



Library of the Theological Seminary

PRINCETON • NEW JERSEY



From the Library of
Professor William Henry Green

BS2418.4 .T79 1844

Trench, Richard Chenevix, 1807-1886.

Exposition of the Sermon on the Mount, d
from the writings of St. Augustine. with ot

H. Henry Green
Director

Sept. 1848



EXPOSITION

OF THE

SERMON ON THE MOUNT,

DRAWN FROM THE

WRITINGS OF ST. AUGUSTINE,

WITH

OBSERVATIONS,

BY

RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, M.A.

AUTHOR OF

NOTES ON THE PARABLES.

LONDON :

JOHN W. PARKER, WEST STRAND.

M.DCCC.XLIV.

L O N D O N :

PRINTED BY C. ROWORTH AND SONS,
BELL YARD, TEMPLE BAR.

P R E F A C E.

THIS little volume is not, as a glance at any page will show, a translation of St. Augustine's Commentary on the Sermon on the Mount,¹ but an attempt to draw from the circle of his writings, (that one of course included,) what of most important he has contributed for the elucidation, or the turning to practical uses, of this portion of Holy Scripture.

Yet I am conscious, from the very plan upon which the book is written, that it may be open to a charge, at least from an unfriendly critic, of something like presumption. It may be said that there is in it a continual passing of judgment,—an allowing and a disallowing,—a selecting and a putting aside,—an approving and condemning; and this in regard of one whom the Church has ever recognized among the very chiefest of her teachers. A friend, to whom the manuscript, when nearly prepared for press, was shown,—and whose counsel and judgment that I am able at all

¹ In the Benedictine Edition, tom. iii. pars 2^a, pp. 162—236.

times to profit by, is one of the chief happinesses of my life,—has warned me that it will hardly escape a charge of the kind. Yet I have not therefore been persuaded to alter my scheme, as indeed I could not have altered it, without renouncing the work altogether. For the plan which is now finding favour among us, of presenting in the mass, unsifted and untried, the old expositions of Scripture, often placing side by side explanations which, in their minor details at least, exclude one another, and this with no attempt to judge or discriminate between them,—no endeavour to separate the accident of one age, the superfluous, it may be the injurious, excrescence from the eternal truth, which is of all and for all ages,—seems to me profitable for little, and not likely to lead us into any deeper, or clearer and more intelligent knowledge of Scripture. Moreover, when we confine ourselves merely to the giving back the old, and this with well nigh a suspension of all judgment about it, what is this but saying, that the productive powers of the Church have ceased; that her power of educating from God's Word, by that Spirit which is ever with her, the truth in those forms in which it will best meet our present needs, exist no longer; that henceforth the Scripture shall be for us a cistern, clear it may be, and full, but no longer a

spring of water springing up as freshly and newly for our lips, as for the lips of any generation which has gone before :—and as her productive, so also that her discriminative power is gone ; she may no longer discern that which is akin to, and will assimilate with, her true life, and claim that and that only for her own ?

Neither seems there any genuine humility in forgoing or denying our advantages ;—they may be slight ones compared with those which other ages enjoyed for entering into the meaning of God's Word ; but, if slight, therefore to be husbanded the more. And, not to speak of the accumulation of merely critical and external helps, some such we plainly have. To deny this were to deny to the Church,—to her who, according to her truest idea, is ever teacher and ever taught,—that she has been learning any thing in the eighteen hundred years of her troubled warfare with the evil within her and the evil without. Yet some things surely she has found out : some practices which promised well, which she anticipated would further piety, her own life and history have taught her do inevitably sooner or later run to seed, and hinder that holiness which they were meant to set forward ; that, tolerably safe in the hands of the earnest few, they are most unsafe when they descend, as by inevitable progress they must descend,

to the more careless many. Some language which for a while she held, or did not at least absolutely exclude, she has now discovered not to be the most adequate expression of the doctrines which she has always held, and therefore she will use no longer, and will disclaim, though she find it used by the most honoured of her teachers, even as she is sure they would disclaim it now. Before the false teaching of Eutyches had compelled her clearly to represent to herself the relation of the two natures in Christ, it impeached no man's orthodoxy, though he spoke of our blessed Lord as God *mingled with* man; but who, that meant right, would have used this language after? Before the order of our justification had been brought out with that distinctness, in which a doctrine only can be brought out through an earnest contending for it against some that would obscure or deny it, men might put the first last, and speak of sins "expiated with alms," or "washed out with tears." We there recognize a loss, while all lack of distinctness is such, but not a denial upon their parts who used this language *then*, that "we are justified by faith only." It were another thing to seek to revive and return to that language now.

The consciousness, moreover, that we, too, in our age, have our errors,—most of them, like some inner vest, worn so close, as to be invisible even

to ourselves,—that we, too, have our mistaken tendencies, our superstitions, our faulty statements of the truth, which we are handing down to the Church of a later age, slowly to discern, painfully to get rid of,—this, while it may well hinder that boastful self-exalting spirit, which is more fatal than any thing beside to a profiting by the past, yet must not hinder from a respectful using, even as regards our great forefathers in the faith themselves, whatsoever since their time the Church has won. Such a freedom they used with one another, such they demanded should be used in regard of themselves;¹ and such we must use in regard of them, if we would obtain from their writings the large blessing which they are capable of yielding; if these are to help to lead us into liberty, and not into bondage; if they are to be indeed our riches, and not, under that name, truly our poverty.

For myself, in regard of this little volume, which is in every way so slight, that it is hardly worth making an apology about it, and yet which I would not willingly leave exposed to this charge

¹ I will quote Augustine's own words on this very subject. He says, (Ep. 148, c. 4,) *Neque enim quorumlibet disputationes, quamvis Catholicorum et laudatorum hominum, velut Scripturas canonicas habere debemus, ut nobis non liceat salvà honorificentiam quæ illis debetur hominibus, aliquid in eorum scriptis improbare atque respuere, si fortè invenerimus quòd aliter senserint quam Veritas habet, divino adjutorio vel ab aliis intellecta, vel à nobis. Talis ego sum in scriptis aliorum, tales volo esse intellectores meorum.*

of presumption, I can only say that it was begun in a thankful admiration, which has gone on ever increasing and deepening, for the infinite spiritual and intellectual riches which are contained in the writings of St. Augustine. All added acquaintance with these more and more has explained to me the mighty influence, the spell which he has exerted over so many among the strongest spirits of all ages,—the great purposes which God in his providence has made him to fulfil for his Church.

For first, if one accurately regards the earlier theology of the Christian East, one cannot fail to be struck with this, that it was prevailingly a metaphysic of the divine Being, a contemplation of the divine attributes and perfections. It was with these, most needful indeed to be fixed and to be first fixed, that the Church was mainly occupied for more than the first three centuries of her existence. But in Augustine the theology of the West, and of the modern world,—the theology which relates not merely to God, but to the God of men,—first came out into its full importance. St. Paul had now his rights no less than St. John. Theology was no longer the science of God merely or mainly as he is in himself, but in his relation to us. It is not any more the objective knowledge of God which is all, but with this the subjective knowledge of sin, and knowledge of grace;

no longer predominantly a God revealing, but also a God communicating, himself;—not Christ the God-man only, but Christ the Redeemer as well. And now, too, man first appears in his true worth and dignity: that which shows him to be nothing, shows him also to be much; for in him all these counsels of grace centre; round him these purposes of eternity revolve; he appears as the meeting-place of two worlds; the personal significance of every man comes out, and the free modern western world begins,—the germs of it at least are securely laid. And believing this, one cannot sufficiently admire the manner in which St. Augustine's appearance was timed; for it was the last moment at which he could have lived to share the fulness of the culture of the ancient world; since from that moment that whole world was daily becoming more incoherent, and going more rapidly to pieces. He in fact himself survived it in Italy: it hardly survived him a few months in Africa. At the same time he thus lived the nearest to, and in the most favourable position for influencing, that new world, in forming of which he was so greatly to aid.

How much he did form it, how he ruled the middle ages, either in his own name, or by moulding the men who in their turn ruled their generation, is known to every student of Church History. Nor is it hard to understand how this should have

been : for the two great tendencies of those ages, the mystic and scholastic, are both lying, in much more than their first elements, side by side in his writings.¹ There is in them, on the one hand, a rare dialectic skill, with the keenest delight in its exercise, and in all speculative inquiry ; a desire ever, where it was possible, to justify to the reason what had first been received by faith, with a confidence that what was humbly received by this would afterwards commend itself to that. Yet with all this there is borne by him a continual witness against the excesses of the dialectic and speculative tendencies : he evermore summons to a more excellent way of knowing, one not mediate, but intuitive and immediate,² a knowing which is first loving ; he evermore would have us remember that we shall sooner enter into the deepest mysteries of the faith by praying than disputing.

Nor did his dominion end with the middle ages.

¹ In remarkable confirmation of this view of him, as one who united and anticipated all that was best and noblest in these two tendencies, is the fact that Hugo de Sancto Victore, on whom Liebner has written a work (Hugo von St. Victor, Leipzig, 1832), as the first in whom the scholasticism and mysticism of the middle ages, hitherto hostile and intolerant of one another, were reconciled and harmoniously atoned, should have borne the title from his contemporaries of *alter Augustinus, lingua Augustini*.

² Thus (which is the very heart of mysticism) he says, on the power in the human mind by which ideas are contemplated (*De Civ. Dei*, l. xi. c. 3), *Quia et ipse rectissimè sensus dicitur*. Cf. *De Quæst.* lxxxiii. qu. 46 ; *De Lib. Arb.* l. ii. c. 16.

On the contrary, that work for which we owe him the greatest thanks was yet to be accomplished. The Reformers felt and found that he was eminently their Doctor. The issue of their later controversy in the matter of justification lay in fact wrapped up in the issue of his controversy with the Pelagians. This last being won, that was implicitly won also, while it was only the same question at a later stage of its development, the necessary carrying out of the truths which he then asserted. The contest concerning the extent of the corruption of human nature did most truly involve the question concerning the nature of the remedies which would be equal to meet that corruption,—the conditions under which it was possible that the sick man could recover his health; whether aught, in short, could be the remedy, except that *faith* which should place him in immediate relation with Christ, and thus be the channel whereby the uninterrupted streams of an healing life should flow into his soul. And in the Romish Church itself, whensoever any of her children, a Baius or Jansenius, without desiring absolutely to forsake her communion, have yet longed to make these doctrines of grace more or less their own, they have ever sheltered themselves under the authority of Augustine,—they have ever pleaded that they were but holding what he had held long before.

When we feel thus concerning him,—when we have this thankful recognition of the greatness of his work, which has extended through so many ages, so much of which we are inheriting now,—which has indelibly stamped itself on the very form of our Catechism and our Articles,—there can be little reason why we should shrink from expressing, with exactly the confidence which we feel in the matter, any occasional dissent from the details of his Scriptural interpretation: more especially when in this matter also we know, that after every drawback which the truth may require is made, our obligations to him, whether as regards scientific or popular exposition, the laws of interpretation, or the practical application of those laws, are probably greater than to any single Interpreter of God's Word. A glance at his popular exposition, as it finds place in his Sermons and Discourses, is sufficient to explain the proverb of the Spaniards, *No hay Sermon sin Augustino*,—so full are they of the richest homiletic treasures, of happiest illustration, the homeliest as the highest: so does he make all daily life, and all men's common words¹ and ways, to witness for truths greater than before they guessed of themselves; with such genial tact does he ever know how to plant himself

¹ As he himself says, *Ipsa lingua popularis, plerumque est doctrina salutaris.*

at the central point of that truth which he desires to illustrate, and from thence securely to unfold it; so skilled is he to reconcile, and that even for the popular apprehension, Scriptures that may seem contrary, showing them one at their root; with such a forceful brevity does he concentrate the whole truth which he desires to impart into some single phrase, some polished shaft, at once pointed to pierce, and barbed that it shall not lightly drop from the memory.¹ Examples of his rare merits in all these kinds, if I have not

¹ Clausen, a living Dane, who in his work *Augustinus Sacræ Scripturæ Interpres*, Berl. 1828, certainly does not spare to bring forward the shadow-side as well as the light-side of his character as an expositor, yet, p. 267, sums up his excellences thus:—*Mira Augustini erat ingenii profunditas, ardens et cordata pietas; ut animum ad ea, quæ intus quæque in sublimi sunt, totum conversum haberet: satis egisse se non prius arbitratus, quàm sibi usibusque suis religiosis satisfactum esset, veritates ex sacro idearum fonte elicere, ad interna conscientiæ oracula revocare studio generoso annisus est. Hinc egregiæ multæ interpretationis virtutes ortæ sunt: sollicitudo religiosa, gravitas verecunda, pia sinceritas: quum litteras sacras fidei regulam, lucem pietatis, vitæ magistram positas esse sciret, neque igitur nisi ad doctrinam et vitam usus redundaret, docto labori laudem pretiumque constare. Et quanta Nostri in vestigiis ad metam hancce dirigendis constantia erat! quanta in sententiis multis dogmaticis vel ethicis efferendis construendisque diligentia, sagacitas, sapientia verè Christiana! ut non tam argutando dixeris eum intellexisse, quid scripserint auctores sacri, quàm impetu interno ductum, quid senserint ipsum sensisse; ita in expositionibus nihil deest, nihil superest, nihil claudicat: cardinem rei acu quasi tetigit feritque, ut veritate tibi persuasum, pietate te commotum, simplicitate delectatum sentias.*

made my selections very ill, this little volume will frequently supply.

And not less valuable are the laws and principles of Scriptural Hermeneutics, as laid down by him, whether in his formal treating of the subject,¹ or scattered here and there with a rich and careless hand through his other writings. Many of them relate to the moral conditions under which alone the interpreter of God's Word can hope to arrive at the truth, the temper in which he shall encounter difficulties, and knock at the door of mysteries ;² that the true order is not, Know and

¹ As mainly in his work, *De Doctrinâ Christianâ*.

² *Enarr. in Ps. cxlvi. 6.* Ideo quid debeas facere in difficultate intelligendi, ostendit tibi, cùm consequenter dicit, *Suscipiens mansuetos Dominus.* Verbi gratiâ, *Non intelligis, parum intelligis, non consequeris: honora Scripturam Dei, honora Verbum Dei, etiam non apertum: differ pietate intelligentiam. Noli protervus esse accusare aut obscuritatem aut quasi perversitatem Scripturæ. Perversum hîc nihil est, obscurum autem aliquid est; non ut tibi negetur, sed ut exerceat accepturum. Ergo quando obscurum est, medicus illud fecit, ut pulses. Voluit ut exerceris in pulsando, voluit ut pulsanti aperiret. Pulsando exerceberis; exercitatus, latior efficieris; latior factus, capies quod donatur. . . . Noli recalcitrare adversus obscura, et dicere, Melius diceretur, si sic diceretur. Quando enim potes tu sic dicere aut judicare, quomodo dici expediat? Sic dictum est, quomodo dicit debuit. Non corrigat ager medicamenta sua; novit ea medicus modificare; ei crede, qui te curat. And elsewhere, on the end which these obscurities serve, *Si nusquam aperta esset Scriptura, non te pasceret; si nunquam occulta, non te exerceat.* And once more, *De Doct. Christ. l. ii. c. 6;* *Magnificè igitur et salubriter Spiritus Sanctus ita Scripturas sacras modificavit, ut locis apertioribus fami occurreret, obscurioribus autem fastidia detergeret. Agam, Latere te æquitas potest, esse ibi iniquitas non potest.**

believe, but, Believe and know;¹ and this is a subject to which he often returns, for, as he is forward to confess, he himself had knocked once in a temper in which it was inevitable that he should knock in vain.² Or else they are technical rules; and these almost always such as are serviceable now, and will be profitably laid up in the mind of any who may undertake the expounding of the Word of God.³ For with the deepest sense

¹ Serm. xliii. c. 3. Dicit mihi homo, Intelligam ut credam. Ego ei respondeam, Immo crede ut intelligas. And elsewhere, Credat in Christum, ut possit intelligere Christum.

² Loquor vobis aliquando deceptus; quum primò puer ad divinas Scripturas ante vellem afferre acumen discutiendi, quàm pietatem quærendi, ipse ego contra me perversis manibus claudebam januam Domini mei: . . . superbus enim audebam quærere, quod nisi humilis non potest invenire.

³ This, for instance, on the dramatic character of much in the Psalms and Prophets and elsewhere; Enarr. in Ps. xlv. 3. Mutationes personarum repentinæ et omnino ex improvise inveniuntur in sanctis Scripturarum libris, et si quis advertat, plenæ sunt paginæ divinæ. On the perversion of Scripture by the forcible rending away a passage from all its context, he notes, Con. Adim. c. 14. Istorum fraus, qui particulas quasdam de Scripturas eligunt, quibus decipiant imperitos, non connectentes quæ suprâ et infrâ scripta sunt, ex quibus voluntas et intentio scriptoris possit intelligi. Again, on the importance of the historic letter of Scripture being left to stand fast, whatever allegorical interpretation may be superinduced; Ante omnia tamen, fratres, hoc in nomine Dei admonemus . . . ut quando auditis exponi sacras Scripturas narrantes quæ gesta sunt, prius illud quod lectum est credatis sic gestum, quomodo lectum est, ne subtracto fundamento rei gestæ, quasi in aëre quæratis ædificare. Thus again, on the allegories of Scripture, Serm. xxxii. c. 6; Non enim semper in Scripturis eadem significantur rebus certis. . . . Non

that nothing but the Spirit can interpret that which was given by the Spirit, he is as far as possible from that enthusiasm which despises outward helps and appliances, as though they too were not gifts of his grace; on the contrary, he would have, where it was possible, the man of God to be largely equipped with these,—exercised, where it may be, with all liberal discipline of his powers. If he has been in Egypt, let him come out of it as amply laden with its gold and silver and precious stuffs as he can. Let him, if it lie within his reach, compare manuscripts, recur to the original tongues in which Scripture was written, acquaint himself with the customs, manners, institutions, natural history of that Eastern world in which mainly the Scripture moves:¹ for in all these he will find frequent profit and help.

semper mons Dominum significat, non semper lapis Dominum significat, non semper leo Dominum significat, non semper bonum, non semper malum: sed pro locis Scripturarum, quo pertinent cætera circumstantia ipsius lectionis. Quemadmodum litteræ in tot millibus verborum atque sermonum ipsæ repetuntur, non augentur; . . . quum una littera variis in locis ponitur, et pro loco valet, non unam rem valet.

¹ See his work, *De Doct. Christ.* l. ii. c. 11—42. He proposes (c. 19) that some one who could do it should undertake a Biblical Dictionary, such as since has often been done. *Ut non sit necesse Christiano in multis propter pauca laborare, sic video posse fieri, si quem eorum qui possunt, benignam sanè operam fraternæ utilitati delectet impendere, ut quoscumque terrarum locos quæve animalia vel herbas atque arbores, sive lapides vel metalla incognita, speciesque*

But because we owe to St. Augustine this large debt, shall we also count ourselves bound to say that, in his practical application of his principles, he is always true to his own laws? or that he had himself the same external helps at command as an Origen or a Jerome? or that his Latin or his Septuagint has not sometimes led him astray? or that his exposition is not occasionally warped by, and submitted to the influence of, his dogmatic system? or that his allegories and mystical numbers are worthy in each case to stand unquestioned, and may profitably now be reproduced to edify us? To demand this were to demand what he would not have demanded for himself: ¹ what can be refused without abating one jot of true and genuine reverence and honour, the more valuable because rendered not blindly, but with knowledge.

To these words of apology or explanation, which have extended to a greater length than I meant they should, I may be allowed to add yet a few words more upon the plan on which this book has been composed. It resembles, to compare a very

quaslibet Scriptura commemorat, ea generatim digerens, sola exposita litteris mandet.

¹ He, who could thus express himself, certainly with no mock modesty, but in entire sincerity, Ep. 95. *Quid ipsa divina eloquia, nonne palpantur potius quàm tractantur à nobis, dum in multis pluribus quærimus potius quid sentiendum sit, quàm definitum aliquid fixumque sentimus?*

small matter with a great, that of the *Augustinus* of Jansenius, which is probably familiar to many. His purpose, as is well known, in his celebrated work, was to bring all which Augustine had written in regard to that great Pelagian Controversy, under review at once,—to set it in order, and to present it thus ordered and arranged, with the quotation of the most material passages, before the eyes of the reader. He implied not, in so doing, that Augustine's own works wanted the highest order and method;—that they were only as a rough quarry, from which others were to dig and build. But the very circumstances of their production necessarily caused that what bore on any single matter should be scattered up and down in diverse treatises, and that matter only fully handled when these separated portions were united and brought together. For a great part of his polemical works will only be contemplated from a right point of view when we regard them as occasional tracts, each drawn from him by the urgent necessities of the Church at the moment, in answer to the solicitation of friends, or the provocation of enemies;—and that during a time when the controversy was ever shifting its aspect, and each party was more and more feeling its grounds, completing and harmonizing its system, discovering the ultimate results to which it would lead.

This is the especial value of his writings in more than one great conflict, wherein he is the standard bearer of the Church, that they are not one great work, calmly and in part with a literary interest reviewing a finished controversy, not the history of a battle which the Church has fought and won, but themselves, so to speak, acts and exploits, often the decisive ones, in that battle. Yet while this is their value, it also leaves room for such a work as that with which the Bishop of Ypres so disturbed from his grave the Vatican, and all who wished to reconcile a professed veneration for the great Doctor of the West, with a real departure from his principles;—one of the hardest tasks which the Church of Rome has found imposed upon her; one which greatly perplexed her at Trent, which has put her to her shiftiest world-wisdom then and since, and the difficulties of which, by this book, were infinitely increased.

Now there is room for a conspectus of the same kind in regard to those portions of Scripture which he has illustrated in his writings. For there too we seldom find in one place all that he has to say upon one matter: in them too he often repeats himself, while for the practical needs of those for whom he wrote or spake it was often needful to go over the same ground again and again; though indeed his resources are such that

it is generally with variations, it rarely happens but that some further touch is added. In them too his opinions often underwent a progress and a change. For example, Rom. vii. 7—25 was differently explained in his youth and with the deeper heart-knowledge of his later years. Thus, again, his Commentary especially dedicated to the Sermon on the Mount, which was written indeed while he was yet a presbyter, contains comparatively little of what he has contributed for the elucidation of that portion of Scripture. For example, he dismisses the words “For they shall see God” in two or three lines, while yet this vision of God occupied him greatly : he has dedicated a letter, so long that it is often numbered among his treatises, to this single subject. The relation, again, of the new legislation of Christ to the law of Moses, the right apprehension of which can alone give us a key to this discourse, is very slightly touched on, as compared with the large handling which it finds in his writings directed against the Manichæans. And other examples of the kind might easily be multiplied. It is in his Sermons, in his Letters, in his Exposition of the Psalms, in his controversial Tracts that what he has most precious as bearing on this discourse is to be found,—from these it has to be gathered together. It has been my aim to concentrate these scattered rays.

I cannot indeed hope that I have brought to bear all in his writings which helps the interpretation of these Chapters, or is characteristic of him as their interpreter, nor that I have made the happiest use of the materials which I had at command. Yet I can truly say that I have been continually embarrassed, not by the penury, but by the riches of my materials; perplexed how to work them up,—how, without exceeding the narrow limits which I had set myself, not to leave out much of a deep interest: Often I have only given a single sentence, oftentimes only a reference, when I would willingly have given a page: so that although the book is constructed throughout on the supposition that the reader will not have an Augustine at hand, or will not care to afford time for the following up the references, yet is it also arranged so as to yield much additional information to any who should be inclined so to do. To aid this the references have been carefully and fully made to the Benedictine Edition. In a very few passages they are wanting; sometimes when a quotation has not extended beyond two or three words, it seemed hardly worth the giving. Again, some passages I had copied out long ago, and not anticipating I should want them as I do now, I had not particularly specified the place from whence they came, nor have I since recovered it.

Here too another observation may be necessary. It is well known that the Benedictine Editors of the works of St. Augustine on very slight evidence, or often indeed on no evidence at all save their own inward conviction, have dismissed numerous Sermons, much too hastily as since has been generally considered, from the body of his works. Now there should be something to justify this dismissal, more than a general observation, with which they are often satisfied, that such or such a sermon is quite in the manner of Cæsarius or some one else.¹ There should be phrases of a more debased Latin, allusion to Church rites which were not in use till a later period, inaccuracies in dogmatic statements, thoughts altogether unworthy of a great teacher. Such, in many of these Sermons, there are, entirely to justify what they have done; but at other times these marks are altogether wanting: and without the presence of any such they relegate, apparently at their caprice, a Sermon into the Appendix. I have a few times quoted from these Sermons, yet always giving notice of the quarter from whence the quotations are drawn, that the reader may know that they are from works which the Benedictines have adjudged as spurious. Of course those I

¹ Cæsarii stylum et mentem refert.

have quoted, I have believed genuine. On the other hand, I have refrained from making any use of the volume of Sermons lately published as Augustine's at Paris,¹ while in it there is a running into the opposite extreme. Doubtless several genuine discourses of his, valuable additions to those which we already possessed, are there to be found; but very much also, altogether unworthy of him, there appears under his name. There is not apparently much in these discourses which would directly bear upon the subject which I had in hand, and till a decision should be arrived at about them, carrying with it more weight than any which this very uncritical edition can lend, I have thought it better to leave them altogether untouched. Perhaps a still more difficult task than to know where to stay one's hand in actual quotation was to leave unnoticed the thousand interesting subjects which the Sermon on the Mount of itself suggests, to refuse to follow down the avenues, which, as one advances, present themselves ever to the right hand and to the left. Yet this self-denial I have used, wherever the subject was not fairly in one way or another suggested by something which Augustine has said. There is indeed a disadvantage in this, a disad-

¹ Sancti Aurelii Augustini Sermones inediti, curâ et studio D. A. B. Caillau. Parisiis. 1842.

vantage like his who undertakes to paint a picture with a single colour, and whose work is in danger of lacking liveliness and variety, yet one counter-balanced by the advantage of being true to the plan of one's book; and that plan in the present instance was not to bring together every thing that I could for the elucidation of this all-important discourse, but rather whatever Augustine had contributed for that elucidation, thus seeking to give the reader an idea of him as a practical interpreter of Scripture, which idea could only have been disturbed by the introduction of alien matter.¹

¹ The ample treasures of St. Augustine's writings have more than once suggested books not unlike this in plan. Thus there is a *Catena* on the Epistles of St. Paul drawn altogether from his works, which is commonly ascribed to Bede as its author; Baronius doubts whether with justice, but apparently without any good grounds for his doubts. There is again, from an anonymous author, *Augustinus in Vetus et Novum Testamentum*, Basileæ, 1542. This seemed to me carelessly and negligently done: the obvious passages which a man might lay his hand on at once are given, but little care is used in collecting what is scattered up and down, and it abounds with large and needless gaps. The books of moral and theological *Loci Communes*, which have been formed exclusively from his writings, have a remoter resemblance. Of such there are several, as *D. Aurelii Augustini Millelogium Veritatis*, à F. Bartholomæo de Urbino, Lugdunum, 1555, alphabetically arranged under several heads. Another commonplace book of his most notable sayings, by Joannes Piscatorius Lithopolitanus, *Augustæ Vindelicorum*, 1537, has not an alphabetical but a dogmatic arrangement.

EXPOSITION,

&c. &c. &c.

ST. MATTHEW, CHAP. V.

VER. 1, 2.—Augustine does not speak with very great decision concerning the question, which has always occupied harmonists, whether the sermon recorded by St. Matthew is the same which St. Luke records (vi. 20—49). Against this, he finds the one to have been spoken on a mountain, the other in the plain (Luke, vi. 17); while yet, on the other side, the great internal resemblance, and the fact that the same miracle, the healing of the centurion's servant, is recorded by each Evangelist as immediately following, speak for the identity of the two. He suggests, as a reconciliation of all difficulties, that the Lord may perhaps, first, on some higher eminence of the mountain have spoken the discourse to his disciples which St. Matthew records; and then, coming down to the foot of the mountain, have repeated the same to the multitude, in an abridged form, and one more suitable to them: and that of this we have the record in St. Luke. Yet, before he leaves the question, he allows that this difference, of one discourse having been spoken on a mountain, the other in the plain, does not imperatively demand such a scheme; which, after all, has in it something unnatural. The two statements are

capable of reconciliation: our Lord may have “stood” (Luke, vi. 17) on some more level space on the slope of the mountain, capable of conveniently receiving the multitude, and then, when they were assembled, have sat down (Matt. v. 1), and spoken once for all that one discourse which both the Evangelists relate.¹ And this is, no doubt, the true and more natural explanation; from which the inner differences, as Augustine himself affirms, need move us as little as the outer. One Evangelist does not contradict another, when, as St. Luke here, he relates more succinctly what the other had related more at length; or again, when he finds place in his narrative for elements in a discourse, which the other, though in general the more copious, has omitted.

There is an emphasis, acknowledged by all later interpreters, in the words, “*He opened his mouth.*” The phrase is not merely another way of saying, He began to teach, but signifies that he was about commencing a discourse more than commonly weighty and full (Job, iii. 1; xxxii. 20; Acts, viii. 35; x. 34.) Augustine has not let this go unobserved, although he

¹ De Cons. Evang. l. ii. c. 19. Quamquam etiam illud possit occurrere, in aliquâ excelsiore parte montis primò cum solis discipulis Dominum fuisse, quando ex eis illos duodecim elegit; deinde cum eis descendisse, non de monte, sed de ipsâ montis celsitudine in campestrum locum, id est, in aliquam æqualitatem quæ in latere montis erat, et multas turbas capere poterat: atque ibi stetisse, donec ad eum turbæ congregarentur; ac postea cum sedisset, accepisse propinquius discipulos ejus, atque ita illis cæterisque turbis præsentibus unam habuisse sermonem, quem Matthæus Lucasque narrarunt, diverso narrandi modo, sed eâdem veritate rerum et sententiarum, quos ambo dixerunt.

finds exclusively an indication of the length of the discourse, which is introduced with this preface, and not also of its weight and solemnity.¹ Yet in truth, when his words, who is himself The Word, are recorded, where there is that, these must of necessity be there also.

Ver. 3.—The very first words of the sermon itself, “*Blessed are the poor in spirit,*” stir a difficult question; in what sense, namely, “in spirit” shall be taken. Augustine explains it: poor in their own spirits, and so rich in the Spirit of God,—who are therefore as valleys, filled with the waters which roll off from the swelling mountains.² Yet while this is no doubt, in its totality, the true meaning of Christ’s saying, it would seem as though Augustine lays on the words “in spirit,” not exactly their right significance; he would have it, Blessed are they that have not an elated spirit, taking “spirit” altogether in an evil sense,³ as that in man which lifts itself up against God, and so hinders the reception of any of his blessings or graces. But what our Lord would say is doubtless this, Blessed are they that are poor in the spirit of their minds, the

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 1. Ista circumlocutio quâ scribitur, Et aperiens os suum, fortassis ipsâ morâ commendat aliquantò longiorem futurum esse sermonem.

² Enarr. in Ps. cxli. 4. Beati pauperes spiritu suo, divites Spiritu Dei. Omnis enim homo qui spiritum suum sequitur, superbus est. Subdat spiritum suum, ut capiat Spiritum Dei. Ibat in culmen, residat in valle. Si ierit in culmen, denatat ab illo aqua, si in valle resederit, implebitur ex eâ.

³ Thus De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. i. Non habentes inflantem spiritum, and Enarr. in Ps. cxliii. 7; see also the preceding note.

term "poor" being alone that which is to exclude the false riches of pride and self-sufficiency, and the words that follow, "in spirit," being to mark that it is the region of the inner man in which his thoughts are moving; that he is not now speaking of worldly riches or worldly poverty, not of the things which are outside of a man, but of that which is within. It is as much as to say, Blessed are they that are inwardly poor, that in their hearts and spirits have a sense of need, of emptiness, and poverty.

His explanation, it will be seen, though capable of winning slightly in accuracy, yet effectually excludes the Romish interpretation, that it is any outward poverty or riches of which Christ is speaking, that he is fore-announcing here any mendicant orders, or any singular beatitudes, which should be theirs.¹ Augustine had far too deep an insight into Christian truth to limit and explain Christ's saying here by the other form in which St. Luke records it, "Blessed be ye poor;" on the contrary, he evermore interprets that by this, completing the briefer by the fuller, not cutting down (which were absurd) the fuller to suit with the briefer. For he that was a faithful monitor, and none more faithful, to the rich of this world,—warning them of the dangers that especially were theirs, hardness of heart, self-indulgence, pride, and notably the last,²—was as faithful also to the poor, did not fall into the temptation, which is equally a temptation, of flat-

¹ Many Romish interpreters make *πτωχοὶ τῷ πνεύματι* the *voluntarily* poor.

² Serm. lxi. c. 9. Omne pomum, omne granum, omne frumentum, omne lignum, habet vermem suum. Vernis divitiarum; superbia.

tering them, and therefore would not let them believe that their outward poverty did itself constitute humility, however it might be a help to it, or that they were necessarily poor in spirit because poor in this world. He often tells them they were not to take for granted that every beggar was a Lazarus;¹ while on the other side there were Jobs and Abrahams, who were adorned with this true poverty, even in the midst of their worldly abundance.²--While this poverty of spirit is the condition of every blessing, therefore to it is attached the promise of "*the kingdom of heaven,*" which is inclusive of all blessings; for all the beatitudes which follow are but, as he observes, the unfolding of this first one.

On the phrase itself, "kingdom of heaven," so often recurring in St. Matthew, (in the other New Testament

¹ Enarr. in Ps. cxxxi. 15. Pauper Dei in animo est, non in sacco. Procedit aliquando homo habens plenam domum, uberes terras; . . . novit quia in ipsis non est presumendum; humiliat se Deo, facit inde benè; ita cor ipsius erigitur ad Deum, ut noverit quia non solùm nihil illi prosunt divitiæ ipsæ, sed et impediunt pedes ipsius, nisi Ille regat et Ille subveniat: et numeratur inter pauperes, qui saturantur panibus. Invenis alium mendicum inflatum, aut ideo non inflatum, quia nihil habet, quærentem tamen unde infletur. Non attendit Deus facultatem, sed cupiditatem; et judicat eum secundùm cupiditatem, quia inhiat rebus temporalibus, non secundùm facultatem, quam non ei contigit adipisci. And Enarr. in Ps. lxxxv. 1. Resistit Deus superbis, et holosericatis et pannosis: humilibus autem dat gratiam, et habentibus aliquam substantiam hujus seculi et non habentibus. Cf. Serm. clxxvii., where he seeks especially to bring out the force of St. Paul's words, Qui volunt divites fieri. 1 Tim. vi. 5.

² Enarr. in Ps. lxxi. 2. Quà paupertate etiam beatus Job pauper fuit, et antequam magnas illas terrenas divitias amisisset. Quod ideo commemorandum putavi, quoniam sunt quidam qui facilius omnia sua pauperibus distribuunt, quàm ipsi pauperes Dei fiant.

