**Chapter I. The Occasion and Purpose of this “Manual”**

1. I cannot say, my dearest son Laurence, how much your learning pleases me, and how much I desire that you should be wise--though not one of those of whom it is said: "Where is the wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the disputant of this world? Hath not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?"[1](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn1" \o ") Rather, you should be one of those of whom it is written, "The multitude of the wise is the health of the world"[2](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn2" \o ") ; and also you should be the kind of man the apostle wishes those men to be to whom he said,[3](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn3" \o ") "I would have you be wise in goodness and simple in evil."[4](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn4" \o ")

2. Human wisdom consists in piety. This you have in the book of the saintly Job, for there he writes that Wisdom herself said to man, "Behold, piety is wisdom."[5](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn5" \o ") If, then, you ask what kind of piety she was speaking of, you will find it more distinctly designated by the Greek term qeosebeia, literally, "the service of God." The Greek has still another word for "piety," εὐσέβεια, which also signifies "proper service." This too refers chiefly to the service of God. But no term is better than θεοσέβεια, which clearly expresses the idea of the man's service of God as the source of human wisdom.

When you ask me to be brief, you do not expect me to speak of great issues in a few sentences, do you? Is not this rather what you desire: a brief summary or a short treatise on the proper mode of worshipping serving God?

3. If I should answer, "God should be worshipped in faith, hope, love," you would doubtless reply that this was shorter than you wished, and might then beg for a brief explication of what each of these three means: What should be believed, what should be hoped for, and what should be loved? If I should answer these questions, you would then have everything you asked for in your letter. If you have kept a copy of it, you can easily refer to it. If not, recall your questions as I discuss them.

4. It is your desire, as you wrote, to have from me a book, a sort of enchiridion,[6](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn6" \o ") as it might be called--something to have "at hand"--that deals with your questions. What is to be sought after above all else? What, in view of the divers heresies, is to be avoided above all else? How far does reason support religion; or what happens to reason when the issues involved concern faith alone; what is the beginning and end of our endeavor? What is the most comprehensive of all explanations? What is the certain and distinctive foundation of the catholic faith? You would have the answers to all these questions if you really understood what a man should believe, what he should hope for, and what he ought to love. For these are the chief things--indeed, the only things--to seek for in religion. He who turns away from them is either a complete stranger to the name of Christ or else he is a heretic. Things that arise in sensory experience, or that are analyzed by the intellect, may be demonstrated by the reason. But in matters that pass beyond the scope of the physical senses, which we have not settled by our own understanding, and cannot--here we must believe, without hesitation, the witness of those men by whom the Scriptures (rightly called divine) were composed, men who were divinely aided in their senses and their minds to see and even to foresee the things about which they testify.

5. But, as this faith, which works by love,[7](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn7" \o ") begins to penetrate the soul, it tends, through the vital power of goodness, to change into sight, so that the holy and perfect in heart catch glimpses of that ineffable beauty whose full vision is our highest happiness. Here, then, surely, is the answer to your question about the beginning and the end of our endeavor. We begin in faith, we are perfected in sight.[8](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn8" \o ") This likewise is the most comprehensive of all explanations. As for the certain and distinctive foundation of the catholic faith, it is Christ. "For other foundation," said the apostle, "can no man lay save that which has been laid, which is Christ Jesus."[9](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn9" \o ") Nor should it be denied that this is the distinctive basis of the catholic faith, just because it appears that it is common to us and to certain heretics as well. For if we think carefully about the meaning of Christ, we shall see that among some of the heretics who wish to be called Christians, the name of Christ is held in honor, but the reality itself is not among them. To make all this plain would take too long--because we would then have to review all the heresies that have been, the ones that now exist, and those which could exist under the label "Christian," and we would have to show that what we have said of all is true of each of them. Such a discussion would take so many volumes as to make it seem endless.[10](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn10" \o ")

6. You have asked for an enchiridion, something you could carry around, not just baggage for your bookshelf. Therefore we may return to these three ways in which, as we said, God should be served: faith, hope, love. It is easy to say what one ought to believe, what to hope for, and what to love. But to defend our doctrines against the calumnies of those who think differently is a more difficult and detailed task. If one is to have this wisdom, it is not enough just to put an enchiridion in the hand. It is also necessary that a great zeal be kindled in the heart.

