THE DOCTRINE OF THE "TWO CITIES" IN AUGUSTINE

Kolawole Chabi, O.S.A.

Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, Rome

kolachabi@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper sets out to modestly explore the Augustinian doctrine of the "two cities", considering first of all its origin in reference to some works of Saint Augustine, most especially his chef-d'oeuvre the City of God. Then it elaborated on how these two cities coexist in history and the relevance of Augustine's vision to our society today. It basically dwelt on the works of Augustine, providing the appropriate texts both in their English translations and in the Latin versions following the available critical editions. This piece discovers that the relationship between these two cities is such that it is difficult to establish physical boundaries since the civitas terrana is the common ground where both live and thrive, one attaching itself to the earth and the other longing for the things of heaven. They are not materially distinguishable, but in the heart of their members the Lord of all knows to whom they pay their allegiance.

Keywords: Doctrine, City of God, City of Man, Augustine

Introduction

In the inter-testament eschatological visions of the book of Daniel[79], the prophet moved by divine inspiration said these words to the people of Israel: "*Of those who are sleeping in the Land of Dust, many will awaken, some to everlasting life, some to shame and everlasting disgrace*"[80]. This prophecy returned on the lips of Our Lord in his confrontation with the Jew as follows: "*Do not be amazed at this, because the hour is coming in which all who are in the tombs will hear this [of the Son's] voice and will come out, those who have done good deeds to the resurrection of life, but those who*

---

[79] Traditionally ascribed to Daniel himself, modern scholarly consensus considers the book pseudonymous, the stories of the first half legendary in origin, and the visions of the second the product of anonymous authors in the Maccabean period (2nd century BCE), hence we consider it an intertestamental literature. A good study on this question is that of J. J.Collins, "*Current Issues in the Study of Daniel*", in J. J. Collins *et al.* (eds.) *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception.* Brill, Leida 2002, 2.

[80] *Dn.* 12:2

have done wicked deeds to the resurrection of condemnation"[81]. Jesus brought some elucidation to Daniel's prophecy by adding the reason why there are two different types of resurrection awaiting human beings on that day: the deeds of each person determine his ultimate destiny.

The words of Jesus-Christ together with the idea of Saint Augustine about "*two loves that built two cities*[82]" are our source of inspiration in framing the topic of this paper. The Augustinian doctrine about these cities rests upon the basic idea that since Lucifer fell from heaven, since Cain built a city and named it for his son, there have been two cities; all humans in history must choose between them; and at the Last Judgment God will consign all His creatures to one everlasting city or the other[83]. This, Saint Augustine said in most explicit terms: "*We distribute the human race into two kinds of men, one living according to man, the other living according to God. Mystically, we call them two Cities, or two societies of men: the one of which is predestined to reign eternally with God, the other to suffer eternal punishment with the devil*[84]."

We set out in this paper to modestly explore the Augustinian doctrine of the "two cities", considering first of all its origin in reference to some works of Saint Augustine, most especially his *chef-d'oeuvre* the *City of God.* Then we shall elaborate on how these two cities coexist in history and the relevance of Augustine's vision to our society today. We are basically dwelling on the works of Augustine, providing the appropriate texts both in their English translations and in the Latin versions following the available critical editions.

1. The genesis and formation of the doctrine of the "two cities"[85]

A research we previously undertook for a licentiate dissertation in Patristic theology and sciences[86] afforded us to discover that Saint Augustine, right from the period after his conversion to Christianity, has nurtured and gradually

---

[81] *Jn*. 5: 28-29.

[82] Aug., *De civitate Dei*, 14, 28 (CCL 48, 451): "*Fecerunt itaque civitates duas amores duo, terrenam scilicet amor sui usque ad contemptum Dei, caelestem vero amor Dei usque ad contemptum sui*".

[83] J. Dougherty, *The sacred city and th\e City of God*, in Augustinian Studies 10 (1979), 86.

[84] Aug., *De civ. Dei*, 15, 1(CCL 48, 453): "*In duo genera distribuimus [genus humanum], unum eorum, qui secundum hominem, alterum eorum, qui secundum Deum vivunt; quas etiam mystice appellamus civitates duas, hoc est duas societates hominum, quarum est una quae praedestinata est in aeternum regnare cum Deo, altera aeternum supplicium subire cum diabolo*".

[85] Certainly one of the best studies on this topic in modern times remains that of A. Lauras – H. Rondet, *Le thème des deux cités dans l'oeuvre de Saint Augustin*, Etudes Augustiniennes, Paris 1953, 99-160.

[86] K. Chabi, *La personnalité corporative du Christ dans l'exégèse de Saint Augustin* : *Une lecture de l'*Enarratio in Psalmum 61 *et* Epistula 140, Unpublished Licentiate dissertation, Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, Rome 2014.

developed a consistent idea of about the existence of two groups of human beings in relation to God. These two groups live in two mystical cities which are not physically identifiable or materially separable. We shall first carry out an overview of the progressive formation of the doctrine by the bishop of Hippo from his early works to his stunningly success masterpiece which is the *City of God*.

1.1.   *De vera religione* and *De catechizandis rudibus*

The first draft of the doctrine of the two cities in St Augustine's thought is found in *De vera religione* (*On the true religion*) which he wrote around 390 AD few years after his baptism and at eve of his priestly ordination. For him, humankind is divided into categories characterised as follows: on the one hand he crowd of the impious who bear the image of the earthly mankind, and the on the other, the people who are faithful to God. The new convert of Thagaste wrote:

> Similarly, the entire human race, whose life, like the life of an individual from Adam to the end of the world, is so arranged by the laws of divine providence that it appears divided among two classes. In one of these is the multitude of the impious who bear the image of the earthly mankind from the beginning to the end of the world. In the other is the succession of the people devoted to the one God. But from Adam to John the Baptist they live the life of the earthly mankind under a certain form of righteousness. Their history is called the Old Testament having the promise of a kind of earthly kingdom, which is nothing but the image of the new people and the New Testament, with the promise of the kingdom of heaven. Meantime the life of this people begins with the coming of the Lord in humility and goes on till the Day of Judgment, when he will come in all clearness. After the judgment the "old man" will come to an end, and there will take place the change that betokens the angelic life. For we shall all be raised, but we shall not all be changed (*1 Cor*. 15:51). The pious people will be raised as they transform the remnants of the "old humanity" that cling to them into the "new humanity". The impious people, who have kept the "old humanity" from the beginning to the end, will be raised in order to be precipitated into the second death[87].

---

[87] Aug., *De vera religione*, 27, 50 (CSEL 77. 6/5, 35-36) : " *Sicut autem isti ambo nullo dubitante ita sunt, ut unum eorum, id est veterem atque terrenum, possit in hac tota vita unus homo agere, novum vero et caelestem nemo in hac vita possit nisi cum vetere; nam et ab ipso incipiat necesse est, et usque ad visibilem mortem cum illo, quamvis eo deficiente, se proficiente,*

In this text, there is no mention of the two cities, but we already recognise the fundamental idea of the *City of God*. Augustine clearly posits the two destinies of human beings: a resurrection either to happiness or to frustration and disgrace, to newness of life or to second and eternal death. About ten or twelve years later, in *De catechizandis rudibus* (*Instructing Beginners in Faith*[88]), the Bishop of Hippo brought some precisions to his thought about the two cities. The book was written as an answer to the Carthagian deacon Deogratias who asked the bishop of Hippo to come to his assistance regarding how best to carry out catechism to those who are not instructed. Augustine was then fighting the Donatists' schismatic movement. In this book, the holy Bishop insists repetedly on the opposition between the good and the wicked, the wheat and the tares, the grain and the chaff. Precisely while elaborating on the Histrory of Salvation : creation, sin, incarnation and redemption, Augustine described the sinful race as follows:

> Neither ought we to be moved by the consideration that many consent unto the devil, and few follow God; for the grain, too, in comparison with the chaff, has greatly the defect in number. But even as the husbandman knows what to do with the mighty heap of chaff, so the multitude of sinners is nothing to God, who knows what to do with them, so as not to let the administration of His kingdom be disordered and dishonored in any part. Nor is the devil to be supposed to have proved victorious for the mere reason of his drawing away with him more than the few by whom he may be overcome[89].

---

perduret: sic proportione universum genus humanum, cuius tamquam unius hominis vita est ab Adam usque ad finem huius saeculi, ita sub divinae providentiae legibus administratur, ut in duo genera distributum appareat. Quorum in uno est turba impiorum, terreni hominis imaginem ab initio saeculi usque ad finem gerentium. In altero, series populi uni Deo dediti, sed ab Adam usque ad Ioannem Baptistam terreni hominis vitam gerens servili quadam iustitia: cuius historia Vetus Testamentum vocatur, quasi terrenum pollicens regnum; quae tota nihil aliud est quam imago novi populi, et Novi Testamenti pollicentis regnum caelorum. Cuius populi vita interim temporalis incipit a Domini adventu in humilitate, usque ad diem iudicii, quando in claritate venturus est. Post quod iudicium, vetere homine exstincto, erit illa mutatio quae angelicam vitam pollicetur: Omnes enim resurgemus, sed non omnes immutabimur. Resurget ergo pius populus, ut veteris hominis sui reliquias transformet in novum. Resurget autem impius populus, qui ab initio ad finem veterem hominem gessit, ut in secundam mortem praecipitetur ".

[88] This is the title given to one of the most recent English translation of this work by Raymond Canning in *The Augustinian Series*, vol. 5, published by New City Press, Hyde Park – New York, 2006.

[89] Aug., *De catechizandis rudibus* 19, 31 (CCL 46, 155-156) : "*Neque hoc nos movere debet, quia multi diabolo consentiunt, et pauci Deum sequuntur: quia et frumentum in comparatione palearum valde pauciorem habet numerum. Sed sicut novit agricola quid faciat de ingenti acervo paleae, sic nihil est Deo multitudo peccatorum, qui novit quid de illis agat, ut administratio regni eius ex nulla parte turbetur atque turpetur. Nec ideo putandus est vicisse diabolus, quia secum plures, cum quibus a paucis vinceretur, adtraxit* ".

