

I D E A S O F C H R I S T I A N W R I T I N G
I N L A T E R O M A N G A U L

Thesis submitted for the degree of D.Phil.
in Literae Humaniores (Ancient History)
in the University of Oxford,
Trinity Term 1988

by

J. Mark Vessey
Corpus Christi College



Modo tempus est seria legi, seria scribi.

SIDONTIUS APOLLINARIS, Ep. VIII 4,3.

PREFACE

For most students of modern European literature, Christian writing of the patristic period is like Keats's Homer - a fabled but untravelled region. So it might have remained for me, had I not met with certain texts and certain teachers. As an undergraduate interested in the works of the Victorian travel-writer and epic poet Charles Montagu Doughty, I was permitted to consult the author's unpublished papers in the library of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. There, among much that I could not decipher, I discovered references to a History by Orosius, apparently used as a source for the Dawn in Britain. Who was Orosius, and what kind of a work was his History ? In search of answers to these questions I came upon Pierre Courcelle's Histoire littéraire des grandes invasions germaniques. Suddenly I found myself staring, with something like 'wild surmise', at a whole new world of writing. A letter addressed to the late Professor Courcelle within a few months of his death was forwarded to a colleague who recommended that I write to Professor Jacques Fontaine at the Université de Paris-Sorbonne. As a result of this contact, I spent the academic year 1982-83 as a student in Paris, attending Professor Fontaine's seminars on 'Langues et littératures de l'antiquité tardive', along with those given by Professor André Mandouze on 'La méthodologie patristique'. The experience convinced me that I should do my doctoral research in late-antique Latin literature. With the agreement of Dr. John Matthews I set about that research in Oxford. The thesis presented here is the product of work done under his supervision in the five-year period 1983-88.

These biographical notes will, I hope, help to explain any oddity that may appear in the Introduction which follows. Written to satisfy the requirements for a thesis in late Roman history, this dissertation remains an expression of the curiosity felt by a student of English literature who strayed into unfamiliar country. Though meant to be judged by specialists, it is also intended to yield certain elements of a more general presentation of early Christian writing, such as might one day recommend itself to other students of modern literature. The view taken is that of an 'outsider', for whom nothing has any sense until it is explained. The explanation given is that offered by the texts themselves and their authors. Contrary to the practice of some other researchers, I have made no consistent effort to account for features of early Christian literary culture in terms of continuities with or transformations of an ancient (i.e. classical) heritage. In cases where such continuities seemed to me especially conspicuous, I have remarked them. As a rule, however, I have described what I have seen in terms approximating as closely as possible to those used by contemporary writers. My role, as I conceived it, was that of an anthropologist attempting to understand the language and rituals of a (literary) culture at a particular stage in its evolution; the archaeology of the region I have left to others better qualified for the task.

Needless to say, a project of this sort could not have been brought to a conclusion without help from numerous quarters. My greatest and longest standing debt is to Jacques Fontaine. It was he who first showed me what riches lay hidden in Migne's Latin Patrology and how they could be brought to light; without his encouragement and patient critic-

ism of my work I should not now have had anything to offer. His, too, was the suggestion that I approach the author of Western aristocracies and imperial court as a possible Oxford supervisor. I could not have wished for better. John Matthews has been the great enabler of this thesis, coaxing, cajoling, never interfering, sceptical and enthusiastic as the case required. His knowledge of late-antique society and his instinct for the historically verisimilar have been a constant resource and reassurance to me. As a member of the Late Roman Seminar in Oxford I have had weekly reminders of the skills required for the serious study of this period and frequent opportunities to test my own ideas about it. Other scholars, both in Oxford and elsewhere, have given me their time and invaluable advice. Peter Godman has read everything that I have written over the past few years and, I believe, has saved me from countless errors of fact and interpretation. Dr. J.N.D. Kelly graciously read and commented upon a draft of my chapter on creeds. James Howard-Johnston, Michael Lapidge, Anthony Meredith and Elizabeth Rawson have all, at various times and in various ways, allowed me to benefit from their erudition. Professor Robert Markus and MM. les Professeurs Jean Doignon and Y.-M. Duval kindly supplied copies of articles which I might otherwise not have seen. I have also learnt much from fellow students who became my close friends - among them Martin Brooke, Philippe Bruggisser, Michael Driscoll, Peter Heather, Adam Kamesar, Neil McLynn and Stefan Rebenich. Every one of the above-named persons has left some mark on the present work. I alone am responsible for the blots. The financial cost of this thesis and the research that preceded it was borne by the French Government and British Institute in Paris, the British Government, Corpus Christi College (who elected me to

a Senior Scholarship in 1986-7) and by my family. My parents and my wife, Marianne McCormick, have paid dearly in every kind of coin for a stake in an enterprise that must often have seemed to them sheer folly; I could not have managed without their support.

HIS OMNIBUS GRATIAS AGO, MAIORES AUTEM HABEO.

J.M.V.

Iffley, 25.vi.88

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

Preface iii
Summary of contents vii
Table of contents viii

Introduction xi

Chapter 1: 'In lectione atque sermone' 1
(The Christian writer as student of the Bible)

Chapter 2: 'Fides relatoris' 138
(The Christian writer as 'editor' of the Fathers)

Chapter 3: 'In modum symboli' 273
(The Christian writer as creed-maker)

General conclusions 389

List of abbreviations

- Notes to Chapter 1
- Notes to Chapter 2
- Notes to Chapter 3

- Bibliography
- I - Sources
 - II - Secondary works

Abstract

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction [xi-xxvii]

Chapter 1 - 'IN LECTIONE ATQUE SERMONE'

The Christian writer as student of the Bible

Introduction [1]

I. A biblical education and its corollaries: Hilary and Priscillian [11]

II. A new kind of writer: Jerome and the Christian 'litterati' of southern Gaul, c.392-412 [32]

1. A biblical poet: Paulinus of Bordeaux [41]
2. A biblical epitomator: Sulpicius Severus [57]
3. A monster of inarticulacy: 'Vigilantius' [72]
4. 'Viri disertissimi et in dei lege perfecti' [77]

III. Theories of monastic reading [87]

IV. The literary persona of the Gallic monk-bishop [108]

Conclusions [134]

Chapter 2 - 'FIDES RELATORIS'

The Christian writer as 'editor' of the Fathers

Introduction [138]

I. The 'Augustinianism' of Prosper of Aquitaine [152]

- (a) 'Ex Augustino sententiae' [157]
- (b) 'Pro Augustino responsiones' [181]
 - Moment and milieu [182]
 - Principles and practice [193]
 - 'Excerpta' [199]
 - 'Auctoritates' [206]
 - 'Sententiae' [213]

II. Cassian and monastic tradition [220]

- (a) The thirteenth Conference [223]
- (b) The De incarnatione contra Nestorium [228]

III. Towards a theory of Christian (re-)writing: Vincent of Lérins [238]

- (a) Vincent and monastic tradition [241]
- (b) Vincent and the use of Christian texts [246]
- (c) Vincent as a reader of Augustine [253]
- (d) Vincent and the idea of a 'commonitorium' [263]

Conclusions [269]

Chapter 3 - 'IN MODUM SYMBOLI'

The Christian writer as creed-maker

Introduction [273]

I. Expositiones symboli: the 'baptismal' creed as text [285]

II. Hilary of Poitiers and fourth-century conciliar creeds [302]

III. Gallic writers and fifth-century Christological definition [313]

1. Cassian and the Fides Leporii [313]
2. Vincent of Lérins and the Council of Ephesus [323]
3. Faustus of Lérins and the deacon Graecus [337]
4. Gallic bishops and Leo's Tome [346]

IV. Some other creeds [363]

Conclusions [385]

General conclusions [389]

List of abbreviations

Notes

Bibliography

Abstract

INTRODUCTION

When Luther wrote to his friend Spalatin in October 1516 to object to Erasmus' annotations on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, he signed his letter 'from a corner in our monastery'. The Latin phrase ('ex angulo monasterii') was almost certainly suggested to him by the closing sentence of a letter addressed to Augustine by Jerome in 404, in which the writer defended himself against criticism of his commentary on Galatians. Erasmus was a great admirer of Jerome, Luther of Augustine. This particular epistolary reminiscence is a relatively trivial example of the way in which Renaissance humanists mimicked their predecessors and, in turn, were represented in their guise - a few years later Luther could appear on a woodcut as a scourge of the papacy, complete with lion, cardinal's hat and full literary paraphernalia of the medieval Hieronymus! On a more significant level, the manner of Luther's self-deprecation may be seen as evidence of a connection between Christian reading-matter (in this case Jerome's Letters, a copy of which he had recently requested from the same correspondent) and the presentation of a Christian literary persona. A man who planned to disagree with a scholar like Erasmus had to take certain precautions. Fortunately for Friar Martin, his situation was not without precedent. Christian exegetes had disagreed before, none more famously than the monk of Bethlehem and the bishop of Hippo. Just as Luther profited from patristic commentaries in preparing his lectures on Galatians in the autumn of 1516, so he could arm himself with a phrase from Jerome's Letters in taking issue with their latest editor.

Given that men like Luther and Erasmus could turn to the Fathers for models of their own literary activity, there is a clear prima facie case for considering the works of patristic writers as part of the background to modern ideas of authorship and the use of texts. How, though, is one to represent that background ? With regard to the period between late antiquity and the Renaissance, the student of literary ideas is in a uniquely disadvantaged position. Theologians and philosophers have long possessed convenient accounts of the main lines of patristic and scholastic thought in their respective fields. In order to distinguish 'traditional' elements in the theological or philosophical discourse of modern writers, it is sufficient to compare their opinions with what is known about the views of their most notable predecessors. The literary historian does, it is true, have certain tools of his own for such purposes. Forty years after the appearance of E.R. Curtius' classic work on European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages, he is well supplied with information on classical and medieval rhetoric and poetics. As Curtius himself recognized, however, the history of ideas about writing in the Middle Ages is not entirely comprehended by the 'artes'. Having largely ignored the subject of Christian writing in the main part of his book, he engages directly with it an important excursus devoted to 'Early Christian and Medieval Literary Studies'. The excursus begins with a call to action: "The vast realm of patristics has not yet been explored in respect to the problems posed by European literary history and literary theory..." This is followed by the statement of a programme: "We must ask: How did preoccupation with the Bible and the rise of Christian writing influence literary theory ?" - and by what the author calls "indications and suggestions" for a new discipline.

Though much relevant work has been done since Curtius sketched his outline-history of Christian literary studies from the fourth to the thirteenth century, the "vast realm of patristics" has still to be plotted on ordinary maps of "European literary history and literary theory". As a result, whereas no-one would now doubt the continuity of **classical** ideals between Virgil and Dante, the continuity of **Christian** ideals from (say) Augustine to Erasmus remains largely hypothetical. It is not difficult to see why this should be so. On the one hand, most practitioners of the "early Christian philology" desiderated by Curtius (and, indeed, already established in his day) are classicists by initial training, more concerned with the much-publicised 'Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der antiken Welt' than with the long-term legacy of Christian attitudes to literature. On the other hand, students of medieval and modern literary theory - even without the encouragement of The Name of the Rose - have tended to concentrate their attention on the later middle ages, where Latin and vernacular literatures exist side by side and current interests in textuality can be freely indulged. While it would be misleading to suggest that there is a 'gap' at any point in contemporary late-antique and medieval literary studies, it could perhaps be claimed that not all necessary connections have yet been made. In particular, there would seem to be a need for a presentation of the main themes of patristic reflection on writing, authorship and texts that would be accessible to students of other (especially later) periods of European literature. Until such information is readily available it must remain doubtful whether that literature can ever be seen, as Curtius believed it should be, "as a whole".

This thesis is an adventure on the field indicated at the close of the previous paragraph. Though restricted to a particular region and time, it is intended to be a contribution to the larger history of early Christian literary ideas, conceived as an integral part of 'European literary history and literary theory'. By proposing to discuss 'ideas of Christian writing' rather than 'Christian literary theory', I hope to avoid suggesting either that late-antique Christian authors possessed a complete and coherent set of literary principles distinct from those enshrined in the secular 'artes', or that their achievement was merely to baptize the principles that they inherited. Of these two possible misconceptions, the second is perhaps the more dangerous. For a humanist like Curtius, the influence of Christianity on European literature appeared as so many modifications to a rhetoric and poetics that were transmitted, essentially intact, from the ancient to the modern world; hence his decision to treat patristic texts as little more than sources for the history of medieval education. One might just as well limit the significance of monastic 'scriptoria' to the change in materials used in the production of classical manuscripts. In fact, Christian reflection on the nature and aims of literate activity extended far beyond what was taught in schools and technical handbooks. It had, for example, to take account of the writer's relation to God and his fellow men, and of the means of his salvation. Concerns of this order might now be admitted to the realm of 'literary theory'; they were not subsumed in any literary discipline known in late antiquity. To avoid confusion, it has therefore seemed advisable to evoke a more general class of (Christian) 'ideas of writing' - one which would allow a phrase such as Jerome's 'in angulo monasterii' to be recognized both as a topos of authorial modesty

and as the expression of certain social and religious ideals. In cases where it was necessary to denote a set of ideas attributable to an individual, group or larger community the phrase 'literary ideology' has been used.

I have accepted Curtius' invitation to regard "preoccupation with the Bible" and reaction to "the rise of Christian writing" as the two primary areas of research, despite the fact that his formulation was designed to justify the treatment of Christian literary ideas as an adjunct to conventional 'litteratura'. The Bible and Christian writing were what Christian 'litterati' read, before they themselves became Christian writers. The order of Sidonius' statement - 'Modo tempus est seria legi, seria scribi' - reflects a common assumption. Even during the fourth and fifth centuries, when there was no generally recognized Christian literary curriculum, the study of Christian texts was widely held to be a prerequisite for serious Christian authorship. This conviction may be explained partly as a result of the importance assigned to the Bible in Christian religion and partly as the natural reflex of the late-Roman 'litteratus' (in whose opinion the most valuable kind of expertise would always be that based on a mastery of written materials). Christian 'studium' might be separate from classical 'litteratura', it could not help being broadly analogous to it as regards the use of texts. Consequently, many of the most important Christian 'ideas of writing' are effectively 'ideas of reading-and-writing'. This fact is reflected in a division of material in the following chapters according to varieties of early Christian reading-matter.

As normally defined, the 'patristic' era in Christian Latin literature begins with Tertullian (late second century) and continues at least until the time of Gregory the Great (late sixth century). The present study is devoted to a span of roughly one hundred and fifty years in the middle of that period, from c.350 to c.500. Though mainly dictated by the distribution of material of a certain provenance, these limits also have a more general relevance. As a result of the policies of successive Christian emperors, the central decades of the fourth century witnessed an unprecedented rise in the number of educated inhabitants of the Roman empire who were interested in Christianity. The increase in Christian literary activity which followed was further stimulated by an intensification of theological controversy ('Arianism') and by the spread of a particular form of religious life (monasticism). In the Latin-speaking West, the effects of these developments began to appear in the late 350s and early 360s in the form of new initiatives in Christian reading and writing. Those initiatives led, in turn, to the florescence of Latin Christian literature in the Theodosian age that is associated with the names of Ambrose, Jerome and Augustine. An initial terminus of c.350 is thus easily justified in relation to a rising level of Christian involvement among Latin 'litterati'. It is tempting to say that a final terminus of c.500 might be justified in relation to a falling level of literacy among Latin Christians. In a sense this is true, though the idea of 'literacy' is one that must be used with discretion in a history of literary ideology. With few exceptions, the Christian writers whose work survives from the fourth and fifth centuries may be assumed to have received a traditional (i.e. secular) education in grammar and rhetoric. By the early sixth century, the institutions

which had previously guaranteed the continuance of that education from one generation to the next no longer existed in many parts of western Europe. As others gradually replaced them, the circumstances of the Christian reader-writer began to change. Without wishing to prejudge the nature of that change or its effects on literary ideas, I thought it best to suspend this study at the point already indicated.

Once the decision had been made to concentrate on Christian ideas of writing in the 'late Roman' West, the choice of a particular cultural and geographical area was relatively simple. Of all the provinces in the western Roman empire (or western 'Romania' as it was to become), none offers a fuller or more varied record of Christian literary activity in this period than Gaul. From the time of Hilary (bishop of Poitiers from c.350) to that of Caesarius (bishop of Arles from 502), there is scarcely a decade that is not illustrated by some major extant work of Gallic Christian literature. All types of Christian writing are represented: letters, sermons, theological and polemical treatises, credal statements, heresiologies, saints' lives, poetry, monastic and ecclesiastical legislation, chronicles, books for the liturgy... By their very profusion and diversity these works provoke questions about their authors' literary ideology. (What motivated this huge investment of time, energy and material resources ? How was it justified ? What kind of relation was held to exist between different forms of religious expression and different aspects of religious life ?) One should not expect, of course, to find a clear set of answers to these questions in the works of any single author. In the case of Gaul, no single author exists who could raise such an expectation. Simply in terms of extant

literary production, there is no Gallic Jerome or Augustine. For a study of the kind here envisaged, this is a distinct advantage. The long-term significance of ideas propounded by writers of exceptional stature lies in the history of their reception by lesser individuals. It would therefore be a serious error to base a study of patristic ideas of writing solely on views expressed by the most eminent 'patres'. As it happens, Gallic 'litterati' of the late fourth and fifth centuries had privileged access to the works of all their most famous Latin contemporaries; in their writings may be traced the beginnings of a process of assimilation that would continue throughout the middle ages.

Besides being receptive to outside influences, Christian writers living in Gaul in the fifth century also rapidly developed a sense of the value of their own literary traditions. The clearest evidence for this Gallic self-consciousness is to be found in the catalogue of Christian authors and their works compiled in c.475 by Gennadius of Marseille, in continuation of an earlier work by Jerome. Gennadius adds 91 authors to Jerome's list, roughly two-thirds of whom wrote in Latin. Of those Latin writers, 2 are stated, known or may be supposed to have been residents or natives of Britain, 3 of Illyria, 7 of Africa, 8 (or 9) of Spain, 15 of Italy - and 19 (or 20) of Gaul. The distribution of Gallic authors mentioned is itself of some significance. Jerome had named just three Latin writers from Gaul. The first (Reticus) had been bishop of Autun in the time of Constantine, when the city enjoyed a brief cultural renaissance following the restoration of its ancient schools. The other two (Hilary of Poitiers, Phoebadius of Agen) were both probably natives of Aquitaine and may have owed their education, if

only indirectly, to the flourishing schools of Bordeaux. Two of the earliest Gallic writers named by Gennadius (Paulinus and Sulpicius) were likewise Aquitanians and are known to have been educated at Bordeaux. A third (Prosper) is described as an Aquitanian but was in Marseille by the mid-420s. Of nine other Gallic authors whose place of residence is specified, four (Victorinus, Cassian, Salvian, Musaeus) are located at Marseille, one (Hilary) at Arles, and another (Vincent) at a nearby monastery on the island of Lérins. Two more (Eucherius, Faustus), though serving as bishops elsewhere in south-eastern Gaul, had important links with the same monastery. Finally, three authors whose place of residence is not indicated (Vigilius, Leporius, a second Vincent) can nevertheless be associated, for one reason or another, with either Lérins or Marseille. As will be seen in due course, Gennadius had special reasons for favouring certain writers over others. It seems unlikely, however, that his prejudices would have led him to omit any whose work he knew. Granted that any bibliographer is likely to be best informed about literary activity in his own vicinity, the preponderance in the Gennadian catalogue of Provençal writers (or, more precisely, of writers whose career was drawn to the ancient Roman 'Provincia') should almost certainly be regarded as the sign of a recent shift in the demography of Gallic literary culture. In the years 406-8, and again in 410-12, large tracts of northern, central and south-western Gaul were subjected to invasion by barbarian tribes from Germany and the East. Most of the invaders stayed on Gallic territory for as long as it afforded them sustenance by pillage, then passed into Spain. Meanwhile, many displaced natives, among them members of the Gallic aristocracy, migrated to the part of the country least affected by the troubles,

namely the south-east. For the remainder of the fifth century this region (which now included the seat of the Gallic prefect, removed from Trier to Arles) was once again the focus of Roman administration west of the Alps. Partly, no doubt, because of the concentration of intellectual resources brought about by the invasions, it was also the scene of important developments in Christian culture and institutions, a fact reflected in the bias of Gennadius' catalogue.

In plotting the course of this thesis I have let myself be influenced a good deal by Gennadius. (I hope one day to offer a more particular study of his work and its place in the history of Christian literary ideas.) I have tried to imitate his combination of 'foreign' and 'domestic' (i.e. Gallic) concerns and to understand why he presents each individual figure as he does. With a few exceptions, the Gallic authors whose works are discussed below are also to be found in his catalogue. For the period after c.420 I rely heavily, as he did, on materials emanating from the area of Arles, Marseille and Lérins. Most important of all, the themes selected for the three main divisions of this dissertation are ones suggested by his treatment of Christian reading-and-writing.

The first thing that Gennadius looked for in an author was a sound knowledge of Scripture: in order to win his approval, a person had to qualify as a 'vir in scripturis sanctis doctus'. Chapter One of this thesis is therefore devoted to **the Christian writer as student of the Bible**. The introduction consists of a review of some of the terms commonly used by late-antique Latin 'litterati' in referring to the

sacred text (e.g. 'verbum dei', 'lex', 'lectio', 'scriptura', 'litterae sacrae'), designed to show what implications each of these might have for the prospective Christian orator or writer. The main part of the chapter is divided into four sections, arranged to offer broad chronological coverage of the period from c.350 to c.500. (A similar format is used in later chapters, though it should be noted that the chronological scope of Chapter Two is considerably narrower.) In the first section, a rough consensus is established of opinions concerning Bible-study and the role of the Christian preacher for the period c.360-390, based on comparison of the later works of Hilary of Poitiers with texts attributed to the Spanish 'heretic' Priscillian (whose links with Gallic Christian circles are duly emphasised). It is argued that both writers were in possession of a more or less consistent theory of Christian education ('eruditio') as effected by God, through the medium of the Scriptures, and that this theory entailed the idea of a Christian utterance ('confessio', 'praedicatio') that was itself closely related to the biblical text. The second section begins with an excursion to Bethlehem in the early 390s to consider the position assumed by Jerome as a Christian writer 'de scripturis'. This position is seen as closely modelled on the literary persona of Origen (as interpreted by Jerome) and deliberately adapted to the climate of Christian intellectual life in the final quarter of the fourth century. Following the line of Jerome's Gallic correspondence in the period c.392-412, an account is then given of the propagation and reception of his literary ideas in Gaul, with particular reference to the works of Paulinus of Bordeaux (later of Nola) and Sulpicius Severus - both of whom are shown to have held definite notions of their own regarding the relation between

biblical reading and Christian writing. Certain features of the Contra Vigilantium and other texts addressed by Jerome to persons living in or near Toulouse, Bordeaux and Marseille are taken to indicate a new concern for the formation of the Gallic biblicist and preacher: the latter was to be one educated in a monastery and later ordained as a member of the clergy. It is suggested that, in proposing such a scheme, Jerome may have been responding to developments that were already taking place in the Gallic church. The remainder of the chapter is intended to show how this institutional kind of Christian 'eruditio' was conceptualised by Gallic writers in the period after c.420. Section three contains a survey of ideas of biblical 'lectio' and related literary/didactic activities discernible in texts associated with the monastic foundations of Marseille and Lérins. That material is then exploited in a final section on the presentation of Christian literary activity in biographical contexts.

From the Bible we pass to the Fathers. Another notable feature of Gennadius' bibliography is the author's interest in works composed 'ex traditione patrum', whether their subject was one of monastic observance or theological doctrine. Chapter Two is concerned with the role of the **Christian writer as 'editor' of the Fathers** in the dogmatic sphere. For practical reasons, it was necessary to confine the discussion to three Gallic writers of the 420s and 430s: Prosper (of Aquitaine), Cassian (of Marseille) and Vincent (of Lérins). As a result of involvement or interest in the contemporary debates on divine grace and the Incarnation, each of these writers was led to reflect on the relation between past and present literary formulations of Christian doctrine. Factors

conditioning that reflection are listed in an introduction; they include the importance generally accorded to Augustine, developments in the use of patristic testimony in theological argument, the formation of Christian libraries, and the sense of a monastic tradition. The first section of the chapter is an attempt to characterise Prosper's 'Augustinianism', considered as a set of principles and procedures for the re-presentation of a literary and doctrinal oeuvre. Following a brief study of his non-controversial works, considerable space is devoted to the circumstances and manner of his 'defence' of Augustine's views on grace and predestination. Special attention is paid to his use of 'excerpta', 'auctoritates' and 'sententiae'. It is shown that in each of these areas of textual practice Prosper was susceptible to the influence of 'Massilian' opponents of Augustinian doctrine. The second section deals directly with the methods of patristic argument adopted by one such opponent, Cassian. On the evidence of certain key passages in the Conferences and De incarnatione, the latter appears as the artist of a subtle compromise between the respective claims of textually and orally mediated doctrinal authority. A similar compromise is detected in the Commonitorium of Vincent of Lérins, who is the subject of the third and final section. Four aspects of Vincent's work are singled out for consideration: his appeal to monastic tradition as a guarantee of orthodoxy, his exploitation of Christian texts (as implied by the theory of patristic 'collatio'), his attitude towards the writings of Augustine, and his idea of a mnemonic or 'commonitory' statement of dogma. The last of these topics affords a natural transition to the theme of the final chapter.

In one of his notices, Gennadius describes a dogmatic summary as composed 'in modum symboli'. The ideal of a concise, creed-like statement of the essentials of the Christian faith is one that can be traced elsewhere in his writings and in those of his Gallic predecessors and contemporaries. Chapter Three of the thesis is about **the Christian writer as creed-maker** and reader of credal texts. The introduction summarises the history of the word 'symbolum' and of the use of creeds in the early church. It is argued that the study of creeds is a matter for the literary historian as well as for the historian of Christian dogma and that past concentration on certain individual forms of confession has led to neglect of the more general questions raised by their existence. Each of the four following sections is centred on a particular body of evidence for the ideas entertained by Gallic 'litterati' concerning creeds and their function. The first section consists of an analysis of works or passages containing theoretical treatments of the 'baptismal' creed, and yields a set of commonly-accepted propositions regarding (1) its character as a compilation, (2) its relation to the Bible, (3) its brevity, (4) its salutary quality, (5) its authorship. These elements of a 'theory of the creed as text' are then used as points of reference for a study of miscellaneous 'conciliar' and 'personal' creeds from the late fourth and fifth centuries. The second section offers an account of the approach taken towards written creeds ('fides conscriptae') by one of the first western theologians ever to confront them seriously, Hilary of Poitiers. A much wider range of material is provided by Gallic reaction to the fifth-century Christological debates, discussed in the third section. Attention is there focussed successively on Cassian's response to the creed-making of a

certain Leporius (418/430), Vincent's attitude towards the decrees of the Council of Ephesus (431/434), Faustus' rejection of a dogmatic statement drafted by the deacon Graecus (c.440), and the reception of pope Leo's Tomus ad Flavianum by the southern Gallic episcopate (450-2). (The sub-section on Vincent of Lérins includes a new solution to the problem posed by the incomplete state of his Commonitorium.) The impression thus obtained of intense Gallic interest in issues of dogmatic formulation is confirmed in the fourth section, which reviews the evidence for the drafting of broader 'Triado-Christological' summaries by writers living in the province. Against the view expressed in many standard works, it is held that there is no reason to assign a Spanish origin to the earliest creeds of this type (including the so-called 'Athanasianum').

The aim of each of these chapters is to recreate an aspect of the reading-and-writing activity of the late-antique Christian 'litteratus' and to discover the dominant ideas associated with it. In order to accomplish this aim, it has proved necessary to offer occasional information on other topics - notably in the areas of social, ecclesiastical and doctrinal history. I make no excuse for including such matter in a dissertation on Christian literary ideology; without it, the purposes of the readers and writers named in these pages would appear wholly aimless and arbitrary. On the other hand, I should not wish it to be thought that I have tried to write social, ecclesiastical or doctrinal history. The continuity of narrative and theme for which I have striven will be found - if it is to be found anywhere - on the level of ideas about reading-and-writing. Whatever cogency may be possessed by my remarks on

other subjects derives from other men's books. In one particular area, I am conscious of having taken less account of existing scholarship than I might have done: the references below to the technical aspects of late-antique book-production and to the manuscript-history of the texts discussed are regrettably sparse. There is a reason for this. At an early stage in my research it became clear to me that study of late-antique **ideas** of reading-and-writing could not ultimately be separated from study of the associated **techniques** (i.e. of the materials, tools, processes and personnel involved in the furnishing of late-antique texts). Since, however, I did not then feel able to embark on a thorough investigation of the physical evidence for early Christian reading-and-writing in Gaul, I decided to pursue the first of these tasks to the exclusion of the second (rather than risk failing in both simultaneously!) Sooner or later, the results of a study such as this must be combined with those of paleographical and codicological research in the same area. To some extent, they may help to set the agenda for that research.

Another class of omission also demands explanation. To have had any claim to completeness, this thesis would have needed to contain six or seven chapters instead of the present three. Student of the Bible, 'editor' of the Fathers, creed-maker - the Christian writer was, or could be, all these things and more. He could be, and almost invariably was, a reader and writer of letters; Gallic materials for a chapter on late-antique Christian ideas of epistolography are abundant, yet find no place below. He could be a compiler of monastic 'rules'; the question of the relation between past and present expressions of spiritual and

ascetic doctrine (cf. Gennadius' 'studia monastica') is touched upon at several points but never discussed as fully as the writings of Cassian and his successors would allow. He could be a versifier of works in prose, biblical and hagiographical; though brief mention is made of verse-paraphrase in Chapter One, nothing is made of the ample evidence for such practices provided by the works of authors such as Claudius Marius Victor, Paulinus of Périgueux and Alcimus Avitus. He could be a writer for the liturgy, assembling texts of various sorts and adding material of his own; clearly attested in fifth-century Gallic sources, this kind of activity barely merits a footnote here. He could be a canonist, revising disciplinary codes of forgotten councils and inventing councils to authorise new codes; Gennadius (if he is responsible for the Statuta ecclesiae antiqua) was such a writer, even though he is not considered in that capacity. This list of literary activities could easily be extended. The thesis, however, could not. It begins at what seemed the most obvious point and ends three hundred or so pages later without having exhausted the subject-matter of its title.

Chapter One

*

'IN LECTIONE ATQUE SERMONE'

The Christian writer as student of the Bible

Introduction

However suspect it may appear to some modern theologians, the Koranic description of Christians as "a people of the book" provides a useful starting-point for a study of the present kind.¹ The Christians of late antiquity were people who set a special value on a particular set of texts. The fact is conveniently illustrated by two contrasting episodes in the history of early fourth-century relations between the church and the Roman empire. When the civil authorities in the time of Diocletian ordered Christian officials to give up their copies of the Scriptures, many preferred torture to compliance; those who did comply were severely criticised by their fellow believers.² A few years later, the newly-converted emperor Constantine ordered fifty de luxe editions of the Bible to be prepared for the use of Christians in Constantinople.³ In theory, such imperial recognition of a sacred text need not have entailed any major adjustment to contemporary ideas of reading-and-writing. Though it may be true that pagan religion had never attached much importance to written materials, the idea of a sacred book (or books) would not in itself have been unfamiliar to the average late-Roman 'litteratus'.⁴ In order to explain the exceptional importance accorded the Christian Scriptures in the post-Constantinian period, one would have to take account of at least three factors: (1) the nature of the Christian message, as announced in the Gospels and other New Testament writings; (2) the claims made for the Bible by articulate Christians of the late second, third and early fourth centuries; (3) the

manner in which the Christian religion was promoted by Constantine and his immediate successors. For the purpose of this enquiry, it is sufficient to observe that, by the mid-fourth century, the publicity surrounding the Bible was such that no educated inhabitant of the Roman empire was likely to be ignorant of its existence.⁵ One may then consider what ideas were entertained of the biblical text by persons more than casually interested in it.

*

The Bible was **the word of God**; it expressed his nature and his purposes for mankind. Various formulated, this idea is at the root of all serious reflection on the Scriptures from the earliest period in the church's history. It is expounded in greatest detail by Greek writers. For Origen, whose entire theological system was centred on the concept of the divine 'logos', the visible letters of the Bible were to be considered in parallel with Christ's human nature, as complementary aspects of a single revelation; the aim of the biblical interpreter was to ascend from the literal or manifest meaning of the text to the divine 'word' which lay concealed within it.⁶ An alternative, though equally logocentric view of the biblical text is to be found in the works of John Chrysostom. Resisting the Alexandrian emphasis on the essential opacity of Scripture, Chrysostom represents the task of the Christian preacher as that of propagating a biblical utterance in which God had already condescended to make himself plain to men.⁷ In both these cases, it will be noticed, the author's conception of the nature of the Bible is inseparably linked to his vision of the role of the modern

expositor; despite the differences between Alexandrian and Antiochene hermeneutics, it was apparently accepted in both quarters that the biblical 'word' laid certain obligations on the intelligent reader with regard to its further communication. To what extent that assumption was endorsed by western writers of the fourth and fifth centuries is hard to judge, since none of them was concerned to set out a detailed theology of the biblical 'word'. The idea of the Bible as the 'verbum dei', though widely attested in the works of Latin authors, seems rarely to have formed part of any coherent theory of scriptural meaning and interpretation.⁸ In seeking to explain this apparent omission one ought perhaps to glance at the iconography of a class of late-fourth- and fifth-century mosaics and reliefs in which Christ is presented in the act of delivering his 'law', in the form of a book-roll or codex, to Peter and the other apostles ('Dominus legem dat').⁹ The designation of Scripture as 'lex' had been current in Latin from at least the time of Tertullian.¹⁰ What is notable about these figurative representations is the way in which they identify Christ's teaching - and (more generally) the significance of his life, passion and resurrection - with the contents of a text. In the case of one sarcophagus from Arles, interest in the written word extends to an additional scene, in which twelve individuals are shown in various attitudes of Bible-study.¹¹ Since the tomb in question is that of a bishop, it is likely (as H.-I. Marrou has argued) that both this scene and the main one depicting Christ as law-giver were meant to portray aspects of the pastoral function of the deceased.¹² The idea of Christ as the institutor of a text would, of course, have been perfectly compatible with that of the Bible as the 'word' of God. Both allowed a place to the post-apostolic teacher as

mediator of the divine message. Even so, it is possible that western 'litterati' of the late fourth and fifth centuries were more interested than some of their Greek forerunners had been in the nature of their personal relation to the Bible as reading-matter.¹³

For the Bible was also a **text to be read**. Already in the works of Cyprian of Carthage (+258), the word 'lectio' appears in three distinct senses in connection with Scripture.¹⁴ It is used of the biblical text as a whole and of two kinds of reading, broadly definable as 'public' and 'private'. Public readings were those given in the course of the liturgy, usually by a person trained for the task (the 'lector'). The practice of such readings may be traced back to the earliest Christian communities, and ultimately to Jewish precedent. "Till I come," says St. Paul, instructing the leader of a newly-formed church, "give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine."¹⁵ 'Reading', in this context, may be understood as referring to public readings of the Old Testament and, perhaps, of Paul's own writings. A work of Justin Martyr offers evidence of liturgical readings of prophetic and apostolic writings in the Roman church of the early second century; in this case, it is clear that the readings were associated with the celebration of the Eucharist.¹⁶ By the end of the fourth century the normal practice was to have three readings at the Eucharistic service; the first from the Old Testament, the second from the New Testament apart from the Gospels, the third from the Gospels.¹⁷ The Gospel reading would be followed by a sermon delivered by the bishop (or, in the East, by a priest), often in the form of a homily on one or more of the biblical

texts previously recited.¹⁸ This close association between lesson and sermon - in Pauline terms, between 'reading' and 'exhortation' or 'doctrine' - provided a natural paradigm for the activity of the Christian orator/writer.¹⁹

For the majority of Christians in late antiquity, liturgical 'lectiones' and 'sermones' provided the sole means of contact with the Bible; their experience of the text was an aural one, enhanced by such visible representations of biblical scenes as they may have found displayed on the walls of their local church or on other Christian buildings and monuments. For the minority who could read, however, the Bible was literally an open book. Unlike some other religions, Christianity did not restrict access to its sacred writings to the priesthood. Nor, except at the time of the Great Persecution, was any consistent attempt made to keep the Bible from non-believers.²⁰ It follows, then, that anyone who wished to consult the text for himself was free to do so - provided, of course, that he could find a copy. For reasons that are still not entirely clear, the production of biblical texts never became a major part of the business of the Roman book-seller. In the earliest Christian communities of which any bibliographical trace remains, copying was done privately, often by persons who lacked any calligraphic training.²¹ Later, texts were produced by 'librarii' attached to particular churches, by monks, and by copyists retained by wealthy individuals.²² A certain number of texts, it seems, did become available for public sale.²³ If the prospective Bible-reader was moderately well-off and lived near a major centre, his acquisition of all or part of the Bible would thus have been a fairly straightforward affair. Even

if he were less materially fortunate, he might hope to make an autograph copy on a borrowed exemplar.²⁴ The final option open to him was to resort to a church outside the times of major assemblies. Even the smallest churches could be expected to have the books necessary for the liturgy, while in some of the larger ones special arrangements were made for personal Bible-study and meditation.²⁵

At least in certain circles, the idea that personal study of the Bible should be a feature of the life of any literate Christian took hold at an early date. Origen, it may be noted, consistently cites St. Paul's instruction to "give attention to reading" in a context that shows that he had in mind a personal commitment to study the text rather than the provision of public lessons.²⁶ This change of emphasis did not mean that the pastoral implications of I Timothy 4,13 were immediately lost from sight; according to Origen, the benefits derived from intensive study of the Bible were to be communicated to other believers. It does, however, signal a development in Christian spirituality that was to have far-reaching consequences, not least in the area of literary ideology. Cyprian promoted the habit of Bible-reading ('lectio') as an integral part of a Christian lifestyle that also included prayer ('oratio'), meditation on the things of God ('dominica cogitatio') and good works ('salutaris operatio').²⁷ Origen made that habit central to an ambitious project of spiritual perfection culminating in contemplation ('theoria') and knowledge ('gnosis') of God and his mysteries.²⁸ In order to be in a condition to understand the Scriptures, the reader had to lead a rigorously ascetic life. He also had to pray constantly for the gift of divine illumination. Considered

in itself, Bible-study involved memorisation of the text, comparison of parallel passages, distinction of various levels of meaning. With it was connected the practice of meditation: Origen linked the Pauline summons to 'reading' with the psalmist's commendation of the man who 'meditates day and night on the law of the Lord', thus ensuring that the Christian ideology of reading inherited one of the most characteristic elements of the Jewish approach to the sacred text.²⁹ Origenist principles of ascetical gnosis played an important part in the formation of early Egyptian monasticism.³⁰ With the rapid spread of monastic ideas in the second half of the fourth century, those principles came to bear on the thought and spirituality of western Christianity. At the same time, the diffusion and translation of Origen's writings ensured that the main elements of his theory of Bible-study were directly available to Christian 'litterati' in the western half of the empire.³¹

As reading-matter, the Bible was to be carefully distinguished from other kinds of text. It was a **unique piece of writing**. Under the title of 'scriptura', the books of the Old and New Testaments enjoyed a privileged status for which there was no obvious precedent in classical literature. The realm of literature ('litterae') had previously been divided into many spheres or 'genera litterarum'. Never before, however, had one body of writing been so clearly detached from the rest. Henceforth there would be 'scriptura'... and other kinds of writing. Christians used the word 'scriptura(-ae)' (Gk. 'graphē') without qualification; it meant the canonical books of the Bible and nothing else besides. If a piece of writing fell outside the canon then, irrespect-

ive of its quality, it was not 'scriptura' (except, of course, in a trivial sense). By the mid-fourth century the idea of a closed canon of Scripture would have been widely accepted, even if disagreement was still possible with regard to the inclusion or omission of particular ancient books.³² On the other hand, the distinction between biblical and extra-biblical writings was not always expressed with absolute clarity. In a Latin book-list of c.365, the contents of the Old and New Testaments are followed immediately by the works of Cyprian.³³ Christian authors of this period were inclined to regard themselves as direct heirs of the prophets and apostles and to claim divine inspiration for their works.³⁴ With rare exceptions, however, none would have proposed to enlarge the sphere of Scripture to include recent or contemporary Christian writing.

A further perception of the Bible is indicated by its designation as 'litterae sacrae/sanctae/divinae'.³⁵ Whereas the exclusive use of the term 'scriptura' was clearly intended to dissociate the text in question from all others, the qualified use of 'litterae' (Gk. 'grammata') would seem to allow for an analogy between biblical and secular literary resources. Some such analogy is already implicit in St. Paul's tribute to his disciple Timothy, 'quia ab infantia sacras litteras nosti'.³⁶ The Bible was **the basis for a Christian culture**. A cultured person, in the terms coined by Cicero and thereafter conventional, was one 'cum Latinis tum etiam Graecis litteris eruditus'.³⁷ In the highly literate urban society of late-republican Rome, a man had to be well read in order to be considered well educated; the terms 'litterae' and

'doctrina' were virtually synonymous.³⁸ With the subsequent constitution of a new and theoretically separate body of 'letters' in the form of the Old and New Testaments, it became possible to conceive of a new kind of 'eruditio' or 'doctrina'. The 'vir divinis litteris eruditus' makes his first regular appearances in Christian Latin writing towards the end of the fourth century.³⁹ Significantly, his arrival coincides with the opening of an important debate on Christian education. In the rapidly-expanding church of the Theodosian age there was a growing need for informed religious instruction. Decisions had to be made as to the proper means of recruiting and training future Christian teachers. Many different approaches were possible.⁴⁰ The one point that was generally agreed was that any truly Christian education ought to be founded on the Bible.

*

What was the ideal relation between the 'word' of God and the words of men ?

How was the Bible to be read, and in what manner did private reading conduce to public teaching ?

What status was to be ascribed to 'new' Christian writing ?

What were the aims and conditions of a Christian culture based on biblical 'letters' ?

These are some of the more obvious questions raised by a survey of the terms in which Latin 'litterati' of the late fourth century habitually referred to the Christian book par excellence. The task of the historian of early Christian literary ideology is to find out what answers were given to them at the time. All Christian writing, it may be supposed, depended in some measure on a set of assumptions concerning the writer's approach to the biblical text and the relation of his own experience of that text to those of his readers. (With the necessary substitutions, this statement would also hold good for the various forms of Christian public speech.) In the following sections of this chapter a series of attempts will be made to discern the particular assumptions held by - or, in some cases, recommended to - Gallic writers of the late fourth and fifth centuries.

I. A biblical education and its corollaries: Hilary and Priscillian

From the account of recent events produced soon after 400 by Sulpicius Severus and centred on the affairs of the Gallic church, two figures emerge with special clarity: those of Hilary, bishop of Poitiers from c.350 to 367/8 and champion of 'orthodox' Trinitarian theology, and of Priscillian, the Spanish preacher and 'heretic' executed at Trier in 385/6.⁴¹ The juxtaposition of these two individuals has a highly determined sense in the narrative of Sulpicius, for whom all history had exemplary and eschatological significance.⁴² Their association in the title of this section is motivated by considerations of a different order. In the history of Christian Latin literature, the works of Hilary and those attributed to Priscillian are among the first major texts that may be claimed to represent - or to have helped in any way to form - the attitudes held by Gallic 'litterati' of the late fourth and early fifth centuries towards the Bible, its study, and related kinds of Christian utterance.

Apart from a fragment from a work of Reticus of Autun (fl. 330) on the Song of Songs, Hilary's commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel (composed c.353-355) is the earliest extant piece of Christian exegetical writing, in Latin, by a Gallic author. It is also the first essay in sustained biblical interpretation in the Latin language.⁴³ The lack of a preface makes it difficult to judge for what audience the In Matthaeum was conceived. Hilary evidently had in mind a reader of some discernment: in style, structure and substance the work is at several removes from the

sort of homily that he may be assumed to have provided for his regular congregation at Poitiers.⁴⁴ As a literary performance, it demonstrates as clearly as one could wish the influence of conventional procedures of reading and writing on what its author terms 'lectio evangeliorum'.⁴⁵ Although almost nothing is known of Hilary's career prior to his episcopate, it is certain that he received a good traditional education.⁴⁶ Jerome speaks of him as a 'vir eloquentissimus'.⁴⁷ For Augustine, he represented the type of Christian writer who successfully 'spoiled the Egyptians', or converted his pagan culture to Christian use.⁴⁸ The nature of this conversion has been exposed with exemplary thoroughness by J. Doignon, with reference to a number of texts from the period to 356.⁴⁹

Despite its value as a document of early Latin biblical exegesis, the In Matthaeum contains little of direct concern to the student of literary ideology. At the moment at which it was conceived, the question of the proper relation between the author's personal Bible-study and his public activity as a writer and teacher had not yet (it seems) assumed critical importance. In this respect, a dramatic change was to be wrought by Hilary's exile (c.356-360) and participation in eastern theological controversy.⁵⁰ The rigours of contemporary Trinitarian debate may well have convinced him of the necessity of an authentically biblical presentation of Christian doctrine.⁵¹ It is apparent, in any case, that his sojourn abroad brought him into contact with the ideas of Greek Christian writers concerning the study and interpretation of Scripture, especially those of Origen.⁵² The fruits of this experience are to be seen in the two most important works from

the later period of his life, the De trinitate and Tractatus super psalmos.⁵³ In both works, one finds expressed a coherent view of the role of the Christian writer/orator considered **as a reader of the Bible**.

Hilary's plainest statements regarding the study of the Bible appear in his writings on the Psalms. Although occasional allusions to a preceding 'lectio' would seem to indicate that some (at least) of the Tractatus were originally composed for a liturgical setting,⁵⁴ the text that has reached us was evidently intended to assist personal Bible-reading. In a carefully written introduction, based largely on similar passages in the Psalter-commentaries of earlier Greek exegetes (Origen, Eusebius of Caesarea), Hilary deals with the difficulties likely to confront the novice reader: the title(s) of the Psalms, their authorship, arrangement, modes of signification and vocabulary are all discussed and explained.⁵⁵ Simultaneously, he warns against excessive confidence in the approach to these texts, citing Isaiah 29,11-12 on the blindness of the Jewish people, to whom God's revelation had become like the words of a sealed book: "When men give it to one who can read, saying, 'Read this,' he says, 'I cannot, for it is sealed.' And when they give the book to one who cannot read, saying, 'Read this,' he says, 'I cannot read'." The quotation was chosen by Origen to underline the obscurity of the Scriptures; Hilary gives it greater prominence, setting it before rather than after a parallel verse from Revelations and adding a comment of his own:

Imperitia legendi et intellegendi librum prophetiae sub
persona utriusque hominis monstrata est, cum intellegentia
docti ad legendum, signaculum clausi mysterii non adeuntis,

illius indocti ignorationi per commune utrique intellegendi inopiam comparetur.⁵⁶

Faced with the mysteries of the Old Testament, the ordinary 'litteratus' was no better off than his unlettered counterpart: the key to understanding the Psalms was Christ, of whom they were a prophecy. A similar point is made in the introduction to Hilary's commentary on Psalm 118. Following a Jewish tradition, Origen and other Greek expositors had interpreted the alphabetical arrangement of this psalm as a sign of its propaedeutic function.⁵⁷ The 'elements' of the alphabet corresponded to the 'elements' of a Christian education (Gk. 'stoicheia' in both cases). Thus Hilary:

Hanc igitur extitisse causam existimo, ut per litteras totius istius psalmi ordo decurrat: ut, sicut parvuli et inperiti et ad legendum inbuendi haec primum, per quae sibi verba contexta sunt, litterarum elementa cognoscerent, ita et humana ignoratio ad mores, ad disciplinam, ad cognitionem dei per hunc singularum litterarum octonarium numerum ipsis velut infantilis doctrinae initiis erudiretur.⁵⁸

For Origen and the majority of his successors, the instructional value of the psalm consisted primarily in its ethical content.⁵⁹ Hilary, however, also posits the need for a special biblical 'literacy', the rudiments of which could be learnt from the present text. In his view, the 'litteratus' who attempted to read the Bible without a proper knowledge of its technical vocabulary was like a semi-educated person grappling with a literary text, one of those 'qui simpliciter ea, quae inter manus sibi inciderint, legunt' without any appreciation of the finer nuances of language.⁶⁰ Part of the value of Psalm 118 lay in the semantic distinctions which it offered between such apparently similar

notions as 'lex', 'iustificatio', 'praeceptum', 'testimonium' and 'iudicium'.

The ability to understand the Bible was not a product of secular literary education, but a spiritual grace. In the introduction to his commentary on Psalm 134 Hilary (again following Origen) makes a comparison between Bible-study and herbalism. Just as a person unskilled in the use of natural remedies might walk through a field full of useful herbs without realising what was there, so the negligent reader of the Bible was bound to mistake the value of its contents. By contrast:

si calens ad cognitionem dei auditor ac lector adstiterit et
cui frequens lectio et spiritalis gratiae donum scientiam
diudicandi singula intellegendique praestiterit, mirabitur
omnia atque his secundum naturales eorum virtutes et
efficientias utetur.⁶¹

Hilary does not seem to have regarded this 'scientia intellegendi' as a special charisma bestowed on certain individuals. (In general, he shows only limited interest in the Pauline notion of a distribution of charismata.) The possibility of obtaining an understanding of the Scriptures was assured for all men by the general gift of the spirit at Pentecost.⁶² In order to live 'according to the spirit', however, it was necessary to overcome the body's gravitational tendency towards sin⁶³ - a fact which is reflected in the consistently ascetic tone of the Tractatus super psalmos. In the passage just quoted, the science of biblical interpretation appears as the effect of a spiritual gift ('donum spiritalis gratiae') combined with a constant habit of reading

('frequens lectio'). Elsewhere that habit is presented as part of a virtually monastic regime of Christian life.⁶⁴

The basis for a 'monastic' reading of the Psalms had been laid in the first half of the third century by Origen, Hilary's chief source for the Tractatus.⁶⁵ The importance of this particular biblical text in the development of fourth-century monastic spirituality is indicated by the Letter to Marcellinus written some years earlier by his eastern counterpart in the struggle against Arianism, Athanasius of Alexandria.⁶⁶ It is perhaps significant that the man whom Sulpicius was to present as the spiritual father of St. Martin of Tours - one of the 'founders' of western monasticism - also appears as the pioneer of Latin commentary on the Psalter. Hilary is the first Latin writer to make consistent use of the expressions 'meditari'/'meditatio' in connection with the Bible, a practice inspired by certain verses in the Psalms.⁶⁷ The expression 'vacare lectioni divinae' is first attested in his commentary on Psalm 118.⁶⁸ In his introduction to Psalm 62, he sketches a picture of the psalmist in the desert:

Non occupatus, non impeditus communium rerum et saeculi
curis, sed in illo solitudinis suae quieto otiosoque
secreto, cum nihil in oculos, in mentem offensionis
incurreret, solis est divinis studiis negotiosus.⁶⁹

This vision of quiet (Bible-)study - recalling the author's depiction of his own situation in the prologue to the De trinitate⁷⁰ - provides a model of the monastic 'otium' increasingly sought after in the West from the mid-fourth century onwards.

The purpose of studying the Bible was to acquire an education. The expressions most commonly used by Hilary of this educational activity are 'erudire' and 'eruditio'. In classical Latin the word 'eruditio' (like 'doctrina') could refer (1) to an actual process of education, or (2) to the personal culture resulting from such a process.⁷¹ Hilary appears to have conceived of biblical 'erudition' primarily in the former sense. 'Erudire' is the verb which he uses, following Old Testament precedent, of God's action in educating man.⁷² Although the grammatical subject of 'erudire' may be one of the prophets or apostles or the inspired text of Scripture, the ultimate agent is always God himself. Even where the verb appears in a passive construction its implication is clear. The '**homo doctrina dei eruditus**' - the '**ideal**' Christian according to Hilary - was not simply a man versed in divine learning, but a man taught by God.⁷³

Since the main object of man's divine education was to bring him to a knowledge of God ('cognitio dei'), the process of 'eruditio' was essentially one of revelation. In former times, God had revealed himself directly to Moses and the other patriarchs. One of the very few instances of Hilary's use of 'erudire' in a secular context occurs in relation to Moses, whom he describes (after Acts 7,22) as '**omnibus Aegyptiorum doctrinis eruditus**'. The phrase appears in Book Five of the De trinitate in the course of a demonstration of the following thesis:

A deo discendum est, quid de deo intellegendum sit, quia non nisi se auctore cognoscitur. Adsit licet saecularis doctrinae elaborata institutio, adsit vitae innocentia, haec quidem proficient ad conscientiae gratulationem, non tamen cognitionem dei consequentur.⁷⁴

Moses was the type of one possessed of 'saecularis doctrina' whose education in divinity ('quid de deo intellegendum sit') could only be accomplished by God himself: 'Dixit autem dominus ad Moysen: "Ego sum qui sum..."'.⁷⁵ These are the very words (Exodus 3,14) which, by his own account, had so impressed Hilary on his first encounter with the Old Testament and had led to his 'conversion'.⁷⁶ Recording the stages of that 'conversion' in the prologue to the De trinitate, he uses the word 'doctrina' rather than 'eruditio'.⁷⁷ Later in the same work, however, he reverts to the terminology of 'eruditio' in a 'sermo temerarius' designed to invalidate the claims of the Arians. God, he says, had first endowed him with rational life, then educated him: 'ad cognitionem me tui sacris... per servos tuos Moysen et profetas voluminibus erudisti'.⁷⁸ It may be instructive to compare the cases of Moses and of Hilary, as presented by the latter. Both were men of secular learning who had come to a knowledge of God as a result of divine action. But whereas God had appeared to Moses in the burning bush, he had revealed himself to Hilary through the Scriptures. This contrast enables one to make a general point: the importance of the Scriptures, for Hilary, lay in the fact that they were the principal medium of divine 'eruditio' in the present age. By failing to understand what was written in the Bible, the Arians had missed their education.⁷⁹

The Bible not only taught one to know God, it taught one how to 'confess' him. Though he generally spoke in (or of) the person of Christ, the psalmist could also adopt the character of the 'ideal' Christian;⁸⁰ in which case, a major purpose of the psalm was to provide

what Hilary calls 'eruditio confessionis', or instruction in the manner of confessing one's faith.⁸¹ Thus he writes of Psalm 63: 'Existimus... cuiusque sancti in domino sperantis confessionem praesenti psalmo contineri.'⁸² The ability to make such a confession is here seen as the mark of a 'mens per deum erudita': the '[vir] sanctus in domino sperans' was, in effect, none other than the 'vir doctrina dei eruditus'. As well as providing a basis for the interpretation of certain kinds of psalm, the link between 'eruditio' and 'confessio' may be said to command Hilary's overall sense of a Christian literary vocation. His description of the psalmist as a 'vir doctrina dei eruditus et in altum humilitatem cordis sui erigens... divinae operationis praeconia proferens'⁸³ might equally well be applied to the author of the De trinitate, since (as he presents it) this work was both testimony to his own divine education and confession of his faith.⁸⁴ **As the means of his erudition had been essentially biblical, so were the terms of his confession;** his aim was to speak of God in God's own words, 'de deo locuturi dei verbis'.⁸⁵

The most pathetic expression of Hilary's ideal of dependence on the Bible occurs in Book Two of the De trinitate where he summons St. John the Evangelist as a witness against the Arians. John is introduced as a 'piscator inlitteratus... egens, ignotus, indoctus, manibus lino occupatis, veste uvida, pedibus limo oblitis, totus e navi.'⁸⁶ As a type of the Christian orator and writer he was at the opposite end of the social and educational scale from David or Moses. Yet he had been privileged to recline on Christ's breast at the Last Supper, to receive the words of God ('eloquia dei') and to reproduce them in a form which

Hilary, in common with many other 'litterati' of his time, considered admirable: 'In principio erat verbum...'⁸⁷ Hilary urges the reader to imitate John: 'in domino Iesu exemplo Iohannis, ut haec possimus sentire et conloqui, adhibemus.'⁸⁸ The apostle's role as transmitter of the 'eloquia dei' is closely paralleled by that of the ideal Christian orator/writer outlined in the introduction to Psalm 13, on the pretext of I Peter 4,11: 'qui loquitur, tamquam eloquia dei.' Here Hilary considers what should be the proper style of expression adopted by Christians, 'loquentibus nobis ea, quae didicimus et legimus.'⁸⁹ Although the particular case contemplated is that of the Christian preacher, the scheme is the more general one implied elsewhere in his work by such paired expressions as 'sentire-loqui', 'credere-
praedicare', 'sensus-sermo', 'eruditio-confessio'. As J. Fontaine has observed, the ideal of Christian utterance expressed in this passage is essentially that of a 'retractatio verborum dei'.⁹⁰ The author's sense of reliance on the (written) word of God receives theological justification in the image of the Christian as an instrument of the Spirit: 'sumus enim quoddam sancti spiritus organum, per quod vocis varietas et doctrinae diversitas audienda est.'⁹¹

Although not developed by Hilary in this context, the image of the Christian as an instrument ('organum') is highly suggestive. In the first place, it suggests a certain continuity between the work of the Spirit in former times and its operation in the author's own day - a continuity on which Hilary insists elsewhere.⁹² Used in a specialised sense, 'organum' meant cithar. The cithar was the symbol of David's prophecy ('species prophetiae').⁹³ In the verses which appear at the

head of the unique manuscript of Hilary's Hymns the psalmist is described as 'Felix propheta... primus organi / In carne Christum ymnis mundo nuntians'.⁹⁴ It would seem natural to take the phrase underlined as implying primacy and/or priority in the art of (Christological) hymnody exemplified by the poems which follow.⁹⁵ The fact that the author of those poems could not claim to prophesy in precisely the way that David had is no obstacle to this interpretation. As evidence that Hilary could understand 'prophecy' in a general sense (comparable to that of the verb 'nuntiare' used in the couplet just quoted) one might cite his comment on St. Paul's statement regarding the prophetic gift: 'vel per profetiam, ut per doctrinae intellegentiam intellegamur ex deo eruditi.'⁹⁶ Defined in these terms, 'profetia' became an alternative expression for 'praedicatio' or 'confessio' and was easily accommodated within the author's general scheme of Christian education and utterance. The manner of the Spirit's speaking 'per nos' was indeed different from its manner of speaking 'per David'. The main difference, for Hilary, lay in the dependence of the modern Christian speaker and writer on the text of the Bible as the medium both of his erudition and of his confession or 'prophecy'.

*

Hilary died in 367 (or possibly 368). According to Sulpicius there then followed a period of grave menace and great upheaval within the church: 'sequuntur tempora aetatis nostrae gravia et periculosa, quibus non usitato malo pollutae ecclesiae et perturbata omnia.'⁹⁷ The cause of the disturbance was a 'gnostic heresy' discovered in the 370s and associated with the name of Priscillian.⁹⁸

Priscillian was a Spaniard. The initial reports of his activity came from southern Spain; he himself was elected bishop of Avila in Lusitania (in 381); the history of 'Priscillianism' after 386 is centred on the north-eastern Spanish province of Galicia. From an early stage, however, the Priscillianist 'affair' was a matter of concern in Gaul, especially in Aquitaine.⁹⁹ Aquitanian bishops were present at the Council of Saragossa in 380 when the activities of Priscillian and his colleagues first became an issue. Their case was subsequently heard by an ecclesiastical tribunal at Bordeaux (384/5) and by a civil court at Trier (385-6). A number of high-ranking Aquitanians allied themselves to the 'heretics'; one of them, Euchrotia, was executed as a result. Beyond these circumstantial connections, there are signs of an important community of interests between the first 'Priscillianists' and certain elements of Christian society in south-western Gaul. Sulpicius describes Priscillian as a person of good birth and considerable wealth, clever and well educated, with strong ascetic inclinations:¹⁰⁰ it is a description which (allowing for a few polemical touches) would fit a whole 'class' of eminent Christians of this period, including Sulpicius himself, his friend Paulinus, and many of the Gallic correspondents of Jerome. In addition, he provides the Spaniard with a literary persona

of wide applicability: 'Priscillianus... multa lectione eruditus, disserendi ac disputandi promptissimus.'¹⁰¹ It was doubtless partly because Priscillian's ambitions and accomplishments were so unexceptional that his case aroused such interest in Gaul. In view of that interest, some space must be allowed in the present study for an account of 'Priscillianist' ideas of Christian reading-and-writing. Evidence for those ideas is supplied by eleven tractates found in a manuscript of Würzburg at the end of the last century, now commonly ascribed to Priscillian or one or more members of his immediate circle, and by the set of Pauline canons produced by Priscillian and revised by 'Peregrinus'.¹⁰²

For the author(s) of the tractates, the statement 'it is written' ('scriptum est'), so frequent in the New Testament, implied a basic truth about the Christian religion: **the Christian's life was to be lived in constant confrontation with a text.** God might of course have revealed himself and his purposes directly to all men, as it were viva voce, but had particular reasons for doing so through the medium of Scripture:

Potuit enim sermo divinus, quoniam ipsius erat omne quod dixerat, tamquam ab se loquens non scribtum ab alio dicere, sed ex se ipse proferre: dicens autem scribtum esse, necessario proponens nobis legendi sollicitudinem, et suam de quo profetatum fuerat gloriam et illius qui profetaverit debitam posteritatis gratiam non omisit.¹⁰³

The divine revelation appeared in written form for the glory of God and his prophets - and the Christian was put under the obligation of reading. The idea of the 'sollicitudo' or (more typically) 'labor

legendi', of the work involved in Bible-study, is fundamental to the asceticism of the tractates.¹⁰⁴ It was through the work of reading Scripture and applying its precepts that the Christian approached the state of perfection. Christ's injunction 'scrutate scripturas' (John 5,30) is recalled at several points. The Priscillianist reader was required to recognize that the biblical text (especially that of the Old Testament) was not intended to provide matter for general speculation ('tamquam ad doctrinam publicae opinionis'); rather, its purpose was to provide an education for those who took it seriously ('ad doctrinam nostrae eruditionis').¹⁰⁵

The expressions 'eruditio' and 'erudire', as used in the tractates, are to be understood in a sense broadly similar to the one which they carry in the writings of Hilary: that is, they refer to a process of divine education effected through the Scriptures. The Priscillianists describe themselves as 'eruditi per scribturas' and as 'divinarum scribturarum edocti verbis'.¹⁰⁶ They contrast their Christian erudition with an earlier secular education, now regarded merely as a set of mental gymnastics.¹⁰⁷ If God is only exceptionally the grammatical subject of 'erudire' in the tractates, the divine agency in man's erudition is never in doubt. Hilary's statement that a knowledge of God was to be obtained from God alone ('qui nisi per se cognitus non est') is repeated verbatim in the tenth tractate, where it is related to the didactic function of the Psalms.¹⁰⁸ Along with these similarities of usage, however, there is an important difference of connotation. The Hilarian 'eruditio', though necessarily biblical, did not imply any particular hermeneutics. In a passage in the first tractate, in which

the author distances himself from the opinions of certain heretics, appears the following statement: 'Illis ergo confusio sit omne quod legerint, nobis eruditio intellegere quod scribturn est.'¹⁰⁹ Besides the familiar play on 'legere'-'intellegere',¹¹⁰ one notes the close liaison established between (divine) education and the **correct** understanding of Scripture. In fact, the heretics in question are convicted of a specific fault: that of taking literally passages in the Bible that required a spiritual interpretation. The necessity for such an interpretation is a recurrent theme in all the tractates. Among the more frequently quoted verses are 2 Peter 1,20 ('omnis profetia interpretaationem indiget') and Romans 7,14 ('lex spiritalis est'). It is in connection with the search for spiritual meanings that the expressions 'intelligentia', 'intellegere' and 'intellectus' are most often found. For the Priscillianists, one might say, the work of Bible-study was a 'labor (intel)legendi'.

More particularly, it was a work of allegoresis. To explain why scriptural teaching was expressed in allegorical form, the author of the tractates draws heavily on Chapters 18 - 20 of Book One of Hilary's De trinitate. Phrases which Hilary had coined to justify his use of comparisons in describing the nature of the Godhead are here applied directly to the biblical text. In the process of adaptation a contrast is set up between, on the one hand, the incapacity of ordinary human intelligence ('infirmetas/inbecillitas humanae intelligentiae') and, on the other, the quest for divinely-inspired understanding ('opus/iter divinae intelligentiae') in which the Christian was encouraged by the oblique style of the Bible.¹¹¹ To judge from the exegesis offered in

the tractates, the chief means to such 'divine intelligence' lay in allegorising the Old Testament in a consistently moral sense.¹¹² The purpose of these books was to confirm the ascetic in his rejection of the material world and his aspiration to spiritual union with God. The subject of all Scripture was thus ultimately man himself: 'inter divinatorum deambulacra verborum omnis scriptura homo totus est.'¹¹³ The aim of the enlightened reader, whom 'a constant faith had called to the study of truth', was to enter into the sense of Scripture through an understanding of its spiritual significance.¹¹⁴ He would then become like the tree growing by water (Psalm 1,3) and bring forth fruits of 'divine erudition'.¹¹⁵

In the absence of any detailed analysis of the principles and sources of the exegesis contained in the Würzburg tractates, various attempts have been made to define the nature of Priscillianist Bible-study. For Schatz (followed by Vollmann and Goosen) such study is to be located in a tradition of Christian gnosis of the kind elaborated by Clement of Alexandria and Origen in the late second and early third centuries A.D. and subsequently adopted, in a simplified form, by the Egyptian monks and their western imitators.¹¹⁶ Lorenz rejects this hypothesis in favour of a more conventional view of Priscillianist exegesis as the underpinning of a radical (i.e. metaphysical) dualism such as might have warranted the original charge of heretical gnosticism.¹¹⁷ That charge is again dismissed by Chadwick, who emphasises the occult tendencies of the tractates, assigning their author a place "in the long line of Christians who sought for hidden mysteries in the Bible or in nature."¹¹⁸ Fontaine, meanwhile, has made a case for seeing

Priscillian as an example of the late-antique 'mousikos anēr' in search of religious knowledge ('gnosis' in a "broad and fundamental sense").¹¹⁹

Whatever the precise motives for Priscillianist preoccupation with the Scriptures, it offended certain members of the Spanish and Gallic hierarchies in the late fourth century. According to Sulpicius, the mixture of rigorous asceticism and intense Bible-study was so distasteful to one of Priscillian's opponents, bishop Ithacius of Ossonuba, that he took to persecuting all those 'quibus aut studium inerat lectionis, aut propositum erat certare ieiuniis, tamquam Priscilliani socios aut discipulos'.¹²⁰ One reason for this official displeasure may be suggested by Sulpicius' use of the term 'disciples'. As well as being dedicated ascetics who assembled to study the Scriptures, Priscillian and his associates were professed teachers. The very existence of the majority of the Würzburg tractates is testimony to the fact that, for their author at least, the idea of a biblical education also implied the existence of a human 'magisterium'.¹²¹ In these works, as in the writings of Hilary, one senses a necessary connection between 'eruditio' and 'confessio' or 'praedicatio'. Here again, Hilary's example seems to have counted for something. It is with the help of further phrases from the De trinitate that the Priscillianist preacher justifies his intention of expounding Exodus: since, he says, 'all Scripture requires interpretation' and the human mind is incapable of receiving divine precepts except through allegory, 'necessarium est nobis propter vos humilitatem sermonis nostri in ea quae inenarrabilia videntur extendere'.¹²² The role assumed by the author of the tractates is, in fact, the one assigned to the 'doctor' in Priscillian's Pauline canons: 'Quia

opus doctoris lectio sit atque evangelii praedicatio' (citing I Timothy 4,13: 'Dum venio attende lectioni, exhortationi, doctrinae').¹²³ It has been suggested that some of the Priscillianists, even as laymen, may have taken the ancient title of 'doctor' (corresponding to the lay 'didaskalos' of earlier Christian communities) and that the seventh canon of the Council of Saragossa (380), restricting the use of this honorific to those 'quibus concessum est' (i.e. bishops ?), was directed against them.¹²⁴ One may suppose, in any case, that the willingness of these individuals to put themselves forward as specially-qualified teachers contributed not a little to their unpopularity with the ecclesiastical establishment.

The reasons for such dangerous outspokenness are to seek in the Priscillianist conception of the life of the spirit. Divine or spiritual understanding of the kind recommended in the tractates was to be expressed not only in virtuous actions but also in speech. The principle of spiritual eloquence is stated in the following Pauline canon: 'Quia spiritus dei omnia scrutetur et noverit etiam alta dei, quae spiritalis tantummodo intellegant et loquantur' (citing I Corinthians 2,12-13: 'ut sciamus quae a deo donata sunt nobis quae et loquimur non in doctis humanae sapientiae verbis sed in doctrina spiritus').¹²⁵ It is fully expounded in the first and third tractates, with respect to the practice of reading apocrypha, for which the Priscillianists had been severely criticised. As Babut and others have observed, this predilection for apocryphal literature (especially 'New Testament' apocrypha) was more than just an enthusiasm for the records of early Christian asceticism.¹²⁶ Without rejecting the idea of a biblical

canon, the Priscillianists clearly believed that the privilege of prophesying ('prophetare'), proclaiming ('praedicare'), confessing ('confiteri') or talking about ('loqui') God-in-Christ was not confined to the authors of the Old and New Testaments. The Lord had promised that he would pour out his spirit on all flesh and that all men would prophesy.¹²⁷ St. Paul had said that all men should confess the Lord. If men remained silent, the very stones would speak!¹²⁸ For the author of the tractates, the inference to be drawn from such biblical statements was that the age of 'prophecy' (in a broad sense) was not closed: 'quia [deus] nullius prohibens aut intercipientis spiritus certo fine conclusit, sed ut omnes qui crede<re>nt eum libere de eo loquerentur indulxit.'¹²⁹

The Priscillianist insistence on 'free speech about God' is the sign of a more charismatic theory of Christian 'praedicatio' than was normal or acceptable in the final quarter of the fourth century. It may also have implications for the history of Christian literary ideology. On the view expressed in the first, second and third tractates, writings transmitted under the name of any 'prophet, apostle, angel or bishop' were to be accepted as forming a part of divine 'scripture', provided that they contained nothing inconsistent either with the canonical writings or with the teaching of the church.¹³⁰ Though the author makes no explicit claims for the status of his own writings or those of other members of his group, it seems clear that the Priscillianist conception of Christian 'legenda' involved a less radical distinction between biblical and extra-biblical writing than was currently taken to be implied by the term 'scriptura(e)'.¹³¹ One should bear in mind that at

the time when the tractates were composed, written collections of sermons were still a rarity in the Latin-speaking world. Hilary's Tractatus super psalmos may have been the only example of such a work known to the Priscillianist author/editor. Scripture, he believed, was what God had ordained should be written down by his prophets, to his **and their** greater glory.¹³² It is hard to resist the suspicion that the first Priscillianist writers - of whom there are known to have been several besides the heresiarch himself¹³³ - expected a certain share in that glory.

*

Considered in terms of their posthumous reputations, Hilary and Priscillian have little in common. One was revered as a 'confessor' and, in due course, as a 'doctor' of the Latin church, while the other was condemned as a heretic. Comparison of their respective theological positions would almost certainly reveal as many divergences as it would similarities. Notwithstanding these differences, the preceding analyses would appear to indicate an important measure of conformity in their attitudes towards biblical 'lectio' and the responsibilities of the Christian orator/writer. That conformity should probably be seen as the product of several factors, including: the impact of Hilary's work in Priscillianist circles, the influence of eastern (i.e. ultimately Alexandrian) ideals of ascetical gnosis, a shared background of western

ideas of Bible-study and Christian utterance. Hilary and 'Priscillian' concur:

- (1) in dissociating Bible-study ('lectio') from secular literary studies,
- (2) in promoting a concept of divine education ('eruditio') effected through the Scriptures and in no way comparable (except by opposition) with secular learning,
- (3) in emphasising the part played in this education by human application ('frequentia lectionum', 'labor legendi'), without excluding divine grace,
- (4) in locating the activity of 'lectio' within the context of a broadly ascetic, potentially monastic lifestyle, and
- (5) in linking the experience of personal, biblically-mediated 'eruditio' with an obligation and/or compulsion to utter what one had learnt ('confessio', 'praedicatio', even 'profetia').

This consensus may now be used as a basis for further comparisons.

II. A new kind of writer: Jerome and the Christian 'litterati' of southern Gaul, c.392-412.

The literary labours of the Priscillianists, together with those of Hilary and other Gallic and Spanish authors of the fourth century, are commemorated in a catalogue produced by St. Jerome in 392/3, known as the De viris illustribus.¹³⁴ There is perhaps no document in the history of early Christian literary ideology more important than this one, for it represents the first serious attempt to define a Christian activity of reading-and-writing. According to the preface, the stimulus for the work had been given by a Spaniard, one Nummius Aemilianus Dexter.¹³⁵ As a model, the latter had proposed the bio-bibliographies of Suetonius:

Hortaris, Dexter, ut Tranquillum sequens ecclesiasticos scriptores in ordinem digeram et, quod ille in enumerandis gentilium litterarum viris fecit inlustribus, ego in nostris faciam...¹³⁶

Suetonius, Jerome points out, had been able to draw on extensive historical resources. His only guide was Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History. One of Eusebius' aims had been to provide a record of all those "who in each generation were the ambassadors of the word of God either by speech ('agraphōs') or writing ('dia sungrammatōn')".¹³⁷ The men whose lives and works he celebrated belonged to a continuous tradition of Christian testimony reaching back to the first apostles. Jerome, too, begins with the apostles. He also follows Eusebius in taking the individual's relation to the 'word of God' as the basis for

his catalogue:

...id est, ut a passione Christi usque ad quartum decimum
Theodosii imperatoris annum omnes qui de scripturis sanctis
memoriae aliquid prodiderunt tibi breviter exponam.¹³⁸

The words underlined imply a significant limitation with respect to the Eusebian programme and a no less significant modification with respect to the Suetonian one. Where Eusebius had looked for 'ambassadors' of the divine word, Jerome seeks writers 'de scripturis': both the **act of writing** and the **fact of the biblical text** are thus given added prominence. This new emphasis on the textual or literary aspect of the Christian tradition is, of course, consistent with the project of a Suetonian bibliography. It is noticeable, nonetheless, how Jerome resists the implied symmetry between the design of his work and that of his Roman predecessor. Whereas Suetonius is said to have given an account of the 'viri inlustres gentilium litterarum', his own subjects are described simply as 'nostri', or as 'ecclesiastici scriptores'. The reasons for this reticence are easily guessed. Pagan culture ('litterae' in the broad sense) was a product of the achievements of many men and was possessed by each man in turn. When Christians spoke of 'litterae nostrae' they almost invariably meant the Bible. It was thus impossible to be a 'man of Christian letters' in the way that one might be a 'vir litterarum'.¹³⁹

On the basis of the remarks quoted above, one might expect Jerome's catalogue to offer so many examples of a new kind of writer: the writer 'de scripturis'. One reason why it cannot be read this way emerges from

the closing section of the preface, where the author promises to refute those critics 'qui putant ecclesiam nullos philosophos et eloquentes, nullos habuisse doctores'.¹⁴⁰ This apologetic aim is manifestly at odds with the project previously outlined, since it implies an acceptance of conventional (i.e. classical) categories of culture.¹⁴¹ In his eagerness to demonstrate how many Christian experts there were in traditional fields of learning, Jerome appears to have lost sight of his intention of illustrating a distinctively Christian expertise. Alternatively, he may never have meant to produce an extensive list of Christian writers of the type first described. After all, how many such writers had there been ? Of all those included in his catalogue, the one whose literary output fits most conveniently under the rubric 'de scripturis' appears prominently in last place: Jerome himself.¹⁴²

The final notice of the De viris illustribus marks the acme of a unique career in Latin letters.¹⁴³ When he wrote it, Jerome was in his mid-forties.¹⁴⁴ For six years he had been living in a monastery at Bethlehem founded on the wealth of his companion and disciple, the Roman matron Paula. Before that he had spent five years at Rome, cultivating a circle of aristocratic patrons and preaching asceticism. The position of influence and relative security which he had come to occupy in the capital - and which, following a brief discomfiture, he had been able to re-establish in the East - was due in large part to his success as a Christian writer. The stages in his adoption of this role cannot now be determined with any certainty. The offspring of a wealthy Dalmatian family, educated at Rome by some of the foremost teachers of his day, it is likely that he was originally destined for a career in the imperial

service. At some point in his early twenties, he converted instead to the new style of ascetic Christianity then becoming fashionable in the West. At around the same time, he began to study and collect the works of Christian writers - at first mainly Latin authors, then Greek as well. By the mid-370s he boasted a substantial 'library' of Christian texts, the major part (it seems) consisting of exegetical works.¹⁴⁵ The first extant writings from his own hand are letters, including a number on ascetic themes. As early as c.375, however, he had experimented in biblical interpretation, producing a highly allegorical commentary on the prophet Obadiah that he was to re-read with some embarrassment in later life. Subsequent study under such masters as Apollinarius and Gregory of Nazianzus, frequentation of the works of Origen and other Greek exegetes, and (most remarkably) the acquisition of Hebrew ensured that the first of his biblical works to receive wide publicity were of a different quality. The late 380s and early 390s saw the production of commentaries on Ecclesiastes, four of St. Paul's letters and five of the minor prophets, together with a set of 'Hebrew questions' on Genesis - works distinguished by their author's philological acumen and unusual knowledge of the prior exegetical tradition. While in Rome, Jerome also undertook a revision of the Latin text of the Gospels, at the instigation of pope Damasus (or so he was to claim). This seems to have led naturally to the project of a revised Old Testament based on the Greek of the Septuagint, which in turn was superseded by that of a new translation based on the Hebrew original. With the addition of the Chronicle, some letters, three short monastic Lives, two polemical works, various biblical 'instrumenta' and a number of translations, these are

the works advertised under the author's own name at the end of his catalogue of 'ecclesiastici scriptores'.

The image which Jerome presented of himself as a Christian writer - in the De viris illustribus, in his letters, in the prefaces to his major works - owed much to the example of the most famous of all Greek writers 'de scripturis', shortly to be notorious: Origen.¹⁴⁶ The notice devoted to the latter in the De viris illustribus is the longest on any post-apostolic writer, despite the omission of the list of his writings which Jerome had included in an earlier letter to Paula.¹⁴⁷ Origen offered Jerome a model of what he calls the 'studium scripturarum'.¹⁴⁸ His commitment to Bible-study was legendary:

Refert [Ambrosius] numquam se cibos Origene praesente sine lectione [sc. scripturarum] sumpsisse, numquam venisse somnum, nisi a fratribus aliquis sacris litteris personaret, hoc diebus egisse vel noctibus, ut et lectio orationem susciperet et oratio lectionem.¹⁴⁹

The alternation of prayer ('oratio') and Bible-reading ('lectio') was to be a feature of the monastic lifestyle as it developed in the West. In Origen's case - and this is why his example was so important to Jerome - the prayerful study of Scripture was accompanied by a constant effort to expound its sense. The lasting result of that effort was the gigantic corpus of his biblical writings, which Jerome divides into the three categories of scholia, homilies and 'tomes' (i.e. full-scale commentaries).¹⁵⁰ By the sheer volume of his literary output Origen had outdone the Greek 'Chalcenterus' and the Latin Varro; indeed he had written more than any individual could possibly read.¹⁵¹ In his early writings,

Jerome was unstinting in his praise of Origen.¹⁵² He published translations of some of his homilies, made constant use of his biblical interpretations (as he was to do throughout his life), and followed him in the choice of forms for his own compositions, 'imitari volens ex parte Origenem, quem post apostolos ecclesiarum magistrum nemo nisi imperitus negat.'¹⁵³ In facing his detractors he was comforted by the thought that Origen, too, had been subjected to criticism.¹⁵⁴

This close association of his own literary persona with that of the great Alexandrian exegete was to cost Jerome dearly in later years. After joining in the chorus of condemnation of Origen's theological opinions, he would be confronted with the evidence of his own enthusiasm for his work. In a letter of 399 addressed to friends at Rome and meant for general diffusion he justifies himself as follows:

Vult aliquis laudare Origenem ? Laudet, ut laudo: magnus vir et vere martyr filius Alexandriae ecclesiasticam scholam tenuit succedens eruditissimo viro, Clementi presbytero; voluptates in tantum fugiit, ut zelo dei, sed non secundum scientiam ferro truncaret genitalia; calcavit avaritiam; scripturas memoriter tenuit et in studio explanationis earum diebus sudavit ac noctibus. Mille et eo amplius tractatus, quos in ecclesia locutus est, edidit; innumerabiles praeterea commentarios, quos ipse appellat tomos et quos nunc praetereo, ne videar operum eius indicem texere. Quis nostrum tanta potest legere, quanta ille conscripsit ? Quis ardentem in scripturis animum non miretur ? Quodsi quis Iuda zelotes opposuerit nobis errores, audiat libere:

interdum magnus dormitat Homerus,
verum operi longo fas est ignoscere somnum.¹⁵⁵

This is one of two occasions on which Jerome applies an expression used by Horace of the process of poetical composition to the exposition of

Scripture, as if to indicate that the ancient 'ars poetica' had now been replaced by an 'ars scripturarum'.¹⁵⁶ The position occupied by Homer in the former art, he implies, was held in the latter by Origen. Jerome's miniature 'laudatio' of the Christian ascetic and writer may also be read as an 'apologia' for his own life's work. The image of the Christian exegete as one who laboured 'night and day' in the study of the Scriptures had been promoted by Origen himself.¹⁵⁷ Jerome combined this ideal of commitment to the biblical text with a strong and highly personal sense of the dignity of the Christian author; the evidence of Origen's 'studium scripturarum' lay in what he had published. (Hence Jerome's repeated emphasis on the volume of his output 'de scripturis'). In highlighting the Alexandrian's activity **as a writer**, his Latin successor took an important step towards establishing a literary ideology that was both **biblically orientated** and **ascetically motivated**. By creating such an ideology, he not only ensured the high valuation of his own literary labours but also exercised a more general influence on the ways in which western 'litterati' regarded the activity of reading-and-writing.

Among the first to be exposed to Jerome's literary and ascetic propaganda were a number of readers in Gaul. A recently-discovered letter of his to Aurelius of Carthage, congratulating the latter on his consecration as bishop (c.392), includes the following suggestion:

Quia orante te non parva de scripturis sanctis composuimus, si tibi placet et commodum videtur, fac quod alii de Gallia et alii de Italia fratres tui, sancti episcopi, fecerunt, id est mitte aliquem fidum tibi qui unum annum hic faciat me exemplaria tribuente et deferat ad te cuncta quae scripsimus.¹⁵⁸

It would appear, then, that one or more Gallic bishops had already sent a copyist to Palestine to secure texts of Jerome's writings. The example of a Spaniard, Lucinus of Baetica, shows that private persons might also take this step.¹⁵⁹ From 395 onwards a succession of Gallic travellers would visit Jerome in Bethlehem, some returning with copies of his works.¹⁶⁰ Otherwise, the normal method of obtaining such copies was by application to one of the author's 'literary agents' in Rome;¹⁶¹ Gallic Christians who visited Rome on personal or public business would thus have had access to the complete 'list' of Jerome's works, as advertised in the concluding entry of the De viris illustribus.¹⁶² By c.403, the idea that any literate Christian living in Gaul could be unaware of Jerome's reputation was considered astonishing.¹⁶³

There are at least two reasons why Gallic Christians might have been expected to respond to Jerome's impassioned advocacy of a new kind of reading-and-writing. In the first place, the province was renowned for the quality of the literary and rhetorical education provided by its schools, particularly those of Bordeaux and the south-west, and for the achievements of their alumni.¹⁶⁴ The date of the De viris illustribus coincides almost exactly with that of the death of Ausonius, a former teacher at Bordeaux and the most famous poet of his day. A few years earlier, in 389, Theodosius' victory over the usurper Maximus had been celebrated in a panegyric delivered to the senate at Rome by another Aquitanian, Pacatus, the latest in a long line of Gallic orators whose talents had brought them before emperors.¹⁶⁵ To such men, books were food and drink. (According to Symmachus, the main difference between

Ausonius' table and his poem on the Moselle was that the latter offered a wider variety of fish.)¹⁶⁶ They prided themselves on their reading, and made essay of their ability as writers at the least opportunity. For those among them who were serious about their Christianity - and many now were - a literary programme as skilfully and energetically promoted as Jerome's could never have been a matter of indifference. Jerome's own seriousness, moreover, was of precisely the type to appeal to persons who (perhaps) had read Hilary's treatises on the Psalms, responded to his 'disciple' Martin, and been fascinated by the character and career of Priscillian. Herein lies the second major reason for the impact of his writings in Gaul. At a time when educated Christians in all parts of the western empire were becoming increasingly susceptible to the attractions of an ascetic lifestyle, Jerome offered to make asceticism intellectually respectable, even exciting. He had done so for a group of aristocratic ladies in Rome in the 380s, by turning Bible-study into something between a parlour-game and an academic discipline.¹⁶⁷ Now that he had moved to Bethlehem, a man of Augustine's genius could conceive a desire to join the circle of his acquaintance.¹⁶⁸ For Gallic 'litterati' of the early 390s, 'quibus [et] studium inerat lectionis [et] propositum erat certare ieiuniis',¹⁶⁹ the opportunity of becoming an associate or disciple of Jerome, if only by correspondence, would have been an extremely interesting one. We shall next consider the case of one who took that opportunity.

1. A biblical poet: Paulinus of Bordeaux

One of the best, certainly the most conspicuous of Ausonius' literary protégés was Meropius Pontius Paulinus.¹⁷⁰ The scion of a wealthy Aquitanian family, born in 353/4, educated at Bordeaux, Paulinus qualified for the senate by the exercise of a minor Roman magistracy and, as a young man, served as governor of Campania. On relinquishing this charge in the mid-380s he married a Spanish noblewoman, Therasia, and settled in Aquitaine. A few years later he underwent a spiritual conversion and was baptised by bishop Delphinus of Bordeaux. In 390, he and his wife went to live in northern Spain. Following the death of their only son, they liquidated their estates and adopted an ascetic lifestyle; at the same time, Paulinus gave up the practice of secular poetry - a decision which he justified in a celebrated poetic correspondence with Ausonius. On Christmas Day 393, he was ordained priest by Lampius of Barcelona, the immediate successor in that see to the bishop Pacianus whose son had recently received the dedication of Jerome's De viris illustribus. Some weeks later, shortly before quitting Spain to take up residence at Nola in Campania, he wrote to the author of this work, expressing a wish to be instructed by him in the art of scriptural interpretation.¹⁷¹ No doubt Paulinus had already seen a number of Jerome's works and knew how to recommend himself to a latter-day Origen. He may also have had certain ideas of his own about the business of Christian reading-and-writing. Before looking at Jerome's reply to his letter, it is worth trying to establish what these ideas may have been.

In addition to his letters to Ausonius, a number of other works of Paulinus are customarily assigned to the period prior to his departure from Spain in the spring of 394. These include three poems based on Psalms 1, 2 and 137 and a fourth - the so-called Laus Iohannis - in which the author relates the early life of John the Baptist as recounted in the Gospels.¹⁷² Broadly speaking, all four compositions belong to the poetical genre of the biblical paraphrase inaugurated in Latin by the Spanish poet Juvencus, whose Evangeliorum libri IV appeared in the time of Constantine. The origins and motivation of this kind of biblical poetry are the subject of a modern debate into which it is not proposed to enter here.¹⁷³ It seems reasonable to suppose, however, that the emergence of biblical paraphrase in the fourth century is to be related in some way to the experience of western 'litterati' in coming to terms with the (Old Latin) Bible. To say that biblical verse-paraphrase was initially intended to provide a **substitute** for an aesthetically unacceptable prose-text is doubtless to oversimplify the situation. Instead, one should probably allow that works of this kind were written by and for persons who had a definite interest in studying the Bible itself, but who, in doing so, were prepared to resort to other texts as well. This is the impression obtained from a study of Paulinus' theory and practice of the genre.

The opening lines of the Laus Iohannis (vv.1-8) announce two closely related ideas - of God as the source of eloquence, and of the poet's need for divine 'irrigation' - that are amply developed in Paulinus' later poetry.¹⁷⁴ The former idea is also invoked in a contemporary letter to Amandus, a priest of Bordeaux. According to the

author, Amandus had misled the bishop of Bordeaux, Delphinus, into thinking that Paulinus could be expected to produce a piece of edifying writing on the Scriptures, 'aliquem... de scripturis sermonem'.¹⁷⁵ Why else, he asks, would Delphinus request such a thing, 'nisi tu illi persuasisses... meum quoque os a domino inter ora mutorum et infantium... fuisse reseratum ?'¹⁷⁶ Paulinus duly excuses himself, by writing two letters whose strongly biblical flavour fully justifies - and was perhaps meant to satisfy - his correspondents' expectations.¹⁷⁷ It is possible, of course, that Delphinus had just such an epistolary composition in mind when making his request. Paulinus' self-consciousness is easier to understand, however, if one assumes that he had been asked for a piece of formal exegesis, of a kind to which Aquitanian readers might already have grown accustomed through contact with the works of Hilary and Jerome. If this were the case, the fact that he chose to confine himself to a modified form of the conventional 'officium epistolare',¹⁷⁸ would be of considerable significance. Though much of Paulinus' literary oeuvre is lost, there is no sign that he ever composed an extended biblical commentary. In 392/3 he clearly had no pretensions in this area. Even so, the letters to Amandus and Delphinus are interesting as expressions of the author's sense of an obligation to acquit himself as a Christian writer. To that extent, they may serve as background to his experiments in biblical verse-paraphrase.

The Laus Iohannis qualifies as a 'sermo de scripturis' in a very particular sense.¹⁷⁹ As Paulinus describes it, his purpose was not to compose an original work but to recount the merits of the Baptist as foretold by the prophets and commemorated by the evangelists: 'Nec nova

nunc aut nostra canam; dixere prophetae / Cuncta prius sanctique viri sermone soluto...' (vv.14-15). His personal contribution would be to versify the Gospel narrative for the greater delight of the reader.¹⁸⁰ This clear insistence on the writer's secondary position with respect to the authors of Scripture is without precedent in Juvenecus' poem;¹⁸¹ it is perhaps most easily explained as the corollary of a theory of Christian education and expression of the type elaborated by Hilary of Poitiers. In due course, the Old Testament figure whom Hilary had claimed as the inventor of Christian hymnody is co-opted as the patron of poetic paraphrase:

Sic (nam magna licet parvis, antiqua novellis,
 Perfecta indoctis conferre, aeterna caducis)
 Inspirante deo quicquid dixere priores
 Aptavit citharis nomen venerabile David,
 Consona caelesti pangens modulamina plectro. (vv.20-24)

Paulinus thus creates a role for the Christian poet which, mutatis mutandis, was comparable to that of the divinely-inspired author of the Psalms.¹⁸² Such an idea was both a natural development of classical notions of poetic inspiration and consistent with the Christian conception of a community of spirit between commentator and biblical author (as expressed by Hilary, among others). It may be noted, however, that Paulinus does not join the author of the Priscillianist tractates in his assertion of an essential unity of inspired utterance and hence of 'scriptura' - including, in principle, contemporary Christian writing. Checking a digression later in the poem, he makes an absolute distinction between the status of his own writing and that of Scripture: 'Nunc coeptum repetamus iter; mortalia dicat / Pagina mortalis, dominum divina

loquantur' (vv.177-178). The poet's text, though capable of carrying a celestial theme, remained separate from and subordinate to the divine text on which it was based.

The Laus Iohannis contains a hint that Paulinus intended to compose other, more ambitious poems of a similar kind 'firmato robore quondam' (v.175).¹⁸³ With the exception, however, of the three poems on the Psalms mentioned earlier his extant works include no further essays in this genre. Before leaving Spain in 394, he had already composed the first of the birthday-poems ('natalicia') that he was henceforth to offer annually to St. Felix at his shrine at Nola. These poems form the bulk of his poetic output as we have it. Though often biblical in content and inspiration, they are in no sense biblical paraphrases. Ought one therefore to suppose - and attempt to explain - a definite decision on his part not to proceed with the kind of writing 'de scripturis' exemplified by the Laus Iohannis ? We shall return to this question when considering the poet's correspondence with Jerome. Whatever answer is given must take account of Paulinus' continuing interest in the relation between Bible-study and poetic composition, as attested in the letter and poem that he addressed to a certain Jovius in c.400.¹⁸⁴

Jovius was a relative of the author, probably a fellow-Aquitanian, a landowner, perhaps of senatorial rank. His accomplishments as a poet and philosopher were sufficient to impress his correspondent. He was a Christian, though not of the dedicated sort.¹⁸⁵ This last fact is borne out by two characteristics on which Paulinus expands at some length: his attachment to pagan philosophy and his failure, hitherto, to turn his

eloquence to the service of Christ. Letter 16 calls for the 'conversion' of the philosopher and of the writer: 'verte potius sententiam, verte facundiam... ut sis dei philosophus et dei vates'.¹⁸⁶ These two conversions presuppose a third: that of the reader. In Poem 22, Paulinus demonstrates how Jovius' aspirations to philosophical knowledge and poetical fame could be satisfied by close attention to the Bible. In the first place, Scripture provided an education superior to that offered by any philosophical school: from Genesis, he would learn about the 'causae rerum et primordia mundi', from the prologue to St. John's Gospel 'quid sit vel quid fuerit prius aevo', from the events of the Old and New Testaments that God alone was responsible for the material order.¹⁸⁷ Secondly, Scripture presented a choice of poetical subjects superior to any in pagan mythology: 'maior rerum tibi nascitur ordo' (v.11). Paulinus' own versification of the truths contained in the Bible was doubtless intended as an example of what might be achieved in this area. He also makes several more specific suggestions:

cane grandia coepta tonantis,
Scribe creatarum verbo primordio rerum
 Et chaos ante diem primaeque crepuscula lucis.
 Quaeque dehinc variis elementa per omnia saeculis
 Dicta vel acta deo per sancta volumina disces,
 Quae docuit tabulis legalibus indita Moyses
 Aut evangelici quae lex nova testamenti
 Signat, operta prius retegens mysteria Christi,
 Tunc te divinam vere memorabo poetam... (vv.149-157)

The question as to precisely what form these poetical developments should take is left open. Paraphrase of the type earlier practised by Paulinus himself is not excluded. The image of Christ as the key to the mysteries of the Old Testament (which Paulinus would have found in the

introduction to Hilary's commentary on the Psalms) suggests the possibility of an exegetical mode of presentation.

The poetic activity here recommended by Paulinus has a manifestly propaedeutic function. Jovius, though persuaded of the value of the Bible, was not disposed to read it.¹⁸⁸ The root of his reluctance, it may be guessed, was a dislike of the style of the Old Latin text. Rather than propose a revised (e.g. poetic) version of the same text as an alternative object of study, Paulinus appeals to another aesthetic instinct: if the Bible was initially unattractive to Jovius as a reader, he should approach it as a writer.¹⁸⁹ It is an interesting solution to what must have been a common problem.¹⁹⁰ Paulinus' own essays in biblical poetry, it is worth recalling, ostensibly belong to the period in which he first applied himself seriously to the Scriptures. Might one not discern a parallel between the progymnasmatic function of paraphrase and related 're-writing' exercises in Roman education and the function of poetical 'retractatio' in the Paulinian scheme of Bible-study ? The analogy - which may help to explain the absence of biblical poems from Paulinus' later repertoire - is not, of course, an exact one. The primary object of scholastic progymnasmata was to improve the student's linguistic skills and generate verbal 'copia', not to facilitate the mastery of a text.¹⁹¹ On the other hand, the various techniques of re-writing were also practised by authors of mature years and, in late antiquity, constituted one of the major forms of intercourse with classical literature. Paulinus' epitome of Suetonius' De regibus had been highly praised by Ausonius, himself the author of many poetical 'retractationes' of other men's works.¹⁹² If experience of such com-

positions had taught him that one of the surest ways of gaining familiarity with any text (the Bible included) was by summarising, paraphrasing or otherwise re-presenting its contents, he may have decided to pass the lesson on to Jovius and others like him.

Paulinus' concern was not, however, simply to introduce his correspondent to a new kind of text. What he advocated was nothing less than a new style of (literary and religious) life: 'His precor, his potius studiumque operamque legendis / Scribendis vove' (vv.148-149).¹⁹³ Like the Priscillianists, Paulinus saw Bible-reading as conducive to a kind of Christian gnosis; when that reading was coupled with writing, the writing also became a part of the gnostic project.¹⁹⁴ Thus, in the poem to Jovius, the choice of a new subject-matter for versification is associated with a new receptivity to divinely-inspired knowledge (vv.19-20: 'suscipe materiam, / Divinos concipe sensus') and the poet's communion with the sacred text subordinated to a process of personal sanctification. If Jovius had won fame as a writer on pagan themes:

Quanto maior ab his cedet tibi gloria coeptis,
In quibus et linguam exercens mentem quoque sanctam
Erudies laudemque simul vitamque capesses ?
Dumque leges catus et scribes miracula summi
Vera dei, propior disces et carior ipsi
Esse deo, quem dum credens miraris, amare
Incipies et amando deum redamabere Christo. (vv.26-32)

Confronted with vv.29-32, one modern scholar refers to the lack of classical precedent "for this rather oriental-seeming view of writing one's way into a right relationship with the divine."¹⁹⁵ In fact, the idea expressed is merely a development, consistent with Paulinus'

cherished notions of Christian friendship (here understood in the strongest sense, of friendship with Christ), of a thought contained in vv.27-28 concerning the rewards of this kind of literary activity. These are: linguistic exercise, 'erudition' of the mind/soul, glory, and (eternal) life. The ideal of the 'mens sancta', considered as the product of a process of 'eruditio' at once literary and spiritual, is evoked in a long passage (vv.64-78) which, at first sight, has no clear connection with the rest of the poem. Later, reference is made to the mind of Jovius as illuminated by divine light (v.83), potent with God (v.161), and as a source of enrichment for Paulinus (v.162). Although there is an obvious precedent for such statements in the Hilarian theory of the 'mens per deum erudita', it is remarkable how much emphasis Paulinus places on the personal activity of the individual 'litteratus': the subject of 'erudire' in v.28 is the human reader-and-writer.

Assuming that views similar to those expounded in the letter and poem to Jovius were already held by Paulinus at the time of his writing to Jerome, the position which he occupied at that date with respect to Bible-study and Christian writing might be tentatively summarised as follows: (1) the Christian 'litteratus' had a duty to adapt his talents to his religion, even if he were not immediately obliged to attempt biblical commentary; (2) one possible role was that of biblical poet; (3) the practice of biblical poetry, especially on the part of a novice reader of the Bible, was to be recommended as a means to Christian gnosis.

How far Jerome was conscious of these attitudes in drafting his 'reply' to Paulinus' in the summer of 394 is open to conjecture. As already mentioned, the letter which he had received from Barcelona apparently contained a polite request for instruction in the science of Scripture. It would also have included some mention of the writer's recent ascetic resolve and (perhaps) of his forced ordination. If it were written in the style of Paulinus' other letters of this period (such as those to Amandus and Delphinus) it may have given an impression of his ability to produce a text constructed largely out of biblical quotations and allusions. In any case, Jerome admits to receiving further details about his character from a mutual acquaintance then resident in Bethlehem, Eusebius of Cremona.¹⁹⁶ The latter would certainly have told him of Paulinus' reputation as a poet, even if he knew nothing of his latest experiments in biblical paraphrase. Whatever the sum of Jerome's information on his new correspondent, it is likely that his main concern in replying to him was to win another wealthy and potentially influential patron, while at the same time making full use of Paulinus' name to publicize his own enterprise as a biblical writer.

Jerome's Letter 53 is a manifest of the author's abilities as a biblicist, an invitation to serious Bible-study, and an introduction to the canonical books of the Bible (as which, it has been preserved in a number of biblical codices).¹⁹⁷ It is also, unmistakably, a caution against certain kinds of Bible-related literary activity. In the opening sections (1-5), Jerome insists on the difficulty of understanding the Bible and the impossibility of doing so without proper guidance. His point is essentially the one that Augustine was to make a

few years later in the prologue to his De doctrina christiana, namely that the 'science of Scripture'¹⁹⁸ was to be acquired - like any other science - through a process of human instruction.¹⁹⁹ Subsequent sections offer a conspectus of the books of the Old and New Testaments, designed to emphasise their complexity - and, no doubt, to impress by its virtuosity (8-9). The general part of the letter concludes with an exhortation, typical of Jerome's manner, to live in constant communion with the sacred text (10), followed by a number of observations relating to the personal qualities and ascetic 'propositum' of his correspondent. Of special interest for the history of ideas of Christian reading-and-writing is a short passage (6-7) that forms a kind of satirical coda to the author's remarks on biblical instruction.

Jerome begins by comparing the science of Scripture to the mechanical and liberal arts. No-one who wished to become expert in any of the latter, he states, would expect to do so without the help of a teacher (6,2: 'absque doctore non possunt esse, quod cupiunt'). There was no reason why the situation should be different with respect to biblical expertise. And yet many people - according to Jerome, everyone (7,1: 'universi') - thought that they could profess the science of Scripture without any special training. The absurdity of their claim is underlined by a quotation from Horace:

quod medicorum est
Promittunt medici, tractant fabrilia fabri.

Sola scripturarum ars est, quam sibi omnes vindicant:

Scribimus indocti doctique poemata passim. (6,2 - 7,1)²⁰⁰

There follows a series of caricatures of persons who presumed to teach this science (or art) before they had learnt it themselves (7,1:'docent antequam discant... disserunt aliis, quod ipsi non intellegunt'). The presumption was particularly flagrant in the case of educated persons like Jerome himself:

Taceo de meis similibus, qui si forte ad scripturas sanctas post saeculares litteras venerint et sermone composito aurem populi mulserint, quicquid dixerint, hoc legem dei putant nec scire dignantur, quid prophetae, quid apostoli senserint, sed ad sensum suum incongrua aptant testimonia, quasi grande sit et non vitiosissimum dicendi genus depravare sententias et ad voluntatem suam scripturam trahere repugnantem. (7,2)

The sense of this complaint emerges from a parallel passage in the earlier Commentary on Ephesians, where Jerome compares his own activity as a biblical interpreter with another kind of Christian writing, considered as of little worth:

Sed cum aliud sit proprios libros componere, verbi gratia, de avaritia, et de fide, de virginitate, de viduis, et super unaquaque materia testimoniis scripturarum hic inde quaesitis eloquentiam iungere saecularem, et pene in communibus locis pompeticum iactare sermonem: aliud in sensum prophetae et apostoli ingredi, intellegere cur scripserit, etc.²⁰¹

The targets of his criticism were certain persons who, shirking the true duty of the biblical expositor, were content to re-use scriptural words and phrases ad libitum in order to compose works on edifying topics. Such works were not written 'de scripturis'; they were ultimately separate from the biblical text ('proprius libros'). In his letter to Paulinus, Jerome compares them with Homeric and Virgilian centos (7,3).

The mis-appropriation of Virgil had been carried so far that it was now possible to read him as a Christian poet!²⁰²

Much has been written in the attempt to identify the victims of Jerome's satire in this passage of Letter 53.²⁰³ There seems little doubt that Ambrose is implicated, as one who (on his own recent admission in the preface to the De officiis) had been compelled to teach what he had still to learn²⁰⁴ and who, moreover, had composed works on most (if not all) of the topics mentioned in the Commentary on Ephesians.²⁰⁵ Other more or less likely subjects are Rufinus, the younger Melania, the anonymous critic of the Adversus Iovinianum mentioned in Letter 50, and Augustine. Since it was pointed out that some of the verses quoted by Jerome as examples of the 'Christian interpretation' of Virgil also appear in the late fourth-century Cento of Proba, it has been customary to identify the latter with the 'garrula anus' mentioned in the tirade against amateur biblicists (7,1).²⁰⁶ Most recently, it has been proposed that by "reading between the lines" of this letter one might see it as a warning to Paulinus against the kind of biblical verse-paraphrase that he had lately begun to practise.²⁰⁷ This possibility depends on two assumptions: (1) that at the time of writing, Jerome was fully informed of the nature of his correspondent's poetical projects, and (2) that the section of his letter satirising those who 'expound what they do not themselves understand' may be read as, inter alia, a critique of that kind of poetry. The first of these points may be more readily granted than the second. While it is likely that Jerome's choice of poetic quotations was calculated to impress one who had a

reputation as a poet, there is no evidence at this stage of any more direct interest on his part in Paulinus' activity as a writer.

Jerome's Letter 53 would have found Paulinus at Nola, in southern Italy. From there, in the spring of 395, he wrote a second time to Bethlehem. As in the previous case, our only evidence for the contents of his letter is provided by Jerome's reply (Letter 58 in his collected correspondence). From this we learn that Paulinus had asked for advice on the proper mode of life for one determined to live ascetically while retaining many of his social and domestic attachments. He had also enclosed a copy of a prose-panegyric that he had recently written in honour of the emperor Theodosius. The theme for this work had been proposed by one Endelevchius, a rhetor and fellow-poet, perhaps a Gallo-Roman, then resident in the capital.²⁰⁸ The continuity of Paulinus' relations with Gaul at this time is attested by his correspondence with the Aquitanian Sulpicius Severus: the messenger who carried his letter to Palestine, a certain Vigilantius, was probably a member of Sulpicius' monastery at Primuliacum.²⁰⁹

In his second 'reply' to Paulinus, Jerome deals squarely with the questions affecting his ascetic lifestyle, at the same time discreetly withdrawing a previous invitation to visit him in Bethlehem. Despite this change of heart, he continues to stress the importance of Paulinus' obtaining a proper training in the Scriptures. Complimenting him on his panegyric of the Christian emperor Theodosius, he insists that it was just a beginning:

O si mihi liceret istius modi ingenium non per Aonios montes
et Heliconis vertices, ut poetae canunt, sed per Sion et
Itabyrium et Sina et excelsa ducere scripturarum, si
contingeret docere, quae didici, et quasi per manum mysteria
tradere prophetarum, nasceretur nobis aliquid, quod docta
Graecia non haberet. (8,3)

Here, then, is a clear acknowledgment by Jerome of his correspondent's accomplishments as a poet. There is still no evidence, however, of an interest in poetry per se. The tradition of classical poetry (represented by its mythical topography) provides an appropriate and suggestive analogy for the discipline of biblical interpretation promoted by Jerome, just as Horace's satire on the fashion for poetry had earlier provided an image for the activity of unqualified biblicists. The convergence between the concerns of this letter and those of Letter 53 is even plainer in the following section, where Jerome resorts for a second time to the image of the sealed book of the Apocalypse.²¹⁰ If Paulinus could only learn to unlock that book, he would be capable of a kind of writing to which he, Jerome, could give his wholehearted approval:

si haberes hoc fundamentum, immo quasi extrema manus in tuo
opere duceretur, nihil pulchrius, nihil doctius nihilque
Latinus tuis haberemus voluminibus. (9,2)

The ideal of scriptural learning adumbrated in the previous section is thus shown to have direct implications for Paulinus' personal activity as a writer. Despite the mention of 'finishing touches' ('extrema manus'), it would be wrong to suppose that Jerome envisaged any substantial continuity between his previous literary practice - as demonstrated by the panegyric of Theodosius and such poems as he may

have seen - and his future career as a biblical writer. The 'finishing touches' would only be given when the foundations ('hoc fundamentum') had been laid! Likewise, the 'volumina' with which Paulinus is credited are those which he had yet to produce - and would only produce if he followed Jerome's instructions. If one asks what kind of works these would be, there is only one possible answer: biblical commentaries, 'volumina' or 'tomoi' of the kind composed by Origen and, in Latin, by Jerome. As if to confirm this inference, Jerome then gives a list of previous Christian Latin writers (Tertullian, Cyprian, Victorinus, Lactantius, Arnobius and Hilary), all of whom had fallen short of his ideal of biblical writing. Even Cyprian, otherwise the most favourably judged, is considered unsatisfactory as a model for the would-be Christian writer: 'occupatus persecutionis angustiis scripturas divinas nequam disseruit' (10,1).²¹¹ Earlier in the same letter, Jerome had provided lists of human 'exempla' in various fields of human endeavour: generals, philosophers, poets, historians, orators... bishops, priests and monks. Every discipline, he claimed, had its own set of models: 'habet unumquodque propositum principes suos' (5,2). The discipline of (Latin) Christian writing, it seems, constituted the one exception to this rule. For when it came to providing a model for Paulinus, the author of the De viris illustribus could offer only... himself.

