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Within these two periods, the submission focuses on a small number of dominant interests, with significant lines of inter-connection between them.

A. Chief among them is Augustine of Hippo, especially the manuscript tradition of his Homilies (Tractatus) on John’s Gospel - the medieval West’s standard commentary on this Gospel (see in the List of Publications submitted nos. 1, 4, 9, with 7, and 8). I have been asked to prepare a new edition for Corpus Christianorum (cf. Clavis Patrum Latinorum, 31995, no. 278), and my identification of breaks in the series is accepted in all studies (e.g. the 6-volume edition by M.F. Berrouard in Bibliotheque Augustinienne). From this has come an interest in wider reaches of Augustine’s biblical exegesis (no. 37).

B. The early history of Christian baptism, especially of infants, has a major source in Augustine (no. 18; forthcoming is ‘Augustine and the Transformation of Baptism’). I have argued, against the stream but with increasing acceptance, that the widespread ‘delay’ of (infant) baptism in the 4th.C. is a misnomer (nos. 17, 19; forthcoming, ‘At What Ages were People Baptised in the Early Centuries?’), and have published the first scientific exegesis of the baptism clause in the Nicene Creed (no. 25).

Baptism spans the early and Reformation eras (nos. 33, 36), not least in the 16th.C.’s appeal to the Fathers (no. 31) - and I may mention my article on ’Baptism’ in the Dictionary mentioned above.

C. Within the Reformation, I have been a leading contributor to the Bucer-renaissance in the English-speaking world (nos. 6 - still the only representative volume of his writings available in English, 28, 29, 33). Since Calvin was the greatest ‘Buceran’, Calvin studies followed. I serve on the Praesidium of the International Congress on Calvin Research and as one of the editors of the recently inaugurated editio recognita of his corpus. I have extended the dimensions of his distinctive ‘accommodation’ motif (nos. 16, 30, 35; forthcoming, ‘Calvin’s Accommodating God’). Related studies focus especially on biblical exegesis (nos. 11, 13, 21, 22, 27, 34; forthcoming, a major article on Bucer in a volume on leading biblical interpreters).

D. My work has kept close to manuscript text and language. Hence the edition of the unique Servetus MS in Edinburgh (no. 23), detailed analyses of the Gospel of Peter (nos. 14, 15, 20), the demonstration that Constantine was the first to call Mary precisely ‘mother of God’ (nos. 22, 32), and much-cited investigations of early responses to homosexuality (nos. 12, 24, 26).

E. In each of these areas, connected as they are variously by baptism, history of exegesis and the Reformation’s appeal to the Fathers (on which I have been invited to four small colloquia in Europe), I submit publications that have been recognised internationally as original and important contributions to scholarship.
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ON THE OCCASION OF HIS PREACHING OF TRACTATUS 23 IN THE COURSE OF HIS EXPOSITION OF THE WHOLE OF JOHN’S GOSPEL, AUGUSTINE COMPLETED THE TREATMENT OF THE DAY’S LECTION (JOHN V. 31-40) WITH UNUSUAL SPEED, AND THEN RETURNED TO DEAL WITH JOHN V. 19, A VERSE WHOSE DIFFICULTY HAD EARLIER LED HIM TO DEFER ITS EXPOSITION:

‘Facilis est ergo, fratres, hodierna lection; sed propter hesternum debitum (scio enim quid distulerim, non abstulerim, et Dominus dignatus est donare etiam hodie loqui ad vos), recordamini quid reposcere debatis. . .’ It soon becomes clear that the question which the bishop had put off the day before is ‘. . . quomodo Verbum Dei unicus Patri, coeternus et aequalis Patri, non faciat nisi quod viderit Patrem faciencem, cum tamen Pater ipse non faciat aliquid nisi per Filium videntem’.1 Shortly afterwards Augustine reminds his congregation again not only that the verse in question was read in church the previous day but that this is the third day that they are tackling it.

‘. . . intende et recolite mecum, non hodiernam, de qua sufficienter locuti sumus, sed hesternam lectionem, quam ecce iam triduo versamus atque tractamus.’2

Which are these two previous sermons? Scholars from the Maurists (1680) onwards3 have all agreed that Tractatus 19-23 were delivered on five successive days in early summer. But on closer examination, there seems good evidence for thinking that Tractatus 23 was preceded not by 22 but by 19, and that 20-22 were not in fact preached in this course of sermons at all. It is evident that Tr. 20-22 were preached on three successive days. In Tr. 20 Augustine handles the exposition of John v. 19, a verse which clearly caused him some embarrassment before he felt that he had at last satisfactorily grasped and explained its

---

1 Tr. 23. 5 (Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, XXXVI, pp. 234-5).
2 Ch. 6 (p. 235).
meaning. At the end of this sermon, he promises that tomorrow he will deal with the following passage in the gospel. The beginning of Tr. 21 refers to the subject-matter of the previous day's sermon, and leads into the exposition of John v. 20-23. Tr. 22 opens with a reminder that the day's lection follows the sermons of yesterday and the day before, and proceeds to deal with John v. 24-30. But nowhere in Tr. 22 does John v. 19 appear at all; certainly it was not part of the day's lection, nor does Augustine anywhere defer the exposition of this or any verse in such a way that on the morrow he could talk about his 'hesternum debitum' to unfold this mystery. In fact Tr. 22 contains no forward reference at all, nor does Tr. 20 recall any previous sermons—least of all is it presented as the fulfilment of the promise made at the end of Tr. 19 to deal with the disputed verse on the next day. Augustine takes up this promise in the words quoted above from Tr. 23. 4, and the sequence of sermons then exhibits a much more orderly arrangement. We may set out the Tractatus and the verses of John v they cover as follows:

Tr. 17: vv. 1-18.
Tr. 18: v. 19. (This sermon was delivered the day following Tr. 17 (see ch. 1, p. 179), but little of it deals with the verse in question (cf. ch. 9, p. 185) Redimus ad id quod explicare non possimus. . . )

1 'Cetera quae consequuntur, quae pertinent ad sermonem ipsius Domini nostri Jesu Christi in evangelio, quomoonam et crastino die sermo debetur vos, adeo ete ut auditis.' Tr. 20, 13, p. 211.
2 'Hesternie die . qua potiusam facultate tractavimus . . . quomodo inseparabili sunt opera Patris et Filii . . . Sequentia verba hodie videntur.' Tr. 21, 1, p. 211. Cf. also ch. 2, p. 212.
3 'Nudissustertiarni et hesterni dii sermones redditis vos sequitur hodierna evangelica lectio, quam ex ordine pertractamus.' Tr. 22, 1, p. 223. Cf. ch. 11, p. 229. It is pertinent to ask why, if Tr. 19 was preached on the day before Tr. 20, Augustine here recalls only the two previous sermons, and not the one immediately preceding the first of these two as well. (It is undeniable that if Tr. 19-23 are in the order in which they were preached, then they were given on five successive days.) It may also be relevant to point out that we have 'pertractamus' and not 'pertractatun'; the latter could be taken as evidence for this sermon's being part of a course on the gospel.
4 'The words in ch. 2, p. 202 ('Unde autem natus sit sermo iste, commemorando estis proprius superiors lectionis, ubi . . .') are not necessarily to be understood in this way; in fact, by the absence of reference to the sermons of the previous few days dealing with John v. 1-19, the pericope of which he now has to remind them, one might well argue that Augustine's words here are further evidence for separating Tr. 20 and the following two from the series.

and at the conclusion Augustine says: 'Sufficienter me locutum arbitror, et lectionem tamen evangelicam non finivi . . . sufficient ergo ista Caritatii vestrae. Debitores sumus, non nunc, sed semper. . .' Ch. 12, p. 187.)

Tr. 19: vv. 19-30. (The reference to Tr. 18 as 'sermone pristino' (ch. 1, p. 188) probably indicates that Tr. 19 did not follow the day after Tr. 18. Augustine aimed to return to v. 19 after expounding the rest of the day's passage (see above, p. 318, n. 5, and cf. ch. 1 and 3, pp. 188-9), but no time remained to fulfill this intention.)

Tr. 20: v. 19. It is not to be denied that Tr. 20 follows on well after Tr. 19, dealing as it does with the verse that Augustine had failed to come to terms with in Tr. 18 and 19. But for reasons outlined above and further below it is impossible to regard the present order as reflecting Augustine's actual preaching.

Tr. 21: vv. 20-23.
Tr. 22: vv. 24-30.
Tr. 23: vv. 31-40 (briefly), v. 19, and finally a quick run through vv. 20-30.
Tr. 24: ch. vi. 1-14.

If the present order is a true transcript of the sequence of Augustine's preaching, it is certainly odd that he should return to v. 19 and feel himself bound to do so, when Tr. 21-22 give the impression, by proceeding with the following verses and containing no hint that v. 19 had not been adequately expounded, that v. 19 had been finished with in Tr. 20. What, moreover, are we to make of 'ecce iam triduo versus atque tractamus', if for the present order is correct Tr. 23 was at least the fourth day that v. 19 had been before Augustine and his people? One would be forced to marvel more than the other Tractatus compel us to at the capacity of the congregation of Hippo that would take five sermons of such depth and complexity as Tr. 19-23 on five days in succession?

The writer must leave it to others more versed in Augustine to

1 It must also be said that two of the back references from Tr. 23 to previous expositions could well refer to parts of Tr. 20-22, but they could just as easily recall Tr. 19. Thus 'iam et sancta tractavimus' (Tr. 23, 12, p. 241) may equally well have in mind Tr. 19, 4-5 as Tr. 21, 5-6 (as Williams recognizes, p. 241, n. 1) and 'iam hoc et hesterno die satisiatisnique auditis' (Tr. 23, 15, p. 243) could indicate Tr. 19, 17-18 as fittingly as Tr. 22, 13. The same could be said of the back reference in Tr. 36, 12, p. 331.

There is no parallel echo of such a feat in the Tractatus; Tr. 34-37 were delivered on four days in succession (see Zark, op. cit., pp. 72-73) but are neither as long nor as complex as those under consideration.
attempt to place Tr. 20-22 in their original setting in the bishop's life and activity, but it will be useful here to consider further evidence from later writers who use the Tractatus and from the manuscripts that bear upon this problem.

First, Possidius' Indiculum lists the following sermons among those found in Augustine's library shortly after his death:

VIII. Tractatus diversi adversus supra scriptos, i.e. Arrianos.

11. Ex evangelio Ioannis: Non potest Filium a se facere quidquid nisi quod viderit Patrem facientem (John v. 19).

12. Ex codem Ioanone: Pater enim dedit Filium et omnia demonstrat ei (John v. 20).

X°. Tractatus diversi.

159. Ex evangelio: Non potest Filium a se facere quidquid nisi quod viderit Patrem facientem (John v. 19).

Wilmart identifies both VIII. 11 and X°. 159 with Sermo 126, which certainly fits the bill for one of them (more appropriately, for VIII. 11, because of the sermon's explicit anti-Arianism), but cannot do service for both. Is it more than a tempting speculation to see in Tr. 20 and 21 sermons corresponding to X°. 159 and VIII. 12? In the nature of the case, proof is impossible and it is very unlikely that if Tr. 20-22 were at one time separate from the body of the Tractatus, they were separate from one another.

There is, however, some evidence that the volume of the Tractatus may originally have lacked Tr. 20-22, though it must be said at the outset that Fulgentius of Ruspae, in a letter probably written from Ruspae in the third decade of the sixth century, quotes from Tr. 22 with the introduction: ‘Idem beatus Augustinus in expositione Evangelii secundum Ioannem, cum de ipso Domine sermonem tractavit. These words clearly suggest that Fulgentius knew Tr. 22 in its present setting, but all the subsequent early users of the Tractatus for whom there is the relevant evidence possessed copies of the work that lacked Tr. 20-22.

There is no dispute that Tr. 27 was preached on 10 August (St. Laurence's Day) and Tr. 13 marks the resumption of the series after the break for Easter in which the ten Tractatus in Epistolam Ioannis were delivered (cf. Zarb, op. cit., pp. 27-72, for the general outline—his detailed datings are not to be trusted). The Tractatus in question were therefore preached in the summer. The Maurists were therefore right to remark (P.L. 35, 1750 n. (a)) on the implication of Tr. 22. 10 (pp. 228-29, ‘Lucernam quiuesque accedisti: exempli gratia, lucerna illa quantum pertinet adflammulum quae ibi lucet, ignis ille ...’, &c.) that the sermon was preached by the light of a lamp. (Cf. also Tillmont, op. cit., pp. 710-11.)

Ed. A. Wilmart, Miscellanea Agostiniana, ii (Rome, 1931), pp. 174, 204.

P. 225.

Cassian, Leo, Eugippius, Cassiodorus, Gregory the Great, Isidore, John the Deacon, Aginond, Alan of Farfa, and Paul Deacon all utilized the Tractatus to some extent, but for none of them is evidence available either for their

Bedes still unprinted Augustinian florilegium on St. Paul cites Tr. 3 and 7 by their correct numbers, but also from fifteen others between Tr. 30 and 108 by numbers three less than they now bear. Against this must be set the probability that Bede's Homel. i. 23, lines 278 ff., is dependent on Tr. 20, 3-8, though it is conceivable that reliance on earlier Tractatus is a sufficient explanation. Alcuin drew upon very many of the Tractatus for his own exposition of John's gospel without referring to his querry, and the absence of Tr. 20-22 is significant. The omission of these three in Alcuin's manuscript is confirmed by his use of the Tractatus in his dogmatic works, in which he never borrows from Tr. 20-22 and while numbering Tr. 7 and 14 correctly refers to Tr. 25, 27, 29, 36, 39, 41, 49, and 51 by numbers three less than the editions give them. Finally Florus of Lyons (as the editor of the Tractatus in the Corpus Christianorum pointed out) in his also yet unprinted Augustinian florilegium on Paul evidently employed a manuscript of the Tractatus which lacked Tr. 20-22 and numbered 23 ff. as 20 ff.

On the other side, an epistle of Pope Hadrian I to Charlemagne in 791 quotes from Tr. 39 as liber XXXVIII super Ioannem evangelistam. But in 794 and 836 conciliar reports contain references to Tr. 28 and 50 as 28 and 48.

When we turn to the manuscripts themselves, we find considerable evidence of disorder of different kinds in this region of the Tractatus knowledge of Tr. 20-22 or for the Tractatus they did use being numbered in such a way as to make the omission of these three very unlikely. Prosper of Aquitaine's Sententiae ex operibus S. Augustini cites, without numbers, Tractatus 3. 5-6, 8-11, 13, 18-19, 26, 28, 32-33, 35, 37-40, 50, 53, 65-68, 73, 75, 87, 95, 99, 102, 104-5, 115, and 123 (P.L. 51, 477-91), but the absence of Tr. 20-22 proves nothing.

1. Cf. Ir. Fransen, Revue bénédictine, lix (1961), p. 66; the only exception is Tr. 46 which is numbered both xlvi and xliii by Bede (p. 53)—presumably a slip; it is not difficult to visualize how both have developed from xliii.


4. Adv. Haeresin Felicis 10, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 38, 60 (P.L. 101. 91 ff.); these are the only occasions on which Alcuin numbers the Tractatus he is dependent upon.

5. Corp. Christ. CXXII, p. vii. n. 4. See C. Charlier, Revue bénédictine, ivi (1947), pp. 774-5. Although several of the manuscripts of Augustine that Florus used have been identified, this is not the case yet with the Tractatus in Ioannem (cf. Charlier, Mélanges B. Podéard, Lyons, 1945, pp. 71-84).


7. MGH Legum, secundum i, concilia, 186 (1968-9), p. 145 (Council of Frankfort, Epist. of French Bishops) and p. 76 (Council of Aachen, letter to King Pippin). None of the other citations from the Tractatus in the Councils in this period is relevant to our inquiry.
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and this among some of the oldest exemplars of the work. Willems in fact notes that some manuscripts omit Tractatus 20–22 and links this omission with manuscripts that exhibit a threefold division of the work, 1–24 (actually only 21, if 20–22 are absent), 25–54, and 55–124. There is, however, far more evidence at hand than Willems gives for this omission, which is neither restricted to nor always a feature of codices supporting such a triple division of the Tractatus:

Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibl. 25 (Phillips 1662); late eighth or early ninth century; from the Mainz– Fulda–Hersfeld region of central Germany; omits Tr. 20–22 and numbers 23 ff. as 22 ff.

Basle, Univ. B. III. 3; ninth century; omission as Phillips 1662—

'Der Verlust dürfte schon in der Vorlage gestanden haben'. Thus the manuscript's i–21 are nos. 1–19, 23, and 24 of the editions.

Oxford, Bodl. Laud. Misc. 139; ninth century; from Würzburg; this exemplar has peculiarities all its own. The original manuscript contained only Tr. 14–16, 19, 23–32, 36–45, and 48–54, all numbered consecutively, so that with ten Tractatus missing, no. 54 ends up as no. 44. This original manuscript is mostly in a script very close to that of the Benedictbeuern school of the first half of the 9th century. Several shorter or longer lacunae in the original's text, plus the missing ten Tractatus have been supplied by various hands almost contemporary with the basic manuscript, and representative of the Würzburg scriptorium in the fourth to sixth decades of the century.

But though Tr. 17–18 and 20–22 are numbered correctly in the secondary sections of the codex, Tr. 33–35 and 46–47 are supplied with numbers three behind those of the editions—though, of course, one

1 In this journal in 1915 (xxvi, p. 113) Miss R. J. Dean wrote that only four complete copies of the work earlier than the 10th century have survived, one of the 8th century (Paris B.N. lat. 1593) and three of the 9th (Karlsruhe Aug. XLVI, Rome Vallicell. A. 14, and Cologne Dombibli. 69). If the catalogues are to be believed, we must add to this the following 9th-century codices: Chartres 6 (17); Chapter.

Vercelli, Archiv. Capitol. XLVI (58)—Willems dates this end of the century. One ought also to include copies of the whole work in more than one volume, such as the three-volume exemplar of the 9th century from St. Kilianus, Würzburg (Würzburg, Univ. M.p.th. f. 74v (1–13); Oxford, Bodl. Laud. Misc. 139 (14–24—but see below) and 124 (55–124)). However, one of Miss Dean's four, viz. Cologne Dombibli. 69, does not contain the whole work. The catalogue of 1752 (F. Hartzheim, Cologne, p. 35) seems clearly to indicate Tr. 55–124 (numbered 1–70) as its content, and this has been confirmed by microfilm. The catalogue of P. Jaffe and W. Wattenbach (Berlin, 1874, p. 23) merely reports 'Aurelii Augustini Tractatus in evangelio secundum Johannis', from which it has been wrongly deduced that all 124 are present.


cannot deny the possibility of influence from the original manuscript's numbering.

Berne, Stadtbibl. 103; ninth to tenth century; omission and numbering as Phillips 1662, so that the last Tr. in the manuscript is no. 52 of the editions (up to ch. 8, line 15, Corp. Christ., p. 449), not 49 (as Willems).

Tours, Bibl. municip. 289 (Marmoutsiers 101); ninth century; Tr. 16 is numbered correctly at its beginning, but there follows a lacuna in the manuscript, representing a loss of probably 17 ff., from Tr. 16. 3–19. 16. At its conclusion Tr. 19 is numbered 20, and Tr. 23 ff. come next, numbered 20 ff.
Vatican, Palat. lat. 207; ninth to tenth century; from Heidelberg; contains Tr. 24-54 numbered 21-51.

Munich, Staatsbibl. 14653; second half of eighth century; written at Regensburg; contains Tr. 30-55 numbered 27-52.

Paris, B.N. nouv. acq. lat. 2247; eleventh to twelfth century; Cluny; omission and numbering as Philippis 1662.

Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibl. Hamilton 55, from Citeaux in central France ('liber sanctae Mariae Cistercii'); twelfth century; omission as Philippis 1662, except that Tr. 20-22 have been inserted later in the middle of the original's ch. 2 of Tr. 23 (numbered 20).

All these manuscripts, which, it will be noted, issue mostly from the Germanic regions of central Europe, offer either direct or strong indirect evidence for the omission of Tr. 20-22 in the exemplars they were copied from.

A large number of further codices contain other irregularities, among which we may notice first the presence of Sermo 125 of Augustine (P.L. 38. 688-98) in which the bishop deals with the incident of John v. 1-18, in at least thirteen exemplars of the Tractatus in Ioannem. As far as is known, this sermon has not preserved in any manuscript other than these of the Tractatus—and it is fairly certain that a re-examination of manuscripts of the Tractatus would reveal several more that contain S. 125. In listing these thirteen codices, we will at the same time note other known irregularities.

Rome, Vallicell. A. 14; ninth century; S. 125 occurs after Tr. 17 and before Tr. 20 which is numbered 18, i.e. Tr. 18-19 are missing—S. 125 is introduced without number simply by 'De eadem lectione', as if it were the second part of Tr. 17 ('Explicit XVII' comes at the end of S. 125, not at the end of Tr. 17).

Verona, Bibl. Capit. XXXVI (34); ninth century; S. 125 follows Tr. 17 as 'Tr. 18', then Tr. 18 (numbered 19), 20 ('... de eadem lectione'.

2 Cf. Lowe, ix. 1307—the plate shows the beginning of Tr. 35 numbered 'XXXII'.
4 For details of this MS, I am indebted to Dr. H. Boese of Berlin, who is in the process of cataloguing the remaining Latin MSS. of the Hamilton Collection.
5 Dom P. Verbraken of Maredsous, who has taken over from Dom C. Lambot the editing of Augustine's sermons, writes that he knows of no other MSS. of S. 125.
6 Reifferscheid (op. cit. lii (1866), pp. 314-5) corrects his statement that Tr. 18-20 are missing by going on to indicate the Incipit of Tr. 20.
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Florence, Medic.-Laurenz. Plut. 14. 5; tenth century; S. 125 ('de eadem lectione') is found as the second part of Tr. 17, and 18-19 are lacking.

Monte Cassino 21 EE; eleventh century; S. 125 occurs as the second half of Tr. 17 (whose Explicit is delayed to the end of S. 125), introduced by 'De eadem lectione' so that there is no dislocation of the numbering.

Vatican, lat. 483; eleventh century; S. 125 is inserted between Tr. 17 and 18.

London, B.M. Burney 291, twelfth century; from 'Popplena' ('Puplena'), modern Poppiena, some 25 miles due east of Florence; Tr. 17 concludes 'Explicit XIII' (the number is due to a misreading of a not very clear 'XVII' at its beginning), S. 125 follows as 'XV' and Tr. 20 ff. as 'XVI', i.e., Tr. 18 and 19 are here missing.

Vorau, Bibl. des Augustiner-Chorherrenstiftes 104 (XIV); twelfth century; S. 125 is inserted at fols. 65-68.

Vatican, lat. 481; fifteenth century; S. 125 as in Vatican lat. 483.

Vatican, Urb. lat. 68 (114); fifteenth century; S. 125 is placed between Tr. 17 and 18.

Kues, St. Nicolaus Hospital 32; fifteenth century; in Florentine script; S. 125 is found as 'Homilia VIII de eadem lectione'.

Florence, Medic.-Laurenz. Plut. 12. 11; fifteenth century; S. 125 follows Tr. 17 (numbered correctly, not 'XVIII' as Bandini's catalogue, vol. i, col. 16, gives) as Tr. 18.

London, B.M. Addit. 18313; A.D. 1466; written by one Thomas Herrant of 'Praetense' (—the manuscript later belonged to the convent of the Friar Preachers in Vienna); as a result of an earlier error Tr. 17 is numbered 16, S. 125 follows unnumbered 'De eadem lectione', and Tr. 20 ff. as 'XVII'.—Tr. 18 and 19 are lacking again.

Amid such disorder, it is possible to discern an Italian origin to this tradition, centring on Rome, Florence, and Verona. 'The Maurists’ two

2 Ramón Paz Remolar and José López de Toro, Inventario General de Manuscritos de la Biblioteca Nacional, i (Madrid, 1953), pp. 143-4.
3 Bibliotheca Canoniensis, i, pp. 247-8.
4 P. Fank, Catalogus Voraviensis, seu Codices Manuscripti Bibliothecae Canoniae in Veronae (Graz, 1936), p. 51.
Classe, the scribings in 1824, 299-320. It is very likely that Verona was the source for this Metz code. It is noteworthy that S. 125 never occurs together with the omission of Tr. 20-22.

Finally let us pass in review other manuscripts which are marked by some irregularity, but neither lack Tr. 20-22 nor contain S. 125.

St. Gall, Stiftsbibl. 244; ninth century; contains, in a frequently abbreviated text, Tr. 1-18 and numbered 1-19.

Wolfenbüttel 4102 (Weissenburg 18); ninth to tenth century; begins with Tr. 24 ff., numbered 22 ff. This may be merely a slip on the part of the scribe, for its companion volume from Weissenburg (Wolffenb. 4094, Weiss. 10) presents Tr. 1-23 numbered correctly.

Orléans, Bibl. Municip. 161 (138); ninth to tenth century; from Fleury, the Maurists' Floriacensis; according to a note in Paris, B.N. lat. 11660, which is one of the volumes containing the materials, collations, &c., gathered by the Maurists in preparation for their edition, this manuscript lacks Tr. 21 and 22.5

1 C. Lambot, Mélanges J. de ghettin (Gembloux, 1915), p. 259. Their transcript of the Carcassonne MS's text is now Paris B.N. lat. 11661, fol. 162-165.

2 S. Aurelii Augustini ... Sermones Novi numero XL (Paris, 1631), pp. 170-93 (no. 15), and notes (unpaginated) ad fin.

3 Deodericus I, Bishop of Metz (956-84) and founder of the Abbey of St. Vincent there, accompanied the emperors Otto I and II to Italy in 970, and presented the Abbey on his return with a quantity of treasures collected on his travels. Various MSS, from St. Vincent's attest their presentation by Deodericus, among them some which clearly derive from Verona, such as Berlin 50 (Philippus 1676), the late 8th-century MS. of the Homily of Eginho, Bishop of Verona (d. 802). Several of these codices have found their way, via the libraries of the Jesuit College of Clermont, of Baron John Meerman and of Sir Thomas Philippus in succession, to the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek in Berlin—see further V. Rose, 'Furche der Latisichen Hiss....', vol. 1, Die Meerman-Hiss des Thiaro Thomas Philippus (Berlin, 1893), esp. pp. 91, 77, 79, 262-3, 280, 285, and 299-300. I have not been able to locate the 'codex S. Vincentii Metensis' from which Sirmond got his text of S. 125; Berlin 25 (Philippus 1662), one of the St. Vincent MSS. which have finished up at Berlin via the College of Clermont (in enriching whose library Sirmond took part), does not contain S. 125 (see above, p. 32). A 15th-century MS. of the Tractatus bought of a certain Leivy of Metz by Philippus in 1824, no. 4477 in his vast collection, might throw some light on the issue if it could be located—it was sold in London to a German bookseller, Jacques Rosenthal of Munich, who presented it for resale in Munich early in 1899 (item 2351 of his catalogue no. 17, n.d.).

4 Willens (op. cit., p. 2) gives only 1-17 and 20, and is inaccurate in describing the contents as excerpts.

5 R. C. Kukula, Sitzungsb., der Kaiserl. Akad. der Wissensch., Phil.-hist. Classe, cxxviii (Vienna, 1892), pp. 49-50. I have been as yet unable to verify this by micro-film.
they appear in our present editions.1 What are we to make of all this evidence?

In the first place, the thesis that Tr. 20–22 were not preached in the series of sermons on John can be allowed to rest on solely internal evidence. The light thrown by the usage of later writers and by the manuscripts may confirm this position, but I believe its validity needs not wait on such confirmation.

But having established that, in this sense, Tr. 20–22 did not originally belong to the Tractatus, we have raised the question in what sense they may have been originally found between Tr. 19 and 23. Did Augustine himself place them there before ever an ‘edition’ of the work was issued to the public? Could the divergent manuscript evidence go back to two different ‘editions’,2 both due to Augustine himself? Were Tr. 20–22

1 However, it must also be said that in the majority of cases, catalogues of MSS. have evidently not examined copies of the Tractatus in sufficient detail to decide whether or not irregularities are present at this point. It is to be hoped that in the light of considerable evidence of disorder in several early exemplars, future catalogues will be disposed to give attention to this possibility (as also to the precise numbering of the Tractatus. Some catalogues conclude from no. 1 at the beginning and no. 70 at the end that a particular copy contains only 70 Tractatus. This may well be so, in which case it will be virtually certain that these 70 will be 55–124 of the editions. But often a copy contains all 124, numbered 1–74 and 1–70. In each case it will help most if both the MS’s and the editions’ numbers are provided.

2 For parallels in Augustine and others, cf. G. Bardy, Éditions et réditions d’ouvrages patristiques, Revue Benedictine, xxxvi (1935), pp. 336–80 (esp. pp. 362–4); H. Emonds, Zweite Auflage im Altkirchen (Leipzig, 1941). (On the question of editions and publishing in the patristic period, see also J. de Gellineck, Patristique et Moyen Age, ii (Grenoble, 1947), pp. 138–195; Bardy, Revue de science religieuse, xxxii (1949), pp. 288–424.) One might compare the similar, though not entirely parallel question, whether, as Cassiodorus says, Augustine divided the Emorations in Psalmos into ‘decedes’—see Wilmart, Misc. August., ii, pp. 266–7; here, though there is more to be said in Cassiodorus’ favour than Wilmart allows. In a communication read to the 1985 Oxford Patristic Congress, Miss B. V. E. Jones pointed out that the MSS. of De Civitate Dei fall into two classes according to the two different divisions of the work suggested by Augustine himself in a letter of instruction to Firmus, his literary agent at Carthage (discovered and published by Lambot, Revue Benedictine, li (1939), pp. 209–211). Of even closer connexion is the question whether Augustine himself divided the Tractatus into two parts, 1–54 and 1–70 (= 55–124), and whether such a division indicates a different origin for the second part, viz. dictation, and not extemporising. It is agreed that almost all the oldest exemplars exhibit such a division—in addition to the evidence in Willems’s list of MSS. (op. cit., pp. viii–x), one might add the following: Engelberg; Sitifahib, 59—Willems lists this, but to it must be added (Lowe, vii, pp. 883 and viii, pp. 883–5); Karlshofe, Landeshild. Ettenheim; Munster 462, which together give 4 ff. of a MS. dated 6th–7th century by Lowe and so our earliest exemplar of any part of the Tractatus), containing parts of Tr. 75–80 and 110–11, numbered as if 55 f. were 1 ff.

inserted some years after the Tractatus were delivered1 in order to augment the force of the bishop’s refutation of Arianism on a crucial point of exegesis, at a time when such strengthening was urgently called for?2 Do the few words of Fulgentius compel us to believe that the Tractatus in question were always present in the larger work, and therefore their later absence is simply due to the accidental or deliberate omission of a (German) copyist?3 On what grounds can such an omission be thought feasible? Does the presence of S. 125 in one branch of the tradition afford a (later) parallel to the intrusion of Gottingen, staatsg. Gesellschaft. Bibl., Deutsches Seminar Muller III, 1–2, 1–2

Hersfeld, Stadtb. Museum C. 155 (binding), two fragments of an 8th-century MS., containing Tr. 102 ff. numbered 44 ff. (Lowe, viii, 1202).

Cologne, Dombibliothek (Darmstadt 2606); 9th century; regarding its contents see above, p. 322, n. 1; the second part is numbered 1–70.

Verona, Bibl. Capitolulare, 3034, a 9th-century fragmentary codex of Tr. 55–124 (companion volume to Bibl. Capitolulare, XXXVI, 34, Tr. 1–54)—the items are numbered 1 ff. Only parts of Tractatus 55–77 have been recovered—see the works of G. Mosetti and M. Carrara referred to in Clausis Patrum Latinorum, no. 278.

It may be relevant to note that there is considerable uncertainty according to the MSS. whether the first sentence of Tr. 53 (Caesa Domini secundum sermones, et de operandis, etc., de urbibus) is explicantum tractatus, et nobis postea donavet, explanandum) is an introductory rubric to the whole of Tr. 55–124, or, as given in the editions, just the first words of Tr. 55. The use of the plural ‘tractatus’ is some evidence for thinking that we have here a resumption of the series on the gospel, whether preached extemporaneously or first dictated. Willems’ claim (p. vii) that this division into two parts cannot be the only one to go back to Augustine because a division into three parts (see above, p. 322) is also found, and because Possidius clearly says that the work, ‘sex partibus constitutum’, falls to the ground because (a) though the threefold division is attested in some MSS., in none does the numbering start again with the second part—this occurs only with Tr. 55 ff., and (b) Possidius talks of ‘sex codices’, not ‘sex partes’ (50 M. P. 1, van den Hout, Augustine, n. 1953, p. 259–60).

1 There is no agreement on the year in which these particular Tractatus were preached. The Maurists decided on 416, and were followed rather half-heartedly by Tillemont (he would have liked to place them in 412). Pope, too, preferred 416, but a few years later Deffarghi argued for 417. Monceaux was uncertain—circa 416, while Camao returned to the traditional 416. Huyben broke new ground in suggesting 356, but Camao (183) and Zarb did the same in the opposite direction with 413, the dating which Willems has followed. The year before Willems’s edition Le Landais made out a very strong case for 415 and support is rallying for this year (e.g. most of the reviews of Willems criticized his unquestioning adherence to Zarb’s dating and spoke favourably of Le Landais’s).

It was only in the very last years of his life that the presence of Vandalia in North Africa rendered Arianism a serious concern for Augustine. By this time copies of the Tractatus had probably already spread overseas—Cassian cited part of Tr. 2 in his De Incarnatione Domini contra Nestorium (vii, 27, G.S.E.L. xvii, 435–46), written in 430–1.

Possidius (Indice, X. 5, Wilmart, p. 182) found the Tractatus ‘in codiceus sex’. If these were of roughly equal size, the end of the second would have occurred somewhere in the region we are considering.
Tr. 20–22? What light does the omission of Tr. 18–19 in some manuscripts throw upon the issue?

It is easy enough to raise such questions, which are hardly likely to be answered satisfactorily without a thorough study of the manuscript tradition of the In Ioannem. The undesirable disorder in the majority of the oldest exemplars in the region of Tr. 17–23 is a further reason to lament the failure of the editors of the Corpus Christianorum to seize the opportunity offered them to base a new edition on such an examination. Meanwhile, more detailed information than the catalogues provide concerning other exemplars of the work will help to provide a broader base on which to begin to build the answers to the questions here raised.

D. F. Wright
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CLEMENT AND THE ROMAN SUCCESSION IN IRENAEUS

Father Maurice Bévenot's reinterpretation of the place of Clement of Rome in Irenaeus's succession-list certainly iron out an element of inconsistency in the early evidence bearing on the point, if indeed it can be vindicated. The purpose of this note is to suggest that the issue is not so straightforward as his article made out, and that both within the succession passage itself and elsewhere in *Adversus Haereses* factors are present which militate against such a new reading of the text. The passage itself is as follows:

Θεμελίωσεντος οὖν καὶ οἰκοδομηθέντος οἱ μακαρὸς ἀπόστολος τῆς ἐκκλησίας, Λίνος τὴν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς λειτουργίαν ἐνεχείρησεν, τοῦτον τούτον Λινοῦ Παῦλου ἐν τοῖς πρὸς Τιμόθεου ἑπισκοποῦς μένυσαν, διαδέχεται δὲ αὐτὸν Ἀνέντεκτον, μετὰ τοῦτον δὲ τρίτον τόσον ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπόστολων τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς κληρονόμαι Κόλιμος, δὲ καὶ ἐπορευόμενος τῶν μακαρίων ἀπόστολον καὶ συμβεβηκότος αὐτοῖς, ...2

Fr. Bévenot blames Eusebius for stamping upon Irenaeus's testimony an erroneous interpretation which depicts Clement merely as the third bishop of Rome, succeeding Anencletus, who had earlier succeeded Linus. We must first question whether, if misinterpretation there has been, Irenaeus himself is not largely to blame for it. Consider the passage in its context. 'We are in a position', says Irenaeus, 'to enumerate those who were by the apostles instituted bishops in the churches, and the successions of these men to our own times.' But to save his readers, he concentrates on the Roman church, the most appropriate illustration by virtue of its doubly apostolic foundation and its general pre-eminence. Then follows the passage cited above. Why, we may ask, if such is Irenaeus's express intention and if Clement is really the proper successor of the apostles, why did Irenaeus confuse the issue by mentioning Linus and Anencletus at all? Fr. Bévenot explains their position thus: 'There is no difficulty in seeing in Linus and (Anen-)Cletus two of the πρεσβυτέρων of Rome, each in turn acted as ἐπισκόπος of the local affairs during the absences of the founding apostles, or as "auxiliary bishop" to Peter even when he was present.'4 But (a) the way Irenaeus introduces Linus, still less Anencletus, does not seem to allow for this interpretation. The clear implication of his words is that Linus took over from the apostles, in fact, though the word itself is not used here, their successor in the leadership of the Roman church. This says nothing as to whether or not one or both of the apostles were still present in Rome, but merely makes plain that they had handed over to Linus.

(b) Bévenot's explanation is even more difficult in the case of Anencletus, of whom Irenaeus uses the already semi-technical verb of succession (διαδέχεται) in relation to Linus. If Irenaeus is seeking to demonstrate a straight-line succession in the church, why does he use his technical term of a figure who, if Bévenot is correct, was not really in the succession at all?

(c) Furthermore, is Irenaeus's text really as muddling as Bévenot's reading makes out? We are promised an enumeration of the succession of bishops in the church of Rome. After the mention of the apostles, we meet next Linus, and after him Anencletus, but then, we are told, we are back to square one and must start again with the first true successor of the apostles, Clement. Irenaeus could at least have made things easier for Eusebius and his subsequent interpreters by not plotting on the map the dead-end of the Linus-Anencletus cul-de-sac.

(4) When we come to Clement himself, we notice first that he comes after τοῦτον, after Anencletus, not after the apostles—i.e. Clement succeeded Anencletus. Again, διαδέχεται is not employed by Irenaeus at this point, but the inference can hardly be questioned, as Irenaeus proceeds to use διαδέχεται accusative twice more, of Telephorus's succeeding Sixinus, and of Anicetus's following Pius.1 If the line that Irenaeus was intent on demonstrating ran from the apostles straight to Clement, why is Clement introduced as coming after Anencletus?2

(e) A more serious objection concerns the participial phrase by which Irenaeus describes Clement: δὲ καὶ ἐφορμωμένος τοῖς μακαρίων ἀπόστολοι καὶ συμβεβηκότος αὐτοῖς. Of course he 'had seen the blessed apostles, and had associated with them' if he had been appointed by them! Surely these words make sense—and indeed make very good sense for Irenaeus's argument here—only if they mean that, even though Clement was the third (and only the third, not the first or the second) to follow the apostles, nevertheless he was numbered among the personal associates

---

1 In this Journal, N.S. xvii (1966), pp. 98–107.
2 iii. ii. 3, p. 11. The page references are to Harvey, vol. ii, unless otherwise indicated.
3 iii. i. p. 8.
4 Art. cit., p. 105.
of the apostles? The emphatic διά των ἀποστόλων is significant, no must we lose sight of the following sentence: 'Nor was he alone in this, for there were many still remaining who had received instruction from the apostles.' In this writer's opinion, this objection alone is virtually sufficient to invalidate Bevenot's conclusion.

(f) It may, of course, be merely a coincidence (though if so, Irenaeus is guilty of making confusion worse confounded) that whether we count Peter + Paul + Clement or Linus + Anencletus + Clement, Clement is by both reckonings the third. But what implications follow if the former reckoning is correct? Can it make sense without at least the implication that Peter preceded Paul? Elsewhere Irenaeus gives no indication of the priority of one to the other. In fact, a few chapters earlier Irenaeus makes it clear that he thought of Peter and Paul as being engaged on the founding of the church of Rome at the same time. Matthew also issued a written gospel among the Hebrews in their own language, while Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome and laying the foundations of the church. But granted Bevenot's implication that according to Irenaeus, Paul was the second bishop of Rome; was he also the first bishop of Ephesus, with John as the second? For Irenaeus relates that the church in Ephesus, founded by Paul, and having John permanently remaining among them until the times of Trajan, is a true witness of the tradition of the apostles. If Peter and Paul are included in the list of bishops at Rome, so must the founding apostles elsewhere, in churches whose successors Irenaeus omits for brevity's sake.

Perhaps we have raised enough queries to acquit Eusebius of a schoolboy's blunder through not knowing his (classical) Greek prepositions. But we still have to come to terms with Bevenot's evidence for Irenaeus's use of από—the genitive with ordinal numbers. We might lay weight on the fact that the two or three passages Bevenot cites are concerned with complicated numerical calculations where precision is essential and are of quite a different nature from the argument from tradition. If

1 On the aim of Irenaeus's remarks on some of the names in the list, see E. Mollard, 'Irenaeus of Lugdunum and the Apostolic Succession,' J.E.H. i (1506), at p. 22.


3 III. iii. 4, p. 15.

4 Bevenot might have added a further example along the same lines, at t. viii. 8 (Harvey, i, p. 142). On the other hand, there undoubtedly exist non-technical usages of από in the genitive which necessitate the meaning 'starting from'; e.g., τὸ μὴ κατὰ λογον, δέκα ἐτῶν χρηστεύματος ἐνδεικτικόν ἐστιν (IL. xi. 30), τὸ δὲ ἐν τῷ προέκοιταν πεθάνον (IL. xi. 11, pp. 48, 49). 'The Gospel of Luke... commenced with Zacharias the priest.' Similarly, with reference to Matthew's Gospel, Gk. fr. xxvii. 1, p. 493, and to John's, i. i. 18 (Harvey, vol. i, p. 76).

Bévenot is right, then enough has been said above to show that precision is not one of the marks of the crucial passage! However, we will not press the point. Rather we must ask whether the phrase από των ἀποστόλων is to be taken in so close a numerical fashion with τρίτη τῶν? Is not Irenaeus's stress here not so much on starting the count with the apostles as on the fact of the apostolic legacy that is being transmitted via this channel and none other? Of his contemporary fellow-bishop Irenaeus writes: νῦν διαδεκατή γοινωνία τῶν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἐπ' από τῶν ἀποστόλων καθέσεως κληρον 'Ἐλευθερος.' 

At one point Bévenot translates, 'today in the twelfth place Eleutherus is possessed of the episcopal inheritance from the apostles' (p. 101; his italics), which suggests that he took the order of the Greek seriously and linked από τῶν ἀποστόλων with τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς... κληρον. But at pp. 104/5, however, he implies that the words arc to be construed with διαδεκατή τῶν. It is to be noticed that in the next sentence Irenaeus repeats the phrase 'από τῶν ἀποστόλων when no ordinal is present, speaking of τε ἀπό τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ παράδοσιν. And just previously he had spoken of ἡν κατοικια από τῶν ἀποστόλων παράδοσιν. 1 In these cases, the phrase clearly means 'from the apostles,' though implying, in some words of Bévenot, the 'dynamic sense that the apostles were the source of the episcopal status of their followers' as far as the reference to Eleutherus goes. After all, the whole passage is dealing with the continuing apostolic tradition in the churches, and there is evidence that it was in this 'non-numerical' sense that Irenaeus regularly used the phrase από τῶν ἀποστόλων. 4 The alternative would be that in the passage being discussed, he uses the words in two different senses. 5

1 III. iii. 3, p. 11.

2 They are so taken in the translations in the Ante-Nicene Christian Library (A.-N.C.L.); Gwatkin, Selections; Stevenson, A New Eusebius; Sources Chrétiennes, vol. 34 (F. Sagnard); Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers (N.P.-N.F.) (Eusebius, H.E.—McGiffert); C. H. Turner, in Swete ed., Essays; Giles, Dox. Illustr. Papal Authority; Jalland, Church and Popacy; Sources Chrétiennes, vol. 41 (Eusebius, H.E.—Bardy); etc. The words are construed in the former sense in Lawlor-Oulton, Eusebius, H.E.

3 III. iii. 2, p. 11.

4 Art. cit., p. 106.

5 Compare: ecclesia... hanc accipit ab apostolis traditionem' (t. viii. 1, Harvey, i, p. 172); 'ide, quam ab apostolis ecclesiae percepit' (t. i. 5, p. 1); 'traditionem, quae est ab apostolis' (t. ii. 2, p. 7); 'eadem quam habet ab apostolis traditionem' (t. iii. 1, p. 9); 'ea quae est ab apostolis traditum' (ibid.); perhaps 'quae ab apostolis nobis tradita sunt... id quod ab apostolis traditum est' (t. ii. 12, p. 52); 'ecclesias... ab apostolis firmum initium' (t. iii. 9, p. 62); 'qui successionem habent ab apostolis' (t. x. 2, p. 236); 'ea quae est ab apostolis ecclesiae successio' (t. xii. 1, p. 235); 'firmam habens ab apostolis traditionem' (t. xx. 1, p. 378); and in the crucial chapter itself, 'fideum quae in ecclesia ab
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It is presumably not in dispute that ἀπὸ γενετίον can mean 'after',
and that Bévenot shows for Eusebius. But did it mean this for Irenaeus here? Bévenot’s resounding ‘no’ does not foresee the issue. Perhaps this is not the correct question to be asking, for it seems very likely that if it did not mean as much as ‘from and including’, it at least meant more
than merely ‘after’. There is no reason why we should allow Fr. Bévenot
to force us to this choice between blank alternatives. It may well be
that neither the fully inclusivistic sense (ὁ λαὸς ὁ Βέβενότῳ) nor the fully
apostolos usque nunc sit conservata' (III. iii. 3, p. 12). Some of these might
represent an original παρὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων, though in the surviving Greek
sections παρὰ is rare and seems normally to denote direct reception by
Hebrew cf. [Palæographus] ταῦτα δεῖληται, ἐν ὑπὲρ τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἐκεῖνος (III. iii.
4, p. 12; cf. similarly of Polycarp, Gk. fr. 11 (Ep. to Florinus), p. 472; also fr. ix,
p. 485, and the Sources Chrétienises retranslation of IV. xlii. 2, pp. 238-9 (vol.
104, p. 729, 731, by A. Rousseau). But for a usage of παρὰ nearer to our
point, cf. i. ii. Harvey, vol. i, p. 90). Cf. also the unexpected use of ἡμᾶς καὶ
μετὰ τὸν ἐλεφαντός ἐλήλυται ὑπὸ τῶν αὐτων, περιπληκτόντως (III. iv. 4, p. 13). The Latin
here is 'ab apostolis percepisse', which reinforces the further possibility that
at least one of the above uses of 'ab apostolis' may translate ἀπὸ, though most of
them probably reflect ἀπὸ. Rousseau has retranslated both the references in
Book IV by ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων (op. cit., pp. 719, 729; he also renders the
Aramaic text parallel to 'apostolorum...dono' in IV. xii. 1, p. 237) by τὸν
ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων...ἀπὸ τῶν (p. 722).

6 F. Sagnard, the Sources Chrétienises editor of Book III, renders ἀπὸ τῶν
ἀποστόλων throughout III. iii. 2-3 by 'απὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων', except for ἀπὸ
τῶν Ἀποστόλων παρὰ τοὺς ἑλήλυται, which is rendered 'ῥησί...τῶν Ἀποστόλων'
(vol. 34, pp. 104-5). Bévenot's explanation (art. cit., pp. 104/5) of Irenaeus's
repetition of the phrase, for Sextius and for Eleutherus as well as for Clement,
'to remove all doubt that it was indeed from and including the apostles that he
was making his enumeration', is not convincing. For if Irenaeus is counting thus
when he calls Clement the third, he is hardly likely to have changed when he
goes on to enumerate the fourth or the sixth or the twelfth! His readers did not
need to be guarded against such a misinterpretation. However ἀπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων
affects the reference of τῷ τῶν, that reference would be quite clear for the
subsequent ordinal numbers without further precision. The repetition makes
more sense if we bear in mind the stress on the apostolic origins and credentials
of the episcopal line, and the apostolic authority of all its members, not merely
those directly commissioned by the apostles. Surely the force of Irenaeus's
argument is diminished if he is shown to be excessively preoccupied with the
manner of his enumeration? One wonders too quite what purpose it achieves,
as the alleged inclusive method of enumeration is hardly integral to Irenaeus's
general aim. On the other hand, neither of the two other occurrences of ἀπὸ τῶν
ἀποστόλων in III. iii. 2-3 can be construed in the sense Bévenot wishes to give it
to when it occurs with an ordinal.

2 'Now Clement is “in the third place from the apostles”. For us, with this
context, “from the apostles” is equivalent to “after the apostles”... ... it meant
“beginning with, inclusively”, and not “from” in the sense of “after”' (art. cit.,
p. 102; my italics).
3 Might we not compare, in a not dissimilar context, τοῦ Clement, xlii. 1-2:
Οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἦσαν ἐπιχειρηματικῶς ἀπὸ τοῦ Κορινθίου (X. X. Ἰρσίλας ἡ Χ. ἂν τῶν ἒκθεσες
ἐξερευνηθησαν ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων. But Clement
does not go on to say that the presbyters/bishops are ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων.

3 H.H. v. 28. 3. 4 Art. cit., p. 105, n. 1 (my italics).

1 Irenaeus' exclusive meaning (ἀ τοῦ Ευσέβιου—if indeed ‘after’ is all that he
understood by ἀπὸ in this context) is nearest to Irenaeus's intention.
2 From' seems the best simple rendering, implying an on-going stream of
tradition which is dependent upon the apostles, and in organic connexion
with them, a succession they instituted but of which they are not them¬
selves the first members. It seems to me fair to interpret the phrase ἀπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων
in some such sense as this—a sense that Bévenot hints at with reference to
Eusebius—both in the mention of Eleutherus and in
the two other proximate occurrences noted above, as well as some at
least of the examples listed in note 5, page 147.

At this point we may usefully consider two related difficulties, one of
them partly raised by Fr. Bévenot.

(i) Eusebius records the notice of an anonymous author who cannot
have been much later than Irenaeus, describing Victor as τραγανὰδεκατομ
ἀπὸ Πέτρου ἐν 'Ῥώμη ἐπίσκοπος. Bévenot cites this to make the point
that the reckoning is from Peter, understanding ἀπὸ in the sense of 'be¬
ginning with'. His footnote acknowledges that this raises a further
difficulty, for, if Peter headed a list that included Linus and Anencletus,
Victor would be the fourteenth; if it excluded them, he would be the
twelfth. Perhaps Paul was being reckoned in too—as the second bishop
of Rome, after Peter the first, for such is the implication of this inter¬
pretation. Is there a parallel to such an ascription of the Roman
church's foundation to both Peter and Paul when only Peter is actually
mentioned, for this is what Bévenot is in fact suggesting here? But if ἀπὸ
Πέτρου could mean 'after or from Peter', then Victor would be the thir¬
teenth if Linus and Anencletus were included. Is this not how Eusebius
would understand his source, if indeed he has correctly transcribed its
words?

(ii) Not long after our contested passage, Irenaeus describes Hyginus
as the ninth bishop (Greek) or the eighth (Latin). If we start from
Clement, Hyginus was only the sixth; he can presumably be made out
to be the ninth only by counting in Peter (without Paul), Linus, and
Anencletus—but then we have a method of enumeration differing in
two respects from the one Bévenot wishes us to adopt, (a) in excluding
Paul, and (b) in including Linus and Anencletus, or in one respect from

1 Cf. the phrases 'apostolicam ecclesiae traditionem' (III. ii. 2, p. 14), and
ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀποστόλων ἐκεῖνος (III. iii. 4, p. 15).

the traditional understanding of A.H. III. iii. 2-3, in including Peter. This suggests that the Latin reading, octonarius, is to be preferred here, agreeing as it does (the implication of) the list in III. iii. 3. But then we must be clear that if Bévenot's account of things is correct, we cannot escape the implication that Hyginus can only be the eighth bishop if Peter and Paul were the first two bishops. Is this how Irenaeus regards them? Of this more anon; for the meantime let us turn to A.H. I. xxiv, where the Greek (and this time the Latin version is in agreement) describes Hyginus as having \\textit{δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγιασμῶν τὴν ἱπποκατάστασιν διαδόθη ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγιασμῶν}. Here we have ὑπὸ τῶν ἁγιασμῶν close to an ordinal number but apparently dependent on διαδόθη.² The reading 'ninth' at this point raises perhaps insoluble difficulties, but once more we must

³ The translators in the A.-N.C.L. think 'there is no discrepancy. Eusebius, who has preserved the Greek of this passage, probably counted the apostles as the first step in the episcopal succession. As Irenaeus tells us in the preceding chapter, Linus is to be counted as the first bishop' (ad loc., vol. I [Eusebius, vol. i], p. 265, n. 2) — precisely the reverse of what Bévenot is arguing for! The editors uniformly prefer 'octonarius' here, though differing in their explanations of the Greek reading.

² Harvey, vol. i, pp. 214-15. The words are read as dependent on διαδόθη by translations in A.-N.C.L., N.P.-N.F. (Eusebius, H.E.), Sources Chretiennes (Eusebius–Bardy), but as dependent on ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγιασμῶν by Lawlor–Oulton's Eusebius.

³ See the notes ad loc. of Harvey (vol. i, n. 2 on pp. 214-15), McGiffert (Eusebius [N.P.-N.F., vol. ii], p. 183) and Kidd (Roman Primary, p. 17, n. 1, with further references). Because of the plural, ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγιασμῶν, we cannot entertain the possibility that 'ninth' is reached by counting in Peter alone without Paul. In fact, Turner (apud Swete ed., op. cit., p. 138) notes that Eusebius 'is careful, as a historian, to note at the head of the line [of bishops at Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch] the name of the particular apostle or disciple to whom the first ordination was due, but for subsequent appointments he prefers to number the individual bishops not from Peter or Mark but 'from the apostles'. The authority of all was involved in the action of one, and the action of one was only effective in so far as it represented and carried with it the consent of all.' Now Bévenot assumes that the plural in ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγιασμῶν refers to the true founding apostles, Peter and Paul. This is most likely true, in view of the immediately subsequent references to 'the blessed apostles' whom Clement knew personally, and to 'the preaching of the apostles' which still rang in his ears. But it must not be assumed too readily, for having spoken of Eleutherus who occupies the twelfth place ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγιασμῶν, Irenaeus continues with words that suggest a wider reference than merely Peter and Paul. In this order and by this succession the ecclesiastical tradition from the apostles, and the preaching of the truth, have come down to us. And this is most abundant proof that there is one and the same vivifying faith, which has been preserved in the church from the apostles until now. Irenaeus proceeds to speak of Polycarp who was 'not only instructed by apostles', but was also, by apostles in Asia, appointed bishop' (III. iii. 4, p. 12). Harvey (p. 12, n. 2) observes: 'It is remarkable that Irenaeus speaks of his appointment as being ἀπὸ ἁγιασμῶν' (Irenaeus's Ep. to Victor, to Polycarp's intercourse with John and other apostles, Gk. fr. iii. 476). May it not be that in this respect also Eusebius is a faithful pupil of Irenaeus, especially

pose the question whether Irenaeus is talking about an episcopal succession that begins in the persons of Peter and Paul or a succession of bishops following on from the two apostles.

At A.H. III. iv. 3, the Latin version (no Greek) reads: '... Aniceto, decimum locum episcopatus continentem'. Now if we commence with Linus and Anencletus, Anicetus was the tenth bishop of Rome. But of course the same holds if with Bévenot we omit Linus and Anencletus and count Peter and Paul as first and second. Were the two apostles the first two bishops of Rome for Irenaeus, or are we faced with two different systems of enumeration within a few pages? For we might conceivably begin with Linus in this passage, yet with Peter in III. iii. 2. It could well be argued that the latter passage, though (so Bévenot) counting continuously from Peter as number one, is nevertheless by no means explicit in making Peter the first bishop. In no case does an ordinal number qualify directly the word \textit{ἔνοικος}, not even in the case of Eleutherus discussed above. It is one thing to number straight through from apostles to bishops; it is quite another matter to regard the apostles as themselves being bishops. On the testimony of III. iii. 2-3 alone, one might argue that Irenaeus is merely doing the former (though one would probably allow that it is liable to lead almost inevitably to the latter), but when we encounter the descriptions of Hyginus and Anicetus considered above, either Irenaeus is at III. iii. 2-3 doing the latter as well, at least by implication, or else he has adopted a different system of enumeration for these descriptions, and we might think this last an impossible conclusion to swallow. If it were acceptable, it would then be permissible to regard Irenaeus on the one hand in III. iii. 2-3 as reckoning Peter-Paul-Clement, etc. \textit{without thereby making Peter and Paul the first members of the episcopal line}, and on the other hand, when he speaks of Hyginus as eighth (ninth) bishop, etc., as counting Linus-Anencletus-Clement, etc. Now in relation to the latter, Irenaeus says quite plainly as the latter nowhere in a similar context appeals to the tradition deriving from one apostle only? Harvey, p. 18.

² Harvey's note ad loc. (p. 18, n. 1) is odd. He seems to have forgotten Fius between Hyginus and Anicetus.

³ In fact, it is not possible to accept this hypothesis of different methods of calculation if one wishes to stress Irenaeus's use of \textit{ἔνοικος} and its cognates. Dr. Ullmann ('The Significance of the Epistola Clementis in the Pseudo- Clementines', J.T.S.N.S. xx [1906], at pp. 297-9) argued that it was the juristic implications of these terms that gave rise to an interpretation of Irenaeus (first found in Tertullian and in the Epistola Clementis) which made Clement the first plenipotentiary successor of Peter and Paul—for it is of Clement, and not of Linus and Anencletus, that Irenaeus first uses \textit{ἔνοικος}. F. Bévenot summarizes Ullmann's reasoning without commenting on its validity (art. cit., 12-13) he is content to base his reinterpretation of Irenaeus to the same effect on the import of \textit{ἔνοικος} genitive. Now as \textit{κλέος} occurs in the description of Hyginus as having
that the apostles \( \text{Λύσις τής ἑπισκοπῆς λειτουργῶν ἐνεχθήσεως} \). Linus is here as good as called a bishop.\(^1\) If Linus, and therefore Anencletus too, are here described as bishops, would Irenaeus have omitted them in the enumeration which makes Hyginus eighth (ninth) and Anencletus tenth bishops? Bévenot perhaps implies (p. 101, bottom), following Ullmann, that \( \tauιν̄ τής ἑπισκοπῆς λειτουργῶν \) may refer to something less than the full episcopal office as held by Clement, etc. This is difficult to confirm or disprove in the absence of parallels in Irenaeus, but it is not easy to see it meaning something like 'the liturgical aspects of the bishop's office.' The genitive is more likely to be definitive than partitive.

'the ninth \( κληρον \) of the episcopal succession from the apostles', it must mean, if Tertullian's understanding of \( κληρον \), etc. in Irenaeus (as explained by Ullmann and perhaps accepted by implication by Bévenot) is correct, that at this point too Irenaeus cannot be counting in Linus and Anencletus, and must therefore be starting with Peter and Paul. It follows further that when Irenaeus describes Hyginus more simply as 'eighth (ninth) bishop' he is regarding Peter and Paul \( τοῦτο κόσμος \) as the first two bishops. But if the weight alleged to have been placed on \( λειτουργῶν \), etc. by Tertullian was in fact misplaced, no such conclusion follows. In fact, if the chain of reasoning begun above and continued below is valid, then \( λειτουργῶν \), etc. cannot bear such significance. For (i) Hyginus is called 'eighth (ninth) bishop' (iib) Linus (and therefore Anencletus) is spoken of as a bishop, and must therefore be included in Irenaeus's count, at least at this point; (ii) Hyginus is equally described as having the 'ninth \( κληρον \) of the episcopal succession', a description which must mean the same as 'eighth (ninth) bishop'; (iv) therefore \( κληρον \) is used by implication of Linus and Anencletus, who we assert must be reckoned in here; (v) therefore the failure of Irenaeus to use \( λειτουργῶν \), etc. of Linus and Anencletus at Irenaeus. iiii. 2 has no significance; examination of Bévenot's thesis in this article provides little or no positive guidance in unravelling the problems of the early Roman succession. But if Ullmann's explanation of the origins of Tertullian's account is accepted, and if at the same time Tertullian can be shown to have misunderstood Irenaeus, then we have gone a good way to throwing light on the divergent traditions. A juridic misreading of Irenaeus by Tertullian, no doubt encouraged by and encouraging the eminence of Clement eclipsing his insignificant predecessors, lies at the base of one line of tradition, while Irenaeus himself and Eusebius represent the other.

\( ἐνεχθήσεως \) is rendered 'tradidereutum' in the Latin version, which uses 'trado' elsewhere when the full commissioning of episcopal successors by apostles is set forth. The apostles 'were desirous that the men whom they were leaving behind as their very successors, 'suum ipsorum locum magisterii tradentes', should be quite perfect and blameless' (iii. iii. 1, p. 9). Note, however, that in the previous sentence 'committit' is the parallel word. The successions of the bishops consist of those to whom the apostles 'eams quae in uniuoque loco est ecclesiasticum tradidereutum' (iii. iii. 2, p. 262). Rousseau in the Sources chrétiennes retranslation renders 'ἐνεχθήσεως', op. cit., p. 821). Cf. too 'quod ... apostoli vero tradidereutum, quibus ecclesia accipiant ...' (v. praef., p. 313), and (the bishops) 'quibus apostoli tradidereutum ecclesiae' (v. xx. i, p. 377). If 'trado' in (some of) these cases represents an original \( ἐνεχθήσεως \), then it must be doubtful whether much can be made of \( ἐνεχθήσεως \) in iii. iii. 2-3 (as distinct from \( κληρον \) and \( λειτουργῶν \) of Clement and Eleutherus respectively) as indicating something less than the full delegation of authority which Clement and his successors enjoyed.

Clement, of course, had used \( λειτουργῶν \) absolutely of the ministerial position of his presbyter-bishops.\(^2\) Furthermore, are we justified in envisaging Irenaeus as distinguishing between the pastoral and the 'authoritative' sides of \( ἑπισκοπῆς \)?

But to come to the main issue underlying these linguistic arguments, Irenaeus's understanding of the relation between the apostles and the bishops. Did he regard Peter and Paul as the first two bishops of Rome? Bévenot does not draw out explicitly at any length this corollary of his reinterpretation, but clearly hints at it when he speculates that Linus and Anencletus may have been auxiliary bishops to Peter.\(^3\) Cuthbert Turner's contrary opinion is well known but worth repeating. In the evidence of Eusebius 'the series of successive bishops is so far distinguished from the apostolic founder or founders of the line that the latter are not reckoned in as a constituent part of it. ... In whatever sense the bishops are successors of the apostles, the office of the apostles is not identified with the office of their successors: Peter and Paul were not, in the conception of Eusebius, exactly bishops of Rome ... Eusebius in all this a faithful exponent of the ideas of his predecessor, Irenaeus. ... Neither in Irenaeus nor in Eusebius are the apostles counted as units in the episcopal list.\(^4\) If Bévenot is right, Turner is most definitely wrong. But is there any other evidence in Irenaeus that he regarded apostles as the first bishops of the churches they had founded? Does he ever use \( ἑπισκοποὶ \) or its cognates of apostles? Does he not always distinguish unmistakably between the two? 'We are in a position to enumerate those who were by the apostles instituted bishops in the churches, and the successions of these men to our own times.'\(^5\) Irenaeus goes on to speak of those 'quos et successores relinquabunt, suum ipsorum locum magisterii tradentes'. Here there is undoubtedly a close approximation of the bishops' function to the apostles' care of the churches, but even here \( ἑπισκοποὶ \), etc. are not used of the apostles.\(^6\) Elsewhere too, Irenaeus speaks of 'successiones episcoporum, quibus illi [i.e. apostoli] eam quae in uniuoque loco est ecclesiasticum tradidereutum.'\(^7\) And again, 'episcopi, quibus apostoli tradidereutum ecclesiast.'\(^8\)
NOTES AND STUDIES

It could perhaps not be demonstrated conclusively that ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνωτάτων cannot bear the meaning Bevenot claims for it in III. iii. 2–3. It may even be the case in the end that strict linguistic considerations force us to take it in an inclusive sense. But we must be clear that such an interpretation is beset with difficulties both within and without the passage itself. These are of such a nature that we may justifiably conclude that Bevenot’s demand can no longer be sustained.

D. F. WRIGHT

also he indicates that he himself had reached back to the first succession from the apostles’. Lawlor-Oulton comment, ‘It will be observed that Eusebius bases his opinion on a statement of Irenaeus himself’ (ad loc., vol. ii, p. 182) [which cannot be identified with Irenaeus’s account of his intercourse with Polycarp contained in the fragment of his letter to Florinus. The fragment is preserved by Eusebius at the same place, but he makes it clear that this letter is to be distinguished from On the Ogdoad. Harvey (p. 470, n. 1) confuses the two.]

Close similarity in language to a comparable reference to Clement of Alexandria (H.E. v. 11. 2) reveals the hand of Eusebius, but if the description of Polycarp (presumably) as the first succession from the apostles depends on Irenaeus himself, we have a further confirmation of the interpretation adopted in this note—unless, of course, Irenaeus counted one way for Rome and another way for Smyrna!
MARTIN BUCER—THE FIRST 'ECUMANIAC'?

Martin Bucer,¹ the Strasbourg Reformer who ended his days as the 'King's Reader of the Holy Scriptures' at Cambridge, long remained one of the neglected figures of the Protestant Reformation. He had the good fortune to leave behind him no sect or Church, no Buceranism, which looked to him as its founding father and eponymous hero. Even in his own Strasbourg he was never able to implement his ideal of a reformed Church with the degree of success enjoyed by Calvin in Geneva, and he was at the last exiled by the city, to die in an alien land of the effects of the dank and misty Cambridge fens. Subsequent to his departure, Lutheran influences in Strasbourg further obscured his theological and ecclesiastical legacy. Too often has the fate befallen him of being interpreted in terms of others, as a Zwinglian, or a Lutheran or even a Calvinist.² An up-to-date biography and a coherent account of his theology are still desiderata, and not until the last few years has a start been made towards a complete edition of his writings, most of which are still available only in the original sixteenth century impressions, and some only in manuscript. Several hundred letters have never been published, a fate for which the extreme illegibility of his handwriting must bear its due share of blame. His verbosity has acted as another deterrent: Luther called him a chatterbox (Klapfermaul) and Calvin deemed him 'too prolix to retain the interest of busy people. . . . Whenever he deals with any subject, his unbelievably forceful and fecund mind brings up so many things that he does not know how to take his pen off the paper'.³ And so for a cluster of varied reasons Bucer's true significance has lain concealed.

But the picture is now decisively changing. Bucer is emerging with increasing clarity as a Reformer of distinction in his own right, as clear-cut and relevant as a Luther or a Calvin or a Zwingli. We may well smile an incredulous smile when Professor Gordon Rupp, in a volume of essays entitled Prospect for Theology, depicts our subject as 'Martin Bucer: Prophet of a New Reformation',⁴ though in so doing we shall not wish to deny the pertinence of many of Bucer's theological, pastoral and liturgical endeavours to our contemporary concerns. But the Bucer whom the ecumenical century is discovering is above all 'the irenical Reformer', who while Luther and Calvin were laying the foundations for confessionally

structured churches, hurried around from conference to conference in the tireless pursuit of Protestant unity and even that hardly more elusive objective of concord between Catholic and Protestant in Germany.

And so there may be some value in a brief survey of Bucer's work as an ecumenical diplomat. Some of the more distinguished members of this audience will have taken part themselves in union negotiations, and it may be that a study of this sort will not be devoid of value by way of example to follow or error to avoid. If we look to the Reformers for guidance in so many issues, have they nothing to teach us in our preoccupation, or even obsession, with the quest for the Church's unity? We may yet learn from one whom Gordon Rupp in an extended cricketing metaphor portrays as 'the greatest ecclesiastical spin bowler of the age, the very model of a modern ecumenical'.⁵

1. From Selestat to Strasbourg

Bucer was born between the Protestant generations—Luther and Zwingli in 1483 and 1484, Calvin in 1509, Bucer in 1491. From the first he had to plough his own furrow in life, his father and grandfather being humble cobbler's of Selestat in Alsace. From the famous Latin school in his home town he preferred to enter the Dominican order at the age of fifteen rather than abandon his studies as financial stringency dictated. But in the monastery he found his humanist zeal for Latin and Greek rather frowned upon, and he was required to turn his attention to the scholastic theologians. In characteristic fashion he made the most of this eventuality to become well versed in the schoolmen and to acquire a facility in the subtleties of scholastic reasoning that served him both well and ill in later life. He was, said Bossuet, 'more fertile in distinctions than the most refined scholastics'.⁶

The Dominicans sent the promising student to the universities of Mainz and Heidelberg. He eagerly devoured the works of Erasmus, and at Heidelberg attended the disputation that Luther conducted in 1518, the year after the Theses, at a General Chapter of the Augustinian Order. He was enthusiastically drawn to this 'real, authentic theologian'.⁷ Almost two years later while still at Heidelberg he vividly recalled in a letter to Luther the effect of that encounter upon him: 'Smitten by great love for you as though wounded by the sharp arrows of your words, or rather the words of God the Mighty, I dared to have a conference with you. . . . The result was assuredly happy. For received at dinner by you . . . , I was wonderfully and bountifully refreshed, not only by the excellent delicacies of the table, but by the exquisite and sweet meat of the
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Scriptures, for which indeed I came more hungry than for bodily food. Among the other excellent gifts of your mind the genuine humility of our Lord Jesus manifested itself with special brilliance; your face, words, gesture and whole body testified to it.

Another letter, much nearer the date of the disputation, reveals how well his humanist and Erasmian studies had prepared Bucer to embrace the new teaching of Paul and the Fathers rather than Aristotle and the schoolmen. He was not the only convert Luther made on that occasion but he was certainly the most significant. Soon Luther died with Erasmus as his favourite writer. The letter from which we have just quoted, in which he greets Luther, 'Hail, reverend father, sincerest of theologians and strongest of Christians', expresses his special pleasure at what Luther says about charity, 'rightly executing that always present curse of a Christian, the saying, “Charity begins at home”, and “Be your own neighbour”.' Bucer proceeds to refer to an incident that took place a year after Luther's visit to Heidelberg, which he had earlier described as follows: 'One day when I was presiding at some stupid debates (for there is a great dearth of learned men here), I propounded some theses differing from their rules and barely escaped a stoning. My chief offence was that I defended the proposition that charity was command to our neighbour.' It is, I think, not without significance that one of Bucer’s very earliest teaching pronouncements should uphold the commandment to love one's neighbour.

Some four years later, the first treatise that Bucer wrote, soon after his arrival in Strasbourg, was entitled That No One should Live for Himself but for Others, and How to Attain to this Ideal. It was presented as an account of what he would preach if permitted to do so. The best, the most perfect and blessed condition on earth, he declares, 'is that in which a man can usefully and profitably serve his neighbour... It is clear that no one should live for himself, because God has created all things so that they might contribute not to their own good but to that of others, and be instruments and evidences of the divine goodness which all things should express and spread abroad. The Lord God first established this order for things at the time of creation, and will again bring it about at the time of the renovation of the world when He will again bring in His kingdom.'

This early emphasis on neighbourly service and love is prophetic of many features of the mature Bucer. It prepares us for his pre-eminence as a pastor, both in deed and more particularly in word, as evidenced in his work on The True Care of Souls and the Proper Role of the Pastor, surely one of the noblest pastoral treatises to come out of the whole Reformation movement. It foretells, secondly, the greater weight placed by Bucer than, say, Luther, on the necessity for faith to be operative through love. This Augustinian inheritance lies behind the remarkable case with which Bucer managed to come to terms with Catholics on the doctrine of justification by faith. Thirdly, we discover in the work That No One should Live for Himself but for Others the first hints of what has been called Bucer's 'eschatology of love', his vision of the kingdom of Christ as embodied in an earthly 'communion of love'. Bucer was especially fond of the Epistle to the Ephesians, and prominent in his three expositions of chapter 4 of that Epistle was his stress on love as a distinctive note of the Christian Church. Finally, we may justly regard the paramountcy of Christian love in the young Bucer as anticipating his subsequent irenicism and as contributing to a stronger missionary concern than is found in any other Reformer.

After becoming a 'Martinian', Bucer could not be expected to tarry long in the monastery. He left it for the last time towards the end of 1520 near his twenty-ninth birthday, and a few months later, through papal intervention, secured release from his vows on the grounds that they were taken before the age of discretion. In the ranks of the secular clergy he passed spells of a few months to a year as, successively, court chaplain at Ebersburg to Franz von Sickingen, a warlike count keen to jump on the Lutheran bandwagon in the cause of German liberty, court chaplain to Count Frederick of the Palatinate, and during the Knights War a pastor at Landstuhl again upon the patronage of Sickingen. He was on his way to Wittenberg (he had stood at Luther's side at the fateful Diet of Worms) when he was prevailed upon to linger at Wiesenburg and assist in the preaching of the new gospel. But after six months opposition to his doctrine and to his marriage (while attached to Sickingen) he had been one of the first reforming clergy to take the step of clerical marriage) rendered flight inevitable, and so he arrived in Strasbourg in May 1523, unknown, penniless, jobless and almost friendless. The happy accident that his parents now enjoyed Strasbourg citizenship prevented his being moved on, and from this auspicious beginning he emerged within a few months as the animating soul of the reformation in Strasbourg, a position he was to occupy for a quarter of a century, and within a few years as the leading Protestant diplomat of his time. He was rarely absent from a top-level conference, and he conducted a correspondence which, if not exceptionally voluminous, was exceedingly wide-ranging, his correspondents numbering some three hundred and fifty. From 1529 onwards he struck up an intimate relationship with Philip, the Landgrave of the region of Hesse, perhaps the ablest of the German princes who supported the Reformers.
Philip was a zealot for Protestant unity, both religious and political—the two could not be separated—and fastened upon Bucer as the man most likely to secure theological harmony among the warring Protestants. From now on Bucer was often away from home. Not only did he play a first-hand part in many of the reform projects in Germany in the next decade or so, at Augsburg, Ulm, Nuremberg, Cologne and Bonn, in Hesse, and elsewhere, but he was also tireless in Philip’s impatient service, for four years on end in the late 1530s and early 1540s being almost permanently occupied with writing, travelling and negotiating on his behalf. He was indubitably a figure of European dimensions.

We shall endeavour to isolate three strands of activity from Bucer’s busiest years—his dealings with the Anabaptists, his efforts for Protestant concord on the Lord’s Supper and his role in the abortive attempts for reconciliation with the Catholics.

2. Bucer and the Anabaptists

Strasbourg possessed the last bridge over the Rhine before the sea, and so occupied a position which made it a great European crossroads not only of commerce (between Italy and the Rhine valley) but also of politics and religion. From almost the outbreak of the Reformation it became an ‘international haven of dissenters’, with a reputation for toleration and leniency which acted as a magnet to unwanted non-conformists. No sooner was Bucer settled in the city than he was faced with the disruptive doings of influential Radicals; he was hardly ever to be free of their menacing presence. In a steady stream they came—Carlstadt, Hans Denck, Pilgrim Marbeck, Melchior Hofmann, Balthasar Hubmaier, Michael Sattler, Caspar Schwenckfeld, Sebastian Franck and a host of lesser worthies. In their dealings with them the Strasbourg Reformers evolved ‘an unusual way of handling “heresy”, differing considerably in spirit and in method from those common in the magisterial Reformation centres of Wittenberg, Zurich and Geneva’.13 Its spirit was a surprisingly tolerant one, so much so that Bucer was more than once in danger of losing his closest associate, Wolfgang Capito, to the cause of the Anabaptists he so hospitably entertained. Its method was open debate, in which the ‘heretics’ were given full rein to expound their errors in public.

What Bucer objected to above all else was the Radicals’ separatism. He once defined heresy as ‘a passion of the flesh through which one thinks he has something better in doctrine and life than the common, divinely-ordained usage of the ancient Church, conducts himself accordingly, and on that account secedes from the Church and betakes himself to some particularist society or sect’.14 And of course Bucer’s was no disinterested toleration; his perennial objective was the recovery of the Radicals for the reformed Church. In this aim he met with no great success in Strasbourg itself, and indeed in course of time the devious tactics of Schwenckfeld and the excesses of the Münsterites’ ‘kingdom of the saints’ provoked him into pursuing a tougher line. But elsewhere Bucer achieved the only mass recovery of Anabaptists into the established Church in the sixteenth century. It happened in Hesse in 1538, when Philip summoned Bucer to curb the Anabaptist expansion which had defied all previous measures of control. Hundreds of the dissenters rejoined the Church of Hesse as a result of a series of debates conducted in a pleasingly calm atmosphere in which Bucer evinced a commendable readiness to learn as well as teach. Foremost among the complaints of the Radicals was the absence of effective moral discipline in the main Churches, a point which Bucer took to heart and stated in so many words, ‘There cannot be a Church without church discipline (ein ban)’.15 As a consequence of this peaceful confrontation a disciplinary system was introduced into the Church of Hesse through Bucer’s agency, and also adopted by Calvin, then an exile in Strasbourg, as a constitutive mark of the true Christian Church. Another innovation to Bucer’s credit most probably as a response to Radical demands was evangelical confirmation. Bucer’s first known reference to the possibility of reviving the patristic custom of confirmation occurs in the context of another debate with an Anabaptist later in the same year,16 and it was first popularised in the following year in his Scriptural Bericht to the people of Münster for a sound reformation of the Christian community. The wider propagation of the rite among the Protestant Churches flowed from Bucer’s reinstitution.

Others have pinpointed further aspects of Bucer’s thought and practice which may exemplify his responsiveness to the legitimate complaints and emphases of the Radicals, such as his missionary outlook, his stress on the necessity of inward Christian experience and personal holiness, the role of the small cell of Christian laymen (the Christian Gemeinschaft), and the relatively greater attention Bucer gives to the ministry of the Holy Spirit. Such features have led more than one distinguished student of Bucer to depict him as the Pietist among the Reformers and to trace a straight line of continuity from him to Methodism.17

It would be folly to leave the impression that between Bucer and the Radicals all was warmth and light; we have already mentioned the implementation of a severer policy in the course of the 1530s, and we should not forget that the magisterial Reformers tolerated the Anabaptists in the last resort only as the objects of their
missionary endeavours. Though moderate, Bucer was nothing if not persistent. Yet we can discern on Bucer’s part an element of give-and-take and more than one hint that he was pursuing a genuine consensus fidelium. The fact that he was himself charged with being an enthusiast, tainted with the spirit and doctrine of the Anabaptists, is clear proof that he was far from insensitive to their protests.

3. Bucer and Protestant Unity

Not only did Strasbourg strategically straddle the Rhine, it occupied an intermediate position between Switzerland and Germany not merely geographically but, more importantly, theologically as well. The chief bone of contention between the Swiss Zwinglians and the German Lutherans was of course the doctrine of the eucharist or Lord’s Supper. We cannot here attempt a detailed examination of the issues involved; we can merely remind ourselves, that while to Luther and his associates the Swiss ‘sacramentarians’ appeared to believe that the Supper contained solely the bare figurative elements of bread and wine, to evoke remembrance of the Cross and worship of the bodily ascended and glorified Christ, to Zwingli and his followers Luther’s insistence on the real, substantial, even bodily presence of the body and blood of Christ, in, under, and with the bread and the wine, seemed little better than a half-baked transubstantiationism, a neo-papist half-way house.

The trouble started late in 1524 with the publication of Carlstadt’s anti-Catholic and anti-Lutheran eucharistic tracts, a reading of which, coupled with a typically meticulous Scriptural examination, forced Bucer to abandon his earlier simplistic adherence to Luther’s teaching and his unthinking refusal to do more than rehearse the words of institution and urge his hearers to the spiritual eating of Christ. The impact of Carlstadt’s pamphlets was reinforced by a visit from Hinde Rohde bearing an influential letter from the Dutchman Cornelius Hoen and by weighty treatises from Zwingli and Oecolampadius, with the net result of turning Bucer into a zealous partisan of Zwinglian symbolism as anyone. He stoutly opposed Lutheran doctrine which seemed to be ‘reintroducing the papists’ error under whose deluding spell men locate and seek salvation in the outward performance of the sacrament with no reference to faith’.

He continued in this mind until a reading of Luther’s largest work on the eucharist, the Confession of February 1528, compelled a reappraisal which issued in the conviction that though Luther’s language had been at the least unfortunate, his beliefs were fundamentally in accord with his own and Zwingli’s. He wasted no time in proclaiming to the world his lonely discovery, and in striving to convert the protagonists in the dispute to the same realisation. For the next ten years nothing so obsessed him as the pursuit of a Protestant concord on the Supper, and he was very early to appreciate the value of Philip of Hesse as a like-minded champion and protector. But the road to reconciliation was strewn with hazards, and there were signal setbacks in store at Marburg in 1529, when because of the eucharistic divide Luther refused to regard the Zwinglians as brethren in Christian communion, and at Augsburg the following year. In the course of these twelve months or so, Bucer distanced himself somewhat from the Swiss Zwinglians, so that he was better fitted to function as a middleman, but the immediate effect was simply the emergence of a third, albeit a mediating, confessional stance adopted by the South German cities under the lead of Bucer’s Strasbourg and exemplified in the Tetonian Confession of 1530. But Bucer pressed relentlessly on, harping monotonously on the theme that the disagreement resolved itself into a battle about words, a logomachia, and doing his utmost to disjoint Luther’s tainted vocabulary of its allegedly grossly material implications. In order to edge the Zwinglians towards an acceptance of Luther’s cardinal insistence that Christ’s presence in the Supper could not be made dependent on the disposition of the recipient but had to be acknowledged as an objective reality, that is to say, a true or real presence, even a substantial presence, Bucer elaborated with increasing lucidity his own distinctive interpretation of the Supper, which indubitably embodied a genuine degree of rapprochement between the embattled fronts of Zürich and Wittenberg. It was an interpretation that focussed centrally on communion or participation in the body and blood of Christ, that is, communion in Christ’s very self, through faith and by means of the bread and the wine. It spoke repeatedly of the presentation (exhibitio) of the body and blood by the elements, by which term Bucer intended not merely their representation but also their actual delivery to the communicant. Hence in the observance of the sacrament there exists a temporal conjunction between the elements and the body and blood, between eating by the mouth and eating by faith, a conjunction regularly described as a sacramental union of the earthly and heavenly realities, whereby the bread and the body may be considered as one, not by mixture of their substances but by virtue of the sacrament. The validity of this ‘real presence’ rests on the institution of the Supper by Christ; whenever the words and ordinance of Christ are duly observed, His true body and blood are truly given and received along with the bread and the wine.

Bucer’s triumph came at last at the Wittenberg Conference of
1536, when a Concord was hammered out which enabled Luther to accept Bucer and the Zwinglians (though Zwingli himself was several years dead) as brothers in Christ, and a common communion service was attended by all. The Concord was bought at great cost, including, it has been plausibly argued, the cost of integrity. The terms of the Concord included a confession of the Lutheran's substantial presence of the body and blood in the eucharist. In endeavouring to convince his colleagues and even more the Swiss that the word substantial was not an index of theological depravity, Bucer hallowed it with the sanction of Oecolampadius in his patrician Dialogue on the Supper, a work which in fact invariably shrinks from or even categorically rejects the word. But the shakiest prop of the Concord was its acknowledgement that the unworthy receive the body and blood when Christ's institution is adhered to, though they partake to their own condemnation because they do so without repentance and faith. In an attempt to persuade the Swiss to swallow this Lutheran camel, Bucer glossed it with a scholastic distinction between two types of unworthiness, that of the godless unbeliever and that of the unspiritual believer. Since the latter possesses faith of a sort, it cannot be denied that he receives the Lord's body and blood, but because his faith is undiscerning and inactive he does not eat the spiritual food of the sacrament. 'He is like the person who takes food with the mouth but does not chew it or fails to pass it down into the stomach, or when it is passed into the stomach, does not digest it and vomits it out with little delay.' This Bucerian distinction, which was not explicit in the articles of the Concord, enabled him to come to terms with the Lutheran axiom that the sacrament's virtue was not determined by the condition of the recipient, but without the necessity of abandoning his own and the Zwinglian's established insistence that apart from faith there is no feeding upon Christ's body and blood, which are heavenly realities.

It is not altogether surprising, in view of such sophistry, that Bucer was disappointed of his hopes of a large scale acceptance of the Concord by the Swiss sacramentarians. He exerted himself to the full in the two years after the Wittenberg Conference to little avail. Ironically enough, while Luther displayed a new friendliness towards the Swiss, in peace but not in unity, Bucer became increasingly persona non grata as they refused to be dislodged from their allegiance to their own Swiss Confession. But within Germany Wittenberg signified almost total harmony. Despite hesitations and reservations on both sides, especially from some of the free imperial cities, Luther's prestige and Bucer's persistence won the day, and German Protestantism was able to present a more united front than at any previous stage in the Reformation movement. And the credit was largely Bucer's.

4. Bucer and Protestant-Catholic Unity

The rebuff that the Swiss Churches handed out to the architect of the Wittenberg Concord seems to have had the effect of diverting his buoyant energy into another channel, leading towards the evidently far more daunting goal of a religious settlement with the Catholics in Germany. Not that his ecumenical ardour had hitherto found no outlet in this direction: both he and Melanchthon, who had made most of the early running in pursuit of an accommodation with moderate Catholics, especially since the Diet of Augsburg in 1530, responded enthusiastically to an invitation to contribute memoranda to a Protestant-Catholic colloquy for the settlement of differences projected by the French king Francis I in 1534-35. It was no fault of Bucer's or Melanchthon's that the plan failed to materialise, for their counsels breathed optimistic hopes of the successful outcome of a round table conference by theologians of good will. They were both prepared to concede some measure of papal supremacy, if only the pope showed himself concerned for the true edification of the Church, and Bucer is confident that in the teachings of the Fathers and the earlier schoolmen (whom he opposed to 'more modern theologians') and in the canons of the primitive Church will be found an adequate basis for, respectively, resolving doctrinal conflicts and reforming clerical disorder. He even suggests, mirabile dictu, that Thomas Aquinas should provide the key to a solution on the sacrifice of the mass.

But despite these earlier efforts, it was not until 1539-41 and to a lesser extent a few years beyond that date that the target of a Protestant-Catholic concord filled Bucer's sights, and now that he took up the chase in earnest he soon outpaced Melanchthon. It would be unpardonable to ignore the political and military pressures that inclined the Emperor Charles V to seek religious peace in Germany in these years, but in the time at our disposal, we shall have to imagine this backcloth without first painting it. It meant that the objective for all practical purposes is the reunification of Germany, religiously and therefore politically and militarily, rather than the reconciliation of Wittenberg or Strasbourg with Rome. None of the Protestant protagonists held out any serious hopes of an agreement with the papacy itself.

As negotiations developed it became clear that the Wittenbergers under the eye of John Frederick, the Elector of Saxony, were far more pessimistic and suspicious of a specious settlement than Bucer and Philip of Hesse. At the second Colloquy of Leipzig early in
1539 Bucer and the Catholic Witzel reached an agreed statement on faith and works which commended itself to Philip but smacked of a perilous compromise to the Lutherans. It is, I think, true that Bucer made a more ardent attempt than the other leading Reformers to do justice to the Scriptural promises of rewards for good works. He can even speak in his *Commentaries on the Gospels and Romans* of good works as a cause of salvation. But at the same time he stresses, as in this agreement with Witzel, that they possess merit only as the gifts of Christ (another Augustinian borrowing), not in respect of their own intrinsic worth. Nevertheless the kind of expressions he employed rendered an accord with Catholics in this area that much easier to attain.

Further discussions between the two sides in 1540 at Hagenau and Worms reported negligible overt progress, though at Worms a joint statement on original sin was formulated and approved. But also at Worms the Emperor's Secretary Granvelle engineered the secret negotiations which produced the so-called Regensburg Book. It was largely the work of a liberal-minded Catholic from Cologne, John Gropper, with revisions by Bucer and Capito. Intended to serve as a draft basis of theological agreement at the Colloquy to be held during the imperial Diet at Regensburg in the following year it represented Granville's endeavours to predetermine the harmonious outcome of those discussions. However, the exclusion of the Wittenbergers from its preparation was predictive of its unacceptability in that particular quarter.

At Regensburg the trio of Protestant negotiators consisted of Bucer, Melanchthon and a Hessian Pistorius, who was of no importance on this occasion. They were chosen to parley with three Catholics who included Gropper and the intransigent anti-Protestant John Eck, backed by the papal legate Cardinal Contarini. Melanchthon laboured unhappily under a very negative mandate from the Elector John Frederick, and as it turned out, dragged his feet hardly less doggedly than the Catholic Eck. After some revision by the Catholics the Regensburg Book was laid on the table and the teams began to work through it. The initial articles on the fall, free will and sin occasioned no serious divergence, and they proceeded to the article on justification. The draft in the Book did not commend itself to either Melanchthon or Eck, and others were prepared by the two sides. Eventually, to the incredulous astonishment of some of the Protestants in the city it was announced that agreement had been attained on the subject of justification. The article, which neither affirms nor denies sola fide but allows it so long as it is complemented by teaching on penitence and good works, is built around the Augustinian and Erasmian concept of justifying faith as a living and efficacious faith, a faith that is effective through love. This link between faith and love we have already noted as particularly characteristic of Bucer's theology, and it was Bucer much more than anyone else on the Protestant side who was responsible for the concord.

We have reached the high-water mark of reconciliation between Catholic and Protestant, not only in the Reformation period but perhaps in the whole pre-Vatican II era. The tide of peace would rise no higher before it began to ebb. For while Calvin was amazed that the Catholics had conceded so much ground, and was ready to approve the article, Luther condemned it as 'a patched-up job', and denounced it at a Consistory in Rome for its failure to mention merit. Furthermore, substantial progress in the Colloquy halted at this point, and deadlock soon ensued on the authority of the Church in relation to Scripture and on the eucharist. Melanchthon was violently opposed to the draft articles on both these subjects, and Contarini's insistence on the mention of transubstantiation put paid to any prospects of a meeting of minds on the eucharist. But what must be highlighted are the lengths to which Bucer was prepared to go to conciliate the Catholics. It is true of course that the Emperor was keenly desirous of a settlement, and Philip of Hesse was eager to please the Emperor (he needed an imperial indulgence to cover his bigamous marriage). But it is impossible to explain Bucer's elasticity solely in terms of pressure from Philip to be as conciliatory as only he knew how. The draft article on the authority of the Church was as ironic as any Protestant could have hoped. It presented Scripture and the consensus of the Church in time and space more or less as co-ordinate rather than conflicting authorities, and made no mention of a magisterium inherent in a particular office such as the papacy. Its chief explicit offence was in speaking of the infallibility of the dogmatic decisions of the early ecumenical Councils, but Bucer defended the whole thing in a manner incomprehensible in the light of his earlier and later writings on the same topics. Had he lost his head? Had the desire for unity become a blinding mania?

The same questions are provoked by the eucharistic debate at the Colloquy, for Bucer seems to have been the author of a draft which speaks of 'a mystical mutation' of the elements. 'We affirm that the body of Christ is truly present but that the bread is converted or changed by a mystical mutation whereby there is now brought about after the consecration a true *exhibito* of the presence of the body, a mystical mutation not merely of significatory import but one whereby Christ's body becomes (or is made, *fit*) present.' Nor is the sacramental adoration of Christ to be rejected as a matter
of principle.\textsuperscript{24} How much further could Bucer go and still be regarded as representative of German Protestant opinion? To his colleagues on this occasion he had already over-stepped the mark, and all in vain.

And so the Colloquy broke up with an agreement on justification but on no other major issue of division. All that could now be gained was a political compromise which secured a degree of toleration for the Protestants and ordered a 'Christian reformation' as a preliminary to a 'Christian agreement'. Bucer may have taken a cue from the terms of this Recess, for we can detect a slight change of strategy after 1541. He no longer aims at complete unification from the first but at a partial agreement to serve as a wedge for reform movements in Catholic states. This policy he implemented with very near success in the Electorate of Cologne in 1542-43. He had been invited by the Archbishop Hermann von Wied (on the recommendation of Gropper) to assist in the reformation of the diocese, but his efforts were finally frustrated by the canons of the Cathedral backed by the threat of imperial troops.

Negotiations between Catholics and Protestants in Germany after Regensburg witnessed the balance of power tilting over menacingly in Charles's favour. The second Colloquy of Regensburg in 1546 was attended with none of the hopeful promise of its predecessor and indeed wore a farcical aspect from the first. By 1547 Charles had spreadeagled the Protestant League in the Schmalkaldic War, and turned to the imposition of a religious settlement in Germany. Bucer now refused to participate in the discussions which produced the Augsburg Interim of May 1548. This provisional truce made only trifling concessions to the Protestants, like communion in both kinds and clerical marriage, and Bucer would have nothing to do with it. As a consequence he was eventually compelled to flee from Strasbourg, and chose an exile in Cranmer's England in preference to Wittenberg or Basel or Geneva whither importunate invitations would have summoned him. Weariness with the endless controversies of Germany and Switzerland may have suggested a refuge in a new land, despite the discomfort and upheaval it entailed. The year before his Channel crossing, he had again failed to compact an understanding with the Zwinglians at Zurich, and left the city in a huff. Hence it was his special sorrow soon after his arrival in England to 'sense the same spirit of contention (on the Supper) beginning to rage here which has brought such great evils upon us in Germany... I am moved to write this much at length (Peter Martyr, in Oxford) because I have seen what scandals have arisen in Germany from this particular disputation these twenty years and more'.\textsuperscript{25}

5. The Ecumenical Bucer

It is time to attempt some assessment of Bucer as an ecumenical figure. Tribute must first be paid to his incredible perseverance. None of his successes was owed to fortune or favour, all were the reward of indefatigable persistence and insistent urgency. Coupled with his ingenuity and versatility (for he was never lost for an expedient), such industry made him the supreme diplomat. He was at home, as no other major Reformer was, in the conference hall and the committee room. He preferred an interview to a letter, and his opponents, aware of his skill in face to face encounter, preferred to avoid meeting him on his chosen ground. For him the colloquy no less than the pulpit was a theatre for the extension of the kingdom of Christ through the word of Christ. In other words, in the words of our modern ecumenical jargon, he was a great believer in dialogue. He knew that books were readily misinterpreted and that polemic was far easier if its object was not facing you across the table. His activity exemplifies the truth that in the context of personal relationships theological disagreements often assume slighter proportions. He was always ready to respond to men of goodwill on the other side, a trait which goes some way, I believe, towards explaining his extraordinary keenness to make concessions at Regensburg. He was unhappy at remaining alienated from men like Gropper to whom he warmed as a trusty fellow Christian. But at the same time it is arguable that Bucer's temperance on that occasion illustrates the danger, which present-day ecumenical conversations do not always avoid, of an excessive importation of personal feelings into what should be objective theological debate.

Bucer never believed that any compromise in essentials was to be contemplated, but the verbal formulations of central doctrines had not been eternally fixed. However, his indifference to hallowed terminology and his facility in devising new formulae exposed him to easy attack and he earned himself an unenviable reputation for ambiguity and even duplicity. His early attempts at eucharistic concord had to dispel the ill odour with which his name stank in Lutheran nostrils as a result of his insertion of his own views of the sacrament into his translations of Luther's and Bugenhagen's works (1525-26). (It was this that caused Luther to greet him at Marburg with the words, 'You scoundrel!', but they were spoken with a smile.) Later in 1542 Luther is reported to have said, 'Bucer, the rascal, has absolutely lost all my confidence. I shall never trust him again; he has betrayed me too often'.\textsuperscript{26} After Marburg the Lutheran Justus Jonas accused him of 'the cunning of a fox',\textsuperscript{27} and Erasmus reproached him with professedly acting in accordance
with the maxim, 'A fraud that harms none and benefits many is a work of godliness' (Pius dolus est qui nocet nemini prodest multis). The most infamous illustration of this device is to be found in Bucer's counsel to Philip of Hesse to conceal his bigamy from the world by telling a 'holy lie', according to Biblical precedent; it appeared that numerous personages from Abraham to God had made false representations to their enemies in order to protect the people of God. It was sharply to be distinguished from the 'strong lie' advocated by Luther (herein lies encapsulated a world of difference between the two Reformers).

At an early stage in the eucharistic strife Oecolampadius warned Bucer against dabbling in deliberate obscurities, with which the Swiss Churches would have no truck at all. Somewhat later, so it is recorded in an early biography of Peter Martyr, Bucer repeatedly urged him to employ certain obscure and ambiguous expressions when speaking about the Supper, as he himself did, for he was persuaded that only in this way could the controversy be resolved. Martyr complied for a while, but finding it an unprofitable as well as an uncondemned exercise resumed his customary clarity. Calvin on one occasion could find no more opprobrious comment to pass on a profession of faith than that even Bucer's writings contained 'nothing so involved, so obscurating, so equivocal, so tortuous as this'. Calvin attests Bucer's widespread reputation as 'the author of approved of indifferent counsels', and doubts whether all Bucer's efforts could remove so deeply rooted a suspicion. Such accusations were, of course, part of the common coin of Reformation controversy, but it is difficult to discount entirely the testimony of so distinguished a figure as a chorus. Even his good friend Ambrose Blauring of Augsburg acknowledged that Bucer sometimes erred in the means he employed. Can it not be claimed then that he 'studied peace too much', that he was crazy for unity, as Margaret Blauring mockingly called him—'the dear politicus and fanaticus of unity', which is as close a Reformation equivalent to 'ecumaniac' as you will find. (I cannot affirm with certainty that no earlier figure earned such a sobriquet, but Bucer seems a far better in the first field.) Should we discern in Bucer not merely an ecumenical born out of due season but even the prototype of those who today lose their heads and even their integrity in a mania for reunion at all costs? Can we acquit Bucer entirely of exacerbating by his very efforts for concord relationships that otherwise might have remained more cordial, of multiplying disagreements by such ardent persistence that other doctrines, such as the Trinity and Christology, became involved where hitherto no suspicion of disharmony had lurked? Did his concern not to lose the influential backing of Philip for his union schemes induce him to consent to the bigamy against his better judgment? I doubt if this construction can be put upon that particular aspect of the affair (for he did subsequently allow Philip to go over to the Emperor rather than accede to his demand for a public defence of the bigamy), but we have seen that his conduct in other aspects of this episode will not stand the light of examination.

And what of his incredibly artificial distinctions, such as this explanation of 'truly' in the Stuttgart Concord of 1534: 'I believe that by virtue of the words, "This is my body", the body of the Lord is truly, that is, substantially and essentially, but not qualitatively or locally, that is, substantially and really, but not in measure of size or quality or measurement of place, in the Supper, is present and is given'. Such subtleties hardly endorse his earlier judgment in a critique of the Schwabach Articles, that 'all such articles (of unity) should be expressed with Biblical words and in the shortest and clearest manner possible'. Some years later, when replying to the queries of some Italian brethren, Bucer seems to have learned the bitter lesson of experience: 'Flee formulae', he advises them; 'while all faith is placed in Christ, the thing is safe. It is not given for all to see the same thing at the same time.'

But at the end of the day one cannot but applaud his profound zeal for the unity of the Church. 'What more serious peril', he wrote to a friend after Marburg, 'could happen to any mortal than that he should fight against the union of the Church?' We admire his irenic spirit, his insight into the incongruity of Christian divisions, and his fundamental interest not in theology as such but in communion, the security, unity and expansion of the Church, the kingdom of Christ. 'It torment me', he wrote towards the end, 'and not without reason, that we to whom the Lord has so bountifully revealed the other mysteries of His kingdom, have not been able now in twenty-four years to agree concerning this most sacred and universal mystery, which all Christians ought to understand as well as use'. We magnify his charity in assessing his opponent's point of view, his appreciation of the elusiveness of the whole truth, his 'charisma for assimilation', and his readiness to revise his understanding and retract his errors. We may not agree with the defence that he 'need not be thought unprincipled because he put the principle of charity before that of theological rectitude', but was it not the weakness of a visionary too easily to subordinate the means to the end?

Some years after Bucer's death, when Catholic Mary had succeeded to the English throne, his remains were ceremonially exhumed and burned in the market place, on a day when 'Cambridge
played the mad bedlam against the dead’. Such antics would not have distressed Bucer; after all, he had enjoyed a glorious funeral such as few foreigners of only two years’ residence received. But the Vice-Chancellor of the University, Andrew Perne, preached a sermon which might well have saddened him. For his text was Psalm 133, which begins, ‘Behold, how good and pleasant it is when brothers dwell together in unity’, and he preached to vilify Bucer as an agent of division, not to praise him as an apostle of peace. So truly has it been said that ‘Martin Bucer seemed born to belie the saying that peacemakers are blessed’. Nevertheless, to use again the words of Gordon Rupp, ‘of all the fierce voices of that contending age, he hails those today who labour, as he laboured, for the Peace of Jerusalem’.

NOTES

1. As the substance of this lecture is due to reappear in the introduction to a forthcoming volume of translations from Bucer’s writings, annotation is here kept to a minimum.

2. It is far more accurate to describe Calvin as a ‘Buceran’ than Bucer as a Calvinist.


9. As n. 7 above.

10. Bucer to Luther, as n. 8 above, 613f; Bucer to B. Rhenanus (July 30, 1519), ed. Horawitz-Hartfelder, p. 166 no. 119.


12. T. F. Torrance, Kingdom and Church (Edinburgh 1956), pp. 73–89.


16. Quid de baptismate infantium inxta Scripturas Dei sentiendum . . . (Strasbourg 1533), sig. F ii^3.

17. A. Lang, Puritanismus und Pietismus, Studien zu ihrer Entwicklung von M. Bucer bis zum Methodismus (Neukirchen 1941).


23. See especially chapters 5-7 in the as yet unpublished thesis of my colleague Dr. P. C. Matheson, *Cardinal Contarini at Regensburg: A Study in Ecumenism, Catholicism and Carism* (Edinburgh 1968), to which the following paragraphs are much indebted.

24. *Corpus Reform.*, vol. 4, 263.

25. Bucer to Martyr (June 20, 1549), *Scripta Anglicana*, p. 549.


27. *Corpus Reform.*, vol. 1, 1097 no. 639.


**Professor DANIEL L. DEEGAN**

It is with a sense of immense loss that I write of the death of Dan Deegan on Sept. 14, 1969, at St. Vincent’s Hospital, Portland, Oregon, at the early age of 39. He was one of the ablest and most promising of America’s younger theologians, and certainly one of the most talented ever to come to New College from the other side of the Atlantic.

Brought up in Des Moines, Iowa, he graduated B.D., *summa cum laude*, from Monmouth College in 1951, and then went on to take a brilliant B.D. at Yale, under the teaching of Robert Calhoun and Richard Niebuhr to whom he was greatly attached. He came to Edinburgh as a Fulbright scholar in the session of 1954-55, with a very remarkable grasp of the history of philosophical and of Christian thought, and quickly flowered into a theologian of mature judgment. He returned to Yale the following year, to take his M.A. in 1957, and then the Ph.D. in 1958. Already, however, Reed College, one of the select Ivy-League Colleges, had laid claim to him and incorporated him into their department of philosophy, where he continued to teach with great acclaim until he was stricken with an incurable blood disease last summer.

His researches at Yale had driven Deegan back into the depths of nineteenth century German theology and philosophy, and it was to that field that he devoted his relentless and rigorous analyses in the years that followed. He contributed to many professional journals papers of such academic distinction that he soon came to be regarded as an international authority in that field. He had hoped to bring out a major work on the theology of the nineteenth century, before publishing a revised version of his work on Barth’s Christology. His brilliant mind and great competence was recognised by Reed College in making him a full Professor of Religion in May 1969 and establishing a major in Religion under his direction. Then God took him home.

Dan Deegan took his illness with rare Christian grace, and no resentment at being struck down in such untimely fashion. His was a redeemed spirit of a rare kind, whose great talents were so dedicated to his Lord that his teaching and scholarship bore throughout the imprint of the *imitatio Christi*.

**THOMAS F. TORRANCE**
The Manuscripts of St. Augustine's

Tractatus in Evangelium Iohannis:

A Preliminary Survey and Check-List

One striking consequence of modern study of Augustine's Tractatus in Iohannem has been the dissolution of their unity, a unity that for centuries has been taken more or less for granted. In the first place, it is no longer possible to regard Tract. 55-124 as the product of extemore preaching exactly like Tract. 1-54 and Augustine's numerous other sermons. It has been claimed that they were dictated by Augustine in his

1. In the preparation of this study I have incurred debts of gratitude to a host of scholars, librarians, friends and others throughout Europe and in the U.S.A. who in response to my enquiries have examined manuscripts and furnished information and photographic copies. In only a small minority of cases have I drawn a blank. To mention by name all to whom I am indebted would be a lengthy operation and I must ask to be excused this duty. My special thanks, however, must be addressed to G. Folliet and his colleagues at Études Augustiniennes for examining on my behalf a considerable number of manuscripts in the Bibliothèque Nationale and for other valued assistance; to Dr. Karl Dachs and his staff of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich for like helpfulness; and similarly to the Directors and their assistants of the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana at Florence, the Biblioteca Nazionale 'Vittorio Emanuele III' at Naples, the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, and the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek in Berlin. I have benefited greatly from the first-fruits of the many-volumed Die Handschriftliche Überlieferung der Werke des Heiligen Augustinus — vol. 1/1, Italien; Werkverzeichnis; 1/2, Italien; Verzeichnis nach Bibliotheken, by Manfred Oberleitner (Sitzungsberichte der Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philos.-Hist. Klasse, 263, 267; Vienna, 1969, 1970), and I am glad to express my appreciation of the co-operation of other members of the team engaged on this project under the direction of Professor Rudolf Hanslik of the Kommission zur Herausgabe des Corpus der Lateinischen Kirchengüter. I received draft lists of manuscripts of the Tractatus from Johannes Divjak (France), Erich Roth (S.-W. Germany), Franz Römer (Great Britain), and Barbara Giorgi (Holland and Belgium). Finally my thanks are due to Edinburgh University Court for grants from the Earl of Moray Endowment to defray most of the expenses involved.
study, conceivably for other preachers to deliver. Much more plausibly, in my opinion, they may well represent the 'private preaching' of which Possidius speaks, that is to say, homilies or expositions addressed to a restricted or domestic circle of hearers. The debate continues, but by now it is at least established that whatever their origin Tract. 55-124 belong to a decidedly different genre from Tract. 1-54.

Secondly, the recognition of this distinction between the two main parts or halves of the work has been followed by a readiness to accept other divisions, which seem at last to be opening up a solution to the most difficult dating problem presented by any of Augustine's major works. The Tractatus were not all produced in the same year or couple of years. Indeed, it is most unlikely that even Tract. 1-54 belong to a single phase of Augustine's career. If the conclusions of Mlle La Bonnardière are to be followed, Tr. 1-16 should be dated in A.D. 406-7, Tr. 17-23 not before 418, and 24-54 in 419-20 at the earliest. More recently, M.F. Berrouard has argued that Tr. 1-16 were produced between December 406 and mid-407, Tr. 17-19 and 23-54 in the summer of 414 and 20-22 in 418-419. Whether or not either of these sets of conclusions proves definitive in the long run, future labourers in this field will feel no compulsion to exercise any indications that might assign the Tractatus to different stages of Augustine's episcopate, as the Maurist editors and Lenain de Tillemont once did. The acceptance of the possibility that the Tractatus were composed in separate sections or blocks over a number of years has broken through an otherwise intractable impasse.

9. The earlier, wildly contradictory, attempts at dating the Tractatus are summarized by La Bonnardière, op. cit., pp. 63-64; and Berrouard, Homilies sur l'Evangelie de saint Jean I-XVI (Bibliothèque Augustiniennne, 71; Paris, 1969), pp. 29-36. Berrouard here accepts La Bonnardière's date for Tr. 1-16, and reinforces it by further evidence in La date... (op. cit., n. 5 above), pp. 107-119. Zwingli, op. cit., pp. 99-129, follows La Bonnardière for the whole collection, and also suggests some further detailed connections between several of the Tractatus and the liturgical assemblies of the Church at Hippo. We still have our doubts (cf. JTS n.s. 17 (1966), pp. 183-184, and n.s. 22 (1971), p. 252; cf. G. Madec, RAE 13 (1967), p. 140) about A.D. 405 as a terminus post quem for Tr. 1-16, but now is not the time to develop them.

Trinitate is now over 30012. But even if the application of different principles of inclusion, for instance, in the case of selections in homiliaries, renders my provisional total for the Tractatus of about 340 manuscripts not strictly comparable with any others, nevertheless it is high enough to scotch the suggestion of Miss Ruth J. Dean that the surviving manuscripts are significantly fewer than for Augustine’s other main works13. Her claim that only four complete copies of the Tractatus earlier than the tenth century are known to exist is also unduly pessimistic. (In fact, of her four Cologne 6914 contains only Tract. 55-124 while Paris, B.N. lat. 1959 can be described as complete only with the major qualifications to be indicated below.)

At this stage we may conveniently list the pre-tenth century manuscripts of the Tractatus. The principles followed in determining the limits of this list are prefaced to the complete check-list on pp. 107-109 below. Contents are given according to the numbering of the Tractatus in the editions; S. 125 is Sermo 125 (PL 38, 688-698). At the end of each item is noted in brackets the title given to the individual Tractatus in the body of the manuscript, except for those which do not specify any at all or for which the relevant information is not available. In some cases more than one title is employed. The diversity of these titles will shortly be discussed.

**vii/viii** Carlsruhe Ettenheim münster 462 + Engelberg 59; fragments of 75-80, 111-112

**vii/viii** Monte Cassino 523 E; fragments of 112-113 (sermo)

**viii** Vatican 3835, 3836; selections (Agimond’s Homiliary) (sermo, omelia)

**viii** Munich 14653; 30-54 (as 27-51) (sermo)


14. In the sections of this article preliminary to the list itself, manuscripts are referred to as briefly as is reasonably possible, but sufficient indication is always given to enable them to be located in the actual list where fuller details may be found. The century is indicated by capital Roman figures: IX/X means the turn of the ninth and tenth centuries, i.e., circa A.D. 900, while IX-X means ninth or tenth century. Page and line references to the Tractatus always relate to the edition in CCL 36. There is now available in print an index of incipits which includes the individual Tractatus and not merely the beginning of the first one. Initia Patrum Latinorum, ed. J.M. Clément (Corpus Christianorum; Turnhout, 1971) utilizes the edition of the Tractatus in CCL 36.
Avranches 109; part of 10
Paris, B.N. n. a. lat. 2322; selections (Paul Deacon's Homiliary)
(omelia)

ix
Verona, Comun. 3034; fragments of 55-77 (homelia)

ix
Chartres 6; 1-124 (sermo, tractatus, homelia)
Florence S. Marco 644; 1-17, S. 125, 15-124 (sermo)
Basel B. III; 1-19, 23-24, 55-124 (sermo)
Angers 75; 2-18, 20, 19, 23-54 (tractatus)
Verona, Capit. XXXVI; 1-17, S. 125, 18, 20-21, 19, 22-53 (sermo)

Cologne 69; 55-124 (omelia)
Le Mans 260; 54-124 (omelia)
Paris, B.N. lat. 974; fragments of 34-36
Paris, B.N. lat. 1960; 55-124
Vatican 637; extracts of 1-18, 20, 19, 21-123
Paris, B.N. lat. 2012, ff. I, 136; parts of 24, 26
Valenciennes 166; part of 10
Vatican Regin. 397; extracts of 1, 36
Vienna 697; fragments of 1-2
Carlsruhe Aug. Fragg. 98; part of 17
Carlsruhe Aug. XV; selections (Paul Deacon's Homiliary)
Carlsruhe Aug. XLIX; selections (Paul Deacon's Homiliary)
Carlsruhe Aug. XXIV; 24 (Paul Deacon's Homiliary)
Manchester, Rylands 12; selections (Homiliary)
Munich 17194; selections (Alan of Farfa's Homiliary)
Wolfenbüttel 4096; part of 15 (tractatus)

ix ex.
Vercelli XLVI; 1-124 (omelia, sermo)
Paris, B.N. lat. 9604; selections (Paul Deacon's Homiliary)
Vatican Regin. 195; selections (Alan of Farfa's Homiliary)

ix/x
Vatican S. Pietro C 105; selections (Homiliary) (sermo)

ix-x
Orléans 161; 1-18, 20, 19, 23-124 (many omissions) (sermo)
Berne 103; 1-19, 23-52 (sermo)
Fulda A. a. 3; 22-54
Paris, B.N. lat 1918; fragments of 37, 39
Düsseldorf B. 80; fragments of 121

For subsequent centuries the approximate totals are as follows:
ix, 14; x-xi, 6; xi, 38; xx-xii, 7; xii, 100; xii-xiii, 6; xiii, 24; xiii-xiv, 4; xiv, 22; xv (and xvi), 47.

The proportionate distribution here is roughly parallel with that established by Wilmart for the Confessores, De Trinitate, City of God and Epistulae in Psalms, except that the marked predominance of twelfth-century exemplars is paralleled — and indeed greatly exceeded — only in the case of the Enarrationes.15

Thus from the period prior to the tenth century (if we omit from consideration manuscripts dated 'ninth or tenth century'), there survive seven basically complete copies of the Tractatus, Paris, B.N. lat. 1959; Rome, Vallicell. A. 14; Carlsruhe Aug. XLVII; Lucena 21; Chartres 6; Florence S. Marco 644; Vercelli XLVI. However, of these three are marked by one or other of the 'standard' irregularities to be discussed in due course and one of these has more serious deficiencies, while of the other four, which one describes hesitantly as perfect copies, Chartres 6 suffered bomb damage in 1944, and is practically useless in its lower 6-8 lines. But quite apart from exemplars of the whole work, even a cursory glance through the seventy odd items listed above will reveal the diversity of material with which the student of the manuscript tradition of the Tractatus has to come to terms.

**TITLES**

This diversity is immediately apparent in the variety of titles used not only among the various manuscripts but even within individual codices. Possidius lists the work as Tractatus de evangelio Iohannis a capite usque in finem in codicibus sex.16 In all the printed editions Tractatus alone appears, and it is commonly regarded as the term Augustine himself chose for these expositions of John's Gospel. But in the centuries of tradition separating the library at Hippo from the printing press, nothing is more patent in both the manuscripts and quotations in other writers than the rarity of 'tractatus' compared with 'sermo' and 'hornilia'. Having indicated above the usage as far as it is known to us in the earlier manuscripts, we will now catalogue the manner of citation in later authors, but with two cautions. First, we cannot always assume that a writer intends to reproduce the actual title in his copy of the work, and secondly, we must in any case distinguish between the overall title it bears at the beginning; and perhaps also at the commencement of a new part such as Tract. 55-124 as well as at the end, and the title or titles given to the individual tractatus. As we shall shortly see, these two often do not coincide.

---

17. E.g., Berrouard, Homiliae (op. cit.), p. 25, with further references.
Leo I quotes Tr. 78 from Augustine's Expositio evangelii secundum Ioannem.  

Engelgippus's Excerpta include a paragraph from homilia X evangelii secundum Ioannem.  

Cassiodorus twice refers to the work as Augustine's expositio on John.  

Fulgensius's usage reveals some of the possible variants. His quotation from Tr. 22 is introduced by: Augustinus in expositione Evangelii secundum Ioannem, cum de ipso Domini sermo tractaret, sic ait, but he twice cites Tr. 14 as a homilia.  

The patristic florilegium of the Second Council of Seville, A.D. 619, drawn up by Isidore, follows Leo I in quoting Tr. 78 from Augustine's expositio Ioannis Evangelistae.  

At the Lateran Synod of A.D. 649 under Martin I, Tr. 22 was cited as homilia vicesima secunda.  

Bede's Augustinian florilegium on Paul refers to several Tractatus between 30 and 108 invariably as (h)omilia, but his two other references, to Tr. 3 and 7, use the term sermo. However, we cannot immediately conclude from this evidence that Bede's manuscripts used different titles in different sections of the Tractatus.  

Alcuin's writings reveal a wide range of usage, referring variously to Augustine's homilia evangeliaca expositionis, sermo, evangeliaca praedicationis homilia, homilia evangelica, etc. Homilia is his most frequent term, and indeed he once quotes Tr. 14 after the

words in opere Homiliarum titulo quartodecimo, but proceeds in the next chapter to refer to sermo XXII. Or again he turns to Augustine's pulcherrimum opus, Homiliarum sigillum [in] Evangelium Ioannis, only to refer to Tr. 14 as a sermo.  

Pope Hadrian I quotes from liber XXXVI super Ioannem evangelistam, while the documents of the Council of Frankfurt (A.D. 794) contain the following variants: expositum evangelii and omelia (Ep. of Frank bishops to Spanish bishops), sermo (Ep. of Hadrian I to Spanish bishops), vicesima secta omelia in expositione (Ep. of French bishops).  

Amalarius of Metz displays no consistency in his numerous citations in Liber Officinalis, referring variously to tractatus, omelia, sermo, etc. He is thus the first writer to my knowledge who uses the term tractatus, though Fulgentius had much earlier used the verb tractare.  

One of the opponents of Amalarius, Florus of Lyons, drew up very many of the Tractatus for his Augustinian florilegium on Paul's Epistles, and invariably employs the title tractatus. In other works which have been ascribed to him afloat in recent decades he quotes from Tr. 53 as sermo 53 expositionis, appeals to what Augustine says in tractibus quos in expositionem Ioannis evangeliaca ad populum loquitur, and refers to Tr. 49 and 66 as the bishop's tractationes evangeliæ. Also at Lyons, archbishop Amulo once quotes from Tr. 53 as Augustine's quinquagesimus tractatus.  

Other ninth-century writers continue the variety of usage as before. Prudentius of Troyes cites the Tractatus nearly always as homilia, but
on one occasion as sermo. Tr. 26 is quoted by Paschasius Radbertus from Augustine's expositio beati Iohannis evangelistae sermones vigesimo sexto. Ratramnus on three occasions refers to the work as Augustine's exposition, while John the Deacon in several quotations names his source either simply as homilia or as in expositione Iohannis homilia. We have no need to pursue this enquiry any further among the early users of the Tractatus in Ioannem. For the moment we merely observe that the evidence indicates the predominance of homilia, the popularity also of sermo and exposition, and the rarity of tractatus, except in Lyons in the first half of the ninth century.

In turning again to the manuscripts, we would expect to discover amid this variety of nomenclature some criteria of classification, but the Maurists' Admonitio immediately warns us against over-optimism. Even within the confines of their largely homogeneous group of manuscripts they encountered tractatus, sermo and homilia. They also reproduce an extended title found in three of their copies, which we may conveniently discuss at this stage:

Aurelii Augustini Doctoris Hipponensis episcopi Homiliae in Evangelium Domini Iesu secundum Ioannem Incipitunt quas ipsae colloquendo prius ad populum habitae inter inter colloquendum a notariis exceptas e quo habitae sunt ordine verbum ex verbo postea dictatis.

This introduction occurs in the following manuscripts, none of them earlier than the end of the eleventh century:

Durham, Cath. B. II. 16; xi ex.; Durham Cambridge, Trinity 116; xii in.; Canterbury London, B.M. Royal 3. C. X; xii in.; Rochester Oxford, Balliol 6; xii in.; Gloucester region Cambridge, St. John's 9; xii; Welbeck Oxford, Christ Church 88; A.D. 1167; Buildwas Rouen A. 85; xii; Rouen (the Maurists' Audoenensis) Rouen A. 91; xii; Jumièges (the Maurists' Gemmellensis) London, Lambeth 44; xii ex.; Lanthony

34. De Praedestinatione contra Joan. Scotum 4 ('sermo'), 10, 13, 16 (PL 115, 1053, 1194, 1212, 1219).
36. De Praedestinatione Del 1, 2; De Carpite et Sanguine Domini 78 (PL 121, 39, 160-161).
38. PL 35, 1377-1378; CCL 36, xii.

THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE « TRACT. IN EVANG. IOH. »

Oxford, Bodl. Auct. D. i. 10; xii, xiv; Missenden Oxford, Bodl. Canon. Pat. 182; xii; N. Italy Oxford, Merton xiv; xiv Rome, Angelica 177; xiv; Rome

It also appeared in the Maurists' Pratellensis, but this manuscript has not been identified in modern times.

In addition, in at least ten manuscripts the same sentence is found at the conclusion of the work, with of course Explicitus substituted for Incipit. Three of the ten also have it as the introductory title.

Oxford, Bodl. Boll. 301; xi ex.; Exeter Oxford, Balliol 6; xii in.; Gloucester region Cambridge, St. John's 216; xii; Chicksands Lincoln 9; xii, Lincoln Oxford, Queen's 386; xii Rouen 467; xii; Rouen Rouen 468; xii; Jumièges Tours 592; xii; Tours Oxford, St. John's 1; xii/xiv; Reading Oxford, Merton 11; xiv in.

And again the code Pratellensis used by the Maurist editors.

It is certain that further scrutiny would increase the number of manuscripts in both these groups. At the moment only a few continental representatives offset the preponderance of English exemplars. The evidence is indicative of an origin in England or Normandy, in a centre where the textual tradition of the Tractatus had attained — or preserved? — a normalized form. In none of these manuscripts does any of the irregularities discussed in this article occur, and Oxford, Queen's 386 is the only one to give the separate numeration of '1-70' for Tract. 55-124.

Sufficient evidence has been adduced so far to demonstrate that the title tractus appears very rarely in the tradition prior to the tenth century. Confirmation of its continuing rarity in at least two branches.

39. It is used in Wolfenbüttel 4094 (in in.; Tr. r-23) and 4102 (in in.; Tr. 24-54), both from Weisenburg, and also for each of the sermons in a third manuscript from the same abbey, Wolfenbüttel 4096, the ninth-century Augustinian homiliary from which G. Morin published so many unknown sermons. Though tractus is a designation of an ordinary sermon, especially one expounding a passage of Scripture, it is well attested for Augustine's era (cf. Berkehard, Homilies, pp. 26-29, and the studies of G. Bardy and C. Mohnmann referred to there), it is not the term normally employed to describe what the editions present as his Sermones. Indeed, Berkeley, ibid., pp. 28-29, points out that tractatus itself, as distinct from the verbs tracere and pertractare, occurs only once in the Tractatus but as a different form. (On this single, and singular, occurrence of tractus see n. 68 below.) Thus there may well be some exceptional local factor behind the use of tractatus in these Weisenburg codices. Alternatively it could be argued that since Wolfenbüttel 4096 obviously stands in a close relationship to the earliest transmission of Augustine's
of the tradition can be obtained by reference to the lists of manuscripts lacking Tr. 20-22 (below, pp. 81-82) and including S. 125 (below, pp. 60-64). Even when tractus features in the overall title of the work, at the beginning or end of a manuscript, not only does its use in the singular (indicated by incipit or explicit, sometimes prefaced by In nomine sanctae et individuae Trinitatis) 40 frequently betray misunderstanding of its meaning, but it is also followed in several codices by sermo and for homilia as the designations for the individual homilies. Thus with sermo: Berlin theol. lat. fol. 343 (for Tr. 55-124); Graz 397, and 411 and 438; Lérida Roda 1; Reims 92 (Explicit sermo contextus secundum quartus. Explicit tractus...Augustini...secondum Ioannem); Vatican Palat. 207; with homilia: Cologne 69; with homilia and sermo: Barcelona S. Cugat 21. Similarly, in Oxford, Bodl. Canon. Pat. 147, the introductory title is Expositio T. 1 appears as an homilia, the rest each as a sermo, and finally comes Explicit liber Tractus. Were fuller details available, there is no doubt that many other codices would qualify for inclusion at this point, such as Lisbon Alcob. 402 (Tr. 124 is a sermo only to be followed by Tractus...expliciti) and Utrecht 3 J. 3 (53), for which the catalogue entry suggests sermo as the usual title (or perhaps merely Sermones as the opening title), yet Tr. 1 begins as an homilia and the work concludes Explicit liber tractatus. However, there are of course a number of copies in which the occurrence of tractus in the title of the whole collection is followed by the regular use of tractus for each item (e.g. Paris, B.N. lat. 3329).

There are other instances of a lack of accord between the designations at the outset of the work and at the commencement of each Tractus. Thus In hoc corpore continetur... homeliae introduces the repeated use of sermo and tractus as well as homelia in at least three manuscripts: Angers 176; Orléans 161; Paris, B.N. lat. 1595. (The position of these last two manuscripts among the earliest witnesses in one branch of the tradition suggests that several others may also display this inconsistency between homilia, sermo and tractus. See pp. 87-88 below.) In Basel B. III. 3 Tr. 55-124 are preceded by Capitula sermonum LXX, but Tr. 55 forthwith commences as an omelia.

sermona, we should treat its use of tractus as a sign of primitive tradition, and likewise for codices 4094 and 4102.

For a tenth-century catalogue of Lorsch Abbey and a ninth-century one of Fulda in which tractus is the title used, see below p. 78. I have there identified one of the Fulda codices with Berin Phil. 1662, which is one of the group of manuscripts omitting Tr. 20-22. Almost all the others in this group employ sermo, but Salzburg VII 33 probably uses tractatus throughout. Mention should also be made of Vatican Palat. 207 (viii ex.: Lorsch), which has Tr. 24-34 as '21-51', severally entitled sermo, but bears the introductory title Tractus ad populum. Concerning Wolfenbüttel 402, containing Tr. 24-34 and using the title tractatus but probably not throughout, see n. 97 below.

40 Occurring in Barcelona S. Cugat 21 (incipit tractus); Paris, B.N. lat. 3329 (incipit liber tractatus); Reims 92 (incipit tractatus); and no doubt others also.
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Abundant evidence could be adduced, even as a result of my restricted enquiries, to illustrate the fluidity of usage within individual manuscripts. The appearance of different titles for Tr. 1-54 and 55-124 will be taken note of below in the pages on the division of the work into these two parts. The list of manuscripts containing S. 125 also given below tells its own tale of inconsistency, which cannot be entirely ascribed to the insertion of S. 125. Thus in Madrid 193 Tr. 17 ends as homelia; S. 125 ends as omelia but Tr. 18 begins as sermo, and in Naples VI. 2 the standard term, even for S. 125, is (h)omelia, but sermo is used at the end of Tr. 18 and the commencement of Tr. 19.

One of the oldest complete exemplars of the Tractatus, Carlsruhe Aug. XLVII, displays remarkable variety. After the initial title of Sermones, tractus designates the first five items, omelia appears for the end of Tr. 5 and the beginning of Tr. 6, and then after the reappearance of tractatus for Tr. 6/7, sermo is the title for Tr. 7/8 and 8/9. Thereafter tractus predominates until the end of Tr. 22, though not without one omelia and a few cases of sermo. Sermo holds the field for the last one, except that omelia twice puts in an appearance, for Tr. 20/21 and 24. Throughout Tr. 1-54 these individual titles are found variously with the Explicit alone, with the Incipit alone or with both. In the second part of the collection Incipit sermo — is the invariable usage. Chartres 6, another of the early copies of the whole work, is in complete agreement with Carlsruhe Aug. XLVII for the section Tr. 17-23 (17 begins as sermo, ends as omelia; 18 ends tractatus; 19 ends sermo; 20-22 end tractatus; 23 ends sermo), and the presumption must be that the agreement extends throughout the collection and establishes a kinship between the two manuscripts.

Other early manuscripts disclose similar variations. Stuttgart H.B. VII 17 (ix in.) normally uses sermo, but Tr. 19, though beginning as sermo, ends as homelia, while the reverse holds for Tr. 20, and then Tr. 21 starts as homelia. Vatican Palat. 206 of the tenth century generally employs sermo but Tr. 33 closes as omelia. Oxford, Bodl. Land. Misc. 139 consists of an early ninth-century codex largely supplementing an in-mid-century. Sermo is the regular usage of both parts, but tractus and liber each occur once in the additions. In Rome, Vallicell. A. 14 omelia is employed throughout, except that Tr. 4 is introduced as a sermo.

There is little point in further documentation of such variations.41

41 In Angers 175, Tr. 15 begins as sermo XV and ends as omelia XVI. Bamberg 118 mostly gives only numbers, but Tr. 17 and 18 end as omelia, but 22 as sermo. In Bernkastel-Kues 32 Tr. 1-12 are called homiliae, and 43-124 sermones, strongly suggesting it is itself a composite codex or goes back to one in the tradition. Homilia, sermo and tractatus are all used by Oxford, Bodl. Canon. Pat. 182 (all three titles occur within the first five Tractus), Orléans 76 (73) (see n. 180 below and cf. the details given above concerning Orléans 161), and, according to the catalogue, Durham, Catk. H. 16. Valenciennes 8c uses rather than sermo 21-51. See n. 97. Several manuscripts throughout except for Tr. 13, 18, 57, 68, 69, 95 and 97, which are severally called sermones. For the distinctive usage of Paris, B.N. lat. 12194 and 12195 see n. 195 below.
It remains to be said that in many manuscripts the numbers of the individual Tractatus often appear alone, and that the inclusion of one or other of the terms we have been discussing seems to observe neither rhyme nor reason. This is the case, for instance, in Berlin Phillippines 1662 (tractus) and Troyes 536 (sermo).

It may be thought premature to attempt to draw any conclusions from the evidence we have adduced, illustrative and almost accidental as it admittedly is rather than systematic and exhaustive. But in addition to the obvious lesson it teaches, that significant and unexpected gains in the association of manuscripts with each other are held out by this method of approach, it raises several questions about the interpretation of Possidius's Tractatus de evangelio Ioannis... in codicibus sex. Are we right to assume that this description tells us anything beyond the kind of title that may well have met Possidius's eyes as he opened the first codex? Does it require us to believe that throughout the six volumes each exposition was introduced as a tractatus? Can it be held to exclude the possibility not only that the successive expositions merely bore numbers but even that sermo (rather than homilia) put in an occasional or even frequent appearance? If, as now seems highly probable, the Tractus were produced in blocks at intervals covering more than a dozen years, would one expect the six manuscripts to have presented a tidy uniformity throughout? No doubt we are groping in the dark, for we do not know what took place between the taking down of these sermons by stenographers and the eventual emergence of the six codices. We cannot say to what extent editorial or redactional activity unified the collection into a consistent whole. We can only suggest that the testimony of the manuscript tradition can hardly be said to support the conclusions normally drawn from Possidius's reference. At most it could be that the tractatus featured only in the initial title (with the individual sermons introduced solely by numbers as in the oldest manuscripts fragments, Carlsruhe Ettenheimminster 462 + Engelberg 59. In the next oldest, Monte Cassino 523 E, sermo appears without a number). And it could be argued that some uses of tractatus as a title in the manuscripts reflect a knowledge of Possidius's description, which did not preclude the misunderstanding of tractatus as a singular noun, in just the same way as it is so easily mistranslated today in both French and English.

PREFACES

The Maurist editors of the Tractus printed between their Admonitio and the commencement of the work itself a Praefatio Incerti Auctoris, beginning Omnibus divinis Scripturâe paginis Evangelium excollit. Like their Louvain predecessors they had failed to find it in any manuscript of the Tractus, were well aware that it did not come from Augustine's pen but nevertheless reproduced it from Erasmus's edition. Whence Erasmus derived it will probably never be known. It did not appear in the earlier editions of the work. The Praefatio is however printed as the prologue to the Glossa on John in Migne's edition, but whether it owes this position to the probable creator of this section of the Glossa, Auskel of Laon, I cannot but doubt. The Maurists encountered this preface paucis mutatis verbis apud Bedam et Alcium in Ioannis, Alcien's Commentary on John's Gospel is prefaced by, inter alia, his Epistle to Gisla and Recluta which in a more expansive introduction to the Evangelist loosely incorporates most of the sentiments and phrases of the Praefatio. This introduction is reproduced almost verbatim at the outset of Ps-Bede's Exposition on John's Gospel, for this Exposition, as far as the end of chapter 12 of the Gospel, is of course none other than the Commentary of Alcine.

With this history it is not surprising that the Praefatio Incerti Auctoris is frequently found in manuscripts relating to the Gospel of John, usually and perhaps invariably as the chief glossa on the prologue of Ps-Bede, Hic est Iohannes evangelista unus ex discipulis Dei. Nor would it be surprising if it had found its way into manuscripts of Augustine's Tractatus on John, especially as several copies of the Codex with the text of the Gospel (see below). In fact, it appears, to the best of my knowledge, in only one manuscript of the Tractatus, Klosterneburg 27 of the fifteenth century, and then at the end of the codex, as the second of two prologues to the Gospel of John (the first is Hieronymus evangelista) following the completion of the Tractatus themselves.

42. PL 35. 1377-1380; CCL. 36. XIV.
43. PL 114. 355-356.
45. PL. 100. 749-743.
46. PL 92. 615-638.
47. All the occurrences of the Praefatio Incerti Auctoris known to me connect it with Hieronymus evangelista, but I have not begun to make a thorough search of the catalogues. Though it does not appear among the prolegomena listed by Wordsworth and White in their edition of the Vulgate of John (see next note), it is probable that on some occasions it occurs separately from Hieronymus evangelista.
49. It appears in manuscripts, a break. Et nunc quod quum altum est unus, autus spirituale... /... omnia apparent nova quae a Christo novum homines constitutunt. I have not identified the source of this allegorical treatment of the miracle at Cana.
connexion with the *Tractatus* in this manuscript is thus fairly tenuous, but it may suggest that perhaps Erasmus was aware of the Praefatio in a copy of the *Tractatus*.

This possibility, together with the question of the origin of the Praefatio, has recently been raised in a new context by the publication of the *Commentary on John* by Salonius\(^1\), the son of Eucherius, bishop of Lyons, who as bishop of Geneva flourished around the middle of the fifth century. This *Commentary*, in the form of a series of questions and answers on selected portions of the Gospel, is dependent not only on Augustine's *Tractatus* but also on the *Praefatio Incerti Auctoris*, at any rate in the opinion of its first editor, C. Curti\(^2\). Though at this stage one could not rule out the possibility that both Salonius and the Praefatio Auctor are dependent on a common source, the similarities suggest a relation of direct dependence between the two. In view of the obscurity of Salonius's treatise (Curti knows of only five manuscripts), there exists an a priori likelihood that it is Salonius who has used the Praefatio and not vice-versa. If this is the case, not only is the origin of the Praefatio pushed back into the fifth century, to a time probably only two or three decades later than the completion of the *Tractatus*, but it is also feasible that Salonius knew the Praefatio in some connexion with Augustine's *Tractatus*, which are by far his most important source in the *Commentary*. However improbable this might seem, in the light of the almost total absence of the Praefatio from the manuscript tradition of the *Tractatus*, it is at any rate time for the sources and origin of the Praefatio to be freshly examined with the aid of the new evidence of Salonius\(^3\).

Care should be taken not to confuse the Praefatio Incerti Auctoris with a different prefacing which begins *Omnes divinae Scripturae sacrae texta sancta* and is taken from Augustine's *De Genesi ad Litteram I*: 1-2 (PL 34, 245-247). It breaks off from this work with the words *In principio fecit Deus caelum et terram* (col. 247 line 19), and concludes *De illa vero caelesti generatione si quaeis...*. *Iohannes ipse testatur: Ecce agnus Dei, ecce qui tollit peccata mundi*. This prefacing is found in at least three manuscripts of the *Tractatus*, and probably in several others:

- Schaffhausen 18; xi; Schaffhausen
- Engelberg 15; xii; Engelberg
- Colmar 23; A.D. 1474; ? Colmar

The first and third of these are marked by the transposition of *Trr.* 19 and 20 and their numbers (a feature to be discussed below). I have been unable to secure relevant information concerning Engelberg 15, and hence cannot say whether it is likely that all manuscripts containing this prefacing also display this transposition. The converse is certainly not true. It is presumably pure coincidence that the *Tractatus* should have attracted to themselves two prefaces with such similar beginnings. It is impossible to suppose that one of them was introduced out of confusion with, or even as a counter to, the other\(^4\).

**THE TEXT OF THE GOSPEL**

In several manuscripts, and most probably in many more unknown to me, the *Tractatus* are preceded by the Gospel of John, normally *in qua translationem quam beatus Augustinus exposit*:

- Gotha I. 57; x-xi; Mainz
- Durham, Catl. B. II. 16; xi ex.; Durham
- Cambridge, *Trinity* 116; xii in.; Canterbury
- Oxford, *Balliol* 6; xii in.; Gloucester region
- Munich 3714; xii; Augsburg
- Rouen A. 85; xii; Rouen\(^5\)
- St. Omer 23; xii
- Oxford, *Bodl. Auct.* D. 1. 10; xii/xiii; Missenden
- Oxford, *Bodl. Canon.* Pat. 182; xii; N. Italy
- Rome, *Angelica* 177; xiv; Rome
- Klosterneuburg 27; xv; Nienburg (here the Gospel appears after the *Tractatus*).

Apart from four manuscripts (Gotha, Munich, St. Omer and Klosterneuburg) all of these reappear in the list drawn up on pp. 64-65 above of copies of the work containing the extended title noted by the Maurists. As in that list, English exemplars preponderate, but the inclusion of the Gospel cannot be regarded as of exclusively English origin. It belongs to a standardized branch of the tradition. All of these manuscripts, with the exception of Klosterneuburg 27, contain *Tract.* 1-124 continuously numbered without any of the divergent features soon to be discussed.

---

\(^1\) C. Curti, *Due Commentarii Inediti di Saloino ai Vangeli di Giovanni e di Matteo: Tradizione Manoscritta, Fonti, Autore* (Turin, 1968), and *Salonii Episcopi Genavensis De Evangelio Ioannis, De Evangelio Mathiae* (Turin, 1968).


\(^4\) The Fa.-Belan prologue to the Gospel *Hic est Iohannes evangelista* appears, together with the Gospel, in Gotha I. 57, Klosterneuburg 27 (see above), and probably Munich 3714. It may well also be the prologue to the *Tractatus* itself, since the text is presented as such in *Natea* 11, to judge from the *Incipit* given in the catalogue, S. 44 (PL 38, 258-262; ed. L. Amiot, *CCL* 41, 513) as presented by the prologue for the *Tractatus*.

\(^5\) The Maurists' collations in Paris, *B.N. lat.* 11600, f. 50°, mention the inclusion of the Gospel text in their codex 7, i.e., *Genaeensis*, which is now Rouen A. 91, but this appears to be an error for codex 1, *Audonensis*, now Rouen A. 85.
DIVISION INTO TWO PARTS

Tractatus 1-54 and ' 1-70 ' (= 55-124)

It is well known that in many of the oldest manuscripts of the Tractatus the use of two numbering sequences divides the collection into two parts, 1-54 and ' 1-70 '. This division is to be distinguished, by virtue of this separate numbering arrangement, from any other partition of the Tractatus. Of the manuscripts prior to the turn of the ninth and tenth centuries on pp. 58-60 above, eighteen are relevant to this enquiry, i.e., contain at least part of Tr. 55-124 with numbers. Fifteen follow the numbering ' 1-70 ' and three (Carlsruhe Aug. XLVII; Chartres 6; Vercelli XLVI) have 55-124.

From the earliest writers to make use or show knowledge of the Tractatus, Alcuin, Amalarius of Metz, and Prudentius of Troyes obviously had manuscripts numbering the second part ' 1-70 ', while both Bede and Florus in their respective Augustinian florilegia on Paul bear testimony to the continuous numbering present in all the editions. As far as I have been able to discover, although there are several writers from Salicuius onwards who obviously knew the Tractatus as a single work, in no one else does the manner of citation or reference furnish any relevant evidence until we reach Abelard, who in Sic et Non quotes according to the single sequence of numbers.

Nevertheless there is an adequate basis in the manuscripts alone for holding that the division into two parts and the ' 1-70 ' numbering go back to Augustine's own work. If Possidius had found the Tractatus numbered 1-124 we might have expected him to mention the fact. He regularly specifies the number of books in the works he lists, and also

57. Lucca 21 has no numbers at all for Tr. 55-124, except that on f. 199 Tr. 67 ends as sermo XIII and Tr. 68 begins as XIII. It is impossible that these numbers are not original here.
58. Adv. Hæresin Felicis 68 (PL 101, 110) quotes Tr. 75 as ' sermo XXIII '.
59. Liber officialis 3:24:3, 26:3, ed. HANSENS, op. cit., pp. 339, 344, respectively cite Tr. 118 and 120 as ' omelia sexagiesima quarta ' and ' sermo LXI '.
60. De Praedestinatione contra Joan. Scottum 13 (PL 115, 1180) quotes Tr. 61 and 86 as ' homilia 7 de Coena Domini, homilia 32 de Coena Domini '.
61. FRANSEN, op. cit., p. 56.
63. Except that Bede and Florus both used manuscripts lacking Tr. 20-22 and so numbering ' 1-71 '. See below.
64. Sic et Non 69 (' tract. CV ') , 83 (' sermo CXXXIII '), 96 (' tract. LXVI ') (PL 178, 1440, 1448, 1453). BERENGAR OF TOURS, De Sacra Cosm. adv. Lanfranconem 43 (ed. W.H. Breukemeier, Kerkhistorische Studien, II; The Hague, 1941, p. 140) cites a sentence from Tr. 40 : 2 lines 16-17 with the erroneous reference, ' [omelia] LX ', i.e., an original ' XL ', has been accidentally transposed.

THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE ' TRACT. IN EVANG. IOH. ' gives the totals of the different categories of Enarrationes in Psalmos. It is difficult to conceive how an originally continuous numbering from 1 to 124 should later have given way to two separate sequences, whereas on the other hand not only is it easy to envisage the two sequences being merged into one within one codex, but we can even detect traces of the process in the occasional manuscript like Lisbon Alcob. 402 which observes the numbering ' 55-124 ', but prefaces it with a list of capitula numbered ' 1-70 '. Indirect confirmation of the antiquity of the twofold division is provided by the host of manuscripts which contain either 1-54 or 55-124 but not both. In catalogues both ancient and modern Tr. 55-124 not infrequently appear as Sermones LXX de Cena Domini or even Liber de Cena Domini without any further identification.

G. Foliert has expressed the hope that a thorough examination of the manuscript tradition would help to resolve the stubborn question whether Tract. 55-124 were originally preached or not. However, the sole assistance such an exercise is likely to provide is confirmation, if that is needed, of the widely held belief that these Tractatus formed a separate part within the whole collection even at Hippo. The main issue has still to be settled on the basis of internal criteria alone, for the mere existence of this original partition tells us nothing about the literary genre of Tract. 55-124. Nor can anything certain be deduced from the fact that in a number of manuscripts Tr. 1-54 are severally entitled homilias and Tr. 55-124 ' (1-70 ' as often as not) sermons:

Lucca 21; IX, Lucca Vercelli XLVI; IX ex.; N. Italy Berlin Philippus 1663; x; Clermont Oxford, Queen's 386; XII Berlin, Kal. Cat. XI; 132; A.D. 1444; Wibelingen Berlin, Preuss. Kulturb. 22; xxxii; Cologne Colmar 258; A.D. 1474; 7 Colmar plus the Mauritius' codex from Carcassonne Cathedral (collated in Paris, B.N. lat. 1166r; f. 107-108).

66. Cf. G. BECKER, Catalogi Bibliothecarum Antiqui (Bonn, 1885), catal. 77 p. 181; St. Bertin, twelfth century, Augustini liber super Ioanneum; Augustini liber de Cena Domini et decem cordis. II. vol.; catal. 125, p. 254; St. Vaast, Arras, twelfth century, Augustini super Ioanneum; Augustini duo in Cena. Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge Deutschlands und der Schweiz, vol. 3: Bistum Augsburg, ed. P. ROY, Munich, 1932, catal. 23, p. 75; Benediktbeuern, mid-thirteenth century, Augustini super Ioanneum; Tractatus Augustini de Cena Domini. Among the standard modern catalogues cf., e.g., the entries for Colmar 258: Donal 271; St. Omer 116. Similarly, some catalogues give the contents as ' 70 sermons/Tractatus ', when in reality 1-54 and 1-70 are all present: so for London, B.M. Harl. 3717; Oxford, Queen's 386; and probably Innsbruck 108.
This motley assortment proves nothing. Not only is the reverse differentiation evidenced in Modena, Capit. O. III. 14 (X.; Modena), so that

Trr. 1-54 are sermones, and the rest omeliae, but no meaning of difference at all pertinent to the point at issue can be imagined between homitita and sermo. The usage of these manuscripts is probably to be explained as the consequence of fusing together part one from an avenue of tradition where homitita was current and part two from an area which used sermo.

Thus although a mass of manuscripts give evidence in a variety of ways of a break between Trr. 54 and 55, none of the different introductions to Trr. 55-124 affords any grounds for distinguishing them from the preached sermons Trr. 1-54.

68. Nevertheless, special interest attaches to the variety of ways in which the manuscripts introduce the second half of the collection and Trr. 55 itself commences. The opening sentence, Coena Domini secundum Iohannem, adibitio ipso, debitis est explicanda tractatibus, et ut nobis posse donarevi explicantur, appears in several manuscripts not as the exordium of this particular homily but almost as an introductory rubric to the whole of the second series of Tractatus: Rome, Palat. A. 14; Bamberg 118 (where the sentence in question is on f. 198), and Trr. 55 does not begin (with Ante dicem ti. 1000). Florence 14 dext. 5 and Mugell. 5; London, B.M. Addit. 18313 and Burney 294; Cologne 69; Basel B. III. 3 (this list would no doubt be considerably longer were fuller information available). BERROUARD, Homilies, p. 28, points out that this opening sentence includes the sole occurrence of the noun tractatus in the whole collection. The sentence has something of the ring of a sermonina or introduction, which certainly indicates a resumption of the exposition of the Gospel but does not point to any particular kind of introduction. In this context tractatus may well be Augustine 's deliberate choice of designation, but see nn. 39 and 42 above. ZWINGLI, op. cit., p. 125, suggests that Augustine's composition or delivery of Trr. 55-124 was in response to a request, after Trr. 54 had been brought together into one corpus; that he complete his exposition of the Gospel. This would account for the somewhat unsystematic arrangement of the opening of Trr. 55.

In some other manuscripts the first two sentences of Trr. 55 begin or begin the homily begins Pascua, frater, non stoit quidem existimatum... Carthage Aug. XLVII (and so by presuming, Chartres 6; see above p. 67 and n. 150 below); Hedelberg 10; London, B.M. Royal 3, C. X.; Oxford, Bodl. Canon. Pat. 182, Basilid 6, St. John's 4. Again it must be certain that further inspection would enlarge this group.

Another feature that delimits a recognizable group of manuscripts, the inclusion of Sermo 125 after Tr. 17, must also have originated before the '1-124' numbering. Of the five pre-eleventh-century manuscripts in this group that contain part two of the Tractatus four have the numeration '1-70', while evidence is not to hand concerning the fifth, Madrid 193. Indeed, of the fifteen manuscripts earlier than the twelfth century, only one, Monte Cassino 21 EB and 22 IEB, definitely follows the numbering through to 124. In addition to Madrid 193 information is required for Florence Aedili. 8 and Paris, B.N. lat. 8912.

Another smaller yet still significant group of manuscripts lacks Trr. 21-22 and transposes Trr. 10 and 20 and their numbers. Its two oldest representatives which contain Tract. 55-124, Paris, B.N. lat. 1599 (viii ex.) and Orleans 162 (ix-x), both number them '1-70'. Although I do not possess the appropriate details concerning other exemplars such as Paris,...
B.N. 12194 and 12195 (x), and hence cannot say when the numbering through to 124 first appears in the manuscripts of this group, the evidence clearly indicates that their distinctive features took their rise before the unbroken sequence of numbers was introduced, at least in this area of the tradition, as in the other areas already examined.

FURTHER DIVISIONS?

Possidius found the Tractatus in the library at Hippo in codicibus sex, a description which of itself tells us nothing about an intended division into parts properly so called. However, in the light of the growing consensus that the Tractatus were produced at intervals over a number of years in separate blocks, some of these codices may have contained discrete groups of expositions, each representing one stretch of preaching. We shall return to this question.

Two manuscripts, to my knowledge, display a fresh introduction before Tr. 112:

Vatican 637; IX; continuous extracts interrupted only twice by rubrics in capitals, Incipit de Cena Dominica (= Tr. 55) and Nunc de Domini Passione sic Exorsus est Evangelista.

Bruges 20/102; XII; after Tr. 111 come Explicit de Cena: Incipit de Passione.

Since I stumbled across this feature only by chance, it is highly probable that a number of other copies also disclose it. It is perhaps of liturgical inspiration but further examination of the older manuscripts might reveal evidence for a primitive origin.

Much more frequently encountered is some kind of division of Trr. 1-54 into two parts, with Trr. 55-124 forming the third or last part of the collection. The evidence derives mainly from Germany and German-speaking Switzerland:

(i) St. Gallen 168; IX; 1-21 and Incipit oedia XXII. The text of 22 is in:

St. Gallen 169; IX; 22-54

St. Gallen 241; IX in.; abbreviated text of 1-18, 20 ('1-19')

St. Gallen 155; IX; 55-124 as '1-70'.

A catalogue of the Abbey Library at St. Gallen in the mid-nineteenth century lists Augustini super Ioannes partem II. et tertiam. We need not spell out the correlation between the surviving codices and these catalogue entries, but merely point to the fact that in codices 168-169 and 241 two different divisions between parts one and two are in evidence (if we may regard codex 241 as containing part one).

(ii) Carlsruhe Aug. LXXVI; IX in.; 1-21 and Incipit omelia XXII.

This manuscript is almost certainly the first codex mentioned in an entry in a catalogue of the Reichenau Abbey Library of A.D. 821-2: In Ioannes evangelistam sermones XXI in codice I. Item in alio codice sermones XXXIV. Item in tertio codice usque ad finem evangelii.

(iii) Stuttgart H.B. VII 17; IX in.; Constance; 2-21 (incomplete at beginning and end).

Fulda A. a. 3; IX-X; Constance; 22-54.

These two manuscripts present a division parallel to that portrayed in St. Gallen 168-169 and the Reichenau catalogue entry.

(iv) Basel B. III. 3; consists mainly of two codices containing respectively 1-19, 23-24 ('1-21') and 55-124.

Morin was of the opinion that these divisions suggested an origin in the Reichenau — St. Gallen region but the contents of part one in this manuscript differs from both of the models surviving from these abbeys.

(v) Würzburg M. p. th. f. 74; IX med.; 1-13. Probably from Freising (cf. Munich 6287; IX; 1-13; Freising), but at St. Kylian's by the middle of the century, where also were Oxford, Bodl. Laud. Misc. 139; IX and 1x med.; 14-54 (composite) as secunda pars.


Here we have a twofold division, but with yet another variation in the partition of Trr. 1-54 into two sections, certainly exemplified for Würzburg around the middle of the ninth century and probably also for Freising.

---

69. Against Willems, CCL 36, viii.
72. Becker, cata. 6, p. 4; Lehmann, cata. 49, p. 244.
(vi) Vatican Palat. 206: x; Lorsch; 1-33 divided into "Sermones I-XXI," and "Sermones XXII-XXXIII" preceded by a separate list of capitula.

The second part of this manuscript, containing twelve Tractatus, may bear some relation to an entry in a tenth-century catalogue of Lorsch Abbey library: "Tractatus Sancti Augustini in Ioannis XXII in uno codice. In alio LII. In tertia LXXI." But the difference of title tractus against sermones, probably counts against this identification. Instead the Lorsch catalogue may possibly attest a further threefold division, into 1-12 (cf. above for manuscripts containing 1-13 at Freising and Würzburg), '13-52' (i.e., probably 13-54 with some omissions, the catalogue perhaps working from the last number in the manuscript), and '1-70'.

(vii) Vatican Palat. 207: viii ex.; Lorsch; 24-54 ('21-51') as pars media.

This manuscript agrees with Basel B. III. 3 in the implied earlier omission of Trr. 20-22 but not in the line of division. [See now n. 213 A below.]

(viii) Wolfenbüttel 4094: ix in.; 1-23 as pars prima.

Wolfenbüttel 4072: ix in.; 24-34 as pars II, numbered apparently as '22-53'.

Of these two codices from Weissenburg Abbey the second agrees with Vatican Palat. 207 in content but not precisely in numeration. A catalogue of the Abbey library before A.D. 1043 lists "Tria volumina super Ioannem". Though this entry probably refers to our two manuscripts, their inconsistent numbering of the Tractatus suggests they have diverse connexions in the tradition.

(ix) A catalogue of the library of Fulda Abbey lists the following:

Tractatus sancti Augustini in evangelium sancti Ioannis libri XXXII in uno codice. Item a XXXII usque ad LI in altero volume. Item a LI usque in fine in tertio volume.

If the numbers have been correctly transcribed, this entry presumably covers three manuscripts containing respectively 1-19 and 23-35 ('1-32')

75. Becker, catalog. 37, p. 84.

76. The catalogue indicates '21-51' as the numbering but on what grounds I cannot say. (It also states that the order of the Tractatus is displaced, but again I do not know to what this refers.) The present numbering of these three items, Trr. 24-26, is confirmed by a microfilm copy as '22-24'. Though the manner in which 'INCP TRAC XXII' etc. appears in the manuscript suggests that these headings were not present when the manuscript was executed, there is no sign in this part of it that an earlier numbering of '21-23' has been obscured. Nevertheless, the codex remains in one or two respects something of a puzzle.

77. Becker, catalog. 48, p. 133.
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36-54 ('33-51'); and 55-124 ('1-70'). To my knowledge none of these has been identified in modern times, but Berlin Philippus 1662 admirably fits the bill for the first of them. It uses the title "tractatus" for each of the expositions, contains 1-19 and 23-35 numbered consecutively '1-32', and according to Lowe was written in an important Anglo-Saxon centre in the Mainz-Fulda-Hersfeld region. The only problem is that of date. This manuscript belongs to Lowe to the end of the eighth century but was given to St. Vincent's Abbey, Metz, by Bishop Deodericus in the latter half of the tenth. Becker places the Fulda catalogue in the twelfth century, so that if our identification is to have any validity it would be necessary either to regard the catalogue as a copy of a much earlier one or to suppose that it refers to a lost manuscript which was a copy of Berlin Philippus 1662 but remained at Fulda when the latter was removed. Fortunately neither of these hypotheses is needed for the catalogue was in fact drawn up shortly before the middle of the ninth century, a date which is confirmed by the identification we have here proposed.

(x) Munich 14653; viii: Regensburg; contains now probably Trr. 30: 6-54 (numbered '27-51') in 182 folios, having lost its first quire. Calculations suggest that it originally comprised Trr. 29-54.

(xi) Salzburg a VII 33; ix in.; Salzburg; contains Trr. 15-36: 0 but lacks 20-22. The original extent of the manuscript (possibly Trr. 15-54) is unknown.

We have exhausted the chief evidence for the division of Trr. 1-54 into two parts, but before assessing its significance we may note some supporting data:

Princeton Friend 1; xi/xii; Tournai; 39-124 as sermones in extrema parte evangeli secundum Ioannem.

Bamberg 110; xi; 55-124 ('1-70') as ultima pars (yet in Bamberg 118; xi; also from the Cathedral, 55-82 are pars secunda).

Laon 317; xi; Vaucler; 1-38 as pars prima.

Berlin, Preuss. Kulturbes. 22; xv ex.; 54 is the last in the seconda pars; presumably 55-124 ('1-70') are the terza pars. This would agree

79. CLA VIII. no. 1053.

with the library catalogue of Leander Van Ess, at Darmstadt, where the manuscript lay in the early nineteenth century.\(^81\)

Colmar 298; A.D. 1474; ? Colmar : 55-124 (1-70) \(=\) tertia pars. I have no information where the earlier division occurs, if at all.