And about the two cities he writes: "*In this way there are two cities— one of the ungodly, and another of the holy— which are carried down from the beginning of the human race even to the end of the world, which are at present commingled in respect of bodies, but separated in respect of wills, and which, moreover, are destined to be separated also in respect of bodily presence in the day of judgment*[90]".

So the separation will be possible at the end. This is obviously against the position of the Donatists who thought they formed the church of the pure, the assembly of saints and progenies of the martyrs. Such a position openly goes against the words of Jesus-Christ who said in the parable that the weed should be left to grow along with the wheat[91]. Subsequently in his reflexion, Augustine states the discrimination among the members of each of these mystical cities:

> For all men who love pride and temporal power with vain elation and pomp of arrogance, and all spirits who set their affections on such things and seek their own glory in the subjection of humans, are bound fast together in one association; nay, even although they frequently fight against each other on account of these things, they are nevertheless precipitated by the like weight of lust into the same abyss, and are united with each other by similarity of manners and merits.
> And, again, all humans and all spirits who humbly seek the glory of God and not their own, and who follow Him in piety, belong to one fellowship. And, notwithstanding this, God is most merciful and patient with ungodly humanity, and offers them a place for penitence and amendment[92].

At this point, although the final formula of the doctrine is not yet expressed, the fundamental opposition between the two cities is already sharply characterised. On the one hand stands pride, on the other humility. It is good to note the reference of the Bishop to the goodness of God who always awaits the conversion of sinners, giving them the hope of salvation insofar as they amend their ways and turn to him. Augustine retraces the story of Noah, and then that

---

[90] *Ibid.*, (CCL 46, 156) "*Duae itaque civitates, una iniquorum, altera sanctorum, ab initio generis humani usque in finem saeculi perducuntur, nunc permixtae corporibus, sed voluntatibus separatae, in die iudicii vero etiam corpore separandae*".

[91] *Mt* 13 : 30.

[92] Aug., *De cat. rud.* (CCL 46, 156) : "*Omnes enim homines amantes superbiam et temporalem dominationem cum vano typho et pompa arrogantiae, omnesque spiritus qui talia diligunt, et gloriam suam subiectione hominum quaerunt, simul una societate devincti sunt; et si saepe adversum se pro his rebus dimicant, pari tamen pondere cupiditatis in eamdem profunditatem praecipitantur, et sibi morum et meritorum similitudine coniunguntur. Et rursus omnes homines et omnes spiritus humiliter Dei gloriam quaerentes, non suam , et eum pietate sectantes, ad unam pertinent societatem. Et tamen Deus misericordissimus, et super impios homines patiens est, et praebet eis paenitentiae atque correctionis locum*".

of Abraham. He recalls the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt, their liberation, the foundation of the historical Jerusalem, figure (image) of the Church, and concludes:

In this manner, then, through many varied signs of things to come, which it would be tedious to enumerate in complete detail, and which we now see in their fulfilment in the Church, that people were brought to the land of promise, in which they were to reign in a temporal and carnal way in accordance with their own longings: which earthly kingdom, nevertheless, sustained the image of a spiritual kingdom. There Jerusalem was founded, that most celebrated city of God, which, while in bondage, served as a sign of the free city, which is called the heavenly Jerusalem which latter term is a Hebrew word, and signifies by interpretation the 'vision of peace'[93].

That Jerusalem includes the faithful angels and the just human beings of all times, and has Christ as its King, whose prophetic figure David was. Christ is the *verissimus rex*, the truth that accomplishes the figure. But the history of the carnal Jerusalem offers another important prefiguration of the history of the Christ and the Church. The Babylonian captivity gives Augustine the occasion to clearly express the opposition of the two cities. Jerusalem is the holy city, Babylon the city of the wicked. The meanings of their names alone suffice to render their evident opposition: *Visio pacis* (for Jerusalem), *confusio* (for Babylone)[94].
In *De catechizandis rubidus*, therefore, we have seen fundamental texts on the basis of which we can confidently say that the theme of the *two cities* is very ancient in the thought of Saint Augustine. It is his own way of presenting the History of Salvation.

1.2.   *Contra Faustum Manichaeum* and *Contra epistulam Parmeniani*
In the year 400, Saint Augustine wrote a book titled *Contra Faustum Manichaeum*, as a reply to a man called Faustus. This fellow of Manichaean extraction was

---

[93] *Ibid.*, 20, 36 (CCL 46, 160) : " *Per multa itaque et varia signa rerum futurarum quas longum est omnes commemorare, et eas nunc in Ecclesia videmus impleri, perductus est ille populus ad terram promissionis, ubi temporaliter carnaliterque regnaret pro modo desiderii sui: quod tamen regnum terrenum regni spiritalis imaginem gessit. Ibi Ierusalem condita est famosissima civitas Dei, serviens in signo liberae civitatis, quae caelestis Ierusalem dicitur, quod verbum est hebraeum, et interpretatur visio pacis* ".
[94] *Ibid.*, 21, 37 (CCL 46, 161) "*Post aliquot tamen generationes ostendit alium typum ad rem maxime pertinentem. Nam captivata est illa civitas, et multa pars eius educta in Babyloniam. Sicut autem Ierusalem significat* civitatem societatemque sanctorum, *sic Babylonia significat* civitatem societatemque iniquorum, *quoniam dicitur interpretari* confusio. *De quibus duabus civitatibus, ab exordio generis humani usque in finem saeculi permixte temporum varietate currentibus et ultimo iudicio separandis, paulo ante iam diximus.* "

undoubtedly the acutest, most determined and most unscrupulous opponent of orthodox Christianity in the age of the bishop of Hippo. The occasion of Saint Augustine's great writing against him was the publication of Faustus' attack on the Old Testament Scriptures, and on the New Testament so far as it was at variance with Manichaean error. Faustus seems to have followed in the footsteps of Adimantus, against whom Augustine had written some years before, but to have gone considerably beyond Adimantus in the recklessness of his statements. The incarnation of Christ, involving his birth from a woman, is one of the main points of attack. He makes the variations in the genealogical records of the Gospels a ground for rejecting the whole as spurious. He supposed the Gospels, in their present form, to be not the works of the Apostles, but rather of later Judaizing falsifiers. The entire Old Testament system he treats with the utmost contempt, blaspheming the Patriarchs, Moses, the Prophets, etc., on the ground of their private lives and their teachings. These are few of the aberrations found in Faustus writing. In responding to him, Augustine makes reference to the *two cities*. About the Babylonian captivity he carries out an interpretation in the same way as in *De catechizandis rudibus*. And so while speaking of the seventy years predicted by the prophet Jeremiah, he says:

> As regards the departure to Babylon, where the Spirit of God by the prophet Jeremiah enjoins them to go, telling them to pray for the people in whose land they dwell as strangers, because in their peace they would find peace, and to build houses, and plant vineyards and gardens,--the figurative meaning is plain, when we consider that the true Israelites, in whom is no guile, passed over in the ministry of the apostles with the ordinances of the gospel into the kingdom of the Gentiles… Accordingly the basilicas of Christian congregations have been built by believers as abodes of peace… Again, in the return from captivity after seventy years, according to Jeremiah's prophecy, and in the restoration of the temple, every believer in Christ must see a figure of our return as the Church of God from the exile of this world to the heavenly Jerusalem, after the seven days of time have fulfilled their course. Joshua the high priest, after the captivity, who rebuilt the temple, was a figure of Jesus Christ, the true High Priest of our restoration[95].

---

[95] Aug., *Contra Faustum Manichaeum*, 12, 36 (PL 42, 272-273): "*Iam ipsa in Babyloniam transmigratio, quo etiam Spiritus Dei per Ieremiam prophetam iubet ut pergant, et orent pro eis ipsis in quorum regno peregrinantur, quod in illorum pace etiam pax esset istorum, et aedificarent domos, et novellarent vineas, et plantarent hortos, quis non agnoscat quid praefiguraverit, qui attenderit veros Israelitas, in quibus dolus non est, per apostolicam dispensationem cum evangelico*

Later on, we find the theme again in *Contra epistulam Parmeniani* where in a controversy with his Donatist opponent on a text from the Old Testament, Augustine insiste on the two heads of the two cities. He brings to the fore the antagonism between the leaders (*principes*, *rectores*), and their various instruments[96]. Augustine returns to this same theme in various sermons. Rondet and Lauras provided a list of *Expositions on the Psalms* in which he speaks about the *two cities*. They observed that from 411 AD on, the theme became more recurrent in the writings of Augustine. For example the *Expositions on Psalms* 61, 64, 125, 136, 138, 147, 148 all include some aspects of his analysis on the two cities[97]. And an interesting element about all these texts is that they were all produced after the year 410 a date to which we shall soon return.

1.3. The development of the doctrine of the two cities the *City of God*

The immediate occasion for the writing of the *City of God* was the sack of Rome by Alaric and his troops. On 24th August 410, the City of Rome, seat of imperial power and living symbol of the ancient world, had fallen to Gothic invaders. They occupied and pillaged the city for three days and left considerable destruction in the wake when they withdrew. The Roman Empire, which many had believed would endure forever, was gradually collapsing in confusion and ruin[98]. The outcome was both clear and inevitable: Roman power in the West was at an end. In fact, the capital of the empire had been transfered to Constantinople and almost a century earlier, the seat of imperial government in Italy had long since been removed from Rome to Milan. In front of the confusion that period its psychological impact, the reason for the calamity remained to be discerned. In time, an explanation was put forward. Rome, in becoming Christian, at least in part, had forsaken its heritage, especially its religion, which had served it so well

---

sacramento ad regnum Gentium transmigrasse? … Ex hoc quippe etiam illis credentibus constructa sunt domicilia pacis, basilicae christianarum congregationum, et novellatae vineae populi fidelium, et plantati hort... Nam quod etiam post septuaginta annos, secundum eiusdem Ieremiae prophetiam, reditur ex captivitate, et templum renovatur ; quis fidelis Christi non intellegat, post evoluta tempora, quae septenarii dierum numeri repetitione transcurrunt, etiam nobis, id est Ecclesiae Dei, ad illam coelestem Ierusalem ex huius saeculi peregrinatione redeundum? Per quem, nisi per Iesum Christum, vere sacerdotem magnum, cuius figuram gerebat ille Iesus sacerdos magnus illius temporis, quo templum aedificatum est post captivitatem? Quem propheta Zacharias vidit… Quod etiam in Psalmo dedicationis domus apertissime canitur…"

[96] Cf. Id., *Contra Epist. Parmeniani* 2, 8-9 (CCL 43, 272-273) : .

