

“JUSTICE: ORDERLY LOVE” ON AUGUSTINIAN TERMS

Doç. Dr. Ayşen Furtun

Law Faculty
Kırıkkale University

If you have ever wondered/pondered about the question why there is no justice on earth –i.e. on Augustinian terms the “Earthly City”(Augustine, *The City of God against the Pagans*, trans. Dyson 1998) Augustine surely offers a most modest answer to your and probably your fellow-individuals question, being a member of a post-modern world and a world state –i.e. exemplar of an Earthly City in which you are living as a citizen but mostly being over-whelmed by the conflicts and struggles of this age, where earthly peace and order seems no more than a fragile and a marginally set compromise expected to be torn-apart and shattered at any foreseeable point of clashes coming into surface through never ending power struggles in the human world where the ideal of “justice” and a “just order” seems merely to be only in the law/philosophy books and theory such as for instance that of Kantian idealism, Hobbesian contractarianism or even ancient philosophy of the pagan times.

Thus for instance Kantian transcendental idealism (Kant, *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals*, trans. Ellington 1981) takes place in a noumenal order/realm versus phenomenal existence arising merely from the concept of “duty” in the morally responsible agent’s free and rational choices whereas in Hobbesian law of nature- that of survival and nature of laws-(Hobbes, *Leviathan* ch.13, 17) that of mutually transforming/curbing off individual identities and building up a common supreme authority reciprocally under whose government thus, a “Mortal God” can perhaps supply shelter and protection for a “secure” life to go on in this planet.

And before Hobbesian and Kantian times where ancient philosophies are concerned pagan “virtue” (Irwin, *The Virtues”: Theory and Common Sense in Greek Philosophy* 1996) achieved as a member of a political “society” as that of Rome brought forth the “common good” of the society together with individually and socially acknowledged pride and glory.

So if you are not satisfied with any of these theoretical explanations thus put forward by the various ages and thinkers of philosophy starting from ancient wisdom up to modern age idealism and in between materialistic thinking of the contractarians and still disturbed by the injustices of the modern world taking place behind individually and socially orienteered sheer clashes and conflicts observed as never-ending lust for dominion over others i.e. as power and glory as we have said perhaps one could have a look at St Augustine’s thinking (Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, ed. Dombart-Kalb 1955) surely arising from a different perspective from all others briefly mentioned above.

Thus we shall first have a look at the details of this different perspective and try to put forward why it is “different” in the first part of our inquiry and then compare this different perspective with that of “others” in its various aspects.

I. Augustinian Answer to Why There is No Justice on Earth i.e. The Earthly City

First of all it is worth noting that as many critical modern political thinkers do (Millbank, *Theology and Social Theory: Beyond Secular Reason* 1990)-as a methodological approach to political matters as in the form of “law” and “order” merely “rationalistic” out-look (MacIntyre, *Whose Justice? Which Rationality* 1988) does not suffice at most cases; actually the reason why certain philosophies briefly mentioned above don’t seem plausible enough to modern age individuals having confronting over-duely matters of personal

identity together with hugely apprehended dimensional aspects of societal-living together with the “other”-fellow! individuals brought together as a unit –i.e. unified under a common theme of understanding which is surely in these cases apprehended as a mere “human-rationale” and nothing more and nothing less or further i.e. the “rational element” in human “nature”! bearing no foundational relation to what source whatever i.e. that’s again autonomous on its own and self-sufficient.

But if we ask (Weithman, Augustine’s political philosophy 2007: 248-249) what if the “rational” element is working merely at surface-value actually “hiding” behind many driving forces of which human understanding is mostly ignorant of or chosen to be so (ignorant) since it has understood its insufficiency to confront it all with its deep dimensions and multi-faceted aspects?

Thus many critical thinkers of political issues stresses these underlying forces (Millbank 1990)_even if “opaquely” at work since not to commit the same methodological mistake as their counter-colleagues have done and thus have narrowed and underestimated the whole question with mere self-deception and folly.