Scriptures, kingdom of God), he notes how it belongs exclusively to the New Covenant; that while all else was in the old, even life eternal, and the resurrection of the dead, yet this name was not there, but would appear reserved for his lips who was to be a King to rule, and a Priest to sanctify, his people.¹

Ver. 4. "*Blessed are the meek.*"—Augustine shares with the Vulgate the better arrangement of the beatitudes which places this immediately after the first, reversing the position of this and the "*Blessed are they that mourn,*" which in our Bibles has precedence of it, but which, for the truer logical coherence, should follow.² He rightly explains this meekness as having reference to our bearing, not toward God, but our fellow-men.³ And then comes out the appropriateness of the blessing. It seems, according to the judgment of men, that in a world of wrong and unrighteousness and violence, the meek man will surely make himself a prey; that sooner or later he will be thrust out from all; that an Isaac, who will rather give up the well than contend for it, and this more than once, will at length have nothing left him which he may call his own (Gen. xxvi. 20). But it is not so. Great under

¹ Con. Faust. l. xix. c. 31. Regnum cœlorum ori eju nominandum servabatur, quem Regem ad regendos et Sacerdotem ad sanctificandos fideles suos universus ille apparatus veteris Instrumenti in generationibus, factis, dictis, sacrificiis, observationibus, festivitibus, omnibusque eloquiorum præconiis, et rebus gestis et rerum figuris parturiebat esse venturum.

² Lachmann has admitted this arrangement into his text.

³ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 2. Mites sunt qui cedunt improbitibus et non resistunt malo, sed vincunt in bono malum.

God is the strength and power of meekness: in the words of the Eastern Proverb,—The one staff of Moses breaks in shivers at last the ten thousand spears of Pharaoh. These meek shall in the end inherit all things, shall inherit even this earth, from which there seemed danger they would be altogether excluded.¹ Here, too, we have one of his many striking antithetic sayings; Thou wishest to possess the earth: beware then lest thou be possessed by it.²—There is force, which I think Augustine intended to bring out, in the form under which the promise is conveyed, “*They shall inherit the earth,*” and that in more ways than one;—“the earth,” while possession in land must always remain the surest of earthly possessions,—and “they shall inherit,” while possession by inheritance in the orderly succession of father and son seems to give the greatest promise and pledge of endurance.³

¹ Serm. liii. c. 8. He observes how in each, congrua congruentibus apposita sint; and on this; Quia mites homines facile excluduntur de terrâ suâ, Beati, inquit, mites, quoniam ipsi hæreditate possidebunt terram. It shall be theirs, not merely as a future benefit, but a present, according to those profound words of his (Ep. 153, c. 6), Omne quod malè possidetur alienum est: malè autem possidet qui malè utitur: and again (ibid.), Fidelis hominis totus mundus divitiarum est; infidelis autem nec obolus. So that he does not in fact contradict that meaning which looks at it as a future inheritance, when (Ep. 149) he explains “the earth” spoken of here as, Ecclesiam hæreditatemque fidelium atque sanctorum, quæ dicitur terra viventium.”

² Serm. liii. c. 2. Vis possidere terram? vide ne possidearis à terrâ.

³ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 2. Significat quandam soliditatem et stabilitatem hæreditatis perpetuæ.

Ver. 5. "*Blessed are they that mourn.*"—There is, he often takes occasion to remark, a mourning which has no blessing attached to it; there is misery enough among men, which yet has no blessing, while it leads to no repentance, or while at best it is only a sorrow of this world. One is groaning for one thing, one for another; for this temporal loss, for that earthly tribulation; for the hail that has laid waste his vineyard, for the death that has entered into his dwelling, for the powerful foes that are seeking his harm: and if perchance the groaning of the faithful reaches to the ears of the world, the world lays his sorrowing to the same account. Men say he has suffered this loss or that; for they know not of a mourning which springs from a higher source, a mourning for our own sins, for the sins of others, out of a sense of our exile here, of our separation from the true home of our spirits, out of a longing for the eternal Sabbath.¹ And yet it is only this nobler grief that has the promise linked to it, this only which will be followed by consolation. To be thus miserable is to be happy, while, on the contrary, he that is without this mourning gives too sure an augury, that there is reserved for him a mourning of another kind, and which shall not exchange itself, as shall this, for the consolations of the kingdom.²

¹ See a beautiful passage (Enarr. in Ps. xxxvii. 9) on the groaning which is before the Lord, compared with that which is only before men.

² Enarr. in Ps. xxxvii. 1. *Felix est qui sic miser est; . . . immo miser esset si lugens non esset: and again (Enarr. in Ps. cxlviii. 1), Qui non gemit peregrinus, non gaudebit civis. Ep. 248, (ad Sebastianum.) Pia est ista tristitia, et, si dici potest, beata miseria,*

Ver. 6. “*Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness.*”—Not that the hunger and thirst are themselves the blessing, but they prepare the way for the blessing, for the heavenly aliment which but for this hunger would be slighted or loathed.¹ Very beautifully Augustine draws from St. John, vi. 26—65, a kind of commentary on this text, making the “righteousness” here to be equivalent with the “bread from heaven” there, and saying that under each we should understand no other than Christ himself. This is at once evident with regard to the bread from heaven, and he quotes the words of St. Paul (1 Cor. i. 30), “Christ Jesus . . . made unto us righteousness,” in proof that “righteousness” here is equally exchangeable for him in whom the righteousness is contained; and that the hungering and thirsting after it is no desiring merely a moral amelioration, but a longing after Christ, and the being clothed with his righteousness, the satisfaction out of his fulness.² The Jews, he says, were in the state of mind directly opposite to this which here has the blessing linked to it, when, going about to establish their own righteousness, they would not submit themselves to the righteous-

vitiis alienis tribulari, non implicari; mœrere, non hærere; dolore contrahi, non amore attrahi. Hæc est persecutio quam patiuntur omnes qui volunt in Christo piè vivere, secundùm apostolicam mordacem veracemque sententiam (2 Tim. iii. 12). Quid enim hîc sic persequitur vitam bonorum, quam vita iniquorum?

¹ Serm. lxi. c. 6. Præcedat saturitatem fames, ne fastidium non perveniat ad panes.

² Thus, too, he exchanges with a true feeling of the text, “righteousness” for “God,” in some allusions to this passage; Enarr. in Ps. cxlv. 18.

ness of God (Rom. x. 3); as no less were those who disputed with the Lord concerning the bread of God which came down from heaven (John, vi.), which he would have given them, but which they scornfully put back: for they had not the spiritual hunger, the sense of emptiness, which alone would have interpreted his words, or given a value to the offer.¹ He cannot find the entire fulfilment of the appended promise, "*for they shall be filled,*" in the present life; for here our jaws are but sprinkled, as it were, with a few drops out of that river of joy, whereof then we shall drink to the full: yet the longing now is the condition of the satisfying of the longing hereafter; and the more longing, the ampler satisfaction, for this longing is the dilating of the vessel that it may contain the more.²

¹ In Evang. Joh. Tract. 26. Isti à pane de cœlo longè erant, nec eum esurire noverant. Fauces cordis languidas habebant . . . Panis quippe iste interioris hominis quærit esuriem: unde alio loco dicit, Beati qui esuriunt et sitiunt justitiam, quoniam ipsi saturabuntur. Justitiam vero nobis esse Christum, Paulus Apostolus dicit. Ac per hoc qui esurit hunc panem, esuriant justitiam; sed justitiam quæ de cœlo descendit, justitiam quam dat Deus, non quam sibi facit homo. And then he justly explains the "righteousness of God" (Rom. i. 17), not as the righteousness with which God is righteous in himself, but the righteousness which he gives to his people.

² De Util. Jejun. c. 1. Pertinet ergo ad homines hanc vitam mortalem gerentes, esurire ac sitire justitiam: impleri autem justitiâ, ad aliam vitam pertinet. Hoc pane, hoc cibo pleni sunt Angeli: homines autem dum esuriunt, extendunt se; dum se extendunt, dilatantur; dum dilatantur, capaces fiunt; capaces facti, suo tempore replebuntur. Quid ergo, hîc nihil inde capiunt qui esuriunt et sitiunt justitiam? Capiunt planè, sed aliud est cùm quærimus de refectioe iter agentium, et aliud cùm quærimus de perfectione beatorum. And Enarr. in Ps. xxxv. 10, Quis est fons vitæ nisi Christus? Venit ad te in carne, ut irroraret fauces tuas sitientes; satiabit sperantem, qui irroravit sitientem.

Ver. 7. "*Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy.*"—This mercifulness Augustine would appear sometimes to confine to the relief of the temporal needs of our brother; yet is it a pitifulness which is evidently of a wider reach, embracing the whole outcomings of a Christian's heart, whether in inward sympathies or outward acts, in relation to the sorrows and sufferings of his brethren. And here the blessed retaliations of the kingdom of God shall find place:—"Do, and it shall be done. Do with another that it may be done with thee: for thou aboundest and thou lackest. Thou aboundest in things temporal, thou lackest things eternal. A beggar is at thy gate, thou art thyself a beggar at God's gate. Thou art sought, and thou seekest. As thou dealest with *thy* seeker, even so God will deal with his. Thou art both empty and full. Fill thou the empty out of thy fulness, that out of the fulness of God thine emptiness may be filled." ¹

Ver. 8. "*Blessed are the pure in heart.*"—The pure heart Augustine explains as the single heart, the heart without folds, and this, with the promise attached, "*for they shall see God,*" causes him to bring this passage at once into connexion with those others in which our Lord speaks of the single eye, the eye of the soul (Matt. vi. 22, 23; Luke, xi. 34), which only when healthy is receptive of divine light, and the channel of light to the whole man; while that is the same statement as this, that only the pure of heart

¹ Serm. liii. c. 5.

shall see God.¹ But *how* this seeing of God should be,—for he will not suffer the words to be explained away into the mere figure of a general felicity,—is a question which occupied him greatly; though he truly said at the beginning of a long epistle on the subject, that it is one upon which holy living will help infinitely more than subtle teaching.² And as this question occupied him, so did another which is nearly connected with it, namely, *when* this shall be? a question which must mainly depend for its answer on the answer given to the first. *What* the seeing of God is must decide *when* it shall be, whether in this life or in the life to come? or whether, like so many other promises, it shall have a partial fulfilment now, an entire one hereafter? To arrive at a satisfactory answer it will be needful to put together, from his different writings, the results which he comes to upon these points. He most truly takes his first stand upon this: that the seeing God at all involves and itself rests upon the divine constitution of man, his original creation in the divine image; and hence, to use an image of the later Platonists, as while the eye is soliform (ἡλιοειδής) it therefore can see the sun, so man, being made in a divine image, is therefore capable of knowing and

¹ “Beati mundicordes,” as he commonly expresses it with a word of his own. The Vulgate, Beati mundo corde;—mundum cor=simplex (i. e. sine plicâ) cor=ὀφθαλμός ἀπλοῦς (Luke, xi. 34). Perhaps “sincerus” would be nearer to the Greek καθαρός, since they both rest on the image of immunity from foreign admixtures—this of colours, that (according at least to one etymology, sine cerâ) of honey from the wax that would impair its perfect purity.

² Ep. 147, (ad Paulinam). Primum mihi videtur plus valere in hac inquisitione vivendi quam loquendi modum.

seeing God.¹ But St. Paul tells us what was this image of God in which man was first created—not outward but inward—created after God in righteousness and true holiness. The seeing then which rests upon this must be an inward seeing; not, as some said, whom he earnestly rebukes, with these carnal eyes, but it must be through the restoration of the effaced likeness of God in the soul that the forfeited capacity of seeing him must be restored; the enlightened eyes of the understanding, the heart purified by faith—and no bodily eyes—these are the organs by which God is seen. In proportion as we are unlike to him, we are incapable of seeing him; in proportion as we grow in likeness, as we are “renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created” us, we grow in the power of this vision.²

Here, then, is the answer to the other question,—When it shall be: whether in this life or in the coming? Plainly in both. For, since this renewal is begun here, the vision must begin here also—though

¹ Serm. lxxxviii. c. 6. *Fecit autem te Deus, ô homo, ad imaginem suam. Daretne tibi unde videres solem quem fecit, et non tibi daret unde videres eum qui te fecit, cum te ad imaginem suam fecerit?*

² Ep. 92, c. 3, (ad Italicam). With allusion to 1 John, v. 2. *In tantum ergo videbimus, in quantum similes ei erimus, quia nunc in tantum non videmus, in quantum dissimiles sumus. Inde igitur videbimus, unde similes erimus. Quis autem dementissimus dixerit, corpore nos vel esse vel futuros esse similes Deo? The whole epistle is directed against those who thought the corporeal eye would be the organ with which God would be seen; yet elsewhere (Ep. 111, and *De Civ. Dei*, l. xxii. c. 29) he expresses himself more doubtfully, as being unable to say what accessions of power the spiritual body may receive.*

it be now but a seeing through a glass darkly; while its consummation will be there, where it will be face to face. For this most earnestly he affirms, that it will be a seeing which shall be intuitive and immediate, a seeing "him as he is;" that it will not be merely a theophany, such as were the appearances of God to the saints in the Old Testament, the taking of a form in which to make himself apparent to men; but a revelation of God in his own most proper nature, from which will follow a seeing him *as he is*. This was denied to Moses then, for it was impossible; no man, while yet flesh and blood, could so see God and live (Exod. xxxiii. 20), but it shall be granted to him and to all the faithful in the world to come. And here, Augustine observes, is the reconciliation of those passages, some of which say, that "no man hath seen God at any time" (John, i. 18), that no man hath seen him nor can see him (1 Tim. vi. 16); while others speak of men being introduced into his presence, seeing him, and speaking with him (Gen. xviii. 1; Isai. vi. 1.)¹ It is to the attaining of this pure heart, this purged eye of the soul, that all helps and appliances of grace are tending.² This is the great meaning and purpose of

¹ See his beautiful letter to Paulina, Ep. 147, c. 6—8. Ipse ergo erat in eâ specie quâ apparere voluerat, non autem ipse apparebat in naturâ propriâ, quam Moses videre cupiebat. Ea quippe promittitur sanctis in aliâ vitâ . . . Multi viderunt, sed quod voluntas elegit, non quod natura formavit."

² Serm. lxxxviii. c. 5. Tota igitur opera nostra, fratres, in hâc vitâ est, sanare oculum cordis unde videtur Deus. Ad hoc sacrosancta mysteria celebrantur, ad hoc sermo Dei prædicatur, ad hoc agunt quidquid agunt divinæ sanctæque literæ, ut purgetur illud interius ab eâ re quæ nos impedit ab aspectu Dei. In this and the following chapters is much more that is admirable on the purging the inward eye.

them,—of sacraments, of preaching, of scripture,—to prepare and fit us for this—for a time when we shall be enabled to see the See-er:¹ for in that seeing, all blessedness is included; without it there were no heaven, with it there could be no hell.²

Ver. 9. “*Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God.*” — Augustine sometimes understands by “peacemakers” those that have made peace in their own inner souls, in whom the spirit is ruling and the flesh serving; who, submitting themselves to God, are able to submit their lower nature to themselves; who, thus being content to be ruled, are able in their turn to rule:³ but generally he takes a wider range, for this is evidently too narrow. It is true that the Latin “*pacifici*,”⁴ which he has in common with the Vulgate, and which is rather “the peaceable” than “the peacemakers,” encourages a narrower view; as indeed it confounds in a great measure this beatitude with the second, for the meek and the peaceable will be nearly the same. But the naming of the peace *makers* introduces a new thought. The Christian is not merely himself quiet in the land, quiet in his own heart, but he is a spreader of peace around him—the peace of this world, but more than this, the peace also of God; knowing the blessedness of that peace himself, he says also by word and deed to

¹ Videre Videntem.

² Visio Dei est tota vita æterna. Si mali Dei faciem viderent, pœnis caderent.

³ So De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 2.

⁴ Pacifici = εἰρηνικοί, but the word here is εἰρηνοποιοί.

his brethren, "Be ye reconciled with God."¹ Too many expositors look exclusively to that other and lower peace, those especially who prize Christianity merely for its power of healing the outward sores of the world, not for its staunching the deep inward hurts of men's souls. Not that the peace of this world is excluded;² Christianity does bring this peace, but only by the way: it is aiming at a higher peace, and one for the sake of which, as being the only real peace, it is willing for the while to forego and sacrifice the other peace—to be called a troubler—to appear to be bringing in the sword of division, rather than the bands of union. Thus it is, he observes, with the faith of Christ, even in the individual man, for in one sense in the redeemed man there is not peace but war—a war which this very redemption has brought in: in him the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh; yet this is in the way to that peace, which alone deserves the name. And so also must it be in a sinful world. (2 Tim. iv. 2.)³

Ver. 10—12.—On these words Augustine has often occasion to remark, that it is a suffering "*for righteousness' sake*," and that alone, which has the blessing—that it is in fact the cause which makes the martyr. This he had need to affirm against the Donatists, who because they were suffering, on account of their schism,

¹ Thus Augustine, with a beautiful allusion to Luke, x. 5, Quo pleni sunt, fundunt.

² Thus Augustine himself, writing to a soldier, says (Ep. 189, ad Bonifac.) Esto ergo etiam bellando pacificus, ut eos quos expugnas ad pacis utilitatem vincendo perducas. Beati enim pacifici, ait Dominus.

³ Con. Lit. Petil. l. ii. c. 69.

many things at the hands of the civil power, therefore claimed for themselves without further question this blessing; and appealed to their sufferings in proof of the righteousness of their cause. Now, not to say that many of their sufferings were self-inflicted,¹ many the just punishment of civil crimes, even those which they bore for their faith's sake did not give them title to this, until another question was settled. For without in the least seeking to justify the means which the temporal power used, and Augustine, with the rest of the Church in Africa, sanctioned and approved, for the forcible reducing them to unity, in this one must see he had right, that they could not claim merely on the strength of these sufferings to be the rightful inheritors of the blessing here.² There was another point which had first to be proved, namely, that it was for Christ's sake, as witnesses of Christ's truth, and as

¹ Con. Gaudent. l. i. c. 28. Genus hominum . . . crudelissimum in mortibus alienis, vilissimum in suis. See the almost incredible details of this fury of self-destruction which possessed them, in his letter to Count Boniface (Ep. 185, c. 3). Yet the actual facts do not altogether bear him out, when to one of them he says (Con. Gaudent. l. i. c. 21,) *Quam persecutionem patimini, nisi à vobis?*

² Thus Gaudentius, a Donatist, writes, *Nostram causam solæ nobis istæ persecutiones gravissimam reddunt*, and proceeds to quote Matt. v. 10—12, to whom Augustine replies (Con. Gaudent. l. i. c. 20), *Rectè ista dicerentur à vobis quærentibus martyrum gloriam, si haberetis martyrum causam. Non enim felices ait Dominus, qui mala ista patiuntur, sed qui propter filium hominis patiuntur, qui est Christus Jesus. Vos autem non propter ipsum patimini, sed contra ipsum.* And again, *Non ex passione certa justitia, sed ex justitiâ passio gloriosa est. Ideoque Dominus . . . non generaliter ait, Beati qui persecutionem patiuntur, sed addit magnam differentiam quæ vera à sacrilegio pietas secernatur. Ait enim, Beati qui persecutionem patiuntur propter justitiam.* Cf. Con. Lit. Petil. l. ii. c. 71.

the true representatives of Christ's body, that they suffered what they did. They could not in arguing with the Catholics, who entirely denied this, bring these sufferings in proof that they were, because they suffered them, the true body of Christ. Else by the same proofs, as Augustine keenly retorts, the priests of Baal were martyrs when Elijah slew them; and their cross the malefactors had in common with Jesus:¹ or if they found here a confirmation of their doctrines, the Pagans who still survived in the Roman empire might as well appeal to the forbidding of their worship, the closing of their temples, the pains and penalties which attended the adherence to their superstition, as evidences of its truth. According to their principles every mine would be full of martyrs, and every one who perished by the sword of justice would be crowned.²

“*For great is your reward in heaven.*” Augustine often enlarges on the sustaining power of Christian hope, and an eye directed to this great reward.³—But on the word “reward” itself he is very distinct, and

¹ Ep. 185, c. 2, (ad Bonifac.) Et ipse Dominus cum latronibus crucifixus est, sed quos passio jungebat, caussa separabat.

² Enarr. in Ps. xxxiv. 23. Martyres non facit pœna, sed caussa. Nam si pœna martyres faceret, omnia metalla martyribus plena essent, omnes catenæ martyres traherent; omnes qui gladio feruntur, coronarentur. Nemo ergo dicat, Quia patior justus sum. Quia ipse qui primò passus est, pro justitiâ passus est, ideo magnam exceptionem addidit, Beati qui persecutionem patiuntur *propter justitiam* . . . Nemo ergo dicat, Persecutionem patior; non ventilet pœnam, sed probet caussam. Cf. Con. Lit. Petil. l. ii. c. 19.

³ Enarr. in Ps. xxxvi. 23. Attende mercedem, si vis sustinere laborem.

guards against all claims which, on the strength of this word, the proud heart of man might make. The “reward in heaven” does, indeed, bear a relation to that which is done or suffered for Christ’s sake on earth, yet is it a relation of grace, and not of debt. God has chosen, has of his own free will and unmerited bounty appointed, that there should be such a relation, and now “he is faithful that promised.” The doctrine of preventing grace, legitimately carried out, must for ever exclude the notion of any claim, as of merit properly so called; not that there are not merits, or rather graces, which will in that day be recognized, but that these merits are themselves gifts of God,¹ so that eternal life will be but the adding one more gift, the crowning, to all the preceding ones, which he has heaped upon his people.² It will be but “grace for grace.”³

¹ Ep. 194, (ad Sixtum). Ipsa vita æterna . . . gratia nuncupatur, . . . nec ideo quia non meritis datur, sed quia data sunt et ipsa merita quibus datur. And again, De Grat. et Lib. Arb. c. 8, Si vita bona nostra nihil aliud est quàm Dei gratia, sine dubio et vita æterna, quæ bonæ vitæ redditur, Dei gratia est; et ipsa enim gratis datur, quia gratis data est illa, cui datur.

² Ep. 194, (ad Sixtum). Cùm Deus coronat merita nostra, nihil aliud coronat, quàm munera sua. Enarr. in Ps. lxx. Tua peccata sunt, merita Dei sunt. Supplicium tibi debetur, et cùm præmium venerit, sua dona coronabit, non merita tua. See too his Anti-Pelagian Tracts, passim.

³ Ep. 194, (ad Sixtum). Nunc verò de plenitudine ejus accepimus non solùm gratiam quâ nunc justè in laboribus usque ad finem vivimus, sed etiam gratiam pro hac gratia, ut in requie postea sine fine vivamus. Augustine has here given the hint, at least, of the right explanation, which so many even now miss, of that difficult $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota\ \chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ (John, i. 16), that it means one grace heaped upon, and as a better grace coming, in some sort, *in the room of* ($\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota$) a preceding; (so Theognis, $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\prime\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\iota\alpha\varsigma$, troubles upon troubles).

Ver. 3—12.—As regards the contemplation of the heptad of beatitudes no longer singly, but as a whole, Augustine suggests, that perhaps they may stand in some relation to the sevenfold operation of the Holy Spirit of which Isaiah (ch. xi.) speaks—though it can hardly, I think, be said that he very successfully traces the relation of each to each. He notes how the eighth beatitude returns, as it were, upon the first, having the same promise, “The kingdom of heaven,”¹ which, in the intermediate ones, has not been forsaken, for that one comprehends all the others, but has been broken up, or rather contemplated successively in its various aspects; and how this return indicates that now the perfect and complete man has on all his sides been declared.² For these, as he says most truly, are not different persons that will be differently blest—it is not that one, being pure of heart, will see God; another, being merciful, will obtain mercy; and a third, who hungering and thirsting after righteousness, will be filled. But these are different sides of the same Christian character, with the capacities of blessedness which are linked to each: so that, while it is true that, because the man is pure of heart, and not because he is merciful, or meek, or peacemaker, he will see God; and again, while he is merciful, and not

It is scarcely, however, probable that St. John meant, as he implies, by the first *χάρις*, the grace of this life, and by the second, the grace of eternal life, but, rather by the two together, the uninterrupted stream of God's gifts in Christ, which are ever succeeding, and, so to speak, *replacing* one another.

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 4; and Serm. cccxlvi.

² De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 3. Octava tanquam ad caput redit; quia consummatum perfectumque ostendit et probat.

while he is pure of heart, that he will obtain mercy, and so forward, yet it is the same person throughout to whom all belong. Just as, if it were said, “Happy are they that have feet, for they can walk; happy are they that have tongues, for they can speak;” we should not think of one man having a tongue, another feet, but only to each limb attribute its appropriate function.¹ It is true, indeed, that these graces, like grapes of the same bunch, may ripen, some earlier than others, yet do they not the less all hang upon the same stem, and the same process of ripening is going forward in them all. He might have added, perhaps, that in these separated blessings there is an implicit summons to seek to complete the Christian character in all its aspects—to polish the diamond on all its sides, that so on every side it may be capable of reflecting the light of heaven which will on that side also fall upon it.

Ver. 13. “*Ye are the salt of the earth.*”—The transition from what went before is easy:—Ye are salt,—intended to communicate a savor of life unto others; to hinder the world from becoming a putrefying mass of corruption. Beware then lest you yourselves, through fear of worldly incommodities and persecutions, lose this your seasoning power, for there are none other to impart grace to you, while it is you that

¹ Serm. liii. c. 9. Sic tanquam spiritalia membra componens, docuit quid ad quid pertineat. Aptā est humilitas ad habendum regnum cœlorum, apta mansuetudo ad possidendam terram, aptus luctus ad consolationem, apta fames et sitis justitiæ ad saturitatem, apta misericordia ad impetrandam misericordiam, aptum mundum cor ad videndum Deum.

are appointed from whom it is to be diffused upon all others.¹ And the salt which has thus “*lost his savor,*”² what will it be good for, “but to be cast out and to be trodden under foot of men?” Augustine makes here the beautiful observation, that they are not truly trodden under foot, who without shrinking suffer persecution, but they who through fear of persecution become vile, abandoning their faith; for however undermost he may *seem*, yet he is not really so, who, whatever he may be suffering below on earth, has his heart fixed above in heaven.³

Ver. 14, 15. “*Ye are the light of the world.*”—Yet not light in themselves, but light in the Lord; rays darted forth from the sun, but not the sun itself. In themselves,

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 6. Si vos per quos condiendi sunt quodammodo populi, metu persecutionum temporalium amiseritis regna cœlorum, qui erunt homines per quos à vobis error auferatur, cùm vos elegerit Deus, per quos errorem auferat cœterorum?

² Here, as there is occasion not unfrequently to notice, the earlier Latin translation which Augustine uses has a better term than that substituted in the Vulgate. In the latter, *μαρανθῆ* is rendered *evanuerit*, which is not indeed incorrect, as Tholuck (Ausleg. d. Bergpredigt, p. 121) asserts, for we have in Cicero, *Salsamenta vetustate evanescent*: but the old *infatuverit* was singularly happy (*fatuus* = *μωρός*, the man saltless, insipid. We have no such happy word for it as the French *fade*.) It is probable, however, that the Vulgate is a translation of *μαζανθῆ*, which is the other, but the inferior reading.

³ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 6. Non itaque calcatur ab hominibus, qui patitur persecutionem, sed qui persecutionem timendo infatuatur. Calcari enim non potest nisi inferior, sed inferior non est qui quamvis corpore multa in terrâ sustineat, corde tamen fixus in cœlo est.

even as all others, they were “sometimes darkness,” (Ephes. v. 8), and, receding from the true light, would become darkness again. For no man is a true light, having light in himself, but is as a candle or a lamp, which has been kindled and may be quenched again; having ever need to exclaim with the Psalmist, “The Lord is my Light.”¹ And Augustine makes a happy comparison of John, v. 35, with words of the same Evangelist, i. 8, 9. Christ was *the* Light, “the True Light which lighteth every man” (τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινόν): John was a lamp or torch (not φῶς but λύχνος),² burning indeed and shining, but yet burning *down* and shining only for a season.

By the “*hill*” on which the city is set, Augustine understands Christ himself, the foundation upon which the Church is built, the stone cut out without hands and growing into a mountain and filling the world.³

¹ Serm. clxxxii. c. 6. Illuminandi sumus, non lumen sumus. Enarr. in Ps. cxviii. 105. Nulla quippe creatura, quamvis rationalis et intellectualis, à seipsà illuminatur, sed participatione sempiternæ veritatis accenditur.

² Serm. clxxxii. c. 5. Lucerna et accendi potest, et extingui potest. Lumen verum accendere potest, extingui non potest. Serm. cclxxxi. c. 7. Johannes lumen illuminatum; Christus lumen illuminans. As in these places he draws out the distinction between Christ the Light, and John the Lamp, so elsewhere in a remarkable way (Serm. cclxxxviii. De Voce et Verbo) between Christ the Word (the Λόγος) and John the Voice (the φωνή): the one a new utterance to the world—a new speaking of God to man—the beginning of a new creation; the other but a startling and awakening cry in an old world.

³ Serm. cccxxxviii. c. 1. Ipse est mons, qui ex parvo lapide crevit, et totum orbem crescendo implevit. And Con. Faust. l. xvi. c. 17, Se scilicet montem, fideles autem suos in sui nominis gloriâ fundatos asserens civitatem.

Yet the Lord may perhaps only mean, the Church can no more escape the notice of the world, than a city set on an eminence the eyes of men; even as in the next verse it seems very questionable whether we are to look for any particular meaning in "*the bushel*," under which to be hid the candle was not lighted. It may be what the Lord would say is but generally this;—You were not given such great gifts, to let them rust in idleness. It is a statement at once of God's intention concerning them, and a warning that they do not defeat that intention. That salt which is yours was intended to season, see then that it grows not savorless; this city to be visible, beware lest it lose the power of drawing men's eyes to it. This light which is kindled in you was meant to shine and to give light to all that are in the house, that is, in the Church, or, as Augustine rather inclines to interpret it, in the world; see then that you suffer not this light to be darkened in you—it was imparted for a very different end. To find, as he does, in the bushel a particular allusion to worldly cares, or worldly lusts, which we may not suffer to darken the light of the spirit, putting that uppermost which ought to be undermost, and vice versâ, certainly seems far fetched.¹

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 6. And yet it is impossible to deny the beauty of his further explanation of this passage, where concerning the candlestick on which the candle is to be set he says, Serm. cxcvi. c. 6, Crux Christi est magnum candelabrum. Qui vult lucere, non erubescat de ligneo candelabro. . . . Audi ergo Paulum Apostolum, audi lucernam in candelabro exsultantem, Mihi autem absit gloriari, nisi in cruce Domini nostri Jesu Christi. Gal. vi. 14.

Ver. 16.—There will be an opportunity of entering into Augustine's view of this passage, when we come to his reconciliation of the command here given, to let our light shine before men, with the warning (vi. 1—18) against the doing ought to be seen of men. For the present it will be sufficient to observe, that he suggests the difficulty, and in this way solves it. The Lord says not here, Let your light shine before men, that they may glorify *you*; but, that they may "glorify your Father which is in heaven,"—this his glory, and not your own, is to be the end and aim of your doings;¹ and the later prohibition will not be found to be a prohibition of the doing good deeds before others, but of the doing them with the purpose that those others may exalt and glorify *us*.

Ver. 17, 18.—To the great and important question, in what way Christ came not to destroy the law, but to fulfil, Augustine gives apparently many answers; yet not in fact many, while they all at the root are one. First, he says, Christ fulfilled the law by himself perfectly doing it. Secondly, he fulfilled it, by shedding abroad that love in the hearts of his people, by which and by which alone it is truly fulfilled² (Rom. xiii. 9, 10); and where, through the weakness of the

¹ Serm. cccxxxviii. c. 3. Non autem Dominus jussit bona opera abscondi, sed in bonis operibus laudem humanam non cogitare. Cf. Serm. cxlix. c. 13. Hoc si quæris, ut glorificetur Deus, noli timere ne videaris ab hominibus. Etiam sic intus est eleemosyna tua in abscondito; ubi solus ille, cujus gloriam quæris, te videt hoc quærere.

² Serm. cxxv. Quia venit dare caritatem, et caritas perficit legem; meritò dixit, Non veni legem solvere, sed implere.

flesh, and the remains of old corruptions, they yet came short, himself fulfilling it in their room, and so having a right to stand as an advocate in their behalf.¹ Thirdly, he fulfilled it, when in him whatsoever was shadowed out in the types of the old law found a completion; whatsoever was prophesied and promised, became in him Yea and Amen² (2 Cor. i. 20.) And lastly, he fulfilled it, by unfolding how much it contained, showing how beside the letter which they deemed so easy to satisfy, it had also an inner spirit: that it had a kernel as well as an outer husk; and he oftentimes quotes as a true parallel to this saying, the words of St. John,³ “The law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came by Jesus Christ” (John, i. 17); this “grace” which was given by Christ being the power of fulfilling that law, which was before only a threatening and killing letter;⁴ this “truth” being not opposed to untruth,⁵ but truth in the sense of reality

¹ Con. Faust. l. xix. c. 17. Deinde quia, etiam sub gratiâ positus, in hac mortali vitâ difficile est omni modo implere quod in lege scriptum est, Non concupisces: ille per carnis suæ sacrificium Sacerdos effectus, impetrat nobis indulgentiam, etiam hinc adimplens legem; ut quod per nostram infirmitatem minùs possumus, per illius perfectionem recuperetur, cujus capitis membra effecti sumus. (1 Joh. ii. 1.)

² Con. Faust. l. xix. c. 8.

³ Con. Faust. l. xvii. c. 16.

⁴ Concupiscentiam terruit, non extinxit; and with a right insight into that often misquoted passage (2 Cor. iii. 6), “The letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life,” (De Spir. et Lit. c. 19,) Lex enim sine adjuvante Spiritu procul dubio est littera occidens: cum verò adest vivificans Spiritus, hoc ipsum intus conscriptum facit diligi, quod foris scriptum lex faciebat timeri.

⁵ Not ἀλήθεια, opposed to ψεῦδος, but ἀλήθεια (= εἰκῶν, Heb. x. 1 = σῶμα, Col. ii. 17,) to σκιά, or ὑπόδειγμα, Heb. ix. 23. Cf. Enarr. in Ps. lxxiii. 1.

or body, opposed to shadow, or outline; so that that declaration of St. John's, and this of our Lord's, he would make exactly to answer to those words of St. Paul, "but the body is of Christ." (Col. ii. 17.) All these expositions run into one; since in Christ's law-fulfilling walk in the flesh, as the promised man, and in the consequences of that life of perfect holiness, in his resurrection and ascension, power was first given to humanity to keep the law, even as by that was first revealed to men all that the law of love was, and all the blessed demands which it made upon them; and where, too, they were to find help for all their shortcomings in it, whereof now they had become more deeply conscious than ever.

