Université de Montréal

Augustine on Adam's Rib and Eve's Sin: An Evaluation of Theological

Sexism in Augustine's Exegesis of Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3

par

Constance Ellen McLeese

Faculté de théologie

Thèse présentée à la Faculté des études supérieures

en vue de l'obtention du grade de

Philosophiæ Doctor (Ph.D.)

en théologie

Octobre, 1997

© Constance Ellen McLeese, 1997

Université de Montréal

Augustine on Adam's Rib and Eve's Sin: An Evaluation of Theological
Sexism in Augustine's Exegesis of Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3

par:

Constance Ellen McLeese

Faculté de théologie

Thèse présentée à la Faculté des études supérieures

en vue de l'obtention du grade de

Philosophiae Doctor (Ph.D.)

en théologie

Octobre, 1997

Université de Montréal

Faculté des études supérieures

Cette thèse intitulée

Augustine on Adam's Rib and Eve's Sin:

An Evaluation of Theological Sexism in Augustine's Exegesis of Gen.

2:15-25 and Gen. 3

présentée par

C. E. McLeese

Cette thèse a été évaluée par un jury composé des personnes suivantes:

Denise Couture
Pamela Bright
Pierre Létourneau
Mary Schaefer
Olivette Genest

Thèse acceptée

le: .... 27. 03. 1998 ....

Abstract

This thesis evaluates Augustine's theological sexism. Theological sexism is defined as theology which understands the subordination of women to be divinely mandated and sanctioned. Two key areas for assessing theological sexism are the interpretation and use of Gen. 2:15-25 (the creation of woman from Adam's rib) and Gen. 3 (the entry of sin into the world). A series of five questions has been developed to aid in the analysis. They are: 1. Is the order of creation indicative of a divine plan concerning gender relations? 2. Is the subordination of women divinely sanctioned? 3. Who is responsible for the entry of sin into the world? 4. Is the patriarchal family divinely sanctioned? 5. Are these texts used in any way which either explicitly or implicitly sanctions female inferiority and/or subordination?

In order to evaluate the level of Augustine's theological sexism, it was necessary to analyze Augustine's exegesis of Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3 as found in his two extended attempts at interpreting the biblical stories: *De genesi contra manichaeos* and *De genesi ad litteram*. It was also necessary to assess the over 337 incidental references to Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3 which Augustine makes throughout the corpus of his work. It was therefore important to understand Augustine's exegetical principals and strategies, particularly as described in his *De doctrina christiana*.

Regarding Augustinian exegesis and interpretation of Gen. 2:15-25 it was determined that the passage was considered prophetic of some future even or person 33% of the time. Roughly 9% of the citations dealt with technical aspects of interpretation while 16% were interpreted

allegorically. Various issues of Christian doctrine accounted for 42 % of the interpretations. Gen. 3 varied slightly from Gen. 2:15-25. Typology and allusion were used with enough frequency to make them detectable. Chronologically Augustine's exegetical strategies regarding Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3 shifted during the course of his lifetime from the allegorical to prophetic or literal forms of exegesis. No particular exegetical strategy appeared to promote or mediate against the subordinationist use of the texts.

Augustine also betrayed some of his exegetical influences. He particularly favored Tertullian or perhaps a North African tradition for Gen. 2:15-25. Ambrose's influence appears far less pronounced for both Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3. Throughout Augustine's exegesis Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3 there are tantalizing hints and echoes of Philo.

Augustine's use of Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3 betrays a small but strong sub-current of theological sexism. Approximately 7% of his interpretations fall into this category. Patriarchal marriage is divinely intentioned and sanctioned and constitutes the sacred paradigm for gender relations in both the pre-lapsarian and post-lapsarian world. Women are doomed to a subordinate position by virtue of their secondary order of creation. However Augustine's insistence upon male responsibility for the entry of evil into the world produces a less negative evaluation of his theological sexism.

Five Key Words

Augustine

Gen. 2:15-25

Gen. 3

exegesis

theological sexism

Résumé

Cette thèse traite la question du sexisme théologique chez saint Augustin. Le champ d'étude est limité, de par l'étendue vaste de la question, aux interprétations augustiniennes de Genèse 2, 15-25 et de Genèse 3 et ceci, en se fondant sur la théorie de Gerda Lerner telle que présentée dans son oeuvre The Creation of Patriarchy.

Le premier chapitre énonce la critique féministe et décrit les méthodes d'analyse utilisées pour les fins de cette recherche. Les paramètres du dialogue féministe y sont définis et la trajectoire historique de la critique y est tracée. À l'égard du christianisme, la critique féministe suit trois trajectoires. En premier lieu, le féminisme dit «post chrétien» formule la plus sévère des critiques. Une des auteurs les plus connues de cette école de pensée est Mary Daly. Pour elle, le christianisme n'est plus qu'un des visages spirituels du sexisme, la religion dominant de la planète. Ainsi, elle rejette radicalement le christianisme en tant que véhicule spirituel pour les femmes. La deuxième trajectoire demeure toujours dans le paradigme chrétien et est appelé «féminisme chrétien». Pour cette école de pensée le sexisme se manifeste dans le christianisme par l'influence mondaine de ce dernier pour des fins non spirituelles. La troisième école de pensée ne rejette ni accepte le christianisme. Pour cette dernière, le christianisme ne représente qu'un corpus de données historiques pour fins d'analyse et d'évaluation. Gerda Lerner appartient à cette école.

Le corpus de recherche dit féministe sur Saint Augustin est plus limité. Dans ce cas-ci, on y retrouve deux écoles de pensée. La première école à laquelle on associe les recherches de Kari Borresen

considère saint Augustin comme n'étant pas typiquement sexiste. Son sexisme reflète la culture de l'époque plutôt qu'une haine profonde vis-à-vis des femmes. La deuxième école, à laquelle les recherches d'Elizabeth A. Clarke sont représentatives, voit dans les écrits de saint Augustin les traces d'un sexisme personnel beaucoup plus profond et alarmant.

Face à cette ambiguïté, cette thèse propose d'évaluer le sexisme théologique dans les écrits de saint Augustin. Le sexisme théologique y est défini comme étant tout sexisme basé sur le vouloir divin ou ayant reçu l'imprimatur de Dieu.

Gerda Lerner, dans The Creation of Patriarchy, privilégie deux mythes pour l'évaluation du sexisme théologique dans l'expression judéo-chrétienne: l'histoire de la création de la femme à partir du corps masculin et l'entrée du péché dans le monde à travers la femme. Elle propose une série de questions pouvant former une grille d'évaluation du sexisme théologique. Le contexte littéraire et théologique des quatrième et cinquième siècles étant différent que celui de Lerner, seulement certaines de ses questions sont retenues. Quelques autres y sont ajoutées: (1) Est-ce que l'ordre de la création sert en tant qu'indication d'un plan divin en ce qui a trait aux relations entre les hommes et les femmes? (2) Est-ce que la subordination des femmes est établie à partir d'un mandat divin? (3) Qui est responsable de l'entrée du péché dans le monde? (4) Est-ce que la famille patriarcale reçoit l'assentiment de Dieu? et (5) Est-ce que saint Augustin interprète la Genèse 2, 15-25 ou la Genèse 3 de toute autre manière pouvant valoriser la subordination de la femme?

Cette recherche priviligie les interprétations de saint Augustin des textes bibliques. Évidemment, il faut être au courant des méthodes et approches augustiniennes. Le chapitre deuxième couvre l'analyse des stratégies et principes exégétiques de saint Augustin. Cette analyse touche entre autres ses discours à l'endroit de l'exégèse manichéenne à partir desquelles il forge ses théories exégétiques au début de sa carrière de théologien tel que contenu dans son chef-d'oeuvre exégétique, la *De doctrina christiana.*

Le chapitre troisième est consacré aux détails sur les traditions de ses manuscrits. Saint Augustin tente deux fois une exégèse systématique de la Genèse 2:15-24 et de la Genèse 3 dans le *De genesi contra manichaeos* et le *De genesi ad litteram*. Ces deux oeuvres constituent le point de repère de cette recherche. Il est donc important de connaître l'authenticité des éditions latines utilisées ainsi que d'être au courant des versions latines des écrits saints utilisés par saint Augustin.

Les chapitres quatrième et cinquième constituent le coeur de la recherche. Le chapitre quatrième, centré sur l'interprétation augustinienne de la Genèse 2,15-25, est divisé en trois sections. La première section décrit les 127 fois que saint Augustin cite une portion de la Genèse 2,15-25. Ici, il est démontré que saint Augustin ne manifeste pas un changement énorme dans ces interprétations durant sa carrière exégétique. On observe un mouvement graduel de stratégie allégorique au début de sa carrière à l'exégèse prophétique et doctrinale vers la fin. Il est aussi évident que saint Augustin emprunte certaines de ses interprétations des autres pères de l'Église. Il favorise tout particulièrement Tertullien qui témoigne peut-être d'une tradition

exégétique de l'Afrique du Nord. Visiblement, saint Augustin emprunte moins souvent les interprétations de saint Ambroise. Il existe aussi des traces légères d'un influence philonique. Aussi, saint Augustin suit une tradition qui date de saint Paul quand il interprète la Genèse 2,24 comme étant prophétique de l'Église chrétienne.

La deuxième section du chapitre quatrième présente l'analyse des stratégies exégétiques employées par saint Augustin. L'analyse démontre qu'une fois sur trois que saint Augustin considère le texte en question comme prophétique d'un événement ou d'une personne dans le Nouveau Testament. La plupart de ses exégèses tombe dans la catégorie d'une doctrine chrétienne. Cette catégorie constitue 42 % des interprétations dont la doctrine de la Chute et la théologie chrétienne du mariage.

La troisième section du chapitre quatrième présente l'évaluation du sexisme théologique manifesté par saint Augustin dans ses exégèses de Genèse 2:15-24. Seulement 4% des exégèses démontrent un sexisme théologique mais cette faible proportion ne cache pas l'importance théologique. Pour saint Augustin, le mariage patriarcal est initié par Dieu et constitue la volonté divine de la subordination culturelle et sociale de la femme.

Le chapitre cinquième suit la même structure que le précédent. La première section décrit l'interprétation augustinienne de la Genèse 3. Saint Augustin suit les mêmes stratégies exégétiques que pour la Genèse 2:15-25. Il y a une légère modification dans ses stratégies préférées. La prophétie est employée moins souvent et plus d'interprétations tombent dans la catégorie de la doctrine chrétienne. L'influence de Tertullien est moins évidente et l'influence de saint

Ambroise se font ressentir plus fréquemment. Face à la Genèse 3:6, saint Augustin se démarque de la plupart des autres pères d'Église. Selon saint Augustin, ce n'est pas la femme qui est responsable en tant qu'être humain de l'entrée du péché dans le monde mais plutôt l'orgueil de ce dernier qui a mené Adam à se subordonner au serpent. Dans ce cas-ci, il n'y a pas de manifestation de sexisme théologique chez saint Augustin. Toutefois sa pensée n'est pas sans trace de sexisme. Il en est ainsi de sa position sur la punition de la femme dans la Genèse 3, 16 qui représente selon lui une approbation divine du mariage patriarcal.

En conclusion, il est évident que le sexisme théologique manifesté dans la théologie de saint Augustin est basé sur le paradigme du mariage patriarcal qui est ordonné par Dieu. Avec son insistance que les êtres humains, et non seulement le genre, sont responsables de l'entrée du péché dans le monde son sexisme théologique est ainsi considéré comme étant plus modéré.

Table of Contents

Table of Contents Continued

Table of Contents Continued

Table of Contents Continued

Table of Contents Continued

Table of Contents Continued

Table of Contents Continued

List of Tables

Abbreviations

ACW	Ancient Christian Writers, New York: Newman Press.
ANF	Roberts and Donaldson, eds. <u>The Ante-Nicene Fathers</u>, American Edition, Hendrickson Press, 1995.
CCL	<u>Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina.</u>
EEC	<u>Encyclopedia of Early Christianity</u>. Edited by Everet Ferguson, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc. 1990.
FC	Deferrari, Roy Joseph, et al. ed. <u>The Fathers of the Church</u>, The Catholic University of America Press: The Fathers of the Church Inc.
Leob	<u>The Loeb CLassical Library</u>, Cambridge Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
NPNC1	Schaff, P. ed. <u>Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers</u>, First Series, American Edition, Hendrickson Press, 1995.
NPNC2	Schaff and Wace, eds. <u>Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers</u>, Second Series, American Edition, Hendrickson Press, 1995.

Abbreviations Continued

PG   *Patrologiae cursus completus, series graeca.* J. P.
            Migne, *Parisiis.*

PL   *Patrologiae cursus completus, series latina.* J. P.
            Migne, *Parisiis.*

SC   Sources Chrétiennes, Henri de Lubac & J. Daniélou,
            Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf.

VL   *Vetus Latina*: Dei Reste der altlateinischen Bibel
            nach Petrus Sabatier, ed. Bonifatius Fischer, Vol. 2.
            Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1951.

"And if I have prophetic powers, and understand all mysteries and all knowledge, and if I have all faith, so as to remove mountains, but have not love, I am nothing." 1 Cor. 13:2

For

John Earl, Shirley Ellen, Bertha Jane, Robert, Ellen and Arndell

who had love

Remerciements

Introduction

The process of doing research is not unlike the structure of an archeological dig. The question which initially prompted the investigation forces the researcher to peel back successive layers of data in order to formulate a response. This thesis certainly follows this pattern. The process of exposing the various levels was prompted by the desire to investigate, in a systematic way, Augustine's theological sexism. In order to do this adequately, it was necessary to analyze several levels of data. Consequently the overall structure of the thesis mirrors these various strata. The thesis moves from the recent issue of the feminist critique of Christianity and the potential for evaluating a given author's level of theological sexism through his or her interpretation of Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3 into Augustine's exegetical world. It passes through the strata of Augustine's biblical manuscript tradition and the manuscript tradition for Augustine's own works. It moves on to the analysis of the numerous literary shards wherein Augustine cited either of the aforementioned biblical passages. Having excavated the terrain, the archeologist attempts to interpret and evaluate the artifacts. So too, does this thesis, shift from an interpretation of Augustine's exegetical tradition and strategies for Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3, to an evaluation of the theological sexism manifest therein.

Before moving on to the main body of the thesis there are several editorial details which need clarification. Rather than use extensive abbreviations to denote Latin texts, I have opted for a conservative approach. The titles of all works, which appear in the text will be cited in

full. This should serve to make this work more readable for those who are not intimately familiar with patristic and Augustinian literature. Upon occasion, when a work is being constantly cited in a given section, abbreviations will be used in the footnote references order to avoid constant and tedious repetition. When this occurs it will be indicated in the footnotes.

Capitalization in Latin titles can occasionally prove problematic. For the purposes of this thesis the following format will be used: only the first letter of the first word of each title will be capitalized. Some authors capitalize all the important words in Latin titles after the English fashion. Some of the titles of their books or articles will contain a Latin title which appears in this way. I have cited all such titles in the manner in which the author of the book or article cited them.

Latin works will be cited in the main body of the text with their Latin titles, followed by the chapter and verse numbers as they appear in Migne's *Patrologiae Latinae* or the *Corpus Christianorum, series Latina.* Quotes from Latin works will appear in their Latin form, followed by the English translation. The footnotes for these quotations will use the following format: the Latin title of the work being cited; the chapter and verse numbers as they appear in Migne; the series, volume and column of the work where the Latin manuscript is published; and in the case where I have used an English translation other than my own, the series, volume and page number for the particular translation will also appear.

I have also adopted the abbreviation VL in my footnotes for the *Vetus Latina* or old Latin translations of the Bible. This abbreviation will be followed by a volume and page number. This refers to the edition of

the *Vetus Latina* which was edited by Bonifatius Fischer. The reference appears in full on the list of abbreviations.

Chapter One

<u>Theological Sexism</u>

"Out flew the web and floated wide;

The mirror cracked from side to side;

'The curse is come upon me' cried

The Lady of Shalott."[1]

For many Christian women, their Christian mirror cracked during the twentieth century. It cracked in 1895 when Elizabeth Cady Stanton voiced the opinion that, "No man ever saw or talked with God."[2] It cracked even further when not only the male perspective of the Christian scripture but the tradition itself was called into question with the writers such as Rosemary Radford Ruether. The web of Christianity itself was thrown out with post-Christian writers such as Mary Daly and Daphne Hampson for whom the strand of misogyny and sexism was too inextricably woven into its structure.

The image of the web is a useful one for describing the project which follows. Webs by their very nature are complex. Each link or stand is inter-related and connected to the others. Individual strands can be broken and even destroyed without damaging the fundamental strength of the web as a whole. If Christianity is the web of belief and historical

---

[1]Alfred Lord Tennyson, <u>The Lady of Shalott</u>, 1832-42.

[2]As found in Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, "Transforming the Legacy of <u>The Woman's Bible</u>," in <u>Searching the Scriptures</u>, vol. 1., ed. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza (New York: Crossroad, 1993), p. 4.

circumstance which has managed to survive nearly two thousand years it is incumbent upon thinking Christians to analyze and understand the spinning which produced this structure. This thesis proposes to look at one of the links in the Christian web.

The particular link which is of interest was spun relatively early during Christianity's weaving. It was produced by no less a weaver than the master of the loom, Augustine of Hippo. In order to create it Augustine spun numerous strands. It is the task of the researcher to unweave the strands in an attempt to understand the knot. The particular knot which we are looking at is theological sexism. We are looking for it specifically as it manifests itself in Augustine's understanding the stories of Adam's rib and Eve's sin. In order to do this a number of theoretical and methodological elements need to be considered. The following chapter is devoted to a discussion of these elements.

Sexism and Theological Sexism

Sexism is a rather broad category which is frequently linked with the word patriarchy. While numerous definitions of both terms exist one of the clearest is found in the work of Gerda Lerner. Feminist theory defines patriarchy as social structures and institutions promoting male dominance over women and children, originating in the family and extending throughout society.[3] Sexism is the fundamental orientation that fuels and perpetuates the patriarchal system.[4] Sexism is defined as "the

---

[3]Gerda Lerner, The Creation of Patriarchy (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986), p. 239. See extended definition of patriarchy.

[4] ibid., pp. 240-242 for fuller description of sexism as the underlying ideology of patriarchy.

ideology of male supremacy, of male superiority..."[5]. Consequently patriarchy is the political, social, cultural, and historical manifestation of the fundamental orientation or bias of sexism. Theoretically this bias has been historically learned. It is perpetuated because the patriarchal system accrues both economic and political advantages from female subordination. This self perpetuating bias is manifest primarily in negative attitudes towards woman.

The origins of sexism and patriarchy remain obscure and debated,[6] however distinctions can be made in the type of arguments which authors use to promote sexism and female subordination. While, theoretically and practically, arguments from all fields of knowledge can be used to prove the inferiority of women, there is a class of proofs which bases itself upon the data of religious expression and doctrine. Sexism and the subordination of women are justified as divinely intended. In other words it is perceived to be the will of God or the gods that women be created inferior and therefore subordinated. It is this category of sexism which I have defined as "theological sexism". It is Augustine's theological sexism, his belief or lack thereof, that female subordination is divinely ordained which is the focus of this work.

---

[5]ibid., p. 240.

[6]There are numerous theories about the historical trajectory of sexism and patriarchy. One of the earliest was the theory of Matriarchy produced by Jacob Bachofen (1815-1887) in *Das Mutterrecht* (Mother Law). Based upon the evolutionary theories of Darwin Bachofen argued for an earlier period of matriarchy which eventually evolved into the superior and more civilized patriarchy. Feminist's such as Mary Daly, follow the same evolutionary pattern but reverse the meaning. Patriarchy is a perversion of the natural matriarchy. Gerda Lerner points out that there is no evidence for a truly matriarchal society. Anthropologist have upon occasion erroneously described matrilineal and matrilocal societies as matriarchal. Lerner argues for early gendered reciprocity rather than an idealized or demonized proto-matriarchal social organization. Primitive humanity operated with "separate but equal status." See Lerner, The Creation of Patriarchy, p. 29. Also see chapter one of this work where Lerner describes the various theories of the development of patriarchy.

In order to attempt to evaluate theological sexism as it may have been manifest by Augustine it is necessary to take a step back. It is necessary to briefly outline the cracked mirror since the approach to be taken towards the evaluation of theological sexism has been dictated to a large extent by the feminist critique of Christianity in general.

The Feminist Critique of Christianity

Historically the feminist critique of Christianity has followed three broad approaches. These three orientations are post-Christian, Christian and a-Christian feminism. They have served to define the researcher's approach towards the phenomena and data of Christianity.

Post-Christian Feminism

The first orientation, rejecting the Christian paradigm, argues that Christianity is the religious expression of patriarchy and hence irredeemable. Methodologically, non-sexist Christianity is inconceivable since Christianity is a cult of patriarchy.[7] On the basis of theories of the origin of patriarchy,[8] post-Christian feminists argue that Judeo-Christian religious expression is a product of patriarchy and therefore virtually useless as a vehicle for female spirituality.[9] The underlying orientation of

---

[7] Mary Daly, Gyn/Ecology (Boston: Beacon Press, 1978), p. 39.

[8] See Lerner, The Creation of Patriarchy. Lerner traces the origins of patriarchy to emergent male desires for material control and power which is translated into control of female sexuality and the creation of male dominated religions to provide divine sanction for male activities. Consequently the goddesses are replaced by gods.

[9] Monica Sjöö and Barbara Mor, The Great Cosmic Mother : Rediscovering the Religion of the Earth (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1991), pp. 264-357. The authors describe the

Christianity consonant with its Jewish antecedents is the suppression of female sexuality and the eradication of the female principle.[10] Such radical feminists tend to view themselves as post-Christian.

One of the most well known writers from this perspective is Mary Daly. For Daly, Christianity is one of the spiritual faces of patriarchy, which is itself the dominant religion of the planet. All patriarchal religions, including Christianity are irredeemable since their purpose and very *raison d'être* is to subordinate women.[11] Consequently, the pseudo-myths of Christianity can only be correctly understood from the feminist paradigm. Specifically such feminist analysis reverses the male reversals of reality. Daly explains that this is a "complex process which involves much more than swinging to a simplistic conclusion that 'opposites' of male myths are the 'depths' we seek."[12] Feminists need to recuperate women's "stolen mythic power" since patriarchal myths are really "pale derivatives of more ancient, more translucent myth from gynocentric civilization."[13]

---

systemic destruction of the female spiritual principal in Judeo-Christian tradition making Christianity useless for women. Joanne Carlson Brown and Carole R. Bohn writing of this position state: "Is it possible to be a feminist and retain some attachment to the Christian tradition? Some radical women among us answer with a resounding No. The more that feminists attempt to recapture women's history, change liturgical practices and religious imagery, and restructure hierarchical ecclesiologies, the more the tradition itself, they claim, will change until eventually it is no longer Christianity. The Christian tradition continues this line of thought, is so entrenched in and undergirded by patriarchy that without it, the very religion itself would disappear." Joanne Carlson Brown and Carole R. Bohn ed., Christianity Patriarchy and Abuse: A Feminist Critique (New York: The Pilgrim Press, 1989), p. xiii.

[10]Daly, Gyn/Ecology, p. 60. Daly writes that the real "object of male envy" is "female creative energy in all of its dimensions."

[11]Ibid., p. 39. Daly writes: "Patriarchy is itself the prevailing religion of the entire planet, and its essential message is necrophilia. All of the so-called religions legitimating patriarchy are mere sects subsumed under its vast umbrella/canopy. They are essentially similar despite the variations. All---from buddhism and hinduism to islam, judaism, christianity, to secular derivatives such as freudianism, jungianism, marxism and maoism---are infrastructures of the edifice of patriarchy."

[12]Ibid., p. 46.

[13]Ibid.

Christian Feminism

The second trajectory of feminism critiques Christianity from within. This view generally argues that Christian sexism is a function of male misogyny or bias, not that of Christianity.[14] Consequently Christianity is not ontologically sexist, but has been perverted by sexism and used to promote sexism and patriarchy. Moderate feminist scholars, such as Rosemary Radford Reuther,[15] Margaret R. Miles,[16] and Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza[17] have been analyzing the origins and foundations of Christian tradition attempting to formulate an authentic female vision of Christianity, and to differentiate this vision from its sexist contextually mediated expressions.

Many proponents of this second view such as Barbara J. MacHaffie,[18] Anderson and Zinsser,[19] Karen Armstrong,[20] Bonnie Bowman

---

[14]Barbara Brown Zikmund, "Feminist Consciousness in Historical Perspective," in Feminist Interpretation of the Bible, ed. Letty M. Russell (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1985), pp. 28-29. Zikmund describes the same split. She characterizes the difference between post-Christian and Christian feminist as the desire to pursue the religious insights of the Goddess traditions.

[15]See Rosemary Radford Ruether, The Church Against Itself (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967). Also see Rosemary Radford Ruether, Women-Church: Theology and Practice of Feminist Liturgical Communities (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985).

[16]Margaret R. Miles, Augustine On the Body (Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979).

[17]Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins (New York: Crossroad, 1990).

[18]Barbara J. MacHaffie, Her Story: Women In Christian Tradition (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), pp. 23-41. This chapter concerns women and the early church. MacHaffie argues that the prominent belief that women were the originators of sin tainted patristic theology.

[19]Bonnie S. Anderson and Judith P. Zinsser, A History of Their Own, vol. 1 (New York: Harper & Row, 1988), pp. 67-84. The authors argue that Christianity initially empowered women but later became more repressive.

Thurston[21] and Karen Jo Torjesen[22] look particularly to the third and fourth centuries as the period which consolidated sexist ideology and patriarchy within Christianity. The interaction of Christianity with the prevalently patriarchal and sexist social context of this period facilitated the creation of patriarchal ecclesial structures, and sexism generally, within Christian expression. Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza situates the fusion of culturally sexist ideology and Christian expression somewhat earlier in the apostolic period. She suggests that the influence of the ambient patriarchal culture can be seen in even the Pauline and deutero-Pauline epistles.[23]

A-Christian Feminism

A third type of feminist analysis deals with the phenomenon of Christianity without actively taking a stance about Christianity from the perspective of faith. Its questions are not primarily theological although the data of theology and even the Christian paradigm itself may be used and scrutinized for the purposes of feminist analysis. Unlike post-Christian feminists, the Christian paradigm is not radically rejected. Neither, however, is it accepted. A number of modern authors fall into this group. They deal with the data of Christianity from the perspectives of their various

---

[20]Karen Armstrong, "The Acts of Paul and Thecla" in Feminist Theology: A Reader, ed. Ann Loades (Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press, 1990), pp. 83-90. Armstrong describes the increasing marginalization of Thecla during the Patristic period with the triumph of Christian Patriarchy.

[21]Bonnie Bowman Thurston, The Widows. A Women's Ministry in the Early Church (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989).

[22]Karen Jo Torjesen, When Women Were Priests (San Francisco: Harper/Collins, 1994).

[23]Schüssler-Fiorenza, In Memory of Her, pp. 160-341.

academic backgrounds. For example, Ross Shepard Kraemer employs the anthropological model of Mary Douglas to the experience of early Christian women.[24] Elaine Pagels[25] uses historical methodology to trace the chronological trajectory and influence of Gen. 3 on Christianity's evaluation of female sexuality. From the sociological perspective, Kathleen Corley has analyzed the similarities between Christian eucharistic meals and the ambient Greco-Roman table etiquette.[26]

Degrees of Suspicion

Concretely, the differences among these three overarching paradigms are manifest in the degree of suspicion regarding the data of Christianity. For example, Mary Daly who rejects the Christian paradigm radically rejects the data of Christianity. Christianity is "veiled vampirism."[27] It perpetuates itself through myth which has transformed and perverted the truly life giving and generative gynocentric spiritual energy. In fact the very

---

[24]Ross Shepard Kraemer, Her Share of the Blessings (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), pp. 128-198. Using Douglas's sociological grid analysis, Kraemer argues that the egalitarian, low grid, high group communities which promoted women within Christianity could not win the day. Sociologically such types of groups are 'conducive on the one hand to fission and dissolution and on the other to inadequate perpetuation." (p. 205).

[25]Elaine Pagels, Adam, Eve, and the Serpent (New York: Random House, 1988). Pagels argues that the negative attitude towards women's sexuality stems from the canonization of Augustine's idiosyncratic attitude towards sexuality and his negative sense of human ability to avoid sin.(pp. 98-126).

[26]Kathleen E. Corley, Private Women; Public Meals: Social Conflict in the Synoptic Tradition (Peabody Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1993). Corely argues that primitive Christianity, contrary to Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza and Karen Jo Torjesen, did not promote women. The positive attitudes displayed to women in the gospels are merely a reflection of a more positive attitude towards women which was to be found generally in the ambient culture.

[27]Daly, Gyn/Ecology, p.81.

point of Christianity is that it has "stolen and reversed, contorted and distorted"[28] antecedent gynocentric symbols and myths. When dealing with the myths of Christianity women must "learn to recognize, avoid and expel these poisons"[29] from their environment. Sjöö and Mor in a less polemical manner, make a similar argument in The Great Cosmic Mother.[30]

From within the Christian paradigm, Christian feminists also employ what Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza describes as a "hermeneutics of suspicion"[31] regarding the data of Christianity. Primarily this means being critically suspicious of all data and documents produced within Christianity in order to counterbalance their overwhelmingly androcentric bias. The vast majority of Christian feminists either explicitly or implicitly adopt this approach. Variations occur in the level of suspicion and the malevolence attributed to androcentricity.[32] Rather than list the numerous writers that fall into this category it is simpler to note the following exception. There exists

---

[28]Ibid., p. 75.

[29]Ibid., p.74.

[30]Sjöö and Mor, The Great Cosmic Mother, pp. 391-432. Herein the authors describe moving beyond the mechanistic male god and returning 'home' to the time of the Goddess. Part of the mechanism that allows one to do this is 'respelling' the world. This is analogous to Mary Daly's 'sparking, spinning and spooking' one's way to gynocentricity. Also see Mary Daly, Outercourse: The Be-Dazzling Voyage, (San Francisco: Harper, 1992).

[31]Schüssler Fiorenza, In Memory of Her, p. 60. To whatever method is being used the feminist applies a hermeneutics of suspicion. This is to counterbalance the overwhelming androcentric bias in 1) translation and interpretation of texts, 2) selection of historical tradition, 3) the canonization of patriarchal social structures and 4) androcentric projection.

[32]A concrete example of the variations in levels of malevolency attributed to androcentric bias can be found in the following collection of essays. Joanne Carlson Brown & Carole R. Bohn ed., Christianity, Patriarchy, and Abuse (New York: Pilgrim Press, 1989). Carole R. Bohn in her article "Dominion to Rule" (pp. 105-116) characterizes the Christian tradition as deeply corrupted by the bias which legitimizes and promotes aggression towards women. Mary E. Hunt in "Theological Pornography: From Corporate to Communal Ethics," (pp. 89-104) describes the bias in terms of the corporate structure of the church. Her analysis is much less gloomy than Bohn's since corporate structures are easier to change than deeply corrupted traditions.

a small group who rejects the notion of androcentric bias. These have been described as loyalists. As Carolyn Osiek explains, such 'feminists' [33] assume that androcentric bias is not part of Christianity which truly represents divine will. Since it is God's will that men and women live harmoniously together, androcentric bias is the error of the interpreter or the interpretive tradition.[34] These writers strongly adhere to the Christian paradigm and weakly adhere to the feminist one.[35]

From the a-Christian perspective, Gerda Lerner has attempted to formulate a basis for evaluating the level of theological sexism within any religious perspective. No spiritual expression is presupposed to be sexist and Lerner remains neutral as to whether or not any contain elements of divine truth. She uses the responses to the following three questions[36] as her bases for making her assessment. The first deals with the locus of creation. Who is responsible for creating life? The second focuses on the entry of sin into the world. Lerner asks: "Who brings evil into the world?" The third asks: "To whom do the gods speak?" [37] Christianity fares rather badly as assessed by Lerner. The male God is

[33]There is debate about whether one can be a feminist properly speaking if one rejects the notion of androcentric bias. Rosemarie Tong in Feminist Thought: A Comprehensive Introduction (San Francisco: Westview Press, 1989), pp. 11-38, characterizes such an approach as "humanism" as opposed to "feminism".

[34]Carolyn Osiek, "The Feminist and the Bible: Hermeneutical Alternatives," in Feminist Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship, ed. Adela Yarbro Collins (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), p. 99.

[35]Ibid., Osiek cites the work of Richard and Joyce Boldrey, Chauvinist or Feminist? Paul's View of Women (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1976), and Evelyn and Frank Stagg, Women in the World of Jesus (Philadelphia: Westminister, 1978). Also see Alvin F. Kimel, Speaking the Christian God: The Holy Trinity and the Challenge of Feminism (Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1992).

[36]Gerda Lerner, The Creation of Patriarchy, p. 146.

[37]Ibid.

responsible for creating life from the male human thereby mythically reversing the natural order of procreation (Gen. 2:24).[38]   For Lerner the creation of life is the strongest and most powerful theological statement made by any religious expression.[39]   In response to the second question Lerner argues that women are responsible for the entry of sin into the world.[40]   Hebrew myth, in Genesis 3, places the blame for evil on woman and her sexual nature. Concerning the third question Lerner argues that the patriarchal family embodied in the community metaphor of covenant and the rite of circumcision provides sacramental sanction for the Gen. 2:24 reversal.

The uniqueness of Lerner's grid is that it moves the assessment of sexism beyond the level of the personal cultural sexism of a given author. It attempts to evaluate sexism at the level of theological meaning, without assuming as post-Christian feminists do, that Christianity is sexist. Her method also makes a distinction between the authority of the various types of literature produced within a religious tradition. Within the Christian perspective, Lerner privileges the Bible. It is the interaction of the Christian interpreter with the Bible which provides the theological foundation and logic to his promotion or lack of promotion of sexist values.

---

[38]Ibid., p. 181. Lerner writes: "The Man here defines himself as 'the mother' of the Woman; through the miracle of divine creativity a human being was created out of his body the way the human mother brings forth life out of her body."

[39]Ibid., p. 180.

[40]Ibid., 204.

The Feminist Critique of Augustine

Augustine has presented feminists researching the Patristic period with a challenge. His attitudes towards women appear ambiguous. For example he argues in _De trinitate_ 12.7.9 that since women are created in God's image Gen. 1:27, consequently 1 Cor. 11:7[41] has to be interpreted allegorically. However Augustine's egalitarianism regarding the issue of _imago dei_, does not appear to preclude subordinationism in human marital relationships. In _De bono conjugali_ I.1 Augustine speculates about pre-lapsarian marriage as a "_alterius regentis, alterius obsequentis amicalis quaedam et germana conjunctio_" (kind of friendly and genuine union of the one ruling and the other obeying).[42] At the very least Augustine appears atypically sexist.

In an effort to explain Augustine's atypicallity, analysis has been divided between two schools of thought. The first group, focusing on Augustine's theological anthropology and the issue of _imago dei_ argue that Augustine is less sexist than his contemporaries. The second group, dealing with Augustine's theology of marriage and virginity, have suggested that Augustine's acceptance of the Greco-Roman household code betrays his fundamentally sexist orientation. The primary difference between the two approaches is the degree of importance accorded to Augustine's patriarchal cultural matrix.

---

[41] 1 Cor. 11:7. "For a man ought not to cover his head, since he is the image and glory of God; but woman is the glory of man."

[42] PL 40, 373. FC 27, 9.

Sexism as a Result of the Ambient Culture:

This first group of scholars argues more strongly for the contextual mediation of Augustine's writing. They suggest that Augustine is less sexist than is generally assumed. His apparent sexism results from his conceptual and linguistic baggage. From this perspective, Augustine's use of language reveals a more positive attitude towards women than that manifested by other patristic writers. Margaret Miles[43] has argued that Neo-Platonic metaphysical and anthropological[44] terminology have allowed an unintentional sexism to creep into Augustine's work. Mary Cline Horowitz suggests that Augustine's allegorical use of patriarchal language allows him to write more affirmatively of women than other patristic writers.[45]   Laporte and Weaver make a similar argument.[46]

---

[43]Margaret Ruth Miles, Augustine on the Body, p. 5. Miles has focused upon Augustine's evaluation of the body from the perspective of his Stoic, Neoplatonic, gnostic and Manichaean tradition. Arguing that if even only 60 % of Augustine's consciousness has been environmentally formed, there is a strong contextual mediation for his language and discourse. Miles reiterates the necessity for understanding contextual mediation of language in 1990, when she writes: "to understand both the intent and the effect of Augustine's thought and teaching on body and sexuality permits us, in the final analysis , to find Augustine not so much a formidable and threatening authority of the history of Christian doctrine, but, as he asked and expected to be seen, in the context of his own struggles, our *fellow pilgrim*." Margaret Miles, "The Body and Human Values in Augustine of Hippo," in Grace, Politics and Desire: Essays on Augustine, ed. H. A. Meynell (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 1990), pp. 65-66.

[44]Kari Borresen, "L'Anthropologie Théologique D'Augustin et de Thomas D'Aquin," Recherches de Science Religieuse 69/3 (1981): 393-406. Describing Augustine's and Aquinas' Neoplatonic anthropology, Borresen writes: "L'intention d'Augustin et de Thomas a été de rendre le message évangélique accessible à la culture de leur temps, en utilisant des systèmes conceptuels humainement déterminés et historiquement donnés". (p. 405).

[45]Mary Cline Horowitz, "The Image of God in Man--Is Woman Included?" Harvard Theological Review 72/3-4 (July-October, 1979): 175-206. Horowitz writes: "In context, Augustine was not referring to the two sexes literally but to the allegory which we have seen in Philo and Origen which identified the male with higher reason and the female with lower reason (*De trin.* 12.7.9)." (p. 202) Horowitz criticizes O'Faolain, Martines and Reuther for ignoring this allegorical aspect of Augustine and consequently making his biblical interpretation appear more sexist.

They question the leap from androcentric language to the promotion of sexist attitudes and behaviors. They argue that Augustine "the pastor of souls" promotes a rich understanding of women's spirituality for his time.[47] Clarissa Atkinson, tracing the influence of the symbol of Monica upon the Christian ideal of motherhood, suggests that Augustine powerfully affirms his mother by making her the voice of God and Christian wisdom.[48] She argues that Augustine does not promote passive behavior in women if his relationship with his mother serves as any indication.

The most comprehensive research into the area of Augustinian sexism has been conducted by Kari Borresen. Borresen, for example, argues that androcentric words such as *homo* also include women.[49] She tackles the issue of Augustine's attitude towards female sexuality under the framework of the penalty of sin. She suggests that Augustine uses human sexuality as an example of any unruly passion.[50]

---

[46]Jean Laporte and F. Ellen Weaver, "Augustine and Women: Relationships and Teachings," Augustinian Studies 12 (1981): 115-131.

[47]Weaver and Laporte, "Augustine and Women: Relationships and Teachings," p. 120. These authors argue , contrary to Elizabeth Clark, that Augustine's letters to women show him to be sensitive and supportive of women.

[48]Clarissa W. Atkinson, "*Your Servant, My Mother*: The Figure of Saint Monica in the Ideology of Christian Motherhood," in Immaculate & Powerful: The Female in Sacred Image and Social Reality, ed. Atkinson, Buchanan and Miles in The Harvard Women's Studies in Religion Series (Boston: Beacon Press, 1985), p. 143.

[49]Kari Borresen, "In Defense of Augustine: How *Femina* is *Homo*," Collectanea Augustiniana 1 (1990): 412-428. Borresen describes Augustine as a 'patriarchal feminist'. Pointing to his metaphysical understanding of body and soul and his shift of the locus of sin from the literally feminine agent to transcendent human pride , Augustine becomes the high water point of patriarchal feminism.

[50]Kari Borresen, Subordination and Equivalence-Nature and Role of Women in Augustine and Thomas Aquinas trans. Charles Talbot (Washington: University Press of America, Inc. 1981). This is Borresen's seminal presentation of her argument for apparent subordination upon the basis of a contextually mediated anthropology which determined the language of Augustine's discourse. For Augustine she writes: "Sexual difference

Theologically the issue is human egotism rather than subordination of women.[51]

    Borresen goes even further in her defense of Augustine. He promotes "patristic feminism."[52] since he is "the first author who directly confronts 1 Cor. 11:7"[53] by affirming that Gen 1:27 takes precedence. Women are created in the image of God. Borresen cautions however that Augustine is thoroughly androcentric in his perspective. "Women are not God-like *qua* females."[54] Augustine's earlier "typological feminism"[55] becomes firmly male centered in his mature work on original sin. Concerned with countering the polemic of Julian of Eclanum,[56] Augustine "invokes Eve's subordinate role in procreation to enforce Adam's exclusive transmission of original sin."[57]

---

belongs only to bodily substance; the rational soul is identical in both sexes, because, since it is spiritual, it is asexual. The soul makes both sexes *homo,* a human being in general; the body makes them differ as *vir* or *femina,* human beings of male or of female sex." (p. 315).

[51]Borresen, Subordination and Equivalence, p. 59. She writes: "In general, concupiscence is regarded exclusively as sexual desire, whose irrational force filled Augustine with fear." She continues "But in his controversy with Julian of Eclanum, he (Augustine) makes it clear that this word covers all unruly passion, and that self-love is differentiated according to the kind of object desired."

[52]Kari Borresen, "Patristic 'Feminism': The Case of Augustine," Augustinian Studies 25 (1994): 144.

[53]Ibid., p. 145. Borresen has long argued this. It also appears in her "In Defense of Augustine: How *Femina* is *Homo,*" Collectanea Augustiniana 1 (1990): 412-428.

[54]Ibid.

[55]Borresen explains that typological feminism is based upon patristic feminism's removal of Gen. 1:27b from it literal connection with Gen. 1:28. This spiritualizing of Gen 1:27b allows both men and women to be created in God's image without necessarily having to argue that procreation is good. Augustine however does not view Eve as asexual wherein lies his typological feminism. Adam/Christ and Eve/Mary include both the spiritual and physical elements in the redemptive order. Ibid., p. 147.

[56]Julian (380-455) was the married Bishop of Eclanum. He strongly supported Pelagianism for which he was condemned at Ephesus in 431 C.E.

[57]Borresen, "Patristic 'Feminism': The Case of Augustine," p. 148.

Sexism Innate to Augustine:

A second group of scholars assumes some intentional sexism in Augustine's writing. The common thread with all these authors is that Augustine does not transcend his fundamentally patriarchal and sexist culture. Any positive attitudes towards women are accidental and the result of the historical context of the debates.

Elizabeth A. Clark, researching Augustinian attitudes towards sexuality and marriage, takes a dimmer view of Augustine's proto-feminist theological leanings. She acknowledges that Augustine modifies the "harsh rhetoric of his predecessors,"[58] however, this "does not mean that he, any more than they, challenged male dominance and female submission within actual marriage."[59] She also points out that Augustine's personal relationships with women were not nearly as frequent nor warm as those of Jerome and Chrysostom.[60] Augustine's less sexist rhetoric was a function of the nature of the debate rather than genuine concern for women. Clark notes that Augustine's later readings

---

[58]Clark is referring to Jerome and Chrysostom.

[59]Elizabeth A. Clark, "Theory and Practice in Late Ancient Asceticism," Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion 5/2 (Fall 1989): 46.
    Also see St. Augustine on Marriage and Sexuality, Selections from the Fathers of the Church Series, vol. 1, ed. Elizabeth A. Clark (Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1996).

[60]Clark, "Theory and Practice in Late Ancient Asceticism," p. 34. Clark notes that 34% of Jerome's correspondence was addressed to women, 23% of Chrysostom's and a mere 7% of Augustine's.
    For the opposite interpretation see Gerald Bonner, "Augustine's Attitude to Women and Amicitia", in Homo Spiritualis. Festgabe für Luc Verheijen, OSA, ed. C. Mayer and K. H. Chelius (Würzburg: Augustinus-Verlag, 1987), p. 259. Bonner writes about the same correspondence: "Augustine, in his letters to women, treated his corespondents as intellectual equals and never shrank from theological exposition on the highest level because of the sex of his correspondent. "

of Genesis are less ascetic and more literal since he is attempting to
refute accusations "that Catholic asceticism was Manichaean."[61] For
Clark, Augustine's more positive attitudes towards women are also the
result of "the theological climate....(which) encouraged more support for
marriage and reproduction than had that of a decade or two earlier,
when Jerome and John Chrysostom developed their theories."[62] On the
basis of Augustine's descriptions of his relationships with women,[63] she
suggests that his less sexist language is not genuinely reflective of a non
sexist attitude.[64] She concedes that Augustine promotes "relatively
positive" behaviors towards women, but these are invalidated by his
personal "misunderstanding and suspicion" of women.[65] For example
Augustine has failed to "develop a richer theory of companionate
marriage" due to his estimation that women were inferior.[66]

Susan Schreiner, suggests that Augustine's positive description
of marriage, and consequently women, is a function of the Manichaean

[61]Elizabeth A. Clark, "Heresy, Asceticism, Adam and Eve: Interpretations of Genesis 1-3 in the Later Latin Fathers, in Genesis 1-3 in the History of Exegesis: Intrigue in the Garden, ed. G. A. Robbins. Studies in Women and Religion, vol. 27 (Queenston, Ontario: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1988), p. 120

[62]Elizabeth Clark, "Theory and Practice in Late Ancient Asceticism, Jerome, Chrysostom, and Augustine," Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion 5/2 (Fall 1989): 34.

[63]ibid., p. 44.

[64]ibid., p. 46. "That Augustine for his own reason chose to modify the harsh rhetoric of his predecessors does not mean that he, any more than they, challenged male dominance and female submission within actual marriage."

[65]Clark, "Theory and Practice in Late Ancient Asceticism: Jerome, Chrysostom, and Augustine," p. 25. Clark concedes that Augustine's theories are relatively "prosexual, promarital, and proreproductive," however points out that Augustine had "no close female friends in his mature years."

[66]Elizabeth Clark, "Adam's Only Companion : Augustine and the Early Christian Debate on Marriage," Recherches Augustiniennes XXI (1986): 157.

discourse against procreation.[67] The affirmation of human reproduction and human sexual relations was intended to refute accusations of Manichaeanism which had been leveled at Augustine. She argues that Augustine's truly sexist bias is evident in his description of Adam's ideal companion, who seems closer to Alypius than to Eve.[68]

Elaine Pagels tracing the historical trajectory of the interpretation of Genesis 3 and its attendant influence upon negative Christian attitudes towards women and sexuality is familiar with the perspectives of Clark and Borresen.[69] However it is her own research which leads her to argue for Augustine's sexism. She suggests that Augustine believed women were inferior by virtue of being created from Adam's rib. It is this inferiority which makes Eve Adam's "temptress" and leads him into disaster.[70]

---

[67] Susan E. Schreiner, "Eve, The Mother of History; Reaching for the Reality of History in Augustine's Later Exegesis of Genesis," in Genesis 1-3 in The History of Exegesis: Intrigue in the Garden, ed. G. A. Robbins, Studies in Women and Religion vol. 27 (Lewiston/Queenston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1988), p. 139.

     Elizabeth Clark makes a similar argument. She suggests that the tenor of the theological debate strongly influenced an apparently positive attitude towards women. However his positive language did not lead to a change of the status quo for women. Clark writes: "Augustine's view of women-in-general, typical for his age, did little to advance his nascent argument about the possibility of friendship in marriage." Clark, "Adam's Only companion: Augustine and the Early Christian Debate on Marriage," p. 140.

[68] p.153. Schreiner argues that Augustine's literal and spiritual attempts as exegesis of the first three chapters of Genesis are a function of his attempt to integrate the vertical transcendent and literal history.

[69]Elaine Pagels, Adam, Eve, and the Serpent (New York: Random House, 1988), pp. 170 & 172.

[70] Ibid., p.114. Also see Karen Jo Torjesen, When Women Were Priests (San Francisco: Harper/Collins, 1993). Karen Jo Torjesen, who is also familiar with Borresen, argues that Augustine's apparent gender equality at the level of theology hides his true sexism which is manifest in the roles he accords to women. She writes: "Initially it may appear that Augustine created gender equality in sin... but he, related to women primarily in their roles as concubines, wives, and slaves." p. 220.

Consequently the contemporary analysis of Augustine from within the feminist perspective has proved ambiguous. Augustine may or may not have employed language in an intentionally sexist manner. Augustine may or may not have promoted behaviors and attitudes that are negative to women. Augustine may or may not have proved sexist in his concrete dealings with women.

Evaluating Theological Sexism

The grid to be used for evaluating theological sexism is derived from the work of Gerda Lerner since she has developed a conceptual framework for addressing the issue which at the very least provides a jumping off point. In this she is unique. However Lerner's tools for analysis are not always sufficiently nuanced to be applied to the historical realities of fourth and fifth century exegesis. Several modifications and adaptations need to be made.

Lerner developed her grid as a tool for evaluating movements in meta-history. She was attempting to trace the shift in theological values over four or five thousand years which served to re-enforce the development of patriarchy. In order to do this she deals with the value of symbol and myth as they move across the transcendental landscape of meaning. Although myths have been generated by historical culturally conditioned individuals or groups in concrete historical circumstances the meanings are a-historical, transcending historical and cultural considerations. Basing her research upon the work of Levi-Straus, Eric

Fromm, Elizabeth Janeway and Erich Neuman,[71] Lerner's focus is the meaning carried by the myths themselves. Whether or not any concrete historical beings ever understood any of the symbols and myths in the manner which Lerner suggests is a moot point.

Such an understanding proves problematic for historical research. Because a given myth may carry a transcendent meaning and may prove to be the vehicle of transmission of that value, does not mean that any historical individuals, engaged in the act of interpreting the texts actually understood that meaning. Furthermore, even if it could somehow be proved that the framers of the myth intended it in the manner which Lerner suggests, (a highly speculative and contentious suggestion), mythical meaning by its very nature is obscure. In other words, the function and meaning of symbol and myth proposed by Lerner at the theoretical level may not have occurred to the concrete individual readers of the texts in the fourth or fifth centuries.

This does not mean that Lerner's approach is unusable as a mechanism for historical research. It does mean that one needs to be sensitive to the fact that the questions may not always produce the answers Lerner anticipated when they are applied to historical individuals and situations. The tenuousness of the link between Lerner's theory and concrete historical instances needs to be explored. This exploration means detailed sifting through the minutiae of specific

---

[71]The following are a few examples taken from Lerner's bibliography pp. 183-288 which serve to illustrate her general intellectual approach. Lerner cites Lévi-Strauss, The Elementary Structures of Kingship, Boston: Beacon Press, 1969; Fromm's The Forgotten Language: An Introduction to the Understanding of Dreams, Fairy Tales and Myths, New York: Rinehart, 1951; Janeway's Man's World, Woman's Place: A Study in Social Mythology, New York: Morrow, 1971; and Neuman's The Great Mother: An Analysis of the Archetype, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

authors, at specific times, in specific contexts in order to understand the meanings with which they invest these myths. In other words her method needs to be used advisedly, and cautiously. Bearing that in mind several comments and modifications regarding Lerner's method need to be made.

Methodological Modifications

This project will attempt to evaluate the level of theological sexism which may exist in Augustine's theology. Lerner privileges two biblical texts as barometers for theological sexism. They are Gen. 2:15-25 which is the creation of Eve from Adam's rib, and Gen. 3 which describes the entry of sin into the world. The meaning of these texts provides the focus for Lerner's first two questions consequently the understanding with which Augustine invests these texts will orient our research. While Lerner's question concerning the entry of sin into the world directed towards Gen. 3 can stand as is, there are some modifications which need to be made to Lerner's other questions.

Lerner suggests that the response to the question: "Who generates life?" serves to indicate theological sexism. For Augustine the fifth century author, the issue is not so much who creates life but who was created first and from whom. It will become evident in chapter four, which describes in detail Augustine's use of Gen. 2:15-25, that Augustine does not understand that Adam has become in effect the mother of Eve. While this is the interpretation pre-supposed by Lerner's question it makes no sense within the concrete world of fifth century exegesis. Augustine does, however understand, that the order of creation indicates man's

superiority and that this particular order is divinely ordained. Consequently Lerner's meta-question has been modified for the historical realities of fifth century theology. Rather than using Lerner's formulation, the following has been added with regards to Gen. 2:15-25: "Is the order of creation indicative of a divine plan concerning gender relations?"

Lerner's third question, "To whom do the God's speak.?" has been purposely excluded from this analysis. This is not because the question is unimportant but rather due to the methodological difficulty determining Augustine's perspective on the issue. This difficulty arises from Lerner's application of her method. Question three pertains to the sanctioning of the inverted natural order of Gen. 2:24. For Lerner this is found in the Hebrew covenant which serves as the metaphor to marginalize women. Yahweh makes several covenants with the Hebrews however none alter the "concepts of gender" [72] therefore she restricts her analysis to the covenant with Abraham. What is at issue is the transference of divine creative powers to the male seed. Lerner writes: "God's blessing of Abraham's seed lends divine sanction to the transfer of procreativity from female to male."[73] Furthermore "Yahweh makes the covenant with Abraham alone, not including Sarah."[74] This is the "divine sanction to the leadership of the patriarch over his family."[75] The covenant is sealed by the act of circumcision which signifies that "that procreativity now

---

[72]Lerner, The Creation of Patriarchy, p. 188.

[73]Ibid., p. 189.

[74]Ibid., p. 190.

[75]Ibid.

lodges in God and in human males."[76]   What is fundamentally at issue is the reversal of the natural order of human generation and the divine sanctioning of the patriarchal family.

While Lerner's question makes sense within the context of the Old Testament, and the Old Covenant, does this apply to the New Covenant? For example the New Covenant, particularly Paul's version, ultimately argues against the necessity for circumcision. Moreover the symbols and metaphors of the New Covenant are modified from those of the Old Covenant. God's relationship with humanity is altered not only by the incarnation but also by the crucifixion. The commemoration of the covenant becomes the wine and bread of the last supper which is available to all. Initiation into the covenant is symbolized by the act of baptism, once again available to all, and not circumcision.

How this shift in covenant symbols from the Hebrew to the Christian tradition plays itself out in relation to sexism and the divine sanctioning of procreativity with the male is not obvious. It constitutes in all probability the topic of a thesis project in and of itself. This does not mean that the link between the divine sanctioning of male   leadership cannot be assessed from within the Christian tradition. Gen. 2 can be interpreted as serving to inaugurate a gender hierarchy. The fact that God apparently condones this order and intentionally employs it also amounts to a divine sanction of this new regime. Furthermore the curses of Gen. 3:16 can also be interpreted as divinely sanctioning the institution of the patriarchal family whereby woman is subordinate to her husband because of her apostasy.   By supplementing and modifying Lerner, the

---

[76]Ibid.

intention of her analysis can be maintained without moving beyond the texts of Genesis 2:15-25 and Gen. 3. The following questions constitute the lens through which Augustinian theological sexism will be assessed:

1. Is the order of creation indicative of a divine plan concerning gender relations?

2. Is the subordination of women divinely sanctioned?

3. Who is responsible for the entry of sin into the world?

4. Is the patriarchal family divinely sanctioned?

It is also possible that interpreters of these Genesis texts might employ them in sexist manners which have not been envisioned by Lerner and do not fall within the purview of the aforementioned questions. To allow for this possibility a fifth question has been added.

5. Are these texts used in any way which either explicitly or implicitly sanctions female inferiority and/or subordination?

The five questions will be applied to the texts of Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3 in the following manner. The first, pertaining to the inauguration of gender hierarchy, will be primarily directed towards Gen. 2:15-25. This is in keeping with Lerner's application. The third question will focus upon Gen. 3. Once again this is based upon Lerner's own approach. Questions two, four and five will be applied to both Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3.

The Choice of Texts

Quite obviously such a task could take on mammoth proportions given the sheer volume of the Augustinian corpus. Consequently restrictions have been placed upon the work. As the title of this thesis suggests, analysis will be limited to Augustine's use of Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3. The choice of these biblical texts is based upon the work of Lerner herself since she privileges these two Genesis stories in her own work. Concretely this means that any allusion by Augustine to Gen. 2:15-25 or Gen. 3 throughout the corpus of his work becomes fodder for analysis. Since Augustine cites some portion of Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3 some 395 times throughout his writings a large data base exists. Augustine also made two systematic attempts at interpreting Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3. The first is *De genesi contra manichaeos* which was produced in 389 C.E. The second is *De genesi ad litteram* written from 401 to 415 C.E. These two texts will be analyzed in some detail in chapters four and five.

Gen. 1:27 has been purposely excluded. There are several reasons for this. This particular verse's insistence upon both genders being created in God's image is not one which lends itself easily to the promotion of sexism and female subordination.[77] Furthermore the issue of *imago dei* and sexism in Augustine's theology has been extensively researched by Kari Borresen. In her book, Subordination and Equivalence-Nature and Role of Women in Augustine and Thomas Aquinas she concluded that for Augustine "the rational soul is identical in

---

[77]Carolyn De Swarte Gifford, "American Women and the Bible: The Nature of Woman as a Hermeneutical Issue," in Feminist Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship, ed. Adela Yarbro Collins (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), p. 18. De Swarte Gifford notes that those attempting to argue for the shared humanity of men and women cite Gen. 1:27-28 as proof text. Those attempting to argue the opposite cite Gen. 2 and 3.

both sexes, because since it is spiritual it is asexual."[78] This rational soul
was the truly divine element of humanity. In "Patristic 'Feminism': The
Case of Augustine," she argued that Augustine's spiritualizing of Gen.
1:27 allowed both men and women to be created in God's image.[79]
Borresen is not alone in her findings. Mary Cline Horowitz, in her article
"The Image of God in Man--Is Woman Included?" also concluded that
Augustine understands women to be created in God's image.[80] Jean
Laporte and Ellen F. Weaver reached a similar conclusion.[81]
Consequently, Gen. 1:27 has been excluded from this analysis.

<center>Historical Considerations</center>

The theologian, whose level of theological sexism is to be
evaluated, lived over fifteen hundred years ago. He was born in the
small village of Thagaste in the North African province of Numidia. His
early life was nurtured in the last glow of the Roman Empire. He studied
the classic Roman art of rhetoric and even rose to the rank of court rhetor
in Milan prior to his much written about conversion to Christianity. While
he flirted with Manichaeism for nine years as a young man, in his maturity
he devoted himself to his Catholic bishopric in Hippo. He was to witness
the increasing instability of the Roman Empire. He saw the fall of Rome

---

[78]Borresen, Subordination and Equivalence, p. 315. Also see "In Defense of
Augustine: How Femina is Homo," pp. 411-428, and "L'anthropologie théologique
d'Augustin et de Thomas d'Aquin," pp. 393-406, where Borresen makes similar
arguments.

[79]Borresen, "Patristic 'Feminism': The Case of Augustine," p. 147.

[80]Horowitz, "The Image of God in Man--Is Woman Included?" pp. 175-206.

[81]Laporte and Weaver, "Augustine and Women: Relationships and Teachings," pp. 115-
131.

in 410 and the Vandal invasion of his homeland in his later years. All of this is to say that Augustine was the product of a particular historical context, a particular world view, a particular religious experience and sensibility which was not that of the twentieth century.

This leads us to a few historical considerations. The grid proposed to evaluate Augustine's theological sexism was developed by a twentieth century feminist. In applying it to a fifth century Christian there is the danger of running roughshod over many of the finer nuances of Augustine's theology and exegesis. There is the danger that we will rip the web of Augustinian thought so irreparably, as to render the evaluation useless.

With that in mind, I wish to propose the following methodological considerations. The focus of this research is historical. It is an attempt to analyze and understand the thinking and bias of a historical individual upon the basis of his written words. The historical evidence used is of one source or type. We have no mosaics of Augustine, no paintings, no diaries produced by members of his household, no newspaper articles, no biographies from the period besides Augustine's own spiritual auto-biography. What we have are tractates, sermons and letters produced by Augustine relating to various spiritual issues, both pastoral and theological spanning roughly fifty years of his life. Therefore there are certain claims we cannot make. We cannot determine with any degree of accuracy how Augustine actually treated women. The limited descriptions of his relationships with them come from his own pen without any outside perspectives. Furthermore any link made between Augustine's theology and the concrete lives of his female parishioners is at the very best highly speculative. The primary historical data available

is Augustine's own thinking as presented in his writings. In order to focus upon these works and do justice to them there are several perspectives which need to be discussed.

The proposed texts are those pertaining to Augustine's use of Genesis 2:15-25 and Genesis 3. Two of the key tractates, *De genesi contra manichaeos* and *De genesi ad litteram* are exegetical. They are Augustine's attempt to interpret the aforementioned biblical texts. Augustine did not interpret within a vacuum. He had theories about exegesis, and strategies of interpretation which were quite different from our own. His tractates were written at specific times and in specific historical contexts. All of these aspects need to be taken into consideration. Consequently the following chapter is devoted to Augustine's exegetical principles and strategies.

Chapter three deals with the technical details of Augustine's versions of scripture. It considers recensions of the *Vetus Latina* which he used in *De genesi contra manichaeos* and *De genesi ad litteram.* It also describes the manuscript tradition for both *De genesi contra manichaeos* and *De genesi ad litteram.*

Chapters four and five constitute the heart of this research. Chapter four will be devoted to Gen. 2:15-25 and chapter five will deal with Gen. 3. Each chapter will be divided into three sections. The first section will describe Augustine's interpretation of the verses in question. The second section will analyze the exegetical strategies and principles which Augustine uses. These two sections will provide a detailed map of Augustine the exegete in action. If the evaluation of theological sexism is to avoid distortion it needs to be founded upon such historical minutiae. The third section will evaluate the level of theological

sexism which Augustine displays. The following is a brief description of the results of the analysis for each of the three sections.

Section 1: The first sections of chapters four and five will consider how Augustine historically used the various verses from Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3. They will describe how he understood and used the verses. During the course of the analysis it will become evident that some verses, such as Gen. 2:15, and Gen. 3:2-3 are scarcely mentioned while others such Gen. 2:17 and Gen. 3:19, are referred to relatively frequently. It will also be evident that Augustine did not radically modify or alter his understanding of the various verses during the course of his writings. Strong evidence will be presented that Augustine's exegesis was influenced by Tertullian, perhaps producing echoes of a North African exegetical tradition. Interestingly, Augustine's contemporaries such as Ambrose and Jerome appear far less influential as sources for specific scriptural exegesis. There is also evidence to suggest that some scriptural interpretations were developed in response to specific historical debates and circumstances. For example, Augustine's understanding of Gen. 2:24 is expanded and developed over the course of a decade in response to Manichaean criticism of the verse. Augustine's later interpretations of Gen. 3 are obviously in response to the Pelagian debate.

Section 2: Section two in chapters four and five, will analyze in detail, the exegetical strategies which Augustine employed in reference to Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3, respectively. It will become evident that Augustine's preferred exegetical strategy was prophecy. Roughly 30% of Augustine's interpretations understand the verse in question as prophetic of some future event, frequently the institution of the Church. The vast

majority of the verses are understood within the context of Christian theological doctrine. The nature of the Fall is a favored category, followed closely by variations upon the themes of marriage, and disordered sexual relations.

Section 3: Having methodically and carefully described Augustine's understanding of Gen. 2:15 and Gen. 3; having analyzed the historical context and influences which helped produce his interpretations; and having detailed the exegetical strategies and principles he applies; section three of chapters four and five will be devoted to the evaluations of Augustine's theological sexism. Theologically sexist interpretations of these verses occur relatively infrequently. Out of 337 citations 23 are understood in a theologically sexist manner. However these 23 instances clearly and categorically illustrate that Augustine understands both Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3 in light of female subordination. The overarching metaphor for this subordinate relationship between men and women is marriage. In other words woman is subordinate to man, and the paradigmatic example used to illustrate the necessity of such subordination is marriage. Such marriages are termed patriarchal by historians.[82] The term patriarchal can be used is several ways, as is illustrated by Gerda Lerner. Narrowly is refers to system "historically derived from Greek and Roman law, in which the male head of the household had absolute legal and economic power over his dependent...family members."[83] Broadly it refers to "the manifestation and institutionalization of male dominance over women

---

[82]Lerner, The Creation of Patriarchy, pp. 238-239.

[83]Ibid.

and children in the family and the extension of male dominance over women in society in general."[84] For the purposes of this thesis the term patriarchal marriage will be defined as a marital relationship wherein the wife plays a subordinate role by virtue of her gender.

It will become clear during the analysis that for Augustine, God not only divinely sanctions this particular marriage arrangement but intentionally uses it as a didactic device in order to illustrate other less obvious anthropological and ecclesiological truths. Furthermore, Augustine quite clearly understands the order of creation as indicative of divinely intentioned male superiority. It is equally evident that Augustine does not view women as being responsible for the entry of sin into the world. While women and the female element are weaker and need to be controlled by the superior male, and they are the chink in the armor which is exploited by Satan, it is the male aspect which bears the ultimate responsibility for human sin. As a result Augustinian theology is spared from some of the worst excesses of misogyny.

Consequently; while Augustine betrays a high level of theological sexism in his sanctification of patriarchal marriage, his insistence upon male responsibility for the entry of evil into the world produces a far more positive evaluation. This in turn may partially explain the ambivalent results in the existent scholarly analysis of Augustinian sexism. Authors, such as Elizabeth A. Clark, who orient their research around Augustine's theology of marriage, are far more likely to encounter Augustine's theological sexism than those, such as Kari Borresen, who focus upon other aspects of Augustine's work. Augustine sanctifies female subordination by using patriarchal marriage as his paradigm both prior to

---

[84]Ibid., p. 239.

and after the fall. However it is only through methodically analyzing Augustine's exegetical activity with regard to Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3 that his pattern of theological sexism becomes obvious. Such analysis is crucial to producing a balanced understanding of Augustine's perspective. In order to develop such an understanding, close attention needs to be paid to Augustine's exegetical background. Consequently the following chapter will focus upon Augustine *qua* exegete.

Chapter Two

<u>Augustine, The Exegete</u>

This chapter proposes to describe Augustine's exegetical tapestry. In order to do so several key sections of his weaving will be highlighted. The first will focus upon the exegetical and theological debates which informed the production of *De genesi contra manichaeos* and *De genesi ad litteram* Augustine's two formal attempts at exegesis for Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3. Much of Augustine's early exegetical activity was in direct response to Manichaean exegesis. Augustine's anti-Manichaean scriptural debates will of necessity be included in this section. The second section will focus upon Augustine's theories about exegesis, and his suggested strategies for scriptural interpretation. Augustine discusses these in a limited way in *De genesi ad litteram imperfectus liber* which will be described briefly in this section. Fortunately Augustine presents the art of exegesis in great depth in his *De doctrina christiana*. This work will provide the theoretical template for Augustinian exegetical strategy.

Section 1

De genesi contra manichaeos

De genesi contra manichaeos is a first for Augustine. It is his earliest attempt at an exegesis on Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3. As such it

constitutes the benchmark against which later interpretations can be measured in order to determine change, development or stasis in Augustine's understanding of the text. It is also Augustine's first exegetical tractate.

De genesi contra manichaeos was written in 388 or 389, shortly after the newly baptized Augustine returned to North Africa. It was produced in Augustine's hometown, Thagaste to which he had retired in 388, after burying his mother in Ostia.[1] He and his life long friend, Alypius, belonged to a quasi monastic group called the *Servi Dei* during this period. Peter Brown describes these *servi* as: "baptized, dedicated laymen, determined to live, in the company of bishops, priests and noble patrons, the full life of a Christian."[2] Augustine's small group of *servi dei* settled near Thagaste. While there, Augustine also came in contact with his old Manichaean companions, who mocked and criticized his new spiritual vocation.[3] It is with the zeal of the newly converted that Augustine, produced *De genesi contra manichaeos*[4] Echoes of its passion can be heard in the *Retractationes* written almost thirty years

---

[1]*Confessiones* IX.XI.27. -XII.37. PL 32, 775-780.

[2]Peter Brown, Augustine of Hippo, p. 132.

[3]Ibid., p. 134.

[4] Many of Augustine's early writings were conceived within the context of the Manichaean debate. Before he was ordained in 391 C.E., Augustine had composed *De libero arbitrio De genesi contra manichaeos, De moribus ecclesiae catholicae, De moribus manichaeorum,* and *De vera religione,* called by Paulinus "the anti-Manichaean pentateuch." In 391 C.E. he published *De utilitate credendi* and *De duabus animabus contra Manichaeos* again dealing with Manichaeanism. *Contra fortunatum manichaeum* was written in 392. This was followed by *Contra adimantum, Contra epistolam manichaei quam vocant fundamenti, Contra faustum manichaeum, Contra felicem manichaeum, De natura boni* and *Contra secundinum manichaeum.* Beyond these specifically anti-Manichaean works, Augustine produced other writings which dealt in some way with Manichaeanism. These included the *Confessiones, Epistolae* LXXIX and CCXXXVI *Enarrationes in psalmos* XL, *Sermo* I, II, XII, L, CLIII, CLXXXII, CCXXXVII, *De agone christiano* and *De continentia.*

later (427 C.E.). Augustine describes the purpose of this early work: "*isti tamen duo libri apertissime adversus eos editi sunt in defensionem veteris legis quam vehementi studio vesani erroris oppugant.*" (these two books very manifestly were published against them [Manichees] in defense of the Old Law which they attack with the vehement intensity of frenzied error.)[5]

The Manichaean Perspective

The "frenzied error" which Augustine perceived was the issue of scriptural authority and the relationship between the Old and New Testaments. Concerning devious Manichaean exegetical practices he wrote in *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae* 1.1(388 C.E.) that the Manichaeans have: "*quibus decipiuntur incauti, ut eos velint habere doctores*" (tricks for catching the unwary, so as to make them take them as teachers.)[6] One common trick was "*Scripturas reprehendunt vel quas male intellegunt vel quas male intellegi volunt.*" (that of finding fault with the scriptures, which they either misunderstand or wish to be misunderstood.)[7] Augustine was familiar with the technique since he had spent nine years as a Manichaean convert. In Book V. of the *Confessiones* he recounts his experiences as a Manichaean from the perspective of sarcedotal middle age.[8] He had associated with the sect

---

[5]*Retractationes* I.IX.1. PL 32, 599. As found in FC 60,41.

[6]PL 32, 1311 & NPNF1 4,41.

[7]Ibid. Augustine recommends bishops, presbyters or any officials of the Catholic Church as appropriate sources for understanding scripture.

[8]There is, however, considerable debate over the extent and nature of Augustine's association with Manichaeanism. George Tavard argues that Augustine's Manichaeanism was merely a phase prior to his adoption of Neo-Platonism. The concreteness of

as a hearer or catechumen, in part because their interpretation of

scripture appeared more intellectually coherent than Christian exegesis.[9]

His fellow Manichaeans deflected any of Augustine's difficult exegetical

questions by recommending that he wait to hear Faustus, their expert

exegete. Augustine described his anticipation and disappointment, at

---

Manichaean spirituality in fact moved the young Augustine to the transcendent and de-material spirituality of Neo-platonic Plotinus. Travard suggests that it is Augustine's awareness of personal sin which moves him beyond Plotinian contemplation to Christianity. G. Travard, "St. Augustine Between Mani and Christ," The Patristic and Byzantine Review 5/3 (1986): 196-206.

Gillian Evans argues, similarly to Tavard; that the Christian Augustine had moved beyond Manichaeanism. She suggests that some elements in Augustinian theology were perceived later by Julian of Eclanum as latently Manichaean. She writes: "Julian calls Augustine a Manichee, not because he believes him to be still a follower of the sect, nor because he believes him to be consistent in his Manichaean views on every point but because, as he argues, the tendency of Augustine's thought is 'Manichaean'. This is Manichaeism by implication, not by conscious commitment." Gillian Evans, "Neither a Pelagian nor a Manichee," Vigilae Christianae 35 (1981): 233.

Taking a somewhat different tack, John Maher, has argued that Augustine was an extremely reliable judge about the differences between Manichaeanism and Christianity. He attempts to prove that Augustine had accurate and intimate knowledge of North African Manichaeanism based upon a comparison of the cosmogonies found in the Coptic Manichaean documents discovered at Medinet Madi in 1930 and the anti-Manichaean writings of Augustine. John P. Maher, "Saint Augustine and Manichaean Cosmogony," Augustinian Studies 10 (1979) : 91-104.

Recently Leo Ferrari has once again tackled the issue of Augustine's relationship to Manichaeanism. He contends that Augustine maintained his status of Catholic catechumen during his Manichean period. Since Augustine did not lose this catechumen status "prior to his arrival in Milan in 384, he must therefore have been a clandestine Manichee. "(p. 113) Ferrari assumes that the Catholic Church would not have continued to consider Augustine as a catechumen had they been aware of his relationship to Manichaeanism. Thus Augustine was a secret Manichaean for the nine years that he associated with the sect. Ferrari suggests that Augustine does not initially make a distinction between Christianity and Manichaeanism. Within this context argues Ferrari: "the question should not be when did Augustine desert the darkness of Manichaeism for the light of Catholic Christianity, but rather when did he disabuse himself of the notion that the Manichees were the real Christians?" (p. 188) Augustine's conversion is not to Catholic Christianity per se but to the realization that Catholic Christianity is the true version of Christianity. Ferrari argues that North African Manichaeans were much closer to North African Catholics than Donatist Catholics were. He also points out that the Manichaeans did not require that the convert abandon his old religion but rather that he should attempt to incorporate it into the Manichaean framework. In essence Augustine switched denominations. Leo C. Ferrari, "Young Augustine: Both Catholic and Manichee," Augustinian Studies 26 (1995): 109-128.

While Ferrari may be correct about Manichaean conversion practices, it should be pointed out that Augustine, when writing about his conversion to Manichaeanism in the *Confessiones* III, he quite clearly does not consider himself to be a Christian and dates his Christian catechumenate from 386 C.E. in Milan.

[9]*Confessiones* III, V.9-VI.10. PL 32, 686-687.

hearing Faustus in Carthage, shortly before his departure for Rome in 383 C.E.,[10] and his later rejoicing in Ambrose's expositions on scripture.[11] Augustine was to credit Ambrose with opening his eyes to the possibilities in scriptural interpretation beyond the slavish literalism of Manichaean exegesis.[12] He wrote of this experience in the *Confessiones*:

"*Et tanquam regulam diligentissime commendaret, saepe in popularibus sermonibus suis dictem Ambrosium laetus audiebam, Lettera occidit; spiritos autem vivficat, cum ea quae ad litteram perversitatem docere, videbantur, remoto mystico velamento spiritualiter aperiret...*" (I heard Ambrose, in his sermons to the people, oftentimes most diligently recommend this text as a rule, 'The letter killeth but the Spirit giveth life,' whilst drawing aside the mystic veil he spiritually laid open that which, accepted according to the letter seemed to teach perverse doctrines.)[13]

In 397-98 C.E. Augustine the Christian Bishop of Hippo had occasion to publicly debate Faustus and his Manichaean exegesis. In *Contra faustum* is found a record of those discussions. Although written eleven years after *De genesi contra manichaeos* they provide a useful background for understanding Manichaean exegetical practices. The major point of contention concerned the relationship between the Old

---

[10]*Confessiones* V, VI. 10-VII. 12. PL 32, 710- 711.

[11]*Confessiones* V.XIII.23. PL 32, 717.

[12]Patout Burns argues that Augustine had to move far beyond Ambrose's Christian understanding to attain the level of commitment to Christianity which is described in the *Confessiones* and exemplified in Augustine's earliest writings. See J. Patout Burns, "Ambrose Preaching to Augustine: The Shaping of Faith," in Augustine: Second Founder of the Faith, *Collectanea Augustiniana*, ed. J. C. Schnaubelt & F. Van Fleteren (New York: Peter Lang, 1990), pp. 373-386.

[13]Augustine, *Confessiones* VI. IV.6. PL 32, 722. NPNF1 1.92.

and the New Testament.[14] The Manichaeans argued that the Old Testament was not authoritative since it is not truly a product of God but rather the Demiurge. The anthropomorphic descriptions of God in the Old Testament bore witness to His brutish nature. God destroyed whole nations for trifling offenses and was greedy for all types of sacrifices.[15] Frequently the morality of the Old Testament prophets and patriarchs was questioned. Abraham's irrational craving for children prompted him to defile himself with Hagar. Isaac called Rebecca his sister in order to act as her pimp. (Gen. 25:7). David seduced Uriah's wife and had Uriah killed (2 Sam. 11:4-15) Hosea had children by a prostitute (Hos. 1:2-3). Moses waged war upon and plundered the peoples he conquered.[16] Furthermore the God of the Old Testament was far from omniscient. Reading with heavy handed literalness the Manichaeans wondered why, for example, would an all knowing God create Eve. She was the author of sin therefore obviously a mistake.[17] Either God had knowingly created the instrument of human destruction or He had been ignorant of Eve's future activities. Either scenario did not present the God of the Old Testament in a favorable light. Therefore the Old Testament was in no

---

[14]See John J. O'Meara, The Young Augustine (London: Longman, 1980). pp. 61-79. Also see A-M La Bonnardière, "L'initiation biblique d'Augustin," in Saint Augustin et la Bible, ed., A-M la Bonnardière, Bible de tous les temps, vol. 3 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1986), pp. 27-47.

[15]Contra faustum XXII. IV. "nunc alia et appetentem sangunis atque adipis ex omni genere sacrificiorum." PL 42, 402. (He was greedy for blood and fat from all kinds of sacrifices. NPNF1 4, 273).

[16]Contra faustum. XXII. V. PL 42, 403-404. Faustus cites all of the aforementioned examples.

[17]Contra faustum XXII.IV. PL 42, 402. Also see O'Meara, The Young Augustine, p. 66.

way prophetic of the New.[18] It was a Jewish document which was not authoritative to the gentiles.[19] Consequently it contained no testimonia nor typology.[20] Augustine was to vigorously defended the prophetic link between the Old and New Testament.[21]

The Manichaeans were also highly critical of the New Testament.[22] It contained numerous Jewish interpolations which diminished its authority. This could be seen in the many inconsistencies among the four gospels. For example the genealogies presented in Matthew and Luke were not the same.[23]

Furthermore the prophetic link between the Old and New Testament was rejected. Once again it was the Matthean genealogies which prove contentious. Matthew, attempting to illustrate the fulfillment of Isaiah 7:14 had merely proved that Joseph is from the house of David. Since Mary is Christ's only biological parent, Matthew needed to prove

---

[18]*Contra faustum.* XII.I. PL 42, 253. "*Cur non accripitis Prophetas? Imo tu dic potius, si quid habes, cur debeamus Prophetas accipere. Propter testimonia, inquis, quae de Christo praefati sunt. Ego quidem nulla inveni, quamvis attentius eos et curiosissime legerim.*" (Why do I not believe the prophets? Rather why do you believe them? On account, you will reply, of their prophecies about Christ. For my part, I have read the prophets with the most eager attention and have found no such prophecies. NPNF1 4,183).

[19]See *Contra faustum* VI.I, VIII.I, X.I,XIII.I. PL 42, 227 & 239 & 243 & 281-282.

[20]*Contra faustum.* XII.VI. PL 42, 401. Augustine writes regarding Manichaeans' misinterpretation of the gospels. "*Nec sacramenta legis intelligitus, nec facta Prophetarum;*" (You understand neither the symbols of the law nor the acts of the prophets. NPNF1 4, 274).

[21]See *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae* IXVI, *Contra faustum* books, IV, VI, VIII, X, XII, XIII, XV, XVI, XVII, XXXII and XXXIII.
This defense and approach to the two testaments was also used in his anti-Donatist works. See Carole E. Straw, "Augustine as Pastoral Theologian: The exegesis of the Parables of the Field and Threshing Floor," Augustinian Studies 14 (1982): 129-151.

[22]See O'Meara, The Young Augustine, pp. 67-69.

[23]*Contra faustum* XXIIII.I, XXVIII.I. PL 42, 467 & 485.

that she is from the line of David. Since he failed to make such a link Matthew's genealogy is worthless as proof of prophecy.[24]

Because of such inconsistencies the Manichaeans were also suspicious of the gospels as an authentic witness to Christ. Once again difficulty arose in Matthew's gospel. Matthew presented Christ as saying he came to fulfill the law rather than destroy it. (Mt. 5:17) It was a strong mandate for the prophetic link between the Old and New Testaments and consequently the authority of the Old Testament. However, only Peter, Andrew, James and John were theoretically present when these words were spoken. John, who presumably witnessed the statement , makes no mention of this in his gospel.[25] Faustus suggests that this verse is a Jewish interpolation since they are the only ones who had a vested interest in preserving the law.[26]

Texts supporting the incarnation were also suspect. O'Meara aptly writes: "the whole account of Christ's birth of a woman and death on a cross was...utterly repugnant." Being highly suspicious of matter,[27]

---

[24]*Contra faustum* XXIII.III. PL 42, 468. Faustus suggests that this is "*falsis credere*," or "false to believe."

[25]*Contra faustum.* XVII.I-II. PL 42, 339-341.

[26]*Contra faustum.* XVII.II. PL 42, 341. Faustus describes the verse as "*falsum est,*" (It is false)

[27]See Tarsicius van Bavel, "The Creator and the Integrity of Creation," Augustinian Studies 21 (1990): 1 -33. Bavel traces the philosophical arguments for the goodness of creation, contrasting them with gnostic and Manichaean ideas. The notion of the goodness of all creation is strongly and consistently supported by the early church Fathers. Augustine's understanding of evil is not merely a clever device which he uses in a tight situation but is fundamental to his conversion to Christianity and a consistent pattern in his thinking. See Augustine, *Confessiones* VII.V.11. PL 32, 759. Describing his misguided notion that evil was part of creation and how that perverted his thinking, Augustine writes: "*et quaereban unde malum et non erat exitus*" (And I sought whence is evil. and sought in an evil way. NPNF1 1,104). He answers his question on the origin of evil in the following manner: "*Et quaesivi quid esset iniquitas, et non inveni substantiam: sed a summa substantia, te Deo, detortae in infima voluntatis perversitatem, projicientis intima sua et tumescentis foras.*" PL 32, 744. (And I inquired what iniquity was, and ascertained it not to be a substance, but a perversion of the will, bent aside from Thee, O

Manichaeans tended to reject, as interpolations, New Testament passages which described the Incarnation. Faustus presented his docetist perspective when he is quoted as saying:

"*Ut enim ab initio sumpta hominis similitudine omnes humanae conditionis simiulavit affectus, sic ab re non erat, si in fine quoque consignandae oeconomiae gratia fuisset visus et mori*" (For, as from the outset of His taking the likeness of man He underwent in appearance all the experiences of humanity, it was quite consistent that He should complete the system by appearing to die.)[28]

Within this context the authority and veracity of the Pauline epistles were also questioned. Faustus argued that they indicate that Paul changed his mind and abandoned his false belief in the incarnation.[29] Rom. 1:3 which describes Christ as coming from the line of David according to the flesh, is contradicted by 2 Cor. 5:16. Paul has either corrected himself or did not write both verses.[30]

Augustine was to take up the issue of Pauline veracity with no less eminent an exegete than Jerome himself. In *Epistola* XXVIII. III.3-4 (394-395 C.E.)[31] Augustine took Jerome to task for suggesting that Paul was dissembling in his admonition to Peter in Gal. 2: 11-14. Augustine was to

---

God, the Supreme Substance towards these lower things, and casing out its bowels and swelling outwardly. *Confessiones* VI. XVI. 22. PL 32, 747. NPNF1 1, 111). In his own mind this is what differentiates his Christian discourse from Manichaean. He states in *Contra faustum* XXII.22. PL 42, 415. "*Si ergo noluerunt, voluntatis crimen est, non neccessitatis. A voluntate igitur initum peccati.*" (there is no need of the origin of evil in an imaginary evil nature, since it is to be found in free-will. NPNF1 4, 281).

[28]*Contra faustum* XXVI.II. PL 42, 479. NPNF1 4, 321.

[29]O'Meara, The Young Augustine, p. 68. Faustus rejects the notion of the incarnation several times in *Contra faustum*. See XXIV.I, XXIX.I, and XXVI.I. PL 32, 473 & 487-488, & 479-480.

[30]*Contra faustum* XI.I. PL 42,243-245.

[31]PL 33, 112-113.

reiterate his objection in *Epistola* XL. III.3-VI.7(397).[32] In *Epistola*
LXXXII.I. 1-2 (403 C.E.)[33] Augustine once again alluded to the issue,
begging Jerome's response to his two earlier letters. Gordon J. Hamilton
describes the exchange as the source for the belief in an Augustinian
theory for the inerrancy of scripture.[34]

When Augustine begins his exegesis of Gen. 2:15-25 in *De genesi
contra manichaeos* he takes pains to explain that these sections of
Genesis cannot always be understood literally. His agenda is to discuss
the passages in two ways. The first is historical which Augustine defines
as "*facta*"(facts) which are "*narrantur*" (narrated).[35] Roland Teske points
out that historical does not mean literally true in the sense that an event
occurred but rather "a narrative of events--as a story with a beginning,

---

[32]PL 33, 156-157.
    See Stephen Cannon, "The Jerome-Augustine Correspondence," Word and Spirit 9 (1987): 35-45 for a detailed description of the chronology of the letters. Also see Joseph W. Trigg, Biblical Interpretation, Message of the Fathers of the Church vol. 9 (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1988), pp. 250-257.

[33]PL 33, 273.

[34]See Gordon J. Hamilton, "Augustine's Methods of Biblical Interpretation," in Grace, Politics and Desire: Essays on Augustine, ed. H. A. Meynell (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 1990), pp. 112-113. Hamilton describes two views regarding Augustine's notion of inerrancy. The first held by Gerald Bonner argues that Augustine believed scripture to be inerrant to the extent that no intentional errors or lies had been placed in it. The second reading, frequently produced by modern evangelical scholars suggests that Augustine believed that there were no errors in scripture, full stop. Proponents for such a view are frequently attempting to make a historical case for the inerrancy of scripture. The following or several examples of this type of scholarship: 1. Paul D. Hanson, "Biblical Authority Reconsidered," Horizons in Biblical Theology 11/2 (December 1989): 57-79. 2. Wayne R. Spear, "Augustine's Doctrine of Biblical Infallibility," in Inerrancy and the Church ed. J. D. Hannah (Chicago: Moody Press, 1984), pp. 37-65.
    Howard J. Loewen argues for a more nuanced sense of inerrancy and biblical authority. Augustine does accord an "indispensable authority" to scripture in his theology, however the " indispensable condition of the faith and life of the Church...serves as the context." (p. 221) Furthermore the authority is signifying or sacramental in that it points to "the spiritual reality of God." Howard J. Loewen, "The Use of Scripture in Augustine's Theology," Scottish Journal of Theology 34 (1981): 201-223.
    Augustine's statement in *De doctrina christiana* I.XXXIX.43 would appear to support Bonner's more liberal view. See note 71.

[35]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.II.3. PL 34, 197.

middle and end."[36] This does not however preclude that the events (*res gestae*) of the story did occur.[37] The second sense is prophetic. Augustine writes: "*historiam facta narrantur ... prophetiam futura praenuntiantur.*" (Facts are narrated by history...future things are predicted by prophecy.)[38] With such an approach "*multa de libris Veteris Testamenti solvuntur aenigmata.*" (Many mysteries from the Old Testament are solved.)[39] As Frederick Van Fleteren notes, the choice of the word "*aenigma*" was rich with classical resonance. He writes: "The term... as Augustine would have been familiar with it from Cicero or Quintilian, indicated that which is dark in a figurative representation, or [in other words] an allegory."[40] Augustine has announced his intention to use allegory to understand obscurities in the biblical text. His allegorizing was not to be unrestrained. He adds the qualifier that he will attempt to explain the figures pertaining to both prophecy and history in fidelity with the Catholic faith.[41]

---

[36]FC 84, 27.

[37]Ibid., 95, note 6.

[38]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.II.3. PL 34, 197.
 See Gordon J. Hamilton, "Augustine's Methods of Biblical Interpretation," p. 110. Hamilton describes Augustine's use of history in both the past, present and future sense.
 Hamilton provides a brief résumé of Augustinian exegetical tools. He lists allegory (p. 110), prophecy (p. 110) typology (p. 111) and *sacramenta* or mystical meanings encoded in numbers etc., (p. 112).

[39]Ibid.

[40]Frederick Van Fleteren, "*Per Speculum et in aenigmate*: 1 Corinthians 13:12 in the Writings of St. Augustine," Augustinian Studies 23 (1992): 70.

[41]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.II.3. "*ut omnes istas figuras rerum secundum catholicam fidem, sive quae ad historiam, sive quae ad prophetiam pertinent, explicemus.*" PL 34, 197. (in order to explain all those figures of things according to the Catholic faith both those which pertain to history and those which pertain to prophecy. FC 84, 96).