**CHAPTER** **XII.  The Role of the Holy Spirit**

38. Are we, then, to say that the Holy Spirit is the Father of Christ's human nature, so that as God the Father generated the Word, so the Holy Spirit generated the human nature, and that from both natures Christ came to be one, Son of God the Father as the Word, Son of the Holy Spirit as man? Do we suppose that the Holy Spirit is his Father through begetting him of the Virgin Mary? Who would dare to say such a thing? There is no need to show by argument how many absurd consequences such a notion has, when it is so absurd in itself that no believer's ear can bear to hear it. Actually, then, as we confess our Lord Jesus Christ, who is God from God yet born as man of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary, there is in each nature (in both the divine and the human) the only Son of God the Father Almighty, from whom proceeds the Holy Spirit.

How, then, do we say that Christ is born of the Holy Spirit, if the Holy Spirit did not beget him? Is it because he made him? This might be, since through our Lord Jesus Christ--in the form of God--all things were made. Yet in so far as he is man, he himself was made, even as the apostle says: "He was made of the seed of David according to the flesh."[80](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn80" \o ") But since that creature which the Virgin conceived and bore, though it was related to the Person of the Son alone, was made by the whole Trinity--for the works of the Trinity are not separable--why is the Holy Spirit named as the One who made it? Is it, perhaps, that when any One of the Three is named in connection with some divine action, the whole Trinity is to be understood as involved in that action? This is true and can be shown by examples, but we should not dwell too long on this kind of solution.

For what still concerns us is how it can be said, "Born of the Holy Spirit," when he is in no wise the Son of the Holy Spirit? Now, just because God made *fecit* this world, one could not say that the world is the son of God, or that it is "born" of God. Rather, one says it was "made" or "created" or "founded" or "established" by him, or however else one might like to speak of it. So, then, when we confess, "Born of the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary," the sense in which he is not the Son of the Holy Spirit and yet is the son of the Virgin Mary, when he was born both of him and of her, is difficult to explain. But there is no doubt as to the fact that he was not born from him as Father as he was born of her as mother.

39. Consequently we should not grant that whatever is born of something should therefore be called the son of that thing. Let us pass over the fact that a son is "born" of a man in a different sense than a hair is, or a louse, or a maw worm--none of these is a son. Let us pass over these things, since they are an unfitting analogy in so great a matter. Yet it is certain that those who are born of water and of the Holy Spirit would not properly be called sons of the water by anyone. But it does make sense to call them sons of God the Father and of Mother Church. Thus, therefore, the one born of the Holy Spirit is the son of God the Father, not of the Holy Spirit.

What we said about the hair and the other things has this much relevance, that it reminds us that not everything which is "born" of something is said to be "son" to him from which it is "born." Likewise, it does not follow that those who are called sons of someone are always said to have been born of him, since there are some who are adopted. Even those who are called "sons of Gehenna" are not born *of* it, but have been destined *for* it, just as the sons of the Kingdom are destined for that.

40. Wherefore, since a thing may be "born" of something else, yet not in the fashion of a "son," and conversely, since not everyone who is called son is born of him whose son he is called--this is the very mode in which Christ was "born" of the Holy Spirit (yet not as a son), and of the Virgin Mary as a son--this suggests to us the grace of God by which a certain human person, no merit whatever preceding, at the very outset of his existence, was joined to the Word of God in such a unity of person that the selfsame one who is Son of Man should be Son of God, and the one who is Son of God should be Son of Man. Thus, in his assumption of human nature, grace came to be natural to that nature, allowing no power to sin. This is why grace is signified by the Holy Spirit, because he himself is so perfectly God that he is also called God's Gift. Still, to speak adequately of this--even if one could--would call for a very long discussion.