Finally, the Maurists' lost codex Carcassonensis presented Tr. 124 as sermon septagesimus in extrema parte (Paris, B.N. lat. 11661, f. 1617).

These last items of evidence serve mainly to press home the point that emerges with clarity from the ninth- and tenth-century material, that there is no such thing as a standard or regular division of Tractatus into two parts. The pattern identified by Willems, whereby part one consists of Trr. 1-19, 23-24 (1-21) and part two of Trr. 25-54 (22-51), in fact occurs, contrary to his claims, in only one manuscript, Basel B. III. 3, while Zwingi's suggestion that the manuscripts indicate the commencement of a new series of sermons with Tr. 24 has the support of only two codices, Vatican Palat. 207 and Wolfenbüttel 41082. In reality the dividing line is drawn at a variety of points ranging from Trr. 12/13 (? Lorsch) and 13/14 (Freising, Würzburg) to 35/36 (Fulda). Nevertheless, it falls most frequently in the region of Trr. 21-25, and in four cases (St. Gallen, Reichenau, Constance, Lorsch) between 21 and 22. But the diversity is such that were it not for the fact that part three, Tract. 35-124, has obvious claims to be regarded as more than merely a division for convenience, one would be inclined to treat 'three parts' as simply synonymous with 'three codices'. However, there is more to be said on this question subsequent.\(^83\)

**THE OMISION OF TRACTATUS 20-22**

This feature of a considerable number of the older exemplars of the Tractatus was dealt with in a previous article.\(^84\) It is uniquely intriguing among the various irregularities displayed by the manuscripts of the Tractatus because, as I believe, I have convincingly demonstrated, the sequence of Augustine's preaching runs from Tr. 10 to 23 ff., and 20-22 form a separate treatment of the same passage, John 5:19-30, dealt with by Trr. 18, 19 and 23. The question immediately raises itself whether the absence of these three Tractatus from several manuscripts is connected in any way with their not belonging to the time of preaching to the series of the Tractatus. But first we must draw up a more complete list of the manuscripts which lack Trr. 20-22 and as a consequence number 23 ff. as '20' ff. The list also indicates the title that the several Tractatus bear in each exemplar:

**Berlin** Philippi 1662; viii ex.; Fulda (tractatus). Tr. 20 has been inserted by a tenth-century hand in the course of 23: 2.

**Tours** 289; ix in.; Marmontier (sermo)

**Salzburg** a VII 33; ix 1; Salzburg (tractatus)

**Basel** B. III. 3; ix; (sermo)

**Paris**, B.N. lat. 1961; ix

**Berne** 103; ix-x; Troyes (sermo)

**Troyes** 536; x; Troyes (sermo)

**Paris**, B.N. n. a. l. 22/17; xi/xii; Cluny (sermo)

**Berlin** Ham. 55; xii; Citeaux (sermo). Trr. 20-22 inserted by another hand, interrupting 23: 2.

**Ghent** 107; xii; Trèves (sermo)

**Lérida** Roda 1; xii; Roda (sermo)

**Troyes** 200; xii; Troyes (sermo)

**Brescia** A. II. 1; xii-xiii; Brescia (omegia)

**Padua** 1650; xiii; Padua (omegia). Trr. 20-22 later inserted between 25 and 26.

**Mantua** C. V. 4; xiii-xiv; San Benedetto Po (sermo)

**Munich** 11303; xv/xvi; Polling (sermo)

In addition there are a few copies whose numbering is probably to be explained by the omission of Trr. 20-22: \(^85\)

**Munich** 11453; viii; Regensburg; 30-54 as '27-51' (sermo)

\(\text{La date (op. cit.), pp. 110-112. I have since found that I was anticipated in the discovery of the intercalation of Trr. 20-22 by H. Rondet; cf. RSR, p. 655.}\)

\(\text{83. Concerning Wolfenbüttel 4102 see n. 76 above. A catalogue of the library of Chur Cathedral in A.D. 1457 lists: Augustinus super Ioannem sermones centum XXI; idem super epistolam Ioannem apocrypta sermones decrem (ed. Lehmann, Ein Bühlerzeichen der Domblibliothek von Chur aus dem Jahre 1457, in Erforschung des Mühltalters. Ausgewählte Abhandlungen und Aufsätze, vol. 2 (Stuttgart, 1959), p. 178, no. F. 17.) This may well have been a manuscript lacking Trr. 20-22 but misnumbering may have been solely responsible. Chur's connections with St. Gallen where the omission is not attested, speak against the possibility of omission, but not conclusively.}\)
Vatican Palat. 207; viii ex.; Lorsch; 24-54 as '(sermo, but introducory title of Tractatus ad populum)'.

Modena, Est. a. W. 1. 13; xiii.; San Prospero; 122: 9-124 as '(110)-121' (sermo).

Turin G. III. 28; xv.; Turin; 49-50, 52, 55-66, 103-121 all numbered three less than in the editions (sermo).

The indirect evidence of two other manuscripts deserves to be mentioned. The original core of Oxford, Bodl. Laud. Misc. 139 (ix); probably Benediktbeuern) contained Tr. 14-16, 10, 23-32, 30-45 and 48-54 numbered '14-44' (mostly sermo). The absence of Tr. 20-22 from this sequence obviously cannot be isolated from the other lacunae for which collectively there is no simple explanation available. But when the ten missing Tractatus were later inserted (ix med.; Würzburg) they were not numbered consistently: 17-18 and 20-22 were given their 'correct' numbers, but 33-35 and 46-47 were provided with numbers three behind the standard numerotation. This omission will be further discussed at a later stage in this article. It appears to suggest that the Würzburg scribe got Tr. 33-35 and 46-47 from an exemplar which lacked Tr. 20-22 or in its numbering reflected a prior lack of them.

Information concerning Valenciennes 80 supplied by courtesy of É. Bleuzen seems to furnish another strand of evidence concerning an original absence of Tr. 20-22. This twelfth-century codex from St. Amand-les-Eaux, which was very probably utilized by the Louvain editors of the Tractatus (see n. 227 below), normally preserves each Tractatus with the text of the Gospel passage it expands copied in extenso, not merely indicated by its opening and closing words. However, this is not the case with Tr. 20-22, though it holds true for the Tractatus that precede and follow these three. For Tr. 20-22 the text of the Tractatus itself follows immediately upon 'Incipit trit tract. S. Aug. XX' etc. Unless the restriction of this peculiarity to Tr. 20-22 is ascribed to chance factors, it suggests that Valenciennes 80 preserves a trace of the insertion at an earlier stage in the tradition of Tr. 20-22 into a form of the work which had previously lacked them. What is surprising is that this echo of an original absence of these three Tractatus should still be detected in a manuscript which, according to the available evidence, appears on other grounds to present a fairly standardized version of the Tractatus. No other irregularity occurs in the region of Tr. 17-23, and the numbering is continuous throughout from 1 to 124, with no break of any kind between Tr. 54 and 55. It is quite possible that further examination would disclose further manuscripts, especially in N.-W. Europe, which distinguish Tr. 20-22 from their neighbours in the manner of Valenciennes 80.

In addition to this direct and indirect manuscript evidence, some later writers who drew upon the Tractatus were obviously using copies lacking Tr. 20-22. The details for Bede, Alcuin and Florus of Lyons have been given previously. To these there is only one certain witness to be added. Amalarius of Metz (d. 850/1) often cites the Tractatus in his Liber Officiorum. The numbers he gives are 'correct' for Tr. 17 but always three less for Tr. 26 onwards. (He cites them variously as 'sermo, omelia, and tracatus). It is possible that other writers should be included here, but positive evidence of sufficient extent is not available. Many writers quote from the Tractatus without numbering them, and in any case the older editions reproduced in Migne it is often difficult to decide whether the numbers in the printed text belong to the original or are editorial insertions. When numbers are available, they are frequently one or two out, and often inconsistently so, which reflects not only the greater case with which Roman numerals are miscopied compared with Arabic but also the loose numbering in so many of the manuscripts. Furthermore, uncertainty often reigns over the question whether a writer is making direct or indirect use of the Tractatus. The sole pertinent reference in Anulo, Archbishop of Lyons, quotes from Tr. 53 as '50'. Prudentius of Troyes in De Praedestinione contra Ioan., sectum, quotes Tr. 27 and 53 by their standard numbers but Tr. 42 as '50'. Citations like these may well attest codices lacking Tr. 20-22, but we would be unwise to place any weight on such isolated references.

86. Wright, op. cit., p. 341. In a work reprinted by Florus by Charlier (see n. 32 above), Ps. Anulo, Augustini Sententiarum de Praedestinatione et Gratia 5 (PL 116, 132), he refers to Tr. 53 as 'sermo 51'. His Pauline Florilegium (see n. 31 above) numbers it '50'. This minor inconsistency may have many explanations, and in any case is no bar to the point we are making about Florus's usage.


88. E.g., Paschasti Raderarius, De Corpore et Sanguine Domini 6: 1 (PL 120, 1282), apparently alludes to Tr. 26, but the explicit reference in Migne's text is editorial, as the footnote shows in the new edition in CCL Cont. Med. 16, 34-35. But see below, p. 85. The same must hold for the several references in Kramannus, De Praestinatione, bks. 1, and 2, in PL 122. The identification of Tr. 26 as its source in De Corpore et Sanguine Domini 78 in PL 121, 160-161, is shown to be editorial in Bakhuizen van den Brink's edition (Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen Afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe reeks 61: 1 (Amsterdam, 1924)). Such instances could be multiplied.

89. Bernold of Constance (d. 1100), Apologeticus 15, cites Tr. 41 by the correct number, but Tr. 27 as XXIII omelia (a corruption of XXVIII) in Libellus de Vitanda Excommunicatorum Communione (MGH Libell. de Licit., II, p. 77: III, p. 600). The Liber Canonum against Henry IV passed by the synods of Mainz and Quedlinburg in A.D. 1085 quotes Tr. 27 correctly but 50 as XVIII (8, 15: ibid. 1, pp. 480, 488). These inconsistencies may well be due to second-hand quotation.

90. See above, n. 33.

91. De Praedestinatione 10, 13, 16 (PL 115, 1145, 1179, 1242). The Capitula de Tregunensi Episcopatu Proposita 9 from the French King Charles III (the Simple) in A.D. 1084 contains a quotation from Tr. 50 to 57 as omelia XVIII (d. 85). The Tractatus cited by Paulus of Limoges (d. 1043) in his Liber de Officiorum 6, ed. G. F. L.-V. (Paris, 1898), p. 300 (no. 290). Manegold of Lautenburg (d. after 1100) in his Liber de Gebhardtum 5, 37 (ibid. 1, pp. 319, 370) cites Tract. 98 as XVIII (sic; no doubt a corruption of 'XCVIII') and 88 as LXXXV.
Over against a tradition marked by the absence of these three Tractatus there are of course many early manuscripts in which they are found in their proper place with or without some other irregularity. The pre-sixteenth-century copies may be summarily listed: Berlin theol. lat. fol. 340; Rome, Vallicelli, A. 14 (plus S. 125, minus Tr. 18-19); Carlsruhe Aug. XLVII, and LXVII (ends with Incipit of Tr. 22); Stuttgart H.B. VII 17 (ends at 21: 12); Wolfenbüttel 4094; Lucca 21; St. Gallen 168, 169 (and 247, abbreviation of Tr. 1-18, 20); Oxford, Bodl. Laud. Misc. 139; Chartres 6; Florence S. Marco 644 (plus S. 125); Vatican 637 (extracts, order 20, 22, 23 ff.); Verona, C. J. XXXVI (plus S. 125, order 20, 21, 22 ff.); Vercelli XLVI; Fulda A. a. 3 (begins with 22 but to be taken together with Stuttgart H. B. VII 17 above). A mention should also be made of the Maurists' basic manuscript, a codex Fossatensis written c. A.D. 840 and according to the collations in Paris, B.N. lat. 11600 containing Tr. 20-22 in their standard position. From the tenth century onwards such regular exemplars increase in frequency. Numerically, they considerably outweigh those lacking Tr. 20-22 in every century.

The witness of the manuscripts to the presence of these three Tractatus is corroborated by the evidence of ecclesiastical writers:

Fulgensianus of Ruspae in a letter written probably in the third decade of the sixth century quotes from Tr. 22 and appears to imply its 'correct' position in the collection of expositions on John92.

Caecilius of Arles may possibly display dependence on Tr. 20 and 21 in his minor works De Mysterio S. Trinitatis93 and Breviarium adversus Haecreticos94, but the indications are not coercive and the wider influence of Augustine's writings may account for the parallels.

At the fifth session of the Lateran Synod of A.D. 649 convened by Pope Martin I a collection of patristic texts was read out that included a sentence from "Tr. 22: 13, Sancti Augustini... ex interpretatione evangelii secundum Ioannem in homilia vicesima secunda"95. (This collection was subsequently sent with Martin's encyclical letter in a Greek version to Constantinople, where it was read again at the seventh session of the sixth General Council in 681. At the tenth session the texts comprising the collection were subjected to scrutiny for authenticity, but the account of this procedure suggests that the Patriarchal library lacked a copy of the Tractatus96.
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We have invoked Bede in his Pauline florilegium as a witness to the absence of Tr. 20-22, but there are some grounds for thinking that in Homilies I: 23 (CCL 122, 160) he echoes Tr. 20 and perhaps also 21. Though the parallels by no means amount to incontrovertible evidence, they are probably nowhere more naturally explained as the result of dependence on these Tractatus. However, I am not yet fully persuaded on the point. The subject-matter of the Tractatus in this area overlaps to a considerable extent, and Bede's homily is dealing with John 5: 18 which Augustine expounds in Tr. 17. It is possible that dependence on this Tractatus and Bede's wider knowledge of Augustine afford an adequate explanation. Hence I do not consider it necessary to revise the conclusion that Bede used a manuscript lacking Tr. 20-22, though it is right to point out that the evidence on which it is based is theoretically open to other interpretations. Bede's florilegium cites Tr. 3 and 7 by their correct numbers, both as sermo, and fifteen others between Tr. 36 and 108 by numbers three less than normal, each as tractatus97. The numeration does not prove the absence of Tr. 20-22, though this remains to my mind the most obvious key to the discrepancy. But the difference of title must make us ask whether Bede did not utilize a composite manuscript or manuscripts which contained all the 124 Tractatus but somehow preserved a numbering arrangement suggestive of the loss of three of them. It is no more than a possibility but it cannot be entirely discounted.

Pope Hadrian I in a letter to Charlemagne in A.D. 797 quotes from Tr. 39 as libri XXXVIII super Ioannem98, which may reflect some minor irregularity but probably attests the presence of Tr. 20-22.

Paschasius Radbertus in a letter dated c. A.D. 856 introduces a lengthy quotation of Tr. 26 with the formula, "Item eiusdem beat Augustini in expositione beati Ioannis evangelistae sermones vigesimo sexto", which is firm evidence that his copy of the Tractatus had Tr. 20-22 in their usual place.

Finally, Aelfric of Eynsham, whose activity spans the latter decades of the tenth century and the first two decades of the eleventh, certainly had access to a regular copy of the Tractatus. Two of his homilies disclose respectively an unquestionable dependence on Tr. 21 and a possible use of Tr. 20100.

97. FRANSEN, op. cit., p. 60.
98. See n. 28 above.
100. Homilies of Aelfric: A Supplementary Collection, ed. J.C. POPE, vol. 1 and 2 (Early English Text Society, 239 and 260; Oxford, 1897, 1909); Homil. 256, lines 1-10 (vol. 2, pp. 756-757), depends on Tr. 21: 7, and Homil. 8, lines 190-202 (vol. 1, pp. 365-366, cf. p. 370), may possibly reveal knowledge of Tr. 20: 3. (Homil. 256 is actually one of three passages published by Pope which are additions to Aelfric's Catholic Homilies II: 25, ed. B. THORPE, The Homilies of the Anglo-Saxon Church, the First Part, Containing the Sermones Catholic, or Homilies of Aelfric, vol. 2, London, 1846, p. 368.)
We have no doubt omitted many writers prior to the eleventh century who may be presumed to have used complete copies of the Tractatus, but positive indications of the presence of Trr. 20-22 are lacking, i.e., neither is any of these three evidently cited nor are citations of later Tractatus furnished with numbers^{101}.

We will return to the task of interpreting this conflicting evidence concerning Trr. 20-22 after we have catalogued other manuscript irregularities in the same region of the Tractatus. In the meantime the absence of these three Tractatus can probably be traced back in the manuscript tradition at least to S. France, and to Lyons and Vienne in particular, and possibly even further south to the area of Lérins and Marseilles. The earliest witness to their omission is Bede, whose testimony concerning the Tractatus leads us back, so we have argued above, through the book-collating activities of Benedict Biscop to Rome or possibly southern France in the latter half of the seventh century. However, we have also seen that a copy of the Tractatus containing Trr. 20-22 is attested at Rome in A.D. 649 at the Lateran Council. Furthermore, the surviving witnesses to the loss of these Tractatus reveal no Italian connexions prior to the twelfth or thirteenth centuries. Our attention is therefore directed to the south of France. Not only did Benedict have early and repeated contact with Lyons, Bede also tells us that he increased his haul of codices at Vienne^{102}. The association of this tradition of the Tractatus with Lyons becomes explicit in Florus the Deacon in the first half of the ninth century, still earlier than any extant manuscript testimony, and is corroborated in Amalarius of Metz and probably also Amulo, archbishop of Lyons. It so happens that at least part of the Tractatus reached southern Gaul only a decade or so after the collection was completed. In the first recorded reference to the work John Cassian quotes Tr. 2 in his treatise against Nestorius written in A.D. 430-1^{103}. Now Benedict Biscop had received his monastic training at Lérins not far from Cassian's foundations at Marseilles. It is thus not impossible that the line of tradition omitting Trr. 20-22 extends back to this very early stage in the collection's history. Its subsequent diffusion as attested by Alcuin and the extant manuscripts is readily comprehensible on this basis, whether by way of Wearmouth-Jarrow and York to Alcuin's Carolingian centres on the continent or more directly from the Rhône valley. And of course Cassian's southern Gaul is no distance in time or space from Augustine's Hippo...

^{101} For citations in Prudentius of Tours see above p. 83 with n. 91. They are not open to confident interpretation one way or the other.


^{103} De Incarnatione Domini contra Nestorium 7: 27 (GSEL 17, 385-386). The quotation is introduced simply by Augustinus quidam.
The Epistle of the Council of Aachen to King Pippin (A.D. 836) cites Tr. 50 as "quadragesima octava." Since we are obviously dealing here with a predominantly French, even northern French, tradition, the former of these two references is probably more germane to our enquiry. Other citations mentioned above may also attest the currency of manuscripts with this irregularity, but the evidence is not clear.

There is more to be said about two of the three oldest exponents in this group, Paris, B.N. lat. 1599 and Orléans 161 (the Mauritii's Floriacensis). In the second part of the collection (they number

105. Ibid., p. 769.
106. Cf. nn. 88 and 90 above.

Tenth. These details are based on the Mauritii's collation of Orléans 161 in Paris, B.N. lat. 11660, ff. 161-221', where it appears as their codex 4. A letter of C. Daubin to P. W. Delfau (173/1765) on ff. 231a-228f. expands on the faults of the manuscript, and lists the number of lines missing from each Tractatus. (a) In the case of f. 104r the copyist originally omitted part of Tr. 28, as in the last few lines of ch. 5 to the first section of ch. 9, the continuation of which runs straight on to what is now f. 107. To make good the lacuna he inserted ff. 105-106 which contain the missing paragraphs. Half of f. 106 and the whole of f. 107 were not needed and left blank. (b) Tract. 122 ends four lines early with the words "...peremptores sedentes piscis." (c) Part of the omission, Sequitur de prando Domini cum isis septem discipulis, occurs as a title for Tr. 123 between "Incipit LX Nonus VIII" (on which the copyist knows nothing) and the Incipit proper, "Imo co ergo turo..." (The early ending of Tr. 122 is naturally paralleled in Orléans 161, but not, it seems, according to Paris, B.N. lat. 11660, the subsequent use of Sequitur de prando etc.).

(c) We have already taken brief note (see p. 66 above) of the variety of titles used in this manuscript (and in Orléans 161). The introductory designation is homoeitic, which persists until the end of Tr. 1. "Explicit homoeiticus III: Incipit quartus [sic]: III:..." Thereafter in the first half of the collection sermo predominates but homoeiticus is not forgotten; e.g., Tr. 20 ('10') begins as sermo, ends as homoeiticus. In part two, sermo is current as far as the beginning of Tr. 62, but from this point onwards the copyist holds the field to the end without any literal sermo, but not necessarily the true meaning of the word. (d) The numbering in the second half obviously occasioned some difficulties. Tr. 55-57 seem originally to have been as '53-55'(Tr. 54, the last in part one, is '52'). However, the erasure which later allowed them to be renumbered '5-7', presumably by the same copyist as that responsible for the beginning of Tr. 56. Subsequently the '1-70' numbering must have got slightly displaced, and corrections by the addition of 1 in each case are decipherable probably from the end of Tr. 75 ('21') to the commencement of Tr. 86 ('32'). On f. 210v after the end of Tr. 58 ('...the page is surprisingly blank; and f. 211' begins in large capital INCIPIT TRACTATVS QVADRAGESIMVS... "Word erasure looks much very like the (correct) QUINCTVS; at any rate a small 'V' is now visible above the gap. The absence of Tr. 109 should mean that Tr. 110-124 be numbered '55-69' instead of '56-70'. In fact from the end of Tr. 118 ('63') to the end of 122 ('67') alterations are apparent by the addition of 1 to an original '62-66'. The final number in the manuscript is the odd of all, LX Nonus VIII at the end of Tr. 122. The copyist originally wrote LX Nonus VII. This suggests that he must have been working from a copy which reflected the normal '1-70' of the complete second half, and on this occasion forgot to omit the 'correct' number for Tr. 123 before penning his own, doubly faulty, LX... VII., which was later, by himself or some later hand, corrected (with the exception of this manuscript) to LX... VIII. (In Paris, B.N. lat. 11660 many of the numbers for the Tractatus in part two of Orléans 161 from 15 (originally '14') to Tr. 69 have been altered by the original writer. No reason is apparent.)

It is quite clear now that Paris, B.N. lat. 1595 was the model, whether direct or indirect, for Orléans 161, and that the scribe of the Paris manuscript was himself responsible for the abridgement of the second half of the collection.
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'Tr. 1-70') they both omit passages from nearly every Tractatus. The exceptions are Tr. 55, 70, 71, 81, 82, 84, 90, 94. Tr. 109 is omitted entirely, and in each of at least four Tractatus (96, 97, 105, 124) a total of one or more lines are missing. It must be very probable, given the fact that these are the two oldest manuscripts in this group to contain Tr. 55-124 (Angers 175 only goes as far as Tr. 54), that others are also marked by these large-scale omissions. Two criteria for easy identification are quickly specified: Tr. 58 ('4') begins 'Nunc est ut haec Petrif...'; (58 : 2 line 3), and Tr. 109 is wholly absent.

I have noticed also that both these exponents together with Angers 175 and Paris, B.N. lat. 12194 give 'Notum est non rude est...'. "As the Incipit for Tr. 15 (editions: 'Non rude est...') which again I would expect to be common if not universal in manuscripts of this type. However, it was also found in the mid-nineteenth-century codex Fossatiensis used by the Mauritii (so the collation in Paris, B.N. lat. 11660, f. 289), which was otherwise a highly regular copy of the Tractatus.

THE TRANSLATION OF TRACTATUS 19 AND 20

At least seventeen manuscripts reverse the order and numbering of Tr. 19 and 20, but without omitting Trr. 21-22.

Vatican 637; IX; Rome; extracts only, but obviously drawn from a copy in which Tr. 19 and 20 were reversed.

Schaffhausen 18; XI; Schaffhausen
Graz 397; XII; Seckau
London, B.M. Addit. 10936; XII; Halberstadt
Munich 2356; XI; Aldersbach
Munich 4757; XII; Benediktbeuern
Munich 9540; XII; Oberaltach
Munich 15807; XII; Salzburg
Munich 21512; XII; Weihenstephan
In 1. Florence tions once only Tr. be their they also fall into in order presence the after For entire having text goes. 

Despite its wide dissemination in the eleventh and subsequent centuries in the regions of S. Germany, this peculiarity cannot be regarded as having originated there. It also cannot be considered from the group of manuscripts which not only reverse these two Tractatus but also omit Trr. 21-22. In turn this twofold irregularity cannot be entirely separated from the omission of Trr. 20-22.

THE INCLUSION OF Sermo 125

Some fifty manuscripts of the Tractatus insert Sermo 125 (PL 38, 688-698) after Tr. 17. This is not the place to present a full study of S. 125, which is not known to have survived in any manuscript outside the Tractatus, but some time can usefully be spent capitalizing upon its presence in order to further our classification of the manuscripts of the Tractatus. For not only do these fifty or so exemplars form a group apart, they also fall into two main sub-groups according to two different Incipits. (No manuscript has yet revealed the Maurists' Incipit, which must be their own emendation. It will shortly be referred to again).

Incipit A: Haec auribus et cordibus vestris nota sunt reparant tamen dicentis effectum

Manuscripts with this or a very similar Incipit nearly always number S. 125 as '18' (or one more than the preceding number if for some reason Tr. 17 is numbered otherwise), and continue with Trr. 18 ff. as '19' ff. In these manuscripts the Tractatus are regularly called homilias or sermones, only once Tractatus. Even within this main group there are some deviations to take note of, and hence sub-division is necessary.

1. Florence S. Marco 644 ; x ; Incipit sermo XVIII De eadem re
   Florence S. Marco 619 ; x ; Incipit sermo XVIII
   Madrid 193 ; x ; Incipit XXVIII (sic) De eadem lectione (dicentis vel audientis)
   Florence 16 dext. 4 ; xi ; De eadem lectione homelia XVIII (dicentis vel audientis)
   Florence 16 dext. 5 ; xi ; Incipit sermo XVIII

2. Florence Fesul. 7 ; xv ; S. 125 is De eadem lectione homelia, with no number ; Tr. 17 is '19', 18 is '20' (dicentis vel audientis effectum)

3. London, B.M. Burney 291 ; xii ; Trr. 18-19 are missing ; S. 125 is xv ; Tr. 17 begins correctly, ends as XIII (dicentis vel audientis)

4. Vatican S. Pietro C 96 ; xii-xiii ; Homelia XVII ex eadem lectione (tamen audientis effectum). The order is Tr. 17 ('16'), S. 125 ('17'), Tr. 20 ('18'), 19 ('21'), 19 ('22'), 21 ('23'), etc.; i.e., numbers 19 and 20 are not used.

5. Naples VI.C.20 ; xii ; Incipit sermo XX (Tr. 17 is XVIII). Incipit: Haec nec auribus nec cordibus vestris ignota sunt reparant tamen audientis effectum. This Incipit forms a kind of bridge to that of the second main group of manuscripts (cf. Prague, Univ. VI. C. 17 below), but for obvious geographical reasons should be regarded as a refinement of type A.
Incipit B: Nec auribus nec cordibus vestris repartant tamen audientis affectum...

Most manuscripts displaying this Incipit present S. 125 without a separate number, and sometimes as the continuation or second half of Tr. 17 without a break of any kind. Many copies omit TrR. 18 and 19 (cf. under type A. 3 above London, B.M. Burney 291 and Naples VLB.17), while others are irregular in other respects, so that again we must sub-divide. Where no contrary indication is given, S. 125 appears unnumbered.

1. Manuscripts omitting TrR. 18 and 19, and numbering TrR. 20 ff. as '18' ff.

Rome, Vallicell. A. 14; VIII/IX; De eadem lectione... Explicit [omelia] XVII
Florence 14 dext. 5; X; De eadem lectione... Explicit homelia XV (which is the number of Tr. 17)
Paris, B.N. lat. 8912; XIII. Sermo de eadem lectione... Explicit omelia XVII
Berlin theol. lat. fol. 675; X; De eadem lectione... Explicit XIV
Heiligenkreuz 10; XI; originally no numbers at all, beginning of S. 125 marked solely by initial capital; later, [Omelia] XVIII.
Klosterneuburg 26; XI; Item unde supra... Explicit omelia XVI (the number of Tr. 17). A corrector has inserted above the line nota sunt after vestris and divers vel after audientis.
Paris, B.N. lat. 1564; XII; Item in eodem, De usitate et acuaptitudine patris et filii... [Nec auribus nec [sic] cordibus vestris reparing tantum audientis]... Explicit XVII. (Both TrR. 21 and 22 are '19'.)
Zwettl 19; XII; S. 125 is numbered separately, Incipit [omelia] XVIII
Prague, Univ. V.C. 174; XV; Item unde supra sequitur... [Hec (? Nec] auribus... vestris ignota sunt quae tradanta sunt repartant... affectum]... Explicit omelia XVI (number of Tr. 17)
Bruno A. 9; XV; De omelia ut supra... Explicit omelia decima VI (number of Tr. 17)
Klosterneuburg 27; XV; Item unde supra... Explicit omelia XVI (number of Tr. 17)
London, B.M. Addit. 18313; A.D. 1466; De eadem lectione... Explicit omelia XVI (number of Tr. 17)
Merkel 354; XV; Item unde supra... (affectum)... Explicit Omelia XVI (number of Tr. 17)
Naples VI. D. 3; A.D. 1500; no numbers (Ei auribus...)

According to a letter received from M. Kostliková, Prague, Kapit. A. 73/6 (XIV) lacks not only TrR. 18-19 but also 21. S. 125 forms the second part of Tr. 17 ('16') and is followed by 20 and 22, which makes it unparalleled. Also to be included here is a manuscript from Carcassonne Cathedral which was one of the Maurists' two authorities for S. 125:

The Manuscripts of the "Tract. In Evang. IOH." De eadem lectione... (affectum)

Their other base was the edition by Jacques Sirmond from a codex belonging to St. Vincent's Abbey, Metz, which in default of evidence to the contrary we may presume to have been a copy of the Tractatus. Sirmond's Incipit is different again: Nec auribus nec cordibus vestris repartant, tamen audientis... We have no way of knowing whether this represents Sirmond's emendation, though the absence of this precise Incipit, and especially the word "vestris", from all the extant manuscripts undoubtedly suggests it does. The Maurists certainly indulged in emendation and produced: Nec auribus nec cordibus vestris repartant: repartant tamen audientis affectum...

Several manuscripts of Incipit B do not lack TrR. 18-19 but display some rearrangement in their position:

2. Three have the order Tr. 17, S. 125 (in each case as Sermo XVIII), TrR. 18, 20, 21, 19, 22 ff.:

Verona, Capit. XXXVI; IX; (Tr. 20 is unnumbered, De eadem lectione)
Modena, Capit. O.III.14; XI; (TrR. 20 again unnumbered, but an earlier XVIII (S XCVIII) seems to have been erased)
Cesena D. III. 3; XV.

3. Two manuscripts place TrR. 18-19 between 20 and 27:

Paris, B.N. lat. 17391; XII; S. 125 is the latter part of Tr. 17 (Item de eadem lectione... Explicit omelia XVII, 20 is '18', '18 unnumbered (Incipit alia de eadem lectione), 19 as 18 again (Item alia incipit de ea quod... Explicit XVII), 21 as 19).

Porto 13; XIII; original arrangement and numbering was: 17 (Sermo XVII), S. 125 (Sermo XVIII), 20 (XVIII), 18 (unnumbered), 19 (XVIII), 21 (unnumbered and untitled), 22 (Explicit homilia XX), etc. One or more 'correctors' have created such confusion that Tr. 17, hitherto correct, is now XVIII, four items are each numbered XVIII, none is XX and TrR. 22 is XXI.


109. S. Aurelii Augustini... Sermone Novo numero XL (Paris, 1631), pp. 170-193 (no. 15) and notes, unpaginated, at fin. The study of P. Dupont-Cinque, "A propos des éditions parisiennes de la Motte-Réforme," Les "Sermônes de la Typographie Vaticane," in Recherches Augustinienes, vol. 4 (Paris, 1966), pp. 199-215, throws much light on Simond's discovery of unpublished Augustinian sermons, but is unable to identify the manuscript from which he drew Sermo 125 (see pp. 231-233, 236-237). The quite plausible suggestion that Simond consulted the codex S. Vincentii Metensis at the College of Clermont proves more fruitful in locating its present whereabouts, if it is still extant. To this study I owe the information that all but one of Simond's forty new sermons of 1631 had previously been published against his wishes as an appendix to volume 10 (the Sermone) of the Paris edition of the Opera Omnia of Augustin in 1614, where S. 125 appears as the third sermon on pp. 390-393. I have been unable to gain access to the 1614 edition in Edinburgh.
4. One codex has the order 18, 20, 19, 21:
   Paris, B.N. lat. 16850; xi; S. 125 is [Omenia] XVIII de eadem lectione.  

5. Another has 18 and 19 between 23 and 24:
   Vich 27; xi; S. 125 is the second part of Tr. 17, De eadem lectione...
   (audientes)... Explicit homelia XVII. See further n. 125 below.

6. Finally, three manuscripts with Incipit B have no omission at all:
   Monte Cassino 21 ER; xi; De eadem lectione. Ubi ait... (audientes)... 
   Explicit Tractatus XVII
   Vatican 483; xi; S. 125 numbered separately as [Sermo] XVIII ut supra.
   Charleville 246B; xi; S. 125 numbered separately as [Sermo] XVIII 
   de eadem lectione (Later both Tr. 21 and 22 are '22').

One further feature of manuscripts containing S. 125 deserves to be 
mentioned. In nearly all of those which are also marked by the omission 
of Tr. 18-19, Tr. 21 has the Incipit Oma potiusus facultate tracticumus, 
i.e., lacking the first seven words. Of eighteen manuscripts at present 
known to have this Incipit, all but one (Lisbon Alcob. 402) include S. 125, 
and of these seventeen all apart from Naples VI.B.17 belong to the B 
group. Indeed, all of the B group manuscripts lacking Tr. 18-19 have 
this feature, except for Prague, Kapit. A. 73/6, which apparently lacks 
Tr. 21 altogether (see above). One of the two A group manuscripts 
lacking Tr. 18-19, Naples VI.B.17, also presents this beginning for Tr. 21. 
Only four of the eighteen (Lisbon Alcob. 402; Modena, Kapit. O.III.14; 
Porto 13; Vich 27) contain Tr. 18-19, and only one of them, Lisbon 
Alcob. 402, puts them in their standard position. The eighteen are:

   Berlin theol. lat. fol. 675  
   Brno A. 9  
   Florence 14 dext. 5  
   Heiligenkreuz 10  
   Klosterneburg 26  
   Klosterneburg 27  
   Lisbon Alcob. 402  
   London, B.M. Addit. 18313  
   Modena, Kapit. O.III.14  
   Naples VI.B.17  
   Naples VI.D.3  
   Paris, B.N. lat. 1964

110. The subsequent numbering is very careless: Tr. 18 begins as '19', ends as 
   '18'; 20 is '19'; 19 begins as '20', ends as '21'; ... 23 begins as '24', ends as 
   '21'; 24 is '22', etc.


Paris, B.N. lat. 8912  
Porto 13  
Prague, Univ. V.I.C.17  
Rome, Vallicell. A.14  
Vich 27  
Zwettl 19

The task of introducing some order into the profusion of this widely 
diffused and variegated branch of the tradition must be attempted on 
another occasion. It will require above all the art of a detective. For 
the present it must suffice to state boldly that it is a markedly Italian 
tradition, and to speculate whether Bishop Deodatus, the founder of 
St. Vincent's Abbey, Metz, was not an early agent of its diffusion. From 
his journeys in Italy in the latter part of the tenth century he 
brought back many codices to stock the new Abbey's library. Verona 
supplied a good number, such as Berlin Philippus 1676, Bishop Eginus's copy of 
Alan of Farfa's homiliary. The ninth-century manuscript Verona, 
Kapit. XXXVI is proof that a copy of the Tractatus containing S. 125 
was to be found there at the time of Deodatus's visit.  

POSSIBLE CAUSES OF THE IRREGULARITIES 
IN THE REGION OF Tractatus 17-23

It remains to ask how we may explain the diverse disorder in so many 
manuscripts in this particular sector of the collection. It is a tantalizing 
question whose answer admits of little more than speculation and guess-
work. We begin with the omission of Tr. 20-22. In my earlier study 
I tentatively proposed that this feature might derive from one original 
copy of the Tractatus, on the twofold grounds that these three sermons 
not only are absent from some early manuscripts, both extant and attes-
ted by mediaeval writers, but also do not belong to the sequence of 
Augustine's Johannine expositions at this point. After doubting 
for a time the viability of this explanation, I am disposed to advance 
it again as a genuine possibility. Reasons for connecting the tradition 
marked by this omission with southern Gaul as early as the middle of 
the seventh century, and perhaps even two centuries earlier in the age 
of John Cassian, have been expounded above. If valid, this reasoning 
would of necessity imply that the unambiguous testimony of both Ful-
gentius and the Lateran Synod of A.D. 649 to the presence of Tr. 22 in 
their copies of the Tractatus relates to another branch of the tradition and 
do not involve us in placing the disappearance of Tr. 22 after A.D. 
649.

111. The only copy of the Tractatus known to have belonged to St. Vincent's is 
Berlin Philippus 1662 from Fulda. No extant catalogue of St. Vincent's lists a copy 
of the Tractatus.

It is difficult to believe that the absence of Trr. 20-22 from certain early manuscripts is unconnected with the fact that they constitute a trio of sermons separate from the rest of Trr. 1-54. If these two circumstances were unrelated, we would be confronted by a remarkable coincidence of irregularities and would surely be pardoned for misreading its significance. In this context it must be clearly established that although our different modern designations for them effectively disguise the point, Tractatus 20-22 and Sermo 125 belong to precisely the same category. Both are sermons on passages in John's Gospel which were not preached in the series of consecutive, if interrupted, preaching that we know as Tractatus 1-54, and yet both have survived solely in manuscripts of the Tractatus.

Both cover ground that the regular sequence of sermons also covered: Tr. 17 and S. 125 both expound John 5:1-18, and the two trios of Tr. 18-19 + 23 and Trr. 20-22 both expound John 5:30-47 (Tr. 23 also runs quickly through John 5:31-47). Any future edition of the Tractatus should at least include S. 125 in an appendix, and it would not be inappropriate to rename it Tractatus 17A. Of course it cannot be denied that Trr. 20-22 and S. 125 appear to stand in quite different relations to the Tractatus as far as the manuscript tradition is concerned. For the circumstances that apparently demand explanation are the omission of the former, but the insertion of the latter. Further reflection, however, shows that the contrast is an elusive one. For if an explanation is to be sought for the omission of Trr. 20-22, one is also required for their prior, even 'original', insertion. They disappeared from a position to which they never really belonged. Indeed, it may well transpire that they never belonged at all to one form of the collection and hence cannot be described as having disappeared or dropped out. Their absence would then be one not of omission but of non-inclusion.

In what follows the discussion revolves around three factors:

(i) the division of the whole collection of the Tractatus into three or more codices;

(ii) the overlapping of the subject-matter dealt with in Tractatus 18-23 (and Tr. 17 and S. 125);

(iii) chronological breaks in Augustine's preaching in this area of the Tractatus.

These are all factors which have a possible bearing upon the origins of the disorder we have encountered, and particularly the absence of Trr. 20-22. They all relate, though not with equal force, both to the very beginnings of the tradition in Augustine's own library at Hippo and to any subsequent stage at which irregularities may have entered in. They are essentially complementary; their validity in any attempted explanation of the irregularities is bound to be cumulative.

Possidius knew it in six codices (1). (Nowhere else in the Indulcium does he specify the number of manuscripts a work occupied, even for more extensive ones like the City of God and the Enarrationes in Psalmos). One can hardly regard the use of six codices as necessitated by the size of the collection. Nevertheless they may conceivably have been of roughly equal dimensions in which case the end of the second would have occurred somewhere in the region we are considering. We can but speculate. But since the omission or intrusion of tractatus or sermons is most likely to have taken place at the beginning or end of codices, the fact of division could be highly significant. For instance, the omission of Trr. 20-22 is intelligible as the result of bringing together a codex containing Trr. 1-19 and another comprising Trr. 23-34. It must be immediately admitted that no exemplars attesting dividing-lines at precisely these points, i.e. between 19 and 20, and 22 and 23, have survived or are mentioned in mediaeval catalogues. Nevertheless, as we saw above in discussing threefold divisions of the Tractatus, divisions occur at several different points, and in particular between 21 and 22, 23 and 24, and 24 and 25. There is sufficient fluidity for other possibilities not to be ruled out. Indeed, the undoubted variation in the dividing-line is grist to my mill, for it asserts the currency of codices perhaps calling themselves pars prima and pars secunda which if brought together would not in many cases comprise the whole of Trr. 1-54. The resulting loss of one or more tractatus would be made all the easier if Trr. 1-54 originally contained no numeration, which I am coming to consider a distinct possibility, especially if they were preached over a span of many years. (We will develop this suggestion below, in considering the third of the factors I have proposed). The sequence of the lections supplies its own order, so that a system of numeration is certainly not essential. Furthermore, if Augustine's 'master copy' embodied the numbering from 1 to 54, it becomes less easy to conceive of omissions and transpositions in the transmission. However, we need not place any great impor-

---

113. Zwingli, op. cit., pp. 124-125, suggests that the six codices each contained one of the six series of sermons into which he believes that L. Bonnardière, with the assistance of the present writer, has dissolved the Tractatus, viz., Tr. 11:12; 13:16; 17-19 and 21; 20-22; 24-54. This attractive theory is, however, not without its weaknesses. In my judgment L. Bonnardière has failed to prove a break between Tr. 23 and 24 (see p. 104 below with n. 123), and it must be doubted whether Tr. 13-16 constitute a group distinct enough to warrant a separate codex. According to L. Bonnardière, they follow Tr. 12 after an interval of less than four months, and Tr. 11-12 themselves span a period of five months. Nevertheless, Zwingli's proposals seem to me to be along the right lines, and incidentally provide him with a simple explanation for the omission of Trr. 20-22, viz., that the codex containing solely these three sermons never featured in one branch of the transmission of the Tractatus, or in other terms (see p. 95 above) one 'original edition' lacked Trr. 20-22.
A simple analysis of the way John 5 is dealt with will put the point beyond doubt.

\[ \text{Tr. 17: vv. 1-18} \]
\[ \text{S. 125: vv. 1-18} \]
\[ \text{Tr. 18: v. 19 (in intention; little of the Tr. actually deals with it)} \]
\[ \text{Tr. 19: vv. 19-30 (Augustine aimed to return to v. 19 after expounding the rest of the lection but left himself no time to do so)} \]
\[ \text{Tr. 20: v. 19} \]
\[ \text{Tr. 21: vv. 20-23} \]
\[ \text{Tr. 22: vv. 24-30} \]
\[ \text{Tr. 23: vv. 31-47 (briefly), 19 and finally a quick run through 20-30.} \]
\[ \text{Tr. 24: ch. 6: 1-14} \]

It is undeniable that the loss of Tr. 20-22 causes no difficulty, but rather removes considerable awkwardness. The same would be true of S. 125 if it had originally belonged to the series but was subsequently omitted. If this remains improbable, the fortunes of Tr. 20-22 and S. 125 present a curious contrast. The former's omission removed duplication, the latter's insertion produced it. Not surprisingly, therefore, the two features are never found together in one manuscript.

What has just been said about the omission of Tr. 20-22 applies with scarcely less force to the omission of any one or two of them. It would have taken an extremely shrewd reader or copyist to discern the anomalous situation resulting from the presence of only one or two of the interpolated trio at Tractatus, while on the other hand the loss of any one of them reduced the degree of duplication.

Even the transposition of Tr. 19 and 20 effects some tidying up, as a glance at the above analysis will demonstrate. When it is unaccompanied by any other change its contribution is admittedly limited, but when it occurs together with the omission of Tr. 21 and 22 it produces a sequence of exposition which, except for the persistent difficulty of John 5:19, no longer involves Augustine in doubling back on his tracks.

The intrusion of S. 125 cannot be understood in these terms at all. Hence it would not be consistent to claim that the omission of Tr. 18 and 19, which in several manuscripts accompanies S. 125 but is never found without it, also decreases the element of repetition and has no adverse effects.

Thus all the irregularities that mark the manuscripts in this region of the Tractatus, except for the inclusion of S. 125, possess the character

---

114. See n. 186 below, and also n. 125.
of improving upon the order of Augustine’s exposition as represented by the regular sequence of Trr. 17-23. In itself, this consideration, on the principle of lectio difficilior, might appear to be proof of their secondary nature, were it not that the problem each of them at least partly resolves is caused by the presence of Trr. 20-22, which is itself in a real sense a secondary feature. And if duplication in the original is tolerated here, why not also between Tr. 17 and Tr. 17A (= S. 125)? Nevertheless, it has to be admitted that this section of our argument not only explains how an omission or transposition caused by some other factor could have gone unnoticed, but also raises the possibility that a perceptive copyist could have felt justified in producing such an omission or transposition. This would provide a very simple explanation of the loss of Trr. 20-22, for these are the three sermons a copyist working through Tr. 17 would most naturally omit, as a cursory glance at the above analysis quickly reveals. Yet this is an explanation which I find too simple to be fully satisfying.

(111) Chronological breaks in Augustine’s preaching in this area of the «Tractatus»

Here we take up consideration of the implications of Mlle La Bonnardière’s and M. Berrouard’s dating of the Tractatus, which embody the conviction that previous attempts to date the collection have focussed on the persistent refusal to allow that Augustine produced them “par fragments”. If, as seems to us almost undeniable, the Tractatus were thus composed in segments over a period of several years, it is a priori likely that such groups of Tractatus would have found their way into Augustine’s library in separate codices.

But before we apply this reasoning to the problems of Trr. 17-23, a further note about Trr. 55-124 is in order in this context. We have argued above, in agreement with other students of the issue, that the numeration ‘1-70’ goes back to the library at Hippos. Now La Bonnardière placed Trr. 1-16 in the years 406-7 and the rest in or after the year 418. This would mean that Tr. 1-16 and 17-54, which were separated by more than a decade, have somehow received a consecutive numeration, while Trr. 17-54 and 55-124, which on this explanation were probably all produced within three or four years,116 have been allotted separate numbering systems. If Trr. 17-54 could thus be regarded as the conclusion of a series broken off in mid-course eleven or twelve years earlier, while Trr. 55-124 were evidently distinguished from the thirty-seven (or thirty-four) sermons delivered in the previous three or four years, then we have a weighty indication that the separate numeration ‘1-70’ reflects some difference of origin or genre between Trr. 55-124 and the earlier sermons. This evidence does not of course define the nature of the difference between the two parts of the collection; it merely confirms what is strongly suspected on other grounds, that such a difference truly exists. In case it should seem that this line of reasoning depends on too many assumptions, we must spell out clearly that the only assumption it requires is one for which evidence is not lacking, namely, that Trr. 55-124 were either numbered ‘1-70’ in Augustine’s library or demarcated from Trr. 1-54 in such a way that the introduction of this numbering ensued at an early stage thereafter. It does not necessitate any particular belief about the numeration of Trr. 1-54; they may originally have lacked numbers altogether.

However, if Berrouard’s revised dating of Tr. 17-19 and 23-54 is accepted, the argument of the preceding paragraph loses much of its force but is not entirely nullified. Berrouard agrees with La Bonnardière in placing Trr. 1-16 in 406-7, but brings Trr. 17-54, with the exception of Trr. 20-22, forward to 414. As he has not yet pronounced on the date of Trr. 55-124, it is too early to say whether he has finally opened up a gap of several years between Trr. 54 and 55, but this is certainly a consequence of combining his dating for Tr. 17-19 and 23-54 with La Bonnardière’s for Trr. 55-124. Trr. 17-19 and 23-54 thus came to occupy a year roughly equidistant between Trr. 1-16 and Trr. 55-124. This set of circumstances undoubtedly weakens the above argument which contrasts in the case of Trr. 17-54 and Trr. 55-124 temporal proximity of origin with separate systems of numeration, but in so far as Trr. 17-54, even on Berrouard’s showing, were delivered as long after Trr. 1-54 as Trr. 55-124 were after Trr. 17-54, the argument retains some of its validity.

The possibility voiced above that Trr. 1-54 may originally have lacked numeration altogether pinpoints the type of question raised by their composition in separate blocks, in relation to the circumstances and manner in which the blocks were brought together to form one collection.117.

116. La Bonnardière, op. cit., does not fix a terminus ad quem for Trr. 55-124 but appears to incline towards a date soon after A.D. 421; cf. pp. 87, 117, 140-141.

117. Zwingli’s study is of relevance in this connection. He shows (op. cit., pp. 126-129) on the basis of La Bonnardière’s dating of the Tractatus that they implement only to a very limited extent the principle of lectio continua, the importance of which in Augustine’s preaching has been much exaggerated. He also points out (pp. 124-125) that Possidius lists the Tractatus in a category which includes in addition only the Enarrationes in Psalms, distinguishing between the dictated and the preached Enarrationes, while the Tractatus on John’s First Epistle appear elsewhere among the Tractatus Diversi (Enarrationes XIX. 1-5, 114; 204; 294; 295; 394. August. vol. II, pp. 181-184, 204). The juxtaposition of the Tractatus on the Gospel and the Enarrationes Zwingli attributes to Possidius’s recognition that like the latter the former were ‘ein Sammelwerk’. It is not only the absence of a title for Possidius’s category comprising these two collections that casts some doubt upon this explanation, but also the difference in the size of the Enarrationes. The Tractatus are less parallel among Augustine’s homiletic output. From this standpoint the ten sermons on I John rightly belong elsewhere, and no doubt appropriately to a category that also includes a short series of sermons on Genesis and other small tracts like De epiphanea tractatus septem...per vigillias paschae tractatus viginti itres (Enarrationes XV. 58-62,
La Bonnardière divides Tr. 1-54 into three segments, 1-16 dated in A.D. 406-7, 17-23 probably in 418-9, and 24-54 in 419-20 or 420-1. If this reconstruction is correct, it means that in 418 or 419 after more than a decade had elapsed since Tr. 16, Augustine preaches Tr. 17 without the slightest hint that he was resuming the consecutive exposition of John's Gospel. The opening of Tr. 17 contains no backward or forward reference. This contrasts markedly with his forceful reminder at the start of Tr. 13 of his previous sermon on John which he had had to discontinue on embarking upon the exposition of John's First Epistle during the Easter Octave. La Bonnardière calculates the interval between Tr. 12 and 13 as less than two months. A similar backward reference at the beginning of Tr. 15 suggests a lapse of time since Tr. 14, but according to La Bonnardière it can only have been a fortnight or at most a month. No doubt in preaching Tr. 17 Augustine could not expect his congregation to recall sermons delivered ten years earlier, but his sudden unexplained resumption is still rather odd. The difficulty is scarcely eased by Berrouard’s date of 414 for the series of sermons beginning with Tr. 17, for the interval since Tr. 16 is still one of seven years. Do we envisage Augustine checking up among his manuscripts?

170-175: Misc. Augst., vol. II, pp. 195, 205. If Possidius was aware of the diversity among the Tractatius, it is surprising that he has failed to indicate it, even in terms of the distinction between dictation and preaching he applies to the Enarrationes. Zwingle’s further suggestion that the bringing together of the sections of the Tractatius should be thought of as analogous to the collection of the Enarrationes into one corpus raises some interesting questions. How did Possidius know which Enarrationes had been preached and which dictated? Was an index or inventory available? Certainly Augustine possessed a catalogue of his works which Possidius used (cf. Wilmart, Misc. Augst., vol. II, pp. 158-160). Does this then preclude the possibility that Possidius’s description of the Enarrationes reflects the circumstances in which he found them in the library at Hippo, i.e. still in sections according to their diverse origins and not arranged after the order of the Psalms? This state of affairs is no doubt rather unlikely, for the numbering of the Psalms afforded the easiest and most obvious methods of arrangement. Likewise the Tractatius would arrange themselves in accordance with the Gospel text (except in the case of the slight difficulty over Tr. 20-22) without the need for any additional enumeration. Thus Possidius’s sex codices probably indicates that his examination of the Tractatius revealed their lack of a continuous enumeration, and in this respect they were like the Enarrationes. (It should not be forgotten that on several Psalms, most notably Ps. 118 (119), Augustine produced more than one Enarratio, so that if the individual Enarrationes were to be numbered consecutively they would total many more than 310). But if Possidius’s description of sex codices suggests to us that the Tractatius also in being ‘ein Sammelwerk’, it is doubtful whether Possidius was aware of this further similarity.

118. Op. cit., pp. 52-53. It must be mere coincidence that in two early or mid-ninth-century codices, Wurzburg M. p. t. 74 and Munich 6287, both probably from Freising, pass prima comprises only Tr. 1-13, while the tenth-century Lorsch catalogue lists at that point only twelve Tractatius, presumably 1-22. But see n. 112 above.

119. Ibid., pp. 36, 53. Among early manuscripts Salzburg a VII 33 (xxi) alone begins with Tr. 15.

120. Rondet, in RSJ 53 (1965), pp. 655-657, believes that La Bonnardière’s dating of Tr. 17-124 needs to be revised. He suggests a date a year or two earlier.

121. Op. cit., pp. 117-119 n. 1. Augustine’s reference in Tr. 22:10 to Incarna illa in the church suggested both to the Maurists (PL 35, 1570 n. 46) and to Tillemont, op. cit., p. 171 n. 7, that it was preached in September or October of the year 419. Both authorities swallowed their surmises because Tr. 22 was obviously delivered on August 10 (St. Lawrence). La Bonnardière’s dating (p. 108) places Tr. 17-23 between Easter and August, which would require some revision for Tr. 20-22 if the suspicions of the Maurists and Tillemont were after all correct. Zwingle, op. cit., p. 119, suggests very interestingly that Tr. 20-22 were preached to the Hippo congregation at large but Tr. 17-19 and 23 to a more restricted and better instructed audience, perhaps consisting largely of clergy, monks and nuns. If this was the case, then in the light of the same writer’s claims for the rest of Tr. 17-14 in this regard, it is Tr. 17-19 and 23, not Tr. 20-22, that should be treated as constituting the insertion. This would mean, however, that John 5:1-18 (Tr. 17) and 31-47 (expounded, albeit briefly, only in Tr. 23) never featured in the ongoing exposition of the Gospel to the normal mixed congregation of the Christian community at Hippo (see the analysis on p. 99 above). Zwingle’s account of the duplication of coverage between Tr. 18, 19 and 23 and Tr. 20-22 is also inconsistent with Berrouard’s recent study, which shows, in my mind convincingly, that Tr. 17-19 and 23 belong with Tr. 24-54 in one series of sermons, and argues that Tr. 20-22 were delivered a few years later. Zwingle does not of course consider what kind of audience is reflected in Sermo 125, which like Tr. 17 expounds John 5:1-18. The exordium immediately suggests a body of hearers well-versed in the Scriptures, or at least in Augustine’s expository sermons, but there is no indication, except...
at length and with persuasive force that *Tr* 20-22 reflect a more advanced stage in Augustine's controversy with Arrianism than the parallel exposition of *John 5:19-30* in *Tr* 18, 19 and 23, and has assigned their production to the years 418-9, soon after *Contra Sermones Arianorum* but four or five years later than the same writer's date of 414 for *Tr* 17-19 and 23-54. If Bonnardière's conclusions are sound, then the first half of the collection would have been complete, in the sense that *Tr* 1-19 and 23-54 provide an exposition of the whole of *John 1-12*, some years before *Tr* 20-22 were delivered. Thus one could regard *Tr* 1-19 and 23-54 as constituting the original 'editio' or 'version' of the first part of the corpus, and a genuine possibility emerges that this version could have enjoyed some circulation before *Tr* 20-22 were even preached, let alone inserted into their present position between *Tr* 19 and 23.

There is no inherent improbability in this suggestion that *Tr* 1-19, with or without *Tr* 20-22, were known and read outside Augustine's library even before *Tr* 55-124 were composed. Indeed, the separate numeration of *Tr* 55-124 and the frequency of manuscripts containing only one half of the collection speak in its favour. Furthermore, such public knowledge of *Tr* 1-19 alone could easily have led to requests for the completion of the exposition of the Gospel and thus to the production of *Tr* 55-124 (see further n. 68 above). Of course the separate circulation of *Tr* 1-19 does not of itself argue the absence of *Tr* 20-22. It merely renders more likely the possibility, given the datings proposed by Berrouard, that an 'original edition' of the *Tractatus* lacked only *Tr* 55-124 but also *Tr* 20-22.

The next point of division in La Bonnardière's dating scheme falls between *Tr* 23 and 24, which again is of no obvious assistance in explaining the disorder prior to *Tr* 23. But elsewhere we have already seriously questioned whether the evidence justifies a break between 23 and 24, and have been confirmed in our doubts by Berrouard's recent demonstration that *Tr* 17-19 and 23 belong closely with *Tr* 24-54 as one series of sermons.

But if most of the details of these proposed chronological divisions do not correspond precisely to the manuscript dislocations, it remains true that the chief area of discontinuity in the first half of the *Tractatus* is almost exactly the same both in the manuscript tradition and in the

peripatetic in the last paragraphs, that the bishop might be addressing a gathering of spirituales. La Bonnardière, op. cit., p. 118 n., put forward the very tentative proposal that the two sets of sermons on *John 5:19-30*, *Tr* 18, 19 and 23 and *Tr* 20-22, were preached in different places.

122. *La date* (op. cit.), pp. 140-141, 146-150, 164.
123. La Bonnardière, op. cit., pp. 87-88, 104-105, 117; Wright, in *JTS* n.s. 17 (1966), p. 185; Berrouard, *La date*, pp. 121-135. The reason given by La Bonnardière, pp. 87-88, for treating *Tr* 24-54 as a separate group leads logically to the inclusion of *Tr* 17-23 as well, as she shows on p. 105.

**THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE "TRACT. IN EVANG. IOH."**

...
transposition of Tr. 19 and 20 together with the omission of 21 and 22 could have resulted from the correction of a copy lacking Tr. 20-22 from one which had only Tr. 1-20. For the obvious place for Tr. 20 is before Tr. 19 and not after it, according to the analysis of contents given above. Then the transposition of 19 and 20 unaccompanied by any other irregularity would be explicable as resulting from a subsequent final correction in terms of the replacement of 21 and 22. We may well be on the right track if we allow for the possibility that attempts to (re-)introduce one or more of Tr. 20-22 caused disorder, simply because their absence occasioned no obvious lacuna for them to (re-)occupy. There is some evidence in the manuscripts to support this hypothesis. And there is always the chance that a抄isten has tidied the order and coverage of Augustine’s exposition, for instance, by transposing Tr. 19 and 20.

All the well-attested irregularities produce a smoother continuity in this area.

**DISTINCTIVE TYPES OF TEXT?**

This article has established some clearly distinguishable branches of the manuscript tradition of the Tractatus, branches which are not easily correlated with the three classes of manuscript generally identified, namely, French and Belgian (Louvain and Maurist editions), Italian, and German. For if the inclusion of S. 125 at its earliest recognizable point in and subsequent centuries belongs to the Italian tradition, the omission of Tr. 20-22 has at an early stage quite widespread connexions. Similarly, although the French and Belgian group of exemplars has come to be regarded as textually uniform, the oldest French manuscript, Paris, B.N. lat. 1599, omits Tr. 21 and 22, transposes Tr. 19 and 20, and presents numerous lacunae in the second half of the collection. This manuscript is supported by several others from France, especially in the north of the country.

But our discussion has been limited to what one can call ‘external’ features of the tradition, i.e., the order and presence or absence of whole tractatus (and Sermon 125). It has not extended to a comparison of textual readings, and hence I cannot yet say whether the groups of manuscripts thus demarcated embody distinctive types of text in any more than minor details. On the basis of a collation of Vienna 725 (xvii; N. Italy), containing fragments of Tr. 116-117, with two other early Italian manuscripts, Ruth J. Dean very hesitantly suggested the possibility of an Italian text-tradition, but Willems denies any significant difference between the French-Belgian, Italian and German traditions. (For Willems the German tradition is marked by the division of the work into three codices.) Willems may possibly be right, but his conclusion as he presents it rests on inadequate foundations, and much spade-work remains to be done.

**INTRODUCTION TO A CHECK-LIST OF THE MANUSCRIPTS**

The list that follows this introduction has been drawn up in the circumstances outlined near the beginning of this article, and consequently displays various deficiencies. It is intended to be exhaustive, but no doubt has several omissions, most likely for Spain and Portugal, Austria, parts of Germany and Switzerland. With regard to homiliaries and lectionaries containing selections from the Tractatus I have been unable to devise any perfectly adequate and precise principles of inclusion. Most pre-tenth-century manuscripts have been included, but ignorance and the unavailability of analyses have imposed limitations on the fulfilment of this general principle. (The listing of ninth-century copies of Paul Deacon’s homiliary is doubtless incomplete, but this is no serious loss). Nevertheless, homiliaries represent a fair proportion of the manuscripts prior to the tenth century, so a glance at pp. 58-60 above will show. In addition, some later homiliaries have been included, in particular those evidencing an unusually heavy indebtedness to the Tractatus (e.g., Madrid 194; Naples VI. B. 2) or a direct use of patristic sources (e.g.

125. In Berlin Philibed 1662 (VIII ex.; Fulda) the original absence of Tr. 20-22 has been corrected only for Tr. 20, inserted by a tenth-century scribe on folio which interrupt Tr. 23:2. Somewhat similarly in Berlin, Ham. 55 (xvii; Citeaux) Tr. 20-22 have been restored by a secondary hand, roughly contemporary on paper 13 ff. which interrupt Tr. 23:2, which means that they have been placed as nearly as possible between Tr. 19 and 23 where they belong. But in Berlin, Preuss. Kulturh. 22 (xvi; Cologne) this has led to the order 19, 23, 20-22, all numbered consecutively.

Vich 27 (xvii; Vich) is an intriguing manuscript in this regard. Homiliae 17-23 are: 17 + S. 125 (unnumbered); 20-23 (‘21’ at beginning, ‘20’ at end), 18-19, 24. After the end of Tr. 19 (‘21’) there occurs the inscription ‘Requisitum 23 with the instruction ‘Require retro’. Since S. 125 has the Inipit which elsewhere is very often accompanied by the absence of Tr. 18-19, it seems clear that in this manuscript, or more likely in its original, this deficiency had been made good from a manuscript that lacked Tr. 20-22 [so that 23 followed 19]. Lérida Roda 1 (xvii; from Roda near Vich) attests the local presence of an exemplar omitting 20-22. In Padua 1650 (xvii; Padua) Tr. 19, 23-25 are numbered ‘19-22’, but then follow correctly numbered Tr. 20-22 after a note ‘Scribunt omnia de utroque sequimus oblivione transpositae sunt quod ordine carmen post XVIIII capitulum est’. Next comes Tr. 20 unnumbered, and Tr. 27 as ‘26’. I can explain this whole state of affairs only in terms of the use of two exemplars, one lacking and the other containing Tr. 20-22. Perhaps the former comprised only Tr. 1-11, 19-25. Finally, we have indicated above (see p. 82) grounds for believing that Valenciennes 88 reflects an earlier insertion of Tr. 20-22 into a branch of the tradition where they had previously been unknown, though without any resultant disorder.

126. Cf. Willems, GCL 36, X-XII.


128. GCL 36, XI-XII.

129. Details of the extent of Willems’ collations are given by VAN DEN HOUT, in Augustiniana 5 (1953), pp. 298-299.
Grenoble 32 and 33), or a distinctive type of collection (e.g. Vatican 4222; Vienna 1616). Moreover, occasional uncertainty whether extracts and fragments derive from homiliaries or not has normally been resolved by inclusion.

With regard to homiliaries, some further comments are in order. H. Barré has distinguished between the ancient type of patristic homiliary, such as those of Alain of Farfa, Paul Deacon and even Raban Maur’s earlier collection of seventy Homilies on the Principal Festivals, which reproduced textually the sermons of the Fathers, the dicta authentica catholicae alpinae orthodoxorum Patrum, and the Carolingian type, which dealt in homilies closely related to the text of the liturgical reading of Scripture, more akin to exegetical commentary and indulging in the reshaping and fusion of patristic material to produce centos or virtually new texts. This involved greater recourse to commentaries than ordinary sermons, but works like Augustine’s Tractatus on John qualified under both heads. Since the latter type of homiliary engages in much heavier manipulation of its sources, by way of abbreviation, insertions, provision of continuity, etc., its emergence offered a convenient point at which to draw the line for the purposes of drafting this list. Hence we have included hardly any of the Carolingian or later more strictly mediaval types, with the occasional exception such as the Mondsche homiliaries in Vienna 1014, which in turn was the principal and direct source of a Bavarian homiliary of the ninth century and influenced other Carolingian models like the collections of Smaragdus and the later Raban Maur.

We have also omitted a group of Florentine homiliaries of the eleventh and twelfth centuries in the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, from which the readings varying from the Maurist text of the Tractatus were conveniently assembled in the first half of the last century by A.B. Callau and B. Saint-Yves, and a similar corpus of eleventh century compilations.

---


132. The mediaval type used post-patristic authors like Bede; Barré, in RÉA 13 (1967), p. 413.


134. Grégoire, op. cit., p. 9. To his list one could add codices Pnt. 21.10 and 30 sim. ib.

135. PL 47, 1200-1221. The occasional reference to Monte Cassino’s manuscripts is also included. The chief Monte Cassino homiliaries are codds. 11H, 12H, 1301H, 102H, 105GG, 109GG, 110GG, 116GG, 305H.

---

136. Grégoire, op. cit., p. 11. Again, other manuscripts could equally be mentioned.

137. Ibid., p. 109. The details are given below, n. 163.


139. La Collection de Sermons de Saint Augustine, Tractatus Domini et Apostoli, in RB 77 (1967), pp. 47-48, at p. 47; List of manuscripts, pp. 42-46. That Tr. 71 is not complete is indicated at PL 39, 2431.
which the extract begins, and sometimes only with the number of the item. The century is indicated in capital Roman figures: \( \text{ix} / \text{x} \) means the turn of the ninth and tenth centuries, i.e., \( \text{circum} \) a.D. 900, and \( \text{ix-x} \) means ninth or tenth century.

The contents of the manuscripts are given in Arabic numerals and, solely in the list itself and nowhere else in this article, not even in the notes to the list, in italics. Furthermore they are identified according to the numbering of the Tractatus in the printed editions but in the order in which they appear in the manuscripts. The use of the separate numbering '1-70' for Tr. 55-124 is indicated by 'a' at the end of the statement of contents. The preceding sections of this study show how often the numbering in the manuscripts diverges from that of the editions, but it seemed unnecessarily burdensome to spell out the details in every instance. The divergences of significant groups of manuscripts have in any case been dealt with above.\(^{140}\)

With regard to the sections of individual Tractatus, it has been considered necessary to indicate contents only by reference to the sections or chapters in which a manuscript or extract begins or ends. This means that '8:3-4' does not specify the whole of chapters 3 and 4 of Tr. 8, but merely that the item begins at some point in Tr. 8:3 and ends somewhere in Tr. 8:4.

In specifying provenances, immediate and ultimate, I have deliberately given fairly explicit geographical indications, normally anglicized, which expert mediaevalists and palaeographers may think superfluous. They may however be appreciated by those who like the writer are neither mediaevalists nor palaeographers and are often frustrated by shorthand references to scriptoria, abbeys and the like which are beyond their ken.

The preparation of this list and the accompanying discussions has been rendered possible only by the admirable co-operation of a great number of librarians and individuals in response to written enquiries. Its improvement in terms of greater completeness and closer accuracy will benefit from similar contributions by librarians, archivists and others with direct access to the manuscripts, and especially by future cataloguers, who, if they would express the hope, will make it their concern to examine manuscripts of the Tractatus with eyes open for the distinguishing features documented above.

---
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**A CHECK-LIST OF THE MANUSCRIPTS**

**Aberdeen**, King's Coll. 219; St. Paul’s Cath., London; XII ex.; 1-124

**Admont**, Stiftsbibl. 165 and 166; Austria (? Admont Abbey); XII: 165, ff. 1r-182, 18-20, 19, 18-45: 166, ff. 1r-11r, 46-124

**Amiens**, Bibl. Mun. 569; Selincourt Abbey, dio. Amiens; XII: ff. 1r-102r, 55-124

**Angers**, Bibl. de la Ville 175 (167); Abbey of St. Séverin, Angers; IX: 1-12 (168) Abbey of St. Aubin, Angers; XI: 1-18, 20, 19, 23-54

**Arras**, Bibl. Mun. 45 (35); Abbey of St. Vaast, Arras; XV; 1-124

**Avranches**, Bibl. Mun. 109; Reims; IX med. (ff. 77-end); f. 179v, 10: 12-13

**Bamberg**, Stadl. Biblioth. 118 (B. II. 11); Bamberg Cath.; XI: 1-82 (a) 41

**—** Misc. Bibl. 119 (B. III. 1); Bamberg Cath.; XII: 55-124 (a)

**Barcelona**, Archivo de la Corona de Aragón S. Cugat 21; Abbey of San Cugat del Vallés, near Barcelona; XII: 1-17, S. 125 (ff. 82-87), 18-124 (a)

**Basel**, Öffentl. Bibliothek der Univ. B. III. 3; ? N. Switzerland (then Chartruse of Val Ste. Marguerite, Basel); IX; ff. 3r-15r, 1-19, 23-24; ff. 158r-289v, 55-124 (a); many lacunae\(^{142}\)

**Berlin**, Deutsche Staatsbibl. Ham. 55; Citeaux Abbey; XII: 1-19, 23: 1-2 (20-23: 2) 23: 2-124\(^{143}\)

---

\(^{140}\) It has occasionally been a problem to know how far to trust catalogue entries which may be mere transcriptions of the manuscript's numbers but alternatively may identify contents according to the numbering of the editions. If a catalogue states that a manuscript contains '1-122', experience has taught that it is most probably a complete copy of Tr. 1-124 with some nummbering or omission somewhere along the way.\(^{141}\) F. LEITSCHE and H. FISCHLER, Katalog der Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Bamberg, vol. 1 (1) (Bamberg, 1895-1906), pp. 100-101. See nn. 68 above and 200 below.

\(^{142}\) Fully described by MEYER and BURKHARDT, op. cit. (n. 68 above), pp. 206-210, who give details of the lacunae and their completion by later hands, as well as evidence of the liturgical use of both sections of the manuscript, which were originally two separate codices. For Morin's questionable linking with the exemplars attested for Reichenau and St. Gallen see p. 77 above. He got his Serm. Morin 12 (II. 7r-9r) and 13 (II. 155r-157r) from this manuscript.

\(^{143}\) On the subsequent insertion of Tr. 20-22 into this manuscript which originally lacked them see n. 125 above. Thirteen sheets, ff. 81-96, have been intruded, in effect between Trr. 19 and 23, but because they in fact interrupt Tr. 23:2 the beginning of Tr. 23 was recopied. Cf. Berlin Philippus 1662 and Pruss. Kulturbes. 22.
For Fulda as the provenance of this codex see pp. 28-29 above, and for the insertion of Tr. 20 on ff. 160-167 by a tenth-century hand see n. 125 above. The implication is that the corrector was working either from a manuscript that ended with Tr. 20 or from one which lacked Tr. 21-22. For complete corrections of the absence of Tr. 20-22, cf. Berlin Hain. 55 and Presse. Küblers, 22. B. Biscory in his study *Panorama der Handschriftenüberlieferung aus der Zeit des Karls des Großen, in Kröl der Grosse: Lebenswerk und Nachleben*, ed. W. Braunsfeld et al., vol. 2: *Das Geistliche Leben*, ed. Bischof (Düsselhöf, 1965), p. 248 n. 114, relates this manuscript to the Hessian school rather than to Fulda itself, and links it with the other three manuscripts of the Tractatus, the codex of which fragments survive in the Götttinger Mittelalter und Herfeld C. 163. On the Berlin codex see also W. Kuhler, *Die Karolingische Miniaturen*, vol. 3 (Berlin, 1969), pp. 99, 100.


Grögro's study does not entirely supersede that of E. HOSP, *Il Sermonari di Atte di Farfa*, in *Eph. L.H.*, 50 (1940), pp. 375-383 and 51 (1941), pp. 210-241. Summarized reproduced by J. Leclercq, *Tables pour l'énumération des homilies manuscrits*, in *Scriptorium* 2 (1946), pp. 197-205. Alan's collection enjoyed a great vogue in Bavaria, and Hops's analysis was based solely on manuscripts preserved at Munich; see codices 4547, 4564, 1468, 1794 and 18092 in this list. For a detailed breakdown of the contents of Items drawn from the Tractatus reference should be made to Grögro, who has references back to Hops. 146. On the back cover is pasted a fragment of another IX-X century manuscript containing the end of Tr. 104 and the beginning of Tr. 105 numbered as 'Sermon 51'.
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Aug. Fragm. 98; Reichenau Abbey; IX; 7-17

Aug. Fragm. Ettenheimmünster 462 + Engelberg, Stiftsbibl. 59; Italy (then Abbey of Ettenheimmünster, dioec. Strasbourg); VII/IX; fragments: Carlsruhe, 75: 7-19: 2-30; 2; Engelberg, 77: 7-39: 2, 111; 4-112: 1 (a)

Karls. 1438; Abbey of Gottesan, near Carlsruhe; IX in.; ff. 7r., 3-4r., 51: 10-13 (Paul Deacon's Homily, pt. II)

Cesena, Bibl. Malatestiana D. III. 3; Franciscan Convent, Cesena; XV; 1-17, S. 125 (ff. 79r-83r), 18, 20-21, 19, 22-24

Châlon-sur-Saône, Bibl. Munic. 2 (a); Abbey of La Ferté-sur-Grosne, near Châlon-sur-S.; XII ex.; 1-124: 6

Chantilly, Musée Condé 121 (607); St. Mary's Abbey, Himmerod, near Trèves; A.D. 1154; ff. 1r-202v, 1-124

Charleville, Bibl. Munic. 246; St. Mary's Abbey, Belleval, dioec. Reims; A.D. 1156-7; vol. I, 1-17, S. 125 (ff. 79r-83r), 18-43; vol. II, 44-124

Chartres, Bibl. Munic. 6 (17); Chartres Cath.; IX; 1-214 (damaged by war action)

Colmar, Bibl. de la Ville 289 (23); (? Collegiate Church of St. Martin, Colmar); A.D. 1474; 1-18, 20, 19, 21-124 (a)

148. See preceding note.

149. Not mentioned in M.R. James's catalogue, but listed by H. SCHENKE, Bibliotheca Patrum Latinorum Britanniae II, 11 (Vienna, 1857), p. 70, and confirmed from a xerox copy supplied by the Librarian, Mr. Philip Gaskell.

150. For the variation in the titles used in this manuscript see p. 67 above, where evidence is given indicative of an affinity to Chartres 6. In the Carlsruhe codex (f. 5r) the numbers at the end of Tr. 18 and beginning of Tr. 19 were originally one less in each case and have been corrected. The same seems to have happened in chartres 6, t. 299. Heidelberg 10, 12 probably belongs with these two manuscripts. It has the same introductory rubric to Tr. 55-124 as Carlsruhe, item de codem libra sermones, and like Carlsruhe begins Tr. 55 with Passa, frares... This latter feature (see n. 68 above) and the numeration '1-124' (see p. 75 above) suggest that in Carlsruhe and Chartres we have early exemplars of a secondary, normalized state of the tradition.

151. The oldest exemplar of any part of the Tractatus (not early eight century, as A. BURGER, Scriptores Medii Aevi Helvetica, vol. 8 (Geneva, 1959), p. 15). The manuscript was cut up for book-binding in the late fifteenth century, probably at Ettenheimmünster. There survive the remains of 4 ff. in each place. Concerning the Engelberg fragments, which were later at Offenburg in the same Strasbourg region, I have been unable to secure more detailed information than the catalogues provided. I am indebted to Dr. Kurt Hannemann for cross-copy of the fragments of the Carlsruhe folios, whose precise contents were originally as follows: f. 1v, Tr. 75: 3 line 18 (diliguum) to 76: 2 line 3 (mansionem); f. 1v, 76: 2 lines 3 (apud) to 77 (teiusm); f. 2r (right half only), 79: 2 lines 16 (remporti) to 81 (millum); f. 2v (left half only), 79: 2 lines 41 (habetus) to 80: 2 line 3 (tractus bibil). The Tractatus bears no title; we merely have FINIT XXI INC XXII, and EXP XXIII.

The following variants from the CCL text are discernible with greater or lesser degrees of clarity: f. 1v, the first word of 76: 1 cannot easily be Interrogativo, but what it is instead is indecipherable; line 6, [Israe]d; line 8, [parti] (CCL, Jacob). f. 76: 2 line 2, meus memo: f. 1v, 76: 2 line 5, sues se: line 6, [probas causas est]: line 9, diliguum (diligenti): line 11, somnant: line 12, [habluentur]; lines 20-21, perse (?): line 25: 2 line 1 (probus): line 25, om. de: lines 22-23, detectionem, mansionem: line 25, esse potius: line 26, ilium (illa): f. 1v, 79: 2 line 10, sanctissim: line 21, restori: line 23, intellegent: line 28, ergo (enim): line 31, idem dict: f. 2v, 80: 1 line 5: 11, [propletam]: line 13, [propletas]: line 15, om. in: line 16: 2 line 3-4, probably ditography of omnem pulcher..., tolerat uerum after of line 3)

152. See n. 150 above.
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Cologne, Erzbischof. Diözesan-Bibl. 69; Darmstadt: ix; 55-124 (a)

Copenhagen, Kongel. Bibli. Gl. kgl. S. 33 fold.; St. Mary’s Abbey, Bordesholm, near Kiel; A.D. 1487; I-18, 20, 21-124

Darmstadt, Hess. Landes- u. Hochschulbibl. 797; Chartreuse of St. Barbara, Cologne; xiv/xxv; ff. 50-80, extracts from 1 : 1-123 : 3

Dijon, Bibl. Munic. 167 (134); Citeaux Abbey; ff. 100r-104r, xii, 92-94

Donauwörth, Fürstl. Fürstenberg. Hofbibl. Fragem. B. III. 20; x; 24 : 3-6

Douai, Bibl. Munic. 254; Abbey of Anchin, near Douai; xi; 1-54

— — 255; Abbey of Sts. Rictrudus and Peter, Marchiennes, near Douai; x/xxi; 1-55

— — 271; Abbey of Sts. Rictrudus and Peter, Marchiennes; xii; ff. 1v-7v, 55-124 (a)

Düsseldorf, Landes- u. Stadtbibl. B. 80; Holy Trinity Abbey, Essen; ix-x; ff. 23r-24r, 121 : 4-5, 5-end

Durham, Cath. Lib. B. II. 16; Durham Cath.; xi ex.; 1-124

— — B. II. 17; Durham Cath.; xi; 1-124

— — Unive. Lib. Cosin V. II. 3; xvii; ff. r-300v, 3 : 3-124

Engelberg, Stiftsbibl. 15; Engelberg Abbey; xi; 1-124s (a)

Épinal, Bibl. Munic. 13; Abbey of Moyenmoutier, Voges; x; 1-30

Erfurt, Wissenschaft. Allgemeinbibl. Anphon. Octav. 20; ? Italy (then Collegium Amphanumericium, Erfurt Univ.); ff. 130r-132v, xiv/xxv, extracts from 18-20, 5, 14

— — Anphon. Quart. 170; ? Italy (? France) (then Collegium Amphanumericium); xvii; ff. 145r-156v, extracts from 1-9, 11-18, 20, 19, 23-25 : 8

Eton, Coll. Lth. 101; Eton Coll.; vol. I (ff. r-181r), xv, 1-124

Florence, Bibl. Medicea Laurenziana Plut. 12, II; xv; 1-17, S. 125 (ff. 107v-113v); 18-124 (a)

— — Plut. 14 dext. 5; Holy Cross Convent, Florence; x; 2 : 4-17, S. 125 (ff. 79r-84r), 20-49 : 6, 69 : 1-78 : 1, 49 : 8-69 : 1(a)

— — Plut. 16 dext. 4; Holy Cross Convent, Florence; xi; 1-17, S. 125 (ff. 64v-68v), 18-124 : 7 (a)

— — Plut. 16 dext. 5; Holy Cross Convent, Florence; (a)

(Paris, 1665), p. 571, where it is regarded as uncertain whether the date is that of the archetype or of this copy.

153 A. Written during the abbacy of Prowin, c. 1143-1170. This is one of the very few manuscripts (two others being Valencia, Bibl. Univ. 31 and 39) of which I have no information beyond that furnished in the printed catalogues. Irregularities cannot be ruled out.
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xi ; 1-17, S. 125 (ff. 65v-69v), 18-124 (a)268

— — Aedil. 8; Florence; x; ff. 1r-123v, 1-17, S. 125 (ff. 32v-34v), 18-124

— — Conv. Sopr. 557; Vallombrosa; xii; 1-17, S. 125 (ff. 70v-73v), 18-124

— — Fesul. 7; Lateran Canons, Fiesole, near Florence; xv; 1-17, S. 125 (ff. 46v-49v), 18-124 (a)

— — Mugell. 5; Franciscans (Observers) of Bosco, region of Mugello, N. of Florence; xii; 1-17, S. 125 (ff. 56v-59v), 18-124 (a)153c

— — S. Marco 619; St. Mark’s Convent, Florence; x; 1-17, S. 125 (ff. 51v-54v), 18-124 (a)

— — S. Marco 644; St. Mark’s Convent, Florence; ix; 1-17, S. 125 (ff. 55v-58v), 18-124 (a)

Fulda, Hess. Landesbibl. A.a.3; Constance Cath. (then Abbey of Weinberg, dioc. Constance); ix-x; 22-54

Ghent, Rijksuniversiteit, Centr. Bibl. 167; Abbey of St. Maximin, near Trèves; xi; 1-19, 23-124

Giessen, Universitätsbibl. 677; St. Mark’s Abbey, Butzbach, S. of Giessen; xvii; 37-124

Göttingen, Niedersächs. Staats- u. Universitätsbibl., Deutsches Seminar Müller III, ff. 1r-2v + Hersfeld, Städt. Museum C. 165 (2 ff. in binding); Germany153a; vii-x; Göttingen, f. 7rv, 102 : 5-103 : 1; f. 2r, 105 : 5-7 (a); Hersfeld; Gotth.

Gotha, Forschungsbibl. Membr. 140; Augustinian Canons of Neuwerk, near Halle; x-xii; f. 139v, 34 : 10-end

— — Membr. I; St. Augustin’s Cath., Mainz; x-xi; ff. 23r-262r, 1-124

153 B. On this manuscript see E. B. GARRISON, Studies in the History of Medieval Italian Painting, vol. 2 (Florence, 1955-6), pp. 56-59, where on the strength of its Florentine illumination it is dated quite precisely ‘very early in the third quarter of the twelfth century’. In vol. 1 (1953-4), p. 60 and Index Garrison refers to this codex as Plut. 16 dext. 4 (sic) containing Augustine’s Commentary on Luke (l). It is correctly listed on pp. 138, 152, but in vol. 3 (1957-8), pp. 158, 187, 198-199 and Index it appears still as the Commentary on Luke, though rightly as Plut. 16 dext. 5.

153 C. See GARRISON, op. cit., vol. 1, pp. 27, 160-164, 176, where it is confidently assigned to a date early in the second quarter of the twelfth century. The scribe identifies himself in the colophon as ‘Arelinus’, i.e., from Arezzo, which confirms the strong evidence of the illumination in favour of an origin in the Florentine region. An additional note at the end asserts that it was given to the Franciscans of Bosco, by the Medici brothers, Cosimo the Elder and Lorenzo, in 1438, suggesting to Garrison that it may have come from Castelfiorentino, to the south-west of Florence, where three other volumes donated by the Medici in the same year had previously lain.

153 D. For its Hersfeld origin according to Bischoff see n. 144.
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— — — Memb. I. 68; xv in.; f. 84r, 124 s, 5

Graz, Universitätsbibli. 397; Augustinian Canons of Setcian, N-W. of Graz; xii; vol. I, 1-18, 20, 19, 21-45; vol. II, 46-78

— — 411 and 438; St. Lambrecht Abbey, W. of Graz; xii/xiii; 438, 1-18, 20, 19, 21-45; f. 411, ff. 107v-109r, 46-124

Grenoble, Bibl. de la Ville 32 (101); La Grande Chartreuse; xii; ff. 104-259, 9; ff. 42-44v, 24; ff. 86v-88v, 104; ff. 88-89r, 94: 3-6; ff. 89-91v, 102: 1-104v, 10; ff. 110v-112v, 12: 11-12; ff. 112-118v, 45; ff. 115-120v, 26; 2-13; ff. 129v-131v, 11: 3-7 (Homiliary, pt. I: Temporal) 154

— — — — 33 (102); La Grande Chartreuse; xii (ff. 1-203), xiii-xiv (ff. 204-245); f. 112v-135v, 1: 8-13; ff. 217v-269v, 124: 5-15; ff. 60-63v, 4: 10-12; ff. 102v-104v, 70; ff. 105v-106v, 71: 1-2; ff. 105v-106v, 67; ff. 117v-119v, 80-81; ff. 122v-124v, 51: 9-10; ff. 144v-145v, 87; ff. 172v-174v, 83: 2-8; ff. 198v-201v, 88-89; ff. 241v-242v, 119: 1-3; ff. 215v-216v, 80: 1-2; f. 238v, 27: 1-6; f. 205v, 12: 11; f. 205v-206v (bis); 40: 2-4; ff. 207v-211v, 52: 6-13 (Homiliary, pt. II: Sanctorale) 156

's-Heerenberg, Huis Bergh Inv. 105; Augustinian Canons of Flône, dioc. Liège; A.D. 1125; fragments of 124: 658

Heidelberg, Universitätsbibli. Salem 10, 12; St. Mary's Abbey, Salem, dioc. Constance; xii; ff. 27-149v, 39-125v 154

Heiligenkreuz, Stiftsbibl. 10; Abbey of Heiligenkreuz; xii; 1-17, S. 125 (ff. 54v-57v), 20-124

Hereford, Cath. Lib. P. 9.5; St. Kenelm's Abbey, Winchcombe, Glos.; xii in.; f. 1r-199r, 1-124

Innsbruck, Univ.-Bibl. 108; Abbey of St. John Baptist, Stams, W. of Innsbruck; A.D. 1347; 1-124 (a)

Klosterneuburg, Stiftsbibl. 26; St. Mary's Abbey, Nienburg, near Magdeburg; xii; 1-17, S. 125 (ff. 73v-77v), 20-124

— — — — — 27; St. Mary's Abbey, Nienburg; xii; 1-17, S. 125 (ff. 54v-55v), 20-124

154. Cf. R. Était, L’aoomiliaritonsen, in Sacræ Erudiri 13 (1992), pp. 67-112, especially pp. 104-112, where Était stresses the singularity of this pure type of lectionary, composed at La Grande Chartreuse soon after the formation of the Order for its new liturgy and compiled directly from the writings of the great Fathers, rejecting later authors.

155. See preceding note. The date of ff. 204-245 is given as xii-xv by Samaran and Marichat, op. cit., vol. 6, p. 469.


156. Bischopp, Kreuz und Duch im Frühdileter und in den ersten Jahrhunderten der deutschen Rekonstruktion, in die Mittelfrankeischen Studien, vol. 2 (Stuttgart, 1967), p. 284, dates this codex in the twelfth century (but mistakenly identifies it as the Sermone de Verbis Domini). So too Lowe in CLA VIII, n. 1110. See also n. 150 above.
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Laon, Bibl. Munic. 317; Vauclair Abbey, near Laon; xii; 1-38

Leipzig, Karl-Marx-Univ. Bibl. lat. 250; Dominican Convent, Leipzig; xii; 1-124

Le Mans, Bibl. Munic. 260; St. Peter's Abbey, La Couture, Le Mans; xix; 54: 7-end, 55: 2-124 (a) (the Maurists' codex Abbattiae de Cultura)

Lérida, Catedral Bibl. Roda 1; St. Peter's Abbey, Roda, near Vich, Barcelona; xii; ff. 1r-131v, 1-19, 23-122; 7157

Léry, Université, Bibl. Général. 117 C (112); Friars of Holy Cross, Liège; xv; 1-124

— — — — 125 C (113); xv; 1-124

Lilienfeld, Stiftsbibl. 164; Lilienfeld Abbey; xiv; ff. 1r-79v, 1-39

Lincoln, Cath. Lib. 9; St. Mary's Cath., Lincoln; xii; 1-84, 113-124

— — — — — — 186; xiv/xv; ff. 1r-216v, 1-124

Lisbon, Bibl. Nac. Alcob. 402 (XXIV); Abbey of Alcobaça, N. of Lisbon; xiii; 1: 3-124

London, Brit. Mss. Addit. 10936; St. Mary's Abbey, Huyseburg, near Halberstadt; xii; 1-18, 20, 19, 21-124

— — — — Addit. 10937; La Grande Chartreuse (then Sallvator Chartreuse, Erfurt); xii; 1-124 158

— — — — Addit. 15405; xv; 1-124

— — — — Addit. 17283; St. Mary's Abbey, Le Parc, near Louvain; xii; 1-43 (the Louvain editors' Parcensis)

— — — — Addit. 18313; ? Abbey of Prato, near Florence (then Dominican Convent, Vienna); A.D. 1466; ff. 1r-200v, 1-17; S. 125 (ff. 54v-57v), 20-124 159

Burn, 911; St. Mary's Abbey, Poppienna, near Florence; xii; 1-17, S. 125 (ff. 60v-70v), 20-124 (a)

Harl. 1916; Glastonbury Abbey; xii ex.; ff. 1r-180v, 1-8; 124 (a)

Harl. 3114; Abbey of Sts. Mary and Nicolas, Arnstein, near Koblenz; xii; ff. 1r-134v, 34-124

— — — — Harl. 3271; A.D. 1477; 1-124 (a)

— — — — Royal 3. C. X; Cath. Priory of St. Andrew, Rochester; xii in.; 1-124

— — — — — — Royal 5.B.XIII; Cath. Priory of St. Andrew, Rochester; xii; ff. 1r-48v, extract, beginning at 1: 8

— — — — — — Royal 6. A. XIII; xii; ff. 168-172v, 1

157. For information concerning this manuscript I am indebted to Fr. Joseph Janini of Valencia.


159. Written by one Thomas Herrou and 'of Praetensee',
160. This manuscript has been very briefly described by L. Schiaparelli, Il codice 490 della Biblioteca Capitolare di Lucca e la Scuola Scritoria Lucchese, (sec. VII-XI) (Studi ed Testi, 36) Vatican City, 1924, pp. 101-103, and Oerleiner, op. cit., vol. I, p. 122. Preliminary examination of a microfilm copy suggests the work of several hands. A very poor original. The topographical data only as far as the beginning of Tr. 27 and several entries onel, though this designation appears only irregularly. The numbers between Tr. 13 and 17 have undergone erroneous correction by the deduction of one in each case. From the end of Tr. 27 numbers or titles are found, except at the commencement of the second part (Incipit: Sempere) and between Tr. 67 and 68, where the first seme XIII incipit XXII is perhaps secondary. Several folios have been lost, one in each case between ff. 32/33 (lumen of Tr. 10: 9-11: 1), 38/39 (13: 2-6), 47/48 (15: 23-end), 51/52 (17: 14-18: 2), 88/89 (31: 7-35: 3), 99/101 (36: 4-8), 96/98 (39-40: 4), 119/120 (86: 2-88: 2), 135/136 (94: 1-95: 2), 176/177 (118: 1-119: 4), 175/176 (121: 5-122: 6), 180/181 (123: 5-124: 2). In it also, f. 199 the text omits Tr. 28-59. Inside the back cover is pasted the top half of a leaf of another copy of the Tractatus, written in a large clear hand in Carolingian minuscule, probably of the first half of the twelfth century, containing in the first column Tr. 102: 4 lines 24 (pro) to 35 (deos), and in the second column 5 (eres) to 14 (causes). Each column now contains 16 lines. The leaf has been turned to the right through ninety degrees before pasting. A stray folio bound in as f. 97 appears to be of an early date, but its script is so faint as to be all but totally illegible on microfilm. Oerleiner gives Bichof's name as his authority for the date of Lucca 21, presumably alluding to Bichoff's study Scriptoris e Manuscrits Medievales de Civilite dal Sesto Secolo alla Riforma di Carolo Magno in Centri e Vie di Erudizione della Civilt de l'Alto Medioevo (Seminario di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull' Alto Medioevo, 11 Spoleto, 1964), at p. 485, where he mentions this manuscript as one of several written shortly after the famous MS. 490 (produced c. 800) and betraying a lasting Visigothic influence.


162. C. Lambot, Sept sermoni inediti di S. Augustino in un manoscrito del Mont Cassin, in RB 48 (1893), p. 114 w. n. 1. The analysis in Inventario General (see previous note on Lambot's study) lacks many of his identifications, including all those for the Tractatus. Lambot observes that if one judges by the space they occupy the Tractatus are not always complete. This holiomity is related by both content and script to others preserved at Mont Cassin.

THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE "TRACT. IN EVANG. IOH."

MANCHESTER, John Rylands Lib. lat. 12; Luxeul Abbey ; ix; f. 8v, 12-12-13; ff. 8v-9v, 45: 1-2; f. 9v, 26: 2-3; ff. 12v-16v, 124 (abbrev.); ff. 31-35v, 67-72 (abbrev.); ff. 53-54v, 123: 4-9 (abbrev.); ff. 64-66v, 81: 9-13; ft. 71v-73; based on 11-12 (f); ft. 74v-75v, 80: 2-2; ft. 83v-92v, 87-91 (abbrev.); ft. 94-97v, 80: 1: 81-93 (abbrev.); ff. 120v-125v, 83: 2-86 (slight abbrev.) (Luxeul Holymiracy)

163. This manuscript is not included in the list of codices indubitably written at Luxeul given by LOWE in CLA VI, pp. xv-xvii. It was similarly passed over in silence in LOWE's earlier study The "Script. of Luxeul". A Title Vindicated, in RB 68 (1949), pp. 132-145. Earlier still Biscop, in Spoleto, 1920, p. 122-124. Earlier still W. J. James, Catalogue of the Latin Manuscripts in the John Rylands Library at Manchester, vol. I (Manchester, 1921), pp. 35-37. James, following Ferrin, dates it eighth or ninth century, but its dependence on Paul Deacon's Holymiracy rules out the eight. It has about 30 items in common with Paul, some two-thirds of its total, but arranged with virtually no regard for Paul's order. I have examined the items from the Tractatus by microfilm (see above p. 109), with the following results:

ff. 89v-92v: same Incipit and Explicit as Paul Deacon, pt. II, n. 393, for which GREGORIUS not: as f. 89v, gives the contents of Tr. 89v, and the contents are as follows: Hoc modo vobis ut diligimus intervenisse. Magno ergo est: ipse est enim rectum noster unde alibi dict. Et possit nos ut rectum admittere, hoc est, ut inuesti diligamus (= 87: 1 lines 7-8, 83: 3 lines 12, 87: 3 lines 14-15): then 88v 2 lines 1-2. Magno ergo (suslinere), and line 3 (truerum) to end of 88v; 83: line 13 (Non est) to line 10 (savrere), omitting in gaudium Dominii tut (lines 23-26); 88v: line 14 (Ego) to end of 89: 1 lines 16 (Non) to 33 (Pacificum ut). Unde et apostolatus alt., quiaque, ut dicitur, eius (lines 3-5, 7); 83: lines 14 (Hi sunt) to 25 (humana); 80: 1 line 2 (cito), 3 lines 27 (Nomolami) to end of 90; Deinde alti, ut superborum (lines 91-92) to line 5 (propheta), line 5 (truerum) to line 5 (truerum), (Faciit) to 10 (guinque), quiaque pares et duoibus pascibus scitari. Et tali miracula plurima quae non semel atque. Dicit Marcus, 3 lines 14 to 20 (sanum et). 4 complete.

ff. 94v-97v: same Incipit as Paul Deacon, pt. II, n. 100, which GREGORIUS, in pp. 101-102, gives the contents of Tr. 80, 81, 82, but different Explicit. Contents: 80v: 1 lines 1-2 ( sequentiae) to 8 (vides eam), and 10 (Sic enim) to 11 (ovis), and 14 (ab illo) to end of 1; Velia, Ego sum vitis, id est, sedipetit, innocentia, insitutea vera, id est, non per graviam sed per naturam. Ex quo vos acceptitis ut sitis siestes, innocentes et laici; 81: 1 line to 35 (Des) and in the second column 5 (eres) to 14 (causes). Each column now contains 16 lines. The leaf has been turned to the right through ninety degrees before pasting. A stray folio bound in as f. 97 appears to be of an early date, but its script is so faint as to be all but totally illegible on microfilm. Oerleiner gives Bichoff's name as his authority for the date of Lucca 21, presumably alluding to Bichoff's study Scriptoris e Manuscrits Medievales de Civilite dal Sesto Secolo alla Riforma di Carolo Magno, in Centri e Vie di Erudizione della Civilt de l'Alto Medioevo (Seminario di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull' Alto Medioevo, 11 Spoleto, 1964), at p. 485, where he mentions this manuscript as one of several written shortly after the famous MS. 490 (produced c. 800) and betraying a lasting Visigothic influence.

164. According to Inventario General de Manuscritos de la Biblioteca Nacional, vol. I (Madrid, 1953), p. 144, f. ur-3° contain fragments of the Tractatus in a twelfth-century hand. Lambot observes that if one judges by the space they occupy the Tractatus are not always complete. This holymity is related by both content and script to others preserved at Mont Cassino.
MANTUA, Bibl. Commun. C. V. 4 (363) ; Abbey of San Benedetto Po, near Mantua; XIII--XIV; 1-19, 23-124
— D.V. 3 (466) and D.V. 4 (467); Abbey of San Benedetto Po; XI; D.V. 3, 1-48; D.V. 4, 49-124

MELK, Stiftsbibl. 354 (323);? Melk Abbey; XV; ff. 17-172, 1-17, S. 125 (H. 52 v. 55), 20-124 med. 163 a.
— 642 (795, O 32);? Melk Abbey; XV; ff. 174-179 v. 5 (sermo quattuor)

MILAN, Bibli. Ambrosiana F. 60 inf.; ff. 50 v. 52 v. 54; Abbey of Bobbio (?); VIII ex.; extracts from 1-496 a.
— H. 146 inf.; Avignon; X, ff. 23 v. 27 v., compilation from 67-71; ff. 27 v. 31, 105-107 v. 4 (both items from Paul Deacon's Homilies, pt. II); somewhat later; ff. 63-64, 12: 12 end; ff. 64 v. 67, 45; H. 67-72, 26 (probably from Homilies) 164 b.

In addition, ff. 31 r. 35 may bear some relation to Paul Deacon, pt. II, no. 23, which is an abbreviated form of Trv. 67-71 (GREGORII, op. cit., p. 96). The item here is constructed from Trv. 67; II line 5 (Nec mortem) to 72: 3 line 28 (et nos. ; Sequitur de eo quod dicit, Quia ego ad Patrem vado; quodcumque frater soli [Patrem, mag. un omnes meos, hoc facent]. Cf. 73: 1) The same methods of compilation have been followed as are illustrated above.

163 a. For my knowledge of these two Melk codices I am indebted to the obliging assistance of Professor Plante (see n. 50 above). In MS. 354, where the Tractatus appears and Omneae, Tr. 5 is unnumbered, and other dislocations occur with the omission of Trv. 18-19 and subsequently, so that Tr. 124 is "Homiliae CV." The manuscript contains also the collection of Sermones ad fratres in everno (ff. 177-199) and Augustine's Tractatus in Epistulam Johannis (H. 199-225). Melk 642 is a volume of miscellaneous, mainly homiletic, material.

163 b. On this codex see LOWE, CLA III, nos. 339, with further bibliography in the Supplement volume, p. 50. nos. 336-340 (where the corrections are needed; the article by Natale is on pp. 54-74, not 3-18, and Collura gives a photograph of only f. 41 v. In CLA it is connected with the Tractatus of Augustine only in R.A.B. MYNORS' Index of Authors, Supplement, p. 73. According to BISCHOF, Wende- punkte in der Geschichte der lateinischen Exegese, in his article "zuerst beider" (p. 106), the contents of these folios were first identified in 1961 by E. Dekkers as an almost complete exposition of John 1: 1-11 in the form of excerpts from the Tractatus.

164. OBERLEITNER, op. cit., vol. 1, p. 143, though with no identification of the first item or collection of the second as Paul Deacon, pt. II, no. 25, so that the reference to the title of Tr. 104 is beside the mark (cf. GREGORII, op. cit., p. 96). The other three items listed (in a somewhat later hand!) most probably derive from another homily. Parts of Tr. 12, 45 and 26 in the same order are found also in Manchester, Rylands 12, ff. 87-97 (see above), Reims, Bibl. Muni., 447 (St. Thury, X-XI), ff. 137-157, and Graz, Universitätsbibl. 88 (Skeat, XIX), ff. 267-297, and doubtless in other manuscripts also. But though the Incipits are the same in each case for Trv. 43 (beginning) and 26 (2 line 6, Magna gratia), they differ for Tr. 12: 1 line 39, Quummodo qui, Reims; and Graz; 12 line 3, Ergo quinnum, Rylands and Milan. Be that as it may, the extent of the extracts is not constant; the first line ends at 12: 1 line 17 (Lucem) in Rylands 12; the second at 45: 2 line 25 (contemnuum) in the same manuscript, and at 45: 8 (end) in Graz 88; the third at 26: 3 line 14 (Patrem meum) in Rylands 12 and at 26: 8 line 9 or 15 (erat Verbum) in Graz 88.
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MODENA, Bibli. Capit. O. III. 14 (? St. Geminianus' Cath.] Modena; XI; 1-17, S. 125 (as 1'8'), 18, 20-21, 19, 22-124 (a)
— Bibli. Estense w. I. 13 (L. 672); Abbey of San Prospero, near Reggio (then St. Peter's Abbey, Modena); A.D. 1273; ff. 277-282, 122: 9-124 (numeration: 119-121)

MONTES CASSINII, Bibli. dell' Abbazia 21, 76; and 22, 76 (51, 222); Monte Cassino; xi; ff. 1-17, S. 125 (pp. 235-248), 18-39, 22, 29-124?

— 170L (312, 246); Monte Cassino; xi; pp. 246-248, includes 55: 1

— 523E (407, 118); c. N. Italy or France 161 b.; vii; ff. 1 v. (pp. 201-214); 112: 1-2 (44 i); f. 2 r. (pp. 203-4), 113: 4 end (aberrant) a.

FRAGM.; Monastery of Sts. Cosmas and Damian, Tagliacozzo, near Avezzano (Beneventan); XIII; one fol., fragment of Go 86 a.

MONTPELLIER, Bibli. Musica, 16; Abbey of St. Guilmel-du-Désert, N. of Montpellier; XII; item 1, 3-10.

164 b. Located by BISCHOF, Panorama..., p. 25 n. 139, in the central or western parts of N. Italy.

165. LOWE, op. cit., p. 323 n. 2. WILLIAMS in CCL collated only ff. 1 r. (p. 201) and 1 r. (p. 204), containing the continuous text of Trv. 112: 3 line 18 (Seebat autem et locum) and 113: 6 line 7 (ex discipulis) to end. Trv. 112 is introduced without a number. The other two pages are less straightforward. F. 1 r. (p. 202) carries on with the text (with the displacement of locum, as noted by WILHELM), and the next item, Tr. 112: 1 line 10 to 11 (ff. 113: 1), contains the first lines of a page, with some variants from the CCL text: Horsor (Proinde sedet elamone) caritatem vestram, frater (not in CCL), ut in suo (is) quae apostela sent sermonum nostrum non requirat; nam minus longum est (erit) in singulis immorari. After the omission of 112: lines 10-18, which in meaning are similar to the insertion from Tr. 44 (cf. in quae est manifesta sent non requirat, proinde sedet elamone), we have lines 29: 20 (non vestrae); sed bib opus est causa pascendi (pascendi) sanctissimis. The text jumps to 112: 2 lines 2-3 (Seebat, inquit locum Iudas qui...). 6 tempus), omitting inquit (line 3), and reading Ut (Ibi), plus obiita and obe. The script on f. 2 r. (p. 203) is less clear, particularly at the foot, Tr. 113: 4 lines 31 (nons orientas) to 113: 5 line 3 (pointis), and 113: 6 lines 4 (Erat autem) to 7 (et ina), with the following variants: 113: 4 lines 22, 23, homo prebeat (praebeat homo) 25, inuita (inuita); 113: 5 line 2, om. emu and reads misit, inquit, Annum lumen (Hayou); 113: 6 line 6, om. (i) 1am; 7, inserts misit after emu.

Thus the two pages not collated by Williams reveal a text rather different in character from that suggested by his collations. The presence of a sentence from Tr. 44 in Trv. 112: 1 is not amenable to any simple explanation. Nor is it readily obvious why the scribe compressed his text at the foot (which contains one line more than the upper); 23 against 22, with the last complete line squashed in height and a further two words, et tu, written below the far right end of this additional line. The text runs on without a break on f. 2 r.

DAVID F. WRIGHT

— Bibl. de la Faculté de Médecine 152; Oratory, Troyes; x; ff. 299v-302v, 1: 1-8

— 240. Concerning this manuscript see below, in note 205.

Munich, Bayer. Staatsbibl. 2556 and 2557: Abbey of Aldersbach, near Passau; xii; two vols., 1-18, 20, 19, 21-124.

— 3714; Augsburg Cath.; xii; 1-124

— 4516; Benediktbeuern, dioc. Freising; xii; 1-18, 20, 19, 21-124

— 4547; S. Bavaria (then Benediktbeuern Abbey); vii IX; item 15(b), 121: 5, 122: 1; f. 146, cento includ. 92: 1-2, 93: 2-4, 96: 1, 4 (Alan of Farfa's Homiliary, pt. II) 168.


— 6287; Freising Cath.; ix 1-13

— 9540; Abbey of Oberaltaich, near Regensburg; xii; 11-13; 30: 6-54 (numbered 27-51) 170.

167. Though the catalogue gives the contents as 118 sermons, I suspect the whole work is present, with misnumbering.

168. According to K. GAMBET, Codices Liturgici Latin Antiquiores (Speleologii Fribergensis Subsidia, I) Flensburg, 1953, p. 293, the best manuscript of the summer part of Alan's collection. Wrongly listed as "457" in the studies of Hop and Lederer (see n. 145 above).

169. This was the basis of Hosp's analysis of pt. I (see n. 145 above).

170. From the plate in LOWE, GLA IX, no. 1293, of f. 147, where Tr. 34 begins at ch. 2, and a microfilm of ff. 14-3, it is probable that this manuscript gives only an abridged text. Tractatus 30-54 are numbered '31-56' (49 is not used).

171. The basis of Hosp's analysis of pt. II (see n. 145 above).

172. The codex consists of 183 ff., but part of Serm. App. 160 appears at the end probably occupying f. 183. The catalogue specifies Tr. 30-55 as '26-51', but examination of plates and a section of microfilm, confirmed by enquiry of the Staatsbibliothek, has corrected this. The codex has lost its first quire, so that if it commenced with the beginning of a Tractatus it must originally have contained Tr. 29-54.

173. Used in Hosp's analysis (see n. 145 above). ROSE, op. cit. (n. 145), p. 81-95, gives a table of comparison with Beilin Phillip's 1676 (Einig). FF. 28-172 contain 81 items, corresponding with omissions to Egino, items 1-98. They are preceded by some pieces from Paul Deacon's collection.

174. According to GAMBET, op. cit., p. 292, the best manuscript of pt. I of Alan's collection. Used by Hop (see n. 145 above), but no details of foliation or numera-


176. For a detailed analysis of the Tractatus in this homiliary for the first part of the liturgical year I am indebted to the Director of the Biblioteca Nazionale. Lambot recovered two unpublished sermons from it: Sermons inédits de S. Augustin sur l'œuvrël et de l'Evangel, in RB 50 (1953), pp. 189-193.
DAVID F. WRIGHT

— — VI. B. 6; xii; 1:17; 11; 19; 5:23; 8; 32; 8:124

(177. The lacunae occur between ff. 60 and 61, and 76 and 77. There may be others.

178. As Tr. 93 is numbered '91' (Oberleitner, op. cit. 1/2, p. 182), there may be irregularity at an earlier stage. Further details have been unobtainable.

179. The whole manuscript lacks 79 folios, of which about 44 are missing from the Tractus, but the absence of Tr. 23 seems 'intentional', as the numbering runs on from 22 to 24 (171). Cf. K. SCHNEIDER, Die Handschriften der Stadtbibliothek Nürnberg, vol. 2: Die Lateinischen Mittelalterlichen Handschriften, pt. 1: Theologische Handschriften (Wiesbaden, 1967), p. 52.

180. I am obliged to M.F. Haachecorne, the Conservateur de la Bibliothèque, for clearing up the confusion of the entries in the successive Orléans catalogues of 1850 and 1885 (1885 merely reproduces part of the 1885 entry). The codex has lost the original 129-30, LXXVII (between the present pp. 133 and 134), CXXXIII (between pp. 228 and 229), CLXXIX (between pp. 302 and 303), CLXXXVI (between pp. 316 and 317), two of which the lower third remains) between pp. 247-49, two (of which scrap survive) between pp. 250 and 251, and three after p. 251, and before p. 516-17 of which only a few words of each line are left, from the latter sections of Tr. 116. The first items are entitled severally kornelia, but thereafter kornelson is the usual title, but tractatus also sometimes occurs. The numbering in the second part jumps from 43 to 54, and then returns from 56 to 48.

181. This manuscript is ascribed to the ninth century in LOWE, CLA Supplement, p. 38, no. 1284. On the contents see above, pp. 66, 68-69. Two quires of this manuscript, pp. 261-78 and 419-43, formed for a time 3-18 in Paris, B.N. n.l. 2243. They were returned to Orleans in 1886. The original numbering of Tr. '18-22' (= the editions' '18-20, 19, 20, 21, 22' has been corrected to '19-23', and further corrected in the case of '21' and '22' to the editions' '23' and '24'.
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— — 334 (283); Abbey of Fleury; XI; pp. 157-160, 67? (extracts?)

OXFORD, Balliol Coll. 6; W. England (Glocester region); XII in.;

1-124

Bodleian Lib. Auct. D. 110; St. Mary's Abbey, Missenden, Bucks. (then St. George's Chapel, Windsor); XII/XIII; 1-124

Boll. 153; Winchester; XV in.; ff. 73-130, abbruv. of 1-124

Boll. 301; (? Normandy, then) St. Peter's Cath., Exeter; XI ex.; 1-124

Canon Pat. lat. 147; N. Italy (Florence); XII; ff. 4-32, 124 (171)

Canon Pat. lat. 182; N. Italy; XIII; 1-124

Lat. theol. C. 10; England; XII in.; ff. 100r, 121; 3-122; 3; f. 101v, 23; 9-11; f. 101Av, 22; 9-10; 12-13

Laud. Misc. 124; St. Kylian's Cath., Wurzburg; IX med.; 55-124 (a)

Laud. Misc. 139; (? Benedictine Abbey, domic. Freising, original MS) and St. Kylian's Cath., Wurzburg (additions); IX (original MS), IX med. (additions); ff. 11-21, 14-16, 7 (ff. 23-25, 16, 7-18) ff. 39-49, 16, 7; 19-18 (ff. 50-59, 19-18-23-1); f. 71v-123, 23; 1-32-8 (ff. 126-138, 32: 8-36-2; f. 139v, 36); 4-5 f. 124-125, 149-158, 36, 2; 4-5 (ff. 189-198, 46-48); f. 199-323, 49: 1-54; 786


185. In this manuscript Tr. 19-59 were originally numbered '20-59' but have subsequently been corrected. See GARRISON, op. cit., vol. 3, pp. 314-16, 168. Comparative study of its illumination places it in the second quarter of the twelfth century, and confirms the Florentine provenance indicated by the notes connecting it with the city in the period 1240 to 1330 found on a folio added at the end.

186. Cf. WRIGHT, op. cit., pp. 321f., with references to BISHOFF, Die Südostdeutschen Schreibhaben, 38, and BISHOFF and HOPFANN, Libri Sacri Kyliani, pp. 20-21, 47, 122. The script of the core of the manuscript is close to that of the Benedictine school in the first half of the ninth century, but it is inconceivable that it was written elsewhere, though hardly at Wurzburg itself, by a scribe trained at Benedictine. The original core contained Tr. 14-16, 10, 23-36, 46-54, numbered '14-54'. The Wirzburg scribal who inserted the ten absent Tractatus (bracketed in the list above; the foliation is that of the composite volume) followed a variety of procedures. Between ff. 21r and 39r (originally consecutive) he copied on f. 22r (a half sheet, cut laterally; verso is blank) the end of Tr. 16 (which reappears in the original on f. 39r) before supplying Tr. 17-18. But between ff. 30v and 31r he removed a sheet containing the end of Tr. 19 and the start of 23. On f. 20v he transcribed the end of 99 together with its number in the original; '17', then intercalated 20-22 with correct numbers, and finally copied the end of 23 from the original, but numbered it '19' instead of '18', on the lower half of f. 20r (top and recto blank). Likewise for the insertion of Tr. 33-35 he removed a folio and
copied out 32: 8-36: 2 on ff. 126-136, but since the excised folio belonged between ff. 123 and 124 the order for the text now is: 123, 124-136, 124-125, 136-137 (207th), 140th. [F. 130th] by the second hand supplies about two-thirds of the omission of Tr. 36: 4-6 from the original's f. 137v. Before introducing Trv. 40-47 the corrector erased the beginning of 48 from the lower half of f. 180v and replaced it with the beginning of 46. Hence he had subsequently to supply the opening of 48 as f. 180v before the original resumed. On p. 98 above we have ventured a possible explanation of the later writer's incoherence in numbering Trv. 17-18 and 20-22 correctly but 33-35 and 46-47 three less than correctly (this also applies to his re-copying of the beginning and end of the Tractatus on either side of these last two insertions). In addition to the intercalation of the ten missing Tractatus, and probably subsequently to it, certain lesser lacunae in the original manuscript were made good by other Würzburg hands. See Bischopf and Romania, Liber Santi Kyhan, p. 44.


188. Hic est liber Sancte Marie de M...i. (partly erased, f. 194).

189. See n. 125 above.

190. Though clearly listed separately from the rest of the codex in P. Lauber, Catalogue général des manuscrits latins, vol. 2 (Paris, 1904), p. 238, these two folios are not so distinguished in Samaran and Marchal, op. cit., vol. 2, p. 95.

---
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occasions (e.g., is cript. this unparalleled why does it follow immediately easily chapter St. eo manuscript) begins used as scripts, principio... ', which means omission of populum work. 2*8*. MS volumes of collations i8r-48r, the this contents the ubi contents of the Tractatus. The omission of the Tractatus is indicated, and the whole work. 2*8*. MS lat. 11660, ff. 18-50, the Fastatus contained the whole work.

These two codices are companion volumes comprising a single copy of the whole work. MS lat. 11660 originally ended (l. 210) at Tr. 35: 8 line 17 (ex Aegypto populum qui viget sum), but a later scribe has supplied the completion of Tr. 36 on ff. 217-238. MS lat. 11659 begins at Tr. 38: 8 line 7 (Nisi credideritis quia ego sum), which means that it provides an overlap of a few lines between the two codices. The use of different titles in the course of these manuscripts merits a brief analysis (in which the numbers of the Tractatus are those of the editions and not those in the manuscript, where, as indicated above, Tr. 19 and 20 are transposed, and as a result of the omission of Tr. 21 and 22, 23-124 are numbered ' 21-122 '). It is difficult to discern any design in the way individual Tractatus are entitled. Tr. 1 begins: ‘Incipit Tractatus Sei Augustini de evangelio secundum Ioannem. Ab eo quod scriptum est: In principio... ’, which looks like an introductory title to the whole work, merged with that for Tr. 1 — hence the use of tracatus in the singular. Thereafter titles are used as follows: tractatus for Tr. 1-43, 1-124, and 1-247; omelia for the end of Tr. 49 (which begins as sermo) and the beginning of 50; and sermo on every other occasion where a designation occurs at all, except for one particular peculiarity. Tr. 20: 9-27 (in the manuscript) begins: ‘Incipit sermo XVIIII Sei Augustini de evangelio Sei Ioannis de eo ubi alii, Iam aurem die festa... ’, where the re-appearance of the references to St. Augustine and John's Gospel is odd. But it ends simply Explicit liber septimus, followed immediately by Explicit liber octavus. Ab eo quod est alii, Noumen Mosses... ’, introducing Tr. 30 (which ends as ‘sermo XVIIII ’). G. Pollet (to whom I am obliged for most of my knowledge of these two codices) has suggested that 'liber' means chapter of the Gospel, but although Tr. 29 deals with part of John 7, so too does Tr. 30, and the exposition of chapter 8 does not begin until Tr. 33. In any case, why this unparalleled reference to the chapters of the Gospel? It is possible, though not easily conceivable, that behind 'liber' stands the Latin for 'twenty', for then the number of these two Tractatus would be correct in the sequence of this manuscript. But I am at a loss to imagine how this corruption could have occurred.

Throughout the two manuscripts, with an inconsistency that seems almost random but allows for patches of uniformity, the Tractatus appear most often with a title at the end (e.g., 'Explicit sermo XI') but not at the beginning (‘Incipit primo'), less frequently with a title in both places (e.g., for Tr. 62-102), more rarely with one only at the beginning (e.g., for Tr. 59-61), and sometimes with a title in neither position. With like irregularity, an Explicit is totally lacking on some sixteen occasions (e.g., for Tr. 59-61), and a few times the word 'Incipit' before 'sermo' etc. is absent.

According to the Maurists' prefatory Admonitio (CCL 36, XIII) among their manuscripts were editissimi Germanes. However, in Paris, B.N. lat. 11660 only one copy of St. Germain-des-Prés is collated, which cannot be identified with the two-volume copy in MSS lat. 12194 and 12195. See the following note. In addition, the original catalogue or press numbers of these two manuscripts at St. Germain-des-Prés were 195 and 196, whereas the one whose collations survive was 197, according to MS lat. 11660, l. 50th. It remains possible, however, in default of further information concerning the second Germanes editissimi, which, if we may judge from a paralect noted on Tr. 87: 1 (PE 35, 1583, n. 1), was probably a complete copy of the work, that it is now Paris, B.N. lat. 12194 and 12195. I know of no evidence to exclude this identification. If it is erroneous, then there is no other extant candidate for the second Maurist manuscript from St. Germain-des-Prés.

196. See the last paragraph of the preceding note. The codex Germanes collated as codex 6 in Paris, B.N. lat. 11660 apparently contained only Tr. 1-54, for it does not feature in the collations for the second half. Paris, B.N. lat. 12196 is the only manuscript extant from St. Germain-des-Prés which could possibly be identified as the Maurists' one (which BEAUMONT, Henrici, p. 114, regards as unknown today). It is, I think, early enough for them to speak of it as editissimum, and examination may well reveal the original St. Germain-des-Prés press mark, 197, which the Maurist's codex bore. The sequence of numbers between these three manuscripts, MSS lat. 12194 to 12195, is probably parallel to their original sequence.
80-82; f. 155*; 83: 2-86; f. 158*; 87-91: 4 (Paul Deacon's Hoomi- 
lary, pt. II)198

— nouv. acq. lat. 2444; Beauvais Cath. (then Cister-
icians of Chaalis (Toussaintres Château), dioc. Beauvais; xi; 1-
124
— nouv. acq. lat. 2617; xii; 58 (end)-94 (incomplete),
95 (end)-99: 9
— nouv. acq. lat. 2639, f. 11*; xii; 121: 3-122: 2
— Bibl. Sainte Geneviève 235; Abbey of St. John Baptist, Le Jard,
S.-E. of Paris; xii; ff. 3r-4r, 17: 1-11

Pistoia, Archiv. Capit. del Duomo C. 158; xi; 1-124

Porto, Bibl. Pubblici. 13 (no. 39); Porto Cath.; A.D. 1261; 1-17,
S. 125 (ff. 90r-95r), 20, 18-19, 21-40

Prague, Knih. Metrop. Kapit. A. 73/f; XIV ex.; f. 1r-197*, 1-17, S. 125,
20, 22-124

— A. 108/3; St. Vitus' Cath., Prague; xvi; ff. 198v-
204v, 1-2

— Univ. Knih. VI. C. 17; Augustinian Convent of St. Giles, Tréboň
(Wittingau), S. of Prague; xiv; 1-17, S. 125 (ff. 70v-83v), 20-
124
— XII B. 11; Monastery of Goldenkron, dioc.
Prague; A.D. 1408; ff. 212r-227*; selections

Princeton, University, Dept. of Art and Archaeology Friend I; St. Martin's Abbey, Tournai; xii-xii; ff. 1r-173*; 39-124

197. See n. 193 above. Analyzed by Delisle, op. cit., pp. 193-104, 298-312. A complete copy of part two of Paul Deacon's homilary, differing from Grégoire's analysis exactly as does Paris, B.N. lat. 604 except that nos. 78-80 are present in
this manuscript, are of course nos. 1-31 and 119-134. After no. 94 (b) a rubric for St. Martin directs the reader to nos. 103-109 below; similarly after no. 103 a rubric refers to nos. 54-55 above. At the end occur Ps.-Breeze, Homilies III; 70-71 (PL 94,
459-455; cf. CCL 122, 383), which do not appear in the table of contents.

198. This manuscript may be the one that appears in the Phillips catalogue as no. 2037, which was almost certainly one of the major portions of the collection, 146 manuscripts in all, bought by Phillips from St. Martin's Abbey, Tournai, in 1822-3, which was fraudulently sold by a man in Brussels charged with their
safekeeping (cf. A.N. Munby, Phillips' Studies 3 (Cambridge, 1954), p. 22). Its absence from Schenk's catalogue of the Chetham library indicates its failure to reach there. Thus though the Princeton manuscript, for details of which I am
grateful to Kurt Wetham, bears none of the identification marks noted
by Munby, Phillips Studies 4 (1956), p. 165, this would not be surprising in the
circumstances. However, the fact that it does not display the pressmark 'B. 28'
mentioned in Phillips' catalogue may tell against the identification. The Louvain
edition of the Tractatus used a codex Tournaiensis containing the whole work, which
may equally have become Phillips 2037. If it survives today, it remains uniden-

199. The Manuscript's Admonition (PL 35, 1578-1600) mentions only one Reims
manuscript among its manuscripts, but in their collations in Paris, B.N. lat. 11606, ff. 49-
212, two Remiges are encountered, codices 4, which may be Reims 93 and 8, and
which is listed in two parts and is certainly Reims 93 and 94. If Reims 92 is codex 4, then according to those collations its text includes several glosses, especially in the
regard of Tr. 5: Reims 92 fits the bill in number 255 as '1-70': 200.

200. On the liturgical significance of this manuscript see Willem, CCL, 36, IX, X,
and G. Löw, loc. cit. A 14 of the Biblioteca Vallicelliana (of the sec. IX) is its
most important manuscript, in Miscellanea Liturgica in Homenom L. Cumberti

Cited in n. 199 above, A. 14, vol. I, p. 228, repeats the reference to the
Sitzungsber. der Kaiserl. Akad. der Wissenschaft, Phil.-Hist. Classe 53 (Vienna, 1866),
p. 335 n. 10, that the omission of Tr. 18-20 as a result of the disordering of
the sheets indicated by Reffereurs, the present order of the text is as follows: Tr. 1-2;
13, 4: 1-5 (f. 19*)-2 (f. 18*): 2-5: 4 (f. 24*); two folia have been lost, containing respectively Tr. 2: 13-16 and Tr. 3: 4-7. The
left-twelfth century ff. 198v-199* supply the loss of Tr. 37: 10-14: 8. Rubrics and
headings in later manuscripts similar to these found in Vallicell. A 14 demonstrate
its connexion with a widely influential line of tradition. The heading to the
Capitula for the first half is as follows (L 14): Nonnini Dominus incipit capitula
in expositione evangelii sancti Iohannis edita a sancto Agustino in primis de [what
comes next is not legible on microfilm; probably as Reffereurs gives, natale
Dominis nostri Iohanne Christi, which is the completion in the parallels noted below].
This formula is found in Naples VI. B. 7, in manuscripts from the region of Florence,
such as Florence 16 dext. 4 and Mugel, 5 and London, B.M. Burney 291, and in
essence in Durham, Cath. B. 117 (expositonum...Augustini venerabilis episcopo),
where in other respects it is far distant from these Italian exemplars. A trace of its
influence may even be discerned in manuscripts like Oxford, St. John's, I where Tr. 14
begins after the bare heading in natale Domini. Similarly, the index of lections from
part two of the collection (cf. CCL 36, IX. 7) is prefaced with the rubric (f. 31*): Hec in libro insularum omnes Aurelii Augustini expositionem in Iohannis
capitulis nuntiatum pro parte capitulorum super caput haec caput super episcopi caput
adnotat. Together with the index itself this formula (with the variant Aurelii) recurs in
Barber in 118 and but situated after Tr. 1-54 as part of the introduction to the second half (f. 199*). In Florence 16 dext. 4, Lincoln 9 and Vick 27, on the other hand it occupies the position of the rubric, 'super caput Iohannis', which is the
heading in the second of the rubric above. Also in Vallicell 251 the index of lections, which precedes the list of Capitula for part two, bears the title Item. Inscripta capitula eiusdem Augustini super Iohannis partis II, a rubric that
appears in Finerum et por base capitula rupit thesauri adnotat (so Oberleitner, op. cit.,
it. vol. I, p. 289), which represents the ending of the line of the rubric above, in
the heading for the Capitula of part two found in Vallicell. A 14 (f. 31*) and in
several other manuscripts. These connections between Vallicell. A 14 and other
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ROUEN, Bibl. Mun. 467 (A. 85); Abbey of St. Evroult, S.-W. of Rouen (then Abbey of St. Ouen, Rouen); xii; 1-124 (the Maurists' Audoenensis)\textsuperscript{200a}

--- --- 468 (A. 91); St. Peter's Abbey, Jumièges, dioc. Rouen; xii; 1-124 (the Maurists' Gemmaticensis)

ST. GALLEN, Stiftsbibl. 155; St. Gallen Abbey; x; 55-124 (a)

--- 168 and 169; St. Gallen Abbey; ix; 168, 1-21 (and introduction to 22); 169, 22-54 (for 168 cf. Carlsruhe Aug. LXXXVI)

--- 241; St. Gallen Abbey; ix; pp. 65-172, abbr. of 1-18, 20

ST. OMER, Bibl. Mun. 23 (two vols.); vol. I, XII, 1-40; vol. II, XIII, 41: 10-124: 8

116; Abbey of St. Bertin, St. Omer; xv; 55-124 (a)

SALISBURY, Cath. Lib. 67; Salisbury Cath.; xii in., and XIII (ff. 17-24, 227*-229*); 1-124

SALZBURG, Bibl. der Erzabtei St. Peter a VII 33; St. Peter's Abbey, Salzburg; ix; 15-19, 23-36: 92

SCHAFFHAUSEN, Stadtbibl. 18; All Saints' Abbey, Schaffhausen; xi; 1-18, 20, 19, 21-124

SIENA, Bibl. Comunale F I 2, ff. 97-209*; St. Mary's Cath., Siena; xii in.; 1-124\textsuperscript{200a}.

STUTTGART, Württemberg. Landesbibl. H.B. VII 17; Constance Cath. (then Abbey of Weingarten, dioc. Constance); ix in.; 2; 2-21: 12

copies of the Tractatus would probably be found to be far more extensive were fuller information available.

In the opinion of M.P.J. van den Hout (Augustiniana 5 [1955], p. 297) the variant readings displayed by this manuscript 'ne sauraient s'expliquer que par des erreurs des divers scribes', which is for him confirmation that all the Tractatus, and not merely Trr. 1-54, were truly preached to a congregation. I do not share this scholar's view of the origins of Trr. 55-124 (he is persuaded by the arguments of M. Le Landais), and have not yet been able to examine the kind of variations he adduces, to ascertain whether or not they support the inferences he draws.

200a The earlier location of Rouen 467 (A. 85) at St. Evroult is established by G. Norbert, Les Bibliothèques Médiévales des Abbayes Benedictines de Normandie (new edn. : Bibliothèque d'Histoire et d'Archéologie Chrétiennes, Paris, 1971), pp. 114-115, 122, 190, [200].


201a I learnt of this manuscript (which is not listed in Oberleitner, op. cit.) from the description by Viviana Jemolo in Censimento dei codici dei secoli X-XII, in Studi Medievali 11 (1970), at pp. 1973-1976.
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--- theolog. et phil. fol. 132; Abbey of Wiblingen, near Ulm; A.D. 1444; 1-18, 20, 19, 21-124 (a)

TARRAGONA, Museo Diocesano; xiii in.; 39: 4-106: 1 (some lacunae)\textsuperscript{202}

TORTOSA, Catedral Bibl. 230; xiii, ff. 7r-?, extracts, beginning at 1; 720a

TOURS, Bibl. Mun. 289; St. Martin's Abbey, Marmoutier, near Tours; ix in.; 10: 12-16; 3, 19; 16-23, 38: 420a

--- 290; St. Martin's Abbey, Marmoutier; xi; 40-124: 7

--- 291; St. Gatin's Cath., Tours; xi; ff. 97-155a, 143-124

--- 292; St. Gatin's Cath., Tours; xi; 1-124

--- 293; St. Gatin's Cath., Tours; xi; ff. 1r-241*, 1-42

TRENTO, Bibl. Comun. 1568 (on permanent loan to Soprintendenza alle Belle Arti, Castello del Buonconsiglio, Treneto); xiv; 1-124

TROYES, Stadtbibl. 1257/1; Italy; x/xi; 1-124

--- 126/1236; Priory of Eberhardsklausen, near Trèves; A.D. 1483; 1-124

TROYES, Bibl. Mun. 116; xiii; 1-121 beg.

--- 199; Abbey of Clairvaux; xii; 1-124

--- 200; St. Peter's Abbey, Montier-la-Celle, Troyes; xii; 1-19, 23-124

--- 536; St. Peter's Abbey, Montier-la-Celle; x; 1-19, 23-38, 41

--- 853; N. Italy (then region of Ravenna, and St. Paul's Abbey, Besançon); viii ex.; ff. 27r, 121: 5, 122: 1; ff. 84r, cento (mutat. at beg.) includ. 92: 1-2, 93: 2-4, 96: 1, 4 (Alan of Farfa's Homiliary, pt. II)\textsuperscript{205}

202. For my knowledge of this manuscript I am indebted to Fr. J. Janini of Valencia.

203. See n. 192 above.

204. Between ff. 28 and 29 (Tr. 16: 3 and 19: 10) probably 16 folios have been lost.
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— lat. 637; Church of St. Vincent at the Vatican; 1X; ff. 126-160r, extracts from 1-18, 20, 19, 21-123: 5 (incomplete at end)\(^{209}\)


— lat. 4222; S. Italy (Beneventum); XI; f. 22rv, 4: 1-6; ff. 437v-461r, 1: 1-8; ff. 94tr-102r, 5-6; ff. 108v-112v, 8: 2-9 (abbrev. ?); ff. 119v-120v, 16; ff. 169v-171v, 17: 1-10 (Homiliary)\(^{211}\)

— lat. 7615; XI; 1-17, S. 125 (ff. 66v-70r, 18-122: 9)

— lat. 13501; S. Italy (Beneventum); XI; f. 41v, fragments of 34: 4-9

— lat. 14004; S.-E. Italy (then Archiepiscopal Seminary, Capua; Beneventum, Bari-type); XI; 2: 15-101, 115: 5-124

— Arch. S. Pietro C 96; S. Peter's Basilica, Rome; XI-XI; 1-17, S. 125 (ff. 61v-64v), 20, 18-19, 21-124 (a)\(^{212}\)

— Arch. S. Pietro C 105; S. Peter's Basilica, Rome; XI/X; ff. 277v-279v, 51: 1-8; ff. 281v-282r, compilation from 55v-56, 58-59, 61-63 (mulit. at end) (Homiliary, pt. II)\(^{213}\)

209. See pp. 76-89, above.


211. Barié, Un homiliaire bâlense... (op. cit., n. 131 above), pp. 89-119, especially pp. 91-97. Although more a collection of 'homilies' than 'sermons' (see pp. 108-109 above), it represents a good textual tradition and is very largely independent and original both in content and arrangement.

212. For its unusual numbering see p. 91 above. This manuscript is briefly described by Franca de Marco in Censimento dei codici dei secoli X-XII, in Studi Medioevali 11 (1970), at pp. 111-112. It is assigned to the eleventh century and to central Italy as its area of origin. An index to the Gospel and accompanying Tractatus appears on ff. 1r-2v.

213. Analyzed by Löw, Il più antico Sermonario di San Pietro in Vaticano, in Rivista di Archeologia Cristiana 19 (1942), pp. 143-183, who describes its close affinities, especially its 'absolute identity', with Egino's collection, Berlin Phil. 1676, i.e., with the Roman homiliary of the early eighth century known usually as that of Alan of Farfa (see n. 145 above). It is probably independently based on the ancient and authentic homiliary of St. Peter's; cf. the articles of A. Chavasse listed in nn. 145 and 210 above. It ends imperfectly with Maundy Thursday.
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VENICE, Bibl. Naz. Marciana lat. Z. 59 (1797); St. Mark's Church, Venice; xix; ff. 17v-20v, 1-17, S. 125 (ff. 69v-69r), 18-124

— lat. Z. 60 (1690); St. Mark's Church, Venice; xii; ff. 5v-8v, 1: 4-40: 4

— lat. II. 18; xiii; ff. 115v-117v, extracts from 1-4

— lat. II. 102 (2418); St. Margaret's Church, Padua; xiv in; 1-18, 20, 19, 21-124 (a)

VERCELLI, Archiv. Capit. XLVI (58); N. Italy; ix ex; 1-124

VERONA, Bibl. Capit. XXXVI (34); St. Zeno's Cath., Verona; ix; 1-17, S. 125 (ff. 117v-124v), 18-20, 19, 22-53: 13

— LII (50); Burgundy; viii/ix; ff. 71v-76v, 7: 7-10, 13-14, 15-16; ff. 76v-79v; 7: 17-18, 19-22 (Hymnary) (a)

— Bibl. Commun. 3034; St. Zeno's Cath. (then Abbey of St. Zeno the Greater) Verona; ix8; fragmentary remains of 55: 1-57, 61-66, 64-67; 1 (a)217

VICH, Bibl. Capit. 27 (II); Vich Cath.; xii; 1-17, S. 125 (ff. 61v-65v), 20-23, 18-19, 24-124 (a)

VIENNA, Österr. Nationalbibliothek 655; St. Mary's Abbey, Garsten, near Linz; xii ex; ff. 11-118v, 55-124 (a)218

216. ÉTAIN, Un homilie ancien dans le ms. LII de la Bibliothèque capitulaire de Veron, in RB 73 (1968), pp. 289-306; GRÖGER, op. cit., p. 8. This Burgundian collection seems to be based on a lost Roman homiliary. The extracts from the Tractatus are found also in Agnuni's homiliary, pt. III, Vatican 386, ff. 104v-105r. While there is general agreement that this manuscript was written in a monastery, perhaps one of little prominence, in Burgundy and reached Verona, it is certainly by the early ninth century (see also LOWE, CLA IV, no. 505; H. HASSLIK, Benedicti Regula [SEL 75; Vienn, 1960], p. 254; Z. VIEX, Der Mönch in der Gesellschaft der Kirche: Leben und Schicksale der Mönche in der Vorgeschichte des Mittelalters [1797]; see also Z. VIEX, Der Mönch in der Gesellschaft der Kirche: Leben und Schicksale der Mönche in der Vorgeschichte des Mittelalters [1797]). There is textual and palaeographical reasoning for linking parts of it with the Abbey of Sts. Peter and Paul at Flavigny (diocese of Dijon, Côte d'Or). Its origin therefore remains unclear. A Burgundian foundation connected with Flavigny would presumably meet the situation. See ÉTAIX, art. cit., p. 299; BISCHOFF, Panorama..., p. 242 n. 66; B. FISCHER, Bibeltext und Bibelzeiten unter Karl dem Großen, in Karl der Große : Lehenswurf, vol. 2, p. 169. The inclusion of the codex in G. TURKENTI'S Monumenta Veronensia [IV vol. al X vil Secl o : Esbozzi di Scrittura Veronese... (Verona, 1967), p. 13, is accompanied by any indication that the author is not claiming it for the Verona scriptorium (a possibility which ÉTAIN, loc. cit., emphatically rejects). Turini places the manuscript unambiguously in the eighth century, and also dates codex XXXVI (see my list above) more precisely to the end of the ninth century.

217. On this reconstructed codex see the works of G. MOSCHETTI and M. CARRA listed in Claris Patrum Latinarum (second edit.), no. 278. More precise indication of contents is given by CARRA, Il più antico Codice della Biblioteca Comunale di Verona, pp. 10-11. Tr. 56, 72 and 75 are complete, 55, 62, 70 and 73 virtually so. The manuscript seems to have been a companion volume to Verona, Capit. XXXVI.

218. On this manuscript, for details of which and for other assistance I am indebted to Dr. M.S. Gros, see n. 125 above. The Tractates are sub-divided into liturgical homilies; cf. n. 147 above.

219. Denis's catalogue describes the contents as sermons I-LXIV of the second part. Mismarking may disguise the presence of the whole of Tr. 55-124.
VORAU, Bibl. Comun. Guarnee 676 (LXI. 8, 5; 22), H. 1-210; Church of St. Cecilia the Less, Volterra; XIV; 1-17, S. 125 (ff. 64v-68r), 18-124

VORAU, Bibl. des Chorherrenstiftes 104 (XIV); Austria (? Augustinian Canons, Vorau); XII ex. 1-17, S. 125 (ff. 64v-68r), 18-124; 328

WERTHEIM, F. von, Löwenstein-Wertheim-Rosenbergsches Archiv Fragm. 2; (? St. Kylian's Cath., Würzburg) then Bronnbach Abbey, dioc. Würzburg; ex. 6; 1-3, 9-12

WINCHESTER, Cath. Lib. II; Cath. Priory of St. Swithin, Winchester; XI 11; ff. 1-261, 1-124

WOLFENBÜTTEL, Herzog-August-Bibliothek. 4904 (10); Abbey of Sts. Peter and Paul, Weisenburg; IX in.; 1-23

4906 (12); Abbey of Sts. Peter and Paul, Weisenburg; IX; ff. 177-179; extracts from 15: 1-14 (Augustinian Homiliary) 224

320. Dein, op. cit. In her edition of this fragment Mrs. Dein has inserted the heading Tractatus LXVII in one of the lacunae. It is far more likely that Sermo [Homilia] LXXIII was in the original.


222. Cf. Lamboy, Sermo inedit de saint Augustin pour une fête de mariees dans un manuscrit de type ancien, in RB 68 (1958), pp. 187-199; G. G. op. cit., pp. 132-141. Lambot puts the composition of the homilyary presented in this manuscript circa 650-750 and regards it as based on an African collection of the early sixth century, which itself goes back to a more primitive compilation. According to N. Italy and Burgundy, perhaps the Abbey of Sts. Peter and Andrew, Novalaise, W. of Turin, or St. Maurice, Agenae, S. of Lake Geneva.

223. P. Fank, Catalogus Variae, seu Codices Manuscripti Bibliothecae Caroliniae in Vorau (Graz, 1936), p. 51. As a result of the disordering of the sheets the text is to be read in the following order: ff. 1-174, 175-189, 190-192, 193-233.

224. Morin, Les Tractatus S. Augustini du ms. 406 de Wolfsburc, in RB 31 (1914-16), p. 150. This remarkable collection of Augustinian sermons goes back to
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4102 (18); Abbey of Sts. Peter and Paul, Weissenburg; IX in.; 24-542

WÜRZBURG, Universitätsbibl. M.p.th.f. 74; S. Bavaria (? Freising) (then St. Kylian's Cath., Würzburg); Ix med.; ff. 1-94, 1-13220

ZURICH, Universitätsbibl. Z. XIV. 17 (614); XII; f. rv, 87: 1-88: 3; ff. 2-3v, 122: 8-123: 5; f. 4v, 124: 4-5

ZWETTL, Stiftsbibliothek (Zurich); Zwettl Abbey; XII; 1-17, S. 125 (ff. 64v-68r), 20-124

THE MANUSCRIPTS USED BY THE LOUVAIN EDITORS

For their edition of the Tractatus, which was published in 1576 at Antwerp in volume 9 of their Opera Omnia, the Louvain editors used seven manuscripts (vol. 9, p. 457), of which three can be identified today:

1. Parcensis, 71r-1-43 = Londin, B.M. Addit. 17289
2. Floreciensis, 71r-1-43
3. Gemblacensis, 71r-1-44 = Brussel 5565
4. Tornacensis, 71r-1-124
5. Cambrosiensis, 71r-1-124
6. S. Amandi, 71r-1-124 = almost certainly Valenciennes 802
7. Carthusiensis, 71r-1-124

I know of no candidates for identification as the remaining four, unless London, B.M. Addit 19037, of the twelfth century, be the codex

the activity of Caesarius of Arles, according to Morin. On its use of the term tractatus see above n. 39.

225. See n. 76 above.

226. In Die Südostdeutschen Schreibschulen, pp. 111-116, Bischoff asserted that the scribe of this manuscript, one Tisc, must have originated in the Freising school even if his script subsequently underwent variation elsewhere. This connexion with Freising, which Bischoff qualifies somewhat in Liber Sancti Kyliani, pp. 42-43, is probably confirmed by Munich 3287 (rv): Freising which alone of other early manuscripts also contains Tr. 1-13 and no more.

227. According to the editors' Castigationes et Variae Lectiones (vol. 9, p. 457) their codex S. Amandi contained the whole work, and Valenciennes 80 is the only known copy from St. Amand-le-Faux which fulfils this requirement. Two items of information received through E. Bleunen confirmed this identification. A page of parchment sewn into the last sheet of the codex bears the date 1570, a probable indication of the year the manuscript was collated for the Louvain edition which appeared in 1576. Secondly, the last words of Tr. 14 in Valenciennes 80 are Deus bles mortem ne mora bles hortisim (Maurists, PL and CCL: unles, winmer), which was the reading in the Louvain edition. However, since all the manuscripts used for this edition, as well as all earlier editions, presented this reading, this last point is of limited significance. For one distinctive feature of Valenciennes 80 see p. 82 above.
Carthusiens. It was brought from La Grande Chartreuse to Erfurt in the fifteenth century (see n. 158 above).

The manuscripts used by the Maurist editors

The Maurists’ edition of the Tractatus appeared in the second part of their third volume (Paris, 1680). Their Admonitio lists fourteen manuscripts, but it omits at least one and is probably inconsistent in the way it counts pairs of codices together forming a single copy of the work. Nor do they specify the contents of their manuscripts, though in several cases these can be determined from the collations in Paris, B.N. lat. 11660 and 11661.

1. Fossatensis, Trr. 1-124; circa A.D. 840
2. Germanensis (vetustissimus), Trr. 1-54 = probably Paris, B.N. lat. 12196 (see n. 196 above)
3. Germanensis (vetustissimus), Trr. 1-124 (?) = perhaps Paris, B.N. lat. 12194, 12195 (see n. 195 above)
4. Corbeiensis = perhaps Paris, B.N. lat. 11635, containing Trr. 55-124 (‘70’) (see n. 194 above)
5. Remigiiensis, Trr. 1-124 in two parts = Reims 93, 94
7. Gemmeclensis, Trr. 1-124 = Rouen A. 91
8. Floriacensis, Trr. 1-124 = Orléans 161 (see above p. 88 and n. 181)
9. Audoenensis, Trr. 1-124 = Rouen A. 85
10. Becheronensis, Trr. 1-27
11. Pratellensis, Trr. 1-124
12. F. Vindocinensis duo, Trr. 1-124 = most probably Vendôme 38 and 41 (see n. 214 above)
13. Carcassonensis, Trr. 1-17, S. 125, 20-124 (55-124 as ‘70’)
14. Abbatia de Cultura = Le Mans 260, containing Trr. 54-124

The Maurist editors also took note of the variant readings listed by their Louvain predecessors from their seven manuscripts, which explains how on occasion they could refer to more manuscripts than their own

---

228. PL 35. 1379-1380; CCL 36, XIII.
229. This manuscript from the Cistercian house of La Merce-Dieu on the River Garonne in Haute-Vienne disappears from the collations in Paris, B.N. lat. 11660, ff. 1'-77'. It is referred to in the edition only on Trr. 1 and 2 (PL 35. 1384 n. 1, 1389 n. 1, 1390 n. 1).

---

230. On Trr. 1: q (PL 35. 1384 n. 1). Cf. also the reference to thirteen manuscripts on Trr. 5: 3 (PL 35. 1386 n. 2), a total which equally cannot be reached solely from the Maurists’ own codices. The Louvain editors’ Parcese is explicitly mentioned on Trr. 5: 14 (PL 35. 1421 n. 1). Fifteen are referred to on Trr. 12: 12 (PL 35. 1490 n. 1), which must include at least one manuscript in addition to their own (so Van den Hout, in Augustiniana 5 (1955), p. 302 n. 7, correctly but working only from the Maurists’ Admonitio), and perhaps two of their Corbeiensis contained only Trr. 55-124 (see above).

---
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THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE «TRACT. IN EVANG. IOH. » maximum, once even to seventeen manuscripts. Of the unidentified codices, the Fossatensis and most probably the Becheronensis must now be regarded as lost. It is possible that the Pratellensis and the Carcassonensis still survive, but in the latter case the mass of exemplars including S. 125 throws up not a single serious candidate for identification.

MANUSCRIPTS LOST OR MISSING

For the sake of completeness I include the following information about a few manuscripts known of in modern times:

Chartres 154 (106) : destroyed in the war.
Münster, Universitätsbibl. (Regia Bibl. Paulina) 41 (215) : destroyed in the war.
Poznan, Archiwum i Bibl. Archidiecezji 14 : destroyed in the war.
Trèves 124 : lost between 1831 and 1891.
Trèves 127 : lost.
Phillips 2037 : location perhaps unknown — see n. 198 above.
Phillips 4477 : last observed when offered for sale by Jacques Rosen- thal of Munich early in 1899 (see Wright, op. cit., p. 326 n. 1). Enquiries in Munich have failed to discover the buyer.
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228. PL 35. 1379-1380; CCL 36, XIII.
229. This manuscript from the Cistercian house of La Merce-Dieu on the River Garonne in Haute-Vienne disappears from the collations in Paris, B.N. lat. 11660, ff. 1'-77'. It is referred to in the edition only on Trr. 1 and 2 (PL 35. 1384 n. 1, 1389 n. 1, 1390 n. 1).

---

230. On Trr. 1: q (PL 35. 1384 n. 1). Cf. also the reference to thirteen manuscripts on Trr. 5: 3 (PL 35. 1386 n. 2), a total which equally cannot be reached solely from the Maurists’ own codices. The Louvain editors’ Parcese is explicitly mentioned on Trr. 5: 14 (PL 35. 1421 n. 1). Fifteen are referred to on Trr. 12: 12 (PL 35. 1490 n. 1), which must include at least one manuscript in addition to their own (so Van den Hout, in Augustiniana 5 (1955), p. 302 n. 7, correctly but working only from the Maurists’ Admonitio), and perhaps two of their Corbeiensis contained only Trr. 55-124 (see above).
THE PURPOSE of this article, which makes no claim to originality, is to present to a wider public of churchmen what might be called 'the new look on Pelagius'. Recent studies of this notorious heretic have led to the inescapable conclusion that he has not received a fair deal from the historians of dogma. Every student of theology is familiar with the Pelagianism so forcefully refuted by Augustine of Hippo, and most have learnt to regard it more as a kind of humanism than as a wrong-headed version of Christianity. It is frequently depicted as a rationalistic moralism after the manner of Stoicism. 'Nature, free-will, virtue and law', wrote Harnack, 'these—strictly defined and made independent of the notion of God—were the catch words of Pelagianism: self-acquired virtue is the supreme good which is followed by reward. Religion and morality lie in the sphere of the free spirit; they are won at any moment by man's own effort.' And even if we do not subscribe to Harnack's characterisation of the movement as godless rationalism, yet it remains true, in the words of Robert F. Evans, that 'Pelagius and the heresy called by his name continue to provide occasion for careless slogans and confident postures. In centres of theological learning, the cry'Pelagianism' is inevitably hurled whenever the schemes of men appear to threaten the necessity and sufficiency of the divine grace.' Even Growing Into Union has not penetrated beyond the level of caricature; Pelagianism is 'the doctrine of self-salvation through self-sufficient self-reliance'.

From the fifth century onwards the name of Pelagius has suffered from being uncritically lumped together with his chief followers, Celestius and Julian, who undoubtedly adopted more brazenly anti-catholic stances as the controversy progressed. In this essay we shall concern ourselves solely with Pelagius, partly because he will always retain the central interest as the trail-blazer of the alleged heresy, and partly because it is above all the image of his theology and religion that twentieth-century scholars have so conspicuously clarified.

Pride of place in a brief survey of Pelagian research must go to Alexander Souter for his unravelling of the complicated manuscript tradition of Pelagius's Commentary on the Thirteen Epistles of St. Paul, which for the first time gave students a text which could be regarded as reliably authentic. (Souter's analysis of the manuscript evidence has recently been challenged in one major respect, but his achievement remains fundamental.) It is of major significance that Pelagius should have chosen Paul's Epistles as the subject of his Commentary. Its central importance in the elucidation of his theology is further enhanced by the fact of its composition some years before the outbreak of the controversy with Augustine, and so before he incurred on that front the suspicion of unorthodoxy in his views on man, sin and grace. A pupil of Souter, A. J. Smith, in a series of painstaking articles stimulated by Souter's own researches pinpointed Pelagius's indebtedness in the Commentary on Romans to earlier writers, especially Origen (through the mediation of Rufinus), Ambrose, 'Ambrosiaster' and Augustine himself in his earlier anti-Manichaean and 'pre-Augustinian' works.

The Swiss scholar Georges de Plinval contributed an excellent full account of Pelagius's life and activities as a writer, teacher and reformer, and also a study of his language and style. Plinval's work gave a great impetus to Pelagian research, partly by his earlier ascription to Pelagius himself of nineteen writings of uncertain but broadly Pelagian (in the generic sense) authorship. Plinval's attributions have been variously received. They were swallowed wholesale by John Ferguson in his rather inadequate little book on Pelagius, and ignored in an equally slight but epoch-making volume on Pelagius's theology and its sources by the Swedish scholar Torgny Bohlin. All subsequent expositions of the thought of Pelagius have been to a greater or lesser extent based on Bohlin, who 'provided a new point of departure for Pelagian studies'.

Most of the latest advances in this field have been made by English-speaking scholars, which is most appropriate since Pelagius is the first author of British origin known to history. Not all these studies have been of permanent value. The endeavours of J. N. L. Myres and John Morris to interpret the early Pelagian movement in terms of the social and political context provided by the end of Roman rule in Britain have not stood the test of critical examination, but more substantial and no less stimulating contributions have issued from the pens of Robert F. Evans of the University of Pennsylvania and Peter Brown of All Souls. The net result of these scholarly developments has been to pose with renewed urgency the kind of question long asked in the case of other heresies, namely, 'How Pelagian was Pelagius?'

The time will not be ripe for a definitive answer to this question until a consensus emerges concerning the authorship of the many contested treatises claimed for Pelagius by Plinval, and until a further improved text of the Pauline Commentary is published. But it is already fully
possible to set forth the main outlines of Pelagius's thought as he himself presented it rather than as Jerome or Augustine reported it. Whether such an exposition justifies describing him as an exponent of 'twice-born' religion, the reader may be left to judge for himself. What is beyond doubt is that Pelagius painted his own portrait rather more attractively than Augustine did. He deserves to be heard in his own cause for a change.

It must first be emphasised that Pelagius saw himself as standing four-square within the tradition of the orthodox catholic Church. His writings drew upon theologians of both East and West, he was a stalwart opponent of Arianism, and he probably wrote also against Apollinarism. Above all, Pelagius constructed his theology in conscience opposition to Manicheanism, the late-agnostic dualistic determinism of Persian provenance to which Augustine adhered for an embarrassingly long time before his conversion (and to which Julian the Pelagian reckoned he never ceased to adhere). Pelagius had no time for an ideology which attributed to evil substantial being, declared sin inevitable and located it in the very nature of our humanity as one of its two constituent principles. This anti-Manichaean orientation of Pelagius's thinking has many ramifications (for instance, in his refusal to set body or flesh over against spirit or soul, as well as explaining the undeniable affinities between Pelagius and Augustine's anti-Manichaean phase. It is a crucial determining factor which has only in recent years received due prominence in the interpretation of his thought, largely through Bohlin's book and derivative studies.

It is doubtful if any theologian of the early centuries placed a higher premium on the doctrine of divine creation than Pelagius. As Evans puts it, 'Pelagius' insistence that man can be without sin is an emphatic assertion of the doctrine of creation by a just God; it is nothing more, and it is nothing less.' It is well known that Pelagius expounds an anthropology which insists that man is bound neither by external necessity, such as original sin or 'irresistible grace', nor by internal necessity, such as belongs to the non-human creation from which man is distinguished by freedom of will. The human 'capacity for either direction', for obedience and disobedience alike, is an essential prerequisite, in Pelagius's view, for all judgments of moral worth, for all talk of reward and punishment. Both good and evil are only real when they are the actions of spontaneous will. This estimate of man's freedom as always constitutive of his being, such that we can call it the only 'necessity' of human nature, remains valid for Pelagius throughout the career of every individual and through all the stages of salvation history, though as we shall see, Pelagius has other things to say which in practice radically qualify it.

For the moment we must re-emphasise that the human capacity for good and hence for sinlessness is a divine endowment and not a cause for boastfulness on man's part. It has clearly proved a difficult thing to give Pelagius the credit he deserves on this point. Harnack's accusation quoted above that he conceived of nature and free will independently of the notion of God could not be more erroneous. For Pelagius human freedom is never independent of God. It owes its existence to God's creative grace (for so he came to describe it in the course of the controversy), and is never the achievement of man himself, who neither creates his own freedom nor is able ever to destroy it. Therefore, when a man exercises his freedom to do good he is utilising a God-given ability, and for that good act both God and the human agent must receive credit, God for the gift and man for the right exercise of it. But man's obedience would be impossible without his possession of a divinely implanted capacity which survives unimpaired any and every abuse of his freedom. Western thinking has been so conditioned by Augustinianism that goodness achieved without the continual grace of God, viewed as an enabling activity 'from without', is almost automatically classified as 'natural' in a pejorative sense. It is precisely at this point that we must stand outside our tradition if we are to let Pelagius praise the grace of God as he desires.

Pelagius's Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul sketches a rudimentary Heilsgeschichte or 'salvation-history' of which we must take note if we are to present a just account of his anthropology. For although he notoriously rejected the (Augustinian) notion of original sin, he did take a reasonably realistic view of the force of sin as an ingrained habit in human history. It is this conception of an ever-increasing incubus of 'the habit of sinning' (consuetudo peccandi) upon successive generations that we must relate to his exposition of the three 'times', the time of nature, the time of law and the time of grace.