Not surprisingly, Jerome's Letter 58 avoids the blatant self-advertisement of the final notice of his catalogue of famous men. Constrained from mentioning other living persons, he appears to reserve the role of ideal Christian writer for his correspondent: 'nihil in te mediocre contentus sum [he concludes]: totum summum, totum perfectum

desidero' (11,3). Whether, at this point, Jerome truly imagined that Paulinus could fill the role that he had devised for him is extremely doubtful. To what extent were Paulinus' own projects affected by the latest manifestation of Jerome's propaganda for the Christian writer 'de scripturis' ? Scarcely at all, it seems - unless one accepts the hypothesis that his 'renunciation' of biblical verse-paraphrase was a direct result of the correspondence of these years. In the succeeding period, he was to devote himself above all to two kinds of writing: to an epideictic poetry for which Jerome offered no brief, and to an epistolography which, however similar to that practised by the monk of Bethlehem, was scarcely his invention. One may conclude that, while recognizing the significance of Jerome's new initiative in Christian reading-and-writing, Paulinus felt under no obligation to follow it.

2. A biblical epitomator: Sulpicius Severus

Of the Aquitanian intimates of Paulinus who, in his view, had succeeded in the conversion of their 'opera ac studia', the most prominent was Sulpicius Severus, described (in one of his friend's letters) as a 'diligens operarius studiosusque mediator divinae voluntatis et legis'.²¹² The character of 'mediator divinae... legis' is partly explained by an accompanying allusion to Sulpicius' activity as a writer: Paulinus was gratified by every evidence of his 'opera', literary works included ('quae aut operaris in verbo dei aut scribis in spiritu verbi').²¹³ Since the particular literary work here in question

was the Life of Saint Martin, of which Paulinus had just received a copy (397), it is worth considering whether the words underlined may not contain a reflection on the relation between Sulpicius' writing and the text of Scripture. As recent research has confirmed, the author of the Life of Martin was a careful student of the Bible. The presentation of his subject as one 'consertus apostolis ac profetis',²¹⁴ depends upon a sophisticated reading of biblical history;²¹⁵ Martin's affinity with his Old and New Testament predecessors is suggested by countless details of characterisation and mise-en-scene.²¹⁶ Despite the importance of biblical models, however, the texture of Sulpicius' writings is much less obviously marked by the phraseology and imagery of the Bible than the Letters of Paulinus.²¹⁷ It may therefore be significant that the latter should compliment his friend on writing 'in the spirit' of the Bible, without ever implying that his works - or indeed his letters - had a biblical 'flavour'. To judge from his extant oeuvre, Sulpicius did not affect the 'sermo spiritali sale conditus' in the sense in which this expression was understood by Paulinus.²¹⁸ What ideas, if any, did he have concerning the relation between Christian writing and the text of Scripture ?

In addition to the Life of Martin (to which reference will be made in a later section of this chapter) and the three Martinian Letters appended to it, two other works of Sulpicius have survived, both composed c.403-405. One of these, known as the Chronicle, offers a curious glimpse of the Christian writer as biblical epitomator, while the other (the Dialogues) includes a contemporary portrait of Jerome. The relevant passages will be analysed in turn.

The preface to the Chronicle

In a letter to Sulpicius of 404, Paulinus refers to his friend's plans for a new work, 'quo te pro utilitate fidei nostrae inspiciendis et conferendis praeteritorum temporum rationibus occupatum indicasti.'²¹⁹ It is clear that he was engaged on a work of chronography. The motive ascribed to the author ('pro utilitate fidei') betrays a longstanding Christian interest in questions of absolute and relative chronology, evidence for which is to be found in the series of chronicles composed by Greek Christian writers from the early third century onwards.²²⁰ Western concern for such matters seems to have been stimulated by Jerome's translation and continuation of Eusebius' Chronicle, published in 379. A decade before Sulpicius began his own research, a universal history ('historia omnimoda') had appeared from the pen of the Spanish writer Nummius Aemilianus Dexter;²²¹ a work by another of his contemporaries, Quintus Julius Hilarianus, is extant under the title De duratione mundi.²²² The aims of these works were variously apologetic, scholarly and eschatological. They usually began with the Creation (in Eusebius' case, with Abraham) and ended at the present day or the Second Coming.²²³ A notable feature of Jerome's Chronicle - which ended with the battle of Hadrianople in 378 - was the detailed coverage which it gave to the events and personalities of recent history. Sulpicius' Chronicle (to give it the title which it bears in modern editions) is a work in two books, written as a continuous narrative, beginning with the Creation and ending in the year 400. It is distinguished (1) by its strongly eschatological bias, (2) by the author's interest in recent

ecclesiastical history, and (3) by his reliance for much of his narrative on the text of the Bible.²²⁴

Sulpicius' work was known to Gemadius as a 'chronica',²²⁵ and is so described in the one medieval manuscript in which it survives.²²⁶ There is no evidence, however, that this title was chosen by the author or that he expected his composition to be identified as belonging to an established tradition of (Christian) chronography.²²⁷ The difficulty for the modern reader is in deciding just what kind of work he thought he was presenting. The long opening sentence of the Chronicle begins thus:

Res a mundi exordio sacris litteris editas breviter constringere et cum distinctione temporum usque ad nostram memoriam carptim dicere aggressus sum...

These words include several echoes of the preface and introduction to the Breviarium of Eutropius, published c.370.²²⁸ The genre of the historical breviarium, to which that work belongs, has been defined as "a brief Roman history, compiled from two or more sources, commencing with the founding of Rome and brought down to the author's own time."²²⁹ Even if Sulpicius was not imitating Eutropius, he was probably writing under the influence of late-antique authors of historical breviararia. He may have calculated that a breviarium-style opening ('Res a[b]... exordio... breviter constringere... usque ad nostram memoriam carptim dicere') would appeal to readers familiar with such works. Needless to say, the breviarium-prologue is here made to accommodate some unusual elements. Sulpicius proposed a history 'a mundi exordio' rather than 'ab urbe condita'. His work was to exhibit a peculiarly Christian

preoccupation with chronology ('cum distinctione temporum'). Most significant of all, his subject-matter was not 'res romanae' but 'res ... sacris litteris editae'.

A moment's reflection would suggest, of course, that a breviarium-style history 'usque ad nostram memoriam' of events recorded in a work finished several centuries earlier was a practical impossibility. This 'absurdity' is explained away in the second sentence of the preface:

Visum... mihi est non absurdum, cum usque ad Christi crucem apostolorumque actus per sacram historiam cucurrissem, etiam post gesta conectere: excidium Hierosolymae vexationesque populi christiani et mox pacis tempora, ac rursum ecclesiarum intestinis periculis turbata omnia locuturus.

Here Sulpicius accurately summarises the contents of the last fifth of the Chronicle (II 28ff). For this 'continuation' of the history related in the Bible and for the determination of chronology at all points, he had consulted non-biblical sources (as explained in the third sentence):

Ceterum illud non pigebit fateri, me sicubi ratio exegit, ad distinguenda tempora continuandamque seriem usum esse historicis mundialibus atque ex his, quae ad supplementum cognitionis deerant, usurpasse, ut et imperitos docerem et litteratos convincerem.

There is nothing in this statement that is not immediately comprehensible in terms of the project of a Christian historical breviarium 'cum distinctione temporum'.²³⁰

That project is not, however, the only one announced in the preface. Between the breviarium-style opening ('Res a mundi... aggressus

sum') and the explanatory section ('Visum... mihi est, etc. '), there appears a second exordium of a somewhat different kind:

...multis id a me et studiose efflagitantibus, qui divina compendiosa lectione cognoscere properabant, quorum ego voluntatem secutus non peperci labori meo, quin ea, quae permultis voluminibus perscripta continebantur, duobus libellis concluderem, ut paene nihil gestis subduxerim.

The looseness of the connection between this statement and the preceding one is betrayed by the transitional ablative absolute construction ('multis id... efflagitantibus') in which 'id' ostensibly refers to the historical breviarium advertised earlier, while the 'multi' are simultaneously the subject of the succeeding clause announcing a further project. As described, this new project is readily identifiable as that of a **biblical epitome**. The comparison of the dimensions of the biblical text with those of his own work, the renewed emphasis on brevity, locutions such as 'compendiosa lectione' and 'concluderem', the claim to have rendered a service - these would all be signs to Sulpicius' readers that they could expect a work of abridgment of the kind so popular in late antiquity.²³¹

As literary genres, the epitome, historical breviarium and chronicle have one thing in common: all attempt to reconcile brevity with comprehensiveness of treatment. With regard to epitomes, it is usual to distinguish two sub-genres, namely the 'epitoma auctoris' (or abridgment of the work of a particular author, whether or not contaminated by material from other sources) and the 'epitoma rei tractatae' (or summary account of a particular subject-matter based on multiple,

often unspecified sources). In terms of the relation to their source-material, both the historical breviarium and the chronicle can be regarded as species of 'epitoma rei tractatae'. Sulpicius' proposed treatment of the Bible, by contrast, would seem to represent a special, essentially Christian form of the 'epitoma auctoris'. By confining himself to the 'gesta' of the Bible, he assimilated his project to that of the late-antique epitomators of Livy, Sallust, and Valerius Maximus.²³²

In presenting his Christian historical breviarium as, at the same time, a biblical epitome, Sulpicius could claim a double innovation. On the one hand, no previous Christian historiographer had so explicitly identified his subject-matter with the historical content of the Bible.²³³ On the other hand, no previous Latin-speaking student of the Bible had proposed a detailed résumé of its contents, albeit limited to the 'gesta'. Juvenius, it is true, had produced what was effectively a verse-epitome of the 'gesta Christi', while Proba had presented the main events of 'sacred history' in Virgilian dress. Prior to the appearance of Jerome's verbatim revisions and translations, these were the only versions of biblical events besides the Old Latin texts themselves. One might therefore suppose that Sulpicius' epitome was intended to serve one of the functions normally ascribed to biblical verse-paraphrase, namely that of providing an educated public with a version of the Bible better adapted to its literary tastes.²³⁴ There is nothing in the present preface to confirm such an hypothesis. Unlike most ancient epitomators, Sulpicius makes a point of referring his reader back to the 'source' text:

Verumtamen ea quae de sacris voluminibus breviata digessimus, non ita legentibus auctor accesserim, ut praetermissis his, unde derivata sunt, appetantur: nisi cum illa quis familiariter noverit, hic recognoscat quae ibi legerit: etenim universa divinarum rerum mysteria non nisi ex ipsis fontibus hauriri queunt.

His ideal reader, like Paulinus', was also - indeed primarily - a reader of the Bible; the Chronicle, like the Laus Iohannis, presupposes a public whose attention was divided between the 'hic' of one text and the 'ibi' of another.

Considered in the context of the Chronicle as a whole, it is difficult to regard the passage just quoted simply as an exhortation to more diligent Bible-reading, or as a Christian addition to the topics of authorial modesty. If Sulpicius chose to present the reader of his epitome as one already conversant with the sacred text, it is probably because that epitome formed part of a more extensive and highly tendentious account of 'sacred history'. As G.K. van Andel has shown, Sulpicius' stylisation of the history of the world 'usque ad nostram memoriam' was designed to enforce a particular understanding of recent and impending events. Thus the treatment of biblical narrative in Book One of the Chronicle is based on a conception of the exemplary value of the Old Testament stories of rulers and prophets, while most of the events of the New Testament are passed over in silence. In order to carry conviction, the author's interpretation of history required his readers to 'recognize' the majority of events related as being identical with those described in the Bible; without the biblical guarantee of their historicity and significance they would have lost their force as

'exempla'. This still leaves the question of why Sulpicius should have decided on the epitome as the best means of reminding his readers of the course of biblical events. One should perhaps note how the introduction of the idea of a biblical epitome affects his own sense of the propriety of his undertaking, as reflected in the preface. Read in the manner outlined above, the second sentence ('Visum... mihi est, etc.') appears as a justification of the initial project of a historical breviarium based on the Bible. As it stands, however, this explanation follows on directly from the announcement of an epitome, a fact emphasised by the adversative conjunction used: 'Visum autem mihi est non absurdum...'. The absurdity or impropriety that the author has to explain away (or disguise ?) is no longer simply that of a history 'ad nostram memoriam' based on an ancient text, but that of the continuation of a text which, we are now informed, is to be nothing less than a compendium of the Bible itself. By placing his narrative of post-biblical events in direct **textual** continuity with the narrative of events in the Bible, Sulpicius took a deliberate step towards asserting the validity of his own 'concept of history'.

The portrait of Jerome in the Dialogues

Sulpicius presents his biblical epitome as the fruit of much 'labor'. As the terms of Paulinus' letter suggest, part of the 'labor' involved in the Chronicle lay in the comparison of chronologies proposed by earlier writers whose works the author was able to consult. An impression of Sulpicius' activity as a researcher is conveyed by a

reference which he makes to his discovery of a table of the kings of Babylon, 'dum multa evolverem'.²³⁵ The image of the writer as an assiduous reader of other men's books was, of course, a conventional one; Ausonius strikes a similar pose in one of his shorter poems.²³⁶ More generally, allusions to books and writing are a commonplace of Greek and Latin literature from the Hellenistic period onwards.²³⁷ Even so, it is interesting to observe how often Sulpicius draws attention to the material and technical aspects of his own literary activity.²³⁸ For one who expresses a wish not to appear as an 'author',²³⁹ he appears strangely preoccupied with the business of authorship. Though natural to a man of his education and circumstances, such literary self-consciousness may have been enhanced in his case by a desire to present a specifically Christian vision of the traditional pursuits of the Roman 'litteratus'. Paulinus, as already noted, had urged the total conversion of a person's 'opera ac studia', including the 'studium et opera legendi scribendique'. Sulpicius nowhere states the matter in such general terms. Instead, he offers the **example** of one whose learning and literary activity were entirely dedicated to the service of the church: Jerome.

In his Dialogues, Sulpicius introduces a certain Postumianus, an Aquitanian recently returned from a journey to the East. At the request of the author and his friend Gallus, Postumianus tells the story of his travels.²⁴⁰ After taking ship from Narbonne, he and his companions had made landfalls at Carthage, at an unnamed spot on the Libyan coast, and finally at Alexandria. There they had found a situation of great tension, brought about by the recent condemnation of the opinions and

writings of Origen. (The reference to these events enables one to 'date' their arrival in the city shortly after the synod held in early 400 by the local patriarch Theophilus.) Disturbed by the harsh treatment meted out by Theophilus and his colleagues to the pro-Origenist monks of the region, the Gallic travellers had cut short their stay in Egypt and continued overland to Bethlehem. Here they had spent six months as guests of Jerome - with whom Postumianus had become acquainted on a previous tour of the Holy Land - before setting off again to visit the monks of the Upper Thebaid.

Postumianus' stay in Bethlehem provides Sulpicius with a chance to celebrate the character and accomplishments of Jerome. It is apparent straightaway that it was the latter's personality as a writer and scholar, as much as his moral and religious qualities, that he considered exemplary. Postumianus describes his host as a 'vir... praeter fidei meritum dotemque virtutum non solum Latinis adque Graecis, sed et Hebraeis litteris ita institutus... ut se illi in omni scientia nemo audeat comparare.'²⁴¹ Although this statement does not amount to proof that Sulpicius had first-hand knowledge of Jerome's work as a biblical translator and commentator, it is clear evidence of the publicity surrounding that work. The success of Jerome's publishing operation is further attested by what follows. According to Postumianus, it would be surprising if Jerome were not well known in Gaul, 'cum per totum orbem legatur'.²⁴² The mention of Jerome's writings provokes a spirited response from Gallus, who complains of the strictness of the dietary regime proposed in the already-famous Letter 22 to Eustochium. Passing over this matter, Postumianus next pays tribute to

Jerome's integrity - which had made him the enemy of heretics and the clergy alike - and to his orthodoxy. All right-minded persons admired and loved him, while those who treated him as a heretic were out of their minds; his learning was orthodox, his teaching sound. There follows a brief description of his literary lifestyle:

Totus semper in lectione, totus in libris est: non die neque nocte requiescit: aut legit aliquid semper aut scribit.²⁴³

As observed, Postumianus' portrayal of Jerome follows immediately on his report of the Origenist controversy as it affected the monks and clergy of Egypt. Jerome, of course, was himself deeply embroiled in that controversy. At the time at which Postumianus is supposed to have visited him in Bethlehem, he would in fact have been devoting most of his energies as a reader and writer to the campaign of anti-Origenist propaganda mounted by Theophilus.²⁴⁴ Commenting on the various opinions current concerning Origen's work, Sulpicius' narrator remarks: 'illud me admodum permovebat, quod Hieronymus, vir maxime catholicus et sacrae legis peritissimus, Origenem secutus primo tempore putabatur, qui nunc idem praecipue vel omnia illius scripta damnaret.'²⁴⁵ The expression 'putabatur' may imply that Sulpicius' sole source of information on Jerome's change of attitude was hearsay or the writings of Rufinus. Or it may have been meant to exculpate Jerome from the charge of heresy or inconsistency. It is notable, in any case, that Postumianus' descriptions of Jerome and Origen are exactly parallel: the latter is, or used to be thought, a 'tractator scripturarum sacrarum peritissimus', while the latter is 'sacrae legis peritissimus'.²⁴⁶

Given the quality of contacts existing between south-western Gaul and the main points of diffusion for Jerome's works,²⁴⁷ it would indeed have been 'surprising' if Sulpicius' own acquaintance with those works had been confined to the ascetical writings apparently best known to Gallus.²⁴⁸ If he had had an opportunity to read some of the other letters and prefaces written by Jerome before 394, he may have been able to appreciate the embarrassment suffered by one who, having formerly professed himself an imitator of Origen, now felt obliged to repudiate him. In reality, Jerome's rejection of Origen was by no means as complete as Sulpicius implies; distinguishing between the exegete and the theologian, he sought, reasonably enough, to justify his allegiance to the former. As late as 399 he could produce a carefully-worded eulogy of the ascetic and biblicalist '[qui] in studio explanationis [scripturarum] diebus sudavit ac noctibus' and who was responsible for innumerable commentaries.²⁴⁹ It is this image of the Christian writer toiling night and day over his books that re-appears in Sulpicius' portrait of Jerome. Conceivably, both men could have arrived independently at the same formula on the basis of biblical (and classical ?) models.²⁵⁰ Alternatively, one might assume a direct influence on Sulpicius of the personal literary ideology created by Jerome. In favour of the second hypothesis, it may be remarked that the depiction of Jerome's **literary activity** is accompanied in Postumianus' account by a passionate assertion of his **orthodoxy**. In the immediate context of the Dialogues, the most obvious threat to Jerome's reputation for doctrinal probity would appear to be the charge of Origenism.²⁵¹ Perhaps significantly, the date of composition of Sulpicius' work (403/4) coincides with that of the renewal of hostilities between Jerome

and Vigilantius.²⁵² The latter, it may be recalled, had been the first person openly to accuse Jerome of heresy in his attitude towards Origen, following his visit to Bethlehem in 395 as a courier of Paulinus. Although there is no hard evidence for the fact, it would not have been in the least astonishing if he had repeated the charge nine years later, as part of a general campaign to damage Jerome's reputation in Gaul.²⁵³ Since Sulpicius was strongly opposed to Vigilantius on other grounds, an accusation of this kind may have given him an additional reason for expressing solidarity with the scholar of Bethlehem. In which case, Postumianus' evocation of the latter's ceaseless reading-and-writing would take on a new significance. For what Sulpicius presented was, in effect, a version of Jerome's own image of his literary activity, stripped of its Origenist connotations.^{253a}

There is, of course, another difference between Sulpicius' vision of Jerome's reading-and-writing and Jerome's description of the reading-and-writing of Origen, taken as a model for his own. Where Jerome had specified a literary activity centred on the Bible, Sulpicius is more vague: 'aut legit aliquid semper aut scribit'. Such vagueness may have been necessary in order to disguise the controversial nature of the work on which Jerome was engaged at the time of Postumianus' visit. Or Sulpicius may have had other reasons, besides the desire to protect Jerome's reputation, for presenting his activity in these general terms. Of all his works, the Dialogues is the one in which he devotes most space to his own achievement as a writer.²⁵⁴ Postumianus' account of the diffusion of the Life of Martin was evidently intended to establish its author as one '[qui] per totum orbem legitur', like Jerome. It is

generally recognized that the Life was written partly in order to provide a Gallic equivalent to the biographies of eastern saints composed by Jerome (among others). This dialectic between eastern and western models of sanctity is continued in the Dialogues. Aside from their hagiographical works, however, the respective literary oeuvres of Jerome and Sulpicius were too dissimilar, both in scope and volume, for the latter to have had any interest in encouraging a direct comparison of one with the other. Whatever his pretensions as a biblical epitomator, Sulpicius would hardly have wished to compare his achievement as a biblical writer with that of a person whom he unaffectedly describes as 'sacrae legis peritissimus'. On the other hand, he would have had nothing to lose by promoting an image of the orthodox and ascetic Christian writer as one '[qui] aut legit aliquid semper aut scribit' - a description which, one imagines, would have struck the sympathetic reader of the Dialogues as no less applicable to their author than to his illustrious counterpart in Bethlehem. Granted that this 'lowest common denominator' of the two men's respective activities tells one little or nothing about their specific literary ambitions, the possibility that Sulpicius may have sought to establish such a bond would (if granted) be a further indication of the need felt by Christian writers of his generation for a literary ideology that they could call their own.

3. A monster of inarticulacy: 'Vigilantius'

Consideration of Sulpicius' treatment of Jerome has entailed mention of the controversy with Vigilantius.²⁵⁵ At first sight, this controversy would appear to have little to do with Christian ideas of reading-and-writing. On the evidence provided by the Contra Vigilantium - the short, venomous pamphlet dashed off by Jerome in the autumn of 406, at the request of two of his Gallic correspondents - the main differences of opinion between the two men were on issues of clerical celibacy, monasticism and the cult of the saints. The manner of Jerome's attack on Vigilantius suggests, however, that some of his animosity against the 'innkeeper of Calagurris' (as he slightly calls him) may have resulted from concerns more directly relevant to the theme of this chapter.

The Contra Vigilantium opens with a catalogue of famous monsters from the Bible and classical legend. According to Jerome, monsters of one kind or another had been reported in all parts of the world, except Gaul: 'Sola Gallia monstra non habuit, sed viris semper fortibus et eloquentissimis abundavit.'²⁵⁶ With the appearance of Vigilantius, the situation had changed: 'Exortus est subito Vigilantius...' The image of the heretic as a monster was a heresiological commonplace. Vigilantius, though, was more than just a monster of unorthodoxy; he was a disgrace to a province which had hitherto been distinguished by its supply of brave and eloquent men. Lest anyone should miss the implication that his opponent was wanting in both these traditional Gallic virtues, Jerome makes the point explicitly a little further on. Recalling how

Vigilantius had run naked into the street during an earthquake one night in Palestine, he remarks: 'Tales habet adversarios ecclesia: hi duces contra martyrum sanguinem dimicant: huiusmodi oratores contra apostolos pertonant'.²⁵⁷

The question of Vigilantius' actual rhetorical attainments is of less immediate interest than Jerome's reasons for belittling them. It was, of course, a part of his normal practice as a polemicist to depreciate the abilities of his opponents. In the case of Vigilantius, however, he had a special motive for doing so. The latter, it seems, had pretensions as a writer and biblical commentator. This fact emerges from a letter which Jerome addressed to him shortly after his ill-fated visit to Bethlehem in 395. During that visit, Vigilantius had questioned his host concerning his attitude towards Origen and, apparently, been given satisfaction. Even so, he had persisted in accusing Jerome of heretical Origenism in certain writings published after his return to the West. In his Letter 61, Jerome first defends his practice as a reader and translator of Origen's exegetical works, then ridicules his opponent's presumption:

Ego quasi Christianus cum Christiano loquens obsecro te, frater, ne plus velis sapere quam sapis, ne vel innocentiam vel simplicitatem tuam... stilo proferas et ineptiarum tuarum cunctis cachinnum praebeas. Aliud a parva aetate didicisti, aliis adsuetus es disciplinis. Non est eiusdem hominis et aureos nummos et scripturas probare, degustare vina et prophetas vel apostolos intellegere.²⁵⁸

As he had explained to Vigilantius' master, Paulinus, in his Letters 53 and 58 of the two previous years, the exposition of Scripture (and hence

the art of Christian writing) was a speciality, to be acquired - like any other skill - by long training. Vigilantius' had been trained as a publican; he should therefore desist from his unfortunate essays in biblical commentary (a specimen of which, relating to the Book of Daniel, is displayed for criticism) and dismiss the secretaries and calligraphers whom he had hired for the production of his work.²⁵⁹ This 'Vigilantius' of c.396 - whose resemblance to the original can scarcely be checked - is a natural addition to the rogues' gallery of unqualified biblicists, '[qui] docent antequam discant', of Letter 53.

Given this background to the dispute of 404-406, it is interesting to note that Jerome's assault on Vigilantius the would-be biblical writer is not renewed in the Contra Vigilantium. Instead, as observed, he attacks the would-be orator. In relation to the classical ideal of the 'litteratus' as one 'qui aliquid diligenter et acute scienterque poss[et] aut dicere aut scribere',²⁶⁰ this difference may not seem very profound. In the context of the emergent Christian culture of the fourth and fifth centuries, however, it marked a significant change of perspective. For Jerome and his contemporaries, the role of Christian orator was most readily identified with that of the priest or bishop. Since the Christian writer was not always a member of the clergy, the roles of writer and orator in a Christian society would not necessarily coincide in the way that they were supposed to do in classical literary ideology. Indeed, given Jerome's insistence on 'scientia scripturarum' as the basis of all worthwhile writing and his predilection for the image of the student of Scripture as one committed 'night and day' to his task, one may doubt whether the occupation of Christian writer, as

he conceived it, could ever have been compatible with the responsibilities of a pastoral charge. The problem of the relation between Christian writing and Christian oratory may thus be seen as an aspect of the more general problem of the relation between monastic and clerical life.²⁶¹ This general problem is raised in the Contra Vigilantium, albeit in a grossly over-simplified form. In reply to Vigilantius' objection that if all good Christians became monks, there would be no one left to minister to the community at large, Jerome makes a radical distinction between the monastic and clerical callings: 'Monachus autem non doctoris habet, sed plangentis officium'.²⁶² In fact, as he himself had long since acknowledged, the practical requirements of Christian 'doctrina' were more complicated than this simple division allowed. As early as 394, the year in which he had first written to Paulinus 'de studio scripturarum', Jerome had sketched the plan of a clerical life-style in which a quasi-monastic 'discere' contributed directly to a pastoral 'docere'.²⁶³ The fruits of his subsequent reflection on this theme are to be found mainly in his Gallic correspondence after c.404.

Vigilantius, however, was to be granted no part in Jerome's modelling of the ideal Christian orator. Having formerly damned him as a writer, he now assailed him as a priest and teacher:

Galliae vernaculum hostem sustinent, et hominem moti capitis, atque Hippocratis vinculis alligandum, sedentem cernunt in ecclesia: et inter caetera verba blasphemiae, ista quoque dicentem...²⁶⁴

The emphasis here on the misfortunes of the Gallic provinces recalls the

opening of the treatise ('Sola Gallia monstra non habuit, etc.') and draws attention to another reason for Jerome's ill-will towards Vigilantius, namely his growing sense of involvement in the affairs of the Gallic church.²⁶⁵ This attachment may be explained as a consequence of personal and financial ties now linking the Bethlehem monastery with certain Christian communities in Gaul (such as those of Toulouse, Bordeaux and Marseille) and of Jerome's disenchantment with the ascetic movement in Rome. It also appears to have had a literary-ideological component. Gaul, as Jerome states, had a reputation for producing eloquent men ('viri eloquentissimi'); this was as true in his day as it had been when the Elder Cato first made the remark.²⁶⁶ Students flocked to the Gallic schools from all parts of the western empire and Gallic rhetoricians were everywhere in demand.²⁶⁷ Some of the most famous Gallic teachers of the fourth century are commemorated by Jerome in the Chronicle.²⁶⁸ He also makes frequent references to the rhetorical style of Hilary of Poitiers, calling him 'the Rhone of Latin eloquence'.²⁶⁹ His decision to expound his ideas on Christian writing in letters addressed to Paulinus (of Bordeaux) was almost certainly influenced by an awareness of the latter's position as a representative of what was best in the Gallic tradition of fine utterance. To what extent Vigilantius had benefitted from the high standards of rhetorical education obtaining in his native province can only be conjectured. Gennadius describes him as a 'homo lingua politus'.²⁷⁰ In view of his success in gaining a party for himself in opposition to powerful interests in south-western Gaul it is unlikely that he was as uncultivated as Jerome makes him out to be. In presenting him as a monster of inarticulacy, the latter evidently hoped to discredit his

doctrines. At the same time, he provided an antithesis to the ideal of the Christian orator/writer which, it seems, he was now intent on fashioning from Gallic materials.

4. 'Viri disertí et in dei lege perfecti'

The messenger who carried the Contra Vigilantium to Gaul in the spring of 407 also took with him a number of other works addressed by Jerome to Christians in the province. Among these were a Commentary on Zachariah dedicated to bishop Exsuperius of Toulouse and a Commentary on Malachi, accompanied by a letter dealing with two awkward passages in St. Paul's Epistles, addressed to Minervius and Alexander (otherwise unknown, perhaps monks attached to the church at Toulouse).²⁷¹

The two larger works belong to the series of commentaries on the minor prophets that Jerome had begun some fifteen years earlier and finally completed in 406; apart from the prefaces, they contain nothing that can be specifically related to persons or circumstances in Gaul. Nevertheless, certain themes recur that are clearly relevant to the author's developing literary ideology. Thus Jerome interprets Malachi 2,7 ('Labia enim sacerdotis custodient scientiam, etc.') as a sign of the learning required of a priest or bishop: 'ut discamus, sacerdotem doctum esse debere, et praeconem dominicae veritatis.'²⁷² Similarly the requirement to pay tithes on agricultural produce (Malachi 3,8-12) is allegorized as the duty of one 'biblically' educated ('doctus et eruditus in lege dei') to ensure that the benefits of his learning were

shared by the wider community:

ut omnes beatum illum dicant gentes, et in terra eius atque doctrina habitare desiderent (cf. Malachi 3,12), qui illum in ecclesia audierint disputantem.²⁷³

One may perhaps discern a contrast between the 'terra desiderabilis' in which people would be able to listen to Jerome's ideal Christian orator and the unfortunate Gallic provinces where they were condemned to listen to 'Vigilantius'. More generally, the writer's continued insistence on the need for a trained clergy coincides with a major concern of successive popes of this period, as expressed in a series of papal letters dating from the time of pope Siricius (384-398).²⁷⁴ For Jerome, this issue was inseparable from the ideal of a 'biblical' education, considered less as a process of **divine erudition** effected through the Scriptures (as it had been by Hilary and the Priscillianists) than as a form of **intellectual preparation** analogous to that required for the practice of the liberal arts.

Jerome's Letter 119 (to Minervius and Alexander) consists mainly of a collection of excerpts from the works of Greek biblical commentators, assembled by the author in view of certain questions of Pauline eschatology allegedly posed by his correspondents. Pressed for time, he had decided to send these materials as they stood:

Itaque subtegmen et stamina liciaque et telas, quae mihi ad vestram tunicam paraveram, vobis confecta transmissi, ut, quicquid mihi deest, vestro texatur eloquio. Prudentes estis et eruditi et de canina, ut ait Appius, facundia ad Christi disertitudinem transmigrastis.²⁷⁵

Other instances could be cited where Jerome leaves the choice of an interpretation to his reader.²⁷⁶ More unusual is the implied association of the latter in the actual composition of a work 'de scripturis', here justified on the grounds of Minervius' and Alexander's (Christian) erudition and eloquence. Later in the same letter, Jerome admits that some of the writers whose opinions he had cited were under suspicion of unorthodoxy, 'et tamen omnes in explanationibus scripturarum sudoris sui nobis memoriam reliquerunt'.²⁷⁷ The terms of this defence recall the criterion of Christian writing invoked in the preface to the De viris illustribus.²⁷⁸ On this occasion, however, Jerome makes a clear connection between the records of past Christian scholarship and the scientific resources of the present-day church:

Etenim, si dialecticam scire voluero aut philosophorum dogmata et - ut ad nostram redeam scientiam - scripturarum, nequaquam simplices ecclesiae viros interrogare debeo, quorum est alia gratia... sed eos, qui artem didicere ab artifice et in lege dei meditantur die ac nocte.²⁷⁹

The quality of 'simplicitas' is one ascribed by Jerome to Christians and clergy in general; he even grants it to Vigilantius.²⁸⁰ 'Scientia scripturarum', by contrast, was possessed only by those who had studied under a master and who applied themselves 'night and day' to the Bible. All this is familiar from earlier letters. What is new here is the note of complicity detectable in the writer's use of the expression 'nostra scientia'. Combined with the invitation to Minervius and Alexander to assist in the solution of an exegetical problem, it would seem to indicate a fresh willingness on Jerome's part to concede expertise in Scripture to others besides himself and past masters like Origen. That

impression is strengthened by certain other items from his Gallic correspondence of these years.

The two female recipients of Letters 120 and 121, Hedybia and Algasia, lived in south-western Gaul.²⁸¹ Hedybia is hailed as a descendant of the rhetoricians Patera and Delphidius, father and son, both of whom had been associated with the school of Bordeaux in the fourth century.²⁸² (Delphidius' wife, Euchrotia, was one of those executed with Priscillian in 385 - a fact which Jerome was hardly likely to mention, but which suggests an interesting continuity of biblical and ascetic interests among female members of a late-Roman family.) Recollection of the fame acquired by these men, provides Jerome with the pretext for a comparison between secular and Christian (i.e. biblical) learning:

Maiores tui... iam dormientes et taciti me iure reprehendunt, quod audeam ad stirpem generis sui quippiam mussitare, licet concedens eis eloquentiae magnitudinem et doctrinam saecularium litterarum merito subtraham scientiam legis dei.²⁸³

As in the letter to Minervius and Alexander, the contrast is not merely between two kinds of 'scientia' (based on acquaintance with different sets of text) but also between two kinds of eloquence: respectively, secular 'eloquentia' and the 'disertitudo Christi'. Although Jerome affects to disclaim the latter ('quippiam mussitare'), there is almost certainly an implied comparison between the literary success of Delphidius, '[qui] me adulescentulo omnes Gallias prosa versuque suo inlustravit ingenio', and that of the biblicalist whose productions were now

being read by persons living '[in] extremis Galliae finibus'. The substance of Letter 120 consists of answers to twelve questions ostensibly posed by the addressee, all but one of which are scriptural.²⁸⁴ Referring to these 'quaestiunculae', Jerome expresses surprise that Hedybia should have sent to Bethlehem for their solution, 'quasi vero non habeas in tua provincia disertos viros et in dei lege perfectos.'²⁸⁵ The surprise, no doubt, was feigned. Even so, it is notable that Algasia, too, is referred in Letter 121 to a 'local man': 'habes ibi sanctum virum Alethium presbyterum, qui viva, ut aiunt, voce et prudenti disertoque sermone possit solvere, quae requiris.'²⁸⁶ Many years earlier, Jerome had emphasised the advantages of viva voce consultation in an attempt to lure Paulinus to Bethlehem; now he portrayed Algasia as a queen of Sheba who had no need to leave home in order to find her Solomon.²⁸⁷ Paulinus was to have been taught how to unlock the sealed book of Scripture; now there were persons living in his native province who, we are assured, were perfectly capable of doing so without outside help.²⁸⁸

The parallel openings to Letters 120 and 121 may thus be taken as evidence of a significant widening of Jerome's idea of current practice of the art of Scripture. How was this development related to his conception of the respective claims of monastic and clerical life? And to what extent does it imply a similar enlargement in his idea of the contemporary practice of Christian writing? Answers to both these questions are suggested by another of his Gallic letters, the last to be considered here.

Jerome's Letter 125 (written c.412) is one of the most artful in all his correspondence. Its addressee, Rusticus, was a young man who, after receiving his primary and secondary education in Gaul, had gone to study (law?) in Rome. Regarding him as a typical product of the Gallic schools, Jerome interprets this stay in the city in terms of its effect on his eloquence: 'ut ubertatem Gallici nitoremque sermonis gravitas Romana condiret.'²⁸⁹ On returning to his native province, he had decided to become a monk. Probably at the instigation of his mother, who is presented as a pious widow of many years' standing, Jerome wrote giving directions for the monastic life: 'nunc monachi incunabula moresque discutimus et eius monachi, qui liberalibus studiis eruditus in adulescentia iugum Christi collo suo imposuit.'²⁹⁰ He advises him to live in a community ('sanctorum contubernium') under the direction of a single master,²⁹¹ and to devote himself to prayer and Bible-study.²⁹² The clear preference for a corporate form of monasticism suggests that Jerome was aware that such communities were already in existence in Gaul at the time of writing; the recommendation of Proculus, bishop of Marseille, as a likely master would seem to indicate that a monastery was to be found in that city.²⁹³ It is possible, moreover, that he had been informed of the close links existing in Gaul between certain monastic communities and the ecclesiastical hierarchy.²⁹⁴ In his Letter 52 (of 394), he had offered a vision of the life of the priest as effectively coterminous with that of the monk. Now he presented the monastery as a school or training-ground for the future holder of ecclesiastical office:

Hoc dico, ut, etiam si clericatus te titillat desiderium,
discas, quod possis docere... ne miles ante quam tiro, ne
prius magister sis quam discipulus.²⁹⁵

The function of the 'ludus monasteriorum', in this context, was to produce persons 'quorum habitus, sermo, vultus, incessus doctrina virtutum est'; it was by the quality of his speech and comportment that the monk-cleric would command respect, not by sham confrontations with demons of the kind staged by certain 'inepti homines' (a probable allusion to Sulpicius' Life of Martin).²⁹⁶ The theme of monastic preparation for the priesthood is sounded again towards the end of the letter: 'ita ergo age et vive in monasterio, ut clericus esse merearis', Jerome tells Rusticus, looking forward to a time 'cum ad perfectam aetatem veneris... et te vel populus vel pontifex civitatis in clerum adlegerit.'²⁹⁷

Compared with the earlier Letter 52, the letter to Rusticus provides clear evidence of a development in its author's ecclesiology. To see how this development was correlated with another in the area of literary ideology, it is necessary to make a comparison with Letters 53 and 58 to Paulinus. There Jerome had been concerned both with the formation of the Christian exegete and with his correspondent's ascetic 'propositum'. Without ever stating in so many words that the 'scientia scripturarum' was to be attained only by those who lived apart from society, he had left little doubt that in order to qualify as a writer 'de scripturis' it was necessary to become, and remain, a monk. The same impression is given by his reluctance to cite examples of successful Christian writers other than himself and Origen (whom he evidently regarded as a monk avant la lettre). It is therefore significant that, having envisaged Rusticus' progress from the monastery to the priesthood, he should continue with the following piece of advice: 'ne ad

scribendum cito prosilias et levi ducaris insania, multo tempore discas, quod doceas.'²⁹⁸ The theme of Christian 'doctrina' is here explicitly linked with the activity of Christian writing for the first time in Jerome's extant correspondence since his letters to Paulinus of 394-5. Subsequent remarks about the danger of succumbing to flattery make it clear that the writing in question was to be of a public kind. The 'levis insania' which Rusticus was to avoid is that which, in Jerome's view, afflicted both Rufinus (mentioned here in this connection) and Vigilantius; it is the folly which gripped Horace's poetasters and the amateur exegetes satirized in Letter 53.²⁹⁹ Given the context of his remarks, it would seem natural to associate the delay which Jerome recommends in the matter of writing for publication with the period of monastic training prescribed for the future priest: when the monk-cleric was ready to teach, he would also be ready to publish. (Horace, it will be recalled, had also been in favour of delayed publication.) If this inference is correct, the letter to Rusticus marks a further stage in Jerome's reflection on Christian literary activity. **It indicates that by c.412 he was able to take seriously the idea of a Christian writing which, though based on a study of Scripture undertaken in a monastic environment, was nonetheless proper to one in a position of pastoral responsibility.** Provided he followed Jerome's advice, Rusticus might expect one day to combine the functions of Christian writer and Christian orator in a manner entirely fitting to a person of his nationality and upbringing.³⁰⁰

*

The ideal of monastic 'education' outlined in Jerome's letter to Rusticus presupposed a certain development in monastic institutions. It assumed the existence of organized communities, with definite (if not necessarily written) rules of conduct, and the elements of a hierarchy. The creation of these conditions in the West was naturally a gradual process, the pace of which varied significantly from one region to another.³⁰¹ In the history of early Gallic monasticism, special importance may be attached to the quarter-century c.405-430. This period saw the formation in south-eastern Gaul of two monastic communities which, once established, might have satisfied all the requirements for a spiritual and literary apprenticeship of the type envisaged by Jerome. The first was founded by a Gallo-Roman, Honoratus, on the island of Lérins (modern St. Honorat, between Antibes and Cannes) shortly before 410, the second by a Scythian émigré, John Cassian, at Marseille around the year 416.³⁰² In both cases, the founder's initiative received the support of a local bishop³⁰³ - a sign, no doubt, that the links between monastic and clerical institutions to which Sulpicius had testified in his Life of Martin (397) remained strong. Whereas little is known of the social background or subsequent activities of those admitted to the new monastery at Marseille, it is clear that Cassian himself maintained friendly relations with a number of high-ranking Gallic churchmen.³⁰⁴ Prosopographical information on the earliest phase of 'Lerinian' monasticism is much fuller - partly, it seems, because Honoratus' first companions and disciples included several men of substance, anxious to make a name and a career for themselves. In both endeavours they were to be remarkably successful. Within little more than two decades of its foundation, the monastery of Lérins had a reputation as a training-

ground for bishops;³⁰⁵ in practice, many of the most conspicuous members of the Gallic ecclesiastical hierarchy of the mid- and later fifth century were either former monks of Lérins or had 'Lerinian' connections.³⁰⁶ Collectively considered, these persons appear as part of a phenomenon that may be loosely termed 'the rise of the Gallic monk-bishop'.

The justification for such a phrase lies in the Christian writing of this period, where the theme of a progression from monastery to episcopal see is embroidered in numerous different ways. In popularising that theme, fifth-century Gallic 'litterati' exploited a concept of 'ascetic authority' which was of vital importance in western ecclesiastical politics from the late fourth century onwards.³⁰⁷ At the same time, they were compelled to develop ideas of Christian 'doctrina' comparable to those advertised in Jerome's Letters: the Gallic monk-bishop had to be shown to have learnt what he taught. As in most other contemporary treatments of the subject, the ideal of Christian education sketched in early Gallic hagiography and kindred texts has clear literary-ideological implications. The monk was a student of the Bible; as bishop, he was required to expound the sacred text; assuming that he had received a secular literary education, he might also be interested in exercising his talents as a writer and orator. How were these different activities to be related? In an attempt to answer that question, it is proposed to study two groups of texts from the period c.420-475. Those in the first group have been chosen mainly for their bearing on the theory of monastic 'lectio', those in the second for their illustration of the literary persona of the Gallic monk-bishop.

III. Theories of monastic reading

Cassian

For Cassian, who had acquired his monastic theory in Egyptian Origenist circles in the 390s, Bible-reading was an integral part of the monk's life.³⁰⁸ In the picture which he presents of the origins of monasticism at the beginning of Book Two of the Institutions (c.420), the first monks are distinguished from their fellow Christians in four ways: by their renunciation of private property, their resolve to live apart from the main community, their habit of abstaining from food and drink for long periods, and their devotion (night and day) to a regime of Bible-reading, prayer and manual work.³⁰⁹ Such behaviour, it is claimed, was an object of wonderment to pagans of the time. Though worthless as history, this account of monastic origins provides a valuable summary of the salient features of the profession as conceived by one of its first western theorists. The monasticism expounded in the Institutions was already an art - to be anatomised, and taught, like any other.³¹⁰ At several places, Cassian lists the elements of this art.³¹¹ They are, essentially: 'ieiunia', 'vigiliae', 'oratio', 'lectio et meditatio scripturarum', and 'labor'. Together these activities constituted the 'virtutes monachorum'. None had any value in itself, all were means to an end ('instrumenta perfectionis'). Practised wisely, and with proper moderation, they assisted the monk in attaining his ultimate goal of spiritual union with God.

A large part of the Institutions and Conferences is occupied with discussion of the function and manner of performing the different monastic observances. Our present concern is with the one that Cassian calls 'lectio et meditatio scripturarum'. It is not clear from the description of monastic origins what form the Bible-readings ('divinarum scripturarum lectiones') practised by his proto-monks were supposed to have taken. Since he deals separately with the origins of the monastic liturgy, it may be assumed that they were 'private', in the sense of taking place outside the main assemblies. Such private reading was evidently an established feature of the monastic lifestyle known to Cassian. Not all monks, of course, would have been able to read the Bible for themselves; many Egyptian ascetics, including some of the most famous, were plainly illiterate.³¹² On the other hand, the Pachomian legislation translated by Jerome indicates that an ability to read the Bible was required of members of certain Egyptian communities.³¹³ The Egyptian monasteries described in the Institutions housed a number of monks whose main occupation was the copying of (biblical) manuscripts.³¹⁴ The furniture of a typical cell is said to include one or more codices, a stylus and writing-tablets, a pen and penknife.³¹⁵ Once equipped with a text, the monk was apparently expected to devote himself to its study ('insistere/incubare lectioni') at all times of the day and night when he was not otherwise needfully employed. Cassian gives few details of the physical circumstances of such Bible-study. He is more concerned with the psychological aspect of reading, and of the related habit of meditation.

The day-and-night occupation of the Egyptian monk is summarised by Cassian as 'opus ac meditatio'. What exactly does he mean by the second of these terms ? In a few instances, the word 'meditatio' appears in his writings without qualification, in what may be called a classical sense; it then refers either to the practice of a discipline or to any process of thought.³¹⁶ As a rule, however, Cassian uses 'meditari', 'meditatio' exclusively of thought-processes having as their immediate or initial object a passage of the Bible - hence the association of 'meditatio' and 'lectio'. The main purpose of reading, whether public or private, was to furnish matter for meditation. Thus the aim of the Fathers in allowing for two lessons to be read at each of the nocturnal offices had been to assist those who wished to augment their personal store of biblical passages ('divinarum scripturarum memoriam possidere adsidua meditatione studentibus').³¹⁷ Readings during the liturgy and at table, the singing of psalms, private study, the inscription of verses on cell walls - all these practices were designed to stimulate the memorisation and recall of Scripture. A further practice, clearly prescribed in the Rule of Pachomius and mentioned in passing in the Institutions, involved the recitation (sotto voce) of biblical texts in the course of the monk's other activities.³¹⁸ It has been argued that Cassian's conception of 'spiritalis meditatio' would have tended to exclude this kind of oral recitative in favour of a purely mental process conducive to his ideal of the wordless 'prayer of fire'.³¹⁹ One may suppose that he envisaged a progression inwards and upwards, in which the 'meditatio oris' prepared and eventually yielded to the 'meditatio cordis'.³²⁰

As instruments of perfection, reading and meditation may be seen to serve the monks in at least three different ways. First, they provided him with a set of examples and precepts for the regulation of his life (witness Cassian's own recourse to biblical quotations in his monastic writings). Secondly, they offered him weapons for use in his fight against the Devil: as Christ had repulsed the Tempter with texts from Scripture, so might he.³²¹ Thirdly, they were a means of fixing the mind's attention on its proper object. Cassian's grasp of the psychology of monasticism is nowhere more clearly evidenced than in his treatment of this last function of the 'lectio et meditatio scripturarum'. Having physically separated himself from the rest of society in order to concentrate on the 'things of God', the monk had to keep his thoughts from wandering. A regime of manual work might reduce the time available for idle reflection, but it could not stop him thinking: 'mens... pro condicione naturae numquam potest otiose consistere.'³²² Though he occasionally speaks of arresting the mind's natural motion (e.g. by reading),³²³ Cassian appears to have been more concerned to exploit it. Since the mind was bound to keep turning like a mill, the monk's task was to supply it with good grist.³²⁴ In other words, he had to fill his memory with suitable matter for reflection.³²⁵ The value of reading as a means of stocking the memory would have been obvious to one educated, like Cassian, in the school of Cicero and Quintilian. In a famous section of the fourteenth Conference, he confesses (in the person of the young Johannes) that the recollection of passages from pagan literature still interfered with his attempts at prayer. He is told that this difficulty could be overcome, 'si eandem diligentiam atque instantiam, quam te in illis saecularibus studiis habuisse dixisti,

ad spiritualium scripturarum volueris lectionem meditationemque trans-
ferre.³²⁶ Instead of allowing himself to be distracted from prayer by
the memory of profane texts, the educated monk ought to be stimulated to
it by the recollection of Scripture. To this end, he was to be
encouraged to read the Bible regularly and to meditate continuously on
the texts which he had read and committed to memory. Even a single
verse, constantly meditated, could help him to achieve the ideal state
of uninterrupted prayer.

Given that the monk had memorised a number of biblical texts, how
was he to arrive at their true sense ? The interpretation of Scripture
is dealt with in the fourteenth Conference (c.427). Rather than treat
the subject in isolation, Cassian places it firmly in the context of a
general spiritual science ('religionis nostrae disciplina atque pro-
fessio').³²⁷ Following Evagrius, he divides this science into two
parts, the practical ('praktikē') and the theoretical ('theōrētikē').³²⁸
The practical science consisted in the expulsion of vices and the cult-
ivation of virtues. It could be divided into several different 'pro-
fessiones', including the specifically monastic professions of hermit
and coenobite. Since it was impossible for a man to succeed in more
than one profession, every individual ought to persist in his initial
intention, 'ut sit in qualibet professione perfectus'.³²⁹ The theor-
etical science consisted in contemplation ('contemplatio divinarum
rerum') and the understanding of Scripture ('sacratissimorum sensuum
cognitio').³³⁰ Cassian here confines his intention to the second of
these topics, continuing: 'theōrētikē... in duas dividitur partes, id
est in historicam interpretationem et intellegentiam spiritalem'.³³¹

He then sub-divides the 'intellegentia spiritalis' (or 'spiritalis scientia') into three 'genera' and expounds a theory, derived from Origen, of the fourfold meaning of Scripture.³³²

As presented by the abba Nesteros, the explanation of the 'sensus quadruplex' is intended merely to whet the appetites of his young listeners. If they truly aspired to 'scientia spiritalis', he says, they would first have to apply themselves to the 'scientia actualis'. The understanding of Scripture was born of works, not meditation; the only people genuinely blessed in their scrutiny of God's testimonies (Psalm 118,2) were those who already walked in his law (ibid., 1).³³³ The same insistence on the ethical prerequisites for Bible-study is to be found in the abba's remarks on Christian instruction. No-one who had failed to master the 'scientia actualis' was fit to teach: 'Nam qui ne ad percipiendum... capax est, quomodo erit idoneus ad tradendum ?'³³⁴ For this reason, one ought to be specially wary of those who set themselves up as teachers on the strength of a purely secular eloquence,

qui peritiam disputandi ac sermonis affluentiam consecuti,
quia possunt ea quae voluerint ornatè copioseque disserere,
scientiam spiritalem possidere creduntur ab his qui vim eius
et qualitatem discernere non noverunt.³³⁵

The terms of this caveat recall Jerome's remarks to Paulinus concerning those 'qui aurem populi mulserint' and who taught before they had learnt.³³⁶ Like Jerome, Cassian sought to recommend a specifically Christian eloquence based on a sure knowledge of the Bible. In the same conference, Nesteros urges the young Johannes to take good note of everything said by his monastic elders 'in conlatione', so that in due

course he also would be qualified to speak:

Si itaque haec diligenter excepta et in recessu mentis condita atque indicta fuerint taciturnitate signata, postea ut vina quaedam suave olentia et laetificantia cor hominis, cum sensuum canitie et patientiae fuerint vetustate decocta, cum magna sui fragrantia de vase tui pectoris proferentur et tamquam perennis fons de experientiae venis et inriguis virtutum meatibus redundabunt fluentaque continua velut de quadam abyssu tui cordis effundent.³³⁷

The image of the Christian teacher as a 'fons perennis' is one that was to appeal to a number of Gallic writers of the fifth century.³³⁸ In laying emphasis on the importance of a lengthy monastic apprenticeship for the would-be biblical expositor, the author of the Conferences may have meant to dissuade his readers from over-reliance on hermeneutical handbooks such as Augustine's De doctrina christiana.³³⁹

What allowance, if any, did Cassian make for the case of the monk who went on to fill a teaching office outside the monastery? Despite the view sometimes expressed that he was concerned only with monks as monks, it is hard to believe that a writer living in southern Gaul in the 420s could have been entirely blind to the realities of local clerical recruitment.³⁴⁰ Many of his own 'monastic' works were addressed to bishops or to persons who (as he may already have suspected) would shortly be elevated to the episcopate. In addition, there are a number of signs that the fourteenth Conference itself was written partly with the duties of bishops in mind.³⁴¹ It remains to be seen how Cassian's prescriptions for 'lectio', 'meditatio' and the formation of the Christian teacher influenced those of his contemporaries and successors in Gaul.

'Lerinian' rules

The second set of Conferences, including the one on the science of Scripture, was dedicated to two monks of Lérins who subsequently became bishops, Honoratus and Eucherius.³⁴² The dedication is normally interpreted as a sign of close relations between Cassian's monastery and its nearby insular counterpart. Although the first Lerinian monks produced no document assimilable to either of Cassian's major treatises, it is possible that a group of early monastic rules recently associated with Lérins by A. de Vogüé may provide some basis for a comparison of the monastic theories promoted in the two places.³⁴³ For present purposes, it will suffice to consider briefly the prescriptions for Bible-study contained in the first and second of these putatively 'Lerinian' texts, the so-called Rule of the Four Fathers (RIVP) and Second Rule of the Fathers (ZRP).

Books were clearly as much a feature of the monastic environment envisaged by the 'Lerinian' rules as they were of the world of the Institutions and Conferences. Thus, for example, RIVP requires a monk arriving from another monastery to relinquish everything that he brings with him, 'sive in rebus sive in codicibus' - reminding one of Cassian's censure of the monk who referred to a book as 'codex meus'.³⁴⁴ It is not clear precisely what kinds of book would have been available within the monastery. Bibles there evidently were, though where and how they were kept is not specified. No new light is shed by these rules on the vexed question of the 'library' at Lérins.³⁴⁵ On the other hand, they may help to confirm the impression obtained from other sources that an

important part of the routine of the monastery - and hence of the 'education' received by its inmates - consisted of the scientific study of Scripture. The sole mention of a 'conference', envisaged as taking place with all members present ('residentibus fratribus'), relates to a 'conlatio de scripturis'. The newly-arrived monk, even if expert on such matters ('ex his talis scitus'), might only contribute to the discussion if invited to do so by the abbot.³⁴⁶ A similar restriction applied to junior monks.³⁴⁷ (Again, one is reminded of the advice given to the young Johannes: 'Nihil itaque in conlatione seniorum proferre audeas'.)³⁴⁸ It is not clear from the rules at what point in the daily (?) routine of the monastery such 'conlationes' would have taken place: the most obvious space for them would seem to be in the late afternoon or early evening.

The basic division of the monk's time prior to the single meal of the day taken at three o'clock in the afternoon (at which there would be readings from the Bible) is between what ZRP calls the 'tempus meditando' and the 'tempus operandi', or 'opera' and 'medite' (sic).³⁴⁹ The forms of manual work undertaken are not specified. Thus one has no idea whether the copying of manuscripts was prescribed at Lérins as it had been in the Egyptian monasteries known to Jerome and Cassian, and in Martin's monastery at Marmoutier.³⁵⁰ It is equally difficult to be sure of the exact character of 'medite'. For the draftsman of ZRP, the monk's meditation was closely associated with the period of reading prescribed between the conclusion of the morning office and terce, after which he would go to work: 'ita meditem habeant fratres ut usque ad horam tertiam legant.'³⁵¹ In the corresponding passage of RIVP one

finds: 'a prima hora usque ad tertiam deo vacetur.'³⁵² There can be little doubt that the occupation of these three hours was meant to be centred on the Bible. To what extent such Bible-study involved (or formed part of) a habit of memorisation, rumination and recitation is impossible to say on the basis of these texts.³⁵³ Nor is there any indication of the way in which the reading of the younger monks was supervised or directed, or of what aids were available for the understanding of the biblical text.³⁵⁴ The relationship between private study and reflection - the 2RP speaks of 'meditem suum' - and public 'conlatio de scripturis' remains obscure. Common sense suggests that one who could be recognized as 'scitus' in a public assembly would previously have benefitted from the (oral and written) teaching of his elders. Understandably, however, the rules do not legislate for this educative process. The object of a rule was to ensure the smooth day-to-day running of the monastery. Unlike Jerome (in his letter to Rusticus) and Cassian (in the fourteenth Conference), the authors of these texts were not immediately concerned to provide an ideological framework within which the young monk might imagine his progress from novice to expert.

Eucherius

Apart from the two rules studied above (which, on one hypothesis, may reflect the organisation of Honoratus' monastery in its formative period), our earliest evidence of a potentially 'Lerinian' ascetic spirituality is provided by the two short treatises De laude heremi and

De contemptu mundi et saecularis philosophiae written by Eucherius.³⁵⁵

Both works date from the period 427-430, during which the author was closely associated with the island community. The second is of particular interest for the history of ideas of Christian literary activity.

The De contemptu mundi takes the form of a letter addressed to a relative of Eucherius named Valerianus, designed to persuade him to become a monk. Like Paulinus' friend Jovius, Valerianus is presented as sympathetic to the author's religious 'professio' but as excessively attached to secular pursuits, especially philosophy. Exhorting him to abandon these concerns in favour of a Christian 'philosophia', Eucherius appeals directly to his sense of his own capacities as a reader and writer/orator:

Quin tu repudiatis illis philosophorum praeceptis quorum
lectioni ac ingenium accommodas, ad imbibenda christiani
dogmatis studia animum adiecis. Illic quoque, quo facundia
tua atque ingenium exerceatur, invenies.³⁵⁶

The conversion of Valerianus' intellectual interests, including his reading, is seen as a prerequisite for his full religious conversion: 'ad studia te nostrorum et scripta converte'.³⁵⁷ The 'scripta' here in question are, of course, the Scriptures. These Valerianus would come to appreciate for their inner meaning; the internal radiance of the Bible was such that the human eye was initially unable to behold it.³⁵⁸ The image of the 'fulgor scripturarum' also appears in Cassian's fourteenth Conference, with the important difference that the brightness is there said to affect only those who had first purged their inner senses by

long ascetic endeavour.³⁵⁹ Such considerations were evidently judged inappropriate to a protreptic work of the kind intended by Eucherius; the Christian 'lectio' which he recommends, though of vaguely philosophical type, is not obviously ascetic.

A further reason for Valerianus to change his style of life is provided by the examples of others, among them men of high secular rank and achievement: 'Nam quae mundi nobilitas, qui honores, quae dignitas, quae sapientia, quae facundia, quae litterae non se iam ad hanc caelestis regni militiam contulerunt ?'³⁶⁰ To make the point more graphically, Eucherius produces a miniature De viris illustribus: Clement (of Rome), two Gregories (Wonderworker and Nazianzen), Basil, Paulinus of Nola...³⁶¹ All these men had become bishops. They are presented to Valerianus primarily as persons distinguished by their literary, rhetorical and philosophical attainments. The catalogue is completed by a list of Christian writers ('clarissimi facundia') adapted and expanded from Jerome's Letter 70.³⁶² Composed by a Christian writer for the benefit of one who himself had artistic pretensions, the passage as a whole can only be construed as an incitement to a double, literary and religious conversion. That said, it is by no means clear what form Valerianus' future Christian literary activity was to take.³⁶³

Eucherius offers his De contemptu mundi as a kind of biblical epitome.³⁶⁴ Additional evidence of his interest in the ideal of a Christian writing 'de scripturis' is to be found in two of his other works, the Formulae spiritalis intellegentiae and Instructiones.³⁶⁵ The

Formulae is a repertory of allegorical interpretations of various words and numbers found in the Bible, divided into ten classes. The first book of Instructiones consists of a collection of biblical 'quaestiones', the second of literal interpretations of expressions liable to cause difficulty. Neither work was intended to be original; the answers and interpretations proposed are ostensibly those encountered by the author in the course of his own reading of the works of biblical commentators.³⁶⁶ The preface to the Formulae begins with a justification of the allegorical quality of Scripture, seen as a means of concealing its most precious contents from the general gaze.³⁶⁷ Eucherius then expounds a theory of the 'sensus triplex', attempting to reconcile it with an alternative theory of the 'sensus quadruplex' as found in Cassian's fourteenth Conference.³⁶⁸ That attempt is followed, rather inconsequentially, by an anatomy of the 'practical' and 'theoretical' sciences derived from the same source.³⁶⁹ The practical science ('practice', 'scientia actualis') is said to concern the 'emendatio morum', the theoretical ('theoretice', 'scientia contemplativa') to consist in 'contemplatio caelestium' and 'divinarum scripturarum disputatio'. The two 'parts' of the contemplative science are termed 'historica disputatio' and 'spiritualis intellegentiae interpretatio'. As a summary of the scheme used by Cassian, Eucherius' exposé leaves little to be desired. What is lacking is Cassian's firm insistence on the priority of the 'scientia actualis'. As a result, whereas the object of the fourteenth Conference had been to assert the necessity of a monastic education for anyone who aspired to interpret the Bible, the reader of the Formulae might be forgiven for supposing that all that was

needed for the acquisition of 'spiritalis scientia' was a facility for recognizing certain figures of speech.

Salvian

Among the Lerinian 'masters' mentioned in the preface to Eucherius' Instructiones is Salvian, there described as 'eloquentia pariter scientiaque praeeminens'.³⁷⁰ Unlike Honoratus and Eucherius, Salvian never became a bishop.³⁷¹ As a teacher and author, however, he appears to have exercised a considerable influence on his contemporaries. Of his surviving works, the only one that contains an explicit reference to the practice of biblical 'lectio' is the De gubernatione dei (c.440).

Having argued that the Romans of his day were being justly punished for failing to observe the divine law, Salvian faced the objection that certain barbarian peoples - namely the Goths and Vandals - were equally deserving of punishment, since they too possessed the Scriptures in which that law was set out.³⁷² His answer is in two parts. In the first place, he says, these peoples had access only to imperfect translations of the biblical text and were thereby deprived of its fullness ('plenitudo'). The Romans were the sole true Bible-readers: 'nos ergo tantum scripturas sanctas plenas inviolatas integras habemus... nos tantummodo bene legimus.'³⁷³ Secondly, the majority of barbarians were illiterate and therefore dependent on a (false) tradition of oral instruction: 'sacramentum divinae legis doctrina magis quam lectione cognoscunt.'³⁷⁴ The conclusion follows naturally: the Goths and Vandals

could not be judged guilty of contravening a law of which they were imperfectly informed. This line of argument reflects Salvian's essentially moral and legalistic approach to Scripture. The Bible was the word of God, to be considered as the word of a law-giver.³⁷⁵ The prime requirement on the Christian was to keep the divine law.³⁷⁶ The error of the Romans was to have read that law without obeying.³⁷⁷ Although this insistence on the Bible as a set of commands ('iussa ac praecepta') is clearly compatible with Cassian's view of the importance of 'actualis scientia' as the basis of all higher achievement in the spiritual life, there is little in Salvian's writings that specifically recalls the ascetic ideology of the Conferences.³⁷⁸

As regards his own role as a Christian writer, Salvian is quite plain: 'quia ipsum quodammodo scripturae sacrae oraculum dei mens est, quicquid agnosci per suos vel praedicari deus voluit non tacebo.'³⁷⁹ There is no suggestion that special skills or qualifications were required of the preacher; his function was simply to publicize what was already manifest in the Scriptures. For the author of the De gubernatione dei, this meant compiling 'exempla' and 'testimonia' from the Bible, so as to reveal the manner of God's dealings with man.³⁸⁰ The foundations of his work were solidly scriptural: 'cum enim opus hoc manus quodammodo divinorum voluminum instruxerit.'³⁸¹ Without pretending to be a biblical epitomator, Salvian claimed the same biblical guarantee for his version of events that Sulpicius had sought in the preface to his Chronicle.³⁸²

Gennadius

Before dismissing Salvian's testimony as irrelevant to the history of monastic 'lectio', one should perhaps consider the notice given of him by a contemporary literary historian:

SALVIANUS, apud Massiliam presbyter, humana et divina litteratura instructus et, ut absque invidia loquar, magister episcoporum, scripsit scholastico et aperto sermone multa...

So writes Gennadius, at the beginning of the sixty-eighth chapter of his De viris illustribus (c.470). As its title suggests, this work is a continuation of the Christian bio-bibliography begun by Jerome at the end of the previous century.³⁸³ Unlike Jerome, however, Gennadius made a consistent attempt to evaluate the performance of individual authors in relation to an ideal of the Christian writer as one versed in Scripture.³⁸⁴ This tendency is chiefly manifested in two ways. On the one hand, writers are commended (criticised) for their use (neglect/abuse) of scriptural 'testimonia' in particular works.³⁸⁵ On the other hand, they are liable to be introduced with a phrase that reflects the bibliographer's judgment of their overall biblical competence. Such phrases are usually complimentary (e.g. 'vir in divinis scripturis doctus/eruditus/satis intentus').³⁸⁶ Occasionally they are not.³⁸⁷ Sometimes they are balanced by an assessment of the subject's secular erudition.³⁸⁸ The phrase used to describe Salvian's educational accomplishments - 'humana et divina litteratura instructus' - is especially notable. In the first place, it is matched only by an earlier description of Evagrius of Pontus ('divina et humana litteratura insignis').³⁸⁹ Secondly,

it involves an unusual application of the word 'litteratura'. Evagrius, it may be recalled, had been one of the masters of John Cassian; Gennadius had translated some of his works, described as 'monachis necessaria'.³⁹⁰ Salvian was still alive and resident in the very city where the De viris illustribus was composed.³⁹¹ What was the sense of the compliment paid by Gennadius to these two men - and what are its implications ?

In its rare occurrences in the works of classical authors, 'litteratura' carries a variety of meanings, none of them equivalent to the modern 'literature'. The first appearance of the word in something like its modern sense is in the work of Tertullian, for whom 'litteratura' regularly meant 'that which existed in writing' or 'a body of texts'.³⁹² On several occasions Tertullian applies the word to the pagan classics, designated simply as 'litteratura (vestra)' in his apologetical works but always as 'litteratura saecularis' in those addressed to a Christian audience. Elsewhere he uses it in connection with the Bible; then the reference is usually to the books of the Old Testament, specified as 'litteratura Iudaica' or 'litteratura divina'. As a rule, however, he refers to the Bible as 'scriptura'. The next Latin writer known to have made consistent use of 'litteratura' in the sense of 'literature' is Jerome, himself an avid reader of Tertullian. Unlike his African predecessor, Jerome never refers to the Bible as 'litteratura'. Instead, he frequently opposes the Scriptures ('scripturae') to classical literature, for which, following Tertullian, he uses the phrase 'litteratura saecularis' (among others). Thus, in the De viris illustribus, he alludes to one writer's erudition 'tam in

scripturis quam in saeculari litteratura' and to the works of another as full of erudition and eloquence 'tam de scripturis divinis quam de saecularis litteraturae instrumento'.³⁹³ From such juxtapositions as these it would appear to be but a short step to the distinction which Gennadius makes between 'litteratura divina' and 'litteratura humana'. There is, however, another aspect of this vocabulary to be taken into consideration. As well as occasionally having the sense of 'literature', the word 'litteratura' is used by late Latin authors in both the senses of 'grammar' and 'liberal culture'. The semantic field of 'litteratura' thus overlapped substantially with that of the more common word 'litterae'. Used objectively of an intellectual discipline, 'litterae' could carry any one (or more) of three meanings in classical and post-classical Latin, namely: the elements of literacy (otherwise 'litteratio'), grammar (otherwise 'grammaticae'), the liberal arts (otherwise 'artes/disciplinae liberales'). In addition to these **objective** meanings, 'litterae' also appears in a **subjective** sense, denoting the accomplishments of a liberally educated person. This remark applies equally to 'litteratura'. One thus arrives at four possible meanings, or areas of meaning, for the word 'litteratura', namely: (1) literature, in something like the modern sense of the word, (2) grammar, (3) liberal culture, considered objectively as a discipline or set of disciplines, and (4) the same liberal culture, considered subjectively as a personal accomplishment of characteristic of the 'vir litteratus'.³⁹⁴

Given the contexts in which it occurs, Gennadius' phrase 'humana litteratura' is evidently to be understood in one or other of senses

(3) and (4) above. ('Litteratura' in the strict sense of 'grammar' is rare outside the grammarians and certain works of Augustine.) Preserving the implicit analogy between human and divine 'litteratura', one may say that Salvian appeared to his bibliographer as a person formed in the twin **disciplines** of pagan and Christian 'letters' ('humana et divina litteratura instructus'), and Evagrius as one distinguished by his double **literary culture** ('divina et humana litteratura insignis').

The significance of these descriptions, it may be suggested, lies in the assurance with which Gennadius assimilates secular and biblical literary learning. Reference was made in the introduction to this chapter to the fourth- and fifth-century debate concerning the proper mode of Christian education.³⁹⁵ Gennadius' views on that subject are not in doubt. As an enthusiastic student of early Egyptian coenobitism and fervent admirer of Cassian (whose bibliography is the second longest in this part of the De viris illustribus), he clearly believed in the value of monastic institutions as centres of Christian instruction. His entries on Gallic authors are the work of one committed to the ascetic and pastoral ideals promoted in the course of the fifth century by a series of teachers associated with Lérins and Marseille. All the major literary exponents of that tradition - Cassian, Eucherius, Vincent of Lérins, Salvian, Hilary of Arles, Faustus of Riez - receive flattering notices. Where Jerome had written on his own account, his successor in Christian literary historiography wrote as the representative of a line of distinguished 'doctores Gallicani'.³⁹⁶ In view of this fact, it is tempting to regard his advocacy of a double 'litteratura' as the product of certain local developments and tendencies. The positive value which

he sets on secular eloquence (considered as the accompaniment of other, more specifically Christian virtues) is perhaps most easily explained as the reflex of one whose ear was attuned to Gallic varieties of the 'sermo scholasticus'.³⁹⁷ More importantly, his willingness to postulate a Christian literary culture broadly analogous to the secular one would seem to argue a greater confidence in the institutional basis for contemporary 'biblical' education than was possessed by either Augustine or Jerome (neither of whom, it may be assumed, would have risked the phrase translated in the previous paragraph). For a writer in Gennadius' position there was no longer any danger that the science of Scripture would be confused with, or subsumed in, the traditional arts of the Roman 'litteratus'. Why ? Because that science now constituted a discipline in its own right, with its own masters. The Massilian rhetor Victorinus is blamed, not for failing to apply himself to the Bible, but for doing so without due supervision.³⁹⁸ Salvian, who had taught Eucherius' son Salonius at Lérins, is described as 'magister episcoporum'. Vincent of Lerins, Hilary of Arles, Musaeus of Marseille and another Gallic writer, also Vincent, are presented as 'viri in scripturis sanctis docti' - that is (one may interpret), as men not merely learned but **instructed** in the Scriptures.³⁹⁹

The above reading of the De viris illustribus admittedly owes something to the more general picture of monastic and episcopal 'doctrina' to be presented in the following section. The object of offering it at this point is to emphasise the extent to which the literary achievements of men like Eucherius and Salvian could be seen - if only in retrospect - as forming part of a continuous tradition of southern Gallic biblical culture. When read as a sequel to Cassian's Conferences or the 'Lerinian' rules, the works of such writers are unlikely to impress by their presentation of the theory of monastic 'lectio'. As testimony to the scriptural prowess of persons known to have lived as monks they could nevertheless serve as powerful confirmation of the existence of a new kind of biblical 'litteratura'.⁴⁰⁰

IV. The literary persona of the Gallic monk-bishop

A feature of much late-antique Christian writing is reliance on the examples of famous individuals as means of recommending particular conceptions of Christian life.⁴⁰¹ Writers whose training in rhetoric had taught them to respect and exploit the normative value of 'exempla' of all kinds were inclined to believe, with Jerome, that 'every enterprise had its natural leaders'.⁴⁰² This belief was confirmed by a practice of biblical interpretation that emphasised the morally exemplary character of Old and New Testament figures. To the existing stock of biblical 'exempla' were added others from ecclesiastical history. Even living personalities were cited in certain connections. (Thus, for instance, Sulpicius could claim his friend Paulinus as a contemporary example - 'praestantissimum praesentium temporum exemplum' - of obedience to the biblical commandment to sell all one's possessions.)⁴⁰³ The range of possible forms of literary presentation of Christian 'exempla' was very wide. At one extreme was the kind of 'name-dropping' favoured by Jerome in his Letters. At the other stood the full-scale portrait or 'life'. The latter type of writing is scarcely attested in the the Christian literature of the first three centuries. In the course of the fourth and fifth centuries, however, the literary 'saint's life' gradually emerged as one of the most popular modes of Christian edification. These Lives appear in a variety of shapes and styles. Common to all of them is the more or less explicit aim of providing a model for imitation: 'ut ad eius aemulationem atque exemplum vos instituere possitis' (thus a Latin translator of the Vita Antonii).⁴⁰⁴ Of the major Latin Lives extant from the fifth century,

all but two are by Gallic authors and of Gallic saints.⁴⁰⁵ Without exception, the subjects of these Gallic Lives are bishops who lived as monks.

Some account has already been given of the role played by human examples in the creation of a Christian literary ideology. Among those implicated were David (cited by Hilary and Paulinus), Origen (cited by Jerome) and Jerome (cited by Sulpicius). Jerome's lists of exemplary Christian writers were imitated by Eucherius, as they were later to be by Sidonius Apollinaris.⁴⁰⁶ The Gennadian De viris illustribus, it was suggested, offered so many examples of the 'vir in divinis scripturis doctus'. There is considerable evidence, then, that Gallic authors of this period were interested in fashioning a literary persona consistent with their idea of the truly Christian life. Might one not expect this interest to be reflected in the literary Lives of prominent Christians, especially when the latter were also 'litterati'? The mention of a person's literary accomplishments was, after all, a standard feature of classical biography and encomium. In panegyric, it was normal to refer to the subject's literary and rhetorical studies in the section devoted to his education.⁴⁰⁷ In Suetonius' Lives of the Caesars, a passage dealing with such pursuits regularly occurs in the part of the Life describing the emperor's character and manners.⁴⁰⁸ The influence of both these biographical traditions would have been felt by the authors of fifth-century saints' Lives. Needless to say, one should not expect to find passages in a Christian Life exactly comparable with those composed in commemoration of the literary culture and eloquence of pagan subjects. The ideals of a classical education had long been perceived

by Christians as, in some respects at least, at variance with those of their religion. Reading, writing and public speaking were nevertheless currently practised by Christians. In certain contexts (e.g. when they were related to the text of the Bible) they could even be considered as specifically Christian activities. How were they to be presented in a Christian Life ?

The third-century Life of Cyprian concerns a saint and martyr who was also a writer. According to the author, Pontius, Cyprian's literary fame was so great 'ut usque in finem mundi fortasse non taceat.'⁴⁰⁹ The project of a Life had therefore to be justified as a means of adorning a reputation already assured. The saint's literary works are catalogued, after a fashion, at the point in the narrative where an explanation is required for his initial evasion of his persecutors: if he had been martyred at this stage, Pontius explains, the world would have been deprived of the benefit of his books.⁴¹⁰ The circumstances of this literary activity are barely touched upon. Rejecting the classical practice of beginning a biography with information on the subject's family, birth, upbringing and education, Pontius begins with Cyprian's conversion, represented as a consequence of his reading the Bible.⁴¹¹ In addition to applying the precepts of Scripture to his own conduct, the saint is said to have used them in his teaching, both as a writer and preacher.⁴¹² Finally, his commitment to the sacred text was expressed in the attitude which he took towards his impending martyrdom: 'tantum illi fuit sacri cupido sermonis, ut optaret sic sibi passionis vota contingere, ut dum de deo loquitur, in ipso sermonis opere necaretur.'⁴¹³ Cyprian, we know from his own writings, regarded Bible-reading

as a way of listening to God and prayer as a way of talking to him.⁴¹⁴ On the evidence of this passage in the Life, it would seem that he regarded the business of the Christian teacher as essentially that of talking about God ('de deo loqui') on the basis of his (biblical) word; the 'opus sermonis' was dependent on the 'sermo sacer'. The idea of a link between reading and teaching is not developed in the Life of Cyprian. It is, however, taken up in one of the fifth-century Gallic Lives to be considered below.⁴¹⁵

Two later Lives of non-Gallic saints likewise concern bishops with literary reputations. The Life of Ambrose (422) by Paulinus of Milan begins with the story of a miraculous event, interpreted as a premonition of the subject's gifts of eloquence.⁴¹⁶ It also contains numerous references to Ambrose's published works. The Life of Augustine (c.432) by Possidius of Calama was accompanied by a list of the saint's writings (the Indiculus), designed to assist those interested in procuring copies.⁴¹⁷ Possidius presents Augustine as one whose activity as a writer was a natural extension of his teaching viva voce and evokes the huge quantity of his works in terms previously used by Jerome with reference to Origen.⁴¹⁸ These works were the author's own memorial. Possidius insists, nevertheless, that there was more to Augustine than met the eye of the reader. Only those who had heard and seen him preach and who were witnesses to his life could fully appreciate his greatness.⁴¹⁹ There was therefore room for a literary Life that would also be, in large measure, a 'literary life'. Possidius' balanced and informative presentation of his subject as saint and writer is unique in

early Christian hagiography and undoubtedly owes much to Augustine's own long reflection on the role of the Christian teacher and intellectual.

Compared with the Life of Cyprian, the Lives of Ambrose and Augustine show clearly the impact on western spirituality of new models of sanctity imported from the East. Those models were constituted of the monastic 'exempla' of men like St. Antony, whose Life appeared in Greek around the middle of the fourth century and was quickly rendered into Latin.⁴²⁰ Other ascetic Lives followed in due course: those of the eastern saints Paul, Malchus and Hilarion (between 377 and 392) by Jerome, that of Martin of Tours (397) by Sulpicius Severus. One effect of the diffusion of such 'exempla' was to create a new ideological environment for the activities of reading, writing and teaching, as practised by Christians. Thus, on the one hand, the tendency to depreciate the supposed merits of a secular literary culture, already observable in the Life of Cyprian, became more pronounced. (Antony, we are told, had resisted his parents' attempts to give him a literary education.)⁴²¹ At the same time, new accents were to be heard in the discussion of specifically Christian activities. Most obviously, perhaps, the examples of the eastern monks provided a powerful sanction for Christian preoccupation with the Bible. In addition, eloquence - particularly if related to the Bible - could now be made to appear as a spiritual gift entirely independent of a person's secular education. Finally, the mechanical activity of writing acquired new prestige as part of a monastic way of life.

All these tendencies are discernible in the Life of Martin. Sulpicius' hero, like the legendary St. Antony, was a 'homo inlitteratus'.⁴²² The rhythm of his daily existence depended on the act of Bible-reading: 'numquam hora ulla momentumque praeteriit quo non aut orationi incumberet aut insisteret lectioni.'⁴²³ Totally committed to prayer and the Bible, he was also highly effective in his public role as teacher and exegete:

Iam vero in verbis et confabulatione eius quanta gravitas, quanta dignitas erat! Quam acer, quam efficax erat, quam in absolvendis scripturarum quaestionibus promptus et facilis! ...Iesum testor... me ex nullius umquam ore tantum scientiae, tantum ingenii, tantum tam boni et tam puri sermonis audisse.⁴²⁴

Antony, too, had been skilled in speech and argument, and many Egyptian monks had reputations as solvers of biblical 'quaestiones'. Despite a number of suspiciously Ciceronian touches, Sulpicius' portrait of the Christian orator reflects a common belief in the divinely-inspired eloquence of the holy man. Insofar as that kind of eloquence had previously been considered the speciality of certain hermits living outside ordinary human society, its attribution to a bishop such as Martin would appear to indicate a major development in the ideology of Christian communication. Martin's conversation ('confabulatio') was more accessible than Antony's. In depicting the character of a Gallic monk-bishop, Sulpicius proposed a new ideal of the Christian teacher. For his ideal of the Christian writer, as we have already seen, he looked elsewhere.⁴²⁵ The only 'writers' mentioned in the Life of Martin - apart from Sulpicius himself and the pagan biographers whom he seeks to outdo - are the junior monks in the monastery at Marmoutier, engaged

in copying manuscripts.⁴²⁶ Even this fact acquires significance when considered in relation to the ideals of sanctity presented in other Latin Lives. Jerome, who recommends the activity of copying to Rusticus, also provides the example of a saint who had transcribed the Gospels for his own use.⁴²⁷ Ambrose, we are told by Paulinus, was in the habit of copying texts for himself ('propria manu').⁴²⁸ In such ways was the monastic 'opus scriptoris' recommended to Latin 'litterati' of the early fifth century.

According to Sulpicius, Martin retained the character of a monk even while acting as a bishop: 'ita... inplebat episcopi dignitatem, ut non tamen propositum monachi virtutemque desereret.'⁴²⁹ He thus appears as the immediate ancestor of the ascetically-inclined bishops of the fifth century. Having already studied several aspects of monastic reading, with particular reference to the ascetic milieu of Lérins and Marseille, we may now turn to the hagiographical evidence for associated ideas of the reading-, writing- and teaching-activity of the monk who turned bishop.

Lerinian Lives

The founder and first abbot of Lérins, Honoratus, was bishop of Arles for barely two years between 427/8 and 430.⁴³⁰ In the Life written for the first anniversary of his death by his successor, Hilary of Arles, and preached as a sermon on that occasion, the section relating to his episcopate (excluding the account of his last moments) occupies less

than a twelfth of the whole. The division proposed by Sulpicius between the hero's deeds 'ante episcopatum' and 'in episcopatu' thus no longer provided the main articulation of the narrative.⁴³¹ Addressing Honoratus' former congregation at Arles, Hilary explains that he has concentrated on what they did not already know - that is, on the events of his subject's life prior to his episcopal consecration.⁴³² This shift in the balance of the Life has important consequences for the presentation of the hagiographic 'exemplum'. Instead of expanding upon the monastic comportment of a bishop (as Sulpicius had done), Hilary insists on the episcopal qualities of a monk. From an early stage in his career, Honoratus' actions had betrayed the future bishop: 'privatus quidam iam tunc in conversatione [eius] episcopatus gerebatur.'⁴³³ His ordination to the priesthood and subsequent elevation to the episcopate were merely the formal recognition of merits already patent.⁴³⁴ Prominent among the saint's 'episcopal' qualities were his hospitality, charity and effectiveness as a teacher, both by word and example.⁴³⁵

The clearest illustration of Honoratus' 'doctrina' relates to the author's own experience as a monk at Lérins. Hilary recalls how, after persuading him to come to the island, he had set about his spiritual instruction:

Alit primum lacte et postmodum cibo, potat me profluo illo
qui in se erat caelestis fonte sapientiae. Atque utinam
tantum angustiae spiritus mei recepissent quantum ille
studebat infundere!⁴³⁶

The process of a Lerinian education is here evoked in terms of a close personal relationship between master and disciple, of a type reminiscent

of Egyptian monasticism and frequently suggested by Gallic writers of this period.⁴³⁷ Compared with the vague manner in which Hilary refers to the education of Honoratus himself,⁴³⁸ the vivid imagery of nutrition and infusion used in this passage is striking. Hilary, unlike his master, was a product of Lérins. Consequently, the autobiographical elements in the Life of Honoratus are no less significant for the history of 'Lerinian' ideology than the example of its hero. The idea of Lérins as a place of education seems to have been established early on, along with the idea that that education could be the making of a bishop.⁴³⁹ By initiating Hilary in the 'caelestia studia' of the island monastery, Honoratus had unwittingly prepared him for his present ministry:

Vobis licet indignum praeparavit, vobis ille me nesciens
tanto labore quaesivit, vobis tam propensa sollicitudine et
cura utcumque erudivit.⁴⁴⁰

The dative 'vobis' (repeated a total of five times in this passage) implies an advantage that the people of Arles would not be allowed to forget: the man now charged with their spiritual education had received the best possible training for the job. Viewed in this light, the first 'Lerinian' Life is as much an apology for its author as a eulogy of his predecessor. In celebrating a monk who was also a great teacher, Hilary presented his own credentials as a monk-bishop.

A similar blend of biography and self-justification is to be found in the Sermo de sancto Maximo episcopo et abbate ascribed to 'Eusebius' but almost certainly by Faustus of Riez.⁴⁴¹ The latter was Maximus'

immediate successor, both as abbot of Lérins (from 433) and as bishop of Riez (from c.460), and presumably composed the sermon for an occasion similar to that indicated for Hilary's Life of Honoratus. Despite its relative brevity, the Life of Maximus is recognizably in the tradition of the earlier work. It differs from it, however, in its much sharper formulation of the hero's progress from monastery to bishopric. Convinced that Honoratus was a 'homo naturaliter episcopalis', Hilary explained his translation from Lerins to Arles as an act of divine providence.⁴⁴² In Faustus' account of the double career of Maximus the workings of providence are guaranteed by a set of appropriate ideas and images. The idea of a monastic preparation for episcopal office remains fundamental, but is extended to include the experience of governing the monastery, common to both Maximus and Faustus: 'praefertur insulae, praeparatur ecclesiae'.⁴⁴³ This statement introduces a sequence of 'Lerinian' datives of advantage ('vobis' nine times in rapid succession!), each accompanied by an image translating Maximus' endeavours as a monk into benefits for his new congregation. Thus, for example, the images of nutrition and infusion used by Hilary to evoke his own spiritual education are given a pastoral connotation: 'vobis potum de illo gratiarum fonte sitiens hauriebat, ut, quasi mater sollicita, escas, quae de illo vitae horreo sumpserat, in sensus vestros pleno de corde transfunderet'.⁴⁴⁴ Lest any member of his audience should miss the invitation to view Faustus' own career in a similar light, he makes a show of withdrawing it: 'merito se vobis imputet beata illa insula ex hoc uno atque unico munere [sc. Maximo], licet multum erubescat ex alio'.⁴⁴⁵ He then presents the career-profile of a Lerinian monk-bishop according to a scheme which would have been familiar to Jerome and

which, to this day, exercises a powerful influence on historians of the fifth-century Gallic church:

Vir ille praecipuus illic doctus, ut hic doceret; illic ditatus, ut hic feneraret; illic illuminatus, ut hic refulgeret; illic purificatus, ut hic sanctificaret; et, ut hic exercere posset confectionem curationum, illuc quaesivit aromata et pigmenta virtutum.⁴⁴⁶

For all their undoubted suggestiveness, these images of a teleological continuity between the monastic and episcopal phases of a person's life offer little or no indication of the content of a Lerinian education. There is one area, however, in which Faustus adds some detail to his portrait of Maximus. Having recounted the circumstances in which his predecessor became bishop of Riez, he alludes briefly to his comportment in the office. Predictably, this is represented as a continuation of Maximus' former monastic lifestyle:

Et quia superius memoravimus quam magnifice insulano illo stadio perfectionis vias cucurrit, plus est quod huc insulam ipsam institutis ac studiis suis transtulit. Et qui iamdudum in abbatem pontificem gesserat, postmodum abbatem in pontificem custodivit.⁴⁴⁷

The subsequent description of Maximus as 'semper occupatus et semper vacans' is partly justified by a reference to his commitment to reading, preaching and prayer:

Nulla illi ex omnibus propensior fuit cura, nisi aut de deo in lectione aut sermone, aut cum deo in oratione loqueretur.⁴⁴⁸

The monastic and Cyprianic doublet of 'lectio' and 'oratio' is thus

expanded into a triple occupation - which is simultaneously a 'vacation' in the sense implied by the expression 'vacare deo' - comprising 'lectio', 'sermo' and 'oratio'.

A third example of 'Lerinian' biography is provided by a late fifth-century Life of Hilary of Arles (+449). Little is known of its author, except that he was a priest. He himself indicates that he was writing a number of years after Hilary's death, at the request of certain bishops.⁴⁴⁹ Other evidence suggests a date of composition around the year 470.⁴⁵⁰ The structure of the work, which was evidently intended to be read rather than preached, is as follows: preface (1-2), Hilary's conversion and life as a monk at Lérins (3-8), his consecration as bishop of Arles in succession to Honoratus (9-10), the character and events of his episcopate (11-24), his final illness, death and funeral (25-29), peroration (29-33). As in the Life of Honoratus, which the author knew well, the hero's elevation to the episcopate is regarded as confirmation of virtues already manifested: 'consecratur in sacerdotio, iam diu virtutum meritis consecratus.'⁴⁵¹ However, the ratio of the parts of the Life allotted to the periods 'ante episcopatum' and 'in episcopatu' is reversed with respect to the earlier work. The biographer was evidently much better informed of the events of his subject's twenty-year episcopate than he was with regard to his early life, for which he relies on the writings of Eucherius (De laude heremi) and of Hilary himself (Vita Honorati). The account given of Hilary's performance as bishop is at once systematic and full of curious detail. It is the most complete presentation that we possess of the character of

a Lerinian monk-bishop in action prior to the mid-sixth-century Life of Caesarius.

Like Faustus in his Life of Maximus, the author of the Life of Hilary lays emphasis on the progression from monastic education to episcopal teaching. He presents Hilary's relationship with his master, Honoratus, as a form of the discipleship owed by the Christian to Christ: 'O vere perfectus Christi discipulus, qui vias magistri [sc. Honorati] secutus exercuit docendo quod didicit!'⁴⁵² One of the first acts of his episcopate was the foundation of a monastery at Arles.⁴⁵³ The continuity between his life as a monk and subsequent existence as a bishop is made plain:

Cum primum speculatoris suscepit officium, in se ipso primum monstravit quomodo congregatio [viz. the urban monastic community] mundum contemneret, corpus despiceret et vitia superaret. Fatigaretur laboribus, manuum quoque operibus continuis vexaretur, sanctis paginis inhaereret, ieiuniis, vigiliis studium commodaret, unius tunicae tegmine aestatis ardorem et hiemis rigorem toleraret.⁴⁵⁴

Read in conjunction with references elsewhere to Hilary's habits of prayer and meditation,⁴⁵⁵ this passage offers as full a repertoire of monastic activities as any list provided by Cassian. The author of the Life insists particularly on the importance of manual work, both as a means of economic support and as the proper accompaniment of more spiritual occupations. At one point he describes how his hero contrived to combine simultaneously the activities of reading, dictating and net-making. His feat so impressed a contemporary poet, Edesius, that he commemorated it in verse:

Credere vix possum quemque sic tempore eodem
Nectere dictantem, relegendo, lecta fatendo,
Ore, manu simul hoc operari, adtendere, fari.⁴⁵⁶

This novelty is followed by another: according to his biographer, Hilary was one of the first to introduce the practice of mealtime Bible-reading in an urban community ('in civitatibus').⁴⁵⁷

In the summary given of Hilary's 'exemplum', personal meditation and public teaching are juxtaposed: 'in meditatione iugiter permanere, verbi ministerio indesinenter insistere.'⁴⁵⁸ For an idea of the relation between these two aspects of a double vocation, one may look to the saint's valedictory speech to the members of his urban monastery:

"Militavimus huc usque spiritali militia, infidi corporis aculeos cilicii asperitate contudimus; abstinentiae rigore ac vigiliarum lassitudine universa vitiorum certamina auxilio superavimus desuper implorato; cogitationum laqueos sancta meditatione disrupimus; occupati studiis doctrinae caelestis talentum perennitatis multitudini fidelium non cessavimus erogare; navigavimus per vitae istius pelagus, et diversa iuvante domino virtutum mercimonia cum fenore usurae salutiferae deo referenda percepimus; ad portum quietis domino gubernante coepimus propinquare."⁴⁵⁹

The order of the narrative (monastic virtues, teaching activity, final reward) is ideological as well as chronological. As in the writings of Cassian, meditation on the Bible ('sancta meditatio') appears as one of a number of monastic activities that are to be fully mastered before a person can aspire to teach others. The Cassianic scheme is combined - in the latter part of the passage quoted - with characteristically 'Lerinian' imagery of an economy of salvation involving both preacher and people. The vocation of the monk-bishop is neatly captured in the

second of the two clauses underlined: the 'Lerinian' saint was one who, wholly engaged as he was ('occupatus') in spiritual pursuits conducive to his own perfection, nevertheless worked tirelessly for the salvation of the multitude. One sign of growing personal perfection, according to Cassian, was enhanced understanding of Scripture.⁴⁶⁰ Summoning his brother monks to close study of the Bible, Hilary had also enjoined them to 'cultivate' the mass of the faithful: "Fidem trinitatis immobiliter retinete; scripturarum interiora penetrate, ut 'abyssum invocantes in voce cataractarum' [Ps. 43,8], id est credentium, terras dono superno irrigare omnimodis non cessetis."⁴⁶¹

Orthodox theology and an ability to grasp the inner meaning of Scripture were the conditions for successful pastoral or 'agricultural' activity. The idea of spiritual 'cultura' reappears in the peroration of the Life, in which Hilary is presented as a 'spiritalis et peritus agricola' and an image of the saint as a source of life-giving water (cf. John 7,38) is combined with one of celestial 'feneratio' to produce a composite picture of the 'dispensator divinus',

de cuius pectore exundanti fluvio et fonte caritatis irriguo
sic hausit unusquisque quod voluit ac potuit, ut nullum
damnum largitas sancta sentiret, sed erogando cumulum potius
fenerator thesauri caelestis acceperit.⁴⁶²

The prominence of this kind of imagery in the Life of Hilary is doubtless largely due to the author's desire to do justice to his subject's reputation for eloquence. (The Christian image of the 'fons aquae viventis' was easily assimilated to the classical 'fons/flumen eloquentiae'.)⁴⁶³ The inexhaustible quality of Hilary's eloquence appears most

plainly in the section devoted to his preaching, corresponding to the rubric 'verbi ministerium' in the author's initial summary.⁴⁶⁴ As a preacher, Hilary had been renowned for his 'sententiae', his allegoresis, his use of rhetorical ornament, and for the trenchancy of his arguments against heresy. Most impressive of all, however, was his copiousness. A Lenten sermon might last four hours, with the result that seats were required for the audience. Only divine intervention, it is alleged, had prevented him from literally preaching without cease ('indessinenter'). Though capable of affecting a simple style for the benefit of the uneducated ('rustici'), he excelled before an audience of learned persons ('instructi'). The testimonies of a number of the latter are quoted as evidence. The most arresting is that attributed to a certain Livius, 'temporis illius poeta insignis', who reportedly told the saint: "Si Augustinus post te fuisset iudicaretur inferior."⁴⁶⁵ The insertion of this comparison may have been partly motivated by the biographer's wish to clear Hilary of imputations of unorthodoxy.⁴⁶⁶ In its immediate context, however, it forms part of a carefully composed portrait of the Christian orator and writer. It is followed by a list of the saint's published works, 'ex [quibus] quae eodem dicendi impetu concepit, genuit, ornavit, protulit, possit absque haesitatione dinosci.' (Was the author of the Life of Hilary influenced by the example of the Augustinian Life and Indiculus of Possidius ?) Apart from letters and some poetry, these works appear to have derived directly from Hilary's activity as a preacher. They include the Life of Honoratus, a series of homilies 'in totius anni festivitibus', and an 'expositio symboli'.

Sidonius Apollinaris

Among the names of the 'litterati' allegedly impressed by the eloquence of Hilary of Arles are a number that reappear in the writings of Sidonius (born c.431).⁴⁶⁷ As the son of the Gallic prefect of 448, the latter would certainly have spent some time in Arles during his adolescence.⁴⁶⁸ He is known to have been there on January 1, 449 (the year of Hilary's death) for the celebration of a consulship; twenty years later he could still describe the impression made on him by a speech delivered on that occasion by the lawyer Flavius Nicetius.⁴⁶⁹ We have no way of knowing whether he ever heard Hilary preach. The critical appreciations recorded in the Life of Hilary may nevertheless provide an appropriate background against which to view Sidonius' reactions to the literary and oratorical accomplishments of certain churchmen of his day. Though not credited with a saint's Life, Sidonius appears in many ways perfectly suited to be the author of Christian biography. Acclaimed panegyrist of three Roman emperors and epideictic poet for all occasions, he clearly possessed the necessary technical skills. Two of his most respected friends, Faustus of Riez and Constantius of Lyon, were the authors of Christian Lives.⁴⁷⁰ Several times, it seems, he himself almost composed such a work.⁴⁷¹ Even as things stand, however, one does not have to look far to find Sidonius the hagiographer. In addition to a semi-biographical poem addressed to Faustus and included in his Poems, many of the letters which he wrote and published after his 'conversion' in 469 contain important elements of biography and encomium. Concluding a volume of his correspondence, Sidonius describes his manner in the following terms: 'Dictavi enim quaequam hortando,

laudando plurima et aliqua suadendo, maerendo pauca iocandoque nonnulla.⁴⁷² Under the heading of 'laudationes' may be placed much of what he wrote concerning his fellow Christians, whether bishops, priests, monks or 'saeculares'. The paraenetic intent behind such writing is unmistakeable. The descriptions which Sidonius offers of the 'mores, gesta, virtutes' of persons whom he admired were meant to serve as 'exempla vitae', 'ad reliquorum informationem'.⁴⁷³

An important aspect of Sidonius' dedication to the ideal of 'Romanitas' was his commitment to a particular way of life, in which the activities of reading and writing occupied a significant place.⁴⁷⁴ It was a way of life exemplified by the friends whom he commemorates in his Letters, among them the rhetor Lampridius whose devotion to literary pursuits he solemnly records in an 'epitaphium' of 477/8: 'Scribebat assidue, quamquam frequentius scripturiret. Legebat etiam incessanter.'⁴⁷⁵ Sidonius was aware, of course, that persons who made a public profession of their Christianity - and, a fortiori, those who accepted the office of bishop - were expected to occupy themselves with texts of a different sort from those which had engrossed Lampridius. So much is apparent from his decision, taken on his 'conversion' ('ab exordio religiosae professionis'), to abandon the writing of poetry.⁴⁷⁶ The context for that decision seems to have been a more general conviction, expressed in a letter of c.479 to the poet Consentius of Narbonne, that the time had come for a new kind of reading-and-writing: 'Modo tempus est seria legi, seria scribi.'⁴⁷⁷ If Sidonius failed to promote the total reorientation of a person's 'studium et opera legendi scribendique', in the manner of Paulinus, he did at least admit the

necessity for a change of priorities.⁴⁷⁸ Models for that change are also presented in his Letters.

In a letter apparently written shortly before he was made a bishop (late 470), Sidonius extols the character of a priest named Himerius, whom he describes as a disciple of the Lerinian bishop of Troyes, Lupus. Among the qualities remarked in this priest is his zest for Christian reading-matter (viz. the Bible and possibly the works of commentators): 'Summa homini cura de litteris, sed maxime religiosis, in quibus eum magis occupat medulla sensuum quam spuma verborum.'⁴⁷⁹ Christian 'lectio', it may be observed, was not held to be exclusive of alternative kinds of reading.⁴⁸⁰ Other elements in this portrait indicate a monastic lifestyle considerably modified to suit contemporary aristocratic mores.⁴⁸¹ The same sense of an accommodation between two modes of life is given by a somewhat later letter describing the conduct of the 'vir inlustris' Vectius. The latter, according to Sidonius, now led a semi-monastic existence, combining such traditional pursuits as falconry and the training of hunting-dogs with Bible-reading and psalmody:

Inter haec sacrarum voluminum lectio frequens, per quam
inter edendum saepius sumit animae cibum; psalmos crebro
lectitat, crebrius cantat; novoque genere vivendi monachum
complet non sub palliolo sed sub paludamento.⁴⁸²

The author holds up the example of this new kind of monasticism as a model to all 'conversi' ('omnes nostrae professionis homines'), including his fellow bishops ('pace ordinis mei').⁴⁸³ As an ideal of sanctity it may have appeared less daunting than that offered by the

Lives of Lerinian monk-bishops and so more acceptable to men of Sidonius' stamp. In one major respect, however, Vectius failed to measure up to the requirements of the 'vir sacerdotalis'. Living as a kind of monk, he was free of the 'officium docentis' incumbent on every bishop.⁴⁸⁴ For examples of men who combined monastic virtues with the exercise of pastoral responsibility, Sidonius was bound to look first in the direction of Lerins.

In a Eucharisticon, or poem of thanks, addressed to Faustus around the year 464, he paints a series of tableaux of the Lerinian monk-bishop in his various roles.⁴⁸⁵ Faustus appears as a hermit, following in the footsteps of Elijah, John the Baptist and the heroes of early Egyptian monasticism (vv.91-103); as a member and past master of the community at Lérins, edifying his disciples with Lives of first-generation Lerinians such as Caprasius, Lupus, Honoratus, Maximus, Eucherius and Hilary (vv. 104-115); and finally as bishop of Riez, tending and teaching the people committed to his charge (vv.116-126). The poet concludes by emphasising the essential unity of these occupations, as represented by the persons (and names!) of Faustus and his illustrious predecessors:

Quidquid agis, quocumque loci es, semper mihi Faustus,
Semper Honoratus, semper quoque Maximus esto. (vv.127-128)

Remarks made earlier in the poem hint at longstanding contacts between the author and the Lerinian milieu.⁴⁸⁶ It is clear, in any case, that already by 464, five years before he himself became a bishop, Sidonius was familiar with the ideal of the monk-bishop advertised in works like Hilary's Life of Honoratus and Faustus' Life of Maximus.⁴⁸⁷

Among the more personal - though no less idealising - touches given to his portrait of Faustus in the Eucharisticon may be reckoned the description of the bishop in the act of preaching:

Seu te conspicuis gradibus venerabilis arae
Contionaturum plebs sedula circumstetit,
Expositae legis bibat auribus ut medicinam. (vv.123-126)

The clarity of the scene is almost iconographic. That Sidonius may in fact have had the opportunity of hearing Faustus preach before composing these lines is suggested both by an earlier narrative passage in the poem and by a letter addressed to the bishop of Riez some years later, in which he recalls the many past occasions on which he had 'applauded' the latter's sermons.⁴⁸⁸ This letter and another to Faustus (both of which appear in Book Nine of the correspondence) contain numerous reflections on his literary and oratorical activity. In neither case, however, is there anything recognizably 'Lerinian' about the manner in which that activity is evoked. Rather than stress the value of Faustus' monastic education as a preparation for his career as a teacher, Sidonius takes delight in juxtaposing the secular and religious aspects of his early formation.⁴⁸⁹ There is no hint of a relation between 'meditatio' and 'ministerium verbi' (as in the Life of Hilary) or between 'lectio' and 'sermo' (as, for example, in the Life of Maximus); indeed the Bible is wholly absent from these letters. Instead, the author insists on the character of the Christian dialectician and hammer of heretics.⁴⁹⁰ What signs there are of an ideological framework would seem to point to a more generalized, less monastic conception of the achievement of the Christian writer and preacher than was current in Lerinian circles.⁴⁹¹

Ought one to suppose, then, that Sidonius' admiration for teachers like Faustus was tempered by a desire to minimise the difference between their monastic formation and his own secular background ? Such a hypothesis may be favoured by the clear association of an ideal of biblical 'lectio' with the teaching function of the bishop that one finds in a letter purportedly written by his friend Claudianus Mamertus (published in Book Four of Sidonius' correspondence). Claudianus - if indeed he is the author - describes Sidonius' own activity in terms which would seem to suggest that the people of Clermont had lost nothing by not electing a former monk to be their new bishop: 'cum scripturarum caelestium mysteria rimaris, quo te studiosum imbuis, eo doctrinam ceteris copiosius infundis.'⁴⁹² Curiously, the idea of a transference of the benefits of private reading recurs in an epitaph which Sidonius composed for Claudianus and which also appears in Book Four. In this case, the subject's 'lectio' is given an explicitly monastic context and (consistently with the author's personal literary ideology, if contrary to expectation) made to include classical as well as Christian texts:

Claudianus,
 Triplex bibliotheca quo magistro,
 Romana, Attica, Christiana fulsit;
 Quam totam monachus virente in aevo
 Secreta bibit institutione,
 Orator, dialecticus, poeta,
 Tractator, geometra, musicusque.⁴⁹³

A proper study of Sidonius' portrait of Claudianus (who was not, after all, a bishop) would exceed the scope of this section. As verses meant for the tombstone of a priest, his tribute may be compared with other, epigraphically attested epigraphs of Gallic clergy of this period.⁴⁹⁴

As the memorial of a Christian writer, it is most nearly comparable with the notices composed by Gennadius of Marseille for his exactly contemporary work De viris illustribus.⁴⁹⁵

The Statuta ecclesiae antiqua

The set of disciplinary ordinances going by this name appears in most manuscripts as the canons of an African council that met in the time of Aurelius of Carthage. It is almost certain, however, that it was compiled in south-eastern Gaul in the final quarter of the fifth century. Solid grounds have been given for assigning its authorship to Gennadius.⁴⁹⁶ Among the major concerns of the Statuta are the education and conduct of the clergy. Although based on precept rather than example, this text provides a convenient résumé of many of the points discussed in the preceding pages.

