

DE GRUYTER

*Michael C. Sloan*

# THE HARMONIUS ORGAN OF SEDULIUS SCOTTUS

INTRODUCTION TO HIS COLLECTANEUM  
IN APOSTOLUM AND TRANSLATION OF ITS PROLOGUE  
AND COMMENTARIES ON GALATIANS AND EPHESIANS

 MILLENNIUM STUDIES

DE  
|  
G

Michael C. Sloan

The Harmonius Organ of Sedulius Scottus

# Millennium-Studien

zu Kultur und Geschichte des ersten Jahrtausends n. Chr.

# Millennium Studies

in the culture and history of the first millennium C.E.

Herausgegeben von / Edited by

Wolfram Brandes, Alexander Demandt, Helmut Krasser,  
Hartmut Leppin, Peter von Möllendorff, Karla Pollmann

Band 39

De Gruyter

# The Harmonius Organ of Sedulius Scottus

Introduction to His Collectaneum in Apostolum  
and Translation of Its Prologue and Commentaries  
on Galatians and Ephesians

by  
Michael C. Sloan

De Gruyter

Diese Publikation wurde im Rahmen des an der Bayerischen Staatsbibliothek durchgeführten und durch das Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung geförderten Vorhabens 16TOA021 – *Reihentransformation für die Altertumswissenschaften („Millennium Studien“)* mit Mitteln des DFG-geförderten Projekts *Fachinformationsdienst Altertumswissenschaften – Propylaeum* im Open Access bereitgestellt.



Dieses Werk ist lizenziert unter der Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International Lizenz. Weitere Informationen finden Sie unter <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

Die Bedingungen der Creative-Commons-Lizenz gelten nur für Originalmaterial. Die Wiederverwendung von Material aus anderen Quellen (gekennzeichnet mit Quellenangabe) wie z.B. Schaubilder, Abbildungen, Fotos und Textauszüge erfordert ggf. weitere Nutzungsgenehmigungen durch den jeweiligen Rechteinhaber.

ISBN 978-3-11-028122-4  
e-ISBN 978-3-11-028188-0  
ISSN 1862-1139

*Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data*

A CIP catalog record for this book has been applied for at the Library of Congress.

*Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek*

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at <http://dnb.dnb.de>.

© 2012 Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin/Boston

Printing: Hubert & Co. GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen  
∞ Printed on acid-free paper

Printed in Germany

[www.degruyter.com](http://www.degruyter.com)

## Acknowledgments

It is with great joy and gratitude that I make mention of professional and personal (and in many instances both) influences without whose help and support this project would not have come to fruition. This monograph first took shape as a doctoral thesis under the indispensable supervision of Karla Pollmann, whose erudition and industry I have continued to call upon even after graduating. I should also like to thank the Leverhulme Trust for their generous grant to the After Augustine Project, which allowed me to study at St Andrews with Karla Pollmann and ultimately produce this work. They should be applauded for their readiness and willingness to support the vision and talent of Karla Pollmann in filling a much needed niche in the study of Augustine.

The entire school of Classics at the University of St Andrews, faculty and staff, deserve my thanks – notably Roger Rees, who served as a reader of this work in its thesis form and offered many fine recommendations and corrections to make it of publishable quality, and Harry Hine, who kindly and astutely read and commented on sections of my translation. I should like to thank too my former colleagues at Baylor University, where my scholarship and teaching were refined. Alden Smith has been a tireless supporter and encouragement of not only this endeavor, but my career. I also frequented the desk of David Lyle Jeffrey, whose wealth of knowledge has proved greatly beneficial in this project. Brent Froberg and Jeff Hunt also kindly read portions of this work; it is better on many levels because of them.

Wake Forest University has not only been a haven within which I am privileged to work, but has extended tremendous support and resources. The library staff of Wake Forest, and particularly Carol Cramer, proved indispensable. My superlative colleagues at Wake Forest in the Classical Languages Department, James Powell, Mary Pendergraft, and John Oksanish, have helped shape this work through their encouragement, insight, and constant support; Jim especially improved its quality through his exceptional reading, astute suggestions, and the specifically allotted meetings for discussion. Additionally, Mariah Wright and Andrew Camp (undergraduate students of Classical Languages at Wake Forest) each pored over the final versions, for which I am very grateful.

Not only has the scholarship of John Contreni been very influential on this thesis, but he also graciously read and commented on a chapter in its early form, even though we have never met nor have any connection other than sharing the same vineyard. Roger P. H. Green immensely improved this work through his

role as one of my PhD examiners. His talents as a translator and vision for its appropriate form as a monograph were happily received.

The staff at De Gruyter press are likewise deserving of my gratitude. I know of only a few names, but assuredly many more were involved: Katrin Hofmann and Maria Erge were exceedingly patient, kind, and very good at their work.

Lastly, my parents, six siblings and their spouses, and wonderful in-laws have been my most enthusiastic supporters throughout. My father, a venerable Pauline scholar, deserves special thanks for his patient reading and thoughtful responses and suggestions to my work from start to finish. I owe sincerest praise and thanks also to my mother who has been an aid in all matters.

While I have enjoyed the input of many, all faults and errors within are my own.

This work is dedicated to my wife, Ali Gardner Sloan. I know of only a fraction of the sacrifices she made as this book was written, for those I am endlessly indebted. Her presence in my life is a continual blessing; it is a joy to share this life with her and now too with our beloved children, Collier and Kaira.

# Contents

Abbreviations .....	IX
Tables .....	XI
I. Introduction .....	1
1 General Introduction .....	1
1.1 Aims .....	1
1.2 Biography .....	3
2 Historical Context and Genre of Sedulius' <i>Collectaneum</i> .....	6
2.1 Historical Context .....	6
2.2 Title and Genre .....	8
3 The Pedagogical Function of the <i>Collectaneum</i> .....	11
3.1 Servius .....	11
3.2 Sedulius and Codex "(B)" .....	12
3.3 The Seven Types of Circumstance .....	13
3.4 Pedagogical Content .....	33
4 Latinity .....	40
4.1 Sedulius and Other Carolingian Pauline Commentators .....	40
4.2 Hiberno-Latin Content and Diction .....	42
4.3 Formatting .....	48
4.4 Linguistic Style .....	56
5 Theological and Ecclesiastical Issues .....	63
5.1 Baptism .....	63
5.2 Jewish-Christian Relations .....	66
5.3 The Trinity and the Divinity of Christ .....	70
6 Studies in Reception .....	74
6.1 Sources .....	74
6.2 Introduction to the Reception of Jerome, Augustine, and Pelagius .....	77
6.3 Reception of Jerome .....	79
6.4 Reception of Augustine .....	91
6.5 Reception of Pelagius within the Commentaries .....	109
6.6 The Augustine and Pelagius Dynamic within the Commentaries .....	112
6.7 Ambrose, Ambrosiaster, and Theodore of Mopsuestia .....	130



---

II. Translations .....	134
1 Intentions and Challenges of the Translations .....	134
2 Biblical Text .....	134
3 The Manuscripts, Text, and Formatting .....	136
4 Text and Translations .....	139
Prologue .....	141
INCIPIT IN EPISTOLAM AD GALATAS .....	152
On the Letter to the Galatians .....	153
IN EPISTOLAM AD EFESIOS .....	188
On the Letter to the Ephesians .....	189
III. Conclusion .....	232
Appendix .....	235
Bibliography .....	239
Greek and Latin Texts .....	239
English Translations .....	239
Secondary Literature .....	240
Index .....	247

## Abbreviations

### Works of Augustine

I follow the form of abbreviations and Latin titles as they appear in *Augustinus-Lexikon*, i. pp. xlii-xliv.

### General Abbreviations

A&G	Allen and Greenough's New Latin Grammar
CC	Corpus Christianorum Series Latina
CCCM	Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis
CLCLT	The CETEDOC Library of Christian Latin Texts
CPG	Clavis Patrum Graecorum
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
L&S	Lewis and Short, A Latin Dictionary
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae Historica
NPNF	Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers
PL	Patrologia Latina
RLM	Rhetores Latini Minores, ed. C. Halm
TDNT	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament
TLL	Thesaurus Linguae Latinae



## Tables

Below are the authors and respective works used by Sedulius in his Prologue and commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians. The abbreviations follow those of Hermann Josef Frede as used in the *apparatus fontium* and throughout his 1997 edition of Sedulius' *Collectaneum in Apostolum*. A key to all of Frede's abbreviations is found in the *Clavis Patrum Latinorum*, CC (ed. Dekkers), Brepols 1995, 831-854 and in Frede's work entitled *Kirchenschriftsteller: Verzeichnis und Sigel*, Freiburg: Herder, 1995.

1

AUTHORS:	BOE	AMst	PEL	RUF	Thr	HI	BED	IS	AU	CAR	CAN	GRM
WORKS:	Eut	Rm (pr)	Gal	Rm	Gal	ill	rat	sent	cred	Gal	co	Ev
			Eph	Eus		phlm		ety	Gal	Eph	in	
						Dn			ep			
						Q			Fau			
						nom			gn li			
						PROL			ench			
						-Heb			prae			
						-Paul			Ps			
						ep			ci			
						Gal			tri			
						Eph						
						Eph (pr)						

Prologue	Galatians	Ephesians
Sed-S, Mt. pr.	PEL, Gal	PEL, Eph
BOE, Eut	HI, Gal	HI, Eph
HI, ill	AU, Gal	Car, Eph
AMst, Rm	Ruf, Eus	AU, prae
HI, Phlm	AU, ep	AU, ench
HI, Dn	Car, Gal	PEL, Eph
HI, q	AU, Fau	GR-M, Ev
(HI) PROL, Paul	BED, rat	AU, Ps
HI, nom	AU, gn li	AU, ci
RUF, Rm	AU, ench	AU, tri
(HI) PROL, Hbr	Thr, Gal	Can, in
HI, ep	Can, co	AU, Gn li
AU, cred	SED-S, misc	IS, sent
		IS, ety
		Can, co
		HI, Eph pr

Clm and Wb. are both used throughout as well (cf. Frede, 1997, \*44-\*46).

- Clm 6235, 14277
- Wb. = glossae codicis Wurzburg M. p. th. F. 12

# I. Introduction

## 1 General Introduction

In 1961, H.J. Frede published a critical edition of both the *Prologus* (the Prologue) to Sedulius Scottus' *Collectanea in Omnes B. Pauli Epistolas* (the collection of commentaries on the "Pauline Corpus" of Epistles: Romans – Hebrews) and, also from that collection, the *In Epistolam ad Effeseos* (commentary on Ephesians) in his work *Pelagius, der irische Paulustext, Sedulius Scottus*. Over three decades later (1997) he published, in the *Vetus Latina* series, a critical text of the entire corpus of Sedulius Scottus' *Collectaneum* on the Pauline epistles, and he entitled the two volume work, *Sedulii Scotti Collectaneum in Apostolum* (hereafter referred to simply as the *Collectaneum*). This critical text, published in 1997, is the one I refer to throughout and ultimately use for my translation of Sedulius' Prologue and commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians.

### 1.1 Aims

This book aims to introduce and make accessible to English readers Sedulius Scottus' Prologue and commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians.<sup>1</sup> McNally calls for such translation projects in the conclusion of his seminal work, *The Bible in the Early Middle Ages*.<sup>2</sup> Sedulius' work and context is of such a nature that this project should also prove useful for a number of other specific fields in the disciplines of classics, medieval history, and Christian biblical and theological studies.

Sedulius is an ideal candidate for an introduction and translation project for a number of reasons. First of all, he is widely acknowledged as one of the great scholars and literary persons of that age.<sup>3</sup> Secondly, not only do we today

- 
- 1 The Prologue is one for Sedulius' entire *Collectaneum*, and I refer to it as the Prologue throughout. Hereafter, I abbreviate my references to Sedulius' commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians as Gal and Eph respectively, but all other references, whether to the biblical letters themselves or another commentary on the letters, are not abbreviated.
  - 2 McNally, 1959, 76–77: "It is an earnest desire and hope of all workers in the field of early medieval theology that one day a series of translations, *Medieval Christian Writers*, may be inaugurated."
  - 3 I am not alone in my estimation of Sedulius' importance and accomplishments in that age. See Simpson, XX; Lapidge, 283; Bieler, 116; Contreni, 1992, chapter IX, 762.

recognize Sedulius' importance, but he enjoyed a certain level of social prestige during his time as well. He served as a mainstream, orthodox writer who was appointed as one of the "chief ministers in the revival of learning and arts in Liège, the intellectual capital of Louis the German's kingdom."<sup>4</sup> In Simpson's introduction to Sedulius' *Collectaneum Miscellaneum*, he cites evidence within that text which buttresses the speculation that Sedulius was active as a teacher in Liège.<sup>5</sup> In fact, there are a number of works which are attributed to "Sedulius' circle", reinforcing the belief that he had a number of companions working with or under him during his scholarly pursuits around the region.<sup>6</sup> Some have speculated that he even held the title *scholasticus* in Liège.<sup>7</sup> Nora Chadwick claims, "we cannot doubt that many of the most important manuscripts known to have been written at the centres of Irish learning on the Continent contain Irish names which are those of monks recognized as having belonged to the circle of Sedulius."<sup>8</sup>

The Prologue and commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians were chosen for multiple reasons. First of all, in his Prologue Sedulius quotes Jerome who nominates these two letters as two of the three that must particularly be read (8, 182–186, Frede),

Whence also Jerome says: I shall quote Paul the Apostle, because however often I read him, it seems to me, that I hear not words but thunderings. Read his letters, especially those to the Romans, Galatians, and Ephesians – in which Paul is totally engaged in dispute, and in whatever way you look there are thunderbolts. He sticks to his purpose, seizes everything which he has touched, retreats so that he might overcome, simulates flight so that he might kill.

Secondly, these letters are some of the most studied and commented on by the patristic writers. To name a few, Marius Victorinus is the first known Latin commentator, and the only three extant commentaries from him are on Galatians, Ephesians and Philippians.<sup>9</sup> Augustine's only complete commentary on any Pauline letter is on Galatians. Jerome wrote full commentaries on only four Pauline letters: Philemon, Galatians, Ephesians and Titus. Therefore, because Galatians and Ephesians were popular letters on which to comment, it seems apt for purposes of this and future studies of Sedulius' work to start with these. The Prologue is also important to include in a study like this, because it prefaces the whole *Collectaneum* and reveals Sedulius' approach to interpreting Scripture, as the opening lines of the Prologue state (1, 1–3, Frede), "[b]efore

4 Doyle, 11. See also Lapidge, 283–284.

5 Simpson, XXII.

6 Traube first developed the theory of "the circle of Sedulius", and it has been accepted by later writers too. See also Bieler, 124; Doyle, 15–16.

7 Doyle, 11.

8 Chadwick, 105.

9 Plumer, 6.

we come to interpreting the apostolic words, let us first examine certain axioms, i. e., the main principles.”

## 1.2 Biography

The first wave of Viking attacks upon Ireland in 795 stimulated the pre-existing trend of Irish and Anglo-Saxon scholars immigrating to the Continent.<sup>10</sup> In 830, the attacks worsened and the Norsemen continued to plague the northern Irish until a decisive victory over the Vikings in 867, but it was not until 1014 that the Vikings were expelled.<sup>11</sup> These two-hundred plus years of battle and subjugation generated a large influx of Irish immigrants into the Carolingian empire, where they were usually welcomed and valued for their learning. In this period Ireland saw the emigration of her scholars, poets, theologians and political consultants who would indelibly impact the Carolingian empire. Sedulius was one of these Irish immigrants, and he stands as one of the more accomplished writers in the Carolingian empire of the ninth century. We can date his arrival to Liège between the dates of 840 and 851, because he addressed some of his poems to Bishop Hartgar – whose first year as Bishop was 840 – and others to the Emperor’s wife, Irmingard, who died in 851.<sup>12</sup> His poems also indicate that he migrated with some fellow Irish monks, and that they were greeted warmly by Bishop Hartgar with whom Sedulius in particular enjoyed both a close professional and personal relationship.<sup>13</sup> Sedulius never says why he and his comrades left Ireland, but their departure was most likely due to the above discussed Viking attacks upon Ireland.<sup>14</sup> The constant barrage of pillaging and warfare must have been frustrating for Sedulius, who undoubtedly sought a more quiet life. Many Irish folk went before him and assuredly he was aware of the serene life available in the Carolingian empire, which Alcuin described, “[o] how sweet life was when we used to sit at leisure among the portfolios of a learned man, among an abundance of books, and among the venerable thoughts of the Fathers; nothing was lacking that was needed for religious life and the pursuit of knowledge.”<sup>15</sup> Sedulius found such a life under Bishop Hartgar and

10 All dates are C.E., unless otherwise noted.

11 Bieler, 117.

12 Doyle, 9.

13 Cf. poems 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 17 (tr. Doyle).

14 McKitterick, 1983, 299; Doyle, 11.

15 Modified translation of Contreni, 1995, 106 (Dümmler ed., MGH, Epp. 4, 439, lines 23–26): *O quam dulcis vita fuit, dum sedebamus quieti inter sapientis scrinia, inter librorum copias, inter venerandos patrum sensus; quibus nihil defuit, quod relegiosae vitae et studio scientiae deposcebat.*



went on to enjoy an illustrious career as a scholar and poet. In fact, his talent in writing poetry eventually won him the position as “chief bard” of Liège.<sup>16</sup>

The dates and places of composition of Sedulius’ works are points of debate; however, the consensus is that the following complete list of his works was mostly composed on the continent (though some seem to have been partially drafted in Ireland before his migration)<sup>17</sup> in and around Liège between 840 and 874, which is the last known date of Sedulius:<sup>18</sup> a commentary on the grammatical tracts of Eutyches and Priscian, a *Collectaneum* on the Pauline epistles as well as one on Matthew, a *Collectaneum* of excerpts from classical authors, *Proverbia Graecorum*, numerous poems now collected and translated by Doyle, and *De rectoribus Christianis* (also known as “A Mirror for Princes”), which is also translated by Doyle in the same volume as the poems.<sup>19</sup>

This prolific output of literary work and the works themselves teach us a few things about Sedulius as a scholar and person. First of all, he was industrious and erudite. The titles alone suggest a vast breadth of reading and learning, and the contents do not disappoint. His poetry is laden with classical and biblical references,<sup>20</sup> and his knowledge of Greek was beyond most of his contemporaries.

There was an early misconception regarding the level of Greek learning held by the Irish, which has plagued medievalists for some time. It was long thought that they were competent Hellenists; however, thanks to scholars such as Esposito and Laistner the confusion is largely dispelled. Most of the Irish immigrants to the Continent, during the eighth and ninth centuries, did not know Greek. Some of them seemed to know the alphabet and even common phrases, but that was the extent of their knowledge.<sup>21</sup> In this area, Sedulius is one of the known exceptions. My own studies of Sedulius’ Prologue and commentaries do not prove that his knowledge of Greek was anything beyond the common Graecisms found in Latin at the time, nor does he seem to make any linguistic contributions beyond Jerome’s own work;<sup>22</sup> however, there is

16 Doyle, 11.

17 Simpson, XXIII.

18 McKitterick, 1983, 299.

19 Doyle, 16–17.

20 See poem 2 (tr. Doyle) where Sedulius likens Christ to a more compassionate Apollo.

21 Laistner, 240. Laistner in *Thought and Letters in Western Europe, A.D. 500 to 900* dedicates a chapter to “The Study of Greek”. Esposito too in his collected essays entitled, *Latin Learning in Mediaeval Ireland* (ed. Lapidge) dedicates a chapter to “Greek in Ireland during the Middle Ages”. This chapter (184–203) not only covers the learning of Greek in Ireland, but that of Irishmen who came to the continent with special reference to Sedulius Scottus and Johannes Scottus Eriugena.

22 These are common traits found in other Hiberno-Latin commentaries that Esposito warns against using as proof for a knowledge of Greek. He makes two salient points specifically on this matter and Sedulius (1988, 196–198): 1) “We must be very careful

sufficient evidence in his other works and from what we know about the schools at Liège (i. e., Sedulius is believed to have taught there, where the study of Greek was active) and other centers west of the Rhine to justify naming Sedulius as one of a few who was competent in Greek.<sup>23</sup>

Regarding personal traits, little is known as Sedulius' poems do not disclose many self-referential facts. But, one personality trait that does shine through is a congenial spirit and sense of humor. This is seen not only in his poetry, which reveals happy times for Sedulius and his comrades as he jokingly writes about beer,<sup>24</sup> food, and feasting,<sup>25</sup> but also in his *Collectaneum*. Sedulius' defense of a sense of humor is revealed in his selection of Jerome's exegesis for Eph 5:4 ("and there must be no filthiness or silly talk, or coarse jesting, which are not fitting, but rather giving of thanks.")<sup>26</sup> Overall, the exposition of this verse venerates the mournful attitude of a pious man, but one gleans from the following excerpt that Sedulius is sympathetic to those with a sense of humor (588, XXI.5–589, XXI.11, Frede):

There is the following difference between '*silly talk*' and '*scurrility*', in that '*silly talk*' contains in it nothing wise or worthy of the human heart, but '*scurrility*' descends from a wise mind and from mature reflection aims at certain urbane or rustic or shameful or facetious words, which we can call humorous by another word, so that it may cause the listeners to laugh.

More than anything else, the *Collectaneum* on the Pauline epistles reveals Sedulius' acute knowledge and understanding of the patristic writers and beyond. A cursory reading of Sedulius' *Collectaneum* may primarily suggest that it represents a simple cut and paste method of editorship from other commentaries, but as this study shows, he exhibits a keen mind in his clever ability to summarize large portions of writing into only a few lines while retaining their theological import. Also, Sedulius does not draw solely from commentaries, but from a wide range of authors and genres further demonstrating his extensive learning. Some of the works outside of commentaries that he uses for content are Augustine's, *civ.*,<sup>27</sup> *util. cred.*,<sup>28</sup> Bede's *De*

---

to avoid invoking, by a common anachronism, the ninth century learning of a Sedulius or of a Johannes Scottus, and regarding it as a characteristic of this period (from sixth century to 800)." 2) "This affectation of employing Greek letters is common to Irish and Anglo-Saxon scribes in the eighth and ninth centuries. It cannot be taken as evidence of knowledge of the Greek language."

23 Laistner, 244.

24 Cf. poem 9 (tr. Doyle).

25 Cf. especially poem 32 (tr. Doyle).

26 This and all other quotations of Scripture in English are taken from the New American Standard Bible.

27 Eph 4:13 (580, XV.28–582, XV.59, Frede).

28 Prologue 200–229 (9–10, Frede).

*temporum ratione*,<sup>29</sup> and Rufinus' translation of Eusebius' *Histories*<sup>30</sup> et al. Likewise, Sedulius exhibits a familiarity with classical models that include an Aristotelian/Ciceronian trope – the seven circumstances – and the commentary of the preeminent Virgilian scholar Servius, whose work Sedulius used as a literary model for the composition of his *Collectaneum*.

## 2 Historical Context and Genre of Sedulius' *Collectaneum*

### 2.1 Historical Context

In order to discuss the historical context of Sedulius' *Collectaneum*, the time and place of its composition must first be noted. Frede convincingly argues in his introduction to the critical text that Sedulius worked on and finished the *Collectaneum* in St. Gall during the second half of the ninth century and certainly before the end of the century.<sup>31</sup> He comes to this conclusion for two main reasons. First, St. Gall housed many of the manuscripts that Sedulius used as sources, most notably manuscript 88 of the Stiftsbibliothek and the Sangallensis 101, which is the manuscript containing the work which Sedulius cites as Ambrose. Manuscript 88 of the Stiftsbibliothek carries considerable weight in Sedulius' *Collectaneum*; it is the manuscript version of Rufinus' translation of Origen, the source used most in Sedulius' commentary on the epistle to the Romans, which is roughly as long as his commentaries on First Corinthians through Hebrews combined.<sup>32</sup> Secondly, Frede traced the dissemination point of Sedulius' *Collectaneum* back to St. Gall. Frede concedes that Sedulius likely worked on the *Collectaneum* in other centers as well, such as Würzburg, which houses the manuscript Frede labels as "Wb".<sup>33</sup> It contains Irish scholarship that Sedulius used in the *Collectaneum*. To these suggestions I offer Liège as another likely center where Sedulius probably worked on his *Collectaneum*, simply because we know that he lived there for a time and was active in many capacities, and because he composed much of his *Collectaneum Miscellaneum* there as well.<sup>34</sup>

29 Gal 3:17 (528, IIII.159–529, IIII.174, Frede).

30 Gal 1:19 (517, II.48–54, Frede).

31 Frede, 1997, 41\*.

32 Frede, 1997, 41\*-42\*.

33 The "Paulus-Handschrift Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek M." Frede, 1997, 44\*.

34 Simpson, XXIII; though see also Frede, 1997, 34\*, who claims Sedulius did at least some of the work on the *Collectaneum Miscellaneum* in Lorsch and Murbach.

While the term “renaissance” is not universally accepted as a description for the Carolingian age,<sup>35</sup> that it was a time of reform and renewal is not questioned. Charlemagne, king of the Franks for 47 years beginning in 768, expanded his kingdom into an empire encompassing most of western and central Europe. He used the infrastructure of the Church to implement a Christian culture of reform and revival. Giles Brown defines what he terms the “Carolingian Renaissance” as “the revival of learning in conjunction with a movement to reform both the institutions of the Church and the lives of the Christian peoples living under the Carolingian rule.”<sup>36</sup> Transformation of religion, law, government and learning within the Carolingian empire was achieved through a concerted commitment, directed by Charlemagne and his successors, to the study and use of the written word, and particularly, the production and study of the Bible.<sup>37</sup> This led to a scholarly culture of compiling, copying, and producing Christian materials. Scriptoria and monastic libraries developed an interdependence for the provision of manuscripts.<sup>38</sup> Furthermore, centers across the empire communicated and shared resources.<sup>39</sup> The concerted effort among these centers allowed Sedulius to draw from a wide range of sources.

Though previous generations had sought to establish programs of education for the purpose of advancing Christian understanding, the Carolingian administrators were the first to consistently apply the legislation.<sup>40</sup> However concerted and expansive these ambitious goals were, they were not prosecuted without hindrance.<sup>41</sup> As one would expect, creating an educated, unified Christian society in an expanding empire with a high number of immigrants made discord the norm.<sup>42</sup> Cultural barriers and the lack of a universally spoken language were challenging obstacles to the conversion and education of newly dominated peoples.<sup>43</sup> Naturally, an empire of such a diverse character, with nonetheless unifying aims, necessitated the teaching and understanding of the fundamental aspects of Christianity. Thus, although certain authors may have

---

35 Cf. Chazelle and Edwards (9), who claim that Carolingian *renovatio* is now the preferred term against Carolingian *renaissance*. McKitterick, Sullivan, Brown and Contreni, all used the term, but Contreni (1992, Chapter V, 71) and Sullivan (Introduction to *Gentle Voices*, 5) are both quick to note the term is not without its detractors.

36 Brown, 1.

37 Contreni, 1995, 106–111; McKitterick, 1989, 2.

38 McKitterick, 1983, 203.

39 McKitterick, 1983, 213.

40 Contreni, 1992, chapter V, 74–75.

41 Brown, 1–46; Smalley, 37–46; McKitterick, 1983, particularly chapters 2–8; Sullivan, 53–59.

42 Contreni, 1995, 110; Sullivan, 53–59.

43 Sullivan, 78–79.

attained a high level of erudition, they nonetheless often wrote at an elementary level.<sup>44</sup>

## 2.2 Title and Genre

Frede titles his critical edition, *Sedulii Scotti Collectaneum in Apostolum*, a title that is similar to the one which appears in the Fulda manuscript “W”.<sup>45</sup> This title departs from the one used in the *editio princeps*, published by Johannes Sichardus (Basle, 1528): *Sedulii Scoti Hyßberniensis, in omnes epistolulas Pauli collectaneum*. Migne in 1851, for the *Patrologia Latina*, copied Sichardus’ title, which became the standard text for Sedulius’ *Collectaneum* until Frede’s critical edition of 1997. All three titles contain the word *Collectaneum*, a term which is instructive with respect to Sedulius’ work and purpose.

In literary terms, a *collectaneum* is a collection of edited excerpts, usually from various authors and works, blended to some degree with the compiler’s own comments. *Collectanea* of this sort are often referred to as *florilegia*. Rochais classified *florilegia* into two broad categories: Classical *florilegia*, which are *collectanea* of classical authors (Sedulius’ *Collectaneum Miscellaneum* is a medieval example of this category), and Christian *florilegia*.<sup>46</sup> He then subdivides Christian *florilegia* into five types, *chaînes exégétiques*, *florilèges dogmatiques*, *collections canoniques*, *recueils liturgiques*, and *florilèges ascétiques*.<sup>47</sup> Sedulius’ *Collectaneum* falls into the category of *chaînes exégétiques* or exegetical chains.

Early Christian councils served as an impetus for the production of summaries on authoritative Christian writings on specific doctrines, a forerunner to medieval *collectanea* of patristic sources: for example, the summaries that were used at the council of Ephesus in 431, the council of Chalcedon in 451, and the fifth General Council in 551.<sup>48</sup> Then at the sixth General Council in 680, two *florilegia*, and not mere summaries, were produced for opposing views on the issue of Monothelites.<sup>49</sup> Rochais dates the *Liber Scintillarum* by Defensor of Ligugé, one of the earliest examples of moral *florilegia*, to about 700.<sup>50</sup> Around the same time, Bede (ca. 672–735) composed

44 Sullivan, 53–59.

45 Fulda, Hessische Landesbibliothek Aa 30, saec. XII (Frede, 1997, 60\*).

46 Rochais, 1953, 247–248. McKitterick, (1977) follows these categories throughout her seminal work on Carolingian *florilèges ascétiques* or “moral *florilegia*”.

47 Rochais, 1953, 248–249.

48 Oestreicii, 121.

49 Oestreicii, 121.

50 Rochais (1953, 251) dates the work to the last decades of the seventh century (“C’est dans les dernières décades du VII siècle que Defensor compose son *Liber Scintillarum*”),

his *Collectaneum in apostolum ex operibus Augustini*. This work is Bede's attempt to collect all of Augustine's exegetical comments on the Pauline letters. It certainly differs from later *collectanea* on patristic exegesis by virtue of its exclusive interest in Augustine's select exegesis and not the treatment of multiple authorities on entire books of the Bible. Bede's *Collectaneum* nonetheless signals an early practice of compiling and excerpting authoritative exegesis on Scripture.

It is from this tradition that the Carolingians began creating their own *collectanea*, a genre that, under the practice of the Carolingians, exhibits new developments and uses. After the production of Bibles and liturgical texts, which were used in the attempt to standardize worship and ensure solidarity in an extremely diverse empire, the preeminent literary genre of the Carolingian age was the biblical commentary.<sup>51</sup>

The impetus for the bulk of Carolingian biblical commentaries was the education of patrons: namely, emperors, bishops, nuns, and even laymen and laywomen.<sup>52</sup> A common feature of these commissioned commentaries was their request for as many Fathers as possible, thus taking the form of *florilegia*.<sup>53</sup> The Carolingian commentators, to varying degrees largely depending on the availability of sources, often blended their own comments with those of the Fathers, a practice that required judiciousness and acute editorial skills.<sup>54</sup> Some of the most prominent authors in the Carolingian empire from 800–850 wrote commentaries, using the Fathers as sources in the same way that Sedulius did: namely, Alcuin, Rabanus Maurus, Haimo of Auxerre and John Scottus, a fellow Irishman. Claudius of Turin (fl. 810–827), for example, foreseeing the possible criticism that his excerpts were contradictory or even misrepresented his sources, noted in the margins the name of the source from which he excerpted and defended the practice as inherited by Bede.<sup>55</sup> The process of compiling, excerpting, and simplifying earlier writers' works into clear, simple Latin drew many comparisons, such as that of a medic who draws from many plants for one medicine, or that of an organ with many pipes producing one harmonious

---

but this date is pushed back when he edits the critical text for the CC (vol. 117) edition (1957, 117).

51 Brown, 34; Contreni (2002, 29) notes that from the time of Charlemagne in the eighth century through the end of the ninth century, Carolingians produced around two-hundred biblical commentaries.

52 Contreni, 1992, chapter V, 87.

53 Contreni, 1992, chapter V, 84–85, 90.

54 Contreni, 1992, chapter V, 85–89.

55 MGH Epp. 4:592, 14–17: *Et ne ab aliquibus praesumptor et temerarius diiudicarer, quod ab alieno armario sumpserim tela, uniuscuiusque doctoris nomen cum suis characteribus, sicut et beatus fecit presbiter Beda subter in paginis adnotavi.* (Lest I be judged as a reckless or rash borrower, because I took arrows from an alien quiver, I beneath noted the name of each teacher with his own initials on the pages just as the blessed elder Bede did.) Cf. Contreni, 1992, chapter V, 81, 89, n. 67.

sound.<sup>56</sup> To bring the production of Carolingian biblical commentaries into proper comparison with Sedulius, I offer Contreni, who has done extensive scholarly work on Carolingian biblical exegesis, both in survey and specific studies. He summarizes the period thus,

The first generation of Carolingian exegetes in the 780s and 790s favored encyclopedic commentaries based on earlier florilegia of patristic and early medieval authors. Wigbod's Genesis commentary and Peter of Pisa's comments on Daniel represent the contributions of this generation. A second generation writing roughly in the period of the 820s through the 840s confronted the patristic and early medieval legacy directly when it composed anthology commentaries based on careful excerpting and juxtaposition of the authorities. The important work of Hrabanus Maurus exemplifies this generation's contribution. By the mid-ninth century a third generation had already begun to comment on the Bible in a new style. Angelomus of Luxeuil, John Scottus, Paschasius Radbertus, and Haimo of Auxerre, among others, blended patristic exegesis with their own grammatical, philosophical, or theological learning to create commentaries in which the imprint of the exegete and the biblical text itself became more apparent.<sup>57</sup>

When we compare Sedulius to the most prominent of his immediate contemporaries, such as the Irishman John Scottus or Haimo of Auxerre, we find that Sedulius' work contains less original exegesis; however, that does not imply a judgment on Sedulius' skill as an editor and compiler within his own *Collectaneum*. Actually, it asserts his orthodoxy and reverence for earlier Christian authorities, which was expected of Carolingian commentators. Too much original assertion was met with critique by peers, such as occurred between Florus of Lyons and John Scottus.<sup>58</sup> McKitterick goes so far as to describe the Carolingian commentators as bending over backwards *not* to be original.<sup>59</sup> It is in this tradition and contemporary practice of collecting and editing patristic biblical exegesis, blended with some of his own comments, that Sedulius composes his *Collectaneum in Apostolum*.

Frede notes in his introduction to the critical text, leaning on Brunhölzl and Bischoff, that Sedulius departed from typical Irish exegetical methods in his *Collectaneum* by consulting the sources themselves.<sup>60</sup> This assertion leads Frede to investigate what served as Sedulius' influence and motivation.<sup>61</sup> Again turning to Bischoff, Frede suggests that the *Liber Glossarum*, commissioned by Charlemagne (742–814), and later the Bible *Catena*, a project initiated by Louis the Pious, both served as trendsetters for future Carolingian exegesis, despite the fact that neither of the said works was completed or widely

56 Contreni, 1992, chapter V, 88–89.

57 Contreni, 2002, 29–30.

58 Contreni, 1992, chapter V, 82, especially n. 36.

59 McKitterick, 1983, 202.

60 Frede, 1997, 35\*.

61 Frede, 1997, 35\*.

circulated.<sup>62</sup> Frede, following Bischoff, then offers the following evaluation of Sedulius' method,

He takes up the new method of the Carolingian renaissance in order to communicate through a direct appeal to the sources the explanations of the Fathers on the individual verses of the Bible, by quoting them literally and naming his source. "Thus with the work of the theologian Sedulius Scottus – whose work concludes, in the middle of the ninth century, the older exegetical literature of the Irish – many of the weaknesses of the pre and early Carolingian Irish exegesis are overcome."<sup>63</sup>

Frede and Bischoff may be correct regarding the implications of the *Liber Glossarum* and the Bible *Catena* upon Carolingian biblical exegesis, i. e., that the two mandated projects added to the visibility and/or the popularity of the "glossing" and "collecting" formats for producing biblical and theological texts; however, Frede fails to identify Sedulius' most important influence with respect to structure and purpose: Servius' commentary on the *Aeneid*.

### 3 The Pedagogical Function of the *Collectaneum*

#### 3.1 Servius

This chapter proposes that Sedulius' *Collectaneum* employs Servius' commentary on the *Aeneid* as its literary model, an association that secures the conclusion that Sedulius' *Collectaneum* functioned as a classroom commentary. At the end of the fourth century, when the Imperial system was under duress and the educational system was experiencing decline, Servius utilized the earliest Virgilian commentators and ancient Latin writers to compose his magisterial commentary, which is singularly pedagogical.<sup>64</sup> Servius' commentary became the quintessential classroom commentary for the study of the *Aeneid* from the early through the later Middle Ages.<sup>65</sup> His method of selecting and editing his sources gives his work a "clear simplicity which characterizes the great and successful

62 Frede, 1997, 35\*-37\*.

63 Frede, 1997, 37\*: "Er nimmt die neue Methode der Karolingischen Renaissance auf, durch direkten Rückgriff auf die Quellen die Erklärungen der Väter zu den einzelnen Versen der Bibel unter Angabe der Fundstellen wörtlich mitzuteilen. 'So sind bei dem Theologen Sedulius Scottus, dessen Werk in der Mitte des IX. Jahrhunderts die ältere exegetische Literatur der Iren abschließt, viele Schwächen der vor- und frühkarolingischen irischen Exegese überwunden.'" Frede refers here to B. Bischoff, *Theodulf und der Ire Cadac-Andres: Historisches Jahrbuch 74* (1955) 92–98; appears again in *Mittelalterliche Studien*, Band II, (Stuttgart 1967), 19–25, the quotation taken from 24.

64 Baswell, 49–50.

65 Baswell, 49.



teacher,”<sup>66</sup> and likely contributes to the commentary’s wide circulation throughout the insular regions and the Continent during the Carolingian era. In the margins of the large, square Carolingian manuscripts containing Virgil’s *Aeneid*, one often finds a full text of Servius: to know one was most likely to know the other.<sup>67</sup>

Sedulius’ life as a poet and scholar who was born and trained in Ireland and then lived and worked in the Carolingian empire is reasonable proof for suggesting a familiarity with Servius’ renowned commentary, given its wide circulation and popularity in both locations. His self assignment as the “Virgil of Liège” also buttresses the conjecture; in poem 7.17–20, Sedulius writes, *Sedulie, assum: aue, tu Mosae filius amnis, tu Maro Leodii Musigenumque comes* (“Be well, Sedulius, son of the river Meuse, Virgil of Liège, and comrade of the Muses.”). That reference alone does not unequivocally establish Sedulius as one familiar with Servius’ work on the *Aeneid*; nevertheless, a number of identifiable links to the work confirm the supposition: 1) Sedulius as the likely penman of a Servian manuscript; 2) Sedulius’ application of the seven types of circumstance; and 3) similarities in matters of Latinity.<sup>68</sup>

### 3.2 Sedulius and Codex “(B)”

In 1921, St Andrews University Publications produced a facsimile of Codex “(B)” (as it is called in the manuscript tradition of Servius’ commentary on the *Aeneid*).<sup>69</sup> Ten years later Savage published an article in which he drew attention to the wealth of historical information contained in the margins of this manuscript. In these margins where the names of people in Sedulius’ circle appear, Sedulius Scottus’ own name occurs 225 times.<sup>70</sup> This codex was deemed a *vade mecum* of an Irish scholar whose itinerary included Liège and Lorsch amongst other known stops of Sedulius.<sup>71</sup> By 1934, in his article “The Manuscripts of Servius’s Commentary on Virgil”, Savage suggested Sedulius Scottus as the scribe of this manuscript, citing extensive internal evidence, but most notably the numerous occurrences of his name and the cities within the Carolingian empire where Sedulius was known to have lived and worked.<sup>72</sup>

66 Goold, 115.

67 Baswell, 50. See, e.g. MS Paris, B.N., lat 10307.

68 The chapter below on Latinity further discusses the links between Sedulius and Servius with special respect to *formulae*, structure and formatting.

69 *Ancient Lore in Mediaeval Latin Glossaries*, “St Andrews University Publications,” No. 13 (1921), 58–59.

70 Savage, 1931, 407–408.

71 Savage, 1931, 408.

72 Savage, 1931, 407–411.

Murgia's 1975 exhaustive publication of his investigations of the manuscripts of Servius and *Servius auctus* offers no substantive corrections to Savage's findings regarding this manuscript, except the suggestion that it "is probably dated not much later than the mid-ninth century, rather than *saec. IX ex.*"<sup>73</sup> An earlier dating to the middle of the ninth century coincides with Sedulius' known dates in Liège (841–860). Yet, there is further evidence that links Sedulius to this Servian manuscript. The following study of the *septem circumstantiae* as a template for Sedulius' Prologue will develop these additional connections.

### 3.3 The Seven Types of Circumstance

Sedulius' Prologue is written in 229 lines of continuous prose, and it covers what he refers to as the *VII species circumstantiae* ("the seven types of circumstance"). Sedulius writes in the opening lines of his Prologue, "[b]efore we come to interpreting the apostolic words, let us first examine certain axioms, i. e., the main principles. In the first place, therefore, it must be known that there are seven types of peristasis, i. e., of circumstance, without which no questions are asked, no arguments are investigated, and no art or work can stand."<sup>74</sup> He proceeds to list the seven types of circumstance and then uses them as a template for an historical introduction to his Pauline corpus (Romans to Hebrews). At the very least, Sedulius' use of the seven circumstances reveals a pedagogical impulse in the tradition of classical schoolroom commentaries, which typically introduce a text through the use of what scholars have broadly identified as one of three *accessus* schemas: 1) model of Donatus / Servius, 2) the *septem circumstantiae* or "rhetorical circumstances", and 3) the late medieval *accessus ad auctores*.<sup>75</sup> Though neither Donatus nor Servius explicitly mention the *septem circumstantiae*, I will demonstrate through a number of intertextual and external links to these texts that Sedulius, nonetheless, used Donatus and Servius as the model for producing this pedagogical Prologue.

#### *i) Connections to Donatus and Servius within Sedulius' Prologue*

The first intertextual link between the prefaces of Servius and Sedulius is found in the opening line for each: Servius writes, *In exponendis auctoribus haec*

<sup>73</sup> Murgia, 38.

<sup>74</sup> Prologue 1–6 (1, Frede): *Antequam ad apostolica verba exponenda veniamus, quaedam prius axiomata hoc est principalia documenta praelibemus. Inprimis itaque illud sciendum est quod VII species sunt peristasios id est circumstantiae, sine quibus nullae quaestiones proponuntur nulla argumenta tractantur nullaque ars aut opus constare potest.*

<sup>75</sup> Cf. Copeland, 63–86; Hunt, 85–112; Quain, 215–264; Przychocki, 65–126. For a seminal and comprehensive review of the historical development of the late medieval *accessus ad auctores*, cf. Minnis' monograph, *Medieval Theory of Authorship* (1984).

*consideranda sunt...* (“These things must be considered to explain authors...”); Sedulius writes, *Antequam ad apostolic verba exponenda veniamus, quaedam prius axiomata, hoc est principalia documenta, praelibemus.*<sup>76</sup> As a matter of introduction, both authors assert that an examination of certain circumstances must precede textual interpretation. The two operative words in Servius’ sentence are *exponere* and *considerare*. Sedulius likewise employs *exponere* and uses the synonym *praelibare* for *considerare*. *Praelibare* is not a typical synonym for *considerare*; however, the probability that it here serves as a synonym is confirmed in Sedulius’ conclusion to the Prologue, where he specifically offers *praelibatis* as a synonym for *consideratis*: *His itaque VII circumstantiis consideratis vel praelibatis...*

The next intertextual link is found in Sedulius’ lines 4–6, specifically in the phrase, *ars aut opus*. Sedulius writes, *id est circumstantiae, sine quibus nullae questiones proponuntur, nulla argumenta tractantur nullaque ars aut opus constare potest*. Sedulius here provides typical contexts within which the circumstances are employed. The *questiones* may refer to their appearance in question-and-answer dialogues common in all disciplines,<sup>77</sup> and/or perhaps to an early practice in which priests used them to judge the severity of confessors’ crimes and prescribe an appropriate penitence, a practice later mandated by the twenty-first canon of the Fourth Lateran Council.<sup>78</sup> The “investigation of arguments” likely refers to their employment in both philosophical and forensic contexts.<sup>79</sup> The third category, *ars aut opus*, is likely a literary expression applied specifically to poetry; the use of the *circumstantiae* in that context is therefore probably an indirect reference to Donatus’ *Vita* and/or Servius’ preface to his *Aeneid* commentary. This supposition is reinforced by Sedulius’ poetry where he uses the term *ars* to refer to poetry, especially Virgil’s. For example, in poem 7.43–44 Sedulius writes: *Nam mihi fas fuerat Laciores cernere terras, / quis meus altiloquus floruit arte Maro* (“For it was good for me to see the Latin lands, where my eloquent Virgil flourished in poetry.”). Similarly, in 35.7–8 Sedulius writes: *arte Maroneas uincit tua pagina Musas / fistola Nasonis qua resonante silet* (“Your poem surpasses the Virgilian Muses in skill / and Ovid’s pipe is silenced by your singing.”). For Sedulius, Virgil was the preeminent Latin poet, and the most prominent commentaries on Virgil, those of Donatus and Servius, contained prefaces which addressed seven questions about the author and work (s) that their commentary treated. Thus, I will show that Sedulius makes no distinction between his use of the *septem circumstantiae* and the *accessus* that

76 I do not offer translations for the longer quotations of Sedulius’ *Collectaneum* within the Introduction, because they are provided below.

77 Cf. Contreni, 1983, 98.

78 Cf. Robertson, 6.

79 Cf. Sloan, 2010, 236–51.

governs Donatus' *Vita*, which is subsequently reemployed by Servius. This is achieved in three steps: first, by demonstrating that Sedulius was familiar with Donatus' commentary on Virgil; secondly, by noting a reference to Donatus in Sedulius' work *Tractatus in Donati Artem minorem*; and thirdly, by demonstrating how Donatus' and Servius' seven *topoi* in their *accessus* are directly accounted for in Sedulius' presentation of the *septem circumstantiae*.

Savage argued that Aelius Donatus' commentaries on Virgil were still extant in the ninth century. He takes particular notice of a marginal comment by the penman of MS (B),

This marginal note reads as follows (f. 41b): *Donatus alter qui in totum Virgilium exposuit in Leotica*. This may be translated: 'The Donatus alluded to here as a Virgil-commentator is not the well known Donatus [i.e., Tiberius Claudius Donatus], but a second Donatus, who wrote a commentary on the Eclogues and Georgics, as well as on the Aeneid. There is a manuscript of his commentary at Liège.'<sup>80</sup>

According to Savage, the Donatus mentioned must be Aelius Donatus, who composed the *Vita Vergilii* as a prologue to his commentaries. With this evidence and other detailed arguments, Savage concludes that Liège housed the Donatus commentaries in the middle of the 9<sup>th</sup> century, and that the writer of this manuscript, who he claims is likely Sedulius Scottus, was familiar with those commentaries.

Evidence in Sedulius' work, *Tractatus in Donati Artem minorem* (hereafter *Tract.*), also suggests that he recognized a version of the *septem circumstantiae* in Donatus' *Vita*. The initial lines of Sedulius' *Tract.* introduce the seven circumstances; immediately after listing and defining each *species circumstantiae*, Sedulius writes (line 25): *Operatrix igitur persona huius artis proprio nomine Donatus* ("The creative employer, therefore, of this trope is our particular Donatus."). Given the pervasive appearance of this rhetorical trope throughout Latin rhetoricians, it is not likely that *operatrix persona* would have been attributed to Donatus for his treatment of this tool in a grammar. Sedulius could have named any number of *rhetoires* who discuss the circumstances in their rhetorical writings, most notably Cicero. This description seems to imply that he understands Donatus' work as a creative employment of the seven circumstances, a novelty that Sedulius' presentation of the *septem circumstantiae* should reflect.

The *Vita* of Donatus provides a treatment of the life of Virgil followed by an introduction to Virgil's poetry; however, only a portion of his comments on the Eclogues, which he examines first, are extant. Donatus provides his schema after concluding his discussion of Virgil's life:<sup>81</sup>

80 Savage, 1934, 191; cf. Savage, 1931, 409.

81 Donatus, *Commentarii in Eclogas*, 1.1–2.

Quoniam de auctore summatim diximus, de ipso carmine iam dicendum est, quod bifariam tractari solet, id est ante opus et in ipso opere. Ante opus titulus causa intentio. Titulus, in quo quaeritur, cuius sit, quid sit; causa, unde ortum sit et quare hoc potissimum sibi ad scribendum poeta praesumpserit; intentio, in qua cognoscitur, quid efficere conetur poeta. In ipso opere sane tria spectantur: numerus ordo explanatio.

Since we have spoken summarily about the author, now we must speak about the poetry itself, which is usually treated in two parts: i. e., before the work, and within the work itself. Before the work, there is the title, the cause, and the intention. The title, in which it is sought, whose it is and what it is; the cause, its origin and, in particular, why the poet ventured to write it; the intention, in which it is discerned what the poet attempted to achieve. Within the work itself, three things are generally observed: the number [of the books], the order [of the books], and its articulation.

Servius applies this model to his preface, changing the topic of *causa* to *qualitas*, but otherwise retaining the same terminology and order of *topoi*. Servius' introductory comment is not only much shorter, but he omits Donatus' distinction between "before the work and within the work":

In exponendis auctoribus haec consideranda sunt: poetae vita, titulus operis, qualitas carminis, scribentis intentio, numerus librorum, ordo librorum, explanatio.

These things must be considered to explain authors: life of the poet, title of the work, quality of the poem, intention of writing, number of books, order of books, articulation.<sup>82</sup>

These *topoi*, represented in Donatus' and Servius' prefaces, are directly addressed under the rubric of the *septem circumstantiae* in Sedulius' Prologue.

Like Donatus and Servius, Sedulius treats the *vita poetae*, or *quis* for Sedulius, at greatest length. Next, Sedulius discusses the *quid*, which, under this rubric, includes the title of Paul's letters as well as their order and number (Prologue, 68–70, 88–89):

Hactenus de persona dictum est, nunc de re vel facto quae est secundaria circumstantia quaedam disseramus. Rem itaque vel factum quatuordecim epistolarum opus intellegimus... Et quoniam de numero epistolarum diximus, quaedam de ipsarum quoque ordine consequenter exponamus.

Sedulius' third circumstance is *causa*, which corresponds with the Donatus' and Servius' *intentio*. Donatus and Servius discuss the time and place of Virgil's writing within the *vita poetae*, but Sedulius discusses these matters as separate circumstances, the fourth and fifth respectively. The two remaining *topoi* in Servius' preface are *qualitas* and *explanatio*, which are precisely Sedulius' last two circumstances. The sixth circumstance is also named *qualitas*, but the seventh is named *materia*. Sedulius equates *materia* with the themes in the letters (Prologue, 192–196),

82 Servius, *in Aeneidem*, praef. 1–3.

Tot enim sunt materiae singularum epistolarum quot titulis singulae quaeque praeantur epistolae, verbi gratia de virginibus, de viduis, de episcopis, de presbiteris, et reliqua quae singulatim prolixum est numerare.

Sedulius' understanding of *materia* seemingly derives from Servius' discussion of *explanatio*: *sicut nunc dicturi thema proponimus* ("just as now we propose to discuss the theme").<sup>83</sup>

Although Donatus and Servius do not explicitly claim to employ the *septem circumstantiae*, Sedulius nonetheless orders their *topoi* under the rubric of the *septem circumstantiae*. Przychocki (1911) first suggested a connection between Servius' prologue to Virgil and the *septem circumstantiae*, a point which has since been contested and supported.<sup>84</sup> This study strengthens Przychocki's conjecture by arguing that at least Sedulius intended his employment of the *septem circumstantiae* to be related to the work of Donatus and Servius as evidenced by the verbal parallels throughout and the use of identical *topoi*.

#### ii) *The History of the Septem Circumstantiae*

While Sedulius used the seven circumstances to present similar material as found in Donatus' and Servius' preface, there is still the question of his sources for the explicit use of the *circumstantiae*. Throughout the Prologue, Sedulius often cites the source for his information, though no citation is provided for his use of the seven types of circumstance. In light of its long history and frequent employment, especially in rhetorical circles, it may be that Sedulius did not deem it necessary to cite any one of a number of rhetoricians who had mentioned them in their respective handbooks on rhetoric.<sup>85</sup>

83 Servius, in *Aeneidem*, praef. 101.

84 Cf. Przychocki, 65–126; Quain, 215–264; Copeland, 63–86; Hunt, 85–112.

85 After the completion of this study, I found an article by D.W. Robertson, "A Note on the Classical Origin of 'Circumstances' in the Medieval Confessional", in: *Studies in Philology*, vol. 43, No. 1 (1946), 6–14. I am gratified to have found this article as it confirms the basic trajectory of occurrences that I had independently taken. In this brief, eight page article he traces the use of the seven types of circumstance as a *schema* which became known to him through their appearance as a set of questions in the "famous twenty first canon of the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215," which serves to assist confessors as they seek to judge the severity of crimes and "administer suitable remedies." My work offers the following important differences: 1) I offer a more detailed analysis, 2) I trace their history back to Aristotle, whereas he thought it originated with Hermagoras of Temnos (first century BC), 3) I identify and demonstrate this *schema* as occurring in Augustine's *util. cred.* and *conf.* (an important point of justification for its use in an exegetical and theological context), and 4) I demonstrate the reception of this tool with particular relevance for Sedulius. Though my work differs in these respects, Robertson's study confirms my analysis of the appearance and importance of the *septem circumstantiae* within Cicero and later rhetoricians.

In his introduction to the critical text, Frede identifies the seven circumstances as an Irish grammatical tool and concedes their importance as an element of the Prologue. However, regarding the issues of the schema's history and possible source, he concludes: "in unserer Ausgabe bleiben diese Eintragungen unberücksichtigt."<sup>86</sup> Due to the schema's considerable importance for Sedulius, I will here trace its development in medieval rhetorical circles and relate how Sedulius' employment of this trope is a reworking of specific medieval *rhetoires*, and in so doing I will identify another link between Sedulius and the Servian manuscript, Codex (B).

What Sedulius referred to as the seven types of circumstance was first listed in a philosophical context by Aristotle (384–322 B.C.E.).<sup>87</sup> He begins book three of his *Nicomachean Ethics* by claiming that an act is only deemed virtuous or shameful when the agent performing an act is doing so voluntarily. Therefore, according to Aristotle, defining the difference between voluntary and involuntary acts ought to be helpful for students of ethics and legislators who dole out rewards and punishments. Thus the major issue of book three, chapter one is defining the difference between "voluntary" (ἐκούσιον) and "involuntary acts" (ἀκούσιον).<sup>88</sup> He further notes that all acts due to ignorance are "non voluntary" (οὐχ ἐκούσιον),<sup>89</sup> but when they induce regret he classifies them as involuntary. He then enumerates the circumstances which one would have to be ignorant of in order to qualify an act as involuntary. He writes,

Therefore it is not a pointless endeavor to divide these circumstances by kind and number: [1] the who, [2] the what, [3] around what place or [4] in which time something happens, and sometimes [5] with what, such as an instrument, [6] for the

86 Frede, 1997, 50\*. In this context, Frede cites two articles by Bischoff: "Wendepunkte" (1991), 221 and "Eine hibernolatinische Einleitung zu den Evangelien", in: *Mittelalterliche Studien*. But, Bischoff only claims in these articles that the *schema* which Sedulius uses (and which is also used by Paschasius Radbertus) is typical to Irish exegesis (i. e., the use of any *schema*) and bears particular resemblance to the scholastic questions of *locus*, *tempus*, and *persona*. The crux of these articles (221 of "Wendepunkte" and the whole of the other) is to demonstrate that the Irish used enumerations and *schemata* as introductory material. I do not contest any of his information, but only wish to point out that he does not offer the necessary specifics to help understand the *schema* which Sedulius in particular uses in his Prologue, namely the seven species of circumstance. I also submit this study of the seven circumstances as further evidence of Sedulius exhibiting typical Irish traits (in his use of a *schema*), while also distinguishing himself as a rare witness to this specific *schema*, which as I will demonstrate reveals Servius as the likely literary model.

87 Sloan, 2010, 236–51.

88 Cf. Ostwald, 52.

89 Such is the way that Rackham and Ostwald translated "voluntary" (ἐκούσιον), "involuntary" (ἀκούσιον) and "non voluntary" (οὐχ ἐκούσιον) actions. They both offered comments explaining their decision to use these words. Cf. Rackham's note on 116 and Ostwald's note on 52.

sake of what, such as saving a life and [7] the how, such as gently or violently. No one would be ignorant concerning these things, therefore, except for the mad.<sup>90</sup>

Aristotle continues by providing an illustration for each of the above seven circumstances, and he further claims that if one does act in ignorance of any one of the seven, then that person is considered to have acted involuntarily. He concludes his comments on the circumstances by asserting that “[3] around what place or [4] in which time something happens”, and “[6] for the sake of what” are the two most important ones.<sup>91</sup> We may deduce then that these circumstances function as a set of questions one ought to investigate before one can rightly judge the merits of an act. Aquinas cited Aristotle as the originator of this schema; however, no modern scholar that I am aware of, including Rackham, Ostwald, and Rowe and Broadie’s translations or commentary has heretofore noted the significance of this passage with regard to its later reception.

As Aristotle noted, defining and enumerating those circumstances would be beneficial not only to students of ethics, but also to those in the realm of law where awards and punishments are decided upon. Cicero (106–43 B.C.E.) wrote *De Inventione* at an early age,<sup>92</sup> and although he would criticize the work later in life, it nonetheless became a prominent resource for Latin rhetoricians, especially for those in the medieval age. The work systematically treats the art of rhetoric, often citing Hermagoras<sup>93</sup> as well as Aristotle. Cicero criticizes the lack of sound philosophical principles within the work of Hermagoras,<sup>94</sup> but praises Aristotle as one who has added more to the subject of rhetoric than anyone else.<sup>95</sup> The philosophical function of the circumstances, as explained in

90 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, IIIa.2–8. ἕως οὖν οὐ χεῖρον διορίσαι αὐτά, τίνα καὶ πόσα ἐστὶ, τίς τε δὴ καὶ τί καὶ περὶ τί ἢ ἐν τίνι πράττει, ἐνίοτε δὲ καὶ τίνι, οἷον ὄργανῳ, καὶ ἔνεκα τίνος, οἷον σωτηρίας, καὶ πῶς, οἷον ἡρέμα ἢ σφόδρα. ἅπαντα μὲν οὖν ταῦτα οὐδεὶς ἂν ἀγνοήσσειε μὴ μαινόμενος. There are numerous acceptable translations available; however, I have used my own translation here and throughout the chapter (even for passages of Cicero and Quintilian, who also have acceptable translations available) so that the reader might more easily recognize the continuity between this passage and my translations of similar material, which appears in later Latin rhetorical writings, for which there are no available translations. The enumerations in brackets (done for the reader) are my own here and throughout all excerpts of passages on the seven types of circumstance which I treat.

91 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, IIIa.18–19.

92 Simon and Obbink, 1558–1564.

93 A Greek rhetorician from Temnos (fl. ca. 150 B.C.E.). Though uninterested in stylistic matters, his rhetorical doctrines soon became a prominent source for later writers such as Cicero and Quintilian. Cf. Russell, 689.

94 Cicero, *De Inventione*, 1.6.8.

95 Cicero, *De Inventione*, 1.5.7.



Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, is embedded throughout book one of *De Inventione*.

After a basic introduction to oratory, which comprises chapters one through eight, Cicero begins to define and classify the different elements of oratory.<sup>96</sup> Chapter nine asserts "invention" as the most important division of a speech and contains Cicero's rationalization for discussing it only and not the rest of the divisions (hence the title, *De Inventione*). Chapter ten contains strong resemblances to Aristotle in thought and language as he divides all disputes into four categories, those of "fact", "name", "type", or "action", and he relates the burden of the speaker, in any speech containing a dispute, to defending the intention of an act or affair. Cicero writes,

Omnis res, quae habet in se positam in dictione ac disceptatione aliquam controversiam, aut facti aut nominis aut generis aut actionis continet quaestionem. Eam igitur quaestionem, ex qua causa nascitur, constitutionem appellamus. Constitutio est prima conflictio causarum ex depulsione intentionis profecta, hoc modo: 'Fecisti;' 'Non feci;' aut 'Iure feci'.<sup>97</sup>

The link to Aristotle is located in the phrase *constitutio est prima conflictio causarum ex depulsione intentionis profecta*. This statement is an explicit claim that a dispute hinges on intention, and it mirrors Aristotle's philosophy that a deed can only be judged after investigating whether or not an agent is acting in "ignorance" or "awareness" of certain circumstances. Chapter ten concludes after he lists and defines each category of dispute. Next Cicero provides a longer explanation of each category by giving hypothetical situations for each. In Cicero's example of a controversy of type he again echoes Aristotle's claim that knowing certain circumstances of an act will help judge its merit. In *De Inventione* 1.9.12, he writes:

Generis est controversia, cum et, quid factum sit, convenit et, quo id factum nomine appellari oporteat, constat et tamen, quantum et cuiusmodi et omnino quale sit, quaeritur, hoc modo: iustum an iniustum, utile an inutile, et omnia, in quibus, quale sit id, quod factum est, quaeritur sine ulla nominis controversia.<sup>98</sup>

96 Cicero, *De Inventione*, 1.8.10.

97 This, *De Inventione*, 1.8.10, and all following translations of Cicero are my own. "Every matter, which has in itself any controversy positioned in speech or discussion, contains a question either of fact or name or type or of proceeding. That question, therefore, out of which a cause is born, we call the issue. The issue is the first conflict of causes having been brought forth by a defense of intention, in this way; 'You did it;' 'No, I did not;' or, 'I did it lawfully.'"

98 Cicero, *De Inventione*, 1.9.12. "It is a controversy of type, when both what has been done and by what name the deed ought to be called is agreed and nevertheless it is questioned 'how important' and 'of what type' and 'of what nature it is', in this way: whether it be just or unjust, useful or unuseful, and all other circumstances, 'in what', 'what type it is', and 'what has been done' is questioned without any debate concerning the 'name' of the deed."

He is not at this point defining or listing the circumstances as he does later, but merely points out that they must be considered. Though he only briefly alludes to a few circumstances here, one can nevertheless recognize the similarity of these questions with the circumstances listed by Aristotle. Specifically, Aristotle listed the two most important circumstances as the nature of the act itself and its consequential effect, κυριώτατα δ' εἶναι δοκεῖ ἐν οἷς ἡ πράξις καὶ οὐ ἕνεκα (with ἐν οἷς ἡ πράξις referring to περὶ τί ἢ ἐν τίνι πράττει from III.a.4, which is circumstance [3] within the above translation), and Cicero here writes *et omnia, in quibus, quale sit id, quod factum est*. They are questions that inquire about the nature and physical setting of an act. They are points of reference which can verify the intention of an agent and ultimately help decide the merit of a deed: “whether just or unjust, useful or unuseful” etc.

Cicero lists the circumstances once he begins his discourse on the “narration” aspect of an oration. In *De Inventione* 1.21.29 he writes,

Probabilis erit narratio, si in ea videbuntur inesse ea, quae solent apparere in veritate; si [1] personarum dignitates servabuntur; si [2] causae factorum existabunt; si fuisse [3] facultates faciendi videbuntur; si [4] tempus idoneum, si spatii satis, si [5] locus opportunus ad eandem rem, qua de [6] re narrabitur, fuisse ostendetur; si [7] res et ad eorum, qui agent, naturam et ad vulgi morem et ad eorum, qui audient, opinionem accommodabitur. Ac veri quidem similis ex his rationibus esse poterit.<sup>99</sup>

The first and last lines of this excerpt are intratextually linked with his opening line about *inventio* (*De Inventione*, 1.7.9.): *Inventio est excogitatio rerum verarum aut veri similibum, quae causam probabilem reddant* (“Invention is the devising of true things or things that seem like the truth, which render the cause as probable.”). Per the previous statement, these circumstances are the nucleus around which a speech of “dispute” (or one containing a “cause”) is built, which is yet another example of the Aristotelian function that the circumstances fulfill in the context of a speech.

A close comparison of this excerpt with Aristotle’s list of circumstances reveals the two as remarkably similar. The differences are easily rationalized when one takes into account the change of perspective. Aristotle is writing from a philosophical context to qualify an act as voluntary or involuntary so that a deed may ultimately be deemed as virtuous or shameful. Thus, for Aristotle the perspective originates with the agent’s personal awareness (or lack thereof) of the circumstances, whereas Cicero is writing from the perspective of a lawyer, and these circumstances are questions to investigate for the purpose of building a defense. So, the *character* of the person is important (an issue which Cicero later discusses) but is a trait absent from Aristotle’s list; likewise, Aristotle’s πῶς (“how”) is important to Cicero inasmuch as the lawyer can relate it to the nature

99 A translation of this quote is given in the appendix under the appropriate heading.

of the agent *and* the opinion of the hearers. Thus, what I have enumerated as the seventh circumstance in Cicero represents Aristotle's category of "how".

In *De Inventione* 1.24.34, Cicero again provides a list of circumstances, again equaling seven in number, though slightly modified from those appearing in 1.21.29, and then explains what he considers to be the necessary questions to consider in order to apply them in a speech. Here he claims that the circumstances are a means for confirming an argument, or adding faith and authority to one's speech, in effect echoing his conviction that the circumstances serve to make a narration probable. Thus, any statement must be made plausible or convincing by adding detailed information. The template of the seven types of circumstance then serves as a basic set of questions one ought to pursue in order to supply substantial information to corroborate one's statement. In more rhetorically technical terms, Cicero contends that every speech hinges on one or several question(s), i. e., a prompt. Every prompt then is either about the law or general reasoning. The ensuing stating of the case requires the confirmation of precepts or proofs. Cicero writes,

(1.24.34) Omnes res argumentando confirmantur aut ex eo, quod [1] personis, aut ex eo, quod negotiis est adtributum... (1.26.38) In gestione autem [2] negotii, qui locus secundus erat de iis, quae negotiis adtributa sunt, quaeretur [3] locus, [4] tempus, [5] modus, [6] occasio, [7] facultas.<sup>100</sup>

The ellipses follow the "person", because Cicero proceeds to discuss the various questions one has to ask in order to discover all the necessary information about the "person" in paragraphs 34–37. Again, the character and various other attributes which make up a person are important for Cicero's purpose, though they were not necessarily important for Aristotle. Once Cicero ends his discussion on the "person", he then lists circumstances two through seven as enumerated above. After listing circumstances two through seven, he examines each one in much the same way he did for the "person", though to a slightly lesser degree in regard to length. While he uses many of the same words in the above chapters (1.24.34–1.27.41) that he uses in the previous list of circumstances (1.21.29), a comparative reading reveals a few changes. Within his explication of *modus* (1.27.41) he includes both the "how", which is represented by the clause *si res... accomodabitur* in 1.21.29, and the "why", which is represented in 1.21.29 by the term *causa*. Also *satis spatii* (from 1.21.29) represents what Cicero here broadly calls *tempus*, and *tempus idoneum* (from 1.21.29) here represents *occasio*.<sup>101</sup>

<sup>100</sup> Cicero, *De Inventione*, 1.24.34 and 1.26.38. A translation of this quote is given in the appendix under the appropriate heading.

<sup>101</sup> One could perhaps argue that *spatii satis* in fact represents *occasio* and *tempus idoneum* represents *tempus*, but either way, a comparison of the two texts clearly shows that *occasio* and *tempus* are accounted for in those other two statements.

Quintilian, known more as a teacher and systematizer of rhetoric than a practitioner, also writes a list of circumstances very similar to Aristotle's and Cicero's in his work, *Institutio Oratoria* (*Inst. Orat.*). In the first instance he sets the circumstances in the larger context of "definite" and "indefinite" questions, which in principle is the same as both Aristotle and Cicero. Quintilian claims that before one can decide "whether or not 'X' ought to marry", one must first decide if marriage is a desirable state. Thus, the circumstances are then introduced as a set of questions which help to ascertain information for the passing of judgment. The explicit reference comes up in the immediate context of defining a *causa*:

Causam finit Apollodorus<sup>102</sup> ... ita: 'Causa est negotium omnibus suis partibus spectans ad quaestionem'; aut: 'Causa est negotium, cuius finis est controversia.' Ipsum deinde negotium sic finit: 'Negotium est congregatio [1] personarum, [2] locorum, [3] temporum, [4] causarum, [5] modorum, [6] casuum, [7] factorum, [8] instrumentorum, [9] sermonum, [10] scriptorum et non scriptorum.' Causam nunc intelligamus ὑπόθεσιν, negotium περίστασιν ... Cicero his verbis:<sup>103</sup> 'Causa certis personis, locis, temporibus, actionibus, negotiis cernitur, aut in omnibus aut in plerisque eorum.'<sup>104</sup>

With Quintilian the scope of the list of circumstances seems to broaden in comparison to Aristotle and Cicero. However, the language and terminology is consistent with that found in Aristotle and Cicero, despite the list of circumstances equaling ten in the Apollodorus quotation. Six of those, the *persona*, *locus*, *tempus*, *causa*, *modus*, and *factum* are identical with the terms found in Cicero, which leaves *instrumentum* and three others seemingly unaccounted for: *casus*, *sermo*, and *scriptum* and *non scriptum*. The latter three are easily explained as they are categories considered by Cicero under his circumstance of *res/factum/negotium*. *Instrumentum* is a specific aspect of what Cicero considers under *facultas*. Though the difference is only slight, Apollodorus uses the word *negotium* differently from Cicero. In Cicero, *negotium* was synonymous with *res* or *factum* and the rest of the circumstances are in relation to *negotium*, but Apollodorus defines *negotium* as the culmination of circumstances and not just a single circumstance in itself, thus making *negotium* a synonym for *circumstantiae*. This conclusion is not only revealed in the context of Quintilian's quotation of Apollodorus, but also by Quintilian's

102 Apollodorus from Pergamum is the figurehead of the *Apollodorei* ("Apollodoreans"), whom Quintilian references at 2.11.2 and 3.1.18 within the *Inst. Orat.* Apollodorus is also noted by Suetonius as serving as a tutor for Augustus on the subject of elocution and that Apollodorus, despite being an old man at the time, accompanied Augustus to Apollonia (Suetonius, *De Vita Caesarum*, 89).

103 Cicero, *Topica*, 21.80.

104 Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.*, 3.5.17–18. A translation of this quote is given in the appendix under the appropriate heading.

own comment that *negotium* equals περίστασις, which when translated directly into Latin is *circumstantia*.<sup>105</sup>

Quintilian's quotation of Cicero at the end of the passage suggests that the circumstances are void of any uniform systematic coherence; however, a comparison of that quotation with the language found in *De Inventione* 1.21.29 reveals almost an identical relation of words in both terminology and order. The main difference between the list in *De Inventione* 1.21.29 and Quintilian's quotation of Cicero (from his *Topica* XXI.80) is that there is no explicit mention of *modus*, *occasio*, and *facultas*.

Quintilian references these circumstances again in his *Inst. Orat.*, though this time in book four, where he discusses how to make a narration probable.

Credibilis autem erit narratio ante omnia si prius consuluerimus nostrum animum ne quid naturae dicamus aduersum, deinde si causas ac rationes factis praeposuerimus, non omnibus, sed de quibus quaeritur, si [1] personas convenientes iis quae [2] facta credi volumus constituerimus, ut furti reum cupidum, adulterii libidinosum, homicidii temerarium, vel his contraria si defendemus: praeterea [3] loca, [4] tempora, [5–7] et similia.<sup>106</sup>

The similarity of this passage with *De Inventione* 1.21.29 is evident and requires no drawn out comparison. The context – how to make a narration probable or believable, in which the reference to the circumstances is made – and the purpose for which they are used are both identical to Cicero's. The difference between the two passages is that Quintilian summarizes certain details listed in Cicero's passage and retains only the main ideas. For example, instead of listing all the circumstances that Cicero mentions, he identifies *persona*, *factum*, *loca*, and *tempora* and envelopes the rest of the circumstances with the phrase *et similia*.

The next instance occurs in the very next chapter as Quintilian continues to discuss the virtues of a credible narration. He suggests that it may be beneficial to refer subtly to certain proofs in the narration.

Est autem quidam et ductus [1] rei credibilis... Ne illud quidem fuerit inutile, semina quaedam probationum spargere, verum sic ut narrationem esse meminimus, non probationem... Omnia denique quae probatione tractaturi sumus, [2] personam [3] causam [4] locum [5] tempus [6] instrumentum [7] occasionem, narratione delibabimus.<sup>107</sup>

105 This is done first in Quintilian's *Inst. Orat.*, 5.10.104, see TLL s.v. *circumstantia* 1173.17–20.

106 Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.*, 4.2.52. A translation of this quote is given in the appendix under the appropriate heading.

107 Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.*, 4.2.53–55. A translation of this quote is given in the appendix under the appropriate heading.

He lists six circumstances after *rei*, thus bringing the total to seven. However, this list differs slightly from Cicero's. This list does not include *modus* and *facultas*, but instead contains *causa* and *instrumentum* respectively. Unlike Cicero's treatment of the circumstances in *De Inventione* 1.24.34–1.27.41, Quintilian never follows the list of circumstances with a series of questions or topics to investigate for each circumstance.

The last instances all appear in the *Rhetores Latini Minores* (hereafter referred to as RLM). The authors featured in the RLM are all very similar in content and lean heavily upon the works of Cicero, Quintilian, and Hermagoras. The works vary in purpose and range from systematic epitomes of classical rhetoric handbooks to a treatise dedicated to a king. The authors of most of the works are presumed as known, however, there are a few entirely unknown and others that are debatable. For example, the editor C. Halm follows a long tradition naming Aurelius Augustinus as the author of *De Rhetorica*. However, much speculation surrounds the issue. This study will assume the authorship of Augustine,<sup>108</sup> but even if later scholarship decides that such an opinion is wrong, it will not impact the findings of this study as it can be confidently asserted that Sedulius presumed as much.<sup>109</sup> The excerpts from the RLM will be presented in chronological order according to their author's life.

Sulpitius Victor (hereafter referred to as S. Victor), presumably from the late third and early fourth centuries, wrote a work entitled *Institutiones Oratoriae*. This work methodically defines certain key rhetorical phrases and concepts; for example, he begins the work by defining the term "rhetoric". The seven types of circumstance are introduced under his discussion of "narration", and particularly, how to make a narration probable or believable. This is the same context under which Cicero (1.21.29 of *De Inventione*) and Quintilian (*Inst. Orat.* 4.2.52) both listed a series of circumstances.

Quod superest, probabilis erit, si argumentorum et quaestionum semina quaedam fuerint ubique respersa, modo ne argumentandi genera ponantur: ut [1] tempus, quo [2] rem factam esse dicimus, [1 sic] adsit, et [3] causa cur facta sit, et [4]

108 As this study will indirectly point out, there is significant lexical evidence based upon similarities between the *De Rhetorica* and other Augustinian writings which leads one to affirm the long standing tradition of Augustine as the author. See also most recently Giomini, 2–33.

109 While it is convenient to have Augustine explicitly using the "seven types of circumstance", his pre-conversion life as a teacher of rhetoric allows us to presume his familiarity with such a tool. Also, other textual evidence from famously known works of Augustine reveal his knowledge of this rhetorical tool and are discussed later in this study.

persona quae fecit, et [5] facultas quare facere potuisse credatur, et [6] locus ubi facta est. In eas res ex omnibus narrationibus Tullianis licet sumere exempla.<sup>110</sup>

All of the circumstances mentioned above are mentioned in 1.21.29 of Cicero's *De Inventione*. However, there are two noteworthy differences. First, the list totals only six of the circumstances, as it lacks *modus*. The term *modus* does not appear in 1.21.29 of Cicero's *De Inventione* either; however, as I argued earlier it is accounted for in a clause, and the term is later employed in 1.24.34 in place of the said clause. S. Victor, however, omits both the clause and the term. The second difference is that S. Victor offers a corresponding interrogative pronoun for some of the nouns. Aristotle introduced the circumstances with interrogatives, but both Cicero and Quintilian described the circumstances with specific nouns. Though S. Victor does not offer a complete list of interrogative pronouns, the partial list is nonetheless a significant first, as almost all of the ensuing listed authors include the combination of nouns and their corresponding interrogative pronouns.

Marius Victorinus, who lived circa 300–370 and is referred to in Augustine's *conf.*, wrote a commentary on Cicero's *De Inventione*. This work is particularly insightful given its explicit intention of expounding Cicero's meaning on the passages which this study has identified as the original *locus* for the Latin employment of what becomes known as the seven types of circumstance.

(Quoting Cicero's *De Inventione* 1.21.29) 'Probabilis erit narratio, si in ea videbuntur inesse ea, quae solent apparere in veritate...' (Here begins Victorinus' commentary) Secundum ordinem divisionis suae, postquam de brevi et aperta narratione tractavit, nunc incipit de narratione probabilis disputare. Probabilis, inquit erit narratio, si in ea fuerint illa omnia, quibus solet veritas inveniri; nam in his septem omnis ad fidem argumentatio continetur....<sup>111</sup> Septem illa superiora, [1] quis, [2] quid, [3] cur, [4] ubi, [5] quando, [6] quemadmodum, [7] quibus adminiculis, omnes artium scriptores tractarunt et in praeceptis suarum artium reliquerunt. Verum Cicero rerum ac temporum personarumque considerans naturam addidit illis omnibus octavam opinionem, et recte. Res enim omnes non per se sunt neque ex natura valent, sed opinione.<sup>112</sup>

This passage reveals a more defined version of the circumstances than previous excerpts. Specifically, he describes them as seven in number, which is a first from the extant literature, and he employs interrogative pronouns for every

110 Halm, 323, 16–21. A translation of this quote is given in the appendix under the appropriate heading.

111 At this point in the text a chart was inserted with the seven nouns listed in the first line and the corresponding interrogatives connected by a line below each noun. The seven nouns listed in chart are: *persona, factum, causa, locus, tempus, modus, facultas*.

112 Marius Victorinus, *explanationem in Ciceronis rhetoricam*, I.21.1–14 (CC 132). A translation of this quote is given in the appendix under the appropriate heading.

circumstance. Victorinus actually goes on to argue that Cicero in fact lists an eighth circumstance and names it *opinio*. This comment is based upon Victorinus' understanding of the phrase *si res... opinionem accommodabitur*.<sup>113</sup> This interpretation of Cicero is particularly revealing on several accounts. First, Victorinus includes the term *modus* in the list of seven, but Cicero does not use that term until *De Inventione* 1.24.34. By adding *modus* to the list, he must either say that it represents the *opinio...* clause or (as he does) that that clause is in fact an eighth circumstance. Also, his first description of the circumstances as “seven”, followed by his comment “but Cicero adds...”, suggests that the seven nouns and their correlating interrogative pronouns were, by this time, widely known and used as a schema or rhetorical tool and that their development over time most likely came from an understanding of reading *De Inventione* 1.21.29 in combination with *De Inventione* 1.24.34. Not that we would presume exaggeration by Victorinus, but these findings help confirm his statement found in the above excerpt, “all writers of academic disciplines have dealt with [the seven types of circumstance] and have embedded them in the precepts of their own academic disciplines.”

R. Giomini and M.S. Celentano edited a text of C. Julius Victor's (hereafter referred to as J. Victor) *Ars Rhetorica*, dating him into the fourth century.<sup>114</sup> J. Victor's treatment of the “seven parts of circumstance”, as he calls them, is the briefest of the three within the RLM and appears under the subject heading of “De Inventione”. He discusses the order in which one organizes a speech, and he claims that once the matter or theme of the speech is established, then the *peristasis causae* (“circumstance of the cause”) ought to be investigated. He proceeds to say,

Accepto igitur themate primum circumstantiam sectari debes, cuius partes sunt septem hae: [1] quis, [2] quid, [3] quando, [4] ubi, [5] cur, [6] quemadmodum, [7] quibus adminiculis. Harum vero omnium aut plurimarum rationalis congregatio facit causam, et hac primum perspicitur, an consistat controversiae ratio, an vero materia, quae proposita est, asystatos sit. Asystaton est enim thema, quod circumstantiam non habet, ut ‘reum facit iniuriarum pauperem dives’. Vides hanc causam stare non posse; neque enim quando nec ubi nec cur nec aliud praeterea potest quaeri, ut altercationem controversia videatur admittere, sed quasi nuda et debilitata proponitur. Nec tamen putes omnes species circumstantiae in themate omni posse reperiri, sed aliquando omnes, aliquando plerasque: at si, ut in suprascripto, paene omnis desit circumstantia, causam stare non posse.<sup>115</sup>

Though he offers the same list of interrogative pronouns as his predecessors, he does not offer the nouns to which they relate. Twice he notes that a cause is not

113 Quoting 1.21.29 of Cicero's *De Inventione*.

114 Celentano and Giomini (eds.), vi.

115 J. Victor, *Ars Rhetorica*, (3, 16–27, Giomini). A translation of this quote is given in the appendix under the appropriate heading.



able to stand unless it contains the circumstances, which is similar to the arguments of both Cicero and Quintilian, who claim that the circumstances help make a narration credible. While J. Victor largely uses his own terminology, the most evident sign of dependence reveals a similarity not with Cicero or with Quintilian, but with Quintilian's quotation of Apollodorus. It is Apollodorus who claims that a circumstance's end is a *controversia* and that the circumstances are in fact a *congregatio* of people, places, times, etc. J. Victor does not offer a series of questions to ask, nor does he suggest what aspects of the *quis* or *quid*, etc., are to be explored as Cicero does in 1.34–41 and as do the later writers within the RLM.

Augustine also discusses the seven types of circumstance in his work *De Rhetorica*. He presents them in the context of defining the word *peristasis*.