The time of nature consisted of the era from Adam to the giving of the law through Moses. During this period there were several individuals, so Pelagius believes, who were able to live without sin by means of the law of their own nature or their reason or conscience (these concepts are closely connected with one another in Pelagian thought). But all the time the snowball of human sinfulness which Adam's disobedience had set rolling was gathering size and momentum. Gradually through ignorance, which was always in Pelagius's mind a basic cause of sin, the potentiality of man's true nature was obscured, being overlaid, as it were, by generations of almost universal iniquity as by layers of rust. It was to remedy this situation that the law was given through Moses, inaugurating the time of the law which lasted until the coming of Christ. And just as the gift of the written law was God's care for the desperate plight of mankind, which had been in progressive declension ever since Adam, so the incarnation was a further divine response to humanity's moral bankruptcy after the effects of the law had 'worn off'. This is how Pelagius himself summarizes the whole development: 'In the time of nature, the Creator could be known by the guidance of reason, and the rule of righteousness
of life was carried written in the heart, not by the law of the letter but of nature. But man's way of life became corrupt, nature was tarnished (decolor) and began to be inadequate, and so the law was added to it, whereby, as by a file, the rust should be rubbed off and its original listre restored. But subsequently the habit of sinning came to prevail so strongly among men that the law proved incapable of healing it. Then Christ came, and the Physician himself in his own person, not through his disciples, brought relief to the sickness at its most desperate stage. 

Before we proceed to Pelagius's doctrine of the work of Christ, three points deserve special emphasis. In the first place, the essence of man's created nature was in no way affected at any point in the moral deterioration of mankind. Pelagius followed the creationist view of the origin of the soul, which means that in his teaching each birth stands in a direct relation to divine creation. Hence there is much truth in the dictum that for Pelagius 'each man is his own Adam', in terms of both undiminished potentiality for moral perfection and beginning of sinning.

But secondly, although human nature is never corrupted, diseased or vitiated in any way, so that no doctrine of original sin defined as transmission of guilt or infection is allowable, nevertheless Pelagius does not minimize the consequences of the long sad tale of human disobedience, the effects of the long-standing practice of sinning, 'the inevitable habit of moral failure'. Before Christ, the habit of sinning grew so strong that no one fulfilled the law. Commenting on the image of the wild olive tree in Romans 11:24, Pelagius says of the forefathers of the Jews that 'they forgot the law of nature, fell away from their nature (degeneraverunt a natura), and through successions of sinning and a persistent habit of sin began to be almost by nature (quasi naturaliter) bitter and unfruitful'. Elsewhere Pelagius can speak of the slavery of sin and of being so drunk by habitual sinfulness that one sins almost unwillingly (invitus) and creates for oneself a 'necessity' of sinning.

Such statements should not mislead us, for in the same context Pelagius insists that sin never becomes part of a man's nature (non naturale) and dwells in him like a lodger rather than as owner-occupier. Or again he depicts sin as staining human nature with the rust of ignorance, which could be dealt with by the file of the law. 'By constant application of its abrasive injunctions the rust of ignorance was to be done away and man's newly polished nature was to stand out again in its pristine brilliance.' This may suggest a literally superficial theory of sin, but must be taken alongside Pelagius's repeated assertions that the power of habitual sinning in the times of nature and of law rendered the vast majority of mankind incapable of keeping God's law, whether the law of nature or the Mosaic law. Prior to Christ, the law had become powerless to keep a man from sinning, and able only to make him conscious of his law-breaking. Nevertheless, Pelagius will also affirm that sinlessness remained always a possibility, even if never or very rarely actualized. Because of the encrustations of habit and oblivion, the hidden treasures of the soul are left untapped. 'It lies beyond the grasp of man to know and to be what he is and remains.'

A third point brings us to the work of Christ. In his distinction between the time of law and the time of grace, Pelagius is not contrasting law and grace. The Mosaic law is no less grace than the grace of Christ is law. This becomes more easily intelligible when we remember that a fundamental cause of sin is ignorance, ignorance both of the divinely created potential of human nature and of the will of God. Ignorance is encountered by impartation of knowledge, and this the law achieves no less than the example and instruction of Christ. From this angle law and grace are in no sense antithetical. It does not follow that Christ's redemptive ministry is interpreted solely as one of revelation and education. Pelagius believes in atonement by penal substitution. Christ's death was a sacrificial offering for the sins of men which secures their forgiveness, a bearing of condemnation which preserves from hell. And if the remission of the cross releases a man from past guilt, the teaching and example of Christ have power to snap the binding force of sinful habit and open up again the possibilities of freedom from sin. The reconciliation of Christ means the restoration or re-establishment of the natural inheritance of humanity. Redemption signifies the realization of the promise inherent in our divinely created destiny. Creation and salvation are impressively held together in the mind of Pelagius.

Thus we are regenerati of God by creation, and regenerati, born again, made regenerate, by the grace of the Gospel in conversion-and-baptism. Pelagius conceives of a radical discontinuity between what we call the 'natural man' and the baptized Christian. Baptism plays a central role in Pelagius's thought as 'the sacrament of justification by faith'. Sola fides occurs quite often in the Commentary, linking together forgiveness of sins through Christ's death, conversion, baptism, and the enjoyment of righteousness understood as acquittal for past sins. But Pelagius also unambiguously teaches justification by works, for the baptized Christian must fulfill works of righteousness for which the blotting out of the past and his present acceptance through faith have prepared him. So in fact justification by faith alone 'applies to the unique situation of the individual at his conversion and baptism'.

The implications of the 'baptismal regeneration' posited by Pelagius are worth pondering, against the background of what has gone before concerning human freedom, the power of sinful habit and the time of grace, and with reference to his setting in the history of the early Church. It is easy to imagine Pelagius's teachings at Rome as a protest against
 lax Christian behaviour which tended to obscure the lines of demarcation between Christian and pagan. It is also important to place Pelagius fully within the circles which had felt the impact of asceticism from the Christian East. One feature of this Westernization of the ascetic movement, which is linked especially with the names of Jerome and Rufinus and found a ready welcome among the Roman aristocracy, was the tendency to universalize the ethic of the elite and apply to the whole Christian community the demands of ascetic discipline. Several of Pelagius’s writings were addressed to high-born Roman ladies whose conversion to the faith was a conversion from the world to the life of ascetic renunciation. He is presented to us in our sources as a counsellor of Christian perfection, concerned to vindicate the ideal of a Church visibly holy in all its members. In other words, he propagated a Christianity of discontinuity, with the crisis of conversion and baptism constituting the decisive break with the old life. As he wrote to Demetrius, ‘Everything that retards or undermines progress in the “spiritual” life you overcame at the outset at the moment of your conversion. The desire for marriage, concern for one’s posterity, the lure of luxury and ease, the pomp of the world, the lust for riches—you rejected them all, and can say with Paul, ‘The world is crucified to me, and I to the world’. ‘In its spiritual meaning,’ declared William James, ‘asceticism stands for nothing less than for the essence of the twice-born philosophy’.

Pelagius refuses to allow that the person speaking in Romans 7 is Paul the Christian apostle. The whole passage culminating in the cry ‘Wretched man that I am! Who will deliver me from this body of death?’ voices the experience of one who has not yet passed through the death and resurrection of Christian baptism. But ‘if any person has been converted from his sins, he can by his own effort and God’s grace be without sin’. ‘How is it possible for the flesh to be contrary to the self in a baptized Christian?’ One can realize how utterly ruinous to Pelagius’s understanding of the Christian religion would have been a ‘peccatoLOGY’ which rooted sin so deeply in human nature that it survived even the waters of baptism. We can probably gain a fair idea of how Pelagius viewed the crisis of conversion and baptism from the accounts Cyprian and Augustine gave of their own experiences.

‘While I lay in darkness and gloomy night,’ wrote Cyprian, ‘wavering to and fro, tossed uncertainly about on the foam of this boastful age, my steps wandering astray, knowing nothing of my real life and a stranger to truth and light, I used to regard it as an especially difficult and demanding thing in the light of my own character at the time, that a man should be capable of being born all over again—a hope which the divine mercy had promised for my salvation, and that a man quickened to newness of life in the laver of saving water should be able to put off what he had previously been, and although retaining all his bodily structure, should be himself changed in heart and soul. ‘How, I said, ‘is such a conversion possible, that there should be a sudden and rapid divestment of everything that, either innate in us has hardened in the corruption of our material nature, or acquired by us has become inveterate by long accustomed use?’ ... Such were my frequent thoughts. And as I was myself so fast bound by the innumerable errors of my former life that I did not believe I could be released from them, so I was disposed to acquiesce in my besetting faults, and in despair of improvement I used to cherish my wickedness as if it was actually native and indigenous to me. But as soon as the stain of my earlier life had been washed away by the aid of the water of (new) birth and a clear light from above had flooded my purified heart, as soon as I had drunk of the Spirit from heaven and the second birth had restored me to a new man, then straightforward in a wondrous fashion doubts began to be resolved, hidden things to be revealed and the darkness to become light. What before had seemed difficult began to appear feasible, what I had thought impossible capable of accomplishment. Thus I was able to recognize that what was born after the flesh and spent its previous life at the mercy of sin was of the earth, while that which the Holy Spirit was enlivening had begun to belong to God.’

Augustine’s story in the Confessions, especially books 8 and 9, is too well known to need rehearsing. But it is highly interesting to observe that the words in it to which Pelagius in Rome reacted with such indignation—in an incident normally regarded as the outbreak of the controversy—are found in book 10, when Augustine is analysing his present condition at the time of writing, that is, some twelve or so years after his conversion. Here Pelagius encountered not once but four times the prayer ‘Grant what you command, and command what you will (Da quod libes et libe quod vis), set amidst a description of the state of the long-baptized Augustine stressing his frailty in face of the manifold temptations he experiences day by day. It was surely not merely against the single sentence that Pelagius reacted but against the whole depressing portrait of the continuing struggle of old lusts and habits. It breathed a defeatist spirit which he could not excuse. In the subsequent controversy Julian was to accuse his catholic opponents of teaching that ‘baptism does not grant complete remission of sins nor remove our faults, but shaves them down, so that the roots of all our sins are retained in the evil flesh, like the roots of shaved hair on the head, whence the sins may grow again and need cutting off once more.’

Augustine seems to have been reluctant to provoke an open confrontation with Pelagius. This may have been partly due to the friends they held in common, such as Paulinus of Nola, and the enemies they also shared, like Jerome. But it is not improbable that it owed something to the nostalgia Augustine felt for a position he had once espoused but adhered to no longer. Parts of his early anti-Manichean work on Free Will were highly congenial to Pelagius, and difficult to square
with his more developed anti-Pelagian views. Moreover, the picture of Augustine that we gain from his writings in the years immediately after his conversion and baptism suggests not a little the "sudden relief of tension, the happy unclouded sense of serious purpose," which Pelagius always associated with the decisive change of regeneration. So when some years later Augustine girded up his loins for combat with the Pelagians both his hesitancy in entering the fray and the vehemence with which he eventually joined battle may be explicable in part from his wistfulness and embarrassment when reminded of attitudes and ideals he once maintained himself. Since then he had come to regard the Christian life more as one long convalescence than a confident advance from grace to perfection. And so, it seems, was Pelagius and not Augustine who preserved the true outlook of the earlier centuries of the Church, which came to terms with the problem of post-baptismal sin only with painful slowness. "Pelagius is the last, the most radical, and the most paradoxical exponent of the ancient Christianity—the Christianity of discontinuity."44

1 The writer acknowledges a deep debt to R. F. Evans, *Pelagius: Inquiries and Reappraisals* (London, 1968), and Peter Brown's brilliant article 'Pelagius and His Supporters: Aims and Environment,' *Journal of Theological Studies* n.s. 19 (1968), pp. 93-114.


9 *Recherches sur l'épave littéraire de Pélagie,'* *Revue de Philologie* 60 (1934), pp. 9-42.


12 *Bonner, art. cit.,* p. 352.


14 Evans' main works are referred to in notes 1 and 6 above; Brown, *art. cit.,* and *The Patrons of Pelagius: The Roman Aristocracy Between East and West* (ibid., n.s. 21 (1970), pp. 56-72; also Augustine of Hippo: A Biography (London, 1967), a profoundly perceptive work.

15 Evans, *Four Letters,* denies Pelagius's authorship of all but four of the nineteen, and it seems that his arguments are winning acceptance.


17 Evans, *Pelagius,* p. 92.

18 *Bohlin, op. cit.,* pp. 10, 12-22; Evans, *op. cit.,* pp. 53, 68, 85, etc.


20 In discussing the Hebrew patriarchs' lack of law before Moses Pelagius comments, 'This was not of course because God was at any time unconcerned for his creation, but because he knew that he had made human nature in such a way that it would suffice for the fulfilling of righteousness in place of law,' *Letter to Demetrias.*

21 Cf. Evans, *op. cit.,* p. 109; 'Pelagius does not teach the doctrine that men by their own "unaided nature" may attain salvation; that men have the capacity to be without sin, which ... is a different doctrine.'

22 Evans, *ibid.,* pp. 96-113.


25 *Commentary on Gal. 3: 10* (Patr. Lat., Suppl. I, 1277)


31 *Cf. Letter to Celinda.*
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36 *Letter to Demetrias.* 10. However, Evans has shown, *op. cit.,* ch. 3, that Pelagius took issue with Jerome over the latter's excessive denigration of marriage.


38 *Cf. apud Augustine, Nature and Grace 54:* 64.


40 *Apud Augustine, Nature and Grace 52:* 60.

41 *Letter to Donatus 3-4.

42 *Apud Augustine, Against Two Letters of the Pelagians 1:* 13: 26.
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Piscina Siloa or piscina Salomonis?
(Possidius, Indiculum X⁶. 57)

Among the 'Miscellaneous Sermons' (Tractatus Diversi) of Augustine listed in the Indiculum traditionally ascribed to Possidius we meet the following title:

De quinque porticibus ubi multitudo
languentium iacebat et de piscina Siloa

From the early seventeenth century onwards, this has been identified with the present Sermo 125, which deals with the healing of the paralytic at the pool of Bethsaida (Bethesda, Bethzatha) narrated in John 5, 1-18. This identification has persisted until the present day, despite the confusion involved between the pool of Bethsaida and the pool of Siloam, whither Jesus sent the man born blind in chapter 9 of John's Gospel. I do not know when the confusion was first noticed in print, nor do I know of any attempts to explain it, nor of any discussion whether it should be laid at the feet of Augustine or Possidius.

Before we grapple more closely with the problem, we must clear out of the way two solutions which are no more than enticing possibilities.

A. Two entries may have been conflated into one (as has happened at one place in the editio princeps of the Indiculum by Vlimmerius — see the next article), either by Possidius or a later copyist, so that the original would have read:

De quinque porticibus ubi multitudo
languentium iacebat.
De piscina Siloa.

The conflation of the two would have been facilitated in the mind of its perpetrator by the fact that the incident referred to in the first also took place at a piscina. Nor would much textual variation be required to move from

...iaccbatdepiscina... to ...iaccbatdepiscina... 

whether we suppose the insertion of et to have resulted from careless dittography or from deliberate correction by someone who concluded that careless haplography had taken place.

Furthermore, Augustine preached several sermons on the Siloam pericope: Sermo 135, Sermo 136, Sermo 136A (= Mai 130), Sermo 136B (= Lambot 10) and Sermo 136C (= Lambot 11). None of these is listed by Possidius (cf. Wilmart's table, Misc. Agost., vol. 2, p. 225), unless, that is, one of them is listed in the separate entry De piscina Siloa hypothetically isolated above.

But there are at least two objections to this solution of the difficulty. In the first place, there appears to be no manuscript support for the omission of 'et', although we cannot rule out the possibility that a more up-to-date critical edition than Wilmart's, such as that in preparation for the Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, by Fr. Glory, may throw new light on this point. In any case it may be felt that the solution could be made to rest on emendation alone, if the traditional text were held to be intolerably difficult, which I am inclined to think it is. But secondly, De piscina Siloa would not be the title we would expect for any of Augustine's expositions of the pericope from John 9, either in terms of the content of these sermons or in terms of the style of most of the titles listed by Possidius. De piscina Siloa is not sufficiently indicative of the substance of the scriptural passage or any of the sermons on it. Possidius's conventions would lead us to expect a title in line with one of the following examples:

Ex evangelio ubi Dominus oves suas 

Petro commendat 

Ex evangelio: Qui non odi patrem et 

matrem, et cetera 

De duobus caecis 

(X6, 89, 132, 16; Misc. Agost., vol. 2, pp. 199, 201, 191).

The opening words of either Tractatus in Iohannis 44, in which Augustine comments on ch. 9 of John's Gospel, De homine quem Dominus Jesus illuminavit, qui caecus natus est, or Tractatus 45, De illuminato illo qui natus est caecus (CCL 36, 287, 338), would be much more appropriate than De piscina Siloa. Of Augustine's sermons on John 9 listed above, none may be said with certainty to have a proper title in the manuscripts, but Florus of Lyons referred to Sermo 136 as De Illuminatione caeci nati (cf. C. Charlier in Reume Béned. 57, 1947, p. 181). Since none of these sermons concentrates substantially on the piscina itself, even though they invariably enlarge on the significance of the Siloam-missus etymology. De piscina Siloa would be virtually without comparable parallel in Possidius, for it would have to be taken as shorthand for something like 'On the enlightening of the blind man at the pool of Siloam'. I included the qualification 'virtually' in this statement because the first title that would result from the division of X6, 57 into two entries would provide something of a parallel:

De quinque poricibus ubi multitudo 

languentium iacabat.

But we should hesitate to solve one difficulty by creating another, especially if the new difficulty is duplicated.

We might of course have recourse to a hypothetical lost sermon which actually corresponded to the title De piscina Siloa, but with no less than five extant sermons which can find no home in Possidius we dare not indulge in the luxury of another, no longer extant, on the same pericope but rather different.

B. The second resolution of the anomaly is simplicity itself: Augustine really did preach a sermon which dealt with the healing of the paralytic and the restoration of sight to the man born blind! Such simplicity has the mark almost of genius. It is after all not inconceivable that the preacher's mind moved from one healing at a pool to another. Moreover the two parts of the title would then agree remarkably well with Augustine's homiletic expositions of these two incidents. Although he regularly explained the etymological significance of Siloa, as we have already noted, to my knowledge he never once used the name 'Bethsaida' (or any of its variants) nor even repeated the Gospel's other name for it, probatica piscina. Although he discerned the symbolical meaning in the necessity of descending into this particular pool (e.g., Sermo 124, 3; PL 38, 687), he was most drawn to the significance of the quinque poricis which spoke of the bondage of the five books of Moses (e.g., Sermo 125, 2; PL 38, 689).

But no such sermon of Augustine's has survived and I am therefore inclined to regard this hypothesis as less forcible than the one I shall present below, but probably more attractive than the one outlined above and certainly not impossible. It undoubtedly has one factor in its favour which any simple identification of the entry at Indiculum X6, 57 with a sermon on John 5, 1-18 such as Sermo 125, with or without an unresolved anomaly, cannot claim. The entry would then be much more obviously in line with most, if not all, of the two-part entries in the section of the Indiculum listing the Tractatus Diversi, that is to say, the second part would specify a subject different from, or additional to, that specified in the first part. Some bipartite entries specify two texts or passages from Scripture, such as X6, 116 (Misc. Agost., vol. 2, p. 201):
to discern some significance in the position of et de piscina Siloa in the second, not the first, part of the title. That is to say, the form of the title leads us to look for a sermon in which the exposition of the piscina Siloa is developed later than Augustine's treatment of the quinque porticus. Does this requirement enable us to identify the sermon that Possidius's title relates to?

According to Tractatus in Iohannem 17, 2 (CCL 36, 170) and Sermo 125, 1 (PL 38, 688) Augustine had often preached on the scriptural passage in question. In addition to Tractatus in Iohannem 17 there survive three sermons on the pericope, Sermo 124 (PL 38, 686-688), Sermo 125 (PL 38, 688-698) and Sermo 125A (= Mai 128, ed. Morin, Misc. Agost., vol. 1, pp. 370-375; PLS 2, 514-515). Moreover, John 5, 1-18 was one of the lections on the occasion of Enarratio in Ps. 83, cf. 83, 10 (CCL 39, 1157). Of these the last is automatically excluded from consideration (and in any case Augustine makes only passing mention of the Gospel text), and Sermo 125A offers exposition neither of the quinque porticus nor of the piscina Siloa. Sermo 124 is brief, and condenses the interpretation of not only the piscina or aqua and the quinque porticus but also other ingredients in the incident into a few rapid lines (124, 3; PL 38, 687). We are left with Sermo 125. Here the quinque porticus are treated at some length in ch. 2 (PL 38, 689-690), while the piscina is considered quite briefly in ch. 3 (690) and again in ch. 6 (693). The piscina does not receive the prominence implied by the otherwise curiously placed last phrase in Possidius's title.

But is the identification of this title with Sermo 125 seriously in doubt? In his helpful review of my study The Manuscripts of St. Augustine's "Tractatus in Evangelium Iohannis" : A Preliminary Survey and Checklist in Recherches Augustiniennes 8, 1972, pp. 151-153, Père G. Follet remarked in discussing Sermo 125 and its relationship to the Tractatus (it has so far been found only in manuscripts of this collection, between TrR 17 and 28) I failed to refer to the agreement between the title in Possidius's Indículum X6, 57 and the title of the Maurists' Sermo 125. The two are indeed virtually identical:

De quinque porticibus ubi multitudo langenitum taccebat et de piscina Siloa (Possidius)

De quinque porticibus, ubi multitudo langenitum taccebat; et de piscina Siloa, cap. ix (Sermo 125, title; PL 38, 688).

2. M. F. Berrouard appears uncertain that Sermo 125 is the one designated by Possidius at X6, 57; cf. Homélies sur l'Evangile de Saint Jean XVII-XXXIII (Bibliothèque Augustiniene, Envois de Saint Augustin, 72 ; Paris, 1977), p. 717.

Apart from punctuation, 'Siloe' for 'Siloa' and the addition of 'cap. ix' are the only differences. (For purposes of comparison we can ignore the Maurists' introductory phrase, 'Rursum in Joannis cap. v.') But the addition of 'cap. ix' and the semi-colon after 'jacebat' together suggest that the Maurists were aware of the force of the position of 'et de piscina Siloe'. Indeed, their form of the title agrees perfectly with the second of two resolutions of the anomaly (Siloa instead of Bethsaida) discussed and felt to be not impossible under B. above. But if this interpretation of Possidius's title is sound, it cannot be combined with the identification of Sermon 125 with Possidius's entry. For Sermon 125 makes no mention of Siloa or John 9. One is left wondering what the Maurists thought they achieved by their punctuation and addition of 'cap. ix'.

G. Pollet took the agreement between Possidius and Sermon 125 to suggest that the latter was still separate from the Tractatus in Johannis when Possidius drew up his catalogue, or edited Augustine's own catalogue. That is to say, Sermon 125 was not inserted into the sequence of the Tractatus by Augustine himself or while in the library at Hippo.

But the issue is not so simple (indeed, nothing is simple in this region of the Tractatus!). For where did the Maurists' title come from? Their text of Sermon 125 was based on two authorities. One was a manuscript of the Tractatus, now lost, from Carcassonne Cathedral which furnished no title beyond 'De eadem lectione'. This much can be ascertained from their copy of the Carcassonne text in one of their volumes of collations, Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 11661, ff. 161-165v. (In none of the numerous manuscripts of the Tractatus where it is found does Sermon 125 possess a title any more colourful than De eadem lectione, Items in eodem, Item unde supra or the like.)

The Maurists' other base was Jacques Sirmond's edition of forty new Augustinian sermons published in 1631, where our Sermon 125 was no XV (S. Aurelii Augustini... Sermones Novi numero XL, Paris, 1631, pp. 170-173 and notes, unpaginated, ad fin.). Sirmond's preface bespeaks his concern to vouch for the authenticity of his sermons, which he rests partly on the antiquity of his main manuscript and partly on the corroborating testimony of Possidius and 'Bede', i.e., Florus of Lyons. In his Notae Sirmond invokes Possidius on eight of the first sixteen sermons, while 'Bede' merits rather more mention. Overall, Sirmond's manuscripts furnish him with sermon titles he seems invariably to indicate how far they agree with any corresponding titles in Possidius or 'Bede'. In cases of discrepancy he makes plain whether he has chosen to follow the manuscript(s) or the writer in question. Thus for his Sermones XXIV and XXXXI he prefers 'Bede' 's titles to the manuscripts', and for Sermon I Possidius is given precedence over the manuscript. Once, for Sermon VII, he tells us that he has himself provided the title.

Sirmont's source for our Sermon 125, his Sermon XV, was a codex of St. Vincent's Abbey, Metz, from which he derived none of his forty new productions and about which he tells us nothing further. His Notae make no mention of a title in the manuscript, but they do give the title (De inferno iacentem ad piscinam) of the sermon (De Verbis Domini 42, now Sermon 124) to which he believes Augustine's new sermon refers at the outset. He then concludes Sed nostri disertis meminit Possidius.

The evidence speaks unambiguously. Sirmond found no title in the Metz manuscript (which must strengthen the probability that it was a manuscript of the Tractatus in Johannis, or possibly a homiliary which had derived the sermon from a copy of the Tractatus). But the discovery in Possidius of a title that fitted his Sermon XV was all that he needed. (It fitted it up to a point. He either did not notice or failed to comment on the puzzling name Siloe.) He made the identification and gave the sermon a title it has retained ever since:

De quinque porticibus ubi multitudine languentium iacent et de piscina Siloe, subjoining the comment, Meminit Possidius Indiculi cap. VIII.

Clinching confirmation of this account of things is provided by an earlier printing of the sermon. At the end of volume ro of the 1614 Paris edition of Augustine's Opera Omnia a number of new sermons appeared which had been pirated from Sirmond and published against his will. Here we find our sermon as the third item (pp. 390-393) under the title, Possidius de quinque porticibus ubi multitudine iacent et de piscina Siloe.4 I submit that the mention of Possidius at this point puts the issue beyond doubt.

It was then Jacques Sirmond who forged the link between our Sermon 125 and Possidius, and we are left with Possidius as the sole authority for the title containing the allegedly erroneous reference to Siloa.

5. SIRMONT, Opera Varia..., Paris, 1616, vol. 1, cols. 329-344; 'Notae' in XI. Sermones Novi S. Augustini, especially cols. 331-332 (Lectori) and 337. The original edition of 1631 is not available in Edinburgh.

6. "Aurelii Augustini... Sermones Novi numero XL, p. 170. I am grateful to G. Pollet for confirming the form of Sirmond's title in this edition. The Louvain editors' text of the Indiculum read 'Siloe' at this point, which accords with Sirmond's reading (cf. edition of Cologne, 1666, Opera Omnia, vol. 1, p. 17). The editio princeps of the Indiculum by J. Vilmurterius was published in 1564 (D. Aurelii Augustini... Sermonum pars una hactenus partim multa, partim diserta. una cum Indicato Possidii... Louvain, 1564). This edition is not to be found in Edinburgh, but it was reprinted in the Froben edition of the Opera Omnia (Basel, 1569) of which Vilmurterius was one of the editors. Here the reading was 'Siloe' (vol. 1, fol. D 4v).

7. Cf. my study The Manuscripts..., supra cit., p. 93. For a xerox copy of the relevant pages of the 1614 edition I am again indebted to G. Pollet.
I am free once again to pursue my speculations about the relation of Sermo 125 to the Tractatus in Ioanennem in Augustine's library, but we are no nearer to resolving the anomaly of 'Siloa'. There remains also the question whether we should persist in identifying Sermo 125 with the sermon listed at X, 57 in Possidius's inventory, in the full knowledge that we have no evidence from the manuscripts of Sermo 125 of any title of significance.

We must now take our argument a step further and ask whether Augustine ever called the piscina of John 5 the pool of Siloam. What in fact did he call it? As far as I can discover he never called it the pool of Bethsaida (Bethesda, Bethzatha) nor did he call it the pool of Siloam, but on three occasions at least he called it the pool of Solomon. Indeed, on the only occasions when he gave it a name he called it the pool of Solomon:

1. In a phrase that must immediately remind us of Possidius's two-part title:

```
quingue porticis circumdabant piscinam Salomonis
```

2. In Tract. in Joh. 20, 2 Augustine speaks of the healing of one person only among those who lay

```
in quingue porticibus piscinae illius Salomonis
(CCL 36, 203)
```

3. In Enarr. in Ps. 83, 10 (CCL 39, 1157) Augustine refers to

```
quingue iliae porticus Salomonis,
```

and proceeds to cite John 5, 3.

This last text suggests a plausible explanation of how the confusion arose. From the single porticus Salomonis of John 10, 23, Acts 3, 11 and 5, 12 Augustine's mind might have moved to the quingue porticus around the piscina of John 5, 2 which he proceeded to think of as the piscina Salomonis. The next stage was to call the piscina around which the five porticoes were situated the piscina Salomonis (cf. Morin's note, Misc. Agost., vol. 1, p. 383 n. 1).

But was the confusion merely Augustine's? It is attested also in a group of manuscripts of the Vulgate whose Capitula on John's Gospel entitle the pericope in question In porticus salomonis. Ad natum et hominem ab infinitate in omnem XXXVIII. The manuscripts range from the seventh or eighth to the ninth centuries, and comprise some of the weightiest of Vulgate codices: the celebrated Book of Arnauld and Book of Kells, both in Trinity College Library, Dublin, the Echternach Gospels (Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 9389), and the Gospels codex from St. Germain, now Bibl. Nat. lat. 11553. These manuscripts represent a range of Irish and continental — southern French and Italian — textual types.

The same Capitula occur in Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 254, a rather later code Colombinus which preserves an Old Latin text of the Gospels but for the rest of the New Testament is Vulgate. They are contained also in the seventh-century code arnemur of the Gospels in Stockholm, Kungl. Bibliotek, which is another witness to the Old Latin version of the Gospels.

Is there any connexion between these Capitula and Augustine's confusion? The Capitula appear to confirm our surmise that the confusion arose at first over the porticus, and only by transference embraced the piscina as well. But did Augustine's mistake influence these particular Gospel Capitula? His references to the porches and pool of Solomon hardly seem prominent enough to make this at all likely. After all, they have gone almost unnoticed until the present. On the other hand it is almost inconceivable that these Capitula should be responsible for Augustine's error. Although the origins and development of capitula in biblical manuscripts remain shrouded in obscurity, it is scarcely credible that Augustine should have had access to capitula of John's Gospel which at this point were so markedly divergent from the text of the Gospel itself. More research is called for on the emergence of capitula.

In the meantime I am left with the feeling that behind the curious agree-


10. M. F. Berrouard was puzzled by the piscina Salomonis at Tract. in Joh. 20, 2, but had not noticed the other occurrences of this anomaly; cf. Houftines (supra cit.), p. 226 n. 6.
between Augustine and these Capitula on John lurks a more widespread tradition of confusion which we may no longer be able to trace. 11

If, then, Augustine’s confusion lay in calling the pool of Bethsaida the pool of Solomon, how did the reading piscina Siloa arise? An invaluable clue is supplied by the oldest and weightiest manuscript of Possidius’ Indiculum, Verona, Bibl. Capit. XXXII (20), ff. 56-69. The catalogue is here interpolated into the chapter on Augustine in Gennadius’s De Viris Illustris. The manuscript dates from the sixth century but ‘le texte de l’Indiculum, dans ce contexte, pourrait être antérieur, tel quel, au v° siècle’ (Wilmart, Misc. Agost., vol. 2, p. 154). The original reading of this manuscript was piscina Saloa (ibid., p. 195). 12 I suggest

11. The erroneous description of Bethsaida as the pool of Solomon probably owes nothing to confusion with any pool in Palestine bearing Solomon’s name. The well-known Pools of Solomon not far from Bethlehem, which are basically early Roman or Herodian, can hardly be relevant to the question. Less well-known and more problematic is the Σαλοιμώνια κολυμνή mentioned by Josephus in his account of the old city wall of Jerusalem that went back to the time of David and Solomon. From Siloan this wall bent again eastwards towards Solomon’s Pool (Jewish War 5: 4: 2, 145, ed. H. St. J. Thackeray, Josephus, vol. 3 (Loeb Classical Library, London and New York, 1928), pp. 224-243). This pool, often identified with the ‘King’s pool’ of Nehemiah 2: 14, has been variously located. Still to be found (e.g., H. G. Mav, Oxford Bible Atlas, London and New York, 1974, pp. 96, 140) is the largely abandoned identification with the husar al-bawana, the so-called Lower Pool or Old Pool of Siloan (cf. E. Pierotti’s claim to have fixed its position with certainty by excavation, Jerusalem Explored, Being a Description of the Ancient and Modern City, vol. 1, London and Cambridge, 1864, pp. 10-11). Some scholars identify Josephus’s pool with a triple rock-cut basin in front of the Gihon spring in the Kidron valley (cf. E. H. Grolleberg, Atlas of the Bible, London and Edinburgh, 1936, p. 66, map 24B; L. H. Vincent in Dictionnaire de la Bible, Supplement, ed. L. Pira and A. Robert, vol. 5, Paris, 1949, col. 924; id. and A. M. Sterve, Jerusalem de l’Ancien Testament in Recherches d’archéologie et d’histoire, vol. 1, Paris, 1934, pp. 86-87, 281-283, and pl. 91). This view is rejected by J. Simons, Jerusalem in the Old Testament, Researches and Theories (Studia Friesiae ScholoniMemoria Dieota, vol. 1; Leiden 1952), pp. 192-193, 227, 335-336. Siloan survives an unknown site in the Kidron valley to which a caravanserai was built in the second century southwards from Gihon.

The Bordeaux pilgrim of A. D. 333 mentions two great pools built by Siloan ad latus tempus immediately before recording the twin pools and five porches of Bethsaida. After further references to pools in the context of Solomon’s constructions the text speaks of Siloan, which habet quadrupunctum (Historiarum Bardi galenicae 580, 7-8, 591, 2, 592, 1; CCL 175 (Hierarchia et alia Geographica), 145-160). Other pilgrims’ narratives or surveys of the holy places make mention of the Bethsaida or Siloan pools in close proximity to works of Solomon; cf. Peter Deacon, De locis sanctis C 4 (CCL 175, 93); P. Antoninus Placentinus, Itinerarium 23 (CCL 175, 221-222) — ante ruinas tempus Salomonicus sub plebis, quae discitur ad Siloan somnium secus porticum Siloanis. But Josephus’s text was not cited by any Christian writer, so far as I have been able to check. Nor have I found any parallel, apart from the Vulgate manuscripts’ Capitula, to Augustine’s designation of the piscina and porticus of John 5 as Solomon.


that Saloa in the Verona manuscript preserves the sole surviving trace of the original reading of the Indiculum, namely, Salomonis or an abbreviation thereof. Saloa itself cannot represent an abbreviation in the Verona manuscript, which uses abbreviations very sparingly. 15

Future editors of the Indiculum will no doubt regard the restoration of piscina Salomonis on the basis of piscina Saloa as an extremely bold, perhaps intolerably bold, emendation. I shall be intrigued to see what F. Glorie makes of it in his Corpus Christianorum edition. For Glorie has already given notice that he intends to demonstrate that Augustine, not Possidius, was the compiler of the Indiculum, which Possidius merely edited. 14 But if Augustine wrote it, we have no grounds for expecting him to have written piscina Siloa, but perfectly adequate grounds for expecting piscina Salomonis, even if the sermon in question did not actually name the piscina, as Sermo 125 fails to, for Augustine seems instinctively to have thought of the pool as Solomon’s.

By the same token there is no reason why Possidius should have written piscina Siloa (if for the sake of argument we suppose him to have written the Indiculum), unless the mistake was his own. Nor would he have written Salomonis unless either he was so familiar with Augustine’s mind as to have been aware of his regular mistaken usage in this regard, which we must judge to be extremely unlikely, or he was working directly from the manuscripts of Augustine’s sermons and came across one in which the pool was called Solomon’s pool, either in the text or in the title. While this second possibility cannot be ruled out of court, we would have to conclude that this sermon no longer survives, for of the three places where piscina Salomonis (or porticus Salomonis) occurs, Tract. in Joh 20 and Enarr. in Ps. 83 are automatically excluded and Sermo 272B is not a serious candidate. 13


15. Of Augustine’s extant sermons on John 5, 18, two are furnished with the same title in the manuscripts, De iurisoma iuris iuris prisc. This is the sole title at all similar to Possidius’s entry with a manuscript basis.

(1) It is part of the title of Sermo 124 in the De Verbis Domini et Apostolis collection in which it is no. 42:

Item eiusdem de Verbis Domini in Evangelio secundum Ioannem de iurisoma prisc. ad piscinam.


(2) In abbreviated form a very similar title is given in Vatican lat. 471 for Sermo 124A (= Mai 128):

Eiusdem in evang. sec. Joh, de i. i. ad pisc.


It so happens that in his much interpolated version of the Indiculum (cf. the Maurits’ comment, PL 42, 1999-1100) Vilmorinus inserted this title ‘De iurisoma prisci’.
But Possidius may well have left ' Salomonis ' (or its abbreviation) faithfully unaltered, whether or not he understood it. We can only suppose that a later copyist altered the text to ' Siloa ' (or its equivalent), confounding one Johannean pool with another, yet at least making sense of a text that must have appeared obviously faulty. The Verona manuscript was itself altered to read ' Siloa ' probably in the eighth century. Since all the other manuscripts used by Wilmart read ' Siloa ' or its equivalent, this ' correction ' must have been introduced at a fairly early stage in the dominant branch of the tradition. If it strains credibility to believe that the original reading has survived in only one manuscript, and only in somewhat cryptic form, it may be no less difficult a challenge to explain the reading ' Saloa ' in the Verona codex. I have looked carefully through Kalinka's detailed listing of the manuscript's deficiencies without discovering a comparable case where the basic form of a presumably well-known biblical name (Siloa) has been so clearly corrupted. To put it the other way round—in my view the right way round, the manuscript offers no parallel to this case of a strange reading which becomes plausible in the light of a strange irregularity in Augustine himself.

Before we rest our case we must reckon with the evidence of Caesarius. His Sermo 171 on the same pericope in John 5 not only bears the title in both its manuscripts De piscina Siloa (Siloa), on which Morin comments ' scripta sancte inscriptio sed dubia et in archetypo ', but also begins with the words Lectio sancti evangelistae quae de piscina Siloa probatur. Morin refers to the earliest occurrence of the error in the title of Sermo 125 of Augustine, a title ' authenticated by Possidius19 '. Does this not suggest that Augustine, to whom Caesarius owed so much, may well have originated the error after all?20


16. So Wilmart, loc. cit., Misc. Agost., vol. 2, p. 193. But unless I have misunderstood him, Kalinka, op. cit., pp. 16, 26 indicates that the reviser in this case merely added a Tilgungspunkt above the letter thus — saloa. Kalinka's text also inserts a small thin L with a short base between the s and the d either on the same level (p. 16) or slightly below (p. 26). If this is what Wilmart took to be the correct i, it is patently different from the normal usage of the reviser, who in other cases inserted an obvious i (with a dot) above the letter or space in question. Does this difference suggest that the alteration of saloa to siloa was done by a corrector different from—and later than?—the chief reviser of the manuscript? The point is relevant to the date at which the Siloa reading is first attested. The oldest manuscript of the Indicula with Siloa as its original reading belongs to the first half of the ninth century (Wilmart, Misc. Agost., vol. 2, p. 151).


18. The next sermon of Caesarius in Morin's edition, Sermo 172, deals with the healing of the blind man of John 9 and refers repeatedly—and now correctly—to Siloa (CCL 104, 702-703).

In the first place we must remember that Caesarius could not have derived the mistake from Augustine's own works. Even if Caesarius was dependent on a lost exposition of Augustine, we are bound by the extant evidence to assume that Augustine never called the pool of Bethesda piscina Siloa. Caesarius could have derived the error only from the Indicula, and then only if his copy had this reading. Secondly, Morin's edition of Sermo 171 of Caesarius at no point identifies any dependence on Augustine. On the contrary, he comments as follows: ' Toujours pen à l'aise, semble-t-il, sur ce terrain, Césaire est ici encore tributaire de quelque devancier inconnu. Thirdly, it is not at all inconceivable that the error originated with Caesarius and only subsequently influenced the text of Possidius's Indicula. If on the other hand Caesarius was influenced by Possidius, it is proof positive that the correction or corruption that produced ' Siloa ' took place fairly early in the manuscript tradition. A further possibility for which I can advance a little supporting evidence is that the confusion between Bethesda and Siloam had wide enough currency to affect both Caesarius and the text of Possidius's Indicula.22

David F. Wright

19. The confusion between Bethesda and Siloam seems at times to have exercised a peculiarly irresistible fascination. Whether or not the Maurists noticed it in their title for Sermo 125, their Index under Piscina probatica Siloe (sic) (PL 46, 534) refers the reader to Sermo 124, where Augustine, with reference to the pool of Bethesda, speaks simply of the piscina without naming it. A similar gratuitous reference to the pool of Siloam in John 5 as the pool of Bethesda is to be found in the Index to S.D.P. Salmond's English translation of the De consensu Evangelistarum (The Works of Aurelius Augustinus, ed. M. Dods, vol. 8, Edinburgh, 1923, p. 510). The text (De Cons. Evang. 4, 14) does not mention the pool, let alone give it a name. No doubt similarly motivated by the title of Sermo 125, A. Künzemmann, Die Chronologie der Sermones des Hl. Augustinus, in Misc. Agost., vol. 2, pp. 470-471, extends the confusion to other sermons.


20. Morin found Sermo 171 of Caesarius in two manuscripts, British Library Addit., 3085 of the eleventh or twelfth century from San Domingo de Silos, near Burgos, and Epinal, Bibl. Mus. 3 (16), a twelfth-century collection from the Abbey of Marmoutier in the Vosges (CCL 103, XXXIV-XC, XCVIII). Spanish manuscripts were very much to the fore among the manuscripts of Possidius's Indicula used by Wilmart (Misc. Agost., vol. 2, pp. 151-155, 157-158).


22. At least two manuscripts of the Vulgate Gospels have ' Siloa ' or ' Sилоа ' inserted into John 5, 4. They are London, British Library Royal I.A.XXVIII, a sixteenth-century manuscript from St. Augustine's Canterbury library, and Paris, British Museum Addit. 4, 3, in which the name is written in France and then inserted into the text. Even in the case of the second, it appears that Siloa was written in France, and then the name was inserted into the text. The name Siloa had wide enough currency to affect both Caesarius and the text of Possidius's Indicula.22

David F. Wright
Furthermore, Wordsworth and White suggest (loc. cit.) that confusion between Bethsaida and Siloam may be responsible for the mention of the inferior pars of the piscina which is found in some Old Latin texts of John 5, 2 (cf. A. Jülicher, Ital. Das Neue Testament in allzeiterner Überlieferung, vol. 4, Johannes-Evangelium, Berlin, 1963, p. 41). Those witnesses from the fourth to sixth centuries are the Corbeiensis (Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 17225), Veronensis (Vercelli, Archiv. Capit.) and Veronensis (Verona, Bibl. Capit. VI (6)). They are sufficiently weighty authorities for Jülicher to include the reference to the inferior pars in his basic text at this point. There is no African support for such a reading.

A Gospel text reading piscina (natatoria) Sylone (Sylone) is also attested by Recension II of the Pseudo-Jeromian commentary on the Gospels (Pseudo-Gregory, Expositio Sacri Evangelii, and by a group of two manuscripts of Recension I (Pseudo-Jerome, Expositio IV Evangeliorum). See B. Griesser, Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Expositio IV Evangeliorum des Ps. Hieronymus, in Romes Beüdd. 49 (1937), pp. 300-304. Griesser notes the singularity of the biblical text and refers to the apparatus in Wordsworth-White. The other manuscripts of Recension I have a lacuna in the commentary between John 4, 43 and 3, 25, so that the agreement between the pair of manuscripts and Recension II establishes that the original version was based on a Gospel text marked by the inclusion of 'Sylone (Sylone)'. Griesser, p. 309, suggests the commentary originated in Ireland or Upper Italy.

B. Bischoff, 'Wendepunkte in der Geschichte der lateinischen Exegese im Frühmittelalter' in Sacris Erudiri 6 (1954), p. 237, inclines towards Ireland. The origins of the commentary belong to the late seventh or eighth centuries.

I have so far found no other evidence indicative of a confusion between Bethsaida and Siloam in the patristic and early medieval centuries. Bede's homily on John 5, 1-18 which is closely dependent on Augustine's Tractatus in Iohannem, never gives the piscina a name, but elsewhere he cites John 5, 2 and clearly distinguishes between the two pools (Homel. I, 23, CCL 122, 161-169; In Evran et Neemi am IIb. 3, CCL 119A, 345; De locis sanctis II, 4, CCL 175, 237). Two other writers manage to distinguish equally clearly between the two while also failing to use the name 'Bethsaida' or any of its variants (Theodosius, De situ terrae sanctae 8, CCL 175, 118-119; Ps-Ant. Antoninus Placentinus, Itinerarium 23, 22, CCL 175, 141, 143). Peter Deacon's De locis sanctis likewise speaks only of the probatica piscina without using 'Bethsaida' (C4, CCL 175, 95), although he also incorporated a passage from Bede's work of the same title which distinguished by name between the two pools (D, ibid. = Bede, De locis sanctis II, 4, CCL 175, 257). Other accounts also make the distinction quite clear (cf. Ps-Eucherius, De situ Hierosolimae Ep. ad Faustum Presbyterum, CCL 175, 238 – used by Bede). The Bordeaux Pilgrim's narrative records a profusion of piscinae around the Temple area and to the south and east but gives no ground for confusing Bethsaida and Siloam (Itinerarium Burdigalense 589, 790, 6-7; 591, 7-8; 592, 3; CCL 175, 14-16).
Piscina Siloa or piscina Salomonis?
(Possidius, Indiculum X⁶. 57)
Augustine's Sermons in Vlimmerius's Editio Princeps of Possidius's Indiculum

David F. WRIGHT
Augustine's Sermons in Vlimmerius's
Editio Princeps of Possidius's Indiculum

The first printed edition of Possidius's catalogue of Augustine's works (or Possidius's edition of Augustine's catalogue of his works) was published in 1564 by Joannes Vlimmerius:

D. Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi,
Sermonum pars una, hactenus partim mutata,
partim desiderata, et ex venerandae antiquitatis
exemplaribus nunc recens eruta, una cum
Indiculo Possidii Episcopi... (Louvain, 1564),
liiv pp. (paginated separately, = sigs. e iii-m ivv).

It was reprinted with negligible textual differences in the first volume of the Froben brothers' 1569 Basel edition of Augustine's works, an edition to which Vlimmerius contributed, signally in volume 10, containing the Sermones. The Indiculum occupied ff. C1'-E3' of volume 2.

1. On Vlimmerius, an Augustinian canon of Val-Saint-Martin in Louvain, see Nieuw Nederlandisch Biografisch Woordenboek 7 (1927), cols. 1272-1273 (J. Fruytier), and Nationaal Biografisch Woordenboek 3 (1968), cols. 917-921 (W. Lourdaux). There is a useful study by Cyrille Lambot, Jean Vlimmerius éditeur de sermons de S. Augustin, in Revue Bénédictine 79 (Mémorial Dom Cyrille Lambot, 1969), pp. 185-192, reprinted from Annales de la Société royale d'archéologie de Bruxelles 50 (1961), pp. 144-149.

2. Dom Lambot in the essay referred to in the previous note, and again in CCL 41, xxv-xxvi, gives an account of Vlimmerius's contribution to the 1569 sermons volume which does not square with the copy in New College Library, Edinburgh. Lambot asserts that the new series De Diversis which Vlimmerius created for this edition consisted of 123 items, in two parts. Items 1-51 reproduced the new sermons published in Vlimmerius's 1564 collection, while items 52-123 had been gathered in subsequent research, especially among manuscripts of the Abbey of Cambron, as Vlimmerius himself told the reader. When the Louvain editors assigned the sermons volume in their Antwerp edition to Vlimmerius, he merely
The most cursory comparison between Vlimmerius's edition and the critical text of the catalogue contributed by André Wilmart to *Miscellanea Augustiniana*, vol. 2 (1931), reveals glaring divergences even in the disposition of its contents. Vlimmerius's dedicatory preface (1564, sig. e iv) reprinted unchanged 1569, fol. C 1r declares that he has rearranged the inventories in *commodiorem aliquid aliquanto concinniori ordinem*. The difference in arrangement can be seen at a glance from the following tables (which omit the numeration supplied by Wilmart):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WILMART</th>
<th>VLIIMERIUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contra Paganos</td>
<td>[Contra Paganos]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Mathematicos</td>
<td>[Contra Mathematicos]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Iudaeos</td>
<td>[Contra Iudaeos]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Manicheos</td>
<td>[Diversi libri]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Priscillianistas</td>
<td>De Div. Quaest. LXXXIII [seriatiini]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contra Pelaginistas</td>
<td>[Diversi libri]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversus Arianos</td>
<td>Contra Arrianos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversus Apolinariaistas</td>
<td>Contra Donatistas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item diversi libri et tractatus vel epistulæ...</td>
<td>Contra Pelagianos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Quaestiones]</td>
<td>[En. in Psalmos]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

republished volume 10 of the 1569 Basel edition, so that volume 10 of the Louvain theologian (1577) contained nothing new. Such is Lambot's account. The volume 10 of the 1569 Basel edition (which Lambot declares to be 'excessively rare') turns out to contain only 43 items in its *De Diversis* series — at least in the only copy I have seen, in New College in the University of Edinburgh. All 43 had appeared in Vlimmerius' 1564 volume. They were in fact the first 43 items in the *De Diversis* collection listed by the Maurist editors (*PL* 39, 2436-2437). At the moment of writing I do not have access to the first Antwerp printing of the Louvain edition, but in the Cologne reprint of 1616 the *De Diversis* collection does indeed consist of 123 items in two parts 1-51 and 52-123, with the second entitled *Pars Alia Sermonum de Diversis, qui per Theologos Louvianienses anno M. D. LXXXVI* [sic] accesserunt (vol. 10, p. 477). This agrees with the Maurists' statement, that of Vlimmerius's 1564 volume, 51 were extracted to become the first part of the new *De Diversis* collection to which the Louvain editors added the second part of 72 new sermons (*PL* 39, 13-14, with '62' erroneously for '72'). The 43 items of 1569 had been increased to 51 by the addition of five sermons contributed by Vlimmerius to the Proben edition of 1566 and published in a separate group in the 1569 edition, and three others that appeared in 1564: *Sermones* 335 and 356 were placed elsewhere in 1569, and *Sermon* 319 apparently was not included separately because of confusion with *Sermon* 319. See n. 21 below.

The *De Diversis* collection in the Louvain edition remains Vlimmerius's work, but Lambot seems to have confounded his 1569 and 1577 productions. It is the Louvain edition's preface which asserts that it includes many previously unpublished sermons which Vlimmerius transcribed from Cambrai manuscripts (edition of Cologne, 1616, vol. 1, fol. 34v).

For my scrutiny of Vlimmerius's edition I have mostly used the 1569 edition, which alone was available to me in Edinburgh. But latterly the exemplary kindness of Dr. G. Pollett procured me a xerox copy of the first printing, for which I express my warm gratitude.

What Vlimmerius's preface does not tell us is that he considerably increased the length of the *Indiculum* by inserting titles not listed by Possidius — if indeed this is the correct explanation of the expansion of the *Indiculum* in his edition. At first sight it appears a most unlikely procedure for a researcher so painstaking and discerning in uneartaining new sermons of Augustine. Moreover, if he expanded the *Indiculum* to include titles derived from his discoveries up to 1564, why did he not further expand it to take account of his later finds in the years up to 1569? And what of his concern to use Possidius's list as a tool to determine the authenticity of unpublished sermons attributed to Augustine? In his preface to the *Indiculum* he presents it *ostreis marginarum scholios illustratus, quibus et per ipsum Augustinum et per veteres Patres quos scripta passim citare non dubitam, opera esse Augustini consecratoare* (1564, sig. e iv, 1569, fol. C 1r); cf. the dedicatory epistle to the 1564 volume as a whole, sig. "iv". Could Vlimmerius have failed to realize that to include titles from published or manuscript sermons, even when corroboration of their Augustinian authenticity appeared to be furnished by 'Bede' (i.e., Florius) or Eugyppius, would frustrate one of the chief aims of his edition of the *Indiculum*?

And yet no other interpretation of the evidence seems possible than that Vlimmerius himself inserted many new sermon titles into the *Indiculum*. In the absence of his sole manuscript (from Villers-en-Brabant) conclusive proof that the enlargement was wholly his own work rather than already partly embodied in his manuscript cannot be claimed, although the preface, volume 1 of the Louvain edition suggests it was wholly Vlimmerius's work. His confessed rearrangement of the

---

4. Unless commodiorem bears the force of 'more ample, more complete', which is not the more natural meaning.

5. But see note 2 above. The 1569 volume of sermons contains nothing that had not been published by 1564.


7. WILMART, *Hist. Aenot.* vol. 2, pp. 140-150, clearly regarded Vlimmerius's manuscript as lost. It may perhaps prove identifiable from a fresh search among the manuscripts, such as Fr. Glorie will doubt undertake in preparation for his new critical edition in *Corpus Christianorum*.

Johannes Molanus's preface to the Louvain Opera comments as follows: *Editio nova autem Indiculum Possidii, cum B. Augustini vita, post Villarion et Lobius ille manu-
DAVID F. WRIGHT

The contents of the Indicum, itself an outrageous editorial practice by later standards, makes it much easier to believe that he was capable also of expanding its contents. And if we were, per impossibile, to suppose that he did nothing more than rearrange it, we would have to conceive of a manuscript of the Indiculum which included not only sermon titles deriving from such well established collections as De Verbis Domini and De Verbis Apostoli but also titles from sermons that Vlimmerius was the first to publish, together with the Indiculum, in 1564, and others from sermons not published until 1577 or, in some cases, decades later. This, I suggest, is much more incredible than Vlimmerius's insertion of titles into his manuscript's text of the Indiculum. Although in the event he inserted very few titles from sermons now regarded as pseudo-Augustinian, the very fact that any insertions were made robbed the work of its unimpeachable authority in determining the authenticity of disputed sermons.

The two hundred odd items collected by Possidius under the category 'Miscellaneous Sermons' (Tractatus diversi — X v in Wilmart's numbering of the main sections of the work) follow no obvious order, although some chronological sequences have been established. What Vlimmerius did was to arrange these sermons in a systematic manner in five groups, De versibus Psalmorum, De diversis, De veritis Evangelii, De Verbis Apostoli, and De tempore et de sanctis. Within each group he has further arranged the titles in the appropriate biblical or calendrical order, with the exception of the section I have labelled [De diversis], which apparently out of sequence, the issue beyond doubt, while doing its utmost to save Vlimmerius's reputation, but unconvincingly.

The Louvain text of the Indiculum (ibid., pp. 12-19) is therefore the edict of the normal form of the work.

Both his 1564 preface (supra cit.) and the separate title-page of the Indiculum in this edition (sig. e iii) mention his marginalia, which for the most part identify the sermons to which the titles belong. In the 1564 edition they do this often by referring to the folios and numbers of the 1564 edition they do this often by referring to the folios and numbers of the publications subsequently in the same volume. For the titles in the group [De tempore et de sanctis], which for some reason Vlimmerius separated from his other groups of sermon titles by the intervening alphabetical inventory of the correspondence of Augustinian, Vlimmerius identified only sermons published by him in 1564, apart from a few attributed to 'Bede' or only in manuscripts. He includes no reference to sermons in the collection Carthusienne. But elsewhere Vlimmerius's annotations often give the number of the sermon in the twelfth early medieval collections De Verbis Domini and De Verbis Apostoli, occasionally in the Quinquaginta Homiliae collection. Normally such references also mention 'Tom. 10', which may indicate in general terms that this is where the sermons are to be found in collected editions but is more likely to refer to the forthcoming 1569 edition. This is confirmed by the fact that many references appear in the form 'Tom. 10 fol.' (i.e., lacking folio number). This in turn supports the impression given by the 1564 preface that Vlimmerius published the Indiculum in that

...
year only because of the pressure of one of his scholarly patrons. Everything suggests that he planned to produce it together with the 1569 edition. The singular advantage of the 1569 reprinting of the Indiculum is that the marginal notes now locate nearly all the sermons by volume and folio in other volumes, chiefly volume 10, of this collected edition. As a consequence most, but not all, of the identifications by reference to the medieval collections, such as De Verbis Domini, have disappeared. But there appear to be no new identifications which were not already present, albeit for the most part in different forms, in the 1564 edition. And since the 1569 reprinting is unchanged from 1564 apart from the marginal notes, it does not incorporate any new titles from sermons that Vlimmerius discovered after 1564. Moreover, all the sermons identified in 1564 only by Incipit appear in the same form in the 1569 reprinting. I take this to mean that the sermons concerned were still in manuscript only. Similarly titles identified in 1564 only by reference to 'Bede' remain the same in form in 1569; several of the sermons from which 'Bede' got his extracts and titles were to be published in full by Vlimmerius but not until 1577.

Among the sermons Vlimmerius identified by Incipit only are three that were not published until 1631, when they were items 10, 11 and 35 in Jacques Sirmond's S. Aurelii Augustini... Sermones Novi numeros XL. They are now Sermons 33, 41 and 357. For the first of these Vlimmerius could find a title in Possidius (XII, 84), but for the latter two his titles must have come from the manuscript(s). Why did Vlimmerius not publish these sermon titles himself subsequently in the Louvain volumes of 1564? From what manuscript or manuscripts did he know them? Sirmond's sole source for all three was copex DD, 12 of the Parisian Abbey of St. Victor, now Paris, Bibl. de l'Arsenal 506. In addition he found the greater part of Sermon 41 in his highly esteemed ancient papyrus manuscript, now Geneva, B.I.M. de la Ville 16. He also found all three sermons listed in an index to Roberto de Bardi's Collectio of Augustinian sermons.

11. This is relevant to my correction of Lambot in note 2 above. Otherwise in the 1569 Indiculum Vlimmerius would be referring by Incipit only to some sermons that were published in the second part of the new De diversis series in 1569 according to Lambot. In reality they were not published until 1577. The items in question here are Sermones 23 (De div. 122), 273 (De div. 101), 280-282 (De div. 103-105), 306 (De div. 94). In addition 1577 saw the published full text of Sermones 51 (De div. 63) and 233 (De div. 86) which Vlimmerius knew in 1564/1569 only in fragmentary or mutilated form.

12. Sermones 191 (De div. 60), 205 (68), 222-223 (80-81), 233-234 (86-87), 236 (88), 302 (111). Also in 1564/1569 Vlimmerius referred to the published fragment from 'Bede' from a sermon, Sermon 23, which was published in full in 1577 as De diversis 122.

13. Sirmond, Opera Varia... (Paris 1606), vol. 1, cols. 336, 341 (Note in XL: Sermones Novos S. Augustini'). Sirmond's 1631 volume is not available to me. An incomplete text of Sermon 41 was earlier published in the Paris Opera Omnia of 1614 against Sirmond's wishes. See P. PETITMENGE, A propos des Éditions patristiques de la Contre-Réforme: Le Saint Augustin de la Typographie Vaticane, in Recherches Augustiniennes 4 (1966), pp. 231-236, to which I owe the identification of Sirmond's manuscripts.


15. For the post-Maurist sermons I have used the definitive intercalations of P. VERBRAKEN, Études critiques sur les sermons authentiques de Saint Augustin (Instrumenta Patristica, XII; Steenbrugge and The Hague, 1976).

Did Vlimmerius's researches extend as far as Paris? Perhaps he was at this point dependent on his uncle Martin Lypsius, a fellow-Augustinian. On his death in 1555 Vlimmerius fell heir to the fruit of Lypsius's systematic pursuit of new Augustinian texts. He sent a body of material to Basel for inclusion in the Froben edition of 1564. Not only were all but five sermons rejected, but the rest were not returned to him. He complains in the preface to his 1564 volume (sigs. *iv-iii*) of having to do Lypsius's research all over again. Perhaps he failed to track down the manuscript from which Lypsius may have known of these three sermons later published by Sirmond.

The aim of this present study is modest enough, namely, to identify the sources of the titles of the sermons or tradus (Vlimmerius seems to use these designations indiscriminately) in the strange édition princeps of the Indiculum. For each of Vlimmerius's group of sermon titles, I have appended below an inventory of his sources, listing items in his order (which is without numeration). When he got his title from Possidius I have given the numbered reference from Wibert's edition. Where published sermons or fragments were his source, I have given the present-day numbers of the sermons or fragments. I have sought to distinguish between published fragments from 'Bede' (Florus), several of which Vlimmerius included in his 1564 corpus, and the derivation of titles alone from the Augustinian compilation falsely ascribed to Bede.

I cannot claim exhaustive accuracy for these lists, but Vlimmerius's vagaries must take at least some of the blame for their inadequacies. Sometimes he repeats titles without rhyme or reason, sometimes he lists sermons twice according to the different elements in their titles (which are sometimes divided into two for this purpose). Sometimes he includes both Possidius's entry and a published sermon's title when it is fairly clear that the two should be identified. Sometimes he concocts a title for a sermon from a scriptural text that appears only half-way through the sermon. On one occasion he (or his manuscript) combines two titles that Wibert lists separately. In his numbering of the Psalms he (or his manuscript) is too often careless. In the section [De tempore et sanctis] the number of sermons his titles record is frequently at variance both with the number attested by Possidius and the number he, Vlimmerius, actually identifies as extant.
Sometimes Vlimmerius appears to have identified Possidius's entry with a title furnished by a published sermon or other source and then to have omitted the former in favour of the latter or a title nearer to it than Possidius's version. He reshaped several of the titles he took from sermons, often to bring them more into line with the style of Possidius's titles, but on occasion without obvious cause. He did not include all of the entries in Wilmart's edition, but then in the absence of his manuscript we cannot be sure whether they were all available to him. Nor did he include all of the titles of published sermons at his disposal. But in view of Vlimmerius's versatile waywardness it must often be difficult to judge whether an omission is deliberate or negligent. When a title is identical or virtually identical with one catalogued by Possidius but is also identified by Vlimmerius's marginal reference with an extant sermon bearing a similar title, I have normally given Possidius as the source.

In brackets I have listed, by their Maurist or post-Maurist (Verbraken) numbers, the sermons that Vlimmerius identified with his titles. Sermons from which he derived titles appear of course without brackets as the source of these titles. Where Vlimmerius offers no identification of a title with an extant sermon, I have given none, even in cases where the identification is not only straightforward for us but also should have been easy for Vlimmerius.

Wilmart dismissed Vlimmerius's editio princeps with a perfunctory 'parait être assez artificielle' ('Misc. Agost., vol. 2, p. 140). A kinder verdict may be in order, at least for the bulk of sermon titles, so long as we cease to regard his aim as the faithful reproduction of Possidius's list. The sections studied here deserve to be viewed as the fruit of an industrious attempt to catalogue systematically all the titles of Augustine's sermons presented by Possidius or by extant sermons or fragments. The result is as much Vlimmerius's work as Possidius's. We might even call Vlimmerius 'a new Possidius'.

De versibus Psalmorum\(^{17}\) (pp. xx-xxiii; ff. C6-D1r)

Sermo 13, X\(^{6}\) 145, Sermo 14, X\(^{6}\) 31, 24, 133, 134, 25, 46, 68, Sermo 40, X\(^{6}\) 75, 71, 7, 47, 138, Sermone 18 and 17 (one only is listed but two

16. In what follows, the page references are to the 1564 edition, the folio references to the 1569 reprinting. I have invariably repeated 'Sermo' before a number, but not the 'X\(^{6}\)' classification from Wilmart's edition.

17. Possidius lists sermons de psalmo... non toto for Psalms 34, 46, 71 and 81, using full words or Roman numerals (Wilmart, X\(^{6}\) 7, 31, 34, 35). Vlimmerius uses the same formula for Psalms 14, 37, 76 and 81, but with Arabic numerals except for trigesimo septimo in the 1564 edition. Since these entries obviously derive from Possidius, I have had to hazard a guess at the most likely corruptions of the numbers, which leave '14' as somehow derived from the original 'XLVI'. Vlimmerius also lists De versibus psalmi quingagesimi secundio (1564; '52', 1569) and De versibus psalmi nonagensesimi... (X\(^{6}\) 42) and... de versibus psalmi nonagensesimi... (X\(^{6}\) 38).

The slip from 'LXXIII' (X\(^{6}\) 140) to '83' is readily intelligible.

are identified in the margin), X\(^{6}\) 80, 43, 66, 26, (on Ps. 107-Vlimmerius lists it for Ps. 59 l), 44 (Sermo 22), 166, MS. (later Sermo 23), X\(^{6}\) 167, 34, 35, 149 ('forte' Sermo 279: 3-7, Incipit, Præcedente die domino cantaviorum; Vlimmerius's reference is wrong), 146, 38, Sermo 25, Sermo 26, X\(^{6}\) 147, 81, 49, 110, 48, 111, 108 and 168 (Sermo 29 — only one identified), Sermo 30, X\(^{6}\) 197, 79, 189, 94, 107, 21 and 154 (Sermo 33 — only one identified).

[De diversis] (pp. xxiii-xxix; ff. D1r-D2r)

De disciplina Christiana (PL 40, 669-678), X\(^{6}\) 14 (Sermo 9), 15 (Sermo 351), 56 (Sermo 352), 16 (identified as both Sermo 32 and the Caesarian adaptation of it, no. 31 (= 32) in the Quinquaginta Homiliae), 55 (De utilitate icenii, CCL 46, 231-241), 9 (Sermo 4), 12 (Sermo 2), 'Bede' (later Sermo 3), X\(^{6}\) 13 (fragm. from 'Bede' = PL 39, 1731-1732, part of Sermo 4A), 39, 17, 19, fragm. from 'Bede' (part of later Sermo 23), 'Bede' (later part of Sermo 322), MS. (later Sermo Mat 153), MS. (later Sermo Aff. 10), Sermo 6 (cf. X\(^{6}\) 109), Sermo 7 (cf. X\(^{6}\) 109), Sermo 341, Sermo 46, X\(^{6}\) 170 (Sermo 58), 175 (Sermo 216), De paullam (CSEL 41, 663-691), X\(^{6}\) 202 (De continuin, CSEL 41, 141-183), 180, 'Bede' (later Sermo 229), X\(^{6}\) 157 (fragm. from Eugyppius, later part of Sermo 8), fragm. from 'Bede' (later part of Sermo 344), MS. (later Sermo 41), X\(^{6}\) 54; and 2 and 165 (Vlimmerius — 'tractatus diversi'; cf. I. 34), 3, 5, 'Bede' (fragm., later Sermo 342), X\(^{6}\) 22, 23, Sermo 349, X\(^{6}\) 78, 56 (cf. X\(^{6}\) 176), Sermo 355 and 356, Sermo 34, Sermo 107, X\(^{6}\) 86 (cf. X\(^{6}\) 115), Sermo 38, X\(^{6}\) 48, 49, MS. (De Hospitalitate; later Maximus of Turin, Sermo 34, CCL 23, 132-134, but here with the slightly divergent Incipit, Animadversion sanclitas vestra, fratres...). (later Sermo 357), X\(^{6}\) 84 (MS. later Sermo 33), X\(^{6}\) 83 (Sermo 36), 82 (Sermo 37), 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 70, 76, 106 ('tract. it' Vlimmerius refers only to 'Bede's excerpt from Sermo 350), 169, 196, 198 ('duo' Vlimmerius gives 'ser. iii', viz. Sermone 15, 336, 337, 338), 'Bede' (later part of Sermo 125A), Eugyppius (De providentia Dei, CSEL 9, i, 448-449), Sermo 60 (cf. X\(^{6}\) 103), X\(^{6}\) 41, 66, 155, 190, 191, 192, 193, 161, 32, 52, 143, 144.

18. Florus refers to this sermon by the title Ad conjugatos. It had long been published in full under the title De muliere cura, as no. 40 of the Quinquaginta Homiliae, which Vlimmerius failed to notice (in 1569 edition, vol. 10, cols. 548-551).

19. Vlimmerius gives the Incipit only. Expositiones sanctorum scripturarum si eo ordine... It had long been published as item 78 in the De Tempore series but with a divergent Incipit, Si expositionem sanctorum... etc. (in 1569 edition, vol. 10, cols. 727-750).
De verbis Evangelii (pp. xxix-xxxix; ff. D2r-D4v)

[Matthew]


[Mark]

X4. 126 (Possidius — one ; Vlimmerius — two, but identifies none), Sermo 233 (Incipit at line 10, Audistis quid dixit Dominus...).

[Luke]


[John]


De verbis Apostoli (pp. xxxix-xlvi; ff. D4r-D6v)


[De tempore et de sanctis] (pp. lxxi-lxv; ff. E2r-E3r)

X4. 100 and 170 (together eight; Vlimm. refers only to ‘Bede’s’ title, from Sermo 101, 171 (seven; only ‘Bede’s’ title, from Sermo 194, 172 (five; De utulillae in CCL 46, 234-231). Sermo 211 and ‘Bede’s’ title, from Sermo 205, 172 (two; ‘Bede’ from Sermo 218A). 147 (twenty-three; only ‘Bede’ from Sermones 222 and 223, but see next), ‘Tempe Paschali, tract. xxxix’ (Vlimm. identifies sixteen — Sermones 240, 235, 231, 232, 237, 239, 242, 248, 253, 254, 245, 116, 255, 251, 252, and 243 — and refers to ‘Bede’s’ titles from Sermones 228A, 233, 234, 235, 270), ‘In octava Paschae, tract. xii’ (Vlimm. identifies sixteen — Sermones 276, 224, 148, 260 and App. 172 — only five), X6. 92 (cf. also 101 and 179 — together five; Vlimm. lists ‘x’ but identifies only six, Sermo 261, 262, 233 (Incipit at line 10, Audistis quid dixit Dominus...), 263, Caesarius Sermo 210, and ‘Bede’ from Sermo 265, 93 (cf. 104; Vlimm. lists ‘x’ but identifies none), 96 (‘Bede’ from Sermo 268), 106 (cf. 107; Vlimm. lists and identifies two — Sermones 267 and 271), ‘De adventu Spiritus sancti, ser. iii’ (nil), ‘De sancto Stephano proemiarlyre, ser. vi’ (Vlimm. Ap. 212 — listed twice.

21. In 1564 (p. lxxi) Vlimmerius had referred to his own text of Sermo 263 in the same volume. In 1569 (fol. E 2v) he referred instead to its appearance as no. 174 in the old De Tempore series. It had been published in all editions since Amerbach, but was to be re-edited by Vlimmerius in 1577 as De Diversis 90. For this title, De Quadragesima Ascensionis Dominis (Wilmart, X6. 92), Vlimmerius listed seven (including ‘Bede’s’) in 1564 but only six (ditto) in 1569. This is probably the only instance of such a change that I have detected (cf. next note). As at present I have access only to the list of contents of the 1564 volume I cannot identify the one that Vlimmerius dropped. It seems not to be a case of accidental omission.

22. In 1564 Vlimmerius provided his own edition of Sermo 319, but this did not appear in 1569, so that the marginal reference in the 1569 Indicecum relates to the old De Sanctis 3, the first part of which is based on Sermo 310. The latter was restored in 1577 as De Diversis 51. Vlimmerius’s text of De Sanctis 3 (1569, vol. 10, col. 1710-1711) was fuller than the present Sermo App. 212.

In 1564 Vlimmerius listed ten sermons for St. Stephen. (‘10’ is erroneous for ‘7’ in the De diversis sequence of the 1564 volume, which is unrelated to the series of the same name in the 1569 and later editions.) In 1569 only eight marginal references are given, but Vlimmerius must have intended all of the group Sermones 320-324 to be included, even if he provided folio numbers for only three of them.)
Sermones 320, 321, 322, 323, 324, App. 215, App. 211, Sermo 382), 'De miraculis et beneficiis sancti Stephani' (De civilate Dei 22, 8-9, CCL 48, 821-827), 'In festo sanctorum Fabiani et Sebastiani Martyrum' (?), X°. 105, 124, 125 (Possidius — two; Vlimm. — one), 130 (MS., later Sermo 306), 131, 139, 141, MS. (later Sermo 273), X°. 137 and 187 (together three; Vlimm. — six, unidentified), Sermo 286, X°. 118 and 150 (together two; Vlimm. records six, identifies five, Sermones 290, 292, 287 and 'Bede' from Sermones 288 and 292), 119 and 158 (together two; Vlimm. — seven, Sermones 147 and 298), 128 (Vlimm. — five; 'Bede' from Sermones 302 and 304), 'In Basilica Tricellarum' (unidentified, probably 'Bede' from Sermo 53), X°. 188 (Sermo 94), 184 (four; Vlimm. identifies only Sermo 309), 185 (MS., later Sermones 280, 281 and 282), 'Martyres, etc.', 'Martyrum festum' (cf. X°. 152), X°. 186, 194 + 195. Sermones 307 and 308 (three recorded), 'De apostolo Paulo et conversione eius, sermon. x' (Sermones 324, 278, App. 189, fragm. = Sermo 43, 6-7 (Incipit, Quanta Christi dignatio), fragm. = Sermo 279, 7-8 (Incipit, Corde creditur ad iustitiam), Sermo 283, X°. 182 (Vlimm. records nine; Sermo 101), 'De natali martyrum, ser. viii' (Sermones 333, 31, 334, 335, 65), 'In festo unius virginis, ser. vi' (Sermo 53).
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A Supplementary List¹

Any listing of the manuscripts and fragments of a work as popular in the mediaeval Church as Augustine’s Tractatus on John’s Gospel is liable to be incomplete, at least until all the volumes of Die Handschriftliche Übereinander der Werke des heiligen Augustinus have been published². Nevertheless, this supplementum is already overdue and must not be deferred until it has a greater hope of being reasonably complete³. It follows the same lines as my ‘Check-List’ of 1972, except that, in addition to new entries, manuscripts listed then reappear here if in the interval fresh or

¹ Cf. The Manuscripts of St. Augustine’s «Tractatus in Evangelium Iohannis»: A Preliminary Survey and Check-List, in Rec. Augustiniennes 8 (1972), pp. 55-143, hereafter ‘Check-List’. A helpful review was contributed by G. Follet in REA 19 (1973), pp. 318-319. For this and for other assistance I express my warm appreciation. This present study has benefited from grants awarded by the Earl of Moray Endowment of the University of Edinburgh and the British Academy’s Small Grants Research Fund in the Humanities.

² Published in the Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, at Vienna: Band I/1 and I/2, Italien (Sitz. 263 and 267, 1969 and 1970), ed. M. Oberleitner; Band II/1 and II/2, Grossbritannien und Irand (Sitz. 271 and 276, 1972), ed. F. Römer; Band III, Polen: Anhang, Die Skandinavischen Staaten Danemark-Finnland-Schweden (Sitz. 289, 1973), ed. Römer; Band IV, Spanien und Portugal (Sitz. 292, 1974), ed. J. Divjak; Band V/1 and V/2, Bundesrepublik Deutschland und Westberlin (Sitz. 306 and 350, 1976 and 1979), ed. R. Kurz. I gladly acknowledge helpful co-operation from the compilers of these volumes, which are referred to hereafter by the editor’s name and the volume number.

³ I have not been able to consult Professor Bernhard Bischoff’s inventory of ninth-century codices in Munich, which is at present unindexed and most likely includes some Tractatus items, chiefly extracts and fragments, unknown to me. However, I have benefited from information supplied by Professor Bischoff by letter, for which I am most grateful.
revised information about contents, dating or provenance has come to my knowledge. All manuscripts listed here for the first time are marked by an asterisk (*).

Altogether just over seventy manuscripts make their first appearance in this supplement. Although, as one might expect, fragments and extracts are prominent among them, they include sixteen additional manuscripts containing the whole or a major part of the Tractatus — Berlin theol. lat. fol. 499 and 551 and Hdschr. 130; Gniezno 48; Kraków 1217; Lambach L; Madrid, Acad. Hist. 82; Munich 17054 and 22217; Pelpin 14; Salamanca 2530; Sigüenza 108; Toledo 14-3; Valencia 892(34); Zeil 1; one unlocated. The items from the Tractatus are listed in at least nine homiliaries - Fabriano, San Silvestro 8; Gerona 44; Grenoble 9 and 24 and Toulouse 1161 and 1162; León 8; Madrid, B.N. 10 and 78; Oxford, Bodl. Lyell 77; Paris, B.N. lat. 5302; Venice Z. 153 and 154. Furthermore the fragments include the remains of at least seven pre-tenth-century manuscripts (excluding homiliary fragments) - Brussels 1831-3 etc.; Bad Hersfeld, Stadtarchiv fragm.; Linz 668 etc.; Munich 29382 (6-12); London, Lambeth 414; Paris, B.N. lat. 2269; Venice XII. 232.

Homiliaries

The publication of analyses of mediaeval homilies and lectionaries has continued thick and fast since my 'Check-List' was compiled. Some homiliaries have clearly merited inclusion in this supplementary list of witnesses to the manuscript transmission of Augustine's Tractatus, but it has become no easier to determine and apply consistent criteria of inclusion and exclusion*.

Jean-Paul Bouhot has devoted a series of studies to the collection known as Sancti catholicci Patres, compiled early in the twelfth century and drawing on an interpolated version of Paul Deacon's homily as one of its three chief sources. For the festival of one or more apostles Sancti catholicci Patres prescribes the nine Tractatus 80-88 in succession (BOUHOT, L'homeliaire des « Sancti catholicci Patres ». Reconstitution de sa forme originale, in RÉA 21 (1975), pp. 188-189). Some manuscripts of the collection contain a few additional items from the Tractatus (BOUHOT, L'homeliaire des « Sancti catholicci Patres ». Tradition manuscrite, in RÉA 22 (1976), pp. 147-148, 180, 183), but even this did not seem to warrant the inclusion of representatives of this collection in our inventory, let alone copies of Robert de Bardi's fourteenth-century Collectorium sermonum sancti Augustini which drew heavily on Sancti catholicci Patres, including Tr. 80-88.

Bouhot regards Tr. 80-88 as belonging to the interpolations in the compiler's copy of Paul Deacon's collection. Although he is unable to point to any exemplar of Paul Deacon which contains even the majority of his (Bouhot's) alleged interpolations, he draws attention to the eleventh-century lectionary of Cluny which has several parallels with the kind of adapted Paul Deacon he envisages (BOUHOT, L'homeliaire des « Sancti catholicci Patres ». Sources et composition, in RÉA 24 (1978), pp. 115-116, 152-153). But why does Bouhot say nothing about a small series of items in the original Paul Deacon which could have provided virtually the whole of Tr. 80-88? I reproduce half a page of Réginald Grégoire's analysis of Paul Deacon (Les homélaires du moyen âge. Inventaire et analyse des manuscrits, Rome, 1966, p. 109):

COMMUNE SANCTORUM

100. In Vigilia unius apostoli
Ego sum uitis uera... agricola (Jean 15, 1)
Iste locus evangeliis fraterni ubi se dictit Dominus uitem — et habituauit in nobis.
Augustin, Tract. in Ioh., 80, 81, 82. C.C., 36, p. 527-534.

101. In Natale unius apostoli
Hoc est praeceptum meum... (Jean 15, 12)
Cam cuncta sacra eloquiu dominii plena sint praeceptis quid est — nunc
decertantes iusti.

102. Sermo beati Augustini episcopi
Hoc est praeceptum meum ut diligatis inuicem sicut dixisti uos... (Jean 15, 12)
Siue dicatur praeceptum sive mandatum ex uno serbo greco utrumque — ad
ratiuum salutis.

103. Haec mando uobis ut diligatis inuicem... (Jean 15, 17)
Ac per hoc intellegere — ipso faciente fecit. Haec autem ipse non illis facientibus
decit.
P.L., 35, 1852-1862.

A comparison with items 308-316 in Bouhot's analysis of Sancti catholicci Patres (Rev. Ét. Aug. 21, 1975, pp. 188-189), presenting Tr. 80-88 individual-
ly 'In natale apostolorum unius siue plurimorum. Sermo beati Augustini episcopi', suggests that at least for Trv. 83 and 87 Paul Deacon's texts omitted some lines at the beginning. (Some doubt may also persist whether Paul Deacon presented an unabridged text of these Tractates; cf. my 'Check-List', p. 121 n. 163). But even if the compiler of Sancti catholici Patres went back to a copy of the Tractates themselves for his items 308-316, it was patently Paul Deacon who prescribed what he was after. 'Interpolation' seems quite an inappropriate description.

I have not included in this supplementary list the various manuscripts used by Raymond Étaix to reconstruct: Le lectionnaire de l'office à Cluny, in Recherches Augustiniennes 11 (1976), pp. 91-159. This system incorporated seventeen items from the Tractatus (p. 154), in part from Paul Deacon and perhaps in part from other homiliary or lectionary collections. Étaix has sought to depict the Cluniac lectionary in use at the close of the twelfth century. This Cluniac lectionary was adopted by the Abbeys of St.-Remi and St.-Thierry at Reims in the course of the twelfth century. Extant manuscripts in the Bibliothèque Municipale at Reims preserve in part the usage of these Abbeys (cf. R. Étaix, Les homiliaires liturgiques de Saint-Thierry, in Saint-Thierry: une abbaye du VIe au XVe siècle. Actes du Colloque international d'Histoire monastique, Reims-Saint-Thierry, 11 au 14 octobre 1976 (Saint-Thierry, 1979), pp. 147-158).

I have, however, included the manuscripts that contain Le lectionnaire cartusien pour le réfectoire analysed also by Étaix in RÉA 23 (1977), pp. 272-303. This lectionary was compiled in the middle or later half of the thirteenth century (p. 302). It has drawn thirty-two items from the Tractatus of Augustine (p. 298), in addition to four complete and seven 'residue' Tractatus items taken from the office homiliary of La Grande Chartreuse preserved in Grenoble 32 and 33, which were included in my original 'Check-List' (see also below).

Collections which have not found a place in my earlier and present lists of manuscripts will be covered in an inventory of the use of the Tractatus in mediæval homiliaries and lectionaries which I have begun to compile.

In Le lectionnaire de l'office à Fleury: essai de reconstitution, in Rev. Bénédict. 89 (1979), pp. 110-164, A. Davril has combined the numerous marginal indications of lections in extant manuscripts from the Abbey of Fleury now at Orléans' Bibliothèque Municipale with evidence provided by surviving lectionaries of strictly limited extent and a late sixteenth-century manuscript breviary. The reconstructed analysis reveals the considerable use made of the ninth-century copy of the Tractatus in Ioan-nem which was later the Maurists' codex Floracensis, Orléans, Bibl. Munie. 161 (138). Twenty-eight lections are identified which correspond to indications in the margins of this codex, which also similarly designates other lections whose use at Fleury Davril cannot document (see p. 112). At the same time the Fleury office used another ten lections from the Tractatus not designated as such in Orléans codex 161 (see p. 154).

Division of the «Tractatus» into Two Sections

Tractatus 1-54 and 55-124 (*1-70*)

This division is further attested (see 'Check-List', pp. 72-76) by Jonas of Orléans (d. 843). In his defence of images against Claudius of Turin he quotes from Tr. 118 calling it homilia sexagesima quarta (De Cultu Imaginationi 1; PL 106, 333-334).


A later witness is Bartholomeus de Urbino the compiler of the Millegoium S. Augustini which was completed by 1347. He relates that the volume of the Tractatus had been sometimes divided into two parts because of its size. He had also seen it divided into three parts, the details of which he does not provide. See further below, under Munich 14286, for other additional late evidence for a three-fold division.

«Tractatus» 20-22

In 1977 Père M.F. Berrouard published the second volume of his edition and French translation of the Tractatus, equipped with an ample introduction and extensive annotation: Homélies sur l'Évangile de saint Jean XVII-XXXIII (Bibliothèque Augustinienne. Œuvres de saint Augustin, 72 ; Paris, 1977). In the introduction the author reproduces the arguments he advanced a few years earlier in favour of dating Trv. 17-19 and 23-54 in the year 414 and Trv. 20-22 in 419-420 (pp. 9-46); cf. id., La date des «Tractatus I-LIV in Ioannem Evangelium» de saint Augustin, in Recherches Augustiniennes 7, 1971, pp. 105-168). Sermo 125 he is inclined to place earlier than its contiguous group of Tractatus, Trv. 17-19 (Homélies..., pp. 16-17).

For the purposes of a study of the manuscripts of the Tractatus in Ioan-nem, it is Père Berrouard's major contribution to have vastly reinforced my arguments, based largely on external features and chronological cross-references, for the independence of Trv. 20-22 by a close textual and theolo-

5. Modern cataloguers occasionally misinterpret the separate numbering of Tract. 55-124. See below on Munich 29382 (6-12 and Salamanca 2530).
viding comparison of these Tractatus with Trr. 17-19 and 23-54 in general and with Trr. 18, 19 and 23 in particular (La date..., pp. 140-163; Homélies..., pp. 12-18, 42-46). We may indeed describe the independence of Trr. 20-22 as one of the "assured results" of study of the Tractatus over the last decade and a half. To my knowledge no writer has called this conclusion into question. One could even suggest that it would not have been outrageous if Dom Verbraken had assigned these three Tractatus new numbers among the Sermones of Augustine. They would presumably become Sermones 126A, 126B and 126C (cf. VERBRaken, inversion des nouveaux sermons de Saint Augustin dans la trame de l'édition bénédictine, in Corona Gratulatorum... Elsjo Dekkers O.S.B. .... oblata (Bruges and The Hague, 1975), vol. 1, pp. 311-337 = Études critiques sur les Sermones authentiques de saint Augustin (Instrumenta Patristica XII; Steenbrugge and The Hague, 1976) pp. 19-42). This would be no less appropriate than it is to leave Sermo 125 where it is among the Sermones rather than incorporate it into the Tractatus as Trr. 17A.

It becomes clear that if we may validly speak of the original form of the Tractatus, it was one that lacked Trr. 20-22. That is to say, as preached Trr. 1-54 lacked 20-22. It is therefore conceivable that these three originally were found apart from 1-19 and 23-54 in Augustine's library. It is certainly difficult, in the light of their separate origin and absence in part of the subsequent tradition, to suppose that they belonged to the series that Possidius saw and catalogued as tractatus de evangelio Iohannis a capite usque in finem in codicibus sex (Indiculum X4, 5; ed. Wilmart, Misc. Agost., vol. 2, p. 182). We should therefore look more closely at a tentative suggestion I made in 1964 (Journal. of Theol. Stud. n.s. 15, 1964, p. 320) that these three Tractatus may be entered elsewhere in Possidius's inventory.

Among the Tractatus diversi Possidius lists one:

Ex evangelio : Non potest Filium a se facere quidquam nisi quod viderit Patrem faciement [ = John 5 : 19]
(X6. 159 ; Misc. Agost., vol. 2, p. 204).

Other things being equal, this would fit Trr. 20, but the following entries in Possidius bear no relation to Trr. 21-22 and we must suppose that Trr. 20-22 would have stayed together. Earlier Possidius lists: Tractatus diversi adversus supra scriptos [Arrianos] qui filium inaequalem Patri esse contendent

11. Ex evangelio Iohannis : Non potest Filium a se facere... Patrem faciement [ = John 5 : 19]

12. Ex codem Johanne : Pater enim diligit Filium et omnia demonstravit ei [ = John 5 : 20]


The explicitly anti-Arian Sermo 126 is a candidate for identification with VIII. 11 here, as would be Trr. 20. But Trr. 21 is the only extant sermon of Augustine on John 5 : 20. (Wilmart has no sermon to suggest

suited for VIII. 12, Misc. Agost., vol. 2, p. 225) But VIII. 13 does not fit Trr. 22, and it is not easy to see why Possidius should include Trr. 20 and 21 in this category but not Trr. 22 - unless because it is perhaps less obviously anti-Arian than the preceding two. But in the light of what is now securely established about Trr. 20-22, there can be no objection to identifying them with appropriate entries in Possidius separate from his listing of the Tractatus in Iohannem series.

Among the manuscripts listed here for the first time, only one (as far as my information goes at present) lacks Trr. 20-22, viz. Toledo, Bibl. del Cabildo 14-3 of the early twelfth century, a second Spanish witness alongside Lerida, Roda 1.

The Venerable Bede's Pauline florilegium is the earliest witness to the omission of Trr. 20-22 (see my note in Journal of Theological Studies n.s. 15, 1964, p. 321). In my 'Check-List', p. 85, I drew attention to an editorial reference implying that in his Homilies 1 : 23 (CCL 122, p. 169) Bede was dependent on Trr. 20. The doubts I expressed on this point have been more than confirmed by M.F. Berrouard's comment in his edition of Homélies sur l'Evangile de saint Jean XVII-XXXIII (Bibliothèque Augustiniene. Oeuvres de saint Augustin, 72 ; Paris, 1977), p. 13 n. 19. He holds that Bede's knowledge of Trr. 20 is far from certain.

Bede's copy of the Tractatus had in all probability been brought to Wearmouth-Jarrow by Benedict Biscop, whose book-collecting activity is surveyed by P. WorMAD, Bede and Benedict Biscop, in Famütus Christi. Essays in Commemoration of the Thirteenth Centenary of the Birth of the Venerable Bede, ed. G. Bonner (London, 1976), pp. 141-169. This article stresses the Gallic and Frankish sources of Biscop's imports to England. While any attempt to locate the provenance of Bede's manuscript of the Tractatus will require close textual study of the extracts in his Augustinian florilegium on St. Paul, which awaits its first printing, it may be noted that one of the places Biscop visited was Tours, the home of perhaps the second oldest manuscript witness to the omission of Trr. 20-22, codex Tours 289. At the same time, as was suggested in 'Check-List', p. 86, the Lyons region remains a stronger possibility.

In Journal of Theological Studies n.s. 15 (1964), p. 321, I cited Florus of Lyons as a witness for the line of transmission in which Tractatus 20-22 were lacking. J.P. Bouhot has recently published an analysis of a short patristic florilegium on the eucharist which at first sight provides evidence to the contrary. The sixteen fragments in this collection, which is found in Grenoble, Bibl. Munic. 131 (268), are derived, according to Bouhot, mostly from Gratian's Decretum and Florus's (Pseudo-Bede's) Augustinian florilegium on Paul. Items 6 and 7 are extracts from Trr. 62 and 72 respectively, with headings which give the standard numbers for the Tractatus (Extraits du « De Corpore et Sangue Domini » de Pascale Radbert sous le nom d'Augustin, in Recherches Augustiniennes 12 (1977), pp. 152-153). In the original version of Florus's collection, indexed by C. Charlier (Rev. Bénéd. 51, 1947, pp. 174-175), Trr. 23 ff. were numbered '20 ff.' The
resolution of the discrepancy presumably lies in the use by the compiler of
the florilegium of a copy of Florus's collection in which the numbers of
the Tractatus cited had been 'corrected'. Charlier notes the frequency of
such revisions in the transmission of Florus's work (art. cit., pp. 137-138).
The Tractatus is thus 'correctly' numbered in the source references (given
in the margins, not the text) of the only early printed edition of Florus's
compilation that I have been able to consult, Bede, Opera (Cologne, 1688),
vol. 6, cols. 380-381, and Bouhot implies that the same holds for the earlier
Cologne printing of 1612 (art. cit., p. 152 n. 50). Variation in the
manuscript tradition may also account for the sentence which appears in
the Grenoble codex's extract from Tr. 27 but not in Florus's (ibid., p. 153),
unless it points us to look elsewhere for the Grenoble copyst's source.

In addition to those writers listed in 'Check-List', pp. 82-85, Hinemar
of Rheims (d. 882) also used a copy of the Tractatus that almost certainly
lacked Tr. 20-22, or at least belonged to this branch of the manuscript
tradition. He quotes at least nine different Tractatus ranging from Tr. 39
to Tr. 123 with numbers three behind the standard enumeration (as was
noted by H. SCHÖRKS, Hinkmar Erzbischof von Reims, Sein Leben und seine
Schriften, Freiburg im Breisgau, 1884, p. 169 n. 108). The evidence may
be found at PL 125, 330, 334, 566, 580-581.

The tenth-century bishop of Verona, Ratherius (890-974), twice quotes
a dictum of Augustine's, 'Si poccata tua recte consideraveris, indicasti
si abieceris, occidisti' (De Otioso Sermone 6). The recent editor of his
Opera Minora, Peter L.D. Reid, gives Tr. 22 : 5 as the source (CCL Cont.
Med. 46, 160, 161), but at most the words embody no more than an echo
of the passage. They have a genuinely Augustinian ring, but I have not
succeeded in locating their place in his works.

My attention was drawn to the possibility that Benedict's Rule may
reflect knowledge of Tractatus 22 by J.T. Lienhard's: Index of Reported
Patristic and Classical Citations, Allusions and Parallels in the «Regula
a possible connexion between Tract. in Joh. 22 : 5 and Regula 4 : 42-43
is credited to Cuthbert Butler's third edition of the Regula (Freiburg,
1935). This edition is not accessible to me in Edinburgh, but I discovered
from B. Linderbauer's edition (Florilegium Patristicum, XVII : Bonn, 1928)
that the reference is in fact to Sermo Guefl : 22 : 5, i.e., the twenty-second
tractatus published by Morin in 1917 from the Woffenbüttel codex Weiss.
12 (4096), now Sermo 293D, according to P. Verbraken's standard inter-
calcation.6

6. Insertion des nouveaux sermon... (art. cit.), p. 331 ; Études critiques (op. cit.),
pp. 130, 186. — It is surprising to find as recent an edition of the Rule as that of R. Hanslik
(CSEL 75, 1960, at pp. 31, 180) transmitting this reference unaltered as 'Aug. tract. 22, 5
ed. G. Morin, p. 86, 169'. Sermo Guefl : 22 is most readily accessible in PL 52, 593-598. —
Another of the three parallels listed by Lienhard, that between Tract. 8 : 5, 5, 9 and Regula

---

4 : 13-17, confuses our Tractatus with the Tractatus in Epistolam Ioannae. As for
the third, between Tract. 43 : 1 and Regula 4 : 42-43, this is but one of many Au-
 gustoian texts that parallel Benedict's sentiment (cf. La Règle de S. Benoit, ed. A.
produced to show that Benedict knew Augustine's Tractatus in Ioannae.

THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE «TRACT. IN EVANG. IOH.»

The library of the ancient monastery of Lobbes possessed a copy of the
Tractatus described in a catalogue compiled between 1049 and the mid-
twelfth century as Augustini episcopi super evangelium Ioannis tractus
CXXII ad populum. The recent editor of this catalogue infers the absence
of Trr. 20-22. See F. DOLBEAU, Un nouveau catalogue des manuscrits de Lobbes aux XIer et XIIer siècles, in Recerches Augustiniennes 13 (1978),
pp. 3-36 at p. 18, and 14 (1979), pp. 191-248 at p. 195. The manuscript
in question is not extant, or if extant has not been identified.

OMISSION OF «TRACTATUS» 21-22

In my 'Check-List', pp. 87-89, a French, even northern French, line of
transmission was established characterized by the omission of Trr. 21-22,
with subsequent renumbering, and the transposition of Trr. 19 and 20.
An exemplar of this kind was probably used by Adhemar, an obscure
twelfth-century canon of St-Ruf at Valence (Dauphiné), in his Tractatus
of Trinitatis, which has been edited by N.M. Haring in Archiv d'histoire
doctre et litt. du moyen âge 32 (1965), pp. 111-206, 287-289,
from Vatican City, Bibl. Apost. lat. 561, a manuscript of the second
half of the twelfth century in French script. Adhemar's numbers for the
Tractatus are normally two behind the editions, but since Tr. 20
appears as '12', the transposition of 19 and 20 may not have been
present. See Haring's edition, pp. 121, 131, 165, 166, 169, 178, 179, 184,
196.

Another (lost) patristic collection on the Trinity by Adhemar was used by
his younger contemporary, Hugh of Honau, in his treatise De Diversitate
Naturae et Personae et Liber de homoyoision et homoysis. Hugh's
numbers for the Tractatus are less consistent than Adhemar's, which
suggests that he drew his material from different sources. The numbers
are sometimes three less than the standard enumeration, more often two
less, on occasions quite irregular. In the second work, the transposition
of Trr. 19 and 20 is clearly attested. See Haring's editions in Arch. dhist.
doct. et litt. du moyen âge 29 (1962), pp. 131, 154, 156, 157, 159, 175, 185,
198, 206, and 35 (1968), pp. 231, 246, 248, 255, 256.

Among the manuscripts listed here for the first time or with fuller details
than were given in my 'Check-List', Valence 577 (39) from the Naples
region has Trr. 19 and 20 transposed and lacks Trr. 21-22, with consequent
adjustment to subsequent numbering (see below).
THE INSERTION OF «SERMO» 125

Six more witnesses to the presence of Sermo 125 have been identified:

A. — Gerona, Museo Diocesano 44, ff. 63'-65' (Sermon 125: 1-4), ff. 153'-
157' (Sermon 125: 4-11). Although this eleventh-century codex is a homiliary, there can be no doubt that its compiler derived Sermon 125 from a copy of the Tractatus. The collection makes abundant use of the Tractatus (see below), while Sermon 125 has survived only in manuscripts of the Tractatus. Moreover, the only other Augustinian material used in the homiliary is Sermon 75 (PL 38, 475-479), which is sandwiched between Tr. 22: 14-23 and Tr. 18-19. These form the lections for the Friday in the second week of Lent. Now Sermon 75 appears in precisely the same position, i.e., between Tr. 23 and 18, in a manuscript of the Tractatus which also contains Sermon 125. This manuscript is Vich 27, which was included in my earlier survey but without any reference to Sermon 75. As we would expect, Sermon 125 has the same Incipit in Gerona 44 as in Vich 27, Nec auribus nec cordibus vestris reparant tamen... (cf. 'Check-List', p. 92), and the first part of Sermon 125 in Gerona 44 follows Tr. 17 as it does in Vich 27 (and indeed in all the manuscripts where it is found).

It can therefore be confidently asserted that Gerona 44 provides no evidence for the transmission of Sermon 125 independently of the Tractatus. Indeed, it is virtually certain that Gerona 44 used either Vich 27, as geographical proximity would tend to confirm, or a copy of the Tractatus almost identical to it. Further corroboration of Gerona 44's dependence on the Vich codex is given below on Vich 27.

The insertion of Sermon 75 in Vich 27 is surprising, but in no way parallel to the singular fortunes of Sermon 125. Since it deals with Matthew 14: 24-
33, it has no 'right' to appear among the Tractatus. Moreover, as Dom Patrick Vanbrak has kindly informed me, Sermon 75 has experienced a fairly widespread transmission quite independently of the Tractatus, both in the collection De Alleluia (studied by C. Lambot in Rev. Bénéd. 57, 1947, pp. 89-108) and in several isolated manuscripts, mostly of Italian origin. Vich 27 remains the only manuscript of the Tractatus so far known to contain Sermon 75. Further research may serve to throw light on its appearance here. It never featured in any of the early medieval homiliaries which enjoyed a wide popularity.

For the other Gospel lections on Matthew the Gerona collection invariably uses Jerome's Commentary. It so happens that Salamanca 2530, another copy of the Tractatus with Sermon 125 intercalated and Tr. 18 and 19 placed between Tr. 23 and 24 (see below), both as in Vich 27, also contains Jerome's work on Matthew. The relationship between this copy of Jerome's Commentary and the extracts from it in the Gerona homiliary remains to be investigated.

B. — Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 5302 (from Languedoc or Catalonia) contains for Lent virtually the same items as Gerona 44. From an analysis of the items from the Tractatus kindly provided for me by Raymond Était he appears to be so close to the Gerona manuscript as to make dependence very likely. However, since these three items either begin earlier or finish later than their counterparts in Gerona 44, the compiler must have had access to a copy of the Tractatus or to a modified version of the Gerona collection. Therefore the inclusion of Sermon 125: 4-11 (ff. 263'-271') merits a mention, even though in this particular it is identical to Gerona 44, no. 47a. It does not, however, include Sermon 125: 1-4 (Gerona 44, no. 27b) or Sermon 75 (Gerona 44, no. 336). See further below pp. 88-89.

C. — Another additional witness to Sermon 125 is Salamanca, Bibl. Univ. 2530, ff. 50'-53'. Here Sermon 125 has the same Incipit as in the Gerona homiliary. It is introduced simply by Item de eadem lectione, and ends with Explicit omelia XVII. These features, together with the manuscript's transposition of Tr. 18 and 19 between Tr. 23 and 24, place it alongside Vich 27 (see 'Check-List', p. 94, and below, and above on Gerona 44). I suspect, although I have not been able to confirm, that this Salamanca codex also contains Sermon 75 between Tr. 23 and 18.

D. — Siena, Bibl. Comun. F. 1. 2 of the early twelfth century has Sermon 125 at ff. 59'-62' as [omelia] XVIII with the Incipit, Haeauribus et cordibus vestris nota sunt, reparant tamen dicentis affectum.

E. — Valencia, Bibl. Univ. 892 (34) from the Naples region has Sermon 125 at ff. 97'-102', with the Incipit, Haeauribus et cordibus vestris nota sunt, reparant tamen dicentis affectum. It follows Tr. 17 with the sole introduction, Sermon unde supra. The chaotic enumeration in this manuscript makes it impossible to determine whether S. 125 bears a separate number from Tr. 17. The manuscript is aligned closely with Naples VI. B. 17 among those that contain S. 125, both by its particular Incipit and by its lack of Tr. 18-19 (see 'Check-List', pp. 90-91, 126).

F. — I am again indebted to R. Étaix, first by letter and subsequently by his article L'Homilie d'Ébrasus retrouve', in Rev. d'hist. des textes 8 (1978), pp. 309-317, for my knowledge of a lost homiliary containing extracts from Sermon 125. In Abbé Jean Lebeuf's chapter on the tradition of the Church of Auxerre in the work entitled Le cri de la foud ou Recueil des différents témoignages rendus par plusieurs Facultés, Chapitres, Cures, Communautés Ecclesiastiques et réguliers, au sujet de la Constitution Unigenitus (3 vols., 1719), he cited 34 extracts from a twelfth-century homiliary from Auxerre Cathedral. Among them was Sermon 125: 2, 7, 10 from the homily for Thursday in the fourth week of Lent (f. 110'-
115'). It is fairly clear from the other extracts from the Tractatus and the parallels with Gerona 44 that Sermon 125 was derived from a copy of
the Tractatus. The following Tractatus excerpts were cited by Lebeuf:

- f. 51v, Tr. 23 : 3 (Monday in Lent I)
- f. 36r, Tr. 25 : 12 (Thursday in Lent III)
- f. 98r, Tr. 29 : 2 (Tuesday in Lent IV)
- f. 108r, Tr. 44 : 17 (Wednesday in Lent IV)
- ff. 124r-131r, Tr. 21 : 5, 9, 10 (Thursday in Lent IV)
- ff. 134r-140r, Tr. 49 : 3, 8, 22, 24 (Friday in Lent IV)
- f. 145r, Tr. 35 : 3 (Saturday in Lent IV)
- f. 163r, Tr. 32 : 8 (Monday in Lent V)
- ff. 169r-170r, Tr. 48 : 4, 6 (Tuesday in Lent V)
- f. 173r, Tr. 26 : 15 (Saturday in Lent V)
- f. 184r, Tr. 50 : 12 (Monday in Holy Week)
- f. 187r, Tr. 51 : 12 (Monday in Holy Week)
- f. 190r, Tr. 52 : 11 (Tuesday in Holy Week)
- f. 263r, Tr. 74 : 1 (Vigil of Pentecost).

Apart from the last item (Gerona 44 does not go beyond Lent), the arrangement of homilies suggested by these extracts is very close to that in the Gerona manuscript. But there are three divergences in the days of the week, and for Thursday in Lent IV Gerona has only sections 4-11 of Sermo 125. However, since it has the rest of it for Friday in Lent I, the dependence of the lost Auxerre homily on one like Gerona 44 remains an open question.

**The « Tractatus » in Later Compositions**

R. Étaix has edited a brief sermon put together by Caesarius using extracts from Tr. 49 : 3, 12-15 in Trois Notes sur Saint Césaire, in Corona Gratiarum: Miscellanea... Eligio Dekkers... obiuta, vol. 1 (Bruges and The Hague, 1975), pp. 220-227. Two manuscripts were available to Étaix, an inferior copy of the first half of the ninth century written in the south of Burgundy or the Rhone valley, later at St. Martial's Abbey, Limoges (Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 2328, ff. 122r-124r), and a twelfth-century homily, B.N. lat. 3794, ff. 77r-79r, which in the fifteenth century was found at Beaune, near Dijon.

The Commentary on John attributed to Bede edited by J.F. Kelly in CCL 108 C (Scriptores Hiberniae Minores II, 1974), 103-131, relies very largely on the Tractatus of Augustine. It is preserved in Vienna, Österr. Nationalbibl. lat. 997, ff. 67r-84r, a Salzburg codex of about the last decade of the eighth century. The Commentary was written not long before, probably in the circle of bishop Virgilius of Salzburg, and stands fully in the Irish tradition of biblical exegesis. Kelly's index (151-152) lists 32 Tractatus, although Augustine is only named once and the author does not indicate his sources. No Tractatus between 17 and 24 were used, but little can be deduced from this, for comments are provided only on John 5 : 17,22 among the verses Augustine expounds in this section of the Tractatus. However, a slightly later Salzburg manuscript of the Tractatus, Salzburg, Bibl. der Erzabtei St. Peter a VII 33, does lack Tr. 20-22 (cf. 'Check-List', p. 134).

On the other hand, unmistakable use of Tr. 20 is evident in a fragmentary commentary on John's Gospel of the eighth century from Bobbio, now part of Milan, Bibl. Ambros. F. 60 sup. (see below on this manuscript). See p. 14 of the privately issued pamphlet In Principio erat Verbum (Steenbrugge, 1961), where the text of the fragments is published. Evidence is hardly available to enable us to identify a recognizable Irish manuscript tradition of the Tractatus, but the fragments agree with the Italian tradition which does not attest the absence of Tr. 20-22 before the twelfth century.

F. Stegmüller, Repertorium Bibliicum Medii Aevi vol. VI (Madrid, 1958), p. 449 no. 9944, lists an unpublished commentary on John's Gospel compiled from Augustine, Gregory and others in Munich, Bayer. Staatsbibl. 14311, ff. 162v-220v. Stegmüller dated it to the eighth century, but Kurz V/I, p. 445 and V/2, p. 351 puts it in the tenth and ninth-tenth centuries respectively. Preliminary examination by microfilm indicates that the text made of Augustine's Tractatus is very fragmentary and generally paraphrased, and therefore likely to be of little value for establishing the textual history of the Tractatus.

Professor Bernhard Bischoff has kindly confirmed the later date, around the middle of the tenth century, and given his judgment that it is an insignificant compilation of Irish origin.

**THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE « TRACT. IN EVANG. IOH. »**

AUGSBURG, Staats- und Stadtbibliothek fragm. lat. 14 ; Benediktbeuern Abbey ; ix in ; f. 1r, 99 : 4-6 ; f. 2r, 101 : 4-5. Cf. Kurz V/I, p. 138, V/2, p. 52. See on Munich, Bayer. Staatsbibl. 29382 (6-9 and 12 below, for further fragments from the same codex.

9. In Principio erat Verbum (Steenbrugge, 1961), p. 14. This privately circulated pamphlet prints the text of this commentary. I am grateful to Dom E. Dekkers for a copy. The pamphlet was produced to celebrate the completion of the first twenty-five volumes in the Corpus Christianorum.
DAVID F. WRIGHT

(AUGSBURG, Staats- und Stadtbibliothek 2. Cod. 192; ff. 228'-234', listed by KURZ V/1, p. 138 and V/2, p. 52, is in fact from Tractatus in Epistolam Ioannis 1: 1-11).

BAMBERG, Staatsarchiv A 221/X, Standbuch 4566/4; Michelburg Abbey, Bamberg; A.D. 1130; f. 1r, 20: 3-4; f. 2r, 35: 3-6; f. 3r, 41: 1-4. Cf. KURZ V/2, p. 72, 603.

BARCELONA, Archivo de la Corona de Aragón S. Cugat 21; XII ex. For this date cf. P. Bohigas (Valaguer), op. cit. (on Lerida below), p. 147 no. 18.

BASEL, Öffentl. Bibli. der Univ. B. III 2; Chartreuse of Val Ste Marguerite, Basel; ix and x; ff. 1-3', 24; ff. 98'-102', 40: 8-42: 13 incompl. (lacuna); ff. 113'-118', 38. This homily is based on part I of Paul Deacon's collection, Die Mittelalterlichen Handschriften der Universität Bibliothek Basel, Beschreibendes Verzeichnis, pt. B, vol. I (Basel, 1960), pp. 202-206. Tr. 24 is PD I, 1, but the other two Tractatus pieces do not derive from PD. The 11th century Catalan homily now preserved in Gerona's Mercurio Dioceziano prescribes partly parallel pieces for the same days: Tr. 41-42: 34 (Thursday of first week in Lent), and 38-40: 11 (Monday of second week). In this Basel codex Tr. 38 has at the end \"E. I. = Explicit omelia XXVIII\", thus indicating by its correct numbering its derivation from a manuscript of the Tractatus unlike Basel B. III 3 from the same provenance, which lacks Tr. 20-22 and hence has numbers lagging three behind the editions.

BASEL, Öffentl. Bibli. der Univ. B. IV 26; (? St. Gallen, then) Chartreuse of Val Ste Marguerite, Basel; x; ff. 60'-62', 55 abbrev.; ff. 66'-68', compilation from 120: 1-5; ff. 84'-85', 121: 4-5. Cf. MAYER and BURKARDT, op. cit., pp. 395-399. This homily is likewise based on Paul Deacon, although the first two Tractatus items here derive from Alan of Farfa I, 88 (part only) and 93.

BASEL, Öffentl. Bibli. der Univ. B. VI 3; Chartreuse of Val Ste Marguerite, Basel; ix-x; ff. 26'-28', 121: 4-5; ff. 52'-56', 67-71 extracts; ff. 62'-66', 105-107: 4 extracts. Folios 2'-199' of this codex are based on pt. II of Paul Deacon's homiliary, items 14, 23, and 25 for the Tractatus pieces. See the detailed analysis of the last two in Meyer and Burkhardt, op. cit., pp. 572-577. It is clear from their information that PD II, 23 is an abbreviation of Tr. 61-71, not omitting 68. Since to my knowledge no detailed breakdown of the contents of these items in PD is available elsewhere in published form, in 'Check-List' I wrongly assumed that the contents of PD II, 23 were uniform with the parallel item for Sts. Philip and James in Agimond's Homily, Vat. lat. 3835, ff. 229'-239', which in reality makes no use of Tr. 68 and also has a different Explicit from 71 (and a divergent Incipit); cf. R. GRÉGOIRE, L'homéliaire romain d'Agimond, in Eph. Lit. 82 (1968), p. 276. Although it may still be assumed that Paul Deacon based himself on Agimond's usage at this point, it is also clear that he drew afresh from the Tractatus themselves. A correction is hence called for in 'Check-List', p. 131 (Paris, B.N. nouv. acq. lat. 2322), as well as more precise indications on pp. 114 (Carlsruhe Aug. XV) and 131 (Paris, nouv. acq. lat. 2322) that PD II 25 consists of an abbreviated form of Tr. 105-107: 4. Meyer and Burkhardt in their quite exemplary description of this manuscript, point out that it agrees with Paris, nouv. acq. lat. 2322, in placing PD II, 57 immediately after PD II, 37, as too does Paris, lat. 9604 - see 'Check-List', p. 129 n. 193. The omission of PD II, 58 and 60 from all three manuscripts is also noteworthy, although Basel B. VI 3 is throughout selective in its use of PD items. One further parallel with Paris, nouv. acq. lat. 2322 lies in the appearance of Ps-Bede, Homily III: 71 (PL 94, 452-455) at the conclusion of both manuscripts (in the Paris one, preceded by 70 also). On Paris, lat. 9604 and its connections see now R. Étain in Revue d'histoire des textes 8 (1978), pp. 309-317.


BERLIN (West), Staatsbibl. Preuss. Kulturbesitz theol. lat. fol. 499; St. Mary's Abbey, Huyse, near Halberstadt; xii med.; 55-124 ('1-69'). Cf. KURZ V/1, p. 138, and V/2, p. 88. I am also grateful to Dr. Gerard Achten of the Staatsbibliothek for information about this and the following three manuscripts.

BERLIN (West), Staatsbibl. Preuss. Kulturbesitz theol. lat. fol. 551; Austria (Hallein, near Salzburg, then the Starkemberg Family Library); xv; ff. 218'-322', 46-124. Cf. KURZ V/1, p. 139, and V/2, p. 88.


BERLIN (West), Staatsbibl. Preuss. Kulturbesitz Hdschr. 130; ff. 2-153, E. or N.-E. France, ix, 1-44: 1; ff. 154-200, x, 44-54; ff. 1, 201-274, Germany, xii, 55-124 ('1-70'). The manuscript belonged at an early date to the Abbey of Gladbach (Münchengladbach). This volume was formerly Phillipps 1095 (listed under London, William H. Robinson Trustees in my 'Check-List', p. 120). It was bought for the Berlin Staatsbibliothek in 1976. Cf. the description in Bibliotheca Philippica: Medieval Manuscripts: New Series: Eleventh Part... 30th November 1976 (Sotheby's, London, 1976), pp. 5-7 and pl. 3.

Folio 1 contains the anonymous preface Hic est Johanneis evangelistae, unus ex discepulis... (PL 92, 633-636; Novum Testamentum... secundum editionem Sancti Hieronymi..., edd. J. Wordsworth, H.J. White, pt. 1, fasc. 4, Oxford, 1895, pp. 485-487), and an extract from Isidore, Etymologies 6: 1: 1-3 (PL 82, 229). Liturgical lections have been marked by a later hand in the margin from Tr. 7 at least as far as Tr. 44. (I have so far been...
able to examine a microfilm of only ff. 1-154). The use of titles is not quite as Bibliotheca Philippipea, p. 6 indicates. Tractatus is the norm for Tr. 1-17 (ff. 2r-72), but omelia and sermo also put in appearances. Sermo is used invariably thereafter at least as far as f. 153. None of the common irregularities is present in the region of Tr. 17-23. Folio 153r ends at Tr. 44: i line 10, indicating some loss of text subsequently made good on ff. 154 ff. Tr. 44 begins again on f. 154r with a patently degenerate text. The manuscript was acquired by the Staatsbibliothek too late to be listed in Kurz V/1, but it is included in V/2, pp. 113, 603.

BERNE*, Bürgerbibl. 47; 'Liber Sanctae Martae'; xx; f. 96v, 80-82; ff. 97v-98v, 87-91: 4. These items, probably composed only of extracts, derive from Paul Deacon II, nos. 100 and 103. Over twenty pieces in this homiliary of Sanetis come from Paul's collection, two were used by Alan of Farfa, and one or two others by the homiliaries in Vienna, Öster. Nationalbibl. 1014 and 1616 (see 'Check-List', p. 140). Identification is possible from the Incipits detailed by H. HAGEN, Catalogus Codicum Bernardini: Bibliotheca Borgensis (Bern, 1875), pp. 63-68.

BOLGNA*, Bibl. Un. 1080 (2205), item xx (ff. 98-99); xii; fragt.

BRUSSELS*, Bibl. Royale 1831-39(392), f. 141v, +Paris, Bibl. Nat. lat. 974, f. 1, i, 122; +Paris, 1918, f. 1v, 154v; +Paris, 2012, f. 1r, 136v; +nouv. acqu. lat. 1525, f. 5v; +Valenciennes, Bibl. Univ. flyleaves in codd. 60, 55, 66, 95, 100, 167, 448, 545; Abbey of St. Amand-les-Eaux, near Valenciennes; ixv; fragments, of whose contents I have only partial details, as follows:

Brussels: 29: 4-7
B.N. lat. 974: 36: 7-11, 34: 10-35: 5
— 2012: 24: 2-6, 26: 1-4

I am grateful to Professor B. Bischoff for assembling these membra some of which appeared disiecta in my 'Check-List', pp. 113, 128, 129, 136.

CARLSRUHE, Badische Landesbibl. Aug. XIX; St. Gallen Abbey; then Reichenau Abbey; ix med.

CARLSRUHE, Badische Landesbibl. Aug. XXIX; St. Gallen Abbey; then Reichenau Abbey; ix in. — The origin of these two copies of Paul Deacon's homiliary at St. Gallen and their revised dates are derived from Bischoff via Kurz V/2, pp. 207-208.


CARLSRUHE, Badische Landesbibl. Ettelheimmünster 462; vi, Kurz V/1, p. 141 records Bischoff's dating of this fragment which is the oldest extant manuscript of any part of the Tractatus. For further details see my 'Check-List', p. 115.

THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE «TRACT. IN EVANG. IOH.»


DURHAM, Cath. Lib. B. II. 17; Normandy (Abbey of St.-Ouen, Rouen) (then Durham Cathedral); xiv; 1-124. — It is now agreed that most of the extant manuscripts that belonged to William Carilef, bishop of Durham 1081-1096, were produced in Normandy. See the studies of F. Avril referred to below on Rouen 467 and the other literature he lists, including DODWELL, The Canterbury School, pp. 111-117. RöMER II/2, p. 105, dates this manuscript more precisely to the end of the 11th century.

DURHAM, Univ. Lib. Cosin v.h. 3; circa 1400 (so Römer II/2, p. 113).

ETON, College Library 101, vol. I (ff. 1v-181r); 1-124; dated to the second half of the 14th century by N.R. Ker, Medieval Manuscripts in British Libraries, vol. 2; Abbotsford-Keele (Oxford, 1977), pp. 713-714. It was written in England, and, like many other English manuscripts, has the extended title 'Aurelii Augustini... homiliat... quas ipse colloquendo...' etc. (cf. 'Check-List', pp. 64-65).


On this homiliary for Lent see J. LEMARÉ, Un nouveau témoign important des 'Tractatus in Matthiæum' de saint Chromace d'Aligre: l'homiliaire de San Silvestro de Fabriano, in RÉA 23 (1977), pp. 124-154. Whenever the lesson comes from John's Gospel the compiler uses Augustine's Tractatus and does so 'particularly generously'. Lemaire underlines the collection's affinity with that in Venice Z. lat. 153 (see below).


Tract. 49, which is preceded on f. 1r by an extract from Ambrose on Luke, is here presented as the homily for Friday in the fourth week of Lent, as in the Lenten homily from San Silvestro di Fabriano analyzed by J. Lemaire also in 1977 (see immediately above). By a curious coinci-
dence a folio is missing from the text of Tr. 49 in the San Silvestro collection.

Tract. 49, on the raising of Lazarus, is allotted to the Friday in Lent IV in numerous other homiliaries, including Gerona 44, Madrid, B.N. 78, Oxford, Bodl. Lyell 77, Paris, B.N. lat. 5302, Toulouse 1161, which are all entered in this Supplement.

FLORENCE, Bibl. Medicea Laurenziana S. Marco 619 ; (XI) XII, according to B.L. ULLMAN, The Humanism of Coluccio Salutati (Mediavie e Umanesimo, 4 ; Padua, 1963), pp. 160, 278. The manuscript belonged to the library of Coluccio Salutati, a Florentine chancellor (d. 1406), who collected numerous manuscripts from monasteries in the Florence region. It reached the Convent of San Marco through the hands of (Niccolò Niccoli and) Cosimo de' Medici. Cf. ULLMAN and P.A. STADTER, The Public Library of Renaissance Florence: Niccolò Niccoli, Cosimo de' Medici and the Library of San Marco (Padua, 1972), p. 150.

FLORENCE, Bibl. Medicea Laurenziana S. Marco 644 ; XII, according to Ullman and Stadter, op. cit., p. 149.

FULDA, Hess. Landesbibliothek Aa 3 ; IX-X ; 22-54. According to KURZ V/1, p. 139 and V/2, p. 172, has an unidentified text (In illa narratione re gesta ..., consubstantiam patri esse) intruded at ff. 78-80 as Omelia XIXIV. Tr. 34 is numbered 'XXXV' but Tr. 35 ff. correctly.

GDAŃSK* (Danzig), Bibl. Gdańska Polskiej Akademii Nauk Mar. F. 227 ; St. Mary's Church, Danzig ; xv ; 110-119, extracts (Flores). A copy of these Flores and other texts from the manuscript existed in codex Mar. F. 272 (St. Mary's Church ; xv), which is now lost.

GDAŃSK* (Danzig), Bibl. Gdańska Polskiej Akademii Nauk Mar. F. 231 ; St. Mary's Church, Danzig ; xv ; 119-121, 26: 17 ?


THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE «TRACT. IN EVANG. IOH.»

y la Decoración del libro manuscrito en Cataluña: Periodo Romano (Barcelona, 1960), pp. 77-81.

Behind this Gerona homily lies a manuscript of the Tractatus like Vich 27, which has both Sermo 125 and Sermo 75 interpolated among the Tractates. See above, p. 68, and below on Vich 27. A closely similar Lenten homily exists in Paris, B.N. lat. 5302 (see below), and is attested for a lost manuscript of Auxerre (see above, pp. 69-70). The Lenten section of the homily in Madrid, Bibl. Nac. 78, displays close affinity with Gerona 44 in its use of items from the Tractatus in Ioannem but not Gerona's other sources, Jerome on Matthew and Bede on Mark and Luke.

The influence of the Gerona homily may be discernible in a thirteenth-century liturgical fragment at Montserrat, now MS. 1039, item VIII, in the Biblioteca del Monasterio (cf. OLIVAR, op. cit. (see below on Montserrat), p. 122). On f. 11, Tr. 10 : 4 (Aliam rem narrat... not 20 : 4 as in Olivar) and 29 : 1 (Quod sequitur de evangelo...) are the Incipits of the homilies for Monday and Tuesday of the fourth week of Lent, as in Gerona 44. (In view of the space suggested by the foliation here the text of the homilies, or at least of the first, may not be as extended as in Gerona 44). The only other detail of the bifolio fragment given by Olivar is : f. 3, Dominica in passione domini. Ventrem, ventrem meum dole... , i.e. Jer. 4, 19 ff., which is not recorded in Gerona 44. The fragment comes from the Abbey of St. Benedict at Bagés, near Manresa, north of Barcelona, and was later at the Monastery of Manresa itself.

Olivar also analyses, pp. 135-139, a Cistercian Breviary from the Monastery of San Clemente at Toledo of the first half of the thirteenth century, MS. 1117. It is largely based on Paul Deacon's Homily, although after PD II, 34 it includes a piece whose incipit is that of Tr. 92, Dominus Jesus in sermone... (Compare item II, 82 in Alan of Farfa's Homily, a cento from Tr. 92-96 beginning midway through 92 : 1). MS. 1117 uses as guard-sheets 3 folios, 2 at the front and 1 at the back, of a liturgical book of probably the end of the twelfth century (OLIVAR, pp. 138-139). On ff. 1-2 for Sexagesima the homilies prescribed are those earlier found as Alan of Farfa I, 52 (Caesarius, S. 199 ; see MORIN, CCL 104, 802 for its very wide diffusion) and Paul Deacon I, 71 respectively. Fol. 3 presents from Monday in the second week of Lent the same Incipit as Gerona 44, Lectio sancti evangeli quae praecessit..., i.e. Tr. 38, and for Tuesday a homily on Matthew 21 : 28-31 (32) from Jerome's Commentary on Matthew, bk. 3 (CCL 77, 193-195), but with an Incipit that is not found in Jerome's text, Homo iste ipse Deus est... The homily for Tuesday in the second week of Lent is missing from Gerona 44 because of a lacuna (ÉTAIX, art. cit., p. 5). Since Jerome's Commentary was one of the three other patristic sources used by the Gerona compiler, it is probable that this Montserrat fragment supplies the missing item.
Tortosa collection would be needed before the extent of the parallels could be established, and possible affinities clarified. For the present I merely list the parallels discernible from the information supplied by Bertomeu, Divjak and Folliet:

Tortosa 62, ff. 1'-? = Grenoble 32 no. 34a
38'-40' = Grenoble 32 no. 31 (Tr. 101)
53'-57' = Grenoble 32 no. 33 (Tr. 102 : 1-end)
76' = Grenoble 32 no. 35b (Tr. 92)
94'-96' = Grenoble 32 no. 44b (Tr. 11 : 3-7)
150'-151' = Grenoble 32 no. 58
163' = Grenoble 32 no. 59

Tortosa 196,
ff. 61'-63' = Grenoble 33 no. 2 (Tr. 1 : 8-13)
77'-80' = Grenoble 33 no. 4c (Tr. 124 : 1-5)
96'-97' = Grenoble 33 no. 7
97'-99' = Grenoble 33 no. 8
111'-114' = Grenoble 33 no. 3b
152'-159' = Grenoble 33 no. 13c (Tr. 4 : 10-end)
171'-179' = Grenoble 32 no. 7 (Tr. 9)
212'-215' = Grenoble 32 no. 16 (Tr. 24)

In his study of the Carthusian homiliary, R. Était stressed its independence of earlier collections, notably Paul Deacon’s, and its direct use of the works of the Fathers (cf. L’Homiliaire Carthusien, in Sacris Erudiri 13 (1962), pp. 104-112). As regards the Tractatus used by the homiliary, there are obvious parallels with Paul Deacon’s at several points:

(i) Tr. 51 : 9-13, with the same Incipit and Explicit, is prescribed by both homiliaries for St. Laurence;

(ii) Paul Deacon assigns Tr. 83 : 2-86 to ‘Natale unius Apostoli’, while Grenoble 33 divides the block into four items — 83 : 2 : end (Sts. Simon and Jude), 84 (ditto), 85 (St. Thomas) and 86 (ditto);

(iii) Paul Deacon presents Tr. 80-82 for the Vigil of an Apostle; Grenoble 33 offers 80 and 81 separately for St. James.

(iv) Paul Deacon also presents for ‘one Apostle’ Tr. 87-91 : 4; Grenoble uses 87 for St. Bartholomew;

(v) Paul Deacon and the Carthusian collection both use Tr. 24, but for the Fifth Sunday before Christmas and for the Fourth Sunday in Lent respectively;

(vi) Paul Deacon gives a compilation from Tr. 67, 69-71 for the Fourth Sunday after Easter, while Grenoble presents 70-71 and 67 for Sts. Philip and James.

Overall, eleven out of the 24 pieces from the Tractatus in the original Carthusian homiliary (six more occur in the later additions to Grenoble 33) are found earlier in Paul Deacon, although often in larger blocks of material. Only textual comparison can indicate whether the Carthusian compilers drew on the earlier and immensely popular collection.
Another parallel suggests that three other pieces from the Tractatus may have been derived from an already existing homiliary. Grenoble 32 nos. 38-40 are three items from the Tractatus which, as was noticed in 'Check-List', p. 122 n. 164, occur with the same Incipits and in the same order in at least four other widely scattered manuscripts ranging from the ninth to the early twelfth centuries. Further enquiry may show whether any relationship exists between these five occurrences of this sequence of extracts. The liturgical occasions and the extent, and therefore Explicit, of the extracts are by no means uniform among the five.


**BAD HERSFELD**, Stadtbibliothek fragm.; Italy; ix med.; f. 1", 30: 6-31: 4; f. 2", 32: 3-8. Cf. Kurz V/1, p. 140 and V/2, p. 201, where he confuses it with the following fragment in linking it with Berlin (East), Philippus 1662. See my 'Check-List', p. 112 n. 144.

**BAD HERSFELD**, Städt. Museum fragm. C. 165; Hersfeld Abbey; viii/ix; f. 1", 100: 1-2; f. 2", 102: 1-3. The content of these fragments is given by Kurz V/1, p. 140 and V/2, p. 201-202, who numbers them 'C. 185' (cf. V/2, pp. 185-6). They belong with Göttingen, Müller III, ff. 1"-2" (see 'Check-List', p. 117).


**LAON**, Bibl. Muniz. 80; Abbey of St. Amand-les-Eaux, near Valenciennes (then Laon Cathedral); ix. This manuscript contains a (Carolingian?) commentary on John's Gospel which is in reality a condensation and reworking of Augustine's Tractatus, according to John J. Contreni, The Cathedral School of Laon from 850 to 930. Its Manuscripts and Masters (Münchener Beiträge zur Medialistik und Renaissance-Forschung, 29; Munich, 1978), pp. 42, 75, 157, 186. The same commentary is also found in Vatican Palat. lat. 176, ff. 87-161' (cf. 'Check-List', p. 138).

**LEÓN**, Real Colegiata de San Isidoro 8; (France ?); xii; f. 14'-19', 42: 14-743; ff. 19'-24', 17; ff. 28'-32', 39; ff. 40'-45', 19: 17-24end; ff. 66'-73', 15; ff. 73'-75', 33; ff. 77'-82', 10; ff. 82'-86', 29: 1-31: 8; ff. 86'-89', 44; ff. 89'-93', 18: 3-7; ff. 93'-99', 49: 1-23; ff. 99'-105', 34-7; ff. 107'-110', 31: 8-32; ff. 110'-114', 28; ff. 114'-116', 48; ff. 116'-117', 33: 1-7; f. 117', 49: 26-2end; ff. 119'-123', 25: 16-727; ff. 125'-130', 50: 5-752.

**THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE «TRACT. IN EVANG. IOH.»**

This MS is written in a French minuscule script, according to J.Z. PEEZÉR LAMAZARES, Catálogo de los códices y documentos de la Real Colegiata de San Isidoro de León (León, 1923), p. 35.

The incomplete identification of the items in this manuscript provided by Divjak IV, pp. 209-210, was supplemented by G. FOLLIET in RÉA 21 (1975), p. 354 (referring wrongly to 'ms. 4'). The parallels with Gerona, Museo Diocesano 44, have enabled me here to suggest other identifications, especially at the end of the various items. The parallelism is clearest between León ff. 107'-130' and Gerona ff. 204'-244', comprising Tr. 31: 8-32, 28, 48, 33: 1-2, 49: 26-2end, 26: 15-27, 50: 5-52 (the only inconsistencies are that, according to Divjak, 26: 15-27 does not follow immediately after the previous item as in Gerona, and the end of the item in León beginning at 33: 1 is difficult to identify in accord with Divjak's information). The other parallels, although not so extended, are obvious enough from the somewhat inadequate details provided by Divjak. Until a closer examination has been carried out, certain questions remain:

I) In Gerona 44 Tr. 17 is preceded by an item ending in 42: 14, in León 8 by one beginning in 42: 14 (which in Gerona occurs later on, immediately before the parallel sequence detailed above);

II) Are Tr. 15, 33 and 10 complete in León 8? In Gerona in the same order they are 15: 5-end, 33: 3-end; [24], 10: 4-11: 2. (In both manuscripts the next items are 29: 1-731: 8 and 44. Tr. 24 precedes 15 in León).

III) Has León 8 no part of Sermon 125 (or Sermon 75)?

**LERIDA**, Bibl. Capit. Roda 1; Cathedral of Roda of Isábena (province of Huesca, north of Lerida); xii (Divjak IV, p. 210-xii); ff. 1'-151', 1-19, 23-122: 7. M.S. Gros of Vich has put me right on the provenance of this manuscript. I had earlier identified this manuscript with the one G. Heine claimed to have seen in the archive of the Church at Roda 'in der Nähe von Vich' (Serapeum 8 (1847), p. 94). It seems that the identification must stand, for the contents are virtually identical (communicated to me previously by Fr. J. Janini of Valencia):

I. ff. 1'-151' = Tractatus

II. ff. 152'-175' = Augustine, Tractatus in Epistolam Ioannis (omitted by Divjak IV, pp. 48, 210)

III. ff. 177'-194' = Anselm, Cur Deus Homo (not mentioned by Heine)

IV. ff. 194'-206' = Anselm, De Casu Diaboli et de Veritate et de Libero Arbitrio.

Heine's location of Roda must therefore be mistaken. The relation between this manuscript and Vich 27 merits further study. (See my previous article, p. 106 n. 125). The earlier date for Vich 27 rules out the possibility that this manuscript's supposed original deficiency with regard to Tr. 18-19 could have been made good from Lerida Roda 1. If the present arrangement in Vich 27 is to be explained in terms of the lacuna being filled from a manuscript lacking Tr. 20-22, as Lerida's does, this must have occurred at an earlier stage in the local tradition.
I have noted that P. Bohigas (BALAGUER), La Ilustración (op. cit.)... Período Gótico y Renacimiento, vol. 2 (1967), p. 147 no. 20, gives the date of the Merida codex as the 11th century.


LONDON*, Westminster Abbey 36, item 3; xv in. fragt. Ker, op. cit. p. 165 no. 1835B. This fragment comes from the same manuscript as the Oxford, Montd. D. 3. 9 (see below).

LOS ANGELES*, Claremont Colleges Hannold Library Crispin 24; Augustinian Canons, Rebold (Bavaria); xi f. 107-125, extracts from 1-3, 5-7, 10-15, 17-19, 24-36, 38-42, 44-55, 55, 58, 62, 77, 79-84, 89, 91-92, 96, 98, 111-112, 118-119, 123-124. I owe my knowledge of this manuscript to a letter from Dr. Rainer Kurz. It was formerly Philippi 783. The extracts from the Tractatus (here called Omeliae throughout) are occasionally misnumbered but accidentally, it seems, rather than as a result of any standard irregularity in the collection. They vary considerably in length, being sometimes only a single line. Two extracts from Tr. 10 are attached to others from Tr. 5 (Ex eadem), although Tr. 10 also appears subsequently in its proper place.

MADRID*, Academia de la Historia S. Millán 82; Monastery of San Millán de la Cogolla, near Nájera (prov. Logroño, Old Castile); xiv f. 111 mut., 22-22: 9, 55-64: 3, 66: 1-80: 1, 81: 4-83: 1, 88-123 (DIVIAK IV, p. 216). The folios are to be read in the following order: 3°-9°, 41°-43°, 44°-51°, 56°-56°, 52°-53°, 55°, 54°, 40°, 63°-100°. From Divjak it is impossible to decide whether the last Tractatus is 123 or 124.

MADRID*, Arch. Hist. Nac. Sección de Códices Carpeta 1452 B frg. 3 (MS 1386 frg. 3): Benedictine Abbey of St. Saviour, Oña, province of Burgos; x in.; 1 f., 111: 1-2. Plate and transcription of recto in A. MILLARES CARLO, Contribución al «Corpus» de códices visigóticos (Madrid, 1931), pp. 200, 203-206, where the fragment is dated in the 9th century. His later study, Manuscrito Visigóticas. Notas Bibliográficas, in Hispania Sacra 14 (1961), p. 89 (and separately, Monumenta Hispaniae...Sacra, Subsidia, vol. 1, Barcelona-Madrid, 1963, p. 89), gives the revised date, but by a confusion identifies the contents as from Tr. 35. The details are correct in L. SÁNCHEZ BELDA, Aportaciones al «Corpus» de códices visigóticos, in Hispania 10 (1950), pp. 441-442. In Corrections and Additions to the Catalogue of Visigothic Manuscripts, Scriptorium 32 (1978), pp. 310, 312 B.A. Shailor refers to a fragment, Carpeta, 1452 B núm. 1, which appears to be this one, but apparently identifies its content in Migne as part of Tr. 33.


The identification of items from the Tractatus, which may well be incomplete, depends on Inventario General de Manuscritos de la Biblioteca Nacional, vol. I (Madrid, 1953), pp. 8-16, DIVIAK IV, pp. 220-221, and FOLLIT, RÉA 21 (1975), p. 354. Although some of the items have the same Incipit as homilies in Paul Deacon's compilation, they are normally shorter than his selections.


These details are based on Inventario General de Manuscritos de la Biblioteca Nacional, vol. I (Madrid, 1953), pp. 68-69; DIVIAK IV, pp. 222-225; FOLLIT, RÉA 21 (1975), p. 354, and on an examination of a microfilm of ff. 65-142. The interest of this homiliary for our purposes lies in the close parallel between the sequence of the Tractatus used in in ff. 65-142 of this manuscript and those used in Gerona, Museo Diocesana 44 analysed by États (see above). Although the Madrid items often vary from those in Gerona, especially by starting earlier in the Tractatus or by being shorter, they are nearly all assigned to the same days in Lent as their counterparts in Gerona 44. Yet there can be no question of Madrid's dependence on the Gerona collection for its Tractatus homilies, nor does the Madrid collection make more than the smallest use of Gerona's other sources, Jerome on Matthew and Bede on Mark and Luke.
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Munich 14286 has the same incipit (Tract. 30 : 1 line 9), and contains Tr. 30-54 numbered as «31-56» (hence the 'sermones 26' of the catalogue) and 55-124, probably in an abridged text. The previous item in the catalogue (‘Item prima pars sermonum sancti Augustini super Ioanne evangeliastic et sunt XXX sermones, et incipit: «In principio erat verbum» etc. Intuentes quodam audivimus ex lectione etc., et est antiqua scriptura in mediocri volume etc. E. 17°) does not signify any manuscript identified as from St. Emmeran. In view of the frequency of disorder in copies of this section of the Tractatus, it cannot be assumed that it contained Tr. 1-30 more no and no less. Although a catalogue of A.D. 1347 of the library of Prüfening Abbey in Regensburg presents similar entries (‘*Item Augustini omelie XXX super Ioannem. Item liber [?MS has 'I', perhaps = 50] Augustini in uno volume. *Item omelie XXX super Ioannem sancti Augustini', Mitteltal. Bibliothekskat., cat. 42, p. 429, Tract. 30/31 does not appear among extant early codices as a dividing point between 'part one' and 'part two' (cf. 'Check-List', pp. 76-80).

MUNICH*, Bayer. Staatsbibl. 17054 ; Schäftlarn Abbey, dioc. Freising ; XII ; i-124 (55-124 as 'I-70'). Cf. Kurz V/1, p. 142 and V/2, p. 373.


MUNICH*, Bayer. Staatsbibl. 29382 6-12. Several fragments of manuscripts of the Tractatus, some of which were listed under their former signatures in my 'Check-List', p. 125 and in Kurz V/1, p. 142, have recently been reunited under Clm 29382 and are thus listed in Kurz V/2, pp. 417-419, 603-604. Examination of a microfilm has enabled me to determine their contents, which are incompletely noted by Kurz. In particular, under Clm 29382 (6 he records fragments from Tr. 57-60, 63-64 which in reality are Tr. 111-114, 117-118, i.e. '57° etc. in the second part of the collection numbered '1-70'.


DAVID F. WRIGHT
They date it, and by implication, L.M. 143, to the second half of the twelfth century but RÖMER II/2, p. 273, puts it at the beginning of the century.


OXFORD, Bodleian Library e Mus. 6; St. Edmund’s Abbey, Bury St. Edmunds; xi ex. For date cf. R.M. THOMSON, The Library of St. Edmunds Abbey in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries, in Speculum 47 (1972), pp. 625, 627 n. 57.


OXFORD*, Merton College D. 39, item 2; xv in.; 1 fol., fragt. (’Omelia 49”). Cf. Ker, op. cit., p. 183. From the same manuscript as London, Westminster Abbey 36 (see above).

PARIS, Bibl. Nat. lat. 1961; St. Peter’s Abbey, Moissac, Tarn-et-Garonne; x (ff. 1-232*), xi med. (ff. 233-333*); 1-19, 23-124 (incomplete at end). On this manuscript see now J. DUFOR, La Bibliothèque et le Scriptorium de Moissac (Geneva-Paris, 1972), pp. xiv, 14, 81, 84, 173-176. If not written at Moissac, it belonged to the Abbey by the end of the eleventh century.

PARIS, Bibl. Nat. lat. 2154; St. Peter’s Abbey, Moissac, Tarn-et-Garonne; xii in.; ff. 72-2?, 1-7?; See Dufour, op. cit. pp. 122-123.

'Check-List', p. 129 n. 192, noted the parallel with Tortosa 230. See now the contents of Tortosa 230 more precisely identified partly by Divjak IV, pp. 278-280, and more fully by G. Folliet in RÉA 21 (1975), p. 355, who demonstrates the Tortosa manuscript’s heavy dependence on the Quinquaginta Homiliae collection. Sufficient information is given in P. LAUER, Bibliothèque Nationale : Catalogue général des manuscrits latins, vol. 2 (Paris, 1940), pp. 342-344 to show that the contents of Paris lat. 2154 are very similar. A selection of pieces from the Quinquaginta collection, probably more extensive than the available analyses of other manuscript show, are preceded by two items which also occur together in a fragment in Vallbona 4 (see below):

1. Prudenter accipiat unusquisque vita praeceptroris non per... sed eorum praedecessit consequentia estis reddentur. This item (the
Explicit in Paris lat. 2154 is not given) is described as 'Augustine, 45 extracts of sermons' (Lauer) or 'Augustinus de penitentia' (Tortosa).

2. Vide se (et) quisque gestare omnis carnis..., Tr. 1: 7 line 32-34. Lauer groups together ff. 72^r-111^r of Paris lat. 2154 as '297 extracts of the Tractatus in Ioanneum and the Emarr. in Psst.' The extracts from the Tractatus in Tortosa 230 (and in Vallbona 4) occupy only ff. 7^r-11^r and extend from Tr. 1: 7 (Videt se quique gestare omnis carnis...) to 124: 5 (non in bonis quibus fruitor, opus est patien
tiae). They are often no more than a few words in length. The collection in this Paris codex is probably identical.

In both the Tortosa and the Paris manuscripts the Quinquaginta material is followed by a section from De moribus ecclesiae catholicae.

PARIS*, Bibl. Nat. lat. 2269, ff. 17^r-48^v (palimpsest); Abbey of St. Nazarius, Carcassonne; viii/ix; ff. 35^r, 38^r, 38^v (= ff. xv^r), 49: 3, 11, 12, 14-15. See A. MUNDO, El Commissus palimpsest Paris lat. 2269. Amb notes sobre liturgia i manuscris visigòtics a Septimànà i Catalunya, in Liturgica I: Cardinal I.A. Schuster in Memoriam (Scripta et Documenta, 7; Montserrat, 1956), pp. 151-275, esp. pp. 209-210, 273-274 (transcription) and plate 5 (of part of ff. 35^r, 38^v).

PARIS*, Bibl. Nat. lat. 3784, ff. 2-13+lat. 2367 f. 111^v-nov. acq. lat. 2479 (4 ff.) Italy, probably in North, perhaps near Verona (later St. Martial's Abbey, Limoges); viii ex: parts of Alan of Farfa's Homiliary, incl. I, 88, a compilation from Trrs. 55-56, 58-59, 61-63. See LOWE, CLA V, no. 553; B. BISCHOFF, Panorama der Handschriftenübereiferung aus der Zeit Karls des Grossen, in Karl der Große: Lebenswerk und Nachleben, edd. W. Brauneis et al., vol. 2: Das Geistige Leben, ed. Bischoff (Düsseldorf, 1965), p. 249 n. The piece from the Tractatus is in either lat. 3784 or nov. acq. lat. 2479.

PARIS*, Bibl. Nat. lat. 5302; Languedoc or Catalonia; vii; ff. 225^r-228^v, 41: 1-11; f. 228^r-231^r, 17; f. 233^r-235^v, 38; f. 237^v-241^r, 22: 14-23: 10; f. 250^r-253^v, 25: 10-26: 2; f. 253^r-256^v, 15: 5-21; f. 256^r-257^v, 33: 3-end; f. 257^r-259^v, 24; f. 259^r-262^v, 10; f. 262^r-266^v, 29: 1-30; f. 266^r-269^v, 44; f. 269^r-271^v, Sermo 125: 4-11; f. 271^r-274^v, 49: 1-14; f. 274^r-276^v, 34; f. 278^v-280^v, 31: 8-32: 9; f. 281^r-283^v, 28; f. 283^r-285^v, 48; f. 285^r-286^v, 33: 1-2: f. 286^v, 49: 26-end; f. 287^r-288^v, 26: 15-end; f. 295^r-298^v, 50; f. 304^v-306^v, 55-56; f. 306^r-309^v, 112: 1-113.

I am indebted to R. Étayx for my information about this homily which is clearly related to that in Gerona 44 (see above). The Paris homily begins only with Ash Wednesday, whereas Gerona 44 starts with Septuagesima. Of the Tractatus items in Paris 5302 some are identical with those in Gerona 44 but the majority are shorter. The formula Et cetera at the end of some of them indicates that the scribe has abridged his model. This probably accounts for his omission of Sermo 75 and Sermo 125: 1-4, but not for all the Gerona items he does not include. The question is complicated by the fact that two Tractatus items in Paris 5302 are longer (ff. 250^r-253^v, 306^r-309^v) and two start earlier (ff. 259^r-262^v, 295^r-298^v) than their parallels in Gerona 44. The Paris collection cannot

be wholly dependent, therefore, on Gerona itself, although the close relationship between the two is undeniable. An analysis of this collection by Étayx is included in this volume pp. 334-349.

PARIS, Bibl. Nat. lat. 9604; Abbey of St. Germain, Auxerre; ix med.; Paul Deacon's Homiliary, pt. II. See 'Check-List', pp. 129-130, and the more recent studies of R. QUADRI, Paolo Diacono e Lupo di Ferreris. A proposito di Parisi B.N. lat. 9604, in Studi Medievali ser. 3, 16 (1975), pp. 737-746, and R. ÉTAYX, L'Homilie e d'Ebrardus retrouvée, in Rev. d'hist. des textes 8 (1978), pp. 309-317, which together establish its revised provenance. Étayx notes the parallels between the distinctive features of this copy of part II of Paul Deacon and other early French copies, such as Troyes 159, Paris B.N. lat. 11699 and 11204, and raises the intriguing question whether they point to a distinctive version of the collection earlier than (the German) one analysed by Grégoire and others and perhaps even deriving from Paul Deacon himself.


PARIS*, Bibl. Nat. nov. acq. lat. 2657, ff. 5-6; xi-xii; 6: 5-6. Cf. Nouvelles acquisitions latines et françaises du Département des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale pendant les années 1972-1976, in Bibl. de l'Ecole des Chartes 136 (1978), p. 284. The Tractatus item (which is imprecisely identified, the pages given for CCL not corresponding exactly to Tr. 6: 5-6) is followed by Sermo 201, which strongly suggests we have here a homiliary or other liturgical fragment for Epiphany.

PARMA*, Archivio di Stato Frammenti di codici 3; Abbey of S. Crisogono (St. Chrysogonus), Zadar (Zara), Dalmatia (then Abbey of S. Giorgio Maggiore, Venice; then Abbey of S. Giovanni Evangelista, Parma); xi ex; 2 mutil. ff., 50: 11-12. Cf. E. FALCONI, Frammenti di codici in benedventana nell'Archivio di Stato di Parma, in Bulletino dell'Archivio Paleografico Italiano 3 rd. ser., 2-3 (1963-64), pp. 73-104, especially 100-104 with full transcription of text, and plates 5-8; V. BROWN, A Second New List of Beneventan Manuscripts, in Medieval Studies 40 (1978), p. 268. See below for further fragments of this Bari-type Beneventan codex at San Francisco.

PELPLIN*, Bibl. Seminarium Duchownego 14 (17); A.D. 1410; 1-124. From RÖMER III, p. 181, who records the note at the end of the codex Hic liber scriptus est ex duobus exemplaribus multum incorrectis et discrepantibus. According to information provided by the Bibliotheque, the numbering is irregular, reaching only '112'.

ROUEN, Bibl. Mun. 467 (A. 85); Abbey of St. Ouen, Rouen; xi ex; 1-124 (the Maurists' Audoenenses). G. Nortier's claim (see 'Check-List', p. 134 n. 200 A) that this manuscript came from St. Evroult is not tenable. Cf. F. AVRIL, Notes sur quelques Manuscrits Bénédictins Normands du

SALAMANCA*, Bibl. de la Univ. 2530; Colegio de San Bartolomé, Salamanca; (then Palace Library, Madrid); xii; ff. 1-181*, 1-17, Sermo 125 (ff. 50*-53*), 20-19, 29-124 (55-124 as '1-70'). Cf. Divjak IV, p. 250; J. DOMÍNGUEZ BORDONA, Manuscritos con Pinturas (Madrid, 1933), vol. 1, p. 452; M.T. HERRERA and J. OROZ RETA, Presencia de san Agustín en Salamanca, in Presencia de san Agustín en España, ed. J. Oroz Reta (Augustinus 25; Madrid, 1980), pp. 379-380, where it is presented as containing only 70 Tractatus. (The list of Augustinian manuscripts in the University Library at Salamanca given by Herrera and Oroz Reta, pp. 374-381, amplifies Divjak's catalogue (IV, pp. 249-250) but also differs from it at several points.)


SANT'AGUSTINA, Bernard M. Rosenthal Collection s.n.; Abbey of St. Chrysogonus, Zadar (Zara), Dalmatia; xii ex.; ff. 19: 18-20, 21: 3-6. Listed in V. Brown, A Second New List of Beneventan Manuscripts, in Mediaeval Studies 40 (1978), p. 271, but not identified as Augustinian. I am grateful to Professor C.E. Murgia of the University of California, Berkeley, for providing me with a xerox of these folios. Other fragments of the same manuscript of the Tractatus survive at Parma - see below.

SANT'AGOSTINO*, Bibl. Comun. 14; Collegiate Church of Sant'Agostino; xii; ff. 6*-7*, 1: 16-18; f. 41*: 82: 3-4; ff. 60*-61*, 29: 6-7; f. 61*: 111: 3; f. 71*: 72*: 29: 6; f. 72*: 25: 12; f. 76*: 80: 3; f. 83*-85*: 6: 11-15; f. 118*: 13: 12; f. 121*: 32: 7-9; f. 121*: 122*: 65: 3; f. 122*: 66: 2; f. 122*: 73; f. 122*: 123*: 87: 1-2; f. 123*: 102: 5; f. 130*-134*: 26; 10-20; f. 134*: 50: 9-11. Inventari dei Manoscritti delle Biblioteche d'Italia, vol. 88: S. Gimignano, Biblioteca Comunale, ed. G. Garosi (Florence, 1972), pp. 74-97. The Tractatus from which the extracts derive are usually numbered in the manuscript: Tr. 6 and 13 correctly (25 not numbered), but 26 and later ones two less than the standard numbering of the editions. This suggests that a manuscript of the Tractatus lacking two homilies, perhaps 18 and 19, was used by the compiler (cf. 'Check-List', p. 92). The manuscript is a collection of Auctoritates Patrum.

SIENA, Bibl. Comunale F.I. 2, ff. 9*-205*; St. Mary's Cath., Siena; xii in.: 1-17, Sermo 125 (ff. 59*-62*), 18-124. The presence of Sermo 125, as [omitted] XVIII and with my Inicipt A ('Check-List', pp. 90-91), I have fixed from a microfilm of Tr. 17-23, which has also revealed other interesting features:

(a) Three liturgical lections are identified in the manuscript: Tr. 17: 1-13 line 11 (Mirum non esse debet) for Friday in the first week of Lent; Tr. 17: 13 line 11-? (Pater meus, inquit, usque modo) for Thursday in Lent III; Tr. 19: 19-? (Non possum ego) for Thursday in Lent II. These calendrical indications are clearly original to the manuscript.

(b) Tr. 23 (here '24') is supplied with a twofold capitulum, Ab eo... et retractatio eorum quae supra tractaverat, ab eo... Between 23: 4 and 23: 5 occurs a heading in larger script, Retractatio superioris.

SIΓEΓIENZA*, Bibl. de la Cat. 108 (202); xiii; 1*-80 beg., 81: 2-84. Divjak IV, p. 258.

SOEST*, Stadtbibliothek, Augustinus Tract. in Ioh. xi; 3 ff., frag. From KURZ V/1, p. 448 and (more fully) V/2, p. 455. Folios 1-2 contain Tr. 24: 3-7 (possibly a homiliary fragment, as Tr. 24 is the first item in Paul Deacon's collection). Fol. 3 is ascribed to the Tractatus by Kurz but I have so far failed to identify it from the Inicipt and Desinit he gives.

STUTTGART*, Württemberg. Landesbibl. theol. et phil. 4* 261; Abbey of Zwiefalten; xii; ff. 12*-19*, extracts.

TOLEDO*, Bibl. del Cabildo 14-3 (LI-98); St. Mary's Cathedral, Toledo; A.D. 1105; 1-19, 23-124. Cf. Divjak IV, p. 266; MILLARES CARLO, Tractado de Paleografía Española, 2nd. edit. (Madrid, 1932), pp. 259, 474. The omission of Tr. 20-22 is evident from information kindly supplied by Ramón González. The subsequent Tractatus are numbered three less than in the editions at least as far as Tr. 58 (there is no break in the numeration at Tr. 55), but Tr. 124 eventually appears as Sermo CXVIII. At least one folio, 77, containing the end of Tr. 17 and the beginning of Tr. 18, has been misplaced and now occurs in the middle of Tr. 15.

TOLEDO*, Bibl. del Cabildo 33-1; x med.; f. 132* (item 56), 105: 1-6 mutil. J.F. RIVERA RECIO, El 'homiliarium goticum' de la Biblioteca Capitular de Toledo, Homiliario Romano del Siglo IX/X, in Hispania Sacra 4 (1951), pp. 147-167, despite his title, dates it 930-960 (p. 148), 930-950 (p. 167). Our item, the sole to bear indication of its liturgical occasion (the Ascension), is evidence of the influence of Paul Deacon's homiliary.

TOULOUSE*, Bibl. Munic. 1161: Chartreuse de Beauvoir ou Saix-lès-Castres, E. of Toulouse; xiii; ff. 7*-53*, 1-2; f. 7*-52*, 7: 5-end; f. 7*-52*, 21*; 49.

TOULOUSE*, Bibl. Munic. 1162: Chartreuse de Beauvoir ou Saix-lès-Castres, E. of Toulouse; xiii; ff. 12*-19*, 104-105, 107; f. 28*-30*, 93;
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conservés dans les Bibliothèques de Catalogne, in Hispania Sacra 5 (1952), pp. 150-151, implies that this manuscript may have belonged to the monastery of Santas Creses between Barcelona and Tarragona. Vallbona is in the province of Lerida and the diocese of Tarragona.


VATICAN CITY, Bibl. Apost. Palat. lat. 206; Central (or Southern) Germany (then Abbey of Sts. Mary and Nazarius, Lorsch); ix/x; 1-33. For provenance and date cf. BISHOFF, op. cit., pp. 49, 106-107.

VATICAN CITY, Bibl. Apost. Palat. lat. 207; VIII/IX - so BISHOFF, op. cit., pp. 22, 106-7. LOWE, CLA Supplement (1971), p. 115, no. 1769, placed it in the late eighth century. Bishoff does not identify the manuscript with any entry in any of the medieval catalogues of Lorsch, on which see Ibid., pp. 16-17. Cf. 'Check-List', pp. 78, 138 n. 213A.

VATICAN CITY*, Bibl. Apost. Palat. lat. 430; S. Germany; ix med.; ff. 41r-42r, 51: 1-8 mutil. ; ff. 46v-47v (?), 120: 1-3 (Alan of Farfa's Homiliary, supplemented). It has proved possible to identify the above items from the information provided by A. REIFFERSCHEID, Bibliotheca Patrum Latinarum Italice, in Sitzungssber. der Katsler. Akad. der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Classe 56 (Wien, 1867), pp. 476-485. It is not impossible that other items from the Tractatus are present.


d'Opuscoli Scientifici e Filologici, edd. G. Enrico et al., tom. 32, Venice, 1778).

VENICE*, Bibl. Naz. Marciana lat. XII. 232 (4257), fragm. 28; Verona; xin. 5: 9-12. Information kindly supplied by Professor Bernhard Bischoff.


