I. Introduction

1 General Introduction

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

1.1 Aims

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

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

1 The Prologue is one for Sedulius’ entire Collectaneum, and I refer to it as the Prologue throughout. Hereafter, I abbreviate my references to Sedulius’ commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians as Gal and Eph respectively, but all other references, whether to the biblical letters themselves or another commentary on the letters, are not abbreviated.
2 McNally, 1959, 76–77: “It is an earnest desire and hope of all workers in the field of early medieval theology that one day a series of translations, Medieval Christian Writers, may be inaugurated.”
3 I am not alone in my estimation of Sedulius’ importance and accomplishments in that age. See Simpson, XX; Lapidge, 283; Bieler, 116; Contreni, 1992, chapter IX, 762.
recognize Sedulius’ importance, but he enjoyed a certain level of social prestige during his time as well. He served as a mainstream, orthodox writer who was appointed as one of the “chief ministers in the revival of learning and arts in Liège, the intellectual capital of Louis the German’s kingdom.”⁴ In Simpson’s introduction to Sedulius’ *Collectaneum Miscellaneum*, he cites evidence within that text which buttresses the speculation that Sedulius was active as a teacher in Liège.⁵ In fact, there are a number of works which are attributed to “Sedulius’ circle”, reinforcing the belief that he had a number of companions working with or under him during his scholarly pursuits around the region.⁶ Some have speculated that he even held the title *scholasticus* in Liège.⁷ Nora Chadwick claims, “we cannot doubt that many of the most important manuscripts known to have been written at the centres of Irish learning on the Continent contain Irish names which are those of monks recognized as having belonged to the circle of Sedulius.”⁸

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

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

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

---

⁴ Doyle, 11. See also Lapidge, 283–284.
⁵ Simpson, XXII.
⁶ Traube first developed the theory of “the circle of Sedulius”, and it has been accepted by later writers too. See also Bieler, 124; Doyle, 15–16.
⁷ Doyle, 11.
⁸ Chadwick, 105.
⁹ Plumer, 6.
we come to interpreting the apostolic words, let us first examine certain axioms, i.e., the main principles.”

1.2 Biography

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

10 All dates are C.E., unless otherwise noted.
11 Bieler, 117.
12 Doyle, 9.
13 Cf. poems 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 17 (tr. Doyle).
14 McKitterick, 1983, 299; Doyle, 11.
went on to enjoy an illustrious career as a scholar and poet. In fact, his talent in writing poetry eventually won him the position as “chief bard” of Liège.\textsuperscript{16}

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

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

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

\begin{itemize}
\item[\textsuperscript{16}] Doyle, 11.
\item[\textsuperscript{17}] Simpson, XXIII.
\item[\textsuperscript{18}] McKitterick, 1983, 299.
\item[\textsuperscript{19}] Doyle, 16–17.
\item[\textsuperscript{20}] See poem 2 (tr. Doyle) where Sedulius likens Christ to a more compassionate Apollo.
\item[\textsuperscript{21}] Laistner, 240. Laistner in \textit{Thought and Letters in Western Europe, A.D. 500 to 900} dedicates a chapter to “The Study of Greek”. Esposito too in his collected essays entitled, \textit{Latin Learning in Mediaeval Ireland} (ed. Lapidice) dedicates a chapter to “Greek in Ireland during the Middle Ages”. This chapter (184–203) not only covers the learning of Greek in Ireland, but that of Irishmen who came to the continent with special reference to Sedulius Scottus and Johannes Scottus Eriugena.
\item[\textsuperscript{22}] These are common traits found in other Hiberno-Latin commentaries that Esposito warns against using as proof for a knowledge of Greek. He makes two salient points specifically on this matter and Sedulius (1988, 196–198): 1) “We must be very careful
sufficient evidence in his other works and from what we know about the schools at Liège (i.e., Sedulius is believed to have taught there, where the study of Greek was active) and other centers west of the Rhine to justify naming Sedulius as one of a few who was competent in Greek.  

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

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

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

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

23 Laistner, 244.
24 Cf. poem 9 (tr. Doyle).
25 Cf. especially poem 32 (tr. Doyle).
26 This and all other quotations of Scripture in English are taken from the New American Standard Bible.
28 Prologue 200 – 229 (9 – 10, Frede).
temporum ratione,\textsuperscript{29} and Rufinus’ translation of Eusebius’ Histories\textsuperscript{30} et al. Likewise, Sedulius exhibits a familiarity with classical models that include an Aristotelian/Ciceronian trope – the seven circumstances – and the commentary of the preeminent Virgilian scholar Servius, whose work Sedulius used as a literary model for the composition of his Collectaneum.

2 Historical Context and Genre of Sedulius’ Collectaneum

2.1 Historical Context

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

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{29} Gal 3:17 (528, III.159–529, III.174, Frede).
\item \textsuperscript{30} Gal 1:19 (517, II.48–54, Frede).
\item \textsuperscript{31} Frede, 1997, 41*.
\item \textsuperscript{32} Frede, 1997, 41*–42*.
\item \textsuperscript{33} The “Paulus-Handschrift Würzburg, Universitätsbibliothek M.” Frede, 1997, 44*.
\item \textsuperscript{34} Simpson, XXIII; though see also Frede, 1997, 34*, who claims Sedulius did at least some of the work on the Collectaneum Miscellaneum in Lorsch and Murbach.
\end{itemize}
While the term “renaissance” is not universally accepted as a description for the Carolingian age,\textsuperscript{35} that it was a time of reform and renewal is not questioned. Charlemagne, king of the Franks for 47 years beginning in 768, expanded his kingdom into an empire encompassing most of western and central Europe. He used the infrastructure of the Church to implement a Christian culture of reform and revival. Giles Brown defines what he terms the “Carolingian Renaissance” as “the revival of learning in conjunction with a movement to reform both the institutions of the Church and the lives of the Christian peoples living under the Carolingian rule.”\textsuperscript{36} Transformation of religion, law, government and learning within the Carolingian empire was achieved through a concerted commitment, directed by Charlemagne and his successors, to the study and use of the written word, and particularly, the production and study of the Bible.\textsuperscript{37} This led to a scholarly culture of compiling, copying, and producing Christian materials. Scriptoria and monastic libraries developed an interdependence for the provision of manuscripts.\textsuperscript{38} Furthermore, centers across the empire communicated and shared resources.\textsuperscript{39} The concerted effort among these centers allowed Sedulius to draw from a wide range of sources.

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

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

\textsuperscript{36} Brown, 1.

\textsuperscript{37} Contreni, 1995, 106–111; McKitterick, 1989, 2.

\textsuperscript{38} McKitterick, 1983, 203.

\textsuperscript{39} McKitterick, 1983, 213.

\textsuperscript{40} Contreni, 1992, chapter V, 74–75.

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

\textsuperscript{42} Contreni, 1995, 110; Sullivan, 53–59.

\textsuperscript{43} Sullivan, 78–79.
attained a high level of erudition, they nonetheless often wrote at an elementary level.44

2.2 Title and Genre

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

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

Early Christian councils served as an impetus for the production of summaries on authoritative Christian writings on specific doctrines, a forerunner to medieval *collectanea* of patristic sources: for example, the summaries that were used at the council of Ephesus in 431, the council of Chalcedon in 451, and the fifth General Council in 551.48 Then at the sixth General Council in 680, two *florilegia*, and not mere summaries, were produced for opposing views on the issue of Monothelites.49 Rochais dates the *Liber Scintillarum* by Defensor of Ligugé, one of the earliest examples of moral *florilegia*, to about 700.50 Around the same time, Bede (ca. 672–735) composed

---

44 Sullivan, 53–59.
45 Fulda, Hessische Landesbibliothek Aa 30, saec. XII (Frede, 1997, 60*).
46 Rochais, 1953, 247–248. McKitterick, (1977) follows these categories throughout her seminal work on Carolingian *florilèges ascétiques* or “moral *florilegia*”.
47 Rochais, 1953, 248–249.
48 Oestreicci, 121.
49 Oestreicci, 121.
50 Rochais (1953, 251) dates the work to the last decades of the seventh century (“C’est dans les dernières décades du VII siècle que Defensor compose son Liber Scintillarum”),
his Collectaneum in apostolum ex operibus Augustini. This work is Bede’s attempt to collect all of Augustine’s exegetical comments on the Pauline letters. It certainly differs from later collectanea on patristic exegesis by virtue of its exclusive interest in Augustine’s select exegesis and not the treatment of multiple authorities on entire books of the Bible. Bede’s Collectaneum nonetheless signals an early practice of compiling and excerpting authoritative exegesis on Scripture.

It is from this tradition that the Carolingians began creating their own collectanea, a genre that, under the practice of the Carolingians, exhibits new developments and uses. After the production of Bibles and liturgical texts, which were used in the attempt to standardize worship and ensure solidarity in an extremely diverse empire, the preeminent literary genre of the Carolingian age was the biblical commentary.\footnote{Brown, 34; Contreni (2002, 29) notes that from the time of Charlemagne in the eighth century through the end of the ninth century, Carolingians produced around two-hundred biblical commentaries.}

The impetus for the bulk of Carolingian biblical commentaries was the education of patrons: namely, emperors, bishops, nuns, and even laymen and laywomen.\footnote{Contreni, 1992, chapter V, 87.} A common feature of these commissioned commentaries was their request for as many Fathers as possible, thus taking the form of florilegia.\footnote{Contreni, 1992, chapter V, 84 – 85, 90.} The Carolingian commentators, to varying degrees largely depending on the availability of sources, often blended their own comments with those of the Fathers, a practice that required judiciousness and acute editorial skills.\footnote{Contreni, 1992, chapter V, 85 – 89.} Some of the most prominent authors in the Carolingian empire from 800 – 850 wrote commentaries, using the Fathers as sources in the same way that Sedulius did: namely, Alcuin, Rhabanus Maurus, Haimo of Auxerre and John Scottus, a fellow Irishman. Claudius of Turin (fl. 810 – 827), for example, foreseeing the possible criticism that his excerpts were contradictory or even misrepresented his sources, noted in the margins the name of the source from which he excerpted and defended the practice as inherited by Bede.\footnote{MGH Epp. 4:592, 14 – 17: Et ne ab aliquibus praesumptor et temerarius diiudicarer, quod ab alieno armario sumpserim tela, uniuscuiusque doctoris nomen cum suis characteribus, sicut et beatus fecit presbiter Beda subter in paginis adnotavi. (Lest I be judged as a reckless or rash borrower, because I took arrows from an alien quiver, I beneath noted the name of each teacher with his own initials on the pages just as the blessed elder Bede did.) Cf. Contreni, 1992, chapter V, 81, 89, n. 67.} The process of compiling, excerpting, and simplifying earlier writers’ works into clear, simple Latin drew many comparisons, such as that of a medic who draws from many plants for one medicine, or that of an organ with many pipes producing one harmonious sound.
sound. To bring the production of Carolingian biblical commentaries into proper comparison with Sedulius, I offer Contreni, who has done extensive scholarly work on Carolingian biblical exegesis, both in survey and specific studies. He summarizes the period thus,

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

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

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

56 Contreni, 1992, chapter V, 88–89.
58 Contreni, 1992, chapter V, 82, especially n. 36.
60 Frede, 1997, 35*.
61 Frede, 1997, 35*.
circulated. Frede, following Bischoff, then offers the following evaluation of Sedulius’ method,

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

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

3 The Pedagogical Function of the Collectaneum

3.1 Servius

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

62 Frede, 1997, 35*-37*.
64 Baswell, 49–50.
65 Baswell, 49.
teacher,” and likely contributes to the commentary’s wide circulation throughout the insular regions and the Continent during the Carolingian era. In the margins of the large, square Carolingian manuscripts containing Virgil’s *Aeneid*, one often finds a full text of Servius: to know one was most likely to know the other.

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

### 3.2 Sedulius and Codex “(B)”

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

---

66 Goold, 115.
67 Baswell, 50. See, e.g. MS Paris, B.N., lat 10307.
68 The chapter below on Latinity further discusses the links between Sedulius and Servius with special respect to *formulae*, structure and formatting.
70 Savage, 1931, 407–408.
71 Savage, 1931, 408.
Murgia’s 1975 exhaustive publication of his investigations of the manuscripts of Servius and Servius auctus offers no substantive corrections to Savage’s findings regarding this manuscript, except the suggestion that it “is probably dated not much later than the mid-ninth century, rather than saec. IX ex.”73 An earlier dating to the middle of the ninth century coincides with Sedulius’ known dates in Liège (841–860). Yet, there is further evidence that links Sedulius to this Servian manuscript. The following study of the septem circumstantiae as a template for Sedulius’ Prologue will develop these additional connections.

3.3 The Seven Types of Circumstance

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

i) Connections to Donatus and Servius within Sedulius’ Prologue

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

---

73 Murgia, 38.
74 Prologue 1–6 (1, Frede): Antequam ad apostolica verba exponenda veniamus, quaedam prius axiomata hoc est principalia documenta praelibemus. Inprimis itaque illud sciendum est quod VII species sunt peristasios id est circumstantiae, sine quibus nullae quaestiones proponuntur nulla argumenta tractantur nullaque ars aut opus constare potest.
consideranda sunt… (“These things must be considered to explain authors…”); Sedulius writes, *Antequam ad apostolic verba exponenda veniamus, quaedam prius axiomata, hoc est principalia documenta, praelibemus.* As a matter of introduction, both authors assert that an examination of certain circumstances must precede textual interpretation. The two operative words in Servius’ sentence are *exponere* and *considerare.* Sedulius likewise employs *exponere* and uses the synonym *praelibare* for *considerare.* *Praelibare* is not a typical synonym for *considerare*; however, the probability that it here serves as a synonym is confirmed in Sedulius’ conclusion to the Prologue, where he specifically offers *praelibatis* as a synonym for *consideratis: His itaque VII circumstantiis consideratis vel praelibatis.…*

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

---

76 I do not offer translations for the longer quotations of Sedulius’ *Collectaneum* within the Introduction, because they are provided below.
78 Cf. Robertson, 6.
governs Donatus’ *Vita*, which is subsequently reemployed by Servius. This is achieved in three steps: first, by demonstrating that Sedulius was familiar with Donatus’ commentary on Virgil; secondly, by noting a reference to Donatus in Sedulius’ work *Tractatus in Donati Artem minorem*; and thirdly, by demonstrating how Donatus’ and Servius’ *seven topoi* in their *accessus* are directly accounted for in Sedulius’ presentation of the *septem circumstantiae*.

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

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

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

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

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

---

81 Donatus, *Commentarii in Eclogas*, 1.1–2.
Quoniam de auctore summatim diximus, de ipso carmine iam dicendum est, quod bifariam tractari solet, id est ante opus et in ipso opere. Ante opus titulus causa intentio. Titulus, in quo quaeritur, cuius sit, quid sit; causa, unde ortum sit et quare hoc potissimum sibi ad scribendum poeta praesumpserit; intentio, in qua cognoscitur, quid efficere conetur poeta. In ipso opere sane tria spectantur: numerus ordo explanatio.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

82 Servius, in Aeneidem, praef. 1–3.
Tot enim sunt materiae singularum epistolarum quot titulis singulae quaeque praenotantur epistolae, verbi gratia de virginibus, de viduis, de episcopis, de presbiteris, et reliqua quae singulatim prolixum est numerare.

Sedulius’ understanding of materia seemingly derives from Servius’ discussion of explanatio: sicut nunc dicturi theme proponimus (“just as now we propose to discuss the theme”).

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

ii) The History of the Septem Circumstantiae

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

83 Servius, in Aeneidem, praef. 101.
85 After the completion of this study, I found an article by D.W. Robertson, “A Note on the Classical Origin of ‘Circumstances’ in the Medieval Confessional”, in: Studies in Philology, vol. 43, No. 1 (1946), 6–14. I am gratified to have found this article as it confirms the basic trajectory of occurrences that I had independently taken. In this brief, eight page article he traces the use of the seven types of circumstance as a schema which became known to him through their appearance as a set of questions in the “famous twenty first canon of the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215,” which serves to assist confessors as they seek to judge the severity of crimes and “administer suitable remedies.” My work offers the following important differences: 1) I offer a more detailed analysis, 2) I trace their history back to Aristotle, whereas he thought it originated with Hermagoras of Temnos (first century BC), 3) I identify and demonstrate this schema as occurring in Augustine’s util. cred. and conf. (an important point of justification for its use in an exegetical and theological context), and 4) I demonstrate the reception of this tool with particular relevance for Sedulius. Though my work differs in these respects, Robertson’s study confirms my analysis of the appearance and importance of the septem circumstantiae within Cicero and later rhetoricians.
In his introduction to the critical text, Frede identifies the seven circumstances as an Irish grammatical tool and concedes their importance as an element of the Prologue. However, regarding the issues of the schema’s history and possible source, he concludes: “in unserer Ausgabe bleiben diese Eintragungen unberücksichtigt.” Due to the schema’s considerable importance for Sedulius, I will here trace its development in medieval rhetorical circles and relate how Sedulius’ employment of this trope is a reworking of specific medieval rhetores, and in so doing I will identify another link between Sedulius and the Servian manuscript, Codex (B).