[97] Lauras A.– Rondet H., *Le thème des deux Cités dans l'œuvre de Saint Augustin*, Etudes Augudtiniennes 28, Paris 1953, 109-137.

[98] According to Virgil's *Aeneid*, written late in the first century B.C., Jupiter had set no spatial or temporal limits on the Roman's power and had given them "empire without end" (*Aeneid* I, 278). With the rise of Christian faith and its triumph thanks to the conversion of some Roman emperors to Christian faith, Rome seems to have attained the culmination of its glory. But in the light of Rome's fall to the Goths, it seemed that Rome had suddenly and desastrously lost its invulnerability and that, against all expection, Jupiter's promise had failed.

during the centuries of imperial ascendancy. Not only had Rome turned away from its gods, it had substituted the Christian values of love and peace for the sturdier and more practical virtues of justice and civic discipline. This argument was all the more persuasive in view of the fact that the defeat of Rome occurred during the reign of Honorius, a Christian emperor[99]. What more proof was needed to demonstrate that the Christian religion was the chief cause of the downfall of Rome? In the *Revisions* of his works which he wrote at the eve of his fulfilled life, Augustine enlightens us about the context in which he composed his apology for the Christian religion. He wrote: "*Burning with zeal for the house of God, I began to write the books of the* City of God *against the blasphemies and errors of its enemies*"[100].   And so, the *City of God* flowed from Augustine's pen as a response to the storm of blame against Christians that followed.

Explaining his design in undertaking the work, Augustine says in the preface of the *City of God* :

> The glorious city of God is my theme in this work, which you, my dearest son Marcellinus, suggested, and which is due to you by my promise. I have undertaken its defence against those who prefer their own gods to the Founder of this city—a city surpassingly glorious, whether we view it as it still lives by faith in this fleeting course of time, and sojourns as a stranger in the midst of the ungodly, or as it shall dwell in the fixed stability of its eternal seat, which it now with patience waits for, expecting until righteousness shall return unto judgment, and it obtains, by virtue of its excellence, final victory and perfect peace. A great work this, and an arduous; but God is my helper[101].

The book is divided in two parts. The first goes from book I to X and is the apologetic part of the work in which Augustine refutes the vanities of the

---

[99] G. J. Lavere, *The Political realism of Saint Augustine*, in *Augustinian Studies* 11 (1980), 135.

[100] Aug. *Retr.* 2, 43. 1 (CSEL 36, 180-181) : « *Interea Roma Gothorum irruptione agentium sub rege Alarico atque impetu magnae cladis eversa est. Cuius eversionem deorum falsorum multorumque cultores, quos usitato nomine paganos vocamus, in christianam religionem referre conantes solito acerbius et amarius Deum verum blasphemare coeperunt. Unde ego exardescens zelo domus Dei adversus eorum blasphemias vel errores libros De civitate Dei scribere institui. Quod opus per aliquot annos me tenuit, eo quod alia multa intercurrebant, quae differre non oporteret et me prius ad solvendum occupabant. Hoc autem De civitate Dei grande opus tandem viginti duobus libris est terminatum* ».

[101] Id., *De civ. Dei* I, *praef.* (CCL 47, 1) : "*Gloriosissimam civitatem Dei sive in hoc temporum cursu, cum inter impios peregrinatur ex fide vivens, sive in illa stabilitate sedis aeternae, quam nunc exspectat per patientiam , quoadusque iustitia convertatur in iudicium, deinceps adeptura per excellentiam victoria ultima et pace perfecta, hoc opere instituto et mea ad te promissione debito defendere adversus eos, qui conditori eius deos suos praeferunt, fili carissime Marcelline, suscepi, magnum opus et arduum, sed Deus adiutor noster est*".

impious[102]. He points out that the gods worshipped by the Romans had not saved them from similar setbacks in pre-Christian times, nor had Christian Romans failed in their civic or military duties because of their Christian commitment. Furthermore, the invasion itself had been much less vicious precisely because the invaders were Christian[103]. In this respect, Rome had been the beneficiary and not the victim of Christianity. Ironically, the moral integrity of Christians in the Roman Empire might well have extended the length of its days which had been seriously threatened for generations by moral corruption, a fact not lost on the Roman moralists and some of her statesmen as well. If Rome had ever achieved the status of a genuine state, a true commonwealth based upon common concerns and common justice, it had certainly lost this status long before Christianity appeared within its precincts. Logically, then, Christianity could hardly be held responsible for something that had, in fact, transpired long before its time. Technically, Augustine is not dealing with two cities in this part of the work. However, at the end of Book I, he mentions his intention to do so: " *… In truth, these two cities are entangled together in this world, and intermixed until the last judgment effects their separation. I now proceed to speak, as God shall help me, of the rise, progress, and end of these two cities; and what I write, I write for the glory of the city of God, that, being placed in comparison with the other, it may shine with a brighter lustre*[104]".

The second part includes the books XI to XXII and treats explicitly the doctrine of the two cities. It however contains many digressions which reflect the various battle fields Augustine was fighting on. One recognises the controversy with the Pelagian Julian of Eclanum and question of the origin of the soul raised by Vincentius Victor[105]. Right from the opening the second part, Augustine clarifies the theme of the two cities:

> The city of God we speak of is the same to which testimony is borne by that Scripture, which excels all the writings of all nations by its divine authority, and has brought under its influence all kinds of minds, and this not by a casual intellectual movement, but obviously by an express

---

[102] Cf. Id., *ep.* 212 A, 1.

[103] The Goths who carried out the sack of Rome were Christians who professed the Arian faith which in opposition with Nicean orthodox faith of the Roman Catholic Church.

[104] Aug., *De civitate Dei* I, 35 (CCL 47, 34) : "*Perplexae quippe sunt istae duae civitates in hoc saeculo invicemque permixtae, donec ultimo iudicio dirimantur; de quarum exortu et procursu et debitis finibus quod dicendum arbitror, quantum divinitus adiuvabor, expediam propter gloriam civitatis Dei, quae alienis a contrario comparatis clarius eminebit*".

[105] Lauras A.– Rondet H., *Le thème des deux Cités*, 139.

providential arrangement. For there it is written, "*Glorious things are spoken of you, O city of God*". And in another *Psalm* we read, "*Great is the Lord, and greatly to be praised in the city of our God, in the mountain of His holiness, increasing the joy of the whole earth*". And, a little after, in the same *Psalm*, "*As we have heard, so have we seen in the city of the Lord of hosts, in the city of our God. God has established it for ever*". And in another, "*There is a river the streams whereof shall make glad the city of our God, the holy place of the tabernacles of the Most High. God is in her midst, she shall not be moved*". From these and similar testimonies, all of which it were tedious to cite, we have learned that there is a city of God, and its Founder has inspired us with a love which makes us covet its citizenship. To this Founder of the holy city the citizens of the earthly city prefer their own gods, not knowing that He is the God of gods, not of false, i.e., of impious and proud gods, who, being deprived of His unchangeable and freely communicated light, and so reduced to a kind of poverty-stricken power, eagerly grasp at their own private privileges, and seek divine honours from their deluded subjects.[106]

After discussing at length on humanity, his/her nature and his/her origin, Augustine consecrates Books XIII and XIV to the temptation and sin of our first parents and brings the tour to end with the most well-known statement on the *City of God*:

Accordingly, two cities have been formed by two loves: the earthly by the love of self, even to the contempt of God; the heavenly by the love of God, even to the contempt of self. The former, in a word, glories in itself, the latter in the Lord. For the one seeks glory from men; but the greatest glory of the other is God, the witness of conscience. The one lifts up its head in its own glory; the other says to its God, "*You are my glory, and the lifter up of*

---

[106] Aug., *De civ. Dei* XI, 1 (CCL 48, 321) : *Civitatem Dei dicimus, cuius ea Scriptura testis est, quae non fortuitis motibus animorum, sed plane summae dispositione providentiae super omnes omnium gentium litteras, omnia sibi genera ingeniorum humanorum divina excellens auctoritate subiecit. Ibi quippe scriptum est: 'Gloriosa dicta sunt de te, civitas Dei' ; et in alio Psalmo legitur: 'Magnus Dominus et laudabilis nimis in civitate Dei nostri, in monte sancto eius, dilatans exsultationes universae terrae'; et paulo post in eodem Psalmo: 'Sicut audivimus, ita et vidimus, in civitate Domini virtutum, in civitate Dei nostri; Deus fundavit eam in aeternum'; item in alio: 'Fluminis impetus laetificat civitatem Dei, sanctificavit tabernaculum suum Altissimus; Deus in medio eius non commovebitur'. His atque huiusmodi testimoniis, quae omnia commemorare nimis longum est, didicimus esse quamdam civitatem Dei, cuius cives esse concupivimus illo amore, quem nobis illius conditor inspiravit. Huic conditori sanctae civitatis, cives terrenae civitatis deos suos praeferunt, ignorantes eum esse Deum deorum, non deorum falsorum, hoc est impiorum et superborum, qui eius incommutabili omnibusque communi luce privati, et ob hoc ad quamdam egenam potestatem redacti, suas quodam modo privatas potentias consectantur, honoresque divinos a deceptis subditis quaerunt; sed deorum piorum atque sanctorum, qui potius se ipsos uni subdere quam multos sibi, potiusque Deum colere quam pro Deo coli delectantur.*

mine head". In the one, the princes and the nations it subdues are ruled by the love of ruling; in the other, the princes and the subjects serve one another in love, the latter obeying, while the former take thought for all[107].