The Venice codices 153 and 154 contain respectively the winter and summer halves of a homily whose compilation, while dependent in part on the collections of Paul Deacon and Alan of Farfa, reveals independent features. These include its extensive use of Augustine's Tractatus on John among a rich library of patristic works. Lemarié shows that it was almost certainly written in a scriptorium in or near Bologna, such as the Benedictine Abbey of San Stefano or one of the abbeys of canons regular, San Giovanni in Monte or San Salvatore. The homily must have been used in one of the abbeys of canons regular, such as those mentioned or Santa Maria di Reno. Lemarié's two studies do not present a complete analysis of the homily, so that the details given here may not include all the items from Augustine's Tractatus.

Two particular items in Venice 153 call for some comment. Items 179 and 180 (prescribed with three others for Thursday in the second week of Lent) provide as lections on John 5: 30 ff. Tr. 22: 14 line 3 - 23: 2 line 21, and Tr. 19: 19 line 3-end. The compiler appears to have been particularly careful to select only those portions of the Tractatus dealing with the lection. (He omitted only half-a-dozen lines at the end of Tr. 23 where Augustine glanced at John 5: 30 in a resume). But how are we to explain the order of these portions? It seems to reflect a copy of the Tractatus in which Tr. 19 came after Tr. 22-23. This is not one of the 'normal' irregularities investigated in my 'Check-List'. It does in fact occur in one interesting MS, Vich 27, for which I hazard the explanation ('Check-List', p. 106 n. 125) that the manuscript's (better, its model's) original lack of Tr. 18-19 had been made good from another manuscript lacking Tr. 20-22. I have demonstrated above, p. 68, that the use of Vich 27 or a virtually identical MS accounts for the presence in the homily in Geron 44 for the same day and on the same Gospel passage of an extended lection consisting of Tr. 22: 14-23 + Sermo 75 + Tr. 18-19. Whatever sense we make of Vich 27, the absence of Tr. 18-19 is well attested for Italy (unlike the absence of Tr. 20-22), so that the later discovery or insertion of Tr. 18-19 may well explain the order of the extracts in the Bolognese homily at this point.

Lemarié also gives some cross-references to other codices whose collections show heavy dependence on the respective halves of the Bolognese homily, although not necessarily on the actual Venice manuscripts:

Turin, Bibl. Naz. F.I. 5; St. Mary's Church, Arceto, dioce. of Reggie Emilia (then Bobbio); xii in.; contains at least Tr. 1-2, as well as one extract from the Tractatus not in the Venice 153 ('Quatre homiliaires', p. 513).

Münich, Bayer. Staatsbib. 22001C; Bologna region (then Abbey of Wessobrunn, dioce. of Freising); xii; contains the same sequences of items from Augustine's Tractatus as Venice 154 (ibid., p. 515). It is clear that the Munich MS was written in a different scriptorium from Venice 154, although in the same neighbourhood.

VENICE*, Bibl. Naz. Marciana lat. Z. 154; Bologna region (then Library of Cardinal Bessarion); A.D. 1133; includes: ff. 66r-67v, 74; ff. 67v-68r, 75; ff. 70r-71v, 76; ff. 71v-72r, 77; ff. 72r-73r, 78; ff. 73r-74v, 79; ff. 78r-79r, 12: 10-14; ff. 80r-83r, 43; ff. 86r-89v, 26; ff. 180r-182r, 16; ff. 186r-187r, 24. See on the preceding manuscript.


VICH, Bibl. Capit. 27 (II); xi (not xii); 1-17, S. 125 (ff. 61r-65r), 20-23, S. 75 (ff. 79r-81r), 18-19, 24-27: 2, 98: 6-124. Cf. DIVIAK IV, p. 299.

M.S. Gros, the Seminari Conciliar at Vich, informs me in a letter that this manuscript belongs perhaps to the first half of the eleventh century. See Lerdet, Roda 1, p. 1, for a possible connexion with the manuscript, and Geron 44 for a homily which makes heavy use of a MS for the Tractatus with both Sermo 125 and Sermon 75 interpolated, as here.

Evidence has been given at p. 68 above for the dependence of Geron 44 on this Vich manuscript or another (unknown or unidentified) copy of the Tractatus essentially identical to it. Confirmation of this dependence is provided by the indications of liturgical lections in Vich 27. (I am indebted to Dr. Bischof both for an analysis of part of the manuscript and subsequently for the provision of a microfilm copy). Of the twenty-six items from the Tractatus in Geron 44 listed by Étay twenty correspond precisely with lections specified in Vich 27, at least as far as the beginning of the lections is concerned (the conclusion is rarely made explicit in Vich 27). One other (no. 51 in Étay's analysis) begins earlier in Vich but otherwise agrees with Geron. Four Geron items are completely unmarked in Vich. It may be significant that they are the first two (nos. 5 and 12) and last two (nos. 61 and 62) Tractatus pieces in Geron 44.
The lectionary history of Vich 27 is complicated by the various ways in which lections are indicated in the manuscript as we now have it. A preliminary paragraph on f. 1r lists eight homilies to be read on particular occasions. To the list of Capitula on ff. 1r-3r have been added in the margins over twenty lectionary instructions, several of them almost illegible from my microfilm. Most of the Gerona items are marked in the Vich manuscript by formal lectionary headings which where necessary occur in the middle of individual Tractatus. So at f. 93v we find:

Ebdomada. III. in XL. Feria V. Lectio secundum Iohannem.

In illo tempore dixit Ihesus turbis: Operamini non cibum... 

But yet again such indications, nearly always corresponding with Gerona 44, sometimes appear not in the text but in the margins of Vich 27, although even here they occasionally look original rather than additions. The lectionary evidence in Vich 27 must be dealt with further in another study. It extends beyond the period covered by Gerona 44, which embraces only Septuagesima to Easter Eve.

For the present I merely note that although the close correspondence in liturgical dispositions between Gerona 44 and Vich 27 might suggest that the latter has copied them from the former, the dependence must in fact lie in the reverse direction. The inclusion of S. 75 in Gerona 44 alone demonstrates this. Since S. 75 expounds Matthew 14: 24-33, its appearance among the lections for a day when the scriptural lesson began with John 5: 30 is to be explained by its presence in Vich 27 (or its model) sandwiched between Tractatus which do deal with the passage in John. The compiler of the Gerona manuscript took from Vich 27 the whole of a block from the point where Augustine first tackles John 5: 30 to the point where he last handles it, as the following table shows:

Gerona 44, item 33 comprises:

Tr. 22: 14 (where Augustine reaches John 5: 30) to end
Tr. 23 (dealing briefly with John 5: 31-40, at length with 5: 19, and briefly with 5: 20-30)
S. 75 (Matthew 14: 24-33!)
Tr. 18 (John 5: 19)
Tr. 19 (John 5: 19-30)

(In Tr. 24 Augustine proceeds with ch. 6 of John. On the different sequences of expositions in this area of the Tractatus see my earlier note in Journ. of Theol. Stud. n.s. 15, 1964, pp. 317-319).

Other evidence could be adduced in support of the priority of Vich to the Gerona compilation, but it will be more appropriate to leave this question to a future article.

Some other special features of Vich 27 should also be mentioned:

1. Several Tractatus between 118 and 123 are prefaced by brief summaries of their content:

Tr. 118 (f. 223v): Hic de tunica dierit usque ad id In vestem meam miserunt sortem.

Tr. 119 (f. 224v): Hic discierrit quod in prima parte euangeli huise euangelistae ait Dominus ad beatam Mariam, Nondum venit hora mea, et quodomodo Iohannes recept cam in sua.

Tr. 120 (f. 225v-226v): Hic disserit mirabiliter non de percusso sed de aperto latere Domini.

Tr. 121 (f. 227v): Hic de visu disputat.

Tr. 123 (f. 231v): Hic tractat qualiter qui propungunt ovibus Christum, et de illo prando Domini.

These summaries are additional to the standard formula introducing the Gospel pericope, De/Ab eo quod scriptum/dictum est... I have not so far encountered them in any other manuscript.

The 'mirabiliter' of Tr. 120 echoes an unparalleled commendation at the beginning of Tr. 102: Item sequitur de cædem lectione sermo mirabilis et necessarius katholicisque audendorum ac firmiter credendus.

Such additions may well find their explanation in the lectionary use of this manuscript.

2. Augustine's characterization of the contrasting life of earth and of heaven in Tr. 124: 5 lines 82 ff. (Duas itaque vitas sibi divinitus praedicitas...) is laid out with spacious emphasis on f. 235v, with each phrase beginning on a fresh line and a larger capital for each 'una'. After 'quid est hoc, nisi' (line 109) the following passage is interpolated:

ut sit intellegimus, Sic eum volo manere, id est, Sic eum volo expectare.
3. After the end of the last Tractatus appears the text (ff. 237v-238r) of Sermo vel oratio sancti Augustini episcopi.

Veni ad nos sancte Spiritus Patris et Filii, illabare sensibus nostris Spiritus amborum qui cum Patre et Filio unus Deus et Dominus es. This has been edited by J. LEMARIÉ, *Le breviare de Ripoll* (Scripta et Documenta, 14; Montserrat, 1965), pp. 163-172.

**VIENNA, Österr. Nationalbibl. 697+725; see above on LINZ, Studienbibl. 668.**


**VORAU*, *Bibli des Chorherrenstiftes 401 (CLXXII)*; Augustinian Canons, Vorau; xiii/xiv; ff. 233r-234v, 91.

**WOLKENBÜTTEL, Herzog-August-Bibl. Weiss. 18 (4102); Abbey of Sts. Peter and Paul, Weissenburg, Alsace; xix; 24-54. Kurz V/2, p. 528 gives the order in which the manuscript is to be read; ff. 1-23, 137-144, 129-126, 121-128, 112-120, 104-111, 96-103, 88-95, 80-87, 72-79, 64-71, 56-63, 48-55, 40-47, 32-39, 24-31, 145-150. He also confirms that the original numbering of the Tractatus here is two behind that of the editions (cf. "Check-List", p. 78 n. 76).**

**ZEIL*, *Fürstl. Waldhurs-Zeilsche Bibl. 1; Weingarten Abbey, dioec. of Constance; xx; (A.D. 1108-1132); 1-124 (Kurz V/1, p. 143 and V/2, p. 552). I have been unable to secure further information about this manuscript.**

**MANUSCRIPTS MISSING**

**MUNICH, Hartung & Karl**

A manuscript of the Tractatus of Italian origin dated circa 1200 was sold in 1977 by Hartung & Karl of Munich (Bücher, Autographen, westliche und orientalische Handschriften. Auktion 22, 2-3 Nov. 1977, no. 3). It was purchased by F. Dörling of Hamburg and subsequently resold. No further information is yet available.

**CHELTENHAM, Phillips 4477**

Part of this codex has been identified but is now lost. It is possible, but not certain, that the other part, whose whereabouts are unknown, contained some of the Tractatus in Ioannem.

Sir Thomas Phillips bought it from Levy of Metz in 1824, and it is identified in the catalogue of his library as follows:

'Expositio in Evang. S. Iohis. S. Augustini Sermones'


H. Schenk's catalogue appears to identify the second part as the Tractatus:


(Bibliotheca Patrum Latinorum Britannica, in Sitzungsber. der Kaiserl. Akad. der Wissenschaft, Phil.-Hist. Classe, 126: 6, Wien, 1892, p. 71, no. 1506). However Sotheby's sale entry in 1898 was less specific:

'Evangelium Sancti Ioannem, cum expositione S. Augustini Sermones' (Bibliotheca Philipippica. Catalogue of a further portion... sold by Messrs. Sotheby, Wilkinson and Hodge on Monday, sixth June 1898, p. 48 no. 375). It was bought for £ 2.9 s. by 'Rosenthal' i.e. Jacques Rosenthal of Munich, who presented it for sale in 1899 in his Catalogue 17: Catholicarum et Literarum et Rerum Studia, pars sexta - Bibliotheca Historico - Ecclesiastica, nos. 2211-2604 (pp. 142-179), pp. 155-156, no. 2351; with the contents described as follows:

'Expositio in evangelium sec. Ioannem.

S. Augustinus. Sermones super decem plagas Egypti'.

It contained 240 ff., a vellum manuscript written in red and black and executed with great care, and it bore the colophon:

'Scriptum per fratrem Everhardum de Siegen anno 1454'.

(Catalogue 17 in the Bodleian bears the Library's datestamp 12.5.1899. The Library also contains another copy, date-stamped 3.5.1899, unbound and lacking all title except Manuscr. Anciens. Alte Handschriften, comprising items 2211-2627, paginated one in advance of part VI above, so that item 2351 appears on pp. 156-157).

It appears that no buyer was found for the manuscript in 1899, when it still consisted of a single volume (cf. K. CHRIST, Eine Neue Handschrift von Meister Eckhart's Kommentar zum Johannes-Evangelium, in Zentral-blatt für Bibliothekswesen 51 (1934), pp. 10-29, at pp. 14f., n. 5. I take it that the old catalogue inventory uncovered in Munich and reported to Christ was the Catalogue 17 of 1899). The codex was subsequently divided into its two parts and rebound separately (Christ, p. 14). The first part was eventually bought from Rosenthal in 1915 by the Berlin Staatsbibliothek as an anonymous commentary on John's Gospel. It was catalogued wrongly as the work of Albert the Great, and subsequently identified by Christ as only the second known copy of Meister Eckhart's Johannine commentary. It became MS. lat. 4° 724 in the Staatsbibliothek, but has been missing since World War II (so a letter of 1978; Kurz V/2, p. 109 lists it as though it were not lost).

This manuscript consisted of 171 folios, and was used by Christ and another scholar, Joseph Koch of Breslau, in preparing a critical text of the commentary for the collected edition of Eckhart's works. Only
part of the commentary was ever published: *Meister Eckhart: Die lateinischen Werke*, Bd. 3, *Expositio Sancit Evangelii secundum Johannis*, Lieb. 1-3, Stuttgart and Berlin, 1936-40. Christ was inclined to date the Eckhart manuscript before the middle of the fifteenth century, and hence did not accept Eberhard of Siegen as the scribe of both parts of Philippus 4477 in the absence of firm evidence to this effect. However, Kurz, *loc. cit.* records this Eberhard as the scribe of the Eckhart manuscript. Christ was also unable satisfactorily to identify the monastery 'mariendael ordinis cistercensis in comitatu seynensi trevirensis dioecesis' where a note at the end of Eckhart commentary says its Vorlage belonged (Christ, pp. 15 n., 18-22).

The settling of these issues may possibly help in tracking down the other, Augustinian, part of Philippus 4477, which, says Christ (p. 14), appears to have found a buyer, although Rosenthal could not indicate its whereabouts. Its provenance is not in doubt. In addition to the colophon naming the scribe and the note at the end of the Eckhart manuscript, the guard-sheet inside the front cover of Philippus 4477 made use of part of a deed of the Church of Trier of the year 1444 in favour of Canon Johannes Pistor. The scribe can be identified with the Eberhard of Siegen whom three Trier manuscripts show to have been a Carthusian of the Chartreuse of St. Alban's adjacent to Trier (*Colophons de Manuscrits Occidentaux des Origines au XVIe Siecle*, vol. 2; *Spicilegium Friburgense Subsidia*, 3; Fribourg, 1967, p. 37, n° 3835, and p. 43, n° 3884-5). Rosenthal's *Catalogue 17* mentions that the second guard-sheet was a fragment of 1382 relating to the right of a Chartreuse to sell wine.

But the manuscript itself, comprising some 70 folios, remains unidentified. As for its contents only Schenkli's catalogue unambiguously specified the *Tractatus*, while only Rosenthal's identified Augustine's *Sermones* (sic) on the ten plagues of Egypt. This is *Sermo 8* (ed. Lambot, *CCL* 41, 77-99), known of until the nineteenth century chiefly in the form of a series of extracts made by Eugippus, and an abridged adaptation preached by Caesarius. Two versions of Caesarius's sermon have been transmitted, one of them with two divergent *Incipits* (ed. G. Morin, *Sermo 100*, *CCL* 103, 406-413, and *Sermo 100A*, *ibid.*, 413-416 = Ps.-Augustine, *Sermo 21*, *PL* 39, 1783-1786). A check of the manuscripts of *De decem plagis* in West Germany listed in *KURZ V/1*, pp. 79-80, and V/2, pp. 597-598, has revealed none that challenges consideration as the lost part of Philippus 4477.
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In an anniversary year (379-1979) it is fitting to consider the regard in which Basil the Great has been held in subsequent eras of Christian history. This paper proposes to do so in outline with reference to the Protestant Reformers of the sixteenth century. You may well wonder whether there was much in Basil's life and writings to commend him to the Reformers. He bequeathed no great corpus of exegetical work, nor did he significantly contribute to dogmatic developments in those areas—namely ecclesiology, sacramental theology, soteriology and anthropology—where the main battles of the Reformation were fought. He was, moreover, a matchless pioneer and champion of monasticism, and he even promulgated a strange vindication of unwritten apostolic traditions.

It is not surprising, therefore, if he counted little to Luther and even Calvin. Luther once dismissed him in his Table Talk in the words, 'Basilius taut gar nichts, der ist gar ein muck; ich wolt nit ein heller umb yhn geben'. On another occasion he spoke scornfully of Chrysostom and Basil as 'mostly chatterboxes' (wescher), and of Basil as 'a rough teacher'. Although more complimentary mentions of Basil are to be found in Luther's works, they are frequently conventional and amount to little in terms of close appreciation of Basil's writings.

John Calvin obviously knew several of the works of Basil. Paul's quotations from pagan writers provoked him to recommend Basil's Ad adolescantes as a guide to the proper use of such authors. He also commended Basil's and Ambrose's expositions of the history of creation (Hexaemeron), and advanced quotations from Basil's Homily on Psalm 32 (declaring 'fortune' and 'chance' to be pagan concepts) and other works. But Ganoczy has rightly judged that Calvin never showed much sympathy for Basil. He apparently disagrees with Basil's interpretation of the image of God in man, and is severely critical of Basil's aberrant estimate of human free will, which 'mixed the earthly with the heavenly, from a desire to please the wise of the world, or at
least from fear of annoying them'. Calvin must have found Basil's allegorism distasteful; he much preferred John Chrysostom to Basil and Gregory Nazianzen - 'causam habeo cum Chrysostomo coniunctam',... the Capuchinos 'ad declarationes suisse magis notares quan ad didacticam scribendi rationem'.

Such lack of enthusiasm for Basil in the two most eminent Reformers contrasts markedly with the praise lavished upon him by Erasmus in the preface to his 1532 edition of his works. This was the first collected edition in Greek, although it lacked the Ascetica and the Contra Eunomiums. (Erasmus had long searched in vain for manuscripts of the latter.) These deficiencies were made good in a supplementary Venice edition of 1535 dedicated to Gaspar Contarini. Individual works in Greek and Latin had been available for many years, as well as Latin collections of varying extent. The Address to Young Men led the way in 1471, while Raphael Volaterranus published a pioneering Latin edition of the Hexameron, the Psalms Homilies, miscellaneous homilies and selected Ascetica at Rome in 1515. Another Latin collection produced by Badius at Paris in 1520 owed its origins to Le Seve d'Etaples, and is known to have been used by Zwingli and by Thomas Muntzer.

Erasmus's 1532 edition was dedicated to Jacobo Sadoletus. Its preface exposed the inadequacies of previous Latin versions which had revealed no more than the 'umbra Basilii'. Now at last (and it was far on in Erasmus's life, almost his last major erudite edition, followed only by his uncompleted Orient), Basil is recognisable as the Greatest ('Maximus') rather than merely the Great, the Christian Demothenes whose eloquence surpasses all other Greek writers, making Athanasius seem just a boy and carrying off 'felicitas' whatever he attempted with his pen.

This eulogy of Basil by the doyen of Christian humanists may be instructively compared with that of a Protestant editor, Wolfgang Musculus, who in 1540 produced in Latin the most complete collection of Basil's works to date. Musculus was a former Benedictine who had spent a few years under Bucer's tutelage at Strasbourg before becoming a reformer at Augsburg and later professor at Berne. He displays a warm appreciation of Basil's ascetic writings: they contain virtually nothing that is not conducive to godliness, their counsel is everywhere derived from the Scriptures and they assiduously name the name of Christ and exhort to the imitation of Christ. The Ascetica interpret over two hundred biblical texts, while the Homilia inculcate the maxim of 'sola Scriptura'. Basil's piety would surely render all the congregations of Christ and all the homes of Christians 'Christianas

dóclicas & vere pietatis ashfídiara'.

Musculus is conscious that some readers will greatly disapprove of the ascetic teachings of Basil, and will censure him as editor for not passing met judgment upon them. It is worth noting how other Reformers who in the main acknowledged Basil's orthodoxy came to terms with his stultar advocacy of monasticism. In general they contrasted the pure simplicity of Basil's monastic regimen with the corruptions and sophistication of later monasticism. That monks once actually slept on the ground and ate only bread, vegetables and roots would be incredible, asserts Calvin, unless reputable eyewitnesses like Basil had recorded the fact.

Thus Philip Melanchthon, who displayed considerable interest in Basil's works and tracked down 'a good part' of them in manuscript in the early 1520's, composed a Declamatio on Basil in 1515. He passed fairly rapidly over Basil's 'immoderate' championship of monasticism, setting over against it other strengths of Basil such as his lucid presentation of justification by faith alone. He concludes that Basil held more modest views of monasticism than had recently been common. As he put it elsewhere, Basil taught that 'monastic life was pleasing to God, not that it merited forgiveness. It was a matter of praxis, not dogma.'

13. Placidus Illyricus, the Protestant chronicler of the Ecclasiastica Historia known as the Magdeburg Centuries, exploits the checks Basil experienced from some contemporary bishops in promoting monasticism as evidence that many condemned the new phenomenon at the time, even though it was immeasurably purer than it later became.

The same point may also be implied in the dedicatory preface of the 1535 editio princeps Graeca of the Ascetica. The editor, Stephanus de Sabio, who goes out of his way to highlight the prominence of Scripture in Basil's ascetic works, claims that 'certain of our brethren' whom Satan's cunning has recently seduced from the Catholic fold, will find here much to recover them from their error, as Contarini, the dedicatee, had never ceased to endeavour.

In Musculus's 1540 preface we may next note his praise of Basil's defence of 'the purity of the Catholic faith' in conflicts with heretics, like Daniel in the den of lions. These efforts naturally receive honourable mention in other Reformers, at some length in Melanchthon's Declamatio. Although Trinitarian debate rarely came to prominent focus in the Reformation except with anti-Trinitarian Radicals, most Reformers accorded Basil due recognition for his vindication of the Nicene faith.

Basil's battles for orthodoxy were at the same time a campaign to preserve or recover the peace of the Church. Here again Melanchthon, Musculus and others found in Basil a model worthy of the keenest imitation. Basil's 'eclesiasticonexus' evoked Musculus's ardent approbation; his passion for the unity of Christ's body must be shared by all Christian people, not least magistrates and clergy, who could learn much from Basil about the causes and healing of disensions. Melanchthon frequently cites a tag from Basil, 'non tam sinistre opus est dextra, quam Ecclesiae opus est docentium concordia'.

But Melanchthon and Musculus were by no means the only Reformers to evince familiarity and sympathy with Basil's works. Zwingli had studied some of Basil's writings, including Sphilita 38 (on the difference between ousia and hypostasi), while a priest at Glarus. Subsequently at Einsiedeln he had access to a rich
monastic library and annotated Pauline Epistles from patristic sources. At Zürich he used Basil's homilies on the Psalms both for a note on Romans and for his own lectures on the Psalms. But he scarcely reveals that affinity for the Greek Fathers which is characteristic of Wolfgang Oecolampadius of Basel. Moral rigour and a mystical bent attracted him to the Cappodocians and John Chrysostom. Around 1521 he brought out German translations of Basil's Epistle 2 to Gregory Nazianzen on the ascetic life, asserting its relevance for all Christians, and of his Homily II on Psalm 14 against usury. He also found more explicitly Protestant grist to his mill in Basil's writings.

Peter Martyr Vermigli's reforming career extended from Italy to Oxford, ending at Zürich in 1562. A few years later the Genevan Academy purchased many of his books, hundreds of which are still identifiable in the Bibliothèque publique et universitaire of Geneva. They include the 1532 Erasmus edition of Basil and the more comprehensive Latin edition of Janus Cornarius from Froben of Basel in 1552, both extensively annotated in Martyr's hand. The fruit of this close study of Basil and other Fathers is seen in Martyr's biblical commentaries, and more solidly in his reply to Stephen Gardiner on the eucharist, De Defensoris Trinitatis Veneratione & Apostolicae Eucharistic Sacramentum (Zürich, 1559), which hinges on the true interpretation of the Fathers and is called by Pontien Polman 'la monographie la plus étendue et, peut-être, la plus érudite que la polémique protestante du XVIIe siècle ait produite sur un sujet spécial de l'histoire du dogme'. Martyr sets high standards for the reading of the Fathers - in the original languages, the works themselves, not extracts in Græcian or Lombard, and with the spurdi carefully sifted out. Martyr introduced new patristic texts into England, and his tradition of patristic apologetic was maintained by his protege John Jovel, whose works made plentiful use of Basil.

None of these Reformers could afford a detached and interested look at Basil. They were all caught up in the familiar appeal to the Fathers which in one form or another was so important an element in their justification of Church reform. This appeal has been skillfully analysed in Melanchthon's case by Pierre Franckel but not yet with comparable thoroughness for any other Reformer. It had to be so advanced that it did not undermine 'sola Scriptura', which meant that the Fathers had to be read with discrimination. Melanchthon, building on Tertullian's axiom of the priority of truth to error, drew attention to the way in which the Fathers regularly cited their predecessors, e.g., Irenæus Polyecyp. Basil provided him with an interesting illustration of this argument, for Basil appealed to the faith of his grandmother, who had been taught by Gregory Thaumaturgus. The latter was a convert of Origen's, who cited apostolic authority for infant baptism. In this and other ways the authority of the Fathers came to be, as it were, encompassed within the apostolic authority of the Scriptures.

This claim on the Fathers inevitably involved the Reformers in selective quotation, the inadvertent citation of spurious and the constant peril of disregarding historical context. Thus Basil was found to furnish the clearest of testimonies to justification tò kara iōto, as well as less unambiguous support in the eucharistic debates, both Protestant-Catholic and inter-Protestant. Yet in Basel's case various Reformers in varying degrees conceded that not everything he wrote was wholly to their liking. Did not Paul suggest that even worthy teachers built 'stipulae' on the foundation of Christ? Melanchthon was fond of alleging that Basil and other Fathers at times used unhappy terminology which at best allowed their intended meaning to be misconstrued and at worst planted a root for the growth of virulent error. Yet Melanchthon is still able to claim in his Declaratio that Basil 'recte de omniis articolis Evangelii sensisse'. If Chrysostom was the Reformers' favourite Greek Father, Luther's dismissiveness towards Basil was the exception rather than the rule. There were blemishes here and there in his output, but others joined with Melanchthon in according him a secure place among the Fathers of the Church catholic and reformed.
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14. Catalogue testamenti... (Basel, 1556), p. 43. The same point was made by Melanchthon in De Ecclesia et de Autoritate Verbi Dei in 1539 (C.R. 23, 600), where it is notable that his text contains a lengthy account of Basil's life and writings (Cent. IV, vol. 2, Basel, 1560, 929-959).
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THE ETHICAL USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN LUTHER AND CALVIN: A COMPARISON
by DAVID WRIGHT

The Holy Scriptures teach ethics, or the theory of duties, far better than any Ciceron or Aristotles, claimed Luther, comparing the Bible with the standard ethical handbooks of antiquity, both Latin (Cicero's De Officiis) and Greek (Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics). Luther had in fact lectured on Aristotle's Ethics in 1508/9, a few years before he received the degree of 'Doctor in Biblia'. It was as a Professor of Bible, mainly of the OT, that Luther earned his living for over thirty years, and Calvin too expended a large proportion of his efforts as preacher, commentator and lecturer on the OT. Comparisons of their use of the OT have tended to concentrate on the law and to a lesser extent on Christological (Christocentric) hermeneutics. This essay will endeavour to cast the net more widely and to broach the question of the law as it arises within a broader context.

EXAMPLES AND PRECEDENTS

Not surprisingly both Luther and Calvin find in the OT ethical examples for Christians to follow. In the preface to his translation of the OT, Luther described the Testament as 'a book of laws, which teaches what men are to do and not to do — and in addition gives examples and stories of how these laws are kept or broken'. Genesis is

ABBREVIATIONS:
CTS Calvin Translation Society, 40 vols., Edinburgh, 1843-55.
WA D. Martin Luther's Werke, Kritische Gesamtausgabe, Weimar, 1883 ff.

1 Lectures on Genesis (hereafter Genesis) 12.11-13 (WA 42, 476; LW 2, 398). Luther began these lectures in June 1535 and resumed them at Gen. 3.15 after a break in January 1536.
2 cf. H. Bornkamm, Luther and the Old Testament (Philadelphia, 1969), pp. 11ff. 'It is difficult to believe in God without an example', Lectures on Psalms 15.13 (12) (WA 40 ff, 348; LW 13, 282).
'made up almost entirely of illustrations of faith and unbelief, and of the fruits that faith and unbelief bear', and Deuteronomy 'really contains nothing else than faith toward God and love toward one's neighbour, for all God's laws come to that'.

Luther is clear that the OT commends the military office. He reassures a professional soldier's troubled conscience by pointing him to 'the stories of war in the Old Testament ... If the waging of war and the military profession were in themselves displeasing to God we should have to condemn Abraham, Moses ... etc., who served God as soldiers and were highly praised in Scripture because of this service'. He disposes of the objection that Christians are in a different situation by citing Rom. 13.1-7 and 1 Pet. 2.13-17. Calvin's position is scarcely divergent. He has the OT in mind in asserting that 'the Holy Spirit declares such wars [of defence] to be lawful by many testimonies of Scripture'. To the objection that no testimony or example in the NT legitimises war for the Christian he has a threefold answer: nothing debars rulers from defending their subjects; the apostolic writings deal with the spiritual and not the civil order; and Luke 3.14 shows 'that Christ by his coming had changed nothing in this respect' (Inst. 4.20.11-12).

But in his treatise on Temporal Authority: to What Extent it Should Be Obeyed, Luther draws on OT 'precedents for the use of the sword' to teach a different lesson. He argues that the OT is 'abrogated in the sense that we are free to keep it or not to keep it'. The precedents of sword-wielding patriarchs are for Christians 'matters of freedom, and you may follow them or not'. OT practice is handled by Luther very much like the Mosaic law. He frequently insisted (e.g. in How Christians Should Regard Moses, 1525) that most of the laws of Moses were Jewish customary laws which were not binding on non-Jews. The Mosaic legislation was on a par with the legal codes of other nations or ethnic groups. He certainly hoped that rulers would choose to adopt many of Moses' enactments, but no obligation required this of them. In practice, Luther had no doubts about the necessity of the ruler's sword in his day; likewise, he was greatly attracted by the laws of Moses on tithing, the jubilee year, the cancelling of loans in the sabbatical year, divorce and other matters.

On the other hand, Luther dismisses attempts to justify monastic vows from the OT.

There is one answer that can be made to all attempts to cite passages from the Old Testament to support [monastic] vows ... 'Do you Christians want to be Jews?' Prove your case from the New Testament. The Old Testament has been set aside through Christ and is no longer binding.

It seems impossible to capture Luther's consistency, for on another polemical front he bases the whole of his case on OT precedents. In rejecting the Roman emphasis on 'consent' alone as constituting the 'form' of the sacrament of marriage and in insisting on parental agreement to an engagement he relies wholly on Mosaic law and Israelite practice.

The Deeds of the Patriarchs

On certain occasions Luther explicitly enunciates 'the rule that the deeds of the saints should not be imitated or taken as examples. It is not logical to say that because Abraham, Augustine and Peter did this, I too, must do it'. He cites the jurists' maxim, 'an action is not a law, just as a law is not an action'. So teachers in the Church 'should not present examples; they should present the rule. You are not Lot; you are not Abraham. Therefore you should not imitate what Lot and Abraham did.' Luther surprisingly invokes this rule when he is justifying, not condemning, certain questionable actions by patriarchal figures. Abraham's pretence that Sarah was his sister (Gen. 12.11ff.), Lot's offer of his daughters to the men of Sodom (Gen. 19.5ff.), and the deceiving of Isaac by Rebecca and Jacob (Gen. 27.1ff.), are all vindicated by Luther. Steadfast adherence to 'the promise' is the keystone of the cases of Abraham and Jacob. Abraham's plan and Sarah's compliance both proceeded from extraordinary faith 'in order that the promise might remain unshaken ...'. Rebecca and Jacob realised that Esau's behaviour nullified the law of primogeniture; he could not

---

2. Whether Soldiers Too Can Be Saved (1526), WA 19, 627-8; LW 46, 97ff.
3. WA 11, 955-6; LW 45, 91ff.
possibly be the first born. This realisation and the prophecy (‘the elder shall serve the younger’, Gen. 25.23) sanctioned them in disregarding the law and deceiving Isaac. They ‘did not sin. No, they acted in a godly and saintly manner’. Luther generalises in the first person:

That which has been given to me by God and concerning which I know that it belongs to me I can claim by using any deception and scheme; for at the risk of committing a mortal sin I am bound to plan, invent, pretend and conceal in order that what has been committed to me by God may come to pass.'

Obedience to the First Table of the Decalogue may require the breach of the Second Table. For Luther this applies chiefly to God’s ‘heroes’:

In order to reveal his power and wisdom, God does many things contrary to the rule; he does so through heroes, whom he himself calls in a special way, although these heroes are rare and few. The others must adhere to the norm and rule, because if they want to imitate those heroes who deviate from the rule, they will stumble disgracefully.

Jacob’s deceit of Laban is justified by Luther in precisely the same terms (Gen. 30.31ff.).

How does Calvin handle these difficult cases? The ingredients of his discussions are mostly the same as Luther’s, but the resultant mix is rather different. In particular he frequently differentiates between laudable ends and reprehensible means. When Abraham pretended that Sarah was his sister (Gen. 12.1ff.), Calvin like Luther fixes on his praiseworthy commitment to the divine promise which depended on the preservation of his own life. ‘Abraham’s end was right, but he erred in the way itself... By this example we are admonished... that we may not attempt anything rashly, without the authority of his Word.’

Likewise when the barren Sarah procured Hagar for her husband (Gen. 16.1ff.), her ‘forgetfulness of her own right’ and her sole concern for ‘the bringing forth of children to Abraham’ furnishes ‘a memorable example, from which no small profit accrues to us’. Yet her pursuit of this commendable ‘end’ or ‘scope’ entangled her in no light sin and Abraham also in the fault of facile compliance. Calvin discerns lack of faith as the root cause of these failures, and so is able to acquit

Abraham of prostituting his wife or being reckless of his wife’s danger (since she was already pregnant). Thus the recognition that Abraham and Sarah were motivated solely by regard for God’s promise did not lead Calvin to justify their illegitimate devices, as it did Luther. Yet it issues in an exposition that belittles ethical demerit and concentrates on defective faith. Nor can Calvin bring himself to condone the deceiving of Isaac by Rebecca and Jacob, although he acknowledges that through their deviuous God transferred the blessing from Esau to Jacob (Gen. 27.1ff.).

One further failing that Calvin accuses in Abraham was a lack of counsel and prudence, which led to intemperate action. This weakness is also prominent in his consideration of Lot’s attempt to appease the Sodomites by offering them his daughters. He disagrees with those who excuse Lot on the grounds that he knew they would not be wanted, which was Luther’s reasoning. Lot’s ‘invincible fortitude’ lacked the direction of ‘a spirit of prudence... a sound judgment... well-regulated reason’. His lapse illustrates the theologumenon that ‘nothing proceeds from [holy men] so excellent, as not to be in some respect defective.’

Only once does Calvin agree with Luther in exculpating the patriarchs. He finds holy Jacob free from blame for depriving Laban of his flocks and herds (Gen. 30.3ff.), not because Jacob acted ‘in reparation of former losses’ (for we must not avenge our own injuries with injustice), but because he ‘had attempted nothing but by the command of God’. Calvin bases this assessment on Jacob’s words in Gen. 31.7-9. This overriding appeal to the command of God Calvin is closer to Luther than in any other instance in Genesis.

Religion Overrides Ethics

A marked difference is recognisable between Luther and Calvin as expositors of these ethical cruces. In two general respects Luther’s approach was not followed by Calvin. In the first place Luther made his OT exegesis serve the history of salvation with a skill at times brazenly perverse, because it effectively disallows ethical judgments and lets religious considerations outweigh ethical concern. These religious factors, notably ‘faith’ and ‘the promise’, are closely related to
his heavily Christocentric reading of the OT. ‘Luther’s meditations on these examples of faith stood outside any moral considerations, be it moral condemnation of these deeds or moral allusion to their model.’ Calvin’s distinction between ends and means retains a more central ethical focus. In general Calvin makes fuller ethical use of the OT than Luther.

At the same time it would be misleading to drive too broad a wedge between them. Their reflections on the casting of lots in Jonah 1.7 reveal basic agreement expressed in characteristically different terms. They both reject the indiscriminate condemnation of lots. Calvin cites Proverbs 16.33, Acts 1.26 and Joshua 7.16ff.; both God’s Word and civil law authorise the use of lots, for example in dividing up an inheritance. Yet he denies that the actions of Joshua, Saul (1 Sam. 14.42) and Jonah and his shipmates offer precedents to be followed. ‘There were some peculiar influences [instinctus] whenever God’s servants used the lot in doubtful and extreme cases.’ Calvin does not provide a criterion to substantiate this judgment, but Luther asserts that lots must not be cast where death is at stake. He condemns Saul, but justifies, Joshua as obeying God’s specific command. The casting of lots is more amenable to Luther’s personal religion than to Calvin’s. For Luther ‘the casting of lots is in itself a real act of faith, subject, of course, to misuse by idle curiosity and self-gratification, similar to the misuse of sword and oath.’

Works are rated by God on the basis of faith. This is why God approves a deed in some cases but disapproves the same deed in other cases.

Luther’s strongly religious weighting of the OT finds expression in the second point to be stressed, namely, the hierarchy he erects within the Decalogue whereby the Second Table must yield to the First. He almost glories in situations where godly people must obey God rather than serve man.

Moses wants you to know that the First Commandment is the measure and yardstick of all others, to which they are to yield and

*21 Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 95. But Luther does find ease to commend to wives the example of Sarah’s unquestioning compliance with her husband’s stratagem in Gen. 12.11ff. (WA 42, 473; LW 2, 296).

*22 Lectures on Jonah 1.7 (CO 43, 218-220; CTS Minor Prophets 3, 47-8).

*23 Lectures on Jonah 1.7 (German, 1526), WA 19, 212-4; LW 19, 60-2.


give obedience. Therefore if it is for the sake of faith and love, you may kill, in violation of the Fifth Commandment, just as Abraham killed the kings (Gen. 14.15) and King Ahab sinned because he did not kill the King of Syria (1 Kings 20.34ff.). Similar is the case of theft, ambush, and trickery against the enemies of God; you may take spoils, goods, wives, daughters, sons and servants of enemies.

Psalm 45.10 (‘Forget your people and your father’s house’) not only means that ‘Christ came to abrogate the whole law, the priesthood and the kingdom of the Jews’, but also speaks to the clash between divine and human demands:

If a situation should arise where you would have to give up either your father or God, you must say, ‘Farewell, Father, with the Fourth Commandment and with the whole Second Table, I know nothing of you, but have completely forgotten you.’

1 Samuel 21.6, 2 Samuel 14.11, 21-4 and 1 Kings 2.5-6 show that ‘Kings, priests and heads of the people often transgressed the laws, boldly, at the demand of faith and love.’

Along essentially similar lines Luther advanced a limited justification of usury as once practised by Jews among Gentiles. Starting from Deut. 15.5-6 (‘If you hear the voice of the Lord . . . you will lend to many nations’) he found that the Jews possessed for a time ‘a fuller and higher law’ which overrode the ban on usury:

If for the sake of vengeance on the Gentiles, God wants to punish them through usury and lending, and commands the Jews to do this, the Jews do well obediently to yield themselves to God as

*25 Luther and Lutheranism followed the arrangement of the Decalogue widely observed since Peter Lombard, which subsumed the ban on images under the First Commandment (or omitted it, in intention or in effect), and split the prohibition of covetousness into two, the Ninth dealing only with coveting one’s neighbour’s house. Cf. Calvin’s criticism, Institute 2.8.12. In this study the two different enumerations are followed in dealing respectively with the two Reformers.

*26 Deuteronomy 6.6 (WA 14, 601; LW 5, 70). Cf. Genesis 27.3-10 (WA 43, 397; LW 5, 114), where the EF in LW (‘For the First Table embraces obedience to parents, brotherhood and love’) is inferior to that in Bornkamm, op. cit., p. 24 — ‘parental obedience, the fellowship of brothers and love were subjected to the first table of the law’, which is a literal rendering of the Latin . . . primae tabulae subjecta sunt.

*27 Lectures on Psalms 45.11(10); WA pp1, 572, 576, 756; LW 12, 272, 275ff. Cf. Deuteronomy 24.18 (WA 14, 741; LW 5, 241): ‘If faith toward God demands it, charity is to be denied to one’s neighbour’.

instruments and to fulfil his wrath on the Gentiles through interest and usury. This is no different from when he commanded them to cast out the Amorites and Canaanites.

But this obtains only as long as they fulfil the condition; once the Jews ceased to 'hear the voice of the Lord', the tables were turned and they became like the Gentiles and even worse. Luther can even generalise speculatively from this unpromising platform, Ifa husband desires to have his wife and children taken away and I am ordered to do this through his Word, I am not an adulterer or kidnapper but 'an obedient whip of God'. What price ethics with this theology?

**LUTHER ON THE LAW OF MOSES**

For Luther Moses was the dominant figure of the Hebrew Scriptures. The prophets and the sacred histories 'are nothing else than what Moses is ... The prophets are nothing else than administrators and witnesses of Moses and his office, bringing everyone to Christ through the law'. The OT's centre of gravity lay in the Pentateuch.

The ambivalence for Luther of the Mosaic law as a whole and of the Decalogue in particular arises from their intermingling of natural law, which is of universal application, and national Jewish law which belongs only to the Jewish people. The natural law in sum comprises the honour and service of God and the love of one's neighbour, respectively the First and Second Tables of the Decalogue. Luther can speak as though this supreme Mosaic embodiment of the natural law were the natural law itself. Thereby the Ten Commandments cease to be Moses' law but go back to creation itself. So the Decalogue is in one important sense incomparable in the eyes of Luther, and the Book of Deuteronomy is 'a most ample and excellent explanation' of the Decalogue.

At the same time the particularist Jewish character of the Mosaic law is obvious. It cannot be fulfilled outside Canaan and Jerusalem. The fate of Judaism in A.D. 70 is an inseparable counterpart to the cross of Christ; material abrogation of the law caps its spiritual abrogation.

**USE OF OT IN LUTHER AND CALVIN**

Within the Decalogue itself Luther identified several merely Jewish elements: the prologue (Exod. 20; 2, Deut. 6:1); the promise of long life in the land in the Fourth Commandment; the ban on images; the specification of the sabbath. He repeatedly declares that the Decalogue is not binding on Christian people.

But is Luther consistent? For even if he believed that Christ in the Gospels and Paul and Peter in their Epistles produced 'new decalogues' which were 'clearer than the decalogue of Moses', they did so on the basis of the Mosaic Decalogue. Moreover, Luther's Catechisms apply the Decalogue to Christians with little of the distance he regularly maintains between his Jewishness and Christian faith.

**LUTHER'S CATECHISMS**

The *Small Catechism* inculcates the Commandments in the most direct and unqualified fashion:

*You shall not steal.* What does this mean? Answer: We should fear and love God, and so we should not rob our neighbour of his money or property, nor bring them into our possession by dishonest trade or by dealing in shoddy wares, but help him to improve and protect his income and property.

But it includes no mention of the prologue, the prohibition of graven images and the promise of long life annexed to the command to honour one's parents, and the sabbath Commandment is made to mean only the following:

We should fear and love God, and so we should not despise his Word and the preaching of the same, but deem it holy and gladly hear and learn it.

Such Christianising of the Decalogue is sharpened in the *Large Catechism*. Again the prologue is absent, as too is any mention of images. The exposition of the Third Commandment, in which Luther's German as in the Small Catechism replaces 'sabbath' with *Feiertag*, 'holy day' or 'rest day', declares that 'According to its literal, outward sense, this commandment does not concern us Christians'. Rather it

---

16 Preface to the Old Testament, WA Deutsche Bibel 8, 29–33; LW 35, 55.
18 Against the Substantiations, WA 40, 390; LW 47, 79.
Luther's servants (modern provides the teaching probably total for Luther 'the denigration for Reformation for the Decalogue 'directly as Decalogue Commandment, Fourth requires regular rest days for workers and the devotion of holy days to the worship of God. The Ninth and Tenth Commandments, 'taken literally, were given exclusively to the Jews; nevertheless, in part they apply also to us'. On the other hand, the promise annexed to the Fourth Commandment, 'that you may have long life ...', is applied directly to his Christian readers, and the conclusion describes the Decalogue as

a summary of divine teaching on what we are to do to make our whole life pleasing to God. They are the true fountain from which all good works must spring, the true channel through which all good works must flow. Apart from these Ten Commandments no deed, no conduct can be good or pleasing to God.

Yet the note of qualification is not absent even here:

It will be a long time before men produce a doctrine or social order equal to that of the Ten Commandments. The expansiveness of the Large Catechism also embraces a polemical thread which is absent from the Small Catechism. The prohibition of adultery, for example, leads Luther to confront the medieval denigration of this 'divine and blessed estate'. But the Catechism contains extended ethical expositions that are free from the concerns of Reformation polemic.

**Law and Love**

In the light of the Catechism Paul Althaus is justified in claiming that for Luther 'the Christian life is lived under the commandments of God'. Yet Luther's continuing incursion of the Mosaic law remains elusive to square with his harsher, clearcut statements on the total abolition of the law. The most problematic aspect of Luther's teaching probably centres around his interpretation of 'love is the fulfilling of the law' (Rom. 13:10). Does Luther mean only that love provides the motivation whereby the law loses the character of demand and becomes sheer delight to the Christians, or is he implying that love would fulfill the requirements of the law *et in non dare*, even if one remained ignorant of the law? Has love superseded the law as that which specifies the content of Christian morality? While the earlier discussion has made clear that the summons of faith and love can override the dictates of the law, Luther should not be credited with the modern aberration that for Christian life love renders law redundant as a determinant of ethics. Perhaps his works in all their volume and diversity yield no ultimate and total consistency on this point. But it must be maintained — and in reaching this conclusion the Catechism must be accorded greater weight than they have often received — that the Decalogue constitutes for Luther a virtually essential element in the shaping of Christian ethics. This does not mean that the Decalogue as it stands is an ethical blueprint for Christians. It requires both dejudization — marginal, perhaps, but in principle significant — and Christianization extensive and thoroughgoing, as the Large Catechism makes plain. Consequently if Luther presents the Commandments as indispensable for Christian mores, he also shows both their inadequacy and how they are fulfilled — which in part means surpassed — in Jesus Christ.

**Calvin on the Law**

By comparison with Luther's, Calvin's unequivocal evaluation of the Mosaic law for the life of the Christian is relatively straightforward. Although there is greater common ground between Luther and Calvin at this point than is normally supposed, Calvin's presentation bears a quite distinctive accent and tone.

Accepting the threefold use of the moral law developed by earlier Reformers, Calvin placed the heaviest emphasis on the role of the law as the guide of Christian life:

The third and principal use, which pertains more closely to the proper purpose of the law, finds its place among believers in whose hearts the Spirit of God already lives and reigns.

---
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The law furnishes both instruction and stimulation:

Here is the best instrument for [believers] to learn more thoroughly each day the nature of the Lord’s will to which they aspire, and to confirm them in the understanding of it ... And not one of us may escape from this necessity ... Even for a spiritual man not yet free of the weight of the flesh the law remains a constant sting that will not let him stand still (Inst. 2.7.12).

For Luther the supreme function of the law had lain elsewhere: “The law, when it is in its principal use and office, can do nothing but accuse, terrify, condemn and kill.”43 Calvin of course fully endorsed this purpose of the law, just as Luther, not without some tensions, acknowledged the role of the law in directing the way of Christian life. But their differing designations of the law’s ‘principal use’ reflect major differences in their outlook.

The close correlation Calvin made between the law and the righteous nature of God and his stress on obedience as the keynote of the Christian’s life were all of a piece with his unambiguous estimate of the law’s perfection:

In his law the Lord has included everything applicable to the perfect rule of the good life, so that nothing is left to men to add to that summary.

Christ [in Matthew 19.17-19] declared that he taught no other plan of life than what had been taught of old in the law of God. So also he attested God’s law to be the doctrine of perfect righteousness.44

He squarely rejects the view that the Mosaic law was entirely a thing of the past for Christians. Citing Deut. 32.46-7, he affirms:

We are not to refer solely to one age David’s statement that the life of a righteous man is a continual meditation upon the law [Psalm 1.2], for it is just as applicable to every age, even to the end of the world (Inst. 2.7.13).

Calvin did not of course ignore the fact that the law was Mosaic, that is, given at a particular stage in the history of Israel. But he will not allow this particularity to qualify its direct reference to the people of

God in all ages. The preface (Exod. 20.2) may speak of Israel’s deliverance from Egypt,

But, in order that it may not seem that this has nothing to do with us, we must regard the Egyptian bondage of Israel as a type of the spiritual captivity in which all of us are held bound ... (Inst. 2.8.15).

On the Second Commandment, banning the use of images in worship, Calvin shows no awareness of any supposed limitation to the ancient people of God. The promise attached to the command to honour parents ‘has reference to us, in so far as length of present life is indeed a proof of God’s benevolence toward us’. It is only in respect of the sabbath law that Calvin recognises an element applicable to Israel alone, in terms closely parallel to Luther.

The way is open for Calvin to give the most comprehensive interpretation to the law. Although he would scarcely talk of Luther’s ‘new decalogues’, his expositions of the Decalogue turn it into a thoroughly Christianised code. He transposes purely negative prohibitions into positive commands, ethnic law into a universal code, external regulations into ethical-spiritual directions and statutory law into ethics.45 This enlarging of the boundaries of the Decalogue is achieved in different ways in the Institute and in his Commentary on his harmony of Exodus-Deuteronomy.

The Decalogue in Calvin’s Institute

The exposition of the Commandments given in the Institute has much in common with the section in Luther’s Large Catechism. Both Reformers expand the scope of ‘Honour your father and your mother’ to embrace obedience and respect to all our superiors — ‘three kinds of fathers, ... fathers by blood, fathers of a household, and fathers of the nation’, as Luther expresses it, adding also ‘spiritual fathers, ... who govern and guide us by the Word of God’.46 Both Luther and Calvin use the prohibition of adultery as an occasion not only to condemn unchastity and to exalt marriage but also to criticise the exaggerated regard for celibacy in the old church, although in Calvin the unchaste vows of Luther’s ‘papal rabble’ recede into the background in favour of a more broadly based biblical consideration.

But if neither Luther nor Calvin kept closely to the precise terms of
the Decalogue, Calvin alone provides an explicit justification for his procedure. First he asserts the inward and spiritual force of the law, in which he is not 'thrusting forth a new interpretation of our own, but following Christ, its best interpreter'. Secondly Calvin claims that 'the commandments and prohibitions always contain more than is expressed in words'. The legitimate scope of 'going beyond the words' is determined by ascertaining the purpose of the commandment. For most of the Second Table this means translating negative prohibition into positive goals (Inst. 2.8.7, 8-g). Calvin begins his exposition of most of the articles of the Decalogue with a statement of their positive demand. Luther's discussions in the Large Catechism are more concerned with the prohibitive force of the law, with its positive converse making a more muted appearance.

One illustration should suffice. Calvin introduces his discussion of 'You shall not steal' as follows:

The purpose of this commandment is: since injustice is an abomination to God, we should render to each man what belongs to him. To sum up: we are forbidden to part after the possessions of others, and consequently are commanded to strive faithfully to help every man to keep his own possessions.

Having surveyed at moderate length different kinds of theft, he spends more time on the positive front:

Let us share the necessity of those whom we see pressed by the difficulty of affairs, assisting them in their need with our abundance (Inst. 2.8.45, 46).

He then continues with an extended paragraph on fulfilling our obligations to others — a people to its rulers, ministers of the churches to their congregations, parents to children, youth to old age, masters to servants, and vice-versa in each case! Luther, on the other hand, devotes most of his space to various kinds of stealing and to the duty to endure fraud and robbery without repining. At every turn contemporary social conditions lend lively colour to his account. Eventually he comes to the importance of promoting and furthering our neighbour's interests, but he brings forth only brief generalisations. Nevertheless, Luther has safeguarded the integrity of the commandment more faithfully than Calvin, whose treatment has the pliability of a wax nose or, to use his own illustration, a ruler made of lead.
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USE OF OT IN LUTHER AND CALVIN

MOSAIC LAW IN CALVIN'S HARMONY

The comprehensive scope of the Decalogue is reinforced by Calvin's organisation of his harmony of Exodus to Deuteronomy and accompanying commentary. He distinguishes two principal ingredients in these books, historical narrative and doctrine, which is the law of Moses. Calvin subdivides it into four principal commandments in order to present the law as a whole.

1. Preface to the Law: Exod. 20.1-2, Deut. 5.1-6, 4.20, Lev. 19.36-7, 20.8, 22.31-3, Deut. 4.1-2, and over a hundred more verses, gathered mostly from Deuteronomy, bearing on 'the dignity of the law'.

2. The Ten Commandments, together with 'those interpretations which the lawgiver had added unconnectedly. For many precepts, which are not found in the Two Tables, yet differ not at all from them in sense; so that due care must be taken to affix them to their respective commandments in order to present the law as a whole'.

3. Supplements (Latin-appendices), i.e., 'with respect to the First Table, the ceremonies and outward exercises of worship; with respect to the Second, the political laws, for the object of both these parts is merely to aid in the observance of the moral law'.

4. The End and Use of the Law, a few pages of Calvin's own construction, which is followed in the commentary itself (but not in his analysis in the Preface) by a review of 'The Sanctions of the Law contained in the Promises and Threats', expounding mostly Deuteronomic passages.

Calvin has intercalated the material of his second and third heads of 'doctrine'. This means that for each of the articles of the Decalogue Calvin presents for commentary

A. The commandment itself from Exod. 20 and Deut. 5;
B. Passages related to the 'exposition' of the commandment (which are in part restatements of the substance of the commandment found elsewhere in these books);
C. Ceremonial and/or political supplements or appendices to the commandment.

45 Harmony, pref., CO 24, 7-8, CTS i, xvii.
46 Harmony, CO 24, 725-8, CTS 3, 196-201, and CO 25, 5-38, CTS 3, 201-89.
So, for example, the year of jubilee and the feasts of Leviticus 23 are brought in as 'supplements' to the sabbath commandment.51 'Honour your father and your mother' has attached to it the restatement in Lev. 19:3, and as supplements: Exod. 21:15, 17, Lev. 20:9 (penalty of death for striking or cursing a parent); Deut. 21:18-21 (provision to stone an incorrigible son); Exod. 22:28, Lev. 19:32, Deut. 16:18, 20:9 (directives about elders and rulers).52 By contrast much more additional material in both categories is appended to 'You shall not steal'.53 The Exposition of the Commandment deals with the following: Lev. 19:11, 13 (restatement, including prompt payment of wages); Deut. 24:1-15, 25:4 (justice for hired labour, including daily payment of wages); Exod. 22:21-4, Lev. 19:33-4 (care of aliens); Deut. 10:17-9 (ditto, against partiality); Lev. 19:35-6, Deut. 25:13-6 (justice in weighing and measuring); Deut. 19:14 (no infringement of landmarks); Exod. 22:26-7, Deut. 24:6, 10-13, 17-18 (pledges on loans); Exod. 22:25, Lev. 25:35-8, Deut. 23:19-20 (usury); Deut. 22:1-3, Exod. 23:3 (recovery of possessions lost by others); Numb. 5:5-7 (reparation for theft); Exod. 23:8, Lev. 19:15, Deut. 16:19-20 (against bribery and corruption); Exod. 23:3, 6 (against unduly favouring the poor). The 'Political Supplements' (Appendices Politicae)54 begin with legislation decreeing penalties for various offences but also include: care to leave gleanings for the needy; the sabbatical year of release (Deut. 15:1-18 and Exod. 21:1-6); regulations against slavery and the possession of land in Lev. 25; ban on destroying food-producing trees during a siege; respite from military service for owners of new house or vineyard, for fiancés and the faint-hearted; duty to brother's widow.

**Category of 'Political' Laws**

In the light of these examples we must clarify Calvin's distinction between the two categories of legal material. According to his own explanation in the Preface, the first category belongs with the commandments themselves as 'interpretations ... which differ not at all from them in sense' and belong to a presentation of 'the law as a whole'. The law here presumably means 'the moral law'. The supplementary 'political' legislation, on the other hand, like the ceremonial supplements which are not our concern here,

---

51 **Harmony**, CO 24, 588-606, CTS 2, 450-64.
52 **Harmony**, CO 24, 609-12, CTS 3, 12-19.
54 **Harmony**, CO 24, 687-712, CTS 3, 140-70.

...merely aid in the observance of the moral law ... They neither change nor detract from the rule laid down in the Ten Commandments ... As to all the political ordinances, nothing will obviously be found in them, which at all adds to the perfection of the Second Table: therefore it follows, that nothing can be wanted as the rule of a good and upright life beyond the Ten Commandments.55

Calvin's discussion of the threefold division of the law in Institute 4.20.14-16 makes it plain that the political or judicial laws were not inviolable or indispensable. So long as the civil laws of the nations were framed to safeguard that basic universal equity which is embodied equally in the natural law and in the moral law of the OT (the latter being 'nothing else than a testimony of the former'), there is no reason why we should disapprove of them, howsoever they may differ from the Jewish law, or among themselves.56 He proceeds to give some examples from the Pentateuch, all of which appear in the category of 'supplements' in his Pentateuch commentary.

But the additional law in Calvin's category of 'exposition' is not thus variable, it would seem. When the fundamental dictate of the moral/natural law 'You shall not steal' is taken seriously, Calvin believes that fair treatment for resident aliens and just weights and measures in trade and commerce will follow automatically. Property boundaries will be respected, hired workers will receive full and prompt payment of wages and justice will not be bought and sold. So far so good, but the dividing line between 'exposition' and 'supplementary' seems very finely drawn at points. What justifies the inclusion in 'exposition' of provisions requiring the return of stolen money together with an additional 20 per cent by way of punitive deterrent (Numb. 5:5-7), and of others effectively prohibiting lending at interest to one's fellow-Israelites (Exod. 22.25, etc.)? What in turn warrants the relegation to the 'appendices' or 'supplements' of the ban on holding a fellow-Israelite as a slave?57

Closer examination of Calvin's commentary on the biblical passages counted as 'exposition' discloses that the differentiation between these and the 'supplements' is not watertight. Although the law of Deut. 24:14-15 'is not political, but altogether spiritual and binding on our
consciences before the judgment-seat of God', Deut. 25:4, which he attaches to these verses, 'properly belongs to the supplements of the commandment'. In discussing Exod. 22:25 etc. on loans and interest he says of the second part of that verse,

A precept is added as to lending without interest, which, although it is a political law, still depends on the rule of charity... It is plain that this was part of the Jewish polity, because it was lawful to lend at interest to the Gentiles, which distinction the spiritual law does not admit. The judicial law, however, which God prescribed to his ancient people, is only so far abrogated as that what charity dictates should remain, i.e., that our brethren who need our assistance are not to be treated harshly. To similar effect Calvin says about the provision for the sabbatical year of release in Deut. 15 which he assigns to the 'supplements':

Although we are not bound by this law at present, and it would not be even expedient that it should be in use, still the object to which it tended ought still to be maintained, i.e., that we should not be too rigid in exacting our debts, especially if we have to do with the needy, who are bowed down by the burden of poverty.

So enactments which spell out the very substance of the commandment, 'You shall not steal', and others which apply it to the particular circumstances of Israelite polity, are intertwined in the Pentateuch and cannot be tidily separated out. We cannot on this occasion trace more closely how Calvin carries out the division into two categories in respect of other articles of the Decalogue. What must be emphasised, however, is the way in which he extends the scope of the Ten Commandments and enlarges the range of Pentateuchal law which enjoys the status of the permanently inviolable moral law. It is all very different from Luther.

**Usury**

Having thus been raised in connexion with the Eighth Commandment, usury merits a brief examination. Note has already been taken of Luther's bizarre use of Deut. 15:5-6 to justify the special conditional privilege of the Jews to lend at interest to Gentiles. Calvin's comments on these verses do not so much as raise the issue. Nevertheless, it seems to have been the decisive biblical locus for Luther. In his 1525 Lectures on Deuteronomy he passed over Deut. 23:19-20, where usury is explicitly dealt with, in two sentences, declaring that sufficient had been said above on Deut. 15. His treatise of 1529 known as The Long Sermon on Usury combines Deut. 15 with Matt. 5:42 and sets up three 'degrees' of godly liberty. The first is to 'let everything go that anyone would take from us by force'. The second is giving freely without hope of return (Deut. 15:11, Matt. 5:42), which is so small a thing that it was commanded even to 'the simple, imperfect Jewish people in the Old Testament'. A fortiori, therefore, Christians must be bound by it. The third degree is to lend without charge (Deut. 15:7-8, Matt. 5:42).

Luther in fact instinctively perpetuated the patristic and medieval consensus against usury. Loans for him were a form of charitable help to the indigent. Deuteronomy 15 rightly spoke about lending in connexion with the care of the poor, and other relevant passages where poverty was not mentioned, such as Deut. 23:19-20, were aligned with this controlling context. Luther detested idleness, whether of beggars, mendicant friars, lazy monks or wealthy bankers who enriched themselves by doing nothing but fleecing others. The accommodation of papal Catholicism to financial practices which he regarded as barely disguised usury evoked his contemptuous condemnation, as did Jewish entanglement with money-lending.

Calvin's approach was somewhat different. We have noted the way he subsumed the issue under the Eighth Commandment. His exposition betrays embarrassment in the face of a prima facie blanket
condemnation of the practice (except to Gentiles). His argument makes the following points:

(i) In the Pentateuch 'the question is only as to the poor, and consequently, if we have to do with the rich, usury is freely permitted'. (So, like Luther, he assimilates Deut. 23.19-20 to the other passages, but to opposite effect.)

(ii) The apparently absolute condemnations of Ps. 15.5 and Ezek. 18.8ff. indicate 'only those unjust exactions ... whereby the creditor, losing sight of equity, burdens and oppresses his debtor'.

(iii) 'It is abundantly clear that the ancient people were prohibited from usury, but we must needs confess that this was a part of their political constitution'.

(iv) 'Usury is not now unlawful, except in so far as it contravenes equity and brotherly union... If we would form an equitable judgment reason does not suffer us to admit that all usury is to condemned without exception'. He furnishes sundry examples of daily occurrence 'in which, as far as equity is concerned, usury is no worse than purchase'. He had earlier stated that 'our determination must be derived from nowhere else than the universal rule of justice', and especially from Christ's golden rule in Matt. 7.12.

Calvin has effectively removed the issue from the sphere of biblical exegesis. He does likewise in his lectures on Ezek. 18.8, but this time without any foundation in the text itself. In effect he appeals from the Scripture to 'the rule of law', and argues that 'a true and complete rule of living justly cannot altogether exclude lending at interest, which therefore cannot 'everywhere... always... in all things... from all people' be contrary to God's will."

**Two Different Interpreters**

Drawing confident conclusions from such a limited survey of the two Reformers' ethical use of the OT would be risky. The differences between them are often plain enough, differences which reflect a host of factors other than — as well as — variant exegetical destinations honourably arrived at. For these exeges were preachers and theologians, and if it was a strictly exegetical discovery that set Luther on the highway to an evangelical theology, excess did not always determine theological construction rather than vice-versa."

But a major element in the difference between their contemporary interpretations of the Old Testament arises from their different challenges and objectives as Reformers. While Luther's teaching is directed so often to the false religion of 'the papists', Calvin's applications turn more naturally to the demands of love and justice in the community. When Luther comments 'the works of love towards the neighbour', he seems impatient to seize the offensive against exponents of the old religion who substituted religious exercises for these works of love, and justified their neglect of the latter by their diligence in the former.

The different approaches of the two interpreters are evident in their handling of Zechariah 7.10, where the prophet warns against oppression of 'the widow, the fatherless, the stranger or the poor'. Calvin in his lectures on the book, published in 1559, identifies why his particular groups in society merited Zechariah's mention and also repeated reference in the Mosaic law. It is because they are especially 'exposed to plunder', whereas the rich and opulent are safe from all injuries because they are surrounded and fortified by strong defences. Then Calvin draws a generalising conclusion, that 'the fear of God is not really proved except when a person cleaves to what is just and right, and is not restrained by fear and shame but discharges his duty... so that he shows favour to the poor and miserable'. Luther on the other hand transposes God's complaint against the ancient people into contemporary terms. Instead of caring for the needy and helpless, churchmen have devoted themselves to 'fasting, sacrifices, gloomy severe lives, ... grey and black clothes, ... sacrifices of dill and

---


*Footnote 67:* Lectures on Ezekiel 18.8 (CO 40, 429-32; CTS 2, 225-8).

*Footnote 68:*

---

USE OF OT IN LUTHER AND CALVIN

determine theological construction rather than vice-versa."

After all, Calvin would have us read the *Institutes* first! Moreover, they had travelled different religious and intellectual roads, and in Saxon and Geneva they inhabited surprisingly different worlds (which is surely of relevance to their handling of Old Testament texts about usury, for example). In addition in temperament and personality one sometimes feels they were as different as chalk and cheese.

But a major element in the difference between their contemporary interpretations of the Old Testament arises from their different challenges and objectives as Reformers. While Luther's teaching is directed so often to the false religion of 'the papists', Calvin's applications turn more naturally to the demands of love and justice in the community. When Luther comments 'the works of love towards the neighbour', he seems impatient to seize the offensive against exponents of the old religion who substituted religious exercises for these works of love, and justified their neglect of the latter by their diligence in the former.

The different approaches of the two interpreters are evident in their handling of Zechariah 7.10, where the prophet warns against oppression of 'the widow, the fatherless, the stranger or the poor'. Calvin in his lectures on the book, published in 1559, identifies why these particular groups in society merited Zechariah's mention and also repeated reference in the Mosaic law. It is because they are especially 'exposed to plunder', whereas the rich and opulent are safe from all injuries because they are surrounded and fortified by strong defences. Then Calvin draws a generalising conclusion, that 'the fear of God is not really proved except when a person cleaves to what is just and right, and is not restrained by fear and shame but discharges his duty... so that he shows favour to the poor and miserable'. Luther on the other hand transposes God's complaint against the ancient people into contemporary terms. Instead of caring for the needy and helpless, churchmen have devoted themselves to 'fasting, sacrifices, gloomy severe lives, ... grey and black clothes, ... sacrifices of dill and

---

*Footnote 66:* Calvin's interpretation of Exod. 21, 22-3, the only OT text to touch on abortion. The Hebrew 'šêm is rendered as 'death' (most) by Calvin (AV 'mischief', RSV 'harm', NIV 'serious injury'), which allows him to raise the question, 'Whose death—the mother's or the foetus?'. For if only the mother's death is intended 'it would not have been a capital crime to put an end to the foetus, which would be a great absurdity'. So he concludes that 'if death should follow' applies to the foetus as well as to the mother. For the foetus is already homo (Harmony, CO 24, 625; CTS 3, 41-2).

*Footnote 67:* Lectures on Zechariah 7.10 (CO 44, 226-7; CTS Minor Prophets 5, 179).
anise..., sleeping on hard beds once a week, eating no meat on
Wednesdays'. For Luther the message becomes a generalised blast
against popes and bishops who wage war and shed blood and return
home to endow masses and hours, a world full of pious usury and fraud
for which a wax candle for St. Anne and fats for St. Barbara and St.
Catherine are thought to atone. Luther's note is of course in the
authentic tradition of OT prophecy, even if it has the effect of
somewhat blunting the ethical edge of Zechariah's burden.
Zechariah's vision of the restored Jerusalem foresaw the streets of the
city full of boys and girls at play (Zech. 8:5). Both Luther and Calvin
half felt the need to justify the children playing in Zion but did so in
characteristically different tones. Calvin's comments as follows: it is
not needful anxiously to raise the question: Whether it is lawful to
play during times of peace? for the prophet here took his language
from the common habits of men, and even from the very nature of
things; for we know that men give way to cheerfulness when no
fear lays hold on their minds, and that play and sport are allowed
to children.

Luther is provoked to a more fulsome outburst:

All must be well in a land where the children of the city leap,
dance and play in the streets... Note that the children's activities, such as the playing and dancing of the young world in
the streets, are not an evil thing but are pleasing to God. For he
praises also these things here as his gifts, though to us they may
seem to be something wasted and useless.

Then the application to the religious conflict of Luther's day:
How will [the monks] stand the test when Christ will say that the
singing and dancing of the children in the streets are dearer to him
than all their howling and mumbling in their churches, and the
little girls' wreaths and dolls, the boys' hobby-horses and red
shoes please him much more than all their hoods, tonsures,
surplices, chasubles, and adornments. For though their activities
are also nothing but child's play, still, because they are without
God's Word, they are not to be compared to real child's play but
rather to buffoonery and fool's play.

The ethical import of such a comment belongs to what is sometimes
called the secularising thrust of the Protestant Reformation. Common
life was invested with a new dignity and celebrated as the gift of God.
At the same time the Reformers cut back the luxurious, dark-faced
undergrowth cultivated by the solemn specialists in religion.

On a broader front also Luther's expositions of the OT Scriptures
are directed more immediately to the contemporary world than
Calvin's. When Habakkuk complains that 'the law is slack and
justice never goes forth' (Hab. 1.4), Calvin's comments are predictable
and unspecific. He notes the prophet's anguish when both human and
divine laws are despised and 'all justice is suppressed', and exhorts us to
'learn to rouse up ourselves for we are very frigid, when the ungodly
openly despise and mock God'. Luther however uses the
prophecy as a mirror in which to discern the social disorder of his day.
Habakkuk, he claims, is really attacking those 'who boast of justice and
who by no means wish to be regarded as acting contrary to justice,...
the shrewd jurists of our own day':

When they have a bad and evil cause, they thumb their noses at
justice and make their cause appear right and good... Few good
causes get into the hands of jurists and judges... The good causes
do not yield any money. And the jurists, who are all gold and silk
today, would indeed be beggars if it were not for the evil cases in
court.

So if Calvin's OT expositions possess almost a timeless quality with a
continuing appeal over the centuries, it is more often Luther who
points the way to applications of the biblical text that bite with a
sharper immediacy. If the extravagances of this unquenchable spirit
make Luther's OT works more awkward to handle today, the task is
well worth the perseverance. A diet of Calvin's alone would be almost
bland without a dash of Luther's tart pungency.

Lectures on Habakkuk 1.4 (CO 43, 497; CTS Minor Prophets 4, 21-2).

Lectures on Habakkuk 1.4, WA 19, 361-2; LW 19, 164.
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HOMOSEXUALS OR PROSTITUTES?
THE MEANING OF ΑΡΣΕΝΟΚΟΙΤΑΙ (1 COR. 6:9, 1 TIM. 1:10)

BY

DAVID F. WRIGHT

That translators of the New Testament into English have had not a little difficulty with both μαλακοί (1 Cor. 6:9) and ἀρσενοκόιται (1 Cor. 6:9, 1 Tim. 1:10) is evident enough from a perusal of a selection of modern translations. The point has been made to good effect by the author of a recent substantial study of attitudes to 'Gay People in Western Europe from the Beginnings of the Christian Era to the Fourteenth Century'.

Professor John Boswell of Yale University devotes a lengthy appendix to 'Lexicography and Saint Paul' in the course of which he provides the fullest investigation to date of the meaning of ἀρσενοκόιται. He concludes that it denotes 'male sexual agents, i.e., active male prostitutes, who were common throughout the Hellenistic world in the time of Paul...

... "Ἀρσενοκόιται" is the Greek equivalent of "drauci". At the time he grants that Paul may not have understood the difference between active and passive male prostitutes. 'It would not be surprising if he considered active prostitution more reprehensible than passive, but it is not necessary to assume that he understood the precise nuance of "ἀρσενοκόιται" in terms of sexual roles. Since it was unambiguous in its reference to male prostitution (as opposed to male recourse to female prostitution), he may well have intended it generically' (pp. 344-345).

The 'unambiguous reference' of the term to male prostitution Boswell claims to establish on grounds that vary considerably in weight.

- The context, particular and general, in Paul

The juxtaposition of ἀρσενοκόιται and παρόνι in 1 Tim. 1:10 'suggests very strongly that prostitution is what is at issue... Moreover, prostitution was manifestly of greater concern to Saint Paul than any sort of homosexual behaviour: excluding the words in question, there is only a single reference to homosexual acts in the Pauline writings, whereas the
word "πορνος" and its derivatives are mentioned almost thirty times" (p. 341). Whatever inference might be drawn from the collocation of words in 1 Tim. 1:10, this is clearly a grossly inadequate account of the meaning of πορνος and its cognates in the New Testament and contemporary literature.

- The linguistic structure and semantic import of ἀπειρωτικαί
- The absence of the term from most Greek literature on homosexuality

Boswell speaks of 'the vast amount of writing extant on the subject of homosexual sexuality in Greek in which this term does not occur. It is extremely difficult to believe that if the word actually meant "homosexual" or "sodomite," no previous or contemporary author would have used it in a way which clearly indicated this connection' (p. 345). This argument makes two claims, first, that the word was thus neglected, and secondly, that its non-use in literary references to homosexuality warrants the inference Boswell draws from it.

- Uses of the term in literature roughly contemporary with Paul

Occurrences of ἀπειρωτικαί and its cognates in works written 'within two or three centuries' of the Pauline letters 'offer further evidence that the word did not connote homosexuality to Paul or his early readers' (p. 350). Aristides and Eusebius are cited to this purpose, together with less clearcut supporting testimony from Origen and Chrysostom. Boswell accepts that after the fourth century ἀπειρωτικαί 'was often equated with homosexuality' (p. 107; cf. pp. 352-353).

Each of these last three grounds alleged by Boswell merits extended examination. The last two obviously overlap and must to some extent be taken together. But first attention must be drawn to the evidence of the Septuagint:

Lev. 18:22 — μετὰ ἀρσενὸς ὁ χομοβίος κοίτην γυναικὸς
Lev. 20:13 — ὁ ἄνδρος ὁ μετὰ ἀρσενὸς κοίτῃς γυναικὸς

Boswell quotes these LXX verses elsewhere in his study (p. 100 n. 28) but never considers their possible significance for the meaning of ἀπειρωτικαί in the New Testament. The reason is no doubt to be found in his claim that these Levitical prohibitions had little or no influence on early Christian attitudes. 'It would simply not have occurred to most early Christians to invoke the authority of the old law to justify the morality of the new: the Levitical regulations had no hold on Christians and are manifestly irrelevant in explaining Christian hostility to gay sexuality' (p. 105).

It is certainly the case that Lev. 18:22 and 20:13 are rarely cited explicitly in Christian literature of the early centuries, although not as rarely as Boswell makes out. He first asserts that 'many [Greek-speaking theologians] considered that [the behaviour condemned in these verses] had been forbidden the Jews as part of their distinctive ethical heritage or because it was associated with idolatry, not as part of the law regarding sexuality and marriage, which was thought to be of wider application' (p. 102). As witnesses he cites only one passage from Eusebius of Caesarea and the Apostolic Constitutions, neither of which substantiates his claim. In his Demonstration of the Gospel Eusebius relates the Mosaic ban on γυναικῶν τε πρὸς γυναικάς καὶ ἀρσενῶν πρὸς ἀρσενὰς μῖξες, preceding it with Lev. 18:2-4 and following it with Lev. 18:24-25, but he does not imply for a moment that, although distinguishing Israel from its neighbours, the ban was intended solely for Israel. If that had been his meaning, the context shows clearly that the same would have to be said about child-sacrifice! Eusebius's meaning is put beyond doubt elsewhere in the same work when he paraphrases Matt. 5:18 as follows:

ὁ μὲν Μωσῆς μορφὰς καὶ ἀκαλλάτας διατάτητο τὸ μῆ μοχανίκιν, μηδὲ ἀρσενοκοιτίν, μηδὲ τὰ παρὰ φῶν ἰδονίν καὶ τὰ κακά μὲ τὴν κακίαν, ἢ γὰρ τὸν ἀλλὸν ἀκαλλάτω τούτων ἰδονίν... τὸν δὲ τὸν ἀνθρωπον ἄλλον ἀλλωστια τούτων ἰδονίν.

It is surely a safe presumption here that ἀπειρωτικαί refers to the Levitical proscription of male homosexual activity. Further confirmation that Eusebius did regard it as still binding upon the people of God is found in The Preparation for the Gospel, in which he contrasts Plato's recommendation of pederasty with the words of Moses διὰ διαρθήσεως τούτως ἐναντίως συμβολεῖται, μετάφρασι τῆς φιλίας τῆς κατὰ παθηθήσαντας προσκόμησιν προφέρεται διπήν, and proceeds to cite both Lev. 20:13 and Lev. 18:22. In the Apostolic Constitutions, which were probably compiled in the late fourth century in Syria or possibly Constantinople, the argument proceeds as follows:

'If the difference of the sexes was made by the will of God for the generation of multitudes, then must the conjunction of male and female be also agreeable to his mind. But we do not say so of that abominable mixture which is contrary to nature,
Then follow the two texts from Leviticus among others. Although a clear distinction is drawn between heterosexual offences and homosexual, as Boswell points out (p. 103 n. 42), its purpose is not to suggest that the prohibition of the latter in Leviticus was valid only for Jews. The implication is rather that offences παρὰ φύσιν are more heinous than offences παρὰ νόμον.

Boswell argues that 'Almost no early Christian writers appealed to Leviticus as authority against homosexual acts' (p. 104). He mentions two exceptions—Clement of Alexandria (‘an exception to this as to most generalizations’, p. 104 n. 47) and the Apostolic Constitutions, which only two pages previously he has cited as attesting the restricted reference of the Levitical enactments against homosexual behaviour—'ceremonially unclean rather than intrinsically evil' (p. 102). As we have seen, his second citation of the work is the more accurate. There are at least two other leading exceptions to be added. In his refutation of Marcion Tertullian distinguishes between the institutio of marriage and the exorbitatio of adultery and other sins, and declares that God punishes with death incestam, sacram legem atque monstrosam in masculos et in pecudes libidinum insaniam, with identifiable allusions to Lev. 20:10, 13, 15. Origen's eleventh homily on Leviticus takes 'Be ye holy...' (Lev. 20:7) as its text. Lev. 20:13 is not among the verses explicitly cited or alluded to, but the general thrust of the homily does not allow an interpretation that such prohibitions are no longer binding on Origen's Christian congregation. But in his Commentary on Romans, now extant only in Rufinus's Latin, Origen quoted first 1 Tim. 1:9-10 and then Lev. 18:22 in the course of a discussion sparked off by Rom. 4:15, Et statuamus ante oculos, si videtur, duos alius, verbi gratia, qui cum masculis non concubuerunt concubitu muliebri; unum ex his praecepto legis prohibuit... A broader range of evidence than Boswell collates can therefore be adduced for the continuing validity of the proscription in Lev. 18:22 and 20:13 in the eyes of early Christian writers. Certainly he is unable to cite any evidence of any degree of explicitness declaring that it had been abrogated, like much else in the Levitical legislation. A more differentiating approach was adopted than Boswell allows. As one of his reviewers commented, 'Sexual prohibitions tend to have a longer life than dietary or dress restrictions. Even if they show no distinctive gravity in early legislation, they are notoriously capable of surviving the dissolution of taboo structures like the heavily ritual Holiness Code of Leviticus and reappearing with increased weight in later patterns of moral offense.'

The argument of the preceding paragraphs may not be strictly relevant to the question whether the LXX of Lev. 18:22 and 20:13 provides a clue to the meaning ἀρετοκοται that had for Paul. It has rather been directed to the reason, so it appears, why Boswell did not investigate this possibility. The parallel between the LXX's ἀρετος and κοιμηθησαν κοιτην and even more κοιμηθησαν μετα ἀρετος κοιτην and Paul's ἀρετοκοται is surely inescapable. If, as seems likely, the ἀρετοκοται-group of words is a coinage of Hellenistic Judaism or Hellenistic Jewish Christianity, the probability that the LXX provides the key to their meaning is strengthened.

If the argument of the last paragraphs is valid, it undermines ab initio the force of Boswell's linguistic approach to the meaning of ἀρετοκοται. In short he claims that the first half of the compound (ἀρετος) denotes not the object but the gender of the second half (κοιτην). This is patently not the case if the LXX of the verses in Leviticus lies behind ἀρετοκοται, whether in encouraging the formation of the word itself or in informing its meaning.

But before looking more closely at the evidence of linguistic structure, we should note that Boswell stresses the coarseness and active licentiousness of the 'sleeping' denoted by κοιτην. 'In this and other compounds [it] corresponds to the vulgar English word “fucker,” a person who, by insertion, takes the “active” role in intercourse' (p. 342). This is not a point of great moment, but is worth a brief examination. Unfortunately no parallels are adduced in support of Boswell's assertion, and it is uncertain which other compounds he had in mind. Of two standard listings, comprising twenty-two compounds of κοιτην, most of them of very rare occurrence, there is scarcely a single example to corroborate Boswell's claim. Only four designate those who engage in nonmarital intercourse—κλωυκοτης (seeking illicit sex), δουλοκοτης (sleeping with slaves), μητροκοτης (engaging in incest), and ανδροκοτης (having intercourse with a man). In none of these compounds, except possibly the last, does the second component -κοτην appear to carry the weight Boswell seeks to assign to it in ἀρετοκοται. To set against these four are
who indulge in sex with other men. To Boswell the phrase makes sense only if ἀρεννος is the object of ἀρεννοκοίτας (p. 344 n. 22). Otherwise ἀρεννος would be wholly pleonastic or, if the gender of ἀρεννοκοίτας needed clarification, one would expect an adjective, ἀρεννικάς, rather than a noun. Such an argument ends up positing a most improbable grammatical construction for the phrase, and also prejudices a plausible meaning of it. In characterizing an alien people there is no little difference between tarring the whole of it with its toleration of male homosexuality and alluding to the obviously more limited prevalence of active male prostitution. Boswell comments on only one other occurrence of ἀρεννοκοίτας, the noun ἀρεννοκοίτα in a homily ascribed to Macarius the Egyptian. He suggests that the writer had conflated the biblical ἀρεννοκοίτας with ‘the more common’ ἄρεννομεία (p. 353 n. 51).

It is presumably true that the variation between the two spellings ἀρεννο- and ἀρεννο- in compounds is no more than a transcript of the variation between ἄρην and ἄρην and their respective derivatives. On this subject there has been considerable discussion, but, so far as I can discover, no writer has yet suggested the difference is other than one of dialectal diversity. Not once in the considerable literature on the question is it claimed that there might be some semantic significance in the variation. In summary terms, something of a shift took place from -rho-to -rho-, affecting especially Attic but not mainstream Ionian. Although -rho- spellings predominate in the LXX, the papyri of the Ptolemaic period and the New Testament, they are less common in the Roman and Byzantine eras in which the dominant Attic influence is apparent. Nevertheless fluctuation persists between the two forms, reflecting the diverse dialectal heritage of Koine Greek. Both spellings are found in modern Greek. But if no semantic import attaches to the difference between ἄρην and ἄρην, a fortiori it can scarcely be pertinent in the case of their compounds.

It is, however, Boswell’s contention that ‘In no words coined and generally written with the form ἀρεννο-’ is the prefix demonstrably objective’ (p. 344). In due course I will argue that this is indeed the case with ἀρεννοκοίτας itself, but first the wider evidence needs to be reviewed. Only some twelve compounds of ἀρεννο- are attested: ἀρεννικάς (and -βάσις), ἀρεννυόμενος, ἀρεννυόμενος, ἀρεννυόμενος, ἀρεννυόμενος, ἀρεννυόμενος, ἀρεννυόμενος, ἀρεννυόμενος, ἀρεννυόμενος, ἀρεννυόμενος. (Compounds of ἀρεννο-number twenty). Of these only the last five occur solely with ἀρεννο-; the rest are found also with ἀρεννο- as the first half. So the range of parallels

---

many others in which -χοίτης denotes the literal activity of sleeping or lying (e.g., ήμευροκοίτης, sleeping by day; χαμαυροκοίτης, sleeping on the ground; ἄνωθενοικητής, with ears large enough to sleep in; βορβοκοίτης, the mudcoucher—a kind of frog), as well as χοίτης and παραχοίτης which both mean ‘bedfellow’ or spouse. Nor does the picture change much if the enquiry is extended to include compounds of -χοίτης, -χοίτης and -χοίτης. (Both ἀρεννοκοίτης and ἀρεννοκοίτης are not infrequently attested). Here one encounters forms which quite patently exclude Boswell’s interpretation, e.g., συγχοίτης and ἀρχοίτης (both meaning ‘bedfellow, sleeping together with, having intercourse,’ like the verb δευτεροκοίτησιν), as well as others, e.g., πολυχοίτης (sleeping with many women or men) and ἀδελφοκοίτης (incest of brother and sister), which may bear a nuance of coarseness but hardly of thrusting activeness.

Boswell’s chief linguistic contention is that ‘In general ... those compounds in which the form ἀρεννο- occurs employ it objectively; those in which ἀρεννο- is found use it as an adjective.... In no words coined and generally written with the form ἀρεννο- is the prefix demonstrably objective; overlap occurs on a small scale in words containing “ἀρεννο-”’ (pp. 343, 344). Several comments are in order.

It is in the first place surprising that, having established the particular force of -χοίτης in the compound, Boswell did not go on to enquire whether in other compounds of -χοίτης the first half ever denoted who did the ‘sleeping’. In all, it seems, of the comparable compounds the first element in fact specifies the object of the ‘sleeping’ or its scene or sphere—what one might call its indirect object (e.g., χαμαυροκοίτης, sleeping on the ground; ἄνωθενοικητής, luller of winds; ήμευροκοίτης, sleeping by day). Thus we have δούλοικοίτης (sleeping with slaves, not slaves sleeping with others), μητροκοίτης (not mother who sleeps around), and πολυχοίτης (sleeping with many others). Inevitably -χοίτης has, as one might expect, a verbal force on which is dependent the object or adverb specified in the first half of the word.

Secondly, Boswell does not take sufficient account of the fact that both ἀρεννοκοίτης and ἀρεννοκοίτης forms are found. He does discuss one late occurrence of the latter, in an inscription at Thessalonica in honour of Basil I of Macedon, the ninth-century Byzantine emperor (A.D. 867-886), who had defeated the Arabs in Asia in 871 and 880:

βασιλεὺς οὐκ ἀρεννοκοίτης, ὀξοὶ ἀρεννοκοίτης ἀρεννοκοίτης. 11

This is addressed to the city of Thessalonica, assuring its citizens that, thanks to Basil, they need no longer fear the barbarians, a race of men
against which Boswell’s claim is to be tested is not very wide, nor can one be sure how much flexibility ‘generally written’ allows. Within these narrow limits (and excepting ἀρενοκοιτίας for the time being) Boswell is correct, but draws from the material untenable conclusions. It is in any case extremely hazardous to base the alleged difference of semantic significance of the two forms on so restricted a sample.

In so far as a distinction can be drawn between those compounds of the group in which the first element is the object of the second and those in which it supplies the qualifying gender of the second, we must start at the other end, with the second element, as was hinted above with reference to the compounds of ἀργετής. In most if not all of the compounds in which the second half is a verb or has verbal force, the first half denotes its object, irrespective of whether it is ἀρρενο- or ἀρενο- (e.g., ἀρενομοίᾳ, ἀρενομότης, ἀρενοβία, etc.). When the second part is substantive, the first half denotes its gender, as in all the five solely ἀρρενο- compounds isolated above, but again irrespective of the spelling (e.g., ἀρενοάρῳ and ἀρενοῦ, ἀρρενοβία, ἀρρενοβίασις and ἀρρενοβίασις, ἀρρενοδύσιος, ἀρρενοποιησις). Such a conclusion does not exactly take one by surprise, but it does suggest how ἀρενοκοιτίας should be interpreted.

To ascertain whether the direction in which all the evidence has so far pointed is the right one, we must now survey the occurrences of the term (ἀρενοκοιτία and ἀρενοκοιτία) in the literature of the patristic era. Since Boswell’s account of the use of the term is far from complete and no lexicon provides a full listing, an attempt will be made to give an exhaustive catalogue of its occurrences.

Of little help in clarifying its meaning are its first certain uses in 1 Cor. 6:9 and 1 Tim. 1:10, although this is not to deny that historical investigation of their sources or backgrounds may provide some evidence. To this we shall return. Likewise straightforward quotations of one or other of these verses are in themselves of no value. Some other isolated uses of the term throw no additional light on its meaning.3 But there are more occurrences than Boswell allows that do disclose the meaning it bore for the writer in question.

Aristides’ Apology was addressed to the emperor Hadrian and hence composed by A.D. 138 at the latest. Its polemic against the gods of the Greeks concentrates especially on their immoral behaviour. If human beings were to imitate them, they would become ἀνδροβάτες and ἀρενοκοιτικοί.4 A little later Aristides argues that if the laws are just, the gods are wholly unjust, having done contrary to the laws ἄλληλοι κοινοίς καὶ φαρμακάζοις καὶ μοιχίας καὶ κλοπάς καὶ ἀρενοκοιτίας.5 The coupling with μοιχία on each of these occasions (albeit separated once by κλοπάς) strongly suggests that ἀρενοκοιτία, ἀνδροβάτης and ἀρενοκοιτίας all carry the same basic meaning. Boswell endeavours to distinguish between them, however, in the following terms:

a) ἀρενοκοιτία designates female addiction to adultery or fornication.6 The context gives no support to this. The preceding paragraph deals solely with the doings of Zeus, the one before that of Kronos. Immediately before the sentence containing ἀρενοκοιτία Zeus’s passion for Ganymede is mentioned. ‘Hence it happened, Emperor, to mankind to imitate all these things and to become μοιχος καὶ ἀρενοκοιτικοί and to engage in other dreadful practices in imitation of their god.’ The fuller Syriac text likewise refers only to male sexual malpractice and includes a mention of ‘sleeping with men’.

b) ἀνδροβάτης designates a stator, one guilty of the rape of a free citizen. There may well be a hint of homosexual assault in the Greek word, but the context in Aristides is precisely the same as for ἀρενοκοιτία, the Syriac uses the same term for both (= ‘sleeping with men’), and other uses of ἀνδροβάτης and its cognates do not appear to specify rape as the homosexual abuse in question.

c) ἀρενοκοιτία still denotes prostitution, but Boswell fails completely in his attempt to show that Zeus could meaningfully be charged with prostitution.

It seems clear that Aristides employed three different words, each with its own nuance, to incriminate male homosexuality as unworthy of gods and men. The parallelism not only suggests the meaning of ἀρενοκοιτία but also confirms that the ἀρενο- element is the object.

Perhaps the most revealing occurrence of ἀρενοκοιτία is not noted by Boswell at all. It comes in Hippolytus’s account of the founder of the Naassene Gnostics:

ο οὔ η λάξεως παρανόμων ἡμείς προσῆλθε γὰρ τῇ Ἑιδώλια τῆς θείας κοινότητας μας καὶ ἑμοί μᾶς ἄνθρωπος καὶ κατανέμεθα αὐτοῦ, ἑπὶ τῶν παρανόμων προσῆλθε διά τι τῇ Ἀδωναὶ καὶ ἑγεμόνι παρανόμων ἔδεχθη καὶ μας ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἀρενοκοιτίας. ἔδεξεν γένος μοιχεία καὶ ἀρενοκοιτία.7

This could scarcely be clearer, and cannot sustain Boswell’s version of the word-structure and meaning of ἀρενοκοιτία.
In reviewing citations and echoes of Lev. 18:22 and 20:13 in early Christian literature we have noted Eusebius's assertion that Moses forbade ἁμολογίαν and ἀρενοκοσίας, μηδὲ τὰς παρὰ φύσιν ἀνδρῶν διωκείν. Boswell contends that the word cannot here refer to homosexual activities because it is distinguished from 'pleasures against nature', and because Eusebius is here presenting a paraphrase of Matt. 5:28 which has in mind the attitude of men towards women. He concludes that Eusebius understood ἀρενοκοσίας to mean male prostitution servicing women (p. 351). Whether it is a sound inference from μηδὲ κ. ο. λ. that what precedes it cannot be 'contrary to nature' is very dubious, nor does it make bad sense of Eusebius's sequence of thought if ἀρενοκοσίας means male homosexuality. For if one explains this word in heterosexual terms, one is still left with 'the pursuit of pleasures contrary to nature'. If this phrase denotes non-heterosexual acts between human beings, then why should not ἀρενοκοσίας denote (non-heterosexual) homosexuality? If it denotes something like (heterosexual?) bestiality, it is still hard to see how this could be appropriate in the context if male homosexuality is not. We could paraphrase Eusebius's paraphrase thus: 'Moses forbade adultery and male homosexuality, but I do not allow my disciples even to look lustfully on a woman [let alone a man]'. In any case, the evidence adduced earlier from Eusebius shows him asserting unambiguously that Moses forbade female and male homosexuality (ὁδηγὸν πρὸς ἄρενος μίτες). The Syriac writer Bardesanes who flourished at the turn of the second and third centuries records different ethnic attitudes to male homosexual intercourse. Eusebius gives an extract in Greek. Beyond the Euphrates a person accused of murder or of theft will not be angered, δι' οὗ ἄρενοκοσίας λοιπόν μεταφέρεται ἐκείνη μεταφέρεται κύριο καὶ φίλου. The Syriac here denotes 'lying with men', using the same vocabulary as in 1 Cor. 6:9, 1 Tim. 1:10. Male prostitution is definitely excluded. We thus have corroboration that ἁμολογίαν for Eusebius specified male homosexuality activity, whether with youths or adults. (We will return to this aspect of the question.)

We must next note some occurrences of the term in question in which it is paralleled to παρόδοφρα, i.e., male homosexuality with teenagers which was of course the dominant form of male homosexuality among the Greeks. The term was a critical way of referring to παρόδοφρα and can certainly not be restricted to child-molesting.

Theophilos of Antioch twice lists the trio of vices, μοιχεία, πορνεία and ἁμολογία.
prohibitions in the Didache's order in its more expansive review of the law of life—οὐ μορφεῖτε...οὐ παιδοφοβεῖτε...οὐ πονεῖτε."

The elevation of the ban on παιδοφοβεία and πονεία to a rank alongside the Decalogue's prohibition of μορφεία almost certainly took place in Jewish circles exposed to the immorality of the Greek world.** Within the Mosaic corpus, Lev. 18:22 and 20:13 provided all the authority that was needed to justify the ban on pederasty.

What seems clear is that Christian writers associated this prohibition which they took over as part of the ethical legacy of Hellenistic Judaism with the ἀφανοκοιτεια in 1 Cor. 6:9 and 1 Tim. 1:10. Not only do we find the trio of μορφεία, πονεία, and παιδοφοβεία paralleled by that of μορφεία, πονεία, and ἀφανοκοιτεια, but in Origen both threefold listings occur. While the meaning assigned to παιδοφοβεία in early Christian writings remains to be considered, the parallelism clearly excludes Boswell's interpretation of ἀφανοκοιτεια. Christian writers and teachers identified ἀφανοκοιτεια with the commonest form of active homosexuality current in the Hellenistic world, that is, the relationship between an adult male and a youth of teenage years.

We have yet to consider the occurrence of ἀφανοκοιτεια in the Sibylline Oracles, which may be one of the earliest appearances of the word after the Pauline writings and may indeed derive from a period roughly contemporary with them. In book 2 are found the following three lines:

71 σπάραμαι μὴ κλέπτειν: ἡπάραςασκέτες ἐκ τῆς εἰκός
ἐξ ἐνεκάς εὐδοκῶν, ἐς ἕποντα ποτῶν
μὴ ἀφανοκοιτείταν, μὴ συσσαρατείταν, μήτε φοινεύειν."

They belong to a section of the book (2:56-148) which most scholars hold to be derived from the collection of Jewish-Hellenistic gnomic wisdom attached to the pseudonym of Phocylides (lines 5-79). Since, however, this block of material is present in only one branch of the manuscript tradition, it was presumably interpolated into book 2 after the composition of this book, which is normally placed around the middle of the second century A.D.** Furthermore, lines 72-73 above are among the twenty or so lines inserted into this material from Ps-Phocylides (in which Or.Sib. 2:71 is line 18). The latest editor of Ps-Phocylides' Sentences is inclined to assign their origin to Alexandria within the period 30 B.C. - 40 A.D.** A wide variety of scholarly hypotheses has been advanced about the poem's character and purpose. Difficulty in placing it with assurance arises largely because so much of

it has parallels in both Jewish ethical teaching, especially the Pentateuch and Wisdom literature of the LXX, and Greek gnomological traditions. Van der Horst draws attention to its heavy use (in lines 9-41) of Lev. 19 as a kind of summary of the Torah, suggesting that at the beginning of the Christian era this chapter was held to be a central one in the Pentateuch. Although the line containing ἀφανοκοιτεία is not part of Ps-Phocylides, this writer's disapprobation of homosexual conduct, often joined with adultery, is unmistakable:

μὴ γαμολάπλετεν μὴ άτρατα Κύριαν άφρον... μὴ παραδίδεσθε εὐνοῦς κύριοιν... οὐδὲ άυτοῖς θήρεσιν οἱκεν... παιδίς ὕπομορφον φορεῖται ψηφίσιν ἑραν... πολλαὶ γὰρ λατρείας πρὸς άτρατα μετίν έρωτος."

The sentiment of the interpolated line 73 therefore accords closely with the source of the block into which it has been inserted, and the inspiration of Leviticus may suggest a more localized connection with the part of the block in which it is found, if the language of Lev. 18 and 20 LXX lies behind ἀφανοκοιτεια, as has been argued above. Considerations of this kind have led some scholars to the conclusion that the Sibyllines' text of this material preserves an earlier form of Ps-Phocylides' lines 5-79. The sequence of Or. Sib. 2:71-73 has been specifically appealed to in support of this case.**

If, however, we adhere to the consensus which regards Or. Sib. 2:56-148 as an interpolated interpolation from Ps-Phocylides, it remains true that the insertion of lines 72-73 fits in remarkably well with the spirit and language of Ps-Phocylides no less than of the Sibylline collection—which is elsewhere repeatedly and emphatically hostile to male homosexual activity.** Although the restriction of book 2:56-148 to only one family of the manuscripts would naturally lead one to suppose that the additional insertions not derived from Ps-Phocylides were made at the same time as the main interpolation, and therefore later than c. 150 A.D. and by a Christian hand (for it is agreed that books 1-2 of the Sibyllines represent a Christianized revision of a Jewish original), the block may have come to the Christian interpolator with the further insertions, in particular lines 72-73, already present. We have suggested the common influence of Leviticus 19 and environs on the context of lines 72-73 and on line 73 itself. Line 72 is notably Jewish in character.
It has further been argued that lines 3-4 of Ps-Phocylides, which immediately precede the block incorporated into the Sibyllines, inspired some of the additions inserted in this block.1 Thus γαμοκλοπίαν (line 3 cited above) is echoed in Or. Sib. 2:53 (οί δὲ γαμοκλόποι γάμων τε, γαμοκλοπίαν τέ ἀπὸγυνού), and μῆς ἀρσεν Κύπριν ὅρισεν ενώκει μὴ ἀφανακοχτεῖν in 2:73. This is entirely plausible and prompts a speculative suggestion about the choice, and perhaps even the very formation, of the word ἀφανακοχτεῖν. A Christian editor, when transferring a block of material from Ps-Phocylides replete with Levitical associations, transposed the patently, even offensively, secular Greek reference to ἀρσεν Κύπριν (i.e., originally Aphrodite) into a compound term suggested by the proscription of Lev. 18:22, 20:13 LXX. It perhaps remains more likely that this occurrence of ἀφανακοχτεῖν is to be ascribed to the interpolator of the material from Ps-Phocylides, working at some date after c. 150 A.D., but the use of ἀφανακοχτεῖν strengthens rather than weakens the case for the existence of this section of the poem already in its expanded form before it found its way into one branch of the Sibyllines' manuscript tradition. That is to say, the enlargement of the section by some or all of the insertions but including at least lines 72-73 may well have been carried out by a Jewish writer like Ps-Phocylides himself. Whether this expansion belonged to the textual history of the Ps-Phocylidean collection or to the Jewish, pre-Christian history of book 2 of the Sibyllines can only be a matter of further speculation. The suggestive possibility for the purpose of the present enquiry consists in its identifying a very plausible milieu for the origination of the word ἀφανακοχτεῖν, viz., a Hellenistic Jewish setting under marked Levitical inspiration seeking a decently Jewish way of speaking about ἀρσεν Κύπριν.

The appearance of ἀφανακοχτεῖν in a work by Rhetorius, an Egyptian astrologer of the sixth century A.D., provides no precise guidance on the meaning of the term. It occurs twice in lists of vices generated by Aphrodite in those born under the signs of the Ram and the Twins.2 Rhetorius' use of the word merits a mention only because one of his sources, not least in respect of this chapter, was probably Teucer of Babylon in Egypt. Teucer, who wrote around the beginning of the Christian era, exerted a wide influence, but only fragments of his work are extant. They contain nothing similar to the catalogues of vices including ἀφανακοχτεῖν.3

It remains to take account of some other occurrences of ἀφανακοχτεῖν, especially some that Boswell has noted. One of the collection of homilies that bears the name of Macarius of Egypt declares that the men of Sodom did not repent 
καὶ ἐκατέκαυσαν αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ ἀφανοκοχτεῖν ἄρσεν (p. 353 n. 51). However, he blurs the force of this concession by groundless philological speculation and by invoking the uncertain authorship and date of the collection. In reality, the author can now be placed and dated within half a century with a fair degree of assurance.4 The use of ἀφανακοχτεῖν by this writer clearly carries the implication of forcible homosexual activity, almost homosexual rape.

In one of the earliest Greek penitentials, traditionally attributed to John the Faster (Joannes Jejunator) of Constantinople (d. 595), is encountered a use of ἀφανακοχτεῖν which in Boswell's view 'would seem to preclude absolutely interpreting this word as referring to homosexual intercourse'.5 In order to determine appropriate penance the priest must enquire about the penitent's sexual activity. Amongst other things he must ask about ἀφανακοχτεῖν, of which there are three kinds, of escalating gravity—passive, active, and both passive and active. At this point ἀφανακοχτεῖν is not defined. Boswell suggests it denotes 'anal intercourse', but acknowledges that semantically this is an impossible construction, and leaves it untranslated (p. 364 n. 25). The reader is given no clue to the grounds on which Boswell finds it to mean 'anal intercourse'. He holds, however, that it cannot refer to homosexual activity generically, partly because of the further occurrence shortly to be discussed, and partly because elsewhere the priest is instructed to enquire about other types of homosexual activity, viz., mutual masturbation (if this is what παλαικτία means here) and παιδεραστία. The latter argument in itself is not conclusive in excluding 'homosexuality between (adult) males' as the meaning of ἀφανακοχτεῖν. Much rests on a sentence that comes at the end of a paragraph on incest: τὸ μὲν γὰρ τὰς ἀφανοκοχτεῖνς μοῦδα πολλοὶ καὶ μετὰ τῶν γυναικῶν αὐτῶν ἐκτελοῦσιν. Boswell again does not translate ἀφανοκοχτεῖνς, but he clearly implies that 'their wives' are the sexual partners of many in ἀφανοκοχτεῖν. It certainly cannot be accommodated within Boswell's standard interpretation of male prostitution; husbands can scarcely be said to serve their own wives as male prostitutes.
Improbable though it may seem at first sight, the proper meaning of ἄρσηνοκτία should probably be maintained here. The preceding paragraph deals solely with the range of possible female partners in male incest; there is no suggestion of mode or position of incestuous intercourse. The writer’s formula for incest is πέπρατον ἕνίκα with the accusative of the female relative involved. Having mentioned sister, cousin, mother-in-law and others, he comes to the peak of perversity: συναναλισ συναναλα
coring homosexual relations in all their manifestations, yet nowhere does he employ the word which supposedly means ‘homosexual’ in Paul’s writings’ (p. 346). This turns out to refer solely to Dem. Evang. 4:10, a passage which at most alludes to Rom. 1:26-27, if that.** Indeed, a citation of any New Testament text would have been quite out of place, for Eusebius is summarising the instructions given to Israel through Moses.

v) Chrysostom is Boswell’s star witness. The prosecutor deserves to be heard at length before some rejoinder is entered:

Saint John Chrysostom probably wrote more about the subject of same-sex sexuality than any other pre-Freudian writer except Peter Damian. In dozens of works he discusses or mentions it. Greek was his native language, the patristic Greek of the later Empire, thoroughly imbued with the Koiné of the New Testament. His writings abound with New Testament references, and he quotes from all the Pauline epistles with accuracy and facility. Yet among the dozens of words and phrases used by Chrysostom to name, describe, or characterize homosexual relations, neither “dpxotvoxxoi” nor any derivative of it occurs in any of these writings. This absence is particularly notable in several instances where the use of the word would seem almost inevitable if it were indeed related to homosexuality: in his commentary on Romans 1:26, for instance where he quotes 1 Corinthians 6:18 in a discussion of Roman homosexual behavior but does not refer to the text in the only nine verses before where homosexuality is allegedly mentioned by name (see text in app. 2). It is even more striking that in discussing the supposedly homosexual activities of the people of Sodom, he quotes directly from the list of sins in 1 Corinthians 6:9 and 1 Timothy 1:10, yet he does not mention the one word which translators would have us believe refers specifically to homosexuality.

All this is convincing enough, but the final proof lies in the fact that after writing so copiously on the subject of homosexual relations in every exegetical work where the text could possibly suggest a connection—e.g., Genesis 19, Romans 1—and even some which do not—Titus, for instance—Chrysostom does not mention as much as one word about homosexuality when expounding on the very places where “dpxotvoxxoi” occurs; in his commentaries on 1 Corinthians 6:9 and 1 Timothy 1:10 there is not a hint about sexual activity between persons of the same sex. In fact on several occasions Chrysostom copied out the list of sins from Corinthians and actually omitted the one word which is claimed to mean homosexual;** considering his feelings on the subject, abundantly evidenced in many works, it is virtually inconceivable that he would have done so had he understood the term to refer to what he elsewhere called “the worst of all sins.”

There are several inaccuracies in these paragraphs, which provide a revealing example of Boswell’s type of exposition:

a) His statement that ‘neither “dpxotvoxxoi” nor any derivative of it occurs in any of these writings’ is corrected by his own n. 34 on the same page. Not only does Chrysostom cite 1 Cor. 6:9 in full in his fifth homily on Titus, but in his homily on the passage itself he comments that many were critical that Paul placed the drunkard and the curser alongside the μοιχας, ησυχρητος and δ ἀσεμνοτος.

b) According to Boswell, in De perfecta caritate 7-8 (PG 56, 288-290) Chrysostom discusses the homosexuality of the Sodomites, ‘quotes directly from’ the list of sins in 1 Cor. 6:9 and 1 Tim. 1:10 but does not use ἀσεμνοτος. This last point is true. After stressing that the one offence of the Sodomites was that they παρενεμανον, some thirty lines later he comes to talk further about divine punishment, in this life and the next. He mentions Pharaoh and the Egyptians and the captivity of Israel. Why are some punished here and not others? οἱ μὲν τῶν μοιχῶν τιμωροῦνται, οἱ δὲ τελευτῶσιν ἀμώμητοι; πόσο τριβωρύχοι διάφρονως; πόσοι λεημνωτα; πόσοι πλανοντα; πόσοι ἄρρηται; Does the use of μοιχῶν, πλανοντα and ἄρρηται constitute direct quotation from 1 Cor. 6:9-10? (None of Chrysostom’s language here is found in 1 Tim. 1:10). The whole construction of the passage is quite different from Boswell’s summary.

c) It is difficult to see why in his Homil. on Titus 5:4 (PG 62, 693-694) Chrysostom should quote 1 Cor. 6:9 between a reference to the punishment of the Sodomites solely because they παρενεμανον and a rebuke to those of his hearers who τοῖς μεν ἄρρηται ώς θηλείας μητρωνείς, if the connexion did not hinge on ἀσεμνοτος. He may not say in so many words ‘the Sodomites were ἀσεμνοτος’ but the implication is clear enough and alone makes sense of the citation.

d) ‘On several occasions,’ asserts Boswell, Chrysostom copied out the list of sins from 1 Cor. 6:9-10 but omitted ἀσεμνοτος. Only two examples are given in the footnote, one of which is the homily on 1 Cor. 6, on which, as we have seen, Boswell is mistaken. The other occasion offers a partial citation (‘Do not be mistaken: neither πόροι nor μαλακοί will inherit the kingdom of God’) in the context of a discussion about Paul’s authority as a teacher. I have come across no other instance that bears out Boswell’s contention.
Yet there is no doubt that Chrysostom rarely used ἀπαίνοοιχεῖν. But is one justified in supposing that his use of it in commenting on Rom. 1:26 'would seem almost inevitable' if it denoted homosexuality? The homily itself gives an uncompromising, unambiguous and extended indictment of the vice. Is it surprising that in his homily on 1 Tim. 1 he makes no allusion to homosexual activity? He does not explain or discuss any of the sins listed in 1 Tim. 1:10, but would it not be foolish to detect in this exercise of homiletic liberty anything whatsoever about Chrysostom's attitude to any of its catalogue of sins?

What is the force of this argument from linguistic silence of which Boswell makes much (and which he has considerably exaggerated)? Romans 1:26-27 provided a much more explicit biblical condemnation, and πανδοκαρπία a term which more closely specified the prevalent form of male homosexual activity in the Greco-Roman world. Failure to use a particular word may indicate any number of things, e.g., greater familiarity with other words or phrases, and reluctance to use a word which, in this instance, clearly never became part of everyday speech and retained a certain technical character. Of itself non-use reveals nothing about a word's meaning; only use clarifies meaning. And Boswell has signally failed to demonstrate any use of ἀπαίνοοιχεῖν etc. in which it patently does not denote male homosexual activity. The only possibility is the occurrence in John the Faster, where even Boswell has to resort to a wholly unprecedented meaning. This appearance of the term can therefore scarcely be regarded as determinative for its other occurrences, which are sufficiently revealing to put its meaning beyond doubt.

Professor Boswell devotes only very limited attention to the evidence of the early versions for the meaning of ἀπαίνοοιχεῖν. The three most significant versions are the Latin, Syriac and Coptic. For the pre-Vulgate Latin translations of the term a critical presentation of the evidence is available only for 1 Tim. 1:10. The main preference is for masculorum concubitores, with concubitores alone and stupratores (or puerorum stupratores) also indicated. Citations of 1 Cor. 6:9 show a similar preference in the early Latin version of Irenaeus' Adversus Haereses, in Tertullian, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyprian's two quotations have masculorum appetitores (adpetitores). The latter clearly reflects an understanding of ἀπαίνοοιχεῖν in which ἀπαίν- is the object of the second half of the word, and the same is implied by masculorum concubitores. The latter word seems to be a coinage of early Christian Latin, and the phrase was scarcely used at all in the early centuries outside of a biblical sphere of reference. In its usage there is nothing to support Boswell's assertion that 'to a Latin speaker the phrase would clearly imply acts of prostitution rather than sexual inclination' (p. 348).

For the Old Syriac version of the New Testament other than the Gospels only quotations provide evidence. The Peshitta text of 1 Cor. 6:9, 1 Tim. 1:10 breaks ἀπαίνοοιχεῖν into three words, literally 'those who lie with men'. This appears to be a direct translation of the Greek word. Confirmation that Syriac speakers read the word in this way is provided by the evidence advanced earlier from Bardesanes and Eusebius's Greek version of part of his text, and from the Syriac translation of Aristides' Apology which may be dated c. 350 A.D. and therefore antedates the Peshitta.

Like the Syriac, the Coptic versions in both the Sahidic and Bohairic dialects render the Greek word by two Coptic words 'lying (or sleeping) with males'. There is no ambiguity about the interpretation of ἀπαίνοοιχεῖν in the Coptic Churches of the third and fourth centuries. The result is that none of the three primary versions of the New Testament affords any support for Boswell's thesis.

This enquiry has concentrated on the use of ἀπαίνοοιχεῖν etc., and on its supposed linguistic form. An alternative approach to its meaning in the New Testament would examine the background to the lists of vices in which it appears in 1 Cor. 6:9 and 1 Tim. 1:10. There is no lack of literature on this subject and no point in retracing well-trodden paths. Most previous studies conclude that the kinds of lists encountered in our two verses developed in late Judaism exposed to strong Hellenistic influences, but they have failed to produce a comparable list in which ἀπαίνοοιχεῖν or its equivalent appeared prior to 1 Corinthians. Nevertheless, that Hellenistic Jewish writings unambiguously condemned the homosexuality encountered among the Greek world is not in doubt. At the same time the moral philosophers of the Hellenistic era were increasingly coming to question homosexual indulgence. The presumption is thus created that ἀπαίνοοιχεῖν came into use, under the influence of the LXX of Leviticus, to denote that homoerotic vice which Jewish writers like Philo, Josephus, Paul and Ps-Phocylides regarded as a signal token of pagan Greek depravity. It is not apparent that investigation of the sources of the New Testament's Lasterkataloge serves to establish further than this the meaning of the term. But it is probably significant that

But Zaas is wrong when he goes on to claim that most examples of the word are found in the moral literature of Hellenistic Judaism and from the syncretistic astrological literature (p. 209), and in his attempt to associate it with idolatry.

Kretschmer and Locker, pp. 40 (xων), 495, 711 (xων), 591, 715 (xων). Buck and Petersen, pp. 163 (xων), 491 (xων). Together they list 26 compounds of -xων, 12 of -ων, and 18 (Kretschmer and Locker alone) of -ων.

Boswell suggests (p. 343 n. 20) that αδηνωονια yields the same meaning whether αδηνριος or the object of xων. It is attested solely in Theophilus of Antioch, Ad Autolycum 1:9, 3:6 (PG 6, 1037, not 1023, as Boswell). 1129, SC XX, 76, 214). On the first occasion it is charged against Jupiter together with xων and παρον. On the second Epicurus and the Stoics are accused of inculcating it and αδηνωονια. Since a few lines previously Epicurus is credited with counselling men xων and μηδενιος and αδηνωονια, the objective force of αδηνριος in διανωνια is clearly implied. This would agree with the semantics of most other compounds with αδηνριος. At one point Boswell claims (p. 343 n. 19) that, had Paul used αδηνωονια instead of αδηνωονια, it would not have been ambiguous. This seems to rest on the assumption that whereas αδηνριος is a proper noun, αδηνωονια may be either a noun or an adjective. This is not the case. If compounds of αδηνωονια are of uncertain meaning, the uncertainty is not rooted here. The αδηνωονια is a proper noun. In any case, there are compounds of αδηνριος, such as αδηνωονια and αδηνωονια, in which it is not the object of the second part but qualifies it like an adjective.

Compounds of αδηνωονια- and αδηνωονια- are rarely discussed in the specialist literature. P. Chantre, Dictionnaire Etymologique de la Langue Grecque. Histoire des Mots, vol. 1 (Paris 1968) 116, translates αδηνωονια as 'pédéraste', and merely comments that most of the αδηνωονια-composites are of a technical character and often late.

Anthology Palatina 9:586 line 5; Anthologie Grecque, pt. 1: Anthologie Palatina,
only—masculorum 10 "Browning, R. (Gottingen vol. 1:60, p.

The of Fragm. Hellenistic of this occasion. 489; W. 1907) is

Thebes, 1043-1056. 1907) does Liddell-Scott-Jones, s.v.; Lampe, s.v. Boswell quotes (with another incorrect reference) Justin, 2 Apol. 12.5; Δίκας και διαμομένα μεταμορφώσεις εν το θρόνω, but nothing in Justin secures his interpretation of 'rape of males by males'. For a similar criticism cf. Tatian, Adv. Graecos 10—a god who makes Ganymede his cupbearer and the καταβατικοὶ συνομιλούν.

Refut. Omn. Haer. 5:26:22-23 (GCS 26, 130).

See n. 6 above.

Boswell is left with the task of showing where Moses forbade male prostitution serving women. He suggests (in another incomplete reference, p. 351 n. 46) that Eusebius' ἐρωτηματικὸν may be an allusion to Deut. 23:18 LXX, but the word there is περίποις, not ἐρωτηματικὸν,
For your consideration, I have included the key points from the image:


2. Prop. Evag. 5:10:25 (SC 43:1, 339); parallel Syriac text, Drijvers, p. 46. Male prostitution is obviously excluded. Elsewhere Bardanes uses two other expressions, literally "marry the men as wives" (Drijvers, pp. 48, 49), and "take mates" as partners in marriage (ibid., pp. 52-53, 60-61).

3. Ad Autolyc. 1:2 (SC 20, 60)—"Show me yourself, ti ois et *muton, ti ois et *nepos, ti ois et *arxaias" (1:14 (SC 29, 91)—for those who are full of *muton and *nepos and *arxaias there awaits wrath.


15. Cf. K. J. Dover, Greek Homosexuality (London 1978) esp. pp. 16, 85-87; L. P. Wilkinson, Classical Attitudes to Modern Issues (London 1978) 116-117, 121. Relationships were generally entered into between young men and teenagers of 12-18 years. Kinship desire of partners of the same age group was almost unknown in Greek homosexuality. The relationship was essentially that of the ruler and the ruled, which helps to explain why *nepos was used of the younger partner even when reaching adult height.


20. E.g., A. Kurkess, 'Das Mahnheld des sogenannten Phocylides im zweiten Buch der Oraclia Sibyllina', ZNW 38 (1939), pp. 171-174; 'Das Verständnis von Or. Sib. II 71 (= Phok. 18) ist also durch V. 72 ein *katarros vermittelt, während der Vers bei Ps.-Phocylides (s. 180) eigentlich in der Luft hängt und kaum verständlich ist.' But Kurkess bases his case at this point too heavily on a strained reading of *katarros. This phrase has given rise to varied interpretations and emendations; cf. Van der Horst, pp. 124-125.


25. See n. 19 above.

26. See W. Jaeger, Two Rediscovered Works of Ancient Christian Literature: Gregory of Nyssa and Macarius (Leiden 1954) 208-270. Jaeger established Macarius's indebtedness to Gregory of Nyssa, which further questions the earlier thesis of Macarius's affinities with Messalianism. The homilies are ascribed to one Symeon in part of the tradition. Jaeger concludes that the unknown writer flourished around the mid-fifth century in the Near East, probably in the Syrian region. The edition by Hermann Dörries et al., op. cit., pp. i-x-x, has nothing to add on this question. It continues to ascribe the collection to the Messalian Symeon, and takes no account of Jaeger. Heinz Berthold's edition of other works of Macarius (Macarius/Symeon Reden und Briefe, vol. 1:1; GCS, 1973, i.f.f.) places the author in Syrian monastic circles towards the end of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century, and maintains the Messalian connexion.
P. 364 n. 26. Cf. p. 353 n. 51, and pp. 363-365, where Boswell gives an English translation of the section from PG 88, 1893, 1896. McNeill, op. cit. (n. 1 above), p. 53, follows Boswell here and describes this use as of the utmost importance for understanding ἄστρονοια. The sixth-century Byzantine writer, Joannes Malalas, in his Chronographia 18:167-168 (PG 97, 644) uses ἄστρονοια of homosexual relations interchangeably with καταθλησια and ἀπάθεια, as Boswell recognizes (p. 172 n. 10). Later, however, Boswell assimilates ἄστρονοια here to καταθλησια as 'illicit relations with boys' (p. 353 n. 51). Nothing explicit in Malalas indicates that this was the precise nature of the offence.

'Appropriately 'daughters'.'

'Minucius does not even cite the evidence of the Scriptures except once or twice in a very obscure manner... Where he might have easily gone nearer to the words of the Bible, he is content to allude rather obscurely', H. J. Baylis, Minucius Felix and His Place among the Early Fathers of the Latin Church (London 1928) 145, 153. It is nowhere near the mark to say (Boswell, p. 349) of either Ausonius or Cyprian or Minucius Felix that they 'discuss homosexual relations in considerable detail and with large vocabularies'.

See nn. 22, 23, 37 above.

See above nn. 6, 34. The latter occurrence is not mentioned by Boswell.

'πάντα ἀπαθηκοηθάντα ήδημον γάμου καὶ πᾶσαν ἀπάθηκα πράξιν, γυναικών καὶ πάντων τὸ πρὸς γυναίκας, καὶ ἀρέτοις πρὸς ἀκραίνα μὲν... The last phrase is a common way of describing homosexuality, being found in Plutarch, Josephus and other writers.

Homil. in Th. 5.4 (PG 62, 693-4).

Homil. in 1 Cor. 16:4 (PG 61, 134-135), Boswell discusses this passage later, on p. 351.

If Boswell were right, one would then need to ask why, in connection with discussion of the Sodomics' homosexuality, Chrysostom should think of 1 Cor. 6:9 if ἄστρονοια did not provide the link. Boswell's reference (p. 348 n. 34) to Homil. on Matt. 42:41:3 (PG 57, 449) seems mistaken. The passage contains nothing of relevance.

Boswell gives a translation (pp. 359-362) of much of Chrysostom's homily.

Homil. in 1 Tim. 2:2 (PG 62, 511-512).

Although strictly irrelevant to this investigation of the meaning and use of ἄστρονοια, it is worth noting, if only to put the record straight, the inadequacy of Boswell's implication (pp. 348-349) that no Latin father cites 1 Cor. 6:9 in connexion with homosexuality. Gregory of Eloy (Tetricus Origens 10.23, 34; CCL 69, 81, 83) and Salvian (De gubern. Dei 7:18-82; CSEL 8, 182) both do so. Tertullian (De pudicit. 16:4; CCL 2, 132—masculorum concubitores) and Cyprian (Testim. 3:65; CCL 1, 155; De Domin. Orat. 12; CCL 3A, 96-97—masculorum adipiscatos/appetitores) both cite 1 Cor. 6:9 but in contexts that do not further clarify its meaning. According to Boswell (p. 349) Lactantius (Div. Inst. 5:9; CSEL 19, 425) 'quotes at length from the list of sins' in 1 Cor. 6:9 without using any word for homosexual. In fact, of his enumeration of seven types of sinner, only two (adulteri and fraudulentii) appear in the African Latin New Testament text reconstructed by H. von Soden, Das Lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur Zeit Cyprians. Texte und Untersuchungen, 33 (Leipzig 1909) 594.

It could be pertinently asked, if one were to take a leaf out of Boswell's book, why not Philo or Josephus use καταθλησια, nor Josephus κατατησιμα, and why, according to his lists, p. 347 nn. 31, 33) Clement did not use the latter and Chrysostom the former.

P. 348 with n. 36. He regards masculine concubitores as a somewhat misleading translation of ἄστρονοια.
Woman Before and
After the Fall: a comparison of
Luther's and Calvin's interpretation of
Genesis 1–3
DAVID F. WRIGHT

The status and role of woman in relation to man, and more specifically of wife in relation to husband, may be considered one of the last issues on which the contemporary Christian community may learn from the past. Has it not arisen as a distinctively modern question, posed almost by the very inadequacy of traditional attitudes and convictions? In historical fact the evangelical tradition has probably displayed less uniformity on this subject than is commonly supposed. Be that as it may, it is worthwhile examining the contribution of significant shapers of this tradition, especially at the level of biblical exegesis. What did Luther and Calvin make of the portrayal of woman in relation to man in Genesis 1–3? For Luther, we will use his Lectures on Genesis, which he began in June 1535, broke off at Genesis 3:15 and then resumed in January 1536; and for Calvin, the Commentary on Genesis, which he commenced in 1550 and brought to publication four years later.

Before the Fall
Luther’s vision of human life before the Fall was a very rosy one. Indeed he repeatedly stresses that because of the disabling effects of the Fall we can no longer imagine how wonderful was the experience of Adam and Eve. Yet, from the first, the female was inferior to the male. Here is Luther’s comment on Genesis 1:27:

Although Eve was a most extraordinary creature—similar to Adam as far as the image of God is concerned, that is, in justice, wisdom and happiness—she was nevertheless a woman. For as the sun is more excellent than the moon (although the moon, too, is a very excellent body), so the woman, although she was a most beautiful work of God, nevertheless was not the equal of the male in glory and prestige... This sex may not be excluded from any glory of the human creature, although it is inferior to the male sex.

At this stage Luther has no textual basis for such an assertion. Indeed, it cuts across what he recognizes to be the main import of this verse, namely, ‘that Eve, too, was made by God as a partaker of the divine image and of the divine similitude, likewise of the rule over everything.’ But he cannot forget that ‘the woman appears to be a somewhat different being from the man, having different members and a much weaker nature.’ Such comments anticipate what later verses will provoke him into saying.

What Luther means by woman’s created inferiority to man is made more puzzling by his comments on the fuller story of the making of woman in Genesis 2:18ff. Here he unambiguously ascribes her subjection to man to the sin of the Fall:

Eve was not like the woman of today; her state was far better and more excellent, and she was in no respect inferior to Adam, whether you count the qualities of the body or those of the mind.

Nothing that Luther says about God’s use of Adam’s rib touches upon this point, but the Hebrew word-play between ‘woman’ and ‘man’ in Genesis 1:23 provokes the following statement:

Whatever the husband has, this the wife has and possesses in its entirety. Their partnership involves not only their means but children, food, bed and dwelling; their purposes too are the same. The result is that the husband differs from the wife in no other respect than in sex; otherwise the woman is altogether a man. Whatever the man has in the home and is, this the woman has and is.

He can even say, in commenting on Genesis 3:16, that ‘if Eve had persisted in the truth, she would not only not have been subjected to the rule of her husband but she herself would also have been a partner in the rule which is now entirely the concern of males.

The pendulum swings back again, however, as Luther comes to the assault of Satan:

[Satan attacked] the weak part of the human nature, Eve the woman... Although both were created equally righteous, nevertheless Adam had some advantage over Eve. Just as in all the rest of nature the strength of the male surpasses that of the other sex, so also in the perfect nature the male somewhat excelled the female.

Adam would have defeated Satan! Luther has now virtually demoted unfallen woman to the moral inferior of man. No longer can his first comment be discounted as careless inconsistency, nor can woman’s inferiority be thought of solely in terms of physical weakness or secondary origin.

Calvin’s exegesis of Genesis 1:27 emphasizes the conjugal bond. The verse implies that the male on his own was only half a man. Hence Malachi 2:15 describes the pair created by God as ‘one man’ (cf. rsv mg.). Calvin’s first emphasis in treating Genesis 2:18 ff. is that ‘man was formed to be a social animal’.

...
In the conjunction of human beings, that sacred bond is especially conspicuous, by which the husband and wife are combined in one body and one soul.

This continues to be his main theme as he considers woman's creation as man's 'help'. Yet there are hints of something more than a harmonious society between the pair. Glancing back to chapter 1, Calvin affirms that 'the woman also, though in the second degree, was created in the image of God.' Moreover, the reciprocity involves not only woman's assignation as a help to the man but also man's 'filling the place of her head and leader'. The male's priority in creation entails the woman in being a complementary counterpart to him—the male, that is, is the datum by relationship to which the female's being is determined.10

Furthermore, when Calvin comes to Genesis 2:21-23, he almost assimilates his established interpretation of Genesis 1:27 to the later passage:

To the end that the conjunction of the human race might be the more sacred, he purposed that both males and females should spring from one and the same origin. Therefore he created human nature in the person of Adam, and thence formed Eve, that the woman should be only a portion of the whole human race. This is the import of the words of Moses which we have had before [Gen. 1:27]. In this manner Adam was taught to recognise himself in his wife, as in a mirror; and Eve in her turn, to submit herself willingly to her husband, as being taken out of him.

But the theme of submission11 is secondary in Calvin's exposition to that of completeness, complementarity, mutual society and love.

Something was taken from Adam, in order that he might embrace, with greater benevolence, a part of himself... He now saw himself, who had before been only half complete [Latin, dimidius], rendered whole [integrum] in his wife.12

And in Genesis 2:23 Calvin represents Adam as saying:

Now at length I have obtained a suitable companion, who is part of the substance of my flesh, and in whom I behold, as it were, another self.13

We must note that Calvin nowhere uses Luther's language of inferiority,14 nor does he risk his reputation with hazardous speculations about Eve's greater vulnerability to Satan.

**Woman's marital and sexual role**

The marital and sexual role of woman, according to God's created order, has been hovering below the surface of the preceding paragraphs. Luther again magnifies the splendour of the age of innocence:

How blessed was that state of man in which the begetting of offspring was linked with the highest respect and wisdom, indeed with the knowledge of God!15

Prior to the Fall intercourse was as natural, sacred and 'respectable' as having a meal with one's wife.16 Luther interprets the Hebrew of the end of Genesis 2:18 (k'negādō) to mean 'which should be about him', i.e., the female 'should everywhere and always be about her husband.' He believed that the animals copulated only once a year; it was not so with Adam and Eve in God's intention.17 Moreover, 'in the state of innocence women would not only have given birth without pain, but their fertility would also have been far greater.' 'Women would have given birth to a much more numerous offspring'—by which Luther means at least more frequent multiple births of twins, triplets and quadruplets.18

The children that were born would not have needed their mother's milk for so long a time. Perhaps they would have stood on their feet immediately, as we see in the case of chicks, and would have sought their food without any effort on the part of their parents.19

In sketching woman's role in life, Luther's thoughts seem preoccupied with her child-bearing function: 'The entire female body was created for the purpose of nurturing children... Even little girls look after babies skilfully, but a man does it as clumsily as a camel trying to dance.20 The 'good' yet to be realized in Genesis 2:18 was the increase of the human race'. Woman was brought into being to be 'a helper for Adam, for he was unable to procreate alone.' The verse provokes Luther into an attack on 'people who do not want to have children', who fail to 'marvel at procreation as the greatest work of God'. The loneliness from which Adam needed to be delivered consisted in his lack of a partner for procreation. Hence Luther can even say:

Today, after our nature has been corrupted by sin, woman is needed not only to secure increase but also for companionship and protection

—as though these latter did not belong to God's purpose in creating woman alongside man. Luther's blinkered outlook is starkly expressed in the following sentence:

When God says: 'It is not good that man should be alone', of what good could he be speaking, since Adam was righteous and had no need of a woman as we have, whose flesh is leprous through sin?21
Churchman

It is also strange to find Luther fixing the establishment of the church—in God's preaching to Adam in Genesis 2:16-17—before Eve was created and hence before the creation of the first human society of home and household. Calvin's discussion of these texts lacks Luther's keen speculative interest, and also speaks far more of marriage than of procreation. 'They shall be one flesh', for example, evokes from Calvin little more than a clarification of monogamy as the divine pattern. As we have seen, Genesis 2:18 ('It is not good for man to be alone') speaks to Calvin of humanity's social calling in broader terms, it seems, than the marital union, although 'in the conjunction of human beings, that sacred bond is especially conspicuous.' The inter-personal relationship clearly looms far larger for Calvin than for Luther:

If the integrity of man had remained to this day such as it was from the beginning, that divine institution would be clearly discerned, and the sweetest harmony would reign in marriage; because the husband would look up with reverence to God: the woman in this would be a faithful assistant to him; and both, with one consent, would cultivate a holy, as well as friendly and peaceful partnership (societatem).

In exegeting carefully the particle in the last Hebrew word in Genesis 2:18 (k'neqədô), Calvin brings out the note of correspondence and equality between man and woman. A divergent interpretation is then refuted which is almost certainly Luther's:

Hence is refuted the error of some, who think that the word was formed only for the sake of propagation, and who restrict the word 'good', which had been lately mentioned, to the production of offspring. They do not think that a wife was personally necessary for Adam, because he was hitherto free from lust; as if she had been given to him only for the companion of his chamber, and not rather that she might be the inseparable associate of his life.

So the Hebrew particle 'is of importance, as intimating that marriage extends to all parts and usages of life.'

The effects of the Fall

How did the Fall affect the position and experience of woman, according to these Reformers' expositions of Genesis? 'We are today like a corpse of that first human being', says Luther. He descends to harsh, even crude, language to depict the fearful blight of 'the leprosy of sin' (as he repeatedly calls it) on womankind. His opinion that woman's subjection to man 'was imposed on her after sin and because of sin' has already been cited. This fate involves the loss of partnership in man's dominion and her confinement to household management. Here is part of Luther's comment on Genesis 3:16, where his Lectures follow the Vulgate in the third line: 'You will be under your husband's power' (rather than 'Your desire shall be unto your husband').

Eve has been placed under the power of her husband, she who previously was very free and, as the sharer of all the gifts of God, was in no respect inferior to her husband. Rule is now entirely the concern of males... The woman... is like a nail driven into the wall. She sits at home, and for this reason Paul, in Titus 2:5, calls her an oikourgos... The wife should stay at home, and look after the affairs of the household, as one who has been deprived of the ability of administering those affairs that are outside and that concern the state.

'Companionship', 'protection' and 'management of the household' devolved upon woman only after the Fall.

But this is only part of the story. Luther cites the popular saying, 'A wife is a necessary evil' (Calvin dismisses it as 'a vulgar proverb'). This side of the Fall 'we are compelled to make use of this sex in order to avoid sin', although one is ashamed to say so. Luther harps obsessively on the wife's sexual role as an antidote to male sin. 'Those who live outside the married state burn most shamefully.' The provision of coverings for nakedness showed that 'through sin the most useful members [of the body] have become the most shameful.' Marriage today is attended by 'epileptic and apoplectic lust'. It belongs to our penal condition that husbands cannot make use of their wives 'without shame', 'without the horrible passion of lust', and 'without a pleasure so hideous and frightful' that physicians compare it to epilepsy. The act of procreation degrades mankind almost to the level of the brute beasts. Furthermore, the female lot undergoes all the perils of pregnancy and the trials of childbirth:

From the time of conception, during birth, and during all the rest of her life, while she devotes herself to her children, she will encounter various dangers which are punishments for original sin. 'The female sex has been greatly humbled and afflicted, and it bears a far severer and harsher punishment than the male.'

And yet her plight is not totally wretched. In addition to the hope of eternal blessedness, Eve enjoys many compensations in her burdensome life. She is not repudiated by God, or deprived of the blessing of procreation. She 'keeps her sex and remains a woman'. She is not 'separated from Adam to remain alone and apart from her husband', and she retains 'the glory of motherhood'. Above all, she
nourishes the confident hope that 'from her will come the seed who will crush the head of Satan.' Godly women are enabled to 'delight in God's gifts and blessings and also bury the punishments, annoyances, pains, griefs and other things'—but only the godly. Godly husbands promote this, by transferring through marriage part of these punishments upon themselves. Nevertheless, although Luther never loses sight of the survival of the basic contours of God's created order, recognizable despite the depredation of sin, his instinctive emphasis in commenting on Genesis 1-3 is to sound the note of woe and distress. In dealing with the story prior to the Fall, he is quite incapable of refraining from delineating its effects. Hence many of the sentiments cited above hang pegless in contexts where Luther has outrun the text before him. Moreover, he also enunciates the principle that corruption has not stood still since that calamitous day. The world has gone on deteriorating, and the penalties have continually increased.44

Both Luther and Calvin devote rather more space in their commentaries to Genesis 3 than to each of the first two chapters. Calvin's altogether more disciplined method (Luther's exposition of these chapters is twice as long as Calvin's) precludes all but a couple of references to the consequences of the primal sin during his consideration of chapters 1-2. But on Genesis 2:18 he makes two points that do not appear on the later chapter. First he speaks of the 'strifes, troubles, sorrows, dissensions and boundless sea of evils' that have in large measure overwhelmed the 'sweetest harmony' that characterized marriage before the Fall. Secondly he alludes briefly to the additional service woman's sexual role fulfills since the Fall, in that man's 'depravity of appetite also requires a remedy'.53

Otherwise Calvin's sole comment on the particular impact of sin on womankind occurs on Genesis 1:3, where he again establishes a twofold penalty.54 Her 'pains' comprise 'all the trouble women sustain during pregnancy... until delivery, which brings with it the bitterest anguish. It is credible that the woman would have brought forth without pain, or at least without such great suffering if she had stood in her original condition.' Notice Calvin's cautious reserve in this last sentence, nor does he extend woman's special troubles into child-rearing. Her second great penalty is subject

For this form of speech, 'Your desire shall be unto your husband', is of the same force as if he had said that she should not be free and at her own command, but subject to the authority of her husband and dependent upon his will; or as if he had said, 'You will desire nothing but what your husband wishes'.

Calvin then somehow manages to make 'Unto you shall be his desire' (Genesis 4:7) mean the same thing, before concluding:

Thus the woman, who had perversely exceeded her proper bounds, is forced back to her own position. She had, indeed, previously been subject to her husband, but that was a liberal and gentle subjection; now, however, she is cast into servitude. Eve's 'liberal and gentle subjection' was obviously compatible with 'the sweetest harmony' in marriage. Now her 'servitude' will be experienced amid the clashes and tensions of a fallen partnership.

**Comments**

A comparison of the two Reformers' treatment of this theme in Genesis 1-3 provides a sound insight into their respective styles as biblical exegesis. Calvin's caution and sobriety contrast markedly with Luther's rumbustious vigour. It is not only the Christian feminist who will feel more at ease with Calvin than Luther (although one suspects neither will strongly appeal to her—or him); the serious Bible student will also know which of the two to prefer. Luther's exposition, to a greater extent than Calvin's, betrays the heavy-laden influence of the Augustinian tradition of interpretation, which maximized the perfection of life before the Fall (evident in Luther's speculations about hyperfertile and trouble-free child-bearing had not the Fall supervened) and hence heightened its disastrous consequences. Luther also found powerful illumination of the Genesis story in 1 Corinthians 7, especially verse 9—'better to marry than to be aflame with passion.' There can also be little doubt that we should discern, in their portrayals of woman's fortunes after the Fall, the outworking of Luther's weaker and Calvin's stronger doctrine of sanctification. *Simul justus, simul peccator* may be a better guide in soteriology than in ethics. Calvin also gives greater prominence than Luther to the social and interpersonal, rather than strictly sexual, dimensions of the relationships in which woman and wife are involved.

But Calvin's exegesis is by no means faultless. No less than Luther (and perhaps more culpably, since he recognized that the Hebrew did not support the Vulgate's version) he misinterpreted 'Your desire shall be for your husband' in Genesis 3:16. This failing leads him to exaggerate the wife's penal subjection to her husband as a consequence of the Fall. Both Reformers bequeathed an overdrawn prescription of male marital rule this side of the Fall.

Genesis, of course, cannot tell the whole story. If such and such were the damaging effects of the intrusion of sin upon the position and experience of woman and wife, how far were they undone by Christ the Redeemer? It is not sufficient to dismiss unwarranted inferences drawn from Galatians 3:28—in Christ Jesus neither male nor female. We must show how in Christ, through the Spirit,
Churchman

woman's and wife's fallen relations with man and husband are renewed. To address this question to the Reformers would require another article (which one suspects would be somewhat briefer than this!). In this study it is enough to have exposed the gross exegetical deficiencies of the Luther whose heroic achievement was commemorated in 1983, half a millennium after his birth, and to have shown that the more scholarly Calvin is not a wholly sure-footed guide in this area of contemporary Christian concern.

DAVID F. WRIGHT is senior lecturer in ecclesiastical history at New College, University of Edinburgh.
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4 Genesis 2:27 (WA 42, 51-2; LW 1, 68-9).
5 Genesis 2:18 (WA 42, 87; LW 1, 115).
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13 Genesis 2:25 (CO 23, 50; CTs 1, 135).

14 The only exception (Genesis 1:26; CO 23, 27; CTs 1, 96) occurs in a discussion of I Cor. 11:7 where Paul, as Calvin understands it, denies woman to be the image of God. The solution is short; Paul there alludes only to the domestic relation. He therefore restricts the image of God to government, in which the man has superiority over the woman and certainly he means nothing more than that man is superior in the degree of honor. 'The note of inferiority comes out more clearly in Calvin's sermons; cf. R. Stauffer, Die, la création et la providence dans la prédication de Calvin, Basler u. Berner Stud. z. hist. u. system. Theol., 33 (Peter Lang, Berne, Frankfurt and Las Vegas 1973), pp. 210-11, disagreeing with A. Bieler, L'homme et la femme dans la morale calviniste (Labor et Fides, Geneva 1963).
15 Genesis 1:28 (WA 42, 53; LW 1, 71).
16 Genesis 2:18 (WA 42, 109; LW 1, 116-17). cf. on 3:16, WA 42, 151; LW 1, 202).
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18 Genesis 2:22 (WA 42, 100; LW 1, 133) and 3:19 (WA 42, 162; LW 1, 217).
19 Genesis 2:15 (WA 42, 78; LW 1, 102).
20 Genesis 3:16 (WA 42, 151; LW 1, 202).
21 Genesis 2:18 (WA 42, 87-9; LW 1, 115-18).
22 Genesis 2:16-17 (WA 42, 79-80; LW 1, 103-5).
23 Genesis 2:24 (CO 23, 51; CTs 1, 136). Calvin already condemns polygamy, which he will continue to do as occasion arises in Genesis. The abuse seems to bother Luther much less. Contrast their comments on Lamech's polygamy (Gen. 4:19), WA 42, 233, LW 1, 1, 316-17, with CO 23, 99, CTs 1, 217.
24 Genesis 2:18 (WA 42, 46-7; CTs 1, 128-129).
25 Genesis 2:18 (WA 42, 47-8; CTs 1, 131).
26 Genesis 3:1 (WA 42, 56; LW 1, 73).
27 His Latin follows the Vulgate rendering, sub vivi potestate eris (WA 42, 138). The idiomatic German of his Old Testament (1523), du socht dichkuchen fur demen man, gave way to the more dignified dein wille sol denen Man unterworfen sein in the complete Bible of 1545 (WA Deutsche Bibel 8, 44-5). Calvin (see below) interpreted 'Your desire shall be unto your husband' (Ad vomum erit appetitus tuus) in the sense of Luther's Latin. NEB and NIV agree with RSV's 'Your desire shall be for your husband'.
28 Genesis 3:16 (WA 42, 151; LW 1, 202-3).
29 Genesis 2:18 (WA 42, 88; LW 1, 116).
30 Luther, Genesis 1:26 (WA 42, 51; LW 1, 67); Calvin, Genesis 2:18 (CO 23, 47; CTs 1, 129). By contrast before the Fall, says Luther, 'No other beautiful sight in the whole world appeared lovelier and more attractive to Adam than his own Eve.'
31 Genesis 2:18, 3:7, 22, 2:18, 1:28 (WA 42, 88, 89, 126, 100, 89, 93-4; LW 1, 116, 118, 116, 134, 118-19, 71). Just as, for Luther, marriage was almost a biological necessity for male chastity (cf. P. Althaus, The Ethics of Martin Luther [Fortress Press, Philadelphia 1972], pp. 86ff.), so he used Esther 1:12-17 to support rejection of a wife who refused matrimonial sex, and subsequent remarriage. 'If she refuses, get rid of her; take an Esther and let Vashti go'; Expose of Marriage (1522); WA 101, 290, LW 45, 33-4.
32 Genesis 2:8, 215, 3:17-19, 3:16 (WA 42, 54, 78, 153, 148, 149-50; LW 1, 71, 102, 205, 198, 200). Luther details the horrors of pregnancy at this last reference.
33 Genesis 3:16 (WA 42, 148, 150; LW 1, 199, 200-1).
34 Genesis 3:17-19 (WA 42, 153-5; LW 1, 206-7).
35 Genesis 2:18 (CO 23, 47; CTs 1, 130).
36 Genesis 3:16 (CO 23, 72; CTs 1, 171-2, where the Victorian modesty of the translator left the detailed pains of pregnancy untranslated in a footnote!).
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The chief historical value of the apocryphal gospels has traditionally been held to lie in the light they throw on popular Christian piety in the second and subsequent centuries, especially in strongly ascetic fringe circles. Their significance for the ministry of Jesus has rarely rated more than a cursory dismissal. A recent verdict starts with a qualification but reflects a long standing consensus:

By and large, the apocryphal gospels are secondary composition, manifestly dependent upon the four traditional Gospels, but otherwise abounding in legendary details and anachronisms... The doctrinal and apologetic interests of the apocryphal gospels are painfully apparent./1/

The Coptic Gospel of Thomas now constitutes a conspicuous exception to such an evaluation. That it preserves, at least in part, traditions of the teaching of Jesus independent of and perhaps more primitive than the Synoptic Gospels is probably now the judgment of a clear majority of scholars. But of no other apocryphal gospel could it be claimed that its historical importance for the Jesus-tradition is even a matter of widespread debate.

In an article published in 1980 Helmut Koester challenged the sharp dichotomy usually drawn between apocryphal and canonical gospels,/2/ arguing that 'five of these apocryphal gospels... are perhaps at least as old and as valuable as the canonical gospels as sources for the earliest developments of the traditions about Jesus. They are significant witnesses for the formation of the gospel literature in its formative stages'. They belong to a stage in its development 'comparable to the
sources which were used by the gospels of the NT. Koester's five candidates are the Gospel of Thomas, the Gospel of Peter, the fragments of Papyrus Egeria 2 known from its edition princeps as the 'Unknown Gospel', and the Apocryphon of James and the Dialogue of the Saviour from the Nag-Hammadi collection. This study will concentrate upon the Egeria papyrus gospel (hereafter UC) and the Gospel of Peter (EVPC).

First, however, comments are in order on the initial pages of Koester's study. Here he sets out to show that the external evidence of surviving manuscripts to the end of the third century and of quotations in Christian writers of the first two centuries reveals no preponderance of canonical over apocryphal gospels and warrants no distinction between the two. Since this introductory section is obviously intended to predispose the reader to a favourable reception of the theses he subsequently defends, an assessment of it is appropriate at the beginning of a critical examination of some of these theses.

Gospels: External Evidence

To Koester's list of extant gospel MSS from the second and third centuries three or four more should probably be added, but such minor adjustments would not alter the general picture. The catalogue comprises seventeen MSS containing one or more canonical gospels (twenty-one in all), and six manuscripts each containing one apocryphal gospel (three being copies of the Gospel of Thomas). Thus all four canonical and four apocryphal gospels are attested, although one of the latter, the so-called Fayoum Gospel (P. Vindob. G. 2325), is hardly more than an abridged version of Mark 14:27ff. In total numbers copies of the former outweigh the latter by between three and four to one, which constitutes a clear preponderance, despite Koester's claim to the contrary. Yet whether much significance should be attached to such statistics is doubtful. The only copy of Mark to survive is in the four-gospel P 45. The Fourth Gospel accounts for ten of the twenty-one canonical copies. Since all of these MSS come from Egypt where Christianity is known to have had a particularly strong heterodox character for much of the second century, their evidence can scarcely be held to be representative.

It is often difficult to determine with certainty whether an early Christian writer has used one or more of the canonical gospels. Koester explains that he has been deliberately conservative in cataloguing usage, along the minimising lines argued in his influential study Synoptische Überlieferung bei den Apostolischen Vatexten. However, before questioning some of the conclusions incorporated into his table, more basic deficiencies need to be pointed out.

(1) At the outset Koester seems to restrict his survey to 'use' of gospels, but soon broadens it into 'knowledge' of gospels. The difference could be important. In the end it is not clear whether 'use' or 'knowledge' is the criterion for inclusion. For example, Irenaeus is listed for the four canonical gospels, but also for the Gospel of the Ebionites. But in no sense did Irenaeus 'use' or accept the latter, and his 'knowledge' of it was at best second-hand.

(2) The Secret Gospel of Mark is listed twice, under the Carpocratians and under Clement of Alexandria. If one and the same entity is intended, it must be the Carpocratians' Secret Gospel which Clement condemned as a 'tissue of falsehoods'. If, however, the mention under Clement denotes the mystical version of canonical Mark which he alleged the Carpocratians had adulterated, we are dealing with a gospel whose existence is attested solely by the new letter of Clement, on the basis of which it is not at all certain that we should conceive of an 'alternative Mark' differentiated from its canonical original, rather than the latter decked out with allegorizing interpretations.

(3) Or again, where for Marcion Koester lists only Luke, with Matthew as a possibility, should we conclude that he did not know of, say, John's Gospel, or merely that he did not use any others? Likewise, under Papias only Mark is listed along with 'Free sayings of Jesus' and 'Sayings of Matthew (= Q'). Papias' extant fragments do not, of course, mention Luke or John, but many scholars hold that Papias' comments on Mark imply a comparison with, and therefore a 'knowledge of, John.
anti-Montanist Apollonius (Matthew), and the letter of the Gallic churches on the persecution at Lyons (Luke and John).

(iii) Despite the uncertainties in this area of study, Koester's judgments should be challenged at some points. It is particularly bold to assert that evidence is lacking for the knowledge of John in Asia Minor until late in the second century. /14/ Irenaeus' assertion that John wrote his Gospel at Ephesus is scarcely conceivable without a knowledge of the Gospel in Asia going back to at least mid-century. Other traditions point to the early currency of the Gospel in this region, and if Ignatius knew it, as is most likely, pace Koester, /13/ this would also be relevant. 2 Clement is credited by Koester with use of solely 'Free sayings of Jesus' and 'Non-canonical materials', but a footnote records that its source for the sayings of Jesus 'shows influence from the canonical Gospels of Matthew and Luke', thus making it an indirect witness to these Gospels. Even this is most probably too cautious a judgment. /16/

The impression of second-century use or knowledge of gospels conveyed by Koester's table should, therefore, not be taken too seriously. It requires supplementation and probably correction at several points, and is altogether too blunt an instrument to measure gospel use. In particular, some entries conceal that very drawing of explicit distinctions by early Christian writers between canonical and apocryphal gospels which Koester is concerned to deny.

The 'Unknown Gospel' (UG)

For his evaluation of the significance of these three papyrus fragments first published in 1935, Koester relies on a Marburg dissertation by a Japanese scholar, Goro Mayeda, published in 1946. /17/ He endorses Mayeda's conclusion that UG was compiled independently of the canonical gospels, and goes beyond this to argue that 'the author of the Fourth Gospel seems to have utilised pieces from the much more tightly composed Unknown Gospel in order to construct his elaborate discourses'. /18/ Mayeda's judgment is that UG and the Fourth Gospel depend on a common tradition or source (p. 75). It is worth noting that Koester's view accords closely with the judgment of the first editors of UG in 1935, a judgment one of them had abandoned two years later. /19/

Wright: Apocryphal Gospels

Other scholars have not been so convinced by Mayeda. Jeremias's verdict is that the Egerton compiler 'knew all and every one of the canonical Gospels' but was reproducing their content from memory rather than text. /20/ Philipp Vieth's judgment is fairly similar. The fragments display some relation to all four canonical works, although there is no question of direct literary use of any of them. Rather UG constitutes 'ein deutscher Beleg für die gegenseitige Beeinflussung von mündlicher und schriftlicher Tradition', since the composition of our four gospels did not bring the oral Jesus-tradition to a halt. /21/ None of these scholars mentions the fullest discussion of the fragments since Mayeda - two long articles published in 1956 by the Italian Ugo Gallizia of Turin. /22/ His study advances some pertinent criticisms of Mayeda's arguments.

The special fascination of UG arises from the interweaving of Johannine and Synoptic elements. If the first two pericope may be characterized as Johannine and the next two as Synoptic, 'the Johannine material is shot through with Synoptic phrases and the Synoptic with Johannine usage' - although, as we shall see, this judgment by Jeremias somewhat overstates the case. /23/ But in addition, the Synoptic passages contain parallels with at least two of the Synoptic gospels. Taken together, these factors seem to exclude the possibility that we are dealing with a literary pastiche compiled directly from the canonical gospels.

The text of the first pericope is as follows, in the reconstruction accepted by Mayeda:

\[\text{\ldots}\]
No agreement has been reached about the original form of lines 1-5. Jeremias briefly discussed whether οὐκεῖντες ... ἦν ἤπειρον and the utterance in lines 18-19 should be regarded as genuine agglopraphs, but concluded that they are 'secondary transitional links'. /24/ The interest centres on lines 5-18. Koester is impressed by the careful construction of the unit, by the continuity between (the parallels to) John 5:39 and 5:45, which in John's Gospel have been separated by an interposed discourse on another theme, and by the obvious connection with lines 15-17, which John has used elsewhere to supplement a statement he has himself composed (John 9:20). Not only is the composition here 'more original', but vocabulary and style are less typically Johannine and more typically Synoptic. Some instances of the evidence gathered by Mayeda are noted by Koester.

Before looking at this case in any detail, a general argument needs to be laid out of special relevance to this pericope but of some general relevance also. Given that the three substantive sentences in lines 5-18 agree 'almost verbatim' (Koester's words) /26/ with the verses in John, and given other, almost incontrovertible circumstances, such as the priority of John to these papyrus fragments, its currency in Egypt at the time they were written (proved by P 52, the famous Rylands fragment of John, and perhaps confirmed by the new second-century fragment referred to in no. 5), and the general 'knownness' of John compared with the obscurity of the 'Unknown Gospel' (which contrasts markedly with the situation of the Gospel of Thomas), a powerful initial presumption exists that the latter is dependent on the former. While we must heed Morton Smith's warning against the 'naive assumption that any occurrence in early Christian literature of an expression found in one of the canonical gospels is to be explained as a borrowing from the gospel', /27/ gospel criticism runs the opposite danger of reaching hazardous conclusions by discounting, for inadequate reasons, normal historical probabilities. It is not a standard historical procedure to approach the question of the relation between UG and the Fourth Gospel as though all of the possible explanations were of equal standing. The question therefore becomes this: are the considerations advanced by Mayeda and Koester strong enough to override the undoubted a priori probability in this case?

Koester exaggerates the cohesion of the first UG pericope. The separate address to 'lawyers' and 'rulers of the people' is awkward, and without parallel in the canonical gospels./20/ Although John 5:45 and 9:29 are linked by their common reference to Moses, the connection between 5:39 and 5:45 is by no means so obvious. The witness of the Scriptures before men is scarcely parallel to the role of Moses as the accuser before God. The content of the two verses is so different that they would not have been brought together unless UG's compiler had found them in the same context - e.g. in John 5. Even 5:45 and 9:29 have little in common apart from Moses. While 9:29 fits in well in its context in 9:27-33 (his disciple(s) - disciples of Moses - well known that God spoke to Moses but not where he (Jesus) comes from - yet he opened my eyes - unheard of - if he were not from God he could do nothing), its allusion to the question of Jesus' origin occurs without preparation in UG. Koester's strongest argument is the interruption of 5:39 and 5:45 by 5:41-44 (not 40-44). Nevertheless, in John's Gospel 5:39 relates well to what precedes it, and 5:45 to what follows it, as Dodd points out./29/

That these lines contain aspects of vocabulary and style that align them at some points more with the Synoptics than with John is undeniable. In particular, 'lawyers' (νομικοί) occurs only in the Synoptics (in fact almost always in Luke - once in Matthew and never in Mark), and so too does 'unbelief' (ἀπίστοια), but too rarely (once in Matthew and twice in Mark) for its occurrence here to be conclusively significant. Where John 5:29 has 'eternal life' and UG only 'life', this is not a preference for Synoptic over Johannine as has often been claimed. Not only do the Synoptics have 'eternal life' more often than 'life', John has 'life' almost as often as 'eternal life' and in any case so much more frequently than the Synoptics that we must regard 'life' alone as more characteristic of John than of the Synoptics. Gallizzi (pp. 59-60) effectively criticises Mayeda's attempt (p. 22) to interpret 'life' simply as 'Lebenskraft' without reference to the specifically Christian content it has in John, and to dispute also the specifically Johannine character of μονή in line 10.