**CHAPTER** **XV.  The Holy Spirit (56) and the Church (57-60)**

56. Now, when we have spoken of Jesus Christ, the only Son of God our Lord, in the brevity befitting our confession of faith, we go on to affirm that we believe also in the Holy Spirit, as completing the Trinity which is God; and after that we call to mind our faith "in holy Church." By this we are given to understand that the rational creation belonging to the free Jerusalem ought to be mentioned in a subordinate order to the Creator, that is, the supreme Trinity. For, of course, all that has been said about the man Christ Jesus refers to the unity of the Person of the Only Begotten.

Thus, the right order of the Creed demanded[110](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn110" \o ") that the Church be made subordinate to the Trinity, as a house is subordinate to him who dwells in it, the temple to God, and the city to its founder. By the Church here we are to understand the whole Church, not just the part that journeys here on earth from rising of the sun to its setting, praising the name of the Lord[111](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn111" \o ") and singing a new song of deliverance from its old captivity, but also that part which, in heaven, has always, from creation, held fast to God, and which never experienced the evils of a fall. This part, composed of the holy angels, remains in blessedness, and it gives help, even as it ought, to the other part still on pilgrimage. For both parts together will make one eternal consort, as even now they are one in the bond of love--the whole instituted for the proper worship of the one God.[112](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn112" \o ") Wherefore, neither the whole Church nor any part of it wishes to be worshiped as God nor to be God to anyone belonging to the temple of God--the temple that is being built up of "the gods" whom the uncreated God created.[113](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn113" \o ") Consequently, if the Holy Spirit were creature and not Creator, he would obviously be a rational creature, for this is the highest of the levels of creation. But in this case he would not be set in the rule of faith *before* the Church, since he would then belong *to* the Church, in that part of it which is in heaven. He would not have a temple, for he himself would be a temple. Yet, in fact, he hath a temple of which the apostle speaks, "Know you not that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit, who is in you, whom you have from God?"[114](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn114" \o ") In another place, he says of this body, "Know you not that your bodies are members of Christ?"[115](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn115" \o ") How, then, is he not God who has a temple? Or how can he be less than Christ whose members are his temple? It is not that he has one temple and God another temple, since the same apostle says: "Know you not that you are the temple of God," and then, as if to prove his point, added, "and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?"

God therefore dwelleth in his temple, not the Holy Spirit only, but also Father and Son, who saith of his body--in which he standeth as Head of the Church on earth "that in all things he may be pre-eminent"[116](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn116" \o ") --"Destroy this temple and in three days I will raise it up again."[117](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn117" \o ") Therefore, the temple of God---that is, of the supreme Trinity as a whole--is holy Church, the Universal Church in heaven and on the earth.

57. But what can we affirm about that part of the Church in heaven, save that in it no evil is to be found, nor any apostates, nor will there be again, since that time when "God did not spare the sinning angels"--as the apostle Peter writes--"but casting them out, he delivered them into the prisons of darkness in hell, to be reserved for the sentence in the Day of Judgment"[118](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn118" \o ") ?

58. Still, how is life ordered in that most blessed and supernal society? What differences are there in rank among the angels, so that while all are called by the general title "angels"--as we read in the Epistle to the Hebrews, "But to which of the angels said he at any time, 'Sit at my right hand'?"[119](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn119" \o ") ; this expression clearly signifies that all are angels without exception--yet there are archangels there as well? Again, should these archangels be called "powers" *virtutes*, so that the verse, "Praise him all his angels; praise him, all his powers,"[120](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn120" \o ") would mean the same thing as, "Praise him, all his angels; praise him, all his archangels"? Or, what distinctions are implied by the four designations by which the apostle seems to encompass the entire heavenly society, "Be they thrones or dominions, principalities, or powers"[121](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn121" \o ") ? Let them answer these questions who can, if they can indeed prove their answers. For myself, I confess to ignorance of such matters. I am not even certain about another question: whether the sun and moon and all the stars belong to that same heavenly society--although they seem to be nothing more than luminous bodies, with neither perception nor understanding.