Nunc, quoniam quidem de differentia generalium et specialium quaestionum satis dictum est separataque thesis ab hypothesi, ut perinde distaret re ac nomine, consequens esse videtur dicere, quid sit quod hypothesin, id est controversiam efficiat. Est igitur circumstantia rerum, quam περίστασιν Hermagoras vocat, sine qua ulla omnino controversia non potest esse. Quid sit autem peristasis, facilius partitione quam definitione eius deprehendi potest. Sunt igitur partes circumstantiae, id est peristaseos, septem, quas Hermagoras μόρια περιστάσεως vocat... Sunt igitur haec: quis, quid, quando, ubi, cur, quem ad modum, quibus adminiculis, quas Graeci ἄφορμας vocant. Horum autem omnium aut plurimorum rationalis congregatio conflatur quaestionem. Sed nimirum singulorum proprietates exprimenda est. [1] Quis significantiam habet personae... [2] Quid significantiam habet rei, quae facta ab aliquo vel dicta vel cogitata, fieri dici cogitari, futura esse dictum iri cogitatum iri videatur... [3] Quando temporis significationem habet... [4] Ubi loci significationem habet... [5] Cur significat causam faciendi vel dicendi vel cogitandi... [6] Quem ad modum significationem habet ex facti vel quod fiat futurumve sit demonstratione... [7] ἄφορμαί, quas nos adminicula dicimus, demonstrationem habent earum rerum, per quas factum esse aliquid dicatur...<sup>116</sup>

Augustine seems to synthesize various works on the subject. He follows Quintilian who is the first to explain that *circumstantia* is the Latin equivalent of the Greek *peristasis*.<sup>117</sup> Previously writers had used either *peristasis* or *circumstantia* but not both. Also, Augustine presents the order of the seven types of circumstance in exactly the same order as J. Victor, which differs slightly from Victorinus, though all three use the same interrogative pronouns. However, Augustine differs from all his predecessors in one respect: where they named *facultas* as the seventh circumstance, he called it by its Greek name, ἄφορμαί (“resources”). Like Cicero, Augustine discusses the nature of each circumstance and presents a series of categories and/or questions to consider when drawing out the relevant information of each species of circumstance. Augustine offers a

116 Augustinus, *De Rhetorica*, 7–8 (47, 1–50, 9, Giomini). A translation of this quote is given in the appendix under the appropriate heading.

117 Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.*, 5.10.104.

longer treatment of *persona* or *quis* than any other circumstance, a characteristic he shares with Cicero; however, the disparity of length in Cicero is explained in his claim that the *persona* is extremely complex in nature,<sup>118</sup> and Augustine echoes that statement by saying that the qualities of a person are *infinita numero*.

The *Dictionary for Greek and Roman Biography*<sup>119</sup> presents Chirius Fortunatianus as a “Roman lawyer who flourished about the middle of the fifth century shortly before Cassiodorus, by whom he is quoted.” Fortunatianus’ three books on the art of rhetoric serve as a general survey of classical rhetoric. This work is largely a series of rhetorical terms and concepts that he lists and defines, and his introduction to the seven types of circumstance in this context affirms it as a common rhetorical tool or even as a fixed schema:

Reperto statu quid consideramus? Totam materiam per septem circumstantias. Cur non statim dividimus? Quoniam prius universam causam confuse considerare debemus, tunc omnia, quae reperta sunt, capitulatim quaestionibus ordinare. Quae sunt circumstantiae? [1] Persona, [2] res, [3] causa, [4] tempus, [5] locus, [6] modus, [7] materia. Persona quot modis consideratur? Viginti et uno... In re quid consideramus? Thesin... Omnis causa qualis est?... Tempus quot modis consideratur?... Locus omnis qualis est?... Modus omnis qualis est?... Materia quibus modis consideratur?... Quodcumque in themate positum fuerit, quibus ex causis conlocatur? Aut ut controversiam faciat aut ut augeat quaestiones.<sup>120</sup>

Fortunatianus does not offer correlating interrogatives for each species of circumstance, but does, like Cicero and Augustine, provide information on what to consider for each circumstance. Also like Augustine, he does not use *facultas* as the seventh circumstance, but instead employs a heretofore unused term, *materia*.

The next instance comes from Isidore (ca. 560–636), who furnishes further proof of the development of the seven types of circumstance. In his *De Generibus Quaestionum*, Isidore names only a few of the circumstances explicitly, but even these he does not cover extensively. The brevity with which he treats this section may suggest the schema is by this point a familiar feature which does not require his commentary. The circumstances are mentioned in the context of discussing the difference between a “hypothesis” and “thesis”, as was the case with Augustine as well. Isidore writes,

Genera quaestionum duo sunt, quorum unum est finitum, alterum infinitum. Finitum ὑπόθεσις Graece, Latine causa dicitur, ubi cum certa persona controversia est: 2. infinitum, quod Graece θέσις Latine propositum nominatur. Hoc personam

118 Cicero, *De Inventione*, 1.24.34.

119 Smith, 181.

120 Halm, 102, 20–104, 31. A translation of this quote is given in the appendix under the appropriate heading.

non habet certam, nec inest aliqua certa circumstantia, id est nec locus nec tempus. In causa vero certa omnia sunt, unde quasi pars causae est propositum.<sup>121</sup>

The last excerpt, which this section will discuss, is found in Alcuin's work *De Rhetorica*, written around 790. Alcuin references the seven types of circumstance in the context of dividing the art of rhetoric into three types and then delineating how one ought to make one's narration credible in any of those types. Alcuin writes,

Nam in iudiciis saepius quid aequum sit quaeritur, in demonstratione quid honestum sit intellegitur, in deliberatione quid honestum et utile sit consideratur. Quot habet causa circumstantias? Plenaria causa septem habet circumstantias, [1] personam, [2] factum, [3] tempus, [4] locum, [5] modum, [6] occasionem, [7] facultatem. In persona quaeritur quis fecerit, in facto quid fecerit, in tempore quando fecerit, in loco ubi factum sit, in modo quomodo fieri potuisset, in occasione cur facere voluisset, in facultate, si ei subpeditaret potestas faciendi; per has enim et confirmari potest causa et infirmari. Frustra enim, quaeris in controversiis quid factum sit, si persona facientis deerit: et iterum personam frustra ostendis, si factum non aderit personae. Item tali in tempore vel tali in loco talis res fieri non potuit, item non eo modo fieri potuit, ut asseris, nec ideo facere voluit, nec talis homo talem habuit potestatem, ut hoc facere potuisset.<sup>122</sup>

Alcuin also uses the term *circumstantia* and describes the circumstances as "seven" in number. He offers all the standard nouns that the predecessors (previously discussed) use, except he employs the term *occasio* for the "why" pronoun instead of *causa*. This excerpt is very similar to the ones presented before, although Alcuin never references any Greek terms, a practice which is nonetheless common in most of the others. This treatment comes only around fifty years before Sedulius' *Collectaneum*.

To summarize, what became known as the "seven types of circumstance" was originally an informal set of questions used by Aristotle to investigate whether or not an act was just or unjust. Cicero used these same questions, and more, and argued for transposing the findings of such questions into a narration in order to make it more credible. The questions were called various things by Cicero, but Quintilian equated them to *peristasis* and *circumstantia*.<sup>123</sup> Eventually, commentators and writers of rhetorical handbooks throughout the early medieval period canonized these questions into specific terms and fixed them to seven in number.

121 Halm, 515, 10–15. A translation of this quote is given in the appendix under the appropriate heading.

122 Halm, 527, 7–20. A translation of this quote is given in the appendix under the appropriate heading.

123 Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.*, 5.10.104.

iii) *Identifying Sedulius' Sources for the Septem Circumstantiae*

Since we do not know which of these works Sedulius had available to him – he did not cite anyone explicitly as the source for the seven types of circumstance – this section of the study will compare Sedulius' passage with the extant works mentioned above to determine, based on lexical similarities, which tradition in particular Sedulius was likely following.

Lines four and five of the Prologue contain two key words: *species* and *peristasis*. J. Victor alone describes the seven types of circumstance as seven *species* of circumstance. Quintilian and Augustine are the only two who use the Greek word *peristasis*. However, Augustine uses *peristasis* in a very similar sentence (though with a slightly different spelling from Sedulius).<sup>124</sup> Augustine writes, *Sunt igitur partes circumstantiae, id est peristaseos, septem...* whereas Sedulius writes, *VII species sunt peristasios id est circumstantiae...* The next clause *sine quibus nullae quaestiones proponuntur nulla argumenta tractantur nullaque ars aut opus constare potest* is similarly expressed in three other writers: J. Victor, Augustine, and Alcuin. Again, Augustine's phrase seems to be the most closely related. Alcuin conveys the same main idea, but it is not lexically related. He writes: *per has enim et confirmari potest causa et infirmari*. J. Victor's clause, *Vides hanc causam stare non posse* uses *stare*; Sedulius uses *constare*, but it comes after the introduction of the circumstances and is used to emphasize an example. Augustine's clause, *sine qua ulla omnino controversia non potest esse* also follows his description of *peristasis*. The salient difference between Augustine and Sedulius is the verb each uses: Augustine employs *esse* while Sedulius writes *constare*; despite this difference the meaning of the clauses remains the same.

Lines 6–11 of Sedulius' Prologue list the seven types of circumstance with their corresponding interrogative pronouns. Though these lines are of course similar to the preceding examples, only Fortunatianus uses the same seven nouns, even listing them in the same order. He does not however include the alternate word for *res* (*factum*), or the alternate word for *materia* (*facultas*), which Sedulius includes. Also, Fortunatianus omits the corresponding interrogative pronouns. There are four authors who offer the corresponding interrogative pronouns: S. Victor, Victorinus, Augustine, and Alcuin. All have *cur* instead of *quare*, but only Cicero, S. Victor, and Alcuin introduce the interrogatives with the verb *facio*, as Sedulius did.

Lines 9–11 of Sedulius' Prologue contain explanatory clauses for two of the *species* of circumstance (1, Frede): *Quomodo fecit? Verbi gratia utrum bene an male, stulte an sapienter. Qua materia vel facultate? Verbi gratia utrum ferro an*

<sup>124</sup> Sedulius spells the genitive with an "i" *peristasios*, but Augustine spells it with an "e" *peristaseos*. Also, Augustine writes the word both in Greek script (but only when quoting Hermagoras) as well as the transliterated form, but Sedulius only uses the transliterated form.

*veneno iste illum occidit*. Cicero offers explanatory clauses such as these for all of the *species* of circumstances that he lists, as does Augustine. Neither Cicero nor Augustine qualify *quomodo* with the adverbs *bene an male*, *stulte an sapienter*, but they do both suggest *ferro an veneno* as possible weapons under the circumstance *materia vel facultate*.

Prologue lines 13–18 also bear similarities to both Cicero and Augustine. Cicero refers to the difficulty of defining human nature at the end of chapter 34 in *De Inventione*, and Augustine likewise claims that the qualities of people are infinite in number. Both go on to list examples of qualities, but, like Sedulius, Augustine claims that his list is not exhaustive. Sedulius writes, *et reliquis quae nunc per singula enumerare perlongum est*, whereas Augustine writes, *et cetera, quae sunt infinita numero*.<sup>125</sup>

The above analysis shows that Sedulius' language and organization most often resembles Augustine's, but discrete occurrences of specific words and constructions suggest the additional influences of J. Victor, Fortunatianus, and Alcuin. This survey of extant examples has revealed the context in which the seven types of circumstance were originally used, as well as how they developed into a defined rhetorical schema. If we were to transpose the traditional rhetorical function of the seven types of circumstance onto Sedulius' Prologue, we could surmise that the Prologue's purpose is to confirm and strengthen the claims of the ensuing commentaries. Furthermore, identifying Augustine, Fortunatianus, and Alcuin as likely sources for Sedulius' presentation of this trope not only improves upon Frede's *apparatus fontium*, but also demonstrates another link between Sedulius and Codex (B).

When J. J. H. Savage described Codex (B), he noted the other works that the scribe had copied:

ff. 143a-166b contain the *Ars rhetorica* of Fortunatianus, *de dialectica* and *de rhetorica* of St. Augustine, and the *Ars rhetorica* of Clodianus (cf. Hagen, codex Bern., praef., ii). From f. 167a to f. 186b: *Carmina Horatii* (incomplete); ff. 187a-188b contain excerpts from the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid; ff. 188b-194a excerpts from Bede's *History*; ff. 194b-197b have various carmina (cf. Hagen, *Carmina medii Aevi*, pp. I ff.)... Quat. XVIII, with which the commentary of Servius ends, runs from f. 137 to f. 144, so that part of the quaternion holds some of the extraneous matter which follows (i. e., Alcuin's *rhetorica*).

The works of notable import are the *Ars rhetorica* of Fortunatianus, *de dialectica* and *de rhetorica* of Augustine, and Alcuin's *rhetorica*. Thus, the above verbal analysis seems to confirm Savage's conjecture that Sedulius Scottus is the scribe for Codex (B), which would also lend weight to the conclusion that Sedulius was familiar with Donatus' *Vita*.

<sup>125</sup> Augustinus, *De Rhetorica*, 7 (49, 1, Giomini).

In conclusion, Sedulius' Prologue and application of the seven types of circumstance mirror the pedagogical approach of Donatus' and Servius' prefaces to their commentaries on Virgil's *Aeneid*. The numerous inter-textual links and external connections between Sedulius and the work of Donatus and Servius suggest that Sedulius was not only familiar with their work but attempted to emulate their methodology in order to instruct his readers of the Pauline epistles in the same way that they had introduced Virgil. In this ecclesiastical context, the application of the seven types of circumstance serves as an early example of a critical approach to the New Testament based at least in part on the historical circumstances from which it was written. It reveals the extent to which Sedulius considered Scripture historical truth, but also the authority he grants to traditional ecclesiastical sources outside of Scripture, especially Augustine, whose promotion of a hermeneutic of trust, as in *util. cred.*, is emphasized through the application of the seven types of circumstance and the authority which they inherently lend to Paul, the author of the surveyed Scriptures. Additionally, Sedulius' adaptation of quintessential classical schoolroom texts exposes a judicious scholarly temperament, a significant point, since some scholars contend that only during the Reformation did biblical studies truly emerge as an academic pursuit alongside devotional ones.<sup>126</sup>

### 3.4 Pedagogical Content

Commentaries are inherently didactic, but vary in purpose, complexity, content etc., to suit their audience. Contreni notes that most Carolingian biblical exegesis was composed for pedagogical purposes rather than to further the cause of scholarship or to expand exegetical frontiers; he proposes the educated layman or laywoman, the ecclesiastical administrator, and the beginning student as the most common audiences.<sup>127</sup> Sedulius' emulation of Servius suggests that his commentary was designed as a school text, and several features in the Prologue and commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians buttress this assertion, including the use of *marginalia* in later copies of Sedulius' *Collectaneum*, numerous references to teachers and students, and elementary, scholastic and theological *topoi*.

Unlike many of the prefaces and prologues of extant biblical commentaries from the Carolingian age, Sedulius does not discuss his motive for writing his *Collectaneum*, and the scant internal evidence is too meager to provide a definitive answer. However, there is reason to believe it was used as a pedagogical tool: Sedulius' probable role as a teacher, his emulation of Servius

126 Kümmel, 1987, 30.

127 Contreni, 1983, 79–80.

(as discussed above), features within his Latinity (ensuing chapter), and matters of content, such as *marginalia*, which I will now discuss.

*i) Marginalia*

The first writer known to have included *marginalia* in his own text was Bede, who noted his patristic source in the margins of his Luke and Mark commentaries. His *marginalia* mark a pivotal point in the formation of a patristic canon, since he only used the marginal source-marks for Ambrose, Augustine, Gregory the Great, and Jerome, thus becoming the first writer to group these four together.<sup>128</sup> Bede included the *marginalia* “lest it be said that I steal the words of those who have gone before me by offering them as my own.”<sup>129</sup> *Marginalia* thus became a common feature in many Carolingian commentaries and served much the same purpose as Bede’s; but in Carolingian society, where education was centered upon the study of the Bible, particularly patristic exegesis, they also functioned as a valuable pedagogical tool.<sup>130</sup> When Alexander Souter first collated the extant manuscripts of Sedulius’ *Collectaneum* and eventually published an article detailing the sources of Sedulius, he believed that the *marginalia* were original to Sedulius.<sup>131</sup> Frede, however, convincingly argues that this is not the case, as not only do some of the *marginalia* indicate the wrong source, but the abbreviations used vary, indicating multiple interpolators.<sup>132</sup> Even though the *marginalia* do not date back to Sedulius himself, their existence in early copies indicates that the *Collectaneum* probably served a pedagogical function.<sup>133</sup>

*ii) References to Teachers and Students*

Sedulius understands Paul’s letters, both individually and corporately, as tools for the edification of the church<sup>134</sup> and directs his commentary to the same purpose. Furthermore, Sedulius realizes that his commentary’s influence extends beyond his own congregation to the entire church. In his comment on Gal 5:9 (541, VIII.20–22, Frede), he reveals a heavy sense of self awareness as a teacher and scholar: “[t]he mange of one member of the herd stains the whole flock. Thus, the perverse doctrine going forth from one individual, enters many hearers.” Hence, it is not surprising to find many pastoral interjections or teaching moments throughout the commentary in the course of his exegesis.

128 Kaczynski, 2001, 22–24.

129 Bede, *In Lucam prologus*, CC 120:7. Translated and cited in Kaczynski, 2001, 23.

130 Contreni, 1992, chapter V, 79–81.

131 Souter, 1917, 225–226.

132 Frede, 1997, 39\* and 55\*-57\*.

133 Cf. Frede, 1997, 39\*.

134 Prologue, lines 140–145.

In Sedulius' commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians, multiple expositions explicitly address or mention teachers and/or students.<sup>135</sup> In some of these instances, the text necessitates an exegetical remark; however, in other cases the issue seems forced, such as when Sedulius addresses teachers and/or students as the audience of the *Collectaneum*. One specific example is Gal 3:1, where Sedulius excerpts from Pelagius' commentary (64–65), the Clm 6235 (65–67), and adds his own comment (67–68). It is interesting to note here that in Augustine's and Jerome's exegesis<sup>136</sup> (which Sedulius does not use in this instance, though we know that he has access to them based on other excerpts from these texts), each are concerned with the issue of *why* Paul called the Galatians foolish and neither mentions the dynamic of a teacher-student relationship. By using Pelagius,<sup>137</sup> Sedulius takes issue with whether or not Paul should call someone "foolish," since the Lord forbids such an action in Matthew 5:22. Next, using the Clm 6235, he concludes that such a comment is acceptable because Paul is correcting in a loving manner. Sedulius then inserts his own remark, *ius enim est magistris peccantes increpare discipulos* ("For it is the right of teachers to chide their erring disciples").<sup>138</sup> The verb *increpare* ("to chide") is a stronger form of rebuke than *corripit* ("corrects"), which is used in line 66 for the justification of the *stulti* ("foolish"); but ultimately Sedulius turns the emphasis from correcting *more diligentis* ("in a manner of loving") into an opportunity to affirm a certain right within a teacher-student relationship.

Another explicit reference to a teacher-student dynamic (specifically patronage) occurs in Gal 6:6–8. The commentary is a combination of authors, though primarily derives from Jerome and Sedulius himself. These three verses account for fifteen lines in the commentary, seven of which are Sedulius' own exegesis. This is an atypical percentage of original exegesis, and an evaluation of his poetry (see below) further reveals the importance of patronage to Sedulius' and his circumstances. These lines of commentary emphasize the importance of material compensation for spiritual enrichment, an issue which had a practical application for Jerome, who throughout his life relied on patronage and kindnesses from his disciples.<sup>139</sup> Upon his arrival at Liège (circa 841), Sedulius and his companions were largely dependent on Bishop Hartgar for the provision of their needs, as they were "his (Hartgar's) scholars".<sup>140</sup> This exegesis about sharing with and providing for the teacher is reminiscent of Sedulius' poems 4, 9 and 49. Whether or not Sedulius specifically taught, he nevertheless provided

135 Cf. Gal 3:1, 3:24, 3:25, 4:12, 5:9, 6:6, 6:10 and Eph 3:2, 4:11, 4:21, 5:21.

136 Cf. Plumer (ed. and tr.), *Augustine's Commentary on Galatians*, 18.1–19.10; Cf. Hieronymus, *ad Galatas*, 3:1 (CC 77 A).

137 Cf. Pelagius, *In Galatas*, 3:1 (317, 8–10, Souter).

138 Frede, 523, III.67–68.

139 Rebenich, 24.

140 Doyle (tr.), 104, poem 4, line 13.



much to his community through his roles as chief bard, head of the library, and mediator with other centers of learning. The exegesis of Gal 6:6–8 thus provides biblical justification for his appeal to Hartgar for better accommodations. In poem 4 (24–28, 36–45), Sedulius compares his own dank, gloomy accommodations with those of Bishop Hartgar's. After describing the fine halls of Hargar's residence, Sedulius describes his own,

Our own abode – Ah woe! – shudders in its / gloomy cloak of black: / when daylight finally comes, the shadow / of night permeates these sorry old walls. / These halls, believe me, are unfit for scholars / ... But now, great father, pastor of bounty / and might, help us in our miseries; / speak your gracious words so that this shadowy / house, deprived of daylight, may be embellished. Adorn our ceilings with panels and lovely paintings, / and give us a new key and firm bar for our door; / then put in sparkling windows made of glass, / so that the streaming rays of gentle Phoebus / may illumine, noble bishop, with radiance, / your scholars who love the light....<sup>141</sup>

The humor here dispensed mitigates some of the tension of Sedulius' requests for improvements to his (and his companions') house, but one can still see the expectation of remuneration underlying his appeal as a scholar in residence. Likewise, in an even more jovial mood, but still with a petitioning voice for due compensation, Sedulius, in poem 9 (1–11, 15, 24–28) criticizes the beer that he and the other scholars are given:

The twin beast of thirst and hunger torments us, / and wounds us with its tearing beaks. / No rich abundance of goods delights us; / rather, dreadful poverty oppresses our spirits. / We cannot revel in the sweet gifts of Bacchus, / and even honeyed mead shuns our halls. / The parched Meuse does not gladden us with wine, / and we lack the sweet grace of golden Ceres. / Thin beer, that cruel monster, vexes us scholars (*sophos*)- / O Blessed Christ and Lord, help us in our need! / Such undrinkable beer is bitter to taste, / ... It numbs all the skills of the scholar's mind (*sophicae mentis*), / as it drives away merriment and brings on gloom; / ... O father, I beseech you, subdue these twin beasts; dispense a healer, good bishop, for our little wounds, and give a poultice to your servant Sedulius. / That pious bishop laughed at these little verses / and granted his scholar's request (*sophicis votis*).<sup>142</sup>

In poem 49, Sedulius makes an even more blatant appeal to Hartgar for better food and drink as his due for roles he fulfills in that community:

... But with it all, there's no mirthful drink for me, / no mead, no beer, no gifts of Bacchus. / Alas, how I lack the manifold substance / which the soft earth and dewy air produce! / I am a writer, a musician, Orpheus reborn, / and an ox treading corn, who seeks what is good; and I am your champion bearing wisdom's arms. O muse, tell my lord bishop of his servant's plight!<sup>143</sup>

141 Doyle (tr.), 102.

142 Doyle (tr.), 110–11.

143 Doyle (tr.), 148.

Sedulius not only refers to himself as a *scriptor* (“author”) and *musicus* (“musician”), i.e., “Orpheus reborn” (*alter Orpheus*), but the reference to himself as “an ox treading corn” (*sum bos triturations*) is almost certainly an allusion to 1 Timothy 5:17–18, “(17) The elders who rule well are to be considered worthy of double honor, especially those who work hard at preaching and teaching. (18) For the Scripture says, ‘You shall not muzzle the mouth of an ox while he is threshing [Vulgate reads, *non infrenabis os bovi trituranti*],’ and ‘The laborer is worthy of his wages.’” By using this interscriptural reference (*bos triturations* [Sedulius] / *os bovi trituranti* [Vulgate]), Sedulius characterizes himself as one who teaches and preaches, and who is therefore due fair compensation as required by the verses he echoes. Also, as we know from Eph 4:11, the role of a teacher must also encompass the role of a pastor and vice versa. Furthermore, the line Doyle translates as “I am your champion bearing wisdom’s arms” is another scriptural reference detailing another pertinent role which Sedulius plays. Doyle’s translation, however, obscures the reference as the Latin reads, *Sum uester miles sophiae praeditus armis* (“I am your soldier gifted with weapons of wisdom”). The military language (*miles* and *armis*) and the reference to wisdom probably allude to his work with Scripture, which is the sword of the Spirit (Ephesians 6:17, “And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God”), and are ultimately a metaphor for Sedulius’ role as a biblical scholar in that community. Thus, Sedulius characterizes himself as a poet, scholar, teacher, pastor, and biblical scholar, all of which justify his requests for material gifts and sustenance. Ultimately, Sedulius’ poetry (specifically his appeals in poems 4, 9 and 49 for better accommodations, food and wine) echoes the principles expounded in Eph 6:6–8; thus, it is not surprising to find such a high percentage of his own exegesis on these verses which are so relevant for his personal circumstances.

Sedulius also employs pastoral or teaching comments on a more subtle level. For example, in Gal 5:5, Sedulius assimilates Paul’s reference to the Spirit to the practical spiritual life of a believer, “FOR WE IN THE SPIRIT. I:E., by spiritual grace and lifestyle, not by the *letter* of the law.”<sup>144</sup> Similarly in Gal 5:10, Sedulius emerges as pastorally encouraging, “I HAVE CONFIDENCE IN THE LORD CONCERNING YOU. Not through conjecture but by means of a prophetic spirit he proclaims that the Galatians are about to return towards the way of the truth.”<sup>145</sup> This hermeneutical maneuver grants a spiritual profundity to Paul, which is transferrable to any shepherd of a flock. The next lines offer yet another example of the apparent teacher-student dynamic in a stylistic feature

144 Frede, 540, VIII.7–8.

145 Frede, 541, VIII.24–25.

that is common to Sedulius. Retaining the voice of Paul,<sup>146</sup> Sedulius interjects his own comment, which offers the biblical text as its own teaching voice, “YOU WILL THINK NOTHING ELSE. I.e., except for that which I teach through the letter.”

*iii) Elementary Grammatical and Literary Topoi*

Another type of content found within Sedulius’ commentaries that indicates it is a work intended for elementary instruction is the inclusion of numerous grammatical and literary terms and explanations. These features may be the product of multiple influences: the education manifestos of Charlemagne and his successors, Servius’ pedagogical commentary on the *Aeneid*, and Sedulius’ early training in an Irish setting. As a cultural setting for his *Collectaneum*, Charlemagne and his successors mandated a number of educational reforms, “which expanded the numbers of clergy and monks possessing basic levels of literacy.”<sup>147</sup> Likewise, Servius’ text, which Sedulius used as a literary model, often identifies – no doubt for his students – the grammatical or literary device employed within a given verse. For example, in I.399, Servius writes:

PUPPESQUE TUAE PUBESQUE TUORUM tropus synechdoche; a parte totum significat, ut Terentius o lepidum caput, id est, lepidus homo.

YOUR SHIPS AND YOUR PEOPLE is an employment of the trope, synechdoche, which signifies the whole from a part, as Terence writes *o charming head*, i.e., charming man.

Also, as an Irishman, Sedulius’ exposure to Latin was largely in a literary environment consisting of grammatical works and commentaries; therefore it is not surprising to find, amidst his exegesis, the identification of basic grammatical and literary terms.

In Gal 3:19, Sedulius identifies a hyperbaton that occurs in the phrase “until his seed came.” Sedulius justifies a gruesome hyperbole in Gal 4:15 (“Where then is that sense of blessing you had? For I bear you witness that, if possible, you would have plucked out your eyes and given them to me.”) by claiming: “This was said hyperbolically because of his superlative love.”

In a display of judicious scholarly temperament, Sedulius also uses literary terms to critique Paul. In Eph 1:16, Sedulius accuses Paul of employing a solecism by employing participles where infinitives are more grammatically correct. Sedulius writes, NON CESSO GRATIAS AGENS. *Non cesso gratias agens et faciens per solocismum pro ‘non cesso gratias agere et facere’.*

Sedulius also identifies the use of metonymy. In Eph 5:16, Sedulius writes: QVONIAM DIES MALI SVNT: *Per metanomialiam pro his qui in diebus sunt,*

<sup>146</sup> See chapter on Latinity, below, for a further discussion of this stylistic feature.

<sup>147</sup> Chazelle and Van Name Edwards, 3.

*quia dies mali esse non possunt*. Pelagius, whose work Sedulius partly copies, notes that humans, not days, are evil; however, Pelagius does not mention the literary term metonymy. For this, Sedulius borrows from Isidore's, *Etymologies*.<sup>148</sup> That Sedulius mirrors Pelagius' work but also excerpts from Isidore's *Etymologies* reveals his knowledge of the presence of a literary trope within the biblical text, if not its name as well.

Sedulius twice refers to the *quattor figurae*, and his employment of all four methods of interpreting Scripture is exceptional among the Carolingian commentators, most of whom employ only one or two.<sup>149</sup> Sedulius first identifies the four-fold method of interpreting Scripture in the Prologue (200–229), where Sedulius quotes from Augustine's *util. cred.*<sup>150</sup> The second, which appears in Gal 4:26, is borrowed from Cassianus. The two passages differ in the specific terms used and their order. Both, however, contain the term “historical” and present it first, a continuity subsequently maintained by Sedulius that underscores his implicit preference for “historical” more than “allegorical”.<sup>151</sup> That Sedulius presents Cassianus' terms with slight variations from his reception of Augustine demonstrates that Sedulius is more concerned with the exegetical fruit which it produces than any debate surrounding it. The four-fold method of Scriptural interpretation was a hermeneutical tool of notorious fluidity, a point to which Sedulius bears witness. De Lubac discusses both Augustine and Cassianus and their significance in the development of this hermeneutical tool in his seminal work on the topic, *Medieval Exegesis*.<sup>152</sup>

#### *iv) Elementary Ecclesiastical and Theological Topoi*

Sedulius' commentary also contains a number of entries that articulate both basic ecclesiastical or theological concepts and terms and concepts whose secular meaning is altered in an ecclesiastical context. For example, in Eph 5:2, Sedulius, receiving Pelagius, distinguishes between the three Latin words: *omne sacrificium* (“every sacrifice”), *oblatio* (“offering”), and *hostia* (“sacrificial victim”). Similarly, with a short explanatory clause, Sedulius clarifies the theologically loaded phrase *hoc aere*, which refers to a phrase from an omitted portion of Eph 2:2, *secundum principem potestatis aeris huius*. In this verse Paul combines Greek thought (i. e., the two elements of air: 1) the impure air, where

148 Isidore and Jerome both commonly serve as a source for linguistic and philological matters for Irish commentators (Cf. McNally, 1958, 396).

149 The two usually used are the literal and allegorical (or tropological). Cf. Laistner, 303.

150 I discuss this quotation further in the chapter below, “The Reception of Augustine”.

151 De Lubac identifies “allegorical” as encompassing the other three terms under a “spiritual understanding” of a text (De Lubac, vol. 1, 135).

152 For De Lubac's discussion on Augustine's treatment of the four-fold method in *util. cred.* see vol. 1, 123–132, and for discussion on Cassianus and his role in the development of this hermeneutical tool, see vol. 1, 132–137.

imperfect spirits reside and 2) the purer ether) with a tradition in Judaism which distinguished between angels and demons, with the latter residing in the air.<sup>153</sup> Thus in Ephesians 2:2 Paul describes “this air” as hosting the ruler of this present age of this world, whose spirit works even now among the sons of disobedience. Sedulius’ commentary, then, receiving Pelagius, refers to “this air” as host not to the devil alone but also his subordinates. Furthermore, the first phrase in III.7, *Id est, diabolus* (“I.e., the devil”), is Sedulius’ own explanatory phrase to aid readers’ understanding of the ensuing commentary, taken from Pelagius, which emphasizes the plural aspect of the singular noun *principem*. The addition of the minor phrase by Sedulius is a further demonstration of his concern for the elementary reader in theology.

A final example is Sedulius’ entry, in which he explains the difference between basic ecclesiastical roles. In Eph 4:11, Sedulius writes:

ALIOS PASTORES ET DOCTORES. Non autem ait: ‘Alios pastores et alios doctores’, sed: Alios pastores et doctores, ut, qui pastor est, debeat esse doctor. ALIOS VERO EVANGELISTAS. Omnis apostolus euangelista est, non omnis euangelista apostolus.

This passage typifies Sedulius’ blending of his Irish tendencies with pedagogical aims.<sup>154</sup> If Sedulius were writing for an advanced member of the clergy or an individual patron strictly desiring the exegesis of the Fathers, then this passage would not likely have appeared. Instead, this passage assumes an audience in the elementary stages of ecclesiastical and educational training as Sedulius uses a subtle linguistic nuance (via Jerome) to highlight an important distinction between the titles of “evangelist” and “apostle”.

## 4 Latinity

### 4.1 Sedulius and Other Carolingian Pauline Commentators

From the years 800–860, the Pauline epistles received more exegetical attention than any other scriptural texts.<sup>155</sup> There are eleven extant works of either homiletic selections (2) or comprehensive commentaries (9) on the Pauline epistles. Six authors are responsible for the nine commentaries: Alcuin, Claudius of Turin, Rabanus Maurus, Haimo of Auxerre, four by Florus of Lyons, and the *Collectaneum* by Sedulius Scottus.<sup>156</sup> The plain style of Carolingian biblical commentaries, and of Sedulius particularly – whose work often appears similar

<sup>153</sup> TDNT s.v. ἀήρ.

<sup>154</sup> Cf. Irvine, 88–106; Bischoff, 1991, (O’Grady, tr.), 85–87.

<sup>155</sup> Heil, 76.

<sup>156</sup> Heil, 77.

to a gloss – may impact conclusions on matters of Latinity, reception and function. Heil, e.g., characterizes Sedulius' *Collectaneum* as a “gloss-commentary” and claims that his “brevity and gloss-style” give it a “harshness of tone” and make it “appear especially anti-Jewish.”<sup>157</sup> While a sympathetic reader of Heil may concede the description of the *Collectaneum* as a gloss-commentary on account of its often brief and dogmatic comments, nevertheless, one must note that glosses comprised a unique genre with their own technical meaning. One ninth century author defines *glossa* as providing the *sensus verbi*, and the content of a gloss generally draws on geographical, zoological, metrological, botanical, historical, legal, and etymological learning in order to define a given word.<sup>158</sup> Contreni notes in his introduction to the *Glossae divinae historiae* that “the characteristic of the glosses is the almost complete absence of allegorizing or other methodologies associated with the higher study of Scripture.”<sup>159</sup> The following are sample entries from Theodore and Hadrian's gloss on the Pentateuch and Sedulius' *Collectaneum*:

[Pent 95, Genesis 15:3] *Vernaculos: .i. servi domestici qui in domo nutriti sunt.*

[Sedulius, Gal 3:25] NON SUB PEDAGOGO SUMUS. *Nam perfectae aetatis discipuli non indigent pedagogo.*

I have chosen these examples because their scriptural contexts are theologically linked, and each lemma treats the title or role of a person relating to the household. These excerpts reveal the fundamental difference between a gloss and Sedulius' *Collectaneum* per their entries. Though both are brief, the gloss here provides the lexical meaning of a word, whereas Sedulius attempts to provide an interpretative understanding of a given word or phrase. Even when Sedulius does highlight only a word, his synonymous explanation(s) are interpretative and not definitive, e.g. Gal 3:20, DEUS AUTEM. *I.e., Christus*. Thus, despite its visible similarity to a gloss, Sedulius' *Collectaneum* is a work of interpretative exegesis, and it will prove fruitful to demonstrate the methods used to achieve a plain style.

In his introduction to the critical text, Frede claims, rightly it seems, that Sedulius marks the end of older Irish exegetical methods.<sup>160</sup> It is, however, still important to note that Sedulius does maintain certain Irish characteristics

157 Heil, 90. This quote, and Heil's interpretation of Sedulius' treatment of the Jews is discussed at length below.

158 Cf. Contreni, 2003, 27–28. Laistner, 1923, 437: *Glossa: lingua. Quidam Latinorum proferunt glosam per unum S sed corrupte. Graecum siquidem est ideoque melius per duo SS glossa profertur, sicut et apud Graecos et bene proprietates unius cuiusque verbi glossa id est lingua illius dicitur, quia sicuti nos per linguam ostendimus quid in animo conceptum habeamus, ita per proprietatem verbi intellegitur sensus ipsius verbi.*

159 Contreni, 2003, 22.

160 Frede, 1997, 35\*.

within his Prologue and commentaries. The inclusion of Irish characteristics, but the avoidance of Irish diction within Sedulius' *Collectaneum*, is best explained by noting that it is a product of a series of phenomena: 1) the spread of Christianity in Ireland and the development of monastic centers; 2) the scholastic and literary environs in which one would have learned Latin; 3) the rise of the Carolingian empire with its aims of a *renovatio* of education towards a Christian end; and 4) the Viking attacks and general instability among the insular regions, which precipitated Sedulius' migration into Liège. Enter into these broad strokes the details that 1) Servius' fourth century commentary on the *Aeneid* enjoyed wide circulation in the Carolingian empire and particularly in Ireland,<sup>161</sup> 2) scholars were afforded the opportunity by libraries of the Carolingian empire to refer directly to patristic sources, and 3) there was a prevailing need for pedagogical commentaries on Scripture.

These particular historical circumstances and phenomena suggest that a work by an Irish scholar living in the Carolingian empire may represent the form and content that mirror works previously studied in Ireland, but whose diction and style are appropriated for and directed toward a general Latin audience, thus fulfilling a pedagogical need. Hence as we shall see, Sedulius' *Collectaneum* resembles other Carolingian exegetical work through its harmonious and simple presentation of patristic sources, but contains content typical of Hiberno-Latin scholars – though a diction that, for reasons examined below, lacks demonstrably Irish traits – and formatting which, when departing from the norms of his Carolingian contemporaries, is often similar to Servius' commentary on the *Aeneid*.<sup>162</sup> Evidence for these observations is demonstrated in the following sections: 1) Hiberno-Latin content and diction, 2) Formatting, and 3) Linguistic Style.

## 4.2 Hiberno-Latin Content and Diction

Bengt Löfstedt's seminal work, *Der hibernolateinische Grammatiker Malsachanus*, provides a survey of linguistic features characteristic of Hiberno-Latin texts. Ten years of further research prompted him to write a follow-up article in which he remarks, “[i]t is natural that grammars and glossaries played a particularly important role in Irish Latinity. Since Latin had never been spoken in Ireland, the Irish had to derive their knowledge to a great extent from written texts only,

<sup>161</sup> Cf. Stok, 15–22.

<sup>162</sup> It must not be forgotten that the macro organizational structure is fundamentally dependent upon Pelagius' Pauline commentaries as discussed below, in “The Reception of Pelagius”.

and their first acquaintance with it was via a school grammar.”<sup>163</sup> The learning of Latin in a literary environ, specifically through exposure to grammars and commentaries, helps explain the Irish predilection for listing and enumerating, allegorical interpretations of numbers, obscure historical minutiae, and general interest in linguistic matters – particularly the “*Tres Linguae Sacrae*.”<sup>164</sup>

Sedulius’ propensity for listing is prodigious. Not only is the entire Prologue organized according to the seven types of circumstance, but there are examples throughout of this habit of mind even on a smaller scale. Some of the lists and enumerations he includes in the Prologue are: “a person is examined in many ways, i. e., by race, citizenship, parents, education...” (Prologue 15–18); “of four emperors: Tiberius, Gaius, Claudius, and Nero” (Prologue 160–162); “the seven principal places” (Prologue 164–165); “there are four types of divine Scripture: history, prophecy, proverbs and simple doctrine...” (Prologue 188–189); and “all divine Scripture is fourfold: history, aetiology, analogy and allegory” (Prologue 201–202). It is not surprising that a Prologue interested in critical matters would entail listing, but it appears throughout his commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians as well, and even in lesser matters. Select examples in the commentaries include: “four types of apostles” (Gal 1:1); “three differences: of type, condition, and sex” (Gal 3:28); “Now, we know nine orders of angels: Angels, Archangels, Powers, Authorities, Rulers, Dominions, Thrones, Cherubim, and Seraphim.” (Eph 1:21); “It must be noted that after the six prohibited faults from above: fornication, impurity, avarice, wickedness, silly talk, scurrility, he has now marked only three, fornication, impurity, and avarice...” (Eph 5:6).

Patristic sources often employed an allegorical interpretation of numbers, a practice the Irish regularly copied. Indeed, Bischoff names this practice as one of the most common traits of Irish exegesis.<sup>165</sup> Sedulius uses this hermeneutical construct twice in his Prologue and commentaries. In the first instance, Sedulius, receiving Jerome, provides an allegorical interpretation of the numbers ten, seven, and eight. Sedulius claims that Paul wrote ten letters to eight churches in order to harmonize the Old and New Testament (Prologue, 75–83),

Sed si quis quaeret quare X epistolas ad octo ecclesias scripsit, huic breuiter respondendum est, ut doctrinam Noui Testamenti a decalogo legis non discrepare ostenderet... ut enim septenarius numerus Vetus Testamentum propter diem sabbati frequenter designat, ita et octonarius propter dominicam resurrectionem, quae octaua die resplenduit, gratiam Novi Testamenti exprimit.

<sup>163</sup> Löfstedt, 165.

<sup>164</sup> Cf. Contreni, 1983, 95–97; Löfstedt, 160–169; Bischoff, 1991, 81–86; McNally, 395–403.

<sup>165</sup> Bischoff, 1991, 86.



Sedulius' reference to the eighth day as the resurrection day of the Lord is based on the Jewish calendar, where Sunday is the first day of the week and Saturday (the Sabbath) is the seventh; therefore, resurrection Sunday is the eighth day of the week. Thus ten letters, representing the Decalogue, which represents the Old Testament, and eight churches, representing the resurrection day of the Lord, underscores Paul's implicit harmonization of the two testaments.

Sedulius' entry for Gal 1:18 is the second employment of this hermeneutical tool. Sedulius' entire entry for this verse, excepting the allegorical interpretation of fifteen, derives from Pelagius. Pelagius partitions this verse into four phrases, offering a brief comment for each recited segment. Pelagius' entry reads (Gal 1:18):

Deinde post tres annos. Ostendit se non indiguisse doceri, qui tribus iam annis aliis praedicarat. Veni Hierusolimam. Quando se discipulis adjungere adtemptabat. Videre Petrum. Videndi gratia, non discendi. Et mansi apud illum diebus XV. Et susceptum se ab illo in caritate demonstrat, et in brevi tempore nihil discere potuisse.

Then after three years. He shows that he did not need to be taught, who already had preached for three years. I came to Jerusalem. Since he was attempting to join the disciples. To see Peter. For the sake of seeing, not for the sake of learning anything. And I remained there for fifteen days. And he demonstrates that he was accepted by the former in love, and in a brief time, could not have learned anything.

Sedulius' entry is very similar to Pelagius', but with some significant differences (Gal 1:18):

DEINDE POST TRIENNIUM. Ostendit se non indiguisse doceri, qui iam tribus praedicaerat annis. VIDERE PETRUM. Id est, uidendi gratia, non discendi. DIEBUS XV. VII et VIII significant Vetus et Novum Testamentum propter sabbatum et octavum diem resurrectionis dominicae.

First, Sedulius only recites three of the four phrases. Second, Sedulius' biblical text differs from Pelagius with respect to the first lemma. The most notable difference, however, is Sedulius' complete omission of Pelagius' comment for the phrase *Diebus XV*. After accepting verbatim Pelagius' comments for the first two phrases, Sedulius inserts his previous allegorical interpretation of the numbers seven and eight, the sum of which equals fifteen, which for Sedulius again represents a harmony between the Old and New Testaments.

None of the other three major sources for his commentary on Galatians (Jerome, Augustine and Pelagius) offer any similar significance for the number fifteen. Jerome does offer an allegorical interpretation of the number fifteen, but it is altogether different from Sedulius' as Jerome locates its significance with the fifteen songs in the Psalter and fifteen steps which a righteous person must

take to sing praises to God in his courts.<sup>166</sup> Sedulius' disregard for the exegesis of Augustine and Pelagius demonstrates his affinity for this hermeneutical construct, and the recourse to his previous allegorical interpretation of the numbers seven and eight demonstrates a conscientious attempt at consistency within his *Collectaneum*.

Another distinctive characteristic among Irish-trained exegetes is their penchant for including obscure historical minutiae in their biblical studies. Löfstedt and Bischoff point to such material as evidence for their claim that the Irish tend to project a sense of learned superiority among their Carolingian peers.<sup>167</sup> Whether or not the existence of obscure historical minutiae is evidence for pomposity is debatable, but certainly, an Irish person's Latin training via grammars and commentaries contributed to their general appreciation for such material. Sedulius' commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians are sprinkled with many historical jewels of this type. Below are three examples of this kind of historical detail.

In his entry for Eph 6:21, Sedulius records Jerome's epithet for Rome: *domina urbium* ("queen of cities"). This epithet for Rome seems to originate with Jerome in his commentary on Eph 6:21 and is subsequently copied only by Bonifacius Moguntinus,<sup>168</sup> Rabanus Maurus,<sup>169</sup> Sedulius, and Atto Vercellensis.<sup>170</sup> All four are Carolingian writers and two of them are specifically Irish. The epithet may have appealed to Sedulius as a rhetorical flourish, on one hand its affirmation of the classical heritage of Rome, and on the other its use of classical vocabulary, as *urbs* was largely replaced by *civitas* and *oppidum* in medieval Latin.<sup>171</sup>

Sedulius' explicit reference to Aquila in his commentary for Eph 4:28 may also rank as an obscure historical detail. Aquila of Sinope provided an exceedingly literal translation of the Hebrew Bible into Greek around 130.<sup>172</sup> Aquila's work is most likely known on account of Origen's (and subsequently Jerome's) use of and reference to it, but his historical importance as a translator of the Hebrew Bible into Greek is recorded in Isidore's *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis* (1.12.41–46):

Post haec secundam editionem Aquila, tertiam et quartam Theodotion et Symmachus ediderunt, ambo Iudaei proseliti; quintam uero et sextam editionem Origenis repperit et cum ceteris supradictis editionibus comparauit. Hii sunt itaque tantum qui scripturas sacras de hebreo in grecum uerterunt.

166 Hieronymus, *Commentarii in epistolam Pauli ad Galatas*, 1:18b, 7–9.

167 Löfstedt, 169; Bischoff, 85–86.

168 Fl. 742; *Epistola XLIX*. Bonifacius Zachariae, PL 89, 0746D.

169 Ca. 780–856; *Enarrationum in Epistolas Beati Pauli*, PL 112, 0447 A.

170 Fl. 960; PL 134, 0586 A.

171 Elliot, §2.1.

172 Cf. Ewert, 108 and Metzger, 141–142.

After this [referring to the Septuagint] Aquila made the second edition, Theodotion and Symmachus edited the third and fourth, both Jewish proselytes; but Origen found a fifth and sixth edition and compared it with the other editions mentioned above. Thus only these people translated the Sacred Scriptures from Hebrew into Greek.

The explicit reference to the work of Aquila comes from a quotation of Jerome and is not a firsthand quotation. This reference gives the impression, at least to a modern reader, that Sedulius' *Collectaneum* draws on more sources than are actually used. This practice is not done to deceive the reader, though referencing various authors adds to the perceived erudition of the work, but rather demonstrates his own lack of distinction between first and secondhand sources. A contemporary reader of Sedulius' *Collectaneum* would have known it was a compilation of various sources largely without intratextual attribution, and so retaining a citation found within the source which Sedulius uses indicates a loyalty to the source (in this case Jerome) and is not merely a pompous display of erudition.

A third example may be noted in the appearance of the epithet "Son of Nun", (Gal 1:1; Frede, 513, 9): *ut Jesus filius Nun a Deo*. "Son of Nun" is an epithet of Joshua found in Deuteronomy 1:38. Origen rendered the Hebrew of "son of Nun" as  $\nu\acute{\omicron}\delta\varsigma$  Nauê and argued that Nave indicated a ship.<sup>173</sup> Subsequent Fathers often called the book of Joshua "Jesus Nave", and based on Origen's rendering, they saw in Joshua the figure of Jesus the Christ as a ship in which the world is saved.<sup>174</sup> While this phrase occurs within ten lines that derive from Jerome, it is not without alteration. Sedulius' text reads *Jesus filius Nun*, but editions *s*, *m* and Jerome's text all read *Jesus filius Nave*. *Nun* is the Hebraic rendering in Latin. Thus, it is likely Sedulius' familiarity with this phrase in other sources and possibly even his knowledge of its Hebrew rendering that accounts for the change. Therefore, while it may be categorized under the rubric of an obscure historical detail, material which links him with Irish exegetes, Sedulius' use and adaptation of this phrase from Jerome also indicates his desire to harmonize the two testaments and his appreciation for the *tres linguae sacrae*.

Also commonly noted is the emphasis that Hiberno-Latin commentators place on the biblical languages of Hebrew, Greek and Latin within their exegesis. Robert McNally in his seminal article, "'Tres Linguae Sacrae' in Early Irish Bible Exegesis", traces the use of these languages in Irish exegesis of the early middle ages. He asserts that the Irish, largely through the linguistic work of Jerome and Isidore of Seville, demonstrated a great concern for philological exegesis. These three biblical languages held a profound mystical meaning for the Irish as they were the three languages written on the cross of Christ and for

173 Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiae*, VI.25.

174 Drum, 524.

that reason deemed the *tres linguae sacrae*. McNally claims, “[i]t is not an Irish invention, though the repeated recourse to Hebrew, Greek, and Latin in the exegesis of Scripture is peculiar to Hiberno-Latin Bible commentators.”<sup>175</sup> This repeated recourse certainly proves true in Sedulius’ *Collectaneum*, as he refers to all three throughout. Greek is referenced three times in the Prologue (42, 47, 84), three times in Gal (1:16, 3:1, 3:27), and twice in Eph (2:3, 4:28). A matter explicitly concerning Latin linguistics or the Latin version of Scripture occurs twice in the Prologue (37, 129), four times in Gal (2:5, 5:8, 5:9, 5:19), and twice in Eph (1:10, 4:28). Hebrew is only referenced five times (Prologue 41, 46; Gal 3:17, 4:6; Eph 4:28). The most notable use of the *tres sacrae linguae* occurs in Eph 4:28, where Sedulius, receiving Jerome, mentions the translation of the word “devil” in all three languages (585, XVIII.21–586, 25, Frede): *Diabolus est Grecum verbum, quod Latine dicitur ‘criminator’. Lingua vero Ebraica ‘Satanas’ appellatur adversarius sive contrarius, et ab apostolo Belial, id est ‘absque iugo’, quod de collo suo Dei eiecerit servitutem; quem Aquila ‘apostata’ transtulit.*

While the content contains items of interest to a mind trained in an Irish monastic setting, the diction of Sedulius does not betray his Irish heritage. Even two of the most renowned Irish scholars on the Continent, John Scottus and Rabanus Maurus, interspersed their Latin exegetical works with words in the Irish vernacular.<sup>176</sup> Rabanus actually advocates the use of vernacular in scriptural studies, following *doct.* 4.9, when he writes:

Quamvis in bonis doctoribus tanta docendi cura sit vel esse debeat, ut verbum, quod nimis obscurum sit vel ambiguum, latinum esse non possit, vulgi autem more sic dicatur, ut ambiguitas obscuritasque vitetur, non sic dicatur, ut a doctis, sed potius ut ab indoctis dici solet.<sup>177</sup>

Although in good teachers there is, or should be, such care that a word, which is excessively obscure or ambiguous, cannot be [expressed in] Latin, but that it be spoken in the manner of the unlearned so that ambiguity and obscurity are avoided, so let it not be spoken as by the learned, but rather as the unlearned are accustomed to speak.

Sedulius’ departure from fellow Irishmen with respect to inclusion of vernacular words assuredly relates to their respective audiences.<sup>178</sup> This point does not indicate an exclusion of Irish readers of Sedulius’ *Collectaneum*, but rather, given the cultural milieu of the Carolingian centers among which Sedulius worked and lived, the audience would have represented multiple ethnicities and

<sup>175</sup> McNally, 396.

<sup>176</sup> Contreni, 1983, 94–97.

<sup>177</sup> R. Maurus, *De institutione clericorum* 3.30 (ed. Knöpfler, 249; MPL 107:408a-b). Cf. Contreni, 1983, 97.

<sup>178</sup> Contreni, 2003, 25.

backgrounds, with simple Latin serving as the baseline for teaching the Pauline letters. Only a single trace of Irish diction appears in Sedulius' commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians: the presence of *more* as an introduction to a comparison or explanatory clause.

*More* occurs three times in his commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians: twice it is the product of Pelagius (Gal 3:1, 4:14), who emigrated from Britain but is likely of Irish descent,<sup>179</sup> but the third is very likely Sedulius' own (Gal 3:19). Sedulius writes in lines III.180–183 for Gal 3:19:

Quare ergo data est lex, dum non in illa promissio est nec implet promissionem  
nemoque per eam saluatur? Ad quod respondet: Lex propter transgressionem posita  
est, et *more* pignoris fuit, donec ueniret semen.

These four lines were unattributed in Frede's *apparatus fontium*, but both their format and the existence of *more* suggests Irish authorship, and therefore are probably Sedulius' own lines. The question-answer schema is a favorite mode of presentation among Hiberno-Latinists,<sup>180</sup> and his use of *more* as a rhetorical and explanatory break in the intra-scriptural citation reveals the furniture of his mind, which is decidedly Irish.

#### 4.3 Formatting

Sedulius' *Collectaneum* is formatted in such a way as to provide a succinct, didactic reading experience. While the Prologue is written in continuous prose with the seven circumstances acting as a template for topics, the commentaries are written with a blend of both complete sentences and synonymous, interpretative phrases. Sedulius, working sequentially through each verse of a given epistle, first recites only the portion of the biblical verse to which his ensuing comments pertain. This practice marks the first major visible difference between Sedulius' *Collectaneum* and the other Carolingian Pauline commentaries. In Sedulius' *Collectaneum* often only a fragment of a biblical verse is quoted and subsequently treated; whereas, for the early patristic commentators as well as the other Carolingian Pauline commentators, the recitation of an entire verse is the norm. E.g., Eph 3:2 in the Vulgate reads, *si tamen audistis dispensationem gratiae Dei, quae data est mihi pro vobis*. Sedulius' entry for that verse reads: SI TAMEN AUDISTIS. *Si tamen firmiter retinetis me in vobis dispensationem accepisse doctrinae*.

After the abbreviated recitation of the biblical verse, five notable formatting features typically emerge in Sedulius' text: the use of 1) *et reliqua*; 2) *id est, hoc est, or ut est*; 3) a relative pronoun; 4) a synonymous phrase in the same noun

179 Herren and Brown, 12.

180 Cf. Löfstedt, 161–169; Bischoff, 1991, 85–86; Contreni, 1983, 9–98.

case or personal verbal voice as used in the biblical lemma; and 5) guide words such as *aliter*, *aut*, *sive*, *vel* and *item*.

*i) Formula for Citation of Biblical Text*

The phrase (*et*) *reliqua* appears periodically at the end of a quoted portion of a biblical verse, as occurs in Sedulius' entry for Gal 1:20: QUAE AUTEM SCRIBO VOBIS *reliqua*. *Quae scribo vera sunt et Deo testante confirmo*. Using *reliqua* may seem superfluous since Sedulius rarely recites the entire biblical verse, but there is a pattern to his usage. He employs this phrase specifically when his comments pertain to the rest of the verse as well, but for the sake of brevity he stops his recitation. The Vulgate for Gal 1:20 reads, *Quae autem scribo vobis, ecce coram Deo quia non mentior*. Sedulius' comment for this verse relates more to the omitted portion than to the provided lemma, and the use of *reliqua* alerts the reader to this possibility. Sedulius' use of *reliqua* is distinct among the four Carolingian commentators mentioned above. Alcuin, Claudius, Rabanus and Haimo each quote the entire portion of the verse with which they are concerned. Though an entire epistle is not always accounted for, the exceptions are few. Rabanus does infrequently use *reliqua* for brevity, but only when making an intra-scriptural reference as part of his commentary on a given verse. For example, in his entry for Romans 1:3 (*de Filio suo, qui factus est ei ex semine David secundum carnem*) Rabanus writes,

Noveramus ergo Christum secundum carnem, id est, secundum carnis mortalitatem, antequam resurgeret; sed nunc jam non novimus, quia sicut dicit idem Apostolus, 'Christus resurgens a mortuis, jam non moritur, et **reliqua** (Rom. VI).'

Therefore we knew Christ according to the flesh, i. e., according to his mortal flesh, before he was raised; but we did not already know, because – as it were – the Apostle says the same thing, 'Christ rising again from the dead, dies now no more, etc.'

Rabanus quotes Romans 6:9, but he omits (by virtue of *et reliqua*) the latter half of the verse, which is *mors illi ultra non dominatur*. His argument here hinges on the quoted portion and not that which is represented by *reliqua*.

The Carolingian glosses employ *reliqua* similarly; however, it occurs with much less frequency. The work that Sedulius' use of *reliqua* most closely resembles, by virtue of frequency and function, is Servius' commentary on the *Aeneid*. The feature is actually employed more often in Servius than Sedulius, and the following is an example of its occurrence in the former: (444) FATA CANIT et reliqua.<sup>181</sup> *Et reliqua* refers to *foliisque notas et nomina mandat*, which is the remainder of the verse and signifies the other two ways (by writings and signs) through which the future is predicted.

181 Servius, *in Aeneidem*, vol. III, (III. 444).

This stylistic difference from contemporary Pauline commentaries and its association with Servius complements the earlier argument that the setting for the use of Sedulius' *Collectaneum* is likely within a classroom, and ultimately in the mold of school commentaries for classical works.

*ii) Formulae Used for Explaining*

Besides immediate entry into a third person explanation, Sedulius typically utilizes one of three formats in the presentation of his comments: the use of 1) *hoc est* and *id est*; 2) a relative pronoun; and 3) a synonymous phrase in the same noun case or personal verbal voice as used in the biblical lemma.

*Hoc est* and *id est* occur throughout Sedulius' *Collectaneum* with high frequency. They are typically employed after the biblical lemma has been quoted and serve to introduce his comments. This pattern is a common practice in the commentary genre, including many of the early Latin biblical commentaries (e.g., Marius Victorinus, Jerome, Augustine and Pelagius all use them) and continued through the medieval period. Thus, their employment is not a stylistic feature particular to Sedulius or even the other Carolingian commentators.

Formatting features more particular to Sedulius' *Collectaneum* are: his practice of beginning his comments with the use of a relative pronoun, or his use of a synonymous phrase in the same noun case or personal verbal voice as used in the biblical lemma. Neither the other extant Carolingian commentaries on the Pauline epistles, nor the early patristic biblical commentaries employ these techniques; however, both are occasionally found in biblical glosses from the seventh to ninth centuries, though the use of the relative pronoun to initiate comments occurs with greater frequency.

Sedulius uses these features prominently and effectively. It allows him to make a point succinctly without repeating words or superfluously introducing his comments, as the example from his entry for Gal 3:14 demonstrates: UT POLLICITATIONEM SPIRITUS reliqua. *Quae per Joel omni carni promissa est, id est, universe generi humano, ut: Effundam de Spiritu meo super omnem carnem.* Alcuin, e.g., does not utilize this practice often and may thus repeat the phrase to which his immediate comment pertains, as occurs in his commentary for Titus 1:6–7:

Si quis est sine crimine, unius uxoris vir, filios habens fideles, non in accusatione luxuriae, aut non subditos peccato. Oportet enim episcopum sine crimine esse, tanquam Dei dispensatorem. Primum enim sine crimine sit....

IF ANY MAN IS WITHOUT CRIME, THE HUSBAND OF ONE WIFE; HAS FAITHFUL CHILDREN, NOT ACCUSED OF EXTRAVAGANCE, OR SUBMISSIVE TO SIN. FOR A BISHOP MUST BE WITHOUT CRIME, AS THE STEWARD OF GOD: For first, let him be without crime...

The recitation of the entire verse, and in this case two verses, requires that he first address the phrase about which he is immediately concerned: *Primum enim sine crimine sit...* The necessity to repeat a phrase is what Sedulius' employment of a relative pronoun effectively eliminates.

Perhaps Sedulius' most distinctive characteristic with regard to formatting is his retention of the personal voice of the verb or case of the nouns as they occur in the biblical lemma. For example, Gal 1:6 reads (514, I.30–31, Frede), MIROR QUOD SIC. *Nescio quae vos a fidei rectitudine deflectit. Nescio* mirrors the personal voice of *miror*, and the rest of the comment provides a brief synopsis of the larger underlying problem that gave Paul occasion to write Galatians. This stylistic choice of retaining the voice of Paul allows him to place words in the Apostle's mouth and ultimately provides an intuitive and effectively short, simple sentence as opposed to a longer one drawn out by an historical exposition of the problem raised in these early verses of the epistle. Without this stylistic feature, the other Carolingian Pauline commentators are demonstrably more verbose. For example, Claudius writes in his entry for Galatians 1:6,

MIROR QUOD TAM CITO TRANSFERIMINI, AB EO QUI VOS VOCAVIT IN GLORIAM CHRISTI, IN ALIUD EVANGELIUM, QUOD NON EST ALIUD. Enumeratis beneficiis mirari se dicit Apostolus....

I AM AMAZED THAT YOU ARE SO QUICKLY DEPARTING FROM HIM WHO CALLED YOU INTO THE GLORY OF CHRIST, FOR ANOTHER GOSPEL, WHICH IS NOT ANOTHER. The Apostle says that he is amazed by enumerable privileges...

Where Sedulius merely retained the voice of Paul to succinctly relate his commentary, Claudius was forced to preface his commentary with a phrase that artificially lengthens his entry by referring to the speaker of the lines, *mirari se dicit Apostolus....*

We see the same characteristic in Gal 1:8 when Sedulius writes (514, I.38, Frede), SED ET SI NOS. *Id est, evangelizaverimus.* Sedulius uses the first person plural in *evangelizaverimus* to echo the *nos* from the recited biblical verse. By retaining Paul's voice in the implied verb of the recited biblical text, he cursorily emphasizes his exegetical point through the tense and mood of *evangelizaverimus*. An example of Sedulius retaining the case of the noun(s) of the recited portion of the biblical verse to create a brief entry occurs in Gal 1:14. Here Sedulius writes (515, II.11–12, Frede), PATERNARUM TRADITIONUM. *Id est, non Dei mandatorum.*

The use of these latter two features occasionally makes Sedulius' commentary visibly similar to biblical glosses of the same time period. These formatting structures are intermixed with conventional commentary entries resulting in a brief composition, but one whose content mirrors the interpretative work of comprehensive commentaries.



*Presenting alternative and supplemental interpretations: Use of Sive:, Vel:, Aliter:, Aut:, Item:,*

Sedulius typically offers a brief interpretation per biblical lemma. A single interpretation may be comprised of multiple authors, but nonetheless Sedulius will have presented the amalgamation of their work as one, simple interpretation.<sup>182</sup> However, in accordance with his contemporary Carolingian exegetes, Sedulius also periodically offers multiple interpretations for a single lemma, an asset generally not located in the glosses. The second and sometimes third interpretation may either supplement the previous interpretation, or more commonly, it may offer an alternative interpretation. To introduce the second or third interpretation, Sedulius uses one of five guide words: *Sive:*, *Vel:*, *Aliter:*, *Aut:*, which serve to introduce an alternative interpretation, and *Item:*, which signifies a supporting argument.

Sedulius' use of these five guide words is consistent throughout his commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians, and a pattern emerges. *Sive* is the exception among these words as almost every instance is not to be attributed to Sedulius but nearly always derives from Pelagius' commentaries.<sup>183</sup> Pelagius uses *Sive* to introduce an alternative interpretation, as occurs in his commentary for Galatians 2:19,

EGO ENIM PER LEGEM LEGI MORTUUS SUM. Per legem Christi legi litterae. **Sive:** Per ipsam ueterem ipsi sum mortuus, quia ipsa se cessaturam esse praedixit.

FOR I AM DEAD TO THE LAW, THROUGH THE LAW. I died through the law of Christ to the law of the letter. Or rather: through the old law itself, I died to that law, because the law itself prophesied of the letter, that it was about to end.

Here *Sive* indicates a second interpretation for the biblical phrase *per legem legi*. Sedulius copies this entry almost verbatim: EGO ENIM PER LEGEM LEGI MORTUUS SUM. *Per legem Christi legi litterae. Sive: Per ipsam ueterem ipsi mortuus sum, quia ipsa se cessaturam esse praedixit.* The only difference between Pelagius' entry and Sedulius' is the transposition of *sum mortuus* to *mortuus sum*, which is presumably a stylistic edit that simplifies the Latin for an elementary reader.<sup>184</sup>

The other three guide words which indicate an alternative interpretation, *Aliter*, *Vel*, and *Aut*, are embedded within the commentary after an initial interpretation has been offered and consequently anticipate an alternative interpretation, as occurs in Sedulius' entry for Gal 5:12:

<sup>182</sup> For further discussion of Sedulius' reception of sources, see pp. 73–75 below.

<sup>183</sup> The exceptions occur in Gal 1:16 and Eph 5:30, inclusions which are by Sedulius.

<sup>184</sup> Cf. below, 59–62, for further discussion regarding Sedulius' penchant for simplifying the syntax of his sources.

VTINAM ABSCIDANTVR! **Hoc est**, utinam a malo in bonum conuertantur! **Vel:** Vtinam totis potius uirilibus suis castrentur, qui modicam corporis partem circumcidi praedicant! **Aliter:** Vtinam aliqua uindicta tales a uobis penitus separentur, ne uos ultra conturbent!

In the above passage, Sedulius presents three possible interpretations for his lemma. *Hoc est*, introduces the first, which offers a moralizing metaphorical interpretation for “circumcision”. *Vel:* introduces the second, which offers a more literal interpretation of “circumcision” that is ultimately directed towards the bodies of the deceivers. *Aliter:* indicates the third, which mirrors the first metaphorical interpretation, but to a literal end with respect to the physical effect of “circumcision”, i.e., bodily separation.

*Aut:*, which is not exhibited in a protracted example above, is used the least. There are only four occurrences of this word as an introduction to alternative interpretations within Sedulius’ commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians. *Sive* is generally tied to Pelagius, *Vel* is occasionally the product of another writer, but *Aliter* and *Aut* are exclusively attributable to Sedulius, inasmuch as they do not derive from the source of the ensuing interpretation. There are no perceptible patterns to his use of these four words with respect to indicating any varying degree of difference within the interpretation, and ultimately his choice between them seems arbitrary. Also, they typically, though not always, signify the use of a different author. Although these words uniformly perform the same function within the text, I do not translate them with the same word. In my following translation of the commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians, *Sive:* is translated as *Or rather:*, *Aliter:* as *Alternatively:*, *Vel:* as *Or:*, and *Aut:* as *Or alternatively:*.

Sedulius’ use of these formulae reveals a distinct difference in the composition of his commentaries compared to the other Pauline commentaries of the Carolingian era. Not only do Claudius, Alcuin, Rabanus, and Haimo each typically offer lengthier explanations per lemma, with fewer offerings of alternative interpretations, but their methods of presentation differ from Sedulius as well. Alcuin and Claudius write the fewest number of alternative interpretations within their commentaries on the Pauline epistles. Each uses *Aliter:* only twice, otherwise they introduce an alternative reading in similar fashion:

O INSENSATI GALATAE, QUIS VOS FASCINAVIT NON OBEDIRE VERITATI? Dupliciter hic locus intelligi potest: **vel** ideo insensatos Galatas appellatos, a maioribus ad minora venientes, quod incoeperant spiritu, et carne consummabantur; **vel** ob id, quod unaquaeque provincia suas habeat proprietates...<sup>185</sup>

O FOOLISH GALATIANS, WHO HAS BEWITCHED YOU NOT TO OBEY THE TRUTH? This passage can be understood in two ways: either the Galatians

185 Claudius of Turin, PL 104, Col. 0865D.

are called senseless, as they move from greater to lesser matters in that they began in a spiritual manner, and they near the end in a fleshly manner; or on the other hand, each province has its own characteristics...

Similarly Alcuin writes,

NON PERCUSSOREM: quod quidem et simpliciter intellectum aedificat audientem, ne facile manum porrigat ad caedendum **vel** ad arma prorumpere: sed altius consideratum melius aedificat, ne aliquid episcopus efficiat, quod mentes intelligentium et videntium offendat...<sup>186</sup>

NOT VIOLENT. This may be simply interpreted as, that he edify the mind of the one hearing, lest that one easily extend his hand to kill or to rush to arms; but a subtler and better interpretation is, that the bishop may do nothing to offend the minds of the ones who understand and see...

Claudius dedicates his commentary on Galatians to the abbot, Dructeramnus, who is both the patron and likely (initial) intended reader of Claudius' commentary. This dedication to a single person is possibly the reason for its lengthy explanations of one lemma and the lack of alternative explanations (perhaps more necessary in a pedagogical setting), which mitigates his need for formulaic words and formats. Alcuin's commentary is formatted similarly to Claudius', and though he does not say to whom or for what purpose he composes his commentary on Titus, the similarities to Claudius and differences from Sedulius' text suggest it was intended not for a classroom setting, but for individual study.

Rabanus and Haimo both employ *aliter* formulae to indicate alternative readings, but with less frequency than Sedulius. Rabanus uses *Aliter autem*: and simply *Aliter*:, but also inserts throughout various phrases, such as *potest et hoc aliter intelligi* and *quod ille aliter intelligit*. Haimo likewise employs *aliter*: and *vel aliter*: as well as phrases such as *Hoc dupliciter intelligi potest*. Haimo's and Rabanus' commentaries on the Pauline epistles were likely written for classroom use and their propensity for formulaic expressions to indicate alternative interpretations supports such a claim.

Sedulius is the only Carolingian Pauline commentator who employs *Vel*:, *Aut*:, and *Sive*:. singularly and with the same function as *Aliter*:, and whose longer expressions for indicating an alternative interpretation occur less regularly than his employment of these four words. Extensive use of these words as a formulaic expression is not exclusive to Sedulius. Servius' commentary on the *Aeneid* also employs all four words regularly in a patterned format; however, Sedulius' imitation of Servius is slightly adapted. Servius often employs *Aliter*:. to indicate an alternative expression with the same meaning as found elsewhere in the *Aeneid*, whereas Sedulius uses *Aliter*:. to introduce an alternative

<sup>186</sup> PL 100, Col. 1014D.

interpretation, either by the same source, or more often, a different author. An example of Servius' employment of this formula follows:

(437). TALIBVS ORABAT **aut** simpliciter accipiendum 'loquebatur': **aut** 'orabat' ideo, quoniam preces inmixtae erant: **aliter** multa Iovem manibus (supplex orasse supinis).<sup>187</sup>

SHE WAS PRAYING IN SUCH A WAY. Either: it must be simply understood as "she was speaking", or therefore "she was praying", since prayers had been offered. Alternatively: many times he humbly prayed to Jove with raised hands [4.205].

Above, Servius identifies another verse within the *Aeneid* (in this instance from 4.205), which contains an expression with a similar meaning, or, specifically here, a different description of the same activity – prayer. As a commentator of poetry, Servius is inclined to reveal an alternative intratextual expression of a similar activity (perhaps often dictated by constraints of meter), whereas Sedulius is explicitly a collector (hence *Collectaneum*) of exegesis who is inclined simply to offer various interpretations. Thus, both authors regularly employ the formula *Aliter*: to indicate an alternative, but Sedulius adapts the lexical value of this formula to his genre.<sup>188</sup>

The above excerpt also demonstrates how Servius employs *aut*, *vel* or *Sive...* *vel*. Servius typically pairs *aut* with *aut*, or *vel* with *vel*, or *sive* with *vel*, but like Sedulius, they serve as formulaic guide words indicating various possible interpretations or meanings.

*Item*: is a guide word commonly appearing in Sedulius' commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians, whose occurrence anticipates an interpretation which buttresses the previous explanation and often signifies a new source. The following is a typical example (from Sedulius' entry for Eph 1:9; Frede, 557, 67–72),

Inter propositum et praedestinationem hoc interest, quod praedestinatio est alicuius rei praefiguratio multo ante in mente eius, qui distinat quod futurum sit, propositum uero, cum uicina sit machinatio et pene cogitationem sequatur effectus.

**Item**: Praedestinatio est gratiae praeparatio, gratia uero est ipsa donatio.

Lines 67–71 are a quotation from Jerome's commentary on Ephesians, but lines 71–72, are taken from Augustine's *prae*. 19.974. *Item* is Sedulius' own word, which introduces a similar interpretation of predestination, but by another source – Augustine.

<sup>187</sup> Servius, in *Aeneidem*, vol. III, (IV.437).

<sup>188</sup> Sedulius does occasionally use *Aliter*: precisely as Servius does, i.e., to indicate an alternative expression of the same meaning elsewhere in Paul's writing cf. Eph 5:15, where Sedulius writes, "Alternatively: Carefully, i.e., discerning good and evil." "Discerning good and evil" is a partial quotation of Hebrews 5:14.

Because Sedulius' explanations are often brief, the employment of *Item* in such a manner is an anomaly among the extant Carolingian Pauline commentators. The other five commentators often included exhaustive comments per lemma; therefore, they needed no verbal marker, such as *Item*, to signify a supplemental comment. There is an alternative function of *Item*: in Sedulius' *Collectaneum*, which is to cite a parallel passage of Scripture. The other Carolingian commentators on the Pauline epistles share this practice, though again with less brevity, e. g., in Claudius' commentary on Titus, he writes *Item alio loco*, before citing a passage from 2 Corinthians 5:21.

Not surprisingly, Sedulius' employment of *Item* mirrors Servius'. Servius uses *item* to cite an intratextual example of his argumen. Where *aliter* references a parallel passage or theme of a given line, *item* is employed with particular reference to his own commentary.<sup>189</sup> These words might be translated in Servius' commentary as "elsewhere" (*aliter*) and "likewise" (*item*). The use of *item* occurs throughout Servius' commentary, but one example is found in I.9.5–6:

TOT VOLVERE CASUS. Id est, casibus volvi... dare classibus austros, cum ventis naves demus, non navibus ventos; **item**: animumque labantem impulit, hoc est, impellendo fecit labantem.

TO ENDURE SO MANY CALAMITIES. I.e., to be encircled by calamities... *to give south winds to the navy*, since ships move only by winds, not winds by ships; likewise: *he persuaded the wavering soul*, i. e., he made it wavering, by impelling it.

Thus, where the formatting features of Sedulius' commentaries differ from the other extant Carolingian Pauline commentaries, a similarity may be noted in Servius' construction of his commentaries on the *Aeneid*: a limited recitation of a verse, the use of (*et*) *reliqua*, short explanations per lemma, and the uses of the five guide words mentioned above.

#### 4.4 Linguistic Style

Ludwig Traube famously said, "There is no such thing as Medieval Latin."<sup>190</sup> While those writing in the approximate (and conventionally labeled) time frames of classical, late antique and medieval eras do not have separate linguistic existences, they do however represent, e. g., slight changes in syntax and grosser differences in orthography and vocabulary. Because Sedulius employs sources ranging from each of these eras (and some late antique writers who emulate classical authors), this section will evaluate the extent to which Sedulius retains

189 Sedulius also mirrors Servius' use of *ut est*, which is a third way that both authors introduce an intratextual citation.

190 Sidwell, 2.

the distinctive elements represented by the various sources, or if he alters their syntax, vocabulary and orthography according to the conventions of his own time period. Specifically, the construction of indirect statements and indirect questions, the change in use and meanings of prepositions, the substitution of vowels, and the development of new words are common points of divergence. As a control, I will compare the constructions used by the sources to lines which are specifically attributable to Sedulius.

*i) Multiple Constructions*

The common construction for an indirect statement in classical Latin is “accusative plus infinitive”. Later Latin, however, often uses “quod plus indicative or subjunctive” to introduce an indirect statement. Both constructions are found within Sedulius’ commentaries. Perhaps more striking is that both constructions are found in consecutive sentences each from a different source. In his entry for Gal 2:11, Sedulius writes (520, IIII.6–8, Frede): *videns quod contra Evangelii regulam ageret. Hoc autem totum agit ut ostendat se nunquam circumcisionis fuisse factorem....* The *videns quod... ageret* is a later Latin construction, but immediately after Sedulius employs a more classical style by using the “accusative plus infinitive” construction: *ostendat se... fuisse*. The “quod plus subjunctive” construction derives from Clm 6235, but the “accusative plus infinitive” construction derives from Pelagius.

A similar example occurs in the Prologue and within lines that are attributable to Sedulius. Sedulius employs both constructions in consecutive sentences and then quotes Jerome, who employs the classical construction, resulting in three consecutive indirect statements. In lines 33–36, which are attributable to Sedulius, he writes (2, Frede), *itaque sciendum est quod Saulus, ut quidam arbitrantur, ante perceptam fidem nominatus est; quod omnino falsum esse Hieronimus in expositione epistolae ad Philemonem Colosensem declarat his verbis dicens*. The later Latin construction occurs with *sciendum est quod Saulus... nominatus est*, with the classical construction immediately thereafter, *quod omnino falsum esse... declarat*. The following sentence is taken from Jerome (2, Frede, 36–38), which reads: *Neque uero putandum est, ut a simplicioribus Latinis legitur, Saulum ante dictum esse et non Saul....* Jerome’s classical construction of the indirect statement mirrors Sedulius’ sentence in line 33, as both authors begin with a passive periphrastic in the main clause and *Saulus* as the subject in the indirect statement, and yet Sedulius employs the later Latin construction. One may conclude here that Sedulius’ embracing of a conglomerate style applies not only to Sedulius’ copying of sources, but to his own writing as well.

One construction found in both the Prologue and the commentaries, which is rare and typically found only in archaic and then again in later Latin, is the employment of an indicative verb in an indirect question. The usual construction for an indirect question is an “interrogative plus subjunctive”, as

occurs in Sedulius' entry for Eph 6:2. Quoting Jerome, Sedulius writes: *quaeritur quare nunc dixerit. Quaeritur* with the interrogative *quare* initiates the indirect question, which is completed with the perfect active subjunctive, *dixerit*. However one occasionally finds otherwise in both the commentaries and Prologue. In the Prologue (75–83), Sedulius constructs an indirect question modeled after Jerome's prologue to the Pauline corpus, a work from which Sedulius heavily excerpts (lines 89–128 of Sedulius' Prologue are nearly verbatim from Jerome's prologue to the Pauline letters, lines 27–53); however, Sedulius asks "why ten letters to eight churches", whereas Jerome is strictly concerned with "why only ten letters." Jerome's indirect question here is composed similarly to the one Sedulius copies in Eph 6:2, but with the interrogative *cur*: *quaeritur cur non amplius quam decem epistulas ad ecclesias scripserit*.<sup>191</sup> Sedulius slightly changes the question to fit his own purposes, but also modifies it syntactically: *Sed si quis quaerat quare X epistolas ad octo ecclesias scripsit*.... Here one would expect to read *scripserit*, which is the perfect active subjunctive, but the indicative, *scripsit*, is used. Likewise, in the commentary on Gal 1:15, Sedulius draws from Clm 6235 (515, II.15–17, Frede), *Et hic quaeritur, cur Paulus ab utero segregatus ecclesiam persequitur et Petrus a Christo electus abnegat Christum*.... The interrogative is *cur*, and normally we would expect the two main verbs, *persequitur* and *abnegat*, to be in the subjunctive mood; however, they are indicatives.

Another example of Sedulius employing varied styles of Latin composition occurs within his commentary on Gal 1:17. Sedulius uses both a classical construction and a later Latin construction for denoting entry into a city. In classical Latin, prepositions were not used with names of cities, towns, small islands or the nouns *domus*, *humus* and *rus*; however, later Latin writers would often employ a preposition in those instances. Thus the phrase in line 29, *neque veni Hierosolimam*, is a classical construction; however, in lines 30–36 Sedulius uses the preposition *in* before all of the city names; e. g., in line 30 virtually the same phrase appears as the one in line 29, but this time with the preposition *in*: *non venisse in Hierosolimam*. The presence of prepositions before a city is not unusual given the date of Sedulius' commentaries; however, Jerome, whose exegesis Sedulius is here excerpting, does not employ the prepositions. Thus, changing Jerome's composition was a grammatically conscientious decision and likely to aid a reader not familiar with the syntactical complexities of classical Latin, a tactic that suggests Sedulius is more concerned with the comprehension of the reader than syntactical cohesion.

191 Hieronymus, *Prologus in epistulis pauli apostoli*, 8–9, ed. Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

### ii) Orthographical Matters

Besides varied syntactical constructions, one occasionally also finds within Sedulius' commentaries orthographic practices common to medieval writers. Examples of this are few, however, as the orthography of Sedulius' text follows the Zürich witness, MS R,<sup>192</sup> except where Frede and Stanjek normalized the unique Hiberno-Latin spellings based upon readings from the other manuscripts. Thus, the appearance of the common orthographic differences between classical and medieval writers, such as substituting an "e" for an "i" or "u" for an "o" is sporadic at best and void of any pattern. Some differences may be attributable to a later copyist; nonetheless, the text records the following rare spellings. In Gal 3:13, Sedulius' text, copying Jerome, reads *desevit* ("ceased") instead of Jerome's *desivit*. This is an irregular perfect form of *desinere* instead of the more regular *desivit* or even *desiit*. *Desivit* is the form used in mss. "F" and "S" and editions *s* and *m*. The CC text of Jerome (77 A) has *desivit* and lists no variant readings. The spelling of words in their archaic form as opposed to the forms found in the respective source is also a sporadic element in Sedulius' commentaries and is seen in the following examples: *adortatus* (extremely rare) in line 94 of the Prologue, which is likely a variant for *adhortatus*, from *adhortor*. Also *aethimologia*, which looks like *etymologica*, but is likely derivative of *aetiologia* (Prologue, 200; a direct transliteration from its original form in Greek). Other examples are *tonicam* for *tunicam* (Eph 4:28, 513,9), and *hiruphin* for *cherubin*.

These combinations of varied syntactical styles and sporadic orthographic elements further demonstrate the multifarious nature of Sedulius' commentaries, and whatever *renovatio* of the classical heritage that was sought through the use of sources and formatting was evidently not applied syntactically in the composition of his *Collectaneum*.

### iii) Simplification

Claudius of Turin defended his simplified style by quoting Augustine's *doct.* 4.11.26, *In lectione enim divina non est amanda verba, sed veritas.*<sup>193</sup> The phrase Alcuin used to describe the composition of his commentary on John is *cautissimo plane stilo.*<sup>194</sup> Likewise, Rabanus Maurus, in a letter-preface accompanying his commentary on Chronicles, wrote:

<sup>192</sup> Frede, 14\*-16\*.

<sup>193</sup> Claudius of Turin, letter-preface to the commentary on Genesis, MGH Epp. 4:590, 33–34.

<sup>194</sup> Alcuin, letter-preface to the commentary on John, MGH Epp. 4:357, 13.