By these answers it will at once be seen how little Augustine consents with them, Manichæans of old, Quakers in modern times, who affirm that in the new legislation of Christ there is any abrogation of, or withdrawing, or casting a slight upon, any part of the old. He had on this matter the same great conflict to maintain with the Manichæans, which Irenæus and others in earlier times had maintained with the Gnostics. These, as those, eagerly snatched at such passages as Matt. v. 31, 32; 43, 44; as evidences of the repealing of the law of Moses; saying, that whatever Christ allowed to stand fast and sanctioned, was not peculiar to Moses, but belonged to the universal morality,—every thing distinctive of Moses was by him cast aside. Now Augustine, in reply to these cavillers, does not avail himself of the timid gloss of some modern commentators, and admit that there is a repealing, but then seek to make out that it is only the Pharisaical additions to, or perversions of, the law

which are repealed. He denies the repealing altogether; and this verse, he affirms, gives us the key-note of the Sermon on the Mount, at least to the end of its first chapter.¹ He affirms how in each case the old stands fast, however there may be a new unfolded out of it. This verse, as may well be supposed, was a hard saying to the adversaries. They had many outlets from it, while they had no good one. Sometimes they denied that the words were Christ's, while they are only recorded by St. Matthew, who was not called till a later period of our Lord's ministry than that at which he reports these words as spoken, and whose witness they claimed therefore the liberty of putting by.² Or allowing them to be the Lord's, they replied, that he did not mean the Jewish law, (however he might have been willing that the Jews should understand him so to speak, and thus lay aside a part of their bitter enmity against him), but quite a different thing: and the law that he came to fulfil was the na-

¹ Con. Faust. l. xix. c. 26. Si Christus ubi quibusdam antiquis sententiis propositis adjunxit, Ego autem dico vobis, neque primorum hominum legem hoc verborum additamento adimplevit, neque illam quæ per Mosem data est quasi contrariorum oppositione destruxit; sed potius omnia ex Hebræorum lege commemorata ita commendavit, ut quidquid ex personâ suâ insuper loqueretur, vel ad expositionem requirendam valeret, si quid illa obscure posuisset, vel ad tutius conservandum quod illa voluisset. Vides quam sit aliter intelligendum, quòd ait, Non se venisse legem solvere, sed adimplere: scilicet, ut non quasi semiplena istis verbis integraretur, sed ut quod literâ jubente propter superbiorum præsumptionem non poterat, suadente gratiâ propter humilium confessionem impleretur, opere factorum, non adjectione verborum.

² Con. Faust. l. xvii. c. 3.

tural law written on men's hearts.¹ And then, with an attempt to shift the ground of controversy, they would retort on the Catholics, that neither could they understand this of the Jewish law. For neither did they themselves act as though Christ had come to fulfil and confirm that, but on the contrary had suffered a great part of its enactments, its feasts and its sacrifices, its circumcision and its sabbaths, its differences of meats, and a thousand other legal observances, to fall away. They too acted, as if Christ had dissolved and repealed the law which he found in force at his coming.²

This charge against the Church, that it too was a dissolver of the law, and could not therefore hold to these words, in any sense which would give it a right to accuse others for utterly rejecting them, was, of course, one well worthy of an answer, and Augustine girds himself to the answering it fully. He replies, that in the Church nothing, which there was in the Synagogue, is dissolved, but rather every thing confirmed,—and this, while in Christ the type has passed into the reality, the flower into the fruit, the prophecy into the fulfilment, and in that is to stand fast for ever. Had those that were Christ's, after his coming abode in the type and the prophecy, refusing the realities when in Christ they were made theirs, then, indeed, there would have been, on their part, a dissolving of the law and the prophets, while it would seem that nothing which these had foretold or prefigured had come to pass. But now, in the letting them go in

¹ Con. Faust. l. xix. c. 1.

² Con. Faust. l. xviii. c. 1, 2. Faustus, the Manichæan, says, *Nec tu id credis, de quo me solum incusas.*

their outward letter, there was the witness for their true fulfilment.¹ They did not practise now the circumcision of the flesh, because Christ had given them the true circumcision of the Spirit, and so caused the shadow to give place to the substance. They kept not the feasts of unleavened bread, for Christ had done that which those feasts announced, purged out the old leaven from men's life, causing them to be unleavened in him ;² nor the passover, while now the true Lamb of God, indeed without spot, was slain. They observed not the sabbath, which, indeed, was only such in a figure, for now the true sabbaths, those to which the others pointed, were come, while *He* was come, in whom there is the true rest and sabbath-keeping for men's spirits,—he, who could say, “Come unto me, all ye that labour, and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.”³ In this way Christ fulfilled and did not dissolve the ceremonial part of Moses's law,—even as the moral precepts, by the new light which he cast upon them, by the added grace that he gave, enabling men to keep them.⁴ But to this subject there will be frequent necessity of returning.

¹ Con. Faust. l. xviii. c. 4. And again, *Ideo ablata quia impleta.*

² Con. Faust. l. xix. c. 10. *Cùm quæris, Cur azyma sicut Judæi non observet Christianus, si Christus non venit legem solvere sed implere? Respondeo, immo propterea magis hoc non observat Christianus, quia quod illà figurâ prophetabatur, expurgato veteris vitæ fermento, novam vitam demonstrans, Christus implevit.*

³ Con. Faust. l. xix. c. 19. Cf. Con. Adimant. c. 16.

⁴ Con. Faust. l. xix. c. 18. *Hæc præcepta sunt morum; illa sacramenta sunt promissorum: hæc implentur per adjuvantem gratiam, illa per redditam veritatem; utraque per Christum, et illam*

Ver. 19—20.—What is this being “*least in the kingdom of heaven,*” which is here threatened? Augustine starts with taking certainly for granted that the doer and teacher of transgression,¹ of whom Christ is now speaking, cannot be one who will ultimately have any part with him. There are two explanations then of the difficulty of finding a place at all assigned to him in Christ’s kingdom: for on the face of the words, he that is least in the kingdom *has* a place in that kingdom, albeit that place is the lowest:—either, that is, to take the kingdom of heaven as the Church militant, the kingdom in the present earlier state of its developement, in which false teachers and evil workers are mingled with the doers and teachers of the truth, and to say, that in this he shall have a place, though, in God’s estimate, the lowest place, and one from which, while he occupies it unworthily, he shall hereafter be cast out altogether. In this way Augustine oftentimes explains the passage, referring in proof of such use of the term, “kingdom of heaven,” to such passages as Matt. xiii. 47.² Sometimes, however, he has another

semper gratiam donantem, nunc etiam revelantem, et hanc veritatem tunc promittentem, nunc exhibentem.

¹ He, however, does not understand the words exactly thus—but of one who does ill, while he teaches well, making this a parallel phrase to Matt. xxiii. 3, “They say and do not.” (Beza, in modern times, has the same construction, making *καὶ διδάξῃ* = *καὶν διδάξῃ*, and referring *οὕτω* to the *παιεῖν*, and not to the *λύειν*.) Thus in Joh. Evang. Tract. cxxii. c. 9. Denique ut ostenderet istos minimos reprobos esse, qui docent bona loquendo, quæ solvunt malè vivendo, nec quasi minimos in vitâ æternâ futuros, sed omnino ibi non futuros . . . continuò subject, Dico enim vobis, nisi &c. And Serm. cclii. c. 3.

² Thus Serm. cclii. c. 3. Minimus vocabitur in regno cælo-

solution; he takes "the kingdom of heaven" as the perfected kingdom of glory, that into which nothing unholy shall enter, and then he takes the announcement that he shall be "least" there, as one of those mitigated forms of expression in which oftentimes threatening is more awfully concentrated than in many a louder menace;¹ —he shall be least there being equivalent to, and another way of saying, he shall not be there at all. The net now has fish of all kinds and all sizes, but then it shall only contain "great fishes"² (John, xxi. 11) in it, and such as are least shall not be found in it at all. It will at once be seen that these two explanations do not contradict one another; he shall be least in the kingdom here, and excluded from it altogether there.

I confess, however, it seems to me hardly likely that our Saviour by the being "least in the kingdom of heaven" means being excluded from it altogether, especially as he has used elsewhere the selfsame phrase in so very different a sense (Matt. xi. 11). It appears more natural to understand him here to be speaking of some who out of a false freedom taught and themselves practised an exemption from certain special Christian precepts, dealing with them as though they were annulled and abrogated; and who yet, despite

rum. Sed in quo regno cœlorum? In ecclesiâ quæ modo est . . . Ibi erit, sed minimus. Cf. De Civ. Dei, l. xx. c. 9.

¹ Ἐλάχιστος = novissimus et nullus.

² In Joh. Evang. Tract. 122. For the full understanding his allusion here, it would be needful to enter into the allegorical signification, which he finds in the miraculous draught of fishes after the Resurrection.

this, did in the inmost centre of their life belong to Christ. Such should be least in the kingdom of God—in it, while their faith saved them, but least in it, while they took so false and one-sided a view of its enactments—least now in the judgment of God, and in the work which, from that false standing point, they should be able to accomplish—least hereafter in the place that should be given them. And Augustine's argument, drawn from ver. 20,—which he makes only to be the stronger and yet more emphatic repetition of ver. 19, and so “least in the kingdom of heaven,” in the former verse, to be identical with the not having an entrance into that kingdom in the latter,—appears to me to be an erroneous one, drawn from a wrong view of the relation in which the verses stand to one another. The second does not say over again what the first had said, but rather there is progress and a climax in the verses. Such a relaxing for yourselves and for others the commandments will set you low in the true kingdom of obedience and holiness; but this of having a righteousness so utterly false and hollow as that of the Scribes and Pharisees, will not merely set you low, but will exclude you from that kingdom utterly; for while that marks an *impaired* spiritual vision, this marks one wholly darkened and destroyed.

Ver. 21, 22.—On the words “*Whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause,*” Augustine observes, that in the Greek MSS. the last words find no place, and it is simply and with no exception, “*Whosoever is angry with his brother shall be in danger of the judgment.*” This, however, is not the fact with infi-

nately the largest number of the MSS. which now exist, in which, as in most of the early versions, "without a cause" is to be found. He must himself naturally have desired it there; for he everywhere recognizes the possibility of an holy anger, and ingeniously shows, that even should it be right to omit these words, as probably it is, the prohibition is still not absolute, nor without its qualifications, since it is with thy brother, not with thy brother's sin, that thou art forbidden to be angry.¹ Anger itself may be an holy passion—it is attributed to Christ, (Mark, iii. 5,) and to God himself—the possibility of its being sinless in man is expressly recognized in those words of the Apostle, "Be ye angry and sin not." (Ephes. iv. 26.) For it is not, he says, itself hatred, though when it is fostered long it is evermore in danger of degenerating into that; as wine too long kept, of turning into vinegar; and therefore is it to be gotten rid of, to be emptied out from the vessel of the heart, without delay. "Let not the sun go down upon your wrath."²

¹ *Retract. l. i. c. 19.* Non fratri irascitur qui peccato fratris irascitur. It is here where he observes that sine causa is wanting in the Greek MSS.; in his Exposition of the discourse itself he reads it.

² *Ep. 38, (ad Profuturum).* Nulli irascenti ira sua videtur injusta [εἰκῆ]. Ita enim inveterascens ira fit odium, dum quasi justī doloris admixta dulcedo, diutius eam in vase detinet, donec totum acescat, vasque corrumpat. Quapropter multò melius nec justè cuiquam irascimur, quàm velut justè irascendo in alicujus odium iræ occultâ facilitate delabimur. In recipiendis enim hospitibus ignotis, solemus dicere, multò esse melius malum hominem perpeti, quàm forsitan per ignorantiam excludi bonum, dum cavemus ne recipiatur malus. Sed in affectibus animi contra est. Nam in-

With regard to the word "*Racha*," Augustine says, that he had learned from a Jew whom he had questioned on the subject, that it is not a word having any distinct significance, but rather an interjection, the vague exclamation of an indignant mind.¹ And accepting this interpretation, he finds a natural and easy climax here. The first grade of the sin is when a man feels the emotion of a causeless anger in his heart, which yet he so represses, that it does not find any utterance without. In the second it breaks forth into utterances of passion, such as this "*Racha*," which however as yet, having no fixed meaning attached to them, are not words of settled scorn and contempt. This is the third degree of the sin, when it is indeed no longer merely anger, for it has ripened into hate. He is no doubt perfectly right in affirming that degrees of guilt are intended to be signified here; although those in modern times best acquainted with the Eastern tongues do not acquiesce in the interpretation of his Jew—but explain *Racha* as a term of reproach, not indeed very severe, but having a fixed meaning, and that pretty nearly equivalent to our English, Oh vain man!²

comparabiliter salubrius est etiam iræ justè pulsanti non aperire penetrare cordis, quàm admittere non facilè recessuram, et perventuram de surculo ad trabem.

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 9. Dixit enim esse vocem non significantem aliquid, sed indignantis animi motum exprimentem.

² *Racha* = ὦ ἀνθρώπε κενέ, Jam. ii. 20. The use by St. James of this very term, and of the forbidden *μωρός* by our Lord himself, (Matt. xxiii. 17,) are alone proofs, if any were needed, that these terms are instanced but as signs of inward states of enmity and scorn: else might a new Pharisaism develop itself out of this very teaching of Christ's—one which, avoiding certain expressly forbidden utterances

And as ascending degrees of guilt are involved in those different outcomings of anger, so also degrees of penalty are expressed by the "*judgment*," the "*council*," and the "*hell-fire*" or Gehenna; but all of them penalties divine, not human: with the deeper guilt there goes along the deeper damnation. For it is a strange marring and misunderstanding of our Lord's words on the part of some, one from which Augustine, as will be seen by the next quotation, is altogether free, to make the two first, the judgment and the council, expressions of penalties inflicted by earthly tribunals; and only the third, the Gehenna, that which comes directly from the sentence of God. On the contrary, they all are earthly forms under which the different degrees of loss and injury for the spirit of man, reaching at last to its total loss and perdition,—set forth by the casting out into the place appointed for the burning of the offal of Jerusalem,—are described. It is scarcely possible to imagine a greater missing of the meaning, a more complete perplexing of the whole passage, than is theirs, who find here any allusion to earthly judgment-seats or human councils, save as the shadows under which the things heavenly, in themselves unutterable, are pourtrayed.¹ Therefore our

of outrage and ill will, should count itself free to use any other. But even as these, where love is, may be righteously and holily used, and Christ and his servants spake the keenest things in love, so where love is not, the guilt of "*Racha*," and "*Thou fool*," will be incurred not merely where these words are exchanged for others, but where no word at all finds utterance from the lips.

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 9. Videntur ergo aliqui gradus in peccatis et in reatu, sed quibus modis invisibiliter exhibeantur meritis animarum, quis potest dicere?

translation "hell-fire" is not happy, as somewhat countenancing the confusion; not that the eternal loss is not by our Lord indicated, but while that has twice before been mentioned under forms of things earthly, so it ought still to be here. The valley of Hinnom, the place where the offal and the carcases were flung forth, to be gnawed by the worm, and from time to time to be consumed by the fire, is the Gehenna here. And our Lord is saying exactly the contrary to that which they who so interpret will then be making him to say: he is saying, Moses gave you a law for the outer man, he told you that if you killed you should die. That is well; but there is another region which that precept could not reach, which nothing that Moses had to impart could reach, a region with which earthly tribunals do not meddle, but over which I am Lord; and I tell you that you must learn to look at the least germs of evil will to your brother, the faintest rudiments of hate, as having in them the nature of deadliest sin, as implicit murder,¹ to be checked in the very outset, since each growth of this indulged evil will bring you under greater and greater condemnation, till at last it will bring on a total and final separation of your souls from the fountain of grace and love, so

¹ Augustine quotes, exactly to the point, 1 John, iii. 15. And Serm. lviii. c. 7. *Gladium non eduxisti, non vulnus in carne fecisti, non corpus plagâ aliquâ trucidâsti. Cogitatio sola odii in corde tuo est, et teneris homicida. . . . Quantùm ad te pertinet, occidisti quem odisti. Emenda te, corrige te. Si in domibus vestris scorpiones essent aut aspides, quantùm laboraretis, ut domus vestras purgaretis, et securi habitare possetis? Irascimini, et inveterantur iræ in cordibus vestris, fiunt tot odia, tot trabes, tot scorpii, tot serpentes; et domum Dei, cor vestrum, purgare non vultis?*

that being entirely reprobate ye shall be cast out to that fearful place, of which the valley of Hinnom, with its worm and its fire, are the nearest, though indeed only the faint, earthly images.

Ver. 23, 24.—In this way Augustine traces the connection with what precedes; If thou mayest not be angry with thy brother, much less mayest thou retain in thine heart a deep seated and lasting alienation from him: or elsewhere, with a slight difference, Thou hast heard the awful consequences of a sin against thy brother, how it separates thee not merely from him but from God: hear now also the remedy,¹ how thou mayest restore thy disturbed relations with thy God; for thy present condition unfits thee for fellowship with him, deprives thee of the privilege of offering to him any gift, since thou must thyself be an offering, before any thing which thou bringest can be welcome as such.²

But how obey the command to go to our brother? The half completed sacrifice will hardly endure so great a delay. It may be that we know not where to seek him now, or, if we know, that lands and seas lie between him and us. This going then must be most often a going in heart, an hastening with the swift affection of love, not with the tardy motion of the feet.³ And the altar and the offering, in like manner,

¹ Serm. lxxxii. c. 3. Ecce ille reatus gehennæ quam citò solutus est. Nondum reconciliatus, eras gehennæ reus: reconciliatus, securus offers munus tuum ad altare.

² Serm. lxxxii. c. 3. Offers munus tuum, et tu nos es munus Dei.

³ De Serm. Dom. in Mou. l. i. c. 10. Pergendum est ergo . . . non pedibus corporis, sed motibus animi, ut te humili affectu pro-

must be spiritually understood. We offer our gift when we bring any sacrifice of praise or prayer,—we offer it on God's altar when we bring it aright: heretics, as Augustine observes, offer not *on the altar*, they rather cast their unaccepted gifts on the ground. From all this it is plain that he does not see any immediate nor any direct reference here to the Eucharist; though, indeed, that being the culminating act of self-oblation unto God, in this self-oblation is of course included, that there must be on the part of the offerer a perfect charity, if that, the highest gift, is to be acceptably offered. Speaking while the Jewish temple service was yet in existence, our Lord clothes an eternal truth in language borrowed from that temporary institution, and to find any direct allusion to any thing else in these terms "altar" and "gift," is highly unnatural; and certainly, as far as any passage I have myself as yet seen, Augustine does not do so.¹

But there still remains to consider what these words, "*have ought against thee*," may mean. Is the offerer of the gift to be considered as the aggrieved or aggrieving person? is he to hasten and bestow forgiveness for a wrong that has been done him, or to claim forgiveness for a wrong that he has done? Now the

sternas fratri ad quem carâ cogitatione cucurreris, in conspectu ejus, cui munus oblaturus es. Ita enim etiamsi præsens sit, poteris eum non simulato animo lenire, atque in gratiam revocare, veniam postulando; si hoc priùs coram Deo feceris, pergens ad eum non pigro motu corporis, sed celerrimo dilectionis affectu.

¹ No doubt there is some passage of the kind, as Johnson in his "Unbloody Sacrifice" numbers St. Augustine among those who have so interpreted the altar here, but he does not give any especial reference.

words, as Augustine observes,¹ clearly point out the last to be the meaning. If our brother had wronged us *we* should have something against *him*, not he against us. It would be no duty then to seek him, or to ask pardon—only to be willing to be sought by him and to bestow pardon: where we have been the wronger, there we are to seek it. This done, “then come and offer thy gift,” that is, this being accomplished in spirit, go forward in the work of worship, or praise, or whatsoever else it was, which thou hadst commenced with thy God.²

Ver. 25, 26.—Augustine’s interpretation of the precept, “*Agree with thine adversary quickly*,” is remarkable, though it requires some modification before it can claim entire assent. That other explanation seems weak and trivial, though supported by considerable authorities, which would make this merely a counsel of worldly prudence, and to say no more than this, While the issue of every pleading before a judge is uncertain, be not stiff and stern in refusing terms of peace and reconciliation, lest unexpectedly judgment be given against thee, and afterwards thou rue

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 10. Si in mentem venerit quod aliquid habeat adversum nos frater: id est, si nos eum in aliquo læsimus, tunc enim ipse habet adversum nos: nam nos adversum illum habemus, si ille nos læsit: ubi non opus est pergere ad reconciliationem: non enim veniam postulabis, ab eo qui tibi fecit injuriam, sed tantum dimittes. A comparison with Mark, xi. 25, Rev. ii. 4, 14, 20, confirms this to be the true meaning of ἔχειν τι κατὰ τινος.

² De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 10. Atque inde veniens, id est, intentionem revocans ad id quod agere cœperas, offers munus tuum.

bitterly thine obstinacy and thine implacable mind. But since counsels of a merely worldly prudence do not and cannot find place in our Lord's teaching, it is not to be wondered that Augustine does not even consider this literal explanation, but at once looks for a spiritual, and inquires, who is the adversary with whom we are bidden to be agreed. It cannot be, he observes, the devil, for however the term "adversary" (*ὁ ἀντίδικος*, cf. 1 Pet. v. 8) would suit with him, yet our part is not to consent with, but to proclaim and maintain eternal warfare with him.¹ Nor can it be the flesh, though that too is an adversary warring against the soul, for men are only too willing to consent with it, and the true course is not so to do, but rather to make it consent with us.² Nor can it, he affirms, be any fellow man whatever, for what power would such an one have to deliver us over to an eternal doom?³ Nor yet can the adversary be exactly God, though he too might well be termed the adversary of the sinner; since then the image would be disturbed, and God would be at the same time the accusing party and the judge before whom the two parties are going. Therefore, Augustine concludes, though this is not far from the truth, yet it will be better still to say that the adversary is the Law—an

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 11. Neque concordare cum illo expedit, cui semel renunciando, bellum indiximus, et quo victo coronabimur: neque consentire illi jam oportet, cui si nunquam consensissemus, nunquam in istas incidissemus miserias.

² Ibid. Qui eam servituti subjiiciunt, non ipsi ei consentiunt, sed eam sibi consentire cogunt.

³ Ibid. Quomodo iudici traditurus est, qui ante iudicem pariter exhibebitur?

adversary so long as for the past it condemns us, and for the present commands us one thing and we do and love another: and every step of our lives which we take with this adversary unreconciled, is a drawing nearer to the judgment and to a certain condemnation.¹ But when we love the thing which it commands, which in Christ we are enabled to do, and the righteousness of the law is fulfilled in us, then we are reconciled unto it. It is a law, indeed, still, but a law of liberty.² For the past also we are reconciled unto it, while through Christ Jesus and faith in his blood it has lost its accusing power. We have learned to accuse ourselves, and have thus taken from the law its desire of accusing us any more. And this is to be done "*quickly*," because we know not how soon for us the way may be ended, and we may find ourselves suddenly in the presence of the Judge.³

¹ Serm. ecli. c. 8. Quis est adversarius tuus? Sermo legis. Quæ est via? vita ista. Quomodo est ille adversarius? Dicit, Non mœchaberis, et tu vis mœchari. Dicit, Non concupiscas rem proximi tui; et tu vis rapere res alienas Quando vides quia ille sermo aliud jubet, et tu aliud facis, est adversarius tuus Compone dum es cum illo in viâ. Adest Deus qui vos concordet. Quomodo vos concordat Deus? Donando peccata et inspirando justitiam ut fiant opera bona. Cf. Serm. cix. c. 3, 4. Adversarius est voluntatis tuæ, donec fiat autor salutis tuæ Adversarius est nobis, quamdiu sumus et ipsi nobis. . . . Si cum eo consenseris, pro jndice invenies patrem, pro ministro sævo angelum tollentem in sinum Abrahæ, pro carcere paradisum. Cf. Serm. ix. c. 3, and Serm. ccclxxxvii.

² The redeemed man is not any more, according to Augustine's profound distinction (in Joh. Tract iii.), sub lege, but cum lege and in lege—not under the law, but yet neither ἀνομος, because ἔνομος Χριστῷ (1 Cor. ix. 21), because every loosing from the old is in its very nature an attaching to the new (Rom. vii. 1—4).

³ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 11.

Now it is most true, as he affirms, that the outraged law of God is the real "adversary," but yet that law is here contemplated, according to the whole connexion of the passage, as embodied and finding its representative in the brother who has something against us. And his objection to understanding by the adversary a fellow man at all—for how, he asks, could such have power to deliver us to the heavenly judgment?—is capable of an easy dilution. His appeals to the All-seeing and All-searching, against our continued enmity, our determined refusals to walk in love, will be, whether he desire them to be so or not, a delivering us to the judge, as again he will deliver us, by being compelled to appear against us and be our accuser at that day.¹

As regards the minor details of this parabolic saying, by the "*Judge*," he understand not the Father, but Christ, since "the Father judges no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son;"—by "*the officer*," an angel, since he will come with all his holy angels to judge both the quick and dead;—by the "*prison*," the outer darkness, the place of lost spirits; not purgatory, as the modern Romanists, who see in the words "*till thou has paid the uttermost farthing*," a limit defined, after which there would be deliverance from this prison. That such an interpretation was stirring in his time we learn from his own words. It was one that he would willingly have himself consented to, but that he found the Scriptures on the

¹ It is remarkable that Hilary had already anticipated this objection and difficulty, and answered it; *Adversario tradente nos iudici, quia manens in eum simultatis nostræ ira nos arguit.*

other side too clear and too strong. He asks with truth, How can any paying of this debt come to pass in that world where there is no place for amendment or repentance?¹ and finds in these words the expression of an everlasting doom.²

Ver. 27, 28.—Here Augustine makes an accurate distinction; that it is not, namely, the looking, out of which, unawares to the beholder, there arises up in his heart the suggestion of an unholy desire, which itself involves the sin, but the looking with the intention and purpose of thereby feeding desire;³ though indeed it is nothing but a practical Pelagianism, which would deny the concupiscence itself, whether willingly or unwillingly stirred, to be of the nature of sin. But it is not this of which Christ is here speaking—rather of the deliberate fomenting of desire through the fuel

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 11. Unde enim solvitur illud debitum, ubi jam non datur pœnitendi et correctius vivendi locus? And again, Semper solvit novissimum quadrantem, dum sempiternas pœnas terrenorum peccatorum luit.

² De Octo Dule. Quæst., qu. 1. Illud enim quod dicitur, quandoque, etsi post plurimum temporis, eos qui in catholicâ communionem moriuntur, quamvis usque in finem vitæ hujus flagitiosissimè et sceleratissimè vixerint, de pœnis ultricibus exituros familiaris meum tangit affectum. But he goes on to say, such passages as I Cor. vi. 9, 10, Ephes. v. 5, 6, are too strong on the other side.

³ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 12. Non dixit, Omnis qui concupiverit mulierem, sed qui viderit mulierem ad concupiscendum eam: id est, hoc fine et hoc animo attenderit, ut eam concupiscat. This distinction has been often overlooked; yet it is required by the words themselves. Πρὸς τὸ (eò ut) is not = εἰς τὸ (ita ut). In the first, which stands here, is involved not merely the event, but also the intention.

of impure looks: he that so doth, hath committed adultery in his heart already, and not he merely in whom sin is "finished" in act as well as in desire.

Ver. 29, 30—He questions whether this "*right eye*," which must be plucked out, and "*right hand*," which must be cut off, shall be understood generally of any thing that is eminently dear to us,¹ or whether we shall give them a more special signification. He determines for the latter, and will have the "*right eye*" to mean some beloved friend, our counsellor and guide in divine things, whom yet we must cast off if he would lead us into heresies and errors,² even as by the "*right hand*" is meant our active helper and minister in the same, whom in like manner, under the like circumstances, at every cost and pain to ourselves, we must reject and cut off. They are therefore called the *right eye* and the *right hand*, that is, those of most price and esteem, because they are guides and helpers in things of greatest moment, to wit, in things spiritual. And in this he notes that another consequence is included: for if even such as these must be cut off,

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 13. Quidquid namque est quod significat oculus, sine dubio tale est quod vehementer diligitur. Solet enim et ab iis qui vehementer volunt exprimere dilectionem suam, ita dici, Diligo eum ut oculos meos, aut etiam plus quàm oculos meos.

² Serm. lxxxii. He instances, as an example of what he means, our Lord's conduct with Peter, and his words to him, "Get thee behind me, Satan," (Matt. xvi. 23,) when he would have placed a stumbling block in his way, though of course it did not then come to the actual casting off, while the rebuke was there effectual to bring back Peter to his true position.

how much more the *left* eye and the *left* hand, the helpers not in spiritual but in wordly things, if they would put a stumbling block in our way.

The only objection to this interpretation is its narrowness: that it does not and cannot exhaust the meaning of the words: though it is important to hold fast what in it is involved, namely, that these are not sins, but *occasions of sin*, which are to be cut off without pity. Christ is not here telling us that our sinful lusts are to be cut off—that were of course;—but that what is harmless in itself, yea in its subordinate position useful and comely, and so likened to the hand and the eye, if through any peculiarity of our temperament or condition, it hinders the main work of our salvation, it is to be offered up to that, as the less to the greater, the part to the whole.

Ver. 31.—Here, too, the Manichæans found a contradiction between the teaching of Moses and of Christ; Moses giving facilities for divorce—“Whosoever will put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement;” but Christ throwing every hindrance in the way of it, declaring that marriage, “saving for the cause of fornication,” was indissoluble. It is true that in this they involved themselves in a contradiction which did not escape the keenness of the adversary with whom they had to do; since Moses, whom they spake against, was yet here, according to their own principles, worthiest of praise, in helping to dissolve the bands of an institution which they traced up to the devil,¹ which, as they affirmed, contributed to

¹ Con. Faust. l. xix. c. 26. Verumtamen . . . quæro cur displiceat

the detaining of the divine principle in a material prison. But soon leaving this, which was only by the way, Augustine answered triumphantly, that the legislation of Moses and of Christ, so far from being opposed to one another, were in fact both in the same line. When Moses said, "*Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement,*"¹ this was not spoken to encourage divorcees, but, on the contrary, to throw impediments in their way. A man could not at every light motion of caprice or anger dismiss his wife, but was thus compelled to have resort to a legal process, and to the Scribe, who alone could draw out the necessary instrument, and who might be assumed, from his position and education, to be a wise and a prudent man; able, therefore, and willing, if that were possible, to remove misunderstandings and offences, to knit again the bands of a broken love between the two parties; and who, only when every such attempt had failed, would give the bill of divorce which the husband required.² This

dimittere uxorem, quam non ad matrimonii fidem, sed ad concupiscentiæ crimen, habendum esse censetis? . . . Eo modo enim putatis partem Dei vestri . . . etiam carnis compedibus colligari.

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 14. Qui dimiserit, det illi libellum repudii: ut iracundiam temerariam projicientis uxorem libelli cogitatio temperaret. Qui ergo dimittendi moram quæsit, significavit quantum potuit duris hominibus se nolle disscidium.

² Con. Faust. l. xix. c. 26. Præsertim quia, ut perhibent apud Hebræos scribere literas Hebræas nulli fas erat nisi scribis solis. . . . Ad hos igitur quos oporteret esse prudentes legis interpretes et justos disscidii dissuasores, lex mittere voluit eum, quem jussit libellum repudii dare, si dimisisset uxorem. Non enim ei poterat scribi libellus, nisi ab ipsis qui per hanc occasionem ex necessitate venientem quodammodo in manus suas bono consilio regerent, atque inter ipsum et uxorem pacificè agendo dilectionem concordiamque suaderent.

much the law did; why it did not more the Lord himself tells us elsewhere; “Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives;”¹ but the legislation is in the same direction, the one a lower, the other a higher, witness for the sanctity of marriage; in each there was alike a declaration that the Lord “hateth putting away,” though he did not impose upon them who were yet living in the oldness of the letter, the higher precept, whose fuller blessings they only were capable of accepting, who were walking in the newness of the Spirit.

Ver. 32.—Is the sin, Augustine stops here to inquire, which the Lord recognizes as a justifying cause of divorce, to be taken in its literal sense, and to be confined to that only, or shall we rather receive it according to its wider spiritual significance, and by this “*fornication*” understand every graver sin which corrupts and defiles the soul, according to that usage of Scripture, which evermore speaks of all grievous departures of all kinds from God under this image of a wife breaking faith with her husband? His determination, in which however he departs from most of the Fathers of the Church, is in favour of the latter view.² Yet one cannot doubt that the literal is the true sense of the passage. For there is evidently no cogency in his

¹ Con. Faust. l. xix. c. 29.

² De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 16. Ex quo intelligitur quod propter illicitas concupiscentias, non tantum quæ in stupris . . . committantur, sed omnino quaslibet, quæ animam corpore malè utentem à lege Dei aberrare faciunt, et perniciosè turpiterque corrumpi, possit sine crimine et vir uxorem dimittere et uxor virum. Cf. c. 12, and Quæst. lxxxviii. qu. 83.

argument, that there are other sins of a deeper dye than this; and, therefore, if this justifies a separation, by so much the more will those. It is enough to reply that those other sins, if indeed they be graver, yet do not contradict the very idea of marriage, do not assail it at its very heart and centre; so little do they do so, that if only this faith be kept, marriage may exist as truly between the unregenerate as the faithful, the wicked as the godly, though of course it will not be the shadow of so great a mystery. Nor is it to be thought of that our Lord, uttering here, as he knew he was, a word which was to be in all ages as a sharp sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of relations the closest, would yet have left it in such vagueness and uncertainty, exposed to such cruel abuses, as it must needs be, if the literal meaning of the words were once abandoned, and that which is thus proposed taken in its stead.¹

But there is another question, in the matter of which the judgment of Augustine has certainly had a most powerful influence, first on the interpretation of the words of Scripture, and through this on the determinations of the Church;—I mean the lawfulness of the marriage of the innocent party, after separation on

¹ Augustine himself, in his *Retractations*, l. i. c. 19, acknowledges that the whole matter—*latebrosissima quæstio*, as he terms it—deserves to be considered anew, and though he does not withdraw, yet speaks with no confidence of, the decision to which he has arrived. *Sed quam velit Dominus intelligi fornicationem, propter quam liceat dimittere uxorem, utrum eam quæ damnatur in stupris, an illam de quâ dicitur, Perdidisti omnem qui fornicatur abs te (Ps. lxxii. 27), in quâ utique et ist. est, . . . etiam atque etiam cogitandum est atque requirendum.*

account of a breach of the marriage vow in the other party. The Church of Rome, which, as is well known, denies altogether this permission, has always very much appealed to his authority. And his weight is no doubt thrown very decidedly into this scale, though he does not profess to see his way with perfect clearness, and at the last¹ acknowledges how little satisfied he is with what he has done, and confesses the great difficulty and obscurity which hangs over the whole subject; an obscurity so great, that in another work, written late in his life, he says that he who shall take up and act on the erroneous interpretation cannot be said more than venially to err.²

His arguments that there can be no permission here of marriage in any case after divorce (the divorced party still living), are chiefly these. Such an interpretation of this passage cannot be the right one, for so it will be brought into contradiction with I Cor. vii. 10, 11, "Let not the wife depart from her husband. But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband." The steps of his argument are the following; Our Lord declares only one cause which will justify a wife departing from her husband, that is, his adultery. St. Paul therefore here could not have contemplated any other cause. Contemplating, then, as he must have done, this, he did

¹ *Retract. l. ii. c. 57.* Scripsi duos libros . . . cupiens solvere difficillimam quæstionem. Quod utrum enodatissimè fecerim nescio : immo verò non me pervenisse ad hujus rei perfectionem sentio.