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

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

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

88 Cf. Ostwald, 52.
89 Such is the way that Rackham and Ostwald translated “voluntary” (ἔκοψιν), “involuntary” (ἀκοψιν) and “non voluntary” (οὐχ ἔκοψιν) actions. They both offered comments explaining their decision to use these words. Cf. Rackham’s note on 116 and Ostwald’s note on 52.
Aristotle continues by providing an illustration for each of the above seven circumstances, and he further claims that if one does act in ignorance of any one of the seven, then that person is considered to have acted involuntarily. He concludes his comments on the circumstances by asserting that “[3] around what place or [4] in which time something happens”, and “[6] for the sake of what” are the two most important ones. We may deduce then that these circumstances function as a set of questions one ought to investigate before one can rightly judge the merits of an act. Aquinas cited Aristotle as the originator of this schema; however, no modern scholar that I am aware of, including Rackham, Ostwald, and Rowe and Broadie’s translations or commentary has heretofore noted the significance of this passage with regard to its later reception.

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

90 Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, III 1a.2–8. ἰσός οὖν ὁ σώματος ὑπάρχον διορίσθαι αὐτά, τίνα καὶ πόσα ἐστι, τίς τε ὅτι καὶ τί καὶ περὶ τί ἐν τίνι πράττει, ἐνίοτε δὲ καὶ τίνι, οἷον ἄργανῳ, καὶ ἐνικα ἐνεργοῖ, οἷον σωφρίνου καὶ χαίρων, οἷον χαῖρε καὶ σφόδρα. ἀπαντάν μὲν οὖν τά τινα υἱὸν τινὸς ἐν ἀνοσίας μη μανύμμενος. There are numerous acceptable translations available; however, I have used my own translation here and throughout the chapter (even for passages of Cicero and Quintilian, who also have acceptable translations available) so that the reader might more easily recognize the continuity between this passage and my translations of similar material, which appears in later Latin rhetorical writings, for which there are no available translations. The enumerations in brackets (done for the reader) are my own here and throughout all excerpts of passages on the seven types of circumstance which I treat.

91 Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, III 1a.18–19.
92 Simon and Obbink, 1558–1564.
93 A Greek rhetorician from Temnos (fl. ca. 150 B.C.E.). Though uninterested in stylistic matters, his rhetorical doctrines soon became a prominent source for later writers such as Cicero and Quintilian. Cf. Russell, 689.
94 Cicero, De Inventione, 1.6.8.
95 Cicero, De Inventione, 1.5.7.
Aristotle’s *Nichomachean Ethics*, is embedded throughout book one of *De Inventione*.

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

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

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

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

96 Cicero, *De Inventione*, 1.8.10.
97 This, *De Inventione*, 1.8.10, and all following translations of Cicero are my own. “Every matter, which has in itself any controversy positioned in speech or discussion, contains a question either of fact or name or type or of proceeding. That question, therefore, out of which a cause is born, we call the issue. The issue is the first conflict of causes having been brought forth by a defense of intention, in this way; ‘You did it;’ ‘No, I did not;’ or, ‘I did it lawfully.’”
98 Cicero, *De Inventione*, 1.9.12. “It is a controversy of type, when both what has been done and by what name the deed ought to be called is agreed and nevertheless it is questioned ‘how important’ and ‘of what type’ and ‘of what nature it is’, in this way: whether it be just or unjust, useful or useless, and all other circumstances, ‘in what’, ‘what type it is’, and ‘what has been done’ is questioned without any debate concerning the ‘name’ of the deed.”
He is not at this point defining or listing the circumstances as he does later, but merely points out that they must be considered. Though he only briefly alludes to a few circumstances here, one can nevertheless recognize the similarity of these questions with the circumstances listed by Aristotle. Specifically, Aristotle listed the two most important circumstances as the nature of the act itself and its consequential effect, κυριώτερα δ’ εἶναι δοκεῖ ἕν οἷς ή πράξις καὶ οὗ ἔνεκα (with ἕν οἷς ή πράξις referring to περὶ τί ἣ ἐν τίνι πράττει from IIII.a.4, which is circumstance [3] within the above translation), and Cicero here writes et omnia, in quibus, quale sit id, quod factum est. They are questions that inquire about the nature and physical setting of an act. They are points of reference which can verify the intention of an agent and ultimately help decide the merit of a deed: “whether just or unjust, useful or useless” etc.

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


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

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

99 A translation of this quote is given in the appendix under the appropriate heading.
of the agent and the opinion of the hearers. Thus, what I have enumerated as the seventh circumstance in Cicero represents Aristotle’s category of “how”.

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


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

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

101 One could perhaps argue that spatii satis in fact represents occasio and tempus idoneum represents tempus, but either way, a comparison of the two texts clearly shows that occasio and tempus are accounted for in those other two statements.
Quintilian, known more as a teacher and systematizer of rhetoric than a practitioner, also writes a list of circumstances very similar to Aristotle's and Cicero's in his work, *Institutio Oratoria* (*Inst. Orat.*). In the first instance he sets the circumstances in the larger context of “definite” and “indefinite” questions, which in principle is the same as both Aristotle and Cicero. Quintilian claims that before one can decide “whether or not ‘X’ ought to marry”, one must first decide if marriage is a desirable state. Thus, the circumstances are then introduced as a set of questions which help to ascertain information for the passing of judgment. The explicit reference comes up in the immediate context of defining a *causa*:


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

102 Apollodorus from Pergamum is the figurehead of the *Apollodorei* ("Apollodoreans"), whom Quintilian references at 2.11.2 and 3.1.18 within the *Inst. Orat*. Apollodorus is also noted by Suetonius as serving as a tutor for Augustus on the subject of elocution and that Apollodorus, despite being an old man at the time, accompanied Augustus to Apollonia (Suetonius, *De Vita Caesarum*, 89).
104 Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.*, 3.5.17–18. A translation of this quote is given in the appendix under the appropriate heading.
own comment that *negotium* equals περίστασις, which when translated directly into Latin is *circumstantia.*

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

107 Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.*, 4.2.53–55. A translation of this quote is given in the appendix under the appropriate heading.
He lists six circumstances after *rei*, thus bringing the total to seven. However, this list differs slightly from Cicero’s. This list does not include *modus* and *facultas*, but instead contains *causa* and *instrumentum* respectively. Unlike Cicero’s treatment of the circumstances in *De Inventione* 1.24.34–1.27.41, Quintilian never follows the list of circumstances with a series of questions or topics to investigate for each circumstance.

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

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


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

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

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

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


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

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

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

\textsuperscript{112} Marius Victorinus, \textit{explanationem in Ciceronis rhetoricae}, I.21.1–14 (CC 132). A translation of this quote is given in the appendix under the appropriate heading.
circumstance. Victorinus actually goes on to argue that Cicero in fact lists an eighth circumstance and names it opinio. This comment is based upon Victorinus’ understanding of the phrase si res... opinionem accommodabitur. This interpretation of Cicero is particularly revealing on several accounts. First, Victorinus includes the term modus in the list of seven, but Cicero does not use that term until De Inventione 1.24.34. By adding modus to the list, he must either say that it represents the opinio... clause or (as he does) that that clause is in fact an eighth circumstance. Also, his first description of the circumstances as “seven”, followed by his comment “but Cicero adds...”, suggests that the seven nouns and their correlating interrogative pronouns were, by this time, widely known and used as a schema or rhetorical tool and that their development over time most likely came from an understanding of reading De Inventione 1.21.29 in combination with De Inventione 1.24.34. Not that we would presume exaggeration by Victorinus, but these findings help confirm his statement found in the above excerpt, “all writers of academic disciplines have dealt with [the seven types of circumstance] and have embedded them in the precepts of their own academic disciplines.”

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


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

113 Quoting 1.21.29 of Cicero’s De Inventione.
114 Celentano and Giomini (eds.), vi.
115 J. Victor, Ars Rhetorica, (3, 16–27, Giomini). A translation of this quote is given in the appendix under the appropriate heading.
able to stand unless it contains the circumstances, which is similar to the arguments of both Cicero and Quintilian, who claim that the circumstances help make a narration credible. While J. Victor largely uses his own terminology, the most evident sign of dependence reveals a similarity not with Cicero or with Quintilian, but with Quintilian’s quotation of Apollodorus. It is Apollodorus who claims that a circumstance’s end is a *controversia* and that the circumstances are in fact a *congregatio* of people, places, times, etc. J. Victor does not offer a series of questions to ask, nor does he suggest what aspects of the *quis* or *quid*, etc., are to be explored as Cicero does in 1.34–41 and as do the later writers within the RLM.

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

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

---

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

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

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


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

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

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

---

\(^{118}\) Cicero, *De Inventione*, 1.24.34.

\(^{119}\) Smith, 181.

\(^{120}\) Halm, 102, 20–104, 31. A translation of this quote is given in the appendix under the appropriate heading.
non habet certam, nec inest aliqua certa circumstantia, id est nec locus nec tempus. In causa vero certa omnia sunt, unde quasi pars causae est propositum.121

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


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

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

121 Halm, 515, 10–15. A translation of this quote is given in the appendix under the appropriate heading.
122 Halm, 527, 7–20. A translation of this quote is given in the appendix under the appropriate heading.
iii) Identifying Sedulius’ Sources for the Septem Circumstantiae
Since we do not know which of these works Sedulius had available to him – he did not cite anyone explicitly as the source for the seven types of circumstance – this section of the study will compare Sedulius’ passage with the extant works mentioned above to determine, based on lexical similarities, which tradition in particular Sedulius was likely following.

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

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

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

---
124 Sedulius spells the genitive with an “i” *peristasios*, but Augustine spells it with an “e” *peristaseos*. Also, Augustine writes the word both in Greek script (but only when quoting Hermagoras) as well as the transliterated form, but Sedulius only uses the transliterated form.
veneno iste illum occidit. Cicero offers explanatory clauses such as these for all of the species of circumstances that he lists, as does Augustine. Neither Cicero nor Augustine qualify quomodo with the adverbs bene an male, stulte an sapienter, but they do both suggest ferro an veneno as possible weapons under the circumstance materia vel facultate.

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

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

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

ff. 143a-166b contain the Ars rhetorica of Fortunatianus, de dialectica and de rhetorica of St. Augustine, and the Ars rhetorica of Clodianus (cf. Hagen, codex Bern., præf., ii). From f. 167a to f. i86b: Carmina Horatii (incomplete); ff. 187a-188b contain excerpts from the Metamorphoses of Ovid; ff. 188b-194a excerpts from Bede’s History; ff. 194b-197b have various carmina (cf. Hagen, Carmina medii Aevi, pp. I ff.)… Quat. XVIII, with which the commentary of Servius ends, runs from f. 137 to f. 144, so that part of the quaternary holds some of the extraneous matter which follows (i.e., Alcuin’s rhetorica).

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

125 Augustinus, De Rhetorica, 7 (49, 1, Giomini).
In conclusion, Sedulius’ Prologue and application of the seven types of circumstance mirror the pedagogical approach of Donatus’ and Servius’ prefaces to their commentaries on Virgil’s *Aeneid*. The numerous inter-textual links and external connections between Sedulius and the work of Donatus and Servius suggest that Sedulius was not only familiar with their work but attempted to emulate their methodology in order to instruct his readers of the Pauline epistles in the same way that they had introduced Virgil. In this ecclesiastical context, the application of the seven types of circumstance serves as an early example of a critical approach to the New Testament based at least in part on the historical circumstances from which it was written. It reveals the extent to which Sedulius considered Scripture historical truth, but also the authority he grants to traditional ecclesiastical sources outside of Scripture, especially Augustine, whose promotion of a hermeneutic of trust, as in *util. cred.*, is emphasized through the application of the seven types of circumstance and the authority which they inherently lend to Paul, the author of the surveyed Scriptures. Additionally, Sedulius’ adaptation of quintessential classical schoolroom texts exposes a judicious scholarly temperament, a significant point, since some scholars contend that only during the Reformation did biblical studies truly emerge as an academic pursuit alongside devotional ones.  

3.4 Pedagogical Content

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

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

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

i) Marginalia

The first writer known to have included marginalia in his own text was Bede, who noted his patristic source in the margins of his Luke and Mark commentaries. His marginalia mark a pivotal point in the formation of a patristic canon, since he only used the marginal source-marks for Ambrose, Augustine, Gregory the Great, and Jerome, thus becoming the first writer to group these four together. Bede included the marginalia “lest it be said that I steal the words of those who have gone before me by offering them as my own.”

Marginalia thus became a common feature in many Carolingian commentaries and served much the same purpose as Bede’s; but in Carolingian society, where education was centered upon the study of the Bible, particularly patristic exegesis, they also functioned as a valuable pedagogical tool. When Alexander Souter first collated the extant manuscripts of Sedulius’ Collectaneum and eventually published an article detailing the sources of Sedulius, he believed that the marginalia were original to Sedulius. Frede, however, convincingly argues that this is not the case, as not only do some of the marginalia indicate the wrong source, but the abbreviations used vary, indicating multiple interpolators. Even though the marginalia do not date back to Sedulius himself, their existence in early copies indicates that the Collectaneum probably served a pedagogical function.

ii) References to Teachers and Students

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

---

131 Souter, 1917, 225–226.
132 Frede, 1997, 39* and 55*-57*.
134 Prologue, lines 140–145.
In Sedulius’ commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians, multiple expositions explicitly address or mention teachers and/or students. In some of these instances, the text necessitates an exegetical remark; however, in other cases the issue seems forced, such as when Sedulius addresses teachers and/or students as the audience of the Collectaneum. One specific example is Gal 3:1, where Sedulius excerpts from Pelagius’ commentary (64 – 65), the Clm 6235 (65 – 67), and adds his own comment (67 – 68). It is interesting to note here that in Augustine’s and Jerome’s exegesis (which Sedulius does not use in this instance, though we know that he has access to them based on other excerpts from these texts), each are concerned with the issue of why Paul called the Galatians foolish and neither mentions the dynamic of a teacher-student relationship. By using Pelagius, Sedulius takes issue with whether or not Paul should call someone “foolish,” since the Lord forbids such an action in Matthew 5:22. Next, using the Clm 6235, he concludes that such a comment is acceptable because Paul is correcting in a loving manner. Sedulius then inserts his own remark, *ius enim est magistris peccantes increpare discipulos* (“For it is the right of teachers to chide their erring disciples”). The verb *increpare* (“to chide”) is a stronger form of rebuke than *corripit* (“corrects”), which is used in line 66 for the justification of the *stulti* (“foolish”); but ultimately Sedulius turns the emphasis from correcting *more diligentis* (“in a manner of loving”) into an opportunity to affirm a certain right within a teacher-student relationship.