Non enim longos florentesque tractatus, in quibus plausibilis ludit oratio, sed commentarios in divinas historias scribere decrevi, quorum officium est preterite manifesta, obscura disserere.<sup>195</sup>

I did not resolve to write long and flowering treatises, in which the oration teases for applause, but commentaries on divine history, whose duty it is to pass over the obvious and elucidate the obscure.

These are just three of many similar apologies contained in letter-prefaces to biblical commentaries composed during the Carolingian era. Sedulius does not explicitly indicate an aim for providing a simplified composition; however, various features of his Latinity suggest a similar purpose.

One of the overarching characteristics of Sedulius' style within the *Collectaneum* is his simplification of sources, which may be manifested through a simpler syntax, editing of extraneous and/or advanced content, or an elucidated presentation of material. The following examples typify this practice.

Sedulius demonstrates a proclivity for simplifying the syntax of his sources. In lines 49–50 of the Prologue, Sedulius writes *Paulus, inquit, a Paulo Seregio vocatur*. Sedulius transposes the normal order of *Seregius Paulus*' name, i.e., Sedulius writes *Paulo Seregio* instead of *Seregio Paulo*. The Greek text, the Vulgate, and even Jerome's discussion of the name in his commentary on Philemon, which Sedulius excerpts, provides *Seregius Paulus* (the order being the notable factor) as the name of the proconsul. Sedulius presumably transposes the order of the names in order to emphasize the *Paulus* portion of *Seregius Paulus*, and ultimately avoids confusion for any reader who is unaware of conventional Roman practices with regard to names.

Lines 85–87 in the Prologue offer a similar example. There Sedulius writes: *Clemens Petri apostoli discipulus sententias Pauli proprio sermone ordinavit atque ornavit*. Sedulius is here copying Jerome, who writes, *vel Clementis Romanae postea Ecclesiae Episcopi, quem aiunt ipsi adjunctum sententias Pauli proprio ordinasse et ornasse sermone*.<sup>196</sup> Sedulius places his excerpt under the discussion of the "second circumstance", but it derives from the same larger passage of Jerome that Sedulius used for the discussion of the "first circumstance" (Prologue lines 19–31). Sedulius' excerpt contains two notable alterations. He added the apposition, *Petri apostoli discipulus* to the name Clemens, ultimately replacing Jerome's ecclesiastical nomenclature with a simple description. The second alteration is the arrangement of Jerome's words into a simpler syntax. The adjective *proprio* is split from the noun which it modifies, *sermone*. Though this construction is not difficult reading for a good Latinist, Sedulius nonetheless

195 Rabanus Maurus, letter-preface to the commentary on Paralipomenon (Chronicles), MGH Epp. 5:423, 27–29.

196 Hieronymus, *De viris illustribus*, 5.10.84.

simplifies it by moving *sermone* to follow *proprio*. Slight changes such as these occur throughout Sedulius' *Collectaneum*, and particularly in his commentaries.

There are also numerous examples of Sedulius editing extraneous or advanced content. Jerome's entry for his commentary on Galatians 3:5 essentially makes three points amounting to thirty lines. The following excerpt of Jerome represents three of Jerome's thirty lines from which Sedulius drew to compose his entry for the same verse.

...simul ostenditur Galatas, accepto post fidem sancto spiritu, dona habuisse uirtutum id est, prophetiam, genera linguarum, morborum curationes, et caetera, quae ad Corinthios in donis spiritualibus enumerantur.<sup>197</sup>

Likewise, he shows that the Galatians, by having accepted the Holy Spirit through faith, had the gifts of miracles, prophecy, speaking in tongues, curing of diseases, and other things, which are enumerated among the spiritual gifts in the letter to the Corinthians.

Sedulius edited even this extracted portion of almost thirty lines to compose the following entry (Gal 3:5):

OPERATVR VIRTUTES. Ostendit Galatas accepto per fidem Spiritu sancto dona habuisse uirtutum, id est, profetiam et genera linguarum.

There is no textual evidence for suggesting that the miracles (*virtutes*) performed (*operatur*) among the Galatians were actually the spiritual gifts of prophecy and speaking in tongues; nonetheless, Jerome asserts this by linking Gal 3:5 to 1 Corinthians 12:4–11, where Paul enumerates some spiritual gifts. Sedulius omits that portion of Jerome's commentary, since it merely substantiates Jerome's claim. Sedulius is by no means opposed to using intra-scriptural references for expositing passages, in fact that is a method he employs pervasively; but rather, the omission of Jerome's link to 1 Corinthians 12:4–11 is here likely for the sake of brevity and simplicity. The omission reveals a higher concern for the exegetical result than the pieces of evidence marshaled in defense of a given assertion, ultimately resulting in a simplified excerpt of Jerome.

Sedulius edits advanced exegetical content in Eph 4:16 (583, 80–81): *Haec idcirco apud nos obscura sunt, quia metaforicos dicuntur*. These lines come from Jerome, who writes, *idcirco (ut supra diximus) haec apud nos obscuriora sunt, quia μεταφορικῶς dicuntur in graeco*. Sedulius edits Jerome by transliterating μεταφορικῶς into Latin (*metaforicos*) and then omitting the phrase *in graeco* ("in Greek"). Thus *metaforicos* is here acting as an adverb, in the same way as its corresponding Greek form in Jerome's sentence. Sedulius' competency in Greek was an exception among his peers, and his editing of Jerome further demonstrates his intent to present his sources in a conceptually and linguistically simplified style.

<sup>197</sup> Hieronymus, *ad Galatas* 3:5, 12–14.

Additionally, Sedulius' reception of Gregory in Eph 1:21 also demonstrates well Sedulius' process of simplification. This passage comes from the thirty-fourth *Homilia* of Gregory the Great, one of the four main authorities of the early Western church, and an early source for identifying the nine orders of angels. Gregory locates the nine orders of angels from various passages in the Bible, an explanation which Sedulius edits out of this passage. Gregory writes *Cherubin vero atque seraphin saepe, ut notum est, libri prophetarum loquuntur* ("But both Cherubim and Seraphim are often, as has been noted, mentioned in the books of the prophets").<sup>198</sup> The only mention of Seraphim occurs in Isaiah 6:1–7. Cherubim occurs over sixty times in the Old Testament. Gregory then understands Ephesians 1:21, where Paul writes *super omnem principatum et potestatem et virtutem et dominationem* ("over all rule and power and authority and dominion"), to be titles of four more orders of angels.<sup>199</sup> "Thrones" is a title he gleans from Colossians 1:16, *Qui rursus ad Colossenses scribens, ait: Sive throni, sive potestates, sive principatus, sive dominationes* ("Who, again, writing to the Colossians, says: Whether thrones or powers or rulers or dominions").<sup>200</sup> Regarding the last two titles, "Angels" and "Archangels", Gregory initially doubts that there are nine orders of angels, because "Angels" and "Archangels" are joined with "Cherubim" and "Seraphim"; however, he concludes through an examination of Ezekiel 28:12–19, which lists nine precious stones made in the likeness of God, that these nine stones represent the nine orders of angels, and therefore "Angels" and "Archangels" form each their own order. A comparison of Gregory's passage with Sedulius' passage reveals that Sedulius is not concerned with how Gregory arrives at his conclusion, but more so with the conclusion itself. The version which Sedulius presents is much simpler both linguistically and conceptually and further suggests that Sedulius intends his work to serve a pedagogical function.

The examples thus far presented illustrate Sedulius' typical *modus operandi* of simplifying the syntax by rearranging a modifier or omitting extraneous or advanced content. Sometimes, however, Sedulius achieves elucidation by merely reorganizing the order of content as found in his sources. An example of this practice occurs in Gal 3:19. Pelagius writes (Gal 3:19), *In manu mediatoris. Sive Moysi, ut quidam putant, sive Christi: "nam et Moyses," aiunt, inter Deum et populum medius fuit.* Sedulius likewise writes (Gal 3:19), *IN MANU MEDIATORIS. Siue: Moysi, ut quidam putant; 'nam et Moyses', aiunt, 'inter Deum et populum medius fuit'. Siue: Christi.* Every word from Pelagius' exegesis for this biblical lemma is accounted for in Sedulius' entry, but Sedulius

198 CC 141, 305, *hom. in evang.* 34.7.

199 CC 141, 305, *hom. in evang.* 34.7.

200 CC 141, 305, *hom. in evang.* 34.7.

simplifies the presentation by moving the phrase *Sive: Christi*, so that the reader may more easily follow the flow of the argument.

The Prologue and commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians contain more extravagant examples of Sedulius' tendency to simplify his sources, but all of the above examples represent typical changes which occur throughout. The result of his work, as demonstrated above, is a commentary which makes patristic (and later) sources accessible to even an elementary student of these texts and does so with marked brevity.

## 5 Theological and Ecclesiastical Issues

As transmitters and users of patristic texts, the Carolingians echoed many of the same ecclesiastical and theological debates of their predecessors. Free will, predestination, and transmission of sin are all treated below in the reception study of Augustine and Pelagius, but here I treat the issues of baptism, Jewish-Christian relations, and the trinity as revealed in Sedulius' Prologue and commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians.

### 5.1 Baptism

Though Charlemagne's policy of capital punishment for pagans refusing baptism was eventually overturned on account of an appeal by Alcuin to Charlemagne in 796, baptism remained a pivotal practice for advancing Christianity among the Carolingian empire. Used as an opportunity for instruction and initiation, baptism was the defining act of an individual which established a person as faithful or infidel: a great concern for the Carolingian empire as it sought to be a wholly Christian society.<sup>201</sup> The extraordinarily high number of extant baptismal expositions from the Carolingian era testifies to both the mystical importance of this sacrament for the Carolingians and their desire to instruct the clergy and through them the laity.<sup>202</sup>

Sedulius references baptism nine times in his commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians, and through these offers five basic teachings. The first instance occurs in Gal 2:21, where Sedulius copies Jerome's commentary on the same verse, which projects post baptismal sin as an activity that makes grace invalid. The second teaching on baptism occurs in Gal 4:27, where Sedulius asserts its practice as a fundamental sacrament inaugurated with the new covenant. Similar to this teaching is Sedulius' claim in Eph 5:26, "IN THE WORD OF LIFE.

---

201 Keefe, 2002, 2–5.

202 Keefe, 1983, 172.

I.e., in doctrine after baptism. Or: *The word*, which is sung by the priest at baptism.” The statement in XXV.9 beginning with “Or:” is Sedulius’ own comment and reflects both the didactic nature of the *Collectaneum* and, by virtue of its tendentious relation to the text, the Carolingians’ emphasis on the rite of baptism.

The third teaching may be located through an examination of Eph 1:1 and 1:4. In his commentary for Eph 1:1 Sedulius defines a series of terms, a practice employed to deal with philological and theological concerns, which is also a common stylistic feature of Irish exegetes and reflective of their affinity to the scholarship of Jerome, Pelagius, and Isidore.<sup>203</sup> In Eph 1:1 Sedulius distinguishes between the terms *fideles* (“faithful ones”) and *sancti* (“holy ones”) by using catechumens as an example. There “holiness” is achieved through the sacrament of baptism. In his commentary on Eph 1:4 (lines I.43–47), however, Sedulius distinguishes between the terms *inmaculatus* (“unstained”) and *sanctus* (“holy”), with “holiness” “achieved by will and zeal” (*voluntate et studio comparatur*) and uses babies as an example to explain the distinctions involved. Thus holiness is seemingly achieved by two fundamentally different means. Furthermore the passage in Eph 1:4 seems to deny the doctrine of original sin, as adopted by the councils of Carthage (418) and Orange (529), a teaching which necessitated the practice of infant baptism.

The key to understanding lines I.43–47 then, as commentary congruent with both Eph 1:1 and the orthodox view of original sin, lies in the interpretation of lines I.37–43 and a broader contextualization of Jerome’s thought. Lines 37–40 highlight an apparent inconsistency between Paul’s claims in Ephesians 1:4 (“so that we would be holy and unstained in his presence”) and Ephesians 5:27 (“...the church of Christ will have neither stain nor wrinkle”) with Psalm 142:2 (“Everyone living will not be justified in your sight”). Sedulius (offering his own exegesis in lines 41–43) justifies this inconsistency by asserting a realized eschatology similar to that which is found in 1 Corinthians 13:12 (*Videmus enim nunc per speculum in aenigmate, tunc autem facie ad faciem; nunc cognosco ex parte*), a construction which Sedulius here echoes (Lines 41–43: *licet etiam in praesenti vita iusti sancti et inmaculati, quamvis non ex toto tamen ex parte non inconuenienter dici possunt*). This theological substructure of Pauline thought is not found in 1 Corinthians 13:2 alone, but is widely evidenced throughout his epistles, and Sedulius clearly uses it.<sup>204</sup>

Lines 43–47 are then predicated on this understanding of a realized eschatology as applied to the present Christian life, through the interpretation of

203 Cf. Bischoff, 1991, 85, and McNally, 1958, 395–403.

204 See Ridderbos, 44–90, who refers to it as a fundamental structure, and also Beker, 29–53.

two terms, *sanctus* (“holy”) and *inmaculatus* (“unstained”). By claiming that babies are *inmaculatus* and nevertheless do not have *sanctitas*, because holiness is achieved through will and zeal, Sedulius, receiving Jerome, seems to deny (as mentioned above) the doctrines of original sin and infant baptism. Jerome, however, himself defends the doctrine of original sin in his *Dialogus contra Pelagianos* (ca. 415), where he follows the teachings of Didymus and holds that original sin is transmitted through the physical act of procreation.<sup>205</sup> In that dialogue (CC 80, 1.23.35), Jerome says *baptismum uetera peccata concedit, nouas uirtutes non tribuit* (“baptism annuls old sins, (but) does not bestow new virtues”). In light of this passage of Jerome, one can better understand Sedulius’ exegesis of Eph 1:4 and assume his acceptance of Jerome’s distinctions. Thus Jerome’s and ultimately Sedulius’ juxtaposition of babies, *qui integri sunt corpore* (“who are corporally pure”), with the actions of will and zeal as necessary for holiness indicates an emphasis on voluntary participation towards achieving holiness in the present life. Babies are called unstained (*inmaculatus*), because they are not willfully participating in sin (n.b., Jerome’s specific qualification of babies as “corporally pure”), which does not, however, exclude them from the stain of original sin, since within this example Jerome is merely emphasizing their inability to develop neither virtues nor vices.

Likewise holiness may still here begin with baptism as stated in Eph1:1 (through the example of catechumens who believe but have yet to be baptized), but holiness on earth as a form of realized eschatology also entails (again, as seen through Jerome’s statement in his *Dialogus contra Pelagians* above) the development of virtues through participation in spiritual disciplines and sacraments. Thus Eph 1:1 highlights baptism as the distinctive act between belief in Christ and the inception of holiness; whereas, Eph 1:4 highlights the realized eschatological elements of holiness, a state which requires participatory action, an involvement of the will not within the capabilities of babies.

Sedulius’ fourth teaching on baptism indicates it is a salvific act synonymous with redemption:

Eph 2:5: (III.4–6) HE MADE US ALIVE TOGETHER. Instead of ‘He will make us alive together’. I.e., by forgiving and purging our sins in justice through baptism and faith.

2:10: (V.6) CREATED IN CHRIST. I.e., reborn through baptism.

4:30: (XVIII.21–22) ON THE DAY OF REDEMPTION. I.e., on the day of baptism.

The fifth teaching on baptism derives from Jerome, who polemically references the Valentinians:

205 Cf. Wiley, 61.

Eph 4:5 (XIII.5–6) ONE BAPTISM. Although it is given under three persons; and this against the Valentinians, who say there are two baptisms.

Although the historical reference may have been lost on Sedulius' readers, dismissing the need for multiple baptisms may have proved necessary in the Carolingian world, where pagan and Gnostic teachings survived and confusion over basic Christian practices was rampant.

## 5.2 Jewish-Christian Relations

The Jews enjoyed a period of relative peace under the reigns of Charlemagne, Louis the Pious and even Charles the Bald, who ruled over Liège where Sedulius lived and worked.<sup>206</sup> Nonetheless during the reign of these rulers certain sources and events manifested anti-Semitic opinions and agendas. While the secular rulers promulgated seemingly pro-Jewish legislation, the Church's policy promoted the Theodosian Code and "received its classical formulation by Pope Gregory I."<sup>207</sup>

Despite this seeming period of peace for Jewish-Christian relations, some historians have asserted that there existed certain signals of the pending persecutions of the later Crusades.<sup>208</sup> In an historiographical essay, D. Malkiel criticized historians largely contemporary to and post World War II for their teleological interpretations of Jewish-Christian relations in Europe from 840–1096.<sup>209</sup> Malkiel argues against their suggestion that certain landmark events or sources prior to the First Crusade were "sign-posts of destruction."<sup>210</sup> Some of the typical sources used to indicate anti-Jewish activity are Bishop Agobard of Lyon (ca. 779–840), his successor Amulo (Archbishop of Lyons 841, died 852), various church councils – most notably the Meaux-Paris (846) and the annals of Saint Bertin, among others.<sup>211</sup> As Bachrach and then Malkiel demonstrate, these are sources and events of isolated influence, whose veracity in reporting historical details is sometimes considered exaggerated or even dubious; nonetheless, they do reflect a genuine concern among ecclesiastical figures regarding proselytizing by Jews.<sup>212</sup> Bachrach notes, "...it is not surprising

206 Cf. Flannery, 80–88; Glick, 43–59; Bachrach, 104–119; Cutler and Cutler, 88.

207 Flannery, 88.

208 This is the departure point for Malkiel's summative essay, 55–83.

209 Malkiel, 55–83.

210 Malkiel, 55.

211 Bachrach, 114–116; Malkiel, 61. The annals of Saint Bertin are anti-Jewish reports written either by Bishop Prudence of Troyes, 835–861, or Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims, 861–882. The latter's known anti-Jewish activities make him the more probable author.

212 Cf. Glick, 32; Flannery, 88; Bachrach, 132.

that the thrust of conciliar legislation was aimed at protecting Christians from Jewish missionary activity and at eliminating Judaizing and Jewish customs followed by Christians.”<sup>213</sup>

Malkiel’s argument that the typical sources (specifically those he highlights in his article) do not reveal an undercurrent of anti-Semitism, which led to a climax of persecution endured in the First Crusade, is a valid claim and worthy of note; however, he does not address the apparently general consensus that both secular and Church leaders were concerned with proselytizing by Jews. Malkiel admittedly only evaluates the above typical sources,<sup>214</sup> so I here offer Sedulius (specifically and only in reference to the Prologue and commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians within his *Collectaneum*) as new data.

Sedulius, as an ecclesiastical witness in the Carolingian context within the realm of Charles the Bald, working with patristic authorities mixed with his own exegesis, accords the Jews a special status in the covenantal history of God’s salvific plan, and does not exhibit any anti-Judaism language which may correlate with anti-Semitic thought. The listed exegesis below may, however, reveal a mild concern regarding proselytizing by the Jews, but such an interpretation certainly does not reflect overbearing attitudes and may only be so construed if the reader is unaware of the socio, political, and religious environs of the biblical text with which Sedulius worked. Such convictions are best interpreted as simply mirroring the concerns of Paul as demonstrated in the scriptural text.

The following table lists all of the explicit references to Jews and Judaism within Sedulius’ Prologue and commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians (ed. Frede):

Gal	Eph	Prologue
1:10 (I.44 Pel; I.47 Sed)	1:11 (I.90 Pel)	ln 26 Jer
1:13 (II.6–10 Pel)	1:12 (I.92 Pel)	ln 28 Jer
1:16 (II.27–28 Wb)	1:13 (I.97 Jer)	ln 150 AMst
1:19 (II.48 Eus/Ruf)	1:22 (II.58 Jer)	
2:2 (III.5, 7 Sed; III.6 Jer)	2:13 (VII.3 Pel)	
2:10 (III.22 Pel)	2:15 (VII.27 Jer)	
2:14 (III.17, 18, 21, 24–25 Sed)	3:1 (VIII.2 Pel)	

<sup>213</sup> Bachrach, 132.

<sup>214</sup> Malkiel, 57, notes, “No new data are offered; on the contrary, my point is that the familiar, traditional sources have yet to receive careful scrutiny in the context of the ‘harbinger’s thesis’.”



Gal	Eph	Prologue
2:15 (IIII.28–38 Clm 6235)	3:3 (VIII.8–9 Pel) pro	
3:4 (IIII.83 Jer)	3:9 (VIII.54 Pel)	
3:8 (IIII.102 Pel)		
3:26 (VI.21 Aug)		
3:28 (VI.23 Pel)		
4:1 (VII.4 Aug)		
4:4 (VII.17 Pel)		
4:24 (VII.106 Pel)		
4:25 (VII.114 Wb)		
4:26 (VII.127 Pel; VII.133 CAr)		
6:1 (VIII.114 Jer)		
6:12 (XI.26 Sed; XI.27 Sed)		
6:13 (XI.29 Pel)		

Per the historical context of Galatians and Ephesians, and even the Prologue which provides an introduction to Paul and his writings, these instances reflect a varied portrayal of Jews and Judaism. There are a number of references in which Sedulius affirms Judaism as a blessed nation with which God has a covenantal relationship, i. e., Gal 3:8, 4:26 and Eph 2:13. Gal 3:26 asserts the equality of both Jews and Gentiles, as does Eph 2:15, 3:1, 3:3 and 3:9. Gal 6:12 highlights the Jews as the ones persecuting Paul, but this reference, as with the others denoting the Jews' blessed status and equality with Gentiles, reflects Paul's own concerns as revealed in the scriptural text.

One implicit reference to Jews and Judaism, which occurs in Gal 3:3, is a strong statement about the foolishness of turning from Christianity to Judaism. This provocative remark, which may be construed to reflect Sedulius' concern about proselytizing by Jews, is also a textually based comment – a notion suggested even by the Anchor Bible Series, which is a joint collaboration by Jews and Christians alike.<sup>215</sup>

If there was a growing adumbration of anti-Semitism which foreshadowed the persecution of the Jews in the First Crusade, it seems likely that Sedulius' exegesis would have reflected as much. Sedulius' *Collectaneum*, as repeatedly asserted throughout this project, was likely intended for pedagogical purposes

<sup>215</sup> Martyn, 282–289.

and therefore would have served as an ideal medium to plant seeds of anti-Semitic thought among fellow clergy; but it did not. While further evidence may surface to the contrary within other writers of the same time, it is safe to conclude that there are no indications from the instances listed above that Sedulius employed anti-Semitic thought within his Prologue or commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians. This conclusion does not in the end differ much from Heil's, who provides a study of ninth century Pauline exegetes, nevertheless some of his arguments require revision.

Heil initially claims that Sedulius' commentary for Gal 1:10 appears especially anti-Jewish,

Undoubtedly [his] interpretation made sense to Carolingian Christians and his explanation followed his source verbatim, but it is this kind of arguing in short, non-discursive phrases and the slogan-like character of much of the commentary that makes Sedulius's text appear especially anti-Jewish.<sup>216</sup>

As discussed above in the chapters on Sedulius' Latinity and the pedagogical function of his *Collectaneum*, his "short, non-discursive phrases" are a product of his aims and the genre within which he is operating and therefore ought not to be anachronistically misinterpreted as indicating a "harshness of tone".<sup>217</sup> Secondly, Heil draws his examples from Sedulius' commentary on Galatians, a letter which has historically been interpreted as Paul's defense of his apostleship and against teachers who claim that the Galatians must follow Jewish practices.<sup>218</sup> Furthermore, Sedulius' comment in Gal 1:10 is not tangential to Paul's argument, but one that is congruent with it as understood by modern commentators.<sup>219</sup> This comment, thus, reflects more Sedulius' historical sensibilities, than any supposed anti-Semitism.

Heil ultimately softens his seemingly negative remarks by claiming that for Sedulius and most of the other Carolingian Pauline commentators, "the Jew" serves largely as a theological construct – the "hermeneutic" or "pneumatic Jew".<sup>220</sup> Thus, while Heil notes the harsh tone of Sedulius, he nonetheless concludes that he should not be regarded as anti-Semitic.<sup>221</sup>

---

216 Heil, 90.

217 Heil, 90.

218 Esler, 69–92; Longenecker, lxxxviii–xcix; Dunnam, 12–13.

219 Esler, 118–126; Longenecker, 18–19; Dunnam, 22–25.

220 Heil, 92–93.

221 Heil, 90–93.

### 5.3 The Trinity and the Divinity of Christ

Carolingian debates concerning the trinity may be traced to the famous double procession, or *filioque* clause represented in the Athanasian Creed and the amended Nicene Creed.<sup>222</sup> The phrase *filioque* was added to the Nicene Creed by the Third Council of Toledo in 589: *Credo in Spiritum Sanctum qui ex patre filioque procedit* (“I believe in the Holy Spirit who proceeds from the Father and Son”).<sup>223</sup> Though widely accepted in the West, it was not officially added to the liturgy until 1017, an adoption which ultimately led to the schism of 1054. The Eastern theologians did not accept the assertion that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father and the Son, but the Father alone, who they claimed is the principal being.<sup>224</sup> Alcuin wrote a polemical work defending the clause in 804,<sup>225</sup> and then shortly thereafter an event occurred further heightening the debate. In 808 Frankish monks, who were stationed in Jerusalem, sang the amended Nicene Creed, as was their custom and the accepted practice in the West.<sup>226</sup> When the Greeks heard the Frankish monks singing the Nicene Creed with the amended phrase *filioque*, they accused them of heresy. The monks then alerted Pope Leo III of the dispute and pointed to verse 23 of the Athanasian Creed in their defense, which reads: *Spiritus sanctus a Patre et Filio, non factus nec creatus nec genitus sed procedens* (“The Holy Spirit is from the Father and the Son, not made nor created nor begotten but proceeding.”).<sup>227</sup> The Pope then notified Charlemagne, who took decisive action by ordering Theodulf of Orleans to study the matter and report to the council at Aix-la-Chapelle (809). Theodulf, in true Carolingian fashion, created a *collectaneum* of the Latin Fathers’ writings in support of the emendation and read it to the Frankish bishops congressed at the council, which consequently confirmed the added clause.

The trinity and *filioque* clause, however, continued to be an issue of debate throughout the ninth century as writers such as Theodulf (d. 821; PL 105, 247; *De spiritu sancto*), Ratramnus of Corbie (d. 868; PL 121, 247; *C. Graec. oppos.*), and Aeneas of Paris (d. 870; PL 121, 701; *adversus Graecos*) all wrote polemical pieces in defense of the amended Nicene Creed.<sup>228</sup> None of the writings produced by the Latin church, however, changed the mind of Photius of

222 Haugh, 15.

223 Cf. Kelly, 1964, 22, 37, 58.

224 Haugh, 17–19.

225 Kelly, 1964, 45. Kelly notes Alcuin may not be the author of the polemical work mentioned (PL 101, 73; 82), *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, but if it is not by him then assuredly by one of his contemporaries.

226 I here follow Lagarde and Lagarde, 427–429.

227 Kelly (ed. and tr.), 1964, 19.

228 Kelly, 1964, 45.

Constantinople (if he even read them), who inveighed against the Latin church and subsequently caused a schism in 867. While the acceptance of the creed in the West into the mass was delayed for various reasons, its fundamental doctrine, first developed by Augustine,<sup>229</sup> was largely accepted. It is in the midst of this heated debate that Sedulius composed his *Collectaneum*.

The issue of the trinity and divinity of the Father and Son appears in the Galatians and Ephesians commentaries by Sedulius. Sedulius does not mince words when confirming the divinity of Christ. Commenting on Galatians 3:20 (“Now a mediator is not for one party only, whereas God is only one.”), Sedulius writes (530, III.190–193, Frede), DEUS AUTEM. *Id est, Christus. UNUS EST. Ideo hoc addidit, ne quis putaret Christum ab unitate divinae naturae divisum, quia mediatoris suscepisset officium.* In this verse Sedulius, receiving Pelagius,<sup>230</sup> states the matter plainly. The exposition, *Id est, Christus* directly confirms the divinity of Christ. However, it should be noted that Sedulius includes the explanatory phrase of God, *Id est, Christus*, on his own initiative. The phrase is implied in Pelagius’ exposition of the verse, which Sedulius quotes after *UNUS EST*. Pelagius’ exposition of Galatians 3:20 reads (322, 2–6, Souter),

Mediator autem unius non est. Unius partis, qui[a] inter deum et hominem medius fuit. Deus autem unus est. Hoc ideo addi[di]t ne quis putaret Christum ab unitate divinae naturae [penitus esse] divisum, quia mediatoris suscepisset officium.

The mediator however is not of one. Not of one part, because he was mediating between God and the human person. God however is one. He therefore added this lest anyone think that Christ has deep down been divided from the unity of divine nature, because he had taken on the duty of the mediator.

Sedulius apparently notices that Pelagius substitutes Christ for God after the phrase *Deus autem unus est* to defend the divine relation of the Father and Son. Thus, Sedulius’ commentary reinforces this implication by inserting the phrase *Id est, Christus* directly after DEUS AUTEM, as seen above. Augustine’s exposition makes the same assertions, but in a lengthier explanation, and Augustine actually makes an explicit reference to the trinity. In his commentary on Galatians 3:19, Augustine likens Galatians 3:19–20 to 1 Timothy 2:5, which as Plumer notes becomes a “central Christological text”<sup>231</sup> for Augustine in his later writings (164–66, 4.4–7, Plumer ed. and tr.),

Mediatorem Jesum Christum secundum hominem dici ex illa eiusdem apostoli sententia fit planius, cum ait: Unus enim deus, unus et mediator dei et hominum homo Christus Jesus. ... Nam si filius dei in naturali aequalitate patris manere vellet

229 Kelly, 1964, 80–90.

230 I think Augustine also served as a source for this clause and Sedulius’ understanding of the verse, but it is Pelagius’ words he most closely follows.

231 Plumer, 165 n. 102.

nec se exinaniret formam servi accipiens, non esset mediator dei et hominum, quia ipsa trinitas unus deus est, eadem in tribus, patre et filio et spiritu sancto, deitatis aeternitate et aequalitate constante.

That Jesus Christ is called mediator according to his human nature is made clearer by the same Apostle when he says: [1Tim. 2:5] For there is one God, and there is one mediator between God and human beings, Jesus Christ, himself a human being. ... For if the Son of God had wished to remain in natural equality with the Father and had not emptied himself, taking the form of a slave [Phil. 2:7], he would not be the mediator between God and human beings, because the trinity itself is one God, with the same eternity and equality of deity remaining without change in three: Father, Son and Holy Spirit.

The thematic and verbal parallels as well as the sequence of argument displayed between Augustine's exposition and Pelagius' lead me to believe that Pelagius abbreviated Augustine's exposition. Sedulius then, aware of both commentaries, abbreviated Pelagius', but with a mind toward both in his simple phrase *Id est, Christus*, since his custom is to provide a curtailed synopsis without stripping the theological import.

The second portion of Sedulius' exposition of this verse, which comes after UNUS EST, is a nearly exact quote from Pelagius and directly addresses the divine nature of Christ and his unity with God, thus confirming Augustine's developed theology of the trinity, as revealed both in his commentary on Galatians and in his other writings.<sup>232</sup>

Sedulius' commentary on Ephesians also addresses trinitarian issues and the divinity of Christ, most evidently at Ephesians 4:6 ("One God and Father of all who is over all and through all and in all."). This verse proves an interesting study of Sedulius' choices in selection and reception, and ultimately, of his doctrinal agenda, as he is faced with two very different expositions of the verse as presented in Pelagius' and Jerome's commentaries, both of which Sedulius pervasively uses throughout his *Collectaneum*.

Pelagius writes for Ephesians 4:6 (363, 9–13, Souter),

Unus deus et pater omnium. Etiam eorum qui ex gentibus crediderunt. Qui super omnes et per omnia et in omnibus nobis. Super omnes virtutes ut [omni]potens, per omnia opera sua qui[a] immensus, in omnibus Christianis secundum sanctificationem qua habitare dignatur.

One God and Father of all. Even of those who out of the gentiles believed. Who is over all people and through all things and among us all. Over all powers as all powerful, through all his own works because he is immense, among all Christians, according to sanctification, through which he deigns to live among them.

232 Many scholars cite Augustine as the original developer of trinitarian thought for the Latin church. See Kelly, 1964, 90, and more recently Ayres' forthcoming work, *Augustine and the Trinity*.

This exposition by Pelagius highlights the omnipotent and salvific power of God. The important matter to note here is how Pelagius understands the prepositions. He takes them to signify various attributes of the one God and Father, but does not extend to them any trinitarian meaning.

Jerome, however, does suggest that the three prepositions denote the three persons of the trinity. Jerome writes in his commentary on Ephesians 4:6 (PL 26, col. 0497B),

sic aestimant esse referendum, ut super omnia Pater sit, quia auctor est omnium: per omnes, Filius, quia per Filium creata sunt omnia: in omnibus, Spiritus sanctus, ipse enim credentibus datur, et templum sumus Spiritus sancti: et Pater et Filius habitant in nobis.

Some think the words, ‘Over all and through all and in all,’ refer to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit in such a way that the Father is over all things ‘because he is the author of all things,’ the Son is through all because all things have been created through the Son, and the Holy Spirit is ‘in all’ for he is given to believers, and we are the temple of the Holy Spirit, and the Father and the Son dwell in us.<sup>233</sup>

Jerome continues his exposition of this verse by offering alternative interpretations; however, it is the above portion which Sedulius edits and inserts for his *Collectaneum*. The force of relating the three prepositions to the three persons of the trinity is to equate them to the “One God and Father of all”, which is the preceding clause in verse six. While Jerome gives many possible interpretations, including one similar to Pelagius’, Sedulius only provides the latter by Jerome and omits his qualifying phrase *sic aestimant esse referendum...* (“Thus some think the words refer...”). Thus, Sedulius’ entry for Eph 4:6 reads (579, XIII.7–10, Frede),

QUI SUPER OMNES EST. Super omnia Pater, quia auctor est omnium; per omnes Filius, quia per ipsum creata sunt; in omnibus Spiritus sanctus. Ipse enim credentibus datur et templum eius sumus.

The omission of Jerome’s qualifying phrase and thus Sedulius’ choice to provide only this interpretation reveal a mind inclined towards a certain doctrinal agenda, i.e., affirming the western principles regarding the trinity. The relevance of this reading, in connection with the debate discussed above, is how these prepositions define the role of each figure and also ultimately how this reading presumes a unified ontological relationship between the three persons in reference to the one God and Father.

These two examples taken from Sedulius’ *Collectaneum* reveal that Sedulius not only has an understanding of the important theological categories regarding the trinity, but also of the broader ecclesiastical issues at stake. Ultimately, his selection and reception of Jerome, Augustine, and Pelagius demonstrate an

233 Heine (tr.), 171.

active attempt at furthering the western ideals of the trinity at a time when East and West sharply disagreed regarding this profound, and divisive, issue.

## 6 Studies in Reception

### 6.1 Sources

English readers interested in the theological scholarship of Sedulius Scottus, emanating from both a Carolingian and Hibernian setting, may locate the value of Sedulius' Prologue and his commentaries of Galatians and Ephesians in their reception of older formative religious writers like Jerome, Augustine, Pelagius, et al. A study of Sedulius Scottus' *Collectaneum* is essentially a study in reception. The selection, the reframing of arguments, the editing, and the occasional original comment are all features which one can highlight as the achievements of both Sedulius and the libraries with which he worked, but, without the sources the *Collectaneum* by definition does not exist. Therefore, a reception study of Jerome, Augustine, and Pelagius – Sedulius' three main sources for the Prologue, Galatians, and Ephesians – proves to be an integral component of an overall understanding of Sedulius' work. Before examining the reception of Jerome, Augustine, and Pelagius, I will 1) offer some preliminary remarks about Sedulius' range of sources, 2) suggest improvements upon Frede's *apparatus fontium*, and 3) explain Sedulius' method of citation.

Frede notes ten different authors that Sedulius draws from for the Galatians and Ephesians commentaries and three more in the Prologue who are not used in those commentaries.<sup>234</sup> The authors range from Origen (185–ca. 254; via Rufinus) to Isidore (ca. 560–636). Some authors, like Isidore, Eusebius, and Boethius are rarely used, while others such as Jerome, Augustine, and Pelagius are employed quite frequently. It is the latter three authors whose reception will be studied more closely in the following sections. Also, in the following reception study, it must be remembered that Sedulius' *Collectaneum* is of a particular type, and his reception practices should not be confused with other theological *collectanea*<sup>235</sup> or even *sententiae* (such as Isidore's or even Peter Lombard's, to name two prominent medieval examples).<sup>236</sup> Similar to theological *collectanea* or *sententiae*, Sedulius uses a wide range of sources, which is a testament to the Carolingian libraries of the Rhineland and Sedulius'

<sup>234</sup> I tabulated these numbers from the footnotes in Frede's critical text (1997) of the Prologue and commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians.

<sup>235</sup> See pp. 8–11 above for the general overview and development of *collectanea*.

<sup>236</sup> Rosemann, 17–19.

reputation and mobility as a scholar;<sup>237</sup> however, Sedulius draws mostly from commentarial works for his exegetical *Collectaneum*. As tables 1 and 2 demonstrate,<sup>238</sup> Sedulius does draw from other genres of work, but again, the majority of content derives from commentaries. For this reason, the nature of exegetical *collectanea* is different from *collectanea* on certain theological issues. The latter have an agenda of specific theological purpose, whereas Sedulius' agenda is to draw out the best exegesis (from the sources he has available) for each verse. Thus Sedulius' *Collectaneum* mirrors early Latin commentators in that they lacked a systematic theological approach and instead sought to explain words or phrases of the biblical text, verse by verse. On this matter, it is helpful to note Jerome's defense against allegations of being an Origenist. Jerome claimed to admire Origen's exegesis, but maintained that his admiration did not extend to Origen's doctrines.<sup>239</sup> Implicit in this defense is an important distinction in early biblical commentators between biblical exegesis and theological doctrines. Only occasionally with the early biblical commentators, and subsequently Sedulius, are larger theological issues drawn out within their exegesis. Nonetheless, one can, through Sedulius' editing of certain key passages (which I will demonstrate below), detect his theological tendencies on certain issues.

*i) Frede's Apparatus Fontium*

Frede's *apparatus fontium* is both thorough and accurate; however, occasionally I have revised or amended his work. Nowhere have I found Frede's attribution to be wrong; however, newer editions of some of the sources have become available since the publication of his text (1997): e. g., he sites the PL version of Jerome's commentary on Galatians, but in 2006 the CC published a critical edition of that work (vol. 77 A edited by Giacomo Raspanti). Therefore, my source citations throughout these reception studies refer to the standard critical text (in the case of Jerome – the CC text) and not the PL. For all of the citations of Pelagius' commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians I have followed Frede's practice of referring to Souter's critical text by giving the page number then the line.

Regarding the unattributed lines in Frede's edition, I entered the text into the PL, TLL and CLCLT databases. This practice did not reveal any new findings; however, I did on occasion, independent of the databases, find sources for some of the unattributed lines. I accept the remaining unattributed lines as

237 See pp. 1–2 above where I discuss Sedulius' reputation among his peers and what Traube and later scholars call "The circle of Sedulius."

238 See p. IX–X above.

239 Cf. Rees, 6–7; Hieronymus, *Apologia adversus libros Rufini* I, 11–17 (PL 23, 397–492).



Sedulius' own, since it is customary for biblical *collectanea* of this time to contain some original exegesis.

I have three improvements to offer upon Frede's *apparatus fontium*:

1) Gal 1:1–2 (I.18–21) deriving from Augustine's *exp. Gal. 2.6*:

(Aug.) ideo enim cum dixisset: et deum patrem, addidit: qui suscitauit illum a mortuis, ut etiam ex hoc modo breuiter iam a clarificato missum se esse commemoraret. Gratia vobis et pax a deo patre et domino Iesu Christo. Gratia dei est, qua nobis donantur peccata....

(Sed.) QVI SVSCITAVIT EVM A MORTVIS. Ideo commemorat Deum Patrem qui suscitauit eum a mortuis, ut per hunc uirtutem sui apostolatus commendat, dum ab ipso Patre missus est. GRATIA VOBIS. Qua gratis nobis donantur peccata.

Lines 18–20 may be more aptly described as an influence, but the key words and ideas in Augustine's passage are found in Sedulius', and the link is strengthened by the direct quote from Augustine in the subsequent verse and line (Gal 1:2, I.21). It is possible that Frede overlooked these verses in Augustine's commentary as a source for Sedulius, but it is more likely that he deemed the lexical links as too loose a connection based upon the pattern of Sedulius' reception elsewhere. If lines 18–20 are an instance of Sedulius receiving Augustine and not merely a case of Augustine broadly influencing Sedulius, then it serves as one of the more highly edited selections of Augustine by Sedulius; but line 21 assuredly derives from Augustine and is near verbatim per usual.

2) Gal 3:23 (VI.7–8) deriving from Augustine's *exp. Gal. 26.8*:

(Aug.) conclusio enim eorum erat timor unius dei.

(Sed.) CONCLUSI. Id est, timore unius Dei.

3) Gal 6:14 (XI.34–36) deriving from Augustine's *exp. Gal. 62.8*:

(Aug.) Mundus mihi crucifixus est, ait, ut me non teneat et: ego mundo, ut eum non teneam, id est ut neque mundus mihi nocere possit neque ego de mundo aliquid cupiam.

(Sed.) MVNDVS CRVCIFIXVS EST. Id est, ut me non teneat. ET EGO MVNDO. Vt eum quasi mortuus non teneam neque concupiscam.

Regarding example three, Sedulius' line 34 seems to be a clear borrowing as does the beginning of line 35. Sedulius' rendering of Augustine's final phrase, *id est ut neque mundus mihi nocere possit neque ego de mundo aliquid cupiam* into *neque concupiscam* is a typical maneuver by Sedulius for the purposes of abbreviating and simplifying the content within his *Collectaneum*.

## ii) Method of Citation

Sedulius intratextually cites seven names of biblical scholars and commentators within the Prologue and commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians, but he never mentions Pelagius, whom he copies most.<sup>240</sup> Sedulius may refrain from mentioning Pelagius, despite summarily using him as a source, because Pelagius was not in good standing with the Church and mentioning his name could have devalued Sedulius' work. This reason is not completely satisfactory, however, since Sedulius mentions Origen three times within the text of the Prologue.<sup>241</sup> Rather, the reason is likely connected to Sedulius' method in composing his *Collectaneum*. The nature of an exegetical *collectaneum* on the Pauline epistles dictates that Sedulius will likely draw from many exegetical works on the Pauline epistles, as he does. Thus, the citations of authors or works are actually the exceptions. All of the explicitly cited authors or works within Sedulius' commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians fit into two categories: either the cited material is merely retained in Sedulius' borrowing of another source as occurs with his citation of Eusebius and Origen via Rufinus and Aquila via Jerome; or, the author or work employed is exceptional. For example, Sedulius' entry for Eph 2:15 is expected to derive from some other commentary on Ephesians 2:15. However, for that verse Sedulius unexpectedly draws from Jerome's commentary on Habakkuk, so he alerts the reader by writing, "[l]ikewise in the exposition of Habakkuk". Similarly, for Eph 4:13, Sedulius draws from Augustine's *civ.*, and therefore cites that work before quoting from it. Therefore, since all of Sedulius' borrowings of Pelagius within Galatians or Ephesians come from Pelagius' commentaries on Galatians or Ephesians, then the use of Pelagius is never exceptional and does not warrant an explicit citation.

## 6.2 Introduction to the Reception of Jerome, Augustine, and Pelagius

Though the commentaries contain very little of Sedulius' own scholarship, his learning and creativity are revealed through his selection of others.<sup>242</sup> In order to appreciate the faculties and editorial skill of Sedulius as revealed in the reception of Jerome, Augustine, and Pelagius, it is first necessary to briefly note certain details concerning their lives, works, and standing within the church as they have a storied and interwoven past.

240 The authors mentioned by name are Jerome (Prologue 19, 35, 45; Gal 2:15), Ambrose (Prologue 57; Gal 4:25), Origen (Prologue 152), Augustine (Prologue 200; Gal 2:15; Eph 4:13), Clement "the disciple of Peter" (Prologue 85), Eusebius (Gal 1:19), and Aquila (Eph 4:28).

241 Prologue 152–170 (7–8, Frede).

242 My own studies affirm this opinion, which is also held by Frede, 1997, 37\*.

Jerome, who wrote commentaries on Philemon, Galatians, Ephesians, and Titus (in that order) sometime around 386–388, was the first of the three to compose commentaries on the Pauline letters.<sup>243</sup> While dissenters as to Jerome's effectiveness and utility within the Latin tradition of theology exist, his attention to historical, archaeological and especially linguistic issues in exposition remain as his renowned strengths.<sup>244</sup>

Augustine then, with Jerome and others<sup>245</sup> as his predecessors, wrote his commentary on Galatians between the writing of his two seminal hermeneutical works *util. cred.* (ca. 391) and *doctr. chr.*, which was begun around 396–397 and completed in 427. Once Augustine had read Jerome's commentary on Galatians, and while he was composing his own commentary on the epistle, Augustine wrote to Jerome (ca. 394, *ep.* 28 in the Augustine corpus and *ep.* 56 in the Jerome corpus) concerning Jerome's exposition of the Peter and Paul confrontation mentioned in Galatians 2:14 ("But when I saw that they were not straightforward about the truth of the Gospel, I said to Cephas in the presence of all, 'If you being a Jew, live like the Gentiles and not like the Jews, how is it that you compel the Gentiles to live like Jews?'"). This letter was the first of many between the two men for the next ten years. Their correspondence contains florid complements and encouragements each to the other as well as points of disagreement on theological and doctrinal issues. Despite many of their differences, they were united in their fight against Pelagius. Their unity of mind on this matter is revealed in Jerome's dialogue *Against the Pelagians* written in 417, when he writes (III.19, tr. Fremantle),

That holy man and eloquent bishop Augustine not long ago wrote to Marcellinus... two treatises on infant baptism, in opposition to your heresy which maintains that infants are baptized not for remission of sins, but for admission to the kingdom of heaven, accordingly as it is written in the Gospel, ... He addressed a third... and recently a fourth to Hilary against this doctrine of yours, which is full of perversity. And he is said to have others on the anvil with special regard to you, which have not yet come to hand. Wherefore, I think I must abandon my task, for fear Horace's words may be thrown at me, 'Don't carry firewood into a forest.' For we must either say the same as he [Augustine] does, and that would be superfluous; or, if we wished to say something fresh, we should find our best points anticipated by that splendid genius.

Though von Campenhausen claims that "the modern reader must conclude with astonishment that Jerome had not the slightest understanding of the real issue in the controversy, and stood much nearer in his attitude in the matter to

---

243 Heine, 7.

244 Campenhausen, 180–181.

245 For a discussion of the influences on Augustine for the writing of his commentary on Galatians, cf. Plumer, 7–59.

Pelagius than to his alleged confederate Augustine!”<sup>246</sup> nonetheless Jerome himself believed that he was aligning with Augustine as revealed in the above excerpt and stood at odds with the Pelagians.

Pelagius was the last of these three to write his Pauline commentaries. Pelagius, like Jerome, is known as one of the Roman commentators, as there were a number of early Latin commentators who lived and wrote in Rome during the late fourth and early fifth centuries. Pelagius wrote his commentaries in Rome sometime between 405 and 410.<sup>247</sup> De Bruyn notes that Pelagius’ expositions of the Pauline letters were influenced by a wide range of commentators and writers such as Tertullian, Augustine, Eusebius via Rufinus, Jerome, et al.<sup>248</sup>

### 6.3 Reception of Jerome

This study is especially relevant in view of the recent surge in scholarship on both the life and *Rezeptionsgeschichte* of Jerome, which reveal a man of embattled personal relationships alongside a long history of critical onlookers. His once close friend, Rufinus, accused him of heresy. Augustine, perhaps the most famous of his contemporaries, often vigorously disagreed with him. Luther too offers scathing remarks about Jerome and modern scholars are rarely any gentler.<sup>249</sup> A recent publication, *Jerome of Stridon*, takes issue with a number of long standing presuppositions surrounding Jerome and even his reception. While this erudite collection of essays offers profound revisions of previous scholarship, it does not address the historical anomaly of Jerome’s sterling reputation within the Carolingian empire. At no point in history does Jerome enjoy a more unbridled appreciation of scholars than that which occurred in the Carolingian empire. The producers of the Vivian Bible (844–851), or “first Bible of Charles the Bald,”<sup>250</sup> included scenes from the life of Jerome alongside two New Testament scenes, two Old Testament scenes, scenes from the life of Paul, a picture of David playing the harp, and lastly a dedicatory scene of the Abbot Vivian giving the Bible to Charles the Bald.<sup>251</sup> Honoring Jerome amongst

246 Campenhausen, 169.

247 De Bruyn, 10–11.

248 De Bruyn, 2–7.

249 See Campenhausen, 129. There he writes “Alongside his brilliant qualities, the weaknesses of his character were always manifest. This was already seen by his contemporaries, and to this day his biographers have not found it easy to narrate his life without polemic or apologetic prejudice.” One biographer, Kelly, writes, “It is a pity that his vanity made him claim to be even more widely read than he was, and that his tendency to rush work made him slipshod and careless.” Kelly, 334.

250 Hinks, 112.

251 Cf. Hinks (above, note 1), 113.

actual characters of the Bible may seem surprising to modern readers, but as McNally claims, “By far the most influential book in the Middle Ages was the Bible, translated by St. Jerome into Latin and known throughout Europe as the *Vulgata Latina*.”<sup>252</sup> Jerome is often praised for his erudite translation of the Bible, but a study of Sedulius’ reception of Jerome should shed additional light on the enormous extent to which Jerome was valued as an expositor of the Bible at a time in which its study impacted virtually every area of life. I shall also contrast Sedulius’ reception of Jerome with that of Augustine and Pelagius.

Sedulius’ Prologue and commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians are ideal texts for studying the reception of Jerome. In the first place, Sedulius quotes Jerome, who names these two letters as two of the three that must particularly be read in a prefatory statement for his commentary on Ephesians.<sup>253</sup> Second, Jerome only wrote full commentaries on four Pauline letters: Philemon, Galatians, Ephesians and Titus. Therefore, in order to fully gauge the value of Jerome as an exegete within these selections of Sedulius’ work, it is imperative to examine the Pauline letters on which Jerome himself wrote commentaries.

#### *i) Reception of Jerome in the Prologue*

The introduction to Servius’ commentary on the *Aeneid* is likely the literary model for Sedulius’ Prologue, but the content mostly derives from various works of Jerome. Frede identifies six different works from Jerome which Sedulius uses as source material: 1) *Lives of Illustrious Men*, 2) the *Commentary on Daniel*, 3) the *Commentary on Philemon*, 4) the *Book of Hebraic Questions*, 5) the *Book of Names*, and 6) his *Epistle 49* to Pammachius. Sedulius explicitly cites Jerome seven times in the Prologue, and in fact almost one-third of the total lines are taken from, or are influenced by, Jerome’s works.<sup>254</sup> Out of the seven times that Sedulius explicitly mentions Jerome’s name in the text, three times Sedulius also gives the title of the work from which he is quoting. The seven different explicit quotations of Jerome can be divided into three categories of comments: linguistic (3), historical (3) and literary critical (1). There is only one section which Frede identifies as coming from Jerome in which Sedulius does not give attribution to Jerome in the text. I will now examine all seven citations, the one section where Jerome is not named in the text, but Frede has identified as deriving from Jerome, and another passage which I have discovered as emanating from Jerome.

After Sedulius introduced and listed the seven types of circumstance, he immediately turns to Jerome for information to use in each respective

<sup>252</sup> McNally, 7.

<sup>253</sup> See the introductory paragraph to Sedulius’ commentary on Ephesians, (8, 182–186, Frede).

<sup>254</sup> I calculated these figures using the footnotes in Frede’s critical text.

circumstance. The first circumstance is *quis*, i.e., the person, so in line 19 Sedulius begins his presentation of information and here uses Jerome as an historical authority (2, Frede), *Itaque Hieronimus de Paulo sic dicit*: (“Thus Jerome says about Paul the following:”). The next thirteen lines are a direct quote from Jerome’s *De viris illustribus* (*ill.*) and contain a mixture of scriptural and non-scriptural traditions. Jerome begins his biography of Paul by relating the scriptural materials, but then adds non-scriptural traditions for further information. Jerome differentiates between the two in his presentation of this material with the sentence, *Et quia in Actibus Apostolorum plenissime de eius conversatione scriptum est, hoc tantum dicam...* (“And because a most full account of his life has been written in the Acts of the Apostles, I only say this...”).<sup>255</sup> Sedulius omits this sentence, and thereby the distinction, and thus apparently presents all of the material on equal ground as known historical truths with the first words of line 32, *His praecognitis* (“these things being known”). This example reveals the extent to which he considered Scripture as historical truth, but equally the authority he grants to Jerome.

Sedulius then transitions by borrowing two lines from Ambrose<sup>256</sup>, which he introduces with the phrase, *ut quidam arbitrantur* (“as some think”). Then, in another concentrated block of twenty-one lines, Sedulius again quotes directly from Jerome. In this second section, Sedulius uses Jerome to establish a point contrary to what some think regarding the Apostle’s two names “Saul” and “Paul”. It is within this block of twenty-one lines that we find all three instances in which Sedulius includes the given title of Jerome’s work from which he is drawing his information. In line 35 Sedulius introduces the quote from Jerome by writing (2, Frede), *Quod omnino falsum esse Hieronimus<sup>257</sup> in expositione epistolae ad Philimonem Colosensem [sic] declarat his verbis dicens*: (“Jerome in his exposition of the letter to Philemon the Colossian, declares this to be completely wrong saying in these words:”). It is within this block of writing (35–44) that Sedulius reveals himself as a stringent copier of Jerome, when he retains whatever morphological form of Judea that Jerome uses. Thus, in line 39, Sedulius copies Jerome’s learned Hebrew form, *Juda*, and not the late Hellenistic form *Judea*, which is used in line 20 (*Judeae*), since that is how it appears in Jerome’s *ill.* 5, 3.

Then in line 45, after another two-line insertion from the work of Ambrose, Sedulius transitions into a different point about the names “Saul” and “Paul”

255 HI *ill.* 5.1–8 (80–84).

256 Sedulius names Ambrose in the text, but the work he uses as a source actually comes from the writer we now call Ambrosiaster, who wrote commentaries which were often wrongly attributed to Ambrose in their early circulation.

257 This unusual spelling of Jerome’s name occurs throughout Sedulius’ Prologue, with the exception of line 19, where Sedulius uses Hieronimus.

and again uses Jerome as the authority (3, Frede), *Sed notandum, ut Heronimus in tractatu Danielis ait*, (“but it must be noted, as Jerome says in his *Commentary Tractate on Daniel*”). By alerting the reader to the new source of Jerome which he is using, Sedulius provides an organizational feature which helps guide his reader as well as add continuity between the various materials from Jerome on the same subject. Furthermore, this passage reveals Sedulius as an astute editor of Jerome. The phrase *Paulus, inquit, a Paulo Seregio vocatur*<sup>258</sup> is not a direct quote from Jerome, but is a summary statement of about ten lines from Jerome’s commentary on Philemon. Sedulius’ employment of *vocatur* is justified by Jerome’s use of *diceretur*, which Sedulius copies as seen in line 54. Acts 13:7 reads that Saul “was summoned” by Seregius Paul, with the Greek using the participial phrase “ὁδτος προσκαλεσάμενος,” rendered as *hic accitis* in the Vulgate. Thus this tradition, that Paul was named after Seregius Paul, is perhaps just an assumption based upon Acts 13:9, which states for the first time that “Saul...is also Paul...,” and its contextual relationship with the Seregius Paulus story.<sup>259</sup> The third break comes again with a quote from Ambrose in line 56, but this time Sedulius cites Ambrose in the text after reminding the reader that the previous portion was from Jerome. Then in the following sentence Sedulius again, for the third and final time, explicitly names both Jerome as well as the given work from which he is quoting within the text (3, 56–62, Frede):

... et hoc secundum Heronimum. Ceterum secundum Ambrosium Saulus inquietudo sive temptatio, Paulus vero quietus interpretatur. Illud etiam non est omittendum, quod Benjamin prius Benoni, hoc est filius doloris mei nominatus est, ut Heronimus in libro Ebraicarum questionum ostendit, quoniam ipso nato Rachel mater defuncta est; propterea vero Jacob eum Benjamin, hoc est filium dexterae nominavit.

The above excerpt demonstrates Sedulius’ unhesitating affirmation of Jerome as a learned and qualified expert in biblical history and language. All five of the above instances of Sedulius citing Jerome could be categorized in terms of language or history. The sixth instance of Sedulius explicitly citing Jerome is no different.

In line 85, Sedulius defers to Jerome in the matter of which language Paul used in composing his letter to the Hebrews. Sedulius draws from Jerome’s *Lives of Illustrious Men*, particularly chapter 5, which discusses Saul, who became Paul the Apostle. In a gerundive denoting a mandate of high importance, Sedulius introduces the testimony of Jerome (4, 83–87, Frede),

Illud quoque sciendum quod apostolus has omnes epistolas praeter unam ad Ebreos Greco sermone Heronimo testante conscripserat atque, ut idem testatur, Clemens Petri apostoli discipulus sententias Pauli proprio sermone ordinavit atque ornavit.

258 Lines 49–50.

259 PL 26, 604B-C.

This quotation further reveals the extent to which Sedulius respects Jerome's claims in the matter of language and history. The authorship of Hebrews was continually contested throughout the history of the Church and there were advocates for and against Paul as the author. Jerome's own discussion on the matter is not as simple as Sedulius represents. Jerome covers various theories concerning Paul's authorship of Hebrews before revealing his own opinion. Jerome writes,

The epistle which is called the Epistle to the Hebrews is not considered his, on account of its difference from the others in style and language, but it is reckoned, either according to Tertullian to be the work of Barnabas, or according to others, to be by Luke the Evangelist or Clement afterwards bishop of the church at Rome, who, they say, arranged and adorned the ideas of Paul in his own language, though to be sure, since Paul was writing to Hebrews and was in disrepute among them he may have omitted his name from the salutation on this account. He being a Hebrew wrote Hebrew, that is his own tongue and most fluently while the things which were eloquently written in Hebrew were more eloquently turned into Greek and this is the reason why it seems to differ from other epistles of Paul.<sup>260</sup>

A comparison then of Jerome's discussion and Sedulius' version of the same passage shows Sedulius' affinity for brevity and simplicity. Sedulius does not include the wider debate concerning the issue, but rather is content with only providing the theory to which he subscribes, i. e., that Paul originally wrote the letter in Hebrew, but that Clement then translated it into Greek. Furthermore, lines 83–84 of Sedulius' Prologue actually originate not from Jerome's discussion of the letter to the Hebrews (*ill.* 5.10.84), but from the same section of *ill.* (5.1) that Sedulius copied in lines 19–31, though with some slight alterations. Sedulius added the apposition *Petri apostoli discipulus*. This demonstrates Sedulius' concern for detail and accuracy as Jerome took for granted that his reader would know he was referring to Saint Clement I or Pope Clement I, who is mentioned in Philippians 4:3, and not Clement of Alexandria (ca. 150–211/216). Sedulius obviously assumed that his readers, possibly less advanced students, might not be aware of the precise identity of the Clement mentioned.

The seventh explicit citation of Jerome references him not exclusively as an expert on language or history, but as a reader of Scripture. Sedulius takes a passage from Jerome's forty-ninth epistle, one to Pammachius, and in it reveals Jerome's prowess as a reviewer and critic of Paul in a literary manner.

Sed quis ignoret qualitatem seu modum apostolicae doctrinae sapienter et eloquenter profundeque esse digestum? Unde et Heronimus Paulum, inquit, apostolum proferam, quem quotienscumque lego videor mihi non verba audire sed tonitrua. Legite epistolas eius et maxime ad Romanos, ad Galathas, ad Effesios, in quibus totus in certamine positus est, et quocumque respexeris fulmina sunt. Heret

260 E. C. Richardson, *Lives of Illustrious Men*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ser., NPNF, 3, New York 1893, 363.



in causa, capit omne quod tetigerit, tergum vertit ut superet, fugam simulat ut occidat.<sup>261</sup>

Sedulius' use of this quote not only reflects his approval of Jerome's opinion, but of Jerome as an authoritative literary person himself. The review of Paul's writing is a powerful piece by Jerome, and Sedulius inserted it as the centerpiece for his discussion of the sixth type of circumstance, "the quality of the work."

There is another section which Frede identified as influenced by Jerome, but it is not cited by Sedulius within the text.<sup>262</sup> In lines 131–138 (6, Frede) Sedulius presents a series of definitions for the name places of each of the Pauline letters. What ensues is an erudite explanation of the meaning of these cities in the Latin tongue.

Ac ne ulla ignorantiae nubecula de obscuritate praefatorum nominum nascatur, placet singula propriis interpretationibus exponere: Romani sublimes sive tonantes interpretantur; Rome Grece, virtus Latine dicitur. Corinthus oritur ipse; Corinthii orientes ipsi. Galathia magna vel translatio; ergo Galathae magnifici vel translatores dicuntur. Ephesus voluntas eius sive consilium meum. Philippenses os lampadis. Colosenses concludentes vel consummantes. Tesalonicenses festinantes. Ebrei transitores. Timotheus beneficus. Titus quaerens sive bonum. Philemon mire donatus.

As Frede's notes indicate,<sup>263</sup> this section is compiled by Sedulius from multiple passages of Jerome's *Book of Names*. Sedulius uses portions ranging from chapters 148, 29–159, 7. This vast amount of material in Jerome's work is succinctly narrowed down to eight lines in Sedulius' Prologue. One reason why Sedulius did not cite the work as Jerome's in the text could be because of the massive amount of editing used to arrange it in the form as it appears. In the other cases where Sedulius cited Jerome in the text, and even in the few instances where he named only the work from which he was drawing, Sedulius never edited on this scale. A change to this degree is unprecedented in Sedulius' usage of Jerome as a source.

The discussion above concludes the eight passages that Frede lists as emanating from Jerome, but I have discovered a ninth example containing a thematic link as well as lexical parallels. Lines 75–83, which Frede presumed were Sedulius' own comments, begin with the line *Sed si quis quaerat quare*.... A similar question is posed in Jerome's prologue to the Pauline corpus, a work from which Sedulius heavily excerpts (lines 89–128 of Sedulius' Prologue are nearly verbatim from Jerome's prologue to the Pauline letters, lines 27–53); however, Sedulius asks why ten letters to eight churches, whereas Jerome is

261 Prologue, 8, 182–188, Frede.

262 Frede notes in the *apparatus fontium*, 6, that lines 131–138 of the Prologue are from various sections of Jerome's *Book of Names*.

263 See n. 262 above.

strictly concerned with why ten letters. Sedulius' rationale for providing an allegorical interpretation of numbers, *ut doctrinam Novi Testamenti a decalogo legis non discrepare ostenderet* ("so that he might show that the doctrine of the New Testament does not differ from the Decalogue of the law) mirrors Jerome's, *Ut ostenderet Novum non discrepare a Veteri Testamento...* ("So that he might show that the New Testament does not contradict the Old Testament..."). They are both seeking to harmonize the Old and New Testaments. Patristic sources, and particularly Jerome, often employed an allegorical interpretation of numbers, a practice the Irish often copied. Bischoff names the allegorical interpretation of numbers as one of the most common traits of Irish exegesis, a trait inherited from Jerome.<sup>264</sup> This example reveals Sedulius using Jerome not just for his linguistic and historical expertise, but as a model for hermeneutical practices.

Therefore in the Prologue, Sedulius used Jerome as an authority on issues of language and history, as an authoritative reader or reviewer of the Pauline epistles, and a model for harmonizing the two testaments. Sedulius never disagreed with Jerome or offered counter points to any of Jerome's claims. Also, Sedulius was not subtle about using Jerome, as every instance except two includes a citation of either name or work or both. It is evident that Jerome was a revered and celebrated scholar of the Bible at the time of Sedulius, as Jerome's influence dominates Sedulius' Prologue, a largely historical and linguistic introduction to the fourteen Pauline letters.

#### *ii) Reception of Jerome in Galatians and Ephesians*

Pelagius is the most used source in Sedulius' *Collectaneum*; however, a study of Sedulius' sources in Galatians and Ephesians requires a slight qualification.<sup>265</sup> Jerome is actually used more in the commentaries of Galatians and Ephesians than Pelagius. According to calculations from the footnotes of Frede's critical text, in Galatians there are 106 instances totaling 248 lines entailing Pelagius' comments and fifty-three instances totaling 149 lines which entail Jerome's comments. However, in Ephesians Jerome's contributions in the commentary are much more than Pelagius'. This proves to be quite important as Sedulius prefaces the commentary on Ephesians with the following assertion (550, lines 1–3, Frede), *Refert Scriptura testante Hieronimo, quod Paulus Ephesi triennio praedicaverit. Haec autem inter omnes Pauli epistolas vel maxime et verbis et sensu*

<sup>264</sup> Bischoff, 1991, 86.

<sup>265</sup> Sedulius may have relied more heavily on Pelagius in the other Pauline epistles because Pelagius is one of the few patristic commentators to have written a commentary for all of the Pauline letters. Augustine's only full commentary of a Pauline epistle is on Galatians, and as mentioned above, Jerome only wrote commentaries for four of the Pauline epistles.

*involuta est.* In Ephesians then, the “greatest” of all the letters of Paul, Pelagius’ contribution equals 111 instances totaling 260 lines while Jerome’s contribution equals 151 instances totaling 458 lines. For the commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians combined, Jerome’s contribution equals 204 instances totaling 607 lines of contribution, while Pelagius’ contribution equals 217 instances totaling only 508 lines. The number of separate instances is virtually the same; however, the overall contribution of lines favors Jerome by twenty percent.

As the numbers indicate, Sedulius’ reception of Jerome is widespread throughout Galatians and Ephesians. Jerome is most known for his work as a translator and expositor of Scripture, his advocacy of ascetic living, and battles with both friends and “heretics”, all of which are topics and characteristics reflected by Sedulius’ reception of Jerome in Galatians and Ephesians.

Jerome’s work as a translator is perhaps his most enduring contribution. Five times in Galatians and Ephesians, Sedulius refers to a translation matter in the Latin codices, Gal 2:5, 5:8, 5:9, 5:19, and Eph 1:10, and each instance locates its source in Jerome. In letter 57 to Pammachius (CSEL 88, 57.5.4–6), Jerome explains his style of translation:

et dum alienam imperitiam volunt coarguere, suam produunt. Ego enim non solum fateor, sed libera voce profiteor, me in interpretatione Graecorum, absque Scripturis sanctis, ubi et verborum ordo mysterium est, non verbum e verbo, sed sensum exprimere de sensu.

And while they intend to assail the ignorance of another, they publish their own. Indeed, I do not only confess, but publicly declare with a free voice that – in my interpretation of Greek writers, except for the Holy Scriptures, where even the order of words is a mystery – I translate not word for word, but meaning for meaning.

Jerome applies this translation principle to the interpretation of biblical words. Jerome wrote in his commentary on Ephesians 2:21 (PL 26, 0477C), *Et si imperitus sermone, non tamen scientia (I Cor. XI, 6), sensuum magis in eo quaeramus ordinem, quam verborum* (“And if one is ignorant in speech, not nevertheless in knowledge, let us seek in him more so the order of the meanings rather than just the words.”). Sedulius slightly adapted this line yet retained its meaning, while revealing a broader understanding of Jerome: (572, VIII.22–23, Frede), *Sensuum magis in apostolo quaerendus est ordo quam verborum.* (“In the Apostle, one must more search for the order of the meanings than of the words.”). This notion, as expressed by Sedulius receiving Jerome, corresponds to Jerome’s expressed approach to translation.

Therefore according to Jerome, providing a good translation of anything but Scripture implies a certain element of interpretation. Likewise, a good translation of Scripture is one that retains the order of words of the original language, which ultimately preserves the role of interpretation of the sacred texts for its readers. Hence, Jerome’s advice on how to read Scripture (as seen in the

commentary of Eph 2:21) is equivalent to how he claims to translate texts (which are not Scripture). Embedded in Jerome's two different approaches to translation is his high view of Scripture, which Sedulius preserves.

A high view of Scripture is likewise espoused in Sedulius' commentary on Gal 3:8, which again derives from Jerome. These verses also implicitly highlight the importance of a Bible expositor. Jerome wrote in his commentary (CC, 77 A, 76, 1–7),

PROVIDENS AUTEM SCRIPTURA QUIA EX FIDE IUSTIFICAT GENTES DEUS PRAENUNTIAVIT ABRAHAE QUIA "BENEDICENTUR IN TE OMNES GENTES." IGITUR QUI EX FIDE SUNT BENEDICENTUR CUM FIDELI ABRAHAM. Non quo ipsa Scriptura, atramentum videlicet et membranae (quae insensibiles sunt) possint futura praenoscerere, sed quo Spiritus Sanctus et sensus qui in litteris latet multis post saeculis ventura praedixerint.

SCRIPTURE, HOWEVER, FORESEEING THAT GOD JUSTIFIES THE GENTILES BY FAITH PREACHED TO ABRAHAM THAT "ALL THE NATIONS WILL BE BLESSED IN YOU." THEREFORE THE ONES WHO ARE BY FAITH WILL BE BLESSED WITH THE FAITHFUL ABRAHAM. Not that Scripture itself, that is black ink and parchment (which are senseless) are able to foreknow the future, but that the Holy Spirit and the sense which hides in the letters, have foretold what was about to come many centuries later.

Sedulius then takes this passage from Jerome and simplifies it to reduce the amount of lines yet retain its meaning, Gal 3:8 (525, IIII. 97–100, Frede):

PROVIDENS AUTEM SCRIPTURA. Non quo atramentum et membrana, quae insensuales sunt, possunt futura praenoscerere, sed quo Spritus sanctus et sensus, qui in littera latet, futura praedicit.

Denying the obvious literal interpretation of this verse allows Sedulius to indicate his understanding of Scripture and the implied importance of an interpreter who can unfold the "sense which hides in the letter."

Jerome was an ardent defender of chastity and virginity.<sup>266</sup> Sedulius too apparently valued chastity as evidenced in his poem 13 (verses 1–18), in which he describes sacred vestments, one of which is the girdle.<sup>267</sup> Thus, when the matter of impurity arises in Paul's letter to the Ephesians, it is no surprise that Sedulius neglects the work of his other known sources –Marius Victorinus (fl. 355), Ambrosiaster (fl. 366–384), Pelagius (ca. 354–420/440), and Cassiodorus (ca. 485–585) – all of whom wrote commentaries on Ephesians and pre-dated Sedulius, but do not contain an exegesis remotely similar to Jerome's.<sup>268</sup> In Eph 5:3, Sedulius copies Jerome's peculiarly detailed description

266 Cf. his *epistula XXII ad Eustochium and Adversus Jovinianum*.

267 CCCM 117 or Doyle, 115 for a translation.

268 Frede includes the expositions of 1–2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philemon, Colossians, 1–2 Thessalonians, 1–2 Timothy, Titust, Philemon under the sigla of CAR;

of impurity: ET OMNIS INMVNDITIA. *Titillatio carnis et fluxus seminis ex qualicumque attritu uentris* (“AND ALL IMPURITY. A tickling of the flesh and a flow of seed from whatsoever kind of rubbing of the stomach area.”). The other expositors either describe impurity as a sin symptomatic of something else or extend its application to the realm of thoughts, but all abstain from describing *inmunditia* (“impurity”) in such narrow physical terms. Even when Paul turns the topic to “empty words” in Eph 5:6, Sedulius again turns to Jerome by inserting twenty-five consecutive lines, which recall the extreme turpitude of sexual immorality through a graphic description:

Respondeat, quia stultiloquium et scurrilitas non eundem habeat reatum, quem fornicatio, inmunditia et auaritia, numquid non et turpitudinem cum tribus superioribus debuit nominare? Ad quod dicendum hic turpitudinem significare absconditam cogitationem, cum inflammatur sensus noster ad libidinem et carnis titillationibus anima ignita succenditur et nihilominus Dei timore in iudicio refrenatur.

Much of Jerome’s literary output was an attempt to thwart what he deemed as heretical doctrines. In Galatians 5:9 (“A little leaven leavens the whole lump of dough”), Sedulius shows the breadth of Jerome’s value not only as an expert in language but as one concerned with heresy and the proclamation of true doctrine. Sedulius whittles forty lines of Jerome’s exposition down to four. Not every point of Jerome’s is transferred, but the platitudes warning teachers of spreading a false doctrine, as well as the fact that there is a problem in the Latin codices are all related. Sedulius starts his exposition of Gal 5:9 by quoting from Pelagius, but seamlessly transitions into Jerome’s work beginning with the words *Parva scintilla moenia* (541, VIII.19–23, Frede):

MODICUM FERMENTUM reliqua. Ne quis diceret: ‘Cur omnes corripis, cum non omnes erraverunt?’ ostendit, quod modicum erroris fermentum totam possit ecclesiae massam corrumpere. Parva scintilla moenia, urbes, latissimos saltus regionesque consumit. Unius pecudis scabies totum maculat gregem. Ita doctrina perversa ab uno egrediens multos invadit auditores. Fermentat, non, ut male in Latinis codicibus, corrumpit.

The above excerpt also demonstrates the inclusive mentality of Sedulius. Jerome and Pelagius were sparring partners in the realm of doctrine, and in a verse warning teachers of spreading perverse doctrine, Sedulius includes the exposition of Pelagius immediately next to Jerome’s, who wrote an entire work consisting of three books which attacked Pelagius and accused him of heresy.

---

however, Frede in *Kirchenschriftsteller* (1995), or Gryson in *Repertoire general* (2007), vol 1, 375 notes that only the exposition on Romans is by Cassiodorus and the other expositions are by his pupils.

Jerome was not, however, treated as always standing in the right in his expositions. Galatians 2:11–14 is a passage with a long history of controversial interpretations, as is illustrated by Jerome’s reaction to Marius Victorinus’ exegesis and Augustine’s subsequent reaction to Jerome’s interpretation.<sup>269</sup> The basic point of controversy between Jerome and Augustine was whether or not Paul’s rebuke of Peter was a pretense or real. As Plumer argues, Jerome was seemingly attempting to protect the reputation of Peter, the first bishop of Antioch and then of Rome, and moreover was the rock on whom the Church is built (Matt. 16:18).<sup>270</sup> Augustine understood Jerome’s interpretation as making Paul into a liar and ultimately saw this as a dangerous precedent which would destroy the authority of Scripture, in that it sacrificed the veracity of Scripture for the sake of preserving the character of a person, namely Peter. Augustine proceeded to write to Jerome in what was the beginning of a long series of letters to discuss this matter along with other issues.<sup>271</sup> In letter 28.3.3, Augustine wrote: *mihi enim videtur exitiosissime credi aliquod in libris sanctis esse mendacium...* (“it seems to me extremely dangerous to believe that anything in the holy Scriptures is a lie...”).<sup>272</sup> Expositors subsequent to Jerome and Augustine often reflect the exegesis of one or the other. Thus the *Collectaneum* of Sedulius, who is a biblical scholar of high ecclesiastical, social, and political standing, serves as an interesting case study on a matter of grave dispute between two of the most important figures for Carolingian writers. As Gal 2:15 reveals, instead of choosing a side, Sedulius presents the core of each of their arguments. Sedulius in his own commentary sides with Augustine, but does not reproach Jerome for missing the point. Sedulius quotes Clm 6235 fol. 17r,b<sup>273</sup> to summarize the history of the problem between the two interpreters, and then ultimately agrees with Augustine by writing in the commentary for Gal 2:15 (521, IIII.28–32, Frede), *Hieronimus de hac questione dicit... Augustinus vero asserit...* (“Jerome says concerning this question... but Augustine asserts...”). It is a lengthy passage and is contained in the translations which ensue, but the key to be noted here is that Jerome, as he himself teaches in his commentary on Galatians 5:9, is held accountable by Sedulius when the latter identifies a false or bad interpretation of this passage and corrects it by presenting – or rather revealing via Augustine – a more satisfactory one. Thus, as exemplified in

269 Cf. Plumer, 41–53 for an in-depth account of various patristic interpretations of this passage with special emphasis on Jerome and Augustine’s disagreement.

270 Plumer, 45; Cf. Jerome, PL 26: 341C: *primum episcopum Antiochenae Ecclesiae Petrum fuisse accepimus, et Romam exinde translatum.*

271 For a discussion of the Jerome-Augustine correspondence, see *Letters of St Jerome*, tr. T.C. Lawler, 1963, 13–17.

272 Cf. Plumer, 48.

273 This codex is from the ninth century, containing Irish glosses from the eighth century; Cf. Frede, (above, note 5) 45\*–46\*.

Sedulius' treatment of this passage, his commentaries are truly a "collection" of authoritative exegesis. This purpose does not preclude him from making dogmatic points elsewhere. Nonetheless, as is typical of this genre and very much unlike patristic or even modern commentaries, Sedulius' work is not governed by a dogmatic or polemical agenda.

Overall, Jerome should be regarded as an esteemed and substantial contributor to Sedulius' Prologue and his commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians. Jerome was very popular with Carolingian expositors,<sup>274</sup> and Sedulius quite naturally also respected his work. Sedulius evidently valued Jerome both as a scholar and interpreter of the Bible and used his work extensively throughout the commentaries, but Jerome's most dominant influence is seen in the Prologue, where he is by far the most frequently used source. Sedulius' reception of Jerome is particularly significant when we consider how differently his use of Jerome is compared to his employment of Pelagius and Augustine. Jerome's lengthy discussions on historical matters and issues of language are often simplified and curtailed, whereas Sedulius predominantly uses Pelagius for his simple phrasing and lucid brevity. As argued below, Sedulius' usage of Jerome is also different from that of Augustine. While Jerome is used consistently throughout Galatians and Ephesians, since Jerome wrote commentaries on both of those letters, there is less exegetical work from Augustine in the *Collectaneum*; nonetheless, Sedulius does excerpt large portions from Augustine's non-commentary works. Such a heavy reliance on Jerome's linguistic and historical knowledge as well as Sedulius' use of Augustine implies a similar sentiment in Sedulius as expressed by Charlemagne in an anecdote related by Notker (ca. 840–912),<sup>275</sup> a near contemporary biographer of Charlemagne. In this anecdote, Charlemagne says to Alcuin, "[i]f only I could have twelve such churchmen as learned and as well taught in all human wisdom as were Jerome and Augustine!" Alcuin then replied, "[t]he Creator of heaven and earth Himself has very few scholars like these men, and yet you hope for twelve!"<sup>276</sup>

This section specifically examined selections of Sedulius' *Collectaneum*, and, it is hoped, has demonstrated how Jerome served as a critical *fons* of information pertinent to the cultural context and aims of the Carolingian empire. Perhaps because the empire was so linguistically diverse and complex, Carolingian

274 Laistner, 239–245.

275 Notker wrote *Gesta Karoli* around 884 through the help of one source, Adabert. See H. Fichtenau, 28, n.4.

276 *O utinam haberem duodecim clericos tales, ita doctos et omni sapientia tam perfecte instructos, ut fuerunt Hieronimus et Augustinus! ... Creator coeli et terrae similes illis plures non habuit et tu vis habere duodecim!* Notker the Stammerer, *De Carolo Magno*, 1.9. "Monumenta Carolina", *Bibliotheca Rerum Germanicarum* v. 4, ed. Philipp Jaffé, Berlin: 1867.

scholars were able to appreciate Jerome's work as a translator to an even greater degree than their predecessors and even successors.<sup>277</sup> This reasoning could also explain why Jerome's exegesis, which largely dealt with linguistic and historical issues, was so popular in the eighth and ninth centuries, a fact clearly evident in Sedulius' *Collectaneum*.<sup>278</sup>

#### 6.4 Reception of Augustine

Sedulius' use of Augustine is very different from that of Jerome or Pelagius, who were used pervasively throughout Galatians and Ephesians. The total usages of Jerome in Galatians and Ephesians equal 204 instances for 607 lines, and Pelagius' are similar at 217 instances for 508 lines.<sup>279</sup> As their instances are so numerous, a listing of each is not only too lengthy but also impractical. However, due to the nature of Sedulius' employment of Augustine (there are fewer occurrences but more lines per instance), a list of the usages throughout the Prologue, Galatians, and Ephesians will be both useful and expedient for our purposes.<sup>280</sup> I have placed the issue to which each usage pertains in parenthesis.

- Prologue, lines 200–229, *util. cred.* 5–8. (interpreting Scripture)
- \* Galatians 1:1, (I.18–21), *exp. Gal.* 2.6. (transmission of sin)
- Galatians 2:15, (III.32–36), *ep.* 40.3.<sup>281</sup> (Jewish element)
- Galatians 3:13, (III.115–136), *c. Faust.* 14.4;14.6. (humanity/divinity of Christ)
- \* Galatians 3:23, (VI.7–8), *exp. Gal.* 26.8. (Jewish element)
- Galatians 3:26, (VI.14–21), *exp. Gal.* 27.3–28.1. (Jewish element)
- Galatians 4:1, (VII.2–5), *exp. Gal.* 29.3. (Jewish element)

<sup>277</sup> Kaczynski, 1995, 177.

<sup>278</sup> See Kaczynski (above, n. 277), 177–178, and for a broader discussion as to the popularity of Jerome's exegesis in these centuries, see Laistner (above, n. 274), 239–245.

<sup>279</sup> An "instance" is the listing by Frede in his *apparatus fontium*. Also, these statistics are used in the chapter on the reception of Jerome as well. They are not exact, as my method was to count a whole line if even just a part of the line was sourced from Jerome, and the same holds true for Pelagius. Thus, as does occur, some lines were counted for each author, e.g., the following is Gal 1:1 (512, I.2, Frede), "*non ab humana praesumptione, ut illi dicunt. Hoc contra eos*,". From "*non*" to "*dicunt*" the source is Pelagius; however, the phrase "*Hoc contra eos*" comes from Jerome. Therefore, Gal 1:1 (I.2) counts as one line for each author.

<sup>280</sup> In the following list, ● denotes that the usage can be found in Frede's *apparatus fontium*, but \* means that Frede did not note the line(s) as coming from Augustine, but that I have.

<sup>281</sup> In Gal 2:15 (521, III.28–38, Frede), Sedulius is excerpting from Clm 6235 (a manuscript from the ninth century, containing Irish glosses from the eighth century; Frede, 45\* – 46\*) and not from Augustine directly, as Frede maintains.