De genesi ad litteram

Augustine started producing his second attempt at interpreting Genesis 2:15-25 in 401 C.E. The work was eventually finished in 415.[42] The books, wrote Augustine in the *Retractationes* II.XXIV.1., were entitled *De genesi ad litteram* because: "*Id est, non secundum allegoricas significationes, sed secundum rerum gestarum proprietatem.*" (They are interpreted not according to the allegorical signification but according to historical events proper.)[43] He provides an expanded explanation in the opening chapter of *De genesi ad litteram*: I.I.1:

"*In Libris autem omnibus sanctus intueri oportet quae ibi aeterna intementur, quae facta narrentur, que futura praenuntientur, quae agenda praecipiantur vel moneantur. In narratione ergo rerum factarum quaeritur utrum omnia secundum figuratum tantummodo intellectum accipiantur, an etiam secundum fidem rerum gestarum asserenda at defendenda sint. Nam non esse accipienda figuraliter, nullus christianus dicere...*" (In all the sacred books, we should consider the eternal truths that are taught, the facts that are narrated, the future events that are predicted and the precepts or counsels that are given. In the case of a narrative of events, the question arises as to whether everything must be taken according to the figurative sense and defended also as a faithful record of what happened. No Christian will dare say that the narrative must not be taken in a figurative sense.)[44]

Augustine goes on to cite apostolic authority as sanction for this type of exegesis. His precedent is Paul's use of Gen. 2: 24 "*Erunt duo in carne una*" (They will be two in one flesh) in conjunction with Eph. 5:32 to describe the relationship between Christ and the Church. [45]

---

[42]This is not his second attempt at interpreting Genesis. He was to produce *De genesi ad litteram, imperfectus liber* in 393-94. This effort does not continue as far as Gen. 2:15.

[43]PL 32, 640. FC 60, 168.

[44]PL 34, 247. ACW 41,19.

[45]*De genesi ad litteram* I.I.1. PL 34, 247.

Section II

Augustine's Exegetical Theories and Strategies

As indicated in the introduction to this chapter, Augustine described his approach to exegesis in some detail. Between the production of *De genesi contra manichaeos* and *De genesi ad litteram* Augustine produced several works dealing with exegesis. The first was *De genesi imperfectus liber* (393-94 C.E.). The second was the *De doctrina christiana* (396 C.E.). In both tractates, Augustine discussed his exegetical strategies.

De genesi ad litteram, imperfectus liber

In 393 C.E. Augustine made an initial attempt to interpret Genesis literally as *historia*. He was forced to abandon his effort before reaching Gen. 2:15.[46] In the *Retractationes* I.XVIII[47] Augustine explains that his desire to explain Scripture according to its own historical meaning collapsed under the weight of his inexperience.

Although the task of a literal exegesis may have proved too daunting, Augustine does provide a more precise definition of the senses of scripture in the work. He wrote:

---

[46]He stopped during a discussion of Gen. 1:26. (PL 34,244). In the *Retractationes* 1.1., Augustine describes adding several paragraphs to this discussion but never completes it. See FC 84. 187 note. 148.

[47]PL 32, 615.

"*Historia est, cum sive divinitus, sive humanitus res gesta commemoratur.*
Allegoria, cum figurate dicta intelleguntur. Analogia, cum Veteris et Novi Testamentorum
congruentia demonstratur. Aetiologia, cum dictorum factorumque causae redduntur."
(History is when the deeds , whether by men or God, are remembered; allegory is when
figures are made intelligible; analogy is when the Old and New Testament are shown to
be congruent; etiology is when the causes of the sayings and deeds is returned to.)[48]

Van Fleteren argues that the source of "this fourfold distinction...is
certainly a Greek exegete."[49] The possible candidates were either Philo
or Origen.[50] Roland Teske concurs but suggests that a more likely
source is through Ambrose.[51] *Historia* once again encompasses a
broader category than modern understanding would allow. Under this
definition miracles, parables and the story of creation itself constitute
historia.

Analogia, would appear to be the exegetical strategy which
Augustine was to employ against Adimantius and Faustus. If this is the
case, then concretely Augustinian *analogia* would include the use of
typologia, testimonia, and *figura.* Consequently *allegoria* and *analogia*
overlapped in practice. Augustine described the theological principle
governing the interconnectedness of all scripture in <u>*Contra adimantum*</u>
III.III, where he wrote: "*uno sancto Spiritu conscripta et commendata*
esse." ([Scripture] is written and commended by the one Holy Spirit)[52] In

---

[48] <u>*De genesi ad litteram, imperfectus liber*</u> II.5. PL 34, 222. FC 84, 107.

[49]Frederick Van Fleteren, "Augustine's Principles of Biblical Exegesis, *De doctrina*
christiana Aside: Miscellaneous Observations," <u>Augustinian Studies</u> 27/2 (1996): 115.

[50]Ibid., p. 116. Van Fleteren cites <u>*De principiis*</u> IV, Praefatio; IV,i,2; iii,5; iv,16., as
examples of Origen's use of these categories. In <u>*De civitate dei*</u> XI. XXXIII., PL 41, 345,
Augustine refers to the <u>*Peri archon*</u> in its Latin version <u>*De principiis.*</u>

[51]See FC 84, 107 note 8 where Teske provides a brief survey of the literature
surrounding the question.

[52]PL 42, 133-134.

418[53] Augustine provides a more general rule for understanding the relationship between the Old and New Testaments in *De civitate dei*. He writes: *"Quid est enim quod dicitur Testamentum vetus, nisi occulatio novi? Et quid est aliud quod dicitur novem, nisi veteris revelatio?"*(What is, in fact, that which is called the Old Testament, if not the concealment of the New? And what is the other which is called the New, if not the Old revealed?).[54]

De doctrina christiana:

It was also during this period (398 C.E.) that Augustine started his work on exegetical method entitled *De doctrina christiana*. He broke off his discussion in book three chapter 25. It is at this point that he had introduced a discussion which he described as: *"Idem verbum non idem significat ubique."*[55] (The same word does not signify the same thing always).

Why Augustine interrupted his work at this point has proved fodder for academic debate. Some scholars argue that Augustine abandoned the *De doctrina christiana* for reasons other than a busy schedule. Charles Kannengiesser describes this cut as being prompted by Augustine's need to work through, to his own satisfaction, the exegetical work of Tyconius, *Liber Regularis*.[56] When Augustine eventually finished

---

[53]Brown, Augustine of Hippo, p. 285.

[54]*De civitate dei* XVI.XXVI.2. (PL 41, 505).

[55]PL 34, 78.

[56]See Charles Kannengiesser, "The Interrupted *De Doctrina Christiana*," in *De Doctrina Christiana: A Classic of Western Culture*, pp. 3-13, ed. D. W. H. Arnold and P. Bright

the *De doctrina christiana* in 426 C.E. he would add 4 chapters dealing with multivalent figures followed by a summary of Tyconius the Donatist's seven rules. Pamela Bright suggests that this break is also significant since it marks the watershed between African exegesis and Augustine's own classically formed understanding.[57] She writes: "...the question of the ambiguity of Scripture marked a significant point of contact between a developed exegetical system in the African church and the thought of Augustine."[58]

The completed *De doctrina christiana* has engendered numerous theories as to Augustine's intention for the work. It has been described variously as a handbook for Christian rhetorics,[59] an attempt to "unite and harmonize the Platonic emphasis on knowledge and the Pauline focus

---

(South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995). Kannengiesser suggests that Augustine confuses Tyconius's *claues* or hermeneutical keys with his own exegetical *regulae* or rules.

Also see P. Bright, The Book of Rules of Tyconius: Its Purpose and Inner Logic (South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988), particularly chapter 3.

[57]See Pamela Bright, "Biblical Ambiguity in African Exegesis," in *De Doctrina Christiana: A Classic of Western Culture*, pp. 25-32, ed. D. W. H. Arnold and P. Bright (South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995). Bright describes the break in the work and suggests that Augustine repudiates the African exegetical tradition of contrariness of signification. This was embodied by Tyconius, the Donatist's *Liber regularis* which was published in 388 C.E., around the time of Augustine's return to North Africa.

[58]Ibid., p. 26.

[59]M. L. Clarke, Rhetoric At Rome: A Historical Survey (London: Cohen & West Ltd., 1953; reprint ed., London: Lowe & Brydone Ltd., 1962), p. 151. Clark argues that Augustine's rhetorical style owes more to Cicero than Aristotle. Augustine indicates himself that he was enormously impressed by Cicero's *Hortensius* (see *Confessiones* III.4). However in IV.16 of the *Confessiones*, Augustine also acknowledges the influence of Aristotle. See Gerald Press, "The Subject and Structure of Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana*," Augustinian Studies 11 (1980): 99-124. Press describes the influence of both Aristotle and Cicero in Augustine's rhetorics. Also see Christoph Schäublin, "*De doctrina christiana*: A Classic of Western Culture?" in *De Doctrina Christiana: A Classic of Western Culture*, pp. 47-67, ed. D. W. H. Arnold and P. Bright (South Bend: Notre Dame University Press, 1995).

on love,"[60] and an exegetical handbook intent upon saving biblical interpretation from the absurdity of literalism.[61] Others have suggested that "it is a treatise on biblical hermeneutics, ...a comprehensive Christian culture, and a treatise on education."[62] Gerald Press describes the difficulty as arising from the word *'doctrina'* which can be interpreted broadly to mean both culture or learning and narrowly as doctrine. Press suggests that Augustine intends both meanings.[63]

Our focus, for the purpose of this research, is more circumscribed. Whether or not Augustine envisioned his work in one, none, or all of the above ways is moot. What he did in the tractate was to provide a description of his exegetical strategies. His intention to do so is clearly indicated in his prologue.

"*Sunt praecepta quaedam tractandarum Scripturarum, quae studiosis earum video non incommode posse tradi; ut non solum legendo alios qui divinarum Litterarum operta aperuerunt, sed et aliis ipsi aperiendo proficiant.*" (There are certain precepts for the interpretation of Scripture which I think might with great advantage be taught to earnest students of the word, that they may profit not only from reading the works of

---

[60]J Patout Burns, "Delighting the Spirit: Augustine's Practice of Figurative Interpretation," in *De Doctrina Christiana: A Classic of Western Culture* ed. D. W. H. Arnold and P. Bright (South Bend: Notre Dame University Press, 1995), p. 184.

[61]Roland Teske, "Criteria for Figurative Interpretation in St. Augustine," in *De Doctrina Christiana: A Classic of Western Culture*, ed. D. W. H. Arnold and P. Bright (South Bend: Notre Dame University Press, 1995),p. 110.

[62]Gerald Press, "The subject and Structure of Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana*," p. 101. Press outlines four interpretations. The first is attributed to Eugene Kevane who argues that *DDC* is a *paida* or pedagogical tractate for Christians. The second represented by L. M. J. Verheijen and H.-I Marrou argues that it is a fundamental charter for Christian culture. A third perspective views the tractate as a treatise on biblical hermeneutics while a fourth group views the work as an *ars rhetorica*. Press suggests that the latter interpretation is too narrow although the tractate certainly is indebted to Cicero and Quintilian. He argues that Augustine has adapted the old rhetorical structures and approaches to his Christian endeavor. Press concludes that *DDC* is all of the four definitions. p. 122.

[63]Ibid., p. 123.

others who have laid open the secrets of the sacred writings but also from themselves opening such secrets to others.)[64]

It is these *praecepta* or precepts which Augustine proposes to teach. It is these strategies, particularly those produced prior to the break in the writing at *De doctrina christiana* III.25 which are of particular interest. Given the relative chronological proximity of the early *De doctrina christiana* and *De genesi ad litteram* they will provide some perspective on Augustine's exegetical activity in the latter work.

With that in mind the following section will be divided into two parts. The first will deal with the hermeneutical foundation of Augustinian exegesis as presented in the *De doctrina christiana.* The second section will look at strategies for determining meaning in obscure texts or in other words how allegorical interpretations are to be determined and applied.

Augustine's Hermeneutic Principle

Gerald Press describes book one of the *De doctrina christiana*[65] as containing "the things (realities, truths, doctrines, that are to be understood) which are the basic theological and moral doctrines of Christianity, the sum of which is love of God and our neighbor."[66] For Augustine scripture cannot be read properly outside the paradigm of Christian faith. The foundational hermeneutic for scriptural interpretation is God. Augustine writes in the *De doctrina christiana*: "*Prima ad Deum*

---

[64]Augustine ,*DDC, Prologus.* 1. PL 14, 15. NPNF2 2, 519.

[65]The abbreviation *DDC* will be used henceforth in the footnotes to denote *De doctrina christiana.*

[66]Press, "Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana,*" p. 116.

via Christus" (the first way to God is Christ).[67] He makes a similar argument in *De trinitate* where he maintains that scriptural language about God must be understood within the faith perspective of the Trinity. Failure to do this results in "*non conturbabimur inquam contrariis ac repugnantibus inter se sanctorum Librorum sententiis*" (apparently contrary and mutually repugnant sayings of the sacred books.)[68] In *De doctrina christiana* I.XXXV.39 this foundation concretely expresses itself with exegesis which promotes the "*amor Dei et proximi*" (love of God and neighbors) since the end or goal of divine law and of all Holy Scripture is this love. Augustine writes:

"*Omnium igitur quae dicta sunt, ex quo de rebus tractamus, haec summa est, ut intelegatur Legis et omnium divinarum Scripturarum plenitudo et finis esse dilectio rei qua fruendum est, et rei quae nobiscum ea re frui potest*" (of all, then, that has been said since we entered upon the discussion about things this is the sum: that we should clearly understand that the fulfillment and the end of the Law and of all Holy Scripture is the love of an object which can enjoy that other in fellowship with ourselves.)[69]

In other words Augustine sums up all of scriptural exegesis with the great commandment (Mk. 12:30-31 & Mt. 22:37-39). The mandate for doing so is also scriptural. It is found in Gal 5:14 and Rom 13:9 wherein Paul makes the same argument.

It is within this context that Augustine continues:

"*Quisquis igitur Scripturas divinas vel quamlibet earum partem intellexisse sibi viditur, ita ut eo intellectu non aedificet istam geminam charitatem Dei et proximi nondum intellexit.*" (Whoever then thinks that he understands the Holy Scriptures or any part of

---

[67]*DDC* I.XXIV.38. PL 34, 33.

[68]Augustine, *De trinitate* I.XI.22. PL 42, 836. NPNF2 3, 29. The focus for the entire book is the inscription of the Trinity in the universe. In an almost Origenian manner Augustine argues that the basis for seeing and understanding the Trinitarian pattern of creation is its impressment upon us.

[69]*DDC* I.XXXV. 39. PL 34, 34. NPNF2 2, 532-533.

them but puts such an interpretation upon them as does not tend to build up this twofold love of God and our neighbor, does not yet understand them as he ought.)[70]

This principle of love is so important[71] that even incorrect interpretations which serve its purposes are not evil. Augustine writes:

"*Quisquis vero tallem inde sententiam duxerit, ut huic aedificandae charitati sit utilis, nec tamen hoc dixerit quod ille quem legit eo loco sensisse probabitur, non perniciose fallitur, nec omnio mentitur.*" (If, a man draws a meaning from them [Scriptures] that may be used for the building up of love, even though he does not happen upon the precise meaning which the author whom he reads intended to express in that place, his error is not pernicious.)[72]

Augustine does caution that such faulty interpretation can lead to confusion and contradiction in other texts.[73] Consequently Augustine describes his ideal exegete in the following manner:

"*Quapropter, cum quisque cognoverit finem praecepti esse charitatem, de corde puro et conscientias bona et fie non ficta, omnem intellectum divinarum Scripturarum ad ista tria relaturus ad tractationem illorum Librorum securus accedat.*" (If a man fully understands that the end of the commandment is charity, out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience and of faith unfeigned and is bent upon making all his understanding of the Scripture to bear upon these three graces, he many come to the interpretation of these books with an easy mind.)[74]

---

[70]*DDC.* I.XXXVI.40. PL 34, 34. NPNF2 2, 533.

[71]C. P. Bammel writes: "The most important Pauline contribution to this Christian Platonism is the emphasis on love (faith, hope and love characterizing the soul's path to the divine vision, love of things that are unseen...love of God and love of neighbor). Bammel, "Pauline Exegesis, Manichaeism and Philosophy," p. 24. If her assessment is correct, this contribution figured highly in Augustinian exegesis, since it becomes the underlying hermeneutical principle for understanding scripture.

[72]*DDC.* I.XXXVI.40. PL 34, 34.

[73]*DDC* I.XXXVII.41. "*Asserendo enim temere quod ille non sensit quem legit, plerumque incurrit in alia quae illi sententiae contexere nequeat.*" PL 34, 35. (For if he takes up rashly a meaning which the author who he is reading did not intend, he often falls in with other statements which he cannot harmonize with this meaning. NPNF2 2, 533).

[74]*DDC* I.XL.44. PL 34.36. NPNF2 2, 534.

Augustine reiterates his foundational hermeneutic several times in books two and three of the _De doctrina christiana._ In book two he devotes chapters 6 and 7 to this task. He writes:

"Nam in eo se exercet omnis divinarum Scripturarum studiosus, nihil in eis aliud inventurus quam diligendum esse Deum propter Deum, et proximum propter Deum: et illum quidem ex toto corde, ex tota anima, ex tota mente diligere; proximum vero tanquam seipsum, id est , ut totat proximi, sicut etiam nostri, dilectio referatur in Deum." (For in this every earnest student of the Holy Scriptures exercises himself to find nothing else in them but that God is to be loved for His own sake, and our neighbor for God's sake; and that God is to be loved with all the heart, and with all the soul, and with all the mind, and one's neighbor as one's self-that is, in such a way that all our love for our neighbor, like all our love for ourselves, should have reference to God.)[75]

This fundamental orientation on the part of the interpreter is so important that Augustine announces that those who possess it no longer need the scriptures.[76] Furthermore love becomes the underlying rhetorical principle for all Christian preaching.[77] Consequently Book one of the _De doctrina christiana_ deals with the fundamental stance, the foundational hermeneutical perspective which informs the task of exegesis.[78] Gerald Press describes this as discovering "the thought and will of God."[79]

---

[75]_DDC_ II.VII.10. PL 34,39. NPNF2 2, 534.

[76]_DDC_ I.XXXIX.43. _"Homo itaque fide, spe et cariate subnixus, eaque inconcusse retinens, non indiget Scripturis nisi ad alios instruendos. Itaque multi per haec tria etiam in solitudine sine codicibus vivunt."_ PL 34, 36. (And thus a man who is resting upon faith hope and love and who keeps a firm hold upon these does not need the Scriptures except for the purpose of instructing others. Accordingly, many live without copies of the Scriptures, even in solitude on the strength of these three graces. NPNF2 2, 534).

[77]Christine Mason Sutherland, "Love As Rhetorical Principle: The Relationship Between Content and Style in the Rhetoric of St. Augustine," in Grace, Politics and Desire: Essays on Augustine, ed. H. A. Meynell (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 1990), pp. 139-153.

[78]See Christoph Schäublin, "_De doctrina christiana_: A Classic of Western Culture?" in _De Doctrina Christiana: A Classic of Western Culture_, pp. 47-67, ed. Duane Arnold and P. Bright (South Bend: Notre Dame University Press, 1995). Schäublin, agreeing with Gerald Press, does not view the _DDC_ as primarily a hermeneutical handbook. He does however acknowledge a similar hermeneutical paradigm. He writes: What, finally, is the

Obscure Texts and Exegetical Strategies

The next two books of the _De doctrina christiana_ deal with obscurities in scripture.[80] Augustine prefaces this with a brief discussion of his theory of language. Humans generate signs in a variety of ways in order to convey meaning.[81] The type of sign which concerns Augustine is the written symbol. It is: "_Ita voces oculis ostenduntur, non per seipsas, sed per signa quaedam sua._" (the sounds of the voice [which] are made visible to the eye...by means of certain signs.)[82]

These are described as falling into two categories. Augustine describes these two uses of signs as either "_signa propria_" (proper or literal signs) or "_signa translata_" (non-literal).[83] Proper signs are those which refer to the concrete object which they were intended to illustrate. Augustine uses the example of _bos_ (ox) which is intended to indicate an ox. _Signa translata_ are proper signs which signify something other than

---

aim of the interpreter? First of all it is essential that his interpretation accord with the _res_ of the Bible as outlined in book I, that is the dual commandment to love." Also see Gerald Press, "Augustine's De Doctrina Christiana," p. 114. Press writes: "Book I thus tells us the things (_res_) that are to be discovered, which are the items of the Christian creed and boil down to the twofold commandment to love God with all your heart, soul, and mind, and to love your neighbor as yourself."

[79]Press, "Augustine's _De Doctrina Christiana_," p. 114.

[80]Ibid., p. 116. Press argues for this type of breakdown.

[81]Augustine describes numerous systems of symbols. Some signs are generated by nature which the human being learns to interpret. These include smoke, footprints, etc., and are natural signs "_signa data_" or "_naturalia_" (_DDC_ II.I.2. PL 34, 36). Other symbol systems a created by humans. These include such things as military flags "_vexilla draconesque militaries_"(_DDC_ II.III.4. PL 34, 37).

[82]_DDC_ II.IV.5. PL 34.38. NPNF2 2, 536.

[83]_DDC_ II.X.15. PL 34, 42.

their original referent. By way of example Augustine describes the use of *bos* to mean *evangelistam* or preacher of the gospel.[84] As Press illustrates in his structural analysis,[85] these two types of signs are the focus for the subsequent two books of the *De doctrina christiana* . Book II deals with obscurities arising from proper use of signs while Book III is primarily devoted to the figurative use of signs.[86] Obscurities in interpreting these signs arise because the exegete lacks technical knowledge regarding the sign or because the language used is metaphorical.

The Exegete's Task

Implicit in Augustine's understanding of the activity of scriptural interpretation are several givens in his theory of language. Language is the tool of the writer.[87] It is a code created by humans to express what is in their minds.[88] Words in and of themselves are arbitrary creations designed to serve the function of conveying ideas.[89] Augustine writes:

---

[84]Ibid.

[85]Press, "Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana*," p. 114.

[86]Christoph Schäublin proposes a slightly more mixed division. He argues that book II deals with *signa ignota* (both *propria* and *translata*) which are unknown. Book III deals with *signa ambigua* or ambiguous signs. These are both *propria* and *translata*. See Schäublin, "*De doctrina christiana*: A Classic of Western Culture?" p. 49.

[87]Takeshi Kato, "*Sonus et verbum*: *De doctrina christiana* 1.13.12.," in *De Doctrina Christiana: A Classic of Western Culture*, ed. D. W. H. Arnold and P. Bright (South Bend: Notre Dame University Press, 1995), p. 89. Kato points out that it is a given in Augustinian studies that Augustine's theory of speech was based upon "the Stoic dyadic distinction between the concept signified and the object."

[88]Augustine points out that there are many types of signs both visual and auditory but words have become the most important for humans. *DDC* II.III.4. "*Verba enim prorsus inter homines obtinuerunt principatum significandi quaecumque animo concipiuntur, si ea quisque prodere velit.*" PL 34, 37. (For among men words have obtained far and away the chief place as a means of indicating the thoughts of the mind. NPNF2 2, 536).

"Data vero signa sunt, quae sibi quaeque viventia invicem dant ad demonstrandos, quantum possunt, motus animi sui, vel sensa, aut intellecta quaelibet. Nec ulla causa est nobis singificandi, id est signi dandi, nisi ad depromendum et trajiciendum in alterius animum id quod animo gerit is qui signum dat." (Conventional signs are those which living beings mutually exchange for the purpose of showing as well as they can the feelings of their minds, or their perceptions, or their thoughts. Nor is there any reason for giving a sign except the desire of drawing forth and conveying into another's mind what the giver of the sign has is his own mind.)[90]

Since signs are consciously constructed with the express desire to convey the meaning of one's mind to another it is consequently the task of the exegete to attempt to determine the intended meaning of the author of the text.[91] Augustine writes: *"Sed quisquis in Scripturis aliud sentit quam ille qui scripsit, illis non mentientibus fallitur."* (Whoever takes another meaning out of Scripture than the writer intended, goes astray.)[92] He states his position even more clearly in Book II where he writes:

---

[89]See Augustine, *De magistro* for a more developed description of the nature of signs. Herman Cloeron describes *De magistro* as a transcendental epistemological investigation since Augustine concludes that we learn through the truth which teaches within us. (*De magistro* XI.36. PL 32, 1215).

See Herman J. Cloeren, "St. Augustine's *De Magistro,* a Transcendental Investigation," Augustinian Studies 16 (1985): 21-27. Also see Mark D. Jordan, "Words and Word: Incarnation and Signification in Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana,"* Augustinian Studies 11 (1980): 177-196. Jordan argues that Augustinian signification is analogous to the relationship between the Word and the Word incarnate. Jordan suggests that this is intended by Augustine.

[90]*DDC* II.II.3. PL 34, 37. NPNF2 2, 536.

[91]See R. A Markus, "Signs, Communication and Communities," in *De Doctrina Christiana: A Classic of Western Culture,* ed. D. W. H. Arnold and P. Bright (South Bend: Notre Dame University Press, 1995), pp. 97-108. Markus explores this communitarian relation between signs and communication.

[92]*DDC* I.XXXVI.41. PL 34, 34. NPNF2 2, 533.

"Quam legentes nihil aliud appentunt quam cogitationes voluntatemque illorum a quibus conscripta est, invenire, et per illas voluntatem Dei, secundum quam tales homines locutos credimus." (men seek nothing more [when interpreting scripture] than to find out the thought and will of those by whom it was written, and through these to find out the will of God, in accordance with which they believe these men to have spoken.) [93] It is this inter relatedness between speaker and hearer (reader and author/ believer and God) which prompts Michael Scanlon to write: "Augustine has been called 'the father of semiotics' the theory of signs."[94]

Prior to describing his precepts for understanding obscure signs, Augustine prefaces his discussion with the technical aspects of the exegete's task. He reiterates that all exegetical work takes place within the horizon of the theological hermeneutical principal of love of God and neighbor. The writers of scripture used this principle in creating their work; consequently the readers of scripture use this principle to discover the intended meaning of the author. Augustine notes that he has already described this principle in the previous book.[95]

---

[93]*DDC* II.V.6. PL 34, 38. NPNF2 2, 536-537.

[94]Michael Scanlon, "Augustine and Theology as Rhetoric," Augustinian Studies 25 (1994): 46. See Louis Kelly, "Saint Augustine and Saussurean Linguistics, " Augustinian Studies 6 (1975): 45-64.
   Also see Andrew Louth, "Augustine on Language," Journal of Literature and Theology 3/2 (July 1989): 151-158, for a brief description of Augustine's theory of signs.

[95]*DDC* II.IX.14. PL 34, 32. *"de quibus libro superiore tractavimus."* (of which we treated in the last book).
   See William S. Babcock, "Caritas and Signification," in *De Doctrina Christiana: A Classic of Western Culture*, ed. D. W. H. Arnold and P. Bright (South Bend: Notre Dame University Press, 1995), pp. 145-163. Babcock argues that Christian's understand signification through the lens of *caritas*. This is the hermeneutical link between the first three books of the *DDC*.

Signa Propria : Proper Signs

There are however many technical skills which will help the exegete understand obscure proper signs. Knowledge of Greek, Hebrew and Latin helps.[96] Sometimes translations prove faulty, particularly when the translator *"non sit doctissimus"* (is not very learned),[97] which can obscure the intended meaning. Occasionally idiomatic expressions are poorly translated or not properly understood by translators. Knowledge of Jewish history and culture can sometimes prove beneficial in such instances however, some idiomatic expressions are basically untranslatable.[98] Interpretive techniques from secular literature can be appropriated and used.[99] Augustine repudiates astrology (*superstitio genethiacorum*)[100] and the use of demons (*daemonis*).[101] Other types of secular knowledge [102] such as history (*historia*), [103] natural science,[104]

---

[96]*DDC* II.XI.16. PL 34, 42-43.

[97]*DDC* II.XIII.19. PL 34, 44.

[98]*DDC* II .XIV.21. PL 34, 45-46.

[99]*DDC* II.XCIII.28. (PL 34. 49-50). *"Profani si quid bene discerunt, non apernandum."* (profane things are not despicable when what they learn is good.)

[100]*DDC* II.XX.30-XXIII.36. PL 34, 51-53. Augustine also calls the *genethliaci* the *mathematici.*

[101]*DDC* II.XXIV.37. PL 34, 53-54.

[102] *DDC* II.XXV.38. PL 34, 54. These are *"Insitutiones homnium non superstitiosae, id est non cum daemonibus,"* (Non superstitious Human institutions , that which is not demonic).

[103]*DDC* II.XXVIII.42-44. PL 32, 55-56.

[104]*DDC* II.XXIX.45-46. PL 34, 56-57. Augustine calls this knowledge of *animalium* and *herbarum.*

the mechanical arts (*artes mechanicae*),[105] dialectics and logic,[106]

rhetoric [107] and mathematics (*numerorum scientia*)[108] can be used in

varying ways to aid the exegete. Augustine concludes: "*Ab Ethnicis si*

quid recte dictum, in nostrum usum est convertendum." (Whatever has

been rightly said by the heathen, we convert to our uses.)[109]

Signa Translata: Figurative Signs

Augustine introduces the third book of the *De doctrina christiana*

with a series of criteria for determining whether or not a sign is truly

figurative.[110] If the sign appears ambiguous the exegete should check

the punctuation of the sentence.[111] Reference to the preceding or

---

[105]*DDC* II.XXX. 48-49. PL 34, 57-58. Augustine includes, agriculture, navigation, racing, dancing, wrestling, pottery, construction in this category. Mechanical arts deal with concrete movement rather than intellectual movement.

[106]*DDC* II.XXXII.50. PL 34, 58-59. & *DDC* II.XXXIII.51-XXV.53. PL 35, 58-59.

[107]*DDC* II.XXXVI.54-XXXVII.55. PL 34, 60-61.
One of these skills was grammatical exegesis a method which the Greeks regularly applied when interpreting texts. The rules of grammar where systematically used to clear up textual difficulties. An example is provided in the following question: *Qui dicit?* (Who speaks) This was the standard introductory question to which three types of responses were possible. 1. The subject is expressly mentioned. 2. The subject is derived from the form of the verb, pronouns etc. 3. The subject is understood from the context. See Hubertus R. Drobner, "Grammatical Exegesis and Christology in St. Augustine," in *Studia Patristica* vol. XVIII,4, ed. E. Livingstone (Leuven: Peeters Press, 1990), p. 51.

[108]*DDC* II.XXXVIII.56-57. PL 34,61-62.

[109]*DDC* II.XI.60. PL 34, 63. NPNF2 2, 554.

[110]See Roland Teske, "Criteria for Figurative Interpretation," in *De Doctrina Christiana: A Classic of Western Culture*, ed. D. W. H. Arnold and P. Bright (South Bend: Notre Dame University Press, 1995), pp. 109-122. Teske traces the development from Augustine's early attempts at understanding Genesis to his formulation of his criteria in *DDC*. Once again the underlying hermeneutic is *caritas*.

[111]*DDC* III.II.2-5. PL 34, 65-67. This criterion seems self-evident to the modern reader however punctuation of clauses and phrases was not indicated nor self-evident in Latin texts. Augustine suggests that the reader should try several versions of punctuation. If

succeeding context can be helpful in clarifying this.[112] If the meaning of the text is still not clear the exegete should check the pronunciation.[113] Ambiguities can also arise from similar case endings for Latin words. The exegete should once again check the context.[114] If the meaning remains obscure the exegete may be dealing with a figurative expression.

Proper signs may have secondary significations. This is a meaning beyond the literal. Augustine cites 2 Cor. 3:6: *"Littera occidit, spiritus autem vivificat"* (The letter kills, but the spirit brings life.) as the biblical sanction for figurative exegesis.[115] There is always the danger

---

this is not enlightening to the reader he should choose the punctuation which is governed by *"regulam fidei"* (the rule of faith). Augustine, *DDC.* III.II.2. PL 34, 65.

[112]*DDC* III.II.5. PL 34, 67. *"ipsius sermonis textu ambiguitas explicari potest."* (the ambiguity of the discourse itself can be explained by the context.)

[113]*DDC* III.III.6. *"Quaecumque autem de ambiguis distinctionibus diximus, eadem observanda sunt et in ambiguis pronuntiationibus."* PL 34, 67. (All the directions that I have given about ambiguous punctuation are to be observed likewise in the case of doubtful pronunciations. NPNF1 2, 557).

What Augustine describes as pronunciation would fall under punctuation in modern English grammar. He is really referring to the tone of voice used by the speaker. Is the sentence written in the exclamatory, exhortatory, interrogatory, affirmative or imperative voice?

See Joseph T. Lienhard, "Reading the Bible and Learning to Read: The Influence of Education on St. Augustine's Exegesis," Augustinian Studies 27/1 (1996): 12. Lienhard describes how Augustine privileges the spoken work over the written. The written is a doubly removed sign. The spoken signifies an object, while the written signifies the sign or the oral sign of the object. Lienhard also describes the oral/aural nature of the education system which formed Augustine.

[114]*DDC* III.IV.8. *"Non solum autem istae, sed etiam illae ambiguitates quae non ad distincionem vel ad pronuntiationem pertinent, similiter considerandae sunt."* PL 34, 68. (And not only these, but also those ambiguities that do not relate either to punctuation or pronunciation are to be examined in the same way. NPNF1 2, 558).

[115]*DDC* III.V.9. PL 34, 69. As previously mentioned this text was one which Augustine heard Ambrose preach on, and which greatly influenced his understanding of exegesis. See note 38.

Augustine was to write a tractate entitled *De spiritu et littera* in 412 C.E. Here he considered this passage very broadly, within the context of Pelagianism. The spirit is Grace which all humans require since none are free of sin. See *De spirituet littera.* XXXIV. PL 44, 240-241.

When Augustine returns to the interrupted *DDC* he makes reference to this work. *"Tertia regula est de Promissis et Lege, Que alio modo dici potest de spiritu et littera, sciut*

that a figurative sign will be interpreted literally. Augustine describes this as "*servilis infirmitatis*" (slavish weakness).[116] Conversely there is the danger that a literal sign will be interpreted figuratively.[117] Humans will assume that their cultural values are transcendent and any scriptural passage which contravenes their customs will be interpreted figuratively.[118] Augustine provides the following litmus test: "*Non autem praecipit Scriptura nisi charitatem, nec culpat nisi cupidiatem.*" (Now Scripture enjoins nothing except charity, and condemns nothing except lust.)[119]

---

nos eam appellavimus, cum de hac re librum scriberemus." *DDC* III.XXXIII.46. PL 34, 83. (The third rule relates to the promises and the law, and may be designated in other terms as relating to the spirit and the letter which is the name I made use of when writing a book on this subject. It may be also named of grace and the law. NPNF1 2,569). The third rule is Tyconius's on the Promise and the Law which Augustine obviously views as the same as his letter/spirit distinction.

[116]*DDC* III.IX.13. PL 34, 71.

[117]*DDC* III.X.14. "*Huic autem observationi qua cavemus figuratem locutionem, id est, translatam quasi propriam sequi; adjungenda etiam illa est, ne propriam quase figuratam velims accipere.*" PL 34, 71. (But in addition to the foregoing rule, which guards us against taking a metaphorical form of speech as if it were literal, we must also pay heed to that which tells us not to take a literal form of speech as if it were figurative. NPNF1 2, 560).

[118]*DDC* III.X.15. "*Sed quoniam proclive est humanum genus non ex momentis ipsius libidinis, sed potius suae consuetudinis aestimare peccata, fit plerumque ut quisque hominum ea tantum culpanda arbitretur, quae suae regionis et timporis homines vituperare atque damnare consueverunt; et ea tautum proband atque laudanda, quae consuetudo eorum cum quibus vivit, admittit; eoque contingit ut si quid Scriptura vel praeceperit quod abhorret a consuetudine audientium vel quo quod non abhorret culpaverit, si animum eorum jam verbi vinxit auctoritas, figuratam locutionem putent.*" PL 34, 71. (Men are prone to estimate sins, not by reference to their inherent sinfulness, but rather by reference to their own customs. It frequently happens that a man will think nothing blamable except what the men of his own country and time are accustomed to condemn, and nothing worthy of praise or approval except what is sanctioned by the custom of his companions: and thus it comes to pass, that if Scripture either enjoins what is opposed to the customs of the hearers, or condemns what is not so opposed, and if at the same time the authority of the word has a hold upon their minds, they think that the expression is figurative. NPNF1 2, 561).

[119]*DDC* III.X.15. PL 34, 71. NPNF1 2, 561.

Scripture so interpreted is a restatement of Augustine's hermeneutical principal from Book I.[120] This principle makes Scripture historically and culturally transcendent in that it enjoins "*charitatis*" (love) across time and culture.[121] Augustine writes: "*Praeteriotorum narratio est, futurorum praenuntiatio, praesentium demonstratio.*" (It is a narrative of the past, a prophecy of the future, and a description of the present.)[122]

Precepts Concerning Figurative Signs

Augustine describes twelve concrete precepts or strategies[123] concerning figurative interpretation. Many of them have obviously been informed by his experience with Manichaean exegesis.

Precept One: Such is the case with Augustine's first precept. All cruelty ascribed to God or to His saints in "*factu dictumque*" (word or deed)[124] should not necessarily be interpreted figuratively. Sometimes God and saints are so portrayed in order to "*regna cupiditatis*

---

[120]Augustine goes on in *DDC* III.X.16 to provide a further definition. "*Charitatem voco motum animi ad fruendum Deo propter ipsum, et se atque proximo propter Deum: cupiditatem autem, motum animi ad fruendum se et proximo et quolibet corpore non propter Deum.*" PL 34,7 2. (I mean by charity that affection of the mind which aims at the enjoyment of God for His own sake, and the enjoyment of one's self and one's neighbor in subordination to God; by lust I mean that affection of the mind which aims at enjoying one's self and one's neighbor, and other corporeal things, without reference to God." NPNF1 2, 561).

[121]*DDC* III.X.16. PL 34, 72.

[122]*DDC* III.X.15. PL 34,71. NPNF1 2, 561.

[123]The rules are not numbered by Augustine. I have presented them in such a way for the purposes of clarity.

[124]*DDC* III.II.17. PL 34,72.

subvertuntur" (pull down the dominion of lust).[125] Usually the context makes it clear when the text is not figurative.

Precept Two: Secondly, Augustine states as a general precept that only inexperienced or poor exegetes ascribe sinful sayings and actions to God and the saints in the first place. Augustine, once again, obviously had Manichaean exegesis in mind when he wrote:

> *"Quae autem quasi flagitiosa imperitis videntur, sive tantum dicta, sive etiam facta sunt, vel ex Dei persona, vel ex hominum quorum nobis sanctitas commendatur, tota figurata sunt."* (Those things, again, whether only sayings or whether actual deeds, which appear to the inexperienced to be sinful, and which are ascribed to God or to men whose holiness is put before us as an example, are wholly figurative.)[126]

Precept Three: Augustine once again reiterates his foundational hermeneutic as his third precept. He writes: *"Servabitur ergo in locutionibus figuratis regula hujusmodi, ut tam diu versetur diligenti consideratione quod legitur, donec ad regnum charitatis interpretatio perducatur."* (Accordingly, in regard to figurative expressions, a rule such as the following will be observed, to carefully turn over in our minds and meditate upon what we read till an interpretation be found that tends to establish the reign of love.)[127] Furthermore if the literal meaning established this rule of love the sign should not be considered to be figurative.

Precept Four: Precept number four stipulates that divine commands enjoining prudence or benevolence or prohibiting crime are literal. However divine commands enjoining vice are figurative.[128]

Precept Five: Fifthly people who are more spiritually wise may sometimes interpret in a figurative way, commands which were intended

---

[125]Ibid.

[126]*DDC* III.XII.18. PL 34, 72-73. NPNF1 2, 561-562.

[127]*DDC* III.XV.23. PL 34, 74. NPNF1 2, 563.

[128]*DDC* III.XVI.24. PL 34, 74-75.

literally for the less spiritually advanced.[129] The household codes of conduct in the New Testament fall into this category. They are literal for those who are married but figurative for those who have embraced celibacy.

Precept Six: Precept number six deals with changed historical circumstances. What was good once may appear evil in the modern context. Augustine continues: "*Multa enim sunt quae illo tempore officiose facta sunt, quae modo nisi libidinose fieri non possunt.*"(For many things which were done as duties at that [past] time cannot now be done except through lust.)[130] In *De bono conjugali* XVI.18.,[131] written in 401 C.E., Augustine was to provide an example of this precept in exegetical practice. The patriarchs did not take multiple wives out of lust but rather out of a sense of duty in order to ensure the propagation of God's people. Given the limited world population of the period, historically the action was appropriate. Such behavior was entirely inappropriate for changed historical circumstances of the Christians of Augustine's period.

Precept Seven: Precept number seven describes an alternate strategy for interpreting the narratives about the sins of great men. They are intended to produce humility in the reader or listener.[132] Augustine writes:

---

[129]*DDC* III.XVII.25. PL 34, 75.

[130].*DDC* III.XII.32. PL 34, 78. NPNF1 2,565.

[131]PL 40, 385-386.

[132]See Gerald W. Schlabach, "Augustine's Hermeneutic of Humility: An Alternative to Moral Imperialism and Moral Relativism," Journal of Religious Ethics 22/2 (Fall 1994): 299-327. Schlabach suggests that the underlying principle for Augustinian ethics is humility.
      Also see *De sancta virginitate* XXXII.32-LII.53. PL 40, 413-427. This is an extended description of Augustine's notion of Christian humility. Humility is the paradigm for Christian life.

"*Ad hoc enim etiam peccata illorum hominum scripta sunt, ut Apostiolica illa sententia ubique tremenda sit, qua ait: ' Auqpropter qui videtur stare, videat, ne cadat'...*" (For the sins of these men were recorded to this end, that men might everywhere and always tremble at that saying of the apostle: 'Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth take heed lest he fall' ...)[133]

Precept Eight: With precept eight Augustine cautions that the same word does not always signify the same thing.[134] It is at this point, as previously mentioned, that Augustine abandons writing.

Precept Nine: When he picks up the *De doctrina christiana* in 426 C.E., he continues with the following advice regarding this fluidity of signification. Precept nine stipulates: "*Obscura ex locis apertioribus explicanda.*" (Obscure passages are to be interpreted by those which are clearer.)[135]

Precept Ten: With precept 10 Augustine cautions that one passage of scripture can potentially hold several equally theologically valid interpretations. Should the interpreter find a meaning which was not intended by the author, but is "*quae fidei rectae non refragatur,*" (not opposed to sound doctrine)[136] the interpretation is not in error.

Precept Eleven: The eleventh precept is fundamentally a restatement of the ninth. Augustine stipulates that: "*Locus incertus tutius per alios Scripturae locos, quam per rationem manifestatur.*" (it is safer to

---

[133]*DDC* III.XXIII.33. PL 34, 78. NPNF1 2, 565.

[134]*DDC* III.XV.35. "*Idem verbum non idem significat ubique.*" PL 34, 78. (The same word does not always mean the same thing.)

[135]*DDC* III.XVI.37. PL 34, 79. NPNF1 2, 566.

[136]*DDC* III.XVII.38. PL 34, 80. NPNF1 2, 567.

explain a doubtful passage by other passages of scripture than by reason.)[137]

Precept Twelve: Finally Augustine admonishes exegetes to acquire a knowledge of what the *grammatici graeco* [138] call tropes if they wish to adequately interpret figurative language. Augustine lists such tropes of allegory (*allegoria*), enigma (*aenigma*) and parables (*parabola*)[139] as actually being named in scripture. He goes on to name *metaphosa, catachresis, ironia* and *antiphrasis* as other tropes which may be found in scripture albeit unnamed.[140]

Augustine concludes his technical description of figurative exegesis by providing a resume of the "*septem regulas*"[141] or rules of Tyconius. Augustine includes them although he does not find them entirely effective. Furthermore, according to Augustine, Tyconius himself does not consistently apply them.[142] He writes:

---

[137]*DDC* III.XVIII.39. PL 34, 80. NPNF1 2, 567.

[138]George Kennedy describes Augustine's rhetorical tradition as technical and entirely Latin based. He finds no evidence of Platonic or Aristotelian philosophical rhetoric in Augustine's approach. Kennedy concludes that Augustine's rhetoric is completely Ciceronian. The *grammatici graeco* probably refer to the grammar school teachers Augustine endured as a child. *Confessiones* I.XIV.23. PL 32, 671., where Augustine describes his experience with these teachers and his subsequent dislike for the Greek language.
    See George A. Kennedy, Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), pp. 256-270. Also see George Kennedy, The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World: 300 B. C.-A.D. 300 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972).

[139]*DDC* III.XXIX.40. PL 34, 80.

[140]*DDC* III.XXIX.40-41. PL 34, 80-81. Augustine describes *antiphrasis* as the use of a word to mean its opposite. Augustine explains that *catachresis* is a word that is etymologically linked to one word but no longer carries this meaning. *Piscina* (literally fish pond) is an example. During Augustine's time it was applied to any pool of water (swimming pool, etc.) even though they contained no fish. See NPNF1 2, 567 note 1.

[141]*DDC* III.XXX.43-XXXVII.56. PL 34, 81-88.

[142]See Pamela Bright, The Book of Rules of Tyconius: Its Purpose and Inner Logic (South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988). Bright argues for a chiastic

"nec tamen omnia quae ita scripta sunt ut non facile intelligantur, possunt his regulis invenirir, sed aliis modis pluribus, quos hoc numero septenario usque adeo non est iste complexus, ut idem ipse multa oxponat obscura in quibus harum regularum adhibet nullam, quoniam nec opus est." (they do not explain all the difficult passages, for there are several other methods required, which are so far from being embraced in this number of seven, that the author himself explains many obscure passages without using any of his rules.)[143]

Book 4 of the *De doctrina christiana* written in 426 deals with Christian appropriation of the tools of rhetorical persuasion when preaching. John Cavadini has described this as "a theory of conversion."[144] Thus the entire enterprise of interpreting and conveying the meaning of scripture is a task of the greatest spiritual importance. David Dawson writes: "Scripture successfully brings the divine will into a therapeutic relation with readers' human wills, enabling them to participate in and thus be redirected by divine will."[145] Lynn Poland links this relationship to textual obscurity, which "creates a crisis for faith"

---

structure to the rules and suggests that Augustine did not truly understand Tyconius. She writes: "Augustine has complained that Tyconius had raised false expectations in claiming that one could be guided through the 'forest of prophecy by a mere seven rules. However close attention to the grammatical parallels in the preamble of The Book of Rules reveals that it is not the rules that guide the interpreter: it is the logic of the rules. The rules are not extrinsic rules to be applied in interpretation....The seven rules are the 'literary principles that govern the formation of the very text of Scripture." p. 186.

[143]*DDC* III.XXX.42. PL 34, 81. NPNF1 2, 586.

[144]John Cavadini, "The Sweetness of the Word: Salvation and Rhetoric in Augustine's *De doctrina christiana,*" in *De Doctrina Christiana: A Classic of Western Culture*, ed. D. W. H. Arnold and P. Bright (South Bend: Notre Dame University Press, 1995), p. 164.
    This would certainly fall under the hermeneutic of *caritas* , and thus preserve an underlying link between all four books of the *DDC*, since the most loving thing one human could do for another would be to facilitate conversion.
    Also see Adolf Primmer, "The Function of the *genera dicendi* in *De doctrina christiana* 4," in *De Doctrina Christiana: A Classic of Western Culture*, ed. D. W. H. Arnold and P. Bright (South Bend: Notre Dame University Press, 1995), pp. 68-86. Primmer describes the structure of book four and its parallels with Cicero's *De oratore*.

[145]David Dawson, "Sign, Allegory and the Motions of the Soul," in *De Doctrina Christiana: A Classic of Western Culture*, ed. D. W. H. Arnold and P. Bright (South Bend: Notre Dame University Press, 1995), p. 131.

leading to allegorical interpretation. Allegorical understanding, engendered by obscure texts becomes the mechanism whereby Augustine repeats "the economic loss and gain of Christian salvation."[146]

Application of the Twelve Precepts to Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3:

As analysis of Augustine's exegesis of Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3 unfolds in chapters four and five it will become evident that Augustine employs with relative frequency certain of his interpretive precepts. These will be described in detail during the course of the analysis in chapters four and five, however the following brief overview will serve to orient the reader.

Gen. 2:15-25: The understanding that scripture is both a narration of past events and prophetic of future events, first found in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.II.3,[147] is one of his most frequently employed exegetical strategies regarding Gen. 2:15-25. In all of these instances the Old Testament is prophetic of the New and while never explicitly stated, such an exegesis is implicitly also an *analogia*. As described in *De genesi ad litteram, imperfectus liber*, [148] *analogia* shows that the Old and New Testaments are congruent. Prophecy as such is the preferred exegetical strategy 33% of the time. Of this group 76 % of the citations are of some portion of Gen. 2:21-24, which is almost always understood as ecclesially prophetic. In order to justify such a reading Augustine

---

[146]Lynn M. Poland, "Augustine, Allegory, and Conversion," Literature and Theology 2/1 (March 1988): 47.

[147]PL 34, 197.

[148]PL 34, 222.

invariably employs the precept, recommended in *De doctrina christiana* III.XVI.37[149] that obscure passages of scripture should be interpreted by clearer ones. Furthermore there is a suggestive coincidence between Augustine's insistence upon prophetic readings for the aforementioned verses and his debates with Manichaean exegetes. Gen. 2:21-24 with its sanction of marriage was one of the main planks in the Manichaean argument that the Old Testament was a corrupted product of the Demiurge.

As recommended in precept number twelve, Augustine employs his knowledge of Latin rhetorics, usually allegory, approximately 16% of the time. Nine percent of the time Augustine uses technical strategies for understanding a particular verse. He brings to his exegesis the types of secular historical, linguist or technical knowledge which he recommended in *De doctrina christiana* II.XIV.21 and II.XXV.38-II.XXI.60.[150]

By far the lion's share of the Gen. 2:15-25 verses are interpreted within the context of theological doctrine. For 27% of the citations, the verse in question is understood within the context of the Fall. For a further 15% of the verses Augustine uses various combinations of the themes of Christian marriage, sex and the fall, in order to formulate his exegesis.

Gen. 3: As with Gen. 2: 15-25, the prophetic nature of scripture accounts for roughly 30 % of Augustine's explanations. Included in these are instances when Augustine employs the strategy of allusion, wherein one biblical text is understood in light of a second. While not strictly

---

[149]PL 37, 79.

[150]PL 34, 54-63.

prophetic such an understanding illustrates the underlying unity of scripture, which is entirely a product of the Holy Spirit.

Augustine applies precept twelve (knowledge of tropes and rhetorics) considerably more frequently to his exegesis of Gen. 3. Twenty-four percent of citations are understood allegorically. Interestingly, while Augustine lists numerous tropes in *De doctrina christiana* III.XXIX.40-41[151] he uniquely employs allegory. Augustine uses his technical secular knowledge to interpret passages from Gen. 3, slightly more frequently than with Gen. 2:15-25. These account for 11% of the citations.

As with Gen. 2:15-25, the lion's share of citations from Gen. 3 are understood from the perspective of Christian doctrine. Augustine employs the categories of the Fall, the disorder in the soul caused by human pride and the lustful nature of post-lapsarian sexual relations in 51% of his interpretations.

Having looked at the historical threads surrounding the production of *De genesi contra manichaeos* and *De genesi ad litteram*., and having unwoven the various strands of Augustine's exegetical precepts and strategies, it is time to move on to the tapestry of manuscript editions and versions of scriptural texts. The following chapter will be devoted to a description of the versions of scripture which Augustine uses in *De genesi contra manichaeos* and *De genesi ad litteram*. It will also discuss the manuscript versions for the two principal works under consideration: *De genesi contra manichaeos* and *De genesi ad litteram*.

---

[151]PL 34, 80-81.

Chapter Three

Scriptural Versions and Manuscript Traditions

This chapter will deal with two areas of Augustinian literary
tradition that are crucial to the analysis of Augustine's use of Gen. 2:15-
25 and Gen. 3. The first is the particular version or versions of scripture
which Augustine used. As will be seen there is evidence that he uses
several versions of the *Vetus Latina* while producing *De genesi contra
manichaeos* and *De genesi ad litteram*. The second area of interest is
modern manuscript versions of Augustine's *De genesi contra
manichaeos* and *De genesis ad litteram* which will form the basis for the
analysis of chapters four and five following. Consequently this chapter
will be divided into two sections. The first will be devoted to Augustine's
version of the *Vetus Latina* and the second will focus upon the most
authoritative versions of *De genesi contra manichaeos* and *De genesi ad
litteram*.

Section 1

Augustine and the *Vetus Latina*

Augustine's Bible

The versions of the Bible with which Augustine was most familiar
were written in Latin. Physically it would have appeared in a series of
codices or separate books made, in all likelihood, of parchment rather

than papyrus.[1] The earliest of these Latin biblical codices were produced in North Africa. The oldest evidence for an African Latin version is found in the works of Tertullian.[2] A later Carthaginian version is attested to by Cyprian.[3] These various African versions were not the work of one translator. They possessed however, according to Jean Gribomont, *"une relative unité, tant dans le type de modèle grec que dans son vocabulaire et sa méthode de traduction, ce que l'on appelle sa «couleur» particulière."*[4] Such codices were plentiful in North Africa, a fact attested to by Optatus[5] and would most certainly be the versions of the Bible which Augustine heard as a child from Monica.

Augustine's Latin version of the Old Testament would have been based upon the Septuagint Greek rather than the Hebrew. Such translations were called the *Vetus Latina* or old Latin versions of the Bible in order to distinguish them from Jerome's newer Vulgate translation which was based upon the Hebrew. While the canonicity of certain books was being debated during this period, Augustine's Old Testament canon resembled that of the Septuagint. It included Judith, Tobit, 1 and 2 Maccabees, Wisdom, Sirach and the Greek fragments of

[1]Pièrre Petitmengin, "Les plus anciens manuscrits de la Bible latine," in Le monde latin antique et la Bible, ed. Jacques Fontaine et Charles Pietri, Bible de tous les temps Series, vol. 2 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1984), p. 92.

[2]Jean Gribomont, "Les plus anciennes traductions latines," in Le monde latin antique et la Bible, ed. Jacques Fontaine et Charles Pietri, Bible de tous les temps Series, vol. 2 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1984), p. 47. Gribomont notes that Tertullian is basing his Latin citations upon an earlier Greek version. Interestingly his vocabulary anticipates the European *Vetus Latina*'s.

[3]Ibid., pp. 47-49.

[4]Ibid., p. 49.

[5]Petitmengin, "Les plus anciens manuscrits de la Bible latine," p. 93.

Esther and Daniel.[6]   Augustine continued to view these works as canonical until the end of his life.[7]

Whether or not Augustine actually used the Septuagint is an issue which is much debated. While he expressed a distaste for the Greek language and a preference for Latin[8] there is limited evidence that he was familiar with some Greek biblical manuscripts. Anne-Marie la Bonnardière devoted most of her academic career to studying Augustine's use of the Bible. She suggests that Augustine did not use Greek manuscripts of the Bible until late in his career.[9] He refers to the Greek rarely, using it to clarify an expression which may be obscure or unclear in the Latin text.[10] She finds evidence for this in *Quaestiones in heptateuchum, De civitate dei,* and the portion of the *De doctrina christiana,* produced after 426 C.E.[11] The earliest instances occur in *Quaestiones in heptateuchum* which dates from 419-420 C.E.,

---

[6]A.-M. la Bonnardière, "Le canon des divines Ecritures," in Saint Augustin et la Bible, ed. A.-M. la Bonnardière, Bible de tous les temps, vol. 3 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1986), p. 297.

[7]Ibid., p. 300.

[8]Augustine, *Confessiones,* I.XII.20. PL 32, 670.

[9]A.-M. la Bonnardière, "Augustine et la «Vulgate» de Jérôme," in Saint Augustin et la Bible, ed. A.-M. la Bonnardière, Bible de tous les temps, vol. 3 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1986), p. 304.

[10]Also see *Locutiones in heptateuchum* 1. Gen. 3.1. PL 34, 487 which la Bonnardière does not mention. This work dates from 419 C.E. Augustine writes that the Latin *prudentissimus* is rendered in Greek by *sophôtatos.* There is the possibility that Augustine cribbed this from Jerome rather than consulting the Greek personally since the strong possibility exists that Augustine was in possession of Jerome's *Quaestiones hebraicae in genesim.* See A.-M. la Bonnardière, "Augustine et la «Vulgate» de Jérôme," p. 307. Citing the work of F. Cavallera, la Bonnardière points out that there is a very strong possibility that Augustine had Jerome's work before him while he was producing his own.

[11]A.-M. la Bonnardière, "Augustine et la «Vulgate» de Jérôme," p. 305.

consequently books 17 onward in *De civitate dei* written from this period contain this influence.[12]

La Bonnardière also dates evidence that Augustine is using Jerome's Vulgate "*ex hebraico* " (from the Hebrew) from the same period. There are four works containing in total eleven citations from Gen. 2:15-25 which were produced after 419. These are *Enchiridion* (421 C.E.)[13] *De civitate dei* XXII (425 C.E.), *De correptione et gratia* (426-427 C.E.), *Contra secundam juliani* (429-430 C.E.). In these instances Augustine's possible use of the Vulgate does not appear to alter his understanding of the texts cited in these works.

Augustine's Versions of Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3

For the majority of allusions or citations from Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3 Augustine is using some version of the *Vetus Latina* or Old Latin Bible. Augustine is familiar with several of these Latin versions, a fact which he attests to in *Locutiones in heptateuchum* I.[14] Fortunately Augustine provides two extended versions of his Latin sources for both Gen. 2: 15-25. and Gen. 3. These are found in *De genesi contra manichaeos* and *De genesi ad litteram*. . Included at the end of Chapter five are several appendixes which may help to orient the reader regarding these various scriptural versions. Appendix I presents a tri-columnar comparison of Jerome's Vulgate, Augustine's *De genesi contra*

---

[12]Peter Brown, Augustine of Hippo (London: Faber and Faber, 1967), p. 285. Brown dates book 17 from 420. Augustine produced no books for *De civitate dei* in 419.

[13]This work is also called *De fide, spe et caritate.*

[14]PL 34, 466. Augustine writes of " *multi latini codices.*" (many Latin codices)

manichaeos and *De genesi ad litteram* versions of Gen. 2:15-25. The passage has been further broken down by verses. <u>Appendix III</u> contains a similar comparison for Gen. 3.

The biblical citations uses in this analysis are based upon the *Patrologia Latina* editions of *De genesi contra manichaeos* and *De genesi ad litteram*. With regards to *De genesi contra manichaeos*, the Maurist is the only published Latin version of the text to date. Consequently, it was the primary source the *De genesi contra manichaeos* version of Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3. These have been cross checked with Fischer's *Vetus Latina* . Fischer's magisterial work provides extensive notes with each verse listing alternate versions found in Patristic manuscripts. Included are Augustine's *De genesi contra manichaeos* and *De genesi ad litteram*.

There are several available versions of the Latin text for *De genesi ad litteram*. These are *Patrologia Latina*, *Bibliothèque augustinienne*, and *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiaticorum latinorum.* The *Bibliothèque augustinienne* text, published in 1972, was edited by P. Agaësse and A. Solignac and is based upon the *Corpus scriptorum* edition. The *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiaticorum latinorum* version of *De genesi ad litteram* was edited by Joseph Zycha and published in 1894.

The Zycha edition has proved problematic since it first appeared. It was noted as early as 1912 that it contained several difficulties with regards to the reproduction of Augustine's biblical texts. As pointed out by J. S. McIntosh,[15] Zycha emended Augustine's biblical citations.

[15]J. S. McIntosh, *A Study of Augustine's Versions of Genesis,* (Chicago: dissertation, 1912), p. 11. I am indebted to the work of Gilles Pelland from the University of Montreal for this reference. Father Pelland's *Cinq étude d'Augustin sur le début de la genèse* (Bellarmin: Montreal) 1972., was most helpful when wading through the minutiae of Augustine's biblical tradition.

Assuming that Augustine's latin version was based upon the Greek Septuagint, Zycha corrected Augustine's Latin to conform with the Tischendorf-Nestle edition of the *LXX*. McIntosh notes that the Greek version of the Septuagint which constituted the bases for Augustine's Latin version, in all probability differed from the modern Tischendorf-Nestle edition. Furthermore; Zycha's emended version quite obviously differed from that found in the Augustinian manuscripts. The *Bibliothèque augustinienne,* version is based upon Zycha's, although some corrections have been made.[16] Given the early difficulties with the Zycha version, I have opted for a conservative approach. The biblical text found in the *Patrologia Latina,* version of *De genesi ad litteram* is the primary source for Augustine's *Vetus Latina*. Once again this has been cross checked with Fisher's notes in the *Vetus Latina*.

Fisher is also primary source for Jerome's Vulgate. This has been cross checked with the *Patrologia Latina* edition of *Liber bresith qui graece dicitur genesis* as found in volume 28, 198-201.

Augustine's Versions of Gen. 2:15-25

De genesi contra manichaeos: Augustine's earliest cited a version of Gen. 2:15-25 appears in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II. I.1,[17] (389 C.E.). Although his version is unique, portions of the text are similar

---

[16]See *Bibliothèque augustinienne: Oeuvres de saint Augustin* (Paris, 1947- in progress). The Latin text with French translations and notes for *De genesi ad litteram* as edited by P. Agaësse and A. Solignac is found in Vols. 48 and 49.

[17]PL 34, 204-206.

to existent *Vetus Latina* manuscripts as found in Fischer's work.[18] Gen. 2:15-18,21, 23-25 are identical to German versions.[19] The only alteration is the substitution of *ei* for *illa* in Gen. 2:18.[20] Gen. 2:19-20 and 22, are identical to the African manuscripts. Interestingly Augustine's text does not resemble any extant Carthaginian manuscripts.[21] Consequently Augustine's *De genesi contra manichaeos* version of Gen. 2:15-25 appears as a hodge podge of various European and African versions of the *Vetus Latina*.[22]

  De genesi ad litteram: Augustine cites a second complete version of Genesis 2: 15-25 in *De genesi ad litteram* (401-415 C.E.). He did not use Jerome's Vulgate version of Genesis[23] even though the work had been produced at least eight years earlier.[24] Augustine, like his

---

[18] *Genesis* in *Die Reste der alterlateinischen Bibel nach Petrus Sabatier*, ed. Bonifatius Fischer, vol. 2 (Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1951). The footnotes following use the abbreviation VL in reference to this work, followed by the volume and page number.

[19] These are Latin manuscripts which have been produced in what is present day Germany.

[20] Augustine writes : "*faciamus ei adjutorium simile sibi*" (PL 34, 195). The German manuscript reads: "*faciamus illi adjutorium simile sibis*" (VL 2,48-49).

[21] Some of the phrasing seems to echo Jerome's Vulgate version of Genesis; however given the date of *De genesi contra manichaeos* this can only be coincidence. See Appendix I for a comparison of Jerome's Vulgate and Augustine's version. Also see J. N. D. Kelly, Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies (London: Duckworth Press, 1975), p. 283. Kelly dates Jerome's translation of the Pentateuch to 404. They were among the last of the books of the Old Testament to be translated.

[22] See Jean Gribomont, "Les plus anciennes traductions latines," in Le monde latin antique et la Bible, ed. Jacques Fontaine et Charles Pietri, Bible de tous les temps Series, vol. 2 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1984). Jean Gribomont writes the following about the evolution of European versions of the *Vetus Latina*: "*Les meilleurs spécialistes, ...sont convaincus que, dans l'ensemble, les recensions européennes sont issues de la même version primitive que la Bible africaine.*" p. 52.

[23] Kelly, Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies, p. 161. According to Kelly, Jerome is producing his Latin version of the Old Testament based upon the Hebrew from 390 to 405/6 (p. 161). He apparently began with Samuel and Kings, continued with the Psalter, the Prophets and Job.

[24] ANF 6, xx. The author dates the Genesis translation to 393 C.E.

contemporary Rufinus,[25] was initially unenthusiastic about Jerome's translations based upon the Hebrew texts.[26] He preferred the older Latin versions which were derived from the Septuagint. In the *De doctrina christiana* II.XV.22 (396 C.E) Augustine recommends the Septuagint version rather than the Hebrew if clarification of an Old Testament text is required. [27] He suggests that the Septuagint was translated by the "*Spiritus Sanctus.*" (Holy Spirit) thus it was more authoritative than the Hebrew. [28]

Augustine was also aware that Jerome had produced an earlier Latin version of the Old Testament which had been based upon the Septuagint.[29] Around 403 C.E., while he was writing his *De genesi ad litteram* Augustine asked Jerome for a copy of the work.[30] Within this context Augustine wrote regarding the various Latin versions of the Old Testament:

---

[25]Rufinus, *Apologiae in sanctum hieronymum* II. 32. PL 21, 611. Rufinus writes in 400 C.E. to is friend Apronianus the following condemnation of Jerome's Vulgate "*An ut divinarum Scripturarum libros, quas ad plenissimum fidei Instrumentum Ecclesiis Christi Apostoli tradiderunt nova nunc et a Judaeis mutata interpretatione mutares.*" (And what are we to do when we are told that the books which bear the names of the Hebrew Prophets and lawgivers are to be had from you in a truer form than that which was approved by the Apostles? NPNF2 3, 475).

[26]Augustine, *Epistola* LXXI.III.5. PL 33, 242. Augustine describes a certain bishop who narrowly avoids a riot in his church when he uses Jerome's new translation. Jerome's rendering of Jonah 4:6 was different from the version the worshipers were used to chanting during the service.

[27]PL 34, 46.

[28]For a fully developed description of Augustine's canon see Anne-Marie La Bonnardière, "Le canon des divines Écritures," in Saint Augustine et la Bible, ed. Anne-Marie La Bonnardière, Bible de tous les temps, vol. 3 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1986), pp. 287-301.

[29]Kelly, Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies, p. 159. His earlier version of the Old Testament (389-93 C.E) based upon *LXX* included the Psalter, (which was to become the Psalter for the Vulgate, rather than his later Hebrew version),Job, 1&2 Chronicles, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes and Song of Songs.

[30]Augustine, *Epistola* LXXI. II.3-4. PL 33, 242.

"*Ego sane te mallem graecas potius canonicas nobis interpretari scripturas, quae Septuaginta interpretum perhibentur. Perdurum erit enim si tua interpretatio per multas ecclesias frequentius coeperit lectitari quod a graecis ecclesiis latinae ecclesiae dissonabunt, maxime quia facile contradictor convincitur graeco prolato libro, id est linguae notissimae.*" (You would therefore confer upon us a much greater boon if you gave an exact Latin translation of the Greek Septuagint version: for the variations found in the different codices of the Latin text are intolerably numerous; and is so justly open to suspicion as possibly different from what is to be found in the Greek, that one has no confidence in either quoting it or proving anything by its help.)[31]

If Augustine had been hoping to use Jerome's improved Latin version of the Septuagint for his commentary he was to be disappointed. Jerome, replying somewhat tardily in 416 C.E., since Augustine's twelve book commentary upon Genesis were finished the year before, had apparently lost his copies of this work.[32] If, as John Kelly suggests, this earlier Latin version did not contain the Pentateuch, Augustine would have been doubly disappointed.[33]

Augustine uses a slightly different version of the Genesis text in *De genesi ad litteram* from that used in *De genesi contra manichaeos*. As with the earlier work, Augustine's version seems like a patchwork quilt with portions echoing existent Italian and German manuscripts. Gen. 2:15-17, is slightly different from the German manuscripts. [34] Augustine's

---

[31]PL 33, 232. NPNF1 1, 327. See Anne-Marie La Bonnardière, "Augustine a-t-il utilisé le «Vulgate» de Jérôme?" in Saint Augustine et la Bible, ed. Anne-Marie La Bonnardière, Bible de tous les temps Series, vol. 3 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1986), pp. 303-312.

[32]Jerome, *Epistola*. CXXXIV,2. PL 33, 1162. Jerome implies that someone has deliberately destroyed them. He writes: "*Pleraque enim prioris laboris fraude cujusdam amisimus.*"(for we have lost, through someone's dishonesty, the most of the results of our earlier labor. NPNF1 1, 544.)

[33]Kelly, Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies, p. 159.

[34]Gen. 2:15 Augustine changes *fecerat* to *fectit*, drops the *ibi* and the final *eum*. Gen. 2:16 Augustine uses *ab omni ligno* instead of *ex omni ligno* and translates *edes ad escam* as *esca edes*. In Gen. 2:17 Augustine uses *de illo* rather than *ab eo*. PL 34, 379, 392. and VL 2, 46-47.

version of Gen. 2:18 is his own. His version's word choice "*secundum ipsum.*" occurs only in one variation of the German manuscripts. All other versions employ "*simile* ".[35] Gen. 2:23-24 follows the German manuscripts.[36] Augustine drops "*et haec erit mihi adjutorium*" (and this will be my helpmate) in his version of Gen. 2:23. He included this passage in *De genesi contra manichaeos.* Gen 2:25 mirrors the German texts once again however Augustine has rearranged the word order very slightly.[37] Gen. 2:19-20, 22 are most similar to Italian manuscripts[38] while Gen. 2:21 seems to be Augustine's own version.[39] It is also worth noting that the only time that Augustine's interpretation of a text is obviously influenced by the scriptural version he has chosen occurs with this particular citation of Gen. 2:21. Augustine's version uses the word *ecstasim* (ecstasy) rather than *soporem.* (deep sleep).[40] As will be described in more detail in chapter four, Augustine describes the institution of Adam's prophetic abilities as being based upon *ecstasim.*

As was the case with *De genesi contra manichaeos* Augustine appears once again to be using a unique version of the *Vetus Latina*. While no manuscript exists for Augustine's version, aside from *De genesi ad litteram*, it is obvious that Augustine's source was European rather

---

[35]PL 34, 393 & VL 2, 49.

[36]PL 34, 393 & VL 2, 52-55.

[37]*Erant ambo nudi,* becomes *erant nudi ambo.* PL 34, 429 & VL 2, 56.

[38]Augustine writes for Gen. 2:19: "*hoc est nomen ejus.*" The Italian manuscript uses "*hoc nomen.*" PL 34, 393 & VL 2, 50. For Gen. 2:20 the Italian version used *inposuit,* rather than *vocavit, Adae* for *Adam,* and omits *Ipsi* from Gen. 2: 20b. PL 34, 393 & VL 2, 50-51. In Gen. 2:22 Augustine replaces *sumpsit* with *accepit.* PL 34, 393 & VL 2, 51.

[39]PL 34, 393.

[40]VL 2, 51.

than African. Given Augustine's aversion to the rather clumsy North African versions this comes as no surprise. When he was in Carthage he had considered them to be roughly fashioned and "*indigna quam Tullianae dignitati compararem*" (unworthy to be compared with the dignity of Cicero).[41] As noted in the previous chapter Augustine recommends a version of the *Vetus Latina* which bears out his anti-African pro-European stance. In the *De doctrina christiana* II.XV.22, (396 C.E.) Augustine suggests that the *Itala* version of the Bible is to be preferred.[42] It should be noted that Augustine's *Itala*, assuming that he has used some version of it in either *De genesi contra manichaeos* or *De genesi ad litteram*, is not the same version described as *Itala* in Fischer's *Vetus Latina*.

Augustine's Versions of Gen. 3.

As with Gen. 2:15-25, Augustine provides two extended textual citations of Genesis 3. These are found in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.I.2[43] and *De genesi ad litteram* XI.I.1.[44] Once again Augustine's texts are unique, combining versions which have come down to us from various manuscript sources. A detailed comparison of the *De genesi contra manichaeos* and *De genesi ad litteram* texts and the various

---

[41]Augustine, *Confessiones* III.V.9. PL 32, 686.

[42]PL 34,46. "*In ipsis autem interpretationibus, Itala caeteris praeferatur*" (Among the translations themselves, the Italian is preferred to the others. NPNF1 2, 542).

[43]PL 34, 196-197.

[44]PL 34, 429-430.

manuscript traditions is found in <u>Appendix III</u>. The following is a brief

résumé of that analysis.

    De genesi contra manichaeos: In *De genesi contra manichaeos*,

Augustine's version is almost identical to the German tradition until Gen.

3:6 "*in escam.*"[45] Gen. 3:6b to Gen. 3:7b's "*et sumpserunt*" appears to

follow the African tradition.[46] The rest of Gen. 3:7b seems to be unique to

Augustine. Gen. 3:8[47] to 3:10a generally follows the German tradition

except for the a short section of Gen. 3:8b which is African.[48] Gen. 3:9

once again returns to the German. Gen. 3:10[49] combines both German

and African elements while 3:11 and 12 most closely resemble the

African.[50] Gen. 3:13 is German while Gen. 3:14 combines both

European and Carthaginian elements.[51] In Gen. 3:15 Carthaginian and

several German variations are combined.[52] With Gen. 3:16 Augustine's

text combines both German and uniquely Augustinian elements.[53] Gen.

3:17 bears echoes of both European and Carthaginian manuscripts but

---

[45]In Gen. 3:3 Augustine changes *paradiso* to *paradisi*. In Gen. 3:5 , Augustine uses *quia qua* rather than *quonim qua*. See VL 2, 56-60.

[46]It is worth noting that Augustine is frequently the source for the subsequent African tradition.

[47]Augustine uses *Domini* instead of *Dei*. VL 2, 62,63.

[48]After *abante* Augustine's version no longer follows the German tradition but rather the African. VL 2, 62- 63.

[49]After *et* manuscript follows African tradition. VL 2, 64.

[50]In Gen. 3:11 Augustine uses *manducasti* instead of *edisti*. VL 2, 64-65. In Gen. 3:12 he uses *manducavi* instead of *edi*. VL 2, 65.

[51]Gen. 2:14 is European to *tu ab* and Carthaginian to *bestiarum*. The rest is Augustine's unique version. VL 2, 66-67.

[52]The version is Carthaginian to *ponam*, German to *illius* and Augustinian (although very similar to some German variations) for the rest. VL 2, 67-68.

[53] Text is German to *suspiria* and Augustinian after. VL 2, 69-70.

appears to be unique to Augustine.[54] Gen. 3:18 combines German and
Carthaginian texts.[55] Gen. 3:19[56] is mainly German while Gen. 3:20 is
African.[57] Gen. 3: 21 -23 combine both German and African elements.[58]
Gen. 3:24 follows the African version.[59]

De genesi ad litteram: As with Gen. 2, Augustine's version of
Genesis 3 in *De genesi ad litteram* is different from that in *De genesi
contra manichaeos*. Gen. 3:1,2,3 and 5 are similar to German versions
but appear to be unique to Augustine.[60] Gen. 3:4, however, is identical
to the German versions.[61] Gen. 3:6 and 7 are a combination of German,
Italian and African texts.[62] Gen. 3:8 blends both Italian and German
traditions,[63] while Gen. 3:9 is German.[64] Gen. 3:10 combines both
German and African versions[65] while Gen. 3:11-12 is unique to
Augustine.[66] Gen. 3: 13 [67]is identical to an alternate German version

---

[54] VL 2, 70-72.

[55]It is German to *geminabit* and the rest is Carthaginian. VL 2, 72-73.

[56]Augustine substitutes *quia* from an alternate German text for *quoniam*. VL 2, 73-74.

[57]VL 2, 74-75.

[58]See Appendix III, pp. 8-9 for detailed comparison of the texts.

[59]VL 2, 77-78.

[60]VL 2, 56-60.

[61]VL 2, 58-59.

[62]See Appendix III, p. 3.

[63]VL 2, 62-63. The text is German to *a facie* while the rest is most similar to the Italian version.

[64]VL 2, 63-64.

[65]Text follows an alternate German version to *et* and is African after that. VL 2, 64.

[66]See Appendix III, pp. 4-5.

[67]VL 2, 65-66.

and Gen. 3:14[68] is the same as the European tradition. Gen. 3:15, 16, 17, 18,19, 20, 23 and 24 find echoes in Italian, German, European and Carthaginian versions but appear to be Augustine's own version.[69] Gen. 3:21[70] combines elements from the Italian and German traditions while Gen. 3:22[71] combines the Italian and European.

As with Augustine's versions of Gen. 2:15-25, Augustine's texts for Gen. 3 appear to contain a mixture of what would become both African and European traditions. While the source of both manuscripts appears to be more preponderantly European, they are not identical to any existent European tradition. Once again Augustine's scriptural versions appear to be uniquely his own.

Section 2

Manuscript versions of *De genesi contra manichaeos* and *De genesi ad litteram.*

As it is important to describe the Augustine's scriptural textual tradition it is also important to clarify the manuscript tradition of both *De genesi contra manichaeos* and *De genesi ad litteram* since these constitute our chief source for Augustine's exegesis of both Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3. The following will briefly sketch the tradition for the various

---

[68]VL 2, 66-67.

[69]See Appendix III pp. 6-8 and 9.

[70]VL 2, 76

[71]VL 2, 76-77.

modern editions of *De genesi contra manichaeos* and *De genesi ad litteram*.

The choice of edition for *De genesi contra manichaeos* was extremely easy. As previously noted the only published Latin versions of *De genesi contra Manichaeos* are based upon the Maurist which were eventually reproduced in the *Patrologia Latina*. This version was produced by the Benedictines of St. Maur between 1679-1700 and is found in *Patrologia Latina* 34,173-220. The Maurist edition collated numerous manuscripts plus the earlier published editions of Amerbach (1506 C.E) Erasmus (1528) and the Louvain editors in 1576.[72]

The choice of text for *De genesi ad litteram* proved more problematic. Three modern editions exist. The first is the Maurist which is reproduced in *Patrologia Latina* 34, 245-486. In this instance the Maurist edition was based upon a collection of twenty-six manuscripts, Amerbach, Erasmus and the Louvain editions.[73] Two other editions of the text exist, as previously mentioned. These are the *Corpus scriptorum ecclesiaticorum latinorum*, version produced by Joseph Zycha in 1894 and the *Bibliothèque augustinienne: Oeuvres de saint Augustin* version, edited by P. Agaësse and A. Solignac in 1972 and based upon Zycha.

The Zycha edition is not without its detractors. This has resulted in two schools of thought. The first group which is historically long standing and by far the more numerous is highly critical of the Zycha edition and

---

[72]ACW 41, 12-13. See J. De Ghellinck, *Patristique et moyen âge: Études d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale*, vol. 3 (Brussels and Paris: Museum Lessianum, 1941), pp. 371-411 for a detailed analysis and critical evaluation of the various manuscripts used by the Maurists.

[73]ACW 41, 13. Unfortunately it is not always obvious which manuscript is being used where since the Maurist edition did not always supply the critical scholarly apparatus one would wish to see today.

prefers the Maurist. The second group is formed of the translators of the *Bibliothèque Augustinienne* edition of <u>De genesi ad litteram</u>. While recognizing the validity of much of the prior criticism of Zycha, they recommend his text primarily because of its superior scholarly apparatus. The following is a brief summary of the debate surrounding Zycha's work.

Zycha based his edition primarily upon six manuscripts; the <u>Sessorianus</u> 13,[74] the <u>Parisinus</u> 2706,[75] the <u>Parisinus</u> 1804,[76] the <u>Sangallensis</u> 161,[77] several passages of the <u>Coloniensis</u> 61,[78] and the *Berolinensis* 24.[79] As with the scriptural passages, the Zycha version presents some technical problems. Zycha's version differs from the Maurist because of his use of the <u>Codex Sessorianus</u> as his primary authority for <u>De genesi ad litteram</u>. This, in all probability, is the earliest existent version of Augustine's text, dating from the sixth century.[80]

---

[74]<u>Codex Sessorianus</u> 13, Vittorio Emanuele Library, Rome, No. 2094. This is a sixth or seventh century manuscript. See John Taylor, "The Text of Augustine's <u>De Genesi Ad Litteram</u>," Speculum 25 (1950): 89-93, particularly p. 87 for the dating of these manuscripts. Also see A. Solignac, "*Introduction Générale*" pp. 55-58 in BA 48, for a slightly more detailed description of the location of these manuscripts.

[75]<u>Codex Parisinus</u> 2706, Colbertinus 5150, Bibliothèque Nationale, France. This is a late seventh or early eighth century manuscript.

[76]<u>Codex Parisinus</u> 1804, Colbertinus 894, Bibliothèque Nationale, France. Zycha did not assign a date to this manuscript. See A. Solignac, "*Introduction Générale*" p. 57 in BA 48.

[77]<u>Codex Sangallensis</u> 161, St Gall, Switzerland. This is a ninth century manuscript.

[78]<u>Codex Coloniensis</u> 61, Cologne. This is a twelfth century manuscript.

[79]<u>Codex Berolinensis</u> 24, Berlin Library. This manuscript dates from the ninth or tenth century. See ACW 41, 13. Zycha did not have access to this manuscript until after he had compiled his work. He placed selected variant readings in the preface of his work.

[80] There is debate over the dating of this codex. E. A. Lowe in <u>Codices latini antiquiores</u>(Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1947) Pt. 4, no. 418, dates the codex to the sixth century. Zycha dates it to the seventh century. See ACW 41, 222., note 39.

Zycha's edition was criticized as soon as it was published. Almost immediately after the publication of Zych's version, a first generation of scholars registered strong reservations regarding the edition's critical reliability. E. Preuscher and Paul Lejay in 1894 and G. Krüger in 1895 produced articles criticizing several components of Zycha's work.[81] Zycha had failed to produce a *stemma codicum* (genealogy of codices) for the manuscripts he used. He rarely indicated his sources, and appeared to be insufficiently informed about the manuscripts and their relative value. Zycha favored the *Sessorinanus* manuscript excessively; however, the relationship between the *Sessorianus* and the other existent manuscripts had not been established.[82] Furthermore, there was some doubt over whether Zycha himself had collated the *Sessorianus* which was the foundation of his translation.[83] In the United States as early as 1912 John McIntosh was highly critical of Zycha's scriptural work as previously noted.

A second generation of scholars continued to express serious doubts about Zycha's work. J. de Ghellinck criticized Zycha's and the *Corpus Vindobonense* in general. He wrote: "*Est-ce quelque chose de définitif, après l'Édition bénédictine, a-t-il été réalisé dans le Corpus Vindobonense? Pour l'ensemble, on doit résolument répondre par la négative.*"[84] James Hammond Taylor, produced an extremely detailed

---

[81]BA 48, 39, particularly note. 107.

[82]ACW 41, 14.

[83]A. Solignac, "*Introduction Générale*" p. 58-59 in BA 48.

[84]J. de Ghellinck, *Patristique et Moyen Age: Études d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale*, tome III (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1948), p. 475. See pp. 475.-484 for a detailed description of the relative merits of the various works in the *Corpus Vindobonense.*

article in 1950 entitled "The Text of Augustine's *De Genesi Ad Litteram*,"[85] in which he once again enumerated the serious defects in Zycha's edition. Taylor had also examined three alternate manuscripts which supported the Maurist versions of *De genesi ad litteram* XI rather than Zycha. These were *Codex Bruxellenis* 1051,[86] *Codex Vaticanus* 449,[87] and *Codex Vaticanus* 657.[88] Taylor wrote: "All three are of some importance in that they frequently supply manuscript evidence in support of the Benedictine edition in places where Zycha found none. It is especially interesting to find *L [Codex Bruxellenis]* (eleventh-century) occasionally supporting a variant for which Zycha found no authority older than the Benedictine text or the edition of Amerbach."[89] For the purposes of this thesis, Taylor's criticism is of particular interest since it is based primarily on Book XI of *De genesi ad litteram.* Book XI is the section of Augustine's tractate which is devoted to his interpretation of Gen. 3.

In 1972 the *Bibliothèque Augustinienne* produced a French/ Latin version of *De Genesi ad litteram* which is found in volumes 48 and 49 of their series. This work was edited and translated by P. Agaësse and A. Solignac. In the introductory notes, Solignac points out that their edition is far from critical and hopes that at some future date "*une édition*

---

[85]John Taylor, "The Text of Augustine's *De Genesi Ad Litteram*," Speculum 25 (1950): 89-93.

[86]Ibid., p. 88. This codex dates from the eleventh century and is found in the *Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique.*

[87]Ibid. This codex dates from the thirteenth or fourteenth century and is located in the Vatican.

[88]Ibid. This codex dates from the thirteenth or fourteenth century and is located in the Vatican.

[89]Ibid.

vraiment critique" will be produced.[90] Contrary to the scholarly current, Agaësse and Solignac based their translation upon the Zycha text rather than the Maurist. Solignac explains their reasoning in the following manner: "*Dans son ensemble, l'édition de Zycha est largement supérieure à celles qui l'ont précédée, même à celles des Mauristes. Sa supériorité vient de ce qu'elle offre pour la première fois un apparat critique...*"[91] Regarding the general scholarly criticism of Zycha, they write, "*quelques unes méritent d'être retenues.*"[92] Included in this group whose criticism merited being retained is the work of John Taylor.[93]

In 1982 Taylor produced an annotated English translation of *De genesi ad litteram* which appeared in the Ancient Christian Writers Series volumes 41 and 42. In his introduction he reiterated his earlier criticisms of Zycha and added that his uncritical devotion to *Sessorianus* "fails to take into consideration the thought and style of Augustine."[94] Once again he expressed his preference for the Maurist version.[95] Taylor concluded, like Agaësse and Solignac, that a great need existed for a

---

[90]A. Solignac, "*Introduction Générale*" p. 64 in BA 48.

[91]Ibid., pp. 59-60.

[92]Ibid., p. 59.

[93]Ibid., p. 59 note 107.

[94]James Hammond Taylor, The Literal Meaning of Genesis, vol. 1 in Ancient Christian Writers, no 41, ed. Johannes Quasten, Walter J. Burghardt and Thomas Comerford Lawler (New York: Newman Press, 1982), p. 14. See pages 12 to 16 for a detailed list of the numerous manuscripts of this particular work in existence.

[95]When producing his own translation Taylor attempted to collate Zycha's version with the Maurist. Variant readings were checked against the *Bodleianus*, Laud. Misc. 141 (8th or 9th century), the *Bruxellensis* 1051 (eleventh century), the *Laurentianus*, S. Marco 658 (9th century), the *Novariensis* 83 (5), (9th century), the *Palatinus Latinus* 234 (9th century) *Parisinus*, Nouv. Acq. Lat. 1572 (9th century), *Vaticanus* 449 & 657 (13th-14th centuries). ACW 41, 14-15.

new critical edition of _De genesi ad litteram_;. Unfortunately such a work has yet to be produced.[96]

There are several reasons for preferring the Maurist version as the primary source of _De genesi ad litteram_. for this thesis. First, the general scholarly opinion favors the Maurist version. Second the primary reason the Agaësse and Solignac edition opted for Zycha was his superior scholarly apparatus. However, there are some serious defects in the scholarly apparatus, particularly Zycha's alteration of biblical citations to conform with modern versions of the Septuagint. The focus of this thesis is Augustine's use of scripture; consequently, the accuracy of such citations is crucial. Third, and most importantly, it is in book XI of _De genesi ad litteram_ that Augustine discusses Genesis 3. Taylor's initial criticism of Zycha and recommendation of the Maurist version, was based upon a detailed analysis of book XI. Furthermore even Agaësse and Solignac, who preferred the Zycha version, accepted Taylor's criticisms of this particular portion of _De genesi ad litteram_..

Consequently, for the purpose of the analysis of _De genesi ad litteram_ which follows in chapters four and five, the Maurist version found in _Patrologia Latina_ 34, 245-486, will be used. Variants in the Zycha text which would radically alter the meaning will be noted in the footnotes if and when they occur. The version of Zycha which will be used is found in the _Bibliothèque Augustinienne_ edition, volumes 48 and 49, and edited by Agaësse and Solignac.

The background for the tapestry of Augustine's understanding of Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3, has been woven. The threads of Augustine's

---

[96]ACW 41, 15.

exegetical theories and principles have been worked through. The shades of manuscript traditions and versions of scripture have been decided upon. It is now time to move to the primary colors. The following two chapters constitute the heart of this work. They depict the primary colors of Augustine's exegesis on the stories of Adam's rib and Eve's sin. They display the various shades of his interpretation of the verses of Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3. They illustrate the hues of Augustine's exegetical strategies when concretely woven into his interpretations. They also pick out the skeins and threads of Augustine's theological sexism as they are entwined throughout his work.