Patently Synoptic rather than Johannine is the participle ἀποκλειόμενος with εἰς rather than ἀποκλείων κατ' εἰς. But such
a variation is of little significance if the author of UG was working from memory rather than directly from the gospel texts. It is characteristic of most users of the gospels in every age not to observe differences between them in such a common and unimportant matter of style as this. The construction ἐπαναλαμβάνω + infinitive, which is also Syoptic rather than Johannine, falls into the same category.\textsuperscript{30}

Mayeda (pp. 19–21) makes much of the fact that UG 7ff. has ἐπαναλαμβάνω as an imperative, which he regards as more primitive than John's indicative. He fails to note that all the ancient commentators except Cyril of Alexandria read John's ἐπαναλαμβάνω as an imperative, as Gallizia points out (pp. 215–216). The confusion in the early versions, which Mayeda does record, is best explained as arising from different readings of John's Greek. So UG's imperative is no index of the priority of his text over John's.

It is doubtful whether the accumulative weight of the evidence discussed above, even when reinforced by other minor points analysed by Mayeda, is sufficient to overthrow or even seriously challenge the \textit{a priori} presumption of UG's dependence on the canonical gospels. The fact that UG, in using Johannine material, has inserted elements of Syoptic vocabulary and style, even if only by memory, is not surprising for the second century, when most Christian writers were not at all interested in distinguishing the gospels from each other. The diversity of the gospels was liable to be as much a source of embarrassment as a matter for differentiated appreciation.\textsuperscript{31} As Campanhausen notes, it was a distinctive practice of early Christianity lasting at least until Clement of Alexandria and abandoned perhaps first by Marcion, not to make references specific to any one named gospel, even when obviously citing from the written text of one in particular.\textsuperscript{32}

The second pericope (perhaps to be regarded as the conclusion to the first) is more exclusively Johannine in content, with parallels chiefly to 10:31, 7:30 and 10:39:

Wright: Apocryphal Gospels

It is in fact the most markedly single-gospel section of UG, and must correct the oft-repeated view that both of UG's Johannine passages are shot through with Syoptic language and style. Little reason is left to doubt dependence upon John's Gospel.
There follows immediately the story of a healing of a leper, in patently Synoptic dress:

καὶ ἔλεγεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἀπεστάλη τοῖς συνεκατοθέντες αὐτῶν προς αὐτούς


eπὶ τὴν ἄγνωστὴν ἕξετε ἐπὶ τὸν πάθος αὐτὸν·

The nearest parallel is the version in Mk 8:2-4 (par. Mk 1:40-44, Lk 12:12-14), but 'the leprosy left him' is close to Mark and Luke (Matthew 'his leprosy was cleansed'). Peculiar to UG is ἔξατο τοῖς συνεκατοθέντες, which also appears in line 45 (see below), and so may be regarded as an Egyptian distinctive. Double vocatives are very rare in the canonical gospels. Another ('Ἐπέστη ἐξω') occurs in Luke 17:13 in another account of healing from leprosy, which also has two other words in common with the pericope in UG: ἐπέστη ἐξω, ἐπέστη ἐξω;

Perhaps of greater significance are UG's differences from all three Synoptics: no parallel to the act of reverential supplication described in different terms by Matthew, Mark, and Luke; καταράζοντας (Synoptics οὐκ οὖν με καταράζοντας); no parallel to the Synoptics 'stretching out his hand he touched him'. Should the latter be regarded as one of the 'redactions or secondary expansions' in the Synoptic versions, whose absence from UG impresses Koester? Is it a 'more elaborate healing procedure'? It may be formally so without being secondary, for it cannot be thought inappropriate for Jesus to have touched lepers. Koester relegates to a footnote his notice of the incontrovertibly later addition of the reason for the leper's condition, but again he fails to remark on the occurrence of δέ κύριος in the narrative. The plural of 'priests' may, like the added explanation for the leprosy, reflect a non-Palestinian origin for the text, but since it is a further parallel with Luke 17:14, it is more likely a significant piece of evidence for UG's dependence upon Luke. It must be difficult, on the basis of this mixed crop of variations, to argue strongly for UG's independence of the Synoptics. Its version is at once more folksy and more abrupt (cf. καθαρίσσομαι). Its silence about Jesus' touching the leper may be the omission of an act distinctively eloquent of his care for such outcasts.

The fourth pericope in UG is the most complex in its relations to the canonical gospels:

The UG passage is again somewhat incoherent. The reuse of lines 52-59 is premature or out of place, for there has been no word of Jesus to obey or disobey. The parallel Koester cites (Lk 12:13-14) is beside the point, for there Jesus' response, if not a true answer, nevertheless relates explicitly to the terms of the question ('divide' - 'divider'). Perhaps the answer has been lost after line 59, in which case it would have occurred rather awkwardly after a digression.
The vocabulary of this passage has some noteworthy features: ἐξετάσας is not found in the NT (once in Justin; cf. ἐκείνος οὐκ εἰσιν, Lines 4-5 above, if the correct reconstruction; ἀνέβλεψε not in the gospels (three times in Paul); ἄνεμον only in Luke 1:51, apart from citations of Deuteronomy 6:5 LXX; τυπὸν agrees with LXX of Isaiah 29:13 (Mt 15:8 - τυχόν). Perhaps most interesting is ἐπάνω πάνω, which stimulates Mayeda to attempt to make consistent sense of the varied uses of the verb in the canonical gospels./41/ Also to be noted, however, is its occurrence in Mark 1:43 in the healing of the leper to which UG's third pericope discussed above is a parallel. Is this another pointer to UG's tendency to connect verses by link-words,42/ which would have an important function in citation from memory? This question merits further discussion below.

This fourth pericope, in Koester's judgment, is a secondary framework for materials such as Luke 6:46 floating freely in the sayings tradition. 'There is no reason to assume that those materials were drawn from the canonical gospels.'/43/ Certainly not to 'assume', but also not to exclude this possibility, or, as I would argue, this a priori probability. The mere fact that we encounter the parallel to this pericope dispersed in different places in the Synoptics of itself counts for nothing. Nor can it be reasonably claimed that any of the constituent sayings appears here in a more primitive form than in the Synoptics. But it is possible to suggest that UG assembled its materials by catchword connections. For example, the introduction to the question ὅπερ ἔδει αὐτῷ ἔρωταν (cf. line 6 par.) is similar enough to John 3:2 (ἐκ τοῦ τοῦτον ἐρωτημάτων ἔρωταν ὅτι ... ἀνέβλεψε) to explain how the latter came to be prefaced to UG's version of the tribute-money exchange. (Would it be far-fetched to remark on the similarity between what follows ἔρωτα ... i.e., ἔρωτας in Matthew and Mark, ἔρωτα ἐρωτημάτων in John? Note that ἔρωτα is reconstructed in UG line 45.) As the pericope develops, ὅπερ ἔδει αὐτῷ recurs; ὅπερ ἔδει is picked up by ἐχθρεύει (some MSS of Is 29:13 LXX and Mt 15:8 have both ὅπερ ἔδει and ἐχθρεύει), and perhaps ἐρωτημάτων recalls ἔρωτα in line 47.

Such verbal connections are relevant to Koester's assertion that 'it is hard to imagine that its author could have patched his text together from half a dozen passages in John...and from the three Synoptic Gospels'.44/ They can be discerned in other pericopes as well. In the first, for example, 'Houses' connects (the parallels to) John 5:45 and 9:29, and καταγορεῖ also functions as a link. In the second, τίνης and τεσσαράκοντα provide connections. Perhaps catchwords even operate between pericope segments, note, for instance, ἀπεξετάσας in the first two, and ἄνεμον ἐξετάσας in the first and the fourth. Jesus is addressed as ὅπερ ἔδει in the third and the fourth, which also shows a special interest in Jesus as ὅπερ ἔδει, 'witness' is a concern of the first and fourth pericope, but given its centrality in John this is not remarkable. Perhaps the fourth is linked to the fifth (which is much more fragmentary, and seems to contain a story of Jesus miraculously foreshortening the time span from sowing to harvest on the bank of the Jordan) by the motif of testing questions. In the fifth, Jesus had apparently posed a Τίνης ἔστιν ἡ ἀξία τῆς ἀσθένειας which the miracle somehow clarified or resolved. If UG's author worked by link-words, triggered partly by memory, it might not be wholly fanciful to see significance in the further use of ἀνέβλεψε 'bank', here in line 66 (cf. line 56 above), and in the occurrence of the phrase 'stretching out his right hand' as an action in the miracle, recalling the phrase in Mark 1:41 par. whose absence from UG's version of the miracle of the leper we noted above.

The remains of the third fragment of UG are much more limited, but the recto seems to give Ἐν οἴκοις (82), ὅπερ ἔδει (83/84) and ἔρωτας (84-85). The sequence obviously recalls John 10:30-31, with ἐξετάσας where John has ἔρωτα.45/ The beginning of pericope two in UG, which parallels John 10:31, shows UG's interest in this theme. Neither Mayeda nor Koester considers the significance of Ἑν οἴκοις. Are we to conclude that 'ὁ κυρίος δέλτια κρίνεται γεννήσεως' (Galilæus, p. 223) was found by John in this supposed source? Dodd (pp. 73-74) asks the same rhetorical question about 'his hour' (line 29): is it likely that John found this conception, which controls his Gospel from 2:4 to 1:17, in a source like UG?

The only noteworthy word identifiable on the verso of the third fragment is εὐνόης, which occurs in line 50 above (par. Mk 12:15), and elsewhere in the canonical gospels, of Jesus' knowledge of the dispositions of opponents (cf. Mt 12:23, Lk 11:17, Jn 6:64).

Repetition of vocabulary may well point to the special interests of the author, which Mayeda found in John's confrontations with opponents. But the healing of a leper cannot be made to fit such a concentration, nor with any ease can the apocryphal miracle in the fifth pericope. The fragments
may suggest that the complete UG consisted solely of miracle-
and controversy-stories, but this would be an insecure
deduction. Nor should we assume that UG was intended as a
gospel, to stand on a par with or in place of any other gospels
its compiler may have known, rather than as a selective
compilation for special purposes, such as cathechism or
apologia, much as a modern Bible Society might produce a
'selection' of gospel passages for a particular readership
without calling it a 'gospel'. Since we have no secure
knowledge of the intention of UG's compiler, we cannot assume
anything about his handling of his sources. It is on the basis
of our knowledge of how other writers used their sources that
we regard it as most probable that he was writing from memory,
least for the Synoptics, but such parallels may be
misleading, especially if Mayeda is correct in arguing that UG
was produced for private, domestic use and is no way an official
or cultic writing./46/ We have no right to take for granted
that the distinctions and categories of form and tradition
established for Synoptic criticism apply to this text./47/

An early date for UG is significant for Koester's thesis,
in rendering it less likely to be based on John's Gospel, and
conversely, if Jeremias' claim were sound, in making it a
spectacularly [i.e., unbelievably!] early witness for the four-
gospel canon of the NT./48/ References by scholars to UG's
date do not always distinguish clearly between the papyrus and
the composition of UG, but Koester obviously has the papyrus
itself in view. He cites the first editors' judgment that its
script aligned it with other papyri written before c.120, and
seems keen to make it as early as possible - 'into the
beginning of II CE...possibly shortly after 100'/49/ But if a
consensus obtains on the papyrus's date, it seems to lie
somewhere in the second quarter of the century. The original
editors' 'revised version' gives 130-165 and 140-160 (reported
by most cataloguers of Christian papyri as about the middle
of the century)./50/ Gallizia's discussion suggests a date nearer
125 than 150 and Jeremias says 'before 150'/51/

Bell and Skeat went on to suggest a date of c.110-130 or
80/90-120 for the composition of UG, partly on the basis of
their assessment of the character of the work, and partly,
on the assumption that the papyrus was found at Oxyrhynchus, to
allow time for UG to have moved up country from Alexandria, its
likely place of origin./52/ But Bell goes too far in asserting
that 'we may quite certainly assume it is not the author's
autograph but is separated from it by repeated copyings'./53/

Perhaps more truly than they realised did he and Skeat call this
an 'unknown' gospel. It remains the solitary exemplar of its
text. There is no evidence that it ever existed beyond Egypt or
even beyond this one copy. No traces have been found of its
influence on later Christian literature, in Egypt or elsewhere.
Other apocryphal gospels survive only in fragments, but no one
has advanced any convincing identification of our text with any
of them./54/

If there is one thing that may with certainty be affirmed
about this text, it is, in Jeremias' words, that it 'shows no
historical knowledge that carries us beyond the canonical
gospels'./55/ Viehauer, who holds that it reflects the
influence of a continuing oral Jesus-tradition, nevertheless
reports that the question whether it contains older and possibly
more authentic tradition than the canonical gospels is answered
in the negative on both critical and conservative sides./56/
Mayeda himself held that it offered no new material for the
history of primitive Christianity and no new information for the
life of Jesus (p. 89). If Koester's case were sound, UG would
provide evidence of the kind of source materials John used and
of the way he used them. Even if this were so, it is doubtful
whether it would raise any new challenge to the historical
worth of his Gospel.

The Gospel of Peter (EvP)

EvP is a considerably longer text than UG and cannot here
be examined in such detail. Koester's summary is accurate:
'Until recently, the almost universal judgment of scholars saw
in this gospel secondary compilation on the basis of the
canonical gospels'./57/ The most recent editor concludes that
EvP follows, for its narrative, the Synoptics, and, for its
textology, the Gospel and Apocalypse of John./58/

Taking his cue from a Kiel dissertation of 1972 by Jürgen
Denker,/59/ Koester argues that, despite its obviously
secondary features (e.g., the exorcism of Pilate and
mythological elements like the speaking cross), EvP is an
independent witness of the formation of the passion narrative
(p. 120). This judgment rests on his view of the general
development of the passion narrative, which grew up, not on the
basis of historical report, but as a kind of Or reflection on
the death of Jesus, finding 'both the rationale and the
content of Jesus' suffering and death in the memory of those
passages in the Psalms and the Prophets which spoke about the
suffering of the righteous' (p. 127). EVp provides, so he believes, just such a composition of this 'scriptural memory'. Its OT material lacks the apologetic interest of Matthew and Justin in demonstrating precise correspondence between prediction and fulfilment, and subject matter from any one OF passage or text is found in only one place in EVp, and not dispersed as often occurs in the canonical gospels (pp. 126-127).

A similar case is argued for EVp's resurrection account. Koester detachas a miraculous epiphany story which is 'well preserved and could be very old' (p. 129). It was used intact by EVp, but fragments of it were inserted by the canonical evangelists into different settings in their narratives.

Before testing Koester's thesis by examining one section from the passion story, we must take note of a new papyrus MS of EVp, P. Oxy. 41. 2949, published in 1972, but unfortunately not known to Harn or Denker, and not considered by Koester. The fullest study so far is by Dieter Lührmman in 1981. The papyrus is dated c.200 and consists of two fragments, the larger of which is clearly identifiable with EVp 2:3-5 in the text of the eighth/ninth-century Akhmim MS, hitherto our sole witness to EVp. Lührmann sets out the text of this fragment and its Akhmim parallels as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POx 2949 fr. I</th>
<th>EVp 3-5 (Akhmim)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 ἴδιος [[ἐκ]] ἱματίσματι</td>
<td>ἵδιος [[ἐκ]] ἱματίσματι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 τε ἐν ἑξελειόνοις</td>
<td>τε ἐν ἑξελειόνοις</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 [[ἀν]] ἄνω τοῦ Πελάτου</td>
<td>ἴδιος ὑπὸ τοῦ Πελάτου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 ἵδιος ὑπὸ τοῦ Πελάτου</td>
<td>ἵδιος ὑπὸ τοῦ Πελάτου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 ἵδιος ὑπὸ τοῦ Πελάτου</td>
<td>ἵδιος ὑπὸ τοῦ Πελάτου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 ἵδιος ὑπὸ τοῦ Πελάτου</td>
<td>ἵδιος ὑπὸ τοῦ Πελάτου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 ἵδιος ὑπὸ τοῦ Πελάτου</td>
<td>ἵδιος ὑπὸ τοῦ Πελάτου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 ἴδιος ὑπὸ τοῦ Πελάτου</td>
<td>ἵδιος ὑπὸ τοῦ Πελάτου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 ἵδιος ὑπὸ τοῦ Πελάτου</td>
<td>ἵδιος ὑπὸ τοῦ Πελάτου</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second, much smaller fragment gives only the beginnings of five lines. Among these the appearance of τε[κίς] suggests that it belongs near to the first fragment, but the other line-beginnings do not allow an obvious identification with any part of the Akhmim text.  

The new papyrus contains a text of EVp 2:3-5 clearly somewhat different from the one in the Akhmim MS. Lührmann's comparison shows that of the sixteen words more or less confidently reconstructed in the larger Oxyrhynchus fragment, ten are identical with Akhmim. The others display some variation, in two cases to a major extent. Lines 5-8 of the fragment correspond more closely with Akhmim than do 9-12. What is identifiable from the smaller fragment also makes some divergence from Akhmim's text inescapable.

P. Oxy. 2949 should therefore be regarded as part of an earlier version of EVp than the one given by the Akhmim MS. Unlike the canonical gospels, EVp's text was obviously open to considerable variation in transmission. As a consequence, any arguments based on the Akhmim text for EVp's relations to the Synoptic and Johannine traditions must now be less secure.

Can any particular tendenz be discerned from a comparison of the parallel texts? The scope for a fruitful comparison is strictly limited, but the following points may be made:

line 6 - ἐξελείονοι (i.e., Herod; ἀξιοῦν is twice used of Herod in EVp 1:2); 6/4 Akhmim has σταυρωθέντα τοῦ Πελάτου (σταυρωθέντα is a hapax legomenon). The variation is considerable.  

Can any particular tendenz be discerned from a comparison of the parallel texts? The scope for a fruitful comparison is strictly limited, but the following points may be made:

line 7 - ἤλευος ὑπὸ τοῦ Πελάτου; Akhmim - ἤλευος ὑπὸ τοῦ Πελάτου. The parallels are: προσέβαλε τῷ Πελάτῳ (Mt and Lk), εὐφαβίστηκεν ὑπὸ τοῦ Πελάτου (Mk). Of the omission of the article before 'Pilate', nothing significant can be said. Akhmim EVp has Pilate with the article slightly more often than without, but cf. νόμος Πελάτου above. On several occasions EVp seems to
prefer simple to compound verbs, /66/ and Lührmann's suggestion of εἰκασθεν (p. 223) is questionable. It is not required by the composition of the MS. The participle is parallel to ἐκδέχομαι, and hence ἦν would have been omitted before ὅτι γὰρ (assumed reconstruction). Another marked stylistic feature of EvP is the frequent use of ως, connecting clause after clause, /67/ The Oxyrhynchus text here linked two participles, not two main verbs. Does this suggest it may have been less popular in this stylistic respect than Akhmīn?

line 8 - lacks Akhmīn's τοῦ κυρίου between τὸ σῶμα and ἐπὶ τοῦ ταφοῦ, did it (or αὐτοῦ, as Lührmann, p. 223, suggests) precede τὸ σῶμα? All the Synoptics have τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ, but EvP invariably has 'the Lord', never 'Jesus'. But was this feature less prominent in Oxyrhynchus than it is in Akhmīn? Lührmann, p. 222, like Coles, is inclined to reconstruct [α] τοῦ κυρίου in line 5, but again the uncertain line-length cannot be said to require it.

The εἰς/κρός ταφοῦ variation is probably without significance. The four gospels provide no parallel here, but cf. εἰς ταφοῦ (Mt 27:7), εἰς τοῦ ἐνταφαγοῦ (Mt 14:8a; par. Mt 26:12, ἐπὶ τοῦ ἐνταφαγοῦ με).

line 9 - probably ἐπὶ ταφοῦ, to Akhmīn's ἤτοι. Note that all three Synoptics have ἤτοι of Joseph's request to Pilate (John ἐπὶ ταφοῦ, here it is Pilate to Herod. The Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich-Danker lexicon regards the active and the middle as interchangeable in early Christian literature. If Joseph's request influenced Pilate's in EvP, Oxyrhynchus is nearer to the Synoptics. At this point Akhmīn's developed text diverged further from the canonical gospels.

line 10 - ἤτοι cannot be further reconstructed from Akhmīn. Coles (p. 16 n.10) suggests ἀποδοθαμείον from Matthew 27:15h, which again would make EvP c.200 closer to the Synoptics than is Akhmīn EvP.

line 11 - ἤτονοτο is a probable reconstruction, perhaps parallel to Akhmīn's ἤτοι, but correlating the texts is difficult. Lührmann (p. 224) suggests that P. Oxy. 2949 may have had a repetition of Joseph's request in Pilate's mouth, ἤτοι, ἠρέτα ἀποτελεῖ τὸ σῶμα ἤτοι, which would distance it further from Akhmīn but in fact make good sense. Akhmīn says that Pilate asked Herod for the body (2:4), and that Herod replied, 'Even if no-one had asked...' (2:5), implying that

Pilate had named the source of the request, since Pilate could scarcely have wanted it himself. At 6:23 the Jews gave the body to Joseph.

line 13 - 9τι is not paralleled in Akhmīn in this context. If it represents the original of Akhmīn's έτοι or γὰρ, the following α is unexplained.

The following tentative conclusions may be drawn from this investigation:

- the Oxyrhynchus text probably used less unusual vocabulary;
- at some points it may well have been closer to the Synoptics;
- at one point it probably made smoother sense than Akhmīn;
- at another it accords more definitively with the apologetic thrust of EvP;
- at one or two points its linguistic and stylistic usages may have been less marked than those of Akhmīn.

We will take up some of these pointers to the character of the Oxyrhynchus text of EvP after the next stage in this examination of the work.

Since the new papyrus has directed our attention towards EvP 2:3-5a, /68/ we shall use the passage as a test-case for the theses of Koester and Denker (even though Koester makes no specific reference to it).

2:3: Ἰσαακαὶ ἐκ νυν Ἰωάννης, ὁ φίλος Πειλάτου καὶ τὸν Κυρίον, καὶ εἶναι ὅτι σταυροφόρων αὐτὸν μελέτουν ἢ μή καὶ τὸν Πειλάτου καὶ ἔπειτα τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου ἐπὶ ταφοῦ.

4. καὶ οἱ Πειλάτου πάνω ἕτοι ἵππου ἤτοι τοῦ ιωάννη
5. καὶ ἢ "Ηρώδης ἦτοι "Απελευθέρωσεν, εἰς καὶ μὴ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐπίθετον ἡμέτερον, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὅταν ἄναγκαι ἐπιθέμεθα..." ἢ τοῦ ὅταν ἅπαν ἀνισοτοῦ ἐπερευκαίρων.

Denker (pp. 60-61) claims that EvP's sources here are the OT and the 'Gemeindetradition', which itself kept close to the OT. The passage relates a tradition similar to but independent of the Synoptic version, but altered by being combined by the author of EvP with a free citation of
Deuteronomy 21:23, which Denker believes was prominent in the Jewish-Christian Jesus-tradition on which EVP drew. In support of this view he cites Acts 5:30, 10:39, and Jerome's references, in his commentary on Galatians 3:13, to Ebion's and Symmachus's renderings of Deuteronomy 21:23.  

Yet Denker recognises that EVP's interest in the verse is quite different from Acts' and Galatians'. EVP is preoccupied solely with the burial of the body before sunset, as is clear from the same citation at 5:15 and an echo of the same motif at 6:23.  

Mara (pp. 86-87) holds that EVP's use of Deuteronomy at 5:15 comes from his following John 19:31, which, like the preceding verse in EVP (4:14), refers to the breaking of the sabbath. Although John, unlike EVP, relates the allusion to Deuteronomy 21:23 specifically to the imminence of the sabbath, EVP's citation here follows immediately upon a mention of the sabbath's proximity. This seems a convincing interpretation. It is difficult to envisage what role EVP's very circumscribed reference to Deuteronomy 21:23 could have played in the development of a passion narrative along Koester's lines of OT meditative recollection. On the other hand, its secondary elaboration, for apologetic purposes, in the train of a more kerygmatic use of the testimonia is historically quite intelligible. Lührmann (p. 221 n.24) validly criticises Denker's later attempt (pp. 80-81) to smuggle the curse (cf. Gal 3:13) into EVP's understanding of Deuteronomy 21:23 by citing EVP 5:17, 'They...completed the measure of their sins on their head'. EVP's concern is simply that no κεφαλής should remain unburied at sundown.  

EVP's citation here is plainly apologetic. It may not be prefaced by a Matthaean fulfilment-formula, but a formal enough introduction is given, Γέφυραν ὕπο... As Denker himself puts it, 'stehn im PE das ängstliche Bemühen in Vordergrund, die Vorschrt des Gesetzes zu erfüllen' (p. 60). Mara may well be right in suggesting (pp. 78-79) that the reason why Joseph's request for Jesus' body comes so early in EVP's sequence of events is precisely in order to ensure the certainty of burial before sunset. The construction of the episode also serves to reinforce the central apologetic motif of EVP, viz., the Jews' total responsibility for doing away with Jesus, by demonstrating Pilate's subservience to Herod.  

Denker (p. 61) maintains that EVP 2:3-5a is independent of the canonical gospels, chiefly on the grounds that it does not use the evangelists' common or special traditions. It does not mention Arimathaea (all four gospels), but EVP seems uninterested in topographical information, such as the place of the crucifixion.  

It makes Joseph not a disciple of Jesus (Matthew and John; cf. Mark and Luke - 'looking for the kingdom of God'), but a friend of both Pilate and the Lord. In fact, when later (6:23) Joseph is given the body for burial, EVP says that he had seen (v3:14(2)) all the good that Jesus had done, which implies that Joseph had been a follower of Jesus. So EVP does not, as Denker claims, tend to present Joseph's relationship to Jesus in markedly neutral terms. EVP also lacks, so Denker points out, Pilate's enquiry of the centurion whether Jesus were already dead (Mk 15:44-45), but this is hardly surprising, since EVP has chosen to place the request for the body well before the crucifixion! In any case, it is Herod, not Pilate, who in EVP has charge of the crucifixion.  

It is easier to demonstrate the secondary and tendentious character of EVP 2:3-5a than its precise dependence upon the canonical gospels. EVP here wears its apologetic Tendenz on its face, which induces a quite unhistorical presentation of political realities in Palestine.  

We should also remember that such hints as the Ὀργανθέαν fragments provide, both strengthen the apologetic Tendenz in this passage and align its text more closely to the Synoptics.  

Denker and Koester are right to stress the OT undergirding of much of EVP, but wrong to deny the parallel undergirding of the canonical gospels. More sensitive and accurate is Mara's assessment of the work: 'il semble donc que l'apocryphe travaille sur un matériel de seconde main qu'il ne domine qu'exterieurement; son intelligence historique parait seulement d'ordre théologique, elle ne part pas d'une expérience d'événements vécus directement et interprétés, mais elle émerge d'une lecture de textes médités religieusement, dans une perspective qui situe au même niveau les prophéties messianiques et le récit des Évangiles officiels' (pp. 31-32).
Notes

/2/ 'Apocryphal and Canonical Gospels', HTR 73 (1980), 105-130.
/4/ In working on these texts for this study, I reached the conclusion that the possibility of DG's being part of the lost pre-paschal section of 229 has been too lightly dismissed. I hope to reopen this question elsewhere. The present study, however, treats them as unconnected texts, in accord with the unanimous consensus.
/7/ P. 142.2949 is a fragment of c. AD 200 'now plausibly assigned to the banned Gospel of Peter' (Roberts and Skeat, op. cit., 44; cf. Haelst, op. cit., 209). See further below.
/8/ Cf. Hanneke et al., op. cit., vol. 1, 115-116 (W. Schneemelcher); Haelst, op. cit., 209.
/9/ Texte und Untersuchungen 65; Berlin, 1957.
/10/ Cf. Vielhauer in Hanneke et al., op. cit., vol. 1, 119.
/11/ The majority of scholars seems still to accept the authenticity of the letter published by Morton Smith in Clement of Alexandria and a Secret Gospel of Mark (Cambridge, Mass., 1973). See his review of its reception in 'Clement of

Wright: Apocryphal Gospels

/9/ Contd.

/11/ Campenhausen, p. 130 (with literature), is convinced that Papias speaks of Matthew's Gospel.
/12/ Synoptische Überlieferung, 240.
/13/ See the study by D. A. Hagner in this volume.
/14/ 'No evidence...until the end of the second century' (art. cit., 110). But the Montanists and Irenaeus, whom Koester cites, give a date no later than c. 170.
/16/ Campenhausen, op. cit., 120 n. 61, accepts that the Didache and 2 Clement refer to written gospels.
/17/ Das Leben-Jesu-Fragment Papyrus Egerton 2 und seine Stellung in der urchristlichen Literaturgeschichte (Berlin, 1976). Cf. the careful assessment by one of the fragments' initial editors, W. J. Bell, 'The Gospel Fragments of P. Egerton 2', HTR 42 (1949), 53-63, concluding that, while Maya's theory about the general character of the new text is acceptable, his view of its use of sources independent of the canonical gospels is more disputable.
/18/ Art. cit., 113. He is more qualified in his Introduction, vol. 2, 181-181, although he later says (p. 222) that DG possibly provided some of John's source material.
/20/ In Hanneke et al., op. cit., vol. 1, 95-96.
/21/ Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur: Einleitung in das Neue Testament, die Apokryphen und die Apostolischen Väter (Berlin and New York, 1757), 537-538.
/22/ 'I 1 P. Egerton 2', Aegyptus 36 (1956), 209-212, 278-234. Koester is incorrect (art. cit., 119) in asserting that 'no major attempt has been made to refute Maya's arguments'.
/23/ In Hanneke, op. cit., vol. 1, 95.
/27/ Art. cit. (n. 9 above), 453.
/30/ Mayeda points out, p. 24 n. 2, that Ἱδον καταλάβων occurs in sayings of Jesus in both the Gospel of the Ebionites and the Gospel of the Egyptians. John 4:7 has ἐπέρεξε... ἐπιλέξαν of the woman of Samaria. Dodd, art. cit., 66, points to the frequency of the Ἰδον in infin. construction in early Christian usage to express the purpose of the incarnation.


/34/ An Gallizia, art. cit., 65-68, effectively demonstrates.

/35/ Art. cit., 121-122.

/36/ In this respect Koester may have been misled by an extraordinary paragraph in Mayeda, p. 49 (cf. Gallizia, art. cit., 187), in which he draws special attention to the striking fact that καταλαβων never occurs in the papyri. He is referring ad loc. to the appearance of ἐπιλέξαν in line 53 instead of καταλαβων of Lk 6:46 (cf. Mt 7:21), but his comments on lines 30, 37 and 39 fail to notice the appearance of καταλαβων. Hence he can say, 'Ob dieses Wort mit christologischer Tendenz in seiner Quelle nicht vorhanden war, oder ob der Verfasser des Papyrus es wegen des Zusammenhanges korrigiert hat, da er daran nicht interessiert war, bleibt eine Frage. Jedenfalls ist es auffallend, dass dieses für das Urchristentum spezifische Wort nicht hier steht. Diese Tatsache gehört mit zu den Merkmalen unseres Papyrus; er erzählt die Geschichten neutral und ohne tiefe theologische Deutung'.

/37/ Art. cit., 123; cf. Mayeda, 51 ('novellistischer').


/39/ Koester, art. cit., 122, says the text 'presents Jesus as rejecting a secular affair', but this is far from obvious.

/40/ Dr. Richard Bauckham has plausibly suggested to me that this pericope is modelled upon the sequence in Mark 10:17-19 par., where Jesus first picks up his questioner's form of address ('Good Teacher') before answering his question. There are, nevertheless, significant differences. Mark 10 contains no reference to failure to fulfill Jesus' teaching, and hence does not stray into gratuitous rebuke of the questioner.

Wright: Apocryphal Gospels

/40/ Cont'd.

Furthermore, Jesus gave an answer after only a short digression. In UG, if he did so at all, it must have been only after a digression of such a kind as to nullify the value of any answer.


/43/ Art. cit., 123. 'On the contrary, the Johannine parallel would argue for a dependence of John upon the Unknown Gospel.'

This claim rests on conclusions reached from his consideration of earlier pericope, especially the first.


/45/ So Dodd, art. cit., 85.


/47/ Koester's assumptions are crucial to his case: e.g., in arguing that, because lines 7-14 are shorter than John 5:39-45, their version is 'older in formal terms' (Introduction, vol. 2, 182). There are clearly other possible accounts of the relation between the two texts.

/48/ Art. cit., 120. Koester makes his point in provocative terms. Not only need not UG's use of the Four Gospels imply their canonical status, but it is certain that it used a source or sources other than the canonical gospels.


/50/ The New Gospel Fragments [by Bell and Skeat, although unnamed], (London, 1935) 10, 17; cf. Bell, Recent Discoveries (1937) 20 (the MS can hardly be appreciably later than the mid-1st C.); Haelst, op. cit., 207 (also citing W. Schubart's date of before 150); Aland, op. cit., 376. Turner, op. cit., 90, 144, is no more precise than second century, as too are Roberts and Skeat, op. cit., 41.

/51/ Gallizia, 42-46; Jeremias in Hennecke etc., op. cit., vol. 1, 94.

/52/ The New Gospel Fragments, 16-19. Cameron, op. cit., 74, believes that UG was composed in the second half of the first century, in Syria.

/53/ Recent Discoveries, 20.

/54/ Gallizia, 207-210. But see n. 4 above.

/55/ In Hennecke etc., op. cit., vol. 1, 95.

/56/ Geschichtte, 639.

/57/ Art. cit., 126, referring to C. Maurer's treatment in Hennecke etc., op. cit., vol. 1, 179-182. Opinions earlier in the century were much more divided; cf. Mara (next note), 17-20.

/58/ M. G. Mara, Evangile de Pierre (Sources Chrétiennes, 201; Paris, 1973), 214. Koester does not mention this edition.
Die theologischgeschichtliche Stellung des Petrusevangeliums. Ein Beitrag zur Frühgeschichte des Duketismus (Europ. Hochschulschr. XXIII:36; Bern, Frankfurt, 1975). Denker was able to take note of Mara only in a brief review at the end (pp. 255-256). Cameron, op. cit., 78 suggests EvP was composed as early as the second half of the first century.


Lührmann, 219-220.

Cf. Lührmann, 225-226.

Unless one is to make no reference at all to the text of EvP beyond 2:3-5, one cannot avoid comparing the Oxyrhynchus text with the Akhmim text elsewhere.


Vaganay, 145.

Denker, 34-35, rightly points out that EvP 2:5 (κακοδίωκας κ.α.λ.) belongs with 2:6 rather than with what precedes it in 2:5.

PL 26, 387.

The Jews rejoiced that, after the darkness since noon (5:15ff.), the sun shone again and it was only the ninth hour (6:22), so they happily gave Joseph the body for burial (6:23).

Cf. Vaganay, op. cit., 126.

Mara, op. cit., 31, 79.
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Bold reassessments and a newly discovered papyrus have conspired to focus fresh attention on the apocryphal Gospel of Peter (hereafter EvP), that is to say, on the gospel fragment found in a manuscript at Akhmīm in Egypt near the end of the last century and almost universally identified with the Docetists' gospel exposed by bishop Serapion of Antioch shortly before A.D. 200 (Eusebius, H. E. 6:12). In Pap. Oxy. 2949, of c. 200, published in 1972, we now have two scraps of a text of EvP some five or six centuries older than the Akhmīm manuscript and sufficiently divergent from it to raise questions about the relationship between the latter and the work unmasked by Serapion.1/ The Docetic character of EvP is by no means as obvious to contemporary students as it was to most (but by no means all) commentators in the 1890's.2/ Furthermore, the earlier hypotheses of Harnack and others, that made EvP earlier than the canonical Gospels, have found a modern counterpart in the views of Helmut Koester in particular, which discern in EvP an independent witness to pre-canonical forms of both the passion narrative and an epiphany resurrection story.3/ Most recently, John Dominic Crossan has argued that most of EvP, which he calls the Passion-Resurrection Source, is independent of the canonical Gospels and was used by all four of them, but that the final integrated form of EvP incorporates some material derived directly from the canonical Gospels.4/

The present study is not concerned to address directly this renewed debate about the relation of EvP to the gospel tradition. (I have elsewhere tested Koester's theory against one section of EvP and found it wanting.5/) Its interest lies instead in the prominent miraculous element in the work. According to the author of the fullest commentary on the text, its account of the resurrection 'relève de la fantasmagorie'. Yet the same scholar
Gospel Perspectives VI

acknowledges that, taken overall, *EvP* is less marked by a delight in wonders ("toujours plus ou moins amusant, parfois grotesque. Ce n'est pas du miracle, c'est de la féerie pour les enfants") than other apocryphal gospels. Nevertheless the undeniable obtrusiveness of the supernatural in the resurrection narrative has tended to colour interpretations of the whole fragment, which extends from Pilate's washing his hands to the beginning of an appearance of the risen Christ at the lakeside at Tiberias. The aim of this paper is to assess the prevalence of miracles in *EvP*, and to characterize the nature of any special interest in miracles that *EvP* may display. It may thereby contribute to the reassessment of the significance of the extra-canonical, including post-canonical, gospel traditions for which Richard Bauckham pried in his epilogue to the previous volume of *Gospel Perspectives*. He argues convincingly that the study of the canonical Gospels cannot logically be detached from enquiry into the fortunes of the broader gospel tradition, pointing out in particular that those whose concern lies with the historical reliability of the canonical Gospels do not have a vested interest in the unreliability of the rest.

I. The Passion Narrative

At the point of transition from the passion account to the resurrection, Ps-Peter makes 'all the people' say, 'If at his death these very great signs (ταῦτα τὰ μεγάλα σημεῖα) have come to pass, see how righteous he was!' (8:28). But *EvP* has so far recorded hardly anything exceptionally miraculous when compared with the canonical accounts. The following list includes, for completeness, some features which most probably do not belong to the category of miracle at all.

1. The Silence on the Cross -- 'as if he experienced no pain' (ὡς μὴν ἔμαθεν σῶμαν Χριστόν, 4:10)

This translation[6] says explicitly neither that Jesus did nor that he did not suffer pain. But if the verse is not clear evidence of *EvP*'s Docetism, it exemplifies the kind of material that could have made the work congenial to Docetists. For even if its inspiration is Isaiah 53:7 (although there is no verbal link),[10] this silence on the cross is much more suggestive of the supernatural character of 'the Lord' (*EvP*'s unvarying designation for Jesus) than the refusal to reply while on trial which the canonical Gospels records. It may be comparable with the similar achievement of the early Christian martyrs,[11] but their silence may also attest special supernatural intervention. So it is not entirely correct to suppose that the translation given above removes the issue from the realm of theology (divine impassibility) to that of asceticism (endurance of suffering).[12] For there is no evidence that Ps-Peter's Christ was vulnerable to pain.

The non-Docetic interpretation advanced by J. K. McCann goes too far in claiming that not only is it 'clearly implied' by 4:10 that Jesus did experience pain, but 'suffering is integral to the "Petrine" passion narrative, and silence is a pronounced feature of this narrative, with the Lord speaking only once'.[13] This reading fails to give due weight to the absence from *EvP*, largely through the continuing silence of 'the Lord', of any indication that what was done to him actually caused him suffering. The distinctive form of its sole word from the cross, a parallel to the synoptic cry of dereliction, confirms this impression (see below). *EvP* is not crudely Docetic, for 'the Lord' can be manhandled, buffeted, scourged, and crucified (cf. 1 Cor. 1:8, the nearest NT parallel to *EvP* 4:10a), but it nowhere discloses that such treatment impinged upon him in a painfully human way. In failing to break his legs, it was his executioners' intention that he should die in torment (4:14), but Ps-Peter does not assure us that he did. Freedom from pain is therefore a more likely explanation of his silence than heroic conquest of it. Such impassibility belongs to *EvP*'s presentation of 'the Lord', whether it be viewed as divine/15/ or angelic/16/ impassibility.

2. The Cry of Departure ('ὁ οὐκόμως μοι, ὁ οὐκόμως, κατέληγος με, 5:19)

This is the sole utterance from the cross in *EvP*, and is ascribed to 'the Lord'. Its interpretation cannot be wholly separated from its immediate sequel, καὶ σίτων ἀνάληψιν. The differences from the synoptic cry of dereliction (Mt 27:46, Mk 15:35) are obvious: οὐκόμως instead of σιθοῦ, indicative rather than interrogative 'why?', and a verbal form different from the γνωρίζειν provided by Ps 21:2 (22:2) LXX. But if it is correct not to seek an explanation for these differences in a full-blooded Docetisation of the tradition, suggesting that the divine power of Christ left the human Jesus before the moment of death, it remains difficult to choose between the various possible sources or inspirations for *EvP*'s version.[17]

The indicative assertion instead of the synoptics' questioning plaint may remove the implication of distress on the speaker's part.[18] *EvP*'s κατέληγος should therefore probably be translated neutrally ('left') rather than pejoratively
('abandoned'). Furthermore, the cry and the death of Jesus are more closely related in EVp than in Matthew and Mark, where, after the cry, Jesus is given vinegar to drink by bystanders just before breathing his last with another loud cry. The connexion between the two in EVp must be an important clue to their interpretation. In particular, it weakens the force of suggestions that δόμαμ is a Jewish circumlocution for God, or another translation, such as Aquila's, of Ps 21:2 (22:1), or a confused misunderstanding of the Hebrew of the Psalm verse. Such explanations tend to fasten upon a comparison between the synoptic and Ps-Petrie forms of the cry, Instead of setting the cry in its context in EVp./19/ It can reasonably be maintained that EVp does not suggest God-forsakenness on the part of Christ.

But what is the relation between the departure of the δόμαμ and the 'taking up' of the Lord? Does the cry tell us that the precondition for the δόμαμ of the Lord has now occurred? Does the departure of the δόμαμ actually bring about, rather than allow for, the taking up? Does Ps-Peter present us with two happenings, even two ascensions, or with two aspects of a single event, even two ways of describing a single event? More precisely still, should the cry be read as explaining when the taking up consisted?

One effect of the immediate juxtaposition of the two statements in EVp is to imply a Christological or anthropological reference more obviously than do the synoptic accounts. Was the Lord's δόμαμ his natural life-force, or the indwelling power of God that overshadowed him from his conception (cf. Lk 1:15) and enabled him to work miracles (cf. Lk 5:17, 7:19)? What is the significance of EVp's subsequent references to 'the Lord' within the passion narrative after his taking up in 5:19? Nails are withdrawn from 'the hands of the Lord' (6:21), while it is 'the Lord himself (not the body of the Lord) that Joseph washed prior to burial (6:24).

Before bringing into this enquiry the question of the meaning of άνελθον, note must be taken of the ease with which Ps-Peter's cry of departure could have been read in a Docetic fashion. A gnostizing interpretation lay only too readily to hand, especially if attention was focussed narrowly on 5:19 alone— or rather on the first part of the verse alone, for άνελθον does not at first sight seem an appropriate description of the death of a Christ-less human Jesus (on the assumption, which will shortly be questioned, that the two parts of 5:19 are to be taken in strict consequence, so that the subject of
If we are justified in seeking to make unified sense of the passion and resurrection sections of E/V, then the presumption exists that 5:19 refers only to the death of the Lord—to the ὄλως that the scribes, Pharisees and elders look back to in 8:28, 24/ Furthermore, it is likely that the cry of departure and ἀνέλεβαν do not signify separate happenings. More plausibly the cry interprets ἀνέλεβαν by anticipation—or ἀνέλεβαν may, vice versa, disclose the significance of the departure of the ὄλως. Either way, the death of the Lord could be spoken of both as the departure of his ὄλως and, euphemistically no doubt, as his being taken up. 25/ In this way Ps-Peter gives expression once again to the Christologia gloriae which informs his whole narrative. 26/ His Christ is always 'the Lord', who suffers no pain, experiences no thirst, and is not forsaken by God, whether in reality or in agony.

The precise meaning of ὄλως becomes on this interpretation of lesser importance. It is sufficient to establish that Ps-Peter is not affirming a dichotomist Christology, of a Docetic or any other kind. E/V will go on to talk about the deposition and burial of 'the Lord' (6:21, 24), and to declare that it was 'the one who was crucified' who rose and departed thither whence he had been sent (13:56). If ὄλως denotes the Lord's divine power, its departure means that in death 'the Lord' is accepted of God rather than that the humanity of Christ is abandoned or that Christ dies under divine displeasure. That is to say, E/V's form of the cry of departure is concerned to exclude precisely what the synoptic cry of dereliction appears to suggest, that Christ dies in weakness, accursed and forsaken by God.

The outcome of this discussion is that there is no miraculous ascension or translation of 'the Lord' is recorded in E/V 5:19. The author's theological or, more strictly, Christological apologetic has occasioned an account of the Lord's passion which tends towards the Docetic, or at least could only too easily be read as such, but this is a Tendenz that is seen more clearly elsewhere in the passion account. Here it has contrived merely to rob the death of Christ of its agony and its sting. The Lord was taken from us in triumphant peace. The contrast is, of course, most marked with Matthew and Mark, for Luke and John do not record the cry of dereliction.

4. The 'Very Great Signs' Accompanying the Lord's Death (5:20-7:27; cf. 8:28)

The summary statement of 8:28 presumably refers to the following features of the passion narrative:

(i) darkness and sunshine (5:15, 6:22)

The darkness enveloping the whole of Judaea at mid-day is paralleled in all the synoptic accounts, but some noteworthy differences appear in Ps-Peter. The darkness is intensified by 5:18, 'Many went around with lamps, thinking it was night, and tripped over.' Ps-Peter's special interest in the preternatural darkness arises from the Jewish concern that the body should not remain on the cross after sunset (5:15, citing Dt 21:23). The reappearance of the sun at what is found to be mid-afternoon (6:22, ninth hour), after the deposition of the body from the cross (6:21), evokes Jewish rejoicing (6:23), presumably because this concern had been met. Although the synoptics all limit the darkness to the three hours from noon to 3 P.M., they are in different ways impregnable about the temporal relation between the end of the darkness and the moment of the death of Christ. More significantly, all four canonical accounts place the taking down of the body considerably later, such that, despite Jn 19:31, a Judeo-Christian reader could not be certain from any of these accounts that Dt 21:23 had been observed. Ps-Peter puts the matter beyond doubt. The body is removed from the cross before 3 P.M., when the sun shines out again (a point without canonical parallel, although Lk 23:45 ascribes the darkness to the sun's failing), demonstrating that the darkness had not been night as many supposed.

Although these differences only marginally enhance the miraculous element in E/V when compared with the canonical Gospels, they provide further illustration of the miraculous serving the cause of Christological apologetic. In this case the ending of the abnormal darkness is correlated to the success in avoiding an infringement of Dt 21:23. In E/V the dying Christ is neither accursed of God (cf. above, on 5:19) nor the cause of fulfilment for the land.

There may be a further significance in the renewed sunshine of 6:22, which will be discussed below in connexion with the earthquake of 6:21.

(ii) rending of the temple curtain (5:20)

As in the synoptics, this is immediately contiguous to the expiry of Jesus. E/V agrees with Mt 27:51 and Mk 15:38 against Lk 23:45 in placing the death first. It also strengthens the implied causal connexion between the two happenings by stressing that the rending took place 'at the very moment' of the Lord's
that its significance lies in the chronological realm, as explained above.

Ps-Peter has no parallel to the splitting of the rocks and the resurrection of the saints found in Matthew's account (27:51–53). Yet if in this respect EVp may appear more restrained than the canonical Gospel with which it has most affinity, it nevertheless betrays a Tendenz which heightens the supernatural dimension of the passion,

(a) by stressing the Lord's impassibility,
(b) by its distinctive form of the cry of departure,
(c) by depicting the Lord's death as an θανάτος, and
(d) by ascribing an earthquake to the deposition of the Lord's body on the ground.

This Tendenz is not strictly Docetic, but may validly be described as proto-Docetic. It belongs to Ps-Peter's presentation of Christ as 'the Lord' throughout his passion. It has led not to the recording of miraculous events unparalleled in the canonical versions, but to a more sharply nuanced presentation effected by modifications of the tradition, whether or not EVp is here dependent on one or more of the four Gospels. These modifications include relocation (of the Lord's silence) and reordering (in the new connexion between the earthquake and the Lord's body touching the ground), as well as a radically recast form of the cry from the cross, making it express almost the opposite of the synoptics' delirium.

EVp 8:28 confirms the importance for the author of the miraculous features of the passion story. It is τὸ υγίειον oμηχλ ὁ μετεξεργάζεται accompanying the Lord's death which have convinced the people of his righteousness. Comparison with the synoptics is again revealing. In Mark the manner of Christ's dying evokes the centurion's confession (15:39). In Matthew the centurion and his men are impelled to the same confession by observing the earthquake and τὸ γυναικὸν (27:54). Luke's centurion makes the same confession as the crowd in EVp, and in addition the crowds at the spectacle, και ἑκατοντάκις τοῦ γυναικοῦ went away beating their breasts (23:47–48). Ps-Peter goes further than them all in pinpointing both the impact of the miraculous signs on ἢ καὶ ἡ ἀνάκοινωσis, and the recognition of this impact by the scribes, Pharisees, and elders.

Whether Ps-Peter's Christologia gloriae is angelomorphic /30/ or more Johannine in its 'compénétration' /31/ of different moments in the passage of the Lord through suffering and death to resurrection and exaltation cannot be established from the
passion narrative alone. It is certainly compatible with the
devotion to an exaggeratedly divine Christ to which popular
Christianity has inclined in every age.

II. The Resurrection Narrative

The miraculous is far more evident in Ps-Peter’s account of
the resurrection than in the preceding part of the fragment.
EvP comes very close to recounting the actual moment of
resurrection. It stops short of describing what happened in
the tomb itself, but this minimal limitation may itself have been
dictated by its unmistakable apologetic interest. For everything
that it does record is presented as heard or seen by those
guarding or observing the tomb—a company which in EvP includes
Jews (elders, 10:38; by implication, elders and scribes, 8:31; perhaps even scribes, Pharisees and elders, 8:28) as well as
Romans (the centurion Petronius and his soldiers, 8:31), and
even a crowd from Jerusalem (9:34). Ps-Peter is intent on
showing that the resurrection took place in full view of the
watching world. In due course we must clarify more precisely the
apologetic concern that has motivated this presentation.

But if EvP chooses not to tell its readers what transpired
within the tomb itself, it has plenty of wonders for those
outside to marvel at:

1. The Opening of the Tomb (9:35-47)
The miraculous features here are three in number:
(i) a loud voice heard from heaven (9:35),
(ii) the opening of the heavens and the descent to the tomb
of two (young) men enveloped in light (9:36),
(iii) the stone rolling back of its own accord (EvP tauroβ, 9:37)/32/
The only canonical parallel is Mt 28:2-3, part of the visit
to the tomb by the two Mary’s, but there is little in common between
the two texts. EvP’s loud heavenly voice may conceivably be a
counterpart to Matthew’s great earthquake, but in Matthew a
single ‘angel of the Lord’ descended, in the sight of the two
Mary’s alone, rolled back the stone and sat on it. EvP will in
data narrate the visit of Mary of Magdala and her friends to the
tomb later in its account (12:50 ff.; cf. 11:44, 13:55 for a
further parallel to Mt 28:2-3).

Wright: Apologetic and Apocalyptic

The only usual feature here is the stone’s rolling back
of its own accord. In Matthew this is the work of the angel,
while in Mk 16:14 and Lk 24:2 the stone is found already rolled
back. A rationale for EvP’s version is elusive. Is it simply
an example of ‘un merveilleux facile’?/34/ Perhaps his two
angelic visitants were intended for quite another role (!) (see
below). The only clue we might discern in the text is Ps-Peter’s
emphasis in this verse that the self-rolling stone was ἐκρήσθη
ὁ θεῖος θαυματουργός ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ—i.e., the stone set in place jointly
by the centurion, his troops and ‘all those who were there’,
including the elders and scribes, and sealed by them seven times
(8:32-33). But to frustrate such a combined effort a self-
rolling stone is not much more remarkable than one rolled by
angelic strength.

But perhaps this stone only appeared to roll of its own
accord. Perhaps we are meant to understand that ‘the Lord’
‘rolled it back, just as, it was tentatively suggested, ’the Lord’
rent the temple curtain, and the body of ’the Lord’,
removed from the cross, shook the ground.

2. The Exit from the Tomb (10:38-42)
Still in the full view and hearing of the assorted
guardians and spectators, another series of extraordinary
events took place.
(i) the emergence from the tomb of three men (tupos),
two bearing up ἀνθίδωροι or leading
(κατάνοονδοικούοι) the third (10:39-40),
(ii) the cross followed them out (10:39),
(iii) the two were as tall as the heavens, while the third
was taller still (10:40). 

(iv) a heavenly voice asked whether he (it?) had preached to the dead (10:41).

(v) the cross replied in the affirmative (10:42). 

Again it is evident that in these verses Ps-Peter belongs to the early Judaean-Christian apocalyptic, whose elements he uses to give expression to his Christologia gloriae in a resurrection that is also an ascension. The only possible discordant note is the need for the third man, i.e., the Christ figure, to be held upright or led by the hand by the other two. This has been explained as the consequence of the abandonment of Christ by his δώματος, which is also why the cross and not he answers the heavenly question. /35/ It is much more likely, however, that the two angels are escorting the third in triumph rather than compensating for his weakness. The rare word Ὠποδίδωσιν would then mean bear up almost in the sense of bear aloft. In the Ascension of Isaiah 3:16-17 Christ comes forth from the sepulchre sitting on the shoulders of the angel of the Holy Spirit and the archangel Michael. /36/

This interpretation accords with the transformation of the cross into a symbol of victory and glory, and its personification in the process. /37/ The cross answers the voice from heaven because it has accompanied Christ on his descensus ad inferos. It is now raised and exalted with him, and in works like the Apocalypse of Peter 1 (8th.) and Epistle of the Apostles 16 it will precede Christ at his parousia. Even if it provides no precise parallel to the cross speaking, a range of early Christian literature illustrates the speculation on the living and active cross which here finds a voice.

The immense height of Christ is another feature of early Christian works influenced by Jewish apocalyptic-angelic theology. /38/ It serves to declare his transcendent majesty. The descensus ad inferos to preach 'to those who sleep' also belongs to primitive Jewish Christianity, for the sleeping ones are almost certainly the Old Testament saints. /39/ Ps-Peter may here betray a further contact with Matthew's special material. His question and answer about Christ's preaching τὸς ἀνθρώπινος θειομάχον attest the deliverance which Mt 27:52 (cf. τῶν ἐκδοθέντων ἀγγέλων) dramatizes.

EvP's apologetic concern is still evident in this passage. It was while the soldiers were reporting the opening of the tomb that they, and presumably the others present, beheld (τάλος ἐπιστήσατο, 10:39) the next happenings. Ps-Peter repeats that they heard (ὃκνοῦν, 10:41) the heavenly voice, and the reply from the cross was heard (ὁμιγκράτω). But the nature of Ps-Peter's apologetic interest must not be misunderstood. W. L. Craig has compared Matthew's story of the guard at the tomb with EvP's 'apologetic legend'. The latter is 'a failsafe apologetic... By contrast in Matthew's story the guard is something of an afterthought'. /40/ But this may be to compare stories of a rather different character, for EvP's apologetic is theological rather than historical in emphasis. Mara points out that, apart from 8:30 (the elders' expression of concern to Pilate that the disciples of Jesus might steal the body, parallel to Mt 27:61), Ps-Peter is relatively uninterested in the empty tomb (but cf. later 13:56). The attention he gives to the co-operation of Jews and Romans in closing and sealing the tomb and witnessing its subsequent opening and the resurrection is directed, not to proving that the body was not stolen and that the tomb was found empty because Christ was raised on the third day, but to manifesting the glory of the Lord. Even while the tomb was shut, Christ with his cross had been announcing salvation to the sleeping saints of Israel. The opening of the tomb demonstrated that not even its sevenfold sealing by an alliance of Jewish religious leaders and a Roman militia could contain the power of the rising and ascending Lord.

3. Another Angelic Descent (11:44, 13:55) 

While the guard and the Jewish representatives were preparing to report all to Pilate, a further figure (ὑποδύτους τις) descended from the re-opened heavens and entered the tomb, in full view of the assembled company (ταῦτα ὁλόκληρα, 11:45).

Here EvP seems to link up again with the synoptic tradition (cf. Mt 28:2), as it paves the way for the visit of the women to the tomb (12:50ff. /41/). EvP's account is in part closer to Mark (16:5, brilliant angelic raiment; 16:8, flight of women in fear) than to Matthew and Luke, but differs significantly from all three in declaring what has happened to Christ. Whereas they say only that Christ ὁμοίως ὁλοκληρωτήματος ἡγέτης (in Lk 24:7 the women are also reminded of his prediction that he must ανασταθήσεται on the third day), Ps-Peter's υποδύτους states twice that the Lord ἀναστήσεται εἰς ἄγιον και τοὺς ἀποστόλους (11:56, 57). The synoptics direct the women to earthly duties—telling the disciples, awaiting Christ in Galilee—whereas EvP has no such reference, for the one who was crucified is no longer on earth. There may possibly be some significance in the difference between EvP's τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν ἀποστόλων of Mt 28:5 and Mk 16:6. Was Ps-Peter more inclined to regard the crucifixion as a merely past event, with the cross itself
transfigured into an emblem of power and victory?

Apart from the merging of resurrection and ascension/42/ in the angelic message to the women, EvP here is not obviously a more miracle-weighted account than its canonical counterparts. The running together of resurrection and exaltation could be viewed as Johannine, but no more than in John, if we may judge from the incomplete sequel in EvP 14:55-60, did it exclude appearances of the risen Lord. In default of the rest of EvP beyond what looks like the beginning of an appearance to the disciples on the shore of Galilee, we cannot argue too confidently from the angelic message to how Ps-Peter might have presented, if at all, the final exaltation of the Lord to heaven. Vaganay reminds us that quite orthodox writers in the early Church could speak in terms very similar to the angel here in EvP./43/

According to Daniélou, Ps-Peter's 'characteristic feature is to make use of apocalyptic symbolism in presenting the events of the life of Christ with a view to bringing out their theological import'./44/ But as we have seen, a distinction probably has to be drawn between those parts of EvP where the author remains firmly in contact with the canonical gospel tradition (whether he had access to it in the form of our actual Gospels or not), and those where he seems considerably freer of the control of this tradition./45/ The latter comprise the core of his resurrection narrative, including 9:34-10:42. In the narrative story and the last part of the resurrection account (12:50-14:60, and probably 11:43-49 also), despite numerous modifications of various kinds, the shape of the canonical tradition remains clearly recognizable. Ps-Peter has enhanced its miraculous content, as we concluded above, only marginally, and in the interests of his consistent presentation of Christ as the Lord. Its strong apologetic thread, which is built up largely out of the ingredients of an originally historical, apocalyptic, is now directed to this theological purpose. In so far as the miraculous dimension has undergone elaboration, the chief causative factor has been the desire to depict Christ, even on the cross and after death before the resurrection, as the Lord.

But in the central section of the resurrection story, apocalyptic has taken over, and EvP has more the colour of the apocalyptic literature of primitive Christianity. The Akhmim manuscript contained also, it must be remembered, a fragment of the Apocalypse of Peter and parts of 1 Enoch. It is consistent with the heavily apocalypticized character of 9:34-10:42 that here, where one might have expected it most in EvP, Christ is not called Ω ὑ π ο τ σ. The passage betrays the oblique symbolic approach typical of apocalyptic.

The relevance of such an evaluation of the work to the question of its sources is not the concern of this study, but it obviously raises the possibility of an influence upon the central description of the resurrection quite different from the broadly canonical gospel tradition which may account for the rest of the fragment./46/ If, however, the dazzling colour of that description is to be ascribed to Ps-Peter himself (since for some of its most noteworthy features no earlier witnesses are known),/47/ the relative restraint of the rest of his work is the more impressive. It is not too far from sustaining the conclusion that 'There is nothing docetic about the Lord of the apocryphal Petrine' gospel fragment.'/48/ By contrast, the claim that Ps-Peter's resurrection narrative is basically a very early miraculous epiphany story antedating the canonical accounts and partly reflected in them seems the more hazardous./49/ To argue this for a narrative including the self-rolling stone, the heavenly height of the risen Christ and his escorting angels and the walking cross,/50/ is certainly to champion a case burdened by improbability.
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/14/ Cf. McCant, *Peter*, 262: 'There is every indication of pain and humiliation... Left to die in torment, he maintains his Lordly dignity to the end.' Crossan, *Four Other Gospels*, 143ff., reads the text differently, attributing the unbroken legs to the good criminal of 4:13 (cf. Lk 23:40-41), not to Jesus. Such a reading makes 4:14 pointless (cf. Mara, Pierre, 121), contrary to Crossan's general picture of Pet-Peter as an author and redactor. *EvP*'s concern in 4:13 is not with the penitent malefactor himself, but with his confession about Jesus.
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/22/ Mara, Pierre, 135-36.
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/25/ This is in effect Denker's interpretation, *Petrusevangeliums*, 74, 118-20.

Maurer, *'Peter*', 181, fails to differentiate both in claiming that 'the author... deliberately purposes to keep to the line of the hitherto existing Gospels' and in asserting that passion as well as resurrection are released from the terra firma of history and transferred to the realm of legend and myth. Mara, *Pierre*, 173, distinguishes between the extraordinary phenomena 'd'ordre naturel' which accompany the crucifixion and those 'd'ordre surnaturel' which attend the resurrection. Vaganay, *Pierre*, 133 (cf. 288, 291), ascribes the difference to Ps-Peter's purpose, which focusses on the resurrection. For the passion he is content to reproduce the community's catechesis.

Crossan, *Four Other Gospels*, 180-81, draws attention to the fact that Denker's analysis (Petrusevangeliums) of EvP finds only the passion narrative to be closely undergirded by Old Testament texts. Denker's work was the basis of Koester's characterization ('Apocryphal and Canonical Gospels') of the passion narrative in terms quite different from the resurrection.

Daniélou, *Jewish Christianity*, 234-35, 266. The starting-point for the speculative development about the cross is probably Mt 24:30.

McCant, *'Peter*', 270.

Koester, 'Apocryphal and Canonical Gospels,' 128-29.
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CALVIN’S PENTATEUCHAL CRITICISM: EQUITY, HARDNESS OF HEART, AND DIVINE ACCOMMODATION IN THE MOSAIC HARMONY COMMENTARY

by David F. Wright

Apart from the Institutes, John Calvin’s extensive biblical commentaries arguably represent his weightiest theological legacy, and yet they have in large measure still to receive the scholarly attention they deserve. In his invaluable introduction to Calvin’s New Testament Commentaries, T. H. L. Parker speaks of “the unjustly neglected heart of Calvin’s work” and finds the literature on the New Testament commentaries “meagre and disappointing.”¹ If such expert opinion holds true for the New Testament commentaries, it is even more markedly applicable to the Old Testament expositions, on which no study comparable to Parker’s is as yet available.² Other secondary literature is no less elusive. In this essay I will be focusing on one of Calvin’s major Old Testament commentaries, the Mosaic harmony commentary, which is substantial enough to occupy some 1,100 columns in the Corpus Reformatum edition and 1,850 pages in the Calvin Translation Society’s English version. This substantial work casts fresh light on what has long been regarded in studies of the Institutes as a characteristic motif of Calvin’s theology: God’s accommodation to the limits and needs of the human condition.³

I. CALVIN’S MOSAIC HARMONY COMMENTARY

After producing a commentary on Genesis, Calvin decided to base his exposition of the four remaining books of Moses on his own har-

²Dr. Parker’s study of this sort is shortly to be published.
mony of them. The work was published in Latin in 1563 and in a slightly revised French edition the following year. To what extent, if any, Calvin's construction of his harmony was influenced by earlier works has yet to be investigated. However, so far there seems no reason to suppose it is not wholly his own work. The material is divided into two categories—history and doctrine, the latter being virtually synonymous with the Mosaic law. Not only has Calvin woven the narrative accounts into a single record, but, more interestingly, he has brought together all the teaching of the law and organized it within a unified pattern based on the Decalogue itself. So the history is interrupted by an enormous block of doctrine. This begins with a section called "Preface to the Law," comprising the preface to the Decalogue ("I am the Lord your God who brought you out . . ."). Exod. 20:1-2) and over a hundred similar verses, mostly from Deuteronomy, inculcating "the dignity of the law," often in reaffirmation of Israel's divine election or the divine authority of the commandments God gave through Moses. Parallel to this introduction, at the end of the whole corpus of legal material, come short sections called "Sum of the Law" and "Use of the Law." Following these, and immediately preceding a resumption of the historical narrative at Exodus 31, is a larger section called "Sanctions of the Law," in which Calvin outlines promises and threats (drawn largely from Deuteronomy) associated with the due observance or transgression of the legal deliverances of Moses.

Between these introductory and concluding sections Calvin treats the substance of the law itself in ten blocks addressing each of the commandments in turn. First he gives the commandment itself, from Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5, followed by other verses that he normally calls "expositions" of the commandment. These are for the most part restatements of the substance of the commandment scattered throughout the four books; Calvin regards them as having the same permanently inviolable authority as the commandments themselves. The expositions vary considerably in length, from a single verse (Lev. 18:20) for the seventh commandment to fifteen verses for the sabbath commandment and many more for the first commandment (including, for example, warnings against resorting to religious experts, whether wizards or prophets, of other nations).

Following the expositions are "supplements" (appendices) to each commandment. At the outset of the work Calvin describes these as "the ceremonies and outward exercises of worship" related to the commandments of the first table of the law and the "political laws" related to the commandments of the second table, but this neat division soon breaks down. He appends to the first commandment not only lengthy ceremonial supplements, on topics ranging from the passover to the Nazarite vow and the treatment of lepers, but also judicial supplements "whereby God commands the penalties to be inflicted if his religion is violated." The second commandment is also followed by supplements of both kinds. The ceremonial supplements (which Calvin does not distinguish in his text in the normal way) embrace the whole of the cultic system of tabernacle, priesthood, and sacrifices; the civil supplements include commands to destroy heathen temples and exterminate the heathen Canaanites.

The supplements together contain the whole of what Calvin assigns to the traditional second and third categories of the Mosaic law, distinct from the eternally valid moral law. The way he organizes and distributes his material is nevertheless interesting on a number of counts.

First, the expositions are distinctive in that they sometimes amount to an intermediate category between the Decalogue and the supplementary applications, possessing the force of neither. For example, he appends to the commandment against stealing an intriguing selection of expositions including the warning against delay in paying laborers their wages, which he insists is not political law but spiritual law, binding our conscience before God's judgment seat. His choice of material for inclusion in this category raises some worthwhile questions.

Second, Calvin sometimes elevates the provisions of the political
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supplements to the force of the moral law, as in the case of the forbidden degrees of marriage in Leviticus 18, which he subsumes under the supplements to the seventh commandment. His preface to this material ("I am the Lord your God. You shall not do as they do in the land of Egypt . . .") indicates that it does not truly belong to the category of political laws, which may vary according to time and place, "since it flows from the fountain of nature itself, and is founded on the general principle of all laws, which is perpetual and inviolable." Third, there is evidence of some vacillation on Calvin's part in his choice of whether to place material in either the ceremonial or political appendices and also in the matter of which commandment the material is properly associated with.

There is much about the composition of this commentary that is worthy of further investigation, but for the purposes of this essay it is sufficient to note the uniqueness of Calvin's distinction between the commandments and their exposition on the one hand and the various kinds of secondary supplements on the other. With this foundation laid, I will concentrate on a pervasive and complex feature of the commentary: Calvin's use of the principle of divine accommodation in coming to terms with textual contents that are in his view incompatible with true religion and natural equity as they stand, that require some kind of explanation or qualification lest they be thought to embody the perfect will of God. I am referring not merely to Calvin's frequent comments on anthropomorphic and anthropopathetic language to his concern with the forms of revelation occasionally employed by a

condescending God but rather to something more fundamental, to something that is in some cases quite surprising.

II. INGREDIENTS IN CALVIN'S APPEAL TO DIVINE ACCOMMODATION

The first of three major ingredients in this aspect of Calvin's exposition is his repeated insistence that God was dealing with a primitive people whose sensibilities had to be elevated in stages to apprehension of a purer spirituality by devices such as the Urim and Thummim, of which inquiry was authorized only by God's "concession . . . to the rudeness of his ancient people." It was improper that the drinking of the blood of a brute beast should be expiated by the death of a human being (Lev. 17:13-14), but "this mode of instruction (pædagogyum) was necessary for a rude people, to prevent their speedily lapsing into barbarism." In the Institutes Calvin stresses the infantile character of Israel (e.g., in 1.11.3 and 2.11.2), but in this commentary the accent falls more on its being rough and uncivilized.

A second ingredient is the hermeneutical constant in Calvin's work of the hardness of heart to which Jesus ascribed the Mosaic permission of divorce (Matt. 19:8; Mark 10:5). This point is sometimes conjoined to the former point, but I feel that it is important to consider it in its own right. Introducing the political supplements to the eighth commandment, Calvin says, "now follow the judicial laws, the principle of which is not so precise and perfect; since in their enactment God has relaxed the rigour of his justice in consideration of the peoples' hardness of heart." The Institutes convey scarcely more than a hint that this is at least one reason why Calvin believed the judicial or political law of the Old Testament could not carry the force of the moral law, but it is a key argument throughout this Mosaic commentary. What is in-
volved here is not simply moral or spiritual hardness in the sense of stony callousness but every aspect of the perversity and inconstancy of fallen humanity. Calvin displays in this commentary a remarkable facility in discerning in particular regulations the means by which God deals with refractory and reckless human beings. In this work he hardly ever invokes the concept of divine accommodation in relation to men and women qua finite creatures but almost invariably qua the sons and daughters of fallen Adam. He states that the equal distribution decreed in Numbers 13:3 was intended to prevent "any sinister suspicion or offence disturbing the unanimity of the people as a whole." He suggests that even the jealousy of Moses' supremacy that was shown by Aaron and Miriam served the "wonderful providence of God," for if the three had enjoyed unbroken harmony, it would have been viewed by many as "a deceitful and insidious conspiracy."19

The third ingredient built into Calvin's critical exposition is the principle of natural equity (aequitias), which from time to time he observes to be breached in the laws and deeds of the Israelites. The sources or precise definition of this notion need not concern us here; it is for Calvin a compound of natural law, moral law, and the law written on the conscience of which the Decalogue is the perfect embodiment and which all particular national laws should approximate (Inst., 4.20.16). In this commentary it provides Calvin with a means by which to differentiate between the requirements of the Mosaic law, for by his measure not all of the ceremonial and political supplements fall foul of this exacting standard—which is to say that they do not all entail divine indulgence toward human ineptitude or corruption. This criterion of equity can in some instances be applied to the Decalogue itself and to other expressions of God's will, such as the institution of marriage in the creation story. On occasion, however, Calvin speaks of an equity the content of which has no such biblical articulation, as in the case of the forbidden degrees of marriage, concerning which he appeals to "the purity (integritas) of nature...the perpetual decency (honestas) of nature" and to the fact that "even among pagan peoples, this law was accounted indissoluble, as though implanted and engraved on the human heart."20

III. EXAMPLES OF CALVIN'S APPEAL TO DIVINE ACCOMMODATION

Having identified these three dominant ingredients in Calvin's application of divine accommodation to the text of his Mosaic commentary, we can now proceed to examine more closely how he works it out in practice. At the outset, we might note Calvin's assertion that the Decalogue alone should have been adequate but that it had to be more fully explained "lest its brevity should render it obscure to a rude and slow-witted people." In amplifying the Ten Commandments, God was being considerate of "the people's dull and weak understanding."21 In fact, he suggests that not even ten commandments were necessary. We should always be occupied with contemplation of God's greatness, but because we are fickle and forgetful, God in his indulgence instituted the sabbath as if to say, "Since you cannot be unceasing in seeking me with your total energy and concentration of mind, at least give up to me some like undistracted time."22 "This rude people required to be enticed by every possible means to present gladly to God the worship that was his due."23

The very repetitiveness and concern with minor details that mark these books of the Bible provide Calvin with numerous opportunities to explain the patient indulgence of God in schooling disciples so easily wayward and negligent. There was, he said, "no manifestation of God's wrath so conspicuous as not to be forgotten too often by human stupidity."24 Thus, in matters great and small Calvin presents the whole scheme of the Mosaic church and community as a concession to human weakness. "In the sacrifices and oblation God consulted the rude condition of the people and took, as it were, the character of a man, as if he dined familiarly with them."25

Divorce is an appropriate subject on which to become more specific. Although Calvin cites a dominical word as his authority, his comments on the provision of divorce in Deuteronomy 24:1-4 are surprising in
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1CO, 24: 662 (ET: CTS, 1: 333).
their sharpness. "Christ pronounces that it was never lawful, because it is openly repugnant to the first institution of God, from which a perpetual and inviolable rule must be sought... How great was the obstinacy of that nation, which could not be restrained from dissolving a sacrosanct and inviolable tie." Calvin acknowledges that divorce did release battered wives from cruel oppression and that it was preferable to polygamy, but he maintains that a subsequent union of a divorced woman was "in the sight of God... unlawful" and that the husband who issued a bill of divorce was signing his own condemnation.

Elsewhere in Deuteronomy (21:10-13), there is a command that the women among the peoples conquered by the Israelites would have to be purified before the latter could marry them. It would have been far better, says Calvin, if intermarriage had been proscribed altogether, but the license enjoyed by the victor of war leaves "no room for perfect discipline... Wherefore God so tempers his indulgence that the Israelites... in the very fervour of their lust should retain some religious consideration (pictatis studium)." In the same general context, Calvin deplores the fact that adultery with a female slave was not made a capital offense. Instead, "in consideration of the people's infirmity, the punishment is mitigated."

The arrangements for the treatment of Israelite slaves provoked lengthy comments from Calvin. He disapproved of any of God's servants becoming slaves on the grounds that it infringed upon God's own sovereign right over them. He was upset that God should have to be satisfied with a symbol of his sole lordship in the form of a limited six-year period of service. Far worse in his estimation, however, was the restriction that, if within this period the slave had married a fellow slave and had children, he could be released in the sabbatical year only if he left his wife and children behind with his master. This was monstrous (prodigio).

for nothing could be more contrary to nature than for a husband to forsake his wife and abandon his children and move elsewhere. But the tie of slavery could be dissolved in no other way than by divorce, that is to say,

by this impious violation of marriage. There was gross barbarity in this forced separation.

Nevertheless, Calvin half-justifies it:

for if the wife and children had been set free for the husband to take with him, their lawful master would have been robbed not only of the woman, who was his slave, but also of the children, on whose upbringing he had incurred expense. The sanctity of marriage therefore gave way in this case to private right.

He concludes that this was yet another defect that God tolerated because of the people's irredeemable hardness of heart.

The same chapter of Exodus goes on to specify what should happen in the case of an Israelite woman sold into slavery by her father. Calvin again excoriates as barbaric this act of fathers selling their children to escape poverty. He discerns some redeeming features in the precise measures laid down, but he states that the passage as a whole reveals "how many vices were of necessity tolerated in this people." He suggests that even in this leniency, God "shows that chastity is pleasing to him, as far as the people's hardness could take it"—the last clause obviously qualifying the verb (ostendit).

But Calvin did not always approve of generosity toward slaves. When Deuteronomy 23:15-16 forbids Israelites to return runaway slaves of Canaanite origin, he cannot regard this as "altogether just," for it violates the ius gentium and defrauds their rightful masters. He reconciles himself to the prohibition only by the groundless assumption that it applied solely when the slaves had fled cruel Canaanite masters. He rejects the argument that foreign slaves were given asylum for evangelistic reasons, maintaining that it was far less likely that such alien "filth and refuse" would adopt the faith of Israel than that they would subvert its true religion and morality.
Some of the occasions and subjects on which Calvin finds God accommodating the terms of his law to the raw human material of Israel are more surprising than others. Mourning is one such instance. Aaron was forbidden to mourn at all, but his progeny could mourn for members of their close family. Even this permission was an improper measure of divine indulgence in Calvin's opinion, granted "lest immoderate strictness might drive them to extravagant passions." He similarly considered the one-month mourning that Israel undertook on Aaron's death to be improper on the grounds that men and women are too much inclined to excessive grief; he conceded, however, that it had the merit of serving to unite the living with the dead, and "the weakness of the ancient people had need of being propped and supported by such aids as this." In another vein, Calvin maintained that the budding of Aaron's rod should not have been needed, because the authority of the priesthood had been more than sufficiently established. Yet the obduracy of Israel was such that one final clinching demonstration was called for, as God "even struggled with their depravity and perverseness, in order to recall them to their senses."

A verse in Numbers (35:19; see also vv. 21, 27) apparently authorizes a private individual to avenge the death of a close relative by killing the murderer. Calvin finds this quite intolerable—"barbaric . . . absurd." It was yet another concession to the people's hardness of heart, he argued; "it would have been difficult otherwise to restrain the strong desire of vengeance arising from the feelings of human nature." Putting the best face on it, Calvin interprets the statement as a warning that unless provision is made for the innocent, the fury of the relatives of murder victims will not be controllable. The law says in effect that death inflicted by a relative in vengeance will not be punished.

Elsewhere in the commentary Calvin is emphatic that the vengeance wreaked upon the Amalekites and others was God's and not Israel's, although the latter served as the instrument of the former. At different times Calvin expresses a concern both that Israel should abandon itself to reckless retaliation and that it should moderate the vengeance decreed by God. But he is not at all hesitant in justifying the total extermination of the tribes of Canaan. A remarkable contrast is evident in his exposition in this connection. On the one hand he has no problem with the divine command to "save alive nothing that breathes" in the cities of the Canaanite peoples (Deut. 20:16-17), arguing that the need for their elimination was such that the Israelites were rightly excused from "applying the common laws of war to the Canaanite nations." On the other hand, he is more hesitant regarding the immediately preceding command to kill all the male inhabitants of captured cities belonging to other peoples (Deut. 20:12-15):

the concession (!) here given seems to confer too great a licence. Since pagan writers command even the conquered to be spared, and teach that those who lay down their arms . . . should be granted mercy . . . how does God, the Father of mercies, give his sanction to indiscriminate slaughter? . . . More was conceded to the Jews on account of their hardness of heart than was justly lawful for them. Unquestionably, by the law of love, even armed men should be spared, if they cast away the sword and craved mercy; at any rate it was not lawful to kill any but those who were captured under arms with sword in hand. This permission, therefore, to slaughter, which is extended to all males, falls far short of perfection.

The only comfort Calvin can draw is that although in their ferocity the Jews would scarcely have tolerated a requirement of perfect justice being laid upon them, nevertheless God would at least restrain their excessive violence from descending to the extremity of cruelty . . ., for they were not allowed to kill either women or children.

It must be emphasized that Calvin does not apply this grave reservation, with its arbitrary differentiation between parallel commands of God within a single passage, to the punishment of the Canaanite peoples by wholesale slaughter—women and children included.


CO, 24:631 (ET: CTS, 3:53). The French edition adds "and of the equity which ought to be in all God's children."
Outside the borders of the promised land, however, Calvin sought to demonstrate that the principles of the just war were upheld in Israel's conquests. So a particular justification is required of the defeat and destruction of Sihon in Deuteronomy 2:24-37. It was “not lawful,” says Calvin, “for the children of Israel to make war upon it until they had been provoked by an unjust refusal” of free passage, for it was not part of the promised land. This circumstance explains to Calvin’s satisfaction why the Israelites sent an embassy of peace despite the fact that God had declared the territory of Sihon ceded to Israel and had told the Israelites to take possession of it by battle. Until this overture had been unjustly spurned, he argues, Israel had no just grounds for waging war on Sihon.41

Calvin resorts to a similar argument in his commentary on Joshua in order to resolve the apparent conflict between Joshua 11:19 and Deuteronomy 7:2.

The Israelites, although they were forbidden to show [the Canaanites, etc.] mercy, were received by them in a hostile manner, in order that the war against them might be just. And it was wonderfully controlled by the secret providence of God that, being doomed to destruction, they should voluntarily offer themselves to it, and by provoking the Israelites be the cause of their own ruin.42

So in some cases Calvin does give evidence of a concern that “the common laws of war” should have been observed even in the conquest of the Canaanites.

There is no denying that this Pentateuchal commentary contains some instances of divine accommodation as impressive as any found in Calvin’s other writings and pointing forward to the supreme accommodation of God to the measure of mankind in the incarnation. In speaking of the burning bush, Calvin says that God “descended in some way from his majesty,” assuming visible form so “that he might reveal himself as far as was useful and as far as their comprehension would admit.”43 “God deigned so far to condescend as to take up the people in his arms.”44 Moses, Aaron, and the elders “saw the God of Israel . . . not in all his reality and greatness but in accordance with the dispensation . . . which he accommodated to human capacity.”45 God accommodates himself to our ignorance, says Calvin, adopts “puerile” descriptions “well adapted to our imperfection,” descends familiarly to us, as if he were our table companion (conviva), “is often wont to deal with his people on human principles,” and “as it were, indulges us, when he listens to our desires,” allowing himself to be influenced by our prayers.46 But in this work Calvin applies the pattern in a more radical manner than the Institutes would lead one to expect and beyond the range of references covered in Ford Lewis Battles’s well-known article on the subject.47

IV. IMPLICATIONS OF DIVINE ACCOMMODATION AS HEURISTIC DEVICE

This heuristic device has a variety of interesting implications. It can be used to answer any number of questions about God’s intent in various actions. Why did God promise prophets to his people? So that they would not feel slighted when they saw all their neighbors entranced by oracles, augury, and magic.48 Why were spies sent into the promised land? Not because it was necessary to reconnoiter the land to ensure a successful attack but rather to encourage the people, who would otherwise have been cowardly and lifeless, to throw off their inactivity.49 In one particularly telling phrase, Calvin likens God’s restriction on the sale of Israelite land to that of a man who has suspicions concerning his heir and forbids him to alienate the family inheritance—“such was the condition of the ancient people.”50

44 Battles, “God Was Accommodating Himself to Human Capacity.”
45 CO, 24: 271 (ET: CTS, 1: 433) on Deuteronomy 18:15-18; see also 18:9-14.
So, application of the axiom of divine accommodation can serve to heighten God's inscrutability. How were the Israelites to know that God disapproved of divorce, for example? Asserting that God broke up the Israelite tribes into separate bands in order to prevent rivalry and feuding, Calvin declares that God chose to rule Israel generously and paternally rather than despotically, that "he rather conformed himself to their wishes than drove them by compulsion." He then proceeds to say that "God appears to concede many things that he does not approve. He allowed the people to eat flesh in the wilderness; he permitted husbands to give a bill of divorce to their wives, and even to have several wives at the same time. Nevertheless such permission did not make it right for them to eat flesh, or free them of blame for divorce and polygamy." But how was Israel to distinguish between God-given direction and God-given "license"?

The distinctive element in this presentation seems not the gracious condescension of God but his malleability, even his vulnerability, indeed even his captivity to the passions and lusts of his rude people. This is at the same time a gain in historical realism. In this commentary Calvin displays at times a remarkably sharp insight into the circumstances of Israelite life, from its religious and material environment to its group dynamics and social psychology. He notes, for instance, that the ban on eating pork was a critical test for Israel partly because it was a comparatively cheap food, and he speculates that the reason for the exclusion of honey from offerings destined to be burned may have been that "cooked honey immediately becomes sour, and causes the bread with which it is mixed to ferment." He suggests that the trouble with allowing a king to have several wives is that they prove expensive, vie competitively for his special favor, and are liable to make him effeminate. And he states that "the poor are led into crime more by the fear of shame than by hunger, cold, and other discomforts."25

Such perceptiveness on Calvin's part is in turn grounded upon his ever-present awareness of the recalcitrance of the human material God is working with. This strain is not infrequently explicit in the biblical text. For example, when Israel left Egypt, God did not lead his people via Philistia, "lest the people change their minds when confronted by war and return to Egypt." Calvin knew that God could have obviated such an eventuality, but "since he is often accustomed to deal with his people on human principles, he chose to adopt the method which was most suited to their weakness."53 But just as often Calvin reads this factor into a passage that affords no hint of its presence, and he does so with notable ingenuity and insight. He explains why the disposition of the tribes in the Israelite camp had to be spelled out so precisely (Numbers 2), for instance, by envisaging in detail a whole series of particular disputes that would otherwise have arisen.54 The priests' share of the offerings is carefully specified, he asserts, in order to prevent them from fleeing the people.55 In such comments Calvin provides an interesting illustration of how theological principle (in this case his conviction of the ubiquitous versatility of human sinfulness) can sharpen historical perception.

It is also tempting to discern in Calvin's tireless emphasis on the willfulness, blindness, and sluggishness of the Israelites that God had to deal with some reflection of his own experiences as pastor in Geneva. He did write this commentary in the last years of his life, and although here as in most of his biblical commentaries explicit references and applications to the contemporary situation are rare, confined for the most part to criticisms of the "papists" and especially the papal priesthood, we may nevertheless be justified in supposing that his insight into the accommodating indulgence of God was in part the result of his suspicion that his own patient struggles with the difficult Genevans may not have been wholly unlike God's having "struggled with the Israelites' depravity and perverseness." As he notes at one point, kings, magistrates, and pastors must recognize that there will always be something less than perfect in whatever they do.56

V. Revelatory Status of the Pentateuch

The status that the Pentateuch is accorded in this commentary also deserves some concluding comment. It emerges as a fusion of God-given instruction and God-directed history with a limited admixture of social anthropology and primitive religion and morality. Where the result differs from a modern historic-critical analysis, of course, is in Calvin's apparent insistence that God is always in control. He is not saying that God revealed his will to Israel and that Israel understood only imperfectly because it was a primitive and hard-hearted people; rather, he is saying that God took Israel's limitations into account and chose to give them a good deal of leeway in the enactment of ceremonial and civil legislation. God allowed this license to qualify his direction to the extent that the direction he delivered already accommodated the people's stubbornness and blindness. As he puts it in his introduction to the political supplements of the sixth commandment, "although God did not carry out to absolute perfection the several laws which he enacted, yet in their principle he desired that a clear and unreserved approval of the Commandment should appear."

At this point Calvin identifies no particular case that falls short of that desired perfection, but he does so a few pages later, in a manner that must make us smile. Exodus 21:18-19 dictates that if a person recovers from an assault after a period of medical treatment, the assailant shall suffer no penalty beyond paying for his victim's time in bed. Calvin argues, "the punishment here exacted for injury and violence is so slight, that it could have served as a provocation to the wantonness of the wicked." He cites an ancient Roman law that inflicted a light fine on one found guilty of unjustly attacking another person and notes that it fell into disuse after the precedent of a man of means who enjoyed beating people about the ears and who went about doing so accompanied by a slave who was instructed to pay the fine on the spot. So with the Israelites in this case, says Calvin, "who would not readily enjoy the pleasure of knocking down his enemies" if the only condition was that one provide for their subsistence while

they were confined to bed? He explains the law once more in terms of the hard heart.

Whenever God seems to pardon too easily, and with too much clemency, let us recall that he designedly deviated from the more perfect rule, because he had to do with an intractable people. The fact that God did not carry out the political laws to their perfection, shows that by this leniency he wished to reprove the people's perverseness, which could not even bear to obey so mild a law.

This God of Calvin's pentateuchal criticism is at one and the same time utterly sovereign (not least in his knowledge of his people's hearts and ways) and self-limiting in his teaching and leading of his people.

God's sovereign control is implicitly attested at every point in the commentary, in which Calvin affirms, as he does incessantly, that the enactments given to Israel were intended by God to point to Christ or to teach (to us as well as to Israel) basic principles of true religion and godly living. That is to say—and the assertion requires due emphasis to eliminate all possibility of misunderstanding—however sharply Calvin adduces concession to the puerilafis of Israel in explaining the details of pentateuchal legislation, it by no means follows that the laws of Moses are nothing more than ad hoc, or rather ad hominem, compromises so relativized by their adaptation to the condition of ancient Israel as to have no continuing purpose in God's revealed wisdom for his people now as well as then.

As evidence to support this point it should be sufficient to cite what Calvin says in the preface to the commentary about the function of the different elements of the law according to his analysis. Not only do the Ten Commandments "briefly but comprehensively encompass the rule of a just and holy life," he says, but their supplementary appendages, which add not the least to the substance of the law itself, are meant "to retain the godly in the spiritual worship of God, which consists of faith, repentance, prayer to God, praises expressing gratitude, and even the endurance of the cross" as well as "to promote justice towards men." Later in the commentary, as we have already noted, Calvin supplies brief accounts of the "sum of the law" (i.e., love of God and of one's neighbor) and the "use of the law." These contain nothing worthy of special note when compared with the corresponding discussions in the Institutes.

See CO, 24: 569 (ET: CTS, 2: 423) on Leviticus 27:14ff. "Undoubtedly superstitious prayers were sometimes mixed up with this exercise of piety, as if they might gain favour for themselves by striking a bargain with God. But because the thing was not wrong in itself, God indulgently bore with errors which could not be corrected."


So it is not surprising that whatever else Calvin might say about the number and the form of the sacrifices as divine concession to the desires and needs of Israel, he also insisted that they were given to direct the faith and hope of Israel to Christ. Indeed, he suggests that God seems to have taken his cue, as it were, from “the many forms of sacrifice heaped together by the Gentiles” in omitting from the prescriptions assigned to his people “no part of them at all which might afford a profitable exercise for believers” concerning the two main purposes of sacrificial thanksgiving and sacrificial expiation. Nor is it at all remarkable that Calvin should have repeatedly drawn out the abiding spiritual and ethical significance of much of the Mosaic law. His concentration in this study on God’s accommodation to resistant humanity in delivering his law to Israel must not for a moment be thought to call into question these fundamental marks of all of Calvin’s expositions of Moses. So instinctively does Calvin read the Pentateuch with an eye to its continuing relevance that he not infrequently includes “us” alongside Israel not only in speaking of those who profit from its divine teaching but also in speaking of those who by virtue of their refractoriness and rawness encouraged God to give his law the form he did.

But an element of tension between the two principles at work here would appear unavoidable. Calvin sought to counter objections raised against the derivation of spiritual lessons from crude materials. The commandment concerning the sabbath of the land, which he placed among the supplements to the fourth commandment, had fallen foul of the criticism that “there is nothing in common between insensible earth and a spiritual mystery.” Calvin responded by asking why the earth should not be “a conspicuous token for the rude inculcation” of the doctrine of the sabbath. After all, the far more basic matter of “the doctrine of salvation is committed to paper or parchment before it reaches us.” Shall we then be faulted for “our foolish credulity,” he asks, in embracing “promises transmitted to us by a stinking skin or some other filthy material?” Such a note directs us toward the skandalon of Bethlehem and Calvary, where the self-accommodating God is seen at his best.

---


CHURCH, WORD, AND SPIRIT

Historical and Theological Essays in Honor of GEOFFREY W. BROMILEY

Edited by James E. Bradley and Richard A. Muller
How Controversial Was the Development of Infant Baptism in the Early Church? 1

David F. Wright

Baptism remains one of the most sensitive points of disagreement among the churches. Although the level of theological and historical debate has subsided since the stir excited by Karl Barth’s celebrated rejection of infant baptism2 and by the exchanges between Joachim Jeremias and Kurt Aland,3 baptism has come increasingly to the fore in ecumenical discussion, largely as a result of Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry.4

But if paedobaptism has been a major topic of inter-confessional controversy intermittently since the sixteenth century, how controversial a subject was it in the early centuries of the church? This question is different from the modern historical one whether babies were baptized in primitive Christianity, and also from that of the biblical and theological rationale for baptizing them today—to which Geoffrey Bromiley has made an invaluable contribution from the perspective of Reformed theology.5 The precise question before us in this essay is the extent to which the baptizing of babies was attended by argument and debate within the early church itself. But although it does not set out to confront the fundamental historical and theological issues, it will scarcely be able to avoid touching upon them here and there.

Although Christian baptism was often surrounded by contention in the patristic centuries, especially in the western church, the period saw no significant disagreement about the acceptability of baptizing babies. There is no precedent in the era of the fathers for the baptismal divide of the sixteenth and subsequent centuries. The magisterial Reformation equated the error of the Anabaptists with that of the

1. This is a revised and expanded version of a paper contributed to a Joint Study Group between representatives of the Church of Scotland and the Baptist Union of Scotland. An earlier contribution, similarly revised, is to appear in the SJT as “The Origins of Infant Baptism—Child Believers’ Baptism?”
4. For Aland’s subsequent works, see my forthcoming article (cited n. 1 above), n. 4.
Donatists of Roman North Africa (and Anabaptists were punished under the provisions of anti-Donatist legislation enacted by the emperors of Christian Rome), but the Donatists’ baptismal dispute with the Catholic church had nothing to do with the propriety of baptizing infants.

Nevertheless, the development of infant baptism in the early church was far from uncontroversial. The fourth century witnessed the widespread deferment of baptism, and the evidence of the inscriptions strongly suggests that this had happened in the third century also, albeit for different reasons. Furthermore, the Pelagian conflict raised in an acute form the question why babies were baptized, and discussion of baptismal issues often exposed uncertainties relating to infant baptism. Solely in the idiosyncratic person of Tertullian did it appear to challenge the practice altogether, although this is not the whole truth.

**NEW TESTAMENT ECHOES OF A PRIMITIVE CONTROVERSY?**

Do the Gospel accounts of Jesus’ blessing of the children (Mark 10:13-16, par.) preserve traces of a debate within the primitive Christian communities on whether babies should be baptized? New Testament scholarship yields no agreed answer to this question (nor indeed to the related question, which is not our concern here, whether the pericope reflects the uncontroversial practice of baptizing babies). The case for a Sitz im Leben in which the question of infant baptism was a live issue has been made chiefly by Oscar Cullmann and Joachim Jeremias. They lean in particular on the use of the Greek verb κολλεῖν, whose occurrence in baptismal contexts in New Testament writings and other early Christian literature they take to reflect a standard inquiry in primitive Christian baptismal procedure whether any hindrance existed to a candidate’s baptism. The inclusion of this technical term shows, in Cullmann’s words, that those who transmitted this story of the blessing of children wished to recall to the remembrance of Christians of their time an occurrence by which they might be led to a solution of the question of infant baptism.

The κολλεῖν hypothesis has not gone uncontested. A. W. Argyle, for example, has objected that a technical liturgical verb would be unlikely to show such variation in the objects it governs as κολλεῖν does—the candidate (Mark 10:14, par.; Acts 8:36; Ps-Clementines); water (Acts 10:47); the baptizer (Matt 3:14; Epiphanius); and God (Acts 11:17). Other considerations must incline us toward

a verdict of uncertainty on the special role of κολλεῖν. Although the claims that the synoptic narrative must be read against a context in which the baptizing of infants was disputed is not wholly dependent upon the κολλεῖν hypothesis, the claim itself enjoys no more than some degree of plausibility. The conclusion must be that, if there are grounds for holding that the baptizing of babies began or was extended around the time Mark’s Gospel was compiled, we can do no more than conjecture that this development ran into controversy which the incident of the blessing of the children was invoked to resolve. It may be speculated that, if the practice of paedobaptism was hotly contested in these early decades, the dispute would have seemed to leave early discernible traces in early Christian writings, within or without the New Testament. Apart from the debatable κολλεῖν, nobody claims that it has.

**TERTULLIAN’S CONTROVERSY**

Tertullian’s well-known objections to baptizing infants, spelled out in his homily on Baptism (c. 200), should be interpreted not as opposition to a novel practice (his failure to state his objection in these terms being undoubtedly significant) but as a corollary of his broader approach to baptism. Although he expresses this in a highly characteristic fashion, it is not far removed from a remarkably common patristic understanding of baptism which should perhaps be regarded as the single most serious weakness of early baptismal thought. Tertullian’s plea for delayed baptism therefore merits more extended treatment than his idiosyncratic presentations might suggest.

Tertullian is concerned with the profitability of baptismal reception. Deferment is advocated because it is “more profitable” (utile), in accordance with the candidate’s character, attitude, and age (Baptism 18:4). Therefore, postponement is particularly appropriate in the case of young children. Tertullian gives no suggestion that he views baby baptism as invalid, as not true baptism at all, as though the person baptized as a baby could subsequently receive a proper (second) baptism. His quarrel with the baptizing of babies is not that of a latter-day credobaptist but seems to be twofold: it is needless, and it is attended with very great risk. On both counts it is unprofitable, or at least highly likely to prove so.

First, it is needless because baptism imparts the remission of sins and infancy is the age of innocence (innocens aetas; Baptism 18:5). The implication is clear: because of their innocence babies have nothing or little to gain from baptism. Tertullian does not unpack for his readers the implications of innocens in this celebrated phrase, but its primary reference must be to a baby’s lack of sins of his own commission. We should not deduce from it that Tertullian held no belief in original sin, nor is it altogether safe to assert that “he could hardly have taken this attitude toward infant baptism unless he had held lightly to the doctrine of original sin.”

7. See E. Ferguson’s suggestive study, “Inscriptions and the Origin of Infant Baptism,” JTS N.S. 33 (1979) 36-46, which is discussed in my article (cited n. 1 above).
though his doctrine has occasioned considerable debate, he is not reticent in speaking about the effects upon all mankind of Adam’s fall. In particular, “he is more explicit and outspoken about this sinful bias [of a vitiated nature] than previous theologians,” and in this treatise on The Soul, in a difficult passage, he declares every soul to be impure (immunda) until it is reborn in Christ. This impurity is more than the soul’s “investment by pagan influences before and after birth,” although Tertullian makes much of these; it also, or rather primarily, encompasses a transmitted natural infection by sin.

But if innocens aetas provides no pointers to Tertullian’s view of original sin, its place in the argument seems to suggest either that no close connection had yet been forged by him or the church between original sin and infant baptism or that, in his thought about the benefits of baptism, the sins of responsible free will involved much larger than the inheritance from Adam, in whatever terms this was defined. The latter is the more likely explanation, and brings us in fact to the second reason why Tertullian advocated the postponement of baptism. We will have cause, however, to return to the former possibility.

The second, and weightier, consideration that argues for the utmost circumspection in giving Christian baptism are the risks attendant upon its premature reception. In his homily on baptism, Tertullian has far more to say about these than his one brief, tantalizing mention of innocens aetas. For they are not limited to infant candidates:

With no less reason ought the unmarried also to be delayed until they either marry or are firmly established in continence; until then, temptation lies in wait for them, for virgins because they are ripe for it, and for widows because of their wandering about. (Baptism 18:6)

Tertullian ends this chapter with a sentence that takes us to the heart of his concern: “All who understand what a burden (pondus) baptism will be have more fear of obtaining it than of its postponement” (Baptism 18:6). It is this awesome pondus that should deter sponsors from promoting infant candidates, since death may prevent them ensuring the fulfillment of the baptismal promises they take on their behalf, or “the subsequent development of an evil disposition” in the baptized younger may frustrate their (the sponsors’) purpose (18:4).

The fearful prospect that governs Tertullian’s counsel is that of serious postbaptismal sin. Indeed, the very fact that he argues as he does about the risks of the premature baptism of infants shows conclusively that baby baptism, however unwise, was real baptism, after which there remained no subsequent (second) baptismal washing. What surfaces here in Tertullian, and much more starkly elsewhere in his corpus, especially in his later (Montanist) treatise De Paenitentia, is by no means confined to his convictions alone. It was a pervasive belief among the fathers that the washing of baptism covered only those sins committed up to this point in one’s life. Providing for sins committed after baptism, especially for grave offences, was a major problem in the early centuries, and was eventually responsible for the development of a system of ecclesiastical penance. In the literature of the period, a clear parallelism obtains between baptism and any subsequent opportunity for remission of grave sins; the latter could be spoken of as a “second repentance (penance),” or even as a “second baptism.” Considerable controversy surrounded the questions whether, for what offences, and whether more than once such post-baptismal remission could be granted. The Monantist Tertullian was of course a strident contributor to these arguments, which constitute the background to the wording of the clause in the Nicene Creed, “one baptism for the remission of sins.”

The baptizing of babies and infants was bound to appear fraught with the greatest peril so long as such profound anxiety contemplated the possibility of moral lapses after baptism. At the very least, baptism should be given only to the person who asks for it, which in the context of Tertullian’s baptismal treatise, must mean the person who receives baptism in the full knowledge of, even in spite of, its forbidding pondus. It makes no sense to entrust substantia divina to one too young to be trusted with substantia terrena. What emerges clearly from the battery of arguments Tertullian discharges is that baptism is most wisely received by the person whose preparation for it has been so thorough that his or her maintenance of baptismal purity thereafter is as fully guaranteed as possible.

While this assumes in practice the baptism only of believers, it goes far beyond this essential requirement of credobaptist teaching. At the end of this chapter of De Baptismo Tertullian declares that “a person whose faith is entire [integral], i.e., who has sufficient faith in God, can be sure [secura] that though he defers his baptism God will not let him die unbaptized.” We must remind ourselves that Tertullian’s position did not entail his treating the baptism of babies or young children as other than Christian baptism. In fact, in cases of “necessity,” he seems to have regarded it as the proper course of action. “Necessity” was constituted routinely, it must be assumed, by the likelihood of death, and occasionally by the threat of persecution. Martyrdom in turn was another form of second baptism, a blood baptism which covered all outstanding sin, and was the supreme baptism inasmuch as it cut off every possibility of subsequent sin.

Tertullian’s controversy with infant baptism turns out to reflect a framework of reference unlikely to be shared by any of the participants in latter-day baptismal

16. A further study would be needed to show the evidence for this. Briefly, the absence of references to “one baptism” in western creeds shows that its inclusion is unrelated to the (largely western) controversies over baptism; the specified purpose “for the remission of sins” indicates the reason for insisting on “one baptism”; and the exposition given by Cyril of Jerusalem, one of the earliest witnesses to such a clause in a creed and the first to provide an explanation of it, makes clear that it excludes the possibility of setting things right a second time if a person falls once after baptism (Procatech. 7). Chrysostom’s comment is very similar (Bapt. Catech. 3:23).
17. Evans’s paraphrase in Tertullian’s Homily on Baptism, 106, of fides integra secura est de salute (Baptism 18:6).
disputes, at least among Protestants. On the other hand, baptism (or its higher surrogate, martyrdom) was essential for salvation (Baptism 12:1, quoting John 3:5), and hence had to be administered in emergency even to infants. But on the other hand, because baptism’s capacity to deal with sin was limited to the burden of sin already accumulated by the candidate, it must be sought only with the utmost caution and sense of responsibility, and hence would normally never be granted, because never requested by infants. It is fair to say that neither of these two fundamental convictions would command much assent in baptismal debate today. Baptizers on both sides of “the waters that divide” are likely to place much greater weight on a belief which the calculating prudence of Tertullian’s theology ineluctably undervalued—namely, that the gift or strengthening of the Spirit associated with baptism is God’s provision enabling the baptized to overcome the temptations that continue to assail him or her to the end of life. This conviction led the early church to baptize catechumens when persecution threatened, so that they might be fortified to stand firm in the hour of trial.

A PRACTICE IN SEARCH OF A THEOLOGY?

In Tertullian, it seems, the reality of original sin has scarcely begun to influence the practice of baptism—although it was presumably original sin that created, or contributed to, the “necessity” of baptism for dying babies. (But only in dying babies was the need constituted by original sin allowed by Tertullian to override prudent considerations and necessitate baptism.) Precisely because of the early references to infant baptism are so brief and allusive, not to say debatable, it is difficult to speak with any confidence of the reasons why baptism was felt to be necessary for babies in the first two centuries or so of the church’s history. Hippolytus is the first to report what might be called the routine inclusion of babies in baptism in his Apostolic Tradition, written c. 215, but he provides no evidence whatsoever about the rationale of baby baptism. Since the whole of the rest of Hippolytus’s account of baptism, including its preparation and sequel, assumes responsible believers as its subjects, we are left to draw the conclusion that babies too needed to be saved from what responsible believers were saved from baptism. But if the plight of those needing baptism was held to lie in the sins they had committed, what could one say about babies or very young children who had committed no such sins? Early Christian writers commonly ascribe to infants innocence or sinlessness, attributes which should be read not so much as denying original sin as reflecting a stage prior to its conscious articulation as a teaching of the church. What they assert, of course, is that young children have yet to commit the culpable, willful sins of their elders.

In this context it is not surprising that the practice of infant baptism became a potent factor in the development of the doctrine of original sin. It is now commonplace to refer to confirmation as a rite in search of a theology, but one could apply the same description of infant baptism in the early church. In the west, if not so obviously in the east, it found the theological justification it needed in the dogma of original sin. If there is a persisting controversy about infant baptism in the patristic age, it concerns primarily the question “why?” rather than “whether,” although the absence of confident answers to the former must to some extent have diverted pressure onto the latter.

There is no doubt that the custom of infant baptism was the single most powerful catalyst of the formulation of doctrines of original sin, and that the direction of argument moved from the accepted practice of infant baptism to the truth of the doctrine, and not vice-versa. We have here an unmistakable illustration of the axiom lex orandi lex credendi. The church baptizes babies who, it is agreed, have not sinned in propria persona; therefore, we must believe that they are baptized for the cleaning or remission of original sin. Original sin must be part of the faith of the church; why else does the church baptize babies?

Although the contours of this argument are clearly recognizable from the third century until the Pelagian controversy in the fifth, it is not always possible to discern the backcloth to discussions in ecclesiastical practice or dispute. That they took place in very varied contexts is obvious enough from the contribution of Cyprian.

HOW CLOSE A CORRESPONDENCE TO CIRCUMCISION?

In one of his letters written in the name of a council of African bishops that met in the spring of 253, Cyprian reports the council’s unanimous response to a question raised by bishop Fidus (of an unknown see). Fidus believed that the analogy with circumcision decreed that babies should be baptized on the eighth day after birth and not before it. The letter reveals little more than this about Fidus’s position. We do not know whether others shared his view, but it is a reasonable inference that disagreement with actual practice, whether established or innovatory, provoked the voicing of his opinion. If we may judge from the terms of Cyprian’s refutation, Fidus had made three points in support of his case.

First, and least clear of the three, Fidus may have claimed that a baby of only two or three days old was not yet capable of receiving the divine gift of baptism. We cannot be certain in inferring that Fidus argued along these lines, but Cyprian’s first rejoinder is to stress that the newborn baby is a completed creature of God, lacking nothing as a human being, and that age makes no difference at all in the

18. No clearer illustration of this common early Christian conviction could be given than that of Chrysostom: “The sins committed before baptism are all cancelled by the grace and kindness of the strength of Christ crucified. The sins committed after baptism require great earnestness, that they may again be cancelled. Since there is no second baptism, there is need of our tears, repentance, confession, absolving, prayer, and every kind of devotion” (De s. Pentecoste hom. 1:6; PG 50, 463).


equality of the divine grace (Epistle 64:2-3). "The mercy and grace of God is not to be refused to anyone born of man."

Second, Fidus had undoubtedly pleaded the impurity of an infant in the first days after its birth, which made people shudder to kiss it. Cyprian has no patience with this kind of almost physical distaste, and seems ready to kiss and baptize even the baby still wet and unwashed from the womb. In embracing the freshly made handiwork of God, we in some sense kiss "the still recent hands of God themselves" (64:4). Scripture declares all persons clean.

Third, "spiritual circumcision ought not to be hindered by carnal circumcision." Cyprian's response implies the acceptance of the parallel of shadow and substance, but lays its main emphasis on the dissolution of the former once the latter had come in Christ (64:4-5).

The greatest interest of the letter, however, is found in the way Cyprian combines both original sin and the child's freedom from sin of his or her own in arguing for the earliest administration of baptism. The bishop of Carthage recommends a course of action directly contrary to that advocated by his earlier fellow-citizen, but sufficiently enough he shared with Tertullian the ingredients out of which the two concocted such totally different recipes. For Cyprian, the fact that the newborn has not sinned on his or her own account but, "being born after the flesh according to Adam, has contracted the contagion of the ancient death at his earliest birth" (with both of which counts Tertullian would agree) argues for, not against, his or her speedy baptism, even to the extent of not waiting until the eighth day after birth. When the sins to be remitted are not his own but another's, he comes "the more easily" to the forgiveness of baptism. Arguing a maior ad minus, Cyprian reasons that, if an adult convert's erstwhile flagrant wickedness is no bar to his baptism, nothing can possibly stand in the way of the baptism of the newborn innocent. The contrast with Tertullian's viewpoint could hardly be more marked, and it is difficult not to discern in this part of the letter a response to Tertullian rather than to Fidus. Otherwise Cyprian must appear to be wielding a theological sledgehammer to crack a minor procedural nut. He gives no hint that Fidus needed persuading of the doctrine of original sin, whereas the force of Cyprian's theological reasoning seems specifically designed to counter Tertullian's appeal to innocens aetatis. The difference between them is attributable in large measure to the conjunction Cyprian makes between infant baptism and original sin. Although the sins needing remission are not the baby's own, they necessitate his baptism. Cyprian fancifully interprets the crying of the newborn as his tearful entreaty for divine grace, which by its very helplessness lays the more powerful claim upon the succor of baptism (Epistle 64:5-6). As he repeats three times in the letter (64:2, 5, 6), since God is merciful toward all, the grace of baptism is to be denied to none.

It was Cyprian's paradoxical contribution, in a writing in which the weight of the reasoning falls on the innocence of babyhood, to have made original sin part of the framework of thought about infant baptism for the first time in the west. The vigor of his episcopate, the prestige of his subsequent martyrdom, and the fact that he wrote with conciliar authority all conspired to exalt his letter as the authentic voice of Catholic tradition. It would prove a priceless weapon in Augustine's armory against the Pelagians.
reverse direction. He does, however, report that "the brethren" frequently discussed the question how infants could be baptized for the remission of sins (the purpose of all Christian baptism) when they had committed no sin of their own. The debates within the Christian community which Origen refers to concerned not whether but why babies should be baptized.

Again we have found the rite in search of an agreed meaning. That this should be the case towards the middle of the third century in Caesarea may suggest that the practice can scarcely have been regularly observed there for almost two hundred years. If it is true that "there is no clearer instance of the control exercised by liturgical or devotional practice over the growth of dogma than that provided by the study of the relations between the custom of Infant Baptism and the doctrine of Original Sin," it is an entirely proper question why in this instance the lex orandi took such a long time to establish the lex credendi—if, that is, infant baptism was, at least in Caesarea, a tradition of apostolic origin. Origen's reference to frequent ecclesiastical discussion of the theological justification for baptizing infants may therefore imply not that the practice was a recent introduction, still resisted by some of the brethren, but that by the 230s and 240s it had not had a sufficiently long history in the church of Caesarea to have evoked a received theological basis in the tradition. Origen's expositions were still needed to provide one. But it remains unambiguously clear from Origen that the practice pre-existed his explanation of it.

THE EAST AFTER ORIGEN: CONSENSUS ELUSIVE

It is not the purpose of this paper to trace the history of infant baptism in the church of the fathers but to attempt to ascertain how far it remained a subject of controversy. In the eastern church there is little indication that Origen's biblical discussions had much influence on beliefs about why babies needed baptism. There is in fact not much evidence that churchmen were unduly concerned about infant baptism at all, and the considerable body of fourth-century Christian literature in the east yields remarkably few references to it. After Origen the first witness is the Arian Asterius the Sophist, whose homilies on Psalms 1-15 were delivered probably in the second quarter of the fourth century. Three of these homilies assume the baptism of newborn babies as the norm but do not connect it with sin or original sin. But baptism of infants is presented as protection against demons, heresy, and premature death. Indeed, it is difficult to point to a single eastern father in the fourth century who links infant baptism with sin or original sin. Chrysostom's enormous corpus yields less than a handful of references to infant baptism, one of which asserts that "we baptize little children, even though they have no sins," in order that they may receive gifts such as righteousness and adoption and become members of Christ and the abode of the Spirit. The Cappadocians, like Chrysostom, plead with their congregations not to delay their baptism, but nearly always, it seems, with adult converts in view. Their pleas are hardly ever directed toward parental responsibility for their offspring in the matter of baptism. Several prominent fourth-century fathers, although of Christian parentage, were not baptized until adult years. In the east these included John Chrysostom, Basil the Great, and Gregory of Nazianzus.

The sole writer to address the issue of the delay of infant baptism directly is Gregory of Nazianzus in his Oration on baptism. His counsel is clear: Babies in danger of death must be baptized without delay, "for it is better that they should be unconsciously sanctified than depart this life unsealed and uninstructed." Circumcision is cited as the warrant for so doing. But for others Gregory advises a wait until they are about three years old,

when they may be able to listen and to answer something about the sacrament, so that, even though they do not perfectly understand it, yet at any rate they know the outlines, and then to sanctify them in soul and body with the great sacrament of our consecration. . . . They begin to be responsible for their lives at the time when reason is matured and they may be instructed in the mystery (for of sins of ignorance owing to their tender years they have no account to give), and it is far more profitable on all accounts to be fortified by the font, because of the sudden assaults of danger that befell us.

That this and similar questions on the timing of baptism were currently matters of discussion among Christian congregations may be implied by the way Gregory responds in his Oration to real or imagined objections and queries.


33. Cf. Jeremias, Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries, 88-89, for details. Basil's exhortation (Homil. 13:1, 5; PG 31, 424, 432) illustrates the pastor's dilemmas. In urging young and old alike to be baptized without delay, he stresses that the whole life of the child is the time (kairos) for baptism, which must have militated against an insistence on invariable paedobaptism.

34. Gregory of Nazianzus, Oration 40:28:40:17 is presumably to be read in terms of this later passage, but the consistency is not obvious: "Do you have an infant child? Do not allow sin any opportunity. Let him be sanctified from babyhood, and consecrated by the Spirit from his tenderest days." He goes on to refer to Samuel, who was consecrated to God immediately after birth. Gregory's mention in sect. 23 of those who "because of infancy" have been unable to receive baptism indicates, not the existence of some parts of the church were paedobaptism was unknown" (Williams,fall and Original Sin, 290n. 4), but simply infants' dependence on negligent parents.
We cannot, however, speak to controversy about infant baptism in this period in the east. Much remains obscure. Baptism is generally assumed to be necessary for salvation, but little clarity is forthcoming on what babies are to be saved from. More is said about the positive gifts imparted to them in baptism, which is also viewed as fortifying the baptized against the perils of life. A poem of Gregory of Nazianzus in speaking of baptism describes it as the seal of God—for infants only a seal, but for adults a remedy as well as a seal. 35 But overall the evidence is too scanty to allow us to delineate a consensus. Gregory of Nazianzus shows that there was scope for considerable variety of teaching, and all that seems agreed is an unwillingness to adopt the standpoint of Origen, the first articulate advocate of infant baptism in the eastern tradition. We must not forget however, that it was in circles strongly influenced by the Cappadocians (among whom Gregory of Nyssa appears to ignore infant baptism altogether) 36 that the phrase “one baptism for the remission of sins” found its way into the Nicene Creed. When this is set in the context of the teachings of the fourth-century Greek fathers about infants and baptism, it is difficult to regard it as having any intended reference to paedo-baptism. It could be paraphrased in the following terms: insofar as baptism is given for the remission of sins (which, it is agreed, is not the case with the baptism of babies), a person may receive it only once. 37

THE WEST AFTER CYPRIAN

It is easy to overlook the overwhelming extent to which the body of early Christian writing about infant baptism is dominated by Augustine’s works, very largely against the Pelagians. 38 The critical issue raised early in the fifth century by Pelagius and, more acutely, his associate Caelestius was simple enough. Their denial of the transmission of original sin dismanted what Augustine depicted as the traditional theological rationale for the practice of baptizing infants—given that, as was agreed on all sides, infants had no sins of their own commission which required baptismal remission. Augustine and other African bishops not unnaturally feared that the airing of such questions would stiffen parental reluctance to bring their babies to the baptistry, at a time when churchmen in the west no less than

35. Gregory of Nazianzus, Carmina Doxotarica 9:91-2 (PG 37, 463-64, with note ad loc.). Cf. Williams, Fall and Original Sin, 288-90. Neither Kraft nor Didier includes this text.
36. Cf. Williams, Fall and Original Sin, 278-80. It is not at all clear from Gregory of Nyssa’s treatise On Infants Who Die Early whether the problem it tackles arises from their not having received infant baptism or from their dying before reaching the appropriate later age for baptism. Since infant baptism is not mentioned, the latter seems more likely. Gregory’s Against Those Who Defer Baptism likewise makes no allusion to infant baptism. His sermon The Baptism of Christ attributes to the newly baptized old person the innocence of the baby and the new-born infant’s freedom from accusations and penalties (PG 46, 579).
37. On this issue, see Williams, Fall and Original Sin, 553-54, who also concludes that those who framed or included this clause could only have had believers’ baptism in mind.
38. In Didier’s collection (La Baptême des enfants), material from the first four centuries occupies 44 pages (including 10 pages of inscriptions), while Augustine is allotted 60.

in the east were striving to overcome the widespread delay of baptism. Augustine’s Confessions did not hesitate to criticize even his own mother for refusing to have him baptized during a serious childhood illness, despite his pleas. 39

But how firmly established in the western tradition was the doctrine of original sin as the strongest theological undergirding for baby baptism? The Pelagians appealed to earlier fathers, but invariably with reference to the transmission of sin from Adam and never explicitly on the grounds for baptizing infants. 40 In the ascetic circles to which they belonged, the related issue of the soul remained the subject of lively debate, fired in particular by continuing controversy over the teachings of Origen; 41 but, whereas this was a question to which, as even Augustine was only aware, Scripture and tradition yielded no incontrovertible answer, could the same be claimed for the presence of original sin in infants as the reason why they had to be baptized if they were to be delivered from damnation? Augustine could with some justice lay claim to an identifiable current of western doctrinal reflection on this subject. After Cyprian, whose Epistle 64 was, of course, Augustine’s star witness for the prosecution, there is a gap in the evidence comparable to that in the east. But toward the end of the fourth century, the convictions of western churchmen emerged into the light of day with a clarity that eludes us in the east. A decretal of Siricius, bishop of Rome, in the year 385 urges the prompt baptism of infants whose age prevents them speaking for themselves, lest, dying unbaptized, they should lose eternal life and the kingdom of heaven—thus neatly excluding in advance the distinction the Pelagians would make between the two. 42 In a letter of A.D. 400, Jerome, a westerner writing in the east, seems to imply that infants are baptized for “sin,” 43 but the most important catholic contributor prior to Augustine was Ambrose of Milan. He not only presents a well-developed doctrine of Adamic fall and its effects upon all humanity (described by N. P. Williams as “Augustinianism before Augustine”), 44 but he also

42. Siricius, Epistle 1:3 (Kraft, Texte zur Geschichte der taufe, 67; Didier, Le Baptême des enfants, 36).
43. Jerome, Ep. 107:6. Jerome is inculcating parental responsibility for children. Until they reach years of discretion, both their mata and their bona are attributed to their parents—unless you happen to suppose that the children of Christians, if they have not received baptism, are themselves liable for (their) sin [peccato] and that guilt [peculium] is not ascribed to those who declined to give them baptism. . . . Is Jerome implying that infants are baptized for their own “sin” but that, where baptism is withheld from them, their parents become liable for their sin? Yet aecles appears not to be synonymous with peccati but to designate the particular offence of parental neglect. In Ep. 85:2, 5, Jerome responds to an enquiry from Paulinus of Nola: “how the children of believing, that is, baptized parents are ‘holy’ [cf. 1 Cor 7:14], seeing that without the gift of grace afterwards received [in baptism] and kept they cannot be saved.” Jerome’s reply does not question Paulinus’s assumptions.
44. Williams, Fall and Original Sin, 300.
makes no distinction between infants and adults in talking about sin as constituting the need for baptism. Yet even Ambrose falls far short of the decisive sharpness of Augustine’s refutation of Pelagian teachings. The bishop of Milan dispenses us if we are looking for an unambiguous declaration that infants are baptized for the forgiveness of original guilt, although he certainly taught this doctrine.

**AUGUSTINE AND THE PELAGIAN CONTROVERSY**

It was, therefore, the peculiar distinction of anti-Pelagian Augustine to make the bonds uniting infant baptism to original sin, in the sense of guilt as well as weakness, disease, or corruption, so firm as to remain virtually unbreakable for over a millennium in the western church. But although it has become commonplace to treat the Pelagian controversy as a western—and typically western-affair, the suggestion has well been made that “Probably the germ of the controversy was the now undisputed fact that differing explanations of infant baptism were held in the East and in the West.”

The teaching of Caesarius, which first significantly disturbed Catholic churchmen in Carthage in 411, maintained that infants were baptized not in order to be delivered from the condemnation attendant upon original sin, and hence not to exchange salvation and eternal life for perdition and death, but in order to secure entry to the kingdom of heaven. Although Caesarius could not challenge the use of the formula “for the remission of sins,” he was unable to salvage any real meaning for it in his baptism of infants; “it is fitting, indeed, to confess this lest we should seem to make different kinds of baptism.” Pelagius’ position was virtually identical; if anything, he exacerbated its provocativeness by insisting that “We hold one baptism, which we affirm ought to be administered to infants in the same sacramental formula as to adults” — which was hardly girt to Augustine’s mill, as we shall see.

The first of Augustine’s anti-Pelagian treatises is entitled *The Merits and Remission of Sins and the Baptism of Infants* (411-412). Much of the first and third books are directed against the central Pelagian convictions about Adam’s sin and infant baptism, but the precise target of book one is probably the *Liber de Fide* of one Rufinus the Syrian, an obscure figure who is nevertheless credited in one source as being the inspirer at Rome of the whole Pelagian heresy. His *Liber* certainly includes an attack on the transmission of sins and the damnation of infants and an assertion that infants are baptized for admission to the kingdom of God.

This Rufinian-Caelesitian-Pelagian approach to paedobaptism is formally similar to that of eastern churchmen, such as Gregory of Nazianzus and John Chrysostom; and the eastern — in particular the Syrian or Antiochene — affinities of Pelagianism have been explored by scholars. Pelagius and Caesarius found a more sympathetic hearing in the east than in the west, and although each side accused the other of innovation and heresy, the Pelagians in addition threatened their opponents with condemnation by the churches of the east. There are, then, good grounds for discerning, as a significant contributory factor to the controversy, at least the absence of consensus, if not a clear disagreement, between east and west on the significance of infant baptism.

The dispute was not whether infants should be baptized but why. When Caesarius complained to Innocent, Bishop of Rome, that he was being defamed for refusing baptism to infants, whereas he had always maintained that they should be baptized, Augustine countered that Caesarius was misrepresenting the charge against him in order to dismiss it more readily. For Augustine the answer to the question “why?” emerged with crystal clarity from a consideration of basic Christian beliefs.

(1) By ancient tradition of apostolic authority the church baptizes infants who have committed sins of their own nor can answer for themselves in the baptismal ritual. Although the movement of Augustine’s argument does not often proceed from the church’s traditional practice to the doctrine of original sin as the sole indispensable basis for it, it does so on some occasions: “What necessity could there be for an infant to be conformed to the death of Christ by baptism, if he were not altogether poisoned by the bite of the serpent?” When accused of Manicheism for maintaining the transmission of sin, he responds that, long before the time of Mani, infant candidates for baptism were being exorcized with exsufflation, showing that they needed deliverance from the power of darkness. It can, moreover, be plausibly claimed that the whole shape of his defense of original sin takes as its starting point the datum of ecclesiastical practice.

(2) The church knows only one baptism, and that “for the remission of sins.”

Augustine resisted, and not only in this particular, the kind of distinction between the baptism of infants and the baptism of adult believers which had, as we have seen, found some currency among the Greek fathers, and which he regarded the Pelagians as advocating. His consistent principle was to insist at every turn on the application to infants of the church’s understanding and practice of baptism.

(3) Newborn babies are included in the one humanity of which all sinned in

---

Adam and of which none is saved except in Christ. "That infants are born under the guilt of [Adam's] offence is believed by the whole Church." If infants have nothing from which they need to be saved, then Jesus cannot be their savior, for only the sick need a doctor.

(4) None, not excluding baby children, is saved in Christ except through baptism. Punish-eating Christians in Africa spoke about baptism as "satisfaction." Unless infants pass into the company of believers through the sacrament divinely instituted for this purpose, they will undoubtedly remain in the darkness of sin.

(5) Infants are saved through baptism as believers, not as non-believers. Augustine recalls that by ancient custom the church calls baptized infants "believers" (fideles, pistoi), as the inscriptions bear out. They believe in the hearts of others (parents or other sponsors) and they confess through the tongues of others, thus fulfilling the requirements of Rom 10:10. Just as they were wounded by another's disobedience, so they are healed by another's confession of faith. It must be remembered here that, in baptismal practice at this time, the infant's parent or sponsor responded to the question, "Does he/she believe?" with the direct affirmative "He/she believes."

(6) Infants who die unbaptized are lost and condemned, although their punishments will be "more tolerable" and "milder" than those who have sinned on their own account. In Augustine's book there is no middle ground for infants dying unbaptized akin to the Pelagians' "eternal life" outside the kingdom of heaven. Catholic faith provides no warrant for believing that they may attain to forgiveness of their original sin.

In addition to this tireless rehearsal of these basic teachings of the church which confound the errors of the Pelagians, Augustine also deploys some ad hominem arguments. Since they grant infants salvation and eternal life without baptism, how would they respond to someone who wanted to grant them the kingdom of heaven as well? They would appeal to John 3:5—a text which since the second century had played a major role in shaping the church's baptismal beliefs. If it were not for this text, the Pelagians would not accept infant baptism at all.

More often, however, Augustine has to reply to Pelagian counter-arguments which appeal to the principles of transmission and solidarity that were so important in his own account of Catholic doctrine. For example, if Adam harms those who have not themselves sinned, Christ should benefit those who have not believed. We have already noted, in section (5) above, part of Augustine's rejoinder. He also turns the tables on the objectors by showing that it is they who accept that Christ benefits those who do not believe, for they cannot deny that in baptism Christ benefits infant non-believers.

An objection that Augustine dealt with in one form or another on many occasions claimed that, if sinful parents produced sinful offspring, parents cleansed of original sin through baptism should surely produce offspring no longer subject to original sin. His counter-attack is nothing if not versatile. He contends that the claim is tantamount to assuming that baptized Christian parents should be expected to bear baptized Christian children, but male babies were not begetted already circumcised by circumcised fathers. If 1 Cor 7:14 is cited in this connection, then whatever sanctified might mean when applied to the unbelieving spouse or children of a Christian, it will prevent no more the child than the spouse from perishing unless they are subsequently baptized. Moreover, the parallelism does not always obtain; whereas all infants contract sin through their parents, some are presented for baptism by other persons. In any case, parents generate, not regenerate their offspring. "Even renewed parents beget children not out of the first fruits of their renewed condition, but carnally out of the remains of the old nature," for concupiscence, which is one element of original sin, persists in the baptized. "The fault of our nature remains in our offspring so deeply impressed as to make it guilty, even when the guilt of the selfsame fault has been washed away in the parent." The true benefit of birth from Christian parents is to be brought by them without delay to the saving waters of baptism.

Augustine was also asked how it is that a child profits from its parents' faith at baptism but is not prejudiced by their later fall from faith when they seek the aid of pagan gods for the healing of the child. He argues that, by virtue of baptism, the child becomes "a soul having a separate life," so that Ezek 18:4 now governs its destiny. The bond of guilt contracted in natural birth, once cancelled in spiritual rebirth, cannot be reimposed by subsequent parental sin.

It did not escape Augustine that to place such a weight on the necessity of baptism for infants provoked the most searching questions about the accidents of bap-
tismal administration. "The baptized mother bewails her own little one who was not baptized [before death], while the chaste virgin gathers in for baptism the offspring of outsiders, exposed by an unchaste mother." Often when the parents are eager and the ministers prepared for giving baptism, it is still not given because death intervenes. Since the Pelagians acknowledge that baptism confers some good value on babies, even they cannot evade the issue altogether. They refuse to ascribe such discrimination to fate or divine election, and must therefore base it on merit, but no such option is available for Augustine. Even the infants who are successfully brought to baptism, crying and kicking; "grace cleaves to them even in their resisting struggles." In this priority of grace, an inscrutable divine providence is at work. The diverse fortunes of infants afford the best illustration known to Augustine of the truth that grace is bestowed according to God's election. "Must we so attribute it to the negligence of parents that infants die without baptism that heavenly judgments have nothing to do with it?" We must conclude that it was of God's choice that he did not keep this particular child in this life a little while longer in order that it might receive baptism.

At this point we have reached the end of the road in more senses than one. If the tradition of baptizing infants acted as a powerful catalyst in the formulation of the western church's high doctrine of original sin, so too, it seems, the somewhat random reception of it by infants was a contributory factor in the formulation of its doctrine of divine election. This is not to claim that Augustine had no other grounds for developing his theology as he did than the implications of infant baptism and its haphazard administration. It is merely to recognize how his theological understanding took shape under the pressure of controversy and harsh experience.

Few paedobaptists, however, will be able to follow Augustine all the way. The Pelagians were the heirs of the long and widespread uncertainty of earlier Christian generations about why newborn children needed to be baptized. Such lack of clarity bred discussion and even controversy. In a Tertullian and a Gregory of Nazianzus, and perhaps in those responsible for the later childhood baptisms attested by third-century inscriptions, as well as in the wider post-Constantinian deferment of baptism, this absence of consensus issued in the avoidance of infant baptism, in theory or in practice. It was Augustine who finally set the necessity of paedobaptism on an impregnable basis. But here lies the rub. For if at last the rite had found its theological rationale, it was one that today's practitioners of infant baptism will scarcely be able to endorse, except perhaps to a very minor extent. We are left in the somewhat uncomfortable position of receiving the traditional observance from the early church, while at the same time rejecting the main planks of the theology in which the church of the fathers found its conclusive justification.

But there is one point on which the voice of Augustine deserves to be seriously heeded. It is a strength of his anti-Pelagian corpus that he endeavors to treat the baptism of infants on all fours with the baptism of adult candidates. We may judge the way he did this to be not very successful, although the rite he knew was obviously framed on the assumption that confessing believers were the normative subjects of baptism with only minimal adjustment made for those who could not answer for themselves. Nevertheless, the challenge to avoid setting up two kinds of baptism has rarely been far distant from the advocacy of infant baptism. Moreover, the subsequent separate development of rites of confirmation and their reformed substitutes has exposed paedobaptists to the associated temptation of treating infant baptism as something less than real and complete Christian baptism. Augustine's theology, however unacceptable as the definitive response to the persistently controversial question "why?" in the early history of infant baptism, at least counsels us both against distinguishing too sharply between infant and adult baptism and against denying full, unqualified integrity to the baptism given to babies.

77. Augustine, Against Two Letters of the Pelagians 2:6:11.
78. Augustine, Gift of Perseverance 12:31. Cf. Williams, Fall and Original Sin, 377, for an illustration starkly depicting this division at the font.
79. Augustine, Grace and Free Will 22:44.
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DONATIST THEOLOGOUMENA IN AUGUSTINE?
BAPTISM, REVIVISCENCE OF SINS,
AND UNWORTHY MINISTERS

The chief question with which this paper is concerned is this: What did Augustine believe happened when a person was baptized in the Donatist schism?

To this question some answers are incontrovertibly clear. For example, such a person was truly baptized. He or she received "the sacrament of grace", a genuine baptism which was, and remained, sanctus. In the vocabulary of later theology, the baptism imparted was valid, and indestructibly so.

Other answers to our question are not so self-evident and still provoke discussion. For instance, in what sense did the candidate for baptism in schism receive a baptismal "character"? Was this anything other than the unrepeatable external rite itself, or the rite's ineffacable designation of the baptized as fidelis or filius, or was it a consecratio or sanctificatio which might even encompass a

---

1 Bapt. III, 10, 15 etc.
2 Cf. G. Bavaud in BA 29, pp. 579-582.
3 Illi quos baptizant sanant a vulnere idololatriae vel infidelitatis (bapt. I, 8, 10).
4 Bapt. I, 10, 14. G. G. Willis, Saint Augustine and the Donatist Controversy, London 1950, is not strictly accurate when he claims that "Schismatic baptism constitutes a man a member of Christ's Church" (p. 159).
5 Christiani baptismi sacramentum ... etiam apud haereticos valet et sufficit ad consecrationem (ep. 98, 5).
6 Satis indicat quod et in malis ... ipsa [sanctificatio sacramenti] integra est (bapt. IV, 23, 30).
"spiritual effect" of baptism, "la présence permanente de la vertu divine à tous baptisé juste ou pécheur."?

Another answer to our initial question which might appear to allow of no qualification is that the schismatic who received the sacramentum gratiae did not receive the gralla sacramentii. This grace, which brings salvation, is not bestowed outside the fold of the Catholic Church. The terms of Augustine's argument are only too familiar.

There is, however, one issue which threatens to blur Augustine's clarity on even this cardinal point of his teaching. He shows an interest in the hypothesis that the grace of baptism may in truth be imparted to the schismatic, but only momentarily; because he is a schismatic and lacks love, his sins, which have been for that instant remitted, return to him forthwith. This is the question normally discussed under the heading of the reviviscence of sins.

Some interpreters of Augustine have held not only that Augustine taught this account of what happened in Donatist baptism but that it was a significant factor enabling him to maintain at one and the same time both the full reality of the baptism given in schism and its total inefficacy for salvation. But in a communication read at the Oxford Patriotic Conference of 1959 F. Floëri argued that Augustine presented this momentary reception of the remission of sins only as a hypothesis, on the truth of which he always avoided pronouncing. Since the publication of this study, scholars have been more guarded in attributing the theory to Augustine, but G. Bavaud comes very close to regarding it as his decided opinion in his edition of the De baptismo. He views it as reconciling, in Augustine's mind, the emphatically positive evaluation he felt led to make of the baptism of the Donatists, who had all, for example, "put on Christ" by their baptism, with his equally emphatic conviction that it produced no effect in the soul of the baptized schismatic — unless, that is, such a person did in truth receive "une consacration intérieure, cell de la justifìcation, mais... une grâce transitoire".

The status of this theory in Augustine's writings may not appear a question of great importance. It appears (to my knowledge) only in the De baptismo, although in more than twice the three passages identified by Floëri. The question may also be insoluble, for Floëri is undoubtedly correct in arguing that Augustine invariably presents the theory as one of two competing hypotheses (the other being simply that those baptized in schism are not cleansed of their sins at all, but even defiled by receiving baptism in schism), and never adjudicates between them.

The problem is, however, not without implications for major elements in Augustine's anti-Donatist case. It should not be thought, for example, that what Augustine's discusssions in De baptismo show clearly that the gift of the Spirit is also involved, and we must conclude that Augustine is really talking about the fleeting enjoyment of the whole effect of baptism. This immediately touches on the fundamental axiom extra ecclesiam nulla salus. Furthermore, if the reviviscence of sins is part of Augustine's teaching, it implies that the sole obex 11

7 Bavaud, op. cit., p. 581, who speaks of "cette consacration qui est tou jours le fruit du baptisme, même chez les indigènes. Le chrétien est enveloppé de gracia de salut à tout instant". For Augustine, baptismal "character" is "une réalité visible, le salut, mais qui n'est pas la grâce du memento sui divina virtus abstitit (bapt. III, 10, 15), but fails to give due weight to the immediately following words sive ad salutem bene utintum sive ad other salvific or damnatory, in accordance with Augustine's frequent citation in particular to sacramental grace (bapt. III, 13, 18).

8 baptism of the schismatic (pp. 154, 156, 159, schismatic), is it inaccurate in speaking of the grace of baptism as being "there [in the grace of the sacraments within the Church", which is precisely what Augustine showing any knowledge of this theory in Augustine, Willis ascribes to him grace (cf. Willis, p. 156, only in the Church is grace received "in full").

9 Cf. A. Michel in DThC XIII, 264-265.
10 So P. Pourrat and F. Batiffol, discussed by F. Floëri (see next note).
12 Le problème de la reviviscence des péchés, in BA 29, pp. 585-586; cf. p. 582. For Rémi Crespin, however, following Floëri, the theory is no more than an explanatory hypothesis. Ministère et sanctité. Pastorale du clergé et solution de la crise donatiste dans le vie et la doctrine de saint Augustin, Paris 1965, p. 259, n. 3.
13 Gal. 3, 27. Cf. bapt. I, 11, 16, etc., and see further below.
14 Floëri discusses bapt. I, 12, 17-13; 21, 13, 18; 8, 9, to which should be added IV, 11, 17; V, 21, 29; VII, 3, 5; VII, 6, 11, and cf. IV, 4, 5. When Augustine says that baptism does not avail for "the irrevocable remission of sins" outside Catholic unity, it is unlikely that he implies a distinction between revocable and irrevocable remission (bapt. III, 17, 22; cf. V, 8, 9, "remission of irrevocable sins").
15 bapt. I, 12, 18-19; V, 21, 29.
to the baptized schismatic's continuing enjoyment of salvation lies in himself, and that the minister of schismatic baptism may be a minister not only of the sacrament of grace but also of the grace of the sacrament, however short-lived that grace may be in the baptized. Such a conclusion would not be inconsistent with Augustine's repeated insistence, in opposition to the Donatists' obdiction with the minister of baptism, that the two key agents in latter's disposition, not the minister's, that determines whether he receives only the sacrament of grace but also the grace of the sacrament. But while Augustine unambiguously holds that within the Catholic Church the minister's disposition is no insuperable obstacle to the candidate's receiving both the sacrament and its grace, it is not at all clear that the parallel with the minister in the Donatist position, holds in this instance except with reference solely to the sacrament itself.

In order to determine whether the notion of the reviviscence of sins is any more than a hypothesis for Augustine, we must consider it in the broader context of his anti-Donatist theology. The texts in which the theory appears do not provide us with a clear answer.

Augustine certainly believed that the return of sins once forgiven was taught by Christ in the parable of the Unmerciful Servant (Mt. 18, 23-35). "The fact that he had not forgiven his fellow-servant did not prevent his master from forgiving him all his debts... But what did it profit him, since they all immediately returned (replicata sunt) again upon his head because of his persisting hatred?" Augustine deduces therefrom that the grace of baptism is not prevented from giving (momentary) remission of all sins, even to a person of unremitting hatred. He discusses this parable only once in his anti-Donatist treatises, but in three of his sermons draws from it the same warning to the unforgiving, lest God bring back (replicare) sins earlier forgiven.

Such cases often occur in the Church, comments Augustine. In De baptismo he presents two kinds of persons in whom such a return of sins might be hypothesized. The catechumen baptized

in some sudden danger of death may show on recovery an unmitigated hostility towards an enemy. A murderer may have secured baptism without any accompanying change of heart. Both of them either experience no baptismal remission of sins, or, if their sins are remitted in baptism, they return to them forthwith. But it is noteworthy that, even here, the fleetingly transient baptismal remission appears as no more than one of two possible explanations, between which Augustine invites his readers to choose. He seems unwilling to affirm it for himself, even in the context of the Catholic Church where prediciing such a baptismal forgiveness posed none of the prima facie difficulties for his theology that it did in the context of schism.

What of the baptized Catholic who subsequently strays into schism? Does his abandonment of the bonds of peace and love recall upon his head the sins forgiven at his baptism, perhaps years ago? Augustine repeatedly affirms that such a person, while not losing his baptism by seceding, henceforth possesses it unlawfully and unprofitably and is bereft of the Holy Spirit. But he never suggests that the sederer from the Catholic Church has his sins, remitted earlier in baptism, reimposed in schism. Yet in every other respect he is no different from the schismatic baptized in schism.

A critical question is whether Augustine believed that a schismatic could in any circumstances be the minister of the remission of sins in baptism. He undoubtedly could in one kind of case, that of the Catholic catechumen facing imminent death and able to obtain a prompt baptism only from a Donatist minister. Provided that he receive it with a Catholic mind and heart not alienated from the unity of peace and unimplicated in the schismatic's perversity, he is baptized salutarius. This has happened to many Catholics (plerisque), comments Augustine. He apparently feels no need to explain the exceptional function of the schismatic minister, other than by emphasizing the correct disposition of the recipient.

Ascertaining Augustine's mind about the normal run of schismatic ministrations of baptism is more difficult, partly because of the

---

17 *s. 5, 2* (non solum dancps non illis dimitur sus sed etiam omnia quae dimissa fuerant replicentur); *s. 83, 7* (si non dimiserit, revocabo te; et quidquid eius replicavit).
18 *bapt. I, 12, 20* (et neque ista contingat in ecclesia).
19 *bapt. I, 13, 21*; *V, 21, 79*. Cf. *too VII, 3, 5*, where Augustine poses the two possibilities generally of those *fallaciter conversi* who have been baptised.
20 *bapt. VI, 15, 25*; *V, 23, 33*.
21 *bapt. VI, 5, 7*; cf. *I, 2, 3*; *VII, 52, 100*. The same situation may also be implied in *IV, 12, 18*. 
parallel he frequently sets up between the unworthy minister within the Catholic Church and the schismatic minister without. Both impart a valid sacrament, but not an efficacious one. Augustine nor schismatic can fulfill with regard to the grace of the sacrament the ministerial role he fulfills for the sacrament itself, but that in the prayers of the spiritual and holy in the Church, like the cooing of the dove, by "a secret dispensation of the mercy of God" avail to secure the remission of sins for those baptized not by the dove but by the hawks, but such a resource is not to be found outside the bounds of Catholic unity.22

There is a crucial distinction here which it is easy to miss. Augustine declares that "God gives the sacrament of grace even per malos, but grace itself he bestows only per se ipsum vel per sanctos stitos". He proceeds to record his agreement with Cyprian that schismatics cannot give the remission of sins, nor, he adds, can the wicked within the Church.23 This declaration in De baptismo appears to conflict with another in Contra epistolam Parmenianam: 24 if the minister is a hypocrite, the Spirit flees from his duplicity and denies him salvation, but does not abandon his (the hypocrite's) ministry, whereby he (the Spirit) effects the salvation of others through him.25 More obviously consistent with the former is a statement in one of the letters: "If the minister is good, he cleaves to God and works together with God; but if he is evil, God works through him (per illum) the visible form of the sacrament, but himself bestows the invisible grace."26

It is clear that, for all Augustine's minimising of the role of the minister,27 he assigned a more substantial function to the good minister than to the wicked or hypocritical.28 If it is true that, "when the name of Christ is invoked, the sins of one do not obstruct the salvation of another",29 it is also true that they require God to bypass, as it were, the ministry of the sinful and to grant salvation per se ipsum.30 If this was the case with the corrupt minister within the Catholic Church, was it also the case with the minister of baptism in schism, seeing that Augustine's argument so frequently paralleled the two? The hypothesis of the momentary remission of sins followed by their immediate reviviscence requires something of the sort to be true. It is worth enquiring to what or to whom Augustine ascribes this hypothetical fleeting remission.

In so far as Augustine provides an answer to this question, he speaks in the following terms in the relevant passages in De baptismo:

— once only of the Holy Spirit coming to the baptized;31
— three times of the baptisi sanctitas clothing the candidate with Christ or remitting his sins;32
— once of the 'grace of baptism' not being prevented from forgiving the impenitent;33
— twice of the vis sacrament (sancta vis tantae sacramenti) remitting sins.34 On one of these occasions, Augustine parallels the working of this vis outside the Church with the vis nominis Christi casting out demons outside the Church.

These phrases of Augustine's take us no farther forward in our attempt to determine whether or not he believed in the return

23 Crespin's account, op. cit., pp. 237-239, could easily mislead ("le péché l'iniquité — du ministre n'entre donc pas en ligne de compte, quand il s'agit d'une affaire dont la sincérité est donnée par le ministre, et le ministre n'est pas en ligne de compte"). As he later makes plain, the powers that belong alike to the sinful Catholic minister and the schismatic minister belong to "l'ordre sacramentel et non ordre de la grâce" (p. 281).
24 bapt. V, 21, 29-22, 30. I, 20, 23 was not addressed to the wicked, who cannot remit sins even though they baptize (VI, 14, 23; cf. VI, 16, 27).
25 Crespin, op. cit., p. 241 n. I juxtaposes the two quotations without comment.
27 ep. 105, 3, 12.
29 "When a person preaches God's word or administers God's sacrament, he does not, if he is evil, preach or administer de suo" (c. litt. Petr. II, 6, 13). The pure preacher is a partner with the word and has his share in begetting (congenerat) the believer, but when the unregenerate preaches, faith is born "not from the barrenness of the minister but from the fruitfulness of the word", ibid. II, 5, 13; cf. III, 55, 67.
31 Yet at the same time there cannot be said to be no association between the wicked's baptizing and God's gift of grace. Since 'no-one can give what he does not have', how does the murder give the Holy Spirit? Yet he baptizes even within the Church. Therefore God gives the Holy Spirit even when the murderer baptizes (etiam ipso baptizante)" (bapt. V, 20, 28). Cf. per eum in c. ep. Parn. II, 11, 24 (n. 26 above).
32 I, 12, 19.
33 I, 12, 19; III, 13, 18.
34 I, 12, 20.
35 I, 12, 19; IV, 11, 17. With the latter's reference to exorcism outside the Church, cf. V, 24, 34.
of sins after a moment's remission. We shall reserve further comment until later, except to note that in all these passages Augustine makes no mention of the minister of baptism in schism. The focus is heavily on the recipient of baptism, and, by implication, on the operation of God's grace per se ipsum. It is, therefore, no bar to believing that Augustine affirmed this hypothesis ex animo that he undoubtedly endorsed Cyprian's dictum, adopted by the Donatists, that no-one can give what he does not have.39 The Donatist minister's lack of salvation would not prevent its being momentarily imparted by God per se ipsum when the Donatist baptized. Indeed, for the theory to be part of Augustine's own teaching, this is what it must be held to entail.

Since on any understanding this transient remission of sins in Donatist baptism is not only here-and-gone in a flash but also a very minor motif in his case against the schismatics, we must not allow the unambiguous and unqualified apparent contradictions of it with which writings abound to exclude the possibility of his actually believing in it. For example, schismatics, like corrupt Catholics, "both have and confer baptism without remission of sins".37 It is pointless to multiply quotations. Not only is the fruit of baptism—grace, remission of sins, the gift of the Spirit, eternal salvation—not to be had in schism, but even what may be had — the Church's baptism — is received pernicioso, poenaliter, ad judicium, in mortem. It would be risky to hold that this solid dogmatic core of Augustine's anti-Donatist theology precludes his genuinely believing in a fleeting remission of sins followed by their return, for this supposition makes a negligible difference to the plight of the baptized schismatic. His interest is undoubtedly in the burden of unforgiven sin carried by the baptized who remains in schism, and hence, as far as this hypothesis is concerned, in the return of sins rather than their very temporary remission. Statements which appear to rule out the possibility of this momentary enjoyment of salvation can easily be viewed as omitting it, by a foreshortened perspective or because

of its transience and insignificance, rather than deliberately rejecting it.

This brings us to consider why Augustine should have entertained, even hypothetically, a notion apparently at odds with his basic convictions about Donatist baptism. First and foremost, the theory should be viewed as a minimal concession on Augustine's part, offered only as a hypothesis, enabling him to escape the horns of an awkward dilemma posed by the Donatists. At the same time, the fact that he advances it even as a hypothesis suggests some recognition of a vulnerable spot in his position. I submit that in the territory covered by this paper Augustine appears uncharacteristically insecure and indecisive.

The Donatists objected to his insistence that they had baptism but without the remission of sins. To be consistent he should grant them either both or neither, for baptism could not be Christ's without forgiveness through the Spirit.38 In the North African Church, unlike the Eastern Churches, no creedal connection between baptism and the remission of sins had yet been forged,39 but the Pelagian controversy discloses the inseparability of the two in the African tradition. The hypothesis of momentary remission conceals this correlation to the Donatists, but with the most minimal prima facie damage to Augustine's position, for the sins are immediately reimposed. As he says in his first discussion of the theory, "Are this person's sins forgiven or not? Let them [the Donatists] choose as they will. For if they are forgiven, they immediately return. The gospel says so, the truth declares it".40 In fact, the very first appearance of the theory takes the form of a conclusion hypothetically adopted by the Donatists in the light of their verdict on the experience of Simon Magus: "But if they should say (Si autem dixerint)..."41 Augustine develops the idea, and does not rule out the reception, for one short moment, of the forgiveness of sins in Donatist baptism. He even furnishes dominical warrant for believing in it — but also, and much more importantly, in the return of sins upon the baptized head.42

---

38 Cf. bapt. V, 20, 28 (n. 31 above), and for its application in a positive form to baptism itself, VII, 29, 57. Cf. Cyprian, ep. 70, 5, 69, 11, Willis, op. cit., p. 160, says Augustine countered Cyprian's catchword with Deum esse datum. But Augustine's acceptance of Cyprian's dictum is reflected in his repeated demonstration that the Donatists do have baptism, which originally they took with them from the Church and did not lose by seceding, and therefore can give it. Cf. bapt. I, 1, 2; IV, 9, 13; IV, 23, 33; VI, 29, 56, VII, 36, 71, etc.

37 bapt. VII, 44, 87.


39 Cf. bapt. I, 18, 27: "on the subject of baptism we should believe what the universal Church maintains".


41 bapt. I, 12, 19.

42 Note the emphasis at the end of Augustine's discussion of the parable of the Unmerciful Servant: "Yesterday is forgiven, and all that preceded it is
But Augustine's readiness to countenance this explanation, albeit only as an hypothesis, is surely symptomatic not so much of his generosity in debate as of, let us say, a sneaking feeling of unease. It should scarcely surprise us if his doctrine of schismatic baptism from time to time failed to carry his full conviction. It was, so he taught, true baptism, complete (integer), holy, God's baptism, Christ's baptism, the Church's baptism, a baptism that 'consecrated' and 'sacramentized' schismatic, that gave birth to sons and daughters, even a baptism that clothed you with Christ — but still a baptism that brought no benefit, but only death and condemnation, to its recipients.

Gal. 3, 27 was a text that Augustine largely avoided in his anti-Donatist treatises: "All who have been baptized in Christ have put on Christ". It had to accommodate the distinctions of his baptismal theology, and so evoked the interpretation, "Men put on Christ sometimes as far as receiving the sacrament, sometimes so much further as to sanctify their lives". When making this comment in De baptismo Augustine refers to his earlier discussion, "at sufficient length", of this text. It occurs in the midst of his first presentation of the reviviscence hypothesis, first of all as an ingredient in the dilemma about the relation between baptism and remission of sins (for "putting on Christ" appears to imply renewal of life and deliverance from sin), and then as a text whose difficulty is resolved by the hypothesis in question, for the sanctitas baptismi clothes the baptized with Christ for an instant and the sinfulness of deceit or schism straightway strips him of Christ. This, it seems, is Augustine's sufficient word on a Pauline verse that clearly embarrassed his doctrine of Donatist baptism.

The sanctitas baptismi which here momentarily clothes the baptized schismatic with Christ is used elsewhere by Augustine not of the efficacy of baptism but of its bare validity. But as we noticed above, Augustine also ascribes the short-lived benefits enjoyed under this theory to the Holy Spirit or to the grace of baptism, both of which in his standard teaching belong solely to the fruit of baptism denied to schismatics. We should probably discern, in the hearing that he gives to our hypothesis, a glimpse of recognition on his part that, if the Donatists have baptism, it may not be entirely without effect — such is the sancta vis tanti sacramenti. The phrase vis sacramenti, which he twice uses in spelling out this hypothetical momentary remission of sins, does not belong to his technical vocabulary on Donatist baptism. It reflects, I suggest, his sympathy for the view of Cyprian and the Donatists that baptism cannot be convincingly separated from its fruit, as his refutation normally maintained. That Augustine never ex professo endorsed this hypothesis, indicates no doubt his awareness of its incompatibility with the main burden of that refutation. That nevertheless he gave it house room in De baptismo, instead of unambiguously rejecting it, points to a degree of affinity with Donatist convictions that the reader of his anti-Donatist works rarely suspects.

A similar sympathy with the position of the Donatist is evident when Augustine denies that God gives the grace of the sacrament per malos. As we have seen, for Augustine the unworthiness of the minister is a barrier to the efficacy of baptism, but one that God circumvents per se ipsum within the Catholic Church. Augustine has not so much abandoned the traditional African standpoint as redefined its field of application. The unworthy minister is no longer debarred from giving the sacrament itself, but he is unable to fulfill the proper ministerial role in imparting the spiritual blessings of the sacrament. Had he been entirely consistent, this element in Augustine's thought should have prevented him entertaining the hypothesis in question, at least as far as Donatist baptism is concerned, for in schism God does not work per se ipsum to compensate for the inadequacy of the minister. De baptismo shows us at times an Augustine who is more comfortable when he can take his stand on the recipients, rather than the ministers, of Donatist baptism. One revealing chapter deserves to be quoted at length:

"As I seem to be hard pressed (urgeri) when the question is put to me, 'Does therefore a heretic remit sins [since Christ's baptism is found among heretics]?', so I in turn press hard

---

46 This blurring of the distinction between the sacrament itself and its effects, normally so sharp in Augustine's anti-Donatist teaching, is relevant to the meaning of "character" in his thought. See n. 7 above.

47 Again contra Willis, op. cit., pp. 154-155.
when I say, 'Does therefore the person who fails to keep the commands of heaven... [in the Catholic Church], remit sins? If per vim sacramenti Dei, the former does no so less than the latter; if per meritum suum, neither the one nor the other does. For this sacrament is recognized as Christ's even in wicked men, but in the body of the one dove... neither one nor the other is found. Just as baptism does not profit the person who renounces the world in word and not in deed, so it does not profit the person baptized in heresy or schism'.

The question about the heretical minister of baptism is left unanswered. Firm ground is reached when the focus shifts from the minister to the recipient. The unworthy Catholic and the schismatic are in precisely the same position as subjects of baptism. Apart from the slight doubt imported by the hypothetical reviviscence of sins (which applies equally to both), they cannot receive any benefit from baptism. No such clarity or parity attaches to them as givers of baptism. Hence we observe Augustine more than once elsewhere in De baptismo resolving or evading a tricky question about ministers by adopting an unambiguous stance about the recipients of baptism. This manner of argument is consistent with his insistence that the cleansing of baptism depends not on its minister but on dantis Dei gratia et percipientis bona conscientia.

The unrighteous who confers baptism, may do so perniciose, not because of his own character or the character of baptism but because of the character of the recipient. Yet when he confers it on a good person, his malitia has to be, and is indeed, overcome (superatur). It is not theologically irrelevant. To the extent that the unworthiness of the minister proved troublesome to Augustine in connexion with the efficacy of baptism, we may recognise, as in some other respects, his sympathy with Donatist positions.