- Galatians 4:4, (VII.16–17), *exp. Gal.* 30.4. (Jewish element)
- Galatians 4:5, (VII.19–20), *exp. Gal.* 30.6. (transmission of sin)
- Galatians 4:5, (VII.21–22), *exp. Gal.* 30.7. (transmission of sin)
- Galatians 4:9, (VII.27–35), *Gn. litt.* 4.9. (predestination)
- Galatians 4:10, (VII.42–48), *ench.* 79. (astrology)
- Galatians 4:14, (VII.62–65), *exp. Gal.* 37.4–5. (persecution of Paul)
- Galatians 4:16–17, (VII.72–75), *exp. Gal.* 37.7. (Jewish element)
- \* Galatians 6:14, (XI.34–36), *exp. Gal.* 62.8. (transmission of sin)
- Ephesians 1:9, (I.71–72), *praed. sanct.* 19 (PL 44, 974). (predestination)
- Ephesians 1:10, (I.84–88), *ench.* 62 (PL 40, 82). (predestination)
- Ephesians 2:8, (V.1–2), *ench.* 31 (PL 40, 66). (predestination)
- Ephesians 4:13, (XV.29–59), *civ.* 22.15.5–24; 22.18.17–21; 22.18.31–38. (humanity/divinity of Christ)
- Ephesians 4:24, (XVII.71–72), *trin.* 14.22. (transmission of sin)
- Ephesians 4:30, (4.4–17), *Gn. litt.* 4.9. (trinity)
- Ephesians 6:12, (XXX.5–6), *en. Ps.* 54.4.27. (transmission of sin)

The two exceptional matters with regard to the list above are the length of lines per use and the array of non-commentary works from which Sedulius drew. The average length per instance for Jerome is almost exactly 3 lines, and for Pelagius it is about 2.3 lines per instance. But for Augustine, 12 out of the 18 instances are 4 lines or more.

Throughout the commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians, Sedulius almost exclusively draws from commentaries. Augustine is one of the rare exceptions. In Galatians there are ten different authors from whom Sedulius draws.<sup>282</sup> Only one work from each author is used, except for Augustine, where Sedulius draws from five different works. The same pattern occurs in Ephesians, where Augustine is one of three authors from whom Sedulius uses more than one work, with Isidore<sup>283</sup> and Cassian<sup>284</sup> each having two works referenced.

These disparities point to an important fact about the reception of Augustine. Even though there is relatively little work in commentary form from Augustine on the Pauline epistles, his biblical exegesis in the doctrinal and theological works remained important to Sedulius. The verses in which Sedulius uses Augustine contain issues important in the time of Sedulius, such as: free will and predestination, transmission of sin, the trinity, the divinity of Christ,

282 This calculation does not include Sedulius himself; calculated from the *apparatus fontium* in Frede's critical edition.

283 Isidore of Seville (560–April 4, 636) served as Archbishop of Seville for over thirty years. His two works which Sedulius used were the *Etymologiae* and the *Sententiae*.

284 John Cassian (ca. 360–435) was a Latin theologian known for his mystical writings, whose two major theological works are both used by Sedulius, the *Institutiones* and the *Collationes*.

and Jewish-Christian relations.<sup>285</sup> All of the twenty-two instances listed above deal with one of these issues except for Gal 4:10 (“You observe days and months and seasons and years.”), where the Augustinian excerpt deals with astrology, also an important issue in both Augustine’s and Sedulius’ time, and Gal 4:14 (“and that which was a trial to you in my bodily condition you did not despise or loathe, but you received me as an angel of God, as Christ Jesus Himself.”), which discusses the Galatians’ reaction to the persecution of Paul. From this verse, Sedulius only takes issue with *et temptationem vestram*.

For the two longest instances, which are also the only two explicitly cited in the text, the thirty line quotation of Augustine’s *util. cred.* found in the Prologue (lines 200–229) and the thirty-one line quotation of Augustine’s *civ.* found at Eph 4:13 (XV.29–59), I have summarized a detailed analysis below. But here, I will offer some evaluations for each of the above listed instances that are not elsewhere discussed in this study.<sup>286</sup>

Ten of the twenty-two instances derive from Augustine’s *exp. Gal.*, and Sedulius’ pattern of reception for these selections is only slightly different than those deriving from other works. Augustine’s writing style in his commentary is occasionally less fluid than appears in his theological and polemical works, and therefore requires more editing by Sedulius to maintain a certain level of simplicity for his readers. The longest excerpt from Augustine’s *exp. Gal.* comes from Gal 3:13. Sedulius there draws from a total of two chapters 27.3–28.1 and only omits a parenthetical statement. In Plumer’s translation of *exp. Gal.*, he places the portion that Sedulius omits in parentheses. The other selections from Augustine’s *exp. Gal.* are shorter in length and are seemingly only edited for purposes of simplification. The quotations used in Gal 4:4 and 4:5, for example, are virtually verbatim; however, Sedulius simplifies Augustine’s writing in his selection for 4:1. There, Sedulius changes Augustine’s phrases, *id est ex ea parte, qua de Iudaeis congregatus est*, and *ex ea parte, qua de gentibus congregatus est* to *ex parte Iudaeorum*, and *ex parte gentium*, respectively.

The instances that derive from works other than Augustine’s *exp. Gal.* receive minimal editing, especially in comparison to the passages received from Jerome and Pelagius. The selections presented are quoted nearly verbatim, though Sedulius often skips chapters or makes large omissions from Augustine’s text. For example, in Gal 3:13, Sedulius selects three passages from *c. Faust.*, but he presents them as one continuous passage. Sedulius omitted Augustine’s polemical rhetoric and direct references to Faustus, but otherwise draws consecutively from 14.4–6. Similarly, his quotation of *Gn. Litt.* 4.9, which is

285 Cf. Bieler, 115; D. Malkiel, 55–63.

286 Thus, all twenty-two instances of Sedulius’ reception of Augustine are treated within this project; for instances not treated immediately below, see the sections in this study on the “Augustine and Pelagius dynamic” and “ecclesiastical and theological issues”.

found in Sedulius' commentary for Eph 4:30, receives few emendations. Sedulius there draws from consecutive lines in Augustine's work and only modifies the opening few words, which better situates the reader.

Sedulius does not often receive Augustine in his commentary on Ephesians, which may be attributed to the fact that Augustine did not write a commentary for that epistle. However, even in Sedulius' commentary for Galatians, a letter for which Augustine did produce a commentary, Augustine is still received demonstrably fewer times than either Jerome or Pelagius. In order to explain this discrepancy, it is beneficial to compare Augustine's content and composition within *exp. Gal.* with that of the commentaries by Jerome and Pelagius, which are used throughout. Pelagius' style and form are very similar to Sedulius' and the general style of biblical commentaries at Sedulius' time. Pelagius, typically, writes brief, lucid explanations, thus Sedulius adapts much of Pelagius' writing verbatim, especially since most of it is orthodox exegesis. Jerome, who is also used pervasively, is more verbose; however, Sedulius, like many of the Carolingian and Irish exegetes before and after him, tends to prefer exegetical comments regarding linguistic and historical issues, which are copious throughout Jerome's commentaries. It is only in the matters of great social and ecclesiastical import that we find the work of Augustine sourced by Sedulius, as discussed above. Partly because Augustine's comments in *exp. Gal.* are more verbose and in total lengthier than Pelagius' commentary and therefore less conducive to Sedulius' own style, and partly due to the lack of linguistic and historical elements, Sedulius does not draw from Augustine's *exp. Gal.* quite as often as he does from Jerome's or Pelagius' commentaries on that epistle. The disparity in the number of instances and average length per instance may further be explained by noting the type of works from which Sedulius was drawing. The non-commentary works of Augustine do not lend themselves to shorter, exegetical explanations like the commentaries of Pelagius or Jerome, but rather, contain a certain verbosity common in theological and polemical treatises.

Scholars often list Augustine among the numerous authors commonly used by Carolingian biblical exegetes,<sup>287</sup> but they do not mention the diversity of work represented, i. e., whether the works used are commentaries or theological treatises, or both.<sup>288</sup> It is not surprising to find that Sedulius used Augustine given Augustine's acknowledged status, by Carolingians, as one of the preeminent contributors to their thought. However, an analysis of the pattern

287 See Contreni, 1992, 85, 88; McKitterick, 1983, 150.

288 Sullivan's comment is typical (60), "Modern scholars all know well enough who, in the eyes of the Carolingians, represented that tradition: God's writ enshrined in Scripture; a select group of pagan Latin authors; a circle of late antique religious Fathers, including especially Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Boethius, Cassiodorus, Benedict of Nursia, Gregory the Great, and Isidore of Seville..."

of collection and reception of the various authors used throughout Sedulius' commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians reveals his reception of Augustine as exceptional.

Not only was Sedulius' selection of Augustinian materials exceptional, as much of it derived from works other than commentaries, but his use of it also reveals a heightened level of respect for Augustine's writings. A survey of each instance reveals that Sedulius rarely adds to or changes any words from Augustine's writing, and the few edits that do take place are often the omissions of a parenthetical statement or digression by Augustine. There is the occasional exception, such as Sedulius' use of the term *saeculum*, but the pattern of editorial deference remains throughout. Beyond the excerpted use of Augustine's materials, Sedulius' work betrays a deep, structural appreciation of Augustine's pattern of thinking. An examination of a methodological maneuver received from Augustine will not only demonstrate Sedulius' skill as an editor but his broad comprehension of Augustinian thought.

*i) The Model for a Methodological Maneuver*

Sedulius' reception of Augustine is not limited to the above list of instances. Victorinus' statement that all writers of academic disciplines have dealt with and embedded the seven circumstances into the precepts of their own work suggests that the employment of the seven circumstances in different disciplines was common. The methodological link, or precedent, for Sedulius' adaptation of the seven types of circumstance, which was previously employed by Servius and rhetoricians in a secular context but here re-applied in a scriptural context, was likely facilitated through Augustine. In book 4 of *doctr. chr.*, Augustine warns his readers not to expect an outlaying of the rules of rhetoric and to seek them from him neither in this work nor in any other by him (4.1.2).<sup>289</sup> Nonetheless, Augustine implicitly advocates the usage of the circumstances in *util. cred.*<sup>290</sup> and employs them in his analysis of the opening verses of Genesis in the *conf.*<sup>291</sup>

In a biblical context, Sedulius uses the seven types of circumstance as a template for situating the Pauline letters into their historical context and for establishing Paul as an authoritative teacher who is to be trusted. In that role, they align with the teachings of Augustine who advocates a hermeneutic of trust, at least in his work *util. cred.* Augustine's work *util. cred.* had an undeniable influence on Sedulius' Prologue as the ending is an extended, cited quotation from that work. Specifically, in *util. cred.* Augustine develops an argument for seeking out scholars and teachers who are sympathetic to the

289 See also Burton, 141–164 on Augustine's partial avoidance of pagan terminology after his conversion.

290 Augustinus, *util. cred.*, 6.13 and 6.14.

291 Augustinus, *conf.*, 11.9.11.

work(s) on which they lecture. The example Augustine uses is the grammarians who lecture on Virgil and expound upon the many questions regarding his life. The reference to the study of the life of Virgil is likely recalling the work of Donatus and Servius, whose commentaries would have been used by grammarians and teachers of that text. In chapter 13 he criticizes those teachers who wage war against the authors of a work. He calls them “foolish” and then names two circumstances: “why” and “what type.”

But do not those teachers seem to you the kind, who, in those matters which they do not understand, either why, or all-together what type, although similar to lowly things, nevertheless they are to the intelligent refined and divine, maligning them with a great force of speech and curses, think that they are accomplishing something, because the ignorant applaud them?<sup>292</sup>

After naming those two circumstances, Augustine discusses the *quis*, or in this instance the author. Concerning the author, Augustine argues that one ought not to seek a teacher who offers only praise for the author but shows, through those innumerable questions (*de illis eius quaestionibus innumerabilibus*) about which the *grammatici* are concerned, how the author erred and doted (*qui per eas illum errasse ac delirasse conaretur ostendere*).<sup>293</sup> Thus, if Sedulius followed Augustine’s advice, he would use those questions to raise even negative points about Paul, which he does. In the investigation of the first circumstance (lines 21–67), Sedulius reports how Paul (there called Saul) erred in his younger life as a persecutor of Christians. Furthermore, he applies a mystical interpretation combining the Hebrew text with information from the New Testament to claim that Paul is in fact a “son of sorrow”.<sup>294</sup>

Further influence from Augustine’s *util. cred.* may be revealed in the opening lines of the Prologue. Sedulius claims that before the Scriptures can be expounded, there is prior work to be done, i. e., one must draw out the seven types of circumstance. This statement mirrors the line of argument found in chapter 13 of *util. cred.* Augustine writes, “[f]irst it must be done with you, so that you do not hate those authors, next so that you may love them. This must be done in some other way rather than by expounding their sentences and

292 Augustinus, *util. cred.*, 6.13.3–6 (CSEL 25): *Sed nonne tibi tales videntur isti, qui ea quae non intellegunt, aut cur, aut omnino qualia sunt, quamve iacentibus similia, subtilia tamen intellegentibus atque diuina, magno impetu orationis maledictisque lacerantes, quia eis imperiti plaudunt, aliquid se proficere existimant?*

293 Augustinus, *util. cred.*, 13. The term *delirasse*, used here in the context of Virgil’s life, may be an allusion to Donatus’ *Vita*, where he writes that Virgil preferred boys, *libidinis in pueros pronioris* (“with regard to pleasure, he preferred boys”). If the latter is an allusion, this furthers the argument that Augustine also understands Donatus’ *Vita* as an employment of the seven circumstances.

294 Prologue 60–67 (3–4, Frede).

letters.”<sup>295</sup> The “some other way” is qualified in the lines that follow, where Augustine describes the questions that must first be answered about the author as the “innumerable ones” about which the *grammataci* are so often concerned. “Innumerable ones” is the same description given to the questions about the authors in both Augustine’s work on rhetoric (*infinita in qualitativibus personarum perspectio*)<sup>296</sup> and in Sedulius’ Prologue (*quae nunc per singula enumerare perlongum est*).<sup>297</sup> And as I demonstrated above, Augustine is not concerned only with that which surrounds the author, or *quis*, but those other things that the dissenting teachers know nothing about, such as matters pertaining to “why” it was written and “what type or kind” it is, etc.

Augustine’s implicit argument within *util. cred.* for the use of the seven circumstances with specific reference to the life of Virgil as the secular example was not likely lost on Sedulius, who was intimately familiar with Servius and *util. cred.* There is, however, another highly suggestive connection between Servius/Donatus, Sedulius, and Augustine. In Sedulius’ work, *Tractatus in Donati Artem Minorem*, he provides a rhetorical explanation of the seven circumstances. He mentions Donatus as the *operatrix*, but when defining *tempus*, the fifth circumstance, he writes: *Augustinus: tempus est aut memoria praeteritorum aut praesentis morula aut quidam intuitus et expectatio futurorum*. This definition is taken from *conf.* book 11, which is the larger context of Augustine’s employment of the seven circumstances. Sedulius’ knowledge of Augustine’s use of the circumstances is clear.

Before Augustine interprets the opening verses of Genesis in Book XII of the *conf.*, he first investigates the seven types of circumstance in Book IX.<sup>298</sup> Augustine begins Book IX by petitioning God for help on how to understand Scripture, and specifically, how he created the world as reported by Moses in Genesis. The petition lasts for three chapters and then beginning with chapter 4, Augustine systematically runs through the seven types of circumstance, though he gives them neither an introduction nor label. The “thing” or “deed” in this instance is the creation of the world and the “who” is God. This much is declared in the line *tu ergo, domine, fecisti ea [caelum et terram]*.<sup>299</sup> He then goes on to describe various qualities of both Creator and creation.

295 Augustinus, *util. cred.*, 6.13.14–16 (CSEL 25): *agendum enim te cum prius est. ut auctores ipsos non oderis, deinde ut ames; et hoc agendum quovis alio modo potius quam exponendis eorum sententiis et litteris.*

296 Augustinus, *De Rhetorica*, 8 (48, 10–11, Giomini).

297 Prologue 18 (2, Frede).

298 Norbert Fischer, *Confessiones II*, “Distentio animi”. Ein Symbol der Entflüchtigung des Zeitlichen”, in: N. Fischer/C. Mayer (eds), *Die Confessiones des Augustinus von Hippo* (Freiburg 1998), 489–552, does not address this issue.

299 Augustinus, *conf.*, 11.4.6.

The next two species of circumstance that he discusses are the “where” and “material” or means by which God created the world: *neque in universo mundo fecisti universum mundum, quia non erat, ubi fieret, antequam fieret, ut esset. ...ergo dixisti et facta sunt, atque in verbo tuo fecisti ea.*<sup>300</sup> The fifth species of circumstance that Augustine investigates is *quomodo*, how or in what manner it was done. The following lines distinguish the means from the mode for Augustine, *Sed quomodo dixisti? Numquid illo modo, quo facta est vox de nube dicens: Hic est filius meus dilectus?*<sup>301</sup> Hence the means by which the world was created was through the voice of God, but the mode was through the wisdom and intelligence of God, as is explained in the rest of the chapter. This is likely Sedulius’ model for explaining the difference between the *materia* and *modus* and suggests why he uses the adjectives “wise or foolish” as examples of attributes for the “why” species, when no other writers include such remarks in their treatment of the seven types of circumstance.<sup>302</sup>

Chapter seven is a continuation of describing the attributes of God’s voice and a transition into the sixth species of circumstance, “why”, as reflected in the opening line of chapter eight: *Cur, quaeso, domine deus meus?*<sup>303</sup> He answers this question with the sentence, *sic in evangelio per carnem ait, et hoc insonuit foris auribus hominum, ut crederetur et intus quaereretur, et inveniretur in aeterna veritate, ubi omnes discipulos bonus et solus magister docet.*<sup>304</sup> The answer to the “why” circumstance serves as a transition into chapter nine and his treatment of the last circumstance, the “when”. This circumstance and all the other quick answers to the aforementioned species of circumstance are recapitulated in the beginning of chapter nine. Augustine writes, *[i]n hoc principio fecisti, deus, caelum et terram, in verbo tuo in filio tuo, in virtute tua, in sapientia tua, in veritate tua, miro modo dicens et miro modo faciens.*<sup>305</sup>

Thus, in that line are the answers he gave to all seven types of circumstance: *[i]n hoc principio* is the “when”, *fecisti, deus* is the “who”, *caelum et terram* is the

300 Augustinus, *conf.*, 11.5.7: “You did not make the whole world in the whole world, because it was not there, where it was made, before it was made, so that it would be. ... Therefore you spoke and they were made, and in your word you made them.”

301 Augustinus, *conf.*, 11.6.8: “But how did you say it? For was it in the same way, by which the voice from the cloud was made, saying: This is my beloved son [Matt. 3:17]?”

302 See particularly pp. 31–32 above for my comments concerning lines 9–11 of Sedulius’ Prologue.

303 Augustinus, *conf.*, 11.8.1: “Why, I ask, O Lord my God?”

304 Augustinus, *conf.*, 11.8.5–6: “Thus in the Gospel he speaks through the flesh, and this sounds in the ears of men, so that it is believed and inwardly questioned, and it is discovered in eternal truth, where the good and only teacher instructs all the disciples.”

305 Augustinus, *conf.*, 11.9.1–2: “In this beginning, O God, you have made heaven and earth, in your word, in your son, in your power, in your wisdom, in your truth; marvelously speaking and marvelously making.”

“what”, *in verbo tuo in filio tuo* is the “material”,<sup>306</sup> *in virtute tua in sapientia tua* is the “manner”, and *in veritate tua* is the “why”. The “where” is denoted by his usage of the preposition *in* for all of those species of circumstance, because God is in all of those things, and only God existed before the creation of the world. Therefore the only “place” one could consider the creation as occurring is *in* Him. The order of treating the species of circumstance seemed to be dictated by the logic of Augustine’s arguments and not by some preset template; however, the order in which he summarized them was the same order in which he treated them. This is a practice which Cicero teaches and Sedulius likewise employs.<sup>307</sup>

After Augustine summarizes the seven types of circumstance in 11.9, he returns to some of the more abstract answers, namely those concerning time and eternity and discusses them at length until the close of book eleven. In book twelve he expositis Genesis 1:1–2. Thus, as Augustine teaches in *util. cred.* and as occurs in Sedulius’ Prologue, the seven types of circumstance presented in *conf.* 11.4.6–11.9.11 introduce Augustine’s biblical exegesis of Genesis 1:1–2, which begins in *conf.* 12.1.1. These connections between Sedulius, Augustine, and Servius and Donatus suggest that Sedulius understood his own presentation of the seven circumstances within his Prologue as a continuation of Augustine’s ecclesiastical deployment of this historically and secularly employed trope. Hence, Servius is Sedulius’ literary model as demonstrated above,<sup>308</sup> but Augustine facilitated Sedulius’ methodological maneuver.

#### *ii) Quotation of De Utilitate Credendi in Sedulius’ Prologue*

The purpose of this section is to examine how Sedulius uses, adapts, and edits his long quotation of Augustine within the Prologue. The quotation extends from line 200 through the close of the Prologue (229) and is taken from chapters 5–8 of Augustine’s *De Utilitate Credendi*. I will note the contexts and purposes of each writer before examining the quotation itself.

The context of Augustine’s writing is his attempt to introduce a methodology for interpreting the Old Testament contra the Manichees. Augustine mentions in his *Retractiones* (i.14) that he wrote *De Utilitate Credendi* (*util. cred.*) for a friend who had been deceived by the Manichees, and thus it serves

306 Note that Augustine equates the word used to create the world with the “Word which became flesh”, i. e., Jesus.

307 Concerning the presentation of the species of circumstance, Cicero stated that it was necessary to discuss them in the same order that they were introduced and uses this phrase at the end of that discussion (*De Inventione* 1.23.33), *ita ut ordo ipse postulat* (“thus as the order itself demands”). Sedulius, it must be noted, does indeed present the circumstances in the order in which he introduces them and even writes this as a transition into the sixth circumstance (Prologue, 174, 8, Frede), *nunc ordo postulat ut* (“now the order demands that”).

308 See pp. 11–12.



largely as a polemic against that group and simultaneously as an exhortation to his friend Honoratus first to believe in order to understand the Old Testament Scriptures and then, more broadly, to believe the Catholic faith.

The context of Sedulius' quotation of Augustine is Sedulius' Prologue to the commentaries of the corpus of Pauline letters. Whereas Augustine's argument for a proper fourfold hermeneutic as a way of interpreting the Bible is limited to the Old Testament, Sedulius uses Augustine's methodology as a general system for interpreting both Testaments – not just the Old.

Sedulius' Prologue consists of two parts; the first dealing with the seven types of circumstance, the other introducing the fourfold hermeneutic from Augustine's *util. cred.* The long quotation is inserted after the seven circumstances are "considered" and is somewhat abruptly situated as both a lead-in to the corpus of commentaries and as a conclusion to the Prologue.

Sedulius' editing and application of Augustine's work seems to serve three purposes: 1) he recognizes Augustine as an authority, 2) he universalizes Augustine's statements so that they might be applicable for his purposes, and 3) there are a) miscellaneous editorial curtailings which are assumed to be for length and b) specific adaptations for audience, as the given changes seem to reflect no other greater purpose.

There are technical and superficial edits and omissions of Augustine's text in Sedulius' quotation. Some changes of course represent only minor textual matters that indicate no substantive difference between the texts of Sedulius and Augustine, but others, which I will indicate below, are of a greater significance. The first sentence of the quotation is the most changed and also reveals Sedulius' attempts to universalize Augustine's statements for his own purposes.

From Augustine's *util. cred.* 3.5 (CSEL 25, 7, 26–27):

Omnis igitur Scriptura, quae Testamentum Vetus vocatur, diligenter eam nosse cupientibus quadrifariam traditur: secundum historiam, secundum aetiologiam, secundum analogiam, secundum allegoriam.

From Sedulius' Prologue (9, 201–202, Frede):

Omnis divina scriptura quadrifaria est hoc est historia aethimologia analogia allegoria.

Sedulius adds the descriptor *divina* to *Scriptura*. Here the term is a supplement to this particular sentence that serves to broaden Augustine's interpretative method to include the New Testament, but Augustine himself did describe *Scriptura* as "divine" four other times throughout the treatise.<sup>309</sup> By transposing it here, Sedulius also incorporates an Augustinian conviction about Scripture which helps to spiritualize his own writing. Sedulius also omits the explanatory

309 Three occurrences in 3.7 alone (CSEL 25): 1) *Scripturis divinis*, 2) *Scripturas divinas*, 3) *divinorum Librorum* (the "divine books" in this context is Scripture).

clause, “which is called the Old Testament”, as another means of broadening Augustine’s interpretative method.

Another significant omission in this sentence is the phrase *diligenter eam nosse cupientibus quadrifariam traditur*. The only word Sedulius retains from that phrase is *quadrifaria*; however, that phrase echoes a major theme of the treatise. Throughout *util. cred.*,<sup>310</sup> Augustine argues that one (*Honoratus* by name) ought to seek teachers of the Old Testament who *believe* its writings, as opposed to those who dismiss them or do not accept their teaching, such as the Manichees. Also key in this notion is the verb *traditur*, which expresses a strong sense of tradition, as we know the word, in a successive line of sympathetic teachers as outlined in Augustine’s examples in chapter 13. Though this omission does not necessarily reveal much of Sedulius’ own purposes, it does indicate that he is not here concerned with retaining Augustine’s context, which is that Scriptures are best learned from scholars who reverence their antiquity and divine origin. This omission reflects again his attempts to universalize Augustine’s interpretative method. The only other difference between the two opening sentences is how Sedulius spells the word *aetiology*: Augustine spells it as *aetiologia* throughout, while Sedulius spells it *aethimologia* throughout.<sup>311</sup>

Sedulius then omits Augustine’s next four sentences. Those sentences are a plea to Honoratus not to think Augustine inappropriate for using Greek transliterated words.<sup>312</sup> By omitting these lines, Sedulius is perhaps preserving Augustine’s authoritative status and/or this is not relevant for Sedulius. Whereas Augustine felt that some type of explanation was necessary for his employment of Greek terms, Sedulius (assuming the adaptation was for a reason other than mere considerations of length) either lacked Augustine’s sensitivities in such matters, or was working in a social setting that would not have thought the

310 Cf. chapters 10.24–15.33, 17.35, but note especially 6.13 (CSEL 25, 7, 15–20): *Sed nihil est profecto temeritatis plenius quae nobis tunc pueris inerat, quam quorumque librorum expositores deserere, qui eos se tenere ac discipulis tradere posse profitentur, et eorum sententiam requirere ab his qui conditoribus illorum atque auctoribus acerbissimum, nescio qua cogente causa, bellum indixerunt.*

311 In A. Hoffmann, *Augustinus De Utilitate Credendi: übersetzt und eingeleitet* (Freiburg: Herder, 1992), 90, the word is spelled “aetiologiam”; however, in his *apparatus criticus* Hoffmann notes variant spellings including “aethimologiam” as appears in Sedulius. Frede, *Sedulii Scotti Collectaneum in Apostolum*, 9, also notes variant spellings for *aethimologia* including *aetiologia*.

312 *Util. cred.* 3.5 (CSEL 25, 8, 1): *ne me ineptum putes graecis nominibus utentem*. As A. Hoffmann, *Augustinus De Utilitate Credendi: übersetzt und eingeleitet*, 90, n. 17, has noted, Augustine may be bearing in mind the Ciceronian tradition of employing exclusively Latin vocabulary (*latinitas*). The fact that Sedulius omitted this comment from his quotation may be a point of reception of Augustine inasmuch as Augustine advocates throughout *De Doctrina Christiana* the learning and using of the original biblical languages for the purpose of interpreting Scripture.

usage of Greek pretentious. For example, earlier in the Prologue, Sedulius uses the word *peristasis*, a transliteration of the Greek term meaning “circumstance”. Furthermore, Sedulius criticizes Paul for his lack of knowledge in Greek when he writes in his commentary on Gal 6:1 (546, VIII.114–116, Frede), “a Jew, most learned in his own language, could not express the profound meanings in a foreign language, nor was he well disposed concerning words, although he had a general understanding.”

The next eleven lines of Augustine are quoted verbatim by Sedulius (9–10, 203–224, Frede), except for a few minor differences.<sup>313</sup> Sedulius then omits the final sentence of chapter 6 of *util. cred.*, which claims that it would take too long to explain the matter further. Sedulius then omits the entire seventh chapter except for the opening sentence which states, *porro analogiam, qua utriusque Testamenti congruentia perspicitur* (“next is analogy, through which the agreement of both testaments is seen”). The rest of Augustine’s chapter 7 is a combination of biographical information and a diatribe against the Manichees and thus unimportant for the purposes of Sedulius. Much of the Augustinian biographical comments are remarks of humility, which are necessary to Augustine’s purpose, but irrelevant to Sedulius, whose omissions of that material signify a subtle attempt at preserving Augustine’s authority as a great teacher.

The Prologue then ends (10, 224–229, Frede) with a quotation from chapter 8, where Augustine introduces the fourth way in which Scripture is “handed down”. Sedulius quotes the beginning of Augustine’s remarks on “allegory” and includes Augustine’s first example, which is a quotation of Jesus from the Gospel of Matthew 12:39–40. In this textual example, Jonah is the allegorical referent of Jesus, the Son of Man, who must like Jonah be swallowed up for “three days and three nights” in the “belly” / “heart of the earth”. Though Augustine continues his discourse on allegory at the end of the citation of Matthew 12:39–40 and includes more examples from Pauline letters (1 Corinthians 9:1ff and Galatians 4:22ff), Sedulius does not. Since this is a prologue to commentaries on the Pauline corpus, it is surprising that Sedulius does not incorporate Augustine’s other examples of allegory into this quotation. Not only does he omit them from this quotation in the Prologue, but he does not even use the materials later in their respective places in the commentaries on Corinthians and Galatians. For example, Augustine refers to Galatians 4:22 as an example of allegory and comments on it; however, in Sedulius’ commentary on Galatians, he does not refer to Augustine’s comments from *util. cred.* This is significant because Sedulius uses Augustine as the authority on the fourfold interpretative method for Scripture and thus is aware of the text in which

313 None of the differences reflected in Sedulius are supported by the extant manuscripts of Augustine’s *util. cred.* (CSEL 25).

Augustine provides examples from Pauline literature; however, he chooses not to rely on those examples.

The ending of the Prologue may seem abrupt to a modern reader; however, there are reasons why it may serve as a suitable ending for Sedulius: first, it ends with a dominical saying of Jesus, thus proving an early authority and example for harmonizing the two testaments.<sup>314</sup> This Christological statement summarizes the Gospel as it occurs in Romans 6:2–4, Colossians 2:12, and 1 Corinthians 15:1–4, which are formulaic summaries of the larger Gospel narrative as they refer to the death and resurrection of Jesus. Sedulius, therefore, positions the Gospels as a scriptural preface to the Pauline epistles: Jonah “prefigures” the Gospel narrative and so Jesus’ quotation of Jonah (Matthew 12:39–40) is a fitting place to end as Jesus’ method foreshadows Sedulius’ own purposes for expounding the Pauline epistles. The heavy spiritualization and pastoral themes throughout the ensuing commentaries indicate that such an ending may be understood as a metaphorical transition into Sedulius’ commentaries on the Pauline corpus. Second, the abrupt ending with no closing remarks beyond what was quoted from Augustine is also fitting in an ironical way. That is, throughout *util. cred.* Augustine argued that one ought to submit not only to a teacher who believes, but one who is an authority in that discipline and is renowned for his or her erudite qualities. Thus, by not adding any closing remarks of his (Sedulius’) own, he is giving Augustine the last word and effectively making Augustine the chief instructor.<sup>315</sup>

Overall, Sedulius abbreviates, changes, and omits from Augustine’s work to form a concise, but accurate rendering of Augustine’s work. The changes were seemingly made to allow for Sedulius’ broader interpretation and preserve Augustine as an authority. In a time before footnotes and modern ideas of citation, it is remarkable how closely and accurately Sedulius quoted Augustine. Also remarkable in Sedulius’ reception of Augustine is the manner and purpose for which Augustine’s material was employed. Sedulius effectively adhered to the larger hermeneutical principle of Augustine’s work, *util. cred.*, by allowing Augustine, the authoritative teacher, to provide the final teaching, which ultimately served as a fitting introduction to the Pauline corpus. Just as

314 As De Lubac notes in his seminal work, *Medieval Exegesis*, vol. 1, 247–248, harmonizing the two Testaments lies at the center of patristic exegesis and serves as the control for their whole doctrine of the “four figures”; therefore, as the Carolingians sought to borrow from or at worst emulate patristic writers, it is not surprising to locate in Sedulius an example like this one at the end of his Prologue.

315 Earlier in this section, the importance of the notion of *traditur*, or knowledge being handed down, was noted as significant for Augustine, and that Sedulius omitted the phrase; but, I would like to note here that there is a difference between Sedulius not retaining the context of an important Augustinian theme, but nevertheless employing its overall hermeneutical thrust, as I argue above.

Augustine deferred to Jesus as an example of allegorical teaching, Sedulius deferred to Augustine. Thus Augustine surfaces not merely as a source of information for Sedulius, but also as an authority worth imitating.

*iii) Quotation of De Civitate Dei in Sedulius' Commentary on Ephesians*

*Civ.* may well be the most copied work of early Latin Christian texts.<sup>316</sup> Einhard, Charlemagne's contemporary biographer, states that *civ.* was a favorite of Charlemagne.<sup>317</sup> Its prominent influence in the Carolingian culture of Christian revival and learning is widely, if not completely, acknowledged. Therefore, it is not surprising to find that of all the cited (where Sedulius named the source within the text) quotations of works throughout Sedulius' commentaries the longest explicit excerpt comes from *civ.* The only other excerpt of nearly equal length is also Augustine's, though from *util. cred.*, which was discussed above. This section explores Sedulius' reception of the two passages of *civ.* which he explicitly quoted for his commentary on Eph 4:13 ("until we all attain to the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to a mature man, to the measure of the stature which belongs to the fullness of Christ").

Sedulius introduces the quotation by simply saying, *Ex libro De civitate Dei XXII* (580, XV.28–29, Frede). The form of this explicit citation mirrors the manner in which he cited Jerome's commentary on Habakkuk in Eph 2:15.<sup>318</sup> The citation in Eph 4:13 and the one which occurs in Eph 2:15 are the only two times in either the Galatians or Ephesians commentaries that Sedulius explicitly names the text from which he is quoting; furthermore, the fame of the book, *civ.*, does not necessitate that he name the author, Augustine.<sup>319</sup> Sedulius then quotes the entire chapter almost verbatim, except for the first sentence (which Sedulius omits), and consequently the *autem* from the second sentence, as well as a few other minor variances. Excluding the *autem* in the second sentence reveals an intentional omission of the first sentence as the *autem* signifies a contrary opinion to the previous statement.

Most of the differences are minor textual matters such as variant spellings (*etiam si* for *etiamsi*), or the transposition of words, such as *proprio spatio* instead of *spatio proprio*; however, there are two differences which may help suggest which manuscript(s) (or from which manuscript family) Sedulius was copying. In both passages of *civ.* cited by Sedulius, there are only two variant readings from codex *E*<sup>320</sup> listed in the *apparatus criticus* to Augustine's text, and both

316 Cf. O'Daly, 275.

317 Einhard, *Vita Karoli*, 2.24. "Monumenta Carolina", *Bibliotheca Rerum Germanicarum* v. 4, ed. Philipp Jaffé, Berlin: 1867.

318 *Idem in expositione Abbae* (570, VII.22–23, Frede).

319 Cf. Sloan, "De civitate dei", in K. Pollman (eds), *OGHRA* (forthcoming).

320 Codex *E* is *Eugippii Excerpta*, ed. P. Knoell, Vindobonae, 1885 (CC 48, 319).

variants are represented in Sedulius' text.<sup>321</sup> They both occur in 22.15 of *civ.* and are even within the same sentence, which reads: *restat ergo, ut suam recipiat quisque mensuram, quam vel habuit in iuuentute, etiamsi senex est mortuus, vel fuerat habiturus, si est ante defunctus...* Instead of an indicative *est* between *senex* and *mortuus*, Sedulius and codex *E* have the subjunctive, *sit*. Both are grammatically correct, with only a slight difference of nuance in meaning. The second difference reflected in Sedulius and codex *E* is the inclusion of an *etiam* between *habiturus* and *si*. Edition *p* also has these variants, but it contains others as well that Sedulius does not include, and Sedulius pre-dates both of these works, *p* and *E*. If both Sedulius and codex *E* were similar only with respect to the changing of *est* to *sit*, then I would be inclined to think that sheer coincidence is as likely as any other reason; however, the inclusion of an *etiam* where none is grammatically needed leads me to believe there may be a relationship between the two texts, that of Sedulius and codex *E*, but whether or not it is causal must be decided elsewhere.

After quoting *civ.* 22.15 nearly verbatim, Sedulius introduces the next excerpt from *civ.* by writing, *Idem in eodem*. He does not say the chapter from which he quotes (he did not name chapter 15 either), but merely begins a new excerpt. The passage that follows comes from 22.18 and is substantially more edited than the previous excerpt. The *titulus* of chapter 18 is [*d*]e viro perfecto, id est Christo, et corpore eius, id est ecclesia, quae est ipsius plenitudo. The opening sentence of chapter 18 claims that in order to understand what the Apostle means by the phrase "perfect man", it is necessary to examine the context of the passage, so Augustine then quotes Ephesians 4:10–16. Immediately following the recitation of Ephesians 4:10–16, Augustine writes, *Ecce qui est vir perfectus*, which is where Sedulius begins the second excerpt. Because Sedulius is writing a biblical commentary and his readers are thus aware of the biblical context of the phrase, it is not surprising that he omitted the recitation of Ephesians 4:10–16 and began with Augustine's ensuing analysis.

Many of the differences reflected in Sedulius' reception of this passage are minor variants and changes and do not warrant our attention; however, some of the omissions and minor changes reveal an astute editor with a clear understanding of Augustine's text and teaching.<sup>322</sup> For example, Sedulius prefers brevity, so though he retains Augustine's recitation of 1 Corinthians 12:27 (581, XV.51–52, Frede), which pertinently refers to the bodily unity of Christ and his church, he omits the thematically related, though supplemental quotations of Colossians 1:24 and 1 Corinthians 10:17. Sedulius also omits most of Augustine's recitation of Ephesians 4:12–16. He does, however,

321 Furthermore, in neither place where Sedulius agrees with codex "E" does Frede offer any variant readings in his *apparatus criticus* of Sedulius' text.

322 Cf. Sloan, "De civitate dei", in K. Pollman et al. (eds), *OGHRA* (forthcoming).

include the last clause of Ephesians 4:16, which is a pivotal reference point in Augustine's argument and exposition of Ephesians 4:13, the verse of concern at this point in Sedulius' commentary.

Once Sedulius omits the extra Scripture references, he then skillfully edits the remaining text for purposes of clarity. He adds an *inquit* between *secundum* and *operationem*, once he starts quoting again. This *inquit* functions similarly to the one that Augustine used after *[p]ro corpore* in the omitted section. Next, he substitutes the term *membris* for *partibus*. *Membris* is a more specific term, which Sedulius may have felt the reader needed, since he did not recite the contextual verses as Augustine did. The sentence does not change, and Green even translates *partibus* as "members".<sup>323</sup> From the same sentence, Sedulius adds *Christi* after *plenitudinis* where Augustine does not. *Christi* is understood in Augustine's text, and its addition by Sedulius only adds clarity.

The final sentence in Sedulius' excerpt is a recitation of Ephesians 1:22–23, which contains informative differences. The first notable change is Sedulius' *implet* for Augustine's *impletur*. Green notes that "the verb *impletur* must be taken as a Graecism, following the original πληρουμένου, a middle voice not much differing from an active in sense."<sup>324</sup> The CCL edition (48) shows no variant readings for *impletur*, nor does Frede's text of Sedulius show any variant readings of his change, *implet*. Thus, it may be that Sedulius understood what Green referred to as a Graecism, and while that possibility alone does not prove that Sedulius knew Greek, it does at a minimum demonstrate an astute mind and sound understanding of language. Sedulius' recognition of this Greek nuance is not surprising, because we know that he copied and used Greek even outside of these commentaries.<sup>325</sup> Nevertheless, one might ask, if he changed *impletur* to *implet* in his quotation of Augustine, why did he not change his own employment of that word in his commentary, where it appears as *adimpletur*.<sup>326</sup> Perhaps he was more reserved about editing the actual version of Scripture he used, yet editing someone else's quotation of Scripture suited his own purposes – especially since it is a different version (Sedulius' text uses *adimpletur*, where Augustine's uses *impletur*). Augustine continues his analysis of 4:13 after he cites Ephesians 1:22–23, but Sedulius does not include that portion in his excerpt. The unquoted portion discusses the implied meaning of the term *vir*. Augustine explains that the promise of the resurrection is not invalid for women nor does it mean that they will turn into men by virtue of the word *vir*, but rather that *vir* encompasses women just as it does in Psalms 112:1.

323 *Civ.* 22.18; tr. Green, *City of God VII* (Cambridge: Loeb Classical Library, 1972) 287.

324 Green (tr.), 286.

325 Cf. Doyle, 15.

326 Eph 1:23 (565, I.60, Frede).

In the case of reception studies, what is not included can often be as informative as what is included. The omitted portion is only five lines long, but it is directly relevant to Ephesians 4:13 and perhaps even more so than some of the other parts included previously from the quotation. It does not express anything blatantly unorthodox or heretical, and it does not contradict Sedulius' teaching elsewhere in either commentary. Since there does not seem to be an obvious reason for the omission, I propose four possibilities in descending order of probability: either 1) the passage is too long for Sedulius (so he is simply economizing), 2) it is a matter so obvious that he does not deem it necessary or informative, 3) the topic has no interest to Sedulius or his audience, or 4) Sedulius disagrees with Augustine, but will only express it via omission, not refutation. To say that the discussion about *vir* and its implication for women is of no interest to Sedulius or his audience may suggest a sexist perspective or at least apathy for women's concerns. Without attempting to impose twenty-first century sensibilities as my standard for gender analysis, Sedulius does project an emotional and physical sense of superiority to men in his exposition of Eph 5:23 (595, XXIII.6–9, Frede), IPSE SALVATOR CORPORIS. Id est, *Christus saluauit ecclesiam. Vel: Vir salvator corporis mulieris* in necessitatibus et doloribus, dum infirmioris sexus est. The alternative interpretation, indicated with *Vel.*, is Sedulius' own comment, revealing a closer reflection of his personal perceptions than if it had derived from another commentator. Of course, Sedulius may simply be echoing 1 Peter 3:7 ("You husbands in the same way, live with your wives in an understanding way, as with a weaker vessel, since she is a woman..."), but even as an echo it represents an editorial decision.

Sedulius also excluded chapters 16 and 17, which fall between the two he did excerpt. Chapter 16 synthesizes Romans 12:2 with Ephesians 4:13, so though it is somewhat pertinent, it is possibly too long a chapter to include for only a few relevant lines. Chapter 17 is devoted to the question of whether or not the bodies of women will remain their own gender after resurrection. Again, Sedulius could have excluded it because he disagrees with Augustine's stance on gender and resurrection, but there is no other evidence to substantiate such an assumption. Also, chapter 17 is the longest out of 15–18, so perhaps its length, in combination with the material being rather simple caused Sedulius to exclude it from his excerpts of *civ*.

In conclusion, Augustine used Ephesians 4:13 to make an eschatological argument, whereas Sedulius ignores the larger purpose of Augustine and seems strictly interested in the exegetical work most relevant to the purposes of his commentary. Though Sedulius' commentary may be devoid of the larger eschatological purposes entailed in Augustine, some earlier, gained affinity analogous to those eschatological concerns may be driving his choice to include Augustine's exegesis of Ephesians 4:13 within his own commentary, such as his past experiences with Viking attacks in Ireland. Also, Sedulius imputes a degree



of authority to Augustine, given that Eph 4:13 is one of the few times Sedulius explicitly cites the text he is quoting.<sup>327</sup> Considering the widespread popularity of *civ.* and the large number of manuscripts produced, it is remarkable how few differences exist between Sedulius' quotation and a modern critical text of *civ.* The changes that do exist (and omissions for that matter) reveal not only an editor who understands the text with which he is dealing, but also has an understanding of his own audience and purpose in writing. This reception study allows us to see how Sedulius, an early reader of Augustine, receives two of his most prominent texts. Furthermore, his reception also illuminates the character of Augustine himself and his work. Though the Carolingians appreciated Augustine as much if not more than any other patristic writer, Sedulius employed Augustine judiciously and not pervasively. It is precisely through these few, though substantive, passages that one may realize a deeper understanding of Augustine. In a telling passage from *conf.*, Augustine reveals himself as a practitioner of philosophy, one concerned not merely with academic pursuits of wisdom or learning, but even with the visceral problem of loving amidst losing: “[m]ay my soul praise you, by these things, O God, Creator of all, but may it not be fastened to them by the adhesive of love through the senses of the body. For they go their own way and cease to be....”<sup>328</sup> It is in this same pastoral manner that we find Augustine in the pages of Sedulius. In Sedulius' Prologue, at the point of teaching others about the four methods of interpreting Scripture, Sedulius defers to Augustine – who himself wrote works on both teaching others how to read Scripture (*doc. Chr.*), as well as the importance of subjecting oneself to a trusted and believing expert (*util. cred.*). Likewise, on the crucial issue of a bodily resurrection as raised in Ephesians 4:13, Sedulius again turns to Augustine for practical and authoritative answers. The exegesis provided by Augustine, which Sedulius borrows, bears a practical sense beyond the theoretical realm common in other theologians. Certainly, Augustine lacks exegetical materials in commentary form; nonetheless, Sedulius – like Bede before him – probably could have filled an entire exegetical handbook with Augustinian materials alone. For Sedulius, Augustine is but one among many, yet his impact as a teacher of hermeneutics and pastoral fountainhead for coping with existential struggles manifests itself through Sedulius' judicious selections and inclusions at pivotal points in his commentaries.

327 Sedulius' omission of Augustine's name may relate to a certain ideal Sedulius has regarding his role as compiler and editor of various exegeses into one corpus, i. e., that he presents the voices of many authors as one harmonious voice (cf. Contreni, chapter V, 88–89).

328 *Conf.* 4.10.14–16; CCL 27: *Laudet te ex illis anima mea, deus, creator omnium, sed non eis infigatur glutine amore per sensus corporis. Eunt enim quo ibant, ut non sint....*

## 6.5 Reception of Pelagius within the Commentaries

Augustine openly attacked Pelagius for the first time in 415,<sup>329</sup> and by 416 he was excommunicated from the Roman church by decree of Pope Innocent I.<sup>330</sup> Then in 417, Augustine wrote *De gestis Pelagii*; subsequently, in 418 the emperor, Honorius, banned Pelagius from Rome.<sup>331</sup> Pelagius' commentaries nonetheless enjoyed circulation both within the continent and in Ireland, though without proper attribution and rarely intact. Given the interpolations of the texts by defenders and opponents alike, reconstructing an archetype has proved delicate work.<sup>332</sup> Bruyn has noted problems with Souter's critical text of Pelagius' commentaries on the Pauline epistles;<sup>333</sup> however, it remains the only critical text for the commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians and is therefore the text I will use in this reception study.

Souter makes the following claim regarding Sedulius' *Collectaneum*, "[i]n other words, his procedure was to take Pelagius, text and commentary, as the basis of his *Collectaneum*, omit from the notes what was unorthodox or useless for his purpose, and fill out its meager, glossarial character from the contents of his library."<sup>334</sup> While Pelagius is the most commonly used source within the *Collectaneum* as a whole, Souter's quote discounts Sedulius' likely method, where selection and editing consisted of a more involved and intricate process based upon the availability of sources and pedagogical function.

Sedulius' proclivity for using Pelagius may stem from his days in Ireland, Pelagius' own homeland, where Sedulius was first trained in biblical exegesis. Michael Herren and Shirley Ann Brown note in their book, *Christ in Celtic Christianity*, that "[i]n the case of Pelagius, we were struck by the fact that not only did his works circulate in Britain, Ireland and also Anglo-Saxon England, there was also scattered evidence for the presence of the Pelagian heresy first in Britain, then in Ireland from the fifth to the seventh centuries."<sup>335</sup> Even through the eighth century in Ireland there seemed to be individuals who opposed the establishment by using Pelagian doctrines.<sup>336</sup> The idea that Sedulius would have been familiar with the Pelagian commentaries from his days as an Irish monk is further buttressed by Ludwig Bieler, who writes, "Pelagius' commentary on the

329 Rees, 10.

330 Cf. Rees, 2–3. For a discussion of the political climate at the time and the African church's role in securing a verdict of heresy against Pelagius etc., cf. Markus, 214–234.

331 Cf. Rees, 2–3 and De Bruyn, 25.

332 De Bruyn, 25–35.

333 De Bruyn, 30–35.

334 Souter, 1922, 338.

335 Herren and Brown, x.

336 Herren and Brown, 9.

Epistles of St. Paul was certainly studied in the Irish schools as late as the ninth century, and Irish expositors of the Bible freely quote their Pelagius [sic].<sup>337</sup>

A particularly revealing example of Sedulius' affinity for the work and maybe even person of Pelagius is revealed in his reception of Pelagius' exegesis of Ephesians 3:16 ("that He would grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened with power through His Spirit in the inner man..."):

IN INTERIORE HOMINE reliqua (3:16). Ubi interior per fidem robustus est, ibi habitat Christus, non ubi exterior saginatus.

IN THE INTERIOR HUMAN etc. Where the interior is strong through faith, Christ dwells there, not where the exterior is fat.

Sedulius quotes this entry exactly as appears in Pelagius' commentary on Ephesians 3:16. The exegesis of this verse is elementary, but Sedulius' reception of Pelagius may here reveal a broader understanding of the person and historical dynamic between Pelagius and his dissenters.

Pelagius is described by his contemporaries as a person of immense physical stature and portliness. Jerome in particular repeatedly insults Pelagius calling him *stolidissimus et Scotorum pultibus praegravatus* ("most stout and stuffed with Scottish porridge"); and in the same work, *grandem et corpulentum* ("large and fat").<sup>338</sup> Jerome again draws attention to the physical features of Pelagius in his work, *Dialogi contra Pelagianos: Tu ipse qui Catoniaca nobis inflaris superbia et Milonis humeris intumesces...* ("You who are puffed up with the haughtiness of Cato, and have the swollen shoulders of Milo...").<sup>339</sup> Paulus Orosius (fl. 415), who was sent by Augustine to Palestine with a letter of introduction to Jerome, also commented on the size of Pelagius (whom he probably met during his time in Palestine), *etiam inmanissimus superbia Goliath, carnali potentia tumidus...* ("indeed a tremendous arrogant Goliath, swollen with mighty flesh...").<sup>340</sup> The latter two excerpts indicate that Pelagius was not merely fat, but that his entire stature was massive. Much of Sedulius' *Collectaneum* is simplified conceptually and linguistically for pedagogical purposes, but as he was probably aware of Pelagius' reputation as a large man, Sedulius' inclusion of this excerpt from Pelagius not only reveals two men with a sense of humor, but also suggests Sedulius' wider knowledge of Pelagius' life and trials.

Pelagius' exceptional influence on Sedulius is evidenced by the frequency of his reception. The longest stretch of verses without a comment deriving from Pelagius is five: Gal 1:5–9.<sup>341</sup> Though I question Souter's estimation of

337 Bieler, 5.

338 CCL 74, *praef. in Jerem.* lib. I, lib. III.

339 CCL 80, I.28.48–49

340 CSEL 5, 2.5.16–18

341 The first half of Gal 1:9 is Sedulius' own comment, but the second half, as shown below, is copied from Pelagius.

Sedulius' process of selection and editing, he is right to describe Pelagius as the "base" of Sedulius' *Collectaneum*. Just as the form and purpose of the Prologue and seven circumstances largely derive from Servius, while most of the content originates from Jerome, likewise, the form and purpose of Sedulius' commentaries also largely derive from Servius' commentary on the *Aeneid*, but most of his content derives from Pelagius.<sup>342</sup> Pelagius' short, simple, and often literal explanations are ideal for Sedulius' purposes and therefore lend themselves to continual usage. Below is a series of four verses which are typical of Sedulius' reception of Pelagius as a general and consistent contributor.

### Pelagius:

Galatians 1:9: Sicut praediximus **et nunc [vobis] iterum dico**: si quis vobis adnuntiaverit praeter quam quod accepistis, anathema sit. **Repetitum fortius commendatur.**

1:10: **Modo enim hominibus suadeo** aut deo? **Numquid propter homines vos suadeo, sicut propter Iudaeorum traditiones ante faciebam? Ostendere vult se odia hominum non timentem libere defendere veritatem...** [Pelagius continues for 10 lines].

1:11: ... **Quia non est secundum hominem**: (12) Neque enim ego ab homine accepi illud neque edoctus sum, sed per revelationem Christi Iesu. **Neque a me confixi** neque ab [alio] homine accepi neque a quoquam didici quod gentes sola fide salvarentur.

### Sedulius:

Gal 1:9: SICVT PRAEDIXIMVS. Id est, praecedenti testimonio.

**ET NVNC ITERVM DICO. Id est, quia repetitum fortius commendatur.**

1:10: **MODO ENIM HOMINIBVS SVADEO? Hoc est, numquid propter homines uos suadeo, sicut propter traditionem Iudaeorum ante faciebam? Ostendere uult se hodia hominum non timentem libere defendere ueritatem.** SI ADHVC HOMINIBVS PLACEREM. Id est, si Iudaeis placerem. CHRISTI SERVVS NON ESSEM. Quia assererem legem et in fide Euangelii Christo non seruirem.

1:11: **QVIA NON EST SECVNDVM HOMINEM. Id est, quia neque a me finxi.**

These lines are abnormally laid out with Pelagius' content, but they demonstrate Sedulius' common recourse to Pelagius and the minimal editing of his work. The changes are all minor, for example, in 1:10 Sedulius moves the genitive plural *Iudaeorum* to follow *traditionem*.

While many of the verses in Galatians and Ephesians do not evoke theological controversy and allow for minimal editing of Pelagius, some of the

<sup>342</sup> I.e., when considering the *Collectaneum* as a whole.

verses do. It is in these verses especially that Sedulius demonstrates his creative use of sources and reveals that he is not merely a slavish imitator.

### 6.6 The Augustine and Pelagius Dynamic within the Commentaries

While Pelagius' commentaries, significantly more than any other, were used by Sedulius in the composition of his *Collectaneum*, this extensive use does not justify labeling Sedulius as a doctrinal Pelagian. As we have seen, his reception of both Augustine and Pelagius is not one-sided. Though Augustine and Pelagius were opponents on certain issues, the common ground between them was often much greater than their differences. This is particularly true for their commentaries, which were written early in each one's career, before their theological arguments had fully surfaced and been clearly defined and defended. Plumer, who recently published an English translation of Augustine's commentary on Galatians, suggests that Pelagius most likely had Augustine's commentary in front of him when writing his own commentary on Galatians. Plumer notes six different verses where Pelagius virtually rewrote Augustine's exposition.<sup>343</sup>

Ascribing a label to Sedulius as Pelagian or Augustinian proves to be precarious work as Sedulius occasionally quotes Augustine and Pelagius in the same sentence.<sup>344</sup> Fifteen years ago, Bertola studied Sedulius' Pelagianism and concluded that while Sedulius was clearly influenced by Pelagius, Pelagius' influence is exclusive of any adherence by Sedulius to traditional Pelagian doctrines.<sup>345</sup> Bertola focused his study on Sedulius' commentary on Romans, so this study, which examines the commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians in depth, complements his work. Like Bertola, I would limit the labels "Pelagian" or "Augustinian" to the issues which separated the two during their own times and not merely on Sedulius' extensive use of either author.

Sedulius proves to be an interesting case study given the circumstances. First, Sedulius is a poet and scholar in high ecclesiastical, social, and political standing working about four hundred and fifty years after Pelagius' excommunication, and he references both Augustine's and Pelagius' commentaries on Galatians as well as many other early and late works of Augustine, such as: *util. cred.* (391/2), *c. Faust.* (397/9), *civ.* (413 426/27), and *praed. sanct.* (428/9). Secondly, in the 840s a Saxon monk named Gottschalk of Orbais taught a double predestination. Leading Carolingian churchmen, such as Hincmar of Reims, opposed him, while others, such as Ratramnus of Corbie,

<sup>343</sup> Plumer, 58, n. 329.

<sup>344</sup> Cf. Gal 1:3 (513, I.21–23, Frede).

<sup>345</sup> Bertola, 54.

supported him. Two councils, one at Mainz in 848 and another at Quierzy in 849, condemned Gottschalk's teaching. The latter council also defrocked, whipped, and imprisoned him. This issue was the greatest theological debate of the 840s and probably of the Carolingian period (it eventually involved John Scottus Eriugena), and it even reached Rome. It is inconceivable that Sedulius, living in Carolingian Europe, was unaware of this controversy, and it is almost inconceivable that he could write about predestination without taking it into account, including the difficult issues it raised. It is, of course, possible that Sedulius did not factor the controversy into his explication of predestination, but, given Gottschalk's fate, anyone writing about predestination likely proceeded with caution.

These often controversial, social, theological, and historical circumstances are certainly relevant when considering Sedulius' reception of Augustine and Pelagius and will guide our choice of the issues to consider. Thus, I will evaluate Sedulius' reception of Augustine and Pelagius with special respect to the issues that divided them, specifically: predestination, divine grace, and human freedom. First, I will examine Sedulius' reception of Pelagius and Augustine within specific verses; next I will provide a study of theologically loaded terms that appear throughout, which will help determine both the breadth of Sedulius' understanding of these writers, and whether or not he consistently subscribes to any doctrinal stance traditionally applied to Augustine or Pelagius.

Augustine, who composed his commentary before Pelagius, would write a verse or a segment of a verse and then comment on it. He did not comment on every word or phrase of a verse in Galatians, but usually included the entire verse in his recitation, so that nearly the entire letter of Galatians is included within the commentary. Pelagius too included the whole of almost every verse, and likewise inserted commentary after each segmented phrase. The partitioning of verses, therefore, reveals some level of interpretation and understanding for each verse and serves as the first level of reception. It is also to be noted that Augustine and Pelagius used different versions of the Bible for their respective commentaries. Augustine used the *Vetus Latina*, and Pelagius, as one of its very first documented readers, used the Vulgate.

Galatians and Ephesians each offer verses that evoke issues that divided Augustine and Pelagius. Galatians 1:4 is the first verse that I will examine and from it demonstrate Sedulius' reception of Pelagius and/or Augustine. The commentaries to this verse reveal a subtle yet marked difference between Pelagius' and Augustine's exegeses and ultimately their theological stances on these issues.

Augustine writes Galatians 1:4 in two sections. The second section, containing the last phrase of Galatians 1:4 and the whole of Galatians 1:5, is not necessary here for our purposes. The following is a table of Augustine's, Pelagius', and Sedulius' texts and commentaries for Galatians 1:4:

Augustine, <i>exp. Gal.</i> 3.3 (Plumer, 128)	Pelagius, Gal 1:4 (307, 12–17, Souter)	Sedulius, Gal 1:4 (513, I.24–514, 28, Frede)
<i>Qui dedit semetipsum pro peccatis nostris, ut eximeret nos de praesenti saeculo maligno.</i> Saeculum praesens malignum propter malignos homines, qui in illo sunt, intelligendum est, sicut dicimus et malignam domum propter malignos inhabitantes in ea. <sup>346</sup>	<i>Qui dedit semet ipsum pro peccatis nostris.</i> Ostendit beneficia Christi, quibus existebant ingrati, [et] in lege, quae peccatoribus data fuerat, vivere cupientes, cum illis omnia essent peccata dimissa. <i>Ut nos eriperet de praesenti saeculo malo.</i> De malis saeculi operibus, quae committuntur in ipso. <i>Secundum voluntatem dei et patris nostri.</i> Non secundum merita nostra. <sup>347</sup>	<i>Qui se dedit.</i> Ostendit beneficia Christi, quibus existebant ingrati, in lege, quae peccatoribus data fuerat, vivere cupientes. <i>De praesenti saeculo malo.</i> Id est, de malis saeculi operibus; mundus enim bonus est. <i>Secundum voluntatem dei.</i> Id est, non secundum facultatem vel merita nostra. <sup>348</sup>

Austine's commentary concentrates particularly on the phrase *de praesenti saeculo maligno* ("concerning the present evil world"), which Plumer argues is surprising given the heavy Christological matter within the same segment from the preceding phrase: *Qui dedit semetipsum pro peccatis nostris, ut eximeret nos* ("Who gave himself for our sins, so that he might rescue us").<sup>349</sup> I agree with Plumer, who suggests that Augustine ignored the Christological statement and narrowed his focus on "the present evil world" as part of a larger program of rebutting the Manicheans' dualistic interpretations of the Pauline letters.<sup>350</sup> Augustine argued that the term "present evil world" is in reference to the evil people who are in it and makes the analogy of a speaker calling a house evil, while intending that it is the inhabitants who are evil and not the house itself. As Plumer notes, this line of thinking preserves the moral autonomy of an

<sup>346</sup> *Who gave himself for our sins to deliver us from the present evil world.* The present evil world is understood to be evil because of the evil people who live in it, just as we also say that a house is evil because of the evil people living in it." (Plumer tr., 129).

<sup>347</sup> *Who gave himself for our sins.* He showed the benefits of Christ to those for whom they existed although they were ungrateful, desiring to live in the law that had been given for sinners, although to those all sins had been forgiven. *So that he might rescue us from the present evil age.* Concerning the evil works of the age, which are committed in it. *According to the will of our God and Father.* Not according to our merits."

<sup>348</sup> *Who gave himself.* He showed the benefits of Christ to those for whom they existed although they were ungrateful, desiring to live in the law that had been given for sinners. *From the present evil age.* I.e., from the evil works of the age; for the world is good. *According to the will of God.* I.e., not according to our ability or merits."

<sup>349</sup> Plumer, 129, n. 13.

<sup>350</sup> Plumer, 63.

individual and opposes a fundamental tenet of Manichaeism, which is that from the origin of the world, evil has fixed an indelible physical force on the material realm.<sup>351</sup> Augustine then combines the second segment of Galatians 1:4 with the entirety of Galatians 1:5 and then his commentary follows.

Pelagius, unlike Augustine, commented on the Christological matter of Galatians 1:4 before focusing on the rest of the verse. Pelagius partitions Galatians 1:4 into three segments. The first segment is the Christological matter to which Plumer was referring, *Qui dedit semet ipsum pro peccatis nostris* (“who gave himself for our sins”). After commenting on this phrase, Pelagius writes the second portion of the verse, *ut nos eriperet de praesenti saeculo malo* (“so that he might take us from the present evil world”). Augustine’s battles with the Manicheans are well documented, but Pelagius too was intentional in opposing their viewpoints throughout his own exegesis and other writings.<sup>352</sup> Whether it was Pelagius’ own initiative or via Augustine’s influence, Pelagius too commented on the phrase “present evil world/age”. He mirrored Augustine’s emphasis on the moral autonomy of the individual as opposed to the material realm of the world as a whole, but Pelagius offered a different interpretation for the phrase “present evil age” than Augustine’s “evil people”. Pelagius claimed the phrase was a reference to evil “works” (*opera*) which an individual, who lives in the world (or, this present age), may do. Both imply that *saeculum* references the framework within which evil exists: the world for Augustine; an epoch for Pelagius. But the ultimate difference between the two is to what or to whom they attribute “evil”: Augustine defines certain human individuals as evil, Pelagius certain works. The difference revealed in each exposition foreshadows the issues of contention in later debates,<sup>353</sup> which were not to become prominent in the public sphere for some time. Nevertheless, the subtle difference is decidedly more marked when we bear in mind that Pelagius’ commentary was written after his famous reaction to the line in *conf.* (X.29.40), *da quod iubes et iube quod vis* (“give what you command and command what you will”).<sup>354</sup> In fact it may be this very line, accompanied by the shocking moral laxity displayed in Rome during Pelagius’ stay there (405), that impelled Pelagius to lay out his own doctrinal understandings by way of expounding the Pauline letters.<sup>355</sup>

351 Plumer, 63 and cf. n. 16.

352 Cf. De Bruyn, 16, n. 102; Campenhausen, 255.

353 Rees offers the most thorough account of Pelagius’ life and the doctrinal differences between Pelagius and Augustine et al. in his newly reprinted work (2004) *Pelagius: Life and Letters*; but see also De Bruyn, 17–30 and Ferguson, 114–119.

354 Plumer, 58

355 Ferguson, 115.



Sedulius, who only quoted the word or phrase he wished to expound,<sup>356</sup> concentrated on the phrases *qui se dedit* (“who gave himself”), *de praesenti saeculo malo* (“from the present evil age”) and *secundum voluntatem Dei* (“according to the will of God”). His partitioning of the verse into three segments is superficially similar to Pelagius. However, there are also some immediately noticeable differences from Pelagius, such as Sedulius’ first phrase quoting Scripture, *qui se dedit*.

Sedulius’ text has neither the same exact words (*se* instead of *semet* or *semetipsum* as Augustine had) nor are they in the same order (*se* splits *qui* and *dedit* instead of coming after *dedit*) as appears in Pelagius’ version of this verse, which is odd because Sedulius goes on to quote from Pelagius’ commentary.<sup>357</sup> After copying Pelagius’ remarks about *qui se dedit* almost in their entirety, Sedulius then copies the first half of Pelagius’ comments regarding the “present evil age”: *Id est, de malis saeculi operibus* (“concerning the evil works of the age”). The fact that Sedulius drew from Augustine’s commentary on Galatians in the previous verse implies an intentional rejection of Augustine’s analogy of *saeculum* as representing a house, which would give the term *saeculum* a closer resemblance to the world as opposed to an age in which the works are committed. Sedulius however omits the rest of Pelagius’ comment, which is *quae committuntur in ipso*, and instead writes on his own initiative *mundus enim bonus est* (“for the world is good”). Though the latter phrase does derive from Augustine or Pelagius, it certainly echoes their mutual emphasis upon refuting a fundamental Manichaean tenet; however, more importantly, it positions Sedulius closer to the Pelagian exegesis than the Augustinian as Sedulius rejects the analogy of the *saeculum* as representing a house. This rejection of Augustine’s analogy of the *saeculum* to a house should be interpreted not as a rejection of Augustine’s doctrine on inherited sin, but rather as a refinement of Augustine’s own position, as further evidence suggests (see below).

The third and final phrase from Galatians 1:4, upon which Sedulius focused, is *secundum voluntatem dei* (“according to the will of God”). Sedulius again copied Pelagius’ comments regarding this phrase, but added a significant phrase: *facultatem vel*. Thus Sedulius’ commentary reads after the third phrase, *I.e., non secundum facultatem vel merita nostra*. The words *facultatem vel* now position Sedulius in the Augustinian camp with regard to a human’s inability to live a sinless life, as demonstrated in Augustine’s use of this phrase in *Gn.*

<sup>356</sup> Cf. below chapter on Sedulius’ biblical text, pp. 134–135.

<sup>357</sup> There are enough occasions as this one to suggest that Sedulius used a version similar to, but different from the Vulgate text which Pelagius was using. For a more detailed discussion, see above, pp. 113–119.

*Litt.* 4.9, a passage and phrase which Sedulius again copies as a source for his exposition of Galatians 4:9.<sup>358</sup>

Sedulius' reception of Pelagius and Augustine on this verse is a complex matter requiring the consideration of the order in which the commentaries were written and also each author's historical circumstances, i. e., situations which impose different anxieties. A cursory evaluation of the text reveals that Sedulius may have preferred Pelagius' organization and wording of some similar main points between Pelagius and Augustine, evidenced by the fact that Sedulius presented the verse in three similar phrases, as did Pelagius. Also, the only copied words derive from Pelagius (though the additional comment in the second phrase bears resemblance to Pelagian thought), but the additional comment in the third phrase, which is Sedulius' own, echoes Augustinian and specifically anti-Pelagian thought. The slight variations that Sedulius added to the second and third phrases, which he highlighted in Gal 1:4, suggest that he was conscientious about his editing of Pelagius and is aware of the larger issues at stake. Hence, Sedulius seems willing to focus on the responsibility of individuals for their evil works, yet claims they do not have the ability to abstain from them. I think Wickham is correct in his assessment that the Pelagian question is essentially about "divine help and human incapacity; about the damage done to human nature by Adam's transgression; about sexuality and the possibility of sinlessness."<sup>359</sup> It is essential then to decide how and to what extent Sedulius receives the exegesis of Pelagius and Augustine, as their commentaries for this verse explicitly treat the issues of human incapacity and the transmission of sin.

The evidence suggests that Augustine, who wrote his commentary prior to his anti-Pelagian phase, and whose main anxiety in commenting on this verse was to oppose the Manichean interpretation, transposed the phrase "present evil world" onto humans, thus rebutting a dualistic worldview of the material world. Augustine does not explicitly say that humans are in turn inherently evil, but indeed Pelagius realized that Augustine's wording could be interpreted as such and, if nothing else, as merely an anthropological dualism. So Pelagius then refined Augustine's interpretation by changing the emphasis from *homines* to *opera*. Sedulius then sided with Pelagius' phrasing, but re-emphasized Augustine's original concern to specifically deny the classical Manichaean claim that the world has suffered an indelible physical stain of evil, by adding, "for the world is good". Interpreting "present evil age" as people who commit evil works does not preclude someone from also believing that a person's will is inherently bent towards evil as Augustine would. At this point in the exegesis one may assume, because Sedulius copied Pelagius' commentary and specifically

358 See also Augustinus, *civ.*, 22.30.

359 Wickham, 205.

maneuvered away from Augustine's *homines*, that he supported the Pelagian view that humans do not inherit the stain of Adam and are therefore capable of living a sinless life on earth by virtue of a free will. Sedulius, however, avoided such a precarious position by adding the words *facultatem vel* in the third phrase of Gal 1:4.

This phrase is significant for judging the reception of Pelagius and Augustine, as it places Sedulius in the Augustinian camp regarding a human's ability to exercise free will in a sinless manner. Initially one might assume that Sedulius, by adding *facultatem vel*, is contradicting his move away from Augustine's *homines* through his use of Pelagius' phrase *opera*; but, because *facultatem vel* is a direct affirmation of an Augustinian position, we can use the phrase *facultatem vel* as the starting point for establishing Sedulius' view. Thus, with the two added phrases, *mundus enim bonus est* and *facultatem vel*, the decision to copy Pelagius' line of evil *opera* and not Augustine's evil *homines* can be interpreted as Sedulius further refining Augustine's opposing of the Manichean worldview. But, because Augustine's exegesis is vulnerable to the critique of supporting an anthropological dualism, Sedulius opts for the related yet modified wording which Pelagius presents, thus ultimately adopting an Augustinian view while retaining Pelagius' phrase.

The next verse I will discuss, Galatians 1:15, evokes the issue of predestination, a pivotal difference between Augustinian and Pelagian thought.<sup>360</sup> Augustine quotes Galatians 1:15–16 together before commenting, while Pelagius divides Galatians 1:15 into two segments. Sedulius subsequently partitions Galatians 1:15 into three phrases:

---

360 Wickham, 205.

Augustine, <i>exp. Gal.</i> 8.1–2 (Plumer, 134)	Pelagius, Gal 1:15 (Souter, 310, 2–6)	Sedulius, Gal 1:15 (515, II.13–516, 21, Frede)
15) <i>Cum autem placuit deo, qui me segregavit de ventre matris meae et vocavit per gratiam suam,</i> 16) <i>revelare filium suum in me, ut annuntiarem eum in gentibus, continuo non acquievi carni et sanguini.</i> Segregatur quodammodo de ventre matris, quisquis a carnalium parentum consuetudine caeca separatur, acquiescit autem carni et sanguini, quisquis carnalibus propinquis et consanguineis suis carnaliter suadentibus assentitur. <sup>361</sup>	<i>cum autem [com]placuit ei qui me segregavit ab utero matris meae.</i> Qui me iam in praesentia ab utero segregaverat, quando voluit, fecit quod sciebat [esse] futurum. <i>Et vocavit per gratiam suam.</i> Non meis meritis. <sup>362</sup>	<i>Qui me segregavit.</i> Id est, elegit. <i>Ab utero matris.</i> Unde apparet, quod quamvis non ab utero statim in apostolatum vocatus est, tamen in praesentia electus est. Et hic quaeritur, cur Paulus ab utero segregatus Ecclesiam persequitur, et Petrus a Christo electus, abnegat Christum: scilicet ut sciant compati infirmis, et ut ostenderent exemplum poenitentiae. <i>Et vocavit per gratiam.</i> Dicendo: Saule, Saule. Qui etiam me in praesentia ab utero segregaverat, quando voluit, fecit quod sciebat esse futurum.

Augustine's commentary for these verses hinges on his understanding of the phrase *de ventre matris meae*. He interprets this phrase to mean the customs of one's carnal parents, which for Paul is his Jewish identity. Therefore Augustine seems to believe that *qui me segregavit de ventre matris meae et vocavit per gratiam suam* refers to Paul's salvific Damascus road experience, which led to his conversion from his ancestral Jewish roots to Christianity.<sup>363</sup> The noteworthy matter in this instance is that Augustine, at this early stage in his writing, apparently does not understand *segregavit de ventre matris meae* as a reference to

361 Translation follows Plumer, 135, with modifications. "But when it pleased God, who separated me from my mother's womb and called me through his grace, to reveal his Son in me that I might preach him among the Gentiles, I did not immediately trust in flesh and blood. One is separated, in a certain way, from one's mother's womb, whosoever is parted from the blind custom of one's carnal parents; on the other hand, one trusts in flesh and blood, whosoever assents to carnal advice from one's carnal family and relatives."

362 "However when it pleased him, who separated me from the womb of my mother. He had already separated me from the womb in foreknowledge, when he wanted to, and he did what he knew was about to be. And called [me] through his grace. Not because of my merits."

363 Never mind that this is an anachronistic understanding, as Paul himself considered "following Christ" as remaining within the Jewish tradition.

Paul being elected or predestined into apostleship from his mother's womb, or more broadly as a statement regarding his predestination for salvation.

Pelagius, however, understands the *cum* temporal clause as connected to the reference *ab utero*, thus pushing the *segregavit* toward a predestinarian meaning. Furthermore, while *praescientia* is the basis of God's action, and Pelagius tries to soften its predestinarian force, it is a foreknowledge of what apparently must be; therefore, God acts *quando voluit*. Because we know Pelagius' stance on predestination for the purposes of individual salvation, he may here be referring to the specific apostolic calling of Paul, and not conceding predestination in a salvific sense, but his commentary certainly does not make the distinction. Sedulius however does.<sup>364</sup>

Sedulius' understanding of *segregavit* as *elegit* ("chose"), as opposed to a more literal meaning of *segregavit*, such as "set apart" or "divide", immediately suggests that he more closely aligns, at the level of grammar and syntax, with Pelagius' exegesis rather than with Augustine's. For the next phrase, *ab utero matris*, Sedulius copies the exegesis found in Clm 6235 fol. 16v, b, from the ninth century, containing Irish glosses from the eighth century.<sup>365</sup> The material found in this codex is here very close to Pelagius', but explicitly refers to Paul's *apostleship* as that for which he was separated from the womb. The force of *segregavit* is best seen in the sentence, *Et hic quaeritur, cur Paulus ab utero segregatus Ecclesiam persequitur, et Petrus a Christo electus, abnegat Christum*. Also the sentence, "[f]rom this it appears, that although he was not immediately called into apostleship *from the womb*, nevertheless he was chosen already in foreknowledge", reveals that Sedulius interprets *segregavit* as "predestination" by virtue of a later definition of "predestination", as presented in Eph 1:9 (557, l.68–70, Frede): "*predestination*' is the prefiguration of some matter a long time beforehand in the mind of that person, who destines what will be in the future." Furthermore, Sedulius manipulates Pelagius' commentary on the phrase *segregavit ab utero matris meae* by transposing it to the phrase *et vocavit per gratiam* to extend the predestinarian force of *segregavit* to Paul's Damascus road conversion. So, even where Augustine expounded a text literally and without any expressed sense of election or predestination, Sedulius edited the exegesis found in Clm 6235 and Pelagius' commentary to advocate a line of predestination which theologically seems closer to Augustine than to Pelagius.

The Latin word for "predestination" (*praedestinatio*) is used twice in the letter to the Ephesians, once in Ephesians 1:5 and again in Ephesians 1:11. Pelagius divides Ephesians 1:5 into 4 parts, but Sedulius separates Ephesians 1:5

<sup>364</sup> Cf. Rees, 38–51. Rees there traces the fundamental elements and history of Augustine's thoughts on predestination and Pelagius' continual rebuttal.

<sup>365</sup> See Frede, 1997, 45\*- 46\*, 56\*.

into two sections and only copied Pelagius' work, albeit in a drastically curtailed fashion.

Pelagius, Eph 1:5 (345,19–346,4, Souter)	Sedulius, Eph 1:5 (554, I.48–555, 51, Frede)
[ <i>Qui</i> ] <i>praedestinavit nos in adoptionem</i> . Non naturae. <i>Filiorum</i> . Hoc praedestinavit, ut habere[n]t potestatem filius dei fieri omnis qui credere voluisse[n]t, sicut scriptum est: 'loquebantur verbum dei cum fiducia omni volenti credere.' <i>Per [Jesum] Christum in ipsum</i> . Ut membra eius simus. <i>Secundum propositum voluntatis suae</i> . Non secundum merita nostra. <sup>366</sup>	<i>In adoptionem filiorum</i> . Nam Salvator eius natura filius est, nos vero adoptione. <i>In ipsum</i> . Id est, Christum, ut simus membra ipsius. <i>Secundum propositum voluntatis suae</i> . Id est, non secundum meritum nostrum. <sup>367</sup>

For Pelagius, as revealed in the above excerpt, predestination is the preordained power of adoption for those who believe; i.e., Pelagius believes that God predestined that all believers have the gift of grace, or God-given power, to become children of God. As will be demonstrated below, this is categorically different from Augustine's understanding of the term predestination.

Sedulius presumably does not agree with Pelagius' exegesis of this passage with respect to the discussion on predestination and completely omits all of Pelagius' exegesis on that issue. The omission of Pelagius' understanding of "predestination" speaks volumes about Sedulius' own stance. Though Sedulius does not include here any exegesis which dissents from Pelagius or adversely reflects on an Augustinian line, he does enter into the debate only four verses later when the word *propositum* ("purpose") is used again. There Sedulius inserts the work of Jerome and Augustine to explain the difference between "purpose" and "predestination". Sedulius writes in Eph 1:9 (557, I.67–72, Frede),

Inter propositum et praedestinationem [sic!] hoc interest, quod praedestinatio est alicuius rei praefiguratio multo ante in mente eius, qui distinat quod futurum sit, propositum vero, cum vicina sit machinatio et penne [sic!] cogitationem sequatur effectus. Item: Praedestinatio [sic!] est gratiae praeparatio, gratia vero est ipsa donatio.

366 "[*Who*] *predestined us into adoption*. Not from nature. *Of sons*. He predestined this, so that everybody might have the power to become a son of God, who wished to believe, as it was written; 'they were preaching the word of God with boldness to everybody wishing to believe.' *Through [Jesus] Christ in himself*. So that we might be his members. *According to the purpose of his will*. Not according to our merits."

367 "*Into the adoption of children*. For the Savior is a son by his nature, but we are by adoption. *Into himself*. I.e., Christ, so that we may be his members. *According to the purpose of his will*. I.e., not according to our merit."

Jerome's contribution is everything between *Inter propositum* and *penne cogitationem sequatur effectus*.<sup>368</sup> The definition given for "predestination" following the *Item* is from Augustine.<sup>369</sup> Though the definition is brief considering the verbosity found in Augustine, nevertheless the difference between Augustine's and Pelagius' understanding of predestination is evident. For Augustine, predestination is the preparation of the soul for the call to salvation, whereas grace is the saving action. Thus predestination is a necessary precursor for belief, and ultimately salvation as Augustine articulates in *ench.* 62, which Sedulius copies in Eph 1:10 (558, I.84–88, Frede):

Those things which are in the heavens are renewed, when that, which was lost in the angels, is restored from humans. But those things that are on earth are renewed, when those humans who have been predestined to eternal life are restored from the corruption of the previous age.

Pelagius on the other hand would contend that predestination is the promise of grace for all those who believe. Belief comes first and out of human initiative for Pelagius, which qualifies one to receive the predestined promise of grace, which is the acting power of salvation.

The word "predestination" appears again in Eph 1:11. The same understandings of predestination that Pelagius maintained in 1:9 are seen here too. Pelagius separates 1:11 into three phrases, as does Sedulius.

Pelagius, Eph 1:11 (347, 11–18, Souter)	Sedulius, Eph 1:11 (558, I.89–91, Frede)
<i>In quo etiam [nos] vocati sumus.</i> Nos, qui ex Iudaeis credi[di]mus [in] Christo. <i>Praedestinati.</i> Ante destinati per fidem. Sive: Praecogniti. <i>Secundum propositum dei.</i> Quo proposuit quidem omnia restaurare, sed primo oves perditas domus Israel. <sup>370</sup>	<i>In quo sorte.</i> Id est, gratuita gratia. <i>Vocati sumus.</i> Id est, nos, qui ex Iudaeis Christo credimus. <i>Praedestinati.</i> Id est, praeparati. <sup>371</sup>

The first phrase explicitly reveals Pelagius' understanding that only those who believe first are the ones called, hence the phrase "destined before, through faith", which demonstrates how faith is the necessary precursor for salvation.

Just as occurred in Eph 1:5, Sedulius does not here admit the whole of Pelagius' comments into his own commentary; however, in Eph 1:5 he simply

<sup>368</sup> Hieronymus, *Commentariorum in Epistolam ad Ephesios* (PL 26, 453C).

<sup>369</sup> Augustinus, *praed. sanct.*, 19 (PL 44, 974).

<sup>370</sup> "In whom indeed we have been called. We, who out of the Jews, believe in Christ. *Predestined.* Destined before, through faith. Or: Foreknown. *According to the will of God.* In this he purposed to rebuild all things, but first the lost sheep of the house of Israel."

<sup>371</sup> "In which destiny. I.e., by gratuitous grace. *We have been called.* I.e., we, who out of the Jews believe in Christ. *Predestined.* I.e., prepared."

omitted what he did not agree with, but in Eph 1:11 he includes an abbreviated version of Augustine's definition for "predestination." Thus, in Eph 1:11, Sedulius copies the exegesis of Pelagius and Augustine without compromising his previous stance on the issue of predestination. Sedulius achieves this by retaining Pelagius' comment, "we who out of the Jews believe in Christ" and then omitting the next qualifying phrase of "destined before, through faith", yet inserting Augustine's definition of "prepared". Sedulius thus successfully reframes the exegesis to advocate an Augustinian line of predestination, though he omits "grace".