² *De Fide et Oper. c. 19.* In ipsis divinis sententiis ita obscurum est utrum et iste, cui quidem sine dubio adulteram licet dimittere, adulter tamen habeatur si alteram duxerit, ut quantum existimo venialiter ibi quisque fallatur.

yet give the precept, "Let her remain unmarried," unless she be reconciled to him.¹

Those who maintain the opposite view have questioned whether St. Paul did not contemplate other grounds of separation, not as belonging indeed to the highest Christian state, in which it is clear they could not occur, but yet as not entirely inconsistent with a true Christian profession; and this provisional bearing with a more imperfect state of things, and this moderation in dealing with the perplexities which must have arisen from the first growing up of a Christian Church out of an heathen world, is part, they say, of the wonderful wisdom of the great Gentile apostle. But while he bears with such things, he yet declares at the same time the higher law; and with this toleration of separations, will yet in no case allow an infringement of the precept of the Lord's, which forbids divorces on all lower grounds, and so forbids a new marriage upon either side, saving on this one cause. But this view is altogether strange to Augustine. When he is pressed, as he is by Pollentius, whom he answers at length, with the Lord's own words here, and at Matt. xix. 9, he forsakes the canon² which he has himself elsewhere laid down, namely, that the shorter and more incomplete passage is to receive the law of its interpretation from the longer and fuller, and proceeding exactly on the opposite principle, he finds the limitation of these passages in St. Matthew in the parallel ones of Mark

¹ De Conjug. Adulter. l. i. c. 1—7.

² Pauciora exponi debent secundum plura, et regula generalis per exceptionem alibi traditam est limitanda.

(x. 11), and Luke (xvi. 18).¹ And then, to bring these sayings into agreement with those, he has recourse to this scheme, certainly an artificial one, namely, that our Lord means by the exception, “saving for the cause of fornication,” that it would be a *greater* sin to dismiss her without this provocation, not that it would be *no* sin to do it with this provocation, and to marry another; for, he says, the Lord affirmed it would be adultery in either case, only in one of a worse kind than in the other.²

Another argument which Augustine finds against understanding the words as involving such a permission, is that so a reconciliation with the guilty party becomes impossible, while yet he believes that under the new covenant of grace such ought to find place, arguing, that as God receives back the souls that have departed from him, and defiled themselves, if only penitent and believing, into union with him, this should be the pattern and example for his people—there should not be a greater severity and remembrance of sin on man’s part—there should not be in any case a casting

¹ De Conjug. Adult. l. i. c. 11, 22. Quod subobscurè apud Matthæum positum est, quoniam totum à parte significatum est, expositum est apud alios, qui totum generaliter expresserunt, sicut legitur apud Marcum (x. 11); et apud Lucam (xvi. 18).

² De Conjug. Adult. l. i. c. 9. Cur ergo, inquis, interposuit Dominus causam fornicationis, et non potius generaliter ait, Quicumque dimiserit uxorem suam et aliam duxerit, mœchatur? Credo, quia illud quod majus est, hoc Dominus commemorare voluit. Majus enim adulterium esse quis negat, uxore non fornicante dimissâ alteram ducere, quàm si fornicantem quisque dimiserit, et tunc alteram duxerit? Non quia et hoc adulterium non est, sed quia minus est.

off for ever.¹ But the analogy does not hold good,—he should have taken the sins not merely which are inconsistent with, but that which directly contradicts, the idea of the relations between God and man, and shown that there is forgiveness for that. Now there is only one such sin, and that we know is irremissible, the sin against the Holy Ghost. If there is to be an argument from this analogy, here and here only would it be fairly drawn. Other blemishes in the conduct of the married, one to another, as unkindness, disturb the relation, but do not, as does this sin, contradict and deny its fundamental idea. Moreover, one cannot help feeling, that while this recommendation, that the innocent party should receive back the guilty, *may* spring from a deep sense of the forgiveness which sinners, who have themselves been forgiven, should extend one to another, yet most often it does spring from a poor view of marriage, from a shallow sense of the reality of the wrong that has been done, of the sanctity that has been violated.

Ver. 33—37.—This prohibition, apparently absolute, of all swearing, perplexed Augustine a good deal, and this he takes occasion more than once to confess.²

¹ De Conjug. Adult. l. ii. c. 6. Hæc crimina in Vetere Dei Lege nullis sacrificiis mundabantur, quæ Novi Testamenti sanguine sine dubitatione mundantur; et ideo tunc omnimodo prohibitum est ab alio contaminatam viro recipere uxorem . . . Nunc autem postea quam Christus ait adulteræ, Nec ego te damnabo, vade, deinceps noli peccare; quis non intelligat debere ignoscere maritum, quod videt ignovisse Dominum amborum.

² Serm. clxxx. c. 4. Scio difficilem questionem, et caritati vestræ fateor, semper illam vitavi.

He feels that the prohibition cannot be thus absolute as it seems; that the oath, or calling of God to be a witness of the truth, or if falsehood be spoken, to be an avenger of it, cannot in itself be sinful, since rather it is a religious act, for it is a testimony of a belief in a righteous and living God. Moreover he finds that God himself swears;¹ as Ps. cix. 4; Gen. xxii. 16; Num. xiv. 28.² So, too, many of his servants, in some of the holiest moments of their lives; thus St. Paul, (Rom. i. 9; 1 Cor. xv. 31; 2 Cor. i. 23; Gal. i. 20): and these cannot be transgressions of theirs.³ He himself, when he found that an oath would give strength to the words which he spoke, and charity made him greatly to desire that they should be implicitly received, was in the habit of confirming them by an appeal to the present and all-seeing God;⁴ and though, as he says, he did this ever with a solemn awe, yet his moral sense told him he was not herein sinning.

But what then does our Lord mean by the "*Swear*"

¹ But in one place, Enarr. in Ps. lxxxviii, he denies that this is in point, saying, Deus solus securus jurat, quia falli non potest. But since the perjury is in the intention, not in the mere sounds that proceed from the lips, the man who does not wish to deceive might in this respect just as securely swear as God, who is not able to be deceived.

² He might have added the *σὺ εἴπας* of our Lord, (Matt. xxvi. 64), which is in the strictest sense an oath; while according to the Hebrew manner, it was the proposer, and not the taker of the oath, who repeated its words.

³ De Mendac. c. 15. Præcepti violati reum Paulum, præsertim in Epistolis conscriptis atque editis ad spiritalem vitam salutemque populorum, nefas est dicere.

⁴ Serm. clxxx. c. 9.

not at all?" He is often content to answer, that it is a counsel of prudence. He who swears often *may* escape falling into perjury, but he who swears never cannot fall into it; as you may be delivered from falling over a precipice, even though you walk on its very edge, but you must escape if you put an ample space between you and it.¹

It is not wonderful that Augustine should feel himself little content with a reply such as this, which indeed could satisfy nobody. But surely this would be something of a truer point of view from which to contemplate the words of our Lord,—a view, as will be seen by the two or three next quotations, not altogether strange to Augustine, though he has not wrought it consistently out. There were, we know, whole worlds of mischief at work among his hearers and contemporaries with regard to oaths; as first, that some were more binding than others; that those made to the Lord must indeed be performed, but those by the altar and the gift on the altar, by the temple and the gold in the temple, did indeed some oblige, while others were nugatory; and the blind leaders of the blind, the spiritual rulers of the people, had made a scale of the obligations of these oaths on the consciences of men. (Matt. xxiii. 16—22.) Then, too, men had learned to think that if only God's name were avoided, there was no irreverence in the frequent oaths by heaven, by the earth, by Jerusalem, by their own heads—and these brought in on the slightest need, or on no need at all;

¹ Serm. clxxx. Cf. De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 17. Sicut enim falsum loqui non potest, qui non loquitur; sic pejerare non potest, qui non jurat.

just as now-a-days the same lingering half-respect for the Holy Name will often cause men, who would not be wholly profane, to substitute for that Name sounds that nearly resemble, but are not exactly it,—or the name, it may be, of some heathen deity.

Our Lord, then, with all this before his eyes, addresses that listening crowd, not abolishing, but here too filling out the commandment given by Moses. You have heard long ago the sanctity of the judicial oath, and that taken upon solemn occasions, and in the express name of God. Moses forbade all rash and all false swearing by that awful Name. But I forbid light, irreverent adjurations of every kind, and at every time,—adjurations so lightly spoken and so lightly broken. I banish them altogether, and from every region of your life.¹ The “at all” which perplexes Augustine so much, and has perplexed so many, is doubtless to be interpreted and limited by what immediately follows. *All these kinds of oaths*, which I specify, are forbidden you. You do not, by using them, really avoid taking God’s name in vain. For why have these oaths any thing binding? It is God’s presence in these created things which gives them any hold over your consciences. If you swear by heaven, you have not escaped the swearing by his Name, for heaven is his throne—if by the earth, it is his footstool—by Jerusalem, it is the city of the great King—if by your head, as supposing that there at least you are

¹ Serm. clxxx. c. 10. *Istam ergo consuetudinem quotidianam, crebram, sine causâ, nullo extorquente, nullo de tuis verbis dubitante, jurandi, avertite à vobis, amputate à linguis vestris, circumcidite ab ore vestro.*

swearing by something which is your own, yet it is not so; that is God's workmanship, you could not of your own power make one hair of it black or white.¹ So that every oath is an awful thing, and in its ultimate ground rests upon God, though the lightness and frivolity of men causes them willingly to conceal this fact from their eyes.

And then he opens to them the deep mystery of the oath, that it is a consequence of sin, not itself evil, but "*of evil*;"² so that in the highest idea of intercourse, as between unfallen beings, angels with angels, it could find no place: it would be utterly inconceivable. Only where the tree of life has been forsaken for the mournful yet wondrous teaching of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, only where the lie has come out, could there be any word for the truth. Were all speech the exact out-coming of the inner life, there could be no form of speech which would carry greater assurance than any other. He that demands an oath recognizes the untruthfulness of man; he does not indeed affirm that he of whom he demands it would now speak falsehood without it, but that there is in him, and in himself, and in every man, that which, but for the ever newly awakened sense of his standing in the presence

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 17. Quid enim poterat quisque magis ad se pertinere arbitrari quàm caput suum. Sed quomodo nostrum est, ubi potestatem faciendi unius capilli albi aut nigri non habemus?

² De Mendacio, c. 18. A malo alterius, cui non aliter videtur persuaderi posse quod dicitur, nisi jurando fides fiat, aut ab illo malo nostro, quod hujus mortalitates adhuc pellibus involuti cor nostrum non valemus ostendere: quod utique si valeremus, juratione opus non esset.

of God, the all-seeing and the all-avenging, would lead him to untruth: that nothing but God, and the awful sense of God's presence among them, can keep men true; so that in this respect the oath is a deeply religious act, a confession that God is true, and only in God can man be other than a liar. Yet not the less it "cometh of evil," while men ought not to need, and but for their first great departure from God would not need, thus continually to be brought back into his presence, in which presence they ought continually to dwell. And the oath disappears wherever there is any near approximation to this. The true ideal of Christian conversation, that to which the Church is continually striving, that to which multitudes of God's saints have already arrived in all their intercourse one with another, is that in which the oath *has* become superfluous, in which the Yea and Nay are all that are ever offered and asked, while there is entire confidence that each is always speaking as though God were hearing him. To this sincerity, this entire truthfulness of conversation one with another, the Lord would have his disciples strive, and to this attain. Let guile and deceit cease from among you, and the oath will cease also; for it is of your evil, and only that renders it so frequently offered, and so frequently demanded.

Ver. 38.—Here is again the apparent difficulty of harmonizing the new and old: the semblance, as though Christ did not intend to do so, did not mean to put his legislation in connection with, but rather in opposition to, the legislation of Moses; and with this difficulty, the temptation to forsake the true explanation for the

easy one—for that, I mean, which seems easy at first, but which yet presently will involve him that snatches at it in infinite perplexities and contradictions. Augustine's dispute with the Manichæans must have brought him early into the consciousness of this. They, of course, gladly seized on this passage¹ as another proof of the manner in which Christ sought to disassociate and disconnect his teaching from the teaching of the Old Testament; as if he were here saying, They of old time taught one thing, but I teach another; they encouraged retaliation, but I denounce it: and in its place require the extreme forgiveness of injuries. But the true explanation is, that the different precepts belong to different domains of man's life; and Christ is bringing the inner domain of man's life under *his* law, while Moses had been satisfied with bringing the outward under the dominion of his. But that outward is not abolished in one jot or tittle of it, by the new law of love. It is still "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth;" not always in this form exactly, but the spirit of all law which is exercised in a Christian state is retributive and avenging, and approximating more or less to this. Neither does it herein sink or obscure its character as a Christian state, but rather asserts it the more. The civil magistrate is a revenger to execute justice. God has appointed him to be such; and without such a witness, all idea of righteousness and of judgment would perish from the world.

Moreover, as Augustine observes,² it is monstrous

¹ See Con. Adim. c. 8.

² Con. Faust. l. xix. c. 25. Quandoquidem et illud antiquum ad reprimendas flammæ odiorum, sævientiumque immoderatos ani-

to speak of this precept, “an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth,” as fostering revenge, that is, private animosity and hate. For, he asks, is the natural man, is the enraged savage, satisfied with inflicting on his foe as much as he has suffered? No; his desire is ever to inflict *more*; to give two, or twenty it may be, for the one which he has received; thus again disturbing the balance of equity, though in the other scale,—and so himself losing, and causing his adversary, under the sense of an unmerited amount of injury, to lose the sense of a righteous government in the world, under which every transgression of law will recoil on the transgressor, and receive its just recompence of reward. But this law, which took the execution of the vengeance out of the hands of the man who might be tempted to mar it by overdoing it, or doing it in hatred and personal enmity, was not a fostering, but a limiting, and in its measure subduing, the evil of man’s heart. It did not indeed implant

mos refrenandos, ita præceptum est. Quis enim tantundem facillè contentus est reponere vindictæ, quantum accepit injuriæ? Nonne videmus homines leviter læsos moliri cædem, sitire sanguinem, vixque invenire in malis inimici unde satientur? Quis pugno percussus non aut judicia concitat in damnationem ejus qui percusserit, aut si ipse repercutere velit, totum hominem, si non etiam telo aliquo arrepto, pugnis calcibusque contundit? Huic igitur immoderatæ ac per hoc injustæ ultioni, lex justum modum figens, pœnam talionis instituit: hoc est, ut qualem quisque intulit injuriam, tale supplicium pendant. Proinde, Oculum pro oculo, dentem pro dente, non fomes sed limes furoris est; non ut id quod sopitum erat, inde accenderetur, sed ne id quod ardebat, ultrà extenderetur, impositus. Est enim quædam justa vindicta, justèque debetur ei qui fuerit passus injuriam: unde utique cùm ignoscimus, de nostro quodammodo jure largimur. Cf. De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 19.

there a principle of love, nor yet certainly secure that they who availed themselves of it should be pure from all motives of private hate, and inspired only by a zeal for God's outraged justice, and a desire to make an offending brother recognize the law against which he had been sinning. But still (as a preparation at least) it was working in this line, until a higher Lawgiver should come, and teach that besides this law of righteousness, there was a law of love which he would write in the hearts of his people, and which would teach them that where only selfish interests were perilled, every thing was to be forgiven, every thing to be forgone;—even as this law of love would teach them the harder lesson yet of carrying out, where need was, the justice at once retributive and corrective, of God,¹ and this, without the slightest feeling that herein they were suspending the law of love, or rendering to the man evil for his evil, but rather still good for his evil, while it is justice for his injustice, right for his wrong. Truly a hard thing to do aright, but yet not impossible.

Ver. 39.—This command to “*resist not evil*,” and the others of like import which are scattered

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 20. Neque hic ea vindicta prohibetur, quæ ad correctionem valet: etiam ipsa enim pertinet ad misericordiam . . . Sed huic vindictæ referendæ non est idoneus, nisi qui odium quo solent flagrare qui se vindicare desiderant, dilectionis magnitudine superaverit. Enarr. in Ps. cviii. 5. [Deus] autem etiam cùm vindicat, non reddit malum pro malo, quoniam justum reddit injusto. Quod autem justum est, utique bonum est. Punit ergo non delectatione alienæ miseræ, quod est, malum pro malo; sed dilectione justitiæ, quod est, bonum pro malo.

through the Gospels, but which lie the closest in this discourse, are open to abuse upon two sides. There is, first, the abuse of the Quaker, who demands that there should be throughout a cleaving to the letter, and who affirms that it is nothing but cowardice and a shrinking from the strictness of Christ's law, which prevents these precepts of his from being literally obeyed. Augustine meets this assertion, first historically, showing that neither did the Lord himself, nor yet his apostles, whom yet all must accept as the most authoritative interpreters of the word spoken, hold themselves bound in every case to the letter of these commandments. For instance, when one of the officers struck Jesus with the palm of his hand, our blessed Lord did not offer himself to be stricken again, but firmly, though mildly, rebuked the smiter (John, xviii. 22, 23). And St. Paul spake yet a sterner word to that judge who unrighteously bade him to be stricken—"God shall smite *thee*, thou whited wall" (Acts, xxiii. 3).¹ Then, further, he refutes this interpretation by showing how such a cleaving to the letter of this and the following precepts, will continually issue in a violation of the spirit of Christ's commandments. Thus, in the case of that man that struck him, to have offered him the other check, would have been no love, while it would have been a tempting him to repeat his fearful offence. Again, it is said, "Give to every man that asketh of thee" (Luke, vi. 30): shall I give therefore an open knife to an infant,—a drawn sword to a madman or a murderer,—money to him who, as I well know, will surely spend it in riot

¹ De Mendacio, c. 15. De Serm. Dom, in Mon. l. i. c. 19.

and debauchery? “Resist not evil;” therefore the merciless and the destroyers are to be allowed to tread the world under their feet, and thou art to do nothing to stay them?

No: it is clear, he says, that our Lord is here giving laws for the inward spirit of man.¹ This offering the other cheek is an inward thing, is the meekness of the spirit under wrong, the preparedness of heart to bear as much or more, if so any good may come to the injurious person. But the man’s Christian love and prudence are in each case to decide whether it is also a precept for his outward conduct. It may be so, it will often be so; for instance, if thou thinkest that thy offending brother will be won by thy Christian patience, and his evil overcome by this exhibition of thy good, then it will be thy duty, if he has done thee one wrong, to lay thyself open to a second outrage: if thou hopest thus to teach him the worthlessness of the things after which he is striving, to let him spoil thee again.²

¹ Ep. 138, c. 2, (ad Marcell.) Denique ista præcepta magis ad præparationem cordis, quæ intus est, pertinere, quàm ad opus quod in aperto fit; ut teneatur in secreto animi patientia cum benevolentia, in manifesto autem id fiat quod eis videtur prodesse posse, quibus bene velle debemus, hinc liquidò ostenditur, quod ipse Dominus Jesus, exemplum singulare patientiæ, cùm percuteretur in faciem, respondit, Si malè dixi, exprobra de malo: si autem benè, quid me cædis? Nequaquam igitur præceptum suum, si verba intueamur, implevit . . . et tamen paratus venerat, non solùm in faciem percuti, verùm etiam pro his quoque à quibus hæc patiebatur crucifixus occidi, pro quibus ait in cruce pendens, Pater, ignosce illis, quia nesciunt quid faciant.

² Ep. 138, c. 2. Qui ergo vincit bono malum, patienter amittit temporalia commoda, ut doceat quàm pro fide atque justitiâ contemnenda sint, quæ ille nimis amando fit malus.

Deal with him as a prudent keeper will sometimes deal with a madman in his charge, giving way to and humouring him in part; or as a compassionate physician, that contradicts not his patient in the delirium of his fever.¹ But if thou countest that his evil will grow with its impunity, that he will strengthen himself in his sin and therefore in his misery, through thy forbearance, then it is thy duty to turn to him thy love on its severer side, to repress the outcomings of his evil,² though it will be the same love that dictates this conduct or the other. Thus in a state which is really Christian, war itself will be no violation of charity, but will be carried on in the spirit of love, that those against whom it is waged may not be allowed to make miserable themselves and others, that henceforth it may be more happily consulted for them, than they would else have consented to consult for themselves.³

From all this it will appear, that while Augustine shows that the literal, or what calls itself the literal, scheme of interpretation, is not to be painfully cleaved to, yet it is not because this is too high, too loving, and too large, but because it oftentimes would not be high, or large, or loving enough. Thus, for instance, a

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 19.

² Ep. 138, c. 2. Cui licentia iniquitatis eripitur, utiliter vincitur: quoniam nihil est infelicius felicitate peccantium, quâ pœnalis nutritur impunitas, et mala voluntas velut hostis interior roboratur. And De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 20. Posse peccatum amore potius vindicari, quàm impunitum relinqui.

³ Ep. 138, c. 2, (ad Marcell.) Si terrena ista respublica præcepta Christiana custodiat, et ipsa bella sine benevolentia non gerentur, ut ad pietatis justitiæque pacatam societatem victis facilius consulatur.

sparing might oftentimes be no true mercy, nor grow out of any root of love, but might only be an indulgence of our own indolence, or sloth, or cowardice.¹ So that in so doing he in no way favours but goes directly against the glosses which the world makes on these sayings of our Saviour's, and which it willingly believes to be the only alternatives, if the literal application be forsaken. What the world says, or, when it dare not say, what it thinks in its heart, is very nearly as follows:—All this is very fine morality, only it is unhappily superfine, and quite unfit for everyday work and wear,—evidently pitched at too high a key for practical use; it must be taken down a little before it will actually serve the needs of men. It could never be meant that we are to be so meek, so forgiving, so ready to impart as this; that were only to make ourselves a prey. These are extreme sayings. It will be enough, if we make some approximation, nearer or more remote, to the conduct here enjoined.—But no: it is not thus: the commands are to stand fast evermore in their breadth and fulness: only love and the Spirit of God are in each case to be their interpreters, to apply them to the emergent necessity. Where these are wanting, the precept must be interpreted falsely: if in the letter, it will be in a loveless form; or, if that

¹ Ep. 153, (ad Macedon.) Plurimum interest quo animo quisque parcat. Sicut enim est aliquando misericordia puniens, ita et crudelitas parcens. And he proceeds to give examples of this. Cf. Con. Petil. l. ii. c. 67. Sicut est plerumque crudelis fallax adulatio, sic semper misericors justa correptio. Cf. in 1 Ep. Joh. Tract. vii. With a play on the words, which yet is much more than a mere play, he says the *severitas* Dei is but indeed the *sæva veritas* Dei.

be forsaken, there will be a sinning against the letter and the spirit alike.

Ver. 40, 41.—These verses Augustine brings into comparison with the precept of St. Paul, “redeeming the time, because the days are evil,” (Ephes. v. 16,) that is, as he understands it, purchasing time, with all its precious advantages, at the cost of meaner things. Give up those meaner things, even though they be thine by right; give thy coat, and thy cloak too, rather than lose thy time, time given thee for working out thy salvation, in too eagerly seeking to regain them.¹ To enter into the meaning of that very difficult passage would be alien to our present purpose; yet it is generally agreed that this is not exactly its meaning, and so that there is no true parallel here. That may be, and indeed certainly is, a counsel of Christian *prudence*, but this is otherwise. Christ, in the form of an outward precept, is giving a law for the inward spirit of a Christian man, and one, as Augustine has himself so often and so distinctly declared, to be, or not to be, carried out by him in the letter according to the varying necessities of the brother that may sin against him. It may be thou canst teach him an higher lesson by letting him have the thing he is unduly snatching at. Let him have it then: count his soul more precious than thy worldly goods. But this does not exclude the other dealing of love. It may be what now he most needs to learn is, that unrighteous-

¹ Serm. clxvii. c. 4. *Judicio vult tecum contendere, . . . vult avocare te litibus à Deo tuo. . . . Quantùm ergo melius est ut nummum amittas et tempus redimas.*

ness is not to carry the day unreprieved even in this present evil time, that the way of the transgressors is hard. Then thou art bound by the same law of love to resist him, and to make him feel that there is a divine order, even in the midst of this sinful world; an order which he cannot break through at will, which, though it looks so weak, is indeed mighty,—which if he violate, it will surely assert and avenge itself. For, as God dealt with men by Law and by Gospel, and the same love was in each, as the Law punished and the Gospel forgave, each for the bringing about an end beyond themselves, and the same end, even the righteousness of the sinner, though they sought it by different ways, so will there be counterparts of both in the wise and loving conduct of a Christian man toward his offending brother.¹

Exactly so, too, will it be in a Christian state. While the judge, indeed, is the representative but of one side of the divine character—of the divine justice, he does not pardon, but only acquit or condemn. The king, however, is a larger mirror of the divine perfections, of grace no less than of justice: he, therefore, after the condemnation, is free to pardon. Yet the idea on which this pardon rests is, that it will bring about in him that is the object of it a truer righteousness than the payment of the extreme penalty would have done, that there is something in him which

¹ In this matter it is not possible beforehand to give any other rule than that which Augustine himself gives, when he says, *Dilige et fac quod voles*. The everlasting law is, that thou render good for thy brother's evil: the shape in which thou shalt render it, love, which means not however merely the unwillingness to inflict present pain, shall prescribe.

promises that the end which punishment was to reach will more surely be attained by the method of grace. Were it otherwise, the true love would be to suffer the punishment to take its course. So that here, too, justice and grace appear as identical, as love, manifesting itself now at its one pole, now at the other. It is true, indeed, that the grace comes out less frequently in the Christian State than in the Christian Church, that there it is ever the exception; for the State stands in many respects in relation to the Church, as the legal economy to the evangelical, an outer court of the same temple. And, as in that earlier economy, the side of grace came out less prominently than that of severe justice, so is it in the State also, which yet knows, as that knew, of the one no less than the other.¹

Ver. 42.—Hitherto, Augustine observes, it has been the more negative virtues of not injuring, and being patient under the injuries of others, which the Lord has urged on his disciples. But this were little, unless the more active and communicative graces were added also; and so follows the precept, “*Give to him that asketh thee.*” But can this, he inquires, mean, that no request is ever to be denied? Was Joseph, then, to give to the wife of Potiphar what she asked? or Susannah to the Jewish elders? Shall I give money to a man to help him in oppressing the innocent? or

¹ A long letter of Augustine’s to a civil ruler, (Ep. 153, ad Macedon.,) justifying the Church in its frequent pleadings for the pardon of criminals, is full of matter of the deepest interest on these relations of Church and State, and of the love whereof punishment no less than pardon is, according to its true idea, the utterance.

which I know that he will spend upon his sinful lusts?¹ It is plain that a thousand other monstrous cases of the kind might be cited, down to that of the Carpocratians, who justified indulgence in all fleshly lusts by these words, saying, Whatever the flesh asked, they were bound to give to it.

It is clear, then, the words must have their limitation somewhere. Augustine finds the limitation not from without, but in the words themselves,—Give to every man; but not every thing.² If you send an unworthy beggar away with a lecture upon idleness, you have sent him not empty away. You have given to him, although not the very thing which he required. Here, too, he observes, we have the Lord's own interpretation of his words. When that suitor cried to him from the crowd, "Master, speak to my brother, that he divide the inheritance with me;" and the Lord made answer, "Man, who made me a judge or a divider over you?"—might it not appear that he forgot his own precept, refusing even this easily granted request which was made him? But it was not so; he gave the man, not indeed what he asked, but something far better, a medicine for the hurt of his soul, saying to him, or at least for him, "Take heed and beware of covetousness."³ So, too, Joseph gave, but it was a counsel of chastity; for when he made answer,

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 20.

² Serm. ccclix. *Omni petenti te da. Non est dictum, Omnia petenti te da: Prorsus da; et si non quod petit, tu tamen aliquid da: malum petit, tu bona da.*

³ Serm. ccclix. *Non dedit Dominus hoc, nec tamen nihil dedit. Minus negavit, sed quod plus est donavit. . . Ergo hanc regulam tenete. Date quando petimini, et si non hoc quod petimini. Hoc*

How shall I, a servant, betray the confidence of my lord? (Gen. xxxix. 8, 9,) in that was involved much more an exhortation to her, How wilt thou, a wife, betray the yet higher confidence of thine husband? The precept, then, "Give," as interpreted by the life of him who uttered it, is ever to stand fast, but it is, Give that which will make the receiver truly richer; and often in this sense a seeming denial will be the most real giving; as on the other side there are gifts which are no gifts, ("All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me,") gifts which it were far better never to have received. He who gives these does not really give; and while he seems to be keeping the letter of this, is indeed breaking the spirit of all Christ's commandments.

So much concerning the spirit in which this precept is to be obeyed,—on the details Augustine does not yield us much; yet he notes how the Lord has instanced, as examples of the things whereof a Christian man shall patiently, where need is, endure the loss, some that are most necessary, the cloak and the coat, that so he may by implication involve all others; for if these, how much more readily the superfluous, shall be forgone.¹

Ver. 43—45.—Here also Augustine has seized with a firm grasp that which can alone be the right interpretation of these verses. In respect of those words,

fecit Dominus. Petebat ille. Quid? Divisionem hæreditatis. Dedit Dominus. Quid? Peremptionem cupiditatis . . . Nunquid petitozem inanem dimisit, et non potius veritate implevit?

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 19. Si enim de necessariis hoc imperatum est, quantò magis superflua contemnere convenit?

“*Thou shalt hate thine enemy,*” he does not, to withdraw the passage from Manichaean calumnies, betake himself to the poor evasion, that because the exact words are not found in their letter in the Old Testament, therefore the Lord is here pointing not at an Old Testament precept, but at a Pharisaical abuse of such, to some addition of the Scribes, falsely made. Be the words in the Old Testament or no, they express the spirit of it; and no one need shrink from allowing this, if only he will keep in mind that they were addressed to Israel solely as the theocratic people, as having therefore no enemies but the same who were God’s enemies,¹—hating them therefore only as God hates them,—hating, that is, the evil in them, and not hating any thing besides. The precept was no concession to man’s weakness,² but a summons to holiness, to a keeping themselves unspotted from the world

¹ Con. Faust. l. xix. c. 24. Unusquisque iniquus homo, in quantum iniquus est, odio habendus est; in quantum autem homo est, diligendus est; ut illud quod in eo rectè odimus arguamus, id est, vitium, quo possit illud quod in eo rectè diligimus, id est, humana natura ipsa, emendato vitio, liberari. . . . Audito igitur et non intellecto quod antiquis dictum erat, Oderis inimicum tuum, ferebantur homines in hominis odium, cùm deberent non odisse nisi vitium. Hos corrigit Dominus, dicendo, Diligite inimicos vestros, ut, qui jam dixerat, Non veni legem solvere, sed adimplere, ideoque de odio inimici quod scriptum est in lege, non solveret, præcipiendo utique ut diligamus inimicos, cogeret nos intelligere quonam modo possemus unum eundemque hominem et odisse propter culpam, et diligere propter naturam.

² Even Augustine himself does not always hold fast to this the one right exposition; as, for instance, when, De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 21, he says, Nec quod in lege dictum est, Oderis inimicum tuum, vox jubentis justo accipienda est, sed permittentis infirmo.

that surrounded them. Let us understand this, and then we shall see that Christ does not intend to repeal this more than any of the preceding commandments of Moses. "Thou shalt hate thine enemy" still stands firm,—*thine* enemy, because God's enemy; there shall be in thee the abhorrence of evil, the holy hatred of sin; though now he adds out of the rich treasure-house of his grace another power, even that of loving at the same time the man, while hating the evil that is in him;—so shalt thou be as the physician, loving the sick man, yet hating and warring with the sickness.¹

He often takes occasion to remark how side by side with these passages,—which they who misunderstood them, wilfully or otherwise, would have to countenance revenge, to encourage hatred,—there were multitudes of passages even in the Old Testament (dawn-streaks of the coming day) breathing the spirit of these new precepts of Christ; however the strength to fulfil them may have been for the most wanting till he came to give it.² Thus he compares with the restraint upon anger (Matt. v. xxii.), the words at Prov. xvi. 34. The adultery of the heart (Matt. v. 28) is equally met, and forbidden in the Old Testament, which has not merely its seventh, but its tenth commandment,—“Thou shalt not *covet* thy neighbour's wife.” The love of enemies is enjoined, Prov. xxv. 21; he elsewhere adds, by example also, as in the cases of Joseph,

¹ Serm. cclxxii. (Appendix.) Quod cum sancto et pio animo feceris, vices cœlestis Medici agis, odio habens morbum, et diligens ægrotum.

² Con. Faust. l. xix. c. 28—30. Omnia vel pæne omnia, quæ monuit seu præcepit ubi adjungebat, Ego autem dico vobis, inveniuntur et in illis veteribus libris.

of David (1 Sam. xxiv. 5; Ps. vii. 4), in the law, too, itself, where it is written, "If thou meet thine enemy's ox or his ass going astray, thou shalt surely bring it back to him again." (Exod. xxiii. 4, 5.) The ground of this love being the goodness of God to all, has its parallel, Wisd. xii. 1. The indissolubility of marriage is declared, Gen. ii. 24, of which words we know the use which was made by the Lord himself (Matt. xix. 4). When the Manichæans seized upon sayings like these, "He maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good," and argued from thence that he who said this, or he of whom this was said, could never be the same God whose severity in word and act came so fearfully out in the Old Testament, Augustine answers, that as the Old Testament is not without its frequent declarations of God's inexhaustible mercy, his patience, his love, so neither is the New without its abundant declarations and instances of his severity and his anger; he quotes in evidence, Matt. x. 28; xxii. 13; xxv. 41; Rom. i. 24; ii. 5; Heb. xii. 29; Luke, xix. 27; 2 Cor. v. 3; Acts, v. 5.¹ It was true that there was more of fear in the Old Testament, and more of love in the New, yet was there each in either; and it was only by a directing attention exclusively to the one side or the other that they could be thus played off against each other.²

¹ Con. Adim. c. 7. Ex quo faciliè apparet et in eâ patientiâ quæ invitât ad pœnitentiâ, et in eâ indulgentiâ, quæ ignoscit pœnitentibus; et in eâ justitiâ quæ punit eos qui corrigi nolunt, utrumque Testamentum convenire atque congruere, tanquam ab uno Deo utrumque conscriptum. Cf. Con. Adv. Leg. et Proph. l. i. c. 16—18.

² Con. Adv. Leg. et Proph. l. i. c. 17. Vaniloqui et mentis

His homilies and discourses are filled with earnest practical applications of passages like the present. Dost thou find it hard to obey this precept of loving thine enemies; and when thy Lord is proposed to thee for an example of this, who made of the blood which his murderers shed an healing salve for those murderers themselves, dost thou answer in thine heart that he was God, but thou art only a man? Look, then, at a man like thyself, at one with the same passions; look at Stephen, not thy Lord, but thy fellow servant, with no other helps save what thou hast, and listen to him praying for his murderers, "Lord, lay not this sin to their charge;"¹ and see in that case the fruit of thus obeying the command, "Pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you." To that prayer of Stephen, Paul's conversion was most probably the answer²—even his, who could not be satisfied with having a single hand in the martyr's death, but who kept the garments of all that stoned him, rendering them apt for their bloody work, and so may be said himself to have stoned him by the hands of all. Pray, then, against the sinner, but pray for the

seductores adversantes litteris sacris, quas intelligere nolunt, eligunt ex eis aspera quæ ibi leguntur ad commendandam severitatem Dei, et de litteris Evangelicis atque Apostolicis lenia quæ ibi leguntur ad commendandam bonitatem Dei; et apud homines imperitos hinc ingerunt horrorem, inde quærunt favorem; quasi difficile sit, ut quisquam similiter blasphemus atque impius, eo modo adversetur Novo Testamento, quo isti Veteri, carpens de Vetere quibus ibi commendatur Dei bonitas, et è contrariò de Novo quibus ibi commendatur Dei severitas.

¹ Serm. clxxxiii. c. 3.

² Ibid. c. 4. Omnium vestimenta servabat, et tanquam manibus omnium lapidabat.

man; pray against what Satan has made of the man, but pray for the man that God made. Hate that, but love this.