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

---

138 Frede, 523, III.67–68.
139 Rebenich, 24.
140 Doyle (tr.), 104, poem 4, line 13.
much to his community through his roles as chief bard, head of the library, and mediator with other centers of learning. The exegesis of Gal 6:6–8 thus provides biblical justification for his appeal to Hartgar for better accommodations. In poem 4 (24–28, 36–45), Sedulius compares his own dank, gloomy accommodations with those of Bishop Hartgar’s. After describing the fine halls of Hargar’s residence, Sedulius describes his own,

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

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

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

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

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

141 Doyle (tr.), 102.
142 Doyle (tr.), 110–11.
143 Doyle (tr.), 148.
Sedulius not only refers to himself as a *scriptor* ("author") and *musicus* ("musician"), i.e., "Orpheus reborn" (*alter Orpheus*), but the reference to himself as "an ox treading corn" (*sum bos triturans*) is almost certainly an allusion to 1 Timothy 5:17–18, "(17) The elders who rule well are to be considered worthy of double honor, especially those who work hard at preaching and teaching. (18) For the Scripture says, ‘You shall not muzzle the mouth of an ox while he is threshing [Vulgate reads, *non infrenabis os bovi trituranti*],’ and ‘The laborer is worthy of his wages.’" By using this interscriptural reference (*bos triturans* [Sedulius] / *os bovi trituranti* [Vulgate]), Sedulius characterizes himself as one who teaches and preaches, and who is therefore due fair compensation as required by the verses he echoes. Also, as we know from Eph 4:11, the role of a teacher must also encompass the role of a pastor and vice versa. Furthermore, the line Doyle translates as "I am your champion bearing wisdom’s arms" is another scriptural reference detailing another pertinent role which Sedulius plays. Doyle’s translation, however, obscures the reference as the Latin reads, *Sum uester miles sophiae praeditus armis* ("I am your soldier gifted with weapons of wisdom"). The military language (*miles* and *armis*) and the reference to wisdom probably allude to his work with Scripture, which is the sword of the Spirit (Ephesians 6:17, "And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God"), and are ultimately a metaphor for Sedulius’ role as a biblical scholar in that community. Thus, Sedulius characterizes himself as a poet, scholar, teacher, pastor, and biblical scholar, all of which justify his requests for material gifts and sustenance. Ultimately, Sedulius’ poetry (specifically his appeals in poems 4, 9 and 49 for better accommodations, food and wine) echoes the principles expounded in Eph 6:6–8; thus, it is not surprising to find such a high percentage of his own exegesis on these verses which are so relevant for his personal circumstances.

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

¹⁴⁴ Frede, 540, VIII.7–8.
¹⁴⁵ Frede, 541, VIII.24–25.
that is common to Sedulius. Retaining the voice of Paul, Sedulius interjects his own comment, which offers the biblical text as its own teaching voice, “YOU WILL THINK NOTHING ELSE. I.e., except for that which I teach through the letter.”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

146 See chapter on Latinity, below, for a further discussion of this stylistic feature.
147 Chazelle and Van Name Edwards, 3.
quia dies mali esse non possunt. Pelagius, whose work Sedulius partly copies, notes that humans, not days, are evil; however, Pelagius does not mention the literary term metonymy. For this, Sedulius borrows from Isidore’s, *Etymologies*. That Sedulius mirrors Pelagius’ work but also excerpt from Isidore’s *Etymologies* reveals his knowledge of the presence of a literary trope within the biblical text, if not its name as well.

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

**iv) Elementary Ecclesiastical and Theological Topoi**

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

---

148 Isidore and Jerome both commonly serve as a source for linguistic and philological matters for Irish commentators (Cf. McNally, 1958, 396).
149 The two usually used are the literal and allegorical (or tropological). Cf. Laistner, 303.
150 I discuss this quotation further in the chapter below, “The Reception of Augustine”.
151 De Lubac identifies “allegorical” as encompassing the other three terms under a “spiritual understanding” of a text (De Lubac, vol. 1, 135).
152 For De Lubac’s discussion on Augustine’s treatment of the four-fold method in *util. cred.* see vol. 1, 123–132, and for discussion on Cassianus and his role in the development of this hermeneutical tool, see vol. 1, 132–137.
imperfect spirits reside and 2) the purer ether) with a tradition in Judaism which
distinguished between angels and demons, with the latter residing in the air.153
Thus in Ephesians 2:2 Paul describes “this air” as hosting the ruler of this
present age of this world, whose spirit works even now among the sons of
disobedience. Sedulius’ commentary, then, receiving Pelagius, refers to “this air”
as host not to the devil alone but also his subordinates. Furthermore, the first
phrase in III.7, *Id est, diabolus* (“I.e., the devil”), is Sedulius’ own explanatory
phrase to aid readers’ understanding of the ensuing commentary, taken from
Pelagius, which emphasizes the plural aspect of the singular noun *principem*.
The addition of the minor phrase by Sedulius is a further demonstration of his
concern for the elementary reader in theology.

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

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

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

4 Latinity

4.1 Sedulius and Other Carolingian Pauline Commentators

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

153 TDNT s.v. ἀνέρ.
155 Heil, 76.
156 Heil, 77.
to a gloss — may impact conclusions on matters of Latinity, reception and function. Heil, e.g., characterizes Sedulius’ Collectaneum as a “gloss-commentary” and claims that his “brevity and gloss-style” give it a “harshness of tone” and make it “appear especially anti-Jewish.” While a sympathetic reader of Heil may concede the description of the Collectaneum as a gloss-commentary on account of its often brief and dogmatic comments, nevertheless, one must note that glosses comprised a unique genre with their own technical meaning. One ninth century author defines glossa as providing the sensus verbi, and the content of a gloss generally draws on geographical, zoological, metrological, botanical, historical, legal, and etymological learning in order to define a given word. Contreni notes in his introduction to the Glossae divinae historiae that “the characteristic of the glosses is the almost complete absence of allegorizing or other methodologies associated with the higher study of Scripture.” The following are sample entries from Theodore and Hadrian’s gloss on the Pentateuch and Sedulius’ Collectaneum:

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


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

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

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


159 Contreni, 2003, 22.

160 Frede, 1997, 35*.
within his Prologue and commentaries. The inclusion of Irish characteristics, but the avoidance of Irish diction within Sedulius’ *Collectaneum*, is best explained by noting that it is a product of a series of phenomena: 1) the spread of Christianity in Ireland and the development of monastic centers; 2) the scholastic and literary environs in which one would have learned Latin; 3) the rise of the Carolingian empire with its aims of a *renovatio* of education towards a Christian end; and 4) the Viking attacks and general instability among the insular regions, which precipitated Sedulius’ migration into Liège. Enter into these broad strokes the details that 1) Servius’ fourth century commentary on the *Aeneid* enjoyed wide circulation in the Carolingian empire and particularly in Ireland,¹⁶¹ 2) scholars were afforded the opportunity by libraries of the Carolingian empire to refer directly to patristic sources, and 3) there was a prevailing need for pedagogical commentaries on Scripture.

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

4.2 Hiberno-Latin Content and Diction

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

---
¹⁶¹ Cf. Stok, 15–22.
¹⁶² It must not be forgotten that the macro organizational structure is fundamentally dependent upon Pelagius’ Pauline commentaries as discussed below, in “The Reception of Pelagius”.
and their first acquaintance with it was via a school grammar.” The learning of Latin in a literary environ, specifically through exposure to grammars and commentaries, helps explain the Irish predilection for listing and enumerating, allegorical interpretations of numbers, obscure historical minutiae, and general interest in linguistic matters – particularly the “Tres Linguae Sacrae.”

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

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

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

163 Löfstedt, 165.
165 Bischoff, 1991, 86.
Sedulius’ reference to the eighth day as the resurrection day of the Lord is based on the Jewish calendar, where Sunday is the first day of the week and Saturday (the Sabbath) is the seventh; therefore, resurrection Sunday is the eighth day of the week. Thus ten letters, representing the Decalogue, which represents the Old Testament, and eight churches, representing the resurrection day of the Lord, underscores Paul’s implicit harmonization of the two testaments.

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


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

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

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

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

None of the other three major sources for his commentary on Galatians (Jerome, Augustine and Pelagius) offer any similar significance for the number fifteen. Jerome does offer an allegorical interpretation of the number fifteen, but it is altogether different from Sedulius’ as Jerome locates its significance with the fifteen songs in the Psalter and fifteen steps which a righteous person must
take to sing praises to God in his courts.\textsuperscript{166} Sedulius’ disregard for the exegesis of Augustine and Pelagius demonstrates his affinity for this hermeneutical construct, and the recourse to his previous allegorical interpretation of the numbers seven and eight demonstrates a conscientious attempt at consistency within his \textit{Collectaneum}.

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

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{166} Hieronymus, \textit{Commentarii in epistolam Pauli ad Galatas}, 1:18b, 7–9.
\textsuperscript{167} Löfstedt, 169; Bischoff, 85–86.
\textsuperscript{168} Fl. 742; \textit{Epistola XLIX}. Bonifaci\textit{us Zachariae}, PL 89, 0746D.
\textsuperscript{169} Ca. 780–856; \textit{Enarrationum in Epistolas Beati Pauli}, PL 112, 0447 A.
\textsuperscript{170} Fl. 960; PL 134, 0586 A.
\textsuperscript{171} Elliot, §2.1.
\textsuperscript{172} Cf. Ewert, 108 and Metzger, 141–142.
After this [referring to the Septuagint] Aquila made the second edition, Theodotion and Symmachus edited the third and fourth, both Jewish proselytes; but Origen found a fifth and sixth edition and compared it with the other editions mentioned above. Thus only these people translated the Sacred Scriptures from Hebrew into Greek.

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

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

Also commonly noted is the emphasis that Hiberno-Latin commentators place on the biblical languages of Hebrew, Greek and Latin within their exegesis. Robert McNally in his seminal article, “‘Tres Linguae Sacrae’ in Early Irish Bible Exegesis”, traces the use of these languages in Irish exegesis of the early middle ages. He asserts that the Irish, largely through the linguistic work of Jerome and Isidore of Seville, demonstrated a great concern for philological exegesis. These three biblical languages held a profound mystical meaning for the Irish as they were the three languages written on the cross of Christ and for
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that reason deemed the *tres linguae sacrae*. McNally claims, “[i]t is not an Irish invention, though the repeated recourse to Hebrew, Greek, and Latin in the exegesis of Scripture is peculiar to Hiberno-Latin Bible commentators.”175 This repeated recourse certainly proves true in Sedulius’ *Collectaneum*, as he refers to all three throughout. Greek is referenced three times in the Prologue (42, 47, 84), three times in Gal (1:16, 3:1, 3:27), and twice in Eph (2:3, 4:28). A matter explicitly concerning Latin linguistics or the Latin version of Scripture occurs twice in the Prologue (37, 129), four times in Gal (2:5, 5:8, 5:9, 5:19), and twice in Eph (1:10, 4:28). Hebrew is only referenced five times (Prologue 41, 46; Gal 3:17, 4:6; Eph 4:28). The most notable use of the *tres sacrae linguae* occurs in Eph 4:28, where Sedulius, receiving Jerome, mentions the translation of the word “devil” in all three languages (585, XVIII.21–586, 25, Frede): Diabolus est Grecum verbum, quod Latine dicitur ‘criminator’. Lingua vero Ebraica ‘Satanas’ appellatur adversarius sive contrarius, et ab apostolo Belial, id est ‘absque iugo’, quod de collo suo Dei eiecerit servitutem; quem Aquila ‘apostata’ transtulit.

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

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

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

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

---

175 McNally, 396.
backgrounds, with simple Latin serving as the baseline for teaching the Pauline letters. Only a single trace of Irish diction appears in Sedulius’ commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians: the presence of *more* as an introduction to a comparison or explanatory clause.

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

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

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

### 4.3 Formatting

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

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

---

\(^{179}\) Herren and Brown, 12.  
case or personal verbal voice as used in the biblical lemma; and 5) guide words such as aliter, aut, sive, vel and item.

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

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

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

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

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

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

**ii) Formulae Used for Explaining**

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

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

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

Sedulius uses these features prominently and effectively. It allows him to make a point succinctly without repeating words or superfluously introducing his comments, as the example from his entry for Gal 3:14 demonstrates: *UT POLLICITATIONEM SPIRITUS reliqua. Quae per Joel omni carni promissa est, id est, universe generi humano, ut: Effundam de Spiritu meo super omnem carnem.*

Alcuin, e.g., does not utilize this practice often and may thus repeat the phrase to which his immediate comment pertains, as occurs in his commentary for Titus 1:6–7:

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

**IF ANY MAN IS WITHOUT CRIME, THE HUSBAND OF ONE WIFE; HAS FAITHFUL CHILDREN, NOT ACCUSED OF EXTRAVAGANCE, OR SUBMISSIVE TO SIN. FOR A BISHOP MUST BE WITHOUT CRIME, AS THE STEWARD OF GOD: For first, let him be without crime...**
The recitation of the entire verse, and in this case two verses, requires that he first address the phrase about which he is immediately concerned: *Primum enim sine crimine sit*.... The necessity to repeat a phrase is what Sedulius’ employment of a relative pronoun effectively eliminates.

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

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

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

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

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

The use of these latter two features occasionally makes Sedulius’ commentary visibly similar to biblical glosses of the same time period. These formatting structures are intermixed with conventional commentary entries resulting in a brief composition, but one whose content mirrors the interpretative work of comprehensive commentaries.
Presenting alternative and supplemental interpretations: Use of Sive:, Vel:, Aliter:, Aut:, Item:

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

182 For further discussion of Sedulius’ reception of sources, see pp. 73–75 below.
183 The exceptions occur in Gal 1:16 and Eph 5:30, inclusions which are by Sedulius.
184 Cf. below, 59–62, for further discussion regarding Sedulius’ penchant for simplifying the syntax of his sources.
VTINAM ABSCIDANTVR! **Hoc est**, utinam a malo in bonum conuertantur! **Vel:** Vtinam totis potius uirilibus suis castrentur, qui modicam corporis partem circumcidi praedicant! **Aliter:** Vtinam aliqua uindicta tales a uobis penitus separentur, ne uos ultra conturbent!

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

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

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

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

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

185 Claudius of Turin, PL 104, Col. 0865D.
are called senseless, as they move from greater to lesser matters in that they began in a spiritual manner, and they near the end in a fleshly manner; or on the other hand, each province has its own characteristics…

Similarly Alcuin writes,

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

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

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

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

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

¹⁸⁶ PL 100, Col. 1014D.
interpretation, either by the same source, or more often, a different author. An example of Servius’ employment of this formula follows:


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

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

The above excerpt also demonstrates how Servius employs aut, vel or Sive… vel. Servius typically pairs aut with aut, or vel with vel, or sive with vel, but like Sedulius, they serve as formulaic guide words indicating various possible interpretations or meanings. Item: is a guide word commonly appearing in Sedulius’ commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians, whose occurrence anticipates an interpretation which buttresses the previous explanation and often signifies a new source. The following is a typical example (from Sedulius’ entry for Eph 1:9; Frede, 557, 67–72),

Inter propositum et praedistinationem hoc interest, quod praedistinatio est alicuius rei praefiguratio multo ante in mente eius, qui distinat quod futurum sit, propositum uero, cum uicina sit machinatio et pene cogitationem sequatur effectus. Item: Praedistinatio est gratiae praeparatio, gratia uero est ipsa donatio.

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

188 Sedulius does occasionally use Aliter: precisely as Servius does, i.e., to indicate an alternative expression of the same meaning elsewhere in Paul’s writing cf. Eph 5:15, where Sedulius writes, “Alternatively: Carefully, i.e., discerning good and evil.” “Discerning good and evil” is a partial quotation of Hebrews 5:14.
Because Sedulius’ explanations are often brief, the employment of *Item* in such a manner is an anomaly among the extant Carolingian Pauline commentators. The other five commentators often included exhaustive comments per lemma; therefore, they needed no verbal marker, such as *Item*, to signify a supplemental comment. There is an alternative function of *Item*: in Sedulius’ *Collectaneum*, which is to cite a parallel passage of Scripture. The other Carolingian commentators on the Pauline epistles share this practice, though again with less brevity, e.g., in Claudius’ commentary on Titus, he writes *Item alio loco*, before citing a passage from 2 Corinthians 5:21.

Not surprisingly, Sedulius’ employment of *Item* mirrors Servius’. Servius uses *item* to cite an intratextual example of his argument where *aliter* references a parallel passage or theme of a given line, *item* is employed with particular reference to his own commentary.\(^{189}\) These words might be translated in Servius’ commentary as “elsewhere” (*aliter*) and “likewise” (*item*). The use of *item* occurs throughout Servius’ commentary, but one example is found in 1.9.5–6:

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

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

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

### 4.4 Linguistic Style

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

---

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

190 Sidwell, 2.
the distinctive elements represented by the various sources, or if he alters their syntax, vocabulary and orthography according to the conventions of his own time period. Specifically, the construction of indirect statements and indirect questions, the change in use and meanings of prepositions, the substitution of vowels, and the development of new words are common points of divergence. As a control, I will compare the constructions used by the sources to lines which are specifically attributable to Sedulius.