This text clearly expresses the doctrine of the two cities and appears as the culmination of long reflexions. It lays emphasis on the irreconcilable antagonism between love of God and love of self. We later find in Augustine's comment on *1 John* a synthesis of the link that exists between love of God and love of neighbourgh. Love of neighbourgh is inseparable from love of God of which it is the practical manifestation. Egoism stands against the one and the other of these two loves.

Here ends the first section of the plan Augustine announced at the end of Book I of the *City of God*: the exposition on the Origin of the two cities. We shall proceed to look at the coexistence of the two cities in history.

2. The development and coexistence of the two cities in history

As we have previously observed, the doctrine of the two cities developed progressively in the works of Saint Augustine. Just as we find the question of their origin in various works, so too do we find the idea of their development diffused in many works prior to the *City of God*. So we shall now examine some of these texts which include letters and predominantly expositions on the Psalms.

2.1. The two cities and their evolution in some epistolary correspondences.

In Augustine's letters, we find some elaborations on the two cities. A recent and interesting study that brought to the light some aspects of the arguments of Bishop of Hippo on how the two cities run their course in history is that of Robert J. Dodaro. In this work, he analysed the correspondence between Augustine and Macedonius, the then imperial vicar for Africa who was a Christian in charge of secular affairs[108]. In this position, Macedonius was responsible for the administration of justice in the provinces of Roman Africa, with the exception of the Proconsular Africa. As a Christian, he listened to the

---

[107] Aug., *De civ. Dei* XIV, 28 (CCL 48, 415): "*Fecerunt itaque civitates duas amores duo, terrenam scilicet amor sui usque ad contemptum Dei, caelestem vero amor Dei usque ad contemptum sui. Denique illa in se ipsa, haec in Domino gloriatur. Illa enim quaerit ab hominibus gloriam; huic autem Deus conscientiae testis maxima est gloria. Illa in gloria sua exaltat caput suum; haec dicit Deo suo: Gloria mea et exaltans caput meum. Illi in principibus eius vel in eis quas subiugat nationibus dominandi libido dominatur; in hac serviunt invicem in caritate et praepositi consulendo et subditi obtemperando*".

[108] R. J. Dodaro, *Augustine on the Stateman and the Two Cities*, in M. Vessey (ed.), *A companion to Augustine*, Blackwell Publishing, London 2012, 386-397.

Bishop of Hippo who would ask favours from him on various occasions. Their relationship was such that Macedonius describes himself as Augustine's spiritual son and friend[109]. They, therefore, exchanged five letters (*Epp.* 152-155) of which the last is of a great importance to us. R. J. Dodaro points out how in this *Ep.* 155, Augustine provides the key to understanding how the two cities correlate in his thought in order to provide a Christian political ideal[110]. The basic ideal put forward here will find enormous expansion in the some preachings where Augustine refers to citizens of the city of God in position of authority in the *civitas diaboli*.

In this same context, other noble Roman political authorities in Africa adressed their queries to the Bishop of Hippo and sought to understand what the Christian religion was all about. This is the case of a certain Volusianus[111] the pagan pro-consul of Africa, but a man of some imputed Christian allegiance. He headed a social group of educated, sophisticated Romans to whom, Christianity appeared, as it appears to many today, as a religion out of joint with the natural assumptions of a whole culture. So Volusianus sent Augustine a series of questions about the Incarnation and other Christian teachings flattering him that he is the only one able to provide accurate answers to his questions: "*You have heard, O man worthy of all honour, the confession of our ignorance; you perceive what is requested at your hands. Your reputation is interested in our obtaining an answer to these questions. Ignorance may, without harm to religion, be tolerated in other priests; but when we come to Bishop Augustine, whatever we find unknown to him is no part of the Christian system. May the Supreme God protect your venerable Grace, my lord truly holy and justly revered!*"[112]. In these corrispondences, Augustine made reference to the two cities. Another friend of Augustine who asked many questions and pressed him to provide answers to the accusations of pagans on Christianism was Marcellinus a Christian Stateman and imperial commissioner in Africa[113]. Augustine replied with letters 137 and 138 in which we find some allusions to the two cities. In the latter he tried to refute the criticism of pagans regarding the

---

[109] Cf. *Ep.* 154, 1 :

[110] Cf. R. J. Dodaro, *Augustine on the Stateman and the Two Cities*, 388.

[111] On his life and opinions, see A. Chastagnol, *Le sénateur Volusien et la conversion d'une famille de l'aristocratie romaine au Bas- Empire*, in *Revue des études anciennes* 58(1956) 240-53 (who suggests at 252-3 that Paulinus of Nola had also tried to convert him to Christianity); P. Brown, "*Aspects of the Christianisation of the Roman Aristocracy*, in *Journal of Roman Studies* 51(1961) 1-11, esp. 7-8.

[112] Cf. *ep.* 135, 2 (CSEL 40,) : "*Accepisti, vir totius gloriae capax, imperitiae confessionem; quid a partibus vestris desideretur agnoscis. Interest famae tuae, ut quaesita noverimus. Utcumque absque detrimento cultus divini in aliis sacerdotibus toleratur inscitia; at cum ad antistitem Augustinum venitur, legi deest quidquid contigerit ignorari. Incolumem Venerationem tuam divinitas summa tueatur, domine vere sancte, ac merito venerabilis pater*".

[113] Cf. Aug., *ep.* 136.

sad events in the city of Rome, but willing to treat the issue in-depth, Augustine promised Marcellinus to write an *ad hoc* work, which is the *City of God*[114]. Let's turn to some sermons of the holy Bishop and how he treats the question of the two cities in their actual evolution and correlation in the course of history.

2.2.   The relation of the two cities in some *Enarrationes in Psalmos*

In the immediate aftermath of the calamity at Rome in 410, Augustine started responding to the complaints, criticisms and attacks of pagans on Christians. Before he began writing the *City of God* in 413, he already had an arsenal of answer to the critics of Christianity on which he could draw. We shall quickly examine some of his expositions of the *Psalms.*

Augustine taking into consideration the parable of the weed and wheat sowed on the field returns once more to the idea that the members of the two cities are mixed together. However, we find that sometimes in his expositions on the *Psalms*, he considers the presence of members of the city of God in the city of the devil as a captivity. Let us examine how the holy bishop develops this idea. Commenting on *Ps.* 126 Augustine clearly says that all the citizens of Jerusalem who are on pilgrimage on earth are captives, but they will return to their fatherland at the end of the captivity. He makes reference to the Babylonian captivity and relates it to the condition of the believers in Christ in this world. He wrote:

> For they for whom innocent blood was given were redeemed, and, turned back from their captivity, they sing this Psalm: "*When the Lord turned back the captivity of Sion, we became as those that are comforted*". He meant by this to say, we became joyful. When? "*When the Lord turned back the captivity of Sion*". What is Sion? Jerusalem, the same is also the eternal Sion. How is Sion eternal, how is Sion captive? In angels eternal, in humans captive. For not all the citizens of that city are captives, but those who are away from thence, they are captives. Mankind was a citizen of Jerusalem, but sold under sin he became a pilgrim. Of his progeny was born the human race, and the captivity of Sion filled all lands. And how is this captivity of Sion a shadow of that Jerusalem? The shadow of that Sion, which was granted to

---

[114] In the very first book of the *City of God*, Augustine affirmed his intention to fulfill his promise to Marcellinus : "*Here, my dear Marcellinus, is the fulfillment of my promise, a book in which I have taken upon myself the task of defending the glorious City of God against those who prefer their own gods to the Founder of that City.*" Cf. Aug., *De civ. Dei* I, *Praef.* (CCL 47, 1): "*Hoc opere instituto et mea ad te promissione debito defendere adversus eos, qui conditori eius deos suos praeferunt, fili carissime Marcelline, suscepi, magnum opus et arduum, sed Deus adiutor noster est*"

the Jews, in an image, in a figure, was in captivity in Babylonia and after seventy years that people turned back to its own city. ... But when all time is past, then we return to our country, as after seventy years that people returned from the Babylonish captivity, for Babylon is this world; since Babylon is interpreted "confusion". ... So then this whole life of human affairs is confusion, which belongeth not unto God. In this confusion, in this Babylonish land, Sion is held captive. But "the Lord has turned back the captivity of Sion".[115]

We still find the same idea in the exposition on *Psalm* 136. This famous *Psalm* plainly recalls the Babylonian captivity. The Jews, seated by the rivers of Babylonia, hung their harps and despite the instance of their enemies, refused to sing the songs of Sion: "*How can we sing the songs of the Lord while in a foreign land?*" Augustine gives a wonderful explanation of this *Psalm*. He says those who are instructed in the holy Church should know to which city they belong, on which exile they are, and that the cause of this exile is sin. They should also know that their return from exile depends on the forgiveness of sins and justification through grace. He reminds his audience that there are two cities, physically mixed together but separated in the heart of their respective citizens. They journey together throughout the course of history. One of them has eternal peace as its end, and is called Jerusalem. The other places its happiness in temporal peace, and is named Babylon. Jerusalem means "*vision of peace*" while Babylon means "*confusion*". Jerusalem is detained in captivity in Babylon but not entirely, for the holy angels of God also belong to it. Those human beings redeemed by the blood of Christ and made coheirs by the grace of filial adoption, so far as they are in this world, are in Babylon captives[116].