Augustine is perplexed by some examples in Scripture that seem to go counter to this. How, for instance, shall we understand Rev. vi. 9, where the souls under the altar exclaim, "How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" But who, he concludes, shall presume to say that this is not a prayer against the kingdom of sin, under which they suffered such things; and which kingdom the very charity which now is theirs, makes them so to desire and pray that it may be overthrown?¹ And, again, there are St. Paul's words, (Rom. xii. 20,) "In so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire on his head;" which at first sight, and as some have interpreted them,² seem to contain rather the precepts of a subtler hatred than of purest love. The image has been explained thus: Do thine enemy good, for thus thou wilt draw down on him, continuing in his enmity, a more signal vengeance from heaven:—or else thus; So doing, thou wilt bring upon him the smart of a

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. i. c. 22. Nam ipsa est sincera et plena justitiæ et misericordiæ vindicta martyrum, ut evertatur regnum peccati, quo regnante tanta perpassi sunt.

² Some in his time did so abuse the passage: thus Enarr. in Ps. lviii. 10, he observes, [Malevolus] malitiosè sapit quod scriptum est, Hoc enim faciens, carbones ignis congeres super caput ejus. Agit enim ut amplius aggravet et ei excitet indignationem Dei, quam carbonibus ignis significare putat, non intelligens illum ignem esse pœnitentiæ urentem dolorem, quousque caput erectum superbiâ beneficiis inimici ad humilitatem salubrem deponitur.

livelier pain, of stronger self-rebuke, of deeper self-scorn. This last explanation is on the way to the right one, but stopping here, is equally with the other opposed to the universal spirit as much as to the present argument of St. Paul; and Augustine, with a righteous earnestness, vindicating the passage, explains how the benefits are to be imparted, not with the purpose of aggravating an enemy's punishment, but for the bringing about in him that true repentance, which shall, if it may be, avert the punishment altogether; that the "coals of fire" heaped upon the head are the image indeed of a pain inflicted, but yet one inflicted in love and for the burning out of the malice that is in the man,¹ a present suffering which is to issue in a lasting healing. For fear of a mistake, and for ever excluding one, the apostle, he observes, was diligent to add, showing what he meant, "Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good."²

He pauses to inquire whether this "*sun*" which God makes to rise, and this "*rain*" which he causes to fall, on the evil as well as the good, the unjust no less than the just, are to be taken literally,—a declaration of the natural bounties and blessings whereof all are par-

¹ Serm. cxlix. c. 18. Ipsa verò ustio, pœnitentia est, quæ tanquam carbones ignis, inimicitias ejus malitiasque consumit. Umbreit, in a valuable note on Prov. xxv. 22, takes quite the same ethical view of the command, but explains the image a little differently; Thou shalt make him *to glow with shame*; and Augustine, too, in one place, says that the enemy under this treatment *blushes*, (erubescit.)

² Enarr. in Ps. lxxviii. 10. Quomodo autem potest vincere in bono malum, in superficie bonus, et in alto malus, qui opere parcit et corde sævit, manu mitis, voluntate crudelis? Cf. also De Doct. Christ. l. iii. c. 16.

takers; or not rather the rain of his grace, the sun of his righteousness, (Mal. iv. 2,) with which he visits the hearts of all, though some are as soil which refuses to be softened by that rain (Heb. vi. 7, 8), or warmed by that sun. But he decides, and we cannot doubt rightly, in favour of the former explanation,¹ for they are not “evil” upon whom the spiritual sun has risen, but through this rising upon them have passed into the number of the good; nor they “unjust” upon whom this rain comes down, but are now the just through its fertilizing and refreshing powers. Rather this sun and this rain are the common mercies which all men receive, the unjust as well as the just,² even those that “walk in their own ways,” (Acts, xiv. 16, 17,) and which they receive at no other hands than his; though, indeed, they are not mercies to the wicked at all in the same sense that they are to the good. And this unstinted bounty of God, this love which comprehends all, according to the measure in which they can be comprehended by it, is the measure by which his people, those who would indeed show themselves his children, are to exercise love, the pattern which they are to seek to imitate.

Ver. 46, 47.—There are three manners of returns, as Augustine sometimes observes, which men may make one to another. There is, first, the returning of good for good, and evil for evil, which is the principle

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 23, and Serm. lviii. c. 6. In this view he brings out rightly the meaning of “his sun;” De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 23. Addidit *suum*, id est, quem ipse fecit atque constituit, et à nullo aliquid sumpsit ut faceret.

² Enarr. in Ps. xxxv. 6.

which the world recognizes and on which it proceeds: “*Do not even the publicans the same?*”¹ this is the rule of the natural man. But beneath this there is the returning of evil for good, which is devilish; while above it there is the returning of good for evil, which is divine, which is God’s principle of action; and unto this the Lord summons the children of God.²

Ver. 48. “*Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.*”—This also was one of the favourite texts of the Pelagians, which they adduced in proof that men might live here altogether without sin. God, they said, would not have commanded what was impossible. If perfection had been unattainable, Christ would not have required it. But Augustine³ answers that we must know what this “perfect” means. It is not necessarily complete, and having attained its ultimate end, in every thing; but that may be perfect in one respect which is not perfect in another: or again, a man may be perfect, as having

¹ In 1 Ep. Joh. Tract. viii. *Extende dilectionem in proximos, nec voces illam extensionem. Propè enim te diligis, qui eos diligis, qui tibi adhærent. Extende ad ignotos, qui tibi nihil mali fecerunt. Transcende et ipsos, perveni ut diligas inimicos. Serm. cclxxiii. (Appendix.) Amas amantes te, filios et parentes. Amat et latro, amat et draco, amant et lupi, amant et ursi.*

² This is drawn out somewhat differently, Enarr. in Ps. cviii. 2.

³ De Peccat. Mer. et Rem. l. ii. c. 15. It may be seen, also, how he dealt with this and passages of the like kind, such as Deut. xviii. 13; 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Col. i. 28; Phil. ii. 14, in his Treatise De Perfect. Justit. c. 8, 9. He says of most of them, *Ipsum finem commemorant, quò currendo pertendant.*

every grace and lacking none, and yet imperfect while he has them not in that intensity which the immutable law of truth requires. And here both these observations find application. It is on an especial point the Lord is speaking; "Be perfect, that is, have the grace of loving, not merely your friends, but your enemies, stop not short at the one, but go on to the other, fulfilling the course set before you, reaching the end of your Christian course; and do this because God does it." But he who says that it means, Do this in the measure in which God does it, and believes this possible, shows, not that he has high notions of what man's love ought to be, but that he has most poor and unworthy notions of what God's love is. It was not that Augustine desired to cast a damp on any true strivings after added measures of Christian grace, after illimitable advances to perfection; but on these, as seeing plainly the false root out of which they grew, that the Pelagian spoke of this perfection as within man's reach, not while he believed in the mightiness of the grace that was given to bring it about, but while he disbelieved in the extent and malignity of the evil which was opposing its attainment. His talk about this state of a perfect health was not an extolling of the medicine, but an extenuating and denying of the disease—an all-important distinction!

In the life to come, undoubtedly, this command would be literally and in all its extent fulfilled. God's people will be perfect as he is perfect: and yet not so, that the distinction between the nature of God and the nature of man will be abolished, as some appeared to him to affirm, but man will reach the perfection of his

nature, as God has ever existed in the perfection of his.¹

¹ Quæst. in Deut. l. v. qu. 9. Neque enim quia dictum est, Estote perfecti, sicut Pater vester cœlestis perfectus est, ideo æqualitatem Patris . . . sperare debemus: quamvis non defuerunt qui et hoc futurum putaverunt; nisi forte quid dicant parùm intelligimus. Con. Maxim. l. i. c. 12. Ipse secundùm naturam suam, nos secundùm nostram.

ST. MATTHEW, CHAP. VI.

VER. 1—4.—The connection of this part of the Discourse, on which we now are entering, with the preceding, Augustine traces thus. In that which went before the Lord had taught his disciples *what* they were to do; he now proceeds to teach them *how* they are to do it, with what simplicity and singleness of eye.¹ And this teaching, as he observes, is never superfluous; for even after the eye is in great part purged to see God, yet it is ever hard to prevent the creeping in of harmful influences, where least suspected, and this even from the very accompaniments of our good actions:² as, for instance, from the praises of men, which those draw after them. And very usefully he brings out how besides the mere and utter

¹ In 1 Ep. Joh. Tract. viii. Videte quanta opera faciat superbia. Ponite in corde, quàm similia faciat et quasi paria caritati. Pascit esurientem caritas, pascit et superbia; caritas ut Deus laudetur, superbia ut ipsa laudetur. Vestit nudum caritas, vestit et superbia. Jejunat caritas, jejunat et superbia . . . Ergo Scriptura divina intrò nos revocat, à jactatione hujus faciei foriusecus . . . Redi ad conscientiam tuam, ipsam interroga. Noli attendere quod floret foris, sed quæ radix est interna. Radicata est cupiditas? species potest esse bonorum factorum: verè opera bona esse non possunt. Radicata est caritas? securus esto, nihil mali procedere potest. Blanditur superbia; sævit amor: . . . accipitur magis plaga caritatis, quàm eleëmosyna superbiam.

² De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 1. Oculo magnà ex parte mundato difficile est non subreperere sordcs aliquas de his rebus, quæ ipsas bonas nostras actiones comitari solent, veluti est laus humana.

hypocrite, who has no motive in what he does but his own glory, there are many in whom there is a very great admixture of motives, whose good deeds have two sources, one pure and one sullied; for whom, indeed, God and the pleasing of God are first, yet the intention does not remain altogether in its simplicity; there is also an eye turned askance to some meaner reward.¹ Yet the warning is throughout not against having the praise of men, but against the doing aught that we may have their praise, instead of with a single eye to God's glory. It is not, Take heed that ye be seen not in your alms; but, Take heed that you do not your alms to be seen of men. For in some sort we are bound in charity to desire men's praises; that is, if there be good wrought by us, we are bound in love to desire there may be a recognition of that good on the part of others: since their failing to recognize it would mark a wrong condition in them. We are bound to desire that our conversation may be attractive, for we may thus sometimes at the same moment do a double alms, ministering to the rich man the example, to the poor the help, that he needs.² If our conscience tells us that God's glory, and not pride or ostentation, is the root of our actions, let us be fearless in this matter, and not dread or shun to be seen, only having a care that this shall not be the final aim of

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 2.

² In 1 Ep. Joh. Tract. viii. Si enim abscondis ab oculis hominis, abscondis ab imitatione hominis. Duo sunt quibus eleemosynam facis: duo esuriunt, unus panem, alter justitiam Ille enim quærit quod manducet, ille quærit quod imitetur. Pascis istum, præbes te isti: ambobus dedisti eleemosynam. Cf. De Civ. Dei, l. v. c. 14; and Serm. clix. c. 10—13.

our deeds.¹ And here, he says, lies the reconciliation of such passages as that of St. Paul, “I please all men in all things” (1 Cor. x. 33), and that other in which he says, “If I yet pleased men, I should not be the servant of Christ.” (Gal. i. 10.) I please men as a means to an end, for the winning them to the truth: I do not make the pleasing them itself an end; on the contrary, this is something which I utterly forgo whenever higher interests of God’s truth are at stake. Yet his affecting words in his Confessions,² concerning the difficulty which he found when he was praised, in distinguishing whether the pleasure that he felt was a pleasure that others should be glorifying God for the good which they saw in him, or a pleasure in being thus himself extolled and glorified, and the deep heart-searchings into which this brought him, will not easily be forgotten by those who once have read them. He notes the peculiar difficulty which besets the faithful man here. In other matters we may avoid that which would prove the occasion of sin in us, we may put the temptation far from us; but we cannot here—for we may not get away from virtue, so to get away from the praises which follow it.

He continually finds an illustration of the warning here conveyed, that, snatching at a false, we do not lose all true reward, in the doom of the foolish virgins (Matt. xxv.) In them he sees the image of persons like those noted here, who are working for, and living on, the praises of men. These praises were as the present oil in the virgins’ lamps, and so long as they had a supply of these, they were adorned with appa-

¹ Enarr. in Ps. lxxv. 2.

² Confess. l. x. c. 37.

rent good works. But when these praises fail, as at the last day they must fail, every thing will fail: all wherein they found their impulses to good will cease; and the good itself, such as it was, will cease likewise. Their oil has failed, and their lamps will have gone out. And for the past they will have already received and already exhausted their reward; what they laboured for they got; but now there will remain for them nothing but that sentence, "I know you not," uttered from his lips with whom no work avails which is not wrought out of love to him.¹—In one place he wittily likens these boasters of their good deeds, and thus losers of all true reward, to the hen, which has no sooner laid its egg, than by its cackling it calls some one to take it away.

Augustine has a laborious, and as I cannot but think an unnecessary, discussion concerning what the "*left hand*" can mean, which is not to be permitted to know what the "*right hand*" gives. It were better to recognize this as one of those strong popular sayings, which are not to be required to give an account of themselves in detail, which they cannot do; while in the very contradictions, which would arise if they were thus pressed, lies the chief of their strength. Thus it is true, that if knowledge might be attributed to the hands at all, it would be impossible that the left hand should not know what the right hand gave, since both

¹ Serm. xciii. c. 9. Non sunt fraudati laudibus humanis: quæsierunt laudes humanas, habuerunt. Istæ laudes humanæ in die judicii non eos adjuvant. Enarr. in Ps. cxlvii. 13. Non inveniunt tunc faventes, non inveniunt tunc laudantes, à quibus solebant laudari et quasi excitari ad bona opera, non robore bonæ conscientiæ, sed incitamento linguæ alienæ.

are organs of one and the same will; but this impossibility is not to make us quit the meaning which the words at first obviously suggest. Rather we are to see how in this very impossibility, which lies on the surface of the precept, is involved the exhortation to the greatest possible secrecy, or rather simplicity, in almsgiving,—for the secrecy is an accident, which in the nature of things must often be wanting, but the simplicity, the absence as far as possible of all reflex consciousness of and dwelling on the work, must always be there. After rejecting many explanations as untenable, he ends by explaining the left hand as the carnal will, manifesting itself in the look turned sideways to the human praise and reward, whereas by the right is meant the single purpose of fulfilling the divine commands;¹ and he makes the entire precept amount to this, Let not meaner motives mingle with and defile your higher. That this lesson underlies the whole teaching of Christ, with which we now have to do, is plain: but here it seems that he is giving rather to his disciples an *example* of what he would have them do, than the *principle* on which they are to do it; While you are looking for an higher reward than the praises of men, let your alms be given in secret (and this he clothes in a strong gnomic saying): so secretly, that if that were possible, no part of yourselves save that actually engaged in the giving should know of the gift—not even the brother-hand.

¹ Serm. cxlix. c. 14. Sinistra est animi cupiditas carnalis, dextera est animi caritas spiritalis. [Elsewhere, the left, the ipsa delectatio laudis—the right, the intentio implendi divina præcepta.] Si ergo cum quisque facit eleemosynam, miscet cupiditatem temporalium commodorum, ut in opere illo aliquid tale conquirat, miscet sinistra conscientiam operibus dextræ. Cf. Enarr. in Ps. cxxxvi. 5.

Ver. 5, 6.—To these words, “*Enter into thy closet, and shut thy door,*” without excluding the literal sense, and the warning against prayers made to be seen,¹ Augustine gives also a mystical meaning. This “closet” or chamber is the heart of man,—“the door” is the avenues of sense by which defiling and disturbing thoughts of this world would enter in; a door, too, at which the tempter is ever knocking, who yet passes on and leaves us, if he finds it resolutely closed against him.² Then, he says, we fulfil the commandment of giving no place to the devil, when we diligently close the heart’s door against him, and against the crowd of distracting thoughts with which he is ever seeking to mar and spoil our prayers. On the shutting of the door in this sense, he is often urgent, yet certainly not more urgent than the immense importance of the subject would warrant. Thus in one place he says, *Wert thou speaking with me, and that, not asking a favour, but as with thine equal, and shouldst thou suddenly break off and give a message to thy servant, could I otherwise than esteem it an affront? Yet this is*

¹ Enarr. in Ps. cxli. 3. Si homines reddituri sunt, effunde ante homines precem tuam: si Deus redditurus est, effunde ante eum precem tuam.

² De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 3. Parùm est intrare in cubi-
cula, si ostium pateat importunis, per quod ostium ea quæ foris sunt
improbè se immergunt, et interiora nostra appetunt. Foris autem
diximus esse omnia temporalia et visibilia, quæ per ostium, id est,
per carnalem sensum in cogitationes nostras penetrant et turbâ va-
norum phantasmatum orantibus obstrepunt. And elsewhere, Clauso
ostio, id est, exclusâ phantasmatum turbâ. And Enarr. in Ps. cxli.
3, Tentator non cessat pulsare ut irrumpat; si clausum invenerit,
transit. There is here much more that is admirable on this shutting
of the heart’s door.

what thou doest daily with thy God.¹ And in another popular exposition² he inquires, why men are so reluctant to obey this command,—why they so seldom turn in upon the solitude of their own hearts,—why they so much prefer to be abroad than at home. And then he likens them to those that have discomfutable households, and so are unwilling to seek their homes, while they know that only wretchedness and strife await them there. It would be otherwise if their

¹ Enarr. in Ps. cxl. 5. Quid facis de cogitationibus tuis? quid facis de tumultu et catervâ rebellantium desideriorum . . . Confiteris peccata, Deum adoras: video corpus ubi jaceat, quæro ubi volitet animus. Modo si mecum loquereris, et subito averteres te ad servum tuum, et dimitteres me, non dico à quo aliquid petebas, sed cum quo ex æquo loquebaris, non mihi injuriam factam deputarem? Ecce quid facis quotidie Deo. Cf. Enarr. in Ps. lxxxv. 4. Et tolerat Deus tot corda precantium, et diversas res cogitantium; omitto dicere et noxias, omitto dicere aliquando perversas et inimicas Deo; ipsas superfluas cogitare, injuria est ejus, cum quo loqui cœperas.

² Enarr. in Ps. xxxiii. 5. Attendat sanctitas vestra: Quomodo nolunt intrare domos suas qui habent malas uxores: quomodo exeunt ad forum et gaudent. Cœpit hora esse, quâ intrent in domum suam; contristantur. Intraturi sunt enim ad tædiâ, ad murmura, ad amaritudines, ad eversiones . . . Si ergo miseri sunt qui cùm redeunt ad parietes suos, timent ne aliquibus suorum perturbationibus evertantur, quantò sunt miseriores, qui ad conscientiam suam redire nolunt, ne ibi litibus peccatorum evertantur? Ergo ut possis libens redire ad cor tuum, munda illud . . . Aufer inde cupiditatum sordes, aufer labem avaritiæ, aufer tabem superstitionum . . . aufer ista omnia; intra in cor tuum, et gaudebis ibi. Cùm ibi cœperis gaudere, ipsa munditia cordis tui delectabit te, et faciet orare: quomodo si venias ad aliquem locum—silentium est ibi, fortè quies est ibi, mundus est locus. Oremus hic, dicis, et delectat te compositio loci, et credis quod ibi te exaudiat Deus. Si ergo loci visibilis te delectat munditia, quare te non offendit immunditia cordis tui?

hearts were pure, if their consciences were purged: they would not then find every thing driving them abroad, but rather every thing attracting them to their homes.

Ver. 7, 8.—In his beautiful letter upon prayer, addressed to the noble widow Paula, Augustine distinguishes between the “*much speaking*,” which is rebuked, and the much praying, which elsewhere the Lord has so earnestly commanded. He who himself passed nights in prayer, who said, “Seek, and ye shall find,” and spake a parable “that men ought always to pray and not to faint,” does not find fault with prayer which is long drawn out, if only it *be* prayer, but with that, in which, while it retains the name of prayer, an endless tumult and hubbub of words is substituted for all deeper, and oftentimes in words unspeakable, utterances of the spirit; or which, having begun aright, has yet come to this, that the words have now survived the feeling with which the prayer was commenced.¹

And why not this much speaking? “*For your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before*

¹ Ep. 130, c. 10. Neque enim, ut nonnulli putant, hoc est orare in multiloquio, si diutius oretur. Aliud est sermo multus, aliud diuturnus affectus; nam de ipso Domino scriptum est quod pernoctaverit in orando, et quod prolixius oraverit: ubi quid aliud quàm nobis præbebat exemplum, in tempore precator opportunus, cura Patre exauditor æternus? Absit ab oratione multa locutio; sed non desit multa precatio, si fervens perseverat intentio. Nam multum loqui est in orando rem necessariam superfluis agere verbis; multum autem precari est ad eum quem precamur diuturnâ et piâ cordis excitatione pulsare. Nam plerumque hoc negotium plus gemitibus quàm sermonibus agitur, plus fletu quàm affatu.

ye ask him.” But these words seem to extend further than to the rebuke of wordy unmeaning prayers. For if it be thus, answered some, if he thus knows before we ask, what need to pray at all? And, first, what need to express any petition in words, to tell him aught, who knows every thing already? But these words, Augustine replies, are only the accidental clothing of our prayer, in which we array them for our own sakes and not for his:—so entirely accidental that very often our prayer exists without them. They were given us at first as helps to memory, instructing us in the things which we ought to desire or deprecate either with words or without them.¹ But then the more real question remains: What need to pray at all, either in words or in unuttered desires? Will not he, who is altogether good, give unasked what his earthly children need? But the prayer, Augustine makes answer, is the preparation and the enlargement of the heart for the receiving the divine gift; which indeed God is always prepared to give, but we are not always prepared to receive.² In the act of prayer

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 3; De Trin. l. xv. c. 13.

² De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 3. Ipsa orationis intentio cor nostrum serenat et purgat, capaciusque efficit ad accipienda divina munera, quæ spiritaliter nobis infundantur. Non enim ambitione precum nos exaudit Deus, qui semper paratus est dare suam lucem nobis; non visibilem, sed intelligibilem et spiritalem; sed nos non semper parati sumus accipere, cum inclinamur in alia, et rerum temporalium cupiditate tenebramur. Fit ergo in oratione conversio cordis ad eum qui semper dare paratus est, si nos capiamus quod dederit; et in ipsâ conversione purgatio interioris oculi, cum excluduntur ea, quæ temporaliter cupiebantur, ut acies cordis simplicis ferre possit simplicem lucem, divinitus sine ullo occasu aut immutatione fulgentem; nec solum ferre, sed etiam manere in illâ; non

there is a purging of the spiritual eye, which thus is averted from the things earthly which darken it, and becomes receptive of the divine light,—able not alone to endure the brightness of that light, but to rejoice in it with an ineffable joy. In the earnest asking is the enlargement of the heart for the abundant receiving; even as in it is also the needful preparation for the receiving with a due thankfulness; while, on the contrary, the unsought would most times remain unacknowledged also.¹

Ver. 9.—On the prayer itself Augustine first notes how we nowhere read that they of the Old Covenant were bidden to say “*Our Father.*” Their word was rather, Master,² while their relation was a servile one. Not, indeed, that they were altogether without hints that the filial relation was the true one, was that into

tantum sine molestia, sed etiam cum ineffabili gaudio, quo verè ac sinceriter beata vita perficitur. And on this that God should command men to pray, he says elsewhere, Ep. 130, c. 8, (ad Proban), Quod quare faciat qui novit quid nobis necessarium sit, prius quàm petamus ab eo, movere animum potest, nisi intelligamus quod Dominus et Deus noster non voluntatem nostram sibi velit innotescere, quam non potest ignorare, sed exerceri in orationibus desiderium nostrum, quo possimus capere, quod præparat dare. Illud enim valde magnum est, sed nos ad capiendum parvi et angusti sumus. And elsewhere, Tam largo fonti vas inane admovendum est.

¹ Serm. lvi. c. 3. Ideo voluit ut ores, ut desideranti det, ne vilescat quod dederit: quia et ipsum desiderium ipse insinuavit.

² De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 4. Multa enim dicta sunt in laudem Dei quæ per omnes sanctas scripturas variè latèque diffusa poterit quisque considerare, cum legit: nusquam tamen invenitur præceptum populo Israel ut dicerat, Pater noster, aut ut oraret Patrem Deum: sed Dominus eis insinuatus est, tanquam servientibus, id est, secundum carnem adhuc viventibus.

which God designed to bring his people. There were glimpses of it in the Old Testament, as Isai. i. 2, lxiii. 16; Ps. lxxxii. 6; Mal. i. 6; but yet at best Israel was but as the heir, who, “as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a servant.” The spirit of adoption, whereby we cry Abba Father, was not theirs: for this is the exclusive prerogative of the New Covenant, the gift of the Son, and the consequence of the Incarnation;¹ to as many as believe on him he gives power to become the sons of God. (John, i. 12.) Most fitting, he remarks, is this address with which to begin our prayer, for by words like these our love is kindled;—since what should be dearer to children than a father?—and our devout affection, that men as we should be permitted thus, and on these relations, to hold converse with God; and no less our confidence that we shall not ask in vain, when, before asking, we have already received this greatest gift of all, the adoption of sons.² Nor less are we prompted here to the study of sanctity, that we prove not altogether unworthy of so high a descent. Moreover, he observes, it is not “*My* Father,” but “*Our* Father,” for this is the prayer of brethren that in Christ are knit together into one body, adopted in him into one and the same family upon earth.³

¹ Ut homines nascerentur ex Deo, primò ex ipsis natus est Deus.

² De Serm. Dom. in Mon. I. ii. c. 4. Quo nomine et caritas excitatur, . . . et quædam impetrandi præsumtio, quæ peturi sumus; cùm prius quàm aliquid peteremus tam magnum donum accepimus, ut sinamur dicere, Pater noster, Deo. Quid enim jam non det filiis petentibus, cùm hoc ipsum ante dederit, ut filii essent.

³ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. I. ii. c. 4, and Serm. lxiv. (Appendix.) Oratio fraterna est; non dicit, Pater meus, tanquam pro se tantùm

“*Which art in heaven,*”—not, Augustine observes, as though God were locally in the higher regions of the world, having by comparison left the others; for if it were thus, they would be nearer him who dwell in the mountains than those in the plains, and the birds of the air, as nearer yet, would be more fortunate and happier than either.¹ But he understands by “heaven” the hearts of the faithful,—Who dwellest in them as in a temple, as in thy chosen habitation: and, of course, when the words are once transferred from the material to the moral world, there is no difficulty in speaking of God as dwelling and delighting to dwell more in one place than another.² But the words “which art in heaven” are capable of a simpler explanation, and do not require that we betake ourselves to an allegory to justify their use. For while it is indeed true that the local heavens are no more the habitation of God than any other place,—that, while God is a Spirit, all place is out of place when we are thinking of him;—yet this attribution of the pure immeasurable spaces of the ether above us—the regions lifted high “above the smoke and stir of this dim spot”—to God for his habitation, is part of the unconscious symbolism which is common to all ages and people, and in no respect a denial of his declaration, “I fill heaven *and earth.*” The introduction of the words into the beginning of

orans, sed, Pater noster, omnes videlicet unâ oratione complectens, qui se in Christo fratres esse cognoscunt.

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 5.

² Ep. 187, (ad Dardanum). Fatendum est ubique esse Deum per divinitatis præsentiam, sed non ubique per habitationis gratiam. This whole letter is on the presence of God, and how far it may be attributed to one place more than another.

this prayer rests on this universal symbolism ; they are, as it were, a *Sursum corda*, they remind us that now we have lifted up our hearts from earth and things earthly to an higher and purer world.

But they have an higher value yet, as they are a protest against all pantheistic notions about prayer, all which rest on philosophical schemes of the identity of our spirit and the Spirit of God. We are thus bidden to look for God, not in ourselves, but out of and above ourselves. Prayer is not to be the sinking in of the spirit upon itself, but the struggling up of our spirit toward another Spirit, higher and holier than our own, one with whom our spirit is indeed allied, but yet with which it is not one and the same ; “ The Spirit beareth witness with our spirit.” The Mahomedan Sufies, and other pantheistic devotees of the East, in the deepest abstractions of their devotions, are indeed worshippers of no God but self, while they have lost or denied this distinction, for which the words here, no less than the recognition of relation in the address “ Our Father,” are a standing witness.

“ *Hallowed be thy Name.*” What is this ? Augustine asks ; can God be holier than he is ? Not in himself ; that Name in itself remains always the same, hallowed for evermore ; but in us the sanctification of that Name is capable of increase, and in this petition we are asking for this increase of its sanctity in ourselves and in others, that God in fact may be known, and honoured, and feared among men as the Holy One.¹ While then there must not be that empty-

¹ Serm. lvii. c. 4. Pro nobis rogamus, non pro Deo. . . . Quid semper sanctum est, sanctificetur in nobis. Serm. lvi. c. 4. Quid

ing of the phrase Name of God, which would make it nothing more than the awful title by which we designate him, for then in this petition there would be little else than a desire that blasphemous speeches might cease out of the world; so, on the other hand, we must not take the Name of God as identical with God himself. For, in proof of this, we could not desire that God might be hallowed or holier than he already is. But his Name we can; for it is that whereby he has revealed himself to men, it is all of himself, which, not being ineffable, he has uttered and declared;—the coming out of all which may be known of him from the infinite abyss of being. (Exod. iii. 13, 14.)¹ As long as there is room either for ourselves or for others to love this Name, this revelation of his perfections, more, so long this prayer must find utterance from the lips of his people, and so long cannot altogether give place to the “Holy, Holy, Holy,” which is not prayer and petition, but purely and solely adoration and praise.

Ver. 10. “*Thy kingdom come;*”—yet not as though his kingdom were not already among us, but even as

est sanctificetur? sanctum habeatur, non contemnatur. Enarr. in Ps. ciii. 1. Quid ergo rogamus? Ut illis hominibus, qui per infidelitatem nondum habent, nomen Dei sanctum sit, quibus nondum est ille sanctus, qui per se et in se, et in sanctis suis, sanctus est. Rogamus pro genere humano, rogamus pro orbe terrarum, pro omnibus gentibus, quotidie sedentibus et disputantibus, quia non est rectus Deus, et non rectè judicat Deus, ut aliquando ipsi se corrigant, et rectum cor ad illius rectitudinem ducant; et adhærentes ei, directi ad rectum, non jam vituperent, sed placeat rectis rectus.

¹ Enarr. in Ps. ci. 25.

the present light is absent to the blind and to them who wilfully close their eyes, so that kingdom, though it be ever with us, is yet now absent from them who will not know of it.¹ But all must know it then, when it shall not merely be intelligibly but visibly set up: and it is for this we ask, that it may so come to us now that we may be found in it then.²

“*Thy will be done,*”—that is, let it be done according to thy will; for Augustine denies, what at first sight might seem to lie in the words, that the end and consummation here prayed for is the absorption of all other wills in the will of God, so that in this sense his will shall everywhere alone be done. Rather is it the bringing all the lesser circles of the wills of God’s creatures to have the same centre as the great circle of God’s all embracing will. God’s will is not that his creatures should not will, but that they should will only what is good and true: it is not that their wills should be annihilated, but brought back into harmony with the will of perfect goodness. This may seem at first a distinction hardly worth making, yet the whole Monothelite controversy was a witness to the deep importance which the Church attached to the maintaining of the reality in the perfected manhood of her Head, and so also in her members, of a human will, which subordinated indeed to the divine will, yet

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 6. Quemadmodum enim etiam præsens lux absens est cæcis et eis qui oculos claudunt, ita Dei regnum quamvis numquam discedat de terris, tamen absens est ignorantibus. And again, Nondum regnat hoc regnum.

² Serm. lvi. c. 4. Ut in nobis veniat, optamus; ut in illo inveniamur, optamus.

should not be abolished by it.¹ And this is his practical exposition of the words. “Thy will be done;” grant that we may never seek to warp the straight to the crooked, thy will to ours, but always to correct the crooked by the straight, our will by thine.²—And “*in earth as it is in heaven* ;” as by the angels there, by us also here.³ This is the simple explanation, not, as he sometimes throws out, that “heaven” may be the Church, and “earth” the world. For this is a prayer for perfection and completion; and since that will is only imperfectly done even in the Church, such could not be the ultimate longing of the souls of the faithful, nor that in which they would find their final rest. And this is fatal to all other explanations of the like kind.⁴

Ver. 11. “*Give us this day our daily bread.*”—Augustine objects to the narrowing this to any one

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 6. Qui ergo faciunt voluntatem Dei, in illis utique fit voluntas Dei; non quia ipsi faciunt ut velit Deus, sed quia faciunt quod ille vult; id est, faciunt secundum voluntatem ejus.

² Enarr. in Ps. xxxi. 11. Duæ voluntates sunt, sed voluntas tua corrigatur ad voluntatem Dei, non voluntas Dei detorqueatur ad tuam. Prava est enim tua, regula est illa, regula, ut quod prævum est, ad regulam corrigatur. And presently before, Quomodo distortum lignum etsi ponas in pavimento æquali, non collocatur, non compaginatur, nec adjungitur, semper agitur et nutat, non quia inæquale est ubi posuisti, sed quia distortum est quod posuisti: ita et cor tuum quamdiu pravum est et distortum non potest collinari rectitudini Dei, et non potest in illo collocari, ut hæreat illi.

³ Serm. lvii. c. 6. Quomodo te non offendunt Angeli tui, sic te non offendamus et nos.

⁴ Such are to be found De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 10; Serm. lvi. c. 5, and lvii. c. 6.

thing: either as some did to the Holy Eucharist, or as others, who gave it somewhat a wider meaning, to all spiritual refection, or, again, as others, going into quite the other extreme, to the nourishment of the body exclusively.¹ This "bread" is rather the whole aliment of body and of spirit; of the body, as food and clothing and whatever else is necessary for our earthly life; and of spirit, so that the frequent communions, the daily worship, the readings of the Scriptures, the hymns we hear and sing, these all will belong no less to the daily bread which we ask.² He does not fail to remark the silent rebuke that there is here for the worshipper who takes these words in his mouth while he is allowing himself in anxious and far-looking cares, while he is making luxurious provision for the flesh and for its lusts. It is but bread he asks, and that the bread of to-day.³ This prayer is the answer of the

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 7.

² Serm. lvii. c. 7. Da æterna, da temporalia. Promisisti regnum, noli negare subsidium. Dabis apud te sempiternum ornamentum, da in terrâ temporale alimentum. Serm. lviii. c. 4. Quicquid animæ nostræ et carni nostræ in hâc vitâ necessarium est, quotidiano pane concluditur.