'Omnes clerici qui ad operandum validi sunt, et artificiola et litteras discant.'⁴⁹⁷ The ideal of a combination of mechanical and literary skills is to be understood against a background of strongly monastic influences on the Statuta.⁴⁹⁸ As we have seen, manual labour and functional literacy were required or taken for granted by most early monastic legislators, including Pachomius, Jerome, Cassian and the authors of the 'Lerinian' rules. The ascetic hero of the Life of Hilary was commended for his success in combining the skills of reading and net-making. As presented in the Statuta, such skills were evidently meant to serve a communal as well as ascetic purpose. Every member of

the clergy, except those who were unfit, was to assure the means of his own subsistence by the exercise of a suitable 'opus manuum', thereby sparing the community the expense of maintaining him.⁴⁹⁹ He was also to learn how to read (and write). At a junior level in the ecclesiastical hierarchy, the ability to read would enable him to perform the function of 'lector' (or 'relator verbi dei'), and so win a share in the honour due to those 'qui verbum dei ministr[ant]'.⁵⁰⁰ In using the latter expression, the author of the Statuta refers to priests and bishops. These persons, upon whom fell the task of preaching ('verbum facere') were to be 'educated in the word of God' ('verbo dei eruditi').⁵⁰¹

The exigencies of the 'ministerium verbi' are spelt out in several passages of the Statuta dealing with the qualifications and lifestyle of bishops. There is, for example, the following list of qualities to be checked in the 'examinatio' of an episcopal candidate:

Qui episcopus ordinandus est, ante examinetur si natura prudens est, si docibilis, si moribus temperatus, si vita castus, si sobrius, si semper sui negotii, si humilibus affabilis, si misericors, si litteratus, si in lege domini instructus, si in scripturarum sensibus cautus, si in dogmatibus ecclesiasticis exercitatus, et ante omnia si fidei documenta verbis simplicibus asserat.⁵⁰²

The doctrinal positions which the future bishop was expected to subscribe and expound are covered in more detail in the (Gennadian) Liber ecclesiasticorum dogmatum.⁵⁰³ In the Statuta, such doctrinal knowledge is closely associated with **scriptural competence** and **literacy**. Read in the light of the canons, the requirement that a bishop be 'litteratus' would appear to imply no more than that he be one who had

learnt to read (and write), and who was thus in a position to be conversant both with the text of the Bible and with essential works of dogma. In reality, few of those who presented themselves as candidates for the episcopate in the late fifth century would have acquired their literate skills in the conditions provided for by the canon quoted at the start of the previous paragraph. The majority would have learnt to read and write in the course of a programme of 'liberal' education which, far from being designed to produce 'clerici' of the kind desiderated by the Statuta, was intended to spare its adepts the indignity of ever having to practise a mechanical art ('artifici[ol]um'). The case of persons liberally educated - 'litterati' in the developed sense - is envisaged in Canon 5 of the Statuta: 'Ut episcopus gentilium libros non legat.' It is also covered by the more general Canon 3:

Ut episcopus nullam rei familiaris curam ad se revocet, sed ut lectioni et orationi et verbi dei praedicationi tantummodo vacet.

As C. Munier has indicated, the prescriptions in this part of the Statuta were probably influenced by those contained in the pseudo-Clementine Apostolic constitutions (a collection of ecclesiastical ordinances that originated in Syria in the late fourth century).⁵⁰⁴ The scheme of a triple occupation or 'vacation' consisting of (biblical) 'lectio', 'oratio' and 'praedicatio' is, however, recognizable as that embodied in Faustus' Life of Maximus (under the headings of 'lectio', 'oratio' and 'sermo') and adumbrated in several other texts considered in this chapter.⁵⁰⁵ Such a scheme could be proposed both to those whose literacy had been formed to specifically religious ends and to the 'litterati' of Canon 5.

A study of Gallic ideas of the relation between Bible-reading and the various forms of Christian eloquence ought not to stop with the Statuta ecclesiae antiqua. Within a few years of the redaction of this text an African émigré and connoisseur of the works of Augustine, Julianus Pomerius, would attempt to reconcile the pursuit of monastic 'otium' with the demands of pastoral 'negotium' in an important work entitled De vita contemplativa. At around the same time, a new bishop of Arles and former monk of Lérins, Caesarius, would set about putting into practice many of the principles laid down by the anonymous canonist. Both men were to express interesting and influential views on the role of the Christian teacher. Caesarius, in particular, would have much to say about the relation between 'lectio' and 'praedicatio'. Their works will not be considered here because they fall outside the chronological limits chosen for the present study. In a certain sense, they belong to a different epoch from most of the texts so far analysed - one in which (for example) priests were encouraged to preach and aristocrats often lacked the ability to read the Bible for themselves. There can be little doubt, however, that close attention to the writings of these and other early sixth-century Gallic churchmen would reveal a substantial continuity with the literary ideology of their predecessors.

Conclusions

1. Following the political establishment of Christianity under the emperor Constantine and his successors, Christian ideas and institutions became matters of general concern to late-antique 'litterati'. One of the more distinctive features of the 'new' religion was the reverence shown by its adepts for a particular set of texts: the Bible. Christian readers and writers of the late fourth century inherited a variety of ideas concerning the nature of the biblical text and their relation to it - a variety that is reflected in the Latin terms used of the Bible itself (e.g. 'verbum dei', 'lex', 'lectio', 'scriptura[e]', 'litterae sacrae'). To a large extent, the early history of western ideas about the Bible, its study and related kinds of literary activity may be seen as a gradual working-out of the implications of this terminology.

2. Analysis of the works of Gallic authors of the fourth and fifth centuries reveals an important development in Christian thinking about the process of a biblical education. A broad distinction may be drawn between a theocentric view characteristic of the period to c.400 and the more institutionally-orientated attitudes that emerge after 420. For Hilary of Poitiers, the Bible served as a medium of divine erudition through which God revealed himself to man. While making it clear that the benefits of this education were not enjoyed by all, he offers no prescriptions for Bible-study beyond indicating the need for application ('frequens lectio') and an ascetic lifestyle. Similar views may be attributed to the first Priscillianists and to Paulinus of Bordeaux.

With the coming of organized monasticism to the province in the first decades of the fifth century, the situation changes. Henceforth, ideas of Christian 'doctrina' and 'eruditio' tend to presuppose the activity of human teachers and the existence of a fixed discipline; the concept of a **divine education** (as personified by Hilary's 'vir doctrina dei eruditus') yields to that of a **biblical culture** (as personified by Jerome's 'vir sacris litteris eruditus'). Jerome's propaganda for the 'scientia scripturarum' undoubtedly helped bring about this change of emphasis. Confirmed by the monastic teaching of Cassian, constantly evoked in the imagery of Lerinian Lives, the idea of the Christian intellectual as one who had been instructed in the Bible by competent masters is concisely formulated in a phrase coined by Gennadius: 'divina litteratura'.

3. Theories of Christian education conceived by trained readers and writers of late antiquity invariably entailed theories of Christian eloquence. At first sight, the shift in educational ideals mentioned above would appear not to have led to any major change in what was expected of the Christian writer/orator. Hilary and the author of the Priscillianist tractates believed that biblical 'eruditio' conduced to a Christian utterance ('praedicatio', 'confessio') based on the text of the Bible. The same assumption apparently lies behind the association of 'lectio' and 'sermo' found in such works as Faustus' Life of Maximus and the Statuta ecclesiae antiqua. Cassian's prescriptions for Bible-study terminate in a vision of the Christian teacher as an inexhaustible source of spiritual nourishment. This kind of imagery was well adapted to the oral performance of the catechist and preacher. As one would

expect, it was freely exploited by the Gallic Christian élite of the fifth century, many of whose members were (or hoped to become) bishops. Even in the later period, an author like Sidonius - whose claims to a biblical education of the type then in fashion were negligible - could see fit to advertise the benefits accruing to his congregation from his own private study of the Bible.

4. The development of a more 'scientific' ideal of Christian education did, however, effect ideas of the role of the Christian **writer**, insofar as it could be distinguished from that of the Christian **orator**. Here again, the influence of Jerome seems to have been decisive. Earlier theories of biblical 'praedicatio' may (in principle) have applied to all kinds of literary composition, irrespective of their original mode of presentation. It was Jerome who first defined a species of Christian writerly activity, based on the Bible, that was neither subordinate to nor derived from the essentially oral activity of preaching. As appears from the examples of Paulinus and Sulpicius, the ideal of the writer 'de scripturis' was one that could be subscribed by Christian authors of many persuasions. It would presumably have been of special interest to those who (for whatever reason) did not obtain a teaching office in the church. The fact that Jerome himself was later prepared to adapt his ideas on Christian writing to suit the requirements of an episcopal career should not be allowed to detract from the significance of his initiative. Not all Christian 'litterati' were bishops. Many of those whose biblical learning is commended in Gennadius' bibliography had won their reputations without aspiring to preach.

5. One might also postulate a link between the decline of ancient ideas of biblical education and a reduction in the claims of Christian writers to possess 'inspiration' of the kind granted the prophets and apostles. As long as Christian erudition was considered primarily as a process of divine revelation effected through the Bible, the role of the latter-day reader-and-writer was readily assimilated to that of the authors of Scripture. In this respect, the Priscillianists' attempt to extend the scope of 'scriptura' to include the works of certain 'bishops' stands as a monument to a passing age. With the exception of Paulinus, none of the later authors studied above shows any interest in the idea of the Christian writer as an instrument of the Holy Spirit. Instead, they insist on the biblical foundations of their work and on their use of biblical 'testimonia' and 'exempla', considered as marks of a serious Christian culture.

6. As developed in Gaul, the idea of a Christian literary culture based on the Bible is inseparable from the rise of monasticism. Already in the works of Hilary and 'Priscillian' the activity of biblical 'lectio' is placed in a specifically ascetic context. Paulinus likewise connects the 'studium et opera legendi scribendique' with an ascetic lifestyle and certain gnostic aspirations. By the time of Cassian, the 'lectio et meditatio scripturarum' could be recommended and taught as a monastic art. Though later writers are rarely as concerned as Cassian to spell out the ethical prerequisites for successful Bible-study, they all seem to have recognized a link between biblical reading-and-writing and the rules of a monastic or quasi-monastic style of life. Even the mechanical act of copying acquired a new dignity as a form of monastic work.

Chapter Two

*

'FIDES RELATORIS'

The Christian writer as 'editor' of the Fathers

Introduction

The Christian writer was a student of the Bible. But he had other reading-matter besides. In the first place, he had the works of fellow 'biblical' writers. As the previous chapter has shown, the late-antique idea of Christian literary composition 'de scripturis' was susceptible of vastly greater extension than the modern idea of biblical commentary. It could - and frequently did - include all post-neotestamentary Christian writing worthy of the name. This binary division of Christian texts into the classes of biblical and para-biblical writing did not occur automatically on the closure of the scriptural canon; rather, it was the product of the experience and conscious reflection of successive generations of fourth-century Christian 'litterati'. Among western writers, the first to express it with any degree of clarity is Jerome. He is followed by Augustine. By the middle of the fifth century, the concept of a 'double' Christian literature consisting, on the one hand, of the books of the Bible, and, on the other, of the works of the 'tractatores'/'disputatores' had become an established element of Christian literary ideology.¹ At the same time, there was begun a process of selection from among the works of post-apostolic writers that would lead, in the course of time, to the constitution of a 'canon' (in reality, multiple 'canons') of non-biblical Christian authors, analogous to that of the Bible. Once again, the origins of this process (in the western church) can be traced with some probability to the writings of Jerome.²

The promotion of the image of the Christian 'litteratus' as one dedicated to the Scriptures thus entailed the recognition of a new body of extra-biblical literature. The twin aspects of this highly significant development in western literary ideology are reflected in a number of different areas of late-antique culture. The same theological controversy that provided Hilary of Poitiers (among others) with an opportunity to acquaint himself with Origenistic ideas of biblical 'lectio' also led to the translation, into Latin, of quantities of Greek exegesis; this Greek heritage, duly augmented by western translators and adaptors of the 380s, 390s and early 400s, provided the basis for the extraordinary prise de conscience of Latin Christian writing in the Theodosian age.³ Jerome's De viris illustribus is both an advertisement for the author's activity as a student of the Bible and, in potentia, the catalogue of a Christian library. His advice on the use of scriptural texts in the education of a young Christian girl is followed by a recommendation of readings from selected Fathers.⁴ Augustine's first successful contact with the text of the Bible (the result of Ambrose's exploitation of Alexandrian techniques of exegesis) was the prelude to intensive study of the works of earlier 'tractatores'.⁵ In the De catechizandis rudibus he envisages the typical 'litteratus' as one who, before seeking baptism, had familiarised himself with parts of the Bible and with other Christian writings ('[qui] multa nostrarum scripturarum litterarumque cognoverit');⁶ his De doctrina christiana is addressed to those who sought to read the Bible 'legendo alios qui divinarum litterarum operta aperuerunt'.⁷ Despite the paucity of our information concerning the practical and economic aspects of early Christian book-production, it is clear that the fabrication of non-

biblical texts in the late fourth and early fifth centuries easily kept pace with that of biblical codices.⁸ Similarly, wherever our sources permit us a glimpse of the literary furniture of a particular Christian centre - such as those at Aquileia, Rome, Nola, Hippo, and in certain locations in southern Gaul - they reveal Christian libraries in the making.⁹ The earliest western monastic communities, it may be assumed, would soon have possessed collections of Christian writings besides the Bible; the fact that the consultation of biblical commentaries was deprecated in some monastic milieux is a clear sign of the high value set on these texts by educated ascetics of the time.¹⁰

How did the emergence of a body of 'secondary' Christian literature affect the ideas of reading-and-writing entertained by the average 'litteratus' ? The answer given to this question will depend to some extent on the period of western literary activity to which it is referred. As already indicated, the 'Golden Age' of Latin Christian writing - like that of secular Latin letters - was ushered in by a period of **translation** and **adaptation** from Greek models (c.350-380). This was followed by a period of more or less conscious **imitation**, of which Jerome's impersonation of Origen provides the most conspicuous example (c.380-420). The same processes - of translation, adaptation and imitation - were, of course, continued in subsequent periods, though usually in a different spirit. Translations, where attempted, were less programmatic. Imitations (henceforth generally of Latin originals) were more loudly proclaimed, if less true; one of their special forms was the **continuation** - e.g. of chronicles, catalogues, etc. Perhaps the most important change came about in the area of 'adaptation' (a term used

here for its convenience rather than for any supposed correspondence with late-antique literary theory). By c.420, the combined literary labours of men like Ambrose, Jerome, Rufinus and Augustine had endowed the Latin-reading public with a body of Christian texts largely sufficient to its needs. In theology, exegesis, and all kinds of edifying writing, the West was now adequately provided - or so it was generally believed. Needless to say, Christian 'litterati' did not therefore stop composing. Some, indeed, continued to maintain that they had things to say that had not yet been expressed in writing. Increasingly, however, Latin authors of the fifth century tended to present their work as a 'retractatio' of what had been written before (usually, if not always, in their own language). This phenomenon has often been commented upon. It is not uncommonly explained as a symptom of cultural sclerosis and/or as the result of a deterioration in the quality of intellectual life occasioned by the collapse of the Roman empire in the West. Before concurring in such judgments, one should perhaps consider more closely the evidence relating to early fifth-century Christian adaptation.

The position of Gallic 'litterati' in the scheme of literary production outlined above is a particularly interesting one. In Hilary of Poitiers, the church of Gaul could claim one of the foremost translator-adaptors of the first period. The achievement of the following generation - as represented by writers like Paulinus of Bordeaux, Sulpicius, Vigilantius (!) - is less easy to categorise; it was argued in the previous chapter that such persons could usefully be regarded as witnesses to the project of a new Christian writing

'de scripturis' announced by Jerome (without implying, however, that this was their only title to consideration). Attention was also drawn to the fact that 'biblical' writing of the kind demonstrated by Jerome was apparently not much practised by his Gallic admirers. One reason for this, it may be suggested, was the priority accorded by the 'monk-bishops' of Provence to the task of popular preaching. A further contributory reason, directly relevant to the theme of the present chapter, is indicated by a claim made by Eucherius of Lyon in the preface to his biblical Instructiones; he had compiled this work, he says, 'non ex meo ingenio sed ex inlustrium doctorum iudicio, neque ex propria temeritate sed ex aliorum auctoritate'.¹¹ This statement is evidence of one of the less predictable results of Jerome's promotion of the Christian 'viri inlustres'. Encouraged to consider Christian authors of even the previous generation as members of an elite group that had 'founded, raised and adorned' the church, a writer in Eucherius' position was apparently content to present himself as their faithful disciple. Rather than undertake a fresh examination of the problems posed by particular passages in the Old and New Testament, he offered a digest of the opinions expressed by such recent authorities as Ambrose and Jerome. One may compare the author's situation (post 430) with that envisaged by Jerome for the two 'monks' of Toulouse, Minervius and Alexander (406-7): whereas the latter were to manufacture a literary garment, the materials for which had already been provided by the tailor of Bethlehem,¹² the former proposed a patchwork or 'cento' made up of scraps from other men's work. (An alternative image is suggested by Gennadius who describes how the same writer had 'rolled up' certain works of Cassian into a smaller compass.)¹³ A witness on other

occasions to the Hieronymian ideal of the 'biblical' writer, Eucherius appears here as the spokesman for a new generation of Christian adaptors - of writers, that is, whose respect for the works of their immediate predecessors manifested itself chiefly in works of compilation and abbreviation.

Besides Eucherius, there are two Gallic authors whose extant works from the period c.425-435 reveal with special clarity the motives and mechanisms of this kind of Christian adaptation. They are Prosper of Aquitaine and Vincent of Lérins, an analysis of whose writings occupies the greater part of this chapter. Ideally, the study of these two authors would form part of a wide-ranging investigation of fifth-century attitudes towards patristic texts. The narrow focus adopted here is a reflection both of the intrinsic complexity of the literary oeuvres in question and of the inadequacy (for present purposes) of the accounts hitherto given of them by patristic and literary scholars. For reasons that will shortly emerge, little has yet been done to place either Prosper's or Vincent's work in its immediate cultural context. Until this task is accomplished, any conclusions that one might wish to draw for the larger history of Christian literary ideology, based on the utterances of these individuals, must necessarily remain provisional. In an effort to achieve a greater degree of certainty than would otherwise be possible in such a case, the following enquiry into the **ideas** of reading-and-writing entertained by Prosper and Vincent has been expanded so as to include a description of their respective ~~performances~~ **ances**, considered (so far as possible) in the light of their actual **circumstances**. It is hoped, by this means, to answer a number of

questions posed by the phenomenon of fifth-century Christian 'retractatio' or 're-writing', while at the same time providing certain elements for a more comprehensive treatment of the works of both writers.

Though reputedly a native of Aquitaine, Prosper's earliest activity as a writer is traceable to the area of Marseille in southern Viennensis. Vincent, it seems, was originally from the northern part of Gaul; he is first remarked as a monk, living on the island of Lérins.¹⁴ Both men may thus be seen as belonging (with Eucherius) to that illustrious society of Christian 'litterati' which, based on the monastic and ecclesiastical establishments of Arles, Lérins and Marseille, was one of the chief glories of the Gallic church and of Gallo-Roman culture in the fifth century. Before proceeding to a close study of individual works, it will be convenient to list certain features of this particular cultural milieu that may be supposed to have helped determine the attitudes adopted by its representatives towards the use of non-biblical Christian texts.

(1) The importance of Augustine. The early history of western reception of patristic writing is dominated by two figures: those of Origen and Augustine. As translated and popularised by Jerome and others in the latter part of the fourth century, the exegetical works of Origen had been taken up enthusiastically by western 'litterati'; following the controversy of the 390s it was generally understood, however, that they were to be read with caution.¹⁵ A broadly similar development is

observable in the early reception of Augustine's works, especially among Gallic readers of a certain persuasion. By 404, on Jerome's testimony, Augustine was universally renowned.¹⁶ His Confessions (397/401) would presumably have circulated in southern Gaul soon after their initial publication. (The inspirer of this work, Paulinus, had been a privileged recipient of Augustine's writings since 394; from Nola, he communicated with Gallic 'litterati' such as Sulpicius Severus and Jovius.)¹⁷ As the researches of P. Courcelle have shown, Augustine's autobiography was to be greatly prized in 'Lerinian' circles.¹⁸ In due course, his anti-Donatist and anti-Pelagian writings, together with such works as the De doctrina christiana, De trinitate and De civitate dei also reached a Gallic audience.¹⁹ The scope and artistic quality of these productions could not fail to impress the Christian 'litterati' of Arles, Lérins and Marseille.²⁰ When, in addition, their author's stand against the Pelagians was resoundingly endorsed by both papal and civil authorities (418-19), his reputation must have appeared almost unassailable.²¹ And yet there was much in Augustine's writings - particularly in his theology of grace - that Gallic (as well as Italian) readers would have found strange and perhaps difficult to accept. The first signs of reaction are detectable in the area of Marseille in the mid-420s. From this time onwards (at least until the middle of the following decade and intermittently thereafter), certain parts of his theological and literary oeuvre were to be the object of defence and criticism by 'Augustinian' and 'semi-Augustinian' parties in that part of the province. The assimilation of Augustine's teaching thus also involved a process of discrimination.²² In this respect, the situation in southern Gaul in the 420s and 430s foreshadows the longer-term history of Christian

doctrine in the middle ages, a period during which (according to Harnack) the western church was continuously occupied in "fixing its relationship to Augustine, and to the numerous impulses originated by him".²³ Insofar as that history is connected with the history of texts and of attitudes towards their use, it is of immediate concern to the literary historian.

(2) **The use of patristic testimony in theological debate.** Apart from the theological issues that it raised, the controversy between Augustine and Pelagius led to an important development in the manner of western recourse to the 'Fathers'.²⁴ From the earliest times, Christian writers and orators had been accustomed to refer to the teaching of their predecessors as a guarantee of their own orthodoxy. This form of self-justification (which, of course, could also be used to impugn the faith of 'unorthodox' opponents) assumed a particular significance during the Trinitarian disputes of the fourth century, when all parties were able to claim scriptural support for their positions. By the end of the third quarter of the fourth century, an appeal to the dual authority of Scripture and (patristic) 'tradition' was one of the commonplaces of both pro- and anti-Nicene theological argument. Up until this point, however, few attempts had been made to demonstrate the legitimacy of such claims by the ordered presentation of patristic **texts** (one reason being, no doubt, the shortage of texts genuinely relevant to the matters under discussion).²⁵ The earliest western dogmatic 'florilegia' may have been Arian productions; in which case, it is unlikely that they had much influence in Gallic circles.²⁶ Of more lasting effect was the attempt made by the Donatists of North Africa to justify their practice

of re-baptism by an appeal to the writings of Cyprian. By skilful pleading, Augustine was able to turn this argument against those who used it.²⁷ Several years later, at the beginning of his polemic with Pelagius, the same writer adduced texts of Cyprian and Jerome in support of a disputed interpretation of Romans 5,12f.²⁸ (In due course, Pelagius countered with a larger florilegium, comprising texts from no less than seven 'tractatores', including Augustine himself.) From c.417 onwards, the bishop of Hippo resorted increasingly to patristic testimony in an effort to disprove the charges of innovation levelled against him by the likes of Julian of Eclanum. The climax of this effort appears in the Contra Iulianum (422), in which he convened a numerous assembly of patristic authorities from both East and West, all of whom could be shown to have pronounced against the opinions upheld by his opponent.²⁹ The Contra Iulianum, along with Augustine's other anti-Pelagian works, was keenly studied in Gaul.³⁰ The style of argument which it displayed was to be imitated by a number of Gallic 'litterati' of the period with which we are concerned.

(3) The formation of Christian libraries. The rapid development of techniques of patristic argument in the East in the early fifth century has been associated by M. Richard with a contemporary increase in the resources of ecclesiastical libraries.³¹ It may therefore be reasonable to look for a similar correlation in the West. Unfortunately, our current information on southern Gallic libraries in this period is confined mainly to what can be deduced from quotations and reminiscences in the works of individual authors. The use of such material for the reconstruction of actual collections of books is, of course, highly

problematical - a fact emphasised by the as-yet unresolved controversy over the 'library at Lérins'. Responding to P. Riché's presentation of the Lerinian monastery as a 'school of asceticism' in which intellectual concerns were strictly subordinated to the pursuit of moral and spiritual excellence, P. Courcelle has argued (on the basis of textual parallels) for the existence on the island of a well-stocked library of secular and ecclesiastical authors.³² One may suspect that both scholars have overstated their case. Though obviously correct in his reaction against the popular view of Lerins as a combined Christian grammar-school and theological seminary, Riché appears merely to have replaced this modern fiction with a more 'authentic' construction based on fifth-century monastic propaganda; because books (apart from the Bible) do not occupy a large place in contemporary hagiography and related texts, they were not especially important to the 'Lerinian' way of life. The dangers of this method of argument need hardly be pointed out. Courcelle begins from the equally correct intuition that many of those who frequented Honoratus' monastery in its early years were already inured to a practice of reading-and-writing that would not have been easily restricted to the Bible, only to draw unwarranted conclusions concerning the books that these men and their successors would have been able to consult while residing on the island. The existence of a sizable library at Lérins c.430 is neither proved by a series of parallels showing that many 'Lerinians' were well read in secular and ecclesiastical literature, nor disproved by citations showing that depth and breadth of reading were not the qualities that they sought to advertise. What is true of Lérins applies also to other important centres of Christian culture in southern Gaul. In the absence of

palaeographical evidence permitting the reconstitution of any particular manuscript collection, one of the aims of the following sections will be to discover to what extent the utterances of Gallic 'litterati' of this period pre-suppose the availability of a large stock of books besides the Bible, and in what circumstances they exclude it.

(4) **The sense of a monastic tradition.** Though inclined to consider all literary activity as an aspect of the 'studium scripturarum', Christian 'litterati' of the late fourth and early fifth century were also prepared to establish sub-categories within the body of extra-biblical writing. These categories might be formal ones (e.g. Jerome's division of Origen's exegetical output into the three classes of homilies, *scolia* and commentaries;³³ Augustine's arrangement of his own works under the rubrics of 'libri', 'epistolae' and 'tractatus').³⁴ Or they might relate to content (e.g. Possidius' arrangement of Augustine's polemical works according to the identity of the author's opponents).³⁵ By the early sixth century, the taxonomy of Christian literature had become a great deal more sophisticated, as can be seen from the alternative schemes proposed by Cassiodorus (in his Institutio divinarum litterarum) and the unknown author of the so-called Decretum Gelasianum de libris recipiendis. The author of the earliest extant Gallic catalogue, Gennadius (fl. 470), adheres to the original bio-bibliographical plan of Jerome's De viris illustribus, thereby apparently avoiding the issue of classification altogether.³⁶ There are, however, a number of signs in his work of a nascent distinction between texts relevant to what he calls 'studia ecclesiastica' (i.e. those that concerned dogma and church discipline) and those relevant to 'studia monastica'.³⁷ This division

is particularly interesting in view of the analogy on which it evidently reposes: in both the ecclesiastical and monastic spheres, as envisaged by Gennadius, there could exist a rule ('regula') and a tradition ('traditio patrum'). By the 470s, it is plain, the ideas of 'rule' and 'tradition' had come to be closely associated with the texts in which they were expressed, irrespective of whether the latter were 'ecclesiastical' or 'monastic' in character. The situation half a century earlier is much less clear. It would seem, however, that whereas the (ecclesiastical) 'regula fidei' was by this date generally identified with a particular form of words - which could, if necessary, be set down in writing³⁸ - the idea of a monastic 'rule' had not yet acquired the same textual reference.³⁹ A similar remark might be made regarding the representation of the corresponding 'traditions'; here again, the process of textualising a body of essentially oral beliefs and precepts would appear to have been more advanced in the 'ecclesiastical' than in the 'monastic' sphere. The fact remains that the language of 'rule' and 'tradition' was felt to be equally applicable in both areas of discourse. One consequence of this is that appeals to the theological teaching of the 'Fathers', when made by persons associated with ascetic milieux such as those of Lérins and Marseille, often receive a specifically 'monastic' colouring. Though it will not be possible to explore in any detail here the emergence of a sense of (written) monastic tradition among Gallic 'litterati', the possibility of interference between these two closely-related ideologies is one that will be borne constantly in mind in the following pages.

(5) A predilection for creeds. As hinted in the previous paragraph, the reception of patristic texts in south-eastern Gaul in the early fifth century was partly conditioned by attitudes towards current written expressions of the 'Rule of Faith'. Because of the importance of this factor for the history of early Christian literary ideology, it has been made the subject of a separate chapter.

The above remarks are offered as general prolegomena to the more minute studies that are to follow. The main objects of those studies, as already indicated, are the works of Prosper and Vincent - to be considered for the evidence that they provide of Gallic adaptation (or 'editing') of patristic texts in the period c.425-435. Between the sections devoted to these two authors has been placed a briefer one, dealing with certain aspects of the literary ideology of John Cassian.

I. The 'Augustinianism' of Prosper of Aquitaine

Our only nearly-contemporary account of Prosper's literary activity is provided by Gennadius:

PROSPER, homo Aquitanicae regionis, sermone scholasticus et adsertionibus nervosus, multa composuisse dicitur, ex quibus ego chronica nomine illius praetitulata legi, continentia a primi hominis condicione, iuxta divinarum scripturarum fidem, usque ad obitum Valentiniani Augusti et captivitatem Romanae urbis a Genserico, Vandalorum rege facta[m]. Legi et librum adversus opuscula (suppresso nomine) Cassiani, quae ecclesia dei salutaria probat, ille infamat nociva. Re enim vera Cassiani et Prosperi de gratia dei et libero arbitrio sententiae in aliquibus inveniuntur contrariae. Epistulae quoque papae Leonis adversus Eutychen de vera Christi incarnatione ad diversos datae ab isto dictatae creduntur.⁴⁰

Much of the interest of this notice lies in what is left unsaid.

Gennadius tells us that Prosper was a native of Aquitaine - a fact of which we should otherwise have been ignorant. He does not tell us (though he must have known) that he also had close associations with Marseille. The one indication that he does give of his subject's place of residence is contained in the closing reference to a supposed collaboration with pope Leo, from which it is usually inferred that Prosper spent the later period of his life in Rome.⁴¹ This selectiveness in the provision of geographical co-ordinates betrays a more general intention on the author's part to misrepresent the course of Prosper's career.

At the time when Gennadius composed the De viris illustribus the controversy between Prosper and Cassian 'de gratia dei et libero arbitrio' was still within living memory. The same issue had, indeed, recently been revived and had given rise to a work with this very title, by Faustus of Riez (commemorated next in the catalogue). It would be surprising if, in the debates on grace and free will that took place in south-eastern Gaul in the early 470s, the name of Prosper was not occasionally invoked. Were his writings also consulted? Of the three works explicitly mentioned by Gennadius - the Chronicle, the Contra collatorem, and Leo's letters De incarnatione - only the second bears directly on this subject. One must suspect, however, that the author of the De viris illustribus knew more of Prosper's output 'de gratia' than he wished to proclaim. In choosing to mention the Contra collatorem, he gave himself an opportunity to defend the revered memory of Cassian. As one who approved of the opinions concerning grace and free will successively adopted by Cassian and Faustus, he would have had no interest in drawing attention to other works promoting a contrary view.⁴² The manner in which he ignores them may itself be significant. 'Prosper [he states] multa composuisse dicitur, ex quibus ego chronica nomine illius praetitulata legi...' Omitting the words underlined, one might infer that Gennadius included in his catalogue only those works which he himself had seen; replacing them, one is faced with the more interesting possibility that he had personal knowledge of works attributed to Prosper which he nevertheless excluded **because they were not published (or did not circulate) under the author's own name.** It is worth considering what may have been the titles of some of the Prosperian works (knowingly?) excluded by Gennadius. Many of them, it may be

supposed, would have contained the name of Augustine, whose views they purported to represent.⁴³ Some, perhaps, lacked the name of the author himself - either because he chose not to have it prominently displayed or because early copyists chose to omit it.⁴⁴ If such were the case, it is conceivable that Gennadius - who elsewhere gives a startlingly defective account of Augustine's own literary activity - may have seized on these features of the transmission of Prosper's writings as a pretext for minimising his role as a defender of Augustinian theology. The absence of a manuscript attribution did not necessarily lead to the exclusion of a work from his catalogue, as is indicated by the subsequent mention of Leo's letters '[quae] ab isto [sc. Prospero] dictatae creduntur'. There was, however, a world of difference between Leo's opinions 'de incarnatione Christi' and Augustine's more extreme views 'de gratia dei et libero arbitrio' (at least so far as Gennadius was concerned); that a writer had helped to give expression to the former could be considered a title of honour, that he had actively subscribed the latter was best forgotten. By excluding all reference to Prosper's works besides the Chronicle and the Contra collatorem, Gennadius effectively 'suppressed the name' of Augustine. This anti-Augustinian bias did not pass unremarked in the early middle ages. Mention will be made in due course of an 'appendix' to the notice on Augustine found in one early manuscript of the De viris illustribus.⁴⁵ Another manuscript (of the seventh century) contains the following addition to the notice on Prosper: 'Hic etiam P. post obitum beati Augustini librorum eius contra hereticos inimicos gratiae Christi defensor extetit.'⁴⁶

The description of Prosper as 'defensor librorum Augustini' provides a necessary complement to Gennadius' presentation of the same author as an Aquitanian chronicler who disagreed with Cassian and assisted Leo with his correspondence. Not only does it help to explain the controversy 'de gratia et libero arbitrio' in which he was involved, it also suggests important links between this polemical activity and his other accomplishments. Prosper's Chronicle is essentially an epitome and continuation of the work of the same title by Jerome. Its most distinctive feature, however, is the inclusion of heresiological notices either derived from or modelled upon those of Augustine's De haeresibus. Of all the qualities that may have recommended Prosper for service in Leo's chancellery, the one that appears most obvious to the modern reader is his profound knowledge of Augustine's works. Commitment to the 'libri Augustini' thus emerges as one of the unifying characteristics of Prosper's literary activity.

The 'defence' of Augustine, it should be noted, is only one aspect of that activity. It is, however, the aspect that has received most attention in all periods since the fifth century. For theologians of every age, including the present, the main interest of Prosper's works has lain in the author's treatment of the 'further questions' concerning divine grace, free will and predestination that were raised by Augustine's anti-Pelagian writings and vigorously debated in Gaul and Italy in the 420s and 430s (as well as in later times). When a consensus on these matters was finally enforced by the Council of Orange in 529 it was expressed in terms borrowed largely from Prosper's summary of Augustinian teaching.⁴⁷ Understandably, therefore, historians of

Christian doctrine have been concerned to establish the precise relation between the formulas transmitted by Prosper and the authentic beliefs of Augustine. The results of their research, though by no means unanimous, are of considerable importance for an appreciation of Prosper's activity as a writer.⁴⁸ Unfortunately, the almost exclusive attention given to his role as a mediator of 'Augustinianism' (in the narrow sense of a doctrine of grace and predestination) has prevented any satisfactory assessment of his literary oeuvre as a whole. With the honourable exceptions of L. Valentin's massive synthesis (published in 1900) and the more recent essay of R. Lorenz, most modern studies of Prosper suffer from a limitation of scope hardly less radical than that affecting Gennadius' original notice. The 'name of Augustine' has been restored, but at the cost of Prosper's own literary identity.

To form a just estimate of Prosper's personal achievement as a writer, Lorenz argues, it is necessary to envisage his 'Augustinianism' as a whole. Instead of concentrating solely on his contribution to the fifth-century debate on grace and predestination, the historian should try to place his work in the context of the more general and long-term process by which Augustine's ideas were assimilated into the life and thought of the western church. This means, on the one hand, taking due account of his presentation of a number of other aspects of Augustine's thought, such as his Christology, ecclesiology, and ethics. It also implies a task of a somewhat different kind - one which is of immediate concern to the student of literary ideology. The ~~manner~~ of Prosper's 'Augustinianism', no less than its **content**, ought to be an object of study. Though nowhere explicitly stated by Lorenz, this conclusion

would seem to follow inescapably from the premise of his article. What justifies the historian in regarding Prosper's work as the expression of an 'Augustinianism' more general than the narrowly theological one already alluded to ? If it is something in the author's own way of presenting his work, then what is it ? That these questions are not entirely vain is already suggested by the above reading of Gennadius' notice: but for the fact that a large part of Prosper's work had appeared 'in nomine Augustini', there would (it has been suggested) have been no excuse for omitting it from a catalogue of Christian writing. In the following sections of this chapter, an attempt will be made to establish (1) the terms in which Prosper himself conceived and presented the relation between his own literary activity and that of Augustine, and (2) the conditions in which this dependence arose. In order to facilitate the treatment of a very substantial body of material, the part of the author's work relating directly to the controversy over grace and predestination will be dealt with separately, in second place. The first section will be concerned mainly with writings of a less polemical character (the majority of which, for reasons that will be questioned, are usually assigned to the later stages of Prosper's literary career).

(a) 'Ex Augustino sententiae'

Among the works of doubtful authenticity that are sometimes ascribed to Prosper is a poem of almost a thousand lines entitled Carmen de providentia dei.⁴⁹ As its title suggests, the purpose of the work is to

'assert Eternal Providence, / And justify the ways of God to men.' In this case, the enemies of divine providence were certain faint-hearted Christians who, dismayed at the disasters that had recently convulsed their land, were inclined to dismiss the claims made for God's benevolent action in the world. The occasion of their complaint is clearly indicated; for the past ten years they had been at the mercy of Vandal and Gothic marauders (vv.33-34: '...caede decenni / Vandalicis gladiis sternimur et Geticis'). On the strength of this reference, most scholars have supposed, not unreasonably, that the poem was composed in Gaul, c.416-17. The question of authorship is more difficult to resolve. Already associated with Prosper's name in the Carolingian period, the poem was printed with his authentic works by Sirmond in 1539. The manuscript used for this edition has not survived and no other has been found; hence it is uncertain on what authority Sirmond's attribution was made. Subsequent arguments for and against Prosperian authorship have necessarily been based on internal evidence. Such evidence relates either to style or to doctrinal content. With regard to the former, there would now seem to be general agreement that the author of the Carmen de ingratis (who is known to have been Prosper) could also have written the Carmen de providentia. It is by no means certain, however, that this consistency of style ought to be taken to imply identity of authorship; the technical accomplishments of the author of the De ingratis (it has been argued) would have been shared by a number of his contemporaries.

Arguments based on the doctrinal content of the poem have proved no more conclusive. It is commonly alleged that certain passages in the

De providentia betray a 'Pelagian' or 'semi-Pelagian' understanding of the role of free will in human salvation. Granted that this may be so, the question arises as to what significance should be attached to such expressions, appearing as they do in a work ostensibly composed c.416-417, in Gaul. The theology of grace elaborated by Augustine in response to the challenge of Caelestius and Pelagius may not have come naturally to Gallic Christians of the early decades of the fifth century; indeed there is plenty of evidence to suggest that it did not. If one assumes that the author of the De providentia owed his theology to a tradition which (in the terms proposed by R.A. Markus) was at least as likely to be 'pre-Pelagian' as to be 'pre-Augustinian' in its understanding of grace and free will, then there need have been nothing 'unorthodox' about his statements on these subjects. It is to be noted, moreover, that the majority of his remarks concerning the efficacy of the human will form part of an argument against astrological fatalism. (Thus one might compare his situation with that of Augustine disputing 'de libero arbitrio' with the Manichees.) Admittedly, any Gallic writer who, in 417, was up-to-date with recent theological controversies in Africa and Palestine could have been expected to be more guarded in his utterances on certain topics. There is no reason to believe, however, that the author of the present poem was in such a position. Could he have been Prosper ? The standard objection to Prosperian authorship - that the 'Pelagian' views expressed in the De providentia could not have been held by the enthusiastic 'Augustinian' who wrote the De ingratis - ignores the possibility that Prosper's initial contact with Augustine's anti-Pelagian writings may have occurred after c.417. If, as a native of Aquitaine, he had first encountered these texts on moving to

moving to Marseille at some time around the year 420 (i.e. shortly after the installation of the Visigothic 'foederati' in the province of Aquitania Prima),⁵⁰ he may have been compelled to alter his own views. The zeal with which Prosper defends Augustine's positions on grace and predestination from 426 onwards is easily reconciled with the possibility that his own conversion to these opinions was then of relatively recent date. Similarly, the hypothesis of Aquitanian authorship squares conveniently with the historical situation evoked in the opening lines of the De providentia.

To summarise: on the evidence of recent research, neither the style nor the doctrinal content of the poem De providentia is incompatible with Prosperian authorship. Since (1) it is unlikely that Prosper's title to the work can ever be established with absolute certainty, and (2) no satisfactory case has yet been made for attributing it to any other writer, one would appear to have the option of either trusting or discounting the tradition which assigns it to the author of the De ingratis. For the purposes of the present study, it is proposed to consider what light may be shed on the manner of Prosper's later 'Augustinianism' if one assumes that he was also responsible for the De providentia.

The poem opens on a note of self-reproach:

Maxima pars lapsis abiit iam mensibus anni,
Quo scripta est versu pagina nulla tuo.
Quae tam longa tibi peperere silentia causae ?
Quisve dolor maestum comprimit ingenium ?
Quamquam etiam gravibus non absint carmina curis,
Et proprios habeant tristia corda modos:

Acsi te fracti perstringunt vulnera mundi,
Turbatumque una si rate fert pelagus;
Invictum deceat studiis servare vigorem. (vv.1-9)

There are several hints in these and the remaining elegaic lines of the poem (vv.1-96) that the author thought of himself as a latter-day Ovid, struggling to remain faithful to his Muse while oppressed by Goths and Scythians.⁵¹ There is something précieux, Alexandrine, about his sense of an obligation to fill a page or two with verses (v.2). It is rapidly apparent, however, that his response to recent events was to be more than simply the assertion of a continued interest in polite versification. The doubts that he had heard expressed concerning God's interest in human affairs posed a serious threat to the simple faith of the multitude ('facilis vulgus' - v.87; cf. 'rudes' - vv.88, 100). A vigorous, even heroic response was required, for which the hexameter was the natural measure. The change in metre is accompanied by a renewed statement of intent:

Ista quidem melius divinis edita libris
Cognoscenda forent, ubi legis in aequore aperto,
Promptum esset ventis dare libera vela secundis.
Sed quoniam rudibus metus est intrare profundum,
In tenui primum discant procurrere rivo,
Qua iacet extremo tellus circumdata ponto,
Et qua gens hominum diffusa est corpore mundi.
(vv.97-103)

Before the novice Christian could entrust himself to the deep of the Bible, he had first to gain experience in on-shore sailing. The curious marine imagery of these lines may be compared with similar expressions of the propaedeutic function of Christian writing in the works of other Gallic authors of this period.⁵² Here the dominant idea would seem to

be that of the literary text as a minor supplement or temporary, partial epitome of the text of the Bible. A considerable part of the Carmen de providentia consists of narrative based on the Old and (to a lesser extent) New Testaments, designed to demonstrate the constancy and justice of God's government. The author's manner of proceeding clearly reflects a basic conviction of the didactic value of the biblical revelation. He is one '[qui] gaudet apostolico doctus caelestia ludo' (v.771) and who seeks to share the knowledge that he has acquired. The lines quoted above from the beginning of the hexametric section of the poem are balanced by those of its conclusion:

Haec sat erit parvo rudibus scripsisse libello:
Qui cum sincerum vivo de fonte liquorem
Gustarint, ipsi profundent flumina ab alvo
Cordis, et irriguas praebebunt fratribus urnas.
(vv.969-972)

To the earlier imagery of seafaring there succeeds the image of a fountain of life-giving water based on John 7,37-38. The Christian was to be a drinker as well as a sailor! Considered in terms of their propositional content, the two sets of images complement one another admirably. The poet's aim was to provide a brief initiation in biblical learning (vv.97-103); to complete his education, the 'rudis' would have to resort to the source of all Christian inspiration (i.e. God himself, as revealed primarily in the Bible); having done this he would be in a position to communicate what he had learnt to his fellow men (vv.969-972), thereby emulating the poet.

The Carmen de providentia proclaims itself as a work of modest dimensions ('pagina' - v.2, 'parvus libellus' - v.969), directly subordinate to the biblical revelation, composed (as it were) 'ad rudes instruendos'. Whoever wrote it had evidently determined that the poetic craft that he had learnt in the school of Ovid and Virgil should now serve the cause of Christian edification. In what degree this aspiration was realised in practice can only be conjectured. There is no evidence that the author had any official pastoral responsibilities; the one glimpse that we have of him in the course of the poem (vv.57-60: where he appears in the company of a bishop banished by the Goths) suggests that his position in the church was that of a pious layman.

The literary and pastoral pretensions expressed by the author of the De providentia acquire an additional significance if it is assumed that he was Prosper of Aquitaine. Among the works securely attributable to the latter is another poem of approximately one thousand hexameter lines, also with a preface in elegaic couplets, entitled Peri acharistōn, hoc est de ingratis carmen. This poem can be dated c.427-30 and belongs to the first phase of Prosper's polemic against the 'Massilian' opponents of Augustine's doctrine of grace and predestination.⁵³ It will therefore properly be considered in the next section of the present chapter. Since, however, it offers a number of obvious points of comparison with the Carmen de providentia, it may also be quoted here. In Part One of the De ingratis, Prosper sets out to show how universal had been the recent condemnation of Pelagianism. He displays a special reverence for the decisions of the African councils:⁵⁴

Conditae sunt, et scriptae manent, quae de cataractis
Aeterni fontis fluxere undante meatu,
Et tercentenis procerum sunt editae linguis...
(vv.84-86)

The brain behind the Council of Carthage of 418 was, of course, that of Augustine,

...quem Christi gratia cornu
Uberiore rigans, nostro lumen dedit aevo
Accensum vero de lumine: nam cibus illi,
Et vita, et requies Deus est... (vv.92-96)

There follow some twenty lines of tribute to Augustine's life's work in combating heresy and teaching the truth:

Istius ergo inter cunctos, qui de grege sancto
Insanas pepulere feras, industria maior,
Maius opus, totum praestantius imbuit orbem...
(vv.99-101)

Istius ore viri fecit deus; istius ore
Flumina librorum mundum effluxere per omnem,
Quae mites humilesque bibunt, campisque animorum
Certant vitalis doctrinae immittere rivos.
(vv.110-113)

From this passage there emerges an ideology of literary production strikingly similar to that expressed in the framing sections of the Carmen de providentia. In place of the poet's own composition one is presented with the doctrinal decrees of the African councils ('scripta' - v.84) and the writings of Augustine ('opus' - v.101, 'libri' - v.111). Both sets of texts are seen as ultimately derived from God himself - that is, as flowing ('fluxere' - v.85, 'effluxere' - v.111) from the eternal source ('fons aeterna' - v.85). The role performed by Augustine

or by the African bishops collectively is that expected of the Christian believer 'de [cuius] ventre fluent aquae vivae' (John 7, 38) and implicitly arrogated by the author of the De providentia. The interpretation of vv.110-113 becomes somewhat easier in the light of a parallel passage from the letter Ad Rufinum (which is closely related to the De ingratis). There Prosper imagines the effect that would be had on any gathering of the faithful if Augustine's works were suddenly to be produced:

Quae [sc. volumina Augustini] cum cordibus audientium
manifestare coeperint potentissimam Christianae fidei
veritatem, et de fontibus divini eloquii praesentium animos
inundare, quis fidelium, quis piorum, recognitis et
commendatis sibi salutis suae causis, amaritudinem istam
[sc. doctrinae Cassiani] volet fumosae recipere vanitatis ?
(4,5)

These expressions confirm that the subject of 'certant' in v.113 of the De ingratis is most probably the 'libri Augustini', rather than the meek and humble of v.112 (as regular syntax would seem to require). They also show that for Prosper (as for the author of the De providentia) the inspiration (or 'infusion') of Christian writing was inseparably related to the text of Scripture.

Clearly, if Prosper wrote the Carmen de providentia in c.417, then ten years later he had come to acknowledge Augustine as the living vessel par excellence of Christian doctrine. In terms of the development of a personal literary ideology, it hardly matters whether or not he be reckoned the author of the earlier poem, since (as already

remarked) the ideas of authorship that are detectable in it are a commonplace of works of this period. A 'homo Aquitanicae regionis' of Prosper's age and literary accomplishments, dedicated but not necessarily ordained in his religion, a reader perhaps of the works of his fellow-Aquitanians, Paulinus of Bordeaux and Sulpicius Severus - such a person could be expected to subscribe the principles of Christian utterance expressed in the De providentia, even if he had no part in their drafting. That the same writer should, however, subsequently find a unique place in his personal literary ideology for the figure of Augustine would seem less easy to predict. We saw earlier how several Gallic writers of this and the previous generation reacted to the literary presence of St. Jerome. Each, in his way, showed his awareness of Jerome's achievement, without allowing it to dominate his own conception of the Christian author's role. It will already be apparent from quotations from the De ingratis and Ad Rufinum that Prosper's reaction to the work of Augustine was to be a body and soul affair. God, in his view, had chosen **this** man rather than any other to be the means of a special outpouring of divinely-infused doctrine. (Note the threefold repetition of 'istius' in the passage of the De ingratis quoted above). Once recognized, it seems, this fact had immediate implications for a person in Prosper's position - for one, that is, who had ready access to Augustine's published works, as well as an acute sense of the pastoral responsibilities of the Christian 'litteratus'.

Despite occasional suggestions to the contrary (e.g. De ingratis vv.112-113, Ep. ad Rufinum 4,5), the 'libri Augustini' did not in themselves possess the power to educate all faithful and pious people in the

'subjects relevant to their salvation'. In reality, they had first to be brought to the attention of such people and then, in most cases, explained. These requirements were to be borne in on Prosper in the course of his dispute with the Massilian theologians. It would be rash to assume, however, that he had no inkling of them before the controversy began. Merely by following the course of Augustine's literary career, he would have come to realise that the latter's views were not always readily understood; he himself admitted experiencing difficulties on certain points.⁵⁵ Then there was the problem posed by the sheer volume of Augustine's output. If novice Christians were afraid to navigate the Bible, how could they be expected to embark on the broad ocean of Augustine's theological and exegetical works ? In view of the uncertainty surrounding the order and circumstances of composition of Prosper's non-polemical writings, it would seem wise to allow the possibility that he may already have begun to experiment in the role of Augustinian vulgariser at a date prior to the outbreak of the 'semi-Pelagian' controversy in Gaul.

The clearest sign of Prosper's esteem for the bishop of Hippo is provided by his Liber sententiarum ex operibus Augustini, a collection of 392 pensées culled from Augustine's writings that was to enjoy a considerable vogue in the middle ages. The methods employed by Prosper in this compilation have been studied in detail by Lorenz, who also gives an account of the principal themes of the Liber sententiarum. Appreciation of the work has since been facilitated by the appearance of a modern edition, with full apparatus criticus, by M. Gastaldo. Two features of the content and organization of the Liber deserve mention

here. First, it may be noted that, although Augustine's anti-Pelagian writings are well represented in Prosper's selection, he is far from confining his attention to these works. There are large numbers of excerpts from the Tractatus in evangelium Iohannis and from the De civitate dei, as well as a significant number from the Confessions, De doctrina christiana, De Genesi ad litteram, De trinitate and Epistulae. Excluding letters and individual sermons, some twenty-four different works are excerpted, among them the early De ordine and De vera religione. The text most frequently laid under contribution, however, is the Enarrationes in psalmos. In this case, many of Prosper's 'quotations' derive, not from the Augustinian original, but from his own abbreviated and sometimes modified version of it, known under the title of Expositio psalmorum.⁵⁶ As a result, this particular text of Augustine - or at least a part of it, since only the final third of the Enarrationes is covered by the Expositio as we have it - can be seen to have undergone a double transformation: abbreviation followed by excerption. (In fact, as we shall see, the process did not always stop there. Many of the Sententiae, including a proportion of those derived from the Expositio, also appear in poetic form in Prosper's Liber epigrammatum ex sententiis Augustini. Hence: abbreviation, excerption, versification - involving, in most cases, amplification.) This reliance on his own prior adaptation of an Augustinian text may be associated with another feature of Prosper's compilation, namely its close relation to his personal experience as a student of Augustine. Although evidently prepared for publication (at some stage), the Liber sententiarum - unlike the Excerpta of Eugippius, with which it is naturally compared - shows no trace of systematic arrangement. Excerpts from

particular texts appear, as a rule, in the order in which they would have been found in the original, with no particular regard for continuity of subject-matter. Where batches of quotations from the same work occur at different points in the collection one may suppose that they were the result of interrupted or deliberately renewed contact with the text in question. To all appearances, the Liber sententiarum is a direct reflection of Prosper's personal activity as a reader of Augustine.⁵⁷

Unfortunately - or perhaps inevitably, in view of its character - it is impossible to say where and when the Liber sententiarum was composed. It could scarcely have been complete in its present form before Augustine's death, since it contains material from his last works. On the other hand, the presence of certain Christological passages can be plausibly linked with the Eutychian controversy, suggesting a terminus post quem (for the 'finished' work) of c.450.⁵⁸ In all probability, the collection came into being gradually over a period of years.⁵⁹ The absence of a preface may indicate that it was never prepared for publication by the author himself, since all Prosper's other works (with the possible exception of the - incomplete ? - Expositio psalmorum) are provided with some kind of preliminary statement of intention. The lack of such a statement in the present case also reduces the value of the work for a study of literary ideology. Happily, this defect is partially compensated by the survival of a preface to the related Liber epigrammatum ex sententiis Augustini, which may be quoted in full:

Dum sacris mentem placet exercere loquelis,
 Caelestique animum pascere pane iuvat:
 Quosdam, ceu prato, libuit decerpere flores,
 Distinctisque ipsos texere versiculis.
 5 Ut proprias canerent epigrammata singula causas,
 Et pars quaeque suo congrueret titulo.
 Nec nostrae hoc opis est, sed ab illo sumitur hic ros,
 Qui siccam rupem fundere iussit aquas,
 Ut quod in affectum cordis, pietate magistra,
 10 Venerit, hoc promat carmine laeta fides.

One may distinguish in this preface a technical and an ideological element. The technical element (vv.3-6) concerns the external form and coherence of the work. This was to consist of a collection of excerpts ('flores decerpere' - v.3), each treating of a single topic ('causas' - v.5) and accompanied by an appropriate verse. The 'pars' of line 6 may refer to the ensemble of excerpt and verse (in which case the 'titulus' would refer to a heading of the kind found in Migne's text) or, conceivably, to the verse alone ('titulus' referring, in that case, to the excerpt itself). In the absence of a satisfactory modern edition of the Liber epigrammatum it is difficult to be sure of the exact appearance of the original text. It would seem, however, to have consisted of around one hundred excerpts (the majority identifiable as 'sentences' from, or common to, the Liber sententiarum), each followed by a set of elegaics. The verses as we have them vary in length from two to twenty-four lines, the average length being roughly ten lines. Each verse re-presents the content of the preceding excerpt, usually with a high degree of amplification. As in the Liber sententiarum, there is no sign of any consistent attempt to group the material according to subject-matter.

Turning to the ideological content of the preface, one notes an equal insistence on the intrinsic pleasure of the activity of excerpting and versifying ('placet' - v.1, 'iuvat' - v.2, 'libuit' - v.3) and on its value as confession (vv.8-10). At first sight, this justification of the author's enterprise appears solipsistic; there is no address to the reader, no clear indication of the benefits that he or she might expect from the work in hand. One should not, however, ignore the force of the closing couplet:

Ut quod in affectum cordis, pietate magistra,
Venerit, hoc promat carmine laeta fides.

The 'pietas' invoked in line 9 is not merely that of the poet but also of his eventual reader. The biblical pairing 'cor'/'os' that lies behind these lines (and is explicitly evoked in the sixth excerpt and epigram 'De vera dei laudatione') may be seen as having a special relevance to the performance of the present work. Presented with a short text (in prose) of religious import, the pious reader would automatically conceive a pious thought ('in affectum cordis... / Venerit'). The simultaneous provision of a verse-paraphrase of that text would then ensure that he uttered it in due form ('promat carmine'). It is assumed, of course, that the verse-part - if not necessarily the prose-part as well - would be recited aloud. In terms of classical rhetoric the progression is thus one from 'inventio' (prose excerpt) to 'elocutio' (verse paraphrase). This is true both from the point-of-view of the poet-excerptor and from that of his reader. Indeed one might say that the latter is put in the position of the former, with this qualification: that neither, if he takes seriously lines 7 and 8 of

the preface, is in the position of 'author':

Nec nostrae hoc opis est, sed ab illo sumitur hic ros,
Qui siccam rupem fundere iussit aquas.⁶⁰

Here one recognizes the characteristically Prosperian imagery of the 'fons aeterna' (also clearly present, and independent of Augustine, in the eighty-second and eighty-third epigrams). On the reading just outlined the 'noster' of line 7 must embrace both poet and reader; neither was ultimately responsible for the song that he sang, inasmuch as it was a song of faith. To this desire to ascribe all meritorious utterance to God alone may also be attributed the absence of any explicit reference to Augustine as 'author' of the works excerpted. It is likely, nevertheless, that his name appeared in the original title of the Liber epigrammatum.

Before leaving the complex of texts constituted by Prosper's 'sentences' and epigrams, it is worth considering why he chose to re-present Augustine's writings in these particular forms. What prompted him to produce a collection of Augustinian 'excerpta' ? And what was his motive for turning some of these excerpts into verse ?⁶¹

The habit of **excerpting** from a favoured author was endemic to Graeco-Roman literary culture. On the one hand, collections of excerpts from the poets and philosophers were used in all periods for didactic purposes.⁶² On the other hand, it appears to have been a rule among late-antique 'litterati' to copy down passages that particularly struck them in the course of their personal reading.⁶³ The preface to the

Saturnalia of Macrobius suggests that it was even considered respectable to advertise one's own literary compositions as, in effect, elaborated notes de lecture.⁶⁴ The novelty of Prosper's undertaking would seem to lie in his decision to publish a collection of extracts from the works of a Christian writer. (Even if one assumes that the Liber sententiarum appeared posthumously, it is clear that he intended his epigrams to be published, along with their Augustinian 'sources'). So far as one can tell, there was no Latin precedent for a published compilation of this kind; nor is it clear what influence a Greek work such as the Philocalia of Origen (compiled in the second half of the fourth century by Basil the Great and Gregory of Nazianzus) could have had on Prosper. The 'private' - if not, as has been argued, solipsistic - tone of the preface to the Liber epigrammatum should perhaps be interpreted as a sign of the author's awareness of his innovation. There was, it is true, an obvious model for a book of 'sentences' of this type, in the form of the collection attributed to 'Sextus', recently translated into Latin by Rufinus of Aquileia. This work was known to Augustine and appears to have circulated widely in the early fifth century.⁶⁵ Predominantly ethical in content and well adapted (in Rufinus' view) to the devotional needs of the less highly educated members of the Christian community, it could have served as an inspiration to Prosper. As one closely associated with monastic society in Provence, the latter may also have had some knowledge of the various books of moral and ascetic maxims composed (in Greek) by Evagrius of Pontus, some of which had also been translated into Latin by Rufinus.⁶⁶ Had he wished to provide an alternative to such works - one in which the perfectionist counsels of a desert sage would yield to the more realistic ethic of the

author of the Confessions - then the Liber sententiarum might have been the result. Finally, one should probably allow for the effect on Prosper's literary sensibilities of the increasing use of patristic 'sententiae' in Latin theological argument from the 420s onwards. Though it can hardly be described as a dogmatic florilegium, the Liber sententiarum was composed by one who (as we shall see) had learnt to respect, and exploit, the value of written 'auctoritates'.

The decision to **versify** these Augustinian 'excerpta' is no doubt partly to be explained as the instinctive reflex of a late Roman 'litteratus'. It may not be strictly the case that, as E.R. Curtius once asserted, writers of this period wrote poetry 'because they had been taught to in school'.⁶⁷ Having reviewed the evidence, the author of a recent study of late-antique biblical epic concludes that "verse composition... does not seem to have been a regular part of grammatical or rhetorical instruction" and that the writing of poetry was therefore "probably an out-of-school activity".⁶⁸ He nevertheless argues for a close connection between the rhetorical exercises ('progymnasmata') prescribed in Roman schools - especially those involving the re-casting of a pre-existing text - and the practice of Christian verse-paraphrase. The case of Prosper merits fuller consideration than it has yet received in discussions of this kind. The author of the Carmen de ingratis and Epigrammata ex sententiis Augustini had clearly been well trained in the art of poetic composition. Given Gennadius' statement of his Aquitanian origins, it is tempting to suppose (as scholars have in the past) that he owed this training to the same educational and literary milieu that had previously nurtured the poetic talents of Ausonius and his 'pupil'

Paulinus (later of Nola). As has already been remarked in another context, both these earlier writers show a penchant for poetical paraphrase.⁶⁹ Ausonius, we know, was ready to versify on any (pre)text, whether it was the sayings of famous philosophers, Suetonius' Twelve Caesars, or the months of the year. A substantial part of his output consists of epigrams. If one were to assume that Prosper's literary education, in and out of school, had been acquired from men like Ausonius, it would be easy to understand his desire to fit every subject with an appropriate set of verses ('Ut proprias canerent epigrammata singula causas').⁷⁰

Just as no account of biblical epic can be complete that confines itself to the technical procedures employed by the authors of such works, so one should not expect to explain a text like Prosper's Epigrammata solely in relation to scholastic models. An attempt has already been made to show how this work was conceived as enabling a double process of thought ('cor') and utterance ('os'). Adopting a more specifically Christian terminology, one might say that its aim was to induce meditation and confession. Granted, Prosper does not state the matter in these precise terms. It may be more than coincidence, however, that the starting point for his versification of Christian themes was provided by Augustine's commentary on a part of the Bible which, as well as being in verse, had long been considered by Christians as a model both for their meditation and for their confession.⁷¹ Prosper's attitude to the Psalms constitutes a subject of study in itself, on which it is impossible to enter here. What dictated his choice of the Enarrationes as suitable matter for abbreviation? To

what extent is the emphasis on suffering that Lorenz detects in the Liber sententiarum a reflection of the mood of the Psalms ? How important was the influence of these ancient poems in determining the final form of Prosper's Augustinian 'retractatio' (i.e. the Epigrammata) ? Did he, like Paulinus, regard the psalmist as the archetypal verse-paraphrast ?

An approach to this topic would be made somewhat easier if one could accept as authentically Prosperian the set of prefatory verses Ad epitomen commentariorum Augustini in psalmos found in one medieval codex. Normally attributed to the Carolingian poet Walahfrid Strabo (whose own abbreviated version of the Enarrationes they precede in the manuscript), these verses were tentatively ascribed to Prosper by G. Morin in 1934.⁷² Although the ascription itself has not found general favour, the grounds on which it was made have never been seriously challenged. Here are the first twenty-two lines of the poem:

Cantica Davidico Christum modulantia plectro,
 Explanata tenet floridus iste liber;
 Maxima succinctis reserans mysteria verbis,
 Et profluos sensus sub brevitae loquens.
 5 Hunc Augustinus, toto venerabilis orbe,
 Egregius praesul, doctor apostolicus,
 In populis largo diffundens flumine linguae,
 Ter quinis decadis grande peregit opus;
 Dum cupit et tenues rerum comprehendere formas,
 10 Et mentem plebis voce movere pia.
 Sed quia rem miram atque omni ratione salubrem,
 Non omnes avido cordis amore petunt;
 Immo etiam plures censu sensuque minores,
 Haudquaquam tantas quimus habere gazas:
 15 Uno cuncta simul libuit perstringere libro,
 Et modicas undas sumere de pelago;
 Saepius ut breviter possit res tanta revolvi,

Nec nimio sumptu sive labore gravet.
Hunc igitur, lector, sensu percurre sagaci,
20 Et cape sidereum nectar ab ore sacro:
Quod recreat mentes, quod mores format et ornat;
Unde trahunt vires spes, amor atque fides.

The remaining six lines are an evocation of the God of the Old Testament; part of their function may be to specify the ultimate source of the celestial nourishment promised in line 20 (cf. 'mannae dulcedine' - v.25). Besides the similarities of diction noted by Morin, the following features of this preface might be claimed as characteristically Prosperian: (1) the author's use of fluvial and marine imagery in his description of the works of Augustine, (2) his careful specification of the form, purpose and compass of his own composition, (3) his concern for the practical convenience and spiritual well-being of the reader.⁷³ The case for ascribing the piece to Walahfrid on grounds of style and content has yet to be made. Meanwhile, the main obstacles in the way of an acceptance of Morin's hypothesis would seem to be (a) uncertainty as to whether Prosper ever completed an abbreviated version of all 150 Enarrationes,⁷⁴ and (b) the absence of external support for an alternative attribution.⁷⁵ If, at some future date, these lines could be securely ascribed to the author of the Liber sententiarum and Epigrammata, they would provide a valuable complement to our information on the early processes of reception of Augustine's works.⁷⁶

In his Life of Augustine, Possidius of Calama justly observes that no-one could possibly read everything that had been published by the former bishop of Hippo.⁷⁷ It is a remark that echoes down the middle ages. For Gennadius of Marseille (whose selective approach to Augustinian literature has already been alluded to), the fact that Augustine had written more books than any individual could reasonably expect to possess, let alone read, provided an excuse for ignoring the greater part of his output.⁷⁸ By his time (c.470), the process of 'digesting' Augustine for easier reference was already well advanced.⁷⁹ In studying the writings of Prosper - and of certain of his contemporaries - one is enabled to perceive the beginnings of that process. By their very nature, works such as Prosper's Expositio psalmorum, his Liber sententiarum or the Epigrammata ex operibus Augustini are difficult to date with precision. The Expositio (if it was ever completed) must have occupied the writer for a number of years, while the collections of sentences and epigrams give every appearance of having been composed piece-meal over an extended period. To attempt to assign strict termini to such works is probably vain. (There is, in any case, no a priori reason for regarding them as exclusive products of the author's Roman 'retirement'.) Granted that the conditions under which Prosper began to excerpt, abbreviate and versify Augustine's works may never be known, it is not unlikely that they were to be found in southern Gaul towards the end of the first quarter of the fifth century. As we have seen, models for this kind of activity were not wanting, either in secular literature or in the rapidly expanding sphere of Christian 'letters'. If Prosper was the author of the Carmen de providentia dei, one might claim evidence of a direct link between the processes of biblical epitomising

and versification - both otherwise attested in Gaul at this period - and a similar manipulation of patristic texts; even if he was not, the ideology of biblical 'retractatio' was one that could be easily transferred to other domains of Christian re-writing. The epitomising of Augustine had been begun by Augustine himself (c.422) in his Enchiridion de fide spe et caritate (the title of which is recalled by v.22 of the metrical preface quoted above). By the mid-420s, on Prosper's own testimony, there existed in or near Marseille a group of dedicated students of this writer's work, 'qui ad perceptionem evangelicae apostolicaeque doctrinae saluberrimis eius [sc. Augustini] disputationibus imbuuntur.'⁸⁰ In view of the alacrity with which the same persons later set about the defence of Augustine's theology - chiefly, it seems, by means of abbreviated presentations of what he himself had written - it is not unreasonable to suppose that some of them had prior experience of the task of Augustinian 'retractatio'. The only explicit statement in Prosper's work concerning the purpose of such undertakings (pending further research into the origins of the preface to the abbreviated Enarrationes) is that prefixed to the Liber epigrammatum. From this there emerges a double motivation based on the intrinsic pleasure of excerpting-and-versifying and the desire to provide suitable 'texts' for Christian meditation-and-confession.

Prosper was not the only southern Gallic 'litteratus' of the early fifth century to make a profession of 're-writing' Augustine. Within a few years of the latter's death, as we shall see, Vincent of Lerins was to publish a set of 'collecta ex Augustino' relating to the doctrines of

the Trinity and the Incarnation. Neither of these writers held high office in the church. Neither, according to the conventions then in force in Gaul, would normally have been permitted to preach. At a time when some of their contemporaries, in similar situations, were busy acquiring reputations as sermon-writers to their ecclesiastical superiors,^{80a} Prosper and Vincent applied themselves to the task of adapting Augustine. There is an obvious parallel between this kind of 'secondary' literary occupation and that adopted by Jerome a few decades earlier. In both cases one is confronted with what would appear to have been a conscious attempt to create a **distinctive writerly persona** on the basis of a **particular readerly competence**. In both cases, the main actors are persons who either resisted or failed to qualify for a conventional teaching role within the church. The chief difference lies in their respective choices of reading-matter. It is striking testimony to Augustine's achievement in Christian 'letters' that within a generation of the emergence of the writer 'de scripturis' there should also have been a place for one who professed to write 'ex Augustino'. That is not to say, of course, that the rise of literary 'Augustinianism' in the 420s and 430s was entirely untroubled. In Gaul, certain of Augustine's writings were more widely acceptable than others. In order to understand the particular styles of 'Augustinian' reading-and-writing adopted by Gallic 'litterati' of this period it is necessary to take some account of contemporary theological controversy. The following section of this chapter is therefore devoted to Prosper's involvement in the initial stages of the western debate on grace and predestination.

(b) 'Pro Augustino responsiones'

In considering the first phase (to c.434) of the controversy provoked in Gaul by Augustine's later anti-Pelagian works, one must try to answer three, closely-related questions:

1. What exactly were the opinions on grace, free will and predestination respectively held by the different parties to the debate - i.e. Augustine, Gallic 'Augustinians' such as Prosper, their opponents in Marseille and elsewhere ?
2. Why - for what reasons, theological and practical - did these persons consider it necessary to take a stand on the issues in question ?
3. How - on the basis of what assumptions, and by what means - did they set about promoting their own ideas and discrediting those of their opponents ?

Although no study yet exists that purports to deal comprehensively with all these points, sufficient work has been done for it to be possible to concentrate here mainly on the third.⁸¹ Thus we shall accept the results of recent research regarding the opinions of the various parties and their respective theological alignments, pausing only to consider (under the heading 'Moment and milieu') the particular circumstances in which Prosper himself came to act as a defender of the Augustinian

theology of grace. These considerations will then serve as background to a more detailed study of the 'Principles and practice' of that defence. As in the previous section, our ultimate concern will be with Prosper's personal sense of the relation between his own undertakings as a writer and the prior literary achievement of Augustine.

MOMENT AND MILIEU

Although the Pelagian controversy brought Augustine international notoriety, it cannot be said to have brought about any significant increase in his contacts with other parts of the Roman world. In the period 418-26, as in that to c.412, the main focus of his attention outside Africa remained Italy (especially Rome).⁸² Unlike Jerome, Augustine seems to have had no special interest in cultivating a Gallic readership. In a letter of 416 to a certain Hilary, perhaps to be identified with the bishop of Narbonne, he warns against the errors of the Pelagians, though without mentioning any names.⁸³ A letter of the following year, addressed to a former Gallic prefect, Dardanus, was written with the same intention.⁸⁴ The existence of these texts is evidence of the author's concern to establish a broadly-based consensus in favour of his own theology at a time when it appeared to be under serious threat.⁸⁵ There is no reason to suppose, however, that Augustine thought of southern Gaul as a potential Pelagian stronghold. (The fact that two former bishops from this region, Heros of Arles and Lazarus of Aix, had been prepared to mount charges against Pelagius at the Council of Diospolis would rather have persuaded him to the

contrary.) He does not, for example, appear to have been especially alarmed by the Christological errors of the Massilian monk, Leporius, who arrived in Hippo in c.418 - despite the fact that these were of a kind that he would later associate with Pelagian views of human perfectibility.⁸⁶ As far as Augustine was concerned - not only in 418, but also in 428 - there were no monsters to be feared in Gaul.

It remains the case, nevertheless, that works such as the Contra Iulianum (published c.422) received a mixed reception from his already-extensive Gallic audience. Despite the campaign of vilification later mounted against them, it is unlikely that more than a few of those who reacted unfavourably to Augustine's repeated affirmations of the absolute sovereignty of grace at every stage in man's salvation and its corollary, absolute predestination, were actually 'Pelagians' in the sense in which this expression may be applied to Julian and the other Italian bishops who refused to subscribe the Epistula tractoria of pope Zosimus. There may indeed have been Christians living in Gaul who, like Paulinus in Nola, had initially been sympathetic to Pelagius' ascetic programme and perhaps also to certain aspects of his theology. With the exception, however, of a single piece of imperial legislation dated 425, of dubious import,⁸⁷ there is no evidence of any prolonged resistance by members of the Gallic clergy to the anti-Pelagian decrees of 418-19. (Prosper's silence on this subject is eloquent testimony.) On none of the points essential to the theology confirmed by Roman church at that time is there any sign of Gallic recalcitrance. Even on the subject of the 'tradux peccati', regarding which Rome had displayed such notable reserve, our sources indicate an attitude of compliance on the part of

Christian intellectuals in Gaul.⁸⁸ Their opposition, when it came, was reserved for two aspects of Augustine's doctrine on grace which, although arguably implicit in his own writings from a relatively early date, had never been officially promulgated. They objected to his view that fallen man retained no natural instinct for good - such as might, in certain cases, precede the gift of efficacious grace. And they resisted his inference that, since those whom God chose to save were so predestined in virtue of merits that he himself bestowed, large numbers of people were necessarily excluded from salvation (a conclusion made inescapable by the arguments of the Contra Iulianum). The effect of proclaiming such doctrines would, they believed, be to induce apathy and despair. In any case, they could find no adequate warrant for them in the Bible or in the writings of earlier Christian teachers. As a result - and notwithstanding the admiration that many of them had for Augustine himself - they felt obliged to dissent from him on these particular matters.⁸⁹

The first intimation of Gallic misgivings concerning aspects of his doctrine of grace reached Augustine from a source in or near Marseille, around the year 426.⁹⁰ A certain Hilary, known to us only from his intervention in this affair, had spent some time in Augustine's company in Hippo. The effect of such personal contact was to inspire in him, as (it seems) in many who shared this experience, a deep sense of loyalty both to Augustine himself and to the causes which he so strenuously promoted. Disturbed by the tenor of theological discussion in his native Provence, Hilary wrote to his former host, informing him briefly of the situation and promising to give a fuller account in due course,

either by letter or (as he hoped) in person. This first letter is not extant. Nor is any reply from Augustine. It is possible, however, that the latter presented his correspondent with a copy of the treatise De correptione et gratia that he had just composed (426/7) for certain African monks.⁹¹ This work contained a notable exposé of his ideas on the Fall and on the regime of divine grace subsequently operative. For those in Hilary's vicinity who were already suspicious of certain tendencies in Augustine's thought, its effect was decisive. Barely suppressed dissent now turned into resolute - if not yet open - opposition. Abandoning his plan of a voyage to Africa, Hilary despatched another letter to Augustine, containing a summary ('summatim... velut commonendo' [479,1-2]) of the main points of contention as they then appeared and a request for further assistance. He also arranged for a parallel account of the situation to be composed by one whom he describes as 'vir cum moribus tum eloquio et studio clarus', namely Prosper. These letters of Hilary and Prosper - written, probably, in 427 - provide our main source of information on the state of opinion concerning Augustine's theology of grace in south-eastern Gaul at this period.

The contrary views reported by Hilary are said to be those 'quae Massiliae vel aliis etiam locis in Gallia ventilantur' [469,4]. For his part, Prosper begins by referring to 'multi servorum Christi qui in Massiliensi urbe consistunt' [455,12] and to 'viri... tam clari tamque egregii in omnium virtutum studio' [456,11]. These indications point unmistakably to the monastic milieux of Marseille and, more vaguely, to certain other areas. Our only sure information concerning monastic

establishments in Marseille at this date relates to the (double) monastery founded by Cassian in c.416. Since the composition of Cassian's thirteenth Conference ('De protectione dei'), which contains anti-Augustinian sentiments on the 'initium bonae voluntatis', can be dated c.427, it may be assumed that he was one of the prime figures envisaged by Prosper and Hilary.⁹² It is perfectly possible, however, that other monasteries besides that of Cassian already existed in the city. As early as c.412, Jerome had considered bishop Proculus of Marseille a suitable master for a young monk; there may therefore have been a monastic community associated with bishop's residence, as is known to have been the case elsewhere.⁹³ In addition, the city would certainly have contained a number of 'conversi' or unattached ascetics, some of whom may have been closely involved in current discussions 'de gratia dei et studio virtutum'. Looking beyond the city of Marseille itself, one's attention is naturally drawn to the island of Lérins and to the community of monks gathered there under abbot Honoratus. A facile association of Lérins with 'semi-Pelagianism' has, in the past, often led to distortion of the historical record. It has been too readily assumed, for example, that all those whose presence may be traced on the island in the 420s and 430s must have been violently opposed to Augustine's teaching on grace. At the very least, such a view involves an oversimplification. From the evidence relating directly to the situation in 427, one may infer only that the issues mentioned by Prosper and Hilary were likely to have been of interest to the members of Honoratus' fraternity. Several of those who spent time at Lérins (or on nearby Lero) in the first decades of the monastery are known to have been attentive readers of Augustine's Confessions.⁹⁴ It

is probable that the same writer's anti-Pelagian writings, including the later works against Julian, were also widely studied in 'Lerinian' circles. Contacts between Marseille and Lérins would have been close; as already noted, Cassian's second set of Conferences, including the thirteenth, was dedicated to Honoratus and Eucherius.⁹⁵ Thus, even if Prosper and Hilary knew nothing for certain of the attitudes of the Lerinian monks, they may have counted their island among the 'other places in Gaul' in which Augustine's ideas were subject to criticism.

It may, in fact, be possible to associate Lérins with the 'anti-Augustinian' movement in Marseille on other grounds as well. In addition to specifying certain monastic milieux, Prosper also alludes to the opposition of persons '[qui], adepto nuper summo sacerdotii honore, supereminet' [465,3]. Similar expressions occur in Hilary's letter. From them one may deduce (1) that the number of Augustine's critics included at least two recently-elected bishops and (2) that these bishops had close links with the monastic movement in Provence. One of them is named by Prosper as Helladius (otherwise Euladius) of Arles, the immediate successor in that see of the turbulent Patroclus who had met a violent end in 426.⁹⁶ Little is known of Helladius' background. The fact that Prosper calls him a 'vir spiritualium studiorum' suggests that he may have been a monk, a possibility that would seem to be confirmed by Cassian's dedication of his first set of Conferences to a monk named Helladius in c.425. Another obvious candidate for the honours ascribed to certain of Augustine's critics is Rusticus, bishop of Narbonne from 426, formerly a correspondent of Jerome and (as recorded in an inscription of his own drafting) both a monk and priest in Marseille.⁹⁷ The

significance of these details of prosopography is not limited to the immediate interpretation of Prosper and Hilary's letters. Helladius and Rusticus represent the vanguard of a company of monk-bishops that was henceforth to take a leading role in the social, political and intellectual life of this part of the province. In the period between 426 and 430, as C. Pietri has recently observed, southern Gallic ecclesiastical politics underwent a radical transformation.⁹⁸ In place of the old rivalries over juridical primacy that had occupied the likes of Patroclus of Arles, Proculus of Marseille and Hilary of Narbonne - and which, since the time of pope Zosimus, had involved regular recourse to Rome - there emerged a new kind of episcopal authority, based mainly on the supposed ascetic virtues of the individual office-holder.⁹⁹ This development is perhaps most clearly reflected in the Lerinian hagiographical texts studied in the previous chapter. It is already apparent, however, in the pattern of preferment to major sees in south-eastern Gaul in the late 420s. Thus Patroclus, who had never shown any special favour to monks, was succeeded by the monk Helladius (though not, it seems, without some tumult). When Helladius himself died, in late 427 or early 428, he was succeeded by Honoratus, the former abbot and founder of the monastery of Lérins who, in turn, was followed two years later by another monk from his old community. As we have seen, Hilary's place in Narbonne was taken by a former monk from Marseille, Rusticus. When Proculus of Marseille died (between 428 and 431), he was succeeded by one of Rusticus' former monastic companions, a certain Venerius. Not long afterwards, a group of citizens from Fréjus attempted to ensure that a Lerinian monk was appointed to that see in succession to Leontius.^{99a} When due allowance is made for the severe

limits on our information, one is left with an impression of something approaching a monastic 'takeover' of the southern Gallic episcopate during these years.

That was also the impression received by pope Celestine from information brought to Rome by one of his subdeacons, returning from an embassy to Arles in the spring of 428. The pope had sent a letter instructing the bishop of Arles to try a certain Daniel, a monk (?) of eastern origins newly arrived in Gaul, for offences that included the ravishing of consecrated virgins.¹⁰⁰ To his amazement, he now heard that Daniel had been made a bishop! He also learnt of several other serious irregularities concerning the ordination and conduct of bishops in that part of Gaul. Apparently, a number of those recently elected - including the new bishop of Arles, Honoratus - had not risen through the ranks of the local clergy. Some of them, moreover, insisted on wearing the 'pallium', traditionally the uniform of Greek philosophers and now the characteristic garb of Christian 'philosophers' (i.e. monks). Such affectation was not to be tolerated; it was the sign of persons 'qui in ecclesia non creverunt, sed alio venientes itinere, secum haec in ecclesia, quae in alia conversatione habuerant, intulerunt.'¹⁰¹ Equally damnable was their refusal to administer the sacrament of penance to persons 'in extremis' - another monkish trait. The only way to prevent such abuses was to ensure that no-one assumed the office of bishop in a particular church who had not previously served an apprenticeship as a member of the local clergy. Foreigners and strangers were not to be preferred to local candidates, 'ne novum quoddam, de quo episcopi fiant, institutum videatur esse collegium'.¹⁰² These declarations are

contained in a letter addressed - as it were 'over the head' of the suspect bishop of Arles - 'Ad universos episcopos per Viennensem et Narbonensem provincias constitutos'.

There can be little doubt that, in proscribing the idea of a 'novum collegium de quo episcopi fiant', Celestine was trying to halt the monastic infiltration of the southern Gallic episcopate. In due course, Prosper and Hilary would provide him with further evidence of the adverse effects of that development. Meanwhile, his letter of 428 sheds interesting light on the situation described by the same two writers in the previous year. Part of the difficulty experienced by Augustine's supporters was the popular credit enjoyed by his critics as men of conspicuous personal sanctity. Celestine's evocation of the Gallic 'palliati' of c.428 suggests vividly one of the ways in which such men had succeeded in imposing their authority. The wearing of the pallium was naturally interpreted as the sign of inner virtues acquired by personal endeavour. In his polemical works, Prosper is quick to accuse his opponents of excessive pride in their own moral accomplishments.¹⁰³ Though such accusations are clearly opportunistic, one cannot entirely discount the evidence of a link between the exhibitionism of certain monk-bishops and the rejection of a thoroughgoing theology of divine grace. The 'new men' in the southern Gallic episcopate of Prosper's day may have judged it impossible to maintain the respect of their congregations without also claiming some part, however exiguous, in the cultivation of their own virtues. Similarly practical motives, it would appear, lay behind their resistance both to Augustine's notions of predestination and to the administration of penance 'in articulo mortis'.

If a man's salvation was indeed determined by God's decree 'ante constitutionem mundi', how could he be persuaded to exert himself on his own behalf ? And if a deathbed penance could absolve him of a lifetime's misdemeanours, what arguments were to be used in recommending a day-to-day morality ? Faced with these questions, some early-fifth-century Gallic churchmen may have preferred the claims of pastoral expediency to those of a rigorously developed theology - particularly when, as in the case of predestination 'sine praevisis meritis', the theology itself was of doubtful ancestry.

A general picture has now emerged of the local ecclesiastical background to the situation evoked by Hilary and Prosper in their letters of 427. Such, in broad outline, were the conditions in which a few 'intrepidi amatores perfectae gratiae' (as Prosper calls them)¹⁰⁴ set about their defence of Augustine's theology. Unfortunately, it is extremely difficult to provide any more immediate context for the personal activity of these Augustinian vigilantes. In the texts attributable to their opponents they are either ignored or presented in caricature, while the writings of Hilary and Prosper themselves offer little on which to base an objective description. The fact that complaints made by these two persons against prominent local churchmen were later taken seriously by the pope would seem to imply that at least one of them was of some social standing. Prosper himself may just possibly have been a deacon by this time.¹⁰⁵ There is no evidence that Hilary was in orders. Both men evidently belonged to a section of Christian society, consisting of both laymen and clergy, in which continence and other ascetic virtues were held in high esteem and where

theological questions were actively debated. The ease with which Hilary communicated with Africa and Rome suggests that he was a person of substantial means (and, no doubt, important connections). Conceivably, he acted in some way as Prosper's patron; it is possible that he facilitated his access to the works of Augustine.¹⁰⁶ Combining these inferences, one may conjecture the existence of a small but influential group of minor clergy and 'conversi', united in a common reverence for the person and writings of the bishop of Hippo.¹⁰⁷ Such a group might naturally have been found at Marseille in the mid-420s, or for that matter at Arles. In either case, it would have been immediately affected by the rapid and decisive changes then taking place in the institutions and ideology of the southern Gallic church.

There is one other element in the background to Prosper's 'defence' of Augustine that needs to be mentioned here: his own conviction of the unique destiny of the bishop of Hippo as 'specialis patronus fidei'.¹⁰⁸ The idea that this man had been called upon to perform a particular, historic role in the establishment of orthodox Christian doctrine is expressed in passages such as that quoted earlier from the Carmen de ingratis and, most graphically, in the Chronicle.¹⁰⁹ It was, one may suppose, a natural product of the acclaim which Augustine had received following his victory over Pelagius. As will be seen, much of the literary effort expended by Prosper 'pro Augustino' was meant to consolidate what he (and many others) took to be the dogmatic gains of 418.

PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICE

The general circumstances of Prosper's 'Pro Augustino' having been established, it is now possible to consider his manner of proceeding. In order to do this conveniently, it is proposed first to provide a brief chronological sketch of Prosper's activities in the period 427-c.432, and then to offer detailed analyses of his work under a number of separate headings.

Even before writing to Augustine in 427, Prosper (and his associates ?) had spoken out against local critics of his ideas on grace and predestination, though apparently to no avail:

Et cum contra eos scripta beatitudinis tuae validissimis et innumeris testimoniis divinarum scripturarum instructa proferimus, ac secundum formam disputationum tuarum aliquid etiam ipsi quo concludantur astruimus, obstinationem suam... defendunt.¹¹⁰

This description of the author's recent practice amounts to an important statement of principle. At the outset of the controversy, and for a considerable while afterwards, Prosper appears to have believed that the best way of dispelling objections to, or doubts concerning, Augustine's theology was to refer to Augustine's own writings. If people would only take notice of what Augustine had written, they would be convinced of the truth and vital importance of what he asserted. This belief is expressed most clearly in a passage of the Ad Rufinum cited earlier.¹¹¹ At the end of that work, Prosper tells his reader:

si vere de his quaestionibus instrui desideras, sicut desiderare te convenit, ipsis beati Augustini disputationibus cognoscendis impende curam, ut in confitenda dei gratia defaecatissimam ac saluberrimam evangelicae apostolicaeque doctrinae intelligentiam consequaris.¹¹²

To defend Augustine was thus, essentially, to draw attention to his writings - 'scripta [Augustini] proferre' - and to allow them to speak with all the authority of the biblical texts on which they were based. For those who responded in a proper spirit of humility these writings carried a divine force of conviction: 'campisque animorum / Certant vitalis doctrinae immittere rivos' (De ingratis, vv.112-113). Nonetheless, Prosper seems to have recognized the need for alternative (i.e. briefer, more polemical) presentations of arguments found scattered in the many volumes of Augustine's published work. Both the Ad Rufinum and the De ingratis are evidence of his efforts to re-present Augustine's ideas on grace and predestination in his own words - 'secundum formam disputationum [Augustini] aliquid adstruere'. Since neither of these works was manifestly written after 427, it is possible that they are both referred to in the passage of Prosper's letter quoted above.¹¹³ Be that as it may, the two complementary tendencies registered in that letter - to present Augustine's writings in their original textual form, and to re-present their inner 'form' or content in a work of the author's own devising - neatly define Prosper's objects in the initial stages of the 'Massilian' controversy.

As long as Augustine himself remained alive, the best course appeared to be to ask him to re-present his own ideas in a form designed to suit the requirements of the latest debate. It was with this end in

view that Prosper and Hilary wrote to the bishop of Hippo in 427. Though raising certain questions that he himself found difficult to resolve on the basis of Augustine's existing writings, Prosper was aware that the new work that he was asking for would consist, for the most part, of a re-statement of old arguments. He justified his request on the grounds that (as he says) 'necessarium et utile est etiam quae scripta sunt scribere, ne leve existimetur quod non frequenter arguitur.'

¹¹⁴ This principle, which Prosper was constantly to apply in his own writings, is one that he might have learnt from Augustine. The latter, currently engaged on a detailed 'retractatio' of his life's work, needed no persuading of the value of selective repetition. Despite the heavy demands then being made on his time, he produced a substantial work De praedestinatione sanctorum, in two volumes, containing a point-by-point treatment of the issues raised by his Gallic correspondents.¹¹⁵

The text of the De praedestinatione must have reached Gaul during 428 - or, at the latest, in 429 - and then have undergone a rapid diffusion. Within a short time of its author's death in August 430 Prosper is to be found replying to a series of questions raised by two Genoese priests with regard to particular passages in it.¹¹⁶ The manner of the work's reception by persons living in the vicinity of Marseille and hostile to Augustine's views on predestination may perhaps be judged from two other works of Prosper of the same period, the so-called Responsiones ad capitula obiectionum Vincentianarum and the Responsiones ad capitula obiectionum Gallorum calumniantium. It has been supposed that the 'Vincent' responsible for the latter set of 'obiectiones' was

Vincent of Lérins.¹¹⁷ Even if this identification is correct, the 'Galli' behind the former set remain obscure. Conceivably, they were a prominent group of displaced persons from northern Gaul who had settled in Provence. There must, in any case, be a strong presumption that the main opposition to Augustine's ideas continued to be manifested in the area round Arles and Marseille. Only then can one understand the application made by Prosper and Hilary to pope Celestine, probably in the year 431, which resulted in the issuing of a papal letter addressed to a number of the bishops of south-eastern Gaul.¹¹⁸

Dismayed by local reaction to the De praedestinatione, and doubting their own ability to defend the memory of Augustine in the face of such formidable opponents, Prosper and Hilary had travelled to Rome to seek the support of the pope. Tactfully, they had confined their formal complaints to the behaviour of certain priests '[qui], indisciplinatas quaestiones vocantes in medium, pertinaciter praedic[abant] adversantia veritati'.¹¹⁹ In view of what he had recently heard concerning episcopal ordinations in south-eastern Gaul, Celestine was only too ready to believe that these troublemakers enjoyed at least the tacit support of their superiors. Again pointedly ignoring the bishop of Arles (in the present case, Hilary), he wrote to Venerius, Leontius and their colleagues, demanding that order be restored. Since the main points at issue related to certain opinions of Augustine, he also saw fit to append a brief testimony to the latter 'quem tantae scientiae olim fuisse meminimus, ut inter magistros etiam a meis semper decessoribus haberetur'.¹²⁰

It is customary to associate two of Prosper's compositions with his activity 'pro Augustino' after 431. First, there is the substantial treatise Contra collatorem in which passages from Cassian's thirteenth Conference are subjected to critical scrutiny. Towards the end of this work, Prosper invokes a number of authorities in favour of his own point-of-view, including those of Celestine and the recently-elected pope Sixtus (432-440).¹²¹ The mention of these witnesses has been used as an argument for dating the work as a whole to c.432. Since, however, the author seems to indicate that the text of Cassian to which he referred had only recently come into his hands, this dating requires one to suppose that the Conference in question had been unavailable to him for almost five years after its composition.¹²² Though it is true that Cassian was cautious in his criticisms of Augustine (and may therefore have tried to restrict the initial circulation of this Conference), such an assumption is difficult to reconcile with the impression that one otherwise obtains of a highly fluid literary society in and around Marseille at this period. It may be noted that another list of 'auctoritates', included in the main body of the Contra collatorem, contains no reference to the opinions of Celestine or Sixtus.¹²³ Is it possible that the second list was added as a coda in or after 432, in order to up-date a work published some years earlier? Pending a closer examination of the text and extant manuscripts, it is perhaps worth considering the hypothesis of a 'second edition' of this important treatise. A similar problem of dating affects the composition known as the Capitula (pseudo-)Caelestini or Praeteritorum sedis apostolicae episcoporum auctoritates, which consists mainly of excerpts from conciliar and papal documents of the period 416-18 relating to the

Pelagian controversy.¹²⁴ Though attached at an early stage in transmission to the text of Celestine's letter in support of Prosper and Hilary, this work is clearly an independent compilation; following the demonstration of M. Cappeluyens, it is now generally attributed to Prosper.¹²⁵ Cappeluyens was inclined to date the Auctoritates after 432, seeing them as a response to those who had been unimpressed by the pope's endorsement of Augustine's reputation and as evidence of a gradual moderation in the author's own opinions. Whether or not one accepts this relatively late dating will depend largely on the view that one takes regarding Prosper's supposed theological 'development';¹²⁶ the texts assembled in the Auctoritates were almost certainly available to him as early as c.426.¹²⁷

In view of the relatively short period separating the first and last of Prosper's polemically pro-Augustinian writings, and the difficulty of dating any of them with precision, there would seem little point in trying to distinguish successive phases in the literary ideology which they represent. Instead, it is proposed to consider three major aspects of the writer's defence of Augustine: his attitude towards the excerpting of the latter's works (whether performed by persons favourable to his own position or by those opposed to it); his use of (written) 'authorities'; his manner of summarising the theological positions for which he stood. In each case, special attention will be paid to the possibility of influence on Prosper of the attitudes and methods of his opponents.

'Excerpta'

Quidam dictiloqui libros seni Augustini
Carpere et adversum condere fertur opus.

These lines occur at the beginning of a satirical epigram composed at an early stage in Prosper's campaign 'pro Augustino'.¹²⁸ In this poem, and in other compositions of similar date, the author vents his annoyance at what he considered the underhand tactics of his opponents. If they found fault with Augustine's theology, why did they not publish their criticisms in writing, instead of merely whispering them in private¹²⁹ ? In due course, publications began to appear. There were, for example, the two sets of Obiectiones and Cassian's thirteenth Conference. In none of these works was the bishop of Hippo the subject of direct attack. His name was not mentioned. His writings were nowhere quoted verbatim. Prosper's demand that Augustine's detractors should provide textual evidence of the errors which they claimed to find in his work - 'proferendo atque explicando libros'¹³⁰ - would thus appear never to have been met. And yet there are clear indications that the adversaries of Augustine's ideas on predestination were making a close study of his writings. Their failure to publish their criticisms in exactly the form required by Prosper should doubtless be seen as the result of respect for Augustine himself and/or fear of the possible consequences.

In their letters to Augustine, both Prosper and Hilary indicate that the 'Massilians' were in the habit of citing texts from the works of Augustine and other catholic 'tractatores' in support of their own arguments.¹³¹ The use made by these theologians of patristic author-

ities in general will be discussed in the following section. First, one may observe the manner of their recourse to Augustine. As already stated, the 'Massilians' found themselves in profound disagreement with Augustine's views on predestination. But they were not about to reject his work en bloc. Instead, they proposed to use one text of Augustine to refute another. Confronted with the uncongenial theology of his later works, they set about finding statements in his earlier writings that were more in accord with their own views. Hilary provides a number of examples of this procedure. These theologians, he informs Augustine, claimed to be in a position to demonstrate the orthodoxy of their opinions 'non solum aliorum catholicorum testimoniis, sed etiam sanctitatis tuae disputatione antiquiore'.¹³² The force of the latter claim lies in the adjective 'antiquior'. To have alleged merely that there were inconsistencies in Augustine's writings would have served no purpose. (If Augustine were in the habit of contradicting himself, why should anyone trouble to read him ?) What the 'Massilians' wished to imply was that the views which Augustine had **formerly** held, and since (apparently) abandoned, were those **anciently** held by the church. The argument is specious and could only have been taken seriously at a time when the use of patristic authorities in theological debate was at an experimental stage. That it should have been resorted to at all is a further sign of the unique importance attached to Augustine's writings in Gallic theological circles.

Augustine's response to this novel kind of 'praescriptio'¹³³ based on a person's own writings can be read in the De praedestinatione. Two main points are made. First, in studying a literary text, especially a

work of theology, it was important to bear in mind the context in which particular remarks were made. (Thus one should not expect to find a full treatment of divine grace in a work 'De libero arbitrio adversus Manichaeos', or an adequate discussion of predestination in a work intended for a pagan audience.) Secondly, due allowance had to be made for progressive refinements - even, indeed, for substantial changes - in the author's thought over a period of years. In the case of a Christian theologian, such modifications could result either from his need to deal with the issues raised by a new heresy, or from his recognition of a previously unsuspected truth. The challenge of Pelagius, for example, had forced Augustine to express himself more clearly on certain points. Even before the emergence of Pelagianism, however, he had been led to reject an opinion that he had once held concerning the 'initium fidei' when God revealed to him the sense of a biblical passage (I Corinthians 4,7) that had previously been obscure.¹³⁴

This technique of self-justification is recognizably that of the Retractationes - a work which Hilary had asked to see as soon as possible and which, though still incomplete, was probably sent to Gaul with the De praedestinatione.¹³⁵ For most of the works which it covered, the Retractationes gave an indication of the original circumstances of composition. To that extent, it already provided a safeguard against misconceived citation. More importantly, it contained clear indications of the author's personal development. The theme of personal progress that dominates the preface to the Retractationes is sounded repeatedly in the De praedestinatione. Augustine had learnt in the process of writing ('scribendo proficere') and wished the fact to be

known. His ideal reader would not be one who embraced the whole of his work without discrimination, but one who followed carefully in his footsteps so as to arrive at the point that he himself had reached. The error of the 'Massilians' was to have read his books without bothering to advance with him: 'quia non sicut legere libros meos ita etiam in eis curaverunt proficere mecum'.¹³⁶

Prosper immediately gives a polemical twist to his master's remarks concerning personal 'profectus':

Quia ergo nec iusta nec rationabilis intelligitur eorum fuisse persuasio, qui huius viri [sc. Augustini] scientiam tot incrementorum profectibus aedificatam, tot annorum studiis expolitam, ad adolescentiae rudimenta revocabant, ut magis suffrageretur haereticis quod inter initia conversionis suae imperite senserat quam prodesset catholicis quod pontificali diligentiae veritas revelaret; merito illos hoc praeiudicio utentes, et in his quae dudum abdicata fuerant immorantes, pii doctoris gravitas notat; quod qui curaverunt omnes sensus ipsius indagare, noluerint cum eius eruditione proficere.¹³⁷

This statement occurs in the Responsiones ad excerpta Genuensium. The prejudice ('praeiudicium') of which Prosper convicts his 'Massilian' opponents does not seem to have affected the persons responsible for this particular set of Augustinian extracts, taken from the De praedestinatione. Indeed it is difficult to see what principle, apart from a general confusion, could have guided their choice. For the most part, Prosper is content to replace the excerpts in their context and expand on their implications. By this means, he is able both to advertise the text of Augustine's most recent work (along with that of the De gratia

et libero arbitrio [426], which he had just received) and to provide a resume of the major points of his doctrine.

Unlike their Genoese counterparts, Augustine's critics in Gaul were not prepared to provide Prosper with a selection of excerpts for comment. Even so, he was convinced that one of the main occupations of their private 'conferences' was the analysis of Augustine's works. What (he asks) did these 'novi censores' expect to achieve ?

Unde ergo haec diligentia tam severi emersit examinis ?
Unde in hanc austeritatem supercilium se tetricae frontis
armavit, ut mensuras sensuum, pondera locutionum, numeros
syllabarum insidiosus scrutator eventilet... ? (Contra
collatorem 1,2)

If their object was to undermine the doctrines that Augustine had fought for during his twenty-year battle with the Pelagians, they were doomed to fail. These doctrines had been endorsed by the most eminent authorities and could not now be called in question. Thus far, the argument of the Contra collatorem parallels that used in the Ad Rufinum and De ingratis.¹³⁸ An interesting development may, however, be seen in the final section of this work.

Having summarised the opinions expressed by Cassian in the thirteenth Conference and associated them with those of Pelagius, Prosper recalls the measures taken by successive councils and popes to eradicate this heresy. Finally, he invokes the recent pronouncement of pope Celestine in favour of Augustine. In his view, the pope's statement left no room for doubt. And yet a certain kind of person could claim to detect an ambiguity in it:

...ut scilicet quia in epistola papae, librorum pro quibus actum est [sc. duorum librorum De praedestinatione], non expressus est titulus, hinc eo appareat non probatos, et istam in sanctum Augustinum laudationem pro anteriorum scriptorum meritis fuisse collatam. (21,3)

Clearly, some such argument had been advanced by Prosper's 'Massilian' opponents. Reminded by Celestine of the history of papal deference to Augustine, they had agreed to accept those works which he and his predecessors had manifestly approved, thereby excluding the later texts which they themselves found most objectionable. (Although the expressions used by Prosper would seem to refer only to the De praedestinatione, it is not unlikely that the 'Massilians' meant to exclude other texts as well - e.g. Contra Iulianum, De correptione et gratia.) In effect, this was another form of the 'praescriptio' attempted earlier. Those who disagreed with particular Augustinian doctrines were once again seeking to uphold a distinction between 'novitas' and 'antiquitas' in what he had written. Prosper's response to this new objection had been prepared by Augustine himself. There was, he asserted, nothing in this author's later works that could not be found more or less clearly expressed in his earlier anti-Pelagian writings. Everything that he had written since c.412 had been informed with the same spirit ('idem doctrinae spiritus'), based on the same arguments ('eadem praedicationis forma').¹³⁹ If the 'Massilians' admitted the orthodoxy of the earlier work - as they were bound to - they had no choice but to approve the later as well.

Prosper's 'responsiones' thus provide us with evidence of two major kinds of critical or selective reading of Augustine's works. The first kind, as practised by the Genoese priests (and implicitly recommended by Prosper), issued in a set of 'excerpta' that could be made the basis of theological discussion and/or instruction: this may be called **expository excerpting**. The second kind, as practised by the 'Massilian' critics of Augustinian predestination, also seems to have involved a process of excerpting, though no complete set of excerpts is extant. Its purpose was polemical rather than expository, since it was intended to justify certain propositions that were excluded by Augustine's mature theology. Within this category of **polemical excerpting** ('excerpere'--'carpere') two particular styles may be distinguished. The first appeals from a later Augustinian text to an earlier one; it is met by Augustine (and Prosper) with a theory of personal 'profectus'. The second seeks to maintain a distinction between 'approved' (earlier) and 'unapproved' (later) Augustine; it is opposed by Augustine (and Prosper) with a theory of the essential unity of the author's writing 'de gratia dei'. These elements of a theory and practice of patristic excerpting will acquire an additional significance when, in due course, we come to consider the 'Augustinianism' of Vincent of Lerins.

'Auctoritates'

If logical arguments failed to convince the 'Massilians' and their sympathisers, recourse was to be had to authority:

Igitur huiusmodi hominum pravitati, non tam disputationum studio quam auctoritatum privilegio resistendum est: ut de prostrati dudum dogmatis corpore nullum membrum sinatur assurgere.

This remark appears in the closing section of the Contra collatorem.¹⁴⁰ Uttered when the author had already been engaged for more than five years in his 'defence' of Augustine, it may reflect a certain disillusion on his part. On the other hand, Prosper had frequently employed the argument from authority in his earlier works - always to the same general effect. There was (he argued) a consensus against the Pelagians expressed in the words and actions of popes, councils, emperors and a number of other prominent individuals, including Augustine; to impute error on this subject to any one of these authorities was to allege that all had erred.

By no means all the authorities invoked by Prosper take the form of textual citations; in the condemnation of heresy, actions often spoke louder than words. Even so, certain documents clearly played an important part in establishing his sense of an anti-Pelagian accord. On the basis of citations and other references, one may suppose that he had access to the following texts or sources of information (square brackets denote areas of major uncertainty):

- acts of the Council of Diospolis (415), as reported by Augustine in the De gestis Pelagii¹⁴¹
- [- letters of the Councils of Carthage and Milevis (416) to pope Innocent]¹⁴²
- letters of pope Innocent (417) to the Councils of Carthage and Milevis, in reply to the above¹⁴³
- anti-Pelagian canons of the Council of Carthage (418), together with a letter of that council to pope Zosimus¹⁴⁴
- Epistula tractoria of pope Zosimus (418)¹⁴⁵
- response of African bishops to the above (418)¹⁴⁶
- copies of imperial decrees against the Pelagians (418-19, 425?)¹⁴⁷
- [- copy(-ies) of decree(s) of pope Boniface (418-422) against the Pelagians]¹⁴⁸

As will be seen, none of these documents was published after 425; the majority were produced before 420. In principle, then, Prosper might have had access to all of them at the beginning of his public campaign 'pro Augustino' (c.426). It may be noted that in 426 Augustine himself sent a dossier of anti-Pelagian materials to the monks of Hadrumetum as a kind of appendix to his De gratia et libero arbitrio, the contents of which corresponded closely to the list of texts given above (with the exception of the first and two last items).¹⁴⁹ Might not Hilary and Prosper have received a similar collection from Africa, along with the De gestis Pelagii ? This hypothesis would help to account for the African bias of their documentation (as revealed in Prosper's citations). For knowledge of papal and imperial legislation they could, presumably, have relied on contacts in Arles and Rome. In any case, there is nothing in Prosper's polemical writings (including the Auctor-

itates apostolicae sedis) that obviously conflicts with an assumption that the documents listed above were available to him in (or near) Marseille, probably as early as 426.