Therefore they assert that “human” rationale i.e. human reasoning can not be the only explanatory scheme to be relied upon at utmost precision since human “nature” is not merely composed of rational or in-counter to that irrational faculties pagan philosophers such as Aristotle has put forward but as an alternative model such as by Augustine that human nature is composed of both intellect as well as memory and “will”(Kahn, *Discovering the Will: From Aristotle to Augustine* 1988: 234-259, Kent, Augustine’s ethics 2007: 220-222) and in this scheme emotions discarded by others as irrational components also take a definitive role in shaping the supposed to be “rational” will_or actually merely “will” on its own not being visible as yet before being shaped by these emotions also present in human reasoning in the beginning as well as part of its nature.

Thus Augustine stresses the “unity” and “autonomy” of the will (De civ. Dei 14.6)_of the same will actually when it is shaped by ill emotions with perverse effects and when it is shaped by “true” emotions with enduring unifying effects where the will does not suffer any longer due to its “divisive” nature i.e. divisioned functioningsince the “quality” of the will has over-come the inherent division it bears within itself.

Thus for Augustine (De civ. Dei 19.4) there are not two wills, one of rational composure at odds with its yet again irrational independent alternative trying to beat/defeat the rational initial will from outside being an “external” so called “other” alternative but rather “one” (single) will as there is one self with its actually irrational counter-“part” within this unity in its running /functioning scheme _yet being “divided” in its “functioning” if not unified by the power of its quality i.e. taking start from a true nature endowed within the human-being or actually rather ordained upon it by a true source i.e. that of God.

Therefore Augustine asserts that human-beings are ordained by God as social creatures actually even being the most sociable among living beings yet having a most conflicting quarrel-some nature as well _both qualities present at the same time within the “same” self as an individual human-being.

Thus human beings value and furthermore “over-duely” value both materialistic things, tastes of the flesh/lust as well as pride and glory (appraise) and most commonly “dominion” over others on Augustinian (De civ. Dei II.16, De lib. arb 3.5) terms. Yet on the other hand humans crave for peace and still retain some elemental part of their will to do the right thing and therefore even the most amiable of all human beings suffer from an ineliminable inner conflict (De civ. Dei 14.7, 19.5, 19.8) thus bearing problems both within their identities and their relations with others and material things as well.

Therefore on Augustinian (Ep. 153, Deane, *The Political and Social Ideas of Saint Augustine*, 1963: 104-105) terms even the philosophy of property thus becomes “unjustly” accomplished and the reason why it is “not” retained from the (unjust) owner is merely that of not letting him obstruct more of his fellow-beings in

a similar course of action since such a nature would not stop till its peak (end-point) i.e. that of taking it all from the others as observed also in human positions as well as dominion over nations such as emperors.

Hence human beings either value things intrinsically_for their own sake which is actually an exception considering human nature who actually can and should love God, for God's sake i.e. enjoy the being of God (De doct. Christ. I. 22.20) where upon actually his own being becomes valuable thus by true/due orderly love versus an over-due love of either the self or even a member of one's family (children, parents, friends, neighbours etc) or material things and human drives such as lust, glory, pride and dominion or even in extremist cases such as that of pagan "virtue" (De civ. Dei 15.22, Langan, "Augustine on the Unity and Interconnection of the Virtues" 1979: 72/81-95) which could only be a gift by God in its accomplishment rather than self autonomous improvement on Augustinian terms.

Yet on the other hand in its over-due excessive form of "love" (De civ. Dei, 5.19.20, Sermons, 150. 5-9, O'Donovan, The Problem of Self-Love in St. Augustine 1980) even if not to abuse the being but to love it improperly/unduely results in an exaltation such as that of individual "self" which actually is a sin of pride versus duely love_for the sake of being which can only be enjoyed in the presence of God (and thus the unity of the self and the related objects with the supreme being of God achieved as that of concept of "will" mentioned above) and only such an orderly/due love can only silence/acquiesce the inner conflicts thus aroused by unduely love bringing forth merely misery else than the Heavenly peace where individuals can find only in the true/due love of a supreme Being/God bearing within its presence the common/supreme good which is surely seeked throughout all philosophy from beginning to end_to rest human heart within with eternal peace which actually can not be found anywhere else than the supreme being of God.