³ The difficult question of the meaning of ἐπιούσιος does not trouble him much. He is in general satisfied with quotidianus; or, if he uses Jerome's correction, supersubstantialis,—and the only passage in which I have found it, is in a sermon which his Benedictine editors have dismissed to the Appendix (Serm. lxiv.),—he does not more than refer the word to Christ, the bread of life, qui omnem superat substantiam. If it be true, as a modern commentator affirms, that whenever he meddles with Greek he betrays a shameful ignorance of it, (turpem literarum Græcarum inscitiam passim prodidit—Winer,) it was well he left the hard question of the etymology of this word alone. But in truth his acquaintance with Greek is not at all so utterly contemptible as this: that he often speaks slightly

faithful to the admonition of the Apostle, (1 Tim. vi.

of it himself is true, and no less so that it was irregularly gotten. Yet we have many examples of no inconsiderable tact and skill with which he draws the distinction between words that in their meaning border on one another, and of other acquaintance with the language, which renders this at least an exaggerated charge. A few examples may not be altogether out of place. Thus he distinguishes between *πλεονεξία* and *φιλαργυρία*, showing how much larger the first is in its significance than the last (Enarr. in Ps. cxviii. 16); again, between *ἄμωμος* and *ἄσπιλος* (Qu. in Lev. l. iii. qu. 40); between *ἐπένδυμα*, *superindumentum*, and *ἐπωμίς*, *superhumera* (Qu. in Jud. l. vii. qu. 41); between *πρωτότοκος*, *πρωτογενής*, and *μονογενής* (Qu. in Deut. l. v. qu. 23); between *ἀπαρχαὶ* and *πρωτογενήματα* (Qu. in Num. l. iv. qu. 32); between *δῶρον* and *δόμα* (Loc. de Num. l. iv.) So, too, he notes that *ἔκστασις* may mean more than fear or great astonishment; it may be as much as *mentis alienatio* (*ἐξίστημι*), and is therefore a peculiarly fit word for expressing the condition of mind in which men receive communications from the higher world (Qu. in Gen. l. i. qu. 80); that *ἀδολεσχεῖν*, though used in the Septuagint in a good, is oftener used in classic Greek in a bad, sense. He gives (Qu. in Exod. l. ii. qu. 177) the right explanation of *πλάγια*, that it means the flanks, and cannot mean the front and rear, and of *κλίτη* (Qu. in Exod. l. ii. qu. 131). So too he distinguishes *ἐνταφιάζειν* and *θάπτειν* (Loc. de Gen. l. i.), *ἄλογος* and *ἄμαθής* (Loc. de Exod. l. ii.) He notices the usage of *παιδεία* in the Greek Scriptures as different from the classical, that it is not instruction generally, as in classic Greek, but always *per molestias* eruditio, (Enarr. in Ps. cxviii. 66.) He takes note of a difficulty in the use of *ἕθριζω*, at Judg. ix. 33, LXX., while *ἄρθρος* is the morning before sunrise, and not, as it seems to be used there, after (Quæst. in Jud. qu. 46). So also he observes a double use of *παράκλησις*, and the verb from which it is derived, that it is both exhortation and consolation (Enarr. in Ps. cxviii. 52). Commenting on Lev. xviii. 21, he rightly concludes that the *ἄρχων*, whom the children of Israel are forbidden to *serve*, which last word he found expressed in the Septuagint by *λατρεύειν*, can be no other than the prince of this world, since, had it been an earthly potentate, *δουλεύειν* would have been the word used (Qu. in

8,) "Having food and raiment, let us be therewith content."¹

Ver. 12. "*And forgive us our debts.*"—This petition Augustine does not refer to the great forgiveness, which is assumed as a thing already past, already in baptism possess, and out of the faith in which, and in the adoption that went with it, the entire prayer proceeds; but he refers it to the sins of a daily infirmity, in which even he who watches the most will yet be entangled; and without which a life in the flesh can scarcely be led:² scarcely without some of the world's

Lev. l. iii. qu. 66). He distinguishes *δικαιοσύνη* and *δικαίωμα* in a distinction of which the philological importance is swallowed up in the infinitely greater doctrinal: of the last of these words he will not allow *justitia* to be the right translation, but *justificatio*; for *δικαίωμα* does not mean a man's inherent righteousness, but, as he expresses it, *justitiæ quibus justificantur gratis per gratiam Dei qui per seipsos justi esse non possunt* (Enarr. in Ps. cxviii. 56). Now I would not affirm that all which he says on these and on other Greek matters can be maintained without occasional modifications, or that the knowledge here displayed is very profound; and it must at once be confessed that he does sometimes greatly trip; take, for instance, his derivation of *πλημμέλεια* (Qu. in Lev. l. iii. qu. 20), which he does not recognize as a disharmony, a violation of *μέλος*, but derives from *μέλει*, *curæ est*; yet in this handful of observations, gathered almost at random, there are at least evidences of something better than a "disgraceful ignorance."

¹ Serm. lviii. c. 4. *Pereat avaritia, et dives est natura.*

² Con. Ep. Parmen. l. ii. c. 10, on this petition,—*Quod utique non de illis peccatis dicitur, quæ in baptismi regeneratione dimissa sunt, sed de iis quæ quotidie de seculi amarissimis fructibus humanæ vitæ infirmitas contrahit.* Cf. Ep. 54 (ad Macedonium); De Civ. Dei, l. xxi. c. 27. *Quid est ergo peccata vestra, nisi peccata, sine quibus nec vos eritis, qui justificati et sanctificati estis?*

dust adhering to him will even the faithful man walk through the world's paths (*vix sine pulvere*). But in this prayer there is, as it were, the shaking off this dust before it has settled and hardened upon him.¹ Herein is the daily washing *of the feet*, for them that are already partakers of the great washing.² (John, xiii. 10.) The daily sins of a Christian man may be small, yet are not therefore to be despised. For if despised, then, though not else, they become indeed dangerous. It is of little drops that mighty rivers are made up. The leak may be trifling, yet if waters are always coming in and not being continually pumped out, they will in the end sink the ship.³ But in this prayer there is, as it were, for the man that faithfully uses it, the pledge of a daily cleansing.⁴

Augustine uses the testimony of this prayer against all proud Pelagian notions of an absolutely sinless

¹ Serm. cccli. c. 3.

² In Evang. Joh. Tract. lvi. Quotidie pedes lavat nobis qui interpellat pro nobis; et quotidie nos opus habere ut pedes lavemus... in ipsâ Oratione Dominicâ confitemur, cùm dicimus, Dimitte nobis. Cf. Serm. cccli. c. 3.

³ Serm. lviii. c. 9. Non potes hic vivere sine ipsis [sc. peccatis,] vel minuta sint, vel levia sint. Sed ipsa levia et minuta non contemnantur. De minutis guttis flumina implentur. Non contemnantur vel minora. Per angustas rimulas navis insudat aquâ, impletur sentina: et si contemnatur sentina, mergitur navis. And Serm. lvi. c. 9. Quid interest, utrùm te plumbum premat, an arena? plumbum una massa est, arena minuta grana sunt, sed copiâ te premunt.

⁴ De Peccat. Mer. et Rem. l. iii. c. 13. And Ep. 167, c. 6, (ad Hieronym.), with allusion to the latter clause of this petition, Forgive, *as we forgive*, Quoniam in multis offendimus omnes, suggerit Dominicam tanquam quotidianam quotidianis, etsi levioribus, tamen vulneribus, medicinam.

state in this life.¹ It was to the Apostles themselves this prayer was first given : they were to acknowledge in these words their own sinfulness.² Shall we suppose others more exempt than they? And since this prayer is ordained for the use of all, it is not to be thought for an instant that Christ would have put a lie into the mouth of any; which would yet be the case, if any who were without sin were still at his bidding to pray this prayer, asking forgiveness for sins of which they were not guilty. The Pelagians had two or three escapes from this conclusion. One was this, that a perfect man might yet pray this prayer out of humility—a lying humility, which Augustine more justly characterizes as itself an awful sacrilege, and would constitute a sinner, were he none before;³ or again, that this prayer was given to the Apostles while they were yet carnal, and suited them then, but not afterwards;⁴ but this he refutes by comparison of other passages, as 1 John, i. 8, where no such refuge is possible. Somewhat more plausibly than this, they said that the sinless man would merge himself, and his own individuality, in the whole body of the Church, and could therefore honestly use this prayer, while still in the body there

¹ Of such a perfect state he says, *De Pecc. Mer. et Rem.* l. iii. c. 13, *Optandum est ut fiat, conandum est ut fiat, supplicandum est ut fiat; non tamen quasi factum fuerit, confitendum.*

² *Ep. 157, c. 2, (ad Hilarium).* *Omnibus enim necessaria est Oratio Dominica, quam etiam ipsis arietibus gregis, id est, Apostolis suis Dominus dedit, ut unusquisque Deo dicat, Dimitte nobis debita nostra.*

³ *Con. Ep. Parmen. l. ii. c. 10.* *Quod si hoc in oratione fictè et non veraciter dicunt, putantes se non habere quod eis dimittat Deus, id ipsum est inexpiabile sacrilegium.* Cf. *Serm. clxxxi. c. 4.*

⁴ *Serm. cxxxv. c. 7.*

was sin, though not in him.¹ Augustine answers them at length, and observes, how one at least of their favourite examples of such a sinless man, that is, Daniel, has cut them off from this refuge, for he expressly distinguishes the two, his own sin and the congregation's (Dan. ix. 20), "While I was confessing my sin and the sin of my people." He rightly concludes that for the spiritual priesthood of the New Covenant this prayer contains the same confession of sin as under the Old did the offerings which the priests made first for themselves, ere ever they made them for the sins of the people. As those offerings implicitly convinced them, so this confession explicitly convinces us.²

This remission of our debts being not so much as asked except on a condition, "*As we forgive our debtors,*" causes Augustine often to remark how terrible this prayer may become to us. If we pray it, keeping an unforgiving temper, we shall be ourselves blocking up the way by which our prayers might ascend: not merely failing to extricate ourselves from the bands of our sins, but with our own hands binding the cords of them round us the closer.³ It will little profit to do as some do, who feeling this, when they

¹ De Peccat. Mer. et Rem. l. ii. c. 10. These are their words: Sancti et perfecti jam Apostoli dicebant, Dimitte nobis debita nostra, . . . ut per hoc quod dicerent *nostra*, in uno esse corpore demonstrarent et illos adhuc habentes peccata, et seipsos qui jam carebant omni ex parte peccato.

² Serm. cxxxv. Sacrificia convincebant sacerdotes . . . Non attendo quod loqueris, sed quid offeras. Victima tua convincit te.

³ Serm. lviii. c. 6. Qui vult dicere efficaciter, Dimitte, oportet ut dicat veraciter, Sicut et nos dimittimus. Serm. cccxv. c. 7. Ibi illa inimica [ira] stat contra te. Sepit viam orationis tuæ, murum erigit, et non est quæ transeas.

come near this petition avoid it, and pass on to the next: like a debtor that, seeing his creditor at a distance, turns into some side alley from the way in which before he was going. For whom is it that we seek to shun? a creditor who, while there is in us this temper, will meet us everywhere, and from whom there is no escape.¹ (Ps. cxxxviii. 7.)

Ver. 13. “*And lead us not into temptation.*” — Augustine traces a connection with the last petition: Forgive us what we have done: grant that we do not the same any more.² He mentions that it was read in numerous Latin MSS., though he had never found it in the Greek, that many also of the faithful in his time were wont to pray, *Suffer us not* to be led into temptation,³ while it seemed to them that the leading of men into temptation might not by any means be attributed to God. (Jam. i. 13.) But he often shows how there is no need of shrinking from the words, or seeking to rob them of their force, by any such additions either secretly or openly made. God does tempt, even as the Devil tempts: all the difference is in the end and aim with which they do it,⁴ — the one tempt-

¹ Serm. ccclii. c. 2. Quomodo quisque in vico cum occurrerit ei, cui aliquid debet, si ad manum est diverticulum, dimittit quo ibat, et it per aliam partem, ne faciem videat creditoris. Hoc tu in isto versu te fecisse arbitratus es. Devitasti dicere, Dimitte sicut ego dimisi, ne sic dimitteret, id est, non dimitteret, quia non dimittis. Quem devitas? quis devitas? Quo ibis, ubi tu esse possis, et ille non esse?

² Serm. xlviii. c. 8. Dimitte quæ fecimus, et da ut alia non committamus.

³ De Dono Persev. c. 6.

⁴ In Evang. Joh. Tract. xliii. Intelligimus duas esse tentationes,

ing to deceive, the other to approve; Satan to bring out men's evil to their ruin, God to bring out, and through the conflict to strengthen, their good to their everlasting gain; or if to bring out their sin, yet this only as a means and a transition to an higher good, that recovering, they may walk henceforward humbler, wiser, more circumspect; that knowing, they may take up arms more earnestly against, the evil that is in them. He adduces oftentimes St. Peter, and his permitted fall, as an instance of what he means. *He* had said, like the Psalmist, "I shall never be moved."¹ How good was it for him that the temptation came, and that through it he found out the secret of his weakness, and so also of his strength.²

But this question being set at rest, there arises another; and seeing that a temptation may come, and often does come, from God, it becomes the more needful to explain why we should here be bidden to deprecate temptation; how, too, this will agree with those Scriptures, in which we are bidden to count it all joy when we fall into divers temptations. Augustine,

unam quæ decipit, alteram quæ probat: secundùm eam quæ decipit, Deus neminem tentat: secundùm eam quæ probat, tentat vos Dominus Deus vester, ut sciat si diligitis eum: . . . non ergo Deus nescit, sed dictum est, ut sciat, quod est, ut scire vos faciat. Cf. Serm. ii. c. 3. Non enim sibi homo ita notus est, ut Creatori; nec sic æger sibi notus est ut medico . . . Si Deus cessat tentare, magister cessat docere. Cf. Serm. lvii. c. 9.

¹ De Corrupt. et Grat. c. 9. Hæc vox et Apostoli Petri esse potuit: dixerat quippe et ipse in abundantia suâ, Animam meam pro te ponam; sibi festinando tribuens, quod ei fuerat à Domino postea largiendum . . . Sed quia didicit non de seipso fidere, etiam hoc ei profecit in bonum, faciente illo qui diligentibus eum omnia co-operatur in bonum.

² Multos impedit à firmitate, firmitatis præsumptio.

in reply, draws a distinction between the being led into temptation, and the being tempted.¹ The first is the coming under the power of a temptation greater than we can bear, and this we deprecate,² saying, “*Lead us not into temptation,*” but not the other, while we acknowledge that as the sad but needful condition of our state in the flesh. And many both in ancient and modern times have taken the same line: Lead us not *into* temptation; that is, they say, Lead us not so far into it that a way back shall be impossible: Suffer us not to be so inextricably entangled in it, that there shall be no way of escape; but with the temptation make ever the way of deliverance. Now though it is most true that this will ever be the prayer³ of the faithful, yet such a distinction cannot be maintained as lying in the words. “Lead us not into temptation” is indeed, what it seems at first sight, a prayer that we may not be tempted; yet not as declining to meet temptation when it comes, not as denying the blessing with which it may be charged; but out of a deep sense of our own infirmity, and of the uncertainty of the issue, praying that it may be averted, however willing we may be manfully to encounter it, yea to count it all joy, if it arrive.⁴

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 9. Aliud est induci in tentationem, aliud tentari . . . Inducimur enim si tales acciderint, quas ferre non possumus. Ep. 130, (ad Probam). [Petimus] ne deserti ejus adjutorio alicui tentationi vel consentiamus decepti, vel cedamus afflicti.

² De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 9. Tanquam si quispiam cui necesse sit igne examinari, non oret ut igne non contingatur, sed ut non exuratur.

³ See Tholuck's *Auslegung der Bergpredigt*, p. 430.

⁴ Ep. 130, c. 14, (ad Probam). In his ergo tribulationibus quæ

“*But deliver us from evil.*” Most truly and most profoundly Augustine brings out how “*Deliver us from evil*” might be put in other words, *Deliver us from ourselves*, for this is indeed the great deliverance that we need.¹—But on the question whether this be a distinct petition, and so the number of petitions in the Lord’s Prayer be seven and not six, he rather wavers. In one place² he makes seven petitions, and finds a meaning and a mystery in the number, drawing a parallel between the seven and the seven beatitudes out of which the whole discourse unfolds itself; and he then refers “*Lead us not into temptation*” to evil threatening in the future, “*Deliver us from evil*” to the evil which already is around us and about us.³ And this, while throughout all Scripture seven is the covenant number, the number of sacrifice and the number of prayer, the signature of all meetings between God and man, is undoubtedly true as regards the number of petitions here; they are seven and not six. Yet Augustine himself sometimes departs from this truer view, and expressly unites these two last as forming parts of the same petition.⁴ But when, as

possunt et prodesse et nocere, . . . quia dura, quia molesta, quia contra sensum nostræ infirmitatis sunt, universali humanâ voluntate ut à nobis hæc auferantur, oramus.

¹ Libera me à me. And again, Serm. xliv. c. 3, Libera me ab homine malo, à me ipso.

² De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 11; Serm. lviii. c. 10.

³ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 9. Ultima et septima petitio est, Sed libera nos à malo. Orandum est enim ut non solùm non inducamur in malum quo caremus, quod sexto loco petitur; sed ab illo etiam liberemur, quo jam inducti sumus.

⁴ Serm. lvii. c. 10. Ideo addidit *sed*: ut ostenderet hoc totum ad unam sententiam pertinere. . . . Liberando nos à malo non nos infert

has just been noticed, he makes "Lead us not into temptation" future, and "Deliver us from evil" present, he has reversed the true order, and that which the very sequence of the petitions indicates. "Lead us not into temptation," is a prayer that we may be kept from the evil which is now alluring and threatening to ensnare us. "Deliver us from evil," is the cry for an entire deliverance, for the redemption of the body, for the coming of that time when, to speak his own language, all that is as yet only *in spe* shall be also *in re*; so that we have here, in these three petitions, a past, a present, and a future; and this the true order he has himself elsewhere implicitly indicated.¹—Augustine knows nothing of the doxology, as neither do the other chiefest of the Latin Fathers; nor yet, commenting on the Sermon on the Mount, does he notice the "*Amen*," though elsewhere he gives well what its meaning is on the lips of the faithful, that it is their seal and subscription to all that has been spoken.²

in tentationem, non nos inferendo in tentationem, liberat nos à malo. Presently after he speaks of them as *sex vel septem* petitiones. Cf. the *Enchir. ad Laurent. c. 116.*

¹ *Con. Julian. l. vi. c. 14.* Quâ [scil. gratiâ] *liberor*, ut sciam, ne intrem in tentationem, à concupiscentiâ meâ abstractus et illectus, . . . quâ *liberabor*, ut spero, in æternum, ubi jam nulla lex in membris meis repugnet legi mentis meæ—this last *liberabor* being evidently in his mind the answer to the prayer, Deliver us from evil, as the *liberor* to the prayer, Lead us not into temptation. This the right meaning he has spoken out, *De Pecc. Mer. et Remiss. l. ii. c. 4,* Deinde addimus quod perficietur in fine, cùm absorbebitur mortale à vitâ: Sed libera nos à malo.

² In a fragment of a sermon, v. 5, p. 1510, (Ben. Ed.) *Fratres mei, Amen vestrum subscriptio vestra est, consensio vestra est, adstipulatio vestra est.*

Ver. 14, 15.—Augustine has some valuable observations on our Lord returning back upon this condition of our obtaining forgiveness, and upon this only, among all the matters of which the prayer had treated; here giving one blow more to the die, so to make the impression sharper and deeper on the minds of all. And this he did because of the fearful consequence of a failure here; for to retain our anger or our malice is not merely to retain one sin, but in the retaining of that one to retain also every other: it is not merely to shut one door, but in that one to shut every door, by which the grace of God might enter into our souls.¹

On the plan and inner coherence of the Prayer he notes how the three first petitions contain, as we have seen that the last three do, a beginning, a middle, and an end. God's Name, at his coming in the flesh, began to be hallowed; since that his kingdom has been ever coming, as it is in part come; hereafter it will be a perfected kingdom, at his second advent, from which time his will will be done here as perfectly as in heaven. So too, he observes, as the eternal things are first in dignity, they are here placed the first in order. We are asking in the three first petitions things which, though having for us a beginning in time, will yet stand fast through eternity; the Name will be hallowed, the kingdom will be established, and the will accomplished for ever. But the other and later petitions relate to things transient: the daily bread will

¹ Serm. lvii. c. 11, 12. Unde accepturus enim veniam fueras pro cæteris delictis, hoc perdis. Si quid aliis sensibus, aliis cupiditatibus peccaveras, hinc erat sanandum quia dicturus eras, Dimitte, sicut et nos dimittimus. . . . Illo perditto cuncta tenebuntur; omnino nihil dimittitur.

not be needed by them who feed on the beatific vision of God; nor the forgiveness of trespasses by them that are perfect; nor exemption from temptation, where there is nothing within or without to tempt; nor deliverance from evil, where all evil will have ended.¹

Nor does he fail to show how this prayer is the mould into which our desires are to be cast,² that it is a ground plan given us, which we may fill out, and on which we may build at large, but yet not go beyond it, while it is, as it were, normal for other prayers; there being no possible petition that a faithful man ought to make, which cannot be reduced under one or other rubric of this prayer; no petition of any saint which is not an unfolding of something which is shut up in the Lord's Prayer. It is only such prayer as should not be made, something that we ask amiss, which will not range itself under one or other of these petitions.³

Ver. 16—18.—Here is another precept, Augustine

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 10; Serm. lviii. c. 10. Tres ergo petitiones superiores æternæ sunt; quatuor autem sequentes ad istam vitam pertinent.

² Serm. lvi. c. 3. Verba quæ D. N. J. C. in Oratione docuit, forma est desideriorum. And De Perfect. Just. c. 8, Oratione insinuans omnes regulas sancti desiderii.

³ Ep. 130, c. 12, (ad Probam). Si per omnia precationum sanctorum verba discurras, quantum existimo, nihil invenies quod in istâ Dominicâ non contineatur et concludatur Oratione. . . . Qui autem dicit in oratione, verbi gratiâ, Domine, multiplica divitias meas; aut, Da mihi quantas illi vel illi dedisti; aut, Honores meos auge; aut, Fac me in hoc seculo præpotentem atque clarentem; . . . puto eum non invenire in Oratione Dominicâ quò possit hæc vota coaptare.

observes, on purity of intention, which is now altogether the matter in hand, a warning that no ostentation or desire of human praise be allowed to mingle with actions which ought to be done simply before God, with an eye to an heavenly and not an earthly reward.¹ All the precepts in this part of the discourse teach us, how it is not merely in the pomp and splendour of worldly things that pride may show itself, but also that it may lurk under rags and in sack-cloth, and a pride the more perilous as being the more veiled. For he who outdoes others in the adorning of his body, and in the splendour of other things, deceives nobody with a fraudulent appearance of sanctity, while he is at once convinced of being a follower of the world's vanities.² But he who draws the eyes of men upon himself by an unusual squalor and self-neglect, when this he does of choice and not suffers it of necessity, must be judged by his other works, whether through contempt of superfluous ornament or through some

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 12. Manifestum est his præceptis omnem nostram intentionem in interiora gaudia dirigi, ne foris quærentes mercedem huic seculo conformemur, et amittamus promissionem tantò solidioris atque firmioris, quantò interioris beatitudinis.

² De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 12. In hoc autem capitulo maximè animadvertendum est, non in solo rerum corporearum nitore atque pompà, sed etiam in ipsis sordibus luctuosus esse posse jactantiam, et eò periculosiorem quo sub nomine servitutis Dei decipit. Qui ergo immoderato cultu corporis atque vestitùs, vel cæterarum rerum nitore præfulget, facilè vincitur rebus ipsis, pomparum seculi esse sectator, neque quenquam fallit dososâ imagine sanctitatis. Qui autem inusitato squalore ac sordibus intentos in se oculos hominum facit, . . . cæteris ejus operibus potest conjici utrùm hoc contemptu superflui cultùs, an ambitione aliquâ faciat.

sinister aim he does it; for the Lord himself has warned us to beware of wolves in sheep's clothing, and to know men not by their appearance but by their fruits. This we shall soon be able to do, for if we give heed, it will not fail but that presently something will fall out whereby we shall be able to know whether such an one be indeed a wolf in sheep's clothing, or a sheep in its own. Yet, he adds, a faithful man should not therefore flatter the eyes of men with a superfluous adorning, because that spare and barely needful array is often usurped by deceivers to cheat the unwary; the sheep should not lay aside their own clothing, because sometimes the wolves cover themselves with the like.¹

But with this clear view into the whole purpose of the passage, it is singular that Augustine should have found a difficulty in the words "*Anoint thine head,*" which he does, while the habit of such anointing in times of fasting or indeed at any time had altogether departed when he wrote: he therefore interprets the precept mystically of the inward gladness of the spirit before the Lord.² Yet it would seem a more natural course rather to substitute for this anointing the head any other forms of outward seemliness and decent comeliness, which are in use in our own time, and the omission of which would attract a peculiar observation. They are not to be thus omitted; there is no such proclamation to be made of what the Christian man is doing.—It hardly needs to add that this,

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 24. Non ideo debent oves odisse vestimentum suum, quia plerumque illo se occultant lupi.

² De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 12. Intelligendum est hoc præceptum unguendi caput . . . ad interiorem hominem pertinere.

“*When ye fast,*” he interprets everywhere as a command. It was reserved for others to turn “*When ye fast*” into the more convenient, *If ye choose to fast*. And other ways he notices in which our fasting may come to nothing, as when, it goes together with any indulged sin, when, abstaining from things which are sometimes allowable, we do not abstain from those which are always unlawful;¹ or again, when it is a mere changing of our luxuries and not an abridging them:² and he draws a picture, evidently from the life, in more places than one, of a luxurious fool-fasting, as our Reformers well named it, which had already sprung up in his time, and which, keeping the name, had entirely evaded the reality of fasting, being in truth no mortifying, but only a pampering of the appetite in new forms; or again, when that which thereby is spared, is not spared for the poor but for ourselves;³ in all which cases it shall not be seen, he says, by our heavenly Father with any pleasure, nor bring any blessing with it.

Ver. 19, 20.—In his work especially dedicated to the elucidation of this discourse, Augustine hastens rapidly over these verses; though in other places he

¹ Serm. cxliii. (Appendix). Quid enim prodest pallidum esse jejuniis, si odio et invidiâ livescas? Quid enim prodest vinum non bibere, et iracundiæ veneno inebriari?

² Serm. cex. c. 8, 9. Tanquam non sit Quadragesima piæ humilitatis observatio, sed novæ voluptatis occasio. And again, Serm. ccv. Nemo sub abstinentiæ specie mutare affectet potius quàm reseccare delitias.

³ Serm. cxliv. (Appendix). Jejunium tuum te castiget, sed lætificet alterum.

has loved to enlarge upon them much: yet not there so rapidly but that he seeks to trace their connexion with what went before and what follows, a connexion which others have despaired of finding. He would find the following: Give with no unworthy aim, with no by-ends and out-looks for thine own advantage—that were to lay up treasure on earth; but do good for the love of God, for the pure love of thy brother—that is to lay up treasure in heaven. And then he points to the following verses (22, 23) in proof that it is singleness and purity of intention upon which the Lord is still dwelling. But this is scarcely tenable; for while it is most true that all which is done out of an unworthy motive perishes, yet the specifying of the moth and rust¹ and thieves, as the instruments of destruction, points to the more obvious interpretation, namely, that this laying up of treasures upon earth is not the laying out the temporal mammon seemingly for God, though indeed with unworthy selfish aims, but the not laying it out for him at all, nor even appearing so to do, but rather only and evidently laying it up for ourselves.

If there be a connexion, it might perhaps be rather traced thus: Prefer the unseen and eternal before the seen and transitory; as I have bidden you to do this in other things, to count the praise of God better than the praise of men,—while this is hollow and transient, that real and enduring,—so also and for the same

¹ For βεβρωσις Augustine has, with the old Italic, comestura; the Vulgate ærugo. Here again the change was for the worse, while βεβρωσις has not the special significance, so given it, of rust, but refers generally to the *gnawing* tooth of time; the consumption, by what ever means it may take place of the things which are of earth.

reasons count it better to have treasure in heaven than on earth. Count it a blessed thing that by giving to God you can set the seal of endurance upon that which is in its nature so transitory, that you can shift beyond mortal decay and evil chance, that which of itself is so liable to these—even as Augustine himself often expresses it, Lift up your fruits to an higher floor, where they will not be exposed to the same inevitable danger of corrupting and spoiling, which they are on the lower.¹ For he who gave, desires that we should not lose even his lower gifts, but should keep them for ever; and therefore gives counsels such as this, offering to take into his own secure keeping that which in no other way can we retain: to send it before us, to that world where we are certainly going, that we may find it there.² You trust *in* God, will you not then trust him? you believe *in* him, will you not then

¹ Enarr. in Ps. xlvi. 9. Modò si amicus tuus intraret in domum tuam, et inveniret te in loco humido frumenta posuisse, qui fortè sciret naturam corruptionis frumentorum, quam tu nescires, daret tibi hujusmodi consilium, dicens, Frater, perdis quod cum magno labore collegisti: in loco humido posuisti; paucis diebus ista putrescunt. Et quid facio, frater? Leva in superiora. Audires amicum suggerentem, ut frumenta levarer de inferioribus ad superiora, et non audis Christum monentem, ut thesaurum tuum leves de terrâ ad cœlum. Cf. Serm. lx. c. 7.

² See his beautiful words, Enarr. in Ps. xxxviii. 7, where, among other things, he says, Quare ibi ponis ubi possis amittere, ubi si non amittas, ibi permanere perpetuò non potes? Est alius locus quo te transferam. Præcedat te quod habes, noli timere ne perdas: dator ego eram, custos ego ero. And again, of what is offered to God he says, Serm. xlii. 2, Non dico, Hoc non perit, sed dico, Hoc solum non perit. And in a sermon, De Contemptu Mundi (v. 5, p. 713), Si amas divitias, præmitte, easque sequaris; ne cùm amas in terrâ, aut vivus eas amittas aut mortuus.

believe him, and that he has occult channels of communication between this world and the other, so that all what is committed to these will be found in that? Beware, he sometimes adds, lest you be of them, the men of the earth, that have slept their sleep, even the sleep of a vain worldly existence, and when they awakened to a world of realities their hands are empty; they "have found nothing," found nothing while they placed nothing in the hand of Christ, which in each of his poor was stretched out to them.¹ And he often uses the gathering distresses and troubles of his time, the barbarian invasions which had now wasted Italy, and were fast advancing toward Africa, and which were bringing an evident uncertainty on all things worldly, as an additional motive for heartily obeying this command;² for, besides the inevitable quitting at death, it seemed likely that many would have to loose their grasp even before. Thus, writing to the clergy and people of Hippo, who in his absence had forgone, under the pressure of their temporal calamities, some usual bounties to the poor, he reminds them, that if indeed the weak fabric of this world was falling, what reason was there here that they should quickly transfer

¹ Enarr. in Ps. lxxv. 6. Dormierunt somnum suum viri divitiarum, et nihil invenerunt in manibus suis. . . . Nihil inveniunt in manibus suis, quia nihil posuerunt in manu Christi. Vis aliquid invenire in manibus tuis postea? Noli contemnere modò manum pauperis, et respice manus inanes, si vis habere manus plenas.

² Serm. lx. c. 6. Non surgitur, non proceditur, nisi ut unà voce dicatur ab omnibus: Væ nobis, ruit mundus. Si ruit, quare non migras? Si tibi architectus diceret, Ruituram domum tuam; nonne prius migrares quàm murmurares? Structor mundi tibi dicit, Ruiturum mundum, et non credis? Cf. Serm. xxxviii. c. 5—7.

their goods to that only stronger built city that would survive the shock.¹ And to some that were already stripped of their worldly possessions he addresses himself thus: The enemy has invaded your house, would he have invaded heaven? He has slain the servant that has watched your goods; would he have slain the Lord that would have kept them there where no thief approacheth, neither moth corrupteth?² You have ransomed your life from the barbarians at the cost of all that you had. And how came this? Because you would not render a portion of that all unto Christ. You would not *give*, so he *took*, and took, not as he was once willing to have received, but took, leaving no blessing behind.³ That which comes from his people on the gentle pressure of his mere bidding, comes as the fine and sweet and golden coloured olive oil which runs freely from the fruit, almost before ever the press has touched them. It is the lees, the dark and vile *amurca*, which is wrung out by the force of an harsh constraint at the last.⁴

¹ Ep. 122. Sicut enim ad loca munitiora festinantius migrant, qui ruinam domus vident contritis parietibus imminere; sic corda Christiana quanto magis sentiunt mundi hujus ruinam crebrescentibus tribulationibus propinquare, tanto magis debent bona quæ in terrâ recondere disponebant, in thesaurum cœlestem impigrâ celeritate transferre; ut si aliquis humanus casus acciderit, gaudeat qui de loco ruinoso emigravit.

² Serm. lx. c. 8. Invasit hostis domum, nunquid invaderet cœlum? Occidit servum custodem, nunquid occideret Dominum servatorem, quo fur non accedit, neque tinea corrumpit?

³ Serm. De Contemptu Mundi, v. 5, p. 713. Christo modicum non dedisti, et barbaris totum quod habuisti, dedisti. . . . Christus rogat, et non accipit. Ille torquet, et totum aufert.

⁴ Mundus est torcular: abundant pressuræ ejus, oleum esto tu, non amurca.

Ver. 21. “*For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.*”—This is the reason why Christ desires his people to lay up store in heaven, namely, that they may have a heart in heaven; this is why he bids them to lift up their goods, that they may lift up their souls as well. For it is the power which the treasure has inevitably to draw after it the heart, the fact that it is the loadstar to which the needle *must* point, which makes it of such consequence *where* the treasure is stored.¹ For him that has his treasure in earth, it is vain when he hears the awakening cry of the Church, Lift up your hearts, to make answer, We lift them up unto the Lord. He does not, he cannot do so—his heart is of necessity where his treasure, that which he esteems his best good, is,—in the earth and not in heaven; and so long as his treasure is there, his heart must remain there too.²

Ver. 22, 23.—Augustine understands “*the eye*” here as the intention with which our works are performed, —“*the body*” the sum total of these works themselves. If the eye be single, if the intention, that is, be right

¹ Enarr. in Ps. xc. 16. Quare autem vult [Christus] ut locum mutes thesauro tuo, nisi ut locum mutes cordi tuo? Nemo enim cogitat nisi de thesauro suo. Quam multi hic sunt qui me modò audiunt, et non est cor eorum nisi in saccellis suis. In terrà estis, quia in terrà est quod amatis; mittatur in cœlum, et erit ibi cor vestrum.

² Serm. cccxlv. Si autem in terrà obruis cor tuum, erubescet, quia mentiris cùm respondes, quando audis, Sursum corda. Nam dicitur, Sursum corda; et continuò respondes, Habemus ad Dominum. Deo mentiris. In terrà obrutum cor habes, quia ubi fuerit thesaurus tuus, ibi erit et cor tuum.

and pure, directed to God and to the pleasing of God, all the works which we work according to that intention, which in other words are wrought in faith,¹ will be right and pure also: they will be illuminated also. "*But if thine eye be evil,*" if thine intention is defiled and blinded by the appetite of things carnal and temporal, all the works that spring out of that impure motive shall be sharers in the darkness.²

There are two explanations of the words following: "*If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness*"—one which should make the second "darkness," the darkness *which shall then ensue* in the body, or, to leave the image, in the whole domain of man's spiritual life; if the avenues of light are stopped, what a great darkness will ensue through that whole region of man's soul! According to the other meaning, which indeed includes this, the second darkness is the darkness *which existed before* (τὸ σκότος, with the article) in that region; and then we must understand our Lord as contemplating the whole region of man's passions and propensities as itself darkness: this dark and confused chaos was to have been lighted up by the rays of heavenly light received through the

¹ Con. Julian. l. iv. c. 3. Hunc oculum agnosce intentionem, quâ facit quisque quod facit; et per hoc disce eum qui non facit opera bona intentione fidei bonæ, hoc est, ejus quæ per dilectionem operatur, totum quasi corpus, quod illis, velut membris, operibus constat, tenebrosum esse, hoc est plenum nigredine peccatorum.