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

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

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

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

ii) Orthographical Matters

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

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

iii) Simplification

Claudius of Turin defended his simplified style by quoting Augustine’s doct. 4.11.26, In lectione enim divina non est amanda verba, sed veritas.\(^\text{193}\) The phrase Alcuin used to describe the composition of his commentary on John is cautissimo plane stilo.\(^\text{194}\) Likewise, Rabanus Maurus, in a letter-preface accompanying his commentary on Chronicles, wrote:

\(^{192}\) Frede, 14*-16*.
\(^{193}\) Claudius of Turin, letter-preface to the commentary on Genesis, MGH Epp. 4:590, 33–34.
\(^{194}\) Alcuin, letter-preface to the commentary on John, MGH Epp. 4:357, 13.
Non enim longos florentesque tractatus, in quibus plausibilis ludit oratio, sed commentarios in divinas historias scribere decrevi, quorum officium est preterire manifesta, obscura disserere. 195

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

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

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

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

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

---

196 Hieronymus, De viris illustribus, 5.10.84.
simplifies it by moving *sermone* to follow *proprio*. Slight changes such as these occur throughout Sedulius’ *Collectaneum*, and particularly in his commentaries.

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

…*simul ostenditur Galatas, accepto post fidem sancto spiritu, dona habuisse viurtutum id est, prophetiam, genera linguarum, morborum curationes, et caetera, quae ad Corinthios in donis spiritualibus enumerantur.*

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

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

"OPERATVR VIRTVTES. Ostendit Galatas accepto per fidem Spiritu sancto dona habuisse viurtutum, id est, profetiam et genera linguarum."

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

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

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

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

---

198 CC 141, 305, *hom. in evang*. 34.7.  
199 CC 141, 305, *hom. in evang*. 34.7.  
200 CC 141, 305, *hom. in evang*. 34.7.
simplifies the presentation by moving the phrase *Sive: Christi*, so that the reader may more easily follow the flow of the argument.

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

5 Theological and Ecclesiastical Issues

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

5.1 Baptism

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

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

\(^{201}\) Keefe, 2002, 2–5.

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

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

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

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

---

204 See Ridderbos, 44–90, who refers to it as a fundamental structure, and also Beker, 29–53.
two terms, sanctus (“holy”) and immaculatus (“unstained”). By claiming that babies are immaculatus and nevertheless do not have sanctitas, because holiness is achieved through will and zeal, Sedulius, receiving Jerome, seems to deny (as mentioned above) the doctrines of original sin and infant baptism. Jerome, however, himself defends the doctrine of original sin in his Dialogus contra Pelagianos (ca. 415), where he follows the teachings of Didymus and holds that original sin is transmitted through the physical act of procreation. In that dialogue (CC 80, 1.23.35), Jerome says baptismum uetera peccata concedit, nouas virtutes non tribuit (“baptism annuls old sins, (but) does not bestow new virtues”). In light of this passage of Jerome, one can better understand Sedulius’ exegesis of Eph 1:4 and assume his acceptance of Jerome’s distinctions. Thus Jerome’s and ultimately Sedulius’ juxtaposition of babies, qui integri sunt corpore (“who are corporally pure”), with the actions of will and zeal as necessary for holiness indicates an emphasis on voluntary participation towards achieving holiness in the present life. Babies are called unstained (immaculatus), because they are not willfully participating in sin (n.b., Jerome’s specific qualification of babies as “corporally pure”), which does not, however, exclude them from the stain of original sin, since within this example Jerome is merely emphasizing their inability to develop neither virtues nor vices.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

5.2 Jewish-Christian Relations

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

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

206 Cf. Flannery, 80–88; Glick, 43–59; Bachrach, 104–119; Cutler and Cutler, 88.
207 Flannery, 88.
208 This is the departure point for Malkiel’s summative essay, 55–83.
209 Malkiel, 55–83.
210 Malkiel, 55.
211 Bachrach, 114–116; Malkiel, 61. The annals of Saint Bertin are anti-Jewish reports written either by Bishop Prudence of Troyes, 835–861, or Archbishop Hincmar of Rheims, 861–882. The latter’s known anti-Jewish activities make him the more probable author.
212 Cf. Glick, 32; Flannery, 88; Bachrach, 132.
that the thrust of conciliar legislation was aimed at protecting Christians from Jewish missionary activity and at eliminating Judaizing and Jewish customs followed by Christians."

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

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

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

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

213 Bachrach, 132.

214 Malkiel, 57, notes, “No new data are offered; on the contrary, my point is that the familiar, traditional sources have yet to receive careful scrutiny in the context of the ‘harbinger’s thesis’.”
Per the historical context of Galatians and Ephesians, and even the Prologue which provides an introduction to Paul and his writings, these instances reflect a varied portrayal of Jews and Judaism. There are a number of references in which Sedulius affirms Judaism as a blessed nation with which God has a covenantal relationship, i.e., Gal 3:8, 4:26 and Eph 2:13. Gal 3:26 asserts the equality of both Jews and Gentiles, as does Eph 2:15, 3:1, 3:3 and 3:9. Gal 6:12 highlights the Jews as the ones persecuting Paul, but this reference, as with the others denoting the Jews’ blessed status and equality with Gentiles, reflects Paul’s own concerns as revealed in the scriptural text.

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

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

---
²¹⁵ Martyn, 282–289.
and therefore would have served as an ideal medium to plant seeds of anti-Semitic thought among fellow clergy; but it did not. While further evidence may surface to the contrary within other writers of the same time, it is safe to conclude that there are no indications from the instances listed above that Sedulius employed anti-Semitic thought within his Prologue or commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians. This conclusion does not in the end differ much from Heil’s, who provides a study of ninth century Pauline exegetes, nevertheless some of his arguments require revision.

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

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

As discussed above in the chapters on Sedulius’ Latinity and the pedagogical function of his Collectaneum, his “short, non-discursive phrases” are a product of his aims and the genre within which he is operating and therefore ought not to be anachronistically misinterpreted as indicating a “harshness of tone”. 217

Secondly, Heil draws his examples from Sedulius’ commentary on Galatians, a letter which has historically been interpreted as Paul’s defense of his apostleship and against teachers who claim that the Galatians must follow Jewish practices. 218 Furthermore, Sedulius’ comment in Gal 1:10 is not tangential to Paul’s argument, but one that is congruent with it as understood by modern commentators. 219 This comment, thus, reflects more Sedulius’ historical sensibilities, than any supposed anti-Semitism.

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

216 Heil, 90.
217 Heil, 90.
218 Esler, 69 – 92; Longenecker, lxxviii-xcix; Dunnam, 12 – 13.
219 Esler, 118 – 126; Longenecker, 18 – 19; Dunnam, 22 – 25.
220 Heil, 92 – 93.
221 Heil, 90 – 93.
Carolingian debates concerning the trinity may be traced to the famous double procession, or filioque clause represented in the Athanasian Creed and the amended Nicene Creed.\(^{222}\) The phrase filioque was added to the Nicene Creed by the Third Council of Toledo in 589: *Credo in Spiritum Sanctum qui ex patre filioque procedit* (“I believe in the Holy Spirit who proceeds from the Father and Son”).\(^{223}\) Though widely accepted in the West, it was not officially added to the liturgy until 1017, an adoption which ultimately led to the schism of 1054. The Eastern theologians did not accept the assertion that the Holy Spirit proceeded from the Father and the Son, but the Father alone, who they claimed is the principal being.\(^{224}\) Alcuin wrote a polemical work defending the clause in 804,\(^{225}\) and then shortly thereafter an event occurred further heightening the debate. In 808 Frankish monks, who were stationed in Jerusalem, sang the amended Nicene Creed, as was their custom and the accepted practice in the West.\(^{226}\) When the Greeks heard the Frankish monks singing the Nicene Creed with the amended phrase filioque, they accused them of heresy. The monks then alerted Pope Leo III of the dispute and pointed to verse 23 of the Athanasian Creed in their defense, which reads: *Spiritus sanctus a Patre et Filio, non factus nec creatus nec genitus sed procedens* (“The Holy Spirit is from the Father and the Son, not made nor created nor begotten but proceeding.”).\(^{227}\) The Pope then notified Charlemagne, who took decisive action by ordering Theodulf of Orleans to study the matter and report to the council at Aix-la-Chapelle (809). Theodulf, in true Carolingian fashion, created a *collectaneum* of the Latin Fathers’ writings in support of the emendation and read it to the Frankish bishops congressed at the council, which consequently confirmed the added clause.

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

\(^{222}\) Haugh, 15.

\(^{223}\) Cf. Kelly, 1964, 22, 37, 58.

\(^{224}\) Haugh, 17–19.

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

\(^{226}\) I here follow Lagarde and Lagarde, 427–429.

\(^{227}\) Kelly (ed. and tr.), 1964, 19.

\(^{228}\) Kelly, 1964, 45.
Constantinople (if he even read them), who inveighed against the Latin church and subsequently caused a schism in 867. While the acceptance of the creed in the West into the mass was delayed for various reasons, its fundamental doctrine, first developed by Augustine, was largely accepted. It is in the midst of this heated debate that Sedulius composed his *Collectaneum*.

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


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

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

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

229 Kelly, 1964, 80–90.
230 I think Augustine also served as a source for this clause and Sedulius’ understanding of the verse, but it is Pelagius’ words he most closely follows.
231 Plumer, 165 n. 102.
nec se exinaniret formam servi accipiens, non esset mediator dei et hominum, quia
ipsa trinitas unus deus est, eadem in tribus, patre et filio et spiritu sancto, deitatis
aetermitate et aequalitate constante.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

232 Many scholars cite Augustine as the original developer of trinitarian thought for the
Latin church. See Kelly, 1964, 90, and more recently Ayres' forthcoming work, Augustine
and the Trinity.
This exposition by Pelagius highlights the omnipotent and salvific power of God. The important matter to note here is how Pelagius understands the prepositions. He takes them to signify various attributes of the one God and Father, but does not extend to them any trinitarian meaning.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

233 Heine (tr.), 171.
active attempt at furthering the western ideals of the trinity at a time when East and West sharply disagreed regarding this profound, and divisive, issue.

6 Studies in Reception

6.1 Sources

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

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

234 I tabulated these numbers from the footnotes in Frede’s critical text (1997) of the Prologue and commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians.
235 See pp. 8–11 above for the general overview and development of *collectanea*.
236 Rosemann, 17–19.
reputation and mobility as a scholar; however, Sedulius draws mostly from commentarial works for his exegetical *Collectaneum*. As tables 1 and 2 demonstrate, Sedulius does draw from other genres of work, but again, the majority of content derives from commentaries. For this reason, the nature of exegetical *collectanea* is different from *collectanea* on certain theological issues. The latter have an agenda of specific theological purpose, whereas Sedulius’ agenda is to draw out the best exegesis (from the sources he has available) for each verse. Thus Sedulius’ *Collectaneum* mirrors early Latin commentators in that they lacked a systematic theological approach and instead sought to explain words or phrases of the biblical text, verse by verse. On this matter, it is helpful to note Jerome’s defense against allegations of being an Origenist. Jerome claimed to admire Origen’s exegesis, but maintained that his admiration did not extend to Origen’s doctrines. Implicit in this defense is an important distinction in early biblical commentators between biblical exegesis and theological doctrines. Only occasionally with the early biblical commentators, and subsequently Sedulius, are larger theological issues drawn out within their exegesis. Nonetheless, one can, through Sedulius’ editing of certain key passages (which I will demonstrate below), detect his theological tendencies on certain issues.

i) *Frede’s Apparatus Fontium*

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

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

---

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

238 See p. IX–X above.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Regarding example three, Sedulius’ line 34 seems to be a clear borrowing as does the beginning of line 35. Sedulius’ rendering of Augustine’s final phrase, id est ut neque mundus mihi nocere possit neque ego de mundo aliquid cupiam into neque concupiscam is a typical maneuver by Sedulius for the purposes of abbreviating and simplifying the content within his Collectaneum.
ii) Method of Citation
Sedulius intratextually cites seven names of biblical scholars and commentators within the Prologue and commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians, but he never mentions Pelagius, whom he copies most.²⁴⁰ Sedulius may refrain from mentioning Pelagius, despite summarily using him as a source, because Pelagius was not in good standing with the Church and mentioning his name could have devalued Sedulius’ work. This reason is not completely satisfactory, however, since Sedulius mentions Origen three times within the text of the Prologue.²⁴¹ Rather, the reason is likely connected to Sedulius’ method in composing his *Collectaneum*. The nature of an exegetical *collectaneum* on the Pauline epistles dictates that Sedulius will likely draw from many exegetical works on the Pauline epistles, as he does. Thus, the citations of authors or works are actually the exceptions. All of the explicitly cited authors or works within Sedulius’ commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians fit into two categories: either the cited material is merely retained in Sedulius’ borrowing of another source as occurs with his citation of Eusebius and Origen via Rufinus and Aquila via Jerome; or, the author or work employed is exceptional. For example, Sedulius’ entry for Eph 2:15 is expected to derive from some other commentary on Ephesians 2:15. However, for that verse Sedulius unexpectedly draws from Jerome’s commentary on Habakkuk, so he alerts the reader by writing, “[l]ikewise in the exposition of Habakkuk”. Similarly, for Eph 4:13, Sedulius draws from Augustine’s *cit.*, and therefore cites that work before quoting from it. Therefore, since all of Sedulius’ borrowings of Pelagius within Galatians or Ephesians come from Pelagius’ commentaries on Galatians or Ephesians, then the use of Pelagius is never exceptional and does not warrant an explicit citation.

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

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

²⁴⁰ The authors mentioned by name are Jerome (Prologue 19, 35, 45; Gal 2:15), Ambrose (Prologue 57; Gal 4:25), Origen (Prologue 152), Augustine (Prologue 200; Gal 2:15; Eph 4:13), Clement “the disciple of Peter” (Prologue 85), Eusebius (Gal 1:19), and Aquila (Eph 4:28).
²⁴¹ Prologue 152–170 (7–8, Frede).
²⁴² My own studies affirm this opinion, which is also held by Frede, 1997, 37*. 
Jerome, who wrote commentaries on Philemon, Galatians, Ephesians, and Titus (in that order) sometime around 386–388, was the first of the three to compose commentaries on the Pauline letters.\footnote{Heine, 7.} While dissenters as to Jerome’s effectiveness and utility within the Latin tradition of theology exist, his attention to historical, archaeological and especially linguistic issues in exposition remain as his renowned strengths.\footnote{Campenhausen, 180–181.}

Augustine then, with Jerome and others\footnote{For a discussion of the influences on Augustine for the writing of his commentary on Galatians, cf. Plumer, 7–59.} as his predecessors, wrote his commentary on Galatians between the writing of his two seminal hermeneutical works \textit{util. cred.} (ca. 391) and \textit{doctr. chr.}, which was begun around 396–397 and completed in 427. Once Augustine had read Jerome’s commentary on Galatians, and while he was composing his own commentary on the epistle, Augustine wrote to Jerome (ca. 394, \textit{ep}. 28 in the Augustine corpus and \textit{ep}. 56 in the Jerome corpus) concerning Jerome’s exposition of the Peter and Paul confrontation mentioned in Galatians 2:14 ("But when I saw that they were not straightforward about the truth of the Gospel, I said to Cephas in the presence of all, ‘If you being a Jew, live like the Gentiles and not like the Jews, how is it that you compel the Gentiles to live like Jews?’"). This letter was the first of many between the two men for the next ten years. Their correspondence contains florid complements and encouragements each to the other as well as points of disagreement on theological and doctrinal issues. Despite many of their differences, they were united in their fight against Pelagius. Their unity of mind on this matter is revealed in Jerome’s dialogue \textit{Against the Pelagians} written in 417, when he writes (III.19, tr. Fremantle),

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

Though von Campenhausen claims that “the modern reader must conclude with astonishment that Jerome had not the slightest understanding of the real issue in the controversy, and stood much nearer in his attitude in the matter to
Pelagius than to his alleged confederate Augustine!”, nonetheless Jerome himself believed that he was aligning with Augustine as revealed in the above excerpt and stood at odds with the Pelagians.