Chapter Four

Augustine on Adam's Rib

This chapter will analyze Augustine's understanding of Gen. 2:15-25, the story of Eve's creation from Adam's rib, as it is found throughout the corpus of his work. It will describe the exegetical strategies which Augustine applies to Gen. 2:15-25 and where possible their relationship to the exegetical precepts enumerated in chapter two. Augustine's use of prophecy, and rhetoric will be concretely illustrated. It will also become evident, during the course of the chapter, that Augustine's divine sanctioning of patriarchal marriage, constitutes the hermeneutical underpinning for his theological sexism. In order to do this the chapter will be divided into three sections. The first section describes Augustine's interpretation of Gen. 2:15-25 verse by verse. The second section will focus upon analyzing the overall pattern of exegetical strategies found in Augustine's interpretations. The third section will be devoted to evaluating the theological sexism which Augustine expresses therein.

The scriptural passage which forms the basis for the analysis in this chapter has proved historically to be highly contentious. It is therefore appropriate that the chapter begin with a brief introduction to the extensive debate over the meaning of Eve's creation from Adam's rib and the much more limited scholarly research into Augustine's understanding of the story.

Gen. 2:15-25: A Much Debated Story

Genesis 2: 15-25 deals with the creation of the female from the body of the male. It is a story which has worried theologians long before a specifically feminist critique. Thomas Aquinas[1] attempted to wend his way through various interpretations of the verse in his *Summa theologicae* 13,1, 92. (1266-73 C.E.) Citing Aristotle,[2] Aquinas acknowledged, that woman's secondary order of creation, hence derivative status, have been interpreted as witnessing to defectiveness. Aquinas, however, argued that women may be misbegotten at the level of biology, but not at the level of shared human nature.[3]

Roughly two hundred years later Heinrich Kramer and James Sprenger published the *Malleus maleficarum* (1486 C.E) which was to become the standard manual for the detection of witches during the European which hunts.[4] Their reading of the creation of women made

[1]See Kari Borresen, Subordination and Equivalence: The Nature and Role of Woman in Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, trans. Charles Talbot (Washington: University Press of America, 1981) and "L'anthropologie théologique d'Augustin et de Thomas d'Aquin," Recherches de Science Religieuse 69/3 (1981): 393-406. In both works Borresen suggests that Aquinas appears less affirmative of women because of his Aristotelian biology.

[2]Aquinas cites Aristotle's *De generate animalium.* IV,2. 766b33, which describes woman as a misbegotten man. The following discussions are found in Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologicae*, trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province, vol. 13 (London: R. and T. Washbourne, Ltd., 1912), pp. 34-47. This is an extract of the *Summa theologicae*1a, 92, 1-4 which has been reprinted in this volume along with the Latin text. "Dom" will be used as the abbreviation for this edition in subsequent footnotes. This will be followed by the volume and page number of the English translation of the passage cited.

[3]"Only as regards nature in the individual is the female something defective and manqué...but with reference to nature in the species as a whole, the female is not something manqué" Dom 13, 37 "*ad primum ergo dicendum quod per respectum ad naturam particularem femina est aliquid deficiens et occasionatum.....Sed per comparationem ad naturam universalem femina non est aliquid occasionatum, sed est de intentione naturae...*" *Summa* la, 92, i, *responsio* i.

[4]See Anne Llewellyn Barstow, Witchcraze: A New History of the European Witch Hunts (New York: Pandora, 1994) for the most recent statistics and background to the Burning

Aquinas appear positively enlightened. They wrote: "There was a defect in the formation of the first woman, since she was formed from a bent rib, that is a rib of the breast, which is bent as it were in a contrary direction to a man. And since through this defect she is an imperfect animal, she always deceives."[5]

The biblical passage was interpreted more affirmatively by Christine de Pizan. Pizan, deeply immersed in the Renaissance *querelle de femmes*[6], invoked Christian tradition to support her arguments for the dignity and shared humanity of women. One of the biblical verses she uses to make her case is Gen. 2:15-25. With a rhetorical sleight of hand she agrees that man is the most supreme matter in creation, only to suggest that the only creature ever made of this superior substance was woman. Christine writes in The Book of the City of Ladies (1405 C.E): "In what place was she created? In the Terrestrial Paradise.[7] From what substance? Was it vile matter?[8] No, it was the noblest substance which

---

Times. Barstow's analysis suggests that considerably fewer witches were burned than the six to nine million quoted in some early feminist literature. Also see Robin Briggs, Witches and Neighbors: The Social and Cultural Context of European Witchcraft (New York: Viking Press, 1996).

[5]As found in William E. Phipps, "Adam's Rib: Bone of Contention" Theology Today XXXIII/3 (Oct., 1976): 246.

[6]This is a literary quarrel surrounding the interpretation of the medieval French work by Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meung entitled The Romance of the Rose. The work presented women in a very negative light and started a pamphlet war among renaissance scholars concerning the nature and role of women. See Marina Warner, Foreword in the Book of the City of Ladies, trans. E. J. Richards (New York: Persea Books, 1982), pp. xxviii-xxvix.

[7]Christine implies that woman was created in a more fitting and dignified place than man since man was created outside paradise and later placed in it.

[8]This is a not so subtle allusion to the fact that Adam was created from mud.

had even been created: it was from the body of man from which God made woman."[9]

More recently Gen. 2:15-25 has proved equally contentious. During the last century, as the battle lines were being drawn over the issue of women's suffrage, scripture was frequently used to support the various positions. Those who argued for the natural and divinely ordained subordination of women or "subordinationists" almost invariably based their argument upon Genesis 2:22.[10]

Unfortunately the issue of woman's derivative status was not confined to exegetes of the last century. It continues to plague modern scholarship such that schools of interpretation can be discerned depending upon the exegetes orientation towards the issue of women.[11] As late as 1991 Raymond C. Orlund was to provide an example of an androcentric interpretation when he wrote: "Man and woman are equal in the sense that they bear God's image equally," but "In the partnership of two spiritually equal human beings, man and woman, the man bears the primary responsibility to lead the partnership in a God-glorifying direction."[12]

Modern, post-Christian feminists have taken the notion that Christian theology promotes divinely sanctioned female inferiority, one

---

[9]Christine de Pizan, The Book of the City of Ladies 1.9.2, p. 24.

[10]Carolyn de Swarte Gifford, "American Women and the Bible: The Nature of Woman as a Hermeneutical Issue," in Feminist Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship, ed. Adela Yarbro Collins (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), p. 18.

[11]William Phipps has delineated three interpretational orientations of Genesis 2. These are androcentric, gynocentric and egalitarian. See William E. Phipps, "Adam's Rib: Bone of Contention," Theology Today XXXIII/3 (October, 1976): 263.

[12]Raymond C. Orlund, "Male-Female Equality and Male Headship Genesis 1-3," in Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism, ed. John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Wheaton, Illinois: Crossway Books, 1991), p. 95.

step further.[13] They argue that not only has Christianity supported the natural subordination of women, but that the tradition has also believed that women did not have souls. For example Monica Sjöö and Barbara Mor write: "The Ecumenical Council at Maçon in 900 decided with only a one-vote margin that women had souls."[14]

Emilien Lamirande, meticulously researched the issue and concluded that a dispute at the Council of Maçon over whether women had souls was spurious.[15] However, the dispute was cited by diverse sources, along with several erroneous dates for the council.[16] As the basis for the legend Lamirande reconstructs the following events. Apparently at a sidebar to the main council, recorded by Gregory of Tours, several delegates debated an item of Latin grammar. Does the word *homo* refer to humans and; therefore women, or merely men? The cleric whose knowledge of Latin was so spotty that he asked the question was corrected. *Homo* did indeed mean humans not just men.[17] Lamirande traces the subsequent the development of the legend during the Enlightenment and modern periods.

---

[13]Mary Daly argues that male falsification of true gynocentric energy starts with the reversal of myths such as Genesis 2 so that "Eve was born of Adam." See Mary Daly, Beyond God the Father, (Beacon Press: Boston, 1973), p. 195.

Sjöö and Mor make a similar interpretation writing: "And the first woman is born from a man's body. A very interesting biological reversal." See Monica Sjöö and Barbara Mor, The Great Cosmic Mother: Rediscovering the Religion of the Earth , p. 276.

[14]Monica Sjöö and Barbara Mor, The Great Cosmic Mother: Rediscovering the Religion of the Earth, p. 292.

[15]Emilien Lamirande, "De l'âme des Femmes Autour d'un Faux Anniversaire," Science et Esprit XXXVII/3 (1985), pp. 335-352.

[16]Ibid., pp. 335-337. The Council was held in 585 C.E.

[17]Ibid., p. 337.

Christian feminists have attempted to read Gen. 2:15-25 in a more positive light. Susan Niditch argues that the derivative interpretation is historically based upon misunderstanding the text, since in the Genesis 2 narrative the first couple "are not aware of their sexual differences."[18] Phyllis Trible has suggested that woman is the crown of creation since she was the last created.[19] Trevor Dennis attempts to read Genesis 2 from a non-sexist perspective and makes a similar argument. He writes: "The woman is the brightest jewel in its (creation's) crown."[20] However, Anne Gardner who has more recently commended Trible's interpretation suggests that the Hebrew does not support such an optimistic reading.[21]

For Gerda Lerner, as mentioned in the previous chapter one, the story of the creation of woman is fundamental and foundational to evaluating theological sexism within the Judeo/Christian tradition. She moves beyond the narrow details of exegesis to the level of mythic understanding of the text. Based upon the work of Peggy Reeves Sunday,[22] Lerner explains that "gender symbolism in creation stories

---

[18]Susan Niditch, "Genesis," in The Women's Bible Commentary, ed. Carol A. Newsom and Sharon H. Ringe (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), p. 13. In the more recent Searching the Scriptures: A Feminist Commentary, vol. 2, ed. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza (New York: Crossroad, 1994), Genesis is not dealt with at all. Its omission may indicate the editors' response to the possibility of positively applying it to women.

[19]Phyllis Trible, "Depatriarchalising in Biblical Interpretation," JAAR XL/1 (March, 1973): 35-42. Also see God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978), pp. 72-143. Here Trible attempts another extended exegesis of Genesis 2.

[20]Trevor Dennis, Sarah Laughed: Women's Voices in the Old Testament (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994), p. 16. Dennis admires Trible and credits her with influencing his interpretation.

[21]Anne Gardner, "Genesis 2:4b-3: A Mythological Paradigm of Sexual Equality or of the Religious History of Pre-Exilic Israel?" Scottish Journal of Theology 43 (1990): 1-18.

[22]Gerda Lerner, The Creation of Patriarchy, pp. 145-146. Reeves Sunday studied 112 creation stories. 50 % had male deities, 32% had divine couples, and 18 % had female deities. "In societies with masculine creation stories, 17 percent of the fathers cared for infants and 52 percent of the fathers hunted large game...in societies with feminine

proves a reliable guide to sex roles and sexual identities in a given society." [23] Lerner points out that Genesis departs from other creation stories from the same region in that the sole creator is the male God. "Yahweh is not allied with any female goddess."[24] Gen. 2:19 describes the power of ordering and naming as being given to the male which is further reinforced symbolically when Adam names his wife in Gen. 2:24. Lerner writes: "The Man here defines himself as the mother of the Woman."[25] Flesh of my flesh "is a peculiar inversion of the only human relationship for which such a statement can be made, namely, the relationship of mother to child."[26]

The Feminist Perspective on Augustinian Understanding of Gen. 2:15-25

In recent years a limited amount of research has been produced regarding Augustine's understanding of Gen. 2:15-25 from the dual perspectives of Augustinian sexual ethics and its possibly feminist implications. The following is a brief description of that research.

Research devoted to Augustine's exegesis of Gen. 2:15-25 produced from the mainly feminist perspective is extremely sparse. There exists a limited amount of research, by feminist writers, which incidentally deals with Augustine's interpretation of Genesis 2. For the majority of

---

creation stories 63 percent of fathers cared infants and 28 % hunted large game." pp. 145-146.

[23] Ibid., p. 145.

[24] Ibid., p. 180.

[25] Ibid., p. 181.

[26] Ibid.

these authors the issue is Augustine's attitudes towards sex and sexuality. David F. Kelly describes Augustine's use of Gen. 2:25 in his article, "Sexuality and Concupiscence in Augustine."[27] Kelly argues that Augustine understood the shame of the first parents to be engendered by concupiscence. Augustine's concupiscence is not merely a disordering factor in sexual relationships, but the disordering factor which taints all sexual relationships.

Elizabeth Clark concurs with Kelly's reading of Augustine. She suggests that Book IX of *De genesi ad litteram* shows that Augustine, even prior to Pelagian criticism, had developed his understanding that "intercourse, even within chaste marriage, was tainted."[28]

Elaine Pagels supports Clark's understanding of Augustine's sexual asceticism in her article comparing Augustine and Chrysostom's exegesis of Gen: 1-3. Pagels also argues that Augustine's negative attitude towards human perfectibility as illustrated in his theology of sexual relations was a reversal of "the classical proclamation concerning human freedom, once regarded by many as the heart of the Christian gospel."[29] More recently Deborah Sawyer reiterates Clark's interpretation in her survey of the interpretations of Genesis 1-3.[30]

---

[27]David F. Kelly, "Sexuality and Concupiscence in Augustine," in The Annual of the Society of Christian Ethics 1983, ed. Larry L. Rasmussen (Dallas, Texas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1983), p. 95.

[28]Elisabeth Clark, "Heresy, Asceticism, Adam and Eve: Interpretations of Genesis 1-3 in the later Latin Fathers," in The History of Exegesis, Intrigue in the Garden, ed. G. A. Robbins, Studies in Women and Religion, vol. 27 (Queenston, Ontario: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1988), p. 120. Also see "Adam's Only Companion: Augustine and the early Christian Debate on Marriage," Recherches Augustiniennes XXI (1986): 139-162, and "Theory and Practice in Late Ancient Asceticism, Jerome, Chrysostom, and Augustine," Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion 5 (Fall 1989): 25-46. In both these articles Clark makes a similar case for Augustine's asceticism.

[29]Elaine Pagels, "The Politics of Paradise: Augustine's Exegesis of Genesis 1-3 Versus that of John Chrysostom," Harvard Theological Review 78/1-2 (1985): 67-99. According

Section I

Augustine on Genesis 2:15-25

This brief sketch of the historically much debated interpretation of Gen. 2:15-25 leads to the main focus of this chapter which is Augustine's interpretation and understanding of the story. Augustine cites or alludes to some portion of Gen. 2:15-25, 127 times throughout the corpus of his work. Gen. 2:15 is referred to twice. Gen. 2:16 is quoted seven times while Gen. 2:17 is cited thirty-three times. Gen. 2:18 is mentioned six times. Gen. 2:19 is cited nine times and Gen. 2:20, three times. Gen. 2:21 is referred to thirteen times and Gen. 2:22, fifteen times. Augustine cites Gen. 2:23 on five occasions. Gen. 2:24 occurs twenty-six times and Gen. 2:25 appears eight times.[31] The following table is an illustration of these results. The first column indicates the verse in question. The second column indicates the number of times the verse is cited. The third column indicates the percentage for the use of the verse as compared with the other verses indicated in column one.

---

to Pagels Augustine's view was held by very few people prior to being popularized by Augustine.

[30]Deborah Sawyer, "Resurrecting Eve? Feminist Critique of the Garden of Eden," in A Walk in the Garden: Biblical, Iconographical and Literary Images of Eden, ed. Paul Morris and Deborah Sawyer (Sheffield: JSOT, 1992), p. 282.

[31]On some occasions Augustine refers to a group of verses together. For example in Contra adimantum II.I, Augustine refers to Gen. 2:18,21,22,24. For the purposes of the present research this reference is calculated as four citations. Each time an individual verse is mentioned , regardless of whether it is in isolation or within a group of verses, it is calculated as one citation of that verse.

Table 1 -Frequency of theUse of Gen. 2:15-25

Verse	Number of Citations	Percentage of Total
Gen. 2:15	2[32]	2%
Gen. 2:16	7	6%
Gen. 2:17	33	26%
Gen. 2:18	6	5%
Gen. 2:19	9	7%
Gen. 2:20	3	2%
Gen. 2:21	13	10%
Gen. 2:22	15	12%
Gen. 2:23	5	4%
Gen. 2:24	26	20%
Gen. 2:25	8	6%
Total	127[33]	100%

This section will be devoted to the description of these 127

interpretations. During the course of the analysis it will become evident

that Augustine's interpretations for 2:17, 21,22, 23, 24 and 25 were

influenced by Tertullian which perhaps bears witness to an ongoing

North African exegetical tradition. Interestingly Ambrose appears to have

[32]These numbers exclude the two instances when Augustine supplies the reader with his version of the verses as found in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.I, PL 34, 195-196 and *De genesi ad litteram* VIII.VIII.15, VIII.XXVII.49, IX.I.1, and XI.I.1, PL 34, 379,392,393, 430.

[33]This number represents the occasions wherein the verse is mentioned in the Augustinian corpus. There is a slight variation in the number of interpretations as is made clear when the numbers are compared during the discussion of the use of each verse. This is because Augustine has quoted the verse but not commented upon it in several instances. In others a particular verse is lumped in with several others as is the instance in *Contra adimantum* III.I. PL 42, 132. Consequently this one interpretation counts as four citations in the above chart. I have calculated in the raw scoreseach time the verse mentioned.

exerted a far less pronounced influence. While Augustine knows Ambrose's treatise on Genesis, _De paradiso_, and quotes directly from it on one occasion, he does not adopt Ambrosian interpretations for the most part. There a few tantalizing hints that Augustine was aware of Philo's exegesis on Genesis. Whether this was via translations of Philo's works or through Ambrose is less obvious. Augustine also follows a long tradition of exegetes, beginning with Paul, through Tertullian, Ambrose and Jerome, who view Gen. 2:24 as prophetic of the Church.

As will be described in detail in sections two and three of this chapter, the vast majority of these 127 citations are concerned with the prophetic nature of scripture. This accounts for 33% of all the citations. 9% of the citations deal with technical aspects of interpretation while a further 16% are devoted to the use of allegory as an exegetical tool. The statistical survey demonstrates that apart from exegetical/ technical usage nearly half (42%) of the references are directly related to central theological questions. Of these, 27%, are used within the context of the Fall while a further 15% deal with marriage, sexuality and the fall. Sprinkled throughout the corpus are the 4% of Augustine's interpretations which are theologically sexist. As will become evident in the subsequent sections the numerical insignificance of these citations is far superseded by their theological significance. Augustine understands patriarchal marriage to have been divinely instituted and sanctioned, thereby, theologically mandating the cultural and social subordination of women.

Augustine's Interpretations of Gen. 2:15-25

The discussion of Augustine's interpretations of Gen. 2:15-25 will proceed in the following manner. Each biblical verse will be dealt with separately. There are several reasons for this approach. Firstly Augustine most frequently cites these verses in isolation. Secondly the historical trajectory and development of the use of a particular verse can be most clearly displayed with this approach. Thirdly, in his two extended commentaries on Genesis 2, *De genesi contra manichaeos* and *De genesi ad litteram* Augustine adopts this type of organization. He discusses each verse and frequently each word individually.

There are several probable reasons why Augustine favored such a technique. Joseph Lienhard suggests that this approach to scripture is a throwback to his classical education. "Augustine reads the Bible as he had been taught to read Virgil. Every word was to be taken seriously."[34] Consequently Augustine approaches scripture in a detailed verse by verse and occasionally word by word fashion. Augustine also had similar Christian exegetical models upon which to base his structure. Such an approach, stretching back to Philo,[35] became the norm in early Christian exegesis. Origen, for example, in *Homilia* III deals word by word with Gen. 17:10-11.[36] Augustine's contemporary exegetes also structured their exegetical commentaries in this manner. Ambrose, for example, follows this word by word approach in his commentaries: *Hexaemeron,*

---

[34]Joseph T. Lienhard, "Reading the Bible and Learning to Read: The Influence of Education on St. Augustine's Exegesis," Augustinian Studies 27/1 (1996): 18.

[35]Philo (b. 20 C.E.), the renowned Alexandrian Jew, wrote numerous commentaries on the Old Testament. See Philo, *De opificio mundi*, trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, The Loeb Classical Library, vol. 226 (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1971), for an example of Philo's breakdown by verse of his exegesis.

[36]FC 71, 89-102. Origen uses this passage as *testimonia* for the New Covenant. He also interprets circumcision as an allegory applying to the moral well being of the believer.

De paradiso and *De cain et abel* to name only a few. Jerome, too, used the same format in his various commentaries.[37]

The discussions of Augustine's use of a particular verse will be divided into three parts. The initial focus will be on Augustine's two extended discussions of Gen. 2:15-25 as found in *De genesi contra manichaeos* and *De genesi ad litteram* book nine. *De genesi contra manichaeos*, (389 C.E.) constitutes Augustine's earliest reference to these biblical passages hence it also functions as a barometer against which change and development in his exegesis can be measured. *De genesi ad litteram* (401-415), provides as a second fixed mark for the purpose of comparison. This will be followed by analysis of Augustine's incidental or discrete references to the verse in question.

Before proceeding to the detailed analysis of Augustine's use of Gen. 2:15-25, it is worth stressing once again the importance of such a methodical approach. In order to avoid a piece-meal and historically anachronistic understanding of Augustine's exegetical activity it is vital that each citation be carefully considered. Furthermore any analysis of Augustine's theological sexism, as it is manifest in these interpretations, runs the risk of appearing manipulative when it is not conducted with such attention to detail. It is also worth noting that several verses will figure prominently in the analysis of sexism. They are Gen. 2:18, Gen.

---

[37]Jerome produced commentaries on Ecclesiastes, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, the minor Prophets, Matthew, Galatians, Ephesians, Titus, Philemon and Job. NPNF2 6, xxv.

Eventually patristic theologians began collating the various interpretations for given verses derived from the commentaries, into formal lists which were known as *catanae* or chains. These first occur in Greek, during the late fifth century with Procopius of Gaza. Latin *catanae* were produced by Bede among others. See Mary T. Clark, "*Catanae*," in Encyclopedia of Early Christianity, ed. Everett Ferguson (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc.), pp. 186-187.

2:19 and Gen. 2:21-23. These citations provide the devine sanction for the gender roles of patriarchal marriage and the subordination of women.

Gen. 2:15

De genesi contra manichaeos

"*Et sumpsit Dominus Deus hominem quem fecerat, et posuit eum in paradiso, ut operaretur ibi, et custodiret eum.*" (*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.I.1.)[38]

Augustine cites Gen. 2:15 only twice throughout the corpus of his work. The first instance occurs in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XI.15.[39] Augustine attempts to reconcile the work required prior to the fall with the work to which "*post peccatum damnatus est*" (he is condemned after sin). Of pre-lapsarian work, Augustine writes: "*operatio illa laudabilior laboriosa non erat.*" (This more laudable work was not laborious). "*Custodiret*" indicates the type of work involved. The man was to guard paradise since prior to sin "*omnis opera est custodire quod tenes.*" (All work is guarding what you have.)

---

[38]English translations for the Latin quotations will generally follow in the main text in brackets. The source for both the Latin and the particular English translation will be provided in the footnotes. In some cases I have used my own translation. This is usually because no published English translation was available although upon occasion the choice was made for stylistic reasons. In these instances only the Latin source for the citation will appear in the footnotes.

[39]PL 34, 204.

De genesi ad litteram

"*Et sumpsit Dominus Deus hominem quem fecit, et posuit eum in
paradiso, ut operaretur et custodiret.*" (*De genesi ad litteram* VIII.VIII.15.)

Augustine introduces his discussion of Genesis 2 with a brief
analysis of the three approaches generally employed when interpreting
this section of scripture. Some interpret the story of paradise in a strictly
corporeal sense. Others view it as entirely figurative. A third group,
which Augustine prefers, combines both types of interpretation.[40] He
suggests that the *genere* (style) of Genesis 2 is not properly speaking
allegorical such as "*in Cantico canticorum.*" (in the Song of Songs).[41] It is
written rather in the style of *historia* (history). Consequently Genesis 2
also contains stories which are, "*rerum proprie gestarum narrationem*"
(properly of things, narrative of events).[42] He goes on to describe
difficulties which develop when exegetes refuse to accept both literal and
figurative interpretations for Genesis. Manichaeans are excluded from
this group since the work is addressed to only those, "*qui auctoriatem
harum Litterarum sequuntur,*" (who follow the authority of scripture).[43] He
writes: "*Verum isti nostri qui fidem habent his divinis Libris, et nolunt*

---

[40]*De genesi ad litteram* VIII.I.1. "*tertia eorum qui utroque modo paradisum accipiunt; alias
corporaliter, alias autem spiritualiter. Breviter ergo ut dicam, tertiam mihi fateor placere
sententiam.* " PL 24, 371. (Finally, there are those who accept the word 'paradise' in both
senses, sometimes corporeally and at other times spiritually. Briefly, then, I admit that the
third interpretation appeals to me. ACW 42, 32.)

[41]*De genesi ad litteram* VIII.I.2. PL 34, 372.

[42]Ibid.

[43]Ibid., VIII.I.4. PL 34, 373.

paradisum ad proprietatem litterae intellegi..."[44] (some of our writers, who have faith in the inspired books of Scripture, are unwilling to accept Paradise in the literal sense...).[45] Who might these writers be? It is certainly not Ambrose who takes pains to explain the physical nature of paradise in his *De paradiso.*[46] John Hammond Taylor suggests that Augustine probably had Origen in mind.[47]

Augustine produces a much more developed exegesis of Gen. 2:15 in *De genesi ad litteram* than in *De genesi contra manichaeos*. Proceeding with an almost word by word explanation Augustine devotes two chapters to describing the nature of the work which would have engaged the first man in paradise. In chapter VIII.15 Augustine proposes to discover the meaning of *"operaretur "*(he should work).[48] What kind of work did God have in mind since *"non est credibile quod eum ante*

---

[44]Ibid.

[45]ACW 42 ,34.

[46]See Ambrose, *De paradiso* I. 1-6. Ambrose writes: *"Intellige etiam quia non eum hominem qui secundum imaginem Dei est, posuit, sed eum qui secundum corpus. Incorporalis enim in loco non est. Posuit autem eum in paradiso sicut solem in coelo."* *De paradiso* I.5. PL 14, 293. (Take not that He placed man there not in respect to the image of God, but in respect to the body of man. The incorporeal does not exist in a place. He placed man in Paradise, just as He placed the sun in heaven. FC 42, 289).

[47]ACW 42, 253 note 8.
   If Taylor is correct, the Origenian exegesis to which Augustine is probably referring is Origen's, *Homilia in genesim*. I.17, where Origen describes the historical sense of Gen. 1:29-30. Rufinus produced his translation of the work between 400 and 404, to which Augustine might have had access given the date of *De genesi ad litteram* 401-415.
   However Origen, does not exclude the physical interpretation of Paradise. For example the plants in paradise have two senses. The first is historical : *"Historia quidem huius sententiae manifeste indicat usum ciborum primitus a Deo ex herbis, id est oleribus at arborum fructibus, esse permissum."* SC 7, 70-71. "(In the historical sense this clearly shows that God permitted them to use as food vegetation, that is the vegetables and fruit of the trees.) Either Augustine had not read this, overlooked it, or was getting his information about Origen from more biased sources such as Jerome. Augustine is asking Jerome for information on Origen as late as 415 C.E., which is roughly around the time he completed the *De genesi ad litteram* . See Teske, "Origen and St. Augustine's First Commentaries on Genesis," p. 185 note 28.

[48]PL 34, 379.

peccatum damnaverit ad laborem" (It is not believable that he will have been condemned to labor before sin).[49] Augustine suggests that pre-lapsarian work was qualitatively different from post-lapsarian. Man gained pleasure cultivating the earth since neither soil nor weather presented any obstacles.[50] Man carried out his task joyfully, of his own will, in harmony with the order of creation since this work was not pressed on him by bodily needs.[51] Such work would be highly spiritual since it would allow man to reflect upon the order of God's creation.[52] Augustine breaks off his commentary to include a short *encomium* to the workings of providence as manifest in creation.[53]

Having dealt with *operaretur*, Augustine picks up his commentary at *De genesi ad litteram* VIII.X.19 with reflections upon *custodiret* (he should guard).[54] Once again the injunction appears to make little sense when interpreted literally. There were no enemies or thieves in pre-lapsarian paradise. Augustine suggests that there may be several levels of interpretation depending upon one's grammatical reading of the text. The text states merely that man is to cultivate and guard.[55] The object is

---

[49]*De genesi ad litteram* VIII.VIII.15. PL 34, 379.

[50]Ibid., "*quando nihil accidebat adversi, vel terra vel coelo. Non enim erat laboris afflictio, sed exhilaratio voluntatis*" PL 34, 379. (when nothing adverse happened either in the land or sky. It was not truly affliction, work, but rather pleasure and enthusiasm. ACW 42, 45).

[51]Ibid., "*non quantum invitum indigentia corporis cogeret.*" (and not in accordance with what bodily needs might force upon him against his will.)

[52]Ibid., VIII.VIII.16. "*et quem regit atque ordinat invisibiliter Deus*" (and whom God rules and governs invisibly).

[53]Ibid., VIII.IX.17-18. PL 34, 379-380.

[54]PL 34, 380.

[55]ACW 42, 259 note 57. Taylor notes that in Hebrew the purpose clause is feminine and therefor obviously refers to paradise. Therefore God cannot be guarding man as Augustine will suggest later on.

left out. Augustine refers to the Greek, a strategy which he had recommended in _De doctrina christiana_ II.XV.22.[56] Unfortunately the Greek proves equally ambiguous.

Augustine suggests an alternate strategy. The text may be read "_in paradiso custodire_" (to guard in paradise) rather than "_paradisum custodire_ " (to guard paradise).[57] The basis for this suggestion is the phrase "_operaretur paradisum_" (to operate or work paradise) which is obviously intended as "_operaretur in paradiso_ " (to work in paradise).[58] This technique was once again one Augustine had recommended in _De doctrina christiana_ . Ambiguity could be clarified by looking at the context of the verse, in other words, what preceded it and what followed it.[59]

Having made the distinction between 'working and guarding paradise' and 'working and guarding in paradise' Augustine can now interpret the verse. Man's work "_in paradiso_" consisted of guarding in himself the likeness of paradise.[60] This spiritual self guarding was played out historically by preserving one's place in paradise. Augustine continues the discussion by suggesting that such was the custodianship

[56]PL 34, 46. "_Et latinis quibuslibet ememdantis, graeci adhibeantur, in quibus seputginta interpretum, quod ad Vetus Testamentum attinet, excellit auctoritas: qui jam per omnes peritores Ecclessias tanta praesentia sancti spiritus interpretati esse dicuntur, ut os unum tot hominum fuerit._" (And to correct the Latin we must use the Greek versions, among which the authority of the Septuagint is pre-eminent as far as the Old Testament is concerned; for it is reported through all the more learned churches that the seventy translators enjoyed so much of the presence and power of the Holy Spirit in their work of translation , that among the number of men there was but one voice. NPNF1 2, 542).

[57] _De genesi ad litteram_ VIII.X.20. PL 34, 380.

[58] _De genesi ad litteram_ VIII.X.19. PL 34, 380.

[59] _De doctrina christiana_ III.II.5. PL 34, 67. See note 196 chapter two.

[60] _De genesi ad litteram_ VIII.X.20. PL 34, 281. "_custodiret per disciplinum in seipso_ " (he guards through self discipline.)

asked of man, so that he would avoid expulsion from paradise.[61]
Augustine offers an alternative reading almost as an afterthought: *"ut
ipsum hominem operaretur Deus et custodiret "* (God was to cultivate and
guard man).[62]

This final suggestion was the one which Augustine would use
when discussing the meaning of *Deus Dominus* (Lord God) in his next
chapter. Calling God both Lord and God seems redundant. Furthermore
until this point God has been only called *Deus.*[63] Augustine argues that
both *custodiret* and *Dominus* are used to illustrate the relationship
between God and man. God guards man and is the Lord over man. This
is why the author of Genesis did not include *Dominus* prior to Gen.
2:15.[64]

Interestingly Augustine uses a different Latin version of Gen. 2:15
to support this reading. *"Operaretur et custodiret"* of *De genesi ad
litteram* VIII.VIII.15., becomes *"in paradiso operari eum et custodire."* This
is a variant of what has come to be known as the German manuscript.[65]
While Augustine suggested in the *De doctrina christiana* II.XV.22 that the

---

[61]Ibid. VIII.X.22. PL 34, 381. *"Custodiret autem eumdem paradisum ipsi sibi, ne aliaquid
admitteret, quare inde mereretur expelli."* (And he was placed there to guard this same
Paradise for himself, so as not to commit any deed by which he would deserve to expelled
from it. ACW 42, 48).

[62]Ibid., VIII.X.23. PL 34, 381.

[63]Augustine has noticed the difference between the Priestly and the Yahwist versions of
Genesis with regards to the title for God. He assumes that the text is continuous with one
author. Furthermore, the Hebrew *YHWH* has been rendered as Lord in the *Itala Vetus
Latina.* Taylor suggests that Augustine is using a version of the *LXX* which only used God
until Gen. 2:15. ACW 42, 258, note 60.

[64]*De genesi ad litteram* VIII.XI. 24. PL 34, 38.

[65]Augustine appears to be using a modified version of the German in *De genesi ad
litteram* VIII.VIII.15. He uses this second version to support his reading of Gen. 2:15 as
God guarding man. The pronoun *eum* could refer to man or to paradise both of which are
masculine in Latin. See VL 2 45.

Latin for the "*codices Veteris Testamenti, sunt emendandi auctoritate graecorum*" (the codices of the Old Testament are to be corrected by the authority of the Greek ones) in particular the "*Septuaginta*"[66] such a strategy would have proved unworkable in this case. Unfortunately the Greek presents the same difficulty.[67] Consequently it is obvious that Augustine has used an alternative Latin version.

Augustine's notion of man the farmer in paradise echoes Philonic interpretations as transmitted by Ambrose. Ambrose himself argues that "*operaretur et custodiret*" refer to the tilling and maintaining of certain virtues and are therefore not literal.[68] He describes Philo as maintaining both the moral and physical aspects of working and guarding while quoting only the physical. Of Philo's interpretation, Ambrose writes: "*ut diceret haec duo quaeri, opera in agro, custodiam domus.*" (He maintained that the two aspects were those of tilling the fields and of protecting the home.)[69] Augustine appears generally to have adopted Ambrose's interpretation in *De genesi contra manichaeos* and expanded upon "*operaretur*" in *De genesi ad litteram*.

Regarding *custodiret*, Augustine reiterates Ambrose's moral interpretation when he writes in *De genesi ad litteram* "*custodiret per disciplinam in seipso.*" (he guards through self discipline)[70] However

---

[66]PL 34, 46.

[67]ACW 42, 257 note 51. Taylor points out that the same the pronoun in Greek can also be read in either way.

[68]Ambrose, *De paradiso* IV.25. PL 14, 301. "*In opere enim quidam virtutis processus est, in custodia quaedam censummatio operis deprehenditur.*" (In tilling there is a certain exercise of man's virtue, while in keeping it is understood that the work is accomplished. FC 42, 302-303).

[69]Ambrose, *De paradiso* V. 25. PL 14, 301. FC 42, 303.

[70]*De genesi ad litteram* VIII.X.20. PL 34, 281.

Augustine's analysis of *custodiret* is quite dissimilar to Philo's.[71] Philo argued that Gen. 2:15 is an injunction for Adam to physically guard paradise against intruders or danger rather than against his own sinfulness. Adam is the superintendent of the place who protects it against "wild animals and especially against air and water."[72] Augustine expressly rejects this notion writing: "*Bestiae jam in hominem saeviebant, quod nisi peccato non fieret*" (the beasts were surely not a threat to man until he had sinned.)[73]

Augustine is not unique in his interpretation of *Dominus Deus*. His exegesis serves as a pointer his North African influences. Tertullian provides an almost identical explanation for the phrase which is found in *Adversus hermogenem* III.[74] Interestingly Tertullian is also attempting to explain why *Dominus* is used for the first time in this particular verse. He suggests that prior to creating man God was not *Dominus* only *Deus*. Once He had someone to be lord over he becomes *Dominus*. Even

---

[71] Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis, trans. Ralph Marcus, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1961), p. vii. Marcus describes the translation of this book. Greek manuscripts are virtually non-existent except for isolated fragments. This version has been translated from Armenian.
    Augustine does appear to have been influenced by Philo either directly or indirectly via Ambrose in some interpretations of the earlier Genesis texts. For example Gen. 2:10-14. and Philo's Allegorical Interpretation I. XIX.63-65 (Loeb 226, 189) and Augustine's De genesi contra manichaeos II.X.14, both describe the four rivers of paradise as representing four virtues. Philo lists these as prudence, self-mastery, courage and justice. Augustine calls them *prudentia, fortitudo, temperantia* and *justitia*. The order is slightly modified in Augustine's version.

[72] Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis, I.14. Loeb Sup I, 10. In his Allegorical Interpretations, Philo was to provide a much more fanciful understanding of this verse. In paradise man was to till the virtues. Tilling was practicing the virtues and guarding was remembering the virtues. See Philo, Allegorical Interpretation of Genesis, I. XXVIII.88-89. Loeb 226, 207. Earlier in the same work Philo makes the rather astonishing suggestion that the man placed in paradise was not the same one which was created in Genesis 1. Allegorical Interpretation I XVI. 54. Loeb 226, 181.

[73] *De genesi ad litteram* VIII. X. 21. PL 34, 381. ACW 42, 48.

[74] PL 2, 202.

earlier his fellow North African Philo also suggested that Lord is used to indicate that God is man's master.[75]

Gen. 2:16

De genesi contra manichaeos

"*Et praecepit Dominus Deus Adae, dicens: Ex omni ligno quod est in paradiso, edes ad escam.*" (*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.I.1).

Augustine cites Gen. 2:16 seven times. His first interpretation is found in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.IX. 12,[76] where the reading is highly allegorized. The commandment does not refer to a literal tree nor literal eating. The tree of life pertains to the discernment of good and evil or wisdom.[77] Its position in the middle of the garden is analogous to that of the soul which is midway between God and corporeal pleasures.[78] The commandment not to eat is an injunction not to enjoy the fruit of this tree. Should it do so the ordered integrity of the soul's nature is corrupted and violated.[79] This occurs when the soul abandons God, turns to itself,

---

[75]See Philo, Allegorical Interpretation of Genesis, I. XXXI.97-98. Loeb 226, 211.

[76]PL 34, 202-203.

[77]*De genesi contra manichaeos*. II.IX.12. PL 34, 203. "*ex ligno autem in quo est dignoscentia boni et mali non edat.*" (But do not eat from the tree in which is discernment of good and evil). "*Sapentiam illam significat*" (This signifies wisdom).

[78]FC 84, 108 note 60. Teske describes Augustine's early theory of the soul which is between God and bodies.

[79]Ibid., "*ut ipsam ordinatam integritatem naturae suae, quasi manducando violet atque corrumpat.*" (because by eating from it, it would violate and corrupt the ordered integrity of its nature. FC 84, 109).

and enjoys its own godlike powers.[80] Such a soul swells with pride which is the root of all sin.[81]

De genesi ad litteram

Et praecepti Dominus Deus Adae, dicens: Ab omni ligno quod est in paradiso, edes ad escam; (De genesi ad litteram VIII.XIII.28)[82]

Et praecepti Dominus Deus Adae, dicens: Ab omni ligno quod est in paradiso esca edes (De genesi ad litteram VIII.XXVII.49)[83]

As noted in chapter two, Augustine cites a variation of Gen. 2:16 which is slightly different from *De genesi contra manichaeos*. Furthermore he cites two variant versions in the course of book 8 in *De genesi ad litteram.* The first found in *De genesi ad litteram* VIII.XIII.28

---

[80]Ibid., *"sua potentia...sine Deo... voluerit."* (Its power, without God, it will wish.)

[81]Ibid., *"intumescit superbia, quod est initium omnis peccati."* (It swells with pride, which is the beginning of all sins)

    The theme of pride as the cause of sin is well attested to in Augustinian literature. In *Confessiones* VII.VII.11. (PL 32, 739-740) Augustine cites his pride as a major impediment to his conversion. Later in *Confessiones.* VII.VIII.12, PL 32, 740 God's healing touch causes his swelling pride to subside. In *De sancta virginitate* XXXI.31. PL 40, 413. Augustine writes: *"Itaque contra superbiam....maxime militat universa disciplina christiana."* (The whole Christian way of life wages war above all against pride... FC 27, 170).

    See Paul Rigby, Original Sin in Augustine's *Confessions* (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1987), pp. 78-83. Rigby provides a summary of the modern theological scholarship concerning this theme. Also see Albert Verwilghen, *"Jésus, source de l'humilité chrétienne,"* in Saint Augustin et la Bible, pp. 428-437. Also see D. J. McQueen, *"Comtemptus Dei:* St Augustine on the discorder of Pride in Society and its Remedies," *Recherches Augustiniennes* IX (1975): 227-293.

[82]PL 34, 383.

[83]PL 34, 392.

uses the phrase "*edes ad escam*"[84] while the second uses "*esca edes*"[85] Since he makes no comment upon these variations and *De genesi ad litteram* was written over an extended period of time, this is perhaps evidence of a break in the work.

Augustine does comment upon his second variant in *Locutiones in heptateuchum*I.(lb.9) written in 419.[86] Depending upon the manner in which one chooses to punctuate the following phrase "*Ex omni ligno quid est in paradiso escae edes*" the meaning is slightly altered.[87] If a comma is added after "*paradiso*" the text translates: "You may eat as food from all the trees in Paradise." If the comma is left out the expression becomes "in the Paradise of food." Some Latin versions have *esca edes* (you eat of this food) wherein the Latin ablative case replaces the Greek dative case. This is the version preferred by Augustine.

When Augustine first comments upon Gen. 2:16 in *De genesi ad litteram* VIII.XVII.37[88] he is preoccupied with Manichaean exegesis. The concern is God's anthropomorphic presentation, which Faustus mocks in *Contra faustum* XXV.I.[89] The issue is introduced at VIII. XVIII. 37[90] wherein Augustine asks how God spoke to Adam. He provides a detailed response several chapters further on at VIII. XXVII. 49. God speaks in two

---

[84]PL 34, 383.

[85]*De genesi ad litteram* VIII.XVII.36. PL 34, 387.

[86]PL 34, 487.

[87]The punctuation would not appear in the text. The reader would add the punctuation as he read out loud.

[88]PL 34, 387.

[89]PL 42, 477-478. Faustus argues that the Old Testament is invalid and obviously corrupt due to the ludicrousness of presenting an infinite God in anthropomorphic ways.

[90]PL 34, 387.

manners either directly "*per suam substantiam*" (through his own substance) or indirectly "*per sibi subditam creaturam*" (through a creature subject to him).[91] God speaks through his own substance in two ways. The first is "*ad creandas omnes naturas*" (in creating the whole world) and the second is in illuminating (*illumindandas*) spiritual and intellectual creatures so that they can understand his *Verbum* (word).[92] This Word is the creative Word which generated the world, which was incarnated in Christ, and is found in scripture. Augustine cites John 1:1-3 as a scriptural sanction for this understanding. Unfortunately not all people are graced enough to understand God's *Verbum*. To these God speaks indirectly via spiritual creatures using the mediums of dreams (*in somnis*) or ecstasies (*in ecstasi*).[93] He may also use a corporeal medium such as a voice. The specifics of God's communication via human voice Augustine would take up in detail in *De doctrina christiana* IV. Augustine concludes that God could have spoken to Adam either directly or indirectly. The discussion leads to a short digression about the visibility of Christ. Some heretics have suggested that Christ was seen in his own form before the incarnation or "*ante acceptam servi formam*" (prior to taking up the form of a slave).[94] Both Migne and John Taylor note that Augustine intends the Arians to be understood as the heretics.[95]

---

[91]*De genesi ad litteram* VIII.XXVII.49. PL 34, 392. This distinction is also described in far less detail in *De genesi ad litteram* VIII.XVIII.37.

[92]Ibid.

[93]Ibid.

[94]Ibid., XVIII.XXVII.50. PL 34, 392.

[95]ACW 42, 264 note 123. Taylor points out that Augustine has used the same description for the Arians in *Epistola*. 148.2.10. PL 33, 626. In this particular letter Augustine describes Athanasius's response to this Arian notion.

Augustine's incidental uses of Gen. 2:16

Discussion of this verse occurs three other times in the Augustinian corpus. The first reference is found in *Enarratio in psalmum* XL.6 (396 C.E.).[96] God, the physician, gave His commandments about food in Gen. 2:16-17 in order to preserve Adam's health. Unfortunately, and to the subsequent detriment of his well being, Adam was not predisposed to listen to God's advice. Here are found echoes of Augustine's concern that God not be held responsible for sin and that sin be presented as a corruption of an initially pristine and whole state. Augustine reiterates this theme in *Enarratio in psalmum* CII.6.[97] Once again God attempts to preserve that health of Adam with his proscriptions about touching and not touching certain foods.

The third incidental reference to Gen. 2:16 is found in *Contra faustum* XXXII.XIV (398-398 C.E.).[98] Faustus, in an attempt to ridicule the authority of the Old Testament and Old Testament God, argues for diminished insight on God's part. Why did he give Adam a commandment which any omniscient deity should clearly know would not be fulfilled? Augustine does not specifically answer Faustus's objection but merely reiterates it before launching into an argument for the authority of the Old Testament.

---

[96]PL 36, 458. "*Scit se sono homini praeceptum dedisse, ne langorem incurreret; dixisse in paradiso, Hoc manduca, et ... Non audivit ...medici praeceptum.*" (He [God] knew to give healthy man, a precept which would prevent sickness: Eat this and not that. He [Adam] did not listen to the prescription of the Doctor.)

[97]PL 37, 1320.

[98]PL 42, 406.

Augustine's interpretations of Gen. 2:16 appear to be unique. Ambrose in _De paradiso_ V.26,[99] is more concerned with reconciling a point of grammar. The command in Gen. 2:16 is given in the singular while that in Genesis 2:17 is plural. Ambrose suggests that singular indicates unity while plural points to the disunity caused by sin. In _Adversus judaeos_ II,[100] (198 or 208 C.E.)[101] Tertullian cites Gen. 2:16-17 as proof that an embryonic Decalogue had been given the first parents. In his _De anima_ XXXVIIII (approximately 203 C.E.)[102] Gen. 2:16 is used as an example of natural or pre-lapsarian concupiscence. Tertullian defines this as: "_Caeterum, proprie naturalis concupiscentia unica est, aliementorum solummodo, quam Deus et in primordio contulit._" (concupiscence simply confined to the desire of those aliments which God at the beginning conferred upon man.)[103] If Augustine had heard of Philo's interpretation of this verse it is not evident. Like Augustine Philo is concerned about the recipient of the commandment, however his solution is quite different. Philo wonders to which Adam was the injuction given. He concludes that commandments and exhortations of Gen. 2:16 were given to the earthly man who is neither bad nor good but midway while the trees from which earthly man can eat represent the virtues.[104]

---

[99]PL 14,301-302.

[100]PL 2, 599.

[101]ANC 3, 151, note 1. There is a debate over the date of this work depending upon whether or not one views it as pre-Montanist or Montanist.

[102]ANC 3,181, note 1.

[103]PL 2, 716. ANC 3, 219.

[104] See Philo, _Allegorical Interpretation,_ II.XXX.95-97. Loeb 226, 211.

Gen. 2:17

De genesi contra manichaeos

"De ligno autem scientiae boni et mali non edetis ab eo: qua die enim edertis ab illo, morte moriemini." De genesi contra manichaeos II.I.1.[105]

Augustine cites Genesis 2:17 the most frequently of all the verses examined in this story. Some portion of the verse is cited thirty-three times. Perhaps this is not surprising since it is the verse that sets the stage for the fall of humanity and the introduction of death into the world. Consequently it is even less surprising that death should constitute the recurrent motif in Augustinian interpretation of the verse.

Augustine's first reference to the verse occurs in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.IX.12.[106] He is attempting to understand the meaning of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. In a highly allegorical fashion, reminiscent of Philo, Augustine describes all trees as representing a spiritual joy. He writes: *"Productum autem ex terra omne illud lignum accipimus omne illud gaudium spirituale."* (We take every tree that the earth produced as every spiritual joy.)[107] Philo commenting upon the same verse wrote: "The several particular virtues, and the corresponding activities, and the complete moral victories, and what philosophers call...common duties. These [the aforementioned] are the plants of the

---

[105]PL 34, 195.

[106]PL 34, 202-203.

[107]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.IX.12. PL 34, 202-203. FC 84, 108.

garden [of Eden]. "[108] If Augustine is reproducing a Philonic tradition, it was not learned via Ambrose who does not appear to have used such an interpretation.[109]

For Augustine the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was planted in the middle of the garden in order to figuratively point to the location of the soul in the hierarchy of creation.[110] The soul occupies a middle position, both understanding God and having a corporeal nature.[111] By eating of the tree the soul disrupts the harmony of its middle position by leaning towards the corporeal.[112] In doing so it also corrupts and violates the ordered integrity of its nature and creation.[113] The seat of this disruption is human pride.[114]

Slightly further on at *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XI.15,[115] Augustine once again refers to Gen. 2:17, this time in the context of Eve.

---

[108]Philo <u>Allegorical Interpretation</u>, IX.VII. 56. Loeb 226, 183.

[109]See Ambrose, *De paradiso* V.29, PL 14, 303, where the tree "*in medio paradiso*" (in the middle of Paradise) is "*vita*" (life) and "*casus mortis.*" (the case of death). Ambrose continues describing the tree as symbolizing Christ.

[110]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.IX.12. PL 34, 203. "*et hoc est lignum vitae plantatum in medio paradisi. Ligno ... scientiae boni et mali, ipsa item mediatas animae et ordinata integritas significatur.*" (and this is the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, planted in the middle of paradise. The tree...of the knowledge of good and evil, itself too signifies the middle place of the soul and its ordered integrity. FC 84, 108)

[111]Ibid., "*ut quamvis subjectam sibi habeat omnem naturam corpoream, supra se tamen esse intellegat naturam Dei.*" (Thus though it has all corporeal nature subject to itself, it still understands that the nature of God is above it. FC 84, 108).

[112]Ibid., "*id est corporeas voluptates*" (That is corporeal voluptuousness).

[113]Ibid., "*ut ipsam ordinatam integritatem naturae suae, quasi numducando violet atque corrumpat.*" (because by eating from it, it would violate and corrupt the ordered integrity of its nature. FC 84,109).

[114]Ibid. "*intumescit superbia, quod es initium ominis peccati.*" (swelling pride which is the beginning of all sins.)

[115]PL 34, 204. "*manducaveritis*" (you will have chewed or eaten) and "*moriemini*" (you will die) are in the second person plural. This is also true for the version of the text Augustine cited PL 34, 195.

He introduces a discussion which he would return to on several other occasions: to whom was God's commandment about eating addressed? Augustine argues that the injunction was intended for both Adam and Eve, even though technically Eve has yet to be created. Augustine justifies his understanding by the use of a plural verb in the Latin text. It is worth noting that this is another instance where Augustine cites different version of the text. When he initially quoted the verse his text used "*ederitis*" (you will have eaten). In the second instance his text contained "*manducaveritis*" (you will have chewed or eaten). The second version appears to be unique to Augustine. This does not change his interpretation of the verse since both verbs are plural.[116]

---

[116] See VL 2, 47.

De genesi ad litteram

"De ligno autem cognoscendi bonum et malum non manducabitis de illo. Qua die autem ederitis ab eo, morte moriemini." (_De genesi ad litteram_ IX.I.1)[117]

Augustine introduces his discussion of Gen. 2:17 in _De genesi ad litteram_ VIII.XIII.28,[118] by attempting to explain why the tree of the knowledge of good and evil was proscribed. Since God had issued the commandment the tree would appear to be evil. This is a theologically untenable reading for Augustine. As in _De genesi contra manichaeos_, he is concerned with stipulating that nothing created by God was evil. He explains: "_ab eo ligno quod malum non erat prohibitus est, ut ipsa per se praecepti conservatio bonum illi esset, et transgressio malum._" (Man was forbidden to touch that tree, which was not evil, so that the observance of the command in itself would be good for him.)[119] Consequently God's injunction functions as a pedagogical aid. "_Nec potuit melius et diligentius_" (There could not have been a better or more careful way)[120] to instruct that disobedience is the only evil. Augustine continues by adding that the sinner seeks only one thing and that is "_non esse sub dominatione Dei._" (not to be under the domination of God).[121]

---

[117]PL 34, 393.

[118]PL 34, 383.

[119]_De genesi ad litteram_ VIII.XIII.28 as found in PL 34, 383 and ACW 42,52.

[120]Ibid., VIII.XIII.29.

[121]Ibid., VIII.XIII.30. PL 34, 384.

This leads Augustine to a digression into whether or not humans must experience evil in order to know it.[122] In an obvious swipe at the Manichaeans, he stipulates that evil is not a substance.[123] Augustine writes: "*Malum enim nisi experimento non sentiremus, quia nullum esset si non fecissemus*" (For we would not feel evil except by experience, since there would be no evil unless we had committed it).[124] Further on Augustine explains that Adam and Eve could certainly recognize, name and understand what was intended by the word evil, even though it was beyond their immediate experience. This capacity is common to all humans. He writes: "*Videant nos omniun inexpertorum nomina, nonnisi ex contrariis* " (we recognize without any doubt or hesitation the names of all things outside of our experience only from their contraries which we have known.)[125] Having experienced good Adam and Eve could certainly understand the notion of lack of good, therefore evil.

Augustine continues his discussion of Gen 2:17 several chapters on in *De genesi ad litteram* VIII.XV.33, by providing an explanation for the naming of the tree of good and evil.[126] Unreasonably, he suggests, other exegetes have been puzzled by this problem.[127] Augustine points out

---

[122]Ibid., VIII.XIV.31-32. PL 34, 384-385.

[123]Ibid., VIII.XIV.31. PL 34, 384. "*Neque enim ulla natura mali est*" (Therefore nothing in nature is evil)

[124]Ibid., Also see ACW 42,54.

[125]Ibid., VIII.XVI.35. PL 34, 386. See ACW 42, 57.

[126]Ibid., VIII.XV.33. PL 34, 385.

[127]John Taylor suggests that scholars do not know who these writers may have been. Agaësse-Solignac suggests that one may have been a disciple of Marcion and Porphyry. See ACW 42, 260 note 86. One wonders, however, if the source might not have been Manichaean. This would seem to be the type of exegesis which would support the notion of the Demiurge. Furthermore the question is raised immediately following the discussion of the non physical nature of evil, which was certainly a major point of contention for Augustine and the Manichees.

that logically evil did not exist "*antequam in eo transgressus esset homo praeceptum*" (before man broke God's commandment).[128] He reiterates his theory that the tree functions as a pedagogical device writing: "*Lignum enim tale nomen accepit, ut eo secundum prohibitionem non tacto caveretur...*"(This tree was given such a name so that our first parents might observe the second prohibition).[129] The tree in and of itself was not evil and had man never touched it, the name would have remained the same.[130] In this instance Augustine's understanding is reminiscent of Philo, who suggested that the moral attitude and spiritual orientation of Adam conferred goodness or evil upon the tree.

Further on Augustine takes up, once again, the problem of the plural verb forms in God's admonition to Adam. This time Augustine asks the question: "*Merito sane quaeritur utrum hoc praeceptum viro tantum dederit Deus, an etiam feminae?*" (With very good reason it is asked whether God gave his command to the man only or to the woman also.)[131] Augustine, assuming that Gen. 1 and Gen. 2 form a continuous story, offers several solutions to this dilemma. The first is recapitulation. Women had already been created in Gen. 1.27, hence Genesis 2 is intended to explain how man and woman were made.[132] Consequently the commandment was directed to both man and woman. This is attested

---

[128] *De genesi ad litteram*, VIII.XV.33.PL 34, 384. ACW 42, 55.

[129]Ibid.

[130]See Philo, Allegorical Interpretation I .XVII. 62. Loeb 226,187. "Thus wickedness neither is in the garden, nor is it not in it, for it can be there actually, but virtually it cannot."

[131]*De genesi ad litteram* VIII.XVII.36. PL 34, 387. ACW 42, 58.

[132]Ibid., "*Sed hoc quemadmodum gestum sit quod prius erat gestum, postea recapitulando narratum est.*" (On this supposition the writer has subsequently recapitulated what was previously done by telling how it was done.)

to by the plural forms of "*manducabitis*" and "*moriemini*" which are used because God is addressing both man and woman. Augustine offers an alternate suggestion. Using the principle he recommended in the *De doctrina christiana* III.XVI.37; "*Obscura ex locis aperioribus explicanda*"(Obsure passages are to be interpreted by those which are clearer);[133] a less obscure biblical passage is used to interpret a more obscure one. Suggesting that Gen. 2:17 should be understood in light of 1 Cor. 14:25[134] Augustine explains: "*An sciens quod ei facturus erat mulierem, ima praecepit ordinatissime, ut per virum praeceptum domini ad feminam perveniret*" (Another explanation could be that, since God knew He was going to make the woman for the man, He thus gave His command with observance of the proper order so that the command of the Lord would come through the man to the woman.)[135]

Augustine was not alone among the church fathers in attempting to explain how Eve, who had yet to be created, was covered by God's injunction. Logically Eve could not be held responsible for her sin against God if she did not know the rules. Ambrose, in *De paradiso* a work with which Augustine was familiar, presented an alternative explanation for this dilemma. In *De paradiso* V.26 [136] Ambrose used synecdoche to explain that the injunction against eating was intended for all of humanity.

---

[133]PL 34, 79. NPNF1 2, 566.

[134]*De genesi ad litteram* VIII.XVII.36. PL 34, 387. ACW 42, 58. Augustine quotes the verse: "*Si quid autem discere volunt, domi viros suos interrogent*" (If they (women) would learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home.)

[135]Ibid.

[136]PL 14, 285-286.

Augustine's last reference to Gen. 2:17 in *De genesi ad litteram* discusses the introduction of death into the world.[137] It occurs within the context of a debate about the nature of sexual reproduction in Paradise. Pre-lapsarian procreation would have taken place without "*appetitum carnalis voluptatis*" (the appetite for carnal pleasure).[138] Furthermore Adam and Eve possessed mortal bodies which prior to sin were not destined to die.[139] Once again Augustine uses a less obscure scriptural passage as the basis for understanding a more obscure one. He makes the distinction between mortal bodies and bodies of death based upon Romans 7:22,25. Paul describes Christ as liberating humanity from "*corpore mortis*" (body of death).[140] Augustine argues that while being mortal is part of the human condition death, on the other hand, is the result of sin.[141]

---

[137] *De genesi ad litteram* IX.X.16. PL 34, 399.

[138] Ibid., ACW 42, 80.

[139] Ibid., PL 34, 399. "*Non ita credendun est fuisse illa corpora, sed licet animalia, nondum spiritualia, non tamen mortua, id est, quae necesse esset ut morerentur: quod eo die factum est, quo lignum contra vetitum tetigerunt.*" (Therefore, although the bodies of our first parents were natural bodies, not spiritual bodies, we should not suppose that they were dead before they sinned--I mean necessarily destined for death: that is what happened to them on the day on which they touched the tree against the prohibition. ACW 42, 81).

[140] Ibid.

[141] This insistence upon the mortal or physical nature of human bodies is probably motivated by Augustine's Manichaean past. Numerous scholars have pointed out the link between Augustine's anti-Manichaean polemic and his insistence upon the necessity of physical creation.

I list only a brief sample. Elizabeth A. Clark, "Vitiated Seeds and Holy Vessels: Augustine's Manichaean Past", in Ascetic Piety and Women's Faith: Essays On Late Ancient Christianity, ed. E. A. Clark, Studies in Women and Religion, vol. 20 (Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1986), pp. 291-349. Johannes van Oort, "Augustine and Mani on *concupiscentia sexualis*," in Augustiniana Traiectana, ed. J. den Boeft and J. van Oort (Paris: 1987), pp. 137-152. Kari Borresen, "Patristic Feminism: The Case of Augustine," Augustinian Studies 25 (1994): 139-152.

The issue of sex in paradise would haunt Augustine as he oscillated between spiritualized and physical understandings of Gen. 1:28. For example, in _De bono conjugali_ II.2, written at approximately the same time as the aforementioned section of _De genesi ad litteram_, Augustine stipulates that reproduction while physical did not necessarily require sexual intercourse. Reproduction could have been accomplished in the manner of bees "_sine concubitu_" (without intercourse).[142] He continues by arguing that sexual intercourse is not possible without mortal bodies which are the product of sin.

Incidental uses of Gen. 2:17

Of the incidental references to Gen. 2:17, twenty-one deal with some aspect of death. The other citations cover a range of themes including, covenant, health, original sin and Manichaean exegetical errors.

Death: The first incidental reference occurs in _Ex epistola ad romanos_ LIII. (394 C.E.).[143] In this instance Gen. 2:17 is used to interpret

---

[142] _De bono conjugali_ II.2. PL 40, 374. Augustine writes: "_Si non peccassent, jabituri essent filios ex munere omnipotentissimi Creatoris, qui potuit etiam ipsos sine parentibus condere, qui potuit carnem Christi in utero virginali formare, et ut etiam ipsis infedelibus loquar, qui potuit apibus prolem sine concubitu dare_" (Whether for example, if our first parents had not sinned, they would have had children in some other way, without physical coition, out of the munificence of the almighty Creator, who was able to create them without parents, and who was able to form the body of Christ in a virgin's womb, and who, to speak now to the unbelievers themselves, was able to grant progeny to bees without intercourse. FC. 27,10).

Also see David Kelly, "Sexuality and Concupiscence in Augustine" in The Annual of the Society of Christian Ethics, ed. Larry Rasmussen et al. (Waterloo, Ontario: Council on the Study of Religion, 1983), pp. 81-116, for a resume of Augustine's thinking on this issue. Also see David G. Hunter, "Augustinian Pessimism? A New Look at Augustine's Teaching On Sex, Marriage and Celibacy," Augustinian Studies 25 (1994): 153-177.

[143] PL 35, 2075.

Romans 7:22, 25 wherein the penalty for sin is death. In *Sermo* CLII.5 Augustine links Gen. 2:17 once again with Rom. 7:22 explaining that the law of sin is death.[144]

Many early citations of Gen. 2:17 stress the physical reality of death. In *Enarratio in psalmum* XXXVII. 26 (396 C.E.), Augustine combines the reality of the Incarnation in conjunction with the physical death.[145] Christ's death is physical because our penalty for sin is truly physical death.[146] In *Enarratio in psalmum* XLVII.9 (396 C.E.) Augustine once again argues for the physical reality of death. In doing so he employs a motif which he will reiterate upon several occasions. The serpent promised life falsely and God promised death truly.[147] The same image occurs in *Enarratio in psalmum* LXXIII.25, *Enarratio in psalmum* LXX.II.2,[148] and *Enarratio in psalmum* XLVII.9[149]

In *Enarratio in psalmum* LXX.II.7.[150] Augustine cites Gen. 2:17 twice. He alludes to the theme which he will take up in more depth, as previously described, in *De genesi ad litteram.* The tree of life is not evil. Man, however, refused to learn good and evil from God, and insisted

---

[144]PL 38, 821.

[145]PL 36, 411.

[146]Ibid., "*Filius Dei vera morte mortuus est, quae mortali carni debebatur.*" (The Son of God really died, for corporeal death was owed."

[147]PL 36, 539. "*Crediderunt serpenti, invenerunt verum esse quod minatus est Deus*" They believed the serpent, and they saw to be true that which God threatened.

[148]PL 36, 945 & PL 36, 892.

[149]PL 36, 539.

[150]PL 36, 896.

upon doing so from his own experience. In *Enarratio in psalmum* LXVIII.II.11 Gen. 2:17 functions as a description of the penalty for sin.[151]

Writing during the midst of the Pelagian controversy Augustine cites Gen. 2:17 in *De peccatorum meritis* III.2 (412 C.E.).[152] Those who argue that death is part of the law of nature and therefore Adam was born to die have fallen into dangerous literalism with their exegesis. Gen. 2:17 refers "*non ad mortem corporis, sed ad mortem animae*" (not to the death of the body but to the death of the spirit). Consequently temporal movement has become synonymous with decay. Time moves not to our perfectioning, which would be the case in paradise, but to our death.[153] Four years later Augustine makes a similar argument in *In joannis evangelium* XXII.6.[154] Once again Augustine uses one scriptural citation to interpret another. John 5:24 is not to be understood literally but rather read in the light of Gen. 2:17. Therefore Christ does not remove physical death, since humanity still suffers this penalty, but rather spiritual death.

Augustine cites Gen. 2:17 four times in Book XIII of *De civitate dei* which he wrote in 417 C.E.[155] Once again the theme is death. In the first instance, Augustine attempts to address the issue of why those who have been baptized "*non auferatur mors, id est, poena peccati.*" (are not exempt from death, that is the penalty of sin).[156] Augustine explains that

---

[151]PL 36, 861.

[152]PL 44,109.

[153]Ibid., I.XVI.21. PL 44, 121.

[154]PL 35, 1577.

[155]Brown, Augustine of Hippo, p. 285. Augustine wrote *De civitate dei* between 413 and 426 C.E.

[156]*De civitate dei* XIII.IV. PL 41, 379. Augustine also notes that he has dealt with the subject of baptism in *De baptismo* in more depth.

death is not overcome but rather "*timor*" (fear) of death is surmounted. The martyrs are used as an illustration of this fact. What has changed is the nature of the death. Sinners die because of sin, as is stipulated in Gen. 2:17. After Christ the martyrs die in order to avoid sin. As a result, "*quam vitae constat esse contrariam, Instrumentum fieret per quod transiretur ad vitam.*" (what stands in contradiction to life, becomes the instrument by which one is transferred to life.)[157] Further on Augustine cites Gen. 2:17 in order to stipulate that the penalty of death applies not only to the body but also to the soul.[158] God's penalty is "*ubi corpus privatur anima*" (when the body is deprived of the spirit) and "*ubi anima privatur Deo*" (when the spirit is deprived of God).[159] Augustine reiterates in *De civitate dei* XIII.XV that the death threatened in Gen. 2:17 is the separation of Adam's soul from God.[160] This is why the scripture writer added *morte moriemini* (you will die by death). The same explanation is provided to the Pelagian Julian in *Contra secundum juliani* V.XXXIV written in the last year of Augustine's life.[161]

In *De civitate dei* XIII.XXIII.1 Augustine explains why Adam did not meet with instantaneous death when he ignored God's injunction.

---

[157]Ibid.

[158]*De civitate dei* XIII.XII. PL 41, 386. This citation occurs within a discussion of the degrees of death. Augustine outlines three types of death. There is death of the body, death of the soul and death of the whole person (body and soul combined). The martyr experiences death of the body but life of the soul. Evil people may experience death of the soul but remain alive in their bodies. The death with which God threatened the first humans included both types of death.

[159]Ibid.

[160]PL 41, 387.

[161]PL 45, 1355. (429-430 C.E.).

Adam's act of disobedience altered the very structure of creation by infecting it with a slow corruption. He writes:

"*Eo quippe die mutata in deterius vitiataque natura , atque a ligno vitae separatione justissima, mortis in eis etiam corporalis necessitas facta est, eum qua nos necessitate nati sumus.*" (For that day, nature was changed and corrupted, and most righteously separated from the tree of life, corporeal death was made necessary (in them), and we, by necessity are born into it.)[162]

Augustine was not alone in his difficulties with the expression *morte moriemini*. It had also proved troublesome to Ambrose. In *De paradiso* IX.43[163] Ambrose suggests that the expression is probably meant to intensify the notion of death. Furthermore, perhaps creating an echo is Augustine's understanding of the text, there are levels of death. Ambrose lists four permutations: "*vita vivere, morte mori, morte vivere, vita mori*" (to live in life, to die in death, to live in death and to die in life).[164]

On several occasions Augustine attributes death to a specific fault or sin. In *Sermo* XCVII.II.2, he ascribes the imposition of death as resulting from human pride. In this particular instance the devil becomes pride personified when Augustine writes: "*Sicut diabolus superbi estis*" (Even as the devil, you are proud).[165] In *Enchiridion ad laurentium* XXV (421 C.E.) death is God's condemnation for the "*malitia*" (evil) of both angels and men.[166] In *Contra secundum juliani* VI.XXX death results

---

[162]PL 41, 396. Augustine was in the midst of the Pelagian controversy when he wrote this particular chapter. In all probability the reference to being born by necessity into the sinful state of the first parents stems from this.

[163]*De paradiso*, IX.43. PL 14, 311-312.

[164]Ibid., PL 14, 312. Philo makes a similar distinction without specifically describing the four possible alternatives. See Philo, *Questions and Answers*, I.16. Loeb Sup 1 ,11.

[165]PL 38, 590.

[166]PL 40, 243. This work is also called *De fide, spe et caritate*.

from separation from the tree of life.[167]   Augustine's understanding

appears almost benign when compared to his contemporary Jerome. In

Epistola XXII.18,[168] to Eustochium,[169] the curse of Gen. 2:17 is linked to

marriage which ends in death.

Original sin: Augustine connects Gen. 2:17 to his doctrine of

original sin on three occasions. The first two instances are obvious, the

third less so. In *Contra julianum* V.18. (421 C.E.), while listing evidence

of patristic support for original sin, Augustine quotes an interpretation by

Basil of Cesarea of Gen. 2:17. Stipulating that he is translating directly

from Basil's Greek *Sermo* I on fasting Augustine writes: "*Quia non*

jejunavimus, inquit, decidimus de paradiso"(Because we did not fast [it is

written] we were forced out of Paradise).[170] From Augustine's

perspective Basil was supporting the notion of original sin. In *De*

correptione et gratia XII.33 (426-27 C.E.) Gen. 2:17 is cited as proof of

free will. He writes: "*Prima ergo libertas voluntatis erat, posse non*

peccare" (Therefore first was free will, the ability not to sin).[171] Augustine

makes what may be an early reference to an embryonic doctrine of

original sin in *Ad simplicianum* II.I.4 (397 C.E.). Gen. 2:17 illustrates that

---

[167]PL 45, 1481.

[168]PL 22, 405.

[169]Eustochium was the daughter of Jerome's great helpmate Paula. She was to take over her mother's role as head of a sister convent to Jerome's in Bethlehem after her mother's death. This letter was written in 384 C. E. prior to the move to Bethlehem, while all of the concerned parties were still in Rome. See J. N. D. Kelly, Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies (London: Duckworth Press, 1975), pp. 91-103 for the Roman years and pp. 129-140 for the double monasteries in Bethlehem.

[170]PL 44, 652.

[171]PL 44, 936.

"*peccatum*" is already present in Adam who accepts the commandment of Gen. 2:17 and yet prevaricates in Gen. 3.[172]

Covenant: In an isolated instance Augustine uses Gen. 2:17 as an example of man's first covenant with God in *De civitate dei* XVI.XXVII (418 C.E.).[173] It is an idea which is found more fully developed in Tertullian's *Adversus judaeos* II. Of the law which was given to Adam and Eve Tertullian was to write: "*In hac enim lege Adae data, omnia praecepta condita recognoscimus quae postea pullulaverunt data per Moysen*" (For in this law given to Adam we recognize in embryo all the precepts which afterwards sprouted forth when given through Moses.)[174] Tertullian's justification for understanding Gen. 2:17 in this way is Rom. 13:9.

Health: Twice Gen. 2:17 is used in reference to Adam's healthy state in Paradise. In *Enarratio in psalmum* XI.6 and CII.6[175] God's admonitions are intended as prescriptions to ensure Adam's continued physical well being.

Manichaean Exegesis: Augustine mentions Gen. 2:17 once in relation to Manichaean exegesis. In *Contra faustum* I.III, (400 C.E) Augustine responds to Faustus's charge that the Catholic Church is semi-Christian by accusing the Manichaeans of pseudo-Christianity. He

---

[172]CCSL XLLIV, 62-63. There is an on going debate about the chronology of Augustine's doctrine of original sin. Classically it has been attributed to his Pelagian period. However some scholars such as Paul Rigby and Elizabeth Clark find evidence of original sin in his pre-Pelagian period. See Paul Rigby, Original Sin in Augustine's Confessions (Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1987). Also see Elisabeth Clark, "Heresy, Asceticism, Adam and Eve: Interpretations of Genesis 1-3 in the later Latin Fathers," in Genesis 1-3 in The History of Exegesis, Intrigue in the Garden, ed. G. A. Robbins, Studies in Women and Religion vol. 27 (Queenston, Ontario: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1988), p. 120.

[173]PL 41, 506.

[174]PL 2, 599. ANF 3,152.

[175]PL 36, 458 & PL 37, 1320.

proves his point with the following statement which also is illustrative of Manichaean exegesis: *"Cur autem serpentem patrem nostrum dixisti? An excidit tibi quemadmodum soleatis vituperare Deum qui homini praeceptum in paradiso dedit, et laudare serpentem quod si per suum consilium occulos aperuit?"* (Do you call us children of the serpent? You have surely forgotten how often you have found fault with the prohibition in Paradise, and have praised the serpent for opening Adam's eyes).[176]

---

[176]PL 42, 208. NPNF1 4, 156.

<u>Gen. 2:18</u>

<u>De genesi contra manichaeos</u>

"Et dixit dominus Deus: Non est bonum esse hominem solum. Faciamus

ei adjutorium simile sibi." (<u>De genesi contra manichaeos</u> II.I.1)[177]

This verse has been frequently cited as proof of God's divinely

sanctioned subordination of women since she was created as a helpmate

for man. Modern Old Testament scholars argue over the nuances of the

word "helpmate" in its Hebrew form. Feminist exegete, Phyllis Trible

suggests, that the Hebrew would be better translated as companion

thereby freeing it of its subordinationist overtones.[178] The Latin text used

by Augustine employs the term *adjutorium*.[179] The word choice strongly

suggests a subordinate helpmate. Augustine cites the verse six times

throughout the corpus of his work. In his first attempt to interpret the

verse, he assumes this subordinate nuance.

In <u>De genesi contra manichaeos</u> II.XI.15 Augustine initially

attempts to answer the question of what kind of help was required of

women. He provides the following, highly allegorical response:

---

[177]PL 34, 195.

[178]See Phyllis Trible, <u>God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality</u> (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978), p. 90. Also see Trevor Dennis, <u>Sarah Laughed: Women's Voices in the Old Testament</u> (Abingdon Press: Nashville, 1994), pp. 1-33 for a survey of the trends in scholarship concerning Genesis 2. Dennis suggests that "man is here given no license to dominate or oppress" his helper. (p. 13).

[179]*Adjutor - oris*(m) is defined as a helper, assistant, confederate, aid, adjutant, deputy, secretary, or supporting actor. See Charlton T. Lewis, <u>An Elementary Latin Dictionary</u>, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), p. 24. Augustine has used, as does the Latin biblical text *adjutorium* (n) which technically means help or assistance, however in the context denotes the helper or assistant.

"et facta dicitur in adjutorium ciri, ut copulatione spirituali spirituales fetus ederet, id est bona opera divinae laudis, dum ille regit, haec obtemperat; ille a spaientia regiture, haec a viro." (It says that she was made as man's helper so that by spiritual union she might bring forth spiritual offspring, that, is the good works of divine praise, while he rules and she obeys.) [180]

Here Augustine once again employs the strategy of using one scriptural citation to interpret another. In this instance he cites I Cor. 11:3 (*Caput enim viri Christus, et caput mulieris viri* For Christ is the head of man, and man is the head of woman). Pursuing this vein of reasoning Augustine suggests that God stipulates that man's solitude is not good because he needed something to rule over. Man represents not only the *anima* (soul) which *"dominaretur corpori"* (rules the body) but also *"ratio virilis subjugaret sibi animalem partem suam"* (the virile rational which subjugates to itself its animal portion.)[181] The creation of woman functions as a pedagogical illustration of man's rule over the *"corpus servilem"* (the servile body) because *"rerum ordo subjugat viro"*(the order of things makes her subject to man).[182] When this natural order is disrupted *"perversa et misera domus est"* (the home is perverted and sad).[183] Furthermore God used this illustration intentionally since the notion of the mind ruling the body is *difficilis* (difficult) to understand.[184]

Philo provides a similar understanding of the role of woman as helper in that woman represents an aspect of the whole human. In

---

[180]PL 34, 204. FC 84, 111.

[181]Ibid.

[182]Ibid.

[183]PL 34, 205.

[184]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XI.16. PL 34, 205.

Philo's case the help provided is sense-perception.[185] Interestingly this is an understanding which Augustine expressly repudiates in *De trinitate* XII.XIII.20.[186] Augustine writes: "*sensumque corporis magis pro serpente intelligendum existimavi*"(I have rather thought that the bodily sense should be understood to be the serpent).[187] Accordingly for Augustine woman is not the bodily senses since the serpent enjoys that distinction but rather the carnal aspect of the human psyche. The comment would lead one to suspect that Augustine, while possibly unaware of the Philonic source of the interpretation, was familiar with the allegory equating woman with sense perception.

De genesi ad litteram : (Gen. 2:18 continued)

"*Et dixit Dominus Deus: Non bonum est hominem esse solum: faciamus ei adjutorium secundum ipsum.*" (*De genesi ad litteram* IX.I.1)

Augustine provides two lengthy interpretations of Gen. 2:18 in *De genesi ad litteram* which both occur in book nine. Augustine introduces his analysis stating that he intends to discuss: "*quomodo si mulier ex viri sui latere creata,.*" (how the woman was created from the side of man).[188]

185Philo, *Allegorical Interpretation* II.V.14. Loeb 226, 233-234.

186PL 42, 1009.

187PL 42, 1009. NPNF1 3, 162.

188ACW 42, 69. The Latin text is Sessorianus 13, Vittorio Emanuele Library, Rome, No. 2094, 6th century, which Hammond views as more accurate than the Migne version for this particular phrase. Migne has "*parandum est*" (PL 34, 395) which Hammond views as a corruption of "*sperandum est.*" See ACW 42, 265 note 125.

The overriding issue which Augustine explores for eight chapters is *"ad quam rem fierei oportuerit hoc adjutorium?"* (for what reason was it necessary that a helper be made for man.)[189] Augustine's answer to the question is quite different from that of his spiritualized response of *De genesi contra manichaeos.* He uses Gen. 1:27-28 as his basis for understanding the nature of woman's help.[190] Woman was needed for procreation. This leads Augustine into a lengthy excursus about the possibility of sex in paradise.

Unlike many of his contemporaries,[191] Augustine affirms the possibility of pre-lapsarian intercourse which would have occurred *"sine ardore libidinis"* (without libidinous passion).[192] If sex was possible in paradise, Augustine asks: *"Cur ergo non coierunt, nisi cum exiissent de paradiso"* (Why therefore did they not have intercourse until they had left paradise?).[193] He offers two solutions to the problem. Firstly Adam and Eve sinned too quickly and were ejected from the garden before intercourse could occur. Furthermore God had not instructed them to have sex and since human sexual relations were not yet plagued by *concupiscentia* (lust), Adam and Eve could easily refrain.[194]

---

[189]*De genesi ad litteram* IX.III.5. PL 42, 395 & ACW 42, 73.

[190]*De genesi ad litteram* IX.III.5. PL 34, 395.

[191]ACW 42, 265-266 note 15. Taylor points out that church fathers such as John Chrysostom and Gregory of Nyssa viewed sex as a product of the fall. Also see Clark, "Theory and Practice in Late Ancient Asceticism," pp. 29-31. Clark points out that Chrysostom and Jerome theorized that prior to the Fall, the first humans would not have engaged in sexual relations.

[192]*De genesi ad litteram* IX.III.6. PL 34, 395.

[193]*De genesi ad litteram* IX.IV.8. PL 34, 393. ACW 42, 74.

[194]*De genesi ad litteram* IX.IV.8. PL 34, 396. Although the argument is ingenious one has to wonder whether the first parents, who, as subsequent events bear witness, were bad at following orders, would have refrained from sex because God had not yet given them permission.

Augustine continues his proofs that woman was intended as man's helpmate in procreation by speculating upon the manner in which she could otherwise help man.[195] She does not work the soil since that was only necessary after the fall. Furthermore *"Duo amici"* (two male friends) would be more of a solace against solitude *"quam vir et mulier"* (than a man and a woman).[196] This leads Augustine to comment upon the possibility of two men living together with one commanding and the other obeying. This is surely possible since the order of creation would dictate who should command and who should follow. Augustine writes: " *nec ad hoc retinendum ordo defuisset, quo prior unus, alter posterior, manime si posterior ex priore unus, alter posterior, maxime si posterior ex priore crearetur sicut femina creata est.* "(there would have been proper rank to assure this since one would be created first and the other second, and this would be further reinforced if the second were made from the first, as was the case with the woman."[197] Augustine is not unique in this understanding since Philo before him has made a similar case.[198] Augustine notes that he has recently published *De bono conjugali* which deals with the issue of marriage in more depth.[199] He concludes his

---

[195]*De genesi ad litteram* IX.V.9. *"Aut si ad hoc adjutorium gignendi filios, non est facta mulier viro, ad quod ergo adjutorium facta est?"* PL 34, 396. (Now, if the woman was not made for the man to be his helper in begetting children, in what was she to help him? ACW 42, 75).

[196]*De genesi ad litteram* IX.V.9. PL 34, 396.

[197]Ibid., ACW 42, 75.

[198]Philo, Questions and Answers, I.27. Loeb Sup 1, 16. Philo argues that Gen. 2:21, the creation of woman from Adam's rib indicates that she is "not equal in honor" with the man.

[199]*De genesi ad litteram* IX.VII.12. PL 34, 397. *De bono conjugali* was written around 401.

discussion by reiterating his thesis that woman was intended as a helpmate for procreation[200] which would have occurred "*non cum libidine*"(without libido).[201]

It is Augustine's reference to *De bono conjugali* , which was produced at the same time as he was beginning *De genesi ad litteram*, that provides some context for his interpretation of sexual activity in the latter work. A certain Jovinian, whose writings have been lost, apparently disputed an overly ascetic theology of Christian marriage. He charged that Christians, by repudiating sexual activity, were falling into the heresy of Mani.[202] Augustine, as a former Manichaean, was particularly sensitive to this sort of accusation.[203] Furthermore Jovinian

---

[200]See *De genesi ad litteram* IX.VIII.13-XI.19.

[201]*De genesi ad litteram* IX.XI.19. PL 34, 400.

[202]Jerome, *Adversus jovinianum*, 1.5. PL 23, 217. The charges of Manichaeanism probably stemmed from Jovinian himself. Jerome quotes Jovinian as saying: "*Ex quo manifestum est vos Manichaeorum dogma sectari, prohebentium nubere, et vesci cibis, quos Deus creavit ad utendum, cauteriatam habentium conscientiam.*" (All this makes it clear that in forbidding to marry, and to eat food which God created for use, you have consciences seared as with a hot iron, and are followers of the Manichaeans. NPNF2 6,349). If this is genuinely Jovinian's thought he seems to be referring to the Manichean practice of not eating meat because God was entrapped in flesh and eating vegetables because particles of goodness could be freed in this way. Also See Augustine, *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et manichaeorum* 14-16 for a description of Manichaean eating habits.

[203]Clark, "Theory and Practice in Late Ancient Asceticism," p. 30. Clark writes: "Only in 401 and thereafter did Augustine grasp the difficulties of his figurative approach: namely, that the spiritualized interpretation of Genesis 1-3 now left him...open paradoxically to the charge of 'Manichaeanism' that is the disparagement of the human body that had been created by God." Also see p. 31 note 31. This is a notion which Clark has developed more fully in "Heresy, Asceticism, Adam and Eve: Interpretations of Genesis 1-3 in the Later Latin Fathers, in Genesis 1-3 in the History of Exegesis: Intrigue in the Garden, ed. G. A. Robbins. Studies in Women and Religion, vol. 27 (Queenston, Ontario: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1988), pp. 99-169.
　　Gerald Bonner comments upon the same issue. He describes Augustine's shift from the spiritual to the concrete regarding the understanding of *adjutorium*. It is not, however Augustine's subordinationism which Bonner views as surprising since it was consonant with the historical period. He suggests that Augustine's focus upon the literal rather than the allegorical has confined "the role of Eve as an aid to Adam to that of childbearing" (p. 271) He also notes that Augustine does not discuss the phrase, "it is not good for man to be alone." Gerald Bonner, "Augustine's Attitude to Women and

suggested that there was no qualitative difference in God's eyes between Christian virgins and Christian married couples. The arguments ultimately coalesced around the interpretation of Gen. 1:28(Be fruiteful and multiply...). For Manichaeans, who believed that reproduction was evil, this verse attested to the error of the Old Testament. To avoid accusations of Manichaeanism, Augustine needed to interpret this verse positively and to some extent literally.

However, if the verse is interpreted too literally, obviously sexual intercourse existed prior to the fall, which would appear to support Jovinian.[204] In *De bono conjugali* Augustine points out that sexual intercourse is a condition of mortal bodies.[205] Mortal bodies are the result of the fall. Consequently the activities of the first couple prior to the fall do not constitute proof in a post-lapsarian context.[206]

Coming within a hair's breadth of repudiating sexual activity and consequently reproduction, Augustine skirts the issue. He writes that he will not "*in ea questione definitam sententiam proferamus*" (put forth a

---

Amicitia", in *Homo Spiritualis*, Festgabe für Luc Verheijen, OSA, ed. C. Mayer and K. H. Chelius (Würzburg: Augustinus-Verlag, 1987), p. 259.

[204]Jerome, *Adversus jovinianum* I.5. PL 23, 215-216. Jovinian did use Gen. 1:28 to support his thesis hence Jerome devotes this rather lengthy section to refuting Jovinian's interpretation.

[205]Augustine, *De bono conjugali*, 2.2. PL 40, 373. Regarding the question of reproduction without sex, Augustine writes: "*et in ea quaestione....unde primorum hominum proles posset existere quose benedixerat Deus dicens 'Crescite et multiplicamini, et implete terram,' si non pecassent; cum mortis conditionem corpora eorum peccando meruerint, nec esse concubitus nisi mortalium corporum possit.*" (on this question--how the progeny of the first parents might have come into being, whom God had blessed saying, 'Be fruitful and multiply; fill the earth' if they had not sinned, since their bodies deserved the condition of death by sinning, and there could not be intercourse except of mortal bodies. FC 27, 10).

[206]The issue of sex before the fall is a contentious one for Augustine in later life. He deals with it in some depth during the Pelagian controversy. See *De nuptiis et concupiscentia, Contra duas epistolas pelagianorum, Contra julianum* and *De natura et gratia* written against semi-Pelagians. Also see David Kelly, "Sexuality and Concupiscence in Augustine" in The Annual of the Society of Christian Ethics, ed. Larry Rasmussen et al. (Waterloo, Ontario: Council on Study of Religion, 1983), pp. 81-116.

final opinion on this question.)[207] Rather he speculates upon the possibility of pre-fall procreation which did not require sexual intercourse. He offers two examples from the bible (the creation of Adam and Eve and Mary's virgin motherhood) and another from the natural science of his time (the procreation of bees) to support his case.[208] Finally he suggests an alternative interpretation of Gen. 1:28, based upon a mystical and figurative("*mystice ac figurate*")[209] method of exegesis. Augustine writes: "*Crescite et multiplicamini, provectu mentis et copia virtutis intelligatur*"(Be fruitful and multiply might be understood to be the advancement of the mind and the fullness of virtue.)[210] Such a position would appear to present a midway point between the highly spiritualized *De genesi contra manichaeos* and his insistence in *De genesi ad litteram* upon the physical nature of pre-lapsary intercourse.[211]

---

[207] *De bono conjugali*, 2.2. PL 40, 374. FC 27, 10.

[208] ibid. "*si non peccassent, habituri essent filios ex munere omni potentissimi Creatoris, qui potuit etiam ipsos sine parentibus condere, qui potuit carnem Christi in utero virginali formare, et ut etiam ipsis infidelibus loquar, qui potuit apibus prolem sine concubitu dare.*" (Whether for example, if our first parents had not sinned, they would have had children in some other way, without physical coition, out of the munificence of the almighty Creator, who was able to creat them without parents, and who was able to form the body of Christ in a virgin's womb, and who, to speak now to the unbelievers themselves, was able to grant progeny to bees without intercourse. FC 27, 10).

[209] ibid.

[210] ibid. Augustine provides an extended version of this explanation in *Confessiones* XIII.XXIV.35-37. PL 32, 860-861.