Thus God has ordained human nature and human world in a mostly hidden hierarchy for us human-beings to apprehend else than two main driving forces called "loves" (De civ. Dei 14.7) (duely or not) which actually terminologically mean "merely attributes, human attitudes towards things" we either possess or not possess _which thereby else than being transient motives actually becomes a whole unifying human character and thus express the true value we attribute/experience when we duely i.e. intrinsically value something for its own sake(De civ. Dei 8.8)_ that is not abusing it for the security of something else just as lust dominion etc or to respect it/its being in daily jargon or terminologically to "enjoy" it (rather than use/misuse/abuse) on Augustinian terms versus an excessively/unduely love not for the object's own sake but to satisfy our "exalted" self beings making the object (person or thing) an obedient servant to ourselves as never satisfied masters till the Earth is abused and tormented/annihilated down to its destruction_ being actually a common theme to modern day observers.

Thus as long as we in our "divided" selves don't love duely_ meaning justice to love objects according to their worth (De vera relig. 48.93) and overcome the "divisive" distinction through true love and keep on exalting our sinful beings and selves in our prideful folly which surely is merely a contempt i.e. a sin (De civ. Dei 14.13) against the supreme Being of God who only should be loved for his own sake humanity as well as justice is doomed_i.e. there would be no justice on earth that is againon multiple possible forms of "Earthly City" (De civ. Dei, 14.28) on Augustinian terms built upon earthy unduely loves due to a hierarchial disarray/distortion of due worth/value (merit) thus disregarded. In this regard even one's beloveds such as parents, children, friends etc should be loved not to exalt our prideful sinful beings but because they were created in the image of God (De vera relig. 46, 88) alone in unity rather than beings of our "own" as "our" children, parents, friends etc. Or else on this version of the Earthly City (and its possible, multiple forms on earth) "compulsion" due to legal order and political authority thus becomes a mere means of subordination on a "compromised" level of "commonly/unduely" loved objects (De civ. Dei, 19.24) and there would be no justice thereby.

Yet Augustine says (De civ. Dei, 4.33, Weithman, 2007: 248-249) that forces of history thus plying shall only be symptomatic i.e. indicative as long as human nature is accomplished thus i.e. over duely loving and satisfying itself over things and beings furthermore over ages and places and countries whatsoever. Thus as long as being a “human” activity “politics” and its law and legal order on Augustinian terms can not be merely “rationally” apprehended considering this “human” “nature” as we have stated in the beginning of our inquiry as well as being put by modern critical thinkers.

Thus Augustine asserts that there are two forms of living for individuals considering this given human nature_one (De civ. Dei, 19.24, 14.28) on compromised level of commonly unduely loved objects reached upon by fellow members of any possible Earthly City and one (De civ. Dei, 10.7, 15.3, 15.7) with that of together with Eternal being and eternal love with even other members of angelic and dead thus life on present world being merely a pilgrimage till we reach this kind of living and even with set-backs at times considering the divided self in all of us until unified by true orderly love i.e. justice/ to love things and beings duely_not more than the being of God or ourselves whereby this kind of attitude i.e. duely love shall help us along the way even with an additive element of accomplished “virtue” as a gift at times as pagans claimed falsely (Retract. II.2) to be their own “self” evaluation and achievement in contra-argument to Augustinian thinking.

Thus on Augustinian terms the “Heavenly City” (De civ. Dei, 18.2, 19.11, I.35) is actually nowhere present on the physical world as a physical entity of a social or political unity as a/any (certain) state or an empire or even either any Church but is a truely ordained hierarchy of true motives leading to action as “intrinsic value or due worth” ordained by God, He himself alone_of which we as human beings can only know this much on our pilgrimage thus “not” a full blown rational faculty alone especially in contra- argument to Pelagians (De pecc. merit.et remis. 2.6-7, 12-17)asserting that God has left us on our own once having nurtured faith and hope in us and thus assuring in their thinking the true path once and for all further without any set-backs, mistakes, obstacles etc.

Thus for instance in their thinking (Kent, Augustine’s ethics 2007: 223-224) Adam and Eve’s sin only has harmed them and has no reflections/bearings up to this age on human nature and coming generations and therefore humans can accomplish their way “completely” to the City of God without extra/any help from God being wholly autonomous on their own and without any set-backs, obstacles and whatsoever as understood like that of pagan “unity” of values/virtue (Ep. 167, 3.10, De civ. Dei, 19.4, Langan 1979: 72/81-95) accomplished in all or nothing fashion for the “virtuous” on their own successful full-blown initiative accomplishments.