---

[115] Aug., *en. Ps.* 125, 3 (CCL 40, 1846-1847) : *Cum converteret Dominus captivitatem Sion, facti sumus sicut consolati. Hoc voluit dicere: Facti sumus gaudentes. Quando? Cum converteret Dominus captivitatem Sion. Quae Sion? Ipsa Ierusalem, et aeterna Sion. Quomodo aeterna Sion, quomodo captiva Sion? In angelis aeterna, in hominibus captiva. Non enim omnes illius civitatis cives captivi sunt; sed qui inde peregrinantur, ipsi captivi sunt. Homo civis est Ierusalem, sed venditus sub peccato, factus est peregrinus. De propagine ipsius natum est genus humanum, et implevit terras captivitas Sion. Et ista captivitas Sion quomodo umbra illius Ierusalem? Umbra illius Sion quam acceperunt Iudaei in imagine, in figura fuit in captivitate in Babylonia, et post septuaginta annos rediit ille populus ad civitatem suam. ... Quomodo ille populus post septuaginta annos rediit a captivitate Babyloniae. Babylonia est enim mundus iste: Babylonia enim interpretatur: "Confusio". ... Confusio ergo est ista tota vita rerum humanarum, non pertinens ad Deum. In hac confusione, in ista Babylonia, captiva tenetur Sion: sed convertit Dominus captivitatem Sion.*

[116] Cf. Aug., *en. Ps.* 136, 1 (CCL 40, 1964) : "*... Omnis eruditus in sancta Ecclesia nosse debet unde cives simus, et ubi peregrinemur, et peregrinationis nostrae causam esse peccatum, reversionis autem munus remissionem peccatorum et iustificationem gratiae Dei. Duas civitates permixtas sibi interim corpore, et corde separatas, currere per ista volumina saeculorum usque in finem, audistis et nostis; unam cui finis est pax aeterna, et vocatur Ierusalem; alteram cui gaudium est pax temporalis, et vocatur Babylonia. Interpretationes etiam nominum, si non fallor, tenetis: Ierusalem interpretari, Visionem pacis; Babyloniam, Confusionem. Ierusalem in Babylonia captiva tenebatur non tota; cives enim eius et Angeli sunt. Sed quod attinet ad homines praedestinatos in gloriam Dei, futuros per adoptionem cohaeredes Christi, quos de ipsa captivitate redemit sanguine*

Though in Babylon, the Christian is a member of the city of God by virtue of his faith. The rivers of Babylon symbolise the ephemeral things of this world onto which the sinner casts himself[117], and the seduction from which the upright man narrowly escapes[118]. Between Christians who are in exile in this world and the pagans who are at home in it, a dialogue continue as by the rivers of Babylon : " *Sing songs to us, sing us a hymn, sing us one of the songs of Zion,*" say the unbelievers, and how shall we respond? "*How can we sing a song of the Lord in a foreign land?*" How can unbelievers understand the message of the Scriptures? The exiled hung their harps and wept for the pain of deportation. They avoided rejoicing in a land of captivity. This should be the attitude of Christians, citizens of Jerusalem, in the midst of the unbelievers.

Augustine lays emphasis on the fact that the citizens of Babylon and the members of the eternal Sion who form a mixed reality are also wayfarers together. He continuously insists on the parallel between the Babylonian captivity and the actual situation of the believer in a society, in a world that is ungodly. That captitivity which came to pass according to the prophecy of Jeremiah was a figure of the temporary captivity we are in now. The idea is beautifully expressed as follows:

> For the captive people Israel from the city of Jerusalem was led into slavery unto Babylon. But holy Jeremiah prophesied that after seventy years the people would return out of captivity, and would rebuild the very city of Jerusalem, which they had mourned as having been overthrown by enemies. But at that time there were prophets in that captivity of the people dwelling in Babylon, among whom was also the prophet Ezekiel. But that people was waiting until there should be fulfilled the space of seventy years, according to the prophecy of Jeremiah. It came to pass, when the seventy years had been completed, the temple was restored which had been thrown down: and there returned from captivity a great part of that people. But whereas the Apostle said, "*these things in figure happened unto them, but they have been written for our sakes, upon whom the end*

---

suo: *particulam ergo istam civitatis Ierusalem captivam teneri in Babylonia pro peccato, incipere autem inde exire prius corde per confessionem iniquitatis et caritatem iustitiae ...*".

[117] Cf. *Ibid.*, 136, 3 (CCL 40, 1965): *Flumina Babylonis, sunt omnia quae hic amantur et transeunt.*

[118] Cf. *Ibid.*, 136, 4 (CCL 40, 1965-1966) : *Alii ergo cives sanctae Ierusalem intellegentes captivitatem suam, attendunt humana vota et diversas hominum cupiditates hac atque illac rapientes, trahentes, impellentes in mare: vident haec, et non se mittunt in flumina Babylonis; sed sedent super flumina Babylonis, et flent super flumina Babylonis, vel illos qui rapiuntur, vel seipsos qui in Babylonia esse meruerunt: sedentes tamen, hoc est humiliati.*

> *of the world has come*": we also ought to know first our captivity, then our deliverance: we ought to know the Babylon wherein we are captives, and the Jerusalem for a return to which we are sighing. For these two cities, according to the letter, in reality are two cities[119].

Knowing one's captivity is already a step towards delivrance. The memory and knowledge of the homeland increase the yearning for a return. That is the point the holy bishop is making here.

Then he gives the criteria of discerment of the between the two cities, indicating their respective protagonists, their first inhabitants, and their present state of mixture:

> Observe now the city of confusion, in order that you may perceive the vision of peace; that you may endure that, sigh for this. How can those two cities be distinguished? Can we now separate them from each other? They are mingled, and from the very beginning of mankind mingled they run on unto the end of the world. Jerusalem received beginning through Abel, Babylon through Cain: for the buildings of the cities were afterwards erected … These two cities then at particular times were built, so that there might be shown a figure of two cities begun of old, and to remain even unto the end in this world, but at the end to be severed. Whereby then can we now show them, that are mingled? At that time the Lord shall show, when some He shall set on the right hand, others on the left. Jerusalem on the right hand shall be, Babylon on the left. ... Two loves made up these two cities: love of God makes Jerusalem; love of the world makes Babylonia. Therefore let each one question himself as to what he loves: and he shall find of which he is a citizen: and if he shall have found himself to be a citizen of Babylon, let him root out cupidity, implant charity: but if he shall have found himself a citizen of Jerusalem, let him endure captivity, hope for liberty[120].

---

[119] Id, *en. Ps* 64, 1 (CCL 39, 822-823): "*Captivatus enim populus Israel, ex civitate Ierusalem ductus est in servitutem Babyloniae. Prophetavit autem Ieremias sanctus, post septuaginta annos rediturum populum de captivitate, et instauraturum civitatem ipsam Ierusalem, quam devictam ab hostibus planxerat. Illo autem tempore fuerunt prophetae, in illa captivitate populi constituti in Babylonia; inter quos erat et Ezechiel propheta. Exspectabat autem ille populus donec implerentur tempora septuaginta annorum, secundum prophetiam Ieremiae. Factum est completis septuaginta annis, restitutum est templum quod deiectum erat; et regressa est de captivitate magna pars illius populi. Sed quoniam dicit Apostolus: Haec in figura contingebant in illis; scripta sunt autem propter nos, in quos finis saeculorum obvenit; debemus et nos nosse prius captivitatem nostram, deinde liberationem nostram; debemus nosse Babyloniam, in qua captivi sumus, et Ierusalem, ad cuius reditum suspiramus. Istae quippe duae civitates, secundum litteram revera duae civitates*".

[120] Id., *en. Ps.* 64, 2 (CCL 39, 823-824) : "*Intendite nunc civitatem confusionis, ut intellegatis visionem pacis: istam toleretis, ad illam suspiretis. Unde dignosci possunt istae duae civitates? Numquid possumus eas modo separare ab invicem? Permixtae sunt, et ab ipso exordio generis humani permixtae currunt usque in finem saeculi. Ierusalem accepit exordium per*

Jerusalem and Babylon were two cities historically erected in particular geographical locations but were figures of other two spiritual intimately mixed cities. Augustine brings his reflection home to the destiny of each of the cities. One will be placed on the right of the Lord because it was made by the love of God, while the other will go to his left because it is founded on the love of the world. We find here once more the fate of each person at the end: eternal peace or eternal frustration depending on the city he belongs to.

The moral consequences of belonging to one city or the other is being drawn already in the text quoted. Augustine makes an appeal to his hearers to examine themselves so as to know deep within where they belong. It is interesting to note that here Augustine exhorts to amendment in one's life which could make it possible to be on right hand of the Lord on the judgement day. He is not emphasizing on predestination for as long as one is on this pilgrimage, there is the possibility to change citizenship by changing the type of love that rules one's life.

Another interesting aspect of the relationship between these two cities is that in the course of history, some citizens of Jerusalem happen to be in charge of the affairs of Babylonia. Augustine returns to this idea time and again. Already we have seen this in his correspondence with Macedonius, the vicar of Africa, who professed Christian faith and maintained a good relationship with the Bishop of Hippo. It is also the case with Marcellinus with whom Augustine exchanged letters. These are example of citizens of the City of God ruling in Babylonia. But there are also the opposite cases whereby some members of the *citivitas diaboli* are in charge of the affairs of the City of God due to the temporary mingling two cities. Probably one of the most original elucidations of Augustine on this idea is the one found in his *en. Ps.* 61. Augustine commenting on the story of three young Hebrew to whom king Nabuchadnezzar gave authority over some part of his kingdom wrote:

Abel; Babylon per Cain: aedificia quippe urbium postea facta sunt. ... Duae ergo istae urbes certis temporibus conditae sunt, ut manifestaretur figura duarum civitatum olim coeptarum, et usque in finem in isto saeculo mansurarum, sed in fine separandarum. Unde ergo possumus eas modo ostendere, quae permixtae sunt? Ostendet tunc Dominus, cum alios ponet ad dexteram, alios ad sinistram. Ierusalem ad dexteram erit; Babylon ad sinistram. ... Duas istas civitates faciunt duo amores: Ierusalem facit amor Dei; Babyloniam facit amor saeculi. Interroget ergo se quisque quid amet, et inveniet unde sit civis: et si se invenerit civem Babyloniae, exstirpet cupiditatem, plantet caritatem; si autem se invenerit civem Ierusalem, toleret captivitatem, speret libertatem".