Overall, my study of specific verses within Galatians and Ephesians has demonstrated that Sedulius prefers the organization and phrasing in Pelagius' commentaries; however, with regard to the issues that eventually caused Pelagius to be deemed a heretic, Sedulius is very careful to not only reframe, edit, or omit some of Pelagius' ideas, but he even affirms Augustinian ones. Ultimately, this section unveils the diverse and complex nature of Sedulius' *Collectaneum* as well as his own creativity and learning as he subtly maneuvered and edited these writers' exegesis to occasionally reveal his own (albeit many times Augustinian) doctrinal stances. The next section extends the reception study of Augustine and Pelagius through certain terms and phrases, which will provide a necessary panorama of Sedulius' commentaries and test the consistency of his positions.

#### i) Saeculum

The first term is *saeculum*, which I translated as "age" in Gal 1:4. A more common translation of *saeculum* as it occurs in patristic and medieval writings is "world". Certainly "world" is a legitimate translation of *saeculum* in many instances, nonetheless such a translation here incurs problems. One problem with such a translation here is that Sedulius does not accept Augustine's metaphor of *saeculum* as representing a house and ultimately the world, but rather inserts Pelagius' exegesis which focuses on the works occurring in the *saeculum*. Another problem with translating *saeculum* as "world" in this instance arises because Sedulius juxtaposes *saeculum* with *mundus* (appearing in the phrase *mundus enim bonus est*, which seems to originate from Sedulius and not a source); thus an unintended confusion over seemingly redundant terms may arise. Either Sedulius is using *mundus* synonymously with *saeculum* or he is using two different terms with different meanings, perhaps toward a larger theological purpose.

If we use Sedulius' poetry as a control (since we know Sedulius' poetry to be his own words as opposed to excerpted writings as most often occurs in the *Collectaneum*), we can better judge if his use of *mundus* and *saeculum* are synonymous, or, alternatively, are words with at least subtly different meanings. Here it is the latter which is the case, as *mundus* continually denotes the created physical world whereas *saecula* refers to a lifetime, an age or epoch, or indefinite



years (*Carmen* 23, verse 39, CCM 117): *Nec similem habuit sub caeli cardine mundus* (“A likeness the world, under the axis of heaven, has not held”). *Mundus* is there very different from *saeculum*, which appears in *Carmen* 6, verses 69–70, CCM 117: *Affluat ipse bonis per candida saecula cunctis, / Gaudens immensis affluat ipse bonis* (“May he himself abound in all blessings throughout bright ages, / rejoicing may he himself abound in immense blessings.”).

Further help in understanding this verse and the significance of two different terms may be gained when we examine a similar doctrinal point which Sedulius articulates at two other verses in the commentary on Ephesians (5:16 and 6:13), i. e., the location of evil, whether in the creation itself or in the works of human beings. Thus if Sedulius uses *saeculum* and *mundus* with different meanings in his poetry, and if the phrase *mundus enim bonus est* does originate with Sedulius (ultimately leading to a translation of *saeculum* as “age”), then a comparison of his poetry with Eph 5:16 and 6:13 should serve either to indicate a point of contradiction in the writings of Sedulius or to justify a nuanced exegesis that supports a systematic view of a doctrine, which is the rejection of Manichean dualism. A nuanced reading is preferred and suggests a theological erudition combined with judicious editing by Sedulius, where his *Collectaneum* would otherwise be mistaken as careless scholarship. As we will see below, evil is attributed to *saeculum* (Gal 1:4), *dies* (Eph 5:16) and *die* (Eph 6:13).

In Gal 1:4 Sedulius receives Pelagius’ exegesis claiming that the *works* of people in the world give cause for Paul to write, *DE PRAESENTI SAECULO MALO*, and not the inherent nature of people themselves. Thus, by saying that the phrase in Eph 5:16, *dies mali sunt* (“the days are evil”) is a metonymy for *his qui in diebus sunt* (“those who are in the days”), Sedulius creates an apparent inconsistency with his claim in Gal 1:4. Such contradictions are known to occasionally occur in Carolingian *collectanea*.<sup>372</sup> However, the metonymical reference to humans should be contextualized with his exegesis in the immediately preceding lines about “redeeming the time” (Eph 5:16 [XXIII.5–7]), where humans are qualified as redeeming the time by doing good works (*bonis operibus*). Therefore, humans who occupy time/days are capable of both good works and maliciousness (*malitia*), thus the metonymy of “days” representing “humans” does not assert a philosophical assumption on the nature of humanity, but rather refers to the nature of their works. Furthermore, both Gal 1:4 and Eph 5:16 offer qualifying statements: in Gal 1:4 Sedulius says *mundus enim bonus est* (“for the world is good”), and in Eph 5:16 he writes, *quia dies mali esse non possunt* (“because days cannot be evil”). Thus in Gal 1:4 the scriptural lemma claims that the age is evil, but Sedulius qualifies that phrase by claiming that evil should be attributed to the works of humans who occupy this age/time, because the created world is good; likewise, Sedulius says in Eph 5:16

372 Cf. above, pp. 8–11.

that the scriptural phrase claiming that the days are evil is metonymical for humans who do evil works, because days are not capable of being evil. Yet again, Sedulius explains the scriptural phrase “on the evil day” by referring the reader to the exegesis in 5:16 and likening the days as the frame in which life endures trials and tribulations, which would echo the difference highlighted earlier between *saeculum* and *mundus*. Thus it follows that *saeculum* is a period of time that is passing away in an eschatological sense, i.e., a temporal reference, whereas *mundus* means the physical creation of God. With this reading, Sedulius maintains the integrity of his exegesis on Gal 1:4 with the exegesis presented in Eph 5:16 and 6:13. For these reasons, I have here translated *saeculum* as “age” and *mundus* as “world”, in order to preserve the distinction which Sedulius seems to represent in 1) his reception of Pelagius over Augustine in his exegesis of the phrase *de praesenti saeculo malo* (Gal 1:4), 2) his use of the two nuanced words in a closely related context (whose distinctive meanings are also reflected in his poetry), and 3) his similarly asserted doctrinal points found in the exegesis of Eph 5:16 and 6:13. Perhaps it was Sedulius’ recognition of *saeculum* as referring to the world in an eschatological, or Augustinian way, which impelled Sedulius to use the phrase *mundus* so as to avoid confusion between the physical world and the temporal framework within which this world suffers evil in an eschatological sense.

## ii) Praefiguratio

*Praefiguratio* and the verb form *praefiguro* are other terms that are used multiple times. They entail various meanings through Sedulius’ nuanced reception of Pelagius and Augustine. In Eph 1:9 the term *praefiguratio* takes on a slightly different meaning from *praefiguro*, which occurs in Gal 4:22 and 4:26.

*Praefiguro* and its various forms do not appear in the Latin language until the patristic writers, when they are used often and by many. Lactantius (ca. 240–320) is likely the first author to have used the word, but its root *figura* seems to be a rendering from the Greek *typos*.<sup>373</sup> In 1 Corinthians 10:6 Paul is urging the Corinthians to avoid Israel’s mistakes and, after referring to various examples related in the Old Testament, Paul writes, ταῦτα δὲ τύποι ἡμῶν ἐγενήθησαν, εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἐπιθυμητὰς κακῶν, καθὼς κάκεῖνοι ἐπεθύμησαν. The dominant reading for this verse in the *Vetus Latina* is a rendering of the noun *tupoi* as *figurae* (the Vulgate, written over a century after Lactantius, also renders *tupoi* as *figurae*). Thus *figurae* serves as the term for specific references to Old Testament events and people which Paul uses as models for instructing Christians. Therefore, these *figurae* from the Old Testament foreshadowed subsequent theological or paranetic issues relevant to the Pauline communities. The *regula* established by Paul in Gal 4:22, which is demonstrated through the

<sup>373</sup> *Diuinae Institutiones*, 6, 20, 31, 560, lin. 17.

Old Covenant's anticipation of the New Covenant, became a hermeneutical principle for interpreting the Old Testament and ultimately for demonstrating the harmony between the two testaments, which De Lubac claims lies at the center of patristic exegesis and serves as the control for their whole doctrine of the "four figures".<sup>374</sup> Other terms and phrases equivalent to *praefiguratio* also emerged in the patristic era in order to demonstrate the harmony of the two testaments, such as *praefigurationis significatio* ("the significance of prefiguration") and *Ecclesiae praeformatio* ("the preformation of the Church") by Hilary (*Tr. myst.*, lib. 1, ca. 39–40; lib. 2, c. 5), or *allegorica praefiguratio* ("allegorical prefiguration") and *sacramenta prophetica* by Augustine (*civ.*, 17.5.2).<sup>375</sup> The pattern in these emerging terms is the prefix *prae* joined with already common words. Hence it is no surprise to find much of Sedulius' commentaries consumed with efforts to harmonize the two testaments and thus also to find within these passages words with the *prae* prefix, e.g., Gal 3:13 (*praevidit*, "foresee"), 3:15 (*praejudicare*, "judge"), 3:21 (*praedicta*, "predicted"), 4:22 (*praefiguraverint*, "foreshadowed"), and 4:26 (*praefiguravit*, "foreshadowed"). Note also in Eph 2:15, where Sedulius' lines VII.24–25 compare closely with Augustine's phrase mentioned above, *sacramenta prophetica*.

While Sedulius' reception of Pelagius in Gal 4:22 is consistent with the traditional patristic employment of the term *praefiguro*, in Eph 1:9 the term, received from Augustine, is used more broadly to indicate predestination in a wider theological sense referring to God's purposes and intentions. It is however no accident that the same word is used in both contexts, one hermeneutically specific and the other theologically broad, because it is precisely the argument from the fulfillment of Scripture with which Augustine justifies his theological argument for predestination. In chapters 19–22 of *praed. sanct.*, Augustine begins his argument by appealing to scriptural prophecy as a defense of predestination since, according to Augustine, prophecy and its fulfillment are typical operations of God in his will to save humanity. Thus for Augustine, scriptural prophecy is a divine causality and a divine causality cannot be conditioned by the human will (*praed. sanct.* 19.16–19):

non de nostrae uoluntatis potestate, sed de sua praedestinatione promisit enim quod ipse facturus fuerat, non quod homines. quia etsi faciunt homines bona quae pertinent ad colendum deum, ipse facit ut illi faciant quae praecepit, non illi faciunt ut ipse faciat quod promisit.

But he did not promise from the power of our will but from his own predestination. For he promised what he himself would do, not that which humans would do. Because, even if humans do those good things which pertain to God's worship, God

374 De Lubac, vol. 1, 247–248.

375 De Lubac, vol. 1, 248.

himself makes them do what he has commanded; they do not make him do what he has promised (to do).

This particular tradition of argumentation for predestination, i.e., from scriptural prophecy to its necessary fulfillment, which may well begin with Augustine, is reflected in Sedulius' two-fold presentation of the term *praefiguratio* and emerges again in Calvin and the later English Calvinist puritan John Owen (1616–1683). Owen likewise begins with scriptural prophecy to argue that God's grace is irresistible, since it is impossible that the prophecy of salvation through God, i.e., "to create" in his people "a new heart", should be conditional, i.e., could not come true; it is "as unto the event infallible, and as to the manner of operation irresistible."<sup>376</sup> In fact, Owen's argument as to the nature of regeneration or conversion (as completely the sovereign works of God) is explicitly grounded for him, as he frequently says, in the "thought of Augustine" and is in opposition to the "Pelagians and semi-Pelagians."<sup>377</sup> Thus, Sedulius' dual use of *praefiguratio* has an understandable basis in his reception of Augustine's mode of argumentation for predestination, a way of theological reasoning utilized (presumably independently) by later authors. Sedulius' exceptional borrowing from a non-commentary work to support a specifically Augustinian mode of argumentation reveals not only his breadth of awareness, but also his understanding of Augustinian thought.

### iii) Non Meis Meritis

Beyond single verses, there is a phrase repeatedly used throughout Sedulius' *Collectaneum*, which also reveals an interesting aspect of Sedulius' reception of the Pelagius and Augustine dynamic. The phrase of interest is *non meis meritis*. This phrase or similar ones with the word *meritum* repeatedly appear throughout Pelagius' expositions on the Pauline epistles and subsequently in Sedulius' commentaries on Gal (1:4, 3:2, 4:9) and Eph (1:1, 1:5, 2:9, 3:20). With the exception of Gal 4:9, all of the instances derive from Pelagius.

In Gal 4:9, a verse with soteriological implications, Sedulius excerpts from Augustine's *Gn. Litt.* 4.9, and the phrase includes the qualifying remark *vel facultate (non suo merito vel facultate)*. As discussed above, this is an important Augustinian concept relating to Augustine's view, contra Pelagius, that humans are incapable of living a sinless life. Sedulius added this significant phrase from Augustine to Gal 1:4, another verse with a soteriological element ("who gave himself for our sins so that he might rescue us from this present evil age,

<sup>376</sup> John Owen, *The Works of John Owen*, ed. by William H. Gould, vol III; first published by Johnstone & Hunter, 1850–53; reprinted by London: the Banner of Truth Trust, 1965; 326–27.

<sup>377</sup> See chapters 5–6, same reference, 297–366; chapter 6 is entitled, "In the Instance of Augustine."

according to the will of our God and Father”). The rest of the line is from Pelagius (I.28: *I.e., non secundum facultatem vel merita nostra*). The other five instances of the word *meritum* appearing in Sedulius’ commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians, all of which derive from Pelagius, do not entail the Augustinian phrase *vel facultas*. In two occurrences, the avoidance is explainable. As the phrase occurs in Eph 1:1, it refers to the apostolic calling of Paul, not to individual salvation: PAULUS APOSTOLUS IESU CHRISTI PER VOLUNTATEM. *Id est, ex voluntate Dei Patris. Ergo per voluntatem Dei, non meis meritis.*

Also, Pelagius’ commentary on Galatians 3:2 reveals another, albeit slightly different, employment of *meritum*, as he refers to the merit of faith (*ex merito fidei*) as the basis for receiving the Holy Spirit (*ex merito fidei Spiritum sanctum accepistis*). There too Sedulius receives the whole of Pelagius’ remarks without interpolation or significant emendation, presumably because in this instance *meritum* is in reference to faith and not human works. However, in the remaining three instances the verses are more broadly soteriological and yet do not contain the added Augustinian phrase, but instead represent Pelagius virtually verbatim, 1) Eph 1:5: *Non secundum meritum nostrum*; 2) Eph 2:9: *Id est, suis meritis et non a Deo esse salvatum*; and 3) Eph 3:20: *Non secundum merita nostra*. Identifying a systematic theological pattern in Sedulius’ choice of reception and emendation proves difficult; however, it may be more than coincidence that the differences are contained within canonical books, where Sedulius is inclined to exercise more theological caution with his emendations.

#### *iv) Sola Fide*

The Latin phrase *sola fide* (“by faith alone”), which much later was championed by the reformer Martin Luther, seems to originate with Tertullian (ca. 160–220) in his work, *De oratione*.<sup>378</sup> The commentator Marius Victorinus, who uses it in his commentary on Galatians 3:2, is likely the gateway for its employment, since the phrase is subsequently employed by many of the Latin ecclesiastical writers.<sup>379</sup> While the phrase appears in works of both Jerome and Augustine, it does not appear in either Augustine’s commentary on Galatians or in any of Jerome’s commentaries on the New Testament epistles. It does however appear repeatedly in Pelagius’ commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians: 1:12, 2:14, 2:20, 3:5, 3:11, 3:22, 3:26 (*per solam fidem*), 5:11, Ephesians 5:5 (*Hoc contra illos agit, qui solam fidem posse sufficere dicunt*), 5:24 (*hoc contra illos qui solam fidem sufficere arbitrantur*), and 6:16. Four times the phrase appears in Sedulius’ commentary on Gal (2:14, 2:20, 3:6, 3:22), and three of those instances can be attributed to his use of Pelagius as a source (Gal 2:14, 2:20, 3:22). The third

<sup>378</sup> According to a search of the TLL, PL, and CLCLT databases.

<sup>379</sup> M. Victorinus converted to Christianity post 354 and is a known source for many of the patristic commentators; cf. Cooper, 16.

instance, Gal 3:6, appears in an unattributed line and is thereby considered Sedulius' own. The irony is that Pelagius was accused of advocating salvation by means of works, yet he is the only one in a group of himself, Jerome, and Augustine as commentators on Galatians, to include that phrase in his exegesis.

In one instance, however, which Sedulius copies from Pelagius, claims that faith alone is not able to suffice. Sedulius receiving Pelagius in Eph 5:5 writes, *[h]oc contra illos agit, qui solam fidem posse sufficere dicunt*. This statement seems to contradict previous comments where Sedulius (receiving Pelagius) argues that one is saved by faith alone, or *sola fide* (Gal 2:14, 2:20, 3:6 and 3:22). However, the phrase *sola fide* in the later instances is used as a specific counterpoint to "the law". In Eph 5:5, however, the statement appears in the context of immoral acts. Thus, Pelagius and then Sedulius are not denying the salvific power of faith alone, but assert the caveat that the fruit of faith alone makes manifest the deeds of the Holy Spirit, as opposed to immoral acts which are symptomatic of the *daemon* "evil one". Pelagius makes this clear in his commentary on Ephesians 5:5, but Sedulius' abbreviated version of Pelagius requires one to read each instance carefully noting the implications of the varied contexts.

Pelagius' repeated employment of the phrase "not according to my/our merits" (a phrase which weakens the assumption that Pelagius is a theologian who supports salvation merely by works), as well as Sedulius' nuanced reception of Augustine within those same scriptural contexts, illustrate the danger of oversimplifying the Pelagian and Augustinian theological polarities for later generations. Thus, as can be seen through an independent study of Pelagius' expositions or even Sedulius' knowledgeable reception of both Augustine and Pelagius, the dispute between Augustine and Pelagius is not a simple difference between a theology of works versus faith, but a highly nuanced and complicated series of arguments where similarities are as common as differences. The latter may be a reason for which, as a surprise to many scholars, Sedulius and other Irish writers frequently used Pelagius' exegesis despite his status as a heresiarch.<sup>380</sup> Overall, Sedulius' reception of the above terms and phrases reveals an astute editor familiar with the historical dynamic of the feud between Augustine and Pelagius and their followers. Sedulius also proves he is no slavish imitator of either, as evidenced by the consistency achieved within his commentaries. Sedulius, however, is required to tread gently, not only because he regularly receives the work of a heresiarch, but also because he composes his *Collectaneum* at the height of a Carolingian controversy over predestination.

---

380 Cróinín, 505.

## 6.7 Ambrose, Ambrosiaster, and Theodore of Mopsuestia

In Galatians 4:21–31 Paul offers an allegorical interpretation of the law. For his commentary on Gal 4:25, Sedulius cites Ambrose (ca. 338–397), but the line actually comes from Theodore’s (bishop of Mopsuestia 392–428) commentary on Galatians. Sedulius’ use and ultimately inaccurate attribution of Theodore’s commentary are significant not only because of the circumstances surrounding the end of Theodore’s life, but also those concerning the circulation of Latin translations of his work. Theodore, who in the East is called *Mpashqana* (Syriac for “The Interpreter”) was born in Antioch and is a notable representative of the Antiochene school of exegesis along with his contemporary and personal friend John Chrysostom; Theodore’s works were penned in Greek and demonstrated a strong preference for literal, historical and grammatical exegesis as opposed to allegorical exegesis, a common trait in the Alexandrian school, which claims Origen as an antecedent.<sup>381</sup>

Theodorus wrote individual commentaries on all of the Pauline letters, because various people requested a commentary on a certain Pauline letter at different times.<sup>382</sup> Theodore used Pelagius in only a few instances in his Pauline commentaries, but the Pelagian controversy is an evident concern throughout them.<sup>383</sup> He received Pelagians in his home in Antioch, and the Pelagians and Nestorians both appealed to his writings in their own defense.<sup>384</sup> Theodore died in 428 and at that time in the East he was still considered an orthodox writer, but in 431 Marius Mercator called him the father of Pelagians, and shortly thereafter Cyril of Alexander dubbed him the father of the Nestorians.<sup>385</sup> Theodore was indeed explicit in his support for Pelagius, and thus on account of these two associations, all of Theodore’s works along with Nestorius’ were ordered to be burned by Theodosius II (401–450). Later in 553 at the 5<sup>th</sup> Ecumenical Council, anathemas were pronounced on both Theodore and Nestorius.

Theodore’s writings in Greek therefore remain only in fragments through the Greek catenae tradition, but a Latin translation of Galatians through Philemon (at least) was made available in the Latin West at some time around 544 to 565.<sup>386</sup> H.B. Swete, who edited a two volume critical edition (published in 1880 and 1882) of these Latin texts with the Greek fragments proposes this date (p. lviii). Yildiz (1998) however, amends this date to 415, largely based on

381 Yildiz, 1, 9–10.

382 Cf. De Bruyn, 3 and Yildiz, 7.

383 Cf. De Bruyn, 3 and Yildiz, 14–15.

384 Mershman, 571.

385 Mershman, 572–573.

386 Swete, p. x.

evidence from M. Geerard, CPG 2, nn. 3846–3848. I however believe Swete's original proposal of sometime between 544–565 is the better estimation. H.B. Swete furthermore suggested that the Latin translations of the original Greek commentaries were thoroughly accurate and complete (p. lxiv). Though the Latin translations may accurately represent the writing of Theodore, they were (presumably because of his known associations with Pelagians) circulated anonymously and thus the problem of attribution began.

In his introduction to the Latin version of Theodore's Pauline commentaries (published in 1880), Swete offers a brief account of the history of their circulation. He maintains that Sedulius is the first known writer in the West to have quoted from that text, albeit with the wrong attribution as to authorship (p. xlvi). Frede denotes the correct attribution in his *apparatus fontium*, but at no point comments on either the issue of attribution or its historical importance. Swete's dates for Sedulius were wrong, thus affecting his theory: Swete offered the dates, fl. 721 or 813, with the "more probable" as 721; but the correct dates for Sedulius are: fl. 841–874. I can here revise Swete and correctly align Sedulius' important role in the history of the circulation of the Latin version of Theodore's commentaries. Furthermore, the attribution itself reveals a number of other important factors about Sedulius and his *Collectaneum*. Rabanus Maurus (Abbot of Fulda, 825–847; thought to have composed his Pauline commentaries around 842) is actually the first writer from the West to quote from the Latin version of Theodore's commentaries, though Rabanus also mistakenly attributed the work to Ambrose.

Ambrose is one of the four canonical doctors of the Western Church along with Jerome, Augustine and Gregory the Great, as first labeled by Bede. The corpus of Pauline commentaries with which Rabanus was working actually consisted of two different commentaries by two different authors, neither of whom was Ambrose. Romans through Ephesians were by "Ambrosiaster", a sobriquet Erasmus cleverly coined – which has ever since been retained – to an otherwise anonymous commentator whose works were often mistakenly attributed to Ambrose. Ambrosiaster wrote commentaries for the entire Pauline corpus, which are thought to originate between 366 and 384. Philippians through Philemon, however, were the focus of Theodore's commentaries. Sedulius then is the second witness to the Latin version of Theodore's commentaries. Sedulius also cited works from both Ambrosiaster and Theodore under the name of Ambrose: in the Prologue he intra-textually cited Ambrosiaster's work on Romans 1:1, in addition to this use of Theodore as Ambrose in Gal 4:25. Using Frede's *apparatus fontium* we know that Sedulius only quoted Ambrosiaster's commentaries on Romans (though pervasively) and 1 Corinthians (six instances), and only quoted from the Latin version of Theodore's commentaries twice: once at Gal 4:25 and again at 2 Tim 3:16. Thus Sedulius' use of the Latin version of Theodore's commentary on Galatians



serves as the first and only quotation of that text from the time of its original circulation until the eleventh century.<sup>387</sup>

Sedulius' reception of Ambrosiaster's commentaries on Romans and 1 Corinthians, and his limited use of Theodore's Pauline commentaries, suggest a number of possible scenarios regarding the circulation of Theodore's commentaries on Galatians and/or the other Pauline epistles. The easiest solution is to hypothesize that Sedulius only had access to those commentaries which he used. However, since we know the composition of Rabanus' corpus of commentaries which he attributed to Ambrose (n.b. also above: Romans – Ephesians was from Ambrosiaster, but Philippians – Philemon was from Theodore), and if we take into account the Roman style of Ambrosiaster's commentaries which Sedulius was apt to follow, and also the occurrence of his exceptional intra-textual citation, I would suggest a revised thesis regarding the circulation of Theodore's commentaries based on Sedulius' use of Theodore in Galatians.

Sedulius' explicit mention of Ambrose in Gal 4:25 is a rare intra-textual citation; he does however occasionally cite an author within the text in this same manner in the other commentaries within his *Collectaneum*, but those instances too may indicate an exceptional circumstance. Nowhere else in Sedulius' commentaries on Galatians or Ephesians does Sedulius himself cite the name of the author from whom he is quoting. Twice he names the work from which he is quoting (cf. Eph 2:15 and 4:13), and there are four instances of names appearing within his commentary (Eusebius, Aquila, Jerome and Augustine), but the difference between the citation in Gal 4:25 and those explicit uses of names is that the latter are merely retained from Sedulius' quotation of his source. It may be that Rabanus had Galatians, but knew it was not Ambrosiaster's (i. e., for him Ambrose) by comparison of the two manuscripts and therefore did not use it. Sedulius then gained access to the discarded or questioned commentary on Galatians and since he does not have Ambrosiaster's (again for him Ambrose) commentaries on 2 Corinthians and beyond (as we may deduce from Sedulius' complete lack of quotations after 1 Corinthians), Sedulius' citation therefore serves to publicly affirm the Galatians commentary (by Theodore, which he is quoting) as Ambrose's. In that way, Sedulius avoids any criticism for using a source whose authority is questioned or unknown. Also, the material Sedulius uses from Theodore further demonstrates his affinity to an allegorical type of exegesis, while also revealing his concern for the historical elements, which Theodore's commentary on this passage offered. Likewise, the fact that Sedulius did not use Theodore's commentary again until 2 Timothy 3:16 may be attributed to the fact that it is written in a verbose style and that furthermore it is typically a literal exposition. Theodore uncharacteristically offers an allegorical interpretation for Galatians 4:25, hence the

---

387 Swete, p. L.

---

comment – *apta est similitudo Agar ad vetus testamentum* (“the comparison of *Hagar* with the Old Covenant is appropriate”). Neither of these two features lends itself to repetitive use by Sedulius.

## II. Translations

### 1 Intentions and Challenges of the Translations

As a translator I have aimed at both accuracy and readability, but when the text necessitated a compromise, I deferred to accuracy, since this is the first translation of these texts into any modern foreign language. In order to provide a greater proximity to the underlying text, I have usually refrained from amplifying Sedulius' brief and often cryptic phrasing, which may often give his commentary a disruptive, wooden appearance. Sedulius' method of composition requires the reader, whether of his text or this translation, to read the Pauline epistles alongside Sedulius' commentary. Sedulius' text *in vacuo* may suggest one thing, but another in the proper scriptural context. The latter is especially true for words with multiple functions and meanings, such as *quod* in Gal 1:7, where Sedulius' lemma reads, QUOD NON EST ALIUD ("which is not another"). *Quod* may be translated various ways *in vacuo*, but here functions as a relative pronoun whose antecedent (*evangelium*) is in the omitted portion of the scriptural text.

Sedulius' world typified a patriarchal society, so in an attempt to closely reflect the language and environment of Sedulius, I have retained Sedulius' gender specific language, e.g., Gal 3:26 is translated "sons of God", not "children of God". Many of the other challenges, such as rendering the meaning of words whose value lies more in their function than in their lexical meaning, e.g., *aliter*, are discussed above in the chapters on Sedulius' Latinity and the pedagogical function of his work.

### 2 Biblical Text

As to the issue of which biblical text Sedulius uses for his *Collectaneum*, Frede answers this question in the introduction to the 1961 publication of the critical texts of both Sedulius' commentary on Ephesians and the Prologue.<sup>388</sup> Alexander Souter, who worked extensively with the manuscripts of Sedulius, Pelagius and various versions of the Latin Bible (including the *Vetus Latina* and the Vulgate), argued that Sedulius most likely used extracts from Pelagius' text – who Souter believed to have used an Old Latin text – as the basis for his

---

388 Frede makes brief mention of this question in the new critical edition of the entire corpus, published 1997 (10\*), and refers the reader to his 1961 edition.

(Sedulius') biblical text.<sup>389</sup> But Souter also mentions that Pelagius' text is particularly similar to the Book of Armagh, which is known as manuscript D (Codex Dublinensis, Trinity College 52). Souter then admits that there are connections (commonalities at points of variance with the Pelagius text) with the Book of Armagh and the Vulgate.<sup>390</sup> Hence, according to Souter, Sedulius' Latin text is a mixture of the Vulgate and various manuscripts in the *Vetus Latina* stemma. Frede then compared the biblical text as quoted by Sedulius to the *Vetus Latina*, as well as the Vulgate and the Book of Armagh and afterwards offered a *caveat* to Souter's assumption that Sedulius just took on the text of Pelagius.<sup>391</sup> Frede discovered that though similar to the Book of Armagh in many places, Sedulius' biblical text lies closer to the Vulgate than does the Book of Armagh, thus making Sedulius' text a better witness for an older Irish version of the Vulgate which lies behind D.<sup>392</sup> Further complicating the matter is Sedulius' practice of providing only the portion of the biblical text with which he is concerned.

An example of Sedulius differing from all three texts can be seen in Eph 1:8 (556, I.59, Frede). There Sedulius' Lemma reads: QUAE SUPERHABUNDAVIT IN **NOS**. However, the Vulgate, the Book of Armagh, and Pelagius' Lemma of this portion all read, QUAE SUPERABUNDAVIT IN **NOBIS**. Concerning the biblical text which is used in the quotes from his sources, Frede concludes that Sedulius often changes them to the biblical text which he is using.<sup>393</sup> An example of this occurs in Eph 1:14, where Sedulius is quoting from Pelagius' text, but changes Pelagius' citation of Scripture. Pelagius writes (348, 11–14, Souter), "IN REDEMPTIONEM ADQUISITIONIS, IN LAudem GLORIAE IPSIUS. Quos *redimendo suo sanguine adquaesivit*, ut etiam in hoc laudemus gloriam eius." The phrase *redimendo suo sanguine adquaesivit* is a quotation of Acts 20:28. Sedulius thus copies everything exactly as Pelagius has written, with the exception of the verb *adquaesivit*. Sedulius writes in his text, *adquisivit*, which is the same reading as the Vulgate supplies.

389 Souter, 1922, 338.

390 Souter, 1922, 338.

391 Frede, 1961, 91: "Schön die Feststellung über Art und Aufbau des Kommentars sollte vor der Annahme warnen, Sedulius habe seinen Paulustext 'from his copy of Pelagius' entnommen."

392 Frede, 1961, 92–95.

393 Frede, 1961, 95, n. 1.

### 3 The Manuscripts, Text, and Formatting

The majority of Frede's introduction to Sedulius' *Collectaneum* is concerned with identifying and describing the various manuscripts used to edit his 1997 publication, so I will not repeat that information here. On page 60\* of that introduction he provides a *Conspectus Codicum et Editionum*.<sup>394</sup> Out of the eight entries (excluding Clm 6235 and Clm 14277 and Wb, *glossae codicis*, which are mentioned among the sources) only two contain the Prologue: "A" and "W", while all of them have both Galatians and Ephesians, except "A", which contains neither. Contra Souter,<sup>395</sup> Frede contends that none of the manuscripts go back to Sedulius.<sup>396</sup>

Frede's text entails an *apparatus criticus* as well as scriptural cross references throughout the text. He also includes in the left margin of each text the *marginalia*<sup>397</sup> as they appear in many of the earliest manuscripts. As a service to the reader, I have retained the same paragraphing format as used in the Latin texts; however, since Frede's numbering system of the Latin text does not exactly coincide with my translation, I have denoted which lines from the Latin text are translated in each paragraph by placing those line numbers in parenthesis (in regular font) before each translated paragraph. The Prologue comprises just 229 lines without sections; however, Frede separates Galatians and Ephesians into sections by Roman numerals, and then each section contains numbered lines in increments of five.

Each translated verse is presented in the same format as it appears in the Latin text; i. e., for the commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians, the excerpt of the Bible verse which Sedulius comments on is written in capital letters. The commentary is in regular font, but any words in the commentary which are scriptural are written in italics.

The Latin text is a reprint of Frede's (1997) text with only a few changes.<sup>398</sup> There are 11 total changes, as I have attempted to eradicate Frede's text of errors. Eight were likely errors caused in the final typesetting changes (superfluous or omitted hyphens), whereas three are likely editorial. The three of note are *ecclesiae* for *eclesiae* (Gal 1:19, line 53, p. 517; this was checked against the Corpus Berolinense, ed. by Mommsen), *membra* for *menbra* (Gal 5:3, line 6, p. 540; this was checked against Pelagius' *Thirteen Expositions of Pauline Epistles*, ed. by Souter and Robinson), and *fidelibus* for *fildelibus* (Eph

394 Frede, 1997, 60\*.

395 Souter, 1916, 184–228.

396 Frede, 1997, 39\*-40\*.

397 See above, p. 34, for a brief discussion of these *marginalia*.

398 I should here like to again thank Francesca Bressan and the Verlag Herder for granting me permission to reproduce Frede's Latin text as published by them in 1997.

1:1, line 4, p. 551; this was checked against Pelagius' *Thirteen Expositions of Pauline Epistles*, ed. by Souter and Robinson).

For example, Gal 1:1, lines 1–6 is formatted by Frede in the following way:

I PAULUS APOSTOLUS, NON AB HOMINIBUS (1,1). Hoc est, *non ab* humana praesumptione, ut illi dicunt. Hoc contra eos, qui Paulum dicunt subito prorupisse in apostolatum, uel *a maioribus* ordinatum. Ergo *non ab hominibus*, uel *per* apostolos alios. NEQUE PER HOMINEM. Ut Aaron per Moysen. Quattuor  
6 sunt apostolorum genera. ...

Because of type setting differences and to more closely mirror the format of the translation, first I write the chapter number and verse in bold font. Next I place Frede's numbering system, denoted by a Roman numeral and line numbers, in parenthesis. I then include as a subscript Frede's line numbers (typically in multiples of 5). Thus, I have formatted Frede's text in the following way:

**1:1** (I.1–20) PAVLVS APOSTOLVS, NON AB HOMINIBVS. Hoc est, *non ab* humana praesumptione, ut illi dicunt. Hoc contra eos, qui Paulum dicunt subito prorupisse in apostolatum uel *a maioribus* ordinatum. Ergo *non ab hominibus*, uel *per* apostolos alios. NEQVE PER HOMINEM. Vt Aaron per Moysen. Quattuor [6] sunt apostolorum genera.

The formatting of my translation of these lines is as follows:

**1:1** (I.1–20) PAUL AN APOSTLE NOT BY HUMAN BEINGS. I.e., *not by* human presumption, as they say. This is against those who say that Paul suddenly rushed forth into apostleship, or was ordained by the *elders*. Therefore *not by human beings* or *through* other Apostles. NOR THROUGH A HUMAN BEING. As Aaron through Moses. There are four types of apostles....

Also, I did not transfer Frede's extensive scriptural cross references into my translation; however, when a use of Scripture occurs that is not noted by Frede in his Latin text, but is one that I have judged as particularly relevant, I have included that reference as a footnote in my translation. Additionally, the marginalia from Frede's text have been inserted as accurately as possible (with respect to their proximity to a given line in Latin) in the margins of my Latin text.



## 4 Text and Translations



(1–11) Antequam ad apostolica uerba exponenda ueniamus, quaedam prius axiomata, hoc est principalia documenta, praelibemus. Inprimis itaque illud sciendum est, quod VII species sunt peristasios, id est circumstantiae, sine quibus nullae questiones [5] proponuntur, nulla argumenta tractantur nullaque ars aut opus constare potest. Hae sunt autem VII species circumstantiae: persona, res uel factum, causa, tempus, locus, modus, materia siue facultas, hoc est, quis fecit, quid fecit, quare fecit, quando factum est, ubi factum est, quomodo fecit, uerbi gratia, utrum [10] bene an male, stulte an sapienter, qua materia uel facultate, uerbi gratia, utrum ferro an ueneno iste illum occidit.

(12–31) Itaque de persona quae est prima circumstantia prius quaedam tractemus. Est autem persona secundum dialecticos rationalis naturae indiuidua essentia siue substantia, cuius multi[15]plex est assertio; nam multis modis persona consideratur, hoc est ex gente, ex ciuitate, ex parentibus, ex educatione, ex professionibus, ex dignitate, ex moribus, ex uitae exitu, ex nomine et reliquis quae nunc per singula enumerare perlongum est. Itaque Hieronimus de Paulo sic dicit: Paulus apostolus *ex tribu* [20] *Beniamin* et oppido Iudeae Egiscalis nomine ortus est; quo capto a Romanis Tarsum Ciliciae commigravit et a parentibus missus Hierosolymam *ad pedes Gamalihel* legem didicit. Iam persecutor effectus pergens Damascum in uia conreptus est a Domino et ab Annania baptizatus Christum praedicat. *Aposto* [25] *lus gentium* ab apostolis iuncto Barnaba constitutus persequentibus Iudeis *Cesarem appellauit*, et ideo Romam uinctus Neronis secundo anno a Felice mittitur, et duobus aliis annis in libera custodia cottidie cum Iudeis disputabat. Post haec in occidente X annis praedicans iterumque Romam reuertens XIII<sup>O</sup> [30] Neronis anno pro Christo capite truncatus, XXX<sup>O</sup> uero anno post passionem Domini sepultus est.

## Prologue

(1–11) Before we come to interpreting the apostolic words, let us first examine certain axioms, i. e., the main principles. In the first place, therefore, it must be known that there are seven types of peristasis, i. e., of circumstance, without which no questions are asked, no arguments are investigated, and no art or work can stand. These, moreover, are the seven types of circumstance: the person, matter or deed, cause, time, place, manner, and material or ability: i. e., who did it, what did one do, why did one do it, when was it done, where was it done, and how was it done, e. g., whether well or poorly, foolishly or wisely, by what material or ability, e. g., whether that man killed the other by sword or poison.

(12–31) Thus let us first investigate certain things about the person, which is the first circumstance. A person is, moreover, according to logicians of rational nature an indivisible being or substance whose manifestation is manifold. For a person is examined in many ways, i. e., by race, citizenship, parents, education, professions, dignity, habits, death, name and other aspects which are too long to list out individually now. Therefore, Jerome says the following about Paul: Paul an Apostle *from the tribe of Benjamin* was born in a town of Judea, Egiscalis by name. After the town was seized by the Romans, he moved to Tarsus of Cilicia and was sent by his parents to Jerusalem and studied the law *at the feet of Gamaliel*. Already an accomplished persecutor, he set off to Damascus and on the way he was seized by the Lord, and after being baptized by Annanias, he preached Christ. *Appointed Apostle of the Gentiles* by the Apostles, with Barnabas alongside, *he appealed to Caesar* because he was being persecuted by the Jews, and therefore was sent, in shackles, to Rome by Felix in the second year of Nero's rule and for two more years was daily disputing with Jews in unshackled custody. After this, preaching in the West for ten years and again returning to Rome, he was decapitated for Christ in the fourteenth year of Nero's rule; in fact, he was buried in the thirtieth year after the Passion of the Lord.

(32–67) His praecognitis de nomine quoque ipsius personae non est nobis reticendum. Itaque sciendum est quod Saulus, ut quidam arbitrantur, ante perceptam fidem nominatus est. Quod omnino [35] falsum esse Heronimus in expositione epistolae ad Philimonem Colosensem declarat his uerbis dicens: Neque uero putandum est, ut a simplicioribus Latinis legitur, Saulum ante dictum esse et non Saul, quia de tribu Benjamin erat in qua hoc nomen familiaris habebatur, siquidem et ille Saul rex Iuda [40] persecutor Dauid de tribu Benjamin fuerat. Quod autem Saulus dicitur non mirum est; Ebraea enim nomina ad similitudinem Graecorum et Romanorum casuum declinari, ut sicut pro Ioseph Iosephus et pro Iacob Iacobus, ita pro Saul quoque Saulus in nostra lingua ac sermone dicitur; Paulus uero post perceptam [45] fidem appellatus est. Sed notandum, ut Heronimus in tractatu Danielis ait, quod p litteram Ebreus sermo non habeat, sed pro ipsa utatur phe cuius uim in Greco sermone phi sonat. Ex quo intellegimus, quod apud HI Ebreos Phaulus uel Phaul per phe litteram sonat. Idem in tractatu epistolae ad Philemonem: Paulus, [50] inquit, a Paulo Seregio vocatur; ut imperatores Romani ex subiectis gentibus nuncupantur, ita et Saulus ad praedicationem gentibus missus a primo ecclesiae spolio proconsule Seregio Paulo uictoriae suae tropea retulit HI erexitque uexillum, ut Paulus diceretur e Saulo. Paulus id est modicus, Saul uel Saulus [55] expetitus uel temptatio respicientis interpretatur, Paulus uero AM mirabilis: et hoc secundum Heronimum. Ceterum secundum Ambrosium Saulus inquietudo siue temptatio, Paulus uero quietus interpretatur. Illud etiam non est HI omittendum, quod Benjamin prius *Benoni*, *hoc est filius doloris mei* nominatus [60] est, ut Heronimus in libro Ebraicarum questionum ostendit, quoniam ipso nato Rachel mater defuncta est; propterea uero Iacob *eum Benjamin*, *hoc est filium dexterarum* nominavit. Quod secundum mysticam interpretationem Paulo congruenter aptatur, qui *persecutor* Christiani nominis existens prius quasi *Be[65]noni*, *hoc est filius doloris* erat, at postquam ipse lupus in ouem conuersus est, mysticus *Benjamin*, *hoc est filius dexterarum* effectus est.

(68–87) Hactenus de persona dictum est, nunc de re uel facto quae est secundaria circumstantia quaedam disseramus. Rem itaque [70] uel factum quatuordecim epistolarum opus intellegimus; namque apostolus X epistolas ad octo ecclesias conscripsit, unam uidelicet ad Romanos, ad Corinthios duas, ad

(32–67) Having become aware of these things, we must also not keep silent concerning the name of that person. Thus it must be known that “Saulus”, as some believe, was his name before he took on the Christian faith; Jerome in his exposition of the letter to Philemon the Colossian, declares this to be completely untrue using these words: “but it must not be thought, as it is read by the more simple Latinists, that previously he was said to be ‘Saulus,’ and not ‘Saul,’ because he was from the tribe of Benjamin where this name, ‘Saul’, is more common; accordingly that famous ‘Saul,’ the king of Juda who persecuted David, was from the tribe of Benjamin.” The fact that he is said to be ‘Saulus’ is not astonishing, for Hebrew names are declined by way of adaptation to Greek and Roman cases, so that for ‘Joseph’, ‘Josephus’ and for ‘Jacob’, ‘Jacobus’, thus also for ‘Saul’, ‘Saulus’ is said in our tongue and speech. But he was addressed as ‘Paulus’ after having accepted the Christian faith; but it must be noted, as Jerome says in his *Commentary Tractate on Daniel* that the Hebrew language does not have the letter ‘p’, but for that it uses ‘phe’, whose force in Greek speech sounds like ‘phi’. From that we understand that among the Hebrews [his name sounds like] ‘Phaulus’ or ‘Phaul’ through the letter ‘phe’. Likewise in the investigation of the letter to Philemon: Paulus, he says, is named after Seregius Paulus; as Roman commanders are named after conquered nations, thus also Saulus was sent to preach to the Gentiles and he brought back a trophy of his victory from the first booty of the Church, under the proconsul Seregius Paulus, and raised a banner, so that he might be called Paulus instead of Saulus. Paul, i. e., Saul, or Saulus, is interpreted as “sought after” or “a test of respect;” truly, Paulus is interpreted as “wonderful,” and this according to Jerome. According to Ambrose, Saul is interpreted as “tirelessness” or “a test,” but Paul is interpreted as “tranquil.” For it must not be omitted that Benjamin was first named *Benoni, i. e., son of my sorrow*, as Jerome shows in his *Book of Hebraic Questions*, since after his birth his mother, Rachel, died; but therefore Jacob named *him Benjamin, i. e., son of the right woman*. That is in conformity with Paul, according to the mystical interpretation, who appearing as a *persecutor* of Christianity was first named as it were *Benoni, i. e., son of sorrow*, and after he himself had been converted from wolf to sheep, he became a mystic *Benjamin, i. e., a son of the right hand*.

(68–87) Hereto we have talked about the “person,” now let us talk about the matter or deed which is the second circumstance. We understand as the matter and deed the work of the fourteen letters; for the Apostle wrote ten letters to eight churches: namely, one to the Romans, two to the Corinthians, one to the Galatians,

Galathas I, ad Effeseos I, ad Philippenses I, ad Colosenses I, ad Tesalonicenses II, ad Ebreos I, ad discipulos uero IIII epistolas transscrip[75]sit, ad Timotheum II, ad Titum I, ad Philemonem I. Sed si quis quaerat quare X epistolas ad octo ecclesias scripsit, huic breuiter respondendum est, ut doctrinam Noui Testamenti a decalogo legis non discrepare ostenderet. Quod autem ad octo ecclesias praefatas X epistolas conscripserat ratione non caret: [80] ut enim septenarius numerus Vetus Testamentum propter diem sabbati frequenter designat, ita et octonarius propter dominicam resurrectionem, quae octaua die resplenduit, gratiam Noui Testamenti exprimit. Illud quoque sciendum quod apostolus has omnes epistolas praeter unam ad Ebreos Greco sermone [85] Hieronimo testante conscripserat atque, ut idem testatur, Clemens Petri apostoli discipulus sententias Pauli proprio sermone ordinauit atque ornauit.

(88–101) Et quoniam de numero epistolarum diximus, quaedam de ipsarum quoque ordine consequenter exponamus. Mouet enim [90] quosdam quare Romanorum epistola in primo loco sit posita, cum eam non primo scriptam ratio manifestet; nam hanc se proficiscentem Hierosolimam scripsisse testatur, cum Corinthios et alios ante iam, ut ministerium quod secum portaturus erat colligerent, litteris adortatus sit. Vnde intellegi quidam [95] uolunt ita omnes epistolas ordinatas, ut prima poneretur quae posterior fuerat scripta et per singulas epistolas gradibus ad perfectiora ueniretur. Romanorum namque plerique tam rudes erant, ut non intellegerent Dei gratia sed suis meritis se esse saluatos, et ob hoc duo inter se populi confligerent. Idcirco il[100]los indegere asserit confirmari uitia gentilitatis priora commemorans.

(102–107) Corinthiis autem iam dicit scientiae gratiam esse concessam, ut non tam omnes increpet quam cur peccantes non increpauerint reprehendit, sicut ait: *Auditur inter uos fornicatio*, et [105] iterum: *Congregatis uobis cum meo spiritu tradere huiusmodi satanae*. In secunda uero laudantur et ut magis ac magis proficiant admonentur.

(108–109) Galathae iam nullius criminis arguuntur, nisi quod calidissimis pseudoapostolis crediderunt.

(110–111) [110] Ephesii sane nulla reprehensione sed multa laude sunt digni, qui fidem euangelicam seruauerunt.

(112–113) Philippenses etiam multo magis conlaudantur, qui nec audire quidem falsos apostolos uoluerunt.

one to the Ephesians, one to the Philippians, one to the Colossians, two to the Thessalonians, one to the Hebrews; he even wrote four letters to his disciples: two to Timothy, one to Titus and one to Philemon. But if anyone asks why he wrote ten letters to eight churches, to that person we must briefly respond: so that he might show that the doctrine of the New Testament does not differ from the Decalogue of the law. But it is not without reason that he wrote ten aforementioned letters to eight churches: for as the number seven frequently designates the Old Testament on account of the day of the Sabbath, thus also the number eight on account of the resurrection of the Lord which shone on the eighth day, expresses the grace of the New Testament. It must also be known that the Apostle had written all these letters in Greek speech except the one to the Hebrews as Jerome testifies, and, he also testifies, Clement the disciple of the Apostle Peter arranged and decorated the thoughts of Paul in his own language.

**(88–101)** And since we spoke about the number of these letters, we should also consequently expound upon the order of those very letters. For it astonishes some people why the letter to the Romans is placed first, although common sense reveals that it was not the first one written; for he testifies that he wrote it upon departing for Jerusalem, when he had already asked the Corinthians and others beforehand in letters that they would collect a gift that he was about to carry with him. Whence certainly some people want all the ordered letters to be understood thus that the letter that had been written later was placed first and that one could progress through the individual letters in steps to the more perfect truths. For most of the Romans were so uncultivated, that they did not understand that they had been saved by the grace of God but thought that they were saved by their own merits and from this misunderstanding two groups clashed among themselves. Therefore, bearing in mind the prior faults of the heathens, he asserts that they needed to be instructed.

**(102–107)** To the Corinthians, however, he says already that the grace of knowledge is granted in such a way that it does not chide everyone so much as it rebukes them as to why they did not chide the ones sinning. Thus he says: “*it is said that there is fornication among you*”, and again “*when you are gathered, with my spirit present, hand such a one over to Satan*”; but in the second letter they are praised and reminded that they should progress more and more.

**(108–109)** The Galatians are not accused of any crime except that they believed in the most cunning false apostles.

**(110–111)** The Ephesians are completely without blame but are worthy of much praise who preserved the evangelical faith.

**(112–113)** And the Philippians are even praised much more who did not wish even to listen to the false apostles.

(114–117) Tesalonicenses nihilominus in duabus epistolis omni laude [115] prosequitur eo quod non solum fidem inconcussam seruauerint ueritatis, sed etiam in persecutione fuerint ciuium constantes inuenti.

(118–120) Colosenses autem tales erant ut, cum apostolo uisi corporaliter non fuissent, hac laude digni haberentur: *Etsi corpore ab[120]sens, sed spiritu praesens gaudens et uidens ordinem uestrum.*

(121–128) De Ebreis uero quid dicendum est, quorum Tesalonicenses qui plurimum laudati sunt imitatores facti esse dicuntur, sicut ipse ait: *Et uos fratres imitatores facti estis ecclesiarum Dei quae sunt in Iudea; eadem enim passi estis et uos a contribuli[125]bus uestris quae illi a Iudeis?* Apud ipsos Ebreos eadem commemorat dicens: *Nam et uinctis compassi estis et rapinam bonorum uestrorum cum gaudio suscepistis agnoscentes uos habere meliorem et manentem substantiam.*

(129–138) Ac ne ulla ignorantiae nubecula de obscuritate praefatorum [130] nominum nascatur, placet singula propriis interpretationibus exponere: Romani sublimes siue tonantes interpretantur; Rome Grece, uirtus Latine dicitur. Corinthus oritur ipse; Corinthii orientes ipsi. Galathia magnifica uel translatio; ergo Galathae magnifici uel translatores dicuntur. Ephesus uoluntas eius siue [135] consilium meum. Philippenses os lampadis. Colosenses concludentes uel consummantes. Tesalonicenses festinantes. Ebrei transitores. Timotheus beneficus. Titus quaerens siue bonum. Philemon mire donatus.

(139–156) Hactenus de secunda, nunc de tertia circumstantia quae [140] causa nuncupatur breuiter exponamus. Itaque sciendum quod propter hanc generalem et quasi uniformem causam Paulus omnes suas epistolas conscripserat, quatinus sponsam Christi ecclesiam superno dogmate irrorans lucrificaret ac multiplicibus sapientiae et scientiae thesauris tenebris ignorantiae repulsis eandem illustraret. Sed specialiter ad Romanos epistola IIII [146] modis conscripta est. Primus enim modus est de semetipso, quo se ostendit quid sit, id est *apostolus*, et quid fuit, id est *persecutor*, et cuius est *seruus* uidelicet *Christi Iesu*; secundus modus causalis est de gentibus quae legem naturalem non [150] seruauerunt; tertius de Iudeis qui legem sibi Noui Testamenti datam spreuerunt; OR quartus de utroque populo qui non ex operibus legis sed per gratiam Saluatoris iustificatus est. Duabus autem ex causis, ut Origenis ait, epistola ad Romanos ceteris difficilior esse putatur, una quod elocutionibus interdum confu[155]sis et minus explicitis utitur, alia quod questiones in ea plurimas mouet.

(114–117) Upon the Thessalonians, nonetheless, he bestows two letters of all praise because they preserved not only the faith of truth unharmed, but because they were even found steadfast while suffering persecution from their own fellow citizens.

(118–120) The Colossians, however, were such that although they had not been seen by the Apostle physically, they were considered worthy of this praise: “*though absent in the body but present in the spirit I am rejoicing and seeing your discipline.*”

(121–128) But what must be said concerning the Hebrews whose imitators, as it is said, the Thessalonians became, who were praised most as he himself says, “*and you brothers have become imitators of God’s churches which are in Judea; for you have endured the same things from your own countrymen which they did from the Jews*”? He remembers among those Hebrews also the same things, saying: “*For you were compassionate with the prisoners and endured the seizing of your possessions with joy knowing that you have a better, everlasting possession.*”

(129–138) But to allow no cloud of ignorance to develop from the obscurity of the aforementioned names, it is desirable to explain the individual names by particular interpretations: “Romans” is interpreted as “sublime” or “thundering”; “Rome” in Greek means “virtus” in Latin. Corinth means “raises itself up”; Corinthians means “they are raising themselves”; Galatia means “magnificent” or “translation”; therefore Galatians means “magnificent” or “translators”. Ephesus means either “the will of someone” or “my plan.” Philippians means “the mouth of a torch.” Colossians means “closing” or “completing”. Thessalonians means “the fast ones.” Hebrews means “the transient.” Timothy means “kind.” Titus means “seeking” or “good.” Philemon means “miraculously given.”

(139–156) Thus far covers the second, now let us briefly expound upon the third circumstance which is called “the cause”. Thus it must be known that on account of this general and, as it were, uniform cause, Paul had written all his own letters: in as much as he profited by bedewing the spouse of Christ, the Church, with heavenly doctrine and in as much as he illuminated the Church with manifold treasures of wisdom and knowledge, repulsing the shadows of ignorance. But particularly the letter to the Romans was written in four manners. The first manner is about himself in which he shows what he himself is, i. e., *an Apostle*, and what he was, i. e., *a persecutor*, and whose *servant* he is, namely that of *Christ Jesus*. The second causal manner is about the Gentiles who did not preserve the natural law; the third is about the Jews who scorned the law of the New Testament given to them; the fourth is about both people, who are not justified by works of law but through the grace of salvation. Moreover, for two reasons, as Origen says, the letter to the Romans is considered to be more difficult than the others because 1) it occasionally uses confused and less clear expressions, and 2) it stirs more questions in it.



(157–162) De tempore uero quae est quarta circumstantia non tam certum habemus, quia nec uspiam diffinitum legimus cuius imperatoris tempore singularae quaeque ab apostolo conscriptae sunt [160] epistolae. Constat tamen secundum istoricam ueritatem apostolum IIII imperatorum temporibus, Tiberii uidelicet Gaii Claudii Neronis, uerbum Christi longe lateque seminasse.

(163–178) His breuiter strictis nunc de loco edisseramus. Itaque cognoscendum est quod in VII principalibus locis, quae sunt Co[165]rinthus Effesus Troia Roma Athenae Macedonia Italia, apostolus omnes praefatas conscripsit epistolas. Nam unam quae ad Romanos praetitulatur Corintho conscripserat, ut Origenis ait, licet huic fidei Origenis resistat dicens: Cincris est locus Corintho uicinus, immo portus ipsius Corinthi, in quo epistolam ad [170] Romanos apostolus scripsit. Item Effesi duas epistolas, hoc est primam ad Corinthios et unam ad Galathas scripsit, unam quoque Troiade, id est secundam ad Corinthios composuit, Romae uero V epistolas, hoc est ad Effesios unam, ad Philippenses unam, ad Colosenses unam, ad Timotheum secundam, ad Phi[175]lemonem unam conscripsit. Item Athenis tres epistolas, id est duas ad Tesalonicenses et unam ad Titum edidit, unam uero in Macedonia, primam scilicet ad Timotheum, unamque in Italia, hoc est epistolam ad Ebreos stilo alligauit.

(179–190) Et nunc ordo postulat, ut qualitatem huius operis peruestige [180]mus. Sed quis ignoret qualitatem seu modum apostolicae doctrinae sapienter et eloquenter profundeque esse digestum? Vnde et Heronimus Paulum, inquit, apostolum proferam, quem quotienscumque lego uideor mihi non uerba audire sed tonitrua. Legite epistolas eius et maxime ad Romanos, ad Ga[185]lathas, ad Effesios, in quibus totus in certamine positus est, et quocumque respexeris fulmina sunt. Heret in causa, capit omne quod tetigerit, tergum uertit ut superet, fugam simulat ut occidat. Sunt IIII species diuinae Scripturae, id est historia, profetia, prouerbialis species, simplex doctrina, in qua epistolae [190] Pauli continentur.

(191–196) Restat septima circumstantia quae materia siue facultas uocatur, cuius natura multiplex esse dinoscitur. Tot enim sunt materiae singularum epistolarum quot titulis singularae quaeque praenotantur epistolae, uerbi gratia de uirginibus, de uiduis, de [195] episcopis, de presbiteris, et reliqua quae singulatim prolixum est numerare.

(157–162) But concerning the time, which is the fourth circumstance, we cannot be so sure, because nowhere do we read a definite statement at which emperor's time the individual letters were written by the Apostle. Nevertheless it is clear according to the historical truth that the Apostle disseminated the word of Christ at length and widely at the times of four emperors: namely, Tiberius, Gaius, Claudius, and Nero.

(163–178) These having been briefly compressed, we should now explain about place. Thus it must be known that the Apostle wrote all the aforementioned letters in the seven principal places which are Corinth, Ephesus, Troy, Rome, Athens, Macedonia, and Italy. For the one which is entitled to the Romans, he had written in Corinth, although Origen disagrees with this assumption, saying: Cenchrea is a place near Corinth, indeed a port of Corinth itself, in which the Apostle wrote the letter To the Romans. Likewise, he wrote in Ephesus two letters: First Corinthians and Galatians. He also composed one in Troy, i. e., Second Corinthians; but in Rome he wrote five letters: Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, Second Timothy and Philemon. Likewise in Athens he produced three letters: First and Second Thessalonians and Titus; but he bound with a pen one in Macedonia, First Timothy, and one in Italy, Hebrews.

(179–190) Now the order demands that we should thoroughly examine the quality of this work. But is anyone ignorant that the quality, or manner, of the apostolic doctrine is arranged wisely, eloquently and profoundly? Whence also Jerome says: I shall quote Paul the Apostle, because however often I read him, it seems to me, that I hear not words but thunderings. Read his letters, especially those to the Romans, Galatians, and Ephesians – in which Paul is totally engaged in dispute, and in whatever way you look there are thunderbolts. He sticks to his purpose, seizes everything which he has touched, retreats so that he might overcome, simulates flight so that he might kill. There are four types of divine Scripture: history, prophecy, proverbs and simple doctrine to which the letters of Paul belong.

(191–196) There remains the seventh circumstance, which is called “material or means,” whose nature is distinguished as manifold. For there are so many materials of single letters, as there are individual letters prefaced with titles, e. g., about virgins, widows, bishops, elders and other themes which are too many to enumerate individually.

(197–229) His itaque VII circumstantiis consideratis uel praelibatis ac uelut quibusdam clauibus praemissis nunc ad apostolica uerba discutienda fauente Spiritus sancti gratia, qui hoc per aposto[200]lum quasi sonorum organum dictauit, accedamus. Augustinus in libro De utilitate credendi dicit: Omnis diuina Scriptura quadrifaria est, hoc est hystoria aethimologia analogia allegoria. Secundum hystoriam ergo traditur, cum docetur quid scriptum aut quid gestum sit, quid non gestum, sed tantummodo scrip[205]tum quasi gestum sit; secundum aethimologiam, cum ostenditur quid qua de causa uel factum uel dictum sit; secundum analogiam, cum demonstratur non sibi aduersari duo Testamenta, Vetus et Nouum; secundum allegoriam, cum docetur non ad litteram esse accipienda quaedam quae scripta sunt, sed figura[210]te intellegenda. His omnibus modis Dominus Iesus Christus et apostoli usi sunt; nam de hystoria illud sumptum est, cum obiectum esset quod die sabbati *discipuli eius spicas euulsissent*: *Non legistis*, inquit, *quod fecit Dauid cum esuriret et qui cum eo erant, quomodo intrauit in domum Dei et panes propo[215]sitionis manducauit, quos non licebat ei manducare neque his qui cum eo erant nisi solis sacerdotibus?* Ad aethimologiam uero illud pertinet, quod cum Christus prohibuisset *uxorem abiici nisi fornicationis causa* relatumque esset ab interrogantibus *Moysen libello dato repudii* permisisse licentiam: *Hoc*, in[220]quit, *Moyses propter duritiam cordis uestri fecit*. Hic enim causa reddita est, cur illud a Moyse pro tempore bene permissum sit, ut hoc quod Christus praecipiebat alia iam tempora demonstrare uideretur. Porro analogia est qua utriusque Testamenti congruentia perspicitur. De allegoria restat ostendere. [225] Ipse Liberator noster in Euangelio allegoria utitur ex Veteri Testamento: *Generatio*, inquit, *haec signum quaerit, et non dabitur ei nisi signum Ionae prophetae; sicut enim Ionas in uentre coeti tribus diebus et tribus noctibus fuit, sic et filius hominis tribus diebus et tribus noctibus erit in corde terrae*.

(197–229) Thus these seven circumstances having been considered or examined, and like keys having been dispatched, we now intend to proceed to unlock the apostolic words with the supporting grace of the Holy Spirit, who dictated this through the Apostle as his sounding instrument, so to speak. Augustine in his book *on the profit of believing*, says: all divine Scripture is fourfold: history, aetiology, analogy and allegory. Therefore Scripture is handed down “according to history”, when it is taught what has been said or done and what has not been done, but merely written as if it had been done. “According to aetiology” occurs when what is shown demonstrates why it has been done or said. “According to analogy”, when it is demonstrated that the two testaments, the Old and New, are not contrary to each other. “According to Allegory” occurs when it is taught that certain things which were written are not to be received literally, but must be understood figuratively. The Lord Jesus Christ and the Apostles used all these ways; from “history” it was taken when it was objected that *his disciples plucked grains on the Sabbath*: “*Have you not read, he said, what David did when he was hungry and those with him, how he entered into the Lord’s house and ate the breads of presentation which were not allowed for him to eat nor for those with him, but only for the priests?*” But to “aetiology” pertains the following, that, when Christ had prohibited *a wife to be sent away in divorce except for the reason of fornication* and when it was then argued by his interrogators that Moses had permitted the license presentation of the bill of divorce, he said, “*This Moses did on account of your hardened hearts.*” For here a reason is given why divorce was well permitted by Moses for that time, so that this which Christ was prescribing could be seen already as different times.<sup>399</sup> Next is “analogy,” by which the agreement of the two testaments is apparent. It remains to give an example for “allegory”. Our liberator himself uses allegory in the gospel from the Old Testament: “*This generation, he said, seeks a sign and it will not be given unless it is the sign of Jonah the prophet. In the same way as Jonah was in the belly of the whale for three days and three nights, likewise the son of man will be in the heart of earth for three days and three nights.*”

---

399 I.e., that divorce was only admitted in the case of fornication, which is a tightening of divorce practice.

INCIPIIT IN EPISTOLAM AD GALATAS

**1:1** (I.1–20) PAVLVS APOSTOLVS, NON AB HOMINIBVS. Hoc est, *non ab humana praesumptione*, ut illi dicunt. Hoc contra eos, qui Paulum dicunt subito prorupisse in apostolatam uel a *maioribus* ordinatum. Ergo *non ab hominibus*, uel HI *per* apostolos alios. NEQVE PER HOMINEM. Vt Aaron per Moysen. Quattuor [6] sunt apostolorum genera. Vnum, quod *neque ab hominibus neque per hominem* est, *sed per Iesum Christum et Deum Patrem*, ut Esaias et caeteri prophetae et ipse Paulus, aliud, quod a *Deo*, *sed per hominem*, ut Iesus filius Nun a *Deo*, *sed per* [10] Moysen, tercium, quod *ab hominibus* et non a *Deo*, cum hominum fauore aliquis ordinatur, ut nunc uidemus plurimos non Dei iudicio sed redempto fauore uulgi in sacerdotium subrogari, quartum quod neque a *Deo* neque *ab homine neque per hominem*, sed a semet ipso, ut omnes pseudoprophetae et pseu[15]doapostoli. SED PER IESVM CHRISTVM. Id est, qui Petrum et caeteros apostolos elegit. ET DEVM PATREM, QVI SVSCITAVIT EVM. Quo ostenditur una operatio *Patris* et *Filii*. QVI SVSCITAVIT EVM A MORTVIS. Ideo commemorat *Deum Patrem qui suscitauit eum a mortuis*, ut per hunc uirtutem sui apostolatus [20] commendet, dum ab ipso *Patre* missus est.

**1:3** (I.21–23) GRATIA VOBIS. Qua *gratis* nobis donantur peccata. In hoc subaudis: ‘*precor, multiplicetur*’. ET PAX. Qua remissis omnibus delictis fuerant *reconciliati Deo*.

**1:4** (I.24–28) QVI SE DEDIT. Ostendit beneficia Christi, quibus existe [25]bant ingrati in lege, quae peccatoribus data fuerat, uiuere cupientes. DE PRAESENTI SAECVLO MALO. Id est, de *malis saeculi* operibus; mundus enim bonus est. SECVNDVM VOLVNTATEM DEI. Id est, non *secundum facultatem* uel merita nostra.

**1:5** (I.29) [29] AMEN. Conclusio praecedentis prologi.

**1:6** (I.30–31) MIROR QVOD SIC. Nescio quae uos aura a fidei HI *rectitudine* deflectit.

**1:7** (I.32–37) QVOD NON EST ALIVD. Nam *Euangelium* uerum *aliud esse non* potest, nisi *Christi*. Quod enim ueritati contrarium *euangelium* non est HI *dicendum*. ET VOLVNT AVERTERE EVANGELIVM CHRISTI. *Euangelium* ad legem reuocant, dum litteram [36] tantum sequuntur; posteriora in faciem ponunt, et quod in facie, post tergum faciunt.

**1:8** (I.38–39) SED ET SI NOS. Id est, *euangelizauerimus*. ANATHEMA. HI *Detestatio*.

## On the Letter to the Galatians

**1:1** (I.1–20) PAUL AN APOSTLE NOT BY HUMAN BEINGS. I.e., *not by* human presumption, as they say. This is against those who say that Paul suddenly rushed forth into apostleship, or was ordained by the *elders*. Therefore *not by human beings* or *through* other Apostles. NOR THROUGH A HUMAN BEING. As Aaron through Moses. There are four types of apostles. One, which is *neither by human beings nor through a human being, but through Jesus Christ and God the Father*, as with Isaiah and the rest of the prophets as well as Paul himself. Another which is by *God*, but *through a human being*, like Joshua the son of Nun, by *God*, but *through* Moses. The third kind, is that one which is by *human beings* and not by *God*, whenever someone is ordained by the favor of human beings, as now we see that many are elected into priesthood not by the judgment of *God*, but by favor bought of the public. The fourth is that which is neither by *God* nor by *a human being nor through a human being*, but by oneself, as are all false-prophets and false-apostles. BUT THROUGH JESUS CHRIST. I.e., who chose Peter and the other Apostles. AND GOD THE FATHER, WHO RAISED HIM. By which one work of the *Father* and the Son is shown. WHO RAISED HIM FROM THE DEAD. For this reason he mentions *God the Father, who raised him from the dead*, so that through him he might establish the power of his apostleship, since he was sent by the *Father* himself.

**1:3** (I.21–23) *Grace* to you. By which our sins are freely forgiven. Here you understand, “... *be multiplied*, I pray.” AND PEACE. In which they had been reconciled to *God* with all their transgressions pardoned.

**1:4** (I.24–28) WHO GAVE HIMSELF. He shows the benefits of Christ, by which those who wanted to live under the law, which had been given to sinners, were proved to be ungrateful. FROM THE PRESENT EVIL AGE. I.e., from the *evil works of the age*: for the world is good. ACCORDING TO THE WILL OF GOD. I.e., not *according* to our ability or merit.

**1:5** (I.29) AMEN. Conclusion of the preceding prologue.

**1:6** (I.30–31) I AM AMAZED THAT YOU ARE THUS. Some breeze or other turns you aside from an upright faith.

**1:7** (I.32–37) WHICH IS NOT ANOTHER. For *it is* not possible that *another* true *gospel* exists, except the *gospel of Christ*. For what is contrary to the truth must not be called *gospel*. AND THEY WISH TO DISTORT THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST. They turn *the gospel* back into the law, since they follow only the letter of the *gospel*; they put what is behind in front, and what is in front they place behind.

**1:8** (I.38–39) BUT EVEN IF WE. I.e., *we would evangelize*. ANATH-EMA. Curse.

- 1:9** (I.40–42) [40] SICVT PRAEDIXIMVS. Id est, praecedenti testimonio. ET NVNC ITERVM DICO. Id est, quia repetitum fortius commendatur.
- PIL **1:10** (I.43–49) MODO ENIM HOMINIBVS SVADEO? Hoc est, numquid *propter homines uos suadeo*, sicut propter *traditionem* Iudae[45]orum ante faciebam? Ostendere uult se hodia hominum non timentem libere defendere ueritatem. SI ADHVC HOMINIBVS PLACEREM. Id est, *si* Iudaeis *placerem*. CHRISTI SERVVS NON ESSEM. Quia assererem legem et in fide Euangelii *Christo non seruirem*.
- 1:11** (II.1–2) QVIA NON EST SECVNDVM HOMINEM. Id est, quia neque a me finxi.
- 1:12** (II.3–5) NEQVE EDOCTVS SVM. Non aliquis me *docuit*, ut intellegerem parabolas et obscura Euangelii. SED PER REVELA[5]TIONEM. Id est, in uia Damasci, uel Spiritus sancti reuelatione.
- 1:13** (II.6–10) AVDISTIS ENIM CONVERSATIONEM MEAM. Ostendere uult, quam firmiter tenuerit *Iudaismum* et fideliter pro *traditionibus patrum expugnauerit ecclesiam*, ut intellegamus eum non potuisse inde humano consilio nisi *reuelatione* diuina se[10]parari. QVOD SVPRA MODVM. Id est, aliorum persecutorum.
- Q **1:14** (II.11–12) PATERNARVM TRADITIONVM. Id est, non Dei mandatorum.
- 1:15** (II.13–21) QVI ME SEGREGAVIT. Id est, elegit. AB VTERO MA[14]TRIS. Vnde apparet quod, quamuis non *ab utero* statim in apostolatam uocatus est, tamen in praescientia electus est. Et hic quaeritur, cur Paulus *ab utero segregatus ecclesiam persequitur* et Petrus a Christo electus *abnegat* Christum; scilicet ut sciant *compati infirmis* et ut ostenderent exemplum poenitentiae. ET VOCAVIT PER GRATIAM. Dicendo: *Saule Saule. Qui etiam [20] me* in praescientia *ab utero segregauerat*, quando uoluit, fecit quod sciebat esse futurum.
- HI **1:16** (II.22–28) IN ME. Per *me*. NON ADQVIEVI CARNI ET SANGVINI. Siue, ut in Greco melius habetur: *Non contuli*. Vel: Nihil ab apostolis *didici*, ut alii putant. *Non contulit* plane Paulus post [25] *reuelationem* Christi *cum carne et sanguine*, quia noluit *margaritas proiicere ante porcos*, sed paulatim de *carne et sanguine* uertit in spiritum. Aut: NON ADQVIEVI CARNI. Id est, Iudaico generi.

**1:9** (I.40–42) AS WE SAID BEFORE. I.e., in the preceding testimony. SO NOW I SAY AGAIN. I.e., because repetition emphasizes the point more strongly.

**1:10** (II.43–49) FOR DO I NOW PERSUADE PEOPLE? I.e., surely *I do not persuade you because of people*, just as I was doing before because of the *tradition* of the Jews? He wishes to show that, not fearing the hatred of the people, he freely defends the truth. IF I WERE STILL PLEASING PEOPLE. I.e., *if I were pleasing* the Jews. I WOULD NOT BE A SERVANT OF CHRIST. Because I would preserve the law and I would *not serve Christ* in faithfulness of the gospel.

**1:11** (II.1–2) BECAUSE IT IS NOT ACCORDING TO HUMAN BEINGS. I.e., I did not fashion it fictitiously of my own accord.

**1:12** (II.3–5) NOR WAS I TAUGHT IT. Nor did anyone *teach* me, that I might understand the parables and obscure statements of the gospel. BUT THROUGH REVELATION. I.e., on the road to Damascus, or by revelation of the Holy Spirit.

**1:13** (II.6–10) FOR YOU HAVE HEARD ABOUT MY PREVIOUS LIFE-STYLE. He wants to show how firmly he held *to Judaism*, and faithfully fought *the Christian Church on behalf of the Jewish Fathers' traditions*, so that we might understand that he could not be separated from his Jewish convictions by human counsel except by divine *revelation*. HOW BEYOND MEASURE. I.e., of other persecutors.

**1:14** (II.11–12) OF MY FATHER'S TRADITIONS. I.e., not of the commandments of God.

**1:15** (II.13–21) WHO SEPARATED ME. I.e., chose. FROM THE WOMB OF MY MOTHER. From this it appears, that although he was not immediately called into apostleship *from the womb*, nevertheless he was chosen already in foreknowledge. And here one asks, why Paul, *separated from the womb, persecutes the Church*, and Peter chosen by Christ, denies Christ: namely, so that they might learn *to have compassion for the weak*, and so that they might show an example of penitence. AND HE CALLED THROUGH GRACE. By saying: *Saul, Saul*. The one *who had separated even me from the womb* in foreknowledge, when he wanted to, he accomplished what he knew was about to be.

**1:16** (II.22–28) IN ME. Through *me*. I DID NOT SUBMIT TO FLESH AND BLOOD. Either it means, as it is rendered better in Greek: *I did not confer with flesh and blood*. Or: that *I did not learn* anything from the Apostles – as others think. Paul plainly *did not confer with flesh and blood* after the *revelation* of Christ, because he did not wish *to throw his pearls before swine*, but he gradually transformed from *flesh and blood* into spirit. Or alternatively: I DID NOT SUBMIT TO FLESH. I.e., to the Jewish race.



**1:17** (II.29–36) NEQVE VENI HIEROSOLIMAM. Id est, ad *descendum*. [30] Queritur quomodo Paulus dicit se *non uenisse in Hierosolimam sed exisse in Arabiam*, cum Lucas in Actibus apostolorum narrat Paulum *uenisse in Hierosolimam*, quando *factae sunt ei insidiae* in Damasco. Ideo ergo Lucas praetermisit de *Arabia*, quia nihil dignum forsitan *in Arabia* Paulus perpetravit. SED [35] ABII IN ARABIAM. *Sed* de Damasco *in Arabiam* protinus *iuu*, ut docerem, quod mihi a Domino fuerat *reuelatum*.

**1:18** (II.37–41) DEINDE POST TRIENNIVM. Ostendit se non indiguise doceri, qui iam *tribus* praedicaerat *annis*. VIDERE PETRVM. Id est, *uidendi gratia, non discendi*. DIEBVS XV. VII et VIII signifi[40]cant Vetus et Nouum Testamentum propter sabbatum et octauum diem resurrectionis dominicae.

**1:19** (II.42–54) ALIVM AVTEM APOSTOLORVM NEMINEM VIDI. HI Ne ab *aliis* *discere* uideretur. NISI IACOBVM FRATREM DOMINI. Ne autem hunc *Iacobum* putes *filium Zebedei*, lege Actus aposto[45]lorum, qui iam ab Herode fuerat interemptus; sic enim in Actibus legitur: *Misit Herodes rex manus, ut affligeret quosdam de ecclesia. Occidit autem Iacobum fratrem Iohannis gladio*. Eusebius in Libro II. historiarum dicit: *Deinde occiderunt Iudei Iacobum, qui dicebatur frater Domini* pro eo quod esset *filius* [50] *Ioseph*, qui Christi quasi pater habebatur, quoniam *disponsata ei fuerat uirgo Maria*. Hunc inquam *Iacobum*, qui et Iustus cognominatus est ab antiquis uirtutum merito et insignis uitae priuilegio, primum historiae tradiderunt suscepisse ecclesiae, quae Ierosolimis est, sedem.

**1:20** (II.55–56) [55] QVAE AVTEM SCRIBO VOBIS reliqua. *Quae* scribo uera sunt et *Deo* testante confirmo.

**1:22** (II.57–58) ERAM AVTEM IGNOTVS FACIE reliqua. Hoc ideo dicit, ne quis putaret eum *ab* illis quoque *Euangelium* didicisse.

**1:24** (II.59–60) ET IN ME MAGNIFICABANT DEVM. Id est, qui solus [60] poterat hoc efficere.

**2:1** (III.1–3) DEINDE POST ANNOS XIII. Id est, quando de *oneribus* legis *quaestio* mouebatur. CVM BARNABA. Id est, circumciso. ET TITO. Id est, ex gentibus praeputium habente.

**1:17** (II.29–36) NOR DID I GO TO JERUSALEM . I.e., *for the purpose of learning from them*. One asks why Paul says that he *did not go to Jerusalem but departed to Arabia*, when Luke narrates in the Acts of the Apostles that Paul *went to Jerusalem*, when *attacks were made upon him* in Damascus.<sup>400</sup> For this reason, therefore, Luke omitted Paul's journey to *Arabia*, because perhaps Paul accomplished nothing of worth *in Arabia*. BUT I WENT TO ARABIA. But I went immediately from Damascus *to Arabia*, so that I might teach what *had been revealed* to me by the Lord.

**1:18** (II.37–41) THEN AFTER THREE YEARS. He shows that he did not need to be taught, who already had preached for *three years*. TO SEE PETER. I.e., *for the sake of seeing*, *not for the sake of learning* anything. FOR FIFTEEN DAYS. The figures seven and eight signify the Old Testament and New Testament respectively, because of the Sabbath and the eighth day of the resurrection of the Lord.

**1:19** (II.42–54) BUT, I DID NOT SEE ANY OTHER OF THE APOSTLES. Lest he seem *to learn from others*. EXCEPT JAMES THE BROTHER OF THE LORD. Lest however you think this is *James the son of Zebedee*, read the book the Acts of the Apostles: he had already been killed by Herod; thus it reads in Acts: *King Herod sent his troops, so that he might afflict some from the Church. And he killed James the brother of John with the sword*. Eusebius says in the second book of his Histories: *Then the Jews killed James, who was called the brother of the Lord*, because of the fact that he was the *son of Joseph*, who was considered, as it were, the father of Christ, since *to him had been betrothed* the virgin *Mary*. This *James*, I say, who was also named "the Just" by the ancients, because of the merit of his powers and the claims of a prominent life, the historians have recorded was the first to receive the See of the church, which is in Jerusalem.

**1:20** (II.55–56) IN WHAT I WRITE TO YOU, etc. The things *which I write* are true, and I confirm this with God as my witness.

**1:22** (II.57–58) AND I WAS UNKNOWN BY APPEARANCE etc. For this reason he says this, lest anyone think that *he had learned the gospel from those too*.

**1:24** (II.59–60) AND THEY WERE GLORIFYING GOD IN ME. I.e., who alone could accomplish this.

**2:1** (III.1–3) THEN AFTER FOURTEEN YEARS. I.e., when a *question* was raised concerning the *burdens* of the law. WITH BARNABAS. I.e., with someone who had been circumcised. AND WITH TITUS. I.e., who came from the Gentiles and was therefore not circumcised.

400 I.e., on his way from Jerusalem.

**2:2** (III.4–8) ET CONTVLI. *Non didici*, sed tantum *contuli*. SEORSVM [5] AVTEM. Id est, secreto propter Iudaeos adhuc Iudaizantes. NE FORTE IN VACVVM CVRREREM. Id est, sicut Iudaizantes putabant *libertatem nostram*, quia non sumus sub lege circumcisionis.

**2:5** (III.9–11) QVIBVS NEC AD HORAM CESSIMVS. Id est, quia *nec Ti[10]tum circumcidimus*. Male in Latinis codicibus legitur: *Quibus ad horam cessimus*.

**2:6** (III.12–15) QVALES ALIQVANDO FVERVNT. Id est, quando eos Dominus sua praesentia docuit. NIHIL MEA. Id est, doctrina. INTEREST. Defert, uel distat. DEVS HOMINIS PERSONAM NON AC[15]CIPIT. Quia nec tempus praecidat fidei nec *persona* labori.

**2:9** (III.16–18) DEXTERAS DEDERVNT. Quod est signum pacis et unitatis; consenserunt enim ita nos docere debere. MIHI ET BARNABAE. Ambo enim missi erant, ut *gentibus* predicarent.

**2:10** (III.19–22) TANTVM PAVPERVM MEMORES ESSEMVS. Id est, sanc[20]torum qui erant Hierosolymis, qui omnia sua *distribuentes ad apostolorum pedes pretia deponebant*. Vel: Quorum *bona* fuerant a Iudeis inuasa, sicut legimus ad Ebreos.

**2:11** (III.1–9) SED CVM VENISSET PETRVS reliqua. Galatarum infirmitas eum compellit narrare, quod non solum ceteri apostoli *nihil ei contulerunt* nec minor eis fuerat, sed ipse in Petro aliquid correxit, qui princeps apostolorum fuit. Aliter: Licet [5] *dexteris* concordiae et pacis *mihī dederint*, tamen *Petro restiti* uidens quod contra *Euangelii* regulam ageret. Hoc autem totum agit, ut ostendat se numquam circumcisionis fuisse fautorem, quod de illo falsi apostoli confingebant. QVONIAM REPREHENSVS ERAT. Id est, dignus *reprehensione*.

**2:12** (III.10–11) [10] CVM GENTIBVS MANDVCABAT. Id est, ut in *uase* demonstratum est.

**2:13** (III.12–14) ET SIMVLATIONI EIVS. Id est, *hypochrisi*, dum aliud coram Deo credebatur et aliud coram hominibus agebat. ITA ET BARNABAS. Id est, qui tamen mecum ad gentes missus fuerat.

**2:2** (III.4–8) AND I DISCUSSED. *I did not learn*, but only *discussed*. BUT PRIVATELY. I.e., in secret because of the Jews who were still Judaizing. LEST BY CHANCE I WAS RUNNING IN VAIN. I.e., as the Judaizers esteemed *our freedom*, because we are not under the law of circumcision.

**2:5** (III.9–11) TO WHOM WE DID NOT YIELD EVEN FOR AN HOUR. I.e., because *we did not circumcise Titus*. It is written badly in the Latin codices, *to whom we yielded for an hour*.