On the other hand exemplar cities of the Earthly City observed as world states on earth can and do differ on their compromised upon levels of commonly unduely loved objects of desire (De civ. Dei 19.17, 5.12, 13, 14, 15.20)such as perhaps in ancient times for Roman empire defined as “dominion” and “glory” and for the republic of Rome civic individual “virtue” or even for a society of robber bandits (De civ. Dei, 4.4)exhalting their sinful prides over unduely loved and acquired properties of others thus abusing and exhalting “property” beyond its due order i.e. most sinfully sharing an evil contempt for the supreme Being of God.

Thus compulsion and political authority becomes a form of dominion/mastery (Enarr. in Ps. 124.8) over things and beings to secure obedience at a certain compromisedlevel (such as over a slave by its master) either in the form of unjustly acquired property or unjustly acquired country/power of land whereby this compromise of whatsoever level (De civ. Dei, 19.24, Burnell, The Status of Politics in St. Augustine’s City of God 1992: 13/I, 13-29)_ better-off or worse is trying to be sustained by use of power or the threat of it.

Yet God in its duely ordered love as a source of supreme Being does not punish or reward for earthly causes or by material things thus but looks for due value/worth (merit) meaning to “deserve” to be rewarded or “deserve” to be punished. Thus God becomes a true source of “supreme good”in His own being_i.e. God as

a “loving” father (Kent, 2007: 219-220) rather than a tyrant/master to be feared as an individual human way of thinking as in pagan thought or philosophers’ theories who loves us back in his supreme Being as long as we love him i.e. duely only glory Him rather than our sinful beings.

II. Virtue-Duty-Love on Pagan, Kantian, Augustinian Terms

Ancient pagan thought considered “virtue” a self achieved character excellence especially strengthened by continual observance as a “habit” in the unity of the concept i.e. “virtue”_whereby certain appearances of character such as courage, temperance and justice had to be essentially accompanied by “practical wisdom” in order to be realised in human actions (Kent, Augustine’s ethics 2007:226-227), furthermore in “all-or-nothing” fashion i.e. thus the “virtue” of human mind and reasoning in each and every case necessarily defining a certain course of action without any suspicions, uncertainties, set-backs, doubts and whatsoever in the whole-course of its totality.

Therefore “habit” i.e. continual observation of a certain course of action/conduct definitely “conditioned” and furthermore strengthened the precision and definition of the “Senses”, whereby the action came through. Yet in Augustine’s thinking (Ep.167, 3.10, *Retract.* 2.45, Langan, 1979:72/81-95) “virtue”_although being yet merely a complementary factor in due understanding of the hierarchy of “God’s Order” and meaning the evaluation of the intrinsic value/worth versus mere utility value we ascribe to things when we “use” them for the security of something else or even at times someone close to us_ is merely a gift from God and therefore can not be self-achieved when for instance again due to a disarray of duely-apprehended loves one does a favour to someone beloved/close to oneself yet by cheating and stealing/robbing on the other “worthy” person’s share of it (cf. carnal law) (*De civ. Dei* II.16, *De lib. arb.*3.5, *De vera relig.* 46.87, 46.88, Kent, 2007: 216-217) yet again thus at the cost of his/her own Soul’s being perverted by over-duely apprehended “love” of the concerned person by means of his/her position/status or mere being_ like in the case of carnal law such as one’s children, family, friends etc based on kinship.

Furthermore according to Augustine “virtue” which can actually be merely based on the concept of duely apprehended “love” and the “supreme good” i.e. the presence of God can never be based on “habit” (Prendiville, *The Development of the Idea of Habit in the Thought of St Augustine: Traditio* 1972/ 28, 29-99) since what he calls “carnal-law” i.e. kinship favouring as in the example above merely “conditions” human actions through certain “senses”, mostly disregarding/discarding Mind’s reasoning in its duely apprehended course of conduct either based on “duty” as in Kantian thinking or on “orderly-love” on Augustinian terms.