[211] For Augustine' s views on marriage see Cormac Burke, "St. Augustine and Conjugal sexuality," Communio 17 (Winter, 1990): 545-565. David Hunter, "Augustinian Pessimism? A New Look at Augustine's Teaching On Sex, Marriage and Celibacy," Augustinian Studies 25 (1994): 153-177. C. E. McLeese, Augustine and Sexism: Interpretation and Evaluation of the Good of Marriage and Holy Virginity, Unpublished thesis, University of Montreal, 1994.

Also see Elisabeth Clark, "Heresy, Asceticism, Adam and Eve: Interpretations of Genesis 1-3 in The Later Latin Fathers," in Genesis 1-3 in The History of Exegesis, Intrigue in the Garden, ed. G. A. Robbins. Studies in Women and Religion, vol. 27 (Queenston, Ontario: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1988), p. 120. Also see "Adam's Only

Incidental Uses of Gen. 2:18

Augustine's incidental use of Gen. 2:18 falls into two categories. The first deals with prophetic exegesis as a strategy for repudiating Manichaean interpretation. The second is an isolated instance wherein Augustine cites a patristic source for his understanding of *adjutorium*.

Anti-Manichaean exegesis: Gen. 2:18 is cited twice in the context of Augustine's debates with the Manichaeans. In *Contra adimantum* II.I (394-95 C.E.) it is used to illustrate the error of Manichaean exegesis. Augustine says that the Manichaeans use this verse to discredit the Old Testament since it appears to contradict Mt. 19:29, Lk. 17:29 and Mk. 10:30 (*Omnis qui reliquerit domum, aut uxorem aut parentes, aut fratres, aut filios.*/ All who will leave their wives and parents and brothers and sons).[212] Augustine points out that one must look beyond the apparent contradictions of scripture to find deeper meaning. In this instance the meaning is prophetic. God's creation of woman from man prefigures the birth of the church from Christ. Augustine cites Eph. 5: 22, 25 to support his argument.[213]

Five years later Augustine debates Gen. 2:18 with the Manichaean Faustus. Augustine has stated the general principle that all the books of the Old Testament prefigure Christ.[214] An example of such a prophetic

---

Companion: Augustine and the early Christian Debate on Marriage," Recherches Augustiniennes XXI (1986); 139-162, "Theory and Practice in Late Ancient Asceticism, Jerome, Chrysostom, and Augustine," Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion 5 (Fall 1989): 25-46.

[212]PL 42, 132.

[213]*Contra adimantum* III.3. PL 42, 134.

[214]*Contra faustum* XII.XXXVII. PL 42, 273-274.

verse is Gen. 2:18. Augustine does not explain precisely what is prefigured but rather provides a biblical sanction for this type of exegesis. He cites I Cor. 10:11 & 6 (*Omnia haec in figura contingebant illis* ; *Haec omnia figurae nostrae fuerunt* / All these took place for them in figures; All these are our figures).[215]

The Meaning of *Adjutorium:* Augustine's last citation of Gen. 2:18 is found in *Contra julianum* III.VIII.20(421 C.E.). In this instance he provides a patristic source for his understanding of *adjutor* . Quoting Ambrose's *De paradiso* X. 47, he concludes that Ambrose also believed that woman was to help man with procreation.[216]

Ambrose's text on the subject merits a closer look since it is one of the few occasions when Augustine directly credits another patristic author as the source of his interpretation. Ambrose cites Gen. 2:18 with Gen. 1:31 in *De paradiso* X.46,[217] in order to contradict Manichaean exegesis and prove that the creation of both man and woman was good. He continues in *De paradiso* X. 48 describing the reason for the creation of all humans from Adam. Gen. 2:18 alludes to the fact that all of humanity has a common source consequently *adjutorium* [218] must be understood in a good sense even though it implies an inferior position. Ambrose continues: "*ut et in usus reperimus humano quia dignitate potiores plerumque adjuctorem meriti inferioris adsciscunt.* "(We see how men in high and important offices often enlist the help of men who are below

---

[215]*Contra faustum* XII.XXVII. PL 42, 273.

[216]PL 44, 688.

[217]PL 14, 297.

[218]PL 14, 298.

them in rank and esteem.")[219] Such an understanding is echoed in Augustine's work.[220]

Gen. 2:19

De genesi contra manichaeos

"Et quaecumque finxerat Deus ex omni genere pecorum, et ex omni genere bestiarum agri, et ex omni genere volatilium volantium sub caelo, perduxit ea ad Adam, ut videret quid ea vocaret et quod vocavit ea omnia Adam animam vivam, hoc est nomen ejus." (De genesi contra manichaeos II.I.1)[221]

The act of naming something has been interpreted by some scholars as an indication of authority over the object named.[222] Since

---

[219]PL 14, 298. FC 42, 327.

[220]Ambrose, *De paradiso* X.47. PL 14, 314. The section of *De paradiso* X.47 cited by Augustine is accurate word for word except for one slight variation. Ambrose writes: "*Si igitur vero culpae auctor est mulier*" (If therefore truly the author of sin is woman.) Augustine quotes Ambrose as writing "*Si igitur viro culpae auctor est mulier*" (If therefore the author of the sin of man is woman).*Contra julianum* II.VII.20. PL 44, 688. No comments about the difference has been made by the Maurist editors. There are several possible reasons for the change since *vero* and *viro* differ by only one letter. Perhaps existent manuscripts of Ambrose were miscopied and Augustine has preserved the original meaning. Perhaps Augustine's manuscript of Ambrose's work was in error. The third option is the most frustrating if one wants to determine Augustine's thinking. Possibly copyists have made the error with Augustine's manuscripts. Since it is impossible to determine at which level of redaction the change occurred, it is impossible to assess its influence if any upon Augustine. However, given the nature of the subject matter found in the citation one is tempted to speculate about the meaning of this change. It could be argued that Augustine's version is more affirmative of women in that they are merely responsible for man's sin rather than all sin. Augustine strongly insists that man is responsible for the entry of sin into the world; this will be made evident in the next chapter.

[221]PL 34, 195.

[222]An example of this kind of argument is produced In Gordon J. Wenham, "Genesis 1-15", Word Biblical Commentary (Dallas: Word Publishing, 1987), p. 68. Also see John S.

Adam will eventually name his wife in Gen. 3:20 such an understanding has proved contentious for feminists. Other exegetes such as Trevor Dennis suggest that no such authority is implied.[223] Augustine cites Gen. 2:19 nine times. Whether or not the author of Genesis intended authority to be conferred by the act of naming, Augustine certainly understands this to be the case. In this he follows Ambrose's lead, who in *De paradiso* XI.49,[224] also described Adam's naming of the beasts as proof that he had authority over them

With his first attempt at understanding Gen. 2:19 in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XI.16, Augustine argues that the verse is an allegory which illustrates man's superiority over the animals. He writes: "*hoc significat quod dictum est, adducta esse ad illum omnia animalia, ut videret quid ea vocaret, et eis nomina imponeret.*"(this is signified by the statement that all the animals were brought to him that he might see what he would call them and give them names).[225] The superiority functions at two levels. Man is superior in the created order by virtue of his *ratio* since only humanity possesses this faculty. Secondly each human's *ratio* makes him superior to the carnal impulses, appetites and desires of his soul. Since this second notion is less easy for man to understand Augustine suggests that God intentionally uses the creation of woman as a pedagogical device. The woman has been used as an illustration of

---

Kselman, "Genesis," Harper 's Bible Commentary (San Francisco: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1988), p. 88.

[223]Dennis, Sarah Laughed, p. 15.

[224]PL 14, 298-299.

[225]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XI.16. PL 34, 205. FC 84, 112.

man's "*appetitum animae*"[226] (soul's appetite) which should be subordinate to his *ratio*.

De genesi ad litteram

"*Et finxit Deus adhuc de terra omnes bestias agri, et omnia volatilia coeli, et adduxit illa ad Adam, ut videret quid vocaret illa. Et omne quodcumque vocavit illud Adam animam vivam, hoc est nomen ejus*" (*De genesi ad litteram* IX.I.1)[227]

Five of the nine references to Gen. 2:19 occur in *De genesi ad litteram.* Augustine, first uses the verse to interpret Gen. 1:27. Mankind's creation in the image of God is not physical but spiritual. Physical man is made out of earth like the animals. It is God's breath which endows humanity with the divine image.[228]

The second time Augustine cites Gen. 2:19 he wonders whether one can properly refer to bird and fish as being made of earth. He suggests that "*terra*" should be understood as "*toto mondo*" (of the whole world).[229] Consequently Gen. 2:19 denotes all the creatures in creation rather than creatures made specifically of earth or clay.

Gen. 2:19 serves as the occasion for arguing for the prophetic meaning of scripture. In *De genesi ad litteram* IX.XII.21 Augustine

---

[226]*De genesi contra manichaeos* IX.XI.15. PL 34, 204.

[227]PL 34, 393.

[228]*De genesi ad litteram* VI.XII.20. PL 34, 347.

[229]*De genesi ad litteram* IX.I.2. PL 34, 394.

stipulates that Adam truly named the animals but this action also had a prophetic intention. However Augustine writes: "*Neque hoc opere suscepimus propheticae aenigmata perscrutare sed rerum gestarum fidem ad proprietatem historiae commendare*" (But in this treatise I have not attempted to examine prophetic mysteries but to interpret the narrative as a faithful history of events that happened.)[230] What the prophetic intention might be Augustine does not supply.[231]

Later, Augustine wonders how God made the animals come to Adam. The animals were not rational souls but rather irrational hence unable to obey God through free will. Augustine further suggests that an immutable God could hardly displace Himself in order to herd animals. Therefore, Augustine argues, God used the intercession of angels to facilitate His will.[232] Augustine continues the discussion noting that the power which man has over the animals was not lost with the advent of sin since he could still dominate them "*eis mirabiliter imperare potentia rationis, non corporis*"(by the power of reason and not just by physical force).[233]

Augustine uses Gen. 2:19 in conjunction with Gen. 2:23 and Gen. 3:6 in *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXI.40-41 in order to prove that humanity

---

[230]*De genesi ad litteram* IX.XII.22. PL 34, 401. ACW 42, 85.

[231]Ibid., Augustine writes, seemingly in a fit of frustration, "*quamvis ejus expositionem vel inquisitionem aut alibi jam exhibuerimus, aut in tempus aliud differamus.*" PL 34, 401. (I may have already considered as proposed such a figurative interpretation elsewhere or may decide to postpone it to another time. ACW 42, 85). Augustine is referring to *De genesi contra manichaeos.*

[232]Augustine explains in detail in *De genesi ad litteram* VIII. XXII-XXVI the uses of angels. The concern is primarily to maintain God's immutability and to explain many of the anthropomorphic representations of the God in Genesis.
Taylor notes that Cardinal Newman adhered to Augustine's notion of angelic intercessors governing the world. ACW 42, 271.

[233]*De genesi ad litteram* IX.XIV.26. PL 34, 403. ACW 42, 88.

possessed physical sight prior to Gen. 3:7. Consequently Gen. 3:7 cannot be interpreted literally. Furthermore the expression "*aperti sunt oculi eorum*" (their eyes are opened)[234] is quite clearly used in a figurative sense in Luke 24:31. Similarly Adam and Eve's spiritual eyes were opened in Gen. 3:7. Augustine was to reiterate this interpretation in *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I.V.6 (419 C.E.)[235] once again using Gen 2:19, 20, and adding Gen. 2:23 to the list of biblical proof texts attesting to pre-lapsarian sight.

Incidental uses of Gen. 2:19

Twice Augustine uses Gen. 2:19 and as an indication of man's fallen state. Both are found in anti-Pelagian works. In *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I.XXXVI.67, Gen. 2:19 is combined with Gen. 2:23 in order to illustrate the difference in intelligence of the first human when compared to all subsequent new borns.[236] Similarly in *Contra secundum juliani* V.I, (429-30 C.E.)[237] Augustine wonders that humans have such difficulty learning when Adam of Gen. 2:19 was so wise that he could name all the animals.

Gen. 2:20.

---

[234]*De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXI.41. PL 34, 44.

[235]PL 44, 417.

[236]PL 44,149. Augustine presents a negative picture of newborns as early as 397. In *Confessiones* I.VII describes infants as experiencing jealousy.

[237]PL 45, 1432.

De genesi contra manichaeos.

" *Et post haec vocavit Adam nomina omnium pecorum et omnium avium*

caeli, et omnium bestiarum agri: et secundum quod vocavit ea Adam hoc

est nomen eorum usque in hodiernum diem. Ipsi autem Adae nondum

fuit adjutorium simile ille." (*De genesi contra manichaeos.* II.I.1)[238]

Augustine uses a version of Gen. 2:20 which is unique to North

Africa and according to Fisher unique to Augustine.[239] Augustine's

recension includes the following explicatory phrase which is not found in

the Greek Septuagint or any other Latin transcripts:[240] "*Et secundum*

quod Vocavit ea Adam hoc est nomen eorum usque in hodiernum." (And

according to what Adam called them, this is their name to this day).[241]

The addition intensifies the act of naming since it holds true not only for

Adam but to the present day. Augustine, however, makes no comment

upon the addition.

Augustine cites Gen. 2:20 a mere three times throughout the

course of his writings. Although he quotes the verse in *De genesi contra*

manichaeos, he does not interpret it. Similarly he quotes the verse

---

[238]PL 34, 195.

[239]VL 2,16. Fisher cites Augustine's *De genesi contra manichaeos* as the source of this particular North African version.

[240]VL 2, 51.

[241]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.I.1. PL 34, 195. In *De genesi ad litteram* IX.XII.20. PL 34, 400-401. Augustine does describe the ongoing naming of animals in reference to this verse. Adam is described as speaking a proto language which ceased to exist with the Tower of Babel. Unfortunately Augustine does not appear to be working from the same manuscript as in *De genesi contra manichaeos,* and the extra phrase does not appear when he directly quotes the verse.

without the added gloss in *De genesi ad litteram*[242] but does not interpret it. Possibly Augustine assumes that the material has already been adequately covered in Gen. 2:18-19.

Incidental Uses of Gen. 2:20

Augustine first alludes to the verse in *De trinitate* XII.XIII.20.(339-419 C.E.)[243] As previously mentioned, Augustine, possibly with Philo in mind, disagrees that woman signifies the bodily senses. This would make her like the animals. The basis for his disagreement is the expression *adjutorium simile illi* found in Gen. 2:20. If the helper is similar it must refer to some portion of the mind which only humans share.

Augustine's second use of Gen. 2:20 occurs in *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I.V.6 (419 C.E.) [244] where it is combined with Gen. 2:19 and 2:23 to interpret Gen. 3:7. This has been already described in detail

---

[242] *De genesi ad litteram* IX.I.1. PL 43, 393. Augustine appears to be using a variation of the Italian text which may possibly have been that used by Ambrose. See VL 2, 18 & 51.

[243] PL 42, 1009. There is an ongoing debate about Augustine's understanding of the image of God in humanity centering on this particular chapter of *De trinitate*, since it has been used to argue that Augustine presents an anthropology which is more affirming of women. See Richard J. McGowan, "Augustine's Spiritual Equality: the Allegory of Man and Woman with Regard to Imago Dei," Revue des Études Augustiniennes 33 (1987): 255-264. Also see Mary Cline Horowitz, "The Image of God in Man--Is Woman Included?" Harvard Theological Review 72/3-4 (July-October, 1979): 175-206. Horowitz writes: "In context, Augustine was not referring to the two sexes literally but to the allegory which we have seen in Philo and Origen which identified the male with higher reason and the female with lower reason (*De trinitate*. 12.7.9)." p. 202 Horowitz criticizes O'Faolain, Martines and Reuther for ignoring this allegorical aspect of Augustine and consequently making his biblical interpretation appear more sexist.
    Also see Kari Borresen, "Patristic 'Feminism': The Case of Augustine," Augustinian Studies 25 (1994): 139-152, and "In Defense of Augustine: How *Femina* is *Homo*," in Collectanae Augustiniana vol. 1, ed. T. J. Van Bavel (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990), pp. 411-428.

[244] PL 44, 417.

in the section devoted to Gen. 2:19. In *Sermo* CLI.V.5[245] Augustine uses
Gen. 2:20 once again to argue that Gen. 3:7 refers to the spiritual opening
of the man's eyes since he could obviously see to name the animals.

In opting for such a spiritualized reading of the verse Augustine did
not follow Ambrose who had assumed the verse dealt with the concrete
realities of human marriage. In *De officiis ministrorum* I.XXVIII. 135 (377
C. E.)[246] Ambrose cited Gen. 2:20 in order to describe the marital bond.
He wrote: "*Ergo secundum Dei voluntatem, vel naturae copulam invicem
nobis esse auxilio debemus certare officiis.*" (Thus in accordance with
the will of the God and the union of nature, we ought to be of mutual help
one to the other.)[247]

Gen. 2:21

De genesi contra manichaeos

"*Et immisit Deus soporem in Adam, et obdormivit: et sumpsit Deus unam
de costis eius et implevit locum ejus carne*" (*De genesi contra
manichaeos* II.I.1)[248]

Augustine cites Gen. 2:21 thirteen times. The first three references
are found in *De genesi contra manichaeos*. When Philo had argued that
women functioned as an allegory for the five senses he did so upon the

---

[245]PL 38, 817.

[246]NPNF2 10. xix.

[247]PL 16, 62-63. NPNF2 10, 23.

[248]PL 34, 195-196.

basis of this verse.[249] Adam's sleep represented the unawakened mind.
Wakefulness of the mind was the time of sleep for the senses and
wakefulness of the senses was the time of sleep for the mind. Augustine
introduces his discussion of Gen. 2:21 categorically stipulating that
woman does not represent the senses. Sleep represents hidden
wisdom.[250] Echoing Philo[251] he continues: "*Sed quanto quisque ab istis
visibilibus rebus in interiora intelligentiae secesserit [hoc est autem quasi
obcormiscere], tanto melius et sincerius illud videt.* " (Rather to the extent
that anyone withdraws from these visible things into the interior realm of
the intelligence, [for this is in a sense to fall asleep], to that extent he sees
it better and more clearly).[252]

Augustine continues by noting that at the level of history woman
was truly created from man. This is, however, further proof of the text's
figurative intention since theoretically God could have made woman in
any number of ways.[253] Augustine uses I Cor. 11:3 as biblical sanction

---

[249]Philo, Allegorical Interpretation II. VII.24. Loeb 226, 241. Explaining Gen. 2:21 Philo
writes: "For his (Moses') immediate concern is just this to indicate the origin of active
sense-perception."

[250]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XI.16 PL 34, 205. "*secretore sapientia*"

[251]Philo, Allegorical Interpretation, II.VIII. 25. Loeb 226, 243. "A proof of this is afforded
by the fact that whenever we wish to get an accurate understanding of a subject we hurry
off to a lonely spot; we close our eyes; we stop our ears; we say 'good-bye' to our
perceptive faculties."

[252]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XII.16. PL 34, 205. FC 84, 112-113.

[253]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XII.17. PL 34, 205. Augustine asks a question which
echoes one found in Philo. "*Num enim aut limus defuit unde femina formaretur?*" (For was
there a lack of mud from which the woman might be formed? FC 84, 114). Philo,
Allegorical Interpretations, II.VII.19. Loeb 226, 239. "And what was there to hinder the
First Cause from creating woman, as He created man, out of the earth? For not only was
the Maker the same Being, but the material too, out of which every particular kind was
fashioned, was practically unlimited."

of this particular order of creation.[254] He concludes that the rib/woman represents carnal concupiscence while Adam represents reason.[255]

De genesi ad litteram

"*Et immisit Deus extasin in Adam, et obdormivit. Et accepit unam costarum ejus, et adimplevit carnem in loco ejus*"(*De genesi ad litteram* IX.I.1)[256]

Augustine attempts to interpret Gen. 2:21 only once in *De genesi ad litteram.* It is one of the few instances where the choice of scriptural manuscript appears to have influenced his understanding of the verse. Augustine cites a version of the text which is unique to himself.[257] *De genesi ad litteram* uses the word *extasin* (ecstasy) rather than *soporem* (deep sleep).[258] The *extasin* into which God placed Adam endowed him with the gift of prophecy. Consequently Adam was able to predict the institution of the church in Gen. 2:24 (*Hoc nunc os ex ossibus meis, et caro de carne mea* / This now is bone of my bone and flesh of my

---

[254]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XII.16. "*Tunc enim ordinatissime caput mulieris viri est, cum caput viri est Christus, qui Sapientia est Dei.*" PL 34, 205. (For the man is the head of the woman in perfect order, when Christ, who is the Wisdom of God, is head of the man. FC 84, 113).

[255]Ibid., "*Sed spiritui subjugetur, id est concupiscenta carnalis.*" (but it is subject to the spirit, that is carnal concupiscence).

[256]PL 34, 393.

[257]VL 2, 51.

[258]Both words are found in existent versions of German manuscripts of the *Vetus Latina*. See VL 2, 51.

flesh),[259] . Augustine cites Eph. 5:31-32 as apostolic proof of Adam's prophetic ability.

Augustine has, in all probability, borrowed his interpretation from Tertullian. In *De anima* XI.IV[260] Tertullian also described Adam's sleep as an ecstasy which endowed him with the power of prophecy. Interestingly Tertullian cites a version of the verse in his work which reads: "*Et misit Deus extasin in Adam et obdormivit.*"[261] The word choice is quite similar to Augustine's as found in *De genesi ad litteram* IX.I.1,[262] which may be the echo of a common North African *Vetus Latina* .

Augustine's interpretation of Gen. 2:21, in this instance, differed from Ambrose's. Ambrose assumed that the text itself, not Adam, was prophetic. He suggested that Adam's deep sleep signified turning our eyes towards the Kingdom of God.[263]

Incidental Uses of Gen. 2:21

Prophetic Exegesis: The earliest references to the prophetic element of Gen. 2:21 occur in 396 C.E., several years before *De genesi ad litteram*. In *Enarratio in psalmum* XL.10 Adam represents Christ and

---

[259]*De genesi ad litteram* IX.XIX.36. PL 34, 408.

[260] PL 2, 725.

[261]ibid.

[262]PL 24, 393. Also see ACW 42, 275 note 95.

[263]Ambrose, *De paradiso*, II.49. "*Quis est iste sopor, nisi quia paulis per ad conjugium copulandum cum intendium animum, veluti intentos oculos ad Dei regnum inclinare.*" PL 14, 316. (What does the phrase deep sleep signify? Does it not mean that when we contemplate a conjugal union we seem to be turning our eyes gradually in the direction of God's kingdom? FC 42, 328).

Eve the Church "*in figura*" (in figures).[264] Similarly Adam's sleep

prefigures Christ on the cross from whose side the Church was born in

Enarratio in psalmum LVI.11.[265] Augustine repeats the theme in

Enarratio in psalmum CXXVI.7[266] and *Enarratio in psalmum*

CXXXVII.2.[267] In the latter instance Rom. 5:14 is cited as apostolic

sanction for Augustine's prophetic reading.

All of the references made to Gen. 2:21 after *De genesi ad litteram*

reiterate this prophetic and ecclesial theme. In *In joannis evangelium*

IX.10 (416 C.E.) as Adam sleeps Christ dies. The removal of the side

prefigures the birth of the church which emerges from Christ's wounded

side at the crucifixion.[268] In *tractus* XV.8 Adam is a *forma* (form or shape)

for Christ. As Adam gives birth to his *uxor* (wife) from his *latus* (side) so

does Christ produce the *Ecclesia*.[269] In *De civitate dei* XXII.XVII (425

C.E.), Augustine cites Gen: 2:21 as prophetic of the church in response to

the question: "*An in suo sexu resuscitanda atque mansura sint corpora*

feminarum (Whether the bodies of women shall retain their own sex in the

resurrection?).[270] He answers this affirmatively with the proviso that the

resurrected bodies of both genders will not longer be troubled by

concupiscentia.

---

[264]PL 36, 461.

[265]PL 36, 668.

[266]PL 37, 1672.

[267]PL 37, 1785.

[268]PL 35, 1163.

[269]PL 35, 1513.

[270]PL 41, 778. NPNF1 2, 495. Some interpreters have apparently suggested that Rom. 8:29 should be understood to mean that all will be resurrected like Christ even with regards to gender.

Augustine's prophetic understanding of Gen. 2:21 would appear, once again, to be proof of his knowledge of Tertullian. In *De anima* XLIII Tertullian explains his exegesis of the text in the following manner:

"*Si enim Adam de Christo figuram dabat somnus Adae mors erat Christi dormituri in mortem, ut de injuria perinde lateris ejus vera mater viventium figuraretur Ecclessia.*" (For as Adam was a figure of Christ, Adam's sleep foreshadowed the death of Christ, who was to sleep a mortal slumber, that from the wound inflicted in His side might, in like manner [as Eve was formed], might be typified the church, the true mother of the living.)[271]

Anti-Manichaean Exegesis: Gen. 2:21 is listed with a series of Genesis texts in Augustine's anti-Manichaean tractate, *Contra adimantum* I.I. (394-395 C.E.).[272] The other texts are Gen. 2:18, 22, and 24. All of these are examples of texts wherein a deeper spiritual meaning must be sought since they appear to contradict Matt. 19:29, Luke 17:29-30 and Mark 10:29-30. These New Testament texts appear to exhort believers to abandon family for the gospel, while the Old Testament passages appear to argue for the divine sanctioning of family.

Literal Exegesis: On one occasion Augustine interprets Gen. 2:21 literally. In *De bono conjugali* I.1 (401 C.E.) this verse is used to illustrate the strength and intimacy of the marriage bond.[273]

---

[271]PL 2, 723. ANC 3, 222. Tertullian also cites Gen. 2:21 in *De exhortatione castitatis* V, as an illustration of God's prescience. PL 2, 920. In this instance God knew or foresaw that man would need a helpmate.

[272]PL 42, 132.

[273]PL 40, 373.

Gen. 2: 22

De genesi contra manichaeos

"et formavit Deus costam quam accepit ab Adam in mulierem. Et adduxit illam ad Adam ut videret quid eam, vocaret" (*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.I.1)[274]

Augustine cites this verse fifteen times. Frequently Gen. 2:22 and Gen. 2:21 are referred to together. In these instances the interpretation is invariably allegorical and frequently ecclesiological. This is a pattern which Augustine hints at in *De genesi contra manichaeos*, and returns to throughout his career. A second theme which accounts for four citations is the definition of the word *mulier*.

In *De genesi contra manichaeos* Gen. 2:22 is discussed twice, both times in conjunction with Gen. 2:21.[275] Augustine has argued, as previously mentioned, that woman functions as a figure for carnal desire and man for wisdom. However there are other *"mysteria et sacramenta"* (mysteries and sacraments)[276] which these figures may signify. Augustine admits, however, that he is at a loss to fully understand them at this point.

---

[274]PL 34,196.

[275]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XII.16 & II.XII.17. PL 34, 205-206.

[276]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XII.17. PL 34, 205.

De genesi ad litteram

"*et aedificavit Dominus Deus costam, quam accepit de Adam, in mulierem; et adduxit eam ad Adam.*" (*De genesi ad litteram* IX.I.1)[277]

In *De genesi ad litteram* Augustine appears to have overcome his difficulty. He alludes to Gen. 2:22 in *De genesi ad litteram* IX.XII.20[278] briefly during a discussion of Gen. 2:19-22. Augustine argues that over and above the passage's literal meaning there is also a prophetic one. In the following chapter Augustine lists a series of incongruencies found in Gen. 2:22 which lead him to believe that God intended a prophetic reading of the verse. Why did Adam have to be asleep? Could God not have created woman from a wakeful Adam? Why was a rib used and why was the space filled in with flesh, not another rib? Furthermore, why would a rib, which is strong, be used to make women which are the weaker sex?[279] Why does the text not say God *finxit* (formed) or *fecit* (made) rather than *aedificavit* (built)?[280] All of this will lead Augustine to argue further on that Gen. 2:19-22 is prophetic of the Church.

---

[277]PL 34, 393.

[278]PL 34, 400. See note 200 above.

[279]*De genesi ad litteram* IX.XIII.23. "*numquid etiam ut dormienti fieret, eadem ratio vel necessitas flagitabat; ut denique osse detracto, in cujus locum caro suppleretur? Num enim non potuit ipsa caro detrahi, ut inde congruentius, quod sit sexus infirmior, mulier formaretur?*" PL 34, 402. (But did reason or necessity also demand that this be done while Adam slept? And that a rib be removed and flesh supplied to fill the empty space? Could not rather flesh have been removed more appropriately for the formation of the woman, who belongs to the weaker sex?" ACW 42, 85-86).

[280]Ibid.

Incidental uses of Gen. 2:22

Mulier Defined: On four occasions Augustine cites Gen. 2:22 in order to explain the meaning of the Latin *mulier*. The first instance occurs in *Epistolae ad galatas* 30 (394 C.E.) where the verse is used to clarify an obscurity which arises in Gal. 4:4. *Mulier* (wife) is used generically to indicate *femina* (woman) in Hebrew expression as is seen in Gen. 2:22. Here according to Augustine, it obviously means woman.[281] It is in this sense that *mulier* is used in Gal. 4:4. Augustine reiterated this point of grammar during his debates with Faustus (400 C.E.). Faustus, denying the reality of the incarnation, has said that Christ was not truly born of woman as is suggested in Gal. 4:4. Augustine disagrees. When Eve is referred to as *mulier* in Gen. 2:22, *mulier* signifies *femina* or woman which is the sense applied to the word by the Apostle Paul.[282]

In *De consensu evangelistarum* (400 C.E.) the Latin *mulier* again proves problematic. In this instance, although *mulier* technically refers to a wife, its scriptural meaning is broader and also includes virgins. Gen. 2:22 is cited as an example of this fluid use of the term. Eve was created as Adam's *mulier* however she was also virgin.[283] In *Sermo* LII.IV.10, Augustine cites Gen. 2:22 to illustrate the same point. The Hebrew *locutio* (expression) *mulier* also refers to "*virginitas non corrupta*" (uncorrupted virginity).[284]

---

[281] *Epistolae ad galatas* 30. PL 35, 2126.

[282] *Contra faustum* XI.III. PL 42, 247.

[283] *De consensu evangelistarum* II.XXVII.68. PL 34, 1111.

[284] PL 38, 358.

Augustine's expanded use of *mulier* is similar to Tertullian's as found in his *De virginibus velandis* V(circa 204 C. E.) Here, Tertullian explains that although *mulier* commonly means *uxor* thereby excluding virgins (which Eve obviously was at this point) this is not the use intended in Gen. 2:22.,[285] In this instance *mulier* refers to the genus woman which includes virgins. It is also prophetic of her future relationship of wife.[286]

Prophetic Exegesis: In *Contra faustum* XII.VIII (400 C.E.) Gen. 2:22 is ecclesiologically prophetic with Adam corresponding to Christ and the creation of woman from his *latus* to the birth of the Church.[287] Augustine had made a similar case to Adimantus several years earlier[288] and twice in his *Enarratio in psalmum*.[289] In all three cases Gen. 2:22 is combined with Gen. 2:21. Augustine seems to pick up his discussion from *De genesi ad litteram* IX.XIII.23, in *De civitate dei* XXII.XVII [290] (425 C.E.).[291] where he notes once again that Gen. 2:22 does not use *formavit* (shaped) or *finxit* (formed) but rather *aedificavit* (built) to describe God's activity while constructing Eve. Furthermore Paul uses the same verb (*aedificare*) in Eph. 4:12 to describe the creation of the Church from

---

[285]Tertullian, *De virginibus velandis* V. PL 2, 895-897.

[286]Once again Tertullian quotes scripture. He writes that for this reason man leaves his father and mother and "*conglutinabitur mulieri suae.*" PL 2, 895. His word choice, which mirrors that of Augustine's text, (*De genesi ad litteram* IX.I.1., PL 34, 393) would appear once again to attest to a common North African version being used by both authors.

[287]PL 42, 258.

[288]*Contra adimantum* II.I. PL 42, 132.

[289]*Enarratio in psalmum* CXXVI.7. PL 37, 1672 and *Enarratio in psalmum* CXXXVIII.2. PL 37, 1785.

[290]PL 41, 779.

[291]Brown, Augustine of Hippo, p. 378.

the body of Christ. Consequently Augustine writes of Gen 2:22:

"*Ecclesia figurata est*" (The Church is prefigured). However Gen. 2:22 is

not prophetic of the Trinity as some have suggested.[292] Augustine

categorically denies such an interpretation in *De trinitate* XII.VI.8.[293]

Ambrose also commented upon the word *aedificavit* although his

understanding proved less allegorical than Augustine's. Following in

Philo's footsteps,[294] Ambrose explains in *De paradiso* XI.L[295] that

aedificavit is used in Gen. 2:22 in order to point to the state of full

perfection which is built in the household.

In *De gratia christi et de peccato originali* II.XXXV.40 (418 C.E.)[296]

Augustine cites Gen. 2:22 as proof that "*quod oculus jam non invenit,*

fides credit" (what the eye has not seen faith believes).[297] The fact that

Adam was created from dust and his *conjux* (spouse) from his *latus* can

not be proved but only believed.

Augustine's spiritual understanding of the verse was quite different

from his near contemporary Jerome. Jerome produced a far more

---

[292]*De trinitate* XII.V.5. "*Proinde non mihi videntur probaliem afferre sententiam, qui sic arbitrantur trinitatem imaginis Dei in tribus personis, quod attinet ad humanam naturam, posse reperiri, ut in conjugio masculi et feminae atque in eorum prole compleatur.*" PL 42, 1000. (Accordingly they do not seem to me to advance a probable opinion, who lay it down that a trinity of the image of God in three persons, so far as human nature can so be discovered as to be completed in the marriage of male and female and in their offspring. NPNF1 3, 156).

Who they may be is not obvious however one wonders if they might not be Jovinius or his supporters to whom Augustine replies in *De bono conjugali.*

[293] PL 42, 1003.

[294]See Philo, Answers and Questions, I.26. Loeb Sup 1, 15-16. Philo explains: "The harmonious coming together of man and woman and their consummation is figuratively a house."

[295]PL 14, 299.

[296]PL 44, 405.

[297]Ibid.

concrete and pastorally motivated reading of Gen. 2:22 during the course
of which he argued that second marriage is not scripturally sound. In
Epistola CXXIII.12 to Ageruchia, a wealthy widow from Gaul apparently
considering remarriage,[298] Jerome wrote: "*Erunt duo in carnem unam;
non in duas, nec tres.*" ("the two shall be one flesh, not two or three.)[299]
Furthermore Gen. 2:24 says nothing about cleaving to "wives" *(uxoribus).*

Gen. 2:23

De genesi contra manichaeos

"*Et dixit Adam Hoc nunc os ex ossibus meis, et caro de carne mea: Haec
vocabitur mulier, quoniam de viro suo sumpta est; et haec erit mihi
adjutorium.*" (*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.I.1)[300]

Augustine cites Gen. 2:23 five times and he quotes two versions of
the verse. The first found in *De genesi contra manichaeos* is identical to
the manuscripts from the German tradition. They alone included Adam's
comment "*et haec erit mihi adjutorium*" (and she will be a helpmate to
me).[301] When Augustine quotes the same verse in *De genesi ad litteram*

---

[298]NPNF2 5,230. Also see Kelly, Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies, pp.
179-194.

[299]PL 22, 1033.

[300]PL 34, 196.

[301]VL 2, 52-53. This addition is not contained in either the Septuagint or Hebrew
tradition.

he uses an identical recension except for the added gloss which is dropped.[302]

Augustine first attempts to interpret Gen. 2:23 in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XIII.18.[303] The verse refers to "*conjugium spirituale in homine*" (the spiritual marriage in man) rather than the literal relations in concrete marriage. Echoing Philo, Augustine explains that bone means *fortitudinem* (strength).[304] while flesh represents *temperantiam* (temperance). These are inferior virtues, and consequently man representative of the superior virtues (*prudentia rationalis* / prudence of reason) manifests his authority by the act of naming.[305] Augustine writes: "*vocavit ero mulierem suam vir, tanquam potior inferiorem.*" (The man named his woman, his inferior).[306]

---

[302]This leads one to speculate about why Augustine does so. If one assumes that Augustine is working from one manuscript version, albeit different in *De genesi contra manichaeos* and *De genesi ad litteram* the solution is relatively simple. Augustine has merely used the citation found in the manuscript at hand.

However there is a second more intriguing possibility. Augustine makes reference several times in his works to the variety of Latin manuscripts. (See *Locutiones in heptateuchum* lb.9. in PL 34, 466). In *De doctrina christiana* II.XI.16, PL 34, 42-43, Augustine refers to faulty manuscripts and translations recommending reference to Greek or Hebrew originals. Possibly this is an instance when Augustine compared the Latin to the Septuagint and dropped the extra gloss.

There is a third possibility which does not exclude the second option. Augustine's versions of Gen. 2:15-25 are not identical to any existent manuscript. Perhaps Augustine is not working from one manuscript but several. In this instance we see Augustine choosing versions and translations verse by verse. This would certainly provide an accurate description of Augustine's versions. See Appendix II.

[303]PL 34, 206.

[304]Philo, Allegorical Interpretation, II.XII.41. "This is bone out of my bones, that is, power out of my powers, for bone is here used as power and strength." Loeb 226, 251. Philo suggests that flesh represents feelings.

[305]The notion of inferior and superior virtues is taken from Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics 1102a28-1102b34. Roland Teske suggests that Augustine probably learned of it from writers such as Cicero. See FC 84, 114 note 86.

[306]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XIIII.18. PL 34, 206. FC 84, 114.

Augustine moves on to an etymological explanation of the word *mulier*. He points out that the etymological link between *mulier* and *vir* is not evident in Latin. Augustine writes that in Hebrew the root word for woman is man [307] hence the significance of the expression "*Haec vocabitur mulier quoniam de viro suo sumpta est.*" (She is called woman since she was taken from her man).[308] Augustine does not explain what the Hebrew is or how it works but merely stipulates that a Latin equivalent would be *vir* and *virago*.[309]

There is a slight possibility that Augustine has cribbed his etymology from Jerome.[310] Jerome's *Hebraece questiones in genesim* was published sometime between 389 and 391[311] while Augustine's *De genesi contra manichaeos* is dated between 388-89. Jerome explains that the Hebrew *his* (*vir*) or man becomes *hissa* (*mulier*) or woman.[312] Thus writes Jerome: "*quod nos latine possumus dicere: haec vocabitur virago, quia ex viro sumpta est.*"(we can say in Latin: She will be called

---

[307]Augustine is referring to the Hebrew word for woman, transliterated into English as *ishah*, which is obviously from the Hebrew root word *ish* or man. Whether or not he is aware of the Hebrew is doubtful.

[308]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XIII.18. PL 34, 206.

[309]Ibid.

[310]There is also the possibility that Augustine learned of this etymology through the works of Symmachus or Theodotion. See VL 2, 53. Symmachus (late second century) was an Ebionite who made a Greek translation of the Old Testament which appears in the fourth column of Origen's *Hexapla*. See Claude Cox, "Symmachus," EEC, p. 876. Theodotion (late second century) was, according to Irenaeus, a Jewish proselyte. He is credited with translating the Old Testament into Greek and his work constitutes the sixth column of Origin's *Hexapla.* See Claude Cox, "Theodotion," EEC, p. 893.

[311]Kelly, Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies, p. 153.

[312]Jerome has transcribed into Latin phonetics the Hebrew for man and woman which is rendered as ish/ ishah in English. See Jerome, *Hebraece questiones in genesim* 6.9-11. CCL LXXII,5.

virago, since she is taken from the *vir*).[313] When Jerome eventually

produced his Vulgate he used *vir / virago*.[314]

As previously mentioned Augustine uses virtually identical texts for

Gen. 2:23 in both *De genesi contra manichaeos* and *De genesi ad*

litteram, however his understanding of the verse shifts in *De genesi ad*

litteram from spiritual to prophetic. Gen. 2:23 no longer refers to the

virtues of the inner man.[315] It is now entirely prophetic of the Christian

Church. Augustine writes: "*Denique evigilans tanquam prophetiae*

plenus, cum ad se adductam costam, mulierem suam videret, eructavit

continuo, quod magnum saramentum commendat" (When he awoke, he

was like one filled with the spirit of prophecy, and seeing his wife brought

before him he immediately opened his mouth and proclaimed the great

sacrament which Saint Paul teaches).[316] The great sacrament which

Paul teaches is the birth of the Church as found in Eph. 5:31-32.

Augustine follows in the steps of Tertullian with this particular

understanding. Tertullian also viewed Gen. 2:23 as ecclesially

prophetic. In *De anima* XI and XXI[317] Adam's "*Caro de carne mea*" (flesh

of my flesh)[318] prefigures the relationship between Christ and the church.

---

[313]Jerome, *Hebraece questiones in genesim* 6.9-11. CCL LXXII,5. "*Vir quippe vocatur*
his et mulier hissa, Recte igitur ab his appelata est mulier hissa..."

[314] PL 28, 198.

[315]Quite obviously Philo does not interpret any of the Genesis 2 verses in such a
prophetic manner although his understanding in generally highly spiritual. However in
Questions and Answers, I.28. Loeb Sup 1, 16-17, Philo waxes lyrical about woman's
physical nature which delights man.

[316]*De genesi ad litteram* IX.XIX.36. PL 34, 408. ACW 42, 95.

[317]PL 2, 665 & 684. Tertullian uses *adglutinabitur* instead of *conglutinabitur* which is
used by Augustine for Gen. 2:24. PL 34, 393. Both words have a sense of being glued
together which is stronger than Jerome's *adaerebit*. PL 28, 199.

[318]PL 2, 665 & 684.

Tertullian linked this understanding to Eph. 5:31-32 and repeats his theory that Adam's prophetic ability is a result of *ectasis.* This same ecclesiological explanation occurs in *De exhortatione castitatis* V,[319] and *De jejuniis* III.[320]

Incidental Uses of Gen. 2:23

Augustine refers to Gen. 2:23 three other times, all in works produced in 419 C.E. The first instance occurs in *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I.V.6[321] were the verse is cited along with Gen. 2:19-20 to prove that Adam had physical sight. Consequently Gen. 3:7 pertains to the opening of Adam's spiritual eyes. Augustine mentions Gen. 2:23 twice in *De anima.* On the first occasion Augustine is responding to two books written by Vicentii Victoris regarding the issue of the transmission of the human soul.[322] Victoris has cited Gen. 2:23 as proof that God breathes upon each human at birth in order to produce their souls since Adam does not say "*anima es anima mea*". Augustine suggests that this does not preclude transference of the original soul[323] during propagation

---

[319]PL 2, 920.

[320]PL 2, 958.

[321]PL 44, 417.

[322]*De anima* XVII.29. PL 44, 492.

[323]There were two theories as to the transmission of the soul. The first was that God created a new soul for each human. The second, "traductianism," argued that a portion of the Adam's original soul was transmitted to each subsequent human being. Consequently all of humanity would share some portion of Adam's soul. This theory was advocated by Tertullian in its materialist version. Each element (or material) used to create Adam propagates itself. Augustine developed his theory of traductianism in an attempt to explain the sin and death of all humanity in Adam. Ultimately Augustine refuses to endorse creationism or traductianism. Book 10 of *De genesi ad litteram,* provides an extended discussion of this theory.
  Also see J. Patout Burns, "Traductianism," EEC, pp. 910-911.

since the writer of Gen. 2:23 could be using synecdoche. If such is the case *"caro de carne mei"* could signify the whole being rather than the merely physical. Augustine returns to the issue of synecdoche and Gen. 2:23 in *De anima* I.XVIII.30.[324] Once again he points out that those arguing for divine aspiration of the soul assume that the author of this verse was not using synecdoche.

<div align="center">Gen. 2:24</div>

<u>De genesi contra manichaeos</u>

"Propter hoc relinquet homo patrem et matrem et adjungetur uxorit suae; et erunt duo in carne una."(<u>De genesi contra manichaeos</u>II.I.1)[325]

Augustine quotes Gen. 2:24 twenty-six times throughout the corpus of his work. Overall there are two recurring themes. The first and most predominant theme is ecclesiological wherein the verse is viewed as prophetic of the church. This accounts for seventeen citations. The second theme approaches Gen. 2:24 more literally. In these cases Augustine understands the citation as supportive of marriage in some way.

Both interpretations are combined in <u>De genesi contra manichaeos</u> II.XIII.19.[326] Augustine writes: *"quomodo referatur ad historiam non*

---

[324]PL 44, 492.

[325]PL 34, 196.

[326]PL 34, 206.

invenio, nisi quod plerumque in genere humano ista contingunt; sed tota prophetia est..."(I find no way that this [Gen. 2:24] pertains to history except in so far as this is what generally happens in the human race. Rather this is all prophecy.)[327] The basis for this prophetic reading is Eph. 5:31-32, consequently the "*duo in carne una*" prefigures the relationship between Christ and the Church.

De genesi ad litteram

"*Et propter hoc relinquet homo patrem et matrem et conglutinabitur uxori suae; et erunt duo in carne una*" (*De genesi ad litteram* IX.I.1)[328]

Augustine repeats his prophetic interpretation of the verse in *De genesi ad litteram* IX.XIX.36.[329] Having explained that Adam's prophetic gift is given during his *ectasin* of Gen. 2:21, Augustine cites Eph. 5:31-32 once again to support his interpretation.

Incidental Uses of Gen. 2:24

Several themes emerge in Augustine's incidental use of Gen. 2:24. The predominant focus is the ecclesially prophetic nature of the verse, however it is also understood to pertain literally to marriage on several occasions. In these instances the issues range from those of

---

[327]PL 34, 206 & FC 84, 115.

[328]PL 34, 393.

[329]PL 34, 408.

indissolubility of marriage and its divine sanctioning to those of disordered post-lapsarian sexual relations.

Prophetic Exegesis: On four occasions Augustine uses prophetic exegesis in order to illustrate faulty reasoning in the Manichaean understanding of scriptures. The first is found in *Contra adimantum* III.I.(394-95 C.E.)[330] where Gen. 2:24 is listed with Gen. 2:18,21-22, as examples of verses which apparently contradict Mt. 19:29 (Lk. 17:29 and Mk. 10:29).[331] As previously mentioned, Augustine argues that such contradiction points to a deeper meaning. Twice in *Contra faustum* XII.VIII and XXII.XXVIII (400 C.E.)[332] Augustine stipulates that the deeper meaning is prophetic of Christ's relationship with the Church. In both instances he cites Eph. 5:32 as apostolic sanction for such an understanding. Writing against the Manichaean Secundinus, Augustine repeats this interpretation of Gen. 2:24 in conjunction with Eph. 5:31.[333]

Augustine was to reiterate his exegesis of the prophetic nature of Gen. 2:24 in numerous works not specifically addressed to the Manichees. In *Enarratio in psalmum* XLIV.12, LIV.3, LXI.4, and CXXXVIII.2[334] (396 C.E.) Augustine applies this understanding. Frequently Gen. 2:24 is linked with Eph. 5:31-32. Such is the case with *Enarratio in psalmum* XXXVII.6, LXVIII.II.1, LXXIV.4, CXVIII.XXIX.9,

---

[330]PL 42, 132.

[331]This verse advises believers to leave their families if they wish to inherit the kingdom, while Gen. 2:24 advises them to stay together. For Manichaean's this was an example of the faulty and erroneous nature of the Old Testament which described the activities of the Demiurge.

[332]PL 42, 258 & 424.

[333]*Contra secundinum manichaeum* XXI.21. PL 42, 597. This work has been variously dated to 399 and 405-406 C.E.

[334]PL 36, 501., 629.,730., & PL 37, 1785.

CXXXVIII.2, and CXLII.3.[335] He cites Gen. 2:24 *In joannis evangelium* IX. 10 (416 C.E.)[336] as prophetic of the church and combines the verse with Eph. 5:32 in *Sermo* CCCXLI.X.12.[337]

Augustine was not unique in attributing a prophetic meaning to Gen. 2:24. Tertullian, as mentioned in the pervious section, Origen, Ambrose and Jerome all understood Gen. 2:24 to prefigure the Church. Origen linked Gen. 2:24 and Ep. 5:31-32 in his debate with the pagan philosopher Celsus.[338] In *De viduis* XV.89[339] (377 C.E)[340] Ambrose cited Gen. 2:24 with Eph. 5:32 as a description of the relationship between Christ and the Church. In *De fide* I.II.18.[341] (378 C.E.)[342] Ambrose again alluded to an ecclesial dimension in Gen. 2:24. Jerome also linked Gen. 2:24 with Eph. 5:31-32. In *Adversus jovinianum* I.16[343] he argued that the Apostle understood the Genesis verse as prophetic of Christ's relationship with the church, not as a recommendation for marriage. In *Adversus jovinianum* I.5[344] Jerome had already repudiated

---

[335]PL 36, 400., 854., 949., & PL 37, 1589., 1784., 1847.

[336]PL 35, 1163.

[337]PL 39, 1500.

[338]See Origen, *Contra celsum,* IV.XLIX. PG 11, 1107.

[339]PL 16, 262.

[340]NPNF2 10, 389.

[341]PL 16, 533.

[342]NPNF2 10, 199.

[343]PL 23, 246.

[344]PL 23, 215.

Jovinian's suggestion that Gen. 2:24 can be used to support the equality of marriage and virginity.[345]

Indissolubility of Marriage: In *De consensu evangelistarum* II.LXII.121. (400 C.E.)[346] Augustine cites Gen. 2:24 to illustrate the continuity between the Old and New Testaments. Mt. 19:1-12 and Mk. 10:1-12 constitute Jesus' restatement of God's intention for marriage in the face of Pharisaic criticism. As marriage was indissoluble for the Jews, which is indicated by Gen. 2:24, so is it indissoluble in the New Testament.

Disordered Sexual Relations: In *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II.IX.22 (419 C.E.) Augustine describes the disorder brought to human sexual relationships by concupiscence; consequently Gen. 2:24 cannot be used to argue that "*voluptas potest honesta.*" (passion can be decent).[347] Further on, Augustine condemns Pelagian use of Gen. 2:24 to prove the present good of marriage.[348] He writes that the Pelagians have accused him of arguing for an unrealistic pre-lapsarian marriage, "*sine concupiscenta*"(without concupiscence) and suggesting that marriage was instituted "*a diabolo*" (by the devil).[349] Augustine points out that Gen. 2:24 deals with the pre-lapsarian world;[350] therefore he is not

---

[345]Augustine makes a similar, albeit far more nuanced, argument for the same case in *De bono coniugali* and *De sancta virginitate*. His response was probably prompted by the extravagant rhetoric of Jerome in *Adversus jovinianum*. See McLeese, Augustine and Sexism: Interpretation and Evaluation of *The Good of Marriage* and *Holy Virginity*. pp. 19-20,56-87.

[346]PL 34, 1135.

[347]PL 44, 448.

[348]Interestingly Augustine does not use Gen. 2:24 in *De bono coniugali* to support his own argument for the good of marriage.

[349]*De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II.XXXI.53. PL 44, 467.

[350]*De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II.XXXII.54. PL 44, 468.

arguing against marriage but rather the changed nature of sexual relations after the fall. A year later in *Contra duas epistolas pelagianorum* I.V.9,[351] once again responding to Julian's charge that he repudiated marriage, Augustine uses Gen. 2:24 to prove that the institution is divinely sanctioned. In *Contra julianum* II.X.20 (421 C.E.) Augustine continues the debate. In this instance Gen. 2:24 is used to argue that God's intention for marriage was not shameful.[352] Augustine makes a similar case in *Sermo* CCCXLIX.III.3.[353] Marriage is sanctioned "*ubi licet, ubi concessum est, ubi honestum est*" (when it is lawful, when it is a concession, when it is decent). In *Contra secundum juliani* II.LVII (429-30 C.E.)[354] Augustine again uses Gen. 2:24 to support marriage.[355]

In understanding the verse as containing levels of meaning Augustine is following in Philo's Alexandrian tradition. Philo used the verse to illustrate both the literal nature of human marriage relations and as an allegory for sense perception.[356] Ambrose provided a unique interpretation of Gen. 2:24 in *De officiis ministrorum* I.XXXII. 167.[357] wherein he exculpated Eve of the Fall. In light of Lerner's analysis it merits being briefly mentioned since it is an interpretation which Augustine may have been familiar with. Ambrose argued that Gen. 2:24

---

[351]PL 44, 554.

[352]PL 44, 712.

[353]In this instance Julian has suggested the Paul confirms his notion that sin is transmitted by imitation "*non seminibus*" (not by seed). PL 39, 1530.

[354]PL 45, 1167.

[355]PL 45, 1116.

[356]Philo, Questions and Answers, I.29. Loeb Sup I, 18.

[357]PL 16, 72.

illustrated that both Adam and Eve were of one flesh and consequently one spirit. This was the spirit of good will. Eve having received the gift of good will did not know there was such a thing as ill will. Preying upon her innocence, the serpent was able to dupe her. [358]

Gen. 2:25

De genesi contra manichaeos and *De genesi ad litteram*

"*Et erant ambo nudi, Adam et mulier ejus, et non confundebantur*"

(*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.I.1)[359]

"*Et erant nudi ambo Adam et non pudebat illos.*"

(*De genesi ad litteram* XI.I.1)[360]

Augustine cites Gen. 2:25 eight times. Although the verse is quoted in *De genesi contra manichaeos,* it is not interpreted. His first exegesis is found in *De genesi ad litteram* XI.I.3[361] where he wonders why Adam and Eve were not ashamed. Augustine answers his own query with the following allusion to Rom. 7:23: "*Quid enim puderet, quando nullam legem senserant in membris suis repugnantem legi mentis suae?*"(Why would they be ashamed since they did not perceive

---

[358]Once again Augustine does not follow Philo who having argued that woman represents the senses, understands Gen. 2:24 to be the integration of sense perception and the mind. See Philo, Allegorical Interpretation, II. XIV.49. Loeb 226, 255.

[359]PL 34, 196.

[360]PL 34, 429.

[361]PL 34, 430.

in their members any law at war with the law of their mind?).[362]
Uncontrolled motion of the flesh was the *poena peccati* (penalty of sin)
consequently there was nothing to be embarrassed about. Sin caused
inobedientium membrorum (disobedient members), hence prior to sin
there was no cause for shame.

Incidental Uses of Gen. 2:25

The theme of disobedient members was one Augustine returned to
on several occasions with regard to Gen. 2:25. It is taken up in *Sermo*
CLI.V.5.[363] Augustine notes that man was not ashamed since his
members were not at odds with the *prima lex* or the law of the spirit. In
De civitate dei XIV.XVII (418 C.E.),[364] written near the beginning of the
Pelagian controversy, Gen. 2:25 is used to illustrate man's ability to
control his sexual organs prior to the Fall. Unfortunately post-lapsarian
sexual desires no longer obediently follow man's will. In *Contra julianum*
IV.XVI.82 (421 C.E.)[365] Augustine stipulates once again that man was not
ashamed in Gen. 2:25 since once man knew shame he covered himself
(Gen. 3:7). Augustine mocks Julian in *Contra secundum juliani* II.LX.
(29-430 C. E.).[366] Julian, according to Augustine, is not ashamed of
interpreting Gen. 2:25 to mean that shameful *libido* (passion) existed

---

[362]PL 34, 430 & ACW 42, 135.

[363]PL 38, 817.

[364]PL 41, 425. For date see Brown, Augustine of Hippo, p. 285.

[365]PL 44, 781.

[366]PL 45, 1168.

prior to the Fall. Later, during the same debate, Augustine calls Julian's interpretation of the verse *sacrilegae* or sacrilege.[367]

Adam's sight was once again at issue in *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I.V.6 (419 C.E.).[368] Gen. 2:25 is used with Gen. 2:19-20,23, as proof that Adam had physical sight prior to the Fall. Consequently Gen. 3:7 refers to the opening of man's spiritual eyes.

Augustine was not unique in assuming that Gen. 2:25 referred to embarrassment caused by unruly sexual organs. Tertullian also interpreted Gen. 2:25 has referring to the genitals. Once the first couple become aware of their gender difference they cover themselves.[369]

Influences of Earlier Exegesis on Augustine

As was noted in the introduction to this section Augustine cites or alludes to some portion of Gen. 2: 15-25 roughly 127 times throughout the corpus of his writings. The citations span the course of Augustine's writings, the earliest being found in *De genesi contra manichaeos* (398 C.E.) and the last reference occurring in *Contra secundam juliani* produced in 429-30 C.E. Prior to moving to the second section of this chapter which will analyze the exegetical strategies which Augustine applied to Gen. 2:15-25 a few concluding remarks need to be made.

In the introduction to this section it was stated that only once did Augustine's version of scripture influence his exegesis. It was noted that

---

[367]PL 45, 1279.

[368]PL 44, 417.

[369]*De velandis virginibus* XI. PL 2, 904. "*Itque sui quique sexus intellectum tegmine notaverunt.*" (Thus they each marked their intelligence of their own sex by a covering. ANF 4,34).

Augustine's interpretations for 2:17, 21,22, 23, 24 & 25 were influenced by Tertullian which perhaps bears witness to an ongoing North African exegetical tradition. It was also stated that Ambrose appears to have exerted a far less pronounced influence. Furthermore it was suggested that a few tantalizing hints could indicate that Augustine was aware of Philo's exegesis of Genesis 2. Also worthy of note was the fact that Augustine follows a long tradition of exegetes, beginning with Paul, through Tertullian, Ambrose and Jerome, who view Gen. 2:24 as prophetic of the Church. The instances which supported these statements were commented upon during the course of the description of Augustine's interpretations. These will be briefly summarized before proceeding to section two and a systematic analysis of Augustine's exegetical strategies.

Influence of Scriptural Versions: Augustine's choice of scriptural version does not appear to influence his interpretations. It occurs only once in *De genesi ad litteram* IX.I.1,[370] where the word *extasin* (which appears in most *Vetus Latina* versions appears as *soporem*)[371] becomes key to understanding Adam's prophetic ability.

Tertullian and the North African Influence: There are several strong indications that Augustine was familiar with the work of his fellow North African exegete, Tertullian. This may be reflective of a North African tradition of exegesis. The first such indication is found in *De genesi ad litteram* VIII.X.23. Augustine's understanding of the expression *Deus Dominus* in Gen. 2:17 is identical to Tertullian's as found in

---

[370]PL 34, 393.

[371]VL 2, 51.

Adversus hermogenem III.[372] Both authors argue that God can only be Lord once Adam has been created. Lordship describes a relationship which only exists when God has created man to be 'Lord over'. There are also similarities between Augustine's suggestion in *De civitate dei* XVI.XXVII[373] that Gen. 2:17 is an example of God's first covenant with man and Tertullian's understanding in *Adversus judaeos* II.[374] In this instance Tertullian argues that Gen. 2:17 represents an embryonic decalogue. The case is similar for Gen. 2:22. Augustine's expanded use of *mulier* echoes Tertullian's in *De virginibus velandis* V. Here Tertullian takes pains to explain that *mulier* is generically used to mean woman rather than wife.[375] In this instance Tertullian quotes scripture providing evidence to a word choice which is also found in Augustine's citation. Tertullian writes that for this reason man leaves his father and mother and "*conglutinabitur mulieri suae.*" which mirrors that of Augustine's text, in *De genesi ad litteram* IX.I.1.[376] The choice is less common and may bear witness to a common or similar North African version of scripture being used by both authors.[377] Perhaps the most telling example of Tertullian's influence is found in Augustine's understanding of Gen. 2:21. Working from a scriptural version which also translates sleep as *ectasin*, Tertullian provides an identical understanding of Adam's prophetic ability

---

[372]PL 2, 202.

[373]PL 41,506.

[374]PL 2, 599.

[375]Tertullian, *De virginibus velandis* V. PL 2, 895-897.

[376]PL 34, 393.

[377]VL 2, 54. *Conglutinabitur* occurs in some exitant German versions of the *Vetus Latina*.

in *De anima* XI.IV[378] as Augustine's in *De genesi ad litteram*
IX.XIX.36..[379] This hints, perhaps, at a North African exegetical tradition
for Gen. 2:21. Another possible example of Tertullian's influence is
found in Augustine's understanding of Gen. 2:23-24 as prophetic of the
church. Tertullian also viewed Gen. 2:23-24 as ecclesially prophetic. In
his *De anima* XI and XXI[380] these verses where linked to Eph 5:31-32
and prefigurative of the relationship between Christ and the church. This
same ecclesiological explanation occurs in *De exhortatione castitatis*
V,[381] and *De jejuniis* III.[382] Augustine's description of the unruliness of
human sexual organs from Gen. 2:25(found in *De genesi ad litteram*
XI.I.3[383], *Contra secundum juliani* II.LX. [384]*Contra julianum*
IV.XVI.82,[385]*De civitate dei* XIV.XVII,[386] *Sermo* CLI.V.5.[387]) also bears
traces of Tertullian's *De velandis virginibus* XI.[388]

Ambrose's Limited Influence: Ambrose appears to have exerted
far less influence upon Augustine with regards to concrete scriptural

---

[378]PL 2, 725.

[379]PL 34, 408.

[380]PL 2, 665 & 684. Tertullian uses *adglutinabitur* instead of *conglutinabitur* which is used by Augustine for Gen. 2:24. PL 34, 393. Both words have a sense of being glued together which is stronger than Jerome's *adaerebit*. PL 28, 199.

[381]PL 2, 920.

[382]PL 2, 958.

[383]PL 34, 430.

[384]PL 45, 1168.

[385]PL 44, 781.

[386]PL 41, 425. For date see Brown, Augustine of Hippo, p. 285.

[387]PL 38, 817.

[388]PL 2, 904.

interpretations than Augustine's reference in the *Confessiones* V.XIV[389] would suggest. While Ambrose may have been responsible for opening Augustine's eyes to the spiritual possibilities of scriptural interpretation, he does not appear to have furnished many specific exegetical models. Augustine's understanding of Adam as the proto-farmer in Paradise mirrors Ambrose's transmission in *De paradiso* V.25[390] of Philonic tradition. Ambrose's suggestion in *De paradiso* IX.42-44[391] that *morte moriemini* of Gen. 2:17 refers to levels of death is distantly echoed in Augustine's distinction between physical death and the death of the soul. Ambrose, however, lists four possible permutations ("*vita vivere, morte mori, morte vivere, vita mori*")[392] to Augustine's two. Augustine directly cites Ambrose's *De paradiso* X.47 to support his suggestion in *Contra julianum* III.VIII.20[393] that woman was created in Gen. 2:18 in order to help Adam with procreation. Such limited influence would tend to support Neil B. McLynn's recently published theory that Augustine's intellectual links to Ambrose were far less extensive than has been generally assumed.[394]

The Philonic Tradition: As mentioned in the introduction to this section Philo's influence on Augustine is difficult to evaluate. Augustine does make an isolated reference to Philo in *Contra faustum* XII.39. He

---

[389]PL 32, 717-178.

[390]PL 14, 301.

[391]PL 14, 311-312.

[392]Ambrose, *De paradiso* IX.43. PL 14, 312.

[393]PL 44, 688.

[394]Neil B. McLynn, Ambrose of Milan (London: University of California Press, 1994), p. 242.

describes Philo as "*vir liberaliter eruditissimus...cujus eloquium Graeci Platoni aequare non dubitant.*"(a man of great learning, whom the Greeks speak of as rivaling Plato in eloquence.)[395]   Furthermore Augustine is familiar with some of Philo's exegetical work, in particular his work on Genesis. In the aforementioned *Contra faustum* passage, Augustine continues by explaining that Philo interpreted the measurements of the ark as a typology for the human body. However Ambrose, when producing his exegetical works on Genesis, also borrowed extensively from Philo. Much of this "borrowing" was unattributed[396] although Ambrose does generally acknowledge Philo's work in *De paradiso* IV. 25.[397]   Since we know that Augustine was familiar with *De paradiso* there is the possibility that some of Augustine's Philonic influence may be attributed to Ambrose. The issue is further compounded by the fact that on several occasions there are multiple sources for Augustine's interpretation. While Philo understands the addition of "Lord" to "God" in Gen. 2:17 to serve as an indication of God's relationship to man, Tertullian provides an identical understanding, as previously mentioned.[398]

---

[395]PL 42, 274. NPNF1 4, 195.

[396]McLynn, Ambrose of Milan, pp. 243-244. McLynn describes the debate over how expert Ambrose's Greek actually was and his incorporation of Philonic ideas into his works. Ambrose presents these as his own. McLynn argues that Ambrose did this in order to "establish his own authority as a teacher." p. 57.

[397]Ambrose writes: "*Philon autem, quoniam spiritalia Judaico non capiebat affectu, intra moralia se tenuit.*" (Philo, on the other hand limited his interpretation of this Scriptural passage to its moral aspect since because of his Jewish affections he did not capture the spiritual. PL 14,301). Here Ambrose makes reference to an interpretation taken from Philo's Questions and Answers, 1.14. (FC 42, 303 note 9).

[398]See Philo, Allegorical Interpretation of Genesis, I. XXXI.97-98. Loeb 226, 211.

Bearing the aforementioned in mind, there are several instances where Augustine appears to echo Philo, while Ambrose's interpretations as found in *De paradiso* are different. While this may be suggestive of a genuinely Philonic influence, it may also bear witness to a more generalized North African exegetical tradition.

The first possibly Philonic influence is found in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.IX.12.[399] Augustine is attempting to understand the meaning of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil from Gen. 2:17. In a highly allegorical fashion, reminiscent of Philo, [400] Augustine describes all trees as representing a spiritual joy.[401]

In *De genesi ad litteram* VIII.XV.33,[402] once again regarding Gen. 2:17, Augustine explains that the tree of good and evil was not intrinsically evil but only became so when Adam touched it with evil intentions[403] In this instance Augustine's understanding is reminiscent of Philo's suggestion that the moral attitude and spiritual orientation of Adam conferred goodness or evil upon the tree.

A third example of possibly Philonic influence is found in *De genesi ad litteram* IX.V.9.[404] Both Augustine and Philo understand the

---

[399]PL 34, 202-203.

[400]Philo Allegorical Interpretation, IXVII. 56. Loeb 226, 183. Philo writes: "The several particular virtues, and the corresponding activities, and the complete moral victories, and what philosophers call...common duties. These [the aforementioned] are the plants of the garden [of Eden]. "

[401]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.IX.12. PL 34, 202-203. He writes: "*Productum autem ex terra omne illud lignum accipimus omne illud gaudium spirituale.*" (We take every tree that the earth produced as every spiritual joy. FC 84, 108)

[402]PL 34, 385. See chapter four, note 130.

[403]*De genesi ad litteram*, VIII.XV.33. PL 34, 384. See Philo, Allegorical Interpretation I .XVII. 62. Loeb 226,187. "Thus wickedness neither is in the garden, nor is it not in it, for it can be there actually, but virtually it cannot."

[404]PL 34, 396.

order of creation in Gen. 2:18 to be indicative of status. Adam's rank was superior to Eve's by virtue of being created first.[405]

A fourth example is found in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XIII.18.[406] Augustine produces an allegorized interpretation of the phrase "*os ex ossibus meis*" from Gen. 2:23 which bears a strongly Philonic imprint. Both authors suggest that bone refers to the inner virtue of strength rather than literal marriage.[407]

To a lesser degree traces of Philo may be evident in Augustine's interpretation of Gen. 2:24. Both Philo and Augustine understand the verse to contain two levels of meaning. Both argue that the verse, at the first level, describes literal human marriage. They differ, quite logically given their historical circumstances and religious perspectives,[408] on the second level of understanding. For Philo the verse is an allegory for sense perception.[409] For Augustine, Gen. 2:24 is prophetic of the Christian Church.

Augustine's repudiation of an interpretation of Gen. 2:21 would also suggest that he was familiar with Philo's understanding of the verse. Philo had argued that the women in Gen. 2:21 functioned as an allegory

---

[405]Philo, Questions and Answers, I.27. Loeb Sup 1, 16. Philo argues that Gen. 2:21, the creation of woman from Adam's rib indicates her being "not equal in honor" with the man.

[406]PL 34, 206.

[407]Philo, Allegorical Interpretation, II.XII.41. "This is bone out of my bones, that is , power out of my powers, for bone is here used as power and strength." Loeb 226,251. Philo suggests that flesh represents feelings.

[408]Philo, the Jewish-Hellenistic philosopher, lived between 20 B.C.E. and 50 C.E.

[409]Philo, Questions and Answers, I.29. Loeb Sup I, 18.

for the five senses.[410]   Adam's sleep represented the unawakened mind.
Wakefulness of the mind was the time of sleep for the senses and
wakefulness of the senses was the time of sleep for the mind. Augustine
introduces his discussion of Gen. 2:21 in *De genesi contra manichaeos*
II.XI[411] by categorically stipulating that woman does not represent the
senses. Augustine expressly repudiates the interpretation again in *De
trinitate* XII.XIII.20.[412]   While rejecting one of Philo's allegories Augustine
appears to adopt another. During the same discussion in *De genesi
contra manichaeos*,[413] sleep from Gen. 2:21 represents hidden wisdom.
Philo also understood sleep as an allegory for wisdom in his Allegorical
Interpretation, II.VIII.25.[414]

 Augustine, Gen. 2:24 and an Exegetical Tradition: Augustine was
not unique in attributing an ecclesially prophetic meaning to Gen. 2:24.
The tradition for such an understanding extended back to Paul in Eph.
5:31-32. including Tertullian, Origen, Ambrose and Jerome, all of whom
understood Gen. 2:24 to prefigure the Church. Origen linked Gen. 2:24

---

[410]Philo, Allegorical Interpretation II. VII.24. Loeb 226, 241. Explaining Gen. 2:21 Philo
writes: "For his (Moses') immediate concern is just this to indicate the origin of active
sense-perception."

[411]PL 34, 205.

[412]PL 42, 1009. Augustine writes: "*sensumque corporis magis pro serpente
intelligendum existimavi*" (I have rather thought that the bodily sense should be
understood to be the serpent. NPNF1 3, 162.)

[413]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XI. PL 34, 205. "*secretore sapientia*"

[414]Philo, Allegorical Interpretation, II.VIII. 25. Loeb 226, 243. Regarding the wisdom of
sleep Philo wrote: "A proof of this is afforded by the fact that whenever we wish to get an
accurate understanding of a subject we hurry off to a lonely spot; we close our eyes; we
stop our ears; we say 'good-bye' to our perceptive faculties." Augustine wrote in *De
genesi contra manichaeos* II.XII.16. PL 34, 205. "*Sed quanto quisque ab istis visiblilbus
rebus in interiora intelligentiae secesserit [hoc est autem quasi obcormiscere], tanto
melius et sincerius illud videt.* " (Rather to the extent that anyone withdraws from these
visible things into the interior realm of the intelligence, [for this is in a sense to fall asleep],
to that extent he sees it better and more clearly FC 84, 112-113.)

and Ep. 5:31-32 in his debate with the pagan philosopher Celsus.[415] Ambrose describes the ecclesially prophetic dimension of Gen. 2:24 in *De fide* I.II.18.[416] In *De viduis* XV.89[417] he attributes this interpretation to Eph. 5:32. Jerome also linked Gen. 2:24 with Eph. 5:31-32. In *Adversus jovinianum* I.16[418] he argued that the Paul understood the Genesis verse as prophetic of Christ's relationship with the church, not as a recommendation for marriage. This tradition is worth noting since, as will be seen in the next section of this chapter, the use of prophecy in connection with Gen. 2:24 was a favorite Augustinian exegetical tactic. That having been said, it is time to move on to section two which is devoted to the analysis of Augustine's exegetical strategies and the frequency of their application to Gen. 2:15-25.

---

[415]See Origen, *Contra celsum* IV.XLIX. PG 11, 1107.

[416]PL 16, 533.

[417]PL 16, 262.

[418]PL 23, 246.

Section 2

Prior to evaluating the level of theological sexism which Augustine manifests in his use of Gen. 2:15-25 another area of analysis needs to be considered. This pertains to Augustine's exegetical practices. There are several reasons why such analysis is important. In order to understand the meaning of any detail one needs to perceive the overall pattern or context. Consequently in order to understand whether or not certain exegetical strategies promote theological sexism it is necessary to understand them from within the overall framework of Augustine's exegetical approaches to Gen. 2:15-25. It is by looking at the broad picture that such patterns may be discerned with regard to theologically sexist interpretations. In doing so hopefully the historical and exegetical circumstances which prompted such theologically sexist exegesis can be highlighted. Consequently this section of chapter four will be devoted to the more global analysis of Augustine's use of Gen. 2:15-25. The discussion will analyze the statistical frequency with which exegetical strategies are employed. It will also trace the chronological development of certain exegetical strategies. Whether or not various strategies and historical circumstances promoted or mediated against theological sexism will be discussed in section three.

Methodological Notes:

For the purpose of calculation in this chapter each time a verse is mentioned counts as one citation. As previously indicated, Augustine occasionally refers to several verses together. For example in *Contra adimantum* III.I Augustine refers to Gen. 2:18, 21, 22 and 24. These have been counted as four citations since four verses are mentioned. This situation arises ten times with regards to Gen. 2:15-25.[419] In other words Augustine cites verses from Gen. 2:15-24, 127 times in 116 contexts.

<u>Exegetical Strategies for Gen. 2:15-25</u>

The following table represents the statistical frequency with which certain exegetical strategies are used to interpret Gen. 2:15-25. The first column lists the exegetical approach. The second column lists the number of citations where this approach is used. Column three translates this raw number into a percentage.

---

[419]*De genesi contra manichaeos,* II.XII.16 & II.XII.17 (Gen. 2:21-22), *Contra adimantum* III.I (Gen. 2:18,21,22,24), *De genesi ad litteram* VIII.XIII.28 (Gen. 2:16,17), *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I.V.6 (Gen. 2:19,20,23), *Enarratio in psalmum* XL.6 (Gen. 2:16,17), *Enarratio in psalmum* LXX.II.7 (Gen. 2:17 twice), *Enarratio in psalmum* CII.6 (Gen. 2:16,17), *Enarratio in psalmum* CXXVI.7 (Gen. 2: 21,22), *Enarratio in psalmum* CXXXVIII.2 (Gen. 2:21,22).

Table 2 - <u>Exegetical Strategies Used for Gen. 2:15-25</u>

Exegetical Strategy	Number of Instances	Percentage of overall citations
Allegory	20	16%
Technical	12	9%
Prophetic	42	33%
Fall	34	27%
Fall/Sex	7	6%
Marriage/Fall/Sex	4	3%
Marriage/Sex	3	2%
marriage	5	4%
Total	127	100%

Detailed descriptions of Augustine's exegesis of Gen. 2:15-25 has already been the subject of section one and will not be repeated here. Rather the focus is upon the frequency with which certain strategies are employed. It is also of interest whether certain strategies occur more frequently during a given period.

<u>Allegory</u>

Augustine used several recurring exegetical strategies while interpreting Gen. 2:15-25. One which was favored, particularly during his earlier writings, was allegory. As indicated in the chart above, in 20 of the 128 citations or 16%, allegory was used to explain the verse. Ten of the allegorical explanations occur in <u>*De genesi contra manichaeos*</u> (389 C.E.). Since only thirteen citations of Gen. 2:15-25 are found in this work,

allegory is obviously the favored technique in countering the literalism of Manichaean exegesis.

During the course of Augustine's life his recourse to allegory diminishes. It is used once in *Sermo* CLI.V.5[420] where Gen. 2:20 is an allegory for the opening of man's spiritual eyes. It is used only five times in *De genesi ad litteram* (401-415 C.E.). In this work Augustine makes 21 citations of Gen. 2:15-25 and expands his exegetical strategies to include various other interpretative categories. [421] Augustine does not use allegory again as an exegetical tool until 419 C.E., in *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I.V.6,[422] written during the course of the Pelagian controversy. In this instance allegory is used in reverse with regards to Gen. 2:19-20, 23. Gen. 3:7 is allegorical since the aforementioned verses are literal. Consequently Adam's eyes could not be opened twice.

There are several allegorical themes which Augustine favors. One theme which recurs with some frequency throughout Augustine's work is the understanding that the male and the female function as an allegory for various aspects of human nature. It is this particular allegorical understanding which is cited by Borresen and Horowitz as mitigating against Augustinian sexism. Woman represents the carnal while man represents the superior rational portion of the human which must govern the inferior animal or carnal appetites.[423] Occasionally the carnal

---

[420]PL 38, 817.

[421]The fall or the fall and the sexual disorder it caused accounts for 5 citations. Four times technical explanations are used. Once the theme of marriage and sex is employed. Six times the verses are understood as prophetic. See *Appendix IV* for the specific references in *De genesi ad litteram* and Migne.

[422]See *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I.V.6 ., PL 44,417, where Augustine uses allegory to explain Gen. 2:19-20,23.

[423]See *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XI.15 (PL 34, 204), II.XI.16 (PL 34, 205) three citations, II.XIII.18 (PL 34, 206),

element varies in its allegorical representation. In *De genesi ad litteram* VI.XII.20[424] the earth portion of man is like the animals thereby representing the carnal. In *De trinitate* XII.XIII.20[425] "*adjutorium simile ille*" (as helpmate similar to himself) refers to some portion of the human mind. Regardless, Augustine never divorces the female element of the allegory from the male. Both represent some aspect of a shared humanity.

In several instances the trees of Eden are allegorical. In *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.IX.12[426] trees represent spiritual joys and the tree of life represents the discernment of good and evil. It is an understanding Augustine repeats in *De genesi ad litteram* VIII.XV.33.[427]

Sight, too is allegorical. In *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXI.40[428] the opening of the eyes of the first parents is spiritual rather than literal. The same holds true in *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I.V.6.[429]

Some allegorical explanations are used only once. Sleep is an allegory for wisdom in *De genesi contra manichaeos* XII.16.[430] Bones are an allegory for force and flesh is an allegory for temperance in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XII.18.[431] In *De genesi ad litteram*

---

[424]PL 34, 347. In this instance Augustine argues that only the spirit portion of man is created in God's image.

[425]PL 42, 1009.

[426]PL 34, 203.

[427]PL 34, 385.

[428]PL 34, 446.

[429]PL 44, 417. This allegory is used to explain Gen. 2:19,20, and 23.

[430]PL 34, 205.

[431]PL 34, 206.

VIII.VIII.15-XII.27[432] man's cultivating and guarding refer to spiritual realities.

In several cases the text is illogical when read literally. This invariably prompts an allegorical interpretation. The situation arise twice, both times in response to Manichaean exegesis. In *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XII.17[433] where obviously Eve could have been made out of *limus* (earth) but was not, Augustine argues that Adam's rib is allegorical for the unity of the rational and the carnal aspects of human nature. Also theoretically Adam could have remained awake during Eve's creation but did not. This inconsistency argues for the text being intended as an allegory.

The Fall

A second interpretive category which Augustine used frequently is the fall. This means that in some way, shape or form, the verse is understood within the framework of the fall. This rather broad interpretive strategy accounts for 27% of the citations and is the second most frequently used exegetical understanding. Unlike allegory, it is an approach which continues throughout Augustine's writings with regard to Gen. 2: 15-25 occurring with greater frequency after 396 C.E. To a certain extent the subject matter of the biblical passages may insure that this is so.

---

[432]PL 34, 379-388.

[433]PL 34, 205-206.

The theme first occurs in _De genesi contra manichaeos_ II.XI.15.[434]

In this instance Gen. 2:15 is not understood as pertaining to or describing the fall, rather the nature of man's work in paradise must be understood in light of the fall.

Most frequently the thematic link between death and the Fall is made in reference to Gen. 2:17. This first occurs in 394 C.E., with _Ex epistola ad romanos_ LIII,[435] where Augustine uses the curse of death accruing from the fall to explain Gen. 2:17. The same exegesis recurs five times in _Enarratio in psalmum_ (396 C.E.),[436] once in _De diversis quaestionibus octoginta tribus_ II.I.4,(397 C.E.)[437] in _Contra faustum_ I.III,(400 C.E.)[438] in _De peccatorum meritis et remissione_ I.II.2 and I.XVI.21(412 C.E.),[439] and in _In joannis evangelium_ XXII.6[440] from 408-413 C.E. In _Sermo_ XCVII.II.2[441] Augustine stipulates that pride which caused the fall is also the cause of the death predicted in Gen. 2:17 while in the _Enchiridion_ XXV[442] from 421 C.E. death and the fall are once again combined with Gen. 2:17. Augustine returns to this theme four

---

[434]PL 34, 204.

[435]PL 35, 2075.

[436]_Enarratio in psalmum_ XXXVII.26 (PL 36, 411), XLVII.9 (PL 36, 539), LXVIII.II.11 (PL 36, 861), LXX.II.2 (PL 36, 892), LXXIII.25 (PL 36, 945).

[437]CCSL XLLIV, 62-63.

[438]PL 42, 208.

[439]PL 44, 109 & 121.

[440]PL 44, 149.

[441]PL 38, 590.

[442]PL 40, 243.

times in *De civitate dei*.[443] Augustine's last references to Gen. 2:15-25 found in *Contra secundam juliani* written between 429 and 430 C.E.[444] also link the fall and the curse of death.

In *De genesi ad litteram*. (401-415) the category of the fall plays a prominent role where it is used four times. [445] Once Gen. 2:17 is linked with the curse of death.[446] Once Adam is responsible to conveying God's injunctions to Eve.[447]

On six other occasions in the *Enarratio in psalmum* Gen. 2:16-17 attest to the primordial health and goodness of God's creation.[448] Flaws in creation as consequently the result of the fall. Twice in *De genesi ad litteram* the issue is once again the goodness of God's creation.[449]

In 412 C.E. the notion of original sin is first employed within the context of the fall. In *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I.XXXVI.67[450] the ignorance of babies attests to their inherently fallen nature since pre-lapsary Adam was not ignorant and could name all the animals in Gen. 2:19. In one of his last references to Gen 2, made in 429-430 Augustine

---

[443]*De civitate dei* XIII.IV (PL 41, 379), XIII.XII (PL 41, 386), XIII.XV (PL 41, 387), XIII.XXII.1 (PL 41, 425).

[444]*Contra secundum juliani* IV.XXXIV (PL 45, 1355) and VI.XXX (PL 45, 1581).

[445]*De genesi ad litteram* VII.XII.28 (twice), VIII.XVII.36, IX.X.16. See Appendix IV for the specific citations and references.

[446]*De genesi ad litteram* IX.X.16. PL 34, 399.

[447]Ibid. VIII.XVII.36. PL 34, 387. This is in reference to Gen. 2:17.

[448]*Enarratio in psalmum* XL.6 (PL 36, 458) twice, II.7 (PL 36, 896) twice, CII.6 (PL 37, 1320) twice.

[449]*De genesi ad litteram*, VIII.XIII.28. PL 34, 383. This chapter contains two citations, Gen. 2:16 and Gen. 2:17.

[450]PL 44, 149.

makes a similar assertion.[451] In 421 Augustine, once again refers to original sin in *Contra julianum* I.V.18.[452] In this instance Basil's reading of Gen. 2:17 is cited as proof that the Fathers of the church have always held with the notion of original sin.

Twice Augustine links the fall and free will. In *De genesi ad litteram* IX.XIV.24[453] animals follow God reflexively since they have no "*voluntatis arbitrio*" or free will. In *De correptione et gratia* XII.33[454] (426-427) Gen. 2:17 is used to support the notion of free will.

The Fall and Sexuality

There are several sub-themes which combine the notion of the fall with a second category. In the first, which accounts for 6% of the citations, the fall is linked with the disorder of concupiscence in human sexuality. This interpretation occurs invariably with regard to Gen. 2: 24-25. These verses function as proof texts that pre-lapsarian humanity experienced no embarrassment with regard to uncontrolled motion in their members.. The first example of this interpretation is found in *De genesi ad litteram* XI.I.3[455] in 401-414 C.E. It is also found in *Sermo* CII.V.5.[456]. and it recurs with some frequency during the Pelagian period where it is taken up twice in *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* written (419

---

[451]*Contra secundam juliani* V.I. PL 45, 1432.

[452]PL 44, 652.

[453]PL 34, 402.

[454]PL 44, 963.

[455]PL 34, 430.

[456]PL 38, 817.

C.E.),[457] in *Contra julianum* IV.XVII.82. from 421 C.E.,[458] *De civitate dei* XIV.XVII,[459] and finally in *Contra secundam juliani* IV.XLIV.[460]

The Fall, Sexuality and Marriage

A second sub theme links the fall with marriage and sexuality. This combination occurs four times accounting for 3% of the citations. Once again the Pelagian crisis provides the historical context. The first time the combination occurs is in 419 C.E. with *De nuptiis et concupiscentia*.[461] Here Augustine introduces the understanding that Gen. 2:24 cannot be used to argue that post-lapsarian sexual relations, even within marriage, are not tainted by the sin of concupiscence. In *Contra secundam juliani* produced ten years later, Augustine twice suggests that Julian has misinterpreted Gen. 2:25 when he argues that pre-lapsarian marriage included *libidinem* (sexual passion).[462]

Marriage

Marriage itself constitutes a third interpretive category. It is used 4% of the time. Gen. 2:21 is understood as pertaining to the divinely ordained intimacy in the married relationship in *De bono conjugali* I.1

---

[457] *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I.V.6 (PL 44, 417) & II.IX.22 (PL 44, 448).

[458] PL 44, 781.

[459] PL 41, 425.

[460] PL 45, 1364.

[461] *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II.XXXI.53 (PL 44, 467) and II.XXXII.54 (PL 44, 468).

[462] *Contra secundam juliani* II.LX (PL 45,1168) and III.LXXIV (PL 45, 1279).

produced in response to Jovinian.[463] (401 C.E.) A year earlier Augustine has used Gen. 2:24 to prove the indissolubility of marriage in *De consensu evangelistrarum* II.LXII.121.[464] In *Contra duas epistolas pelagianorum* I.V.9[465] written in 420 C.E during the height of the Pelagian controversy, Gen. 2:24 is used to support the divine institution of marriage. The Pelagians have suggested that idea of original sin besmirches the goodness of marriage, a notion which Augustine disputes. This is reiterated in *Contra julianum* II.X.20[466] written a year later and in *Contra secundam juliani* II.LVII[467] (429-430 C.E.).

Marriage and Sexuality

Marriage and sexuality constitute a sub-theme accounting for 2% of the citations. Two citations pertain to woman's role as helpmate. In *De genesi ad litteram* IX.III.5[468] Gen. 2:18 is cited with Gen. 1:27 as proof that woman is to help man with procreation. In 421 C.E. with his *Contra julianum* II.VII.20,[469] Augustine reiterates this understanding. In *Sermo* CCCXLIX.III.3[470] Augustine uses Gen. 2:24 to argue that sexual relations within marriage are a divine concession.

---

[463]PL 40, 373.

[464]PL 34, 1135 .

[465]PL 44, 554.

[466]PL 44, 712.

[467]PL 45, 1167.

[468]PL 34, 395.

[469]PL 44, 688.

[470]PL 39, 1530.

Prophecy

A fourth exegetical strategy understands the scriptural passage to be prophetic. Included in Augustine's practice of prophetic exegesis are both typology and testimonia. However Augustine's use of prophetic exegesis is considerably broader than these aforementioned terms would indicate. Texts are not only prophetic of the New Testament but also of subsequent passages of the Old Testament. Furthermore they are prophetic of social arrangements and events which occur in the real world.

Augustine uses prophecy as an exegetical strategy 33% of the time, which accounts for 42 citations. As such it is his preferred approach. He first uses it in 389 C.E., with *De genesi contra manichaeos* and continues to employ it until 429-30 C.E., in his last literary effort, *Contra secundam juliani* Unlike both allegory and the fall, the use of prophecy is more evenly spread throughout his exegesis of Gen. 2:15-25.

Anti-Manichaean Exegesis: Augustine first broaches the use of prophecy during the course of repudiating Manichaean exegesis in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XIII.19.[471] In this instance Gen. 2:24 is literally prophetic of the social interaction between men and woman. Men will leave their paternal families and cling to their wives. Several years later, in 394-395 C.E., in *Contra adimantum* III.I,[472] Augustine provides specific insight into his earlier understanding of Gen. 2:24. The Manichaeans have used this verse to discredit the Old Testament since it

---

[471]PL 34, 206.

[472]PL 42, 132.

appears to contradict Mt. 19:29, Luke 17:29 and Mark 10:30. Quite obviously marriage cannot be good if only those who forsake family ties will be admitted to the Kingdom of Heaven. Augustine argues that Gen. 2:18, 21, 22, 24, point to deeper prophetic meanings.