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

6.3 Reception of Jerome

This study is especially relevant in view of the recent surge in scholarship on both the life and Rezeptionsgeschichte of Jerome, which reveal a man of embattled personal relationships alongside a long history of critical onlookers. His once close friend, Rufinus, accused him of heresy. Augustine, perhaps the most famous of his contemporaries, often vigorously disagreed with him. Luther too offers scathing remarks about Jerome and modern scholars are rarely any gentler. A recent publication, Jerome of Stridon, takes issue with a number of long standing presuppositions surrounding Jerome and even his reception. While this erudite collection of essays offers profound revisions of previous scholarship, it does not address the historical anomaly of Jerome’s sterling reputation within the Carolingian empire. At no point in history does Jerome enjoy a more unbridled appreciation of scholars than that which occurred in the Carolingian empire. The producers of the Vivian Bible (844–851), or “first Bible of Charles the Bald,” included scenes from the life of Jerome alongside two New Testament scenes, two Old Testament scenes, scenes from the life of Paul, a picture of David playing the harp, and lastly a dedicatory scene of the Abbot Vivian giving the Bible to Charles the Bald. Honoring Jerome amongst
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246 Campenhausen, 169.
247 De Bruyn, 10–11.
248 De Bruyn, 2–7.
249 See Campenhausen, 129. There he writes “Alongside his brilliant qualities, the weaknesses of his character were always manifest. This was already seen by his contemporaries, and to this day his biographers have not found it easy to narrate his life without polemic or apologetic prejudice.” One biographer, Kelly, writes, “It is a pity that his vanity made him claim to be even more widely read than he was, and that his tendency to rush work made him slipshod and careless.” Kelly, 334.
250 Hinks, 112.
251 Cf. Hinks (above, note 1), 113.
actual characters of the Bible may seem surprising to modern readers, but as McNally claims, “By far the most influential book in the Middle Ages was the Bible, translated by St. Jerome into Latin and known throughout Europe as the Vulgata Latina.” Jerome is often praised for his erudite translation of the Bible, but a study of Sedulius’ reception of Jerome should shed additional light on the enormous extent to which Jerome was valued as an expositor of the Bible at a time in which its study impacted virtually every area of life. I shall also contrast Sedulius’ reception of Jerome with that of Augustine and Pelagius.

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

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

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

252 McNally, 7.
253 See the introductory paragraph to Sedulius’ commentary on Ephesians, (8, 182–186, Frede).
254 I calculated these figures using the footnotes in Frede’s critical text.
circumstance. The first circumstance is *quis*, i.e., the person, so in line 19 Sedulius begins his presentation of information and here uses Jerome as an historical authority (2, Frede), *Itaque Hieronimus de Paulo sic dicit*: (“Thus Jerome says about Paul the following:”). The next thirteen lines are a direct quote from Jerome’s *De viris illustribus* (ill.) and contain a mixture of scriptural and non-scriptural traditions. Jerome begins his biography of Paul by relating the scriptural materials, but then adds non-scriptural traditions for further information. Jerome differentiates between the two in his presentation of this material with the sentence, *Et quia in Actibus Apostolorum plenissime de eius conversatione scriptum est, hoc tantum dicam*… (“And because a most full account of his life has been written in the Acts of the Apostles, I only say this…”). Sedulius omits this sentence, and thereby the distinction, and thus apparently presents all of the material on equal ground as known historical truths with the first words of line 32, *His praecognitis* (“these things being known”). This example reveals the extent to which he considered Scripture as historical truth, but equally the authority he grants to Jerome.

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

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

255 HI *ill. 5.1–8* (80–84).
256 Sedulius names Ambrose in the text, but the work he uses as a source actually comes from the writer we now call Ambrosiaster, who wrote commentaries which were often wrongly attributed to Ambrose in their early circulation.
257 This unusual spelling of Jerome’s name occurs throughout Sedulius’ Prologue, with the exception of line 19, where Sedulius uses Hieronimus.
and again uses Jerome as the authority (3, Frede), *Sed notandum, ut Heronimus in tractatu Danielis ait,* (“but it must be noted, as Jerome says in his *Commentary Tractate on Daniel*”). By alerting the reader to the new source of Jerome which he is using, Sedulius provides an organizational feature which helps guide his reader as well as add continuity between the various materials from Jerome on the same subject. Furthermore, this passage reveals Sedulius as an astute editor of Jerome. The phrase *Paulus, inquit, a Paulo Seregio vocatur*258 is not a direct quote from Jerome, but is a summary statement of about ten lines from Jerome’s commentary on Philemon. Sedulius’ employment of *vocatur* is justified by Jerome’s use of *diceretur*, which Sedulius copies as seen in line 54. Acts 13:7 reads that Saul “was summoned” by Seregius Paul, with the Greek using the participial phrase “οὗτος προσκαλεσάμενος,” rendered as *hic accitis* in the Vulgate. Thus this tradition, that Paul was named after Seregius Paul, is perhaps just an assumption based upon Acts 13:9, which states for the first time that “Saul…is also Paul…,” and its contextual relationship with the Seregius Paulus story.259 The third break comes again with a quote from Ambrose in line 56, but this time Sedulius cites Ambrose in the text after reminding the reader that the previous portion was from Jerome. Then in the following sentence Sedulius again, for the third and final time, explicitly names both Jerome as well as the given work from which he is quoting within the text (3, 56–62, Frede):

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

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

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

*Ille quoque sciendum quod apostolus has omnes epistolas praeter unam ad Ebreos Greco sermone Heronimo testante conscripserat atque, ut idem testatur, Clemens Petri apostoli discipulus sententias Pauli proprio sermone ordinavit atque ornavit.*
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258 Lines 49–50.
259 PL 26, 604B-C.
This quotation further reveals the extent to which Sedulius respects Jerome’s claims in the matter of language and history. The authorship of Hebrews was continually contested throughout the history of the Church and there were advocates for and against Paul as the author. Jerome’s own discussion on the matter is not as simple as Sedulius represents. Jerome covers various theories concerning Paul’s authorship of Hebrews before revealing his own opinion. Jerome writes,

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

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

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

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

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

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


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

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

261 Prologue, 8, 182–188, Frede.
262 Frede notes in the *apparatus fontium*, 6, that lines 131–138 of the Prologue are from various sections of Jerome’s *Book of Names*.
263 See n. 262 above.
strictly concerned with why ten letters. Sedulius’ rationale for providing an allegorical interpretation of numbers, *ut doctrinam Novi Testamenti a decalogo legis non discrepare ostenderet* (“so that he might show that the doctrine of the New Testament does not differ from the Decalogue of the law) mirrors Jerome’s, *Ut ostenderet Novum non discrepare a Veteri Testamento*… (“So that he might show that the New Testament does not contradict the Old Testament…”). They are both seeking to harmonize the Old and New Testaments. Patristic sources, and particularly Jerome, often employed an allegorical interpretation of numbers, a practice the Irish often copied. Bischoff names the allegorical interpretation of numbers as one of the most common traits of Irish exegesis, a trait inherited from Jerome.²⁶⁴ This example reveals Sedulius using Jerome not just for his linguistic and historical expertise, but as a model for hermeneutical practices.

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

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

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

²⁶⁴ Bischoff, 1991, 86.

²⁶⁵ Sedulius may have relied more heavily on Pelagius in the other Pauline epistles because Pelagius is one of the few patristic commentators to have written a commentary for all of the Pauline letters. Augustine’s only full commentary of a Pauline epistle is on Galatians, and as mentioned above, Jerome only wrote commentaries for four of the Pauline epistles.
Involuta est. In Ephesians then, the “greatest” of all the letters of Paul, Pelagius’ contribution equals 111 instances totaling 260 lines while Jerome’s contribution equals 151 instances totaling 458 lines. For the commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians combined, Jerome’s contribution equals 204 instances totaling 607 lines of contribution, while Pelagius’ contribution equals 217 instances totaling only 508 lines. The number of separate instances is virtually the same; however, the overall contribution of lines favors Jerome by twenty percent.

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

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

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

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

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

Therefore according to Jerome, providing a good translation of anything but Scripture implies a certain element of interpretation. Likewise, a good translation of Scripture is one that retains the order of words of the original language, which ultimately preserves the role of interpretation of the sacred texts for its readers. Hence, Jerome’s advice on how to read Scripture (as seen in the
commentary of Eph 2:21) is equivalent to how he claims to translate texts (which are not Scripture). Embedded in Jerome’s two different approaches to translation is his high view of Scripture, which Sedulius preserves.

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

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

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

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

PROVIDENS AUTEM SCRIPTURA. Non quo atramentum et membrana, quae insensuales sunt, possint futura praenoscere, sed quo Spiritus sanctus et sensus, qui in littera latet, futura praedicit.

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

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

266 Cf. his epistula XXII ad Eustochium and Adversus Jovinianum.
267 CCCM 117 or Doyle, 115 for a translation.
268 Frede includes the expositions of 1–2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philemon, Colossians, 1–2 Thessalonians, 1–2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon under the sigla of CAR;
of impurity: ET OMNIS INMVNDITIA. Titillatio carnis et fluxus seminis ex qualicumque attribu uentris (”AND ALL IMPURITY. A tickling of the flesh and a flow of seed from whatsoever kind of rubbing of the stomach area.”). The other expositors either describe impurity as a sin symptomatic of something else or extend its application to the realm of thoughts, but all abstain from describing inmunditia (“impurity”) in such narrow physical terms. Even when Paul turns the topic to “empty words” in Eph 5:6, Sedulius again turns to Jerome by inserting twenty-five consecutive lines, which recall the extreme turpitude of sexual immorality through a graphic description:

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

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


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

However, Frede in Kirchengeschichtsteller (1995), or Gryson in Repertoire general (2007), vol 1, 375 notes that only the exposition on Romans is by Cassiodorus and the other expositions are by his pupils.
Jerome was not, however, treated as always standing in the right in his expositions. Galatians 2:11–14 is a passage with a long history of controversial interpretations, as is illustrated by Jerome’s reaction to Marius Victorinus’ exegesis and Augustine’s subsequent reaction to Jerome’s interpretation.269 The basic point of controversy between Jerome and Augustine was whether or not Paul’s rebuke of Peter was a pretense or real. As Plumer argues, Jerome was seemingly attempting to protect the reputation of Peter, the first bishop of Antioch and then of Rome, and moreover was the rock on whom the Church is built (Matt. 16:18).270 Augustine understood Jerome’s interpretation as making Paul into a liar and ultimately saw this as a dangerous precedent which would destroy the authority of Scripture, in that it sacrificed the veracity of Scripture for the sake of preserving the character of a person, namely Peter. Augustine proceeded to write to Jerome in what was the beginning of a long series of letters to discuss this matter along with other issues.271 In letter 28.3.3, Augustine wrote: mihi enim videtur exitiosissime credi aliquod in libris sanctis esse mendacium… (“it seems to me extremely dangerous to believe that anything in the holy Scriptures is a lie…”).272 Expositors subsequent to Jerome and Augustine often reflect the exegesis of one or the other. Thus the Collectaneum of Sedulius, who is a biblical scholar of high ecclesiastical, social, and political standing, serves as an interesting case study on a matter of grave dispute between two of the most important figures for Carolingian writers. As Gal 2:15 reveals, instead of choosing a side, Sedulius presents the core of each of their arguments. Sedulius in his own commentary sides with Augustine, but does not reproach Jerome for missing the point. Sedulius quotes Clm 6235 fol. 17r,b273 to summarize the history of the problem between the two interpreters, and then ultimately agrees with Augustine by writing in the commentary for Gal 2:15 (521, IIII.28–32, Frede), Hieronimus de hac questione dicit… Augustinus vero asserrit… (“Jerome says concerning this question… but Augustine asserts…”). It is a lengthy passage and is contained in the translations which ensue, but the key to be noted here is that Jerome, as he himself teaches in his commentary on Galatians 5:9, is held accountable by Sedulius when the latter identifies a false or bad interpretation of this passage and corrects it by presenting – or rather revealing via Augustine – a more satisfactory one. Thus, as exemplified in

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


272 Cf. Plumer, 48.

273 This codex is from the ninth century, containing Irish glosses from the eighth century; Cf. Frede, (above, note 5) 45*-46*.
Sedulius’ treatment of this passage, his commentaries are truly a “collection” of authoritative exegesis. This purpose does not preclude him from making dogmatic points elsewhere. Nonetheless, as is typical of this genre and very much unlike patristic or even modern commentaries, Sedulius’ work is not governed by a dogmatic or polemical agenda.

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

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

274 Laistner, 239–245.
275 Notker wrote Gesta Karoli around 884 through the help of one source, Adabert. See H. Fichtenau, 28, n.4.
scholars were able to appreciate Jerome’s work as a translator to an even greater
degree than their predecessors and even successors.\(^\text{277}\) This reasoning could also
explain why Jerome’s exegesis, which largely dealt with linguistic and historical
issues, was so popular in the eighth and ninth centuries, a fact clearly evident in
Sedulius’ *Collectaneum*.\(^\text{278}\)

### 6.4 Reception of Augustine

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

- **Prologue**, lines 200–229, *util. cred.* 5–8. (interpreting Scripture)
- * Galatians 2:15, (III.32–36), *ep. 40.3.* \(^\text{281}\) (Jewish element)
  Christ)

\(^{277}\) Kaczynski, 1995, 177.

\(^{278}\) See Kaczynski (above, n. 277), 177–178, and for a broader discussion as to the
popularity of Jerome’s exegesis in these centuries, see Laistner (above, n. 274), 239–245.

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

\(^{280}\) In the following list, • denotes that the usage can be found in Frede’s *apparatus fontium*,
but * means that Frede did not note the line(s) as coming from Augustine, but that I
have.

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

- Galatians 4:4, (VII.16–17), exp. Gal. 30.4. (Jewish element)
- Galatians 4:5, (VII.21–22), exp. Gal. 30.7. (transmission of sin)
- Galatians 4:9, (VII.27–35), Gn. litt. 4.9. (predestination)
- Galatians 4:10, (VII.42–48), ench. 79. (astrology)
- Galatians 4:16–17, (VII.72–75), exp. Gal. 37.7. (Jewish element)
- Ephesians 1:10, (I.84–88), ench. 62 (PL 40, 82). (predestination)
- Ephesians 2:8, (V.1–2), ench. 31 (PL 40, 66). (predestination)
- Ephesians 4:13, (XV.29–59), civ. 22.15.5–24; 22.18.17–21; 22.18.31–38. (humanity/divinity of Christ)
- Ephesians 4:30, (4.4–17), Gn. litt. 4.9. (trinity)
- Ephesians 6:12, (XXX.5–6), en. Ps. 54.4.27. (transmission of sin)

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

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

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

---

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

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

284 John Cassian (ca. 360–435) was a Latin theologian known for his mystical writings, whose two major theological works are both used by Sedulius, the *Institutiones* and the *Collationes*.
and Jewish-Christian relations. All of the twenty-two instances listed above deal with one of these issues except for Gal 4:10 (“You observe days and months and seasons and years.”), where the Augustinian excerpt deals with astrology, also an important issue in both Augustine’s and Sedulius’ time, and Gal 4:14 (“and that which was a trial to you in my bodily condition you did not despise or loathe, but you received me as an angel of God, as Christ Jesus Himself.”), which discusses the Galatians’ reaction to the persecution of Paul. From this verse, Sedulius only takes issue with et temptationem vestram.

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

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

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

286 Thus, all twenty-two instances of Sedulius’ reception of Augustine are treated within this project; for instances not treated immediately below, see the sections in this study on the “Augustine and Pelagius dynamic” and “ecclesiastical and theological issues”.
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found in Sedulius’ commentary for Eph 4:30, receives few emendations. Sedulius there draws from consecutive lines in Augustine’s work and only modifies the opening few words, which better situates the reader.

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

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

---

287 See Contreni, 1992, 85, 88; McKitterick, 1983, 150.
288 Sullivan’s comment is typical (60), “Modern scholars all know well enough who, in the eyes of the Carolingians, represented that tradition: God’s writ enshrined in Scripture; a select group of pagan Latin authors; a circle of late antique religious Fathers, including especially Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Boethius, Cassiodorus, Benedict of Nursia, Gregory the Great, and Isidore of Seville….”
of collection and reception of the various authors used throughout Sedulius’ commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians reveals his reception of Augustine as exceptional.

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

i) The Model for a Methodological Maneuver

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

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

---

289 See also Burton, 141–164 on Augustine's partial avoidance of pagan terminology after his conversion.
291 Augustinus, *conf.*, 11.9.11.
work(s) on which they lecture. The example Augustine uses is the grammarians who lecture on Virgil and expound upon the many questions regarding his life. The reference to the study of the life of Virgil is likely recalling the work of Donatus and Servius, whose commentaries would have been used by grammarians and teachers of that text. In chapter 13 he criticizes those teachers who wage war against the authors of a work. He calls them “foolish” and then names two circumstances: “why” and “what type.”