And sometimes this very temporal mingling brings it to pass that certain men belonging to the city Babylon, do order matters belonging to Jerusalem, and again certain men belonging to Jerusalem, do order matters belonging to Babylon. Something difficult I seem to have propounded. Be patient, until it be proved by examples. … There were great kings in Jerusalem: it is a known fact, they are enumerated, are named. They all were, I say, wicked citizens of Babylon, and they were ordering matters of Jerusalem: all men from thence to be dissevered at the end belong to no one but to the devil. Again we find citizens of Jerusalem to have ordered certain matters belonging to Babylon. For those three children, Nabuchadnezzar, overcome by a miracle, made the ministers of his kingdom, and set them over his Satraps; and so there were ordering the matters of Babylon citizens of Jerusalem[121].

Further, he gives more examples in the life of the society. Due to his rank and the many issues he had to sort out with the political authorities, Augustine knew many statesmen who were believers and who never separated their Christian faith from their civil life. The Bishop of Hippo testifies to this saying:

For how many faithful, how many good men, are both magistrates in their cities, and are judges, and are generals, and are counts, and are kings? All that are just and good men, having not anything in heart but the most glorious things, which have been said of You, City of God. And as if they were doing bond-service in the city which is to pass away, even there by the doctors of the Holy City, they are bidden to keep faith with those set over them, "*whether with the king as supreme, or with governors as though sent by God for the punishment of evil men, but for the praise of good men*", or as servants, that to their masters they should be subject, even Christians to Heathens, and the better should keep faith with the worse, for a time to serve, for everlasting to have dominion. For these things do happen until iniquity do pass away. Servants are commanded to bear with masters unjust and capricious: the citizens of Babylon are commanded to be

---

[121] Aug., *en. Ps.* 61, 8 (CCL 39, 778-779): *Et aliquando ipsa commixtio temporalis facit, ut quidam pertinentes ad civitatem Babyloniam, administrent res pertinentes ad Ierusalem; et rursum quidam pertinentes ad Ierusalem, administrent res pertinentes ad Babyloniam. Difficile aliquid promisisse videor. Patientes estote, donec demonstretur exemplis. Omnia enim in vetere populo, sicut scribit Apostolus, in figura contingebant eis: scripta sunt autem ad correctionem nostram in quos finis saeculorum obvenit. Respicite ergo populum illum primum, positum etiam ad significandum populum posteriorem; et videte ibi quae dico. Fuerunt reges magni in Ierusalem; notum est; numerantur, nominantur. Omnes ergo iniqui cives erant Babyloniae, et administrabant res Ierusalem: omnes in finem inde separandi, nonnisi ad diabolum pertinent. Rursus invenimus cives de Ierusalem administrasse res quasdam pertinentes ad Babyloniam.*

endured by the citizens of Jerusalem, showing even more attentions, than if they were citizens of the same Babylon, as though fulfilling the precept, "*He that shall have exacted of you a mile, go with him other two*"[122].

Augustine brings this truth to the level of the Church and observes that at every level of ecclesial hierarchy, there are citizens of Babylonia in charge of some affair of the holy City. He quotes *Mt.*23: 3 : "*Therefore, whatever they bid you to observe, observe it and do it, but do not act according to their works, for they say and do not do it*" and concludes:

> All those to whom these words apply are citizens of Babylon who control the public affairs of the Jerusalem. This is incontestable, because if they had no such authority over Jerusalem's business, how could we be commanded, '*observe and do whatever they tell you?*' And how could it be said of them '*they have taken place in the chair of Moses?*'. But then, if they are citizen of Jerusalem, destined to reign for ever with Christ, how can it be said, '*Do not imitate what they do?*' That must imply that they are to hear one day, *Depart from me, all you who act unjustly*' [123]".

The relationship between Babylon and Jerusalem in the course of history is also one of persecution of the former by the latter. The sons of Babylon launched attacks on the citizen of Jerusalem. Augustine illustrates the antagonism between the two cities with the story of the rivalry between Esau and Jacob which he links to 1 *Cor.* 15: 45 : "*non prius quod spirituale est, sed prius quod animale*". Esau, the first born, is the figure of the bodily man, while Jacob is the figure of the spiritual man. From the sin of Adam and Eve, human beings come to this world as carnal beings, members of the city of perdition; to belong to Jerusalem, on needs to be born again, and continue to fight the desirs of the flesh. Augustine observes that not long ago, the sons of Edom, *i.e.* pagans, cried: *Tollite christianos, exstinguite*

---

[122] Aug., *en. Ps.* 61, 8 (CCL 39, 779) : *Quam multi enim fideles, quam multi boni et magistratus sunt in civitatibus suis, et iudices sunt, et duces sunt, et comites sunt, et reges sunt? Omnes iusti et boni, non habentes in corde nisi gloriosissima quae de te dicta sunt, civitas Dei. Et quasi angariam faciunt in civitate transitura, et illic a doctoribus civitatis sanctae iubentur servare fidem praepositis suis, sive regi quasi praecellenti, sive ducibus tamquam ab eo missis ad vindictam malorum, laudem vero bonorum; sive servi, ut dominis suis subditi sint, et Christiani Paganis; et servet fidem melior deteriori, ad tempus serviturus, in aeternum dominaturus. Fiunt enim ista donec transeat iniquitas. Iubentur servi ferre dominos iniquos et difficiles: cives Babyloniae iubentur tolerari a civibus Ierusalem, et amplius obsequiorum exhibentibus, quam si cives essent ex ipsa Babylonia; tamquam implentibus: Qui te angariaverit mille passus, vade cum illo alia duo.*

[123] *Ibid* : " Respicite nunc impleri hoc et agi in Ecclesia, et his temporibus. Omnes de quibus dictum est: *Quae dicunt facite; quae autem faciunt facere nolite,* cives sunt Babyloniae, administrantes rempublicam civitatis Ierusalem. Si enim nihil administrarent civitatis Ierusalem, unde: *Quae dicunt facite*? unde, *cathedram Moysi sedent*? Rursus si cives sunt ipsius Ierusalem qui regnabunt in aeternum cum Christo, unde: *Quae faciunt facere nolite*, nisi quia et audituri sunt: *Recedite a me, omnes qui operamini iniquitatem*?

christianos. But in truth, the battle ground is within man. It is in our innermost that we need to fight our passions, the bad desirs that resurface even in the just man. They are all daughters of Babylon to cast against the rock, Christ Jesus[124].

These are but few examples of the many instances in which Augustine gave a clear presentation of the relationship existing between the two cities in his letters and sermons. In the next section, we are going to look at the arrival point of his reflections in the *City of God.*

2.3.   The earthly history of the two cities in the *City of God*

The doctrine of the two cities, even as it appears in its final form in the *De civitate Dei)* insists on a contrary principle of confusion and indeterminacy. Two Cities exist side by side in this world, but in a way so intertwined and confused with each other so completely that it is impossible to make confident distinction between them[125]. Yet there is an element, as we have seen in the foregoing enquiry, that help differentiate them: the love that guides, for *two loves founded two cities.*

Having examined the origin of the two cities, the earthly and the heavenly, in the Books XI-XIV of the *City of God*, Augustine dedicates the next four books (XV-XVIII) to their development and interaction, their growth and progress in the course of history. This tracking of the two cities through history largely consists of charting the sequence of biblical generations in which the heavenly and earthly cities are respectively represented. Coupled with drawing a pattern of correlations between biblical history and the various kingdoms that rose into and fell from prominence through the course of time; culminating in the rise of Rome itself to the status of world domination. For the purpose of this paper, there is no need to trace its account in detail. It is important, however, to see how Augustine characterises the two cities and the interactions between them in their earthly histories.

Just as he asserted in 390 in *De vera religione*, Augustine starts by affirming, here again, that humankind is divided into two categories of people. He maintains the

---

[124] Aug., *en. Ps.* 136, 21 (CCL 40, 1977- 1978) : *Quando enim nati sumus, parvulos nos invenit ista confusio saeculi huius; et offocavit nos errorum diversorum vanis opinionibus adhuc infantes. Natus infans futurus civis Ierusalem, et in praedestinatione Dei iam civis, sed interim captivatus ad tempus, quando discit amare, nisi quod insusurraverint parentes? Instruunt et docent illum avaritiam, rapinas, mendacia quotidiana, diversas culturas idolorum et daemoniorum, remedia illicita praecantationum et ligaturarum. Quid facturus est adhuc infans, anima tenera, attendens ad maiores quid agant, nisi ut quod eos viderit agere hoc sequatur? Babylonia ergo persecuta est parvulos nos; sed Deus dedit nobis agnitionem sui iam grandibus, ut non sequeremur errores parentum nostrorum.*

[125] Cf. J. J. O'Donnell, *The Inspiration for Augustine's* De civitate Dei, in *Augustinian Studies* 10 (1979), 76.

same viewpoint regarding the course of the human beings according these two spiritual cities. He begins with the first children of Adam and Eve – Cain, who was born first and belonged to the earthly city, and Abel, who was born later and belonged to the city of God:

> This race [the human race] we have distributed into two parts, the one consisting of those who live according to man, the other of those who live according to God. And these we also mystically call the two cities, or the two communities of men, of which the one is predestined to reign eternally with God, and the other to suffer eternal punishment with the devil[126].