Thus on Kantian terms (Kant, *Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals*, trans. Ellington 1981, Furtun, *On Kantian Philosophy versus an Epitaph for the Survival of the Wicked* 2001) “duty” surely transcends above “senses” whereby the Mind reaches its Freedom and free course of conduct else than being merely shaped and conditioned by senses i.e. like an obedient servant as well as above mentioned “habitual” thinking repeating one certain course of conduct without giving it “due” consideration which would be in the form of “Freedom” from the senses by freeing and transcending the course of habitually defined certain version i.e. by way of being originally created and transcended through Freedom of the Mind.

In comparison Augustine asserts (*De civ. Dei.* 12.8-9, 15.5, 15.7, *De trin.* 8.8.12, *De civ. Dei* 19.17, 19.21, 4.5, Kent 2007: 218-219) that in the example considered above_ disregarding duely apprehended orderly love i.e. intrinsic worth of the person or object involved_ thus merely means “instrumentalising” it i.e. “using” it for the sake and security of something else and furthermore repeats this course of action as required in the “compromised”-level of “commonly-loved” objects (and even persons) which takes place through/by political authority and coercion –and even at times merely by threat of it_ and thus observes and

strengthens the “habitual” i.e. “traditional” performance/compliance upon which actually in the first instance the “Earthly City” and its law and order is built upon and live by.

Therefore we can say that both Kantian and Augustinian thinking opposes “instrumentalisation” of things, objects and persons for the sake and security of something else and thus both build upon the concept of “intrinsic worth/value” which should be duly apprehended either as Kant asserts through transcending senses and freeing of the Mind by a single “categorical imperative” whereby the action takes place upon the concept of “duty” thus Free Mind imposes as a requisite for its freedom_ or as Augustine asserts by apprehending the Supreme Good- i.e. God and the hierarchial order whereby only God can be loved for His own sake (and humanity, things, persons thus being unified in His Presence and Love because they were created in the image of God)_ i.e. duly orderly “love” not to be perverted in the “self”-love of oneself or of a beloved or even a material thing_ therefore to be duly evaluated i.e. not to be instrumentalised over and above its due worth/merit either in the form of contempt of God versus self-love or the sin of pride__ actually being the reason why virtue can not be based on mere observance of “habit” without giving it due consideration and be merely self-achieved without God’s help.

Yet at this point Kant’s thinking surely presupposes an “autonomous” moral agent rather than Augustine’s yet again “moral agent” since mentioned as above “habit” in the form of carnal law and other mere traditionally conditioned courses of action is strongly rejected_ but being surely “dependent” on A Supreme Being.i.e. God_a concept of supreme good in the presence of God.(Retract. I.I.2, Ep. 130.2.3, De civ. Dei 8.8, Conf. I.I, Weithman, 2007: 235-236)

Thus Augustine considers “God” a specific present Being rather than an intellectual way of human thinking (Kent, 2007: 216) as Kantian theory supposes to be in the form of a concept of “duty” formulated in one single categorical imperative (formulae)_ i.e. formally defined reasoning pattern which of course_ in such course of thinking to secure its autonomy and freedom should take place in “all or nothing fashion” as in the pagan thinking of “unity of virtue/value” either altogether present or absent with all its elements and require a total “re-shaping” of the Mind and its reasoning process conceptually and reciprocally transcending the “senses” once and for all in its full-blown achievement i.e. total successand furthermore thus giving way to an originally/newly built law and order_ i.e. “legal order” reached by transcending contracting Minds all of them shaped by “categorical imperative duty”and furthermore bearing within its formular precise definitive course of actions each and every time the “concept” of “justice” and a “just” society thus reached upon whereas in Augustine’s thinking “Earthly City” as we have mentioned (in part I) can never be “just” (De civ. Dei 4.5, 19.21) on earthly compromised upon scale of commonly loved objects and human selves unduely exalted by their self-loves and sensual drives.

Therefore different than Kant’s way of getting out of this dilemma Augustine offers not a “full-blown”, “transcendental”, “autonomous”, “formal” solution _based on the freedom of Reason providedby one single categorical imperative which has to be applied universally and furthermore in all or nothing fashion to be “effective” and “just” but a “dependant”, “substantial” and furthermore to be able to take place needing a “spatial” referant in the form of a “Heavenly City” rather than a conceptual referant that of a “duty” and a “categorical imperative”_yet to be apprehended only after death in God’s order by human beings in their limited understandings due to Heavenly design (Markus, Saeculum, 1970) i.e. not to be present anywhere on planet Earth not in any age, time or spatial land, country in any wordly states whatsoever.