**2:6** (III.12–15) WHATEVER SORT THEY WERE AT SOME POINT IN THE PAST. I.e., when the Lord taught them in his own presence. NOTHING TO ME. I.e., teaching.<sup>401</sup> IT MATTERS. I.e., “concerns” or “there is a difference.” GOD DOES NOT PAY ATTENTION TO THE EXTERNAL CIRCUMSTANCES OF A PERSON. Because neither does the duration of time that someone believed influence the judgment about his faith, nor the external circumstances influence the judgment about his or her work.

**2:9** (III.16–18) THEY GAVE THEIR RIGHT HANDS IN FELLOWSHIP. Which is a sign of peace and unity. For they agreed that we ought to teach thus. TO ME AND BARNABAS. For both had been sent, to preach to the *Gentiles*.

**2:10** (III.19–22) ONLY THAT WE BE MINDFUL OF THE POOR. I.e., of the saints who were in Jerusalem, who *distributing* all their possessions, *were laying the proceeds down at the feet of the Apostles*. Or: of those whose *goods* had been taken by the Jews, as we read in Hebrews.

**2:11** (III.1–9) BUT WHEN PETER HAD COME etc. The weakness of the Galatians compels him to tell this, that not only did the other Apostles *not converse with him*, and yet he was not less worthy than they, but that he himself corrected something in Peter, who was the leader of the Apostles. Alternatively: although *they had extended the right hand* of concord and peace *to me*, nevertheless *I opposed Peter*, seeing that he was acting contrary to the rule of the *Gospel*. And he does this entirely so that he might show that he was never a supporter of circumcision, a matter about which the false Apostles were fabricating lies concerning him. SINCE HE HAD BEEN CENSURED. I.e., worthy of *censure*.

**2:12** (III.10–11) HE WAS EATING WITH THE GENTILES. I.e., as was revealed in the *dish*.

**2:13** (III.12–14) AND IN HIS DECEIT. I.e., in his *hypocrisy*, while he was believing one thing in the presence of God, and doing another in the presence of people. THUS ALSO BARNABAS. I.e., who nevertheless had been sent with me to the *Gentiles*.

401 The commentator may here misunderstand the idiom ‘*mea interest*’. I.e. he thinks ‘*doctrina*’ must be supplied with ‘*mea*’.

**2:14** (IIII.15–25) [15] DIXI PETRO CORAM OMNIBVS. Dum enim *coram omnibus* culpa commissa fuit, *coram omnibus* argui debuit. Ideo autem hoc dixit, ut Iudeis de circumcissione superbia et gentibus desperatio tolleretur. SI TV CVM SIS IVDEVS GENTILITER VIVIS. Hoc est, *si tu* non tenes quod natus es, *quomodo* illos facis [20] tenere quod nati non sunt? Rationem reddit, non iniuriam facit. GENTILITER. Id est, *non Iudaice*. Hoc est, *non ex operibus legis* sed sola *fide*, sicut et *gentes*, uitam in Christo inuenisse te nosti. QVOMODO GENTES COGIS IVDAIZARE? Id est, dum *te subtrahis*, tamquam *a peccatoribus*. IVDAIZARE. Id est, honorem [25] circumcissioni dare uel *litteram* obseruare.

HI **2:15** (IIII.26–38) NOS NATVRA IVDEI. *Nos*, inquit, ego et tu, Petre. Illius miscuit personam et suam, ne illi facere uideretur iniuriam. Hieronimus de hac questione dicit, quod subtiliter hoc fecit Paulus non uere *Petro resistendo*, sed in forma uituperat Pe[30]trum alios per eum obseruantes *litteram* percutiendo. Cur enim ille uituperet Petrum *consentiendo* Iudaeis, dum ipse *circumcidit Timotheum propter Iudaeos*? Augustinus uero asserit, quod uere Paulus Petrum *reprehendit*, ne falsum sit, quod superius in hac epistola dixit: *Quae autem scribo uobis, ecce co[35]ram Deo quia non mentior*. Non enim ita laudandi sunt sancti uiri, ut frangatur sancta Scriptura. Sicut alii dicunt Petrum Deum non *negasse* et in hoc mendacem faciunt Saluatorem dicentem: *Ter me negabis*.

**2:16** (IIII.39–44) QVONIAM NON IUSTIFICATVR HOMO EX OPERIBVS LEGIS [40]. Id est, sabbatis et circumcissione ceterisque quae non propter iustitiam, sed ad edomandam *populi duritiam* sunt mandata. Siue: NON IUSTIFICATVR. Hoc scilicet tempore noui testamenti. NISI PER FIDEM IESV CHRISTI. Nam patriarchae et profetae *non ex operibus legis*, sed *ex fide iustificati sunt*.

**2:17** (IIII.45–48) [45] INVENTI SVMVS ET IPSI PECCATORES. Dum nec *ex ipsis operibus legis iustificatur homo*. NVMQVID ERGO CHRISTVS MINISTER PECCATI EST? Id est, si hos, *pro quibus passus est*, non absoluit tamquam non ualens indulgere.

**2:19** (IIII.49–54) EGO ENIM PER LEGEM LEGI MORTVVS SVM. *Per legem* [50] Christi *legi litterae*. Siue: *Per ipsam ueterem ipsi mortuus sum*, quia ipsa se cessaturam esse praedixit. VT DEO VIVAM. Qui legem suam innouauit. CVM CHRISTO CRVCIFIXVS SVM. Quia omnibus peccatis quibus *lex est data sum mortuus*; ergo lex mihi minime necessaria.

**2:14** (III.15–25) I SAID TO PETER IN THE PRESENCE OF ALL. For since the sin was committed *in the presence of all*, it had to be criticized *in the presence of all*. For this reason, moreover, he said this, so that pride concerning circumcision may be taken away of Jews and despair of Gentiles. IF YOU, ALTHOUGH YOU ARE A JEW, LIVE LIKE A GENTILE. I.e., *if you* do not preserve (the tradition into) which you are born, *how* do you make them hold to that which they were not born into? He gives a justification, and does not cause offense. LIKE A GENTILE. I.e., *not like a Jew*. I.e., you know that you found life in Christ *not by works of the law*, but by *faith* alone, just as the Gentiles too. WHY ARE YOU FORCING THE GENTILES TO JUDAEIZE? I.e., while *you withdraw* yourself from the Gentiles as if *from sinners*. TO JUDAEIZE. I.e., to give honor to circumcision, or to observe the *letter* (of the law).

**2:15** (III.26–38) WE ARE JEWS BY BIRTH. *We*, he said, I and you, O Peter. He associated himself with Peter, so that it would not seem like he was causing offense to him. Jerome says, concerning this question, that Paul delicately handled this, by not truly *opposing Peter*, but blames Peter in kind, by criticizing others who observe the *letter* through him. For why would Paul blame Peter *for agreeing* with the Jews, since he himself *circumcised Timothy on account of the Jews*? Augustine however maintains that Paul truly *reprehended* Peter, lest it be wrong what he said earlier in this letter: *In what I write to you, behold in the presence of God I am not lying*: for holy men must not be so praised that holy Scripture would be undermined. As for instance, others say that Peter did not *deny* Christ, and in this they make the Savior a liar who said: *You will deny me three times*.

**2:16** (III.39–44) SINCE A HUMAN BEING IS NOT JUSTIFIED BY WORKS OF THE LAW. I.e., by the Sabbath, and circumcision, and from other things which have been commanded not for the sake of justice, but for the purpose of subduing *the harshness of the people*. Or rather: NOT JUSTIFIED. Undoubtedly, this applies to the time of the New Testament. EXCEPT THROUGH FAITH IN JESUS CHRIST. For the patriarchs and the prophets *were not justified by works of the law*, but *by faith*.

**2:17** (III.45–48) AND WE OURSELVES HAVE BEEN FOUND AS SINNERS. Since a *human being* is not *justified by actual works of the law*. IS CHRIST THEREFORE A MINISTER OF SIN? I.e., if he does not acquit those *for whom he suffered*, as if he is not able to forgive.

**2:19** (III.49–54) FOR I AM DEAD TO THE LAW, THROUGH THE LAW. I died *through the law* of Christ *to the law of the letter*. Or rather: *through* the old law itself, *I died* to that law, because the law itself prophesied, that it would end. SO THAT I MIGHT LIVE FOR GOD. Who renewed his own law. I WAS CRUCIFIED WITH CHRIST. Because *I died* to all sins for which *the law was given*; therefore, the law is completely unnecessary for me.

**2:20** (III.55–57) [55] VIVO AVTEM. Id est, uita spirituali. IAM NON EGO. Id est, *uetus homo*. Vel: Non mea facultate. IN FIDE VIVO DEI. Id est, *in sola fide*, quia nihil debeo *legi*.

**2:21** (III.58–63) NON IRRITAM FACIAM GRATIAM DEI. Hoc est, non debeo illi esse ingratus, *qui me tantum dilexit*, ut *pro me* etiam [60] moreretur; *abiecta* enim et *irrita gratia* est, si mihi sola non sufficit. *Irritam* ergo *gratiam facit*, qui post euangelium uiuit in lege et qui peccatis post baptismum sordidatur. Hucusque contra Petrum, nunc ad Galatas sermonem retorquet.

**3:1** (III.64–75) O STVLTI GALATAE reliqua. Hoc non est contrarium [65] uerbo Saluatoris, quo *fratrem fatuum* uocari prohibuit, quia more diligentis bene corripit, sicut Dominus dicit: *Et uos sine intellectu estis*, et: *Modicae fidei*; HI ius enim est magistris peccantes increpare discipulos. QVIS VOS FASCINAVIT? *Quis* uobis inuidit? *Fascinatio* enim Grece *inuidia* interpretatur. ANTE [70] QVORVM OCVLOS PROSCRIPTVS EST. Id est, quibus per meam predicationem ita manifestata est passio eius, ut ipse *ante* uos sententiam damnationis excepit. IN VOBIS CRVCIFIXVS. Id est, quasi apud uos omnia facta sint. Siue sic: Quem uere pro damnato et mortuo etiam nunc uilem habetis, dum putatis eum uo[75]bis non sufficere ad salutem.

**3:2** (III.76–77) AN EX AVDITV FIDEI? Si enim ex merito *fidei Spiritum* sanctum *accepistis*, quid uobis lex amplius dare poterit?

**3:3** (III.78–81) SIC STVLTI ESTIS reliqua. Magna *stultitia* est in seruitutem ueteris a libertate noui testamenti et gratiae diuertere. [80] NVNC CARNE CONSVMMAMINI. Id est, in legem carnalem euntes.

**3:4** (III.82–88) TANTA PASSI ESTIS SINE CAVSA, SI TAMEN SINE CAVSA? Galatae in *Crucifixum* credentes a Iudeis et gentibus tormenta et obprobria multa perpassi sunt. Dicit ergo: *Tanta sine causa* [85] *pro Christo toleratis*, *si tamen* non iterum corrigatis? Siue: In hoc non dubitantis sermo est, sed potius confirmantis, secundum illud: *Si tamen iustum est apud Deum retribuere his qui uobis tribulant tribulationem*.

HI **3:5** (III.89–91) OPERATVR VIRTUTES. Ostendit Galatas *accepto per fi* [90] *dem Spiritu* sancto dona habuisse *uirtutum*, id est, *profetiam* et *genera linguarum*.

**2:20** (III.55–57) I LIVE. I.e., with a spiritual life. NO LONGER I. I.e., *the old self*. Or: Not by my ability. I LIVE BY FAITH IN GOD. I.e., *in faith* alone, because I owe nothing to the *law*.

**2:21** (III.58–63) I SHALL NOT MAKE THE GRACE OF GOD INVALID. I.e., I ought not be ungrateful to him, *who* so greatly *loved me*, that he even died *on my behalf*. For *grace* is *debased* and *invalid*, if it alone does not suffice for me. Therefore *one makes grace invalid*, who after the gospel lives in the law, and who is stained with sins after baptism. So far was against Peter, now he redirects his address towards the Galatians.

**3:1** (III.64–75) O FOOLISH GALATIANS etc. This is not contrary to the saying of the Savior, in which he forbade the *brother* to be called *idiotic*: because he corrects well in the manner of someone who loves, just as the Lord says: *And you are without understanding*, and *of little faith*. For it is the right of teachers to chide their erring students. WHO BEWITCHED YOU? *Who* has cast an evil eye upon you? For ‘*fascinatio*’ (a bewitching) is interpreted as ‘*invidia*’ (ill-will) in Greek. BEFORE WHOSE EYES HE WAS CONDEMNED TO DEATH. I.e., for whom through my preaching his passion was made known to such a degree, that he himself received the verdict of damnation *before* you. HE WAS CRUCIFIED AMONG YOU. I.e., as though all this happened among you. Or rather thus: whom in truth you even now consider worthless because he was condemned and died, since you think that he is not sufficient for your salvation.

**3:2** (III.76–77) OR BY HEARING WITH FAITH? For if *you have received* the Holy *Spirit* by merit *of faith*, what more will the law be able to give to you?

**3:3** (III.78–81) ARE YOU SO FOOLISH, etc. It is very *foolish* to divert from the freedom of the New Testament and of grace into the slavery of the Old Testament. ARE YOU NOW PERFECTED BY THE FLESH? I.e., resorting to the carnal law.

**3:4** (III.82–88) HAVE YOU SUFFERED SO GREATLY WITHOUT CAUSE, IF ACTUALLY WITHOUT CAUSE? The Galatians, believing in *the crucified one*, have suffered many torments and insults from the Jews and Gentiles. He says therefore: *do you suffer so greatly without cause on behalf of Christ*, *if actually* you do not improve again? Or rather: in this statement is an expression not of someone doubting, but rather of someone affirming, as is attested in the following statement: *If nevertheless it is just according to God to repay those who confer tribulation upon you with tribulation*.

**3:5** (III.89–91) HE WORKS MIRACLES. He shows that the Galatians, *by having accepted the Holy Spirit through faith*, had the gifts *of miracles*, i.e., *prophecy* and *speaking in tongues*.



**3:6** (III.92–96) CREDIDIT ABRAAM. Non dixit ‘operatus est per legem’, sed sola *fide credidit*, hoc est, quod *exiit de terra sua in terram quam ignorabat*, quod *Sarram nonagenariam et sterilem credi[95]dit esse parituram*, quod in *Isaac uocaretur sibi semen* et quod *obtulit filium suum*.

**3:8** (III.97–102) PROVIDENS AVTEM SCRIPTVRA. Non quo atramentum et membrana, quae insensuales sunt, possunt futura praenoscere, sed quo Spiritus sanctus et sensus, qui in littera latet, futura [100] praedicat. IN TE. Id est, non in lege, sed *in te*, hoc est, in fide tua, quia caput fidei es. BENE-DICENTVR OMNES GENTES. Non una *gens* tantum Iudaica, sed *omnes gentes*.

**3:10** (III.103–107) SVB MALEDICTO SVNT. Quia ita praevaluit consuetudo peccandi, ut nemo iam perficiat legem, sicut Petrus apostolus [105] ait: *Quod neque nos neque patres nostri portare potuimus*. Si qui uero iusti non erant *maledicti*, non *ex operibus legis*, sed *fidei gratia saluati* sunt.

**3:12** (III.108–110) SED QVI FACIT ILLA. Id est, mandata legis. VIVET IN EIS. Carnali scilicet uita, quia *non est reus mortis*, dum implet [110] mandata legis.

**3:13** (III.111–136) CHRISTVS REDEMIT NOS reliqua. Inter emere et *redimere* hoc interest, quia qui emit, alienum emit; qui autem [113] *redimit*, id emit proprie, quod suum fuit, et suum esse deseuit. MALEDICTVS OMNIS QVI PENDIT IN LIGNO. Non ideo *maledictus* quia *pendit*, sed ideo *pendit* quia *maledictus*. Ille negat Christum *maledictum*, qui negat Christum mortuum; qui autem confitetur mortuum et negare non potest mortem de peccato esse et ob hoc etiam ipsam peccatum uocari, audiat ipse apostolum dicentem: *Quoniam uetus homo noster simul cum illo [120] crucifixus est*, et intellegat, quem *maledictum* Moyses dixerit. Ideoque securus apostolus ait de Christo: *Factus pro nobis maledictum*, sicut non timuit dicere: *Pro omnibus mortuus est*, hoc est enim *mortuus est*, quia *maledictus*, quia mors ipsa ex *maledicto* est et *maledictum* est omne peccatum, siue ipsum, [125] quod fit, ut sequatur supplicium, siue ipsum supplicium, quod alio modo uocatur peccatum, quia fit ex peccato. Quod autem additum est: *omnis*, ut diceretur: *Maledictus omnis qui pendit in ligno*, non sane Moyses minus praeuidit etiam iustos in cruce futuros, sed bene praeuidit hereticos ueram mortem Do[130]mini negaturos et ideo uolentes ab hoc *maledicto* *Christum* seiungere, ut a mortis etiam ueritate seiungerent. Si enim uera illa mors non erat, nullum *maledictum* *Christo crucifixo* *pependit in ligno*, quia nec uere *crucifixus est*: Ac per hoc additum est: *omnis*, ne Christus ad ueram mortem non pertinere [135] diceretur, si a *maledicto*, quod morti coniunctum est, insipienti honorificentia separaretur.

**3:6** (III.92–96) ABRAHAM BELIEVED. He did not say that he worked through the law, but by *faith* alone *he believed*, that is, because *he went from his own land into another land which* he did not know; because he believed that *Sarah* at *age ninety* and *sterile would give birth to what in Isaac would be called his seed*, and because he *offered* his own son.

**3:8** (III.97–102) AND SCRIPTURE, FORESEEING. Not that black ink and parchment, which are without sensual perception, can know the future, but that the Holy Spirit and the sense, which hides in the letter, foretells the future. IN YOU. I.e., not in the law, but *in you*, i. e., in your faith, because you are the head of faith. ALL RACES SHALL BE BLESSED. Not the one Jewish *race* alone, but *all races*.

**3:10** (III.103–107) THEY ARE UNDER A CURSE. Because the habit of sinning has grown so strong, that no one carries out the law anymore, just as the Apostle Peter says: *What neither we nor our fathers have been able to bear*. But if some just people were not *cursed*, they were *saved* not *through works of the law*, but by the *grace* of faith.

**3:12** (III.108–110) BUT THE ONE WHO DOES THOSE THINGS. I.e., the commands of the law. HE WILL LIVE IN THEM. Namely, with a carnal life, because *he is not a prisoner of death*, since he fulfills the command of the law.

**3:13** (III.111–136) CHRIST REDEEMED US etc. This is the difference between, 'to buy' and 'to *buy back*': that anyone who buys, buys something that does not belong to him; but whoever *buys back*, properly speaking, buys something which was his own and ceased to be his own. CURSED IS EVERYONE WHO HANGS ON A TREE. Not *cursed* because *he hangs*, but rather *he hangs* because *he is cursed*. The one who denies that Christ died, denies that Christ *is cursed*. However, the one who confesses that he died and cannot deny that death is from sin, and that because of this death itself is actually called sin, let him hear the Apostle saying: *Since our old self was crucified together with him*, and let him understand whom Moses called *cursed*. For this reason, the Apostle says confidently about Christ: *He was made a curse for us*, just as he did not fear to say: *He died for all*, for that is, *he died* because *he was cursed*, because death itself is from a *curse*, and every sin is a *curse*, either the deed itself is a *curse*, so that punishment follows, or even the punishment itself, that is called sin in a different sense because it happens as a consequence of sin. But '*omnis*' (*everyone*) was added, so that it was said: *Cursed is everyone who hangs on a tree*, Moses certainly did not fail to foresee that just people too would hang on the cross, but he foresaw well that heretics would deny the true death of the Lord, wishing to separate *Christ* from this *curse* for this reason, that they might separate Christ from the reality of death. For if that was not a true death, then *no curse hung on the cross when Christ was crucified*, because he has not been truly *crucified*. '*Omnis*' (*everyone*) was also added for this reason, lest Christ should be said not to relate to a true death, if by the foolish honor he were separated from the curse which was linked to death.

**3:14** (III.137–139) VT POLLICITATIONEM SPIRITVS reliqua. Quae per Ioel *omni carni* promissa est, id est, uniuerso generi humano, ut: *Effundam de Spiritu meo super omnem carnem*.

**3:15** (III.140–153) [140] FRATRES, SECVNDVM HOMINEM DICO. Hoc est, humano utor exemplo. Siue: SECVNDVM HOMINEM. Nam excelsiorem et profundiore sensum habeo in his *promissionibus*, si dicerem; HI tamen non profunda profero sed, quae potest *homo* intellegere. NEMO IRRITVM FACIT. Quasi dixisset: Si *hominis* [145] *testamentum nemo spernit*, quanto magis Dei *testamentum*, hoc est, *promissionem*! Ac si diceret: Quamuis lex data est, antequam impleretur *promissio*, tamen non in illa lege impleta est *Abrahae promissio*, sed ad hoc tantum lex data est, ut per illam aleremur, donec adueniret *promissio*. Simplex autem sensus, [150] qui in hoc loco textitur, talem uim habet, ut doceat apostolus non posse per legem, quae postea data est, *repromissiones* quae ante factae sunt *ad Abraam*, destrui et posteriora prioribus praeiudicare.

**3:17** (III.154–174) NON IRRITVM FACIT. Id est, quae *post* tantum temporis [155] data est lex, *testamentum* illud non potest *euacuare*, quod *Abraae Deus confirmauit* in Christo. AD EVACVANDAM PROMISSIONEM. Id est, ut non postea impleretur *promissio post* datam legem, quasi in illa impleretur. POST CCCC ET XXX ANNOS et reliqua. *Habitatio filiorum Israhel, qua manserunt in Egypto, fuit CCCC XXX annorum, quibus expletis eadem die* [160] *egressus est omnis exercitus Domini de terra Egypti*, ut Scriptura testatur Exodi. Quorum tamen summam annorum chronografi a septuagesimo quinto anno natiuitatis Abraham, quando *terram repromissionis* intrauit, computant sequentes editionem [165] LXX interpretum, quae dicit: *Habitatio autem filiorum Israhel, qua habitauerunt in Egypto et in terra Chanaan, ipsi et patres eorum, anni CCCC XXX*. Quam necessario sequendam et ipsa Ebraica ueritas ostendit, quae narrat *Caath filium Leui*, quem natum esse constat in terra Chanaan, *uixisse annos C XXX III* et [170] *filium Amram patrem Moysi annos C XXX VII* et ipsum *Moysen LXXX fuisse annorum* tempore *egressionis de Aegypto*, quia nimirum horum summam *annorum* constat *CCCC et XXX* implere non posse. Annuit autem horum translationi et apostolus, cum ait: *Abrahae dictae sunt promissiones* et reliqua.

**3:18** (III.175–177) [175] ABRAHAE AVTEM PER REPROMISSIONEM. Id est, non *per legem*, quae nondum erat, sed *per repromissionem*, ut: *In semine tuo benedicentur omnes tribus terrae*.

**3:14** (III.137–139) SO THAT [WE WOULD RECEIVE] THE PROMISE OF THE SPIRIT etc. Which was promised through Joel *to all flesh*, i.e., to the entire human race, namely: *I will pour out my spirit over all flesh*.

**3:15** (III.140–153) BROTHERS, I SPEAK AFTER THE MANNER OF A HUMAN BEING. I.e., I use a human example. Or rather: ACCORDING TO A HUMAN BEING. For I grasp a more eminent and profound meaning in these promises, if I were to speak of it. Nevertheless I do not proclaim profound things, but that which *a person* can understand. NO ONE MAKES IT INVALID. As if he had said: if *no one scorns the testament of a human*, how much more the *testament of God*, i.e., *the promise!* As if he said: Although the law was given before the *promise* was fulfilled, nevertheless, *the promise of Abraham* was not fulfilled in that law, but the law was given only for this purpose, so that we might be nourished through it, until the *promise* arrived. The simple sense, however, which is in this place of the text, has such force, meaning that, the Apostle teaches that it is not possible to destroy through the law which was given afterwards, *promises*, which were made *to Abraham* beforehand, and to judge later events in light of the earlier ones.

**3:17** (III.154–174) DOES NOT MAKE IT INVALID. I.e., the law, which was given *after* such a great measure of time, cannot *invalidate* that *testament* that *God confirmed to Abraham* in Christ. FOR THE PURPOSE OF INVALIDATING THE PROMISE. I.e., so that the *promise* would not be fulfilled retrospectively *after* the law was given, as if the promise were fulfilled in the law. AFTER 430 YEARS etc. *The habitation of the sons of Israel, where they remained in Egypt, lasted for 430 years, with those completed, the same day the whole army of the Lord walked out of the land of Egypt*, as Scripture testifies in Exodus. Nevertheless the chroniclers calculate the sum of those years from the 75<sup>th</sup> year of Abraham's birth, when he entered the *land of the promise*, following the edition of the Seventy Translators, which says: and *the habitation of the sons of Israel, which they and their fathers inhabited in Egypt and in the land of Canaan lasted for 430 years*. The truthful Hebrew version itself shows that it is necessary to follow the Septuagint edition, which tells that *Caath the son of Levi*, about whom it is certain that he was born in the land of Canaan, *lived for 133 years*, and his son *Amram* the father of Moses lived for *137 years*, and *Moses* himself *was 80 years old* by the time of *the exodus from Egypt*, because it is certainly clear that the sum of these years cannot amount to 430. Even the Apostle however assented to the translation of these seventy, when he says: *promises were uttered to Abraham* etc.

**3:18** (III.175–177) BUT TO ABRAHAM THROUGH THE PROMISE. I.e., not *through* the law, which was not yet, but *through the promise*, as in: *in your seed all the tribes of the earth shall be blessed*.

**3:19** (III.178–189) QUID ERGO LEX? PROPTER TRANSGRESSIONEM POSITA. A latere uenientem questionem sibi ipse proponit: [180] Quare ergo data est *lex*, dum non in illa *promissio* est nec implet *promissionem nemoque* per eam saluatur? Ad quod respondet: *Lex propter transgressionem posita est*, et more pignoris fuit, *donec ueniret semen*. Hic autem hiperbaton est ex omni parte confusum. Est enim hic ordo: *Lex posita est in [185] manu mediatoris propter transgressionem disposita per angelos*. DISPOSITA PER ANGELOS. Quia *per angelos lex ministrabatur*. IN MANU MEDIATORIS. Siue: Moysi, ut quidam putant; ‘nam et Moyses’, aiunt, ‘*inter Deum et populum medius fuit*’. [189] Siue: Christi.

**3:20** (III.190–192) DEVS AVTEM. Id est, Christus. VNVS EST. Ideo hoc addidit, ne quis putaret Christum ab unitate diuinae naturae diuisum, quia *mediatoris* suscepisset officium.

**3:21** (III.193–195) LEX ERGO ADVERSVS PROMISSA EST? ABSIT! Quia nec *lex* prohibuit, ut *promissa*, quae praedicta sunt: postea com[195]ple-  
rentur.

**3:22** (VI.1–5) SED CONCLVSIT. Id est, deprehendit. Ostendit arguendo peccata, quia uetus *lex* pestem non detulerat, sed ostendit *omnia sub peccato* dicendo: *Non est, qui faciat bonum* reliqua. VT REPROMISSIO. Id est: *In semine tuo* reliqua. EX FIDE. Id [5] est, ut sola *fide* saluarentur credentes.

**3:23** (VI.6–8) SVB LEGE CVSTODIEBAMVR. Hoc est, seruabamur a *lege* huic *fidei quae erat* suo tempore *reuelanda*. CONCLVSI. Id est, *timore* unius *Dei*.

**3:24** (VI.9–11) ITAQUE LEX PAEDAGOGVS reliqua. Ad disciplinam [10] nos arctius retentans perfectam doctrinam uero magistro reseruabat.

**3:25** (VI.12–13) NON SVB PEDAGOGO SVMVS. Nam *perfectae aetatis* discipuli non indigent *pedagogo*.

AU **3:26** (VI.14–21) OMNES ENIM FILII DEI ESTIS reliqua. Ad hoc ualet, ne [15] gentes de se desperarent, quia non *custodiebantur sub pedagogo* et ideo *se filios* non putarent, sed *per fidem induendo Christum* omnes fiunt *filii*, non natura, ut unicus, qui etiam *sapientia Dei* est, prestante *mediatoris fide*. Quam *fidei* gratiam nunc *indumentum* uocat, ut *Christum induti* sint, qui *in Chris[20]tum* crediderunt, et ideo *filii Dei fratresque mediatoris* effecti, in qua *fide* non est distantia *Iudei neque Greci* et reliqua.

**3:28** (VI.22–28) NON EST IVDÆVS NEQVE GRECVS et reliqua. Ante enim non solum inter *Iudaeum* et *Grecum*, sed etiam inter tribum et

**3:19** (III.178–189) WHAT THEREFORE IS THE LAW? IT WAS ESTABLISHED BECAUSE OF TRANSGRESSION. He asks himself the question arriving from the side: Why, *therefore*, was the *law* given, since the *promise* is not in that, nor does it fulfill a *promise*, and *no one* is saved through it? To that he responds: *The law was established because of transgression*, and in the way of a pledge, *until his seed could come*. Here however is a hyperbaton, in every respect confused. For this is the right sequence: *The law was placed in the hand of a mediator on account of transgression, ordained through angels*. ORDAINED THROUGH ANGELS. Because *through angels the law was administered*. IN THE HAND OF THE MEDIATOR. Either: of Moses, as some think. “For also Moses”, they say, “*was the mediator between God and the people*.” Or rather: of Christ.

**3:20** (III.190–192) BUT GOD. I.e., Christ. IS ONE. For this reason he added this, lest anyone think that Christ was divided from the unity of the divine nature, because he assumed the duty of *mediator*.

**3:21** (III.193–195) IS THE LAW THEREFORE CONTRARY TO THE PROMISES? NO! Because the *law* did not forbid the *promises*, which were predicted, from afterwards being fulfilled.

**3:22** (VI.1–5) BUT SCRIPTURE INCLUDED. I.e., revealed. It exposed by revealing sins, because the old law had not removed the disease, but showed that *all things* were *under sin*, by saying: *There is no one who does good* etc. AS THE COUNTERPROMISE. I.e.: *in your seed* etc. BY FAITH. I.e., so that the ones who believe *would be saved by faith* alone.

**3:23** (VI.6–8) WE WERE BEING GUARDED UNDER THE LAW. I.e., we were saved by the *law* for this *faith*, *which had to be revealed* in its own time. WHO WERE SHUT UP. I.e., by *fear* of the one *God*.

**3:24** (VI.9–11) THUS THE LAW IS A DISCIPLINARY MASTER etc. More closely retaining us for instruction it was reserving the perfect teaching for the true teacher.

**3:25** (VI.12–13) WE ARE NOT UNDER A DISCIPLINARY MASTER. For students *of the perfect age* are not in need of a *disciplinary master*.

**3:26** (VI.14–21) FOR YOU ALL ARE SONS OF GOD etc. The significance of this is that the Gentiles should not despair, because *they were* not *being guarded under the disciplinary master*, and therefore they did not think of themselves as *sons*, but all become *sons by putting on Christ through faith*, not by birth, as there is only one who is also the *wisdom* of *God*, by the outstanding faithfulness of the mediator; this grace of *faith* he now calls a *garment*, so that they might *be clothed with Christ*, those who believed *in Christ*, and therefore have become *sons of God* and *brothers* of the *mediator*, in which *faith* there is no difference between *Jew* and *Greek* etc.

**3:28** (VI.22–28) THERE IS NEITHER JEW NOR GREEK etc. For before not only between *Jew* and *Greek*, but even between tribe and tribe there was great diversity. But it must be noted, that in this passage he established three

tribum erat magna diuersitas. Sed notandum, quod in [25] hoc tres differentias, generis uidelicet, conditionis, sexus posuit. OMNES ENIM VOS VNVM ESTIS. Si *omnes unum corpus Christi effecti estis, Abrahae semen estis* ut ueri *heredes, non ex carnali semine, sed ex diuina promissione* generati.

4:1 (VII.1–7) DICO AVTEM, QVAMDIU PARVVLVS EST reliqua.  
 AU *Paruulus* filius, id est, populus propter *unam fidem* ad *unum semen Abrahae* pertinens, sed partim *sub pedagogo* fuit ex parte Iudaeorum, partim *sub elementis huius mundi*, quibus tam[5]quam *procuratoribus seruiebant*, ex parte gentium. NIHIL DIFFERT A SERVO. Quia filius sub correctione disciplinae est quomodo *seruus*.

4:2 (VII.8–11) SED SVB CVRATORIBVS. Qui hereditatem puero custodiunt. ET ACTORIBVS. Qui eum ad bonos mores cogunt. Item: SVB TVTORIBVS reliqua. Id est, angelis uel prophetis, quorum [11] uerbis in aduentum Saluatoris cottidie erudiebantur.

4:3 (VII.12–15) SVB ELEMENTIS HVIVS MVNDI. Quibus quasi diis usque ad aduentum Christi gentiles *seruiebant*. Alii legem et eloquia prophetarum, quibus quasi quodam alphabeto erudiebantur, di[15]cunt.

4:4 (VII.16–18) FACTVM SVB LEGE. Quia *circumcisus est* et *hostia* pro illo oblata est. Quia si *sub lege factus* non esset, Iudei in eum credere non poterant.

4:5 (VII.19–22) VT ADOPTIONEM FILIORVM. Nos enim beneficio et dig[20]natione misericordiae eius *Dei sumus filii*. VT RECIPEREMVS. Non accipiamus sed *recipiamus*, ut significaret et hoc nos amisisse in Adam, ex quo mortales sumus.

4:6 (VII.23–25) CLAMANTEM. Nos *clamare* suscitantem. ABBA HI PATER. Consuetudo Scripturae est, ut Ebreum uerbum cum interpreta[25]tione ponat, ut in Genesi: *Mesech uernaculus*.

4:9 (VII.26–39) IMMO COGNITI ESTIS A DEO. Quia non illum uos quaesistis, sed ille uos *perditos requisiiuit*. Non quod tunc *cognouisset illos Deus, praecognitos* uidelicet *ante constitutionem mundi*, sed quia tunc ipsi eum illius munere, non suo merito uel fa[30]cultate, *cognouerant*, maluit apostolus tropice loqui, ut tunc *ab illo cognitos* diceret, cum eis *cognoscendum* se praestitit, et maluit uerbum suum corrigere, quod dixit: *Nunc autem cognoscentes Deum*, quasi hoc minus recte dixerit, quod proprie dixerat, et dicere: *Immo cogniti estis ab eo*, quam sinere, ut hoc [35] sibi arrogarent se potuisse, quod eis posse ille donauerat. AD INFIRMA ET EGENA ELIMENTA. Quae nunc *infirma et egena* dicit, superius *mundi elementa* posuit. *Infirma* autem dicuntur, quia nihil possunt his, qui se adorant; *egena* uero, quod diuina [39] gubernatione egeant.

differences: namely of race, social condition, and gender. FOR YOU ARE ALL ONE. If *you all* have become *one body of Christ*, *you are the seed of Abraham*, as true *heirs* having been produced *not from carnal seed, but from divine promise*.

**4:1** (VII.1–7) MOREOVER I SAY, AS LONG AS [THE HEIR] IS A CHILD etc. A *little* son, i. e., a people on account of *one faith* pertaining to *the one seed of Abraham*, but they were partly *under a disciplinary master* on the Jewish side, and partly *under the elements of this world*, whom *they served* as under *administrators*, on the Gentile side. HE BY NO MEANS DIFFERS FROM A SLAVE. Because a son is under the correction of instruction, just like a *slave*.

**4:2** (VII.8–11) BUT UNDER GUARDIANS. Who guard the inheritance for the boy. AND UNDER MANAGERS. Who urge him towards good habits. Likewise: UNDER TUTORS etc. I. e., angels or prophets by whose words they were daily being instructed anticipating the coming of the Savior.

**4:3** (VII.12–15) UNDER THE ELEMENTS OF THIS WORLD. The Gentiles served to those as if they were gods until the arrival of Christ. Others say they are the law and sayings of the prophets, in which they were instructed as if in a certain alphabet.

**4:4** (VII.16–18) BORN UNDER THE LAW. Because he *was circumcised* and a *sacrifice* was offered for him, because if he had not *been born under the law*, the Jews would not be able to believe in him.

**4:5** (VII.19–22) AS THE ADOPTION OF SONS. For we are *sons of God* by the kindness and grace of his compassion. SO THAT WE MAY RECEIVE AGAIN. It is not ‘we may receive’, but ‘we may *receive again*’, so that it may indicate that we also lost this in Adam, through whom we are mortals.

**4:6** (VII.23–25) CRYING. Urging us to *cry*. ABBA FATHER. It is a habit of Scripture that it juxtaposes a Hebrew word with an interpretation, as in Genesis, \* *mesech* \* *born in slavery*.

**4:9** (VII.26–39) YOU ARE INDEED KNOWN BY GOD. Because you did not seek him, but he *sought* you again when you were *lost*: not because then *God knew those*, who were clearly *foreknown before the creation of the world*, but because then they themselves *knew* him through his gift, not through their own merit or ability. The Apostle preferred to speak figuratively, so that he said that *they were then known by him*, when he allowed himself to be known by them, and he preferred to correct his own words, when he said: *but now that you have come to know God*, as if he had said less correctly what he had said properly, and to say, *or rather, you are known by him*, instead of allowing them to claim that they were able to do for themselves, what he had given them the ability to do. TO THE FEEBLE AND DESTITUTE ELEMENTS. What he now calls *feeble and destitute*, above he called *the elements of the world*. They are called *feeble*, moreover, because they can do nothing for those who adore them. To be sure, they are called *destitute* because they need divine guidance.



AU **4:10** (VII.40–49) **DIES OBSERVATIS** reliqua. Sunt quaedam, quae leuissima putarentur, nisi in Scripturis demonstrarentur opinione grauiora. Quis enim estimaret, quam magnum peccatum sit, *dies obseruare et menses et annos et tempora*, sicut *obseruant*, qui certis *diebus* siue *mensibus* siue *annis* uolunt uel nolunt [45] aliquid inchoare, eo quod *secundum doctrinas uanas hominum* fausta uel infausta existiment *tempora*, nisi mali huius magnitudinem ex *timore* apostoli pensaremus, qui talibus ait: *Timeo uos, ne forte sine causa laborauerim in uobis?* Nihil enim profeci uos faciendo Christianos, si ista iterum *obseruetis*.

**4:12** (VII.50–56) [50] **ESTOTE SICVT ET EGO**. Id est, ueteres errores relinquite, *sicut et ego* reliqui! Vel: In omnibus *imitatores mei estote!* QVONIAM ET EGO SICVT ET VOS. Id est, errans fui aliquando. Vel: Homo sum *sicut et uos*. NIHIL ME LAESISTIS. Id est, ut merito putetis me inimicitiarum et non salutis uestrae causa moueri. *Laedit* discipulus magistrum, si per negligentiam suam [56] praecepta eius laboremque disperdat.

**4:13** (VII.57–61) **SCITIS QVIA PER INFIRMITATEM CARNIS**. Vel passionibus, uel dolore corporis. Ac si diceret: Ideo dico, quod *non me laesistis*, quia quando uobis praedicaui, *infirmus* fui et ta[60]men *nec me tunc lesistis neque spreuistis*, sed mihi compassi estis.

AU **4:14** (VII.62–67) **ET TEMPTATIONEM VESTRAM** reliqua. *Temptati* sunt enim, cum persecutionem pateretur apostolus, utrum desererent eam an caritate amplecterentur. Et dicit: *Neque spreuistis*, ut [65] non susciperetis communionem periculi mei. Grandis itaque *temptatio* discipuli est, si uir sanctus aut *infirmetur* aut impune *laedatur*.

**4:15** (VII.68–71) **QVAE ERGO EST BEATITVDO VESTRA**. Id est, illa, quam in uobis in initiis laudabam, nunc nulla est. QVONIAM SI FIERI [70] POSSET reliqua. Hoc yperbolice pro nimia dilectione dictum est.

**4:16** (VII.72–73) **VERVM PRAEDICANS VOBIS**. Non quicquid *uerum*, sed ut non circumcidantur.

AU **4:17** (VII.74–77) **AEMVLANTVR VOS**. Id est, inuidet uobis, qui *uos* carnales de spiritualibus facere conantur. **NON BENE**. Id est, [76] dum seducere *uos uolunt*. **VT ILLOS AEMVLEMINI**. Id est, ut sub iugo legis te-neamini.

**4:18** (VII.78–79) **CARISMATA**. Id est, dona. **EMVLAMINI**. Id est, sectamini.

**4:19** (VII.80–84) [80] **FILIOLI MEI, QVOS ITERVM PARTVRIO**. Id est, per hanc epistolam. Quia prius *parturiui uos* per Euangelium genitos in lucem ueritatis, sed eundo in ueterem legem *uanasque hominum doctrinas nouam uitam Christi*que formam perdidistis; sed nunc *uos iterum parturio*, ut per po-nitentiam renascamini.

**4:10** (VII.40–49) YOU OBSERVE DAYS etc. Certainly there are things that would be considered most trivial, were they not revealed in the Scriptures as more weighty than commonly assumed. For who would estimate how great a sin it is to *observe days, months, years and times* as those *observe* who on certain *days* or in certain *months* or *years* wish or do not wish to commence something, because *according to vain doctrines of humans*, they reckon either good or bad omened *times*, unless we measured the magnitude of this evil by the *fear* of the Apostle who said the following: *I am fearful for you lest by chance I labored among you in vain?* For I gained nothing by making you Christians, if you *observe* those dastardly things again.

**4:12** (VII.50–56) BE AS I AM. I.e., quit your old ways, *as I too* quit them! Or: *be imitators of me* in everything. FOR I ALSO AM AS YOU ARE. I.e., I was erring sometime in the past. Or: I am human *just like you*. YOU HAVE NOT INJURED ME. I.e., so that you may rightly believe that I am stirred because of your enmities and not for the sake of your salvation. The student *injures* the teacher, if through his own negligence he ruins the precepts and efforts of the teacher.

**4:13** (VII.57–61) YOU KNOW IT WAS BECAUSE OF A BODILY ILLNESS. Either through sufferings or through pain of the body. It is if he were saying: therefore I say that *you did not harm me*, because I was *weak* when I preached to you, and nevertheless you did *not harm me* even then, *nor did you despise* me, but you had compassion on me.

**4:14** (VII.62–67) AND YOUR TRIAL etc. For they were *tried* when the Apostle suffered persecution, whether they forsook it, or they embraced it with love. And he says: *And you did not despise* me, by failing to undertake the fellowship of my danger: thus it is a grand *temptation* of a disciple, if a holy man is either *weakened* or harmed with impunity.

**4:15** (VII.68–71) WHERE THEREFORE IS YOUR BLESSEDNESS? I.e., that which I was praising as among you in the beginning is no longer there. BECAUSE IF IT WERE POSSIBLE etc. This was said hyperbolically because of his superlative love.

**4:16** (VII.72–73) PREACHING YOU THE TRUTH. Not everything *true*, but that they should not be circumcised.

**4:17** (VII.74–77) THEY ARE ZEALOUS FOR YOU. I.e., they are envious of you, they who try to make *you* carnal beings from spiritual ones. NOT WELL. I.e., since *they wish* to seduce *you*. SO THAT YOU MAY EMULATE THEM. I.e., so that you may be held under the yoke of the law.

**4:18** (VII.78–79) PRESENTS. I.e., gifts. EMULATE. I.e., follow.

**4:19** (VII.80–84) MY LITTLE CHILDREN, FOR WHOM I AM AGAIN ENDURING LABOR PAINS. I.e., through this letter. Because previously *I endured labor pains for you* when you were born through the gospel into the light of truth, but by entering into the old law and *vain doctrines of human beings*, you have lost the *new life* and *image of Christ*; but now *I labor again for you*, so that through penitence you might be reborn.

**4:20** (VII.85–87) [85] ET MVTARE VOCEM. Id est, quia magis uiua quam mortua prodest. QVONIAM CONFVNDOR IN VOBIS. *Confunditur*, quia *fili* effecti *serui* esse coeperunt.

PIL **4:22** (VII.88–94) QVONIAM ABRAHAM DVOS FILIOS HABVIT reliqua. Dedit autem ex hoc loco regulam apostolus intellegendi alligo[90]ricas rationes, scilicet ut manente historiae ueritate figuras testamenti ueteris exponamus. Nam cum dixisset *Abraham* duas uxores uerissime *habuisse*, postea quae praefigurauerint demonstrauit. VNVM. Id est, *Ismael*. DE ANCILLA. Id est, de *Agar Aegyptia*. ET VNVM. Id est, *Isaac*. DE LIBERA. Id est, *Sara*.

HI **4:23** (VII.95–101) [95] SECVNDVM CARNEM. Id est, *secundum* usum *carnalem* *Ismael natus est*, quia *Abraam* *carnalem* concupiscentiam in iuuentute habens ex iuuenali *ancilla* eum genuit, *Isaac* uero *per repromissionem*; uirtus enim *repromissionis* suscitauit illum de senili patre sterilique matre, aliud ex alio significantia, [100] quia qui litteram sequitur, *filius* est *Agar*, qui uero intelligentiam spiritualem, *filius* est *liberae*.

PIL **4:24** (VII.102–107) NAM HAEC SVNT DVO TESTAMENTA. Per *ancillam* uetus lex designatur, per *liberam* noua lex. Filii autem *Agar* filii ueteris legis sunt *in seruitutem generantis*, filii autem *liberae* [105] filii noui testamenti intelleguntur. IN SERVITVTTEM GENERANS. Iudei metu etiam praesenti cogebantur ut *serui*, nos uero praemiis inuitamur ut *liberi*.

AM **4:25** (VII.108–124) SINA ENIM MONS EST reliqua. Hoc dicit, quia sicut confinis est *Sina* et *Hierusalem*, terminus enim tribus Iuda pertingit [110] *Sina montem*, qui est in extremo *Arabiae*, ita utraque conueniunt in figuram *Agar*, id est ueteris testamenti, *Sina* uidelicet, in quo lex data est, et *Hierusalem*, in qua lex custodita et impleta est. SERVIENS. Id est, terrestris *Hierusalem*. CVM FILIIS SVIS. Id est, Iudeis. Item secundum Ambrosium: [115] *Apta* est similitudo *Agar* ad uetus testamentum, eo quod in illo sit data loco, qui locus ad gentem pertingit illam, unde erat et *Agar*; *Agar* enim *Aegyptia* erat et tamen ex *Arabia* fuerat, quoniam non modica pars *Aegypti* in *Arabia* concludebatur. Nam quod dicit: *Adfinis est eius quae nunc est Hierusalem*, de *Agar* [120] dicitur, quoniam illa, quae apud nos est *Hierusalem*, hoc est, quae in saeculo hoc esse uidetur, aequam uirtutem habet ad *Agar*. *Sarra* autem *Hierusalem celestem* significat. Quod autem dicit: *Et seruit cum filiis suis*, non de *Agar* dicit, sed ad testamentum quod datum est in *Sina* reddit illud.

**4:20** (VII.85–87) AND TO CHANGE MY VOICE. I.e., because it is more useful alive than dead. SINCE I AM TROUBLED ABOUT YOU. He is *troubled* because the *sons* have begun to become *slaves*.

**4:22** (VII.88–94) SINCE ABRAHAM HAD TWO SONS etc. And the Apostle gave a rule from this text, for understanding the allegorical accounts, namely, so that with the truth of history remaining, we may expound the figures of the Old Testament. For when he had said that *Abraham* most truly *had* had two wives, afterwards he showed what they foreshadowed. ONE. I.e., *Ishmael*. FROM THE MAID-SERVANT. I.e., from *Hagar the Egyptian*. AND ONE. I.e., *Isaac*. FROM THE FREE ONE. I.e., *Sara*.

**4:23** (VII.95–101) ACCORDING TO THE FLESH. I.e., *Ishmael* was *born according to intercourse*,<sup>402</sup> because Abraham, having fleshly desire in his youth, begot him from a youthful *maid-servant*, but *Isaac through the promise*; for the merit of the *promise* raised him from an old father and a sterile mother; and all this signifies something else as well, because the one who follows the letter, is a *son* from *Hagar*, but he who follows the spiritual meaning is a *son* of the *free woman*.

**4:24** (VII.102–107) FOR THESE ARE THE TWO COVENANTS. The old law is represented through the *maid-servant*: the new law through the *free woman*; the sons of *Hagar* are the sons of the old law, which *begets into slavery*, but the sons of the *free woman* are understood as sons of the new covenant. BEGETTING INTO SLAVERY. The Jews were being forced like *slaves* out of fear even in the present time; but we are invited with rewards like *free* people.

**4:25** (VII.108–124) FOR SINAI IS A MOUNTAIN etc. This he says, because just as *Sinai* and *Jerusalem* are adjoining (for the boundary of the tribe of *Juda* touches *Mount Sinai*, which is at the end of *Arabia*), thus both come together in the figure of *Hagar*, i.e., of the old covenant, *Sinai* clearly, where the law was given, and *Jerusalem*, where the law was guarded and fulfilled. SERVING. I.e., the earthly *Jerusalem*. WITH HIS OWN SONS. I.e., with the Jews. Likewise, according to Ambrose, the comparison of *Hagar* with the old covenant is appropriate, because the law was given in desert place, which extends to that people from which *Hagar* came. For *Hagar* was *Egyptian*, and nevertheless had been from *Arabia*, since not a modest part of *Egypt* was confined in *Arabia*. For what he says: *It is neighboring to that, which now is Jerusalem*, is said concerning *Hagar*, since that *Jerusalem* which is among us, i.e., which seems to be in this world, is equivalent to *Hagar*. *Sara* however indicates the *heavenly Jerusalem*. And what he says: *And she serves with her own sons*, he says not concerning *Hagar*, but he applies it to the covenant, which was given on *Sinai*.

402 The phrase *secundum usum carnalem* (lit. “according to bodily practice”) is referring to not only the natural physical process of conceiving in this world, but also suggests the pejorative sense of *carnalem*, i.e., in sin – which is teased out by Sedulius in the ensuing phrase.

- CAS 4:26 (VII.125–136) QVAE AVTEM SVRSVM EST HIERVSALEM. Id est, quam [126] praefiguravit *Sarra* cum filio, id est, spiritalis ecclesia, *quae mater est* tam gentilium credentium quam etiam Iudeorum, cuius *filiis serui* esse non possunt. Bene autem addit: *sursum*, quia Christi ecclesia spe et *conuersatione* caelesti desiderio subleuatur, ut: *Nostra conuersatio in caelis est*. Quattuor figurae, id [131] est, historia, allegoria, tropologia, anagoge, hoc solo nomine, quod est
- CAS *Hierusalem*, significantur. Nam secundum historiam ciuitas est Iudeorum, secundum allegoriam ecclesia Christi, secundum anagogen *ciuitas Dei illa caelestis, quae est mater omnium* [135] *nostrum*, secundum tropologiam anima hominis, quae frequenter hoc nomine aut increpatur aut laudatur a Domino.
- 4:27 (VII.137–147) LAETARE STERILIS. Hoc in Esaia scriptum est. Hoc autem uel ecclesiae ex gentibus uel *Hierusalem caelesti* comparatur. Vtraque enim *sterilis* erat, ecclesia quidem gentium, [140] quod nec spiritalis per baptismum filios Deo peperit; nec non *caelestis Hierusalem* apostaticis angelis derelicta hominibusque uacua usque ad aduentum Saluatoris *sterilis* permanebat. QVAE NON PARIS. Pro ‘non pariebas’. ERVMPE. In gaudium. ET CLAMA. Id est, in tuba doctrinae uel iubilo laetitiae exulta. [145] DESERTAE. Id est, ecclesiae. QVAM EIVS. Id est, sinagogae, uel terrestris Hierusalem. QVAE HABET VIRVM. Id est, sermonem legis.
- PIL 4:29 (VII.148–156) PERSEQVEBATVR EVM. Id est, Isaac. In Genesi quidem hoc scriptum est, quia *luserit* cum Isaac Ismahel. Sed apostolus [150] ostendit non simplicem lusum fuisse, quem *persecutionem* appellat. Vnde intellegitur, quia scurrilem eum et leuem, sicut ipse erat, facere cupiebat, ne illi posset in *hereditate* praeferrri. Ideo Abraham de *eiiciendo eo uocem Sarrae* iubetur *audire*. SECVNDVM SPIRITVM. Id est, *secundum promissionem* [155] et uirtutem *Spiritus*. ITA ET NVNC. Hoc est, *ita et isti seruos* sibi similes uos facere nituntur.
- 4:30 (VII.157–159) NON ENIM HERES ERIT reliqua. Sic filii circumcisionis increduli atque heretici cum filiis gratiae noui testamenti *heredes non erunt*.

**4:26** (VII.125–136) BUT JERUSALEM, WHICH IS ABOVE. I.e., which Sara prefigured with her son, i.e., the spiritual Church, *who is the mother*, both of the Gentile believers, and also of the Jews, whose *sons* cannot be *slaves*. And he adds well: “*above*”, because the church of Christ in its hope and lifestyle is elevated by a heavenly desire, as: “*Our citizenship*<sup>403</sup> *is in the heavens.*” The four figures, i.e., history, allegory, tropology and anagogy, are indicated by this name alone which is *Jerusalem*. For according to history Jerusalem is a city of the Jews; according to allegory it is the Church of Christ; according to anagogy it is the *heavenly city* of God, *who is the mother of us all*; according to tropology it is the human soul, which is frequently either rebuked or praised in this name by the Lord.

**4:27** (VII.137–147) REJOICE, O STERILE WOMAN. This was written in Isaiah. This however is compared either to the Church of the Gentiles or to the *heavenly* Jerusalem. For both were *sterile*, the Gentiles’ church, because it produced for God no spiritual sons through baptism; and also the *heavenly Jerusalem*, left by the apostate angels, and void of human beings, remained *sterile* till the arrival of the Savior. YOU WHO DO NOT PRODUCE. Instead of: were not producing. BREAK OUT. In rejoicing. AND SHOUT. I.e., rejoice in the trumpet of learning, or in a cry of joy. OF THE DESOLATE. I.e., of the Church. THAN SHE. I.e., of the synagogue, or earthly Jerusalem. WHO HAS A HUSBAND. I.e., the word of the law.

**4:29** (VII.148–156) HE WAS PERSECUTING HIM. I.e., Isaac. This was indeed written in Genesis, *because* Ishmael *jested* with Isaac. But the Apostle shows that it was not an innocent jest, which he refers to as a *persecution*. Hence it is understood, that he was desiring to make him scurrilous and slight just as he was himself, lest he could be preferred to him in the *inheritance*. For that same reason Abraham is ordered to *listen* to the *voice* of Sara concerning his *ejection*. ACCORDING TO THE SPIRIT. I.e., *according to the promise* and power of the *Spirit*. SO IT IS NOW ALSO. I.e., *thus* also these strive at making you *slaves* similar to themselves.

**4:30** (VII.157–159) FOR HE WILL NEVER BE AN HEIR etc. Thus the sons of circumcision, the infidels and the heretics, *will not be heirs* with the sons of the grace of the New Testament.

403 The verse Sedulius here references is Philippians 3:20, but either his text reads *conversatio* (lit. “lifestyle” but here rendered as “citizenship”), or he has substituted *conversatio* for *municipatus* (“citizenship”), which is used in the Vulgate and is a closer rendering of the original Greek, to theologically link Gal 4:27 with Philippians 3:20. The modern division/dichotomy between “life-style” and “citizenship” may not have been so strong in Sedulius’ monastic environs where the two are more synonymous.

**5:1** (VIII.1) STATE. Id est, in fide Euangelii.

**5:2** (VIII.2–3) CHRISTVS VOBIS NIHIL PRODERIT. Si solum illum ad salutem uestram sufficere non putetis.

**5:3** (VIII.4–6) QVONIAM DEBITOR EST VNIVERSAE LEGIS. Quia caput [5] operum *legis*, id est, *circumcisionem*, suscipit, necesse est, ut caetera membra sustineat, ne *maledictioni subiaceat*.

**5:5** (VIII.7–8) NOS ENIM SPIRITV. Id est, spiritali gratia et conuersatione, *non littera*.

**5:6** (VIII.9–10) NEQVE PREPVTIVM. Id est, ne aliquis *praeputium* tantum [10] sufficere putaret *circumcisione* euacuata.

**5:7** (VIII.11) CVRREBATIS. Id est, fidei passibus.

HI **5:8** (VIII.12–15) PERSVASIO VESTRA NON EX EO EST. *Persuasio haec*, quam nunc sequimini, *non est ex eo, qui in principio uos uocauit*, sed ex his, qui postea *uos conturbauerunt*, non, ut male [15] in Latinis codicibus legitur: *Persuasio uestra ex Deo est*.

**5:9** (VIII.16–23) MODICVM FERMENTVM reliqua. Ne quis diceret: ‘Cur omnes corripis, cum non omnes errauerunt?’ ostendit, quod [18] *modicum erroris fermentum totam* possit ecclesiae *massam corrumpere*. Parua scintilla moenia, urbes, latissimos saltus regionesque consumit. Vnius pecudis scabies totum maculat gregem. Ita doctrina peruersa ab uno egrediens multos inuadit auditores. *Fermentat*, non, ut male in Latinis codicibus, *corrumpit*.

**5:10** (VIII.24–27) EGO CONFIDO DE VOBIS IN DOMINO. Non per coniec[25]turam, sed spiritu profetico pronuntiat Galatas ad ueritatis uiam reuersuros. NIHIL ALIVD SAPIETIS. Id est, nisi quod doceo per epistolam.

**5:11** (VIII.28–33) SI CIRCVMCISIONEM PRAEDICO reliqua. Hoc ideo dicit, quia quidam ex ipsis dicebant, quod Paulus obseruaret *circumcisionem*, [30] dum *circumcidit Timotheum*. ERGO EVACVATVM EST SCANDALVM CRVCIS. Id est, *scandalum*, quod patior propter praedicationem *crucis, euacuatum est*, si non *crucem praedico*, sed *circumcisionem*.

**5:12** (VIII.34–38) VTINAM ABSCIDANTVR! Hoc est, *utinam* a malo in bonum [35] conuertantur! Vel: *Vtinam* totis potius uirilibus suis castrentur, qui modicam corporis partem circumcidi praedicant! Aliter: *Vtinam* aliqua uindicta tales a uobis penitus separentur, ne *uos ultra conturbent!*

**5:1** (VIII.1) STAND. I.e., in faith of the Gospel.

**5:2** (VIII.2–3) CHRIST WILL PROFIT YOU NOTHING. If you do not think that that he alone is sufficient for your salvation.

**5:3** (VIII.4–6) SINCE HE IS A DEBTOR OF THE ENTIRE LAW. Who receives the chief of the works of the *law*, i.e., *circumcision*, it is necessary that he sustains the other members lest he be *subject to condemnation*.

**5:5** (VIII.7–8) FOR WE IN THE SPIRIT. I.e., by spiritual grace and lifestyle, not by the *letter* of the law.

**5:6** (VIII.9–10) NEITHER UNCIRCUMCISION. I.e., lest someone think that *uncircumcision* alone suffices with *circumcision* voided.

**5:7** (VIII.11) YOU WERE RUSHING. I.e., in steps of faith.

**5:8** (VIII.12–15) YOUR PERSUASION IS NOT FROM HIM. *This persuasion*, which you now follow, *is not from him who* in the beginning *called you*, but is from these who have since been *confusing you*, not as it is poorly recorded in the Latin codices, *your persuasion is from God*.

**5:9** (VIII.16–23) A LITTLE YEAST etc. Lest anyone say: ‘Why do you reproach all, when they have not all erred?’ He shows that a *little yeast* of an error can *corrupt the whole loaf* of the Church. A little sparkle consumes walls, cities, and the most extensive woods and regions. The mange of one member of the herd stains the whole flock. Thus the perverse doctrine going forth from one individual, enters many hearers. *Fermentat*: “Leavens”, not, as is written poorly in the Latin codices: *corrumpit*, “it corrupts”.

**5:10** (VIII.24–27) I HAVE CONFIDENCE IN THE LORD CONCERNING YOU. Not through conjecture, but by means of a prophetic spirit he proclaims, that the Galatians are about to return to the way of the truth. *You will think nothing else*. I.e., except for that which I teach through the letter.

**5:11** (VIII.28–33) IF I PREACH CIRCUMCISION etc. For this reason he says this, because certain people among them were saying that Paul adhered to *circumcision*, since he *circumcised Timothy*. THEREFORE THE SCANDAL OF THE CROSS HAS BEEN MADE VOID. I.e., the *scandal* which I suffer on account of my proclamation of the *cross was made void, if I do not preach the cross*, but *circumcision*.

**5:12** (VIII.34–38) I WISH THAT THEY MIGHT BE CASTRATED. I.e., *would* that they be changed from evil into good! Or: that they may rather be castrated from their whole genitalia, who proclaim that a modest portion of their body is to be circumcised! Alternatively: Would that such ones would entirely be divided from you by some punishment, lest they further confuse you.



- 5:13** (VIII.39–55) VOS ENIM IN LIBERTATEM VOCATI ESTIS reliqua. Pot[40]est locus iste sic melius explanari quasi unum corpus se inuicem complectens et non discrepans: *Fratres, de seruitute legis uocati estis in libertatem* Euangelii. Verum obsecro uos, *ne libertate* pro licentia abutamini *detisque occasionem carni et luxuriae*. Quin potius discite, quod *libertas* haec maior sit *serui* [45]*tus*, ut quod ante lex ab inuitis extorquebat obsequium, nunc *per caritatem uobis inuicem seruiatis*. Vos autem, *fratres*, propterea secundum legem spiritualem debetis uiuere, et *desideria carnis ne perficiatis*. Caro enim frigus timet, fame attenuatur et uigiliis reliqua. E contra spiritus, quae carni contraria sunt, expetit. Ita fit, ut non ideo, quia sub *seruitute* legis [51] esse cessastis, putetis uos esse *liberos*, quia non statim, et si lex non imperat, natura cessauit. Non enim ita de *seruitute in libertatem uocati* sumus, ut *carni seruiamus*. SED PER CARITATEM
- PIL SPIRITVS SERVITE. Id est, non superbiam insinuo sub specie [55] *libertatis*, sed spontaneum uolo esse *seruitium*.
- HI **5:15** (VIII.56–58) QVOD SI MORDETIS. Id est, *oculum* reddentes *pro oculo*, uel plasmam reliqua. NE AB INVICEM CONSVMMAMINI. Id est, ne aliquis alicui causa mortis existat.
- 5:16** (VIII.59–60) SPIRITV AMBVLATE. Id est, spiritalibus *desideriis* et [60] *operibus*.
- PIL **5:17** (VIII.61–71) CARO ENIM CONCVPISCIT reliqua. Non quod *caro* sine anima *concupiscat*, sed ipsa anima, quando *carnalia cogitat*, *caro*
- HI dicitur, quando uero spiritualia, *unus* cum Deo fit *Spiritus*. Item: CARO CONCVPISCIT ADVERSVS SPIRITVM. Hoc est, [65] Scripturae carneus
- CAS intellectus *aduersus* allegoriam spiritalem. In hoc loco *carnem* non hominem, id est, non hominis substantiam, sed *uoluntatem carnis* et *desideria* pessima debemus accipere, sicut *spiritum* non aliquam substantiam, sed animae *desideria* bona et spiritualia designari, quem idem apostolus superius [70] euidenter expressit ita incipiens: *Dico autem, Spiritu ambulate, et desideria carnis non perficietis*.
- 5:18** (VIII.72–73) QVOD SI SPIRITV DVCEMINI. Id est, spiritali desiderio, uel Spiritu sancto.
- 5:19** (VIII.74–82) MANIFESTA AVTEM SVNT OPERA CARNIS. His tantum [75] *manifesta sunt*, qui in Christo credunt. Plurimi quippe gentilium in suis ignominiiis gloriantur. Hic *opera carnis* magis uidentur mihi ad simplicem *carnis* et spiritus intellegentiam quam ad carnem legis et paruulos in Christo referri. ADVLTERRIVM. Superflue in Latinis codicibus legitur *adulterium*. FORNICATIO. [80] A legitimo coniugio declinatio. INMVNDICIA. Vt: *Masculi in masculos turpitudinem operantes*. LVXVRIA. Quae in duas species, in gulam et fornicationem, diuiditur.

**5:13** (VIII.39–55) FOR YOU HAVE BEEN CALLED INTO LIBERTY etc. This statement can be better explained thus, as though the one body is mutually embracing itself and is not discordant. *Brothers, you have been called away from the slavery of the law into the liberty of the gospel.* In truth, I implore you, not to take advantage of liberty as if it were licentiousness, and surrender to the flesh and luxury. Why do you not rather learn, that such a liberty is a greater slavery, so that *mutually to each other through love*, you may now administer the obedience that previously the Law extracted from people against their will. And you, *brothers*, therefore ought to live according to the spiritual law, and so that you do *not bring about the desires of the flesh*. For flesh fears cold, and is diminished by hunger and sleeplessness etc. On the contrary, the spirit desires what is hostile to the flesh. Hence it follows, for this reason not that you think you are free because nature did not immediately cease, although the law does not command it, but [you think you are free] because you ceased to be under the *servitude* of the law. For we have not been *called from slavery into freedom* in such a way that we may *serve the flesh*. BUT THROUGH THE LOVE OF THE SPIRIT SERVE. I.e., I am not insinuating arrogance under the appearance of *liberty*, but I wish there to be spontaneous *service*.

**5:15** (VIII.56–58) BUT IF YOU BITE. I.e., returning an *eye for an eye*, or blasphemy etc. LEST YOU BE CONSUMED BY EACH OTHER. I.e., lest anyone becomes the cause of death to anyone.

**5:16** (VIII.59–60) WALK IN THE SPIRIT. I.e., in spiritual *desires* and *works*.

**5:17** (VIII.61–71) FOR THE FLESH DESIRES ETC. Not because *flesh desires* without a soul, but the soul itself, when it *considers carnal things*, is called *flesh*: but when the spirit considers spiritual things, the *spirit* becomes *one* with God. Likewise, THE FLESH DESIRES AGAINST THE SPIRIT. This is a carnal understanding of Scripture *contrary* to spiritual allegory. In this statement we must not interpret *flesh* as human being, i.e., not as a human substance, but as the *will of the flesh* and the worst *desires*, just as we ought to define the *spirit* not as some substance, but as good and spiritual *desires* of the soul, the same thing which the Apostle clearly expressed previously, beginning as follows: *I say, however, walk in the spirit, and you will not act out the desires of the flesh.*

**5:18** (VIII.72–73) BUT IF YOU WILL BE LED BY THE SPIRIT. I.e., in spiritual desire, or by the Holy Spirit.

**5:19** (VIII.74–82) NOW IT IS OBVIOUS [WHAT] THE WORKS OF THE FLESH ARE. They are *obvious* only to those, who believe in Christ. Of course, most of the Gentiles are glorying in their own disgraces. Here *works of the flesh* seem to me to refer rather to a simple, straightforward understanding of *flesh* and spirit than to the flesh of the law and to the little children in Christ. ADULTERY. Adultery is read superfluously in the Latin codices. FORNICATION. Averting from lawful intercourse. IMPURITY. As *males acting*

HI **5:20** (VIII.83–89) IRAE. Inter iracundiam et *iram* hoc interest, quod iracundus semper irascitur, *iratus* pro tempore concitatur. Quaerendum [85] est, quomodo haec *opera carnis* uocat, cum multa ex his etiam animae sunt *opera* sicuti *ira* et cetera similia. Itaque quando *caro*, id est, *carnale desiderium*, regnat, etiam animae *opera* illi deputantur, quando uero *spiritus* regnat, si qua bona *opera caro* fecerit, in *fructibus spiritus* reputantur.

**5:21** (VIII.90) [90] SICVT PRAEDIXI. Id est, cum praesens inter uos eram.

PIL **5:22** (VIII.91–95) FRVCTVS AVTEM SPIRITVS EST CARITAS. Mater in primis debuit numerari. GAVDIVM. Id est, spiritale. PAX. Etiam *cum odientibus pacem*. PATIENTIA. Multas iniurias patienter sustinere. BENIGNITAS. Semper bene uelle facere. BONITAS. [95] *Bonum facere* omnibus.

**5:23** (VIII.96–100) MODESTIA. Nulli iniuriam irrogare. LENITAS. Nec laesus irasci. CONTINENTIA. In cibo et coniugio. CASTITAS. Virginitas corporis et mentis. ADVERSVS HVIVSMODI. Id est, uirtutes. NON EST LEX. Non enim ista *lex* prohibet sed, qui talibus [100] pollent, supra *legem* sunt.

**5:24** (VIII.101–104) QVI AVTEM SVNT CHRISTI reliqua. Si omnia simul *uitia crucifixa* sunt et *caro* quasi *pendens in ligno* non *concupiscit*, ut quid nobis *lex* necessaria, quae data est ad *uitia* coercenda?

PIL **5:25** (VIII.105–109) [105] SI AVTEM SPIRITV VIVIMVS. Hoc est, si *per spiritum* uitam habemus, spiritualiter conuersemur et non *legi* carnaliter *seruiamus!* *Inanis gloriae cupidus* est, qui alterius quamuis doctrinam ueram euacuare conatur. PROVOCANTES. Alios in iram instigantes.

PIL **6:1** (VIII.110–119) [110] FRATRES, ET SI PRAEOCCVPATVS FVERIT HOMO. Hoc illis dicit, qui non fuerant persuasi, ut *praeuentos* corrigant *mansuete*. CONSIDERANS TE IPSVM reliqua. Hic Paulus ab aliis arguitur, quod post pluralem singularem numerum posuit; sed tamen Ebreus in uernaculo doctissimus profundos sensus aliena [115] lingua exprimere non ualebat nec curabat magnopere de uerbis, cum sensum haberet in tuto. NE ET TV TEMPTERIS. Quia *et tu ipse, homo* cum sis, potes in aliquo *praeueniri* et adiutorio indigere, sicut sani infirmos sustinent et mortuos sepeliunt uiui, quia et ipsi infirmari et mori posse se credunt.

**6:2** (VIII.120–122) [120] INVICEM ONERA VESTRA PORTATE. Id est, compatiendo peccantibus. LEGEM CHRISTI. *Lex Christi* caritas est, ut: *Mandatum nouum do uobis*.

*shamefully with males.* EXTRAVAGANCE. Which is divided into two aspects, into gluttony and fornication.

**5:20** (VIII.83–89) ANGER. The difference between resentment and *anger* is that the resentful is always angered, the *angry* is only temporarily provoked. It must be asked why he calls these *works of the flesh* when many of these, actually, are *works of the soul*, like *anger* and other similar things. Thus when *flesh*, i. e., *carnal desire*, reigns, then also the *works of the soul* are counted among it, when, however, the spirit rules, if the *flesh* does any good *works*, and therefore they are counted among the *fruits of the spirit*.

**5:21** (VIII.90) JUST AS I PREDICTED. I. e., when I was present among you.

**5:22** (VIII.91–95) BUT THE FRUIT OF THE SPIRIT IS LOVE. The mother ought to be numbered in the first place. REJOICING. I. e., spiritually. PEACE. Even *with those hating peace*. PATIENCE. Patiently sustain many injustices. KINDNESS. Always be mindful to act kindly. GOODNESS. *Do good to all*.

**5:23** (VIII.96–100) MODESTY. Inflict injury upon no one. GENTLENESS. Do not get angry when you are hurt. RESTRAINT. In food and intercourse. CHASTITY. Virginity of body and mind. AGAINST THE THINGS OF SUCH KIND. I. e., virtues. THERE IS NO LAW. For that *law* does not prohibit, but those who are able to do such things are above the *law*.

**5:24** (VIII.101–104) WHO ARE OF CHRIST etc. If all *vices* are *crucified* at once, and if the *flesh*, as it were, *hanging on the cross does not covet*, to what purpose then is the *law* necessary for us, which was given for the purpose of confining *vices*?

**5:25** (VIII.105–109) AND IF WE LIVE BY THE SPIRIT. I. e., if through the spirit we have life, we should act spiritually, and should not carnally *serve the law!* *A person desires vain glory*, who tries to void any true doctrine of someone else. PROVOKING. Instigating others into anger.

**6:1** (VIII.110–119) BROTHERS, EVEN IF A PERSON HAS BEEN PREOCCUPIED WITH SOMETHING ELSE. He says this to them, who have not been led astray, that they correct with mildness the ones who hinder. EXAMINING YOURSELF etc. Here Paul is criticized by others, because he placed a singular after a plural; but nonetheless a Jew, most learned in his own language, could not express the profound meanings in a foreign language, nor was he greatly concerned about words when he had the meaning secure. LEST ALSO YOU BE TEMPTED. Since *also you* yourself, because you are a human being, can be *prevented* in something and require help, just as the healthy sustain the sick and the living bury the dead, because they believe that they themselves can be sick and die.

**6:2** (VIII.120–122) BEAR YOUR BURDENS MUTUALLY. I. e., by having compassion for sinners. THE LAW OF CHRIST. The *law of Christ* is love, as it is written: *A new commandment I give to you*.

**6:3** (VIII.123–126) NAM SI QVIS EXISTIMAT reliqua. Id est, *qui se putat* non posse *temptari*. Siue: Qui plus de se laudanti se quam suae [125] conscientiae credit. CVM NIHIL SIT. Id est, eo ipso quo arrogans est.

**6:4** (VIII.127–130) PROBET. Id est, conscientiae testimonio examinet. IN SEMET IPSO. Id est, in sua conscientia. GLORIAM. Retributionis. ET NON IN ALTERO. Id est, non in *alterius* adolatione. Bonum [130] enim alterius non illum adiuuat nec malum eius illum infuscat.

**6:5** (VIII.131–132) ONVS SVVM PORTABIT. Id est, qui meruerit uindictam, sustinebit eam, sic et qui proemium.

**6:6** (XI.1–4) COMMVNICET AVTEM IS QVI CATAICIZATVR reliqua. HI Superius *spiritales* docuerat, ut *instruerent in spiritu lenitatis*; nunc imbecillioribus imperat, ut sicut ipsi a magistris *spiritalia metunt*, sic magistris *carnalia* praebeant.

**6:7** (XI.5–7) [5] NOLITE ERRARE: Ac si aliquis diceret: Non habeo, unde doctore meo *communicem*. DEVS NON DERIDETVR. Ipse scit, si habes an non.

AU **6:8** (XI.8–15) QVAE ENIM SEMINAVERIT HOMO reliqua. Roborat eos ad considerationem earum rerum, quas non uident, per eas, [10] quas

HI uident. IN CARNE SVA. Id est, *in carnalibus desideriiis*. Aut: IN CARNE SVA. Id est, *in auaritia carnali* non *communicando* doctore. DE CARNE METET. De ipsa auaritia. CORRPTIONEM. Id est, diffectionem diuitiarum. IN SPIRITV. Id est, in spiritualibus desideriiis, uel in spiritali largitate. METET VITAM. Id [15] est, largitatis retributionem.

**6:9** (XI.16–18) NON DEFICIAMVS. *Indifferentem* enim iustitiam *indifficiens* proemium subsequetur: *Qui enim perseuerauerit usque in finem*.

**6:10** (XI.19–20) AD DOMESTICOS FIDEI. *Domesticos fidei* supradictos [20] magistros nominauit.

**6:11** (XI.21–24) VIDETE QVALIBVS LITTERIS reliqua. Intellegite, si istae *litterae* carnalem circumcisionem probant an non. Ab hoc loco usque ad finem *manu sua scripsit* ostendens superiora ab aliquo arata.

**6:12** (XI.25–27) [25] QVICVMQVE PLACERE VOLVNT. Id est, *quicumque* Iudaeis carnalibus *placere* desiderant. IN CARNE. Id est, in littera carnali. NON PATIANTVR. Scilicet ab Iudaeis.

**6:13** (XI.28–30) VT IN VESTRA CARNE GLORIENTVR. Hoc est, ut de *carne uestra circumcisa* laudem apud Iudaeos habeant. Siue: [30] Quod discipulos ad se traxerint.

**6:3** (VIII.123–126) FOR IF ANYONE JUDGES etc. I.e., *Who think that they themselves cannot be tempted.* Or rather: the one who puts more trust in one praising himself about himself than his own conscience. WHEN HE IS NOTHING. I.e., because he is arrogant.

**6:4** (VIII.127–130) HE SHOULD TEST. I.e., he should examine by evidence of his conscience. IN HIMSELF. I.e., in his own conscience. GLORY. Of retribution. AND NOT IN ANOTHER. I.e., not in flattery of *another*. For the good of another does not assist him, nor does the evil of another corrupt him.

**6:5** (VIII.131–132) HE WILL BEAR HIS OWN BURDEN. I.e., the one who will have deserved punishment, will sustain it, thus also he who will have deserved a reward.

**6:6** (XI.1–4) MOREOVER, LET THE ONE WHO IS TAUGHT, SHARE etc. Above Paul had taught the *spiritual* ones to *instruct in the spirit of gentleness*; now he orders the weaker ones, that they themselves just as they *reap* the *spiritual* things from their teachers, likewise they should furnish material things to their teachers.

**6:7** (XI.5–7) DO NOT DESIRE TO DO WRONG. But if anyone should say: I do not have from which *I may share* with my teacher. GOD IS NOT MOCKED. He himself knows whether or not you have.

**6:8** (XI.8–15) FOR WHAT SOMEONE SOWS etc. He confirms them to consideration of these things which they do not see, through those things which they do see. IN THEIR (OWN) FLESH. I.e., in their *carnal desires*. Or alternatively: IN THEIR (OWN) FLESH. I.e., in the greed of the *flesh* by not *sharing* with their teacher. HE WILL REAP CONCERNING THE FLESH. Concerning greed itself. CORRUPTION. I.e., the disappearance of riches. IN SPIRIT. I.e., in spiritual desires, or in spiritual bounty. ONE WILL REAP LIFE. I.e., the recompensation of bounty.

**6:9** (XI.16–18) THAT WE MAY NOT BE LACKING. For *unfailing* favor follows *unfailing* justice: *for whoever perseveres unto the end.*

**6:10** (XI.19–20) TO THE HOUSEHOLD OF FAITH. He called the aforementioned teachers the *household of faith*.

**6:11** (XI.21–24) YOU SEE WITH WHAT KIND OF LETTERS etc. Understand whether those *letters* approve carnal circumcision or not. From this place until the end he *wrote with his own hand*, indicating that everything before had been transcribed by someone else.

**6:12** (XI.25–27) WHOEVER WISHES TO PLEASE. I.e., *whoever* desires to *please* Jewish flesh. IN THE FLESH. I.e., in the letter of the flesh. SO THAT THEY MIGHT NOT SUFFER. Namely, from the Jews.

**6:13** (XI.28–30) SO THAT THEY MAY GLORY IN YOUR FLESH. I.e., so that they may have praise among the Jews concerning *your circumcised flesh*. Or rather: Because they attracted disciples to themselves.

**6:14** (XI.31–36) NISI IN CRUCE reliqua. Id est, non *in carne uestra gloriabor* nec in mea doctrina, sed in fide *crucis*, per quam *mibi* omnia peccata dimissa sunt, ut *ego mundo* morerer et ille mihi. MVNDVS CRUCIFIXVS EST. Id est, ut me non teneat. ET [35] EGO MVNDO. Vt eum quasi mortuus non teneam neque concupiscam.

**6:15** (XI.37–38) SED NOVA CREATVRA. Id est, si quis *renatus in Christo noua* conuersatione utatur.

**6:17** (XI.39–43) DE CETERO NEMO MIHI MOLESTVS. Id est, *nemo mihi* [40] resistat interrogando: Quare haec dicitis? EGO ENIM STIGMATA. Id est, signa et characteres non circumcisionis, sed crucis et passionis Domini *in corpore meo* circumfero, ut: *Ter uirgis caesus sum* reliqua.

**6:14** (XI.31–36) EXCEPT IN THE CROSS etc. I.e., I will not *glorify in your flesh*, not in my teaching, but in the *faith* of the *cross*, through which all *my* sins were forgiven, so that *I* die to the *world* and the *world* to *me*. THE WORLD HAS BEEN CRUCIFIED. I.e., so that it may not hold me. AND I TO THE WORLD AND I TO THE WORLD. So that I as one dead may not possess it nor covet.

**6:15** (XI.37–38) BUT A NEW CREATURE. I.e., if anyone is *reborn in Christ* he experiences a *new* way of life.

**6:17** (XI.39–43) LET NO ONE TROUBLE ME ABOUT THE REST. I.e., let *no one* resist *me* by asking, ‘Why do you say this?’ FOR I HAVE STIGMATA. I.e., the signs and marks, not of circumcision, but of the cross and of the suffering of the Lord I bear *on my body*, as *thrice I have been beaten with sticks*, etc.



## IN EPISTOLAM AD EFESIOS

Refert Scriptura testante Hieronimo, quod Paulus Ephesi triennio praedicauerit. Haec autem inter omnes Pauli epistolas uel maxime et uerbis et sensu inuoluta est.

**1:1** (I.1–11) PAVLVS APOSTOLVS IESV CHRISTI PER VOLVNTATEM.

- PIL Id est, ex *uoluntate Dei Patris*. Ergo *per uoluntatem Dei*, non meis meritis. SANCTIS. Id est, non omnibus Ephesiis, sed his qui credunt in Christo. ET FIDELIBVS. Omnes *sancti fideles*, [5] non *omnes fideles sancti*, quia etiam catu-  
mini possunt ex eo, quod Christo credunt, *fideles* dici; non tamen *sancti* sunt, quia non sunt per baptismum sanctificati. Non solum ergo *sanctis*, sed etiam *fidelibus*,  
HI qui non adhuc sanctificati sunt, Paulus *gratiam* Christi exoptat. QVI SVNT IN CHRISTO IESV. Plures *fi[10]deles* sunt, sed non *in Christo*, uerbi gratia, si quis fideliter reddat depositum. Ad distinctionem ergo posuit: *In Christo Iesu*.

**1:2** (I.12–18) GRATIA VOBIS ET PAX. *Gratia et pax* siue utrumque tam ad *Patrem* quam ad *Dominum Iesum*, siue ad singulos singula referenda sunt, ut *gratia* ad *Deum Patrem*, *pax* uero referatur [15] ad *Christum*, siquidem sequitur: *In laudem gloriae gratiae, in qua gratificauit nos in dilecto*, ut *gratia Patris* sit, quod Filium pro salute nostra mittere dignatus est, *pax* uero Filii in eo quod per ipsum *Patri reconciliati sumus destructo medio pariete*.