² De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 13. Enarr. in Ps. cxviii. 37. Proinde magni interest cum aliquid bonum facimus, cujus rei contemplatione faciamus; ut scilicet non tantum si bonum est quod facimus, sed præcipuè si bonum est propter quod facimus, cogitemus.

eye of the soul; but if even this eye is obscured, if that which was light becomes darkness, what will it be with that *which is of its own nature darkness*: not, as our version has it, “*that darkness,*” but “*the darkness,*” which is now cut off, by the obstruction of its one avenue of light, from the only illumination which could have reached it? I cannot doubt that this deeper, is also the truer, meaning. Tholuck¹ affirms that Augustine has embraced it; yet not certainly in his exposition of this discourse; where his meaning, though hard to catch, is certainly not this, nor have I been able to find any other passage to justify the assertion.²

Ver. 24.—The connection is thus traced by Augustine. There was a warning in the preceding verse against the double eye as opposed to the single, and now follows the assurance of the folly of attempting the double service, an attempt which might flow out of that double eye. He has a subtle remark, noting the nice selection of the words here, and clearing the passage even from the appearance of a repetition. In the first clause, the “*master*” whom the man will “*hate*” is Satan, the “*master*” whom he will “*love*” is God, and this the faithful man will both do and profess to do. But no man actually and openly professes to hate God and love the Devil; so that in the

¹ Auslegung der Bergpredigt, p. 452.

² It is evidently implied in the translation of the Vulgate, *Ipsæ tenebræ quantæ erunt*: (but for this Augustine has, *Tenebræ quantæ!*) and by St. Jerome, *Ipsa caligo quantis tenebris obvolvitur*; by Chrysostom also, and most of the ancients, though the other is in modern times the most common explanation.

second clause, when the Lord is putting the converse case, he changes both words, since they would be no longer the most appropriate; the sinner "*holds to*" Satan when he follows his rewards, he practically "*despises*" God when he heeds not his promises and his threatenings, however little he may acknowledge to himself or to others that he is doing the one or the other.¹ Augustine does not commit the mistake, which is a modern one, of making mammon actually a proper name, and a title of the god of this world; but, on the contrary, gives its right explanation, though at the same time he says, with truth, that its service is his service.²

Ver. 25—34. "*Therefore,*"—while there cannot be a single eye (ver. 22) so long as we propose a double object for our striving, and while under the pretext that we are only providing things necessary, the whole inordinate care and servitude to mammon may again come in, "*therefore,*" our Lord proceeds, "*take no thought*³ *for your life, what ye shall eat or*

¹ Quæst. Evang. l. ii. c. 36. Non dixit, Odiet, sed contemnet: sicut solent minas ejus postponere cupiditatibus suis, qui de bonitate ejus ad impunitatem sibi blandiuntur.

² De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 14. Lucrum Punicè mammon dicitur. Sed qui servit mammonæ, illi utique servit, qui rebus istis terrenis merito suæ perversitatis præpositus, magistratus hujus seculi à Domino dicitur.

³ μὴ μεριμνᾶτε. Augustine's non habere sollicitudinem, and the ne solliciti sitis of the Vulgate, are both better than our "Take no thought," which was a change for the worse from the "Be not careful" of the earlier translations. The μερίμνα (from μερίς and μερίζω) is the care which divides and draws the soul more ways than one,—hinders a serving of the Lord ἀπερισπάστως (1 Cor. vii.

what ye shall drink, nor yet for your body what ye shall put on ;” and then Augustine traces the argument in the latter clause of the verse thus: Will not he who gave the more excellent thing, the breath of life, give also the meaner thing, the meat by which that life is sustained? he who made your marvellous bodies, cannot and will not he furnish the raiment which they need? ¹

Augustine connects ver. 27 with the first clause of the verse following, and reads, “Which of you, by taking thought,² can add one cubit unto his stature? And why” (or, Why then) “take ye thought for raiment?” He who has said your bodies shall be just what they are, and that is evidently God, for ye

35). Now it is true that the words *solicitus* and *solicitudo* do not rest on the same image of *distraction*, but they express the *unsettling* of the spirit through unreasonable anxiety. *Solicitus*, from *solo* and *cio*, that which is moved from its resting-place, and borne up and down, the contrary of the ἐδξαῖος. It will thus stand in its etymology in connexion with the μὴ μετεωρίζεσθε, in the parallel passage in St. Luke (xii. 29), Be not swayed backward and forward, as a bucket in the air, without any sure resting-place (Nolite in sublime extolli—Augustine). Our “Take no thought” sounds like an exaggeration of the precept of faith, and by the help of assuming that it is so, and the consequent impossibility of carrying out the precept, men justify to themselves the whole extent of their unfaithful anxieties and cares.

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 15. Dominus admonet, ut meminerimus multò amplius nobis Deum dedisse, quod nos fecit et composuit ex animâ et corpore, quàm est alimentum atque tegumentum; . . . qui dedit animam multò facilius escam esse daturum. He rightly remarks, that ψυχή here is to be translated life, and not soul, as at Matt. x. 39, “He that findeth his life (ψυχὴν) shall lose it.”

² μεριμνᾶν, for which he has curans—which at least is better than the cogitans of the Vulgate.

yourselves are powerless in the matter, you could add nothing to them in this respect, cannot he also clothe them?¹ But Maldonatus rightly remarks, that it is impossible that this can be the true connexion, as is clear from a comparison with the parallel passage in St. Luke (xii. 25—27), where the interposition of ver. 26 makes it impossible that such could be the line of thought. Nor yet does he himself give the right, though he acutely points out the error of this. That true one will only be attained when the word which we have taken as signifying “stature” (*ἰλακία*) is accepted rather in its other sense, term of life. (John, ix. 21—23.)² There is much against taking it as stature here. In the first place, if our Lord wished to show that a man could not do “*that which is least*”³ for his body, we should rather expect, Which of you by taking thought can add an inch, or, he might have said yet more strongly, an hair’s breadth, to his height? So large a measure as a cubit seems, according to the laws of a natural rhetoric, certainly out of place. We should feel this much more vividly if we were to substitute a foot, which yet is not by one-half so much, for the cubit, which not being a measure familiar to us, we do not at once associate actual length with it.

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 15. Cujus potestate atque dominatu factum est, ut ad hanc staturam corpus vestrum perduceretur, ejus providentiâ etiam vestiri potest.

² This was first, I believe, suggested by Erasmus. Hammond has brought well together the arguments in its favour.

³ Augustine feels that adding a cubit to the body can hardly be called “*that which is least*,” and seeks to help the interpretation thus, (Quæst. Evang. l. ii. c. 28,) Minimum est enim hoc, sed Deo corpora operanti.

Suppose it were said, Which of you with all his caring can make himself *a foot* higher? we should feel at once that a foot was scarcely the measure which would there have most naturally found place.

This difficulty was perceived long ago by Euthymius, who sought to escape it by replying, that the cubit was used as the ordinary measure of stature. This is most true, even as the foot with us, but not to the exclusion of a smaller measure when any inner necessity shall require the mention of the latter. And then there is this second objection, that increase of stature is not a thing about which men do take anxious thought; it can scarcely be said in any case to be an object of desire. But it is otherwise with added length of days (1 Kings, iii. 11); and understanding the passage to refer to that, our Saviour's argument will then be this: To what profit is all this solicitude about that which is to sustain life, when after all it can effect so little? with all your carking and caring, you cannot make the most trifling addition, not so much as a single cubit, to the length of your life:¹ God brings in the day that terminates your course, whensoever he will. (Luke, xii. 10.) The image will then be that of life as a race or course (*ἄρόμος*), and the cubit, which would have been much in the stature of a man, while that rarely consists of more than three cubits in all, would be exceedingly little, and therefore most appropriate, in the length of a course. We have abundant

¹ Attempts thus to add to it are not without example in the East. Von Hammer, in his *Fundgruben des Orients*, gives a copy of a regularly executed document of the kind, in which an inferior formally makes over to his patron a certain number, I think fifteen, of the years of his life.

examples in Scripture, of life set forth under this image; as Job, ix. 25; 2 Tim. iv. 7, and Ps. xxxix. 5, "Thou hast made my days as an handbreadth."¹

But these sayings, and those that follow to the end of the chapter, might seem at first sight to cast a slight upon *all* labour, and *all* providence, on man's part: and, as was to be expected, they have not escaped this abusive interpretation. The Manichæans, for instance, as we learn from Augustine,² in their eager quest for discrepancies between the Old and the New Testament, if so they might find help for their assertion, that the Old came from a different God, while it taught another doctrine, found in this passage a contradiction to the summons of the wise man, to learn foresight from the ant, "Go to the ant, thou sluggard, &c." (Prov. vi. 6-8); and the idle vagabond monks, who bore, after the Church had cast them out, the name of Euchites,³ affirmed not merely the lawfulness

¹ A saying of Augustine's, *Plus est pauperi videre cœlum stellatum quàm diviti tectum inauratum*, is exactly in the same line of thought as this, "Consider the lilies of the field . . . yet I say unto you, that Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these," though it does not come from him with any direct reference to what the Lord has spoken here.

² *Con. Adimant. c. 24*. See another contradiction that they found between this passage and Gen. iv. 10, in this same treatise, c. 4, with Augustine's admirable answer. As regards the passage from the Proverbs (vi. 6), he gives it altogether a spiritual significance. The time of outward prosperity is our summer, in which we must lay up of the Word of God, of the lessons of his truth, and all that which shall secretly nourish and feed us when the winter of tribulation and sorrow shall arrive. Cf. his beautiful words, *Enarr. in Ps. lxvi. 2*, and in *Ps. xxxvii. 20*.

³ *Liber de Hæres. c. 57*.

of living without labour, but on the plea of this passage, avowed it as a point of perfection to abstain from all toil, declaring, that so they came close to this command of Christ, feeding like the birds out of God's hand, and living on his free bounty, without any carefulness for to-morrow.¹

But Augustine set himself with a strong earnestness against this perversion of Christ's words, and the spreading evil which from this had infected many,—dedicating an especial treatise to this object. It cannot be, he says, that abstaining from labour is a point of perfection, for the blessed Apostle St. Paul himself, when indeed he had abundant causes to exempt him from toil, yet laboured with his own hands, and gave the same commandment in the Churches, “that if any would not work, neither should he eat.” (2 Thess. iii. 8—11. Cf. Acts, xviii. 1; xx. 33.) And then with regard to forethought and preparation for the coming day, neither can this, he shows, be altogether forbidden, for the Lord himself, with his disciples, had a bag, from which things needful were purchased: the fragments that remained of the loaves he bade to be gathered up, evidently to be reserved for another occasion. How far looking too was St. Paul in the matter of the collection for the poor saints at Jerusalem (1 Cor. xvi. 1; Acts, xi. 27); how rejoiced at its large-

¹ De Opere Monach. c. 3. Evangelica præcepta, de quibus nonnulli non solum pigritiam sed etiam arrogantiam suam fovent. And c. 30, Quis ferat homines contumaces saluberrimis Apostoli monitis resistentes, non sicut infirmiores tolerari, sed sicut etiam sanctiores prædicari, ut monasteria doctrinâ saniore fundata, geminâ illecebrâ corrumpantur, et dissolutâ licentiâ vacationis, et falso nomine sanctitatis?

ness (2 Cor. ix. 15);¹ how provident in all his arrangements concerning the different members of the Church (1 Tim. v. 16). Were the not making any provision for the morrow the point of perfection, then the savage who wastes what he cannot immediately consume, who lives only for the present hour, would have reached the highest state of all.²

He turns upon these idle monks, who do not seem to have made a very profitable use of the leisure which this interpretation gave them—wandering about the country, as he describes them, selling now the relics of martyrs, if indeed of martyrs—now phylacteries and amulets—professing now to be on journeys to visit their kindred, whom they had heard to be alive in some distant land, and everywhere seeking the profits of a gainful poverty, the rewards of a pretended sanctity;³ and he says to them, if you are determined to take this Scripture in the letter, you must at least be consistent and carry your interpretation through. It is true you do not sow, nor reap; you understand Christ literally,

¹ De Opere Monach. c. 16. Quantâ pinguedine sanctæ lætitiæ perfusus Apostolus, dum loquitur de alterno supplemento indigentiae militum et provincialium Christi. Cf. De Mendacio, c. 15.

² Con. Adimant. c. 24. Si hoc [Matt. vi. 24] ideo dictum est ut non servetur panis in crastinum, magis hoc implent vagi Romanorum, quos Passivos appellant, qui annonâ quotidianâ satiato ventre, aut donant statim quod restat aut projiciunt; quàm vel Domini discipuli, qui etiam cum ipso Domino cœli et terræ in terrâ ambulantes oculos habebant: vel Paulus Apostolus, qui omnium terrenorum contemptor sic tamen gubernavit ea quæ præsentî vitæ erant necessaria, ut etiam de viduis præceperit. (1 Tim. v. 16).—Passivus, in this passage, is a word of African origin, and was applied to persons who led an idle, tramping, gypsy-like kind of life. See Du Cange, s. v.

³ Sumptus lucrosæ egestatis, aut simulatæ pretium sanctitatis.

where toil is to be avoided; then by the same reason you ought also to have no barns, but you have such, in which you are ready enough to store the labours of others. If you will be as the birds, what mean the preparations of your food, your grinding and your baking? what your reserving of aught for to-morrow? And then he draws a lively picture of a flock of monks, as they should be, if they will adhere to the letter of this precept, lighting on a field and gathering what they need for the moment of its produce, which they must consume raw as they find it.

But who is it, he asks, that really lives according to the spirit of the precepts which his Saviour has given him here? He who is confident that if by infirmity or other cause he is cut off from his work, he shall indeed be fed without his toil, as the birds are, and clothed as the lilies: but with health and strength and opportunity, knows that these are God's appointed means whereby he shall receive things needful for the body; yet esteems not, because he labours, that it is any other than God who does truly feed him and clothe him now: ² who knows that it is the solicitude

¹ De Opere Monach. c. 23. Cur ergo isti manus otiosas et plena repositoria volunt habere? Cur ea quæ sumunt ex laboribus aliorum, recondunt et servant unde quotidie proferatur? Cur denique molunt et coquunt? Hoc enim aves non faciunt. And ibid. c. 24, Cur volatilia cæli non vobis sunt exemplo ad nihil reservandum, et vultis ut sint exemplo ad nihil operandum?

² De Opere Monach. c. 27. Si et nos per aliquam vel infirmitatem vel occupationem non possimus operari, sic ille nos pascet et vestiet, quemadmodum aves et lilia, quæ nihil operantur hujusmodi: cùm autem possumus, non debemus tentare Deum nostrum, quia et hoc quod possumus, ejus munere possumus, et cùm hinc vivimus, illo largiente vivimus, qui largitus est ut possimus.

and not the labour (for that is God's appointment) which is excluded;¹ the doubt whether God could, if need were, provide for us in any other-way, that is checked; and the feeling that it is any other who does ever under any circumstances, whether we labour or whether we are hindered from labour, in fact provide.

Augustine does not take our Saviour's words, "*But seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added to you,*" as actually excluding prayer for these lower things; only they shall not be the objects of our first or chiefest or most earnest prayers. The great things of the kingdom are to claim these; but in subordination to those greater we may ask for health of body, peace in our times, and the other forms of an outward prosperity.²

¹ De Mendac. c. 15. Satis elucet ista præcepta sic intelligenda ut nihil operis nostri temporalium adipiscendorum amore, vel timore egestatis, tanquam ex necessitate faciamus.

² Serm. lxi. (Appendix). Nec hoc sic dicimus, ut pro rebus temporalibus Deum non oremus, id est, pro sanitate corporis, aut pro pace temporum, aut pro abundantia fructuum. Debemus et ista à Deo petere, sed secundo et tertio loco, ut primas partes in omni intentione nostræ orationis amor animæ et desiderium vitæ æternæ obtineat.

ST. MATTHEW, CHAP. VII.

VER. 1.—Upon these words, “*Judge not, that ye be not judged,*” Augustine observes, that they must not be understood as though the Christian man were altogether to abdicate the right of discerning between good and evil: for the Lord himself bids us to know men by their fruits, that is, to judge of what spirit they are; and says again, “*Judge righteous judgment*” (John, vii. 24); and again his Apostle, “*Do not ye judge them that are within?*” (1 Cor. v. 12.) For there are some sins which are manifest, actions which cannot be done with a right intention,—“*open beforehand, going before to judgment.*” (1 Tim. v. 24.) On all these a Christian *must* pass a judgment; though even here he will refrain from judging what will be the final state of him who does these things, since it will be always possible that he may repent and be saved. But the not judging chiefly refers to those acts which are capable of a double interpretation,¹ these are ever to have the judgment of charity. He gives for examples the following: If a man, on the plea of bodily weakness, should decline to keep the fasts of the Church, and you should not believe his plea, but should count that it were only an excuse for self-indulgence,—an unwillingness to mortify the flesh,

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 18. Sunt quædam facta media quæ ignoramus quo animo fiant, quia et bono et malo fieri possunt, de quibus temerarium est judicare, maximè ut condemnemus.

this were to transgress the commandment, and to be a judge of evil thoughts. Or a man rules his house, as it seems to you, with too severe a strictness; yet do not therefore conclude him harsh and cruel, since it may be out of a zeal for righteousness, and the love of an holy discipline, that he does it.¹ In these, and all such like cases, that word will apply, "Who art thou that judgest another man's servant? to his own master he standeth or falleth" (Rom. xiv. 4); and that other word, "Judge nothing before the time" (1 Cor. iv. 5); and our Lord's precept here, "Judge not, that ye be not judged." Nor are they things questionable alone, and acts capable of a double interpretation, on which men are tempted to exercise uncharitable judgment. But the evil of their own hearts, the sad consciousness of their own mingled, and oftentimes impure, motives, makes them prompt to suspect the same in others, and to think that even deeds evidently good do yet grow out of some evil root.² Against all this he reminds us, the seeking of that charity which "thinketh no evil," is the only remedy that will avail.

Ver. 2.—But, Augustine asks, how is what follows to be understood: "*For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged;*" since it cannot mean that if we judge rashly of others, God will judge rashly of us;

¹ Serm. lxxvi. (Appendix). De illis verò quæ aperta sunt et publica mala judicare et arguere, cum caritate tamen et amore, et possumus et debemus, odio habentes non hominem sed peccatum, non vitiosum sed vitium; detestantes morbum potius quàm ægrotum.

² Thus Enarr. in Ps. cxviii. 39, with a mournful, yet most true heart-knowledge, he says, Hoc enim proclivius homo suspicatur in alio, quod sentit in seipso.

or if we measure unjustly to them, it will in turn be measured unjustly to us?¹ But it is not the temerity of the sinner's judgment which God will imitate, but the severity of it; "With the froward thou wilt show thyself froward." (Ps. xviii. 26.) Nor in the moral world can the retaliation, whether it comes directly from God, or from those that are his vicegerents on earth, be considered as a new act of injustice, but is rather the restoration of the disturbed balances of righteousness,² by throwing a counter-weight into the scale opposite to that into which the offender had thrown his weight. Punishment is the recoil of crime, and the strength of the back-stroke proportions itself to the strength of the original blow.

He has a remarkable reply to one who found in these words an argument against the everlasting duration of the punishment of sinners. These argued, that as men sinned within limits of time, so within limits of time their punishment must be restrained, according to that phrase, "*With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again;*" and according to the general equity, which would demand, that the sin which was temporal should receive also a punishment only temporal. But their sin, though accidentally confined within limits of time and space, had its true seat and root in that which was everlasting in them, in their will, in that latent eternity which

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 18.

² So, speaking of Dives and Lazarus, with reference to this verse, he says, Serm. cclxvii., Pensantur . . . pro purpurâ flamma, refectio pro nuditate, ut salva sit æquitas statera. Cf. De Civ. Dei, l. xxi. c. 11.

is in every man.¹ A sin, though coming outwardly to pass under conditions of time and of space, yet in its essence lies out of these altogether,—is eternal as the woe it brings.

Ver. 3—5.—As examples of what the Lord means by “*the mote*” and “*the beam*,” Augustine instances anger and hate: transient anger is a mote disturbing indeed, but not destroying, the spiritual vision; while hatred, which is anger grown inveterate,² the mote now swollen into a beam,³ quite destroys that vision, causing a man to walk altogether in darkness.⁴ (I

¹ Ep. 102, quæst. 4, where he says, In eadem igitur mensurâ, quamvis non æternorum malefactorum, æterna supplicia remetuntur, ut quia æternam voluit haberi peccati perfruitionem, æternam vindictæ inveniatur severitatem. See, too, his argument from the analogy of human punishments (De Civ. Dei, l. xxi. c. 11). The chapter is very remarkable, as anticipating so much of Butler's argument “On the Government of God by Rewards and Punishments.” Among other things he says, Jam verò damnum, ignominia, exsilium, servitus, cum plerumque sic infligantur ut nullâ veniâ relaxentur, nonne pro hujus vitæ modo similia pœnis videntur æternis? Ideo quippe æterna esse non possunt, quia nec ipsa vita quæ his plectitur porrigitur in æternum: et tamen peccata quæ vindicantur longissimi temporis pœnis, brevissimo tempore perpetrantur, nec quispiam existit qui censeret tam citò nocentium finienda esse tormenta, quam citò factum est vel homicidium, vel adulterium, vel sacrilegium, vel quidlibet aliud scelus, non temporis longitudine, sed iniquitatis et impietatis magnitudine metiendum.

² De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 19. Odium est ira inveterata.

³ Serm. lxxxii. c. 1. Festuca initium trabis est. Nam trabes quando nascitur, priùs festuca est. Rigando festucam, perducis ad trabem: alendo iram malis suspicionibus, perducis ad odium.

⁴ Serm. lvi. (Appendix.) Cordis oculus festuca turbat, trabes excæcat . . . Per subitanam iracundiam cordis oculus turbatur, per odium lumen caritatis extinguatur.

John, ii. 11.) He who in his heart nourishes hatred to his brother, with what front shall he condemn and rebuke his brother for the passing anger which may find place in his? At times it would appear as if Augustine meant to limit the interpretation to this single case, but of course this would be too narrow a meaning; and elsewhere he gives the more comprehensive interpretation, which makes the mote and the beam to be respectively any smaller and greater sins: the mote being that sin which is indeed injurious to, but is still consistent with, a state of grace, an impaired but not a destroyed vision of God; but the beam involving absolute blindness, total suspension of spiritual vision.

He is very earnest in warning us lest we should understand this passage—which in our cowardice and sloth we might perhaps be tempted to do—as though all fraternal rebuke and correction were declared to be out of place. The warning is only directed against the rebuking in a wrong spirit, without earnest endeavours at self-amendment, without a recognition of our common sinfulness,¹ without the remembrance that we too, also, have been “foolish, disobedient;” and so rebuking, not in the spirit of meekness and of love, but in that of arrogance or scorn, or with an evil pleasure in the humiliation of a brother.² So far from all Chris-

¹ On this “Judge not,” he asks, *Serm. cccxxxvii.*, *Ergo tacebimus et neminem omnino corripiemus? Corripiamus planè, sed priùs nos. Proximum vis corripere: nihil est tibi te ipso propinquius.*

² *De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 19.* See also much that is most admirable on this matter of Christian rebuke, *Exp. Ep. ad Gal. (vi. 1)*, where among other things he says, *Nunquam alieni peccati objurgandi suscipiendum est negotium, nisi cùm internis interroga-*

tian rebuke being here condemned, there is implicitly in the passage a command to exercise this difficult grace,¹ only at the right time and in the right temper; “*then,*” after we have in ourselves sought the removal of all that is hindering our own vision of God, and rendering us incapable of giving true counsel to our brother, “*shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother’s eye;*”² and it is not to love, but to hate our brother,³ under the plea of charity, not to exercise it, when it is needed. He observes often what sharp correction there will be frequently in love, while indifference or hatred will either keep silence, or else flatter and by their flattery strengthen and confirm in evil.⁴ How sharply Stephen could speak to those Jews (Acts, vii. 51), for whom yet, after they had proceeded to far greater outrages against him, he could pray even in his dying agony.⁵

tionibus examinantes nostram conscientiam liquidò nobis coram Deo responderimus, dilectione nos facere.

¹ Exp. Ep. ad Gal. vi. 1. Nihil autem sic probat spiritalem virum, quàm peccati alieni tractatio, cùm liberationem ejus potius quàm insultationem, potiusque auxilia quàm convicia meditatur.

² Serm. lxxxii. c. 2. Lumen quod in te est, non te permittit negligere lumen fratris.

³ Ibid. Tua patientia, illius mors est.

⁴ In 1 Ep. Joh. Tract. 7. Si qui fortè vultis servare caritatem, fratres, ante omnia ne putetis abjectam et desidiosam. . . . Non putes tunc te amare servum tuum, quando eum non cædis; aut tunc te amare filium tuum, quando ei non das disciplinam; aut tunc te amare vicinum tuum, quando eum non corripis. Non est ista caritas, sed languor.

⁵ Of Stephen, with one of those plays on the words which were rarely unwelcome to him, he says, *Lingua clamat, cor amat.*

Ver. 6.—Augustine distinguishes between the “*holy*” and the “*pearls* :” he allows them indeed ultimately to mean the same, yet the same contemplated upon different sides. “That which is holy” is the truth, as it may not be spoiled or corrupted, or, if in itself inviolable, as it may not be laid open to profane attempts of the kind. The “*pearls*” are the same mysteries of the faith, as they are too precious to be exposed to slights or careless contempt.¹ So also he distinguishes between the “*dogs*” and the “*swine* :” the dogs are the active opposers of God’s truth (the *rabiosa canis*, see Acts, xiii. 45), the swine the passive despisers² (the *amica luto sus*); somewhat, I suppose, as we have in the parable of the marriage of the king’s son, (Matt. xxii.) those that killed the king’s messengers, and those that were content with despising the message, (Matt. xxii. 5, 6). And then he distributes the two exhibitions of hostility, giving the contemptuous trampling under foot to the swine, the turning again and rending to the dogs.³ Yet I can hardly doubt but

¹ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 20. Sanctum ex eo quod non debet corrumpi, margarita ex eo quod non debet contemni.

² De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 20. Canes ergo pro oppugnantoribus veritatis, porcos pro contemptoribus positos non incongruè accipimus. And he assumes the same, Enarr. in Ps. ix. 15, where of these two kinds of opposers he says, Qui malunt pertinaciter latrare, quàm studiosè quærere, aut qui nec latrare nec quærere, sed in suarum voluptatum cœno volutari.

³ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 20. Porci quamvis non ita ut canes morsu appetant, passim tamen calcando coinquinant. It may be seen in Hammond what can be said in defence of this distribution; it is in itself most harsh, connecting the first and fourth clauses, the second and the third, instead of the first and third, the second and fourth. Certainly the connecting particle would not be καὶ but ἢ, were this the meaning.

that this is an erroneous distribution, and that they both belong to the swine, so that there might well be a semicolon after “*Give not that which is holy unto the dogs;*”¹ for the treading under foot is as little proper to these animals as the other outbreak of hostility, the turning again and rending: while both are the most graphic and exactest delineations of the bearing of the enraged swine, which we must naturally here consider, not as the domesticated creature, but as the hog in the ferocity of its savage state.² The words in fact say this, You will expose the truth to insult and yourselves to injury.³ So that if we are to find here two different characters of bestial opposers, we should rather say that the “dogs” were the unclean, the utterly and shamelessly sunken in impure lusts (Rev. xxii. 15), the “swine” the fierce and bitter opponents of the truth of God. (Compare Ps. lxxx. 13. “The wild boar out of the wood doth root it out.”) The first the Heliogabalus, the second the Galerius.⁴

¹ In Bishop Lloyd’s Greek Testament there is a punctuation equivalent to this, but it is not common.

² The *στραφέντες* will express the quick sharp turn of the head of the boar with which the wound is inflicted (Horace—*Verres obliquum meditans ictum*; Ovid—*Obliquo dente timendus aper*); and the *ῥήξασι*, the nature of the wound, which is formidable, not so much from its depth as from being a long tearing or ripping up, or, as we have it, rending.

³ Serm. lxxvii. c. 6. *Ne forte &c. . . id est, post contemptum margaritarum vestrarum etiam molesti sint vobis.*

⁴ This view derives an additional confirmation from an accurate fixing of the meaning of *τὸ ἅγιον*. We translate it vaguely “that which is holy,” but it is certainly “the holy thing,” i. e. the altar flesh. See Lev. xxii. 6—16, LXX., where that is several times called *τὰ ἅγια*, which no unclean person might eat. It is not that

Ver. 7.—This, according to Augustine, is the connexion between this verse and the preceding. Some one, hearing these last words, might be tempted to say in his heart, But what pearls have I, which I am even in danger of losing, by casting before the unworthy? I hardly seem to have such for myself. In answer to this thought, rising out of a sense of spiritual poverty, opportunely follows the suggestion, how this poverty may be removed, “*Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you.*” In his *Retractations* he recalls the distinction which in his *Exposition* of this discourse he had sought to draw between these three, and which, being withdrawn, it will be needless to examine, and he recognizes, in all three, exhortations to an instancy of earnest prayer.¹ He finds in ver. 11 a proof that

the dogs would not eat it, for it would be welcome to them; but that it would be a profanation to give it to them, thus to make it a σκίβαλον. (Exod. xxii. 31.) Such “dogs” are they who would turn the grace of God into lasciviousness. This, the true interpretation of τὸ ἅγιον, was preserved in the ancient Church, in the cry of the deacons to those who were about to communicate, τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις, which did not mean generally, holy things for holy persons, but the holy flesh for the holy persons, for the kingdom of priests; with allusion to those Levitical ordinances, now transmuted and glorified, which I have referred to above. So, too, I have no doubt that there is a singular propriety in the image of the pearls; that they are selected, as Maldonatus suggests, for the likeness to acorns which they bear; and the fury of the swine is supposed to be excited by discovering that they are not these, but something which, though infinitely more precious, they have no desire for.

¹ L. i. c. 19. Operosè quidem tria ista quid inter se differant exponendum putavi, sed longè melius ad instantissimam petitionem omnia referuntur. So Enarr. in Ps. cxviii. 48.

it is so; where “ask” evidently stands for and represents not merely itself, but the “seek” and “knock” as well. In his popular homiletic use of these words he very frequently brings into comparison the two parables of the Unjust Judge (Luke, xviii. 1), and the Friend at midnight (Luke, xi. 5).¹ The image of the knocking, with the final opening of the door, gives to the latter parallel a peculiar fitness.

Ver. 8.—The objection might here be urged, namely, that notwithstanding this and like promises in Scriptures (as John, xiv. 13, xv. 16, xvi. 23; 1 John, iii. 22), the saints do not always obtain their petitions, do not invariably ask and receive. For example, St. Paul asked, and earnestly and often, for the removal of the thorn in his flesh, whatever that was, and it was not removed; this was expressly denied him. (2 Cor. xii. 7—9.) Augustine takes up this very example, and affirms that God’s servants *are* always heard, showing how in that very instance the Apostle was heard, not indeed to his present desire, but to his lasting good, since by that temptation and through those buffetings he was to be perfected.² God dealt with him as the faithful physician deals with his patient, from whom he withdraws not the knife and the cautery, notwithstanding his instant cries. He knows how far the wound reaches, and so he will search it to the bottom and

¹ Serm. lxi. c. 4. Ecce paterfamilias et magnus dives, divitiarum scilicet spiritualium et æternarum, hortatur et dicit tibi, Pete, quære, pulsa. Hortatur ut petas, negabit quod petis? Attende à contrario similitudinem. And he quotes Luke, xviii. 1. Cf. Ep. 130, c. 8.

² In 1 Ep. Joh. Tract. 6. Deus etsi voluntati nostræ non dat, saluti dat.

make a perfect cure. He knows too that the patient will thank him for this in the end, and so he hears him for his lasting desire, which is health; not for his momentary desire, which is release from pain. It is thus that God hears his servants for the lasting desire of their souls, which is holiness; not for the immediate, which may be ease.¹ Augustine brings out, moreover, how, on the other side, a petition may be granted in anger, as was that of the devils, when they were allowed at their petition to enter into the swine, but did only so accelerate the doom which they feared (Matt. viii. 31, 32); as that of the prince of all evil (Job, i. 12), when he desired to tempt Job, and was permitted to do so, for Job's greater approval and for the aggravation of his own confusion; as that of the Israelites, when they asked for quails and perished while the meat was yet in their mouths. And so, on the other hand, a petition may be refused in love; in which case it is not really refused, but rather granted in an higher shape than the asker contemplated. There is a beautiful passage in his Confessions, where, concerning some prayers of his mother

¹ In 1 Ep. Joh. Tract. 6. [Deus] secare vult, urere vult. Tu si clamas et non exaudiris, in sectione, in ustione, et tribulatione, novit ille quousque putre est. Tu jam vis revocet manus, et ille vulneris sinum attendit; scit quousque perveniat: non te exaudit ad voluntatem, sed exaudit ad sanitatem. Cf. Serm. cccliv. c. 7. Petit æger ut quod ad salutem apponit medicus, cùm voluerit ægrotus, auferatur. Medicus dicit, Non: mordet, sed sanat. Tu dicis, Tolle quod mordet. Medicus dicit, Non tollo, quia sanat. Tu ad medicum quare venisti? Sanari, an molestiam non pati? Non ergo exaudivit Dominus Paulum ad voluntatem, quia exaudivit ad sanitatem. Cf. Enarr. in Ps. cxxx. 1.

Monica's, he says, God gave heed to the *hinge* of her desire, though he gave her not the boon exactly by the means through which she sought it. Her anxiety and her earnest prayer was that he might not sail for Italy, while she dreaded the dangers and temptations which he would encounter at Rome: he sailed, notwithstanding, and it was there at length that he found Christ.¹

Ver. 9, 10.—The very ingenious allegories which Augustine discovers, in the “*bread*” and the “*stone*,” the “*fish*” and the “*serpent*,” and not less in the egg and the scorpion, which St. Luke (xi. 12), but not one Evangelist, has recorded, may be seen by any one who places sufficient value upon such to take the trouble of following up the references given below.² Yet I cannot doubt that these objects were selected for no other reason than as objects among the most obvious of an wholesome nourishment, which a father would give to his children; and that in each case the anti-thesis rests on the resemblance: a stone has some like-

¹ Confess. l. v. c. 15. Quid à te petebat, Deus meus, tantis lacrimis, nisi ut navigare me non sineres? Sed tu altè consulens, et exaudiens *cardinem desiderii ejus*, non curasti quod tunc petebat, ut in me faceres quod semper petebat. We may compare Serm. lxxx. Qualis est apud te filius tuus nesciens res humanas, talis es et tu apud Dominum, nesciens res divinas. Ecce ante te filius tuus totà die plorans, ut des illi cultrum, id est gladium: negas te dare, non das, contemnis flentem, ne plangas morientem. Pioret, affligat se, collidat se, ut leves eum in equum: non facis, quia non potest eum regere; elidet et occidet illum. Cui negas partem, totum illi servas. Sed ut crescat, et totum possideat securè, non das illi modicum periculosum.

² Ep. 130, c. 8, (ad Probam); Quæst. Evang. l. ii. c. 22.

ness to bread, a serpent to a fish, and a scorpion to an egg. And these allegories, and the like, should pass for what they are worth, as the harmless, often times edifying and graceful, plays and scintillations of a religious fancy; frequently meant for no more by those who offered them; but which assume a very different aspect when they are afterwards fixed and hardened into permanent expositions of Scripture truth.