Furthermore “God” ordains no actually “autonomous” full-blown (in all or nothing fashion) “conceptual duty” or similar to that no human excellence of character such as “virtue” as a self-achieved (yet again) autonomous improvement but rather helps us along the way on our “pilgrimage” in this land_ on the “Earthly City” as a model under whatever name and form of wordly states ever possible in time and space and actually if we say in Kantian terms “transcends” the “Earthly City” in all its possible existent forms in

the way of a categorical universal imperative “just” order of Divine/Heavenly City_yet thus taking place in another dimension of immortality of the Soul i.e. not being possible on its own on mortal life on this planet again or not merely by way of Freedom of Reason. Therefore we can and should always depend on his Order by way of duely ordained love not to be exalted above or below its (due) worth/merit.

Thus in God’s order to transcend the earthly “senses” or the Earthly City if you like_ one single concept of duty or mere Reason can not suffice and furthermore never in a “once and for all” fashion like that of accomplishing precise habitual traditional compliances at each and every case for the true course of conduct. On the contrary human beings in their human “nature”s are all through their whole lives driven by two ineliminable “loves” (De civ. Dei 15.22, 14.28) i.e. human attributes/attitudes_of self versus God and therefore personal and societal “conflicts” can never be settled in once and for all fashions i.e. by way of total transformations without set-backs, violations, short-comings etc versus the form of peace and justice thus achieved once and for all by Kantian legal order or by ancient pagan “societies” whereby “supreme good” is institutionalised again once and for all thereby.

Therefore on the “Earthly City” law and legal order can only be achieved at a certain “level”_ “compromised upon” and furthermore strengthened by “political authority”by whom it was in the first place created upon the concept of commonly_yet of course “unduely” shared, exalted loves_ actually conflicting with each other in the face of duely (true) “Heavenly” love within which self-loves are united in its “supremacy” bearing within the “supreme good” in the presence of God.

Furthermore whereby such a scale (De civ. Dei 19.2.4) would happen to exist can even be a band of robbers (De civ. Dei 4.4) or a better-off scale of understanding of “due worth”_like the good times of Rome (De civ. Dei 5.12, Weithman 2007: 242-243) built upon virtue (yet never being able to be wholly transformed to be a “just” Heavenly City) where one conflicting part of human nature or divided nature of human will thus becomes dissolved completely and once and for all through the concept of unity of virtue/value rather thanbeing unified by its quality of due worth of true love on the Heavenly City which would actually require a different “nature” and a “different” “spatial” element in thinkingandeven in existence on Augustinian terms to be realised which thus surely has to be suspended/continually “carried out” at each and every step of individual human life whereby due worth of true love gains superiority over self-love at times and vice-versa exalted unduely/unworthy self-loves gaining victory at other times.

Thus the path to “Heavenly City” becomes a rough way with set-backs and conflicts at times ineliminably even for the most virtuous and good members of the Heavenly City with a (human) “nature” plying under true or false loves being a member/citizen of any possible Earthly City as well as the “Heavenly City”to be reached upon later in a different spatial realm rather than “saeculum” and we continue our journey till we can/or not reach at the Heavenly City_one part known to us thus through due love of God yet the other part “not” known to us i.e. human “nature” in God’s due order as such ordained on Augustinian terms.(De civ. Dei 4.33, Weithman 2007: 245)

Furthermore another thinker/philosopher “Hobbes” (Hobbes, Leviathan) has in mind that of a “Mortal” God to secure “justice” in his contractarian theory yet requiring a different frame-work than that of Kant i.e. under the “laws of nature” and the concept of “survival” yet to be realised merely by totally transforming human nature_yet again autonomously by individual self-understanding of aforementioned laws and reciprocity and being unified after transformation in a “superior” authority whereby individual conflicting natural elements of humanity are thus “dissolved” under this “artificially” built supreme authority_like the superior being of Augustinian God perhaps but unlike that_ to be “realised” on Earth i.e. on the “Earthly City”(in any of its possible forms) and thus bearing the “superior good” and earning the title of a formal/Mortal “God” and bringing conflict to an end and bringing peace and order within its mere Being i.e. Existence and thus bearing “justice” due to its superiority but on the Earthly City.