- 1:3** (I.19–32) [19] BENEDICTVS DEVS. Id est, quod nos benedictos facit. Laudat *Deum*, quod donauerit infra scripta. ET PATER DOMINI reliqua. Hoc est, qui est *et Pater Domini nostri Iesu Christi*, uel *benedictus Deus* eius, qui assumptus est, hominis *et Pater* eius, *qui in principio apud Deum erat* reliqua.  
HI QVI BENEDIXIT NOS IN [24] OMNI BENEDICTIONE SPIRITALI. Id est, in omni habundantia et gratia. Non in una, sed *in cunctis benedictionibus*, non quod omnes omnia consequamur, sed, dum singuli singulas uel plures habemus, omnes per singulas possidemus. IN CAELESTIBVS. Id est, ipse *Deus*, qui est *in caelestibus*. Aliter: Non in carnali [30] prosperitate nec in terrena habundantia, sed *in caelestibus* donis uirtutibusque *nos benedixit*. IN CHRISTO IESV. In capite namque omnia membra *benedixit*.

## On the Letter to the Ephesians

Scripture reports, as Jerome testifies, that Paul preached for three years in Ephesus. This one, however, among all the letters of Paul, assuredly is the most intricate in both words and meaning.

**1:1** (I.1–11) PAUL AN APOSTLE OF JESUS CHRIST THROUGH THE WILL. I.e., by the *will of God the Father*; therefore, *through the will of God*, not by my merits. TO THE HOLY ONES. I.e., not to all the Ephesians, but to these who believe in Christ. AND TO THE FAITHFUL ONES. All the *holy are faithful* ones, not all the *faithful are holy* ones, because even catechumens can be called *faithful* because of the fact that they believe in Christ; nevertheless, they are not *holy*, because they are not sanctified through baptism. Not only therefore for the *holy* ones, but even for the *faithful* ones, who have not as yet been sanctified, Paul much desires the *grace* of Christ. WHO ARE IN CHRIST JESUS. There are more *faithful* ones, but not *in Christ*, for instance, if someone faithfully returns a deposit. Therefore he added in order to differentiate: *In Christ Jesus*.

**1:2** (I.12–18) GRACE TO YOU AND PEACE. *Grace and peace*, either both must be referred as much to the *Father* as to the *Lord Jesus*, or they must be referred to each individually, so that *grace* refers to *God the Father*, but *peace* to *Christ*, accordingly there follows: *to the praise of the glory of grace, in which he made us acceptable in the beloved*, so that it is the *grace* of the *Father*, because he deemed it a worthy matter to send his Son for our salvation, but that it is the *peace* of the Son, because of the fact that we have been *reconciled* through him to the *Father, with the dividing wall having been destroyed*.

**1:3** (I.19–32) BLESSED BE THE GOD. I.e. because he makes us blessed. He praises *God*, which he gave as written below. AND THE FATHER [OF OUR] LORD etc. I.e., who is *also the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, or *blessed* is the *God* of that man who was taken up, *and is the Father of him, who in the beginning was with God* etc. WHO BLESSED US WITH EVERY SPIRITUAL BLESSING. I.e., with all abundance and grace. Not with one, but with all blessings, not that we all obtain everything, but, since we each have one or many, we possess all through individual blessings. IN THE HEAVENS. I.e., God himself, who is in the heavens. Alternatively: Not in carnal prosperity nor in earthly abundance, but *in heavenly* gifts and virtues *He blessed us*. IN CHRIST JESUS. For in the head he blessed all members.

- HI **1:4** (I.33–47) SICVT ELEGIT NOS. Id est, sic *nos benedixit, sicut elegit nos*. ANTE MVNDI CONSTITVTIONEM. Cui omnia futura per [35] praesentiam iam facta sunt. VT ESSEMVVS SANCTI ET INMACVLATI CORAM IPSO. Id est, non in hipochrisi *coram* hominibus. Quaerendum quare hoc dicat, cum scriptum sit: *Non iustificabitur in conspectu tuo omnis uiuens*, in praesenti scilicet uita. Ceterum ad hoc *nos elegit, ut essemus sancti et immaculati* [40] in futura uita, quando Christi *ecclesia non habebit maculam neque rugam*, licet etiam in praesenti uita iusti *sancti et immaculati*, quamuis non ex toto, HI tamen ex parte non inconuenienter dici possunt. Inter *sanctum et immaculatum* hoc interest, quod *sanctus immaculatus* quoque intellegi potest, *immaculatus* uero [45] non statim *sanctus*. Paruuli quippe *immaculati* sunt, qui integri sunt corpore, et tamen non *sancti*, quia sanctitas uoluntate et studio comparatur.
- PIL **1:5** (I.48–51) IN ADOPTIONEM FILIORVM. Nam Saluator eius natura *filius* est, nos uero *adoptione*. IN IPSVM. Id est, Christum, ut [50] simus membra ipsius. SECVNDVM PROPOSITVM VOLVNTATIS SVAE. Id est, non *secundum* meritum nostrum.
- HI **1:6** (I.52–56) IN LAVDEM GLORIAE. Id est, ut *laudemus gloriam gratiae ipsius*. IN QVA GRATIFICAVIT NOS. In qua gratos *nos* sibi fecit. IN DILECTO. ‘Ab omnibus’ subauditur; nam etiam ab im[55]piis Christus diligitur. Nam *cum sit Christus sapientia, ueritas, pax, gaudium*, quis haec etiam impiissimus non diligit?
- XP **1:7** (I.57–58) SECVNDVM DIVITIAS CLARITATIS GRATIAE. Id est, ut: *Copiosa apud eum redemptio*.
- 1:8** (I.59–64) QVAE SVPERHABVNDAVIT IN NOS. Hoc est, *plus quam* [60] *habundauit*, ut non solum a morte redemptis gratis peccata dimitteret, sed etiam tantam *nobis sapientiam* donaret, ut *uoluntatis eius occulta misteria* nosceremus. IN OMNI SAPIENTIA. Visibilium et inuisibilium. ET SCIENTIA. Tantum uisibilium; non tamen *in nobis* est haec *omnis scientia et sapientia*, sed in Deo.
- HI **1:9** (I.65–72) MISTERIVM VOLVNTATIS SVAE. Id est, *redemptionem* [66] *nostram per suum sanguinem*; sed Deus *in omni sapientia* sua hoc fecit. QVOD PROPOSVIT IN EO reliqua. Inter *propositum* et *praedestinationem* hoc interest, quod *praedestinatio* est alicuius rei praefiguratio multo ante in mente eius, qui distinat quod [70] futurum sit, *propositum* uero, cum uicina sit machinatio et pene cogitationem sequatur effectus. Item: *Praedestinatio* est *gratiae* praeparatio, *gratia* uero est ipsa donatio.
- AU

**1:4** (I.33–47) JUST AS HE CHOSE US. I.e., thus *he blessed us, just as he chose us*. BEFORE THE CREATION OF THE WORLD. For whom everything that will happen has already happened through foreknowledge. SO THAT WE WOULD BE HOLY AND UNSTAINED IN HIS PRESENCE. I.e., not in hypocrisy before people. It must be asked why he says this, since Scripture says: *Not everyone living will be justified in your sight*, namely, in the present life. Besides: *he chose us for that purpose, so that we might be holy and unstained* in the future life, when the Church of Christ *will have neither stain nor wrinkle*, although even in the present life the just can be called *holy and unstained*, even if not completely, nevertheless not unsuitably in part.<sup>404</sup> There is the following difference between ‘*holy*’ and ‘*unstained*’: *holy* can be understood also as *unstained*, but *unstained* not necessarily as *holy*. Certainly, the little children are *unstained*, who are corporally pure, and nevertheless not *holy*, because holiness is obtained by will and zeal.

**1:5** (I.48–51) INTO THE ADOPTION OF SONS. For the Savior is God’s *son* by nature, but we are by *adoption*. INTO HIMSELF. I.e., Christ, so that we may be his members. ACCORDING TO THE PURPOSE OF HIS WILL. I.e., not *according to* our merit.

**1:6** (I.52–56) INTO THE PRAISE OF THE GLORY. I.e., so that we might *praise the glory of his grace*. WHICH HE FREELY BESTOWED ON US. For which he made us pleasing to himself. IN THE BELOVED. ‘By all’ is understood; for Christ is loved even by the impious. For *since Christ is wisdom, truth, peace and joy*, who should not love these things even if he is most impious?

**1:7** (I.57–58) ACCORDING TO THE RICHNESS OF THE SPLENDOR OF HIS GRACE. I.e., as: *With him is abundant redemption*.

**1:8** (I.59–64) WHICH HE MADE OVERFLOW IN US EXCESSIVELY. I.e., *more than made overflow*, so that he did not only redeem us from death and cast away our sins gratuitously, but also gave such great *wisdom to us* that we might know *the secret mysteries of his will*. IN ALL WISDOM. Of visible and invisible things. AND KNOWLEDGE. Only of visible things. Nevertheless, *all knowledge and wisdom* are not *in us*, but in God.

**1:9** (I.65–72) THE MYSTERY OF HIS WILL. I.e., *our redemption through his blood*, but God *in all his wisdom* accomplished this. WHICH HE PURPOSED IN HIM etc. There is the following difference between ‘*purpose*’ and ‘*predestination*’: ‘*predestination*’ is the prefiguration of some matter a long time beforehand in the mind of that person, who destines what will be in the future, but ‘*purpose*’ is when design is near and the effect follows the thought closely. Likewise: ‘*Predestination*’ is the preparation of *grace*, but *grace* is the gift itself.

404 \*1 Corinthians 13:9–12.

- PIL **1:10** (I.73–88) IN DISPENSATIONE PLENITVDINIS TEMPORVM. Id est, *postquam uenit plenitudo temporum*, quando iam omnis *dis[75]pensatio*
- HI *temporum* legis et naturae profetarumque transacta est. INSTAVRARE OMNIA IN CHRISTO. Pro ‘*capitulare*’ in Latino codice scriptum est *restaurare*. Sensus itaque in praesenti loco iste est: Omnis *dispensatio* quae ante mundum et postea coepit esse in mundo, tam inuisibilium quam uisibilium creaturarum, [80] aduentum Domini pollicebatur. Itaque uniuersa misteria et omnis *dispensatio* uetustatis non solum, *quae in terris*, sed etiam, *quae in caelis*, in Christi passione breui *recapitulatione* completa sunt, uerbi gratia, sicut Isaac oblatus praefiguratur
- AU Saluatorem, et Abel a Cain occisus et reliqua. *Instaurantur quae in caelis sunt*, cum id, quod in angelis lapsum est, ex hominibus [86] redditur; *instaurantur* uero *quae in terra sunt*, cum ipsi homines qui *praedestinati sunt in aeternam uitam* a *corruptione* uetustatis *renouantur*.
- 1:11** (I.89–91) IN QVO SORTE. Id est, gratuita gratia. VOCATI SVMVS. [90] Id est, *nos, qui ex Iudeis Christo credimus*. PRAEDISTINATI. Id est, praeparati.
- 1:12** (I.92–94) NOS QVI ANTE SPERAVIMVS. *Nos* apostoli uel Iudei, *qui priores gentibus credidimus Christo*. Siue: Ex lege expectauimus Christum.
- 1:13** (I.95–104) [95] IN QVO ET VOS, CARISSIMI reliqua. *In quo* etiam uobis gentibus adnuntiata est *salus*. Hucusque alloquitur specialiter qui in Efeso erant Iudeos de sacramento incarnationis Christi, deinde gentes, ut sint grati de beneficiis Dei. SIGNATI ESTIS reliqua. Vbi *imago*, quae perdita est, reparata est. Primus *homo* [100] *ad imaginem et similitudinem Dei conditus est*, secundus in secunda regeneratione, cum Spiritum sanctum acceperit, figuram conditoris accipit. SPIRITV PROMISSIONIS. Qui *omni carni* per Ioel profetam promissus est, ut: *Effundam de Spiritu meo super omnem carnem*.
- 1:14** (I.105–107) [105] IN REDEMPTIONEM ADQVSSIONIS. Quos *redimendo suo sanguine adquisiuit*, ut etiam in hoc *laudemus gloriam eius*, quod non Deo sed laudatoribus prosit.
- HI **1:16** (II.1–5) NON CESSO GRATIAS AGENS. *Non cesso gratias agens* et faciens per solocismum pro ‘*non cesso gratias agere et facere*’. Notandum quia *fidem et caritatem habentibus sapientiam* a Deo depraeatur; nouerat enim eam *adiutricem om[5]nium esse uirtutum*.

**1:10** (I.73–88) IN THE DISPENSATION OF THE FULLNESS OF TIMES. I.e., after *the fullness of times had come*, when already all dispensation of the times of the law and nature and the prophets was brought to an end. TO RENEW ALL THINGS IN CHRIST. Instead of ‘*to sum up*’ in one Latin codex was written ‘*to rebuild*’. Thus the meaning in the present place is the following: All *dispensation*, which was before the world and which afterwards began to be in the world, as much of invisible as of visible creatures, promised the coming of the Lord. Thus all mysteries and all *dispensation* of ancient times, pertaining not only to those things which are *on earth* but even to those things which are *in the heavens*, have been fulfilled in the passion of Christ by a brief recapitulation, for instance, just as Isaac who was offered as a sacrifice prefigures the Savior, or as Abel who was slain by Cain, etc. *Those things which are in the heavens are renewed*, when that, which was lost in the angels, is restored from humans. But those things that *are on earth are renewed*, when those humans who have been *predestined to eternal life* are restored from the *corruption* of the previous age.

**1:11** (I.89–91) IN WHOM BY LOT. I.e., by gratuitous grace. WE HAVE BEEN CALLED. I.e., *we, who* out of the Jews *believe in Christ*. PREDESTINED. I.e., prepared.

**1:12** (I.92–94) WE WHO HOPED FIRST. *We*, the Apostles or Jews, *who* prior to the Gentiles *believed in Christ*. Or rather: we expected Christ out of the law.

**1:13** (I.95–104) IN WHOM YOU ALSO, YOU MOST BELOVED etc. *In whom* also to you Gentiles *salvation* has been announced. Till now he addresses especially the Jews that were in Ephesus, about the mystery of the incarnation of Christ, and then the Gentiles, so that they may be thankful for the benefits of God. YOU HAVE BEEN SEALED etc. Where the image, which was destroyed, has been repaired. The first *human was made to the image and likeness of God*, the second receives in the second rebirth, when he has received the Holy Spirit, the form of the creator. WITH THE SPIRIT OF THE PROMISE. The spirit that was promised to *all flesh* through the prophet Joel, as: *I will pour out from my Spirit over all flesh*.<sup>405</sup>

**1:14** (I.105–107) INTO REDEMPTION OF POSSESSION. That is a reference to those people that he acquired by *redeeming them through his own blood*, so that also in this *we may praise his glory*, which does not profit God, but those who praise him.

**1:16** (II.1–5) I DO NOT CEASE GIVING THANKS. *I do not cease giving* and “making” *thanks* appears by means of a solecism instead of ‘*I do not cease to give* and make *thanks*’. It must be noted that he begs wisdom from God for those who have faith and love; for he knew that wisdom was the helper of all virtues.

405 \*Acts 2:17 and \*Joel 2:28–32.

**1:17** (II.6–16) PATER GLORIAE. Id est, secundum diuinitatem. Christus enim *gloria Patris* est sicut et *sapientia* reliqua. DEVS DOMINI NOSTRI. Id est, secundum carnem. ET REVELATIONIS. Id est, ut: *Reuelata facie gloriam Domini contemplemini*. IN AGNI[10]TIONEM EIVS. Id est, ut perfecte cognoscatis *magnitudinem* eius atque *uirtutem*, qua potest promissa proemia uel poenas implere, *magnitudinem*, qua, cum ubique sit, nihil eum potest omnino latere. Qui enim hoc cognouerit pro certo, nullo poterit in loco peccare. Nam qui humanum testimonium erubescit, multo [15] magis diuinum poterit reuereri. Vnde et Iohannes apostolus *omnem qui peccat Deum non cognouisse* confirmat.

PIL **1:18** (II.17–23) OCVLOS CORDIS. Id est, non corporis. *Spiritualia* enim promissa non nisi *spiritualibus oculis* peruidentur. VT SCIATIS QVAE SIT SPES VOCATIONIS. Si enim *scieritis*, ad quantam *spem* [20] *uocati* estis, omnem *spem* saeculi facile contempnetis, et si *diuitias hereditatis Dei* uideritis, omnis terrena uobis horrebit *hereditas*. Nemo enim regnum cum opibus suis sperans mediocrem substantiam possidere dignatur.

**1:20** (II.24–27) ET CONSTITVENS AD DEXTERAM SVAM. Non quod Pa[25]ter solium ponat et in eo sedeat et Filium *ad dexteram* habeat, sed per humanam similitudinem *potentiam* demonstrat diuinam.

**1:21** (II.28–48) SVPER OMNEM PRINCIPATVM ET POTESTATEM ET VIRTVTEM ET DOMINATIONEM et reliqua. Nouem autem angelorum [30] scimus ordines: Angelos, Archangelos, Virtutes, Potestates, Principatus, Dominationes, Thronos, Cherubin, Seraphin. Qui minima nuntiant Angeli, qui summa Archangeli uocantur; Virtutes, per quos signa et miracula fiunt; Potestates, id est, super uirtutes aduersas, quorum potestate uirtutes aduersae re [35] frenantur, ne corda hominum quantum uolunt temptent; Principatus, qui ipsis quoque bonis angelorum spiritibus praesunt; Dominationes sunt, qui etiam Principatus et Potestates dissimilitudine alta transcendunt, quibus cetera agmina ad oboedientiam subiecta sunt; Throni sunt, qui tanta diuinitatis gratia [40] replentur, ut in eis Dominus sedeat et per eos sua iudicia discernat; Hiruphin quoque, id est, plenitudo scientiae, sunt, qui tanto perfectiori scientia pleni sunt, quanto claritatem Dei uicinius contemplantur; Seraphin autem, id est, ardentes uel incendentes, qui tanto magis conditoris sui ardent amore quanto [45] hunc uicinius uident, inter quos et Deum nulli alii spiritus intersunt. ET DEDIT EI NOMEN. Id est, Filius. QVOD EST SVPER OMNE NOMEN. Vt: *Magnificasti super omne nomen sanctum tuum*.

**1:17** (II.6–16) **THE FATHER OF GLORY.** I.e., according to divinity. For Christ is the *glory* of the *Father* just as he is also his *wisdom*, etc. **THE GOD OF OUR LORD.** I.e. according to flesh. **AND OF REVELATION.** I.e., as: *once your face has been revealed, you may gaze upon the glory of the Lord.*<sup>406</sup> **IN RECOGNITION OF HIM.** I.e., so that you may perfectly know his *greatness* and *power*, by which he can fulfill the promised awards and punishments. *Greatness* is that quality through which, because he is everywhere, absolutely nothing can be hidden from him. For who has understood this for certain, will not be able to sin in any category. For the one who feels ashamed before human testimony against him, will all the more be able to revere the divine. Whence also John the Apostle confirms that *everyone who sins does not know God.*

**1:18** (II.17–23) **THE EYES OF THE HEART.** I.e., not of the body. For the spiritual promises are not perceived except with *spiritual eyes*. **SO THAT YOU MAY KNOW WHAT IS THE HOPE OF VOCATION.** For if you knew to how much hope you have been called, you shall easily despise all the hope of this world, and if you saw the riches of the inheritance of God, all earthly inheritance will be horror to you. For no one hoping for a kingdom with his own riches is worthy to possess mediocre substance.

**1:20** (II.24–27) **AND ESTABLISHING AT HIS RIGHT HAND.** Not because the Father sets a throne and sits in it and has the Son at his right hand, but because through human likeness he demonstrates divine power.

**1:21** (II.28–48) **OVER ALL RULE AND AUTHORITY AND POWER AND DOMINION** etc. Now, we know nine orders of angels: Angels, Archangels, Powers, Authorities, Principalities, Dominions, Thrones, Cherubim, and Seraphim. Those who announce the smallest matters, are called Angels, those who announce the most important things, Archangels. Powers are those through whom signs and miracles happen. Authorities, i.e., over adverse powers, are those through whose authority opposite powers are restrained, lest they tempt the hearts of humans as much as they wish. Rules are those who even also command over the good spirits of angels. Dominions are those who transcend with great difference both Rules and Authorities, to whom the other hosts have been subjected in obedience. Thrones are those who are filled with such great grace of divinity, that the Lord sits on them and determines his own judgments through them. There are also Hiruphin,<sup>407</sup> i.e., the fullness of knowledge, who are fulfilled by so much more perfect knowledge, the closer they behold the splendor of God. Seraphim, however, i.e., the ones who burn or shine, are those who burn all the more with love for their maker, the more closely they see him; no other spirits intercede between them and God. **AND HE GAVE A NAME TO HIM.** I.e., Son. **WHICH IS ABOVE EVERY OTHER NAME.** Thus: *You have magnified your holy one over every other name.*

406 2 Cor 3:18.

407 (sic) This is an alternate spelling for 'cherubim'.



- HI **1:22** (II.49–59) ET OMNIA SVBIECIT SVB PEDIBVS EIVS. Id est, *sub* dominatione humanitatis eius. Vel: Contrarium uidetur esse, [51] quod alibi ait: *Necdum uidemus ei omnia subiecta* et cetera. Aut ergo secundum praescientiam id quod futurum est quasi iam factum esset commemorat secundum eum sensum, quem exposuimus: *Qui benedixit nos in omni benedictione spiritali in [55] caelestibus*, aut certe, si de praeterito accipiendum est, sic debemus accipere, quod etiam ea quae non sunt *ei uoluntate subiecta* naturae conditione deseruiunt, uerbi causa, demones, Iudei, gentiles. Sic intellege: *Et dedit caput*. SVPER OMNEM ECCLESIAM. Id est, non solum hominum, sed etiam angelorum.
- PIL **1:23** (II.60–66) QVI PER OMNIA IN OMNIBVS ADIMPLETVR. Nam quan[61]do omnes crediderint, tunc erit *corpus* eius perfectum *in omnibus* membris; totus enim *in* membris *omnibus*, non in singulis, *adimpletur*, ne ulla sit diuersitas membrorum. Aut: *Omnia*, id est, dona *in omnibus*, quia singula dona uel plura per partes [65] sunt in singulis. Nam in alio Deus iustitia est, in alio castitas, in alio temperantia est, sic et reliqua.
- HI **2:1** (III.1–6) ET VOS CVM ESSETIS MORTVI. Incipit collata beneficia replicare, ut ad officium mandatorum ex contemplatione donatae indulgentiae audius concitentur. ΠΑΡΑΙΤΟΜΑΤΑ, hoc est, *delicta* quasi initia peccatorum sunt, cum cogitatio tacita [5] subrepat; ΑΜΑΡΤΙΑ uero, id est, *peccata* sunt, cum quid opere consummatum peruenit ad finem.
- PIL **2:2** (III.7–9) SECVNDVM PRINCIPEM. Id est, diabolus. Multi sane opinantur, quod diabolus in *hoc aere* satellitibus suis ad decipiendos diuersis peccatis homines diuiserit potestatem.
- 2:3** (III.10–15) ET COGITATIONVM. In Greco *mentium*, quod ad dog [11]mata pertinet contraria ueritati. ET ERAMVS NATVRA FILII. Id est, quod *ab adolescentia mens hominum adposita sit ad malitiam*. *Non est enim homo qui non peccet*. FILII IRAE. Siue *perditionis*, siue *diaboli*, qui ira dicitur propter eam, quam ex[15]ercet aduersus homines, feritatem.
- 2:4** (III.1–3) DEVS AVTEM. *Autem* uacat. PROPTER MVLΤAM CARITATEM. *Nimia caritas est rebelles seruos quasi filios diligere*.
- 2:5** (III.4–6) CONVIVIFICAVIT NOS. Pro ‘*conuiuificabit*’. Id est, in [5] iustitia peccata per baptismum et fidem dimittendo et purgando.

**1:22** (II.49–59) AND HE SUBJECTED ALL THINGS UNDER FEET OF HIM. I.e., *under* the dominion of his humanity. Or: it seems to be contradictory to what he says elsewhere: *We do not yet see all things subjected to him* etc. Either therefore he calls to mind according to foreknowledge that which is future as if it had already happened – according to that sentence which we previously explained: *Who blessed us in every spiritual blessing in the heavens*, or certainly, if it must be understood as concerning the past, we must understand it thus, that even those things which are not subjected to him by will serve him by condition of nature, for instance, demons, Jews, Gentiles. So understand: *And he gave the head*. OVER ALL THE CHURCH. I.e., not only of humans, but also of angels.

**1:23** (II.60–66) WHO IS FULFILLED THROUGH ALL IN ALL. For when all have believed, then his *body* will be perfected *in all* members; for he is entirely fulfilled *in all* members, not in individual ones, lest there be any difference among the members. Or alternatively: *All*, i.e., gifts *in all*, because individual or multiple gifts are in individuals through parts. For in one God is justice, in another chastity, in a third he is moderation, so etc.

**2:1** (III.1–6) AND WHEN YOU WERE DEAD. He begins to unfold the collective benefits, so that they may be more zealously impelled towards their duty of the commandments because they contemplate the lenience they have received as a gift. **PARAPTOMATA** (“blunders”) i.e., *transgressions* are, as it were, the beginnings of sins, when silent thought creeps along, but **HAMARTIA** (“faults”), i.e. *sins* are when what has been completed by action comes to an end.

**2:2** (III.7–9) ACCORDING TO THE PRINCE. I.e., the devil. Many conjecture reasonably that the devil has divided power in *this air* among his followers for beguiling humans with various sins.

**2:3** (III.10–15) AND OF THOUGHTS. In Greek, *of minds*, because it pertains to teachings that are contrary to the truth. AND WE WERE BY NATURE SONS. I.e., because *since adolescence the mind of humans has been bent towards malice*. For there is no human that does not sin. SONS OF WRATH. Either they are sons of perdition, or of the devil, who is called wrath on account of that savagery which he exercises against humans.

**2:4** (III.1–3) GOD HOWEVER. The ‘*However*’ is empty. ON ACCOUNT OF MUCH LOVE. *It is excessive love* to love *rebellious* slaves as if sons.

**2:5** (III.4–6) HE MADE US ALIVE TOGETHER. Instead of ‘*He will make us alive together*’. I.e., by forgiving and purging our sins in justice through baptism and faith.

- 2:6** (III.7–9) ET CONRESVSCITAVIT. Quia quod in capite praecessit, certum est et in membris aliquando futurum. SIMVLQVE FECIT. Pro *'faciet'*.
- HI **2:7** (III.10–13) ABVNDANTES DIVITIAS. Id est, quod daturus sit, quae [11] *nec oculus uidit nec auris audiuit* et reliqua. Vere *abundans gratia* est, quae nec solum peccata donauit, sed etiam cum Christo *resuscitatos in dextera Dei in caelestibus collocabit*.
- 2:8** (V.1–3) PER FIDEM. Id est, non *per* opera. Sed ne sibi saltem ipsam *fidem* arrogarent, secutus adiunxit: *Et hoc non ex uobis* quoniam ipsa *fides non ex uobis*, sed *ex eo qui uocauit uos*.
- 2:9** (V.4–5) NE QVIS GLORIETVR. Id est, suis meritis et non a Deo [5] *esse saluatum*.
- 2:10** (V.6) CREATI IN CHRISTO. Id est, *renati* per baptismum.
- 2:11** (VI.1–6) MEMORES ITAQVE ESTOTE reliqua. Commemoratur illos, de quanta ignobilitate ad summam regni perducti sunt dignitatem, ut non sint ingrati beneficiis largitoris. QVAE DICITVR CIRCVMCISIO. Id est, non ueritate sed nomine. IN CARNE. [5] Id est, non *spiritu*. MANV FACTA. Id est, *manu humana facta, non Spiritu Dei in corde*.
- 2:12** (VI.7–11) ALIENATI A CONVERSATIONE ISRAHEL. Id est, qui tunc erat populus Dei. ET PEREGRINI et reliqua. Etiam si ex parte credebatis, proseliti tamen, hoc est, aduenae habebamini. SINE [10] DEO ERRANTES IN HOC MVNDO. Multos falsos deos colentes unum *uerum Deum* amisistis.
- 2:13** (VII.1–4) ERATIS LONGE. Deus, cum ubique sit praesens, *longe* tamen *ab impiis* dicitur. FACTI ESTIS PROPE. Id est, ut Iudaeis aequaremini, qui cum Deo erant. IN SANGVINE CHRISTI. Id est, credendo vos *eius sanguine* et passione liberatos.
- 2:14** (VII.5–13) [5] IPSE EST ENIM PAX NOSTRA. *Ipse est reconciliatio utriusque populi* ad inuicem et ad Deum. ET MEDIVM PARIETEM  
 PIL MACERIAE. *Medius paries et sepi et maceria onera legis* erant duos populos diuidentia, et ideo *ipse paries inimicitiae* nominantur. SOLVENS INIMICITIAM. Id est, circumcision[10]em et cetera, quae non tam Dei uoluntas quam  
 HI aut temporis ratio aut populi *duritia* exegerat. Aliter: SOLVENS INIMICITIAM. Id est, *sapientiam carnis quae inimica est Deo*. IN CARNE SVA. Id est, passione *carnis suae*.

**2:6** (III.7–9) AND HE CORESURRECTED. Because what has preceded in the head is certain to happen at some point in the future in the members. AND LIKEWISE MADE. Instead of *'will make'*.

**2:7** (III.10–13) ABUNDANT RICHES. I.e., what he is about to give, *which no eye has seen and no ear has heard*, etc. Truly *abundant* is a *grace* that not only forgave sins, but will even *join the resurrected ones* with Christ *at the right hand of God in the heavens*.

**2:8** (V.1–3) THROUGH FAITH. I.e., not *through* works. But lest they claim at least *faith* itself for themselves, he followed this up and added: *And this is not from you*, since *faith* itself *is not from you*, but *from him who called you*.

**2:9** (V.4–5) LEST ANYONE BOASTS. I.e., *to have been saved* by his own merits and not by God.

**2:10** (V.6) CREATED IN CHRIST. I.e., *reborn* through baptism.

**2:11** (VI.1–6) THEREFORE BE MINDFUL etc. He reminds those from what most humble origin they have been led towards the highest dignity of kingship, so that they are not ungrateful for the kindnesses of the benefactor. WHICH IS CALLED CIRCUMCISION. I.e., not by truth but by name. IN THE FLESH. I.e., not in the *spirit*. DONE BY HAND. I.e., *done by a human hand*, not by the *Spirit of God in the heart*.

**2:12** (VI.7–11) ESTRANGED FROM THE COMMUNITY OF ISRAEL. I.e., who were then the people of God. AND FOREIGNERS etc. Even if you were believing in part, nevertheless you were still being considered as proselytes, i.e., newcomers. WANDERING WITHOUT GOD IN THIS WORLD. You, worshipping many false gods, have abandoned the one *true God*.

**2:13** (VII.1–4) YOU WERE FAR AWAY. Although God is everywhere present, he is nevertheless said to be *far away from the impious*. YOU HAVE BEEN MADE NEAR. I.e., so that you may be equal to the Jews, who were with God. IN THE BLOOD OF CHRIST. I.e., by believing you were freed *by his blood* and passion.

**2:14** (VII.5–13) FOR HE HIMSELF IS OUR PEACE. *He himself is the reconciliation of both peoples* mutually to each other and to God. AND THE DIVIDING WALL OF A BARRIER. *A dividing wall, a fence, and a barrier* were *the burdens of the law*, dividing the two peoples, and therefore they are called *the very wall of enmity*. REMOVING ENMITY. I.e., circumcision et cetera, which not so much the will of God rather than either the reasoning of the time or *the harshness* of the people necessitated. Alternatively: REMOVING ENMITY. I.e., *the wisdom of the flesh, which is hostile towards God*. IN HIS OWN FLESH. I.e., by the passion of *his own flesh*.

- 2:15** (VII.14–32) LEGEM MANDATORVM. Id est, in qua sunt *mandata* HI [15] circumcisio et *sabbata* et *neomeniae* et reliqua. DECRETIS. Id est, Euan- gellii dogmatibus EVACVANS. Item: IPSE EST PAX NOSTRA QVI FECIT VTRAQVE VNVM. Caeterum tota intellegentia ad angelos transferenda est uirtutesque caelorum et ad animas humanas, quod in suo sanguine terrena et caelestia copularit, quae [20] inter se ante dissidebant, et *bonus pastor* morbidam HI ad montes reuectans *ouem* fecerit esse cum ceteris; atque ita crux Domini non solum terrestribus, sed etiam caelestibus profuit. Idem in expositione Abbauc: *Ipsae enim soluit medium parietem* et reliqua. Id est, obscuritatem ueterum pro- fetarum et omnia antiquae [25] legis aperuit sacramenta. Quod autem ait: *Vt duos conderet in semet ipso in unum nouum hominem*, magis uidetur superiori de Iudaeis et gentibus sensui conuenire. Sic intellege *hominem iuxta imaginem et similitudinem Dei factum eandem per reconciliationem* formam recepturum, quam et nunc angeli habent et [30] ipse perdiderit, *nouum autem hominem, qui* PIL *cottidie renouatur* et habitaturus est in *nouo* mundo. Aliter: IN VNO NOVO HOMINE. Id est, in *unum* populum Christianum effectum.
- 2:18** (VII.33–35) IN VNO SPIRITV. Pulcre III personas dicit in *accessu* duorum populorum, id est, totius Christiani populi generis hu[35]mani.
- HI **2:19** (VIII.1–8) ERGO IAM NON ESTIS HOSPITES. Ad id quod praemiserat: *Hospites testamentorum Dei*, nunc respondit. SED ESTIS CIVES. Praemiserat: *Alienati a conuersatione Israhel*. Hic locus aduersum eos uel maxime XP facit, qui diuersas naturas nituntur introducere. Quomodo enim *peregrini* facti sunt *ciues* [6] *sanctorum* et quomodo *domestici Dei* fuerunt *quondam alieni a conuersatione Israhel*, si non potest uel in melius uel in peius natura mutari?
- HI **2:20** (VIII.9–17) SVpra FVNDAMENTVM APOSTOLORVM. *Apostoli fun[10]damentum* sunt, uel Christus est *fundamentum apostolorum*. Christus est *fundamentum*, qui etiam *lapis* dicitur *angularis* duos coniungens et continens pa- rietes. Ideo autem *fundamentum* et *summus* est *lapis*, quia in ipso et fundatur et consummatur ecclesia. *Summus* autem *angularis lapis*, qui populum [15] utrumque continet, siue iuxta secundam interpretaationem caelestia iungit atque terrena. Christus est *lapis praecisus de monte, reprobatus a fariseis legem aedificantibus*.
- PIL **2:21** (VIII.18–23) IN TEMPLVM SANCTVM IN DOMINO. *In templo sancto* non possunt lapides poni non sancti. Ad comparationem templi [20] Ierosolimae dicit *extrui corpus* Christi, id est, *ecclesiam*, ut multo maiorem munditiam et sanctitatem habeat ueritas quam imago. Sensuum magis in HI apostolo quaerendus est ordo quam uerborum.

**2:15** (VII.14–32) THE LAW OF THE COMMANDMENTS. I.e., in which are the *commandments* of circumcision, the keeping of the *Sabbath*, and the celebration of the *new moons* etc. IN DECREES. I.e., MAKING THEM VOID in the teachings of the gospel. Likewise: HE HIMSELF IS OUR PEACE WHO MADE THE TWO INTO ONE. For the rest, the entire understanding of these words must be transferred to the angels and the powers of the heavens and to human souls, because in his own blood he has joined earthly and heavenly things, which before were at variance with each other, and as a *good shepherd* carrying the diseased *sheep* back to the mountains has made it to be with the others. And thus the cross of the Lord benefited not only the earthly, but also the heavenly things. Likewise in the exposition of Habakkuk: *For he himself broke down the dividing wall* etc. I.e., he revealed the obscurity of the ancient prophets and all the mysteries of the old law. But that he says, *so that in himself he might make the two into one new human*, seems to agree more with the previous sense referring to Jews and Gentiles. Thus understand that *the human person, made according to the image and likeness of God*, is about to receive that same form *through reconciliation*, which the angels have even already now and he himself lost, but as a *new human, who is daily renewed* and is about to live in a *new world*. Alternatively: IN ONE NEW HUMAN. I.e., having been made into *one* Christian nation.

**2:18** (VII.33–35) IN ONE SPIRIT. He beautifully names the three persons *in the access* of the two nations, i.e., of the whole Christian nation of humankind.

**2:19** (VIII.1–8) THEREFORE, NO LONGER ARE YOU STRANGERS. To that which he had said first: *Strangers to the covenants of God*, he now responds. BUT YOU ARE CITIZENS. He had said first: *Estranged from the community of Israel*. This verse is most effective against those who endeavor to introduce diverse natures. For how have *foreigners* been made *citizens of saints* and how were *the members of God's household once estranged from the community of Israel*, if nature cannot be changed into better or into worse?

**2:20** (VIII.9–17) ON THE FOUNDATION OF THE APOSTLES. *The Apostles are the foundation*, and Christ is the *foundation of the Apostles*. Christ is the *foundation*, who is also called the *corner stone*, joining and holding two walls. For that reason, moreover, is *the foundation* even *the most important stone*, because on it the church is both founded and perfected. But the *most important* is *the corner stone*, which holds both nations, or, according to the second interpretation, joins both heavenly and earthly things. Christ is *a stone cut off from the mountain, rejected* by the Pharisees *who construct* the law.

**2:21** (VIII.18–23) INTO A HOLY TEMPLE IN THE LORD. Stones that are not holy cannot be placed *in a holy temple*. By way of a comparison with the temple of Jerusalem he says that the *body* of Christ, i.e., the *church*, has been *built up*, so that truth may have a much greater purity and holiness than the image. In the Apostle, one must search more for the order of the meanings than of the words.

3:1 (VIII.1–5) HVIVS REI GRATIA. Id est, *huius rei* quam superius HI memoraui, quod Filius Dei et gentes saluauerit et Iudaeos et *utrosque fecerit unum*. EGO PAVLVVS. Id est, *cognoui misterium*, uel docui. VINCTVS CHRISTI. Id est, *Christi amore liga[5]tus* Romae.

3:2 (VIII.6–7) SI TAMEN AVDISTIS. *Si tamen* firmiter retinetis me in *uobis dispensationem* accepisse doctrinae.

3:3 (VIII.8–11) NOTVM MIHI FACTVM EST MISTERIVM. Id est, Iudaeos [9] et gentes unum populum esse factum in Christo. SICVT SVPRA HI SCRIPSI. In superioribus huius epistolae, quando dixit: *Vt notum faceret nobis sacramentum uoluntatis suae*.

3:4 (VIII.12–14) IN BREVI PROVT POTESTIS reliqua. Non quantum *poteram ego scribere*, sed quantum vos assequi ualebatis. IN MISTERIO [14] CHRISTI. Non in eloquentia saeculari.

HI 3:5 (VIII.15–23) NON EST AGNITVM FILIIS HOMINVM. Signanter et caute ait *filiis hominum fuisse absconditum sacramentum*, non tamen filiis Dei, id est, patriarchis et profetis, de quibus ait: *Ego dixi, dii estis* et reliqua. Aliter: Quomodo *reuelatum est apostolis*, ignorabant *profetae*. Aliud est enim *Spiritu* uentura cognoscere, [20] aliud ea cernere opere completa. Vnde et *Iohannes maior omnibus profetis* esse dicitur, quia quem ceteri profetauerunt, ipse conspexit et digito monstrauit dicens: *Ecce agnus Dei* et reliqua.

HI 3:6 (VIII.24–31) [24] IN SPIRITV ESSE GENTES COHEREDES. *Per Spiritum* mihi *reuelatum est*. Siue: *In Spiritu* illos sociatos esse, non carnis circumcissione. COHEREDES. Id est, Israheli, uel quod melius est, Christo, ut PIL hereditas nostra Deus sit et coheres Christus. ET CONCORPORALES. Id est, unius corporis, non solum *coheredes*, quod possunt diuersi generis esse, nec solum *concorporales*, [30] quia possunt eiusdem generis filii non eiusdem esse substantiae et gloriae. Ideo sequitur: ET CONPARTICIPES PROMISSIONIS.

3:7 (VIII.32–34) SECVNDVM OPERATIONEM VIRTVTIS EIVS. Cuius *uirtus* me confirmat. Siue: Cuius *uirtutes* meum confirmant Euangelium.

**3:1** (VIII.1–5) FOR THE SAKE OF THIS MATTER. I.e., *of this matter* which I mentioned earlier, that the Son of God saved both Gentiles and Jews and *made both into one*. I, PAUL. I.e., *I know the mystery*, or I have taught it. THE PRISONER OF CHRIST. I.e., out of love *for Christ* chained in Rome.

**3:2** (VIII.6–7) IF NEVERTHELESS YOU HAVE HEARD. *If nevertheless* you firmly keep in mind that I have accepted the *dispensation* of teaching *among you*.

**3:3** (VIII.8–11) THE MYSTERY HAS BEEN MADE KNOWN TO ME. I.e., that Jews and Gentiles have become one nation in Christ. JUST AS I WROTE ABOVE. In the earlier part of this letter, when he said: *So that he made known to us the mystery of his own will*.

**3:4** (VIII.12–14) JUST AS [I WROTE BEFORE] IN BRIEF... YOU CAN etc. Not how much *I was able to write*, but how much you were able to comprehend. IN THE MYSTERY OF CHRIST. Not in secular eloquence.

**3:5** (VIII.15–23) IT IS NOT KNOWN TO THE SONS OF HUMAN BEINGS. Markedly and cautiously he says that *the mystery was hidden from the sons of human beings*, not, however, from the sons of God, i.e., to the patriarchs and prophets, concerning whom he says: *I said you are gods* etc. Alternatively: *The prophets* did not know it in the way in which *it was revealed to the Apostles*. For it is one thing to know *in the Spirit* the things that are about to come, and another thing to perceive those things completed in the action. Whence also *John* is said to be *greater than all the prophets*, because he himself saw him, whom the others prophesied, and pointed at him with his finger saying: *Behold the lamb of God* etc.

**3:6** (VIII.24–31) THAT IN THE SPIRIT THE GENTILES ARE FELLOW HEIRS. *It was revealed to me through the Spirit*. Or rather: That they are associates *in the Spirit*, not by the circumcision of flesh. FELLOW HEIRS. I.e., with Israel, or which is better, with Christ, so that God may be our inheritance and Christ our fellow heir. AND FELLOW BODY MEMBERS. I.e., of one body, not only *fellow heirs*, because they can be of a different type, nor only *fellow body members*, because sons of the same family can be of a different substance and glory. Therefore it follows, AND FELLOW PARTICIPANTS OF THE PROMISE.

**3:7** (VIII.32–34) ACCORDING TO THE WORKING OF HIS POWER. Whose *power* confirms me. Or rather: Whose *powers* confirm my Gospel.



HI **3:8** (VIII.35–52) MIHI ENIM MINIMO reliqua. Non puto apostolum  
 Q cum mentis suae concordasse secreto, ut uere *omnibus sanctis mi[37]nimum* se  
 esse dixerit, uerbi gratia, his qui erant in Efeso, Corinto, Tesalonica uel in toto  
 orbe. Quod cum humilitatis indicium sit *se omnibus sanctis minimum* dicere,  
 mendacii est rea[40]tus aliud in pectore clausum habere, aliud in lingua pro-  
 mere. Sed hoc Paulus praecepto Domini fecit dicentis: *Qui uult in uobis maior*  
*esse, fiat omnibus minor, et qui uult esse primus, sit omnium nouissimus. Omnibus*  
 igitur, qui se propter Christum *infirmos* esse cupiebant, apostolus Paulus in-  
 firmior erat et id[45]circo *maior omnibus. Plus*, inquit, *aliis laboraui*. EVAN-  
 Q GELIZARE INVESTIGABILES DIVITIAS CHRISTI. Quaeritur si *inue-*  
*stigabiles*, cur *euangelizantur* in populo? Si *abscondita*, qua ratione per Paulum  
 referuntur? Hic ergo *inuestigabiles* et *absconditum* dupliciter sentiendum. Quod  
*inuestigabiles* ante *diuitiae* fue[50]runt, et *nunc* post Domini *apertae* sunt pas-  
 sionem. Aut certe quae natura sua homini *inuestigabiles* erant, haec Deo *reue-*  
*lante*, in quantum tamen possumus, nobis sunt cognita.

**3:9** (VIII.53–56) ET ILLVMINARE OMNES. Tunc *illuminat*, quando  
 gentes et Iudaeos ad fidem Christi uocat. SACRAMENTI ABSCONDITI. [55]  
 Id est, incarnationis Christi et uocationis gentium ad fidem, quod prioribus  
 temporibus soli Deo cognitum erat.

PIL **3:10** (VIII.57–67) VT INNOTESCERET PRINCIPIBVS reliqua. Vt per  
 me his, qui rebus *caelestibus* donisque per omnem ecclesiam principantur,  
 HI *multiformis sapientia innotescat*. Item: Si *principibus* [60] *et potestatibus in caelis*,  
 licet quidam *principem aeris istius et angelos eius* interpretaentur, ignota fuit  
 Q *multiplex sapientia Dei, quae nunc eis per ecclesiam reuelata est*, quanto magis  
 patriarchis et profetis ignota fuit, quos supra non ignorasse *misterium* Christi  
 sed, ita ut apostoli, nescisse monstrauius! [65] Ex quo intellegimus, quia crux  
 Christi non solum nobis, sed et angelis profuit et aperuit *sacramentum*, quod  
 ante nesciebant. Denique interrogat: *Quis est iste rex gloriae?*

**3:11** (VIII.68) QVAM FECIT. Quam olim Deus in sua mente decreuit.

**3:12** (VIII.69–71) IN QVO HABEMVS LIBERTATEM. Id est, cons-  
 cientiam [70] puram uel conscientiae puritatem. ET ACCESSVM. Id est, ut  
 noster ad Dominum sensus *accedat*.

**3:8** (VIII.35–52) FOR TO ME WHO IS THE VERY LEAST etc. I do not think that the Apostle would have agreed in the hidden part of his own mind that he truly said that he was the least among all the saints, for instance, among the ones who were in Ephesus, Corinth, Thessalonica, or in the whole world. Whereas it is a sign of humility to say that *I am the least among all the saints*, it is an offence of lying to have one thing locked in your heart, and to disclose another with your tongue. But Paul did this according to the precept of the Lord who said: *The one who wishes to be greater among you, should become less than all the others, and the one who wishes to be first, should be the last of all others.* Therefore the Apostle Paul was weaker *than all* those who desired themselves to be *weak* for the sake of Christ, and on account of that he was *greater than all others*. He said, *I have laboured more than others.* TO PREACH THE UNSEARCHABLE RICHES OF CHRIST. It is asked, why are they being *preached* among the people, if they are *unsearchable*? If *hidden*, by what account are they reported through Paul? Therefore, *unsearchable* and *hidden*, must here be understood on two levels. That they were *unsearchable riches* before, and *now* after the passion of the Lord they have been *revealed*. Or, certainly, the things which – according to their own nature – were *unsearchable* by the human being, have now been recognized by us through God's *revelation*, at least to whatever extent we can.

**3:9** (VIII.53–56) AND TO ILLUMINATE ALL. He *illuminates* then, when he calls the Gentiles and the Jews to the faith of Christ. OF THE HIDDEN MYSTERY. I.e., of the incarnation of Christ and of the calling of the Gentiles to faith, which in previous times was only known to God.

**3:10** (VIII.57–67) SO THAT IT MIGHT BE KNOWN TO THE RULERS etc. So that through me to these, who rule through every church with *heavenly* matters and gifts, *the manifold wisdom might be known*. Likewise: *If to the rulers and authorities in the heavens* – even if some interpret this as *the ruler of this air and his angels* – the *manifold wisdom of God* was unknown, *which now has been revealed to them through the church*, how much more was it unknown to the patriarchs and prophets, who, as we showed above, were not ignorant concerning *the mystery* of Christ, but just like the Apostles, did not understand it! From this we understand that the cross of Christ was not alone of benefit to us, but also to the angels and revealed the *secret*, which they did not know before. Finally they ask: *Who is this king of glory?*

**3:11** (VIII.68) WHICH HE MADE. Which God formerly decreed in his own mind.

**3:12** (VIII.69–71) IN WHOM WE HAVE FREEDOM. I.e., a pure conscience or purity of conscience. AND ACCESS. I.e., so that our mind may have access to the Lord.

**3:13** (X.1–4) PROPTER QVOD PETO et reliqua. Sed magis gloriari debetis intellegentes me tanta absque certae spei fiducia sustinere non posse. Quae apud infideles poenae, apud fideles uictoriae sunt. QVAE EST GLORIA VESTRA. Pro *‘quae sunt’*.

HI **3:15** (XI.1–8) EX QVO OMNIS PATERNITAS et reliqua. Hoc solus Pater omnium ceteris praestat, ut patres dicantur. Siue: Per naturam *Pater Domini*, sic ceterae quoque creaturae paternitatis nomen adoptione meruerunt. Quomodo autem nos, qui non su[5]mus de genere Abraham, *si fidem illius habuerimus, filii Abraham* uocamur et patriarchas quoque et profetas patres uocamus, ita puto et angelos habere principes sui generis, quos *patres* gaudeant habere *in caelestibus*.

**3:16** (XI.9–10) IN INTERIORE HOMINE reliqua. Vbi *interior per fidem* [10] *robustus* est, ibi *habitat Christus*, non ubi exterior saginatus.

PIL **3:18** (XI.11–18) VT POSSITIS COMPRAEHENDERE QVAE SIT LATITVDO reliqua. Quidam dicunt, quod *latitudo spatiosa uia, quae ducit ad mortem*, intellegatur, *longitudo* uita aeterna, *altitudo* caelestes uirtutes, *profundum* contrariae inferorum uirtutes ac potes[15]tates, ut scilicet horum omnium HI notitiam habentes nouerint, quid eligant, uel quid refutent. Nulla rotunditas *longitudinem et latitudinem* habet, *altitudinem* quoque *et profundum*, sed ex uniuersis partibus coaequalis est.

PIL **3:19** (XI.19–25) SCIRE ETIAM SVPEREMINENTEM reliqua. Hoc est, ut [20] digni simus per *scientiam* et *bonam conuersionem* habere *Christi supereminentem caritatem*. *Supereminet* autem *scientiae caritas Christi*, cum ex ipsa nascatur, sicut radici *supereminet* fructus. VT IMPLEAMINI reliqua. Quia non prodest *scientia sine caritate*; *plenitudo* namque donorum Dei non erit, [25] si *caritas* desit.

HI **3:20** (XII.1–3) EI AVTEM reliqua. Redit ad id, quod supra dixit: *Propterea flecto genua* reliqua; nuncque subinfert: *Ei autem* reliqua. SECVNDVM VIRTVTEM. Non *secundum* merita nostra.

**3:21** (XII.4–5) IN OMNIA SAECVLA SAECVLORVM. Immensa beneficia [5] immensis laudibus sunt celebranda.

**4:1** (XIII.1–5) EGO VINCTVS IN DOMINO. Id est, carcere scilicet *uinctus* uel, quod melius est, Christi caritate. Quidam uinculum animae corpus dicunt. IN DOMINO. Id est, non meo delicto. Vel: *Obsecro uos in Domino*. VT DIGNE AMBVLETIS. Id est: *Non de[5]clinantes ad dexteram neque ad sinistram*.

**4:2** (XIII.6–9) ET MANSVETVDINE. *Mansuetus* nulli nocet. SVFFERENTES INVICEM IN CARITATE. Quia *sufferunt* philosophi, sed non *in caritate*. Nos uero, non ut laudemur, sed ut ille quem *sustinemus* proficiat, diligentes *sustinere* debemus.

**3:13** (X.1–4) ON ACCOUNT OF WHICH I SEEK etc. But you must pride yourselves more when you understand that I cannot endure such great things without faith of certain hope. What are punishments among infidels, are victories among the faithful. WHICH IS YOUR GLORY. Instead of ‘*which are*’.

**3:15** (XI.1–8) FROM WHOM EVERY FAMILY etc. In this alone the Father of all is superior to others, so that they may be called fathers. Or rather: *Father of the Lord* through nature, likewise also all other creatures have merited the name *of family* by means of adoption. Moreover, in the same way as we, who are not from the stock of Abraham, *if we have the faith of him*, are called *sons of Abraham* and also refer to both patriarchs and prophets as fathers, thus I think that angels also have rulers of their own kind, whom they rejoice to have as *fathers in the heavens*.

**3:16** (XI.9–10) IN THE INNER HUMAN etc. Where *the interior is strong through faith*, there *Christ dwells*, not where the exterior is fattened.

**3:18** (XI.11–18) SO THAT YOU CAN COMPREHEND WHAT IS THE BREADTH etc. Certain people say that *breadth* should be understood as the *wide way which leads to death*, *length* as the eternal life, *height* as the heavenly powers, *depth* as the opposite powers and authorities of the infernal ones, namely, so that those who have knowledge of all these might know what to choose and what to refuse. Nothing round has *length and breadth* and also *height and depth*, but is equal on all sides.

**3:19** (XI.19–25) EVEN TO KNOW THE ONE THAT SURPASSES etc. I.e., so that we may be worthy through *knowledge* and *good fellowship* to have *the all surpassing love of Christ*. *The love of Christ*, however, *surpasses knowledge*, although it is born from that, *just as* a fruit *surpasses* a root. SO THAT YOU MAY BE FILLED etc. Because *knowledge* without *love* is of no benefit. For there will be no *fullness* of the gifts of God, if *love* is wanting.

**3:20** (XII.1–3) NOW TO HIM etc. He returns to that which he said above: *On account of which I bend my knees* et cetera; and now he adds: *Now to Him* etc. ACCORDING TO THE POWER. Not *according to* our merits.

**3:21** (XII.4–5) UNTO ALL GENERATIONS OF GENERATIONS.<sup>408</sup> Immense benefits must be celebrated with immense praises.

**4:1** (XIII.1–5) I AM A PRISONER IN THE LORD. I.e., a *prisoner* in jail, or, which is better, through the love of Christ. Some people say the body is a fetter to the soul. IN THE LORD. I.e., not by my transgression. Or: *I implore you in the Lord*. THAT YOU WALK WORTHILY. I.e., *Not turning aside to the right nor to the left*.

**4:2** (XIII.6–9) AND WITH MILDNESS. *A mild person* harms no one. SUFFERING ONE ANOTHER IN LOVE. Because the philosophers *suffer*, but

408 Normally translated: FOREVER AND EVER.

**4:3** (XIII.10–13) [10] SOLLICITI SERVARE VNITATEM SPIRITVS. Nec dicentes: *Ego Apollo, ego Cephae*. Quidam hic non *Spiritum* sanctum, sed mentis affectum dicunt, ut: *Erat illis cor unum et anima una*.

**4:4** (XIII.1–4) VNVM CORPVS. Id est, ecclesia unum consensum debet habere in *uno corpore* omnium compago membrorum, quae *ad unam spem sunt uocata* salutis. ET VNVS SPIRITVS. Id est, sanctus. Quamuis multa largitur.

**4:5** (XIII.5–6) [5] VNVM BAPTISMVM. Quamuis sub tribus personis datur; et hoc contra Valentinianos, qui duo baptismata dicunt.

**4:6** (XIII.7–10) QVI SVPER OMNES EST. *Super omnia Pater*, quia auctor est omnium; *per omnes Filius*, quia *per ipsum creata sunt*; *in omnibus Spiritus sanctus*. Ipse enim credentibus datur *et templum* [10] *eius sumus*.

HI **4:7** (XV.1–6) VNICVIQVE AVTEM NOSTRVM reliqua. Nunc de differentia donorum dicit, ne ob hoc invidi fiant inuicem, dum Christus *singulis diuidit*. SECVNDVM MENSVRAM. Tam nostrae capacitatis quam illius largitatis. Quamuis immensus est Deus, [5] tamen *iuxta mensuram gratiam* donat, id est, ut capere possimus.

**4:8** (XV.7–9) CAPTIVITATEM. Nam quos diabolus tenebat in morte, Christus *captiuauit* ad uitam. DEDIT DONA. In psalmo ait: *Accepisti* [9] *dona*. Ipse ergo et *dat* et in suis membris *accipit*.

Q **4:9** (XV.10–13) QVOD AVTEM ASCENDIT, QVID EST NISI QVIA ET DESCENDIT? Exponit, cur dicatur *ascendisse*, quem ubique esse non dubium est, secundum *formam* scilicet *serui*, ad quam non localiter, sed dignanter *descenderat*.

HI **4:10** (XV.14–21) SVPER OMNES CAELOS. Numquid corporaliter  
Q *omnes* [15] *caelos*, quos philosophi speras uocant, transiens stetit in summo caeli fornice? Aut certe omnia corporalia contempnens et aeterna contemplans *super caelos*, id est, *super inuisibilia*, sedisse credendus est? Quod ego melius puto. VT ADIMPLERET OMNIA. Vt non solum profetas *compleret*, sed etiam has occultas [20] dispensationes, quae neque scire possumus, quomodo et angelis et inferno sanguis Christi profuerit.

HI **4:11** (XV.22–27) ET IPSE DEDIT reliqua. Nunc tractat donorum praedictorum differentiam *secundum mensuram donationis Christi*. ALIOS PASTORES ET DOCTORES. Non autem ait: *‘Alios pastores* [25] *et alios doctores’*, sed: *Alios pastores et doctores*, ut, qui *pastor* est, debeat esse *doctor*. ALIOS VERO EVANGELISTAS. Omnis *apostolus euangelista* est, non omnis *euangelista apostolus*.

not *in love*. But we must *sustain* when we love, not that we may be praised, but so that the person we are *sustaining* makes progress.

**4:3** (XIII.10–13) ANXIOUS TO PRESERVE THE UNITY OF THE SPIRIT. Not saying: *I of Apollo* or *I of Cephas*. Some call this here not the Holy Spirit, but an affection of the mind, as: *They had one heart and one soul*.

**4:4** (XIII.1–4) ONE BODY. I.e., in the church the unity of all members must have one consensus in *one body*, the members, which *have been called to the one hope* of salvation. AND ONE SPIRIT. I.e., Holy. Although it bountifully provides many things.

**4:5** (XIII.5–6) ONE BAPTISM. Although it is given under three persons; and this against the Valentinians, who say there are two baptisms.

**4:6** (XIII.7–10) WHO IS ABOVE ALL. *The father is above all things*, because he is the creator of all; the Son is *through all*, because the things have been *created through him*; the Holy Spirit is *in all*. For He Himself is given to the believers *and we are His temple*.

**4:7** (XV.1–6) BUT TO EACH ONE OF US etc. Now he is speaking about the difference of gifts, lest people become envious of each other because of this, when Christ *divides among all individually*. ACCORDING TO MEASURE. As much of our capacity as of his liberality. Although God is immense, nevertheless he gives *grace according to measure*, i.e., so that we can grasp it.

**4:8** (XV.7–9) CAPTIVITY. For the ones the devil was holding in death, Christ *took captive* for life. HE GAVE GIFTS. In a psalm he says: *You received gifts*. He himself therefore both *gives* and *receives* in his own members.

**4:9** (XV.10–13) BUT THAT HE ASCENDED, WHAT DOES IT MEAN OTHER THAN THAT HE ALSO DESCENDED? He explains why it is said that he, about whom it is not at all doubtful that he is everywhere, *ascended*, namely, according to *the form of a slave*, to which he did not *descend* in space but in dignity.

**4:10** (XV.14–21) ABOVE ALL THE HEAVENS. Did he, who crosses over *all the heavens*, which the philosophers call spheres, really physically stand in the highest vault of heaven? Or alternatively, must he certainly be believed to have sat *above the heavens*, i.e. *above* the invisible things, disdaining all corporeal and contemplating all eternal things? The latter I think is better. SO THAT HE MIGHT FILL ALL THINGS. So that *he might fill* not only prophets, but even these secret dispensations, things which we also cannot understand, namely how the blood of Christ was of benefit to the Angels and the Underworld.

**4:11** (XV.22–27) AND HE HIMSELF GAVE etc. Now he treats the diversity of the before mentioned gifts *according to the measure of the gift of Christ*. OTHERS AS PASTORS AND TEACHERS. However he does not say: *others as pastors and others as teachers*, but: *others as pastors and teachers*, so that, whoever is a *pastor*, ought to be a *teacher*. BUT OTHERS AS EVANGELISTS. Every *apostle* is an *evangelist*, not every *evangelist* is an *apostle*.

**4:13** (XV.28–59) DONEC OCCVRRAMVS OMNES reliqua. Ex libro AU De ciuitate Dei XXII: Si dixerimus ad dominici corporis modum [30] etiam quorumque maiora corpora redigenda, peribit de multorum corporibus plurimum, *cum ipse capillum non periturum esse promiserit*. Restat ergo, ut suam recipiat quisque *mensuram*, quam uel habuit in iuuentute, etiam si senex sit mortuus, uel fuerat habiturus, etiam si est ante defunctus. Atque illud [35] quod commemorauit apostolus *de mensura aetatis plenitudinis Christi*, aut propter aliud intellegamus dictum esse, id est, ut illi capiti in populis Christianis accedente omnium perfectione membrorum *aetatis eius mensura compleatur*, aut, si hoc de resurrectione corporum dictum est, sic accipiamus dictum, ut [40] nec infra nec ultra iuuenalem formam resurgant corpora mortuorum, sed in eius *aetate* et robore, usque ad quam *Christum* hic peruenisse cognouimus. Circa XXX quippe annos definierunt esse etiam saeculi huius doctissimi hominum iuuentutem, quae cum fuerit proprio spatio terminata, inde iam hominem [45] in detrimenta uergere grauioris et senilis aetatis. Et ideo non esse dictum *in* AU *mensuram* corporis uel *in mensuram* staturae, sed: *In mensuram aetatis plenitudinis Christi*. Idem in eodem: Ecce qui est *uir perfectus, caput et corpus*, quod constat omnibus *membris*, quae suo tempore *complebuntur*, cottidie [50] tamen eidem *corpori* accedunt, dum *aedificatur* ecclesia, cui dicitur: *Vos estis corpus Christi et membra*. *Secundum operationem*, inquit, *in mensuram uniuscuiusque partis*. Sicut ergo est *mensura uniuscuiusque partis*, ita totius *corporis*, quod omnibus suis *membris* constat, est utique *mensura plenitudinis* [55] *Christi*, de qua dictum est: *In mensura aetatis plenitudinis Christi*. Quam *plenitudinem* etiam illo commemorauit loco, ubi ait de Christo: *Et ipsum dedit caput super omnem ecclesiam, quae est corpus eius, plenitudo eius, qui omnia in omnibus implet*.

**4:14** (XV.60–66) [60] PARVVLI FLVCTVANTES. Id est, instabiles ad instar *fluctus, qui a uento mouetur*. ET CIRCVMFERAMVR OMNI VENTO DOCTRINAE. Id est, *ut non simus* ignorantes nec dubie uacillantes et more imperiti gubernatoris *omnis doctrinae uento* nostrae fidei uela pandentes, ne facile naufragemus aut ad portum [65] *perfectionis* numquam peruenire possimus. ET ASTVTIA. Id est, dialecticae artis.

**4:15** (XV.67–69) VERITATEM AVTEM FACIENTES. Id est, omnia in *ueritate* propter *caritatem* Christi et nihil in hipochrisi *facientes*. PER OMNIA. Id est, incrementa uel dona seu opera.

**4:13** (XV.28–59) UNTIL WE ALL ATTAIN etc. From the book, *The City of God*, XXII:

If we say that the bodies of all which have as yet been larger than the Lord must be reduced to the size of the Lord's body, then very much substance will perish from the bodies of many, *although he himself promised that not a hair would perish*. Therefore it follows that each one will receive his own *size*, either that which one had in youth, even if one died at an old age, or what one would have had, even if one died at an early age. Also, regarding what the Apostle noted *about the measure of the age of the fullness of Christ*, we should understand to have been said either on account of something else, i. e., that, when the perfection of all the members among the Christian nations approaches to that head, then *the measure of his age is completed*. Or alternatively, if it was mentioned in reference to the resurrection of the bodies, we may understand it to have been said in such a way that the bodies of the dead will rise neither below nor beyond youthful form, but at his *age* and robustness which we know *Christ* reached here. For even the most learned people of this world have limited "youth" as being around thirty years old; when that age has been reached in that particular time, from then on already a person begins to decline into a more burdensome and old age. And therefore it was not said *in the measure of the body* or *in the measure of stature*, but: *in the measure of the age of the fullness of Christ*.

Likewise in that same book:

Behold, here is the *perfect man*, consisting of *head* and *body*, which consists of all its *members*, which *will be completed* at their fitting time, but nevertheless new members are daily being added to that same *body*, while the church *is being built*, to whom it is said, *You are the body and members of Christ. According to the effectual working*, he said, *in the measure of each part*. Therefore just as there is a *measure of each part*, so it is *of the whole body*, which consists of all its own *members*. Surely the latter is *the measure of the fullness of Christ*, about which it has been said: *In the measure of the age of the fullness of Christ*. This *fullness* is also noted in that place, where Paul says concerning Christ: *And he gave himself as the head over all the church, which is his body, his fullness, he who fills all things in all things*.

**4:14** (XV.60–66) BABIES WAVERING. I.e., unstable like a *wave, which is moved by the wind*. AND WE MAY BE CARRIED ABOUT BY EVERY WIND OF A DOCTRINE. I.e., *so that we are neither ignorant nor dubiously tottering* and like an unskilled steersman, setting the sails of our faith *by the wind of every doctrine*, lest we may be easily shipwrecked, or that we may never be able to arrive at the harbor of *perfection*. AND CUNNING. I.e., of dialectical skill.

**4:15** (XV.67–69) BUT DOING THE TRUTH. I.e., *doing* everything in *truth* because of the *love* of Christ and nothing in hypocrisy. THROUGH ALL THINGS. I.e., advancements, be it either gifts or works.



**4:16** (XV.70–81) [70] EX QVO TOTVM CORPVS COMPACTVM. Id est, singulis *membris*, id est iustus quibuslibet. ET CONEXVM. Id est, neruis et cute. PER OMNEM IUNCTVRAM. *Membrorum* scilicet a capite usque ad pedes. *Ex capite conexum corpus per omnem iuncturam uel subiunctionem operationis crescit, dum se alterutrum* [75] *membra aedificant* diligendo, ita ut unumquodque *membrum in sua mensura augeatur*, hoc est, ut, qui est per sapientiam oculus, in eorum numerum *crescat*, qui oculi officium gerunt, et singula suo loco *membra proficiant*. IN CARITATE. Dum dicit: *In caritate*, ad sensum pertinet, quia hoc totum spiritaliter intellegendum [80] est. Haec idcirco apud nos obscura sunt, quia metaforicos dicuntur.

**4:17** (XVI.1–4) HOC IGITVR DICO ET TESTIFICOR IN DOMINO. HI Quos superius *rogauerat*, hic *Domini* obtestatione constringit. *Hoc ergo dico uobis, qui occursuri estis in mensuram aetatis plenitudinis Christi, ne ambuletis sicut gentes ambulantes.*

**4:19** (XVI.5–8) [5] QVI DISPERANTES SEMETIPSOS. Id est, nullam spem caelestium proemiorum habentes. ET AVARITIAE. Non ad *auaritiam*, ut sonat simpliciter, pertinet, sed ad libidinem atque luxuriam, quod numquam luxuriando satiantur.

**4:20** (XVII.1–2) NON ITA DIDICISTIS et reliqua. *Discere Christum idem est et sapientiam audire.*

**4:21** (XVII.3–9) SI TAMEN ILLVM AVDISTIS. *Si* autem omnes, qui *Christum audire* uidentur, *audirent*, numquam ad Effesios, et [5] certe illos, quibus *sacramenta* Christi *reuelauerat* apostolus, diceret: *Si tamen illum audistis.* ET IN ILLO DOCTI ESTIS. Aliquando per semetipsum *docet* nos in cordibus nostris, aliquando per *doctores*. SICVT EST VERITAS et reliqua. Nam sancti *per speculum et enigmata* uident, *in Iesu* autem *ueritas*.

**4:22** (XVII.10–11) [10] SECVDVM DESIDERIA ERRORIS. Id est, faciens omnia *secundum desideria cordis carnalium cogitationum*.

**4:24** (XVII.12–16) ET INDVITE NOVVM HOMINEM. Id est, *Christum*, cuius *conuersatione induimur*. QVI SECVDVM DEVM CREATVS EST IN IUSTITIA et reliqua. Ecce manifestum est, quod amisit Adam: [15] *iustitia et sanctitas et ueritas*. *Iustitia*, id est in iudiciis, *sanctitas*, id est in operibus, *ueritas*, id est in uerbis.

**4:25** (XVII.17–19) LOQVIMINI VERITATEM. Vsque ‘*suo*’ de Zacharia sumptum est. QVIA SVMVS INVICEM MEMBRA. Non possunt *alterutrum membra* se fallere uel laniare, ita et uos.

**4:26** (XVIII.1–7) IRASCIMINI ET NOLITE PECCARE. Euidenter hoc dicit: *Irascimini* uitii et furori uestro, ne coniuentibus uobis *sol iustitiae*

**4:16** (XV.70–81) FROM WHOM THE WHOLE BODY HAS BEEN COMPOSED. I.e., to all *members* individually, i.e., to all just ones. AND CONNECTED. I.e., by tendons and skin. BY EVERY JOINT. *Of the members*, namely, from the head down to the feet. *The body connected from the head by every joint or subjoining of effectual working grows*, whilst *the members edify one another* through love, in the same way that each *member is increased in its own measure*. I.e., so that he who is an eye through wisdom, *may grow* into the number of those who perform the duty of the eye, and that all individual *members* are of benefit in their place. IN LOVE. While he says: *In love*, this relates to the feeling, because this must be understood entirely in a spiritual sense. Therefore these things are obscure among us, because they are spoken metaphorically.

**4:17** (XVI.1–4) THIS THEREFORE I SAY AND ATTEST IN THE LORD. Those whom *he had interrogated* above, he here binds together by adjuring to the *Lord*. *This therefore I say* to you, who *are about to reach the measure of the age of the fullness of Christ*, lest you walk as the Gentiles walk.

**4:19** (XVI.5–8) WHO DESPAIRING OF THEMSELVES. I.e., having no hope of the heavenly rewards. AND OF GREED. This does not relate to *greed* as it sounds at face value, but to desire and luxury, because they are never satisfied by living licentiously.

**4:20** (XVII.1–2) THUS YOU DID NOT LEARN etc. *To learn Christ* is the same as also to *hear* wisdom.

**4:21** (XVII.3–9) IF NEVERTHELESS YOU HAVE HEARD HIM. *If* however all, who seem to *hear Christ*, *were hearing*, he would never say to the Ephesians and certainly to those, to whom the Apostle *had revealed the secrets* of Christ: *If nevertheless you have heard him*. AND HAVE BEEN TAUGHT IN HIM. Sometimes he *teaches* us in our hearts through himself, at other times he teaches through *teachers*. JUST AS TRUTH IS etc. For holy ones see *through a mirror and through riddles*, but *truth is in Jesus*.

**4:22** (XVII.10–11) ACCORDING TO THE DESIRES OF SIN. I.e., doing all things according to the desires of the heart's thoughts.

**4:24** (XVII.12–16) AND PUT ON THE NEW SELF. I.e., Christ, through whose fellowship we are adorned. WHO ACCORDING TO THE WILL OF GOD HAS BEEN CREATED IN RIGHTEOUSNESS etc. Behold it has been shown what Adam lost: righteousness, holiness, and truth. Righteousness, i.e. in judgments, holiness, i.e. in works, truth, i.e. in words.

**4:25** (XVII.17–19) SPEAK THE TRUTH. Up until 'his own' has been taken from Zecharia. BECAUSE WE ARE MEMBERS OF EACH OTHER. Members cannot deceive or mangle each other, so neither should you.

**4:26** (XVIII.1–7) BE ANGRY AND DO NOT SIN. Evidently he says this: Be angry about your vices and your rage, lest on you who sleep, the sun of

Christus incipiat propter *iracundiam uestram mentibus obscuratis occidere* et discedente illo *locum diabolo* [5] in uestris cordibus praebeatis. Aliter: SOL NON OCCIDAT SVPER IRACVNDIAM VESTRAM. Hoc est, ut *ira* sit breuis nec in diem crastinum differatur.

4:27 (XVIII.8–9) NEQVE LOCVM DETIS DIABOLO. Porta enim *diaboli* peccatum est, quomodo Spiritus sancti iustitia.

PIL 4:28 (XVIII.10–27) QVI FVRBATVR IAM NON FVRETVR. Hoc est, alienos [11] labores aliquando dereptos nunc suo labore compenset et *operando*  
 HI *tribuat indigentibus*, qui *multos furando* fecit *egentes*. MAGIS AVTEM LABORET OPERANS MANIBVS. *Operatur bonum, qui declinat a malo et facit bonum* et *operatur* in agro animae [15] suae, ut spiritalibus *panibus* impleatur et possit *commodare esurienti* et *necessitatem sustinenti*, *dans in tempore cibaria* caelestis dogmatis *conseruis suis*. Si autem talis est, qui *operatur bonum*, ergo et is *qui furatur* consequenter uerba *furatur* et dogmata, de furto uiuens, de furto sibi *ceruicalia consuens* et  
 XP [20] Scripturarum pannos hinc inde colligens, ut possit *tonicam* facere *conscissam*. *Diabolus* est Grecum uerbum, quod Latine dicitur ‘*criminator*’. Lingua uero Ebraica, ‘Satanas’ appellatur aduersarius siue contrarius, et ab apostolo *Belial*, id est ‘absque iugo’, quod de collo suo Dei eiecerit seruitutem; quem Aquila [25] ‘apostata’ transtulit. OPERANS MANIBVS QVOD BONVM EST. Non *quod* malum ut sunt multae inhonestae uel malae artes, ut maleficia et reliqua.

4:29 (XVIII.1–2) SED SI QVIS BONVS. Id est, *sermo*, qui docet uirtutes.

AU 4:30 (XVIII.3–22) ET NOLITE CONTRISTARE SPIRITVM SANCTVM DEI. Non quod ipsa *Spiritus sancti* substantia *contristari* potest, cum [5] habeat aeternam atque incommutabilem beatitudinem, sed quia ita *in sanctis habitat*, ut eos impleat caritate, qua necesse est, ut homines ex tempore gaudeant profectu fidelium et bonis operibus. Et ideo necesse est, ut etiam *contristentur* lapsu uel peccatis eorum, de quorum fide ac pietate gaudebant; quae tris[10]tritia laudabilis est, quia uenit ex *dilectione* quam *Spiritus sanctus infundit*. Propterea et ipse *Spiritus* dicitur *contristari* ab eis, qui sic agunt, ut eorum factis *contristentur* sancti, non ob aliud, nisi quia *Spiritum sanctum* habent. Quo dono tam boni sunt, ut eos mali maestificent, hi maxime, quos bonos fuisse siue noue[15]runt siue crediderunt. Quae profecto tristitia non solum non culpanda, uerum etiam

righteousness – Christ – begin to set, when your minds have been obscured on account of your anger and lest, as Christ disappears, you offer the devil a place in your hearts. Alternatively: DO NOT LET THE SUN SET OVER YOUR ANGER. I.e., so that anger may be brief, not extended into tomorrow's day.

**4:27** (XVIII.8–9) DO NOT GIVE THE DEVIL AN OPPORTUNITY. For the gate to the devil is sin, in that way the gate to the Holy Spirit is righteousness.

**4:28** (XVIII.10–27) THE ONE WHO WAS STEALING, MUST NO LONGER STEAL. I.e., let the one who once stole the fruits of other people's labor, now make compensation by means of his own work, and let him give to the needy through work who made many needy through theft. MORE; BUT RATHER LET ONE LABOR, WORKING WITH HANDS. One does good, who resists evil and does good and works in the field of one's own soul, so that one is filled with spiritual bread and can give provision to the hungry and needy, giving at the proper time food of heavenly doctrine to one's own fellow slaves. If however he is of such a kind, who does good, therefore also he who steals consequently steals words and doctrines, living from thievery, stitching for oneself pillows from thievery and collecting from here and there pieces of cloth taken from the Scriptures, so that he can make a torn tunic. "Devil" is the Greek word, but in Latin he is called "accuser". But in the Hebrew tongue the adversary or opponent is called "Satanas" and by the Apostle, "Belial", i.e. 'without a yoke', because he cast the servitude of God from his own neck. Aquila translated "Belial" with "apostate". WORKING WITH ONE'S OWN HANDS ON WHAT IS GOOD. Not on what is evil as there are many dishonest or evil trades, like fraud etc.

**4:29** (XVIII.1–2) BUT ONLY SOME [WORD AS IS] GOOD. I.e., a word, which teaches virtues.

**4:30** (XVIII.3–22) AND DO NOT GRIEVE THE HOLY SPIRIT OF GOD. Not because the very essence of the Holy Spirit can be grieved, since it has eternal and immutable happiness, but because it so *dwells in holy people*, so that it fills them with love, by which it is necessary, so that humans may rejoice spontaneously by the progress of believers and their good works. And it is inevitable for this reason that they are also grieved by the fall or sins of those about whose faith and piety they were rejoicing. Such sadness is laudable, because it comes from love which the Holy Spirit pours out. For this reason the Spirit himself is said to be grieved by those, who act in such a manner, so that the saints are saddened by their deeds, for no reason except that they have the *Holy Spirit*. By this gift they are so good that evil people sadden them, especially those they know or believed to have been good. Such sadness truly not only must not be blamed, but must even eminently be praised and proclaimed.

praecipue laudanda atque praedicanda est. Item: NOLITE CONTRISTARE SPIRITVM SANCTVM. Hominibus loquens comparationes inducit humanas, ut ex nobis intellegamus, quantam *Spiritui sancto* iniuriam facimus, cum domum [20] eius in nobis aliqua peccati sorde polluimus. IN QVO SIGNATI ESTIS. *Signati* autem sumus *Spiritu sancto*. IN DIE REDEMPTIONIS. Id est, *in die* baptismi.

Q 4:31 (XVIII.23–31) AMARITVDO. Id est, rancor in corde. IRA. Quae in uultu apparet. Furore restincto desiderat ultionem. INDIGNATIO. [25] Et ex superbia, cum aliquem iudicamus indignum, et ideo eum nolumus sustinere. CLAMOR. Ille scilicet qui ex furore descendit. Ceterum Isaias bene *clamare* ESI iubetur et ipse Dominus in templo *clamabat*: *Qui sitit, ueniat et bibat*. Peccatum perpetrare crimen est, peccatum praedicare *clamor*. CVM OMNI MALITIA. [30] Comprahendit omnia mala dicendo: *Malitia*. Aut: *Malitia* est, quae inimico uicem reddere potest.

4:32 (XVIII.32–35) ESTOTE AVTEM INVICEM reliqua. Postquam uitia eradicauit, uirtutes *plantat*, ut Ieremias dicit: *Vt euellas et plantes*. BENIGNI. Id est, ex corde. MISERICORDES. Id est, operibus. DONANTES [35]. Id est, remittentes peccata.

5:1 (XX.1–2) ESTOTE AVTEM IMITATORES DEI. Id est, indulgendo peccata, ut est: *Domine ne statuas illis* et reliqua.

5:2 (XX.3–8) ET TRADIDIT SEMET IPSVM. Ergo sicut *ille animam suam pro nobis tradidit, ita et nos pro fratribus animas ponamus*. [5] OBLATIONEM ET HOSTIAM. Omne sacrificium *oblatio* uocatur, *hostia* uero de uiuis. Et in Christo continetur utrumque, quia ipse oblatum est et uiuus. IN ODOREM SUAVITATIS. *Suauissimus odor* est caritatis.

HI 5:3 (XXI.1–4) FORNICATIO AVTEM et reliqua. *Omnia crimina* breuiter comprahendit duas criminum designando *radices*, id est *fornicationem* et *auaritiam*. ET OMNIS INMVNDITIA. Titilla[4]tio carnis et fluxus seminis ex qualicumque attritu uentris.

HI 5:4 (XXI.5–14) AVT TVRPITVDO. Id est, libidiosa cogitatio. Inter *stultiloquium* et *scurrilitatem* hoc interest, quod *stultiloquium* nihil in se sapiens et corde hominis dignum habet, *scurrilitas* uero de prudenti mente descendit et consulto appetit quaedam uel urbana uerba uel rustica uel turpia uel faceta, quam nos io[10]cularitatem alio uerbo possumus appellare, ut risum moueat audientibus. Verum et haec a sanctis uiris propellenda, quibus magis conuenit flere atque lugere. SED MAGIS GRATIARVM ACTIO. Non ut Deo *gratias agamus*, sed ut grati siue gratiosi *apud homines* simus, ut: *Sit sermo uester sale conditus*.

Likewise: DO NOT GRIEVE THE HOLY SPIRIT. Speaking to humans he introduces human comparisons, so that we may understand from ourselves, how much injustice we cause the *Holy Spirit*, when we pollute his house in us with some filth of sin. IN WHOM YOU HAVE BEEN SEALED. But, we have been sealed by the *Holy Spirit*. ON THE DAY OF REDEMPTION. I.e., *on the day* of baptism.

**4:31** (XVIII.23–31) BITTERNESS. I.e., rancor in the heart. ANGER. Which appears in the face. Even once rage has been extinguished, it longs for vengeance. INDIGNATION. And from haughtiness, when we judge someone as unworthy, and therefore do not wish to support him. SHOUTING. That, namely, which descends from rage. But yet, Isaiah was ordered to shout in a good sense and the Lord himself was *shouting* in the temple: *If anyone is thirsty, let him come and drink*. It is a crime to commit a sin, a *shout* to make public a sin. WITH ALL MALICE. He includes all evil things by saying: *malice*. Or alternatively: *malice* is that which can return the same to an enemy.

**4:32** (XVIII.32–35) AND BE TO ONE ANOTHER etc. After he had eradicated vices, he plants virtues, as Jeremiah says: *So that you may eradicate and plant*. KIND. I.e., from the heart. COMPASSIONATE. I.e., through works. FORGIVING. I.e., pardoning sins.

**5:1** (XX.1–2) MOREOVER BE IMITATORS OF GOD. I.e., by indulging sins, for example: *Lord, do not judge these* etc.

**5:2** (XX.3–8) AND HANDED HIMSELF OVER. Therefore just as *he surrendered his own life for us, so also let us lay down our lives for our brethren*. AN OFFERING AND SACRIFICIAL VICTIM. Every sacrifice is called an *offering*, but a *sacrificial victim* when it concerns living things. And in Christ, both are contained because he was offered and was alive. IN THE FRAGRANCE OF SWEETNESS. *The sweetest fragrance* is of love.