Augustine makes Abel and Cain the protagonists of the two human races and thus the first citizens of the two cities. This is not new, for Augustine repeats it very often as we have seen it in the expositions on the *Psalms.* In the *City of God*, however, the reflection has reached a certain maturity and depth. Indeed we find Augustine implying here that the sequence of the births of Cain and Abel exemplifies a truth which also holds good for each human individual:

> Of these two first parents of the human race, then, Cain was the first-born, and he belonged to the city of men; after him was born Abel, who belonged to the city of God. For as in the individual the truth of the apostle's statement is discerned, "*that is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural, and afterward that which is spiritual*", whence it comes to pass that each man, being derived from a condemned stock, is first of all born of Adam evil and carnal, and becomes good and spiritual only afterwards, when he is grafted into Christ by regeneration: so was it in the human race as a whole. When these two cities began to run their course by a series of deaths and births, the citizen of this world was the first-born, and after him the stranger in this world, the citizen of the city of God, predestinated by grace, elected by grace, by grace a stranger below, and by grace a citizen above[127].

---

[126] Aug., *De civ. Dei* XV, 1 (CCL 48, 452) : "… *ipsius generis humani, quod in duo genera distribuimus, unum eorum, qui secundum hominem, alterum eorum, qui secundum Deum vivunt; quas etiam mystice appellamus civitates duas, hoc est duas societates hominum, quarum est una quae praedestinata est in aeternum regnare cum Deo, altera aeternum supplicium subire cum diabolo.*"

[127] *Ibid.*, XV, 2 (CCL 48, 453-454): "*Natus est igitur prior Cain ex illis duobus generis humani parentibus, pertinens ad hominum civitatem, posterior Abel, ad civitatem Dei. Sicut enim in uno homine, quod dixit Apostolus, experimur, quia non primum quod spiritale est, sed quod animale, postea spiritale : unde unusquisque, quoniam ex damnata propagine exoritur, primo sit necesse est ex Adam malus atque carnalis; quod si in Christum renascendo profecerit, post erit bonus et spiritalis: sic in universo genere humano, cum primum duae istae coeperunt nascendo atque moriendo procurrere civitates, prior est natus civis huius saeculi, posterius autem isto peregrinus in saeculo et pertinens ad civitatem Dei, gratia praedestinatus, gratia electus, gratia peregrinus deorsum, gratia civis sursum*"

That Cain, the first born, was a citizen of this world is signified by the fact that he founded a city. His aim, then, was to make himself at home in this life and to invest himself in a society of this world. But Abel, who was born later, founded no city. Instead, he was by grace a pilgrim in this world and a citizen of the city above, the heavenly city. Thus the status of the heavenly city – or, at least, of that part of it that is here on earth – is the status of a pilgrim who is not yet at home but is rather on the way towards a destination. Augustine then uses the births of the Abraham's sons, Ishmael and Isaac, to reinforce and further interpret this pattern. These two personalities exemplify the two cities as a replica of Cain and Abel and thus, the history of the two cities progresses.

To sum up this important part of our inquiry, we could say that the factors that will be in play in Augustine's characterisations of the two cities are these: The earthly city, pursuing its own personal and private good, will look for its good here on earth, and his joy will come from sharing this good. But Augustine makes it clear that, because such goods as can be found in this earthly life are limited goods that cannot be shared without being diminished, they inevitably give rise to anxieties (about gaining and losing them) and conflicts (between those who seek to gain or keep them for themselves. The bishop of Hippo gives as prime example the case of Romulus and Remus, the twin brothers of Roman legend, each of whom wanted himself the glory of founding the Roman republic. To have a living co-ruler, however, would have meant having less power, less dominion, and therefore less glory of oneself. Consequently, to secure total dominion and power for himself, Romulus murdered Remus and made himself the the sole founder of Rome. The murder, in Augustine's view, exemplifies the way in which the earthly city is divided against itself "by lawsuits, wars and conflicts" in which each side seeks victory over the other in a constant struggle to gain position and power.

In contrast, the heavenly city finds its joy "in the common and immutable good" – God himself – which is not diminished when it is shared and thus does not generate the anxieties and conflicts that stem from competition for a limited good that one person or group can acquire only at the expense of another. Instead, its good is of such a kind that the more it is shared the greater each person's possession of it becomes. The heavenly city, then, is characterised not only by the love for the supreme and immutable good but also by its citizens' love for each other, which brings them to unity and harmony rather than conflict and competition.

In addition to the antagonisms within the earthly city that mark its course through time, there is also the antagonism between the two cities which sets them at odd with each other in their historical existence; and this antagonism is exemplified by fratricide (Cain's murder of Abel). According to the biblical account, Cain and Abel offered a sacrifice to God. Abel's was accepted, but Cain's was not; and, out of envy, Cain killed Abel. The Scripture says God told Cain that his sacrifice was *rightly offered* but not *right divided*[128]. For Augustine, the most basic meaning of this text is that Cain's sacrifice was wrongly divided in the sense that, although he offered something from his own possessions to God, he kept himself for himself; and this, Augustine says, is precisely what people do when they "follow their own will rather than God's … and yet still offered gift to God[129]". In final analysis, those act this way imagine that, with their gift, they will buy God's help not in healing their own misguided and misdirected desires but in fulfilling them. And there is a political as well as personal dimension to this kind of attempt to make the divine serve human purposes[130].

In this perspective, Augustine says "the good make use of the world in order to enjoy; but the evil, in contrast, want to make use of God in order to enjoy the world[131]. What turns the earthly city against the heavenly, then is the very fact that the city of God does not support or join its attempts to gain its own ends; and just as the enmity between Cain and Abel was rooted in the Cain's hatred for Abel, so the antagonism between the earthly and the heavenly cities is rooted in this hatred of the evil for the good.

But despite of this dire and persistent antagonism between the two cities through history, Augustine refuses to reduce his charting of the interactions within and between the two cities. If the earthly city is characterised by conflict and war in its competition for earthly goods, which does not mean that the goods it seeks are not goods or that human society is not often better when it attains them. When one side triumphs over the other, Augustine argues, there will be a sort of earthly peace ; and if the victory goes to the side that was fighting for the more just cause, "*who can doubt that the victory deserves to be celebrated or that the resulting peace is very much desired? These are goods, and they are undoubtedly gifts from God*[132]". We need then, to recognise a more complex pattern of conflict and

---

[128] *Gn*. 4:7 . Augustine Latin text of Genesis was based on the Greek translation of the Hebrew known as Septuagint.

[129] Aug., *De civ. Dei* XV, 7 (CCL 48, 460).

[130] Cf. W. Babcock, Introduction to *The City of God*, The Works of Saint Augustine. A Translation for the 21st Century, Vol. 6, New City Press, New York 2013.

[131] Aug., De civ. Dei. XV, 7 (CCL 48, 460). In Augustine's thought on ethics and values the concepts of "use" and "enjoyment" play a central role.

[132] Aug., *De civ. Dei* XV, 4 (CCL 48, 453).

allow that, even within the pattern of conflict, there can be instances of social good.

When Augustine lists the forms of conflicts that obtain in our present social interactions, his list is surprisingly nuanced. The holy Bishop was very careful in his analysis of the human condition and the struggles that take place in the correlation of the two cities:

> The wicked war with the wicked; the good also war with the wicked. But with the good, good men, or at least perfectly good men, cannot war; though, while only going on towards perfection, they war to this extent, that every good man resists others in those points in which he resists himself. And in each individual "*the flesh lusts against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh*". This spiritual lusting, therefore, can be at war with the carnal lust of another human beings; or carnal lust may be at war with the spiritual desires of another, in some such way as good and wicked human beings are at war; or, still more certainly, the carnal lusts of two persons, good but not yet perfect, contend together, just as the wicked contend with the wicked, until the health of those who are under the treatment of grace attains final victory[133].

If the earthly city is marked by war and conflict, that does not mean that it has entirely cut itself off from all earthly good or from the possibility of attaining an earthly peace that comes from God[134] ; and if the heavenly city is characterised by love for God and for others, that does not mean that its pilgrimage on earth is immune to the bitter struggles of the self against itself or of the self against others. Augustine rightly says to that effect:

> It is difficult to discover from Scripture, whether, after the deluge, traces of the holy city are continuous, or are so interrupted by intervening seasons of godlessness, that not a single worshipper of the one true God was found

---

[133] *Ibid.*, XV, 5 (CCL 48, 455) : "*Pugnant ergo inter se mali et mali; item pugnant inter se mali et boni: boni vero et boni, si perfecti sunt, inter se pugnare non possunt. Proficientes autem nondumque perfecti ita possunt, ut bonus quisque ex ea parte pugnet contra alterum, qua etiam contra semetipsum; et in uno quippe homine 'caro concupiscit adversus spiritum et spiritus adversus carnem'. Concupiscentia ergo spiritalis contra alterius potest pugnare carnalem vel concupiscentia carnalis contra alterius spiritalem, sicut inter se pugnant boni et mali; vel certe ipsae concupiscentiae carnales inter se duorum bonorum, nondum utique perfectorum, sicut inter se pugnant mali et mali, donec eorum, qui curantur, ad ultimam victoriam sanitas perducatur.*"

[134] Augustine makes mention of the fact that God did not dismiss Cain, the protagonist of the earthly city, without counsel holy, just and good (XV, 7). The same is offered to the citizens of the earthly city and God awaits their return to him. And this opens the possibility of change.

among men; because from Noah, who, with his wife, three sons, and as many daughters-in-law, achieved deliverance in the ark from the destruction of the deluge, down to Abraham, we do not find in the canonical books that the piety of any one is celebrated by express divine testimony[135].

From these considerations, it follows that neither society can be reduced to a simple, monochromatic coloration. Neither city follows a course through time that can be characterised as unrelievedly evil or as unrelievedly good.