During his production of the *Enarratio in psalmum* the following year Augustine was to describe what he considered to be the prophetic intent of Gen. 2:21, 22 and 24. Gen. 2:21 was typological. Adam was Christ and Eve the Church "*in figura*" (in figures).[473] Gen. 2:24 was prophetic of the bond between Christ and the Church.[474] In what would become a consistent pattern, Augustine cites Eph. 5:31-32 as justification.[475]

In *Contra faustum* XII.VIII[476] written two years later Augustine describes the prophetic meaning of Gen. 2:22 &24. Gen. 2:22 is typological wherein Adam represents Christ who produces from his side Eve who represents the Christian Church. Consequently Gen. 2:24 is prophetic of the relationship between Christ and His Church. The justification for such a reading of the verse is Eph. 5:31-32. Augustine was to reiterate this interpretation further on in the same work.[477]

---

[473]*Enarratio in psalmum* XL.10. (PL 36, 461). Also see *Enarratio in psalmum* LVI.II(PL 36, 668). In *Enarratio in psalmum* CXXVI.7 (PL 37, 1672) and CXXVIII.2 (PL 37, 1785) Augustine combines Gen. 2:21 with Gen. 2:22 for the same typological reading.

[474]See *Enarratio in psalmum* XXXVII.6 (PL 36, 400), XLIV.12 (PL 36, 501, LIV.3 (PL 36,629),LXI.4 (PL 36, 730), and CXXXVIII.2 (PL 37, 1785) where Augustine describes Gen. 2:24 as prophetic of the Church.

[475]See *Enarratio in psalmum* LXVIII.II.1 (PL 36, 854), LXXIV.4 (PL 36,949), CXVIII.XXXIX.9 (PL 37,1589), CXXXVIII.2 (PL 1784-1785), and CXLII.3 (PL 37, 1847), where Augustine cites Eph. 5:31-32 as his justification for understanding Gen. 2:24 as being prophetic of the Church.

[476]PL 42, 258.

[477]*Contra faustum* XXII.XXXVII. PL 42, 424.

Implicitly such an exegetical strategy presupposes that the prophetic meaning of the Old Testament can only be understood in light of the New Testament. In *Contra faustum* XII.XXXVIII[478] Augustine was to state this principle explicitly writing: *"Omnia haec in figura contingebant illis; et; Haec omnia figurae nostrae fuerunt"*[479] (All this they seized in figures and all these were figures for us).

Shortly after his debate with Faustus Augustine stared writing his *De genesi ad litteram* . In this work he provides further insights into and justifications for understanding Gen. 2:21-24, as being ecclesially prophetic. Augustine perceives, in the literal description of the creation of woman from man's side, a non logical statement. This illogic suggests that the author's intention was prophetic. Augustine renders the Latin *latus* or side as *os* [480] or bone in order for his explanation to work It is illogical that the weaker woman should be made from the strongest substance in man's body. Since she is not described as being made from the soft *caro*[481] or flesh of Adam, the verse must be prophetic rather than literal. As further explanation of Adam's prophetic ability Augustine describes Adam's sleep in Gen. 2:21 as an ecstasy during which he participates in the angelic court and receives the gift of prophecy.[482] Having received this gift, Adam begins to prophesy the Church in Gen. 2:23.[483] which is reiterated by Paul in Eph. 5:31-32.

---

[478]Ibid., XII.XXXVIII. PL 42, 274.

[479]ibid., XII.XXXVII. PL 42, 274.

[480]*De genesi ad litteram* IX.XIII.23. PL 34, 402.

[481]Ibid.

[482]Ibid. IX.XIX.36. PL 34, 408.

[483]Ibid. IX.XIX.36. PL 34, 408.

Augustine was to consistently interpret Gen. 2:21,22,23 , and 24 as ecclesiologically prophetic until the end of his life. The verses are interpreted in this manner at total of 32 times. In other words they constitute 76% of the total number of prophetically understood texts arising in Gen. 2:15-25. Invariably the justification for such an interpretation was Eph. 5:31-32. This is expressly stated in 10 of the 32 citations.

Rather than list all of the remaining instances wherein Augustine understands Gen. 2:21-24 as ecclesially prophetic, the results have been displayed in the following table. The first column contains all the location of the citation within the Augustinian corpus. It is followed by a column indicating its location in *Patrologia Latina*. The third column indicates which verse from Gen. 2:21-24 is being referred to. The fourth column indicates whether or not Augustine specifically mentions Eph. 5:31-32 as justification for his prophetic exegesis of the preceding citation. All of the citations in the table follow the pattern first found in *Contra faustum* and *De genesi ad litteram* which have been described above. The citations are listed chronologically with the dates provided in brackets after the reference in column one. Those instances which deviate from or supply added details for the exegesis will be described individually following the table.

Table 3 - Prophetic Exegesis of Gen. 2:22 and Gen. 2:24

Location of Citation	PL	Gen. 2:21,22,23,24	Eph 5:31-32
De genesi ad litteram IX.XII.20 (401-415)	34, 400	Gen. 2:22	
De genesi ad litteram XI.XIX.36 (401-415)	34, 408	Gen. 2:24	yes
In joannis evangelium IX.10 (408-413)	35, 1163	Gen. 2:24	
In joannis evangelium IX.10 (408-413)	35, 1163	Gen. 2:21	
In joannis evangelium XV.8 (408-413)	35, 1513	Gen. 2:21	
Sermo CCCXLI.X.12	39, 1500	Gen. 2:24	yes
De civitate dei XXII.XVII (425)	41,778	Gen. 2:21	
De civitate dei XXII.XVII (425)	41, 779	2.22	

There are several instances where Augustine adds to or expands upon his pattern of interpretation for Gen. 2:21-24. *De trinitate* XII.VI.8[484] describes a misuse of Gen. 2:22. Although Adam in this instance may be prophetic of Christ it does not follow that the man, woman and son of Gen. 2 and 4 can be understood to contain the image of the Trinity. In *Contra secundam juliani* II.LIX[485] the relationship of Adam and Eve is not perfectly prophetic of the Church. The Church and Christ do not share any of the rude passions of Adam and Eve.

---

[484]PL 42, 1003.

[485]PL 45, 1163.

On two occasions Augustine provides isolated and unique readings for prophetic verses. In *De genesi ad litteram* IX.XII.20[486] Adam's naming of the animals is described as prophetic although Augustine neglects to explain its prophetic import. In *De civitate dei* XVI.XXVII[487] Gen. 2:17 describes God's first alliance with man, hence it is prophetic all the subsequent alliances in both the Old and New Testament.

Technical

A fifth and final exegetical strategy falls into the category of technical explanations. This includes a number of concrete exegetical tactics, such as etymology, recourse to alternate manuscript versions of a biblical verse, use of grammatical explanations, the use of rhetorical tropes, and the use of Christian doctrine or theology to understand the verse. Augustine was to employ these techniques throughout his descriptions of Gen. 2:15-25. The earliest example is found in *Epistolae ad galatas* in 394 C.E. , the last in *De anima* written in 419 C.E. They account for 9% or 12 of the citations of Gen. 2:15-25.

Augustine introduces what is to be a recurring theme in his technical explanations in *Epistolae ad galatas* 30.[488] It is Hebrew custom, according to Augustine, to use the word wife to signify woman, consequently the Latin *mulier* designates *femina*. Augustine reiterates

---

[486]PL 34, 400.

[487]PL 41, 506.

[488]PL 35, 2126.

this six years later in *Contra faustum* XI.III[489] (400 C.E.) and in *De consensu evangelistrarum* II.XXVII.68.[490] In *Sermo* LII.IV.10[491] Augustine provides a similar explanation whereby *mulier* in meaning *femina* can also include virgin woman.

In *De genesi ad litteram* IX.12.[492] the meaning of a word is the issue once again. *Terra* of Gen. 2:19 should not be interpreted as soil but rather earth thereby referring to the entire world.

A second recurring technical discussion concerns the nature or manner in which God communicated when he is described as speaking. Once again the issue is theological. The Manichaeans have presented the Old Testament has being horribly corrupted, therefore non-authoritative upon the basis of the anthropomorphic representations of God.[493] In *De genesi ad litteram* VII.XVII.37, VIII.XXVII.49 and IX.II.3-4[494] Augustine addresses this issue by illustrating numerous possibilities regarding God's ability to communicate which do not diminish His authority nor the authority of scripture. These have been dealt with in some detail in section one of this chapter under the heading of Gen. 2:16 and will not be repeated here.

On occasion the technical explanation is derived from theological doctrine as is the case in *Contra faustum* XXII.XIV.[495] Since God is truly

---

[489]PL 42, 247.

[490]PL 34, 1111.

[491]PL 38, 358.

[492]PL 34, 393-394.

[493]See *Contra faustum* XXV.I, PL 42, 477-478 for an example of this type of argument.

[494]PL 34, 387 & 392 & 394.

[495]PL 42, 274.

God and not the Demiurge of Manichaean theology, he did not put man in paradise and present him with an impossible command in Gen. 2:16. Sometimes, Augustine notes, theological doctrine requires that certain things be seen and accepted with the eyes of faith. Such is the case in *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* II.XXXV.40.[496] (418 C.E.) wherein the creation of Adam from dust and Eve from his side "*fides credit*" (faith believes).

In *De anima* I.XVIII.29-30[497] the technical discussion revolves around the manner in which the soul is transmitted. Both propagation from Adam or inspiration from God at each birth are presented as possibilities. Although Adam does not say "*anima ex anima mea*" (soul of my soul) in Gen. 2:23 this does not preclude the possibility of propagation. "*Os ex ossibus meis*" (bone of my bone) may be an example of synecdoche whereby a part signifies the whole.

Chronological Development and Historical Influences
on Augustinian Exegesis of Gen. 2:15-25

Augustine's understanding of Gen. 2:15-25 remains surprisingly constant over the course of his life. This does not, however, mean that it was static. Some exegetical strategies are more popular during certain periods. Allegory is found most frequently in Augustine's early exegesis, particularly in *De genesi contra manichaeos.* After 418 C.E. it is not used again in conjunction with Gen. 2:15-25. On the other hand Augustine employs the theological category of the fall as an exegetical theme

---

[496]PL 44, 405.

[497]PL 44, 492.

throughout his work, using it long after he has abandoned the secularly derived allegorical method. On occasion an interpretation will appear only once. For example Augustine's explanation of the *Deus Dominus* from Gen. 2:15 occurs uniquely in *De genesi ad litteram*. VIII.XI.24.[498]

It is Augustine's use of prophetic exegesis which provides some tantalizing hints about its historical development. Augustine first introduces the possibility of prophetic meaning in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XIII.19.[499] Gen. 2:24 is literally prophetic of the marriage. Consequently marriage, contrary to Manichaean belief, is good and divinely ordained. This explanation does not appear to satisfy his Manichaean interlocutors since the issue is taken up again in *Contra adimantum* III.I.[500] For Adimantus, Mt. 19:20, Lk. 17:29 and Mk. 10:30 clearly contradict Gen. 2:24. Even if marriage had been considered good in some unenlightened period, the same does not hold true in light of the New Testament. Augustine expands his description of the prophetic arguing that it points to a deeper meaning. Gen. 2:24 is prophetic not merely of marriage but of a spiritual reality. Five years later in his debate with the Manichaean Faustus,[501] this deeper spiritual meaning is described for the first time as the birth of the Church. While subsequent works such as *De genesi ad litteram* IX.XII.20,23[502] and IX.XIX.36[503] provide added rationale for a prophetic interpretation, the

---

[498]PL 34, 383.

[499]PL 34, 206.

[500]PL 42, 132.

[501]*Contra faustum* I.III. PL 42, 208.

[502]PL 34, 400,402.

[503]PL 34, 408.

prophetic meaning does not alter. Consequently, in order to counteract Manichaean exegesis which understood Gen. 2:21-24 as doggedly literal, Augustine shifted exegetical paradigms to the prophetic. The development from the bald assertion that the text is prophetic to the later sophisticated interpretation and justification takes approximately eleven years.

This brings the analysis of Augustine's exegetical strategies to a close. Before moving on to the final section of this chapter where the level of theological sexism which Augustine expresses will be evaluated, the situation thus far will be briefly summarized. Augustine's interpretation for given verses remains relatively constant. While he may expand upon an exegesis discussing new literal or spiritual elements he never reverses or repudiates a previous understanding. It is evident that Augustine's preferred exegetical strategy was prophecy. Roughly 30% of Augustine's interpretations understand the verse in question as prophetic of some future event, frequently the institution of the Church. Almost invariably Augustine understands Gen. 2:24 as ecclesially prophetic. In doing so he follows a long tradition. There are, however, tantalizing suggestions that his arguments for the prophetic nature of scripture stem from his experiences with Manichaean exegesis. The prophetic link is the glue which holds the New Testament and Old Testament together, a notion which was disputed by the Manichaeans. As seen above, the vast majority of the verses are understood within the context of Christian theology. The nature of the Fall is a favored category, followed closely by variations upon the themes of marriage, and disordered sexual relations. The underlying hermeneutical thread seems to be Augustine's foundational understanding which stipulates that scripture enjoins love

and condemns lust. Disorder is engendered by lust, while the Christian way of life promotes love.

Section 3

Theological Sexism in Augustine's Understanding of Gen. 2:15-25

In the preceding section as full an understanding as possible of Augustine *qua* exegete within his own historical horizon has been produced. Having done this, it is time to move on to the question of theological sexism. Now a late twentieth century question can be addressed to the fourth and fifth century texts.

Evaluating Theological Sexism

Four questions have been formulated to facilitate the evaluation of theological sexism. 1. Is the order of creation indicative of a divine plan concerning gender relations? 2. Is the subordination of women divinely sanctioned? 3. Is the patriarchal family divinely sanctioned? 4. Are these texts used in any way which either explicitly or implicitly sanctions female inferiority and/or subordination?

Before embarking upon the details of the various texts, there are several comments which need to be made. There are verses from Gen. 2:15-25 which are never interpreted in a sexist manner. The issue for Augustine has nothing to do with the relationship between the sexes. Consequently Gen. 2:15-17 and 24-25 are never understood in an obviously sexist manner. There is the possibility that woman's identification with the church as opposed to Christ in Gen. 2:24 might be construed to indicate to a subtly sexist bias. However there is also the possibility that this interpretation is reflective of the social context of early

house churches. This will be discussed further on. The remaining
citations of Gen. 2:18-23 are occasionally understood in obviously sexist
terms. It is also equally evident, that Augustine also interpreted these
texts neutrally. Statistically speaking the texts where Augustine obviously
assumes or argues for the subordination of women occur very
infrequently. They make up an extremely tiny portion of all the citations of
Gen. 2:15-15 accounting for eight out of 127 references or a mere four
percent. [504]

<center>Sexist Use of Texts from Gen. 2:15-25</center>

Since there are so few interpretations which fall into this category
the following section will be organized in chronological order, from
earliest interpretation to latest. In other words, interpretations of Gen.
2:15-25 which appear to answer any of the aforementioned questions,
will be discussed in their historical order of appearance in Augustine's
writings.

The earliest obviously subordinationist interpretation is found in *De
genesi contra manichaeos* II.XI.15.[505] The verse in question is Gen. 2:18
and the issue is the type of helpmate (*adjutorium*). Augustine
understands Gen. 2:18 in light of I Cor. 11:3. The Pauline text obviously
assuming patriarchal marriage states: "*Caput enim viri Christus, et caput
mulieris vir*" (For Christ is the head of man and man is the head of
woman). For Augustine it was God's intention that Adam rule over

---

[504]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XI.15 (PL 34, 204), II.XI.16 (PL 34, 205) three times,
II.XIII.18 (PL 34,206), *De genesi ad litteram* IX.V.9 (PL 34, 396), IX.XIII.23 (PL 34, 402).

[505]PL 34, 204.

something. That something is "*animalem partem suam*" (his animal part).
Woman represents this animal portion of the human being. It could be
argued that such a gendered anthropology was part of Augustine's
cultural baggage and he has used it without reflection. However
Augustine continues with his allegory. God intentionally created woman
as a pedagogical device so that man would understand the necessity of
ruling of the "*corpus servilem*" (servile body) since "*rerum ordo subjugat
viro*" (the order of things made her subject to man).[506] When this natural
order is disrupted "*perversa et misera domus est*"[507] (the home is
perverse and miserable).

In Augustine's defense it should be pointed out that such an
interpretation could be viewed as a step up. Philo had suggested that
woman represented sense perception.[508] Augustine was specifically to
reject such a reading in *De trinitate* XII.XIII.20.[509] on the grounds that this
would make her like the animals. Since scripture had stated "*adjutorium
simile ille*" woman's similarity had to reside in her shared humanity
consequently in some portion of the mind common to all humans.

Augustine continued his reflections on human nature with his
discussion of Gen. 2:19 in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XI.16.[510]
Once again man's *ratio* made him superior to the *appetitum animae*
(soul's appetites) which God intended to be symbolized by the woman. It
was within this context that Augustine referred to the power of the act of

---

[506]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XI.15. PL 34, 204. FC 84, 111.

[507]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XI.15. PL 34, 205.

[508]Philo, Allegorical Interpretation II.VII-VIII, Loeb 226, 241-243.

[509]PL 42, 1009.

[510]PL 34, 205.

naming. Adam's naming of the animals is an indication of his superiority over them. Further on in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XIII.18[511] Augustine once again refers to the act of naming, this time in relation to Eve. He argues that man represents the superior virtues which Augustine describes as "*prudentia rationalis*" (the prudence of reason). This allegorical reading is justified through the act of naming. Augustine writes: "*vocavit ero mulierem suam vir, tanquam potior inferiorem.*" (The man named his woman, his inferior).[512]

While Augustine obviously understands the act of naming as indicative of superiority he does not employ this interpretation for Gen. 3:20. Since there are numerous instances wherein Augustine quite clearly assumes male superiority, this is probably the result of oversight rather than intention.

When Augustine tackles Gen. 2:21-22 in *De genesi contra manichaeos*[513] II.XII.16 he focuses upon the order of creation. I Cor. 11:3 "*Tunc enim ordinatissime caput mulieris viri est, cum caput viri es Christus qui Sapientia est Dei*" (For the man is the head of the woman in perfect order, when Christ who is the Wisdom of God is head of the man),[514] provides the divine sanction for man being created first. The fact that woman was created from man rather than from earth, serves as further indication that she represents carnal concupiscence to Adam's reason. Being created from the first human she represents part of every human and not merely those of the same gender.

---

[511]PL 34, 206.

[512]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XIII.18., PL 34, 206., FC 84, 114.

[513]PL 34, 205.

[514]PL 34, 205. Also see FC 84, 113.

There would seem to be some slightly illogical reasoning governing the various allegories surrounding *terra* or *limus* which may also have some bearing upon the issue of theological sexism. In *De diversis quaestionibus octoginta tribus* LXV[515] (388-395 C.E.). the *terra* of Gen. 3:19 represents "*cupiditatum, carnalium*" (carnal concupiscence). This would seem to imply that Adam, being made entirely of the substance, should represent carnal concupiscence. Augustine offers no explanation and in all probability his *De genesi contra manichaeos* interpretation had slipped his mind when he was formulating his answer in the subsequent work. Since the tractate was a transcription of oral discussions with Augustine, which extended over a seven year period, it is entirely possible that Augustine merely used what seemed expedient in the heat of discussion. It is also possible that the transcriber misunderstood.

In *De genesi ad litteram* IX.V.9[516] written approximately fifteen to twenty-five years later than *De genesi contra manichaeos* Augustine once again focuses upon the type of helpmate constituted by woman. Augustine asks the following rhetorical question. "*Aut si ad hoc adjutorium gigendi filios, non est facta mulier viro, ad quod ergo adjutorium facta est*" (Now if the woman was not made for the man to be his helper in begetting children, in what was she to help him?).[517] The apparently baffled Augustine suggests that if God had intended woman to be a solace against solitude he would have been better served to create

---

[515]PL 40, 60. Leaving the tomb meant leaving carnal vices.

[516]PL 34, 396.

[517]*De genesi ad litteram* IX.V.9. PL 34, 396. ACW 42, 75.

"two male friends"(*duo amici*). [518] It is within this context that Augustine turns once again to the order of creation. He writes: *"nec ad hoc retinendum ordo defuisset, quo prior unus, alter posterior, manime si posterior ex priore unus, alter posterior, maxime si posterior ex priore creaetur sicut femina creata est"* (There would have been proper rank to assure this [that the two hypothetical men were not confused about who was the leader] since one would be created first and the other second, and this would be further reinforced if the second were made from the first, as was the case with the woman.)[519]

Once again quite clearly Augustine understands the order of creation as indicative of superiority and inferiority. What is of added interest is the second portion of his statement. It hints at an almost Lernerian understanding of the verse. The reversal of the natural order of procreation, whereby woman is physically given life from the man's body indicates her natural inferiority to him.

In *De genesi ad litteram* IX.XIII.23[520] Augustine makes one final overtly sexist comment. He is laying the groundwork for his argument that Gen. 2:19-22 were intended by God to be prophetic, not only literal. Since he will eventually argue that Eve functions typologically for the church, Augustine asks the following rhetorical question: *"ut denique osse detracto, in cujus locum caro suppleretur? Num enim non potuit ipsa caro detrahi ut inde congruentius, quod si sexus infirmior, mulier*

---

[518]Susan E. Schreiner has already pointed this out in "Eve, the Mother of History; Reaching for the reality of History in Augustine's Later Exegesis of Genesis," in Genesis 1-3 in The History of Exegesis: Intrigue in the Garden, ed. G. A. Robbins, Studies in Women and Religion vol. 27 (Lewiston/Queenston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1988), p. 153. Schreiner writes that Augustine's ideal companion is closer to Alypius than Eve.

[519]*De genesi ad litteram* IX.V.9. PL 34, 396. ACW 42, 75. See chapter 4, pp. 138-139.

[520]PL 34, 402.

formaretur?" (And that a rib be removed and flesh supplied to fill the empty space? Could not rather flesh have been removed more appropriately for the formation of the woman, who belongs to the weaker sex?)[521]

Theological Sexism

As previously indicated, a number of questions have been formulated in order to assess the level of Augustine's theological sexism. The first question pertained to the order of creation. It asked: Is the order of creation indicative of a divine plan concerning gender relations?. The answer is overwhelmingly yes. The order of creation is given a divine imprimatur with I Cor. 11:3 in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XI.16. Augustine reiterates this more forcefully in *De genesi ad litteram* IX.V.9 where he explicitly describes the order of creation as determinant of one's rank.

The second question was: Is the subordination of women divinely sanctioned? Again the answer is overwhelmingly yes. Gen. 2:18 is understood in the light of I Cor. 11:3. Man is naturally the head of the woman. This is the natural order of things, the reversal of which results in unhappiness. Augustine's allegory about human anthropology is unintelligible if a patriarchal marriage relationship is not assumed. Furthermore God intentionally employed the example of a patriarchal marriage as the most appropriate allegory to illustrate human nature.

---

[521]PL 34, 402. ACW 42, 85-86.

The third questions asked: Is the patriarchal family divinely sanctioned? Once again the answer is yes. The patriarchal marriage is the paradigm for understanding gender relations. It is God's intention that the relations between the two genders follow this pattern. In fact the primacy of this arrangement is so unquestioned, that it can also be used as an allegory as previously noted. As such Augustine obviously assumes that the metaphor is beyond question and furthermore was employed be the Holy Spirit in scripture precisely because of its unassailability.

The fourth question asked : Does Augustine understand these verses in any manner, aside from the aforementioned, which would implicitly or explicitly suggest an inferior status for women? The answer to this question is also yes. There are two themes which attest to woman's inferior status. The first is the act of naming which is an indication of superiority over the named. What is implied in *De genesi contra manichaeos* IIIXI.16 with regard to naming of the animals is made explicit in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II. XIII.18 in the naming of the wife.

The second is the use of the female to symbolize the non-rational element, and inferior virtues in the human psyche. While Augustine is certainly an improvement upon exegetes such as Philo, his anthropology is still solidly Neo-Platonic, a fact which has been worked out in great detail in the work of Kari Borrenson, Mary Cline-Horowitz, Jean Laporte, Rebecca Weaver and Prudence Allen.[522]

---

[522]See Prudence Allen, R.S.M., The concept of Woman; The Aristotelian Revolution, 750 B.C.-A.D. 1250 (Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing company, 1997), pp. 218-235.

As suggested in the introductory discussion it is possible to read Augustine's Christ/Church, husband/wife allegory as representative of theological sexism. Given Augustine's divine sanctioning of patriarchal marriage a strong case can be made to suggest that the allegory is intentionally employed because of its subordinationist element. In understanding how a wife is subordinate to her husband, the reader will comprehend the dynamics of the relationship between Christ and the Church.

While all of the aforementioned may be true there are several qualifiers which need to be added. As noted in the conclusion to section one of this chapter, this particular interpretation is not unique to Augustine. He is following a long tradition of Christian writers stemming from the apostle Paul. While the interpretation may have strongly sexist overtones, Augustine, in using it is merely following Christian tradition.

The second qualifier stems from recent historical and sociological research. Margaret Y. MacDonald, in her recently published, Early Christian Woman and Pagan Opinion,[523] notes that marriage metaphor may have been intended as a much more concrete historical description of the ecclesial realities of the early church than modern readers assume. Early church life was centered in private homes, traditionally the sphere of woman. She writes: "As is made clear by the appropriation of household language to express church identity in both its local and universal manifestations, the private home could be used as a symbol for the public entity."[524] In other words, rather than divinely sanctioning the

---

[523]Margaret Y. MacDonald, Early Christian Women and Pagan Opinion: The Power of the Hysterical Woman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 183-248.

[524]Ibid., p. 234.

220.

patriarchal marriage, marriage language was used since it reflected the historical ecclesial reality of the early church.

This leads to a few concluding remarks about Augustine's use of marriage language as an ecclesial metaphor before we move on to chapter four and the analysis of Gen. 3. While MacDonald may be correct in her assessment about the inception of ecclesial marriage language, Augustine is no longer living in the world of house churches. The exegetical tradition into which Augustine falls, may have dimly preserved a historical memory of primitive Christian ecclesiology, however there is no indication that Augustine is aware of this. While the earliest Christian writers may have intended merely to describe a historical reality, Augustine clearly understands the application of patriarchal marriage language to Church structure as divinely intended. God intentionally employs the metaphor in a prophetic way in Gen. 2:23-24 so that from this unshakable truth humans will understand Christian ecclesiology. For the metaphor to work the reader must understand the power relationships of the patriarchal household.

Chapter Five

Augustine on Eve's Sin

This chapter will analyze Augustine's understanding of Gen. 3, the story of the entry of sin into creation. As with Gen. 2:15-25 it will describe Augustine's exegetical strategies and their links to his exegetical precepts. Given the subject matter of the texts under consideration, it will come as no surprise that 51% of Augustine's citations deal with the Fall. Augustine insists that the cause of the Fall is solely and uniquely human pride. It will become obvious that Augustine's understanding of the entry of sin into the world is not gender specific. Sin entered through humans hence both Adam and Eve share equally in the Fall. While Augustine's theology of the Fall is less violently misogynist, it is not devoid of sexism. It will also become evident Augustine once again assumes the primacy of patriarchal marriage. This functions implicitly in his understanding of the subordination of the female element of the psyche to the masculine *ratio* and explicitly in the subordination of the historical female to her husband.

As with the previous chapter, this chapter will be divided into three sections. The first will describe Augustine's interpretation of Gen. 3 verse by verse. The second section will be devoted to analyzing the overall pattern of exegetical strategies which Augustine uses in relation to this text. The third section will evaluate the level of theological sexism which Augustine manifests in his use of Gen. 3.

Historically, Gen. 3 has been haunted by interpretations which understand woman as the cause of sin in the world. To varying degrees

the text has been used to justify female subordination. Prior to embarking upon the analysis of Augustine's use of the text, a brief introduction to the historical contours of the tradition of Gen. 3 is appropriate. Furthermore, Gen. 3 has a bearing upon the theological doctrines of the Fall and original sin, both of which are popular areas of research for Augustinian scholars. Given the subject matter under consideration, a somewhat larger corpus of research exists regarding elements of Augustine's use of Gen. 3 than that of Gen. 2:15-25. A brief résumé of these will also be included in this introduction.

Gen. 3, Woman's Sin

In the Sistine Chapel, Michelangelo produced an illustration of Genesis three.[1] Eve was depicted receiving the forbidden fruit from the serpent, whose reptilian body coiled around the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. The serpent, unlike its post-lapsarian genus, had a woman's head and torso. The picture graphically illustrated the link between the female element and the fall of humanity.

This link has proved historically both unfortunate and tragic for women. The tale of Eve's seduction of Adam into sin, and the subsequent expulsion of the first parents from paradise has been used to sanction female subordination. The understanding that Eve is responsible for the fall is an exegesis which finds biblical precedence in Sirach 25:24 (From a woman sin had its beginning and because of her

---

[1] Richard Marshall, Witchcraft: The History and Mythology, (China: Saraband, 1995), p. 22 for photo of this painting.

we all die)[2] and 1 Tim. 2:14 (and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor).[3] Tertullian, with his usual rhetorical flare, interprets Genesis 3 similarly, when he describes woman as "*diaboli janua*" (the devil's gate) and the "*prima desertrix*" (first deserter) of divine law.[4]

There was also an alternative interpretive tradition which mediated against subordinationist readings. Carolyn Gifford relates the story of Judith Sargent Murray, of Massachusetts, who attempted in 1790 to argue against the prevailing understanding that "Eve's disobedience in the Garden of Eden had caused the Fall and provoked God to decree women's subordination to man in punishment for her sin."[5] Murray suggested that both Adam and Eve had sinned, however Eve was motivated by the laudable desire for knowledge, while Adam committed sin by his weak attachment to a woman.[6] Murray was not the only countervailant voice. Gerda Lerner describes a thousand year old tradition of biblical interpretation which included less well known writers

---

[2] As found in the Revised Standard Version (New York: William Collins Sons & Co., Ltd. 1973).

[3] Ibid., These are the only two instances in the Bible where woman is made responsible for the entry of sin into the world. See. Linda M. Maloney, "Pastoral Epistles," in Searching the Scriptures: A Feminist Commentary , vol. 2, ed. E. Schüssler Fiorenza (New York: Crossroad, 1993), p. 370.

[4] Tertullian, *De cultu feminarum* I.1. PL 1, 1419.
    See Daniel L. Hoffman, The Status of Women and Gnosticism in Irenaeus and Tertullian, Studies in Women and Religion, vol. 36 (Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1995), pp. 145-207. Hoffman argues that despite this particular reference in *De cultu feminarum* Tertullian was far less misogynist than is customarily assumed.

[5] Carolyn De Swarte Gifford, "American Women and the Bible: The Nature of Woman as a Hermeneutical Issue," in Feminist Perspective on Biblical Scholarship ed. Adela Yarbro Collins (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985), pp. 12-13. Murray wrote a tractate entitled "On the Equality of the Sexes" in response to a male friend who had argued for female subordination based upon the scriptures.

[6] Ibid., p. 13.

such as Isotta Nagorola (1418-66 C.E.),[7] and Jane Anger (1589).[8] Later the American, Sarah Grimké (1792-1872) understood God's curse as simple prophecy.[9] God was not condoning or sanctioning but rather predicting what would happen. Grimké's understanding was reminiscent of Thomas Aquinas who had produced a similar interpretation for Gen. 3. Cribbing from Augustine[10] he was to argue that there were two types of subjugation, pre-lapsarian and post-lapsarian. Pre-lapsarian was characterized by a superior making use of an individual for the individual's benefit. Post-lapsarian subordination, which was the consequence (not punishment) of sin, was servile. Aquinas describes it as a superior making use of a subject for the superior's benefit.[11]

Modern feminists have approached Genesis 3 in several ways. Post-Christians such as Mary Daly cite the story as proof of the perversion, and mythic reversals which Christianity promotes against women. Anne Gardner, from the anthropological perspective, produces a similar understanding. She argues that the Yahwist tradition (Gen. 2:4b-3) refers to the historical period when the Israelites were overcoming the

---

[7]Gerda Lerner, The Creation of Feminist Consciousness, (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1993), pp. 146-147. Isotta engaged in an exchange of letters with the Italian humanist Ludovico Foscarini concerning Adam and Eve's responsibility for the Fall. Isotta argues that Adam not Eve received the command. Furthermore Adam received a far worse punishment in death than Eve did in painful childbirth.

[8]Ibid., pp. 150-151. Anger argued that women were more excellent than men in being produced from superior matter. (Christine de Pizan made a similar interpretation in The City of Ladies I.9.3., almost 200 years earlier.) Furthermore Eve was the first to repent her sin.

[9]Ibid., p. 161.

[10]De genesi ad litteram XI.XXXVII.50. PL 34, 450.

[11]Aquinas, Summa Theologicae, Ia.92.2. Here Aquinas describes two types of subjugation, one which is 'servilis' slavery introduced after sin and the other which is 'oecomonica vel civilis' (economic and civil). This secondary sort would have existed before sin and is the category into which marriage falls.

Cannanite fertility goddess hence the negative and subordinate representations of the female image. As this epoch receded beyond memory, the Priestly source added his more female affirming version of creation.[12]

Some Christian feminist such as Susan Niditch have attempted to move beyond the heavy theological baggage which accompanies Genesis 3 and focus upon the trickster element of the story. In the recently published Women's Bible Commentary, Niditch describes how the wily trickster serpent throws a proverbial spanner into the works of creation. She writes: "What the author of Genesis does reveal is that man and woman share responsibility for the alteration of their status."[13]

The editors of Searching the Scriptures have opted for a different approach. They have ignored the biblical Genesis 3, in favor of the Gnostic version as found in The Hypostasis of the Archons.[14] Karen King writes that the inclusion of the Book of Norea is justified since "it applies a kind of 'hermeneutics of suspicion, in that it does not approach scripture as fixed or universally authoritative."[15] Furthermore it illustrates that

---

[12]Anne Gardner, "Genesis 2:4b-3: A Mythological Paradigm of Sexual Equality or of the Religious History of Pre-exilic Israel?" pp. 1-18.

[13]Susan Niditch, "Genesis," in The Women's Bible Commentary, ed. Carol A. Newsom and Sharon H. Ringe (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992), p. 14.

[14]See The Nag Hammadi Library in English (New York: Harper & Row Publishers, 1977), pp. 152-160, for the English version of this text, which was translated by Bentley Layton.

[15]Karen L. King, "The Book of Norea, Daughter of Eve," in Searching the Scriptures, vol. 2., p. 66. King points out that the rape of Eve should serve as a caution "that no text, even one as seemingly positive in its attitudes toward women as the Hypostasis of the Archons is pure or safe." (p. 66).
  There is an ongoing debate about whether or not Gnostic literature is truly more affirmative of women and female values. Elaine Pagels argued in The Gnostic Gospels (New York: Random House, 1979) that Gnosticism was more affirmative of women than main stream Christianity. In fact the catholic Church considered this element heretical and threatening. More recently scholars have questioned Pagels' evaluation suggesting she has manipulated texts and been highly selective with her data. See Daniel L. Hoffman, The Status of Women and Gnosticism in Irenaeus and Tertullian, Studies in Women and

"Genesis could be read as a story about powerful female spirituality, not as proof of women's natural inferiority."[16]

Perspectives on Augustinian Understanding of Gen. 3.

A limited number of articles have been produced during the past decade regarding Augustine's understanding of Gen. 3. While several address the issue of sexism most are simply devoted to Augustine's exegetical practices.

As with Genesis 2, feminists have cited Augustine's uses of Genesis 3 within the context of various other issues. The assessment of Augustinian sexism varies depending upon whether the author focuses upon Augustine's earlier or latter interpretations of Gen. 3. Authors analyzing Augustine's earlier interpretations of Gen. 3 present a more positive, less sexist vision of the fall. They focus upon the allegorical or spiritual elements of the exegesis and Augustine's insistence that Adam and Eve represent aspects of a complete human psyche. Authors focusing on Augustine's later works present a more negative image of Augustinian understanding of sin. The later group includes many feminists, such as Elizabeth Clark, Susan Schreiner, Deborah Sawyer and Elaine Pagels.

For the purposes of this discussion the authors have been divided into spiritual versus historical exegesis. Spiritual are those who deal with

---

Religion, vol. 36 (Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1995), pp. 23-77. Hoffman calls this chapter "The Status of Women in Gnosticism." He exhaustively surveys the literature criticizing Pagels' work and refutes her readings of the gnostic texts regarding the status of women.

[16]Ibid.

Augustine's earlier allegorical exegesis of Gen. 3. The historical are those who deal with the physical, or literal events of Gen. 3. Both groups include feminist and non-feminist scholars. Elaine Pagels also addressed the issue of Augustine's understanding of Gen. 3, however she is not primarily concerned with Augustine the exegete. Her interest is the historical trajectory of the notion of human freedom within Christianity rather than interpretation of Augustine. For this reason I have included her in a separate category.

<u>Spiritual Exegesis</u>

Eugene TeSelle has recently produced a short article tracing the Stoic origins for one of Augustine's allegorical interpretations of Genesis. 3. The serpent represents "suggestion," Eve is "delight" and Adam "consent."[17] He notes that feminists view Eve's association with the affections and Adam's with the rational, as a negative representation of the female principle. TeSelle remarks that it could hardly be otherwise since "It was developed by and from the standpoint of males, for whom women were 'the other'..."[18]

Patout Burns has also analyzed Augustine's understanding of original sin in *De genesi contra manichaeos* . For Burns the first parents'

---

[17]Eugene TeSelle, "Serpent, Eve, and Adam: Augustine and the Exegetical Tradition," in <u>Augustine *Presbyter Factus Sum*</u>, *Collectanea Augustiniana*, ed. J. Lienhard, E. Muller and R. Teske (New York: Peter Lang, 1993), p. 341.
TeSelle bases his assessment upon 6 examples of Augustine's use of Gen. 3. See note 2 p. 355.

[18]Ibid., p. 341. TeSelle does not view such sexism as surprising are particularly upsetting since :"The culture...gave males the dominant role." p. 341. He suggests, similar to Daniel Hoffman, that even interpretations by the Gnostics, which did not use this particular allegory were equally sexist. pp. 342-342.

embarrassment at their nudity indicates " the loss of simplicity."[19] The fall

and its consequences are situated in the soul which is, according to

Burns, the theory which Augustine will advance in his subsequent _De_

libero arbitrio[20]

    Roland Teske has discussed the typological spiritual exegesis of

De genesi contra manichaeos . He suggests that Augustine's first man

was spiritual. The serpent made his approach spiritually and the first

couple were not cast out of a physical place but rather cast into an animal

state. Teske writes: "We born after him bear the animal man until we

attain Christ the spiritual Adam."[21]

Historical Exegesis

    Elizabeth Clark has analyzed the development of Augustine's

understanding of the fall in Genesis 3 from his Manichaean to Pelagian

period. She notes that Augustine's perspective shifted from "soaring

allegories"[22] in _De genesi contra manichaeos_   to his earthier speculation

about pre-lapsarian sexual intercourse in _De genesi ad litteram_ . Clark

argues that the exegetical shift was a product of Augustine's response to

Jovinian's accusations of Manichaeanism (circa 400 C.E.) rather than the

Pelagian crisis.[23] Clark, also links Augustine's understanding of original

---

[19]J. Patout Burns, "St. Augustine: Humanity 's Original State," in _Studia Patristica_, vol. XXII (Leuven: Peeters Press, 1989), p. 221.

[20]Ibid., p. 222,

[21]Roland J. Teske, "_Homo spiritualis_ in St. Augustine's _De Genesi contra Manichaeos_," in _Studia Patristica_, vol. XXII (Leuven: Peeters Press, 1989), p. 354.

[22]Elisabeth Clark, "Heresy, Asceticism, Adam and Eve: Interpretations of Genesis 1-3 in the Later Latin Fathers," p. 120.

[23]Ibid.

sin in Genesis 3 with sexual disorder. She writes: "That the sin in Eden affected all later human beings is proved to Augustine by both our unruly sexual members and our sense of shame at sexual intercourse."[24] David Kelly agrees with Clark. He deals tangentially with Genesis 3 and like Clark, argues that Augustine combines *concupiscentia carnis/ libido carnalis*, which is the result of original sin, with disordered sexual excitement "even with one's spouse."[25]

Susan Schreiner argues that the purpose of Augustine's *De genesi ad litteram* is primarily related to history. She writes that Augustine's goal is "to defend exegetically the opening of Genesis as the beginning of God's providential historical plan."[26] It is necessary that Genesis 2 and 3 be historically true if Augustine is going to argue that Genesis 1 is historically true. She continues: "Augustine would not settle for that interpretation which understood paradise allegorically and began history with sexual procreation after expulsion from the garden."[27] The very goodness of creation was at stake and Augustine understood that a "purely allegorical interpretation" of Genesis 1-3 would make "history a mistake."[28]

---

[24]Elizabeth A. Clark, "Vitiated Seeds and Holy Vessels: Augustine's Manichean Past," in Images of the Feminine in Gnosticism, ed. Karen King (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), p. 370. Also see Clark's other articles "Adam's Only Companion: Augustine and the early Christian Debate on Marriage," and "Theory and Practice in Late Ancient Asceticism, Jerome, Chrysostom and Augustine," which are listed chapter 2 note 242.

[25]Kelly, "Sexuality and Concupiscence in Augustine," p. 93.

[26]Susan E. Schreiner, "Eve, The Mother of History: Reaching for the Reality of History in Augustine's Later Exegesis of Genesis," in Genesis 1-3 in The History of Exegesis: Intrigue in the Garden, ed. G. A. Robbins, Studies in Women and Religion, vol. 27 (Queenston, Ontario: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1988), p. 136.

[27]Ibid., p. 155.

[28]Ibid.

Deborah Sawyer contends that Augustine "singles Eve out as having particular responsibility for the Fall." [29] She bases this upon *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XLII[30] wherein she understands Augustine's comment that Adam was "not lead astray" to mean that he was not primarily responsible for the Fall. Elizabeth Clark comments that Adam sinned with his eyes open "because ...he was faithful to a social instinct: he refused to be separated from his only companion."[31]

Pagels on Augustine and Genesis 3:

Perhaps the most well known feminist perspective upon Augustine's understanding of Genesis 3 has been provided by Elaine Pagels' <u>Adam, Eve, and the Serpent.</u> [32] Pagels suggests that Augustine's dark view of human nature, combined with his "own aversion to the flesh,"[33] lead him to see in Genesis 3 proof of man's lack of

---

[29]Deborah F. Sawyer, "Resurrecting Eve? Feminist Critique of the Garden of Eden," in <u>A Walk in the Garden: Biblical, Iconographical and Literary Images of Eden,</u> ed. P. Morris and D. Sawyer, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 136 (Sheffield: JSOT, 1992), p. 280.

[30]Ibid., p. 289, note 17. Sawyer bases her assessment of Augustine, and her translation of *De genesi ad litteram* upon Elizabeth Clark's <u>Women in the Early Church</u> (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1984).

[31]Elizabeth Clark, "Adam's only Companion: Augustine and the Early Christian Debate on Marriage," p. 139. She goes on to argue that Augustine describes Edenic marriage as "a faithful partnership based on love and mutual respect (*inter se coniugum figa ex honesto amore societas...De civitate dei* 26, CCL 48, 449)" p. 162.

[32]Elaine Pagels, <u>Adam Eve, and The Serpent,</u> (New York: Random House, 1988). If the non specialist has any familiarity with Augustinian understanding of Gen. 3 it has usually been provided by Pagels. Her book continues to be sold through the Book of the Month Club, and the Historical Book Club and is easily available in paperback in most book stores. When Pagels' work was first published reviews of her book appeared in <u>Time, McLeans, The Atlantic Monthly, The New York Times</u> among others. She was widely interviewed by various television personalities including Barbara Walters and Bill Moyers.

[33]Ibid., p. 150.

freedom concerning sin. She writes: "Since everyone is conceived, as Augustine argued, through sexual desire, and since sexual desire is transmitted to everyone through the very semen involved in conception... all humankind is tainted with sin 'from the mother's womb.' ..."[34] For Augustine, Pagels continues, pre-lapsarian sex was "like a handshake."[35]

In an article published the same year as her book Pagels wonders: "Why did the majority of Christians, instead of repudiating Augustine's views as idiosyncratic or rejecting them as heretical- embrace them instead?"[36] She suggests that Augustine's theory of sin had profound political implications. It provided a theological paradigm for making religious sense "of the observation that both state and church are as imperfect as those who administer them," and it explained why Christians must "accept and obey both" institutions.[37] For women this produced some unfortunate consequences. Pagels notes that Augustine agrees "three forms of oppression are evils-male domination of women, coercive

---

[34]Ibid., p. 131. Pagels understanding of Augustine's attitude towards sex is based upon the work of Elizabeth Clark, particularly "Vitiated Seeds and Holy Vessels: Augustine's Manichaean Past", Gerald Bonner's "Libido and Concupiscentia in St Augustine," and Peter Brown's "Sexuality and Society in the Fifth Century A.D.: Augustine and Julian of Eclanum,". See note 7, p. 172.

[35]Elaine Pagels, "The Politics of Paradise: Augustine's Exegesis of Genesis 1-3 versus that of John Chrysostom," Harvard Theological Review 78/1-2 (1985): 82. Once again Pagels argues that Augustine's understanding of the fall ran counter to classic Christian tradition. Originally espoused by marginal groups it becomes mainstream in Western theology after Augustine.
    Although Pagels calls her article Augustine's exegesis of Genesis 1-3 her analysis is based primarily upon the Confessiones, De civitate dei, and De peccatorum meritis et remissione. Although her analysis of Augustine's understanding of original sin may be correct, it is perhaps somewhat optimistic to describe the work as "Augustine's exegesis."

[36]Elaine Pagels, "Adam and Eve and the Serpent in Genesis 1-3," in Images of the Feminine in Gnosticism, ed. Karen King (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988), p. 417-418.

[37]Ibid., p. 420.

government, and slavery," however he views them as "utterly necessary evils-because of original sin."[38]

Pagels' analysis of Augustine's interpretation of Genesis three is based primarily upon his debates with Julian of Eclanum.[39] during the course of which Augustine cites Genesis 3 eleven times.[40] Since Augustine makes over 208 over references to Genesis 3, including two extended attempts at exegesis in *De genesi contra manichaeos* and *De genesi ad litteram*, Pagels' use of texts would appear somewhat limited. In fairness to Pagels, she is less concerned with Augustine the exegete, than in making a case for the eventual triumph of Augustinian theology over the "classical proclamation concerning human freedom, once so widely regarded as the heart of the Christian gospel."[41] She is attempting to prove that Augustine's negative assessment of the flesh and his dismal theory of original sin as found in his late writings have become the predominant understanding of Genesis 3 in Western culture.[42]

---

[38]Ibid., p. 419-420.

[39]Chapter six of her book _Adam Eve, and The Serpent,_dealing with Augustine negative veiw of nature and human nature is based entirely upon *Contra julianum* and *Contra secundam juliani* . See pp. 172-175.
    Dealing with Augustine negative attitudes towards sex, Pagels cites *De unico baptismo,Sermo* 355,2, *De moribus ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus manichaeorum* , *De civitate dei* , *Confessiones,* and *De peccatorum meritis et remissione*. See pp. 167-172.

[40]Appendix IV, pp. 26-27.

[41]Pagels, Adam, Eve and the Serpent, p. 126. Pagels also argues that the Donatists and Pelagians who believing in human freedom continued this ancient Christian tradition. Eventually ironically both groups came to be regarded as heretics.

[42]Ibid., p. 150 "Augustine's pessimistic views of sexuality, politics, and human nature would become the dominant influence on western Christianity, both Catholic and Protestant and color all western culture, Christian or not, ever since. Thus Adam, Eve, and the serpent-our ancestral story- would continue, often in some version of its Augustinian form, to affect out lives to the present day."

Section 1

Augustine on Genesis 3

Having briefly described the current debate of modern scholars concerning Augustine's understanding of Genesis 3, it is time to move on to Augustine himself. As with Gen. 2:15-25 it will become evident during the course of the analysis, that Augustine's use and interpretations remain relatively constant during the course of his lifetime. Once again there is a general shift from allegorical to spiritual exegesis, however both strategies continue to be used throughout his life. Only once does Augustine directly attribute an exegesis to another author, the author in question being Jerome. However, Augustine exhibits traces and hints of other exegetes and exegetical traditions as he did with Gen. 2:15-25. There are echoes of Origen and strong indications of a shared Philonic tradition. Tertullian is less frequently a source while Augustine borrows more often from Ambrose. Of particular interest is Augustine's understanding of Gen. 3:6. This verse is frequently cited as proof that women bear the responsibility for the entry of sin into the world. In this instance Augustine does not follow Patristic tradition.

Augustine cites directly or alludes to some portion of Genesis 3, 208 times throughout the corpus of his work. Gen. 3:1 is cited eighteen-teen times while both Gen. 3:2, and 3:3 are mentioned only twice. Gen. 3:11, 3:13, 3:20 and 3:24 are each quoted three times. Gen. 3:12, 3:14, and 3:21 accumulate four citations each, while Gen. 3:10 is referred to five times. Six allusions each are made to Gen. 3:16, and 3:22. 3:9 and 3:18 have seven references each and Gen. 3:4, 3:15 and 3:17 get eight.

Gen. 3:7 and 3:8 receive sixteen and ten citations respectively. Gen. 3:5 is referred to twenty times and Gen. 3:6 is mentioned twenty-four times. The most frequently cited verse is Gen. 3:19 which is alluded to on thirty-two occasions.

The following is a tabular illustration of Augustine's use of Gen. 3. The first column indicates the verse cited, the second the frequency of citation and the third, the percentage of the total number of references to Gen. 3.

Table 4 - Frequency of the Use of Gen. 3

Verse	Number of Citations	Percentage of Total
Gen. 3:1[43]	18[44]	9 %
Gen. 3.2	2	1%
Gen. 3.3	2	1 %
Gen. 3.4	8	4 %
Gen. 3.5	20	10 %
Gen. 3.6	24	12 %
Gen. 3.7	16	8 %
Gen. 3.8	10	5 %
Gen. 3.9	8	4 %
Gen. 3.10	5	2 %
Gen. 3.11	3	1 %

[43]Note that when Augustine alludes to the entire story I have calculated this as a citation of Gen. 3:1. I have not added the implicit reference to the other verses into the totals.

[44]Note that this number does not include the two instances when Augustine merely cites his Vetus Latina manuscript version as found in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.I.2, PL 34, 196-197 and *De genesi ad litteram*. XI.I.1, PL 34, 429-430.

Table 4 - <u>Frequency of the Use of Gen. 3</u> (cont'd)

Verse	Number of Citations	Percentage of Total
Gen. 3.12	4	2 %
Gen. 3.13	3	1 %
Gen. 3.14	4	2 %
Gen. 3.15	8	4 %
Gen. 3.16	6	3 %
Gen. 3.17	8	4 %
Gen. 3.18	7	3 %
Gen. 3.19	32	15%
Gen. 3.20	3	1 %
Gen. 3.21	4	2 %
Gen. 3.22	6	3 %
Gen. 3.23	4	2 %
Gen. 3.24	3	1 %
Total	208	100%

As with the analysis of Gen. 2:14-25 Augustine's use of Genesis 3 will be described verse by verse. The discussion of each verse will be divided into three sections, the first dealing with *De genesi contra manichaeos* , the second with *De genesi ad litteram* and the third with other uses of the text. Each verse will be prefaced with Augustine's version of the biblical citation.

Gen. 3:1

De genesi contra manichaeos :

"*Serpens autem erat sapientior omnium bestiarum, quae erant super terram, quas fecerat Dominus Deus. Et dixit serpens ad mulierem: Quare dixit Deus ne edatis ab omni ligno quod est in paradiso?*" *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.I.2.[45]

Augustine's earliest citation of Gen. 3:1 is found in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XIV.20.[46] His understanding of the verse is allegorical. He writes: "*Serpens autem significat diabolum, qui sane non erat simplex*" (The serpent however signifies the devil who was truly not simple). As the devil he was not in paradise since he previously "*de sua beatitudine ceciderat*" (from his happiness had fallen). Augustine continues by speculating about how the devil could speak to the women who was in paradise when he was not. He suggests that paradise is not a place but a state of *beatitudinis affectum* (blessed love). If, however, paradise should be physical the serpent's approach was definitely *spiritualiter* (spiritual). Augustine bases this understanding on Eph. 2:2[47] and 2 Cor. 2:11.[48] A similar tactic was used with Judas when the serpent spoke not to his eyes but his *cor* (heart).

---

[45]PL 34, 196. See Appendix III for a tri-columnar comparison of Augustine's versions of Gen. 3 as found in *De genesi contra manichaeos*, *De genesi ad litteram* and Jerome's Vulgate.

[46]PL 34, 206.

[47]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XIV.20. PL 34 , 206-207. Augustine writes: "*Apostolus dicit, 'Secundum principem potestatis aeris, spiritus qui nunc operatur in filiis diffidentiae.'...*" (The Apostle says, 'According to the prince of the power of the air, of the spirit who now is at work in the children of disbelief.' FC 84, 116).

Augustine suggests that woman represents the part of the soul which *"quae debet obtemperare rationi tanquam rectori viro."* (which ought to submit to the rational as its ruling husband).[49] He continues by describing the roles played by the man, the serpent, and the woman. He writes: *"Etiam nunc in unoquoque nostrum nihil aliud agitur, cum ad peccatum quisque delabitur, quam tunc actum est in illis tribus, serpente, muliere, et viro."*(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.)[50] The serpent is the *suggestio* (suggestion) which operates through human thought or the physical senses. The woman plays the role of *cupiditas* or desire which is present in all humans. When *ratio viriliter* (reason, manfully) *refrenant cupiditatem* (checks desires) sin is blocked.

Augustine takes up again the question of whom the serpent is intended to represent further on in *De genesi contra manichaeos*. In these instances the agenda is highly polemical and political. In Book II.XXV.38 the serpent is an allegory and prophecy for heretics in general and the Manichaeans specifically. He writes: *"Etenim serpens ille secundum prophetiam, haeretiorum venena significat, et maxime istorum Manichaeorum at quicumque Veteri Testamento adversantur."* (For that serpent taken prophetically signifies the poisons of the heretics and especially of these Manichees and all those opposed to the Old

---

[48]Ibid., PL 34, 207. *"dicit Apostolus: Non enim ignoramus astutias ejus."* (the Apostle says: 'For we are not ignorant of his wiles.' FC 84, 116).

[49]Ibid.

[50]Ibid., II.XIV.21. PL 34, 207. FC 84, 117.

Testament.)[51] In Book II.XXVI.38-40[52] Augustine once again equates the serpent and the Manichaeans.

It is worth noting at this point that Augustine's tri-partite allegory strongly resembles Philo's although the roles of the woman and the serpent are reversed. Philo describes woman as representative of the physical senses while the serpent is presented as desire.[53] As noted in the previous chapter Augustine strenuously objects to women being equated to the senses. Whether or not Augustine was aware that elements of his interpretation were borrowed from Philo is difficult to determine. The problem arises since Ambrose in *De paradiso* XV.73[54] repeats Philo's interpretation but does not attribute it. Consequently Augustine may be borrowing and modifying Ambrose.

De genesi ad litteram :

"Serpens autem erat prudentissimus omnium bestiarum quae sunt super terram, quas fecit Dominus Deus. Et dixit serpens mulieri: Quid quia dixit Deus, non editis ab omni ligno paradisi?" De genesi ad litteram XI.I.1.[55]

---

[51]PL 34, 216-217. FC 84, 134-135.

[52]PL 34, 217-218.

[53]Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis, I.32. Loeb, Sup I, 18. Philo writes: "To me, however it seems that this (the serpent is more cunning) was said because of the serpent's inclination toward passion, of which it is the symbol." translated from Armenian by Ralph Marcus.

[54]PL 14, 329.

[55]PL 34, 429.

Augustine shifts his discussion of Gen. 3:1 from the allegorical and prophetic to the technical in _De genesi ad litteram_. In this instance the concern is understanding how the manifestly evil serpent could be described as wise. The manuscript version Augustine is using, employs _prudentissimus_ (most subtle) but he notes that other Latin versions use _sapientissimus_ (most wise).[56] Augustine speculates that the wisdom of the serpent is not derived from its animal nature but rather its possession by the spirit "_id est diabolico_" (that is of the devil).[57] Quite obviously this would make the serpent _spapientissimus_ (wisest) of all the animals who merely possessed "_irrationalem animam_ " (irrational souls).[58] Augustine stipulates that the devil was not created evil but rather cosmically prefiguring the sin of Adam and Eve, the fallen angels "_de...suae perversitatis et superbiae merito dejecti sint._" (through their perversity and pride deservedly were ejected [from heaven].[59]

Augustine continues his discussion by suggesting that _astutiorem_[60] (most cunning) which is used by some Latin manuscripts probably better describes the nature of the serpent. Translators who use this word have correctly translated the idea rather than translating, with slavish literalism, the word. Augustine notes that linguistic experts are perhaps better suited to determining the most accurate meaning of the Hebrew text.[61]

---

[56]_De genesi ad litteram_ XI.I.2. PL 34, 430.

[57]Ibid., PL 34, 431.

[58]Ibid.

[59]Ibid.

[60]Ibid.

[61]Ibid., "_Quid habeat hebraea_" (What the Hebrew has).

This leads Augustine into a short digression about whether or not the devil could use the serpent without God's permission. Nothing which is created moves outside of God's good creation without God's knowledge. Consequently Augustine concludes that "*Diabolus non nisi per serpentem tentare permissus*" (The devil is permitted only to tempt through the serpent).[62] Why God should permit this is unclear however Augustine asserts "*non est iniquitas apud Deum*" (there is no iniquity in God).[63]

Incidental Uses of Gen. 3:1

Augustine cites Gen. 3:1 incidentally, fourteen times. The predominant theme is the nature of sin and the inducement to sin in paradise. Eight citations deal with some aspect of this theme. Two citations are devoted to refuting Manichaean exegesis and a further four deal with prophetic texts.

Sin: Augustine reiterates his *De genesi contra manichaeos* tripartite allegory for Adam, Eve, and the serpent four years later in *Sermone domini in monte* I.XII.34 (393 C.E.).[64] Once again Eve represents the *appetitu carnali* (carnal appetite), and Adam the *ratio* (rational) which consents to sin. The serpent is presented more generically as the inducement or persuasion to sin. As in *De genesi contra manichaeos* Augustine focuses upon paradise as a state of being rather than a physical location. Ejection from paradise means removal

---

[62]Ibid., XI.III.5. PL 34, 431.

[63]Ibid., ACW 42, 137.

[64]PL 34, 1246.

"*de beatissima luce justitiae*" (from the most beatific light of justice).[65] In *De trinitate* XII.XIII.20 (401-415 C.E.)[66] Augustine returns squarely to his *De genesi contra manichaeos* understanding whereby the serpent represent the *sensum corporis* (bodily senses).

Six years after writing *De genesi contra manichaeos* Augustine alludes to Gen. 3:1 in *Enarratio in psalmum* XLVIII.II.2 (396 C.E.).[67] He writes that mankind fell "*per superbiam*" (through pride). The same understanding is found in *Enarratio in psalmum* CXXI.6.[68] The disorder of pride however starts with the devil.[69] Referring to Gen. 3:1 in *Enarratio in psalmum* LXVIII.I.9[70] Augustine described the disorder of pride in the following manner: "*Usurpavit sibi diabolus quod non acceperat; perdidit quod acceperat*" (The devil usurped for himself that which had not been given , and he lost what had been given). In *Enarratio in psalmum* LXX.II.2 [71] Augustine merely characterizes God as the *imperator* (emperor) and the devil as the *desertor* (traitor). Later in *In joannis evangelium* XLII.11 (408-413 C.E.)[72] Augustine provides the serpent's

---

[65]Ibid.

[66]PL 42, 1009.

[67]PL 36, 556.

[68]PL 37, 1623.

[69]Without specific reference to Gen. 3:1 Augustine was to describe the Devil in *De genesi ad litteram* as being "*superbia tumidus, et propriae potestatis delectatione corruptus*"(swollen with pride and corrupted by delight in his own powers). See *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXIII.30. PL 34, 441. ACW 42, 155.

[70]PL 36, 848.

[71]PL 36, 892.

[72]PL 35, 1703-1704.

motivation for inducing the first parents to sin. What the devil had lost he envied lesser creatures possessing.

Augustine's description of the serpent's motivation was probably cribbed from Ambrose who wrote in *De paradiso* XII.54: "*Considerabat enim diabolus quod ipse qui fuisset superioris naturae, in haec saecularia et mundana deciderat: homo autem inferioris naturae speabat aeterna. Hoc est ergo quod invidet dicens: Iste inferior adipiscitur quod ego servare non potui?* " (The Devil began to reflect that man was an inferior creature, yet had hopes of an eternal life, whereas he, a creature of superior nature, had fallen and had become part of this mundane existence. This is the substance of his invidious reflection: 'Will this inferior acquire what I was unable to keep?')[73] Ambrose cited Wis. 2:24 (*invidia diaboli mors introivit in orbem terrarum/* through the envy of the devil death came into the world)[74] as the source for this understanding.

Augustine alludes to Gen. 3:1 within the context man's sinful nature in *Contra gaudentium* I.V. (420 C.E.). Augustine repudiates the Donatist penchant for militantly promoting themselves as the purified remnant. He points out that Christians need to persecute *vitiorum* (vices) rather than each other.

Anti-Manichaean Exegesis: Twice Gen. 3:1 is cited within the context of exegetical debate. In *Contra faustum* XXII.XIV (400 C.E.)[75] Augustine describes the Manichaean misuse of Gen. 3:1. Understanding the wiseness of the serpent to be positive, Manichaean exegesis has argued that the serpent opened men's eyes to wisdom.

---

[73]PL 14, 318. FC 42, 333.

[74]Although Augustine does not cites this verse in the context of his exegesis, he was certainly familiar with Ecclesiasticus which might also be the source for his understanding.

[75]PL 42, 406.

This was obviously to man's benefit. The theme is taken up again in *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XIII.17. According to Augustine the Manichees wanted to "*alienare conantur a creatura summi et veri Dei, et alterum ei dare principium, quod sit contra Deum*" (remove him [the devil] entirely from the creatures made by the true sovereign God and to attribute him to another principle which in their account is opposed to God).[76] It is possible that Augustine's insistence that the serpent represented the senses and not wisdom, in his earlier allegorical interpretations from *De genesi contra manichaeos*, may have also been formulated with an eye to anti-Manichean exegesis. Later in *Contra julianum* IV.XI.20 (421 C.E.) Augustine explains that the serpent can be used as symbol of good or evil. While Gen. 3:1 is an example of the serpent being used negatively, Mt. 10:16 (*Astuti ut serpentes*/ be wise as serpents)[77] presents a positive use.

Prophetic Exegesis: Augustine uses the serpent from Gen. 3:1 typologically or prophetically on several occasions. In *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I.II.2 (412 C.E.)[78] the serpent of Gen 3: 1 is the same serpent into which Moses changes his rod in the desert. This in turn is a figure of the crucified Christ. Augustine writes: "*Serpens in deserto exaltatus Christum in cruce pendentem figuravit*" (The serpent raised up in the desert is a figure for Christ hung on the cross). [79] There are echoes of Origen in this rather convoluted exegesis. In Origen's

---

[76]PL 34, 436. ACW 42, 145.

[77]PL 44, 748.

[78]PL 44,145.

[79]Ibid.

Homiliae in exodum IV[80] the rod of Moses also prefigures the crucified Christ. However Origen understands the serpent somewhat differently. It represents wisdom since it is described as *astuti* in both Gen. 3:1 and Mt. 10:16.

Augustine links Eve with Job's wife in *De symbolo* III.10.[81] Like Eve, Job's wife attempts to dissuade her husband from his faith in his God. Augustine takes up the association of Gen. 3:1 and Job 11:10 on two other occasions. In *In epistolam joannis* VI.7 (416 C.E.)[82] the devil sticks to a tried and true method for furthering his goals. He used Eve to poison Adam and employs the same tactic with Job through his wife. Augustine repeats this understanding in *De patientia* XII.9 (418 C.E.).[83]

In conclusion it is worth noting that Augustine does not comment upon, or perhaps notice that the serpent has introduced a reversal of God's command into his question. This bears mentioning since Ambrose includes a detailed discussion of the question in *De paradiso* XII.55, describing the serpent as the one who "*inseruit mendacium* " (inserted a lie).[84]

---

[80]PG 12, 321.

[81]PL 40, 632.

[82]PL 35, 2025.

[83]PL 40, 616.

[84]PL 14, 319.

Gen. 3:2 and 3:3

De genesi ad litteram :

"*Et dixit mulier serpenti. A fructu ligni quod est in paradiso edemus* (Gen. 3:2) *de fructu autem ligni quod est in medio paradisi dixit Deus, Non edetis ex eo neque tangetis illud, ne moriamini* (Gen. 3:3)" *De genesi ad litteram* XI.I.1[85]

Although Augustine provides a scriptural version for Gen. 3:2 and 3:3 in both *De genesi contra manichaeos* and *De genesi ad litteram* , he only comments on the verse in the second work. In this later instance they are cited together consequently I have choosen to discuss them together. I have provided the *De genesi ad litteram* version of the text above. The *De genesi contra manichaeos* version can be found in Appendix IV.

Augustine understands Gen. 3:2-3 to indicate that the woman had properly understood God's commandment. He writes: "*Ideo prius interrogavit serpens, et respondit hoc mulier, ut praevaricatio esset inexcusabilis, neque ullo modo dici posset, id quod praeceperat Deus oblitam fuisse mulierem.*" (The serpent, then first asked the question, and the woman replied, that her transgression would be inexcusable, and no one would be able to say that the woman had forgotten the command of God).[86] Forgetfulness, however, was not justification for the breaking of so important a command since it "*nulla est excusatio*" (is no excuse).[87]

---

[85]PL 34, 429.

[86]*De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXX.38. PL 34, 445. ACW 42, 161-162.

Augustine cites Gen. 3:2 and 3:3 on one other occasion. This occurs in _Sermo_ CLIII.IX.11.[88] The two verses are referred to along with Gen. 3:4 and 3:5 within the context of the cause of the sin. Humanity fell because of its _superbia_ or pride.

Gen. 3:4

De genesi contra manichaeos :

"_Et dixit serpens mulieri: Non morte moriemini_" _De genesi contra manichaeos_ II.I.2[89]

In _De genesi contra manichaeos_ II.XV.22 Augustine asks the question: "_Quo autem modo serpens ille peccatum persuaserit._" (How the serpent persuaded them to sin).[90] The question is of some importance since this obviously has bearing upon human salvation. Augustine cites Gen. 3:4 with Gen. 3:5 in response to this query. Of these verses he writes: "_Videmus his verbis per superbiam peccatum esset persuasum_" (We see from these words that they were persuaded to sin through pride).[91] Augustine concludes that "_solus Deus_" (only God)[92]

---

[87]_De genesi ad litteram_ XI.XXX.38. PL 34, 445.

[88]PL 38, 831.

[89]PL 34, 196.

[90]PL 34, 207. FC 84, 117.

[91]PL 34, 207. FC 84, 118.

[92]PL 34, 208.

247.

can be happy with no one ruling over Him. Augustine was to repeat his assertion about pride in conjunction with these verses on one other occasion. This is found in *Sermo* CLIII.IX.11.[93]

De genesi ad litteram :

"*Et dixit serpens mulieri: Non morte moriemini*" *De genesi ad litteram* XI.I.1[94]

Augustine cites Gen. 3:4 and 3:5 together in *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXX.39, where he attempts to explain why Eve believed the serpent and did not believe God. He suggests that Eve "*non credens posse inde se mori, arbitror quod putaverit Deum alicujus significtionis cause dixisse....*"(did not believe that eating it could bring about her death, I think she assumed that God was using figurative language when He said...).[95]

Incidental Uses of Gen. 3:4

Augustine develops several themes during the course of his incidental use of Gen. 3:4. The first deals with the duplicity of the devil, the second with prophetic exegesis and the third , Adam's free will.

---

[93]PL 38, 831.

[94]PL 34, 429.

[95]PL 34, 445. ACW 42, 162.

Duplicity of the Devil: Although Augustine provides a text for Gen. 3:4, in *De genesi ad litteram* ,[96] which is identical to *De genesi contra manichaeos* , he does not comment upon the verse. The second time he attempts to interpret the verse, he does so in light of Gen. 2:17. In *Enarratio in psalmum* XLVII.9 (396 C. E.).[97] Perhaps with Manichaean exegesis in mind, Augustine explains that Gen. 3:4 proves that the devil lied while Gen. 2:17 represents God's truth. It is a theme he takes up again in *Enarratio in psalmum* LXXIII.25 where he writes: "*Creditus est serpens, contemptus est Deus*"(The serpent is believed and God is held in contempt).[98] In *Sermo* CCXXIV.II.2[99] man chose to follow the Devil's suggestions rather than God's command.

Prophetic Exegesis: In *Enarratio in psalmum* LXXIII.5,[100] Augustine reiterates a theme which had been used already with regard to Gen. 3:1. Gen. 3:4 is understood typologically and allegorically. The serpent of Gen. 3:4 represents death in this instance. Thus Moses turns his *virga* (rod) into a serpent in Ex. 4:4, thereby prefiguring Christ's crucifixion..

Free Will: In *De catechizandis rudibus* XVIII.30[101] (400 C.E.) Augustine cites Gen. 3:4 while describing Adam's sin. In this instance man's own *voluntate* (will) caused his sin, since he allowed himself to be seduced by his wife.

---

[96]"*Et dixit serpens mulieri: Non morte moriemini*" *De genesi ad litteram* XI.I.1. PL 34, 429.

[97]PL 36, 539.

[98]PL 36, 945.

[99]PL 38, 1094.

[100]PL 36, 933.

[101]CCSL XLVI, 155.

Gen. 3:5

De genesi contra manichaeos:

*"Sciebat enim Deus quia qua die manducaveritis ex illo, aperientur oculi
vestri, et eritis sicut dii, scientes bonum et malum"* *De genesi contra
manichaeos* II.I.2[102]

Gen. 3:5 is the third most frequently cited of the Genesis 3 verses.
It accounts for 10% of the overall citations and Augustine mentions it
twenty times throughout his work. The theme with several variations is
remarkably consistent. Gen. 3:5 is cited proof that human pride is
responsible for the Fall. Less frequently Augustine uses the verse
prophetically and as proof of human free will.

Augustine first mentions the verse in conjunction with Gen. 3:4 in
De genesi contra manichaeos II.XV.22. This very first interpretation of
the verse sets the tone for most of the subsequent interpretations. The
first parents *"usurpare voluerunt"* (wanted to usurp) the power of God.
Augustine continues that *"id est contra legem Dei"* (This is against the
Law of God.)[103]

---

[102]PL 34, 196.

[103]PL 34, 208.

De genesi ad litteram :

"*sciebat enim Deus Quonima qua die manducaveritis de eo, aperientur vobis oculi, et eritis tanquam dii, scientes bonum et malum.*" *De genesi ad litteram* XI.I.1[104]

Once again in *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXX.39, Eve's sin is pride. Augustine asks rhetorically regarding Eve's motivation for following the Devil's suggestion: "*Quando his verbis crederet mulier a bona atque utili re divinitus se fuisse prohibitos, nixi jam inesset menti amor ille proprie potestatis, et quaedam de se superba praesumptio, qua per illam tentionem fuerat convincenda et humilianda?*" (How could these words persuade the woman that is was a good and useful thing that had been forbidden by God if there was not already in her heart a love of her own independence and a proud presumption on self which through that temptation was destined to be found out and cast down?).[105]

Incidental uses of Gen. 3:5

Pride: The theme of human pride accounts for the lion's share of citations from Gen. 3:5. In *De fide et symbolo* IV.6. (393 C.E.) Augustine cites the verse as proof that "*sumus lapsi*" (we are lapsed) by *superbia* (pride).[106] Two years later in *De libero arbitrio* III.XXIV.72 (395 C.E.) he writes: "*Superbia enim avertit a sapientia*" (pride therefore has an aversion to wisdom). This is the meaning of "*Gustate et eritis scicut dii*"

---

[104]PL 34, 429.

[105]PL 34, 445. ACW 42,162.

[106]PL 40, 185.

(taste and you will become like the gods).[107] Augustine reiterates that pride caused the fall in *Enarratio in psalmum* LXVIIII.I.9[108] and XC.I.3[109] (396 C.E.). In *Enarratio in psalmum* LXX.II.6,[110] "*homo se extollit*" (man extolled himself) thereby causing the Fall while in *Enarratio in psalmum* LXXIII.18[111] Adam wished to be like God. The pride of the first parents was flattered by the words: "*Eritis sciut dii*" (You will be like Gods) in *Enarratio in psalmum* CXVIII.IX.1.[112] Ten years later in *In joannis evangelium* XVIII.16[113] (408-413 C.E.) the devil offers humanity pride. Augustine writes: "*superbiam homini propinavit*" (He [the devil] offered pride to man). In *Sermo* CLIIII.IX.11[114] Gen. 3:5 is cited with Gen. 3:2-4 as proof that pride caused humanities' fall. In *Sermo* CLXIII.VIII.8 [115] *superbia* caused mankind's fall while in *Sermo* CCLXIV.3,[116] Gen 3:5 proves that men wanted to be like God. Augustine explains the Fall as being *per superbiam* once again in *De civitate dei* XIV.XIII.2, (418 C.E.).[117]

---

[107]PL 32, 1207.

[108]PL 36, 848.

[109]PL 37, 1151.

[110]PL 36, 895.

[111]PL 36, 940.

[112]PL 37, 1522.

[113]PL 35, 1535.

[114]PL 38, 831.

[115]PL 38, 893.

[116]PL 38, 1214.

[117]PL 31, 442. *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XV.19-20. PL 34,436-437, which was finished three years before Augustine wrote this chapter of *De civitate dei*, describes the origin of

Prophetic Exegesis: On several occasions Augustine uses Gen. 3:5 typologically. In *Enarratio in psalmum* LXXIII.5 (396 C.E.) the death dealing serpent of Gen. 3:5 is the serpent appearing from Moses' *virga* (rod) in Ex. 4:4. Augustine describes the images in the following manner: "*Virga in serpente Christus in morte*" (The rod in the serpent [is] Christ in death).[118] In *De trinitate* III.X.20 (401-415 C.E.) the serpent of Gen. 3:5 once again appears in Ex. 4:4.[119]

Augustine is not the first interpreter to link the serpent in Gen. 3:5 with the serpent in Ex. 4:4 . Philo also makes this connection. In Philo's case the serpent signifies pleasure (as it did in Gen. 3:5) from which Moses flees.[120]

Augustine employs a second typology regarding Gen. 3:5 which was almost axiomatic for Patristic exegesis. In *Enarratio in psalmum* CXIX.2 Adam is presented as a type of Christ. As Adam fell by *superbia* (pride) Christ *descendit* (came down) through *misericordia* (mercy).[121]

Free Will: In several instances Gen. 3:5 is used to describe the free nature of the fateful choice which the first parents made. In *Sermo* CCXXIV.II.2[122] Adam and Eve choose to believe the Devil's lies rather

the two cites. The city which is *sanctus* is *socialis* or oriented towards one's neighbor . The other dominated by pride is *privatus* (self-centered).

It would seem that Augustine's insistence that pride was the instigator of the fall is uniquely his. It is not found in Ambrose, who equates the first sin with pleasure. (*De paradiso* XII.54. "*Sed voluptas atque delectatio bene sapiens dicitur, quia et sapientia carnis appellatur sapientia...*" PL 14, 318 (Gratification of pleasure has been fittingly called wisdom because it is called the wisdom of the flesh. FC 42, 332).

[118]PL 36, 933. As described in the previous section devoted to Gen. 3:4, Augustine also cites Gen. 3:4 during this discussion.

[119]PL 42, 880.

[120]Philo, Allegorical Interpretation II. XXIII.90-93. Loeb 226, 283.

[121]PL 37, 1598.

[122]PL 38, 1094.

than God's truth. In *Enarratio in psalmum* CIII.II.10 (396 C.E.) Augustine simply states that the serpent "*Angelus lapsus de caelo*" (a lapsed angel from heaven)[123] lied in Gen. 3:5. Augustine last refers to the verse in *De civitate dei* XXII.XXX.5 (425 C.E.).[124] Once again sin was precipitated by listening to the false words of the serpent.

Interestingly Philo and Ambrose take up a technical point regarding Gen. 3:5 which Augustine has either missed or ignored. The serpent promises that the first parents will be like gods, not like God. The plural found in both the Hebrew and Greek is maintained in Latin with the use of *dii* . Philo suggests that the serpent's use of the plural is prescient of the introduction of polytheism which is manifest in the worship of reptiles and beasts. [125] In *De paradiso* XIII.61 Ambrose makes a similar assertion. He writes: "*In quo licet advertere idololatriae auctorem esse serpentem, eo quod plures deos induxisse in hominum videatur errorem quaedam serpentis astutia.*" (Hence you may note that the serpent is the author of idolatry, for his cunning seems to be responsible for man's error in introducing many gods.).[126] If Augustine remembered Ambrose's comments he did not incorporate them into his own work.

---

[123]PL 37, 1358.

[124]PL 41, 803.

[125]Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis, I.36. Loeb, sup I, 21. Philo describes these as "the most noxious and vile of beasts and reptiles."

[126]PL 14, 324. FC 42, 342.

Gen. 3:6

De genesi contra manichaeos:

"*Et vidit mulier quia bonum est lignum in escam, et quia bonum est oculis ad videndum et cognoscendum et sumpsit fructum de ligno illo, et manducavit, et dedit viro suo; et accepit Adam, et manducavit.*" *De genesi contra manichaeos* II. I.2.[127]

Gen. 3:6 is the second most frequently cited of the verses from Gen. 3. It accounts for 24 or 12% of all of the references. Augustine covers a wide series of topics in reference to the verse, including pride, Eve's motivation for sinning, and Job's wife.

When Augustine introduces Gen. 3:5 in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XV.23 the issue is the nature of Eve's sight. Augustine asks: "*Quomodo videbat, si clausi erant oculi?*"(How was she seeing if her eyes were closed?).[128] Augustine concludes that this does not refer to Eve's physical eyes which obviously were already open in Genesis 2.23. It was with the eyes of "*astuta superbia*" (cunning pride)[129] that Eve saw in Gen. 3:6.

---

[127]PL 34, 196.

[128]PL 34, 208.

[129]Ibid., Augustine may be following Origenian tradition with this interpretation. In *Contra Celsum* VII.XXXIX., PG 11, 1475, Origen says that the eyes of the first parents were physically closed and they initially saw with the eyes of their mind. With Gen. 3:6 Eve's physical eyes are opened and the eyes of the mind which allowed her to see God, were closed.

De genesi ad litteram :

"_Et vidit mulier quia bonum lignum ad escam, et quia placet oculis videre, de decorum est cognoscere, Et sumens, de fructu ejus edit, et dedit viro suo secum et ederunt._" _De genesi ad litteram_ XI.I.1.[130]

In _De genesi ad litteram_, Augustine first broaches Gen. 3:6 by wondering how Adam was persuaded to eat. Perhaps Eve induced him with "_verbo suasorio_" (persuasive words) or by other means which Scripture "_relinquit intelligendum_" (leaves to the imagination).[131] Or perhaps it was not necessary to persuade Adam since he could see that Eve "_non esses mortuam_" (was not dead).[132]

Augustine moves on to the theme of "_Ad qui operti oculi Adami et Evae_"[133] (to what are Adam and Eve's eyes opened?). Augustine's discussion of this question provides some insight into his methods for determining whether or not a text was to be taken literally. He suggests that Gen. 2:23 (_Hoc nunc os de ossibus meis, et caro de carne mea/_ This now is bone of my bone and flesh of my flesh)[134] implies that Adam and Eve had physical sight prior to Gen. 3:6. Otherwise how would Adam recognize Eve's similarity if his eyes were closed? Furthermore if Gen. 2:23 is intended literally obviously Gen. 3:6 is not, since two literal readings would produce a contradiction.

---

[130]PL 34, 429.

[131]_De genesi ad litteram_ XI.XXX.39. PL 34, 445.

[132]Ibid.

[133]Ibid.

[134]_De genesi ad litteram_ XI.XXXI.40. PL 34, 446.

Augustine uses Gen. 3:6 in numerous ways throughout the corpus of his work. The verse is understood prophetically or spiritually, producing several typologies. It is also allegorical and is the subject of several technical expositions. Three major themes are linked with the verse. These are the fall, man's free will and disordered post-lapsarian sexual relations. The verse is also used as proof, as in *De genesi contra manichaeos* and *De genesi ad litteram*, of the first couple's pre-lapsarian physical sight.

Typological Exegesis: Augustine first links Gen. 3:6 with Job 2:10 in *Enarratio in psalmum* XXXIV.I.7 (396 C.E.). Job becomes quasi Christ-like in behavior. Augustine writes: "*Ibi victus est a diabolo per mulierem, hic vicit diabolum et mulierem*" (There [in paradise] he is vanquished by the devil through woman, here [on the *stercore*/ manure] he [Job] vanquished the devil and the woman).[135] Augustine reiterates this theme in *Enarratio in psalmum* XLVII.9,[136] and XCIII.19.[137] In *In epistolam joannis* IV.3 [138] (416 C.E.) Gen. 3:6 is once again linked to Job 11:10. Job sitting on his manure is a type of Adam, while is wife is a type of Eve.

Augustine may have borrowed elements of the Job/Adam/Christ combination from Ambrose since Ambrose also viewed Job as a type of Adam. In *De interpellatione job et david* III.III.8 (383 C.E.)[139] Ambrose

---

[135]PL 36, 286.

[136]PL 36, 539.

[137]PL 37, 1207.

[138]PL 35, 2007.

[139]PL 14, 870.

wrote: "*Sermone deceptus est Adam*" (Adam was deceived by speech).[140] Speech will also constitute the third trial of Job. However the *sermones* or speeches in this case are delivered by Job's friends rather than his wife.

In an isolated case Augustine connects the story of Adam and that of Esau. In <u>*In Ioannis evangelium*</u> LXXXIIII.1 (408-413 C.E.) Esau is presented as a type of Adam. As Adam lost his birthright because of a *pomum* (apple) so Esau lost his for a plate of *lenticulam* (lentils).[141]

<u>Allegorical Exegesis</u>: With <u>*Enarratio in psalmum*</u> LXXXIII.7 Augustine uses his tri-partite allegorical description of sin which was found in his exegesis of Gen. 3:1. The man is the *mente* (mind) and the woman is *desideria carnis* (desires of the flesh). The serpent is no longer sense perception but generically *malus* or evil.[142] Only when the mind acquiesces to the desires of the flesh can evil succeed. In <u>*De trinitate*</u> XII.XII.17[143] (401-415 C.E.) Augustine alludes once again to this anthropology. Both sexes must eat the food, since the part of the human psyche represented by the woman is common to all humans.

<u>Technical Exegesis</u>: Augustine provides a technical description of Gen. 3:6 in <u>*Enarratio in psalmum*</u> XCV.15.[144] Adam's name represents the *orbem terrarum* (whole world) since the Greek letters of his name stand for the four cardinal points of the compass.

---

[140]Ibid.

[141]PL 35, 1824.

[142]PL 37, 1060.

[143]PL 42, 1007.

[144]PL 37, 1236.

The Fall: There are a series of references which deal in some way with the fall. In *De fide et symbolo* X.23 (393 C.E.) Augustine describes the first sin of Gen. 3:6 as "*Mors quippe animae est apostatare a Deo*"[145] (Death of the soul is separation form God). In *Enarratio in psalmum* XLVIII.I.6.(396 C.E.)[146] the devil wanted to trick man via the flesh therefore he used Eve. Eph. 5:8 is linked with Gen. 3:6 in *Enarratio in psalmum* LIX.2 where the *tenebrae* (shadows) described by Paul refer to the sin of Gen. 3:6.[147] In *Enarratio in psalmum* LXX.I.2 Augustine writes: "*Adam non obediendo peccavit*" (Adam not obeying, sinned).[148] In *Enarratio in psalmum* LXXIII.18[149] Adam wishing to be like God eats what his wife offers. Gen 3:6 is an example of the first prevarication which all sinners commit in *Enarratio in psalmum* CXVIII.XXV.5. [150] Gen. 3:6 is cited in *De natura* XXXVII.44[151] (415 C.E.) as proof that original sin is attested to in the scriptures. In *Epistola* CLXXIX.8, written a year later Augustine once again cites Gen. 3:6 as scriptural proof for original sin. To the Pelagian Bishop John of Jerusalem, Augustine writes: "*Eva peccavit; Scriptura hoc prodidit. Adam quoque deliquit.*" (Eve sinned, scripture reports this, Adam also did wrong).[152]

---

[145]PL 40, 194.

[146]PL 36, 548.

[147]PL 36, 714.

[148]PL 36, 877.

[149]PL 36, 940.

[150]PL 37, 1574.

[151]PL 44, 268.

[152]PL 33, 777.

Free Will: Augustine returns to the theme of the free choice of Adam and Eve in _Sermo_ CCXXXIII.II.2.[153] Adam and Eve choose to believe lies rather than the truth of God.

Disordered Sexual Relations: In _De trinitate_ XII.XII.17 (401-415 C.E.) Augustine again broaches the notion that the fall has a sensual element. The eating of the fruit disordered man's soul. It causes man to share the "_senualis animae motus_" (sensual movement of the soul) which "_nobis pecoribusque comunis est_" (is common to us and animals).[154] Augustine continues by commenting that both the man and the woman must eat the food, since the part represented by the woman is common to all humans.[155] In _Sermo_ CLI.V.5 the sensuality of the soul is manifest in the movement of Adam and Eve's sexual organs. This is "_concupiscentia nobis innata et ex primo peccato orta_" (the concupiscence innate to us and springing from the first sin).[156]

Physical Sight: In _De trinitate_ XII.VIII.13 Augustine returns to the theme of the opening of the first parent's eyes. Adam loses _lumen oculorum_, the light of his eyes or divine light only to have the eyes of his conscience opened ("_apertis oculis conscientiae_"). [157] In _De civitate dei_ XIV.XVII [158] Augustine once again stipulates that Adam and Eve's eyes were physically open prior to Gen. 3:6. When Augustine last cites Gen. 3:6 he returns to the theme he introduced almost thirty years earlier. In

---

[153] PL 38, 1108.

[154] PL 43, 1007.

[155] Ibid.

[156] PL 38, 817.

[157] PL 42, 1005.

[158] PL 41, 425.

De nuptiis et concupiscentia I.V.6,[159] the verse is twice cited as proof that the eyes of the first parents were already physically open.

Augustine did not borrow his understanding of Gen. 3:6 from Philo or any of his popularizers. Philo had provided both a literal and allegorical meaning for the verse. Literally woman had priority in sinning since man reigned over all that is good and immortal while woman reigned over all that is mortal and evil.[160] Allegorically woman represented sense perception while the man represented the mind.

Neither did Augustine adopt Tertullian's understanding of Gen. 3:6. In *De cultu feminarum* I.1, Tertullian wrote with rhetorical flourish: "*Tu es diaboli janua, tu es arboris illius resignatrix, tu es divinae legis prima desertrix, ...Tu imagenem Dei, hominem, tam facile elisisti.*" (You are the gate of the devil, you are the unsealing of this tree, you are the first deserter of divine law...you so easily cast down the image of God which is man).[161]

Nor does Augustine follow Ambrose's lead regarding Eve's deception of Adam. Ambrose did not share Augustine's conviction that both parents were at fault in Gen. 3:6. He wrote in *De paradiso* XIII.62: "*Bene praetermissum est ubi decipitur Adam; quia non sua culpa, sed vitio lapsus uxuoris est.*" (Omission is made, and rightly so, of the

---

[159]PL 44, 417.

[160]Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis, I.37. Loeb Sup 1, 22. Philo writes: "the priority of the woman is mentioned with emphasis" since "it was fitting that man should rule over immortality and everything good, but woman over death and everything vile."