**5:3** (XXI.1–4) BUT FORNICATION etc. He briefly treats *all crimes* by noting two *roots* of crimes, i. e. *fornication* and *avarice*. AND ALL IMPURITY. A tickling of the flesh and a flow of seed from whatsoever kind of rubbing of the stomach area.

**5:4** (XXI.5–14) OR WICKEDNESS. I.e., libidinous thought. There is the following difference between ‘*silly talk*’ and ‘*scurrility*’, in that ‘*silly talk*’ contains in it nothing wise or worthy of the human heart, but ‘*scurrility*’ descends from a wise mind and from mature reflection aims at certain urbane or rustic or shameful or facetious words, which we can call humor by another word, so that it may cause the listeners to laugh. But even these things must be rejected by holy men, for whom it is more appropriate to weep and groan. BUT RATHER GIVING OF THANKS. Not so that *we may give thanks* to God, but so that we may be thankful or obliging among *humans*, thus: *so that your speech may be seasoned with salt*.

**5:5** (XXI.15–19) [15] HOC ENIM SCITOTE et reliqua. Hoc contra illos agit, qui solam fidem posse sufficere dicunt. AVT AVARVS. Qui sic honorat diuitias ut deos. Nam in *auaro idolatria* est, quod scripturam ipsius nummi colit. Vt *uoracium deus uenter est*, ita cupidorum pecunia deus dicitur.

HI **5:6** (XXII.1–25) IN FILIOS DIFFIDENTIAE. Id est, in Sodomitas uel in eos qui in diluuiio perierunt. Notandum est, quod sex uitiiis supra prohibitis, *fornicatione, immunditia, auaritia, turpitudine, stultiloquio, scurrilitate*, nunc tantum tria posuerit, *fornicatio*[5]*nem* et *immunditiam* et *auaritiam*, quibus, qui fuerit obnoxius, *hereditatem in regno Christi et Dei non possit habere*. Si enim ita *stultiloquus et scurra* alieni essent a *regno Dei*, quomodo III, quos specialiter separauit, uideretur sententia esse crudelis, non ignoscere inbecillitati fragilitatis humanae, cum etiam per iocum nos dicta dampnarent. *Qui enim in sermone non labitur*, [11] *perfectus est*. Neque uero ista dicentes *locum stultiloquio* et *scurrilitati damus*, dum non excluduntur a *regno*, sed quomodo *apud Patrem diuersae sunt mansiones* et *stella a stella differt in gloria, sic et resurrectio mortuorum*. Quamuis aliquis a *for*[15]*nicatione, immunditia* atque lasciuia alienus sit, tamen si *stultiloquus* et *scurra* fuerit, non tenebit eum locum, quem possessurus erat, si haec uitia non haberet. Respondeat, quia *stultiloquium et scurrilitas* non eundem habeat reatum, *quem fornicatio, immunditia et auaritia*, numquid non et *turpitudinem* cum [20] tribus superioribus debuit nominare? Ad quod dicendum hic *turpitudinem* significare absconditam cogitationem, cum inflammatur sensus noster ad libidinem et carnis titillationibus anima ignita succenditur et nihilo minus Dei timore in iudicio refrenatur. Et quomodo *stultiloquium et scurrilitas*, sic ista *tur*[25]*pitudo* non perdit nec in perpetuum excludit a *regno*.

**5:7** (XXII.26–27) PARTICIPES EORVM. Id est, *fornicatione, immunditia, auaritia*.

**5:8** (XXII.28) FILII LVCIS. Id est, Christi, uel fidei, uel scientiae.

**5:9** (XXII.29–31) IN OMNI BONITATE. Id est, in benignitate ad omnes, ut: [30] *Deus solem suum oriri facit super bonos et malos*. IVSTITIA. Id est, operum et iudiciorum. ET VERITATE. Id est, uerborum.

HI **5:10** (XXII.32–36) PROBANTES reliqua. Quia uidetur tota scaterententia, ordini tenenda est: *Nolite fieri participes eorum probantes, quid sit beneplacitum Deo. Et si enim eratis aliquando tene*[35]*brae, nunc autem lux in Domino, ut filii lucis ambulate; fructus lucis ostendite in bonitate et iustitia et ueritate*.

**5:5** (XXI.15–19) FOR YOU SHOULD KNOW THIS etc. He writes this against those who say that faith alone can suffice. OR A GREEDY PERSON. Who thus honors riches as gods. For in *a greedy person* there is *idolatry*, because he cherishes the ‘Scripture’ of money itself. Just as the *god of the voracious is the stomach*, so money is called the god of the greedy.

**5:6** (XXII.1–25) AMONG THE SONS OF DISOBEDIENCE. I.e., among the Sodomites or among those who perished in the flood. It must be noted that after the six prohibited faults from above: *fornication, impurity, avarice, wickedness, silly talk, scurrility*, he has now marked only three, *fornication, impurity, and avarice*, because of which everyone who has been guilty of them *cannot have an inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and God*. For if a *silly talker and a joker* were strangers from *the kingdom of God*, in the same way as the three, which he especially separated, then it would seem to be a cruel idea not to forgive the weakness of human fragility, since even things said in jest condemn us. *For who does not lapse in speech, is a perfect person*. But in saying these things we do not give an *opportunity* for *silly talk* and *scurrility*, since they are not being excluded *from the kingdom*, but in the same manner that there are *diverse mansions with the Father*, and a *star differs from another star in glory, so does also the resurrection of the dead*. Although someone may be a stranger to *fornication, impurity* and lust, nevertheless if he was a *silly talker* or *joker*, he will not hold that place, which he would have possessed, if he had not had these faults. Someone may respond that, because *silly talk* and *scurrility* do not have the same guilt as *fornication, impurity, and avarice*, should *wickedness* not also be named with the three above? In response to that it must be said that here *wickedness* means hidden thought, when our feeling is inflamed to lust and our aroused spirit is kindled by titillations of the flesh and nevertheless restrained by the fear of God at judgment time. Just as *silly talk and scurrility*, so also turpitude is not a capital offence, nor does it exclude one from the kingdom for eternity.

**5:7** (XXII.26–27) PARTAKERS IN THEM. I.e., in *fornication, impurity, and avarice*.

**5:8** (XXII.28) SONS OF THE LIGHT. I.e., of Christ, or of faith, or of knowledge.

**5:9** (XXII.29–31) IN ALL GOODNESS. I.e., in kindness to all, as: *God makes his sun rise over the good and evil*. IN RIGHTEOUSNESS. I.e., of works and judgments. AND IN TRUTH. I.e., of words.

**5:10** (XXII.32–36) INVESTIGATING etc. Because it seems that the whole sentence is chaotic, it must be comprehended by methodical arrangement: *Do not become partakers of them investigating what may be pleasing to God. For you were formerly darkness, but now you are light in the Lord, so walk as sons of the light, and show the fruit of the light in goodness and righteousness and truth*.



**5:11** (XXII.37–40) ET NOLITE COMMVNICARE reliqua. Id est, quia *lux non potest communicare cum tenebris. Tenebrarum opera sunt, quae ad tenebras ducunt.* REDARGVITE. Id est, peccantes, dum [40] *lux estis.*

HI **5:12** (XXII.41–44) QVAE ENIM IN OCCVLTO FIVNT. Id est, *fornicatio, immunditia, auaritia.* AB EIS. *Filiis scilicet diffidentiae.* ETIAM DICERE. Aliquando nominat *turpia* pro utilitate, aliquando pro uerecundia non nominat.

PIL **5:13** (XXII.45–49) [45] OMNIA QVAE ARGVVNTVR. *Quae occulta fiunt a filiis diffidentiae,* ut ex eo quod corripuntur, mutantur in melius, et mutata *manifestentur* in publico, et publicata fiant *lumen.* OMNE AVTEM QVOD MANIFESTATVR LVMEN EST. Id est, incipit *lu[49]men* esse, cum crediderit, et uobis adiungitur.

HI **5:14** (XXII.50–67) PROPTER QVOD DICIT: EXSVRGE et reliqua. Ego Q secundum ingeniolum meum omnes editiones ueterum Scripturarum, ipsaque Ebreorum uolumina, diligenter euentilans numquam hoc scriptum repperi. Nisi forte hoc dicamus: Quomodo olim profetae in concione populi loquebantur: *Haec dicit [55] Dominus,* et: *Quoniam Dominus locutus est,* ita et apostolum *Spiritu sancto plenum* repente in uerba quae *in se Christus loquebatur* erupisse atque dixisse: *Haec dicit Dominus.* Nec non et illud est disserendum, quomodo uni atque eidem dicatur quasi dormienti: *Surge qui dormis,* et quasi mortuo: *Exsurge a [60] mortuis.* Igitur quia et spiritus est hominis, quem semper in bonam partem scriptum inuenimus, et anima, cuius infirmitates et mortes legimus peccatorum, id quod nunc dicitur: *Surge qui dormis,* referatur ad spiritum, et quod sequitur: *Exsurge a mortuis,* animae coaptetur. *Anima enim quae peccauerit, ipsa [65] morietur.* Spiritus autem mortem numquam legimus. Christus uero *lux uera orietur* ei, qui *surrexit* de somno et *ex mortuis* fuerit suscitatus.

**5:15** (XXIII.1–4) QVOMODO CAVTE AMBVLETIS. Non ad insidias faciendas, sed ad *cauendum* peccatum, ut est illud: *Astutus dirigit gressus suos.* Aliter: *Caute,* id est, *discernentes bonum et malum.*

ESI **5:16** (XXIII.5–9) [5] REDIMENTES TEMPVS. Hoc est, poenitentia residuo *tempore* in bonis operibus perseuerantes *tempus* praeteritum in peccatis *redimentes,* quod *tempus* malitia hominum uenditum erat. QVONIAM DIES MALI SVNT: Per metanomiam pro his qui in *diebus* sunt, quia *dies mali* esse non possunt.

**5:17** (XXIII.10–11) [10] SED INTELLEAGENTES. Id est, *scrutamini legem,* in qua uoluntas eius continetur.

**5:11** (XXII.37–40) AND DO NOT MINGLE etc. I.e., because *light* cannot *mingle with darkness*. The *works* of the *darkness* are those which lead to *darkness*. REPROVE. I.e., sinners, since you are the light.

**5:12** (XXII.41–44) FOR THOSE THINGS WHICH ARE DONE IN SECRET. I.e., *fornication, impurity, and avarice*. BY THOSE. Namely, by *sons of disobedience*. EVEN TO SPEAK. At one point he uses the term *wicked things* for the sake of convenience, at another occasion he does not use any term at all, for the sake of shame.

**5:13** (XXII.45–49) ALL THINGS WHICH ARE REPROVED. *Things which are done secretly by the sons of disobedience*, so that – because they are rebuked – they may be changed from that into something better, and the changes made manifest in public, and the things made public become *light*. BUT EVERYTHING THAT BECOMES VISIBLE IS LIGHT. I.e., he begins to be light, when he has believed and is joined to you.

**5:14** (XXII.50–67) ON ACCOUNT OF WHICH HE SAYS, RISE UP etc. I, according to my feeble intellect, diligently searching all the editions of the Old Scriptures and even the volumes of the Hebrews, never found this quotation. Unless perhaps we should say this: In the same manner as at some point the prophets were speaking in a meeting of the people: *The Lord says these things*, and *Since the Lord has spoken*, so also the Apostle *full with the Holy Spirit*, suddenly burst out and spoke in words which *Christ spoke in him: The Lord says these things*. And this furthermore must be examined, how to one and the same it is said to one as sleeping: *Rise you who sleep*, and to one as dead: *Rise up from the dead*. Therefore because there is a spirit of man, which we always find written about favorably, and a soul, whose infirmities we read as modes of death from sins, therefore that which now is said: *Rise you who sleep*, let it be assigned to the spirit, and what follows: *Rise up from the dead*, let it be applied to the soul. *For the soul which sinned will die itself*. However, we never read of the death of the spirit. But Christ will rise as *the true light* to the one who *rose* from sleep and was resurrected *from the dead*.

**5:15** (XXIII.1–4) BE CAREFUL HOW YOU WALK. Not for the purpose of doing treachery, but for the purpose of *avoiding* of sin. An example of the former: *the clever person arranges his own steps*. Alternatively: *Carefully*, i.e. *discerning good and evil*.

**5:16** (XXIII.5–9) REDEEMING THE TIME. I.e., they are persevering in good works by penitence with their remaining time, ‘buying back’ time passed in sins, which has been sold by the malice of humans. SINCE THE DAYS ARE EVIL: Through metonymy, for ‘these people who are in the *days*, because *days* cannot be *evil*.

**5:17** (XXIII.10–11) BUT UNDERSTANDING. I.e., *examine the law*, in which his will is contained.

- HI **5:18** (XXIII.12–17) ET NOLITE INEBRIARI VINO reliqua. Quomodo non possumus *duobus dominis seruire, Deo et mammonae*, sic non possumus *Spiritu impleri* pariter et *uino*. Qui enim *Spiritu impletur*, habet prudentiam, mansuetudinem, uerecundiam, castitatem, qui *uino* habet insipientiam, furorem, procacitatem, libidinem. Hoc quippe aestimo uno uerbo significare *luxuriam*.
- HI **5:19** (XXIII.18–30) IN PSALMIS reliqua. *Ymni* sunt, qui fortitudinem et maiestatem Dei praedicant et eiusdem semper uel beneficia uel [20] facta mirantur, quod omnes *psalmi* continent, quibus Alleluia uel praepositum uel subiectum est. *Psalmi* autem proprie ad ethicum locum pertinent, ut per organum corporis, quid faciendum et quid uitandum sit, nouerimus. Qui uero de superioribus disputat et concentum mundi omniumque creaturarum ordinem [25] atque concordiam subtilis disputator edisserit, iste *spiritale canticum canit*. Vel certe propter simpliciores manifestius, quod uolumus, eloquamur: *psalmus* ad corpus, *canticum* refertur ad mentem. Et *canere* igitur et *psallere* et laudare *Dominum* magis animo quam uoce debemus. Hoc est quippe, quod dici[30]tur: *Cantantes et psallentes in cordibus uestris Domino*.
- SED **5:20** (XXIII.31–32) SEMPER GRATIAS AGENTES PRO OMNIBVS. Id est, quae accidunt uobis siue prosperis siue aduersis.
- HI **5:21** (XXIII.33–42) SVBIECTI INVICEM IN TIMORE CHRISTI. Propter *timorem Christi* fiat subiectio, dum illum offendere timemus. Audi [35]ant hoc episcopi, audiant presbiteri, audiat omnis ordo doctorum: subiectis suis se esse subiectos et imitentur dicentem apostolum: *Cum enim liber essem ex omnibus, omnium me ipsum seruum feci, ut omnes lucrificerem*, et in alio loco: *Seruite inuicem*. Saluator quoque *formam serui accepit, ut seruiret discipulis suis, et pedes eorum lauit*. Hoc interest inter *gentium principes* et Christianorum, *quod illi dominantur subditis*, nos seruimus et in eo *maiores sumus, si minimi omnium fuerimus*.
- 5:22** (XXIII.1–3) MVLIERES VIRIS SVIS reliqua. Hucusque in commune, nunc singulatim unumquemque docet, ut debita officia singulis non cessent.
- 5:23** (XXIII.4–9) SICVT CHRISTVS CAPVT EST ECCLESIAE. Id est, quo[5]modo in *Christo* et *ecclesia* sancta coniunctio est, sic et in *uiro* et *muliere* debet esse sancta copula. IPSE SALVATOR CORPORIS. Id est, *Christus saluauit ecclesiam*. Vel: *Vir saluator corporis mulieris* in necessitatibus et doloribus, dum infirmioris sexus est.

**5:18** (XXIII.12–17) AND DO NOT BE DRUNK ON WINE etc. In that same manner as *we cannot serve two masters, God and mammon*, so we cannot be equally *filled with the Spirit and wine*. For the one who is filled with the Spirit has wisdom, gentleness, respect, chastity, but the one who is filled with *wine* has folly, rage, impudence, lust. Certainly, I reckon that this means, in one single word: *'luxury'*.

**5:19** (XXIII.18–30) IN THE PSALMS etc. These are *hymns* which proclaim the strength and majesty of God and always admire his benefits and deeds, which all the *psalms* contain, to which a Hallelujah has been added either at the beginning or at the end. *Psalms*, moreover, properly relate to a moral standard, so that through the instrument of the body we know what must be done and what must be shunned. The one who truly debates about the things above, and, as a subtle disputant, explains the harmony of the world as well as the order and concord of all the creatures, that one *sings a spiritual song*. Or certainly on account of more simple minds let us say what we desire, more manifestly: *a psalm* refers to the body, *a song* to the mind. Therefore we ought to *sing* and *chant the psalms* and praise the *Lord* more with the soul than with the voice. This is certainly what is said: *Singing songs and psalms in your hearts to the Lord*.

**5:20** (XXIII.31–32) ALWAYS GIVING THANKS FOR ALL THINGS. I.e., which happen to you, whether for the good or bad.

**5:21** (XXIII.33–42) BEING SUBJECT TO ONE ANOTHER IN THE FEAR OF CHRIST. Let subjection happen on account of *fear of Christ*, since we fear to offend him. Let the bishops hear this, let the elders hear it, may every rank of teacher hear it, that they are subject to their subjects, and let them imitate the Apostle saying: *For although I was free from all, I made myself a slave of all, so that I would win all*, and in another place: *Serve one another*. The Savior also *received the form of a slave, so that he might serve his own disciples, and he washed their feet*. There is the following difference between the leaders of the Gentiles and those of the Christians, that *those dominate over their subjects*, we serve and in that *we are greater, if we were the smallest of all*.<sup>409</sup>

**5:22** (XXIII.1–3) WIVES TO YOUR HUSBANDS etc. Up to this point to the community, now he teaches something to each individually, so that they do not relent from performing the duties they owe to one another.

**5:23** (XXIII.4–9) JUST AS CHRIST IS THE HEAD OF THE CHURCH. I.e., How there is a holy connection between Christ and the church, thus also there must be a holy community between husband and wife. THE SAVIOR HIMSELF IS OF THE BODY. I.e., *Christ saved the church*. Or: *Man is the savior of the woman's body* in necessities and pains, since the female is the more feeble sex.

409 \*Cf. Matthew 19:30.

**5:25** (XXV.1–5) VIRI DILIGITE VXORES VESTRAS. Sanctus hic amor intellegendus, ut uoluntates resecentur, ut praegnantes ad partum usque non coeant. SICVT ET CHRISTVS DILEXIT ECCLESIAM. Ita et uos pro sanctitate *uxorum* nec mori, si necesse [5] fuerit, recusetis.

**5:26** (XXV.6–10) VT EAM SANCTIFICARET. *Aqua* enim *lauit* corpus, animam doctrina; ita et uos corpora uxorum continentia et animam *mundate* doctrina. IN VERBO VITAE. Id est, in doctrina post baptismum. Vel: *Verbum*, quod cantatur a sacerdote ad [10] baptismum.

**5:27** (XXV.11–12) VT SIT SANCTA. Id est, anima. ET INMACVLATA. Id est, corpore.

HI **5:29** (XXV.13–16) SED NVTRIT ET FOVET. Vt *uxoribus* uestimentum et uictum et, quae necessaria sunt, praebeamus. SICVT CHRISTVS [15] ECCLESIAM. *Quomodo Christus fouet ecclesiam*, ut: *Quotiens uolui congregare filios tuos* reliqua.

**5:30** (XXV.17–19) QVIA MEMBRA SVMVS. *Membra* eius debent in omnibus eum imitari. DE CARNE IPSIUS. Siue: Hominis, quem adsumpsit ex Maria. Siue: Ecclesiae.

Q **5:31** (XXV.20–23) PROPTER HOC RELINQVET reliqua. Spiritualiter *reliquit* [21] Christus Deum *Patrem et matrem Hierusalem caelestem* et uenit ad terras ad ecclesiam. ET ADHEREBIT VXORI SVAE. Spiritualiter Christus ecclesiae ex utroque populo collectae.

**5:32** (XXV.24–25) SACRAMENTVM HOC MAGNVM EST. Sunt enim et alia [25] *minora sacramenta*.

**5:33** (XXV.26–39) VERVMTAMEN SINGVLI reliqua. Hoc est, licet *in Christo et in ecclesia* dixerim, tamen oportet seruari in coniugio. VT VNVSQVISQVE SVAM VXOREM SICVT SEMET IPSVM DILIGAT. *Diliges proximum tuum sicut te ipsum*. Iuxta interpretationem Saluatoris *proximus* est omnis homo. Nulla ergo erit [31] inter *uxorem* et quorumlibet hominum dilectionem differentia caritatis? Quod dicere absurdum est. In *proximo* enim similitudo ponitur, ut *sic* eum *diligas sicut te*, et cupias esse saluatum, in *uxore* autem comparationis aduerbium dicitur ‘*sicut*’; [35] non similitudinem, sed probationem et confirmationem sonat, sicut de Christo dicitur: *Quasi unigeniti a Patre*. VXOR VT TIMEAT VIRVM. Duae significantiae in uerbo *timoris* sunt. Vna est qua serui *spiritum seruitutis* habent *in timore*, altera pro reuerentia dici potest, ut *uxor* reuereatur *uirum suum*.

HI  
XP

**6:1** (XXVI.1–2) FILII, OBOEDITE PARENTIBVS. Id est, imperantibus ea quae non sunt Domini contraria uoluntati.

**5:25** (XXV.1–5) HUSBANDS LOVE YOUR WIVES. Here a holy love must be understood, so that desires may be restrained, so that pregnant ones do not copulate endlessly until birth. JUST AS ALSO CHRIST LOVED THE CHURCH. Thus do not refuse even to die for the holiness of your *wives*, if it should be necessary.

**5:26** (XXV.6–10) SO THAT HE MIGHT SANCTIFY HER. For *water washed* the body, doctrine *washed* the soul. So also, cleanse their bodies with continence and her soul with doctrine. IN THE WORD OF LIFE. I.e., in doctrine after baptism. Or: *The word*, which is sung by the priest at baptism.

**5:27** (XXV.11–12) SO THAT SHE MAY BE HOLY. I.e., in soul. AND STAINLESS. I.e., in body.

**5:29** (XXV.13–16) BUT NOURISHES AND CHERISHES. So that we may offer the *wives* clothing and food and all that are necessary. JUST AS CHRIST [NOURISHES AND CHERISHES] THE CHURCH. *In the same manner that Christ nourishes the church*, thus: *How often I desired to gather your sons*, etc.

**5:30** (XXV.17–19) BECAUSE WE ARE MEMBERS. His *members* ought to emulate him in every way. CONCERNING HIS FLESH. Either: Of the human nature, which he received from Mary. Or: Of the church.

**5:31** (XXV.20–23) ON ACCOUNT OF THIS ONE WILL LEAVE etc. Spiritually, Christ left God *the Father, and the mother, heavenly Jerusalem*, and came to earth to the church. AND HE WILL CLEAVE TO HIS OWN WIFE. Spiritually, Christ is joined to the church [having been] collected from both nations.

**5:32** (XXV.24–25) THIS MYSTERY IS GREAT. For there are also other lesser *mysteries*.

**5:33** (XXV.26–39) NEVERTHELESS EACH etc. I.e., although I have spoken *in Christ and in the church*, nevertheless it is proper to be saved in marriage. THAT EACH MAN LOVE HIS OWN WIFE JUST AS HE LOVES HIMSELF. *Love your neighbor as you love yourself*. In accordance with the Savior's interpretation, everyone is our neighbor. Therefore will there be no difference of love between the love for a wife and that of any other humans? That is absurd to say. For a comparison is stated concerning the *neighbor*, so that *you may so love him, just as yourself*, and that you desire to be saved, but the '*just as*' concerning the *wife* is called an adverb of comparison; it does not signify a comparison, but a proof and confirmation, just as it is spoken about Christ: *As of the only begotten from the Father*. AND LET THE WIFE FEAR HER HUSBAND. There are two meanings in the word '*fear*'. One is in which the slaves have the *spirit of servitude in fear*, the other can be said as reverence: that the wife revere *her husband*.

**6:1** (XXVI.1–2) SONS, OBEY YOUR PARENTS. I.e., when they order things which are not contrary to the will of the Lord.

- 6:2** (XXVI.3–19) QVOD EST MANDATVM PRIMVM. Quaeritur quare nunc dixerit: *Quod est mandatum primum*, cum sit quartum uel quin[5]tum; *primum enim mandatum: Non erunt tibi dii alieni praeter me*. Ideo alii distinguunt: *Quod est mandatum primum in repromissione*, quasi quatuor alia *mandata*, quae ante hic dicta sunt, non habeant *promissionem*. Sed uidentur mihi non obseruasse subtilius et in secundo *mandato repromissionem* esse so[10]ciatam; ait enim: *Non facies tibi idola neque omnem similitudinem usque: Et facio misericordiam his, qui diligunt me* reliqua. Obserua uerba sponsionis: *Faciens misericordiam* et reliqua. Forsan ergo, quia decalogus exeunti de Aegypto populo prima lex data est, unumquodque *mandatum* decalogi primum est, ad [15] comparationem eorum praeceptorum, quae postea in lege scripta sunt. Qui uero priorem expositionem defendit, in secundo *mandato* non seorsum dicet, sed sub uno textu atque sermone, non tam *promissionem* datam quam sententiam in laudes Dei esse finitam *facientis misericordiam* et reliqua.
- PIL **6:5** (XXVIII.1–6) IN SIMPLICITATE CORDIS. Id est, deposita priori superbia et simulatione. Hic autem prouidet apostolus, *ne doctrina Christi* in aliquo *blasphemetur*, si credentes serui dominis *inutiles* fiant. SICVT CHRISTO. Pulcre addidit: *Sicut* [5] *Christo*, ut scilicet non audiat seruus carnalem dominum, si contraria praeceptis Dei uoluerit imperare.
- HI
- PIL **6:6** (XXVIII.7) NON AD OCVLVM. *Non* praesentibus tantum dominis.
- 6:7** (XXVIII.8–12) SICVT DOMINO. *Domino* seruit, qui *cum bona uoluntate* animi seruitium dominis facit; Deus enim non solum opus, sed et *bonam uoluntatem* exigit. CVM BONA VOLVNTATE. Id est, [11] non cum *murmuratione*, ne *apud homines gratia* et *apud Deum* mercede priuemi.
- 6:9** (XXVIII.1–7) REMITTENTES MINAS. Ne uestrae malitiae impu-  
tetur, si effugerint. QVIA ET ILLORVM ET VESTER EST DOMINVS IN CAELIS. Id est, sicut super seruos uindicare potestis, magis autem super uos uindicare potest Deus, ut: *Quocumque* [5] *iudicio* et reliqua. PERSONARVM ACCEPTIO NON EST APVD DEVM. Qui solus tantum iudicat uoluntates et iuxta eas deteriori praefert meliorem eligens facta, non homines.
- 6:10** (XXX.1–2) DE CETERO reliqua. Post specialia mandata uirorum et mulierum nunc generaliter omnes admonet.
- 6:12** (XXX.3–8) RECTORES HVIVS MVNDI. Id est, qui regunt in aere suos angelos. Diabolus enim satellitibus suis diuersa officia [5] diuisit. Aut:
- HI RECTORES HVIVS MVNDI. Id est, amatorum et carnalium *huius mundi*. TENEBRARVM HARVM. Tota ista terrena uita *tenebrae* dicitur: *Lux quippe lucet in tenebris*. IN CAELESTIBUS. Id est, in aere discurrentibus.

**6:2** (XXVI.3–19) WHICH IS THE FIRST COMMANDMENT. It is asked why he said this now: *Which is the first commandment*, since it is the fourth or fifth. For the *first commandment* is: *There shall be for you no other gods but me*. In that same way others distinguish: *Which is the first commandment in a counter-promise*, as if the four other *commandments*, which have been said before this, do not have a *promise*. But they seem to me not to have rather acutely observed that also in the second *commandment* a *counter-promise* is associated; for it says: *Do not make for yourself idols nor any likeness until: And I give compassion to these, who love me* etc. Observe the words of promise: *Giving compassion* etc. Perhaps therefore, because the Decalogue was given to the people departing from Egypt as the first law, each commandment of the Decalogue is first in comparison with those precepts that were later written in the law. But whoever defends the first exposition, will not speak otherwise on the second *commandment*, but under one single text and speech, and that not so much a *promise* is given as a sentence is completed in the praise of god *who gives compassion* etc.

**6:5** (XXVIII.1–6) IN THE SIMPLICITY OF YOUR HEART. I.e., with the previous haughtiness and pretence put away. And here the Apostle provides, *lest the doctrine of Christ is blasphemed* in another, if believing slaves should become *useless* to their masters. JUST AS TO CHRIST. Beautifully he added, *just as to Christ*, namely so that a slave may not hear the carnal master, should that one wish to order something contrary to the precepts of God.

**6:6** (XXVIII.7) NOT TO THE EYE. *Not* only to the present masters.

**6:7** (XXVIII.8–12) JUST AS TO THE LORD. He serves *the Lord*, who *with a good will* performs a servitude of the soul to masters. For God does not demand work alone, but also a *good will*. WITH A GOOD WILL. I.e., not with *protesting murmurs*, lest you be deprived of *grace before humans* and of reward *before God*.

**6:9** (XXVIII.1–7) FORGETTING THREATS. Lest it is attributed to your malice, if they flee. BECAUSE IT IS THEIR LORD AND YOURS WHO IS IN HEAVEN. I.e., just as you can appropriate over slaves, even more so can God punish you, as in: *With whatever judgment* etc. THERE IS NO PARTIALITY TO INDIVIDUALS WITH GOD. Who alone only judges intentions and according to those prefers the better before the worse, choosing as a criterion deeds not humans.

**6:10** (XXX.1–2) CONCERNING THE REST etc. After the special commandments for men and women he now generally admonishes all.

**6:12** (XXX.3–8) RULERS OF THIS WORLD. I.e., who rule in the air their own angels. For the devil divided different duties among his own followers. Or alternatively: RULERS OF THIS WORLD. I.e., of the beloved and carnal things of *this world*. OF THESE DARKNESSES. This entire earthly life is called *darkness*. *Certainly the light shines in the darkness*. IN THE HEAVENS. I.e., to the ones hastening about in the air.



HI **6:13** (XXX.9–13) IN DIE MALO. *Diem malum* aut praesens tempus osten[10]dit, de quo supra dixerat: *Redimentes tempus, quoniam dies mali sunt*, propter angustias et uitae huius labores, aut certe consummationis atque iudicii, quando diabolus, inimicus et uindex, sua nos cupiet in parte retinere.

HI **6:14** (XXX.14–21) STATE ERGO. Ne moueamini de acie, sed stabilem fi[15]gite gradum super *petram Christum*. SVCCINCTI LVMBOS. Zona continentiae. Quia igitur *lumbi* in generatione semper accipiuntur et semine, uidetur nobis *accinxisse lumbos* suos, qui nequaquam *uxori debitum reddit* nec seruit libidini. IN VERITATE. Id est, non in hipochrisi. *Nemo enim coronabitur* et reliqua. LORI[20]CAM IVSTITIAE. Sicut *lorica* multis circulis et armillis intexitur, ita iustitia diuersis uirtutum conectitur speciebus.

**6:16** (XXX.22–24) SCVTVM FIDEI. Sine *scuto* omnis armatus inermis est, ita et hae uirtutes sine fide saluare non possunt. In omnibus ergo certaminibus fide muniamur.

CAS **6:15** (XXX.25–47) [25] ET CALCIATI PEDES. Docet fiduciam *praedicationis oportune et inopportune*, ut *calciatus* audenter ambulet. *Sumite*, inquit, *scutum fidei*, in quo *possitis omnia tela nequissimi ignita restinguere*. Ergo *fides* est, quae excipiens *ardentissima* libidinum *tela* metu futuri iudicii et caelestis regni [30] crudelitate mortificat. *Et lorica*, inquit, *caritatis*. Ipsa nempe est quae uitalia pectoris nostri circumdans atque communiens loetalibus perturbationum obiecta uulneribus contrarios retundit ictus nec ad *interiorem hominem* nostrum *iacula zabolii* penetrare permittit. *Omnia enim suffert, omnia patitur, omnia* [35] *sustinet*. *Et galeam spem salutis*. *Galea* capitis est munimen. Quia ergo *caput* nostrum *Christus est*, debemus istud semper spe *futurorum bonorum* uelut *inexpugnabili galea* in cunctis temptationibus ac persecutionibus communire et principaliter fidem eius inlaesam atque integram custodire. Aliis enim [40] membris truncatum quempiam, licet debilem, possibile tamen est utcumque superesse; sine capite uero nemini uel breuis uitae spatium prorogatur. *Et gladium spiritus, quod est uerbum Dei*. *Penetrabilius namque est omni gladio ancipiti et pertingens usque ad diuisiones animae et spiritus compagum quoque* [45] *et medullarum et discretor cogitationum et intentionum cordis, diuidens* scilicet et abscondens, quicquid in nobis carnale terrenum repperit.

PIL **6:18** (XXX.48–49) PER OMNEM ORATIONEM. Id est, semper hunc *gl[49]adium* portate uel postulate.

**6:13** (XXX.9–13) IN THE EVIL DAY. Either he signifies the evil day as the present time, about which he had spoken above: Redeeming the time, since the days are evil, on account of the anxieties and labors of this life, or certainly it is the day of the end and judgment, when the devil, the enemy and avenger, will desire to claim us for his side.

**6:14** (XXX.14–21) THEREFORE STAND. Do not move from the line, but fix a stable step upon *Christ the rock*. HAVING GIRDED YOUR LOINS. A girdle of continence. Because therefore *loins* are always understood of begetting and seed, it seems to us that he *girded* his own *loins*, who never pays back his debt to his wife nor serves lust. IN TRUTH. I.e., not in hypocrisy. *For no one will be crowned* etc. BREASTPLATE OF RIGHTEOUSNESS. Just as a breastplate is woven with many circles and hoops, thus righteousness is entwined with different types of virtues.

**6:16** (XXX.22–24) SHIELD OF FAITH. Without a shield everyone armed is vulnerable, thus also these virtues without faith cannot save. Therefore in all struggles we should be fortified by faith.

(sic) **6:15** (XXX.25–47) HAVING FURNISHED YOUR FEET WITH SHOES. He teaches assurance of preaching whether the opportunity is convenient or inconvenient, so that having been shoed, one may walk bravely. *Take up*, he said, *the shield of faith, in which you can extinguish all the flaming arrows of the most evil one*. Therefore faith is that which, receiving the most ardent arrows of lustful desires, kills them out of fear of the future judgment and because of the cruelty of the heavenly kingdom. *And the breastplate*, he said, *of love*.<sup>410</sup> Certainly, that breastplate of love is what, enveloping the vitals of our chest and protecting them when they are exposed to lethal wounds of damaging desires, repels hostile blows and does not allow the darts of the devil to penetrate our inner being. *For it bears all things, suffers all things, endures all things. And [put on] the helmet, the hope of salvation*. A *helmet* is a defense for the head. Therefore, because, because our *head is Christ*, we always ought to protect that, by the hope of future good just as by an impregnable helmet, in all temptations and persecutions, and most importantly we ought to guard our faith in him unimpaired and unviolated. For concerning other members, whenever one of them has been mutilated, it is possible nevertheless to live on, although in a weakened state; but no one without a head is preserved even for a brief amount of time. *And the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God. For it is sharper than any two edged sword, and piercing all the way to the divisions of soul and spirit, and also of joints and marrows, and a discerner of thoughts and intentions of the heart*, namely, *dividing* and hewing off whatever carnal or earthly thing it has found within us.

**6:18** (XXX.48–49) THROUGH EVERY PRAYER. I.e., always carry or demand this *sword*.

410 \*1 Thessalonians 5:8

**6:19** (XXX.50–51) AD APERTIONEM ORIS MEI. Vt: *Domine labia mea aperies* et reliqua. CVM FIDVCIA. Sine metu persecutionis.

HI **6:21** (XXXI.1–10) OMNIA NOTA FACIET TITHICVS. Dupliciter intellegendum: Vel ideo *Tithicus* missus est ad Ephesum, ut nuntiaret eis *uincula* apostoli ad fidem *Euangelii profecisse*, eo tempore quo et ad Colosenses scripsit dicens: *Omnia nota fa[5]ciet uobis Tithicus* et reliqua. Grandis enim consolatio erat audire Paulum Romae in domina urbium de uinculis triumphantem. Vel certe ob id *Tithicus* missus est, ut conuersionem Pauli, quam ignorabant, adnuntiaret eis, et quasi quoddam uiuendi exemplar daret discentibus gesta apostoli atque uirtutes [10] et eum imitari uolentibus. Nec parua esse poterat consolatio.

PIL **6:23** (XXXI.11–15) PAX FRATRIBVS ET CARITAS reliqua. *Pax et caritas* et *fides* perfectum faciunt Christianum; tam enim sine *fide* infructuosa est *caritas* quam *fides* sine *caritate* uel *pace*. Nam *caritas* maior est *pace*; potest enim odio non haberi quis, non tamen et [15] amari.

**6:24** (XXXI.16–18) IN INCORRVPTIONE. Siue: *In* castitate. Siue: In quorum corde nullo adulterino saeculari amore Christi delectatio uioletur.

---

**6:19** (XXX.50–51) FOR THE OPENING OF MY MOUTH. Thus: *Lord, open my lips* etc. WITH BOLDNESS. Without fear of persecution.

**6:21** (XXXI.1–10) TYTHICUS WILL MAKE ALL THINGS KNOWN. This must be doubly understood: Either, for this reason, Tythicus was sent to Ephesus to announce to them that the *chains* of the Apostle progressed the faith of the *Gospel*, at that time when he also wrote to the Colossians saying: Tythicus *will make all things known to you* etc. For it was a great consolation to hear that Paul, who was in Rome – the queen of cities – was triumphing over his chains. Or certainly, Tythicus was sent so that he might report to them his conversation with Paul of which they were ignorant, and that he might give to them as it were a role-model for life, who learn of the deeds and virtues of the Apostle and wish to imitate him. And this could not have been a small consolation.

**6:23** (XXXI.11–15) PEACE AND LOVE TO THE BROTHERS etc. *Peace and love and faith* make the perfect Christian. For *love* is as fruitless without *faith* as *faith* without *love* or *peace*. For *love* is greater than *peace*. For it is possible for someone not to be hated yet remain unloved.

**6:24** (XXXI.16–18) IN INCORRUPTION. Either: *In* chastity. Or: In whose heart the joy of Christ should be injured by no adulterous love of this age.

### III. Conclusion

Sometime during 840–851, Sedulius Scottus emigrated from Ireland to the Carolingian empire, where he attained notoriety as both a scholar and poet. Among his many literary works is the *Collectaneum in Apostolum*. The evidence suggests that the *Collectaneum* represents Sedulius' attempt to introduce and exposit the Pauline letters in the same manner that Servius introduced and expounded Virgil's *Aeneid*. Like Servius, Sedulius' introduction is organized via the seven circumstances, his commentaries combine the interpretative work of others with his own comments, he employs specific formulae for formatting and explaining, and the function is clearly pedagogical.

The rhetorical schema, the seven types of circumstance, which was widely referred to by later Latin rhetors and Cicero in particular, and which I ultimately traced back to Aristotle, served as the template that Sedulius used to compose his Prologue. Through this schema, Sedulius introduces the Pauline letters (fourteen in his collection) and relates a number of early Church traditions regarding Paul the Apostle and his letters, including a number of historical critical matters such as places of authorship and dating.

Unlike theological *collectanea* of the same period, Sedulius' *Collectaneum* is practically devoid of any particular agenda, but instead represents an attempt to collect and edit the best exegesis available for virtually every verse of each Pauline epistle. Nonetheless, one can occasionally detect from Sedulius' commentaries certain doctrinal stances on specific theological and ecclesiastical issues as they arise in given verses, such as an Augustinian line on predestination as well as the assertion of the divinity of Christ and the related trinitarian theology as articulated in the Athanasian Creed. In addition, one can certainly tell from reading Sedulius' commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians that educating his readers on baptism was very important. Also, as a matter of historical interest, Sedulius does not reflect any anti-Semitic sentiment. Overall, the intended function of the *Collectaneum* was likely for pedagogical use.

The genre of works from which Sedulius most often draws are commentaries, but there are representatives of other genres as well, such as Augustine's *civ.* and Bede's *De temporum ratione*. The three most commonly used authors by Sedulius within the Prologue and commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians are Jerome, Augustine, and Pelagius. Jerome and Augustine were both widely read and revered throughout the Carolingian age, but the influence of Pelagius is most likely due to Sedulius' Irish background. Since most of the extant witnesses to Pelagius' commentary (during this time) were Irish or

---

British, it seems likely that Sedulius brought Pelagius' text with him from Ireland. Using this text and the resources available to him in Liège and the broader Rhineland area, Sedulius was able to compose his *Collectaneum*.

Most of his selections should be regarded as near verbatim or as abbreviated but accurate in their representation of the source. Thus, the Latin literary style within the *Collectaneum* resembles that of his sources, as one would expect given the close nature by which they were copied and edited into the work. Hence there is a mixture of late, classical, and archaic Latin constructions. The explicit goal of many authors contemporary to Sedulius and working within the same genre was to create a harmonious, brief, and lucid commentary, all of which are attributes characteristic of Sedulius' *Collectaneum*. The literary achievement and original contribution of the work is located within Sedulius' selections and skill as an editor, though he did occasionally include his own exegetical remarks.

While dissonance was the norm in Carolingian society, Sedulius nonetheless proves to be an ideal candidate for study as he enjoyed the fellowship of high ranking ecclesiastical and secular leaders and knew and communicated with fellow scholars and authors throughout the Carolingian empire.



## Appendix

Translations of Latin quotations from 3.3.ii: „The History of the *Septem Circumstantiae*“. All translations are my own.

Cicero, *De Inventione*, 1.21.29

A narration will be probable if there will be seen to be within it those things which normally appear in the truth; if the dignity of the *persons* will be preserved, if the *causes* of *deeds* will appear suitable, if the *means* of performance seem to have been existent, if the *time* was suitable, if there was a sufficient *interval*, if the *place* for performing that same action, the *deed* about which the narration is concerned, will be shown to have been ideal, if the matter will be applied to the nature of those who will do it, and to the character of the people and to the opinion of those who will listen. And the narration consisting of these elements will be able to be like the truth.

Cicero, *De Inventione*, 1.24.34 and 1.26.38

All claims are confirmed by argumentation, either by that which is attributed to [1] persons, or by that which is ascribed to the matters... Regarding the [2] action of a matter [i.e. the what], which was the second topic about these things which were ascribed to the matters, [3] the place, [4] the time, [5] the mode, [6] the occasion, and [7] the means will be investigated.

Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.*, 3.5.17–18

Apollodorus defines a cause thus: ‘a cause is a matter in all its own parts viewing towards a question.’ Or: a cause is a matter, whose aim is a dispute.’ He then defines „a matter“ itself is then defined thus: ‘A matter is a coming together of people, places, times, causes, modes, incidents, deeds, instruments, speeches, written works and non-written works.’ Let us now understand a cause as the Greek word hypothesis and a matter as the Greek word peristasis. ... Cicero defines it in these words: ‘A cause is discerned by definite people, places, times, actions, and either by all of or at least most of them.’

Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.*, 4.2.52

A narration will be credible above all if first we consult our mind lest we say something contrary to nature, then if we place the causes and reasons before the deeds, not before all, but before those which we investigate, if we establish the people as fitting to the deeds we wish to be believed, like e.g. someone accused



of theft to be greedy, someone accused of adultery as libidinous, someone accused of murder to be heedless, or if we defend the contrary to these: moreover we address places, times and similar things.

Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.* 4.2.53...54...55

There is however a certain structure of a credible matter... [while giving the narration] it would not be altogether unuseful if we sow certain seeds of proofs as long as we remember that it is a narration and not a proof... Finally, we will introduce in the narration everything we are going to draw out in the proof: the person, cause, place, time, instrument, and occasion.

Sulpitius Victor in Halm, 323,16–21

As for what remains, will be probable, if certain seeds of arguments and questions were besprinkled everywhere, provided they are not thought to be types of argumentation: as time, by which we say that the deed is done, is present, and the cause: why it was done, and the person: who did it, and the means why it is believed that she/he was able to do it, and the place where it was done. For these matters it is possible to take examples from all the narrations in Cicero.

Marius Victorinus, *expl. in Cic. rhet.*, I.21.1–14 (CC vol 132)

‘A narration will be probable if there will be seen to be in it those things which are accustomed to appear in the truth.’ According to the order of his own division, after he had dealt with the brief and open narration, he now begins to dispute about a probable narration. A narration will be probable, he says, if in it there are all those things by which the truth is accustomed to be found; for every argument pertaining to the truth is included in these seven things. ... [chart inserted here in Halm’s text, see n. 292 above] ... The seven things, as mentioned above: who, what, why, where, when, how, by what means, all writers of academic disciplines have dealt with and have embedded in the precepts of their own academic disciplines. But Cicero considering the nature of things, times, and people adds to all those an eighth circumstance, namely opinion, and rightly so. For all things are strong neither through themselves nor by nature, but by opinion.

J. Victor, *Ars Rhetorica*, (3, 16–27, Giomini)

Therefore, the theme having been established, you ought first to attend to the circumstance, whose parts are the following seven: ‘who, what, when, where, why, how, by what means’. But of all of these or most of them the reasoned assembly makes the cause, and is examined here first, whether the circumstance of debate consists in it or rather whether the material which was set forth, may be disconnected. For the theme is disconnected, which does not have a circ-

umstance, such as 'a wealthy person accuses a poor person of wrongful deeds'. You see this cause is not able to stand; for neither the when nor where nor why nor anything else is able to be asked, so that the dispute seems to permit a debate, but it is exposed as, so to speak, bare and weak. Nor nevertheless should you think that all the species of circumstance can be found in every theme, but sometimes all, sometimes most of them: but if, as is written above, almost every circumstance is absent, the cause is not able to stand.

Augustinus, *De Rhetorica* 7–8 (47,1–50,9, Giomini)

Now, since indeed enough has been said about the difference of general and specific questions and a thesis has been separated from a hypothesis, so that the thesis stands thoroughly apart by fact and name, it seems to be the next thing to say what exactly it is that produces a hypothesis, i. e. a debate. For it is the circumstance of things, which Hermagoras calls peristasis, without which no dispute at all can exist. What is, however, a peristasis, can more easily be understood by its partition than by its definition. For there are seven parts of circumstance, i. e. of peristasis, which Hermagoras calls 'pieces of the circumstance', For they are the following: who, what, when, where, why, how, by what means, which the Greeks call 'resources'. However, the reasoned assembly of all or most of these things manufactures the question. But doubtlessly the quality of individual parts must be made explicit. Who denotes the person... What denotes the thing, which seems to have been done or said or thought by someone, seems to be done, to be said or to be thought by someone, or about to be done, about to be said or about to be thought by someone... When denotes the time... Where denotes the place... Why indicates the cause of doing or saying or thinking a thing ... How signifies the demonstration of something that happened, that is happening or will happen... The resources, which we call aids, denote these things, through which it is said that something has been done...

Fortunatianus in Halm, 102, 20 – p.104, 31

With the condition having been discovered, what shall we consider? The entire material through the seven circumstances. Why not divide them immediately? Because first we ought to consider without order the cause as a whole, then we ought to order all things, which have been discovered, summarily into questions. What are the circumstances?: „person“, „thing“, „cause“, „time“, „place“, „mode“, „material“. The „person“ is considered in how many ways? Twenty one... What shall we consider in the „thing“? The thesis... Every cause is of what kind?... In how many ways is „time“ considered?... „Place“ is all-together of what kind?... The „mode“ is all-together of what kind?... In what ways is „material“ considered?... Whatever was placed in the theme, for which reasons

is it assembled? Either so that it might raise a debate or so that it might augment the questions.

Isidorus in Halm, 515, 10–15

There are two types of questions, one of which is limited, and the other unlimited. In Greek the limited one is called an 'hypothesis', in Latin it is called a 'cause', and occurs where there is a dispute with a certain person: 2. The unlimited one is called a 'thesis' in Greek and a 'theme' in Latin. The infinite one does not have a certain person, nor does it contain any certain circumstance such as 'place' or 'time'. But in a cause all certain things are contained, whence the 'theme' is, as it were, part of the 'cause'.

Albinus in Halm, 527, 7–20

For in judicial cases it is often questioned what is fair, in an epideictic speech is understood what is honest, in a forensic, deliberative speech is considered what is honest and useful. A cause has how many circumstances? A full cause has seven circumstances: person, deed, time, place, mode, occasion, and faculty. In „person“ it is asked „who“ acted, in „deed“ it is asked „what“ was done, in „time“ it is asked „when“ it happened, in „place“ it is asked „where“ it happened, in „mode“ it is asked „how“ it could happen, in „occasion“ it is asked „why“ one wished it to happen, in „faculty“, whether someone was supported by the power of acting. Through these things a cause is able to be both confirmed and weakened. For vainly you seek in disputes what has been done, if the person of the agent is unknown. And again you vainly reveal the person if the deed is not linked to the person. Likewise, in such a time or in such a place such a thing could not happen, likewise it could not be done in that way you assert, nor therefore did anyone desire to do it, nor did such a person have such a power, to be able to do this.

# Bibliography

## Greek and Latin Texts

- Augustinus, *De Utilitate Credendi; De Duabus Animabus; Contra Fortunatum; Contra Adimantum; Contra Epistulam Fundamenti; Contra Faustum*, CSEL 25, ed. Iosephus Zycha (Imprint Vindobonae: F. Tempsky, 1891).
- Frede, H.J., *Pelagius, der irische Paulustext, Sedulius Scottus*, Vetus Latina, Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel, 3 (Freiburg: Herder, 1961).
- Frede, H.J. and H. Stanjek (eds.), *Sedulii Scotti Collectaneum in Apostolum* (2 vols.; Freiburg: Herder, 1997).
- Halm, C. (ed.), *Rhetores Latini Minores* (Imprint Lipsiae: In aedibus B.G. Teubneri, 1863).
- Souter, Alexander (ed.), *Pelagius' Expositions of Thirteen Epistles of St Paul*, ii. *Text*, Texts and Studies, 9 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1926).

## English Translations

- Broadie, Sarah (trans.), and Rowe, Christopher (ed.), *Nicomachean Ethics* (USA: Oxford University Press, 2002).
- Cooper, Stephen A., *Marius Victorinus' Commentary on Galatians*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).
- De Bruyn, Theodore S., *Pelagius' Commentary on St Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).
- Doyle, E.G., *On Christian Rulers and The Poems / Sedulius Scottus*, Medieval and Renaissance texts and studies, 17 (Binghamton, N.Y.: State University Of New York, 1983).
- Fremantle, W.H., „Against the Pelagians“, 2<sup>nd</sup> ser., NPNF, 6 (New York, 1912), 227–83.
- Gilby, Thomas (ed.), *Summa Theologica: English and Latin*, Blackfriars (61 vols.; New York: McGraw Hill, 1964–1980).
- Green, R.P.H. (ed. and trans.), *Augustine: De Doctrina Christiana*, Oxford Early Christian Texts (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995).
- Kelly, J.N.D. (ed. and trans.), *Athanasian Creed* (New York: Harper and Row, 1964).
- Lawler, Thomas Comerford, *The Letters of St. Jerome*, trans. Charles Christopher Mierow (New York, NY and Ramsey, NJ: Newman Press, 1963).
- O'Donnell, James J., *Augustine: Confessions* (3 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992).
- Ostwald, Martin, *Aristotle: Nicomachean Ethics*, Library of Liberal Arts (New York: Prentice Hall, 1962).
- Plumer, Eric A., *Augustine's Commentary on Galatians*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (New York: Oxford University Press, 2003).
- Rackham, H., *Aristotle: Nicomachean Ethics*, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926).

- Richardson, E.C., „Lives of Illustrious Men“, 2<sup>nd</sup> ser., NPNF, 3 (New York, 1893), 359–384.
- Thorpe, Lewis, *Two lives of Charlemagne: The life of Charlemagne, by Einhard. Charlemagne, by Notker the Stammerer* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1969).

## Secondary Literature

- Abraham, William J., *Canon and Criterion in Christian Theology: From the Fathers to Feminism* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998).
- Bachrach, Bernard S., *Early Medieval Jewish Policy in Western Europe* (Minnesota: University of Minnesota Press, 1977).
- Baswell, Christopher, *Virgil in Medieval England: Figuring the Aeneid from the Twelfth Century to Chaucer* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- Bauer, Walter, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, ed. Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Krodel (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971).
- Baxter, J.H. and Charles Johnson (eds.), *Medieval Latin Word-List From British and Irish Sources* (England: Oxford, 1934).
- Beker, Christiann J., *Paul's Apocalyptic Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982).
- Bertola, Ermenegildo, „Il Commento Paolino di Sedulio Scoto. Un Caso di Pelagianesimo nel Secolo Nono?“ *Divinitas*, 39 (1995), 41–54.
- Bieler, Ludwig, *Ireland: Harbinger of the Middle Ages* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1963).
- Bischoff, Bernhard, *Manuscripts and Libraries in the Age of Charlemagne*, trans. Michael Gorman (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- , *Mittelalterliche Studien*, Band I (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1966).
- , *Mittelalterliche Studien*, Band II, (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1967).
- , „Turning-Points in the History of Latin Exegesis in the Early Middle Ages“, trans. Colm O'Grady in *Biblical Studies: The Medieval Irish Contribution* (Irish Biblical Association, 1991), 74–161.
- Boyer, Blanche B., „Insular Contribution to Medieval Literary Tradition on the Continent“, *Classical Philology*, 43 (1948), 31–39.
- Brown, Giles, „Introduction: the Carolingian Renaissance“, in (ed.) Rosamond McKitterick, *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 1–51.
- Burton, Phillip, „The Vocabulary of the Liberal Arts in Augustine's *Confessions*“, in K. Pollmann and M. Vessey (eds.), *Augustine and the Disciplines* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 141–164.
- Campanhausen, Hans von, *Fathers of the Latin Church*, trans. Manfred Hoffman (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1969).
- Chadwick, Nora, *Studies in the Early British Church* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1958).
- Chazelle, Celia and Burton Van Name Edwards (eds.), *The Study of the Bible in the Carolingian Era* (Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 2003).
- Cloke, Gillian, *This Female Man of God* (London and New York: Rutledge, 1995).
- Contreni, J. John, „By lions, bishops are meant; by wolves, priests: History, Exegesis, and the Carolingian Church in Haimo of Auxerre's *Commentary on Ezechiel*“, *Francia*, 29 (2002), 29–56.

- , „Carolingian Biblical Studies“, in Uta-Renate Blumenthal (ed.), *Carolingian Essays: Patristics and Early Medieval Thought* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1983), 71–98.
- , *Carolingian Learning, Masters and Manuscripts* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1992).
- , „Glossing the Bible in the Early Middle Ages: Theodore and Hadrian of Canterbury and John Scottus (Eriugena)“, in Celia Martin Chazelle and Burton Van Name Edwards (eds.), *Study of the Bible in the Carolingian Era* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), 19–38.
- , „The Pursuit of Knowledge in Carolingian Europe“, in R. E. Sullivan (ed.), *The Gentle Voices of Teachers* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1995), 106–141.
- Cooper, Stephen A., *Marius Victorinus' Commentary on Galatians: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (Oxford, Oxford University Press: 2005).
- Copeland, Rita, *Hermeneutics and Translation in the Middle Ages: Academic Traditions and Vernacular Texts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).
- Cramer, Peter John, *Baptism and Change in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993).
- Cróinín, Dáibhí Ó., „New Heresy for Old': Pelagianism in Ireland and the Papal Letter of 640“, *Speculum*, 60/3 (1985), 505–516.
- Crouzel, Henri, *Origen* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1989).
- Cuddon, J.A., *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory* (London: Penguin Books, 1991).
- Cutler, Allan H. and Helen E. Cutler, *The Jew as Ally of the Muslim: medieval roots of anti-Semitism* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1986).
- Daniel-Rops, H., *The Church in the Dark Ages* (London: Phoenix Press, 2001).
- Davies, Norman, *Europe: A History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).
- De Bruyn, Theodore, *Pelagius' Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans: Translated with Introduction and Notes* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993).
- Deferrari, R.J. and M.J. Keeler, „St. Augustine's City of God: its plan and development“, *American Journal of Philology*, 50 (1929) 109–137.
- De Jong, Mayke, „The Empire as Ecclesia. Hrabanus Maurus and Biblical Historia for Rulers“, in Y. Hen and M. Innes (eds.), *The Uses of the Past in the Early Middle Ages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 191–226.
- , „Exegesis for an Empress“, in E. Cohen and M. De Jong (eds.), *Medieval Transformations: Texts, Power, and Gifts in Contexts* (Leiden, 2001), 69–100.
- Dekkers, Eligius, *Clavis Patrum Latinorum*, CC 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., (Turnhout: Brepols, 1995).
- De Lubac, Henri, *Medieval Exegesis*, trans. Mark Sebanc (2 vols.; Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Pub; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998).
- Dodaro, Robert, and George Lawless (eds.), *Augustine and His Critics: Essays in Honour of Gerald Bonner* (London: Routledge, 2000).
- Doyle, E.G., *On Christian Rulers, and the Poems of Sedulius Scottus*, Medieval & Renaissance texts and studies, 17 (Binghamton, N.Y.: State University of New York, 1983).
- Drum, Walter, „Josue (Joshua)“, *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. 8 (New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1910), 524–526.
- Duffy, Eamon, *Saints and Sinners A History of the Popes* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997).
- Dutton, Paul E. (ed.), *Carolingian Civilization: A Reader* (Toronto: Broadview Press, 2004).
- Elliot, Allison G., „A Brief Introduction to Medieval Latin Grammar“, in K.P. Harrington (ed.), *Medieval Latin* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), 1–56.

- Esposito, Mario, *Irish Books and Learning in Medieval Europe* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1990).
- , *Latin Learning in Mediaeval Ireland* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1988).
- , *Studies in Hiberno-Latin Literature* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006).
- Ewert, David, *A General Introduction to the Bible: From Ancient Tablets to Modern Translations* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1990).
- Ferguson, John, „In Defence of Pelagius“, *Theology*, 83 (1980), 114–119.
- Fichtenau, Heinrich, *The Carolingian Empire*, trans. Peter Munz (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1978).
- Fischer, Norbert, „‘Distentio animi’. Ein Symbol der Entflüchtigung des Zeitlichen“, in N. Fischer and C. Mayer (eds.), *Die Confessiones des Augustinus von Hippo*, *Confessiones II* (Freiburg, 1998), 489–552.
- Fitzgerald, Allan D. (ed.), *Augustine Through the Ages: an Encyclopedia* (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 1999).
- Flannery, Edward H., *The Anguish of the Jews: Twenty-Three Centuries of Anti-Semitism* (New York: Macmillan, 1965).
- Frede, H.J., *Kirchenschriftsteller: Verzeichnis und Sigel* (Freiburg: Herder, 1995).
- Ganz, David, „Mass production of early medieval manuscripts: The Carolingian Bibles from Tours“, in Richard Gameson (ed.), *The Early Medieval Bible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 53–62.
- Garrison, Mary, „The Emergence of Carolingian Latin Literature and the Court of Charlemagne (780–814)“, in Rosamond McKitterick (ed.), *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 111–140.
- Glick, Leonard B., *Abraham’s Heirs: Jews and Christians in Medieval Europe*, (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1999).
- Goold, George P., „Servius and the Helen Episode“, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 74 (1970), 101–168.
- Gorman, Michael, *Biblical Commentaries from the Early Middle Ages* (Florence, 2002).
- , „A Critique of Bischoff’s Theory of Irish Exegesis“, *The Journal of Medieval Latin*, 7 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1997), 178–233.
- , „The deceptive apparatus fontium in a recent edition (CChr.SL 82)“ *Zeitschrift für antikes Christentum*, 8 (2004), 8–22.
- Gryson, Roger, *Repertoire general des auteurs ecclesiastiques latins de l’antiquite et du haut Moyen Age*, *Vetus Latina*, Vol. 1/2 (Freiburg: Herder, 2007).
- Hagendahl, Harald, *Augustine and the Latin Classics* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1967).
- Haug, Richard, *Photius and the Carolingians: The Trinitarian Controversy* (Belmont, Massachusetts: Nordland Publishing Company, 1975).
- Heil, Johannes, „Labourers in the Lord’s Quarry: Carolingian Exegetes, Patristic Authority, and Theological Innovation, a Case Study in the Representation of Jews in Commentaries on Paul“ in Celia Martin Chazelle and Burton Van Name Edwards (eds.), *Study of the Bible in the Carolingian Era* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2003), 75–97.
- Heine, Ronald E., *The Commentaries of Origen and Jerome on St. Paul’s Epistle to the Ephesians* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002).
- Herren, Michael W. and Shirley Ann Brown, *Christ in Celtic Christianity: Britain and Ireland from the Fifth to the Tenth Century* (New York: Boydell Press, 2002).
- Hinks, Roger, *Carolingian Art: A Study of Early Medieval Painting and Sculpture in Western Europe* (Detroit, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1962).

- Hoffmann, Andreas, *Augustins Schrift „De Utilitate Credendi“: eine Analyse* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1997).
- , *Augustinus De Utilitate Credendi: übersetzt und eingeleitet*, (Freiburg: Herder, 1992).
- Hunt, Richard W., „The Introduction to the ‘artes’ in the Twelfth Century“, in *Studia Medievalia in honorem Rf Martin* (Bruges, 1948), 85–112.
- Innes, Matthew and Rosamond McKitterick, „The Writing of History“, in Rosamond McKitterick (ed.), *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 193–220.
- Irvine, Martin, *The Making of Textual Culture: ‘Grammatica’ and Literary Theory, 350–1100* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- Kaczynski, Bernice M., „Bede’s Commentaries on Luke and Mark and the Formation of a Patristic Canon“, in Sian Echard (ed.), *Anglo Latin and Its Heritage: Essays in honor of A.G. Rigg* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2001), 17–26.
- , „Edition, Translation, and Exegesis: The Carolingians and the Bible“, in R. E. Sullivan (ed.), *The Gentle Voices of Teachers* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1995), 171–185.
- , „Some St. Gall Glosses on Greek Philanthropic Nomenclature“, *Speculum*, 58/4 (October 1983), 1008–1017.
- Keefe, Susan A., „Carolingian Baptismal Expositions“, in Uta-Renate Blumenthal (ed.), *Carolingian Essays* (Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1983), 169–237.
- , *Water and the Word: Baptism and the Education of the Clergy in the Carolingian Empire* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2002).
- Kelly, J.N.D., *The Athanasian Creed*, The Paddock lectures, 1962–3 (New York: Harper & Row, 1964).
- , *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (New York: Harper & Row, 1975).
- Kelly, Joseph F., „Augustine in Hiberno-Latin Literature“, *Augustinian Studies*, 8 (1977), 139–149.
- , „A Catalogue of Early Medieval Hiberno-Latin Biblical Commentaries“, *Traditio*, 44 (1988), 537–571.
- , „A Catalogue of Early Medieval Hiberno-Latin Biblical Commentaries“, *Traditio*, 45 (1989), 393–434.
- Kenney, Joseph F., *The Sources for the Early History of Ireland, Vol. I: ecclesiastical* (Shannon: Irish University Press, 1968).
- Kümmel, W.G., *Introduction to the New Testament*, trans. H. C. Kee (SCM Press, 1975).
- , *New Testament. The History of Investigation of its Problems*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. trans. S. McLean Gilmore and Howard C. Kee (SCM Press, 1973).
- Lagarde, Andre, and Andrae Lagarde, *The Latin Church in the Middle Ages*, trans. Archibald Alexander (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1915).
- Laistner, M.L.W., *Thought and Letters in Western Europe, A.D. 500 to 900*, Revised ed. (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1957).
- Lapidge, Michael, *Anglo Latin Literature, 600 – 899* (Ohio: Hambledon Press, 1996).
- Lausberg, Heinrich, *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: a foundation for literary study*, trans. Matthew T. Bliss, Annemiek Jansen and David E. Orton; eds. David E. Orton and R. Dean Anderson (Leiden and New York: Brill, 1998).
- Law, Vivien, „The Study of Grammar“, in Rosamond McKitterick (ed.), *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 88–109.
- Leonardi, Claudio, and Gioranni Orlandi (eds.), *Biblical Studies in the Early Middle Ages* (Florence, 2005).



- Löfstedt, Bengt, *Der hibernolateinische Grammatiker Malsachanus* (Uppsala: Uppsala Universitet, 1965).
- Malkiel, D., „Jewish-Christian relations in Europe, 840–1096“, *Journal of Medieval History*, 29/1 (2003), 55–83.
- Marenbon, John, „Carolingian Thought“, in Rosamond McKitterick (ed.), *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 171–192.
- Markus, R.A., „The legacy of Pelagius“, in Rowan Williams (ed.), *The Making of Orthodoxy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 214–234.
- Martyn, Louis J., *Galatians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, in William Foxwell Albright and David Noel Freedman (eds.), *The Anchor Bible* (New York: Doubleday, 1997).
- McCue, James F., „Orthodoxy and Heresy: Walter Bauer and the Valentinians“, in *Vigiliae Christianae*, 33 (1979), 118–130.
- McGurk, Patrick, „The oldest manuscripts of the Latin Bible“, in Richard Gameson (ed.), *The Early Medieval Bible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 1–23.
- McKitterick, Rosamond, „Carolingian Bible production: the Tours anomaly“, in Richard Gameson (ed.), *The Early Medieval Bible* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 63–77.
- , *The Carolingians and the Written Word* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).
- , *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms, 785–895* (London: Royal Historical Society, 1977).
- , *The Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians, 751–987* (London: Longman, 1983).
- , „Script and Book Production“, in Rosamond McKitterick (ed.), *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 1–51.
- McNally, Robert E., *The Bible in the Early Middle Ages* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1959).
- , „The *Tres Linguae Sacrae* in Early Irish Bible Exegesis“, *Theological Studies*, 19 (1958), 395–403.
- Metzger, Bruce, „Theories of the Translation Process“, in *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 150 (April–June 1993), 140–50.
- Mershman, Francis, „Theodore (Bishop of Mopsuestia in Cilicia)“, *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. 17 (New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1910), 571–573.
- Milbank, John, „6 Sacred Triads“, in Robert Dodaro and George Lawless (eds.), *Augustine and His Critics: Essays in Honour of Gerald Bonner* (London: Routledge, 2000), 77–103.
- Nelson, Janet, „Kingship and Empire in the Carolingian World“, in Rosamond McKitterick (ed.), *Carolingian Culture: Emulation and Innovation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 52–87.
- Murgia, Charles E., *Prolegomena to Servius 5: The Manuscript* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1975).
- O’Daly, Gerard, *Augustine’s ‘City of God’: A Reader’s Guide* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999).
- Oestreich, Thomas, „Florilegia“, *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. 6 (New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1910), 121.

- Pollmann, Karla, „Augustine’s Hermeneutics as a Universal Discipline?“, in Karla Pollmann and Mark Vessey (eds.), *Augustine and the Disciplines: From Cassiciacum to ‘Confessions’* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 206–231.
- Poulain, Augustin., „Stigmata, Mystical“, *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. 14 (New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1910), 294–296.
- Przychocki, Gustavus (ed.), *Accessus Ovidiani* (Krakow, 1911).
- Quain, Edwin A., „The Medieval Accessus Ad Auctores“, *Traditio*, 3 (1945), 215–264.
- Rebenich, Stefan, *Jerome* (London and New York: Routledge, 2002).
- Rees, B.R., *Pelagius: Life and Letters*, Vol. 1 (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2004).
- Ridderbos, Herman, *Paul: An outline of his theology*, trans. John R. De Witt (London: SPCK, 1977).
- Robertson, D. W., „A Note on the Classical Origin of ‘Circumstances’ in the Medieval Confessional“, *Studies in Philology*, 43/1 (1946), 6–14.
- Rochais, H.M. „Contribution à l’histoire des florilèges ascétiques du haut moyen âge latin. Le *Liber scintillarum*“, *Revue bénédictine*, 63 (1953), 246–291.
- Rosemann, Philipp W., *Peter Lombard, Great Medieval Thinkers* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2004).
- Russell, Donald A., „Hermagoras“, in *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., ed. Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 689.
- Savage, John J., „The Manuscripts of Servius’s Commentary on Virgil“, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 45 (1934), 157–204.
- , „Was the Commentary on Virgil by Aelius Donatus Extant in the Ninth Century?“, *Classical Philology*, 26/4 (1931), 405–411.
- Sidwell, Keith C., *Reading Medieval Latin* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- Simon, John H. and Dirk Obbink, „Tullius“, in *Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., ed. Simon Hornblower and Antony Spawforth (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 1558–1564.
- Simpson, Dean, „Introduction“, in *Sedulii Scotti Collectaneum Miscellaneum*, CCCM 67, ed. Dean Simpson (Turnholt: Brepols, 1988), i-xxxix.
- Sloan, Michael C. „Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics* as the Original *Locus* for the *Septem Circumstantiae*“, *Classical Philology*, 105 (2010), 236–251.
- , „De civitate dei“, in: K. Pollmann et al. (eds), *The Oxford Guide to the Historical Reception of Augustine* (forthcoming).
- Smalley, Beryl, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1952).
- Souter, Alexander, *A Glossary of Later Latin* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949).
- , „Pelagius and the Pauline Text in the Book of Armagh“, *The Journal of Theological Studies*, 17 (1916), 105.
- , *Pelagius’s Expositions of Thirteen Epistles of St Paul*, i. *Introduction*, Text and Studies, 9 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922).
- , „The Sources of Sedulius Scottus’ *Collectaneum* on the Epistles of St. Paul“, *The Journal of Theological Studies*, 18 (1917), 184–228.
- Stok, Fabio, „Virgil between the Middle Ages and the Renaissance“, *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, 1/2 (Fall 1994), 15–22.
- Sullivan, Richard E., „The Context of Cultural Activity in the Carolingian Age“, in R. E. Sullivan (ed.), *The Gentle Voices of Teachers* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1995), 51–105.
- , „Introduction: Factors Shaping Carolingian Studies“, in R. E. Sullivan (ed.), *The Gentle Voices of Teachers* (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1995), 1–50.

- Swete, H.B., *Theodori Episcopi Mopsuesteni: In Epistolas B. Pauli Commentarii*, i. *Introduction. Galatians-Colossians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1880).
- Testard, Maurice, *Saint Augustin et Cicéron* (Paris: Études Augustiniennes avec le concours du CNRS, 1958).
- Tilley, Maureen A., „When Schism Becomes Heresy in Late Antiquity: Developing Doctrinal Deviance in the Wounded Body of Christ“, in *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 15/1 (2007), 1–21.
- Wickham, Lionel, „Pelagianism in the East“, in Rowan Williams (ed.), *The Making of Orthodoxy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 200–213.
- Wiley, Tatha, *Original Sin: Origins, Developments, Contemporary Meanings* (New York: Paulist Press, 2002).
- Wright, Charles D., „Bischoff’s Theory of Exegesis“, *The Journal of Medieval Latin*, 10 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2000), 115–175.
- Yildiz, Efrem, „The Literary Activity and Biblical Exegesis of Mar Theodorus the Interpreter“, *Journal of Assyrian Academic Studies*, 12/2 (1998), 4–32.

## Index

- Abraham 166 f., 171, 174–177, 206 f.  
*accessus ad auctores* 13  
Adam 117 f., 170 f., 212 f.  
Aelius Donatus 15  
Alcuin (Albinus) 3, 9, 30–32, 40, 49 f.,  
53 f., 59, 63, 70, 90  
allegorical interpretation (allegory) 43–  
45, 85, 130, 132  
Ambrosiaster 81, 87, 130–132  
Angels 40, 43, 62, 122, 169, 171, 177,  
193, 195, 197, 201, 205, 207, 209,  
227  
Anglo-Saxon 3, 5, 109  
Antiochene School 130  
Apollodorus 23, 28  
apostle 2, 40, 43, 49, 51, 72, 81 f., 86,  
105, 137, 141, 143, 145, 147, 149,  
151, 153, 155, 157, 159, 165, 167,  
171, 173, 175, 177, 181, 193, 195,  
201, 203, 205, 209, 211, 213, 215,  
221, 223, 227, 231 f.  
Aquila 45–47, 77, 132, 214 f.  
Aristotle 17–23, 26, 30, 232  
– *Nicomachean Ethics* 18 f.  
astrology 92 f.  
Athanasian Creed 70, 232  
Augustine (Augustinus) 2, 5, 9, 17,  
25 f., 28 f., 31–35, 39, 44 f., 50, 55,  
59, 63, 71–74, 76–80, 85, 89–110,  
112–123, 125–129, 131 f., 151,  
161, 232  
– *civ.* 5, 77, 92 f., 104–108, 112, 117,  
126, 232  
– *conf.* 17, 26, 95, 97–99, 108, 115  
– *doctr. Chr.* 78, 95  
– *util. cred.* 5, 17, 33, 39, 78, 91, 93,  
95–97, 99–104, 108, 112  
baptism 63–66, 78, 163, 177, 189,  
197, 199, 209, 217, 225, 232  
Bede 5, 8 f., 32, 34, 108, 131, 232  
beer 5, 36  
Benedict of Nursia 94  
Bible 1, 5, 7, 9–11, 34, 45–47, 62, 68,  
79 f., 85, 87, 90, 100, 110, 113, 134,  
136  
Bischoff, B. 10 f., 18, 40, 43, 45, 48, 64,  
85  
Boethius 74, 94  
Britain 48, 109  
Calvin 127  
Carolingian 3, 7–12, 33 f., 39 f., 42,  
45, 47–54, 56, 60, 63 f., 66 f., 69 f.,  
74, 79, 89 f., 94, 103 f., 108, 112 f.,  
124, 129, 232 f.  
– Biblical exegesis 10 f., 33, 75, 92, 99,  
109  
– Education 7, 9, 34, 38, 42 f., 140 f.  
– Legislation 7, 66 f.  
– Renaissance 7, 11  
Cassianus 39  
*catena (catenae)* 10 f., 130  
Charlemagne 7, 9 f., 38, 63, 66, 70, 90,  
104  
Charles the Bald 66 f., 79  
Cicero 15, 17, 19–32, 99, 232  
circle of Sedulius 2, 75  
Claudius of Turin 9, 40, 53, 59  
Clement 77, 83, 145  
councils (early Christian) 8, 64, 66, 113  
David 49, 79, 143, 151  
De Lubac 39, 103, 126  
Devil (demons) 40, 47, 197, 209, 215,  
227, 229  
Egypt 167, 175, 227  
Einhard 104  
emperors 9, 43, 149  
Eusebius 6, 46, 74, 77, 79, 132, 156 f.  
Eutyches 4  
*florilegia* 8–10  
Florus of Lyons 10, 40  
Fortunatianus 29, 31 f.

- Fourfold: types of Scripture  
 – Aetiology (aethimologia) 43, 101, 151  
 – Allegory 43, 102, 151, 177, 181  
 – Analogy 43, 102, 114, 116, 151  
 – History 1, 17 f., 32, 43, 60, 67, 79, 82 f., 85, 89, 120, 131, 149, 151, 175, 177  
 Frede, H.J. 1 f., 5 f., 8, 10 f., 13, 18, 31 f., 34 f., 37, 41, 46–48, 51, 55, 57–59, 67, 71, 73–77, 80–82, 84–89, 91 f., 96 f., 99–102, 104–107, 112, 114, 119–122, 131, 134–137  
 free will 63, 92, 118  
  
 Gentiles 68, 72, 78, 119, 141, 143, 147, 157, 159, 161, 163, 169–171, 177, 181, 193, 196 f., 201, 203, 205, 213, 223  
 gloss (*glossa*) 41, 49–52, 89, 91, 120  
 gospel 78, 98, 102 f., 151, 153, 155, 157, 159, 163, 173, 179, 181, 201, 203, 231  
 Greek 4 f., 19, 28–31, 39, 45–47, 59–61, 70, 82 f., 86, 101 f., 106, 125, 130 f., 143, 145, 147, 155, 163, 169, 177, 197, 215, 238  
 Gregory the Great 34, 62, 94, 131  
  
 Haimo of Auxerre 9 f., 40  
 harmony of the two testaments 126  
 Hartgar (Bishop) 3, 35 f.  
 Hebrew 1, 6, 13, 45–47, 55, 81–83, 96, 143, 145, 147, 149, 159, 167, 171, 215, 221  
 Heretic (heresy / heretics) 86, 123, 165, 177  
 Hermagoras 17, 19, 25, 28, 31  
 Hiberno-Latin 4, 42, 46 f., 59  
 Holy Spirit 61, 70, 72 f., 87, 128 f., 151, 155, 163, 165, 181, 193, 209, 215, 217, 221  
 Honorius 109  
 humility 102, 205  
 humor 5, 36, 110, 217  
  
 Innocent I 109  
 Ireland 3 f., 12, 42, 107, 109, 232 f.  
 Irmingard 3  
  
 Isidore (bishop of Seville) 29, 39, 45 f., 64, 74, 92, 94  
 Israel 122, 125, 167, 201, 203  
  
 Jerome 2, 4 f., 34 f., 39 f., 43–47, 50, 55, 57–61, 63–65, 72–75, 77–94, 104, 110 f., 121 f., 128 f., 131 f., 141, 143, 145, 149, 161, 189, 232  
 Jerusalem 44, 70, 141, 145, 157, 159, 175, 177, 201, 225  
 Jesus Christ 72, 151, 153, 189  
 Jews 41, 66–68, 78, 122 f., 141, 147, 155, 157, 159, 161, 163, 171, 175, 177, 185, 193, 197, 199, 201, 203, 205  
 Joshua 46, 153  
 Judaism 40, 67 f., 155  
  
 Law 7, 19, 22, 37, 52, 85, 114, 129 f., 141, 145, 147, 153, 155, 157, 159, 161, 163, 165, 167, 169, 171, 173, 175, 177, 179, 181, 183, 193, 199, 201, 221, 227  
*Liber Glossarum* 10 f.  
 libraries 7, 42, 74  
 Louis the German 2  
 Louis the Pious 10, 66  
  
 Manichees (Manichean) 99, 101 f.  
 marginalia 33 f., 136 f.  
 miracles 61, 163, 195  
 Mirror for Princes 4  
 – *De rectoribus Christianis* 4  
*Miscellaneum* (*Collectaneum Miscellaneum*) 2, 6, 8  
 monks 2 f., 38, 70  
 Moses 97, 137, 151, 153, 165, 167, 169  
*mundus* 76, 114, 116, 118, 123–125, 152  
 mystery 86, 193, 203, 205  
  
 New Testament 33, 43 f., 79, 85, 96, 100, 128, 145, 147, 157, 161, 163, 177  
 Notker the Stammerer 90  
 numbers (allegorical use of) 38, 43–45, 74, 85 f., 136 f.  
 nuns 9

- Old Testament 44, 62, 79, 85, 99–101, 125 f., 145, 151, 157, 163, 175
- Origen 6, 45 f., 74 f., 77, 130, 147, 149
- Orpheus 36 f.
- orthography 56 f., 59
- Ovid 14, 32
- Owen, John 127
- Paul 2, 16, 33–35, 37–40, 43 f., 51, 55, 61 f., 64, 67–69, 78 f., 81–84, 86–89, 92 f., 95 f., 102, 110, 119 f., 124 f., 128, 130, 137, 141, 143, 145, 147, 149, 153, 155, 157, 161, 179, 183, 185, 189, 205, 211, 231 f.
- Damascus 119 f., 141, 155, 157
- Pauline letters 2, 9, 48, 58, 78–80, 84 f., 95, 100, 102, 114 f., 130, 232
- Saul 57, 81 f., 96, 119, 142 f., 154 f.
- Pedagogical function 11, 34, 62, 69, 109, 134
- Pelagius (Pelagians / Pelagianism) 1, 35, 39 f., 42, 44 f., 48, 50, 52 f., 57, 62–64, 71–75, 77–80, 85–88, 90–94, 109–130, 134–137, 232 f.
- Pentateuch 41
- peristasis* 13, 27 f., 30 f., 102, 141
- Peter 10, 44, 77 f., 89, 107, 145, 153, 155, 159, 161, 163, 165
- Peter Lombard 74
- poetry 4 f., 14–16, 35, 37, 55, 123–125
- Pope 66, 70, 83, 109
- praefiguro* 125 f.
- predestination 55, 63, 92, 112 f., 118, 120–123, 126 f., 129, 191, 232
- Priscian 4
- Prologue 1 f., 4 f., 13–18, 31–34, 39, 42 f., 47 f., 57–60, 63, 67–69, 74, 77, 80 f., 83–85, 90 f., 93, 95–100, 102 f., 108, 111, 131, 134, 136, 141, 153, 232
- prophecy 43, 61, 126 f., 149, 163
- Psalms 106, 223
- Quintilian 19, 23–26, 28, 30 f.
- Rabanus (Hrabanus) 40, 45, 47, 49, 53 f., 59 f., 131 f.
- Rhetores Latini minores* 25
- Rhine (Rhineland) 5
- Rome 45, 79, 83 f., 89, 109, 113, 115, 141, 146 f., 149, 203, 231
- Rufinus 6, 74, 77, 79
- saeculum* 95, 114–116, 123–125
- Sarah 165
- scholasticus* 2
- Scottus, John 1, 4 f., 9–12, 15, 32, 40, 47, 74, 113, 232
- Sedulius 1–18, 25, 30–69, 71–77, 80–114, 116–136, 175, 177, 232 f.
- Septuagint 46, 167
- Seventy Translators 167
- Servius 6, 11–18, 32 f., 38, 42, 49 f., 54–56, 80, 95–97, 99, 111, 232
- Seven Circumstances (*Septem Circumstantiae*) 6, 13, 15, 17–19, 48, 95–97, 99 f., 111, 151, 232
- sola fide* 111, 128 f., 160, 162, 164, 168, 218
- son of Nun 46, 153
- Souter, A. 34 f., 71 f., 75, 109 f., 114, 119, 121 f., 134–137
- students 18 f., 33–35, 38, 83, 163, 169
- syntax 52, 56 f., 60, 62, 120
- teachers 33–35, 47, 69, 88, 95–97, 101, 163, 185, 209, 213
- Theodore of Mopsuestia 130
- Timothy 37, 71, 87, 132, 145, 147, 149, 161, 179
- trinity 63, 70–74, 92, 135
- Vetus Latina 1, 113, 125, 134 f.
- Victor, J. 25, 27 f., 31 f.
- Victor, S. 25 f., 31
- Victorinus, M. 2, 26–28, 31, 50, 87, 89, 95, 128
- Vikings 3
- vita poetae* 16
- Vivian Bible 79
- Vulgate 37, 48 f., 60, 82, 113, 116, 125, 134 f., 177