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

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

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

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

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

294 Prologue 60–67 (3–4, Frede).
letters.” 295 The “some other way” is qualified in the lines that follow, where Augustine describes the questions that must first be answered about the author as the “innumerable ones” about which the grammataci are so often concerned. “Innumerable ones” is the same description given to the questions about the authors in both Augustine’s work on rhetoric (infinita in qualitatibus personarum perspectio) 296 and in Sedulius’ Prologue (quae nunc per singula enumerare perlongum est). 297 And as I demonstrated above, Augustine is not concerned only with that which surrounds the author, or quis, but those other things that the dissenting teachers know nothing about, such as matters pertaining to “why” it was written and “what type or kind” it is, etc.

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

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

296 Augustinus, De Rhetorica, 8 (48, 10–11, Giomini).
297 Prologue 18 (2, Frede).
299 Augustinus, conf., 11.4.6.
The next two species of circumstance that he discusses are the “where” and “material” or means by which God created the world: *neque in universo mundo fecisti universum mundum, quia non erat, ubi fieret, antequam fieret, ut esset. …ergo dixisti et facta sunt, atque in verbo tuo fecisti ea.* The fifth species of circumstance that Augustine investigates is *quomodo*, how or in what manner it was done. The following lines distinguish the means from the mode for Augustine, *Sed quomodo dixisti? Numquid illo modo, quo facta est vox de nube dicens: Hic est filius meus dilectus?* Hence the means by which the world was created was through the voice of God, but the mode was through the wisdom and intelligence of God, as is explained in the rest of the chapter. This is likely Sedulius’ model for explaining the difference between the *materia* and *modus* and suggests why he uses the adjectives “wise or foolish” as examples of attributes for the “why” species, when no other writers include such remarks in their treatment of the seven types of circumstance.

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

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

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

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

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


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

305 Augustinus, *conf.*, 11.9.1–2: “In this beginning, O God, you have made heaven and earth, in your word, in your son, in your power, in your wisdom, in your truth; marvelously speaking and marvelously making.”
“what”, *in verbo tuo in filio tuo* is the “material”, *in virtute tua in sapientia tua* is the “manner”, and *in veritate tua* is the “why”. The “where” is denoted by his usage of the preposition *in* for all of those species of circumstance, because God is in all of those things, and only God existed before the creation of the world. Therefore the only “place” one could consider the creation as occurring is *in* Him. The order of treating the species of circumstance seemed to be dictated by the logic of Augustine’s arguments and not by some preset template; however, the order in which he summarized them was the same order in which he treated them. This is a practice which Cicero teaches and Sedulius likewise employs.307

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

308 See pp. 11–12.
largely as a polemic against that group and simultaneously as an exhortation to his friend Honoratus first to believe in order to understand the Old Testament Scriptures and then, more broadly, to believe the Catholic faith.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

309 Three occurrences in 3.7 alone (CSEL 25): 1) Scripturis divinis, 2) Scripturas divinas, 3) divinorum Librorum (the “divine books” in this context is Scripture).
clause, “which is called the Old Testament”, as another means of broadening Augustine’s interpretative method.

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

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

---


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

312 *Util. cred*. 3.5 (CSEL 25, 8, 1): ne me ineptum putes graecis nominibus utentem. As A. Hoffmann, *Augustinus De Utilitate Credendi: übersetzt und eingeleitet*, 90, n. 17, has noted, Augustine may be bearing in mind the Ciceronian tradition of employing exclusively Latin vocabulary (*latinitas*). The fact that Sedulius omitted this comment from his quotation may be a point of reception of Augustine inasmuch as Augustine advocates throughout De *Doctrina Christiana* the learning and using of the original biblical languages for the purpose of interpreting Scripture.
usage of Greek pretentious. For example, earlier in the Prologue, Sedulius uses the word *peristasis*, a transliteration of the Greek term meaning “circumstance”. Furthermore, Sedulius criticizes Paul for his lack of knowledge in Greek when he writes in his commentary on Gal 6:1 (546, VIII.114–116, Frede), “a Jew, most learned in his own language, could not express the profound meanings in a foreign language, nor was he well disposed concerning words, although he had a general understanding.”

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

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

---

313 None of the differences reflected in Sedulius are supported by the extant manuscripts of Augustine’s *util. cred.* (CSEL 25).
Augustine provides examples from Pauline literature; however, he chooses not to rely on those examples.

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

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

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

315 Earlier in this section, the importance of the notion of traditur, or knowledge being handed down, was noted as significant for Augustine, and that Sedulius omitted the phrase; but, I would like to note here that there is a difference between Sedulius not retaining the context of an important Augustinian theme, but nevertheless employing its overall hermeneutical thrust, as I argue above.
Augustine deferred to Jesus as an example of allegorical teaching, Sedulius deferred to Augustine. Thus Augustine surfaces not merely as a source of information for Sedulius, but also as an authority worth imitating.

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

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

Sedulius introduces the quotation by simply saying, *Ex libro De civitate Dei XXII* (580, XV.28–29, Frede). The form of this explicit citation mirrors the manner in which he cited Jerome’s commentary on Habakkuk in Eph 2:15.318 The citation in Eph 4:13 and the one which occurs in Eph 2:15 are the only two times in either the Galatians or Ephesians commentaries that Sedulius explicitly names the text from which he is quoting; furthermore, the fame of the book, *civ.*, does not necessitate that he name the author, Augustine.319 Sedulius then quotes the entire chapter almost verbatim, except for the first sentence (which Sedulius omits), and consequently the *autem* from the second sentence, as well as a few other minor variances. Excluding the *autem* in the second sentence reveals an intentional omission of the first sentence as the *autem* signifies a contrary opinion to the previous statement.

Most of the differences are minor textual matters such as variant spellings (*etiam si* for *etiamsi*), or the transposition of words, such as *propio spatio* instead of *spatio proprio*; however, there are two differences which may help suggest which manuscript(s) (or from which manuscript family) Sedulius was copying. In both passages of *civ.* cited by Sedulius, there are only two variant readings from codex E320 listed in the *apparatus criticus* to Augustine’s text, and both

316 Cf. O’Daly, 275.
variants are represented in Sedulius’ text. They both occur in 22.15 of civ. and are even within the same sentence, which reads: restat ergo, ut suam recipiat quisque mensuram, quam vel habuit in iuventute, etiamsi senex est mortuus, vel fuerat habiturus, si est ante defunctus…. Instead of an indicative est between senex and mortuus, Sedulius and codex E have the subjunctive, sit. Both are grammatically correct, with only a slight difference of nuance in meaning. The second difference reflected in Sedulius and codex E is the inclusion of an etiam between habiturus and si. Edition p also has these variants, but it contains others as well that Sedulius does not include, and Sedulius pre-dates both of these works, p and E. If both Sedulius and codex E were similar only with respect to the changing of est to sit, then I would be inclined to think that sheer coincidence is as likely as any other reason; however, the inclusion of an etiam where none is grammatically needed leads me to believe there may be a relationship between the two texts, that of Sedulius and codex E, but whether or not it is causal must be decided elsewhere.

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

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

321 Furthermore, in neither place where Sedulius agrees with codex “E” does Frede offer any variant readings in his apparatus criticus of Sedulius’ text.
include the last clause of Ephesians 4:16, which is a pivotal reference point in Augustine’s argument and exposition of Ephesians 4:13, the verse of concern at this point in Sedulius’ commentary.

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

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

324 Green (tr.), 286.
325 Cf. Doyle, 15.
326 Eph 1:23 (565, I.60, Frede).
In the case of reception studies, what is not included can often be as informative as what is included. The omitted portion is only five lines long, but it is directly relevant to Ephesians 4:13 and perhaps even more so than some of the other parts included previously from the quotation. It does not express anything blatantly unorthodox or heretical, and it does not contradict Sedulius’ teaching elsewhere in either commentary. Since there does not seem to be an obvious reason for the omission, I propose four possibilities in descending order of probability: either 1) the passage is too long for Sedulius (so he is simply economizing), 2) it is a matter so obvious that he does not deem it necessary or informative, 3) the topic has no interest to Sedulius or his audience, or 4) Sedulius disagrees with Augustine, but will only express it via omission, not refutation. To say that the discussion about *vir* and its implication for women is of no interest to Sedulius or his audience may suggest a sexist perspective or at least apathy for women’s concerns. Without attempting to impose twenty-first century sensibilities as my standard for gender analysis, Sedulius does project an emotional and physical sense of superiority to men in his exposition of Eph 5:23 (595, XXIII.6–9, Frede), IPSE SALVATOR CORPORIS. Id est, *Christus salvauit ecclesiam.* Vel: *Vir salvator corporis mulieris in necessitatibus et doloribus, dum infirmioris sexus est.* The alternative interpretation, indicated with *Vel*:, is Sedulius’ own comment, revealing a closer reflection of his personal perceptions than if it had derived from another commentator. Of course, Sedulius may simply be echoing 1 Peter 3:7 (“You husbands in the same way, live with your wives in an understanding way, as with a weaker vessel, since she is a woman…”), but even as an echo it represents an editorial decision.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

329 Rees, 10.
331 Cf. Rees, 2–3 and De Bruyn, 25.
332 De Bruyn, 25–35.
333 De Bruyn, 30–35.
334 Souter, 1922, 338.
335 Herren and Brown, x.
336 Herren and Brown, 9.
Epistles of St. Paul was certainly studied in the Irish schools as late as the ninth century, and Irish expositors of the Bible freely quote their Pilagius [sic].

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

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

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

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

Pelagius is described by his contemporaries as a person of immense physical stature and portliness. Jerome in particular repeatedly insults Pelagius calling him *solidissimus et Scotorum pultibus praegravatus* (“most stout and stuffed with Scottish porridge”); and in the same work, *grandem et corpulentum* (“large and fat”). Jerome again draws attention to the physical features of Pelagius in his work, *Dialogi contra Pelagianos*: *Tu ipse qui Catoniaca nobis inflaris superbia et Milonis humeris intumesces*… (“You who are puffed up with the haughtiness of Cato, and have the swollen shoulders of Milo….”)

Paulus Orosius (fl. 415), who was sent by Augustine to Palestine with a letter of introduction to Jerome, also commented on the size of Pelagius (whom he probably met during his time in Palestine), *etiam inmanissimus superbia Goliath, carnali potentia tumidus*… (“indeed a tremendous arrogant Goliath, swollen with mighty flesh…”). The latter two excerpts indicate that Pelagius was not merely fat, but that his entire stature was massive. Much of Sedulius’ *Collectaneum* is simplified conceptually and linguistically for pedagogical purposes, but as he was probably aware of Pelagius’ reputation as a large man, Sedulius’ inclusion of this excerpt from Pelagius not only reveals two men with a sense of humor, but also suggests Sedulius’ wider knowledge of Pelagius’ life and trials.

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

---

337 Bieler, 5.
338 CCL 74, *praef. in Jerem*. lib. I, lib. III.
339 CCL 80, I.28.48–49
340 CSEL 5, 2.5.16–18
341 The first half of Gal 1:9 is Sedulius’ own comment, but the second half, as shown below, is copied from Pelagius.
Sedulius’ process of selection and editing, he is right to describe Pelagius as the “base” of Sedulius’ Collectaneum. Just as the form and purpose of the Prologue and seven circumstances largely derive from Servius, while most of the content originates from Jerome, likewise, the form and purpose of Sedulius’ commentaries also largely derive from Servius’ commentary on the Aeneid, but most of his content derives from Pelagius. Pelagius’ short, simple, and often literal explanations are ideal for Sedulius’ purposes and therefore lend themselves to continual usage. Below is a series of four verses which are typical of Sedulius’ reception of Pelagius as a general and consistent contributor.

Pelagius:  
1:10: Modo enim hominibus suadeo aut deo? Numquid propter homines vos suadeo, sicut propter Iudaeorum traditiones ante faciebam? Ostendere vult se odia hominum non timentem libere defendere veritatem… [Pelagius continues for 10 lines].
1:11: … Quia non est secundum hominem: (12) Neque enim ego ab homine accepi illud neque edoctus sum, sed per revelationem Christi Iesu. Neque a me confinxi neque ab [alio] homine accepi neque a quoquam didici quod gentes sola fide salvarentur.

Sedulius:  
Gal 1:9: SICVT PRAEDIXIMVS. Id est, praecedenti testimonio. ET NVNC ITERVM DICO. Id est, quia repetitum fortius commendatur. 
1:10: MODO ENIM HOMINIBVS SVADEO? Hoc est, numquid propter homines uos suadeo, sicut propter traditionem Iudaeorum ante faciebam? Ostendere uult se hodia hominum non timentem libere defendere ueritatem. SI ADHVNC HOMINIBVS PLACEREM. Id est, si Iudaes placerem. CHRISTI SERVVS NON ESSEM. Quia assererem legem et in fide Euangelii Christo non seruirem.
1:11: QVIA NON EST SECVNDVM HOMINEM. Id est, quia neque a me finxi.

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

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

342 I.e., when considering the Collectaneum as a whole.
verses do. It is in these verses especially that Sedulius demonstrates his creative use of sources and reveals that he is not merely a slavish imitator.

6.6 The Augustine and Pelagius Dynamic within the Commentaries

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

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

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

343 Plumer, 58, n. 329.
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supported him. Two councils, one at Mainz in 848 and another at Quierzy in 849, condemned Gottschalk’s teaching. The latter council also defrocked, whipped, and imprisoned him. This issue was the greatest theological debate of the 840s and probably of the Carolingian period (it eventually involved John Scottus Eriugena), and it even reached Rome. It is inconceivable that Sedulius, living in Carolingian Europe, was unaware of this controversy, and it is almost inconceivable that he could write about predestination without taking it into account, including the difficult issues it raised. It is, of course, possible that Sedulius did not factor the controversy into his explication of predestination, but, given Gottschalk’s fate, anyone writing about predestination likely proceeded with caution.

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

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

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

Augustine writes Galatians 1:4 in two sections. The second section, containing the last phrase of Galatians 1:4 and the whole of Galatians 1:5, is not necessary here for our purposes. The following is a table of Augustine’s, Pelagius’, and Sedulius’ texts and commentaries for Galatians 1:4:
--- | --- | ---
*Qui dedit semetipsum pro peccatis nostris, ut eximeret nos de praesenti saeculo maligno.* Saeculum praesens malignum propter malignos homines, qui in illo sunt, intelligendum est, sicut dicimus et malignam domum propter malignos inhabitantes in ea. 346 | *Qui dedit semet ipsum pro peccatis nostris.* Ostendit beneficia Christi, quibus existebant ingrate, [et] in lege, quae peccatoribus data fuerat, vivere cupientes, cum illis omnia essent peccata dimissa. *Ut nos eriperet de praesenti saeculo malo.* De malis saeculi operibus, quae committuntur in ipso. *Secundum voluntatem dei et patris nostri.* Non secundum merita nostra. 347 | *Qui se dedit.* Ostendit beneficia Christi, quibus existebant ingrate, in lege, quae peccatoribus data fuerat, vivere cupientes. *De praesenti saeculo malo.* Id est, de malis saeculi operibus; mundus enim bonus est. *Secundum voluntatem dei.* Id est, non secundum facultatem vel merita nostra. 348

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

---

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

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

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

349 Plumer, 129, n. 13.

350 Plumer, 63.
individual and opposes a fundamental tenet of Manichaeism, which is that from the origin of the world, evil has fixed an indelible physical force on the material realm.351 Augustine then combines the second segment of Galatians 1:4 with the entirety of Galatians 1:5 and then his commentary follows.