Ver. 11.—Augustine observes how those who are addrest here as “*being evil*” are the very same into whose mouths but now the Lord has put that word, “Our Father;”¹ to whom he has made the promise, “Ask, and it shall be given you:” so that every faithful man has a double aspect—he is “evil” through his old nature—he is good through participation with him who is the highest good, who is in some sense the alone good, (Matt. xix. 17,) the good in himself, and altogether good, while others are good through him, and only as they are sharers in his life.² So that we may perceive here that he has seized the right interpretation of the “being evil,” which they fail to catch³ who take the epithet “evil,” not as the desig-

¹ Ep. 153, c. 5, (ad Macedon.) Num igitur Deus Pater malorum est? Absit. Quomodo dicitur, Pater vester cœlestis, quibus dicitur, Cùm sitis mali: nisi quia utrumque Veritas monstrat, quid simus Dei bono, quid humano vitio, hoc commendans, illud emendans? Cf. Serm. xc. Pater ergo malorum, sed non relinquendorum, quia medicus sanandorum.

² Con. duas Ep. Pelag. l. iii. c. 3. Inde mali, unde adhuc filii sæculi, jam tamen filii Dei facti pignore Spiritus Sancti.

³ Even he himself at times, as De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 21, Malos appellat dilectores adhuc sæculi hujus et peccatores.

nation of all men, of human nature in general (Gen. viii. 21), as it is opposed to the goodness and holiness of God, but of some particular men deeper sunken in corruption than the rest; as if Christ would say, Even the worst among you (even the *πονηροί*)¹ do not extend their malignity to their children, but in their relations to them show themselves bountiful and good. But the other is the truer and deeper explanation, embracing the whole race of men under this charge of evil, who, being such, have yet natural affections, the yearnings of a parent's heart toward their children, and, according to their ability and knowledge, impart unto them good gifts, which if not in the highest sense deserving the title of "good," are yet good for the necessities of this present life. How much more certainly will the Heavenly Father impart the true goods of his kingdom, for it is those that the Lord has prominently in his eye, as is plainly shown by a comparison with the parallel passage in St. Luke (xi. 13), where instead of "good things" it is his "Holy Spirit" which is promised to them that ask.² As he will not deny his children, altogether withholding

¹ This will come more clearly out if we note how *τίς ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος*, ver. 9, is not pleonastic, as we make it, "what man of you;" but there is a silent opposition between the *ἄνθρωπος* here and the *Πατὴρ ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* of ver. 11; Who of you, though he be but a man, &c.; and then the being but a man will plainly appear as equal to *πονηρὸς ὢν*.

² Enarr. in Ps. cxviii. 48. Alius porrò Evangelista non ait, Dabit bona petentibus se, quæ multipliciter possunt intelligi, vel corporalia vel spiritalia; sed circumcidit inde alia, satisque diligenter expressit quid nos vehementer atque instanter voluerit poscere Dominus, et ait, Quantò magis Pater vester dabit Spiritum bonum petentibus se?

what they ask (ver. 7, 8), so neither will he deceive his children, giving to them a useless or a noxious thing instead of a good (ver. 9, 10). He observes how here again it is the same argument as finds place in the parable of the Unjust Judge, an argument from the worse to the better.

Ver. 12.—Some will perhaps remember Gibbon's sneer concerning this precept, that, extolled as it was, he had read it four hundred years before Christ announced it in the Gospel, and he produces a passage from Isocrates,—which by the way is no anticipation of it at all, for it is merely the negative injunction of not doing to others what we are unwilling to suffer from them, a rule marvellously distant from Christ's law of an active love. But Augustine, so far from being afraid of the charge that this is an old precept, makes it the glory of the written and spoken law, that it is the transcript of that which is old, and not merely as old as this man or that, but as the creation itself, a reproduction of the dimmed and obscured law written once by the finger of God on the hearts of all men. When therefore heathen sages or poets proclaimed any part of this, they had not thereby anticipated Christ,¹ they had only decyphered some fragment of that law, which he gave at the beginning; and which when men, fugitives from themselves and from the knowledge of

¹ Enarr. in Ps. cxl. 6. Dixit hoc Pythagoras, dixit hoc Plato. . . . Propterea si inventus fuerit aliquis eorum hoc dixisse quod dixit et Christus, gratulamur illi, non sequimur illum. Sed prior fuit ille quàm Christus? Si quis vera loquitur, prior est quàm ipsa Veritas? O homo, attende Christum, non quando ad te venerit, sed quando te fecerit.

their own hearts, had lost the power of reading, he came in the flesh to read to them anew.¹

He notes that in the Latin copies it was not "*All things*," but "*All good things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them*." But he rejects this "good" as clearly an addition, and one which was not to be found in any Greek MSS. He thus explains the manner in which it probably first found its way into the text. It had occurred to some one: But what if a man should desire sinful things of another, as to be invited of him to a drunken revel, and should proceed himself first to invite the other to the same, that he might be requited in like kind, this could not surely be fulfilling the Lord's precept. And so to avoid this evil consequence, which yet to the transcriber seemed to be involved in the words, he guarded the "*All things*" by making it rather, *All good things*.² Augustine, however, shows that there is not really such a difficulty here; for we *will only good things, we desire bad things*.³ It is

¹ Enarr. in Ps. lvii. 2. Non enim scriptum non habebant, sed legere nolebant. . . . Quia homines appetentes ea quæ foris sunt, etiam à seipsis exules facti sunt, data est etiam conscripta lex: non quia in cordibus scripta non erat; sed quia tu fugitivus eras cordis tui, ab illo qui ubique est, comprehenderis, et ad teipsum intrò revocaris.

² De Civ. Dei, l. xiv. c. 8. Cavendum enim putaverunt, ne quisquam inhonesta velit sibi fieri ab hominibus, ut de turpioribus taceam, certè luxuriosa convivia in quibus se, si et ipse illis faciat similia, hoc præceptum existimet impleturum. Cf. De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 22.

³ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 22. Id enim quod dictum est, Quæcunque vultis, non usitatè ac passim, sed propriè dictum accipi oportet. Voluntas namque non est nisi in bonis. Nam in malis

true, that “to will” may be sometimes used in a laxer and in the lower sense; but this does not hinder, where need is, the taking it in the stricter, in which here it is to be accepted.—“*This is the Law and the Prophets,*” not “*All the Law and the Prophets,*” as Christ expressed himself elsewhere, (Matt. xxii. 40,) for there he had been giving the two commandments, Love to God, and Love to our neighbour, so that he could thus speak; but this commandment in its utmost latitude includes only love to our brother.

Ver. 13, 14.—On the words “*Enter ye in at the strait gate*” he has in one of his homilies many beautiful observations. What is it, he asks, which makes this gate so strait to us and so narrow? It is not so much that it is strait in its own nature, as that we make it strait for ourselves—by the swellings of our pride;—and then vexed that we cannot enter, chafing and impatient at the hinderances we meet with, we become more and more unable to pass through. But where is the remedy? how shall these tumid places of our souls be brought down? By accepting

flagitiosisque factis, cupiditas propriè dicitur, non voluntas. Cf. De Civ. Dei, l. xiv. c. 8. To the unregenerate belongs indeed the liberum arbitrium, that is, in each individual case a choice is possible to them: the libera voluntas pertains only to the regenerate; this is their redemption that they have the will set free in Christ. And there is an higher yet, as Augustine teaches, even than this libera voluntas, namely, the libertas, the beata necessitas boni, which may be ascribed only to God and to his holy Angels; as at the other extreme there is the misera necessitas peccandi, the condition of devils, and that into which evil men are every day more and more coming.

and drinking of the cup, wholesome though it may be bitter, of humility; by listening to and learning of him, the same who said, "Enter ye in at the strait gate," and who gives also answer to them who inquire, "How shall we enter in?" and says, "I am the way," "I am the gate."¹

We may here adduce an example of the rich symbolic significance which of old they traced in many of the ways and works of the lower creation: most, it is true, of these being found by this time to be entirely mythical, yet not therefore marred for us. Thus Augustine, with reference to this passage, makes use of a legend concerning the artifice by which the serpent was believed to get rid of its old skin, namely, by forcing itself through some narrow aperture and so leaving behind that old, and coming out in all the freshness and splendour of its new. And wouldst thou, he asks, according to the bidding of the Apostle, put off the old man and put on the new, there is but one way to effect it. Thou must not be afraid of the straitness of this gate; it is only by forcing thyself through it, that thou canst leave behind thee the exuviæ of the old man.² And if processes like these be painful, yet

¹ Serm. cxlii. c. 5. Clamat ille qui factus est Via; Intrate per angustam portam. Conatur ingredi, impedit tumor: et tantò magis perniciosè conatur, quantò magis impedit tumor. Tumidum autem vexat angustia, vexatus autem ampliùs tumebit. Ampliùs tumens quando intrabit? Ergo detumescat. . . . Accipiat humilitatis medicamentum, bibit contra tumorem poculum amarum sed salubre, bibit poculum humilitatis. Quid se arctat? Non sinit moles, non magna, sed tumida. Magnitudo enim soliditatem habet, tumor inflationem.

² Enarr. in Ps. lvii. 5. Et quomodo exuo, inquis, veterem hominem? Imitare astutiam serpentis. Quid enim facit serpens ut exuat

still remember, says he in another place, the present time is the time of healing, not of enjoying.¹—And on the “*many*” and the “*few*,”—Be not led away by the numbers of those, nor abashed by the fewness of these. For do not number them but weigh them, and in a just balance, see how a few grains are enough to overbalance whole armsful of chaff.²

Ver. 15—20.—Our Lord has said just before that there are few that find this way of life; and now there is danger lest heretics, who commonly glory in their fewness,³ as though it marked them especially as the *little* flock to whom the kingdom was given, should snatch at these words, and boast that they were the finders of, and leaders in, the way. Therefore he adds immediately the caution, “*Beware of false prophets.*” This is the connexion which here Augustine gives: but concerning the “*fruits*,” the not having of which, and the having the contrary to which, will cause these false prophets to be known, and will lay bare their hypocrisy; these, he remarks, it is clear cannot be those more prominent works of an outward piety,

se veterem tunicam? Coarctat se per foramen angustum. Et ubi, inquis, invenio hoc foramen angustum? Audi. Arcta et angusta est via quæ ducit ad vitam. . . . Ibi ponenda est vetus tunica et alibi poni non potest. Aut si vis vetustate impediri, gravari, premi, noli ire per angustam. Cf. Serm. lxiv. c. 2; and De Doct. Christ. l. ii. c. 16.

¹ Serm. lxxxvii. c. 11. Sanitatis tempus est, non voluptatis.

² Enarr. in Ps. cccix. 4. Noli numerare, sed appende: stateram affer æquam. . . . Vide contra pauca grana quantam paleam leves.

³ De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 23. Hæretici, qui se plerumque paucitate commendant.

prayer, fasting, alms, which have been mentioned before. For these are the "clothing" which at first meets the eye, the true and natural in the case of the sheep; the adventitious and false in that of the wolves. But the "fruits" which they ought to have and have not, having their evil contraries, he explains by a reference to Gal. v. 19, and to the "fruit of the Spirit" which are enumerated there:¹ not that there may not be in bad men imitations also of these, but the simple eye will most often detect them, which is the reason why, before these cautions are given, so much has been said concerning the keeping the eye single, since the single eye will alone be able to profit by them.² This is not the general explanation of the early Church, but the "fruits," which shall declare the true character of the men, are generally taken as the false doctrines by the bringing forward of which, false teachers, bearing an appearance of outward sanctity, shall at length be detected. Yet any satisfying explanation must combine both false doctrines and sinful works; and they cannot be thus distinguished, for a false doctrine is as much a work as a wicked deed, as really the outgrowth of the inner man.

But the impossibility of the actual outcoming from evil being anything but evil, the certainty therefore that sooner or later it will display itself in its true character, the Lord illustrates and sets forth by the examples of trees which must bear after their kind. Yet here Augustine notes how the error of the Manichæans

¹ So Enarr. in Ps. cxlix. 1. Non enim fructus ostenditur nisi in factis. . . . Querimus fructus caritatis, invenimus spinas dissentionis. Ex fructibus eorum cognoscetis eos.

² De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 24.

is carefully to be guarded against. They made much of the Sermon on the Mount, calling it the *Sermo deificus*,¹ (while they arbitrarily rejected so much of Christ's teaching,) mainly on account of these verses 17 and 18, in which they assumed to find a support for their system of two original principles²—one good, from which good proceeded, and one evil, from which evil; and of two races of men, claiming their descent from the one and from the other. But he shows plainly that what went before and what comes after (see Luke, vi. 43—45) alike require another interpretation, that it is only when forcibly rent away from the context, that the words can be made even to seem to give support to such a doctrine. There is no assertion here of a Manichæan dualism, neither does Christ say of men that there is aught irrevocably fixed in their natures, so that some can never become good, and others never evil; but only that so long as a man is as an evil tree, he cannot bring forth good fruits, that if he would *do* good he must first *be* good.³ To support the

¹ See the words of Faustus in Augustine's work, *Con. Faust.* l. xxxii. c. 7. *Credimus . . . cunctum Sermonem deificum, qui maximè duarum præferens naturarum discretionem, ipsius esse non venit in dubium.*

² *De Serm. Dom. in Mon.* l. ii. c. 24. *Illorum error maximè cavendum est, qui de ipsis duabus arboribus duas naturas opinantur esse, quarum una sit Dei, altera verò neque Dei, neque ex Deo.*

³ *Con. Adimant.* c. 26. *Mala ergo arbor fructus bonos facere non potest; sed ex malâ fieri bona potest, ut bonos fructus ferat.* And again, *Muta cor et mutabitur opus.* Cf. *Con. Fortunat. Disput.* 2. He is scarcely correct, however, when he explains "*Make the tree good*" (*Matt. xii. 33*), as an admonition; for so a perplexity will arise with regard to the words that follow, "*Make the tree corrupt*;" since no such admonition could have come from the lips of

other view, as he acutely observes, it ought to have been said, A good tree cannot become a bad one, nor a bad one good. There is indeed, he affirms, a difference in men, as they are regenerate or natural, as they belong to the stock of the wild olive (the oleaster), or have been engrafted anew on the good olive tree, as they pertain to Adam or to Christ. But then the wild olive is not of a different kind from the good, but is only a degeneration of that good. This degeneration took place at the fall: then, that which was a good tree became the wild and bitter stock, and as such it filled the world with its shoots,—incapable of restoring itself to its first and nobler condition, yet capable of being restored, if only it were grafted anew upon one of that stock from which it originally fell away, and through this re-engrafting became partaker of its better life. The first Adam, the head of the fallen race, is this oleaster, having become such at his fall; the second Adam, the head of the restored race, is the olive, in whom there are possibilities of renewal for all.

But Augustine, as he had, on the one side, to deny, against the Manichæans, an evil creation coming from the hands of a God of perfect goodness,—to deny that there were any men the very original foundations of whose being were evil, trees which could not become good, and therefore could not bring forth good fruit,—so also had he, on the other side, to deny, against the Pelagians, that the degenerate tree was capable of re-

Christ. But “Make” here rather answers to our English, Suppose: Grant or suppose a corrupt tree, give me such by way of argument, and I say the fruit will be corrupt also. He often himself uses *Fac*, and *Pone*, in this same sense.

storing itself, and bringing forth good fruit, by its own unaided power :¹ and as he had to rescue this verse from Manichæan abuses, so it furnishes him with weapons against the shallow Pelagian scheme which would look at men's deeds apart from the living root in the man out of which they grew. When he, awfully conscious of God as the one and only fountain of all goodness, laid down the great principle, No act is good, if it be not of faith ;² that is, if the man who did it stood not in a living connexion with the one source of goodness, they sought to embarrass him with the splendid deeds of heathens and unbaptized men,—with the chastity of Scipio, the fortitude of Regulus, the incorruptibility of Fabricius. They demanded, whether he would deny these to be good. To this he made answer, that they had no right as moralists to take isolated acts, and ask a judgment upon them. For the true question was this, Was the man who wrought these acts a righteous man? was the tree good? for if not, he who is himself the Truth had

¹ The statement of Pelagius (*De Gratiâ Christi*, l. i. c. 18), is so exactly that of a Pelagian world now and at all times, that it is worth quoting : *Habemus autem possibilitatem utriusque partis à Deo insitam, velut quamdam, ut ita dicam, radicem fructiferam atque fœcundam, quæ ex voluntate hominis diversâ gignat et pariat, et quæ possit ad proprii cultoris arbitrium vel nitere flore virtutum, vel sentibus horrere vitiorum.* It is at once evident that this theory of human nature is at the bottom of all our modern schemes of education, which proceed on the plan of cultivating the old stock, rather than the being engrafted on a new.

² *Enarr. 2^a. in Ps. xxxi.* *Laudo fructum boni operis, sed in fide agnosco radicem.* There is here in the introduction to this psalm a large discussion, in the most popular form, on the relation of faith and works, the tree and its fruits, and one full of interest.

declared that the fruit could not be good. We may think that the truest application of his principle to Pelagian objectors would have been one which should not thus have made these lofty deeds to have been wholly false, only more splendid vices, as he keenly calls them; but rather to have replied, that these also were of faith; that wherever there was a deed lofty or pure or true, that also was of his inspiration from whom all good things do come, and who left himself nowhere without a witness. Yet, even while we thus feel that the faith without which it is impossible to please God, might have been made by him of larger reach, and to embrace some whom he excludes, his principle stands fast. He was here asserting the foundation of all morals, namely, that the condition of the man determines the value of the deed, that the motive is the deed,¹—and of all religion, namely, that it is only the man in relation with God who can do righteous acts; or in forms of speech which this Scripture supplies, and which he often uses, the good tree only can bring forth good fruit, and that tree only is good which has been engrafted on a nobler stock, and made partaker of an higher life than its own.²

¹ One of the chiefest obligations of Christian Ethics to Augustine and to his influence, is that he nowhere deals with, but everywhere attacks at the root, what one might not unfitly call *quantitative* morality,—I mean a morality which acknowledges such questions as this, which I take from a Romish book of casuistry lately published, *How many scudi must a man steal to constitute a mortale peccatum?* What morality can exist in a land, where the light has become such darkness as this?

² The largest use of this passage, in its bearing on the Pelagian controversy, is to be found in his treatise *Con. Julian.* l. iv. c. 3.

Ver. 21, 22.—How, Augustine inquires, are these words of the Lord to be reconciled with those other of his Apostle, “No man can say that Jesus is the Lord but by the Holy Ghost” (1 Cor. xii. 3); for here are some that call Jesus Lord, whom yet he denies ever to have been his, who therefore could never have said this in the power of the Holy Ghost.¹ But he easily sets the two passages at one, showing how the *saying* that Jesus is the Lord, is there to be accepted in its highest sense; it is the saying which is the true outcoming and expression of the innermost conviction, that which all speech would have been, if sin had not made every man more or less a liar, and therefore his speech not always to be the faithful utterance of that which is within him, he now oftentimes speaking more or less or differently from that which he actually feels. But such is not properly *speech* at all.² And in this highest sense of saying, in which the saying is the expression of the being, no man *says* that Jesus is the Christ but by the Holy Ghost; no man, in other words, believes it in his heart but by the Holy Ghost. This is what St. Paul affirms;³ while our Lord, using the words as men are commonly wont to use them,

¹ The apparent opposition comes out in the double *dicit* of the Latin, here, *Non omnis qui dicit mihi Domine*, and there, *Nemo potest dicere Dominus Jesus*, more than either in the Greek or English, which both have different words in the two places.

² De Serm. Dom. in Mon. l. ii. c. 25. *Videtur enim dicere etiam ille qui nec vult nec intelligit quod dicit: sed ille propriè dicit, qui voluntatem ac mentem suam sono vocis enuntiat.*

³ Exactly in the same way, when he declares, “Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved” (Rom. x. 13), the word “call” is to be taken in the same pregnant sense.

who do not deny even to falsehoods the title of speech, affirms there will be some who will have said, "*Lord, Lord,*" but out of no true heart. Elsewhere Augustine uses the same deep distinction, for the purpose of delivering our Saviour's declaration, "Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him" (Matt. xii. 32), from shallow and yet mischievous interpretations,¹ as though they could mean any mere words whatsoever,—even such as a man in the wildest and guiltiest moments of his blasphemy may have spoken; as though they could mean aught short of the entire and final alienation of the heart and will and life from every thing divine, the contradiction of the whole man to all of God's which testifies of grace and mercy and truth and holiness; a sin which therefore, in its very nature, has excluded its own forgiveness.²

Will these who say, "*Have we not prophesied in thy Name, and in thy Name have cast out devils?*" be in this speaking truly, or will this be yet another untruth added to all that have gone before in their

¹ Exp. Ep. ad Rom. Verbum enim dicere non ita videtur hic positum, ut tantummodò illud intelligatur quod per linguam fabricamus, sed quod corde conceptum etiam opere exprimimus. Thus on the parallel, Rom. x. 10, "With the mouth confession is made unto salvation," he observes (In Evang. Joh. Tract. 26), De radice cordis surgit ista confessio. Aliquando audis confitentem, et nescis credentem. Sed nec debes vocare confitentem, quem judicas non credentem . . . Si aliud in corde habes, aliud dicis; loqueris, non confiteris. Here, it will be noted, he makes "confess" to be the pregnant word.

² Exp. Ep. ad Rom. Qui hoc verbum, quod sine venià vult intelligi Dominus, in Spiritum Sanctum dicit, hoc est, qui desperans de gratià et pace quam donat, in peccatis suis perseverandum sibi esse dicit, *dicere* intelligendus in factis.

lives? Some, Augustine replies, might understand it in the latter sense, that in this also they are liars; some might be so tempted to understand the passage, finding a difficulty in attributing the actual performance of miracles or wonderful works to ungodly men, to any who should finally hear that "*Depart from me,*" from the lips of the Saviour. But to dissolve this objection, he refers to the case of the Egyptian magicians, to those of Saul¹ and of Balaam, and to the Lord's own words concerning the false prophets of the latter days.² (Matt. xxiv. 24.) All these were really partakers of a divine power, though they used it for their own harm. And suggested by this and like passages, he has in many places instructive words and warnings on the nothingness of all gifts, even up to the greatest gift of working all miracles, if there be not charity. These all are no proofs of holiness, without which holiness we cannot enter into life; while without them we may well have a place in the kingdom. Not their peculiar gift, not that the devils were subject to them, was the true matter of rejoicing for the Apostles; but rather, as their Lord reminded them, that which they had in common with all was that in which they were truly to exult, namely, that their names were written in heaven.³ And he has many

¹ Enarr. in Ps. ciii. 3.

² Ad Simplicianum, l. ii. qu. i. Non enim eos mentientes putamus ista dicturos in illo iudicio, ubi nullus erit fallendi locus, aut ullam vocem talium legimus, dicentium, Dileximus te. Cf. Serm. cxxxviii. c. 3.

³ Enarr. in Ps. cxxx. 1. Non omnes Christiani boni dæmones ejiciunt, omnium tamen nomina scripta sunt in cælo. Non eos voluit gaudere ex eo quod proprium habebant, sed ex eo quod cum cæteris salutem tenebant. Cf. Serm. cxliii. c. 7.

warnings drawn from the declaration here,¹ against wishing to be signalized in the Church for gifts, which always bring with them the danger of puffing up the possessor, rather than for graces, which will keep him humble. Better, in this mystical body, to be a little finger which is sound, than an eye which is bleared and winking;² though one be a member of so little esteem, the other the noblest of the body. It was woe to Simon Magus when he wished to do the works which the Apostles did, but did not at the same time wish to be the man which the Apostles were.³

Ver. 23.—The Lord's answer, "*I never knew you,*" is here to be accepted according to that deeper meaning of knowing, which, as Augustine truly brings out, includes also loving,—a knowing which, in its essence, is reciprocal: he only is known who also knows; so that he has all right when he affirms, "*I never knew you,*" is but another way of saying, *Ye knew me never.* Not to be known of the Judge is never to have known him, and is therefore itself the condemnation.⁴ And hereupon follows that terrible "*Depart from me,*" that everlasting separation from the presence of God,⁵

¹ Enarr. in Ps. ciii. 3. Videant qualem rationem habituri sunt cum Deo qui sanctis non sanctè utuntur.

² Enarr. in Ps. cxxx. 1. Tutior est enim in corpore digitus sanus, quàm lippiens oculus Non ergo quærat quisque in corpore Christi nisi sanitatem.

³ Enarr. in Ps. cxxx. 1. Voluit talia facere, non talis esse.

⁴ Enarr. in Ps. cxli. 4. Non novi vos. Non inde gaudeant et dicant, Non puniemur, quia non novit nos Judex. Jam puniti sunt, si eos non novit Judex.

⁵ Enarr. in Ps. xlix. 3. Si enim possemus facere, fratres, ut dies

wherein every thing that is fearful is contained. And he often brings out that the terribleness of that "Depart from me" presents itself unto men under very different aspects, as they are or are not the true servants and children of God. For the faithful man, for him who has been saying, "One thing have I desired of the Lord, to behold the beauty of the Lord, and to inquire in his temple," it is terrible for this, even that it is exclusion from the face of the Beloved; therefore he is not of the "*workers of iniquity*," lest he should thus lose the light of God's countenance.¹ But for the ungodly these words are terrible, not for this exclusion, but only for the after pains and penalties which they involve: and if hindered from sinning, it is not the fear of displeasing that Lord, and being bidden to depart from him, that hinders these; on the contrary, if they could ensure to themselves an eternal impunity of sinning, they would choose to sin on for ever. Not the fear of this loss of his favour, this separation from his presence, but the dread of what in his

judicii non veniret, puto quia nec sic erat malè vivendum. Si non veniret ignis die judicii, et sola peccatoribus immineret separatio à facie Dei, in quâlibet essent affluentia deliciarum, non videntes à quo creati sunt, et separati ab illâ dulcedine ineffabilis vultûs ejus, in quâlibet æternitate et impunitate peccati, plangere se deberent. Sed quid loquar, aut quibus loquar? Hæc amantibus pœna est, non contemnentibus. Qui dulcedinem sapientiæ et veritatis utcumque sentire cœperunt, noverunt quod dico, quanta pœna sit tantummodo à facie Dei separari: qui autem illam dulcedinem non gustaverunt, si nondum desiderant Dei faciem, timeant vel ignem, supplicia terreat, quem præmia non invitant. Cf. Enarr. 2^a. in Ps. xxvi. 9.

¹ Gratis amans, non puniri timens ab eo quem tremit, sed separari ab eo quem diligit.

anger he could do to them, restrains them.¹ And he often presses each man to judge of himself and of his state, whether he be a lover of God or only a fearer of hell, by asking himself, what is the truly terrible which this "Depart from me" seems to contain for him.

Ver. 24—29.—There is a solemn awfulness in this conclusion, which Augustine bids us specially to note; and he observes how neither by the one or other of these parties, not by those who are swept away any more than by those who stand, can the open despisers of the truth be signified.² For in each case there is a willingness to hear the word, a certain good will therefore towards the truth. But the only way whereby that which is heard wins a stable foundation in the soul, is through its being turned into action; "*Who-*

¹ He has a beautiful passage, in 1 Ep. Joh. Tract. 9, on the subject, where he likens souls in these two conditions to two wives; the one purely loving her absent husband, the other adulteress in will, though not daring to be also in deed; each *fearing* her husband. Et quomodo discernuntur duo ista timores? Timet illa, timet et illa . . . Jam ergo interrogentur, Quare? Illa dicit, Timeo virum, ne veniat: illa dicit, Timeo virum, ne discedat. Illa dicit, Timeo ne damner: illa dicit, Timeo, ne deserar. Yet the servile fear has its subordinate value; it may be keeping a place and making room for the holy fear, though the latter cannot enter till the first go out; to use his own illustration, Sicut videmus per setam introduci linum, quando aliquid suitur, seta prius intrat, sed nisi exeat, non succedit linum.

² Ep. 127, c. 7. Dominus enim Jesus non ab iis qui non audiunt, sed eos inter se auditores verborum suorum, latissimo limite non tenui distinctione discrevit.

soever heareth these sayings of mine, and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man, who built his house upon a rock." Christ, as in so many other places of Scripture, is himself to be understood by the rock,—that man builds on the rock, who does the things which he hears and learns of Christ. He distinguishes, but not in a way calling for especial note, three forms of trial and temptation, as set forth under "*the winds,*" "*the rain,*" and "*the floods;*" and in one place asks, If it be thus to have built insecurely, what will it be not to have built at all? Some indeed might say, if such is the doom of the building insecurely, it were better not to build at all. But will it be any better doom to be swept away naked than to be swept away among the ruins of thy fallen house?¹ That were not to hear at all, to have built nothing; this is to hear and not do, to have built weakly. It remains as the one wise thing,—to hear, and what we hear to do; being doers of the word, and not hearers only, deceiving our own selves. (Jam. i. 22.)

¹ Serm. clxxix. Venit pluvia, veniunt flumina. Nunquid ideo tutus, quia raperis nudus. Enarr. in Ps. cii. 21. Audire et non facere, in arenâ ædificare est; audire et facere, in petrâ ædificare est; nec audire, nec facere nihil ædificare est. Si in arenâ ædificas, ruinam ædificas: si nihil ædificas, expositus pluviis, fluminibus, ventis, antè rapieris quàm steteris. Ergo non est cessandum, sed ædificandum; nec sic ædificandum, ut ruina ædificetur; sed in petrâ ædificandum, ut tentatio non evertat.

L O N D O N :

PRINTED BY C. ROWORTH AND SONS,
BELL YARD, TEMPLE BAR.

New Books and New Editions,

PUBLISHED BY

JOHN W. PARKER, WEST STRAND.

Practical Geology and Mineralogy, and the Chemistry of Metals. With a Discourse on the Nature, Tendency, and Advantages of Geological Pursuits. By J. Trimmer, F.G.S. Octavo, with Two Hundred Illustrations. 12s.

Practical Chemistry for Farmers and Landowners. By Joshua Trimmer, F.G.S. Post Octavo. 5s.

The Practical Bee-Keeper; or, Concise and Plain Instructions for the Management of Bees and Hives. By J. Milton. With Illustrations. 4s. 6d.

Domesticated Animals, considered with reference to Civilization and the Arts. With Wood-Cuts. By Mary Roberts. 3s. 6d.

Wild Animals; their Nature, Habits, and Instincts: and the Regions they inhabit. With Wood-Cuts. By the same. 3s. 6d.

A Familiar History of Birds; their Nature, Habits, and Instincts. By Edward Stanley, D.D., Lord Bishop of Norwich, New Edition, in one Volume, with additions.

The Animal and Vegetable Productions of America. With Wood-Cuts. By Mary Roberts. 3s. 6d.

Roads and Railroads, Tunnels, Bridges, and Canals, popularly described; with an Account of the various Vehicles and Modes of Travelling, from the earliest to the present Time. With a Hundred Wood-Cuts. 5s.

Minerals and Metals; their Natural History and Uses in the Arts; with Accounts of Mines and Mining. With many Cuts. 2s. 6d.

Recreations in Physical Geography, or the Earth as it is. By Miss R. M. Zornlin. With numerous Wood-Cuts. 6s.

Recreations in Geology; with a Discourse on the Nature and Advantages of the Science. By the same. Many Wood-Cuts. 4s. 6d.

2 New Books and New Editions.

Recreations in Astronomy. By Rev. L. Tomlinson, M.A.
With Wood-Cuts. 4s. 6d.

Recreations in Chemistry. By T. Griffiths. 4s. 6d.

What is a Voltaic Battery? By Miss R. M. Zornlin. 2s. 6d.

The World of Waters; or Recreations in Hydrology. By
Miss R. M. Zornlin, Author of *Recreations in Geology, Physical Geography, &c.* 6s.

Readings in Science; Familiar Explanations of Appearances
and Principles in Natural Philosophy. With Wood-Cuts. 5s.

Readings in English Prose Literature. 4s. 6d.

Readings in Poetry. 4s. 6d.

Readings in Biography. 4s. 6d.

Readings in Natural Theology; or, The Testimony of Nature
to the Being, Perfections, and Government of God. By the Rev. H. Fergus. 4s.

Travels in Egypt and Sinai; Mount Horeb, and other Locali-
ties of the Exodus. From the French of Dumas, by a Biblical Student. 3s. 6d.

Three Weeks in Palestine and Lebanon. Wood-Cuts. 3s.

Humboldt's Travels and Discoveries in America. Cuts. 2s. 6d.

Captain Cook's Voyages, with Accounts of Pitcairn's Island,
and the Mutiny of the Bounty. With Wood-Cuts. 2s. 6d.

Christopher Columbus; his Life, Voyages, and Discovery of
the New World. With Wood-Cuts. 2s. 6d.

Mungo Park; his Life and Travels; with an Account of his
Death, and of later Discoveries. With Wood-Cuts. 2s. 6d.

The Family Hand-Book, or Practical Information on Cookery,
Household Management, and all other Subjects connected with the Health,
Comfort, and Expenditure of a Family. 5s.

On the Moral, Mental, and Physical Training of Girls at
School. By Madame de Wahl. 3s.

Mothers and Governesses, by the Author of *Aids to Development, Memorials of Two Sisters, &c. &c.* 3s.

The Mother-Tongue: or, Methodical Instruction in the Mother-Tongue in Schools and Families. Translated and adapted from the French of the Pere Girard. Edited by Viscount Ebrington, M.P. 5s.

Instructions in Household Matters, or the Young Girl's Guide to Domestic Service. Written by a Lady, with an especial view to Young Girls intended for Service on leaving School. With Wood-Cuts. 1s. 6d.

On the Education and Treatment of Children; Mrs. Child's "Mother's Book," revised. 2s. 6d.

The House I live in; or, Popular Illustrations of the Structure and Functions of the Human Body. With Wood-Cuts. 2s. 6d.

Popular Physiology; familiar Explanations of interesting Facts connected with the Structure and Functions of Animals, and particularly of Man. By P. B. Lord, M.B. Many Engravings. 7s. 6d.

Family History of England. By the Rev. G. R. Gleig, M.A. With One Hundred and Twenty Engravings of the Costumes, Architecture, Implements, Shipping, Coins, &c. Three Volumes. 6s. 6d. each.

Peter Parley's Universal History for the Young, on the Basis of Geography. With Two Hundred Wood-Cuts. 7s. 6d.

The Crusaders; Scenes, Events, and Characters, from the Times of the Crusades. By T. Keightley. New Edition, One Volume. 7s.

History of Mohammedanism, and the Principal Mohammedan Sects. By Dr. Taylor. 5s. 6d.

Universal Mythology; an Account of the most important Mythological Systems, their Origin and Connection. By the Rev. H. Christmas. 7s.

The Student's Manual of Ancient History; containing the Political History, Geographical Position, and Social State of the Principal Nations of Antiquity. By W. C. Taylor, LL.D. 10s. 6d.

The Student's Manual of Modern History; the Rise and Progress of the Principal European Nations, their Political History, and the Changes in their Social Condition. By the same Author. 10s. 6d.

A History of the English Reformation. By F. C. Massingberd, M.A., Rector of South Ormsby. A New Edition, Revised and Enlarged. 6s.

BS2418.4 .T79 RES.STORAGE
Exposition of the Sermon on the Mount,

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00069 7898