[161]PL 1, 1419. ANF 4, 14. Some recent work on Tertullian's sexism has argued that the case has been overstated by feminists. See Daniel L. Hoffman, The Status of Women and Gnosticism in Irenaeus and Tertullian, in Studies in Women and Religion, vol. 36 (Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1995).

deception of Adam, since he fell by his wife's fault and not because of his own).[162]

Gen. 3:7

De genesi contra manichaeos :

"*et aperti sunt oculi eorum, et tunc scierunt quia nude erant; et sumpserunt sibi folia fici, et fecerunt sibi succinctoria*" *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.I.2.[163]

Augustine's initial understanding of Gen. 3:7 is highly allegorical. The opening of the eyes refers to an inner disposition. They are "*oculos astutiae, quibus simplicitas displicet.*"(the cunning eyes, which are displeased with simplicity).[164] They are the eyes of *superbia* (pride) which only derive pleasure from "*fraudulentis simulationibus*"(fraudulent dissimulation).[165] To such perverted eyes the simplicity "*quae nuditatis nomine significata est*" (which was signified by the word nakedness)[166] was embarrassing. Consequently the eyes of cunning sought to complicate primeval simplicity with *folia fici* (fig leaves) which signified the cunning itching of the mind.[167]

---

[162]PL 14, 324. FC 42, 343.

[163]PL 34, 196.

[164]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XV.23. PL 34, 208.

[165]Ibid.

[166]Ibid.

[167]Ibid.

De genesi ad litteram :

"_Et aperti sunt oculi amborum et agnoverunt quia nudi erant, et consuerunt folia fici, et fecerunt sibi campestria_" _De genesi ad litteram_ XI.I.1[168]

In _De genesi ad litteram_ XI.XXXI.40 Augustine once again takes up the issue of the opening of the first parent's eyes. Augustine argues that the opened eyes of Gen. 3:7 must be understood allegorically, however he cautions: "_Nec tamen ideo propter unius verbi translationem totum figurate accipiendum est_" (Nevertheless one could not take the whole passage in a figurative sense on the basis of one word used with a transferred meaning.)[169] Therefore given the context, Augustine argues that "_Cognoverunt quia nudi erant_"(They knew they were naked)[170] was not intended allegorically. He cites Lk. 24:31 (_aperti sunt oculi eorum, et cognoverunt eum_/ Their eyes were opened and they knew him)[171] as an example of a verse which contains both allegorical and literal elements. As with Gen. 3:6 the first portion of the text contains transferred meaning while the second portion is literal. Having argued that the first parents were literally aware of their physical nudity Augustine writes: "_superbo_

---

[168]PL 34, 429.

[169]Ibid. XII.XXXI.41. PL 34, 446. ACW 42, 163.

[170]Ibid., XII.XXXI.41. PL 34, 446.

[171]Ibid.

amore suae potestatis offenderant" (They offended with their arrogant love of their own power).[172]

This leads Augustine into a discussion of *ficulnea succinctoria* or the fig leaf apron.[173] Having lost their *"statu mirabili"* (miraculous state)[174] beyond death and aging Adam and Eve experience sexual desire *"ut succedant nascentia morientibus"*(in order to produce children to replace those who died).[175] Augustine writes: *"Denique illa conturbatione ad folia ficulnea cucurrerunt, succinctoria consuerunt"* (Finally, in this troubled state they hastened to get fig leaves, they sewed aprons together).[176] They did this in order to hide their shame in their sexual organs. Augustine doubts that there is any particular significance to the use of fig leaves. In their panicked condition they were compelled to use whatever material they could find to hide their *"membra prurientia"* (prurient members).[177] Consequently the aprons signify humanities' *"mortalitatis an libidinis"* (mortality or libido).[178]

---

[172]Ibid. Augustine continues in the following chapter *(De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXII.42. PL 34, 446-447) to argue that *libido* (lust, sexual passion) and *mors* (death) result from the Fall.

[173]*De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXII.42. PL 34, 446.

[174]Ibid.

[175]Ibid., PL 34, 447.

[176]Ibid., ACW 42, 165.

[177]*De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXII.42. PL 34, 447.

[178]Ibid., PL 34, 446.

Augustine explores several themes in his incidental use of Gen. 3:7. He touches upon faulty Manichaean exegesis and allegorical exegesis. The predominate issue, however, pertains to the disorder of the sexual members after the Fall.

Manichaean Exegesis: Augustine describes Manichaean misuse of Gen. 3:7 in *Contra faustum* I.III. (400 C.E.). The Manichaeans understood the serpent to be the hero of the Genesis 3. Of this exegesis Augustine comments that they use Gen. 3:7 "*Laudare serpentem quod ei per suum consilium oculos peruit*" (To praise the serpent who by his advice opened their eyes).[179]

Allegorical Exegesis: In *De trinitate* II.X.18[180] (401-415 C.E.)Augustine merely makes reference to the fact that the nature of the seeing described in Gen. 3:7 has proved a thorny exegetical issue. In *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I.V.6[181] (419 C.E) Augustine uses both Gen. 3:7 and Gen. 3:6 in order to stipulate that Eve's eyes were physically opened prior to Gen. 3:7.

Disordered Sexual Organs: The theme of sin producing unruliness in the sexual organs is reiterated in *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* II.XXII.36 (412 C.E.) where Adam and Eve cover their *membra* (sexual organs) after their eyes are opened.[182] In *Sermo* CLXXIV.IV.4[183] Gen.

---

[179]PL 43, 308.

[180]PL 42, 856.

[181]PL 44, 417.

[182]PL 44, 173.

[183]PL 38, 942.

3:7 is used to prove that Adam and Eve are ashamed of their sexual organs. In _Sermo_ CXXIII.I.1[184] the _foliis ficulneis_ (fig leaves) signify sin. Adam and Eve are embarrassed and cover themselves because they can no longer control their _membra_ in _De civitate dei_ XIII.XIII. (417 C.E.).[185] In Book XIV.XVII of the same work, written a year later, Gen. 3:7 describes "_inobedientia carnis suae_" (their disobedient flesh).[186] Further on Augustine once again argues that Adam and Eve are embarrassed by their members after sin since "_id est per libidinem_ " (It is through libido)[187] that sin is initially displayed after the fall.

In _De gratia christi et de peccato originali_ II.XXXIV.39, an anti-Pelagian work produced in 418 C.E., Augustine refines his argument. Gen. 3:7 cannot be used to prove that marriage is bad. To the contrary marriage, as an institution, is good. Sin, in marriage and elsewhere, results from _inobedientia_ (disobedient) members.[188] This lack of control is what caused blushing and embarrassment in the first parents. In 419 with _De nuptiis et concupiscentia_ II.XII.36[189] Augustine made a similar assertion. Further on in the same work Augustine suggests that the _succinctoria_ (apron) or _campestria_ as it is called in some Latin texts, is designed to hide the sex organs hence sin has caused some disruption there.[190] Augustine's last citation of Gen. 3:7 is found in _Contra_

---

[184]PL 38, 680.

[185]PL 41, 386.

[186]PL 41, 425.

[187]_De civitate dei_ XIV.XXII. PL 41, 428. Gen. 3:7 is cited PL 41, 429.

[188]PL 44, 401.

[189]PL 44, 417.

[190]_De nuptiis et concupiscentia_ II.XXX.52. PL 44, 467.

secundam juliani III.LXXIV (429 C.E.). Julian has asserted that the doctrine of original sin is *profanitatis* (profane) and based upon "*testimoniis genitalium pudorem*" (testimony of shame of the genitals).[191] Augustine cites Gen. 3:7 as scriptural sanction to the soundness of the doctrine of original sin.

Augustine's allegorical reading of Gen. 3:7 as found in *De genesi contra manichaeos,* bears within it some echoes of Philo. He too suggested that the knowledge of nakedness represented an interior change.[192] However the most obvious source for Augustine's allegorical interpretation of Gen. 3:7 is Ambrose. In *De paradiso* XIII.63 Ambrose described the open eyes of the first parents as the loss of virtue and *simplicitatem* (simplicity). [193] They realized that they were naked having lost the protective covering of *virtutum* (virtue).[194]

Tertullian produced a more literal understanding of Gen. 3:7 which displayed some similarity to Augustine's later description of sexual embarrassment being caused by the perception of one's nudity. He wrote in *De virginibus velandis* XI that after eating of the tree "*nihil primum senserunt quam erubescendum. Itaque sui quique sexus intellectum tegmine notaverunt.*" (They were first sensible of nothing more than of their cause for shame. Thus they each marked their intelligence of their own sex by a covering).[195]

---

[191]PL 45, 1279.

[192]Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis, I.40. Loeb Sup 1, 23. Philo described this "as strangeness ..conceived by the mind toward the whole world."

[193]PL 14, 324.

[194]Ibid.

[195]PL 2, 904. ANF 4, 34.
Unlike Augustine, Philo did believe that the fig loin-cloths signified something. The fig, being sweet to taste, is symbolically woven together to indicate the

It is worth noting that Augustine did not explore Eve's motivation in offering the fruit to Adam. Perhaps because Eve functions as a part of the whole human psyche this is less of an issue. It was however of concern for Ambrose who expostulated upon it in *De paradiso*. Ambrose argued that Eve invited Adam to eat, thus repeating her sin with full knowledge because "*ne sola de paradiso eiecaretur*" (She did not want to be ejected alone from paradise).[196] Augustine, who is concerned with illustrating that humanity rather than a specific gender is responsible for sin does not use Ambrose's interpretation.

Gen. 3:8

De genesi contra manichaeos :

"*Et cum audissent vocem Domini deambulantis in paradiso ad vesperam, absconderunt se Adam et mulier ejus abante faciem Domini Dei, ad illam arborem quae erat in medio paradiso*" *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.I.2[197]

---

interrelationship of the many sense pleasures. This is also why the leaves were girded around the genitals. Furthermore the roughness of the fig leaves symbolized the pain which followed joy and pleasure. Pleasure in a and of itself was not necessarily evil and even the most violent pleasure which was connected with sexual intercourse was ordained. Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis, 1.41. Loeb Sup 1, 24. Philo wrote that sexual pleasure was "the method ordained by Nature for the reproduction of the type."

Ambrose also thought that the fig lead *succinctoria* (apron) had some symbolic meaning. The leaves signified the choice of the sinner. The fruit of the fig tree represented the fruits of the spirit which were "*caritas, gaudium, pax, patientia, benignitas, modestia, continentia, delictio*" (charity, joy, peace, patience, kindness, modest, continence and love.) Ambrose based his understanding of the twofold symbolism of the fig leaf and fruit on Mich. 4:4 and Prov. 27:18. Se De paradiso XIII.64. PL 14, 325 and VI. 33., PL 14, 306.

[196]Ambrose , *De paradiso*, VI. 33. PL 14, 306.

[197]PL 34, 196.

Augustine's first exegesis of Gen. 3:8 occurs in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XVI.24. Augustine understands God's walking in paradise to represent that "*movebatur in eis praesentia Dei*" (the presence of God moved among them [Adam and Eve].)[198] However God comes at *vesperam* (sunset) since "*ab eis sol occideret*"(for them [Adam and Eve] the sun is setting).[199] In other words Adam and Eve are loosing the "*lux... interior veritatis*" (the interior light of truth).[200] This is graphically illustrated by their hiding from God. Augustine continues that only those who love themselves more than God would ever hide from Him. They hide "*in medio paradisi*" (in the middle of paradise) to indicate their turn to themselves "*qui in medio rerum*" (who [are] in the middle things [of the created order]).[201]

De genesi ad litteram

"*Et audierunt vocem Domini Dei deambulantis in paradiso ad vesperam, et absoncerunt se Adam et mulier ejus a facie Domini Dei, in medio ligni paradisi.*" *De genesi ad litteram* XI.I.1[202]

When Augustine was to deal with Gen. 3:8 in *De genesi ad litteram* some of the allegorical elements from his *De genesi contra*

---

[198]PL 34, 208. FC 84, 119.

[199]PL 34, 208.

[200]Ibid.

[201]Ibid.

[202]PL 34, 429.

manichaeos were discarded for a more literal reading. Consequently in _De genesi ad litteram_ XI.XXXIII.43, God's visit _ad vesperam_ has no special significance beyond the fact "_ea quippe hora tales jam convenerat visitare_"(This had been the hour when God would visit them).[203]

Elements which describe God in anthropomorphic ways continue to be understood spiritually or allegorically. The question which preoccupies Augustine is the manner in which God was heard. Augustine suggests that God communicated in some interior way. This could have been facilitated "_per creaturam_" (by a creature) either "_in ecstasi spiritus corporalibus imaginibus,_" (in an ecstasy of the spirit with corporeal images)[204] or by means of clouds and angels. However when God communicated he did not take a finite visible shape since his _substantia_ is "_invisibilis et ubique tota_"(invisible and omnipresent).[205]

Augustine also comments upon Adam and Eve's impulse to hide. He writes: "_Cum Deus avertit intrinsecus faciem suam, et fit homo conturbatus..._" (When God averted his interior face, and man became confused)[206] the instinct was to hide his shame.

Incidental Uses of Gen. 3:8

Augustine cites Gen. 3:8 in a variety of contexts throughout the corpus of his work. He touches upon two themes. The first is the

---

[203]PL 34, 447. ACW 42, 165-166.

[204]PL 34, 447. ACW 42, 166.

[205]PL 34, 447.

[206]_De genesi ad litteram_ XI.XXXIII.44. PL 34, 448.

meaning of light and the second concerns disobedient sexual organs. On two occasions the verse provides fodder for a technical discussion. Both of the technical explanations were, in all likelihood, a response to Manichaean exegetical strategies.

Light: Augustine take's up the theme of light with regard to Gen. 3:8 in *Enarratio in psalmum* XXXVII.15 (396 C.E.).[207] In this instance God is the light of Adam's eyes. For this reason once Adam had transgressed against God, he hid himself in the shadows. In *Enarratio in psalmum* LXX.I.5[208] it is Adam's doubt of God which prompts him to flee while in *Annotationum in job* Ib.VII (400-401 C.E.) the failing light of Gen. 3:8 represents the hope of afflicted souls whose only relief comes in *mane* or the morning light.[209]

It is also in *Annotationum in job* Ib.VII, that Job is once again presented as a type of Adam. Job, who like a slave longs for the shadow (Job 7:2) reminds the reader of Adam fleeing the Lord. Augustine writes that this is "*singificat absconditio Adae a facie Domini et tectio foliorum de quibus umbra sit*" (signified by Adam's flight from the face of God and the belt of leaves in whose shadow he is).[210]

Technical Exegesis: Augustine cites Gen. 3:8 twice in *De trinitate* (401-415 C.E.). Both instances produce technical discussions about some scriptural point of contention. In the first instance Augustine wonders which manifestation of the Trinity was heard by Adam in Gen. 3:8. He writes: "*Quis erat ergo ille? Utrum Pater, an Filius, an Spiritus*

---

[207]PL 36, 405.

[208]PL 36, 878.

[209]PL 34, 832.

[210]PL 34, 832.

sanctus?" (Who therefore was He? Whether the Father, or the Son or the Holy Spirit).[211] He continues: *"Contextio quidem ipsa Scripturae nusquam transire sentitur a persona ad personam."* (The context, indeed, itself of the Scripture nowhere, it should seem indicates a change from person to person [of the Trinity]).[212] Augustine concludes that possibly scripture has passed over the change. Further on at *De trinitate* II.X.18[213] Augustine cites Gen. 3:8 a second time. Once again the issue is the nature of Adam's perception of God which *"non evidenter apparet"*(is not obvious)[214] from Scripture. Accordingly Augustine stipulates that whatever manner God used to communicate his presence *"invenire difficile est"* (it is difficult to discover)[215] and not the topic of *De trinitate* .

A third technical explanation is found in *Epistola* CXLVIII. IV.14.[216] Here Augustine alludes to Gen. 3:8 and also makes reference to Jerome's *In isaiam* III.I. Jerome is used to buttress Augustine's case against anthropomorphism. Exegetical difficulty arises when anthropomorphisms are understood literally. Augustine argues that spiritual interpretation of scripture, resists the falsehoods of the *"Anthropormorphitae"* (Anthropomorphites)[217] who attribute physical characteristics to God.

---

[211]*De trinitate* II.X.17. PL 42, 856. NPNF1 3, 45.

[212]Ibid.

[213]PL 42, 856.

[214]Ibid.

[215]Ibid.

[216]PL 33, 628

[217]*Epistola* CXLVIII.IV.13. PL 33, 628.

Disobedient members: Augustine's last citation of Gen. 3:8 is found in *Contra julianum* IV.XVI.82[218] (421 C.E.). Here Augustine describes Adam and Eve as hiding from God because they are embarrassed by their nudity.

Augustine was not alone in attributing allegorical meaning to various elements of Gen. 3:8. Philo also understood the middle of the woods in an allegorical manner. In Philo's case the middle represented the center of the mind or the center of the soul.[219] For Philo man's flight to this center meant, as it does for Augustine, man's reliance upon himself.[220]

Similarly both Augustine and Ambrose understood *vesperam* as having allegorical significance. While Augustine optimistically described it as the light, albeit failing, of God, Ambrose understood the last light of the day to mean that it was too late for the sinners. He wrote: "*Quid est ad vesperam, nisi quia culpam suam sero cognoscit.*"[221] (What is in the evening, if not that by which he [the sinner] recognizes his guilt late in the evening.)

Augustine follows a long tradition of writers who understand Gen. 3:8 anthropomorphisms non-literally. Philo also addressed the question of the manner in which God was perceived in Gen. 3:8. While his assertions about God's nature resembled Augustine's,[222] his solution to

---

[218]PL 44, 780.

[219]Philo, Allegorical Interpretation , III.IX.28. Loeb 226, 321. Philo described the mind "which in its turn is the center of what we may call the garden of the whole soul".

[220]Ibid., III.IX.29. Loeb 226, 321. Philo writes man "takes refuge in himself."

[221]Ambrose, *De paradiso* XIV.68. PL 14, 326.

[222]This may mean nothing more than two Neo-Platonists hold the same theory of metaphysics regarding the nature of God.

the problem of God's walking and talking was quite different. God does not actually walk or speak since He is immutable.[223] Adam and Eve had enjoyed this state of immobility prior to the Fall. Once fallen they interpreted their own motion as movement on God's part.[224] God, however, does speak with a divine albeit unheard voice which the prophets perceive. Ambrose also stipulated that God did not physically walk but rather moved "*in mentibus signulorum*" (in the minds of each [person])[225] His understanding of how God spoke was almost identical to Philo's. God spoke not with the voice of the body but with a voice that is heard by the *prophetae* (prophets) and the *fideles* (faithful).[226]

Gen. 3:9

De genesi contra manichaeos :

"*Et vocavit Dominus Deus Adam, et dixit illi: Adam ubi es?*"
De genesi contra manichaeos II.I.2[227]

In *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XVI. 24 Augustine introduces a theme which he maintains relatively constantly regarding Gen. 3:9. God's question regarding Adam's whereabouts is not produced by divine ignorance rather it is intended pedagogically. Augustine writes: "*non*

---

[223]Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis I. 42. Loeb Sup 1, 24. Philo describes God as "stable and immobile as the highest and eldest cause."

[224]Ibid., I. 42. Loeb Sup 1, 25. Philo writes: "they moved of themselves and changed from being immobile"

[225]Ambrose, *De paradiso* XIV.68. PL 14, 326.

[226]Ibid., XIV.69. PL 14, 326.

[227]PL 34, 196.

Deo nesciente ubi esset" (God was not ignorant of where he is) but rather "*cogente ad confessionem peccati*"(He was forcing [Adam] to confess his sin).[228]

De genesi ad litteram :

> "*Et vocavit Dominus Deus Adam, et dixit illi: Ubi es?*"
> *De genesi ad litteram* XI.I.1[229]

Augustine picks up, once again, the theme of God's question in *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXIV.45. Augustine writes: "*Increpantis vox est, non ignorantis*"[230] (the voice is admonishing not ignorant). Augustine goes on to speculate upon the obviously mystical meaning in the order of the transmission of God's communications.[231] God's "*praeceptum viro datum est*" (precepts are given to the man)[232] who then relays them to the woman. Sin on the other hand is from "*diabolo per femina..ad virum.*"(the devil through the woman to the man)[233] thereby reversing natural order. Precisely what the mystical import might be of such a reversal Augustine leaves to his readers' imaginations.

---

[228]PL 34, 209. FC 84, 120.

[229]PL 34, 429.

[230]PL 34, 448.

[231]Augustine writes: "*Haec mysticis significationinus plena sunt*" (These are full of mystical meanings)

[232]Ibid.

[233]Ibid.

Interestingly, the issue of why God does not address his question to Eve also crops up in Philo. He suggested that God's question is directed to the mind of Adam. Eve representing the physical senses is included in the mind and therefore in God's question.[234]

Incidental Uses of Gen. 3:9

Augustine's incidental citations of Gen. 3:9 are solely concerned with the nature of God's question; "*Ubi es*?" When Augustine cites Gen. 3:9 in *Enarratio in psalmum* CXVIII.IX.1 (396 C.E.) he reiterates that God is not requesting knowledge, rather He is asking the question in order to reproach Adam for his *superbia*.[235] In *Contra faustum* XXII.XIV[236] (400 C.E.) Augustine provides some historical background for this focus when he accuses Faustus the Manichaean of faulty exegesis. Faustus has apparently used Gen. 3:9 to criticize God for not knowing where Adam is. In *De civitate dei* book XIII (417 C.E.) the *ubi es* is rhetorical. God so addresses Adam because He wants him to look at what he has done.[237] God also uses the question to announce Adam's death to him.[238]

In *De trinitate* II.X.17[239] (401-415 C.E.) Augustine comments that precisely how God asked "*Ubi es*" is not possible to determine from

---

[234]Philo, Allegorical Interpretation, III. XVI.49. Loeb 226, 333.

[235]PL 37, 1523.

[236]PL 42, 407.

[237]*De civitate dei* XIII.XV. PL 41, 387.

[238]Ibid., XIII.XXIII.1. PL 41, 396.

[239]PL 42, 855.

scripture. It could have been through some physical manifestation or in Adam's mind's eye.

In *In joannis evangelium* XLIX.20 (408-413 C.E.) the "*Ubi es*" of Gen. 3:9 has prophetic and typological implications. It is prophetic of the question asked of Christ which is found in John 11:34 (*Ubi posuistis eum* / where have you put him).[240] Both the old and new Adam are asked the same question. While the first *ubi es* signifies the entry of sin into the world, the second announces the entry of redemption.

Augustine is not unique in understanding God's *ubi es* rhetorically. Philo viewed the question as a threat or reproach.[241] He added that woman was not asked the question since she was the initiator of evil.[242] Tertullian also described God's question as a threat. He writes in *De jejuniis* VI: "*Illa enim pasto homini minabatur*" (For the latter voice was uttering a threat to a fed man).[243] Ambrose viewed the question as a reproof. When God asks "*Adam ubi es? Id est non in quo sed in quibus es...non in quo loco quaero, sed in quo statu.*"(Adam where are you? it is not in where but in what circumstance...not where but what state).[244] Ambrose added: "*in his remedium sanitatis est*" (In this remedy is health) since it prompts the sinner to take stock of himself.

---

[240]*In joannis evangelium* XLIX.20. PL 35, 1756.

[241]Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis, I.45. Loeb Sup 1, 26.

[242]Ibid. Philo wrote: "But the woman He did not consider it fitting to question, although she was the beginning of evil and led him into a life of vileness."

[243]PL 2, 961. ANF 4, 106.

[244]Ambrose, *De paradiso* XIV.70. PL 14, 327.

Gen. 3:10

De genesi contra manichaeos :

"*Et dixit ille: Vocem tuam audivi, Domine, in paradiso, et timui et absondi me , quia nudus sum*" *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.I.2[245]

Augustine provides a very brief treatment of Gen. 3:10 in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XVI.24. He describes Adam's answer to God's question as a "*miserrimo errore*" (miserable error) as if human nudity could be displeasing to the God who created it. He continues: "*Est autem hoc erroris prorium ut quod cuique displicet, hoecetiam Deo displicere arbitretur.*" (It is a distinguishing mark of error that whatever anyone finds personally displeasing he thinks is displeasing to God as well).[246]

De genesi ad litteram :

"*Et dixit ei, Vocem tuam audivi deambulantis in paradiso, et timui, quia nudus sum, et abscondi me*" *De genesi ad litteram* XI.I.1[247]

In *De genesi ad litteram* Augustine introduces his discussion of Gen. 3:10 by speculating upon the possibility that God did, through the use of creatures, appear to the first humans "*in forma humana*" (in human

---

[245]PL 34, 196.

[246]PL 34, 209. FC 84, 120.

[247]PL 34, 429.

form).[248] Adam and Eve did not notice their nakedness until "*post peccatum*" (after sin)[249] when they became ashamed of the motion of their members. This was the reason they hid from God.

<center>Incidental Uses of Gen. 3:10</center>

Augustine cites Gen. 3:10 three other times during the course of his writings. The first mention is found in *De diversis quaestionibus octoginta tribus* LXV[250] (388-395 C.E.) where reference is made to Gen. 3:10 in relation to John 11:1 (the raising of Lazarus). In this instance the verse describes the hiding all sinners do from God. Lazarus functions in this case as a type of Adam. As God called Adam so does Christ call Lazarus.

In *De trinitate* II.X.17[251] (401-415 C.E.)Augustine returns to the issue of the divine mode of communication. He cites Gen. 3:10 with Gen. 3:8-9 in order to explain that it is impossible to determine from Scripture precisely how God communicated with Adam.

In *Contra julianum* IV.XVI.82[252] (421 C.E.) Augustine speculates upon the nature of Adam and Eve's shame. He argues that it was twofold. The first was caused by *concupiscentia* (concupiscence) and the second was *conscientia* (conscience).

---

[248]*De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXIV.46. PL 34, 448.

[249]Ibid.

[250]PL 40, 60.

[251]PL 42, 855.

[252]PL 44, 781.

Augustine's focus, in his later exegesis, on the physical aspect of Adam's nakedness is quite different from both Philo and Ambrose. Philo had argued that Adam's nakedness must be understood allegorically in light of Gen. 3:7. If Adam and Eve were already clothed, their nakedness must pertain to the mind bereft of virtue.[253] Ambrose seems to have borrowed his interpretation of Gen. 3:10 from Philo. In *De joseph patriarcha* V.25 he wrote: "*Ille autem nudus remasit, qui se iterum vestire non potuit singulari spolio virtutis exutus*"(But he [Adam] remained naked: he could not clothe himself again, once he had been stripped of the unique clothing of virtue).[254]

Gen. 3:11

De genesi contra manichaeos :

"*Et dixit Dominus Deus, Quis nuntiavit tibi, quia nudus es, nisi quia ab illa arbore de qua dixeram tibi ex illa sola non manducare ex illa manducasti?*" *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.I.2[255]

Gen. 3:11 is one of the most infrequently cited of all the verses of Genesis 3. Augustine refers to it a mere three times. The first citation occurs in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XVI.24. In this instance the

---

[253]Philo, Allegorical Interpretation, III. XVIII.55. Loeb 226, 337.

[254]PL 14, 684. FC 65, 206. Some commentators suggest that this sermon was produced in 387 C.E. around the period when Augustine was in Milan. Possibly he heard Ambrose deliver it. Others suggest the fall of 388 C.E., as a possible date. If that is the case Augustine had probably returned to North Africa by the time the sermon was delivered. (FC 65, 187).

[255]PL 34, 196.

nakedness of the first couple is not understood literally. In keeping with the allegorical tenor he introduced earlier in his explanation of Gen. 3:10, Augustine writes of man's pre-lapsarian state: "*Nudus enim erat a simulatione, sed vestiebatur luce divina*"(For he was naked of dissimulation, but clothed with the divine light).[256] When man turned away from divine light unto himself, he perceived his nakedness. This was displeasing to him because "*non habet aliquid proprium*"[257] (he had nothing of his own).

De genesi ad litteram :

"*Et dixit illi, Quis nuntiavit tibi quia nudus es, nisi a ligno quod praeceperam tibi tantum ne ex eo manducare, ab eo edisti?*"
De genesi ad litteram XI.I.1[258]

By the time he produced *De genesi ad litteram* the nudity of the first couple had shifted from the allegorical to the literal. Augustine understands God's question as being reminiscent of the procedures followed in courts of law. God interrogates the first couple before "*punire amplius quam illa poena de qua jam congebantur erubescere*" (imposing a greater punishment than that penalty which already caused

---

[256]PL 34, 209. FC 84, 120.

[257]PL 34, 209.

[258]PL 34, 429.

them to feel shame).[259] This initial penalty was experienced "*in membris motum*" (in the movement of the sexual organs).[260]

Incidental Uses of Gen. 3:11

Augustine cites Gen 3:11 once more. This is found in *Contra secundam juliani* V.XVI (429 C.E.). In this instance the first parent's know they are nude because their members as infected with *concupiscentia* or concupiscence.[261]

Gen. 3:12

De genesi contra manichaeos :

"*Et dixit Adam: Mulier quam dedisti mihi, decit ut ederem, et manducavi.*"
De genesi contra manichaeos II.I.2.[262]

Genesis 3:12 is also very infrequently cited by Augustine. Unlike Gen. 3:11 which shifts from the allegorical to the literal, Augustine maintains a consistent understanding of the verse throughout his work. Pride causes the man to accuse the woman and subsequently God who created the woman, for his own sin. The first instance of this interpretation is found in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XVII.25.

---

[259]*De genesi ad litteram*. XI.XXXV.47. PL 34, 44. ACW 42, 168.

[260]PL 34, 448.

[261]PL 45, 1449.

[262]PL 43, 196.

Augustine writes: "*Deinde jam more superbiae in se non accusat quod consensit mulieri, sed in mulierem refundit culpam suam*" (Then as is the custom with pride, he does not accuse himself of having consented to the woman, but pushes the fault off upon the woman).[263] Ultimately Adam accuses God for giving him the woman. Of this Augustine writes: "*Nihil est autem tam familiare peccentibus, quam tribuere Deo vele undecumque accusantur et hoc de illa vena superbiae..*" (Nothing is as familiar for sinners as to want to attribute to God everything for which they are accused as this arises from that vein of pride.)[264] Adam in accusing God has tried to make himself God's equal.

De genesi ad litteram :

"*Et dixit Adam, Mulier quam dedisit mecum, haec mihi decit de ligno et edi*" *De genesi ad litteram* XI.I.1.[265]

Augustine reiterates this understanding in *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXV.47.[266] Of Adam's words, as quoted in Gen. 3:12, Augustine writes: "*Elia superbia!*" (What pride!). Once again Augustine describes the foolishness of man who attempts to attribute to God his own sins. He adds that Adam's logic in Gen. 3:12 makes no sense. With a rhetorical flourish Augustine invokes patriarchal marriage in order to illustrate his point. He writes: "*quasi ad hoc data sit, ut non ipsa potius obediret viro,*

---

[263]PL 34, 209. FC 84, 121.

[264]PL 34, 209. FC 84, 121.

[265]PL 34, 429.

[266]PL 34, 449.

et ambo Deo." (As if she had been given [to Adam] for this purpose [to persuade him to eat] and not rather that she should obey her husband and that both of them should obey God).[267]

Incidental Uses of Gen. 3:12

Augustine cites Gen. 3:12 on two other occasions. Both occur in *De civitate dei* . In Book XIV.XI.2 (418 C.E.) Adam sinned with his eyes open. Augustine writes: "*Non est ille seductus*"[268] (He was not seduced). Regardless Adam attempts to blame the woman for his sin. Augustine cites Gen. 3:12 a second time at *De civitate dei* XIV.XIV.[269] In this instance *superbia* causes Adam to blame Eve for his own sin.

Augustine's suggestion that Adam was not seduced by Eve finds parallels in Philo. Philo had argued that at the literal level the verse meant that it was in woman's nature to be deceived but not in man's.[270] Allegorically, however, the female senses do deceive the masculine mind. Ambrose understood the order of denial to having meaning. Commenting upon the fact that Adam is rebuked first (Gen. 3:11) while Eve was the first to sin Ambrose wrote: "*ut femina erroris causa fuerit, vir pudoris*" (The female furnished the occasion for wrongdoing; the male, the opportunity to feel ashamed).[271]

---

[267]bid., ACW 42, 168.

[268]PL 41, 420.

[269]PL 41, 422.

[270]Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis, I.46. Loeb Sup 1, 26.

[271]Ambrose, *De paradiso* XIV. 70. PL 14, 327. FC 42, 349.

Gen. 3:13

De genesi contra manichaeos :

"*Et dixit Deus mulieri: Quid hoc fecisti? Et dixit mulier: Serpens seduxit me, et manducavi.*" *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.I.2.[272]

Augustine cites Gen. 3:13 a mere three times throughout his work. The first occasion is in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XVII.25. Having described Adam's attempt to lay the responsibility for sin upon God, Augustine moves on to Eve's attempt to blame the serpent. Augustine then comments upon the lack of logic and silliness of the excuses of the first parents in their attempts to deflect guilt. His rhetorical comments assume the primacy of patriarchal marriage. Augustine writes: "*Quasi aut ille sic acceperat uxorem ut ei obtemperaret, et non potius ut ipsam sibi obtemperare faceret; aut illa non poterat Dei praeceptum potius custodire, quam verba serpentis admittere.*" (They act as if he had received his wife in order to obey her rather than to make her obey him, or as if she had not been able to keep God's commandment rather than listen to the words of the serpent).[273]

---

[272]PL 34, 196.

[273]PL 34, 209. FC 84, 121.

De genesi ad litteram :

"*Et dixit Dominus Deus mulieri, Quid hoc fecisti? Et dixit mulier, Serpens seduxit me et manducavi.*" *De genesi ad litteram* . XI.I.1.[274]

In *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXV.48 Augustine notes that Eve, like Adam, also refuses to accept responsibility for her sin and admit her guilt. She blames the serpent and consequently Eve may be "*impari sexu*" (unequal in sex) but " *pari fastu*"(equal in pride or arrogance).[275]

Incidental Uses of Gen. 3:13

In 418 C.E. Augustine cites Gen. 3:13 one last time. In *De civitate dei* XIV.XIV[276] *superbia* caused Adam to blame Eve and Eve to blame the serpent for their sins.

Augustine's insistence that Eve is equally responsible for her sin is quite different from both Philo's and Ambrose's. Having argued that woman was representative of sense perception, Philo concludes the Eve's giving of the fruit to Adam was not an act of free will[277] for as soon as Eve perceived the object so did Adam. While Augustine views Adam and Eve as prevaricating equally, Ambrose suggested that Eve's answer to God's question constituted a confession of her sins. Ambrose wrote:

---

[274]PL 34, 429.

[275]PL 34, 449.

[276]PL 41, 422.

[277]Philo, Allegorical Interpretation III.XIX.60. Loeb 226, 341.

"*Veniabilis culpa quam sequitur professio delictorum*"(guilt [is] pardonable which follows the profession of sin).[278]

Gen. 3:14

De genesi contra manichaeos :

"*Et dixit dominus Deus serpenti: Quia hoc fecisti maledictus tu ab omni pecore, et omni genere bestiarum. Pectore et ventre repes et terram manducabis omnibus diebus vitae tuae*" *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.I.2.[279]

Augustine cites Gen. 3:14 a mere four times throughout the course of his writings. The first citation occurs in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XVII.26. Augustine initiates his discussion of the verse by pointing out that God does not question the serpent. This is because "*nec confiteri peccatum potest, nec habet omnino unde se excuset*" (he cannot confess his sin and has no grounds at all for excusing himself).[280] Consequently the serpent is punished first. Augustine points out that there is not mention of the final condemnation of the Devil which "*ultimo judicio reservatur*" (is reserved for the final judgment).[281] The phrase, "*pectore et ventre repes*"(your will creep on your chest and belly)[282] has allegorical

---

[278]Ambrose, *De paradiso* XIV.71. PL 14, 327.

[279]PL 34, 196.

[280]PL 34, 210. FC 84, 121.

[281]PL 34, 209.

[282]PL 34, 210.

significance Augustine writes that "*Significatur superbia*" (Pride is signified) by the chest and that the belly signifies "*carnale desiderium*" (carnal desire).[283] These are the weapons which the devil uses *decipere* (to deceive).

Augustine cites Gen. 3:14 once again in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XVIII.27. His focus is upon the second portion of the serpent's punishment "*Et terram manducabis omnibus diebus vitae tuae.*"(And you will eat earth all the days of your life).[284] Augustine suggests that this phrase can be understood in two ways. Firstly earth may refer to the devil owning those people "*quos terrena cupiditate deceperis*" (whom you [the devil] have deceived by earthly lust). However the words may also refer to a third type of temptation which is *curiositas* (curiosity).[285] Consequently, those who attempt to understand deep and dark things can be described as eating the earth.

De genesi ad litteram :

"*Et dixit Dominus Deus serpenti, Quia fecitis hoc, maledictus tu ab omnibus pecoribus, et ab omnibus bestiis, quae sunt super terram, super pectus tuum et ventrem tuum ambulabis, et terram edes omnes dies vitae tuae.*" *De genesi ad litteram* XI.I.1[286]

---

[283]Ibid.

[284]PL 34, 210.

[285]Ibid.

[286]PL 34, 429.

Augustine introduces his discussion of Gen. 3:14 in *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXVI.49 with the following words: "*Tota ista sententia figurata est*" (this whole statement is figurative).[287] However the writer has truly recorded the words which were spoken adding only the statement : "*Et dixit Dominus Deus serpenti*" (And the Lord God said to the serpent).[288] Once again Augustine takes up the question of why God does not question the serpent. He concludes that it is pointless to query the animal since the devil, "*qui jam ex peccato impietatis ac superbiae suae igni destinatus fuerat sempiterno*"(who had already been assigned to everlasting fire for his sin of impiety and pride),[289] was merely using the beast. Consequently what was addressed to the serpent was intended for the Devil and to be understood figuratively. The curse of the serpent describes relationship between the devil and the human race since humanity only began *propagari*(to be propagated) after God pronounces these words.[290]

Incidental Uses of Gen. 3:14

Augustine makes one other reference to Gen. 3:14. This is found in *De agone christiano* II (396 C.E.). Here *terra* signifies *cupiditates*(the passions of the world).[291]

---

[287]PL 34, 449.

[288]Ibid.

[289]Ibid., ACW 42, 170.

[290]PL 34, 449.

[291]PL 40, 291.

Philo, before Augustine, had also felt that the serpent's crawling upon its belly was significant. He suggested that the verse is obviously allegorical and that the serpent represented desire. The beast was condemned to crawl on its belly since pleasure lovers overindulged in food and drink.[292] Ambrose produced an identical, although unaccredited, understanding in *De paradiso* XV.74. He wrote: "*Qui sunt qui in utero suo ambulabant, nisi qui ventri et gulae vivunt*"[293](Who are they who move on their stomachs if not those who live for their bellies and gullets.)

<div align="center">Gen. 3:15</div>

De genesi contra manichaeos:

"*Et inimicitiam ponam inter te et mulierem, et inter semen tuum, et inter semen illius. Ipsa tuum observabit caput, et tu ejus calcaneum*"
De genesi contra manichaeos II.I.2.[294]

Augustine initially asks why scripture in Gen. 3:15 is so specific about the fact that no enmities have been set between the man and the serpent but only the woman. This is not because the serpent fails to deceive men since "*manifestum est quod decipit*" " (it is manifest that he deceives them). Furthermore it is not because the serpent can no longer

[292]Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis, I.48. Loeb Sup 1, 27. Philo wrote: "Since the serpent is a symbol of desire he takes the form of lovers of pleasure for he crawls upon his breast and belly, stuffed with food and drink."

[293]PL 14, 329.

[294]PL 34, 196.

deceive Adam in the future since the same can be said of the woman. The author of scripture has framed the text in such a manner since woman exemplifies "*animalem partem*" (the animal part) found "*in uno ...homine*" (in one man). Consequently the verse must be understood allegorically. Augustine writes: "*Signifigantur semine diaboli perversa suggestio; semine autem mulieris fructus boni operis quo perversae suggestioni resistit*" (The seed of the devil signifies perverse suggestion and the seed of the woman the fruit of the good work by which one resists such suggestion).[295]

Augustine alludes to Gen. 3:15 once more in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XXVI.40. In this case the Manichaean and Orphite[296] heretics are "*Ille ergo error pectore et ventre serpit, et terram manducat.*" (that error creeps on its chest and belly and eats the earth).[297]

De genesi ad litteram :

"*Et inimicitias ponam inter te et inter mulierem, et inter semen tuum et semen ejus; ipsa tibi servabit caput, et tu servabis ejus calcaneum.*"

De genesi ad litteram XI.I.1[298]

Augustine does not comment at length upon Gen. 3:15 in *De genesi ad litteram*. He writes that the passage "*figuratum est*" (is

---

[295]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XVIII.27. PL 34, 210. FC 84, 123.

[296]See FC 84, 136, note 181 for discussion of the possibility of these heretics also being the Orphites.

[297]PL 34, 217. FC 84, 136.

[298]PL 34, 429.

figurative).[299] He adds: "*Haec itaque verba quomodo figuris expositis accipienda sim et in illis duobus adversus Manichaeos editis libris de Genesi*" (In the commentary I wrote entitled <u>Two books on Genesis against the Manichees</u>, I have discussed to the best of my ability these words as they are to be understood in a figurative sense).[300]

Incidental Uses of Gen. 3:15

Augustine cites Gen. 3:15 on five other occasions. These are all found in his *Enarratio in psalmum*. In *Enarratio in psalmum* XXXV.18 (396 C.E.) Augustine comments upon pride which will cause the Church to fall. Of Gen. 3:15 he writes: "*Ideo cum cautam faceret dominus Ecclesiam*"(This is how God cautions the Church).[301] In *Enarratio in psalmum* XLVIII.I.6 "*Eva nobis interior caro nostra est*"(Eve is our interior flesh)[302] which is subject to temptation. In *Enarratio in psalmum* LXXIII.16 the serpent of Gen. 3:15 is "*draconum capita*" (the head of the dragon)[303] mentioned in Ps. 73:13. Both signify the origin of sin which is pride. In *Enarratio in psalmum* CIII.IV.6[304] Gen. 3:15 refers to the death of all future generations which is the result of sin. In *Enarratio in*

---

[299]*De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXVI.49. PL 34, 449.

[300]PL 34, 450. ACW 42, 170.

[301]PL 36, 354.

[302]PL 36, 548.

[303]PL 36, 938.

[304]PL 37, 1381.

psalmum CIII.IV.8[305] Augustine cautions against judging others since the serpent is always at one's heel.

Augustine was not unique in his attempt to explain the enmity between the serpent and the woman. Philo also attempted such an explanation He drew the following analogy. As pleasure represented by the serpent is to the senses represented by the woman so passion is to the mind.[306] Since the former are mutually hostile so are the latter. Ambrose also broached the issue by merely pointing out that the enmity between the woman and the serpent indicates that *malitia* (evil) is not *sublata* (removed) from the world.[307]

Tertullian provided a unique understanding for Gen. 3:15. Woman's setting of her heel on the serpent's head referred to her propensity for adorning herself with jewels since gems are taken "*de frontibus draconum*"(from the foreheads of dragons).[308]

---

[305]PL 37, 1383.

[306]Philo, Allegorical Interpretation of Genesis, III.LXV..185. Loeb 226, 427). Philo wrote: "Since therefore, the former pair are mutually hostile, the latter must also be at war with each other." Philo repeats this understanding in Questions and Answers on Genesis, I.48. Loeb Sup 1,27.

[307]Ambrose, *De fuga saeculi*, VII. 43. PL 14, 618. This sermon was written in 387 C.E. Possibly Augustine heard it preached by Ambrose.

[308]Tertullian, *De cultu feminarum* VI. PL 1, 1425.

Gen. 3:16

De genesi contra manichaeos :

"*Et mulieri dixit: Multiplicans multiplicabo dolores tuos, et suspiria tua, et in doloribus paries filios tuos; et ad virum tuum conversio tua, et ille tui dominabitur*"

De genesi contra manichaeos II.I.2[309]

Augustine's initial attempt at understanding Gen. 3:16 is found in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XIX.29. Since animals bear their offspring in pain "*Potest ergo fieri ut etiam in feminis hominibus mortalium corporum sit ista conditio*" (it is possible that this be the condition of mortal bodies even in the females of humans.)[310] Mortality therefore is the great punishment not pain in childbirth. Furthermore "*Erit tibi conversio ad virum tuum et ipse tui dominabitur*"[311] (you will turn to the man and he will dominate you) appears to make no literal sense since most women give birth alone. Even after giving birth women are not easily dominated by their husbands since "*superbae sunt mulieres*" (women are proud)[312] of their achievement. Augustine concludes that Gen. 3:16 must be read with different eyes for the "*Lex enim spiritualis est*" (Law [of God] is spiritual).[313] Woman's turning to her husband refers to the "*pars animae,*

---

[309]PL 34, 196.

[310]PL 43, 210. FC 84, 124.

[311]PL 34, 211.

[312]Ibid.

[313]Ibid. Also see FC 84, 124.

quae carnalibus gaudiis tenetur" (the part of the soul which is held by the glory of the carnal)[314] and willingly submits to the rational in order to conquer bad habits. Consequently *"Ista ergo quae videntur maledicta, praecepta sunt, sin non carnaliter spiritualia legamus"* (Those things which seemed to be curses are commandments, if we do not read those spiritual things in a carnal way.)[315]

Augustine cites Gen. 3:16 a second time in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XXVI.40. Manichaeans have used Gen. 3:15-16 to argue for two creations one evil and one good. Humans are not therefore responsible for sin since it arises *"ad gentem tenebrarum"* (from the nation of shadows).[316] Augustine disputes such an interpretation, alluding to patriarchal marriage by writing: *"sed potius et illud quod regandi habet potestatem in homine et illud inferius quod regendum est ex Deo esse"* (But the part that has the power of ruling in man and that lower part that should be ruled are both from God.)[317]

De genesi ad litteram :

"Et mulieri dixit, Multiplicans multiplicabo tristitias tuas, et gemitum tuum. In tristitiis paries filios, et ad virum tuum conversio tuas, et ipse tui dominabitur" De genesi ad litteram XI.I.1[318]

---

[314]PL 34, 211.

[315]Ibid. FC 84, 124.

[316]PL 34, 218.

[317]PL 34, 218. FC 84, 137.

[318]PL 34, 429.

Augustine's spiritual reading of Gen. 3:16 develops into a second concretely *carnalis* understanding in <u>De genesi ad litteram</u> . XI.XXXVII.50. Augustine introduces his discussion by describing the meaning found "*figurate ac prophetice*"[319] (in a figurative and prophetic) sense. The first portion of the verse describes future events since Eve has yet to give birth and since birth pangs are the result of the mortal state produced by sin. As such it is not a punishment but a prediction.

However, the second portion of the verse does refer to "*haec poena* " (this punishment) and is to be understood literally (*litterae*).[320] The basis for assuming that section was intended literally is divinely instituted patriarchal marriage. Augustine writes the following: "*Neque enim et ante peccatum, aliter factam fuisse decet credere mulierem, nisi ut vir ei dominaretur, et ad eum ipsa serviendo converteretur*"(For we must believe that even before her sin woman had been made to be ruled by her husband and to be submissive and subject to him).[321] However pre-lapsarian domination was different from post-lapsarian. Paul describes pre-lapsarian servitude in Gal. 5:13 when he writes: "*Per charitatem servite invicem*" (Through love serve one another).[322] Post-lapsarian domination is the punishment for the woman's sin. Augustine writes: "*Hoc enim viro potius Dei sententia detulit, et maritum habere dominum meruit mulieris non natura sed culpa: Quod tamen nisi servetur, depravabitur amplius natura, et augebitur culpa*"(The sentence pronounced by God gave this power rather to man, and it is not by her

---

[319]PL 34, 450.

[320]Ibid.

[321]Ibid., ACW 42, 171.

[322]PL 34, 450.

nature but rather by her sin that woman deserved to have her husband for a master. But if this order is not maintained, nature will be corrupted still more and sin will be increased.)[323]

Incidental Uses of Gen. 3:16

In *Enarratio in psalmum* CXXXVI. 8[324] Augustine alludes to Gen. 3:16 typologically. Eve becomes a type for the Church giving birth to its offspring. In *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* II.XXXIII.53 (412 C.E.) Augustine refutes a Pelagian reading of Gen. 3:16. If Gen. 3:16 is truly a punishment for original sin and not a function of nature, birth pangs should have ceased with the coming of Christ. Augustine argues that the punishment is not remitted since it is a means to perfecting "*in agone justitiae*" (the painful work of justice).[325]

Augustine's last reference to Gen. 3:16 is found in *De civitate dei* XV.VII.2 (418 C.E.). In this instance he combines both his spiritual and literal understanding of the text, however the literal meaning takes precedence. He writes: "*Ubi intelligendum est virum ad regendam uxorem, animo carnem regenti similem esse oportere*" (We are to understand that the husband is to rule his wife as the soul rules the flesh).[326] The biblical precedent for this dual understanding is Eph. 5:28-

---

[323]Ibid., ACW 42, 171.

[324]PL 37, 1673.

[325]PL 44, 183.

[326]PL 42, 445. NPNF1 2, 289.

29 which describes the husband as one "*Qui diligit uxorem suam se ipsum diligit*" (Who loves his wife as he loves himself).[327]

Augustine was not the only exegete who did not view Gen. 3:16 as a curse. Prior to Augustine, Philo also described Gen. 3:16 in a similar manner. While Augustine viewed the verse as prophetic of the consequences of sin, Philo suggested that the experience described in Gen. 3:16 was natural to all human marriages[328] It was necessary that the female senses be under the domination of the male mind. Woman's sorrow pertained to grief which is perceived by the senses.[329] Tertullian, on the other hand was to produce one of the most vitriolic uses of Gen. 3:16. Found in Tertullian's *De cultu feminarum* I.1 and describing conservative dress as a further penance on top of the curses Gen. 3:16, Tertullian wrote: "*Quo plenius id quod de Eva tradit (ignominiam dico primi delicti, et invidiam perditionis Humanae) omni satisfactionis habitu expiaret*"(In order that by every garb of penitence she might the more fully expiate that which she derives from Eve, the ignominy I mean of the first sin and the odium attaching to her as the cause of human perdition).[330]

---

[327]PL 41, 445.

[328]Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis, I.49. Loeb Sup 1, 28. He wrote that this "comes to every woman who lives together with a man" and "It is not as a curse but as a necessity."

[329]Philo, Allegorical Interpretation, III.LXXXI.200. Loeb 226, 437. Philo writes: "Woman, who is, as we have seen, Sense, is the subject of an experience peculiarly her own, namely grief, which is called sorrow; for there is a quarter of our being in which gladness takes rise, and in that same quarter does grief also take rise."

[330]PL 1, 1418. ANF 4, 14.

Gen. 3:17

De genesi contra manichaeos:

"Et tunc dixit Deus ad Adam: Quia audisti vocem mulieris tuae, et

manducasti de ligno de quo praeceperam tibi, ex illo solo ne ederes,

maledicta terra erit tibi in omnibus operibus tuis et in tristitia et gemitu tuo

manducabis ex ea omnibus diebus vitae tuae" De genesi contra

manichaeos II.I.2[331]

Augustine first cites Gen. 3:17 in *De genesi contra manichaeos*

I.XIII.19. The verse is used to explain the existence of poisonous plants.

Augustine writes: *"Herbae autem venenosae ad poenam, vel ad*

excercitationem mortalium creatae sunt, et hoc totum propter peccatum,

quia mortales post peccatum facti sumus." (Poisonous plants were

created as a punishment, or as a trial for mortals and all of this is the

result of sin because we became mortal after sin).[332]

Augustine presents his allegorical understanding of Gen. 3:17 in

De genesi contra manichaeos II.XX.30. Here the cursed work of Adam

represents the labor and pain required to get at the truth. Augustine

writes : *"quod in hac vita quisque natus, difficultatem inveniendae*

veritatis habet ex corruptibilit corpore" (For anyone born in this life has

difficulty in discovering the truth because of the corruptible body).[333]

---

[331]PL 34, 196-197.

[332]PL 34, 182. FC 84, 67.

[333]PL 34, 211. FC 84, 125.

De genesi ad litteram :

"*Adae autem dixit, Quia audisti vocem mulieris tuae, et edisti de ligno, de quo praeceperam tibi de eo solo non edere, maledicta terra in operibus tuis; in tristitiis edes illam omnes dies vitae tuae*" *De genesi ad litteram* XI.I.1[334]

Augustine does not attempt to explain Gen. 3:17 in *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXVIII.51. He views the literal meaning as self-evident. Augustine writes: "*Hoc esse in terra labores humani generis, quis ignorat?*" (Who does not know that these are the labors of man on earth).[335] However the prophetic meaning of the words is most important. Augustine concludes: "*Servanda tamen est et exspectanda significatio prophetiae, quam maxime hic intuetur Dei loquentis intentio.*" (Nevertheless we must safeguard the prophetic meaning and be open to it, as it is foremost in God's intention when He speaks these words.).[336] Augustine does not explain precisely what the prophetic meaning of Gen. 3:17 might be although one might assume it to be similar to his commentary in *De genesi contra manichaeos* .

---

[334]PL 34, 429.

[335]PL 34, 450. ACW 42, 171.

[336]PL 34, 450. ACW 42, 171.

Augustine cites Gen. 3:17 five other times. The first is found in *Enarratio in psalmum* LVII.2 [337] (396 C.E.) where Gen. 3:17 merely describes the consequences of sin. In *Enarratio in psalmum* LIX.2, Gen. 3:17 describes the *tenebrae* (darkness) referred to by Paul in Eph. 5:8.[338] Augustine alludes to Gen. 3:17 in *Enarratio in psalmum* LXV.13 where he writes: "*Nos meritum nostrum dejecit*"[339] (We fell by our own merit). In *Enarratio in psalmum* LXI.18 Gen. 3:17 is cited as proof that God spoke to men.[340] In *Contra secundam juliani* VI.XXX (429 C.E.) Augustine makes his last allusion to Gen. 3:17. He suggests that the tree of life was never intended as food and is not subject to the curse of Gen. 3:17. Augustine continues by pointing out that this tree must have been a *sacramentum* (sacrament) for Adam and not something he ate from.

Philo, like Augustine in *De genesi contra manichaeos*, did not view Adam's curse as pertaining literally to agriculture. Earth was an allegory for the body which the mind cultivated.[341] Ambrose, also understood the verse allegorically. He noted that the sadness with which man eats indicates the his contriteness "*in nostorum poenitentia peccatorum*" (in the penalty of our sin).[342]

---

[337]PL 36, 675.

[338]PL 36, 714.

[339]PL 36, 795.

[340]PL 36, 741.

[341]Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis, I.50. Loeb Sup 1, 28-29.

[342]Ambrose, *De paradiso* XV.75. PL 14, 331.

Gen. 3:18

De genesi contra manichaeos :

"_Spinas et tribulos germinabit tibi, et edes pabulum agri tui_"
De genesi contra manichaeos II.I.2[343]

Augustine first refers to Gen. 3:18 in _De genesi contra manichaeos_ I.XII.19.[344] He cites the verse with Gen. 3:17 and Gen. 3:19 in order to explain the existence of poisonous plants.

In _De genesi contra manichaeos_ II.XX.30 the _spinas_ (thorns) and _tribuli_ (thistles) are "_punctiones tortuorsarum quaestionum, aut cogitationes de provisone hujus vitae:_" (the punctures of torturous questions or thoughts concerning the provisioning for this life).[345] If these are not extirpated "_de agro Dei_" (from the field of God) the word of God will suffocate.[346] Augustine refers once again to Gen. 3:18 in _De genesi contra manichaeos_ II.XXVII.41. In this instance Augustine cautions against the Manichaean understanding that Gen. 3:17 describes some alternate evil or dark creation. Rather Gen. 3:17 proves "_spinas et tribulos...non naturae esse, sed poenae_" (the thorns and thistles to be from the punishment and not nature).[347]

---

[343]PL 34, 197.

[344]PL 34, 182.

[345]PL 34, 211.

[346]Ibid.

[347]PL 34, 218.

De genesi ad litteram :

"Spinas et tribulos germinabit tibi, et edes fenum agri"

De genesi ad litteram XI.I.1[348]

As with Gen. 3:17, Augustine does not comment upon Gen. 3:18 in _De genesi ad litteram_, XI.XXXVII.51,[349] except to underline the fact that the verse has a _"significatio prophetiae"_ (prophetic significance). Augustine does not describe what this prophetic significance might be.

Incidental Uses of Gen. 3:18

Augustine mentions Gen. 3:18 three other times. On the first occasion, found in _Enarratio in psalmum_ LVII.2[350] (396 C.E.), Gen. 3:18 is cited with Gen. 3:17 as descriptive of the consequences of sin. Augustine refers to Gen. 3:18 twice in _Contra julianum_ (421 C.E). In the first instance penitence without fasting produces thorns. Augustine writes: _"poenitentia vero sine jejunio vacua est"_ (penitence, truly, without fasting is empty).[351] In _Contra julianum_ VI.XX.65,[352] Gen. 3:18 is merely cited as the punishment resulting from the fall.

Philo also understood the spines and thistles of Gen. 3:18 in a spiritual manner. They were not the torturing questions of Augustine, but

---

[348]PL 34, 429.

[349]PL 34, 450.

[350]PL 36, 675.

[351]_Contra julianum_ I.V.18. PL 44, 652.

[352]PL 44, 863.

rather the passions which wounded the soul.[353]   Origen similarly

interpreted Gen. 3:18 spiritually in light of Gen 1:9. He wrote: *"Si qui*

ergo sua culpa aridus manet" (if one therefore holds on to his arid

guilt)[354] his soul produces *spinas et tribulos.* Ambrose understood the

eating of earth to which the serpent was condemned and the eating of

Gen. 3:18 as representing a spiritual gradient. Those eating the earth

were in a state of warfare, while those eating the herbs *(fenum)* of Gen.

3:18 represented some advancement.   Ultimately mankind would forsake

this condition to enjoy the *panis* (bread) of Christ.[355]

Gen. 3:19

De genesi contra manichaeos :

"In sudore vultus tui edes panem tuum, donec revertaris in terram, de qua

sumptus es; quia terra es, et in terram ibis" *De genesi contra manichaeos*
II.I.2[356]

Gen. 3:19 is by far the most frequently quoted of all the verses from

Genesis 3. It constitutes 15% of the citations or 31 references. Augustine

uses the verse almost exclusively within the context of sin. The most

frequent theme pertains to death which is the result of the Fall.

---

[353]Philo, Allegorical Interpretation of Genesis, III.LXXXIX.248. Loeb 226, 469.

[354]Origen, *Homiliae in genesim* I.2.85. SC 7, 32

[355]Ambrose, *De paradiso* XV.76. PL 14, 332.

[356]PL 34, 197.

Augustine first cites Gen. 3:19, along with Gen. 3:17-18, in *De genesi contra manichaeos* I.XIII.19.[357] Man's fall has resulted in the growth of poisonous and fruitless trees. Augustine's second reference to Gen. 3:19 is equally brief and once again the verse is cited with Gen. 3:17-18. In *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XX.30[358] Gen. 3:19 refers to man's difficult labor which is required to find the truth.

De genesi ad litteram :

"*In sudore faciei tuae edes panem tuum, donec convertaris in terram ex qua sumptus es; quia terra es, et in terram ibis.*" *De genesi ad litteram* XI.I.1[359]

Augustine's treatment of Gen. 3:19 in *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXVIII.51 is also minimal. Gen. 3:19 is like Gen. 3:17-18 and therefore contains "*significatio prophetiae*" (prophetic significance or meaning).[360] As with Gen. 3:17 and 18, Augustine does not elaborate upon this possible meaning.

Incidental Uses of Gen. 3:19

The major recurring theme in Augustine's incidental use of Gen. 3:19 concerns the *lex mortis* or the law of death. This includes the sub-

[357]PL 34, 182.

[358]PL 34, 211.

[359]PL 34, 429.

[360]PL 34, 450.

themes of sinful pride and the nature of human work. On several occasions Gen. 3:19 is used to interpret alternate biblical passages. These include the raising of Lazarus, Mt. 6:19 and 21, Rom. 8:3 and John 6:41.

   Lex Mortis: *Contra fortunatum* contains the minutes of a debate which took place between the Manichaean Fortunatus and Augustine on August 28 and 29 , 392 C.E. In it Augustine introduces his major theme concerning Gen. 3:19. The punishments of Gen. 3:19 are the consequence of sin. They are the "*lex mortis*" (law of death)[361] under which all humans are born and not proof that God's creation includes evil. In *Sermone domini in monte* I.XVII.53[362] (393 C. E.) all sinners are condemned to the earth. In *Enarratio in psalmum* XL.6[363], XLI.14[364] and LXXIV.7,[365] Gen. 3:19 describes the penalty for sin. In *Enarratio in psalmum* LXVIII.II.11[366] death is the consequence of sin. Man merited his punishment "*terra es, et in terram ibis*" (earth you are and to earth you will go)[367] in *Enarratio in psalmum* LXXI.12 because of his sin. The *terra* of Gen. 3:19 refers to this fallen world in *De agone christiano* II. [368](396 C.E.). In *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I.II.2[369] (412 C.E.) Gen.

---

[361]*Contra fortunatum* I.22. PL 42, 126.

[362]PL 34, 1256.

[363]PL 36, 458.

[364]PL 36, 474.

[365]PL 37, 1072.

[366]PL 36, 861.

[367]PL 36, 606.

[368]PL 40, 291.

[369]PL 44, 109.

3:19 refers to the mortal body and not to the soul. *Terra* is a figure for death in *Sermo* LXXVII.5.[370] In *Sermo* LVIII.III.4[371] Augustine comments that the Lord's prayer expresses the hope that even this earth under the penalty of sin will be transformed. Gen. 3:19 describes the punishment for sin in *Sermo* CCCLIX.1.[372] In *Sermo* CCCLXII.16 Gen. 3:19 describes the consequence of sin which is death. This is the meaning of "*in terram ibis*" (you will go into the earth).[373] In *De civitate dei* Gen. 3:19 once again describes man's punishment for sin. In Book XIII.XV[374] (417 C.E.) God announces his punishment in Gen. 3:19. Further on Augustine writes regarding Gen. 3:19: "*mortem significaverit corporis que illi sit anima discedente*"(He signified death of the body with the soul abandoning it)[375] . In Book XX.XX.2[376] (425 C.E.) the words of Gen. 3:19 do not apply to those who are still alive upon Christ's return. Augustine's last reference to Gen. 3:19 is found in *Contra secundam juliani* I.CLXXVII (429 C.E.) where it is used to support the notion of original sin. Since all men are from *terra* then all men share Adam's sin.[377]

Work: A secondary theme, within the context of man's fallen state, concerns the nature of the work described in Gen. 3:19. In *Enarratio in psalmum* XXXII.II.1 (396 C.E.) the *panem* of Gen. 3:19 is the word of God.

---

[370]PL 38, 492.

[371]PL 38, 394.

[372]PL 39, 1590.

[373]PL 39, 1621.

[374]PL 41, 387.

[375]*De civitate dei* XIII.XIII.1. PL 41, 396. This book was written in 417 C.E.

[376]PL 41, 688.

[377]PL 45, 1219.

307.

Augustine writes: *"Si panis noster est verbum Dei sudemus in audiendo ne moriamur in jejunando"* (If our bread is the word of God, we should sweat listening, in order not to die of fasting).[378] In *Enarratio in psalmum* LXXVII.4 another reference is made to work with regards to Gen. 3:19. God speaks in parables because of sin. Consequently *"cordis labore pendamus"* (the heart is laden by work)[379] in order to understand God's meaning. In *Sermo* XIV.4[380] humans work because they are under the sentence of Gen. 3:19. Augustine responds to the Pelagian contention that work should cease with the coming of Christ if it is truly a result of original sin in *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* II.XXXIII.53.[381] Augustine contends that the punishment is not remitted since it continues to function as a means to perfect the painful work of justice.

Pride. In *Enarratio in psalmum* LXXXI.5[382] Augustine takes up the theme of pride with regards to Gen. 3:19. He writes: *"Terrenae autem felicitatis regnum superbia est, contra quam venit humilitas Christi"* (The kingdom of earthly happiness is pride, against which came the humility of Christ).[383] In *Enarratio in psalmum* LXXXII.14 Augustine writes: *"Terra id est homo"* (the earth is man).[384] The earth is also pride, man's sin. In *Enarratio in psalmum* LXXXIV.14 the earth of Gen. 3:19 is the same earth

[378]PL 36, 386.

[379]PL 36, 985. Augustine cites Ps 73:13 as an example of God's cryptic manner of speaking.

[380]PL 38, 265.

[381]PL 44, 183.

[382]PL 37, 1050.

[383]*Enarratio in psalmum* LXXXI.6. PL 36, 1050.

[384]PL 37, 1055.

referred to in Ps. 74:12 where the psalmist writes: "*Veritas de terra orta est*" (Truth is left the earth).[385]

Intertextual Exegesis: In *Enarratio in psalmum* CXXXVIII.1 Augustine provides a typological reading for Gen. 3:19. Adam's bread is also the *panis vivus*[386] (living bread) of Christ described in John 6:41.

In *De diversis quaestionibus octoginta tribus* LXV (388-395 C.E.) Augustine uses Gen. 3:19 to explain the raising of Lazarus. The *terra* (earth) of Gen. 3:19 signifies *cupiditatum carnalium* (carnal concupiscence). Of Lazarus' reanimation Augustine writes: "*Quod autem exiit de monumento animam significat recendentem a carnalibus vitiis*" (When he exits the tomb, it signifies the spirit abandoning its carnal vices).[387]

In *Sermo* XXXVII.VI.9[388] Gen. 3:19 is used in reference to Mt. 6:19 and 21. The fields of paradise are not like the fields of Adam. In *Sermo* LX.VI.6, [389] Matthew is once again alluding to Gen. 3:19 in these verses. Gen. 3:19 is used to interpret Rom. 8:3 in *Contra maximinum* I.II[390] (418 C.E.). In response to the Arian bishop Maximinus Augustine writes that Jesus' body was "*de similitudine carnis peccati quae ipsius erat*"(similar to the sinful body but was his own).[391] However since Gen. 3:19

---

[385]PL 37, 1079.

[386]PL 37, 1784.

[387]PL 40, 60.

[388]PL 38, 226.

[389]PL 38, 405.

[390]PL 42, 744.

[391]PL 42, 745.

condemns all humanity to death Jesus suffers "*vera morte*" (true death).[392]

Augustine's insistence upon the physical aspect of death was quite unlike Philo's. Philo understood Gen. 3:19 to represent spiritual death. If Adam had been seeking virtue which is the soul's immortality[393] he would have achieved heaven. Unfortunately by lusting after pleasure the opposite is true. In his Allegorical Interpretation of Genesis, Gen. 3:19 represents the lot of the foolish man who greedily seeks pleasure until he dies.[394]

Augustine was not alone however in assuming that Gen. 3:19 described a literal reality. Fellow North African, Tertullian also understood Gen. 3:19 to pertain to literal death. In *De resurrectione carnis* XVIII he writes: "*Sententiam Dei natura pronuntiat*" (nature pronounces the judgment of God).[395] Ambrose too interpreted the death of Gen. 3:19 literally. While maintaining that death is the result of man's prevarication and fraud and therefore not created by God, Ambrose placed a positive spin on dying. He wrote: "*inveniemus mortem finem esse peccati*"(We will find death to be the end of sin).[396]

---

[392]Ibid.

[393]Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis, I.51. Loeb Sup 1, 29.

[394]Philo, Allegorical Interpretation of Genesis, III.XC.252. Loeb 226, 471-472.

[395]PL 2, 819.

[396]Ambrose, *De bono mortis* IV.XV. PL 14, 574. This work was produced in 387 C.E. Once again it is possible that Augustine could have heard Ambrose speak of it.

Gen. 3:20

De genesi contra manichaeos :

"*Et tunc Adam imposuit nomen uxori suae, Vita: quia mater est omnium vivorum*" *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.I.2[397]

Augustine cites Gen. 3:20 on only three occasions. The first is found in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XXI.31. Augustine is troubled by the fact that after the fall and judgment of God Adam calls his wife, *Vita* or life.[398] He suggests that the offspring of the woman might be the fruits of the cultivation of man's interior field. Augustine derives this spiritual reading from 1 Tim. 5:6 and Sir. 34:30-31 where "*Mortui nomine peccatum ipsum significari legimus*" (we read that sin itself is signified by the expression dead body).[399] He concludes that the portion of the soul which "*recte facta pepererit*" (has brought forth a good habit for good deeds)[400] should be called life.

De genesi ad litteram :

"*Et vocavit Adam nomen mulieris suae, Vita, quoniam haec est mater omnium viventium*" *De genesi ad litteram* XI.I.1[401]

[397]PL 34, 197.

[398]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XXI.31. PL 34, 212.

[399]Ibid., FC 84, 126.

[400]PL 34, 212. FC 84, 127.

[401]PL 43, 429.

In _De genesi ad litteram_ XI.XXXVIII.51 Augustine pronounces Gen. 3:20 to be prophetic. What the verse might be prophetic of, he does not supply, but rather goes on to describe the structure of the text. The words spoken are genuinely Adam's and not an interpolation by the author. Furthermore, Augustine notes, Adam supplies an explanation _"quoniam haec est mater omnium viventium"_(For she is the mother of all living)[402] for his choice of name.

Incidental Uses of Gen. 3:20

In _Enarratio in psalmum_ CXXVI.8 (396 C.E.) Augustine explains Eve's name typologically. Eve is a type for the Church which is why she is called _Vita_ or life.[403]

Gen. 3:21

De genesi contra manichaeos :

"Et tunc fecit Dominus Deus Adae et mulieri ejus tunicas pelliceas et induit illos" De genesi contra manichaeos II.I.2[404]

---

[402]PL 34, 451.

[403]PL 37, 1673. Philo understands Gen. 3:20 more literally. Woman is called life because "from a living being she first came into being". Philo also suggests a metaphorical understanding wherein woman once again represents the senses. "As nothing is born without a mother so there is no living creature without sense." Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis I.52. Loeb Sup 1, 30.

[404]PL 34, 197.

Augustine cites Gen. 3:21 four times throughout the corpus of his work. When he first refers to it in _De genesi contra manichaeos_ II.XXI.31[405] Augustine argues that Gen. 3:21 is prophetic. He writes: "_mors in tunicis pelliceis figurata est._" (death was prefigured by the garments of skin).[406] He notes that Adam and Eve already have clothes in the fig aprons which they fashioned for themselves earlier. However "_Deus illis fecit tunicas pelliceas_"(God made them skin tunics)[407] which signifies their change into mortal flesh. Furthermore there could be no more appropriate symbol of human mortality than the hides of dead animals. Augustine concludes with a rhetorical flourish that man "_illicita superbia_" (by illicit pride)[408] fell to the mortality of animals.

De genesi ad litteram :

"_Et fecit dominus Deus Adam et mulieri ejus tunicas pelliceas et induit eos_" _De genesi ad litteram_ XI.I.1[409]

While the actions and words described in Gen. 3:21 literally occurred, their intention was symbolic. Augustine writes: "_a narratore rerum proprie gestarum exigendum est, ut ea narret facta esse quae facta sunt, et dicta esse quae dicta sunt_" (we must demand of the author of a historical narrative that his account contain the events that actually

---

[405]PL 34, 213.

[406]PL 34, 212. FC 84, 127.

[407]PL 34, 212.

[408]PL 34, 213.

[409]PL 34, 429-430.

occurred and the words that were actually spoken).[410] However the historical accuracy of the narrative does not preclude a figurative meaning which unfortunately Augustine does not supply.

Incidental Uses of Gen. 3:21

Augustine reiterates the figurative understanding he developed in *De genesi contra manichaeos* in *De trinitate* XII.XI.16 (410-415 C.E.).[411] The animal skin tunics (*pelliceas tunicas*) signify man's mortality. In *Contra secundam jul ani* IV.XXXVII (429 C.E.) the coverings are more literally understood. The tunics covered the members of the first parents, which were infected with concupiscence (*concupiscentia*).[412].

There are perhaps some dim echoes of Philo in Augustine's understanding of the mortality signified by the animal skins. Philo also suggested that the hides represent in a symbolic way human skin[413] However the image was viewed as a positive reflection of the goodness of God's handiwork. Tertullian, on the other hand, chastised women for desiring to adorn themselves beyond their *pelliceas tunicas* in *De cult feminarum* I.I.[414] Ambrose described the skins as "*tunicam corruptelae, tunicam passionum*" (tunic of corruption, tunic of passions) which Adam and Eve accepted "*post culpam*" (after their guilt).[415]

---

[410]*De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXIX.52. PL 34, 451. ACW 42, 172.

[411]PL 43, 1006.

[412]PL 45, 1357.

[413]Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis , I.53. Loeb Sup 1, 31.

[414]PL 1, 1419.

[415]Ambrose, *De isaac et anima* VI.52. PL 14, 547. This work was also produced in 387 and possibly heard by Augustine.

Gen. 3:22

De genesi contra manichaeos :

"*Et dixit: Ecce Adam factus est tanquam unus ex nobis, ad scientiam cognoscendi bonum et malum. Et tunc ne porrigeret manum suam Adam ad arborem vitae et sumeret sibi inde, et ederet et viveret in aeternum.*"
De genesi contra manichaeos II.I.2[416]

Augustine points out that "*unus ex nobis*" (one of us) is "*ambigua locutio figuram fecit*" (an ambiguous expression making a figure of speech).[417] Oddly it is not the plural form that proves contentious for Augustine but the *ex* . This can be understood in two ways. The first implies that Adam has joined the ranks of the gods. In English this is expressed by he is one of us. The second meaning is one of separation from the gods. This would be translated as "one from us" in the sense that Adam has separated from us. Augustine uses both meanings. Adam became "one of" and "one from" the gods by discerning "*boni et mali*" (good and evil).[418]

The expression "*ne manum porrigat, et vivat in aeternam*" (lest he stretch out his hand and live eternally)[419] is also ambiguous. The "*ne*" in

---

[416]PL 34, 197.

[417]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XIII.33. PL 34, 213. Teske points out that the particular figure is amphiboly whereby one word can have two meanings. See note 146, FC 84, 129.

[418]PL 34, 213.

[419]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XXII.34. PL 34, 214.

Latin can make either a negative or affirmative statement depending upon the context. If the phrase is intended to express hope the *ne* is affirmative. In essence God is expressing the hope that man will stretch out his hand and live forever. If the *ne* is negative it is a warning against Adam's stretching out his hand. In other words, God does not want Adam to stretch out his hand. Augustine prefers the first reading. In this instance the outstretched hand is prophetic as it *"significat crucem per quam vita aeterna recuperatur"*(signifies the cross through which eternal life is recuperated).[420]

De genesi ad litteram :

"Et dixit Dominus Deus, Ecce Adam factus est tanquam unus es nobis in cognoscendo bonum et malum. Et nunc ne aliquando extendat manum suam et sumat de ligno vitae et edat, et vivat in aeternum."

De genesi ad litteram XI.I.1[421]

Augustine does address the grammatical plural *"ex nobis"* in *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXIX.53. He writes that it *"propter Trinitatem numerus pluralis accipiatur"* (the plural reference must be to the Trinity)[422] since this is certainly the case in Gen. 1:26. Augustine goes on to suggest that God's motivation for speaking these words was

---

[420]Ibid.

[421]PL 34, 430.

[422]PL 34, 451. ACW 42, 172.

"*non...insultantis*" (not as opprobrium)[423] but rather to instill fear in the rest of humanity.

Incidental Uses of Gen. 3:22

Augustine makes incidental reference to Gen. 3:22 three times. In *Enarratio in psalmum* LXXII.18[424] (396 C.E.) Augustine cites Gen. 3:22 along with Gen. 3:5-6 to prove that Adam wishes to be like God. In *Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum* I.XV.23[425] (419 C.E.) Augustine stipulates that Gen. 3:22 illustrates that Adam did not improve his lot. Augustine introduces this work with the following statement: "*non enim soli Manichaei Legem Prophetasque condemant sed et Marcionistae...cum Manichaei quamvis librum Geneseos non accipiant atque blasphement*" (Not in fact, only the Manichaeans condemn the Law and the Prophets but also the Marcionists....with the Manichaeans, even the book of Genesis they do not accept and they curse.)[426] Given this statement, it seems fair to assume that Marcion and Manichaean exegetes have argued that Adam's lot improved after Gen. 3. In *Contra secundam juliani* VI.XXIII (429 C.E.) Augustine suggests that Adam's sin was very great in order to merit his subsequent punishment. To suggest otherwise would be to attribute great *crudelitate* (cruelty) to God.[427]

---

[423]PL 34, 451. ACW 42, 172-173.

[424]PL 36, 940.

[425]PL 42, 615.

[426]*Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum* I.I.1. PL 42, 603. Also see *Retractationes* II.LVIII, PL 32, 654 where Augustine refers once again to this nameless Marcionite.

[427]PL 45, 1556.

Philo was also troubled by the ambiguity of the "lest clause". Philo suggested that scripture used ambiguity[428] to indicate spiritual principals. In this case the plural indicated the two highest principles. Firstly God is not like man and secondly man's training needs to be voluntary. Augustine's suggestion that the plural form of Gen. 3:22 indicates the Trinity echoed Tertullian. In *Adversus praxeam* XII Tertullian wrote concerning the expression *ex nobis* : "*ex unitate Trinitatis loquebatur*"(He spoke from the unity of the Trinity).[429]

Gen. 3:23

De genesi contra manichaeos :

"*Dimisit eum Dominus Deus de paradiso suavitatis, ut operaretur terram de qua et sumptus fuerat*" *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.I.2[430]

Augustine first cites Gen. 3:23 in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.V.8[431] as proof that work was a consequence of sin. He initiates his exegesis further on in book II by focusing on the word *dimisit* (he dismissed) . Adam is dismissed from paradise *non exclusit* (not excluded).[432] Augustine understands this to mean that Adam was driven

---

[428]Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis, I. 55. Loeb Sup 1, 32.

[429]PL 2, 168.

[430]PL 34, 197.

[431]PL 34, 119.

[432]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XX.34. PL 34, 213. See note 148, FC 84, 129 where Teske describes one of the current theories that Augustine's *dimisit* insight is linked to Plotinus' *Ennead* 4.3-12-13.

by his sin but not excluded against his will. The work outside of paradise is to fit man to return to paradise. Augustine concludes: "*Nam beatam vitam paradisi nomine significatam existimo*" (I think the happy life is signified by the name paradise).[433]

De genesi ad litteram :

"*Et dimisit illum Dominus Deus de paradiso voluptatis operari terram, es qua sumptus est*" *De genesi ad litteram* XI.I.1[434]

Augustine introduces his exegesis of Gen. 3:23 explaining that "*superiora verba Dei sunt*"(The first words are God's).[435] The subsequent words in the verse are the author's description of what happened after God spoke. Having stipulated that the text literally took place Augustine goes on to provide a spiritual exegesis of the text. The tree of life is the "*sacramentum visibile invisibilis sapientiae*"(visible sacrament of invisible wisdom).[436] Paradise is like the Church which also contains visible sacraments of the invisible Christ on the altar. Adam's expulsion is the same as the excommunication which is enforced against members of the Church.[437]

---

[433]PL 34, 214. FC 84, 130.

[434]PL 34, 430.

[435]*De genesi ad litteram* XI.XL.54. PL 34, 451.

[436]Ibid.

[437]Interestingly Augustine's description of the invisible sacrament of wisdom contained some resonances of Philo. See Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis, I.56. Loeb Sup 1, 34,-35. For Philo paradise was the state of wisdom without which life "is harsh and terrible".

Incidental Uses of Gen. 3:23

In *Enarratio in psalmum* XXXV.18[438] (396 C.E.) Augustine cites
Gen. 3:23 as proof that God spoke the truth in Gen. 2:15-16 while the
demon lied in Gen. 3:3.

Gen. 3:24

De genesi contra manichaeos :

"*Et ejectus foras de paradiso moratus est contra paradisum voluptatis, Et
Cherubim et illam flammeam frameam quae versatur, posuit Deus ad
custodiendam viam arboris vitae*" *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.I.2[439]

Like Gen. 3:23, Gen. 3:24 is cited very infrequently, accounting
for a mere three references. Augustine first mentions the verse in *De
genesi contra manichaeos* II.XIII.35. He introduces his exegesis with a
technical note. The Hebrew word for *Cherubim* means "*scientiae
plenitudo*"(fullness of knowledge)[440] in Latin. Where Augustine found
such a definition presents a minor mystery. Roland Teske excludes
Jerome, who does make a similar assertion in *De nominibus hebraicis,*[441]

---

[438]PL 36, 354.

[439]PL 34, 197.

[440]PL 34, 214.

[441]PL 23, 820.

upon the basis of dates.[442] Philo, on the other hand, described the Cherubim as representing the creative and kingly attributes of God.[443]

For Augustine the *"flammeam frameam"* (movable flaming sword) represent *"omnis tribulatio"* (every tribulation) which burns.[444] Consequently there are two ways to attain the tree of life, *"id est per tolerantiam molestiarum et scientiae plenitudinem"*(That is by the endurance of troubles and the fullness of knowledge).[445] Added to this must be Rom. 13:10 (*plenitudo autem Legis charitas/* the fullness of the law is love).[446]

De genesi ad litteram:

"Et ejecit Adam, et collacavit eum contra paradisum voluptatis; et ordinavit Cherubim et flammeam rhomphaeam quae veritur, custodire viam ligni vitae" De genesi ad litteram XI.I.1[447]

In *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XL.55 Augustine states that the actions described in Gen. 3:24 actually took place however they also have a symbolic meaning. He writes: *"ut contra paradisum quo beata vita etiam spiritualiter significabatur habitaret peccator utique in miseria"* (it prefigures a sinner living in a wretched state over against paradise, by

---

[442]FC 84, 109, note 67.

[443]Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis, I.57. Loeb Sup 1, 35.

[444]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XXIII.35. PL 34, 214.

[445]Ibid.

[446]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XXXIII.36. PL 34, 214-215.

[447]PL 34, 430.

which is signified the blessed life).[448] The flaming swords and cherubim existed in visible paradise "*per angelicum ministerium*" (through the ministry of angels).[449]   As with Gen. 3:17-19 Augustine asserts that these events must also signify something "*De paradiso spirituali*" (of the spiritual paradise),[450] although he does not speculate about what this might be.

<center>Incidental Uses of Gen. 3:24.</center>

When Augustine last cites Gen. 3:24 in <u>Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum</u> .XVI.27[451] (419 C.E), he returns to the theme of God's truthfulness. Gen. 3:24 proves that God did not lie about the results of sin.

<center><u>Influences of Earlier Exegesis on Augustine</u></center>

Prior to moving on to section two of this chapter which will present the analysis of Augustine's exegetical strategies for Genesis 3, a few concluding remarks need to be made about possible patristic influences upon Augustine. As noted in the introduction to this chapter, Tertullian appears less frequently as a source of interpretations. There are more echoes of Philo, however given Ambrose's propensity for using Philonic exegesis it is difficult to assess whether or not Augustine was intimately

---

[448]*De genesi ad litteram* XI.XL.55. PL 34, 451-452. ACW 42, 173.

[449]*De genesi ad litteram* XI.XL.55. PL 34, 452.

[450]Ibid.

[451]PL 42, 616.

familiar with Philo's work. There is the possibility that Augustine simply bears witness to a North African tradition of exegesis for Gen. 3, dating to Philo. There are a few tantalizing hints that Augustine may have been influenced by Origen. Once again this may merely attest to a North African tradition of exegesis. Augustine seems to have borrowed more frequently from Ambrose for his understanding of Gen. 3 than he did with Gen. 2:15-25. On one occasion Augustine directly cites the work of another Patristic author in order to support his exegesis. In this instance the author in question is Jerome. Augustine follows a tradition of exegesis concerning his understanding of Gen. 3:8 and 3:9. However with regards to Gen. 3:6, the verse most frequently cited as justification for attributing the entry of sin into the world to women, Augustine runs counter to tradition.

The Philonic Tradition: There are echoes of Philo in Augustine's exegesis of Gen. 3. Whether or not these represent an intimate knowledge of Philo, or rather second hand knowledge transmitted through Ambrose and others is more difficult to assess. Any answer is speculative at best. Several interpretations in particular bear such an imprint.

The first is Augustine's exegesis of Gen. 3:1 as found in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XIV.20.[452] Augustine's tri-partite division of the anthropology of human sin strongly resembles Philo's although the roles of the woman and the serpent are reversed. Philo described woman as representative of the physical senses while the serpent was presented as

---

[452]PL 34, 206.

desire.[453] As noted in the previous chapter Augustine strenuously objects to women being equated to the senses. Augustine reiterates his *De genesi contra manichaeos* tri-partite allegory for Adam, Eve, and the serpent in *Sermone domini in monte* I.XII.34.[454] and *De trinitate* XII.XIII.20[455] Unfortunately Ambrose repeats Philo's interpretation *De paradiso* XV.73[456] but does not attribute it. Consequently Augustine may be borrowing and modifying Ambrose rather than Philo.

A second such case is found in Augustine's exegesis of Gen. 3:14 which contains possible echoes of Philo. Both Philo and Augustine understand the serpent's crawling upon its belly to pertain to carnal pleasures.[457] However, Ambrose also reproduced Philo's explanation, albeit not credited, in *De paradiso* XV.74.[458] Consequently Augustine may be echoing Ambrose rather than Philo.

On several occasions Augustine's exegesis contains hints and traces of Philonic understanding which cannot be credited to Ambrose. Augustine's linking of the serpent from Gen. 3:5 and the serpent from Ex. 4:4 in *Enarratio in psalmum* LXXIII.5 [459] echoes Philo. While Augustine's

---

[453]Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis, I.32. Loeb, Sup I, 18. Philo writes: "To me, however it seems that this (the serpent is more cunning) was said because of the serpent's inclination toward passion, of which it is the symbol." translated from Armenian by Ralph Marcus.

[454]PL 34, 1246.

[455]PL 42, 1009.

[456]PL 14, 329.

[457]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XVII.26. PL 34,210. *De agone christiano* II. PL 40, 291. Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis, I.48. Loeb Sup 1, 27.

[458]PL 14, 329.

[459]PL 36, 933.

serpent is representative of evil Philo's signifies pleasure (as it did in Gen. 3:5) from which Moses flees.[460]

Augustine also shares an understanding of several allegorical elements from Gen. 3:8 with Philo. Philo, too, described the middle of the woods in an allegorical manner. For Philo man's flight to the middle of the woods in order to avoid God's wrath signified, as it does for Augustine, man's reliance upon himself.[461]

Augustine's suggestion regarding Gen. 3:12[462] that Adam was not seduced by Eve also finds parallels in Philo. Philo had argued that literally the verse meant that it was in woman's nature to be deceived but not in man's.[463]

There are strong echoes of Philo in Augustine's use of Gen. 3:17 in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XX.30,[464] Philo, like Augustine, did not view Adam's curse as pertaining literally to agriculture. Earth was an allegory for the body which the mind cultivated.[465]

There are perhaps some dim echoes of Philo in Augustine's understanding in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XII.31[466] of human mortality being signified by the animal skins. Philo suggested that the

---

[460]Philo, Allegorical Interpretation II. XXIII.90-93. Loeb 226, 283.

[461]Philo, Allegorical Interpretation , III.IX.28. Loeb 226, 321. Philo describes the mind "which in its turn is the center of what we may call the garden of the whole soul" Also see Allegorical Interpretation, III.IX.29. Loeb 226, 321. Philo writes man "takes refuge in himself."

[462]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XVII.23. PL 34, 209. *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXV.47. PL 34, 449. *De civitate dei* XIV.XI.2 & XIV.XIV. PL 41, 420 & 422.

[463]Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis, I.46. Loeb Sup 1, 26.

[464]PL 34, 211.

[465]Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis, I.50. Loeb Sup 1, 28-29.

[466]PL 34, 213.

hides represent in a symbolic way human skin hence the moral condition of humanity.[467]

Tertullian: Tertullian's influence is much less pronounced in Augustine's exegesis of Gen. 3 than it was in Gen. 2:15-25. There are only three possible case which may indicate some borrowing. This occurs with Augustine's interpretation of Gen. 3:7. Tertullian produced a more literal understanding of Gen. 3:7 which displayed some similarity to Augustine's later description of sexual embarrassment being caused by the perception of one's nudity. Tertullian wrote in *De virginibus velandis* XI that after eating of the tree "*nihil primum senserunt quam erubescendum. Itaque sui quique sexus intellectum tegmine notaverunt.*" (They were first sensible of nothing more than of their cause for shame. Thus they each marked their intelligence of their own sex by a covering).[468]

Tertullian, like Augustine, understood Gen. 3:19 to pertain to literal death. In *De resurrectione carnis* XVIII he wrote: "*Sententiam Dei natura pronuntiat*"(nature pronounces the judgment of God).[469]

A third probable influence from Tertullian is found in *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXIX.53[470] Augustine understands the *ex nobis* of Gen. 3: 22 to be referring to the Trinity. Tertullian provides an identical explanation in *Adversus praxeam* XII.[471]

---

[467]Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis , I.53. Loeb Sup 1, 31.