59. Furthermore, who can explain the kind of bodies in which the angels appeared to men, so that they were not only visible, but tangible as well? And, again, how do they, not by impact of physical stimulus but by spiritual force, bring certain visions, not to the physical eyes but to the spiritual eyes of the mind, or speak something, not to the ears, as from outside us, but actually from within the human soul, since they are present within it too? For, as it is written in the book of the Prophets: "And the angel that spoke in me, said to me..."[122](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn122" \o ") He does not say, "Spoke *to* me" but "Spoke *in* me." How do they appear to men in sleep, and communicate through dreams, as we read in the Gospel: "Behold, the angel of the Lord appeared to him in his sleep, saying..."[123](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn123" \o ") ? By these various modes of presentation, the angels seem to indicate that they do not have tangible bodies. Yet this raises a very difficult question: How, then, did the patriarchs wash the angels' feet?[124](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn124" \o ") How, also, did Jacob wrestle with the angel in such a tangible fashion?[125](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn125" \o ")

To ask such questions as these, and to guess at the answers as one can, is not a useless exercise in speculation, so long as the discussion is moderate and one avoids the mistake of those who think they know what they do not know.

**CHAPTER** **XXIII.  The Reality of the Resurrection**

84. Now, with respect to the resurrection of the body--and by this I do not mean the cases of resuscitation after which people died again, but a resurrection to eternal life after the fashion of Christ's own body--I have not found a way to discuss it briefly and still give satisfactory answers to all the questions usually raised about it. Yet no Christian should have the slightest doubt as to the fact that the bodies of all men, whether already or yet to be born, whether dead or still to die, will be resurrected.

85. Once this fact is established, then, first of all, comes the question about abortive fetuses, which are indeed "born" in the mother's womb, but are never so that they could be "reborn." For, if we say that there is a resurrection for them, then we can agree that at least as much is true of fetuses that are fully formed. But, with regard to undeveloped fetuses, who would not more readily think that they perish, like seeds that did not germinate?[192](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn192" \o ")

But who, then, would dare to deny--though he would not dare to affirm it either--that in the resurrection day what is lacking in the forms of things will be filled out? Thus, the perfection which time would have accomplished will not be lacking, any more than the blemishes wrought by time will still be present. Nature, then, will be cheated of nothing apt and fitting which time's passage would have brought, nor will anything remain disfigured by anything adverse and contrary which time has wrought. But what is not yet a whole will become whole, just as what has been disfigured will be restored to its full figure.

86. On this score, a corollary question may be most carefully discussed by the most learned men, and still I do not know that any man can answer it, namely: When does a human being begin to live in the womb? Is there some form of hidden life, not yet apparent in the motions of a living thing? To deny, for example, that those fetuses ever lived at all which are cut away limb by limb and cast out of the wombs of pregnant women, lest the mothers die also if the fetuses were left there dead, would seem much too rash. But, in any case, once a man begins to live, it is thereafter possible for him to die. And, once dead, wheresoever death overtook him, I cannot find the basis on which he would not have a share in the resurrection of the dead.

87. By the same token, the resurrection is not to be denied in the cases of monsters which are born and live, even if they quickly die, nor should we believe that they will be raised as they were, but rather in an amended nature and free from faults. Far be it from us to say of that double-limbed man recently born in the Orient--about whom most reliable brethren have given eyewitness reports and the presbyter Jerome, of holy memory, has left a written account[193](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn193" \o ") --far be it from us, I say, to suppose that at the resurrection there will be one double man, and not rather two men, as there would have been if they had actually been born twins. So also in other cases, which, because of some excess or defect or gross deformity, are called monsters: at the resurrection they will be restored to the normal human physiognomy, so that every soul will have its own body and not two bodies joined together, even though they were born this way. Every soul will have, as its own, all that is required to complete a whole human body.