Pelagius, unlike Augustine, commented on the Christological matter of Galatians 1:4 before focusing on the rest of the verse. Pelagius partitions Galatians 1:4 into three segments. The first segment is the Christological matter to which Plumer was referring, \textit{Qui dedit semet ipsum pro peccatis nostris} ("who gave himself for our sins"). After commenting on this phrase, Pelagius writes the second portion of the verse, \textit{ut nos eriperet de praesenti saeculo malo} ("so that he might take us from the present evil world"). Augustine’s battles with the Manicheans are well documented, but Pelagius too was intentional in opposing their viewpoints throughout his own exegesis and other writings.352 Whether it was Pelagius’ own initiative or via Augustine’s influence, Pelagius too commented on the phrase “present evil world/age”. He mirrored Augustine’s emphasis on the moral autonomy of the individual as opposed to the material realm of the world as a whole, but Pelagius offered a different interpretation for the phrase “present evil age” than Augustine’s “evil people”. Pelagius claimed the phrase was a reference to evil “works” (\textit{opera}) which an individual, who lives in the world (or, this present age), may do. Both imply that \textit{saeculum} references the framework within which evil exists: the world for Augustine; an epoch for Pelagius. But the ultimate difference between the two is to what or to whom they attribute “evil”: Augustine defines certain human individuals as evil, Pelagius certain works. The difference revealed in each exposition foreshadows the issues of contention in later debates,353 which were not to become prominent in the public sphere for some time. Nevertheless, the subtle difference was decidedly more marked when we bear in mind that Pelagius’ commentary was written after his famous reaction to the line in \textit{conf.} (X.29.40), \textit{da quod iubes et iube quod vis} ("give what you command and command what you will").354 In fact it may be this very line, accompanied by the shocking moral laxity displayed in Rome during Pelagius’ stay there (405), that impelled Pelagius to lay out his own doctrinal understandings by way of expounding the Pauline letters.355
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Sedulius, who only quoted the word or phrase he wished to expound,\textsuperscript{356} concentrated on the phrases \textit{qui se dedit} (“who gave himself”), \textit{de praesenti saeculo malo} (“from the present evil age”) and \textit{secundum voluntatem Dei} (“according to the will of God”). His partitioning of the verse into three segments is superficially similar to Pelagius. However, there are also some immediately noticeable differences from Pelagius, such as Sedulius’ first phrase quoting Scripture, \textit{qui se dedit}. Sedulius’ text has neither the same exact words (\textit{se} instead of \textit{semet} or \textit{semetipsum} as Augustine had) nor are they in the same order (\textit{se} splits \textit{qui} and \textit{dedit} instead of coming after \textit{dedit}) as appears in Pelagius’ version of this verse, which is odd because Sedulius goes on to quote from Pelagius’ commentary.\textsuperscript{357} After copying Pelagius’ remarks about \textit{qui se dedit} almost in their entirety, Sedulius then copies the first half of Pelagius’ comments regarding the “present evil age”: \textit{Id est, de malis saeculi operibus} (“concerning the evil works of the age”). The fact that Sedulius drew from Augustine’s commentary on Galatians in the previous verse implies an intentional rejection of Augustine’s analogy of \textit{saeculum} as representing a house, which would give the term \textit{saeculum} a closer resemblance to the world as opposed to an age in which the works are committed. Sedulius however omits the rest of Pelagius’ comment, which is \textit{quae committuntur in ipso}, and instead writes on his own initiative \textit{mundus enim bonus est} (“for the world is good”). Though the latter phrase does derive from Augustine or Pelagius, it certainly echoes their mutual emphasis upon refuting a fundamental Manichaean tenet; however, more importantly, it positions Sedulius closer to the Pelagian exegesis than the Augustinian as Sedulius rejects the analogy of the \textit{saeculum} as representing a house. This rejection of Augustine’s analogy of the \textit{saeculum} to a house should be interpreted not as a rejection of Augustine’s doctrine on inherited sin, but rather as a refinement of Augustine’s own position, as further evidence suggests (see below).

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

\textsuperscript{356} Cf. below chapter on Sedulius’ biblical text, pp. 134–135.
\textsuperscript{357} There are enough occasions as this one to suggest that Sedulius used a version similar to, but different from the Vulgate text which Pelagius was using. For a more detailed discussion, see above, pp. 113–119.
Litt. 4.9, a passage and phrase which Sedulius again copies as a source for his exposition of Galatians 4:9.\(^{358}\)

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

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

---

358 See also Augustinus, *cit.*, 22.30.
359 Wickham, 205.
maneuvered away from Augustine’s *hominest*, that he supported the Pelagian view that humans do not inherent the stain of Adam and are therefore capable of living a sinless life on earth by virtue of a free will. Sedulus, however, avoided such a precarious position by adding the words *facultatem vel* in the third phrase of Gal 1:4.

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

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

---

360 Wickham, 205.
Augustine's commentary for these verses hinges on his understanding of the phrase de ventre matris meae. He interprets this phrase to mean the customs of one's carnal parents, which for Paul is his Jewish identity. Therefore Augustine seems to believe that qui me segregavit de ventre matris meae et vocavit per gratiam suam refers to Paul’s salvific Damascus road experience, which led to his conversion from his ancestral Jewish roots to Christianity.\textsuperscript{363} The noteworthy matter in this instance is that Augustine, at this early stage in his writing, apparently does not understand segregavit de ventre matris meae as a reference to

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

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

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

\textsuperscript{363} Never mind that this is an anachronistic understanding, as Paul himself considered “following Christ” as remaining within the Jewish tradition.
Paul being elected or predestined into apostleship from his mother’s womb, or more broadly as a statement regarding his predestination for salvation.

Pelagius, however, understands the *cum* temporal clause as connected to the reference *ab utero*, thus pushing the *segregavit* toward a predestinarian meaning. Furthermore, while *praescientia* is the basis of God’s action, and Pelagius tries to soften its predestinarian force, it is a foreknowledge of what apparently must be; therefore, God acts *quando voluit*. Because we know Pelagius’ stance on predestination for the purposes of individual salvation, he may here be referring to the specific apostolic calling of Paul, and not conceding predestination in a salvific sense, but his commentary certainly does not make the distinction. Sedulius however does.364

Sedulius’ understanding of *segregavit* as *elegit* (“chose”), as opposed to a more literal meaning of *segregavit*, such as “set apart” or “divide”, immediately suggests that he more closely aligns, at the level of grammar and syntax, with Pelagius’ exegesis rather than with Augustine’s. For the next phrase, *ab utero matris*, Sedulius copies the exegesis found in Clm 6235 fol. 16v, b, from the ninth century, containing Irish glosses from the eighth century.365 The material found in this codex is here very close to Pelagius’, but explicitly refers to Paul’s apostleship as that for which he was separated from the womb. The force of *segregavit* is best seen in the sentence, *Et hic quaeritur, cur Paulus ab utero segregatus Ecclesiam persequitur, et Petrus a Christo electus, abnegat Christum*. Also the sentence, “[f]rom this it appears, that although he was not immediately called into apostleship from the womb, nevertheless he was chosen already in foreknowledge”, reveals that Sedulius interprets *segregavit* as “predestination” by virtue of a later definition of “predestination”, as presented in Eph 1:9 (557, I.68–70, Frede): “*predestination* is the prefiguration of some matter a long time beforehand in the mind of that person, who destines what will be in the future.” Furthermore, Sedulius manipulates Pelagius’ commentary on the phrase *segregavit ab utero matris meae* by transposing it to the phrase *et vocavit per gratiam* to extend the predestinarian force of *segregavit* to Paul’s Damascus road conversion. So, even where Augustine expounded a text literally and without any expressed sense of election or predestination, Sedulius edited the exegesis found in Clm 6235 and Pelagius’ commentary to advocate a line of predestination which theologically seems closer to Augustine than to Pelagius.

The Latin word for “predestination” (*praedestinatio*) is used twice in the letter to the Ephesians, once in Ephesians 1:5 and again in Ephesians 1:11. Pelagius divides Ephesians 1:5 into 4 parts, but Sedulius separates Ephesians 1:5

364 Cf. Rees, 38–51. Rees there traces the fundamental elements and history of Augustine’s thoughts on predestination and Pelagius’ continual rebuttal.
365 See Frede, 1997, 45*- 46*, 56*.
into two sections and only copied Pelagius’ work, albeit in a drastically curtailed fashion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In adoptionem filiorum. Nam Salvator eius natura filius est, nos vero adoptione. In ipsum. Id est, Christum, ut simus membra ipsius. Secundum propositum voluntatis suae. Id est, non secundum meritum nostrum. 367</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Pelagius, as revealed in the above excerpt, predestination is the preordained power of adoption for those who believe; i.e., Pelagius believes that God predestined that all believers have the gift of grace, or God-given power, to become children of God. As will be demonstrated below, this is categorically different from Augustine’s understanding of the term predestination.

Sedulius presumably does not agree with Pelagius’ exegesis of this passage with respect to the discussion on predestination and completely omits all of Pelagius’ exegesis on that issue. The omission of Pelagius’ understanding of “predestination” speaks volumes about Sedulius’ own stance. Though Sedulius does not include here any exegesis which dissents from Pelagius or adversely reflects on an Augustinian line, he does enter into the debate only four verses later when the word propositum (“purpose”) is used again. There Sedulius inserts the work of Jerome and Augustine to explain the difference between “purpose” and “predestination”. Sedulius writes in Eph 1:9 (557, I.67–72, Frede),

Inter propositum et praedistinationem [sic!] hoc interest, quod praedistinatio est aliciuis rei praefiguratio multo ante in mente eius, qui distinat quod futurum sit, propositum vero, cum vicina sit machinatio et penne [sic!] cogitationem sequatur effectus. Item: Praedistinatio [sic!] est gratiae praeparatio, gratia vero est ipsa donatio.

366 “[Who] predestined us into adoption. Not from nature. Of sons. He predestined this, so that everybody might have the power to become a son of God, who wished to believe, as it was written; ‘they were preaching the word of God with boldness to everybody wishing to believe.’ Through [Jesus] Christ in himself. So that we might be his members. According to the purpose of his will. Not according to our merits.”

367 “Into the adoption of children. For the Savior is a son by his nature, but we are by adoption. Into himself: I.e., Christ, so that we may be his members. According to the purpose of his will. I.e., not according to our merit.”
Jerome’s contribution is everything between Inter propositum and penne cogitationem sequatur effectus. The definition given for “predestination” following the Item is from Augustine. Though the definition is brief considering the verbosity found in Augustine, nevertheless the difference between Augustine’s and Pelagius’ understanding of predestination is evident. For Augustine, predestination is the preparation of the soul for the call to salvation, whereas grace is the saving action. Thus predestination is a necessary precursor for belief, and ultimately salvation as Augustine articulates in ench. 62, which Sedulius copies in Eph 1:10 (558, I.84–88, Frede):

Those things which are in the heavens are renewed, when that, which was lost in the angels, is restored from humans. But those things that are on earth are renewed, when those humans who have been predestined to eternal life are restored from the corruption of the previous age.

Pelagius on the other hand would contend that predestination is the promise of grace for all those who believe. Belief comes first and out of human initiative for Pelagius, which qualifies one to receive the predestined promise of grace, which is the acting power of salvation.

The word “predestination” appears again in Eph 1:11. The same understandings of predestination that Pelagius maintained in 1:9 are seen here too. Pelagius separates 1:11 into three phrases, as does Sedulius.

|-----------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|

The first phrase explicitly reveals Pelagius’ understanding that only those who believe first are the ones called, hence the phrase “destined before, through faith”, which demonstrates how faith is the necessary precursor for salvation.

Just as occurred in Eph 1:5, Sedulius does not here admit the whole of Pelagius’ comments into his own commentary; however, in Eph 1:5 he simply

368 Hieronymus, Commentariorum in Epistolam ad Ephesios (PL 26, 453C).
369 Augustinus, praed. sanct., 19 (PL 44, 974).
370 “In whom indeed we have been called. We, who out of the Jews, believe in Christ. Predestined. Destined before, through faith. Or: Foreknown. According to the will of God. In this he purposed to rebuild all things, but first the lost sheep of the house of Israel.”
371 “In which destiny. I.e., by gratuitous grace. We have been called. I.e., we, who out of the Jews believe in Christ. Predestined. I.e., prepared.”
omitted what he did not agree with, but in Eph 1:11 he includes an abbreviated
version of Augustine’s definition for “predestination.” Thus, in Eph 1:11,
Sedulius copies the exegesis of Pelagius and Augustine without compromising
his previous stance on the issue of predestination. Sedulius achieves this by
retaining Pelagius’ comment, “we who out of the Jews believe in Christ” and
then omitting the next qualifying phrase of “destined before, through faith”, yet
inserting Augustine’s definition of “prepared”. Sedulius thus successfully
reframes the exegesis to advocate an Augustinian line of predestination, though
he omits “grace”.

Overall, my study of specific verses within Galatians and Ephesians has
demonstrated that Sedulius prefers the organization and phrasing in Pelagius’
commentaries; however, with regard to the issues that eventually caused Pelagius
to be deemed a heretic, Sedulius is very careful not only to reframe, edit, or omit
some of Pelagius’ ideas, but he even affirms Augustinian ones. Ultimately, this
section unveils the diverse and complex nature of Sedulius’ Collectaneum as well
as his own creativity and learning as he subtly maneuvered and edited these
writers’ exegesis to occasionally reveal his own (albeit many times Augustinian)
doctrinal stances. The next section extends the reception study of Augustine and
Pelagius through certain terms and phrases, which will provide a necessary
panorama of Sedulius’ commentaries and test the consistency of his positions.

i) Saeculum
The first term is *saeculum*, which I translated as “age” in Gal 1:4. A more
common translation of *saeculum* as it occurs in patristic and medieval writings is
“world”. Certainly “world” is a legitimate translation of *saeculum* in many
instances, nonetheless such a translation here incurs problems. One problem
with such a translation here is that Sedulius does not accept Augustine’s
metaphor of *saeculum* as representing a house and ultimately the world, but
rather inserts Pelagius’ exegesis which focuses on the works occurring in the
*saeculum*. Another problem with translating *saeculum* as “world” in this instance
arises because Sedulius juxtaposes *saeculum* with *mundus* (appearing in the
phrase *mundus enim bonus est*, which seems to originate from Sedulius and not a
source); thus an unintended confusion over seemingly redundant terms may
arise. Either Sedulius is using *mundus* synonymously with *saeculum* or he is
using two different terms with different meanings, perhaps toward a larger
thetical purpose.

If we use Sedulius’ poetry as a control (since we know Sedulius’ poetry to be
his own words as opposed to excerpted writings as most often occurs in the
Collectaneum), we can better judge if his use of *mundus* and *saeculum* are
synonymous, or, alternatively, are words with at least subtly different meanings.
Here it is the latter which is the case, as *mundus* continually denotes the created
physical world whereas *saecula* refers to a lifetime, an age or epoch, or indefinite
years (Carmen 23, verse 39, CCM 117): *Nec similem habuit sub caeli cardine mundus* (“A likeness the world, under the axis of heaven, has not held”). *Mundus* is there very different from *saeculum*, which appears in Carmen 6, verses 69–70, CCM 117: *Affluat ipse bonis per candida saecula cunctis, / Gaudens innemensis affiliat ipse bonis* (“May he himself abound in all blessings throughout bright ages, / rejoicing may he himself abound in immense blessings.”).

Further help in understanding this verse and the significance of two different terms may be gained when we examine a similar doctrinal point which Sedulius articulates at two other verses in the commentary on Ephesians (5:16 and 6:13), i.e., the location of evil, whether in the creation itself or in the works of human beings. Thus if Sedulius uses *saeculum* and *mundus* with different meanings in his poetry, and if the phrase *mundus enim bonus est* does originate with Sedulius (ultimately leading to a translation of *saeculum* as “age”), then a comparison of his poetry with Eph 5:16 and 6:13 should serve either to indicate a point of contradiction in the writings of Sedulius or to justify a nuanced exegesis that supports a systematic view of a doctrine, which is the rejection of Manichean dualism. A nuanced reading is preferred and suggests a theological erudition combined with judicious editing by Sedulius, where his *Collectaneum* would otherwise be mistaken as careless scholarship. As we will see below, evil is attributed to *saeculum* (Gal 1:4), *dies* (Eph 5:16) and *die* (Eph 6:13).

In Gal 1:4 Sedulius receives Pelagius’ exegesis claiming that the works of people in the world give cause for Paul to write, *DE PRAESENTI SAECULO MALO*, and not the inherent nature of people themselves. Thus, by saying that the phrase in Eph 5:16, *dies mali sunt* (“the days are evil”) is a metonymy for *his qui in diebus sunt* (“those who are in the days”), Sedulius creates an apparent inconsistency with his claim in Gal 1:4. Such contradictions are known to occasionally occur in Carolingian *collectanea*.