The anti-Pelagian consensus is evoked in summary form at the beginning of the Ad Rufinum. Here it is stated that the wiles of the heretics had been detected by the bishops of the diocese of the Orient ('orientalium episcoporum iudicia' - i.e. the Council of Diospolis), the Apostolic See ('apostolicae sedis auctoritas') and the African councils ('Africanorum conciliorum vigilantia'). Reference is then made to the extensive anti-Pelagian writings of Augustine, with which catholics the world over are said to be in agreement:

...noverint [novi censores librorum Augustini, i.e. 'Massilienses'] Romanam Africanamque ecclesiam, et per omnes mundi partes universos promissionis filios cum doctrina huius viri, sicut in tota fide, ita in gratiae confessione congruere. (3,4)

The same general agreement is indicated in the first part of the Carmen de ingratis, though without the explicit defence of Augustine. In this case, however, the doctrinal conformity of Christians 'per omnes mundi partes' is made more graphic by the listing of a number of other places and individuals besides the Apostolic See and the Palestinian and African councils: Bethlehem (in the person of Jerome), Constantinople (in the person of the patriarch Atticus), Ephesus and Sicily had all joined in the condemnation of Pelagius and his supporters.¹⁵⁰ An alternative development is signalled at Contra collatorem 5,3 where Prosper again invokes the authority of the Apostolic See and of the

Palestinian and African councils, but this time cites documents. Towards the end of the same work (21,1-2), he returns to the same argument in order to extend the list of papal authorities opposed to Pelagianism; in addition to Innocent and Zosimus (cited earlier), Boniface, Celestine and (presumptively) the newly-elected Sixtus were all of the same mind on this matter. Among the more notable actions of Celestine was his statement in favour of Augustine in a letter recently addressed to the bishops of southern Gaul (a passage of which is duly cited).

In each of the above cases, the argument from a consensus of authorities forms part of a general presentation of anti-Pelagian doctrine which is also (explicitly or implicitly) a defence of Augustinian doctrine against the 'Massilians'. For much of the time, it seems, Prosper was content to invoke his authorities by name and/or place, taking for granted the fact that they had expressed themselves clearly in favour of his cause. Documents might be referred to ('Condita sunt et scripta manent', De ingr., v.84) but were not necessarily cited. Of the works mentioned in the previous paragraph, only the Contra collatorem offers examples of textual citation of authorities. Assuming that this treatise - even in its putative 'first edition' - is to be dated somewhat later than the Ad Rufinum and De ingratis, it may perhaps be taken to represent a refinement in Prosper's argumentative technique, brought about by the tactics of his 'Massilian' adversaries. The perfection of this method of argument is to be seen in the so-called Auctoritates apostolicae sedis, in which the

author cites textually a series of papal and conciliar documents from the period 417-18.

The reasons for the compilation of the Auctoritates are stated as follows:

Quia nonnulli qui catholico nomine gloriantur, in damnatis autem haereticorum sensibus, seu pravitate, sive imperitia demorantes, piissimis disputatoribus obviare praesumunt; et cum Pelagium atque Caelestium anathematizare non dubitent, magistris tamen nostris, tamquam necessarium modum excesserint, obloquuntur, eaque tantummodo sequi et probare profitentur, quae sacratissima beati apostoli Petri sedes contra inimicos gratiae dei, per ministerium praesulum suorum sanxit, et docuit: necessarium fuit diligenter inquirere, quid rectores Romanae ecclesiae, de haeresi, quae eorum temporibus exorta fuerat, iudicarint, et contra nocentissimos liberi arbitrii defensores, quid de gratia dei sentiendum esse censuerint. [205-6]

After the removal of a number of pejorative expressions, the first part of this statement might be claimed as a reasonably objective summary of a 'Massilian' response (c.430) to the problems posed by Augustine's anti-Pelagian writings. Since, as has already been argued, the materials used in the Auctoritates may already have been available to Prosper in the mid-420s, there is no need to interpret the compiler's 'necessarium fuit diligenter inquirere' as implying a search for documents. **Rather, it suggests an intention of exploiting certain texts in a new way.** For example: the 'Massilians' had doubtless claimed that their views on the 'initium bonae voluntatis' were not excluded by papal legislation; Prosper counters this claim with a carefully selected excerpt from the Epistula tractoria (VI). Other texts are chosen to demonstrate the ruinous effects of the Fall (I) and the necessity of

continuous grace for overcoming temptation (III). Viewed as a whole, the evidence of Roman opposition to recognisably 'Massilian' opinions is not particularly impressive. Apart from the Epistula tractoria, the only papal documents adduced are letters addressed to African councils. Also cited are three of the canons of the Council of Carthage of 418 (VII), included on the dubious grounds that they too had received papal 'approval' ('quas [sententias] utique suas fecerunt apostolici antistites, cum probarunt'). Finally, Prosper resorts to arguments from the 'lex orandi' (VIII) and baptismal rite (IX) that have no special connection with the papacy. One may conclude that he was not well equipped to answer the 'Massilian' appeal to the Apostolic See. For while it was easy enough to demonstrate that Augustine belonged to a broadly anti-Pelagian consensus which included several popes, and to imply that the 'Massilians' threatened that consensus, it was much more difficult, if not impossible, to prove that the non-Augustinian views adopted by 'Massilian' theologians on particular matters were contrary to papal pronouncements. Inevitably, the Auctoritates offers no defence of the Augustinian doctrine on predestination; this is tacitly subsumed in the more difficult and obscure points of teaching '[quas] sicut non audemus contemnere, ita non necesse habemus astruere' (X). It may be that Cappuyns was right to interpret this last statement as the sign of a major doctrinal concession on Prosper's part.¹⁵¹ Alternatively, one might regard it as the minimum possible concession in a work of this kind. Having agreed, for once, to base a defence of the Augustinian theology of grace on texts that were independent (at least in theory) of Augustine himself, he was bound to leave certain things unsaid. He remained confident, even so, that the unbiased reader would arrive at a

correct overall understanding of the relations of grace and free will:
'agnoscat omnium disputationum connexionem ex hac subditarum
auctoritatum brevitatem pendere' (praef). Where was this general
synthesis to be found, if not in the 'libri Augustini' ?

Two general observations may now be offered regarding Prosper's use of 'auctoritates'. First, it is likely that his special deference for the Roman see was at least partly dictated by the attitude of his 'Massilian' opponents. Evidence of doctrinal ultramontanism can be detected in many of Prosper's writings, including the Chronicle.¹⁵² Conceivably, such a tendency could have resulted directly from his study of Augustine's tactics during the Pelagian controversy.¹⁵³ Its practical application - in the appeal to pope Celestine in 431/2 - is easily explained if, as seems probable, the circle of doctrinaire Augustinians to which he belonged included persons in close contact with Rome. Even when full account has been taken of these factors, however, one must suspect that Prosper's insistence on the doctrinal importance of the Apostolic See was primarily a response to the 'Massilian' attempt to read the 'libri Augustini' in a Roman light. Secondly, one may remark the absence from Prosper's writings of any sustained attempt to present a general patristic consensus in favour of Augustinian theology, of the kind that Augustine himself had sought to offer in the Contra Iulianum and elsewhere.¹⁵⁴ This apparent omission is all the more striking in view of the importance attached to this kind of argument by the 'Massilians'. When others were invoking the support of famous 'tractatores' for their opinions, why did Prosper confine himself to a

limited dossier of mainly 'official' (i.e. papal or conciliar) documents ? One possible answer is that he lacked the resources that would have enabled him to do otherwise. In order to have assembled even a modest collection of patristic authorities 'de gratia et praedestinatione' he would have needed access to a much more extensive library of ecclesiastical texts than any private individual or small group of 'litterati' was likely to command at this period. His own 'library', it would seem, consisted mainly of two sets of texts: the Scriptures and the works of Augustine.

'Sententiae'

Concerned that the mounting controversy over grace and predestination could be a cause of anxiety to many people, Prosper had undertaken to explain everything, 'quantum epistolari licuit sermone' (Ep. ad Rufinum, prol). The explanation that he gives is a masterpiece of concision, covering scarcely twelve columns in Migne. Though it could not replace the many volumes of Augustine's works (to which the reader is referred) it might nevertheless serve as a convenient introduction to them. The pretensions of the Carmen de ingratis are apparently somewhat greater; here the author compresses his exposé into a thousand lines of verse:

Quos si tranquilla studeas cognoscere cura,
Tutus ab adverso turbine, lector, eris.

(praef vv.5-6)

Although Augustine's works are commended at length in the course of the

poem, the reader is not explicitly referred to them; his 'safety from the whirlwind' was not conditional on any further reading.

As early as 426, one may assume, Prosper had recognized the need for a more summary treatment of the issues of grace, free will and predestination than was provided by the ensemble of the 'libri Augustini'. The epistolary format used in the Ad Rufinum offered one obvious and highly reputable means of abbreviation. Poetry offered another. In due course, further modes of presentation were suggested to him by his collaborators and opponents. Thus the 'excerpta' compiled by the Genoese priests Theodore and Camillus provided him with an opportunity to reproduce the main points of Augustine's teaching. Here again the accent is on brevity: 'de capitulis istis [sc. de libris De praedestinatione excerptis] quid cum sanctis et eruditis fratribus sentiam, breviter indicabo' [188A]. The most important stimulus to this activity of abridging and simplifying seems to have been provided by the local critics of doctrinaire Augustinianism.

Rather than submit particular texts of Augustine for public discussion (an operation that would have exposed them to serious charges of disloyalty, if not indeed of heresy), the 'Massilians' preferred to circulate lists of propositions in which his views on predestination and man's imbecillity were presented in a grossly simplified, often distorted form. Two of these 'indiculi' have survived, preserved by Prosper himself in order to refute the propositions ('sententiae', 'definitiones', also 'capitula', 'obiectiones') which they contained. It would, he says, have been possible to disown them all simply by

appending an anathema. But such extreme brevity might have invited suspicion. It had therefore been decided to give a somewhat fuller answer:

Unde... necessarium conveniensque credidimus, ut sive ad calumniantium animos mitigandos, sive ad eos quorum auribus tale aliquid insonuit instruendos... plene lucideque pandamus quid de perversis definitionibus judicemus.
(Resp. ad cap. object. Vincent., praef)

The opponents' 'definitiones' are duly reproduced, each accompanied by an appropriate Augustinian response. Whereas the 'definitiones' take the form of single sentences introduced by 'Quod', the 'responsiones' are developed at greater length and frequently include biblical quotations. This manner of reply is employed by Prosper in dealing both with the 'objections' ascribed to 'Vincent' and with those of the 'Galli'. The main difference between the prefaces to the two works lies in the fact that the 'indiculus' published by the 'Galli' is presented as being an explicit attack on Augustine's work and reputation. According to Prosper, this text had been promoted as a summary of Augustinian doctrine ('quasi compendium cognitionis' [155A]), in the hope that persons who might have resorted to Augustine's writings would be deterred from doing so: 'ut... ab his quae infamassent, curam exterriti lectoris averterent' [156A]. His replies would present the true Augustinian doctrine in such a way as to convince even the most casual reader that its author had been maligned:

...singulis capitulis quae damnationis titulo praenotarunt, brevi et absoluta professione respondeo: in nullo recedens a tramite earum definitionum quae in sancti viri disputationibus continentur: ut facile vel tenuis diligentiae advertat inspector, quam iniustis opprobriis catholici

praedicatoris memoria carpatur; et in quod peccatum cadunt
qui, aliena instigatione commoti, scriptorem celeberrimi
nominis promptius habeant culpare quam nosse.

(Resp. ad cap. object. Gall., praef)

The thought behind this passage is the same as that which informs the Ad Rufinum: in order to 'know' Augustine ('scriptorem nosse'), one had to have read his works; no 'compendium' could discharge one of this obligation. Since, however, the enemies of Augustine had now mischievously produced their 'indiculi', his supporters might usefully reply in similar fashion.

The use of summary statements in defence of Augustinianism is carried a stage further in the second part of the Responsiones to the 'Gallic' objections. Here Prosper condenses both proposition and response into a single 'sententia' to produce a total of fifteen 'sententiae' (equalling the number of original objections). Though none of the new 'sententiae' is complete in a single period, most are considerably shorter than the corresponding 'responsiones'; biblical quotations are generally omitted. The motive for this re-drafting is stated as a desire that the Augustinian point-of-view be more clearly understood 'sub paucorum verborum simplicitate' [169D]. In fact, it seems likely that Prosper was seeking to tailor the form of his response as closely as possible to that of the original anti-Augustinian 'indiculi', in the hope of reaching the same readership.¹⁵⁵

A further sign of Prosper's responsiveness to the tactics of his opponents may be detected in the closing sections of the Contra collatorem. Having completed a close analysis of several passages from

Cassian's thirteenth Conference, the author announces a summary of the main arguments advanced in that work:

Necessarium sane aestimo, ante conclusionem voluminis, ea quae ostendimus non congruere catholicae veritati, breviter coniunctimque digerere: ut quae interiectis responsionibus nostris [i.e. in previous sections of the C.coll] possent recordationem legentis effugere, facilius simul decursa recolantur. (19,1)

There follows a list of twelve 'definitiones' or 'sententiae' based on statements in the thirteenth Conference, each accompanied by an Augustinian gloss. Finally, Cassian's position on grace and free will is summarised in an even briefer set of propositions which, being run together, give the appearance of a kind of 'Massilian' creed (20). If this section of the Contra collatorem had been issued separately it would have constituted an almost exact counterpart to the 'compendia' published by the critics of Augustine's views on predestination.

As considered thus far, the dogmatic summaries produced by Prosper consist of a dialogue between a 'Massilian' (or pseudo-Augustinian) view and the opposing statement of a truly 'Augustinian' doctrine. The only one of Prosper's polemical works to contain a set of purely positive 'sententiae' is the Auctoritates apostolicae sedis. Significantly, perhaps, the terms in which this work is presented contain a clear echo of the (earlier ?) Responsiones:

Ut ergo plenius, qui in aliquo dubitant, instruantur, constitutiones sanctorum patrum compendioso manifestamus indiculo... [206A]

Each of the first six 'capitula' into which the Auctoritates is divided begins with a short statement in the form either of a 'Quod'-clause (IV-VI) or of an object-clause with the accusative (I-III). All of these clauses are subordinate to the expression which occurs at the end of the preface: '...si cum catholicis credat et dicat [lector], etc.' The work as a whole is thus designed to provide the text of a personal statement of belief. Following the digressions of c.VII, c.VIII, and the first paragraph of c.IX as printed, the confessional tone can be heard again in a summary towards the end ('His ergo ecclesiasticis regulis... profiteamur, etc.' [210C-D]). It would seem that Prosper meant the Auctoritates to comprise a kind of Augustinian creed 'de gratia dei' comparable, if demonstrably superior, to the 'Massilian' creed presented in the Contra collatorem. He was convinced, in any case, that no opinion could be called catholic that did not accord with these basic assumptions: 'ut prorsus non opinemur catholicum quod apparuerit praefixis sententiis esse contrarium' [212A].

*

In the course of the preceding pages Prosper's literary activity 'pro Augustino' has been scrutinised from a number of different angles. How does it appear as a whole ? In the first place, it was manifestly based on a conviction of the outstanding importance of Augustine's work as a Christian teacher - a conviction shared by his contemporaries in Gaul, including (it seems) the majority of those opposed to particular Augustinian doctrines. In Prosper's case, respect for Augustine meant commitment to the 'libri Augustini'. Without ever visiting Hippo

himself, he was able to benefit from a supply of books assured by persons who had. After making a thorough study of these writings, he apparently decided that his own literary labours should henceforth be dedicated to the diffusion of their contents. It is possible that his earliest initiatives in this direction are reflected in the works studied in the previous section. In any case, one may suppose that there was a measure of continuity between his first essays in Augustinian re-writing (before the 'Massilian' crisis) and his subsequent literary activity. His response to the controversy that broke out in c.426 was a straightforward one: if certain people had failed to read Augustine properly, he would ensure that the remainder were better instructed - by summarising what Augustine had written and/or referring the reader to his works. At the same time, he challenged the critics of Augustine to justify their position **on the basis of texts**. This they duly did, by means of a number of different techniques: polemical excerpting, appeal to other authorities, drafting of 'sententiae'. While protesting against their use of these devices, Prosper showed a readiness to deploy them to his own ends; in certain cases, he was even prepared to adapt his methods to conform with those of his opponents. The manner of his 'Augustinianism', viewed as a public practice of reading-and-writing, was thus directly affected by contemporary counter-'Augustinianisms'. This fact has obvious implications for a study of literary ideology: Prosper's ideas of writing 'ex Augustino' must be considered in conjunction with those entertained by the men whom he calls the 'novi censores'. The following section is devoted to the most famous of these, the man known to Prosper as the 'Collator'.

II. Cassian of Marseille and monastic tradition

It is clear from Hilary's and Prosper's accounts of the situation in Marseille around 427 that the opponents of Augustine's ideas on grace and predestination were in the habit of adducing texts from the works of other eminent Christian writers in support of their opinions. Faced with an unfamiliar exegesis of certain passages in the Bible, the 'Massilian' theologians appealed to what they considered to be their true sense, as traditionally upheld by the church. In order to establish the 'sensus ecclesiasticus',¹⁵⁶ they referred to the works of the most reputable Christian writers ('libri... [eorum] quorum est in ecclesia auctoritas').¹⁵⁷ Behind this procedure lay the assumption that in most cases - or at least in those cases where certainty was essential for the maintenance of the faith - there would emerge a single, commonly held opinion. According to Prosper, the desired result had been obtained in the 'Massilian' survey of earlier views on predestination: 'retractatis priorum de hac re opinionibus, pene omnium par invenitur et una sententia'.¹⁵⁸

Augustine appears to have taken seriously the challenge of the 'Massilian' appeal to ecclesiastical tradition. In the De praedestinatione he goes to considerable lengths both to provide evidence of patristic support for his views and to explain why that evidence was not more plentiful.¹⁵⁹ Prosper (as we have seen) makes no attempt to improve on this defence, confining himself to the citation of authorities for the period after 412. It is possible that he and Hilary were

in possession of collections of anti-Augustinian 'excerpta' compiled and referred to in 'Massilian' circles. Unfortunately, no trace of any of these collections has survived and one can only speculate as to which texts may have been included in them.¹⁶⁰

So far as one can tell, the textual citation of patristic authorities in theological argument was something of a novelty in the Latin church of the early fifth century.¹⁶¹ It is virtually impossible, in any case, to point to a Gallic author from the period before c.420 who quotes the ipsissima verba of another individual Christian writer in a polemical context.¹⁶² Yet by c.427 it could apparently be taken for granted, at least among educated Christians in the vicinity of Marseille, that one of the ways of resolving doctrinal disputes was by reference to the written opinions of the 'patres' or 'priores'. How did this situation come about? Part of the explanation may lie in the increased availability of biblical commentaries, in Latin as well as Greek. Readers of the commentaries of Jerome, for example, would have grown accustomed to the idea that for many difficult passages in the Bible there could be assembled a selection of interpretations from the works of earlier 'tractatores'.¹⁶³ Although such comparisons would frequently reveal a divergence of opinions, they might also on occasion provide evidence of an agreed or 'traditional' exegesis. With the rapid increase in the stock of Latin Christian writing that took place between c.350 and c.425, the opportunities for textual comparison on particular topics were vastly increased. Readers of Greek would, of course, have enjoyed additional advantages; it may be significant that the earliest evidence of the systematic exploitation of patristic authorities by

persons living in Gaul relates to the part of the province in which Greek influence had traditionally been strongest.

One may suppose, then, that 'Massilian' theologians of Prosper's day were in possession of the human and bibliographical resources required for this kind of argument. They would also have seen it used by Augustine in his anti-Pelagian writings, notably in the Contra Iulianum. Such a combination of opportunity and example might, in itself, appear sufficient to account for their tactics in c.427. There is, however, another factor to be taken into account. As already noted, the 'Massilian' opposition to Augustine's ideas can be closely identified with the monastic movement in southern Gaul. An important feature of early monastic spirituality, as is well known, was reverence for the teaching of the 'Fathers'. This attitude is expressed with particular clarity in the monastic writings of one of Augustine's most conspicuous critics in Gaul: the abbot Cassian. To what extent should the 'Massilian' appeal to the 'opinio patrum' in matters of theology be regarded as a product of the more general respect displayed by such persons towards their spiritual elders ? This question has recently been posed by H.J. Sieben, with special reference to the Commonitorium of Vincent of Lérins and the writings of Cassian.¹⁶⁴ It is proposed to pursue it here in some detail, beginning with a study of the most relevant texts from Cassian.

The thirteenth Conference¹⁶⁵

At the end of his thirteenth Conference (427), entitled 'De protectione dei', Cassian summarises his opinions on grace and free will in the form of a threefold 'definitio', introduced in the following terms:

et idcirco hoc ab omnibus catholicis patribus definitur, qui perfectionem cordis non inani disputatione verborum, sed re atque opere didicerunt... (18,4)

The phrase underlined recalls Prosper's reference to the allegedly unanimous opinion of the fathers ('par et una sententia') concerning predestination. In the present case, a distinction is enforced between, on the one hand, those whose dogmatic pronouncements were based on experience of the Christian life in its highest form and, on the other, those whose only expertise was in argument. The distinction is attributed by Cassian to the highly experienced protagonist of Conferences XI-XII, abba Chaeremon. It was evidently designed to exclude the opinions of the former rhetor Augustine, who (one may suppose) might otherwise have ranked among the 'patres catholici'.¹⁶⁶ When allowance is made for this polemical interest, the manner in which Cassian introduces his dogmatic 'definitio' appears perfectly consistent with the general character of his monastic writing. Thus one notes: (1) a concern to establish what was universally approved ('ab omnibus'), (2) an insistence on the value of experience ('experientia'), (3) an attempt at self-effacement - involving, in this case, the use of a persona.

All these features of Cassian's style as a monastic educator are discernible in the preface to his earliest extant work, the Institutions (c.420-). Invited by a local bishop to lay down guidelines for the organisation of a Gallic monastery, he there promises to expound the 'instituta monasteriorum, quae per Aegyptum ac Palaestinam custodiri conspeximus' (Inst., praef 3). The geographical extension of these 'instituta' was clearly felt to constitute an important part of their claim to authority. No less important was their antiquity. Later in the same preface Cassian contrasts the 'monasteriorum regula per Aegyptum vel Palaestinam antiquitus fundatorum' with recent local innovations ('novellam constitutionem in occiduus Galliarum partibus'), to the obvious disadvantage of the latter (8). The twin claims of universality and antiquity are even more forcefully stated in a chapter of the Institutions dealing with the conventions of monastic dress:

illis enim debemus institutis ac regulis indubitata fide
et indiscussam oboediantiam per omnia commodare, non quas
paucorum voluntas intulit, sed quas vetustas tantorum
temporum et innumerositas sanctorum patrum concordi
definitione in posterum propagavit. (I 2,4)

One notes the ideal of a 'definitio concors' in matters of monastic discipline and its close analogy with the doctrinal agreement 'ab omnibus' evoked in the thirteenth Conference. For Cassian, the basic consistency of eastern monastic practice was to be explained in terms of the apostolic origins of monasticism. Conformity in styles of dress, psalmody and other customs was a sign of fidelity to apostolic institutions. In order to preserve the authentic quality of Christian monasticism, it was essential that founders of new monastic communities

- even in such faraway places as southern Gaul - should follow the examples of their predecessors.

Linked with this requirement of fidelity to ancient and widely respected prototypes is an insistence on personal experience as the indispensable qualification of the monastic teacher. Only one who had lived as a monk, constantly putting into practice the instructions of his elders, was fit to instruct others:

...cum harum rerum ratio nequaquam possit otiosa meditatione doctrinaque verborum vel tradi vel intellegi vel memoria contineri. Totum namque in sola experientia usuque consistit, et quemadmodum tradi nisi ab experto non queunt, ita ne percipi quidem vel intellegi nisi ab eo, qui ea pari studio ac sudore adprehendere elaboraverit, possunt.

(Inst., praef 4)

Gaul, according to Cassian, was a 'provincia... coenobiorum experts' (ibid., 3). He himself possessed first-hand knowledge of the life of the Egyptian communities and had consorted with some of their leading members. Whereas earlier ascetic writers, such as Basil and Jerome, had had to be content with reporting what they had heard (7: 'audita potius quam experta describere'), he was in a position to pass on what he had learnt in person from his desert masters (3: 'ibi nobis a patribus tradita'). Cassian's idea of monastic 'tradition' implies both personal contact between master and disciple, and a measure of shared experience. His own writings, he believed, might render the desert fathers personally present to inhabitants of Gaul. It was up to his readers to ensure that they entered as fully as possible into the experience of the Egyptian monks.¹⁶⁷

Cassian's commitment to the idea of monastic tradition also helps to account for his penchant for (conspicuous) self-effacement. This tendency manifests itself in the preface to the Institutions in the form of repeated apologies for the uncouth style of his prose. Before dismissing such statements as pure artifice, one should consider what motives Cassian may have had for indulging in this kind of rhetoric. In common with other Christian writers of this period, he would have seen no reason to pride himself on his literary skills. On the contrary, since pride was the most dangerous of all vices, the monk who had received a literary education was, in his view, to be especially on his guard.¹⁶⁸ Given this prejudice, one would expect the traditional devices of the 'captatio benevolentiae' to receive a new moral sanction in the preface to any work of his. In the case of the Institutions, however, there was a special motive for the author's request to his readers: '[ut] pie relegant... fidem potius mei sermonis quam venustatem eloqui requirentes' (7). The claim to fidelity of representation signals one of the major pretensions of both the Institutions and the Conferences. Cassian's aim in composing the former work was, he says, to expound faithfully the principles of Egyptian monasticism - 'fideliter explicare' (8) - that is, to transmit to his Gallic readers what he himself had received from the desert fathers. Going a stage further in the preface to the first set of Conferences, he describes the contents of his work as 'non tam mea quam patrum instituta' (5). The decision to present these 'instituta' in the form of speeches attributed to historical figures may be seen as confirmation of the author's desire to assimilate his own role to that of a well-qualified reporter. By adopting such procedures, Cassian contrived to suggest that he had no

personal title to the doctrines which he transmitted, either as monk or writer. As far as his readers were to be concerned, he was merely the latest link in a continuous chain of monastic tradition stretching back to the apostles.

It will now be clear how great a moral and ideological weight would have lain behind abba Chaeremon's claim to offer a definition on grace and free will approved by all catholic fathers 'qui perfectionem cordis... re atque opere didicerunt'. In treating of the issues raised by Augustine's later writings in one of his celebrated Conferences, Cassian ensured that his own opinions received the stamp of a highly respectable, essentially monastic tradition. He also gave the impression that the monastic 'collatio' was the natural medium for the discussion and transmission of ideas of this kind. It is impossible to tell from the thirteenth Conference that grace and free will were the subjects of recent papal and conciliar pronouncements. Nor would one easily suppose, without the parallel evidence of Prosper's and Hilary's letters, that Chaeremon's handling of these issues was influenced by Cassian's reading of Augustine's De correptione et gratia,¹⁶⁹ or that his allusion to a consensus of the catholic fathers could have been justified by a comparison of patristic texts. The author of the thirteenth Conference succeeds brilliantly in shifting the contemporary debate on grace to ground which he himself already dominated. In doing so, he partially obscures the terms in which it was being conducted. For this reason, it would be unwise to base a view of 'Massilian' recourse to patristic authority on this text alone.

The De incarnatione domini contra Nestorium

Shortly after completing his final set of Conferences in 428, Cassian was persuaded to undertake a literary work of an altogether different kind. At the request of the Roman archdeacon (and future pope) Leo, he composed a treatise in seven books directed against the Christological errors of Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople.¹⁷⁰ The difference in nature between this new task and his earlier literary enterprises is clearly stated in the author's preface: 'nam qui iussi antea de dominicis studiis locuti sumus, nunc id exigis ut de ipsa incarnatione domini ac maiestate dicamus' (2). In principle, there was nothing to prevent a discussion of the Incarnation being cast in the form of a monastic 'collatio'. According to the terms of Leo's brief, however, Cassian was now obliged to address a more general audience than the one explicitly envisaged in the Conferences and Institutions. He had also, it seems, been instructed to present the teaching of Nestorius in the worst possible light. The tone of the Contra Nestorium is thus at once more public and more polemical than that of the thirteenth Conference. Although only obliquely related to the controversy over grace and predestination, the work provides a useful index to certain features of 'Massilian' theological argument.

A large part of the Contra Nestorium consists of arguments based on Scripture. In the preface, Cassian presents himself in the guise of a magician charged with destroying the monster of Nestorianism by means of biblical spells: 'ut insurgentem in ecclesias dei sinuosis tractatibus draconem vis prophetica et sermonis evangelici divina virtus me quasi

incantatore disrumpat' (3). This sense of reliance on Scripture does not, however, prevent him from adducing other texts favourable to his cause. Thus Book One contains lengthy citations from a recent profession of faith attributed to a certain Leporius, while the argument of Book Six is based on a version of the 'baptismal' creed. The significance of these developments will be considered in more detail in the next chapter. It is sufficient to note here the importance which Cassian attaches to both the Creed and the Fides Leporii as statements of a universal faith. The following remarks appear in connection with the Fides Leporii:

Sufficere ergo solus nunc ad confutandum haeresim deberet consensus omnium, quia indubitatae veritatis manifestatio est auctoritas universorum et perfecta ratio facta est ubi nemo dissentit, ita ut, si qui contra hoc sentire nitatur, huius a prima statim fronte non tam sit audienda assertio quam damnanda perversitas, quia praeiudicium secum damnationis exhibet qui iudicium universitatis impugnat, et audientiae locum non habet qui a cunctis statuta convellit. Confirmata enim semel ab omnibus veritate, quidquid contra hoc venit, hoc ipso statim falsitas esse noscenda est quod a veritate dissentit. (I 6,2)

The 'confession' of Leporius is claimed as a statement of the 'fides omnium catholicorum' (I 6,1) in virtue of the fact that it had been subscribed by a number of African and Gallic bishops. The status of the 'baptismal' creed of the Antiochene church is beyond doubt:

...dicerem te [Cassian is addressing Nestorius], etiamsi expers intellegentiae ac sensus esses, oportere tamen sequi saltem consensum generis humani nec plus facere debere paucorum improborum perversitatem quam ecclesiarum omnium fidem, quae utique a Christo fundata, ab apostolis tradita non aliud existimanda esset quam vox atque auctoritas dei, quae haberet in se utique et vocem et sensum dei. (VI 5,1)

The language used in these passages suggests a number of parallels with the ideas of monastic tradition advertised in the Institutions and Conferences. Once again, the main emphasis is on universality and (in the case of the creed) on the related idea of a continuous tradition reaching back to the time of the apostles. Not surprisingly, since the point at issue was now one of belief rather than of custom, there is no mention here of 'experience'. This does not mean, however, that the idea of dogmatic tradition presented in Book Six of the Contra Nestorium is devoid of all sense of personal involvement. Cassian cites the Creed in the version in use at Antioch because that was the church in which Nestorius had been baptised and ordained; the form of words quoted is one that the future bishop of Constantinople had been taught as a catechumen: 'a parentibus... a magistris atque auctoribus tuis traditum' (VI 5,2). The relation of personal discipleship that is such an important element in Cassian's monastic writings is thus made to serve, somewhat unexpectedly, as part of his argument against Christological heresy.

That argument assumes an even more sophisticated form in the final book of the Contra Nestorium where, having re-stated the main objections to Nestorius' point-of-view (as he understood it), Cassian announces a collection of patristic citations in support of the orthodox position: 'si pauca... sanctorum virorum atque inlustrium sacerdotum dicta subdidero' (VII 24,1). There follow a number of brief 'quotations' from the writings of Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, Rufinus, Augustine, Gregory of Nazianzus, Athanasius and John Chrysostom. Each text or set of texts is

preceded by a brief notice on the career and accomplishments of the author. No single principle appears to have guided the composition of these notices. Thus the writers in question are variously commended for their constancy in the faith (Hilary, Athanasius, Chrysostom), their piety (Ambrose), their asceticism (Rufinus), their learning, eloquence and literary success (Hilary, Jerome, Gregory), or for their authority in the church (Rufinus, Gregory). Augustine is unceremoniously introduced as 'Hipponae Regiensis oppidi sacerdos' (27,1). The texts themselves are a mixture of quotation, paraphrase and artful conflation. Not all the works cited can now be identified and some are manifestly spurious. The quotations from Athanasius appear in the same order (in Greek) in a contemporary work of Cyril of Alexandria which Cassian may be assumed to have seen.¹⁷¹ It is likely that the texts attributed to Gregory of Nazianzus (= Apollinarius of Laodicea!) were also ultimately derived from an Alexandrian source. The remaining selections and overall arrangement of the 'testimonia' should probably be ascribed to Cassian himself. (Note, however, that he may have drawn on existing compilations for certain of his 'quotations' from Hilary and Ambrose.)¹⁷²

The patristic citations of the Contra Nestorium constitute the first extant dogmatic florilegium compiled and published by a Gallic author. In the light of the summary given above, one may suggest two possible external influences on its composition. The first would have been provided by the various sets of patristic 'testimonia' included in the anti-Pelagian works of Augustine, especially those of the Contra Iulianum (with which Cassian would have been particularly familiar).¹⁷³

A second may have derived from the texts and instructions sent to Marseille from Rome, probably towards the end of the year 429. Unfortunately, it is impossible to form an entirely clear idea of the state of Nestorian and anti-Nestorian documentation achieved by the Roman curia at the moment at which Leo referred the matter to Cassian.¹⁷⁴ This is notably the case with regard to Christological florilegia. By the spring of 430, Celestine and his advisers were in possession of the first of several dossiers of anti-Nestorian patristic 'testimonia' compiled by Cyril of Alexandria.¹⁷⁵ At the Roman synod of August 430, the pope himself drew on a collection of excerpts from the writings of Hilary, Ambrose and Damasus, of a type similar to that produced (for Latin writers) by Cassian.¹⁷⁶ But by this date the Contra Nestorium would almost certainly have been received in Rome. Given that Cassian shows no awareness of the contents of the Alexandrian dossier of 430,¹⁷⁷ a question remains as to whether or not Leo would have been likely to propose the device of a Christological florilegium as early as 429, and, if so, what materials he would have been able to offer for one. The example of Augustine's anti-Pelagian florilegia would presumably have been remarked in Rome as in Marseille. There is, however, no evidence comparable to that of Prosper and Hilary's letters to suggest that Roman theologians of the late 420s were in the habit of deducing dogmatic rules from the comparison of patristic texts. On balance, therefore, it would seem reasonable to regard the patristic florilegium in Book Seven of the Contra Nestorium as the product of a distinctively 'Massilian' initiative in theological argument, albeit partially dependent on materials transmitted from Rome.¹⁷⁸

In view of his earlier insistence on the criterion of universality as a means of excluding heresy (I 6), one might expect that Cassian would conclude the Contra Nestorium by underlining the unanimity of the authors cited in his florilegium. The theme of unanimity is indeed central to his peroration, but is not developed in connection with these texts. Having fixed upon a phrase from Athanasius as an expression of the 'fides universorum' (VII 29,3), Cassian proceeds to introduce his final witness to the orthodox doctrine of the Incarnation, John Chrysostom. The latter, like Nestorius, had been a member of the clergy of Antioch before becoming patriarch of Constantinople; in choosing Nestorius to be their bishop, the people of the eastern capital had imagined (says Cassian) that they were gaining another Chrysostom. As things turned out, they were to be badly disappointed. Instead of perpetuating the teaching of John, Nestorius had openly challenged it by disputing Mary's right to the title of 'Theotokos'. To make matters worse, he had publicly called in question the Christological teaching of all his predecessors in the see of Constantinople, and (by implication) that of their colleagues in the eastern episcopate: 'sacerdotes semper inlaesae fidei et catholicae confessionis infamas, dicens magistrorum priorum vitio plebem Constantinopolitanae urbis errare' (30,3). (There is an allusion here to a sermon of Nestorius that was later cited at the Council of Ephesus.)¹⁷⁹ According to Cassian, these eastern bishops were at one with Chrysostom in matters of the faith ('eiusdem fidei fuerunt'); the only dissenter was Nestorius.

The effect of this new turn in the argument is to distract attention from the textual consensus suggested at Contra Nestorium

VII 24 - 30,1 and to concentrate it on the doctrinal tradition of the eastern churches - especially those of Antioch and Constantinople - as represented by a number of prominent individuals (viz. Chrysostom, Gregory and Nectarius). While the opportunity for this development may have been provided by a text of Nestorius, its tendency is recognizably Cassianic. As in Book Six, the author's purpose would seem to be to locate a point at which the experience of the individual was so obviously associated with the doctrinal tradition of the community at large as to render absurd any attempt at separatism. The moments of the 'traditio symboli' and of accession to the episcopate marked two such points in the career of a bishop like Nestorius. Significantly, the final charge levelled against the latter in Book Seven is one of presumption: the new patriarch of Constantinople had dared to consider himself superior to his predecessors and his peers (30,4). This accusation, and the accompanying emphasis on Nestorius' personal links with Chrysostom, are clear echoes of the monastic ideology of the Conferences.

The climax of the Contra Nestorium is provided by the author's plea to the people of Constantinople to remain faithful to the instruction of their former masters, especially John Chrysostom:

Mementote magistrorum veterum sacerdotum vestrorum, Gregorii per orbem nobilis, Nectarii sanctimonia insignis, Iohannis fide ac puritate mirabilis, Iohannis, inquam, Iohannis illius, qui vere ad similitudinem Iohannis evangelistae et discipulus Iesu et apostolus quasi super pectus domini semper affectumque discubuit. Illius, inquam, mementote, illum sequimini, illius puritatem, illius fidem, illius doctrinam ac sanctimoniam cogitate. Illius mementote semper doctoris vestri ac nutritoris, in cuius quasi gremio quodam-

modo amplexuque crevistis, qui communis mihi ac vobis
magister fuit, cuius discipuli atque institutio sumus.
(VII 31,4)

With this passionate eulogy of the bishop who had ordained him deacon in Constantinople thirty years earlier (31,1), Cassian completes his appeal to tradition against the teachings of Nestorius. The tradition invoked is an essentially personal one, based on discipleship, with strong overtones of apostolicity. Thus, in the first sentence of the passage just quoted, John Chrysostom usurps the role of St. John the Evangelist, with (John) Cassian, the disciple of this second John, appearing next in line. St. John was famous as 'the disciple whom Jesus loved', who reclined on the Saviour's breast at the Last Supper and, divinely inspired, uttered a book of gospel and another of revelation. For Cassian and his contemporaries, he provided an imposing model of the Christian (disciple and) teacher.¹⁸⁰ This was an idea that had recently obtained classic expression in Augustine's Tractatus in evangelium Iohannis - one of two Augustinian works cited in the Contra Nestorium. It is used initially by Cassian to evoke a doctrinal unity ('institutio') involving both himself and the members of Nestorius' congregation. It is subsequently made the basis for a claim to absolute fidelity in the presentation of Chrysostom's ideas:

Illius [sc. Iohannis] scripta legite, illius informationem tenete, illius fidem ac meritum amplexamini... Ille ergo vobis in sensu semper et quasi in conspectu sit, ille in animo atque in cogitatione versetur, ille denique ipse vobis etiam haec quae a me sunt scripta commendet, quia haec quae ego scripsi ille me docuit. Ac per hoc non tam mea haec quam illius esse credite, quia rivus ex fonte constat, et quid-
quid putatur esse discipuli, totum ad honorem referri
convenit magistri.
(VII 31,5-6)

The assertion that the contents of the Contra Nestorium are 'non tam mea quam [Iohannis]' exactly parallels Cassian's earlier promotion of the Conferences as 'non tam mea quam patrum instituta'. As in the preface to the first set of Conferences, the reader is urged to see through the text that the author has created in order to enter into imaginary communion with a true master. It is easy to see how such an idea might have recommended itself for use in a work of monastic instruction. The Egyptian monks, we know from other sources, attached icons of the saints to the inside walls of their cells and made them the object of their meditations:¹⁸¹ a text like the Conferences could be regarded as a verbal supplement to these pictorial aids to sanctity. The application of the same idea to a dogmatic work such as the Contra Nestorium is far less obvious and would appear to have been something of an afterthought on Cassian's part. In reality, Chrysostom's 'presence' in this treatise is only briefly required. While seeming to refer his Constantinopolitan readers to the person and writings of their former patriarch, Cassian transfers the saint's authority to his own pronouncements: 'ille... haec quae a me sunt scripta commendet'. The doctrinal inheritance which ought to have fallen to the new bishop of Constantinople was thus temporarily claimed by a monk living in Gaul.

Cassian is an important witness to developing attitudes towards the 'Fathers' in early fifth-century Gaul, whose literary works may be seen as interesting experiments in the definition of a Christian authorial persona. At no point, however, does he attempt to set his own activity as a writer in a specific relation to the writings of his predecessors (except, once, to claim originality). This is perhaps not surprising. As one who constantly emphasised the personal and practical aspects of Christian experience, he would hardly have wished to advertise a dependence on literary sources. Despite this fact, the treatise De incarnatione domini contra Nestorium contains several instances of the exploitation of extra-biblical Christian texts - in the author's reference to the Fides Leporii, in his citation of the 'baptismal' creed of Antioch, in his use of the device of the patristic florilegium. The appearance of these features in the work of such a respected author and spiritual leader could only serve to foment the interest in new modes of Christian reading-and-writing which, as Prosper's testimony shows, was already being expressed by southern Gallic 'litterati' in the mid-420s. For the example of a writer who was influenced both by Cassian's ideal of the monastic 'collatio' and by his manner of using patristic texts one may turn to the works of Vincent of Lerins.

III. Towards a theory of Christian (re-)writing: Vincent of Lérins

Much of what we know about the person and career of Vincent is to be read in Gennadius' short notice:

VINCENTIUS, natione Gallus, apud monasterium Lerinensis insulae presbyter, vir in scripturis sanctis doctus et notitia ecclesiasticorum dogmatum sufficienter instructus, composuit ad evitanda haereticorum collegia, nitido satis et aperto sermone, validissimam disputationem, quam, absconso nomine suo, adtitulavit 'Peregrini adversum haereticos'...¹⁸²

A native of the northern part of Gaul, Vincent may have settled in Provence in the aftermath of the invasions of the early fifth century.¹⁸³ Assuming that he was already at Lérins by the mid-420s, he would have been well placed to follow the controversy between the 'Massilians' and Augustinians concerning grace and predestination. It is possible that he was himself responsible for the set of anti-Augustinian 'sententiae' referred to by Prosper as Capitula obiectionum Vincentianarum.¹⁸⁴ The work that Gennadius knew under the title of 'Peregrini adversum haereticos' is extant, and commonly referred to as Commonitorium. The description of Vincent as 'vir in scripturis sanctis doctus et notitia ecclesiasticorum dogmatum sufficienter instructus' is clearly based on the rule of orthodoxy established in that work, according to which the twin guarantees of true doctrine were the Bible and the 'traditio ecclesiae catholicae'.¹⁸⁵ Gennadius does not mention any other work of Vincent. Some scholars have suggested that he may have been the author of the so-called Athanasian Creed or 'Quicumque'.¹⁸⁶

Although this hypothesis is now out of favour, striking evidence of Vincent's contribution to the process of Trinitarian and Christological formulation in the West has emerged in the form of a set of dogmatic Excerpta from the works of Augustine. First published in their entirety and attributed to Vincent by J. Madoz in 1940, the Excerpta are now generally accepted as his.¹⁸⁷ Gennadius dates the writer's death to the reigns of Theodosius II (408-450) and Valentinian III (425-455). As neither of his authenticated works can be positively dated later than c.435, the termini for this event would seem to be 435-450.

Virtually disregarded during the middle ages, Vincent's Commonitorium has attracted attention in modern times for two main reasons: first, for the definition which it offers of the content of Christian tradition as 'that which has been believed everywhere, in all times, by all people' ('quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est')¹⁸⁸ and, secondly, because of the suspicion - or, as some have considered, the certainty - that it was meant as a veiled attack on Augustine's theory of predestination. The most recent full-length study of Vincent's work (by Madoz, published in 1933) takes the form of an analysis of his idea of Christian tradition, and includes a lengthy chapter entitled "Against whom was the Commonitorium written ?" This double orientation reflects the controversies which have surrounded Vincent's work since the Reformation. It is doubtful, however, whether it provides a truly satisfactory basis for an assessment of its historical significance. Unlike the majority of previous students of the Commonitorium, Madoz was more concerned with the proper interpretation of the so-called 'Vincentian canon' and its place in the

history of ideas of Christian tradition than with its application in contemporary theological debate. He nevertheless paid only scant attention to the milieu in which Vincent lived and wrote, beyond establishing (as he thought) his strongly anti-Augustinian bias on predestination.¹⁸⁹ In publishing the Excerpta a few years later, the same scholar was obliged to deal more thoroughly with questions of local influence and affinity - in order to show, for example, how the author's whole-hearted acceptance of Augustinian ideas of the Trinity and Incarnation could be harmonized with the attitudes of other 'semi-Pelagian' writers.¹⁹⁰ Since Madoz wrote, the view that Vincent's purpose in drafting the Commonitorium was to undermine the authority of Augustine's teaching on predestination has been seriously challenged.¹⁹¹ It has also become apparent that previous concentration on his 'canon' of orthodoxy may have partly obscured the historical interest of his reflections on Christian tradition.¹⁹² As yet, however, no sustained attempt has been made to place Vincent's work in a broader or more historically relevant context than that suggested by post-Reformation theological discussion.¹⁹³

The aim of the present study is to suggest ways in which the Commonitorium and Excerpta might usefully be viewed as products of the same cultural environment that gave rise to the contemporary works of Prosper and Cassian. The titles of the following sections have been chosen to indicate possible lines of continuity in the theory and practice of Christian writing - involving, in many cases, the 're-writing' of patristic texts - in this particular Gallic milieu.

(a) Vincent and monastic tradition

The Commonitorium begins with a quotation from the book of Deuteronomy: 'Dicente scriptura et monente: "Interroga patres tuos et dicent tibi, seniores tuos et adnuntiabunt tibi"...' (Deut. 32,7). In their biblical context, these words are a summons to the people of Israel to recall God's past mercies; the appeal is to those who were able to testify to the events of previous generations. Reinterpreted to suit the requirements of ascetical society in late antiquity, they had become a sanction for the moral authority of monastic leaders. The same verse, in a different version, is quoted by Cassian in the second Conference.¹⁹⁴ There it forms the conclusion to a passage in which the abba Moyses explains the importance, for a young monk, of constantly consulting his elders; only by such means would he avoid the vice of 'praesumptio', or proud independence. The author of the Commonitorium, himself a monk (I 4-5), had evidently taken this lesson to heart. Like Cassian, Vincent presents his own writings as the record of what he had received from his monastic superiors and their predecessors:

...videtur mihi... quod res non minimae utilitatis... futura sit, si ea quae fideliter a sanctis patribus accepi, litteris conprehendam... (I 1)

Sed iam... quod instat agrediar, ut scilicet a maioribus tradita et apud nos deposita describam relatoris fide potius quam auctoris praesumptione... (I 6)

In this context, the expressions 'litteris conprehendere' and 'describere' are more than just synonyms for the verb 'to write'. Vincent's Commonitorium, no less than the Conferences, was to treat of

subjects 'quae in usum stili... antea non venerunt' (Conf., 1 praef 1), to provide a written memorial of doctrines hitherto transmitted by word of mouth alone. The rule of orthodoxy which the author goes on to state is one which he has learnt by personal enquiry, 'perquirens a quamplurimis sanctitate et doctrina praestantibus viris' (II 1). It is, as it were, the graphic distillation of a long series of 'collationes'.

If the idea of a (monastic) tradition ('a maioribus tradita...') was common to both Cassian and Vincent, that of a doctrinal deposit ('...et apud nos deposita') would seem more characteristic of the latter. The Pauline text 'O Timothee, depositum custodi, devitans profanas vocum novitates' (I Timothy 6,20) is central to the argument of the Commonitorium and gives rise to a number of interesting reflections concerning the role of the modern guardian of the faith.¹⁹⁵ For the purpose of announcing his own work, Vincent chooses the role of 'relator'. One should probably regard the opposition 'fides relatoris' / 'praesumptio auctoris' as little more than a formalisation of the attitude expressed by Cassian in the prefaces to the Institutions and Conferences. It is true that similar professions of narratorial as opposed to authorial status are to be found in the works of classical writers.¹⁹⁶ It may even be significant that two of the clearest instances of this type of profession occur in introductions to dialogues, as the classical dialogue was almost certainly among the literary models used by Cassian in the composition of his monastic 'conferences'. Such textual echoes serve as a useful reminder that Christian writers of late antiquity were not the first among the ancients to attempt to set their personal literary activity in manifest

relation to the doctrines of the 'maiores'. Needless to say, Vincent's preference for the role of 'relator' is no more to be taken literally than Cicero's claim to represent faithfully the utterances of the Scipios. This does not mean, however, that one is bound to dismiss it as mere affectation. Enough has already been said to indicate that the Christian writer's role, especially in relation to the 'Fathers', was a subject of serious reflection in southern Gallic circles in the late 420s and early 430s. The formula of the 'fides relatoris', it may be suggested, captures better than any other the dominant tendency of that reflection.

Not content merely to describe himself as a 'relator', Vincent adopts a modest pseudonym: 'videtur mihi minimo omnium servorum dei Peregrino' (I 1). Manuscripts of the Commonitorium present it, accordingly, as the work of one 'Peregrinus', and it is only on the basis of Gennadius' reference to a 'disputatio... quam, absconso nomine suo, adtitulavit "Peregrini adversum haereticos" [Vincentius]' that modern editors are able to ascribe the text to this particular author. A similar device of pseudonymity is employed by another Lerinian writer, Salvian, in his Ad ecclesiam (c.440), which begins: 'Timotheus, minimus servorum dei, ecclesiae catholicae toto orbe diffusae...'. In a letter written shortly after the publication of this work, Salvian explains that he had used a pseudonym (1) so as not to appear to glory in his own achievement and (2) in order that prospective readers should not be deterred by their knowledge of who the author was.¹⁹⁷ Neither reason is very convincing when stated in a text that reveals the true identity of 'Timothy', was clearly intended for the public, and has been transmitted

in conjunction with the work in question. Nevertheless, as N. Brox has recently shown, such statements can be placed in an interesting relation to ideals of humility current in monastic circles at this time.¹⁹⁸ It would seem that the particular difficulty of reconciling Christian humility with Christian authorship was one that exercised the ingenuity of more than one ascetically-minded 'litteratus' in early fifth-century Gaul. Salvian has a surprising amount to say on the subject and implies that much more could be said. His correspondent, Salonius of Geneva, who is alleged to have questioned him regarding his use of a pseudonym, had himself spent time at Lérins between c.425 and c.435;¹⁹⁹ he was therefore doubtless aware of the interest attaching to this topic. When due account is taken of Cassian's habit of issuing his Conferences in the names of famous desert fathers, and of the allusion in one of Prosper's epigrams to a critic of Augustine who planned to publish under an alias ('mutato nomine')²⁰⁰, one is left with the definite impression that authorial humility and pseudonymity were the subjects of lively debate in Lerinian/Massilian monastic society of this period. The particular reasons for Vincent's choice of the pseudonym 'Peregrinus' can only be conjectured. It has been suggested that the sense of this title was approximately equivalent to that of 'monachus'.²⁰¹ One should also consider the possible influence of Augustine's favourite idea of the Christian's life on earth as a 'peregrinatio'. To judge from what Salvian says regarding his choice of 'Timothy', Vincent would not have meant to deceive his readers into believing that a person named Peregrinus was responsible for the work which he had composed. Rather, he may have intended to confirm the author's status as a humble monk,

and hence as the natural beneficiary of the teaching of wise and saintly men.

Why (one may ask) should Vincent have gone to such lengths of self-effacement in the preface to the Commonitorium ? The idea that he wished to protect himself from accusations of anti-Augustinianism is less attractive now than it might once have seemed. More to the point is Sieben's observation that, in the preface, Vincent "justifies his canon or concept of tradition by an appeal to tradition".²⁰² In order to possess any authority, Vincent's anti-heretical rules had to appear to have prior sanction. He apparently believed that by reducing his own role to that of pseudonymous - effectively, anonymous - reporter he would enhance the credibility of what he had to say, while simultaneously providing an example of the reverence for tradition that he was seeking to inculcate.

Surprisingly, perhaps, the distinctively monastic atmosphere created in the preface to the Commonitorium is not maintained. Indeed there is nothing in the remainder of the work to suggest that it was composed by a monk. There was, of course, no particular reason why a book containing a rule against heresies should appear in monastic dress; neither Tertullian's De praescriptione haereticorum nor Augustine's De haeresibus announced themselves as 'monastic' works.²⁰³ Quite apart from these precedents, the nature of Vincent's approach to Christian tradition would have made it extremely difficult for him to sustain the pretence of a monastic 'collatio'. The essentially oral tradition invoked in the preface to the Commonitorium was not favourable to the

production of texts - and Vincent's rule (as will be seen) demanded recourse to written materials. Cassian may have succeeded in disguising a treatise 'de gratia dei et libero arbitrio' as a monastic conference, at the cost of presenting his argument from patristic consensus in a less textually explicit form than that in which (to judge from Prosper and Hilary's letters) it was currently being publicised. Vincent was not prepared to make such concessions. In order to establish what was believed 'ab omnibus' it was necessary to appeal, not to oral tradition, but to what had been written.

(b) Vincent and the use of Christian texts

Despite its initial ostentation of orality, the Commonitorium is a highly literate work. This quality of 'literacy' is manifested in three ways: in the evidence of the author's personal reading, conspicuous on every page of his treatise; in the systematic appeal to (non-biblical) texts as means of establishing traditional doctrine; in the advocacy of a dogmatic 'progress' consisting mainly in a process of re-writing. It is not proposed to attempt here any further study of Vincent's literary sources.²⁰⁴ His ideas on dogmatic drafting will be considered in detail in the following chapter.²⁰⁵ The purpose of the present section is to show how he mounts his appeal to a textually-based doctrinal tradition.

Of the three criteria which Vincent provides for the determination and assertion of orthodoxy, only the first (on the evidence of his own examples) would appear to be applicable without recourse to texts of one

kind or another. The faith of the church as a whole, we are told, was to be preferred to that of a minority group (Criterion of Universality); witness the behaviour of African catholics in the time of Donatus who, rejecting the sacrilegious opinions of one man, adhered to the beliefs of the church universal - 'profano scismate detestato universis mundi ecclesiis adsociati sunt' (IV 2). In fact, as soon emerges (VI 3-10), the success of the anti-Donatist party in Africa had been due in no small part to its use of documents (such as the letter of pope Stephen condemning re-baptism) that attested the traditional view of the Roman and other churches. To some extent, therefore, the appeal to universality of belief could be seen as involving an appeal to texts. How else, indeed, could one establish with certainty what was believed in other parts of the Christian world ? As an inhabitant of Provence, Vincent would presumably have been aware of the value of information gathered from merchants, pilgrims and other travellers for a knowledge of the rituals and beliefs of faraway churches. The demonstration of the first part of his 'rule' reveals only an awareness of the normative effects of episcopal - especially papal - correspondence.

An even stronger bias towards textual authority is observable in Vincent's illustration of the Criterion of Antiquity. At first, it is true, he does not specifically require the use of texts in cases where a large part of the church has been infected with novel opinions (thus excluding the appeal to Universality). The rule of antiquity is said to be observed 'si ab his sensibus nullatenus recedamus, quos sanctos maiores ac patres nostros celebrasse manifestum est' (II 6). This formulation leaves open the question of how such antique belief was to

be seen to be manifest. The main example given concerns the later stages of the 'Arian' controversy, when (according to Vincent) the opponents of catholicism had openly flouted what had previously been taught: 'superiorum instituta violantur... rescinduntur scita patrum... convelluntur definita maiorum' (IV 7). As Sieben has remarked, the language used here and at other points in Vincent's treatise (e.g. 'instituta', 'definita') has numerous parallels in Cassian's monastic writings.²⁰⁶ However, whereas Cassian alludes merely to a set of observances, Vincent clearly has a text in mind. The Arianizing bishops of the second half of the fourth century had tried to dispense with the Nicene creed, a text described by Ambrose in the De fide as a 'liber sacerdotalis' and compared by him to the 'liber propheticus' of the Old Testament (V 2). In place of this sacred text, they had proposed creeds of their own, dismissed by Vincent as 'non litterae sed liturae' (V 4 - cf. Ovid, Tristia III i 15). This passage of the Commonitorium is the first of two in which the author reveals his deep respect for the creed of Nicaea.²⁰⁷ It has been argued that it was reverence for this text, considered as a classic of dogmatic definition, that led Vincent to his particular conception of Christian tradition as the subject of **written** pronouncements.²⁰⁸ It is certain, in any case, that his idea of 'manifest antiquity' in matters of the faith was ultimately dependent on that of recourse to written record.

The first explicit reference to writing in Vincent's introduction to his 'rule' occurs in connection with the Criterion of Consensus. Where recourse to antiquity revealed a divergence of opinions, notice was to be taken first of the decrees of general councils: 'Tunc omnino curabit

[christianus catholicus], ut paucorum temeritati vel inscitiae, si qua sunt universaliter antiquitus universalis concilii decreta, praeponat' (III 3). (The qualification 'si qua sunt' is significant. From the manner in which Vincent introduces the final part of his treatise [XXVIII 1], one must assume that he considered sufficient examples had already been given of the appeal to consensus based on conciliar authority. In fact, the only conciliar text referred to in Commonitorium I-XXVII is the creed of Nicaea. As stated above, this creed is mentioned at an early stage in the work, ostensibly as part of an illustration of the Criterion of Antiquity. In retrospect, one might regard the passage in question [IV-V] as the exposition of a composite Criterion of Consensus-in-Antiquity-and-Universality or 'consensio antiquitatis et universitatis' [XXIX 4].) In cases where no appropriate conciliar statement was available:

...operam dabit [christianus catholicus], ut conlatas inter se maiorum consulat interrogetque sententias, eorum dumtaxat, qui diversis licet temporibus et locis, in unius tamen ecclesiae catholicae communione et fide permanentes, magistri probabiles exstiterunt; et quidquid non unus aut duo tantum, sed omnes pariter uno eodemque consensu aperte frequenter perseveranter tenuisse scripsisse docuisse cognoverit, id sibi quoque intellegat absque ulla dubitatione credendum. (III 4)

Here, then, is Vincent's 'collatio maiorum' - no longer a question-and-answer session between young monks and their superiors, but a careful scrutiny of patristic texts of a type that could be performed by any individual, provided that he had access to an adequate library. The idea of the 'consensus omnium' is already familiar from the writings of Hilary, Prosper and Cassian. To the extent that Vincent's prescriptions

on this point reflect what would appear to have been a basic orientation in 'Massilian' theological argument from the mid-420s, one may perhaps grant the 'traditional' nature of the teaching contained in the Commonitorium. Where Vincent departed from Cassian (to judge from their extant works) was in his frank admission of the importance of texts for the process of establishing a doctrinal consensus. Even while retaining the language of oral relations ('consulere', 'interrogare'), he emphasises the role of writing: in order to know what was **thought** and **taught** in former times and other places, it was essential to refer to what was **written**. Though only stated in connection with the Criterion of Consensus, this assumption would seem to underlie all Vincent's pronouncements concerning Christian tradition.

The appeal to a consensus based on patristic 'sententiae' was to have been demonstrated in the second 'commonitorium', with particular reference to the recent Council of Ephesus. Though we have only a 'recapitulatio' of this part of the treatise, its general tendency is clearly discernible. Vincent apparently had access to a set of 'gesta' relating to the most important session of the Cyrillian council, which took place on the 22nd of June, 431.²⁰⁹ From this text he would have learnt how, shortly after the opening of proceedings, instruction had been given for the Nicene creed to be read out, in order that there should be a standard by which to judge the competing Christologies of Cyril and Nestorius; how Cyril's 'Second' Letter to Nestorius had been approved as being in accordance with the Nicene position; how the latter's reply had been condemned as contrary to it; and how Nestorius' views had been anathematized by all present.²¹⁰ If any of these events

was mentioned in the original second 'commonitorium', none has left any trace in the 'recapitulation'. Here Vincent concentrates instead on the dossier of patristic 'testimonia' prepared by Cyril and read out at a somewhat later stage in the same session of the Council.²¹¹ Curiously, in view of his undoubted attachment to the Nicene creed, he manages to insinuate that it was the dogmatic consensus obtained from a reading of these patristic excerpts, rather than the creed of the '318 fathers' of Nicaea, that had provided the test of Christological orthodoxy.²¹² He also gives the erroneous impression that the same collection of excerpts had been made the basis of some kind of pronouncement or decree. A possible explanation for these distortions - and for the non-appearance of the second 'commonitorium' - will be offered in the following chapter.

Setting aside for the moment the problems posed by Vincent's overall presentation of the Council of Ephesus, one may consider the particular way in which he presents Cyril's dossier of patristic 'testimonia'. As it stands, the second 'commonitorium' offers no view of the contents of this collection beyond a mention of the 'names and number' (XXIX 10) of the authorities cited: 'Sunt ergo hi viri, quorum in illo concilio vel tamquam iudicum vel tamquam testium scripta recitata sunt...' (XXX 1). There follows a list of the fathers, re-ordered to conform with geographical principles already announced in the dogmatic florilegia of the Contra Iulianum and Contra Nestorium. As in these earlier works, the mention of each authority includes a brief reference to that person's ecclesiastical position, learning, moral rectitude and/or constancy in the faith. In conclusion, Vincent refers

to the sacred quality of the number (10) of witnesses cited and asserts that this number was sufficient to represent a general consensus, 'quia... decem illos non aliud fere sensisse, quam ceteros omnes collegas suos nemo dubitabat' (XXX 7). The dossier presented at Ephesus is thus shown to meet two of the most important conditions previously laid down for a 'collatio' of patristic texts; namely (1) that it be based on the opinions of those 'qui in fide et communione catholica sancte sapienter constanter viventes docentes et permanentes, vel mori in Christo fideliter vel occidi pro Christi feliciter meruerunt' (XXVIII 6) and (2) that it represent what was commonly believed by the majority of such persons, 'velut quodam consentiente sibi magistrorum concilio' (XXVII 7).

If it is true to say (following Sieben) that the starting-point for Vincent's reflections on Christian tradition in the Commonitorium was the text of the Nicene creed, it may perhaps be suggested that the point to which this particular work conduces - but, in its present state, never attains - is another 'conciliar' text, compounded of the sayings of orthodox fathers and designed to refute Nestorianism in the way in which the creed of 325 was perceived to have refuted Arianism. The Council of Ephesus, as we know, promulgated no such text; the nearest it came to doing so was in its decision to insert a copy of Cyril's collection of anti-Nestorian 'testimonia' into the official acts. It will be argued in the following chapter that Vincent was inclined to regard the Ephesine recourse to patristic texts as an initiative in (Christological) creed-making, and that his inability to represent it clearly as such may be held to account for the incomplete state of the

Commonitorium as we have it. In order that this argument may appear more credible, it will be useful to have in mind two other aspects of Vincent's use of Christian texts - to be considered below.

(c) Vincent as a reader of Augustine

Putting himself forward as a 'relator' or reporter of traditional (oral) wisdom, the author of the Commonitorium also appeared as a would-be 'collator' or compiler of patristic texts. (It appears, in fact, that the two roles were closely associated in his own mind.)²¹³ This said, the Commonitorium itself is not a dogmatic compilation of the type specified by its author, nor - so far as one can tell - was it intended to be one. The sole example which it offers of patristic 'collatio' is of a dossier prepared in Alexandria and presented to a council at Ephesus. If this were the only evidence available of Vincent's interest in the practice of dogmatic excerpting, it would be difficult to set much store by his ideas on the subject. Fortunately, one can now turn to another of his works, which begins as follows:

Cunctis haeresibus repugnantia, unitatem ac trinitatem
catholicae religionis specialiter adserentia, fideliter
credentibus saepius ad instructionem relegenda
transcripsimus. (Excerpta, prol)

It is possible to read the words 'Cunctis... adserentia' in sequence with those that appear in the title of the one complete extant manuscript of the work - i.e. 'Excerpta [sanctae memoriae Vincentii lirinensis insulae presbyteri] ex universo beatae recordationis

Augustini episcopi <opere ?> collecta, cunctis... adserentia.'²¹⁴ If this was the original title of the work (as Madoz suggests), its opening sentence ('Fideliter... transcripsimus') would still have contained a general statement of the author's practice as a re-writer of edifying texts. In any case, the sentences which immediately follow in the prologue probably indicate that the Augustinian 'excerpta' were meant to be considered as a particular project within a larger activity of (dogmatic) transcription. Bearing in mind the pronouncements of the Commonitorium, it would seem reasonable to interpret the opening words of the Excerpta as the profession of a dedicated and eclectic compiler whose reading-and-copying was not confined exclusively to the works of Augustine. This initial impression must, however, be tested against what Vincent has to say later in the same work.

The main body of the Excerpta is divided into two parts, the first of which consists of excerpts from Augustine's writings relating to the Trinity, the second of excerpts from the same author relating to the Incarnation. In all, eleven of Augustine's works are laid under contribution; some of them (notably the De Trinitate) are cited several times. In presenting his selection, the excerptor makes a number of minor modifications to the original text, usually in the interests of clarity or enchainement.²¹⁵ He explains in the prologue that his aim has been to provide a convenient statement of orthodox faith against the doctrines of Arius and Apollinarius (Part I) and those of Nestorius (Part II). The prologue also contains an outline of Nestorius' teaching, followed by ten 'tituli' summarising orthodox Christology. Another Christological summary appears as an epilogue, together with

anathemas of Nestorius and Photinus. The work concludes with a brief commendation of Augustine's teaching, considered as representative of that of the church as a whole.

In whatever form it appeared in the earliest manuscripts, the announcement of a set of specifically Augustinian 'sententiae' on the Trinity and Incarnation would have been a cause of some astonishment to anyone familiar with the theory of patristic consensus outlined in the Commonitorium. There Vincent insists repeatedly on the need to consult multiple witnesses to the church's traditional teaching, rather than just one or two ('non unus aut duo tantum' - Comm. III 4; cf. XXVII 4; XXVIII 7). The purpose of resorting to patristic texts, he asserts, was to convene an 'assembly' of eminent authorities ('velut quodam... concilio'). To accept the doctrines of a particular master, without proper regard for what was generally and anciently taught, was the sign of a heretic (XXVIII 7-8). How could one who held these opinions now undertake to refute the heresies of Arius, Apollinarius and Nestorius on the basis of texts chosen from the works of a **single** Christian writer ? It is impossible to remove this seeming contradiction by supposing that the Excerpta was an immature work, devised and published before the author had had time to develop the theories expounded in the Commonitorium; whenever Vincent began excerpting Augustine, he could hardly have composed the prologue and epilogue to the present collection prior to the condemnation of Nestorius in 431 - i.e. three years (at most) before the drafting of the second 'commonitorium'. Either the Excerpta reveals a fundamental inconsistency in Vincent's ideas about Christian

tradition or it represents a development that is not specifically envisaged in the Commonitorium.

The view that the Excerpta was composed - or at least published - after 434 is usually justified by reference to a passage in the Commonitorium where Vincent states his intention of dealing elsewhere, and at greater length, with the subject of the Incarnation: 'alias, si deo placuerit, uberius tractanda et explicanda' (XVI 9). This promise, it is claimed, is redeemed in the Excerpta, the second part of which is concerned with precisely the issues raised in sections XII-XVI of the Commonitorium.²¹⁶ The work in question certainly answers the description of a 'tractatus uberius', even if one cannot prove that it is what Vincent had in mind when concluding his (earlier) Christological excursus. More telling evidence of the priority of the Commonitorium is provided by the terms in which Vincent justifies his (subsequent) recourse to Augustine as a unique doctrinal authority. Having outlined the plan and contents of the Excerpta, he proceeds:

Nunc iam ipsum beatae memoriae sanctum Augustinum, immo per eum Christi potius et ecclesiae antiquam et universalem fidem audiamus loquentem. Cuius sanissimum sensum in ipso statim primo debemus avertere... Ait namque: "Omnes quos legere potui..." (I 1-11)

The first passage quoted, from the beginning of Book One of the De trinitate, is commended as evidence of the author's respect for the twin pillars of catholic orthodoxy, Scripture and the 'ecclesiastica traditio' - the latter being represented by the 'catholici tractatores' whose common opinion on the Trinity Augustine claimed to represent

('Omnes quos legere potui qui ante me scripserunt... hoc intenderunt, etc.'). By choosing this quotation, Vincent draws attention to one of the most important sources for his theory of the double (textual) basis of the Christian faith. His immediate purpose, however, was to accredit his projected set of Augustinian 'excerpta'. Since Augustine had observed faithfully the rules set out in the Commonitorium (!) for recourse to the fathers - and since, moreover, the fathers whom he had consulted had themselves referred correctly to the Scriptures - his personal statements on the Trinity and Incarnation could be regarded as expressions of the 'ancient and universal faith of the church'. In other words: because Augustine was a model 'collator', Vincent had only to 'collect' what he had written (cf. 'Excerpta... ex universo Augustini <opere> collecta'). A similar argument appears in the final sentences of the Excerpta:

Haec sunt quae de libris sancti Augustini in unum velut opusculum sparsim collecta digessimus... Quibus et sacrae scripturae sensus et maiorum doctrina, id est ecclesiae traditio, et Nestorii profanitas cumulate abundeque monstrata est, ut adversus eum, licet unius sacerdotis verbis omnium sanctorum patrum sensu locuti esse videamur.
(X 59-65)

In view of the evidence which exists for earlier compilations of Trinitarian and Christological passages from the writings of single authors such as Hilary and Ambrose,²¹⁷ it is unlikely that Vincent would have felt obliged to justify his work in this way had he not already committed himself to the theory of patristic 'collatio' expounded in the Commonitorium. Why (one may ask) had he previously ruled out - or at least made no allowance for - the idea of a dogmatic 'collection'?

derived from the work of a single author ? And what had persuaded him of the value of such a collection in the present case ?

The first of these questions relates directly to the issue of the alleged polemical purpose of the Commonitorium. According to Madoz (who here represents a tradition going back to the seventeenth century), the wish to provide a general rule against heresies was merely the ostensible motive of Vincent's treatise: the author's real aim was to mount an attack on Augustine's theory of predestination. Others (most recently W. O'Connor) have argued that the Commonitorium is innocent of any anti-Augustinian sentiment.²¹⁸ Neither of these views, it may be suggested, does justice to the subtlety of Vincent's work as a whole. Even if the Commonitorium was not intended as "a pamphlet against saint Augustine" (Madoz) it is possible that it nevertheless bears certain traces of the 'Massilian' reaction to his literary oeuvre. Rather than discussing for the thousandth time the brief and inconclusive passages usually adduced as evidence of Vincent's opposition to Augustinian ideas of grace and predestination, it may be worth considering what he has to say about eminent teachers and writers, and the bearing that this could have on his own activity as a 'collator'/'collector'.

At an early stage in the Commonitorium, Vincent quotes Galatians 1,8: 'Sed licet nos aut angelus de caelo evangelizet vobis, praeterquam quod evangelizavimus vobis, anathema sit' (VIII 1). Like Tertullian, he interprets this remark as a ban on every kind of doctrinal innovation.²¹⁹ Then, before going on to discuss other passages in which the Apostle inveighs against novelty in the church, he considers a possible

objection: 'Sed dicet aliquis: Cur ergo persaepe divinitus sinuntur excellentes quaedam personae in ecclesia constitutae res novas catholicis adnuntiare ?' (X 1). His answer: false prophets were sent to test the people's love for God (Deuteronomy 13,1-3),

Et profecto magna temptatio est, cum ille quem tu prophetam, quem prophetarum discipulum, quem doctorem et adsertorem veritatis putes, quem summa veneratione et amore complexus sis, is si subito latenter noxios subinducat errores, quos nec cito deprehendere valeas, dum antiqui magisterii duceris praeiudicio, nec facile damnare decidas, dum magistri veteris praepediris adfectu. (X 8)

Although Tertullian had a passage in the De praescriptione concerning false prophets and false apostles, he had nothing quite like this.²²⁰ The problem of a cherished master who lapsed into novelty would seem to have been one that was particularly acute for Vincent and his imaginary interlocutor. As if to confirm the significance which he attached to this issue, Vincent proceeds to give a number of examples from ecclesiastical history: Nestorius, Photinus, Apollinarius, Origen, Tertullian (XI, XVII-XIX). The first of these persons, admittedly, had barely established his reputation before it was called into question. The others, however, were teachers of proven worth, distinguished by their zeal for orthodoxy and (in every case) by a substantial output of published work. Yet all had erred and, in so doing, had led others astray: 'cum aliquandiu sanae fidei forent habiti, ad extremum tamen aut in alienam decidissent sectam aut ipsi suam haeresim condidissent' (XVII 1). Vincent's sense of the importance of these 'magistri' was clearly based on his awareness of what they had written. (While he may not have read any authentic Photinus or Apollinarius,²²¹ he could easily guess at

the influence exercised by their works.) It was not the man, but the text, that ultimately mattered; granted that the doctrinal errors in Origen's writings might have been the result of later interpolation, 'Origen' (that is, the corpus of writings associated with his name) posed a serious danger to the would-be orthodox Christian (XVII 17). The Latin counterpart of Origen, according to the author of the Commonitorium, was Tertullian. The latter, too, had produced works of great merit only to deprive them, ultimately ('ad extremum'), of the favour that they might otherwise have enjoyed: 'Sequenti errore detraxit scriptis probabilibus auctoritatem' (XVIII 5 - a quotation from the In Matthaeum of Hilary of Poitiers).

Supporters of the view that the Commonitorium is an anti-Augustinian tract have often cited passages such as these in corroboration of their theory. The 'Massilians', they say, were inclined to dismiss Augustine's later teaching on grace and predestination as a deviation from the norms of catholic orthodoxy, even though they had previously recognized him as a master; the bishop of Hippo was thus the obvious target for Vincent's censure on famous teachers who had erred 'ad extremum'.²²² So much, if no more, may be safely granted. For while it seems unlikely that the Commonitorium was conceived primarily as an attack on Augustinian doctrine, it is difficult not to make a connection between sections X-XI, XVII-XIX and the attitudes reported by Prosper and Hilary as typical of 'Massilian' readers of Augustine.²²³ A similar observation may be made with regard to Vincent's alleged distortion of the import of pope Celestine's letter of 431/2 to the southern Gallic bishops in section XXXII;²²⁴ although the passage in

question does not prove that he was violently opposed to Augustine's later teaching, it does suggest that he was conscious of the current controversy surrounding the reception of his works. Given the circumstances in which he was writing, it would have been surprising if he had not shown at least some awareness of this issue. Since 426 or thereabouts, a group of Gallic theologians closely associated with his own milieu had been making determined efforts to circumscribe that part of Augustine's theology of grace, and of his works, which they themselves found acceptable. They had been opposed by men like Prosper of Aquitaine who - in appearance, if not always in reality - upheld the claims of a thoroughgoing Augustinianism. In an attempt to counter appeals to the 'total' Augustine, Cassian and his followers had developed a habit of referring to a wider consensus of doctrinal authorities. Vincent's theory of patristic 'collatio' may be seen to reflect this 'Massilian' practice. His preoccupation with the problem of the 'fallible master' may likewise be considered a product of contemporary anxiety about the influence of Augustine's teaching.

It will now be clear why the author of the Commonitorium saw fit to exclude recourse to a single doctrinal authority and why, in subsequently presenting the Excerpta, he should have felt obliged to justify his undertaking. It remains to suggest a reason for the apparent volte-face represented by the second of these two works. What determined Vincent's shift from the role of patristic 'collator' to that of Augustinian 'collector' ? In the absence of any evidence of change either in his personal circumstances or in the intellectual climate in which he wrote, one is reduced to guesswork based on the state of the

texts themselves. Assuming that the Excerpta were completed and published after the drafting of the Commonitorium, as seems to have been the case, one might expect them to reflect a progression in the author's thinking. Paradoxically, the development marked by the later work is in a direction contrary to that apparently indicated by the earlier one; for all Vincent's skilful pleading, the Excerpta can hardly be regarded as a natural sequel to the second 'commonitorium'.²²⁵ One way of removing this paradox would be to suppose that the latter part of the Commonitorium (i.e. sections XXVIIIff), far from providing a basis on which the author could build in the future, amounted to a serious methodological failure. If, say, Vincent had been unable to exploit the example of the Council of Ephesus in the way that he had originally intended, it would not be surprising to find him applying an alternative method of dogmatic definition in a subsequent work. The trend towards patristic 'collatio' was, after all, only a trend; other, less problematical ways of defining the faith were still to hand. In choosing to excerpt the works of a single recognized authority, Vincent would merely have fallen in line with the common tendency to rely on a favourite master in matters of doctrine... One obvious objection to this hypothesis - that no writer with Vincent's background would be likely to manifest such respect for the particular authority of Augustine - can be shown to be groundless: whatever doubts they may have had concerning his doctrine of grace, the 'Massilians' were happy to defer to the bishop of Hippo on most other subjects.²²⁶ A more serious objection would be that there is nothing to support a conjecture of this sort. Where (it may be asked) is the evidence that Vincent regarded the Commonitorium as at least a partial failure? An answer to this question will be given in

the next chapter. For the present, it is sufficient to have noted this author's interest in two closely related (though theoretically irreconcilable) images of the Christian writer - those of patristic 'collator' and Augustinian 'collector'.

(d) Vincent and the idea of a 'commonitorium'

At several points in the Commonitorium the author describes his purpose in writing as that of providing a personal aide-mémoire:

...si ea quae fideliter a sanctis patribus accepi, litteris comprehendam, infirmitati certe propriae pernecessaria, quippe cum adsit in promptu, unde inbecillitas memoriae meae adsidua lectione reparetur. (I 1)

Me vero sublevandae recordationis vel potius oblivionis meae gratia commonitorium mihimet parasse suffecerit, quod tamen paulatim recolendo, quae didici, emendare et implere cottidie domino praestante conabor. (I 7)

Haec sunt fere, quae duobus commonitoriis latius disserta aliquanto nunc brevius recapitulandi lege constricta sunt, ut memoria mea, cui adminiculandae ista confecimus, et commonendi adsiduitate reparetur et prolixitatis fastidio non obruatur. (XXXIII 7)

Clearly, one should not regard such statements as proof that Vincent had no intention of publishing the Commonitorium; despite his suggestion to the contrary (I 8), works as highly wrought as this one rarely come into the public domain without the author's connivance.²²⁷ Are his appeals to the idea of a 'commonitorium', then, merely remnants of a classical topics of authorial modesty? There is reason to believe otherwise.

The word 'commonitorium' was used regularly in late antiquity in the sense of a 'memorandum', often with reference to a text (e.g. a letter or annex to a letter) containing instructions or other detailed information in convenient form. Typically, a piece of writing designated as a 'commonitorium' would be relatively short and composed in an unartificial style; it might even consist simply of notes or a series of headings. In principle, 'commonitoria' were intended to serve purely practical purposes. They may thus be said to have constituted a 'sub-literary' genre. Not surprisingly, however, in view of the tendency towards rhetorical self-deprecation in late-antique literary manners, the title of 'commonitorium' was also applied in certain cases to texts of obvious artistic pretension. Examples of, and references to, 'commonitoria' of all sorts are to be found in both pagan and Christian literature of the late fourth and early fifth centuries.²²⁸

Despite the efforts of S. Prete to establish a specifically Christian usage of the term 'commonitorium', it is doubtful whether such a distinction can be recognized. It is clear, on the other hand, that the 'commonitorium'-form (and, to an even greater extent perhaps, the 'commonitorium'-concept) had a special attraction for certain Christian 'litterati' of this period. A particularly interesting development may be observed in the area of anti-heretical writing. At the Council of Saragossa of 380, Hydatius of Mérida presented a Commonitorium in which, we are told, there were set out certain principles of Christian discipline; in all probability, this text also included details of the alleged heresy of Priscillian.²²⁹ Some thirty-five years later, two other Spanish bishops sent a text with (it appears) the same title to

Augustine, informing him 'de aliquantis haeresibus'.²³⁰ In due course, their information was supplemented by the Commonitorium de errore Priscillianistarum et Origenistarum composed by the Spanish priest Orosius.²³¹ In none of these cases, it would seem, was the word 'commonitorium' employed in anything other than its usual sense of a 'memorandum'. Similarly, when (in 427/8) the Carthaginian deacon Quodvultdeus asked Augustine to prepare a summary catalogue of heresies, 'velut quodam ex omnibus concepto commonitorio',²³² there was nothing in the manner of his request that would suggest (to the modern reader) that 'commonitorium' had acquired the technical sense of an 'anti-heretical text'. There is a distinct possibility, nonetheless, that by the time Vincent came to compose his treatise 'adversum haereticos' (Gennadius), the idea of an anti-heretical 'commonitorium' had become something of a commonplace.

A few years earlier an Italian writer living in Constantinople, Marius Mercator, had published two works entitled Commonitorium super nomine Caelestii and Commonitorium adversum haeresim Pelagii et Caelestii vel etiam scripta Iuliani. (The first of these works, its author declares, originally appeared in Greek, and therefore presumably had the word 'hypomnesticon' in its title.) While there is no evidence that Vincent saw either of Mercator's 'commonitoria', it is conceivable that he had access to others like them. Though resident in the East by 429, Mercator had previously been at Rome, where (to judge from a letter of Jerome) he was one of a group of anti-Pelagian vigilantes. As early as 418 he had composed two treatises (now lost) against the Pelagians and had sent them to Augustine, whose ardent disciple he professed himself

to be.²³³ It has been suggested that some of Mercator's Roman associates may have composed anti-Pelagian tracts of similar type.²³⁴ One such work, variously assigned a Gallic or African provenance and dated to the 430s or 440s, is the pseudo-Augustinian Hypomnesticon contra Pelagianos et Caelestianos.²³⁵ As already indicated, 'hypomnesticon' was the normal Greek equivalent for the Latin 'commonitorium'. The author explains his purpose as follows:

Igitur de magisterio gratiae dei confidens his [sc. Pelagianis et Caelestianis haereticis] respondendum, tamquam hypomnesticon, abbreviatum hunc facere curavi libellum. Quem si quis legere voluerit, non verborum mediocritatem contempletur, sed fidei rationem. [102,35]

The treatise itself consists of a series of answers (varying in length from just over two to eighteen columns in Migne's edition) to five Pelagian 'sententiae'; the answer to a sixth proposition 'de praedestinatione' was apparently added as an afterthought. The author's main source was the works of Augustine. It is more than likely that the latter's name appeared in the original title.²³⁶ That compositions of this kind were not uncommon in the period immediately following Augustine's death is suggested by remarks contained in a work published by Sirmond under the title of Praedestinatus, written soon after 432. There we are told that certain books had recently been issued 'sub Augustini nomine', including one on the subject of predestination (which the author claims to reproduce verbatim) 'qui Augustinum mentitur in titulo, cum se haereticum ostendat in textu.'²³⁷ This work, it is alleged, had been damned by the late pope Celestine yet was still circulating in private; in some quarters it was being treated as a creed

('in modum symboli non discutiendus trad[i]tur aliquibus sed credendus').²³⁸ It begins with a profession of brevity comparable to that found in the preface to the Hypomnesticon and perhaps characteristic of other anti-Pelagian 'commonitoria' as well.²³⁹

As an interested observer of the contemporary debate on grace and predestination, Vincent would have been easily influenced by the language and ideology of works such as those mentioned above. Even if he did not intend his own composition to be known by the title of 'Commonitorium' - and there is no sure sign that he did - he may have sought deliberately to exploit the current association between anti-heretical literary intent and a certain kind of mnemonic presentation. There is a further point to be noted. As observed, Vincent lays special emphasis on the **private** function of his text: his aim, ostensibly, was not to inform a large public of the errors of certain heretics, but rather to ensure that he himself had a ready reminder of the essential truths of his religion. The use of the word 'commonitorium' in the sense of a personal aide-mémoire is attested once in the works of Augustine, where it denotes a temporary record of the writer's thoughts that would later be superseded by another text of more artistic devising.²⁴⁰ The text that Vincent had in mind, by contrast, was to be the object of constant 'revision' - in the sense both of re-reading ('adsidua lectione') and of emendation ('emendare et implere'). A similar insistence on the provisional status of a text is to be found in the preface to the Hypomnesticon and in other concise doctrinal writings of this period.²⁴¹ In every case, however, it is balanced by a manifest desire on the author's part to arrive at a definitive and generally acceptable statement 'de

ratione fidei'. This impulse to textual definition is aptly represented by the author of the Praedestinatus in his accusation that certain putatively Augustinian texts had been accepted 'as though they were creeds'. The distance between the idea of a creed and that of a 'commonitorium' (especially of the personal kind advertised by Vincent) may not, in fact, have been very great. A Latin writer of the late fourth century, Nicetus of Remesiana, was able to assert: 'Symbolum est commonitorium fidei et sancta confessio.'²⁴²

It remains to be seen how Vincent and other Gallic 'litterati' of his time reconciled their respect for creeds - considered, in principle, as unalterable statements of the faith - with their interest in a continuing activity of Christian writing.

Conclusions

1. Simultaneously with the emergence (in the late fourth and early fifth centuries) of a clearly-formulated ideal of the Latin Christian writer as a student of the Bible, there arose fresh opportunities for literary self-definition with respect to the work of previous Christian authors. A new era of literary 'adaptation' began, announced by the appearance of definite ideas concerning the relation between original and derived texts in the same language. At the risk of some oversimplification, one might claim to recognize a new determination on the part of western 'litterati' to present themselves as 'editors' of the Fathers.
2. In southern Gaul, this new spirit is clearly detectable in the works of writers such as Eucherius, Prosper, Cassian and Vincent, all of whom flourished in the period c.420-440 and were associated in one way or another with the monastic milieux of Lérins and Marseilles. Among the factors which may have disposed these individuals to reflect on their literary relation to the 'patres' one should consider especially their exposure to the works and reputation of Augustine, their awareness of new methods of theological argument based on textual comparison, their access to Christian 'libraries', and (except perhaps in the case of Prosper) their sense of a monastic tradition.
3. If Prosper was the author of the Carmen de providentia dei (as seems entirely possible, despite doubts recently expressed on this score) he

may be credited with a clearly-conceived idea of the Christian writer as a biblical adaptor. Even if he was not, it is likely that ideas of a similar kind played a part in his (Christian) literary education. At some point in the early 420s - at the latest - he turned his talents as an adaptor to the voluminous works of Augustine. In a text of uncertain date (but which may nevertheless represent an attitude formed early in his career) he justifies the practice of excerpting and versifying this writer's works in terms both of the intrinsic pleasure of the activity itself and of its utility as an aid to Christian 'meditation' and 'confession'. Further elements of an early fifth-century theory of Augustinian adaptation may be contained in the metrical preface to an epitome of the Enarrationes in psalmos speculatively attributed to the same author.

4. It is probable that a number of Prosper's works were issued, or circulated, with Augustine's name in the title. Such a contingency is easily reconciled with the author's professed aim of presenting Christian doctrine 'secundum formam disputationum [Augustini]' - an ideal that he sought to realise during the controversy on grace and predestination that broke out in south-eastern Gaul in the c.426. In the literary manner of his 'defence' of Augustine against the 'Massilians', Prosper appears to have been influenced not only by the tactics of his master but also by those of his opponents; this is notably the case as regards the use of 'excerpta', 'auctoritates' and 'sententiae'. Despite showing considerable flexibility in other respects, he was ill-equipped to deal with the challenge of anti-Augustinian arguments based on a theory of patristic consensus (see below).

5. By the late 420s, Cassian and (in all probability) a number of his associates in and around Marseille had developed a practice of checking theological propositions against the testimony of orthodox Christian writers, with a view to asserting what was believed 'ab omnibus'. In expressing the results of such **textual** enquiry, Cassian himself drew upon an ideology of essentially **oral** tradition that he had been expounding in his monastic works since the beginning of the decade. Central to his conception of monastic tradition were the ideas of universality, antiquity/apostolicity, personal discipleship and practical experience. As a monastic writer - but also in the final section of the Contra Nestorium - he emphasises his own dependence on his masters to the extent of 'attributing' his work to them.

6. Cassian's attempt to 'monasticate' the process of dogmatic definition - and with it the role of the Christian writer as representative of the Fathers - is mirrored in the preface to Vincent's Commonitorium. Unlike Cassian, however, Vincent was prepared to make the appeal to texts in doctrinal debate a matter of formal principle. As expounded by him, patristic 'collatio' ceases to be a conference of monastic elders and becomes a comparison of written opinions. Partly because of the suspicion attaching to certain of Augustine's ideas in Massilian and Lerinian circles, Vincent deliberately excluded recourse to the works of a single individual from the theory of doctrinal consensus outlined in the Commonitorium. For reasons not yet fully elucidated, he later saw fit to resort exclusively to the writings of Augustine in order to produce a summary of Trinitarian and Christological doctrine. As a result of these changes of viewpoint, Vincent presents at least three

different images of the Christian writer as, respectively, patristic 'relator', 'collator' and 'collector'.

7. One of the dominant features of Prosper's work of Augustinian adaptation, in both its polemical and non-polemical parts, is an impulse towards the 'compendious' or convenient expression of a given set of ideas. Generally, this end is achieved by means of a series of concise statements ('sententiae'). Similar tendencies towards abbreviation and simplification are discernible in the anti-Augustinian propaganda of the 'Massilians' and in contemporary doctrinal 'commonitoria'. There are even suggestions (e.g. in the manner of some of Prosper's summaries, in the insinuations of the author of the so-called Praedestinatus) that the object of such processes was to produce a text that could be treated as a 'creed'. Vincent's interest in creeds and creedlike statements is evidenced by the place implicitly assigned to the Nicene creed in the scheme of the Commonitorium and, it has been suggested, by his very use of the 'commonitorium'-concept. (For further discussion of this theme, see the next chapter.)

8. In their different ways, Prosper, Cassian and Vincent all witness to what seems to have been a common desire among western 'litterati' of the period to appear as epigoni of an established doctrinal tradition rather than as independent authorities - as 'relatores' rather than 'auctores'. The immediate literary-ideological consequence of this desire was an increased interest in devices of authorial anonymity and pseudonymity.

Chapter Three

*

'IN MODUM SYMBOLI'

The Christian writer as creed-maker

Introduction

For the historian of early Christian literary ideology, as for the patristic theologian, there exists a category of texts whose importance is inversely proportional to their extent. They are the creeds. We saw in the previous chapter how attempts made by Gallic writers of the early fifth century to re-present the teaching of their masters frequently conduced to a short dogmatic summary. A similar tendency towards summary and abbreviation was earlier observed in the writings of Gallic 'students of the Bible' such as Sulpicius and Eucherius. To a remarkable degree, it seems, the study of the literary ideology of these particular Christian milieux is a study of Christian forms - and, a fortiori, of Christian ideas - of the epitome. This being the case, there is a strong argument for considering in some detail the influence of a textual form which, from the mid-fourth century onwards, enjoyed unrivalled supremacy as a pattern for dogmatic résumé.

The OED defines 'creed' as a "a form of words setting forth authoritatively and concisely the general belief of the Christian Church, or those articles of belief which are regarded as essential; a brief summary of Christian doctrine". The term, it states, is "usually and properly applied to the three statements of belief known as the Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds" - that is, to the three credal statements found (at least until recently) in the regular liturgies of both the Catholic and Anglican churches. Given (1) that none of these

'Creeds' was part of the ordinary liturgy of the church of the fourth and fifth centuries, and (2) that the idea of such a triadic grouping was not current in that period, there is no reason to regard them as comprising a special class for the purposes of the present chapter. It is proposed, instead, to apply the word 'creed' indiscriminately to any "brief summary of Christian doctrine" and to distinguish particular summaries, where necessary, by the addition of an appropriate adjective (e.g. 'apostolic'/'baptismal', Nicene, 'Athanasian'). By this means it may be possible to give a just impression both of the singular importance ascribed to the creed as an ideal Christian text and of the relative interest attaching to individual realisations of that ideal.

The Latin words most commonly to be translated as 'creed' are 'fides' and 'symbolum'. The second of these expressions is of particular interest as an index to the history of the idea of a creed in late antiquity.¹ As used by pagan authors, the Latin word 'symbolum' or 'symbolus' (cf. Gk. 'symbolon'/'-os') meant a sign, token or symbol; among its possible senses was that of a business agreement or contract. From the third century onwards the same word appears regularly in Christian contexts with reference to the rite of baptism. The normal procedure for baptism in this period was for the candidate to be asked a series of questions concerning his belief in the Trinity ("Do you believe in God the Father...?", "Do you believe in Jesus Christ...?", "Do you believe in the Holy Spirit...?"). On replying "I believe" ('Credo') to each question in turn, he would be baptized by immersion. According to the best modern accounts, the word 'symbolum' as originally employed by Christian writers in this context is to be referred to "the

threefold interrogations, responses and immersions... together making up the baptismal act."² In precisely what sense this combination of utterances and actions was held to constitute a 'sign' or 'symbol' is a matter of some uncertainty. A number of later Christian writers interpret 'symbolum' as meaning a pact or contract concluded between God and man - a fact which suggests that its use may have been based on an analogy between a commercial or legal agreement and the spiritual bond effected in baptism.

Whatever its original connotations, the word 'symbolum' would appear to have undergone a radical change in denotation by the end of the fourth century. As a result of a combination of factors as yet only imperfectly understood, the early decades of this century saw the emergence of a new kind of Christian text. Such a text would typically consist of a brief statement of the main points of Christian doctrine concerning the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, in declaratory form, with particular attention to difficult or disputed elements. It might have appended to it a number of proscriptions ('anathemas') of possible doctrinal errors. It would be issued in the name of an individual or group of individuals, usually bishops, and be intended to serve as a test and guarantee of orthodoxy. Its Greek title would include a word such as 'ekthesis' or 'pistis'; if composed in Latin, or subsequently translated, it would be called 'symbolum' or 'fides'.³ The obvious precedent for the majority of texts of this kind was the doctrinal statement issued at the Council of Nicaea in 325.

Until recently, it was usual to regard the Nicene creed as an adaptation, for controversial purposes, of a form of words currently in use as a baptismal profession in one or more of the local eastern churches. This view depended on two related assumptions: (1) that by 325 the learning and recitation of a declaratory statement of faith, as distinguished from the more ancient sequence of baptismal questions and responses, formed part of the regular process of Christian initiation in the East, and (2) that the doctrinal text issued by the Nicene bishops could best be regarded as the descendant of such a statement. Neither of these assumptions, it appears, can now be taken for granted. In the first place, there would seem to be considerable doubt remaining as to the precise period and circumstances in which a declaratory, as opposed to interrogative, form of creed came to occupy a place among the procedures associated with baptism. The first clear evidence for the recitation of a text of this kind by a catechumen relates to the period c.350.⁴ The arrangements in place at that date may be assumed to have been at least a generation old. But how much older were they? If the emergence of a declaratory form of 'baptismal' creed can be explained as a result of developments in the catechumenate that had taken place in the third century (as J.N.D. Kelly has argued),⁵ there is no difficulty in supposing that creeds of this type were already widely used by the time of the Council of Nicaea. If, on the other hand, the practice of referring to and exploiting such normative doctrinal texts could be shown to be the product of new conditions created for the church during the reign of the emperor Constantine (as H. von Campenhausen has suggested),⁶ one might be forced to review one's assumptions concerning the priority of local 'baptismal' creeds with respect to those issued by

church councils. In the light of this second possibility, it is worth considering a further question: If the earliest conciliar creeds are not necessarily to be regarded as modifications of local 'baptismal' creeds, in what other context might they be envisaged? It has long been recognized that there is a close relation between the content of declaratory creeds of the type first clearly manifested in the fourth century and that of the so-called 'Rule of Faith' commonly invoked by Christian writers of the preceding period. The 'Rule' has been defined as "an account of the teaching of the church as it is known to the writer who uses the concept [of the rule], believed to be continuous and virtually identical with the teaching which the church has been giving from the very beginning, from the time of the apostles."⁷ An important feature of this definition is the allowance which it makes for the subjective and creative elements involved in the application of the 'Rule of Faith'. Though conceived of as an objective norm, the latter could only be given expression by individual writers (or speakers) "who use[d] the concept of the rule". It is not surprising, then, that scholars have attempted to discern a continuity between the forms of expression given to the 'Rule of Faith' by second- and third-century Christian writers and the earliest declaratory creeds to be issued in the names of particular individuals. On one recent view, it is these 'personal' creeds (Privatbekenntnisse) that should be regarded as the natural ancestors of the conciliar creeds of the fourth century, including the Nicene creed.⁸

The essential difference between earlier accounts of the church's traditional teaching based on the concept of the 'Rule of Faith' and

later declaratory creeds would seem to lie in the degree of importance attached to a particular form of words. In the case of a creed, respect was to be had not merely for doctrinal content but also for the precise verbal form in which that doctrine was expressed; the text could not be changed without risk of serious alteration to the substance. This principle applied equally to the creed learnt by ordinary Christians as part of their initiation and to those published by bishops, councils or other individuals on particular occasions. Whatever relation may originally have held between these two varieties of creed, it is clear that the fashion for publishing statements of the faith in order to clarify disputed points of doctrine was accompanied by an enhanced awareness of the forms of profession made at or shortly before baptism. The evidence for this observation is provided by the history of the ceremonies of 'traditio' and 'redditio symboli'.

As already noted, the word 'symbolum', in a Christian context, had hitherto referred to the ensemble of questions, answers and actions that together constituted the act of baptism. In the course of the fourth century, the same word came to refer increasingly, if not yet exclusively, to a declaratory statement of faith that was learnt, and probably recited, by persons seeking baptism ('competentes'). Both form and content of the so-called 'baptismal' creed seem to have been closely modelled on the threefold interrogation that had always occurred, and continued to take place, at the moment of baptism itself. It has been suggested that this form of creed may, in fact, have been derived from a version of the baptismal questions and answers that had been expanded with material of a kind associated with expressions of the 'Rule of

Faith'.⁹ By the early fifth century, in any case, the majority of local churches in the Latin-speaking part of the Roman empire appear to have been using a 'baptismal' creed of common type - i.e. one based on the creed adopted by the church of Rome in the second quarter of the previous century (if not considerably earlier).¹⁰ According to an opinion widely held at the time, this creed had been devised by the apostles; several late-antique writers refer to it as 'symbolum apostolorum' or 'symbolum apostolicum'.¹¹ This was the creed (a direct ancestor of our present Apostles' Creed) that was the object of the ceremonies known as 'traditio' and 'redditio symboli'.¹²

Recounting the conversion (c.355) of the famous philosopher and rhetorician Marius Victorinus in Book Eight of the Confessions, Augustine tells how the latter had made profession of his faith in front of the Roman congregation, 'verbis certis conceptis retentisque memoriter' (VIII 2,5). The verb used in this connection ('reddere') and a number of other details of the rite make it certain that the event described was a regular stage in the process of Christian initiation as then practised in Rome.¹³ Other, roughly contemporary Latin sources enable one to establish that the recitation ('redditio') of the creed by the individual 'competens' was preceded by a formal delivery ('traditio') or oral presentation of the same by a member of the clergy. Often, it seems, this ceremony of imparting the creed was accompanied by a sermon in which the speaker would comment on the general nature of the 'text' in question, its origin and function, and the sense of its various articles. Versions of a number of these sermons 'in traditione symboli' survive among the works of Christian authors of the late fourth

and fifth centuries, together with one sermon 'in redditione symboli'. Our fullest information relates to the church of Hippo in the time of Augustine. Here the ceremony of the 'traditio symboli' took place regularly on the fourth Saturday in Lent, and was followed, on the two succeeding Saturdays, by a preparatory 'redditio'. Finally, on Easter Eve, each 'competens' made a final, solemn 'redditio' and shortly afterwards underwent baptism.¹⁴

Texts relating to the processes of Christian initiation in Gaul in the fourth and fifth centuries confirm that in this period, as (no doubt) previously, the baptismal rite itself included a threefold sequence of questions and answers on the faith.¹⁵ Whether at any time the preliminaries to baptism also included the formal rehearsal of a declaratory creed, or 'redditio symboli', of the kind practised at Rome as early as the 350s and later in other Italian and African churches, is difficult to determine with certainty.¹⁶ The absence of any definite evidence for such a usage does not by itself warrant a negative conclusion. As indicated above, most of our information on Christian initiation in late antiquity comes from sermons. With few exceptions, the extant remains of Gallic sermons of the fifth century are transmitted in collections assembled after 500. Given the greatly reduced importance of the adult catechumenate in this later period, it is conceivable that texts relating to a formal 'redditio' were discarded as no longer appropriate. It is apparent from the sermons of Caesarius of Arles (+542) that adult 'competentes' were still expected to be able to recite the creed ('ut qui seniores sunt per se reddant'), though on what occasion is not clear; parents who rendered the creed on behalf of child

'competentes' were expected to ensure that the latter subsequently learnt it for themselves.¹⁷ There can be no doubt, however, that the ceremony of the 'traditio symboli' was a normal occurrence in the early Gallic church; at the Council of Agde in 506 it was decreed that it should take place everywhere on Palm Sunday.¹⁸ There are a number of extant Gallic sermons 'in traditione symboli' which may be considered to contain fifth-century material, even though their present form may be the result of subsequent revision.¹⁹

Besides their value as documents of theology and popular piety, late-antique sermons 'de symbolo' offer a particularly rich (and as yet largely unexploited) field of enquiry for the literary historian. For as long as the 'symbolum' was a complex of dialogue and action, it lay outside the realm of literary ideology; in whatever sense Christians of the second and third centuries may have understood baptism to be 'symbolic', one can be sure that their attention was not focused on a text. Not until the middle of the fourth century - around the time that Marius Victorinus was rendering a creed in Rome, 'verbis certis conceptis' - is it possible to detect signs that Latin 'litterati' were able to consider their baptismal profession as in some way involving a verbal artefact. The beginnings of this new consciousness coincide, significantly, with the first serious attempts by western theologians (among them the same Marius Victorinus) to come to terms with the Greek conciliar creeds published since Nicaea. Once it was acknowledged that the faith in which every Christian was baptised could be expressed in writing in the form of a single, continuous statement, certain

fundamental questions were bound to arise. What kind of text was the 'symbolum' ? What were its origins ? What was the relation between a person's baptismal profession, in whatsoever form expressed, and the competing formulations of successive church councils ? How was the 'baptismal' creed - or any creed, for that matter - to be related to the Bible ? To what extent could its particular terminology be reproduced, or varied, in a writer's pronouncements 'de fide' ? The answers given to these questions, implicitly or explicitly, by 'litterati' of the late fourth and fifth centuries constitute an important part of the available evidence for their ideas of Christian reading-and-writing.

Most surveys previously carried out of late-antique attitudes to creeds have been envisaged either as complements to the history of the Apostles' Creed or as studies in theological method.²⁰ However useful in their own terms, they have thus rarely addressed the issues of greatest interest to the historian of literary ideology. In particular, they have tended to concentrate on the 'apostolic' or 'baptismal' creed, to the exclusion of other texts of a similar kind. At first sight, such exclusiveness may appear justified. For Christians of the fourth and fifth centuries, the so-called 'symbolum apostolorum' was indeed the creed par excellence. Closely associated with their own baptism, preserved in the memory, constantly meditated upon, it was the sign and surety of their salvation. No other 'text' could supplant it. And yet, for all its importance, the 'text' of the 'baptismal' creed (qua text) was far from unique. The very sense of its existence is first clearly attested in a period during which formal professions of faith proliferated, were copied on all sides, emended, circulated and

subscribed. These published creeds - 'fides conscriptae' - were not uncommonly advertised as having been composed 'according to the (baptismal) symbol', 'iuxta symbolum'. Some of them (notably the Nicene creed) even acquired the title of 'symbolum' themselves. Their structure was generally similar to that of the 'baptismal' creed, their phraseology frequently reminiscent of it. To consider all such written 'fides' as genetic descendants of a single, prototypical 'baptismal' creed may (or may not) be historically justifiable. What is certain is that the declaratory text associated with baptism came, in the course of time, to be recognized as the ideal type of Christian professions and summaries of the faith. One result of this process of idealisation is that remarks made by Christian 'litterati' concerning the nature and function of the 'symbolum (apostolorum)' are liable to have a wider reference than may at first appear. In assessing the literary-ideological significance of such remarks one should consider not only their relation to their ostensible object (the 'baptismal' creed) but also their possible bearing on other texts of similar type (creeds in general).

The order of the succeeding sections of this chapter will, it is hoped, acquire a certain logic in the light of the foregoing remarks. The first section is devoted to a study of extant Gallic 'expositiones symboli' (i.e. commentaries on the 'baptismal' creed) considered as evidence for a contemporary ideal of credal form and function. The following three sections then offer a wide variety of material relating to the reception and production of 'conciliar' and 'personal' creeds by

Gallic 'litterati' of the fourth and fifth centuries. The overall aim of the chapter is twofold: first, to indicate how commentary on existing creeds, 'ancient' and modern, may be seen to reflect a broadly consistent ideal of the dogmatic text 'in modum symboli' and, secondly, to draw attention to some of the experiments in early Gallic creed-making to which that ideal gave rise.