This position of Saint Augustine is clearly at variance with that of modern scholars who emphasise a certain "Augustinian pessimism" affirming that he has a totally negative vision of all human effort in matters of politics. In a recent publication, an author presented Augustine's ideas in a way that plainly contradicts it; at least as far as what the holy Bishop says in the *City of God* is concerned. This modern augustinologist says: "*For him* [*Augustine*], *politics can never be redeemed because it is the archetypal sinful activity. It is the archetypal sinful activity because it is the ultimate expression of man's willed estrangement from God*[136]". One needs no effort to discern the inaccuracy of this judgment when we consider Augustine's appraisal of humans used by God to be involved in politics and rule the affairs of the earthly city even as they belong to the city of God. Augustine also speaks of Christian commonwealth promoted by the doctrine of Christ[137]. This gospel oriented commonwealth is nothing less than a kind of theocratic political society, at least in the desire of the one who conceives it. How then could politics as such be the "*archrtypal sinful activity*" if it is oriented from the perspective of that love which places God and neighbour first? Besides, this author provides no text from Augustine's many writings to back his position up. It is true that the bishop of Hippo, according to the issue at hand, may adopt a position rather hard on those involved in the unending conflicts and competitions in love of self and subjection of others. But he has never been so negative as to consign human attempt to organise society to a total doom as

---

[135] Aug., *De civ. Dei* XVI, 1 (CCL 48, 489): "*Post diluvium procurrentis sanctae vestigia civitatis utrum continuata sint an intercurrentibus impietatis interrupta temporibus, ita ut nullus hominum veri unius Dei cultor existeret, ad liquidum Scripturis loquentibus invenire difficile est, propterea quia in canonicis Libris post Noe, qui cum coniuge ac tribus filiis totidemque nuribus suis meruit per arcam vastatione diluvii liberari, non invenimus usque Abraham cuiusquam pietatem evidenti divino eloquio praedicatam*".

[136] M. Hollingworth, *The Pilgrim City. Saint Augustine of Hippo and his innovation in Polical thought*, T&T Clark, New York 2010, 65.

[137] Cf. Aug., *ep.* 138, 2, 10-15 (CSEL 44,126-148)

(A Publication of the Augustinian Institute in collaboration with AATREPSCHOLARS)

some scholars would like us to believe. George Lavere seems to have got the point of Augustine's argument when he says:

> In a secondary and relative sense, the earthly city has a common purpose, those interests which prompted its members to form a community in the first place, and an imperfect form of justice, more or less adequate to its needs as a functional community seeking a peace of its own design. To some extent, the goals of the earthly city correspond to those of the heavenly city and, insofar as they do, the Christian pilgrim, exiled in the earthly city, may and, in some cases, must cooperate with his fellow citizens irrespective of their theological differences. For the earthly city is best described as secular rather than evil[138].

Augustine never casts off completely the positive aspect in political life for he recognises that the citizens of Jerusalem in exile in Babylon can use any pacific moment they get there. He seems to establish a parallel between the *pax romana* and the *pax eternitatis*. Without any hesitation, Augustine says "*Utimur et nos pace Babyloniae*[139].

The last part of the Augustine's *City of God* (Books XIX-XXII) deals with the eternal destinies of the two cities. And this brings us back to the title of our paper: *Eternal peace or eternal frustration*. The city of God after the painful pilgrimage on earth is destined to everlasting glory while the earthly city ruled by pride and contempt to God is destined to eternal shame and disgrace. We shall not elaborate on this as we have already examined many texts on the reason why one could end up in one destiny or another. Having made these observations, we have come to end of the second part of this paper. It is now important to consider the relevance of the effort of Saint Augustine in theorising on the two cities.

3. The relevance of Augustine's vision to our society today

From the inception of his literary activity and more precisely from his conversion to Christ till the end of his life Augustine has reflected, written and preached on the two cities. We have sufficiently shown this in the first part of the paper. The questions that come to mind have to do with the relevance of all these speculations to us today.

---

[138] G. Lavere, *The problem of Common Good in Saint Augustine's* Civitas Terrena, in *Augustinian Studies* Vol. 14 (1983), 9.

[139] Aug., *De civ. Dei* XIX, 26.

Augustine's teaching on the two cities falls within the scope of long-standing tradition of Christianity as religion which had to defend itself in various circumstances right from its beginnigs. It is enough to think of the Apologists who stood to counter those who accused Christians of various crimes in the society. Justine, Tertullian and Lactantius are few examples of such witnesses to Christ and to his community, the Church. Augustine took up the same task at a time when the Roman Empire, after being christianised, fell into disgrace. However, this doctrine by and large, even outside the context of an apologetic struggle, is nothing strange if we consider that the Bible tells us that we, who believe in Christ Jesus, are citizens of Heaven. A corresponding citizenship exists and it is the proper domain of those who reject God and his Christ. It is exactly these two citizenships that Augustine calls heavenly and earthly. Now Christians and those who discard the teaching of Christ are living together the one and same *civitas terrena.* The danger is great for the citizens of the holy city, who are only known in their hearts, to be enticed by the seductions of Babylon. It is here that the alarming insistence of Augustine on these two cities and their ultimante ends prove important to us insofar as we are constantly exposed to the possibility of being drifted way from our focus. As Donald Burt rightly observes, the basic differentiation between the City of the world and the City of God is that the former ignores the claims of God upon the soul. It is a social organization of and for this world alone. The City of God, one might say, is the fellowship of those who are living for eternity even in this life[140]. Living for eternity would mean considering the realities of this world as ephemeral. By so doing we shall not hold unto things that are irrelevant for eternity.

We belong to the *civitas peregrina*, a community in exile, dwelling in the midst of the earthly city. And so we should not consider ourselves as having a permanent abode here below. Augustine's plea to the people of Hippo on behalf of Roman refugees after the calamities of 410 brings to mind this idea of instability on earth that should characterise Christians. The fall of Rome set off a minor wave of refugees from Italy towards North Africa: mostly wealthy members of the senatorial aristocracy who would have property across the sea to which to flee, and an unusually high percentage of whom would be among the lingering remnants of Roman society still sentimentally attached to the ancient religion, blaming Christianity for Rome's misfortunes. They would find a receptive audience for their complaints among even Christians of minimal piety, whose

---

[140] Cf. D. X. Burt, O.S.A, *St. Augustine's Evalution of Civil Society*, 92.

inadequate understanding of their faith might have led them to expect that Christ would protect his own people as well as the pagan gods had been expected to. Augustine told his congregation at Hippo to receive these wanderers as charitably as possible, out of concern for the sad circumstances which drove them from their homes[141].

According J. J. O'Donnell, what must have dawned upon Augustine is that the situation of these cultured refugees was precisely analogous, in legal terms, to the kind of behavior which he wanted to preach as most suitable for Christians living in the earthly city. These refugees were themselves citizens of Rome, a great city far away, and only strangers (*peregrini*), in North Africa. They came into the country not as permanent residents or citizens would, but rather precisely as strangers. They lamented their exile from their great city far away, they criticized their temporary surroundings vehemently as lacking the amenities of their real home, and they looked forward eagerly to the day when they could return in comfort and safety to their true *patria*[142].

This analogy of noble Romans living temporarily in a country which is not theirs and the Christians living in the world as foreigners could help us today to reconsider our attachment to those things which, in the last analysis, are of no relevance for our return to our real home. The doctrine of the two cities, moreover, enlightens us to discern where we really belong, since it is in our heart that we personally know the love that motivates our actions. This love which determines the city each person belongs to, also fortells the kind of resurrection each of us is destined. In such a situation we can say love, citizenship and final resurrection are linked in the light of all we have said so far. We need to keep in mind that being members of the pilgrim Church does not secure for us citizenship of the city of God. But loving God and neighbour according to the precepts of Christ gives a guarantee of the eternal peace.

Conclusion

We started this tour by linking the idea of the two cities to the different destinies awaiting human beings at the close of earthly existence. On the one hand, those

---

[141] Cf. Aug., *Sermon* 81, 9 (PL 38, 506) : "*Rogamus vos, obsecramus vos, exhortamur vos, estote mites, compatimini patientibus, suscipite infirmos: et in ista occasione multorum peregrinorum, egentium, laborantium, abundet hospitalitas vestra, abundent bona opera vestra.*"
[142] Cf. J. J. O'Donnell, *The Inspiration for Augustine's* De civitate Dei, 78.

who identify with Jerusalem will awake to eternal peace, on the other hand all who cling to Babylon and its values will resurrect to everlasting shame and frustration. Before we arrive at that point, however, there is a span of time for choice-making by person. Augustine shows us that the choice to be made is between two loves from which are born the two cities. And so at the origin of the two mystical cities – exhaustive and mutually exclusive communities of rational creation[143] – are two contrasting loves. From his *De vera religione* to the *City of God*, Augustine continually developed and enriched the doctrine. He then exposes the development of the two cities through history, examining the history of humanity from Cain and Abel, the first protagonists of the two cities. The relationship between these two cities is such that it is difficult to establish physical boundaries since the *civitas terrana* is the common ground where both live and thrive, one attaching itself to the earth and the other longing for the things of heaven. They are not materially distinguishable, but in the heart of their members the Lord of all knows to whom they pay their allegiance.

Through the doctrine of the two cities, Augustine exhorts us today, as he did many centuries ago, to strive for the right love which will assure us of the citizenship of the city of God. As pilgrim in the earthly city, we need to fight the many tribulations that test our desires, and when we prove to really long for the vision of peace, we shall rest in him who promised rest to those come to him (*Mt.* 11, 28) when we awake at the end to eternal peace. The ills of our pilgrimage are instrumental. In the thought of Augustine, one of the functions of the "ugly" is to enhance by contrasting the "beautiful". His aim in extensively elaborating on the earthly city and its ills in a book on the city of God is to glorify the latter and that it may "*gleam more brightly*" by the contrast[144]. When our appetite for the earthly things turn into repugnance, then our sense of this contrast will appear more sharply and we shall long more for the Jerusalem, the vision of peace.

---

[143] R. R. Barr, The Two Cities in Saint Augustine, in *Laval théologique et philosophique* 18/2 (1960), 223.
[144] Aug., *De civ. Dei* XVI, 2 (CCL 48, 490).