88. Moreover, with God, the earthly substance from which the flesh of mortal man is produced does not perish. Instead, whether it be dissolved into dust or ashes, or dispersed into vapors and the winds, or converted into the substance of other bodies (or even back into the basic elements themselves), or has served as food for beasts or even men and been turned into their flesh--in an instant of time this matter returns to the soul that first animated it, and that caused it to become a man, to live and to grow.

89. This earthly matter which becomes a corpse upon the soul's departure will not, at the resurrection, be so restored that the parts into which it was separated and which have become parts of other things must necessarily return to the same parts of the body in which they were situated--though they do return to the body from which they were separated. Otherwise, to suppose that the hair recovers what frequent clippings have taken off, or the nails get back what trimming has pared off, makes for a wild and wholly unbecoming image in the minds of those who speculate this way and leads them thus to disbelieve in the resurrection. But take the example of a statue made of fusible metal: if it were melted by heat or pounded into dust, or reduced to a shapeless mass, and an artist wished to restore it again from the mass of the same material, it would make no difference to the wholeness of the restored statue which part of it was remade of what part of the metal, so long as the statue, as restored, had been given all the material of which it was originally composed. Just so, God--an artist who works in marvelous and mysterious ways--will restore our bodies, with marvelous and mysterious celerity, out of the whole of the matter of which it was originally composed. And it will make no difference, in the restoration, whether hair returns to hair and nails to nails, or whether the part of this original matter that had perished is turned back into flesh and restored to other parts of the body. The main thing is that the providence of the divine Artist takes care that nothing unbecoming will result.

90. Nor does it follow that the stature of each person will be different when brought to life anew because there were differences in stature when first alive, nor that the lean will be raised lean or the fat come back to life in their former obesity. But if this is in the Creator's plan, that each shall retain his special features and the proper and recognizable likeness of his former self--while an equality of physical endowment will be preserved--then the matter of which each resurrection body is composed will be so disposed that none shall be lost, and any defect will be supplied by Him who can create out of nothing as he wills.

But if in the bodies of those rising again there is to be an intelligible inequality, such as between voices that fill out a chorus, this will be managed by disposing the matter of each body so to bring men into their place in the angelic band and impose nothing on their senses that is inharmonious. For surely nothing unseemly will be there, and whatever is there will be fitting, and this because the unfitting will simply not be.

91. The bodies of the saints, then, shall rise again free from blemish and deformity, just as they will be also free from corruption, encumbrance, or handicap. Their facility *facilitas* will be as complete as their felicity *felicitas*. This is why their bodies are called "spiritual," though undoubtedly they will be bodies and not spirits. For just as now the body is called "animate" *animale*, though it is a body and not a "spirit" *anima*, so then it will be a "spiritual body," but still a body and not a spirit.

Accordingly, then, as far as the corruption which weighs down the soul and the vices through which "the flesh lusts against the spirit"[194](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn194" \o ") are concerned, there will be no "flesh," but only body, since there are bodies that are called "heavenly bodies."[195](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn195" \o ") This is why it is said, "Flesh and blood shall not inherit the Kingdom of God," and then, as if to expound what was said, it adds, "Neither shall corruption inherit incorruption."[196](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn196" \o ") What the writer first called "flesh and blood" he later called "corruption," and what he first called "the Kingdom of God" he then later called "incorruption."

But, as far as the substance of the resurrection body is concerned, it will even then still be "flesh." This is why the body of Christ is called "flesh" even after the resurrection. Wherefore the apostle also says, "What is sown a natural body *corpus animale* rises as a spiritual body *corpus spirituale*."[197](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn197" \o ") For there will then be such a concord between flesh and spirit--the spirit quickening the servant flesh without any need of sustenance therefrom--that there will be no further conflict within ourselves. And just as there will be no more external enemies to bear with, so neither shall we have to bear with ourselves as enemies within.