I. 'Expositiones symboli': the 'baptismal' creed as text

After Hilary of Poitiers (+367), whose testimony will be assessed separately,²¹ the first Gallic writer to provide clear evidence of contemporary attitudes towards the 'baptismal' creed is Cassian of Marseille. In the sixth book of his De incarnatione domini contra Nestorium, written in 429/30, Cassian confronts his adversary with the text of the creed that he (Nestorius) had received as a catechumen at Antioch, evoking the scene 'cum sacerdos symbolum respondenti et acclamanti populo dei traderet'(VI 11,1). (It is a curious fact that this, the first unambiguous reference by any Gallic author to the 'traditio symboli', occurs in the work of an émigré from the East and concerns the ceremony as performed in distant Syria.) He then proceeds to give an exposition of the text, designed to demonstrate the untenability of Nestorius' present position. Cassian may have been a priest at Antioch before coming to Gaul; elsewhere he acknowledges his debt to a former bishop of the see, John Chrysostom.²² Though it is unlikely that the particular version of the creed quoted in the De incarnatione was one to which Cassian would have referred when instructing the members of his monastery in Marseille, his willingness to invoke such a text for polemical purposes may conceivably reflect a common tendency in 'Massilian' theological method and/or pastoral practice.²³

Among those receptive to Cassian's teaching may be numbered Eucherius, who, in his second book of Instructiones (after 430) defines

'symbolum' as a 'conlatio aut pactum vel conplacitum quod sit homini cum deo'.²⁴ The sense of these expressions will be considered in due course. As bishop of Lyon, Eucherius would have been responsible for catechetical instruction and must have been in the habit of delivering sermons 'de symbolo'.²⁵ Unfortunately, it is impossible to point to any extant work of his on this subject. The same remark applies to his contemporary, Hilary, bishop of Arles from 429 to 449, who is reported to have published 'homiliae in totius anni festivitatis' and an 'expositio symboli'.²⁶ The description of the latter as 'ambienda' (i.e. to be sought after, worth reading) may suggest that it was still available to the saint's biographer in the third quarter of the fifth century, though Gennadius apparently knew nothing of it. Several attempts have been made to identify this work with extant texts of Gallic provenance.²⁷ According to one hypothesis, the remains of Hilary's 'expositio' are to be found in two sermons 'de symbolo' preserved in the collection attributed to 'Eusebius Gallicanus' (numbers 9 and 10).²⁸ The most that can be said for this suggestion is that it is not incompatible with what is currently known about the constitution of the 'collectio Eusebiana'.²⁹ If one accepts, however, that the collection contains material from diverse hands, 'edited' in south-eastern Gaul by one or more persons in the late fifth or early sixth century, then a number of other names present themselves as possible 'authors' of the texts in question - among them those of Eucherius, Salvian, Musaeus of Marseille, and Faustus of Riez, all of whom may be assumed to have composed elegant homilies 'de symbolo'.³⁰

Of the above-mentioned writers, the one most obviously associated with the pseudo-Eusebian corpus as a whole is Faustus (+ c.480). Arguments for considering the bishop of Riez and former abbot of Lérins as the sole or original author of the majority of the sermons attributed to 'Eusebius' have been canvassed at various times since the eighteenth century.³¹ The question of his possible involvement in the collection is particularly acute with regard to Sermon 9 'de symbolo', on account of a number of similarities of thought and expression between this work and passages in the authentically Faustian treatise De spiritu sancto.³² Gemadius' catalogue of Christian writers contains the following piece of information: 'Faustus... ex traditione symboli occasione accepta composuit librum de spiritu sancto, in quo ostendit eum iuxta fidem patrum et consubstantialiorem et coaeternalem esse patri et filio ac plenitudinem trinitatis obtinentem.'³³ As W. Bergmann has pointed out, the expression 'traditio symboli' must here refer to the form of words transmitted to the catechumen rather than (as is regularly the case elsewhere) to the act of transmission itself.³⁴ The particular 'occasion' of Faustus' work was an attempt made by certain heretics to impose an anti-Trinitarian interpretation on the part of the 'baptismal' creed dealing with the Holy Spirit. Accordingly, he begins his treatise with a number of reflections of a type natural to the contemporary 'expositio symboli' but most closely comparable to those found in the pseudo-Eusebian Sermon 9. Irrespective of whether or not Faustus was also the author of this sermon, or of an earlier version of it, it is reasonable to regard it as representative of attitudes towards the creed that were current in certain circles in the second half of the fifth century. The same may be safely asserted of its companion-piece,

pseudo-Eusebian Sermon 10. Closely related to pseudo-Eusebian Sermon 9, but posterior to it, is the so-called Tractatus s. Faustini de symbolo attributed to Faustus by Engelbrecht and printed by Glorie as an appendix to his edition of the 'collectio Eusebiana'.³⁵ Likewise dependent on the pseudo-Eusebian sermons 'de symbolo', though incorporating additional material, is a sermon falsely ascribed to Augustine (= ps.-Augustine, Sermo 242) which was included in a set of homilies for the various festivals of the year, compiled at Arles in the time of Caesarius of Arles.³⁶ According to G. Morin, the hand of Caesarius himself is to be detected in an 'expositio vel traditio symboli' found in an early Gallic liturgical collection, the so-called Missale gallicanum vetus.³⁷

If one adds to the items described above another sermon 'de symbolo' published by A.E. Burn and entitled (in the MS) Expositio de fide catholica,³⁸ one obtains the following list of texts that may be supposed to reflect ideas of the 'baptismal' creed entertained by fifth-century Gallic 'litterati' - and so also, in some measure, by the less well-educated persons to whom they regularly addressed themselves:

1. Cassian, De incarnatione VI 2-5
2. Eucherius, Instructiones II 15
3. Faustus, De spiritu sancto I 1
4. 'Eusebius Gallicanus', Homiliae 9 & 10
5. (Ps.-)Faustinus, Tractatus de symbolo
6. Ps.-Augustine, Sermo 242
7. Caesarius, Sermo 9 (ed. Morin)
8. Anonymous, Expositio de fide catholica

Comparison of these texts enables one to arrive at a broad consensus of ideas and opinions relating to the creed. That consensus may be conveniently represented in the form of a series of propositions.

1. The creed is a compilation

The equivalence 'symbolum' = 'collatio' is stated in two of the earliest Latin commentaries on the 'apostolic' creed, namely the Explanatio symboli attributed to Ambrose (+397) and the Expositio symboli ad Laurentium (404) of Rufinus of Aquileia.³⁹ It was based on a wilful confusion of the Greek words 'symbolon' (Lat. 'symbolum', pl. 'symbola') - meaning sign or token - and 'symbolē' (Lat. 'symbola') - meaning a collection or pooling of resources - and was probably adopted to harmonize with the legend of the collaborative composition of the creed by all twelve apostles.⁴⁰ Both legend and false etymology would seem to be products of the period immediately succeeding that in which the 'baptismal' creed became established in its declaratory form. As already noted, the word 'symbolum' had previously been applied to the ensemble of interrogations and responses constituting the main baptismal profession. The new etymology helped to justify a shift in the meaning of the term, while at the same time corroborating a legend that provided 'authors' for this newly-constituted Christian text. The first appearance of the 'collatio'-definition in Gallic Christian literature is in the De incarnatione of Cassian: 'symbolum quippe, ut scis, ex collatione nomen accepit, quod enim Graece symbolos [sic!] dicitur, Latine collatio nominatur.'⁴¹ It recurs in Eucherius' Instructiones (without further

explanation) and in pseudo-Eusebian Sermon 9 (whence it was copied by 'Faustinus'), and is hinted at in another of the sermons listed above.⁴² Eucherius also offers an alternative definition, based on one of the senses of the Greek 'symbolon' (= treaty, contract): 'symbolum est conlatio aut pactum vel conplacitum quod sit homini cum deo.' The idea of the 'baptismal' creed as the sign (Lat. 'signum') of a compact between God and man appears in a number of late-antique 'expositiones';⁴³ it is not, however, prominent in our extant Gallic texts.

2. It is derived from the Bible

For many Gallic writers, it seems, the definition of the creed as a 'collatio' also involved the notion that it was an abstract of various parts of the Bible. (The two ideas were not necessarily connected. For Ambrose and Rufinus, the composite nature of the creed derived exclusively from the fact that it had been compiled by the apostles working in committee.) Thus Cassian writes: 'collatio autem idea, quia... quidquid per universum divinorum voluminum corpus immensa funditur copia, totum in symbolo colligitur.' His words are echoed by Faustus and 'Eusebius'. The same point is made in pseudo-Augustinian Sermon 242 (though not by Caesarius).⁴⁴

The idea of the creed as a kind of biblical epitome first appears in a work by Niceta of Remesiana (the friend of Paulinus of Nola) who compares the 'symbolum' to a crown made up of the most precious gems.⁴⁵ It is much more fully developed by Augustine. In a sermon 'de symbolo',

the bishop of Hippo insists that there was nothing in the creed that was not already present in the Bible: 'Ista verba quae audistis, per divinas scripturas sparsa sunt, sed inde collecta et ad unum redacta... non nova vel inaudita sunt vobis.'⁴⁶ Augustine's confidence in the 'baptismal' creed as a source of Christian teaching parallel to the Bible is reflected in the use which he makes of it in his theological works, beginning with the De fide et symbolo (393).⁴⁷ According to Kattenbusch, his promotion of the credal text as a theological norm valid against all heresies played a large part in assuring its central place in subsequent western theology.⁴⁸ Among Gallic writers of the fifth century, recognition of the essentially biblical character of the 'baptismal' creed does not seem to have led to the same high estimation of its usefulness in doctrinal debate. Although both Cassian and Faustus treat the credal text as a theological norm, the latter's purpose (in the De spiritu sancto) is primarily to defend the 'traditio symboli' rather than to use it as an independent authority, while the former (in the De incarnatione) cites the creed only in the last resort, having already fully exploited the 'auctoritas divinatorum testimoniorum'.

In their appreciation of the composite character of the creed, Gallic writers appear to have been influenced less by theological than by aesthetic considerations. In place of Niceta's image of the jewelled crown, Faustus offers that of an unguent or medicine concocted of innumerable aromatic herbs that filled the world with its fragrance.⁴⁹ According to 'Eusebius', the creed was to be compared to the portrait of an ideal figure, composed of traits derived from many individuals, or to the treasure gathered in a single bag by a rich proprietor on the point

of quitting his estates for a far country ('migraturus ad alienam regionem').⁵⁰ All three images do justice to the idea of the 'baptismal' creed as a 'collatio', while at the same time heightening one's sense of its value and/or beauty. The image of the rich man's treasure - apart from its possible relevance to an age of widespread personal upheaval - lends special emphasis to another feature of this text on which all writers insist: its 'portability'.

3. Its brevity makes it easily memorable

The creed contained much, but in a small compass. Its dominant characteristic was its 'brevitas', variously designated as 'perfecta', 'conpendiosissima', 'plenissima' (Cassian), 'mira' (Faustus).⁵¹ It contained 'verba brevia et certa, expedita sententiis sed diffusa mysteriis... angusta sermonibus sed diversa sensibus' ('Eusebius', 'Faustinus').⁵² It was 'breve... verbis, sed magnum sacramentis: parvum ostendens imminutione latitudinis, sed totum continens compendio brevitatis' (ps.-Augustine), a 'salubre compendium' ('Eusebius', Caesarius), the 'verbum breviatum' mentioned in Romans 9,28: 'quia verbum breviatum faciet dominus super terram' (Cassian, 'Eusebius').⁵³ These qualities of brevity and plenitude are regularly alluded to by writers on the creed from the late fourth century onwards. They seem, however, to have held a particular fascination for Gallic 'litterati' of this period.

In Gaul, as elsewhere, the brevity of the creed was interpreted as a sign that it was meant to be memorised. It had been made concise, 'ut non laboraret utique quamvis simplex et inperita mens capere, quod possit facile etiam memoria continere' (Cassian).⁵⁴ Similar remarks appear in the sermons of 'Eusebius' and the pseudo-Augustine, while Caesarius lays it down as a principle, 'ut symbolum et oratio dominica a christianis omnibus teneatur.'⁵⁵ In the works of writers of the late fourth and early fifth centuries, when the conventions of the so-called 'disciplina arcani' were more or less rigorously observed, the injunction to memorise the creed is often accompanied by a caution against committing it to writing.⁵⁶ Traces of this prohibition are to be found in 'Eusebius'' statement that the creed was to be retained 'non in arca sed in memoria'; its words, he says, were to be written on the page of the mind ('mentium pagina inscribenda').⁵⁷

The object of memorising the creed was not simply to be able to 'render' it as part of a process of Christian initiation, but to have it continuously available as an object of meditation. 'Eusebius', following Niceta, Ambrose, Augustine and (no doubt) many others, exhorts his listeners to meditate on this brief text at all times and in all places, 'sive in secreto sive in publico, sive in domo sedentes sive in itinere gradientes.'⁵⁸

4. It is an instrument of personal salvation

The idea that a person's hopes of eternal life depended on his remaining true to his baptismal profession was, of course, common to all Christian writers of late antiquity. It helps to explain the importance attached by Hilary of Poitiers to what he calls the 'symbolum regenerationis suae'.⁵⁹ With the advent of declaratory creeds, the ideas of 'faith' and 'confession' came increasingly to be associated with the contents of a particular text. From the late fourth century onwards, 'fides', 'confessio' (less often 'professio') and 'symbolum' are used almost interchangeably as titles both of the 'baptismal' creeds of particular churches and of (written) declarations of faith, for whatsoever reason composed. Through its close association with the rite of baptism (cf. 'symbolum' in its earlier sense), the creed took on the character of a 'saving confession' ('salutaris confessio'). This particular expression is used by Niceta of Remesiana, who considered that the creed provided a person with 'sufficientem sibi scientiam salutarem'.⁶⁰ For Augustine, the 'baptismal' creed was both a 'regula fidei' and a 'regula salutis'; like many other expositors of this period, he makes constant appeals to Romans 10,10: 'Corde enim creditur ad iustitiam, ore autem confessio fit in salutem'.⁶¹ For Maximus of Turin, the creed was the key to the kingdom of heaven, while Peter Chrysologus calls it a 'pactum vitae, salutis placitum' (a definition echoed by Eucherius).⁶²

The 'salutary' quality of the creed is emphasised in the opening sentence of pseudo-Eusebian Sermon 10: 'Fides religionis catholicae, lumen est animae, ostium vitae, fundamentum salutis aeternae' (where, as

the context makes clear, 'fides' refers primarily to the creed).⁶³

These phrases are taken up again by Caesarius in a sermon in which he also describes the creed as a 'credulitatis salubre compendium'.⁶⁴ It is easy to see how adjectives such as 'salubre' and 'salutare' came to be applied to the 'symbolum'; as the fixed expression of a saving faith, the creed was naturally regarded as a saving text. Recognition of this fact may assist one in interpreting the peculiarly Gallic designation of the credal text as a 'carmen'.

The words 'salutare carmen' (of the 'symbolum') are found once in a work of Faustus, while the expression 'vitale carmen' is used twice in the same connection by 'Eusebius' and Caesarius.⁶⁵ Attempts to elucidate this usage exclusively in terms of the supposed poetic qualities of the creed overlook both the wide range of possible senses of the Latin word 'carmen' and the ideological context in which it appears.⁶⁶

According to the OLD, in addition to meaning 'song' or 'poem' (religious or secular), 'carmen' could also have the sense of (a) 'a magical chant, spell or incantation', (b) 'an oracle or prophecy', or (c) 'a legal or ceremonial formula or pronouncement'. One can imagine how the creed might be considered as a 'carmen' in sense (c) (cf. 'sacramentum').

Caesarius' use of the phrase 'vitalis carminis oraculum' suggests, moreover, that associations with sense (b) ought not to be ruled out. Finally, one should consider the precise context in which 'carmen' is employed by Faustus:

...ita [apostolica sollicitudo] in symboli salutare carmen
mira brevitae [fidem] collegit et tamquam dispersas
remediorum species disposuit in corpus unum...

Used in the sense (a) of a spell or incantation, 'carmen' frequently has negative connotations, especially in the works of Christian authors. The positive notion of a (magical) remedy for some physical or psychological ailment is, however, well attested.⁶⁷ It is conceivable that Faustus' use of the image of the panacea was connected with some such idea.⁶⁸ The creed - strictly speaking, the faith which it expressed - was a 'cure' for man's mortal condition; on this point all our expositors would have been in agreement. The above passage from the De spiritu sancto cannot, of course, be held to prove that the word 'carmen', as used in relation to the 'symbolum', was regularly understood to mean a remedy. One might suppose, nevertheless, that the appearance in several of these Gallic texts of the expression 'salutaris / vitalis carmen' was motivated, in part at least, by the sense of an analogy between the healing or life-restoring potency traditionally ascribed to certain magical formulae and the special saving power commonly attributed to the 'baptismal' creed.⁶⁹

5. The immediate authors of the creed were the Apostles and/or the Fathers

For many earlier expositors of the creed, the question of its authorship did not arise. As far as they were concerned, this 'text' formed part of the ancient (i.e. ultimately apostolic) tradition of the church and no more needed attribution than the baptismal formulae or the so-called 'Rule of Faith'. This group of commentators includes Niceta and Augustine, both of whom viewed the 'baptismal' creed as a kind of biblical

epitome but saw no reason to enquire into its origins. Others, as was noted earlier, sought to account for the new text by means of a pious fiction. According to Rufinus, the creed had been composed by the apostles after Pentecost, 'conferendo in unum quod sentiebat unusquisque'.⁷⁰ The spurious etymology 'symbolum' = 'collatio' was naturally urged in support of this theory. (One interesting consequence of the legend of apostolic authorship was the creation of a sacred text outside the canon of Scripture. Ambrose - assuming that he is the author of the Explanatio symboli - refers to the creed at one point as 'scriptura divina'.)⁷¹

A new departure is signalled by Cassian who, apparently combining elements from two different traditions, arrives at the idea of the 'baptismal' creed as a 'collatio de scripturis'.⁷² According to the abbot of St. Victor, the creed had both divine and human authority: it had been devised by God ('deus fecit'), through the agency of men ('per homines').⁷³ On the question of the identity of these men he appears to equivocate, twice mentioning the apostles alone, and once - in the following passage - assigning authors' rights more widely:

Sicut enim immensam illam scripturarum sacrarum copiam per patriarchas et prophetas maxime suos condidit [deus], ita symbolum per apostolos suos sacerdotesque constituit, et quidquid illic per suos larga ac redundanti copia dilatavit, idem hic per suos plenissima brevitae conclusit.⁷⁴

Why should Cassian attribute composition of the creed jointly to the apostles and to 'bishops' ? Apart from his desire to complete a parallel with the 'patriarchs and prophets' of the Old Testament, it is likely that he was influenced by the fact that the version of the creed

that he was quoting contained several terms (including the celebrated 'homousios') for which there was no obvious apostolic warrant. As an easterner, moreover, he would doubtless have been aware of the large number of written creeds produced in the previous century and may have found it difficult to subscribe the theory of an exclusively apostolic creed.

Cassian's ideas on the composition of the creed attracted the attention of at least one of his Gallic contemporaries. The opening sentences of Faustus' De spiritu sancto contain a manifest 'retractatio' of the passage just quoted from the De incarnatione:

Fides catholica in universum mundum per patriarchas prophetas et gratiae dispensatores, spiritu sancto insinuante, diffusa est. Hanc apostolica sollicitudo atque perfectio sicut per sacras paginas dilataverat, ita in symboli salutare carmen mira brevitae collegit...

Unlike Cassian, Faustus makes specific provision for the composition of the New Testament. He is also careful to exclude the 'sacerdotes' invoked by his predecessor in connection with the creed. Instead of the parallel established by Cassian between the literary activity of the patriarchs and prophets (as composers of the Old Testament) and that of the apostles and bishops (as composers of the creed), one finds the authorship of both biblical and credal texts ascribed to the action of an abstract 'apostolica sollicitudo atque perfectio'. One ought not to deduce from this that Faustus was opposed to Cassian's theory of the joint apostolic and patristic composition of the creed.⁷⁵ Intent on resisting what he regarded as an arbitrary re-casting of one of the articles of the credal text, the author of the De spiritu sancto was

unlikely to draw attention to any supposed post-apostolic influence on its redaction. Had he wished to take a stand on apostolic authorship in the literal and exclusive sense implied by the legend (as recounted by Rufinus and others), he could have stated the matter more clearly than he does. As it is, no sooner has he evoked the (apostolic) perfection of the 'baptismal' creed than he seeks to bolster its authority by appealing to the '318 bishops' of the Council of Nicaea.⁷⁶ Subsequent references to the creed as 'derived from' and 'dependent upon' the Bible further detract from the idea that it was the exclusive product of first-century apostolic 'sollicitudo'.⁷⁷ There is no difficulty, in fact, in supposing that Faustus was in sympathy with the view expressed by Cassian. The manner in which he commences the De spiritu sancto is perhaps best explained as a tactic adopted by one obliged to defend a particular reading of the creed against persons who - like himself - considered the text in question to be at least partly the work of bishops or other successors of the apostles. Since his opponents were apparently also inhabitants of Gaul, this interpretation enables one to suppose that the idea of post-apostolic collaboration on the creed was fairly widely held in the province at the time.

For an unambiguous statement on this subject, one may turn to pseudo-Eusebian Sermon 9. This sermon begins with a conventional reminder of the equivalence 'symbolum' = 'collatio', then continues:

Ita et ecclesiarum patres, de populorum salute solliciti, ex diversis voluminibus scripturarum collegerunt testimonia divinis gravida sacramentis: disponentes itaque ad animarum pastum salubre convivium, collegerunt verba brevia et certa expedita sententiis sed diffusa mysteriis, et hoc symbolum nominaverunt.⁷⁸

A little further on in the same work, the compilers of the creed are referred to as 'ecclesiarum magistri, studiosissimi salutis nostrae negotiatores'.⁷⁹ Since there is no indication that these 'magistri' or 'patres' are the apostles, they are presumably to be identified with the 'sacerdotes' mentioned by Cassian - i.e. the leaders of the church in the post-apostolic age, working together (in council ?) as biblical epitomators. This inference would seem to be confirmed by a corrective addition made in the version of the same remarks attributed to 'Faustinus', according to whom the creed was compiled by the 'apostoli et ecclesiarum patres'.⁸⁰ It is worth noting, too, that the image of the Christian pastor as a 'negotiator', engaged in spiritual commerce on behalf of himself and his congregation, was one commonly employed by 'Lerinian' writers, usually with a contemporary reference.⁸¹

*

The idea that the composition of a 'saving text' could be partly, if not wholly, attributable to certain 'bishops' or 'fathers' is easily related to a period in which concise, memorable statements of the faith were constantly circulating under the names of councils or of individual churchmen. The legend of the purely apostolic composition of the 'baptismal' creed would doubtless have impressed the mass of illiterate believers in places where it was promoted. For those who had access to Christian texts, however, the continuing production and authorisation of creed-like statements was bound to prompt reflection on the relation

between faith and (written) words. Such reflection may have led some Christians to doubt the adequacy of their own baptismal professions. In others it may have inspired a sense of the relative merits of different formulas. For many Gallic 'litterati', it seems, the realisation that the essentials of their faith could be set forth in a variety of ways, each one potentially useful and 'saving', led to a desire to compose and publish doctrinal professions of their own and to collect those that reached them from elsewhere. Having obtained a view of 'orthodox' responses to the 'baptismal' creed, it may therefore be useful to consider how such attitudes were related to contemporary practice in the reception and production of texts of similar type.

Gallic sources for the period to c.480 offer three main kinds of material for a study of this kind. First, there is limited evidence of initial reaction to the promulgation of conciliar 'fides' during the Arian controversy, to be found mainly in the works of Hilary of Poitiers. Secondly, there are several texts (including the Commonitorium of Vincent of Lérins, already studied in the previous chapter) that bear directly on the problems of fifth-century Christological definition. Finally, it is possible to point to a number of extant creeds or creed-like statements (besides those issued by popes or councils) that may be supposed to have circulated in Gaul during the fifth century - some of them apparently of Gallic composition. Each of these three types of evidence will be considered in turn in the following sections of this chapter. From them, it is hoped, will emerge a composite picture of the Christian writer as reader and deviser of credal texts.

II. Hilary of Poitiers and fourth-century conciliar creeds

In the spring of 358 a number of Gallic bishops met and condemned a recent declaration on the faith made by the Council of Sirmium (357).⁸² Included in that declaration, which had been published in Latin, was a prohibition on the use in Trinitarian discussion of the words 'homousios' (Gk. 'homouousios') and 'homoeusios' (Gk. 'homoiousios'), the former of which had, of course, appeared in the Nicene creed.⁸³ The Gallic bishops' rejection of this text was probably the result of pressure brought to bear by their absent colleague, Hilary of Poitiers, then living as an exile in Asia Minor.⁸⁴ In informing Hilary of their resolution, they asked him for details of other declarations of faith produced by eastern councils over the previous thirty years.⁸⁵ His answer to this request took the form of a letter containing extensive discussion of the theory and practice of conciliar creed-making, known as the De synodis or De fide orientalium.

Despite a promise to reproduce and expound all the conciliar creeds published since 325 (7: 'omnes fides quae post sanctam synodum Nicaenam diversis temporibus et locis editae sunt'), the author of the De synodis presents only a selection, concentrating on those texts which best assisted his design of encouraging a rapprochement between the anti-Arian faction in the West and the moderate or 'homoiousian' interest in the East. In the interpretations which he offers of these documents, he can be seen to minimise the differences in theology that might be claimed to separate the two parties.⁸⁶ At the same time, he seeks to

justify the eastern practice of issuing written statements of belief. The average Gallic churchman of c.358 would, it seems, have been seriously disconcerted by the idea of publishing the 'faith' in written form, and still further dismayed by the recent multiplication of 'fides conscriptae'. In replying to possible objections on both these scores, Hilary exhibits a large measure of sympathy with his western colleagues. The ambivalence of his position - manifested in other works besides the De synodis - makes his remarks particularly interesting for a study of early attitudes towards creeds.⁸⁷

Of the numerous conciliar 'fides' promulgated since 325, few, if any, seem to have circulated in Gaul before c.355.⁸⁸ In an often-quoted remark, which appears towards the end of the De synodis, Hilary recalls that he had only become aware of the Nicene creed on the eve of his departure into exile (91: 'fidem Nicaenam numquam nisi exsulaturus audivi'). There is no way of knowing for sure how this text came to his attention or what other documents he would then have been able to consult. It would appear, however, that he shortly afterwards made it his business to become acquainted with the products of recent conciliar creed-making. Some time before leaving Gaul in 356 (on the traditional view), or while living as exile in Phrygia in 357/8 (as has lately been argued), Hilary composed an account of the recent proceedings against himself and other anti-Arian bishops - the so-called Liber primus adversus Valentem et Ursacium - into which he inserted a number of documents relating to earlier stages of the controversy.⁸⁹ Among the texts included were the creed of Nicaea and that promulgated by the eastern bishops at Serdica in 343.⁹⁰

earlier chapter, was that one should talk about God in language provided by the Bible: 'de deo [loqui] dei verbis'.⁹³ This assumption was perfectly compatible with a respect for the form of words used in the baptismal liturgy, since those words were derived from Christ's command in St. Matthew's Gospel: '"Euntes nunc docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti"' (Matthew 28,19).⁹⁴ Citing this verse at the beginning of Book Two of the De trinitate, Hilary comments:

Quid enim in eo de sacramento salutis humanae non continetur ? Aut quid est quod sit reliquum aut obscurum ? Plena sunt omnia ut a pleno et perfecto profecta. Nam et verborum significationem et efficientiam rerum et negotiorum ordinem et naturae intelligentiam conpraehendunt.
(II 1,7-12)

In normal circumstances, such a perfect statement of the essence of Christian religion would have required no gloss; its implications were beyond human expression. However, the behaviour of certain heretics had now brought about a situation in which some additional comment was called for: 'ut quae contineri religione mentium oportuissent, nunc in periculum humani eloqui proferantur' (ibid. 2,7-9). Hilary was thus obliged to give voice to his religious conscience. A similar thought lies behind the De synodis. While emphasising the difficulty involved in the expression of religious belief (5: 'cum difficillimum sit sensum... fidei secundum intelligentiae interioris affectum loquendo proferre'), the writer admits the present necessity of expounding ('exponere') and inscribing ('[con]scribere') the faith: 'ubi enim sensus conscientiae periclitatur, illic littera postulatur. Nec sane scribi impedit, quod salutare est confiteri' (63). This justification is clearly meant to apply equally to his own attempt to expound his

For the majority of Hilary's Gallic readers, one must suppose, the news of the existence of these texts would have come as a complete surprise. The innocence of his fellow bishops in such matters is celebrated in the De synodis:

Sed inter haec, o beatos vos in domino et gloriosos, qui perfectam atque apostolicam fidem conscientiae professione retinentes, conscriptas fides huc usque nescitis! Non enim eguistis littera, qui spiritu abundabitis. Neque officium manus ad scribendum desiderastis, qui quod corde a vobis credebatur, ore ad salutem profitebamini [cf. Romans 10,10]. Nec necessarium habuistis episcopi legere, quod regenerati neophyti tenebatis. (63)

Nothing in these persons' previous experience had prepared them for the possibility that their faith might have to be set down in writing. In making this point, Hilary apparently refers to a creed learnt at the time of baptism. To what extent he conceived of this (pre-)baptismal profession as a 'text' analogous to the written creeds that he was now considering is open to question. It was certainly not a text that he felt able to reproduce; as noted by Coutant, his remarks hint at a ban on committing the 'baptismal' creed to writing, of the kind invoked in later 'expositiones symboli'.⁹¹ Unlike the authors of such later works, however, Hilary does not appear to have felt it incumbent upon him to explain the particular form of words used in the baptismal profession. His concern is rather to find words in which to express his baptismal faith. The De synodis is not an 'expositio symboli' but an 'expositio fidei', in which a number of previous 'expositiones fidei' are passed in review.⁹²

The problem of the expression of religious belief was one of Hilary's constant preoccupations. His basic premise, as observed in an

beliefs in writing (65: 'quantum humani sermonis consuetudo patiebatur') and to the regular practice of oriental synods: 'necessitas consuetudinem intulit, exponi fides, et expositis subscribi' (63).

On the view expressed in the De synodis, the eastern habit of issuing written creeds and definitions was to be explained partly as a consequence of the emergence of new kinds of error, each of which had to be carefully excluded in its turn (39; 62-63), and partly by the fact that no single expression of the Christian faith - least of all one as brief as the average conciliar pronouncement - could be expected to comprehend its subject:

Non enim infinitus et immensus deus brevibus humani sermonis eloquiis vel intelligi potuit, vel ostendi. Fallit enim plerumque et audientes et docentes brevitatis verborum: et compendio sermonum aut non intelligi potest quod requiritur, aut etiam corrumpitur quod significatum magis quam enarratum rationis absolute non constat. (62)

On account of this difficulty, the eastern bishops had been obliged to multiply their declarations, 'ut... de divinis rebus nihil aut periculosum aut obscurum... loquerentur' (ibid.) Though intended to help justify the publication of such texts, Hilary's remarks about the constraints of brevity amount to a fundamental criticism of the 'genre' of the conciliar creed. Proceeding to explain the sense of the controversial terms 'homousios' and 'homoeusios', he states the following general principle: 'in his igitur tot et tam gravibus fidei periculis, verborum brevitatis temperanda est' (69). Christ's command to his disciples concerning the proper form of baptism may indeed have been commendably brief, while also encapsulating the sense of the Christian faith; when ordinary men attempted to express their faith in their own

words they ought to be wary of the 'sermo brevis ac nudus' (70). In putting forward a summary of his own belief regarding the relations between the Father and the Son (64: 'Confitemur... et scribimus... non deos duos, sed deum unum, etc.'), Hilary lays stress on the inadequacy of his words (65). He also asks repeatedly that his 'expositio fidei' - that is, the De synodis - be considered as a whole (6, 66, 92). Commencing the De trinitate, he prays that his work may be blessed with a number of special qualities of expression and, above all, that he may be enabled to utter what he believes (II 2,1: 'ut quod credimus et loquamur'); at no point does he ask for the gift of brevity.

Though prepared to justify the fashion for 'fides conscriptae', the author of the De synodis nowhere pretends that they are indispensable. The fact that many of his colleagues in Gaul had never previously had any use for them is interpreted as a sign of divine blessing (63). He himself had only recently become acquainted with the Nicene creed and the technical terminology of 'substance': 'sed mihi homousii et homoeousii intelligentiam evangelia et apostoli intimaverunt' (91). The idea that a text compiled by a council of bishops in 325 could contain anything relevant to the Christian faith that was not already implicit in the Bible would have run contrary to Hilary's convictions concerning divine 'eruditio'.⁹⁵ These convictions determine the nature of his initial response to the Nicene creed. They also explain why, at a given moment, he was able to dispense with all such documents.

The earliest evidence of Hilary's reaction to the creed of Nicaea is provided by a chapter in the Liber primus adversus Valentem et

Ursacium, written within a short time of his own first encounter with the text in question.⁹⁶ Here he presents the action of the 'three hundred or more' bishops who attended the council as in direct continuity with that of the apostles, whose concern to ensure the purity of the faith had led them to compose letters in which was clearly laid down 'quae de deo patre opinio, quae de dei filio cognitio, quae in spiritu sancto sanctificatio oporteret esse' (B II 9,5). Arius and his followers had failed to respect the second element in this apostolic teaching; it had therefore to be reasserted by the 'apostolici viri' or 'patres' of a later age:

Itaque comprimendi mali istius causa trecenti vel eo amplius episcopi apud Nicheam congregantur. In omnes Arrianos adsensu omnium damnatio heretica decernitur et evolūtis evangelicis atque apostolicis doctrinis perfectum unitatis catholicae lumen effertur. Quid igitur fuerit expressum, fides ipsa, ut est exposita, commendat. [There follows a Latin version of the Nicene creed, including its anathemas]
(B II 9,7)

Hilary insists on the biblical tenor of the Nicene declaration. It was, he claims, the direct product of a 'reading' (cf. 'evolvere' above) of the New Testament; despite the appearance of certain new words, it added nothing to what was already believed in the West on the basis of an essentially biblical 'eruditio' (cf. B II 11,1: 'occidentalium fides evangelicis instituta doctrinis'). He also stresses its formal perfection as an instrument for excluding heresy: 'fides... quae apud Nicheam ordinata est, plena atque perfecta est' (B II 11,1), 'diligens Nicheni tractatus perfectusque sermo artissimo veritatis praescripto omnia haereticorum ingenia conclusit' (B II 11,5). Finally, he draws attention to its sacramental and 'saving' quality: 'sacramenta salutis nostrae in his continentur' (ibid.) With one important qualification,

all these themes recur in the fifth-century 'expositiones symboli' studied in the previous section of this chapter.⁹⁷ They are likewise fundamental to the theory and practice of fifth-century Gallic creed-making, evidence for which will be considered in due course.

As expressed in the De synodis and the Liber primus adversus Valentem et Ursacium, Hilary's approval of conciliar 'fides' is clearly conditional. These texts had a certain utility as confirmation of a biblical and baptismal faith, in a situation where that faith was under threat. If everyone were able to understand the Bible aright, there would be no call for conciliar pronouncements. Equally, if such pronouncements ceased to fulfil their proper function - or usurped functions not properly theirs - they would cease to have any justification. This last point is made forcefully in another of Hilary's works, the so-called Liber ad Constantium, composed towards the end of 359 and addressed to the Arianizing emperor Constantius II.⁹⁸ Here the writer opposes the current 'usus scribendae fidei' (4,3) on the grounds that those responsible for successive drafts had lost sight of the common faith professed at baptism. Since Nicaea, he drily remarks, the composition of creeds had become the most popular of all kinds of literary activity (5,1: 'nihil aliud quam fidem scribi'). New 'faiths' appeared at annual intervals. Everyone was anxious to know what the latest creed contained. It was as though the unwritten baptismal faith had been forgotten or superseded:

...facta est fides temporum potius quam evangeliorum, dum et secundum annos scribitur et secundum confessionem baptismi non tenetur. (4,3) ...Fides quaeritur, quasi fides nulla sit. Fides scribenda est, quasi in corde non sit. Regenerati per fidem nunc ad fidem docemur, quasi regeneratio illa sine fide sit. (6,1)

Earlier, Hilary had presented the literary activity of the Council of Nicaea as a natural extension of that of the apostles. Now the pretension of successive groups of bishops to have formulated an 'apostolic' faith ('fides apostolica') was to be confronted with the one genuinely 'evangelical' faith contained in Christ's baptismal command (Matthew 28,19) and professed by every Christian (both before and) at his baptism ('fides evangelica') (6,2). In the face of the current tempest of doctrinal controversy the only safe course of action lay in a return to this original confession (7,1: 'primam et solam evangelicam fidem confessam in baptismo intellectamque retinere nec demutare'). Such an attitude, the author claims, implied no disrespect for the work of the fathers of Nicaea; it was merely the result of a recognition of the unsatisfactory state-of-affairs brought about by repeated and unnecessary attempts to 'emend' the text which they had promulgated.

Hilary concludes his appeal to Constantius with a request that he be allowed to expound the faith in person, made in accordance with his conception of the role of the Christian writer/orator:

Rogo, ut praesente synodo, quae nunc de fide litigat, pauca
me de scripturis evangelicis digneris audire et loquar tecum
verbis domini mei Iesu Christi, cuius vel exsul sum vel
sacerdos... Fidem, imperator, quaeris: audi eam, non de
novis cartulis, sed de dei libris. (8,1-12)

As a sample of the speech that the emperor would hear on that future occasion, he then offers a biblical improvisation on what would appear to have been a declaratory creed associated with the rite of baptism (11,1). With due respect for the definitions of the 'patres', this (he

says) is what he had to affirm, on the basis of his baptismal 'symbol' and the knowledge that he had acquired through the medium of the Bible, 'secundum regenerationis meae symbolum et doctrinae evangelicae scientiam' (11,2).

*

The writings of Hilary (like those of his contemporary, Marius Victorinus) represent a critical phase in the development of western attitudes towards creeds. They display a willingness to cite and discuss eastern conciliar creeds for the benefit of a Gallic audience, without concealing the author's strong sense of allegiance to the unwritten baptismal profession currently in use in Gaul (and elsewhere). They show how a privileged observer of the theological controversies of the mid-fourth century could reconcile his conviction of the unique status of the Bible as source and standard of Christian utterance with respect for a dogmatic text such as that produced by the fathers of Nicaea, even while retaining his suspicion of all recent pronouncements 'de fide'. They offer recognition of the occasional value of concise, written summaries of Trinitarian doctrine, tempered by a warning against the dangers, in matters of this kind, of excessive brevity and over-reliance on writing. In short, they disclose a tension between an ideal of religious understanding and expression that no human text could ever realise and the practical exigencies of theological debate. That such a tension should emerge from the writings of a fourth-century bishop of

Poitiers is largely a matter of historical accident; neither in the quality of his reflection on religious expression nor in his experience of theological controversy can Hilary be accounted a typical Gallic 'litteratus' of his time. One has only to compare his thoughts on creeds with those of his contemporary and compatriot, Phoebadius of Agen, to realise the exceptional nature of his achievement. That said, the Contra Arrianos of Phoebadius also reveals a definite stage in Gallic reception of the idea of a written creed; part of the interest of the work (at least for the modern reader) lies in the manner in which the author uses material derived from Hilary.⁹⁹ The same observation applies to the remarks concerning 'fides conscriptae' made almost half a century later by the Aquitanian Sulpicius Severus, in the part of his Chronicle that deals with the Arian crisis.¹⁰⁰ Unfortunately, the evidence relating to Gallic attitudes towards creeds and creed-making in the closing years of the fourth century is too scanty for any worthwhile general survey to be possible. Only with the beginnings of Christological controversy in the second and third decades of the fifth century do our sources again permit an insight into this complex area of Christian reading-and-writing.

III. Gallic writers and fifth-century Christological definition

1. Cassian and the Fides Leporii

Gallic involvement in the controversy provoked by the Christological teaching of the new patriarch of Constantinople, Nestorius, dates from almost the earliest stage of western awareness of the issue. In late 429 a dossier of 'Nestoriana' was forwarded by the Roman archdeacon (and future pope) Leo to Cassian in Marseille, apparently with instructions for the composition of a polemical treatise 'contra Nestorium'.¹⁰¹

Cassian may have become known to Leo during one or more visits that he had made to Rome a number of years earlier, before taking up residence in Provence.¹⁰² A talented writer who combined mastery of Greek with first-hand experience of eastern ecclesiastical affairs, he would have seemed an obvious choice as author of a work which would both provide support for the anti-Nestorian stance shortly to be taken by the Roman authorities and offer a caution against Christological heterodoxy in the West.¹⁰³

Cassian begins the De incarnatione domini contra Nestorium with a list of the most famous Christological and Trinitarian heresies of the first four centuries (I 2). He then alludes to an additional form of error, '[quam] nuper... id est in diebus nostris emersisse ex maxima Belgarum urbe conspeximus' (I 2,4). This most recent heresy is described as a descendant of Ebionism (in that it denied the divinity of

Christ) and of Pelagianism (in that it asserted the ability of man to obtain salvation by his own merit, 'sine adiutorio dei') (I 3). As the sequel shows, these are precisely the characteristics that Cassian attributes to 'Nestorianism'.¹⁰⁴ His immediate concern in Book One, however, is not with Nestorius himself but with one whom he presents as 'apud Gallias assertor praedictae haereseos aut inter primos aut inter maximos' - namely a certain Leporius (I 4,2).¹⁰⁵ The latter, having been admonished of his errors in Gaul, is said to have despatched a written 'confession' from Africa - 'ubi tunc erat atque nunc est' - for circulation in the former province: 'ut ubi deviatio eius prius cognita erat, illic etiam emendatio nosceretur' (I 4,3). Cassian evidently had a copy of this confession in his possession, since he announces that he will insert a number of excerpts from it ('nonnulla inserenda') into the present treatise: 'ut [haec] correctio... et nobis testimonio et his qui mutant exemplo esset' (I 5,1). There follow four passages of quotation without commentary, amounting to a total of three printed pages in the Vienna edition, or exactly a third of Book One. If one discounts an initial passage of (exemplary) self-castigation, the texts quoted provide a more or less continuous statement of current western orthodox belief in the union of the two natures in Christ. This form of words, Cassian observes, had been approved by both African and Gallic bishops and could therefore be regarded as an expression of the 'fides omnium catholicorum'; to dissent from it was to admit heresy (I 6,1-2).

Occurring as it does at the outset of a work in which the author argues mainly from scriptural authority (II-V) and then from that of the 'baptismal' creed (VI), this endorsement of the written testimony of an

obscure and manifestly fallible theologian strikes the modern reader as somewhat adventurous. There are no obvious precedents for it in other Latin theological works of this period. Two factors, one may suppose, would have combined to recommend such a proceeding in the present case. First, as Cassian himself is at pains to point out, Leporius' confession had been sanctioned by a number of bishops (if not as many as he appears to imply).¹⁰⁶ It could therefore be regarded as having a certain general validity, comparable, say, to that of the professions received from recanting heretics during the Arian controversy and quoted by writers such as Hilary of Poitiers. Secondly, the text in question was almost certainly one of very few Christological summaries currently available in Latin. Though Cassian (not surprisingly) says nothing explicit to this effect, the prominent place which he assigns to Leporius' statement in his treatise and the respectful manner in which he reproduces it strongly suggest that his approval of the author's revised theology was matched by an awareness of the potential didactic value of his literary 'testimonium'. If so, his judgment was to be backed by that of many others. In the course of the fifth and early sixth centuries the text of Leporius' confession was cited on more than half a dozen occasions by writers concerned to establish the orthodox consensus 'de incarnatione domini'.¹⁰⁷ Given the celebrity of this doctrinal statement, it may be worth studying more closely the circumstances of its production. Such study is made possible by the survival (in a single medieval manuscript) of a complete text of the original document, first published by Sirmond in 1630.

According to Cassian, the author of the Libellus emendationis (as it is generally called) was a monk who had since become a priest (I 4,2). From his earlier reference to the emergence of a heresy 'ex maxima Belgarum urbe' it has been inferred that Leporius was a native of Trier.¹⁰⁸ From there, it seems, he travelled south, perhaps as a refugee of the barbarian invasion of 406. In view of Cassian's interest in his case and the fact that the Libellus is addressed to the bishops Proculus (of Marseille) and Cillenius (see unknown), it may be assumed that he was active in promoting his theological opinions in Provence. It is possible that he was a member of a monastery in or near Marseille.¹⁰⁹ From a letter addressed to Proculus and Cillenius in the name of Aurelius of Carthage, Augustine of Hippo and two of their African colleagues, we learn that he was reproached by the local Gallic bishops for professing false doctrine and, proving intransigent, subsequently excommunicated.¹¹⁰ Accompanied by two sympathisers, he next sought refuge in north Africa, where, as a result of the efforts of Augustine and others, he was finally induced to admit his error and made a formal profession of faith before a synod at Carthage in 418. It is a slightly modified text of that profession - addressed to Proculus and Cillenius and subscribed by Leporius, his two companions and the four African bishops previously mentioned - that forms the Libellus.

The natural title for this document would be Fides Leporii. After an initial explanation of the nature and circumstances of his former error (1 - 3,14), the author produces a closely-argued doctrinal statement (3,15 - 7,22), beginning with the words: 'Ergo confitemur dominum ac deum nostrum Iesum Christum, unicum filium dei...' and

followed by the assertion: 'Haec fides nostra... sic credimus, sic tenemus.'¹¹¹ He then provides a detailed refutation of two particular misconceptions for which he had been criticised, before rounding off the central section of his statement, as he had begun it, with an amplified paraphrase of elements of the Christological part of the 'baptismal' creed: 'ita ipsum proprie in eadem carne credo esse venturum ad faciendum iudicium in vivos et mortuos, atque ab eodem pro merito proprio unumquemque sempiternum habere praemium' (10,4ff). There follows a brief rejection of one further error, a reference to other disputed points ('quaestiones') dealt with in a prior consultation, an anathema of several major heresies, and a plea for forgiveness (10,8 - 11,12). Stripped of its more personal elements, the text of the Libellus may thus be reduced to the form [Credo + anathemas] that underlies the majority of conciliar and personal 'fides conscriptae' from the time of the Council of Nicaea onwards.

Leporius expresses openly his sense of dependence on a pre-existent credal text; his confession was made, he says, 'iuxta symboli veritatem' (2,18). The strenuously rhetorical and dialectical style in which he expands the Christological part of the 'baptismal' creed does, it is true, somewhat obscure the 'symbolic' character of his declaration - a fact that may help to explain why it is that, despite the enthusiasm shown by later writers for certain sections of the Libellus, the work as a whole did not find its way into any major collection of dogmatic texts.¹¹² Nevertheless, there are indications that one of the author's principal aims, besides securing his religious rehabilitation, was to produce a lucid and coherent statement of the true faith concerning

Christ's Incarnation. His awareness of the literary and technical aspects of his undertaking is revealed in references to an earlier composition, namely the one that had first brought him into disrepute (2,1: 'auctor scandali et offendiculum caritatis'). This work, described as a 'letter' (ibid.), is said to have consisted of 'sententiae' (10,12) and to have included biblical 'testimonia' (9,17 - cf. 7,1). Its doctrinal content is referred to as 'prior definitio nostra' (2,18). The present composition, one may infer, was conceived as constituting - or rather, as contributing to - a revised 'definition'. The relationship between the two texts is evoked in concrete terms at the beginning of the Libellus:

Epistola itaque, auctor scandali et offendiculum caritatis, a me quondam simpliciter scripta quidem, sed in quibusdam, ut agnosco, infideliter ordinata, quaeso, secundum huius epistolae professionem et sanctimoniae vestrae auctoritatem, ut in ea paginae parte vel causa in abolitione calcanda ducatur, in qua contra veritatem et per ignorantiam edita comprobatur, ut cunctis innotescat et pateat iusto iudicio illud, quod erat aemulum fidei, contrarium veritati, de corpore eiusdem epistolae cum damnatione esse decism.

(2,1-9)

One may deduce from this passage that Leporius' previous public statement - of which no other trace remains - was not concerned exclusively with questions of Christology. Conceivably, it took the form of a general treatment of the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation. Though apparently argumentative in tone, it had been kept within the compass of a letter (cf. 'pagina') and may have been intended as a summary of the faith (hence 'definitio'). That this earlier composition had been most carefully constructed is suggested both by the author's regrets concerning those elements in it that he had since come to recognize as infelicitously drafted ('in quibusdam... infideliter

ordinata')¹¹³ and, most strikingly, by his obvious reluctance to withdraw the text as a whole. In his own mind, it seems, the present statement amounted to no more than a corrigendum or partial 'retractatio' of the previous work: by subscribing this revision, the Gallic bishops would, in effect, be joining with their African colleagues to sanction a more comprehensive version of the Fides Leporii.

The possible presence in or near Marseille in the period c.410-415 of a young monk capable of realising the publication of a summary doctrinal statement of the kind here hypothetically attributed to Leporius is a matter of some significance for the history of Christian reading-and-writing in early fifth-century Gaul. It was at just this time that Jerome addressed his Letter 125 to the Gallic monk Rusticus, advising him to place himself under the direction of a suitable master (such as Proculus of Marseille) and to postpone all public literary activity until a future season: 'Ne ad scribendum cito prosilias et levi ducaris insania, multo tempore disce quod doceas'.¹¹⁴ The relevance of such advice would seem to be demonstrated by the case of Leporius. The latter had chosen to make public trial of his biblical learning, only to be convicted of serious error: 'sed quid aliud fieri poterat nisi ut propria stultitia in me viveret quando ego mihi discipulus habueram me magistrum?' (1,30-32). In the absence of more definite information regarding Leporius' circumstances in Gaul or the nature of his first 'epistula' it is probably pointless to speculate about likely models for his initial activity as a Christian writer. One fact, however, seems assured: Leporius' interest in publishing a succinct statement of orthodox doctrine preceded the requirement to present a written

confession to the Carthaginian synod of 418. The form and content of his extant Libellus may indeed owe much to the influence of Augustine and his African colleagues (as some scholars have supposed);¹¹⁵ the writer's own remarks suggest, however, that the ideal of the 'pagina fideliter ordinata' was one that he had conceived in Gaul.

*

Cassian presents Leporius' confession as an authoritative statement of the 'fides catholica' regarding the Incarnation. At the moment at which he was writing (429/30) this text would, it has been suggested, have been one of very few documents of its kind available to him. Shortly afterwards, the views attributed to Nestorius in the De incarnatione were condemned by a Roman synod (August 430).¹¹⁶ No official acts of this synod have survived. In his notice on pope Celestine, Gennadius refers to a 'decretum synodi adversum... Nestorem [i.e. Nestorium] habitum' which had been communicated to the churches in both halves of the empire and which contained a clear definition of orthodox Christology.¹¹⁷ As Grillmeier has observed, however, the summary given of this definition in the De viris illustribus is manifestly post-Chalcedonian.¹¹⁸ Thus, either Gennadius misrepresented the contents of an authentic document or the text which he describes was a fraud. In any case, it seems unlikely that the synod of 430 produced a formal dogmatic statement. In a letter addressed to Nestorius after the council, Celestine called upon him to anathematize his former error, in writing, within ten days of receipt of the present notice to do so; thereafter he would be expected to preach only those doctrines approved

by Rome, Alexandria 'and the catholic church in general'.¹¹⁹ There was no suggestion of his subscribing a particular dogmatic decree. The service of the pope's summons was entrusted to Cyril of Alexandria who, apparently acting on his own initiative, then proceeded to draw up a detailed profession of faith with twelve Christological anathemas, to be submitted for signature by the bishop of Constantinople.¹²⁰ Not surprisingly, Nestorius refused to sign. The same document (the 'Third Letter of Cyril to Nestorius') was subsequently read and approved, though not subscribed, at the Council of Ephesus in the following year.¹²¹ The main dogmatic statement of this council took the form of a re-affirmation of the Nicene creed, of which another of Cyril's letters (the 'Second Letter to Nestorius') was formally recognized as providing the authentic Christological interpretation. These two texts (creed and letter) follow one another in the acts of the decisive session of 22 June 431.¹²²

There were no Gallic bishops present at the Council of Ephesus. Through what channels information and texts relating to its proceedings first reached Christian 'litterati' in southern Gaul can only be conjectured. The most obvious source was Rome. In the immediately preceding period, contacts between the papal see and the bishops of south-eastern Gaul had been regular, if rarely harmonious.¹²³ In 431, a year before his death, Celestine intervened in a dispute between Gallic theologians concerning Augustine's theories of grace and predestination.¹²⁴ Of the correspondence between his successor, pope Sixtus (432-440), and the Gallic episcopate no trace remains; there is evidence, however, that some information regarding his dealings with the

eastern bishops in the aftermath of Ephesus did reach Gaul.¹²⁵ Sixtus was to be succeeded by Leo, who (as already noted) had been responsible for involving Cassian in the initial Roman response to the Nestorian affair. Leo appears to have had close contacts with southern Gaul¹²⁶ and it is possible that in the years preceding his election as pope he may have been in the habit of passing important information in this direction, as he had done in 429. Precisely which of the documents from Ephesus were received in Gaul, and at what moment, is difficult to determine. In the first 'edition' of his Chronicle, completed in Marseille in 433/4, Prosper records that a council of more than two hundred bishops, assembled at Ephesus in 431, had condemned Nestorius and his heresy, together with the Pelagians.¹²⁷ A preceding notice on Nestorius burdens him with a radically adoptionist Christology (which Prosper, like Cassian, associates with a supposedly Pelagian doctrine of human perfectibility) and records that both pope Celestine and Cyril of Alexandria had opposed his views.¹²⁸ Clearly, Prosper had received an accurate account of the main events of 430-31. He may also have seen copies of the pope's letter to Nestorius (of August 430) and of one or more letters of Cyril. It is not inconceivable that, even as early as 433/4, he had access to a set of 'acta' relating to the most important session of the Ephesine council. That some such ensemble of documents was available to certain Christian readers in south-eastern Gaul at this time is apparent from a contemporary work of Vincent of Lérins, the so-called Commonitorium, to which attention must now once again be turned.

2. Vincent of Lerins and the Council of Ephesus

In the recapitulation which is all that we have of the proposed second book of his Commonitorium, Vincent offers an example of the way in which a collection of excerpts from the writings of the fathers ('sanctorum patrum sententiae') might be used to refute certain kinds of heresy. The instance given concerns the council that had met three years earlier at Ephesus.¹²⁹ As remarked in the previous chapter, Vincent's presentation of the proceedings of the first session of this council raises several difficulties for the reader acquainted with the 'acta'. First, there is his failure to refer explicitly to the use made at Ephesus of the Nicene creed (all the more surprising given the high esteem in which he evidently held this particular text). According to his own clearly stated principle, recourse to a 'collation' of patristic texts was to be had only in cases where no relevant conciliar decree could be cited.¹³⁰ If the fathers of Ephesus were prepared to recognize the Nicene creed as an authoritative Christological statement (albeit in need of interpretation), why should he not have done likewise? Then there is the curious fashion in which he describes the action of the council in resorting to patristic 'sententiae'; the latter were invoked, he says, 'ut secundum eas ex decreto atque auctoritate concilii ecclesiasticae fidei regula figeretur' (XXVIII 16). In reality, the contents of Cyril's dossier of Christological excerpts had been read out and copied into the official acts - and that was all.¹³¹ What, then, was the intended meaning of the phrase 'ut...fidei regula figeretur' and of others similar to it used by Vincent in the same connection? In order to answer these questions it is necessary to look more closely at

Vincent's ideas on dogmatic formulation and at his own practice in that regard.¹³²

Of the many biblical texts cited in the Commonitorium, the one which is repeated most often and with greatest emphasis is I Timothy 6,20-21: 'O Timothee, depositum custodi, devitans profanas vocum novitates, etc.' In a word by word exposition of the first element of St. Paul's command, Vincent initially identifies 'Timothy' with the church as a whole, as represented by her bishops (XXII 2). The 'depositum' is the faith which Christians in every age receive from their predecessors and so, ultimately, from Christ himself:

Id est, quod tibi creditum est, non quod a te inventum; quod accepisti, non quod excogitasti; rem non ingenii sed doctrinae, non usurpationis privatae sed publicae traditionis; rem ad te perductam, non a te prolatam; in qua non auctor debes esse sed custos, non institutor sed sectator, non ducens sed sequens. (XXII 4)

As already noted, this insistence on tradition as opposed to invention is the keynote of Vincent's work.¹³³ From the principle that the Christian faith was to be transmitted pure and unadulterated from one age to the next, he derives a notion of the activity proper to those in positions of special responsibility within the church:

'O Timothee', o sacerdos, o tractator, o doctor, si te divinum munus idoneum fecerit ingenio exercitatione doctrina... pretiosas divini dogmatis gemmas exsculpe, fideliter coapta, adorna sapienter, adice splendorem gratiam venustatem. Intellegatur te exponente inlustrius, quod antea obscurius credebatur. Per te posteritas intellectum gratuletur, quod antea vetustas non intellectum venerabatur. Eadem tamen, quae didicisti, doce, ut cum dicas nove, non dicas nova. (XXII 6-7)

Two points may be noted. First, those responsible for the transmission

of Christian doctrine are now considered as individuals rather than as members of an episcopal body (cf. XXII 2); there is at least a hint, moreover, that the roles of 'sacerdos' and 'tractator' (= 'doctor': XXVIII 9) might not always coincide (i.e. there could be 'tractatores' / 'doctores' who were not bishops). Secondly, the activity of these persons is presented mainly in terms of verbal artistry. It is possible to be more precise than this: the role which Vincent conceived for his model 'tractator' combines those of dogmatic draftsman and literary artist.¹³⁴

The implications of this view of the Christian tradition are worked out in more detail in the following section of the Commonitorium, where Vincent deals with the question of the 'profectus religionis' (XXIII 1). Three analogies are offered for the temporal development of Christian doctrine: those of the growth of the human body, of the maturing of a crop, and of the finishing of a piece of jewellery. The first comparison involves the use of such verbs as 'consolidari', 'dilatari', 'sublimari' (9). The second emphasises development in 'species, forma, distinctio' and yields 'evolvi', 'emucleari', 'excoli' (11). The third provides 'excurari, limari, poliari' (13). By using only passive verbs, Vincent avoids introducing an agent for any of these processes of enhancement. (It is notable, nonetheless, that several of the verbs chosen could also be applied in a transferred sense to processes of literary exposition or refinement.)¹³⁵ When a sequence of active verbs does eventually appear, their subject is the church as a whole:

Christi ecclesia... omni industria hoc unum studet, ut
vetera fideliter sapienterque tractando, si qua illa sunt
antiquitus

informata et inchoata,
iam expressa et encucleata,
iam confirmata et definita,
accuret et poliat, si qua
consolidet et firmet, si qua
custodiat. (XXIII 16-17)

Despite the prominence of the verb 'tractare' (otherwise used exclusively in connection with texts), there is still no clear indication at this point of the medium in which these operations are conceived as taking place. Finally, Vincent provides a concrete example of the church's custodianship of the received faith: the dogmatic decrees of councils (18: 'conciliorum decreta'). The effect of all such pronouncements, he states, was to add a new quality to the way in which the church believed, preached and worshipped - without, however, altering the object of its activities. The principal means of achieving that effect was the use of writing:

Hoc, inquam, semper... conciliorum suorum decretis catholica
perfecit ecclesia... ut, quod prius a maioribus sola
traditione susceperat, hoc deinde posteris etiam per
scripturae chirographum consignaret, magnam rerum summam
paucis litteris comprehendendo, et plerumque propter
intellegentiae lucem non novum fidei sensum novae
appellationis proprietate signando. (XXIII 19)

As Sieben has pertinently observed, this generalisation is based on the single instance of conciliar drafting to which Vincent appears to have paid any serious attention: the Nicene creed.¹³⁶ This fact may help to explain why a gradual process of doctrinal elaboration (as it has appeared until now) should suddenly be presented in the light of a contrast between oral and written tradition. It undoubtedly accounts

for the importance now attached, no less unexpectedly, to the idea of concision: 'magnam rerum summam paucis litteris comprehendendo'.

The passages just quoted form part of one of the fullest treatments offered by any patristic writer of the problem of doctrinal development.¹³⁷ While no attempt has been made to do justice to the complexity of the author's thinking on this topic, it has at least been possible (following the lead given by Sieben) to uncover one important strand in his argument. On Vincent's view, the Christian religion 'progressed' as its most articulate members (i.e. bishops and other 'tractatores') gradually perfected the expression, and hence the intelligibility, of its traditional faith. In expounding this idea in the Commonitorium, Vincent gives particular prominence to the conciliar decree, considered as a **concise written statement** of what had always been believed. Significantly, he never uses the word 'symbolum'.^{137a} As used in his day, this term referred primarily to a creed learnt and recited before baptism but not committed to writing. Whatever value Vincent may in fact have attached to his 'baptismal' creed, it was evidently impossible for him to assign it any place in a scheme of dogmatic elaboration so clearly orientated towards the production of texts. This displacement of the orally-transmitted 'symbolum' in favour of 'fides conscriptae' marks a major development in Christian literary ideology since the time of Hilary of Poitiers. Vincent's theory of religious expression is post-Nicene in a way that Hilary's was not. A mode of dogmatic drafting which, in c.355, could still strike an educated western Christian as, at best, the product of temporary necessity could be represented in c.435 as part of the natural business of the church. It is perhaps not

surprising that Christian 'litterati' of Vincent's milieu should have shown so little interest in the legend of the apostolic composition of the 'baptismal' creed: creed-making, for them, was a process that had begun at Nicaea - and was still going on.

The question that must now be asked is: What stage in this process had been reached, in Vincent's view, by the time he set about the Commonitorium ? The main purpose of the Council of Ephesus, he indicates, was to 'fix the rule of faith' ('ut... fidei regula figeretur' - XXVIII 16).¹³⁸ This and other expressions used in the same connection suggest that, as regards Christological definition, the church of the early 430s had reached approximately the second stage in the three-stage process of dogmatic development evoked at XXIII 17: 'si qua iam expressa et enucleata, consolid[a]t et firm[a]t'. It is clear, in any case, that for Vincent the council of 431 had had more to do than simply conserve a text (or texts) already sufficiently elaborated ('si qua iam confirmata et definita, custodiat'). In reality, of course, the fathers of Ephesus had been content to regard their task as precisely that of conserving a Christological belief already stated in the Nicene creed; if anyone were in doubt as to the authentic sense of this document, let him refer to Cyril's 'Second Letter'.¹³⁹ Far from drafting an additional credal statement, they had expressly forbidden the composition and use of creeds other than that first promulgated in 325.¹⁴⁰ The council's attitude might thus be compared to that expressed in Book Six of the De incarnatione, where Cassian attempts to exclude Nestorius' teaching by means of a careful reading of the (substantially 'Nicene') creed of Antioch. Cassian, however, had also been attracted

to the 'confession' of Leporius, as endorsed by the African and Gallic bishops. Might not Vincent likewise have hankered after a more conclusive and convenient - as well as preferably conciliar - statement of orthodox Christology ? Such a hypothesis accords well both with the manner of his treatment of the proceedings at Ephesus and with the evidence of his personal attempts at creed-making. It is time now to turn briefly to the latter.

Reference was made in the previous chapter to Vincent's use of the examples of Photinus, Apollinarius and Nestorius as illustrations of the thesis that great teachers were sometimes sent to test the love of the multitude for God.¹⁴¹ In partial contrast with the other two examples quoted (Origen and Tertullian), these three 'heretics' were all notorious for errors concerning the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation (i.e. within the usual scope of the 'regula fidei' as understood by Vincent and most of his contemporaries). Having given an outline of the careers of these men (XI), Vincent interrupts the main development of the Commonitorium in order to explain the nature of their respective heresies (XII). He then provides a brief opposing statement of orthodox doctrine on the Trinity and Incarnation, with emphasis on the latter (XIII 2-4). He goes on: 'Sed operae pretium est, ut id ipsum etiam atque etiam distinctius et expressius enucleemus' (XIII 5). There follow several pages of closely-written Christological exposition, consisting of: a general statement concerning the union of the two natures (XIII 5-15), a refutation of docetism based on a false understanding of the word 'persona' as applied to the Son (XIV), a defence of the idea of a union 'ante partum' and of the description of Mary as

'Theotokos' (XV). Vincent proceeds:

Sed iam ea, quae de supra memoratis haeresibus vel de
catholica fide breviter dicta sunt, renovandae causa
memoriae brevius strictiusque repetamus, quo scilicet et
intellegantur iterata plenius et firmitus inculcata
teneantur. (XVI 1)

This abbreviation takes the form of three anathemas directed against Photinus, Apollinaris and Nestorius, followed by a mainly Christological summary in six sections, each of which begins with the words: 'Beata vero ecclesiae, quae... (credit)' (XVI 2-8). The writer concludes: 'Haec in excursu dicta sint, alias, si deo placuerit, uberius tractanda et explicanda' (XVI 9). It was once thought that the 'tractatus uberius' here promised might be identical with the 'Athanasian' creed or 'Quicumque vult'; it is now generally accepted, however, that Vincent's words are to be referred to his (later) collection of Augustinian Excerpta. This work also deals with the issues of the Trinity and Incarnation, with (once again) a special emphasis on the latter. As in the Commonitorium, so in the Excerpta the tendency towards greater expansiveness in doctrinal discussion ('distinctius et expressius enucleare', 'in excursu dicere', 'uberius tractare et explicare') is accompanied by a movement towards concision ('brevius strictiusque repetere' - cf. 'magnam rerum summam paucis litteris comprehendere'). Thus Augustine's utterances are said to have been gathered together 'in unum velut opusculum' (X 59). In addition, the polemical thrust of the work as a whole is announced in a set of ten preliminary 'sententiae' (or 'tituli regularum' as Vincent calls them), while the conclusions of its Christological part are summarised in a short series of definitions followed by an anathema (X 34-58). In both the earlier 'excursus' and

the later Excerpta the author can thus be seen to respond to the twin claims of clarity ('[ut] intellegatur inlustrius' - Comm. XXII 7) and convenience ('[ut] intellegatur commodius' - Exc. prol 30).

There can be little doubt that these essays in Christological definition were meant to contribute in some way to the larger process of dogmatic elaboration evoked in sections XXII-XXIII of the Commonitorium. Vincent, it is clear, did not regard the Nicene creed as an adequate defence against the heresies of Photinus, Apollinarius and (most important of all) Nestorius. On the contrary, he believed that there was a need for a new dogmatic text - for a new creed that would deal briefly but fully with the doctrine of the Incarnation as well as that of the Trinity. The Commonitorium was apparently conceived as providing prolegomena for the drafting of this text. The task before the Council of Ephesus, the proceedings of which were to occupy virtually an entire book or 'commonitorium' of their own, was to fix the rule of faith in such a way as to exclude Nestorianism and related forms of error. Given the terms of Vincent's earlier discussion of dogmatic development, this act of definition was bound to issue in a text. But what texts had the council of 431 actually produced? As Vincent turned over the leaves of his copy of the acts he would have found, inter alia, a copy of the Nicene creed, a copy of Cyril's 'Second Letter' and a dossier of patristic 'testimonia'. None of these texts, one may suppose, would have exactly answered his purpose. The Nicene creed, though immensely venerable, did not go far enough in its Christological specification. Cyril's letter conformed neither to the aesthetic ideal of a creed-like summary of the faith nor to the moral ideal of a universal or 'con-

ciliar' statement. The patristic dossier, though satisfactory on the latter count, was no less defective with regard to the former. As a follower of recent trends in theological argument, Vincent would have been well able to appreciate the value of a Christological florilegium that apparently combined testimony from East and West. How, though, was he to present this particular compilation as a text which both clarified and rendered more easily memorable the church's traditional beliefs ? These are the terms in which he introduces the council's decision to refer to the 'patres':

...hoc catholicissimum fidelissimum atque optimum factu
visum est,

ut in medium sanctorum patrum sententiae proferrentur...

ut scilicet rite atque sollemniter ex eorum consensu atque
decreto antiqui dogmatis religio confirmaretur et
profanae novitatis blasphemia condemnaretur. (XXIX 7)

Of the two actions described in this pair of clauses, only the first can be easily related to events recorded as having taken place at Ephesus. As regards the **presentation** of patristic 'sententiae', the acts (as we have them) are quite explicit: Peter, priest of Alexandria and 'primicerius' of the notaries, read extracts from the works of ten of the fathers and these were entered into the record.¹⁴² The names of these ten authorities are duly listed by Vincent in the Commonitorium (XXX).¹⁴³ He then repeats his assertion concerning their **exploitation** for the purposes of dogmatic definition: 'quorum [sc. patrum] beata illa synodus doctrinam tenens... de fidei regulis pronuntiavit' (XXX 6). The expression 'de fide regulis...pronuntiare', like others used elsewhere by Vincent of the same proceeding, strongly suggests an act of verbal (i.e. textual) formulation carried out by the council on the basis of

the patristic texts produced. As we know - and as Vincent must have known - the bishops assembled at Ephesus in June 431 performed no such act.

If the inferences drawn in the preceding paragraphs are correct, the author of the Commonitorium ultimately set himself an impossible task. Committed to the ideal of a creed-like summary as the highest form of Christian dogmatic expression, he attempted to derive such a summary from the acts of a recent council - and failed. The evidence of this failure, it may be suggested, is to be found in the incomplete state of his treatise. According to the manuscript tradition, the greater part of the second 'commonitorium' (containing Vincent's treatment of the Council of Ephesus) had been lost ('interlapsum est'), leaving only a final résumé ('sola recapitulatio' - XXVIII/XXIX). This version of events is accepted by the majority of modern scholars; the sections dealing with Ephesus, it is suggested, were probably omitted by a copyist who failed to appreciate their interest.¹⁴⁴ Thus stated, the traditional explanation for the state of the text is open to a serious objection. Whereas the section of the résumé relating to the extant first 'commonitorium' (XXIX 2-6) may easily pass for a 'recapitulation', the same cannot be said for that purporting to deal with the missing part of the second book (XXIX 7 - XXXIII 6). This second section of summary is approximately nine times the length of the first. Unlike the first, it contains detailed exposition, biblical quotations and major rhetorical developments. Despite repeated references to what has already been done or said (i.e. in the main body of the missing book), the passage as a whole strikes one less as a concluding summary than as

an epitome intended to serve as the substitute for a longer text. That the same impression was received by at least one late-antique reader is apparent from the colourful explanation that Gennadius provides for the mutilated state of the Commonitorium: 'cuius operis quia secundi libri maximam in schedulis partem a quibusdam furatam perdidit [Vincentius], recapitulatio eius paucis sermonibus sensu primo conpegit et in uno edidit'.¹⁴⁵ The main difficulty with this account is that the text itself offers no hint that the author had been impelled to produce his summary by some external action, or that he envisaged his reader as lacking a full version of the second book. It is conceivable, of course, that the 'epitome' was the work of someone other than Vincent and that this person (the 'editor' of the Commonitorium) chose to disguise his abridgement as a 'recapitulatio'; if positive reasons could be found for believing this to have been the case, such an explanation would account for all the features of the work as we have it. There is, however, a further possibility, suggested by study of the author's theory of dogmatic development: Vincent failed to complete the main part of the second 'commonitorium'; the 'recapitulatio' represents a sketch or substitute for a full-length discussion of the Council of Ephesus that he never produced. Although it can only be a conjecture, the hypothesis of an originally incomplete Commonitorium, if accepted, would offer one important advantage for the attempt to appreciate Vincent's work as a whole. It would enable one to understand why it was that, having developed a complex theory of patristic 'collatio' based on multiple sources, he should subsequently revert (in the Excerpta) to a practice of 'collection' centred on a single author.

*

Among factors said to have favoured composition of the Commonitorium is the author's place of residence (I 2: 'opportunitas loci'). Since it is probable that both this work and the Excerpta were composed while Vincent was living as a monk on the island of Lérins, one should perhaps consider whether other productions of a similar kind may not also have been favoured by the conditions of Honoratus' monastery. Apart from the tranquillity evoked by Vincent (ibid.), there were a number of circumstances, cultural and material, that may be supposed to have facilitated Christian writing on the island.

To judge from the literary remains of several individuals who are known to have been at Lérins (or on nearby Lero) in the 420s and 430s, a significant number of those living in the monastery at this time were 'litterati' of conventional type. For such persons, the study and production of texts were long-established habits. There is good reason to believe, moreover, that their new monastic environment provided them with the means and leisure to indulge these habits to the full. Many 'Lerinians' were persons of aristocratic background who, it may be assumed, had brought a part of their personal wealth to the monastery with them.¹⁴⁶ Their possessions would have included books that would henceforth have been available for other members of the community to read and copy.¹⁴⁷ While it is clearly hazardous to attempt to reconstruct the 'library' of Lérins on the basis of reading manifested in the works of 'Lerinian' authors (many of whom spent long periods elsewhere),

it would be equally unwise to deny the possibility that a large number of texts - secular and spiritual, biblical and ecclesiastical - were gradually assembled at Lérins, simply because these texts can no longer be inventoried.¹⁴⁸ (By the same token, the absence of definite references to the activities of 'notarii' or 'librarii' on the island does not constitute proof that these functions were not discharged, either by junior monks - as at Martin's monastery at Marmoutier - or, less probably, by hired artisans.) As we have seen, Vincent's conception of Christian tradition implied constant recourse to Christian texts; it is difficult to believe that the Commonitorium could have been composed by one who did not have access to a standing collection of biblical, conciliar and patristic manuscripts, together with the means of excerpting and reproducing them.

The material endowments that assured Vincent and his fellow-monks of the prerequisites for Christian literary activity would also, presumably, have guaranteed them the leisure to engage in it. If the Lerinian ascetic devoted a part of each day, apart from Sunday, to manual labour (as the recently-attributed Rules prescribe),¹⁴⁹ it is likely that he did so more out of compliance with a widely-venerated monastic ethic than for reasons of economic necessity. It is possible, moreover, that the ample period set aside for 'meditation' was in fact sometimes occupied for literary ends. Strictly interpreted, 'meditatio' (or 'medite' in the early 'Lerinian' rules) meant reflection on the biblical text itself, to the exclusion of most other (including literary) objects. As previous chapters have shown, however, the relationship between 'lectio', 'meditatio' and various kinds of

biblically-orientated writing and speaking appears as an extremely close one in texts bearing on the Christian literary ideology of this period and milieu. To what extent could dogmatic writing of the kind recommended by Vincent be considered an integral part of 'lectio et meditatio scripturarum' and therefore a natural occupation for one dedicated to the monastic life ? The text to be studied in the following section may help provide an answer to this question.

3. Faustus of Lerins and the deacon Graecus

Of all the Christian 'litterati' associated with Lérins in the fifth century, the one most famous in his own time as a dogmatic writer was undoubtedly Faustus, monk and abbot of the island monastery and later bishop of Riez.¹⁵⁰ Sidonius praises Faustus for his 'works of saving doctrine' ('opera... doctrinae salutaris').¹⁵¹ For Gennadius, the bishop of Riez was a 'doctor egregius'; the amount of space devoted to his theological writings in the De viris illustribus is exceeded only by that allowed to Cassian (among Gallic authors).¹⁵² Faustus' most important productions are the treatises De spiritu sancto and De gratia dei, the second of which can be dated to c.473.¹⁵³ The author of these works was clearly capable of large-scale theological composition of a type rarely practised in the West at this date. That he was equally concerned with the concise formulation of dogma is apparent from a number of shorter items that are preserved under his name in epistolary and canonical collections.¹⁵⁴ Of particular interest for the present

study is the text printed by Engelbrecht as Letter 7 in his edition of Faustus' correspondence, beginning with the words: 'Domino sancto et in Christo devinctissimo fratri Graeco diacono Faustus.'¹⁵⁵

All that is known of the deacon Graecus is to be deduced from this letter. On the basis of what Faustus says or implies, one may imagine his correspondent as a typical Christian 'litteratus' from south-eastern Gaul, c.440. He had been living as an ascetic, though not in a monastery. He was a keen reader who did not confine his studies to the Bible. He was used to expressing himself in writing. Having read certain works of Augustine in which the theory of Christ's two natures was clearly expounded, he had been moved to set down what he took to be the true and orthodox doctrine concerning the Incarnation. (Thus far his behaviour recalls that of Vincent of Lérins; as we shall see, however, Graecus was no staunch 'Augustinian'.) He had then sent a copy of his composition to Faustus for comment. The text was relatively brief; Faustus twice refers to it dismissively as a 'scripturula'.¹⁵⁶ It apparently comprised (1) a positive element that included (biblical?) 'testimonia' [201,7] and a Christological formula ('verbum... quod more prophetico ad te factum dicis' [201,18]) and (2) a number of anathemas directed against the views of Augustine ('his quae damanda iudicasti' [201,13]). The author was aware that there had been some controversy concerning the title of 'Theotokos' as applied to the Virgin Mary. By rejecting this epithet, as Faustus (and later Gennadius) observes, he risked falling into the heresy of Nestorius.¹⁵⁷ In fact, Graecus' Christology would seem to have been at the opposite pole to that commonly ascribed to the former patriarch of Constantinople; far from

dissociating the two natures in Christ, he was led by his conviction of the Son's divinity into a frank monophysitism ('secutum est, ut diceret dei et hominis unam esse naturam' [202,14]). Since there is no mention in Faustus' letter of the heresy of Eutyches, it is almost certain that it was written before 450 - i.e. at a time when the author was abbot of Lérins.¹⁵⁸

Predictably, the greater part of Faustus' letter [201,25 - 206,21] consists of corrections of his correspondent's doctrinal errors, combined with elements of a more general Christological presentation. Partly owing to the corrupt state of the text, the logic of the argument is not always easy to follow. The authorities on which Faustus bases his exposition are fourfold: (1) a number of quotations from Scripture, including a sequence apparently borrowed from a recent Christological source [202,5-9]¹⁵⁹ and another appropriated from anti-Arian polemic [203,20 - 204,6]; (2) a passage from the 'baptismal' creed ('iuxta symboli auctoritatem' [205,5f]); (3) an anathema 'quod suscepta per omnes insulas [!] et ecclesias patrum signat auctoritas', similar in content to the first of Cyril's twelve anathemas against Nestorius that had been read out at the Council of Ephesus and widely diffused;¹⁶⁰ (4) a quotation from a hymn of Ambrose 'quem in natali dominico catholica per omnes Italiae et Galliae regiones persultat ecclesia',¹⁶¹ and several quotations from an unidentified patristic source [203,5-9]. This medley of texts is interesting as further evidence of attempts by southern Gallic authors to formulate Christological doctrine in the absence of a single authoritative document. Faustus had become abbot of Lérins in 433, three years after Cassian completed his De incarnatione

and shortly before Vincent began to draft his account of the Council of Ephesus. While it is unlikely that Christological disagreements posed a serious threat to the peace of his monastery, it would be surprising if he had not taken the trouble to ponder such problems. An earlier specimen of Christological summary was, of course, available in the shape of the Fides Leporii. From the letter to Graecus it appears that Faustus already had a clear idea of the kind of text now required.

To comply with his correspondent's request for critical comment on the text submitted was, he says, to run a great risk: 'quia de rebus tam profundis et meas ac tuas vires excedentibus non minus periculi est respondere quam incondito stilo ingentia sacramenta committere' [200, 14]. Hilary, it will be recalled, had spoken of the risks involved in bringing matters of the faith 'in periculum humani eloquii'. For Faustus the danger lay precisely in the act of **writing** about such mysteries; the theme of the 'periculum scribendi' recurs at several points in his letter.¹⁶² Graecus would, he says, have been better advised to consult directly with one of his elders, according to the biblical command (Deuteronomy 32,7), thereby sparing him (Faustus) the necessity of corresponding on such a topic. Since, however, he was now obliged to write, he could only hope that his doing so would serve a useful purpose: 'sic et te interrogasse et me respondisse ad bonum commune proficiat' [201,10]. Faustus believed that the Christian writer should expect some return on his labour. He continues:

...in his, quae agimus vel quae dicimus atque ad extremum scriptis mandare praesumimus, fructum profectumque operis expectare debemus. [201,2]

The notion of literary accountability, here made dependent on a more general notion of Christian accountability, is also clearly present in Vincent's work.¹⁶³ The value attached by Faustus to writing - as act and then object - would appear to be both a devotional and a pastoral one (cf. 201,9: 'pro studio tuae salutis haec conloquor'). Those things which a person 'did, said and ultimately committed to writing' might not, in principle, involve the salvation of anyone besides himself. (Thus the purpose of writing might simply be to provide a support for one's own memory, as Vincent pretends in the preface to the Commonitorium.) However, once a text was drafted with a view to its perusal by others, the 'common good' of writer and reader was immediately put at stake. In sending his composition to the abbot of Lérins, Graecus had signalled his intention of publishing it; what he had written was henceforth to be judged according to the strictest standards of public as well as personal utility.

Faustus' requirements for a piece of dogmatic writing may be deduced from his censure of Graecus' text:

In hac... scripturula, quam ad me dirigere dignatus es, non eloquentia, non scientia, non ratio, non aedificatio aliqua ordinati aut conpuncti sermonis adparet, sed testimonia confusissime pro memoriae facilitate congesta temeritatem incauti cordis adcusant. [201,4]

A commentary on the ideals of 'eloquentia', 'scientia', 'ratio' and 'aedificatio' here invoked would take us too far from our present concern. Of immediate interest, given the nature of Graecus' text and of Faustus' reply, is the latter's insistence on the 'sermo ordinatus et conpunctus'.¹⁶⁴ Both writers, one may assume, intended to be brief and

systematic in their exposition of the supreme mystery of the Incarnation (cf. 'ingentia sacramenta' [200,14]); Faustus, indeed, refers explicitly to the brevity of his own account ('breui sermone constringam' [201,22]; 'haec ipsa breviter strictimque memorata' [206,23]). Like Vincent and perhaps also Leporius, both men recognized that these qualities were essential if their text was to serve a useful or edifying function as a readily intelligible and memorable definition of Christological doctrine. According to Faustus, Graecus had failed to produce such a document owing to ignorance and lack of supervision; his text was to be suppressed ('scripturulam ipsam... subprimendam putavi' [207,18]). How far the abbot of Lerins himself succeeded in meeting his own stated requirements is difficult to judge, given the condition in which his letter has reached us. Parts of the text show signs of extremely careful composition. Even though the overall impression now given may be one of 'testimonia confusissime congesta', it is worth recalling that in a previous age this document was judged worthy of preservation and that it was included in an early canonical collection.¹⁶⁵

It is possible, then, to regard Faustus' letter to Graecus both as a theoretical treatment of the problems involved in dogmatic definition and as an essay in the genre. In addition, the author offers a number of more general observations on the role and position of the Christian writer. His sense of the seriousness and potential liabilities of any act of Christian writing ('quae ad extremum scriptis mandare praesumimus') has already been alluded to. All such writing, he implies, involved an element of 'presumption' and of risk. In the case of one insufficiently prepared for the task, the pretension to write for the

benefit of others - however natural to the 'litteratus' - was to be reckoned a serious fault. Towards the end of his letter, Faustus comes to consider in more detail the situation of his correspondent and the causes of his (culpable) 'praesumptio scribendi'. The passage in question (to be cited in due course) has a special bearing on the place assigned to dogmatic writing in ascetic ideology.

A consistent feature of 'Lerinian' hagiography is a predilection for images of thesaurization and dispensation ('dispensatio', 'erogatio'), particularly as applied to the activities of reading and teaching.¹⁶⁶ The monk-bishop was one whose private study fitted him to be a dispenser of doctrine for the public good; he was, typically, one active both 'in lectione atque [in] sermone'. For obvious reasons, the second part of this dual activity was generally represented - at least in hagiography - in terms of oral performance. The principle nevertheless applied equally to written productions. Since, in the case of persons who were not (or not yet) bishops, writing was virtually the only means available for presenting ideas publicly, one might expect this alternative application to have had a wide appeal for lay and junior clerical 'litterati'. That this was indeed the case might be shown by a thorough study of the Christian epistolography of this period. Meanwhile, Faustus' letter to Graecus may offer a useful illustration of the principle. According to the abbot of Lérins, his correspondent had arrogated the function of spiritual provider, presuming on the quality of his learning to teach by writing. It was time for him to review his situation:

Revoca, quaeso, ab hoc discrimine pedem tuum, priusquam in profundum inrevocabile elationis torrente rapiaris, et rectum animi sensum, qui multae lectionis pondus non sustinet nec novit thesaurum scientiae dispensare, magis laboris occupatione castiga. Tempera inmoderatum abstinentiae rigorem, qui etiam menti generat infirmitatem, quem [quam?] puto inde nasci, unde scribendi praesumptionem. Regredere ad viam regiam, nutricem elationis refuge sollicitudinem [solitudinem?]. [206,26f]

Graecus' activity as a writer is located firmly in the context of his style of life. Living as an ascetic, but not attached to any monastery, he had failed to maintain a proper moderation in his observances. (In terms of the monastic theory elaborated by Cassian, he had not exercised 'discriminatio'.) His recent adventure in dogmatic definition was to be seen as the product of a kind of drunkenness ('periculosa ebrietas' [207,10]) brought on by excessive or uncontrolled reading. Faustus' advice is simple: 'cave nimiam lectionem' [207,8]. Henceforth, he says, his correspondent should read with a view to perfection, not publication ('magis imitanda legas quam legenda conscribas' [207,11]). Insofar as reading inspired the ascetic with personal literary ambitions it was a source of pride ('elatio') and therefore dangerous. The only way in which Graecus could be sure of avoiding such dangers was to place himself under the direction of a superior: 'nihil tibi utilius scias, quam ut sub aliquo probatissimo abbate vitam tuam munias ac voluntates tuas senioris legibus tradas' [207,14]. Once subject to a monastic regime, he would be unlikely to repeat his recent error.

In castigating Graecus, Faustus does not rule out the possibility of useful literary activity of a type similar to that in which he had indulged. On the contrary, his depiction of one 'qui multae lectionis

pondus non sustinet nec novit thesaurum scientiae dispensare' presupposes the ideal of one who could manage both tasks successfully. As his own modest example was doubtless meant to demonstrate, one could 'presume' to write - on the strength of previous reading - without necessarily being guilty of 'presumption'; to the 'periculosa ebrietas' brought on by ill-advised study there corresponded a 'sobria ebrietas' which was the quality of Christian eloquence.¹⁶⁷ Much of the interest of the final paragraphs of the letter to Graecus derives from the connection therein implicitly established between the sequence 'legere' - 'legenda conscribere' and the environment of a monastery. In terms of a general ideology of ascetic reading, writing and teaching, Faustus' remarks are in perfect harmony with the principle of doctrinal 'dispensatio' discernible in certain 'Lerinian' Lives. Their context, however, invites one to interpret them in a more specific sense. Faustus' immediate concern was with a particular kind of Christian 'legendum' - namely the dogmatic summary. The character of his own text, no less than the experience of Graecus, is evidence of the close relation between writing of this kind and prior reading - of the Bible, of the works of Augustine and other Fathers, of conciliar texts. As the example of Vincent has already shown, it was now possible for Christian 'litterati' to consider as one of their main tasks the re-presentation of doctrine already available in written form. By integrating 'lectio' (in a broad sense, not confined to the text of the Bible) within the scheme of a monastic lifestyle, while at the same time allowing the possibility of a related literary 'dispensatio' in the form of dogmatic summary, Faustus provides a brief for this kind of Christian writing: if Graecus would only place himself under the direction of a suitably

qualified abbot he might one day be in a position to compose dogmatic texts that could be usefully read by others. The historical implications of the present letter are, of course, somewhat wider than this: according to Faustus, the preparation of dogmatic texts could, in the right circumstances, be a suitable occupation for a monk. As abbot of Lérins from 433 to c.460 he would have been the natural patron of enterprises such as Vincent's Commonitorium and Augustinian Excerpta.

*

As a final example of Gallic interest in the problems of Christological definition one may consider the reaction of certain of the province's bishops to the most influential of all pre-Chalcedonian statements on the Incarnation, the celebrated Tomus ad Flavianum of pope Leo the Great.

4. Gallic bishops and Leo's Tome

Leo was made pope in September 440, while absent on a diplomatic mission in Gaul.¹⁶⁸ During the early years of his pontificate he was able to remain relatively detached from the doctrinal controversies which, even after the 'Reunion' of 433, continued to disturb the churches of the East. Then, in the spring of 448, a letter reached the Roman curia from an elderly Constantinopolitan priest and archimandrite named Eutyches, reporting a resurgence of Nestorianism in the eastern capital.¹⁶⁹ Alarmed, Leo asked the sender for more detailed information. When

Eutyches wrote again it was to protest against his own recent trial and excommunication by a local synod presided by the new patriarch of Constantinople, Flavian (November 448). This assembly had convicted him of refusing to confess two natures in Christ after the Incarnation, an idea for which Eutyches claimed to find no warrant in the decrees of Nicaea (325) and Ephesus (431). Initially impressed by the archimandrite's recriminations, Leo wrote to Flavian, demanding a full account of the synod's proceedings. Such an account had, in fact, already been despatched. On reading it, the pope concluded that the action taken by Flavian and his colleagues had been justified, and undertook to provide a full refutation of Eutyches' opinions. By this time, however, the latter's supporters in Constantinople - who included prominent members of the court - had set about overturning the decisions of the synod of 448. In March 449, the emperor Theodosius II summoned a general council to meet at Ephesus four months later with a view to settling the issue. Leo, who was detained in Rome, chose to be represented at this council by a small delegation. Among the documents which he entrusted to his legates were a letter to Flavian (the so-called Tome) containing the promised Christological exposé and another to the members of the council referring them to this document.¹⁷⁰

The Tome opens with a lament for Eutyches' lapse into heresy. Was it any wonder that he had erred in his understanding of the Bible, seeing that he had neglected the teaching of the ('baptismal') creed:

Quam enim eruditionem de sacris novi et veteris testamenti
 paginis adquisivit, qui ne ipsius quidem symboli initia
comprehendit et quod per totum mundum omnium regenerandorum
 voce depromitur istius adhuc senis corde non capitur ?
 (10-11)

Here as elsewhere in his letters and sermons, Leo presents the 'baptismal' or 'apostolic' creed as a perfect summary of the faith, 'brevis et perfecta confessio'.¹⁷¹ If Eutyches could only have grasped ('conprehendit') and taken to heart ('corde capitur') the sense of the opening phrases of the creed, he would (Leo implies) have had no difficulty in understanding the true nature of the Incarnation. The remainder of the Tome consists of an elucidation of the union of the divine and human in Christ, 'salva... proprietate utriusque naturae' (54) - an important phrase, that was to recur in the Chalcedonian definition.¹⁷² To deny the humanity of God incarnate, as Eutyches was supposed to have done, was, according to Leo, to call into question the very principle of man's salvation (157: 'sacramentum per quod unum salvati sumus... vacuare').

Recommending his Tome to a group of monks in Constantinople, Leo describes it as being based upon 'the tradition of the fathers'.¹⁷³ He evidently intended that it should be accepted by the forthcoming general council as an authoritative statement of orthodox Christology. (One may compare his decision to commission a work 'de incarnatione' from Cassian in preparation for the Roman council held almost twenty years earlier. It is perhaps worth recalling that, according to a rumour reported by Gennadius, the composition of the Tome was partly the work of the Gallic émigré Prosper.)¹⁷⁴ In the event, Leo's text was not even considered by the assembled bishops. Dominated by its president, the monophysite bishop Dioscorus of Alexandria, the Second Council of Ephesus of August 449 dramatically reversed the decisions taken by the Constantinopolitan

synod of the previous year. The doctrine of 'two natures after the Incarnation' upheld by Leo (and later by the Council of Chalcedon) was rejected as heretical. Eutyches was rehabilitated, Flavian deposed. The pope's representatives barely escaped with their lives. Back in Rome, Leo received the news of this 'latrocinium' or brigandage (as he was to call it) with predictable displeasure. In the autumn of 449 a synod of Italian bishops met in Rome and condemned the decisions taken at Ephesus. At the same time, the pope began attempts to persuade Theodosius II to convene a fresh council, preferably in Italy. Despite enjoying the support of Valentinian's court at Ravenna, these efforts met with no success. Further progress would only become possible on the death of Theodosius in July 450.

In order to mobilize opposition to the 'brigandage' of Ephesus, Leo had to ensure that the facts relating to the case of Eutyches and his own attempted intervention were properly publicized. Towards the end of 449 or early in 450 he therefore arranged for the compilation of a dossier 'de re Eutychis' containing some of the most important documents currently available in Rome. This dossier appears to have comprised: (1) documents relating to the synod of Constantinople of November 448, including Flavian's letters to the pope, (2) Leo's Tome, (3) documents relating to the Council of Ephesus of August 449.¹⁷⁵ All these texts would have lain before the Roman synod of 449 and may have been inserted in its 'gesta'. They would presumably have been made available to those persons - for example, members of the western imperial family - whom Leo most wanted to influence. In the spring of 450 copies of some, if not all, of them were carried to Gaul.

In the **second** of two letters to bishop of Ravennius of Arles, dated 5 May 450, the pope expresses a desire that he and his Gallic colleagues should be fully informed of the recent transactions 'de ratione fidei'. He asks, in particular, that the text of his Tome ('epistola nostra quam ad Orientem pro fidei defensione direximus') and of a letter of Cyril of Alexandria (i.e. the 'Second Letter to Nestorius', 'quae cum nostris sensibus tota concordat') be widely diffused.¹⁷⁶ That these were not the only documents transmitted is clear from an entry in Hydatius' Chronicle for the year 450 which refers to a number of texts concerning Eutyches that had reached Spain from Gaul; these are said to have included letters between Leo and Flavian 'quae cum aliorum episcoporum et gestis et scriptis per ecclesias [i.e. in Gaul and Spain] diriguntur.'¹⁷⁷

In order to send these documents to Gaul, Leo took advantage of the presence in Rome on other business of two members of the Arlesian clergy, the priest Petronius and a deacon named Regulus. These persons had been charged by a group of bishops from south-eastern Gaul to represent the claims of the bishop of Arles to ecclesiastical primacy in the region.¹⁷⁸ The right to exercise such a primacy - consisting, essentially, in the privilege of ordaining new bishops - had been granted by pope Zosimus to Patroclus of Arles (+426) with respect to the provinces of Viennensis (to which Arles itself belonged), Narbonensis Prima and Narbonensis Secunda. It had not, however, been ratified by his successors. In 445, following certain indiscretions committed by the present incumbent, Hilary, Leo had deprived the see of Arles of all external jurisdiction, including that which it had traditionally

exercised in the province of Viennensis. Among those involved in the process of conciliation between Arles and Rome around the time of this incident was the priest Ravennius, who later succeeded Hilary as bishop (May/June 449). Ravennius appears to have had the pope's confidence from the start. Immediately after congratulating him on his election, Leo had asked him to warn his fellow bishops against the wiles of a clerical impostor named Petronianus (August 449).¹⁷⁹ The terms of the request ('admonitis totius provinciae episcopis') could easily have been interpreted as a sign that he considered Ravennius as his natural spokesman in southern Gaul (i.e. the former Provincia) and may have encouraged the new bishop and his supporters to seek the restoration of what they took to be the ancient privileges of the see of Arles. In any case, Petronius and Regulus had appeared in Rome later in the same year (or possibly early in 450) with a petition asking (1) that the bishop of Arles be granted the right to ordain bishops throughout Viennensis and the 'three provinces' (i.e. the two Narbonenses and the Alpes Maritimae), and (2) that he be confirmed as the pope's 'vicarius' in Gaul.¹⁸⁰ Leo, it seems, had no intention of bestowing a supra-provincial primacy on any Gallic bishop, or of creating a Gallic vicariate. The most that he would do, in this case, was to restore to Ravennius the de facto right of episcopal ordination in the southern part of the province of Viennensis that had been exercised by his predecessors up until 445 (the remainder of that province falling under the jurisdiction of the bishop of Vienne). This was the tenor of the first of the two letters that Petronius and Regulus took back to Gaul in the spring of 450.¹⁸¹

Its territorial claims rejected, the Arlesian party could at least take comfort from the pope's apparent acquiescence in certain of its ideological pretensions. According to the petition sent to Rome, the primacy of Arles was founded on its historical claim to be the oldest Christian city in Gaul. The first bishop of Arles, Trophimus, had (it was alleged) originally been sent by St. Peter to begin the conversion of the province; Arles was the source from which all other Gallic cities - including her great competitor for ecclesiastical dominion in the south-east, Vienne - derived their Christianity:

Iure enim ac merito ea urbs [sc. Arelate] semper apicem sanctae dignitatis obtinuit, quae in sancto Trophimo primitias nostrae religionis prima suscepit, ac postea intra Gallias hoc quod divino munere fuerat consecuta, studio doctrinae salutaris effudit.¹⁸²

The portrayal of Trophimus as St. Peter's missionary was doubtless calculated to affect a pope who stood firm on his Petrine authority. At a moment when that authority was in danger of being seriously undermined by developments in the East, Leo could hardly afford to discourage such ultramontane sentiments, particularly when they were expressed on behalf of a bishop whom he knew and trusted. To have acceded to the Arlesian request for extensive rights of ordination would have been to risk stirring up trouble in the province (petitioners from Vienne were also present in Rome in 450). However, the idea of Arles as an intermediate source of Christian doctrine for the population of Gaul ('[fons] doctrinae salutaris'), fed by streams of apostolic teaching emanating from Rome ('fluenta... apostolicae institutionis'), was one that was certain to recommend itself to the pope in his present diplomatic extremity. In entrusting the western diffusion of his Tome, in the

first instance, to Ravennius of Arles, Leo provided the latter with a chance to enhance his personal standing without offending other ecclesiastical factions in Gaul. At the same time, he ensured the cooperation of powerful motives of local self-interest in his own campaign to undo the work of the Second Council of Ephesus.¹⁸³

Hence it was that, in addition to bearing the pope's response to the petition for Arlesian primacy, Petronius and Regulus returned to Gaul with a letter to Ravennius (already quoted) concerning publication of the Tome and related documents. They also transmitted certain verbal instructions from Leo.¹⁸⁴ As observed by the brothers Ballerini, it is probable that the latter meant the Gallic bishops to make representations to the emperor in favour of a new council. In the event, the death of Theodosius in July 450 rendered such a move unnecessary. Whether acting on instructions or his own initiative, Ravennius decided to convene a council of Gallic bishops to receive the pope's Tome. Unable to do so in the summer or autumn of 450, he wrote to Leo promising a synodical letter early in the following year.¹⁸⁵ However, unfavourable weather conditions (or the repercussions of the Hun invasion ?)¹⁸⁶ prevented the bishops from assembling until late in 451, by which time events in the East had entered a new phase with the meeting of the Council of Chalcedon (October 451). Thus Leo was cheated of any hope that he may have had of adducing broad western support for his position in the preparations for the long-awaited re-opening of the Christological debate. The letter which he finally received from Gaul in the winter of 451-2 provided just the sort of endorsement that he might have wished for. It was signed by Ravennius and forty-three other

bishops from southern Viennensis, the two Narbonenses and the Alpes Maritimae.¹⁸⁷ Armed with the Tome, the new bishop of Arles (whose name appears at the head of the list) had evidently succeeded in carving out a sizeable constituency for himself, despite the fact that he had been denied a formal primacy. The inference that the synodical text was drafted by Ravennius himself or one of his close associates would seem to be borne out by the similarity between certain expressions contained in this letter and the earlier petition; one notes, for example, a reference to the apostolic see 'unde religionis nostrae... fons et origo manavit' (V 69-70). As an expression of Gallic ultramontanist the document left little to be desired. As we shall see, it is no less interesting as an expression of contemporary ideas of the 'fides conscripta'.

The first half of the letter is mainly concerned with the reception of the Tome. After accounting for their delayed response (I 13-23), the bishops evoke the reaction of those who had seen the text of Leo's statement: they themselves had rejoiced on discovering its contents, that joy was now shared by everyone in Gaul ('omnes intra Gallias constitutos exultare mox fecimus'), all alike grieved for those who had fallen into error (I 24-28). What follows next is worth pausing over. Leo's Tome is assimilated to the 'baptismal' creed:

Quae apostolatus vestri scripta, ita ut symbolum fidei,
quisquis redemptionis sacramenta non negligit, tabulis
cordis adscribit, et tenaci, quo ad confundendos
haereticorum errores paratior sit, memoriae commendavit.
(I 28-31)

As noted earlier, the idea of the 'baptismal' creed as a text to be inscribed in the heart was a commonplace of contemporary 'expositiones symboli'.¹⁸⁸ Given that the mystery of man's salvation (as 'symbolised' in the act of baptism) was intimately bound up with that of Christ's incarnation - a point emphasised by Leo in the Tome - it was perhaps only natural that a text which seemed to guarantee a better understanding of both mysteries (cf. 'redemptionis sacramenta') should have been regarded as fit for similar treatment. On the other hand, as has been suggested at several points in this chapter, Gallic 'litterati' may have been more than ordinarily susceptible to the charms of creed-like summaries of the faith. In granting credal status to Leo's Tome they would appear to have been influenced, above all, by its relative brevity and by the 'apostolic' claims of its author.

Of the mass of Christological documents brought back from Rome by Petronius and Regulus, the pope's letter to Flavian was the only one that could be received as a convenient exposition of the faith. Not only was Leo's statement contained within the limits of the 'modus epistolaris', the manner of its composition would also have made certain parts of it, if not the whole, eminently suitable for memorisation. Its lapidary, frequently formulaic, highly artificial style would almost certainly have been appreciated by an audience of Christian 'litterati' who - to judge from the examples of Leporius, Vincent, Graecus and Faustus - were as much concerned with the presentation of religious doctrine as with its content.¹⁸⁹ This interest in presentation was not, as the statements of both Vincent and Faustus make plain, a purely artistic one. Ravennius and his fellow bishops would presumably have

been interested in the possibility of transmitting orthodox Christological doctrine to their congregations (cf. 'omnes intra Gallias constitutos'). Formulas such as those provided by Leo could be usefully incorporated in their own sermons 'de incarnatione' (as required, for instance, on the Feast of the Nativity) or 'de trinitate'.¹⁹⁰ They might also serve, where necessary, in the fight against heresy ('ad confundendos hereticorum errores'). As in contemporary expositions of the creed, however, a sense of the pastoral and personal utility of a text can here be seen to converge with an appreciation of its aesthetic qualities. Vincent, it will be recalled, had compared the presentation of dogma to the sculpting of precious stones.¹⁹¹ Ravennius (or his draftsman) sees fit to thank Leo for the gift of a text 'quo non solum Gallias, sed totum mundum, velut quibusdam pretiosissimis gemmis ornavit [apostolatus vester]' (III 41-42).

The phrase 'apostolatus vester' occurs frequently as an appellation for Leo both in the text of the letter and in the subscriptions of individual bishops. As well as accepting the decisions of the Apostolic See in matters of discipline (such as that recently pronounced upon), the bishop of Arles and his colleagues thus implicitly affirmed their acceptance of the pope's doctrinal authority. As is apparent from Vincent's Commonitorium, the idea of a papal 'magisterium' (as it would later be called) was not current in Gaul in the early fifth century. Former bishops of Rome might qualify as 'magistri probabiles', along with other orthodox teachers who had pronounced on matters of the faith. Or they might take part in a council that produced a doctrinal decree. The possibility that a living pope could be considered, in his own right

as a successor of Peter, as the originator of uniquely authoritative statements 'de fide' was not envisaged by Vincent.¹⁹² In this respect, the synodical letter of 451 may be seen to mark a development. Ravennius and his party show no hesitation in ascribing to the pope an office of 'apostolica institutio' (III 45). They even assert that the amended heretic would henceforth believe 'quod per os vestrum dominus noster Iesus Christus de sacramento incarnationis suae docet' (III 47-48). Their acceptance of the Tome 'ut symbolum fidei' is clearly a product of this general attitude of deference towards the Roman pontiff. One ought not, however, to exaggerate the honour done to Leo. Educated Gallic Christians of this period did not, it has been suggested, necessarily regard the text of the 'baptismal' creed as an apostolic composition in the strict sense (i.e. as composed by the apostles).¹⁹³ They could therefore assimilate a 'tomus' or 'epistola' to the 'symbolum fidei' without elevating its author to a status superior to that of all other post-apostolic Christian writers. Moreover, as the draftsman of the synodical letter makes plain, Leo's definition contained nothing that was not already a part of the faith traditionally held in Gaul:

Multi itaque in ea gaudentes pariter et exultantes,
 recognoverunt fidei sui sensum, et ita se semper ex
 traditione paterna tenuisse, ut vester apostolatus exposuit,
 iure laetantur. (I 32-34)

The pope's statement confirmed an existing doctrinal tradition. It is not necessary to restrict the sense of 'traditio paterna' to the formal process of the 'traditio symboli', though the idea of that process may well be present: the distinction drawn is one between a formal, written definition of the faith and an understanding of the same faith obtained by essentially oral transmission from one generation to the next. Leo's

mise par écrit of the traditional faith would, it is claimed, have the effect of assisting its proclamation: 'asser[it] unusquisque quod credit... suffragante apostolicae sedis auctoritate' (II 38-9) (cf. I 13-14: 'epistola... quam... pro catholicae fidei assertionem sistis'). In principle, however, his text represented no more than a temporary manifestation of the faith in written form: once his words had been committed to memory - that is, inscribed in the 'tables of the heart' - there would be no further need of his Tome.¹⁹⁴

As a complement to the synodical declaration of 451, one may consider a letter sent to the pope at around the same time by three bishops from Alpine sees - Ceretius, Salonius and Veranus - which also concerns the Tome. The second- and third-named persons may be identified as the sons of Eucherius, both of whom had been tutored at Lérins. Salonius had since become bishop of Geneva, Veranus of Vence; Ceretius, apparently the most senior of the three, occupied the see of Grenoble.¹⁹⁵ Despite their absence from Ravennius' council, all these men can be safely reckoned as members of the cultural community there represented. Their background - aristocratic and (in at least two out of three cases) monastic - was the same as that which can be reconstructed or supposed for such persons as Ravennius himself, Rusticus of Narbonne, Venerius of Marseille, Maximus of Riez and Valerianus of Cimiez (all signatories of the text analysed above).¹⁹⁶ Like those present at the council, they could be expected to combine a practical interest in the communication of orthodox doctrine with a fine sensitivity to the artistic aspects of dogmatic expression.

The three bishops begin their letter by acknowledging receipt of the Tome [888A]. There follows a conceit on Leo's prescience in forestalling error in one province (Gaul) while extirpating it elsewhere [888A-889A], from which it appears that Ceretius and his colleagues had no direct experience of Christological unorthodoxy in their own dioceses. Lack of local controversy would not, however, prevent the Tome from becoming an object of keen interest on the part of Christian 'studiosi'. After thanking Leo for the work, the writers make this request:

Idcirco si dignanter admittis, deprecamur ut opus et praesentibus et futuris temporibus profuturum, quod nos asservandi studio foliis mandare curavimus, sanctitas vestra percurrere, et si quid librarii errore defuerit, emendare dignetur; vel, si salutarem lecturis omnibus paginam aliquo studii vestri accumulastis augmento, idipsum addi libello huic sollicita pietate iubeatis: ut non solum plures sancti episcopi fratres nostri per Gallias, verum etiam multi ex laicis filii vestri, qui epistolam istam magnopere pro veritatis manifestatione desiderant, remissam ad nos, et sancta manu vestra emendatam transcribere, legere et tenere mereantur. [889B]

The respect here shown for the Tome is equal to that evinced by the synodical document quoted earlier. Like the author(s) of that document, the present writers apparently regarded the faculty of 'apostolic' utterance as an aspect of Leo's tenure of the Petrine see: 'merito illic principatum sedis apostolicae constitutum, unde adhuc apostolici spiritus oracula reserentur' [889A]. As before, emphasis is laid also on the mnemonic character of the Tome ('ut... epistolam illam... tenere mereantur') and on its utility as a summary of the faith ('opus et praesentibus et futuris temporibus profuturum'). Ceretius, Salonius and Veranus would clearly have experienced no difficulty in subscribing a document in which Leo's letter was received 'ut symbolum fidei'. In

their eyes, the Tome was nothing less than a 'saving text'; the phrase which they employ - 'pagina salutaris' - evokes both the brevity of the composition and its sacramental quality.¹⁹⁷ Compared with their colleagues, however, they appear less interested in metaphors of inscription than in the practicalities of securing a text. These practicalities may be considered under the three headings of emendation, promulgation and preservation.