But different than Kant, Hobbes does consider the “violations” (meaning set-backs i.e. not a full-blown all or nothing fashion transformation at all) of the thus compromised and originally built “Mortal God” and its law and order and therefore requires full accomplishment and compliance of its orders with full authority without criticism/further/due evaluation and thus strengthens its mortal supremacy in the form of “supreme good/formal God” by full compulsion and force which would actually happen/take place in this course merely on the “Earthly City” on Augustinian terms rather than the counter version of Heavenly City thus not earning the title of God, Supreme Being at all, but being merely a prideful contempt as in the form of yet another_ unfortunately this time “united” self-loves exhaltation under the fake/pseudo name of a Mortal God and its law and order and even (its) justice.

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

- Augustine: Confessions, trans. H.Chadwick, Oxford University Press 1991.
 De civitate Dei, ed. B.Dombart and A.Kalb, CCSL 47-48, Turnhout: Brepols 1955
 Augustine: The City of God against the Pagans, trans. R.W.Dyson, Cambridge University Press 1988
 De doctrina Christiana, ed. J.Martin, CCSL 32, Turnhout: Brepols 1982
 De libero arbitrio, ed. W.M. Green, CCSL 29, Turnhout: Brepols 1970
 De peccatorum meritis et remissione et de baptismo parvulorum, ed. C.F. Urba and J. Zycha, CSEL 60, Vienna: F. Tempsky, Leipzig: G. Freytag 1913
 De Trinitate, ed. W.J. Mountain, CCSL 50, Turnhout: Brepols 1970
 De vera religione, ed. J. Martin, CCSL 32, Turnhout: Brepols 1982
 Epistulae, ed. A. Goldbacher, CSEL: Vienna: F. Tempsky, Leipzig: G.Freytag, 1895-1923
 Retractationes, ed. A. Mutzenbecher, CCSL 57, Turnhout: Brepols 1984
 Newly Discovered Sermons, ed. E. Hill in series The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st century, Hyde Park NY: New City Press 1997
 Hobbes, Leviathan, 1651, rep. Penguin Books 1985
 Kant, Grounding for the Metaphysics of Morals, trans. J. Ellington, Indianapolis: Hackett 1981

Secondary Sources

- Burnell, P.J. “The Status of Politics in St. Augustine’s City of God”, History of Political Thought 1992: 13/1, 13-29
 Deane, H.A. The Political and Social Ideas of St. Augustine, New York: Columbia University Press 1963
 Furtun, A. “On Kantian Philosophy versus an Epitaph for the Survival of the Wicked”, Annales de la Faculté de Droit d’Istanbul Vol.33 No: 50, 2001: 53-67
 Irwin, T.H. “The Virtues: Theory and Common Sense in Greek Philosophy”, R. Crisp ed. How Should One Live? Oxford: Clarendon 1996
 Kahn, C.H. “Discovering the Will: From Aristotle to Augustine” J.M. Dillon and A.A. Long eds. The Question of “Eclecticism”: Studies in Later Greek Philosophy, Berkeley: University of California Press 1988: 234-259
 Kent, B. “Augustine’s ethics” E. Stump and N. Kretzman eds. The Cambridge Companion to Augustine, Cambridge University Press 2007: 205-233
 Langan, J. “Augustine on the Unity and Interconnections of the Virtues”, Harvard Theological Review 1979/72: 81-95
 MacIntyre, A. Whose Justice? Which Rationality? Notre Dame: University of the Notre Dame Press 1988
 Millbank, J. Theology and Social Theory: Beyond Secular Reason, Oxford: Blackwell 1990
 O’Donovan, O. The Problem of Self-Love in St. Augustine, New Haven and London: Yale University Press 1980
 Prendiville, J. “The Development of the Idea of Habit in the Thought of Saint Augustine”, Traditio 1972/28: 29-99
 Weithman, P. “Augustine’s political philosophy”, E. Stump and N. Kretzman eds. The Cambridge Companion to Augustine, Cambridge University Press 2007: 234-252