[468]PL 2, 904. ANF 4, 34.

[469]PL 2, 819.

[470]PL 34, 451.

[471]PL 2, 168.

Origenian Tradition: There are two possible cases where Augustine may have been influenced by an Origenian tradition. In Augustine's *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I.II.2 (412 C.E.)[472] the serpent of Gen 3: 1 is the same serpent into which Moses changes his rod in the desert which in turn is a figure of the crucified Christ. [473] It is an allegory which Augustine also used in *Enarratio in psalmum* LXXIII.5[474] and in *De trinitate* III.X.20 In Origen's *Homiliae in exodum* IV.6,[475] the rod of Moses also prefigured the crucified Christ although the serpent was understood more positively. It functioned as an allegory for wisdom since it is described as *astuti* in both Gen. 3:1 and Mt. 10:16.

There are also possible echoes of Origenian tradition in Augustine's understanding of Gen. 3:16. Both Augustine and Origen assumed the divine institution of patriarchal marriage with regards to concrete human marriages. Origen also described Gen. 3:16 as God's revealed intention human marriages.[476] However such similarity in thinking may merely reflect the similarity in the ambient cultural matrix rather than any genuine literary borrowing.

Ambrose: Unlike Gen. 2:15-25 Ambrose does appear to be the source for several of Augustine's interpretations of Gen. 3. In *In joannis*

---

[472]PL 44,145.

[473]Ibid. Augustine writes: *"Serpens in deserto exaltatus Christum in cruce pendentem figuravit"* (The serpent raised up in the desert is a figure for Christ hung on the cross)

[474]PL 36, 933.

[475]PG 12, 321.

[476]Origen, *Homiliae in genesim* VI.I.40. Origen writes: *"Quod utique in corporali coniugio non conuenit dictum, quippe cum diuinitus prolata sit illa sententia quae dicit ad mulierem de viro..."* SC 7,184. (This saying, [Gen. 21:12] at any rate is not appropriate to physical marriage, since that well known statement was revealed from heaven which says to the woman of the man. FC 71, 122). Origen goes on to cite Gen. 3:16.

evangelium XLII.11 (408-413 C.E.)[477] Augustine provides the serpent with a motivation for inducing the first parents to sin in Gen. 3:1. The devil envied lesser creatures what he had lost. The description was probably cribbed from Ambrose who wrote in *De paradiso* XII.54:

"*Considerabat enim diabolus quod ipse qui fuisset superioris naturae, in haec saecularia et mundana deciderat: homo autem inferioris naturae speabat aeterna. Hoc est ergo quod invidet dicens: Iste inferior adipiscitur quod ego servare non potui?* " (The Devil began to reflect that man was an inferior creature, yet had hopes of an eternal life, whereas he, a creature of superior nature, had fallen and had become part of this mundane existence. This is the substance of his invidious reflection: 'Will this inferior acquire what I was unable to keep?')[478]

Augustine's use of the Job/Adam/Christ typology in *Enarratio in psalmum* XXXIV.I.7, XLVII.9,[479] and XCIII.19,[480] and *In epistolam joannis* IV.3, [481] is possibly borrowed from Ambrose. Ambrose uses the same combination in his *De interpellatione job et david* III.III.8 (383 C.E.),.[482] a work which Augustine could have had access to. Ambrose, however does not employ the Eve/Job's wife typology which Augustine was to use.

Augustine's allegorical reading of Gen. 3:7 as found in *De genesi contra manichaeos*, may echo Philo, who also suggested that the knowledge of nakedness represented an interior change.[483] However

---

[477]PL 35, 1703-1704.

[478]PL 14, 318. FC 42, 333.

[479]PL 36, 539.

[480]PL 37, 1207.

[481]PL 35, 2007.

[482]PL 14, 870.

[483]Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis, I.40. Loeb Sup 1, 23. Philo described this "as strangeness ..conceived by the mind toward the whole world."

the most obvious source is Ambrose. In *De paradiso* XIII.63 Ambrose described the open eyes of the first parents as the loss of virtue and *simplicitatem* (simplicity). [484] They realized that they were naked having lost the protective covering of *virtutum* (virtue).[485]

Augustine also echoes Ambrose with his understanding of death Gen. 3:19. Ambrose too, interpreted the death of Gen. 3:19 literally. Death was the result of man's prevarication and fraud and therefore not created by God.[486]

Jerome: Augustine alludes to Gen. 3:8 in *Epistola* CXLVIII. IV.14,[487] wherein he refers to a portion of Jerome's *In isaia* III.I. Jerome is used to buttress Augustine's case against anthropomorphism. The difficulty arises when anthropomorphisms are understood literally. Augustine argues that spiritual interpretation of scripture, resists the falsehoods of the *Anthropormorphitae*(Anthropomorphites)[488] who attribute physical characteristics to God.

Traditional Interpretations: On several occasions Augustine follows a tradition of interpreters. One example is found in Augustine's exegesis of Gen. 3:8. Regarding the possibility of divine movement Augustine follows a long tradition of writers who understand the anthropomorphisms of Gen. 3:8 non-literally. Philo also addressed the question of the manner in which God was perceived to have moved in

---

[484]PL 14, 324.

[485]Ibid.

[486]Ambrose, *De bono mortis* IV.XV. PL 14, 574. This work was produced in 387 C.E. Once again it is possible that Augustine could have heard Ambrose speak of it.

[487]PL 33, 628

[488]*Epistola* CXLVIII.IV.13. PL 33, 628.

Gen. 3:8.[489]   God's apparent movement in the garden was merely a

projection by sinful Adam and Eve of their own motion.[490]   God, however,

does speak with a divine albeit unheard voice which the prophets

perceive. Ambrose also stipulated that God did not physically walk but

rather moved "*in mentibus signulorum*" (in the minds of each [person])[491]

His understanding of how God spoke was almost identical to Philo's.

God spoke not with the voice of the body but with a voice that is heard by

the *prophetae* (prophets) and the *fideles* (faithful).[492]

A second such example is Augustine's understanding *ubi es* of

Gen. 3:9 as a rhetorical question. Philo,[493] Tertullian[494] and Ambrose[495]

also viewed the question as non literal.

Non-traditional Interpretations: For some verses Augustine did not

appear to have been influenced by any writers or traditions. One case

which is of particular interest given the question of theological sexism is

Gen. 3:6. This is the verse which is frequently cited in order prove that

woman was responsible for the entry of sin into the world. Augustine's

reluctance to attribute the fault of original sin to the woman makes him

atypical of many patristic exegetes. It is obvious that Augustine did not

borrow his understanding of the verse from Philo or any of his

---

[489]Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis I. 42. Loeb Sup 1, 24. Philo describes God as "stable and immobile as the highest and eldest cause."

[490]Ibid., I. 42. Loeb Sup 1, 25. Philo writes: "they moved of themselves and changed from being immobile"

[491]Ambrose, *De paradiso* XIV.68. PL 14, 326.

[492]Ibid., XIV.69. PL 14, 326.

[493]Philo, Question and Answers on Genesis, I.45. Loeb Sup 1, 26.

[494]Tertullian, *De jujunis*, VI. PL 2, 961. ANF 4, 106.

[495]Ambrose, *De paradiso* XIV.70. PL 14, 327.

popularizers. Philo had provided both a literal and allegorical meaning for the verse. Literally woman had priority in sinning since man reigned over all that is good and immortal while woman reigned over all that is mortal and evil.[496] Neither does Augustine adopt Tertullian's understanding of Gen. 3:6 found in *De cultu feminarum* I.1. Here woman was described: "*Tu es diaboli janua,*" (You are the gate of the devil)..[497] Nor does Augustine follow Ambrose's lead regarding Eve's deception of Adam. Ambrose did not share Augustine's conviction that both parents were a fault in Gen. 3:6. He wrote in *De paradiso* XIII.62: "*Bene praetermissum est ubi decipitur Adam; quia non sua culpa, sed vitio lapsus uxuoris est.*" (Omission is made, and rightly so, of the deception of Adam, since he fell by his wife's fault and not because of his own).[498]

---

[496]Philo, Questions and Answers on Genesis, I.37. Loeb Sup 1, 22. Philo writes: "the priority of the woman is mentioned with emphasis" since "it was fitting that man should rule over immortality and everything good, but woman over death and everything vile."

[497]PL 1, 1419. ANF 4, 14.

[498]PL 14, 324. FC 42, 343.

Section 2

Augustine's Exegetical Strategies for Gen. 3:1-24

Having described Augustine's interpretative activity and the
possible literary influences, it is time to analyze the exegetical strategies
which Augustine applies to Gen. 3. As with Gen. 2:15-25 no particular
strategy seems to produce a more positive reading for women. The shift
from the allegorical to the prophetic or literal follows the same pattern that
it did with Gen. 2:15-25. Augustine's early work tends to be more
allegorical while after *De genesi ad litteram* interpretations tend to focus
upon the prophetic or the literal. There is also a shift in the frequency with
which certain strategies are employed. While Augustine frequently used
prophetic exegesis with Gen. 2:15-25, the majority of Gen. 3
interpretations are devoted to doctrinal issues pertaining to the Fall.
These account for 51% of Augustine's explanations. Given the subject
matter of Gen. 3 this is to be anticipated. A strong secondary theme is
the disorder in creation caused by human concupiscence. As with Gen.
2:15-25 there are few changes of interpretation over the course of
Augustine's life. An exception is Gen. 3:11 which Augustine eventually
understands much more concretely than his early *De genesi contra
manichaeos* interpretations.

Augustine cites verses from Gen. 3:1-24, 208 times. However, on
sixteen occasions Augustine combines verses.[499] Consequently the 208

---

[499]*De genesi contra manichaeos*, I.XIII.19 (Gen. 3:17,18,19), II.XV.22 (Gen. 3:4,5),
II.XX.30 (Gen. 3:17,18,19), II.XXVI.40 (Gen. 3:15,16), *Enarratio in psalmum* LVII.2 (Gen.
3:17,18), LIX.2 (Gen. 3:6,17), LXXIII.5 (Gen. 3:4,5), LXXIII.18 (Gen. 3: 5,6,22), *De genesi
ad litteram* XI.XXXVI.49 (Gen. 3:14, 15), XI,XXXVIII.51 (Gen. 3:17,18,19), *De trinitate*
II.X.17 (Gen. 3:8,9,10), *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I.XXXII.53 (Gen. 3:19,16),

citations occur in 185 contexts. The following represents the exegetical tactics employed in reference to these verses. The breakdown of strategies varies slightly from Gen. 2:15-15. Typology was used with enough frequency to warrant its own category on the table. Allusion has been added. Allusion, as the name suggests, is reference to a second biblical text within the context of interpreting the first. Unlike typology or testimonia, allusion does include the prophetic or prefigurative element, rather one biblical citation is understood by reference to another. By far the largest interpretive category is that of the fall. This comes as no surprise given the subject matter of the text. This large designation is broken down into the sub-groups of pride and sex.

Table 5 - Exegetical Strategies for Gen. 3:1-24

Exegetical Strategies	Number of Citations	Percentage of total number of citations
Fall	55	26%
Pride	33	17%
Fall/sex	17	8%
Technical	24	11%
Allegory	51	24%
Prophetic	14	7%

Sermo CLIII.IX.11 (Gen. 3: 2,3,4,5), CCXXIV.II.2 (Gen. 3:4,5), *De civitate dei* XIV.XIV(Gen. 3:13, 12), and *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I.V.6 (Gen. 3:6,7).
    On several instances (*Sermone domini in monte* .XII.34, *Enarratio in psalmum* CXXI.6, *De symbolo* II.10) Augustine alludes to the entire story of Genesis 3. These have been calculated as on citation and are discussed under Gen. 3:1 in chapter four.

Table 5 - <u>Exegetical Strategies for Gen. 3:1-24</u> (cont'd)

Exegetical Strategies	Number of Citations	Percentage of total number of citations
Typology	10	4%
Allusion	6	3%

The Fall

The fall is by far the most frequently employed interpretive strategy. It accounts for 26% of the citations. When the sub-categories of pride and sex are added the percentage increases to 51%. This number takes on added significance when one considers that Augustine never directly attributes the responsibility for the entry of sin into the world to woman *qua* female. This is not because Augustine fails to discuss the issue. Given the frequency with which the category of the Fall is employed as an interpretive strategy, Augustine had ample opportunity to blame Eve had this been his intention. However, Augustine views sin as a human corruption. Furthermore no particular sex has a monopoly on sin. Furthermore, as was evident in the third section of chapter four and will become evident in section three of this chapter, Augustine views the subordination of women as divinely intended and sanctioned from the beginning of creation, hence does not need to blame Eve in order to justify her subordination.

Augustine explores several sub-themes under the general category of the fall. These include the disorder in creation resulting from

the fall, *lex mortis*, God's truthfulness, free will and original sin. There are other isolated references to the fall which defy categorization.

Disorder in Creation: One of Augustine's earliest themes concerning the fall is the disorder in creation which accrued from mankind's disobedience. The first instances are found in *De genesi contra manichaeos* where Augustine merely describes this disorder. In *De genesi contra manichaeos* I.XIII.19[500] poisonous and fruitless trees are the result of the fall not an inherent evil in matter as the Manichaeans had suggested. Work too is a result of the fall.[501] Furthermore mankind's sense of spiritual realities become disordered, since what man finds personally displeasing he attributes to God.[502] However this disorder, contrary to Manichaean cosmology, is not God made but rather a product of mankind's turning from the divine to himself.[503] As a result Augustine argues that Gen. 3:15-16 cannot be used to prove that there is already evil in creation, rather the verses must be understood allegorically.[504]

Lex mortis: A second theme concerning the fall is *lex mortis* (the law of death) under which all of humanity is born. Augustine first introduces this phrase in *Contra fortunatum* II.22 (August 28-29, 392 C.E.) in the context of his anti-Manichaean debates.[505] He alludes to it again in *Sermone domini in monte* I.XVII.53 (393 C.E),[506] and in *De fide*

---

[500]PL 34, 182.

[501]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.V.8. PL 34, 199.

[502]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XVI.24. PL 34, 209.

[503]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XXVI.40. PL 34, 217-218.

[504]Ibid.

[505]PL 42, 126.

[506]PL 34, 1256.

et symbolo IV.6[507] (393 C.E.) where death is the separation of the soul from God. In eight of the *Enarrationes in psalmum* , from 396 C.E., in *Sermo* CCCLIX.1[508] and CCCLXII.XIV.16[509] *lex mortis* is described as the penalty for sin.[510] In *Sermo* XLV.4[511] work also falls under this law, while the Lord's prayer expresses our hope that even in this situation the earth will be transformed.[512] In *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* II.XXXII.53[513] (412 C.E.) Augustine responds to the Pelagians who wonder that these curses are not lifted even after Christ's advent. Augustine counters that this fact not prove that *lex mortis* is part of our pre-lapsarian condition. It has been maintained after Christ as a means of perfecting the painful work of justice. In *De civitate dei* XIII.XV[514] (417 C.E.) God merely announces his *lex mortis* in Gen. 3:19. In *Contra secundam juliani* VI.XXII[515] (429 C.E.), Adam merited *lex mortis* because of the magnitude of his sin. To suggest that death was merely part of the natural order as Julian has done would be to attribute great cruelty to God.

---

[507]PL 40, 194.

[508]PL 39, 1590.

[509]PL 39, 1621.

[510]*Enarratio in psalmum* XL.6 (PL 36, 458),XLI.14 (PL 36, 474), LVII.2 (PL 36, 675) twice, LXV.13 (PL 36, 795),LXVIII.II.11 (PL 36, 861), LXXI.12 (PL 36, 909), LXXXIV.7 (PL 37,1072), and CIII.IV.6 (PL 37, 1381).

[511]PL 38, 265.

[512]*Sermo* LVIII.III.4. PL 38, 394.

[513]PL 44, 183.

[514]PL 41, 387.

[515]PL 45, 1446.

A secondary theme concerning the *lex mortis* is God's truthfulness. God told the truth when he announced the consequences of man's disobedience. The devil, on the other hand, lied. This theme is first found in reference to Gen. 3 in *Enarratio in psalmum* XXXC.18[516] (396 C.E.) and later repeated in *Enarratio in psalmum* LXVII.9,[517] LXXIII.25,[518] *Sermo* CCXXIV. II.2,[519] *Sermo* CCXXXII.II.2,[520] *Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum* I.XV.23 & I.XVI.27[521] (419 C.E.), and *De civitate dei* XXII.XXX.5[522](425 C.E.).

Free Will: In *De catechizandis rudibus* XVIII.30[523] (400 C.E.) Augustine makes an early reference to the theme of man's free will. Regarding Gen. 3:4, he stipulates that Adam's own *volunatas* (will) allowed himself to be seduced by Eve. In *De civitate dei* XIV.XI.2[524] (418 C.E.) Adam was not seduced into sin like Eve, but entered of his own free will.

Original Sin: There are some hints at a nascent doctrine of original sin in some of Augustine's early references to Gen. 3. In *Enarratio in psalmum* CXVIII.XXV.5[525] (396 C.E.) Augustine repeats a theme which he

---

[516]PL 36, 354.

[517]PL 36, 539.

[518]PL 36, 945.

[519]PL 38, 1094.

[520]PL 38, 1108.

[521]PL 42, 615 & 616.

[522]PL 41, 803.

[523]CCSL XLVI, 155.

[524]PL 41, 420.

[525]PL 37, 1574.

was to employ the following year regarding Gen. 2:17 in *Ad simplicianum* II.I.4[526]. Adam's prevarication is indicative of a fault in his character which all sinners share. In *De natura et gratia* XXXVII.44[527] (415 C.E) Augustine states explicitly that Gen. 3:6 is a scriptural attestation to original sin. A year later (416 C.E) Augustine makes a similar assertion in *Epistola* CLXXIX.8[528] addressed to John the Bishop of Jerusalem. In *Contra secundam juliani* II.CLXXVII[529] (429 C.E.) Augustine argues that all men are from *terra* hence all share Adam's sin.

There a number of isolated references to the fall. They form a tapestry of ideas, some pastorally motivated, attesting to generalized post-lapsarian disorder. In *Enarratio in psalmum* LXX.I.2[530] Adam's disobedience resulted in the fall. In *Enarratio in psalmum* LXX.I.5[531]Adam doubts God's goodness and flees. In *Enarratio in psalmum* LXX.II.2[532] God is the *imperator* (head) and the devil is the traitor. In *Enarratio in psalmum* LXXVII.4, God speaks in parables because the sinful heart needs to work at understanding His word.[533] Augustine cautions his listeners not to judge each other since the serpent is always at our heel in *Enarratio in psalmum* CIII.IV.8. (396 C.E.)[534]

---

[526]CCSL XLIV, 62-63.

[527]PL 44, 268.

[528]PL 33, 777. The letter had been provoked by a Pelagian tractate which had been produced previously by Bishop John.

[529]PL 45, 1219.

[530]PL 36, 877.

[531]PL 36, 878.

[532]PL 36, 892.

[533]*Enarratio in psalmum* LXXVII.4. PL 36, 985.

[534]PL 37, 1383.

Writing twenty-four years later Augustine expresses a similar view in *Contra guadentium* I.V.[535] In this tractate addressed to the Donatist Bishop Gaudentius Augustine suggests that Christians need to persecute vice rather than each other. In *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXIII.44[536] Augustine notes that Adam is dimly aware by Gen. 3:8 that his actions will have consequences for all eternity.

Sexuality

One of the most noticeable physical manifestations of the fall is disordered sexuality made evident in man's inability to control the movement in his sexual organs. This constitutes a major sub-theme to the category of the fall in Augustine's exegesis of Gen. 3. It is in *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXIV.46[537] and XI.XXXV.47[538] that Augustine first introduces the theme of disordered human sexuality in reference to Gen. 3. The first couple hides in Gen. 3:10 because of the unruliness of their sexual members. In *Sermo* CLI.V.5[539] concupiscence arises from the first sin which causes Adam and Eve, in *Sermo* CLXXIV.IV.4[540] to be ashamed In *De trinitate* XII.XII.17[541] from roughly the same period, the

---

[535]PL 43, 709.

[536]PL 34, 447-448.

[537]PL 34, 448.

[538]PL 34, 448-449.

[539]PL 38, 817.

[540]PL 38, 942.

[541]PL 42, 1007.

physical movement mirrors a similar animal sensuality in the human soul. This man shares in common with the animals. In *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I.XXII.36[542] (412 C.E.) through the opened eyes of Gen. 3:7, the first couple perceives the libidinous movement of their members which they attempt to cover.

From 417 on the theme of disordered sexuality and the uncontrollability of the members becomes a more frequent and predominant theme with regards to Gen. 3.[543] Augustine last mentions it in *Contra secundam juliani* V.XVI[544]. Once again he explains that man was made aware of his nudity when he ate the forbidden fruit.

Pride

The category of pride, which could be considered a sub-theme of the fall, is cited with enough frequency to merit its own section. It accounts for 35 references or 17% of the explanations used with regard to Gen. 3. It is introduced early in Augustine's writing. The first instance is found in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XV.22 (389 C.E.)[545] where pride is introduced as the cause of man's fall. It is a theme which would continue throughout Augustine's exegesis of Gen. 3.[546]. It was found in

---

[542]PL 44,173.

[543]See *De civitate dei* XIII.XIII. (PL 41, 386), XIV.XVII (PL 41, 425), 418 C.E., XIV.XXI (PL 41, 429),418 C.E.; *De gratia christi et de peccato originali* II.XXXIV.39 (PL 44, 401), 418 C.E.; *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II.XXI.36 (PL 44, 457), II.XXX.52, (PL 44, 467) 419 C.E.; *Contra julianum* IV.XVI.82 (PL 44,780) twice, VI.XX.65 (PL 44, 863), 421 C.E.; *Contra secundam juliani* III.LXXIV (PL 45, 1279), IV.XXXVII (PL 45, 1357) 429 C.E.

[544]PL 45, 1449.

[545]PL 34, 207-208.

[546] See *De fide et symbolo* IV.6 (PL 40, 185), *Enarratio in psalmum* XLVIII.II.2, LXVIII.I.9 (PL 36, 848), LXX.II.6 (PL 36, 895), LXXIII.18 (PL 36, 940) three citations, XC.I.3 (PL

all contexts from anti-Manichaean to anti-Pelagian. Pride is responsible for Adam's accusation of Eve and his attempt to blame God for creating her.[547] It is pride which prompts Eve to blame the serpent.[548] Furthermore pride motivated the first couple to cover themselves since they disdained their previous innocence.[549] Pride caused the serpent to usurp that which was not rightly his.[550] Later on in *In joannis evangelium* XLII.11[551] (408-413 C.E.) envy prompted the serpent to approach Eve. Consequently he offered pride to Adam who took it.[552] In *De libero arbitrio* III.XXIV.72[553] (395 C.E.) pride has an aversion to wisdom. Pride is also the serpent which will cause the church to fall in *Enarratio in psalmum* XXXV.18 (396 C.E.).[554] In *Enarratio in psalmum* LXXXI.5 pride is the false happiness of the world.[555]

37,1151),CXVIII.IX.1 (PL 37, 1522), CXXI.6 (PL 37, 1623), *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXX.39 (PL 34, 445) twice, *Sermo* CLIII.IX.11 (PL 38, 831), *Sermo* CLXIII.VIII.8 (PL 38, 893), *Sermo* CCLXIV.3 (PL 38, 1214), *De civitate dei* XVI.XIII.2 (PL 41, 421).

[547] *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XVII.25. (PL 34, 209). Also see *De genesi ad litteram* XIXXXV.47, (PL 34, 448-449), and *De civitate dei* XIV.XIV(PL 41, 422) twice.

[548] *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XVII.25. (PL 34, 209). Also see *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXV.48, (PL 34, 449),

[549] *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XV.23. PL 34, 20. In this instance no mention is made of the disordered sexual members which were to plague Adam and Eve in later exegesis.

[550] *Enarratio in psalmum* LXVIII.I.9 . PL 36, 848.

[551] PL 35, 1703-1704.

[552] *In joannis evangelium* XVIII.16. PL 35, 1535.

[553] PL 32, 1307.

[554] PL 36, 354.

[555] PL 37, 1050.

<u>Allegory</u>

Several allegorical images emerge relatively consistently. One of the earliest is the link between the serpent and the devil which is first found in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XIV.20-21.[556] Further on in the same work the devil takes on a human face when the serpent is equated with heretics in general and specifically to Manichaeans.[557] In *Enarratio in psalmum* LXIII.16[558] the serpent is the dragon of Ps LXXII.13. This signifies that the original sin was that of pride. The serpent represents the lapsed angel in *Enarratio in psalmum* CIII.II.10.[559] In *De trinitate* XI.XIII.20[560] written between five and twenty years later, the serpent signifies the *sensum corporis* (bodily senses).

A second allegorical theme is one which had already been discussed in relation to Gen. 2:15-25. This was the nature of the opening of Adam and Eve's eyes. Augustine refers to the understanding he had developed during his earlier discussions of Gen. 2. In *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XV.23[561] Augustine argues that any reference to opened eyes of the first parents must be understood allegorically since quite obviously they possessed physical sight in Gen. 2. Therefore the opened eyes of Gen. 3:7 represent the spiritual attitude of cunning. In

---

[556]PL 34, 206-207.

[557]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XXC.38-40. PL 34, 216-218.

[558]PL 36, 938.

[559]PL 37, 1358.

[560]PL 42, 1009.

[561]PL 34, 208.

Enarratio in psalmum XXXVII.15[562] God is the light of Adam's eyes which is why he hid himself in the shadows after his disobedience. Augustine provides insight into the issue of the open eyes in *Contra faustum* I.III and XII.XIV[563] (400 C.E.). Manichaeans have praised the serpent for opening man's eyes to spiritual truth. In *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXI.40[564] Augustine uses the fact that the woman could see to find the tree as proof that Gen. 3:6 is intended allegorically. Furthermore the allegorical language of Gen. 3:7 is the same as Lk. 24:31. The open eyes signify arrogant pride and curiosity.[565] In *De trinitate* XII.VIII.13[566] (401-415 C.E.) the eyes of Adam's conscience are opened. In *De civitate dei* XIV.XVII[567] (418 C.E.) and *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* I.V.6[568] (419 C.E.) Augustine flatly states that the eyes of the first parents were already physically open in Gen. 3:6-7.

A third allegorical theme is the theological anthropology previously discussed in relation to Gen. 2:15-25. As with Gen. 2. 15-25, Augustine's anthropology emerges early, in his exegesis of Gen. 3. It is first found in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XVIII.27, (389 C.E.)[569] Here woman represents the carnal propensity of all human beings which continues to be subjected to the temptation of the devil. In *Sermone*

---

[562]PL 36, 405.

[563]PL 42, 208 & 406.

[564]PL 34, 445-446.

[565]*De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXI.41. PL 34, 446.

[566]PL 42, 1005.

[567]PL 41, 425.

[568]PL 44,417. Note that Gen. 3:6 is cited twice within this context.

[569]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XVIII.27. PL 34, 210.

domini in monte I.XII.34[570] written four years latter, the serpent represents persuasion; Eve the *appetitu carnali* (carnal appetite); and Adam the consent of the rational to sin. In *Enarratio in psalmum* XLVIII.I.6[571] (396 C.E.) Eve is our flesh which is the vehicle the devil used to trick man. In *Enarratio in psalmum* LXXXIII.7[572] man represents the *mente* (mind), woman the *desideria carnis* (desires of the flesh) and the serpent evil. Only when the *mente* acquiesces to *desideria carnis* can evil succeed. In *De trinitate* XII.XII.17,[573] written at least six years later, Augustine hints at an exegetical reason behind his allegorical representation. Both Adam and Eve are presented as eating from the forbidden fruit. This is necessary since the faculty represented by woman is common to all humans. In *De civitate dei* XV.VII.2[574] from 418 C.E. the soul rules the flesh the way the husband rules the wife.

In *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXII.42,[575] Augustine introduces a fourth allegorical theme where he expressly links death and sexual desire. The *succinctoria*, (belt) of Gen. 3:7 represents human mortality and libido. In *Sermo* CXXII.I.1[576] the *succintoria* is called a *foliis ficulneis* (fig leaves) and signifies sin. Along a similar vein the *peliceas tunicas*

---

[570]PL 34, 1246.

[571]PL 36, 548.

[572]PL 37, 1060.

[573]PL 42, 1007.

[574]PL 41, 445.

[575]PL 34, 446-667.

[576]PL 38, 680.

(tunics of skins) mentioned in Gen. 3:21 signify man's mortality in *De trinitate* XII.XI.16 (401-415 C.E.).[577]

There are numerous incidental allegorical correspondences. Evening represents the failing light of truth in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XVI.24.[578] Later in *Annotationum in job* Ib.VII[579] (400-401 C.E.) evening signifies the hope of afflicted souls who will only obtain relief in the pure light of morning. Nakedness denotes lack of dissimulation,[580] *pectoris* (chest) means pride and *ventris* (stomach) signifies carnal desire.[581] Woman's curse is an allegory for the struggle between the desire to do good and bad habits, [582] Eve representative of life is the portion of the soul which is preoccupied with good, [583] while thorns and thistles are torturous questions.[584] The cherubim represent fullness of knowledge and the flaming sword is temporal punishments.[585] The plural 'us'of Gen. 3:22 signifies the Trinity.[586] The serpent being

---

[577](PL 42, 1006).

[578]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XVI.24. PL 34, 208. Augustine was to use this image on one other occasion in *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXIII.43, (PL 34, 447) where once again evening represents the loss of the light of truth.

[579]PL 34, 832.

[580]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XVI.24. PL 34, 209.

[581]Ibid. II.XVII.26. PL 34, 210.

[582]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XIX.29,. PL 34, 210.

[583]Ibid. II.XXI.31. PL 34, 212. In *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XXVII.41 (PL 34, 218) Augustine was merely to stipulate that Gen. 3:18 was intended allegorically without explaining the allegorical elements.

[584]Ibid. II.XX.30. PL 34, 211.

[585]Ibid. II.XIII.35. PL 34, 214.

[586]*De genesi ad litteram* XIXXXIX.53. PL 34, 451.

condemned to eat earth refers to sinners and curiosity which is the third type of temptation.[587]

The meaning of some allegories shifted over the years. Such is the case with *terra*. In *De diversis quaestionibus octoginta tribus* LXV[588] (388-395 C.E.). Linking Gen. 3:19 with John 11:1 *terra* becomes *cupiditatum, carnalium* (carnal concupiscence) which is equated to Lazarus' tomb. In *Enarratio in psalmum* LXXXII.14[589] *terra* was man and also pride while in *De agone christiano* II[590] (396 C.E.) terra referred both to this world and the passions of this world. In *Sermo* LXXVIII.5[591] *terra* was a figure for death.

On several occasions, Augustine merely states that verses should be considered allegorically, although he does not provide an interpretation. Such is the case with Gen. 3:21 in *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXIX.52,[592] and the tree of life in found in *Contra secundam juliani* VI.XXX[593] (429 C.E.).

Technical

Twenty-four of the citations, or 11% require technical explanations. Frequently the issue is the nature of God particularly His greatness. In

---

[587]Ibid. II.XVIII.27. PL 34, 210.

[588]PL 40, 60. Leaving the tomb meant leaving carnal vices.

[589]PL 37, 1055.

[590]PL 40, 291.

[591]PL 38, 492.

[592]PL 34, 451.

[593]PL 45, 1581.

the early years the underlying concern is probably the Manichaean contention that the God of Gen. 3 is the inferior Demiurge. Evidence for this is found in *Contra faustum* XXII.XIV[594]. Faustus has suggested that an omniscient God, if He were who He purported to be, would not have had to ask where Adam was. Consequently the earliest technical explanations concerned with this theme arise during the post conversion period when Augustine actively debates the merits of Christianity with his former co-religionists. In *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XVI.24[595] Augustine's concern is God's omniscience, which appears to be undermined by the question *ubi es?*. Augustine explains the question is not asked for knowledge but rather salvific purposes. God wants Adam to confess his sin. Later in *Enarratio in psalmum* CXVIII.IX.1[596] God's omniscience is once again an issue. In this instance God asks *ubi es* as a reproach for Adam's *superbia*. In *De civitate dei* XIII.XV[597] (417 C.E.) Augustine describes the question as rhetorical and in *De civitate dei* XII.XXIII.1[598] the question is intended as an announcement of Adam's death. In *De trinitate* II.X.18[599] (401-415 C.E.) Augustine merely alludes to the fact that Gen. 3:7 has proved problematic for exegetes.

God's superiority and His loving nature are at issue for other technical explanations. In Gen. 3:22 God does not literally mean that

---

[594]PL 42, 407.

[595]PL 34, 209.

[596]PL 37, 1523.

[597]PL 41, 387.

[598]PL 41, 396. Augustine cites Gen. 3:19 twice in this chapter, using the same explanation both times.

[599]PL 42, 856.

Adam has become like him, which would diminish God's supremacy. Rather God is making an ironic statement or commenting upon Adam's attempt to act outside of God.[600]

The nature of Adam's ejection from paradise also results in a technical discussion in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XII.34. God does not reject Adam, but rather Adam is driven to remove himself from the Godly sphere of the garden.[601]

The anthropomorphic representation of God also prompts technical discussions. Precisely how God spoke, and what Adam heard and saw was an issue which Augustine never resolved. In *De trinitate* II.X.17[602] Augustine notes that exactly how this communication occurred is impossible to determine from scripture. However the reader was to understand that anthropomorphic representations did not mean that God was physically limited.[603] In *De trinitate* II.X.18[604] Augustine points out that Adam did not need to physically see God to be aware of his presence. Augustine once again takes up this issue in *Epistola* CXLVIII.IV.V.14[605] (413 C.E.) which was addressed to Bishop Fortunatianus of Sicqua. Here he explains that the language of Gen. 3:8 *anthropormorphitae sunt* (are anthropomorphisms). Since Adam heard God corporeally he consequently attributed human qualities to God.

---

[600]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XII.33. PL 34, 213.

[601]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XII.34. PL 34, 213-214.

[602]PL 42, 855-856.

[603]As mentioned in chapter 2 and chapter 4 the Manichees had frequently ridiculed the Old Testament because of its anthropomorphisms.

[604]PL 42, 856.

[605]PL 33, 628.

On some occasions the technical discussion is prompted by some perceived contradiction in the biblical texts. For example, in _De genesi ad litteram_ XI.II.4[606] the use of the word *prudentissimus* (wise) with regard to the serpent leads to a long digression concerning the possibility that the Devil was created in an evil state. Augustine is adamant that God does not create evil since such is the cosmology of the Manichaeans and the *raison d'être* for the existence of the Demiurge. The devil was obviously good until pride caused him to usurp what was not rightly his. Similarly Augustine wonders in _De genesi ad litteram_ XI.XXX.39[607] why Adam ate in Gen. 3:6 when he knew God's commandment. Perhaps Eve proved too persuasive, or perhaps he could see for himself she was not dead.

In some instances the biblical citation has been used as an *exemplum* to prove a case. In _Enarratio in psalmum_ LXI.18[608] Gen. 3:17 is cited as proof that God did speak with humans.

On other occasions the technical explanations appear to be unique and isolated. For example in _Enarratio in psalmum_ XCV.15[609] the four Greek letters which make up Adam's name stand for the four corners of the earth. Consequently Adam means the whole world. In _De genesi ad litteram_ XI.XL.54[610] Augustine stipulates that Gen. 3:23 is not a direct quotation but rather the author records the results of God's words which

---

[606]PL 34, 431-432.

[607]PL 34, 445.

[608]PL 36, 741.

[609]PL 37, 1236.

[610]PL 34, 451.

are found in Gen. 3:22. In *Sermo* XXXVII.VI.9[611] Augustine states that the fields of paradise from Mt. 6:21 are not like those of Adam in 3:19. In *De peccatorum meritis et remissione* I.II.2[612] (412 C.E.) the curses of Gen. 3:19 apply only to the mortal body and not to the soul. For those living when Christ returns for a second time, the words of Gen. 3:19 do not apply at all.[613] In *Contra julianum* fasting without a properly penitent spiritual orientation is likened to the empty labor of working among the thorns.[614] In *Contra julianum* IV.XI.20 Augustine discusses multivalency in connection with the use of the word serpent in the Bible. In Mt. 10:16 being wise as serpents is used positively to describe the disciples, while in Gen. 3:1 the image is negative.[615]

Prophetic

As mentioned previously Augustine's use of prophetic exegesis includes several elements such as typology, testimonia, etc. It also includes the notion that Old Testament texts prefigure or predict incidents and situations not necessarily related to the New Testament but to the human condition. When Augustine first uses prophecy as an exegetical tool with regard to Gen. 3, it is this third type of prophecy which he has in mind. The skin garments of Gen. 3:21 do not symbolize death, as he was to suggest much later on in *De trinitate* XII.XI.16 (401-415 C.E.). Rather

---

[611]PL 38, 226.

[612]PL 44, 109.

[613]*De civitate dei* XX.XX.2. PL 41, 688. This book was written in 425 C.E.

[614]*Contra julianum* I.V.18. PL 44, 652. This was written in 421 C.E.

[615]PL 44, 748.

the animal skins are prophetic of, or prefigure the death to which Adam and all humankind will eventually succumb.[616] In *De genesi ad litteram* Gen. 3:14-15 are prophetic of the relationship between humanity and the devil.[617] Gen. 3:16 is prophetic of the pains of child birth and the marriage relationship.[618] Gen 3:20 is prophetic of Eve's role as mother since she has yet to have children.[619] Gen. 3:24 prefigures the wretched state of the sinner in the post-lapsarian world.[620]

On occasion the Old Testament is prophetic of the New. In *Enarratio in psalmum* CXXXVIII.1[621] the bread won by the sweat of Adam's brow in Gen. 3:19 prefigures the *panis vivus* or living bread of Christ mentioned in John 6:41.

On some occasions Augustine baldly states that a text is prophetic without supplying an exegesis. Such is the case for Gen. 3:9 in *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXIV.45,[622] and Gen. 3:17-19 in *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXVIII.51.[623]

---

[616]*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XXI.32. PL 34, 21.

[617]*De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXVI.49. PL 34, 449-450.

[618]*De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXVII.50. PL 34, 450.

[619]*De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXVIII.51. PL 34, 450.

[620]*De genesi ad litteram* XI.X..55. PL 34, 451-452.

[621]PL 37, 1784.

[622]PL 34, 448. Augustine's rationale for failing to supply the exegesis is that he is only concerned with the historical meanings in this particular work.

[623]PL 34, 450.

Typology

There are several recurring typologies which Augustine employs regarding Gen. 3. The first is found in *Enarratio in psalmum* XXXIV.I.7[624] (396 C.E.). The temptation story of Gen. 3 is linked with the temptation of Job as found in Job 2:10. As the devil worked through the woman in Gen. 3:6 so did he work through Job's wife in Job. 2:10. He repeats this understanding in *Enarratio in psalmum* XLVII.9,[625] XCIII.19[626] *De symbolo* III.10,[627] *In epistolam joannis* IV.3,[628] VI.7[629] (416 C.E.) and *De patientia* XII.9[630] (418 C.E.).

A second typological theme links Gen. 3, Ex. 4:14 and Christ's crucifixion. This is first found in *Enarratio in psalmum* LXXIII.5[631] (396 C.E.). Since the serpent of Gen. 3 brought death, the rod which changes to a serpent prefigures Christ in death. Furthermore the rod which is made of wood prefigures the cross. Augustine repeats this exegesis in *De trinitate* II.X.20 (401-415 C.E.).[632] In *De peccatorum meritis et*

---

[624]PL 36, 327.

[625]PL 36, 539.

[626]PL 37, 1207.

[627]PL 40, 632.

[628]PL 35, 2007.

[629]PL 35, 2025.

[630]PL 40, 616.

[631]PL 36, 933.

[632]PL 42, 880.

remissione I.XXXII.60[633] (412 C.E.) the exegesis is expanded. As Moses raised the serpent in the desert so was Christ raised upon the cross.

The Adam/Christ typology, so axiomatic of patristic exegesis, is presented by Augustine for the first time in _Enarratio in psalmum_ CXIX.2[634] As Adam fell through pride so Christ rose through mercy. Augustine hints at a similar typology in _In joannis evangelium_ XLIX.20[635] (408-413 C.E.). Here the _ubi posuistis eum_ (Where have you placed him) with regards to Christ, echoes God's _ubi es_ to Adam.

In _Enarratio in psalmum_ CXXVI.8[636] Augustine introduces a typological exegesis which we have already seen in reference to Gen. 2:22-24. Eve is presented as a type for the Christian church. In this instance her name _vita_ (life) provides the key for such a reading, since the church is the life of the world.

Allusion

Augustine employs an exegetical strategy which he views as falling under the preview of prophetic, however is not strictly prefigurative. In other words the interpretation pertains in some way to the future but the link is not a direct "_praenuntiatio futurum_" (prophecy of the future). [637] Augustine uses a second biblical citation to clarify the meaning of the first,

---

[633]PL 44, 145

[634]PL 37, 1598.

[635]PL 35, 1756.

[636]PL 37, 1673. Augustine cites both Gen. 3:16 &20.

[637]_De doctrina christiana_ III.X.15. PL 34, 71.

a strategy which he recommends in *De doctrina christiana* III.XVI.37.[638] I have called this intertextual interpretation, allusion.

One of the first instances wherein Augustine uses this technique is found in *De diversis quaestionibus octoginta tribus* LXV[639] (388-395 C.E.). John 11:1 becomes a parallel for Gen. 3:10. The point Augustine wishes to make is that all sinners hide from God. He illustrates it by suggesting that Christ's calling out of Lazarus is similar to God's calling of Adam. Lazarus is not a type of Adam in this instance but rather illustrative of the general category of sinner to which both he and Adam belong.

There a several other isolated instances of allusion. The first is found in *Enarratio in psalmum* LIX.2[640] (396 C.E.) where Adam's acquiescence to Eve are the *tenebrae* (shadows) referred to by Paul in Eph 5:8, under which we all live. In *Enarratio in psalmum* LXXIV.14[641] Ps. 84:12 describes truth as having left the earth. Augustine suggests that this is a reference to Gen. 3:19. Esau's sacrifice for his birthright for a plate of lentils is similar to Adam's for an apple in *In joannis evangelium* LXXII.1. [642] In *Annotationum in job* I b.VII[643] (400-401 C.E) Adam's flight in Gen. 3:8 is similar to Job's in Job 7:2. Both are fleeing the Lord. Augustine alludes to Rom. 8:3 in reference to Gen. 3:19 in *Contra maximinum* I.II. (418 C.E.).[644] In this instance the issue is the veracity of

---

[638]PL 34, 79.

[639]PL 40, 60.

[640]PL 36, 714.

[641]PL 37, 1079.

[642]PL 35, 1824.

[643]PL 34, 832.

[644]PL 42, 745.

Christ's body which has been apparently questioned by the Arian Bishop Maximinus. Augustine argues that Christ's body is similar to our sinful body minus the sin. As such he truly suffers the death to which all bodies are condemned in Gen. 3:19.

Chronological Development and Historical Influences on Augustinian Exegesis of Gen. 3

Prior to moving on to section three, and the evaluation of theological sexism found in Augustine's understanding of Gen. 3 several concluding remarks need to be made concerning his exegetical strategies.

As noted in the introduction to this chapter, Augustine does not radically shift or alter his interpretation of verses during the course of his life time. Most verses follow the pattern of Gen. 3:12. Augustine's earliest exegesis of the verse understood pride as the weakness which allowed sin to enter the world. He remained faithful to this interpretation until the end of his life. There are, however, several possible exceptions. The first is Gen. 3:11. In *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XVI.24[645] Augustine understands the man's nudity allegorically. The man's awareness of his nudity referred to the realization that he no longer walked in God's divine light. By the time Augustine wrote *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXV.47,[646] nudity was physical and graphically concrete. The man was embarrassed, not because he no longer walked in divine illumination, but because the disorder of concupiscence has created unruly motion in his

---

[645]PL 34, 209.

[646]PL 34, 44.

sexual organs. This understanding of the verse was used on the only other occasion when it was cited in *Contra secundam juliani* V.XVI.[647] However the notion that concupiscence infected and disordered human sexual relations was to recur more and more frequently in Augustine's exegesis of Gen. 3.[648]

As previously noted, the shift from the allegorical to the prophetic or literal follows the same pattern that it did with Gen. 2:15-25. Augustine's early work is more allegorized while after *De genesi ad litteram* interpretations focus upon the doctrinal, the prophetic and the literal which are frequently levels of the same reality. The majority of Gen. 3 interpretations are devoted to doctrinal issues pertaining to the Fall, accounting for 51% of Augustine's explanations. A strong secondary theme is the disorder in creation caused by human concupiscence.

As with Gen. 2:15-25, no particular exegetical strategy appears more affirmative of women than any other. However, Augustine's understanding of certain theological issues does mitigate against some of the more virulent expressions of sexism. For example, Augustine's insistence that humanity is responsible for the fall accounts for his reluctance to attribute sole responsibility to Eve in Gen. 3:6. This is played out at the allegorical level where Eve represents some part of the human psyche common to all humanity and at the historical level where Adam was not seduced into sin but consented with his eyes open.

---

[647]PL 45, 1449.

[648]See *De civitate dei* XIII.XIII. (PL 41, 386), XIV.XVII (PL 41, 425), 418 C.E., XIV.XXI (PL 41, 429),418 C.E.; *De gratia christi et de peccato originali* II.XXXIV.39 (PL 44, 401), 418 C.E.; *De nuptiis et concupiscentia* II.XXI.36 (PL 44, 457), II.XXX.52, (PL 44, 467) 419 C.E.; *Contra julianum* IV.XVI.82 (PL 44,780) twice, VI.XX.65 (PL 44, 863), 421 C.E.; *Contra secundam juliani* III.LXXIV (PL 45, 1279), IV.XXXVII (PL 45, 1357) 429 C.E.

Section 3

Theological Sexism and Gen. 3.

The criterion for evaluating theological sexism has been described
in detail in chapter one. As previously described in chapter one the
questions for evaluating theological sexism have been slightly modified
for Genesis 3. Question one, pertaining to the order of creation, is
obviously only applicable to Gen. 2:25-24 and therefore excluded. The
following questions have been retained:

> 2. Is the subordination of women divinely
>
> sanctioned?
>
> 3. Who is responsible for the entry of sin into
>
> the world?
>
> 4. Is the patriarchal family divinely
>
> sanctioned?
>
> 5. Are these texts used in any way which either
>
> explicitly or implicitly sanctions female
>
> inferiority and/or subordination?

As with Gen. 2:15-25, the statistical frequency of obviously sexist
texts is limited. Of the 208 instances when some portion of Gen. 3 is
cited a mere 15[649] or seven percent betray obvious sexism. The

---

[649]These are *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XVIII.27 (PL 34, 210), II.XIX.29 (PL 34, 210),
Sermone domini in monte I.XII.34 (PL 34, 1246), *Enarratio in psalmum* XXXIV.I.7 (PL 36,
327), XLVII.9 (PL 36, 539), XLVIII.I.6 (PL 36, 548) twice, LXXXIII.7 (PL 37, 1060), XCIII.19
(PL 37, 1207), *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXVII.50 (PL 34, 450), *De symbolo* III.10 (PL 40,
632), *De civitate dei* XV.VII.2 (PL 41, 445), *In epistolam ioannis* IV.3 (PL 35, 2007) VI.7 (PL
35, 2025), and *De patientia* XII.9 (PL 40, 616).

description of these texts will proceed chronologically as was the case with Gen. 2:15-25.

Sexist Use of Texts

In *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XVIII.27[650] Augustine describes woman as the *animalem partem* of human nature. This occurs within the context of God's curses or punishments of the first couple. Referring to Gen. 3:15 Augustine understands this portion as the part which is susceptible to temptation by the devil. This serves to explain why there is no enmity between the serpent and Adam but only between the serpent and the woman. Further on in *De genesi contra manichaeos* II.XIX.29[651] Augustine explains Gen. 3:16 (woman's curse) using the same anthropology. Quite obviously the curse of painful childbirth is not intended literally since "*mortalium corporum sit ista conditio*" (this is the condition of mortal bodies) including animals. Hence the verse was obviously intended to be spiritual with the male signifying reason which ruled "*pars animae, quae carnalibus gaudiis tenetur*" (the part of the soul which is held by the glory of the carnal).[652] In *Sermone domini in monte* I.XI.34[653] (393 C.E.) Augustine once again presents Eve as the *appetitu carnali* (carnal appetite) while Adam signifies the rational element. In *Enarratio in psalmum* LXXXIII.7 Eve's signification is slightly modified.

---

[650]PL 34, 210

[651]PL 34, 210.

[652]PL 34, 211.

[653]PL 34, 1246.

She becomes *desideria carnis* (carnal desires) while Adam is the *mente* or the mind.

Augustine's shifts from a spiritualized understanding of Gen. 3:16 in *De genesi contra manichaeos* to a concrete one in *De genesi ad litteram* XI.XXXVII.50.[654] Eve's birth pangs are now physical and a result of the mortal state produced by sin. They are not however a punishment but rather the consequences of the actions of the first couple. The second portion of Gen. 3:16 concerning the woman's desire for her husband and the husband's ruling over his wife is intended as a *poena* (punishment) however "*neque enim et ante peccatum aliter factam fuisse decet credere mulierem, nisi ut vir ei dominaretur, et ad eum ipse serviendo converteretur*" (For we must believe that even before her sin woman had been made to be ruled by her husband and to be submissive and subject to him.)[655] While pre-lapsarian domination was part of God's natural order, post-lapsarian domination was God's punishment for woman's sin. Furthermore when this is reversed or subverted, sin increases in the world. Augustine writes: "*Hoc enim viro potius Dei sententia detulit, et maritum habere hominu meruit mulieris non natura, sed culpa: Quod tamen nisi servetur, depravabiltur amplius natura et augebitur culpa*" (The sentence pronounced by God gave this power rather to man, and it is not by her nature but rather by her sin that woman deserved to have her husband for a master. But if this order is not maintained nature will be corrupted still more and sin will be increased.)[656] Augustine cites 1 Tim. 2:12 as apostolic sanction of this state of affairs.

---

[654]PL 34, 450.

[655]PL 34, 450. ACW 42, 171.

[656]Ibid.

In *De civitate dei* XV.VII.2[657] (418 C.E.) Augustine once again employs the husband/wife, soul/flesh correspondence to describe Gen. 3:16 . He writes: "*Ubi intelligendum est virum ad regendam uxorem, animo carnem regenti similem esse oportere*" (Here we are to understand that the husband is to rule his wife as the soul rules the flesh)[658] As further proof of the divine sanction for this understanding Augustine cites Paul with Eph. 5:28-29.

There are a number of texts where Eve, although not responsible for the entry of sin into the world, is presented as the weak link. She is the fissure through which sin, in the guise of the serpent, was able to gain victory. Frequently the texts of Gen. 3 are used to interpret Job. 2:10. The devil, having found a method which worked in Gen. 3, uses similar tactics with Job and attempts to suborn his faith through his wife. Unfortunately for the devil Job was to prove a better man than Adam. In *Enarratio in psalmum* XXXII.II.1[659] (396 C.E.) Augustine writes "*Ibi victus est a diabolo per mulierem, hic vicit diabolum et mulierem.*" (There [in paradise] the devil vanquished through woman, here he [Job] vanquished the devil and woman.) Augustine describes the situation similarly in *Enarratio in psalmum* X.VII.9,[660] XCIII.19[661], *De symbolo* III.10,

---

[657]PL 41, 445.

[658]NPNF1 2, 289.

[659]PL 36, 286.

[660]PL 36, 539.

[661]PL 37, 1207.

[662] *In epistolam joannis* IV.3 & VI.7[663] (416 C.E.) and *De patientia* XII [664]((418 C.E.). In *Enarratio in psalmum* XLVIII.I.6[665] Eve *"nobis interio caro nostra est"* (is our interior flesh) via which the devil tricks man.

Evaluating Theological Sexism in Gen. 3.

The first question asked: Is the subordination of women divinely sanctioned? With respect to Gen. 3 the answer is emphatically yes. Whether in the spiritualized exegesis of *De genesi contra manichaeos* or the literal exegesis of *De genesi ad litteram* Augustine consistently understands that the female element is dominated by the male. As the physical male dominates and controls his wife so does the male *ratio* or *mente* control the female carnal appetites and desires in each human psyche. Once again God expressly employs the metaphor of patriarchal marriage with the view to making this anthropology intelligible to human readers of scripture. Furthermore the domination of the male by the female was operative in paradise prior to the Fall. As women were created subordinate in God's perfect pre-lapsarian order so they remained subordinate in the corrupted post-lapsarian order.

The second question asked: Is the patriarchal family divinely sanctioned? Once again the answer is yes. The model of patriarchal marriage is divinely intended and sanctioned. In *De genesi ad litteram* this is presented as being further mandated as God's punishment for

---

[662]PL 40, 632.

[663]PL 35, 2007 & 2025.

[664]PL 40, 616.

[665]PL 36, 548.

woman's sin. Woman, both as literal wife and carnal element of the human psyche needs to be controlled by the husband. Failure to do this results in sin's increment.

The third question, adopted from Gerda Lerner asked: Who is responsible for the entry of sin into the world?. Strictly speaking human pride is responsible for the entry of sin into the world. Pride is an equal opportunity employer consequently neither gender has a monopoly on it. The man attempts to shift the blame for sinning onto the woman because of pride. Similarly the woman attempts to shift the blame onto the serpent. Furthermore the female element through which sin made its initial approach represents the carnal element found in every human being. Augustine's placing of responsibility on humanity rather than a specific gender for the entry of sin into creation produces a more positive evaluation of his theological sexism. There are however several nuances which mitigate against a totally gender neutral theology. This brings us to question number four.

The fourth question asked: Does Augustine understand these texts in any manner which would implicitly or explicitly suggest an inferior status for women? Once again the answer is yes. Augustine consistently presents woman and or the female element as the weak link in the entry of sin into the world. The serpent was able to infiltrate creation through the female element. Adam's acquiescence to Eve, either literally as her husband, or allegorically as the male *ratio* presents an inversion of the natural order. This inversion allowed sin the license it required. The tactic worked so well that is attempted again with Job's wife. As a result of female weakness Eve needs to be controlled by the husband and or male element. Furthermore this control is God's intention.

This may partially explain the ambivalent results in the existent scholarly analysis of Augustinian sexism. Authors, such as Elizabeth A. Clark, who orient their research around Augustine's theology of marriage, are far more likely to encounter Augustine's theological sexism than those, such as Kari Borresen, who focus upon other aspects of Augustine's work.

In conclusion Augustine's understanding of the dynamics of the entry of sin into the world, while less theologically sexist than some of his contemporaries, is far from gender neutral. The female element of the psyche is the mechanism by which the serpent suborns the masculine *ratio*. As a result subordination of the female element in the psyche is divinely sanctioned in the literal domination of wives by their husbands. Marriage becomes the symbol or sacrament of the spiritual struggle which occurs in every human soul. As male domination in literal marriage creates correct order so does the 'male' domination of the 'female' element in every human being prevent sin. While Augustine manifests a low degree of theological sexism with regards to attributing blame for the entry of sin into the world, his divine sanctioning of the patriarchal marriage mitigates against a truly non-sexist theology.

Chapter Six

Conclusions

"She left the web, she left the loom...
she took three paces round the room"[1]

The time of weaving has finished. The tapistry of Augustine on
Adam's rib and Eve's sin is completed. The analysis of the various
colours of Augustine's exegetical strategies, his interpretative categories,
his historical influences, and his theological sexism has been conducted.
All that is left is to step back and reflect upon the work. It is time to leave
the web and leave the loom.

Augustine's Exegetical and Interpretive Colours

All master weavers employ combinations of colours which are
unique to the subject matter of their work. Augustine is no exception. The
exegetical hues of his tapestry on Abam's rib are slightly different from
those used to describe Eve's sin. One of the most predominant
exegetical colours which Augustine uses to interpret Gen. 2:15-25 is
prophecy. The story was prophetic of some future event or person. This
particular hue accounts for 33% of the weaving. A further 9% dealt with
technical aspects of interpretation while 16% is devoted to the use of

---

[1]Alfred, Lord Tennyson, The Lady of Shalott, 1832-42.

allegory as an exegetical tool. Christian doctrine was by far the most popular colour. It is used for 42 % of the work. There are however various shades and intensities. 27% uses the tone of the fall while a further 15% is woven in shades of marriage, sexuality and the fall.

Augustine's palette for Gen. 3 varies slightly from Gen. 2:15-25. The shades of typology and allusion are used with enough frequency to make them detectable. Typological threads account for 4% of the texture while allusion makes up 3%. By far the strongest shade is that of the Fall which depicts 51% of the work. It is a hue, however, dictated by the subject matter of the work.

As Augustine's weaving progresses with both Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3, there are subtle changes in the tones he uses. The shift from the allegorical to the prophetic or literal forms of exegesis followes a similar pattern. Augustine's early work tends to be more allegorical while after *De genesi ad litteram* interpretations tend to focus upon the phrophetic or the literal. There is also a shift between the two tapestries in the frequency with which certain strategies are employed. While Augustine uses prophetic exegesis with Gen. 2:15-25, the majority of Gen. 3 interpretations are devoted to doctrinal issues pertaining to the fall. A strong secondary thread woven into the work is the disorder in creation caused by human concupiscence. While this is dictated to some extent by the subject matter, it probably also attests to Augustine's understanding that scripture abjures lust and enjoins charity. However with both Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3 Augustine rarely changes an interpretive thread during the course of his weaving. The sole exception is Gen. 3:11. Adam's nakedness shifts from meaning lack of dissimulation to concrete unruliness in his sexual organs.

The Influence of Other Weavers

Augustine occasionally borrows techniques from other weavers. He particularly favours Tertullian or perhaps a North African tradition for Gen. 2:15-25. Augustine's interpretations for 2:17, 21,22, 23, 24 and 25 bear strong traces of this. However Tertullian exerted far less influence for Augustine's interpretations of Gen. 3. Ambrose's input appears far less pronounced for both Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3. While Augustine knows Ambrose's treatise on Genesis, _De Paradiso_, and quotes directly from it on one occassion, he does not adopt Ambrosian interpretations for the most part. Throughout both Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3 there are tantalizing hints and echoes of Philo in Augustine's work. Whether such influence was transmitted directly from Philo, from North African tradition or via Ambrose is not evident. Augustine's weaving of Gen. 2:14 as prophetic of the Church follows a long tradition begining with Paul, and continuing through Tertullian, Ambrose and Jerome.

The Thread of Theological Sexism

Ambiguous Colours

There are two areas where the values promoted by Augustine appear ambiguously sexist. The first is his anthropology. His insistence that all humans contain both feminine and masculine elements certainly serves to include the female within the sphere of the human. It was this very inclusion which lead Kari Borresen to describe Augustine as a

"patristic feminist." The second is his ecclesiology. Presenting Eve as a type for the Christian Church also presents the female element in a favorable light. Depending upon one's perspective these two values could be viewed as redeeming or at the very least moderating Augustine's theological sexism. There is however an implicit structure in both values which, given Augustine's understanding of the divinely mandated subordination of woman, serves to nuance an overly optimistic reading.

While the female element has been incorporated into the human psyche, it exists in a subordinated manner. It needs to be controlled by the male *ratio*. It is equated with carnality, concupiscence, the non-rational; as such becomes the Achilles heel of the rational element. When the hierarchy of ruler and ruled becomes disordered in Genesis 3, sin enters the world. While woman is not responsible for the entry of sin into the world, the female element of human nature is. Consequently the female element needs to be controlled by the masculine. This control is divinely intended and sanctioned as God's punishment for women.

Augustine's use of Eve as a typos for the Church includes a similar hierarchical structure. While all Christians are identified with the female image, this female too is controlled by the male who in this instance is identified with Christ himself. It is Adam/Christ who constitutes the head of the Eve/Church. While Augustine may be less vitriolic than Tertullian and Jerome in his description of divinely mandated gender relations, he does manifest a predominantly sexist theology.

Theologically Sexist Colours

Woven throughout Augustine's tapestry is slim but strong thread of theological sexism. Of 337 citations from Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3, a mere twenty-three are understood in a theologically sexist manner. However these twenty-three instances clearly and uncategorically illustrate that Augustine understands both Gen. 2:15-25 and Gen. 3 in the light of the patriarchal marriage. God not only divinely sanctions this type of marriage but intentionally uses it as a didactic device in order to illustrate other less obvious anthropological and ecclessiological truths. Furthermore, Augustine quite clearly understands the order of creation as indicative of devinely intentioned male superiority.

It is equally evident that Augustine does not hold woman or the female element of the human psyche responsible for the entry of sin into the world. Both female aspects are weaker and need to be controlled by the superior male. Both are the chink in the armour which is exploited by Satan. However it is the male aspect of the psyche which bears the ultimate responsability for human sin. It is this orientation in Augustine's theology which mediates against the worst excesses of theological sexism. In *De civitate dei* XIV.XI.2[2] Augustine describes the situation in the following manner: while the women being weaker was seduced into sin *"non est ille seductus"* (he is not seduced). Adam sinned knowingly and gave rational consent to his sinning. Eve, on the other hand, was persuaded into sin by the manipulative suggestions of the serpent. She

---

[2]PL 41,421.

may have been the devil's gateway, but she functioned in a diminished capacity.

Unfortunately the statistical infrequency of sexist texts does not permit an in-depth understanding of the historical influences which might have mitigated against theological sexism. However a few tentative observations can be made. Both allegorical and literal readings of these Genesis texts produced similar results. As the female element of the pysche is to be dominated in *De genesi contra manichaeos* so is the corporeal female to be dominated in *De genesi ad litteram*.

Consequently; while Augustine betrays a high level of theological sexism in his understanding that patriarchal marriage has been divinely sanctioned, his insistence upon male responsibility for the entry of evil into the world produces a less negative evaluation. Women are doomed to a subordinate position by virtue of their secondary order of creation not because they allowed sin into creation. Thus patriarchal marriage constitutes the divinely sanctioned paradigm for gender relations in both the pre-lapsarian and post-lapsarian world.

Bibliography

Atkinson, Clarissa W. "*Your Servant, My Mother*: The Figure of Saint Monica in the Ideology of Christian Motherhood." In Immaculate & Powerful, The Female in Sacred Image and Social Reality, pp. 139-186. Edited by C. W. Atkinson, C. H. Buchanan and Margaret R. Miles. Boston: Beacon Press, 1985.

Ariès, Pillippe & Duby, Georges., gen. ed. A History of Private Life. 4 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1987. Vol. 1: From Pagan Rome to Byzantium. Edited by Paul Veyne. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer.

Ayers, Robert H. "Language Theory and Analysis in Augustine." Scottish Journal of Theology 29 (1974): 1-12.

Babcock, William S. "Caritas and Signification." In *De Doctrina Christiana*: A Classic of Western Culture. pp. 145-163. Edited by D. Arnold and P. Bright. South Bend: Notre Dame University Press, 1995.

Bammel, C. P. "Pauline Exegesis, Manichaeism and Philosophy in the Early Augustine." In Christian Faith and Greek Philosophy in Late Antiquity. pp. 1-25. Edited by L. Wickham and C. Bammel. New York: E. J. Brill, 1993.

371.

Barnard, Leslie W. "To Allegorize or not to Allegorize?" Studia Theologica 36 (1982): 1-10.

Barnes, Timothy David. Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971.

_____. "Augustine, Symmachus, and Ambrose." In Augustine From Rhetor to Theologian. pp. 7-13. Edited by Joanne McWilliam. Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1992.

Berrouard, Marie-François. "L'exégèse de saint Augustin prédicateur du quatrième Evangile." In Freiburger Zeitschrift Für Philosophie und Theologie 34. pp. 311-338. Freiburg: Paulusverlag, 1987.

Biolo, Salvino. "A Lonerganian Approach to St. Augustine's Interpretation of Consciousness." Science et Esprit XXXI/3 (1979): 323-341.

Bonner, Gerald. "Augustine's Attitude to Women and *Amicitia.*" In *Homo Spiritualis.*, Edited by C. Mayer and K. H. Chelius. Würzburg: Augustinus-Verlag, 1987.

Borresen, Kari Elisabeth. Subordination and Equivalence: The Nature and Rôle of Woman in Augustine and Thomas Aquinas. Translated by Charles Talbot. Washington: University Press of America, 1981.

_____. "L'anthropologie théologique d'Augustin et de Thomas D'Aquin. " Recherches de Science Religieuse 69/3 (1981): 393-406.

_____. "In Defence of Augustine: How *Femina* is *Homo.*" In Collectanea Augustiniana Vol. 1, pp. 411-428. Edited by T. J. Van Bavel. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990.

_____. "Patristic 'Feminism': The Case of Augustine." Augustinian Studies 25 (1994): 139-152.

Bright, Pamela. The Book of Rules of Tyconius: Its Purpose and Inner Logic. South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1988.

_____. "Biblical Ambiguity in African Exegesis." In *De Doctrina Christiana: A Classic of Western Culture.* pp. 25-32. Edited by D. Arnold and P. Bright. South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995.

Brown, Peter. Religion and Society in the Age of Saint Augustine. London: Faber and Faber, 1974.

_____. The Body And Society, Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity. American Council of Learned Societies New Series on History of Religions, no. 13, New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.

Burke, Cormac. "St. Augustine and Conjugal Sexuality." Communio 17 (Winter, 1990): 545-565.

Burns, Patout. "St Augustine: The Original Condition of Humanity." In Studia Patristica Vol. XIII. pp. 119-222. Edited by E. A. Livingstone. Leuven: Peeters Press, 1989.

_____. "Ambrose Preaching to Augustine: The Shaping of Faith." In Augustine: Second Founder of the Faith. pp. 373-386. Collectanea Augustiniana. Edited by J. C. Schnaubelt and F. Van Fletern. New York: Peter Lang, 1990.

_____. "Delighting the Spirit: Augustine's Practice of Figurative Interpretation." In De Doctrina Christiana: A Classic of Western Culture. pp. 182-194. Edited by D. Arnold and P. Bright. South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995.

Cannon, Stephen. "The Jerome-Augustine Correspondence." Word and Spirit 9 (1987): 35-45.

Cavadini, John. "The Sweetness of the Word: Salvation and Rhetoric in Augustine's De doctrina christiana." In De Doctrina Christiana: A Classic of Western Culture. pp. 164-181. Edited by D. Arnold and P. Bright. South Bend: Notre Dame University Press, 1995.

Chadwick, Henry. The Early Church. London: Penguin Books Ltd., 1967.

_____. Augustine. Past Masters Series, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

Clark, Donald Lemen. Rhetoric in Greco-Roman Education. New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1963.

Clark, Elizabeth A. "*Adam's Only Companion*: Augustine and the Early Christian Debate on Marriage." Recherches Augustiniennes XXI (1986): 139-162.

_____. Ascetic Piety and Women's Faith: Essays On Late Ancient Christianity, Studies in Women and Religion, Vol. 20. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1986.

_____. "Theory and Practice in Late Ancient Asceticism, Jerome, Chrysostom, and Augustine." Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion 5 (Fall 1989): 25-46.

_____. "Heresy, Asceticism, Adam, and Eve; Interpretations of Genesis 1-3 in the Later Latin Fathers." In Genesis 1-3 in The History of Exegesis, Intrigue in the Garden. pp. 99-169. Edited by G. A. Robbins. Studies in Women and Religion. Vol. 27. Queenston, Ontario: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1988.

_____. ed. St. Augustine on Marriage and Sexuality. In Selections from the Fathers of the Church Series. Vol. 1. Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1996.

Clark, Gillian. <u>Women in Late Antiquity, Pagan and Christian Lifestyles</u>. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.

Clarke, M. L. <u>Rhetoric At Rome, A Historical Survey</u>. London: Cohen & West Ltd., 1953; reprint ed., London: Lowe & Brydone Ltd., 1962.

Cloeren, Herman J. "St. Augustine's <u>De Magistro</u>, a Transcendental Investigation." <u>Augustinian Studies</u> 16 (1985): 21-27.

Cook, John. "The Protreptic Power of Early Christian language: From John to Augustine." <u>Vigilae Christianae</u> 48 (1994): 105-134.

Corbett, J. Edward. <u>Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student, Second Edition</u>. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Corbett, Percy Ellwood. <u>The Roman Law of Marriage</u>. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1930.

Dawson, David. "Sign, Allegory and the Motions of the Soul." In <u>De Doctrina Christiana: A Classic of Western Culture</u>. pp. 123-141. Edited by D. Arnold and P. Bright. South Bend: Notre Dame University Press, 1995.

De Ghellinck, J. <u>Patristique et moyen âge: Études d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale</u>. Vol. 3. Brussels and Paris: Museum Lessianum, 1941.

Dennis, Trevor. <u>Sarah Laughed: Women's Voices in the Old Testament</u>. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1994.

De Pizan, Christine. <u>The Book of the City of Ladies</u>. Translated by Earl Jeffrey Richards. New York: Persea Books, 1982.

_____. <u>The Treasure of the City of Ladies</u>. Translated by Sarah Lawson. London: Penguin Books Ltd., 1985.

Doherty, Dennis. "The Tradition in History." In <u>Dimensions of Human Sexuality</u>, pp. 39-69. Edited by Dennis Doherty. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1979.

Drobner, Hubertus R. "Grammatical Exegesis and Christology in St. Augustine." In <u>Studia Patristica</u> Vol. XVIII,4. pp. 48-63. Edited by E. A. Livingstone. Leuven: Peeters Press, 1990.

Eliade, Mircea. <u>The Sacred and the Profane</u>. Translated by W. R. Trask. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers, 1959.

Elledge, W. Paul. "Embracing Augustine: Reach, Restraint, and Romantic Resolution in the *Confessions*." <u>Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion</u> 27, 1 (1988): 72-89.

Evans, Gillian. "Neither a Pelagian nor a Manichee." <u>Vigilae Christianae</u> 35 (1981): 232-244.

Ferrari, Leo. "Young Augustine: Both Catholic and Manichee." Augustinian Studies 26 (1995): 109-128.

Firth, Francis. "Catholic Sexual Morality in the Patristic and Medieval Periods." In Human Sexuality and Personhood, pp. 36-66. Chicago: Franciscan Herald Press, 1981.

Fox, Robin Lane. Pagans and Christians. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1989

Froehlich, Karlfried. ed. and trans. Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church. Sources of Early Christian Thought Series, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

Gardner, Anne. " Genesis 2:4b-3: A Mythological Paradigm of Sexual Equality or of the Religious History of Pre-Exilic Israel?" Scottish Journal of Theology 43 (1990): 1-18.

Getty, M. M. The Life of the North Africans as Revealed in the Sermons of Saint Augustine. Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, Vol. XXVIII. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1931.

Gould, Graham. "Women in the Writings of the Fathers: Language, Belief, and Reality." In Women In the Church, pp. 1-13. Edited by W. J. Sheils and Dianna Wood. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990.

Guindon, André. The Sexual Creators, An Ethical Proposal for Concerned Christians. Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, Inc., 1986.

Guthrie, W. K. C. The Greek Philosophers, From Thales to Artistotle. London: Methuen & Company Limited, 1950; reprint ed., New York: Harper & Row, 1975.

Grant, Michael. A Social History of Greece and Rome. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1992.

Gribomont, Jean. "Les plus anciennes traductions latines." In Le monde latin antique et la Bible. pp. 43-65. Edited by Jacques Fontaine and Charles Pietri. Bible de tous les temps Series, Vol. 2. Paris: Beauchesne, 1984.

Hamilton, Gordon J. "Augustine's Methods of Biblical Interpretation." In Grace Politics and Desire: Essays on Augustine. pp. 103-115. Edited by H. A. Meynell. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 1990.

Hanson, Paul D. "Biblical Authority Reconsidered." Horizons in Biblical Theology 11/2 (December 1989): 57-79.

Hauser, Gerard A. Introduction to Rhetorical Theory. Speech Communication Series, New York: Harper & Row, 1986.

Hick, John, and Knitter, Paul F. ed. <u>The Myth of Christian Uniqueness,</u> <u>Towards a Pluralistic Theology of Religions</u>. Faith Meets Faith Series, New York: Orbis Books, 1988.

Hoffman, Daniel L. <u>The Status of Women and Gnosticism In Irenaeus</u> <u>and Tertullian</u>. Studies in Women and Religion Vol. 36. Lewiston: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1995.

Horowitz, Maryanne Cline. "The Image of God in Man--Is Woman Included?" <u>Harvard Theological Review</u> 72/3-4 (July-October, 1979): 175-206.

Hunter, David., ed. & trans. , <u>Marriage in the Early Church</u>. Sources of Early Christian Thought Series, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

_____, "Augustinian Pessimism? A New Look at Augustine's Teaching On Sex, Marriage and Celibacy," <u>Augustinian Studies</u> 25 (1994): 153-177.

James, William. <u>The Varieties of Religious Experience</u>. United States of America: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1902; reprint ed., New York: Penguin Books, 1985.

Jenkyns, Richard. ed. <u>The Legacy of Rome, a New Appraisal</u>. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Jordan, Mark D. "Words and Word: Incarnation and Signification in Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana*." Augustinian Studies 11 (1980): 177-196.

Kannengiesser, Charles. ed., Bright, Pamela. trans. Early Christian Spirituality. Sources of Early Christian Thought Series, Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.

_____. "The Interrupted *De Doctrina Christiana*." In *De Doctrina Christiana: A Classic of Western Culture*. pp. 3-13. Edited by D. Arnold and P. Bright. South Bend: University of Notre Dame press, 1995.

Kato, Takeshi. "*Sonus et verbum: De doctrina christiana* 1.13.12." In *De Doctrina Christiana: A Classic of Western Culture*. pp. 87-94. Edited by D. Arnold and P. Bright. South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995.

Kelly, David F. "Sexuality and Concupiscence in Augustine." The Annual of the Society of Christian Ethics, pp. 81-116. Edited by Rasmussen et al., 1983.

Kelly, J. N. D. Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies. London: Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1975.

Kelly, Louis. "Saint Augustine and Saussurean Linguistics." Augustinian Studies 6 (1975); 45-64.

381.

Kennedy, George. The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World 300 B.C.-A.D. 300 . Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1972.

_____. Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.

La Bonnardière, Anne-Marie. "Augustin, ministre de la parole de Dieu." In Saint Augustin et la Bible, pp. 51-57. Edited by A. -M. La Bonnardière. Bible de tous les temps Series, Vol. 3. Paris: Beauchesne, 1986.

_____. "L'initiation biblique d'Augustin." In Saint Augustin et la Bible, pp. 27-47. Edited by A. -M. La Bonnardière. Bible de tous les temps Series, Vol. 3. Paris: Beauchesne, 1986.

_____. "Bible et polémiques." In Saint Augustin et la Bible, pp. 329-352. Edited by A. -M. La Bonnardière. Bible de tous les temps Series, Vol. 3. Paris: Beauchesne, 1986.

_____. "Augustin a-t-il utilisé la Vulgate de Jérôme?" In Saint Augustin et la Bible, pp. 303-312. Edited by A. -M. La Bonnardière. Bible de tous les temps Series, Vol. 3. Paris: Beauchesne, 1986.

_____. "Le canon des divines Ecritures." In Saint Augustin et la Bible, pp. 287-301. Edited by A. -M. La Bonnardière. Bible de tous les temps Series, Vol. 3. Paris: Beauchesne, 1986.

Lamberigts, Mathijs. "Julien D'Éclane et Augustin D'Hippone, deux conceptions d'Adam." In Collectanea Augustiniana, Vol. 1. pp. 373-409. Edited by T. J. Van Bavel. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990.

Laporte, Jean and Weaver, F. Ellen. "Augustine and Women: Relationships and Teachings." Augustinian Studies 12 (1981): 115-131.

Lenox-Conyngham, Andrew. "Ambrose and Philosophy." In Christian Faith and Greek Philosophy in Late Antiquity. pp. 112-128. Edited by L. Wickham and C. Bammel. New York: E. J. Brill, 1993.

Leinhard, Joseph T. "Reading the Bible and Learning to Read: The Influence of Education on St. Augustine's Exegesis." Augustinian Studies 27/1 (1996): 7-25.

Loewen, Howard J. "The Use of Scripture in Augustine's Theology." Scottish Journal of Theology 34 (1981): 201-223.

Lonergan, Bernard. Method in Theology. London: Darton Longman & Todd Ltd., 1972; reprint ed., Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990.

Louth, Andrew. "Augustine on Language." Journal of Literature and Theology 3/2 (July 1989): 151-158.

Lowe, E. A. Codices latini antiquoires. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1947.

Mack, Burton. Rhetoric and the New Testament. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

Maher, John. "Saint Augustine and Manichaean Cosmogony." Augustinian Studies 10 (1979): 91-104.

Maker, William. "Augustine on Evil: The Dilemma of the Philosophers." International Journal of Philosophy of Religion 15 (1984): 149-160.

Markus, R. A. "Signs, Communication and Communities." In De Doctrina Christiana: A Classic of Western Culture. pp. 97-108. Edited by D. Arnold and P. Bright. South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995.

Mathews, Alfred Warren. The Development of St. Augustine from Neoplatonism to Christianity, 386-391 A.D.. Washington: University Press of America, 1980.

MacQueen, D. J. "Contemptus Dei: St Augustine on the Disorder of Pride in Society, and its Remedies." Recherches Augustiniennes IX (1975): 227-293.

_____. "Augustine on Superbia: The Historical Background and Sources of His Doctrine." Mélanges de Science Religieuse 34/3-4 (1977): 193-211.

384.

McGowan, Richard J. "Augustine's Spiritual Equality: the Allegory of Man and Woman with Regard to *Imago Dei*." <u>Revue des Études Augustiniennes</u> 33 (1987): 255-264.

McLynn, Neil B. <u>Ambrose of Milan</u>. London: University of California Press, 1994.

Miles, R. Margaret. <u>Augustine On the Body</u>. AAR Dissertation Series, no. 31. Missoula, Montana: Scholars Press, 1979.

_____. "The Body and Human Values in Augustine of Hippo." In <u>Grace, Politics and Desire: Essays on Augustine</u>, pp. 55-67. Edited by H. A. Meynell. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 1990.

_____. "Infancy, Parenting, and Nourishment in Augustine's *Confessions*." <u>The Journal of the American Academy of Religion</u> 50/3 (1982): 349-363.

_____. "Patriarchy as Political Theology: The Establishment of North African Christianity." In <u>Civil Religion and Political Theology</u>, pp. 169-185. Edited by Leroy S. Rouner. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1986.

O'Donovan, Oliver. "*Usus* and *Fruitio* in Augustine, *De Doctrina Christiana*." <u>Journal of Theological Studies</u> 33 (1982): 361-397.

O'Ferrall, Margaret More. "Monica, the Mother of Augustine, A Reconsideration." <u>Recherches Augustiniennes</u> X (1975): 23-43.

O'Meara, John J. <u>The Young Augustine, An Introduction to the *Confessions* of St. Augustine</u>. London: Longman, 1954.

Orlund, Raymond C. "Male-Female Equality and Male Headship Genesis 1-3," In <u>Recovering Biblical Manhood and womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism</u>, pp. 95-112. Edited by John Piper and Wayne Grudem. Wheaten, Illinois: Crossway Books, 1991.

Pagels, Elaine. "The Politics of Paradise: Augustine's Exegesis of Genesis 1-3 Versus that of John Chrysostom" <u>Harvard Theological Revue</u> 78:1-2 (1985): 67-99.

Pelland, Gilles. <u>Cinq Études D'Augustin Sur Le Début De La Genèse</u>. Montreal: Bellarmin, 1972.

Petitmengin, Pièrre. "Les plus anciens manuscrits de la Bible latine." In <u>Le monde latin antique et la Bible</u>. pp. 89-117. Edited by Jacques Fontaine and Charles Pietri. Bible de tous les temps Series. Vol. 2. Paris: Beauchesne, 1984.

Petry, Ray C. ed. <u>A History of Christianity</u>. Vol. 1. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, 1962.

Poland, Lynn M. "Augustine, Allegory and Conversion." <u>Literature and Theology</u> 2/1 (1988): 37-47.

Press, Gerald. "The Subject and Structure of Augustine's *De Doctrina Christiana*." Augustinian Studies 11 (1980): 99-124.

Primmer, Adolf. "The Function of the *genera dicendi* in <u>*De doctrina christiana*</u> 4." In <u>*De Doctrina Christiana*: A Classic of Western Culture</u>. pp. 68-86. Edited by D. Arnold and P. Bright. South Bend: Notre Dame University Press, 1995.

Rigby, Paul. <u>Original Sin in Augustine's *Confessions*</u>. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 1987.

Rouselle, Aline. <u>*Porneia, On Desire and the Body in Antiquity*</u>. Translated by F. Pheasant. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd., 1988.

Saunders, Jason L. <u>Greek and Roman Philosophy after Aristotle</u>. Readings in the History of Philosophy Series, New York: The Free Press, Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1966.

Saxer, Victor. "La Bible chez les Pères latins du IIIe siècle." In <u>Le monde latin antique et la Bible</u>. pp. 339-369. Edited by Jacques Fontaine and Charles Pietri. Bible de tous les temps Series, Vol. 2. Paris: Beauchesne, 1984.

Scanlon, Michael. "Augustine and Theology as Rhetoric." <u>Augustinian Studies</u> 25 (1994): 37-50.

Schreiner, Susan E. "Eve, The Mother of History; Reaching for the Reality of History in Augustine's Later Exegesis of Genesis," In <u>Genesis 1-3 in The History of Exegesis, Intrigue in the Garden</u>, pp. 135-186. Edited by G. A. Robbins. Studies in Women and Religion. Vol. 27. Queenston, Ontario: The Edwin Mellen Press, 1988.

Schäublin, Christoph. "*De Doctrina Christiana*: A Classic of Western Culture?" In <u>*De Doctrina Christiana*: A Classic of Western Culture</u>. pp. 47-67. Edited by D. Arnold and P. Bright. South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995.

Schlaback, Gerald W. "Augustine's Hermeneutic of Humility: An Alternative to Moral Imperialism and Moral Relativism." <u>Journal of Religious Ethics</u> 22/2 (Fall 1994): 299-327.

Smith, Robert W. <u>The Art of Rhetoric in Alexandria, Its Theory and Practice in the Ancient World</u>. The Hague: Martinus Nijoff, 1972.

Spear, Wayne R. "Augustine's Doctrine of Biblical Infallibility." In <u>Inerrancy and the Church</u>. pp. 37-65. Edited by J. D. Hannah. Chicago: Moody Press, 1984.

Straw, Carole E. "Augustine as Pastoral Theologian: The Exegesis of the Parables of the Field and Threshing Floor." Augustinian Studies 14 (1982): 129-151.

Sutherland, Christine Mason. "Love as Rhetorical Principle: The Relationship Between Content and Style in the Rhetoric of St. Augustine." In Grace, Politics and Desire: Essays on Augustine. pp. 139-153. Edited by H. A. Meynell. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 1990.

Taylor, John H. "The Text of Augustine's De genesi ad Litteram." Speculum 25 (1950): 89-93.

Teske, Roland. "Homo Spiritualis in St. Augustine's De Genesi contra Manichaeos." In Studia Patristica Vol. XIII. pp. 351-355. Edited by E. A. Livingstone. Leuven: Peeters Press, 1989.

_____. "Criteria for Figurative Interpretation in St. Augustine." In De Doctrina Christiana: A Classic of Western Culture. pp. 109-122. Edited by D. Arnold and P. Bright. South Bend: University of Notre Dame Press, 1995.

Tillich, Paul. Theology of Culture. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1959.

Tavard, G. "St. Augustine Between Mani and Christ." The Patristic and Byzantine Review 5/3 (1986): 196-206.

Treggiari, Susan. Roman Marriage. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

Trigg, Joseph W. Biblical Interpretation. Message of the Fathers of the Church, 9. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, 1988.

Ward, J. W. C. Doctors and Councils. London: The Faith Press, 1962.

Wolinski, Joseph. "Il a planté sa tente dans le soleil." In Saint Augustin et la Bible, pp. 98-115. Edited by A. -M. La Bonnardière. Bible de tous les temps Series, vol. 3. Paris: Beauchesne, 1986.

Van Bavel, Tarsicius. "Woman as the Image of God in Augustine's De Trinitate XII." In Signum Pietatis. pp. 267-288. Edited by A. Zumkeller. Würzburg: Augustinus-Verlag, 1989.

_____. "The Creator and the Integrity of Creation." Augustinian Studies 21 (1990): 1-33.

Van Fleteren, Frederick. "Per Speculum et in Aenigmate: 1 Corinthians 13:12 in the Writings of St. Augustine." Augustinian Studies 23 (1992): 69-102.

_____. "Augustine's Principles of Biblical Exegesis, De doctrina christiana Aside: Miscellaneous Observations." Augustinian Studies. 27/2 (1996): 107-128.

Vannier, Marie-Anne. "Saint Augustin et la Création." In <u>Collectanea Augustiniana</u>, Vol. 1. pp. 349-371. Edited by T. J. Van Bavel. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1990.

The Feminist Critique

Agonito, Rosemary. ed. <u>History of Ideas on Woman</u>. New York: Perigee Books, 1977.

Allen, Prudence. R.S.M. <u>The Concept of Woman: The Aristotelian Revolution, 750 B.C.-A.D. 1250</u>. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997.

Anderson, Bonnie S., and Zinsser, J. P. <u>A History of Their Own, Women in Europe from Prehistory to the Present</u>. Vol. 1. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1988.

Armstrong, Karen. "The Acts of Paul and Thecla." In <u>Feminist Theology: A Reader</u>, pp. 83-90. Edited by Ann Loades. Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press, 1990.

Baker, Derek. gen. ed. <u>Medieval Women</u>. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1978.

Bowe, Barbara., Kathleen Hughes, Sharon Karam, and Carolyn Osiek. ed. <u>Silent Voices, Sacred Lives: Women's Readings for the Liturgical Year</u>. Mahwah, New York: Paulist Press, 1992.

Brown, J. Carlson and Bohn, C. R. ed. Christianity, Patriarchy, and Abuse. New York: The Pilgrim Press, 1989.

Cantarella, Eva. Pandora's Daughters: The Role and Status of Women in Greek and Roman Antiquity. Translated by Maureen B. Fant. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.

Christ, Carol P. "Mircea Eliade and the Feminist Paradigm Shift." Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion 7/2 (Fall, 1991): 75-94.

Chodorow, Nancy J. Feminism and Psychoanalytic Theory. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.

Clark, Elizabeth & Richardson, Herbert. ed. Women and Religion: A Feminist Sourcebook of Christian Thought. New York: Harper & Row, 1977.

Cloke, Gillian. This Female Man of God: Women and Spiritual Power in the Patristic Age, AD 350-450. London: Routledge, 1995.

Collins, Adela Yarbro. ed. Feminist Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.

Cooper, Kate. The Virgin and the Bride: Idealized Womanhood in Late Antiquity. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1996.

Corley, Kathleen E. Private Women; Public Meals: Social Conflict in the Synoptic Tradition. Peabody Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc., 1993.

Craven, Toni. "Tradition and Convention in the Book of Judith." In Feminist Theology; A Reader, pp. 29-41. Edited by Ann Loades. Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press, 1990.

Daly, Mary. Gyn/Ecology, The Meta-ethics of Radical Feminism. Boston: Beacon Press, 1978.

_____. The Church and the Second Sex. New York: Harper & Row, 1968; reprint ed., New York: Harper & Row, 1975.

De Beauvoir, Simone. The Second Sex. Translated by H. M. Parshley. New York: Random House, 1974.

Doely, Sarah Bently. Women's Liberation and the Church: The New Demand for Freedom in the Life of the Christian Church. New York: Association Press, 1970.

Fiorenza, Elisabeth, Schüssler. ed. Searching the Scriptures. Vols. 1&2. New York: Crossroad, 1993.

_____ "Transforming the Legacy of the Woman's Bible," In Searching the Scriptures. Vol. 1. pp. 1-24. Edited by Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza. New York: Crossroad, 1993.

_____. In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins. New York: Crossroad, 1990.

_____. Bread not Stone. Boston: Beacon Press, 1984.

Fortune, Marie. "The Transformation of Suffering: A Biblical and Theological Perspective." In Christianity Patriarchy, and Abuse: A Feminist Critique, pp. 139-147. Edited by J. Brown and C. Bohn. New York: The Pilgrim Press, 1989.