The first concern of the writers is to obtain an ~~emended~~ text of Leo's Tome. They refer to the work as 'per omnium ecclesiarum conventicula celebrat[um]'. In the absence of any suggestion to the contrary one may suppose (with the brothers Ballerini) that they owed their copy, or copies, to the measures taken by Ravennius for its diffusion in Gaul.¹⁹⁸ Now they wished to establish a good exemplar on which further copies could be made. Since it was possible to refer to the author himself for verification of the text, that is what they did. Apart from their concern for textual fidelity, it had occurred to them that Leo might already have produced a 'second edition' of the Tome ('si... aliquo... accumulastis augmento').

Once revised by the author, the text of the Tome could be safely **promulgated**. Leo's original brief to Ravennius had been to ensure distribution of the work to every bishop in Gaul ('universis fratribus'). Ceretius and his associates were anxious to furnish copies not only to their colleagues in the episcopate¹⁹⁹ but also to interested laymen ('multi ex laicis'). Between the clergy on the one hand (primary recipients of the Tome in the persons of their bishops) and the mass of

the faithful on the other (beneficiaries of its message through pastoral instruction) there was evidently a well-defined 'second estate', consisting of literate laymen eager to study such documents for themselves. The manners of these lay Christian 'litterati' - many of whom would have been 'conversi' - may be glimpsed in the correspondence of Gallic writers like Faustus of Riez, Sidonius Apollinaris and Ruricius of Limoges. Evoking a scene which took place in Vienne or Lyon some years later (c.469), Claudianus Mamertus relates how he had come across a group of people - presumably laymen - poring over an anonymous theological tract, every one of them '(as is normal in such cases) excited by the prospect of getting to know a new work and intent on grasping its significance.'²⁰⁰ In attending to the publication of Leo's letter, Ceretius and his brother bishops were catering for a ready market.

They were not, however, concerned solely with the immediate needs of the Christian reading public; the text of the Tome was also to be preserved for the future ('futuris temporibus profuturum'). To this end, we are told, it had already been transferred to a parchment codex ('quod nos asservandi studio foliis mandare curavimus' - cf. 'libello huic'). In making such provision, the three Alpine bishops show a keen awareness of the requirements of a doctrinal tradition that was now also, in large measure, a literary tradition. The idea that the Tome could be memorised like the 'baptismal' creed - as proposed in the synodical letter of 451 - was more than just a pious conceit; late antique men and women were, we know, capable of much greater feats of memory than this. However, texts like the Tome were not simply to be entrusted to the collective memory of succeeding generations of Christ-

ians. As Vincent and others had long since recognized, the successful transmission of orthodox doctrine now depended on the maintenance of a body of texts. If Leo's Tome merited credal status it also needed to be copied, re-copied and kept.

*

Evidence of Gallic concern with Christological definition does not cease abruptly in c.451. Many of the dogmatic statements made by writers of the immediately succeeding period presuppose a continued frequentation of texts of the sort preserved 'in foliis' by Ceretius, Salonius and Veranus.²⁰¹ Enough has already been said, however, to indicate the main directions of contemporary thought on this subject. Taken as a whole, the testimony of writers like Cassian and Leporius, Vincent, Faustus, and the recipients of Leo's Tome is sufficient to persuade one that Gallic interest in 'fides conscriptae', originally stimulated by reports on the activity of fourth-century councils, was sustained in the later period - and that it came to have important implications for the Christian reader-writer's idea of his own function. In the following section, an attempt will be made to link these developments with the wider history of early Latin creeds and with individual products of fifth-century Gallic creed-making.

IV. Some other creeds

By the time the emperor Theodosius came to power in 379, according to R.P.C. Hanson, "most responsible Christians had come to the conclusion... that the formulae enshrined in the [Nicene] creed... were the best expression of the church's doctrine of God and best declared what the church believed".²⁰² In this sense, the accession of the second great 'Christian emperor' may be said to mark the end of a formative period in the history of Christian attitudes towards texts. The idea that the essence of the Christian faith could be expressed in a single authoritative statement had first been seriously proposed during the period of the church's political establishment under Constantine; more than half a century later, at the beginning of a new epoch of ecclesiastical consolidation and expansion, the existence of such a statement was recognized by the majority of educated Christians. The imposition of Nicene orthodoxy, as is clear from the works of Christian authors of the latter part of the fourth century, ultimately involved the imposition of a text.²⁰³ This text - Ambrose's 'liber sacerdotalis' - would henceforth be copied, commented upon and held in the highest regard wherever Christianity extended its dominion. The status of many other Christian texts would be determined, in part, by their relation to it. Already (it has been suggested) the attention given to the Nicene creed by fourth-century theologians had affected the way in which Christians regarded their baptismal professions. In future, any statement 'de fide' would be liable to association with the 'fides Nicaena'.

In theory, the creed drafted in 325 was adequate in itself. In practice, and from as early as the 380s (if not before), it needed to be expanded and/or supplemented by other concise statements of the faith.²⁰⁴ There was nothing surprising about this. The '318 fathers' had been concerned to exclude the errors of Arius: 'Sufficiebat fides conscripta apud Nicaeam adversus haeresin Arianam...' (so begins a 'confession' of c.380).²⁰⁵ They had not had to deal with the Christology of a Photinus or Apollinarius, or with ideas concerning the nature of the Holy Spirit promoted by the 'Macedoniani'. Nor had they taken any special precaution against the possible confusion of the persons of the Trinity which, to the western mind at least, would always suggest the heresy of Sabellianism. Consequently, the final triumph of Nicene theology was attended by a process of discreet addition to the Nicene text. In the East, the task of dogmatic aggiornamento was undertaken, if not (in everyone's view) satisfactorily performed, by the Council of Constantinople of 381.²⁰⁶ At around the same time in the West there appeared a document of the utmost importance for the history of dogmatic formulation, known as the Tomus Damasi.²⁰⁷ The major part of this work consists of a list of twenty-three anathemas, designed to clarify various aspects of Trinitarian and Christological doctrine, concluding with the words: 'Haec ergo est salus Christianorum, ut credentes trinitati, id est, patri et filio et spiritui sancto in eam veram, solam, unam divinitatem et potentiam eiusdem, haec sine dubio credamus.' It is not known in exactly what circumstances the Tome was first promulgated. In one of the two major recensions of the text the anathemas appear as a sequel to the Nicene creed and are introduced as follows: 'Post hoc concilium Nicaenum, quod in urbe Roma concilium

congregatum est a catholicis episcopis, addiderunt de spiritu sancto...'
Whatever the origins of the document, it is clear that it came to be regarded at an early stage as a set of addenda to the anathemas drafted in 325 and thus as a natural extension of the positive statement issued on that occasion.

The Tomus Damasi is preserved in a number of important early medieval collections of dogmatic texts. Besides the Nicene creed (in one or other of its Latin versions) the same collections also regularly contain other credal texts of broadly similar type but with contents that indicate composition after c.380.²⁰⁸ The history of these texts is one of the great mysteries of patristic literature. The titles which they bear in the manuscripts - e.g. 'Fides catholica', 'Fides Damasi', 'Fides Romanorum', 'Fides s. Augustini', 'Fides s. Hieronymi' - are generally either vague or misleading (or both). Few (if any) of them can be attached with any certainty to a particular gathering of bishops; thus they cannot be considered as 'conciliar' creeds. Where a particular author or historical occasion is reliably indicated, the style of the dogmatic utterance frequently suggests indebtedness to an earlier model; thus it is doubtful whether they can be fitly described as 'private' or 'personal' creeds. The most useful way of approaching these texts may well be to regard them as products of a continuous tradition in Latin creed-making, dating from the time when it first became generally apparent to Christian 'litterati' (1) that the catholic faith had been drafted, once and for all, at Nicaea in 325, and (2) that the Nicene creed was to be understood to imply a great deal more than it obviously expressed. The evidence of such creed-making activity in the

late fourth and fifth centuries will be sampled in the following paragraphs of this section. At the outset, one may note a remark made by Augustine in Book One of the De trinitate (composed c.399) concerning those '[qui] perturbantur, cum audiunt deum patrem, et deum filium, et deum spiritum sanctum, et tamen hanc trinitatem non tres deos, sed unum deum' (I 8,5). It was once held that these words revealed a knowledge on the author's part of a particular credal text, namely the 'Athanasian' creed or 'Quicumque'.²⁰⁹ It now seems more reasonable to interpret them as the sign of a time when (as one scholar puts it) "the common sense of the church was busy at work on certain formulas which experience taught men they might safely employ in speaking of the Holy Trinity."²¹⁰ Without attempting to penetrate the 'common sense of the church' in the Theodosian age, it may be possible to reconstruct a number of these essays in post-Nicene creed-making, with an eye to the possible contributions of Gallic 'litterati'.

Attention has already been drawn to the unique achievement of Hilary of Poitiers in the area of Latin religious expression. While for the most part eschewing brevity in his own utterances 'de fide', he left behind a stock of formulae ideally suited for use in creed-like statements.²¹¹ Among those who exploited this resource in the final decade of the fourth century was Victricius, bishop of Rouen, who included a brief Trinitarian confession in his panegyric De laude sanctorum (composed c.396 and dedicated to the champion of western orthodoxy, Ambrose of Milan).²¹² The confession comprises (1) an assertion of the unity-in-trinity of the Godhead, based on a number of passages in Hilary's work, (2) a paraphrase of the Christological part of the

'baptismal' creed, (3) a collation of biblical verses relating to the Holy Spirit. Some years later (in 403), the same writer seems to have presented a similar confession of faith to pope Innocent, the terms of which are partially reproduced in a letter to Victricius from Paulinus of Nola.²¹³ Whether gratuitously, or because he suspected his correspondent of Apollinarian leanings, Paulinus also added a Christological passage of his own. Both Paulinus and Victricius were admirers of Martin of Tours and may have considered themselves inheritors of the theological legacy of his master, the former bishop of Poitiers. Martin's hagiographer, the Aquitanian Sulpicius Severus, was likewise a reader of Hilary's work and pays eloquent tribute to his practical 'confession' of the faith;²¹⁴ he appears, however, not to have been particularly interested in problems of dogmatic formulation. For further signs of such an interest among Gallic 'litterati' one must look to the monastic milieux of Provence in the second, third and fourth decades of the fifth century.

The initiatives of Leporius, Cassian, Vincent and Faustus in the production and reception of credal texts have been discussed at length in the previous section of this chapter, with special reference to the drafting of Christological summaries. It will be sufficient to note here (1) the evidence of Gallic concern with Trinitarian (as well as Christological) formulation, and (2) the absence of any serious attempt to integrate the expression of beliefs concerning the nature of the Godhead with a statement of the means of human salvation.

Among the writers commemorated in the Gennadian De viris illustribus of whom no other trace remains is a certain 'Sabbatius, Gallicanae provinciae episcopus', credited with authorship of a work De fide in which 'ostendit patrem et filium non duarum esse naturarum ex divinitate parillum, sed unius essentiae et alterum ex altero, id est ex patre filium, alterum alteri coaeternum, cui credulitati Aetius et Eunomius contradicunt.'²¹⁵ The position of this notice in Gennadius' catalogue indicates that Sabbatius' floruit should be placed in the late fourth or early fifth century. The fact that his treatise was dedicated to a consecrated virgin named Secunda may suggest that the refutation of historically interesting forms of Trinitarian heresy had by then become a subject of polite interest for 'litteratae' and 'litterati' alike. That precision in the formulation of Trinitarian theology was, in any case, a quality much admired in the Christian preacher is clear from the tribute paid to Honoratus of Arles (formerly abbot of Lérins) by his disciple Hilary:

Quotidianus siquidem in sincerissimis tractatibus
 confessionis patris ac filii ac spiritus sancti testis
 fuisti: nec facile tam exerte tam lucide quisquam de
 divinitatis trinitate disseruit, cum eam personis
 distingueres, et gloriae aeternitate ac maiestate
 sociares.²¹⁶

This passage and a similar one from the 'Sermo in depositione sancti Honorati' attributed to 'Eusebius Gallicanus' were regularly cited by A.E. Burn in support of his theory (later abandoned) of Honoratus' authorship of the 'Quicumque';²¹⁷ what they undoubtedly show is the convergence of a concern for personal orthodoxy with an interest in pastoral efficacy, both of which were seen as being served by the use of well-chosen formulae. Hilary's own biographer (writing c.475)

summarises his dying instructions to the clergy of Arles in the double imperative: 'fidem trinitatis immobiliter retinete, scripturarum interiora penetrate.'²¹⁸ The command receives added poignancy from an accompanying premonition of the trials that the city would shortly undergo at the hands of the Arian Goths. Insofar as any record survives of the oral instruction 'de trinitate' provided by Honoratus, Hilary and other fifth-century Gallic bishops, it is to be found in the sermons attributed to 'Eusebius' and those published by Caesarius of Arles.²¹⁹ Evidence of their written pronouncements is generally harder to come by and often impossible to date - for the obvious reason that any truly serviceable statement on this subject was likely to be removed from its original (bibliographical) context, adapted as necessary, and re-titled 'De fide catholica'. Thus, whereas Faustus' substantial treatise De spiritu sancto has been preserved entire under the name of Paschasius,²²⁰ it is no longer possible to identify with certainty the work described by Gennadius as a 'parvus libellus... adversum Arianos et Macedonianos... in quo coessentialem praedicat trinitatem'.²²¹ The major exception to this rule (prior to the work of Caesarius in the sixth century) is provided by the literary activity of Gennadius himself who, though not a bishop, clearly played a major role in the codification of Christian doctrine in the province.²²²

When combined with the material surveyed in the previous section of this chapter, the above evidence of Gallic interest in the problems of theological formulation is sufficient to suggest that southern Gaul in the fifth century would be a natural place to look for draftsmen of creed-like statements of the (post-)Nicene faith. Before considering

the possible Gallic associations of extant anonymous and pseudonymous 'fides catholicae', it is worth reflecting on one further fact: despite their involvement, at various times between c.418 and c.529, in major debates concerning the respective roles of grace and free will in the process of human salvation, Gallic authors of this period show no inclination to expand the ordinary credal format so as to accommodate a statement of their beliefs on that issue. In this respect, it seems, they shared the opinion of Pelagians like Caelestius who had argued that such matters lay outside the 'faith' strictly conceived ('praeter fidem') and were therefore open to discussion.²²³ Augustine, as is well known, had taken the contrary view. According to the bishop of Hippo, a person who mistook the quality of human nature after the Fall (as the Pelagians did) did not err 'in aliqua quaestione, in qua dubitari vel errari salva fide potest, sed in ipsa regula fidei qua Christiani sumus, gratiae dei convincitur inimicus.'²²⁴ This important difference of opinion is reflected in the contrasting expressions given to the 'Rule of Faith' by the two parties concerned. In setting out their beliefs for the benefit of pope Zosimus in 417, both Caelestius and Pelagius adhered to a credal form in use in the West since the 390s (and ultimately based on the 'baptismal' creed), consisting of a full statement of Trinitarian and Christological doctrine followed by a number of additional articles.²²⁵ Such allusions as they made to the issues currently in dispute thus appeared separately from their statements concerning the nature of the Godhead and the work of Christ. When, some years later (c.422), Augustine found himself obliged to state in summary form 'quod [sit] certum propriumque fidei catholicae fundamentum', he also chose the 'baptismal' creed as the basis of his

exposition - with startlingly different results.²²⁶ Instead of appearing as an appendix to the 'theological' part of the creed (as one might have expected), the author's ideas on original sin, grace and predestination were fully incorporated into his commentary on its first and second (as well as third) articles.²²⁷ The Enchiridion thus combined theory of God and theory of salvation in a manner unprecedented in any previous Latin credal statement. It did not, however, lead immediately to a redrafting of traditional formulae, as can be seen from the reactions of Gallic creed-makers of this period. Though prepared, on occasion, to produce creed-like statements 'de gratia et libero arbitrio',²²⁸ Prosper makes no attempt at a more integrated summary 'de fide'. Vincent's use of the concept of the 'regula fidei' suggests that he understood the expression in a more or less restricted sense, as applying to doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation.²²⁹ Confronting a priest who had lapsed into predestinatarianism, Faustus has this to say:

illud autem venerationem tuam dixisse miratus sum, quod nullus umquam sub religiosa professione contra catholicam fidem vel scripserit vel praedicaverit, cum plurimi multiplices et profanos errores suos etiam scriptorum monumentis crediderint inserendos, qui tamen Christiano nomine gloriabantur.²³⁰

As the sequel shows, the writer's concern that no erroneous statement on the subject of grace and free will be admitted to the series of documents representative of the 'fides catholica' had led him to produce a summary of his own. The rules laid down for the drafting of dogmatic texts in his letter to Graecus presumably also held in cases such as this. There is no indication, however, that the bishop of Riez had any intention of combining theology and soteriology in a single concise 'scriptum'/'legendum'. When this task was eventually accomplished by a

Gallic writer (Gennadius) the result was an extended version of the old scheme of confession used by Pelagius, Caelestius and (it seems) the majority of fifth-century Latin creed-makers.

What traces of Gallic interest in the formulation of dogma are there to be found among the Latin credal texts that survive from late antiquity ? In answering this question one is obliged to take account of almost a century's research on individual specimens of post-Nicene creed-making, the results of which are anything but conclusive. The most widely-studied of all these 'miscellaneous' creeds is, of course, the 'Quicumque' (or 'Athanasian' creed). In an important work published in 1896, A.E. Burn re-stated the case - already made by Ommanney and others - for regarding this creed as the work of a Gallic author of the early fifth century.²³¹ He also suggested that both the 'Quicumque' and another text of similar structure (the so-called 'Fides Damasi') might originally have been directed against certain Trinitarian and Christological doctrines held by the Priscillianists.²³² This suggestion was taken up and developed by K. Künstle who argued (in two studies published in 1900 and 1905) that a whole series of early Latin 'fides' and related texts were to be considered as anti-Priscillianist productions, of Spanish origin. Despite the reservations expressed by many eminent scholars, Künstle's thesis exercised a powerful influence on subsequent research.²³³ In particular, the idea that Spanish writers of the late-fourth and fifth centuries were especially expert in the drafting of creed-like texts is one that has persisted to this day. Reviewing the list of early creeds of 'Triado-Christological' type in

1934, A. de Aldama pronounced in favour of a Spanish prototype, which he attributed to Gregory of Elvira.²³⁴ (This did not, however, prevent him from ascribing both the 'Quicumque' and the 'Fides Damasi' to Gallic authors - a view which is reflected in the current edition of the Roman Catholic Church's Enchiridion symbolorum.)²³⁵ The author of the most recent full-length study of the 'Athanasian' creed, J.N.D. Kelly, likewise makes Spain the "centre, or more precisely the source" of a credal activity of which the 'Quicumque' is a (Gallic) by-product.²³⁶

The theory of Spanish dominance (or at least priority) in a certain kind of early post-Nicene creed-making, though easily reconcilable with the view of Gallic activity in this area obtained in the course of the present chapter, does not stand up to scrutiny. Its plausibility depends on the possibility (1) of extrapolating the creed-making prowess of seventh-century Spanish councils into an earlier period, (2) of reading anti-Priscillianist intent into commonplace statements of Trinitarian and Christological orthodoxy, (3) of attributing the so-called 'Libellus fidei' or 'Fides Romanorum' to Gregory of Elvira. Since no-one would now subscribe Künstle's attempt to 're-date' the creeds of the fourth (633), sixth (638) and eleventh (675) councils of Toledo,²³⁷ the argument for a strong tradition of Spanish conciliar creed-making in the fifth century rests on de Aldama's identification of the creeds of Toledo 400 and c.447, neither of which (following the work of B. Vollmann and H. Chadwick) seems likely to be authentic.²³⁸ Similarly, whereas modern scholarship may grant "that the Priscillianist doctrine of the Trinity occupied a rather larger place in the controversy than one would deduce from the great majority of the

documents",²³⁹ it requires more than the mere assertion of orthodoxy as proof that a text was written with Priscillianism specifically in mind. Finally, Gregory's claim to the invention of the 'Triado-Christological' type of creed has been undermined by the discovery that the 'Libellus fidei' (at least in its present form) could not have appeared before the second quarter of the fifth century.²⁴⁰ Having removed these three prejudices in favour of the 'Spanish' tradition of creed-making, how many early Spanish or putatively Spanish creeds remain ? The answer is: two of Triado-Christological type, attributable to Bacharius and Pastor, and one other. At some time in the early fifth century (as it now seems) a wandering ascetic named Bacharius was obliged to clear himself of a suspicion of heresy while living in Rome; the manner in which he does so strongly suggests that he came from the part of Spain associated with the name of Priscillian.²⁴¹ His apology includes a formal profession of faith of common type. The similarities between this profession and another made by Rufinus were once cited as evidence of a Roman protocol for statements of this kind; it has since been shown that Bacharius was copying from Rufinus' Apologia ad Anastasium (400).²⁴² A Spanish connection may also be indicated for the work described in Gennadius' De viris illustribus, c.87:

PASTOR, episcopus, composuit libellum in modum symboli parvum totam paene ecclesiasticam credulitatem per sententias continentem, in quo inter ceteras dissensiones, quas praetermissis auctorum vocabulis anathematizat, Priscillianos cum ipso auctore nomine damnat.

A text answering this specification is preserved in the Hispana canon-law collection, where it is simultaneously associated with the Council of Toledo of 400 and ascribed to another Spanish council said to have

convened during the pontificate of pope Leo the Great (440-461); in all probability it had no original connection with either assembly.²⁴³ Announced in the Hispana as a 'regula fidei catholicae contra omnes haereses et quam maxime contra Priscillianos', it consists of a credal statement of Triado-Christological type followed by eighteen anathemas, the last of which explicitly condemns Priscillianism. Though Gennadius shows no sign of knowing that Pastor was Spanish,²⁴⁴ the modern assumption that he was may well be justified. Wherever he came from, the author of the 'parvus libellus' seems to have done no more than embellish an existing credal statement (with twelve anathemas) that is still extant, variously attributed to Augustine or Jerome, and for which no Spanish context need be supposed.²⁴⁵ The other putatively Spanish creed of this period is the Fides Valeriani ascribed (on the strength of a notice appended to the Hieronymian De viris illustribus) to an early fifth-century bishop of Calahorra.²⁴⁶

It appears, then, that claims made for the productivity of late-antique Spanish creed-makers, especially with regard to texts of Triado-Christological type, may have been somewhat exaggerated. Does this mean that one would be justified in transferring the 'centre' or 'source' of this particular kind of credal activity to southern Gaul ? Clearly, it does not. In the first place, there is no reason to suppose that any Gallic 'litteratus' was responsible for inventing the Triado-Christological form of creed. (Such evidence as there is suggests that the origins of western use of this form are to be looked for in Italy in the 380s.) Secondly, the class of extant late-antique creeds currently ascribed a Gallic provenance is itself fairly small (some three or four

texts including the 'Quicumque'). One may of course question whether the extent of credal activity in a given region is properly to be judged in terms of the number of its 'native' creeds. As earlier sections of this chapter have shown, many of the clearest indications of Gallic interest in dogma relate to documents transmitted from other parts of the Roman world (e.g. from the East in the time of Hilary, from North Africa in the time of Augustine, from Rome in the time of pope Leo). At every stage, it seems, the concern shown by Gallic 'litterati' for the production of creed-like summaries of the faith was stimulated and conditioned by their reception of texts from outside the province. This being the case, any thoroughgoing attempt to reconstruct the history of specifically Gallic credal activity ought (one may suppose) to begin with a survey of the manuscript evidence for the earliest western collections of dogmatic texts. That survey cannot be undertaken here. To conclude this chapter, it is proposed simply to refer to a number of late-fifth-century creeds of Gallic origin, associating them where possible with elements of the credal ideology observed in previous sections.

The most interesting of all probable relics of early Gallic creed-making is the 'Quicumque' or 'Athanasian' creed. The arguments for assigning this text to Gaul have been cogently presented by J.N.D. Kelly, whose conclusions may be summarised here. The 'Quicumque' is a credal text of the type traditionally (if wrongly) associated with Spain, providing a didactic presentation of the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation. The measured way in which it deals with the heresy of

Nestorianism indicates a date of composition after c.440. The fact that Eutychianism is not clearly envisaged does not provide a terminus ante quem; this is dictated, instead, by evidence of the use made of the text by Caesarius of Arles (+542). The theology and argumentative style of the creed are dependent on the literary achievements of Augustine and Vincent of Lérins. Though it is unlikely that Vincent was the author, all the evidence points to Lérins as the milieu in which it was elaborated "at some time between 440 and the high noon of Caesarius' activity".²⁴⁷ To this exposé one may add three observations, suggested by a more general study of Gallic attitudes to creeds and creed-making. First, the strongly didactic character of the 'Quicumque' - which (as Kelly records) caused Thomas Aquinas to deny its credal status - is perfectly consistent with ideas expressed by fifth-century Gallic 'litterati' concerning the use of creed-like texts. Vincent (in his way), Faustus, and the author responsible for the synodical letter acknowledging receipt of Leo's Tome all lay emphasis on the utility of creeds as means of pastoral instruction. The same thought lies behind Hilary's tribute to the dogmatic preaching of Honoratus and the pseudo-Eusebius' attribution of the 'baptismal' creed to certain fathers of the church, 'de populorum salute solliciti'. In prefixing a text of the 'Fides s. Athanasii' to a collection of sermons, and recommending it to clergy and laymen alike for their education, Caesarius was following in a long tradition of essentially public credal activity.²⁴⁸ Secondly, the insistence found in the 'Quicumque' on the importance of correct belief for salvation (vv. 1-2, 42 in Kelly's text) would seem to fit naturally with a general conception of creeds as 'saving texts', expressed most clearly in Gallic 'expositiones symboli' (but also

elsewhere - e.g. in the letter of the Alpine bishops to pope Leo). Thirdly, the termini proposed by Kelly for the composition of this particular creed (c.440-540) include a period in which, as has been shown, the interest of southern Gallic 'litterati' in the theory and practice of creed-making ran high. A major defect of several other attempts to date and localise the 'Quicumque' has been their failure to prove not merely the availability at a given time and place of the materials required for such a work but also the presence of persons concerned to undertake it. This problem of creed-making personnel does not apply to Gaul in the mid-fifth century; if it is impossible to identify an 'only begetter' for the 'Athanasian' creed, one can at least point to a community of Christian 'litterati' that may have been responsible for its nurture.

Thus far, admittedly, our examples of Gallic interest in creeds have been mainly confined to the period up to c.450. It is possible to go beyond this date by considering the works attributed to Gennadius of Marseille (fl. 470).²⁴⁹ Gennadius' singular description of Vincent of Lerins as 'vir... notitia ecclesiasticorum dogmatum sufficienter instructus' has already been noted.²⁵⁰ It is clear from his catalogue of Christian writers and their works that he himself took a special interest in the formulation of dogma. Along with a number of other works 'De fide (adversus haereticos)' (e.g. cc.14,23,25,43,58,66), he refers to the professions of Bachiarus (c.24)²⁵¹ and Leporius (c.60), to the dogmatic statements of popes Innocent (c.44), Celestine (c.55), Sixtus (c.55) and Leo (c.71), and to three 'libelli fidei' attributed (falsely, in his opinion) to Theophilus of Alexandria (c.34). He was

acquainted with a collection of dogmatic texts attributed (again, as he believed, falsely) to a certain Syagrius, which is still extant (c.66).²⁵² He complains of the convoluted style of a work 'De trinitate et de incarnatione domini' by Isaac (c.26). In a drastically abbreviated notice on Augustine (c.39) he finds space only for the De trinitate and for two texts (compendia ?) entitled 'De incarnatione domini' and 'De resurrectione mortuorum' - all of which would have been useful to the prospective creed-maker.²⁵³ He notes the De symbolo of Nicetas of Remesiana (c.22) and has high praise for the similar work of Rufinus (c.17). Finally, as observed above, he shows special appreciation of the 'parvus libellus in modum symboli' of bishop Pastor (c.77). This evident concern for the **literary expression of orthodoxy** provides one of the main points of contrast between Gennadius' catalogue and that of his predecessor, Jerome. The latter, it may be recalled, had been reproached by Augustine for not signalling clearly enough the errors of the heretics whom he had listed;²⁵⁴ Gennadius refers the reader to a parallel Catalogus haereticorum.²⁵⁵ According to a notice appended to his De viris (probably by a sixth-century continuator), the author was also responsible for a number of other anti-heretical works, including a treatise Adversum omnes haereses in eight books (c.101).²⁵⁶ The possible remains of this very substantial output of dogmatic writing comprise: (1) a few chapters found in certain manuscripts of the De haeresibus of Augustine and pseudo-Jerome;²⁵⁷ (2) the first and/or second recension of a dogmatic summary variously attributed to the Council of Nicaea, Augustine, and (least improbably) Gennadius, known as the Liber sive definitio ecclesiasticorum dogmatum;²⁵⁸ (3) a profession of faith prefixed to the collection of Gallic disciplinary canons known

as the Statuta ecclesiae antiqua and now commonly held to be a work of Gennadius;²⁵⁹ (4) a credal statement ascribed to the same author in a ninth-century manuscript.²⁶⁰ The second, third and fourth items in this list are of obvious interest for a study of early Gallic creed-making.

The Fides Gennadii - item (4) above - is a creed of Triado-Christological type containing a number of echoes (if that is what they are) of the 'Quicumque'. The theory that this text might be derived from the 'Epistula de fide mea missa ad beatum Gelasium episcopum urbis Romae' mentioned in c.101 of the De viris, though impossible to disprove, is rendered less likely by the nature of its concluding remarks, based on the final elements of the 'baptismal' creed. Having compared Christ's bodily resurrection to the final resurrection of the dead, the author ends paraenetically with a summons to confession and penance ('pura confessione et poenitentia'), evoked as means to the enjoyment of eternal life. The tone is euchological rather than apologetic and (one would think) inappropriate to a public profession of the kind alluded to in the passage cited. The two other Gennadian summaries of the faith were plainly intended to serve an instructional purpose. The Statuta ecclesiae antiqua is a late fifth-century compilation designed to provide a norm for the conduct of the Gallic clergy, especially of its most senior members. It opens with a detailed prescription for the examination and ordination of a new bishop. The latter was to be one 'in scripturarum sensibus cautus, [et] in dogmatibus ecclesiasticis exercitatus' [164,4-6], an ideal which reflects two of Gennadius' main areas of preoccupation in the De viris illustribus. He was, moreover, to be capable of expounding the faith in an easily

comprehensible manner: 'ante omnia... fidei documenta verbis simplicibus asserat' [164,6-7]. To show more particularly which 'documenta' were meant - and, presumably, the kind of language that was to be used - the author proceeds to give an outline of catholic orthodoxy, consisting of a Triado-Christological statement followed by a number of other points introduced by the words 'Quaerendum etiam...' (i.e. of the episcopal candidate) [165,23]. If the prospective bishop was found to be competent in all these subjects ('cum in his omnibus examinatus inventus fuerit plene instructus' [165,36-37]), then he might be ordained.

The procedure of episcopal examination laid down in the Statuta provides a likely context for the much longer, though still highly condensed, Liber ecclesiasticorum dogmatum. In its primitive form, this work opens with a statement of Trinitarian and Christological doctrine, beginning with the words: 'Credimus unum esse deum, patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum', and including a summary characterisation of relevant heresies (I-V). Next come explanations of the resurrection of the dead and the final judgment (VI-IX), of the creation of the world and the nature of man (X-XX), of the sacraments of baptism, the eucharist and penance (XXI-XXIII). The remaining chapters (XXIV-LIV) provide a medley of information on subjects as diverse as the origin of evil, dietary abstinence and the dating of Easter. The complete text covers ten printed pages. Up to a point, it may be reckoned another representative of the Triado-Christological type of creed. In this case, however, the supplementary matter (corresponding to the rubric 'Quaerendum etiam...' in the Statuta) occupies fourth-fifths of the whole. One may suppose that the author/editor began with a standard credal format, then added

to it whatever else seemed important.²⁶¹ Beyond roughly chapter XXIII there is no sign of a preconceived plan. The impression of a gradual accretion of material is borne out by the final chapter, inserted 'Propter novos legislatores, qui ideo animam tantum ad imaginem dei creatam dicunt... ut... anima incorporea esse credatur' (an allusion to the controversy on the nature of the human soul that broke out in south-eastern Gaul in c.470).²⁶² Another important divergence from ordinary credal structure appears in the treatment of heresy. The Liber dogmatum contains no anathemas; instead, heresiological information is incorporated where appropriate in the positive statement of doctrine. This development may be seen as confirming the tendency already noted in the 'Quicumque' towards a more didactic, less polemical style in the presentation of dogma. It can also be related to Gennadius' work as a catalogue of heresies and composer of anti-heretical treatises. One might, in fact, consider the whole of the rest of his literary oeuvre, including the catalogue of Christian writers, as a form of preparation for this one, concise, positive document. The continuator of Jerome's De viris illustribus was undoubtedly one of the most widely read of all Gallic 'litterati' of the late fifth century. If our sources are to be trusted, he was also one of the most prolific. It is clear, however, that he shared a literary ideal expressed, more or less eloquently, by a large number of his contemporaries and predecessors in Gaul - the ideal of a 'saving' formulation of the most important elements of Christian doctrine that would resume and clarify what had already been stated (i.e. written) elsewhere by the most reputable authorities, the Bible and the Fathers. The Liber dogmatum is an attempt to realise this ideal. It is a 'parvus libellus... totam (paene) ecclesiasticam

credulitatem per sententias continens' in which the 'modus symboli' is plainly exceeded, though not yet superseded.

The 'Quicumque' and Liber dogmatum represent the twin summits of fifth-century Gallic creed-making. One last example may serve to show this process in an alternative light. It is provided by a letter addressed by Ruricius, bishop of Limoges (c.480-510), to his colleague Sedatus of Nîmes, some time around the year 500.²⁶³ In a characteristically mannered opening, the writer tells how he thirsts after conversation with his friend, quoting Psalm 142,6 ('anima mea sicut terra sine aqua tibi'). The imagery of desiccation leads on naturally to a development on the themes of Christ as a font of life-giving water (John 7,37-38; 4,14) and of St. John as the privileged drinker at the Last Supper who belched a gospel: 'In principio erat verbum et verbum erat apud deum et deus erat verbum'. Ruricius continues in his own fashion:

Hoc erat illud verbum
quod sine tempore a patre genitum
in tempore creatur ex matre
ut creator fieret
5 ut esse posset humanitatis quaedam portio
divinitatis totius plenitudo
et plenitudinem humanitatis
portio ipsa humanitatis sua passione redimeret
dum imago invisibilis dei
10 forma fit servi
ut posset impassibilis pati
incomprehensibilis capi
immortalis mori
qui mortem occumbendo perimeret
15 ut vitam resurgendo repararet. (II 34,25-31)

Aside from the evidence that it offers of an informed interest in Christological formulae half a century after the Council of Chalcedon,²⁶⁴ this passage is chiefly significant for the context in which it appears. Ruricius had risked these expressions, so he informs his correspondent, 'quasi de huiuscemodi rebus tecum conloquens' (33-34). Credal improvisations, we are to believe, formed a natural part of polite conversation among Christian 'litterati' of Ruricius' and Sedatus' circle. In any case, a Christian writer could include a credal composition of this sort in a letter, and apologise for it, in much the same way that he might offer up other literary 'nugae'. Within the small extant correspondence of Ruricius and Sedatus, one letter from the bishop of Limoges consists of a short poem in commendation of the author, while another apparently contained an extravagant eulogy of a broken-winded horse.²⁶⁵ The same indulgence that greeted these jeux d'esprit would, presumably, have awaited the present effusion 'de incarnatione domini'.²⁶⁶

Conclusions

1. In the first half of the fourth century there appeared a new kind of Christian text: the creed. The creed was a declaratory statement of belief, the content of which corresponded closely to that of certain earlier expressions of the 'Rule of Faith'. The two most important contexts for early use of the creed were (a) the process of Christian initiation leading up to baptism, and (b) anti-heretical legislation. (The exact historical relation between these two uses remains unclear.) The form of creed associated with baptism came to be known as 'symbolum' - a term previously used of the questions, answers and ritual gestures constituting the baptismal act itself. Other Latin words applied to creeds were 'fides', 'confessio', 'professio'. By contrast with the concept of the 'Rule of Faith', the concept of a creed implied concern with a particular form of words.

2. As a text, the creed was a natural object of literary-ideological reflection. That is to say: it was something about which late-antique 'litterati' - as readers and writers - had definite ideas. These ideas are to be found expressed in a variety of writings from the late fourth and fifth centuries, but especially in sermons 'in traditione symboli'. Past study of such sources has been directed mainly towards establishing the history of a particular form of creed (the 'baptismal'/'apostolic' creed). In order to appreciate the importance of creeds in the history of Christian ideas of reading-and-writing one must take a larger view of the processes of their production and reception.

3. On the evidence of a number of early Gallic 'expositiones symboli' it is possible to ascertain the elements of a credal ideology. The creed was a work of compilation ('symbolum' = 'collatio'). It was an epitome of the teaching contained in the Bible, remarkable both for the value of its contents and for the formal beauty of its composition. Its brevity made it accessible and readily memorable. It had a salutary virtue, comparable to the medicinal properties of certain other verbal formulae ('symbolum' = 'carmen'). Ultimately attributable to the apostles as founders of the Christian religion, it owed its present form to certain Fathers of the church... These features are ascribed to the 'baptismal' creed. They may also be seen as composing a more generally applicable and widely attested ideal of the 'saving text'.

4. The first Gallic writer to offer opinions on the drafting of creeds is Hilary of Poitiers. Hilary shows little inclination to treat his own 'baptismal' profession as a text. His remarks on 'fides conscriptae' refer to the dogmatic pronouncements of church councils from the time of Nicaea. While recognizing the 'biblical' and 'apostolic' character of the best of these productions and their usefulness as weapons against heresy, he was apparently constrained in his approval of them by a conviction of the inexpressibility of religious truth. He never makes a virtue of brevity in his own writings 'de fide'.

5. By the end of the fourth century - probably as a result of the final canonisation of the Nicene creed - the ideal of a written dogmatic summary in credal form was generally accepted in the West. Respect for the Nicene formula did not, however, preclude the drafting of alternative or

supplementary statements. Evidence that the educated Christian could by then regard creed-making as a natural occupation is provided by a work of Victricius of Rouen (c.396) and, perhaps, by the 'first edition' of the Fides Leporii (c.415). Later essays in the new genre were encouraged by the eastern Christological controversies leading to the Councils of Ephesus (431) and Chalcedon (451).

6. Of particular moment are the credal designs of Vincent of Lérins. In his Commonitorium Vincent outlines a theory of dogmatic development based on the idea of progressive literary enhancement culminating in a creed-like text. It seems that he expected the Council of Ephesus to produce such a text in order to clarify and consolidate the church's teaching on the Incarnation. The fact that it did not do so may perhaps be held to account for the incomplete state of his most famous work. The author of important essays in Christological definition that influenced the form of the 'Quicumque vult', Vincent appears as a personification of the Christian writer in his role as creed-maker.

7. Vincent's monastic superior was Faustus, abbot of Lérins from 433 until c.460. Later to be renowned for two major theological treatises, Faustus also shows a concern for the theory and practice of dogmatic résumé. In a letter written c.440 he lays down rules for the drafting of a 'sermo ordinatus et conpunctus' on a doctrinal subject, implying that the proper conditions for literary activity of this kind were to be found in a monastery.

8. Concern for the composition of creed-like texts was naturally accompanied by an interest in other examples of the 'genre'. Such interest is manifested in the reception given by certain Gallic bishops to Leo's Tome, and in the careful appraisal made of this and other works of a similar kind in the De viris illustribus of Gennadius of Marseille. Gennadius' survey of Christian writing may have been partly motivated by a desire to assemble materials for doctrinal summaries of the sort found in the Statuta ecclesiae antiqua and Liber dogmatum.

9. Despite the attention given by Gallic theologians of this period to questions of soteriology, there is no evidence of any concerted attempt to produce an integrated statement on the nature of the Godhead and the means of grace. The general preference seems to have been for a creed of the Triado-Christological type attested in the West since the 390s (and by no means necessarily of Spanish invention). It is probable that the 'Athanasian' creed - which conforms to that type - was composed in Gaul in the second half of the fifth century.

10. Depending on the context in which it was presented, a creed might serve any one of several purposes. As a 'saving text', it was primarily an object of personal meditation (cf. Vincent's 'commonitorium'). For a writer like Faustus, a person who set out to compose a dogmatic summary also had a duty to promote the common good. The pastoral value of concise and lucid doctrinal exposition is underlined in a wide variety of sources. One must allow, too, for the 'ludic' aspect of much late-antique creed-making: like any other text composed to strict rules, a creed was easily made the object of virtuoso literary performance.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

1. "The vast realm of patristics has not yet been explored in respect to the problems posed by European literary history and literary theory" (Curtius). Despite the attention paid to patristic literature in recent times by scholars of non-theological disciplines, there remains a need for a clear, synthetic presentation of the ideas entertained by educated Christians of late Latin antiquity on the subjects of writing, authorship and the use of texts. This object will not be attained merely by taking account of the modifications imposed by Christians on the traditional arts of grammar, rhetoric and poetics. The Christian religion possessed and produced large numbers of texts of its own, none of which originally had any place in the ordinary curriculum of late-antique education. In order to recover the elements of a distinctive 'early Christian' or 'patristic' literary ideology, it will be necessary to examine every kind of Christian writing by turn, taking careful note of the considerations advanced by contemporary authorities with regard to its production and reception.

2. On the evidence of a strictly limited survey of the attitudes of Gallic 'litterati' of the late fourth and fifth centuries, it would appear that significant developments took place over that period in at least three areas of what might be called 'textual theory' (i.e. theory of the use of texts). These developments concern the ideas of the Christian writer as, respectively, student of the Bible, 'editor' of the Fathers and creed-maker. In each of the areas named, it is possible to detect a progressive **recognition** and **exploitation** of a given textual resource. As student of the Bible, the Christian writer learnt to see

himself less as a natural successor to the prophets and apostles than as the exponent of a new kind of literary culture complete with its own rules, rewards and responsibilities. As 'editor' of the Fathers he gradually acquired a set of principles for adapting the literary works of his most famous predecessors. As creed-maker he took into his own hands a process of dogmatic elaboration that had been begun by the church councils of the early fourth century and suspended - as far as most westerners were concerned - in the time of pope Damasus. (It is likely that similar changes might be traced with respect to ideas of the Christian writer as epistolary correspondent, monastic legislator, verse-paraphrast, liturgist and canonist.)

3. As manifested in Gaul, the above-mentioned developments in Christian literary ideology are closely correlated with a major development in Christian institutions: the rise of monasticism. Without exception, the most effective advocates of the 'studium scripturarum' and of biblical 'litteratura' (e.g. Jerome, Cassian, Gennadius) were also enthusiasts for the monastic way of life. The most sophisticated approach to patristic 'editing' is that of a monk (Vincent of Lérins), acting on hints provided by a monastic colleague (Cassian). There is even evidence of an attempt to 'monasticate' the process of creed-making (Faustus of Lérins). In the same way that asceticism had come to be regarded as the only suitable ethic for a member of the Christian elite in fifth-century Gaul, so (it seems) the sole reputable literary ideology was henceforth to be one with strong monastic overtones.

4. The expression 'literary ideology' (here standing for the set of ideas concerning reading-and-writing attributable to the majority of Christian 'litterati' in a particular region) does not translate any phrase used by a late-antique Latin author. Its justification depends on proof of the usefulness of the literary-historiographical concept which it represents. Whatever degree of accuracy may be ascribed to the findings expressed in the preceding chapters, it will (I hope) be granted that these studies have revealed sufficient signs of continuity and coherence in the literary ideas of successive generations of Gallic Christians to warrant constituting the latter as the subject of research. Christian attitudes to pagan literature have long been considered a legitimate field of academic study. The aim of this thesis has been to expose a larger landscape: that of Christian attitudes to 'literature' itself.

5. What has been offered, inevitably, is little more than a sketch-map of one corner of the "vast realm" indicated by Curtius. As an account of ideas of Christian writing in late Roman Gaul, the present work is far from complete (see above). Even if completed, it would make at best a partial kind of sense. As often observed, Gallic 'litterati' worked largely with materials furnished from abroad: their literary ideology, like their theology and spirituality, was derived from multiple sources. Study of ideas associated with this region therefore implies a larger task - one involving the entire literary legacy of the patristic period. Only when that task is satisfactorily accomplished will it be possible to construct secure links between patristic ideas of writing and those entertained by Christian and non-Christian authors in later ages.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACO	<u>Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum</u> , ed. E. Schwartz (Berlin, 1914-1940)
ANRW	<u>Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt</u>
AS	<u>Acta Sanctorum</u>
BA	<u>Bibliothèque Augustinienne</u>
BTT	Coll. <u>Bible de Tous les Temps</u> 2 - <u>Le monde latin antique et la Bible</u> , ed. J. Fontaine and C. Pietri (Paris, 1985) 3 - <u>Saint Augustin et la Bible</u> , ed. A.-M. la Bonnardière (Paris, 1986)
CCL	<u>Corpus Christianorum (Series Latina)</u> (Turnhout)
CHB	<u>Cambridge History of the Bible</u>
CPL	<u>Clavis Patrum Latinorum</u> (2nd edition, 1961)
CSEL	<u>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</u> (Vienna)
DHGE	<u>Dictionnaire d'Histoire et de Géographie Ecclésiastiques</u>
DPAC	<u>Dizionario Patristico e di Antichità Cristiane</u> , ed. A. di Berardino (Rome, 1983)
DS	H. Denzinger and A. Schönmetzer (edd.), <u>Enchiridion Symbolorum Definitionum et Declarationum de Rebus Fidei et Morum</u> (36th edition, 1976)
DSp	<u>Dictionnaire de Spiritualité, Ascétique et Mystique</u>
DTC	<u>Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique</u>
EOMIA	<u>Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima</u> , ed. C.H. Turner (Oxford, 1899-1939)
Frede	H.J. Frede, <u>Kirchenschriftsteller. Verzeichnis und Sigel</u> (Freiburg, 1981; Aktualisierungsheft 1988)
Hahn	A. and G.L. Hahn, <u>Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der alten Kirche</u> (3rd edition, 1897).
MGH	<u>Monumenta Germaniae Historica</u>
AA	<u>Auctores Antiquissimi</u>
Epp	<u>Epistulae</u>
OLD	<u>Oxford Latin Dictionary</u>
PCBE	<u>Prosopographie Chrétienne du Bas-Empire</u>

PG	<u>Patrologia Graeca</u> , ed. J.-P. Migne
PL	<u>Patrologia Latina</u> , ed. J.-P. Migne
PLRE	<u>Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire</u>
PW	<u>Paulys Realencyclopädie der Classischen Altertumswissenschaft</u>
RAC	<u>Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum</u>
SC	<u>Sources Chrétiennes</u> (Paris)
Settimane	<u>Settimane di Studio del Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo</u> (Spoleto)
TLL	<u>Thesaurus Linguae Latinae</u>
TRE	<u>Theologische Realenzyklopädie</u>
TU	<u>Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur</u>

NOTES TO CHAPTER 1

- 1 On the theological implications of the phrase see most recently: Le Christianisme est-il une religion du livre ?; J. Barton 'People of the Book ? The authority of Scripture in Christianity' (Oxford University Bampton Lectures 1988).
- 2 Leclercq 'Bibliothèques' 859-862; Gage (who links a fifth-century mosaic representation of the passion of St. Lawrence, book in hand, with the events of 303-4).
- 3 EUS., VConst. 4,36; Wendel 'Bibel-Auftrag'.
- 4 For Lane Fox 304 "One of the fundamental contrasts between pagan cult and Christianity was [the] passage from an oral culture of myth and conjecture to one based firmly on written records." Frédoille 'Lettres' 27 draws attention to the sacred 'libri' of the so-called 'Etrusca disciplina' and to Tertullian's mention (An. 2,3) of the 'sacrae, quas putant, litterae' of the pagans.
- 5 A project such as Lactantius' Divine institutions (written c.304-311) is only comprehensible against a background of general awareness of the Bible, if not of its contents: Monat. Cf. AUG., Cat. 8,12,1 concerning the typical educated baptismal candidate: 'difficillimum omnino est, ut non multa nostrarum scripturarum... cognoverit.' On access to the Scriptures see below 5-6.
- 6 Gögler 299ff.
- 7 Kaczynski 26-27, 132ff.
- 8 The only Latin writer of the patristic period who can be credited with a fully worked out theology of the Bible is Augustine. He, however, is more inclined to regard the Scriptures as a manifestation of divine authority ('auctoritas') than as an expression of the divine 'word'. See e.g. Civ. XI 3: 'Hic [sc. deus] prius per prophetas, deinde per se ipsum, postea per apostolos, quantum satis esse iudicavit, locutus etiam scripturam condidit, quae canonica nominatur, eminentissimae auctoritatis, cui fidem habeamus de his rebus, quas ignorare non expedit nec per nos ipsos nosse idonei sumus.' Strauss; Lütcke 53f. A similar emphasis on biblical authority is to be found in the works of Gallic authors such as Cassian, Vincent of Lérins and Gennadius.
- 9 Surveys and discussion by Schumacher '"Dominus legem dat"'; Congar 'Thème'. This type of scene originated at Rome in the time of Constantine; it is found only on western monuments, including several of Gallic provenance.
- 10 Harnack History of dogma V 16 n.3 (citing a work by T. Zahn); Congar 'Thème' 929f.
- 11 Sarcophagus of bishop Concordius of Arles (+c.390): Benoît Sarcophages 35 (no.4) and pl. III; Heinzelmann Bischofsherrschaft 66f.

- 12 Marrou Mousikos anēr 285-287, part of an important study of the late-antique iconography of Christian reading.
- 13 For a similar shift from biblical 'word' to biblical 'text' between Eusebius and Jerome, see below 32-33. Note also that Hilary's thoughts on the transmission of the 'eloquia dei' (below 20) revolve around those things 'quae didicimus et legimus'.
- 14 Fahey 32-34.
- 15 I Timothy 4,13; C. Spicq, Saint Paul. Les Épîtres pastorales I (Paris, 1969) 514-516.
- 16 I Apol. 67,3 [PG 6,430]; Lamb 568.
- 17 Lamb 570-575; Saxer 'Bible et liturgie' 170-172.
- 18 Longère 24-35; Olivar 'Quelques remarques' 430: "L'homélie était toujours essentiellement un commentaire des saintes Ecritures et comme un prolongement ou résonance des leçons précédant immédiatement, auxquelles les orateurs faisaient constamment allusion."
- 19 Thus, for example, Cyprian introduces one of his literary works as a 'sermo... de dominica lectione conceptus' (Mort. 1). The whole of Augustine's treatise De doctrina christiana is conceived with the situation of the preacher in mind.
- 20 Leipoldt and Morenz 88-114 ('Vorlesung und Geheimhaltung'), 123-160 ('Das hausliche Lesen') for comparisons with other ancient religions. References to extra-liturgical reading in the early Christian church collected by Harnack Gebrauch.
- 21 C.H. Roberts 62; Cavallo 'Libro' 107-108.
- 22 Cavallo 'Libro' 113-119.
- 23 AUG., Psalm. 36 s.1,2: 'Arguat quisque, murmure, si non per totum orbem haec scriptura recitatur atque cantatur; si cessat etiam venalis ferri per publicum' (cited by Petitmengin 111).
- 24 The hero of Jerome's Vita Hilarionis is said to have sold a copy of the Gospels 'quem manu sua adolescens scripserat' [PL 23, 47B]. This fact should probably be interpreted as a sign of ascetic zeal rather than of an economic hardship: below 113-114.
- 25 On ecclesiastical libraries in general: de Ghellinck II 284-288 and articles by Wendel. For a distinction between books kept for the liturgy and the 'library' of a church: Scheele 65,72. Note the verses composed by Paulinus for inscription over the entrance to one of the sacristies ('secretaria') in his new church at Nola: 'Si quem sancta tenet meditandi in lege voluntas, / Hic poterit residens sacris intendere libris' (Ep. 32,16).
- 26 E.g. Comm. in Matth. 10,15; In Genes. hom. 1,17; In Lucam hom. 9.

- 27 Zel. 16. Cf. Don. 15: 'Sit tibi vel oratio adsidua vel lectio. Nunc cum deo loquere, nunc deus tecum' (a formula repeated by many later Latin writers: Rousse 472).
- 28 Origen's approach to Scripture: Crouzel Origène 399ff ('Les conditions subjectives de la connaissance').
- 29 E.g. Comm. in Matth. 10,15. The Biblia Patristica lists some 40 citations of Psalm 1,2 in Origen's extant writings. The importance of Jewish influences on Origen's attitude towards the biblical text: Jousse 473. Similar theories of psychagogical reading in classical authors: von Rabbow 215-222.
- 30 Seston; Crouzel 'Origène précurseur'.
- 31 Studer 'Frage' for the different ways in which Origen's influence came to be felt in the West from the mid-fourth century onwards.
- 32 Schneemelcher 43-45.
- 33 Sanday (MS Cheltenham 12266, s.X); D. van Damme Pseudo-Cyprian; Adversus Iudaeos (Freiburg, 1969) 78-81.
- 34 Bardy 'Inspiration' 10f. Cf. Monat I 33: Lactantius, like the author of the Passio Perpetuae, placed himself "dans une sorte de continuité des écrivains sacrés."
- 35 The use of the word 'litterae' in connection with the Scriptures is attested in Tertullian (Braun 459; van der Geest 24f), avoided by Cyprian (Fahey 29f), common from the time of Lactantius (Monat I 35; TLL s.v. 'littera' 1526-7). Unlike 'scriptura' it always appears with a Christianizing qualifier.
- 36 II Timothy 3,15. Cf. C. Spicq Saint Paul: Les Epîtres pastorales II (Paris, 1969) 786: "Il faut entendre que Timothée apprit à lire dans le texte biblique, que toute sa formation humaine et religieuse fut scripturaire, que son éducation maternelle a fait de lui 'un homme biblique'."
- 37 Brut. 107.
- 38 Hus Docere 291; Havelock 40-41.
- 39 TLL (s.v. 'erudio') cites as the first instance of the usage HIER., Ep. 53,3,3 (written 394): 'Timotheum... ab infantia sacris litteris eruditum'. Note, however, that Lactantius had already described Cyprian as 'raptus eximia eruditione divinarum scripturarum' (Inst. V 4,7).
- 40 Evidence of this 'debate': Jerome's Letters, various items of papal correspondence from the late fourth and early fifth century, Augustine's De doctrina christiana, writings of Cassian, hagiographical texts. A range of opinions will be presented in the ensuing pages.
- 41 SULP., Chron. II 39-51.

- 42 Van Andel Concept.
- 43 Latin biblical exegesis prior to the time of Hilary: Doignon Hilaire 201ff and (more summarily) 'Premiers commentateurs'.
- 44 Doignon Hilaire 162-164. On the need for discernment ('diligentia'): Mat. 14,3.
- 45 Mat. 14,3. Doignon observes: (1) Hilary's perception of the gospel narrative as composed of 'dicta' and 'facta' in the manner of a classical history (Hilaire 231f); (2) his choice of conventional categories and terms for allegorical interpretation (262f); (3) his use of scholastic forms of exposition, e.g. 'tractatus', 'quaestiones' (295f); (4) his practice of discreet plagiarism or 'contaminatio', as justified by late-antique rhetorical theory (418-419).
- 46 Biography of Hilary: Kannengiesser 'Hilaire' 466f; Brennecke 'Hilarius' 315f.
- 47 Transl. hom. Origenis in Luc. praef [PL20, 220]. On Jerome's attitude towards Hilary see now: Doignon Hilaire 49f.
- 48 Doct. chr. II 40,61; Doignon '"Nos bons hommes de foi"'
- 49 Doignon Hilaire passim. (An article on Hilary by the same author may be expected in the volume of RAC now in the course of publication.)
- 50 On Hilary's exile and involvement in the Arian controversy see now: Brennecke Hilarius.
- 51 See also below 302ff.
- 52 Hilary and Origen: Bardy 'Traducteurs' 271-273; Goffinet (with the reservations of Kannengiesser 'Exégèse' 133); Rondeau Commentaires I 147-149, II 38f.
- 53 Cf. Kannengiesser 'Hilaire' 481: "Le commentaire du psautier représente avec les douze livres De trinitate un fruit doctrinal mûri par Hilaire à travers l'expérience de son bannissement chez les grecs. **Une même médiation semble visée dans les deux ouvrages...**" (emphasis added).
- 54 Psal. 13,2; 14,1. Kannengiesser 'Exégèse' 134 mentions the possibility that the Tractatus may have been meant for a monastic audience. SULP., VMart. 5,2 has Hilary address certain 'fratres', though in a different context.
- 55 Psal. instr; Goffinet 17-36; Rondeau Commentaires II 38-40.
- 56 Psal. instr 5. For 'legere-intellegere' cf. Const. 9: 'scripturae enim non in legendo, sed in intellegendo... sunt' (a wordplay that recurs in later authors: Kannengiesser 'Héritage' 442; below n.110).
- 57 Harl Chaine 121f, with Origen's commentary 182-184 and notes.

- 58 Psal. 118 prol 1.
- 59 Cf. AMBR., Exp. ps. 118 prol 1; HIER., Tract. de ps. 118 [CCL 78, 246]: 'Centesimus ergo octavus decimus psalmus alfabetites moralis est, et instruit vitam nostram.'
- 60 Psal. 118 prol 2.
- 61 Psal. 134,1. Origen's use of the simile: Crouzel Origène 404 n.1.
- 62 Ladaria 163ff, 223.
- 63 E.g. Psal. 52,7 [121,25]; Rondeau 'Remarques'.
- 64 Psal. 91,10: 'aeternitatis est requies praeparanda orationum vigiliis, lectionum frequentia, ieiunii voluntate, humilitatis tranquillitate, bonitatis operibus, castitatis nitore, virtute patientiae'. Cf. Cassian's lists of monastic virtues: below 87.
- 65 Harl Chaîne 146f ('David prototype du moine'); Crouzel 'Origène précurseur'.
- 66 Text: PG 27, 12-45. Rondeau 'Epître' emphasises the monastic aspect of the work.
- 67 Psal. 118 passim. Note also Psal. 1,12: 'meditatio itaque legis non solum in verbis legendi<s> est, sed in operis religione; neque ut libros tantum et scripturas recenseamus, sed ut ea, quae scripturis ac libris continentur, gestis rebusque meditemur, et diurna nocturna-que opera legens semper exerceant' (to be compared with Origen's commentary on Ps. 118,16.47-48.97.105: Harl Chaîne, with the editor's notes; Goffinet 40-44; Crouzel Origène 402 n.6). For a similar insistence on the classical sense of 'meditari' = 'practise, exercise' in Ambrose: von Severus.
- 68 Psal. 118 iod 15 [448,13] - cf. vau 9 [416,12].
- 69 Psal. 62,1. On classical elements in this description: Doignon 'Deux traditions'.
- 70 Cf. Trin. I 8: 'His itaque piae opinionis atque doctrinae studiis animus imbutus, in secessu quodam ac specula pulcherrimae huius sententiae requiescebat'; 14: 'In hoc igitur conscio securitatis otio mens... requieveret' - with Fontaine 'Ascétisme' 96-97.
- 71 TLL s.v. 'erudio'; Hus 'Doctor, doctrina' 43-44.
- 72 E.g. Psal. 1,1 [20,11]; 13,1 [78,19]; 62,3 [217,17]; 63,3 [226,7]; 65,24 [264,7]; 118 mem 10 [471,28]; Trin. VI 19,12; VII 28,4; IX 75, 30; XI 7,10 (and other examples in the concordance to CCL 62a). Cf. Myst. 32,3.
- 73 Psal. 63,11 [231,22]; 123,2 [590,24].

- 74 Trin. V 21 - cf. IV 14: 'Nemini autem dubium esse oportet, ad divin-arum rerum cognitionem divinis utendum esse doctrinis... Ipsi de se deo credendum est, et his quae cognitioni nostrae de se tribuit obsequendum.'
- 75 Trin. V 22.
- 76 Trin. I 5.
- 77 Trin. I 8.10 - with Doignon Hilaire 118, 139.
- 78 Trin. VI 19 - cf. VI 21: 'fides mea, quam tu erudisti.' Doignon 'Sermo temerarius'.
- 79 Trin. XI 5: 'Nec apostolicis nec evangelicis praedicationibus eruditi.'
- 80 Rondeau Commentaires II 92-93 ('Portee educative des discours tenu par David "ex persona sua"').
- 81 Psal. 63,3 [226,6] - cf. Trin. X 71. On Hilary's idea of confession as praise of God, a notion derived from the Psalms: Mohrmann Etudes I 30f. It is apparent from passages such as Psal. 63,5.9f; 118 rasch 1 that the Hilarian 'confessio laudis' was also a 'confessio fidei'. On the development of ideas of Christian 'confession' in the fourth century: Ratzinger.
- 82 Psal. 63,5 [227,7].
- 83 Psal. 63,11 - cf. Trin. II 2: 'cogimur sermonis nostri HUMILITATEM ad ea quae inenarrabilia sunt EXTendere... ut quae contineri religione mentis oportuissent, nunc in periculo humani eloqui PROFERANTUR.'
- 84 See especially Trin. I 14,9; 37,1.
- 85 Trin. I 19 - cf. I 18: 'cum itaque de rebus dei erit sermo, conced-amus cognitionem sui deo dictisque eius pia veneratione famulemur.'
- 86 Trin. II 13.
- 87 Ibid - cf. I 10. According to Augustine, a certain Platonist of his acquaintance had expressed a wish to have to the opening verses of St. John's Gospel set up in gold letters in every church: Civ. X 29. See also HIER., Ep. 53,4 and below 235.
- 88 Trin. II 21 - cf. VI 43 (to the heretic): 'Anne secreto tibi hoc per familiaritatem amoris recumbenti in pectus suum dominus ostendit ?'
- 89 Psal. 13,1.
- 90 'Apport' 300 (an important article).
- 91 Psal. 13,1.

- 92 E.g. Trin. II 32: 'Est enim spiritus sanctus unus ubique, omnes patriarchas profetas et omnem chorum legis inluminans, Iohannes etiam in utero matris inspirans, datus deinde apostolis ceterisque credentibus ad cognitionem eius quae indulta est veritas' - with Ladaria 163f.
- 93 Psal. instr 7: 'Et quamquam omnia a divino spiritu per David dicta esse... noscamus, tamen etiam id ipsum prophetiae huius species docet supernae et caelestis in eo doctrinae scientiam extitisse. Eo enim organo prophetatum est, graece psalterium, hebraice nabla nuncupato, quod unum omnium musicorum organorum rectissimum est...'
- 94 CSEL 65, 209.
- 95 Cf. Fontaine 'Poète chrétien' 134-136.
- 96 Trin. VIII 30 (referring to I Corinthians 12,10).
- 97 Sulp., Chron. II 46.
- 98 Of the abundant recent literature on Priscillian and Priscillianism see especially: Vollmann 'Priscillianus'; H. Chadwick Priscillian.
- 99 For the closeness of cultural relations between N. Spain and S. Gaul in this period, with special reference to Priscillianism: Fontaine 'Société et culture'; Matthews Aristocracies 149, 160f.
- 100 Chron. II 46: 'Priscillianus... familia nobilis, praedives opibus, acer iniquis, facundus, multa lectione eruditus... vigilare multum, famem ac sitim ferre poterat, habendi minime cupidus, utendi parcissimus' - with Fontaine 'Affaire' (literary determinants of this portrait), 'Panorama' (Priscillian as a late-Roman 'litteratus').
- 101 Ibid.
- 102 Text: CSEL 18 (ed. Schepss, 1889). Authorship of the tractates: Vollmann 'Priscillianus' 551f; H. Chadwick Priscillian 57f.
- 103 Tract. III 69. According to Schepss' index, the phrases 'scriptum est' and 'scripta sunt' occur 126 times in the tractates. Cf. VINC., Comm. XXV 1: 'Lege Pauli Samosatani opuscula, Priscilliani, Eunomii, Ioviniani, reliquarumque pestium, cernas... prope nullam omitti paginam, quae non novi aut veteris testamenti sententiis fucata et colorata sit'; XXVI 67: 'Ac si quis interroget quempiam haereticorum...: Unde probas, unde doces, quod ecclesiae catholicae universalis et antiquae fidei dimittere debeam? Statim ille: scriptum est enim. Et continuo mille testimonia, mille exempla, mille auctoritates parat, de lege, de psalmis, de apostolis, de prophetis...' Of the heretics listed in the first of these passages, the only one whose works Vincent is likely to have read is Priscillian.
- 104 Goosen 91-92 (with references).
- 105 Tract X 124 [92,7]; 138 [101,4].
- 106 Tract. I 15 [14,8]; 7 [8,12].

- 107 Tract. I 15 [14,11]: 'stultitias saeculares et infelicitates, quorum tamquam ad ingenii instructionem opera legebamus'.
- 108 Tract. X 138 [100,16] = HIL., Trin. I 18,23 (unremarked in Schepss' apparatus).
- 109 Tract. I 34 [28,24].
- 110 Above n.56 - cf. Tract. I 8: 'qui ista cognoscentes quid esset quod legerent non intellexerunt recte.'
- 111 See especially Tract. IV 76; VI 91-92.103; X 137 (parallels with the De trinitate noted by Schepss ad loc.)
- 112 Babut Priscillien 115-120 (still the most useful general account of Priscillianist exegesis).
- 113 Tract. X 125 [93,4] - cf. Tract. V 81: 'omnia enim quae vel facta vel scribta sunt, ad correctionem labentium hominum et ad credentium fidem monstrantur'; Can. 68: 'Quia quae in veteri testamento vel facta vel scripta sunt, in nostri figuram contigerint.'
- 114 Tract. X 137: 'In hac parte psalmidici sermonis, quos fides constans ad studium veritatis vocat, non tantum excipere auditu, sed introspicere sensu convenit'; V 89-90: 'per intellectum spiritalium virtutum in opus lectae lectionis intrantes.'
- 115 Tract. VII 117: 'quos divini sermonis eruditio fecundarit.'
- 116 Schatz 130ff; Vollmann 'Priscillianus' 535; Goosen 103-113. For other attempts to place 'Priscillianism' in the history of early western monasticism see: Pérez de Urbel 52-54; Díaz y Díaz; Linaje.
- 117 'Anfänge' 19-23.
- 118 Priscillian 99.
- 119 'Panorama' 192-193, 206. For van Dam 92 the Priscillianist affair was "an internal problem generated by the rivalries appearing when a religious organization for which books were central acquired educated men as members."
- 120 Chron. II 50,3.
- 121 Cf. Tract. VII 112: 'David sanctus magisterium divinae instituens eruditionis'; III 56: 'apostoli Christi Iesu magistri nostrae conversationis et vitae'; Can. 48: 'Quia in ordinibus ecclesiae elegerit deus prius apostolos, secundo prophetas, tertio magistros.'
- 122 Tract. VI 92 - cf. HIL., Trin. II 2 (cited above n.83).
- 123 Can. 39.

- 124 [PL 84,317]: 'Ne quis doctoris sibi nomen imponat praeter has personas quibus concessum est, secundum id quod scriptum est'. For a recent attempt to make sense of this statute: González Blanco.
- 125 Can. 21.
- 126 Babut Priscillien 120-135 (followed by Schatz, Vollmann and Chadwick). On Priscillian and the OT canon see now: Wermelinger 'Canon' 154-160; Kaestli 74-75.
- 127 Tract. I 38-39.
- 128 Tract. III 70.
- 129 Tract. I 39.
- 130 Tract. I 37; II 52; III 66-67.
- 131 It is noteworthy that the exegesis of the tractates is confined to the books of the Old Testament. Might these texts have been designed for use in parallel with (i.e. as substitutes for) readings from the New Testament? One of the objects of the Priscillianist Canons may have been to create a situation in which the content of 'lectio' and its relation to 'exhortatio'/'doctrina' (cf. I Timothy 4,13) were more fluid than they would otherwise have been in the church of the late fourth century.
- 132 Above 23 n.103.
- 133 Vollmann 'Priscillianus' 526-527 and following note.
- 134 Priscillianist authors: Vir. 121-123 (Priscillian, Latronianus, Tiberianus). On Jerome's initially sympathetic attitude towards these persons: Schatz 217f. Hilary: Vir. 100. Other Gallic authors: Vir. 82 (Reticus of Autun), 108 (Phoebadius of Agen). Other Spanish authors: Vir. 84 (Juvenius), 105 (Gregory of Elvira), 106 (Pacian of Barcelona), 111 (Acilius Severus), 132 (Dexter).
- 135 Dexter's career: PLRE I 251. His association with Jerome: Matthews Aristocracies 133-134, 167-168.
- 136 Vir. prol [1,1-3].
- 137 HE I 1,1 (K. Lake's translation, slightly modified).
- 138 Vir. prol [1,4-6].
- 139 For a later addition to the Christian vocabulary of 'letters' see below 102f.
- 140 Vir. prol [2,15-16].
- 141 Pricoco 'Motivi'.
- 142 Vir. 135.

- 143 The standard biographies of Jerome are those of Grützmacher, Cavallera and Kelly (who provides convenient accounts of the genesis and contents of his main works). For the results of recent research: Nautin 'Hieronimus'.
- 144 Booth 'Date' (Jerome was born in 347/8).
- 145 Note especially Ep. 5,2: 'Et quoniam tribuente domino multis sacrae bibliothecae codicibus abundamus...' Pace Mundo 'Bibliotheca' 74, it is far from certain that the expression 'sacra bibliotheca' is here to be understood as referring exclusively to biblical codices. Cf. Ep. 34,1 where Pamphilus' 'studium sacrae bibliothecae' manifests itself in his collection of works by Origen.
- 146 According to Nautin 'Hieronimus' 311, it was his encounter with the works of Origen (at Antioch, c.372) that persuaded Jerome to devote himself to serious study of the Bible. Antin 'Saint Jérôme' 192 detects Origen's influence on Jerome "peut-être même dans l'aménagement des tâches habituelles", adducing the Alexandrian's habit of giving instruction in the pagan classics (for which Jerome was to be reproached by Rufinus).
- 147 Vir. 54 - cf. Ep. 33,4.
- 148 Apol. contra Ruf. III 9: 'Ignosce mihi quod Origenis eruditionem et studium scripturarum, antequam eius haeresim plenius nossem, in iuvenili aetate laudavi.'
- 149 Ep. 43,1 - cf. EUS., HE VI 23, 1-2. The ultimate source for this information appears to have been a letter of Origen to pope Fabian: Nautin Origène 58.
- 150 Trans. hom. Origenis in Ierem. et Ezech. praef [PL 25, 585-586] - cf. Ep. 84,8 (cited below 37).
- 151 Ep. 33,5; 84,8.
- 152 Cavallera Saint Jérôme II 115-127 for details.
- 153 Hebr. nom. praef [CCL 72,59].
- 154 Hebr. quaest. in Gen. praef: 'De Adamantio autem sileo, cuius nomen ("si parva licet componere magnis") meo nomine invidiosius est... Hoc unum dico, quod vellem cum invidia nominis eius habere etiam scientiam scripturarum.'
- 155 Ep. 84,8 - cf. HOR., Ars poetica 559-360.
- 156 Cf. Ep. 53,6-7 (cited below 51).
- 157 Völker 184 n.1 provides references.
- 158 AUG., Ep. *27,3 - with the commentary of Y.-M. Duval in BA 46B, 560-568.

- 159 HIER., Ep. 71,5 (c.398).
- 160 E.g. Vigilantius (395), 'Postumianus' (c. 400, his second visit), Sisinnius (405). Further details: Hunt 146, 177-179.
- 161 Arns 141-148.
- 162 Arns 161; Feder Studien 110ff discusses the evidence for early 'updated' versions of Vir. 135. (Note also the latter's remarks, 143-148, concerning the role played by Paulinus of Nola as intermediary between Jerome's Roman circle and his own acquaintances in Gaul.)
- 163 SULP., Dial. I 7,3 (cited below 67).
- 164 Haarhoff 39ff; Etienne 235ff.
- 165 Pan. lat. 11 - with introduction and commentary by Nixon.
- 166 SYMM., Ep. I 14,4.
- 167 Gorce Lectio; Kelly Saint Jerome 91ff.
- 168 See e.g. AUG., Ep. 28,4,6: 'Multa alia cum sincerissimo corde tuo loqui cuperem et de christiano studio conferre...' (written 394/5). The same letter contains an interesting allusion to Jerome's 'Origenizing': 'Potes enim efficere, ut nos quoque habeamus tales illos viros [sc. qui graece scripturas tractaverunt] et unum potissimum quem tu libentius in tuis litteris sonas [other MSS: personas]' (2,2).
- 169 SULP., Chron. II 50,3 (cited above 27 n.120).
- 170 Paulinus' early life: Desmulliez.
- 171 None of Paulinus' letters to Jerome is extant. That he initially appealed to him as a biblicalist may be inferred from the reply which he received, e.g. HIER., Ep. 53,1: 'vera... illa necessitudo est... quam timor domini et divinarum scripturarum studia conciliant.' On the order, date and circumstances of Jerome's Letters 53 and 58: Nautin in REAug 19 (1973) 213-239, partially correcting Courcelle 'Paulin'.
- 172 Carm. 6-9. Fabre Essai 113 placed these poems "aux environs de 390" but thought that they were written before the author left Gaul for Spain in 389. Lienhard Paulinus dates them to 389-394. Duval (art. cit. n.207) shows that Carm. 6 is influenced by the Adversus Iovinianum and could not therefore have been completed before 393.
- 173 For recent discussion: Thraede 'Epos' 1022-1030; Herzog Bibelepik; Fontaine Naissance 67ff; Roberts; Charlet 631-643; Brooke. Studies of Paulinus' paraphrastic technique: Flury; Prete 'Paolino'.
- 174 Junod-Ammerbauer 'Poète chrétien' 37-44 ('Le logos comme source').

- 175 Ep. 10,1 (to Delphinus). Dated 392/3 by Desmulliez.
- 176 Ep. 9,1 (to Amandus). Exactly contemporary with Ep. 10.
- 177 On Paulinus' use of biblical citations and allusions in his correspondence: Fabre 'Citations'; Rizza (which I have not seen). The idea of writing with a biblical 'flavour' is evoked at Ep. 9,1 [53,7]: 'sermo spiritali sale conditus'; 42,2 [460,14]: 'sermo... apostolico sale conditus' (cf. HIER., Ep. 52,8: 'sermo presbyteri scripturarum lectione conditus sit'). Behind these expressions lies Colossians 4,6: 'sermo vester semper in gratia sale sit conditus', which Paulinus associates with the parable of the salt.
- 178 Ep. 10,2: 'sola in litteris meis officii verba praetendo'.
- 179 On the issues raised by this poem: Witke 75-79; Herzog Bibelepik 212-221; Kohlwes 124ff; Fontaine Naissance 150-151.
- 180 Vv. 18-19: 'Nos tantum modulis evolvere dicta canoris / Vovimus et versu mentes laxare legentum'.
- 181 Cf. IUVENC., Evang. praef vv.25-27 where the poet invokes the Holy Spirit as 'auctor mihi carminis', but without referring to the human 'auctores' of the Gospels. In practice, Paulinus is less bound by his New Testament exemplar than Juvenecus: Flury.
- 182 Fontaine 'Symbolismes' 125-126 (the parallel with Hilary) and Naissance 151: "Dans ces belles déclarations ambiguës, Paulin ne se dit pas encore proprement inspiré; mais il y tend, par l'analogie qu'il y établit entre son projet et celui de David - poète et prophète."
- 183 Kohlwes 129.
- 184 Ep. 16 and Carm 22; discussed in detail by Kohlwes 48ff, who argues that the two texts originally formed a unity. Lienhard Paulinus dates the first to 399 (?), the second to 401-403.
- 185 Ep. 16,1: 'cum certe studiosus Christiani nominis conprobatorque propositi etiam nostri docearis'; 6: 'quas [sc. litteras saeculares] utinam iam ut iudicio ita et studio sacris litteris posthaberes.'
- 186 Ep. 16,6.
- 187 Carm 22, vv. 35-64, 87-147. The didactic function of the biblical text is underlined by repeated use of the expressions 'docet', 'docerbit', etc. (vv. 44, 53, 90, 108, 137).
- 188 Ep. 16,6: 'arguit enim ipsa facundiae tuae doctrinaeque fecunditas voluntatem tibi potius in sacris litteris parem quam aut vacationem aut facultatem abesse' - with the second text cited n.185 above.
- 189 Kohlwes 62.
- 190 Cf. AUG., Cat. 9,13; Frédoille 'Lettres' 28-29.

- 191 On these exercises: Roberts 37ff (with extensive bibliography).
- 192 AUS., Ep. 19 (ed. Prete).
- 193 A fuller statement of Paulinus' ideal of the 'conversio studii' appears at Ep. 24,12 (to Sulpicius): 'Itaque novitatem vitae in nobis aedificantes... oportet novis ut vetera mutemus et occupationis pariter ac vacationis genere converso implicemur quibus vacavimus, ut vicissim vacemus quibus fuimus implicati, moriamur quibus viximus et vivamus vicissim his operibus ac studiis quibus mortui fuimus...' See also Lienhard 33f. Babut 'Paulin' 261-262 collects instances of Paulinus' use of 'studium' and 'opus/opera' under the rubric 'Le labeur de l'exégèse', in order to suggest the possible influence of Priscillianist ideas.
- 194 Cf. Fontaine Naissance 152.
- 195 Witke 99.
- 196 HIER., Ep. 53,11; Courcelle 'Paulin' 264-266.
- 197 De Bruyne Prefaces 1-7. The title 'de studio scripturarum' in Hilberg's ninth-century MS P is also attested in an early MS of the De viris illustribus in which this letter is included in the list of Jerome's works: Feder Studien 112.
- 198 'Scientia scripturarum': Ep. 53,3,3 [447,10]; 8,18 [461,15].
- 199 Ep. 53,6,1: 'Haec a me perstricta sunt breviter... ut intellegeres te in scripturis sanctis sine praevio et monstrante semitam non posse ingredi.' On Augustine: Brunner 88ff.
- 200 Cf. HOR., Ep. II 1, vv.115-117.
- 201 Comm. in Ephes. praef [PL 26,440], composed in 386.
- 202 To illustrate the 'interpretatio Christiana' of Virgil, Jerome cites Eclog. IV, vv.6-7 ('Iam redit et virgo'), Aen. I, v.664; II, v.650. The first of these passages was held up as a Christian prophecy by Constantine; Christological interpretations of the others appear in the works of fourth-century centonists: Courcelle 'Exégèses' 309-311.
- 203 Courcelle 'Exégèses' 309-311, 'Paulin' 259 n.3; Hagendahl Latin fathers 189; Nautin in REAug 19 (1973) 222-224, 228-229; Duval art. cit. (below n.207).
- 204 AMBR., Off. I 1,3-4: 'Unus enim verus magister est, qui solus non didicit quod omnes doceret; homines autem discunt prius quod doceant et ab illo accipiunt quod aliis tradant. Quod ne ipsum quidem mihi accidit. Ego enim... docere vos coepi quod ipse non didici. Itaque factum est ut prius docere inciperem quam discere' - with M. Testard 'Jérôme et le De officiis d'Ambroise', forthcoming in Jérôme entre l'Orient et l'Occident. Actes du colloque de Chantilly (11-13 septembre 1986).

- 205 E.g. De fide, De virginitate (originally part of the De virginibus), De viduis. The subject of 'avaritia' is treated in the De Nabuthae (based on Basil's Homilia in divites). The passage cited from the Commentary on Ephesians should probably be added to Paredi's list of Jerome's allusions to Ambrose.
- 206 An identification recently upheld by Schanzer 243 n.58, for whom Jerome's 'garrula anus' is a woman in her early forties.
- 207 Y.-M. Duval 'Les premiers rapports de Paulin de Nole avec Jerome. Moine et philosophe ? Poète ou exégète ?', forthcoming in a Festschrift for S. Costanza. (I am grateful to the author for allowing me to see the typescript of this article.)
- 208 PAUL., Ep. 28,6. The work is not extant. On Endecheus: W. Schmid.
- 209 Stancliffe 306.
- 210 Cf. Ep. 53,5,1. The application of this passage to the problems of biblical exegesis had been popularised by Origen. It is cited in the same connection by HIL., Psalm. instr 6 (see above 13).
- 211 On the sense of this passage: Duval 'Lecture' 60. For Tertullian, Cyprian and Lactantius as biblical writers see Jerome's letter to Aurelius of Carthage (= AUG., Ep. *27) 3,1: 'cum in vestra provincia tanti in sanctas scripturas amnes fluxerunt, Tertullianus, Cyprianus, Lactantius...'
- 212 PAUL., Ep. 11,7.
- 213 Ibid. 4.
- 214 SULP., Ep. 2,8.
- 215 Van Andel Concept 55ff.
- 216 As revealed by Fontaine's commentary on the VMart. See the same scholar's remarks in SC 133, 114f.
- 217 Cf. Stancliffe 39.
- 218 See above n.177.
- 219 PAUL., Ep. 28,5.
- 220 For details: Gelzer.
- 221 HIER., Vir. 132 - see above 32 n.135.
- 222 Text: PL 13, 1097-1106.
- 223 Von den Brincken
- 224 Van Andel Concept deals thoroughly with (1) and (2). On (1) see also: Prete 'Degenerazione'.

- 225 GENN., Vir. 19: 'Composuit et chronicam...'
- 226 CSEL 1, 3: 'Incipit prologus Sulpitii Severi in chronica'.
- 227 Note references to other 'chronica': Chron. I 36,6; 42,1. On Sulpicius' use of the works of Eusebius, Hippolytus and Africanus: van Andel Concept 26-29.
- 228 As noted by Prete Chronica 9 n.18. The relevant passages are juxtaposed by Stancliffe 178-179.
- 229 Eadie 11.
- 230 Cf. the résumé offered by van Andel Concept 8: "I propose to recount the history of the world from the creation as we find it related in the Scriptures and then to add what happened subsequently... I shall do so by providing constant chronological details and by using secular sources."
- 231 On the history and characteristics of this kind of writing: Opelt 'Epitome'.
- 232 One should perhaps add: and Pompeius Trogus. For a proposal to date Justinus' epitome of Pompeius' Philippic Histories in the closing years of the fourth century see: R. Syme (article forthcoming in Historia).
- 233 Cf. von den Brincken 73: "[Sulpicius] is der einzige Chronist, der wirklich für sich in Anspruch nehmen kann, sein werk in erster Linie an der Bibel orientiert zu haben. Bei allen anderen Geschichtsschreibern sind derartige Behauptungen weitgehend leere Redensarten." Note, however, GENN., Vir. 1: 'Iacobus ['Nisibenus']... composuit chronicon minoris quidem Graecorum curiositatis sed maioris fiducia, quia divinarum tantum scripturarum auctoritate constructum comprimit ora eorum qui praesumptuosa suspicione de adventu antichristi vel domini nostri inaniter philosophantur' (referring to a sermon of Jacob Aphraates which the author had not seen and which he describes according to his own fancy: Czapla 10); 85: 'Prosper [composuit] chronica... continentia a primi hominis condicione, iuxta divinarum scripturarum fidem, usque ad obitum Valentiniani...' (referring to Prosper's epitome and continuation of Jerome-Eusebius).
- 234 Thus, most recently, Stancliffe 82. The idea can be traced back to Bernays 41f.
- 235 Chron. II 5,7.
- 236 AUS., Opusc. XXVII (ed. Prete) 'In notarium', v.7: 'Ego volvo libros uberes.'
- 237 Curtius 305f.
- 238 E.g. VMart. praef (publication of Vita); Ep. 1,1 (circulation of Vita); 3,1-5 (unauthorised publication of Sulpicius' writings by his

- mother-in-law; his 'notarii'); Dial. I 23; III 17 (diffusion of Vita); II 9,5 (availability of Ep. 1).
- 239 VMart. praef 6: 'titulum frontis erade, ut muta sit pagina et, quod sufficit, loquatur materiam, non loquatur auctorem.'
- 240 Dial. I 3ff.
- 241 Dial. I 8,3.
- 242 Ibid.
- 243 Dial. I 9,5.
- 244 Kelly Saint Jerome 259ff supplies full details.
- 245 Dial. I 7,3. Sulpicius' reaction to the Origenist controversy: van Andel 'Sulpicius'.
- 246 Dial. I 6,1; 7,3. Like Jerome himself and most of his Christian contemporaries, Sulpicius uses the word 'tractator' in the technical sense of 'biblical commentator', 'author of works of biblical exegesis': Bardy 'Tractare' 224f.
- 247 Above 38-39.
- 248 Stancliffe 66-69 deals only with Sulpicius' knowledge of Jerome's ascetical works.
- 249 Text cited above 37.
- 250 For a close analogue in a non-Christian context see SHA Tac. 11: 'legit sane senex minutulas litteras ad stuporem nec unquam noctem intermisit quo non aliquid vel scriberet ille vel legeret.' The insistence on reading and/or writing night and day would appear to be a specifically Christian trait, deriving from Psalm 1,2.
- 251 Note, however, that many people - including some of Jerome's closest allies - had been scandalised by the view of marriage expressed in the Adversus Iovinianum (393): Kelly Saint Jerome 187f. It is possible that Sulpicius also had these criticisms in mind.
- 252 See below n.255.
- 253 Stancliffe 309. Cf. Massie 106.
- 253a Among later verbal (as opposed to pictorial) presentations of Jerome as Christian reader-and-writer one may note: HYDAT., Chron. 59: 'Hieronimus qui supra praecipuus in omnibus, elementorum quoque Hebraeorum perit-issimus Hebraeorum, in lege domini quod scriptum est diurna nocturnaue meditatione continuus studia operis sui reliquit innumera'; BREVIARIUM ROMANUM, Die 30 Septembris (S. Hieronymi) in II nocturno, lectio v: 'in monasterio quod a Paula Romana exstructum erat, caelestem quamdam vitae rationem instituit; et, quamquam varie morbis doloribus tentaretur, tamen corporis incommoda piis laboribus

- et perpetua lectione ac scriptione superabat; ERASMUS, Letter 396 (trans. R.A.B. Mynors and D.F.S. Thomson): 'As for [Jerome's] industry, who ever either read or wrote so many volumes ?'
- 254 Dial. I 23; III 17.
- 255 Jerome's relations with Vigilantius: Kelly Saint Jerome 286-290; Stancliffe 297ff ('Jerome, Vigilantius and the Dialogues'). Useful chronology by Crouzel in BLE 73 (1972) 265-266. See also: Griffe La Gaule chrétienne III 226-230; Massie.
- 256 Contra Vig. 1 [339]. Cf. n.266 below.
- 257 Contra Vig. 11 [349A]. Vigilantius' inarticulacy is also asserted at 1 [340A]: 'mutus Quintilianus'; 3 [341C]: 'Est quidem imperitus, et verbis et scientia, et sermone inconditus'.
- 258 Ep. 61,3.
- 259 The 'notarii' and 'librarii' employed by Vigilantius c.396 may have been those retained by his masters, Paulinus (at Nola) and Sulpicius (at Primuliacum).
- 260 SUET., Gramm. 4 - with Bower.
- 261 For Jerome's views on the latter subject: Antin Recueil 104f; Rousseau Ascetics 126ff; König 20ff.
- 262 Contra Vig. 15 [351B].
- 263 In his Letter 52 to Nepotianus. Note especially Ep. 52,7,1: 'Divinas scripturas saepius lege, immo numquam de manibus tuis sacra lectio deponatur. Disce quod doceas...'
- 264 Contra Vig. 4 [342B]. At this period, preaching in church was done from the sitting position ('ex cathedra'). Jerome therefore implies that Vigilantius, as a priest, was in the habit of preaching during the liturgy, contrary to the rule then in force in the West.
- 265 Rousseau Ascetics 131.
- 266 CATO, Orig. II 2: 'Pleraque Gallia duas res industriosissime persequitur, rem militarem et argute loqui.'
- 267 See above 39 n.164.
- 268 Chron. a.336; a.353; a.355.
- 269 Comm. in Gal. prol 2 - with Antin 'Hilarius Latinae eloquentiae Rhodanus' and Doignon loc. cit. n.47 above. On contemporary notions of the 'sermo gallic(an)us': Norden II 631-642.
- 270 Vir. 36. There is no evidence, however, that Gennadius had seen any of his writings.

- 271 For details: Crouzel 'Saint Jérôme et ses amis toulousains'.
- 272 Comm. in Mal. ii 5/7, 229.
- 273 Comm. in Mal. iii 8/12, 358.
- 274 SIRICIUS, Ep. 6 ('Cogitantibus nobis', 384-398) 3,5 [PL 13,1166]: 'Et qui non didicit, iam docere compellitur'; ZOSIMUS, Ep. 9 ('Exigit dilectio', 418) 1,2 [PL 20,671]: 'quis ille tam arrogans... ut... prius velit docere, quam discere?'; CAELESTINUS, Ep. 4 ('Cuperemus quidem', 428) 4 [PL 50,430]: 'Debet enim ante esse discipulus quisquis doctor esse desiderat, ut possit docere quod didicit.' The last of these letters was addressed 'ad universos episcopos per Viennensem et Narbonensem provincias constitutos'; for the circumstances see below 196.
- 275 Ep. 119,1,2.
- 276 For an important statement of principle see the text cited below 221 n.163.
- 277 Ep. 119,11,4.
- 278 Cf. Vir. prol: 'omnes qui de scripturis sanctis memoriae aliquid prodiderunt' (cited above 33).
- 279 Ep. 119,11,3.
- 280 Ep. 61,3,2 (cited above 73); Antin '"Simple"' 378-380.
- 281 Their messenger is said to have travelled 'de extremis Galliae finibus' (Ep. 120 praef 1), 'de oceani litore atque ultimis finibus Galliarum' (Ep. 121 praef 1). Crouzel 'Echanges' 321 reasonably supposes that they were residents of Bordeaux.
- 282 Etienne 240. On Delphidius see also: Booth 'Notes on Ausonius' Professores 236-239.
- 283 Ep. 120 praef 2.
- 284 At least three of them were derived from earlier sets of 'quaestiones': de Bruyne 'Lettres fictives' 231-232 (who unnecessarily concludes that Hedybia and Algasia were figments of Jerome's imagination); Bardy 'Littérature des quaestiones' 363-369.
- 285 Ep. 120 praef 1.
- 286 Ep. 121 praef 4. This Alethius is probably to be identified with the addressee of Paulinus' Ep. 33 (c.401-406). A fragment of another letter of Paulinus, apparently written at the time of the Vandal invasion of 407-9, mentions a bishop of Cahors with the same name: Courcelle Histoire littéraire 284-286. Thus, if one accepts the usual dating of Jerome's Ep. 121 to 407, it is possible that the person there referred to as a priest was soon afterwards made a bishop.

- 287 Ep. 53,1-2; Ep. 121 praef 2.
- 288 Above 55 n.210; Ep. 121 praef 3-4.
- 289 Ep. 125,6,1.
- 290 Ep. 125,8,2.
- 291 Ep. 125,9,1; 20,2.
- 292 Ep. 125,7,3; 11,1. Note also the suggestion that he imitate Jerome in learning Hebrew (12). The emphasis on the importance of manual work (11) recalls the Pachomian legislation that the same author had recently translated into Latin.
- 293 Griffe III 319-321; Atsma 12-14.
- 294 See e.g. Sulp., VMart. 10,8-9: 'plures ex eis [sc. discipulis Martini nobilibus natu] postea episcopos vidimus. Quae enim esset civitas aut ecclesia, quae non sibi de Martini monasterio cuperet sacerdotem?'. ZOSIMUS, Ep. 9 ('Exigit dilectio', 418) 1,1 condemns the Gallic habit of ordaining monks to the priesthood.
- 295 Ep. 125,8,2. Cf. Heinzelmann Bischofsherrschaft 198.
- 296 Ep. 125,9,3; Stancliffe 300 n.18.
- 297 Ep. 125,17,2.
- 298 Ep. 125,18,1.
- 299 The phrase itself is from HOR., Ep. II 1, v.118:
 Scribimus indocti doctique poemata passim.
 Hic error tamen et levis haec insania quantas
 Virtutes habeat sic collige...

(The allusion is not remarked by Hilberg.) For Jerome's quotation of the preceding lines in his Letter 53 to Paulinus see above 51-52. Vigilantius is described as 'homo moti capitis' in the text cited above 75 n.264 - cf. Ep. 61,3,1: 'gloriari cupis, ut in patria tua iactites me non potuisse respondere eloquentiae tuae.'

- 300 The addressee of Letter 125 may be identified with Rusticus, bishop of Narbonne from 427 to c.461. Before his elevation, the latter had been a priest at Marseille and a monk (presumably in the same city); his father had also been a bishop. For details: Atsma 10-17. In a letter of 458/9, pope Leo was obliged to dissuade Rusticus from renouncing his pastoral charge in favour of a return to the cloister: LEO, Ep. 167 ('Epistolae fraternitatis') [PL 54, 1200B].
- 301 Lorenz 'Anfänge' (12-18 for Gaul). On early Gallic monasticism in general see also: Prinz Frühes Mönchtum 19ff; Griffe La Gaule chrétienne III 299ff; Fontaine 'Ascétisme'.

- 302 On these foundations: Pricoco Isola 30f; Marrou 'Jean Cassien à Marseille'.
- 303 HIL.ARELAT., VHon. 15,2 (patronage of Leontius of Fréjus in the case of Lérins); Marrou 'Jean Cassien à Marseille' 21f (support of Proculus of Marseille and of the deposed Lazarus of Aix [?] for Cassian's monastery).
- 304 See e.g. Inst. praef (bishop Castor of Apt); Coll. 1 praef (bishop Leontius of Fréjus), 3 praef (bishop Helladius of Arles); Heinzelmann Bischofsherrschaft 195-196.
- 305 See below 114ff.
- 306 Prinz Frühes Mönchtum 59-62.
- 307 Rousseau Ascetics passim. For a complementary view of the 'adoption' of asceticism by the Gallic ecclesiastical aristocracy of the fifth century: Heinzelmann Bischofsherrschaft, esp. 185ff.
- 308 On Cassian's life and work see especially: O. Chadwick John Cassian; Rousseau Ascetics 169ff. For his contacts with Egyptian Origenists such as Evagrius: A. Guillaumont 77-80.
- 309 Inst. II 5,2; de Vogüé 'Monachisme et l'Eglise'.
- 310 Rousseau Ascetics 197.
- 311 See e.g. Inst. V 14, VI 1, XI 3, XII 13; Coll. I 2.7, XII 4, XVII 28, XXI 14.
- 312 See e.g. Inst. V 33-34. For more general discussion of this topic: Dörries; Bacht 'Umgang'.
- 313 Praec. 139 [ed. Boon, 49].
- 314 Inst. IV 12 [54,27]; O. Chadwick John Cassian 67.
- 315 Inst. IV 13; Coll. I 6; IV 21,2.
- 316 E.g. Coll. VII 3,2 [181,18]; X 8,1 [294,9].
- 317 Inst. II 6.
- 318 Praec. 3, 28 et al. Cf. Inst. III 2. For details of this practice: Bacht Vermächtnis 244-264; de Vogüé 'Deux fonctions'. On meditation in Pachomius' monasteries see now: Rousseau Pachomius 81f.
- 319 Bacht Vermächtnis 260-261.
- 320 Cf. Inst. II 15,1: 'oris pariter et cordis officio in meditatione spiritali iugiter occupato'. For another aspect of the internalisation and appropriation of biblical passages see Coll. X 11, where the monk is said to become 'author' of the psalms which he has memorised and applied to his own experience.

- 321 Coll. XXII 10.
- 322 Coll. VII 4,2. Cf. Coll. I 17; XIV 13.
- 323 Coll. X 10: 'volentem me ob stabilitatem cordis insistere lectioni'.
- 324 Coll. I 18.
- 325 Coll. VII 4,2.
- 326 Coll. XIV 13,1.
- 327 Coll. XIV 1,3.
- 328 Marsili 75ff (Cassian's debt to Evagrius); A. and C. Guillaumont 48ff (history of the division between 'theory' and 'practice').
- 329 Coll. XIV 6.
- 330 Coll. XIV 1,3.
- 331 Coll. XIV 8,1.
- 332 Coll. XIV 8,1-7; de Lubac I 190f.
- 333 Coll. XIV 9.16,3.
- 334 Coll. XIV 14,1. Cf. AUG., Doct.chr. prol 1: 'Sunt praecepta quaedam tractandarum scripturarum quae studiosis earum video non incommode posse tradi... Haec tradere institui...'; 5: 'sine invidia tradat quod accepit'; 8: 'qui litteras tradit... similis est tradenti litteras' with n.339 below.
- 335 Coll. XIV 9,7.
- 336 Above 52.
- 337 Coll. XIV 13,5.
- 338 Examples below 115, 122, 129.
- 339 See n.334 above and Coll. XIV 13,3: 'Ut ergo haec in te scientia spiritalis perpetua soliditate roboretur nec ea iam temporarie perfruaris sicut illi qui eam non suo studio, sed aliena relatione contingunt et velut aërio ut ita dixerim odore percipiunt...'. The suggestion that the prologue of Augustine's De doctrina christiana was written c.427 in response to views expressed by Cassian (Duchrow 'Zum Prolog') is untenable (J. Martin). On the other hand, the fourteenth Conference might be read as a riposte to the newly-published four-book edition of the De doctrina christiana. For a proposal to make Cassian himself the author of a hermeneutical guide: Cazier.
- 340 Cf. Rousseau Ascetics 212ff ('A pastoral role'). Leonardi 1108ff and König 75-86 ('Das geistliche Amt als Versuchung für den Mönch') take a much narrower view.

- 341 Note the author's choice of confirmatory/cautionary examples: the apostles (16), those '[qui] eloquia dei... humanae laudis amore disponant' (17), the man 'qui... pro salute multorum spiritalis doctrinae gratiam consequ[e]tur' (19) - all of whom are active in a wider sphere than that of the monastery. The list of practical 'professiones' (4) includes those '[qui] aut doctrinae instantes aut elemosynam pauperibus largientes inter magnos ac summos viros pro affectu suo ac pietate vigerunt.' Christophe 16 unconvincingly locates the activity of such persons "à l'intérieure de la vie monastique".
- 342 For their careers: Pricoco Isola 42-44, 44-46.
- 343 De Vogüé Règles des Saints Pères. Serious doubts concerning the proposed dating and attribution of certain of these texts are raised by J. Biane in REA 84 (1982) 173f. Pricoco Isola 77ff argues that the Lerinian community did not and could not have possessed a written rule in the first decades of the fifth century.
- 344 RIVP 4,11. Cf. Inst. IV 13.
- 345 See below 148.
- 346 RIVP 4,13.
- 347 2RP 12.
- 348 Coll. XIV 9,5.
- 349 2RP 11.22-24.
- 350 Cf. VMart. 10,6 where it is stated that only the junior monks were occupied in this way, leaving their elders free to pray. Pricoco Isola 121-122 finds no evidence that manual work was prescribed at Lérins "ne come un principio di ascesi ne come un'attività prevalente ed economica". For an opposing view: Quacquarelli 61-64. Apart from the 'Rules', the first 'Lerinian' text to set a definite value on manual labour would appear to be the Life of Hilary of Arles: below 120-121. See also Heinzelmann Bischofsherrschaft 90-91.
- 351 2RP 23 - with de Vogüé's commentary 230-231.
- 352 RIVP 3,10 - cf. 3,6: 'Die autem dominica non nisi deo vacetur'. An allotment of the first three hours of the day to reading is also found in FAUST., Ep. 6 [196-197]: 'Itaque ad immolanda orationum sacrificia amica sunt fruentibus nocturna silentia, quibus usque ad horam tertiam lectio moderata succedat'. The interest of this letter as a document of Lerinian spirituality is remarked by Fontaine in DSp 5 (1962) 800-801.
- 353 For 'ruminatio' in a 'Lerinian' context see: EUS.GALL., Hom. 37 ('Ad monachos' - commonly attributed to Faustus) 1 [428,3ff]. The same idea appears frequently in the sermons of Caesarius of Arles. On its history: Ruppert.

- 354 Consistently with his policy of emphasising the ethical requirements for 'spiritalis scientia' Cassian decries the use of commentaries in the study of Scripture: Inst. V 34. It is clear, however, that he himself had access to a substantial 'library' of ecclesiastical texts: below 220ff.
- 355 According to Pricoco Isola 46 Eucherius is "per certi aspetti... la personalità più rappresentativa della cultura e della spiritualità di Lerino". For his career: ibid. 44-46.
- 356 Cont. [724A] - cf. [726A]: 'Proinde iam nunc omnia dicta factaque tua ad deum vel propter deum dirige' (an echo of Augustine's theory of 'usus'/'fruitio' in Book One of the De doctrina christiana ?)
- 357 Cont. [724C].
- 358 Cont. [725D]: 'Quod si ad fontes ipsos sacri eloqui scrutator accesseris, ibi tu non exteriora magis quam interiora mirabere. Ita scriptura, dum intrinsecus radiat, velut pretiosissima quaeque gemma, in profundum fulgorem considerantium demittit oculos.' One may infer that Valerianus, like other 'litterati' of his time, had reacted unfavourably to the outward appearance of the Scriptures, or that Eucherius anticipated such a reaction on the part of his readers.
- 359 Coll. XIV 11: 'Pro capacitate enim humanorum sensuum earum [sc. scripturarum] quoque species coaptatur et vel terrena carnalibus vel divina spiritalibus adparebit, ita ut his quibus antea videbatur crassis quibusdam nebulis involuta, nec subtilitatem eius deprehendere nec fulgorem valeant sustinere.'
- 360 Cont. [718B].
- 361 Cont. [718C-719A]. For the sources of this catalogue, which include the Hieronymian De viris illustribus: Courcelle 'Nouveaux aspects' 383f. In addition, Eucherius names a certain 'Hilarius' and one 'Petronius... in Italia nunc antistes'; on the identification of these figures see now Mathisen 'Petronius'.
- 362 Cont. [719A]; Courcelle 'Nouveaux aspects' 390.
- 363 For the possibility that the addressee of Eucherius' letter is to be identified with Valerianus, bishop of Cimiez from c.439: Weiss 'Personnalité'. Tibiletti 'Valeriano' detects strong similarities between the views on grace and free will expressed by this Valerianus and those held by Cassian and Faustus of Riez. There is no evidence, however, that the future bishop of Cimiez was ever a monk at Lérins: Pricoco Isola 58. Cf. Mathisen 'Petronius' 110.
- 364 Cont. [726D]: 'Vim caelestium praeceptorum arcte breviter collecta accipe'.
- 365 Addressed, respectively, to the author's two sons Veranus and Salonius, both of whom later became bishops (Pricoco Isola 46-48).

- 384 Pricoco 'Storia ecclesiastica' 244; Pietri 'Gennadius' 377.
- 385 Commendations: Vir. 11, 12, 16, 25, 34, 50, 71, 86, 88, 90. Criticisms: 56 (neglect); 33, 54 (abuse). The success of an author in investing his work with the 'auctoritas scripturarum': 1, 12, 78, 93. Note also 8: 'epistulae... sanctarum scripturarum sermone digestae'; 9 and 76: 'libri... divino sale conditi'; 29: 'volumen... sanctis scripturis instructum'; 94: 'docens secundum relationem scripturarum'. A possible local source for the idea that Christian argument should depend largely on judicious use of scriptural 'testimonia' was Salvian: above 101 n.380.
- 386 Vir. 3, 9, 18, 21, 46, 65, 68, 70, 80, 81, 86. The last six of these refer to Gallic authors with Lerinian/Massilian associations.
- 387 Vir. 36, 61.
- 388 Vir. 18, 39, 46.
- 389 Vir. 11 - cf. 39 (Augustine): 'eruditione divina et humana... clarus'; 15 (Commodian): 'inter saeculares litteras etiam nostras legit... sed... parum nostrarum adtigerat litterarum.'
- 390 Evagrius and Cassian: m.308, 328 above. Gennadius' translations: Vir. 11; A. and C. Guillaumont 318-319.
- 391 Vir. 68: 'Salvianus, apud Massiliam presbyter... Vivit usque hodie in senectute bona'. The fact that Gennadius does not mention Salvian's earlier association with Lérins cannot be adduced as a reason for calling it in doubt; in this case, as in others (e.g. Eucherius), he limits biographical information to the minimum required to establish a writer's present or final situation: Pricoco 'Nota' 355-356.
- 392 Braun 460; van der Geest 24f.
- 393 Vir. 36, 38 - cf. Adv.Iov. 14 [PL 23,214]; II 35 [333]; Ep. 52,2,1; II2,5,2. Pace Wölfflin it would seem to have been Jerome, not Tertullian, who formalised the opposition 'scriptura'/'litteratura'.
- 394 TLL s.v. 'littera', 'litteratura'; Hus 'Doctor, doctrina' 38f; Grundmann.
- 395 Above 9.
- 396 The phrase appears in Vir. 60. Notwithstanding Pricoco's attempt to clear Gennadius of the imputation of 'semi-Pelagianist' sympathies ('Storia ecclesiastica' 251ff), it is impossible to ignore the bias that he shows towards Gallic writers with monastic and/or Lerinian/Massilian connections.
- 397 See e.g. Vir. 64 (Eucherius), 68 (Salvian), 80 (Musaeus of Marseille).
- 398 Vir. 61: 'Victorinus... saeculari litteratura occupatus [i.e. as a teacher]... et nullius magisterio in divinis scripturis exercitatus.'

Gennadius identifies this Victorinus with the author of an extant poem on Genesis entitled Alethia (=CPL 1455).