D. F. WRIGHT

University of Edinburgh

\*\* baptized IV, 4, 5. This is precisely the kind of controversy in which elsewhere in De baptismo Augustine imports the hypothesis of reviviscence. E.g., baptized V, 21, 29; VI, 23, 41; VI, 32, 62. c. Cresc. IV, 18, 21, and A. C. de Veere's note in BA 31, pp. 783-786. baptized VI, 4, 6. The translation in BA 29, p. 413, wrongly implies that he who has baptism perniciose, always confers it perniciose.
THE ORIGINS OF INFANT BAPTISM—
CHILD BELIEVERS' BAPTISM?

by DAVID F. WRIGHT

BAPTISM has been placed firmly on the agenda of ecumenical theology by the Lima Report, Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry. It makes no attempt to resolve the question of baptismal origins, but judiciously summarizes the state of the debate: 'While the possibility that infant baptism was practised in the apostolic age cannot be excluded, baptism upon personal profession of faith is the most clearly attested pattern in the New Testament documents'. The paucity of recent discussion of the beginnings of infant baptism may suggest that they are deemed insoluble, short of the discovery of new evidence. Theology, at any rate, may neither be able nor need to wait until historians of primitive Christianity reach a consensus. The possibility that infant baptism was practised relatively early, perhaps even in the New Testament Churches themselves, was no deterrent to Karl Barth's regarding it as theologically indefensible. Nevertheless, he could not ignore what he called 'the brute fact of a baptismal practice which has become the rule in churches in all countries and in almost all confessions', and he ventured his own explanation of the triumph of infant baptism and of the New Testament passages to which its advocates customarily appeal. His sharp critique of the tradition provoked a greater stir on the

1 Faith and Order Paper No. 111 (Geneva, 1982), p. 4, para. 11. This article is itself based on a paper prepared in April 1985 for the conversations between representatives of the Church of Scotland and the Baptist Union of Scotland. The 1984 report of the Multilateral Conversation in Scotland has subtly altered the judgment in Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry into 'While baptism on profession of faith is the most commonly attested practice in the New Testament, there is some evidence that infant baptism also took place' (para. 14).

continent of Europe than in the English-speaking world. A fresh look at the historical question is certainly overdue, although its starting-point is bound to be the celebrated exchange between Joachim Jeremias and Kurt Aland of two decades ago. Ecumenical discussion, and in some Churches, ecumenical reality, call on both paedobaptists and credobaptists to examine the others' practice with a new seriousness. In such a context the beginnings of the dominant tradition cannot healthily be left unscrutinised or treated as inscrutable.

Three preliminary points must be made. First, the word 'infant' may foster ambiguity, and we would be wiser to distinguish between 'children' and 'babies'. This is in effect the distinction that Aland insisted on (between Kindertaufe and Säuglingstaufe) but the English translations ignored. Some important early sources differentiate between those who can answer for themselves, from the age of perhaps three onwards, and those who cannot. It is here that the divide falls between believers' baptism and what has traditionally been called infant baptism. Not only is this not equivalent to an adult/infant distinction, but believers' baptism may be the baptism of children whose ages would classify them as infants, e.g., in the

British school system. In what follows, except where greater precision is explicit, infant baptism will be used of the baptism of those who cannot answer for themselves.

Secondly, we must beware of the assumption that child or baby baptism emerged at the same time or developed at a uniform pace throughout the early Church. Much recent study of primitive Christianity has emphasized its diversity; monepiscopacy is a prominent development varying considerably in timescale from region to region. Recognition of the variables of time and place may help in making consistent sense of apparently conflicting evidence.

Thirdly, it may be the case that in one and the same Church at any one time only some infants were baptized. That is to say, infants may conceivably be divided into different categories, quite apart from the issue of age. This study will in fact consider three possible classes of infants as subjects for baptism.

The Jeremias-Aland debate issued in no consensus, although among New Testament scholars the view is increasingly widespread that infant baptism was not practised in the New Testament Churches. The study of the New Testament might conceivably justify a range of conclusions. It may be held that its evidence does not enable us to decide whether infant baptism was practised in apostolic Christianity. Or a distinction may be made between historical and theological evidence, leading possibly to the conviction that, although historical evidence is lacking, the theological evidence shows or implies that infants were baptized. Less likely is the view that the theological evidence gives us no ground for supposing the practice but the historical suggests the opposite. Some will hold that both kinds of evidence rule out the baptizing of infants, or again that both demonstrate its observance in the New Testament Churches. It is perhaps an unlikely verdict that the historical and theological evidence conflict, with one leaving no room for paedobaptism and the other requiring us to believe the opposite, although this study will suggest that the practice may have been current in the face of apparently conclusive evidence to the contrary.

The distinction between historical and theological evidence
may be open to challenge, if only because all theological material in the New Testament is ipso facto historical, even if it cannot be assumed that all historical evidence is of obvious theological import. By 'historical evidence' I have in mind such matters as household baptisms and proselyte baptism, and by 'theological evidence' material about the significance of baptism or the place of children or the continuity and discontinuity between old and new Israel. The distinction is broadly between what was done and what was believed and taught. Advocates of infant baptism may be too indifferent to the quest for historical evidence in their readiness to take a stand on theological foundations alone. They conclude that the apostolic generation must have baptized infants because of what it believed about, say, the covenant people of God, or taught, say, about Jesus's blessing of children.

On the other hand, those who claim that the New Testament allows only believers' baptism may be presuming to know too much about primitive Christian practice if they infer that infant baptism did not happen from the undoubted fact that only faith-baptism is incontrovertibly attested in the New Testament. This is in effect Barth's position. Advocates of infant baptism are justified in insisting that the New Testament nowhere explicitly excludes the practice. It is possible that baptism was given to infants without leaving any historical trace and without entailing any special rationale in baptismal theology.

This is very nearly what confronts us in the earliest unmistakable evidence for the practice of baptizing both children and babies, in Hippolytus' Apostolic Tradition. The order it lays down for baptism may confidently be held to reflect Roman practice not only when it was compiled, c. A.D. 215, but a generation or so earlier, back to c. 180. But its claim to prescribe apostolic tradition is not to be taken seriously; there is much in the work which can by no stretch of the imagination be regarded as apostolic practice. The Greek for the chapter in question is not extant, but the Latin and the oriental versions agree in speaking of the baptism of 'the little ones' (parvulos), first those who can answer the baptismal interrogations for themselves and then those who cannot. How was this ability to speak for oneself measured — in maturity of comprehension or in speaking competence expressive of only basic levels of understanding?

Hippolytus is commonly regarded as describing a Christian proselyte baptism, and it is quite conceivable that, in the conversion-baptism of a family, children of infant age, perhaps of four or five, were told by their parents to answer for themselves and instructed how to do so. Thus in our earliest explicit text, the sharp lines between paedo-baptism and credo-baptism are blurred, for Hippolytus' parvuli who answer for themselves are receiving child believers' baptism.

By this time baptism was probably given only once a year, at Easter, except during outbreaks of persecution. Unless Hippolytus' account deals only with Christian proselyte baptism (in which case it would tell us nothing about babies born to parents already baptized), those receiving baptism must have included some babies born since the last baptismal service a year ago. If so, baby baptism would not take place at intervals throughout the year, but only once, for babies whose ages might range up to virtually twelve months. There is thus a liturgical delay built into Church practice, which is markedly different from Jewish circumcision on the eighth day after birth.

Among the issues left unclear by Hippolytus is the form of words in which parents or relatives answer for 'the little ones'. All the available evidence indicates that the early baptismal rites were originally established to cater solely for those able to speak for themselves, and were only slowly and sometimes awkwardly adapted to infant (baby) subjects. Although Hippolytus could not be plainer in revealing the contemporary Roman practice of baptizing babies and children, all that the rest of the work says about baptism, its preparation and its sequel, makes sense only of

---

7 Cf. Aland (1963), pp. 49-52; Jeremias (1965), pp. 28-32. Jeremias is probably right that the fact that children, males and females were baptized separately and that parents answered for their little ones before they were themselves baptized does not count decisively against our seeing here the baptism of adult converts (proselytes) along with their children. Hippolytus' text (Apost. Trad. 21) may be found in H. Kraft, Texte zur Geschichte der Taufe, besonders der Kinderbatafe in der Aten Kirche (Kleine Texte 174; Berlin, 1969), p. 20 (cited as Kraft).

* Cf. Church of Scotland Special Commission on Baptism, Interim Report (1955), p. 19. The claim that 'if the New Testament had meant to exclude infants from Christ's Baptism, it would have used language . . . to make this quite clear', is quite untenable. Cf. Barth, p. 179, and Aland (1967), p. 21 (there is solid evidence of the presence of children of all ages in the earliest congregations, but nothing is said about their baptism).
persons of responsible years. The point can be made another way. If one were to remove three brief sentences about *parvuli*, everything else in the work would require one to conclude that only professing believers were baptized.1 Infant baptism nestles wholes under the mantle of believers’ baptism, although it is quite visible. This might suggest that infant baptism is of recent origin, but the slow adaptation of liturgical procedure to infants evident in later sources cautions against overconfident deductions.10 As late as, and later than, Augustine, the baptismal questions were still being addressed about the baby to the parent or sponsor in the third person, ‘Does he believe in God?’ etc., with the reply, ‘He believes’. Already in Hippolytus the special provision made for those who cannot answer for themselves marks babies out as abnormal subjects for baptism, and we must assume, in default of contrary evidence, that at this time the third person was used in question and answer about them, thus drawing attention to their abnormal, even if by now routine, inclusion.

The almost contemporary evidence of Tertullian from Roman North Africa plainly reveals that infants (*parvuli*) had been or were now being baptized there, but does not tell us how well and long established the practice was. Is his preference for the deference of baptism (‘let them be made Christians when they have become competent to know Christ’)11 a protest against an innovation, or his dissent from common observance? Jeremias has no doubt: ‘Tertullian’s reservations . . . are directed against an established usage. . . .’ Thus right at the beginning of the North African Church we find infant baptism as a universally observed practice.12 This is coupled with an interpretation of Tertullian’s *De Baptismo* that restricts the reference to *parvuli* to ‘the children of pagans joining the Church’, and of other works of Tertullian that makes him both ‘emphatically oppose’ the tendency to postpone joining the Church’ and ‘not only presuppose the practice of infant baptism’ but even ‘advocate it’.13 Aland’s analysis of these texts gives a far more satisfying and consistent account of Tertullian’s thought, but he goes too far in asserting that ‘In Tertullian’s tract *De baptismo* . . . we catch a glimpse of the very beginnings of infant baptism in Carthage and Africa. . . . Tertullian’s polemic is directed against something new.’14 But novelty is one argument that Tertullian does not level against infant baptism — presumably because he knew he could not convincingly do so. Moreover, Aland takes no note of Tertullian’s acceptance of emergency baptism for infants, or of the apparently established role of the sponsors. Above all, Aland underestimates the idiosyncratic character of Tertullian’s case for delaying baptism, which he also urges upon unmarried women, especially widows and virgins. This has been impressively spelt out by Eduard Nagel, who also points to the possible influences making for delay exerted by the risk of persecution, the experience of difficulties in daily life and the Church’s penitential discipline.15 We conclude that Tertullian’s objections were directed against a practice already prominent in the Carthaginian Church.

So infant baptism is first inescapably attested early in the third century both in Rome (baby as well as child baptism) and in Carthage, in texts which require us to believe that it had been observed in both centres for a generation or more. Can we move any further back towards the New Testament?

All the earlier evidence is vulnerable to some element of uncertainty or qualification. For example, Justin Martyr, who had experience of Christianity in Asia Minor as well as Rome, declares that he knows of ‘many men and women of the age of sixty and seventy years who have been disciples of Christ from

12 Op. cit., pp. 55-76. Although he does not directly address the question how well established infant baptism was, it is clearly his view that in the late 2nd C. it was the standard practice (cf. p. 166).
childhood (ἐκ παιδίων). Jeremias argues that this last phrase and the verb used (μαθητεύει) must mean that these persons were baptized as infants 'in the time between A.D. 80 and 95'. But ἐκ παιδίων may well denote 'from childhood' rather than 'from babyhood' or 'from birth', and this would accord better with the force of μαθητεύει. Aland, for whom the sentence means 'they had been instructed in Christian faith from childhood, and grown up as members of a Christian family', succeeded in eliciting a more precise analysis from Jeremias, although the latter still insists that it was 'in early childhood' that they 'had become disciples of Christ' and that we have here a definite allusion to baptism.

Nothing more definite can be deduced from two other first-person testimonies to long Christian lives in the later second century — Polycarp's 'Eighty-six years have I served [Christ]' and Polycrates 'I have now lived in the Lord sixty-five years'. The latter belongs to A.D. 190-191, which enables Jeremias to conclude that Polycrates 'was baptized as a child about A.D. 125'.

Polycarp's martyrdom is variously dated between 177 and 153, which would give an infant, perhaps baby, baptism for Polycarp in the first century. The discussion of such statements between Jeremias and Aland is inconclusive, although in his later book Jeremias concedes that some of them show only that the persons concerned 'were not first converted as adults, but were Christians already from their youth up'. He makes no mention of a reference introduced into the discussion by Aland from I Clement (c. A.D. 90) to certain Christians who 'have walked among us from youth to old age unblameably', where on no reasonable chronology can ἀπὸ νεοτήτος specify the years of childhood. Such testimonies can more confidently be held to reflect the baptism of teenagers or children as believers (cf. Hippolytus' parvuli who can speak for themselves), than baby baptism.

Irenaeus' Against Heresies was written c. 180. His knowledge of Christianity embraced Asia Minor and Rome as well as Gaul. In a familiar passage, extant only in Latin, he includes infants, parvuli and pueri among all 'the ages of man' which Christ came to save by passing through himself and thereby sanctifying, and which 'are reborn (renascuntur) through him to God'. Everything hinges on the verb. Jeremias has the better of this argument with Aland, and rightly stresses that the reference presupposes the practice of infant baptism (including baby baptism), which must therefore go back at least a couple of decades before Irenaeus wrote, i.e., to c. 150. This is roughly the date of Justin's description of baptism as administered in Rome and perhaps also Asia Minor, which presupposes only confessing believers as subjects. If Irenaeus' evidence holds good for Rome as well as Gaul (and Asia Minor?), how are we to reconcile his testimony with Justin's? Perhaps in Justin's rite infants (or babies) nestled under the wing of older (parental) candidates, but invisibly rather than visibly as in Hippolytus. Aland mentions also Hermas' references to baptismal practice, which likewise relate to Rome around the mid-second century and prima facie envisage only responsible recipients.

The significance of the silence of such sources is an important question, because to the texts referring to baptismal procedure in terms relevant solely to candidates capable of speaking for themselves or otherwise acting responsibly (e.g., in undergoing instruction or fasting), belongs also the Didache, which most scholars date c. 100. Aland regards it as automatically ruling out infants and little children. It is among the negative evidence...
omitted by Jeremias in his first work, but incorporated into a broader argument in the second. First, Jewish ritual arrangements are often framed entirely to suit adults, even in cases, such as proselyte baptism, in which it is otherwise known that infants took part. Secondly, Tertullian and Hippolytus seem almost invariably to have in view the baptism of persons of mature years, and yet we know by their own testimony that infants too were included in baptism. Jeremias then combines these two points in support of his larger thesis of the correspondence between Jewish proselyte baptism and primitive Christian baptism.

There is, however, one demurrer to be entered against this reasoning. As far as the Jewish observances are concerned, we have explicit evidence for the inclusion of infants when the ritual regulations fail to mention them. This is precisely what we lack for baptism in the era of the Didache. Nevertheless, Jeremias' argument may be held to have shown a prejudice in favour of preferring explicit incidental evidence over the silence of accounts of ritual when the two appear to conflict, as we suggest they do for Rome in the mid-second century. But we cannot do this with the silence of the Didache. Also left unexplained is why the ritual silence is broken early in the third century in Hippolytus. The question is the more acute the longer one supposes it to have lasted — over a century, on Jeremias' supposition.

The Apology of Aristides probably belongs to the reign of Hadrian (117-138). Its most pertinent passage (not discussed by Jeremias until Aland adduced it) describes Christians as persuading (melëuvw) any male or female slaves they may have, 'or children (èvna), to become Christians.' To Aland the text expressly places the baptism of the children of Christians 'only after they have attained the needful insight, hence not before they have become several years old'. Jeremias interprets them as the children of the slaves, in yet another case of a house baptism. Then 'persuade them to become Christians' applies

only to the slaves; it is scarcely appropriate to any but adults. While one or two features in this deceptively simple text count in Jeremias' favour, such as the mention of children after the slaves, Aland's explanation is more natural. For Jeremias' version to carry conviction, 'and children' would be required, not 'or' children as given by both Greek and Syriac versions. Aristides is therefore another witness to a form of young believers' baptism.

There is one further area of evidence to investigate before we come to the New Testament, and that is epitaph inscriptions of Christians dying in childhood. They have evoked one of the very few fresh contributions to the whole debate in the last few years. Jeremias distinguished two main groups of inscriptions. In the first only the child's age at death is given, together with some indication that the child was a Christian and occasionally that its parents were Christians. All these Jeremias takes to reflect the baptism as infants of the offspring of Christian parents. In the second group the date of baptism is mentioned along with the child's age at death, showing that baptism was administered in extremis. 'In all probability in these cases the parents were pagan.'

Aland knocks some sizeable holes in this construction. The inscriptions in question date from the third century. In order to avoid irrefutable evidence of the non-observance of infant baptism so soon after it is first unambiguously attested, Jeremias advances the anachronistic notion of pagan parents requesting and succeeding in securing, the baptism of their dying children, ranging in age from eleven months to twelve years, in the century before the Peace of the Church. If these inscriptions belonged to the fourth century, they would be further evidence of the well-attested deliberate postponement of baptism. Jeremias is no more convincing in his response to Aland, with a hypothesis that, in the emergency baptism of a twelve-year-old in A.D. 268, the parents were catechumens, which would explain why the child had not been baptized earlier.

It remains possible that some of the inscriptions which do not give the date of baptism but disclose that the child died a
Christian refer to children baptized as babies, but no firm conclusions can be drawn without clear indication. Incidentally, it is noteworthy that in inscriptions even children of a few months or years are called fidelis or pious to attest their baptized status, which is further evidence that the baptism of infants has been accommodated to an observance designed for faith-professing candidates.

An American scholar, Everett Ferguson, in an article in the Journal of Theological Studies in 1979, used the evidence of the inscriptions to argue that infant baptism developed by the regularising of emergency procedures. Tertullian stood at the point where there was pressure from some to extend the emergency measure to other circumstances. Ferguson linked the emergency baptism of children observed in the inscriptions to the influence of John 3.5, ‘the favourite baptismal text of the second century’, which was thought to deny heaven to the unbaptized. ‘The high mortality rate of infants in the ancient world, to which the Christian inscriptions are a powerful if mournful witness, would encourage the practice of giving baptism soon after birth as insurance no matter what might happen.’

This thesis is not inconsistent with the evidence surveyed so far. It offers an alternative explanation to Jeremias’ of Justin’s failure to mention infants in his account of baptismal practice at Rome at a time when, from Irenaeus’ assertion, we inferred that baby and infant baptism were already being observed there. Justin’s silence would show that the emergency baptism of infants had not by then become the regular baptism of all infants, while Irenaeus might be alluding to the regular practice of emergency baptism of children. Ferguson’s account also has the advantage of smoothing out the course of the early history of paedobaptism, at least if it did not begin until well into the second century and did not become common until the third century, and then in the fourth century became less common. To Ferguson the fourth-century delay of baptism arose from the

same association of baptism with death evident in the emergency baptism of infants.

Ferguson’s hypothetical account does not comprehensively answer the question when infant baptism began, for it does not tell us when the emergency baptism of infants began. Worth quoting at this point is Beasley-Murray’s comment on 1 Cor. 15.29: ‘The attitude that could adapt the baptism of believers to baptism for dead people, that they might gain the benefits believed to attach to the rite, would find it a short step to baptize infants, that they too might receive its blessings.’ It is not clear whether he implies that the baptism of infants might have begun as early as 1 Corinthians, but the link between baptism for the dead and emergency baptism is a suggestive one. Both, in Beasley-Murray’s view, find their roots in a sacramental-magical perversion of Paul’s teaching.

But does baptism in extremis necessarily entail regarding baptism as essential in order to avoid hell after death? It is possible to view it, in the case of at least some of the children in these inscriptions, as an appropriate mark or seal for those brought up in the nurture of the Lord, perhaps regarded as ‘holy’ by virtue of their Christian parentage (see the following discussion of 1 Cor. 7.14), and thereby marked out for baptism as and when they become able and ready to answer the baptismal questions for themselves. Their baptism prior to their premature death would be a fitting, rather than an indispensable, act, to which their ‘holiness’ and perhaps also their innocence or
The most intriguing New Testament text is 1 Cor. 7.14, which is popularly viewed as one of its clearer warrants for infant baptism. The structure of Paul's reasoning is widely misunderstood. When Paul asserts 'Otherwise your children would be unclean, but as it is, they are holy' (RSV, NIV), he is not basing the children's holiness on their being of two holy parents, one a believer and the other sanctified through the believer. Rather he is adding the same principle both in what he says about the unbelieving partner in a mixed marriage and in what he says about the children of a mixed marriage. The holiness of the believing spouse covers both the unbelieving partner and their children. This in turn is the same principle that he adds in what he says about the children of an unbelieving partner and their children. Paul is not interested in the relation between the children and the unbelieving parent. A parallel obtains between the unbelieving partner and the children, in their relations to the believing wife/mother or husband/father.

Furthermore Paul's argument moves from the children to the unbelieving spouse. The holiness of the children of a single Christian parent is the acknowledged assumption upon which Paul bases his substantive assertion about this parent's unbelieving spouse, an assertion which clearly does not possess the self-evident validity of what he says about the children.

The next step is to note that the argument holds water only if the children, like the unbelieving partner, are unbaptized. It is inconceivable that, if they had been baptized, their holiness should have been grounded not on the fact of their baptism but on their relationship to a Christian parent — which must be if the analogy is to retain its force. Furthermore, it follows that if the children of a single Christian parent in a mixed marriage are holy, so *a fortiori* are the children of two Christian parents, and in both cases without baptism, on the basis of their Christian parentage. This exegesis has the broad support of the Fathers, as well as generally of exegetes today, including both Jeremias and Aland. It suggests a parallel with Jewish proselyte baptism, which was not given to children born after the conversion-baptism of their parent(s).

We must not obscure possibly important distinctions. Paul says nothing directly about baptism, although it is unquestioned that the unbelieving husband or wife was unbaptized. Exegesis can establish only that the presupposition (the holiness of the children) of the main argument (the holiness of the unbelieving spouse) is not grounded in the children's baptism. There exists, however, the strongest presumption that the children had not in fact been baptized. Moreover, Paul is obviously alluding to a matter of common practice rather than to a specific instance. The verse is therefore of unique relevance to this enquiry, for no other material in the New Testament enables us to be so confident that any child or children were or were not baptized.

Can we deduce anything further — in particular, whether the children were subsequently baptized, and if so, at what age? The Greek itself can give us little clue as to their age. Whether, in addition, to being 'holy' by birth, they were also baptized, already or subsequently, is an issue on which Jeremias changed his mind. In the German edition of his first work, he endorsed the view that, according to this text, the Pauline Churches did not baptize children born to Christian parents. By the time of the English translation he had 'begun to doubt the validity of this reasoning', for it ignored 'the important fact that in Judaism all boys, whether their birth was "in holiness" or not, were circumcised on the eighth day'. Since baptism replaced circumcision, the holiness from birth of the children of 1 Cor. 7.14 did not preclude the possibility that they were already baptized. The holiness of the unbelieving spouse did not make it unnecessary

---


13 The relation of Jewish proselyte baptism to primitive Christian baptism remains disputed. G. Barth, *op. cit.,* pp. 30f., 141, denies any significant influence on Christian practice until the later 2nd C. Cf. similarly Strobel, pp. 11-12.

14 Bentley-Murray, *op. cit.,* pp. 119, 331, argues from the fact that the Church at Corinth was only about four years old when 1 Cor. was written that most of the children in it must have been born before their parents' conversion, and were either baptized with their parents (in which case Paul's argument here fails) or still uncirumcised (because born before their parents' conversion but not baptized). But this argument holds only if your children' denotes all the children of the Corinthian Christians. It is more naturally taken only of those parallel to unbelieving partners, viz., those unbaptized and perhaps also unbelieving.
that he or she be subsequently converted and baptized. But Jeremias affirms only that 'the baptism of children on the eighth day [sic], in place of circumcision' is no more excluded by the verse than is the later baptism of the unbelieving spouse. In emphatic italics he declares: 'We must accordingly be content with the conclusion that 1 Cor. 7.14c bears no reference to baptism'.

This revision of opinion significantly alters the thrust of Jeremias' case, which separates the baptism of children of parents joining the Church from the baptism of children born to Christian parents. On the former he is never in any doubt. As in Jewish proselyte baptism, the children were baptized together with their converted parents. But in the German edition he argued that, to start with, both the Pauline Churches and the Church in Jerusalem did not baptize the children of baptized parents, and this practice changed in the Pauline Churches sometime after 1 Corinthians, and in the Jerusalem Church around the same time, say, between 60 and 70. His main evidence for holding that in Jerusalem the children of Christians were not at first baptized is his inference from Acts 21.21, that c. 55 the male children of the Christian Jews were still being circumcised.

In the English version of 1960, scarcely more than a hint is given of a change in practice from non-baptism to baptism of the children of Christian parents. The shift in Jeremias' reading of 1 Cor. 7.14 is the chief factor behind this revised account. On Acts 21.21 he has very little to say. He maintains his inference that 'in a.D. 55 new-born male infants of the Jerusalem Church were circumcised', and merely poses the question whether they were also baptized. He is altogether more confident in drawing another twofold conclusion from Acts 21.21 combined with Col. 2.11, namely that in Pauline territory the children even of Jewish parents were not circumcised but were baptized.

Aland exposes the weakness of Jeremias' argument that Jewish proselyte baptism provides the background to 1 Cor. 7.14 when he points to the totally non-Jewish character of the notion that the unbelieving partner in a marriage may continue in his or her unbelief and yet be regarded as holy. Jeremias' response does not attempt to counter this objection. Furthermore, the parallel Jeremias draws between the non-exclusion of the subsequent baptism of the unbelieving spouse and of the prior baptism of the children is not the most obvious one to draw. A truer parallel would be between the non-exclusion of the subsequent baptism of both unbelieving spouse and children. We must remember that the weight-bearing element in Paul's argument is the holiness of the children, which is already self-evident in a way that does not hold for the holiness of unbelieving spouses.

It is generally held that the children of 1 Cor. 7.14 were born after their parent's baptism, which for Jeremias rests on the parallel with Jewish proselyte baptism. Although Aland rejects this parallel, he does not develop another possible line of reasoning suggested by this verse. The mixed marriages resulted from the marriage of two pagans, one of whom was subsequently converted. Why then should the statement about children not apply to children born before the parent's conversion and baptism? This would make the parallel between the two cases even closer. It is too readily assumed that, when only one spouse was baptized in becoming a believer, the children were also baptized at the same time. This would presumably be less likely if the wife and not the husband were converted. Variation might be expected according to the unbeliever's strength of opinion. It is quite possible that the children envisaged by Paul included some born before the parental conversion but not baptized with the parent. Only children in this position offer a precise parallel to the unbelieving partner. Whether all the children so born were in this position can be determined only by extraeaneous factors.

We have got this far without broaching the meaning in this verse of ἅπασα ἡ πατρία (of the unbelieving partner) and ἅγιος (of the children), nor is a detailed enquiry called for at this stage. The words seem to indicate status or relation, presumably both to God and to the Christian community, rather than religious influence (pace Barth) or ritual cleansing. Their meaning is important for the question before us: is the holiness predicate of the children such as to be likely to preclude or promote their

---

*Perpetua was baptized in prison prior to martyrdom in A.D. 203 apparently without her child who at the time was not allowed to be with her in prison (Passion of Perpetua 8:5, 9). The narrative nowhere mentions Perpetua's husband.*
baptism as babies? (Their later baptism as children able to answer for themselves would simply put their case on a par with that of the unbelieving spouse.) If they already 'belong to God' (NEB) by virtue of their Christian parentage, would this exclude any need for speedy baptism, or would it, in the words of the Church of Scotland Special Commission, 'demand' it?**

Jewish proselyte baptism provides no model for the baptism of children born to baptized Christians. Nevertheless, we should not rule out the possibility that the baptism of infants as part of household baptisms may, in due time, alone or in concert with other factors, have fostered the separate baptism of infants born after their parents’ entry into the Christian community. There would thus be two kinds of infant baptism, one of them starting perhaps considerably earlier than the other. On any construction some interval is required between the two, in so far as, before one had any babies born to Christian converts to baptize, one had to have adult Christian converts. At the very least two different bases for infant baptism must have been involved. If Jewish proselyte baptism was a catalyst for the separate Christian baptism of infants, via the intermediary of Christian household baptism, then the interval may have been considerably longer than the nature of the case itself demanded, for the Jewish practice did not imply any special treatment for the new-born.

A second possible factor predisposing to the baptism of both categories of infants in Christianity is circumcision. On the dependence of Christian baptism on Jewish circumcision Jeremias could scarcely be more emphatic. In Col. 2.11 Paul names baptism “the Christian circumcision” . . . and describes it thereby as the Christian sacrament which corresponds to Jewish circumcision and replaces it*. But if in Jerusalem male babies of Jewish Christian parents continued to be circumcised for two decades or more, as Acts 21.21 implies, would they also have been baptized — and on the same eighth day? Is it not much more likely that communities which continued to practise circumcision would for that very reason not have baptized their male babies? And by what logic would female babies who could not be circumcised be baptized? (Did baby baptism begin solely as a female rite, as a counterpart to male circumcision?) In the Pauline world, circumcision was so closely identified with the Jewish law that not only was it not countenanced for male Gentile children (and presumably also their male children; cf. Gal. 5.2), but its continuance by Christians of Jewish origin may also have been actively discouraged, as Acts 21.21 indicates. The polemic against circumcision must have mitigated against its exercising a significant influence on Christian observance. Nor is there an obvious carry-over from circumcision to baptism, such as obtains in the relationship between the Jewish Passover and the Christian Pascha and Lord’s Supper. Nor can we point to any significant moment or focus of transition from one to the other comparable to the role of the Last Supper. Much more plausible is the hypothesis that the parallel between circumcision and baptism became influential at a later date (as it plainly was by Cyprian’s time), when the controversies over the Christians’ non-observance of the Jewish law had largely receded. No writer in the first two centuries used Col. 2.11-12 to relate circumcision positively to baptism. It is not until Cyprian that we have any grounds for viewing infant baptism as a rite for the new-born, as might have been expected if circumcision had influenced Christian practice. A closely parallel development can be seen in Christian attitudes to the sabbath. Until the fourth century, it was either part of the jettisoned law of Moses or spiritualised. Early Christian writers frequently discuss circumcision and sabbath in similar terms in the same context.*

There remains Col. 2.11f., which starts with a spiritualisation of circumcision as a way of describing the Christian experience of Christ’s redemption, and then refers to the baptismal incorporation of Christians into Christ’s spiritually circumcising atonement. The correspondence is not between two rites, of

**Interim Report (1955), p. 27. The Commission lands itself in self-contradiction. It argues that some implies either that they were already baptized or that they participated in their parent’s baptismal incorporation. But since primitive Christianity knows nothing of unbaptized Christians, their being already within the Holy People demands that they were subsequently baptized. But how could they require to be baptized if they already partook of their parent’s baptism?


** Cf. Justin, Dialogue with Trypho 19. This work contains the fullest Christian discussion of circumcision to date. It speaks of circumcision and baptism in close proximity, but falls short of suggesting any positive correspondence. Justin takes a metaphorical view of circumcision, which was given only for Israel’s hardness of heart and to mark her out for condign punishment at the hands of Rome. Cf. M. Simon, Virtue (Paris, 1964), pp. 198ff.
circumcision and baptism, but between the Jewish rite and the divine work of spiritual circumcision accomplished by Christ. ‘The circumcision of Christ’ is the atoning death of Christ.

A third possible stimulus for the baptism of babies or children in the apostolic Churches might be sought in the example or teaching of Jesus himself, which brings us to the Blessing of the Children (Mark 10.13-16 par.). The issue here is not the intention of Jesus as such, which can scarcely have related directly to the baptism of infants, but how the pericope was understood, and why it received the form it did in the developing Gospel tradition. Tertullian reveals that ‘Let the children come to me ...’ was in his day aduced by the defenders of infant baptism, but Jeremias believes that the command to give the children to Jesus through baptism was inferred from the passage much earlier than Tertullian. The evidence for this he finds in its interrelationship with other Gospel texts, especially Matt. 18.3 and John 3.5, both within the Gospels and in second-century tradition. The use of κορίτσια shows, according to Oscar Cullmann’s thesis picked up by Jeremias, that ‘in the period in which the Gospel tradition took shape the question of infant baptism was a live one, and that the passage about the blessing of the children was used as an argument against doubts about it.’ The laying on of hands must also be seen in connexion with baptism.

It is not clear whether Jeremias would argue that the command to baptize infants would have been inferred from this passage alone, in the absence of other factors precipitating its development. Once infant baptism had begun, the passage would of course be used in its defence against critics, but is its import clear enough, with or without Jeremias’ accompanying evidence, for it to have been responsible for initiating the baptism of children born to Christians in a situation like Corinth? Was it a decisive factor in the extension of infant baptism to the children of baptized Christians which Jeremias originally posited for the very decade, A.D. 60-70, during which Mark’s Gospel was probably produced? In any case, does it refer with any clarity to babies rather than, or as well as, to young children?

If, however, the final form of the passage reflects an established practice or controversy about an incipient practice, we would have to look elsewhere for a precipitating factor or factors, unless we could attribute that role to the Blessing of the Children in its pre-Marcan existence. It is difficult to identify such an initiating cause elsewhere in the ministry of Jesus.

This review has yielded regretfully few certainties. The evidence will sustain the confidence neither of a Jeremias nor of an Aland. The former’s is even less warranted than the latter’s. Before 200 in Rome, and possibly in North Africa too, the baptism of babies had become routine, but in a form of service devised for professing believers. Irenaeus implies that by about the mid-second century babies were being baptized in Southern Gaul and probably Rome and Asia Minor, but Justin’s account of baptism at Rome c. 150 suggests that they were not routinely baptized there. We noted two different ways of resolving this conflict, one based on the nature of ritual regulations and the other finding Irenaeus’ allusion consistent with the solely emergency (albeit regular) baptism of infants. Some evidence is best interpreted of the believers’ baptism of quite young children, which is provided for by Hippolytus. Many inscriptions do not allow us to determine whether the Christian children had been baptized as babies or later, but some reveal in the third century the emergency baptism of both babies and older children.

The New Testament seems to show that in the Pauline Churches until at least c. 55 the offspring of baptized Christians were not themselves baptized. It is not impossible that, on the model of Jewish proselyte baptism, converts were baptized in families on their accession to the Church (solely Gentile converts, i.e., quite strictly on the model of the Jewish practice?), but the influence of proselyte baptism on Christian practice before the second century is increasingly doubted. Nevertheless, Aland’s attempt to demonstrate, from other things that are said about the members of baptized households, that infants could not have been included, ultimately fails to carry conviction. We have no right to expect such precision of these texts, as even Barth came near to seeing (p. 180). There is of

*Baptism 18:5 (Kraft, p. 13).

course, a close parallel in the silence of the baptismal liturgies of the Didache and Justin, on one interpretation of it, and in the near silence of Hippolytus. The point is relevant to Barth’s objection (pp. 165-6) that the possibility that baptism might have embraced infants simply does not rear its head in the biblical discussion.

The analogy of circumcision is unlikely to have played a significant role until the later second century. The Blessing of the Children may reflect debates c. A.D. 60 about whether infants or young children were fit subjects for baptism. If it does, it clearly supports their baptism. But it is only in such a conjectural context that the passage is directly relevant to the question of infant baptismal origins. It is most unlikely, without other and weightier causes, to have led the early Christians to believe that they should baptize baby infants.

So the baptism of babies in families converted to Christianity may have begun early in the apostolic age, although the baptism of babies born to Christian parents probably did not. The latter may have developed out of the emergency baptism of infants sometime in the second century, or out of the inclusion of infants in household conversion-baptisms, or out of the practice of baptizing very young children who could answer for themselves. In so far as more of the evidence points to young children belonging to the Christian community alongside their elders and hence presumably on the same basis of faith-baptism, the extension of children’s baptism to baby baptism is becoming an increasingly attractive hypothesis.50

In the year 381 Gregory Nazianzen advised that children should normally be baptized at about the age of three ‘when they can take in something of the mystery, and answer (the questions), and even if they do not yet understand fully, can nevertheless retain some impression’.51 In the whole debate the place of parvuli who can answer for themselves has not been given the consideration it deserves. Texts such as Acts 2.39 and Mark 10.14 should be read in the light of the portrayal of children in

the apostolic Churches of the Epistles, where they are addressed as responsive and responsible Christian like their parents.52 These pictures, viewed against the background of synagogue practice, are fully consistent with the children’s incorporation into congregational life according to their developing capacities. Child believers’ baptism fits very well into this scenario.
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50 Cf. Strobel, pp. 63-68.
Papyrus Egerton 2
(the Unknown Gospel)—
Part of the Gospel of Peter?*

DAVID F. WRIGHT

When the papyrus fragments of the Unknown Gospel (hereafter UG) were first published in 1935,1 scholars naturally inquired whether they did not belong to one or other of the already known and mostly fragmentary apocryphal gospels. The question was answered in the negative on all sides. One of the gospels under consideration was the Gospel of Peter (hereafter EvP). A well-known passage in Eusebius's Church History reproduces bishop Serapion of Antioch's own account of his exposure of a Gospel of Peter as tainted by Docetism.2 The contents of this heterodox gospel remained almost entirely unknown until the discovery in 1886-87, at Akhmim in Egypt, of a narrative of the passion and resurrection of Jesus, with Peter appearing at two points in the first person (7:26-27; 14:59-60). Virtually all scholars have agreed that the Akh-
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*This study has benefited from some perceptive comments by Dr. Richard Bauckham of the University of Manchester, to whom I am most grateful.


This unmasking took place in the last years of the second century, so the EvP cannot have originated later than the third quarter of the century, and probably nearer the middle of the century, a date which places it close to the Egerton papyrus. Nevertheless, commentators on UG gave short shrift to the possibility that it belonged to EvP. In the opinion of C. H. Dodd, “In style and language it [EvP] has nothing in common with our document,” apart from its use of χριστός. The original editors of UG devoted a couple of pages to the question but excluded any relation between the two writings. In particular they supposed EvP to have had a very restricted circulation. “One would hardly expect . . . to find it in an Egyptian papyrus of about the middle of the second century.”

The fact that such a papyrus, or one close enough to it in date, has recently been published may in itself be held to warrant a re-opening of the question. P. Ox. 2949 comprises two papyrus fragments of the late second or early third century, according to its first editor, the larger of which contains the clearly recognizable remains of EvP 3-5, albeit in part in a somewhat divergent text. It is not our concern here to investigate the possible significance of this element of textual discrepancy. I have considered this elsewhere, with results that seem to confirm the strong likelihood that the Oxyrhynchus version of EvP is earlier than the Akhmim one. We will assume that P. Ox. 2949 is evidence


See the essay referred to in n. 14 below, where I reach the tentative conclusions that: (a) the Oxyrhynchus text probably used less unusual vocabulary; (b) at some points it may well have been closer to the Synoptics; (c) at one point it probably made a smoother transition than Akhmim; (d) at another it accords more definitively with the apocalyptic thrust of EvP; (e) at one point or perhaps two its linguistic and stylistic usages may have been less distinctive than those of Akhmim.

Dr. Richard Bauckham has raised the intriguing question whether a connection exists between the secondary character (if established) of the Akhmim text of EvP and the fact that the same Akhmim MS contains a text of the Apocalypse of Peter (ApocP) which is generally held to be a shorter, edited version of the work preserved more substantially and reliably in an Ethiopic translation (cf. C. Maurer in Hennecke, etc., op. cit., vol. 2, 664-66). He even speculates that the Oxyrhynchus find may occasion a fresh look at the argument of R. M. James, preceded by A. Dieterich and Th. Zahn, that the Akhmim ApocP is in reality another fragment of EvP (cf. James, “A New Text of the Apocalypse of Peter III,” JTS 12 (1911): 573-83, at 577-82. Whereas Zahn and James held that EvP derived and adapted its material from the original ApocP, Dieterich argued that ApocP was developed out of the apocalyptic section of EvP. For a critique of James see Vaganay, op. cit., 187-92.

A more likely outcome of a re-opening of the question of the relationship between
for the circulation of EvP in Egypt in the later second century, but this assumption is invoked here merely as suggesting a re-examination of the relation between UG and EvP. The evidence advanced is almost entirely independent of the identification of P. Ox. 2949 with EvP. One might, however, point out that although the provenance of the Egerton fragment is not known for certain, the first editors regarded Oxyrhynchus as most likely. We are dealing with two documents attested there within a half century of each other.
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Although the Akhmim MS of EvP (and P. Ox. 2949) contains only narrative material parallel to the canonical Gospels’ accounts of the passion and resurrection (the Akhmim copyist may well have had no more extensive text than he has given us), this in itself is no bar to the identification with EvP of UG, whose contents in summary terms comprise the remains of five or six pericope of different kinds but all recognizably Synoptic or Johanne in type—controversial exchanges with Jewish leaders, including an abortive attempt at stoning and arrest, the healing of a leper, and a nature miracle more apocryphal than canonical in respect of possible parallels.

Eusebius’s account of the unmasking of EvP by Serapion of Antioch gives no hint that it was confined solely to the passion and resurrection of Jesus. At the same time, the extract from Serapion’s exposure of the work provides little positive indication of what it did contain. Other non-canonical gospels, notably the Gospel of Thomas, prevent us drawing conclusions about content from the title “the evangilion of Peter,” which its Syrian users clearly gave it. Serapion does, however, say that most of it belonged τον θρόνον λόγου of the Savior.

EvP and ApocP in the Akhmim MS is confirmation of the secondary character of its text of EvP. Not only are the two texts written by the same scribe in the MS; their redaction may now more plausibly be assigned to the same writer. Given that the Oxyrhynchus text seems to have lacked one of the two ἁπάντα λεγέμενα in EvP (ματαιώσθητε, 2:3; cf. Lührmann, art. cit., 218, 223), renewed significance may well attach to the impressive parallels in vocabulary and linguistic usage between the two Akhmim texts assembled by James. There may be, of course, other possible explanations of these parallels, such as the ApocP reviser’s dependence upon EvP. But the new evidence that the Akhmim EvP is, at least in part, a secondary text, makes it more likely that we should look to a common reviser at work behind both Akhmim texts, especially where the linguistic parallels between the two include usages in EvP which are distinctive when compared with the canonical gospel traditions and, less importantly, with other primitive Christian literature. The whole question clearly calls for fresh investigation in the light of the implications of the Oxyrhynchus papyrus.

These include the significance of ματαιώσθητε (which Serapion tolerated in the readers of EvP until he discovered its Docetic tendency), the identity of his informants, and their relationship to EvP’s originators. I hope to pursue these questions separately.

2Swete, op. cit., xii.
UG 29 declares that “the hour of his [Jesus'] paradosis” had not yet come, a remark which implies that this gospel originally included an account of the passion and presumably the resurrection. Beyond this, the remains of UG contain no explicit clue to the contents of the full work. The possibility of implicit indications will be touched on later in this study.

UG has no parallel to EvP’s narration in the first person by Peter, but it nowhere refers explicitly to the disciples of Jesus. The only place where it has been suggested that they may be in view is the introduction to the fifth pericope, now extant only in seriously fragmentary condition. Jesus performs an apocryphal nature-miracle on the bank of the Jordan in response, it seems, to the ἐξορίσεως of his interlocutors at his ἔξων ἐξορίσεως (lines 63-64). They are referred to solely as ἔξων, and have usually been understood as hostile questioners: “ἐξων sollen die Gegner Jesu sein, die in dem ganzen Text unseres Papyrus eine Rolle spielen” (Mayeda, p. 53). Dr. Richard Bauckham of the University of Manchester has suggested privately that the disciples may be intended. In the Gospels they are often perplexed or bewildered. At John 13:22 the same verb ἐξορίσεως is used of them (cf. Luke 24:4, of the women at the tomb). Moreover, the group here seems to be accompanying Jesus περιοδικοὺς (line 65), which perhaps fits better with disciples than opponents. If this interpretation is adopted, it obviously counts against the identification of UG with EvP, on the assumption that Peter would have been one of the disciples on this occasion.

II

GENERAL FEATURES

Both EvP and UG are closely related to both Johannine and Synoptic gospel traditions

This is not the place to examine closely the question of the dependence or independence of these two gospel documents in relation to the canonical Gospels. Helmut Koester has recently argued for their independence, but a majority of scholars would in each case maintain their substantial dependence upon all or most of our written Gospels. A literary dependence upon all four has more often been argued for EvP, not without some possible influence from oral tradition, whereas UG may well draw on the Synoptics only by memory, but certainly shows a more direct use of Johannine material.

More significant is the consensus on their undeniable close affinities with both Johannine and Synoptic gospel material. On UG, for example, Jeremias speaks of “the juxtaposition of Johannine and Synoptic material and the fact that the Johannine material is shot through with Synoptic phrases and the Synoptic with Johannine usage,” while Mara argues that EvP for its narrative episodes follows the Synoptics and for its theology the Gospel and Apocalypse of John. Maurer links the two works together in their use of the canonical evangelists: “Since the ‘Unknown Gospel’... makes a similar use of the four Gospels already in the first half of the second century, the Gospel of Peter also may possibly be carried further back”—a judgment which is endorsed by R. McI. Wilson. Gallizia remarks on the fact that the two works are broadly contemporary and composed from sources at least partly the same. So in the view of most researchers, we are concerned in both cases with dependence on both John’s Gospel and probably two if not three of the Synoptics.

Furthermore, the two texts appear to have used these sources in similar ways. When Maurer comments that in EvP “the different sources, often as far as particular expressions, are woven into one another,” he could as well be speaking of UG. Such is the interweaving of Johannine and Synoptic pseudepigraphy in the latter that many have concluded that its compiler must be working from memory, at least in his use of Synoptic material. The only other possibility, a skilfully contrived mosaic or literary pastiche, has generally been ruled out on the grounds of the inherent improbability of such a method of composition. In addition, it would be unlikely, it is often held, if a writer in the early part of the second century had in his hands all four, or three at least, of our canonical Gospels. This factor has, however, not prevented the widespread conclusion that behind UG lies a knowledge, if not direct literary use, of Synoptic Gospels as well as the Fourth Gospel.

H. B. Swete’s invaluable tabulation of the details of EvP’s relationship to the Johannine Gospels leads him to the conclusion that if its author is no mere compiler or harmonist, his harmonizing tendency is nevertheless well established. Indeed, so intermeshed is his text with that of the Gospels, in Swete’s view, as to create a strong presumption that he used a pre-Tatianic gospel

14In his Introduction (n. 7 above), vol. 2, 49, 68, 162-63, 181-83, 222, and art. cit. (n. 7 above), 119-23, 126-30. I have argued against Koester in favor of dependence in “Apocryphal Gospels: the ‘Unknown Gospel’ (Pap. Egerton 2) and the Gospel of Peter,” in Gospel Perspectives, vol. 5: The Jesus Tradition Outside the Gospels, ed. D. Wenham (Sheffield, 1985) 207-32. The present study inevitably reflects my conclusions on this issue without, I think, at any significant point resting upon them. The case could stand equally well if Koester’s judgments were accepted for both texts. The question would be less straightforward if dependence were claimed for one but not the other.

15Jeremias in Hennecke, etc., op. cit., vol. 1, 95; Maurer, ibid., 180; Mara, op. cit., 214; Wilson in TRE III, 332; Gallizia, art. cit., 210. Note that Cameron, op. cit., who agrees closely with Koester’s opinions on both UG and EvP, places each of them in the second half of the 1st century in Syria (74, 78).

16Loc. cit.
mony, even if he also knew one or more single Gospels.\footnote{Op. cit., xviii, xxv.} Even if such a view has not found much support,\footnote{Wilson thought it worth citing in TRE III, 331.} it illustrates the kind of judgment scholars have been led to in seeking to identify EvP’s peculiarly close, yet selective affinities with the canonical Gospels. In this it is uncannily similar in general terms to UG.

Both EvP and UG display unfamiliarity with Palestine and Palestinian Judaism

This has commonly been asserted of UG, particularly with regard to the account of the healing of a leper (lines 32-41). The leper’s explanation of how he contracted the disease is not only unparalleled in the Synoptics but appears to reflect ignorance of the Palestinian situation: “wandering with lepers and eating with them in the inn I became a leper myself.” Furthermore, he is instructed after being healed to show himself to the priests—in the plural, which, even if it depends on Luke 17:14, where ten lepers were involved, shows ignorance of Palestinian Judaism in using the plural with reference to a single leper. Furthermore, the composite pericope which seems to be based upon the question posed to Jesus about paying tribute to the emperor (lines 43-59) has lost its particular local color. Now Jesus is asked, “Is it permitted to render to the kings what pertains to their rule?” In addition, Dodd concluded that διάσπαστι Ἰησού, which occurs twice in the papyrus (33, 45), was “an imitative form arising in a circle not intimately acquainted with Jewish usages.”\footnote{Art. cit., 64-65. Cf. Mayeda, op. cit., 33-34, 36, 44-45, 76, 77 for Egerton’s “Unkenntnis der Lage im Lande Palästina”; also Jeremias in Hennecke etc., op. cit., vol. 1, 96; Gallizia, art. cit., 225-26.}

On EvP Mara records his judgment as follows: “l’auteur du fragment est incompétent et gauche quand il touche à l’histoire de la Palestine en générale, et à ce qui concerne les institutions juives et le milieu de vie du Κύριος en particulier.”\footnote{Op. cit., 213; cf. also 30-31, 71, 79, 132, 163, 194.} Maurer’s comment is to similar effect, and more specific. He speaks of EvP’s “vague presentations of the circumstances obtaining in Palestine in the time of Jesus. Ignorance of the political relationships, the religious groups, the feast-calendar etc. Likewise result in the real figure of Jesus being allowed to become more and more hazy.”\footnote{In Hennecke etc., op. cit., vol. 1, 181-82.} Although some of these elements are obviously apologetically determined, for example Pilate’s subjection to Herod (EvP 2:3-5), others, such as the loose or inaccurate references to the

Sanhedrin (1:1; 8:28-33), cannot be so explained. The author feels the need to identify the temple as that of Jerusalem (5:20), and his account of the role of the women after the death of Jesus misses the implications of the subordinate role of women in Palestinian society (12:50-13:57).\footnote{Op. cit., 199-200.}

Ignorance or misrepresentation of religious and social life in Palestine is not a surprising characteristic of apocryphal gospels. What makes it noteworthy in these two texts is that their presentation of Johannine and Synoptic tradition is in some other respects remarkably primitive or primary.

Both UG and EvP betray an anti-Jewish apologetic tendency

From the outset EvP seems determined to exonerate Pilate of responsibility for the crucifixion of Jesus and to lay the whole blame at the door of the Jews—people and leaders alike. Denker has attempted to qualify both emphases.\footnote{Op. cit., 78-87.} He points out that in the latter part of EvP (cf. 11:43-49) Pilate is depicted as cooperating with the Jewish leaders’ scheme to ensure the silence of the eye-witnesses of the rising of Jesus, and therefore EvP cannot be regarded as philo-Roman. More persuasive is his argument that EvP is a Jewish-Christian gospel. Whereas nearly all previous commentators on the work have attributed to it an anti-Jewish animus, which has commonly been viewed as the single most determinative apologetic factor operating on the text,\footnote{Cf. for example, Swete, op. cit., xxviii; Vielhauser, op. cit., 648; Mara, 72 etc. At the same time Mara points out, p. 33, that EvP’s anti-Jewish Tendenz implies a sound knowledge of late (non-Palestinian) Judaism on the author’s part. See also M. Lowe, “Tendenz des der Apokryphen,” Nov. Test. 23 (1981): 56-90, at 85-86, who suggests that the influence of the various canonical accounts on EvP may be reflected in different senses of Ἰονδάτος.} Denker denies that it is anti-Jewish as such. Rather it is “ein Bussruf an Israel,” and to this end engages with Jewish anti-Christian polemic. EvP highlights Jewish responsibility for the passion of Jesus not simply in order to condemn them but rather to move them to repentance, of which some indications are evident even within the story itself (cf. 7:25; 8:28; 11:45, 48). This reading of EvP by Denker is attractive, but it is doubtful whether it does full justice to the poor light in which Jews are placed by the author of EvP (cf. 12:50, 52). Nevertheless it does call for some revision of the by-now traditional ascription to EvP of an aggressive anti-Jewish hostility.

The Egerton Gospel deals with quite different subject matter, but attention has been drawn, particularly by Goro Mayeda, to the fact that all but one of its pericope (the exception is the healing of a leper) are concerned with confron-
Both EvP and UG have been presented as works of popular Christianity

In their editio princeps of UG, Bell and Skeat contrasted it with EvP on the grounds that the latter was a more vulgar production. Its style, they claimed, was characteristic of the naive Greek of the uneducated classes, and its tone more inclined to the marvellous, to wordiness, and to occasional extravagance. This is broadly the impression made by EvP on most readers familiar with the canonical Gospels. We shall return shortly to the question of style. The sentiments of EvP were similarly assessed by L. Vaganay, in 1930, as the product of popular Christianity rather than sophisticated Docetism. The author was “un de ces chrétiens du commun dont la foi n’est pas toujours guidée par une doctrine très ferme.” Vaganay instances “une conception enfantine du miracle,” the tendency to intensify the cruelty of the passion, an apologetic effort to guarantee details of the story and contemporary ecclesiastical customs, and above all the concern to magnify the person of “the Lord.”

Whereas many early commentators on EvP found its Docetism unambiguous, more recent scholarship, like Vaganay, has been less certain. Maurer, for example, speaks of “odd statements . . . at most to be regarded as fingerholds upon which the Gnostic remodelling of the Gospel accounts could get a grip.” Vielhauer too holds that to assert its Docetic character is precarious. Which of the canonical Gospels, he asks, was not taken in their own sense by Docetists and Gnostics? Mara emphasizes the author’s concern to exalt the divinity of “the Lord,” without excluding the popular or heterodox character of his presentation. Such modern judgments link up with Seraphion’s obvious difficulty in recognizing heresy in EvP or the Christian community that used it. Perhaps their μαρτυρία, as he put it, was not so much a dissenting or capacious spirit as that cast of mind associated with popular or vulgar Christianity.

The brief remains of UG do not at first sight support similar conclusions. Were the last pericope more complete, however, we might be able to speak of

27Fragments. 31.
29In Hennecke, etc., op. cit., vol. 1, 181.
more "popular" of the two documents, for if anything is clear from Serapion’s report it is that EvP was the church gospel-book of the congregation at Rhossus. But suggestive though it be, Mayeda’s conclusion can be only provisional at best.

III

VOCABULARY AND STYLE

Some readers of this study will have been champing impatiently at the bit, unimpressed perhaps by the more general similarities advanced so far and desirous to get to grips with the nuts and bolts of the two texts. Unfortunately, a comparison of their language and style encounters major limitations. They contain different kinds of material, so that we should not be surprised to find differences of the same kind as obtain between the narratives of the passion and resurrection and the accounts of the teaching and works of Jesus in the canonical Gospels, or at least in the Synoptics. Furthermore, UG is a small text, whose reconstruction is at points quite tentative. There is the added complication that the Oxyrhynchus fragment has placed a fresh question mark over the textual history of EvP. Finally, assessments of style cannot avoid some element of subjectivity.

With these qualifications in mind, we will first draw attention to some interesting points of connection between the two texts which, if significant, are of varying weight, before proceeding to a more systematic survey of their distinctive vocabularies and then to a consideration of stylistic features.

(1) A conspicuous feature of EvP is its invariable use of (δ) κάρσος for Jesus (with which one might also connect its use of ἡ καρποφορία for the first day of the week, 9:35; 12:50). All thirteen occurrences are in narrative. One of these, however, seems to be missing in the new Oxyrhynchus papyrus, which raises the possibility that this usage was not so marked in the primitive EvP as in the Akhmin MS. Jesus is never addressed in EvP at all. On four occasions Jews (3:6, 9), Roman soldiers (11:45) and Pilate (11:46) refer to him as "(the) son of God," and one of the malefactors speaks of his becoming "the savior of mankind" (4:13). In UG the narrative twice refers to Jesus as δ κάρσος (30, 37—and reconstructed at 39), and three times as "Jesus" (17, 50, 65—and reconstructed at 2). In addition, Jesus is twice addressed as "teacher Jesus" (33, 45). The canonical parallels to UG’s two certain uses of δ κάρσος (respectively John 10:39 and Mark 1:40-44 par.) have no designation for Jesus at
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"une conception enfantine du miracle" for this text as well as for EvP. Too many evaluations of UG have ignored this final and admittedly very fragmentary section, which is nevertheless recognizable as "a bizarre story, implying a nature-miracle unknown to the other Gospels, canonical and apocryphal alike" and resting on no source known to us from gospel-literature. Two points need to be stressed here. First, this part of the text requires us to posit for UG a source outside the Johannean and Synoptic traditions, whereas for all its differences in detail, there is little, if anything, in EvP "which compels us to assume the use of historical sources other than the canonical Gospels." In this respect it is UG which is the more apocryphal or secondary of the two.

In the second place, this section in UG is patently thaumaturgic. Hence in a lecture given a couple of years after the first publication of UG, Bell excepts this miracle-story when saying that elsewhere the new gospel is noticeably sober in style. So if due account is taken of this element in UG, our two documents may no longer afford so clear a contrast between "matter-of-fact" and "extravagant." If Bell and Skeat originally found UG "sober" when compared with EvP, other scholars have asserted the comparative sobriety of EvP when set alongside "later Gnostic embellishments" and later apocryphal writings.

Bell also declared himself persuaded of Goro Mayeda’s evaluation of the genre of UG: "er gehört zu den Schriften, die nicht offiziell und kulturlich von der Gemeinde, sondern privat und häuslich gebraucht wurden." The work has "eine Ausdrücke, die zu einer nicht tief theologischen, sondern volksstämmischen und allgemein verständlichen Erzählung passen. . . . Dieser Papyrus zu einer der Schriften gehört, die die ersten Christen zur häuslichen Lektüre benommen und auch zum Zweck der persönlichen Werbung oder der christlichen Erziehung gebrauchten."

If this account of UG is sound, it makes UG the

23Dodd, art. cit., 83, 85.

24Swete, op. cit., xvi (cf. Wilson in TRE III, 331). Swete held that nothing in EvP required a non-canonical source, but Dr. Richard Bauckham has pointed out that the similarity between 10:39 ("two men carrying another" coming out of the tomb) and Ascension of Isaiah 3:16-17 ("the Beloved" coming forth from the tomb "sitting on the shoulders of the Angel of the Holy Spirit and of Michael") can only be explained in terms of common, non-canonical tradition.

25Recent Discoveries, 19-20.

26Maurer in Hennecke, etc., op. cit., vol. I, 182; Swete, op. cit., xiii; Vaganan, op. cit., 191: "Il suffit de lire le fragment évangelique pour juger de la sobriété du récit qui s’apparente beaucoup à la narration synoptique. Jusque dans les passages où l’auteur se montre le plus indépendant, . . . il garde encore une réserve remarquable auprès des autres livres apocryphes."

these points. It is also worthy of note that UG’s parallel to Luke 6:46 (lines 52-53) has διάδοχονον instead of χίρον. UG’s limited use of χίρον aligns it more with gospels like Luke, which uses it a number of times, and perhaps the Gospel of the Hebrews,49 with EvP’s invariable use.

(2) The double vocative διάδοχον διονομένων in UG (33, 45) provokes the following comment from Mayeda: “zum doppelten Vokativ δ.’1. ist keine Parallele zu finden [in the canonical Gospels]. Höchstens könnte θείον οίκος Λκ 17,13 und θείον του Ἰουδαίων Mk 5,7 par. hier genannt werden. Die Beispiele für diese Ausdruckweise sind jedoch im klas. Griech. zahlreich vorhanden, z.B. φίλε πατερέ, ζευ πάτερ

It happens that EvP provides a closer parallel than any of these—Aδέλφε Πελάτε (2,5), which in coupling a substantive with a proper name is precisely similar in construction to the phrase in UG. But Vaganay points out that the coupling of Aδέλφοι with a proper name in introductory greeting in letters is found in Josephus and the papyri and that a close parallel to EvP 2:5 exists in LXX Tob. 5:11, Toδίτε Aδέλφε.41 There is a difference, however, between a conventional greeting formula and a usage which, as here, carries almost the force of a predicate: “Jesus, we are Teacher.” This is made clear at UG 45 by the ensuing discussion, “why do you call me ‘Teacher’ . . . ?” In EvP 2:5 also, Aδέλφε is weight-bearing rather than merely conventional.

(3) EvP contains a number of details not found in any canonical passion narrative.42 Among these is the urgent request of, so it appears, the Jewish leaders to Pilate in order to the Roman guard to tell no one what they had seen, “for it is better for us to make ourselves guilty of the greatest sin before God καὶ μὴ εἰρωνεύουν εἰς χείρας τοῦ λαὸς τῶν Ιουδαίων καὶ λαθενείας” (11:48). Neither such a concern in general nor in particular the verb λιθάζω occurs in any of the canonical accounts of the passion, but as we have seen above, the remains of UG contain probably two references to stoning. The certain one (23-25) not only has the verb λιθάζω, but also mentions the rulers’ “laying their hands on him.” These parallels may not be devoid of significance in view of what seems to be UG’s special interest in attempts on Jesus’ life by stoning.

(4) Similarly in EvP 2:5 Herod, at Pilate’s request, παρέδωξεν αὐτὸν [Jesus] τῷ λαῷ. This is close to Mark 15:15 par. and John 19:16, although

*a Cf. fragments. 2 and 7, ed. P. Vielhauer, in Hennecke, etc., op. cit., vol. 1, 163, 165.

*b Op. cit., 213, where references are given (but the Xenophon one is incorrect).

41 There is a useful listing in Swete, op. cit., xiii-xv.

in none of the four Gospels is the precise wording found, either at this point or elsewhere. A closer parallel occurs in UG 26-27, where the rulers laid hands on Jesus in order to arrest him καὶ παραδοθοντον τῷ δίκαυο, which in substance is unparalleled in the canonical evangelists. The variation between λιθάζω and δίκαυον is of no moment, for each document uses both words (UG 6-λιθάζω; EvP 9:34-δίκαυον). Again we have between UG and EvP a minor verbal agreement which can carry weight only as one element in a broader argument.

(5) The noun διάνοια in the canonical Gospels in citations of Deuteronomy 6:5 LXX (Mt. 12:30 par.) but otherwise only in Luke 1:51 (but cf. Luke 11:17, εἴδος αὐτῶν τὰ διανοηματα). It is found, however, both in UG 50-51 (εἴδος την διάνοιαν—a certain reconstruction) and in EvP 7:26 (τετραμύλινα κατὰ διάνοιαν). Moreover, EvP has διανοηματα at 11:44, a verb which is found nowhere in the New Testament. But the LXX at 2 Maccabees 3:16 provides a precise parallel to EvP 7:26 (τετραμύλινα κατὰ την διάνοιαν), and the meaning of διάνοια is not the same in the two texts.

In designating groups of Jewish leaders, the two texts differ. Whereas UG mentions only lawyers (2) and rulers (γραμματεῖς—6, 25-26), EvP names only priests (7,25), elders (7,25; 8,28; 29, 31; 10,38), scribes (8,28, 31) and Pharisees (8,28). It is not obvious that any significance attaches to this difference, since in this territory EvP’s usage is patently ill-informed and UG’s is awkward in switching rapidly from lawyers to rulers (2-6). The accident of survival may have limited the categories in UG, which also lacks any reference to “the Jews,” who appear several times in EvP (1:1; 6:23; 7:25; 11:48; 12:50, 52).

Distinctive Vocabulary

The following lists record all words not found in any of the four Gospels at all or only in a clearly different sense. ‘NT’ denotes occurrence(s) elsewhere in the New Testament. Indications of other occurrences are illustrative rather than exhaustive.

Unknown Gospel

παρακλήσων (3)—not in Bauer43; Plutarch.

[ἀνεκτούτος (4-5)—uncertain reconstruction (but cf. ἐξαιταινίως below); not in Bauer; Aquila (Prov. 25:3), Philo, Plutarch, Athenagoras, Iren.].

Εξάκω (22) in sense of ‘draw, haul’—NT (Jn. only in sense of ‘draw, attract’).

Gospel of Peter

[παρατέθημα (1:1) in the reconstruction accepted by Mara, pp. 40 (where erroneously παρατέθημα), 74-75; (most editors—παρατέθημα)—in sense “reject”—not in Bauer—Hellen.].

σταυρίσμα (2:3)—haplog. (but notice that P.Ox. 2949 line 6 has a divergent text which may not have included this word—cf. Lührmann, art. cit., pp. 218, 222-223).

ἀδέλθο (3:6) - LXX, Philo, Josephus, Barnabas.

ὁμιλίς (3:9) in plural probably meaning “face”—Josephus, Eusebius.

μαστίγος (3:9) - NT (Acts 22:25) [ApolP].


δρόθοι (4:11) - LXX, Philo, Lucian (cf. δρόθοι below).

κυρίς (4:12) - Justin M. (cf. legatōn, Jn. 19:24).

σειροσπότο (4:14) - haplog. (- itt occurs, late).

μεσιμία (5:1) - NT (Acts), LXX, Philo.

ἀγονία (5:15, 11:45) in sense “be anxious, fearful”—LXX, Josephus, Polybius.

κόσμίων (5:16) - NT (Rev.), LXX, Philo.

περίγραμμα (5:18) - NT.

εἰλίνος (6:24) - Hellen.

τυχόντο (7:26) - LXX, Philo, Josephus, Diodorus Sic.

χρύσα (7:26) - Josephus, I Clement, papyri (Hellen. formation from aorist ἐκπληθύνῃ of κρύπτω).

σφηνός (8:33) - NT, LXX etc.

χαμάρι (9:35, 12:50) - NT etc.


ἐπίχειρε (9:37) - not in Bauer; in sense of “give way”? Hellen. See Mara, p. 65 for proposed emendations, all of which (ἀνετ-, ἀντ-, ἀπο-) are used in the Gospels, in the sense required here.

ὑποθέσι (10:39) - Symmachus (Ps. 43:19, 72:2) - very rare.

χειρογράφει (10:40) - NT (Acts), Hellen., Josephus.

ὑπερβάλλον (10:40) - LXX, Philo, Josephus.

ὑποκοψ (10:42) in sense of “answer”—Methodius (and verb so used perhaps especially in early Christian liturgy—Acts of John, etc.; cf. Swete and Vagianay, ad loc.)

συνοπτικόν (11:43) - Symmachus, Herodian, Justin M. ὑμνών (11:33) - LXX, Philo, Josephus.

μεγάλος (11:45) - NT.

καθάρει (11:46) - Philo, Josephus, Plutarch.

ἀξιόλογοι in rare aorist ἀξιόλογοι (11:48) - Aelius Aristides.

μαθηταί (12:50) - NT (Acts 9:36), Diodorus Siculus, Diogenes Laertius.

φλέγ (12:50) - Philo, Dio Chrysostom etc. [ApolP].

μνημεια (12:53) - Classical (LXX and NT have μνημεια),

τελευτάτοι (14:58) - LXX, etc., Plutarch.

λίνον (14:60) in sense of “fish-net”—Classical, Philo.

What conclusions may be drawn from this linguistic evidence? Perhaps only that in respect of vocabulary, the two documents cannot be sharply distinguished in character. Each contains a perhaps surprising number of words not found in the canonical Gospels. In regard to the relative lengths of the two texts, UG uses a higher proportion of terms not in the four Gospels than does EV. On the other hand, EV alone has words not otherwise attested, or extremely rare (ὑποθέσι, ἀξιόλογοι, ἐπίχειρε). At the same time it alone employs distinctive usages of early Christian language (κόσμιων, and perhaps ἄγονία). Both use words found in the New Testament only in Acts (UG - συνοπτικόν, EV - μαστίγος, μεσιμία, κειρογράφει, μπάλα). For both there is some overlap with the Septuagint in words not found in the New Tes-

*Contra Dodd, art. cit., 61, for UG.*
tament (UG - λεπτά, καταστάσεις; EvP - ὁθέτα, ὁθέτος, τιτρώσκω, φρουρά, ὑπερβαίνω, διανοέω, τελευταῖος). If Vaganay can conclude decisively that the language of the Akhmim fragment is koine Greek, the same may be said for UG on the basis of the evidence cited above.

There are, however, some features of EvP's narrative style which are not paralleled in UG, although we must bear in mind the difference in material between the two texts. Bell and Skeat pointed out that asyndeton occurs seven times in EvP but never in UG. The point stands, but requires qualification. UG contains no clear case of asyndeton, but line 17 (παροχθείεις τοῦ Ιησοῦ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς) follows an awkward genitive absolute (αὐτῶν δὲ λεγόντων . . .) with almost the force of a separate main clause. In addition, in its parallel to John 5:39 UG 9 omits the καί before ἐξετάζω εἰσών. Of the seven instances in EvP, three (6:22, 7:25, 13:57) begin with τότε and one (11:47) with εἶτα-words which, as Vaganay shows, have lost their temporal force and function merely as terms of conjunction. Another of the seven begins with τῶν ἰδιῶν (11:45). Of the two cases of pure asyndeton (8:29, 11:46), the latter parallels UG 17—παροχθείεις τοῦ Π. Ἐφρ. So by this criterion EvP is not as markedly different from UG as Bell and Skeat supposed.

But the frequently repeated use of καί to connect clauses is a clearly distinguishing feature of EvP's narrative. It occurs proportionately far more often than in any of the canonical Gospels and must represent a mark of popular speech. Comparison with UG is difficult, but it is noteworthy that it used καί most often in narrative—three times in the abortive stone and arrest (24, 26, 27), twice at least (as conjunctions) in the healing of the leper (32, 35; cf. reconstructed 38), and four certain times in the final miracle (67, 69, 70, 72). There are two further occurrences of καί, and another construction. By comparison, UG gives five certain uses of δὲ and six reconstructions of some degree of probability. EvP has only 25 uses of δὲ to 106 of καί.

One feature of EvP's style which has no parallel in UG is the author's preference for simple forms of verbs. Vaganay lists eleven instances where, compared with the canonical evangelists, Ps-Peter eschews compound verbs. This he regards as an index of his poverty of vocabulary. Mara draws regular attention to this feature also, but interprets it differently, as "1° indice d'une certaine recherche" in the pursuit of liveliness and immediacy suggested by simplicity of diction. The range of unusual words used by EvP, according to the list above, counsels caution in speaking of the poverty of his language, not least in view of his preference in some places for Classical over Hellenistic forms, as Vaganay himself notes.

It was another of the initial judgments of Bell and Skeat on UG that it displayed "a far more developed construction" than EvP. Dodd agreed. Not only did its vocabulary have a closer affinity to Luke's than to any other Gospel's but if Luke was literary, the Egerton Gospel was even more so. By contrast it has not been difficult to point to certain awkward or vulgar features of EvP's style. One such, identified by Bell and Skeat in their first edition, is the use of ὅτι before reported direct speech. On some five occasions out of about twenty in all, EvP prefices direct speech with ὅτι (1:2; 4:11; 8:28 bis; 10:42). UG never commits such clumsiness. On several occasions EvP adds ἐξετάζω to create a clearer but less literary connection with what has gone before (4:13; 9:37; 10:38; 11:43; 12:52; 13:56). There is no parallel in UG. At some junctures, EvP's attempt at a more complex construction leaves the author floundering and entails crude endeavors to recover the sequence of expression. Vaganay well illustrates this at 8:28-29 and 12:50-51, concluding justifiably, "Nous nous trompons fort, si l'auteur est un écrivain de métier." A particularly maladroit sequence at 4:13-14 presents ambiguity about the subject of 4:14; 4:13 would make it the penitent malefactor, but it must in fact be Jesus.

But is UG entirely flawless? In the opening lines Jesus is presented rather awkwardly as addressing some words to the σωματίαν and then turning to the ἐνθατομοί of the people with an exhortation to “search the Scriptures” (2-7). The imperative ἔρωτε γραφεῖς τὰς γραφὰς followed by ἐν ὀπίσθεν . . . is regarded by Mayeda (p. 21) as a “Vulgar . . . gut gemeinchristisch.” Later in the same pericope occurs a transition with a genitive absolute (14-15, ἀνθρώπῳ δὲ λεγόντων . . . αὐτοῖς) which Mayeda calls “loose” and Lagrange “banal.” We have earlier referred to the inconsistency of the beginning of


"Fragments," 32.


"Bell and Skeat, Fragments," 31; Vaganay, op. cit., 145. Mara, op. cit., 77, regards the frequency of καί as a Semitism rather than a mark of popular style. On the currency of many "Semitisms" in popular Greek see Vaganay, 143-44.

the next pericope when, as the crowd prepared to stone Jesus, the authorities attempted to arrest him to hand him over to the crowd (22-27). The long pericope based on a developed form of the tribute-question suffers from more than one incoherence. Jesus is apparently provoked without cause into an extended rebuke of his questioners’ failure to fulfill his teaching, and no answer is given to the question itself (48-59). The literary demerits are not wholly on EvP’s side.

Nor indeed are the literary credits all due to UG. Vaganay is able to enumerate several features in EvP which exemplify “le souci de l’élégance.” This author too shows a certain predilection for words or forms characteristic of the Lukan literature. At a number of places he prefers Classical to Hellenistic usages, in vocabulary, grammar, and syntax. For example, he prefers πατωμα to ἐμετατάσσω (11:46, Matt. 27:42); he twice uses the good Attic construction ἕν ἀρχῇ to give a chronological reference-point for a main statement (5:15, 14:58), he uses ὅσοι (11:45), which is rare in koine Greek and is found in the New Testament only as a variant at Mark 15:6; and he knows to follow ὅσοι μαθητάς with an infinitive (11:48), whereas koine normally follows it with ἢ ὅσῳ. So Ps-Peter did not wholly neglect the literary aspects of his work. He had “quelque préoccupation de bien dire,” even if he did not succeed to any marked degree.

Mara (pp.26ff.) regards Vaganay’s judgment as unfounded. For him, EvP purveys “une prose apparemment pauvre, mais qui, à travers ses simplifications littéraires, est essentiellement cultivée et recherchée, qui invite à la reflexion et la sugère par de délicats rappels de l’Ancien Testament” (p.33). The quality of EvP’s prose derives, in Mara’s view, from the perspective of meditative reflection and the pursuit of “fiction dramatique et suggestion pour une réédition cathétique.” This is not inconsistent with its being “une composition populaire, dans le meilleur sens du terme, inspirée d’une théologie simple mais profonde, qui dans son intention apologétique, didactique, et dans sa volonté d’exhorter, recherche le plaisir du beau récit, même au prix de colorations que nous paraissent exagérées’’ (p.29).

There are strong indications that UG’s material has been brought together partly by catch-words, which would be entirely natural if the author were working in part from memory of the written gospels. Is there any evidence of a similar procedure at work in the composition of EvP? The situation is inevitably somewhat different, for in EvP the writer is following a narrative sequence already in broad terms established, while UG is clearly gathering material selectively. Nevertheless, Mara’s interpretation of EvP as the fruit of meditative reflection on the passion in the light of both messianic prophecy and the four gospels (pp.31-32) may suggest parallels. He draws attention to Herod’s instruction (1:2), δοθεὶ τῇ ἡμῖν πιστὴν τιμήν, and notes the similarity to John 13:27, where Jesus tells Judas, δοθεὶ τῇ πιστῇ τιμίᾳ, “It illustrates what he calls “l’habileté de l’auteur pour utiliser à nouveau des formules familiales déjà employées et pour suggérer des rapprochements ou des oppositions. Il peut être bien voire mis sur les lèvres d’Hérode, représentant des Juifs et juge de perdition, l’expression employé par Jesus, juge de salut, en face du ‘fils de perdition’” (p.76). At 6:23 it is said of Joseph (of Arimathaea) that θεοφύλακτος νῦν ὠν οὕτως ἔστησεν. Mara (pp.147-148) finds a striking coincidence with John 11:45, θεοφύλακτος οὗτος (v.l. θεοφύλακτος). In justifying the concession to Joseph, Mara claims, EvP will have remembered those who believed on Jesus because they had seen the great things he had done. “Et cet ‘emprunt’ lui sera venu spontanément puisqu’il s’agissait là aussi de sépulture et de résurrection.’’ There is perhaps a similar echo of John 11:50 at EvP 11:48, in both structure and subject-matter. The latter reads: “Il est mieux (οὐμενεῖ) pour nous de nous faire savants de la plus grande chose avant que Dieu nous en fasse voir l’étoffe.” One should note that in all these three instances, the text in EvP has no parallel in the canonical passion narratives. Mara believes (p.196) that 11:48 possibly contains Old Testament echoes (cf. Dan. 13:23, 2 Sam. 24:14), for EvP was based on reflective absorption of Old Testament material and hence included “l’abondance de passages ou de pensées ou de personnages.”

Detection of such echoes and resemblances, summoned up perhaps by the memory of a mind well-versed in the Old Testament and the canonical gospels, can only too easily verge on the fanciful. In Mara’s case it is all part of a suggestive overall interpretation of EvP, which at the same time rejects a rapid dismissal of EvP as the work of puerile incompetence.

* * * *

This enquiry did not set out to prove the identity of UG and EvP. Only if vocabulary and style were overwhelmingly similar could one argue decisively that they are parts of one gospel. They obviously do not display such coercive similarity. Given the brief compass of UG and its difference in content from EvP, the evidence of vocabulary would not be expected to be markedly significant one way or the other. All that has been claimed here is that their distinctive vocabularies are not incompatible with the hypothesis of their identity, and would in fact in general terms accord with it. Although stylistic differences are clearly recognizable, the two texts have often been too sharply contrasted on this score. Even in this area difference of subject matter may suggest caution.
in drawing firm conclusions. The question must be squarely faced: is their identity excluded by variations in style and literary composition? A confidently affirmative answer is not warranted. The new Oxyrhynchus fragment of EvP counsels qualified judgments, for it patently proves that by the date of the Akhmîm MS the text of EvP had undergone some development. About half a century after the date of the Egerton papyrus, EvP lacked, it seems, one of its two hapax legomena (στοιχεῖον).

The burden of this study has been that the possibility of the identity of the two writings has in the past been overhastily dismissed. A prima facie case of some plausibility exists. It would be hazardous to claim more than degrees of possibility or probability. The issue deserves reconsideration, if only because of its direct relevance to the question of the relationship of each text to the canonical gospel traditions, as well as to their date and place of origin.58

---

58The most recent scholar to attempt to answer these questions places them both in the second half of the first century in Syria. See n. 15 above.
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'Mother of God'?

It is tempting for Christians who seek to base all their beliefs on Scripture to attack the exaggerated reverence for Mary in Catholic Christianity at its weakest points. These must include, in the area of doctrine, the modern Roman Catholic dogmas of Mary's immaculate conception and bodily assumption into heaven, defined infallibly by the popes of the day in 1854 and 1950 respectively. In the area of Marian devotion, the extraordinary popularity of Marian shrines and centres of pilgrimage, new as well as old and ardently promoted by Pope John Paul II, not least in the special Marian year of 1987–8, has reinforced the impression that is often received, whether fairly or not, that Mary is at least as important for many Roman Catholics as Christ himself.

But Mary’s role in Catholic Christendom is by no means so vulnerable as to be shaken by fire directed at these sitting targets, nor so shallowly rooted as to be in danger of collapse if some of its more extravagant excrescences were cut back. These essays take Mariology more seriously than this—and hence include no specific discussion of the two modern dogmas in their own right. If this is taken to imply that we think there is nothing to be said in their favour, so be it. Any consideration of them would have to take note of the dexterity with which many leading Roman Catholic theologians are now accustomed to reinterpreting them (as they do other ecumenically offensive Roman dogmas, such as papal infallibility and transubstantiation), in an endeavour to make them more congenial to other Christian traditions—and to themselves.11

These innovations—at least as formal definitions—of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries are the end-products of a millennium and a half of galloping Marianism in Western Catholicism. Their origins must be traced ultimately to the Church of the Fathers, and particularly to the early creedal and conciliar affirmations about Mary’s function in the incarnation of Jesus Christ. It is here that we encounter the most potent of all the factors making for a high regard for Mary—one that is shared in principle by all the main historical traditions of Christianity—Orthodox, Anglican, Lutheran, Reformed and Presbyterian, Methodist and others, as well as by Roman Catholics. But for reasons that have rarely been exposed, they do not all use the same language to give impression to their convictions. To be explicit, rarely if ever do Methodists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists and many Anglicans and Lutherans speak of Mary as ‘mother of God’. The committed and fervent use of this title is, however, perhaps the most significant common element in the Marianism of Anglo-Catholicism, Orthodoxy and Roman Catholicism.

Theotokos—‘God-Bearer’

‘Mother of God’ is the standard, if imprecise, translation of the Greek adjective (or adjectival noun) theotokos, which more exactly rendered means ‘God-bearing’, ‘the God-bearer’. (It is a compound of two words, theos, ‘God’, and tokos, from the verb, tiktein, ‘to bear, give birth to’.)

The designation of Mary as theotokos is ancient and venerable, claiming the authority of the ecumenical councils of Ephesus in AD 431 and Chalcedon twenty years later. It was the focal term in the decisions of the Ephesus council, comparable in centrality to homousios (‘of one substance with’) in the statement of faith about the deity of Christ agreed by the Council of Nicaea in AD 325. Chalcedon reaffirmed the predication of Mary as theotokos in its more comprehensive definition of church doctrine about the per-
son of Christ. *Theotokos* thus entered the vocabulary of ecclesiastical dogma in a context that was through and through Christological. To claim that these councils made a Mariological term the ultimate test of Christological orthodoxy is to turn history on its head.² Mariology was a later growth, out of Christological roots.

The Council of Ephesus approved *theotokos* against the objections of Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, whose teaching was felt to imperil the unity of the person of Christ.³ By overemphasising the difference between Christ's human and divine natures, he was felt to suggest that Christ was not one but two—Son of God and son of Mary. *Theotokos* alarmed him, because it implied that the Son's deity originated with Mary, or else sounded like a resurgence of heresies long since condemned in the church. He would have preferred other terms, such as *theodoschos*, 'God-receiving', or *Christotokos*, 'Christ-bearing'. But Nestorius did not exclude altogether a careful, well qualified use of *theotokos*.

The bishops at Ephesus, however, led by Cyril of Alexandria, insisted that nothing less than *theotokos* was adequate to safeguard the truth of the incarnation. As Cyril put it, in a letter canonised by the Council:

> Since the holy virgin brought forth after the flesh God personally united to flesh, for this reason we say of her that she is *theotokos*, not as though the nature of the Word had its beginning of being from the flesh, for he was 'in the beginning, and the Word was God, and the Word was with God', . . . but . . . because having personally united man's nature to himself, he vouchsafed also to be born in the flesh, from her womb.⁴

What Cyril here excludes is as important to note as what he affirms, but the latter is our concern. The union of divine and human in the incarnation meant that God entered to the very fullest into the life and experiences of humanity—to be conceived and born of a female womb (although supernaturally, through the power of the Holy Spirit, with no male contribution), no less than to walk the hills of Galilee and suffer death in Jerusalem.

*Theotokos* (of which, as already said, 'mother of God' is the normal but inexact translation) was thus sanctioned as a designation of Mary with reference to the beginnings of the incarnation—the process of procreation that began at conception and was completed at birth. It has a place in the inheritance of the whole Church from the so-called undivided church of the Fathers. Ephesus and Chalcedon, along with Nicaea (AD 325) and Constantinople (AD 381), are the four ecumenical (general or universal) councils acknowledged by the Churches of the Reformation no less than by the Western (Roman) and Eastern (Orthodox) Catholic traditions. The Reformers of the sixteenth century accepted these councils' doctrinal definitions as part of the faith of the true Catholic Church.

**Drawing Distinctions**

Yet the Reformers were not agreed about the propriety of calling Mary 'mother of God'; Calvin, in particular, disapproved of it.⁵ The Churches that look back to the Reformers have on the whole been less affirmative about Mary than most of the Reformers themselves, but the non-use of 'mother of God' poses a sharp question. If it is a faithful translation of a sound dogmatic ruling of a universally recognised ecumenical council, should it not be a regular part of Protestant, as well as Roman and Orthodox, vocabulary? A report by a Church of Scotland committee on *The Motherhood of God* touched briefly on Mary. It argued that 'an evangelical freedom to remember with particular honour and respect one character in the gospel story, as good and as fallen and as ordinary as any, yet chosen to be the mother of our Lord', will
help to promote the greater recognition and freedom of women in the Church, but it never raised the possibility of honouring Mary as ‘mother of God’.6

Attempts to distinguish between ‘God-bearer’ and ‘mother of God’, whether as translations of theotokos or in their own right, are sometimes cursorily dismissed,7 but the two are certainly not synonyms. ‘Mother of God’ clearly has a wider reference than ‘God-bearer’, which specifies only the act of giving birth. The maternal relationship is undoubtedly much more extensive than the generation of the child. The implications of the latter for the former are rarely explored in Mariology; most of the literature draws no distinction between ‘God-bearer’ and ‘mother of God’, and as a result it is normally impossible to tell from English translations whether a Greek or Latin writer is using theotokos (or a Latin equivalent) or ‘mother of God’ (Greek, mētēr theou, theometor; Latin, mater Dei).

It is noteworthy that the Greek for ‘mother of God’ came into common Christian use considerably later than theotokos, and hardly ever appears in the extensive controversial literature of the age of Ephesus and Chalcedon. The Latin mater Dei, on the other hand, had begun to be used in the West before Ephesus, although it did not become the standard Latin version of theotokos. It may well be the case that Christian Greek first adopted ‘mother of God’ as a direct translation of the Latin rather than as a synonym of theotokos. Only from the late sixth century do Greek Christian writers seem to use ‘mother of God’ with any frequency.8

‘Mother of God’ in Greek Fathers

John of Damascus, who died c. 750 and is often called the last of the Greek Fathers, was perhaps the first Greek writer to use ‘mother of God’ as a matter of routine. It occurs repeatedly in his homilies on Mary’s nativity and dormition (literally, her ‘falling asleep’, one of the festivals that anticipated the assumption). Mary’s whole pure body was not abandoned to the dust, for to the royal mansions in heaven was translated ‘the queen; the sovereign lady (kyria), the mistress (despoina), the mother of God, the true theotokos’. On one occasion he even calls Mary ‘the mother of the only good God’—a phrase that brings to mind Luke 18:19 and John 17:3.9 He also used both ‘mother of God’ and the single-word compound theometor in other writings, for example, in The Orthodox Faith in a more Christological context. John Damascene’s Marian theology was exuberant, encompassing not only Mary’s assumption and immaculate conception but also her universal mediation. ‘Through her, our reconciliation with God has been consecrated, peace and grace bestowed.’10 John would not shrink from according her the sublimest of praises.

Before John of Damascus it is certainly possible to collect some occurrences of the Greek ‘mother of God’, but it can scarcely be said to be normal, instinctive usage.11 In the indexes to Eduard Schwartz’s magisterial edition of the documents of the ecumenical councils, it is found only once, in an episcopal memorandum sent to the emperor Justinian in AD 536.12 Cyril of Alexandria, the relentless defender of theotokos against Nestorius, in a famous sermon lauded Mary in extravagant terms, as ‘the sceptre of orthodoxy’ and the one ‘through whom the holy Trinity is glorified and worshipped throughout the whole world, . . . demons are put to flight, . . . holy baptism comes to believers, . . . churches are founded throughout the whole world, nations are brought to repentance’. But only once or twice did he come near to speaking of Mary directly as ‘mother of God, and then with reference to her giving birth to God incarnate in Jesus, i.e. in a verbal not a titular sense.13

Athanasius never used ‘mother of God’, although he was quite familiar with theotokos. Indeed, the long currency of theotokos in the Greek Church before the Nestorian controversy and the Council of Ephesus serves only to throw the
Coined by Constantine?

The first recorded use of the Greek "mother of God" is unexpected, often unnoticed and deceptive. It stands to the credit of Constantine the Great—who seems to have a corner in initiating this shift—in the development of the word "homoousios" into the discussions at Nicaea in AD 325. In his Address to the Assembly of the Saints delivered a few years earlier, Constantine declared that in Mary

There was conception, yet apart from marriage; childbirth, yet pure virginity; and a maiden became the mother of God.

The authenticity of this Address has not been unchallenged but it is probably Constantine's work, even if he was heavily indebted to advisers like Lactantius and Osius for some of its content and language. But perhaps the language is Constantine's own—in which case an untutored layman would be rushing in where the theologians had so far feared to tread.

The Address survives in Greek but must have been delivered in Latin, which would accord with other evidence, still to be presented, for the priority of Latin over Greek in speaking of Mary precisely as 'mother of God'. In reality, because we are dealing with translation Greek, we cannot be certain that Constantine's Latin had mater Dei, rather than some other form of words that could have been readily rendered into Greek as 'mother of God'. This is not groundless speculation, for one of the two normal Latin translations of theotokos was Dei generix (genitrix), which preserves the sense of 'bearer of God', but was itself often translated into Greek directly as 'mother of God'.

When the Greek phrase was next used is difficult to say. Extensive research in the writers of the fifth and sixth centuries might well disclose a steady increase in frequency. A
standard German Catholic history of dogma cites an occurrence after the mid-fourth century in the Ps-Clementine Recognitions, but the appendix which calls Mary 'mother of God' and 'sovereign lady and mistress of all creation' is a later addition. Proclus, Bishop of Constantinople shortly before the mid-fifth century, described Mary as 'mother of the Sovereign (Despotou)'. He also insisted that in the incarnation 'the divine nature' of Christ did not experience change, even in having a mother according to the flesh, for he did not cease to be motherless (amḗtố) according to the Godhead. It is but a little step to the increasing use of 'mother of God' in Greek theologians like Leontius of Jerusalem, Anastasius of Antioch and others before the end of the sixth century.

'Mother of God' in Latin Fathers

Latin theologians had apparently less reserve about mater Dei, 'the mother of God'. Zeno of Verona said that Mary 'conceived in herself the creator of the world', and before the fourth century was out Ambrose of Milan argued that if conception without sexual congress occurs in vultures, why should it be thought impossible in 'the mother of God'. 'What is nobler,' he asks on another occasion, 'than the mother of God?' In his Exposition of Luke he calls us to 'acknowledge the mystery: the mother of the Lord, pregnant with the Word, is full of God.' Ambrose was an important mediator of Greek theology to the Latin West, and his vocabulary may reflect his knowledge of the Eastern use of theotokos.

A full generation later, John Cassian in southern Gaul gave both mater Dei and Dei genetrix as Latin translations of theotokos, as well as using the former on several other occasions in his anti-Nestorian treatise on the incarnation. Dei genetrix was, with Deipara, a commoner Latin equivalent of the Greek word, as is evident from the index to Schwartz's collection of conciliar documentation.

Nestorius's fragmentary writings which survive in Latin present mater Dei on a few occasions but more often give Dei genetrix.

Photius of Constantinople, the ninth-century encyclopediast of earlier literature, records evidence that Leo the Great, bishop of Rome in the mid-fifth century, was the first to render theotokos as 'mother of God'. Photius is here citing lost writings of Ephraim of Antioch, who flourished in the second quarter of the sixth century. But Ephraim is mistaken on two counts. Before Leo, Ambrose and Cassian had used the Latin 'mother of God', as we have seen, while Leo himself did not follow them, keeping closer to 'God-bearer' with Dei genetrix, as well as using 'mother of the Lord'. The sequence of translation suggested by Ephraim's account confirms our earlier argument; theotokos in Greek became Dei genetrix in Leo's Latin, which had probably in turn become mater deum in Ephraim's Greek. Ephraim's note is nevertheless of interest in paying attention to the usage of Latin writers.

In a later phase of the Christological conflicts in the East, known as the 'Three Chapters' controversy, Latin writers from Africa intervened forcefully. The Defence of the Three Chapters addressed to the emperor Justinian by Facundus of Hermiane, who flourished in the mid-sixth century, moves easily between 'mother of God' and 'bearer of God'. A younger and more significant fellow-African contemporary, Fulgentius of Ruspe, similarly speaks routinely of Mary the virgin becoming the mother of the only-begotten God.

Reasons for Fathers' Reserve

And so, by the fifth century in the West and a century or so later in the East, churchmen had begun routinely to designate Mary 'mother of God'. But the evidence adduced above demonstrates that 'mother of God' is by no means the straight equivalent of theotokos, behind which
stands the authority of the early councils. Theologians who heartily endorsed the confession of Mary as 'God-bearer' and 'mother of the Lord' never spoke of her as 'mother of God'—for example, Cyril of Alexandria and the greatest of the Western Fathers, Augustine of Hippo. Can any reasons be advanced for this reserve evident in the delayed acceptance of 'mother of God' language in Christian theology?

One possible explanation is a nervousness at confusion with one or other of the many mother-goddesses of Graeco-Roman religion, such as Rhea or Cybele. One of Nestorius's fears about theotokos was that it risked making Mary herself divine.26 But this was not a prominent strain in his polemic against the term, which was directed more towards what it implied or entailed for the divinity of Christ. Nestorius's worries were far more Christological than Mariological. Nor am I aware of other Fathers who hesitated to call Mary 'mother of God' because it appeared to assimilate her to the goddesses, particularly the mother-goddesses, of pagan religion. That the title subsequently encouraged or facilitated such an assimilation is scarcely to be doubted, but to pursue the development of the cult of Mary in this direction is beyond the scope of this paper. One reason for Calvin’s disapproval of the designation was his belief that it promoted superstition. While it is sound counsel that abuse of a thing should not justify its wholesale rejection (abusus non tollit usum), it is at least understandable, and perhaps even inevitable and acceptable, if what many Protestants identify as Mariolatry persuades them not to call her 'mother of God'.

Another objection of Nestorius to theotokos claimed that Scripture called Mary not the mother of God the Word but the mother of Christ.27 Calvin also argued that 'mother of God' was not a biblical expression, any more than 'blood of God' or 'death of God' were. Strictly speaking we may adjudge them both correct but unconvincing. If we ignore 1 Corinthians 2:8 ('crucified the Lord of glory') and Hebrews 6:6 ('crucify the Son of God'), we can sharpen the issue by noting that the New Testament hardly ever, if at all—and certainly not characteristically—declares Jesus Christ to be 'God' without qualification, even in contexts, e.g. of worship, where its appropriateness would be unquestionable. Yet this has not deterred the Churches. The World Council of Churches is 'a fellowship of churches which confess the Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour according to the Scriptures'. In an age when 'the death of God' and 'the crucified God' are at the centre of theological reflection, should we expect, pace Calvin, a greater readiness among Protestants to speak of the 'mother of God'?

Perhaps not, for 'the death of God', like 'God-bearer' but unlike 'mother of God', is an explicit reminder of one of the moments of salvation-history. It is the weakness, from this perspective, of 'mother of God' that it is not anchored, as was pointed out earlier, to the human conception and birth of the divine Son. In the history of Mariology it has demonstrated its ability to extend its reach and to encompass the relationship between mother and Son not only throughout his earthly life but even beyond it.

Theotokos, on the other hand, has a certain singularity to it. It seems to have had no pre-Christian usage at all. (Herein may lie one reason why the Greeks were slow to adopt 'mother of God'. In theotokos they had a term perfectly adequate to express their mind and one also free, by its lack of prior history, from the kind of confusion to which 'mother of God' was prey.) Its singularity, not to say singularity, has probably been partly responsible for its limited use in prayer and worship, at least in English translation. To the uninformed 'God-bearer' is even more ambiguous. But its singularity keeps it close to its original Christological context—which 'mother of God' has conspicuously failed to do. As Karl Barth has said:

To a certain extent it amounts to a test of the proper understanding of the incarnation of the Word, that as
Christians and theologians we do not reject the description of Mary as the 'mother of God', but in spite of its being overloaded by the so-called Mariology of the Roman Catholic Church, we affirm and approve of it as a legitimate expression of christological truth ... The description of Mary as the 'mother of God' was and is sensible, permissible and necessary as an auxiliary christological proposition. 28

If we allow for Barth's adoption of the traditional rendering of theotokos, we note his earnest concern to confine the designation to a precise Christological focus.

'Divine Maternity'

Part of the unease that the wider application of 'mother of God' arouses in Protestants relates to language. I had long been familiar with 'mother of God' before encountering 'God's mother'. There is no sensible reason why the latter should be more disturbing than the former—it is, of course, closer in linguistic shape to theotokos. But whereas 'mother of God' can more readily be kept at a safe distance as a hallowed formula, 'God's mother' (which occurs in the English versions of the Vatican II documents and of John Paul II's Marian encyclical 'Mother of the Redeemer') makes the issue inescapable with its familiar directness. Part of the bemusement it produces arises from not knowing how much of the mother-son relationship is meant to obtain in this case.

Those who come fresh to this subject are also taken aback to discover that the theological literature normally refers to it as 'the divine maternity or motherhood' of Mary. This is a highly unusual phrase, which would not naturally be construed as 'motherhood of the divine'. It might speak of God's being a mother or motherly—very much the emphasis that the Church of Scotland report on The Motherhood of God was seeking to expose. Or it might easily mean a motherhood appointed by God— which would be quite acceptable for Mary. But as the phrase is used in Mariology it is difficult to conceive of an obvious parallel. This is highly regrettable, because it appears to push Mary herself towards being a divine mother.

Like Son, Like Mother?

Much Mariological development reflects a creeping tendency to elevate Mary to a quasi-divine status. It is almost as if it has operated with an axiom of thought parallel to the one that fourth-century theologians like Athanasius advanced against Arianism's denial of the deity of Christ. In the Arian controversy Catholic orthodoxy insisted that what the Father is as God, that the Son must be also, for identity of being unites fathers and sons. In Marianism the unspoken assumption reads something like this: what the Son is, that must his mother be also.

Thus the Anglo-Catholic theologian, L. S. Thornton, claims that 'language which scripture associates with our Lord is, in liturgical practice, carried over into association with our Lady'. Hence he supports a certain 'identification' of Mary with Jesus in mediatorial function. There are, he suggests, 'in the amazing lowliness of deity, two centres of reference which are yet inseparably one, namely the God-Man and his God-bearing Mother'. 29 In another essay in the same volume Vladimir Lossky affirms that to Mary the Orthodox liturgy 'describes the glory which is appropriate to God', in 'extreme giorification and unlimited veneration'. It was her vocation 'to have by grace what God has by nature', whence she is 'the boundary between the created and the uncreated'... Beside the incarnate divine hypostasis [of Christ] there is a deified human hypostasis. 30 Even if we remember that for Orthodoxy, deification does not mean being made into deity, Lossky is making staggering claims for Mary.

An eminent Italian Mariologist of earlier this century, Gabriele Roschini, spelt out the principles at work in the
development of Mariology. Among them is what he called the principle of analogy to or likeness of Christ.

Privileges analogous to the various privileges of the humanity of Christ are possessed correspondingly by the most blessed Virgin and according to the condition of the one and the other. 31

What this has meant is that immaculate conception comes to be credited to Mary also, and not only to Jesus. It is in Mary first of all that the hypostatic (personal) union of divine Word and humanity is effected—which conciliar orthodoxy at Chalcedon affirmed of Christ. After death, or instead of death, Mary is assumed body and soul into heaven in a manner akin to the ascension of the risen Christ. Mary as queen of heaven consorts with Christ the king of heaven. 'Our Lady' (Greek, kyria; Latin, domina) is modelled on 'our Lord' (kyrios; dominus). And so we could go on.

For Roschini the foundation of all his four principles of development is the divine maternity, which raises her to a dizzy height and places her immediately after God in the vast scale of beings, causing her to be a member of the hypostatic order . . . an order superior to the order of nature and grace and glory. For this the Fathers and the Scriptures have almost exhausted their resources of language in exalting her without succeeding in giving her the glory that becomes her. Her greatness borders on the infinite. 32

Newman was correct to compare Arius's conception of Christ with Mary—a creature but not like all other creatures, raised to a status that compensates as much as possible for not actually belonging to the Godhead itself. 33 Extrapolation from the 'mother of God' theme even has a throw-back effect not only on Mary's birth ('in a certain sense even the Nativity of our Lady itself belongs to the mystery of salvation') 34 but on her parents, who are honoured as 'the grandparents of God' in the Greek liturgy of Chrysostom. Even Elizabeth has been known to merit the dignity of being 'the aunt of God'.

Divine and Human Motherhood

In the Middle Ages Marian devotion developed in one particular direction which integrated elements from the 'mother of God' motif with others drawn from the 'mother of a human child' theme—the baby Jesus dependent on the milk of Mary's breasts, Mary's ability as mother to make her child compliant and indulgent, Jesus' sovereignty over human affairs, the compassionate mother, the stern masculine Jesus. These were combined to create a prominent thread of Marianism against which the Reformers vehemently protested as though grace and mercy were not the gifts of Christ but ultimately of Mary. Another chapter in this book examines what Mary's role as the human mother of Jesus amounts to according to the Gospels, but it is surely important not to confuse divine and human in respect of her motherhood. It is, I suspect, in this area that the deepest unease about the 'mother of God' title will be found to lie. For Evangelical Protestants it has nothing to do with a desire to have a low Christology. 35 It probably has a great deal to do with an almost uncontrolled extension of her motherhood beyond her 'God-bearing' and her human relationship to Jesus as portrayed in the Gospels.

What may be properly said of the mother-Son relation beyond the incarnate life of the Son? Is an eternal intimacy between them to be asserted, on the basis of an (alleged) intimacy in their earthly relationship? Is the Son dependent still on his mother, and does he still honour and revere her as a human son should his human mother? Can she influence him the way a mother can her child? Is humanity taken
up into the eternal Godhead not only in Christ, who never ceases to be the God-man, but also in Mary? Or does Scripture set certain bounds to the maternal role of Mary? The alternative is clear: everything that Christ did and was, does and is, must also be in some fashion connected with Mary, because, on this understanding, Christ is inseparable from his mother.

The essence of this kind of approach to Mary is contained in a comment by E. L. Mascall, an Anglo-Catholic theologian:

if the Church is the living organism of Christ’s glorified human nature communicated to men, and if Mary is still the human mother of the human Christ, she is the mother of the Church and our mother too... The Church lives its whole life under the maternal love of Mary.36

Or, as Pope John Paul II puts it in his encyclical ‘Mother of the Redeemer’:

Mary became ‘a mother to us in the order of grace’. This motherhood in the order of grace flows from her divine motherhood. Because she was, by the design of divine Providence, the mother who nourished the divine Redeemer, Mary became ‘an associate of unique nobility, and the Lord’s humble handmaid’... And ‘this maternity of Mary in the order of grace... will last without interruption until the eternal fulfilment of all the elect.’37

Everything through Mary?

If this approach to Mary’s motherhood is consistently followed through, all that comes to us from and in Christ also comes from Mary—for the Son was not given to the world except through his mother. The only thing that is excluded is her origination of the divine nature of the Son, which is from eternity. I find it startling that an eminent theologian can write as follows of the continuing significance of Mary’s motherhood:

The Christian returning from his communion can repeat in a totally new sense the words of Adam, ‘the woman gave me and I did eat.’38

When Evangelical Christians have recovered their breath before statements such as this one, which are by no means the utterances of the lunatic fringes of Marianism, they will rightly be provoked to think harder—but still biblically—about the mother of Christ. They have probably limited the biblical teaching to two or three aspects: a unique motherhood as ‘God-bearer’ more or less exhausted by physical procreation, some generalised moralising about the relations between mothers and sons, and an emphasis on spiritual affinity as what really counts (cf. Luke 8:19-21, 11:27-8). They may well be able to believe that ‘Christianity without Mary is a monstrosity’, but doubtful in the extreme whether they should never think of God without thinking of Mary.39 And they are likely to remain properly nervous of calling Mary ‘the mother of God’. The privileges of Mary grounded in her ‘divine maternity’ have in Catholic tradition at times seemed to threaten even an expansion of the Trinity into a quaternity. Biblical Christians are right to be cautious and reserved.
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David F. Wright
Mary in the Reformers

We must at the outset keep our subject in proper perspective. Mary was not a central or prominent issue in the sixteenth-century Reformation. It is important to emphasise the point, in view of the heightened Protestant concern occasioned by the modern Marian dogmas. Karl Barth could claim that Mariology is the critical central dogma of Roman Catholicism, the one heresy that explains all the others, but 'For Luther and the Reformers Mary is not a significant theme of theological controversy'. There was, I think, no single treatise on Mary from the Protestant side—if we except sermons and expositions of relevant biblical passages, such as the Magnificat. Surprisingly little is said about Mary in the Reformation confessions—a reticence which in turn is largely responsible for the extensive silence about Mary in the theological systematics of the age of confessional orthodoxy. (The sole reference to Mary in the Westminster Confession of Faith is to the virgin birth.) The great reserve of the documents of the Council of Trent is also noteworthy. Furthermore, among the Reformers themselves, some noteworthy diversity of emphasis and opinion is evident, along with a remarkable degree of agreement on Mary's perpetual virginity.

The limited interest of the Reformers in Mariology—evident, for example, in a perusal of the tables of contents and indexes of many a standard account of Reformation theology—is explicable partly by the limits of official ecclesiastical doctrine on Mary. At the outset of the Reformation era, formally approved Church teaching
about Mary encompassed only the virgin birth, her role as 'God-bearer' (theotokos) in the incarnation, and her perpetual virginity—and all of these were the legacy of the age of the Fathers. But since these early definitions, theological speculation had steadily mounted. If there had so far been no further dogmatic deliverances, this was partly because on one or two issues different segments of the medieval Church were at loggerheads. Nevertheless, Mary’s immaculate conception had been promulgated at a session of the Council of Basel in 1439, only to live on in a kind of dogmatic limbo when the session failed to secure papal recognition. Pope Sixtus IV in 1482-3 decreed that the immaculate conception should not be made the object of attack, but it was still not part of the Church’s defined belief. Nevertheless, in the late medieval era a strong theological tide was running in support of Mary’s immaculate conception, her collaborative role in salvation and her bodily assumption. Such developments inevitably gave Mary a prominent place in ‘the communication of grace’ in Catholic devotion. It was on this front that battle was chiefly joined. The Reformers’ teaching about Mary were to a considerable measure a critique of piety and liturgy.

Corruption of Piety

Luther affirmed one day, as recorded in his Table Talk, that ‘if the article of justification hadn’t fallen, the brotherhoods, pilgrimages, masses, invocation of the saints, etc., would have found no place in the church’. In the perversion of true religion the cult of Mary had played an inescapable role. It rightly deserved to be branded as idolatry. The Scottish Reformer John Knox playfully mocked another Mary, the Catholic English queen, who ‘suffered her self to be called the moste blessed Virgine . . . But you, Papistes, wyl excuse your Mary the Virgine; wel, let her be your virgine, and a goddes mete to maintaine such idolatres.’

In his Apology for the Augsburg Confession of 1530 Philip Melanchthon summarised the Marian domination of popular religion as follows:

In some places this form of absolution is used: ‘The passion of our Lord Jesus Christ and the merits of the most blessed virgin Mary and of all the saints be to the forgiveness of sins’ . . . Some of us have seen a certain monastic theologian . . . urge this prayer upon the dying man, ‘Mother of grace, protect us from the enemy and receive us in the hour of death.’ Granted that blessed Mary prays for the church, does she receive souls in death, does she overcome death, does she give life? What does Christ do if Mary does all this? . . . The fact of the matter is that in popular estimation the blessed Virgin has replaced Christ. People have invoked her, trusted in her mercy, and sought her to appease Christ, as though he were not a propitiator but only a terrible judge and avenger.

Melanchthon also noted seeing in one monastery a statue of Mary ‘which was manipulated like a puppet so that it seemed to nod Yes or No to the Petitioners’.

Luther came from a mining family. The patron saint of miners was Anne, Mary’s mother according to the tradition, and Luther’s upbringing had a strong Marian colouring. The Augustinian Order which he joined paid high honour to Mary. He remembered being afraid of Christ and taking refuge with Mary and saints, as though they were the mediators and Christ the judge and executioner. ‘We held Christ to be our angry judge, and Mary our mercy-seat, in whom alone was all our trust and refuge.’ He recalled an accident in his student days when he feared bleeding to death and ‘cried out “Mary, help!” I would have died . . . with my trust in Mary.’ He quoted Bernard, an otherwise pious teacher, in his estimation, to show how deep-seated was this dreadful misconception: ‘Behold how Christ chides, censures and condemns the
Pharisees so harshly throughout the Gospel, whereas the Virgin Mary is always kind and gentle and never utters an unfriendly word. Christ is given to scolding and punishing, but Mary has nothing but sweetness and love. The traditional Marian anthem, *Salve Regina* (‘Hail, Queen’), came in for frequent criticism from Reformers for addressing Mary as ‘mother of mercy, . . . our life, our sweetness and our hope’.6

The practice of ‘calling upon . . . the holy virgin to bid her Son do what [you] request’ had been ridiculed by Erasmus in his *Colloquies*. He depicts Mary as delighted that Luther has dried up the stream of prayers to her, because she was wearied with being asked, as though Christ were a babe in arms who dare not deny her anything lest she deny him milk. He alludes to a well-known artistic portrayal, to which Luther refers more than once, of the Virgin Mary as showing the Lord Christ the breasts at which he had nursed, as gathering emperors, kings, princes, and lords under her cloak, as protecting them and pleading with her dear Son to drop his wrath and penalties over them. Hence those who invoke the aid of the saints and the Virgin are wont to cry, ‘Intercede for me before your Son; show him your breasts!’7

**Mary’s Lowliness and Faith**

In face of such perversions, Luther’s critique is basically a Christocentric one which makes full use of justification by grace alone. This finds fine expression in an exposition of the Nativity accounts and the Magnificat which in its exegetical details became common currency among the Reformers. Erasmus had led the way, arguing that the Greek word *kecharitoménē* in Luke 1:28 should be translated in Latin not *gratia plena* (‘full of grace’)) but *gratiosa* (‘favoured’). According to Calvin, the verb ‘expresses the free favour of God’ as it does in Ephesians 1:6. The English Geneva Bible of 1560 makes Mary to be ‘freely beloved’ (or ‘received into favour’, mg.).8

No less important for Erasmus and the Reformers was the correct meaning of the Greek word *tapeínōsin* in the Magnificat (Luke 1:48). Mary recognises that God has been mindful not of her *humilitas* (the rendering of the Church’s official Bible, the Latin Vulgate), but of her ‘poore dege’ (or ‘lowe estate’, mg.), according to the Geneva Bible’s translation. There was nothing praise-worthy or meritorious in Mary herself. It was, in Calvin’s view, her *petitesse* not her ‘submissiveness, modesty or any state of mind, but precisely a poor and abject condition’ that God had regard to, in an act of divine favour that made her, in Luther’s eyes, ‘the greatest example of the grace of God’. God worked in her ‘dispised her insignificance, lowliness, poverty and inferiority’. Among the various meanings Luther discerned in Mary’s name was one that spoke of her littleness—an ‘drop of water’.9

Luther’s exposition of the Magnificat goes out of its way to highlight Mary’s low degree. ‘We must believe that she came of poor, despised and lowly parents.’ Even in Nazareth she was ‘a poor and plain citizen’s daughter . . . To her neighbours she was but a simple maiden, tending the cattle and doing the housework.’ Elsewhere Luther suggests that Mary may have been an orphan. She was ‘the despised stump’ of Isaiah 11:12. We need to show ‘how the exceeding riches of God joined in her with utter poverty, the divine honor with her low estate, the divine glory with her shame, the divine greatness with her smallness, the divine goodness with her lack of merit, the divine grace with her unworthiness.’ Luther accepts the words of the Church’s hymn *Regina Caeli* (‘Queen of heaven’) — *quam meruistit portare, quem you were worthy (merited) to bear*, but only in a sense that was equally true of the wooden cross. She had to be a woman, a virgin, of the tribe of Judah, and ‘had to believe the angelic message’. But ‘as the wood had no other merit
The Mother of Christ

But the Reformers have no interest in denying Mary her honour as the mother of Christ. 'To this day,' says Calvin, 'we cannot enjoy the blessing brought to us in Christ without thinking at the same time of that which God gave as adoration and honour to Mary, in willing her to be the mother of His only-begotten Son.' Men have crowded all her glory into a single word, calling her the Mother of God.' This last statement is Luther's, not Calvin's, for Luther's Christology had no hesitation in ascribing to Christ's divine nature the capacities and experiences proper to his human nature, and vice versa. Indeed, he greatly relished the paradoxes inherent in what theologians call 'the interchange of properties' (communicatio idiomatum) between the divine and the human in the one person of Christ. 'Mary suckles God with her breasts, bastes God, rocks him' in the cradle, for 'Mary is Christ's mother not only according to His humanity, but she is also the Mother of the Son of God' (citing Hebrews 6:6 and 1 Corinthians 2:8). It is noticeable that in his sermons on the early chapters of John's Gospel, Luther often speaks of Christ as 'the Son of God and of Mary', and makes few references to his conception through the Spirit, so that a suspicion is given that the divine Sonship and the overshadowing of the Spirit have been conflated in his mind. Mary's 'unique place in the whole of mankind' is that 'she had a child by the Father in heaven, and such a child'.

'Mother of God' is a frequent instinctive usage for Luther, as is evident not only from his exposition of the Magnificat in 1521, but also from writings of the last years of his life. Zwingli also endorsed it explicitly—and generally on Mary is nearer to Luther than one might expect. Calvin, however, never adopted the phrase 'mother of God', or even cited the Greek term theotokos that
lies behind it. Of course he willingly embraces and reveres the deliverances of the early councils, including the Council of Ephesus of AD 431 which declared Mary to be **theotokos** (literally, ‘God-bearer’, but commonly translated into ‘Mother of God’), and the Council of Chalcedon of AD 451, which endorsed it. Nevertheless in the **Institutes** Calvin goes no further than to acknowledge that in Scripture ‘the name “Son of God” is applied to him who is born of the virgin, and the virgin herself is called the “mother of our Lord”.’ In his Gospel commentary these words of Elizabeth in Luke 1:43 prompt the explanation that ‘he who is born a mortal man in the womb of Mary is at the same time the eternal God’, but the reserve is inescapable when he is compared with Luther. Only once, it seems, did Calvin even discuss the designation ‘Mother of God’, in a letter in French written in 1552 to the French Reformed Church in London. In response to a question that had been raised with him, he accepts that objection may have been taken to ‘mother of God’ for the wrong reasons, out of ignorance and brashness. Nevertheless, he ‘cannot think such language either right, or becoming, or suitable’. It would be like speaking of the blood or death of God, or the head of God, and ‘the Scriptures accustom us to a different style’. Furthermore, the use of the phrase can only serve to harden people in their superstitious regard for Mary.14

The magisterial Reformers developed their Christology in part over against the espousal by various of the Radical Protestants of the notion of the celestial flesh of Christ. This belief took different forms in some of the most notorious (Michael Servetus), most attractive (Caspur Schwenckfeld) and most influential (Melchior Hofmann and Menno Simons) of the Radicals. Its commonest configuration, transmitted to all Dutch and North German Anabaptism from Hofmann via Menno and Dieterich Philips, asserted that Christ brought his own body or flesh with him from heaven which acquired merely visibility or corporality in Mary.15 Calvin refutes this error, that made Mary no more than a channel through which Christ flowed, but again it was Luther whose instinctive way of speaking ruled it out of court most forcefully, even when he did not have such teaching specifically in view. He insists on calling Christ ‘a true and natural son of the Virgin Mary . . . the real and natural fruit of Mary’s virginal womb’. Although the co-operation of a male was lacking, Mary contributed everything else that a mother imparts to a child—her seed and natural flesh and blood. The infrequency of Luther’s references to conception by the Spirit seems all of a piece with this insistence that Christ ‘became a natural man like any other man of flesh and blood’. At the same time Luther could believe that part of Mary’s blessedness above all other women (Luke 1:42) lay in her giving birth without the customary pains and trauma of labour.16

**Perpetual Virginity**

But such assertions belong more to Christology than to Mariology, for they do not prevent Luther upholding not only the virginal conception in the strict sense (i.e. what the New Testament clearly portrays) but also the virgin birth properly so called, that is to say, Mary’s giving birth with her virginity still intact. Marian theology had long distinguished between her virginity ‘before the birth’ (ante partum—consistent with virginal conception), ‘in the birth’ (in partu—virgin birth in a precise sense) and ‘after the birth’ (post partum). The last of these, implying that Mary subsequently had no marital intercourse with Joseph, was necessary for the long-established universal belief in Mary’s perpetual virginity, which was endorsed by all the Reformers virtually without qualification.

The marginal comments of the Geneva Bible of 1560 consistently maintain this viewpoint. When Matthew 1:25 and Luke 2:7 speak of Jesus as, respectively, her ‘first borne sonne’ or ‘first begotten sonne’, they speak thus
because she had never none before, and not in respect of any she had after. Neither yet doeth this worde (til) import always a time following: wherein the contrarie may be affirmed, as our Saviour, saying, that he wil be present with his disciples, til the end of the worlde, meaneth not, that after this worlde he wil not be with them.

The brethren of Jesus are on many occasions provided with an alternative position in life as his cousins or kinsfolk or kinsmen, and 'before they came together' (Matt. 1:18) means 'Before he toke her home and remained.'

The Geneva Bible is thus faithful to Calvin, who argues that Matthew 1:25 ('knew her not till she had') tells us nothing about what happened after Mary brought forth her first-born. Nevertheless, he refuses to allow Luke 1:34 ('How shall this be since I am a virgin?') to be read of a vow of perpetual virginity already undertaken by Mary, although he seems sympathetic to the interpretation that Mary now 'looks to the future, and so signifies that she will have no intercourse with a man'. 'The likely and simple conjecture' is that she was bowled over in wonder. 'When she hears that the Son of God will be born, she appreciates that it is no common thing and that this is a reason to exclude man's intercourse. 'Coming together' in Matthew 1:18 is 'either a modest expression for intercourse, or simply means living in one place, making one's home and family as husband and wife.'

Zwingli had earlier been more explicit. It was not enough that the conception of Jesus take place without a male role, for if a woman who had previously known a man had conceived him, even through the Holy Spirit, 'who would ever have believed that the child that was born was of the Holy Spirit? For nature knows no birth that is not besmirched with stain?' For the same reason she had to be ever a virgin, she who bore the one in whom there could not be even the least suspicion of blemish. For the birth of Jesus to be absolutely pure of every stain, Mary herself had to be free of any pollution of normal child-bearing—which hints strongly at the logic that leads to her own immaculate conception.

At this point Zwingli has to counter the claim that Mary's perpetual virginity can be believed only by heeding the teaching authority (magisterium) of the Church. He refuses to yield on 'Scripture alone', but he goes out of his way to emphasise the ministry of the Spirit in bringing out the force of the biblical texts, which otherwise may appear rather opaque. He appeals first to Isaiah 7:14. There is nothing remarkable in a woman who had once been a virgin conceiving a child—it happens to every woman. 'But the uncommon thing is that she who conceives and bears should remain a virgin.' That this is the correct interpretation is confirmed by Ezekiel 44:2 'This gate is to remain shut. It must not be opened: no-one may enter through it. It is to remain shut because the Lord, the God of Israel, has entered through it'). If you quibble about the context of the verse, Zwingli directs you to 1 Corinthians 10:6—'all these things happened to them by way of example'. So Zwingli believes he has shown that Mary's permanent virginity rests on biblical fact, not human decree.

In one of his writings on the Lord's Supper, Zwingli had to deal with an argument for the ubiquity of Christ's body which appealed to the belief that Christ was 'born of the Virgin Mary without violation of her maidenly purity', just as he passed through closed doors and made himself invisible to escape the hands of his enemies. Zwingli believed that only Christ's divine nature was ubiquitous. Christ was indeed 'born without any violation of the virginity of his mother', but Christ's body cannot be in the bread on every communion table 'in the same way as it was born of the Virgin Mary and passed through closed doors' without his passion causing him no suffering or his body being an incorporeal one, as the early heretic Marcion had maintained.
The English Reformers probably to a man shared this conviction of Mary's perpetual virginity. Hugh Latimer used the exegetical and linguistic arguments already noted to evade the natural sense of Matthew 1:25 and Luke 2:7. Miles Coverdale claimed that Robert Barnes held this belief, and himself regarded it as unworthy of Mary to rest her 'most pure virginity' on the authority of the Church alone. 'Will not the prophecies of Christ's birth, the performance of the same, and the practices of the Holy Ghost in Christ's blessed mother, allow this doctrine?' Thomas Cranmer, like Zwingli, had to rebut the charge that certain verities have to be believed on the authority of tradition or Church alone, as several Fathers had done with Mary's perpetual virginity. Not so, said Cranmer. They all proved it by Ezekiel chapter 44. Had they not judged it to be in Scripture, they would never have made it binding.22

This teaching also found its way into the Lutheran Formula of Concord, where the principle of the 'interchange of properties' in Christ shows its force. The Son of God 'demonstrated his divine majesty even in his mother's womb in that he was born of a virgin without violating her virginity. Therefore she is truly the mother of God and yet remained a virgin'.23 It is appropriate to find this in a Lutheran confessional statement, for it was Luther among the Reformers who wrote most fully and unambiguously and most interestingly about it. One of his Table Talk responses acknowledged that the Church had not decided whether Mary subsequently had intercourse with Joseph, but Luther went on to demonstrate that he was in no doubt about it. 'What happened afterward shows quite strongly that Mary remained a virgin. For after she had perceived that she was the mother of the Son of God, she didn't think she should become the mother of a human child and adhered to this vow.'24 Calvin's reasoning was closely similar, as we have seen.

Elsewhere, however, Luther goes further, but in a manner that betrays the status of his belief in Mary's perpetual virginity as a received assumption rather than a securely biblical deduction. How could Christ have brothers, he argues, since he was the only son of Mary, and the Virgin Mary bore no children besides him? Different explanations of these 'brothers' of Jesus have been given; Luther's preference is for regarding them as cousins, but it matters little which account you accept. 'So God the Father does not have a son apart from Mary's, nor does Mary have a son apart from God the Father's... Both, Mary and God, had one Son... Mary is to have no other Son than the one whom God, the heavenly Father, has. Nor is God, the heavenly Father, to have a different Son from the one Christ's mother has.'25 In their context, these comments are directed against the teaching, known as Nestorianism, that exaggerated the distinction between Christ's human and divine natures, even separating them as 'the son of Mary' and 'the Son of God', but they imply something more than that Christ was one Son, not two. For Luther, Mary's having one child appears to follow inseparably from Christ's being the Father's only Son. If this seems a hazardous argument, it may do no more than provide a theological undergirding for what others might wish to hold on lesser grounds—of propriety, for example. Should we be able to contemplate with equanimity Mary's having other, natural, children after Jesus? This is an issue that merits careful reflection. There is no doubt that the consensus of the Reformers affirmed Mary's virginity not only 'before the birth' (which was not in question) but also 'in the birth' (in partu) and after it (post partum). Calvin is something of an exception, in that his more careful biblicism could insist on only Mary's refraining from intercourse before the birth of Jesus (i.e. her virginity ante partum). On the other hand, he never excluded as untenable the other elements in her perpetual virginity, and may be said to have believed it himself without claiming that Scripture taught it.
A Sinner or Sinless?

This brings us to the question of Mary’s preservation from other aspects of human existence in a fallen world. Was she a sinner? The Reformers speak with less clarity and unanimity on this point. One of the fullest discussions comes from Hugh Latimer, the English Reformer and martyr. In some of his sermons he seems to convict Mary of vain-glory or ambition and of folly, and of the fault and sin of negligence in losing Jesus in Jerusalem. He cites Augustine and Chrysostom in support of her being arrogant, and comments: ‘We gave her too much, thinking her to be without any spark of sin.’ But then Latimer is found defending himself against the charge, advanced by Edward Powell, prebendary of Salisbury, of teaching that ‘Our lady was a sinner’. Here he endorses the ‘universal’ and ‘constant’ tradition of the Church’s teaching that she was no sinner, with only this qualification: ‘though she never sinned, yet she was not so impeccable, but she might have sinned, if she had not been preserved.’ He makes his chief concern crystal-clear, that Mary should not be seen as ‘a Saviouress’. ‘It has been said, without sin, that Mary was a sinner. It has never been said, without sin, that Mary was a Saviour.’

At this point Latimer strikes a note sounded by all the Reformers, who frequently cite the Gospel pericope where Jesus names as his mother and brothers those who do his Father’s will (Matt. 12:46-50). John Jewel cites Augustine: ‘The nearness of mother’s blood should have profited Christ’s mother nothing at all, unless she had more blessedly carried Christ in her heart than in her body.’ Thomas Becon reminds us that in the Magnificat, Mary called God her Saviour, ‘considering certain imperfections to remain and abide in her, which she received of old Adam from her father and mother.’

Calvin insists that Mary ‘cherished the Son of God as much in her heart through faith as in her womb by conception . . . Mary’s happiness in bearing Christ in her womb is not the first thing—that honour actually is second in degree to [her] rebirth into newness of life by the Spirit of Christ.’ She was pronounced blessed in believing. ‘It is quite absurd to teach that we are to seek from her anything which she receives otherwise than we do ourselves.’ Calvin commonly speaks of Mary as ‘the holy Virgin’ (and rarely simply as ‘Mary’ preferring ‘the Virgin’ etc), and also reasons that ‘no great effort is required from us to clear her from all fault’ when her response to Gabriel ‘How will this be?’ (Luke 1:34), appears to put a false limit on God’s power. But even if Calvin rarely depicts Mary expressly as a sinner, he objected to her specific exclusion from the reach of original sin by the Council of Trent. He also argued that the Purification of Mary and Joseph in the temple (Luke 2:22-4) was necessitated by the universality of original sin—although even here his language is general rather than particular in its reference. Zwingli likewise often called Mary ‘pure, holy, spotless’, without offering an unambiguous commitment to either her immaculate conception or her sinlessness.

Luther, on the other hand, can be found saying both things. In his Magnificat exposition he argues that ‘Though [Mary] was without sin, yet that grace was far too great for her] to deserve it in any way.’ On other occasions he clearly accepted that Christ would have inherited the entail of sin from Mary were it not for the operation of the Holy Spirit. This much was involved in confessing that Christ assumed genuine flesh and blood from Mary. ‘Though Mary has been conceived in sin, yet the Holy Spirit takes her flesh and blood and purifies them . . . Thus [Christ] assumed a genuine body from His mother Mary, but this body was cleansed from sin by the Holy Spirit.’ Luther also discussed the scholastic speculation whether God had preserved from the beginning of the world some
pure drop of blood from which Christ should be born'. He rejects it emphatically, making much of the immorality attested in the Bible in Christ's ancestors according to the flesh.

Thus Christ must become a sinner in His flesh, as shameful as He ever can become. The flesh of Christ comes of an incestuous intercourse, likewise also the flesh of the virgin, His mother, . . . in order to signify the unspeakable plan of God's mercy in that He assumed the flesh and human nature from flesh that was contaminated and horribly polluted . . . But in the moment of the virginal conception, the Holy Spirit cleansed and sanctified the sinful substance and wiped away the poison of the devil and death, that is, sin.

But Luther's admirable ability to transpose doubtful elements of the tradition is evident when he portrays the angel as saying to Mary, '[God] will find the best and purest drops of blood in your heart; these He will set aside, purify, and cause not to be corrupted by sin.'

Long before the sixteenth century, discussion of Mary's deliverance from original sin in her own conception had invoked distinctions of various kinds, especially between different forms or stages of conception. Luther's writings often reflect these scholastic debates. He seems to have believed that the Church had left Mary's immaculate conception an open question, and to have found it congenial himself, although his teaching on the issue remains disputed—particularly whether he later abandoned what he earlier espoused. Beyond doubt Luther instinctively affirmed a special purification or sanctification of Mary, of a piece with her unique virginity in fitting her to be mother of the sinless Son of God. Here again we find Luther holding more closely to the late medieval world of thought than Calvin.

Christ, not Mary

What is discernible in the Reformers is a central concern that the honour paid to Mary should hinge solely on her role in the incarnation, and that her honour should never threaten that of the incarnate Lord himself. Luther once gave this advice:

When preaching [on the Annunciation] one should stick to the story, so that we may celebrate the incarnation of Christ, rejoice that we were made his brethren, and be glad that he who fills heaven and earth is in the womb of the maiden . . . Bernard filled a whole sermon with praise of the Virgin Mary and in so doing forgot to mention what happened; so highly did he and Anselm esteem Mary . . . Mary can't be sufficiently praised as a creature, but the Creator himself comes to us and becomes our ransom—this is the reason for our rejoicing.

In his Sermons on John (whose Gospel, he observes, says little about Mary), he asserts that, 'The greater the men of God and the larger the measure of the Spirit in them, the greater the diligence and attention they devote to the Son rather than to the mother. The outstanding men have always insisted that we fashion our gaze on the fruit.' The Magnificat is for Luther the conclusive justification for this attitude. Mary 'does not say people will speak all manner of good of her, praise her virtues, exalt her virginity or her humility or sing of what she has done . . . For in proportion as we ascribe merit and worthiness to her, we lower the grace of God and diminish the truth of the Magnificat.' To honour Mary properly, you must 'set her in the presence of God and far beneath Him, and must there strip her of all honor . . . 'It is better to take away too much from her than from the grace of God. Indeed, we cannot take away too much from her.' In a sermon on Christmas Eve Luther agreed that 'Mary . . . can never be lauded and
extolled enough... (But) the praise of the mother should be as a drop, but the praise of this Infant should be as the entire expanse of the wide sea.\textsuperscript{32}

It is Calvin's complaint against 'the papists' that their praises of Mary have obscured her greatest honour of all, and have robbed the Son of God of his own in order to dress her up in the sinful spoils of the robbery. 'The praises of Mary, where the might and sheer goodness of God are not entirely set forth, are perverse and counterfeit.' So Calvin betrays some concern at the parallelism of the salutation of Elizabeth, 'Blessed are you among women, and blessed is the child you will bear!' (Luke 1:42). The connecting particle must be taken in a causal sense, for the blessedness of Mary is due to that of Christ.\textsuperscript{33}

It is surprising to find that Luther's exposition of the Magnificat begins and ends with a prayer for help to Mary: 'May the tender Mother of God procure for me the spirit of wisdom...'. 'May Christ grant [a right understanding] through the intercession and for the sake of his dear Mother Mary!' This was a work of the year 1521, and Luther's mind certainly hardened somewhat with the years; indeed as early as 1523 he expressed the wish that the cult of Mary would be completely abrogated, solely because of abuse.\textsuperscript{34} Nevertheless, he seems never to have put completely behind him his earlier fondness for invoking Mary, although he strenuously denied that she was our advocate or mediatrix or reconciler. The Augsburg Confession accepted that saints are to be remembered for the strengthening of our faith, but said that it 'cannot be proved from the Scriptures that we are to invoke saints or seek help from them'. All invocations to Mary were removed from the Book of Common Prayer in England. If in Geneva all the festivals of Mary in the calendar were suppressed, so too were those of the apostles. In Zwingli's Zurich, on the other hand, even the feast of the Assumption of Mary was apparently specifically retained—and Zwingli's successor, Bullinger, once con

fessed that Mary's 'sacrosanct body was borne by angels into heaven', although he declined to take a firm stand on either her bodily assumption or her immaculate conception.\textsuperscript{35} Luther's new Church Order of 1523 retained the Annunciation, Visitation and Purification, but as festivals of Christ. It also kept for the present, because their abolition would be too upsetting, the Assumption and the Nativity of Mary.

The question of the continued use of the Ave Maria ('Hail Mary') engaged the attention of the Reformers. It was one of the allegations Latimer responded to that he had urged its abandonment. He allowed its use, although we had 'no plain bidding of God' in its favour, but as a salutation or greeting to Mary (which is what it was originally), not as a prayer. He draws the sharpest difference between it and the Lord's Prayer, with which it had become so closely bound in medieval piety that no Pater noster could be said without a preceding Ave Maria. Zwingli defended its use, but as praise, not prayer. It was, said Calvin, no more than a word of congratulation. It was a tragedy, commented Luther, that in praying for grace, Christendom had substituted Christ's mother for Christ. 'Ave Maria, plena gratia' had remained popular and current, but the words of John 1:16 (the Son who came from the Father, full of grace and truth) had lapsed into oblivion.\textsuperscript{36}

As in the medieval West, so in the pioneers of Protestantism there are divergent strains of teaching about Mary. On the one hand, she is an example to all of us and not an exception. To Luther she embodies above all a model of the faith that acknowledges its nothingness before the grace of God, to Calvin more a model of submission and docility, which make her a fine teacher for Christian believers. In her faith she is comparable to Abraham, the father of believers. In commenting on the Magnificat Calvin insists that we make generally applicable what the tradition had bracketed off in its exaggerated reverence for Mary. In so far as Mary directs us away from herself to Christ,
she may even be called 'treasurer of grace'. Calvin will not minimise the significance, in what today might be spoken of as 'salvation-history', of Mary's own believing response to God's promise. 'She kept the teaching which today opens to us the kingdom of heaven and which leads us to our Lord Jesus Christ; she kept this as a deposit and through her we received this and today we are edified therefrom.' She may even be said, by receiving God's Word into her heart, to have conceived and brought forth salvation for herself and the whole world.\footnote{1}

But on the other hand, in the works of the Reformers the central focus on Mary's blessedness in being the mother of the Lord did not succeed in throwing off entirely the accumulated deposit of speculative tradition, in respect of both what preceded the incarnation and what followed it. Calvin has cut free from it most radically, with only a subdued recognition of perpetual virginity. Luther is still toy-ing with Mary's prevenient sinlessness. Most remarkable to modern Protestants is the Reformers' almost universal acceptance of Mary's continuing virginity, and their widespread reluctance openly to declare Mary a sinner needing a Saviour. Is it a favourable providence that so little of this extra-biblical reflection was transmitted to the Protestant Churches? The Reformers' Christocentrism seems to have won out, despite some of its limitations in their own minds and hearts.

Notes
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where the Lord of the history of all peoples is working to create a single community of brotherhood and sisterhood. Steps of progress on this way are therefore our greatest joy because we are convinced that these Christian goals are not only the meaning of our own earthly existence but also the meaning of history.

NOTES
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The Edinburgh Manuscript Pages of Servetus' Christianismi Restitutio

David F. Wright

Few episodes of the Reformation have been as frequently told—and mistraded—as the fateful condemnation and burning of Michael Servetus in Geneva in 1553. During his trial the prosecution extracted from him the admission that he was the author of the Christianismi Restitutio, which had been published all but anonymously at the outset of the year. After considerable difficulty Servetus had found a printer in the small town of Vienne, near Lyons in southern France, where Balthazar Arnoullet and his brother-in-law Guillaume Guérot allowed their presses to produce around eight hundred or a thousand copies.

By the time of Servetus' arrest in Geneva on Sunday, August 13, most of the printing had been consigned to the flames that awaited the works of heretics and blasphemers. At Lyons, at Frankfurt, and perhaps also at Geneva major consignments were destroyed. Although the comprehensiveness and rapidity of its incineration may sometimes have been exaggerated, the Restitutio soon became a very rare book. By the close of the sixteenth century very few, if any, copies may have survived beyond the three that are today to be found in Paris, Vienna, and Edinburgh. It is, however, becoming increasingly clear that manuscript copies compensated in part for the almost total elimination of the printed book. Most recently a copy made late in the sixteenth or early in the seventeenth century has come to light in Milan.1

The publication of the Restitutio and its early history have attracted close attention, not only from bibliographers and students of Reformation radicalism but also from historians of medicine, for it contains the first printed sketch of the pulmo-
The singular interest of the copy now preserved in the Library of the University of Edinburgh (shelf mark Df.8.90) lies in its having lost, perhaps not many months after publication in January 1553, the first sixteen pages of the printed text, and their replacement, probably not many moons later, by eighteen manuscript pages. The printed volume lacks the title page, the Index of contents on the next page, and the two-page Proemium and first twelve pages of text of the first work of this compilation, De Trinitate Divina... Libri Septem. These pages are numbered continuously, 1-16. The manuscript pages, numbered 2 (recto) to 10 (verso), cover only pages 3 through 16 of the printed book. The text of De Trinitate Divina continues without a break from the end of the manuscript at the foot of f.10v, on the left side of the opening to the beginning of the print on the first line of page 17 on the right. Such a perfect match required the scribe to squeeze forty lines onto f.10v (and at the last line to stray minimally into the margin). His earlier pages contain between 29 and 37 lines, averaging 33.5.

It has long been recognized that the manuscript text diverges to some extent from its printed counterpart, and at least since David Guthbertson's A Tragedy of the Reformation was published in 1912 an explanation of the divergence has been ready to hand. The manuscript pages derive from Servetus' original draft of the work which he sent to Calvin probably in the year 1546. We must return to this hypothesis. In the meantime, it is the main purpose of this study simply to give the text of the manuscript section in full, as a basis for further investigation of questions long considered but never pursued to a satisfactory resolution. Although this occasion will not allow an extended discussion of these questions, the presentation of the text will be followed by some preliminary orientation, as well as by reference to its special appropriateness in a volume honoring a distinguished American interpreter of John Calvin.

This study does not set out to supply a critical edition of the manuscript's contents. That task, along with translation into English, still awaits the Restitutio as a whole. That will be the place to identify in full biblical quotations and allusions, provide cross-references to other works of Servetus, and pinpoint his patristic and other sources.

In transcribing the text, I have not reproduced its abbreviations and contractions, except in references to books of the Bible. They are in fact sparingly used in the manuscript, in turn probably because of the page reduction. Similarly, I have not annotated the sigla which serve to identify the different manuscripts. In the Appendix, following the textual analysis, I have reproduced and commented on the siglas of all the manuscripts, so that the reader can follow the development of the text from manuscript to manuscript. The sigla allow ready reference to the different readings of the manuscript.

The sigla "E" refers to the readings of the manuscript at Paris and Vienna; "P" and "V," respectively, to the complete copies at Paris and Vienna.
Part Three: The Sixteenth Century

David F. Wright, *Edinburgh Manuscript Pages*

10 reveal, J. Modus verus aperte referens quibus se nobis a] [h] Deum externe visibilium verbo, et interne percepsit Deum ipsum homines spectat, et possidet. Deum anea non visum, nos nunc revelata facie videbimus et perspicue in nobis ipsa intuemur, si ostium spectamus, et videmus imaginem. Aperi aptum ostium ostium hoc, ut viam hanc lucis sine quia nihil potest videi, sine quo rei potest


30 Haec de te cælestia omnia perintendent, et Deum verum ex veris omnibus proponente, ut eum cognoscas semper adhuc, ei eum gloriam in utriusque se in Dei secretat. Tu nos facilis, sine mur.

40 et Secundus modum declarabit, practica, de visione Dei, et locos absurdissimorum invisibilium cum propone, ut ponet. Haec primus liber Jgessimus non Deus externe

50 Age igitur pie, lector, revelata cogi nostre si ostium qua inveni, et eum causa verumque referemus quibus Deum. O Christe lesu et deseras Christi esseque animarum, et vere


70 De homine lesu Christo, et simul-chris falsis.

Liber Primus.

Libro primam narratorium filii Dei, iustiarum praelectionis Apostolorum, a nobis collecho, ab iis caro et quibus sunt manifesta, et omnia publice praedicta, ut haec nota

46-48 ne me deseris et robur om. PV et suppl. fili Dei, qui de caelo nobis datum, deis temporibus et in tempore visibili manifesta, teipsum obierto tuo, ut manifestissima tanta verum pateter. Spiritum tuum

56 et verborum efficaciam; 50 et, et, ac PV; 51 post tua est add. PV et tuum a patre, et spiritus tuus; 51 tuam om. PV; 51 et tuorum salutem om. PV; 52 mihi... vigilant om. PV; 52 divino quodam impulsu PV; 53 mihi obtulit; PV; 53 de his... doctus E; essem de tua veritate solicius PV; 54 tunc E, aliquando PV; 54-66 et (quae... non licet om. PV; 67-66 differre... ostendum E; et nunc iterum tractare cogor, quia complerent esse tempus, ut ex rei ipsae certitudine, et ex signis temporum manifestis, sum nunc et omnibus ostensuro PV; 69 veritas E; communi Christianis omnis PV; 70 post benevolent add. PV usque ad finem; 71 auditis PV; 71-72 simplici... sermone PV; 76-77 apostolorum praedicationis PV; 78 sint PV.
via facile principum habeat. Ab ipso homo leus Christo prince-

80

pinculum sumum, tum qua de ipso nunc ageret, tum ut sophistis

principis, qui ad / verbi speculacionem, sine hoc fundamento

ascendentes, in alium filium traducuntur, et verum filium Dei

obtinent tradunt. Quibus ego ad memoriam quis sit ille verus

ilium reducere conabor, promovine ad sensum demonstrant, ipsum

hominem verborum caenum et flegaturum concedam hac /a

simpliciter vera esse. Primo, hic est leus Christus. Secundo,


via, in qua sola est illuminatio cognitionis glorie Dei, quae

reloquitur in facie leus Christi.

Principio hunc dici leum, quanto propter postulatum ex seipso

aperte patet. Nam illud est puer in concrecum die nomen

impositum scit ilbi loanes, et illi Petrus Luc. 1. et 2. leus

ut veriles docentis, est nominem proprii viri, et cognomen Chri-

stus. Ludei eum esse leum omnis concedebant, sed Christum esse

necabant, interrogantes de leus qui dixit: Deus est et aetetis a

syringa faciendo illos, qui laterem illum esse Christum.

Super quae re frequens est Apostolorum contra ipso disputato.

An leus ille esset messias. Sed de leus nulla fuit unquam

dubitatio, nec quaestio, nec aliquid unquam hoc negavat. Per-

pundo quo tandem ille se iro, et quo animo Paulus testificatber

ludaeus leus illum esse messiam Act. 9. 17. 18. Quo spiritus

fenero Apollos ille Alexandrius ludaeor revicavit, probans

hunc leum esse Chrestum. De homo ipso haec diocabere sine

sophistiae alioque. Non sophistis, sed ludaeos ille cogita, pis-

catores cogita, et mulieres simplicita pura credentes hunc

leum esse Chrestum. Caeci item cum quorumdam relatione leum

Nazaarium transito audissent, mou clamantibus, leus dii pett

missores nostri. Qualem tu ibi existens transuestem leum Nazi-

arenum mente conceperes? Concedentes igitur hominem esse leum,

concede deinde cogimur esse Christum, cum concedamus eum

esse a Deo unctum. Nam ipse est purus sanctus tucum quem

unxit.
de Christo creditit. Praeiturae de quo homo intelligi illud Apostoli. Sicut uesti delicio et rel. Ita per gratiam unus
hominis leu Christi: sicut per hominem mortis ita, ita et per
hominem resurrectionem mortuum. Aut utroque homo dictur
absoluto aut utroque connotativo, aliquui comparatio esset
nulla. Primus / Adam, et secundus ibi dictur, ut nihil hoc
sophistae preti connotativo sumere. Deum loquit, 20. Signa
fect, ut ordinamus quod leu Christi filius Dei. Expedition
est de leu. Sed ut creatus quod leu est a Deo
genitus, et mortuos pro salute nostra, Nataela ex eo quod
dict. Vidi te sub luci, infert, ipsum esse filium Dei.
Similal imitationem ali facit Matth. 14. 4. Deo quod fugavit
venturum.

Illosiones istae aperte probabi, quod secundo dicti hunc
ipsum quen Christum appello esse filium Dei. Nam ex signing
quae factitiv infra eum ipsum esse filium Dei. Probatio quod
ipse est leu Christus, est hoc quoque probatum, cum scriptura
sempem clamat ipsum esse filium Dei. Simul Christum
fuisse dicitur, et ipsum esse filium Dei et eiusmod Christi
pater, quae ab eo est substantiae titular, sicut a patre tuo.
Non est ex ipso leu Christus, sed de
sanctum sanctum genuen
est, de substantia Dei genitus
corpus hoc est, et naturalis genitus ex Deo, sine aliquo
substantias quern generaciones modum in sequentibus aperte
docebimus. Id nunc obiter dicens, quod verbum Dei
im vibrarit virginem, et futur nos naturales genituras
instructa nibil terram garninare facientes. Psal. 71. Esai. 45 et
In Luca alia angelus ipsi Mariae. Spiritus sanctus supernerven
in te, et virtus amisendi obumbrabili tibi, under sequitur.
Quapropter et quod nascetur sancum vocabur filius Dei,
Eodem rationem tradit Matheo, dicens eam factam gravitatem
de spiritu sancto, et quod in ea genitum est, de spirito sancto esse.
Quod in ea genitum est filius. Aperte loquitur non socratico,
Ex Maria genitus est leu, ex substantia Mariae filius. Si

345 Pronomina E, Cogita tu, per pronomina PV; 345-348 demonstrant... iustus erat E, demonstrati. Cogita deinceps, contumens non tuisse sophistam, nec tuisse per communicacionem idiomatum locutum, nec connotativa hominis voce usum. Verum hominum ostendens dixit PV; 348 erat Dei PV; 356 Obstilam lam sophista E, At dices tu PV, nec caput novum incip.; 363-364 per ipsum nobis facta E, ipsius PV; 366 ut postea videatur om. PV; 367 sed finitim filii Dei E, Fiunt illi Dei, non nascuntur illi Dei PV; 373 suorum filiorn PV; 378 operati om. PV; 378 propri merebitur PV.
3. Es magis quia non solum ssem genuit, sed et deelatis substantiis, locu, et plenitudine eum decoratur, ut in hoc assimilator patri filiis. Item illa ratione proprioquam quam homines dicunt.


400 Id iam improbat scriptura tota, improbat ipsum: / Christus, qui alienum hominum comparatione se filium ostendit Ioannis 10. Si alii inquit homines scriptura vocat Deos, et illi Dei dixit me blasphemeram quia dixi filius Dei sum, patem ultra alos consorles, et participes mos, me sanctificavit.

405 Ecce illum qui sanctificatus est, esse filium Dei. Hic est idque sanctus Ilia Dei. Hic est ille de quo dicit Apostoli: Sanctum filium tuum Iesum. Quis sanctus, nisi masculus aperiens corporis et verus, et corporalis filius Dei?

410 Tertio istam dixi esse veram. Christus est Deus. Dictur propositio vere Deus, substantialis Deus, cum in eo sit delata corporis. Sed qua haec sunt in sequentibus aperientem aperiens sufficit nunc si dixit Deus forma Dei, species Dei habens potentiam, et virtutem Dei, dictur Deus per virtutem sicut homo per carnem: Data losi a patre ipsa deitas potestia dicitur esse Deus fortis Esai. 9. Puer natur est nobis, vocabular Deus fortis. Ecce Dei nominem et potentiam nato puerum tribuit, cui data est omnis potestas in caelo, et in terra. Ipsa dictur Deus Israele Esai. 45. Thomas Ioan. 20. eum appelatis,

Dominus meus, Deus meus, Paulo ad Romani 9. 5. 15.
of capitalization. Whereas the 1553 text abounds with contractions and abbreviations, Murr reproduced every word in full, in the process perpetrating several of his mistakes.


Murr's list of Errata (p. 734) is his own, not that of the 1553 edition, but he records only the first one of those I have listed above. In the whole book he noticed only about twice the number extracted here from the first sixteen pages.

**Servetus as Jonah, America as Nineveh**

Alexander Gordon was the first to notice that in the manuscript, but not the printed, version of the Prooemium (f. 3r; cf. p. 4) a sentence occurs which shows, as Roland Bainton later put it, that "Servetus for the first time in history thought of America as a place of refuge for the religious exile." In an intriguing autobiographical comment, Servetus admits to having long put off the task he now undertakes (i.e., the writing of the Restitutio), partly "because of the threat of persecution, which made me wish instead to flee, like Jonah, to the sea or to some new island (in insulam aliquam novam)" (lines 64-66). Gordon's translation is bolder: "to one of the New Isles."

In 1535 and again in 1541 Servetus had brought out editions of Ptolemy's Geographia, using as his starting point the newly annotated Latin translation of Wilhelm Pirckheimer, the Nuremberg humanist, published at Strassburg in 1528. In one of his additions to Pirckheimer's commentary, Servetus insists that the territory discovered by Christopher Columbus must not be called "America," for "Americus" (i.e., the Italian navigator, Amerigo Vespucci) reached it much later than (multo post) Columbus—and in the service of Portugal, not Spain!...
Alas for the Spanish Servetus; he was a born loser. He had no more success in influencing the naming of the new continent than in defying the fundamental creedal traditions of European Christendom. He might have stood a better chance of preventing “America” from catching on if he had offered an attractive alternative. With an uncharacteristic lack of imagination, he could do no better, in his edition of Proleny, than “new land” (terra nova) or “new islands” (insulae novae).

As Gordon also pointed out (though without providing the references), Servetus mentions “the new islands” twice in the printed Restitutio. In the second book of one of its constituent treatises, De Fide et Jusstitia Regni Christi, he opposes the belief that righteousness and salvation are to be found only where the biblical promises are heard. Appealing to Rom. 2:14-15 and a series of Old Testament precedents, he also cites “the new islands”:

Whatever kind of faith in God is to be found in the new islands (in insulis novis), it can be sufficient, provided a person acts correctly in accordance with conscience.

He argues to similar effect in the tenth of his Epistolae Triginta to Calvin:

In the new islands (in insulis novis), the ground of faith and righteousness is found solely in the testimony of conscience.

In both these passages the case of Nineveh is advanced as a biblical support for Servetus’ argument.

The Ninevites’ fasting was their righteousness, even though they had no promises there. . . . The Ninevites believed that God could avert the ruin of their city. . . . The Ninevites in believing the God of the prophet Jonah were justified, despite knowing neither the promises made by God nor the Law.

Those who shared the ship with Jonah and those who lived in Nineveh believed God, even though he promises nothing but threatened them with death. Christ bears witness that they were justified on account of their entrusting themselves to God with unwavering confidence, in the conviction that he could avert their death.

Angel Alcala suggests a connection between Servetus’ temptation to flee to “some new island” and his idealization of this new world, like some idyllic Nineveh—“un locus ideal de primitivismo regido por la conciencia y la razón natural.”

Bainton’s comment that “Jonah did not desert Nineveh, and under the assumed name of Villanovanus or Villeneuve went to France” confuses the picture, or rather reflects Servetus’ versatile use of the biblical story. The enticing allure of “the new islands” to Bainton’s “hunted heretic” was that of a place where his message, like Jonah’s at Nineveh, would be indiscriminately embraced by a conscience taught by nature, free of the overlay of the prejudiced and persecuting tradition of post-Constantinian Europe.

It is not known, adds Alcala, whether Servetus’ “intención migratoria” manifested itself in any external action. He did not yield to the temptation to take to flight, nor will I yield to quite a different temptation. It is not for a citizen of the United Kingdom to indulge in speculative reconstructions of America’s religious history had Servetus actually done a Jonah and taken ship for “the new islands.” But one is surely safe in believing that Ed Dowey is not sorry that Servetus remained on my side of the Atlantic, even though the author of The Knowledge of God in Calvin’s Theology may not be quite so hostile to Servetus’ epistemological notions about Nineveh as some other modern interpreters of Calvin are.

There is another, hitherto unnoticed, reference in Servetus to “the new islands” whose significance goes beyond this constellation of ideas. It occurs in a letter to Calvin first published by the editors of the Corpus Reformatorum in the Prolegomena to their dossier on the Servetus affair. Probably in 1546, Servetus addressed three questions to Calvin. The letter before us (unnamed by Calvin, it seems) was Servetus rejoinder to Calvin’s second reply (i.e., his response to Servetus’ rebuttal of his initial reply), in which Calvin had briefly answered seven additional questions which Servetus had attached to his rebuttal. The second of these was whether anyone can be justified without the divine promise. Calvin grants (concedo) that this is impossible, but he immediately guards his flank against any inference therefrom debarring infants from baptism.

Servetus’ letter ridicules Calvin’s insistence that no one can believe in God except in response to his promise.

I could adduce innumerable witnesses and examples to explode this statement of yours—of people who were justified both before the age of the law and during the age of the law and the age of grace, even in Nineveh and in the new islands (etiam in Ninise et in insulis novis). The added importance of this passage lies in the realm of chronology. It provides an invaluable connection between a letter that can be dated with some confidence to 1546 (or
possibly 1547), and the text of the Edinburgh manuscript, with its mention of fleeing like Jonah to "some new island." This link affords a timely transition to the last section of this study, which will consider in a preliminary fashion the broader questions raised by the Edinburgh manuscript pages.

Manuscript and Printed Book

Ever since it came to light, the manuscript section of the Edinburgh _Restitutio_ has attracted scholarly speculation. David Cuthbertson, a librarian in the University Library, claimed that the book was Calvin's own copy and that the manuscript pages derived from the "original draft" of the work sent to Calvin by Servetus in 1546. The latter hypothesis remains more probable than the former, although even the former has some suggestive evidence in its favor.

On February 26, 1553, a close associate of Calvin's in Geneva, Guillaume de Trie, disclosed in a letter to his cousin, Antoine Arney, in Lyons that the town of Vienne was host to an archeretic named Servetus, or "Villeneufve," who had succeeded in having his blasphemous books published there. As proof of this verdict on the man, de Trie enclosed "la premiere feuille" of what could only be the printed _Restitutio_. T. H. L. Parker translates this as "page 1," but this can scarcely have been adequate for de Trie's purpose, whether it was the first page of the _Prooemium_ (page 3) or of the treatise proper (page 5). For Bainton it was "the first folio," which meant "the first four leaves" of the book. Bainton is here following Antoine Gachet d'Artigny, who in 1749 discovered and published de Trie's letters to Servetus in the Vienne archives and reported that the latter enclosed "des quatre premieres feuilles" of the _Restitutio_. This report in turn appears to rest on Gachet d'Artigny's discovery of any pages of the printed _Restitutio_ at Vienne, but on his combining a later accusation by Servetus with a reference to "quatre feuilles d'un Livre" in a submission made on March 16 by one of the Lyons officials charged with pursuing de Trie's disclosures. It must be to this same sample of printed material that Servetus referred months later in Geneva when he accused Calvin of getting de Trie to send "la moitié du premier quayer du livre dudit Servetus, ou estoy le titre, et indice ou table et quelque commancarment du dict livre, intitule Christianismi restitutio." For Cuthbertson (unaware, it seems, of the Vienne evidence of "quatre feuille") de Trie's "la premiere feuille," eluci-
The manuscript and printed texts compared

Attention has already been drawn to the extensive agreement between the two versions of this short section of the Restituto. For lines on end they are identical (e.g., 261-274, 462-478), or virtually so (e.g., 156-179, 233-250, 322-340, 345-363). A fair proportion of the differences between them are little more than cosmetic, such as minor variations in word order, of which some twenty-five can be counted. A preference for *sat nunc erit* over *sufficit nunc* (412) is attributable only to taste or whim (cf. *perspicue for aperte*, 214, etc.).