92. But whoever are not liberated from that mass of perdition (brought to pass through the first man) by the one Mediator between God and man, they will also rise again, each in his own flesh, but only that they may be punished together with the devil and his angels. Whether these men will rise again with all their faults and deformities, with their diseased and deformed members--is there any reason for us to labor such a question? For obviously the uncertainty about their bodily form and beauty need not weary us, since their damnation is certain and eternal. And let us not be moved to inquire how their body can be incorruptible if it can suffer--or corruptible if it cannot die. For there is no true life unless it be lived in happiness; no true incorruptibility save where health is unscathed by pain. But where an unhappy being is not allowed to die, then death itself, so to say, dies not; and where pain perpetually afflicts but never destroys, corruption goes on endlessly. This state is called, in the Scripture, "the second death."[198](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_edn198" \o ")

93. Yet neither the first death, in which the soul is compelled to leave its body, nor the second death, in which it is not allowed to leave the body undergoing punishment, would have befallen man if no one had sinned. Surely, the lightest of all punishments will be laid on those who have added no further sin to that originally contracted. Among the rest, who have added further Sins to that one, they will suffer a damnation somewhat more tolerable in proportion to the lesser degree of their iniquity.

**CHAPTER** XXXIII.**Conclusion**

122. But somewhere this book must have an end. You can see for yourself whether you should call it an Enchiridion, or use it as one. But since I have judged that your zeal in Christ ought not to be spurned and since I believe and hope for good things for you through the help of our Redeemer, and since I love you greatly as one of the members of his body, I have written this book for you--may its usefulness match its prolixity!--on Faith, Hope, and Love.

Source: <http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm#C1>
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[10](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_ednref10" \o ") Already, very early in his ministry (397), Augustine had written *De agone Christiano*, in which he had reviewed and refuted a full score of heresies threatening the orthodox faith.

[80](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_ednref80" \o ") Rom. 1:3.

[110](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_ednref110" \o ") Reading the classical Latin form *poscebat* (as in Scheel and PL) for the late form *poxebat* (as in Riviere and many old MSS.).

[111](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_ednref111" \o ") Cf. Ps. 113:3.

[112](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_ednref112" \o ") Here reading *unum deum* (with Rivière and PL) against *deum* (in Scheel).

[113](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_ednref113" \o ") A hyperbolic expression referring to "the saints." Augustine's Scriptural backing for such an unusual phrase is Ps. 82:6 and John 10:34f. But note the firm distinction between *ex diis quos facit* and *non factus Deus*.

[114](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_ednref114" \o ") I Cor. 6:19.

[115](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_ednref115" \o ") I Cor. 6:15.

[116](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_ednref116" \o ") Col. 1:18.

[117](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_ednref117" \o ") John 2:19.

[118](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_ednref118" \o ") II Peter 2:4 (Old Latin).

[119](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_ednref119" \o ") Heb. 1:13.

[120](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_ednref120" \o ") Ps. 148:2 (LXX).

[121](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_ednref121" \o ") Co1. 1:16.

[122](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_ednref122" \o ") Zech. 1:9.

[123](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_ednref123" \o ") Matt. 1:20.

[124](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_ednref124" \o ") Gen. 18:4; 19:2.

[125](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_ednref125" \o ") Gen. 32:24.

[192](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_ednref192" \o ") *Sicut semina quae concepta non fuerint*.

[193](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_ednref193" \o ") Jerome, *Epistle to Vitalis, Ep. LXXII*, 2; *PL*, 22, 674. Augustine also refers to similar phenomena in *The City of God*, XVI. viii, 2.

[194](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_ednref194" \o ") Gal. 5:17.

[195](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_ednref195" \o ") I Cor. 15:40.

[196](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_ednref196" \o ") I Cor. 15:50.

[197](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_ednref197" \o ") I Cor. 15:44.

[198](http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/augustine_enchiridion_02_trans.htm" \l "_ednref198" \o ") Rev. 2:11; 20:6, 14.