- 399 Vir. 65, 68, 70, 80, 81, 86.
- 400 The fact that Gennadius gives no clear indication that either Eucherius or Salvian had received a monastic training does not invalidate this point. Eucherius (Vir. 64) is commended as the epitomator of works 'tam ecclesiasticis quam monasticis studiis necessaria', while the details of Salvian's career would presumably have been common knowledge to many of the original readers of the De viris illustribus. More importantly, the system of values implied by the work as a whole has an obviously monastic character: Pricoco 'Storia ecclesiastica' 245-246. See also n.498 below on monastic influences in the (Gennadian) Statuta ecclesiae antiqua.
- 401 Lumpe 1245-1247.
- 402 HIER., Ep. 58,5,2: 'habet unumquodque propositum principes suos' (cited above 56).
- 403 VMart. 25,4 - cf. 19,3 where Paulinus is described as 'magni vir postmodum futurus exempli'. Other instances of the use of Paulinus as an 'exemplum': PL 61, 128f.
- 404 VAnt. interprete Evagrio, praef [PL 73,125-126].
- 405 Exceptions: Vita Ambrosii, Vita Augustini. Recent discussion of early Gallic Lives: Heinzelmann 'Neue Aspekte'; Consolino 39ff; Berschin 241ff.
- 406 Eucherius: above 98. Sidonius: Duval 'Lecture' 66.
- 407 Russell and Wilson 83 ('basilikos logos') - cf. 175 ('epitaphion').
- 408 E.g. Iul. 55-56; Aug. 84-86; Tib. 70.
- 409 VCypr. 1,1.
- 410 VCypr. 7,12.
- 411 VCypr. 2,3: 'Postquam et sacras litteras didicit, et mundi nube discussa in lucem sapientiae spiritalis emersit.'
- 412 VCypr. 7,4: 'velut frenis quibusdam lectionis dominicae' (in the Ad virgines); 9,6: 'divinae lectionis exemplis' (in preaching). On the possible senses of 'lectio' in Cyprian's own writings: above 4 n.14.
- 413 VCypr. 14,6.
- 414 Above n.27.
- 415 Below 118-119.
- 416 VAubr. 3 (miracle of the bees).

The dates of composition are unknown but the Instructiones was written after Hilary became bishop of Arles (probably in 430). Lerinian associations are emphasised in the first of the prefaces to Salonius.

- 366 Eucherius' sources: Opelt 'Quellenstudien'; J.F. Kelly 'The exegetical methodology of Eucherius of Lyon' (Paper delivered to the Tenth International Conference on Patristic Studies, Oxford, August 1987).
- 367 Form. praef [3-4]. On the ideas contained in this preface and their relevance to Eucherius' own practice as a biblical exegete: Curti.
- 368 Form. praef [4-5]; de Lubac I 193f.
- 369 Form. praef [5,19 - 6,3] - cf. CASS., Coll. XIV 1.8 (cited above 91-92).
- 370 Instr. 1 praef [66,6].
- 371 Biography of Salvian: Pricoco 'Nota', Isola 53-54. Bibliography: Badot 'Notice'.
- 372 Gub. V 2,5-11.
- 373 Gub. V 2,6.
- 374 Gub. V 2,8.
- 375 See e.g. Gub. I 9,43 (the delivery of the Law to Moses).
- 376 Gub. III 1,2: 'si scire vis quid tenendum sit, habes litteras sacras: perfecta ratio est hoc tenere quod legeris' - cf. II 8.
- 377 Gub. IV 14,70: 'Noster ergo hic peculiariter reatus est, qui legem divinam legimus et legalia semper scripta violamus, qui deum nosse nos dicimus et iussa illius ac praecepta calcamus.'
- 378 Pace Henss 49f.
- 379 Gub. III 1,5 - cf. 1,3: 'Nihil ergo in hac re opus est novum aliquid audire: satis sit pro universis rationibus auctor deus'; 1,4: 'Alia enim omnia, id est humana dicta, argumentis ac testibus egent: dei autem sermo ipse sibi testis est.'
- 380 See especially Gub. I 4,19 [11,12]; II 1,1 [30,10].
- 381 Gub. III 1,1.
- 382 Above 59ff.
- 383 According to Feder 'Entstehung' Gennadius' catalogue was composed in stages between 467 and 476 and first published in 477/8. Analysis of contents: Czapla (needs updating). Pricoco 'Storia ecclesiastica' is an excellent study of the principal themes of the work.

- 417 VAug. 18,10.
- 418 VAug. 3,2; 7; 11,5; 18,9: 'Tanta autem ab eo dictata et edita sunt... ut ea omnia vix quisquam studiosorum perlegere et nosse sufficiat.' Cf. AUG., Civ. VI 2 (of Varro, to whom Jerome had compared Origen): 'tam multa scripsit quam multa vix quemquam legere potuisse credamus.' Jerome's remarks are cited above 36 n.151. For the same sentiment in later Augustinian hagiography: below 178 n.78. CLAUD. MAM., Stat.an. II 9 calls the bishop of Hippo 'Varro noster voluminum magnitudine'.
- 419 VAug. 31, 9-10.
- 420 Against the ascription of the Greek Life to Athanasius of Alexandria see now: Barnes 'Angel of light'.
- 421 VAnt. 1 - cf. 43, 49. Although two of Jerome's ascetic heroes are granted a literary education comparable to that of the author himself (VPauli 4, VHilarionis 2) the privilege serves mainly to magnify their sacrifice of secular ambition.
- 422 VMart. 25,8; Grundmann 21.
- 423 VMart. 26,3.
- 424 VMart. 25,6-7 with Fontaine's commentary.
- 425 Above 65ff.
- 426 VMart. 10,6 (also cited above 95 n.350).
- 427 Ep. 125,11,4: 'scribantur libri, ut manus operetur cibos et anima lectione saturetur'; VHilarionis 35.
- 428 VAmbr. 38.
- 429 VMart. 10,2.
- 430 Pricoco Isola 49-50.
- 431 Cf. VMart. 1,7.
- 432 VHon. 25,1.
- 433 VHon. 9,4.
- 434 VHon. 16,3.
- 435 Hospitality: VHon. 9,4. Charity: 9,5. Teaching: 9,5; 10,2; 19,3 (by word and example).
- 436 VHon. 24,2.
- 437 Cf. SULP., VMart. 5,1; 7,1 with Fontaine's commentary; Pricoco Isola 92.

- 438 VHon. 5,1: 'divino quodam paedagogio educatum putes, eruditur sine aliquo suorum instantia' - hinting, perhaps, at a theory of divine erudition of the type expounded by Hilary of Poitiers and ultimately traceable to Alexandrian sources.
- 439 Note especially EUCH., Laus 42: 'digna [Lirinus] quae et praestantissimos alat monachos et ambiendos proferat sacerdotes' and the same author's description of his son's Lerinian education at Instr. I praef (after 430), where (as in the Life of Honoratus) the accent falls on the relation between master and disciple.
- 440 VHon. 36,2. Note the appearance of a human agent as the subject of 'erudire'.
- 441 Attribution to Faustus, based on circumstantial details in the text itself: Gennaro. On the more general problem of the authorship of the sermons ascribed to 'Eusebius': Morin 'Collection'; van Buchem 45f; CCL 101 vii- (Glorie); Griffe 'Sermons', 'Nouveau plaidoyer' (referring to an unpublished thesis by J. Leroy). Careers of Maximus and Faustus: Pricoco Isola 48-49, 55-56.
- 442 VHon. 25,2-3.
- 443 EUS.GALL., Hom. XXXV 4,57.
- 444 Ibid. 4,70.
- 445 Ibid. 5,79.
- 446 Ibid. 5,80.
- 447 Ibid. 12,234.
- 448 Ibid. 12,244.
- 449 VHil. 1,5: 'vicit meritum dominorum praesentiumque pontificum'; 29,6: 'Hebraeam concinentium linguam in exequiis honorandis audisse me recolo' (the only manifestly personal reminiscence, perhaps indicating that the author was still in his youth at the time of the saint's death).
- 450 Note especially GENN., Vir. 70 (Hilary of Arles) which would seem to be based almost entirely on information in the Life. The questions of authorship and circumstances of composition are discussed by Kolon 109-124 (who favours a date in the early sixth century) and Cavallin Vitae 35-40. The latter attributes the work to Honoratus of Marseille, on the strength of ps.-GENN., Vir. 100 (though this implies that Honoratus had adapted an earlier Life). On the formation of the Arlesian legendary containing the Lives of Hilary and Honoratus: Bouhot 'Texte'.
- 451 VHil. 10,11.
- 452 VHil. 10,10.

- 453 VH11. 10,14 - cf. 11,15: 'instituere monasteria'.
- 454 VH11. 11,1.
- 455 E.g. VH11 18,10: 'Ille autem lectioni intentus, vigiliis deditus, orationi ac ieiuniis iugiter mancipatus'; 26,11: 'cogitationum laqueos sancta meditatione disruptimus.'
- 456 VH11. 15,12 - cf. 18 where the saint is said to have spent his nights engaged in net-making, psalmody, prayer and meditation.
- 457 VH11. 15,15.
- 458 VH11. 11,11.
- 459 VH11. 26,8.
- 460 E.g. Coll. XIV 11 (cited above n.358).
- 461 VH11. 26,54.
- 462 VH11. 30,32.
- 463 See also VH11. 2,17; 4,2; 13,6; 14,1.
- 464 VH11. 14.
- 465 VH11. 14,23.
- 466 Cavallin Vitae 37-39.
- 467 Namely Dommulus, Eusebius (VH11. 14,17) and Livius (14,23). See also the Index nominum to Loyen's edition of Sidonius. The Eusebius mentioned in the Life may be the one to whom Sidonius refers when recalling his own education 'intra Eusebianos lares' (Ep. IV 1,3).
- 468 Biography of Sidonius by Loyen in the introduction to the first volume of his edition.
- 469 Ep. VIII 6,6.
- 470 For Faustus' Life of Maximus see above 116f. SID., Carm. XVI, vv.109-112 (cited below 127) may indicate that Faustus also composed Lives of other prominent Lerinians; among the sermons attributed to 'Eusebius' is one 'in depositione sancti Honorati' that could have been preached at Lérins in the time of Faustus. Constantius was the author of a Life (c.480) of St. Germanus of Auxerre, which includes a notable description of the 'biblical' eloquence of Germanus and the Lerinian bishop Lupus of Troyes: VGerm. 14.
- 471 Possible hagiographical projects are mentioned at Ep. VIII 15 (a Life of St. Amianus of Orléans) and Ep. IX 16,3 v.61ff (a poem in honour of various saints and martyrs, beginning with St. Saturninus of Toulouse). Sidonius was also responsible for a translation of Philostratus' Life of the pagan philosopher Apollonius of Tyana, whom he

describes (Ep. VIII 3,5) in terms easily transferrable to a Christian ascetic.

472 Ep. VII 18,2.

473 Ep. VII 17,2 (cf. VIII 15,1: 'mores, merita, virtutes'); V 11,3; IV 9,5.

474 For the ideological and political importance of secular 'lectio' according to Sidonius see especially Ep. IV 17,2; V 5,4.

475 Ep. VIII 11,3.

476 Ep. IX 12,1 - cf. IX 13,2 v.25; IX 16,13 v.49f. On the literary consequences of Sidonius's conversion: Løyen Sidoine Apollinaire 157-159; Rousseau 'Search' 368-371; Gualandri 3ff; Consolino Ascesi 110f.

477 Ep. VIII 4,3.

478 Cf. Rousseau 'Search' 370: "Sidonius may not have nurtured in his dreams the scruples of a Jerome, nor indeed of the school of Lérins. Yet there was a change, a development in his attitude."

479 Ep. VII 13,2. The final part of this sentence is a reminiscence of HIER., Ep. 36,14: Gualandri 17 n.57. Other evidence of Sidonius' reading of Jerome's Letters: Pricoco 'Studi' 123-129, 143ff; n.406 above.

480 Cf. Ep. VII 18,4 where Sidonius' 'editor', Constantius, is invited to read his Letters 'si quid a lectionis sacrae continuatione respiras'. The reading attributed to Claudianus Mamertus is equally eclectic: below 129.

481 E.g. Ep. VII 13,3: 'Ieiuniis delectatur, edulibus adquiescit; illis adhaeret propter consuetudinem crucis, istis flectitur propter gratiam caritatis.' Note also 2: 'Deus bone, quae viro censura cum venustate, si quid vel deliberet forte vel suadeat! Abundat animi sale, cum consulitur, melle cum consulit.' The combination of 'sal' and 'mel' was a feature of the 'genus pingue et floridum' beloved of Sidonius: Løyen Sidoine Apollinaire 134. Given the context of this remark (which immediately precedes the mention of Himerius' Christian reading) one might detect the influence of an ideal of the 'sermo spiritali sale conditus' as expressed (e.g.) by Paulinus and Gennadius.

482 Ep. IV 9,3. On the terms of this description see also Heinzelmänn Bischofsherrschaft 207.

483 Ep. IV 9,5.

484 Cf. Ep. VII 9,6 (from a speech made at an episcopal election at Bourges, shortly after his own consecration as bishop of Clermont): 'prius quam ulli bonorum reddam discentis obsequium, cogor debere ceteris docentis officium.' For an exact parallel in the De officiis of Ambrose, and Jerome's hostile reaction, see above 53 n.204.

485 Carm. XVI, v.91ff.

486 Cf. vv.71-77 where Sidonius speaks of Faustus' tutelage of a 'brother' of his ('mihi germanus') - at Lérins ?

487 That Sidonius had read the second of these two works may be inferred from a comparison of his Ep. IX 3,4:

'[tu Fauste] precum peritus INSULANarum, quas de palaestra congregationis heremitidis et de senatu Lirinensium cellulanorum in urbem quoque, cuius ecclesiae sacra superinspicias, TRANSTUListi, nil ab ABBATE mutatus per sacerdotem, quippe cum novae dignitatis obtentu rigorem veteris disciplinae non relaxaveris'

with EUS.GALL., Hom. XXXV 12:

'Et quia superius memoravimus quam magnifice INSULANO illo stadio perfectionis vias cucurrit, plus est quod huc insulam ipsam institutis ac studiis suis TRANSTULit. Et qui iamdudum in abbatem pontificem gesserat, postmodum ABBATEm in pontificem custodivit'.

488 Ep. IX 3,5. This letter is dated by Loyen to the period of Sidonius' exile (c.476). Harries Bishops provides good reasons for assigning it to the year 469, shortly after the writer's 'conversion' and entry into holy orders but before his elevation to the episcopate. Sidonius' other surviving letter to Faustus (Ep. IX 9) is dated by Loyen to the end of 471 (cf. Pricoco 'Studi' 139). Both letters would presumably have been revised before publication in 482, by which time Faustus may have been dead.

489 Ep. IX 9,13: 'sive in palaestris exerceris urbanis sive in abstrusis macerare solitudinibus' - cf. 3,5: 'inter spiritaes regulas vel forenses medioximum quiddam contionantem'. On Faustus' secular education see now: Lapidge 32.

490 Ep. IX 9,12-15. Factors influencing this mode of presentation: Pricoco 'Studi' 113ff.

491 Note especially the conclusion to Ep. IX 9: 'Quocirca merito te beatissimum boni omnes idque supra omnes tua tempestate concelebrent, cuius ita dictis vita factisque dupliciter inclaruit, ut, quando quidem tuos annos iam dextra numeraverit, saeculo praedicatus tuo, desiderandum alieno, utraqe laudabilis actione, decedas te relicturus externis, tua proximis.' Anderson translates: "... you will bequeath your possessions to your immediate flock, but your real self [i.e. the inspiration of your life and work - added in note] to the world at large."

492 Ep. IV 2,3. For the suggestion that Sidonius may have been partly responsible for the contents of this letter, the only one in his correspondence published under another man's name: Rousseau 'Search' 365 n.2. Claudianus was dead by the time the text appeared in this form.

- 493 Ep. IV 11,6. On the 'triplex bibliotheca': Fortin 17-20. The insertion of 'tractator' (i.e. biblical commentator) into a list of practitioners of the liberal arts may have been inspired by HIER., Ep. 53,6 (cited above 51). There is no other evidence of Claudianus' alleged 'monastic' education. In the De statu animae he is scornful of the claims to superior Christian learning made by or on behalf of ascetics like Faustus of Riez.
- 494 See e.g. ILCV 1062 (Hilary of Arles), 1065 (Eutropius of Orange) - studied by Heinzelmann Bischofsherrschaft 84-98. Consolino Ascesi 136 notes that specifically literary activities receive less notice in Gallic epitaphs of this period than the examples offered by Sidonius might lead one to expect.
- 495 Note the similarities between Claudianus' literary career as described by Sidonius and that of the Massilian priest Musaeus at GENN., Vir. 80: both men composed lectionaries and assisted in the preparation of homiletic material. Another priest of Marseille, Salvian, is said to have produced a sacramentary, numerous homilies for use by bishops, and a commentary on Ecclesiastes for a certain bishop of Vienne (Vir. 68). It would appear that such ancillary tasks fell naturally to men of talent and learning who either did not seek or failed to obtain the highest ecclesiastical office. A generation or so later they would have been permitted to preach.
- 496 Munier Statuta.
- 497 SEA can 45.
- 498 Munier Statuta 164f, 197-198.
- 499 SEA can 29: 'Clericus victum et vestimentum sibi artificiolo vel agricultura absque officii sui dumtaxat detrimento praeparet' - cf. can 79: 'Clericus, quamlibet verbo dei eruditus, artificio victum quaerat.'
- 500 SEA can 96. Similar language at EUS.GALL., Hom. LXIV 8: 'quando aut lector aliquis aut minister dei verba dispensat.'
- 501 SEA can 31, 56, 79.
- 502 SEA 1.
- 503 See below 381f.
- 504 Munier Statuta 129f. Note especially Const.apost. I 5,3 [ed. Funk, 36]: 'sit episcopus sollicitus in doctrina, et assiduus in scripturis dei sollicite legendis, ut scripturas accurate vertat et interpretetur.'
- 505 Munier Statuta 162 draws attention to a similar prescription in the De septem ordinibus ecclesiae [PL30,150A]: 'Sola esto tibi lectione et oratione contentus' - cf. [149A]: 'Omnes scripturas mente per—
curre, totum canonem lege'; [149C]: 'Non recedat liber legis, ut scriptum est, de manu tua, sed meditare in eo die ac nocte.'

NOTES TO CHAPTER 2

- 1 Thus Sidonius Apollinaris, writing c.471, compliments an episcopal colleague on his mastery of the 'bybliothea fidei catholicae [quae] tibi tam per authenticos quam per disputatores perfamiliaris est' (Ep. VII 9,1) - text cited by Curtius 258. For the rare 'authentici', cf. CLAUD.MAM., Stat.an. I 2 [25,16]; II 9 [138,3]. Sidonius' idea of the Christian 'library': Fortin 17-20.
- 2 The patristic canon: Curtius 256-260; de Ghellinck II 250-258. Jerome's lists of Christian authors: above 56 n.211.
- 3 Bardy 'Traducteurs' surveys the results of western contact with Greek Christian writing during the Arian crisis.
- 4 HIER., Ep. 107,12 (Cyprian, Athanasius, Hilary).
- 5 On Augustine's early reading of the Bible and biblical commentary see now La Bonnardière 'Initiation'.
- 6 Cat. VIII 12,1. The unusual dichotomy 'scripturae/litterae (nostrae)' acquires its sense from the subsequent distinction between 'libri canonici' and 'libri utilium tractatorum' (12,3).
- 7 Doct.chr. prol 1.
- 8 Cavallo 'Libro' 119f.
- 9 Evidence collected by de Ghellinck II 275-289; Wendel 'Bibliothek' 246f. On the library at Hippo: Scheele 61f.
- 10 Above 96 n.354 .
- 11 EUCH., Instr. I praef [65,6]. For the sources of this work: above 99 n.366.
- 12 Above 78. Note that the materials assembled by Jerome consisted mainly of 'excerpta' from the works of earlier Greek commentators.
- 13 Vir. 64: 'sancti Cassiani quaedam opuscula lato tenso eloquio angusto verbi revolvens tramite in uno coegit volumine.' There is a chance that fragments of this work may have survived: Honselmann (which I have not seen). On Eucherius as an epitomator of Cassian see also above 99-100.
- 14 For the biographies of these men see below n. 41 (Prosper) and n.183 (Vincent).
- 15 See also above 37, 68-70 (Jerome and Origen).
- 16 HIER., Ep. 112,5 [372,17]: 'episcopus in toto orbe notissimus'. Cf. (ps.-)FAUST., Serm. 27 (Engelbrecht) 'In depositione s. Augustini' [333,26]: 'passim per populos conscia tantorum bonorum fama volitabat et odore amoenissimae suavitatis longe lateque

fulgebat' - following a development based loosely on the Confessions. (On the attribution of this work to Faustus of Riez: Morin, CCL 104, 961; Frede 324.)

- 17 Paulinus' relations with Augustine: Courcelle Confessions 559ff. His only extant letter to persons whose abode can be securely fixed in SE Gaul is Ep. 51 (c.423-6 ?) - addressed to Eucherius and Galla when they were living on Lero, a neighbouring island to Lerins.
- 18 Courcelle 'Nouveaux aspects' 381-404 who also notes the influence of the De civitate dei in a work of Eucherius.
- 19 So much may be deduced from analysis of the sources of Vincent's Excerpta and Prosper's Liber sententiarum (though it is not clear how much of the latter was composed in Gaul). On Salvian's knowledge of Augustine's work: O'Donnell.
- 20 Note the tribute implicitly paid to Augustine as a literary artist in the Vita Hilarii (text cited above 123 n.465).
- 21 Cf. HIER., Ep. 141,2 [290,11]: 'in orbe celebraris. Catholici te conditorem antiquae rursum fidei venerantur atque suscipiunt.'
- 22 Details below 183ff.
- 23 History of dogma V 8.
- 24 The idea of the 'Fathers' in this period: E. Amann in DTC 12 (1933) 1192f; Quasten Patrology I 9-10; Congar Tradition I 60f.
- 25 Appeal to 'tradition' in the early church: Congar Tradition I 41ff. The beginnings of formal argument from patristic testimony: Richard 'Florilèges diphysites'; Tetz 'Streit'; H. Chadwick 'Florilegium' 1156f.
- 26 See the two sets of patristic 'testimonia' in the Arian Fragmenta theologica from the Bobbio palimpsest: CCL 87, 229-231 (Hilary, Phoebadius, Ambrose - whose opinions are controverted); 235 (Athanasius, Theognius of Nicaea). Dated 'after 380' by Gryson, *ibid.* xxv.
- 27 The main points of his argument appear in Bapt. II. For a general account: Bord.
- 28 Peccat.merit. III 4,9f. Augustine's method of patristic argument in the period 412-418 is discussed by Maschio. For subsequent developments: Batiffol 479f; Martíl 12-37; and esp. Wermelinger Rom und Pelagius 264f.
- 29 C.Iul. I-II. The image of an assembly or 'council' appears notably at I 7,30-32; II 10,33-37. On the means by which Augustine collected and presented his patristic evidence: Altaner 'Augustins Methode'; Doignon '"Testimonia"'.

- 30 See the text cited below n.197. It is clear from PROSP., Ruf. 18,19 that the charge of Manichaeism that Julian had brought against Augustine was repeated by certain parties in Gaul.
- 31 'Florilèges diphysites' 721-722.
- 32 Courcelle 'Nouveaux aspects' who states, 407: "Il faut donc conclure, je crois, en dépit de l'opinion la plus accréditée, que les ascètes de Lérins disposaient d'une belle bibliothèque et n'avaient pas honte de leur culture profane, même s'ils prisait davantage la culture sacrée..." Cf. Riché Education et culture 140f.
- 33 Text cited above 36 n.150.
- 34 In the Retractationes (as originally planned).
- 35 In the Indiculus. The traditional view that this work was compiled at Hippo (probably on the basis of a catalogue instituted by Augustine himself) has recently been challenged by Ludwig; see the review of her dissertation by A. Mutzenbecher in REAug 33 (1987) 128-131.
- 36 On the relation between Gennadius' catalogue and Jerome's see now: Pricoco 'Storia ecclesiastica' 242f.
- 37 GENN., Vir. 64: 'aliaque [conposuit] tam ecclesiasticis quam monasticis studiis necessaria'; 42: 'vir... monachorum studiis... exercitatus'; 11: 'scripsit multa monachis necessaria'; 62: 'scripsit... res omnium monachorum professioni necessarias'; 65: 'vir... notitia ecclesiasticorum dogmatum sufficienter instructus' (cf. the title of another of Gennadius' works: Liber ecclesiasticorum dogmatum); 18: 'in ecclesiasticis quoque negotiis studiosus'; 77: 'conposuit libellum... totam paene ecclesiasticam credulitatem continentem'; 4: 'ad regulam ecclesiasticam pertinentia multa disseruit'; 7: 'scripsit regulam utrique generi monachorum aptam'; 52: 'conposuit ex traditione patrum monachorum regulam'; 12: 'scripsit de incarnatione domini... citatis etiam patrum traditionibus' (cf. 34: ostendit deum incorporeum iuxta patrum fidem credendum'; 86: 'patrum confirmat sententiis nihil credendum incorporeum praeter deum').
- 38 For the convergence of the ideas of 'regula fidei' and 'symbolum' in the late fourth and early fifth centuries see below 277, 294 n.61.
- 39 Pricoco Isola 93f strongly opposes the tendency to assume the existence of written disciplinary codes in the earliest stages of western monasticism. A contrary view is taken by de Vogüé: see above 94 n.343.
- 40 Vir. 85. Cf. Czapla 158f.

- 41 Biography of Prosper: Valentin 121-155; PW 23.1 (1957) 880-882 (R. Helm); DSp 12.2 (1986) 2446-2448 (A. Solignac).
- 42 Gennadius' position in the debate on grace and free will: Feder 'Semipelagianismus', Pricoco 'Storia ecclesiastica' 251f (who rightly resists the identification of G. as a 'semi-Pelagian').
- 43 A full list of titles will be found under PROSPER in Part I of the Bibliography. It is not clear how accurately these reflect the wording found in the earliest MSS.
- 44 Were one to accept the attribution to Prosper of the pseudo-Augustinian Hypomnesticon, the manuscript history of this work would provide a clear example of such a 'loss' of the author's name (Chisholm I 63, 78-79, 124-125). See below n.235. Evidence of suppositious works circulating 'sub Augustini nomine' in Prosper's time: below 266-267.
- 45 Below 178 n.78.
- 46 Vir. [90] - MS Paris BN Lat. 12161, which also contains other important additions to the Gennadian text [xii].
- 47 Details in CCL 148, 53.
- 48 See especially the studies of Cappuyns, de Plinval and Lorenz listed in Part II of the Bibliography.
- 49 Recent discussions: McHugh Carmen 10-24; Longpré 'De providentia'; J.P. Bouhot in REAug 27 (1981) 398. Gallo's attempt to attribute the work to Hilary of Arles does not convince. (Note: new edition with commentary by M. Marcovich forthcoming.)
- 50 It is tempting to see vv.940-946 of the poem as containing an ironic allusion to the settlement of 418:

Sed si quis superest animi vigor, excutiamus
Peccati servile iugum, ruptisque catenis,
In libertatem et patriae redeamus honorem.
Impia non oberunt cum saevo pacta tyranno,
Captiva conscripta manu, resolubile Christo est
Hoc foedus, quod iure potest subvertere iusto.

Such a reading would, of course, require the text to be dated a year or two later than it usually is.

- 51 Ovidian echoes are listed by McHugh Carmen 69f who states, 107: "the influence of Ovid [in the De providentia] ranks second only to that of Vergil."
- 52 See above 47-48 (Paulinus), 97-98 (Eucherius) and, for a close parallel in another biblical poem by a Gallic author, CL.MAR. VICT., Alethia prec vv.103-106.

- 53 For the dating of this and other works: Cappuyns 'Premier représentant' (with the modifications of Lorenz 'Augustinismus' 233-236); PW 23.1 882-896 (Helm, following Valentin).
- 54 The African councils mentioned at Ingr. v.76f have been variously identified: PL 51 ad loc. In vv.76-77 Prosper refers to a double assembly ('gemino senum coetu') whose decisions were ratified by Rome. He almost certainly means the Councils of Carthage and Milevis of 416, both of which addressed letters to pope Innocent and in due course received replies. (For Prosper's knowledge of the correspondence see below 207 nn.142-143.) On this interpretation, the 'tercentenis linguis' of v.86 must stand for the bishops present at these two councils and v.90 begin a new development relating to the Council of Carthage of 418 (otherwise referred to by Prosper as the council of '214' bishops). There is no evidence that the author was informed of the decisions of the 'Concilium Africanum' of Oct./Nov. 417: Wermelinger Rom und Pelagius 149.
- 55 See his letter of 427 to Augustine, in which he seeks clarification of the latter's views on predestination - cited below 184f.
- 56 Thus Sent. 1-38 are derived from Prosper's abbreviation of Ennar. 100-129. For details see Gastaldo's apparatus and Lorenz 'Augustinismus' 223-226.
- 57 Lorenz 'Augustinismus' 218-219.
- 58 Valentin 193. See e.g. Sent. 348, 351, 363, 385.
- 59 Lorenz 'Augustinismus' 218.
- 60 The expression 'Nec nostrae hoc opis est' is a Virgilianism (as noted by the editors of Migne's text) - cf. Aen. I 601.
- 61 Bernt 86 emphasises the originality of the Liber epigrammatum: "Diese Gedichte sind eigentlich ohne Vorbild... [E]in ganzes Buch Epigramme nach vorliegenden Prosasentenzen muss wohl als Prosper's eigene Erfindung angesehen werden."
- 62 See H. Chadwick 'Florilegium' for details.
- 63 E.g. PLIN., Ep. III 5: 'liber legebatur, adnotabat excerpebatque. Nihil enim unquam legit quod non exciperet'; SEN., Ep. ad Lucil. 2,4-5: 'Probatos... semper lege... et cum multa percurreris, unum excerpe, quod illo die concoquas. Hoc ipse quoque facio...'
- 64 MACR., Sat. I praef. 6: 'nos quoque quicquid diversa lectione quaesivimus committamus stilo...' The passage as a whole is modelled on SEN., Ep. 84,2-10.
- 65 H. Chadwick Sentences of Sextus 118-119.

- 66 Latin translations of Evagrius' Sentences by Rufinus and Gennadius: A. and C. Guillaumont Evagre le Pontique: Traité pratique 318-319. Cf. GENN., Vir. 11.
- 67 Curtius 468.
- 68 Roberts 70-71.
- 69 Above 47.
- 70 Cf. Valentin 860 (who also makes a connection between Prosper's shorter poems and the epigrams of Ausonius).
- 71 Above 16, 18-19 (Hilary).
- 72 Morin 'Préface métrique', reproducing the text in PL 36, 59-60. Cf. CPL 524; CCL 68A praef. to Expos.psalm. viii n.5.
- 73 For (1) see above 164-165. For examples of (2) and (3) see above 170 (preface to the Epigrammata) and passages cited below 213f.
- 74 On the question of the original extent of the Expositio see now Rondeau Commentaires 188-190. Regarding the termini 435-449 traditionally assigned to the composition of this work, the author remarks, 190: "On peut se demander... si la nature... des rapports qui lient l'Expositio et les Enarrationes ne révèlent pas un jeune disciple travaillant méthodiquement un ouvrage de son maître, et si par conséquent il ne faudrait pas situer l'Expositio assez haut, avant la crise marseillaise."
- 75 It is possible that these two objections might be shown to cancel each other out. If Prosper did compose the preface but only completed the work itself to the extent represented in all surviving MSS (i.e. Psalms 100-150), one might expect the two texts to have become detached at an early stage in transmission. The manuscript tradition of the Expositio is, in any case, fairly exiguous. As a membrum disiectum the preface might have become anonymous and so have been lost altogether, had it not offered itself for inclusion among the preliminaries to a similar work at a later date. One would thus have merely to grant that Prosper may have written a preface in anticipation of a work that he ultimately left unfinished, in order to accept the solution proposed by Morin. Clearly, the matter calls for further research.
- 76 Note the parallel between v.13 of the metrical preface and EUGIPP., Ep. ad Probam [2,28]: 'pauca proinde quae congeSSI non solum mihi qui sensu censuque sum pauper sed etiam his qui utroque praediti sunt munera profutura confido' (re. his own Augustinian Excerpta). Do these words contain a reminiscence of a poem written in the first half of the fifth century, or did a Carolingian poet adapt a phrase of Eugippius? TLL s.v. 'census' gives only one instance of this wordplay in a late antique author (AVIT., Ep. 6 [33,19]: 'in qua elemosynaria largitate operantis

- sensus potius quam census aspicitur'). There is some evidence to suggest that the text of Prosper's Expositio was known to Eugippius: CCL 68A praef to Expos.psalm. x.
- 77 VAug 18,9. Cf. HIER., Ep. 33 (of Origen, cited above 36 n.151); AUG., Civ. VI 2 (of Varro).
- 78 GENN., Vir. 39: 'Quis enim gloriatur omnia se illius habere, aut quis tanto studio legat, quanto ille scripsit?' The inadequacy of this notice led to the insertion in one sixth-century MS of the De viris of the Indiculus listing Augustine's works: Kalinka. Similar statements by later writers: EUG., Ep. ad Probam [2,19]; ISID., [PL 83,1109]; CSEL 85,1 xxix (verses attributed to Gualcaudus).
- 79 Below 379 n.253.
- 80 PROSP., Ep. ad Ruf. 3,4 [79C].
- 80a See above 130 n.495.
- 81 Among recent studies of Gallic 'semi-Pelagianism', see esp. the articles of Chéné and Tibiletti listed in Part II of the Bibliography; Pricoco 'Storia ecclesiastica' 263ff. The position of Cassian is discussed by O. Chadwick John Cassian 110-136. On Prosper see the studies cited above n.48. Markus 'Heresy, orthodoxy and conciliation' points the way towards a new synthesis.
- 82 Mandouze Saint Augustin 562f provides a view of Augustine's contacts based on his correspondence.
- 83 AUG., Ep. 178.
- 84 AUG., Ep. 187 ('De praesentia dei'). Cf. Retr. II 49: 'De praesentia dei scripsi librum, ubi nostra intentio contra heresim Pelagianam maxime vigilat non expresse nominatam.' Dardanus' career: PLRE II 346-347; Matthews Western aristocracies 321-324.
- 85 Bonner 'Augustine and modern research' 55f, Wermelinger Rom und Pelagius 91.
- 86 Leporius: below 313f.
- 87 Rescript of Valentinian III, dated 9 July 425 = Const. Sirm. 6 (ed. Mommsen-Krüger 911-912). Discussed by de Plinval Pélage 348, who notes that "après [425] on n'a plus entendu parler en Gaule d'évêque pélagien". Cf. Wermelinger Rom und Pelagius 207; Markus 'Heresy, orthodoxy and conciliation' n.7.
- 88 For a reconstruction of the Roman position as expressed in the Tractoria: Wermelinger Rom und Pelagius 211-214. The main object of Zosimus' pronouncement was to assert (1) that Adam's sin affected the whole human race and (2) that divine grace was necessary for the accomplishment of any virtuous action.

- 89 This summary is based on information contained in the letters of Prosper and Hilary (see following note).
- 90 O. Chadwick 'Euladius' dates the outbreak of the 'semi-Pelagian' controversy to 427 when the De correptione et gratia arrived in Gaul. It is clear from Prosper and Hilary's letters (= AUG., Ep. 225,226) that the first protests against Augustine's teaching had been heard some time before that.
- 91 PROSP., Ep. ad Aug. 2 [456,1] states merely that this work had reached him 'insperata opportunitate'. He remarks however that Augustine had dealt with the points at issue 'quasi hoc specialiter studueris, ut, quae apud nos erant turbata, componeres' [456,4-5]. Assuming that the bishop of Hippo had been alerted to the situation in Provence in 426 (as a result of Hilary's first letter) it is probable that he had it in mind while composing the second of his treatises for the monks of Hadrumetum.
- 92 In his Ep. ad Ruf. 4,5 [80A] (written at around the same time as the Ep. ad Aug.) Prosper refers disparagingly to the private 'collationes' of the local anti-Augustinian party. He would later compose a work Contra collatorem directed specifically against Cassian's thirteenth Conference. GENN., Vir. 62 credits Cassian with the foundation of 'duo id est virorum et mulierum monasteria quae usque hodie extant.'
- 93 Early monastic foundations in Marseille: above 82 n.293.
- 94 Cf. Courcelle 'Nouveaux aspects' 404: "Tous ces semi-Pélagiens [sic] se sentent, en tant que convertis à l'ascétisme, les disciples de l'auteur des Confessions."
- 95 Above 94.
- 96 PROSP., Ep. ad Aug. 9 [467,14]. The reading '[H]elladium' (for the 'Hilarium' found in most MSS and all existing editions) is convincingly restored by O. Chadwick 'Euladius' 203-204 on the strength of a single MS of the tenth or eleventh century.
- 97 The career of Rusticus: above 84 n.300.
- 98 Roma christiana II 1026-1033. For surveys of southern Gallic ecclesiastical politics in this and the immediately preceding period: Griffe La Gaule chretienne II 146ff; Langgärtner 26-61. Dates of episcopal succession: Duchesne Fastes I ('Provinces du Sud-Est'), modified in places by Palanque; Roux.
- 99 The ascetic claims of these bishops were frequently used to justify a kind of Gallic separatism in ecclesiastical affairs: Heinzelmann Bischofsherrschaft 78ff (with special reference to the case of Hilary of Arles).
- 99a EUS.GALL., Hom. XXXV ('De sancto Maximo') 8,159: 'ambiebat illum [Maximum] proxima eremo civitas [Frejus], quae inter locum hunc

[Riez] et insulam [Lérins] interiacet.' On the career of Maximus, one-time abbot of Lérins and bishop of Riez from c.433: Pricoco Isola 48-49.

- 100 Ep. 4 'Cuperemus quidem', 26 July 428.
- 101 Ibid. 1,2 [430B].
- 102 Ibid. 4,7 [434B].
- 103 E.g. Ep. ad Ruf. 4,5; Ingr. praef. v.3.
- 104 Ep. ad Aug. 7 [465,5].
- 105 In his Ep. ad Aug. 1 [454,12] Prosper refers to a deacon named Leontius as 'sanctus frater meus', whence Mommsen in MGH AA IX 344 inferred that the writer himself held this rank. It is likely, however, that Prosper used the term 'frater' in a less official sense to denote one dedicated (as he was) to a godly and ascetic way of life. He addresses Rufinus as 'frater dilectissimus in Christo' and promises to inform the Genoese priests 'quid cum sanctis et eruditis fratribus sentiam' (Resp.Gen. praef). Gennadius, generally meticulous in such matters, gives no hint that Prosper held ecclesiastical office.
- 106 Note that it is Hilary (Ep. ad Aug. 10 [479,14f]), rather than Prosper, who asks Augustine for copies of his Retractationes and De gratia et libero arbitrio.
- 107 Cf. Prosper's evocation of his group of loyal Augustinians in Ep. ad Ruf. 3,4 [79C] - cited above n.80.
- 108 Ep. ad Aug. 1 [455,10].
- 109 Chron. 1204, 1261, 1304.
- 110 Ep. ad Aug. 3 [459,2]. Cf. Resp.Gall. praef [156-157]: 'in nullo recedens a tramite earum definitionum quae in sancti viri disputationibus continentur.'
- 111 Above 165.
- 112 Ep. ad Ruf. epil 20 [89A-90A].
- 113 Cf. Cappuyns 'Premier représentant' 317 n.19 (contra Valentin 167).
- 114 Ep. ad Aug. 9 [468,1].
- 115 This is the title of the work as referred to by Prosper in the preface to his Resp.Gen. [187A]: 'In libris beatae memoriae Augustini episcopi, quorum titulus est, de praedestinatione sanctorum.' In modern editions the first and second volumes

appear separately as De praedestinatione sanctorum (henceforth Praed.) and De dono perseverantiae (Don.)

- 116 See preceding note and Cappuyns 'Premier représentant' 317 n.22. De Plinval 'Prosper' 342 n.11 suggests emending the MS reading 'Genuensium' to 'Agennensium' on the grounds that "Il semble plus naturel que l'Aquitain Prosper ait été en rapport avec les centres religieux d'Agen plutôt qu'avec ceux de Gênes (ou de Genève!)" This hardly seems necessary. Genoa was on the coastal route between Marseille and Rome and contacts between Christian communities in S. Gaul and N. Italy at this period were close.
- 117 The case for identifying the two Vincents is made by H. Koch 'Vincenz und Gennadius'. For counter-arguments: O'Connor 141-173. The Obiectiones are not included in the most recent edition of Vincent's work (CCL 64, ed. Demeulenaere).
- 118 CAELESTIN., Ep. 21 'Apostolici verba'. For the date: Pietri Roma christiana II 1035 n.2.
- 119 CAELESTIN., Ep. 21,1,2 [528D].
- 120 Ibid. 2,3 [530A].
- 121 C.coll. 21 [270-274]. For details of the authorities cited see below 209.
- 122 Ibid. 2,1 [218A]: 'Scriptae enim sunt, et auctoris sui editione publicatae: nec iam, an sint, quaerendum est; sed quid docent, demonstrandum.' Compare this statement with his earlier complaints against those who refused to publish their opinions, cited below n.129. Cappuyns 'Premier représentant' 312 n.7 infers that Prosper "n'est parvenu à mettre la main sur la treizieme Conference que peu avant 433."
- 123 C.coll. 5,3.
- 124 Details below 210-211.
- 125 Cappuyns 'Origine des capitula ps.-célestiniens'.
- 126 For differing opinions on this subject see Cappuyns 'Premier représentant'; de Plinval 'Prosper' (both of whom detect a gradual retreat from Augustine's final position on predestination) and Lorenz 'Augustinismus' (who emphasises the basic consistency of Prosper's views).
- 127 Below 206-208. It is not proposed to consider here the work entitled De vocatione omnium gentium attributed to Prosper by Cappuyns, since this is generally believed to have been written after c.435 when the author was resident in Rome. (For a recent discussion of Prosper's removal to Italy and of influences on the De vocatione see Markus 'Chronicle and theology'.) On the pseudo-Augustinian Hypomnesticon: below 266 n.235.

- 128 Epigr. in obtrect. Aug. 1 vv.1-2 [149A].
- 129 Cf. Epigr. in obtrect. Aug. 2 [149D-152A]; Ep. ad Ruf. 3,4 [79A]: 'occultis sed non incognitis susurratationibus obloquuntur'; ibid. [79C]: 'occulta obtrectatione'; 4,5 [79D]: 'Sed quis nescit cur ista privatim de stomacho garriunt, et publice de consilio conticescant ?'
- 130 Ep. ad Ruf. 18,19 [88B].
- 131 PROSP., Ep. ad Aug. 2 [455,14], 3 [459,9], 8 [467,1]; HIL., Ep. ad Aug. 3 [471,3], 7 [477,6], 8 [477,14] ...
- 132 Ep. ad Aug. 3 [471,3]. Cf. ibid. 7 [477,6]: 'Hoc... et illis locis tuorum opusculorum et aliorum, quae persequi longum est, se demonstrare testantur.' The Augustinian works cited in this connection apparently included Ep. 102 (composed c.409), In Rom. (394) and Lib. arb. (387-c.391).
- 133 Don. 11,26 [1008]: 'agebam in libris de libero arbitrio, unde isti [sc. Massilienses] nobis praescribendum putant.'
- 134 The relevant passages are Praed. 3,7 - 4,8; 9,17; Don. 9,23; 11,26 - 12,30; 20,52 - 21,55.
- 135 HIL., Ep. ad Aug. 10 [479,14]: 'Libros, cum editi fuerint, quos de universo opere moliris, quaeso habere mereamur, maxime ut per eorum auctoritatem, si qua tibi in tuis displicent, a dignitate tui nominis iam non trepidi sequestremus.' PROSP., Resp.Gen. [190A] refers to the second book of the Retractationes.
- 136 Praed. 4,8. Cf. Don. 21,55.
- 137 Resp.Gen. [191B].
- 138 Below 208-209.
- 139 C.coll. 21,3 [273A]. At Don. 21,55 Augustine had cited his Ad Simplicianum and Ep. 186 (to Paulinus of Nola) and 194 (to the future pope Sixtus) as evidence of the consistency of his views on grace. Prosper cites the same two letters and extends the demonstration to include all the author's major anti-Pelagian works.
- 140 C.coll. 21,4 [273B].
- 141 References to Council of Diospolis: Ep. ad Ruf. 3,4 [78C]; Ingr. vv.42-54; C.coll. 5,3 [227B]; 9,1 [236A]; 21,1 [271A].
- 142 Ingr. v.76f ? See above 163 n.54.
- 143 Cited Auct. 4; 1-3. Cf. Chron. 1261 (a.416 [sic]): 'Quo tempore Pelagianis iam a papa Innocentio praedamnatis Afrorum industria ac

- maxime Augustini episcopi scientia resistebatur'; C.coll. 21,1 [271A].
- 144 References to the Council of Carthage of 418 (= council of '214' bishops): Ingr. vv.90-92; Resp.Gall. I 8 [164B]; Chron. 1266; C.coll. 21,1 [271A]. Canons cited: C.coll. 5,3 [227B]; 15,4 [258C]; Auct. 7. Letter to Zosimus cited: C.coll. 5,3 [227C]. For the number 214: Wermelinger Rom und Pelagius 150.
- 145 References to the Tractoria: Ep. ad Ruf. 3,4 ? C.coll. 21,1 [271A]. Citations: C.coll. 5,3 [228A]; Auct. 5.
- 146 Cited C.coll. 5,3 [228A-B]; Auct. 5.
- 147 Ingr. vv.181-182: 'Sanctorum decreta patrum, regumque piorum / Scriptas lege dei leges'.
- 148 C.coll. 21,1 [271A]: 'quando sanctae memoriae papa Bonifacius... contra inimicos gratiae dei... apostolicis utebatur edictis'. Cf. Wermelinger Rom und Pelagius 243 who finds no evidence for legislative action by Boniface against the Pelagians.
- 149 AUG., Ep. 215.
- 150 Ingr. v.33f.
- 151 'Premier représentant' 328-329. Cf. 'Origine des capitula ps.-célestiniens' 159.
- 152 Note especially Ingr. vv.39-42 (with C.coll. 21,1) and Chron. 1261 (cited above n.143).
- 153 Cf. Gantoy 116.
- 154 An appeal to the 'sensus omnium tractatorum' at C.coll. 9,5 [238C] is justified by a single quotation from Ambrose, In Lucam VII (a text cited regularly by Augustine since the beginning of the Pelagian controversy). Chisholm I 14, 125-126, 212 remarks the absence of explicit patristic testimony in the Hypomnesticon.
- 155 De Plinval's proposal ('Prosper' 351) to consider the second part of the Resp.Gen. as a later 'retractatio' of the views expressed in the first part is rightly rejected by Lorenz 'Augustinismus' 235-236.
- 156 PROSP., Ep. ad Aug. 2 [455,14]: 'contrarium putant patrum opinioni et ecclesiastico sensui'. The expression 'sensus ecclesiasticus' also appears in VINC., Comm. XXIX,1 (cf. Madoz Concepto 123f).
- 157 HIL., Ep. ad Aug. 8 [477,14].
- 158 PROSP., Ep. ad Aug. 8 [467,1].
- 159 Praed. 14,27-28; Don. 19,48-50.

- 160 Chéné 'Origines' 74-75, 90-93; BA 24, 806-807; Tibiletti 'Giovanni Cassiano' 374-380 provide indications of the patristic sources exploited by the 'Massilians'.
- 161 See the studies cited above 146 n.25.
- 162 The practice of citing **credal** texts (as seen, e.g., in the works of Hilary of Poitiers) will be considered separately in Chapter 3.
- 163 Note esp. HIER., Ep. 112,5: 'hoc [audeo] confiteri, me maiorum scripta legere et in commentariis secundum omnium consuetudinem varias ponere explanationes, ut a multis sequatur unusquisque, quod velit.' On Jerome's eclecticism as a biblical commentator: Penna 20f.
- 164 Sieben Konzilsidee Kap.IV ('Der Konzilsbegriff des Vinzenz von Lerin) 165-168 ('Mönchischer Kontext').
- 165 For the contents of this Conference see O. Chadwick John Cassian 119-127, Tibiletti 'Giovanni Cassiano' 369-374.
- 166 A similar critique of Augustine's ideas on biblical interpretation may be detected in the fourteenth Conference: above 93 n.339.
- 167 Cf. Coll. 1 praef 7.
- 168 Above 92.
- 169 The influence of the De correptione is noted by O. Chadwick 'Euladius' 202, John Cassian 126.
- 170 On the circumstances of this work see below 313.
- 171 Richard 'Florilèges diphysites' 722. Cf. H. Chadwick 'Florilegium' 1158. The text in question is Cyril's letter to the Egyptian monks (ACO 1,1,1,12; Festugière 27f) which contains two short quotations from Book Three of Athanasius' Contra Arianos. According to E. Amann 'Nestorius' 95, this letter was written shortly after Easter 429; a copy must (presumably) have reached Rome later in the same year, in order for it to have been available to Cassian.
- 172 Doignon 'Compilation' 487-493, who notes the close relationship between certain texts cited by Cassian and those later produced by pope Celestine at the Roman synod of August 430.
- 173 PROSP., Ep. ad Aug. 3 [458,16] probably refers to the 'Massilian' reaction to the Contra Iulianum.
- 174 The evidence is assembled and discussed by Loofs 51-57; Schwartz Konzilstudien; Amann 'Affaire' 231-232; O. Chadwick John Cassian 141-142.

- 175 Schwartz Konzilstudien 2. Whereas this florilegium is lost, others compiled by Cyril are extant among the materials relating to the Council of Ephesus (431): H. Chadwick 'Florilegium' 1159.
- 176 ARN.IUN., Confl. II 13 [PL 53, 288-290] with Doignon 'Compilation' passim.
- 177 Thus O. Chadwick John Cassian 141, in agreement with the other scholars cited above n.174.
- 178 The importance of the 'Roman' contribution should not be underestimated. Besides the elements of patristic argument offered by Cyril's letter to the monks (above n.173), Leo's 'Nestoriana' included a defamatory Libellus, composed by one Eusebius (later bishop of Dorylaeum) and first published in Constantinople, which seems to have provided the stimulus for Cassian's use of the 'baptismal' creed of Antioch in Book Six of the De incarnatione: Schwartz Konzilstudien 15-16; Tetz 'Zum Streit' 365. See also following note.
- 179 ACO 1,1,2,60 [52,2-5]; Festugière 244; Loofs 283,2-8. An excerpt from this sermon must have reached Cassian from Rome - an item to be added to the list of 'Nestoriana' sent in 429/30. VINC., Comm. XXXI 6 alludes to the same text (available to him in a set of 'acta' of the council of 431).
- 180 See H. Rahner '"De dominici pectoris fonte"' and the discussion of Augustine's use of the image of John as preacher by Mohrmann Etudes II 66.
- 181 Rousseau Ascetics 75.
- 182 Vir. 65.
- 183 Cf. Prinz Frühes Mönchtum 52; Pricoco Isola 52-53, both of whom identify the Vincentius of Vir. 65 with the homonymous brother of Lupus (later bishop of Troyes, originally from Toul in modern Lorraine) mentioned in EUCH., Laus 42. For a contrary view see Angrisani Sanfilippo 347-349.
- 184 Above 196 n.117.
- 185 Comm. II 1. Becker 341-342 detects the influence of Vincent's terminology in Gennadius' use of the word 'dogma', though without noting its appearance in Vir. 65.
- 186 Kelly Athanasian creed 116ff gives the state of the question.
- 187 Cf. CCL 64, 132-133.
- 188 Comm. II 5.
- 189 Madoz Concepto 59-89.

- 190 Id. Excerpta 30-33.
- 191 See especially Griffe 'Pro Vincentio'; O'Connor. The former argues that the debate on grace and predestination was irrelevant to V.'s concerns in the Commonitorium, the latter that the author of the Excerpta cannot be suspected of harbouring anti-Augustinian opinions on any subject of doctrinal importance. O'Connor's views are accepted by Demeulenaere in the introduction to his recent edition of V.'s work.
- 192 Sieben Konzilsidee 149-152. The interpretation of the Commonitorium proposed in these pages provides the basis for much of what follows here.
- 193 Cf. Markus 'Heresy, orthodoxy and conciliation' n.1: "The 'profectus fidei non commutatio' of Vincent of Lérins and his conception of heresy and orthodoxy need more careful discussion than they have received since Newman's time."
- 194 Coll. II 15. Cf. FAUST., Ep. 7 [200,21] - cited below 340.
- 195 Below 324ff.
- 196 Weyman "'Edition"' 584, citing CIC., Rep. I 13; TAC., Dial. 1.
- 197 SALV., Ep. 9,13-16. For the textual tradition see SC 176, 28.
- 198 Brox Falsche Verfasserangaben 101-104 and esp. 'Quis ille auctor?'. Cf. Lagarrigue in SC 176, 44.
- 199 On the career of Salonius: above 98 n.365.
- 200 PROSP., Epigr. in obtrect. Aug. 1 v.13 [150A]. It has been suggested, on the basis of a possible wordplay in the following line ('Si pastorem ovium laedere vis, lupus es'), that the author in question may have been Lupus, a future bishop of Troyes then resident at Lérins. The latter is not otherwise known for his literary activity. (See also n.207 above on the possibility of a family relationship between Lupus and the author of the Commonitorium.) For a suspected case of Lerinian anonymity (c.470): CLAUD.MAM., Stat.an. I 2 (re. FAUST., Ep. 3).
- 201 Thus Luiselli 'Sulla pseudonimia'. Cf. Leclercq Sources 35f ('Monachisme et pérégrination').
- 202 Konzilsidee 154.
- 203 Vincent's use of Tertullian's treatise is attested by the numerous textual parallels noted in the apparatus of Demeulenaere's edition. It is conceivable that his decision to compose the Commonitorium was partly motivated by a wish to supply the theoretical study of heresy that Augustine had promised in the preface to his (incomplete) De haeresibus.

- 204 On this subject see Madoz 'Cultura humanistica', Courcelle Lettres grecques 218-219 and the Index scriptorum in CCL 64, 465f.
- 205 Below 323ff.
- 206 Konzilsidee 165f.
- 207 Cf. Comm. XXIII 19 (discussed below 326).
- 208 Sieben, Konzilsidee 157-158.
- 209 Comm. XXXI 1: 'adiecimus... beati Cyrilli sententiam, quae gestis ipsis ecclesiasticis continetur'; 2: 'ait [Cyrillus]... in fine gestorum'. As noted by Madoz 'Cultura humanistica' 468-471, Vincent's translation of Cyril's remarks does not correspond to any of those preserved in later Latin conciliar collections. If he did not make it himself, may one suppose that it was made by a Greek scholar in S. Gaul ? In any case, this passage would appear to disprove the traditional view that no detailed account of the proceedings at Ephesus was available in the West until long after the event: ACO 1,3,1 x.
- 210 ACO 1,1,2,43-48; Festugière 196-226.
- 211 ACO 1,1,2,54; Festugière 229-236.
- 212 Cf. Sieben Konzilsidee 159: "Weil es Vinzenz gerade auf diesen Aspekt des Ephesinums, die Praktizierung des Väterarguments, ankommt, erweckt er bei seiner Darstellung absichtlich den Eindruck, als beriefen die ephesinischen Synodalen sich ausschliesslich auf die Väter. Geflissentlich erwähnt er mit keinem Wort das Nicaenum, das doch eindeutig nach den Akten der Haupttext war, aufgrund dessen Nestorius, weil im Widerspruch zu ihm, verurteilt wurde." Madoz Concepto 157-163 takes no account of this distortion.
- 213 Thus, for example, the recourse of the bishops at Ephesus to the sayings of their predecessors (XXXI 4: '[ut] nihil... novarent, nihil praesumerent, nihil sibi penitus adrogarent') is commemorated in terms reminiscent of Vincent's own promise to write down what he had learnt from his elders (I 6: 'ut... describam relatoris fide potius quam auctoris praesumptione'). The verb 'describere' is used in classical and post-classical Latin both of the act of writing something down for the first time and of that of copying from an exemplar; it was therefore equally applicable to the roles of 'relator' and 'collator' as conceived by Vincent.
- 214 Madoz Excerpta 11.
- 215 Ibid. 33-37, 46-50.
- 216 Ibid. 6f.

- 217 Doignon 'Compilation', '"Testimonia"'. An interesting example of such a compilation is the so-called Fides Ambrosii (CPL 789; Hahn 203), a Trinitarian confession probably composed in the late fourth or early fifth century that conflates two passages from Ambrose's De fide.
- 218 See above n.191.
- 219 Cf. TERT., Praescr. 6,5; 29,7.
- 220 Cf. ibid. 4.
- 221 Courcelle Lettres grecques 218-219, who likewise concludes that he had no direct knowledge of the works of Origen.
- 222 See e.g. Madoz Concepto 86-88.
- 223 Pace O'Connor 240-243.
- 224 Cf. Madoz Concepto 79-84; O'Connor 216-233.
- 225 Pace Madoz Excerpta 40; O'Connor 184.
- 226 Madoz Excerpta 30-33; Courcelle 'Nouveaux aspects' *passim*.
- 227 The arguments advanced by H. Koch 'Vincenz und Gennadius' in favour of regarding the Commonitorium as a purely 'private' composition are refuted by Weyman 'Die "Edition"'.
 228 See the examples in TLL s.v. 'commonitorium' and Prete Commonitorium 1-32.
- 229 PRISC., Tract. 2 [35,19]: 'Datum nescio quod ab Hydatio ibi commonitorium est quod velut agenda vitae poneret disciplinam.'
- 230 OROS., Comm. 1 [151,8]: 'Eutropius et Paulus episcopi eadem qua et ego puer vester salutis omnium utilitate permoti commonitorium iam dederunt de aliquantibus haeresibus nec tamen omnes significarunt.'
- 231 Two other examples of Spanish anti-Priscillianist 'commonitoria': AUG., Ep. 11 (note, however, that many of these 'new' Augustinian letters bear the title 'commonitorium', without necessarily being concerned with heresy); LEO.M., Ep. 15 [678B] (referring to a work composed by Turibius of Astorga c.447: Vollmann Studien 146-149). Prosper's colleague Hilary informs Augustine of the views of his critics 'velut commonendo' - text cited above 185.
- 232 AUG., Ep. 221,3.
- 233 Career and works of Mercator: Wermelinger 'Marius Mercator'. Jerome mentions him in Ep. 154,3. For the lost works see AUG., Ep. 193,1.

- 234 Prete Commonitorium 46.
- 235 This work has recently been edited by Chisholm who dates it to the early 430s and ascribes it to Prosper of Aquitaine. The attribution has not received general assent: J. de Savignac in Scriptorium 37 (1983) 134-140; J.P. Bouhot in REAug 30 (1984) 403; Frede (1988) 38, 85. It is possible, nevertheless, that the Hypo-
mnesticon belongs to a Gallic milieu: Markus 'Heresy, orthodoxy and conciliation' n.27.
- 236 Chisholm II 83.
- 237 PL 53, 534B.534D. The text in question appears at col. 621-628. It was almost certainly fabricated for the purpose. Most modern scholars regard the Praedestinatus as the work of an Italian writer sympathetic to the views of Pelagians like Julian of Eclanum but anxious to escape the charge of anti-Augustinianism. See most recently: Abel (who follows Morin in attributing the work to Arnobius Junior).
- 238 [535B].
- 239 'Unde breviter nisibus vestris me interserens, sermonis latitudinem fugi, sensusque qui latum quaerunt certaminis campum in angustum constitui, ut fastidium vobis lectionis auferrem' [621B].
- 240 AUG., Retr. I 5,1: 'Post libros soliloquiorum... scripsi librum de immortalitate animae, quod mihi quasi commonitorium esse volueram propter soliloquia terminanda, quae imperfecta remanserant. Sed nescio quo modo me invito exiit in manus hominum, et inter mea opuscula nominatur'. Angrisani Sanfilippo 355-359 conjectures that this passage may have influenced Vincent's presentation of his own work. It seems certain, in any case, that the word 'commonitorium' was not commonly used of a written record intended only for the author's own use (hence Augustine's approximative 'quasi'); no other example is to be found in TLL.
- 241 Hyp. [102,39]: 'Si qua vero sunt quibus nolentes erravimus, si tamen sunt aliqua corrigenda, intuitu caritatis, deo iudice, corrigat; sed is cui sensus est catholicus corrigendi. Cf. the request made by Pelagius towards the end of his Libellus fidei, submitted to pope Zosimus in 417: 'Haec fides est... In qua si minus perite aut parum caute aliquid forte positum est, emendari cupimus a te' (Hahn 292) and the position adopted by the Gallic monk Leporius in his Libellus emendationis (below 318-319). Note also AUG., Don. 23,68 where the author expresses the hope of being made more correct ('emendatior') through the attentions of his readers.
- 242 NICET., Comp. II fg.5.

NOTES TO CHAPTER 3

- 1 Eichenseer 26-48 provides a general survey of credal terminology. For 'symbolum' see esp. Carpenter '"Symbolum"'; Kelly Early Christian creeds 52-61.
- 2 Carpenter '"Symbolum"' 8. Cf. Kelly Early Christian creeds 57.
- 3 Examples of such texts: Hahn nos.151f ('Symbole von Particular-Synoden') and 185f ('Privat-Symbole').
- 4 CYRILL.HIEROSOL., Cat. 20,2-4 [PG 53, 1077-1082]; AUG., Conf., VIII 2. Both passages are discussed by Kelly Early Christian creeds whose chapter on 'Creeds and baptism' remains fundamental.
- 5 Early Christian creeds 49-52.
- 6 'Das Bekenntnis Eusebs von Caesarea' 134: "Ich möchte meinen, dass gerade die Zeit der werdenden Reichskirche für die Entstehung oder doch die weitere Verbreitung der neuen Sitte [viz. the use of a declaratory symbol in Christian initiation] besonders geeignet war." The implications of this important article are spelt out by Ritter 'Glaubensbekenntnis(se)' 405-412.
- 7 Hanson Tradition 124-125.
- 8 Von Campenhausen 'Das Bekenntnis Eusebs von Caesarea' 134-139, followed by Ritter 'Glaubensbekenntnis(se)' 408-412.
- 9 For a full discussion see Kelly Early Christian creeds 100-130.
- 10 Ibid. 167f (178-179 for Gallic forms).
- 11 Eichenseer 39-40. The legend of apostolic composition: Kattenbusch 3-24; Eichenseer 48-53; Kelly Early Christian creeds 1-6.
- 12 On these ceremonies: Kelly Early Christian creeds 32-36.
- 13 For a recent reassessment of the historical significance of this passage of the Confessions see Poque, who concludes that **public** recitation of the creed was not normal outside Rome at the time when Augustine was writing (c.397).
- 14 See now Poque 142-143.
- 15 Evidence collected by de Puniet 'Liturgie baptismale' and 'Baptême' 325-330. Kretschmar 222f assimilates the Gallic rite to that in use in Milan and N. Italy, omitting the testimony of Gallic authors.
- 16 De Puniet 'Liturgie baptismale' 396-397 (cf. 'Baptême' 328); Beck 176.
- 17 CAES., Serm. 130,5 - discussed by Beck 175-176. Contrary to what the latter asserts, Caesarius' allusion to the shame that would be suffered by one unable successfully to render the creed ('noverit

grandem verecundiam sese passurum') would seem to indicate that the 'redditio' was a public event. The view that there was no formal rendering of the creed in the time of Caesarius is endorsed by M.-J. Delage, SC 175, 364 n.3.

- 18 CCL 148, 200.
- 19 Below 286f.
- 20 Kattenbusch II 433-471 ('Die "Expositiones symboli" und sonstiges zur volkstümlichen Schätzung des Symbols') contains valuable material for the social history of creeds. The more ambitious study of Wiegand does not fulfil the promise of its title.
- 21 Below 302ff.
- 22 Griffe 'Cassien'; Incarn. VII 31 (cited above 234-235).
- 23 For external influences Cassian's method of argument in Book Six see above 231-232.
- 24 EUCH., Instr. II 15 [160,18].
- 25 For a contemporary tribute to Eucherius' powers as a teacher see CLAUD.MAM., Stat.an. II 9 [135,12f] who quotes part of a lost homily by this author.
- 26 VHil. 14,27. See also above 123.
- 27 CPL 505. On the Expositio fidei catholicae: below 288 n.38.
- 28 Bergmann 84; Morin 'Collection gallicane' 178.
- 29 Morin, op. cit. (n.28); Glorie, preface to CCL 101.
- 30 Salvian and Musaeus as sermon-writers: above 130 n.495.
- 31 For recent opinion see the studies cited above 116 n.441.
- 32 Caspari Ungedruckte Quellen II 183f (in favour of Faustian authorship of both sermons 'de symbolo'); Bergmann 71-86 (against).
- 33 Vir. 86.
- 34 Bergmann 38-39. On the general context of the De spiritu sancto: Simonetti 'Fausto di Riez'.
- 35 Caspari Alte und neue Quellen 257-281; Engelbrecht Studien 39-40; Bergmann 86-91; CCL 101B 829f (= EUS.GALL. Serm.extrav. 2).
- 36 PL 39, 2191-2193. Morin (ed.), S. Caesarii opera lxii, 931. Cf. Barbet and Lambot 337.
- 37 Morin 'Symbole de s. Césaire'; S. Caesarii opera 47-50 (= Sermo 9).

- 38 Burn 'Neue Texte' 179-182 who gives reasons for regarding this work as of Gallic provenance. The same text is edited with the aid of an additional MS by Künstle Bibliothek 173-175.
- 39 AMBR.(?), Symb. 2; RUF., Symb. 2,16. The Ambrosian authorship of the Explanatio symboli has recently been called into question again by Gamber 'Geht die sogenannte Explanatio'.
- 40 Kelly Early Christian creeds 53-54.
- 41 Incarn. VI 3 [328,5].
- 42 EUCH., Instr. II 15; EUS.GALL., Hom. IX 1,1. Cf. ps.-AUG., Serm. 242,1: 'Tenendo ergo, f.c., collationem fidei...'
- 43 Eichenseer 34-35 gives examples. The significance of this image is discussed by Carpenter '"Symbolum"' 8-11; Kelly Early Christian creeds 58-60.
- 44 CASS., Incarn. VI 3 [328,7]; FAUST., Spir.sc. I 1 [102,7] - cf. I 2 [104,16; 105,4]; EUS.GALL., Hom. IX 1,5; Serm.extrav. 2 ('Faustini') 1,5; ps.-AUG., Serm. 242,1.
- 45 NIC., Lib. V 13.
- 46 AUG., Symb. I 1,10. Cf. Serm. 212,2; 214,1.
- 47 Eichenseer 146f documents Augustine's use of the 'baptismal' creed at various stages in his career.
- 48 Kattenbusch 403-422. Cf. Eichenseer 104-105.
- 49 FAUST., Spir.sc. I 1 [102,9-13].
- 50 EUS.GALL., Hom. IX 1,16-27.
- 51 CASS., Incarn. VI 3 [328,11.17]; 4 [329,1]; FAUST., Spir.sc. I 1 [102,8].
- 52 EUS.GALL., Hom. IX 1,8; Serm.extrav. 2 ('Faustini') 2,1.
- 53 Ps.-AUG., Serm. 242,1; EUS.GALL., Hom. IX 1,37; CAES., Serm. 9 [47,15]; CASS., Incarn. VI 3 [328,11]; EUS.GALL., Hom. IX 1,35.
- 54 CASS., Incarn. VI 3 [328,19].
- 55 EUS.GALL., Serm. IX 1,14.30-34; ps.-AUG., Serm. 242,1; CAES., Serm. 1,12 [12,8] - cf. 6,3 [34,3]; 13,2 [63,33]...
- 56 Powell 'Arkandisziplin' 6. See also below 304.
- 57 EUS.GALL., Hom. IX 1,14.30.
- 58 Ibid. 1,39-42. Cf. NIC., Lib. II fg.4; V 14; AMBR., Virg. III 4,20 [PL 16,225D]; Symb. 1; AUG., Symb. I 1,1; Serm. 215,1.

- 59 Below 311.
- 60 NIC., Lib. V 14.
- 61 E.g. Symb. I 1,8 (citing Romans 10,10); Serm. 214,1 (citing Romans 10,9-10). The language of Romans 10,9 is reflected at Serm. 212,1: 'Hinc enim salvi eritis...' The creed is referred to as 'salutis regula' at Serm. 215,2. See also Eichenseer 108f for the equivalence 'symbolum = regula fidei'.
- 62 MAX.TAUR., Serm. 52,4; PETR.CHRYS., Serm. 58,2,24 – cf. 57,16,149.
- 63 EUS.GALL., Hom. X 1,1.
- 64 CAES., Serm. 9 [47,12-17].
- 65 FAUST., Spir.sc. I 1 [102,4]; EUS.GALL., Hom. IX 1,33; CAES., Serm. 9 [47,17].
- 66 See the references given by de Ghellinck I 122-125, and Kelly Early Christian creeds 111-112.
- 67 E.g. OV., Met. X 397; APUL., Apol. 40,4. The noun 'carmen' and verb 'carminare' appear regularly in this positive sense in the the De medicamentis of the late-fourth-century Gallic writer Marcellus.
- 68 Cf. QUODVULTDEUS, Serm. de symb. I 1,9: 'Purgata itaque familia redemptoris, posteaquam cantavit canticum salutis, accepit symboli remedium contra serpentis venenum.'
- 69 Note also CAES., Serm. 54,1: 'Illas vero non solum sacrilegas sed etiam ridiculas sternutationes considerare et observare nolite: sed quotiens vobis in quacumque parte fuerit necessitas properandi, signate vos in nomine Christi, et symbolum orationem dominicam fideliter dicentes, securi de dei adiutorio iter agite' – with the remarks of Kattenbusch II 470-471 on superstitious uses of the creed. The medicinal virtues of an induced sneeze are described by Marcellus, De medicamentis XVII 45 (see n.67 above).
- 70 RUF., Symb. 2,18.
- 71 AMBR.(?), Symb. 3.
- 72 Above 290.
- 73 Incarn. VI 4 [328,24].
- 74 Ibid. [328,25f].
- 75 Pace Bergmann 82-83. For previous discussion of the evidence for a distinctively Gallic view of post-apostolic influence on the 'baptismal' creed see Caspari Ungedruckte Quellen II 221, Alte und neue Quellen 263 n.32; Zahn 6f (followed by Wiegand 161).

- 76 Spir.sc. I 1 [102,18 - 103,4].
- 77 Ibid. 2 [104,17; 105,4].
- 78 EUS.GALL., Hom. IX 1,5.
- 79 Ibid. 1,28.
- 80 EUS.GALL., Serm.extrav. 2 ('Faustini') 1,5.
- 81 See e.g. the texts cited above 118 (n.446), 121 (n.459).
- 82 On this assembly of Gallic bishops and the circumstances in which Hilary composed the De synodis see now Brennecke 346f.
- 83 Text at HIL., Syn. 11 (= Hahn 161), discussed by Meslin 276-278; Kelly Early Christian creeds 285-287.
- 84 Brennecke 333. This interpretation depends upon the same author's re-dating of the Liber primus adversus Valentem et Ursacium to late 357 or early 358 (i.e. after the Third Council of Sirmium): see n.89 below.
- 85 HIL., Syn. 5.
- 86 Brennecke 347-349.
- 87 Hilary's ideas on creeds are studied by Kattenbusch 380-387; Eichenseer 28-29 (both mainly concerned with the 'baptismal' creed); Sieben Konzilsidee 202-204 (Nicene creed). For a more general survey of attitudes towards dogmatic formulation in the decades after Nicaea see Hanson 'Dogma and formula'.
- 88 The situation in general: Bardy 'L'Occident et les documents'. Early western transmission of the Nicene creed: Dossetti 133.
- 89 For the new dating see Brennecke 306-312, 325-325.
- 90 Coll.antiar. A IV 2 (Serdica), B II 10 (Nicaea). It is possible that the complete work also contained a version of the creed of Sirmium (351): CSEL 65, 191.
- 91 PL 10, 524 note e. For traces of this prohibition in later Gallic texts see above 293.
- 92 See especially Syn. 65: 'Exposui... communis fidei conscientiam'; 66: 'non verear de me iudicari secundum expositionem totius fidei'; 92: 'expositionem huius fidei'. Cf. 66: 'ostendi vobis, sicut voluistis, quae ante expositae fides essent ab orientalibus episcopis'. Besides 'fidem exponere' (e.g. 28,35,39,63,66,80,84), the expression most commonly used by Hilary of the dogmatic activity of eastern councils is 'fidem (con)scribere' (e.g. 9,10, 27,28,33,62,84,90). Note also 'fidem edere' (7), 'fidei definitio' (12,27).

- 93 Above 19f.
- 94 The importance of this biblical verse in patristic understanding of the 'baptismal' creed is emphasised by Eichenseer 53-60.
- 95 Above 17f.
- 96 Coll.antiar. B II 9-11. For a recent attempt to establish the historical context and implications of this work see Brennecke 325-334. Hilary's comments on the Nicene creed are skilfully analysed by Doignon Hilaire 495-499.
- 97 In general, the authors of Gallic 'expositiones symboli' do not make large claims for the utility of the 'baptismal' creed as a weapon against heresy - see above 291. This fact may be related to their interest in alternative or complementary credal statements, of which the Nicene creed provided the prototype.
- 98 On the circumstances of this work: Brennecke 352f.
- 99 Written c.358 in response to the 'blasphemy' of Sirmium (as Hilary called it), the Contra Arrianos contains numerous reminiscences of the Liber primus adversus Valentem et Ursacium. One may note in particular the author's eulogy of the fathers of Nicaea (VI 3): 'Quid egistis, beatae memoriae viri, qui, ex omnibus orbis partibus Nicaeam congregati et sacris voluminibus pertractatis, perfectam fidei catholicae regulam circuminspecto sermone fixistis', echoing Coll.antiar. B II 9 (cited above 308). Other reflections on creed-making appear at III 7 and XXIII 1. According to Sulp. Sev., Chron. II 44, Phoebadius was partly responsible for a set of anathemas presented to the Council of Rimini in 359, some of which may be preserved by Hier., Lucif. 18: see now CCL 64, 5-11 (and the Index scriptorum 424-425).
- 100 Sulp. Sev., Chron. II 35,4; 42,4; 43,1; 44,6-7.
- 101 O. Chadwick John Cassian 142-143 and other studies cited above 232 n.174.
- 102 For the events of Cassian's life see now Rousseau Ascetics 169ff; the evidence for his first and second (?) visits to Rome is discussed 172, 174. It is also possible that Leo met Cassian during a visit to S. Gaul in the 420s; for evidence of his connections with the province see below 322 n.126.
- 103 On the theological aspect of Cassian's response to 'Nestorianism': Grillmeier 468-471; Codina 119ff (who emphasises the continuity of thought between the De incarnatione and the writer's earlier monastic works).
- 104 Factors determining Cassian's presentation of Nestorius as a crypto-Pelagian: Plaignieux (the influence of Augustine and Prosper); O. Chadwick John Cassian 147 (the attitude of Rome); Codina 153f. See also following note.

- 105 Biography of Leporius: PCBE I 634-635. Date of his Libellus emendationis (May-July 418): Maier. His theology: de Beer. Influence of his ideas on Cassian's attitude to Nestorius: Morel; Grillmeier 464-467. Weijenborg's over-ingenious attempt to prove that 'Leporius' is a fictional character, created by the author of the De incarnatione, raises more problems than it purports to solve. See also CCL 64, 97-103.
- 106 In the form in which it has reached us the Libellus emendationis is subscribed by Aurelius of Carthage, Augustine of Hippo Regius, Florentius of Hippo Diarrhytus and Secundus 'episcopus ecclesiae Aquensis sive Megarmelitanae'. It is addressed to the Gallic bishops Proculus (probably of Marseille) and Cillenius. Cf. CASS., Incarn. I 6,1: 'Hanc ergo confessionem, id est catholicorum omnium fidem, et omnes Africani episcopi, unde scribebat, et omnes Gallicani, ad quos scribebat, comprobaverunt.' It is possible, of course, that Proculus and Cillenius circulated the text for subscription by their southern Gallic colleagues.
- 107 Details at CCL 64, 98-101. The most important texts are assembled by Glorieux ss.10-14.
- 108 Morin 'Solution'.
- 109 Note the reference to his fellow-monks in Lib.emend. 2,20: 'Clamaverunt... quidam fratres melius interiora cernentes.' It is by no means certain that Leporius was a member of Cassian's monastery.
- 110 AUG., Ep. 219.
- 111 Cf. PHOEB., C.Arr. XXVII 6: 'Hoc credimus, hoc tenemus...' and other parallel passages cited by Demeulenaere, CCL 64, 51.
- 112 The Libellus is extant only in MS Ripoll 106 (s.X), now at Barcelona, described by Demeulenaere (CCL 64, 102) as "un codex miscellaneus groupant les écrits les plus divers". Another MS, known to Sirmond, has since been lost. It is clear, in any case, that the Fides Leporii was not judged worthy of the treatment accorded to the roughly contemporary Fides Bachiarrii. Gennadius, who was particularly interested in texts of this type, bases his notice on Leporius (Vir. 60) on the information provided by Cassian.
- 113 Cf. HIL., Coll.antiar. B II 1: 'Fides... quae apud Nicheam ordinata est, plena atque perfecta est'.
- 114 Text cited above 84 n.298.
- 115 E.g. Grillmeier 466: "It is Augustine who speaks in this libellus". Cf. van Bavel 72 n.193 who considers "l'hypothèse selon laquelle saint Augustin aurait rédigé ce Libellus pour Leporius [comme] abandonnée aujourd'hui".
- 116 Details: Amann RSR 24, 28-44; Grillmeier 471-472; Pietri Roma christiana 1360-1365.

- 117 Vir. 55.
- 118 Grillmeier 472.
- 119 ACO 1,1,1,10; Festugière 116-133. The passage quoted occurs in the final paragraph of this letter.
- 120 Cyril's letter plus anathemas: ACO 1,1,1,6; Festugière 57-68. For the train of events leading from the Roman synod of 430 to the Council of Ephesus in the following year see Amann in RSR 24 (1950) 44-52, 235-251; Pietri Roma christiana 1365f.
- 121 ACO 1,1,2,49; Festugière 22.
- 122 Above 250 n.210. On the dogmatic enactments of the Council: Grillmeier 484-487.
- 123 Langgärtner 26-61; Pietri Roma christiana 967f.
- 124 Above 196.
- 125 VINC., Comm. XXXII 2 cites a letter of Sixtus to John of Antioch (=Ep. 6 'Si ecclesiastici'). GENN., Vir. 55 records that the same pope 'ad ipsum Nestorem [i.e. Nestorium] et ad orientis episcopos adversum errorem eius occidentalium sententias direxit.' Madoz Excerpta 41-42 would identify these 'sententiae' with Vincent's Augustinian excerpts, on the strength of a statement made by a ninth-century epitomator of Cassiodorus to the effect that V.'s work was originally addressed to Sixtus. How, though, is one to reconcile Gennadius' reference to 'sententiae occidentalium' with the exclusively Augustinian content of the Excerpta ?
- 126 Prosper records that he was in Gaul when elected pope in 440 (text cited below 346 n.168). According to a medieval legend, it was in the same year that he performed the dedication (to saints Peter and Paul) of a church attached to Cassian's monastery at Marseille: Benoît Villes episcopales 36; Ewig 'Kathedralpatrozinien' 284-285. On Leo's contacts with the southern Gallic episcopate during his papacy see below 350ff.
- 127 PROSP., Chron. 1306.
- 128 Ibid. 1297: 'Nestorius Constantinopolitanus episcopus novum ecclesiis molitur errorem inducere... cui... praecipue Cyrilli Alexandrini industria et papae Caelestini repugnat auctoritas.'
- 129 Comm. XXIX 7f. See above 250f.
- 130 Comm. III 3-4; XXVII 4; XXIX 5-6.
- 131 Grillmeier 485-486 stresses the secondary role assigned to this patristic collection (together with certain other texts) in the deliberations of the Council: "Cyril's third letter to Nestorius, like that of Pope Celestine, rated only as evidence and was included in the acts... This is still truer of the patristic

anthology... [For] the Fathers of 431 Nicaea provided the really **authoritative Christological formula**" (emphasis added). Likewise Sieben Konzilsidee 244: "Papstbrief and Väterflorilegium stellen in den Augen des Konzils die Bestätigung eines schon ergangenen Urteils dar. Deutlicher kann die Monopolstellung der fides Nicaena nicht zum Ausdruck kommen."

- 132 On Vincent's theory of doctrinal development: Madoz Concepto 117-130; Lods *passim*; Sieben Konzilsidee 160-164. His own manner as a dogmatic writer has yet to be studied in detail; see meanwhile the scattered remarks in Madoz Excerpta.
- 133 Above 241f.
- 134 For Vincent, as for Jerome and others (above 69 n.246), the Christian 'tractator' is essentially an interpreter of the Bible. Thus Comm. XXVIII 9: 'Doctores, qui tractatores nunc appellantur, quos hic idem apostolus etiam prophetas interdum vocat, eo quod per eos prophetarum mysteria populis aperiuntur.' As remarked by Bardy 'Tractare' 232 n.1, V. would seem to indicate that the usage was of recent establishment; one may conjecture that Augustine's frequent recourse to the 'tractatores divinarum scripturarum', notably in his anti-Pelagian works, had proved decisive for the history of this term. The verb 'tractare' also appears twice in the Commonitorium with reference to biblical exposition (XI 3,12; XXXI 6,31). On two other occasions it is used of the process of dogmatic definition (XVI 9,36; XXIII 17,79).
- 135 E.g. 'dilatare', 'enucleare' (cf. Comm. XIII 5,19: 'ut id ipsum distinctius et expressius enucleemus'), 'limare', 'poliare'.
- 136 Sieben Konzilsidee 162.
- 137 Within the realm of Latin Christian writing of this period the only obvious comparison is with Augustine's reflections on his own doctrinal 'profectus', briefly discussed above 200-202. Did V. develop his theory in response to Augustine's ? If so, this passage in the Commonitorium might be claimed as further evidence of 'Massilian' reaction to the problems posed by Augustine's literary oeuvre. It may be noted, in any case, that both theories of doctrinal development - the Vincentian as well as the Augustinian - depend on the idea of **progress through writing** ('scribendo proficere').
- 137a Kattenbusch 397-402 comments on Vincent's apparent lack of confidence in the 'baptismal' symbol as an instrument against heresy, though without remarking his veneration of the Nicene creed. See also following note.
- 138 Cf. XXIX 9: 'antiqui dogmatis religionem confirmare'; XXIX 10: 'divini dogmatis regulam constabilire'; XXX 6: 'de fide regulis pronuntiare'; XXXIII 2: 'credendum decernere'. According to Madoz Concepto 155-156, Vincent's 'regula fidei' was "una fórmula o conjunto de verdades de fe, fijo, concreto y conocido", to be identified with the 'baptismal' symbol. If so, why did it still

need to be 'fixed' ? For a comparable use of the verb 'figere' by a Gallic author see PHOEB., C.Arr. VI 3 regarding the drafting of the Nicene creed (text cited above n.99).

- 139 Grillmeier 484-487; Sieben Konzilsidee 243-244 - both of whom emphasise the centrality of the Nicene creed in the Council's enactments and the absence of any intention on the part of the assembled bishops to formulate a new creed. Similarly Person 200: "The council did not understand its task to be that of producing or creating a theological statement which would set forth the church's teaching on Christology."
- 140 ACO 1,3,46,42: 'decrevit sancta synodus aliam fidem nulli licere proferre vel conscribere vel componere praeter illam quae definita est a sanctis patribus qui Nicaeam per spiritum sanctum con-
venerunt' with Sieben Konzilsidee 238-239. (It is not certain that V. would have been aware of this decision.)
- 141 Above 259-260.
- 142 ACO 1,1,2,54; Festugière 229f.
- 143 Above 251-252.
- 144 CCL 64, 130 and n.28.
- 145 Vir. 65.
- 146 Prinz Frühes Mönchtum 47f emphasises the aristocratic attachments of the Lerinian foundation.
- 147 For a mention of 'books' in a putatively 'Lerinian' monastic rule see above 94 n.344.
- 148 Above 148.
- 149 Above 95 (n.350).
- 150 Biography of Faustus: Pricoco Isola 55-56. Literary oeuvre: Bergmann; CPL 961f; Frede 323-324. Theology: A. Koch; Tibiletti 'Libero arbitrio', 'Fausto di Riez'.
- 151 SID., Ep. IX 3,6. See also above 128.
- 152 Vir. 86.
- 153 CSEL 21 xv; Griffe La Gaule chrétienne III 372 prefers a slightly earlier date.
- 154 All Faustus' extant letters (with the exception of Ep. 4 [Engelbrecht] which is from his correspondent Paulinus) appear as part of an epistolary collection in a ninth-century MS of Sankt Gallen (no. 190). In addition, Epp. 4-7 [Engelbrecht] are found in MS Paris BN Lat. 2166 (s.IX), while Ep. 4 [Engelbrecht] appears alone

in MS Paris BN Lat. 12097 (s.VI-VII) - both canon-law MSS (see Maassen 608 and 568 for details).

- 155 CSEL 21, 200-207 - also printed as Ep. 17 among the letters of Faustus and others by Krusch in MGH AA VIII, 284-288. To my knowledge, the contents of this text have never been subjected to close analysis.
- 156 [201,5; 207,18].
- 157 Mention of Nestorius or of the Nestorian heresy: [201,27; 202,11; 204,17]. Cf. GENN., Vir. 86: 'Graecu[s]... qui a fide catholica discedens ad Nestorianam abiit impietatem'.
- 158 CSEL 21 xxi-xxii (following an observation of J. Stilting). Even if Engelbrecht's premise "si concilii Chalcedonensis anno 451 habiti statuta Faustum novisse statuimus" is not easily granted, it is reasonable to assume that the abbot of Lérins would have received notice of pope Leo's action against Eutyches immediately prior to the council (see below 346 ff).
- 159 Faustus' use of the combination of Isaiah 7,14 (Matthew 1,23) and Luke 1,35 may have been suggested by CASS., Incarn. II 2,6 - 3,2.
- 160 [202,11]: 'Maledictus, inquit, qui filium dei deum verum de Maria nonne nuper natum pro nostra salute non confitetur' (the text is uncertain - omit 'nonne' ?) Cf. ACO 1,1,1,6,12 and 1,1,2,49.
- 161 [203,11]: 'procede de thalamo tuo, geminae giga[n]s substantiae' = AMBR., Hymn. IV 13.15 [PL 16, 1411]. This formula had been used by Augustine, e.g. Arian. 8,6 [PL 42,689]; Maxim. 10,2 [PL 42, 765]; Serm. 372,3 [PL 39, 166] and - doubtless under his influence - by Leporius Lib.emend. 6,16. For its later history see L. Ott in Grillmeier-Bacht II 907f.
- 162 [201,25; 206,24; 207,9].
- 163 VINC., Comm. I 1: 'videtur mihi... quod res non minimae utilitatis domino adiuvante futura sit...'
- 164 For similar uses of the verb 'ordinare' in connection with dogmatic drafting see above 308 (Hilary, referring to the Nicene creed), 318-319 (Leporius, of the first draft of his own Fides) and below n.219.
- 165 Above n.154.
- 166 See e.g. texts cited above 117-118, 121-122, (129).
- 167 On the history of this image see Lewy. The expression 'sobria ebrietas' appears in a letter of one of Faustus' later correspondents, Ruricius of Limoges, to Sedatus of Nîmes (RURIC., Ep. II 34,11) - in close proximity to a Christological improvisation (see below 383).

- 168 PROSP., Chron. 1341.
- 169 For Leo's involvement in events leading up to the Council of Chalcedon see the narrative of Jalland 205ff. Arens 52ff provides detailed commentary on the pope's correspondence at this period. Chronology: Grillmeier-Bacht II 948f. Theology: Grillmeier 523f.
- 170 LEO, Epp. 28 and 33 (both dated June 13, 449).
- 171 Ep. 31,4 [794B]. Cf. Epp. 45,2 [833C]; 54 [856A]; 102,2 [986A]; Serm. 62,2,30. Leo's writings provide the first instance of the adjective 'apostolicus' applied to the 'baptismal' creed: Eichen-seer 40, citing Serm. 24,6,136. See also Kattenbusch II 423-424.
- 172 Ortiz de Urbina 399.
- 173 Ep. 32 [798A].
- 174 Recent discussion of this subject: Arens 105-110 (who concludes, 108: "Wir glauben Gründe zu haben, uns für eine weitreichende Mitarbeit Prosper's speziell am Tomus entscheiden zu können"); Markus 'Chronicle and theology' 35f (who points out the frailty of many of the arguments hitherto adduced in corroboration of Gennadius' report).
- 175 Most of these texts are preserved in the Collectio Novariensis published by Schwartz in ACO 2,2,1. On the original constitution of the Leonine dossier 'de re Eutychis' see *ibid.* v-viii and especially Silva-Tarouca 'Nuovi studi' 397ff.
- 176 LEO, Ep. 67 (= Ep.Arelat. 14) with Silva-Tarouca 'Nuovi studi' 393f.
- 177 HYD., Chron. 145.
- 178 Langgärtner 79f provides a useful account of these events. For the background: *ibid.* 61ff; Griffe La Gaule chretienne II 200ff; Mathisen 'Hilarius'. See also above 187f.
- 179 LEO, Ep. 42 (= Ep.Arelat. 10). For the pope's response to Ravennius' election: Epp. 40 and 41 (= Epp.Arelat. 9 and 11).
- 180 Ep.Arelat. 12.
- 181 LEO, Ep. 66 (= Ep.Arelat. 13).
- 182 Ep.Arelat. 12 [18,33].
- 183 Cf. Langgärtner 86f.
- 184 LEO, Ep. 67 [887A]: 'Quae autem committenda litteris non fuerunt, cum praedictorum filiorum nostrorum insinuatione didiceris... laudabiliter exsequeris' with note ad loc. Cf. Ep. 99,4.

- 185 So much may be deduced from LEO, Ep. 102,1 [985A]: 'Optassemus quidem fraternitatis vestrae litteras eo tempore quo promiseratis accipere, ut profecturis ad orientem fratribus nostris, quos ad sanctam synodum vice nostra... direximus [i.e. the Roman delegates to the Council of Chalcedon, who set off in the summer of 451], etiam vestrae sententiae professio iungeretur.'
- 186 Bardy 'Répercussion' 775.
- 187 CCL 148, 107-110 (reproducing the Ballerini text of LEO, Ep. 99).
- 188 Above 293. For the expression 'symbolum fidei' as a term for the 'baptismal' creed see Eichenseer 37 n.127 (citing Augustine and CASS., Incarn. VI 10,1).
- 189 The artistic aspect of the Tome may be best appreciated in the edition per cola et commata of Silva-Tarouca. For an almost poetic re-use of some of Leo's formulae by a Gallic writer see below 383.
- 190 Examples of such sermons are EUS.GALL., Hom. I, II, XXXIV, LXXVI; Serm.extrav. 9 (none of which, admittedly, betrays the influence of Leo's Tome).
- 191 Above 325; see also Exc. X 60: 'Quas [sc. sententias de libris Augustini collectas] non tam capitula quam gemmas potius et margaritas quasdam appellaverim.' On this imagery: Madoz Excerpta 20 (no obvious precedent for its application to dogmatic drafting).
- 192 Pace Madoz Concepto 179. This does not mean, of course, that Gallic theologians of Vincent's generation were not prepared to play on the sense of Rome's growing importance in the affairs of the western church: see above 196, 212 (re. Prosper and the 'Massilians'). V. himself pays special attention to the role of pope Stephen in the controversy over re-baptism and makes a point of citing the pronouncements of popes Celestine and Sixtus at the close of the Commonitorium.
- 193 Above 296f.
- 194 One might compare the attitude of Hilary of Poitiers towards eastern 'fides conscriptae': above 307-308.
- 195 Salonius and Veranus: above 98 n.365. Ceretius appears as a signatory to the acts of the Council of Orange (441) and Vaison (442), both summoned by Ravennius' predecessor, Hilary of Arles.
- 196 Rusticus and Venerius: above 84 n.300, 187-188. Valerianus: 98 n.363. Maximus was a product of Lérins. As successor to Hilary, Ravennius would almost certainly have been a monk; the ease with which he established his authority in the south-east suggests that he was a person of some social standing.
- 197 'Salutaris' as a qualifier for nouns denoting the 'baptismal' creed: above 294-295.

- 198 Cf. Silva-Tarouca 'Nuovi studi' 395, who describes this letter as "un documento di singolare valore... per la storia della diffusione [del Tomus] di S. Leone."
- 199 A subsequent letter to Leo from the bishop of Milan, Eusebius, records that a copy of the Tome had been made available to a synod of N. Italian bishops meeting in late 451, 'fratre et coepiscopo Ceretio mutuante': LEO, Ep. 97,2 [946B] with Silva-Tarouca 'Nuovi studi' 395-396.
- 200 CLAUD.MAM., Stat.an. I 1: 'Nuper etenim offendi in quosdam, qui chartulam quandam oppido studiose lectitabant, et quia mortalium generi mos est, novi operis agnitione pellecti ad id percipiendum sedulo animo intenderant.' The text referred to is extant as FAUST., Ep. 3. For the controversy surrounding this work see n.262 below.
- 201 See below 378ff (Gennadius and Ruricius).
- 202 Hanson 'Dogma and formula' 172-173.
- 203 The trend towards acknowledgment of the unique status of the Nicene creed in this period is documented by Sieben Konzilsidee 207ff. Note especially his remarks concerning the appearance of commentaries on the text itself, 213-214.
- 204 For evidence of modification of the Nicene text in the late fourth and early fifth centuries (mainly in the East) see Kelly Early Christian creeds 323f.
- 205 FAUSTINUS, Fides Theodosio imp. oblata (CCL 69, 357). On the relation between this work and the (later) Fides Luciferi: Simonetti 'Note su Faustino'.
- 206 On the dogmatic activity of this council: Ritter Konzil von Konstantinopel. Knowledge of the modified version of the Nicene creed ascribed to the fathers of Constantinople is first attested in the West in the mid-sixth century: Kelly Early Christian creeds 346.
- 207 Text: EOMIA 1,2,1, 281-296. On the transmission and circumstances of composition see also Dossetti 94-111; Pietri Roma christiana 873-880 (both of whom follow Schwartz in accepting a date of 377/8 for the drafting of the document).
- 208 Dogmatic texts in canon-law manuscripts: Maassen 394-397. Other MSS containing important collections of 'fides': Künstle Bibliothek 140f.
- 209 Brewer Athanasianische Glaubensbekenntnis 27-28 (following a suggestion of Kattenbusch).
- 210 Burn The Athanasian creed (1918) 33. Note, however, that the same scholar was later converted to Brewer's theory of the Ambrosian authorship of the 'Quicumque': id. 'Authorship'.

- 211 Stegmuller credits Hilary with composition of a short Trinitarian confession traditionally ascribed to St. Martin of Tours (CPL 1748a) and produced, in his view, c.360 as part of a campaign to repair the damage done by the Council of Rimini.
- 212 VICTRIC., Laud.sanct. IV 2-31. The parallels with Hilary's writings are noted by Demeulenaere ad loc.
- 213 PAUL., Ep. 37,5-6 - discussed by Burn Introduction 130.
- 214 See especially Chron. II 39,7 - 45,9; VMart 5,1 ('spectata et cognita fides').
- 215 GENN., Vir. 25. Possible identifications of Sabbatius are recorded by Czapla 65.
- 216 HIL.ARELAT., VHon. 38.
- 217 Cf. EUS.GALL., Hom. LXXII 7: '...sequamur illa prius quae docuit. Teneamus fidem rectam: Credamus patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum unum deum. Ubi enim est unitas, esse non potest inaequalitas; et cum filius, quia deus est, perfectus, consummatus et plenus sit, prorsus minor dici non potest plenitudo.' Burn The Athanasian creed and its early commentaries xcv-xcvi; Introduction 148-149; The Athanasian creed (1918) 38. See also n.210 above.
- 218 VHi1. 26,54.
- 219 See e.g. EUS.GALL., Serm.extrav. 9,7: '...apud nos ita est ordinanda credulitas: ut, in numero subsistente et diversitate cessante, in singulis trina proprietates et in tribus una esse intellegatur aequalitas; ut sciatur itaque in divinitate, sub observantia personali: unum non unus, simplex atque multiplex, nihil separatum nihilque permixtum, nihil solitarium nihilque diversum; quia nec trinitate unitas separatur, nec trinitas unitate distinguitur' - and the other texts cited above n.190.
- 220 Engelbrecht Studien 28-46. Pace Demeulenaere (CCL 64, 129) there is no reason to believe that Faustus himself adopted the name of Paschasius as a pseudonym.
- 221 For alternative theories see Huhn (with CPL 964); Rehling 33-35.
- 222 Below 378ff.
- 223 On Caelestius' position: Wermelinger Rom und Pelagius 18, 138-139.
- 224 AUG., Pecc.orig. 29,34.
- 225 On this form of credal statement: n.234. The professions of Pelagius and Caelestius appear at PL 48, 488-505 with commentary by J. Garnier; they are also discussed by Wermelinger Rom und Pelagius 137-141.
- 226 AUG., Enchir. I 4,35.

- 227 See the important study of this work by Harnack History of dogma V 222-240.
- 228 Above 218.
- 229 Above 328 n.138; Markus 'Heresy, orthodoxy and conciliation' [8] - [9].
- 230 FAUST., Ep. 1 [161,13]. I take the expression 'inserere... scriptorum monumentis' to refer to a proper facility (abused by heretics) for entering new writings into an existing series of documents, rather than to an illicit activity involving the interpolation of previously sound texts.
- 231 The Athanasian creed and its early commentaries lxxxix-xcvii.
- 232 Ibid. lxxv-lxxvii.
- 233 To the list of reviews of Künstle's work provided by Vollmann Studien 32-35, add Brewer Athanasianische Glaubensbekenntnis 1-25. H. Chadwick Priscillian 219 n.2 fairly describes his Antipriscilliana as "a maze of improbable conjecture".
- 234 Simbolo Toledano 76-97. The 'Triado-Christological' type of creed is described ibid. 80 and, more summarily, by Kelly Athanasian creed 55 as "an exposition of abstract Trinitarian teaching followed by a Christological statement with an appended paragraph about the resurrection and judgment." Following the work of de Aldama, the theory of a continuous Spanish tradition in the composition of creeds of this type, beginning with Gregory of Elvira, was popularised by J. Madoz in a series of studies of the dogmatic pronouncements of later councils of Toledo: for a typical expression of this view see his Segundo decenio 149.
- 235 De Aldama 'El símbolo "Clemens Trinitas"' 495f. Cf. DS 39-42.
- 236 Athanasian creed 59. R.J.H. Collins, art. 'Athanasianische Symbol', TRE 4 (1979) 328f invokes "das typische spanische Interesse [sic] an Glaubensdefinitionen" in arguing for a Spanish origin for the 'Quicumque'.
- 237 Antipriscilliana 67-83 - rejected with good reason by de Aldama Simbolo Toledano 150f.
- 238 Ibid. 44ff. Cf. Vollmann Studien 168f; H. Chadwick Priscillian 176-179 (citing Barbero de Aguilera 33-35).
- 239 H. Chadwick Priscillian 221. The remark occurs in the course of a valuable discussion of Künstle's thesis.
- 240 Simonetti 'Alcune osservazione' demonstrates the priority of the Fides Damasi with respect to the Libellus fidei. Given that the author of the Fides Damasi appears to have used a version of Book Ten of the pseudo-Athanasian De trinitate that had been interpolated with material from the Fides Leporii (Chavasse), he could

- not have been working much before 425. Vega 'De patrología española' dates the Fides Damasi after 450, though on questionable grounds.
- 241 H. Chadwick Priscillian 167-169. Text of Bachiarus' profession edited by Madoz; on the manuscript tradition see also Bouhot.
 - 242 Simonetti 'Note Rufiniane'.
 - 243 Vollmann loc.cit. (n.238). Text edited by de Aldama (who attributes it to a council of Toledo of 447) Símbolo toledano 29f.
 - 244 Pace Künstle Antipriscillian 46 who claimed that his notice implied recognition of a distinctively Spanish expertise in creed-drafting.
 - 245 The two texts are printed in parallel by de Aldama loc.cit. (n.243) who attributes the shorter one to the Council of Toledo of 400. See also n.238 above.
 - 246 Text: PLS I 1045. Cf. ps.-HIER., Vir. 136. The attribution was made by Morin 'Fides sancti Valeriani', followed by Madoz 'Valeriano'.
 - 247 Kelly Athanasian creed 123.
 - 248 CAES., Praef. libri sermonum (ed. Morin 21): 'Et quia necesse est, et satis oportet, ut fidem catholicam omnes non solum clerici sed etiam laici notam habeant, ideo in libellis istis secundum quod sancti patres ipsam fidem catholicam definierunt, in primis scripsimus; quam et ipsi frequenter legere, et aliis insinuare debemus' - discussed by Morin RBen 44 (1932) 207f; Kelly Athanasian creed 120-123.
 - 249 On the life and works of Gennadius: Pietri 'Gennadius'.
 - 250 Above 238.
 - 251 The theory advanced by Mundo 'Estudio' 284-292, according to which Gennadius himself was responsible for a revised version of the Fides Bachiaris, is rejected by Bouhot.
 - 252 '...Sub huius Syagrii nomine septem de fide et regulis fidei libros praetitulatos inveni, sed quia lingua variantur, non omnes eius esse credidi.' Morin 'Pastor et Syagrius' drew attention to the existence in a Reims MS (no.295, s.XI/XII) of a series of eight anti-heretical works; the first of these, he suggested, was to be identified with the work De fide considered by Gennadius as genuinely Syagrian, while the remaining seven might have been those whose authenticity he questioned. Künstle Bibliothek 62ff was less sceptical than Gennadius. The current state of scholarly opinion is reflected at CPL 560.

- 253 'Edidit etiam senex quos iuvenis coeperat de trinitate libros ... De incarnatione quoque domini idoneam edidit pietatem. De resurrectione etiam mortuorum simili cucurrit sinceritate, licet minus capacibus dubitationem de abortivis iecerit.' Neither the Retractationes nor the Indiculus lists any substantial work 'De incarnatione' or 'De resurrectione mortuorum'; discussions 'de abortivis' occur at Civ. XXII 13 and Enchir. 85. According to Czapla 86-87, Gennadius refers here merely to the substance of Augustine's teaching on the Incarnation and the Resurrection of the Dead: "Er hat... nur die Doktrin des hl. Augustin kennzeichnen wollen." Given the evidence for early fifth-century Augustinian compilation, it is just as likely that he possessed two sets of 'collecta'.
- 254 AUG., Ep. 40,6,9.
- 255 Vir. 36 (Vigilantius), 54 (Nestorius).
- 256 On the authorship of this notice: Feder 'Zusätze des gem. Schriftstellerkatalogs' 381-383.
- 257 Morin 'Liber dogmatum' 450-453; Bardy 'Indiculus' 388-389; CCL 46, 349-351.
- 258 Turner 'Liber ecclesiasticorum dogmatum'; Morin op.cit. (n.257) 446-450.
- 259 Munier Statuta; see especially 107f for discussion of the sources of this profession.
- 260 Brewer Kommodian 217-226; Munier Statuta 108 - contra Caspari Anecdota 301-304. Text: Hahn no.240.
- 261 Cf. Grillmeier 'Patristische Vorbilder' 398-400 who argues (without sufficient reason, in my view) for the influence of an Augustinian model.
- 262 Cf. Vir. 84 and 86, in which Gennadius clearly favours the position adopted by Faustus of Riez (against Claudianus Mamertus) and also represented in this chapter of the Liber dogmatum. On the history of the controversy: Fortin.
- 263 RURIC., Ep. II 34. On the career and works of Ruricius see now CCL 64, 305-309.
- 264 Compare lines 2-3, 9-13 of Ruricius' statement with this passage from section 4 of Leo's Tome: 'Novo ordine, quia invisibilis in suis visibilis factus est in nostris, incomprehensibilis voluit comprehendi; ante tempora manens esse coepit ex tempore; universitatis dominus servilem formam... suscepit; impassibilis deus non dedignatus est homo esse passibilis, et immortalis mortis legibus subiacere.' Other borrowings from Leo are noted by Demeulenaere, CCL 64, 361 and 384.

- 265 RURIC., Ep. II 19 (probably despatched with II 18). Cf. Ep. ad Ruric. 8.
- 266 A comparable instance of 'polite' creed-making is provided by vv. 25-32 of the Versus Agresti episcopi de fide ad Avitum episcopum:

Sed ne suspensum te longa exorsa morentur,
 Catholici recti cordis secreta fidelis
 Incipiam prompto sermone exponere. Tu vel
 Quisquis amans dominum quid credam consulis, audi:
 Est pater ingenitus, est Christus, filius eius,
 Spiritus est sanctus unum qui monstrat utrumque:
 Unica maiestas, virtus, substantia trini
 Nominis, unus honor atque indiscreta potestas.