If the manuscript is treated for comparative purposes as representing the draft from which Servetus prepared the work for publication, few obvious corrections are discernible, such as *obumbutio* (278), and probably *imbris* (217), *metaphysico* (274, 319) and *vocatio* (131; *unicus* at 206 is more questionable). In cases like these, however, the divergence may be the fault of the copyist of the manuscript.
The most prominent difference is the absence from the 1553 text of most of the autobiographical material in lines 54-66 and parts of lines 82 (a reference to Servetus' youthful age) and 46-48, where, in place of the fraught prayer ne me deseras affectionibus pressum, the book offers a more conventional request for assistance (teipsam aperi servo tuo). The omission of the exhortation to the reader at lines 25-32 also softens the personal thrust of the preface, without removing it entirely (cf. 70-72). A similar interest may help to explain the omission of 106-109, with its question addressed to the reader.

A toning down is probably also to be recognized in the omission of two bold promises made in the manuscript preface: the way of truth "will openly display to you the secrets of God" (21), and "will lead you to all heavenly realities" (24). Yet a number of differences suggest a firmer decisiveness in the printed version. The time is "truly" fulfilled (67), as Servetus will demonstrate from "manifest" signs of the times (68). Aperte strengthens docemur (133), and on other occasions a higher degree of certainty or clarity is claimed for the exposition (e.g., 90-91, 204). Likewise curabo replaces conabatur at line 84.

Indeed, once the preface is over and Servetus is launched on his subject, many of the changes, albeit minor in scope, are additions which serve to sharpen or clarify the force of the printed text. Thus at lines 206-208 the latter spells out the progression of thought more painstakingly, and the lucidity of 287-288 similarly improves on the manuscript. The omission of Hic homo stultus erat (348) leaves the argument more precisely focused on Jesus the homo being filius Dei. At line 221 the holy offspring of Mary "truly will be" the Son of God, rather than "will be called." A few changes may more significantly preclude misunderstanding. At line 213 Hic Jesus replaces corpus hoc when Servetus is speaking of the one born of God in the incarnation. Similarly at 259-290, proprius passio corporis in the manuscript gives way to proprium hominis, and likewise with carnis. Unhappiness with the draft's use of corpus with reference to the human Jesus may account for the omission of lines 119-122, which I have above attributed to haplography in the printed version.

Other variants reveal no Tendenz. At line 367 the printed text clearly recalls Tertullian's tag Fiunt, non nascentur Christiani (Apol. 18.4), but Servetus had long been familiar with his works. The workmanlike simpliciore via replaces the classical pinguiore minerva at 461-462. Concedentes seems less appro-
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David F. Wright

Homosexuality: The Relevance of the Bible

The subject of homosexuality is very much at the forefront of Christian ethical discussion at the present time. Some of the debate is highly technical, and Mr. Wright has entered into it elsewhere (see n. 4) to correct mistaken interpretations. We are grateful to him for this essay written at a more popular level; it was originally presented at a Seminar at Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH, and is printed as delivered.

It has become almost a commonplace in the contemporary discussion of homosexuality—whether ethical, theological or ecclesiastical-disciplinary—that the Bible has little or no direct or specific light to cast on our modern problems. This verdict may be illustrated by the words of Robin Scroggs:

Not only is the New Testament church uninterested in the topic, it has nothing new to say about it . . . Biblical judgments against homosexuality are not relevant to today's debate.1

This broad position, which is standard fare in liberal writing, may be said to rest on a single conviction—that the biblical texts are invariably found to be talking about or alluding to only something quite different from what poses the real dilemmas today. The difference may vary from text to text, but the points of reference or concern to the biblical writers do not match ours.

This paper seeks to challenge this consensus, or at least to put some sharp questions to it, by means of a re-examination of the main texts and of the processes of reasoning commonly applied to them. In the bygone it should provoke discussion about the criteria or methods whereby we assess the relevance of biblical material to present-day issues. For convenience I will follow the biblical order—which does not imply importance or priority. Each text of course merits extended exegesis, which it is impossible to provide in this context.

The non-sexual interpretation (pioneered by D. Sherwin Bailey, *Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition*, 1955, and borrowed, often slavishly, by a number of later writers) has had a far longer innings than it deserves, and is now rarely put into bat. It was perhaps an inevitable and needed corrective. But how do we know what the Sodomites wanted to do to Lot’s guests, and whether they sinned in so wanting? Bailey and others have made much of the fact that references to their misconduct and fate elsewhere in the Old Testament (e.g. Ezk. 16:46ff) never explicitly mention their homosexual gang rape but only their neglect of the poor, inhospitality, etc. It was the intertestamental literature that brought out the homosexual interpretation, which became ubiquitous in Hellenistic Judaism.

But what should surprise us in this? It was only when Judaism encountered homosexuality in the Greek world, chiefly in the form of pederasty, that it became more than a marginal issue. Homosexuality scarcely surfaced as a domestic concern in Israel—or in rabbinic Judaism, for that matter. By what criterion should the interpretation of a passage be determined by the rest of the biblical tradition’s interest in it? It is not as though the sexual reading is excluded by any subsequent comment.

This is not to minimize the importance of the revisionist treatment of the passage. Much more was wrong with the Sodomites than homosexuality, and perhaps much that was more reprehensible. The language of “sodomy” is indefensible. But this consideration cannot be allowed to excise the sexual element from the text, or make it morally equivocal.

The same would need to be said to the argument that what was damnable in the Sodomites’ endeavour was not its homosexuality as such but the violence of its homosexuality—the attempted rape.

**Leviticus 18:22, 20:13**

The textual meaning here is not in dispute. Although the precise physical form of homosexual intercourse may not be certainly identifiable, no body of opinion claims that this is at issue—as though what is banned is only a posit in parallel to heterosexual congress, but not necessarily other forms, such as anal intercourse.

Two reasons are commonly advanced for limiting the scope of the Levitical law—the ritual context of the Holiness Code, and the cultic context of the proscription of Egyptian or Canaanite religion. They may be two sides of the same coin, and are in any case not easily separable. The claim is made that the prohibition is no more of general reference or lasting import than the ban on cutting your beard in a certain way (19:27) or making a garment out of two different materials (19:19) or intercourse during menstruation (18:19) and so on. Since we no longer entertain similar notions of ritual impurity or are faced with homosexual behaviour associated with heathen idolatry, this part of the Mosaic law has nothing to say to the permanent-loving-preference type of homosexuality.

The argument has to recognize that many other unambiguously sinful acts are also encompassed by the Levitical code, such as bestiality (18:23) and child sacrifice (18:21), the immediate neighbours of 18:22, and adultery (20:10) and incest (18:6ff). These chapters undoubtedly place a great mixture of activity and conduct under the ban, but is there no way of discriminating between the more and less grave?

Another way to pose the issue is to ask whether the Mosaic law reprobated behaviour simply because the Canaanites indulged in it. This would presumably mean that it condemned everything the Canaanites did, which is scarcely a tenable possibility. Is it not eminently more reasonable to argue that the Canaanites’ cultic homosexual prostitution (if that is what it was) provided a further reason for avoiding Canaanite religion—because homosexual relations were unacceptable on more fundamental grounds than their contextual association with pagan cult? After all, the Israelites did not need, one assumes, to be informed about the Canaanite practice of child sacrifice before they could know whether it was permissible for them to dispose of their children in this way. To put it another way, is it conceivable, from what else we know about Mosaic or Israelite ethics, that child sacrifice or homosexuality would have been tolerated if disinfection of their Canaanite associations?

In any case, the argument goes on, the whole of the Levitical legislation lapsed in the Christian church:

It would simply not have occurred to most early Christians to invoke the authority of the old law to justify the morality of the new: the Levitical regulations had no hold on Christians and are manifestly irrelevant in explaining Christian hostility to gay sexuality.2

---

This sounds like a historical statement (i.e., rather than an assertion of what they should have done, on theological or ethical grounds). In the context it considerably underestimates the early Christian citation or appeal to the two verses in question. It also misses a weightier consideration which I will raise below.

Romans 126-27

Two or three main arguments are commonly advanced against discerning here a permanent position for Christian ethics to adopt. For many interpreters, Paul's diatribe is merely preformed tradition, typical of the strictures passed on the immoral world by Hellenistic moralists such as Philo and Plutarch. It is entirely conventional, contributes nothing distinctly Christian, and may tell us little about the behaviour of real people in Paul's day.

Others discount the passage by highlighting, as with Leviticus (and the two cases are often felt to reinforce each other), the links between idolatry and perverse sexuality. Even if it is not cultic prostitution that is in view, Paul is indicting activity that issues from corrupt religious roots (vv. 23,25) His horizon does not extend beyond the consequences of worshipping creatures rather than the creator. He is surely not saying anything of the highly moral homosexual monogamy of faithful Christians.

And if you attempt to counter this disqualification by drawing attention to Paul's argument from nature, the reply comes back that it is a very versatile, not to say slippery or devious, device in Paul's hands: does not 'nature' teach us that long hair is degrading for a man (1 Cor. 11:14)? Nature may be nothing more than convention, fashion, common use and wont. Paul is not propounding an argument from natural law or even a conviction based on the doctrine of the creation of human nature, male and female.

John Boswell's ingenuity delivers a further coup de grâce. Paul has in view only those individuals who abandoned their own natural dispositions in order to engage in same-sex behaviour—contrary to their nature. They are in fact heterosexuals who defy their own heterosexuality. This interpretation has not been without its followers, but need detain us least of all. Its atomistic concept of nature seems to me to require a highly contrived, not to say esoteric, reading of the passage. It also entails in Paul an awareness of the difference between homosexual and heterosexual natures that most students of the subject find nowhere in antiquity. It would enable one to distinguish between two types of homosexual practitioners—in Bailey's terms, between perverts and inverters.

What few have sufficiently weighed is Paul's linking together of male and female same-sex conduct. What is for us an instinctive association was very rare in antiquity, not least because female homosexuality is rarely mentioned. Prior to Paul I know of only two writers who subject them to common condemnation—Plato and Ps-Phocylides. Scroggs, who makes much of the character of the Pauline material as merely 'preformed tradition', is aware of the difficulty of pointing to any relevant 'preformed tradition' in this case, but is not thereby deterred.

The linkage has implications beyond the question of Paul's originality, to which we shall return. It bears also on his meaning, for the parallelism strongly suggests that Paul gives us something like a generic condemnation of homosexuality. This is to say, he sees beyond particular forms of same-sex relations or same-sex relations in particular contexts to what it is that enables one to lump both male and female conduct together. For if, as most scholars hold, the only pattern of male homosexuality that Paul could have known or dreamt of was pederasty, there is no counterpart on the female side. From what we know of the latter, the arguments used to limit Paul's animadversions to pederasty and so to disenfranchise it cannot be applied to the unnatural relations of woman with woman.

Indeed, the equivalence in Romans 1 bids us not be so dismissive towards Paul's appeal to nature. This is assuredly a widespread category in the moral writers of the Hellenistic era, particularly as a result of the influence of Stoicism. But the allusions in the chapter to divine creation (vv. 20,25) justify us in believing that the argument from nature has to be taken with great seriousness. In my view its force is not lessened by invoking the active/aggressive v. passive/receptive form of gender expectations to which it often gave rise. What has to be shown (and I firmly believe the onus probandi lies on this interpretation) is that Paul did not believe that male and female were created for each with complementary sexualities grounded in the distinctive constitutions of their sexual organs.

---

4 For the evidence see my article 'Homosexuals or Prostitutes? The Meaning of ἀναγαγόμενος (1 Cor. 6:9; 1 Tim. 1:10)', in *Vigiliae Christianae* 38 (1984), 125-53.


7 Cf. Scroggs, 131, 141.
Before advancing certain more general considerations pertinent to Romans 1 we must turn to the last textual evidence to be considered.

1 Corinthians 6:9, 1 Timothy 1:10

We have in fact already passed in review the major factors that lead many commentators to refuse to allow any abiding ethical significance in the occurrences in these two verses of the Greek term arsenokoites.

For Scroggs and his ilk, Paul and the Paulinist have simply taken over a conventional vice-list from the moral literature of Hellenistic Judaism or even secular Hellenistic writers. As such it tells us nothing in detail about his attitude to particular forms of behaviour; it serves merely to convey a generalized outlook on society. It bears little or no relation to the kind of people the Corinthian Christians may previously have been, or indeed to the ills of their Corinthian milieu. Its 'traditional form...forbids an assessment in terms of the contemporary scene, as if, for example, we had to do with a realistic description of conditions in Corinth'.

The tradition determines that Paul could have in mind only the particular form of male homosexuality that was culturally dominant, namely pederasty, as analysed by Kenneth Dover and others. It is to the undesirable features of that kind of relationship that arsenokoites refers, and not in principle to same-sex intercourse. Some writers, including Scroggs, believe that we can more closely define the meaning of the term. Both of its uses condemn very specific forms of pederasty; 1 Timothy has in view 'the enslaving of boys or youths for sexual purposes, and the use of these boys by adult males', and 1 Corinthians condemns only 'the active partner who keeps the malakos (effeminate call-boy) as a “mistress” or who hires him on occasion to satisfy his sexual desires'. Scroggs holds in particular that insufficient regard has been had by historians to homosexual prostitution, which enables us to interpret the arsenokoites as an exploitative, aggressive participant in this commerce. I think Scroggs is entangled in a deep inconsistency—between identifying the Pauline vice-lists as essentially 'preformed tradition' and discerning in the two occurrences of arsenokoites not only surprisingly precise forms of pederasty but two different expressions of it. The two elements in

his case are linked together by such profound analytic insights as the following: 'it is not hard to imagine that Paul's basic attitude toward pederasty could have been seriously influenced by passing a few courtesans and perfumed call-boys in the marketplace'.

Professor Boswell is almost alone in questioning whether anything homosexual is involved in this Greek term at all. He concludes that it denotes 'male sexual agents, i.e. active male prostitutes, who were common throughout the Hellenistic world in the time of Paul', who may have serviced male or female clients. He reaches this position by construing the word in a manner calculated to evoke from classical linguists only scornful derision. It does not mean 'those (males) who lie with males' but 'males who lie with others, whether male or female. Compounds of arren—when spelt with rs instead of rr make it the subject or qualifier of the second element, not its object. This is patent nonsense; the difference is purely dialectal.'

What Boswell and many other writers (but not Scroggs) have failed to notice is the significance of Paul's choice of arsenokottai, which is not attested before 1 Corinthians. Whether Paul coined it we cannot tell, but it is certainly a coinage of Hellenistic Christianity or Judaism. What should by now have occasioned more surprise is that, if Paul or his source wanted to condemn pederasty, he did not use one of the many words or phrases currently in common use to refer to it. Instead he employed a new term—and one fashioned on the basis of those Levitical prohibitions:

meta arsenos ou koinathē kai tên gnaikos (18:22)

koinathē meta arsenos kai tên gnaikos (20:13)

One clearly need look no further for the inspiration of this Jewish or Christian neologism. Scroggs recognizes this (although he inclines, in my view implausibly, to seeing the Greek term as the equivalent of the rabbi's semi-technical phrase based on Leviticus—mishkav [b]zakur, but the difference between us is not great at this point). But he then devises for the word a meaning that forgets its provenance. Boswell's eccentric etymology at least has this much in its favour, that it faces up to the word itself.

Confirmation of the derivation of the word from the LXX of

10 Ibid., 43.
12 See my extended refutation in the article cited in n. 4 above, and my paper 'Early Christian Attitudes to Homosexuality' forthcoming in Studia Patristica, for a broader critique of Boswell's handling of patristic material.
Leviticus comes from what is probably its next occurrence, in the Sibylline Oracles 2:73. Here it is found in what may be one of the Christian interpolations of the Jewish base; but it is more likely to be of Jewish origin, for it appears in a section closely related to the Hellenistic-Jewish gnomic wisdom collection known as the Sentences of Ps-Phocylides, although arsenokoités itself does not occur in the latter. Ps-Phocylides, according to its latest editor, originated in Alexandria roughly between 30 BC and AD 40. The relevant part of the collection, which appears in very similar form in the Sibylline Oracles, betrays heavy Levitical influence.

Now no-one claims that Leviticus had pederasty in mind! Paul has in fact adopted or fashioned a term which is little more than a substantial transcript from Leviticus (LXX) and which speaks simply of males sleeping with males. Oddly enough, despite the liberal consensus, the New Testament at no point obviously refers to pederasty at all. It might be overrating to claim that Paul in his choice of language seems to have deliberately avoided the plethora of terms current to denote pederasty, but if he had wanted to condemn only pederasty, let alone only the highly specific vices detected by Scroggs, he went a very odd way about it.

It may be thought that this argument is too etymological, recalling the shades of Kittel and the pre-Barr era. It is true of course that had Paul used an explicitly pederastic word, it would not have followed that he meant by it solely pederasty. For so dominant was the pederastic form of homosexuality that its vocabulary had come to refer to other forms, almost generically. Thus Hellenistic Jewish writers like Philo talk about the Sodomites as pederasts. This usage has persisted even to the present day; cf. our 'rent-boys', who are normally adults. The early medieval penitential literature similarly speaks of adult partners in homosexuality as 'boys'. My argument from arsenokoités does not stand alone, but forms a double cord with the distinctiveness of Romans 1:26–27.

In particular, the argument that Paul is merely retailing preformed tradition is decidedly shaky. Scroggs persists in it despite the fact that he cannot point to any source that Paul may be presumed to have known which combines a condemnation of both male and female homosexuality in the manner of Romans 1. Nor is the situation with the vice-lists quite so clear-cut with respect to the Pauline verses. Many a commentator claims that the vices itemized in these two verses derive from the common content of many such lists, but hardly anyone provides firm evidence to back this up. The exegete's and the translator's quandary over arsenokoités arises in part precisely from the lack of plain parallels in lists earlier than 1 Corinthians.13

It need not be a corollary of derivation from conventional moralistic wisdom that Paul/the Paulinist is not addressing a concrete context in these letters. The selection made from pre-existing vice-catalogues may reflect the writer's awareness of the local problems or the social composition of the church.14 Is it in any case a sound or reasonable deduction from the use of traditional material that its user cannot be directing or adapting it to a live audience or real-life situation? This is a useful point at which to draw out some general considerations in conclusion.

General Considerations

How can we determine, if Paul does not use specific language, that he has only specific abuses in view? Such an assertion is in effect the stance of Scroggs et multi alii, although it has too often rested on inadequate linguistic analysis. One might ask the converse: if a writer attacks pederasty in an unmistakable manner but uses the vocabulary of 'male' rather than 'boy', would we again be required to conclude that his hostility was without prejudice to his estimate of any other form of homosexuality? I have argued that the distinctiveness of both the word arsenokoités and the content of Romans 1:26–27 at least prima facie reveals Paul extrapolating from the particular to the general. Why should the fact that the only form of homosexuality Paul could have known about at all directly was pederasty, whether involving prostitution or not, be allowed to dictate the conclusion, in the face of linguistic evidence to the contrary, that he could not have been passing a broader judgment, and that his opinion of other patterns of homosexuality is quite indeterminable?

My rebuttal of such a position is twofold: not only has insufficient regard been taken of the precise originality of Paul's statements, but also inadequate heed been paid to what else we know of Paul's mind, which is neither so inaccessible that we may rest upon him some of the wilder speculations found in this area of discussion, nor so 'cribbed, caged and confined' by the phenomena of contemporary society that he was incapable of

13 Cf. Conzelmann's silence ad loc. (102) on the occurrence of this particular term in other lists.
14 See an argument to this effect for 1 Cor. 6 by P. Zauz, '1 Corinthians 6:9ff: Was Homosexuality Condoned in the Corinthian Church?', Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 1:17 (Chico, CA, 1979), 205–12.
formulating a moral judgment with a reach beyond the immediately observable. I find it quite inconceivable, from what else I know of Paul's mind, e.g. on the significance of the one-flesh heterosexual union, that he could have countenanced any model of same-sex genital relationship. This assessment of mine (which I merely summarize rather than substantiate at length) confirms me in my conclusions drawn from a close analysis of Paul's particular statements. Scrogg's failure is partly one of inadequate scrutiny of the trees and partly one of missing the wood for the trees.

A final issue concerns the question of originality in another sense. What if we decide that Paul has nothing to say about homosexuality that goes beyond the wisdom of the Old Testament and later Judaism? Does it devalue his strictures if they display nothing distinctively Christian? I leave aside here the question whether nothing of a distinctively Christian kind about homosexuality can be deduced from what Paul says elsewhere about sexual relations (e.g. in 1 Corinthians 6). My answer to my own question will not be hard to predict, for I have discerned special significance precisely in the fact that in arsenokoitês Paul deliberately sided with the Levitical ban. But quite apart from this, Conzelmann's comment is pertinent:

The fact that Christianity takes over the Jewish ethic must be theologically understood. Christianity regards itself not as a new system of ethics, but as a practical exercise of the will of the long-known God.15

While I doubt if this can be viewed as wholly satisfactory as a generalization, Christianity's adoption of Jewish ethical attitudes should not of itself be treated as somehow sub-Christian or negligible. Plenty of evidence from antiquity could be advanced to show that you did not have to be Jewish, or even Stoic, to condemn pederasty as contrary to nature. Why should Christianity's sharing of common ground with earlier traditions be sufficient cause not to take it seriously?

What price originality? I conclude that Paul's lay partly in being unoriginal. Although Paul said remarkably little about homosexuality (which may in itself be open to varying hypothetical explanations), what he does say reveals a remarkable originality, in part by adopting the broader perspectives of the tradition that derived from the Old Testament and from Leviticus in particular.


---

Larry Kreitzer

Nero's Rome: Images of the City on Imperial Coinage

Illustrated articles are rare in our journal, but in this essay Dr Kreitzer, Dean of Regent's Park College, Oxford, demonstrates visibly the light that can be shed on the historical setting of the NT by a consideration of numismatic evidence. The drawings of the coins were produced by Rosemary Lehan.

That Paul the Apostle intended to visit Rome on his way to Spain is clearly recorded in his letter to the Roman church (Rom. 15:24). Whether he ever did manage to get as far as Spain, and when, is a matter of considerable scholarly debate.1 Certainly we know that Paul eventually made it to Rome and stayed there for a considerable time, perhaps as long as two years or more (Acts 28:11–31). But the account in Acts breaks off so abruptly that we are left wondering what happened to Paul afterwards. In all probability he was executed in Rome under Nero in late AD 64 or early 65 in the turmoil following the great conflagration.2 By the end of the first century and the beginning of the second century AD Christian writers were already beginning to speak of Paul's martyrdom in Rome under the Emperor Nero (AD 54–68) as a factual matter.3

Assuming that this early tradition about Paul's martyrdom rests on historical fact, we can safely deduce that Paul did indeed manage to visit Rome as he had hoped, but that he was frustrated

---

1 On this question, see: Robert Jewett, Dating Paul's Life (London, 1979), 44–46.
2 Jewett, Op. cit., 46, suggests a date range for Paul's execution from spring of AD 62 to August 64.
3 1 Clem. 5, written about AD 96, speaks of both Peter and Paul as martyred saints in language which seems to suggest them as recently killed, that is to say, within living memory of those being addressed. The most likely setting for this martyrdom would have been the Neronic persecutions which arose following the great fire in Rome in July of AD 64. Similarly, Ign. Rom. 4:2–3, written about AD 110, speaks of his own impending martyrdom and contrasts himself with both Peter and Paul in this context. The Muratorian Canon (lines 38–39), written about AD 207 (or) also speaks of Paul's intended journey to Rome.
The Meaning and Reference of
"One Baptism for the Remission of Sins"
in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed

D.F. Wright, Edinburgh

The creed that most of the Christian world knows as the Nicene Creed, and that patristic scholars commonly refer to by the first letter (C or K) of Constantinople, enjoys unparalleled ecumenical acceptance. The significance of the phrase with which this paper is concerned ("one baptism for the remission of sins") has taken on increased importance in the light of the intensified interest in baptism in recent ecumenical discussion.¹ Yet it is a phrase that very rarely attracts more than passing attention. I have yet to find a single extended examination of it.² Students of the Constantinopolitan Creed concentrate on far weightier matters,³ and students of baptism in the fathers hardly ever mention it.⁴ Perhaps it is assumed on all sides that the meaning of the clause is self-evident. It is the contention of this paper that it is by no means as straightforward as it might appear — or as its free and easy citation by theologians might suggest.

We are faced with at least two main issues: 1. the meaning of "one" (Ev

as the new-born baby.\(^1\) Cyril of Jerusalem’s *Catechism* show no awareness of infant baptism, but he teaches that we come into the world sinful and new in our free will (4:19). Moreover, Cyril tells us that the creed of the Church of Jerusalem acknowledged “one baptism of repentance (μετανοιας) for the remission of sins” (18:22), which rendered the clause more obviously inapplicable to the newborn.\(^2\) The second creed at the end of Epiphanius’ *Ancyrae* speaks more briefly of “one baptism of repentance”.\(^3\)

The conclusion is inescapable. Although the evidence is not abundant (partly because infant baptism was clearly exceptional in the Greek Church for most of the fourth century\(^4\)), enough is available to establish that “one baptism for the remission of sins” could not have been understood to encompass the baptism of babies. If the Creed’s original meaning is allowed to determine its meaning for later centuries, then its confession of “one baptism” is of very limited direct relevance to subsequent baptismal practice among the Churches of both East and West.

For the meaning of the numeral “one” there are a number of possibilities, not all mutually exclusive, but the main candidates seem to boil down to two:

(i) “one” in the sense of Ephesians 4:5 — “one Lord, one faith, one baptism”. This phrase “one baptism” is misinterpreted far more often than our creedal clause. The context puts the meaning beyond doubt. Paul is talking about the common baptism received by all Christians, the one and the same baptism which unites them in one Lord and one body. A temporal reference, excluding rebaptism, for example, is as inappropriate as it would be for “one Lord” and “one faith”.

(ii) “one” in a temporal sense, perhaps parallel to, and grounded in, the once-for-all character of the saving work of Christ. The clause is most frequently interpreted in this way, as affirming the unrepeatability of baptism, but a further narrowing of its meaning may be possible, or even required:

A. Does the Creed reflect the consensus, firmly established by now at least in the Latin West, that those who had received baptism in heresy or schism should not be rebaptized on admission to the Catholic Church?

B. Or does it relate instead to the early Church’s persisting preoccupation with the problem of post-baptismal sin?

---


The evidence points unmistakably to the second of these possibilities. “One baptism for the remission of sins” — and here again the specification of the purpose or benefit of baptism is important — declares that the washing away of sins in baptism may be received only once. This is how Cyril of Jerusalem explains the words in his Procathecesis:

“A person cannot be baptized a second or a third time. Otherwise, he could say: ‘I failed once; the second time I shall succeed.’ Fail once and there is no putting it right. For [there is] ‘one Lord, one faith, one baptism’. It is only heretics who are rebaptized, and then because the first [baptism] was no baptism”.

Thus Cyril interprets the phrase in a manner that explicitly denies that it debar the rebaptism of those baptized at the hands of heretics. Speaking to neophytes Chrysostom warns them to “be alert to prevent any second contract [i.e., of debt from post-baptismal sins]. For there is no second cross, nor a second remission by the bath of regeneration. There is remission, but not a second remission by baptism”.15 On other occasions also he denies that there is any second baptism to cancel sins committed after baptism.16 Theodore likewise insists that, “As we will not receive a second renewal, so we should not expect a second baptism, just as we hope for but a single resurrection”.

That this is the correct explanation of the clause finds confirmation from other considerations. In the first place, the possibility of Western influence, reflecting the recognition of schismatic baptism and hence exclusion of rebaptism established in the controversies of the third and fourth centuries, seems extremely unlikely. Western Creeds hardly ever include an explicit mention of “baptism”, let alone “one baptism”, even in North Africa.18 Secondly, the Eastern attitude to heretical and schismatic baptism was much less uniform than the Western. We have already cited Cyril of Jerusalem, and one need refer further only to the long discussions in Basil’s two letters to Amphiloctius on the canons,19 and to the Apostolic Constitutions’ ban on recognizing baptism “conferr’d by wicked heretics” (6:15). Thirdly, it is a major pastoral concern of the Cappadocians and Chrysostom that baptism should not be indefinitely deferred.20 At first sight, the credal affirmation that no second baptismal repentance and remission are available to the

18 For the evidence cf. A. Hahn, Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der Alten Kirche (Breslau, 1897), pp. 17, 25, 27ff., 40ff., 59, 62, 64, etc.
19 Epp. 188:1, 199:XX, XLVII. On the so-called canon 7 of Constantinople (381) see W. Bright, The Canons of the First Four General Councils (Oxford, 1892), pp. 119-23. Asterius speaks of a child who, through a heterodox father or mother, was baptized and yet not baptized but rather plunged (καταβαπτισθηθ) into heresy (Homil. in Ps. 12:4, ed. M. Richard, p. 82).

20 Cf. Basil’s Homil. 13 (PG 31, 423-44), which is from first to last a discussion against the
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In another communication during this Conference Dr. Bernadette Brooten advanced grounds for dissenting from the thesis of John Boswell's book *Christianity, Social Tolerance and Homosexuality* (Chicago and London, 1983) in so far as it touches on patristic views of lesbianism.1 The aim of this paper is to summarize reasons for deeper dissatisfaction with his work, which deals chiefly with male homosexuality. This critique is restricted to the age of the Fathers (the book itself goes up to the fourteenth century), on which Boswell sums up his conclusions as follows:

The early Christian church does not appear to have opposed homosexual behaviour _per se_. The most influential Christian literature was mute on the issue; no prominent writers seem to have considered homosexual attraction 'unnatural,' and those who objected to physical expression of homosexual feelings generally did so on the basis of considerations unrelated to the teaching of Jesus or his early followers. Hostility to gay people and their sexuality became noticeable in the West during the period of the dissolution of the Roman state—i.e., from the third through the sixth centuries—due to factors which cannot be satisfactorily analyzed, but which probably included the disappearance of urban subcultures, increased governmental regulation of personal morality, and public pressure for asceticism in all sexual matters. Neither Christian society nor Christian theology as a whole evinced or supported any particular hostility to homosexuality, but both reflected and in the end retained positions adopted by some governments and theologians which could be used to derogate homosexual acts. (p.333)

Not much has been written about early Christian attitudes to homosexuality after the New Testament period. One of the merits of Boswell's work is to have opened up the subject in an entirely fresh way, with great frankness and sensitivity. It provides the fullest collection available so far of patristic material on homosexuality. The book won various awards and nominations and received prominent treatment in _Newsweek_ and rave reviews on both sides of the Atlantic, sparing no superlatives:

John Boswell restores one's faith in scholarship as the union of erudition, analysis and moral vision. I would not hesitate to call his book revolutionary ... (It) sets a standard of excellence one would have thought impossible.5

Indubitably one of the most profound, explosive works of scholarship to appear within
recent memory... On a first reading I found the book overwhelming, on a second merely stunning.5

One of those rare books which is so exciting simply because it is so good.6

Some medievalists have given the volume a more critical reception, but no examination of the patristic sections has yet appeared in print. Robert M. Grant's short review in Christian Century 98 (Jan. 21, 1981) pp. 60-61, praised it as 'an excellent start' in rescuing its subject from obscurity but also posed some critical questions. Boswell's edifice is certainly impressive but closer acquaintance (overcoming the difficulties presented by his frequently inaccurate references) exposes ever-widening cracks. This paper can do no more than present a selective summary of its weaknesses.

Untenable Interpretation of Biblical Texts

Boswell denies the presence of a homosexual element in the Sodom and Gomorrah incidents (Genesis 19, Judges 19). This view has had a fair innings since D. Sherwin Bailey's Homosexuality and the Western Christian Tradition (London, 1955), but surely now deserves to be quietly put to rest.3

A long appendix (pp. 335-353) discusses the meaning of ἀσεβεία in I Cor 6:9, 1 Tim 1:10, concluding that it denotes 'active male prostitutes', i.e., ἀσεβεῖα does not indicate the object of ἀσεβία but qualifies it adjectively. Among his supporting arguments Boswell claims that in compounds the ἀσεβεια- spelling has objective force and ἀσεβεια- adjectival. In fact the difference is merely dialectal, with no implications whatsoever for meaning.6 The obvious background to this linguistic formation which first occurs in Paul is the LXX of Lev 18:22 (μετὰ ἀσεβείας συναντήσῃ ἔνας ἄνδρα) and 20:13 (κοινωνίας μετὰ ἀσεβείας συναντήσῃ. Other evidence, such as its occurrence in the Sibylline Oracles, confirms the view that the word originated in Hellenistic Jewish or Jewish-Christian circles. The early Latin, Syriac, and Coptic renderings concur with the interpretation Boswell dismisses.

Similar grave reservations are merited by Boswell's explanations of the Levitical verses and Rom 1:26-27.

Misleading Minimising of the Influence of the Biblical Texts on Patristic Opinion

One reviewer has prophesied that 'it will be hard to forget Boswell's demonstration that the sin of the Sodomites was recognized by centuries of rabbic and Christian commentary as primarily an offense against the law of hospitality, only secondarily if at all as sexual misbehavior'.7 Boswell cites four authors who give a non-homosexual interpretation of the Sodom story. Of these one (Ambrose, Abraham 1.6.52) patently identifies homosexual malpractices, two (Cassian, Inst. 5.6, and Isidore, Sent. 2.42) condemn the Sodomites' foul depravity without being more specific, and the fourth (Origen, Homil. on Gen. 5.1) leaves his readers guessing. In reality, no patristic source excludes a homosexual interpretation, and many unmistakably entertain it.6 On this point Sherwin Bailey is a more reliable guide to the Fathers.

Boswell believes the Levitical prohibition lapsed with the whole Holiness Code in apostolic Christianity and thereafter. He acknowledges that Clement of Alexandria and the Apostolic Constitutions exceptionally cite it as authority against homosexual acts, but he fails to mention other Fathers who did so. Moreover, as shown above, the LXX of Leviticus lies behind the key New Testament term ἀσεβεία. I have dealt at length elsewhere with patristic occurrences of ἀσεβεία and citations of I Cor 6:9 and 1 Tim 1:10.9 Here only a few comments can be made. Boswell claims that Chrysostom never used it or any of its derivatives, but his own evidence contradicts him. One use occurs in immediate connection with a reference to the Sodomites' lust for young men (παιδίν ἐρωτάτων);10 Boswell ignores altogether a clear occurrence in Hippolytus: Naas committed adultery with Eudoxia and ἀσεβεία with Adam (Refut. 5.26.22-23). He also has failed to notice a significant parallelism between two versions of a threefold listing of sexual sins in early Christian writings which almost certainly derives ultimately from Hellenistic Jewish vice catalogues. Although the order varies, the first two terms are normally ἡμερία and πασχέω, while the third is either πανθροποιεῖται or ἀσεβεία. Patristic writings suggest a straight continuity between Hellenistic Judaism's aversion from πανθροποιεῖται and Pauline condemnation of ἀσεβεία. Boswell both exaggerates their non-use of the Pauline text and misinterprets some instances of its admitted use.11

Exaggerated Significance Attached to 'the Attitudes of Christian Asconics'

Boswell attributes to what he calls 'the attitudes of Christian ascetics' the main inspiration for the eventual condemnation of homosexual activity. He discusses them under four headings:

1. Animal Behaviour

Although strange arguments drawn from popular Hellenistic zoology are found in Barnabas and Clement of Alexandria, there is no evidence of their widespread impact on the practice of thinking in the Latin West or a sentence in Novatian and an epigram of Eunomius, both cited by Boswell, exhibit the Alexandrians' interpretation of the Mosaic ban on eating the hare. In any case one finds opposing applications of zoology to homosexuality among the Fathers—not only this is how animals
behave', but also 'not even animals behave this way'.

2. Unsaioy Associations

3. Concepts of 'Nature'

Boswell persistently argues that most Christian writers were unaffected by Stoic or similar concepts of 'nature'. He interprets Rom 1:26-27 in terms of the character of individuals (heterosexuals, for whom homosexual acts were contrary to their natures), and denies the importance of considerations of the 'natural order' in much of the subsequent tradition. Even Augustine's objections to homosexual behaviour stigmatize it merely as 'incongruous, contrary to human custom, ... odd and unfamiliar' (pp. 150-151). Conf. 3.8.15 seems clear enough: 'The offences which are contra naturam are ever and everywhere to be detested and punished, such as were those of the Sodomites ... The divine law did not so make men that they might use themselves in that way'. A long list of Christian writers in East and West depict homosexual intercourse as in conflict with man's created nature.

4. Gender Expectations

Contempt for a man's sexual passivity towards another man, whereby he plays the woman's role, is clearly an element in the condemnation of homosexual practices by writers like Clement of Alexandria and Salvin. It is also found in John Chrysostom, but only in one of his many passages on the subject, so that Boswell exaggerates in identifying it as the 'single powerful hostility' which animates his antagonism to homosexuality (p. 157). In assessing other Fathers' references to men assuming the position of women in intercourse, it has to be remembered that Lev 18:22, 29:13 set a precedent in depicting male homosexuality in this way. Furthermore, the argument about 'gender expectation' is but a form of the 'contrary to nature' argument. Female passivity is embodied in the receptor-role of woman in intercourse according to nature. Failure to accord sufficient weight to the natural order in the thought of Fathers like Augustine, Lactantius, and Cyprian has led Boswell to misconceive the force of this particular 'asetic attitude'.

Exaggeration of Prevalence of Homosexual Relationships Among Christians

While there is no doubting that some Christians, both lay and clerical, indulged in homosexual acts (even if the pictures drawn by moralists such as Chrysostom and Salvin may be larger than life), Boswell is wide of the mark in asserting that 'many prominent and respected Christians — some canonized — were involved in relationships which would almost certainly be considered homosexual in cultures hostile to same-sex eroticism. ... To a contemporary observer of social trends, it would probably have seemed that the examples of Ausonius and Paulinus or Perpetua and Felicitas would in the end triumph over the hostility of Ambrose and Augustine' (pp. 135-136). These are the only two relationships he cites - a narrow and, in both cases, insubstantial basis for such a grandiose affirmation.

The conclusion must be that for all its interest and stimulus Boswell's book provides in the end of the day not one firm piece of evidence that the teaching mind of the early Church countenanced homosexual activity. If Ausonius, who enjoyed homosexual literature and riddles, counts against this, he was scarcely representative, at best a half-baked Christian. It is true that active homosexuality was rarely singled out by the Fathers for execration as 'the sin of sins'. They may even be said to treat the subject with a degree of reserve. But what they do say leaves little room for debate: homosexual behaviour was contrary to the will of God as expressed in Scripture and nature.

EDINBURGH

Notes

4. R.I. Moore in History 65 (1981) p. 282. Moore confesses himself 'completely satisfied' that 'neither classical nor early Christian tradition condemned erotic relations between members of the same sex per se'.
6. For a full discussion see the author's Homosexual or Prostitutes? The Meaning of ἀποστειρωματικαί (1 Cor. 6:9, 1 Tim. 1:10), in Theologica Christana 38 (1984) pp. 125-153.
8. Chrysostom, Homilies 43.4, 4.9.4; Cyril of Alexandria, De adulatione 1 (PG 68: 169, 172); Ephraim, Epist. 19, 11; Basil, Hom. 2.22; Methodius, Symp. 5, 5; Orosius, His. 1, 5; Ps. - Tertullian, Solane, passim. Others should probably be added, such as Salvin, Caecil. Dei 1.39.
9. Clement, Phaed. 2.89, 91; Tertullian, Adv. Marc. 1.29.4; Origen, Comm. on Rom. 4.4 (Latin), and cf. Fragm. e Catena in 1 Cor. fr. 27, ed. C. Jenkes, JTS 9 (1908) p. 369; Apoc. Const. 6.284; Eusebius, Dem. Evang. 1.6, 4.10, Proop. Evang. 13.20.7 (Boswell's treatment of Eusebius's evidence is inconsistent and uncertain); Hesychius of Jerusalem, Comm. on Lev., ad loc. Allusions are probably rightly identified in other writers, such as Gregory of Nyssa, Trans. Origen, 10.34.
10. See n. 6 above.
11. Homil. on Tit. 5.4.
12. With ἀποστειρωματικόν: Barnabas 19.4; Dei. 2.2; Clement, Phaed. 2.89, cf. Prot. 10.108.5; Origen, Fragm. e Catena in Exod. 12.15 (PG 12: 284); Apoc. Const. 7.2.10, cf. 6.281.2; with ἀποστειρωματικόν: Thelipos, Ad Ancy. 8.4, 1.14; Origen, Comm. on Matt. 14.10, cf. Ep. ad amicum Alex. apud Jerome, Apoc. conf. 1.2.18 (muscular consonant); Peter of Alexandria apud Theodoret, H.E. 4.22.9; Nilus of Anicura, Ep. II.282; Cyril of Alexandria (Πρωτοθεόπουλος), Homil. Dia. 14; John of Damascus, Sacra Paral. I.11.
13. Aristotle uses ἀποστειρωματικόν synonymously with ἀποστειρωματικόν and ἀνδροφασχία τοῦ Zeus's behaviour with
Ganymede (Apoc. 9.8-9, 13.7). It can scarcely mean 'male prostitute' here.


15. Tertullian, Cor. 6, Pass. 4.5; Lactantius, Div. Inst. 6.23; Ambrose, Abraham 1.6.52; Pelagius and Ambrosiaster in their commentaries on Rom. 1:26-27; Salvin, Gubern. Dei 7.80; Athenagoras, Suppl. 34; Clement, Paed. 2.83 ff.; Methodius, Symp. 5.5; Eusebius, Dem. Ev. 1.6, Lives Const. 13.11, Theoph. 2.81, etc.; Apost. Const. 6.28.1-3, 7.2.10; Chrysostom, Homil. on Gen. 43.4, De Fato et Provid. 4, Homil. on Rom. 4.1-3 (more clearly than in Boswell's selective translation, pp. 359-562); Acts of Thomas (ed. Klijn, p. 94); Ephraim, Hymn on Nativity 1; Hesychius of Jerusalem and Procopius of Gaza in their commentaries on Leviticus (PG 93: 1015, 1046; 87: 765-6); Cyril of Alexandria, De adoratione 1 (PG 68: 172). This is certainly an incomplete list.

16. Homil. on Rom. 4.2-3.
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Robert Estienne's *Nova Glossa Ordinaria*: A Protestant Quest for a Standard Bible Commentary

D.F. Wright

The importance of the *Glossa Ordinaria* for the understanding of the Bible in the later medieval church is well established. It was 'der einflussreichste Bibelkommentar des hohen Mittelalters.' Scholars frequently refer to it as the 'Standard Commentary on the Bible'. Although the compilation of Anselm of Laon and his assistants was extensively supplemented by later collectors, especially Peter Lombard and Hugh of St. Cher, the *Glossa* remained one of the two most important tools of biblical scholarship devised in the Middle Ages...the main vehicle for the accumulation and transfer of thought.

Yet the fortunes of the *Glossa Ordinaria* in the sixteenth century remain little investigated. Louis Boyer's judgement that Erasmus ignored it has been shown to be premature. Erasmus is apparently the only biblical interpreter in the Reformation century whose attitude to and use of the *Glossa* have been specially studied. Luther's dependence on it, not only for his access to the Fathers in his early years in Wittenberg but also, for example, in his Genesis lectures of 1535-45, is obvious enough but has yet to be thoroughly examined. Even the...

5. *Erasmus in Relation to the Medieval Biblical Tradition*, in: CPH II, 492: 'there is no relationship at all between Erasmus and the medieval biblical tradition'.
8. See the indices to the translation in the 'American Luther', J. Pelikan (ed.), *Luther's Systematic Theology*.
11. There are copies in Geneva, the British Library (L.21 a 1; General Catalogue...to 1973), 86 - with Estienne named solely as publisher), and Boston Public Library. No doubt in a few other continental collections. Of the Latin there are at least ten copies in the UK and five in the USA. When asked by a visitor in late summer 1952 who discovered him engaged in printing the *Nova Glossa*, who would buy and read it, Estienne replied 'Omnes patet et docet' (Armstrong, 293). His Geneva editions appear to have been smaller than his Parisian ones (ibid., 287).

The Protestant who took the influence and status of the *Glossa Ordinaria* most seriously was Robert Estienne (c.1500-1559), the eminent scholar-printer who removed from Paris to Geneva in 1550. From 'the Olive-Tree of Robert Stephanus' in that city there issued on January 13, 1553 a folio volume entitled:

In Evangelium secundum Matthaeum, Marcum, et Lucam Commentarii ex Ecclesiasticis Scriptoribus Collecti, Nova Glossae ordinariae specimen, donum Meliora Dominus.

It was followed the next year by a French version:

Exposition continuelle & familiare sur les III. Evangelistes, S. Matthieu, S.Marc, S.Luc, S. Iesu, Recueillie des expositions des plus saints Docteurs Ecclesiastiques. Par Laquelle on peut voir comment les Glosses ordinaires & Postilles que le temps passe sur un bailli au peuple Christien en lieu de l'Evangile. Pont esquioine & d'estornue de Jesus Christ... This differs from the Latin not only in omitting Estienne's preface and in covering all four Gospels. A cursory examination shows that it is not a straightforward translation of the Latin. It is now also markedly rarer than its predecessor.

The extent of its divergence from the Latin remains for future investigation. The rest of the present essay will be concerned with the *Nova Glossa* of 1553.

The character of Estienne's compilation has largely gone unnoticed. That it is 'a sort of Protestant replacement' for the medieval *Glossa Ordinaria* is evident from its title, but even Elizabeth Armstrong, to whose monograph on Estienne all subsequent students are deeply indebted, describes it merely as 'derived from Fathers of the Church'. Of the notices of the *Nova Glossa* I have come across, only two have been aware that Estienne has drawn, as he states in his preface, 'not only from the old doctors of the church but also from those who in our present age daily preach Jesus Christ purely and sincerely without corruption' (L.iii; para.[10] in the translation below).

Not least of...
the interesting features of the Nova Glossa is its use of ancient Fathers and contemporary Reformers on equal terms as Ecclesiastici Scriptores. What precedents for such a canonizing of the Reformers might have influenced Estienne? He deliberately refrained from identifying his sources (E.iii; para.[17]), but examination quickly reveals the use of Bucer, Osiander and Bullinger (and in the French, of Calvin on John).16

The best introduction to Estienne's work is his own prefatory epistle, of which a complete English translation is given below. It is significant for several reasons in addition to the light it throws on his intention to replace the old Glossa with a new one. Elizabeth Armstrong points out that, apart from his 1552 Responsorio to the censures of the Paris theologians, his 'only original published utterances were the prefaces to his learned works'.17 This particular preface has special interest as 'the nearest thing that we have to an account of Estienne's religious development'.18 Its earlier paragraphs overlap to a considerable extent with the narrative in the Responsorio of his trials at the hands of the Sorbonne faculty.

The preface also highlights the place that the provision of a new 'standard commentary' on the Bible occupied in Estienne's aspirations from the mid-1530s onwards. Although driven by 'pure scholarly curiosity' to improve the text of the Vulgate for his editions of the Bible, he also displays 'a continual attempt to combine the presentation of a scholarly edition with vulgarization, with something, that is, corresponding to a "Helps to the study of the Bible."' If we take the preface at face value (e.g. para.[3], and cf.[17]), some at least of his annotated editions of the Bible, in whole or in part, should be viewed as preparatory stages on the way to the goal of a new Glossa Ordinaria - the best that could be done in the circumstances of the time.

Commentarii ex Ecclesiastici Scripturis (sive Calvinianis) Scriptoribus...: H.J. de Jonge, art. cit., 76f.
15. In his letter to Simon Grynaeus on his Romans commentary, after reviewing the efforts of earlier commentators, ancient and modern, including Melanchthon, Bullinger and Bucer, Calvin reported that for some time he contemplated compiling quidam verba recensionem post ipser intakte rather than composing a perpetuum commentarium aequaliter (G. Baum, "Schriften"). However, when a manuscript was discovered at the University of Paris, it contained a complete glossary of the New Testament, compiled by a contemporary of Alcuin, and, as a result, Calvin decided not to pursue the project. 16. Estienne's Nova Glossa never got beyond the four Gospels, but the project did not die there. In the French Reformed period, Augustin Marlorat, who was executed at Rouen in 1562, Estienne found the collaborator he had sought in vain among the theologians of the Sorbonne. The preface by Robert Estienne's son Henry to his (Henry's) edition of Marlorat's Genesis Cum Catholica Expositione Ecclesiastica (1562) explains that the compiler was executing his father's plans along lines agreed between the two and with resources supplied to Marlorat by Robert. Marlorat's commentaries, like the Nova Glossa, await further investigation, but one feature of them is worth noting here. They derive their extracts not only from Fathers (and a few medievals) and Reformers alike but from Reformers of every hue, from Lutheran, Swiss and Reformed. This reflects the seriousness of Robert Estienne's quest for a new 'standard commentary' to serve the churches of the Reformation.

In the following translation of Estienne's preface to the Nova Glossa, the paragraph divisions and numbers have been added by the translator.

Robert Stephanus to readers who sincerely love Christ - greetings.

1. It is now eighteen years and more since at Paris, where I had my business established, I began to reflect on the expositions in the book which is commonly called the Glossa Ordinaria and is highly regarded by the theologians. When asked to print the book, I carefully investigated every way of improving it, both by eliminating the faults in the text through collation with the sources from which each of the glosses was derived, and also by retaining and reintroducing some excellent extracts likewise taken from the ancient authorities, in line with the intention of the one who devised this kind of volume of expositions drawn from different authors.

2. So with great diligence I set about finding among the theologians and the religious - both the ones called mendicants, beggars (for so they are), and those who have rich and plentiful resources - someone blessed with ample leisure than I and willing and able to help me undertake this project with application and energy. But after spending a great deal of time on this search with the utmost thoroughness, I failed to discover a single person willing to offer me any assistance, even among those who claim to hold 'the keys of knowledge' to the Holy Scriptures. They all commended my plan and my dedication and described the

20. Marlorat is not mentioned in CHB.
21. I.e. in 1534 or earlier; cf. Armstrong, 261 ('about the time of the 1532 Biblia'), 280 ('in 1535 or earlier'). But see para.[3] and n.23.
task as noble and sacred, but intimated that they lacked sufficient time and were too busy. And so they were drinking, and getting drunk, and stuffing their bellies for that is what keeps their whole life busy.22

3. When I perceived and reflected upon their attitude and deceitful spirit, which made them more of a hindrance than a help to me, I did not on that account abandon my intention or set aside my plan, but instead examined how best to make a start on such a large venture. I concluded that it would not be an inappropriate beginning to produce a carefully corrected printing of our old translation, with which could be combined at some stage a new version truly translated from the Hebrew. Therefore I accordingly printed with great care first the ancient translation,23 and later added to it a new version, together with annotations drawn from Jewish commentaries and the lectures of Francis Vatable, a very learned Hebrist and the Regius Professor in that language.24 These annotations were designed to teach a more fruitful reading of Scripture and to aid understanding by presenting such interpretation as could be given at that time, when the thickest mark of ignorance pervaded everything, as it still does today.

4. But the theologians, so far from welcoming this start to the work and my zealous service, on the contrary took vehement and strident offence. It was no thanks to them that I was not burnt and roasted once they realized that my first efforts were set to expose all their false and godless interpretations. They complained most vociferously, as though in presenting these annotations I was condemning their own beliefs and received opinions.25 [I.8]

5. After26 the Lord had rescued me from their bloody hands and made them somewhat friendlier towards me, I promised them that I would pursue my plan for a new Glossa Ordinaria, of which I had spoken to them before, provided they were willing to help me with it. They promised me that they would. Observing, however, and taking cognizance of their patent hostility and enmity to the blood of Christ, without a true and perfect knowledge of which no-one can reach an understanding of the Scriptures, I resolved to take my leave of them, wanting no dealings or business whatsoever with such bitter enemies of Jesus my Saviour.27

6. I betook myself to the mountains,28 amid whose peaks savage and wild beasts have their haunts, but I found among those mountains more humanity, genuineness and godliness than among the theologians, and greater recognition and gratitude to their Creator than among those who, in innocent sheep's clothing, maliciously seduce people from the true fear of God and prevent creatures having access to their Creator through Jesus Christ. Here among the beasts I encountered men who proclaim God's goodness as worthy of love and celebration and preach both his grace and his mercy in their fulness, serving as Christ's ambassadors in his name. They so present him to their brethren and set forth his portrait, as it were, before their eyes that the image and face of the Son of God, previously unknown to me but now so splendidly depicted, and the new lineaments and teaching of the gospel instilled in me the greatest amazement and astonishment.29 For I reckoned that I had hitherto made such progress in the knowledge of Jesus Christ that I judged myself capable of being their teacher, whereas the outcome was quite different - the opposite of what I supposed.

7. First I had thoroughly to unlearn the false and twisted teaching in which I had been brought up by those false prophets and ungodly masters, in order to learn my first elementary lessons in the Christian religion, in which I was ignorant of what faith was, and what the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper were. You can imagine what Glossa - what kind of Glossa - we would have published if at that time the Lord had permitted me to make such progress in that task, relying on the counsel of the enemies of truth.

8. Once I had removed myself far enough from those lowland wolves which

---

22. Cf. the comments of Armstrong, 280.
23. His three-volume Vulgate folio Biblia of 1540 (1538-40); cf. Armstrong, 72-75, 298; B. Hall, Biblical Scholarship, Editions and Commentaries, in CHB II, 66. It is possible that he is referring to his 1532 Biblia, which he claimed "is now for the first time more or less as whole and complete as of old time the translator himself wrote it" (Armstrong, 72), but the corrected Vulgate of 1540 marked a considerable advance on 1532 and is commonly regarded as his masterpiece (ibid., 298).
24. His two-volume octavo Biblia of 1545, which printed in parallel columns the Vulgate and the new (1543) Zürich Protestant Latin version done by Leo Jud and others; cf. Armstrong, 78, 298; Hall, op. cit., 66, 71.
25. On the proceedings against Estienne by the Sorbonne theologians, prompted by their Louvain colleagues, from August 1545 to December 1548 (when he was released from custody through the intervention of Henry II), see Armstrong, 174-193; F. M. Higman, Censorship and the Sorbonne (Travaux d'humanisme et renaissance: 157), Geneva 1979, 17, 56, 92-93.
27. "He seems to have experienced, as a result of his 'reconciliation' with the Park theologians, an entirely fresh feeling of revulsion against what they taught, brought home to him by the renewal of contact with them and their work" (Armstrong, 264).
28. On the move to Geneva (rather than to Lausanne, which he first had in mind) see Armstrong 211-220.
29. Estienne may overdraw his earlier ignorance of the biblical gospel: Armstrong, 263. In his Réponse to the theologians' censure, he contrasts in the strongest terms the 'deep darkness of the kingdom of Satan' with 'his church in which shines the light, the only light of salvation and life, which lights up all darkness' (tr. Armstrong, 324), but does not speak of his own conversion. In November 1550 Calvin wrote to Farel of Estienne as 'now wholly ours' (CO XIII, 657).
pollute the minds of everyone with their flatulence, and began to experience among these mountains instruction in Christian piety and religion which comprises
God's Word and his sacraments. I consulted the Scriptures to ascertain whether
the teaching I was hearing agreed with them. Since our mind is wicked and
pervasive, I expected to find some divergence and some noticeable omissions.

But - God be praised! - I found the greatest possible consistency, agreement
and concord. Indeed, what divinity could there be where the teaching is of
the one and only God, the Creator and Sustainer, and of Jesus Christ the Son
of God, the only Saviour, who according to promise presented himself as the
price of redemption for the elect and made full satisfaction, bestowing on them
His Holy Spirit to destroy the old nature with its lusts and to fashion the new
nature to that purity of life in which they can attain to eternal life?

9. When I had unlearned those primitive lies and had learned Jesus Christ who is
truth itself, I kept considering in my mind with what kind of service and
endeavour I could celebrate his holy name and thank him with the glory
and praise which he seeks from us in return for his supreme blessings to us. I
concluded that I could do nothing finer or more appropriate for my occupation
than to put into print the material from which his singular goodness and mercy
could be known. This knowledge of God's perfect kindness, so necessary for
salvation, can be found only in the Holy Scriptures, and in their purest and truest
understanding, which is best provided by the most faithful expositions of its
interpreters. It is in them that God most clearly discloses and reveals himself
for our comfort and salvation.

10. Therefore, since I had consigned to oblivion neither my responsibility to God
nor that earlier plan - which in fact I felt clearly developing and strengthening within
me, I made a start and created as the firstfruits this new Glossa Ordinaria,
drawing interpretations not only from the old doctors of the church but also from
those who in our present age daily preach Jesus Christ purely and sincerely
without corruption. Against the teaching of godliness in this work those ravening
wolves ought not to be howling or barking like rabid dogs. But let them shout
and bellow and protest as they will; against their will the Lord will disclose
himself more and more each day and subdue his enemies before the feet of his
Son.

11. I am well aware that the theologians, especially in Paris and Louvain, and
all who have been trained by these undying enemies of Jesus Christ, will condemn
these commentaries. They routinely condemn every book that mentions Jesus
Christ and especially the writers and interpreters who, enlightened and guided
by his Spirit, devote their elucidations to the increase of his glory and of the
purity of Christian living. But I consign these contumacious and rebellious
individuals to our God and Father and to his Son Jesus Christ, before whose
judgement-seat they will at some time soon be summoned and whose face they
will behold, on such terms that they will then be unable to bear the majesty and
severity as judge and avenger of the one they now reject, with the frightful
indignation and arrogance, as king and shepherd and teacher.

12. Indeed, these teachers will readily and gladly accept, instead of the pure
 teaching of Christ the Saviour, the teaching of that pernicious and godless
individual Francis Rabelais, an utter atheist, and his works entitled, no less
impiously than tastelessly, Gargantua and Pantagruel - except, of course, for the
passages where he insolently slanders their venerable persons. As for the
satires and mockeries - scurrilous and even execrable - in which he most
disgracefully and shamelessly rails at God and his Son Jesus Christ and his
Scriptures, their judgment about such utterances and godless humour finds in
them nothing evil or offensive and allows them even to read and hear them freely
for their mental dejection and pleasure. That this is their attitude can be easily
gathered from their total lack of effort or concern at any time to have his latest
book, in which this foulmouthed and blasphemous reviler acknowledges these
godless and blasphemous works as his own, burned along with its author. If he
had spoken about Jesus Christ purely and piously and seriously, as befits his
majesty, he would not [f. vii] enjoy this impetuosity and licence, but would long
ago have been reduced to ashes together with his books.

13. Such is the infamous religion of the venerable theologians and conventual
monks, the one imitating the fierce voracity of wolves, the others in their frenzy
surpassing even the savagery of rabid dogs. These firstfruits of a Glossa Ordinaria
would never have won their approval and acceptance, but only immediate and
totally unjust condemnation on no other ground than their right and true teaching
that Jesus Christ is the corner-stone. In this reconstruction and restoration of
the edifice of the church, he has so regained and repossessed the key topmost
corner position, from which he had been discarded by these master-builders,
that he will fall on their heads and utterly crush them, despite all their endeavours
and efforts to lead everyone astray, from the least to the greatest.

30. "qui retro affluant suo animis... inefficium. Armstrong renders 'who back there infect with
their breath' (205).

31. It is for this uncharacteristic outburst against Rabelais that Estienne's preface is best known;
see Armstrong, 1951: A. Leclerc, Rabelais et les Estéenne, in: Revue du science et de la
had earlier drawn on Rabelais for some of the definitions in his Dictionnaire francois-latin
(1549); R. Saincin, Le lecteur de Rabelais entre 1540 et 1549, in: Revue des études Rabelaisiennes
11 (1910), 139-140.

32. Rabelais', Tiers livre (1546).
are they so arrogant as to suppose that, in hatching and pursuing this godless and depraved conspiracy against the Lord, they will achieve anything more than their forefathers and mentors did - the schismatics, Pharisaees, Sadducees, Herodians and chief priests, in defiance of whom, though cruelly killed by them, Jesus Christ reigns and will reign perpetually? It should not astonish us if they devote all their efforts and energies to the single aim of preventing any mention of this teaching. They call it new, although it was found in every tradition and phase of antiquity. It seems new to them, of course - as it did to us too - because, after having been for long unknown to mankind and completely buried in gross darkness, it has now by God's matchless kindness been revived and renewed, so to speak, and has emerged to human recognition in brilliant light. Thus restored to its beauty, it deservedly appears different from its earlier disfigurement.

14. This teaching imparts nothing else than repentance and faith in Jesus Christ, the mortification of the flesh and renunciation of everything displeasing to God in the flesh and the world, and finally eternal life through the same Christ, which in this world we already lay hold of by faith and hope while we await that blessed resurrection of our bodies and perfect glory. This teaching - new and unfamiliar to them, yet not unheard of - can in no wise please them, whereas everything does which seems to conflict blatantly with it. Consequently it is not for their benefit that we have undertaken the labour of compiling these commentaries, but rather for those who long for Christ Jesus in true faith yoked with love and yearn for him, as the sole author of our salvation, with all their mind and heart. To him I pray repeatedly and fervently that he will soon dispatch those accused wolves and all the godless and blasphemous Rabeliansis, Satan's teachers, and eject them from his flock - which he will surely do at last when the time of the abominations and delusions they bring into the world has run its course. Meanwhile, by his most assured and just judgement, he allows them to reign in the midst of his people. Those who refuse to receive the teaching of truth are bound to believe the deceptive spirit of error, who, under the pretext of the name of Christ, teach that another than he is Saviour, and ["..."] mock the one who created them by whose power they are also preserved in this life.

15. To prevent the deception propagated in their false and impious teaching being recognized by the untutored and totally blinded populace, these impostors extort edicts from rulers sternly forbidding anyone to read the Holy Scriptures, especially in French. They have perpetually on their unclean lips that common blasphemy which calls the teaching of the gospel a kind of poison to the soul - and for them it is certainly a teaching that makes for death, but for believers who acknowledge Christ the Lord, for salvation and life. Thus they strive to ensure by every craft and cunning that the people should not discern and apprehend the falsity of their teaching - which can be detected and perceived only by reading Scripture, where salvation and eternal life are promised and guaranteed to us through Jesus Christ. He always directs all his believing followers to the same Scripture, so that on its basis alone they may grasp and recognize their salvation.

16. But I must return to my programme. It will perhaps seem strange that, in initiating this massive project of a Glossa Ordinaria, we have begun with those three Evangelists who on their own are apparently none too difficult for most to understand (and have not been badly understood), even without the provision of an exposition or explanation, so long as in them is sought Jesus Christ and the benefits he gains us by his death, resurrection and ascension to the Father's right hand. Yet readers will easily appreciate from merely perusing this volume the difficulty it has caused and the great benefit to be expected from reading it all through carefully and conscientiously. We have therefore put into people's hands these three Evangelists, elucidated and printed by us, as a kind of trial, submitting them to the church as a whole so that individuals can assess and determine whether the venture will carry some value or none at all. Thereafter, informed and guided by this experiment, we may embark on an undertaking likely to be more beneficial.

17. Moreover, since we had earlier published annotations on the Old Testament (which represented a start on this Glossa Ordinaria such as could be completed and produced at that time), we were keen to publish something similar, or better still, on the New Testament. In such a production none should expect that interlinear gloss which deceived many uninformed users, who were unaware how it was compiled, and still have no desire to know. Nor has it been our concern in this volume to cite by name the individual writers and interpreters from whom these expositions have been harvested, lest a variety of names distract the reader and especially since the authority of the Word does not rest in the names of those through whom the Lord has spoken but solely in a sound and true interpretation and explanation proceeding from the Spirit of God alone. Nor also was it our intention in undertaking this task to assemble in these

33. In his Responsorio Estense quotes the baren testimony of one Surbonne doctor: 'It astonishes me that these young men quote the New Testament at us: my word, I was over fifty before I knew what the New Testament was' (tr. Armstrong, 325). Cf. the proverbial ignorance of the bishop of Dunkeld: 'I thank God, that I never knew what the Old and New Testament was!' (D.F. Wright, The 'Commons Buke of the Kier': The Bible in the Scottish Reformation, in: Wright (ed.), The Bible in Scottish Life and Literature, Edinburgh 1998, 162).

34. E.g., the Edict of Chateaubriant of June 27, 1551.

35. Probably his Latin edition with ample annotations of Libri Megaliquinque (1541; Armstrong, 77, 121) and of the Psalms and Canticles (1546), rather than his Hebrew Old Testament of 1539-44 and 1544-46.
commentaries the opinions of all or many writers and to compare them. We have followed only the expositions which both lead straightforwardly to Christ, to whom everything must be directed, and [f. "iii"] fully agree with the whole of Scripture.

18. At the very time when I had begun to do the same for John's Gospel, there was handed to me and submitted for publication the commentary on that Evangelist written by John Calvin, 36 that most true and faithful minister of God and Jesus Christ his Son - most faithful, I say, and most diligent and zealous in seeking that his Lord be acknowledged and recognized in his church as Saviour and be accordingly treated with all honour and extolled by all. (I will not be deterred from declaring the truth about this faithful minister of Christ by the malevolence of spiteful persons to whom all the ministers of Jesus Christ are odious and despised - and even Jesus Christ himself accused! How can such people love his good and faithful servants when they do not love the Lord himself, but treat him with the bitterest hatred? How could they accept the Lord's conscientious and loving servants while rejecting the Lord himself and his Word, and most shamefully desecrating his supreme dignity and majesty? No blame, therefore, attaches to the finest and most faithful ministers when they incur hostility, hatred and an evil and undeserved reputation from persons who resist the reign of God's Son and on that account have a horror of his ministers.)

19. Since we had previously been helped by Calvin's very learned annotations and expositions of the three Evangelists, 37 we accordingly read also his manu-

36. Published by Estienne on December 31, 1552 (colophon, M.D.LIII. Prd. Cal. Ian.), or January 1, 1553 (colophon, M.D.LIII. Cal. Ian.). For the former, Parker, op. cit., 159, for the latter CO XLVIII, 9. The earlier date (sometimes misread as December 31, 1553) is found in the copies in the British Library and Cambridge University Library, the later in the two in Geneva and those in Harvard and Yale. A letter of Calvin to Ambrose Blarer of November 19, 1552, reported that Estienne had the commentary sub prelo (CO XIV, 413). H.M. Adams, Catalogue of Books Printed in the Continent of Europe, 1501-1600 in Cambridge Libraries, 2 vols., Cambridge 1967, places this and other productions of Estienne's Genevan years in Paris: cf. 1, 228, 11, 705-708, 783.

37. Annotationibus, atque lectionibus in tres Evangelistas. What were these? Calvin's commentary on his harmony of the Synoptic Gospels was first published, in both Latin and French versions, in 1555. Although preceded and in part, no doubt, prepared for by Calvin's (and others') expositions in the weekly Congregation, the Gospels Harmony did not appear on these occasions until 1553 (Parker, op. cit., 228; CO XXI, 76). In any case, while these expositions are appropriately described as lectiones, annotationes leads one to expect a printed, or at very least written, form. (Elsewhere in Estienne's preface it always denotes printed annotations.) Perhaps the punctuation should be given unusual weight, in which case 'Calvin's learned annotations' would be a general reference to his commentaries, but the lectiones on the three Evangelists would still speak of otherwise untested activity. There is no evidence of Calvin's preaching on these Gospels in the period between Estienne's arrival in Geneva and his Nova Glossa, nor indeed earlier (cf. Parker, The Oracles of God, script commentary on John and concluded that its composition displayed the thoroughness I was looking for. 38 It omits nothing germane either to an explanation by a careful and scholarly interpreter or to understanding John, that most attractive and serious and lofty Evangelist, but without superfluous verbiage, occasionally criticizing others' opinions and judgements with approval, occasionally citing others' opinions and judgements with approval, occasionally criticizing them with the utmost modesty when they seem to diverge noticeably from the writer's meaning.

20. So I have what previously I greatly wanted - commentaries by highly learned men excellently suited for the compilation and construction of this Gloss. I pray God that, just as he has met our aspirations in this beginning, so he may be pleased to prosper and help us in accomplishing and completing the rest. For our part, we pledge to this task the attentiveness that will overlook nothing requiring some explanation, not even the most minor conjunction like 'and, or, but', which often present great difficulty.

21. Meanwhile, reader, of you I earnestly and insistently beg that you carefully read these annotations or commentaries or Glossa Ordinaria - call them what you will - and cordially advise me of anything you come across which may be found wanting and can be improved or clarified. May you also ask God, the Father of all mercy, through Jesus Christ his Son, to guide our gifts by his Spirit, that we may be able to honour him purely and blamelessly in body and soul, and do such things as unceasingly serve his glory and praise and the advantage of his church.

Farewell. In the year 1553 after Christ's nativity

London 1947, 35ff., 160)

38. Several copies of the Nova Glossa are found bound up with Calvin's commentary on John (e.g. two in Geneva and four in Cambridge - UL, Gosville and Caius, Emmanuel, Peterhouse; the last two are not in Adams). These copies normally sandwich Osiander's Harmonia Evangelica between the two commentaries.
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An Anglican Evangelical journal for theology and mission
Martin Bucer (1491-1551)
in England

DAVID WRIGHT

On November 12, 1991, a special service in Great St Mary's, Cambridge, marked the quincentenary of the birth of Martin Bucer, Reformer of Strasbourg, father of Calvinism, and one of the earliest Regius Professors of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. To John Bradford, Reformer and martyr, he was 'God's prophet and true preacher', to Matthew Parker, later Archbishop of Canterbury, 'a singular gift of God, a treasure hydden, an incomparable ornament', to Martin Luther 'that chatterbox' (and much worse besides) and to Margaret Blaueur a dear 'fanaticus of unity' (the first 'ecumaniac'?). One whose 'remarkable piety and profound learning' produced, in Cranmer's words, 'not a transient but an everlasting benefit to the church' in England, merits some recognition on this half-millennial anniversary.

Yet at the same time, in the measured judgement of Professor Basil Hall in 1977, it would be difficult to say anything new about the influence Bucer exercised on the English Reformation. Bucer lived in England for less than two years—from April 24, 1549, to his death overnight February 28-March 1, 1551. These months have been thoroughly chronicled and catalogued by earlier investigators, especially Constantin Hopf (Hope) and Herbert Vogt.

Close concentration on this final span of Bucer's life has occasionally resulted in some loss of perspective, and an exaggeration of Bucer's impact in England. Can it be sustained that 'No professor ever taught at Cambridge for so brief a period and yet made so deep an impression'? He did not know

1 'The type of church which we call Calvinistic or Reformed, is really a gift of Martin Butzer to the world.... It is quite evident that the so-called Calvinist type of church organisation originated very largely in Strasbourg and in the mind of Butzer, whose ideas Calvin put into practice... during the years from 1538 to 1541, Calvin became in many regards Butzerian.... His views on predestination and on the Lord's Supper became more precise. In regard to these doctrines, he was, when he left Strasbourg, a pupil or follower of Butzer'. W. Pauck, The Heritage of the Reformation, 2nd edn, OUP 1968, pp 91, 93, 90.
2 However we ought to take the death of the Godly, a Sermon made in Cambridge at the burial of the noble Clerk, D. M. Bucer. London 1551, Ch. I, for the rest see the introduction to D. F. Wright (tr. and ed), Common Places of Martin Bucer, Courtenay Library of Reformation Classics 4, Sutton Courtenay, Appleford 1972.
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English, and although he preached in Latin with exemplary regularity, he was delighted when English-speaking preachers kept him out of the pulpit. Since they taught what they had learned from him, ‘He it was that spake and preached... in other men's persons.’ 4

For most of his short time in Cambridge, Bucer was 'paynfullly disquieted and broken with sykes'; 'his immoderate pains in the great rigour of the winter'—despite the stove translated by the generosity of Edward VI—almost certainly hastened his death. The domestic distractions of 'dailyly furnishing of his house and familie' added to his unhappiness. 5 Like Erasmus before him in Cambridge (who also complained of the cold), he was short of money—despite King Edward's trebling of the stipend granted by Henry VIII. There was much to remind him that he was an alien in exile. In his speech on receiving the University's Doctorate in Divinity, he referred to himself as 'an old, sick, and useless foreigner'.

Yet Bucer's time in England remains intrinsically important. He was after all the most substantial foreign divine (if we exclude Erasmus) to be recruited to the service of church reform in sixteenth-century England, challenged only by Peter Martyr in Oxford. His appointment to one of the regius professorships at Cambridge sealed the ascendancy of Protestant reform in the University. He had a significant hand in the revision of the 1549 Book of Common Prayer thus contributing to the 1552 Book which embodied the genius of Anglican Protestantism. 6 In Cambridge, Bucer taught and counselled the present and future leaders of the English Church, and in The Kingdom of Christ he reserved for almost his last publication his most comprehensive mature manifesto for the Christian Commonwealth which had been his goal for a quarter of a century in Strasbourg. 7 The University had been the nursery of the English Reformation and would therefrom, under Elizabeth, again be its most vital intellectual centre. Bucer could not have been better placed to bring his wisdom and experience and scholarship to bear on a

6 Parker, Howe we ought, C. ii.
7 Ibid., D. ii., vi., iii.,
8 The 1549 Book was itself indebted to the Cologne church order of 1543 (Engl. transl., A. simple and religious order of ecclesiastical government, of which was largely Bucer's work; see the little-known essay by Hopf, Lutheran Influences on the Bishops of England, in And Other Pastors of Thy Flock: A German Tribute to the Bishop of Chichester, F. Hildebrandt, ed., CUP 1922, pp. 1-70). Cranmer's copy of the Latin version Simplex ac pia delibem, Born 1545, is now in Chichester Cathedral Library; Cranmer Prima of All England. Catalogue of a Quincentenary Exhibition, P. N. Brooks, ed., British Library, London 1989, no. 61 (and 57 and 74 for other Bucerian items). On the Cologne book see Wright, Common Places, pp. 465f.
9 See the interesting comments of J. N. King, English Reformation Literature, Princeton University Press 1962, 277; on De Regno Christi (Kingdom of Christ). As a New-Year gift to Edward VI, it was a 'Protestant curtesy book' that ignored the traditional issues of court etiquette (p. 169). The book's discussion of comedy and tragedy contributed to the development of Protestant theories of their right use (pp. 272f). Bucer fused Erasmus's call for biblical preaching with Protestant theology. He warns that when crimes were portrayed, 'some dread of divine judgement and a horror of sin should appear in them: no exultant delight in crime, or shameless insolence should be displayed' (Kingdom of Christ II: 54; cf. W. Pauck, Melanchthon and Bucer, Library of Christian Classics 12, SCM, London 1970, p. 351).
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The Kingdom of Christ
Yet remarkably little of Bucer's corpus of writings was ever translated into English. The tally of Bucerian works translated into English in the period covered by Pollard and Redgrave's Short-title Catalogue is so trifling as almost to suggest deliberate neglect. 8 Even De Regno Christi (1550), which appeared in French in 1558 and in German in 1563, though written in and for England had to wait until 1559 for a complete English translation, by Wilhelm Pauck, who omitted the long section on divorce (chapters 22-46 of Book II) which John Milton had used in 1664. But it would be rash to conclude that precisely this part made available by Milton appealed broadly to English minds (although Bucer's stipulations may have influenced the divorce provisions of the Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticorum of 1634). Bucer's attitudes towards divorce and remarriage were too radical by far not only for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. 9 The liberalization of the late twentieth century makes him seem uncannily modern. He made daring use of texts such as Gen. 2:18 (11 it is not good for man to be alone) and 1 Cor. 7:2 (11 each man should have his own wife and each woman her own husband') to justify divorce whenever a marriage relationship had in practice broken down. And anyone who lacked the gift of living chastely outside marriage must be able to re-marry, regardless of whose fault it was that the previous marriage collapsed. Underlying this apparent leniency was Bucer's recognition that biblical marriage was a compact, which not infidelity could break. 10 Where its enjoyment was lost, divorce became necessary to enable it to be recovered, for solitariness was not 'good'.

The only other early translation from The Kingdom of Christ was of two chapters on poor relief. 11 Bucer's recommendations may have helped to shape English legislation on relief of poverty, although Hopf probably overstates the case. 12 Bucer proposed a ban on all begging, and indeed on all indiscriminate giving, i.e. private almsgiving. For the able-bodied poor work should be found, and if they shrank from labour they should be denied charity (cf. 2 Thess. 3:10). The poor who were unfit for work, on the other hand, should be maintained in an appropriate institution. Deacons were given a key role in monitoring the poor in the parish, and other officers should regulate the whole relief system. At his funeral, Matthew Parker bore

10 Howe we ought, Bb.
witness to 'his charitable importunity and counsayl', in frequently calling for adequate provision for the poor of Cambridge. 16

**Popular Piety**

The standard history by A. G. Dickens, *The English Reformation*, which appeared in a revised and enlarged form in 1989, continues to defy the trend that regards the impact of the Reformation on the people of England as slow, late, patchy and somewhat superficial. Dickens had earlier warned that scholars who seek an historical understanding of the English Reformation would be wise to think a little less about Bucer, Bullinger, and even Cranmer, and somewhat more in terms of a diffused but investigate Lollardy, reunited by contact with continental Protestantism. 17

Anne Hudson has recently pointed out how minds imbued with Lollard ideas would have received imported works of continental Reformers. One such was William Marshall's translation of Bucer's *Non esse ferendas in templis Christianorvm imaginis et statvs...* (1530): A treatise declaring & shewing dyvers causes taken out of the holy scripture, of the sentences of holy fathers... that pictures and images... ar in wise to be sufferd in the temples or churches of Christen men... (London, 1535). It reads, says Hudson, 'like any fifteenth-century tract from the unorthodox side of the images argument'. It illustrates the 'Lollardy' of 'Reformation' texts. 18

Protestant lay piety in England was partly shaped from 1530 onwards by selections from Bucer's *Psalmes* and *Gospel harmonies*, translated by George Joye, William Marshall and John Rogers and printed in the early English primers and psalters. 19 In these primers Bucer's paraphrastic harmonies of the four Gospels' accounts of Christ's passion and resurrection, published originally in his Latin *Commentary on the Gospel of John* (Strasbourg, 1528), became the first Gospel harmonies on these subjects to be printed in English. And a handful of distinctive Buceran renderings of the *Psalmes* persisted as far as the King James Version of 1611.

**Prayer Book Revision**

But Bucer's most lasting influence on English religion undoubtedly flowed from his part in the production of the 1552 *Book of Common Prayer*. At the request of Bishop Goodrich of Ely (not Thomas Cranmer, as is often asserted), Bucer compiled a detailed critique (Censura) of the 1549 *Book*. 20 Although as many of Bucer's proposals were rejected as accepted — and some of the latter were in any case urged by others like Peter Martyr (who

16 *Howe we ought, C. ii.*
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also drew up a *censura* 21 — nevertheless it cannot be denied that the second Edwardine *Prayer Book*, and consequently also the 1662 *Book*, bears many traces of Bucer's mind and hand, both in what it prescribes and in what it excludes. Omissions include the baptismal use of chrism, union and the blessing of the water, and in the *Communion* the signing of crosses over the bread and wine and references to the departed in the *Prayer for the Church* and to the ministry of angels in the *Prayer of Oblation*. Among Bucer's contributions, whether direct or indirect, are numbered the prescribed choice of lessons, the bishop's address and the questions asked of the candidates in the *Ordering of Priests*, in the *baptismal service parts* of the *initial rubric*, the opening *exhortation* and the *first two prayers*, the addressing of the questions to the godparents instead of the child and the location of the *whole action* at the font, and in the *Communion* the delivery of the *bread* into the hand and not the mouth, much of the *General Confession*, the *Comfortable Words* and parts of the *Prayer of the Whole State of Christ's Church*. Bucer was also responsible for a heightened emphasis on *congregational presence* and participation. 22

His suggestion, however, that the *Prayer of Humble Access* be said by the whole people was not incorporated. Bucer's orders for the visitation of the sick insisted that, whether or not they requested and received private instruction and comfort, absolution must nevertheless always be imparted to them as a corporate act of the Church and therefore not without the presence of the rest of the gathering to represent the Church of Christ, and only after a confession of sins has been publicly recited to them, and they have made a public petition for grace. 23

Such an emphasis expressed something of Bucer's fundamental commitment as a Reformer to the renewal of the Christian community.

The indebtedness of the revised *Prayer Book* to Bucer's contributions should not, however, be exaggerated. Samuel Leuenberger vastly overstates Bucer's role when he claims that the revised 1552 *Book* is 'scarcely imaginable without the proposals of Bucer... Surely it was through his participation that [it] developed into a book useful both to a congregation and for faith awakening.' 24

Leuenberger draws attention to several points in Bucer's *Censura* without demonstrating their impact on the revised *Prayer Book*. A new discovery may allow a more precise measure of Bucer's imprint on the *Book*. In a copy of the 1549 *Book* in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, Francis Higginson of Geneva has recently noted marginalia recording both the changes made in 1552 and the relevant advice in Bucer's *Censura*. It may yet prove


22 *Weight*, *Common Places*, p. 27.

23 Ibid., p. 437.

24 Archbishop Cranmer's *Immortal Request*. The *Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England*: An *Evangelical Liturgy*, Emden, Grand Rapids 1990, p. 47. Leuenberger illustrates Bucer's basic theology from his *Censura* of the 1549 *Book* (pp. 28-47), and characterises it as 'revivalistic' (pp. 85f) and hence close to pietism (pp. xxi-xvii).
Bucer, Cranmer and the Lord's Supper
In the second edition of his fine little book, *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist*, Peter Brooks highlights the successful opposition of Bucer's *Censura* to any notion of the consecration or sanctification of the elements. The revised *Book's* avoidance of such concepts should probably be viewed as one further evidence of the close affinity between Cranmer's and Bucer's understandings of the Lord's Supper. It is also borne out by their common insistence that the godless, as distinct from unworthy believers, do not receive the Lord's body and blood at the table.27

Past controversies have shown that the character of Cranmer's eucharistic doctrine is of more than scholarly interest. They have not only thrown up an extraordinary historical 'howler' but also betrayed an almost xenophobic suspicion of continental Reformation influences.28 The issue seems no longer to evoke such keen passions. The nature of Bucer's mature eucharistic views — during the months in England when he was in a position to influence Cranmer directly — is not open to doubt. This must be emphasized in the face of the stubborn persistence — in the 1989 edition of Dickens' *The English Reformation*, for example — of the story of Bucer's re-conversion to a Zwinglian understanding in the last months of his life. The only evidence, such as it is, derives from Bucer's critics and opponents.29 It collapses immediately when confronted by his aphoristic *Confession* on the eucharist written in late 1550, and by his further treatise on the sacraments left unfinished on his death (and, like the *Confession*, compiled in response to John a Lauso).30

The distinguished French Reformation scholar, François Wendel, regarded Bucer's 1550 *Confession* as probably the nearest of all his eucharistic writings to Calvin's position.31 This is yet another reason for quoting some paragraphs of this work.32

8. There is imparted and received in the eucharist when administered and received aright, that communion with the Father and the Son and with all the saints which is spoken of in the first chapter of this Epistle, and that unity with the Father, the Son, and all the saints which the Lord prayed for us in John 17, the unity whereby Christ is in us as the Father is in him, and we in them, Father and Son. Of this communion the Lord said also, 'He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood abides in me and I in him' . . . .

27 Ibid., pp 149f.
30 This treatise was published for the first time by J. V. Pollet, Martin Bucer: Etudes sur la Correspondance, avec de nombreux textes médiévaux, vol. 1, Paris 1958, pp 285-96.
32 Wright, Common Places, pp 388-98.
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19. So then, when we are treating of this mystery, whether of the eucharist or more generally of Christ's presence with us (for why should we not say he is present when he dwells in us and stands in our midst?), it is irrelevant to advance those passages of Scripture which assert that Christ has left this world and abides in the heavens, and as this man, possessing a real body and therefore a circumcised body, which cannot be dispersed in all or many places at the same time.
20. For the presence of Christ in this world, whether offered or attested by the word alone or by the sacraments as well, is not one of place, or sense or reason, or earth, but of spirit, of faith, and of heaven, in so far as we are conveyed therewith by faith, and placed together with Christ, and apprehend and embrace him in his heavenly majesty, even though he is disclosed and presented by the dim reflection of words and sacraments discernible by the senses . . . .
21. And when it is asserted that one cannot receive what one has already, and moreover that the person who approaches the eucharist not having Christ already in himself receives there not Christ but death, I think the reply is simple: Christ must be given and received by us until there remains in us nothing of ourselves, but he is all things in us, and there is wholly in him and not one whit in ourselves. For the communion of Christ that we have received by baptism is, we declare, strengthened and increased by the eucharist. But does this not happen also by means of the gospel when it is read and heard in faith? Indeed, it does, nor does the eucharist contain or confer anything extra, except that in it the visible words of Christ are used as well, and these are not devoid of effect upon the saints. For they are used by the ordinance of the Lord whose every word and ordinance is life and spirit . . . .
22. Since I am asked, therefore, who it is who gives and imparts the Lord's body and blood, that is, life-giving communion in them and in the whole Christ, I state that it is Christ, who is in the midst of his own and who spoke these words 'Take and eat'; he is the chief and effectual giver of himself, yet the minister serves as his minister for this imparting of himself, just as he does for that giving of himself which takes place through the gospel and baptism . . . .
23. But if I am asked about the use here of the bread and wine, my reply is that they are presenting signs whereby the Lord presents and imparts himself as bread from heaven, the bread of eternal life, in exactly the same way as he bestowed the Holy Spirit on the disciples by the sign of the breath of his mouth, and as he conferred healing of body and mind on many by the touch of his hand, and sight by clay made from spittle, and circumcision of heart by circumcision of the flesh, and regeneration by baptism . . . .
24. Accordingly, the Lord was pleased to use here these symbols of food and drink and to give his flesh to be eaten spiritually by means of the symbol of bread to be eaten physically, and his blood to be drunk spiritually by means of the symbol of wine to be drunk physically . . . .
25. If I am asked what conjunction can possibly exist between the glorified body of Christ in heaven — and at a particular place in heaven
and perishable bread confined to earth and to a discernible position,
I give the answer, the conjunction of a covenant, so that those who
physically partake of these signs with true and living faith truly receive
in a spiritual manner the strengthening and increase of communion in
the body and blood of the Lord, that communion whereby they are
members of Christ, flesh of his flesh and bone of his bones, to the end
that they may become more perfectly his members...
50. If I am asked in connection with the Lord's words 'This is my body',
what 'This' denotes here, I maintain that to the sense it denotes the
bread but to the mind of the body of the Lord, as in the case of every
term which presents insensible realities by means of sensible signs. So
this is the meaning: 'This that I give you by this sign is my body which is
delivered up for you'.
52. And so I consider it settled that in the eucharist three things are
given and received by those who rightly partake of the Lord's table:
(i) the bread and the wine, which in themselves are completely
unchanged but merely become symbols through the words and
ordinance of the Lord; (ii) the very body and blood of the Lord, so
that by their means we may increasingly and more perfectly share in
the imparting of regeneration — or, if you prefer, what we receive is
more perfect communion, or the greater perfecting in us of
communion, in the body and blood of the Lord; and hence (iii)
the confirmation of the new covenant, of the remission of sins, and
of our adoption as the children of God.
53. Together with Irenaeus I call the symbols an earthly reality, and
communion in the Lord and its effect, the confirmation of the new
covenant, I call a heavenly reality, and therefore one to be laid hold of
by faith alone, and not to be entangled in any conceptions drawn from
this world.
54. And because we are here not merely reminded of our Christ or of
communion in him but also receive him, I prefer to say, in accordance
with the Lord's words, 'Take and eat...', that by the bread and wine
the Lord's body and blood are given rather than just signified, and that the
bread is here a presenting sign of his body and not simply a sign.

This doctrine of the Supper has high claims to be regarded as one of the most
balanced biblical accounts of this storm-centre of inner-Protestant debate
given during the sixteenth century.

Bishops and Archbishops

Edward VI died two years after Bucer, and there followed the short-lived
Catholic revival under Queen Mary. Further effects of Bucer's sojourn in
Cambridge were inevitably delayed until the reign of Elizabeth, when
several of the reforming scholars he had attracted to his pattern of mediating
Protestanism became leaders of the English Church.33 His three executors
all became archbishops, Matthew Parker of Canterbury, Edwin Sandys of

33 C. Cross, Church and People 1450-1660, Glasgow 1976, p. 86.
He ended his days resisting demands for more drastic purification of religion from 'the Zurich people', represented variously by John à Lasco of the strangers' church in London and by John Hooper. His contribution to Anglican adiaphorism, both during the Edwardian vestments controversy and when strife recurred in the 1560s and again in the 1570s (when Whitgift quarrelled extensively from Bucer against Cartwright), has been ably charted. Against John Hooper Bucer refused to acknowledge that the disputed vestments were in themselves anti-Christian and could not be used piously by the pious. He did not concede the principle that precise scriptural warrant was required for all such usages. Rites and ceremonies which had belonged to the church from antiquity and could be preserved without detriment to true religion should not be abandoned. The church's liberty in such matters was not to be constrained.

Bucer knew how to commend reformed episcopacy with a range of vocabulary that could always draw the sting of the offensive term *episcopus*, and while rejecting any difference of order between bishops and presbyters.

Among the elders to whom ecclesiastical administration is chiefly committed, one exercises singular care for the churches... For this reason, the name of bishop has been especially attributed to these chief administrators of the churches, even though these should decide nothing without the consultation of the other presbyters, who are also called bishops in the Scriptures because of this common ministry... It is therefore necessary that bishops before all other ministers and caretakers of the churches... devote themselves totally to the reading and teaching of the Holy Scripture.

The practical, ethical thrust of Bucer's reformism helped to blunt the cutting edge of an insistence on the most rigorous application of the loftiest principles, while his passionate commitment to the 'common good' of the whole *respublica* warned against yielding to reformist sectarianism.

'Bucer was Bucer in Cambridge'

Matthew Parker believed that, for all his ailments and preoccupations, Bucer was at the height of his powers during his English period. After 'his traineryng with the best learned in Christendome', if Bucer was ever Bucer, certenly in my judgement he was Bucer in Cambridge: that is pithy in learning, and evident in order.

Order and facilitie have not been the most widely recognized qualities of Bucer's writings (Calvin commented that he does not know how to take his pen off the paper), but language narrowed his sphere of operation (in Strasbourg he had been a pastor) which in turn may have clipped his more normal effusiveness. Parker gives no impression that Bucer was ever relaxed in Cambridge; he may even have been holding himself in, as it were. For all his professed diligence in trying to capture the man, Parker had to confess: 'I could not say that as yet I ever knewe Bucer. He was not known by a daye or two, as most part of men maye sone be.'

Was this why Parker called him 'a treasure hyddon'? He has remained too long an unknown — and often misrepresented — Reformer. He deserves better, at least from a Church of England that is mindful of its Reformation heritage.

David Wright is Dean of the Faculty of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh.

The author's essay on 'Martin Bucer and England - and Scotland', forthcoming in the papers of the commemorative Colloque Bucer held at Strasbourg in August 1991, deals more fully with some topics noted in this article, as well as surveying other issues.

43 The Kingdom of Christ, II.12 (tr. Pauck, pp 284).
44 *Howe we ought*, C iii, D v; cf. D vii, 'in reeding and disputing, Bucer was Bucer'.
46 Ibid., D viii: 'His grauitie could not bere childish trifeling in weightie causes.' A. N. Burnett connects his various distresses at Cambridge with 'his increasingly strident...
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MARTIN BUCER AND ENGLAND — AND SCOTLAND

by

DAVID F. WRIGHT

Edinburgh

'Il serait difficile de trouver des choses nouvelles à dire sous l'influence que Bucer a exercée sur la Réformation anglaise' — the measured judgement of Professor Basil Hall in 1977.1 The exile from Strasbourg lived in England for less than two years — from April 24, 1549 to his death during the night of February 28-March 1, 1551.2 These twenty-odd months have been thoroughly chronicled and catalogued by earlier investigators — A. E. Harvey in 1906, Hastings Fells in 1931 in what is still the fullest life of Bucer, Constantin Hopf (Hope) in 1946 and Herbert Vogt in 1968, as well as by contributions from other Bucer experts such as François Wendel, Jean Rott and Pierre Franckel.

Intense concentration on this brief final span of Bucer's life has occasionally resulted in some loss of perspective, and an exaggeration of Bucer's impact in England. He did not know English, and he left adequate evidence of the unhappiness of his last years in a foreign land. He was repeatedly ill, felt the dank cold of the Cambridge fens very keenly (despite the two stoves — not one — acquired by the generosity of Edward VI), was short of money and pined for his beloved Strasbourg. A partial comparison with Erasmus's sojourn in Cambridge immediately suggests itself.

Yet Bucer's time in England remains intrinsically important. He was after all the most substantial foreign divine (if we exclude Erasmus) to be recruited to the service of church reform in sixteenth-century England. (No leading Lutheran theologian was brought to England — Cranmer had invited Melanchthon in vain — and Reginald Pole failed to find a comparable continental Catholic to strengthen the conservative reaction under Mary.) Bucer's appointment to one of the regius professorships at Cambridge

2. On the date of Bucer's death, see Hopf, Martin Bucer and the English Reformation, 28 n. 3.
(whose creation Erasmus had urged) signified the ascendency of Protestant reform in the University. His most lasting contribution was probably his part in the revision of the Book of Common Prayer, in which more than in anything else the identity of Anglican Protestantism has consisted ever since (until perhaps the last few decades). Bucer consorted closely, in life and in death, with the present and future leaders of the English Church, and in De Regno Christi he reserved for almost his last publication his most comprehensive charter for the republica Christiana which had been his goal for a quarter of a century in Strasbourg. There is no gainsaying the significance of Bucer's final efforts at reform of church and society, set as he was in the University which had been the nursery of the English Reformation and would thereafter, under Elizabeth, again be its most vital intellectual centre.

Town and Gown

At Cambridge Bucer occupied what was for him an unusually restricted position as professor of theology. In Latin he could preach as well as lecture to University audiences, but his lack of the vernacular tongue prevented him fulfilling the wider pastoral role of his Strasbourg years. It is, therefore, particularly noteworthy that contemporaries attested his concern for town as well as gown in Cambridge: he had 'a speciall eye or desier to the politique and Cristen order of the hole towneship in the respect of the civyll societie.' It was unusual for the funeral of a professor — especially a foreigner of less than two years' standing — to be attended by such crowds of townspeople as was Bucer's. Yet we know very little of his efforts in urban reform in Cambridge. Whether future research will throw further light on the subject is unlikely. Nevertheless we may envisage Bucer, while he compiled De Regno Christi with its detailed provisions for social renewal, incarnating his own programme as far as he was able, for example, in calling for adequate poor relief in the town as well as the University.

3 For the earlier indebtedness of the 1549 Book to the Cologne order of 1543 (ET, A simple and religious consideration... 1547), which was largely Bucer's work, see the little-known essay by Hopf, 'Lutheran Influences on the Baptist Services... of 1549', in 'And Other Pastors of Thy Flock': A German Tribute to the Bishop of Chichester, ed. F. Hildebrandt (Cambridge, 1942), 61-100. Cranmer's copy of the Simplex, apud delibaritino (Bonn, 1543) is now in Chichester Cathedral Library; Cranmer Primate of All England. Catalogue of a Quincentenary Exhibition... ed. P.N. Brooks (London, 1989), no. 61 (and 37 and 74 for other Bucerian items).

4 See the interesting comments of J.N. King, English Reformation Literature. The Tudor Origins of the Protestant Tradition (Princeton, 1982), especially 275-6, on De Regno Christi's contribution to the development of a Protestant theory of the 'right use of comedy'.

5 Cited from Matthew Parker's funeral sermon, where we ought to take the death of the godly, by Basil Hall, 'Martin Bucer in England', in a commemorative volume (1491-1991) to be published by Cambridge University Press.

One surprising circumstance warns us against overestimating the breadth of Bucer's appeal in England: little of his corpus of writings was ever translated into English. 'The tally of Buceriana translated into English in the period covered by Pollard and Redgrave's Short-title Catalogue is so trifling as almost to suggest deliberate neglect.' The inaccessibility of his writings, whose notorious longwindedness and convoluted style may well have deterred would-be translators, has led researchers to seek his influence in other directions, especially through personal relationships. Even De Regno Christi, which appeared in French in 1558 and in German in 1563, had to wait until 1969 for an English translation, by Wilhelm Pauck, who omitted the long section on divorce (chapters 22-46 of Book II) which John Milton had translated in 1644. But it would be rash to conclude that precisely this part made available by Milton appealed broadly to English minds. Bucer's attitudes towards divorce and remarriage were too radical by far not only for the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The liberalization of the late twentieth century makes him seem uncannily modern. The only other early translation from De Regno Christi was of two chapters on poor relief. Bucer's recommendations may have helped to shape English legislation on relief of poverty, although Hopf probably overstates the case.

The English Reformation and the Prayer Book

The study of the English Reformation — the context within which any evaluation of Bucer's role must be set — has advanced vigorously during the last two decades or so, but fresh currents have shifted the argument away from the public and official face of reform — Cranmer, the Book of Common Prayer and the work of imported theologians at the Universities. A collection of essays assembled by Christopher Haigh, The English Reformation Revised (Cambridge, 1987), finds no reason to mention Bucer at all, in its concentration on local reform, parish clergy, popular responses, anticlericalism and the persistence of Catholicism. The volume's title surely tilts at the standard account by A.G. Dickens, The English Reformation, which appeared in a revised and enlarged form in 1989. Dickens continues to defy the trend that regards the impact of the Reformation on the people of England as slow, late, patchy and somewhat superficial — despite his being accused by Haigh of presenting simply 'a highly sophisticated expe-
sition of a story first told by John Foxe in 1563. Yet even Dickens had earlier warned that

Scholars who seek an historical understanding of the English Reformation would be wise to think a little less about Bucer, Bullinger, and even Cranmer, and somewhat more in terms of a diffused but ineradicable Lollardy, reunited by contact with continental Protestantism.

Lollardy has attracted intense scholarly attention of late. Anne Hudson has noted the impact on the Lollard mentality of imported books by continental Reformers. One such was William Marshall's translation of Bucer's Non esse fereendas in templis Christianorum imaginis et status... (1530). A treatise declaring & shewing dyvers causes taken out of the holy scripture... (1535) reads, says Hudson, 'like any fifteenth-century tract from the unorthodox side of the images argument'. It illustrates the 'Lollardy' of 'Reformation' texts. Margaret Aston suggests that it may have been through Bucer that the English Reformers came to adopt that division of the Decalogue which warranted a total ban on images.

Protestant lay piety in England was partly shaped from 1530 onwards by selections from Bucer's Gospels and Psalms commentaries, translated by George Joye, William Marshall and John Rogers and printed in the early English primers and psalters. Hopf and C. C. Butterworth laid the groundwork in establish devotional manuals' indebtedness to Bucer. A new essay by Gerald Hobbs investigates the survival of distinctive Buceran renderings of the Psalms in English Bibles as far as the King James Version of 1611. If there were 'very few instances where the latter inherited a form attributable to Bucer', nevertheless he set in place 'a number of elements that... became constants of Psalms interpretation in English Protestantism for some generations'.

There is little new to report about Bucer's imprint on the 1552 Prayer Book. The literature thrown up so far by the 1989 Cranmer anniversary (more is on the way) has not changed the picture. Geoffrey Cuming did not vary his original assessment when he revised his standard History of Anglican Liturgy in 1982. In essence, the 1552 Book bears many traces of Bucer's mind and pen, both in what it includes and what it omits, but Samuel Leuenberger vastly overstates Bucer's contribution. A copy of the 1549 Book recently discovered in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris by Francis Higman of Geneva records both the changes made in 1552 and the relevant advice in Bucer's Censaurs. It may yet prove to have belonged to one of the revisers. The Ordinal of 1550 which was incorporated into the 1552 Book depended heavily on Bucer's De Ordinatione Legitima. Whether this treatise was composed in England or earlier, perhaps for Cologne, is not yet resolved.

Matthew Parker and Edmund Grindal

Bucer's death was followed two years later by that of Edward VI and by the short-lived Catholic resurgence under Queen Mary. It would not be remarkable if major Bucerian influences upon the English Church were delayed until the Elizabethan era, when to two of the reforming scholars he had closely associated with at Cambridge became Archbishops of Canterbury. Many leading Protestants fled from Marian England to continental centres where they learned of more drastic patterns of reform. The strains and conflicts that followed their return under Elizabeth were managed to a great extent by men like Matthew Parker, Edwin Sandys and Edmund Grindal, who had been schooled in principled but moderate reform in Bucer's company at Cambridge. Several of this circle had been members of Pembroke Hall, a college whose 'place... in the Edwardian Reformation has never been duly acknowledged'.
The Buceran formation of Matthew Parker's churchmanship has been variously estimated. The life by V.J.K. Brook (1962) gave it considerable weight, but a more recent attempt by Mark VanderSchaaf to demonstrate that 'Parker's policies as archbishop reveal a continual concern to establish a Bucerian discipline in the Church of England' is in my judgement unconvincing. On the other hand, we now have in the Opera Latina III (1988) Pierre Fraenkel's meticulous edition of the Florilegium Patristicum, whose Buceran base Parker so developed that Fraenkel presents it under both their names. It serves, I believe, to temper Patrick Collinson's stringent estimate of Parker's dependence upon Bucer.

Professor Collinson has in turn highlighted the Bucerian features of the archepiscopate of Grindal, partly as a consequence of identifying in The Queen's College, Oxford, Grindal's copy of the first edition of De Regno Christi (Basel, 1557). Grindal was not in the habit of annotating his books, but he inserted extensive underlinings and marginal notes on Book 2:12, on 'The Restoration of the Ministries of the Church'. Collinson identifies three main areas of activity in which 'Grindal appears to have acted, consciously, as a Bucerian': first, his pursuit of a via media in church-state relations, 'between Erastianism of the English type and the resurgent clericalism which would later develop within Calvinism'; second, his handling of the Puritans, with whom both Bucer and Grindal shared basic interests (e.g., Reformation as an ongoing refining process, a practical concern with abuses, a high moral tone, sabbatarianism but with whom both lost patience (e.g. Bucer with John Hooper in November 1550) when they insisted with scrupulous 'precision' on strict prohibition of certain ceremonial externals; and third, the pastoral and evangelistic priorities that Grindal, like Bucer, made central to the renewal of the ministry — which was itself the key to the renewal of both church and society.

Collinson's appreciation of Grindal's regard for Bucer's counsel extends even to critical decisions Grindal faced as an ecclesiastic. His rehabilita-
Here already we find almost the same characteristics of a rational and ethical religion from the ancient Stoic heritage as will later become common currency in the Enlightenment. So we find the same devaluation of everything cultic, which is peculiar to the whole of the Spiritualist tradition.  

— within which Reventlow places Bucer from the outset.

Such a presentation of Bucer shows how difficult it remains to capture him whole and entire. But my present concern is not so much with the accuracy of Reventlow's summary of Bucer's theology as with his claims for his longer-term influence on English thought. He unfortunately fails to trace the historically attested currency of Bucer's writings, which might map precisely the lines of contact between Bucer's corpus on the one hand and both Deism and the target of the Deists' protest on the other! More than indications of suggestive parallels or antecedents is called for if Reventlow's case is to earn a verdict more favourable than 'not proven'.

Scotland

I am on record as denying virtually all trace of direct Buceran influence on the Scottish church in the time of John Knox or on Knox himself.  

I am still unaware of any reference to Scotland in Bucer's writings, although he must have known something of Scottish affairs, perhaps through Alexander Alesius whom he met at the Regensburg Colloquy in 1541.  

In August 1549, Bucer's opinion was consulted about the problems thrown up by the betrothal of Mary Queen of Scots to the French dauphin, by a reforming Scottish laird from Ayrshire, Robert Lokhart, then in London on royal service.  

No reply from Bucer is extant.

In the absence of a synoptic survey of the links between Bucer and Scotland, we merely refer to some of the possibilities that such an account would have to consider. Within what later became a united kingdom, the nearest homegrown equivalents to De Regno Christi must be the First Book of Discipline of 1560 and the Second of 1578. At one point — on the role of the Christian magistrate — the latter is incontrovertibly dependent on De Regno Christi I.2  

James Cameron claims the same for a section in the First Book on the provision of schools, but the parallelism is not close enough to require dependence.  

Nevertheless, in several areas such as education — from primary schooling to universities — the role of deacons and the importance of discipline, as well as in their breadth of vision, the two books challenge comparison with De Regno Christi. In their educational programmes both the latter and the First Book of Discipline evince an idealism in their attempt to translate what was practicable at city level (Strasbourg, Geneva) on to a national canvas.

As a sequel to his edition of the First Book, Professor Cameron has argued for its indebtedness to the Cologne reform ordinances drawn up by Melanchthon and Bucer and translated into English as early as 1547. He identifies four topics on which Cologne influence is discernible — readers, superintendents, education and general assemblies. The probabilities could well be strengthened by adding evidence of other Scottish connexions with Cologne in this period.

If Bucer never mentions Knox (who was minister at Berwick during most of Bucer's time in England), Knox's History recorded the liberality of Edward VI towards refugees like Bucer.  

Bucer was cited against Knox by Maitland of Lethington in an Assembly debate on regime in 1564, and half a dozen of his works including De Regno Christi, were among the books of the Edinburgh lawyer, Clement Litill, which formed the nucleus of the library of the future University of Edinburgh in 1583. The legacy of the Strasbourger reformer continued to permeate and inform discussions, affirms James Kirk. More searching among book lists and extant copies will surely substantiate this judgement.

The way forward for research will surely be no different for England. The wider recognition of borrowings from Bucer's exegetical works may

24 Ian Hazlett suggests that the emphasis on discipline is Bucer's most likely mark on the Scots Confession; ‘The Scots Confession 1560: Context, Complication and Critique’, ARG 78(1978), 299-311.

25 ‘The Cologne Reformation and the Church of Scotland’, JEH 30 (1979), 39-64. See also Kirk, Second Book of Discipline, 5-8.


27 Ibid., vol.2, 121.

28 C. P. Finlayson, Clement Litill and His Library (Edinburgh, 1980), nos. 68(a), 69-71, 76(a).

29 On Litill see further James Kirk, Patterns of Reform (Edinburgh, 1989), 16-69.

30 Patterns of Reform, 95.

31 A copy of the Scripta Anglica that formerly belonged to James Melville (1556-1614), nephew and colleague of Andrew, found its way into Edinburgh University Library by the bequest of James Nairn; A Catalogue of the Library of the Revd. James Nairn (1602-1678), by M.C. T. Simpson (Edinburgh, 1990), no. 235. No works of Bucer are recorded in J. Durkan and A. Ross, Early Scottish Libraries (Glasgow, 1961).

32 I am indebted to Mr Marijn de Kroon of Münster for drawing my attention to the use made of Bucer by Adrian Saravia in his treatise on the eucharist, presented to James I e.1605 but first published by G. A. Denison, Saravia on the Holy Eucharist (London, 1855) Saravia (1530-1612) was a native of Flanders who settled in England in the late 1580s and was a close friend of Hooker and a translator of the AV. His treatise quotes from Bucer: (i) an extract from a letter of July 8, 1532, to Servetus (from Scripta Anglica, 612; letter edited in QGT VII,
have to await the appearance of new editions in the Opera Latina. It was the Scots writers C.G. McCrie in 1906 who credited Peter Martyr in Oxford and Bucer and Fagius in Cambridge with laying "the foundation of the exegetical and historical science of the Church of England". Only further investigation will vindicate — or disqualify — this tribute.

544–5, Denison, 34–5; (ii) an extract from the Proposiciones Novum de Sacra Eucharistica (1530; from Scripta Anglicana, 611), Denison, 34–5; (iii) the Dedication Epistle to Edward Fox, bishop of Hereford, from the 1536 Gospels Commentary (probably from the edition in Scripta Anglicana 676–81), Denison, 127–51; (iv) the Wittenberg Concord, Denison 122–5; Saravia's version is not the official Latin text published in Scripta Anglicana and elsewhere (see E. Bizer, Studien zur Geschichte des Abendmahlsstreits. Darmstadt, 1962, 96 n.1; WAB.I:12, 205–6) but derives from D. Chytraeus, Historia Augustanae Confessionis (Frankfurt, 1578), 630–1; Saravia found it 'in Actis cam Cinglianis', which is the title of this section (633–86) of the Historia. This alternative Latin version of the eucharistic concord is the work of the translator Chytraeus' book from the German, apparently unaware of, or unconcerned with, the approved Latin text which had already been widely published.
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What difference does it make to profess the study of the Old Testament in a distinctively Reformed context—compared with, say, an Anglican or a Lutheran or a Baptist one? This is a question on which the views of the distinguished honorandus of this volume would be at least doubly valuable. Not only did George Anderson teach for many years in New College, which is both the Divinity Faculty of the University of Edinburgh and, in an important if at times somewhat elusive sense, a Church of Scotland theological college, but also his own belonging to the people called Methodists will be certain to have sharpened his apprehension of the distinctives of the Reformed tradition. Perhaps in an era in which Old Testament studies, like nearly all the theological disciplines, have become irreversibly ecumenical and international—a development in which George Anderson has long been conspicuously active—the distinguishing features of a Reformed approach to the Hebrew Bible have ceased to be recognizable.

It was not always thus. All the leading sixteenth-century architects of Reformed Protestantism, whether Zwingli in Zürich, Martin Bucer in Strasbourg and Cambridge, Calvin in Geneva or Scotland’s own John Knox (who conceived of his calling as that of a non-writing prophet), possessed a strong sense of the continuity of the people and promises of God between the two Testaments, and of the abiding value of the earlier one within the Christian order. Of no one was this more true than John Calvin. He made the principal ‘use of the law’, by which he understood not only the Decalogue but ‘the form of religion handed down by Moses’ (Institutes 2.7.1), its role in teaching and exhorting ‘believers in whose hearts the Spirit of God already lives and reigns. For even though they have the law written and engraved upon their hearts by the finger of God,…they still profit by the
(written) law' in these two ways (ibid. 2.7.12). Calvin spelled out at length this evaluation of the Mosaic law—so starkly contrasting with Luther's—both in his expansive exposition of the Decalogue in the Institutes (2.8) and in his commentary on Exodus-Deuteronomy, for which he constructed his own masterly and intriguing harmony of the whole corpus of Pentateuchal legislation (Wright 1986; Parker 1986: ch. 4).

The prominence of the Psalter in the worship and piety of Reformed churches, even when it has not been the exclusive form of hymnody, is another measure of the tradition's identification with the church of Israel. It has been suggested that the Psalter's dominance derives in part 'from the underlying assumption that [the Psalms] are Christological in a thoroughly respect' (McKane 1984: 258), but Calvin in particular stands out among Reformation expositors of the Old Testament in the restraint of his Christocentric interpretation. Indeed, it would not be difficult to heap up citations attesting the merits of Calvin's commitment to the historical sense of Scripture and the abiding usefulness of his biblical commentaries. He certainly devoted an enormous amount of time and energy, especially in the last decade and a half of his life, to lecturing, preaching and commenting on the books of the Old Testament (Parker 1986, 1992). Not only did he lecture but also, it seems, preach (Parker 1992: 172-78) with nothing but the Hebrew text in front of him.

An illuminating recent essay finds Calvin in a decided minority—'perhaps, even, a minority of one'—when his treatment of the immoralities of the Hebrew patriarchs is compared with some twenty Fathers and other Reformers (Thompson 1991: 45; cf. Wright 1983: 465-67). He is almost alone in the relentless consistency with which he dismisses virtually all of the excusatory arguments advanced by other interpreters, and with some contempt. 'To excuse such misconduct, Calvin asserts, is somehow to impugn "the clear authority of Scripture"...it dishonors Scripture to read its silence as excusing the very sins which it elsewhere so loudly condemns' (Thompson 1991: 44). And as Calvin himself put it, generalizing as a pastor from these particular cases, 'whenever the faithful fall into sin, they do not desire to be lifted out of it by false defences, for their justification consists in a simple and free demand of pardon for their sin' (on Exod. 11.18; CO 24.19 = CTS 11: 35; cited Thompson 1991: 43). 'What the patriarchs require is far less a rationalization than simple forgiveness' (ibid.; cf. the related discussion of Calvin in Zagorin 1990).

Calvin's position here invites extended discussion, but a few comments must suffice. His rigorous biblicism forbids him invoking special divine dispensation for the patriarchs to lie or deceive when the text provides no evidence for it, or resorting to other devices for getting them off the hook that fly in the face of the simple clarity of Scripture. He thus displays a remarkable readiness to read the narratives just as they stand, while agreeing with most earlier and contemporary commentators that the patriarchal misdeeds set no precedent. It is particularly interesting that he seems to make little or no use in this context of any of the forms of accommodation which elsewhere assist him in coming to terms with unparalleled features of the Old Testament.

The recognition of the importance of accommodation in Calvin's theology as well as exegesis goes back less than half a century (Dowey 1952). Its full ramifications and roots still require extensive investigation. Scholars have been too ready to speak of 'the principle of accommodation' (ibid. 18; Battles 1977: 19; even Wright 1986: 36), whereas in reality, once we venture beyond the placid waters of the Institutes into the vast choppy sea of the commentaries on Scripture, what confronts us is more a handful of practices, whereby Calvin steers perhaps a not always wholly consistent course through the reefs and shallows of the Old Testament in particular. Or it may be, to risk a provisional judgment in advance of further published studies, that we should think in terms of a single hermeneutical tendency that finds expression in different, and at first sight not always compatible, ways.


4. Dowey (1952: 3) refers to accommodation as 'the process by which God
In the Institutes, Calvin lists five differences between the Old and New Testament, relating not to substance but to mode or form of administration (2.10.1). The second of these depicts the Old Testament era as the childhood of the church. Calvin takes his cue from Paul in Galatians 3.24, 4.1-2, and explains as follows:

It was fitting that, before the sun of righteousness had arisen, there should be no great and shining revelation, no clear understanding. The Lord, therefore, so muted out the light of his Word to them that they still saw it afar off and darkly. Hence Paul expresses this slenderness of understanding by the word ‘childhood’. It was the Lord’s will that this childhood be trained in the elements of this world and in little external observances, as rules for children’s instruction, until Christ should shine forth, through whom the knowledge of believers was to mature (Institutes 2.11.5; McNeill and Battles 1960: 1, 455).

The same image, likening the span from Abraham to Christ to a human life, even allows Calvin, prompted this time by Hab. 3.2, to speak of God’s people at that time being in mid-life, still to attain to adult maturity (CO 43: 566 = CTS IV: 137). The perspective is basic to one of the important contexts for divine accommodation: ‘he accommodated diverse forms to diverse ages’ (Institutes 2.11.13).5

Yet little in the Institutes prepares the student of Calvin for the not unrelated yet significantly different developmental scale that he frequently uses in the Old Testament commentaries. The dominant metaphor is not childishness or childishness, but rawness, primitiveness, crudity, even barbarity, not infancy but hardness of heart. Calvin acknowledges the presence in the Old Testament, especially in the Pentateuch and Joshua (he produced no commentaries on Judges to Job; sermons survive on 1 and 2 Samuel and Job but those on Judges and 1 Kings are lost), of not a little that his contemporaries would call barbaric and that he does not appear to hesitate so to call himself. We are reminded that his first publication was a commentary on Seneca’s De Clementia, and that he was profoundly shaped by his humanist education. In Calvin we meet a cultivated son of the renaissance who knew uncivilized rawness when he saw it, even in Scripture. He has different ways of coping with it, not all of which invoke a form of accommodation.

First and foremost, God was personally responsible for barbaric behaviour by his people on some occasions. When the Israelites, on capturing Jericho, destroyed every living thing in it, humans and animals alike (Jos. 6.20), the indiscriminate (promiscue) slaughter without distinction of age or sex would have been savagery (immanis) had not God instructed it. Although Canaan’s putrid obscenities merited purging, if the Israelites had on their own initiative slain tender babies (foetus) with their mothers, it would have been a deed of atrocious and barbaric ferocity (quod atrociet et barbarum barbarum) that innocent infants should be thus cruelly executed. ‘God even publicly inflicts punishment on children for their parents’ offences, contrary to what he declares through Ezekiel’. Although Calvin cannot, of course, accept that any who were innocent were killed, we can but submit in our ignorance to God’s incomprehensible wisdom (CO 25: 479-80 = CTS: 117).6

The ignominious execution of the five Amorite kings (Josh. 10.16-26) evokes parallel comments from Calvin in the light of their royal status. Because they had been elevated in sacram dignitatem by God (divinitus), it would have been barbarum atrocitas and monstrous arrogance to trample on their necks and hang them from gibbets without divine command. Again, like the young and old, women and babies massacred in the two earlier incidents, no doubt these kings deserved to die, but on a scale of justice that resided in God’s inescapable counsel and took no need of the humane conventions of warfare (CO 25: 502 = CTS: 158).

Calvin expresses himself even more vehemently on Josh. 10.40. ‘So Joshua subdued the whole region... He left no survivors. He totally

6. Cf. also the discussion of the vengeance threatened on animals, birds and fishes in Zeph. 1.3 at CO 44.5-6 = CTS IV: 188-89. The reason why God’s impenetrable judgment to extend destruction to them is disclosed to Judah lies in Judah’s numbness (torpeant... vel stupeant potius in sua sociordia) which called for violent disturbance.
destroyed all who breathed, just as the Lord, the God of Israel, had commanded:

Had Joshua of his own accord raged with indiscriminate fury (promiscue saevitiae) against women and children, no excuse could have freed him of execrable savagery (detestabilis immanitas), the equal of which we do not read of even among wild tribes living almost like beasts. But what otherwise would horrify everyone they must reverently accept as issuing from God (CO 25: 505 = CTS: 163).

And if we judge at least the bairns and most of the womenfolk to be guiltless, 'let us remember that the court of heaven is not one whit subject to our laws'.

The examples we have cited have so far all been taken from the Joshua commentary, which Calvin worked on to the very last days of his life.7 But we should not imagine that we have encountered only an untypical Calvin, soured by advancing pain and incapacity. In his lectures on Ezekiel, he explains that 'our prophet was not a barbarian (homo barbarus), driven by indignation to vomit out coarse reproaches (atrocius evomeret convicia) against his people, the Spirit of God dictated what might seem too harsh for tender and sensitive ears'. Though often savage and fierce (saevit et atrocos) of speech, the prophets breathed pure humanitatem at heart (CO 40: 71 = CTS I: 122). Or again, in the extermination of the peoples of Palestine decreed in Deut. 20.16-18, 'an exception is made to prevent the Jews applying the common laws of war to the Canaanite nations. God not only armed the Jews to wage war on them but appointed them the agents and executors of his retribution' (CO 24: 632 = CTS III: 53-54).

What is remarkable about this last citation is that it follows immediately on an endorsement of the received terms of the 'just war' (with a reference to Cicero), which justifies Calvin in criticizing the 'concession' given to the Israelites in Deut. 20.12-15—to kill all the males without exception in other cities—as 'conferring too great a license'. The passage is worth quoting at length, because it takes us on to the next stage in our argument, in which, far from God shouldering the responsibility for his servants’ barbaric actions or words, Calvin finds fault with what God commands or allows the Israelites as excessively barbaric.

Since pagan writers order even the conquered to be spared and teach that those who lay down their arms...should be accepted,...how does God, the Father of mercies, sanction indiscriminate (promiscuits) carnage?... More was conceded to the Jews in regard for their hard-heartedness than was justly lawful for them. Certainly by the rule of love, even armed men should have been spared if they threw down their swords and craved mercy; at any rate, it was not lawful to kill other than those captured armed with a sword. This authorization to kill extended to all males thus falls far short of perfection. But since in their ferocia the Jews would scarcely have tolerated a prescription of unqualified justice, God at least determined to curb their indiscretion from descending to the extremes of cruelty... This much savagery was checked, that they should slay neither women nor children (CO 24: 632 = CTS III: 53).

We will return to the question why Calvin differentiated so sharply between parallel commands of God within this single passage in Deuteronomy 20. Meanwhile, further illustration is needed of God’s excessive accommodation, in Calvin’s judgment, to human barbarity.

After Ai was taken, Joshua hanged the king’s body on a tree for a day before casting it down before the city gate (Josh. 8.29). Calvin thinks that Joshua faithfully observed the Mosaic regulation of Deut. 21.23, on which he comments: ‘Lest the people become accustomed ad barbariam, God allowed criminals to be hanged, provided they did not hang unburied for more than one day’. Nor does Calvin so interpret the verse that Joshua was guilty of savagely (immane) exposing the body to be torn by animals and birds (CO 25: 487 = CTS: 130). On the other hand, the provision in Num. 35.19, 21, 27 for ‘the avenger of blood’—normally a close relative—to execute the murderer outside the cities of refuge ‘smacks of barbarity (barbariam saperet)’. Indeed, so ‘absurd’ was this relaxing of the reins for the satisfaction of blood-lust that Calvin doubts if it ever had divine approval. The apparent authorization should really be read as a warning, that unless the innocent are protected, the anger of the relatives of murder victims will be uncontrollable. Calvin wriggles uncomfortably to evacuate this concession to barbarity of its offensiveness (CO 24: 639 = CTS III: 64-65).

Calvin took a close interest in the Mosaic legislation concerning slavery. The stipulation in Exod. 21.1-6 (which is separated from its sequel in Calvin’s harmony), that, if a Hebrew slave had married and had children during his six years’ service, they could not accompany

---

7. French and Latin versions were published—in that order, it seems—soon after Calvin’s death by Beza, with his first sketch of Calvin’s life. I have used the Latin version, since this is the one included in the Corpus Reformatorum. See CO 21:5-10; Parker 1986: 32-33.
him on his release, revealed the intractability of the Israelites’ ‘servile condition’ (cf. Gal. 4). It could not be regulated sine prodigio, ‘without this monstrosity’—a word which the next sentence shows that Calvin meant strictly:

For nothing was more contrary to nature than for a husband to forsake his wife and abandon his children and move elsewhere. But the bond of slavery could be dissolved in no other way than by divorce, that is, by this godless violation of marriage. There was then in this tearing asunder truly gross barbarity.

This perversion has to be counted with the others which God tolerated ‘because of the people’s callousness, which was almost incorrigible’ (CO 24: 700-701 = CTS III: 160). When he deals elsewhere with Exod. 21.7-11, Calvin is again reminded ‘how many depravities had to be permitted in that people’. For fathers to sell their children to relieve their own poverty was ‘utterly barbaric’ (CO 24: 650 = CTS III: 80-81).

We move on to note more briefly a third category of material, in which Calvin discerns God setting bounds or restraints on Israelite rawness or barbarity. This is how the Joshua commentary views the renewed instruction to appoint cities of refuge (Josh. 20). Unless this remedy had been provided, the kindred of those who were murdered would have doubled the evil by proceeding without discrimination (promiscue) to avenge their death (CO 25: 545 = CTS: 239). In rather starker terms, Calvin asserts that for the drinking of the blood of a brute beast to be atoned for by the death of a human being was quite incongruous, but such a form of paedagogiam (cf. Gal. 3.24) was essential for this rudi populo, to prevent them descending ad barbariam (Lev. 17.10-14; CO 24: 619 = CTS III: 31). And we have already cited Calvin’s comment on the law that allows victims of execution to hang unburied until sunset.

Calvin interprets the legislation in Exod. 21.10-21, on a master’s violence against slaves, with considerable subtlety. On the one hand, he applauds the absence of discrimination between the penalties for murdering a slave and for murdering a free person. It was savage barbarism (immanis barbariae) among the Romans and other nations to grant a slave-owner the power of life and death over slaves. But on the other hand he is troubled by the apparent serious injustice that the master goes unpunished if the slave survives injury for a couple of days; Calvin’s Latin translation of the beginning of v. 21 is:...si per
diem vel duo dies steteri, literally, ‘if he stands for one day or two’. Eventually Calvin satisfies himself that this clause means that the slave was sound and whole in every limb, and that no yawning license for murder with impunity has been opened up (CO 24: 624-25 = CTS III: 40-41).

This is not by any means the only place in the commentary on the Mosaic harmony where Calvin’s exegesis, normally so respectful of what the text does or does not say, reaches a strained conclusion because to do otherwise would countenance something patently unacceptable. A good example is Exod. 21.22-25, concerning a premature birth resulting from accidental injury to the mother. Calvin’s translation, it must be noted, makes death the outcome that may or may not ensue. His problem is that the passage appears to punish only the mother’s death, and not that of the foetus, ‘which would be a great absurdity. For the foetus enclosed in its mother’s womb is already a human being, and it is quite monstrous (prodigiosum) for it to be deprived of the life it has not yet begun to enjoy.’ He cannot avoid concluding that the proviso ‘if death ensues’ must extend to the foetus no less than to the mother.

Calvin’s dilemma here is not untypical of his response to numerous aspects of the early books of the Old Testament. Too often what he finds is inconsistent with an external objective standard of measurement which he calls ‘equity’ (aequitas), a compound of natural law, the law engraved on the human conscience and ‘the law of the nations’ (lex gentium). The Decalogue is its perfect expression—hence Calvin’s embarrassment at discovering features of the ‘political laws’ of Moses which fall short of ‘equity’ and even of the law codes of pagan peoples such as Rome. It is in such a context that he repeatedly brings into play the device of God’s accommodation to an intractable people. God was unable to enact ceremonial, political and judicial legislation that in every case embodied the perfection of the Decalogue itself. And the reason was the resistance offered by the obstinacy or torpor or blindness of the chosen people (Wright 1986). The Institutes censured the ‘barbaric and wild laws’ of other nations that failed to conform to the perpetual principle of love and were abhorrent to all justice, humanity and peaceableness (Institutes 4.20.15). What is missing in the Institutes, in its recognition that every nation was free to frame its own ‘judicial laws’ to give expression to the perfect moral law, is any hint that not all of Israel’s laws come up to this standard. For this one
needs to turn to the commentaries of Calvin.

Sometimes what is there condemned is unwarrantable leniency, as in Calvin's amusing verdict on Exod. 21.18-19 (CO 24: 622-23 = CTS III: 39-40). But normally the concession is in the direction of a materialism or crassness or superstition that respected the limited capacity (captus) of Israel to receive the Lord's full demand. As we have seen, Calvin from time to time depicts this interaction as one between God and barbarities. (Calvin seems to have no single word to represent the opposite of barbaries in his thinking, unless it is humanitas.) Sometimes the Mosaic law restricts the scope for barbaric behaviour. On other occasions, as we have seen, God commands or allows something barbaric which Calvin disapproves. Probably in a majority of cases, often without the language of barbarity being present, a mixture of these last two motifs is at issue. That is to say, God reaps in his people's indiscipline or license, but imperfectly, leaving in Calvin's eyes some undesirable concession. A notable instance is his sharp critique of the provision for divorce in Deut. 24.1-4 (CO 24: 657-58 = CTS III: 93-94).

At this point we must ask how we should view the vocabulary of barbarity. In particular, is it more than a metaphor? After all, the pope is condemned for barbaries in allowing children to marry without parental consent (on Gen. 24.3; CO 23: 331 = CTS II: 14), and 'to feel no sadness at the sight of death is more barbaries and stupor than bravery of spirit' (on Gen. 23.2; CO 23: 322 = CTS I: 578). A rhetorical usage is certainly present in Calvin's writings, and the current fashion that fastens on rhetoric as the hermeneutical key to unlock the Calvinian treasure-chest, enabling his theology to be described as 'rhetorical theology' (Bouwsma 1986), may yet cast light on it. Yet it must be a priori highly improbable that the humanist education that made Calvin such a consummate scholar left him with a solely metaphorical notion of barbarity.

In any case, internal considerations make it inescapably clear that Calvin was thinking of the mores of an uncivilized, primitive people. The Latin term barbaries belongs to a group of words that he uses to characterize the religious and moral crudity of Israel. The most prominent is rudis (and rudimenta) and crassus is also common, while the comment of Jesus on divorce provides durites, 'hardness', and cognates. We have noted some other terms earlier in this chapter. Without attempting to be exhaustive, I should mention Calvin's fondness for words that express insensitivity, unresponsiveness, thickness, such as stupor, torpor, socordia, hebetudo, and the related emphasis on obstinacy and contumacy.

There is, of course, some overlap with the language of infancy, through puerilitas in particular, but also inevitably with rudimenta and elementa. But it is unmistakable that Calvin's language in portraying the intractability, recalciience and sheer rawness of Israel goes well beyond what 'the infancy of the church' would lead us to expect. The human condition to which divine limitation corresponds quite often in the Old Testament commentaries is worse than restricted capacity (for milk only, not meat; cf. 1 Cor. 3.2), elementary mentality, ignorance, fickleness, even stubbornness—which are all predictable of the child. To the images of the human being highlighted by Battles—child, schoolboy, invalid, frail creature (Battles 1977: 20, 27-32)—we must add the brute, the primitive, the savage. This will correct the imbalance in the direction of recipient passivity that has tended to distort presentations of God's ' ... Accommodating Himself to Human Capacity' (Battles 1977). Above all we must avoid any cross-contamination of the concept of the church's Israelite infancy by the language of the nurse's baby-talk (balbutio) used by Calvin and others before him in this context (Institutes 1.13.1; OS III: 109).

What a concentration on depictions of human grossness and barbarity brings into sharp focus is the resistant nature of the human material God had to work with. To the fore here is not the finite creature but the perverse sinner—variously pig-headed, leadenly sluggish, aggressive, rapacious, pertinaciously obtuse, almost unmanageable. Thompson concludes his survey with the verdict that 'Calvin's judgments of all the patriarchal misdeeds studied are significantly harsher than those of his predecessors and contemporaries' (Thompson 1991: 40). When the revealing and teaching God tempers (attempero) himself to this humanity, the result, as we have seen, is sometimes a wrong, rather than a partial or imperfect, portrayal of his will.

8. In the 1559 Institutes alone, the usage of the barbar- word-group (now easily surveyed using Wevers [1992] ranges from the polemical (e.g. 4.10.1, 16.10, 20.1) to the strictly historical (4.4.13, 11.16) to what might be called the socio-cultural (e.g. 2.10.11, 3.4.24, 4.20.15).

light that has since shone on his writings, he deserves greater credit than Grieve implies, both for historical perspectives that, long before post-Darwinian notions of ‘progressive revelation’, gave remarkable weight to cultural, social and religious development in Israel, and for theological perspectives that did not discriminate against earlier ages as the recipients of only a partial self-disclosure by God. Calvin’s flexible, self-adapting God did not reveal himself in escalating stages, but was ever giving himself wholly as far as the people could bear.
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AUCTORITAS PATRUM
CONTRIBUTIONS ON THE RECEPTION
OF THE CHURCH FATHERS
IN THE 15TH AND 16TH CENTURY
GEORGE CASSANDER AND THE APPEAL TO THE FATHERS IN SIXTEENTH-CENTURY DEBATES ABOUT INFANT BAPTISM

The subject is an ideal one for a symposium on the church Fathers in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Infant baptism was the weightiest constitutive feature of the old church that the magisterial Reformers perpetuated on the basis of tradition rather than explicit scriptural authority. Luther’s preservation of private oral confession, similarly without clear biblical warrant, was of less fundamental significance for the ordering of the reformed church than the continued practice of baptism the new-born.

The issue remains a live one today, biblically, historically, theologically, ecumenically. Since the sixteenth century, the Anabaptist protest, so despised in its day by Catholics and Protestants alike, has won respectability, ecclesiastically and probably confessionally also. If no consensus yet obtains about the origins of infant baptism, the influential Faith and Order report ‘Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry’ captures the state of the debate with fine precision: ‘While the possibility that infant baptism was practised in the apostolic age cannot be excluded, baptism upon personal profession of faith is the most clearly attested pattern in the New Testament documents.’

A growing majority of scholars probably inclines to side with Kurt Aland in his celebrated dialogue with Joachim Jeremias, but Aland’s position - that infant baptism was not apostolic and not practised until shortly before the end of the second century but is nevertheless rightly and properly practised today - would have found no supporters in the sixteenth century. Too much was at stake for either Catholics or Protestants to opt for this theologically sophisticated stance. Paradoxically, as we will see, Menno Simons could accept that infant baptism began in the time of the apostles without feeling bound for that reason to approve of it - for it was not instituted by the apostles themselves.

3 ‘... the practice of infant baptism today can claim that it fulfils in a new time and in a new way what took place in early times in a different manner ... it is possible for us to keep on making renewed efforts to realize the demands of the New Testament. According to the presuppositions that we share, the practice of infant baptism today belongs to that category.’ Kurt Aland, Did the Early Church Baptize Infants? London 1963, 113-114.
By comparison with the Lord's Supper, the history of baptismal controversy in the Reformation remains relatively neglected. (The same could indeed be said of the whole span of church history.) For the arguments between Anabaptists and magisterial churchmen, whether in the old church or the new, we lack the equivalent of Walter Köhler's classic survey of the Supper-strife. The discussions in the sources are often brief and occasional, as well as widely dispersed. This present essay claims no more than to review some aspects of the debates about the bearing of the patristic evidence on the status of infant baptism.

1. George Cassander's Testimonia

Our starting-point is a work published at Cologne in 1563 by George Cassander (c.1513-1556), the irenic and Lutheran theologian, entitled De Baptismo Infantium, Testimonia Veterum Ecclesiasticorum Scriptorum. Cassander has attracted the greatest interest for his persistent efforts to reconcile Catholics and Protestants, but he is in need of a critical biography and a comprehensive theological assessment. Little attention has been paid to Cassander's engagement with Anabaptists, to which his Testimonia on infant baptism belongs. It has not been previously noticed, for example, that the text of the Testimonia reprinted in Cassander's Opera Omnia in 1616 is an expanded version of the 1563 original.

4 Zwingli and Luther. Ihr Streit über das Abendmahl, (FQRG 6 und 7) Leipzig 1924 and Gütersloh 1953.


7 Cassander, Opera Omnia, Paris, 1616, 688-689. The 1653 edition also lacks the "Appendix de Autorum Ecclesiasticorum Apostolicarum e Tertulliano". (1616, 599-790), as well as his De Baptismo Infantium, Doctrina Catholicae Ecclesiae, Divinarum Literarum Testimonia Explicata, which follows it in the Opera Omnia (701-779) and is often regarded as part of the same work, e.g. by Polman, L'Elément Historique, 385 n.2. It was first published quite separately in 1556.

The two editions will be cited here as Testamentum 1563 and Testamentum 1616. I am grateful to the Master and Fellows of Trinity College Library, Cambridge, for permission to quote from a microfilm of the 1563 edition in the College Library. I am also grateful to Dr. Frank Stubbings, Honorary Keeper of Rare Books in Emmanuel College Library, Cambridge, for supplying me with a photocopy of part of a second 1653 edition of the Testamentum (recorded by Herbert M. Cassander). Cassander's collection and discussion may represent the earliest attempt in the sixteenth century at a comprehensive treatment of the evidence to be garnered from the Fathers. He had compiled the collection as part of his recent success in attempting to convert to a sound mind a prominent Anabaptist (quidam inter professor et docentes huic erroris extus) held in custody in arce Clervorum. Now, in response to wider demand, Cassander published it, prefaced with a clarification of the authority of the consensus of the early church conveyed by the testimonies, which in turn are followed by a further discussion of the authority of the universal practice of baptizing infants.

Cassander's witnesses are restricted to Fathers who flourished within three hundred years of the death of the last apostle, John, i.e. up to A.D.400. (The dates given in the margin are calculated on this basis, which has the curious effect of making them all seem a hundred years earlier.) Cassander largely observes his own limit, but Leo I is included, along with Theodor of Cyrillus (only in the 1616 edition) and of course the last Augustine in extent.

Adams, Catalogue of the Books Printed on the Continent of Europe 1501-1600 in Cambridge Libraries I, Cambridge, 1967, 247 no. 340. In this printing, the text has been reset from the original, (as of dates, as differences of spelling, abbreviation etc. make clear), and at the end Cassander has added (after recovering from illness, as he says in a note at sig. Gv) not only errata (which are listed at sig. Gv in the first printing) but also the interpolations which are identifiable in the 1616 edition, as sigs. Gv - Hl. He also now gives the Appendix from Tertullian which appears in 1616 (sig. Hl - Hf). The new text of sigs. Gv - Hf already incorporates the additions (two only, but one of them lengthy) relating to this section of the work. In this article all references are to the original 1606 edition.

8 Testamentum 1616, sigs. Bt - 2; Testamentum 1616, 673-674: "...ingenuus confessus est, quae hanc tum Ecclesiae consensum magnificare, sequaco tam concordi veterum Ecclesiasticorum scriptorum consen consecutam plurimum commovere... Quare impune huomodi testimonia sibi exhibebat portavit, quibus inexpertis, et qua pollet ingenii perspicacitate diligentiter exploratis, opiniones suae pravae tuae scripturae intellectu haustum, cum universali hac et perpetuo totius Ecclesiae sententia haud difficiliter commutari, utque, ut hanc errorem com nonnullis in sedes sacra eiusdem oppidi Clervorum, frequentissime populii concionem damnaverat... Haec autem res... occasionem dedit hospes testimonia colligendi... The Anabaptist's question is identified by Rembert, Die "Wiedertäufer", 277-287 (citing Hermann Heinemann, Opera Genealogico-Historica, De Westphalia et Saxonia Inferiori... Leipzig, 1711, 101) as Johannes Campanus (on whom see Rembert, 160-302; MennEnc I, 499-500; MennEnc I, 1913, 317-324; Williams, Radical Reformation, especially 272-273, 309-311, 457-459), the year 1563 (but Cassander had discussed with Campanus the previous year also) and the place Schloss Angermund, between Duisburg and Kaiserswerth.

Cassander's summary of similar discussions with one Johannes Kremer a Castorp in July 1558 in arce Dinslachon (Dinslaken, a few miles north of Duisburg) includes a similarly successful outcome but a less prominent, not less insignificant, role for the appeal to the universal consensus of the early church (Acta Colloqui..., Opera Omnia, 1227-1324; cf. III, i, 1985). Better known are Cassander's conversations with Mathias Servaes in Cologne in July 1565 (Acta Colloqui..., Opera Omnia, 1234-1240; cf. III, ii, 1203-1204).

9 Cum autem haec testimonia a nonnullis expetuerunt, versus quidem non absurde sunt, si in publico etemetur. Testamentum 1616, sig. Bt; Testamentum 1616, 674.

10 Testamentum 1616, sigs. Bt - C; Testamentum 1616, 675-681.

The keenest interest attaches to the testimonia of the pre-Nicene era. They are seven in number:

1. *Irenaeus*: Christ came to save all *qui eram reasensibatur Deum, infantibus et parvoles, et pueros, et seniorem*.

2. *Tertullian*: not from *De Baptismo* (which, although best known for its advocacy of the deferment of baptism, reveals that some infants were being baptized), but from *De Anima*, a passage that stresses only the necessity of baptism for adults.

3. *Origen*: three extracts, two from homilies assuming the practice of paedobaptism, finding its justification in the sinfulness of babies and citing *Job* 14:4f. LXX, and a third from the Romans commentary, which also asserts the apostolic origins of the tradition (*Ecclesia ab Apostolis traditionem suscipit, etiam parvulis baptismum dare*).

4. *Dionysius (the Areopagite)*: Cassander’s Preface has already explained this position for a passage from the *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*: *Primum quidem locum debetur Dionysio, qui si Areopagitam ille est, Apostolorum synchronus fuit, utpotest Apostoli Pauli discipulus, sed quia de eo inter doctos ambiguitat, Origin illum subieci, iis concedens, qui illum Clemente Alexandrino post limo fuisse suspicantur*.

5. *Cyprian*: the famous letter to *Fidus*, in which *Cassander* adds a comment by Augustine in a letter to Jerome.

When compared with the list given by Jeremias in his monograph of 1958/1960 (of which Charles Francis D. Moule once said that he provided at least all the evidence), Cassander’s collection is limited partly by availability of material but also partly, we must judge, by modesty. He has not cited, for example, the references to the *Martyrdom of Polycarp* and Justin Martyr to those who had been Christians from their early years. The prize witness he could not have

12 Testimonia 1563, sigs. D1r-4r; Testimonia 1616, 682-684. The two editions do not differ at this point.


14 Tertullian, *De Anima* 39,3-40,1; not in Kraft, who includes selections from *De Baptismo* (and *De Paenitentia*; no. 13).

15 Testimonia 1563, sig. B2r; Testimonia 1616, 682. The texts are: Comment. in Epist. ad Romanos 5,9 (Kraft, no. 12(b)), in Lucam Homil. 14 (not in Kraft, perhaps because it adds nothing to the next), in Leviticum Homil. 8,3 (Kraft, no. 12(b)).


17 Cyprian, *Epistle* 64,2,3,5 (Kraft, no. 19(d)); Augustine, *Epistle* 166,8,23.

known is the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus. He does not mention the inscriptions, but one wonders in any case whether he would have counted them among the testimonia patrum.

The post-Nicene witnesses are of course more abundant but they need not detain us at this stage. In the discussion of the *auctoritas* of *the universal custom of baptizing infants*, which follows the testimonia, Cassander shows his awareness of other patristic evidence which he has not included in the testimonia proper. He knows, for instance, from Tertullian (*De Baptismo of course*) and Gregory Nazianzen that some Fathers counselled the delay of baptism to *aetatem paulo prosectorem, quae Tertullian utpote intelligere et meninisse posse*. Cassander, however, is not thereby disturbed, for two reasons: no-one in the early church rejected paedobaptism as *neferium*, and even Tertullian and Gregory regarded it as so necessary as to urge the clinical baptism of babies. Some variety of practice in primitive Christianity is allowed for by Cassander. He suggests that at first it may have been only seriously ill children that were baptized, in addition to their converting parents. This is in line with a recent hypothesis that normal paedobaptism developed by extension from the clinical baptism of children. And so Cassander’s review is not lacking in sophistication.

2. *Apostolic Institution*

But where does the weight of his exposition fall? Is it primarily historical or theological? It is obviously both at the same time. On the one hand it is not theological alone; Cassander does not rest his case on an appeal to the magisterium of the tradition or on the congruity of infant baptism with the theology of the Fathers. Nor is it historical alone, as though primitiveness of origin sufficed. For Cassander, it is important not only that paedobaptism went back to the age of the apostles but was instituted by the apostles themselves.

Cassander’s two key witnesses to this effect are Origen and Augustine. We have already noted Cassander’s inclusion in his testimonia of Origen’s assertion

18 Despite his ignorance of the *Apostolic Tradition* and its derivatives, Cassander’s reconstruction of the primitive baptismal observance later in his work comes remarkably close to Hippolytus’ account in some respects, especially in distinguishing among the categories of candidates between children who could and could not answer for themselves: *erant et puero ei aetate, ut ipsi quos per eum baptizati Cathecismi doctrinam, hoc est orationem Dominicae, et Symbolum redire possint.* He has already mentioned the adults *qui... ipsi pro se respondant* (Testimonia 1563, sig. F6r; Testimonia 1616, 694). Hippolytus likewise distinguishes among children in terms of their ability to answer for themselves; see Wright, *The Origins...* cited n.2 above, 4-6.

19 Testimonia 1563, sig. G2r; Testimonia 1616, 677. The text is *Tertullian, De Baptismo 18,4* (Kraft, no. 13(b)) and *Gregorius Nazianzen*, *Oratio* 40,28 (Kraft, no. 24).

20 Testimonia 1563, sig. G2r; Testimonia 1616, 679.

21 Testimonia 1563, sig. F3r; Testimonia 1616, 694.

22 Cf. Everett Ferguson, *Inscriptions and the Origins of Infant Baptism*, *JThS* n.s. 30 (1979), 34-46, followed by Wright, *The Origins...*
in his Romans commentary that the church received the tradition of baptizing infants from the apostles. Two passages from Augustine making the same point are recorded by Cassander. The African Father repeats it in other places.

Origen and Augustine were the two commonest witnesses cited by the Protestant Reformers also, from the 1520s onwards. In 1525 Oecolampadius appealed to Origen’s Romans in Ein Gespräch etlicher Predigten zu Basel,24 and in the same year, Zwingli quoted one of Cassander’s Augustinian testimonies in Von der Taufe, von der Wiedertaufe und von der Kindertaufe.25 In his 1528 Iudicum contra Anabaptistas Melanchthon appealed to both Origen and Augustine in arguing backwards, according to Pierre Fraenkel, from the Fathers to Scripture.26

But Cassander finds it necessary to be more precise on the apostolic institution of paedobaptism than some Protestants were on some occasions. He knows that Menno Simons, prudens et diligentior than those Radicals who blamed his origin on one of the popes, acknowledged that iam inde ab Apostolis temporis baptismum infantium usurpavit suisse, ac paulatinum invalidissimum. Verum haus re auctores facit Pseudostipolos et falsos doctores.27 Cassander thinks it incredible that a practice with such auspicious beginnings should so soon (statim) have pervaded all the churches. In any case, there is no trace of any attack on it in many refutations of false teachers and teachings by the apostles and their successors.28

The Reformers were not always as careful as Cassander. Calvin states that nullus est scriptor tam vexitius qui non eius originem ad Apostolorum seculum pro certo reperat.29 Similar assertions are to be found in Zwingli and Luther, and in other Reformers too. In most instances, to be sure, there is no reason to doubt that these Reformers believed it to have been instituted by the apostles - or even Christ himself - but their arguments not infrequently stress antiquity rather than precise apostolicity.

Luther cites Augustine’s assertion that infant baptism derived from the apostles, but his main argument hinges on the unbroken continuity of the practice for over a thousand years, from the time of the apostles even, rather than

3. Tradition and Scripture

There may be significance in the Reformers’ reading Origen, Augustine and other Fathers as demonstrating the primitive antiquity rather than the strict apostolicity of paedobaptism. Perhaps it enabled them to cope with the awkward question of non-biblical tradition. In his Refutation of the Tricks of the Baptists, Zwingli comments as follows after invoking Origen and Augustine as witnesses that the church received infant baptism from the apostles: Quo testes non in hoc adduce, ut eis auctoritates tribuam scripturas, sed proprihbstis fiden (Origines enim post centum et unquinginta annos ab ascensione Christi floruit), ne vetustatem baptismi infantium ignoramus simillime possimis adequen vindicatione esse, quod apostolici citra omne controversiae infantis baptismaverint.31 Zwingli’s conclusion - that the apostles themselves baptized infants - cannot conceal his discomfort at having to rely on non-apostolic attestation of apostolic practice.

The Reformers found themselves permanently impaled on the horns of a dilemma. They deployed a range of arguments based on the Bible in favour of baptizing infants. But none, to my knowledge, claimed that the Bible provided an express warrant for the practice (though Calvin held that the intention of baptism is no less appropriate for children than for adults33), and none could avoid resort to patristic testimony to help out. Yet miserium asylum forest, says Calvin, si pro defensione paedobaptismi ad nudam Ecclesiae auctoritatem suffugere cogemur.32

So for Calvin, to credit the testimony of Origen and Augustine is not to rely on nudae Ecclesiae auctoritatis. Indeed, it is worth noticing that the testimony of these two Fathers in particular - affirming the apostolic institution of paedobaptism - stand in a class of their own among the patristic evidence commonly cited in the debate. Their force lies not so much in what they attest as the church's
was second to none, to retort that such reasoning mistakenly inferred the general from the particular. Their counter-argument was already well rehearsed on biblical material and could automatically be extended to the Fathers: the need for adults to come to baptism penitent, believing and instructed did not mean that only adults could come.

But a reply like this, however impeccable its logic, evaded rather than countered the Anabaptist appeal to inconsistency of practice in the early church. In terms of modern discussion, Menno and others were nearer the truth than their Protestant and Catholic opponents, despite their very limited awareness of the widespread deferment of baptism in Christian families in the fourth and fifth centuries. It is arguable that progress in resolving the historical dispute about origins will be possible only with the recognition that the question whether infants were baptized in the early church cannot be satisfactorily answered with a straight yes or no. Differences of category of infants, of circumstances and even of region alone make sense of the evidence.

George Cassander, ardent champion of the Vincentian canon, will hear nothing of such diversity. Veteres omnes Ecclesiastici et Orthodoxi scriptores uno calamo scripturum, et uno ore locuti sunt de baptismo parvulorum. He makes the point repeatedly. His argument is the very reverse of Menno’s. The unanimity of veteres illos omnes Ecclesiastarum praefectus et doctores, per universum orbem Christum, speaks in favour of their common tradition being apostolic, especially since plerique Apostolici temporibus vicini fuerunt. Cassander uses the strongest language - absurdissimum, insanias. - to dismiss the notion that this common mind on the part of churchmen who otherwise faithfully transmitted the apostles’ teaching was no more than a common delusion. And he can cite a Father to provide the clinching principle, Tertullian, who on this occasion is a wholly amenable witness: quid apud multos unum inventur, non erratum, sed traditum.

Cassander’s position is rather different from Melanchthon’s. When the ancient writers’ teachings are clear, non est ab illos sine certis et perspicuis scripturis testimonii dissentientium. When early tradition is not in dispute, one needs incontrovertible scriptural grounds for abandoning it in preference for novelty.

5. Infant Baptism and Original Sin

In turn Cassander accuses the Anabaptists of serious disagreement among themselves on whether infants are or can be saved. He makes much of this issue, not only for its controversial value but also because the universal early consensus
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<td>35</td>
<td>Quod de Baptismate Infantiu... (Strasbourg 1533), sigs. Aiii - Avr; this section ed. Robert Suggs, Die Schriften Bernhard Rothmanns, VHRK XXXII, Die Schriften der Münsterischen Täufer und ihrer Gegenf. j. Münster 1970, 49.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Ibid.</td>
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<td>37</td>
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<td>38</td>
<td>Cf. Armour, Anabaptist Baptism, 50.</td>
</tr>
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on which his argument hinges includes, in addition to the invariable practice, a single shared theological rationale for the practice: *idem omnes rationibus et argumentis utuntur, sive ad infantes originalis peccati contagione vitiatos, peccati et mortis reos teneri, a quo nisi per aquam et spiritum renati purgentur, et sanguine Christi, qui per baptismum efficax est, ablueantur, a societate corporis Christi, et ingressu regni caelestis exclaudi.* In other words, the Fathers were all Augustinians! (Cassander is nearer the mark in quoting from John 3:5; no other text was so influential in shaping early Christian thought about baptism.)

When this particular claim is tested against Cassander's catalogue of testimonia, it manages to retain some degree of plausibility. Origen in Latin can be read, no doubt unhistorically, as propounding an orthodox Western doctrine of original sin, citing as he does Job 14, 4f. LXX and Psalm 50:51: 7 LXX, two of Augustine's favourite proof-texts. In fact, Origen is most probably assuming the impurity of new-born pre-existing souls. Tertullian's warning in *De Baptismo* against *innocens aetas* hastening to the font is not among the testimonia (although Cassander mentions the work elsewhere in his treatise).

Cassander knew John Chrysostom's homily to the newly-baptized only in Augustine's quotation: *et infantes baptizamus, quamvis pecatu non habentes, which Augustine interpreted as excluding only sins of their own commission, not the stain of original sinfulness.* 46 Not only Chrysostom but the Greek Fathers almost to a man never linked infant baptism with original sin. For the rest, the testimonia are overwhelmingly derived from Augustine and the Pelagian controversy.

Cassander thus remains happily unaware of the broad consensus of the pre-Nicene Fathers on the sinlessness of infants, 47 and the widespread conviction among the later Greek Fathers that infants were baptized not for the remission of sins at all - whether original or their own - but to receive gifts and graces. 48 Although they lacked the knowledge of the Fathers to support it, those Anabaptists who regarded infants as free from sin (Cassander names Obbe Phillips and Menno Simons 49) were closer to a patristic consensus than Cassander.

Yet in the end of the day, a consensus of the Fathers eluded all parties to the controversy. It would be harsh to judge them by the canons of modern historical study. Amid much that does not survive serious scrutiny (such as the allegation found among the Anabaptists that paedo-baptism had been in effect instituted with the invention of godparents by Hyginus, a short-lived pope who flourished c.1409), Cassander's treatise stands out for its responsible moderation. 51

---

46 *Testimonia* 1563, sigs. Bv - 7; *Testimonia* 1616, 676.
50 Cf. Menno Simons, *Verklärung* (Opera Omnia, fol. 411b; Complete Writings, 253), and elsewhere; Bernhard Rothmann, in *A Disputation of August* 7-8, 1533; ed. Stepperich, 113-114. The source of this strange notion is most probably Gratian's *Decretum* III, *De Consecr.,* IV,100 (ed. A. Friedberg, Corpus Iuris Canonici I, Leipzig 1879, col. 1194). However, the ruling credited there to Pope Hyginus (*In catecumeno, et in baptismo, et in confirmatione unus parvus fieri potest, it necessitati cognit ...*) derives from the *Penitentiarum of Theodore of Canterbury*, Bk. 2,4,8 (PL 99, col.929; tr. John T. McNeill and Helma M. Gartner, *Medieval Handbooks of Penance, New York* 1938, 202). How it came to be ascribed to Hyginus (in several collections earlier than Gratian's) I have yet to discover.
51 A cursory comparison with the collection discussed by Balthasar Hubmaier in the second version of his *Der uralt und gar unseren Lehrer Urteil* of 1526 places Cassander in a different league for scholarship. Hubmaier's listing is spattered with gross errors, e.g. his second authority, in *Anno 137*, is one Thonatus, bishop of Carthage, who taught *das man kein Kind solt taufen, das nit den glauben bekennen* (Balthasar Hubmaier Schriften, eds. Gunnar Westin and Torsten Bergsten, *QFRG XXIX; QGT IX*) Gütersloh 1962, 243-249, at 244.)
Constantine and the ‘Mother of God’:
*Oratio Ad Sanctorum Coetum 11:9*

D.F. WRIGHT, Edinburgh

Constantine enjoys a certain reputation for theological innovation in connexion with the Nicene keyword *homoousias*. Most historians conclude that the responsibility for insisting upon its decisive inclusion in the Creed of Nicaea in 325 lies to a significant extent with the emperor. While its introduction into the debate at the Council can hardly be credited to him, it was his contribution to urge successfully that it be inserted into the statement of faith. What degree of comprehension his advocacy of *homoousias* betokened and how vigorous were the promptings of this or that ecclesiastical counsellor we may never know. In any case, the term was not new to this area of Christian doctrine, nor had its earlier usage been restricted to it. But for its erection as a touchstone of orthodoxy, Constantine merits due recognition. Whether *homoousias* first surfaced at Nicaea in its Latin equivalent *consstantialis* is a possibility that cannot be confidently excluded.

There is a better case for granting Constantine the distinction of being the first to describe the Virgin Mary as ‘mother of God’ — in the strict terms of ὦθορ μήτηρ or *mater Dei*. The evidence has never to my knowledge been discussed, and is often not noticed. As we will see, it is attended by more than one uncertainty.

The passage in question occurs in the *Oratio ad sanctorum coetum*, which in the manuscripts always follows Eusebius’ *Vita Constantini*, and which most

---

1 N.H. Baynes, *Constantine the Great and the Christian Church* (1931), ed. H. Chadwick (London, 1972), 21: ‘At that council, I believe, Constantine acted as President and as such directed its proceedings towards the adoption of his own solution — the Homoousion. Whence Constantine derived that solution we need not ask here...’ No connexion between Constantine and *homoousias* is made by I. Ortiz de Urbina, *Nicée et Constantinople* (Histoire des conciles ecuméniques 1; Paris, 1963).


scholars identify with the emperor’s speech which his biographer promises to append to the Vita¹. The identification is summarily dismissed by Friedhelm Winkelmann in the revised edition of the Vita in Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller. No doubt his forthcoming edition of the Oratio itself will provide some grounds for this verdict.

Even if the identification is granted, it does not conclusively settle the celebrated debate about the authenticity of the speech, which there is neither need nor time to rehearse here.³ Its disputed attribution to Constantine is inseparable from the further question whether it was originally composed in Latin, as was Constantine’s custom, according to what Eusebius says when he promises to annex one such discourse, now translated into Greek, to his Life of the emperor.