Fulkerson, Mary McClintock. "Contesting Feminist Canons, Discourse and the Problem of Sexist Texts." Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion 7/2 (Fall, 1991): 53-73.

Greer, Germaine. The Female Eunuch. London: MacGibbon & Kee Ltd., 1970; reprint ed. London: Paladin, 1971.

Gifford, Carolyn De Swarte. "American Women and the Bible: The Nature of Woman as a Hermeneutical Issue." pp. 11-33. In Feminist Perspectives on Biblical Scholarship. Edited by Adela Yarbro Collins. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.

Hampson, Daphne. Theology and Feminism. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990.

Higgens, M. W. and Letson, D. R. ed. Women and the Church: A Sourcebook. Toronto: Griffen House, 1986.

Hopkins, Julie M. Towards a Feminist Christology: Jesus of Nazareth, European Women, and the Christological Crisis. Grand Rapids, Michigan: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995.

Johnson, Elizabeth A. She Who Is: The Mystery of God in Feminist Theological Discourse. New York: Crossroad, 1993.

Kraemer, Ross Shepard. Her Share of the Blessings. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Kimel, Alvin F. Speaking the Christian God: The Holy Trinity and the Challenge of Feminism. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1992.

Lerner, Gerda. The Creation of Patriarchy. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.

_____. The Creation of Feminist Consciousness. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Loades, Ann, ed. Feminist Theology: A Reader. London: SPCK, 1990.

MacDonald, Margaret Y. Early Christian Women and Pagan Opinion: The Power of the Hysterical Woman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

MacHaffie, J. Barbara. Her Story: Women In Christian Tradition. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.

McFague, Sallie. The Body of God: An Ecological Theology. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

McNamara, JoAnne. A New Song: Celibate Women in the First Three Christian Centuries. New York: Harrinton Park Press, 1983.

Marcil-Lacoste, Louise. "Égalitarisme et féminisme." Mots 13, (1986): 65-82.

Nemiroff, Greta Hofmann. gen. ed. Women and Men, Interdisciplinary Readings on Gender. Richmond Hill: Fitzhenry & Whiteside Ltd., 1990.

Newsom, Carol A. and Ringe, Sharon H. ed. The Women's Bible Commentary. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992.

Olson, Carl. ed. The Book of the Goddess Past and Present: An Introduction to Her Religion. New York: Crossroad, 1992.

Osiek, Carolyn. "The Feminist and the Bible: Hermeneutical Alternatives." In Feminist Perspective on Biblical Scholarship, pp. 93-105. Edited by Adela Yarbo Collins. Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1985.

Page, Ruth. "Elizabeth Cady Stanton's *The Woman's Bible.*" In <u>Feminist Theology: A Reader</u>, pp. 16-23. Edited by Ann Loades. Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press, 1990.

Pagels, Elaine. <u>Adam, Eve, And The Serpent</u>. New York: Random House, 1988.

_____. <u>The Gnostic Gospels</u>. New York: Random House, 1979.

Pantel, Pauline Schmitt. ed. <u>A History of Women in the West: From Ancient Goddesses to Christian Saints</u>. Translated by Arthur Goldhammer. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1992.

Perkins, Judith. <u>The Suffering Self: Pain and Narrative Representation in the Early Christian Era</u>. London: Routledge, 1995.

Petersen, Joan M. ed. <u>Handmaids of the Lord: Contemporary Descriptions of Feminine Asceticism in the First Six Christian Centuries</u>. Kalamazoo, Michigan: Cistercian Publications, Inc., 1996.

Pierson, Ruth Roach. "Experience, Difference, Dominance, and Voice in the Writing of Canadian Women's History." In <u>Writing Women's History: International Perspectives</u>. pp. 79-104. Edited by Karen Offen, Ruth Roach Pierson and Jane Reudall. London: MacMillan, 1991.

Pomeroy, Sarah B. Goddesses, Whores, Wives and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity. London: Pimlico, 1994.

Ramshaw, Gail. God Beyond Gender: Feminist Christian God-Language. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.

Reuther, Rosemary Radford. The Church Against Itself. New York: Herder and Herder, 1967.

_____. Sexism and God-Talk: Toward a Feminist Theology. Boston: Beacon Press, 1983.

_____. Women-Church: Theology and Practice of Feminist Liturgical Communities. New York: Harper & Row, 1985.

_____. "The Western Religious Tradition and Violence Against Women in the Home." In Christianity Patriarchy, and Abuse: A Feminist Critique, pp. 31-41. Edited by J. Brown and C. Bohn. New York: The Pilgrim Press, 1989.

Ringe, Sharon. "A Gentile Woman's Story. " In Feminist Theology: A Reader, pp. 49-57. Edited by Ann Loades. Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press, 1990.

Russell, Letty M. ed. Feminist Interpretation of the Bible. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1985.

398.

Russell, Letty M. and J. Shannon Clarkson. ed. <u>Dictionary of Feminist Theologies</u>. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996.

Sands, Kathleen M. "Uses of the Thea(o)logian; Sex and Theodicy in Religious Feminism. " <u>Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion</u> 8/1 (Spring, 1992): 9-33.

Sawyer, Deborah F. "Resurrecting Eve? Feminist Critique of the Garden of Eden," in <u>A Walk in the Garden: Biblical, Iconographical and Literary Images of Eden,</u> pp. 279-290, ed. P. Morris and D. Sawyer, Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 136. Sheffield: JSOT, 1992.

Sharma, Arvind. ed. <u>Women in World Religions</u>. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1987.

Sjöö, Monica and Mor, Barbara. <u>The Great Cosmic Mother, Rediscovering the Religion of the Earth</u>. San Francisco: Harper Collins Publishers, 1991.

Slee, Nicola. "Parables and Women's Experience." In <u>Feminist Theology; A Reader</u>, pp. 41-47. Edited by Ann Loades. Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press, 1990.

Swidler, Leonard. <u>Biblical Affirmations of Woman</u>. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1979.

399.

Thatcher, Adrian and Elizabeth Stuart. ed. <u>Christian Perspectives on Sexuality and Gender.</u> Grand Rapids: Wm B Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1996.

Thurston, Bonnie Bowman. <u>The Widows, A Women's Ministry in the Early Church.</u> Minneapolis: Fortress Press: 1989.

Tong, Rosemarie. <u>Feminist Thought: A Comprehensive Introduction.</u> San Francisco: Westview Press, 1989.

Torjesen, Karen Jo. <u>When Women Were Priests.</u> San Francisco: Harper/Collins, 1993.

Trible, Phyllis, "Depatriarchalising in Biblical Interpretation," <u>JAAR</u> XL/1 (March, 1973): 35-42.

_____. <u>Texts of Terror.</u> Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

_____. "Five Loaves and Two Fishes: Feminist Hermeneutics and Biblical Theology." <u>Theological Studies</u> 50 (1989): 270-295.

_____. "Feminist Hermeneutics and Biblical Studies." In <u>Feminist Theology; A Reader</u>, pp. 49-57. Edited by Ann Loades. Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press, 1990.

Waring, Marilyn. <u>If Women Counted, A New Feminist Economics.</u> San Francisco: Harper Collins Publishers, 1988.

West, Angela. "Sex and Salvation: A Christian Feminist Bible Study on 1 Corinthians 6:12-7:39." In Feminist Theology; A Reader. pp. 72-80. Edited by Ann Loades. Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press, 1990.

Zikmund, Barbara Brown. "Feminist Consciousness in Historical Perspective." In Feminist Interpretation of the Bible. pp. 21-29. Edited by Letty M. Russell. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1985.

Appendix I

Manuscript Versions of Gen. 2:15-25

The following table is broken down into five columns. The first column indicates the verse from Gen. 2:15-25 that is being cited. The second column provides Jerome's version of the verse. The numbers following the citation are its location in Fischer's *Vetus Latina*. The third column contains Augustine's version of the verse as found in *De genesi contra manichaeos* which is followed by the location in Migne. The fourth column is Augustine's version of the verse as supplied in *De genesi ad litteram* with the corresponding location in Migne. The fifth column compares the two Augustinian versions with the various *Vetus Latina* translations as found in Fischer's *Vetus Latina: Dei Reste der altlateinischen Bibel nach Petrus Sabatier*, ed. Bonifatius Fischer, Vol. 2. Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1951.[1]

	Jerome's Version *Liber besith qui graece dicitur genesis* VL 2, 45-56	*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.I PL 34, 195-196	*De genesi ad litteram.* VIII.VIII.15, VIII.XXVII.49, IX.I, and XI.I.1. PL 34, 379, 392-393, 430	*Vetus Latina* most closely resembling Augustine's text (VL 2, 46-56)

---

[1] For the purposes of consistency the Latin "i" has been rendered "J" where appropriate. "*Eius*" is therefore written "*ejus*". I have also rendered "*coelum*" as "*caelum*".

2:15	Tulit ergo Dominus Deus hominem et posuit eum in paradiso voluptatis, ut operaretur et custodiret illum	Et sumpsit Dominus Deus hominem quem fecerat, et posuit eum in paradiso, ut operaretur ibi, et custodiret eum (195)	Et sumpsit Dominus Deus hominem quem fecit, et posuit eum in paradiso, ut operaretur et custodiret (379)	De genesi contra manichaeos is German version. (VL 2, 45) De genesi ad litteram is similar but changes fecerat to fecit, drops ibi and final eum.
2:16	praecepit que ei dicens: Ex omni ligno paradisi comede	Et praecepit Dominus Deus Adae, dicens: Ex omni ligno quod est in paradiso, edes ad escam (195)	Et praecepit Dominus Deus Adae, dicens: Ab omni ligno quod est in paradiso esca edes[2] (392) [alternate edes ad escam is found PL 34, 383.]	German version uses: ex, edes ad escam (VL 2, 46-47)

---

[2]Words which are underlined present variations between Augustine's text and the various *Vetus Latina* versions. The German and Italian versions have several variations. I have only underlined variations which appear in none of the existent manuscripts.

2:17	de ligno autem scientiae boni et mali ne comedas; in quocunque enim die comederis ex eo morte morieris.	de ligno autem scientiae boni et mali non edetis ab eo: qua die enim ederitis ab illo, morte moriemini(195)	de ligno autem cognoscendi bonum et malum, non manducabitis de illo. Qua die autem ederitis ab eo, morte moriemini. (392)	_De genesi contra manichaeos_ follows German Text. _De genesi ad litteram._ resembles the German texts but use, de illo, and ab eo. (VL 2, 47-48)
2:18	Dixit quoque Dominus Deus: Non est bonum esse hominem solum: faciamus ei adjutorium simile sui	Et dixit dominus Deus: Non est bonum esse hominem solum. faciamus ei adjutorium simile sibi. (195)	Et dixit Dominus Deus: Non bonum est hominem esse solum: faciamus ei adjutorium secundum ipsum. (393)	_De genesi contra manichaeos:_ German manuscript has illi. _De genesi ad litteram._ Augustine uses own version. note that secundum ipsum also occurs in one of the German manuscripts. (VL 2, 48-49)

2:19	Formatis igitur, Dominus Deus, de humo cunctis animantibus terrae, et universis volatilibus caeli, adduxit ea ad Adam, ut videret quid vocaret ea: omne enim quod vocavit Adam animae viventis, ipsum est nomen ejus	Et quaecumque finxerat Deus ex omni genere pecorum, et ex omni genere bestiarum agri, et ex omni genere volatilium volantium sub caelo, perduxit ea ad Adam, ut videret quid ea vocaret et quod vocavit ea omnia Adam animam vivam, hoc est nomen ejus. (195)	Et finxit Deus adhuc de terra omnes bestias agri, et omnia volatilia caeli, et adduxit illa ad Adam, ut videret quid vocaret illa. Et omne quodcumque vocavit illud Adam animam vivam, hoc _est_ nomen _ejus_ (393)	_De genesi contra manichaeos_: African.[3] _De genesi ad litteram._ Italian version Augustine adds est and ejus. (VL 2, 49-50)

---

[3]This version of the African text is derived from Augustine's _De gen contra man_. (VL 2. 49-50) There is a Carthaginian version which Augustine does not appear to use.

2:20	Appellavitque Adam nominibus suis cuncta animantia, et universa volatilia caeli, et omnes bestias terrae. Adam vero non inveniebatur adjutor similis ejus	Et post haec vocavit Adam nomina omnium pecorum et omnium avium caeli, et omnium bestiarum agri: et secundum quod vocavit ea Adam hoc est nomen eorum usque in hodiernum diem. Ipsi autem Adae nondum fuit adjutorium simile illi. (195)	Et _vocavit_ Adam nomina omnibus pecoribus, et omnibus volatilibus caeli, et omnibus bestiis agri. _Ipsi_ autem _Adam_ non est inventus adjutor similis ei. (393)	_De genesi contra manichaeos_: African version.[4] _De genesi ad litteram_:: Italian text[5] note: Italian text uses _inposuit_, rather than _vocavit_. _Ipsi_ does not occur in Italian version and Adam is _Adae_. (VL 2, 50-51)

---

[4]See previous note.

[5]This Italian version was probably the one used by Ambrose. Augustine may have been responsible for some modifications. (VL 2. 50-51).

2:21	Immisit ergo Dominus Deus soporem in Adam: cumque obdormisset, tulit unam de costis ejus, et replevit carnem pro ea.	Et immisit Deus soporem in Adam, et obdormivit: et sumpsit Deus unam de costis ejus, et implevit locum ejus carne (195-196)	Et immisit Deus extasin in Adam, et obdormivit. Et accepit unam costarum ejus, et adinplevit carnem in loco ejus (393)	*De genesi contra manichaeos*: German text *De genesi ad litteram* German text uses the word extasin (VL 2, 51) Note: this particular verse has portions from several German manuscripts but does not appear to be using a known version.

2:22	Et aedificavit Dominus Deus costam, quam tulerat de Adam, in mulierem, et adduxit eam ad Adam	et formavit Deus costam quam accepit ab Adam in mulierem. Et adduxit illam ad Adam ut videret quid eam, vocaret. (196)	et aedificavit Dominus Deus costam, quam _accepit_ de Adam, in mulierem; et adduxit eam ad Adam. (393)	_De genesi contra manichaeos_: African version.[6] _De genesi ad litteram_: Italian version (VL 2, 51) note: _sumpsit_ is used in Italian, _accepit_ occurs in African version.
2:23	Dixitque Adam: Hoc nunc, os ex ossibus meis, et caro de carne mea, haec vocabitur Virago, quoniam de viro sumpta est.	Et dixit Adam, Hoc nunc os ex ossibus meis, et caro de carne mea: haec vocabitur mulier, quoniam de viro suo sumpta est; et haec erit mihi adjutorium. (196)	Et dixit Adam: Hoc nunc os ex ossibus meis, et carode carne mea; haec vocabitur mulier, quoniam ex viro suo sumpta est. (393)	Augustine uses the same version in both tractates. Both are identical to German manuscripts. Augustine ommits _et haec erit mihi adjutorium_ in _De genesi ad litteram_. (VL 2, 52-53)

---

[6]See note 2.

2:24	*Quamobrem reliquet homo patrem suum et matrem, et adhaerebit uxori suae, et erunt duo in carne una.*	*Propter hoc relinquet homo patrem et matrem, et adjungetur uxori suae; et erunt duo in carne una.* (196)	*Et propter hoc relinquet homo patrem et matrem, et conglutinabitur uxori suae; et erunt duo in carne una* (393)	Augustine uses two versions which are both identical to existant German manuscripts. (VL 2, 54-55)
2:25	*Erant autem uterque nudi, Adam scilicet et uxor ejus, et non erubescebant.*	*Et erant ambo nudi, Adam et mulier ejus, et non confundebantur* (196)	*Et erant nudi ambo Adam et mulier ejus, et non pudebat*[7] *illos* (429)	German version. *De genesi ad litteram*. This appears similar to German but not identical. slight variation in word order: *erant ambo nudi.* (VL 2, 55-56)

---

[7] *Pudebat* occurs in one of the German manuscripts however the rest of the text is not identical.

Appendix II

<u>Augustine's use of Gen. 2:15-25</u>

The following is a table of the instances in which Augustine cites some portion of Genesis 2: 15-25. The first column contains the title and location within the work authored by Augustine. Augustine's works have been listed in chronological order. Their dates appear in brackets.[1] The second column displays the biblical citation. The third column indicates the context in which the citation is used.

In the second column, the biblical citation is followed by a letter representing the manner in which the text is used.

> A= Allegory text
>
> T= Technical Exegetical discussion (grammar,
>
>   technical meaning of words, etymology etc.)
>
> P= Prophetic text (typology, testimonia)
>
> F= Fall
>
> M= Marriage
>
> S= Sexuality

---

[1]Dates have been taken from, Mary T. Clark, <u>Augustine</u>, (Washington: Georgetown University Press, 1994), and Migne. The dates for the various books of <u>*De civitate dei*</u> are those found in Peter Brown, <u>Augustine of Hippo: A Biography</u> (Berkeley: University of Southern California Press, 1969).

Location	Biblical citation	Context
De genesi contra manichaeos (389 C.E.) II.XI.15, PL 34, 204	Gen. 2:15 F	Man's work in paradise was as custodian since work is his punishment for the fall.
ibid. II. IX.12, PL 34, 203	Gen. 2:16 A	every tree is a spiritual joy
ibid. II.IX.12, PL 34, 203	Gen. 2:17 A	defines tree of life as discernment of Good and Evil
ibid. II.XI.15, PL 34, 204	Gen. 2:17 F	admonition against tree of knowledge addressed to all humanity
ibid. PL 34, 204	Gen. 2:18 A	woman is allegory for the animal in human. women becomes parabole in argument from lesser to greater
II.XI.16. PL 34, 205	Gen. 2:19 A	Allegory to show that man is superior to animals/ Man has difficulty discerning the rational from the animal in himself
II.XII.16. PL 34, 205	Gen. 2:21 A	Deep sleep allegory for wisdom

ibid. PL 34, 205	Gen. 2:21-22 A	Rib allegory for unity of the rational and carnal. Female (parabole) indicating as woman is obedient to man so must rational rule the carnal.
II.XII.17 PL 34, 205-206	Gen. 2:21-22 A	Why this must be interpreted allegorically (not because no *limus* left and Adam could have been awake)
II.XIII.18 PL 34, 206	Gen. 2:23 A	Man names woman as superior to subordinate (parabole rational carnal) bones allegory for force and flesh allegory for temperance.
II.XIII.19 PL 34, 206	Gen. 2:24 P	literal, it is a prophecy of what will happen, and what does happen. (parabole: exemplum taken from nature and normal social practice).
Epistolae ad galatas 30. (394 C.E.) PL 35, 2126	Gen. 2:22 T	*Mulier* used as *femina* following the Hebrew custom in Gal. 4:4. Gen. 2:22 is used as non-technical proof of this.
Ex epistola ad romanos LIII. (394 C.E.) PL 35, 2075	Gen. 2:17 F	All are subject to death.

Contra adimantum _manichaei discipulum_ III. I. (394-395 C.E.) PL 42, 132	Gen. 2:18,21,22, 24 P	Manichaeans have argued that this is in contradiction with Mat. 19:29, Luke 17:29 and Mark 10:30. (_Omnis qui reliquerit domum aut uxorem aut parentes aut fratres, aut filios propter regnum caelorum_) Augustine writes that one needs to look at apparent contradictions to find deeper meaning (_Intelligenda enim sunt, non temere accusanda que imperitis videntur esse contraria_) *note uses same language is _De doctrina christiana; Prolog_ and this is one of his principles in _De doctrina christiana._
Enarratio in psalmum XXXVII.6 (396 C.E.) PL 36, 400	Gen. 2:24 P	Used as allegory for the bond between Christ and the church (two of one flesh) used with Eph. 5:31-32.
Enarratio in psalmum XXXVII.26 PL 36, 411	Gen. 2:17 F	Christ really died because our penalty really is death. Gen. 2:17 is used as non-technical proof.

Enarratio in psalmum XL.6 PL 36, 458	Gen. 2:16-17 F	God gave his commandment about eating to a healthy man.
Enarratio in psalmum XL.10 PL 36, 461	Gen. 2:21 P	Adam is the figure of Christ and Eve is the figure of the church.(in figura)
Enarratio in psalmum XLIV.12 PL 36, 501	Gen. 2:24 P	Gen. 2:24 describes union of Christ and Church.
Enarratio in psalmum XLVII.9 PL 36, 539	Gen. 2:17 F	God honestly promised death while the serpent falsely promised life.
Enarratio in psalmum LIV.3 PL 36, 629	Gen. 2:24 P	Describes the relationship of Christ and Church.
Enarratio in psalmum LVI.11 PL 36, 668	Gen. 2:21 P	Adam's sleep prefigures Christ on the Christ from whose side the Church is born.
Enarratio in psalmum LXI.4 PL 36, 730	Gen. 2:24 P	an allusion to the union between Christ and the Church.
Enarratio in psalmum LXVIII.II.1. PL 36, 854	Gen. 2:24 P	Indication of union between Christ and Church. (used with Eph. 5:31)

Enarratio in psalmum LXVIII.II.11. PL 36, 861	Gen. 2:17 F	Description of penalty of sin.
Enarratio in psalmum LXX.II.2. PL 36, 892	Gen. 2:17 F	God spoke truly about penalty of sin
ibid. II.7 PL 36, 896	Gen. 2:17 (bis) F	Tree is not evil. Man refused to learn good and evil from God but wanted to do it from his own experience. (*homo*)
Enarratio in psalmum LXXIII.25 PL 36, 945	Gen. 2:17 F	God spoke truly and serpent spoke mendaciously
Enarratio in psalmum LXXIV.4 PL 36, 949	Gen. 2:24 P	Allusion to the relationship of Christ and the Church. (used with Eph. 5:31-32)
Enarratio in psalmum CII.6 PL 37, 1320	Gen. 2:16-17 F	Allusion to health prescribed by God by not touching certain things
Enarratio in psalmum. CXVIII.XXIX.9 PL 37, 1589	Gen. 2:24 P	Description of relationship of Christ and the Church.(attributed to Paul Eph. 5:32)
Enarratio in psalmum CXXVI.7 PL 37, 1672	Gen. 2:21-22 P	Adam/Christ sleep/death and Eve/Church is form from their side

Enarratio in psalmum CXXXVIII.2 PL 37, 1784 (note Eph. 5:31-32 found PL 37,1784-1785)	Gen. 2:24 P	(*Nam hoc sic exponit Apostolus: "Erunt duo in carne, inquit una: sacramentum hoc magnum est; ego autem dico, in Christo et Ecclessia*) Augustine attributes this reading to Paul in Eph. 5:31-32.
ibid. PL 37, 1785	Gen. 2:21-22 P	Since Paul says Christ is the new Adam (Rom. 5:14) Augustine argues Adam/Christ, sleep/death, from rib come Eve/Church
ibid. PL 37, 1785	Gen. 2:24 P	cited as prophetic of church
Enarratio in psalmum CXLII.3 PL 37, 1847	Gen. 2:24 P	Describes relationship of Christ and Church based again upon Paul's Eph. 5:32 which is cited.
Diversis quaestionibus ad simplicianum II.I.4 (397 C.E.) CCSL, XLLIV, 62-63	Gen. 2:17 F	In an argument about the origin of sin. Augustine suggest that *peccatum* is seen in Adam who accepts the commandment of Gen. 2:17 and yet prevaricates.

Contra faustum manichaeum I.III. (397-398 C.E.) (example of Manichaean versus Christian exegesis) PL 42, 208	Gen. 2:17 (also Gen. 3:7) F	Faustus has called Augustine semi Christinaos children of the serpent. Augustine writes: (Cur autem serpentem patrem nostrum dixisti? An excidit tibit quemadmodum soleatis vituperare Deum qui homini praeceptum in paradiso dedit, et laudare serpentem quod ei per suum consilium occulos aperuit?)
ibid. XI.III PL 42, 247	Gen. 2:22 T	Fautus denies that Christ was made of woman Augustine adds that mulier is used of Eva in Gen. 2:22 to mean women and it is in this sense that Paul uses it
ibid. XII.VIII PL 42, 258	Gen. 2:22 P	Adam/rib(uses latus) prophetic of Christ/Church
ibid. PL 42, 258	Gen. 2:24 P	Gen. 2:24 describes the relationship of Christ and Church (Eph. 5:32)

ibid. XII. XXXVIII (note in XXXVII. Augustine writes that All the books of the Old Testament announce Christ in *figura*) See _De trinitate_ for a similar interpretation. PL 42, 274	Gen. 2:18 P	Old Testament prefigures the new Gen. 2:18 is non-technical proof. Why would it be necessary to make Eve from *latus*? (Bases this figurative interpretation upon Paul : *Omnia haec in figura contingebant illis* (1Cor. 10:11 & 6): *et: Haec omnia figurae nostrae fuerunt.* All this they seized in figures and all these were figures for us. XII.XXXVII).
ibid. XXII.XIV PL 42, 406	Gen. 2:16 T	Example of Manichaean exegesis: Faustus criticizes God for placing man in paradise and then giving him an impossible command.
ibid. XXII.XXXVIII PL 42, 424	Gen. 2:24 (with Eph. 5:32) P	One flesh is union of Christ and the Church.
De bono conjugali I.1 (401 C.E.) PL 40, 373	Gen. 2:21 M	Cited to explain the strength of the marriage bond.
De genesi ad litteram (401-415 C.E.) VI.XII.20 PL 34, 347	Gen. 2:19 A	man is in God's image because of his spirit not because he was made of earth like the animals/ earth represents the carnal.

VIII.XVII.37 PL 34, 387	Gen. 2:16 T	How God spoke to Adam
VIII. VIII. 15-XII.27 PL 34, 379-383	Gen. 2:15 A	Meaning of cultivate and guard and Lord God.
VIII. XIII.28 PL 34, 383	Gen. 2:16-17 F	Tree is not evil, evil is man's disobedience
VIII. XV.33. PL 34, 385.	Gen. 2:17 A	Why the tree is named the way it is.
VIII. XVII.36 PL 34, 387	Gen. 2:17 F	Adam is ordered not to eat, he is responsible for telling Eve (1 Cor. 14:35)
VIII. XXVII.49 PL 34, 392	Gen. 2:16 T	How does God speak? Adam understands God because all creation is His Word.
IX.I.2 PL 34, 393-394	Gen. 2:19 T	*Terra* should not be interpreted as soil but earth in the sense of the world.
IX.II.3-4 PL 34, 394	Gen. 2:18 T	Woman the helpmate is spoken in the same way that all word and creation is the Word. (*per quam creata sunt omnia*)
IX.III. 5 (this discussion continues until IX.IX.15) PL 34, 395	Gen. 2:18 M,S	Woman is a helpmate in procreation (cites Gen. 1:27 to prove that procreation is good)

IX.X.16 PL 34, 399	Gen. 2:17 F	Death is caused by sin (Rom. 7:10). Death did not exist in paradise. The point of the incarnation is to restore this order.
IX.XII. 20 PL 34, 400	Gen. 2:19 P	Adam truly named all the animals but there is a prophetic meaning.
ibid. PL 34,400	Gen. 2:22 P	Allusion to Eve's creation from Adam's *latus*.
IX.XIII.23. PL 34, 402	Gen. 2:22 P	Argues that *latus* (side which Augustine renders *os*, bone) is prophetic since 1. logically weaker women should have been made from *caro* (flesh).
IX.XIV.24. PL 34, 402	Gen. 2.19 F	Animals are lead by God because they obey him reflexively rather than by free will (*voluntatis arbitrio*)
IX.XIX.36 PL 34, 408	Gen. 2:21 P	Adam's sleep is an ecstasy during which he participates in the angelic court and receives the prophetic spirit.
IX.XIX.36 PL 34, 408	Gen. 2:23 P	Adam makes this as prophetic statement which is reiterated by Eph. 5:31-32.

Ibid.	Gen. 2:24 P	Prophetic of relationship between Christ and the Church. (Eph. 5:31-32).
XI.I.3 PL 34, 430	Gen. 2:25 F,S	Adam and Eve do not hide their nakedness since members are not yet disobedient.
XI.XXXI.40 PL 34, 446	Gen. 2:19. T	used as exemplum to support argument that opening of eyes of first parents is spiritual not literal.
De consensu *evangelistrarum* *II.XXVIII.68* (400 C.E.) PL 34, 1111	Gen. 2:22. T	exemplum (non-technical proof) that scripture uses *mulier* to signify both wives and virgins. Eve is created *mulier* even though she is virgin. (*note in Latin *mulier* can also mean wife)
II.LXII.121. PL 34, 1135	Gen. 2:24 M	(non-technical proof) that marriage was indissoluble for Jews and Jesus is restating God's intention in face of Pharisees.
Contra secundinum *manichaeum* XXI.21 (405-406 C.E) PL 42, 597	Gen. 2:24 P	Verse describes Christ's relationship with the Church (Eph. 5:31)

De peccatorum meritis et remissione et de baptismo parvulorum (ad marcellinum) I.II.2. (412 C.E) PL 44, 109	Gen. 2:17 F	Those who argue that death is part of the law of nature therefore Adam was born to die have misinterpreted this verse which refers _non ad mortem corporis, sed ad mortem animae._
ibid. I.XVI.21 PL 44, 121	Gen. 2:17 F	because of this time moves not to our perfection but our death.
ibid. I. XXXVI.67 PL 44, 149	Gen. 2:19 F	non-technical proof that man was not born in ignorance as babies are now since he could name all the animals. (in the course of arguing that infant ignorance proves they are born fallen)
In joannis evangelium, tractus IX.10. (408-413 C.E.) PL 35, 1163	Gen. 2:24 P	This verse prefigures Christ's relationship with the church. Christ leaves his parents by taking on the human form.(Eve= Church)
ibid. PL 35, 1163	Gen. 2:21 P	This verse prefigures the birth of the church. Adam sleeps, Christ dies. (Eve= Church)
XV.8 PL 35, 1513	Gen. 2:21 (quotes this as _costa_) P	Adam (_res_)is a figure (_forma-figura_) for Christ. Adam/Christ give birth to _uxor/Ecclesia_ from their _latus._

XXII.6 PL 35, 1577	Gen. 2.17 F	Used against literal interpretation of John 5:24. Christ does not remove physical death. Gen. 2:17 cited as non-technical proof that all humanity still suffers this penalty.
De trinitate XII.VI.8 (401-416 C.E.) PL 42, 1003	Gen. 2:22 P	Augustine is arguing that Man, Woman, and Son do not bear the image of the Trinity.
ibid. XII.XIII.20 PL 42, 1009	Gen. 2:20 A	Augustine disagrees with equating women with bodily senses (like animals) upon the bases of _Adjutorium simile illi_ therefore this refers to some other portion of the mind which all humans share. (uses _de latere_)
De gratia christi et de peccato originali (contra pelagium et caelestium) II.XXXV.40. (418 C.E.) PL 44, 405	Gen. 2:22 T	(_latus_) Augustine is arguing for faith since how could one prove now that Adam was made of dust and his _conjux_ from his _latus_? He writes: _Et tamen quod oculus jam non invenit, fides credit._ Thus what the eye has not seen faith believes.

De nuptiis et concupiscentia (ad valerium comitem) I.V.6 (419 C.E.) PL 44, 417	Gen. 2:19,20,23. A	Used as non-technical proof that Adam had physical sight and the opening of his eyes is spiritual. (Gen. 3:7)
ibid. PL 44, 417	Gen. 2:25 F,S	Adam and Eve saw they were naked (therefore had physical sight) but _non confundebantur_ (were not ashamed). This implies for Augustine spiritual innocence.
ibid. II.IX.22. PL 44, 448	Gen. 2:24 F,S	Cites this as being used incorrectly to argue that _voluptas potest honesta_.
ibid. II.XXXI.53 PL 44, 467	Gen. 2:24 M,F,S	Augustine quotes the Pelagians as citing this as proof of the present good of marriage and of accusing Augustine of arguing for an unrealistic _sine concupiscentia_ pre-fall and attributing present marriage to the devil (_ista vero conjugia que nunc aguntur, a diabolo inventa definis._)
ibid. II. XXXII.54 PL 44, 468	Gen. 2:24 M,F,S	Augustine argues that he is not arguing against marriage but rather the changed flavor of the sexual relations after the fall

De anima et ejus origine I.XVIII.29.(419 C.E.) note: Aug. quotes Gen. 2:23 d and e, *Haec vocabitur mulier, quia de viro suo sumta est)* *Vocabitur mulier* is not conforming with the Vulgate. PL 44, 492	Gen. 2:23 T	Augustine is responding to two books by Vincentii Victoris. Augustine is uncertain about how souls are transmitted (God's breath at birth or from Adam's soul passed on) Victoris has cited Gen. 2:23 to argue that God breaths on each person at birth because Adam does not say "*anima ex anima mea*" Augustine argues that this does not preclude propagation since part can signify the whole.
ibid. I.XVIII.30 PL 44, 492	Gen. 2:23 T	Those who argue for divine inspiration need to find authoritative texts to support this. *Os ex ossibus meis, et caro de corne mea, non tropice a parte totum* however. (the part signifying the whole)
Sermo LII.IV.10 PL 38, 358	Gen. 2:22 T	(*Proprietas enim locutionis Hebraeae mulieres, non corruptas virginitate sed seminas appellat.*) Cites Gen. 2:22 as an example of this Hebrew practice.

Sermo. XCVII.II.2. PL 38, 590	Gen. 2:17 F	Death is the penalty of pride.(_diabolus_ is pride)
Sermo CLI.V.5 PL 38, 817	Gen. 2:25 F,S	Man was not ashamed since his members were not at odds with _prima lex_ or the law of the spirit.
ibid. PL 38, 817	Gen. 2:20 F	Non-technical proof that the opening of men's eyes was spiritual not physical otherwise Adam would not have seen the animals.
Sermo CLII.5 PL 38, 821	Gen. 2:17 F	The law of sin is also death. (cited with Rom. 7:22)
Sermo CCCXLI.X.12 PL 39, 1500	Gen. 2:24 P	Attributes to Paul interpretation of Gen. 2:24 (Eph. 5:32) which describes Christ's relationship to the Church.
Sermo CCCXLIX.III.3 PL 39, 1530	Gen. 2:24 M,S	Non-technical proof that God approves of licit unions (_Dictum est enim hoc divinitus; sed de viro et uxore ubi licet, ubi concessum est, ubi honestum est_)
Contra duas epistolas pelagianorum I.V.9. (420 C.E.) PL 44, 554	Gen. 2:24 M	Non-technical proof that God has established marriage (Augustine states this since Julian has accused him of repudiating marriage.

Contra julianum I.V.18. (421 C.E.) PL 44, 652	Gen. 2:17 (N.B. Augustine cites Basil's interpretation of the text) F	Augustine quotes _Basilius_ on Gen. 2:17 (Augustine says he is translating Basil word for word from the Greek text) Basil is interpreted as supporting the notion of original sin because he suggest the necessity for fasting comes from Eve's lack of fasting)
ibid. II.VII.20 PL 44, 688	Gen. 2:18 M,S	Augustine quotes Ambrose's use of this passage: _"Ergo, inquit propter generationem successionis humanae debuit mulier adjici viro."_ Therefore he said that women was given to man to help in the propagation of the human race.
ibid. III.X.20 PL 44, 712	Gen. 2:24 M	These words prove that nothing shameful is created by God.
ibid. IV.XVI.82 PL 44, 781	Gen. 2:25 F,S	These words indicate that they covered themselves because they were ashamed (which they had not been before)
Enchiridion XXV. (421 C.E.) Ben XXI, 306	Gen. 2:17 F	Death is God's condemnation because of the _malitia_ of angels and men.

De civitate dei XIII. IV (417 C.E.) PL 41, 379	Gen. 2:17 F	attempting to answer the question why purified people are not exempt from penalty of death. Augustine answers that death becomes our justification particularly with martyrs
ibid. XIII.XII (417 C.E.) PL 41, 386	Gen. 2:17 F	The penalty of death applies not only to the body but also the soul.(_Ubit anima et a Deo et a corpore separata punitur_)
ibid. XIII. XV (417 C.E.) PL 41, 387	Gen. 2:17 F	"_Morte moriemini_" quoniam non _est dictum Mortibus_. Non-technical proof that death is of the soul and not the body.
ibid. XIII. XXIII.1. (417 C.E.) PL 41, 396	Gen. 2:17 F	Adam does not die immediately rather the act of disobedience changed the very structure of creation. (_Eo quippe die mutata in deterius vitiataque natura_)
ibid. XIV.XVII. (418 C.E.) PL 41, 425	Gen. 2:25 F,S	Non-technical proof that prior to disobedience organs did not move except voluntarily.
ibid. XVI.XXVII (418 C.E.) PL 41, 506	Gen. 2:17 P	This is the first alliance that God made with man

I.

ibid. XXII. XVII (Augustine is attempting to answer the question *An in suo sexu resuscitanda atque mansura sint corpora Feminarum* Will women conserve their female bodies at the resurrection?) PL 41, 778 (425 C.E.)	Gen. 2:21 P	Prophetic of Christ and the Church (*Christum et Ecclesiam tali facto jam tunc prophetari oportebat.*)
ibid. (Augustine concludes *Qui ergo utrumque sexum instituit, utrumque restituet.* He who therefore instituted both sexes will resurrect both sexes) Use of *aedifcere* by Paul makes this prophetic text. (425 C.E.) PL 41, 779	Gen. 2:22 (uses *latus* for both Christ and Adam.) P	Since woman is *Aedificavit* not *formavit* or *finxit* and the same verbe *Aedificere* is used by Paul for the Church out of Christ's body (Eph. 4:12) therefore women has been created by God, to indicate the unity and to be in this the figure of Christ and the Church. (*Creatura est ergo Dei femina, sicut vir: sed ut de viro fieret, unitas commendata; ut autem illo modo fieret, Christus, ut dictum est, et Ecclesia figurata est*)

*De correptione et gratia (ad valentium)*XII.33 (426-427 C.E.) PL 44, 936	Gen. 2:17 F	non-technical proof for free will.(*Prima ergo libertas voluntatis erat, posse non peccare)* The first freedom of man's will was the power not to sin.
Contra secundam juliani responsionem, imperfectum opus (429-30 C.E.) II.LVII PL 45, 1167	Gen. 2:24 M	Julian has said that Paul supports his notion of sin by imitation and not generation (*non seminibus)* Julian say :*quanta ergo de ore tuo effluxerit falsitas* (thus will have flowed great falseness from your mouth) PL 45, 1166. Augustine says that Julian has misunderstood *De nuptiis* C.XXXVII. Marriage is sanctioned in Gen. 2:24 and Matt. 19.6.
ibid. II.LIX PL 45, 1163	Gen. 2:24 P,	Rude passion of Adam and Eve is not found in the marriage of Christ and the Church
ibid. II.LX PL 45, 1168	Gen. 2:25 F,M,S	Augustine argues that Julian is not ashamed of interpreting this verse to mean shameful passion *libidinem* existed before the fall.
ibid. III.LXXIV PL 45, 1279	Gen. 2:25 F,M,S	Augustine suggest that Julian's interpretation this verse is *sacrilegae*

ibid. IV.XXXIV PL 45, 1355	Gen. 2:17 F	Augustine says he has not suggested that God made death but rather God said *morte morieris* (you will die by death) as the punishment for sin.
ibid. IV.XLIV PL 45,1364	Gen. 2:25 F,S	Uses this verse to mean that they were not embarrassed because these members were not yet shameful which they would become.

ibid. V.I. PL 45, 1432	Gen. 2:19 F	Augustine wonders why man has such difficulty learning when Adam was extremely wise in that he could name all the animals. (this is implicitly an indication of his fallen state)
ibid. VI.XXX PL 45, 1581	Gen. 2:17 F	Julian has argued against introducing all the ugliness of death into paradise. Augustine argues that death occurs when they are separated from the tree of life.

Appendix III

Manuscript Versions of Genesis 3

The following table is broken down into five columns. The first column indicates the verse from Gen. 3:1-24 that is being cited. The second column provides Jerome's version of the verse as found in Fischer's *Vetus Latina*. The third column contains Augustine's version of the verse as found in *De genesi contra manichaeos* which is followed by the location in Migne. The fourth column is Augustine's version of the verse as supplied in *De genesis ad litteram libri duodecim* with the corresponding location in Migne. The fifth column compares the two Augustinian versions with the various *Vetus Latina* translations as found in *Vetus Latina: Dei Reste der altlateinischen Bibel nach Petrus Sabatier*, ed. Bonifatius Fischer, Vol. 2. Freiburg: Verlag Herder, 1951.[1]

Verse	Jerome's Version *Liber Bresith qui Graece Dicitur Genesis* (VL 2, 56-78)	*De genesi contra manichaeos* II.I.2. PL 34, 196-197.	*De genesi ad litteram*XI.I.1. PL 34, 429-430.	*Vetus Latina*

---

[1]For the purposes of consistency the Latin "i" has been rendered "J" where appropriate. "*Eius*" is therefore written "*ejus*". I have also rendered "*coelum*" as "*caelum*".

3:1	Sed et serpens erat callidior cunctis animantibus terrae quae fecerat dominus deus qui dixit ad mulierem cur praecepit vobis dominus dominus deus ut non comederetis de omni ligno paradisi	Serpens autem erat sapientior omnium bestiarum, quae erant super terram, quas fecerat Dominus Deus. Et dixit serpens ad mulierem: Quare dixit Deus ne edatis ab omni ligno quod est in paradiso? 196	Serpens autem erat prudentissimus omnium bestiarum quae sunt super terram, quas fecit Dominus Deus. Et dixit serpens mulieri, Quid, quia dixit Deus, Non editis ab omni ligno paradisi? 429	_De genesi contra manichaeos_ German manuscript _De genesi ad litteram_:. Most closely follows alternate version of German manuscript (VL 2, 56-57)
3:2	cui respondit mulier de fructu lignorum quae sunt in paradiso vescemur	Et dixit mulier ad serpentem: Ex omni ligno quod est in paradiso edemus 196	Et dixit mulier serpenti. A fructu ligni quod est in paradiso edemus 429	_De genesi contra manichaeos_ German _De genesi ad litteram_:. Similar to German variations but appears to be Augustine's own version. (VL 2, 57-58)
3:3	de fructu vero ligni quod est in medio paradisi praecepti nobis deus ne comederemus et ne tangeremus illud ne forte moriamur	a fructu autem ligni quod est in medio paradisi dixit Deus ne edamus, sed neque tangamus, ne moriamur 196	de fructu autem ligni quod est in medio paradisi, dixit Deus, Non edetis ex eo, neque tangetis illud, ne moriamini. 429	_De genesi contra manichaeos_. German (adds _paradisi_ rather than _paradiso_) _De genesi ad litteram_. Some similarities to German but appears to be Augustine's own version (VL 2, 58)

3:4	dixit autem serpens ad mulierem nequaquam morte moriemini	Et dixit serpens mulieri: Non morte moriemini 196	Et dixit serpens mulieri, Non morte moriemini 429	Both follow German (VL 2, 58-59)
3:5	scit enim deus quod in quocumque die comederitis ex eo aperientur oculi vestri et eritis sicut dii scientes bonum et malum	sciebat enim Deus quia qua die manducaveritis ex illo, aperientur oculi vestri, et eritis sicut dii, scientes bonum et malum 196	sciebat enim Deus, quoniam qua die manducaveritis de eo, aperientur vobis oculi, et eritis tanquam dii, scientes bonum et malum 429	_De genesi contra manichaeos._ similar to German (uses _quia qua_ not _quonim qua_,) _De genesi ad litteram._ Similar to German but Augustine appears to be using his own version. (VL 2, 59-60)
3:6	vidit igitur mulier quod bonum esset lignum ad vescendum et pulchrum oculis aspectuque delectabile et tulit de fructu illius et comedit deditque viro suo qui comedit	Et vidit mulier quia bonum est lignum in escam, et quia bonum est oculis ad videndum et cognoscendum ; et sumpsit fructum de ligno illo, et manducavit, et dedit viro suo; et accepit Adam, et manducavit 196	Et vidit mulier quia bonum lignum ad escam, et quia placet oculis videre, de decorum est cognoscere. Et sumens, de fructu ejus edit, et dedit viro suo secum, et ederunt. 429	_De genesi contra manichaeos._ German / African version[3] _De genesi ad litteram._ German to _ad escam;_ the following has some similarities to African version: From _et sumens_ follows Italian version (VL 2, 60-61)

---

[3]Augustine is frequently the source for the African versions of the Vetus Latina.

3:7	et aperti sunt oculi amborum cumque cognovissent esse se nudos consuerunt folia ficus et fecerunt sibi perizomata	et aperti sunt oculi eorum,et tunc scierunt quia nudi erant; et sumpserunt sibi folia fici, et fecerunt sibi succinctoria. 196	Et aperti sunt oculi amborum, et agnoverunt quia nudi erant, et consuerunt folia fici, et fecerunt sibi campestria 429	_De gen contra man._ African version to _et sumpserunt_ the rest is Augustine's version. _De genesi ad litteram._ African. _Amborum_ to _consuerunt_ from Italian. The rest appears German. (VL 2, 61-62)
3:8	et cum audissent vocem domini dei deambulantis in paradiso ad auram post meridiem abscondit se Adam et uxor ejus a facie domini dei in medio ligni paradisi	Et cum audissent vocem Domini deambulantis in paradiso ad vesperam, absconderunt se Adam et mulier ejus abante faciem Domini Dei, ad illam arborem quae erat in medio paradiso. 196	Et audierunt vocem Domini Dei deambulantis in paradiso ad vesperam, et absconderunt se Adam et mulier ejus a facie Domini Dei, in medio ligni paradisi. 429	_De genesi contra manichaeos_ German to _Abante_ except _Domini_ is used instead of _Dei:_ Rest is African. _De genesi ad litteram._ German to _a facie,_ except _Domini Dei_ is used instead of _domini._ The rest similar to Italian excpet _Dei_ has been added. (VL 2, 62-63)
3:9	vocavitque dominus deus Adam et dixit ei: ubi es?	Et vocavit Dominus Deus Adam, et dixit illi: Adam ubi es? 196	Et vocavit Dominus Deus Adam, et dixit illi, Ubi es? 429	German manuscript (VL 2, 63-64)

3:10	qui ait vocem tuam audivi in paradiso et timui eo quod nudus essem et abscondi me	Et dixit ille: Vocem tuam audivi, Domine, in paradiso, et timui et abscondi me, quia nudus sum 196	Et dixit ei, Vocem tuam audivi deambulantis in paradiso, et timui, quia nudus sum, et abscondi me 429	*De genesi contra manichaeos.* German to *et,* African after. *De genesi ad litteram.* Alternate German version to *et,* African after. (VL 2, 64)
3:11	Cui dixit quis enim indicavit tibi quod nudus esses nisi quod es ligno de quo tibi praeceperam ne comderes comedisti	Et dixit Dominus Deus, Quis nutiavit tibi, quia nudus es, nisi quia ab illa arbore de qua dixeram tibi ex illa sola non manducare, ex illa manducasti? 196	Et dixit illi, Quis nuntiavit tibi quia nudus es, nisi a ligno quod praeceperam tibi tantum ne ex eo manducares, ab eo edisti? 429	*De genesi contra manichaeos.* African version except *manducasti* is used instead of *edisti.* *De genesi ad litteram.* Augustine's own version, mixture of Italian and African. (VL 2, 64-65)

| 3:12 | dixitque Adam mulier quam dedisti sociam mihi dedit mihi de ligno et comedi. | Et dixit Adam: Mulier quam dedisti mihi, dedit ut ederem, et manducavi

196 | Et dixit Adam, Mulier quam dedisit mecum, haec mihi dedit de ligno et edi

429 | *De genesi contra manichaeos.* African, except *manducavi* used instead of *edi.*

De genesi ad litteram. Augustine's own version, combines ellements from several African versions and the Italian version.

(VL 2, 65) |
| 3:13 | Et dixit dominus deus a mulierem quare hoc fecisti quae respondit serpens decepit me et comedi | Et dixit Deus mulieri: Quid hoc fecisti? Et dixit mulier: Serpens seduxit me, et manducavi.

196 | Et dixit Dominus Deus mulieri, Quid hoc fecisti? Et dixit mulier, Serpens seduxit me, et manducavi

429 | *De genesi contra manichaeos.* German

De genesi ad litteram. alternate German version.

(VL 2, 65-66) |

3:14	et ait dominus deus ad serpentem quia fecisti hoc maledictus es inter omnia animantia et bestias terrae super pectus tuum gradieris et terram comedes cunctis diebus vitae tuae	Et dixit dominus Deus serpenti: Quia hoc fecisti, maledictus tu ab omni pecore, et omni genere bestiarum. Pectore et ventre repes, et terram manducabis omnibus diebus vitae tuae 196	Et dixit Dominus Deus serpenti, Quia fecitis hoc, maledictus tu ab omnibus pecoribus, et ab omnibus bestiis, quae sunt super terram, Super pectus tuum et ventrem tuum ambulabis, et terram edes omnes dies vitae tuae. 429	_De genesi_ _contra_ _manichaeos_. European to _tu ab_. Carthegenian to _bestiarum_. The rest Augustine's version. _De genesi ad_ _litteram._ European version (VL 2, 66-67)
3:15	et inimicitias ponam inter te et mulierem et semen tuum et semen illius ipse conteret caput tuum et tu insideaberis calcaneo ejus	Et inimicitiam ponam inter te et mulierem, et inter semen tuum, et inter semen illius. Ipsa tuum observabit caput, et tu ejus calcaneum 196	Et inimicitias ponam inter te et inter mulierem, et inter semen tuum et semen ejus; ipsa tibi servabit caput, et tu servabis ejus calcaneum 429	_De genesi_ _contra_ _manichaeos_ Carthaginian to _ponam_, German to _illius_, the rest similar to German variations but appear to be Augustine's own version. _De genesi ad_ _litteram_. European to _ponam_, German to _ejus_, the rest appears to be Augustine's own version. (VL 2, 67-68)

3:16	*mulieri quoque dixit multiplicabo aerumnas tuas et conceptus tuos in dolore paries filios et ab viri potestate eris et ipse dominabitur tui*	*Et mulieri dixit: Multiplicans multiplicabo dolores tuos, et suspiria tua, et in doloribus paries filios tuos; et ad virum tuum conversio tua, et ille tui dominabitur.* 196	*Et mulieri dixit, Multiplicans multiplicabo tristitias tuas et gemitum tuum. In tristitiis paries filios, et ad virum tuum conversio tuas, et ipse tui dominabitur.* 429	<u>*De genesi contra manichaeos*</u>. German to *et suspiria*, the rest is Augustine's own version. <u>*De genesi ad litteram*</u>. Similar to several German versions, Augustines own version. (VL 2, 69-70)
3:17	*ad Adam vero dixit quia audisti vocem uxoris tuae et comedisti de ligno ex quo praeceperam tibi ne comederes maledicta terra erit in opere tuo in laboribus comedes eam cunctis diebus vitae tuae*	*Et tunc dixit Deus ad Adam: Quia audisti vocem mulieris tuae, et manducasti de ligno de quo praeceperam tibi, ex illo solo ne ederes, maledicta terra erit tibi in omnibus operibus tuis et in tristitia et gemitu tuo manducabis ex ea omnibus diebus vitae tuae* 196-197	*Adae autem dixit, Quia audisti vocem mulieris tuae, at edisti de ligno, de quo praeceperam tibi de eo solo non edere, maledicta terra in operibus tuis; in tristitiis edes illam omnes dies vitae tuae;* 429	<u>*De genesi contra manichaeos.*</u> combines elements of various Carthaginian and European manuscripts, Augustine's own version. <u>*De genesi ad litteram*</u>. European to *de eo solo*, rest similar to European and Carthaginian manuscripts but Augustine's own version. (VL 2,70-72)

3:18	Spinas et tribulos germinabit tibi et comedes herbas terrae	Spinas et tribulos germinabit tibi, et edes pabulum agri tui 197	spinas et tribulos germinabit tibi, et edes fenum agri 429	_De genesi contra manichaeos_. European to _Geminabit_, rest is Carthaginian. _De genesi ad litteram_. European to _germinabit_, rest is Augustine's version. (VL 2, 72-73)
3:19	in sudore vultus tui vesceris pane donec revertaris in terram de qua sumptus es quia pulvis es et in pulverem reverteris	In sudore vultus tui edes panem tuum, donec revertaris in terram, de qua sumptus es; quia terra es, et in terram ibis 197	In sudore faciei tuae edes panem tuum, donec convertaris in terram ex qua sumptus es; quia terra es, et in terram ibis. 429	_De genesi contra manichaeos_. German version, note subsitutes _quia_ from alternate German text for _quoniam_. _De genesi ad litteram_. Augustine's own version. (VL 2, 73-74)
3:20	et vocavit Adam nomen uxoris suae Hava eo quod mater esset cunctorum viventium	Et tunc Adam imposuit nomen uxori suae, Vita: quia mater est omnium vivorum 197	Et vocavit Adam nomen mulieris suae, Vita, quoniam haec est mater omnium viventium 429	_De genesi contra manichaeos_. African version. _De genesi ad litteram._ Augustine appears to be using several versions of the Italian manuscripts. (VL 2, 74-75)

3:21	fecit quoque dominus deus Adam et uxori ejus tunicas pellicias et induit eos	Et tunc fecit Dominus Deus Adae et mulieri ejus tunicas pelliceas, et induit illos 197	et fecit Dominus Deus Adam et mulieri ejus tunicas pelliceas, et induit eos 429-430	*De genesi contra manichaeos.* African *et tunc* and *illos*, rest is German. *De genesi ad litteram*. Italian *et tunc* and *eos*, rest is German, uses alternate German version *Adam* rather than *Adae*. (VL 2, 76)
3:22	et ait ecce Adam factus est quasi unus ex nobis sciens bonum et malum nunc ergo ne forte mittat manum suam et sumat etiam de ligno vitae et comedat et vivat in aeternum	et dixit: Ecce Adam factus est tanquam unus ex nobis, ad scientiam cognoscendi bonum et malum. Et tunc ne porrigeret manum suam Adam ad arborem vitae et sumeret sibi inde, et ederet et viveret in aeternum 197	Et dixit Dominus Deus, Ecce Adam factus est tanquam unus ex nobis in cognoscendo bonum et malum. Et nunc ne aliquando extendat manum suam, et sumat de ligno vitae et edat, et vivat in aeternum 430	*De genesi contra manichaeos.* African to *in aeternum* which is German. *De genesi ad litteram.* Italian to *cognoscendo*, note uses *tanquam* instead of *quasi*, rest is European, except for *in aeternum* which is German. (VL 2, 76-77)

3:23	emisit eum dominus deus de paradiso voluptatis ut operaretur terram de qua sumptus est	dimisit eum Dominus Deus de paradiso suavitatis, ut operaretur terram de qua et sumptus fuerat 197	Et dimisit illum Dominus Deus de paradiso voluptatis operari terram, es qua sumptus est. 430	*De genesi contra manichaeos.* German to terram, rest is African. Note uses *eum* instead of *illum.* *De genesi ad litteram.* Uses combination of two German manuscripts to terram, rest is original to Augustine. (VL 2, 77)
3:24	ejecitque Adam et collocavit ante paradisum voluptatis cherubin et flammeum gladium atque versatilem ad custodiendam viam ligni vitae	Et ejectus foras de paradiso, moratus est contra paradisum voluptatis, Et Cherubim et illam flammeam frameam quae versatur, posuit Deus ad custodiendam viam arboris vitae. 197	Et ejecit Adam, et collocavit eum contra paradisum voluptatis; et ordinavit Cherubim et flammeam rhomphaeam quae veritur, custodire viam ligni vitae. 430	*De genesi contra manichaeos.* African version *De genesi ad litteram.* Augustine appears to have combined several Italian versions. (VL 2, 77-78)

Appendix IV

Augustine's use of Gen. 3:1-24

The following is a table of the instances in which Augustine cites some portion of Genesis 3: 1-24. The first column contains the title and location within the work authored by Augustine. Augustine's works have been listed in chronological order. Their dates appear in brackets. The dates are based upon PL, Peter Brown's Augustine of Hippo (1967), Mary Clark's Augustine (1994) and the notes in Augustine's Retractations FC 60 (1968). When no date is available this information has been left blank. The second column displays the biblical citation. The third column indicates the context in which the citation is used.

In the second column, the biblical citation is followed by a letter representing the type of use made of the text.

A= Allegory text

T= Technical Exegetical discussion (grammar,

technical meaning of words, etymology etc.)

P= Prophetic text

F= Fall

S= Sexuality

Al= Allusion to another biblical passage

Pr= Pride

Location	Biblical Citation	Context
De genesi contra manichaeos (389 C.E.) I.XIII.19 PL 34, 182	Gen. 3:17-19 F	Poisonous and fruitless trees are the result of the fall
Ibid., II.I.2 PL 34, 196-197	Gen. 3:1-24 T	Biblical text is quoted
Ibid., II.V.8. PL 34, 199	Gen. 3:23 F	Work is a product of sin/ fall
Ibid., II.XIV.20-21 PL 34, 206-207	Gen. 3:1 A	Serpent is allegory for the devil
Ibid., II.XV.22 PL 34, 207-208	Gen. 3:4-5 Pr	Pride is the cause of man's fall
Ibid., II.XV.23 PL 34, 208	Gen. 3:6 A	Woman's eyes are physically open, rather her eyes of cunning are opened
Ibid.	Gen. 3:7 Pr	Cunning pride made them disdain simplicity therefor they covered their previous innocence
Ibid., II.XVI.24 PL 34, 208	Gen. 3:8 A	God's presence is still with Adam and Eve, evening represents the failing light of truth being taken from the first couple.
Ibid. , II.XVI.24 PL 34, 209	Gen. 3:9 T	God asks where Adam is, not because he does not know but because he wants Adam to confess his sin.
Ibid. PL 34, 209	Gen. 3:10 F	What man finds personally displeasing he attributes to God, this is the error of the Manichees.

Ibid.	Gen. 3:11 A	naked= naked of dissimulation but clothed in divine light. After the fall this nakedness is displeasing to man
Ibid., II.XVII.25. PL 34, 209	Gen. 3:12 Pr	Pride makes Adam accuse the woman and God for giving him the woman far his own sin.
Ibid.	Gen. 3:13 A	Women blames serpent.
Ibid., II.XVII.26 PL 34, 210	Gen. 3:14 A	*pectoris* = pride *ventris significatur carnale desiderium* (carnal desire)
Ibid., II.XVIII.27 PL 34, 210	Gen. 3:14 A	*Terram manducabis*=sinners or curiosity (the third type of temptation)
Ibid.	Gen. 3:15 A	Woman is carnal portion of man, which is the portion that the serpent continues to tempt
Ibid., II.XIX.29 PL 34, 210	Gen. 3:16 A	Woman's curse allegory for struggle between desire to do good and bad habits (not referring to pain of childbirth which is a condition shared by all creatures by virtue of their mortality.) ruling husband is reason, woman is carnal passion
Ibid., II.XX.30. PL 34, 211	Gen. 3:17-19. A	Man has difficulty discovering the truth because of corruptible body, thorns and thistle as torturous questions
Ibid., II.XXI.31. PL 34, 212	Gen. 3: 20 A	life is portion of soul preoccupied with the good and resisting evil habits.
Ibid., II.XXI.32. PL 34, 213	Gen. 3:21 P	Skin garments prefigure death
Ibid., II.XXII.33 PL 34, 213	Gen. 3:22 T	Adam has become one of us i. meant ironically ii. Adam is acting from, outside of God

Ibid., II.XII.34 PL 34, 213-214.	Gen. 3:22-23 T	dismissed is not excluded, rather driven from the company. Lest Adam... possible meanings in Latin of *ne* clause. (in Latin it can be affirmative and negative)
Ibid., II.XXIII.35 PL 34, 214	Gen. 3:24 A	*Cherubim* (Hebrew)= *Scientiae plenitudo* (fullness of knowledge) Flaming sword = temporal punishments
Ibid., II.XXV.38. PL 34, 216-217	Gen. 3:1 A	Serpent= heretics
Ibid., II.XXVI.38-40 PL 34, 217-218.	Gen. 3:1 A	Serpent= Manichaeans
Ibid., II.XXVI.40.	Gen. 3:15-16 A	Heretics use this to absolve themselves form Evil. Does not represent to parts of creation Evil and Good, but that evil is turning from God
Ibid., II.XXVII.41 PL 34, 218	Gen. 3:18 A	This verse is intended allegorically
De diversis quaestionibus octoginta tribus (388-395 C.E.)LXV. PL 40, 60	Gen. 3:10 AI	Explaining John 11:1 (raising of Lazarus) Gen. 3:10 refers to the hiding which all sinners do from God (JC calls Lazarus, God calls Adam)
Ibid.	Gen. 3:19 A	*Terra= Cupiditatum carnalium* (Lazarus leaving the tomb: *Quod autem exiit de monumento, animam significat recendentem a carnalibus vitiis:* When he exits the tomb, it signifies the spirit abandoning its carnal vices.)

Contra fortunatum manichaeum II.22. (August 28-29, 392 C.E.) PL 42, 126	Gen. 3:19 F	This is *lex mortis*/law of death, under which all are born
Sermone domini in monte (393 C.E.)I.XII.34. PL 34, 1246	Gen. 3:1-24 A	Serpent= persuasion Eve= *appetitu carnali* (carnal appetite) Adam= consent by *ratio* (rational) to sin. Leaving Paradise is being chased from *de beatissima luce justitiae* (the beatific light of justice)
ibid., I.XVII.53 PL 34, 1256	Gen. 3:19 F	sinners are condemned to earth
De fide et symbolo (393 C.E.)IV.6 PL 40, 185	Gen. 3:5 Pr	*Qui superbia lapsi sumus*: We lapsed by pride.
Ibid., X.23 PL	Gen. 3:6 F	(Eccli. 10:14, *Mors quippe animae est apostatare a Deo*: Death of the soul is separation from God) refers to Gen. 3:6
De libero arbitro (395 C.E.) III.XXIV.72 PL 32, 1307	Gen. 3:5 Pr	*Superbia enim avertit a sapientia* (Pride therefor has an aversion to wisdom) which is the meaning of Gen. 3:5 *Gustate et eritis scicut dii* (Taste and you will become like the gods)
Enarratio in eudem psalmum (396 C.E.) XXXII.II.1 PL 36, 286	Gen. 3:19 F	Bread=word of God which we must not fast with. *Si panis noster est verbum Dei sudemus in audiendo ne moriamur in jejunando* (If our bread is the word of God, we should sweat listening, in order to not die of fasting.)

Ibid., XXXIV.I.7 PL 36, 327	Gen. 3:6 Ty	*Ibi victus est a diabolo per mulierem, hic vicit diabolum et mulierem* [There(in paradise) he is vanquished by the devil through woman, here (on the manure/ in stercore) he (Job) vanquished the devil and woman] This is the meaning of Job 2:10
Ibid., XXXV.18 PL 36, 354	Gen. 3:15 Pr	pride is the serpent which will case church to fall (*Ideo cum cautam faceret Dominus Ecclesiam* / This is how God cautions the Church)
Ibid.	Gen. 3:23 F	God told the truth, demon lied about consequences
Ibid., XXXVII.15 PL 36, 405	Gen 3:8 A	God is the light of Adam's eyes which is why he hid himself in the shadows
Ibid., XL.6 PL 36, 458	Gen. 3:19 F	penalty of sin
Ibid., XLI.14 PL 36, 474	Gen. 3:19 F	penalty of sin
Ibid., XLVII.9 PL 36, 539	Gen. 3:4 F	Serpent lied and God told the truth Gen. 2:17
Ibid.	Gen. 3:6 P	Man tempted by woman and devil is victor in Job 2:10
Ibid., XLVIII. I.6 PL 36, 548	Gen. 3:15 A	Eve is the flesh (*Eva nobis interior caro nostra est* /Our Eve is our interior flesh)
Ibid.	Gen. 3:6 A	Devil wanted to trick man via the flesh therefor he used Eve
Ibid., XLVIII.II.2 PL 36, 556	Gen. 3:1 Pr	Man falls through pride (*per superbiam*)
Ibid., LVII.2 PL 36, 675	Gen. 3:17,18 F	the consequences of sin
Ibid., LIX.2 PL 36, 714	Gen. 3:6,17 Al	reference to the Fall, these are the *tenebrae* described by Paul in Eph. 5.8

Ibid., LXI.18 PL 36, 741	Gen. 3:17 T	Used as proof that God spoke to men
Ibid., LXV.13 PL 36, 795	Gen. 3:17 F	Man deserved his punishment (We fell by our merit / *nos meritum nostrum dejecit*)
Ibid., LXVIII.I.9 PL 36, 848	Gen. 3:1 Pr	Disorder of pride, Devil usurped what had not been given to him. (*Usurpavit sibi diabolus quod non acceperat; perdidit quod acceperat /*The devil usurped for himself that which had not been given to him, and he lost what had been given)
ibid.	Gen. 3:5 Pr	Man's pride caused fall. (*superbiae suae*)
Ibid., LXVIII.II.11 PL 36, 861	Gen. 3:19 F	Death consequence of sin
Ibid., LXX.I.2 PL 36, 877	Gen. 3:6 F	Adam non obediendo peccavit (Adam not obeying, sinned)
Ibid., LXX.I.5 PL 36, 878	Gen. 3:8 F	Adam doubts God and flees
Ibid., LXX.II.2 PL 36, 892	Gen. 3:1 F	God is the head, (*imperator*) the devil is the traitor (*desertor*)
Ibid., LXX.II.6 PL 36, 895	Gen. 3:5 Pr	*Et homo se extollit* (man extolled himself) this caused the fall.
Ibid., LXXI.12 PL 36, 909	Gen. 3:19 F	Man, because of his sin merited his punishment (*Terra es, et in terram ibis*)
Ibid., LXXIII.5 PL 36, 933	Gen. 3:4-5 Ty	death was brought by the serpent, if the serpent is death then the yard changed into a serpent (Ex. 4:14) is Christ at his death. (*Virga in serpente Christus in morte/*the yard in the serpent, Christ in death)
Ibid., LXXIII.16 PL 36, 938	Gen. 3:15 A	*Serpent= Draconum capita* from Ps.LXXIII.13. is the serpent which signifies the origin of sin which is pride.

Ibid., LXXIII.18 PL 36, 940	Gen. 3:5,6,22. Pr	Adam wishes to be like God
Ibid., LXXIII.25 PL 36, 945	Gen. 3:4 F	Serpent was believed and God was not (*Creditus est serpens, contemptus est Deus/* The serpent is believed and God is held in contempt)
Ibid., LXXVII.4 PL 36, 985	Gen. 3:19 F	God speaks in parables Ps. LXXVII.2 because of sin. The heart also needs to work (*Sed et cordis labore pendamus/* the heart is laden by work)
ibid., LXXXI.5 PL 37, 1050	Gen. 3:19 Pr	Pride is the happiness of the world LXXXI.6 (*Terrenae autem felicitatis regnum superbia est, contra quam venit humilitas Christi/* The kingdom of earthly happiness is pride, against which came the humility of Christ.) PL 36, 1050
Ibid., LXXXII.14 PL 37, 1055	Gen. 3:19 A	Man is earth (*Terra, id est homo*) earth is also pride
Ibid., LXXXIII.7 PL 37, 1060	Gen. 3:6 A	man=mind (*mente*) woman=*desideria carnis* (desires of the flesh) Serpent=evil (*malus*) Only when the mind acquiesces to the desires of the flesh can evil succeed.
Ibid., LXXXIV.7 PL 37, 1072	Gen. 3:19 F	penalty for sin
Ibid., LXXXIV.14 PL 37, 1079	Gen. 3:19 Al	*Veritas de terra orta est* (Truth is left the earth) Ps.LXXXIV.12 is reference to Gen. 3:19
Ibid., XC.I.3 PL 37, 1151	Gen. 3:5 Pr	Reference to the pride of man
Ibid., XCIII.19 PL 37, 1207	Gen. 3:6 Ty	Job's wife like a second Eve tempts Job

Ibid., XCV.15 PL 37, 1236	Gen. 3:6 T	Adam is scattered throughout the world, in Greek the letters of Adam's name stand for *Orbem terrarum/* whole world
Ibid., CIII.II.10 PL 37, 1358	Gen. 3:5 A	Serpent (*Angelus lapsus de caelo/* the lapsed angel from heaven) lied
Ibid., CIII.IV.6 PL 37, 1381	Gen. 3:15 F	Death to all future generations is a result of the first sin
Ibid., CIII.IV.8 PL 37, 1383	Gen. 3:15 F	Beware of judging since the serpent is always at your heal.
Ibid., CXVIII.IX.1 PL 37, 1522	Gen. 3:5 Pr	First parent's pride flattered by the words: *Eritis sicut dii.*
Ibid. PL 37, 1523	Gen. 3:9 T	God knows where Adam is physically but was reproaching him for his *superbia*
Ibid., CXVIII.XXV.5 PL 37, 1574	Gen. 3:6 F	cited as an example of the first prevarication, which all sinners do
Ibid., CXIX.2 PL 37, 1598	Gen. 3:5 Ty	Adam a type of Christ, as Adam fell by *superbia* Christ *descendit* (rose) by *misericordia.*
Ibid., CXXI.6 PL 37, 1623	Gen. 3:1-24 Pr	Man's *superbia* caused his fall
Ibid., CXXVI.8 PL 37, 1673	Gen. 3:16 Ty	Eve is a type for the Church
Ibid.	Gen. 3:20 Ty	Eve is a type for the Church which is why she is called *Vita.*
Ibid., CXXXVIII.1 PL 37, 1784	Gen. 3:9 P	Linked with John 6:41, bread of Adam, *panis vivus* (living bread) of Christ
De agone christiano (396 C.E.)II PL 40, 291	Gen. 3:14 A	This reference to terra is to *cupiditates*: passions of this world
Ibid.	Gen. 3:19 A	*Terra* refers to this world

Contra faustum manichaeum (400 C.E.)I. III PL 42, 208	Gen. 3:7 F	Manichaean's use this verse to praise the serpent for opening man's eyes. (_Laudare serpentem quod ei per suum consilium oculos aperuit/_ to praise the serpent which by his advice opened their eyes)
Ibid., XXII.XIV PL 42, 406	Gen. 3:1 (Gen. 2:16 also cited) A	Manichaeans use verse to argue that serpent opened man's eyes which was to man's benefit
Ibid. PL 42, 407	Gen. 3:9 T	Faustus criticizes God for not knowing where Adam is.
De catechizandis rudibus (400 C.E.)XVIII.30 CCSL XLVI, 155	Gen. 3:4 F	Man's own will, (_voluntate_) caused him to allow himself to be seduced by his wife.
De genesi ad litteram (401-415 C.E.)XI.I.1. PL 34, 429-430	Gen. 3:1-24 T	Augustine merely cites his manuscript version of the passage
Ibid., XI.II.4 PL 34,431-432	Gen. 3:1 T	Suggestions for meaning and translation of _prudentissimus_. (note long discussion about why God allowed man to be tempted in the first place particular XX.27 where Augustine takes up the question of whether God created the Devil in an evil state)
Ibid. XI.XXX.38 PL 34, 445	Gen. 3:2 F	Woman's sin is inexcusable because she knows what God commanded
Ibid	Gen. 3:3 F	Woman's sin is inexcusable because whe knows what God commanded
Ibid. XI.XXX.39 PL 34, 445	Gen. 3:4 Pr	serpent's words work because of woman's pride

Ibid.	Gen. 3:5 Pr	serpent's words word because of woman's pride
Ibid. XI.XXX.39 PL 34, 445	Gen. 3:6 T	Why did Adam eat?
Ibid., XI.XXXI.40 PL 34, 445-446	Gen. 3:6 A	Must be figurative since obviously woman could see to get to the tree
Ibid.,XI.XXXI.41 PL 34, 446	Gen. 3:7 A	This is figurative because same language is used Lk.24:31 where it is also figurative, symbolizes arrogant pride and curiosity
Ibid., XI.XXXII.42. PL 34, 446-447	Gen. 3:7 A	*Succinctoria= mortalitatis an libidinis.* The meaning of the aprons or belts is the origin of mortality and libido.
Ibid., XI.XXXIII.43 PL 34, 447	Gen. 3:8 A	Voice speaks to Adam in interior way, not anthropomorphic, also evening because they have fallen away from the light of truth.
Ibid., XI.XXXIII.44. PL 34, 447-448	Gen. 3:8 F	Adam confused by losing God's face, also dimly aware that actions will have consequences for all eternity
Ibid., XI.XXXIV.45 PL 34, 448	Gen. 3:9 P	Full of mystical meaning, however Augustine is not going to worry about it, but rather work on the historical meaning. (Gen. 2:24 was considered to be mystical, which was prophetic)
Ibid., XI.XXXIV.46 PL 34, 448	Gen. 3:10 F, S	God may have spoken by using an appropriate creature as a medium, Members are no longer obedient hence couple hides
Ibid., XI.XXXV.47 PL 34, 448-449	Gen. 3:11 F, S	concupiscence and lack of control of members
Ibid.	Gen. 3:12 Pr	Pride makes man blame woman
Ibid., XI.XXXV.48 PL 34, 449	Gen. 3:13 Pr	Woman's pride is the same as man's and she shifts the blame

Ibid., XI.XXXVI.49. PL 34, 449-450	Gen. 3:14-15 P	This verse is prophetic, it describes the relationship between the devil and the human race which Augustine notes, he has discussed at length in _De genesi contra manichaeos_
Ibid., XI.XXXVII.50 PL 34, 450	Gen. 3:16 P	Prophetic of literal pain of child birth, prophetic of the new relationship in marriage where woman due to her sin deserved to have man as her master. Apostle condones this in I Tim. 2:12.
Ibid., XI.XXXVIII.51 PL 34, 450	Gen. 3:17-19 P	Text to be understood both literally and yet be open to prophetic meaning. Augustine does not elaborate about the prophetic meaning (_significatio prophetiae_)
Ibid.	Gen. 3: 20 T	These are Adam's words and not the authors. (in which case they must be prophetic since Eve has yet to have children)
Ibid., XI.XXXIX.52 PL 34, 451	Gen. 3:21 A	This action was a historical action done for it's symbolic meaning
Ibid., XI.XXXIX.53 PL 34, 451	Gen. 3:22 A	Us is the Trinity, words were to instill fear in the rest of mankind.
Ibid., XI.XL.54 PL 34, 451	Gen. 3:23 T	First portion is God's words, the second the author records the result of God's words, ejection is similar to excommunication
Ibid., XI.XL.55 PL 34, 451-452	Gen. 3:24 P	Prefigures sinner living in wretched state as compared to Paradise which is the _beata vita_. Furthermore the Cherubim although literal must also signify something about the spiritual paradise

Annotationum in job (400-401 C.E.?) Ib.VII PL 34, 832	Gen. 3:8 AI	Job reminds one of Adam fleeing the Lord _Quod significat abscoditio Adae a facie Domini et tectio foliorum de quibus umbra sit_ (Which is signified Adam's flight from the face of God and the belt of leaves which is shadow.) Gen. 3:8 used to explain Job. 7:2
Ibid.	Gen. 3:8 A	Gen. 3:8 evening corresponds to hope of afflicted souls. _Quod significat dolentes quibus nulla expecatio est remedii, nisi mane._ (Which signifies that afflicted souls only have hope of relief in the morning)
De trinitate (401-415 C.E.) II.X.17 PL 42, 855-856	Gen. 3:8-10 T	Who spoke to Adam? Augustine suggests that their is nothing which indicates a shift from the singular to the plural therefor it most probably is God the Father, who can speak to man in whatever manner is appropriate. Does God speak literally to Adam. Where God spoke to Adam (in his minds eye or by physcial manifestation is not possible to determin from scripture)
Ibid. II.X.18 PL 42, 856	Gen. 3:7 T	merely an allusion to the fact that the nature of seeing has proved problematic for exegetes.
Ibid., II.X.18 PL 42, 856	Gen. 3:8 T	Adam knows God is there and hides from him. He is not obligated to see God with his eyes.
Ibid., III.X.20 PL 42, 880	Gen. 3:5 P	Serpent of Genesis is Serpent in Ex. 4:4 (_virga_) which prefigures Christ's cross

Ibid., XII.VIII.13 PL 42, 1005	Gen. 3:6 A	Adam looses *lumen oculorum* (light of his eyes) and the eyes of his conscience are opened (*apertis oculis conscientiae*)
Ibid., XII.XI.16 PL 42, 1006	Gen. 3:21 A	*Pelliceas tunicas* =man's mortality
Ibid., XII.XII.17 PL 42, 1007	Gen. 3:6 F, S	This has caused man to share a sensual movement of the soul (*senualis animae motus*) which is common to us and animals (*Qui nobis pecoribusque communis est.*)
Ibid.	Gen. 3:6 A	Both must eat the food, since the part represented by the woman is part of all humans
Ibid., XII.XIII.20 PL 42, 1009	Gen. 3:1 A	Serpent= *Sensum corporis*
In joannis evangelium tractus XVIII.16 (408-413 C.E.) PL 35, 1535	Gen. 3:5 Pr	Pride (*superbiam homini propinavit*/ he (devil) offered pride to man)
Ibid., XLII.11 PL 35, 1703-1704	Gen. 3:1 F	Envy of the serpent causes him to approach Eve
Ibid., XLIX.20 PL 35, 1756	Gen. 3:9 Ty	John 11:34 (*Ubi posuistis eum*/ where have you put him) echoes God's words in Gen. 3:9
Ibid., LXXIII.1 PL 35, 1824	Gen. 3:6 Al	Adam lost his birthright because of an apple (*pomum*) Esau lost his for a plate of lentils (*lenticulam*)

De peccatorum meritis et remissione et de baptismo parvulorum (ad marcellinum) I.II.2 (412 C.E.) PL 44, 109	Gen. 3:19 T	Refers to mortal body not the soul
Ibid., I.XXXII.60 PL 44, 145	Gen. 3:1 Ty	Serpent in Gen. 3. is serpent raised by Moses in the desert, which is Christ on the Cross (*Serpens in deserto exaltatus Christum in cruce pendentem figuravit*/The serpent raised up in the desert is a figure for Christ hung on the cross)
Ibid., II.XXII.36 PL 44, 173	Gen. 3:7 F, S	After their eyes are opened they cover their *membra*.
Ibid., II.XXXIII.53 PL 44, 183	Gen. 3:19,16. F	Pelagians argue that this should cease. Augustine says the punishment stays as a means to perfecting the painful work of justice/ *in agone justitiae*.
Sermo XXXVII.VI.9 PL 38, 226	Gen. 3:19 T	The fields of paradise are not like the field of Adam (Mt. 6:21)
Sermo XLV.4 PL 38, 265	Gen. 3:19 F	We work because we are under this sentence
Sermo LVIII.III.4 PL 38, 394	Gen. 3:19 F	Lord's prayer hopes that even the earth under the penalty of sin will be transformed
Sermo LX.VI.6 PL 38, 405	Gen. 3:19 F	Don't build your treasure (Mt. 6:19,21 is an allusion to Gen. 3:19) on earth
Sermo LXXVIII.5 PL 38, 492	Gen. 3:19 A	*Terra*, is a figure for death
Sermo CXXII.I.1 PL 38, 680	Gen. 3:7 A	*Foliis ficulneis* signifies sin

Sermo CLI.V.5 PL 38, 817	Gen. 3:6 F, S	They see the movement of their members (*Concupiscentia nobis innata et ex primo peccato orta*)
Sermo CLIII.IX.11 PL 38, 831	Gen. 3:2-5 Pr	man falls because of his own pride
Sermo CLXIII.VIII.8 PL 38, 893	Gen. 3:5 Pr	*Superbia* causes man's fall
Sermo CLXXIV.IV.4 PL 38, 942	Gen. 3:7 F, S	They are ashamed of their members
Sermo CCXXIV.II.2 PL 38, 1094	Gen. 3:4-5 F	Followed Devil's suggestions rather than God's command
Sermo CCXXXII.II.2 PL 38, 1108	Gen. 3:6 F	Adam and Eve choose to believe lies rather than God
Sermo CCLXIV.3 PL 38, 1214	Gen. 3:5 Pr	Man wanted to be like God
Sermo CCCLIX.1 PL 39, 1590	Gen. 3:19 F	punishment for sin (its opposite is the reward for saintly)
Sermo CCCLXII.XIV.16 PL 39, 1621	Gen. 3:19 F	Consequence of sin, man returns to the earth. (*Terra es, et in terram ibis*)
De symbolo III.10 PL 40, 632	Gen. 3:1-6 Ty	Job's wife tempts as Eve does Adam. (note there are four sermons with this name attributed to Augustine. The other three are not genuine.)
Ep. CXLVIII.IV.V.14 (413 C.E.) *ad fortunatianum* PL 33, 628	Gen. 3:8 T	Adam heard God corporeally and consequently attributed human qualities to God. (*Anthropormorphitae sunt*) They are anthropomorphisms
De natura et gratia (415 C.E.) XXXVII.44 PL 44, 268	Gen. 3:6 F	Original sin attested to in scriptures

De civitate dei (413-427 C.E) XIII.XIII. (this book written 417 C.E) PL 41, 386	Gen. 3:7 F, S	Adam and Eve are embarrassed and cover themselves because they no longer control their members (membra)
Ibid., XIII.XV PL 41, 387	Gen. 3:9 T	Ubi es is rhetorical question addressed to Adam so that Adam will look at what he has done. God knows where Adam is.
Ibid.	Gen. 3:19 F	God announces the punishment for sin
Ibid., XIII.XXIII.1. PL 41, 396	Gen. 3:9 T	God asks the question Ubi es to announce Adam's death to him
Ibid.	Gen. 3:19 F	mortem significaverit corporis, quae illi sit anima discedente. He will have signified death of the body which is the soul abandoning it.
Ibid., XIV.XI.2. (418 C.E.) PL 41, 420	Gen. 3:12 F	Adam was not seduced into sin as was the woman. (Non est ille seductus/he is not seduced) but he tries to blame the woman anyway
Ibid., XIV.XIII.2 PL 41, 421	Gen. 3:5 Pr	Pride caused fall (per superbiam)
Ibid., XIV.XIV. PL 41, 422	Gen. 3:13,12 Pr	superbia causes Adam to blame Eve and Eve to blame the serpent.
Ibid., XIV.XVII PL 41, 425	Gen. 3:6 A	Eyes were physically open
Ibid.	Gen. 3:7 F,S	The flesh revolts against them (inobedientia carnis suae, their flesh is disobedient)

Ibid., XIV.XXI PL 41, 429	Gen. 3:7 F, S	Adam and Eve are embarrassed by their members after sin. (*id est per libidinem* PL 41, 128) Manichaei reject this passage, others argue that it is totally spiritual arguing that sex is a product of the fall (Augustine continues in the next chapter arguing that the *De copula conjugali a Deo primitus instituta atque benedicta/* Conjugal relations (are) instituted and blessed by God from the beginning PL 41, 429
Ibid., XV.VII.2. (418 C.E.) PL 41, 445	Gen. 3:16 A	We are to understand that the husband is to rule his wife as the soul rules the flesh (NPNF1 2, 289) *ubi intelligendum est virum ad regendam uxorem, animo carnem regenti similem esse oportere.* This is what Paul means with Eph. 5:28-29. (*Qui diligit uxorem suam, se ipsum diligit: nemo enim unquam carnem suam odio habuit* / Who loves his wife as he loves himself. No one, indeed, hates his own flesh.)
Ibid., XX.XX.2 (425 C.E) PL 41, 688	Gen. 3:19 T	These words do not apply to those who will still be alive when Christ returns
Ibid., XXII.XXX.5 (425 C.E.) PL 41, 803	Gen. 3:5 F	Sin caused by listening to false words of the serpent
*Ep.*CLXXIX.8 (416 C.E.) *a joahnni expiscopo hierosolymitano* PL 33, 777	Gen. 3:6 F	(response to Pelagian tractate written by John) Original sin. (*Eva peccavit; Scriptura hoc prodidit. Adam quoque deliquit;* Eve sinned, scripture reports this, Adam also sinned)

In epistolam joannis (416 C.E.) IV.3 PL 35, 2007	Gen. 3:6 Ty	Eve and Job's wife are both used by the devil to tempt men (Adam is a type of Job) Job 11:10 note Job is on manure
Ibid., VI.7 PL 35, 2025	Gen. 3:1 Ty	As devil use Eve to poison Adam, so uses Job's wife
De patientia (418 C.E.)XII.9 PL 40, 616	Gen. 3:1 Ty	Devil attempts to seduce Job by means of his wife since this worked for Adam.
De gratia christi et de peccato originali contra pelagium et caelestium (418 C.E.)II.XXXIV.39 PL 44, 401	Gen. 3:7 F, S	Marriage is good, sin manifest in disobedient members. (*inobedientia*) which caused blushing.
Contra maximinum haereticum arianorum episcopum (418 C.E.) I.II. PL 42, 745	Gen. 3:19 AI	Rom. 8:3, (PL 42, 744) Jesus' body is *de similitudine carnis peccati, quae ipsius erat*/which is similar to the sinful body but was his own. Gen. 3:19 condemns all to death and Jesus suffers a real death (*vera morte*)
Contra adversarium legis et prohetarum (419 C.E.) I.XV.23 PL 42, 615 Also see *Retratactiones*. II.LVIII, (PL 32, 654) Augustine once again cites the nameless Marcionite.	Gen. 3:22 Adam did not improve his lot. F	The adversary appears to be an anonymous Marcionite (*Non enim soli Manichaei Legem Prohetasque condemant sed et Marcionistae...cum Manichaei quamvis librum Geneseos non accipiant atque blasphement.* /Not in fact , only the Manichaeans, condemn the Law and the Prophets but also the Marcionists....with the Manichaeans ,even the book of Genesis they do not accept and they curse. I.I.1 (PL 42, 603)
Ibid., I.XVI.27 PL 42, 616	Gen. 3:24 F	God spoke truly

De nuptiis et _concupiscentia_ (419 C.E.) I.V.6 PL 44, 417	Gen. 3:6-7 A	The eyes were physically open
Ibid.	Gen. 3:6 A	Eve's eyes physically open prior to Gen. 3:7
Ibid., II.XXI.36. PL 44, 457	Gen. 3:7 F, S	Sin cause the shame between the first parents
Ibid., II.XXX.52 PL 44, 467	Gen. 3:7 F, S	The _succinctoria_ or _campestria_ as some Latin texts call it is designed to hide the sex organs hence sin has caused some disruption there
Contra gaudentium _donatistarum_ _episcopum_ (420 C.E.) I.V. PL 43, 709	Gen. 3:1 F	Christian's need to persecute vices (_vitiorum_) not each other. Augustine quotes Gaudentius and then responds to him.
Contra julianum _haeresis_ _pelagianae_ _defensorem_ (421) I.V.18 PL 44, 652	Gen. 3:18 T	Without fasting penitence produces thorns (_Poenitentia vero sine jejunio vacua est/_ Penitence, truly, without fasting is empty.)
Ibid., IV.XI.20 PL 44, 748	Gen. 3:1 T	serpent can be used in both good and bad manner in bible. Mtt. 10:16 _Astuti ut serpentes/_ be wise as serpents, is good. Gen. 3:1 is bad
Ibid., IV.XVI.82 PL 44, 780	Gen. 3:8 F, S	Adam and Eve hid because they are embarrassed by their nudity
ibid. PL 44, 781	Gen. 3:10 F, S	concupiscence made them shameful (_concupiscentia_) also _conscientia_ (conscience) made them shameful
Ibid., VI.XX.65 PL 44, 863	Gen. 3:18 F	This is the condamnation for the fall

Contra secundam juliani responsionem imperfectum opus (429 C.E.) II.CLXXVII. PL 45, 1219	Gen. 3:19 F	All men are from *terra* and all men share Adam's sin
Ibid., III.LXXIV PL 45, 1279	Gen. 3:7 F, S	Julian has asserted that doctrine of original sin is *profanitatis* and based upon *testimoniis genitalium pudorem/* testimony of shame of the genitals. Augustine asserts that this sound because of Gen. 3:7
Ibid., IV.XXXVII. PL 45, 1357	Gen. 3:21 F, S	First parents cover their *membris* which are infected with *concupiscentia*
Ibid., V.XVI PL 45, 1449	Gen. 3:11 F, S	Because man ate he realized he was nude.
Ibid., VI.XXIII PL 45, 1556	Gen. 3:22 F	Adam's sin was great to merit this punishment , to suggest otherwise is to attribute great *crudelitate/* to God.
Ibid., VI.XXX PL 45, 1581	Gen. 3:17 A	Tree of life must have been a *sacramentum* for Adam, not something he ate from