Vega and Smolak agree in ascribing this work to the Spanish bishop Agrestius of Lugo mentioned at HYD., Chron. 102, on the grounds that it betrays a concern with Priscillianism. (Both scholars are visibly influenced by the pan-Priscillianist views of Künstle.) It is also possible that it is by a writer otherwise known as 'Agroecius', a correspondent of Sidonius Apollinaris whose extant De orthographia is dedicated to Eucherius of Lyon: CPL 1463a; Smolak 13-14; H. Chadwick Priscillian 221-222. (Note also CL.MAR. VICT., Alethia prec vv.4-7.)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I - Sources

- AGRESTIUS Versus de fide ad Avitum episcopum, ed. K. Smolak
 (Vienna, 1973)
- AMBROSIUS (?) Explanatio symboli ad initiandos, ed. R.H. Connolly
 (Cambridge, 1952)
- ARNOBIUS IUNIOR Conflictus cum Serapione, PL 53
- AUGUSTINUS De catechizandis rudibus, ed. I.B. Bauer, CCL 46
 (1969)
 De civitate dei, ed. B. Dombart and A. Kalb
 (Stuttgart, 1981)
 Confessiones, ed. M. Skutella (Stuttgart, 1981)
 De correptione et gratia, PL 44
 De doctrina christiana, ed. J. Martin, CCL 32 (1962)
 De dono perseverantiae, PL 45
 Enchiridion ad Laurentium, ed. E. Evans, CCL 46
 (1969)
 Epistulae, ed. A. Goldbacher, CSEL 34,44,57-58
 (1895-1923)
 De gratia et libero arbitrio, PL 44
 De haeresibus, ed. R. Vander Plaetse and C. Beuker,
 CCL 46 (1969)
 Contra Iulianum, PL 44
 De praedestinatione sanctorum, PL 44
 Retractationes, ed. A. Mutzenbecher, CCL 57 (1984)
 Sermones, PL 38-39
 De symbolo ad catechumenos ed. R. Vander Plaetse,
 CCL 46 (1969)
 De trinitate, ed. W.J. Mountain and F. Glorie,
 CCL 50-50A (1968)
- ps.-AUGUSTINUS Hypomnesticon contra Pelagianos sive Caelestianos
 haereticos, ed. J.E. Chisholm (Fribourg, 1967-80)
- AVITUS Opera, ed. R. Peiper, MGH AA VI 2 (1883)
- AUSONIUS Opuscula, ed. S. Prete (Leipzig, 1978)
- BACHIARIUS Libellus de fide, ed. J. Madoz, RET 1 (1940-41)
 457-488
- CAESARIUS Opera, ed. G. Morin (Maredsous, 1937-42)
- CASSIANUS Conlationes, ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 13 (1886)
 De incarnatione domini contra Nestorium,
 De institutis coenobiorum, ed. M. Petschenig,
 CSEL 17 (1888)
- CLAUDIANUS
MAMERTUS De statu animae, ed. A. Engelbrecht, CSEL 11 (1885)

Concilia Galliae, ed. C. Munier, CCL 148 (1963)

Epistulae Arelatenses, ed. W. Gundlach, MGH Epp III (1892)

EUCHERIUS De contemptu mundi, PL 50
 Formulae spiritalis intellegentiae,
 Instructiones,
 De laude heremi, ed. C. Wotke, CSEL 31 (1894)

EUGIPPIUS Epistola ad Probam,
 Excerpta ex operibus s. Augustini, ed. P. Knöll,
 CSEL 9 (1885)

EUSEBIUS Homiliae, ed. F. Glorie, CCL 101-101B (1970-71)
 'Gallicanus'

FAUSTUS Reiensis Epistulae,
 De gratia dei,
 De spiritu sancto, ed. A. Engelbrecht,
 CSEL 21 (1891)

GENNADIUS Liber ecclesiasticorum dogmatum, ed. C.H. Turner,
 JThS 7 (1906) 78-99, 8 (1907) 103-114
 De viris illustribus, ed. E. Richardson,
 TU 14 (1896)

HIERONYMUS Comm. in ep. Pauli ad Ephesios, PL 26
 Comm. in Malachiam,
 Comm. in Zachariam, ed. M. Adriaen, CCL 76A (1970)
 Contra Vigilantium, PL 23
 Epistulae, ed. I. Hilberg, CSEL 54-56 (1910-1930)
 De viris illustribus, ed. E. Richardson,
 TU 14 (1896)
 Vitae Pauli, Hilarionis, Malchi, PL 23

HILARIUS Comm. in evang. Matthaei, ed. J. Doignon, SC 254,
 Pictaviensis 258 (1978-79)
 Liber ad Constantium,
 Collectanea Antiariana Parisina,
 Hymni,
 Tractatus mysteriorum, ed. A. Feder, CSEL 65 (1916)
 Tractatus super psalmos, ed. A. Zingerle, CSEL
 De trinitate, ed. P. Smulders, CCL 62-62A (1979-80)

HILARIUS Sermo de vita s. Honorati, ed. M.D. Valentin,
 Arelatensis SC 235 (1977)

HYDATIUS Chronica, ed. Th. Mommsen, MGH AA XI (1894)

IULIANUS De vita contemplativa, PL 59
 POMERIUS

- LEO Magnus Epistulae, PL 54
Tomus ad Flavianum, ed. C. Silva-Tarouca
(Rome, 1932)
- LEPORIUS Libellus emendationis, ed. R. Demeulenaere,
CCL 64 (1985)
- NICETA Works, ed. A.E. Burn (Cambridge, 1905)
- Pachomiana Latina, ed. A. Boon (Louvain, 1932)
- PAULINUS Vita Ambrosii, ed. A.A.R. Bastiaensen (1975)
Mediolanensis
- PAULINUS Carmina,
Nolanus Epistulae, ed. W. von Hartel, CSEL 29-30 (1894)
- PHOEBADIUS Contra Arrianos, ed. R. Demeulenaere,
CCL 64 (1985)
- PONTIUS Vita Cypriani, ed. A.A.R. Bastiaensen (1975)
- POSSIDIUS Vita Augustini, ed. A.A.R. Bastiaensen (1975)
- Praedestinatus, PL 53
- PRISCILLIANUS Canones,
Tractatus XII, ed. G. Schepss, CSEL 18 (1889)
- PROSPER Carmen de ingratis,
Epigrammata ex sententiis Augustini,
Epigrammata in obrectatorem Augustini,
Ep. ad Rufinum,
Epitaphium Nestorianae et Pelagianae haereseos,
De gratia dei et libero arbitrio contra collatorem,
Praeteritorum sedis apostolicae episcoporum
auctoritates,
Pro Augustino resp. ad cap. obiect. Gallorum
calumniantium,
Pro Augustino resp. ad cap. obiect. Vincentianarum,
Pro Augustino resp. ad excerpta Genuensium,
De vocatione omnium gentium, PL 51
Expositio psalmorum, ed. P. Callens, CCL 68A (1972)
Sententiae ex operibus Augustini, ed. M. Gastaldo,
CCL 68A (1972)
Epitoma chronicon, ed. Th. Mommsen, MGH AA IX (1892)
- (ps.-)PROSPER Carmen de providentia dei, PL 51
- Regulae sanctorum patrum, ed. A. de Vogüé, SC 297-298 (1982)
- RUFINUS Expositio symboli, ed. M. Simonetti, CCL 20 (1961)
- RURICIUS Epistulae, ed. R. Demeulenaere, CCL 64 (1985)

- SALVIANUS De gubernatione dei, ed. F. Pauly, CSEL 8 (1883)
 Ad ecclesiam,
 Epistulae, ed. G. Lagarrigue, SC 176 (1971)
- SIDONIUS Carmina,
 APOLLINARIS Epistulae, ed. A. Loyen (Paris, 1960-70)
- Statuta ecclesiae antiqua, ed. C. Munier, CCL 148 (1963)
- SULPICIUS SEVERUS Chronica,
 Dialogi, ed. R. Halm, CSEL 1 (1866)
 Epistulae,
 Vita Martini, ed. J. Fontaine, SC 133 (1967)
- TERTULLIANUS De praescriptione haereticorum, ed. R.F. Refoulé,
 CCL 1 (1954)
- VALERIANUS Sermones, PL 52
- Cl. Marius
 VICTORIUS Alethia, ed. P.F. Hovingh, CCL 128 (1960)
- VICTRICIUS De laude sanctorum, ed. R. Demeulenaere,
 CCL 64 (1985)
- VINCENTIUS Commonitorium,
 Lirinensis Excerpta, ed. R. Demeulenaere, CCL 64 (1985)
- Vita Hilarii Arelatensis, ed. S. Cavallin (Lund, 1952)

II - Secondary works

An asterisk after the title [*] indicates a work that I wished to consult but was unable to obtain.

ABEL, M., 'Le Praedestinatus et le pélagianisme', RTAM 35 (1968) 5-25.

ALDAMA, A. de, 'El símbolo Clemens trinitas', Gregorianum 14 (1933) 485-500.

— 'Baquiaro y Rufino', Gregorianum 15 (1934) 589-598.

— El símbolo Toledano I. Su texto, su origen, su posición en la historia de los símbolos (Rome, 1934).

— 'Una nueva tentativa sobre el autor del Quicumque', EE 24 (1950) 237-9.

ALES, A. d', 'La fortune du Commonitorium', RechSR 26 (1936) 334-356.

— Priscillien et l'Espagne chrétienne à la fin du IV^e siècle (Paris, 1936).

ALFONSI, L., 'Cultura classica e cristianesimo. L'importazione del problema nel proemio della Divinae institutiones di Lattanzio e nell' Ep. XVI di Paolino di Nola', Le Parole e le Idee 8 (1966) 163-176. [*]

ALTANER, B., 'Die Benutzung von original griechischen Vätertexten durch Augustinus', ZRGG 1 (1948) 71-79 (=Kl. Schriften 154-163).

— 'Der Liber de fide ein werk des Pelagianers Rufinus des "Syrers"', ThQ 130 (1950) 431-449 (=Kl. Schriften 467-482).

— 'Augustinus und Origenes', HJ 70 (1951) 15-41 (=Kl. Schriften 224-252).

— 'Augustins Methode der Quellenbenutzung. Sein Studium der Väterliteratur', SE 4 (1952) 5-17 (=Kl. Schriften 164-173).

— Kleine patristische Schriften, herausgegeben von G. Glockman (TU 83, Berlin, 1967).

AMANN, E., Art. 'Nestorius' in DTC 11 (1931) 75-157.

— Art. 'Semi-Pélagiens' in DTC 14 (1941) 1796-1850.

— 'L'affaire Nestorius vue de Rome', RSR 23 (1949) 5-37, 207-244; 24 (1950) 28-52, 235-265.

- ANDEL, G.K. van, The Christian concept of history in the Chronicle of Sulpicius Severus (Amsterdam, 1976).
- 'Sulpicius Severus and Origenism' VChr 34 (1980) 278-287.
- ANTIN, P., '"Hilarius Gallicano cothurno attollitur" (Jérôme, Ep. 58, 10)', RBen 57 (1947) 82-88 (=Recueil 252-258).
- Essai sur saint Jérôme (Paris, 1951).
- '"Simple" et "simplicité" chez saint Jérôme', RBen 71 (1961) 371-381 (=Recueil 147-161).
- 'Saint Jérôme' in Théologie de la vie monastique 191-199 (=Recueil 137-145).
- 'Autour du songe de saint Jérôme', REL 41 (1963) 350-377 (=Recueil 71-100).
- '"Hilarius Latinae eloquentiae Rhodanus" (Jérôme, In Gal. prol. 2)', Orpheus 13 (1966) 3-25 (=Recueil 259-277).
- Recueil sur saint Jérôme (Brussels, 1968).
- ANGRISANI SANFILIPPO, M.L., 'Problemi vincenziani', Quaderni Catanesi di Studi Classici e Medievali 5 (1983) 341-359.
- ARENS, H., Die christologische Sprache Leos des Grossen. Analyse des Tomus an den Patriarchen Flavian (Freiburg, 1982).
- ARNOLD, C.F., Caesarius von Arelate und die gallische Kirche seiner Zeit (Leipzig, 1894).
- ARNS, E., La technique du livre d'après saint Jérôme (Paris, 1953).
- ASSCHE, M. van, '"Divinae vacare lectioni": de "ratio studiorum" van Sint Benedictus', SE 1 (1948) 13-34.
- ATSMA, H., 'Die christliche Inschriften Galliens als Quelle für Klöster und Klosterbewohner bis zum Ende des 6. Jahrhunderts', Francia 4 (1976) 1-57.
- BABUT, E.C., Le concile de Turin. Essai sur l'histoire des églises provençales au V^e siècle et sur les origines de la monarchie ecclésiastique romaine 417-450 (Paris, 1904).
- Priscillien et le priscillianisme (Paris, 1909).
- 'Paulin de Nole et Priscillien', Revue d'Hist. et de Litt. Religieuse n.s. 1 (1910) 97-130, 252-275.
- Saint Martin de Tours (Paris, 1912).
- BACHT, H.J., 'Vom Umgang mit der Bibel im ältesten Mönchtum', Theologie und Philosophie 41 (1966) 557-566.

- 'Pakhome et ses disciples' in Théologie de la vie monastique 39-71.
- Das Vermächtnis des Ursprungs (Wurzburg, 1972).
- BADOT, P., 'La notice de Gennade relative à Salvien', RBen 84 (1974) 352-366.
- 'L'utilisation de Salvien et de la Vita patrum Iurensium comme source historique', RBen 54 (1976) 391-405.
- BALOGH, J., '"Voces paginarum". Beiträge zur Geschichte des lauten Lesens und Schreibens', Philologus 82 (1926/7) 84-109, 202-240.
- BATIFFOL, P., Le catholicisme de saint Augustin (Paris, 1929).
- BARBET, J. and LAMBOT, C., 'Nouvelle tradition du symbole de rit gallican', RBen 75 (1965) 335-345.
- BARBERO DE AGUILERA, A., 'El Priscilianismo: Herejía o movimiento social ?', Cuadernos de Historia de Espana 37-38 (1963) 5-41.
- BARDY, G., 'L'Indiculus de haeresibus du ps.-Jérôme', RechSR 19 (1929) 385-405.
- 'La littérature des "quaestiones et responsiones" sur l'Ecriture Sainte', RevBiblique 41 (1932) 210-236, 341-369, 515-537; 42 (1933) 14-30, 211-229, 328-352.
- 'Edition et réédition d'ouvrages patristiques', RBen 47 (1935) 356-380.
- 'Faux et fraudes littéraires dans l'antiquité chrétienne', RHE 32 (1936) 5-23, 275-302.
- Art. 'Biographies spirituelles: antiquité chrétienne' in DSP 1 (1937) 1624-1634.
- 'Les répercussions des controverses théologiques des V^e et VI^e siècles dans les Eglises de Gaule', Revue d'Histoire de l'Eglise de la France 24 (1938) 23-46.
- 'L'Occident en face de la crise arienne', Irenikon 16 (1939) 385-424.
- 'Traducteurs et adaptateurs au IV^e siècle', RechSR 30 (1940) 257-306.
- 'L'Occident et les documents de la controverse arienne', RSR 20 (1940) 28-63.
- 'Tractare, tractatus', RechSR 33 (1946) 211-235.
- La question des langues dans l'Eglise ancienne (Paris, 1948).

- 'Copies et éditions au V^e siècle', RSR 23 (1949) 38-52.
 - 'Les origines des écoles monastiques en Orient' in Mélanges J. de Ghellinck (Gembloux, 1951) 293-309.
 - 'L'inspiration des Pères de l'Eglise', RechSR 40 (1952) 7-26.
 - 'La répercussion du controversaire christologique en Occident entre le concile de Chalcedoine et la mort de l'empereur Anastase (451-518)', in GRILLMEIER-BACHT II, 771-789.
 - 'Les origines des écoles monastiques en Occident', SE 5 (1953) 86-104.
- BARNES, T.D., Tertullian: a historical and literary study (Oxford, 1971; reissued with corrections 1985).
- 'Angel of light or mystic initiate. The problem of the Life Antony', JThS n.s. 37 (1986) 353-368.
- BAUER, F., 'Die Heilige Schrift bei den Mönchen des christlichen Altertums. Nach den Schriften des Johannes Cassianus', Theologie und Glaube 17 (1925) 512-532. [*]
- BAUER, J.B., 'Das Verständnis der Tradition in der Patristik', Kairos 20 (1978) 193-208.
- BAVEL, T. van, Recherches sur la christologie de saint Augustin (Fribourg, 1954).
- BECK, H.G.J., The pastoral care of souls in south-east France during the sixth century (Rome, 1950).
- BECKER, K.J., 'Dogma. Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte des lateinischen Wortes in der christlichen Literatur bis 1500', Gregorianum 57 (1976) 307-350, 658-701.
- BEER, F. de, 'Une tessère d'orthodoxie: le Libellus emendationis de Leporius (vers 418-421)', REAug 10 (1964) 145-185.
- BENOIT, F., 'Les fouilles de Marseille', C.-r. de l'Acad. des Inscr. (1947) 582-5.
- 'Le martyrium rupestre de l'abbaye Saint-Victor', C.-r. de l'Acad. des Inscr. (1966) 110-126.
 - et al., Villes épiscopales de Provence: Aix, Arles, Fréjus, Marseille et Riez de l'époque gallo-romaine au moyen-âge (Paris, 1954).

- BERGMANN, W., Studien zu einer kritischen Sichtung der südgallischen Predigtliteratur des fünften und sechsten Jahrhunderts I: Der handschriftlich bezeugte Nachlass des Faustus von Reji (Leipzig, 1898).
- BERNAYS, J., Über die Chronik des Sulpicius Severus. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der klassischen und biblischen Studien (Berlin, 1861). Reprinted with additional notes in Gesammelte Abhandlungen II (Berlin, 1885) 81-200.
- BERNOUILLI, C.A., Der Schriftstellerkatalog des Hieronymus. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur (Freiburg, 1895).
- BERNT, G., Das lateinische Epigramm im Übergang von der Spätantike zum frühen Mittelalter (Munich, 1968).
- BERSCHIN, W., Biographie und Epochenstil im lateinischen Mittelalter I: Von der Passio Perpetuae zu den Dialogi Gregors des Grossen (Stuttgart, 1986).
- BERTI, G., 'Il più antico lezionario della Chiesa', Ephemerides liturgicae 68 (1954) 147-154.
- BESSE, J.-M., Les moines de l'ancienne France (période gallo-romaine et mérovingienne) (Paris, 1906).
- BEUMER, J., 'Hilarius von Poitiers, ein Vertreter der christlichen Gnosis', ThQ 132 (1952) 170-192.
- BIARNE, J., 'La Bible dans la vie monastique' in BTT 2, 409-430.
- BINNS, J.W. (ed.), Latin literature of the fourth century (London, 1974).
- BLUM, R., 'Die Literaturverzeichnung im Altertum und Mittelalter. Versuch einer Geschichte der Biobibliographie von den Anfängen bis zum Beginn der Neuzeit', Archiv für Geschichte des Buchwesens 24 (1983) 1-256.
- BODIN, Y., Saint Jérôme et l'Eglise (Paris, 1966).
 — 'Saint Jérôme et les laics', REAug 15 (1969) 133-147.
- BOHLIN, T., Die Theologie des Pelagius und ihre Genesis (Uppsala, 1957).

- BONNEFOY, J.F., 'Le docteur chrétien selon saint Augustin', RET 13 (1953) 25-54.
- BONNER, G., Augustine and modern research on Pelagianism (Villanova, 1972).
 — God's decree and man's destiny. Studies on the thought of Augustine of Hippo (London, 1987).
- BOOTH, A.D., 'The date of Jerome's birth', Phoenix 33 (1979) 346-352.
 — 'The chronology of Jerome's early years', Phoenix 35 (1981) 237-259.
- BOUHOT, J.P., 'La tradition manuscrite du De fide de Bachiarus', REAug 25 (1979) 73-84.
 — 'Le texte du Sermo de vita sancti Honorati d'Hilaire d'Arles', REAug 28 (1982) 133-147.
- BORCHARDT, C.F.A., Hilary of Poitiers' role in the Arian struggle ('s-Gravenhage, 1966).
- BORD, J.B., 'L'autorité de saint Cyprien dans la controverse baptismale jugée d'après saint Augustin', RHE 18 (1922) 445-468.
- BOUSSET, W., Apophthegmata. Textüberlieferung der Apophthegmata Patrum. Zur Überlieferung der Vita Pachomii. Evagrius-Studien (Tübingen, 1923).
- BOWER, E.W., 'Some technical terms in Roman education', Hermes 89 (1961) 462-477.
- BRAUN, R., Deus christianorum. Recherches sur le vocabulaire doctrinal de Tertullien (Paris, 1977²).
- BRENNECKE, H.C., Hilarius von Poitiers und die Bischofsopposition gegen Konstantius II. Untersuchung zur dritten Phase des arianischen Streites (337-361) (Berlin, 1984).
- BREWER, H., Kommodian von Gaza (Paderborn, 1906).
 — Das sogenannte athanasianische Glaubensbekenntnis ein Werk des heiligen Ambrosius (Paderborn, 1909).
- BRINCKEN, A.-D. von den, Studien zur lateinischen Weltchronistik bis in das Zeitalter Ottos von Freising (Düsseldorf, 1957).

- BROWN, P.R.L., Augustine of Hippo. A biography (London, 1967).
 — Religion and society in the age of Saint Augustine (London, 1972).
- BROX, N., (ed.) Pseudepigraphie in der heidnischen und jüdisch-christlichen Antike (Darmstadt, 1977).
 — Falsche Verfasserangaben. Zur Erklärung der frühchristlichen Pseudepigraphie (Stuttgart, 1975).
 — 'Quis ille auctor? Pseudonymität bei Salvian', VChr 40 (1986) 55-65.
- BRUYNE, D. de, Sommaires, éditions et rubriques de la Bible latine (Namur, 1914).
 — Préfaces de la Bible latine (Namur, 1920).
 — 'Lettres fictives de saint Jérôme (Ep. 106, 117, 120, 121, 147)', ZNTW 28 (1929) 229-234.
 — 'Les anciennes collections et la chronologie des lettres de saint Augustin' RBen 43 (1931) 284-295.
 — 'La correspondance échangée entre Augustin et Jérôme', ZNTW 31 (1932) 233-248.
- BUCHEM, L.A. van, L'homélie pseudo-eusébienne de Pentecôte: l'origine de la confirmation en Gaule méridionale et l'interprétation de ce rite par Fauste de Riez (Nijmegen, 1967).
- BURN, A.E., The Athanasian Creed and its early commentaries (Texts and Studies IV.2, Cambridge, 1896).
 — 'Neue Texte zur Geschichte des apostolischen Symbols', ZKG 19 (1898), 179-190.
 — An introduction to the creeds and to the "Te deum" (London, 1899).
 — Niceta of Remesiana. His life and works (Cambridge, 1905).
 — The Athanasian Creed (London, 1918²).
 — 'The authorship of the Quicumque vult', JThS 27 (1925), p.19-28.
- CAMELOT, P.-T., 'Autorité de l'Ecriture, autorité de l'Eglise. A propos d'un texte de saint Augustin' in Mélanges M.D. Chenu (Paris, 1967) 127-133.
- CAMPENHAUSEN, H.F. von, 'Das Bekenntnis im Urchristentum', ZNW 63 (1972) 210-253.
 — 'Das Bekenntnis Eusebs von Caesarea', ZNW 67 (1976) 123-139.
 — Urchristliches und Altkirchliches (Tübingen, 1979).

- CAPELLE, B., 'Le progrès de la connaissance religieuse d'après saint Augustin', RTAM 2 (1930) 410-419.
- CAPPUA, F., 'Osservazioni sulla lettura e sulla preghiera ad alta voce presso gli antichi', RAAN 28 (1953) 59-99.
- CAPPUYNS, M., 'L'auteur du De vocatione omnium gentium', RBen 39 (1927) 198-226.
- 'L'origine des capitula pseudo-célestiniens contre le semi-pélagianisme', RBen 41 (1929) 156-170.
- 'Le premier représentant de l'augustinisme médiéval, Prosper d'Aquitaine', RTAM 1 (1929) 309-337.
- 'L'origine des capitula d'Orange 529', RTAM 6 (1934) 121-142.
- Art. 'Cassien' in DHGE 11 (1949) 1319-1348.
- CARPENTER, H.J., '"Symbolum" as a title for the creed', JThS 43 (1942) 1-11.
- 'Creeds and baptismal rites in the first four centuries', JThS 44 (1943) 1-11.
- CASAMASSA, A., 'Appunti per lo studio dei Tractatus super psalmos di S. Ilario' in Miscellanea A. Miller (Rome, 1951) 231-238.
- CASATI, G., 'S. Agostino e S. Paolino di Nola', Augustinianum 8 (1968) 40-57.
- CASPARI, C.P., Ungedruckte, unbeachtete und wenig beachtete Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel I-III (Christiania, 1866-1875).
- Alte und neue Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols und der Glaubensregel (Christiania, 1879).
- Kirchenhistorische anecdota I (Christiania, 1883).
- Briefe, Abhandlungen und Predigten (Christiania, 1890).
- CAVALLERA, F., 'Saint Jérôme et la vie parfaite', RAM 2 (1921) 101-127.
- 'Saint Jérôme et la Bible', BLE 22 (1921) 214-227, 265-284. [*]
- Saint Jérôme. Sa vie et son oeuvre I-II (Louvain, 1922).
- CAVALLIN, S., Literarhistorische und textkritische Studien zur Vita s. Caesarii Arelatensis (Lund, 1934).
- 'Die Lobrede des heiligen Hilarius auf das Leben des heiligen Honoratus. Eine textkritische Studie' in Floridus liber. Festschrift P. Lehmann (Berlin, 1950) 83-93.

- Vitae sanctorum Honorati et Hilarii episcoporum Arelatensium (Lund, 1952).
- CAVALLO, G., 'Libro e pubblico alla fine del mondo antico' in Libri, editori 83-132.
- (ed.) Libri, editori e pubblico nel mondo antico (Rome, 1977).
- 'Scrittura, alfabetismo e produzione libraria nel tardo antico' in La cultura in Italia fra tardo antico e alto medioevo. Atti del convegno tenuta a Roma, 1979 (Rome, 1981).
- CAZIER, P., 'Cassien auteur presume de l'epitome des Regles de Tyconius', REAug 22 (1976) 262-297.
- CERESIA-GASTALDO, 'La tecnica biografica del De viris illustribus di Girolamo', Renovatio 14 (1979) 221-236. [*]
- CHADWICK, H., The Sentences of Sextus. A contribution to the history of early Christian ethics (Cambridge, 1959).
- Art. 'Florilegium', in RAC 7 (1966) 1131-1160.
- Priscillian of Avila. The occult and the charismatic in the early church (Oxford, 1976).
- Art. 'Priscillien' in DSp 12.2 (1986) 2353-2369.
- CHADWICK, O., 'Euladius of Arles', JThS 46 (1945) 200-205.
- John Cassian (Cambridge, 1968²).
- CHASTAGNOL, A., 'Le diocèse civil d'Aquitaine au Bas-Empire', BSAF (1970) 272-290.
- 'Le repli sur Arles des services administratifs gaulois en l'an 407 de notre ère', RH 249 (1973) 34-40.
- CHAVASSE, A., 'Le dossier de Leporius (vers 418-421) et le livre X du De trinitate pseudo-athanasien', RBen 74 (1964) 316-318.
- CHENE, J., 'Que signifiaient "initium fidei" et "affectus credulitatis" pour les semipélagiens ?', RechSR 35 (1948) 566-588.
- 'Les origines de la controverse semi-pélagienne', L'Année Théologique Augustinienne 45-46 (1953) 56-109.
- 'Le semi-pélagianisme du Midi de la Gaule d'après les lettres de Prosper d'Aquitaine et d'Hilaire à saint Augustin', RechSR 43 (1955) 321-341.

CHISHOLM, J.E., The pseudo-Augustinian Hypomnesticon against the Pelagians and Celestians I-II (Fribourg, 1967-80).

Le Christianisme est-il une religion du livre ? Actes du colloque de Strasbourg 1981 (Strasbourg, 1984).

CHRISTOPHE, P., Cassien et Césaire, prédicateurs de la morale monastique (Gembloux, 1969).

CLERCQ, C. de, 'L'influence de la Règle de saint Pachôme en Occident' in Mélanges L. Halphen (Paris, 1951) 169-176.

CODINA, V., El aspecto cristológico en la espiritualidad de Juan Casiano (Rome, 1966).

COLOMBAS, J.M., 'El concepto de monje y vida monástica hasta finales del siglo V', StudMon 1 (1959) 257-342.

CONGAR, Y., La Tradition et les traditions I-II (Paris 1960-63).

— 'Le thème du don de la Loi dans l'art paléochrétien', NRT 84 (1962) 915-933.

— 'Bekennnisaussagen der mittelalterlichen Kirche' in P. MEINHOLD (ed.), Studien zur Bekenntnisbildung (Berlin, 1980) 48-66.

CONNOLLY, R.H. The "Explanatio symboli ad initiandos". A work of St. Ambrose (Cambridge, 1952).

CONSOLINO, F.E., Ascesi e mondanità nella Gallia tardoantica. Studi sulla figura del vescovo nei secoli IV-VI (Naples, 1979).

— 'Fra biografia e confessio: la forma letteraria del Sermo de vita s. Honorati di Ilario di Arles', Orpheus 2 (1981) 170-182.

COOPER-MARSDEN, A.C., The history of the islands of Lerins. The monastery, saints and theologians of S. Honorat (Cambridge, 1913).

CORTI, M., Studi sulla Latinità merovingia in testi agiografici minori (Messina, 1939).

COSTANZA, S., 'I Chronica di Sulpicio Severo e le Historiae di Trogo-Giustino' in La storiografia ecclesiastica nella tarda antichità, 275-312. [*]

COURCELLE, P., 'Paulin de Nole et saint Jérôme', REL 25 (1947) 250-280.

— Les lettres grecques en Occident, de Macrobe à Cassiodore (Paris, 1948²).

— 'Les exégèses chrétiennes de la quatrième Eglogue', REA 59 (1957) 294-319 (=Opuscula 156-181).

— Les "Confessions" de saint Augustin dans la tradition littéraire. Antécédents et postérité (Paris, 1963).

— Histoire littéraire des grandes invasions germaniques (Paris, 1964³).

— Recherches sur les "Confessions" de saint Augustin (Paris, 1968²).

— 'Nouveaux aspects de la culture lérinienne', REL 46 (1968) 379-409 (=Opuscula 249-279).

— 'Sidoine philosophe' in Festschrift K. Büchner (Wiesbaden, 1970) 46-59.

— Opuscula selecta (Paris, 1984).

COURTOIS, C., 'L'évolution du monachisme en Gaule de saint Martin à saint Colomban' in Settimane 4 (1956) 47-72.

CROUZEL, H., Origène et la "connaissance mystique" (Paris, 1961).

— 'Origène précurseur du monachisme' in Théologie de la vie monastique 15-38.

— 'Saint Jérôme et ses amis toulousains', BLE 73 (1972) 125-146.

— 'Les échanges littéraires entre Bordeaux et l'Orient au IV^e siècle: saint Jérôme et ses amis aquitains', Revue Française d'Histoire du Livre 3 (1973) 301-326.

CURTI, C., '"Spiritalis intelligentia". Nota sulla dottrina esegetica di Eucherio di Lione' in Kerygma und Logos. Festschrift C. Andresen (Göttingen, 1979) 108-122.

CZAPLA, B., Gennadius als Litterarhistoriker. Eine quellenhistorische Untersuchung der Schrift des Gennadius von Marseille "De viris illustribus" (Münster, 1898).

DELEHAYE, H., 'Saint Martin et Sulpice Severe', AB 38 (1920) 5-136.

DEMIANS D'ARCHIMBAUD, G., 'Les fouilles de Saint-Victor de Marseille', C.-r. de l'Acad. des Inscr. (1971) 87-117.

— 'Saint-Victor de Marseille, fouilles récentes et nouvelles interprétations architecturales', C.-r. de l'Acad. des Inscr. (1974) 313-345.

- DESMULLIEZ, J., 'Paulin de Nole. Etudes chronologiques (393-397)' RecAug 20 (1985) 35-64.
- DESPREZ, V., Règles monastiques d'Occident: IV^e-VI^e siècle. D'Augustin à Ferreol (Bellefontaine, 1980).
- DIAZ Y DIAZ, M.C., 'A proposito del Concilio de Zaragoza de 380 y su canon VI' in I Concilio Caesaraugustano 226-235.
- DIHLE, A., 'Antike Höflichkeit und christliche Demut', Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica 26 (1952) 169-190.
- DOBSCHUTZ, E. von, Das Decretum Gelasianum de libris recipiendis et non recipiendis (TU 38, Leipzig, 1912).
- DÖRRIES, H., 'Die Bibel im ältesten Monchtum', ThLZ 72 (1947) 215-222.
- DOIGNON, J., '"Nos bons hommes de foi": Cyprian, Lactance, Victorin, Optat, Hilaire (Augustin, De doctrina christiana II 40,61)', Latomus 22 (1963) 795-805.
- 'Une compilation de textes d'Hilaire de Poitiers présentée par le pape Celestin I^{er} à un concile romain en 430' in Oikoumene (Studi paleocristiani pubblicati in onore del concilio ecumenico Vaticano II) (Catania, 1964) 477-497.
- Hilaire de Poitiers avant l'exil. Recherches sur la naissance, l'enseignement et l'épreuve d'une foi episcopal en Gaule au milieu du IV^e siècle (Paris, 1971).
- 'Tradition classique et tradition chrétienne dans l'historiographie d'Hilaire de Poitiers au carrefour des IV^e-V^e siècles', Caesarodunum 15bis (1980) 215-226.
- 'Un "sermo temerarius" d'Hilaire de Poitiers sur la foi (De trinitate 6, 20-22)' in Fides sacramenti sacramentum fidei. Studies in honour of Pieter Smulders (Assen van Gorcum, 1981).
- '"Testimonia" d'Hilaire de Poitiers dans le Contra Iulianum d'Augustin', RBen 91 (1981) 7-19.
- 'Deux traditions sur la vie contemplative chez Hilaire de Poitiers', Helmantica 34 (1983) 163-169.
- 'Les premiers commentateurs latins de l'Ecriture et l'oeuvre exégétique d'Hilaire de Poitiers' in BTT 2, 509-522.
- Art. 'Hilarius von Poitiers' [forthcoming in RAC]. [*]
- 'L'évolution spirituelle de Paulin de Nole et sa conversion à l'ascétisme' [forthcoming in ANRW]. [*]

- DOLD, A., Das älteste Liturgiebuch der lateinischen Kirche. Eine altgallikanisches Lektionar des 5./6. Jahrhunderts aus dem Wolfenbütteler Palimpsest-codex Weissenburgensis 76 (Beuron, 1936).
- DORENKEMPER, M., The Trinitarian doctrine and sources of St. Caesarius of Arles (Fribourg, 1953).
- DOSSETTI, G.L., Il simbolo di Nicea e di Constantinopoli (Rome, 1967).
- DUCHROW, U., 'Zum Prolog von Augustins De doctrina christiana', VChr 17 (1963) 165-172.
- DUHR, J., 'Le De fide de Bachiarus', RHE 24 (1928) 5-40, 301-331.
 — 'A propos du De fide de Bachiarus', RHE 30 (1934) 85-95.
- DUVAL, Y.-M., 'La "manoeuvre frauduleuse" de Rimini. A la recherche du Liber adversus Ursacium et Valentem' in Hilaire et son temps 51-103.
 — 'Une traduction latine inédite du Symbole de Nicée et une condamnation d'Arius à Rimini. Nouveau fragment historique d'Hilaire ou pièces des actes du concile ?', RBen 82 (1972) 7-25.
 — Le livre de Jonas dans la littérature chrétienne grecque et latine: sources et influences du "Commentaire sur Jonas" de saint Jérôme (Paris, 1973).
 — 'La lecture de l'Octavius de Minucius Felix à la fin du IV^e siècle', REAug 19 (1973) 56-68.
 — 'Pélage est-il le censeur inconnu de l'Adversus Iovinianum à Rome en 393 ? ou Du portrait-robot de l'hérétique chez saint Jérôme', RHE 75 (1980) 525-557.
 — 'L'Ecriture au service de la catéchèse' in BTT 2, 261-288.
 — 'Le Liber Hieronymi ad Gaudentium: Rufin d'Aquilée, Gaudence de Brescia et Eusèbe de Crémone', RBen 97 (1987) 163-186.
- EADIE, J.W., The Breviarium of Festus. A critical edition with historical commentary (London, 1967).
- EICHENSEER, C., Das Symbolum Apostolicum beim heiligen Augustinus (St. Ottilien, 1960).
- EISWIRTH, R., Hieronymus' Stellung zur Literatur und Kunst (Wiesbaden, 1955).

- ELG, A.G., In Faustum Reiensem studia (Uppsala, 1937).
 --- In epistulam Fausti Reiensis tertiam adnotationes (Lund, 1945).
 --- Epistula Fausti Reiensis tertia (Uppsala, 1946).
- ENGELBRECHT, A., Studien über die Schriften des Bischofs von Reii Faustus. Ein Beitrag zur spätlateinischen Literaturgeschichte (Vienna, 1889).
 --- Patristische Analecten (Vienna, 1892).
 --- Das Titelwesen bei den spätlateinischen Epistolographen (Vienna, 1893).
- ERDT, W., Christentum und heidnisch-antike Bildung bei Paulin von Nola. Mit Kommentar und Übersetzung des 16. Briefes (Meisenheim-am-Glan, 1976).
- ETIENNE, R., Bordeaux antique (Bordeaux, 1962).
- EVANS, R.F., Pelagius: inquiries and reappraisals (New York, 1968).
 --- Four letters of Pelagius (New York, 1968).
- EYNDE, D. van den, Les normes de l'enseignement chrétien dans la littérature patristique des trois premiers siècles (Paris, 1933).
- EWIG, E., 'Die Kathedralpatrozinien im römischen und frankischen Gallien', HJ 39 (1960) 1-61 (=Spät. u. frank. Gallien II 260-317).
 --- Spätantikes und frankisches Gallien I-II (Munich, 1979).
- FABRE, P., 'Les citations dans la correspondance de Paulin de Nole' in Mélanges 1945 II: Etudes littéraires (Publications de la Faculté de Lettres de l'Univ. de Strasbourg 105, Paris, 1946).
 --- Essai sur la chronologie de l'oeuvre de saint Paulin de Nole (Paris, 1948).
 --- 'La suscription des lettres de Paulin de Nole', REL 26 (1948) 56-58.
 --- Saint Paulin de Nole et l'amitié chrétienne (Paris, 1949).
- FAHEY, M.A., Cyprian and the Bible: a study in third-century exegesis (Tubingen, 1971).
- FRANK, K.S., Grundzüge der Geschichte des christlichen Mönchtums (Darmstadt, 1975).

- FEDER, A., Studien zu Hilarius von Poitiers in Sitzungsberichte (Vienna) 162.4 (1909), 166.5 (1910), 169.5 (1912).
- Studien zum Schriftstellerkatalog des heiligen Hieronymus (Freiburg, 1927).
- 'Der Semipelagianismus im Schriftstellerkatalog des Gennadius', Scholastik 2 (1927) 481-504.
- 'Die Zusätze im Augustinuskapitel des gennadianischen Schriftstellerkatalogs', Scholastik 3 (1928) 238-243.
- 'Die Entstehung und Veröffentlichung des gennadianischen Schriftstellerkatalogs', Scholastik 8 (1933) 216-232.
- 'Zusätze des gennadianischen Schriftstellerkatalogs', Scholastik 8 (1933) 380-399.
- FESTUGIERE, A.J., Ephèse et Chalcedoine. Actes des conciles (Paris, 1982).
- FEVRIER, P.-A., Le développement urbain en Provence de l'époque romaine à la fin du XIV^e siècle (archéologie et histoire urbaine) (Paris, 1964).
- FIGURA, M., Das Kirchenverständnis des Hilarius von Poitiers (Freiburg, 1984).
- FISCHER, B., Die Psalmen als Stimme der Kirche. Gesammelte Studien zur christlichen Psalmenfrömmigkeit (Trier, 1982).
- FISCHER, J., Die Völkerwanderung im Urteil der zeitgenössischen kirchlichen Schriftsteller Galliens unter Einbeziehung des heiligen Augustins (Heidelberg, 1948).
- FLURY, P., 'Das sechste Gedicht des Paulinus von Nola', VChr 27 (1973) 129-145.
- FONTAINE, J., 'Hilaire et Martin' in Hilaire de Poitiers 59-86.
- 'L'apport d'Hilaire à une théorie chrétienne de l'esthétique du style (remarques sur In psalmos 13)' in Hilaire et son temps 287-305.
- La littérature latine chrétienne (Paris, 1970).
- 'Valeurs antiques et valeurs chrétiennes dans la spiritualité des grands propriétaires terriens à la fin du IV^e siècle occidental' in Epektasis. Mélanges J. Danielou (Paris, 1972) 571-595 (= Etudes 241-266).
- 'L'ascétisme chrétien dans la littérature gallo-romaine d'Hilaire à Cassien' in La Gallia Romana (Rome, Accademia dei Lincei, 1973) 87-115.

- 'Les symbolismes de la cithare dans la poésie de Paulin de Nole' in Romanitas et Christianitas. Studia J.H. Waszink oblata (Leiden, 1974) 123-143 (=Etudes 393-413).
- 'Société et culture chrétiennes sur l'aire circum-pyrénéenne au siècle de Théodose', BLE 75 (1974) 241-282 (=Etudes 241-266).
- 'L'affaire Priscillien ou l'ère des nouveaux Catilina. Observations sur le "sallustianisme" de Sulpice Sévère' in Classica et Iberica. Festschrift J.M.F. Marique (Worcester [Mass.], 1975) 355-392.
- 'L'aristocratie occidentale devant le monachisme aux IV^e et V^e siècles', RSLR 15 (1979) 28-53.
- Etudes sur la poésie latine tardive d'Ausone à Prudence (Paris, 1980).
- 'Le poète latin chrétien nouveau psalmiste' (=Etudes 131-145).
- Naissance de la poésie dans l'Occident chrétien: esquisse d'une histoire de la poésie latine chrétienne du III^e au VI^e siècle (Paris, 1981).
- 'Panorama espiritual del Occidente peninsular en los siglos IV^o y V^o: por una nueva problemática del priscilianismo' in I reunión gallega de estudios clásicos 183-209 (repr. in Culture et spiritualité).
- 'Christentum ist auch Antike. Einige Überlegungen zu Bildung und Literatur in der lateinischen Spätantike', JbAC 25 (1982) 5-21.
- Culture et spiritualité en Espagne du IV^e au VII^e siècle (London, 1986).

FORTIN, E.L., Christianisme et culture philosophique au V^e siècle. La querelle de l'âme humaine en Occident (Paris, 1959).

FOURNIER, P. and LE BRAS, G., Histoire des collections canoniques en Occident depuis les fausses décrétales jusqu'au décret de Gratien I: De la réforme carolingienne à la réforme grégorienne (Paris, 1931).

FRANSEN, G., Les collections canoniques (Typologie des sources du moyen âge occidental 10, Turnhout, 1973)

FRANSES, D., 'Prosper et Cassianus', Studia catholica 3 (1937) 145-183. [*]

FREDOUILLE, J.-C., 'Les lettrés chrétiens face à la Bible' in BTT 2, 25-42.

- FREND, W.C., 'Paulinus of Nola and the last century of the western empire', JRS 59 (1969) 1-11.
 — 'The two worlds of Paulinus of Nola' in BINNS 100-133.
- FUHRMANN, M., 'Die lateinische Literatur der Spätantike. Ein literarhistorischer Beitrag zum Kontinuitätsproblem', Antike und Abendland 13 (1967) 56-79.
- GAGE, J., 'Le livre sacré et l'épreuve du feu. A propos d'une mosaïque du mausolée de Galla Placidia à Ravenne' in Mullus. Festschrift T. Klauser (Münster, 1964) 130-142.
- GAIDIOZ, J., 'Saint Prosper d'Aquitaine et le Tome à Flavien', RSR 23 (1949) 270-301.
- GALDI, M., L'epitome nella letteratura latina (Naples, 1922).
- GALLO, G., 'Uno scritto filo-pelagiano attribuito a Ilario di Arles', Aevum 51 (1977) 333-348.
- GALTIER, P., 'Pénitents et convertis: de la pénitence latine à la pénitence celtique', RHE 33 (1937) 5-26, 277-305.
 — 'Saint Hilaire trait d'union entre l'Occident et l'Orient', Gregorianum 40 (1959) 609-623.
- GAMBER, K., 'Das Lektionar und Sakramentar des Musaeus von Massilia', RBen 69 (1959) 198-215 (=Sakramentarstudien 33-42).
 — Niceta von Remesiana: Instructio ad competentes. Frühchristliche Katechesen aus Dacien (Regensburg, 1964).
 — 'Geht die sogenannte Explanatio symboli tatsächlich auf Ambrosius zurück?', Byzantinische Forschungen 2 (1967) 184-203.
 — Sakramentarstudien und andere Arbeiten zur frühen Liturgiegeschichte (Regensburg, 1978).
- GANTOY, R., '"Prima sedes Roma Petri". Essai d'interprétation d'une formule de Prosper d'Aquitaine', RBen 68 (1958) 114-118.
- GASTALDI, N.J., Hilario de Poitiers, exegeta del Salterio. Un estudio de su exegesis en los comentarios sobre los Salmos (Paris, 1969).
- GEEST, J.E.L. van der, Le Christ et l'Ancien Testament chez Tertullien. Recherches terminologiques (Nijmegen, 1972).

- GELZER, H., Sextus Julius Africanus und die byzantinische Chronographie I-II (Leipzig, 1880-98).
- GENNARO, S., Dinamii Vita sancti Maximi episcopi Reiensis. Fausti Reiensis Sermo de sancto Maximo episcopo et abbate (Catania, 1966).
- GHELLINCK, J. de, Patristique et Moyen Age. Etudes d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale I-III (Brussels, 1946-).
- GHIZZONI, F., Sulpicio Severo (Parma, 1983).
- GLORIE, F., 'La culture lérinienne (Notes de lecture)', SE 19 (1969) 71-76.
- GLORIEUX, P., Prénestorianisme en Occident (Tournai, 1959).
- GOGLER, R., Zur Theologie des biblischen Wortes bei Origenes (Düsseldorf, 1963).
- GOFFINET, E., L'utilisation d'Origène dans le Commentaire des Psaumes de saint Hilaire de Poitiers (Louvain, 1965).
- GOLDSCHMIDT, R.C., Paulinus' churches at Nola: texts, translations and commentary (Amsterdam, 1940).
- GONZALEZ BLANCO, A., 'El canon 7 del Concilio de Zaragoza (380) y sus implicaciones sociales' in I Concilio Caesaraugustano 237-253.
- GOOSEN, A.B.J.M., Achtergronden van Priscillianus' christelijke Ascese (Nijmegen, 1976).
- GORCE, D., 'L'usage de la sainte Ecriture d'après l'Expositio in psalmum 118 de saint Ambroise', Vie spirituelle 8 (1923) 616-641.
 — La lectio divina des origines du cénobitisme à saint Benoît et Cassiodore I: Saint Jérôme et la lecture sacrée dans le milieu ascétique romain (Wepion-sur-Meuse, 1925).
- GREEN, W.M., 'A fourth century manuscript of saint Augustine ?' RBen 69 (1959) 191-197.
- GREEN, R.P.H., The poetry of Paulinus of Nola; a study of his Latinity (Brussels, 1971).

- 'Paulinus of Nola and the diction of Christian Latin poetry', Latomus 32 (1973) 79-85.
- GREGOIRE, R., Homiliaires liturgiques médiévaux. Analyse de manuscrits (Spoleto, 1980).
- Art. 'Sermo' in DPAC 3157-3163.
- GRIBOMONT, J., 'Les plus anciennes traductions latines' in BTT 2, 43-66.
- 'Les "Orthographica" de la Bible latine: éditions, manuscrits, fragments, instruments de travail' in Grafia e interpunzione del Latino nel medioevo (Seminario Internazionale, Roma, 1984) (Rome, 1987) 1-14.
- GRIFFE, E., 'Aux origines de la liturgie gallicane', BLE 52 (1951) 17-43.
- 'Cassien a-t-il été prêtre d'Antioche?', BLE 55 (1954) 240-244.
- 'L'apocryphe hiéronymien De septem ordinibus ecclesiae', BLE 57 (1956) 215-224.
- 'Les sermons de Fauste de Riez', BLE 61 (1960) 27-38.
- 'Pro Vincentio Lerinensi', BLE 62 (1961), 26-32.
- La Gaule chrétienne à l'époque romaine I-III (Paris, 1964-66).
- 'Nouveau plaidoyer pour Fauste de Riez', BLE 73 (1972) 187-192.
- GRILLMEIER, A. and BACHT, H. (edd.), Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart, I-III (Würzburg, 1953).
- GRILLMEIER, A., 'Von Symbolum zur Summa' in Kirche und Überlieferung. Festschrift J.R. Geiselman (Freiburg, 1960) 119-169.
- 'Patristische Vorbilder fröhscholastischer Systematik. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Augustinismus', StudPatr 6 (TU 81, 1962) 390-408.
- Christ in Christian Tradition. I: From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451) (trans. J. Bowden, London, 1975²).
- GRUNDMANN, H., 'Litteratus-illiteratus. Der Wandel einer Bildungsnorm vom Altertum zum Mittelalter', AKG 40 (1958) 1-65.
- GRUTZMACHER, G., Hieronymus. Eine biographische Studie zur alten Kirchengeschichte I-III (Leipzig, 1901-1908).
- GUALANDRI, I., Furtiva lectio. Studi su Sidonio Apollinare (Milan, 1979).

GUILLAUMONT, A., Les "Kephalalaia Gnostica" d'Evagre le Pontique et l'histoire de l'origénisme chez les grecs et chez les syriens (Paris, 1962).

GUILLAUMONT, A. and C. (eds.), Evagre le Pontique: Traité pratique ou le moine (SC 170-171, Paris, 1971).

GUY, J.C., Jean Cassien. Vie et doctrine spirituelle (Paris, 1961).

— 'Jean Cassien, historien du monachisme égyptien ?', StudPatr 8 (TU 93, 1963) 363-372.

HARLEMAN, E., 'La littérature gallo-romaine vers la fin de l'Empire d'Occident', Eranos 76 (1978) 157-169.

HAARHOFF, T.J., Schools of Gaul. A study of pagan and christian education in the last century of the western empire (Johannesburg, 1958²).

HAGENDAHL, H., 'Methods of citation in post-classical Latin prose', Eranos 45 (1947) 114-128.

— La correspondance de Ruricius (Göteborg, 1952).

— Latin fathers and the classics (Göteborg, 1958).

— 'Die Bedeutung der Stenographie für die spätlateinische christliche Literatur', JbAC 14 (1971) 24-38.

— Von Tertullian zu Cassiodor. Die profane literarische Tradition in dem lateinischen christlichen Schrifttum (Göteborg, 1983).

Hagiographie, culture et sociétés (IV^e-XII^e siècles). Actes du colloque organisé à Nanterre et à Paris, 1979 (Paris, 1981).

HANSON, R.P.C., Tradition in the early church (London, 1962).

— 'Dogma and formula in the Fathers', StudPatr 13,2 (TU 116, 1975) 169-184 (= Studies 298-318).

— 'The church in fifth-century Gaul: evidence from Sidonius Apollinaris', JEH 21 (1970) 1-10 (= Studies 332-346).

— Studies in Christian antiquity (Edinburgh, 1985).

HARL, M., (ed.) La chaîne palestinienne sur le Psaume 118 I-II (SC 189-190, Paris, 1972).

— 'La "bouche" et le "coeur" de l'apôtre: deux images bibliques du "sens divin" de l'homme (Proverbes 2,5) chez Origène' in Forma futuri: studi in onore del Cardinale M. Pellegrino (Turin, 1975) 17-42.

- HARNACK, A., History of dogma (trans. N. Buchanan et al., London 1894-1899).
- 'Die Retraktionen Augustins', Sitzungsberichte (Berlin) 2 (1905) 1096-1131.
- Über den privaten Gebrauch der Heiligen Schriften in der alten Kirche (Leipzig, 1912).
- HARPER, J., 'John Cassian and Sulpicius Severus', Church History 34 (1965) 187-202.
- HARRIES, J.D., 'Church and state in the Notitia Galliarum', JRS 68 (1978) 26-43.
- Bishops, senators and their cities in southern and central Gaul, A.D. 407-476 (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1981).
- HARTBERGER, M., 'Priscilians Verhältnis zur hl. Schrift', Biblische Zeitschrift 8 (1910) 113-129.
- HAVELOCK, E.A., The literate revolution in Greece and its cultural consequences (Princeton, 1982).
- HEINZELMANN, M., 'Neue Aspekte der biographischen und hagiographischen Literatur in der lateinischen Welt (1.-6. Jahrhundert)', Francia 1 (1973) 27-44.
- Bischofsherrschaft in Gallien. Zur Kontinuität römischer Führungsschichten vom 4. bis zum 7. Jahrhundert. Soziale, prosopographische und bildungsgeschichtliche Aspekte (Munich, 1976).
- 'Gallische Prosopographie, 260-527', Francia 10 (1982) 531-
- HENRIKSSON, K.E., Griechische Büchertitel in der Römischen Literatur (Helsinki, 1956).
- HENSS, W., 'Die Integrität der Bibelübersetzung im religiösen Denken des 5. Jahrhunderts (Zum geistigen Umfeld von Salvian Gub. V 2, 5ff.) in W. LOURDAUX and D. VERHELST (edd.), The Bible and Medieval Culture (Louvain, 1979) 35-57.
- HERZOG, R., Die Biblepik der lateinischen Spätantike. Formgeschichte einer erbaulichen Gattung I (Munich, 1975).
- HEUMER, J., 'Studien zu den ältesten christlichen lateinischen Litterarhistorikern', WS 16 (1894) 121-158.

Hilaire de Poitiers, évêque et docteur (368-1968). Cinq conférences données à Poitiers à l'occasion du XVI^e centenaire de sa mort (Paris, 1968).

Hilaire et son temps. Actes du colloque de Poitiers 1968 (Paris, 1969).

HILL, E., 'De doctrina christiana: a suggestion', StudPatr 6 (TU 81, Berlin, 1962).

HOFMANN, F., Der Kirchenbegriff des hl. Augustinus (Munich, 1933).

HONSELMANN, C., 'Bruchstücke von Auszügen aus Werken Cassians. Reste einer verlorenen Schrift des Eucherius von Lyon', Theologie und Glaube 51 (1961) 300-304. [*].

HUEGELMEYER, C.T., Prosper of Aquitaine: Carmen de ingratis (Washington, 1962).

HUHN, J., 'De ratione fidei als ein Werk des Faustus von Reji', ThQ 130 (1950) 176-183.

HUNT, E.D., Holy Land pilgrimage in the later Roman empire (Oxford, 1982).

HUS, A., 'Docere' et les mots de la famille de "docere" (Paris, 1965).

— 'Doctus et les adjectifs de sens voisin en latin classique', RPh 46 (1972) 238-245.

— 'Doctor, doctrina et les mots de sens voisin en latin classique', RPh 44 (1974) 35-45.

HYLTEN, P., Studien zu Sulpicius Severus (Lund, 1940).

JACQUIN, M., 'La question de la prédestination aux V^e et VI^e siècles', RHE 5 (1904) 265-283, 725-754; 7 (1906) 269-300.

— 'A quelle date parut le terme "semi-pélagien" ?', Rev. des Sci. Philos. et Théol. 1 (1907) 506-8. [*]

JALLAND, T., The life and times of Saint Leo the Great (London, 1941).

JANSON, T., Latin prose prefaces: studies in literary conventions (Stockholm, 1964).

JANNSEN, H., Kultur und Sprache. Zur Geschichte der alten Kirche im Spiegel der Sprachentwicklung von Tertullian bis Cyprian (Nijmegen, 1938).

- JAY, P., 'Saint Jérôme et le triple sens de l'Ecriture', REAug 26 (1980) 214-227.
- 'La datation des premières traductions de l'Ancien Testament sur l'hébreu par saint Jérôme', REAug 28 (1982) 208-212.
- L'exégèse de saint Jérôme d'après son Commentaire sur Isaïe (Paris, 1985).
- 'Jérôme et la pratique de l'exégèse' in BTT 2, 523-542.
- JUNOD-AMMERBAUER, H., 'Le poète chrétien selon Paulin de Nole. L'adaptation des thèmes classiques dans les Natalicia', REAug 21 (1975) 13-54.
- 'Les constructions de Nole et l'esthétique de saint Paulin', REAug 24 (1978) 22-57.
- KACZYNSKI, R., Das Wort Gottes in Liturgie und Alltag der Gemeinden des Johannes Chrysostomus (Freiburg, 1974).
- KAESTLI, J.-D., 'Le récit de IV Esdras 14 et sa valeur pour l'histoire du canon de l'Ancien Testament' in KAESTLI-WERMELINGER 71-97.
- KAESTLI, J.-D. and WERMELINGER, O., Le canon de l'Ancien Testament: sa formation et son histoire (Geneva, 1984).
- KALINKA, E., 'Die älteste erhaltene Abschrift des Verzeichnisses der Werke Augustins', Sitzungsberichte (Vienna) 203.1
- KANNENGIESSER, C., 'L'exégèse d'Hilaire' in Hilaire et son temps 127-142.
- 'L'héritage d'Hilaire', RechSR 56 (1968) 435-456.
- Art. 'Hilaire de Poitiers (saint)' in DSp 7.1 (1969) 466-499.
- KARTSCHOKE, D., Bibeldichtung. Studien zur Geschichte der epischen Bibelparaphrase von Juvenius bis Otfried von Weissenburg (Munich, 1975).
- KATTENBUSCH, F., Das apostolische Symbol. Seine Entstehung, sein geschichtlicher Sinn, seine ursprüngliche Stellung im Kultus und in der Theologie der Kirche. Ein Beitrag zur Symbolik und Dogmengeschichte. I-II (Leipzig, 1894, 1900).
- KOCH, H., 'Vincentius von Lerinum und Marius Mercator', ThQ 81 (1899) 396-434.

- 'Vincenz von Lerin und Gennadius. Ein Beitrag zur Literaturgeschichte des Semipelagianismus', TU 31.2 (1907) 37-58.
- KLOPSCH, P., Einführung in die Dichtungslehren des lateinischen Mittelalter (Darmstadt, 1980).
- KONIG, D., Amt und Askese. Priesteramt und Mönchtum bei den lateinischen Kirchenvätern in vorbenediktinischer Zeit (St. Ottilien, 1985).
- KOHLWES, K., Christliche Dichtung und stilistische Form bei Paulinus von Nola (Bonn, 1979).
- KOLON, B., Die Vita s. Hilarii Arelatensis. Eine eidographische Studie (Paderborn, 1925).
- KRETSCHMAR, G., 'Die Geschichte des Taufgottesdienstes in der alten Kirche' in K.F. MÜLLER and W. BLANKENBURG (edd.), Leiturgia. Handbuch des Evangelischen Gottesdienstes V: Der Taufgottesdienst (Kassel, 1970) 1-348.
- KUNSTLE, K., Eine Bibliothek der Symbole und theologische Tractate zur Bekämpfung des Priscillianismus und westgothischen Arianismus aus dem VI. Jahrhundert. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der theologischen Litteratur in Spanien (Mainz, 1900).
- Antipriscilliana. Dogmengeschichtliche Untersuchungen und Texte aus dem Streite gegen Priscillians Irrlehre (Freiburg, 1905).
- LA BONNARDIERE, A.-M., 'Jérôme "informateur" d'Augustin au sujet d'Origène', REAug 20 (1974) 42-54.
- 'L'initiation biblique d'Augustin' in BT 3, 27-47.
- LAMB, J.A., 'The place of the Bible in the liturgy' in CHB 1.
- LADARIA, L.F., El Espiritu santo en san Hilario de Poitiers (Madrid, 1977).
- LADEUZE, P., Etude sur le cénobitisme pachomien pendant le IV^e et la première moitié du V^e. (Louvain, 1898).
- LAMBERT, B., Bibliotheca Hieronymiana manuscripta I-VII (Steenbrugge, 1968-72).

- LAPIDGE, M., 'Gildas's education and the Latin culture of sub-Roman Britain' in LAPIDGE-DUMVILLE 27-50.
- LAPIDGE, M. and DUMVILLE, D. (edd.), Gildas. New approaches (Woodbridge, 1984).
- LANE FOX, R., Pagans and Christians in the Mediterranean world from the second century A.D. to the conversion of Constantine (London, 1986).
- LANGGÄRTNER, G., Die Gallienpolitik der Papste im 5. und 6. Jahrhundert. Eine Studie über den apostolischen Vikariat von Arles (Bonn, 1964).
- LASSANDRO, D., 'Note sugli Epigrammi di Prospero d'Aquitania', Vetera christianorum 8.2 (1971) 211-222.
- LAUGIER, E., Saint Jean Cassien et sa doctrine de la grâce (Lyon, 1908).
- LAWLESS, G., Augustine of Hippo and his monastic rule (Oxford, 1987).
- LEANZA, S., 'Aspetti esegetici dell'opera di Paolino di Nola' in Atti del convegno XXXI. cinquantenario della morte di S. Paolino di Nola, 67-91. [*]
- LECLERCQ, H., Art. 'Bibliothèque' in DACL 2 (1908) 842-904.
- LECLERCQ, J., Otia monastica. Etudes sur le vocabulaire de la contemplation au moyen age (Rome, 1963).
- Aux sources de la spiritualité occidentale. Etapes et constantes (Paris, 1964).
- LEIPOLDT, J. and MORENZ, S., Heilige Schriften. Betrachtungen zur Religionsgeschichte der antiken Mittelmeerwelt (Leipzig, 1953).
- LEO, F., Die Griechische-römische Biographie nach ihrer litterarischen Form (Leipzig, 1901).
- LEONARDI, C., 'Alle origini della cristianita medievale. Giovanni Cassiano e Salviano di Marsiglia', Studi Medievali 18 (1977) 1057-1174.

- LEROY, J., 'Les préfaces des écrits monastiques de Jean Cassien', RAM 42 (1966) 157-180.
- 'Le cénobitisme chez Cassien', RAM 43 (1967) 121-158.
- LETTER, P. de, St. Prosper of Aquitaine: Defense of St. Augustine (Westminster [Maryland], 1963).
- LEWY, H., Sobria ebrietas. Untersuchungen zur antiken Mystik (Giessen, 1929).
- LIETZMANN, H., 'Carmen = Taufsymbol', RhM 71 (1916), 281-282.
- 'Zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Briefsammlung Augustins', Sitzungsberichte (Berlin) (1930) 356-388 (=Kl. Schriften I 260-304).
- Kleine Schriften I-III (TU 67-8, 74, Berlin, 1958-68).
- LIENHARD, J.T., 'Paulinus of Nola in the literary tradition' in Paradosis. Studies in memory of E.A. Quain (New York, 1976) 35-45.
- Paulinus of Nola and early western monasticism (Cologne, 1977).
- Art. 'Paulin de Nole' in DSp 12.1 (1984) 592-602.
- LINAJE, A., 'Prisciliano y los origines monásticos hispanos' in Prisciliano y el priscilianismo 88-99.
- LINTON, O., 'Interpretation of the Psalms in the early church', StudPatr 4 (TU 79, Berlin, 1961).
- LODS, M., 'Le progrès dans le temps de l'Eglise selon Vincent de Lérins', RHPH 55 (1975), 365-385.
- LONGOSZ, S., 'La tradizione nella controversia ariana (a.318-362). Testimonianze non Atanasiane', Augustinianum 19 (1979) 443-468.
- LONGERE, J., La prédication médiévale (Paris, 1983).
- LONGPRE, P.A., 'Le De providentia divina de Prosper d'Aquitaine et la question de son authenticité', REA 80 (1978) 108-113.
- 'Le De ingratias de Prosper d'Aquitaine', Cahiers des études anciennes (Montreal) 7 (1977) 73-81. [*]
- LOOFS, F., Nestoriana. Die fragmente des Nestorius gesammelt, untersucht und herausgegeben (Halle, 1905).

- LOPEZ CANEDA, R., Prisciliano, su pensamiento y su problema historico (Santiago de Compostela, 1966).
- LOPEZ FERREIRA, A., Estudios historico-criticos sobre el priscilianismo (Santiago de Compostela, 1978). [*]
- LORENZ, R., 'Die Wissenschaftslehre Augustins', ZKG 67 (1955-6) 29-60, 213-251.
 — 'Der Augustinismus Prospers von Aquitanien', ZKG 73 (1962) 217-252.
 — 'Die Anfänge des abendländischen Mönchtums im 4. Jahrhundert', ZKG 77 (1966) 1-61.
- LOYEN, A., 'Les débuts du royaume wisigoth de Toulouse', REL 12 (1934) 406-415.
 — Recherches historiques sur les panégyriques de Sidoine Apollinaire (Paris, 1942).
 — Sidoine Apollinaire et l'esprit précieux en Gaule aux dernier jours de l'Empire (Paris, 1943).
 — 'Sidoine Apollinaire et les derniers éclats de la culture classique dans la Gaule occupée par les Goths' in Settimane 3 (1955) 266-284.
 — 'Les miracles de saint Martin et les débuts de l'hagiographie en Occident', BLE 73 (1972) 147-157.
- LUBAC, H. de, Exégèse médiévale. Les quatre sens de l'Ecriture I-II (Paris, 1959-1964).
- LUCK, G., 'Die Form der suetonischen Biographie und die frühen Heiligen-
 viten' in Mullus. Festschrift T. Klauser (Munster, 1964).
- LUDWIG, D.L., Der sogenannte Indiculus des Possidius. Studien zur Entstehungs- und Wirkungsgeschichte einer spatantiken Augustin-Bibliographie (Göttingen, 1984). [*]
- LUMPE, A., Art. 'Exemplum' in RAC 6 (1966) 1229-1257.
- LUTKE, K.-H., "Auctoritas" bei Augustin. (Mit einer Einleitung zur römischen Vorgeschichte des Begriffs) (Stuttgart 1968).
- LUISELLI, B., 'Sulla pseudonimia di Vincenzo di Lerino' A&R 4 (1959) 216-222.

- MAASSEN, F., Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des canonischen Rechts in Abendlande bis zum Ausgange des Mittelalters I (Gratz, 1870).
- McGURK, P., Latin Gospel books from A.D. 400 to A.D. 800 (Paris, 1961).
- McHUGH, M.P., The "Carmen de providentia Dei" attributed to Prosper of Aquitaine (Washington, 1964).
- 'Observations on the text of the Carmen de providentia Dei', Manuscripta 12 (1968) 3-9.
- 'Observations on the text of the Carmen de ingratis', Manuscripta 14 (1970) 179-185.
- MACQUEEN, D.J., 'John Cassian on grace and free will', RTAM 44 (1977) 5-28.
- MADOZ, J., El concepto de la tradición en San Vicente de Lerins. Estudio historico-critico del Commonitorio (Rome, 1933).
- 'Un tratado desconocido de San Vicente de Lerins', Gregorianum 21 (1940) 75-94.
- 'Una nueva redacción del Libellus de fide de Baquiaro', RET 1 (1940-41) 457-488.
- Excerpta Vincentii Lirinensis, según el codice de Ripoll, N.151 con un estudio critico introductorio (Madrid, 1940).
- 'La teología de la Trinidad en los símbolos toledanos', RET 4 (1944) 457-479.
- 'Valeriano, obispo Calagurritano, escritor del siglo V', Hispania sacra 3 (1950) 131-137.
- Segundo decenio de estudios sobre patristica española (1941-1950) (Madrid, 1951).
- 'Cultura humanística de san Vicente de Lerins', RechSR 39 (1951) 461-471.
- 'Citas y reminiscencias clásicas en los Padres españoles', SE 5 (1953) 105-132.
- MAIER, J.L., 'La date de la rétractation de Leporius et celle du sermon 396 de saint Augustin', REAug 11 (1965) 39-42.
- MALNORY, A., Saint Césaire d'Arles (503-543) (Paris, 1894).
- MANDOUZE, A., Saint Augustin: l'aventure de la raison et de la grâce (Paris, 1968).

- MANOIR, H. du, 'Le Symbole de Nicée au Concile d'Ephèse', Gregorianum 12 (1931) 104-137.
- 'L'argument patristique dans la controverse nestorienne', RechSR 25 (1935) 441-461, 531-559.
- MARCOVICH, M., 'The text of St. Prosper's De providentia Dei', Illinois Classical Studies 8 (1983), 108-121. [*]
- MARKUS, R.A., Saeculum. History and society in the theology of Augustine (Cambridge, 1970).
- From Augustine to Gregory the Great. History and Christianity in late antiquity (London, 1983).
- 'Chronicle and theology: Prosper of Aquitaine' in C. HOLDSWORTH and T. P. WISEMAN (edd.), The Inheritance of Historiography (Exeter, 1986) 31-44.
- 'Pelagianism: Britain and the Continent', JEH 37 (1986) 191-204.
- 'Heresy, orthodoxy and conciliation: the legacy of Pelagius' in R.D. WILLIAMS (ed.), The Evolution of Orthodoxy. Essays in honour of Henry Chadwick (forthcoming).
- MARROU, H.-I., '"Doctrina" et "disciplina" dans la langue des Pères de l'Eglise', ALMA 9 (1934) 5-25.
- Mousikos anēr. Etudes sur les scènes de la vie intellectuelle figurant sur les monuments funéraires romains (Grenoble, 1937).
- Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique (Paris, 1938; reissued with 'Retractatio' 1949).
- 'Jean Cassien à Marseille', RMAL 1 (1945) 1-26.
- 'La technique de l'édition à l'époque patristique', VChr 3 (1949) 208-224.
- A history of education in antiquity (trans. G. Lamb, London, 1956).
- Saint Augustin et l'augustinisme (Paris, 1956).
- 'Le dossier épigraphique de l'évêque Rusticus de Narbonne', RAC 46 (1970) 331-349.
- Patristique et humanisme. Mélanges (Paris, 1976).
- Décadence romaine ou antiquité tardive ? (Paris, 1977).
- Christiana tempora. Mélanges d'histoire, d'archéologie, d'épigraphie et de patristique (Rome, 1978).
- MARSILI, S., Giovanni Cassiano ed Evagrio Pontico. Dottrina sulla carità e contemplazione (Rome, 1936).

- MARTIL, G., La tradición en san Agustín a través de la controversia pelagiana (Madrid, 1943).
- MARTIN, J., 'Abfassung, Veröffentlichung und Überlieferung von Augustins Schrift De doctrina christiana', Traditio 18 (1962) 69-87.
- MASCHIO, G., 'L'argomentazione patristica di s. Agostino nella prima fase della controversia pelagiana (412-418)', Augustinianum 26 (1986) 459-479.
- MASSIE, M., 'Vigilance de Calagurris face à la polemique hiéronymienne. Les fondements et la signification du conflit', BLE 81 (1980) 81-108.
- MATHISEN, R.W., 'Sidonius on the reign of Avitus: a study in political prudence', TAPhA 109 (1979) 165-171.
- 'Hilarius, Germanus and Lupus. The aristocratic background to the Chelidonius affair', Phoenix 33 (1979) 160-169.
- 'Petronius, Hilarius and Valerianus. Prosopographical notes on the conversion of the Roman aristocracy', Historia 30 (1981) 106-112.
- 'Epistolography, literary circles and family ties in late Roman Gaul', TAPhA 111 (1981) 95-109.
- 'PLRE II: suggested addenda and corrigenda', Historia 31 (1982) 363-386.
- MATTHEWS, J.F., 'The letters of Symmachus' in BINNS 58-99 (repr. in Political life and culture).
- Western aristocracies and imperial court, A.D.364-425 (Oxford, 1975).
- Political life and culture in late Roman society (London, 1985).
- MEHLMANN, J., 'Tertulliani Liber de carne Christi a Leporio monacho citatus', SE 17 (1966) 290-301.
- MEIJERING, E.P., Hilary of Poitiers on the Trinity (Leiden, 1982).
- MESLIN, M., Les Ariens d'Occident (Paris, 1967).
- MEYER, R.T., '"Lectio divina" in Palladius' in Kyriakon. Festschrift J. Quasten II (Munster, 1970) 580-584.
- MISCH, G., Geschichte der Autobiographie I: Das Altertum i-ii (Bern, 1949-1950³).

- MOHRMANN, C., Etudes sur le latin des chrétiens I-IV (Rome, 1958-1977).
- MONAT, P., Lactance et la Bible. Une propédeutique latine à la lecture de la Bible dans l'Occident constantinien I-II (Paris, 1982).
- MOREL, B., 'De invloed van Leporius op Cassianus' weerlegging van het Nestorianisme', Bijdragen. Tijdschrift voor Filosofie en Theologie 20 (1960) 31-52. [*]
- MORIN, G., 'Pastor et Syagrius, deux écrivains perdus du cinquième siècle', RBen 10 (1893) 385-394.
- 'Solution d'un problème d'histoire littéraire: le diocèse d'origine de Léporius, théologien gaulois du V^e siècle', RBen 14 (1897) 102-103.
- 'La Fides sancti Valeriani du ms. Paris lat. 2076', RBen 15 (1898) 102-3.
- 'Le symbole d'Athanase et son premier témoin, saint Césaire d'Arles', RBen 18 (1901) 337-363.
- 'Le Liber dogmatum de Gennade de Marseille et problèmes qui s'y rattachent', RBen 24 (1907) 445-455.
- 'L'origine du symbole d'Athanase', JThS 12 (1911) 161-190, 337-359.
- 'Deux pièces inédites du disciple de Fauste de Riez auteur des soi-disant Instructiones Columbani', Revue Charlemagne 1 (1911) 161-170.
- 'L'origine du symbole d'Athanase: témoignage inédit de saint Césaire d'Arles', RBen 44 (1932) 207-219.
- 'La préface métrique au Commentaire sur les psaumes de Prosper d'Aquitaine ?', RBen 46 (1934) 36-40.
- 'Le symbole de s. Césaire d'Arles', RBen 46 (1934) 178-189.
- 'La collection gallicane dite d'Eusèbe d'Emèse et les problèmes qui s'y rattachent', ZNW 34 (1935) 92-115.
- 'Le plus ancien monument qui existe de la liturgie gallicane: le lectionnaire palimpseste de Wolfenbüttel', Ephemerides liturgicae 51 (1937) 3-12.
- 'Brillantes découvertes d'un jésuite espagnol et retractation qui s'ensuit', RHE 38 (1942) 411-417.
- MORRIS, J., 'Pelagian literature', JThS n.s.16 (1965) 26-60.
- MOUNTAIN, W.J., 'The Excerpta Vincentii Lirinensis, Part I: a revised edition', SE 18 (1967/8) 385-405.

- MUNDO, A.M., 'Bibliotheca. Bible et lecture du Carême d'après saint Benoît', RBen 60 (1950) 65-92.
- 'Il monachesimo nella penisola Iberica fino al secolo VII' in Settimane 4 (1956) 73-108.
- 'Estudio sobre el De fide de Baquiari', StudMon 7 (1965) 247-303.
- 'Las Reglas monásticas latinas des siglo VI y la "lectio divina"', StudMon 9 (1967) 229-255.
- MUNIER, C., Statuta ecclesiae antiqua (Strasbourg, 1960).
- Art. 'Gennade de Marseille' in DSp 6 (1967) 205-209.
- MUNZ, P., 'John Cassian', JEH 11 (1960) 1-22.
- MURPHY, F.X., 'Rufinus of Aquileia and Paulinus of Nola', REAug 2 (1956) 79-91.
- MURRU, F., 'La concezione della storia nei Chronica di Sulpicio Severo', Latomus 38 (1979) 961-981.
- MUTZENBECHER, A., 'Codex Leningrad Q.v.1.3 (Corbie). Ein Beitrag zu seiner Beschreibung', SE 18 (1967/8) 406-450.
- NAGEL, P., Die Motivierung der Askese in der alten Kirche und der Ursprung des Mönchtums (TU 95, Berlin, 1966).
- NAT, P.G. van der, 'Die Praefatio der Evangelienparaphrase des Iuvenus' in Romanitas et Christianitas. Studia I.H. Waszink oblata (Amsterdam, 1973) 249-257.
- NAUTIN, P., 'La date du De viris illustribus de Jérôme, de la mort de Cyrille de Jerusalem et de celle de Grégoire de Nazianze', RHE 56 (1961) 33-35.
- 'Chronologie hiéronymienne (393-397)', REAug 18 (1972) 209-218; 19 (1973) 69-86, 213-239; 20 (1974) 251-284.
- 'La date des commentaires de Jérôme sur les Epîtres pauliniennes', RHE 74 (1979) 5-12.
- 'Le premier échange épistolaire entre Jérôme et Damase: lettres réelles ou fictives ?' Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie 30 (1983) 331-334. [*]
- 'L'activité littéraire de Jérôme de 387 à 392', RThPh 115 (1983) 247-259.
- Origène: sa vie et son oeuvre (Paris, 1977).
- Art. 'Hieronimus' in TRE 15 (1986) 304-315.

- NEWLANDS, G.M., Hilary of Poitiers: a study of theological method (Bern, 1978).
- NIXON, C.E.V., Pacatus. Panegyric to the emperor Theodosius (Liverpool, 1987).
- NORDEN, E., Die antike Kunstprosa I-II (Leipzig, 1909).
- O'CONNOR, W., 'St. Vincent of Lerins and Saint Augustine. Was the Commonitorium of Saint Vincent of Lerins intended as a polemic treatise against Saint Augustine and his doctrine on predestination?', Doctor communis 16 (1963) 123-257.
- O'DONNELL, J.J., 'Salvian and Augustine', Augustinian Studies 14 (1983) 25-34.
- OLIVAR, A., 'La duración de la predicación antigua', Liturgica 3 (1966) 143-184.
- 'Preparación e improvisación en la predicación patristica' in Kyriakon. Mélanges J. Quasten II (Munster, 1970) 736-767.
- 'Quelques remarques historiques sur la prédication comme action liturgique dans l'Eglise ancienne' in Mélanges B. Botte (Louvain, 1972) 429-443.
- OLPHE-GALLIARD, M., 'La science spirituelle d'après Cassien', RAM 18 (1937) 141-160.
- O'MALLEY, T.P., Tertullian and the Bible: language, imagery, exegesis (Nijmegen, 1967).
- OPELT, I., Art. 'Epitome', RAC 5 (1962) 944-973.
- 'Quellenstudien zu Eucherius', Hermes 91 (1963) 476-483.
- 'Zur literarischen Eigenart von Eucherius' Schrift De laude eremi', VChr 22 (1968) 198-208.
- Hieronymus' Streitschriften (Heidelberg, 1973).
- 'Hieronymus' Leistung als Literaturhistoriker in der Schrift De viris illustribus', Orpheus n.s. 1 (1980) 52-75.
- ORTIZ DE URBINA, P., 'Das Symbol von Chalkedon. Sein Text, sein Werden, seine dogmatische Bedeutung' in GRILLMEIER-BACHT I 389-418.
- PALANQUE, J.R., 'La date du transfert de la préfecture des Gaules de Trèves à Arles', REA 36 (1934) 359-365.
- 'Les évêchés provençaux a l'époque romaine', Provence Historique 1 (1951) 104-143.

- PAREDI, A., 'S. Girolamo e S. Ambrogio' in Mélanges E. Tisserant 5.2 (Vatican City, 1964) 183-198.
- PASTORINO, A., 'Il concetto di tradizione in Giovanni Cassiano e in Vincenzo de Lerino', Sileno 1 (1975) 37-46. [*]
- 'I "temi spirituali" della vita monastica in Giovanni Cassiano', Civiltà classica e cristiana 1 (1980) 123-172. [*]
- PENNA, A., Principi e carattere dell'esegesi di S. Girolamo (Rome, 1950).
- PEITZ, W.M., Das vorephesinische Symbol der Papstkanzlei (Rome, 1939).
- PELLAND, L., Prosperi Aquitani doctrina de praedestinatione et voluntate Dei salvifica (Montreal, 1936). [*]
- PETITMENGIN, P., 'Les plus anciens manuscrits de la Bible latine' in BTT 2, 89-128.
- PEREZ DE URBEL, J., 'Le monachisme en Espagne au temps de saint Martin', Studia Anselmiana 46 (1961) 45-65.
- PERI, V., Omellie origeniane sui Salmi. Contributo all'identificazione del testo latino (Vatican City, 1980).
- PEROSANZ, J.M., El simbolo atanasiano (Madrid, 1976). [*]
- PERROT, C., La lecture de la Bible dans la synagogue. Les anciennes lectures palestiniennes du Shabbat et des fêtes (Hildesheim, 1974).
- PERSON, R.E., The mode of theological decision making at the early ecumenical councils. An inquiry into the function of Scripture and Tradition at the councils of Nicaea and Chalcedon (Basel, 1978).
- PETRUCCI, A., 'La concezione cristiano del libro fra V e VII secolo', StudMed 3^a s. 14 (1973) 961-984.
- Libri e lettori nel medioevo. Guida storica e critica (Bari, 1977).
- PHILIPP, M., Zum Sprachgebrauch des Paulin von Nola (Erlangen, 1904).

- PIETRI, C., Roma Christiana. Recherches sur l'Eglise de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie - de Miltiade à Sixte III (311-440) I-II (Paris, 1976).
- Art. 'Gennadius von Marseille' in TRE 12 (1984) 376-378.
- PLAIGNIEUX, J., 'Le grief de complicité entre erreurs nestorienne et pélagienne d'Augustin à Cassien par Prosper d'Aquitaine', ReAug 2 (1956) 391-402.
- PLINVAL, G. de, Pélage: ses écrits, sa vie et sa réforme. Etude d'histoire littéraire et religieuse (Lausanne, 1943).
- 'Prosper d'Aquitaine interprète de saint Augustin', RechAug 1 (1958) 339-355.
- POIREL, R.M.J., De utroque commonitorio Lirinensi (Nancy, 1895).
- POSWICK, F., 'Les apophthègmes de Hyperechios. L'ascèse du moine, méditation des Ecritures', CollCist 32 (1970) 231-255.
- POWELL, D., Art. 'Arkandisziplin' in TRE 4 (1979) 1-8.
- PRETE, S., I Chronica di Sulpicio Severo. Saggio storico-critico (Vatican City, 1955).
- 'Sulpicio Severo e il millenarismo', Convivium n.s. 26 (1958) 394-404.
- Il "commonitorium" nella letteratura cristiana antica (Bologna, 1962).
- Paolino di Nola e l'umanesimo cristiano. Saggio sopra il suo epistolario (Bologna, 1964).
- 'Paolino di Nola: la parafrasi biblica della Laus Iohannis (carm. 6)', Augustinianum 14 (1974) 625-635.
- 'Paolino di Nola: la storia umana come provvidenza e salvezza', Augustinianum 16 (1976) 145-157.
- 'Degenerazione e decadenza morale nell'escatologia di Sulpicio Severo', Augustinianum 18 (1978) 245-256.
- PRICOCO, S., Per una nuova edizione del "De contemptu mundi" di Eucherio di Lione (Turin, 1967).
- 'Modelli di santità a Lerino. L'ideale ascetico nel Sermo de vita Honorati di Ilario d'Arles', SicGymn 27 (1974) 54-88.
- 'Una nota biografica su Salviano di Marsiglia', SicGymn 29 (1976) 351-368.
- 'Barbari, senso della fine e teologia politica. Su un passo del De contemptu mundi di Eucherio di Lione', Romano-Barbarica 2 (1977) 209-229. [*].

- L'isola dei santi. Il cenobio di Lerino e le origini del monachesimo gallico (Rome, 1978).
- 'Storia ecclesiastica e storia letteraria. Il De viris illustribus di Gennadio di Marsiglia' in La storiografia ecclesiastica nella tarda antichità 241-273.
- 'Motivi polemici e prospettive classicistiche nel De viris illustribus di Girolamo', SicGymn 32 (1979) 69-99.

I Concilio Caesaraugustano. MDC aniversario (Zaragoza, 1980) (Saragossa, 1981).

Primera reunión gallega de estudios clásicos (Santiago-Pontevedra, 1979)
(Santiago de Compostela, 1981).

PRINZ, F., Frühes Mönchtum in Frankenreich (4. bis 8. Jahrhundert)
(Munich, 1965).

- Askese und Kultur. Vor- und frühbenediktinisches Mönchtum an der Wiege Europas (Munich, 1980).

Prisciliano y el priscilianismo (Pontevedra, 1981) (Monografías de los Cuadernos del Norte, Oviedo, 1982).

PROCOPE, J., Art. 'Erbauungsliteratur I' in TRE 10 (1982) 28-43.

PUECH, A., 'Les origines du priscillianisme et l'orthodoxie de Priscillien', Bulletin d'Ancienne Litt. et d'Archéol. Chrétiennes 2 (1912) 81-95, 161-213.

PUNIER, P. de, 'La liturgie baptismale en Gaule avant Charlemagne', Revue des questions historiques 72 (1902) 382-423.

- Art. 'Baptême' in DACL 2,i (1910) 251-346.

QUACQUARELLI, A., Lavoro e ascesi nel monachesimo prebenedettino del IV e V secolo (Bari, 1982).

RABBOW, P.V., Seelenführung. Methodik der Exerzitien in der Antike (Munich, 1954).

RAHNER, H., '"De dominici pectoris fonte potavit"', ZKTh 55 (1931) 102-108.

- '"Flumina de ventre Christi". Die patristische Auslegung von Joh 7,37-38', Biblica 22 (1941) 269-302, 367-403.

RAHNER, K., 'Augustin und der Semipelagianismus', ZKTh 62 (1938) 171-196.

- RAMOS Y LOSCERTALES, J.M., Prisciliano: gesta rerum (Salamanca, 1952).
- RATZINGER, J., 'Originalität und Überlieferung in Augustins Begriff der "confessio"', REAug 3 (1957) 375-392.
- RECCHIA, V., L'iniziazione biblica negli autori cristiani antichi (Bari, 1969). [*]
- REHLING, B., De Fausti Reiensis epistula tertia commentatio historica (Munster, 1898).
- REINELT, P., Studien über die Briefe des hl. Paulinus von Nola (Breslau, 1904).
- REITZENSTEIN, R., Historia monachorum und Historia Lausiaca. Eine studie zur Geschichte des Mönchtums und der frühchristlichen Begriffe Gnostiker und Pneumatiker (Göttingen, 1916).
- RICHARD, M., 'Notes sur les florilèges dogmatiques du V^e et du VI^e siècle', Actes du VI^e Congrès International d'Etudes Byzantines I (Paris, 1950) 307-318 (=Opera minora I).
- 'Les florilèges diphysites du V^e et du VI^e siècle', in GRILLMEIER-BACHT I 721-748 (=Opera minora III).
- Opera minora I-III (Turnhout, 1976-77).
- RICHE, P., 'La survivance des écoles publiques en Gaule au V^e siècle', Le Moyen Age 63 (1957) 421-436 (=Instruction II).
- Education et culture dans l'Occident barbare (VI^e-VIII^e siècles (Paris, 1962³).
- Les écoles et l'enseignement dans l'Occident chrétien (Paris, 1979).
- Instruction et vie religieuse dans le Haut Moyen Age (London, 1981).
- RITTER, A.M., Das Konzil von Konstantinopel und sein Symbol (Göttingen, 1965).
- Art. 'Glaubensbekenntnis(se) V (Alte Kirche)' in TRE 13 (1984) 399-412.
- RIZZA, G., 'Imitazione biblica ed influenza retorica nell'opera di Paolino di Nola' in Miscellanea di studi di letteratura cristiana antica (Catania, 1947) 153-164. [*]
- ROBERTS, C.H., 'Books in the Graeco-Roman world and in the New Testament' in CHB I.

- ROBERTS, C.H. and SKEAT, T.C., The birth of the codex (London, 1983).
- ROBERTS, E.D., 'Notes on early Christian libraries', Speculum 9 (1934) 190-194.
- ROBERTS, M., Biblical epic and rhetorical paraphrase in late antiquity (Liverpool, 1985).
- ROCHAIS, H., Art. 'Florilèges spirituels (latins)' in DSp 5 (1962) 435-460.
- RONDEAU, M.-J., 'Remarques sur l'anthropologie de saint Hilaire', Stud Patr 6 (TU 87, Berlin, 1962) 197-210.
- 'L'Épître à Marcellinus sur les Psaumes', VChr 22 (1968) 176-197.
- Les commentaires patristiques au Psautier I-II (Rome, 1982-5).
- ROUSSE, J., Art. '"Lectio divina" et lecture spirituelle. 1: La "lectio divina"' in DSp 9 (1976) 470-487.
- ROUSSEAU, P., 'The spiritual authority of the monk-bishop. Eastern elements in some western hagiography of the fourth and fifth centuries', JThS n.s. 22 (1971) 380-419.
- 'Cassian, contemplation and the coenobitic life', JEH 26 (1975) 113-126.
- 'In search of Sidonius the bishop', Historia 25 (1976) 356-377.
- Ascetics, authority and the church in the age of Jerome and Cassian (Oxford, 1978).
- Pachomius. The making of a community in fourth-century Egypt (Berkeley, 1985).
- RUPPERT, F., 'Meditatio-ruminatio. Une méthode traditionnelle de meditation', CollCist 39 (1977) 81-93.
- RUSSELL, D.A. and WILSON, N.G., Menander rhetor (Oxford, 1981).
- Saint Martin et son temps. Memorial du XV^e centenaire des débuts du monachisme en Gaule (Rome, 1961).
- SALAVERRI, J., 'El argumento de tradición patristica en la antigua Iglesia', RET 5 (1945) 107-119.

- SANDAY, W., 'The Cheltenham list of the canonical books of the Old and New Testaments and of the writings of Cyprian' in Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica 3 (Oxford, 1891) 217-325.
- SAXER, V., 'Bible et liturgie' in BTT 2, 157-188.
- SCHAFERDIECK, K., Die Kirche in den Reichen der Westgoten und Suewen bis zur Errichtung der westgotischen katholischen Staatskirche (Berlin, 1967).
- SCHANZER, D., 'The anonymous Carmen contra paganos and the date and identity of the centonist Proba', REAug 32 (1986) 232-248.
- SCHATZ, W., Studien zur Geschichte und Vorstellungswelt des frühen abendländischen Mönchtums (Diss., Freiburg, 1957).
- SCHEELE, J., 'Buch und Bibliothek bei Augustinus', Bibliothek und Wissenschaft 12 (1978) 14-114.
- SCHERMANN, T., Die Geschichte der dogmatischen Florilegien vom V.-VIII. Jahrhundert (TU 28, Leipzig, 1904).
- SCHMID, J., SS. Eusebii Hieronymi et Aurelii Augustini epistulae mutuae (Bonn, 1930).
- SCHMID, W., Art. 'Endelechius' in RAC 5 (1962) 1-3.
- SCHNEEMELCHER, W., Art. 'Bibel III: Die Entstehung des Kanons des Neuen Testaments und der christlichen Bibel' in TRE 6 (1980) 22-48.
- SCHUBERT, H. von, Der sogenannte "Praedestinatus" (TU 24.4, Leipzig, 1903).
- SCHUMACHER, W.N., '"Dominus legem dat"', RQ 54 (1959) 1-39.
 — 'Eine römische Apsiskomposition', RQ 54 (1959) 137-202.
- SCHWARTZ, E., Konzilstudien I: Cassian und Nestorius (Strasbourg, 1914).
- SCIUTO, F., 'Tertulliano e Vincenzo di Lerino', MSLC 4 (1953) 127-38.[*]
- SCOTT HOLMES, T., The origin and development of the Christian church in Gaul during the first six centuries of the Christian era (London, 1911).

- SEMPLE, W.H., 'Apollinaris Sidonius, a Gallo-Roman seigneur', Bulletin of the John Rylands Library 50 (1967) 136-158.
- SESTON, W., 'Remarques sur le role de la pensee d'Origène dans les origines du monachisme' RHE 108 (1933) 197-213.
- SEVERUS, E. von, 'Das Wort "meditari" im Sprachgebrauch der Hl. Schrift', Geist und Leben 26 (1953) 365-375. [*]
 — '"Silvestram tenui musam meditaris avena". Zur Bedeutung der Wörtern "meditatio" und "meditari" beim Kirchenlehrer Ambrosius' in Perennitas. Festgabe T. Michels (Munster, 1963) 25-31.
- SIEBEN, H.J., 'Athanasius über den Psalter. Analyse seines Briefes an Marcellinus', Theologie und Philosophie 48 (1973) 157-173.
 — Die Konzilsidee der Alten Kirche (Paderborn, 1979).
 — Voces. Eine Bibliographie zu Wörtern und Begriffe aus der Patristik (1918-1978) (Berlin, 1980).
 — Exegesis patrum. Saggio bibliografico sull'esegesi biblica dei Padri della Chiesa (Rome, 1983).
- SILVA-TAROUCA, C., S. Leonis epistulae contra Eutychis haeresim (Rome, 1934).
 — 'Nuovi studi sulle antiche lettere dei Papi', Gregorianum 12 (1931) 3-56, 349-425, 547-598.
 — S. Leonis Magni tomus ad Flavianum ep. Constantinopolitanum (Epistula XXVIII) (Rome, 1932).
- SIMONETTI, M., 'Studi sul De trinitate pseudoatanasiano', ND 3 (1949) 57-72.
 — 'La processione dello Spirito Santo nei Padri latini', Maia 7 (1955) 308-324.
 — 'Note Rufiniane. I - Rufino e Bachiaro', RCCM 2 (1960) 140-152.
 — 'Alcune osservazioni a proposito di una professione di fede attribuita a Gregorio di Elvira', RCCM 2 (1960) 307-325.
 — 'Note su Faustino', SE 14 (1963) 50-98.
 — 'Le fonti del De spiritu sancto di Fausto di Riez', Sic Gymn 29 (1976) 413-425.
 — 'Il De gratia di Fausto di Riez', Studi storico-religiosi 1 (1977) 125-145. [*]
 — 'Fausto di Riez e i Macedoniani', Augustinianum 17 (1977) 333-354.

- SKEAT, T.C., 'Early Christian book-production: papyri and manuscripts' in CHB II 54-79.
- SMOLAK, K., Das Gedicht des Bischofs Agrestius. Eine theologische Lehr-epistel aus der Spätantike (=Sitzungsberichte [Vienna] 284.2 [1973]).
- SMULDERS, P. La doctrine trinitaire de saint Hilaire d Poitiers. Etude précédée d'une esquisse du mouvement dogmatique depuis le Concile de Nicée jusqu'au regne de Julien (Rome, 1944).
- SOTOMAYOR Y MURO, M., 'La Iglesia en la España romana' in R. GARCIA VILLOSLADA (ed.), Historia de la Iglesia en España I: La Iglesia en la España romana y visigoda (siglos I-VIII) (Madrid, 1979) 7-400.
- SOUTER, A., 'Observations on the pseudo-Eusebian collection of Gallican sermons', JThS 41 (1940) 47-57.
- SPARKES, H.F.D., 'Jerome as a biblical scholar' in CHB I 510-541.
- SPEYER, W., 'Religiöse Pseudepigraphie und literarische Fälschung im Altertum', JbAC 8/9 (1965/6) 88-125.
 — Art. 'Fälschung, literarische' in RAC 7 (1969) 236-277.
 — Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum. Ein Versuch ihrer Deutung (Munich, 1971).
- STANCLIFFE, C., Saint Martin and his hagiographer. History and miracle in Sulpicius Severus (Oxford, 1983).
- STEGMÜLLER, F., 'Das Trinitätssymbolum des heiligen Martin von Tours', in Universitas. Festschrift A. Stöhr I (Mainz, 1960) 151-164.
- STEVENS, C.E., Sidonius Apollinaris and his age (Oxford, 1933).
- La storiografia ecclesiastica nella tarda antichità. Atti del convegno tenuto in Erice 1978 (Messina, 1980).
- STRAUSS, G., Schriftgebrauch, Schriftauslegung und Schriftbeweis bei Augustin (Tübingen, 1959).
- STROHEKER, K., Eurich, König der Westgoten (Stuttgart, 1937).
 — Der senatorische Adel im spätantiken Gallien (Tübingen, 1948).

STÜDER, B., 'Zur Frage des westlichen Origenismus', StudPatr 9 (TU 94, Berlin, 1966) 270-287.

--- Art. 'Argomentazione patristica' in DPAC 334-337.

SYCHOWSKI, S. von, Hieronymus als Litterarhistoriker. Eine quellenkritische Untersuchung der Schrift des heiligen Hieronymus "De viris illustribus" (Munster-i.-W., 1894).

TETZ, M., 'Zum Streit zwischen Orthodoxie und Häresie an der Wende des 4. zum 5. Jahrhundert. Anfänge des expliziten Väterbeweises', Evangelische Theologie 21 (1961) 354-368.

Théologie de la vie monastique: études sur la tradition patristique (Paris, 1961).

THOMPSON, E.A., 'The settlement of the barbarians in Southern Gaul', JRS 46 (1956) 65-75.

--- Saint Germanus of Auxerre and the end of Roman Britain (Woodbridge, 1984).

THRAEDE, K., Art. 'Epos' in RAC 5 (1962) 983-1042.

TIBILETTI, C., 'Giovanni Cassiano: formazione e dottrina', Augustinianum 17 (1977) 355-380.

--- 'Libero arbitrio e grazia in Fausto de Riez', Augustinianum 19 (1979) 259-285.

--- 'La salvezza humana in Fausto di Riez', Orpheus 1 (1980) 371-390. [*]

--- 'Fausto di Riez nei giudizi della critica', Augustinianum 21 (1981) 567-587.

--- 'Valeriano di Cimiez e la teologia dei maestri provenzali', Augustinianum 22 (1982) 513-532.

--- 'La teologia della grazia in Giuliano Pomerio. Alle origini dell' agostinismo provenzale', Augustinianum 25 (1985) 489-506.

--- 'Rassegni de studi e testi sui "semipelagiani"', Augustinianum 25 (1985) 507-522.

TRAPE, A., 'Un caso de Nestorianismo prenestoriano en Occidente resuelto por san Augustin', Ciudad de Dios 155 (1943) 45-67. [*]

'Un libro sulla nozione di eresia mai scritto di sant' Agostino', Augustinianum 25 (1985) 853-865.

TRANOY, A., La Galice romaine. Recherches sur le nord-ouest de la peninsule iberique dans l'Antiquite (Paris, 1981).

- TURNER, C.H., 'The Liber ecclesiasticorum dogmatum attributed to Gennadius', JThS 7 (1906) 78-99, 8 (1907) 103-114.
- 'A critical text of the Quicumque vult', JThS 11 (1910) 401-411.
- The history and use of creeds and anathemas (London, 1910²).
- 'Arles and Rome: the first developments of canon law in Gaul', JThS 17 (1915-16) 236-247.
- UYTFANGHE, M. van, Art. 'Heiligenverehrung II (Hagiographie)' in RAC Lieferungen 105-6 (1987) 150-177.
- VALENTIN, L., Saint Prosper d'Aquitaine (Toulouse, 1900).
- VALK, H.L.M. van der, 'On the edition of books in antiquity', VChr 11 (1957) 1-10.
- VATHAIRE, J. de, 'Les relations de saint Augustin et de saint Jérôme' in Miscellanea Augustiniana (Rotterdam, 1930) 484-499. [*]
- VEGA, A.C., 'Un poema inedito titulado De fide de Agrestio, obispo de Lugo, siglo V', Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia 159 (1966) 167-209.
- 'De patrología española. La expresión anti-priscilianista "non sic unum deum solitarium vel quasi solitarium" y la datación de ciertas "profesiones de fe" antiguas', Boletín de la Real Academia de la Historia 168 (1971) 207-225.
- VERHEIJEN, L., La Règle de saint Augustin I-II (Paris, 1967).
- VISCHER, L., 'Die Rechtfertigung der Schriftstellerei in der alten Kirche', ThZ 12 (1956) 320-336.
- VIVES, J., Concilios visigóticos e hispano-romanos (Madrid, 1963).
- VOGEL, C., La discipline pénitentielle en Gaule des origines à la fin du VII^e siècle (Paris, 1952).
- VOGUE, A. de, 'Monachisme et l'Eglise dans la pensée de Cassien' in Théologie de la vie monastique 213-240.
- 'Les deux fonctions de la méditation dans les Règles monastiques anciennes', Revue d'Histoire de la Spiritualité 51 (1975) 3-16.
- 'Les mentions des oeuvres de Cassien et de ses contemporains', StudMon 20 (1978) 275-285.

- 'La Règle de Vigile signalée par Gennade. Essai d'identification', RBen 89 (1979) 217-229.
 - Les Règles des Saints Pères I-II (SC 297-298, Paris, 1972).
 - Le Maître, Eugippe et saint Benoît. Recueil d'articles (Hildesheim, 1984).
 - Les Règles monastiques anciennes (400-700) (Typologie des sources du moyen age occidental 46, Turnhout, 1985).
- VOGUE, A. de and NEUFVILLE, J., La Règle de saint Benoît I-VIII (SC 181-188, Paris, 1972-1977).
- VOLLMANN, B., Studien zum Priszillianismus. Die Forschung, die Quellen, der fünfzehnte Brief Papst Leos des Grossen (St. Ottilien, 1965).
- Art. 'Priscillianus' in PW Suppl. 14 (1974) 485-559.
- WALSH, P.G., 'Paulinus of Nola and the conflict of ideologies in the fourth century' in Kyriakon. Festschrift J. Quasten (Munster, 1970) II 565-571.
- 'Paulinus Nolanus, Carmen 24' in Latin script and letters. A.D. 400-900. Festschrift L. Bieler (Leiden, 1976) 37-43.
- WEBER, H.-O., Die Stellung des Johannes Cassianus zur ausserpachomianischen Mönchstradition. Eine Quellenuntersuchung (Munster, 1961).
- WEIGEL, G., Faustus of Riez. An historical introduction (Philadelphia, 1938). [*]
- WEIJENBORG, R., 'Leo der Grosse und Nestorius. Erneuerung der Fragestellung', Augustinianum 16 (1976) 353-398.
- WEISS, J.-P., 'La personnalité de Valerien de Cimiez', Annales de la fac. des lettres et sc. humaines de Nice 11 (1970), 141-162.
- 'Valerien de Cimiez et Valère de Nice', SE 21 (1972-73) 109-146.
 - 'Honorat heros antique et saint chrétien. Etude du mot gratia dans la Vie de saint Honorat d'Hilaire d'Arles', Augustinianum 24 (1984) 265-280.
- WENDEL, C., 'Der Bibel-Auftrag Kaiser Constantins', Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen 56 (1939) 165-175 (=Kl. Schriften 35-45).
- Art. 'Bibliothek' in RAC 2 (1954) 231-274 (=Kl. Schriften 165-199).

- Kleine Schriften zum antiken Buch- und Bibliothekswesen
(Cologne, 1974).
- WERMELINGER, O., Rom und Pelagius. Die theologische Position der
römischen Bischöfe im Pelagianischen Streit in den Jahren
411-432 (Stuttgart, 1975).
- Art. 'Marius Mercator' in DSp 10 (1980) 610-615.
- 'Le canon des Latins au temps de Jérôme et d'Augustin' in
KAESTLI-WERMELINGER 152-196.
- WEYMAN, C., 'Die "Edition" des Commonitoriums', HJ 29 (1908) 582-586.
- Beiträge zur Geschichte der christlich-lateinischen Poesie
(Munich, 1926).
- WIEGAND, F., Die Stellung des apostolischen Symbols im kirchlichen Leben
des Mittelalters I: Symbol und Katechumenat (Leipzig, 1899).
- WILD, P.T., The divinization of man according to Saint Hilary (Mundel-
ein [Illinois], 1950).
- WILES, M.F., 'Origen as a biblical scholar' in CHB I 454-488.
- WILMART, A., 'L'Ad Constantium liber primus de saint Hilaire de
Poitiers et les Fragments historiques', RBen 24 (1907)
140-179, 293-317.
- 'Les Fragments historiques et le Synode de Béziers en 356',
RBen 25 (1908) 225-229.
- 'Les Monita de l'abbé Porcaire', RBen 26 (1909) 475-480.
- 'La lettre de Potamius à saint Athanase', RBen 30 (1913)
256-285.
- 'La tradition des grands ouvrages de saint Augustin' in
Miscellanea Agostiniana II (Rome, 1931) 256-315.
- 'Operum s. Augustini elenchus a Possidio... digestus' in
Miscellanea Agostiniana II (Rome, 1931) 149-233.
- WITKE, C., Numen litterarum. The old and the new in Latin poetry from
Constantine to Gregory the Great (Leiden, 1971).
- WLOSOK, A., Lactanz und die philosophische Gnosis (Heidelberg, 1961).
- WÖLFFLIN, E., 'Litteratura', Archiv für Lateinische Lexicographie und
Grammatik 5 (1888) 49-55.
- WOOD, I.N., Avitus of Vienne. Religion and culture in the Auvergne and
the Rhone Valley, 470-530 (Oxford D.Phil. thesis, 1980).

— 'The end of Roman Britain. Continental evidence and parallels' in LAPIDGE-DUMVILLE 1-26.

ZAHN, T., Das apostolische Symbolum. Eine Skizze seiner Geschichte und eine Prüfung seines Inhaltes (Erlangen, 1893).

ZELZER, M., 'Zum Wert antiker Handschriften innerhalb der patristischen Überlieferung (am Beispiel von Augustinus- und Ambrosius-handschriften)', Augustinianum 25 (1985) 523-538.

ZUMKELLER, A., 'Die pseudo-augustinische Schrift De praedestinatione et gratia: Inhalt, Überlieferung, Verfasserfrage und Nachwirkung', Augustinianum 25 (1985) 539-563.

ABSTRACT

J. Mark VESSEY
Corpus Christi College

D.Phil.
Trinity 1988

Ideas of Christian writing in late Roman Gaul

The Christianization of the educated élite of Roman society in the fourth and fifth centuries A.D. entailed a number of important changes in attitudes towards the written word. In particular, ideas concerning literary authorship and the use of texts developed at that time were to exercise a profound influence on subsequent European culture. This thesis is a survey of three major areas of emergent Christian literary ideology, based on close analysis of Gallic sources for the period c.350-500.

Chapter One: The Christian writer as student of the Bible. The idea of a necessary relation between Christian 'sermo' and biblical 'lectio' is pursued through the works of Hilary of Poitiers and the Priscillianists, the Gallic correspondence of Jerome, and the ascetic propaganda associated with the monastic milieux of Lérins, Arles and Marseille.

Chapter Two: The Christian writer as 'editor' of the Fathers. The idea that the primary duty of the Christian intellectual was to ensure safe transmission of the doctrinal (and literary) legacy of his most esteemed predecessors is explored with reference to the writings of Prosper of Aquitaine, Cassian of Marseille and Vincent of Lérins.

Chapter Three: The Christian writer as creed-maker. The idea that Christian literary activity might culminate in the perfection of a text composed 'in modum symboli' is traced from the time of Hilary to that of Gennadius of Marseille.

In each of these areas (it is argued) may be discerned a progressive realisation of written resources, involving the establishment of clear principles for a Christian use of texts. In Gaul, this process was closely related to the development of monastic ideas and institutions.

'Excerpta'

Quidam dictiloqui libros seni Augustini
Carpere et adversum condere fertur opus.

These lines occur at the beginning of a satirical epigram composed at an early stage in Prosper's campaign 'pro Augustino'.¹²⁸ In this poem, and in other compositions of similar date, the author vents his annoyance at what he considered the underhand tactics of his opponents. If they found fault with Augustine's theology, why did they not publish their criticisms in writing, instead of merely whispering them in private¹²⁹ ? In due course, publications began to appear. There were, for example, the two sets of Obiectiones and Cassian's thirteenth Conference. In none of these works was the bishop of Hippo the subject of direct attack. His name was not mentioned. His writings were nowhere quoted verbatim. Prosper's demand that Augustine's detractors should provide textual evidence of the errors which they claimed to find in his work - 'proferendo atque explicando libros',¹³⁰ - would thus appear never to have been met. And yet there are clear indications that the adversaries of Augustine's ideas on predestination were making a close study of his writings. Their failure to publish their criticisms in exactly the form required by Prosper should doubtless be seen as the result of respect for Augustine himself and/or fear of the possible consequences.

In their letters to Augustine, both Prosper and Hilary indicate that the 'Massilians' were in the habit of citing texts from the works of Augustine and other catholic 'tractatores' in support of their own arguments.¹³¹ The use made by these theologians of patristic author-