The resolution of these and other major problems about the Oratio may be assisted by focussing on singularities in the text such as the phrase in ch. 11:9 which declares that ‘a maiden [was, became] the mother of God’:

When [the Son] was due to adopt a terrestrial body and sojourn on earth, as need required, he devised a novel (νόμιμον) form of birth for himself: χορήγες γάρ τοι γόνον σύκανοις, καὶ ἀγαθής παρθένες εἴλευθα, καὶ θεοῦ μητὴρ κόρη, καὶ αὐτοῦ φύσεως ἀρχή χρόνος καὶ νοητῆς οὐσίας αὐθεντής καὶ αὐτοῦ κατά τὸν φανερότατον βαλα.

Ivar Heikel, the editor of the Oratio in GCS, places the phrase καὶ θεοῦ μητὴρ κόρη in square brackets, not because the manuscripts display any disagreement but in deference to an earlier commentator on the text. In his own critical review of the text of the Oratio Heikel fails to remark on the words in question.

¹ VC 4:32, ed. F. Winkelmann, Eusebius Werke 1:1 (GCS; Berlin, 1975), 132, with the abrupt comment ‘Nicht identisch mit der Or. ad sanct. coet.’.


⁵ Kritische Beiträge zu den Constantin-Schriften des Eusebius (TU 36:4; Leipzig, 1916), 16-17 (where his abridged German version omits the words), 65, 80.

In 1894 Victor Schultze bracketed the four Greek words as a later gloss for two reasons, which I will discuss in reverse order. First the words constitute an awkward interpolation as is betrayed by their ‘Stellung’. Whether this means ‘construction’ or ‘position’, it is hardly a convincing objection. While it is true that the phrase is both preceded and followed by phrases constructed of nominatives and genitives, yet the two cases are not related to each other in a uniform manner throughout. The four words maintain the note of the extraordinary set by the bold use of νόμιμον; their anarthrous form, which might itself be remarkable, agrees with neighbouring phrases; and their meaning, which is not in doubt, fits the sequence of thought — conception, childbirth, motherhood — admirably well. J.M. Püttische believes that Schultze is probably correct, because the expression is a concrete one amid many abstract ones. But the preceding phrases are concrete enough, and the contrast is overdrawn. One could put the position this way: the phrase is no more problematic or angular than many others in this enigmatic work.

Of a different order is Schultze’s other objection: ’um jene Zeit der Ausdruck θεοῦ μητὴρ κόρη ausgeschlossen ist’¹⁰. If he is correct, he is so, I suggest, more by instinct than by science. He cites no investigation chronicling the adoption of the designations θεοῦ μητὴρ and mater Dei for Mary, which is a task still awaiting thorough research. My own provisional conclusions are as follows:¹¹

1. Despite — or perhaps because of — the relatively early and widespread currency of theotokos, the Greek Fathers were surprisingly slow to speak of Mary as ‘mother of God’. John of Damascus was probably the first to use the phrase as a matter of routine, although Sophronius of Jerusalem used both θεοῦ μητὴρ and θεομήταρ on several occasions. Throughout his extensive vindications of theotokos, Cyril of Alexandria only once, and then hesitantly, called Mary the ‘mother of God. The indexes to Schwartz’s Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum throw up only one occurrence, in A.D. 536.¹²

2. The Latin West did not develop a single standard translation of theotokos. Deipara, Dei genitrix (genitrix) and mater Dei all served, with mater Dei used twice by Ambrose and several times by Cassian. The phrase

¹ Quellenuntersuchungen zur Vita Constantinii des Eusebii, ZKG 14 (1894), 503-555, at 547.

¹² Die Rede Konstantins des Grossen an die Versammlung der Heiligen (Strassburger Theologische Studien 9; Freiburg im Breisgau, 1908), 89.

¹³ Püttische, loc. cit., rejects Schultze’s reasoning, because of the similarity with Oratio 19:6 (Heikel, 182), where Mary is pregnant with the ‘divine Spirit’.


also occurs in some of Nestorius's fragments extant in Latin, and, although avoided by Augustine, appears regularly in the Africans Facundus of Hermiane and Fulgentius of Ruspae in the sixth century.13

3. There is some evidence that θεοῦ μήτηρ came into Greek usage at least partly by translation of the Latin Dei genitrix or mater Dei. Photius cites Ephraim of Antioch as recording that Leo the Great spoke more clearly than others of the Virgin as 'mother of God'14. This is wrong on two counts: before Leo, Ambrose and Cassian used mater Dei — Cassian clearly as an equivalent to theotokos — while Leo himself kept to Dei genitrix. But the sequence of translation suggested by Photius's record of Ephraim's lost writings is from Greek theotokos to Leo's Latin Dei genitrix, which then became θεοῦ μήτηρ in Ephraim's (and Photius's) Greek. This was spotted in the seventeenth century by John Pearson, Bishop of Chester:

those ancient Greeks which call the Virgin θεοτόκος, did not call her μήτηρ τοῦ θεοῦ. But the Latins translating θεοτόκος Dei genitrix, and the Greeks translating Dei genitrix θεοῦ μήτηρ, they both at last called her plainly the mother of God.15

In the light of this provisional sketch of the early use of 'mother of God' in Greek and Latin, we return to the Oratio ad sanctos. Victor Schütze was correct, in that θεοῦ μήτηρ is not attested as early as the early decades of the fourth century. But by the same token it would not have been a natural interpolation earlier than the seventh century, yet its interpolation must have taken place early enough to influence the whole manuscript tradition, although this is not a broad one.

It may be less problematic — it is certainly less hazardous — to view the phrase as original to the text of the Oratio but arising from translation from Latin into Greek, especially if the translation were the work not of a theologian but of a professional interpreter. Eusebius used theotokos at least three times,16 but I have no evidence of a Latin version of the word in the

first half of the fourth century. It is not, however, inconceivable that Dei genitrix had already come into use early enough to occasion the unuttoed Greek rendering θεοῦ μήτηρ. Certainly, if we look for the inspiration of the phrase in the mind of Constantine, we are more likely to find it in a Eusebian than a Laetantian direction. One can indeed speculate that Schütze's exclusion of it was partly suggested by the lack of any obvious parallel to it in Laetantius' Divinae Institutiones 4:12-13, on which he believes the Oratio to be dependent at this point.18 Although Laetantius' designation of the Son as μήτηρ (like the Father) refers to the Son's first generation from the Father, he shows no inclination to affirm Mary's maternity in his second generation of his divinity as well as his humanity.19

Other possibilities may suggest themselves, such as the prompting or tuition of Ossius20. The phrase itself has points of contact with other parts of the Oratio. Its Christianized adaptation of Virgil's Fourth Eclogue provides the author with another opportunity to emphasize the Virgin Birth of Christ. The passage uses κόρη — which often conveys the hint of virginity caught by the English 'maiden' — as a synonym for μαθητής.21 Christ's divinity is also clearly emphasized in the speech, being attested not only by the same Virgilian passage but also by the Erythraean Sibyl. While not purveying Nicene orthodoxy, the Oratio is in no doubt that Christ is 'God and the Son of God'.22 The affirmation that 'a maiden became mother of God' is not out of tune with the subject-matter of the address.

Perhaps in the end of the day we could do worse than attribute the phrase to the lay clumsiness or boldness of Constantine, or of his secretary or his translator,23 who rushed in with explicit 'mother of God' language decades or centuries ahead of the tradition, when professional theological attitudes still feared to tread. Not wholly unlike homoioteousis, we might say.

13 Ambrose: Hexaemeron 5:20:65 (PL 14, 248). De Virginitate (PL 16, 220); Cassian: Incarna. 2:2, 5, 6, 517:29 (PL 50, 41. 43. 46. 98, 265); F. Loofs, Nofiarinza. Die Fragmenta des Nofiarinza (Halle, 1905), 167, 212, 252 (although the original Greek may not have been μήτηρ θεοῦ — see below); Facundus: Defence of Three Chapters 1:1. (PL 67, 529-531, 540-547); Fulgentius: On the Faith 17 (PL 65, 680).
14 Photius, Bibliotheca codex 328 (ed. R. Henry IV, 121); Leo, Epist. 165:2 (PL 54, 1157f).
The Vocation of a Reformed Scholar
Arthur S. Link, Historian and Editor

"I fancy myself an intellectual," he says, "but I have never encountered anyone in history with such a mind as Wilson. That mind of his was always challenging me — to stretch my mind to meet his. I've read a lot of history in my life, and I think that aside from St. Paul, Jesus and the great religious prophets, Woodrow Wilson was the most admirable character I've encountered in history, and the most wonderful person. A man of complete integrity."

Comparing Woodrow Wilson to Jesus Christ is likely to raise eyebrows, not to mention hackles, in academic circles; but such juxtapositions come naturally to Mr. Link, the son of a minister who remains, like Wilson, a devout and unabashed Presbyterian. In his epilogue to the final volume of the Wilson papers, he thanked his colleagues, his wife, and "Him who gave me the strength for labors through the years."

Asked if he feels destiny may have played a part in his having been chosen to edit the Wilson papers, he answers unhesitatingly: "I believe God created me to do this, and it's just as simple as that. Not many people in this day and age would think there was such a thing as a divine call, but I do, and I had it." Looking at the 69 volumes of "The Papers of Woodrow Wilson," still the only comprehensive set of Presidential papers to have been published in its entirety, even the most chronic of scoffers is likely to wonder if Arthur Link might just be on to something.

"35 Years with Woodrow Wilson: The Journey of a Long-Distance Editor"
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David Wright

If one may combine hypothesis and anachronism, I reckon that John Calvin would be highly uncomfortable in the pluralist society of the West at the end of the second Christian millennium. Even if we do not find him eulogizing in so many words Zwingli's bold axiom that 'a Christian city is none other than a Christian church,'1 nevertheless the central thrust of the reform in Geneva is clear — that the whole city be united in the honour and service of God. All children should be baptized, and no open dissent or defiance of the Christian order to which the city was corporately committed should go unchallenged. This, at any rate, is the conventional account of a fundamental platform of the Genevan Reformation, shared in large measure by Zürich, Strasbourg and other cities, but not by Lutheran territories.

From such a perspective, the current fortunes of many churches, especially Protestant churches, in Europe and the 'New World' would have variously baffled or outraged the Genevan Reformer. Quite apart from their internal pluralism (which means that in most mainstream denominations, the first task of ecumenism is internal reconciliation — inter-church rather than inter-church), Christianity in numerous countries is but one option on offer in the marketplace. Even where church membership remains numerically strong, even claiming a majority of the population, and even where the church, or a church, enjoys established or national status (as, respectively, in England and Scotland, for example), its teaching is accorded little or no privileged recognition in the formation of the norms of public life. It is tolerated as a private option, and perhaps even respected, so long as its convictions do not entail a refusal to grant equal recognition to other options. For the most heinous sin in the late twentieth century is intolerance, otherwise known as bigotry. Where a communal consensus has so dramatically broken down, church discipline is an early casualty. One cannot but believe that Calvin would have found this scene unbearably messy — or, we might say, abnormally labyrinthine.

Calvin's Trials and Disappointments

This is not to forget that Calvin was never free from troublesome dissent in Geneva. If from c. 1546 he could command the virtually unanimous support of his colleagues in the Company of Pastors, there were battles royal to come for another decade. In late December 1563 Calvin called for a day of thanksgiving to mark the unmasking and overthrow of the final Libertine conspiracy to surrender the city to Savoy, while within the Company of Pastors itself a country pastor was brazenly unrepentant when rebuked in 1558 for having read out Berne's ban on the preaching of predestination, and even in 1564 another minister, 'newly returned from Tübingen where he had studied for several years,' was singing Bolsec's song against predestination.2 That is to say, the pursuit of conciliarism of the whole community to serve God according to his Word entailed for Calvin almost unending conflict with critics and enemies. His farewell message to his fellow-pastors was scarcely up-beat.
I have lived here amid remarkable struggles... I have had battles to face, and you will experience them no less but even more mightily. For you are set in a perverse and wretched people and however many good folk there be in it, the people is perverse and wicked, and you will have trouble when God has taken me off.  

Calvin could surely not have endorsed John Knox's eulogy of Geneva, which commended not so much purity of doctrine — which could be found elsewhere also — as 'maners and religious so sincere to reform, I have not yet seen in any other place.'

As Heiko Oberman has recently shown, Calvin's assessment of the state of religion in Europe in mid-century was bleak. To the testimonies he cites we may add the following verdict from the Zephaniah commentary published in 1559, evoked by the meagre and short-lived fruits of Josiah's reforms.

This example ought at this day to be carefully observed: for though God now appears to the world in full light, yet very few there are who submit themselves to his word; and of this small number fewer still are who sincerely and without any dissimilation embrace sound doctrine. We indeed see how great is their inconsistency and indifferance...

We may also derive hence an admonition no less useful — not to regard ours as the golden age, because some portion of men and women profess the pure worship of God... The sacred name of Reformaition is at this day profaned, when anyone who shows as it were by a mere nod that he is not wholly an enemy to the gospel is immediately lauded as a person of extraordinary piety. So although many show some regard for religion, let us yet know that among so large a number there are numerous hypocrites... we may see here, as in a mirror, how difficult it is to restore the world to the obedience of God.

Or again, from the Haggai commentary, on the Jews' neglect of rebuilding the temple while revelling in domestic comfort.

And how is the case today? We see that through a remarkable miracle of God the gospel has shone forth in our time, and we have emerged, as it were, from the neither regions. Yet who now rears up, of his own free-will, an altar to God? On the contrary, all regard what is advantageous only to themselves; and while they are occupied with their own concerns, the worship of God is cast aside; there is no care, no zeal, no concern for it; nay, what is worse, many profit from the gospel, as though it were a lucrative business.

And yet, as far as I know, Calvin was never induced, by his depressing estimates of the progress of spiritual renewal, to entertain those aspirations which tempted other leading Reformers to abandon hopes of a communal Reformation and provide instead, or as well, for a minority church, a gathered or convened fellowship, ecclesiola in ecclesia.

Luther's Ideal Congregation

Best known are Luther's nomenclatures in the Preface to his German Mass of 1526.

The third kind of service which a truly evangelical church order should have (in addition to the new Latin and German masses) would not be held in a public place for all sorts of people, but for those who mean to be real Christians and profess the gospel in deed as well as word. They would record their names on a list and meet by themselves in some house in order to pray, read, baptize, receive the sacrament and do other Christian works. In this manner, those who do not lead Christian lives could be known, reproved, reclaimed, cast out or excommunicated... In short, if one had the people or the persons who wanted to be Christians in reality, the rules and regulations could easily be supplied.

But as yet neither can nor desire to begin, or to make rules for, such a congregation or assembly.

We may note the comments of Martin Bucer, who thinks that these reflections issued from Luther's recent discussions with Caspar von Schwenckfeld on the "coming church":

Here one may see Luther's ideal of a congregation, along with his sober evaluation of how far distant such an ideal was... In Luther's opinion, up to now there had not been a group which worshiped spontaneously and in which church discipline and intensive charitable acts were practiced.

'Christian Communities' in Strasbourg

The most remarkable effort to implement something of this kind was that of Martin Bucer in Strasbourg during 1547-9. To the depression brought on by the Protestants' defeat in the Schmalkaldic War and the imposition of the Augsburg Interim on Strasbourg was added disenchantment at the failure of reform measures to fashion an authentically Christian church in the city. These two reverses were not unconnected: apathy in reforming the church had drawn down God's wrath upon the community in military and religious-political disasters.

Bucer now channeled his energies into the formation of 'Christliche Gemeinschaften,' small Christian communities, which are first mentioned in January 1547. These were groups of believers committed to firmer disciplinary exercises than the city magistrates would sanction in the majority church, with the aim of promoting closer unity, deeper sanctification and fuller fidelity to the pattern of the primitive Christian congregations. Their meetings were to supplement the Sunday worship of the whole parish, and indeed the cells were envisaged as catalysts for the wider church's renewal in dedication.

Although these fellowships were to elect their own elders from among 'the most zealous and wisest in the Lord,' Bucer and his colleagues made a show of maintaining the overall supervision of the parish wardens (Kirchenpfleger), who represented the authority of the city council. Yet this "core-church" movement only too easily invited the council's suspicious attention, and also stirred up tensions, and even charges of schism, among the pastors of the city. Bucer was certainly mistaken in claiming, in response to the objection that other evangelical churches lacked such house-groups, that they were not only to be found, but even more completely implemented, 'in all properly evangelical churches and in those that maintain Luther's order.'

In this ecclesiological experiment Bucer resiled from weariness and increasingly frustrated efforts to Christianize the city as a unified community. It produced the most
concrete embodiment of one motif in Bucer's twofold ecclesial vision, so finely characterized in Gottfried Hamann's monograph entitled (in French) 'Between the Sect and the City: the Church Envisaged by the Reformer Martin Bucer.' He shows how deeply rooted in Bucer's thought about the church lay this duality between the corpus mixtum of the majority and the commune sanctorum of those who truly professed Christ. In his great pastoral manual of 1538, On True Pastoral Care (Von der Warren Sedeorge), of which an English translation may be confidently expected before long, Bucer committed himself to supplementing the inadequacies of public worship and instruction for all and sundry by means of house fellowships to foster living faith in Christians. But as early as 1527, in his first Gospels commentary, he had sketched one design of what he attempted to create only two decades later.

In fact our congregations are still too impure and the number of those who have pledged themselves wholly to Christ too few. For reasons of public concord we may not debar from the church's meetings for worship those who are unproven. Hence in the public assemblies of the church...excommunication cannot be publicly exercised — unless...the majority of the population together with the magistrates are wholeheartedly converted to Christ. Where this is not granted, it is essential that those who have fully accepted Christ should reestablish among themselves Christ's most godly and wholesome practice of assiduous and untainted mutual exhortation of all of their family or neighbours or other connexions who have named the name of Christ. Any who proceed to scorn their admonitions they should cite for contempt before the church to which they belong by virtue of locality or acquaintance or parental or family connexion...if they continue to despise the Word of the Lord, they should excommunicate them.13

Another focal point of Bucer's almost ministry-long struggle with the competing inclusivist and exclusivist tendencies of his ecclesiology was infant baptism. He soon became one of its staunchest sixteenth-century defenders, but at the cost of qualifying its significance. He ascribes to it 'a containing role, the marking of an outer ring, within which another and more decisive line would be drawn, coming into sacramental focus in confirmation.'14 It was inconceivable that the sign of redemption should be given less indiscriminately (promiscuously) under the new covenant than under the old. Far from baptizing only solidly instructed disciples, as the Anabaptists claimed, the apostles often baptized people they had spoken to for scarcely an hour. Baptism merely enrolled them in a school, an apprenticeship; they could be expelled again as soon as it became clear that teaching them was wasted labour. In fact, Bucer attested from his own experience the value of a residual 'cradle Christianity' fostered by the practice of general baptism.

To us it was especially useful that the whole of our people was from the cradle admitted to the church, whatever its condition. In this way some belief about Christ and some appreciation of Holy Writ were instilled. These had the effect of opening up a wide window for the recent recovery of the pure gospel, which could not have opened up if no respect for Sacred Scripture had been held by the people.15

Baptismal discipline remains a pressure-point today, at least in Britain, where not all would endorse Bucer's appreciation of indiscriminate paedobaptism. They view it more like an inoculation, all too effectively immunizing its recipients against catching the real thing later in life.

Gathered Congregations

Bucer's nagging aspirations for some more authentic Christian community in the midst of the nominally Christian majority may well have rubbed off on Calvin during his Strasbourg exile. As Willem van't Spieker points out, it was in accordance with this ideal that Calvin successfully organized his French refugee congregation in the city. I hazard the opinion that biographers of Calvin have paid insufficient attention to the possibility that his ecclesiology was influenced at Strasbourg, where he pastored a congregation that was almost by definition gathered rather than territorial, by elements such as we have noted in Bucer's vision of a purer church.

The impact of such convictions is identifiable elsewhere also. The scheme that Francois Lambert drew up for the reformation of the church of Hesse at Landgrave Philip's invitation has been called 'the first Church Order which can be called "Reformed"' (as distinct from Luther or Anabaptist).17 It enunciated a drastic congregationalism, with a church of true believers only, governed by a weekly meeting of church members and practicing a strict discipline. Although Luther advised against the scheme's adoption, the influence of his own earlier 'congregationalism' is undeniable, and perhaps too of the Preface to his German Mass published several months earlier in the same year 1526.18

Debate at Zurich

Even at Zurich, that supreme embodiment of the Reformed city-church, similar impulses were felt. In 1532 a brief exchange of letters took place between Leo Jud, Zwingli's intimate associate, and Zwingli's successor, Heinrich Bullinger.19 It largely turned on whether excommunication should be left in the hands of the magistrates. Jud claims that church and magistracy are utterly different realities, and argues that the holy church of Christ is assembled from the godly and faithful, by which I mean those who profess their trust in Christ and do not deny it by manifest deed or word. The church is spiritual...because its members are led and governed by the Spirit of Christ, or at least ought to be, for in them Christ's Spirit fights against the flesh and its corruptions. But in the church we have priests, godless, brazen, incorrigible wretches, mockers and enemies and persecutors of Christ and the gospel...They freely declare their disbelief in our gospel and call its teaching heresy and the devil's doctrine. Jud challenges Bullinger to contemplate the visage of the church of Zurich, 'in which scoundrels like this not only exist but actually reign,' and ask whether it deserves the name of Christ's church. He goes on:

I have no wish to turn the church into a monastery or a coeterie of Pharisees, like the Anabaptists...But nor do I want it to harbour leathal lice and dregs and garbage like these folk, whom one would never reckon among decent citizens.20

When at the end of his reply Bullinger relaxes his guard and says, in effect, 'the world's been the same from the beginning, you won't change it now,'21 Jud retorts with passion:

If we cannot change the world, why then do we preach?...God translated us from the kingdom of darkness and the power of Satan into the kingdom of light of his beloved
Son. Christ chose us from the world, and his teaching is none other than the renewal of the world.22

The church of Christ is not founded on the votes of the majority23 this was Jud’s opening gambit. Calvin knew it well enough, and his goal in Geneva had more in common with Jud than with Bullinger. And yet he would not acquiesce in sharp distinction between the congregation of Christ and the civic community. He would aim for Geneva — Geneva simpliciter — to be a perfect school of Christ, a city in which the wits of Christ ran through the agency of a vigorously independent church order — vigorous and independent enough to ensure the survival of churches elsewhere as persecuted minorities in hostile territory.

Protestant Minorities in France: Calvin’s Counsel

So our attention shifts from Strasbourg, Zürich and Geneva to France, for whose scattered and suffering Protestants Calvin expended such efforts. On this front if anywhere one might hope to find pointed counsel from Calvin on the vocation of religious minorities. Among his preoccupations, engaging his thought and writing for some twenty-five years, was the problem — or rather, the complex of problems — which he called Nicodemism. We can do no more than touch on some aspects of his controversy with the sin as he saw it of religious dissimulation, that is, of continuing to conform outwardly to Catholic worship and devotion while inwardly dissenting from them.

For Calvin there were at hand commendable ways of avoiding the perils of Nicodemism, i.e. emigration and exile, and martyrdom — solutions which would of course dissolve a minority altogether. They were infinitely preferable to compromise. Charles Eire has helpfully outlined the ecclesiastical dimensions of Calvin’s appreciation of exile: they include the ineluctable need, the obligation, of all Christians to take part in regular corporate worship in all its aspects, and the alien and contemptuous character of residence in an idolatrous nation compared with the attractions of the Christian’s true homeland in the visible church.24 Old Testament examples and warnings could be readily pressed into service, and one wonders also if Calvin’s own position in Geneva as himself a displaced person or resident alien predisposed him to favour flight in quest of freedom of worship. In the city of Geneva a massive influx of Protestant refugees counted very decisively on the credit side of the Reformers’ ledger. When Oberman recently characterized the Genevan pattern of Reformation as ‘the Reformation of the Refugees,’ he did so with a special eye on Calvin’s European-wide perspectives.25 In this context the strangers’ churches in London, Emden and elsewhere naturally invite due consideration.26

Bucer and Calvin on Nicodemism

The sharpness of Calvin’s almost unreserved hostility to Nicodemism emerges in clear relief when compared with the position adopted, perhaps all too predictably, by Martin Bucer. His Consilium Theologicum Privatum Conscriptum (Theological Advice Written Privately) on the subject, written probably in 1540, was published for the first time in 1588.27 It is in part almost certainly a direct response to Calvin’s first anti-Nicodemite writing, On Avoiding the Unlawful Rites of the Goddess (De Fugiendis Impiorum Illisac Sacris).28 The individual to whom Bucer is writing remains unknown, but the date, c. 1540, sets the Consilium in the midst of the series of colloquies with reformist Catholics in which Bucer played such an adventurous role. As Fraenkel shows, there are significant points of contact between the Consilium and the Worms/Regensburg Book.

Most of Bucer’s treatise is taken up with an assessment of three categories of observances found in churches serving the papacy. First are those established ‘by explicit God-given instruction,’ ranging from baptism to ministerial orders, psalm-singing and discipline. Secondly, some ceremonies of human institution, introduced ‘partly in imitation of the Lord and his apostles, partly also in imitation of the Mosaic cultus, partly in a certain excess of godly zeal,’ these begin with confirmation and include private confession and veneration of relics. The third class comprises ‘nothing more than superstitions and perversions of those ceremonies which the church received by the Lord’s appointment or by commendation of the saints’; here belong ‘the abominations of the mass’ (spelt out at length), celibacy, the mendicant orders, the cult of images, veneration of the saints and papal pardons.29

Bucer’s analysis recognizes that even dominical institutions have been vulnerable to human adulation to a greater or lesser extent, but this does not deter him from acknowledging churches of Christ under the papacy. He prefacing the Consilium with two principles that inform it throughout, the first one enunciated at some length.

We must regard as a member of Christ anyone who invokes the name of Christ and does not deny this by behaviour that requires us not to eat with him...[cf. 1 Cor. 5:11]. Of those who invoke Christ in true faith there are very many in all the churches which still endure the papal yoke. Their observance of numerous superstitious ceremonies — invocation of saints, veneration of the crucifix, and so on — is so much a matter of ignorance, that they are nonetheless living faith in Christ. This they demonstrate by the chief fruits of faith — fear of the Lord, love of their neighbour, and complete integrity of life. So they have Christ as their foundation, however much wood, hay and stubble they erect on this foundation. Consequently, wherever there are those who thus truly possess Christ and have communion in the Word, the sacraments and prayers — even though with these they have also the observance of much that is quite uncongenial with true faith and hence must sometime be abolished by the fire of a severer testing accompanied by enlightenment — there one must acknowledge the church of Christ. For Christ’s church is none other than the assembly and company of those who truly invoke Christ and have communion with one another in the Word, the sacraments and prayers, however much of error and iniquity also cleaves to them.30

Bucer never departed from this basic proposition. The difference between papal churches and Protestant churches lay in degrees of purification. ‘When today churches are reordered in conformity to the gospel of Christ, they do not become churches from not being churches, but churches already in being are purified and reformed.’51 Bucer’s patristic expertise informed him of the antiquity — and original wholesomeness or innocence — of many observances subsequently abysmally perverted, but it is nevertheless remarkable to find him acknowledging the kernel of the Lord’s Supper amid the violatio and contaminatio of the mass, which he admits are horrendous and utterly deplorable.

Yet at the same time, since it is sufficiently established that in these churches a solemn memorial of the Lord’s death is celebrated and participation in Christ is presented
Calvin's attitude could not have been more contrasting. He believed that his whole case against Nicodemism could be made by reference to the mass.

I deny that there is any Lord's Supper if all believers present do not have a common invitation to its sacred feast, if the sacred symbols of the bread and the cup are not set before the church, and the promises as a seal of which it has been given are not explained, and the gift of life purchased for us by Jesus Christ is not preached. Can you show me one iota of these in the mass?32

Bucer's approach is more patently ecclesiological. In his anti-Nicodemite writings Calvin rarely grasps the nettle whether the Roman Church is truly a church of Christ, and when he does, seems to deny it or concede it only within highly damaging limitations.33 For Calvin what mattered in this context was not only fuller conformity to the scriptural order for the Supper but sound teaching and preaching. Similarly, while Bucer's Consilium is one-sided in concentrating on only one mark of the church and preoccupied with the liturgical and ceremonial, Calvin sets the issue in the broader framework of one's proper deportment while living in Catholic territory. And so in De Gugiendiis, Calvin sets himself to answer two questions applying to every believer thus placed:

First, what kind of confession does the Lord require of his followers who live few and scattered among the ungodly, in a place from which the discipline of true religion has been exiled? And secondly, by what marks in the outward conduct of life would the Lord have them differ from the hordes of idolaters among whom they are mixed?34

While Calvin does not require, or approve of, aggressive protestation of one's scruples, and appropriately stresses 'the duties of private life' as the locus of perfection of faith, nevertheless confession holds an important role in his critique of Nicodemism because it cuts across the grain of unacceptable distinctions — between bodily demeanour and attitude of heart, between private behaviour and public, between passivity and active testimony.35

Vocation and Neighbourly Love

Here we may return to the prologue of Bucer's Consilium and notice the second of his fundamental propositions.

Any Christian who resides in such a church [i.e. one that must be acknowledged, despite all its defects, to be a true church of Christ] by a legitimate vocation, must treat it as the church of Christ, and embrace as brothers and members in Christ all in it who are not openly ungodly. By 'legitimate vocation' I mean some position in life agreeable to the Word of God, such as citizen, head of a household, recognized member of a household, magistrate, and so on.36

The influence of a more conservative Lutheran emphasis on the ordered stations of human life is very evident. To Bucer, Calvin's summons to exile sounded irresponsible and heartless:

to desert such churches without being called away from them by a lawful vocation is less tolerable than abandoning brethren who are dangerously ill.37

It would be tempting to discern part of the difference between the two Reformers in Bucer's stronger accent on love of the neighbour. The Consilium includes several citations of 1 Corinthians 9:19-22 — Paul's becoming a Jew to the Jews etc., in order by any means to save some. The verses appear on the title page itself. Calvin was ready enough to please all but only for their own good; accommodation to the weak is enjoined on us only for their edification.38 Setting a bad example by committing idolatry would make for no one's salvation. But Bucer evinced a more prominent concern lest separation and clamorous protest offend the weaker brethren and snuff out the dimly burning wick of their faith and devotion.

In the very short comment that Bucer provided in 1545, on Calvin's two main anti-Nicodemite works, the first point he makes is as follows:

I am eager that those brethren held fast in a Babylonian exile take the greatest care to avoid incurring a reputation for impiety with God's elect, whom they should be winning for the Lord, by inopportune and reckless castigation of common observances. Thereby those who seek to draw them to the Lord render themselves ineffectual.39

As he put it in the 1540 Consilium:

How shall we bring people to a more perfect knowledge of Christ when we so harshly condemn everything they hold as the height of religion? And when in turn we inculcate so insensitively everything they judge to be utterly irreverent? To be sure, unless they recognize us as Christ's ministers serving him faithfully, we will do them no good for the kingdom of Christ.40

The debate is a fascinating one, with the arguments more nuanced on both sides than is often recognized. If Calvin found fault with a false dichotomy between conforming body and nonconforming soul, he can nonetheless say that fellowship with sacrilege consists not in physical proximity but in inward consent. No guilt is contracted by look, access or vicinity. After all, Paul took a thorough tour of Athens before he found the illustration he needed for his sermon.41 On the other hand, while Bucer insists on the inexorable duty of evangelical believers to associate fully with Catholic congregations, they must shun Catholics who profess Belial and not Christ.

You must adhere very strictly in this principle in contracting marriages, in fixing a place of residence, in settling in a city, choosing a neighbourhood and selecting a household, and in absolutely every concern of human life which lies within your own discretion.42

What bearing has this sixteenth-century discussion on pluralism in the modern world? The pluralism that dwells within the gates of Jerusalem has already been alluded to. Perhaps in some circles on some occasions the intrusion of paganism has been so blatant that not only must Barmen's voice resound again but even separation be contemplated. But even in denominations apparently so hell-bent on not lagging behind society and a culture in headlong flight from their Christian roots, we would probably be indulging in a kind of
The Church as Remnant

In the end, the issue comes back to the doctrine of the church, which for Calvin of course is found not only in the New Testament but also in the Old. I am not aware of any study so far of what he has to say, as preacher and commentator, of the remnant motif in the Old Testament. T.H. Parker devotes a few pages to it, showing how Calvin uses the distinction between the irredeemable mass and the faithful remnant to make consistent sense of the mingling of denunciations and encouragements in the prophets.44 Parker cites Calvin on Habakkuk 1:11: “Then he [the Chaldean] shall change his spirit.”

The prophet now begins to give some comfort to the faithful, lest they succumb under such burdensome evils. He had hitherto directed his address to that irreclaimable people, but now he turns to the remnant. For there were always among them some of the faithful, though few, whom God never neglected, for who sake he often sent his prophets. Although the multitude derived no benefit, the faithful understood... This was why the prophets were accustomed, after speaking generally, to come down to the faithful, and as it were to comfort them apart and privately. This distinction should be noted:... when the prophets warn of God’s wrath, their speech is addressed indiscriminately to the whole body of the people, but when they add promises, it is as if they called the faithful to a private conversation, and spoke in their ear what the Lord had commanded them.55

The preservation of the remnant, on which the continuation of the covenant depends from Abraham to Christ, provides a hermeneutical key, as it were, to the understanding of the apparently unqualified denunciations of Israel, which seemed to cancel out God’s promises of mercy. It is to ‘the remnant of his heritage’ (Micah 7:18) that his mercy applies.64 And again, on Jeremiah 23:3:

...the covenant remains valid in the remnant... God then has ever been the preserver of his church; and thus his gratuitous adoption, by which he had chosen the seed of Abraham, never fails. But this adoption is effectual only as to the remnant.47

In another context, the remnant can function as the firstfruits, as it were, of a more abundant harvest. The remnant left in Judaea under Gedaliah (Jeremiah 40:11) embodied the moderation of the divine vengeance; some remnants continued in Judaea until the restoration of the whole people.46

But Calvin does not very often explicitly reflect on the implications of the salvation of only a remnant of Israel or Judah for the fortunes of the church of his day. But Jeremiah’s expectation that the return from exile will witness the salvation of only the remnant of Israel evokes this application from Calvin:

This doctrine may justly be applied to our time. For we are by no means to expect that God will restore his church in all the world, that all shall be renewed by his Spirit and unite in true religion; but he gathers his church on all sides, and yet in such a way that his gratuitous mercy is ever evident, for there shall be remnants only.49

Church Under the Cross

The foundation of the remnant is, of course, God’s election. I have learnt from David Wiley’s essay on ‘The Church as the Elect’ in the Theology of Calvin’ in the volume edited by Timothy George.50 The importance of the confidence given by election for the suffering church is skillfully illustrated from the Institutes. The 1559 edition inserts in 4:1:2 passages that in Wiley’s view must have in mind a perspective beyond Geneva. Commenting on the credal phrase ‘believe the church,’ Calvin says:

But the purpose is for us to know that, even though the devil moves every stone to destroy Christ’s grace, and though God’s enemies also rage with the same savage fury, it cannot be extinguished... For God alone ‘knows those who are his’... But because a small and contemptible number are hidden in a huge multitude and a few grains of wheat are covered by a pile of chaff, we must leave to God alone the knowledge of his church, whose foundation is his secret election... Although the melancholy dissolution which confronts us on every side may cry that no remnant of the church is left, let us know that Christ’s death is fruitful, and that God miraculously keeps his church as in hiding places. So it was said to Elijah, ‘I have kept for myself seven thousand men who have not bowed the knee before Baal.’51

Wiley suggests that Calvin must here be thinking of the persecuted Protestant communities of France, for these sentences are not applicable to Geneva at this time. His essay ends with the following paragraph:

If one reads Calvin basically in terms of Geneva, which is a strong temptation, one may also have to read him almost exclusively in terms of a theology of glory and, in turn, ruminate, on occasion, on the unfortunate connections between Calvin and the theology of glory, which has strongly shaped the self-understanding of several Western countries that have been significantly influenced by the Reformed tradition. But if one can learn to read Calvin in terms of the ‘first generation’ concerns of the evangelical party in France and its poor, little, suffering churches that lived under the cross, then, perhaps something of Calvin’s version of a theology of the cross — a theology lived out under it — yet speaks powerfully today to both insiders and outsiders alike.52

An ecclesiastical theologia gloriae and theologia crucis? Whether Calvin would have liked his Genevan ministry to sail into the future under the epitaph theologia gloriae — or ecclesia gloriae (his farewell words to his fellow-pastors hardly encourage us to contemplate this), we should note carefully Wiley’s argument that at last Calvin recovers the motif of the minority church which features in the 1536 Institutes. But we may surely question if a solely, or predominantly, geographical distinction between the two is really plausible. Over against this interpretation we may set Oberman’s insistence that Calvin is ‘bound to be misunderstood when typcast as the reformer of Geneva. His parish was as wide as Europe and his vision was directed to France as its center.’53 The conclusion of Oberman’s reading of the Calvinian reform as ‘The Reformation of the Refugees’ is this:
...where Calvinism became the dominant culture, it showed the ugly face of suppression for which it is widely known. However, when forced to go underground and to live 'East of Eden,' it could regain the original vision of John Calvin, the vision of the remnant, destined to serve as pathfinder and refugee.54
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A RECENT DISCOVERY

This paper can be no more than a Forschungsbericht—or even a Forschungsprogram, not only because of my own limited investigation of the subject so far, but also because we are dealing with a theme that surfaced relatively recently in Calvin studies and whose lineaments are still in process of being recognized. The credit for unearthing it usually goes to Ford Lewis Battles, although Richard A. Stauffer said in 1978 that he discovered its importance at the same time as Battles. Neither acknowledges indebtedness to Edward A. Dowey, who has since claimed that the first extended treatment of the issue was his own in 1952. Perhaps the most substantial exposition to date is that of Reinhold Hefisk. Although there were briefer anticipations of these discussions, it is not much more than a generation since Calvinian scholarship first came to recognize the significance of this thread in the Reformer's writings. (One looks for it in vain in Francois Wendel's Calvin5 And like all new discoveries, the danger of exaggeration may not always have been avoided. Is accommodation really "perhaps Calvin's most widely used exegetical tool?"

One can readily understand the appeal of accommodation, as presented by Battles, in a theologian like Calvin whose marketability in the modern world is not of the highest. It is not too difficult to come across writers keen to cite Calvin on accommodation who find little else to their liking in his teaching. It is almost as if predestination must decrease and accommodation must increase. No longer is it a matter of Calvin against the Calvinists. That is kids' stuff compared with Calvin against Calvin, in which the accommodating Calvin is played off against the patriarchal Calvin or the tyrannical kill-joy Calvin or what have you. And it may well be that in accommodation we encounter a structural feature of Calvin's theology or exegesis not wholly consistent with some other features; we shall return briefly to this question later. For the moment I suggest that the very
attractiveness of the standard account of accommodation in Calvin—in a raw nutshell.

God submitting to human limitations to speak to and save humans—should set our critical antennae quivering, alert to the risks of misrepresentation or overstatement. We are still, I would claim, at the stage of uncovering the shape of the animal.

SOURCES

Not that we yet know whence it originated. Although there is general agreement that accommodation, in the sense of condensation to human capacities, had a long pre-history in Christian and Jewish thought, it is not yet clear where Calvin got it from. In 1969, Hedtke noted that an investigation of the idea in the history of theology was lacking, and this is still the position, although very soon to be remedied in some measure by the publication of Stephen D. Benin’s The Footprints of God: The history of theology remedied. This work has long been awaited, and in a time under the title “The Cunning of God.” Its contents may be at least partly gauged from two articles Benin produced in 1983 and 1984, sacrifice, “Sacrifice as education in Augustine and Chrysostom” and “The Cunning of God” and divine accommodation, which are also valuable in pointing to some of the further literature. The launching pad for Benin was his dissertation on sacrifice, which I have been unable to obtain. The only other historical survey known to me is a study of the eighteenth-century philosopher-theologian Johann Georg Hamann, which does not mention Calvin.

Battles believed that Calvin learned accommodation from classical rhetoric and some of the Fathers, notably Origen, Chrysostom, and Augustine, and this has become the standard account, being frequently repeated. I am certain that Calvin found no category of rhetoric called “accommodation” in the rhetorical works of Cicero, Pr-Cicero (Ad C. Herennium), Quintilian, and others. What he might have noticed was the use of verbs like accommodo in a range of senses like “adjust, adapt, apply, suit, correspond, match” etc.—so that Battles considerably oversimplifies when he asserts that

However accommodo... was used in Latin rhetoric, it always had to do with the adaptation of the verbal representation of the verb under consideration to the person being addressed, with full regard to their situation, their character, intelligence, and their emotional makeup. There is no evidence that accommodo, or any similar word, functioned as a technical term in classical or medieval Latin rhetoric. Nor did accommodation, however expressed, constitute an identifiably distinct topic of discussion in any of Calvin’s likely sources in this field.
Ilia certe et rerum tractationem et dictionem attempserat, quasi hominum multisindonem instinuare velit. 20

Such a comment, of course, need not imply any notice on Calvin’s part of Chrysostom’s emphasis on divine condescension. But the use of the verb attempsero may hint at some impression made by his favourite patristic exegete on Calvin in this area. Olivier Millet has a highly suggestive discussion of Chrysostom as Calvin’s model for popular teaching and preaching—the task of “la vulgarisation de la doctrine chrétienne.” 21

ORIGEN AND AUGUSTINE

Two other possible contenders as patristic sources of accommodation need not delay us so long. Origen (who receives the fullest discussion among the Fathers in Battles’ influential article—Chrysostom very little) certainly presents what Richard P. C. Hanson calls a “principle” or “doctrine of accommodation.” Hanson analyses God’s role in this under the three heads Battles deploys with reference to Calvin—God as father, teacher and physician. 22 Origen has a characteristic term for this accommodation, ouvrepasó (and the verb), although he also uses others such as ouvrepasóλα and ouvrepasó (and cognates)—the latter being another term that has attracted some scholarly attention in this area of historical theology. 23 But pending evidence thrown up by further investigation, it is difficult to suppose that Calvin, whose antipathy for Origen’s allegorical exegetics is well known (‘Origen succeeds notably in obscuring the straightforward sense of Scripture’), 24 was decisively influenced by the Alexandrian’s application of ouvrepasó, although some of his statements, as Battles shows, are quite similar to some of Calvin’s. There is probably scope here for some examination of linguistic questions in particular, e.g. the Latin equivalents to ouvrepasó etc. and the texts of Origen Calvin might have had access to.

“Calvin’s reading of Augustine”, states Battles, “clearly familiarized him with accommodation as a hermeneutical principle.” He may well be correct, but some evidence would be welcome. Neither Luchesius Smits’ two volumes nor the recent monograph by Marius Lange van Renswoude provide it in so many words, although the former gives extensive data for some testing. 25 Battles mentions in particular Augustine’s anti-Manichaean writings, but Smits does not identify accommodation among the materials Calvin drew from them. And in the “Contra Adimantum”, specifically named by Battles, although passages occur which might well be grist to an accommodationist mill, they do not appear in Smits’ list of Calvin’s citations and allusions. 26 Further comparative checking of Augustine and Calvin with the aid of Smits might conceivably throw up instances of the latter’s dependence on the former on this theme, but some might view such an exercise as unnecessary. Are we justified in requesting explicit evidence in the case of a thinker and writer so comprehensively immersed in the Augustinian corpus as Calvin unquestionably was?

Would be not have absorbed such elements imperceptibly into his blood-stream through drinking daily at the Augustinian well? Perhaps, but if this is how the issue is to rest, one or two further comments need to be made.

Most students of Augustine, I reckon, would not immediately recognize what is meant by his principle or doctrine of divine accommodation. When Benin writes that “Accommodation provided Augustine with a framework on which to erect an immense intellectual edifice encompassing the whole of the human experience,” 27 I suspect that Augustinian scholars have another word—or several words—for it. And although, against the Manichaean, Augustine has evil vindicating extensive tracts of the Old Testament, as Calvin will do by means of accommodation, differences between them are immediately obvious: for example, Augustine contrasts the servility of the Old with the sonship of the New, whereas Calvin sets the infancy of the Old against the adulthood of the New. Finally, it may be a commonplace but it is nevertheless true and worth repeating here that Calvin liked Augustine the theologian far more than Augustine the exegete. 28 The verdict—a distinctively Scottish one—remains “not proven.”

ERASMUS

One further possible inspiration falls to be considered—Erasmus. Although not, to my knowledge, the subject of any lengthy examination to date, his use of the concept and the language of accommodation bears close similarities to Calvin’s.

Balbutit nobis divina sapientia et veluti matre quaeplum officios ad nostrum infantiam voces accommodat. 29

Pedagogical accommodation is prominent in his Ratio Veræ Theologiae, with the verb accommodo—and attempsero—frequent. The motif is also significant in the Examenes. Differences, however, are not hard to seek. One of the virtues of allegory for Erasmus lay in its “mutability: its accommodation to the human interpretation of many readers.” 30 This accommodating versatility of Scripture is mirrored in the teaching ministry of Christ, which is the chief focus of the pedagogy of accommodation in the Ratio. These are not the accents of Calvin’s deployment of accommodation.

Millet, however, has now suggested a possibility that I find immediately attractive. Even if the sources of Calvin’s idea of accommodation lie further back, especially in Chrysostom, “la médiation d’Erasme, rhétorique et exégétique, est ici tout de même essentielle.” Millet cites one of Erasmus’ comments on Chrysostom:

Almost everything he wrote he accommodated (accommodavit) to popular ears, and to this end lowered (dimidit) the character of his speaking to their capacity (capuit), as a teacher prattles (balbutit) with an infant pupil. 31

175
If Chrysostom was Calvin's preferred tutor for his role as communicator of Christian simplicity to the public at large, it was Erasmus' highlighting in Chrysostom of the qualities this required that helped to focus Calvin's attention both on divine accommodation (accommodation) as expounded by the Greek Father and on pedagogical accommodation practiced by him. And here, finally, Millet attaches the significance of Calvin's abortive French translation of Chrysostom's homilies. Calvin first thought of reaching a popular public by a French translation of his own Institutes but of "des sources patristiques qui avaient en matière de vulgarisation doctrinale"—the homilies of Chrysostom.32

EMERGENCE AND DEVELOPMENT IN CALVIN

Another approach to the sources of Calvin's use of accommodation would trace its appearance and development in his writings, in the hope of correlating them with what is otherwise known of new inspirations and stimuli on his thought. The various editions of the Institutes would be an obvious starting point. Comparing these is a slow painstaking business, on which I have not spent much time. But it seems to me clear so far that 1536, as we might expect, has virtually no trace of accommodation, whereas 1539 presents what is sometimes called its focus classicus.

Who ever of slight intelligence does not understand that God has been accustomed to blabber (babillard), as it were, with us, like nurses with babies? Consequently such forms of speaking do not so much give a pristine picture (ad liquum) of what God is like as accommodate the knowledge of him to our slender capacity. That this may be done, it is necessary for a descent to be made far below his majesty.33

Although the Latin verb accommodo remains the most readily identifiable fingerprint of the motif, perhaps the Institutes' nearest approximation to a definition, which is also contained in 1539, uses neither it nor attempert.

What, then, does the word 'repentance' mean [of God]? Surely the same as all the other forms of speaking which depict God to us in human terms (humanitatis). Because our weakness does not reach to his loftiness, a depiction of him which is communicated to us must be lowered (subministrando) to our capacity, in order to be understood by us. Now the rationale of such lowering (subministrando ratio) is this, that he represent himself to us not such as he is in himself but as he is seen (acquiritur) by us. 34

It may be worth noting the outcomes of some straightforward word-count comparisons between 1539 and 1559.35 While attempert shows little increase (from 8 to 10), accommodo multiplies to 37 from 10 (as does temperto, from 13 to 32). Captus expands considerably (24 instead of 14), and radis and raditius together double, from 25 to 52. And so one could go on, remembering all the while that such statistics may cover a multitude of inconsequences. The increased usage of this basic vocabulary of accommodation is not disproportionate to the overall enlargement of the Institutes between 1539 and 1559.

There is perhaps only one note in respect of which the final Latin edition of the Institutes marks a clear advance on 1539 on accommodation, in a passage which first appeared in the 1543 edition on the temporum diversitas.

God ought not to be judged changeable just because he accommodated varying forms to various ages, as he knew to be expedient for each . . . . [Farmers and fathers are not considered fickle if they act differently at different times]. . . Why, then, do we brand God with the mark of inconsistency because he has differentiated the temporum diversitas with fitting and appropriate marks? . . . Paul likens the Jews to infants, Christians to adolescents. What is inordinate in this regimen of God that he confined them [the Jews] within the rudiments which suited the limitations of their age but trained us with a firmer and, so to speak, more adult discipline? Thus God's consistency is conspicuous in his having imparted the same teaching to all ages, and in persisting in requiring that worship of his name which he commanded at the outset. That he has changed the external form and means does not show him to be himself subject to change. But he has accommodated (attempert) himself to human capacity, which varies and changes.36

I have quoted this at length because it takes us into some of the more problematic aspects of accommodation in Calvin.

ACCOMMODATING TO PRIMITIVE ISRAEL

There is first the claim, which is hard to credit, that in adjusting to variable human capacities in different ages, God has varied not his doctrine and worship but only their external forms and modus. This is difficult to square with numerous appeals to accommodation in the Old Testament commentaries, especially on the Mosaic Harmony, where Calvin unambiguously states that the accommodating God "relaxed the rigour of his justice," allowed what was "unlawful" (e.g. divorce) or "gross barbarity" (the separation of married slaves on the man's release), conceded the "abuse" and "barbaric" provision for a close relative to avenge a murder, and so on.37
At this point it may be helpful to distinguish two quite central expressions of 
divine accommodation in Calvin. First and foremost is the truth enunciated in two 
dicts of Princetons's Calvinian perist "the accommodated character of all knowledge of 
God" and "humanitas capar divinitus per accadominem." This is familiar 
territory which needs no mapping by me today. One of the images Calvin uses to 
illuminate it is that of a father confounding to his children. Such an image 
is applicable to the whole grand sweep of God's adopting our humanness--of speech, 
of mental capacity, of flesh itself--to communicate himself to us human.

But there is another sphere of divine accommodation in which the image of 
adapting to men and women as children applies specifically to the economy of Israel. 
It is important that we bear clearly in mind the distinction between these two 
applications of the accommodating-to-children motif. It is my submission that if we 
may differentiate between forms of God's self-accommodation according to its 
recipients, then in Calvin it addresses first human beings qua finite creatures, 
secondly human beings qua sinners, and thirdly Israel as a primitive ethos. 
Although his distinguishing between Jews and Christians as infants and young 
adults, as he did quite often, may suggest that a third category is not called for and 
that the different stages on the age scale represent simply different positions on the 
spectrum of human sinfulness, we must not forget the other vocabulary Calvin uses 
so often of Israel, which I sum up as that of primitive barbarity.

We embark here on waters of which the Institutes give one barely an inkling. 
I wonder, for example, if anyone has compared the expositions of the Decalogue in 
the Institutes on the one hand and in the commentary (and sermons) on the other. 
I believe that the commentary on the Mosaic Harmony is one of Calvin's most 
remarkable productions, partly because of the construction of the harmony itself, but 
also partly because here--and in other of his Old Testament expositions, e.g. the 
Joshua commentary, but supremely here--Calvin grapples realistically with the 
rawness of an uncivilized people capable of monstrous enormities. Perhaps it 
required a humanistic like Calvin to recognize the primitive crudity of too much Israelite 
life for what it was. He shows himself capable at times of some impressive socio-
historical perceptions.

For our purposes what is important is that the accommodating God remains 
sovereign in all his dealings with Israel. We must never forget that, for Calvin, 
accommodation on God's part is not evidence of his weakness or loss of control, of 
his vulnerability or malleability at the hands of intractable humanity. Parts of the 
Pentateuch commentary make it look awfully like this on occasions, but even when 
Moses ends up enacting something such as divorce that is emphatically anathema to 
God, this is presented as God's concession to a hard-hearted people. And so Calvin 
will nearly always come up with some extenuating factor behind the most astonishing 
divine indulgence of Israelite recalcitrance or barbarity--even if it is only the cold 
comfort that, unless he had given them this much rope, they would not have played 
ball with him at all. Here, as so frequently elsewhere in his biblical expositions, 
Calvin brings to bear his characteristic interest in human motivation that makes him 
what I can only call a peculiarly psychologically-sensitive interpreter of Scripture.

We are some distance here from a cozy view of accommodated revelation as "God's baby-talk." Indeed, because of the range of phenomena that cluster under 
this accommodating umbrella I am nervous of talking of "the principle" of 
accommodation, although I am aware that the most distinguished of Calvin scholars 
do so. (Had I allowed myself that whimsey of an American double-entendre in the title 
of this paper, I could have spoken of revisiting Calvin's "accommodations," in the 
plural!) What I believe we see in his bold handling of this Old Testament material is 
what some might describe as his "saving the Old Testament" and what others may 
view as an anticipation of "progressive revelation." But it must emphatically be 
repeated that Calvin does not concede what post-Enlightenment biblical criticism 
would introduce to resolve the difficulties he faced—that is, a sharp dichotomy 
between God's revelation to Israel and Israelite religion, as though God left Israel to 
do the best it could, or would, with his revelation—for the most part not a very good 
best. Nor, for Calvin a combination of God's sovereignty with his condescending 
self-accommodation, not without of course a stark appreciation of human perversity, 
enabled him still to own Israel's history as God's history with his people—his church 
in fact, as he regularly calls Israel. This is a people left to its own devices or its 
own best lights, but one with whom God is ever grappling in his sovereign grace and 
in its stupifying torpor and brutal obstinacy. Such are the elements of which the 
most dramatic accommodation is compounded.

WIDER APPLICATIONS OF ACCOMMODATION

In the last section of this paper I raise some questions about the relation of 
accommodation to other reaches of Calvin's teaching. None will deny that 
accommodation bears upon absolutely central areas of his biblical theology. Stauffer 
shows its application in the sermons to cosmology, theology proper (the doctrine of 
God) and Christology. As we have noted, there is a true and important sense in 
which the whole Christian economy is characterized by God's accommodation—even, 
surprisingly enough, the angels. Indeed, it is for that reason crucial that we attend to 
the contexts in which Calvin does, and does not, speak of accommodation—for, 
however frequently he does so speak, he does not do so all the time! Even if 
Calvin's God, in revelation above all but also in incarnation and his provision for his 
church, among other areas, operates within the limits of human capacity, his 
accommodation is not unlimited. Nor, it seems, does God's accommodation issue a 
warrant for his people to be accommodating. It is on this latter question that I 
particularly want to concentrate.

But first a few words about the doctrine of Scripture—only a few, because this 
is a well-worn pitch (a metaphor from cricket, I hasten to add) and Richard C. 
Gouge has helpfully assembled a number of earlier essays at batting on it. Yet I am 
not persuade that attempts to spell out how Calvin viewed Scripture have taken 
the full measure of some aspects of the accommodation motif. Since God is always 
sovereign in accommodation, the finished product of Scripture is his work—all of it.
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every word of it. Whether later predications such as verbal or plenary inspiration are appropriate to express this is not my concern here. No *partum-partum* distinction is applicable. If it would be true to say that for Calvin the Bible is wholly human, it would be more critical to say that it is wholly divine in the sense of God-given. The accommodated character of the presentation of God's revelation in Scripture does not militate against the Scripture's being wholly what God designed it to be. But, on the other hand, because behind Scripture lies God's self-limitation to human unfitness, what we now read in Scripture does not always express God's will. When Moses provided for divorce in Deuteronomy 24, it was wrong; that it was "never lawful" Calvin knows not from anything in Deuteronomy but from Christ's pronouncement in the Gospel. But there are other occasions when Calvin identifies illegitimate concessions to Israelite perversity in the Pentateuch without such explicit indication elsewhere in Scripture. For example, he finds most of the provisions for the treatment of Israelite slaves intolerable. Yet God truly authorized these woful declensions from justice and piety. So the biblical record authentically preserves God's sovereignty, accommodated instructions or legislation even when it is hard, for Calvin at least, to recognize them as God's will. But his recognition of some of the elements of the Mosaic order and history as "monstrous" or "barbaric" or "absurd" does not lead Calvin to depict Scripture here as an all-too-human corruption of God's wisdom, primitive human religion rather than God's Word.

To express the point in a more general terms, I suspect that our inability to reach a consensus about Calvin's view of Scripture arises from our difficulty in holding together what he held together. From our different perspectives we know well enough what is compatible and what is incompatible with believing the Bible to be God's written Word, without qualification, and we proceed to cut the Gordian knot accordingly, where Calvin keeps it tied. He has, I think, a more highly developed (accommodating?) sense of the co-habitation of divine and human in the undivided house of Scripture than most modern visitors.

**ETHICAL AND RELIGIOUS ACCOMMODATION?**

If God, according to Calvin, was so considerate of the vagaries of fallen humankind, what implications, if any, follow for the life of his people? How far does Calvin extrapolate from his understanding of God's behavior to the proper behavior of the godly?

Ethical accommodation is a related subject often discussed in connection with the use of *olivcrout* in patristic and later writers.46 Athanasius describes *olivcrot* as an arrangement whereby "with regard to the same action it is not lawful to do it under one circumstance and at one time, but under another circumstance it is both conveniently forgotten and acquiesced in." 47 Is it fair to say that Calvin had little time for it? A fine article by John L. Thompson has recently shown how exceptional Calvin was in not excusing the immoraties of the patriarchs. 48 Calvin's judgments of all the patriarchal misdeeds studied are significantly harsher than those of his predecessors and contemporaries. 49 In particular, Calvin dismisses, "not infrequently with a measure of contempt," virtually all the factors cited by others in mitigation of the patriarchs' guilt. There is no consideration here for the human frailties of cowardice and loneliness, nor will he countenance any special divine dispensation justifying patriarchal mendacity or polygamy. No divine accommodation here! Or rather, more accurately, no divine warrant for human accommodation. 

Nor will Calvin contemplate with equanimity religious accommodation—dissimilation and Nicodemism, as apparently he was the first to style them—conformity to the Old Church. The interesting monograph by Perez Zagoria emphasizes the singularity of Calvin's preoccupation with this issue:

No Protestant leader subjected the phenomenon of dissimulation and its rationales to closer scrutiny than the Genevan reformer John Calvin. Calvin rejected it in a succession of works that contain the most significant and influential Protestant discussions of the subject during the Reformation. 50

And I believe it is fair to say that none of the Reformers was as inflexibly uncompromising in condemning any expression of external accommodation to Roman Catholic religion. The discussion is indeed conducted from time to time in the vocabulary Calvin uses for God's self-accommodation to our weakness and wilfulness, but now invariably with reprobation. Even though that divine action is seen to result from time to time, according to Calvin, in commands and practices which expressed something less than, even occasionally something conflicting with, the perfection of God's will, the Reformer finds no grounds for tolerating in the present any concession entailing derogation from the total demands of fidelity to divine truth.

**PEDAGOGICAL ACCOMMODATION**

Some of the biblical material discussed in Calvin's arguments against religious dissimulation is more pertinent to his view to what can be called pedagogical accommodation—for example, Paul's becoming all things to all kinds of people, his having Timothy circumcised, his counsel on the weak and the strong in Romans 14 and 15, his own participation in ritual purification at Jerusalem in Acts 21. On this front Calvin clearly effects a carry-over from the accommodating methods of biblical teachers to procedures recommended to preachers and others in his day. Since prophetic and apostolic accommodation to the customs of their hearers and readers is for Calvin part of God's accommodation to sinful humans, we find here, it seems, one important area in which the accommodating God becomes an example to his accommodating servants. Indeed, more than an example, for the ministry of preachers and teachers is the way in which today God deals with us humanly.
familiarly, according to our capacities and perversities.

This is all amply documented by Hedtke, not I think as well-known as it deserves to be (the copy in Princeton Theological Seminary's Speer Library is in pristine condition!). I quote him in rounding off this point.

Jedoch ist für Calvin die accommodatio [of preachers] letztlich nicht ein pädagogischdidaktischer Kunstgriff, sondern ein Akt, der aus der accommodatio Gottes resultiert und sie wiederum übergibt. In der Schwäche der Gemeindelieder hat auch die accommodatio der Diener der Kirche ihren Grund. In die Predigt durch Menschenmund grundsätzlich eine Form der accommodatio Gottes an die Fassungskraft der Menschen. 52

We have then found that the God whose hallmark in his once-for-all revelation and redemption in Israel and in Jesus was accommodation to human finitude, corruption and primitiveness, is accommodating still in and through the church's testimony and proclamation. One could go on raising questions that I have neither the time nor the competence to answer here and now. What of Calvin's pastoral practice, for example, not least in the light of the revised picture emerging from the Consistory record? Does his pastoral counsel, or his counsel to other pastors, to any recognizable degree bear the stamp of his accommodating God? And if in ancient Israel God accommodated his self-revelation to a people characterized by uncivilized barbarity, what might Calvin have to say about accommodated Christian communication today to a sophisticated electronic culture?
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49 As Thompson, "Immoralities of the Patriarchs in the History of Exegesis: a Reappraisal of Calvin's Position," pp. 41-42, points out, there are other occasions when Calvin justifies God's overturning the natural law, but apparently "only God may initiate acts contrary to the order of nature."


52 Hedtke, Erziehung durch die Kirche bei Calvin, 109, and cf. especially 106-114 ("Die Predigt und die accommodatio").
Calvin Studies VIII

The Westminster Confession in Current Thought

Presented at
The Colloquium on Calvin Studies
held
January 26-27, 1996
at
Davidson College
and the
Davidson College Presbyterian Church
Davidson, North Carolina

John H. Leith
Baptism at the Westminster Assembly

David Wright
Senior Lecturer
New College, University of Edinburgh

INTRODUCTION: BAPTISM'S NEGLECT

The choice of subject may surprise readers. Baptism did not provoke any of the Westminster Assembly’s momentous debates—although, as will be seen, it did give rise to some lengthy and divisive discussions. Nor can the Westminster divines be said to have made any remarkable contribution to the church’s understanding or practice of baptism.

Yet a reaction of surprise that baptism should enjoy a paper of its own in a conference commemorating the Westminster Assembly may have more to do with a wider neglect or devaluation of baptism, at least when compared with the Lord’s supper. Modern ecumenical conversations have paid it little attention—and the section on baptism in the landmark Faith and Order statement Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry (World Council of Churches, Geneva, 1982) has been judged the least accomplished of the three. We have no history of Christian baptism nor a comprehensive account of baptism in the Reformation. The magisterial Reformers’ differences from the Old Church on baptism were relatively slight, and both joined in scornful dismissal of the Radical Anabaptists’ protest. Compared with the mass and the inner-Protestant ‘supper-strife’, baptism was very small beer. One has only to reflect on the massively contrasting weight of preoccupation displayed over the proper minister of baptism on the one hand and of the Lord’s supper on the other.

Whether this relative depreciation of baptism faithfully reflects the witness of the New Testament is a large question for another occasion. Let me simply affirm my judgment that it would be far truer to the apostolic testimony to portray the church as a baptismal community than as a eucharistic community, as it is commonly called today. The conviction grows on me that the devaluing of baptism, in much of British evangelical church life, for example, cannot be understood in detachment from the predominance of infant baptism and its largescale failure - its failure, that is, in such a high proportion of cases measured on any realistic assessment, actually to initiate people into the church. Inevitably, if paedobaptism is so often ineffective, it cannot sustain grandiose theological pretensions. Inevitably, the focus shifts to some later occasion of confirmation or admission to communion or to full membership. Inevitably, reductionist treatment is meted out to the New Testament presentations of baptism, to make them fit our experience of the administration of infant baptism on the ground.

Such contemporary concerns may help to sharpen our investigation of baptismal deliberations at the Westminster Assembly. After all, the Westminster documents have to a major degree shaped baptismal understanding and practice in the Reformed churches in the West. And the very fact that our instinctive initial reaction at the pairing of baptism and Westminster suggests that its approach to the sacrament has been assimilated among our churches without much controversy may point up the special value of bringing to it the harder questions of the present - the kind of questions, for

example, that the dissolution of Christendom in the western world poses to the practice of baptizing infants. For, as Karl Barth well recognized, Christendom and paedobaptism go together.

THE WESTMINSTER DOCUMENTS AND MINUTES

Four of the Westminster documents deal with baptism: the Confession of Faith, the Directory for Public Worship, and the Larger and Shorter Catechisms. The minutes of the Assembly record next to nothing of the discussions on the contents of the Catechisms, and, as far as baptism is concerned, very little of those on the Confession. The only extended minutes of baptismal debate relate to the Directory for Public Worship.

Not that the extant minutes are a high-quality record. This is the verdict of the late Robert Paul:

"These manuscript Minutes are something of a misnomer, since they appear to be little more than the hasty notes of a scribe, probably written in preparation for a fuller account to appear at some later date. The speeches are often cryptic to the point of being almost meaningless, there are frustrating gaps in the text where the scribe had possibly intended to insert summaries of the speeches to be obtained from the notes of the speakers themselves, and the whole is written in an inextricable seventeenth century hand of extraordinary abstruseness and complexity."

Fortunately, not least for the purposes of this paper, the Library of New College, Edinburgh holds an invaluable manuscript transcript in highly legible copper-plate script of the original manuscript minutes (which are in Dr. Williams’ Library, London). The transcript was made in the late 1860s and early 1870s under the auspices of a Church of Scotland committee. The published copy of

1 Cf. The Teaching of the Church Regarding Baptism, translated by E.A. Payne (SCM Press, London, 1948), 52-4; "the really operative extraneous ground for infant baptism, even with the Reformers, and ever and again quite plainly, since has been this: one did not want then in any case at any price to deny the existence of the evangelical Church in the Constantinian epoch (Volkskirche? - (52).

2 Robert S. Paul, The Assembly of the Lord, Politics and Religion in the Westminster Assembly and the 'Grand Debate' (T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1985), 72-3; cited henceforth as 'Paul'. See also his Appendix IV, 'Interpreting the Minutes', 562-4. Among the oddities of the manuscript is the misspelling of names. George Gillespie, one of the Scottish commissioners, commonly appears as 'Gelapi'.

3 On these matters see Paul, 73, with notes. In June 1867 the Church of Scotland’s General Assembly appointed a committee to obtain a transcript of the manuscript minutes held in Dr. Williams’ Library, London (Principes Actus of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland 1867, 60). This committee, convened until his death by Professor Alexander F. Mitchell and then from 1899 by Thomas Leishman, until it was discontinued by the 1904 Assembly, arranged for the completion of the transcript (on the difficulties of this task see Principes Actus 1868, 63-5), and subsequent annual reports to the Assembly), which it presented to the 1875 Assembly which deposited it in the General Assembly Library (Principes Actus 1875, 85). The committee also secured the publication of most of volume III of the minutes, in 1874 (see next note), and in 1892 also of The Records of the Commission of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland held in Edinburgh in the Years 1646 and 1647, ed. Mitchell and James Christie (Scottish History Society, 11; Edinburgh, 1892; see Principes Actus 1850, 82, 1892, 78), but failed despite years of effort to find adequate funds for the publication of the rest of the Westminster Assembly’s minutes (Principes Actus 1881, 84; 1904, 66). The completion of this task of publication I hope to achieve in time for it to stand as a commemoration of the 350th anniversary of the Assembly. Further investigation is called for to clarify some of the General Assembly reports on the progress of the project (e.g. Principes Actus 1870, 75; 1871, 99; 1872, 76; 1877, 66).
part of the minutes, edited by Alexander F. Mitchell and John Struthers in 1874, presents this transcript. This volume covers the Assembly's proceedings from November 1644 to March 1649 and hence does not include the debates on the Directory for Public Worship and contains little about baptism.

The minutes can be supplemented, and sometimes corrected, from the accounts of participants, especially the Journals of the noted Hebraist, John Lightfoot, covering July 1643 to December 1644, and the Notes of George Gillespie of debates from February 1644 to January 1645, together with the briefer general comments in Robert Baillie's Letters and Journals. Both Lightfoot and Gillespie are of value in supplying some of the deficiencies of the minutes in relation to the sessions on baptism.

Maunde Thompson, of the Manuscripts Department of the British Museum, on Thompson (1840-1929), later Principal Librarian of the British Museum 1888-1902 (with title of Director from 1896), see Dictionary of National Biography 1922-1930 (1937), 834-6, although this tribute by F.G. Kenyon does not mention Thompson's transcripts of the Westminster Assembly's minutes. On the Church of Scotland's General Assembly Library see briefly John Howard, 'New College Library', in Wright and Badcock (eds), Dissolution to Diversity (op. cit., n. 58 below), 187-202, at 192-3. The transcript appears in the printed Catalogue of Books, Pamphlets and Manuscripts in the Library of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland (Blackwood, Edinburgh, 1907), 441: 'Minutes of the sessions of the Assembly of Divines at Westminster, August 4, 1643 - March 25, 1652, 3 vols. in 5 folio.' In the preparation of this paper I have been wholly dependent on the New College transcript, which, following Paul, I cite as 'TM.' and not on the original manuscript. In manuscript the minutes extend from August 4 (erratum for September 4), 1643 to April 24, 1652.

Minutes of the Sessions of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, While Engaged in Preparing their Directory for Church Government, Confession of Faith and Catechisms (November 1644 to March 1649), From Transcripts of the Originals Procured by a Committee of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, Edited for the Committee by Alex. F. Mitchell and John Struthers (William Blackwood & Sons, Edinburgh, 1874, republished Still Waters Revival Books, Edmonton, Alberta, 1991), cited hereafter as 'Mitchell and Struthers.' On Mitchell, see briefly Nigel M. de S. Cameron et al. (eds), Dictionary of Scottish Church History and Theology (T&T Clark, Edinburgh, 1993), 594, and on Struthers, Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticae, 2nd. edit., 1 (1915), 591. Only further research will clear up some uncertainty over Struthers's contributions to the transcripts published by Mitchell and Struthers. According to the General Assembly record, E.M. Thompson (see previous note) transcribed volume II, and Struthers an important part of volume III (Principal Acts ... 1856-64; the Assembly Acts give no more detail). Mitchell and Struthers, ix, state that the transcripts of volume III were made by Thompson and Struthers, but also that 'the Minutes throughout stand in their [published] text as, after repeated and careful revision, it was fixed by Mr. Thompson.' Furthermore, the five folio volumes of the transcript in New College Library appear to be all in a single hand. Paul, 73, with n. 5, if anything compounds the confusion. It may well be that the transcript we now have is wholly Thompson's production.

It should be noted that where Mitchell and Struthers insert an ellipsis (...) in their text, it does not indicate omission of material in the minutes but merely gaps in the transcript itself, nearly always immediately evident from parts of lines or several lines at a time left blank. Here the transcript faithfully reproduced the original: see Paul, 73, cited above. Mitchell and Struthers might have obviated any misunderstanding of their practice had they been fully consistent, but cf. 180, 'Her '; 182, 'Debate of ...'. The present essay uses ellipsis (...) to indicate only my omission of material from the source. I have modernised the spelling of the manuscript minutes only in giving 'that' for 'it', 'and' for the copula.

be baptized to be a believer,"11 He certainly denies that the sacrament is a naked sign—"there is no nakedness in a seal"—but he apparently envisages baptism as conferring its gifts on those who already enjoy grace. He seems to reject the notion that baptism imparts the grace of conversion: "he that is without the first grace hath nothing to make him in a capacity of receiving; he is dead."12 But Whittaker is not satisfied: Palmer has not answered the Scriptures he quoted. "The Scripture speaks more about conferring than it doth either of signing and sealing."13

Such is our intriguingly brief glimpse of a debate that must have engaged weighty theological considerations. On my reading of the minutes, the draft before the Assembly at this point did not contain the language now present—"not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred"—but the text is not lucid enough to allow certainty on this question. Whittaker not only advances the word 'exhibited' but also evinces awareness of its Latin original—"in conjuncta exhibitione, Ursinus." The verb was widely used in Reformation disputes on the Lord's supper, especially by Martin Bucer, but its currency in this context goes back at least to Aquinas.14 Its pairing with 'conferred' reveals its meaning, which is stronger than 'exhibit' in modern English. The word 'convey' comes near to the double reference of exhibere, as does 'present' itself.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION

What then about the efficacy of baptism according to the Westminster Confession? Its central affirmation seems clear: 'the grace promised is not only offered, but really exhibited and conferred by the Holy Ghost' (28:6). It is true that a variety of qualifications to this assertion are entered in the chapter on baptism: efficacy is not tied to the moment of administration (ibid.), grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed to baptism that no person can be regenerated or saved without it (28:5) or that all the baptized are undoubtedly regenerated (ibid.). But these qualifications serve in fact only to highlight the clarity of the core declaration, which is set forth as follows in the preceding chapter on sacraments in general:

neither doth the efficacy of a sacrament depend upon the piety or intention of him that doth administer it, but upon the work of the Spirit, and the word of institution; which contains... a promise of benefit to worthy receivers (27:5).

The Westminster divines viewed baptism as the instrument and occasion of regeneration by the Spirit, of the remission of sins, of ingrafting into Christ (cf. 28:1). The Confession teaches baptismal regeneration. We should note also that while the Catechisms use the language only of

11Ibid., 176.
12Ibid., with n. 1.
13Ibid.
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'sign and seal', if the Directory for Public Worship has the following passage in the model prayer before the act of baptizing:

That the Lord ... would join the inward baptism of his Spirit with the outward baptism of water; make this baptism to the infant a seal of adoption ... and all other promises of the covenant of grace: That the child may be planted into the likeness of the death and resurrection of Christ.16

But if the Assembly unambiguously ascribes this instrumental efficacy to baptism, it is not automatically enjoyed by all recipients: it contains: 'a promise of benefit to worthy receivers' (27:3), who from one point of view are 'those that do actually profess faith in and obedience unto Christ, but also the infants of one or both believing parents' (28:4), and from another, 'such (whether of age or infants) as that grace belongeth unto, according to the counsel of God's own will, in his appointed time' (28:6). But it would surely be a perverse interpretation of the Confession's chapter on baptism if we allowed this last allusion to the hidden counsel of God to emasculate its vigorous primary affirmation.

PROFESSION OF FAITH

I have been struck, in re-reading the Confession and Directory for Public Worship and scrutinizing records of the debates, at the Assembly's relatively muted concern with faith as a prerequisite for baptism to have effect. The key stipulation is, of course, present: baptism is for 'those that do actually profess faith in and obedience unto Christ, but also the infants of one or both believing parents' (28:4). Westminster provides no support for a tendency observable in recent years for the requirement of sincere and credible Christian faith on the part of at least one parent to be transposed into an emphasis on the faith of the receiving congregation. While heightened congregational involvement is to be welcomed, this shift is motivated by some measure by a desire to accommodate the baptism of children whose parent or parents cannot with any honesty be acknowledged as believers or church members. Increasingly, indeed, this is the one pressing for the baptism. From other angles also infant baptism is becoming a more tangled pastoral issue as the norms of marriage and family disintegrate.

In the light of these present-day concerns, it is instructive to note the absence from the Directory for Public Worship of any provision for the parent(s) to be called upon to profess their faith afresh at the baptism, or to undertake any vows or commitments in relation to the child. The question was one which occupied the assembled divines on two occasions, in July 1644 (July 12 and 15) and again on October 9-11 later that year. For the second debate we have invaluable reports by Lightfoot and Gillespie. The latter records that the Assembly voted by 28 to 16 to include a parental profession of faith, in the form of affirmative answers to creedal questions.17 The deletion of such a

15Larger Catechism A. 165: 'Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, wherein Christ hath ordained the washing with water ... to be a sign and seal of ingrafting into himself, of remission of sins ...'; Shorter Catechism A. 95: ... a sacrament, wherein the washing ... doth signify and seal ...

16The words 'join the inward baptism ... with the outward' did not win immediate acceptance from the Assembly on July 19, 1644, according to TMs. II. 261-3. Whittaker declared the child to be as capable of the working of the Spirit in baptism as afterwards, Stephen Marshall was sure that, as a sign, baptism fulfilled all three functions of a sign, viz. to signify, to seal (obsignare) and to exhibit, and Palmer affirmed that, since God baptizes through ministerial instruments, 'if he doe it he doth it inwardly as well as outwardly' (263).

17Gillespie, 91.
section from the Directory was the work of the English Parliament in early 1645. What th Commons and Lords dropped was the following paragraph:

It is recommended to the parent, to make a profession of his faith, by answering these and the like questions:

Dost thou believe in God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost? Dost thou hold thyself bound to observe all that Christ hath commanded thee, and will thou endeavour so to do? Dost thou desire to have this child baptised into the faith and profession of Jesus Christ? All that Parliament added by way of compensation was the phrase ‘requiring his [the parent’s] solemn promise for the performance of his duty’.

The minutes together with the reports of Lightfoot and Gillespie enable one to follow with reasonable confidence a quite surprising range of arguments batted to and fro on the desirability of recommending such a profession. The Scots, with Alexander Henderson to the fore, ‘did urge it mightily, because of the use of it in all reformed churches’. Citing Calvin’s exegesis of 1 Peter 3:21, Henderson reckoned a profession in the form of questions and answers ‘as ancient as the baptism of infants and taken from that practise used in baptizing of adults’. It added to the solemnity of the occasion. For others like Thomas Wilson and Philip Nye, the usage of the Reformed churches and Scotland was inadequate ground, if it did not satisfy the criteria of Scripture or prudence. ‘We may pray reformed churches may be reformed more than they are.’

The Scots were clearly not of one mind, for Samuel Rutherford opposed it as lacking warrant in Scripture, and he wanted nothing in the Directory that could not command full uniformity. 24

18 Journals of the House of Commons IV, 70; Journals of the House of Lords VII, 264.

19 For the text. Journals of the House of Lords VII, 264 (March 5, 1645) and Gillespie, 91; and TM. II, 493, in part only. See A.F. Mitchell, The Westminster Assembly, Its History and Standards (Nisbet & Co., London, 1883; reprinted, St. Johns, Revival Books, Edmonton, Alberta, 1992), 216-19. The omitted paragraph would have appeared immediately after ‘if he be negligent’, i.e. where the inserted phrase is now placed. Lightfoot, 314-15, includes an earlier form of the questions proposed to the Assembly by its committee:

1. Do you believe all the articles of faith contained in Scripture?
2. That all men and this child are born in sin?
3. That the blood and Spirit washeth away sin?
4. Will you have, therefore, this child baptized?

This came forward for discussion on October 9, 1644, according to Lightfoot. The manuscript minutes contain neither set of questions nor the form that later failed to secure Parliament’s approval.

20 TM. II, 251-5 (July 12 and 15), 479-93 (October 9-11, 1644), Lightfoot, 314-16 (October 9-11); Gillespie, 88-91 (October 9-11).

21 Lightfoot, 315.

22 TM. II, 489, 481; Gillespie, 91.

23 TM. II, 483-4.

24 Gillespie, 90; TM. II, 481, 486.
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form. The procedure could not have attested more unambiguously that infants were being included in a rite devised for faith-professing candidates. The outcome of the Westminster Assembly’s toruous deliberations reflected many centuries of practice, undisturbed by the mainstream Reformation, in which infant baptism, not faith-baptism, had been de facto the norm.

In Public or in Private?

Two other issues likewise kept the assembled divines busy for days during consideration of the Directory’s draft section on baptism. One was whether dipping, i.e. immersion, should be mentioned, and if so in what terms, and the other was what emerged eventually in the Directory as the stipulation that baptism was not to be administered in private places, or privately, but in the place of public worship and in the face of the congregation, where the people may most conveniently see and hear; and not in the places where fonts, in the time of Popery, were unfitly and superstitiously placed.

‘Here’, records John Lightfoot, ‘began we to enter into the ocean of many vast disputes’.36 They spent all of July 11, 1644, on it, and returned to it on October 9, when the location of the font was on the table. The Scots, as Gillespie tells us, claimed that there was ‘no place so fit for seeing and hearing of the people as the pulpit ... the pulpit is chosen for the fittest place’.37 Not surprisingly they did not prevail, but Scottish practice reflected their plea, with basins affixed to the outside of the pulpit and basins held up aloft by parents to ministers to sprinkle with baptismal dew from above.38 The height of the pulpit determined how hazardous the elevation was.39

The prior question - in private, or only in public? - implicated weighty considerations of theological import. Robert Baillie’s letter expresses his relief. We have carried, with much greater ease than we expected, the publickness of baptism. The abuse was great over all this land. In the greatest parishes in London, scarce one child in a-year was brought to the church for baptism. Also we have carried the parents presenting of his child, and not their midwives, as was their universal custom.40

Edmund Calamy made the same point more sharply: ‘great abuse in the city [of London: he was vicar of St Mary’s, Aldersmabury], in 2 or 3 years none baptized in the church’.41 For centuries in the medieval West the majority of babies may well have been baptized by midwives or other lay persons. The custom restored, of course, on the Augustinian premise of the necessity of baptism for eternal salvation. The Westminster Confession and the Directory for Public Worship tod deliberately in eschewing this notion with its abusive consequences but without relaxing the reins irresponsibly. Thus the Directory:

[O]utward baptism is not so necessary, that, through the want thereof, the infant is in danger of damnation, or the parents guilty, if they do condemn or neglect the ordinance of Christ, when and where it may be had.

And so ‘to propound the case of sickness’ as justification for private baptism ‘is to go too near the tenet of the absolute necessity’, as Thomas Wilson put it.42

The argument between public and private baptism again reveals the company of divines searching in vain for decisive scriptural guidance. Was not circumcision done in private houses? Gillespie was not convinced, and in any case ‘circumcision and baptism differ, because of the wound and plastering it’. No blood on the synagogue floor!43 ‘All the nation was baptized, when they were to come out of Egypt; but this could not be done in a congregation’, retorted John Lightfoot.44 Stephen Marshall could cite ‘reasons a man may give many why in the publice congregation, but noe instance of it in the new testament’.45 Lazarus Seaman added that it provided ‘noe instance... in a private place by any ordinary minister either’.46 The quest for precise scriptural precedent threatened at such junctures to issue in absurd minimalism.

A more substantive aspect of this question was the child’s relationship to the church. Calamy is credited with asserting that ‘Baptism properly is noe church ordinance/Baptized and then added to the church’, but Samuel Rutherford retorted: ‘It is admission to the church; ergo, it must be in the face of the church.’47 It was left to Seaman to supply another word of sanity: ‘If the church go to the child, when the child go to church, this is not to be thought private baptism.’48 Amid the ebbs and flows of conflicting opinions, in which one reluctantly admires the ingenuity of the assembled minds more than their sweet reasonableness, it is astonishing to find on this issue no forthright

---

36 Lightfoot, 297.
37 Gillespie, 89; Lightfoot, 315.
38 See the present writer’s article in Cameron (ed.), Dictionary (op. cit. n. 4 above), 57.
39 Pseudo-baptism in other forms has occasionally afforded an unwitting recollection of the etymological and symbolic links between baptism and death by immersion in water. According to the Financial Times of March 2, 1996, President Boris Yeltsin was nearly drowned by a sippy press when being baptized in a Siberian village as a child. I recall a story that used to go the rounds of the Anglican theological colleges. What should a vicar do if he accidentally dropped a baby into a deep stone font? Replace the lid on the font and turn in the Prayer Book to the service for Burial at Sea! Karl Barth commented scornfully on the loss in dramatic vividness as complete immersion yielded to affusion which itself was reduced from a real wetting to a sprinkling and eventually to the ‘mere moistening with as little water as possible’ of the innocuous form of present-day baptism. The Teaching of the Church Regarding Baptism, 9-11.
40 Baillie II, 204-5.
41 TMs. II, 244.
42 Lightfoot, 297; TMs. II, 244-5.
43 Lightfoot, 297; TMs. II, 245.
44 Lightfoot, 298.
45 TMs. II, 245.
46 TMs. II, 249.
47 Lightfoot, 297; TMs. II, 244.
48 Lightfoot, 297; TMs. II, 245.
appeal to the principle of holding Word and sacrament together. One might have expected it to clinch the argument, so that baptism could only properly take place when and where the Word was ministered. The divines too easily lost sight of the theological wood amid varied individual trees of New Testament baptisms.

**DEBATE OVER DIPPING**

At times when one eavesdrops on the Assembly's deliberations, one can only marvel at the providence that produced such a majestic outcome from such an astonishing pot-pourri of discussion. This is nowhere more keenly felt than in the protracted altercations over whether the Directory should mention dipping. Herein, says Lightfoot, 'fell we upon a large and long discourse', on which they spent at least three days, July 21 and August 7-8, 1644, according to the minutes. Lightfoot was absent on August 7. In the end, the Directory kept silent. 'To baptize the child, which, for the manner of doing it, is not only lawful but sufficient, and most expedient to be, by pouring or sprinkling of the water on the face of the child, without adding any other ceremony.'

As Lightfoot commented, 'it was thought fit and most safe to let it alone.' Later the Confession would be explicit, 'Dipping of the person into the water is not necessary' (28:3), but the course of reasoning that led to this change of mind is hidden from us.

On August 7 the company voted and split down the middle: 24 were for keeping a mention of dipping, 25 were against. And this was after a re-count: 'it was voted so indifferently that we were glad to count names twice', wrote Lightfoot. 'And there grew a great heat upon it: and when we had done all, we concluded upon nothing in it.' The arguments were truly wondrous in their variety and vixenity:

if dipping is needed to depict burial, 'what must answer dying?' (Francis Woodcock);

if we say dipping is necessary, 'we shall further anabaptism' (John Ley, and John Lightfoot);

what was the 'proper native signification' of the Greek verb *baptazo*? (Gillespie);

how could 5000 be dipped in a day? (George Walker);

what happened in Jewish proselyte baptism, which was followed by John the Baptist and the disciples of Jesus? (Thomas Coleman and Lightfoot gave different answers); Lightfoot was in his element citing the rabbinic commentators; others

---

49Lightfoot, 290.

50Ibid. 301.

51Ibid., 300.

52TMs. II, 265.

53TMs. II, 265. 275.

54TMs. II, 267.

55TMs. II, 266.

56TMs. II, 271 (Coleman: proselytes went in up to their necks and dipped themselves all over), 272 (Lightfoot: sprinkling attested by Rabbi Solomon).

---

reported what was the practice in Muscovy and Spain, or registered that 'those that incline most to popery are all for sprinkling'; the Hebrew host 'baptized into Moses' were not immersed (John Arrowsmith); the meaning of Hebrew words was ventilated and Latin terms flew to and fro.

And early on Lazarus Seaman posed one of the Assembly's dilemmas: we must follow the mind and institution of Christ, but if that turns out to be dipping, we will be hard put to it to persuade parents to have their children baptized.

1 CORINTHIANS 7:14: HOLINESS, FEDERAL OR REAL?

With some relief, we turn to some contested exegesis. In one of his letters from Westminster Robert Baillie wrote home as follows:

We have ended our Directorie for baptism. Thomas Goodwin one day was exceedinglie confounded: He has undertaken a publicke lecture against the Anabaptists: it was said, under pretence of refuting them, he betrayed our cause to them: that of the Corinthians, our chief ground for the baptism of infants, 'Your children are holy', he exponed of a real holiness, and preached down our ordinarie and necessary distinction of real and federal holiness. Being posed hereupon, he could no wayes cleare himselfe, and no man took his part.

The Directorie ended up with the statement that the children of believers are Christians, and federaly holie before baptism, and therefore are they baptized. John Lightfoot was unfortunately absent from the Assembly on July 16, 1644, when the meaning and implications of 1 Corinthians 7:14 were rehearsed at length and in depth. We may judge it one of the company's better days. The minutes are ample but not clear at every point.

Goodwin kept up his end from first to last. It is such a holiness as if they dy they should be saved/whether a holynesse of election or regeneration I know not, but I think it is they have the holy ghost.

Lazarus Seaman spelt out the alarm that others showed: 'all agree that this holynesse is the ground of baptism... except he can make out this, the baptizing of infants is gone as touching his
judgment.' Goodwin in effect denied any distinction between real and federal holiness; the holiness predicated of the children of a single Christian parent by Paul is the same as that of 'I will be your God and you shall be my people. Therefore be holy.' If 1 Corinthians 7:14 speaks of any other holiness, then baptism is the seal of some other holiness than the holiness of salvation.63

But saving holiness is what infallibly saves, commented Stephen Marshall anxiously.64 As Rutherford put it, 'wiser there is real and inherent holynesse ther must be a seeing of god, and being in the state of salvation.' But 'the Lord hath election and reprobation amongst Infants noe lesse than those of age.'65 This emerged as the main objection to Goodwin's interpretation, which was alleged to imply that all such infants would indubitably be saved (so Marshall) and that the decrees of election and reprobation could not stand (Rutherford).66

So argument ensued on the difference between an indefinite proposition and a universal proposition. Goodwin's case rested on the former: 'an indefinite faith founded upon an indefinite promise'.67 Herbert Palmer could not concur: Paul's answer to the 'inconvenience' to a child from one parent's infidelity must be 'a universal proposition and de fide we are bound to believe it de omnibus et singulis'.68 To be sure, Goodwin did not entertain every notion that some divines read into his position. He denied that he was speaking of a holiness received by the child by tradition from the parent, as Richard Vines had supposed ('and so they shall be born regenerate and really holy')69, but only of a holiness by way of designation.70 Calamy came back at Goodwin: 'he judges of the real holynesse of the infant by the real holynesse of the parent.' But this is how we all proceed, rejoined Goodwin; if it is the children of believers that we baptize.71

The combined learning and piety of the Westminster theologians did not resolve the exegesis of 1 Corinthians 7:14. The verse had inevitably engaged the attention of previous generations of expositors, and had found the early Fathers and the Reformers of the sixteenth century espousing a variety of theories that, if not universally comprehensive, was at least indefinite.72 But whereas earlier exegetes had been especially preoccupied with avoiding the attribution to the children of a holiness which they could not comfortably credit also of the unbelieving partner, the dominant concerns of the divines at Westminster led in other directions. The irony lay in their very captivity to this verse in the first instance, for at least one thing can be incontrovertibly deduced from it - that the children in question who are declared 'holy' had not been baptized, nor, if the parallel with the unbelieving spouse extends this far, is their imminent baptism implied. This is, I think, the only place in the New Testament where children are in view of whom we know for certain whether they have or have not been baptized. They have not - but are said to be already 'holy'.

INFANT BAPTISM AND FEDERAL THEOLOGY

The sentence that eventually appeared in the Directory for Public Worship - 'they are Christians, and federally holy before baptism' - appears to owe the inclusion of 'federally' to Goodwin's opposition. If the minutes can be trusted, the wording before the Assembly at the outset of this discussion was 'they are Christians and holy ...'.73 This is not the only statement in the Westminster documents' delverances on baptism that ventures explicitly into the special language of covenant theology. This latter species of theology is in no way my territory, but I raise a question for others to ponder and adjudicate upon. It was a comment by Sinclair Ferguson on the renewed interest displayed in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in the Bible's teaching on the covenant that set me thinking:

'It was given fresh impetus by the Anabaptist accusation that the mainstream Reformers had thoughtlessly acquiesced in the 'unbiblical' practice of infant baptism. In response the Reformers argued that God had made one covenant with men with Jesus Christ at its heart, administered in two dispensations, the 'old' and the 'new'. Since the children of believers received the initiatory sacrament of this covenant in the restricted administration of the 'old covenant', they must also receive the initiatory sacrament of baptism in the 'new covenant'.74

Was it the case, as this statement suggests, not only that covenant theology afforded a strong defence of baptizing infants, but also that the imperative to defend the baptizing of infants enhanced the attractiveness of doing theology covenantally? I find the implication - or is it my inference? - intriguing. There is no doubt in my mind that infant baptism was the single most substantive constitutive element of the church that the Reformers perpetuated from the Old Church without explicit biblical authorisation. In vindicating it they displayed immense versatility, but it was no easy task. Does the pressing necessity of doing so help to explain the shift towards the federalization of theology? Can it be shown that the apologia for paedobaptism was a significant organizing centre in the structural elaboration of covenant theology?

62™s II, 258; cf. 256. Goodwin's interpretation removes the 'common and ordinary' ground of infant baptism and lays new ground.
63™s II, 275: 'that which you call federal holynesse and that which I call real doe both coincidere in this'.
64™s II, 257.
65™s II, 256.
66™s II, 256, 257.
67™s II, 256.
68™s II, 258; the 'terminus' of human judgment is to be the infant's salvation, but the minister is not to have an infallible judgment of it, but 'such a judgment as answers the promise'. But at 260, if the minute is reliable, Goodwin apparently accepted that the verse in some sense embodied 'a universal proposition': 'if the children are by a warrant from the apostle accorded holy see as to be brought into the bosom of the church, then the unbeliever must needs be sanctified to the believers bed'.
69™s II, 260.
70™s II, 258.
71™s II, 259.
72™s II, 261.

My paper '1 Corinthians 7:14 in Fathers and Reformers' is forthcoming in a volume edited by David Steinmetz based on an Arbeitsgesprach held at the Herzog August Bibliothek at Wolfenbüttel in March 1994 on the Fathers in sixteenth-century biblical exegesis.
73™s II, 255, at the beginning of session 254 on the morning of July 16, 1644.
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Augustine: His Exegesis and Hermeneutics

By David F. Wright, Edinburgh

Sources: nearly all Augustine's works are in PL and PLSup, very many in CSEL and CCL. Texts with French transl. and ample introductions etc. are in BAug (Paris: Desclée 1949-); English translations in NPNF, ACW, FC, LCC and other smaller series and sets, including The Works of St Augustine (ed. J. E. Rotelle; New York: New City Press 1990—).


0. Introduction


Augustine's first encounters with the Bible revealed no promise of the enormous and massively influential efforts he would later devote to explaining and inculcating its mysteries, as first presbyter and then bishop (395-430) of the Catholic Church of Hippo in Roman North Africa (modern Annaba in Algeria). His reading of Cicero's Hortensius at Carthage in 372/3 when he was probably eighteen enthused him for "the immortality of wisdom" (Con-
Augustine's His Exegesis and Hermeneutics

Augustine particularly emphasized Psalm 4, and Psalm 80 is also attested. In addition, the Psalter would have been used in his private or communal devotions.

The Psalms would become the special love of the African father. He produced expositions of them all, informed by his distinctive, Christological and ecclesiastical exegesis. When, in the late 390s, he recorded God's mercy in his own wayward life, the Confessions were shot through with quotations, allusions and echoes of the Psalter from their opening words. Thus the language of the Psalms was woven deeply into the warp and woof of Augustine's piety. His second most famous work, City of God, opens with an echo of Ps 67:3. During his final illness, according to his biographer Possidius, he had the "very few" penitential Psalms posted up on the walls of his sick-room for daily meditation.

Yet in the autumn of 386, when Ambrose recommended Augustine to read Isaiah in preparation for baptism, he stumbled at the first obscure chapter, and laid aside until he was better versed in dominico eloquio. Ambrose may well have expounded Isaiah in Milan in 386 or early 387, and perhaps intended Augustine to be prepared for pre-baptismal catechesis from Isaiah.

In the years that followed, prior to his ordination to the presbyterate at Hippo in 391, it is not easy to trace his coming to terms with the OT, except in controversial engagement with Manichaicism (see below). The demands of this campaign were uncompromising, as he wrote in perhaps his first post-ordination treatise:

I call my conscience to witness, Honorable. I call God who dwells in pure souls to witness, that I am convinced there is nothing more wise, more chaste, more religious than those Scriptures which the Catholic Church accepts under the name of the Old Testament.

After his ordination, he requested from bishop Valerius a couple of months' leave to familiarize himself with the Bible. From now on, his ever-deepening immersion in the Scriptures was driven not only by apologetic exigencies but increasingly by the expectations laid on one qui peplo ministret sacramentum et verbum Dei.  

---

8 Conf. 9. 4. 8-11. For a comparison with his Enarr. in Ps 4 (produced ca. 394) see O'Donnell, Confessions III (1992) 91-94.
9 On Order 1. 22-3 (PL 32, 897-893).
12 Life of Augustine 31 (PL 32, 63).
13 Conf. 9. 5. 13.
14 Geyson, Le prêtre (1968) 37; Courcelle, Recherches (1968) 215-16.
16 Letter 21.3 (PL 33, 88-89).
17 Ibid.
1. The Exegetical Work of Augustine

The first three chapters of Genesis preoccupied Augustine's earliest exegetical labors on the OT. Their motivation was explicitly anti-Manichaeism.

i. De Genesi contra Manichaeos

This was Augustine's first writing after returning from Italy to Africa, to his hometown Tagaste. Written ca. 388–89, its two books cover Genesis 1–3, very manifestly published against the Manichaeans in defence of the old law. In Augustine later explained that here he followed the allegorical meaning, not daring to expound such great mysteries ad litteram, that is, secundum historicam proprietatem. But in his more expansive exposition of Genesis, he gave a more differentiated account of his first attempt:

At that time I did not see how all of Genesis could be taken in the proper sense (proprie), and it seemed to me more and more impossible, or at least scarcely possible or very difficult, for all of it to be so understood.

But not willing to be deterred from my purpose, whenever I was unable to discover the literal meaning of a passage, I explained its figurative meaning as briefly and as clearly as I was able, so that the Manichaeans might not be discouraged by the length of the work or the obscurity of its contents... I was mindful, however, of the purpose which I had set before me and which I was unable to achieve, that is, to show everything in Genesis is to be understood first of all not in the figurative but in the proper sense (non figuratus sed proprie); and since I did not completely despair of the possibility of understanding it all in this sense, I made the following statement...13

Augustine then quoted what he had written in De Genesi contra Manichaeos as he embarked on the exposition of Gen 2:4–3:24:


14 Ibid. 1.18 (17) (PL 32, 613).

iii. Confessiones 11-13

These merit inclusion as Augustine's third exposition of the beginning of Genesis. Written in the last years of the fourth century, these books have taxed the ingenuity of scholars seeking an overall design for the Confessiones. Chadwick suggests that in Bks. 11 (or 10)–13 we see wide large throughout the created order what in Bks. 1-9 is an individual human story of exile and return. 23

Augustine appears to embark on an account of the whole of Scripture: "Let me confess to you what I find in your books ... from the beginning in which you made heaven and earth until the perpetual reign with you in your heavenly city". 26 What follows is unsystematic musings — in Bk. 11 especially on time, Bk. 12 chiefly creation, and Bk. 13 ranging over most of Gen 1-2:3, applying it allegorically to the community of faith.

Here we encounter Augustine the Platonic Christian at work: "What wonderful profundity there is in your utterances! The surface meaning lies open before us and charmers beginners. Yet the depth is amazing, my God, the depth is amazing". 27 A multiplicity of interpretations is consistent with the many and varied embodiments in the physical realm of the unvarying realities of the intelligible world, such as wisdom and knowledge (Conf. 13. 20. 27).

In Bk. 12 Augustine addresses critics—not Manichees but presumably Catholic Christians—of his earlier interpretation of Genesis, in De Genesi contra Manichaeos, no doubt (Conf. 12. 14. 17, 12. 15. 19, 22-23, etc.). His response holds to "a diversity of true views" (Conf. 12. 130. 41), even if it conflicts with the author's (Moses') intended meaning.

In Bible study all of us are trying to find and grasp the meaning of the author we are reading, and when we believe him to be revealing truth, we do not dare to think he said anything which we either know or think to be incorrect. As long as each interpreter is devouring to find in the holy scriptures the meaning of the author who wrote it, what evil is it if an exegete gives it is one shown to be true by you, light of all sincere souls, even if the author he is reading did not have that idea and, though he had grasped a truth, had not discerned that seen by the interpreter. 28

iv. De Genesi ad litteram (CPL 266–67; PL 34, 245–486; CSEL 28:1, 3-435) 29

These twelve books on Genesis 1–3 were started in 401 and completed in 415, with at least nine written near to 401. They constitute Augustine's most substantial work of biblical exegesis (apart from series of preached expositions see below), which deserves to be ranked with other better-known operas of the African church father.

It is called ad litteram, he commented later, because Genesis is explained non secundum allegoricas significations, sed secundum rerum gestarum proprieto, although he added that it raises more questions than it resolves—and resolves often provisionally rather than definitively. 30

Since Augustine's insistence that this is a literal commentary must puzzle modern readers, we must look more closely. He certainly leaves no doubt on the point. The narration of Gen 2:8, he asserts, is not in a figurative genre (genere loci) and figuratum rerum (like the Song of Songs, but historical like Kings). 31 It is the unfamiliarity of the subject-matter that induces some people to treat Genesis 1–3 (rather than 4ff) figurativae. Augustine disputes both the claim that happenings in Genesis 4ff, such as Enoch's translation and Sarah's child-bearing, fall within the compass of human experience, and the supposition that the unparalleled uniqueness of natural Gen 1–3 is a bar to its character as event. Are we to believe that God never made a world because he does not do so every day? 32 Why should the historical creation of paradise be more incredible than that of the first human being? Both lie wholly beyond our experience, but if Adam is understood only figuratively, who begot Cain and Abel? 33

So Augustine commits himself to defending the proprieatem litterae of what the scriptural writer reports historically (gestum narrat). 34 This approach has no difficulty in recognizing anthropomorphic or anthropopathic expressions, 35 or the metaphorical figurativeness of "your eyes will be opened" (Gen 3:4), but such usages do not justify the allegorical treatment of the whole passage. The serpent's warning and its subsequent fulfilment (Gen 3:7) are written just like the rest of the narrative. 36

Sometimes, however, the literal sense (corporaliter) is absurd, or prejudicial to the analogy of faith (fide veritatis; regulam fidei). In such cases a figurative reading is obviously preferable. 37 For example, whenever God is said to know anything in time, we cannot take it literally; in accordance with a common scriptural practice, the outcome is signified by the cause, and hence God makes humans or angels know in time. 38

The greatest profit comes from both ascertaining the original meaning and preserving the regulam pietae. When what the author intended is uncertain or altogether elusive, the interpreter's criterion must be the circumanstaniae Scripturae or sana fide. In unclear cases, we may properly believe that the author intended two different meanings if both have the support of the context. 39 Thus the "light" of Gen 1:3 may rightly be spiritual or physical, although Augustine's preference is clearly for the former: it is the illumination of intelligent creatures. 30

24 Conf. 11. 2.3, tr. Chadwick 222.
26 Ibd. 12. 18. 27, Chadwick 259-60. See the whole section, Conf. 12. 16. 23 – 32. 43.
27 There is an English translation by J.H. Taylor in ACW 41-42 (see n. 18 above), and an excellent Latin-French edition by A. Agostini and A. Solonac in BSAQ 48-49 (1972).
28 See Retractaciones 2:24 (525); 2:25 (526).
29 De Genesi ad litteram 8. 1.2 (PL 34, 372).
30 Ibid. 8. 1.3 (PL 34, 372-73).
31 Ibid. 8. 1.4 (PL 34, 373).
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33 Ibid. 5. 19. 39 (PL 34, 353).
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37 Ibid. 11. 31. 41 (PL 34, 446).
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The obscurity of a text may even be deliberate, in order to stimulate reflection. In such instances Augustine refrains from insisting on one explanation to the exclusion of a possibly better one, leaving each reader to choose the version that he can cope with. In general, Augustine accepts that "paradise" is sometimes to be taken materially and sometimes spiritually, but in Gen 2:8 he stipulates that it is simply a place on earth. (But Book 12 is an appendix devoted to Paul's vision of paradise in the "third heaven" of 2 Cor 12:2-4.) Nevertheless, when he comes to the "tree of life" (Gen 2:9), he cannot resist viewing it also as a sacrament, a mystery of spiritual reality.

Yet however explicitly and lucidly Augustine clarifies his approach to exegesis, the reader is scarcely prepared for the complexities of his grappling with the early verses of Genesis, where he has to struggle to expose the ad literam meaning. Finding a non-allegorical sense for "In the beginning God created heaven and earth" lands him in an endless series of questions. How can we understand God's saying "Let there be light"? As for the "days" of creation, "morning" is the beginning of each creature's nature and "evening" the limit of its making. Similarly "day" itself might denote the form of the created being and "night" the privation of its form.

Thus in this rambling and frequently inconclusive discussion, the bishop of Hippo only too readily inclines towards a "literal" meaning located in an immaterial order of being. He is well aware of the diversity of Christian interpretations of Genesis, and is anxious that they should not pronounce ignorantly on matters belonging to the physical scientists. On the other hand, he is mindful of vulnerable Christians whose faith fails when they hear unbelieving experts expatiating on cosmology or astronomy.

For all these reasons, Augustine's "literal" exposition is highly sensitive to the apologetic challenges raised by Genesis 1 (e.g., the relation between the "heaven" of 1:1 and 1:8; how could there be time, i.e., literal day and night, before earth existed?). But he normally resists the temptation of an allegorical or prophetic significance until he has determined the sense in which what is recorded took place. Adam's naming of the animals cries out for a prophetic meaning; once the historical happening is established (re gesta confirmata), we are left free to seek its figurative significance.

These seven books on Expressions in the Heptateuch, compiled ca. 419, aim to clarify the obscurities of the Latin of the Vetus Latina, especially when its reproduction of Hebrewisms or, more often, Grecisms might misrepresent the author's intended meaning. The interest of the work is largely linguistic, bearing on Augustine's knowledge of Greek (see below) and use of the Vetus Latina (see below).

vi. *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum* (CPL 270; PL 34, 547-824; CCL 33, 1-377). These seven books were composed at the same time as the *Locutiones*. (Augustine reports that he had made a start on *I Samuel* also, but other urgent demands frustrated further progress.) They are more strictly exegetical. Augustine does himself less than justice when he explains the title as issues presented for investigation rather than resolution.

With a reference to his earlier exposition of Genesis 1-3, he begins with Gen 4:17. Most *quaestiones* deal with a single phrase or verse, but longer passages are also covered, e.g., Num 15:24-29; Deut 10:1-4; 22:13-21. In default of a continuous exposition of the bulk of the Pentateuch, the *Quaestiones* was heavily used in later centuries.

This work belongs to a recognized if flexible genre of biblical *quaestiones*. A comparison with Jerome discloses not only their deeply differing approaches to the LXX and the *hebraica versione* respectively, but also Augustine's preoccupation with more taxing apologetic and doctrinal questions over against Jerome's dominant linguistic, geographical and historical interests.

vii. *De octo questionibus ex Veteri Testamento* (CPL 277; CCL 33, 469-72; PL Sup II, 386-89). This is included for completeness' sake.

viii. *Adnotationes in lob* (CPL 271; PL 34, 825-86, CSEL 28:2, 509-628). Written, it seems, ca. 400, Augustine hesitates in his *Retractions* to call it his own. Augustine's marginal notes to a text of Job had been collected and issued by others. These notes' brevity and obscurity were compounded by the incorrigible defectiveness of the MSS available to Augustine. Only regard for his brethren's attachment to them dissuaded him from disowning them.

The above comprise Augustine's writings devoted specifically to exegeting parts of the OT. But they by no means exhaust the efforts he expended on elucidating its wisdom for the people of God—and its enemies and critics.

ix. *Sermones* (CPL 284, 287-88; Verbraken, *Études critiques*). About 565 individual sermons of Augustine survive (i.e., excluding his major series of expositions on the Psalms and on John's Gospel and First Epistle). *Verbraken* (p. 18) listed 544, to which must be added some twenty new ones.
This collection—the only exposition of the whole Psalter surviving from any of the Fathers—may be viewed as the largest of Augustine's works, but it is far from constituting a unitary production. These expositions were given in different forms over some three decades. First treated were Psalms 1-32 early in Augustine's years in Hippo, ca. 394-96, and last was the longest, Psalm 118 (119). His preface to the thirty-two sermons on this Psalm explains that its strange profundity—which was not its obscurity so much as its elusive clarity—had long deterred him, despite persistent entreaties from his brethren, from expounding it and thereby completing his exposition of the Psalter. When he finally yielded, he did so by dictating sermons "to be delivered to the people" (presumably by other preachers)—what the Greeks call homilies. These thirty-two sermons have been most reliably dated in or around 406.54

But the problems of dating the Enarrationes are in general far from resolution. Those on "the songs of degrees" (Cantica graduum), Psalms 119-133 (MT 120-134), have attracted much attention, partly because they are known to have been intercalated with the early Tractatus on John's Gospel. They can be fairly confidently dated to the winter, December to April, of 406-7.55 La Bonnardière has studied another recognizable group, those on Psalms 110-17 (111-18), and argued that their singular qualities, e.g. in the use of other verses of Scripture, are best explained if they are dated ca. 406.56 But for the rest, although clusters of three or more Enarrationes, often without regard to numerical sequence, can sometimes be shown to belong together, there is no alternative to painstaking investigation to date each one separately.57

The listing of the Enarrationes in Possidius' Elucidarii of Augustine's works distinguishes between two categories—those dictated (dictati) and the rest (tractati). Augustine drew the same distinction in the preface to his expositions on Psalm 118 (119).58 Quite apart from the textual uncertainties of this entry in Possidius' inventory, scholars are not all persuaded that Possidius got it right in every case.59 In fact, a bare division between dictation and preaching is unsatisfactory. Possidius himself may have noted different categories of dictati, and there is certainly a considerable gulf between the Enarrationes on Psalms 1-32, which are little more than concise glosses, and even the short sermons on Psalm 118 (119), let alone the extended exposition of some of the others known to have been dictated, such as Psalms 67 (68), 71 (72) and 77 (78). Some of those not first of all preached before the congregation may have been delivered by Augustine, in a manner not too different from dictation to a class of pupils, in the monastery or to a weekday assembly limited de facto to the religious, clergy and members of the episcopal household. Augustine informs


58 See n. 57 above; he had expounded all the other Psalms parsimoniamente in populis, partim dictando.

us that the sermones on Psalm 118 (119) were intended for popular delivery—which Enarr. in Ps. 1-32 could not have sustained.66 Thus the unity of the Enarrationes in Psalmos is deceptive, at least in respect of genre.

The chronological spread of these Psalms' expositions means that they inevitably encompass a wide range of themes, emphases and applications. "Toute la carrière d'Augustin y est en quelque sorte résumée."67 Thus the sermones on Psalm 118 (119), dictated after a decisive phase in the Pelagian controversy, interpret the Psalmist's insistent prayers, in his zeal for the righteousness of God's law, in terms of the continued dependence of the regenerate on divine grace, which alone enables us not only to know but even to accomplish God's will. Augustine interiorizes the piety of the Psalmist in what is almost a synthesis of Paul and the Psalm.68

Elsewhere the expositor's treatment of the bleaker features of David's experiences—persecution, the prosperity of the wicked, the faithlessness of the people of God—makes the Enarrationes comparable to the City of God. It has been pointed out that many of them were preached at Carthage, in a metropolitan pulpit, as it were, where it was particularly fitting for Augustine to address the grand fortunes and misfortunes of the church in the world.69 The Psalms give him ready-made opportunities to speak of the two cities, Jerusalem and Babylon, their contrasting origins and destinies and yet inseparable intermingling in this life.70

Yet if there is one distinctive hermeneutical thread running through the Enarrationes, it is the unity of the body of Christ with Christ its head. Thus the expository, "Kill the man, all of you" (Ps 61:62:3) evokes the following clarification from Augustine:

How huge is the size of the body of one man that he can be killed by all? We should rather recognize here our person, the person of our church, the person of the body of Christ. For Jesus Christ with his head and his body is a single man, the beauty of the body and the limbs of the body, two in one flesh and in one voice and in one passion, and when inequity has passed away, in one rest. Therefore the sufferings of Christ are not in Christ alone—through the sufferings of Christ are not other than in Christ. If you understand Christ to be head and body, the sufferings of Christ are not other than in Christ; but if you understand Christ to be head alone, the sufferings of Christ are not in Christ alone.71

In his early glossed explanation of Psalm 21 (22) such an exegesis is barely hinted at, but in his later more expansive treatment of this Psalm it comes to the fore. Why did the Lord cry "God, my God... why have you abandoned me?" (v. 2; Matt 27:46), for God did not abandon him since he was himself God?

Augustine: His Exegesis and Hermeneutics

Why is it said unless because we were there, unless because Christ's body is the church? Why did he say "God, my God..." unless in some way to catch our attention and say "This Psalm was written about me"? "Far from my salvation are the words of my offences" (v. 2). Which offences, since it was said of him, "He did no sin...?" How then can he say "my offences" unless he himself prays for our offences and makes up our offences his own...?72

When Christ complained "Day and night I have cried and you will not hear me" (v. 3), "that voice was the voice of his members, not of the head".73 Yet much of the rest of the Psalm is without difficulty set in the mouth of Christ himself.

Repeatedly in the Enarrationes Augustine reminds his hearers that sometimes Christ speaks in the Psalms in the person of his members, at other times in his own person as our head.74 One cannot but admire Augustine's versatility in applying a profound theological theme that here becomes an interpretative device serving highly diverse ends. Often it enables him to resolve an apparent contradiction, or even a harmless inconsistency between a plural, "We will confess to you, O God" (Ps 74:75:2), and a singular, "I will tell of all your wonders" (ibid., Vl).

The discourse begins in the person of the head. Whether the head speaks or the limbs speak, Christ is speaking: he speaks in the person of the head, he speaks in the person of the body. What is it that was said? "The two will be in one flesh. This is a great sacrament. I am speaking in Christ and in the church." And he himself in the Gospel, "Therefore they are now not two, but one flesh." So that you may realize that these are in some sense two persons, and yet again are one by the union of marriage, he speaks as one in Isaiah and says, "He has bound a headband on me like a bridegroom, and clothed me with ornament like a bride" (Isa 61:10). He calls himself a bridegroom as the head (ex capite), the bride as the body (ex corporis). So he speaks as one; let us hear him, and let us also speak in him may we be his members, so that this voice can be ours also.75

Augustine can ring all the possible changes: Christ speaks alone, of his own special role, as we have seen in much of Psalm 21 (22); or his members speak alone, when complaint or confession of sins makes attribution to the head inappropriate; or sometimes different companies of the members may be identified, some at ease and others in distress;76 or the emphasis is on head and members speaking in perfect union, as "the whole Christ". Yet in all cases Augustine is clear that it is Christ that is speaking. It is an exercise in exegesis that calls for wonderful suppleness, not to say ingenuity, on

66 BERKHOUD contrasts the Enarr. in Ps 118 (119) with the Tractatus in Johannean 55-124: both sets were dictated and are similar in other respects, whereas the former were dictated to be preached, the latter were dictated solely to complete the series in John's Gospel; Homelies sur l'Évangile de saint Jean LV-LXXIX (Bong, 74A, 1993) 39-44.
67 Wilmart, La tradition (1931) 295.
68 De Margerie, S. Augustin (1983) 120-34; Karmengeasser, Enarratio in Ps. CXVIII (1962); La Bonnica, Recherches (1965) 156-52.
69 Pontet, L'égérie (1945) 388.
70 For, e.g., En. in Ps 61:62:6-91:74 (57) 36, 733-36, 772-85; Pontet (1945) 387, speaks of Augustine portraying in the Enarr. "une histoire spirituelle de l'humanité".
71 En. in Ps. 61:62:4 (PL 36, 730).
73 Ibid. 4 (PL 36, 172-73).
74 Pontet, L'égérie (1945) 400-411.
75 En. in Ps. 74:75:4 (PL 36, 948-98).
76 So En. in Ps. 50:11:1/2:1. (PL 36, 239-40). CE 85 (86.5) (PL 37, 1085), on "to have I cried... at the day long": "the body of Christ cries... at the day long, its members departing and succeeding one another. A single person is extended to the end of the world. The same members of Christ cry, and some members are already at rest in him, some are crying now, some will cry when we ourselves have passed to our rest, and after them yet others will cry." The beginning of this Enarr. is a particularly fine statement of the "one Christ, head and body", theme: "when the body of the Son prays, it does not separate its head from itself... he both prays for us and prays in us and is prayed to by us. He prays for us as our priest, he prays in us as our head, he is prayed to by us as our God. Let us recognize both his voices in him and his voices in us." (85 (86):1; PL 37, 1081).
Augustine's work. Yet its fruitful suggestiveness is not in doubt as Augustine copes with the contrasting tones and moods of the Psalms. The variations he plays on the theme of the identification of Christ with his people, especially in their tribulations— even if, as he commonly puts it, the head is above in heaven, the body below on earth—promote a spirituality that can glimpse "transfiguration" in that identity. In another comment on Ps 21 (22), 2, "My God... why have you abandoned me?", he says: "Transfiguring (transfiguravit) us into what he was saying, and into his body (for we are his body and he our head), he uttered from the cross not his own voice but ours."

In addition to the writings listed above, which, with the partial exception of Confessions 11-13, are all devoted wholly to the OT, a number of other works deal with it directly to a significant extent.

xi. Contra Adimantum Manichaei discipulam (CPL 319; PL 42, 129-72; CSEL 25:1, 115-90)

Written ca. 399-49 in refutation of a demonstration by one Adimantus, a follower of Mani, that the law and the prophets conflicted with the NT, it deals point by point with twenty-eight alleged disagreements. In the by-going Augustine touches repeatedly on the unity of the two Testaments. One general statement to this effect he subsequently wished slightly to revise:

That people who had received the Old Testament were held fast before the coming of the Lord by certain shadows and figures of realities, in accord with a wonderful and excellently ordered dispensation of the times; yet in it there is such strong predicament and pre-announcement of the New Testament that nothing is found in the teaching of the Evangelists and the apostles, however exalted and divine the precepts and promises, that is lacking in those ancient books.

On reviewing this book for his Retractions, Augustine added "almost" before "nothing is found", since although in figures "everything is found prophesied (in the OT) which was realized or is expected to be realized through Christ", not all of the precepts of the NT are figured in the OT. In illustration Augustine cites "You have heard that it was said... but I say to you..." (Matt 5:21).

Augustine: His Exegetical and Hermeneutic


This is the most extensive of Augustine's anti-Manichean works, composed in 397-98 in the form of a dialogue with one of the leading African advocates of Manichaeism, whom Augustine, so he tells us in his Confessions, had found so disappointing and inadequate (Conf. 5.6.10-7.13). Many of the thirty-three books, which vary considerably in length, display Augustine's explanations and defences of Catholic Christianity's use of the OT. Faustus tirelessly charged Catholics with unprincipled selectivity in their fidelity to the OT. Hence in Bk. 6 Augustine draws the essential distinction between commands that shape life ("You shall circumcise") and those that signify life ("You shall keep them").

Much of what Augustine states about the figurative significance—of the future and the spiritual—of the OT's concern with the temporal and material is unsurprising. He is keen to insist that the godly saints of the OT, the patriarchs and prophets, knew better than the carnal masses:

They understood by the revelation of God's Spirit what was appropriate for that era and how God determined that future realities should be symbolized and foretold through all these actions and words. Their greater longing was for the New Testament, but their present duty in the body was carried out to signify new things to come by means of ancient promises.

Christians have no interest in the fulfillment of OT promises in material terms.

Bk. 14 defends the application to Christ of Deut 21:33, "Cursed is everyone who hangs on a tree". The lengthy Bk. 12 surveys prophecies of Christ throughout the OT, and the even longer Bk. 22 seeks to rebut Faustus' maligning of the horrors of the OT, whether perpetrated by God or his servants, sometimes at his command. Augustine here provides one of his fullest justifications of war—a topic on which his teaching was to be of enormous influence. Polygamy was no offence when it was customary, and the licentiousness of the patriarchs did not consist simply in having many wives.

Bk. 22 also contains as lucid a general statement of the relation of the two Testaments as one can find in Augustine:

Concerning the precepts and sacraments of the Old Testament we have by now repeatedly said that we should understand them to have contained one element which was given to be fulfilled in practice through the grace of the New Testament, and another which would be shown by its removal as having been fulfilled through the truth now made manifest. By the love of God and neighbour the command of law would be accepted for implementation, but the promise of the law would be exposed as having been accomplished by the cessation of circumscription and other sacraments of that time. The commandment made people guilty, engendering a desire for salvation, while the promise employed figures (signa), arousing expectation that at last the promise of the Law, the actualization of the New Testament, the bestowed of grace freed the former and the actualizing of the truth abolished the latter. The very law which was given through Moses became grace and truth through Jesus Christ—grace, that is, so that,
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with the gift of the remission of sins, what was commanded might be observed by the gift of God, and truth, so that what was promised be realized by the faithfulness of God.87

In another book Augustine draws out one implication of these guidelines for exegesis: when we find something in the OT which the NT does not require or even forbids, we must seek its meaning, for the very fact of its no longer being observed proves that it has been fulfilled. What does the now obsolete requirement of levirate marriage (Deut 25:5–10) prefigure but the obligation on every evangelist to raise up seed for his deceased brother, that is, Christ, and to name that seed after Christ, which Paul fulfilled, spiritually, with the truth now accomplished (1 Cor 4:15; 2:13).88

xiii. Contra adversarium legis et prophetiarum (CPL 326; PL 42, 603–66; CCL 49, 1–131)

In 420 Augustine undertook, at the urgent request of fellow-Christians in Carthage, the refutation of a book by an unnamed heretic of Marcionite or similar persuasion which was creating a stir in Carthage.89 As justification for not devoting more than this mention to it here, we cite Augustine’s own statement near the end of the work: in Contra Faustum and Contra Adiman tum you will find a great deal that is applicable to this critic likewise. “And perhaps if those books were read, there would have been little or no need to write this one”.90

xiv. City of God (CPL 313; PL 41, 13–804; CSEL 40; CCL 47–48)

Augustine’s most celebrated treatise focuses heavily on the OT in several books. Book 11 is mostly concerned, yet again, with the Genesis creation story. Bk. 18.26–48 surveys OT prophecies of Christ, while Bk. 20.21–30 deals with its predictions of the final judgement. But the most extended treatment of the OT comprises most of Bks. 15–17, which ramble through what may be called the salvation-history of the OT, with an eye to the development of the city of God in its earthly pilgrimage. For the present purpose, this brief record must suffice.

2. The De doctrina Christiana of Augustine and His Hermeneutics


In expounding the OT, as we have seen, Augustine is often remarkably explicit about the principles determining his exegesis. Yet his only discussion devoted specifically to the task of interpreting and proclaiming the Bible is De doctrina Christiana. Thus in translating the title, the active sense of ‘teaching’ or ‘instruction’ is more appropriate than ‘doctrinal’. It is a book about the task of the Christian teacher in construing and communicating the Scriptures. When compiling his dictum, Augustine had to decide in which OT passages to develop the special inspiration and in which to demonstrate the fallibility of the human author. While he had earlier left De doctrina Christiana (DDC) incomplete, up to 3.25.35. Therefore he completed the third book and added the fourth, making, as he says, three to aid the understanding of the Scriptures and the fourth their public presentation—a two-part exegetical and homiletic manual.91

There is general agreement that the first part of the work was completed early in Augustine’s episcopate, by 397. This certainly holds for Bks. 1–2, which some scholars believe, partly on the evidence of a very early manuscript, may have first been issued separately. Others find no grounds for supposing that any of it was published until it was completed in 426–27.92 The attempt has also been made, unconvincingly to most minds, to fix the composition of the prologue in 426–27 rather than in the mid-390s.93

DDC has attracted an enormous literature from specialists in several disciplines. Book 4, on the proper eloquence of the Christian orator, need not concern us here, but we may note that Augustine takes Amos as an example of the eloquence of the OT prophets. He chose Amos because his prophecy allowed Augustine to concentrate on the way it was expressed, without having to bother with explaining its meaning. (The frequency of tropes in the prophesies set a challenge to the exposer, although Augustine took comfort from the fact that the greater the figurative obscurity, the more delightful the enjoyment of elucidation.) And since the LXX was more enigmatic, because more figurative, than the original, he would use Jerome’s Vulgate translation of Amos.94

Elsewhere also in DDC, the OT is drawn in illustratively rather than addressed exegetically in its own terms, although at a few points the OT is clearly in Augustine’s sights. Having distinguished between things (or realities, re) and signs (signa), he devotes most of Book I to the former. He uses re here of things that do not signify something else, whereas signa are things used to signify something. So Book I deals with the realities of the Christian creed which are to be enjoyed or used or both.

In Book 2, after distinguishing various kinds of signs, he fastens on words—the main signs by which human beings express themselves, both orally and in written letters, which are thus signs of signs.95 Scripture is
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composed of signs, in one language originally but dispersed in numerous translations. But the reader of the Scriptures is beset with many and varied obscurities and ambiguities. It cannot be unimportant that this is the first marker Augustine erects when he comes to speak of the Scriptures. That this is so is confirmed by his proceeding immediately to discern this state of affairs as God-given. Although hardly anything is found in Scriptures' obscurities which is not plainly expressed elsewhere, the Holy Spirit has so healthily modulated (modificavit) the Bible that its clarity satisfies the hungry while its lack of clarity humbles the proud, who have to work at understanding it, and counters the disdain that regards the obvious as worthless. To Augustine it is well evident that the discovery accomplished only with difficulty is the more pleasurable, and that comprehension is more readily secured through similitudes than literal directness.

Augustine's example is Cant 4:2, "Your teeth are like a flock of rams (sheep), coming up from washing, which all bear twins and not a barren one among them". This extended similitude tells one nothing that is not conveyed in plain words elsewhere.

Nevertheless, in a strange way, I contemplate the saints more pleasingly when I envisage them as the teeth of the Church, cutting off men from their errors and transferring them to her body after their hardness has been softened as if by being bitten and chewed. I recognize them more pleasingly as rams sheep having put aside the burdens of the world like so much fleece, and as ascending from the washing, which is baptism, all to create twins, which are the two precepts of love, and I see no one of them sterile of this holy fruit.

This whole passage is highly revealing of the true face of Augustine the interpreter of Holy Scripture. It is not so much the exquisite ingenuity (a common enough quality, after all, when expositors set to work on the Song of Songs) as the unabashed delight he takes in it and the playfulness with which he deploys it. The preference for the figurative over the literal reminds us of his exegetical apprenticeship at Ambrose's feet in Milan — "the letter kills, the spirit gives life" — and the Platonic reinforcement, in both master and pupil, of the instinctive tendency to eschew the surface meaning in favour of the depth it points to and conceals. As he commented on Psalm 104 (105), "let us commend in the body of this psalm its soul lurking hidden, as it were, that is, the inner understanding hidden in the externals of its words." Such an attitude helps to explain why Augustine expended such energy on the OT in particular, and why the often fanciful outcome so often conveys a certain spiritual gravitas — for it is expressive of a profoundly spiritual vision of heaven and earth.

Before proceeding further with Augustine's guidance in DDC on the deciphering of texts, we must touch on a couple of prolegomena which he deals with in the work, beginning with the canon of Scripture.
the average theology graduate today knows at least as much Greek as did the great bishop of Hippo\(^{104}\).

The authority of the LXX for Augustine rested on consensus, as well as on its inspiration. This was first "the consensus of so many venerable and learned translators" — even if they had collaborated rather than worked independently.\(^{105}\) But more important was the consensus of the churches:

> The church has received this Septuagint as if it were the only translation, the Greek speaking Christians use it and most are not aware whether any exists ... it is the judgement of the churches of Christ that no one person (i.e. Jerome) should be preferred over the authority of so large a body of men (i.e. the Seventy).\(^{106}\)

In addition, Augustine was pastorally sensitive to the conservatism of congregations familiar with a translation based on the LXX and liable to be suspicious of novelty in such an important foundation of faith.\(^{107}\)

All of these arguments, and others besides, featured in the correspondence between Augustine and Jerome on translating the OT that began in 395 with Augustine's Letter 28 and lasted a decade, giving way after Letter 82 of 405 to other pressing church concerns.\(^{108}\)

Yet, troubling as Augustine found Jerome's abandonment of the LXX for the veritas hebraica, in DDC he still commends the learning of Hebrew as well as Greek in order to make one's way through the number and variety of the Latin translations.\(^{109}\) An alternative way of coping with divergent translations is "to consult the versions of those who have bound themselves closely to the words".\(^{110}\)

At this juncture Augustine identifies no such literal or verbatim translation, but soon afterwards names the Itala as his preference, both for its adherence to the words and its clarity of meaning.\(^{111}\) If only what Augustine meant by the Itala were so clear! Some scholars have emended the text to remove it, others improbable have identified it as Jerome's Vulgate, but most plausibly it was an earlier translation made in Italy, or at least current there, and brought back to Africa by Augustine.\(^{112}\)

---
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---

We must envisage Augustine working with different texts of the Bible throughout his life. In his Letter 261 to Audax, of indeterminate but presumably later date, he told the grammaticus:

> I do not have Jerome's translation of the Psalter from the Hebrew. I myself have not made a translation but have corrected several faults of the Latin codices from Greek manuscripts. I have perhaps thereby made the text better than it was, but not what it should be. Even now when I am struck while reading by defects that escaped me at that time, I correct them by comparing the codices.\(^{115}\)

DE BRUYN has examined Augustine's revisions of the Psalter in detail, from which it may be concluded that he used a Milanese Psalter similar to that of Verona, and from about 415 also took account of the Gallican Psalter of Jerome.\(^{116}\) But the special status of the LXX was never undermined. Although in his later works he paid more attention to Jerome's OT translations, he tended to accept Jerome's renderings alongside those based on the LXX.\(^{117}\) But in a later work such as the Questions on the Heptateuch, the use made of the LXX remains minimal.

In addition to the original languages, Augustine also comments in DDC on other studies such as history and geography for the elucidation of Scripture. Yet his conclusion is characteristically limiting — and allegorical: just as what the Israelites got by spoiling the Egyptians was less than they later acquired at Jerusalem, so too "all the knowledge, which is certainly useful, collected from the books of pious writers, when compared with the knowledge conferred by the divine Scriptures. For whatever one learns elsewhere is condemned there if it is harmful, and is found there if it is beneficial".\(^{118}\) Such an attitude separated him from Jerome, and helps to explain the inconsistencies and limitations of his biblical scholarship.

Augustine's biblical expositions, especially in sermon and homily, are also animated far more than Jerome's by the need to edify the faithful. The importance of this for Augustine becomes evident in the discussion of figurative signs which occupies most of Bk. 3 of DDC. After touching on the typically Jewish servitude of taking signs for the realities themselves, he propounds a method for determining whether a work or expression is literal or figurative: "anything in the divine Word that can be literally referred neither to correct behaviour nor to the truth of the faith you should recognize as figurative". For "Scripture teaches nothing but love, and condemns nothing but lust (cupiditatem")\(^{119}\) Augustine proceeds to spell out what these criteria entail for understanding figurative signs. interspersed with this guidance is a number of commonsense rules of thumb, bearing particularly on diversity of contexts.

\(^{114}\) Letter 261.5 (PL 33, 1077).

\(^{115}\) "Saint Augustin réviseur de la Bible", in Miscellanea Augustiniana II (1931) 521-560 at 544-78; A. Sohnle in Diez XII (1966) 2566-7. De Bruyn also covers more briefly Ecclesias-

\(^{116}\) De Bruyn also covers more briefly Ecclesias-

\(^{117}\) So concludes La Ronchardière, "Augustin a-t-il telé la 'Vulgata de Jérôme', S. Augustine et la Bible (BTT 3; 1986) 303-12.

\(^{118}\) DDC 2.42.63 (PL 34, 64-65).

\(^{119}\) DDC 3.10.15, 15 (PL 34, 71).
Things which seem disputable to the inexperienced, whether merely spoken or actually done on the part of God or of human beings whose sanctity is commended to us, are all figurative; their hidden kernels are to be extracted from the husks to nourish love. But since desire or intention is the critical factor, "what is normally shameful in other persons is, in a divine or a prophetic person, the sign of an important reality. There is every difference between union with a prostitute in moral abandon and in the foreshadowing of the prophet Hosea". Augustine arrives at the following general comment on the OT:

Therefore, although all or almost all of the things recorded in the books of the Old Testament are to be taken not only literally but also figuratively, there are those taken literally by the reader because done by individuals who are commended but which are alien to the practice of worthy people who observe God's commands after the coming of the Lord. In these cases the reader must refer the figure to his understanding but not translate the act itself into behaviour. Many things were at that time done honourably (offices) which now can be done only hastily. This judgement follows Augustine's discussion of David's condemnation for his adulterous passion for Bathsheba, but not for having many wives. It reveals again that drive to make consistent and acceptable sense of Scripture which led Augustine not only to a quasi-modern appeal to cultural relativism but also into hazardous rationalizations and above all into futile figurative spiritualizing to save the appearances.

In completing DDC in the mid-420s, Augustine commended the seven rules of Tyconius as aids for penetrating the hidden recesses of Scripture. This nonconfessional Donatist layman, who flourished ca. 370-390, was excommunicated for his departures from Donatist orthodoxy, without it seems, ever becoming a Catholic. His commentary on the Apocalypse of John, now recoverable only in fragments, was a powerful influence in Western medieval interpretation, and Augustine's indebtedness to him at a formative stage of his theological development, after his return to Africa in 388, was considerable. Tyconius' Book of Rules, his only work to survive intact, is the first Latin (i.e. Western Christian) treatise on biblical interpretation. Augustine is careful to stress that Tyconius remained in error as a Donatist and exaggerated the usefulness of his rules, which by no means clarified all of Scripture's obscurities (as Tyconius' own Apocalypse commentary demonstrated). Yet the attraction for Augustine of the seven rules is inescapable, and their importance will be immediately obvious to readers of this essay in the light of much that has been presented above. Tyconius offered keys and windows into the secrets of the law...certain mystical rules which hold for the recesess of the whole law and make the treasures of the truth invisible to some people. If the rationale of these rules is accepted...whatever is closed will be opened and whatever is obscure made luminous, so that anyone traversing the immense forest of prophecy guided by these rules like tracks of light will be preserved from going astray. Four of the seven rules are concerned with parts and whole. The first is "Concerning the Lord and his Body", whereby, as Augustine puts it, a transition takes place from the head to the body or vice versa without change of person. When a speaker describes himself as both a bridegroom and a bride (Isa 61:10), the interpreter has to determine which applies to Christ the head and which to his body the church. The counterpart to this rule is the seventh, on the devil and his body, which is given twice as much space by Augustine. The address to Lucifer in Isa 14:12 can be understood only partly of the devil himself, for it is his body that is cast down upon earth, although he is in his body. The second rule, entitled "Concerning the Bipartite Body of the Lord", points, says Augustine, to the mixed character of the church and hence should have been called "Concerning the True and Mixed (or Counterfeited) Body of the Lord". The woman speaking in Cant 1:5 says "I am black and the Count, because of "the temporal unity of good and bad fish within the same net". Authentic and hypocrite similarly appear together in Isa 42:16-17. Rule four deals with "species and genus", seen, for example, when Scripture mentions a particular city or nation in a manner applicable to the whole human race. Augustine discusses at length how Scripture switches without explicit warning between carnal and spiritual Israel, requiring vigilance in the reader and affection benefit thereby.

The elevated prophetic style, while speaking to or about the carnal Israel, imperceptibly switches to the spiritual, and while speaking of or to the latter, still seems to be speaking of or to the former—not steeply beguiling us understanding of the Scriptures but therapeutically exercising our understanding.
Or again things said about Solomon may become clear only when related to Christ or the Church of which he is part. Of the three remaining rules, the fifth, "Concerning Times", still bears on parts and wholes, for one of the ways it operates is through syllogism: by inclusive counting (as we might put it) "after six days" may be the same as "after eight days". This rule also applies to special numbers 7, 10, 12 and their multiples. "Seven times a day" means "always" (cf. Ps. 118 (119):164; 33:2 (34:1)). Thus the rule has much wider application than to times. Rule six, on "Recapitulation", is invoked to resolve difficulties resulting from Scripture's departure from the strict sequence of events. Thus Gen 2:9 (the bringing forth of trees from the garden) refers to something that happened before God put the man in the garden, which is recorded in the previous verse. Likewise Gen 11:1 (the earth was of one language) harks back to the situation before the division into nations chronicled in Genesis 10.

Finally we must note the third rule, "Concerning Promises and Law", which Augustine disposes of fairly rapidly. It is not so much a rule to solve questions as itself a major question, perhaps better called "Concerning the Spirit and the Letter" (with explicit mention of his earlier treatise of this title) or "Concerning Grace and Command". Tyconius laboured under the disadvantage of preceding the Pelagian dispute, "which has made us", says Augustine, "much more alert and attentive" towards the Scriptures than he was. Hence the inadequacies of this rule, such as Tyconius' failure to recognize that faith is a gift of God.

Augustine's presentation of Tyconius' seven rules completes the longer part of DDC, which is devoted to finding out (inveniendo) what is to be rightly understood from the Scriptures. The interest of this chapter is Augustine rather than Tyconius, and hence with what the former made of the latter rather than with the latter's teaching in its own right. In these terms, "the extent to which Augustine's exegesis is in debt to the Book of Rules is remarkable", for Augustine "was always in search of universal principles that might help to remove subjectivity from spiritual exegesis". Not least did Augustine share with Tyconius the conviction that the obscurity of much of the Bible was a good thing — intended by the Spirit, the author of all Scripture, to exercise the intuition of the expositor and to reward the seeking of those who refuse to remain at the level of appearances. That is to say, Tyconius' rules were made by Augustine to subserve the requirements of his instinctively Platonic exegetical bent.

At the same time to Tyconius is due, as well as to Africa's deep-seated Catholic-Donatist divide which he to some extent straddled, the heavily ecclesiastical preoccupation of much of Augustine's OT exegesis. Throughout the rules Tyconius keeps returning to the theme of the bipartite church and interprets cities as dissimilar as Jerusalem and Nineveh and Tyre, as well as nations as different as Elam and Egypt, as figures of the church's bipartite character. Augustine will locate the mixed nature of the church in less visible differences than Tyconius, focussing more on the ambiguity of the apparently holy, but the community of concern is only too evident.

A magnificent start to the scientific collection and analysis of all of Augustine's citations of the OT has been made by ANNE-MARIE LA BONNARDIÈRE in a series of volumes covering Deuteronomy (1967), Joshua to Job, with 1 Esdras, Tobit, Judith and Maccabees (1960), Proverbs (1975), Jeremiah (1972), the twelve Minor Prophets (1964) and the Wisdom of Solomon (1970). The completion of such a labour will doubtless be facilitated by computer technology. These inventories produce their surprises, such as Augustine's minimal interest in Jeremiah, his personality and role in the history of God's ancient people. On the other hand, Augustine makes remarkably heavy use of Proverbs and the Wisdom literature in general, in a variety of liturgical, catechetical, pastoral and apologetic contexts, as well as for the prefiguring of Christ by the personified Wisdom. The letters recently first published by JOHANNES DIJKJIT further confirm Augustine's predilection for these books.

The availability of a full set of such analyses of the OT books would not ease the challenge of formulating some final comments on Augustine's use of the former Testament. We certainly must not miss the sheer vastness of his immersion in it. "No Western theologian before him had lived so much in Scripture, or taken so much from it as he". But as we have just noticed, his grip on the OT very unevenly. Ponet can even say that his recourse to the OT would be strictly limited were it not for the Psalms, but his judgement relates to Augustine's sermons, which give an inadequate impression of his preoccupation with early Genesis, and happens also to underestimate his fondness for the Wisdom books.
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115 DDC 3.3.33-46 (PL 34, 83). Augustine does less than justice to Tyconius, who not only talks of faith as given "through Christ", like the Spirit and grace, but also cites most of Augustine's anti-Pelagian proof-texts, "What have you that you did not receive?" (1 Cor 4:7); see LIII (Burkitt 18-19).
116 See n. 124 above for a comment to this question. Kannengiesser unconvincingly argues that for Tyconius the regulae were not guidelines for interpretation but structuring principles inherent in Scripture; see also Conflict (1989) 64-49.
117 H. Chadwick in Kannengiesser/Bright, Conflict, 49, with many examples on 40-50.
118 LA BONNARDIÈRE, Biblia Augustiniana; all volumes published by Études Augustiniennes in Paris.
119 For earlier attempts see De Bruyne, S. Augustin réviseur, Misc. Aug. II. (1931) 522.
120 La Bibliographie. L'Exégèse (1967-77). Cottet's bibliography yields no citations and deuterocanonical Baruch only two isolated texts.
122 Over a third of OT references are to the four Wisdom books; ed. Dijkjiet al., Bp 48 B, 587.
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Yet uneven use does not indicate any departure on Augustine's part from the common convictions of the early Church of the plenary inspiration of the whole of Scripture and its freedom from error.144 This persuasion of the God-given unity of the Bible is responsible for what might be called the 'butterfly method' in his exegesis—his flitting from text to text, apparently arbitrarily, in search of illumination. The connections too often seem fanciful, yet manage to elicit admiring smiles at their delightful ingenuity.

For our purposes, the unity of the Bible determines the relationship between the Testaments. Put at its boldest, "For what is the 'Old Testament' but a concealed form of the new? And what is the 'New Testament' but the revelation of the old?"145 The OT is replete with 'figures', 'mysteries', 'sacraments', 'signs', 'shadows', 'forms' etc. of the NT. Augustine uses a rich vocabulary to portray the symbolic foreshadowing character of the OT. Indeed, he will call the whole of the Bible "the books of the divine sacraments" or "the Scripture of mysteries", but it is chiefly in the expositions of the OT that the cracking of a code comes most frequently to mind in reading Augustine.146 One repeatedly senses the expectation of the congregation waiting for their bishop to conjure up Christ and his Church in the most unpromising of OT passages.

Thus Augustine normally works with a two-level understanding of Scripture. The terms may vary—literal, historical, carnal, etc. on the one side, and allegorical, spiritual, prophetic, mystical, etc. on the other. He seems most at ease in allegorizing when the literal-historical meaning has first been affirmed. Thus he could say of his treatment of paradise in the City of God:

This is the kind of thing that can be said by way of allegorical interpretation of paradise; and there may be other more valuable lines of interpretation. There is no prohibition against such exegesis, provided that we also believe in the truth of the OT as a faithful record of historical fact.147

Precisely why the two belong together in Augustine's mind is open to further investigation. Certainly they are not related as they would be in the Reformation, in the insistence that the literal, i.e. grammatical-historical, meaning is the spiritual meaning. Nor is the common relationship between them in Augustine that of some more modern discussion, as in the Pontifical Biblical Commission's recent document, Interpretation of the Bible in the Church:

The spiritual sense can never be stripped of its connection with the literal sense. The latter remains the indispensable foundation. Otherwise, one could not speak of the "fulfillment" of Scripture. Indeed, in order that there be fulfillment, a relationship of continuity and of conformity is essential.148

144 See Polman, Word of God (1961).
145 City of God 16.26; cf. similarly 4.33; 5.18. On the unity of OT and NT, see Perrone, L'exégèse (1945) 325-84; Strauss, Schriftgebrauch (1959) 68-72.
146 On the Advantage of Believing 17.35 (PL 42, 91); Against Julian 6.7.23 (PL 44, 834).
147 C. Constantin, "Sacraments et mystérian dans l'œuvre de saint Augustin", H. Rondet et al., Études augustiniennes (1953) 161-332, esp. 195-225 on the OT.

It is precisely "the relationship of continuity and conformity" that one too often misses in Augustine.

Yet the spiritual meaning has experienced a minor comeback in the latter twentieth century. At a time when reaction against the aridity of the historic-critical approach has fostered, and been fostered by, what at times seems almost a free-for-all in biblical hermeneutics, marked frequently by a blatant disregard for the literal sense interceding by the writer, Augustine must appear less alien. There is after all no doubting the depths of spirituality and the profoundly Christ-centred and church-centred theology that his OT exegesis served.

3. The Influence of Augustine's Old Testament Exegesis and Hermeneutics


So all-pervasive a influence on Christian thought and writing in the medieval West that in short compass one cannot avoid selecting in identifying the impact of his handling of the OT. Its range is evident in unexpected directions. His sole extended treatment of 1 and 2 Samuel and then only a few chapters, in City of God 17, has been shown to have become a source for numerous medieval commentators on Samuel.150 The derivation of Adam's name from the four corners of the world was probably mediated to the Middle Ages by Augustine from a Jewish apocryphal source.151

There is no doubting the wide dissemination of the major works—the Psalms exposition, De Genesi ad litteram and Quaestiones in Heptateuchum. Andre W. Wimmer's survey of "La tradition des grands ouvrages de saint Augustin" lists 368 MSS of the Enarrationes in Psalms, compared with 258 for the Confessions, 233 for On the Trinity and 376 for the City of God.152 Although many of the Enarrationes MSS are partial copies, it is after all by far Augustine's bulkiest work.

It continued to be copied (even into the era of printing) despite the production of numerous other Psalms commentaries which drew heavily on Augustine's. The exposition of Psalms 100-150 by Prosper of Aquitaine in the mid-fifteenth century is little more than a condensation of Augustine (and he may have done the same for the rest of the Psalter).153

150 J. Black, De Civitate Dei and the Commentaries of Gregory the Great, Isidore, Bede and Hrabanus Maurus on the Book of Samuel, Augustinian Studies 15 (1964) 114-27.
151 It occurs in, e.g., E. Ei. in ES 59 (1936) 12 (PL 37, 1236); McNally, The Bible (1959) 26-27.
Cassiodorus's "Expositio Psalmorum" was compiled by "borrowing light, in my usual fashion, from Augustine's light," so he tells us in commending the latter's commentary in his programmatic manual which had a wide influence on libraries and curricula in the medieval world. Despite his fulsome praise of Augustine's collection, Cassiodorus's own effort is jejune, primarily a literary exercise lacking the African author's rich vein of spirituality in exegesis.

Despite such later expositions, Augustine's "Enarrationes" "rests justly on the authority supreme in the Church". Its place as the sole complete systematic treatment of the Psalter was further strengthened by the special importance of the Psalms for the lectio divina and the "opus Dei" of devotional culture. Augustine was by far the most heavily used exegetical quarry of the Carolingian commentary compilers, but more significant still was the use of material from him in the standard Bible commentary of the central and later Middle Ages, the "Glosa Ordinaria". The gloss on the Psalter, while not the work of Anselm (d. 1116), a pupil of Anselm at Bec and the key figure in the formation of the complete "Glosa" at Laon. In turn his gloss on the Psalter was expanded by Peter Lombard in his "Magnum Glossarium". Peter was an ardent disciple of Augustine.

"A history of commentaries in the Middle Ages is to be written." No listing comparable to Warburg's for the other "grandes ouvrages" yet exists of the MSS of Augustine's "De Genesi ad litteram", although the job is being tackled country by country in the Vienna Academy's series, "Handschriftliche Überlieferung der Werke des Heiligen Augustinus". Yet is clear that the two early commentaries most exploited by the Carolingians, and

154 CPE 990; CCL 97-98 (1958).
156 Expos. Psalmorum, praef. (CCL, 97, 3).
157 Peter of Eboli, "Education and Culture in the Barbarian West, Sixth through Eighth Centuries" (1972); J. J. Contreni, "Carolingian" (Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina Press 1976) 166-67.
158 Wilpert, "Liber laudis" (1931) 300.
159 On this see the fine portrait by the lamented J. Leclercq, "The Love of Learning and the Drama of God" (C. Murthy; New York: Fordham University Press 1961).
160 For a list of their Psalms commentaries see McNally, "The Bible" (1959) 100-101.
162 For his Psalms commentary, PL 116, 195-606; A. Wilpert, "Un commentaire des Psautiers restitut à l'Anseam de Laon", RTAM 8 (1936) 325-44.
163 Wilpert, "Psalmus commentary", PL 191, 55-1296. One feature of the "Enarrationes in Psalmus" that was not influential in the medieval period was its title, which was first given by Erasmus (Wilpert, "psalmus commentary", PL 191, 395-410). This was not known by N. M. Hering, "Commentary and Hermeneutics", R. L. Benson/M. Contreni (eds.), "Renaissance and Renewal in the Twentieth Century Oxford: Clarendon Press 1982) 373-205 at 174.
164 Hering, Commentary (1982) 199-200; cf. Smalley, "The Study" (1952) 185: "The later middle ages is largely unexplored territory from the point of view of study".
165 McNally, "The Bible" (1939) 63-64, with citing Augustine of Lixenee (ca. 850), on whose OT commentaries see M. L. W. Laistner, "The Intellectual Heritage of the Early Middle Ages" (ed. C. M. Griff; Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press 1952) 181-201.

167 Smalley, "The Study" (1952) 112-19 (esp. 126-23), 384 n., 385 n.
168 H. Chadwick in DBI 88.
169 CB 2 (1969/80) 194-95, but see the critical comment on this chapter by J. J. Contreni, "Carolingian Biblical Studies", J. J. Contreni (ed.), "Carolingian Education, Writing, and Inheritance: The University of America Press 1983) 37-78 at 73 n. 7. Augustine's selective coverage may have influenced the mediæval—perhaps the meager attention paid to the OT prophetic books in the Carolingian era, otherwise prolific for Bible commentaries: see M. L. W. Laistner, "Theological and Philological Studies" in "The Bible in the Middle Ages" (ed. I. Ortel; Leiden: Brill 1971) 64-73.
170 CEB 30, 176 n. 13 (1975) 301, confirmed by the texts in McNally, "The Bible" (1959) 122-24.
171 Perhaps slightly exaggerated by H. Chadwick in "The Oxford History of the Bible" (ed. D. B. Melville, London: Oxford, 1978) 432, 433, but see Smalley, "The Bible" (1939) 34-35. The patristic work which furnished the Middle Ages with the most useful category of the biblical senses was Augustine's "De Genesi ad litteram", which provides a fourfold division".

172 McNally, "The Bible" (1939) 63-64, with citing Augustine of Lixenee (ca. 850), on whose OT commentaries see M. L. W. Laistner, "The Intellectual Heritage of the Early Middle Ages" (ed. C. M. Griff; Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press 1952) 181-201.

173 That the gloss on Genesis and Exodus was largely composed from De Genesis and Augustinian's Quaestiones in Heptateuchum by one Gilbert the Universal, a pupil of Anselm of Laon. Another medieval biblical scholar rescued from obscurity by the later Beryl Smalley, Andrew of St. Victor who flourished in the mid-twelfth century, also made considerable use of the two works of Augustine just mentioned.

Yet Augustine has been described as "less influential as a biblical commentator than Jerome, Ambrose, and Ambrosiaster". Jean Leclercq regards Origen, especially as Latinized by Jerome and Rufinus, as the most important predecessor of medieval biblical learning. While it is undoubtedly true that "Augustine's De doctrina Christi" enjoyed wide reception in the medieval centuries, and that knowledge of Tycius' "Epistola regulares" was almost entirely dependent upon Augustine's presentation of it in DDC; Augustine's book was read far more for its case for a Christian rhetoric (Bk. 4) and its bearing on the relation between secular and sacred studies than for its guidance in interpreting literal and figurative signs.

Augustine only very rarely, and in early writings, speaks of "four senses of Scripture", but he has nevertheless been credited with being the chief transmitter of this notion to the Middle Ages. More securely his contribution should be discerned in the more general legacy of patristic biblical study to later centuries, namely, the superiority of the spiritual sense of Scripture, which is so pervasive as to need no illustration or documentation. We may couple with this the raising of larger questions that could be the work only of an exegete with the theological, philosophical and spiritual depth of Augustine. According to Smalley, Augustine's DDC bequeathed "a philosophy of Bible study ... St. Jerome gave the medieval scholar his text and his learned apparatus; St. Augustine told him what his aim should be"—and that
aim is inseparable from the reign of love of which DDC talks.\footnote{Ibid. 22-23. Cf., on a somewhat different level, the persisting preoccupation with his question of the relation between the two accounts of creation, Ibid. 132.} From another perspective, it was precisely the fusion of Platonic and Christian visions in De Genesi ad litteram that attracted medievals such as Honorius of Autun and Giles of Rome.\footnote{See the papers by R. D. Crouse and E. Giannarelli in Congresso ... Atti (see n. 179 below) III, 167-77, 179-87.\footnote{J. Pielman, Luther the Expositor: Introduction to the Reformer’s Exegetical Writings (Luther’s Works; St Louis: Concordia Publishing House 1959) 243.} In that massive renewal of Bible study that was the sixteenth-century Reformation, it was Luther’s continuing commitment to multiple senses, rather than Calvin’s stricter historical exegesis, that could still reckon seriously with Augustine’s treatment of the OT. Calvin consulted De Genesi ad litteram, Quaestiones in Heptateuchum and, most of all Enarrationes in Psalmos, but frequently faulted their author’s speculative bent, excessive subtlety and obsession with the LXX.\footnote{L. Smits, Saint Augustin dans l’œuvre de Jean Calvin (Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp. N.V. 1956-58) I, 170-71, 180-81; II, 201-02, 230-38; J. M. Lange van Ravenswaay, Augustinus totus noster. Das Augustinusverständnis bei Johannes Calvin (FKDG 45; Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht 1990) 113-15.\footnote{F. Held, “Augustinus Enarrationes in Psalmos als exegetische Vorlage für Luthers erste Psalmenvorlesung”, TNS 102 (1992) 1-30; E. G. Row, The righteousness of God. Luther Studies (London: Hodder and Stoughton 1953) 140-57; H.-U. Deimel, Augustin als Quelle Luthers. Eine Materialamendung (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt 1984), summarized in idem, “Zu Luthers Augustinerezeption”, in Congresso Internazionale su S. Agostino nel XVII Centenario della Conversione. Roma, 15-20 settembre 1986. Atti (Studia Ephemeridis “Augustinianum” 26; Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum 1987) III, 241-56.}}

In the words of another distinguished historian of Christian biblical wisdom, “Luther was one of the few exegetes since St. Augustine to give basic thought to the meaning of time and of history in the plan of God”.\footnote{Cf., on a somewhat different level, the persisting preoccupation with his question of the relation between the two accounts of creation, Ibid. 132.}\footnote{J. Pelikan, Luther the Expositor: Introduction to the Reformer’s Exegetical Writings (Luther’s Works; St Louis: Concordia Publishing House 1959) 243.} In that massive renewal of Bible study that was the sixteenth-century Reformation, it was Luther’s continuing commitment to multiple senses, rather than Calvin’s stricter historical exegesis, that could still reckon seriously with Augustine’s treatment of the OT. Calvin consulted De Genesi ad litteram, Quaestiones in Heptateuchum and, most of all Enarrationes in Psalmos, but frequently faulted their author’s speculative bent, excessive subtlety and obsession with the LXX.\footnote{L. Smits, Saint Augustin dans l’œuvre de Jean Calvin (Assen: Van Gorcum & Comp. N.V. 1956-58) I, 170-71, 180-81; II, 201-02, 230-38; J. M. Lange van Ravenswaay, Augustinus totus noster. Das Augustinusverständnis bei Johannes Calvin (FKDG 45; Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht 1990) 113-15.\footnote{F. Held, “Augustinus Enarrationes in Psalmos als exegetische Vorlage für Luthers erste Psalmenvorlesung”, TNS 102 (1992) 1-30; E. G. Row, The righteousness of God. Luther Studies (London: Hodder and Stoughton 1953) 140-57; H.-U. Deimel, Augustin als Quelle Luthers. Eine Materialamendung (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt 1984), summarized in idem, “Zu Luthers Augustinerezeption”, in Congresso Internazionale su S. Agostino nel XVII Centenario della Conversione. Roma, 15-20 settembre 1986. Atti (Studia Ephemeridis “Augustinianum” 26; Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum 1987) III, 241-56.}} By comparison, Luther’s use of De Genesi ad litteram and Augustine’s other OT exegetical works is limited.

\footnote{Ibid. 22-23. Cf., on a somewhat different level, the persisting preoccupation with his question of the relation between the two accounts of creation, Ibid. 132.}