However, the metonymical reference to humans should be contextualized with his exegesis in the immediately preceding lines about “redeeming the time” (Eph 5:16[XXIII.5–7]), where humans are qualified as redeeming the time by doing good works (*bonis operibus*). Therefore, humans who occupy time/days are capable of both good works and maliciousness (*malitia*), thus the metonymy of “days” representing “humans” does not assert a philosophical assumption on the nature of humanity, but rather refers to the nature of their works. Furthermore, both Gal 1:4 and Eph 5:16 offer qualifying statements: in Gal 1:4 Sedulius says *mundus enim bonus est* (“for the world is good”), and in Eph 5:16 he writes, *quia dies mali esse non possunt* (“because days cannot be evil”). Thus in Gal 1:4 the scriptural lemma claims that the age is evil, but Sedulius qualifies that phrase by claiming that evil should be attributed to the works of humans who occupy this age/time, because the created world is good; likewise, Sedulius says in Eph 5:16

---

372 Cf. above, pp. 8–11.
that the scriptural phrase claiming that the days are evil is metonymical for humans who do evil works, because days are not capable of being evil. Yet again, Sedulius explains the scriptural phrase “on the evil day” by referring the reader to the exegesis in 5:16 and likening the days as the frame in which life endures trials and tribulations, which would echo the difference highlighted earlier between \textit{saeculum} and \textit{mundus}. Thus it follows that \textit{saeculum} is a period of time that is passing away in an eschatological sense, i.e., a temporal reference, whereas \textit{mundus} means the physical creation of God. With this reading, Sedulius maintains the integrity of his exegesis on Gal 1:4 with the exegesis presented in Eph 5:16 and 6:13. For these reasons, I have here translated \textit{saeculum} as “age” and \textit{mundus} as “world”, in order to preserve the distinction which Sedulius seems to represent in 1) his reception of Pelagius over Augustine in his exegesis of the phrase \textit{de praesenti saeculo malo} (Gal 1:4), 2) his use of the two nuanced words in a closely related context (whose distinctive meanings are also reflected in his poetry), and 3) his similarly asserted doctrinal points found in the exegesis of Eph 5:16 and 6:13. Perhaps it was Sedulius’ recognition of \textit{saeculum} as referring to the world in an eschatological, or Augustinian way, which impelled Sedulius to use the phrase \textit{mundus} so as to avoid confusion between the physical world and the temporal framework within which this world suffers evil in an eschatological sense.

\textit{ii) Praefiguratio

Praefiguratio and the verb form \textit{praefiguro} are other terms that are used multiple times. They entail various meanings through Sedulius’ nuanced reception of Pelagius and Augustine. In Eph 1:9 the term \textit{praefiguratio} takes on a slightly different meaning from \textit{praefiguro}, which occurs in Gal 4:22 and 4:26.

\textit{Praefiguro} and its various forms do not appear in the Latin language until the patristic writers, when they are used often and by many. Lactantius (ca. 240 – 320) is likely the first author to have used the word, but its root \textit{figura} seems to be a rendering from the Greek \textit{typos}.\footnote{\textit{Diuinae Institutiones}, 6, 20, 31, 560, lin. 17.} In 1 Corinthians 10:6 Paul is urging the Corinthians to avoid Israel’s mistakes and, after referring to various examples related in the Old Testament, Paul writes, \textit{ταῦτα δὲ τύποι ἡμῶν ἔγενοσαν, εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἐπιθυμητὰς κακῶν, καθὼς κάκεινοι ἐπεθύμησαν}. The dominant reading for this verse in the \textit{Vetus Latina} is a rendering of the noun \textit{tupoi} as \textit{figurae} (the Vulgate, written over a century after Lactantius, also renders \textit{tupoi as figureae}). Thus \textit{figurae} serves as the term for specific references to Old Testament events and people which Paul uses as models for instructing Christians. Therefore, these \textit{figurae} from the Old Testament foreshadowed subsequent theological or paranetic issues relevant to the Pauline communities. The \textit{regula} established by Paul in Gal 4:22, which is demonstrated through the
Old Covenant’s anticipation of the New Covenant, became a hermeneutical principle for interpreting the Old Testament and ultimately for demonstrating the harmony between the two testaments, which De Lubac claims lies at the center of patristic exegesis and serves as the control for their whole doctrine of the “four figures”. Other terms and phrases equivalent to praefiguratio also emerged in the patristic era in order to demonstrate the harmony of the two testaments, such as praefigurationis significatio (“the significance of prefiguration”) and Ecclesiae praeformatio (“the preformation of the Church”) by Hilary (Tr. myst., lib. 1, ca. 39–40; lib. 2, c. 5), or allegorica praefiguratio (“allegorical prefiguration”) and sacramenta prophetica by Augustine (civ., 17.5.2). The pattern in these emerging terms is the prefix prae joined with already common words. Hence it is no surprise to find much of Sedulius’ commentaries consumed with efforts to harmonize the two testaments and thus also to find within these passages words with the prae prefix, e.g., Gal 3:13 (praevidit, “foresee”), 3:15 (praefudicare, “judge”), 3:21 (praedicta, “predicted”), 4:22 (praefiguraverint, “foreshadowed”), and 4:26 (praefiguravit, “foreshadowed”). Note also in Eph 2:15, where Sedulius’ lines VII.24–25 compare closely with Augustine’s phrase mentioned above, sacramenta prophetica.

While Sedulius’ reception of Pelagius in Gal 4:22 is consistent with the traditional patristic employment of the term praefiguro, in Eph 1:9 the term, received from Augustine, is used more broadly to indicate predestination in a wider theological sense referring to God’s purposes and intentions. It is however no accident that the same word is used in both contexts, one hermeneutically specific and the other theologically broad, because it is precisely the argument from the fulfillment of Scripture with which Augustine justifies his theological argument for predestination. In chapters 19–22 of praed. sanct., Augustine begins his argument by appealing to scriptural prophecy as a defense of predestination since, according to Augustine, prophecy and its fulfillment are typical operations of God in his will to save humanity. Thus for Augustine, scriptural prophecy is a divine causality and a divine causality cannot be conditioned by the human will (praed. sanct. 19.16–19):

non de nostrae voluntatis potentate, sed de sua praedestinatione promisit. promisit enim quod ipse facturus fuerat, non quod homines. quia etsi faciunt homines bona quae pertinent ad colendum deum, ipse facit ut illi faciunt quae praecipit, non illi faciunt ut ipse faciat quod promisit.

But he did not promise from the power of our will but from his own predestination. For he promised what he himself would do, not that which humans would do. Because, even if humans do those good things which pertain to God’s worship, God

himself makes them do what he has commanded; they do not make him do what he has promised (to do).

This particular tradition of argumentation for predestination, i.e., from scriptural prophecy to its necessary fulfillment, which may well begin with Augustine, is reflected in Sedulius’ two-fold presentation of the term praefiguratio and emerges again in Calvin and the later English Calvinist puritan John Owen (1616–1683). Owen likewise begins with scriptural prophecy to argue that God’s grace is irresistible, since it is impossible that the prophecy of salvation through God, i.e., “to create” in his people “a new heart”, should be conditional, i.e., could not come true; it is “as unto the event infallible, and as to the manner of operation irresistible.” In fact, Owen’s argument as to the nature of regeneration or conversion (as completely the sovereign works of God) is explicitly grounded for him, as he frequently says, in the “thought of Augustine” and is in opposition to the “Pelagians and semi-Pelagians.” Thus, Sedulius’ dual use of praefiguratio has an understandable basis in his reception of Augustine’s mode of argumentation for predestination, a way of theological reasoning utilized (presumably independently) by later authors. Sedulius’ exceptional borrowing from a non-commentary work to support a specifically Augustinian mode of argumentation reveals not only his breadth of awareness, but also his understanding of Augustinian thought.

iii) Non Meis Meritis
Beyond single verses, there is a phrase repeatedly used throughout Sedulius’ Collectaneum, which also reveals an interesting aspect of Sedulius’ reception of the Pelagius and Augustine dynamic. The phrase of interest is non meis meritis. This phrase or similar ones with the word meritum repeatedly appear throughout Pelagius’ expositions on the Pauline epistles and subsequently in Sedulius’ commentaries on Gal (1:4, 3:2, 4:9) and Eph (1:1, 1:5, 2:9, 3:20). With the exception of Gal 4:9, all of the instances derive from Pelagius.

In Gal 4:9, a verse with soteriological implications, Sedulius excerpts from Augustine’s Gn. Litt. 4.9, and the phrase includes the qualifying remark vel facultate (non suo merito vel facultate). As discussed above, this is an important Augustinian concept relating to Augustine’s view, contra Pelagius, that humans are incapable of living a sinless life. Sedulius added this significant phrase from Augustine to Gal 1:4, another verse with a soteriological element (“who gave himself for our sins so that he might rescue us from this present evil age,

377 See chapters 5–6, same reference, 297–366; chapter 6 is entitled, “In the Instance of Augustine.”
according to the will of our God and Father”). The rest of the line is from Pelagius (I.28: *I.e., non secundum facultatem vel merita nostra*). The other five instances of the word *meritum* appearing in Sedulius’ commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians, all of which derive from Pelagius, do not entail the Augustinian phrase *vel facultas*. In two occurrences, the avoidance is explainable. As the phrase occurs in Eph 1:1, it refers to the apostolic calling of Paul, not to individual salvation: PAULUS APOSTOLUS IESU CHRISTI PER VOLUNTATEM. *Id est, ex voluntate Dei Patris. Ergo per voluntatem Dei, non meis meritis.*

Also, Pelagius’ commentary on Galatians 3:2 reveals another, albeit slightly different, employment of *meritum*, as he refers to the merit of faith (*ex merito fidei*) as the basis for receiving the Holy Spirit (*ex merito fidei Spiritum sanctum accepistis*). There too Sedulius receives the whole of Pelagius’ remarks without interpolation or significant emendation, presumably because in this instance *meritum* is in reference to faith and not human works. However, in the remaining three instances the verses are more broadly soteriological and yet do not contain the added Augustinian phrase, but instead represent Pelagius virtually verbatim, 1) Eph 1:5: *Non secundum meritum nostrum*; 2) Eph 2:9: *Id est, suis meritis et non a Deo esse salvatum*; and 3) Eph 3:20: *Non secundum meritum nostra*. Identifying a systematic theological pattern in Sedulius’ choice of reception and emendation proves difficult; however, it may be more than coincidence that the differences are contained within canonical books, where Sedulius is inclined to exercise more theological caution with his emendations.

iv) Sola Fide

The Latin phrase *sola fide* ("by faith alone"), which much later was championed by the reformer Martin Luther, seems to originate with Tertullian (ca. 160–220) in his work, *De oratione*. The commentator Marius Victorinus, who uses it in his commentary on Galatians 3:2, is likely the gateway for its employment, since the phrase is subsequently employed by many of the Latin ecclesiastical writers. While the phrase appears in works of both Jerome and Augustine, it does not appear in either Augustine’s commentary on Galatians or in any of Jerome’s commentaries on the New Testament epistles. It does however appear repeatedly in Pelagius’ commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians: 1:12, 2:14, 2:20, 3:5, 3:11, 3:22, 3:26 (*per solam fidem*), 5:11, Ephesians 5:5 (*Hoc contra illos agit, qui solam fidem posse sufficere dicunt*), 5:24 (*hoc contra illos qui solam fidem sufficere arbitrantur*), and 6:16. Four times the phrase appears in Sedulius’ commentary on Gal (2:14, 2:20, 3:6, 3:22), and three of those instances can be attributed to his use of Pelagius as a source (Gal 2:14, 2:20, 3:22). The third

378 According to a search of the TLL, PL, and CLCLT databases.
379 M. Victorinus converted to Christianity post 354 and is a known source for many of the patristic commentators; cf. Cooper, 16.
instance, Gal 3:6, appears in an unattributed line and is thereby considered Sedulius’ own. The irony is that Pelagius was accused of advocating salvation by means of works, yet he is the only one in a group of himself, Jerome, and Augustine as commentators on Galatians, to include that phrase in his exegesis.

In one instance, however, which Sedulius copies from Pelagius, claims that faith alone is not able to suffice. Sedulius receiving Pelagius in Eph 5:5 writes, *hoc contra illos agit, qui solam fidelium posse sufficere dicunt.* This statement seems to contradict previous comments where Sedulius (receiving Pelagius) argues that one is saved by faith alone, or *sola fide* (Gal 2:14, 2:20, 3:6 and 3:22). However, the phrase *sola fide* in the later instances is used as a specific counterpoint to “the law”. In Eph 5:5, however, the statement appears in the context of immoral acts. Thus, Pelagius and then Sedulius are not denying the salvific power of faith alone, but assert the caveat that the fruit of faith alone makes manifest the deeds of the Holy Spirit, as opposed to immoral acts which are symptomatic of the *daemon* “evil one”. Pelagius makes this clear in his commentary on Ephesians 5:5, but Sedulius’ abbreviated version of Pelagius requires one to read each instance carefully noting the implications of the varied contexts.

Pelagius’ repeated employment of the phrase “not according to my/our merits” (a phrase which weakens the assumption that Pelagius is a theologian who supports salvation merely by works), as well as Sedulius’ nuanced reception of Augustine within those same scriptural contexts, illustrate the danger of oversimplifying the Pelagian and Augustinian theological polarities for later generations. Thus, as can be seen through an independent study of Pelagius’ expositions or even Sedulius’ knowledgeable reception of both Augustine and Pelagius, the dispute between Augustine and Pelagius is not a simple difference between a theology of works versus faith, but a highly nuanced and complicated series of arguments where similarities are as common as differences. The latter may be a reason for which, as a surprise to many scholars, Sedulius and other Irish writers frequently used Pelagius’ exegesis despite his status as a heresiarch. Overall, Sedulius’ reception of the above terms and phrases reveals an astute editor familiar with the historical dynamic of the feud between Augustine and Pelagius and their followers. Sedulius also proves he is no slavish imitator of either, as evidenced by the consistency achieved within his commentaries. Sedulius, however, is required to tread gently, not only because he regularly receives the work of a heresiarch, but also because he composes his *Collectaneum* at the height of a Carolingian controversy over predestination.

---
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6.7 Ambrose, Ambrosiaster, and Theodore of Mopsuestia

In Galatians 4:21–31 Paul offers an allegorical interpretation of the law. For his commentary on Gal 4:25, Sedulius cites Ambrose (ca. 338–397), but the line actually comes from Theodore’s (bishop of Mopsuestia 392–428) commentary on Galatians. Sedulius’ use and ultimately inaccurate attribution of Theodore’s commentary are significant not only because of the circumstances surrounding the end of Theodore’s life, but also those concerning the circulation of Latin translations of his work. Theodore, who in the East is called Mpashqana (Syriac for “The Interpreter”) was born in Antioch and is a notable representative of the Antiochene school of exegesis along with his contemporary and personal friend John Chrysostom; Theodore’s works were penned in Greek and demonstrated a strong preference for literal, historical and grammatical exegesis as opposed to allegorical exegesis, a common trait in the Alexandrian school, which claims Origen as an antecedent.381

Theodorus wrote individual commentaries on all of the Pauline letters, because various people requested a commentary on a certain Pauline letter at different times.382 Theodore used Pelagius in only a few instances in his Pauline commentaries, but the Pelagian controversy is an evident concern throughout them.383 He received Pelagians in his home in Antioch, and the Pelagians and Nestorians both appealed to his writings in their own defense.384 Theodore died in 428 and at that time in the East he was still considered an orthodox writer, but in 431 Marius Mercator called him the father of Pelagians, and shortly thereafter Cyril of Alexander dubbed him the father of the Nestorians.385 Theodore was indeed explicit in his support for Pelagius, and thus on account of these two associations, all of Theodore’s works along with Nestorius’ were ordered to be burned by Theodosius II (401–450). Later in 553 at the 5th Ecumenical Council, anathemas were pronounced on both Theodore and Nestorius.

Theodore’s writings in Greek therefore remain only in fragments through the Greek catenae tradition, but a Latin translation of Galatians through Philemon (at least) was made available in the Latin West at some time around 544 to 565.386 H.B. Swete, who edited a two volume critical edition (published in 1880 and 1882) of these Latin texts with the Greek fragments proposes this date (p. lviii). Yildiz (1998) however, amends this date to 415, largely based on

381 Yildiz, 1, 9–10.
382 Cf. De Bruyn, 3 and Yildiz, 7.
383 Cf. De Bruyn, 3 and Yildiz, 14–15.
384 Mershman, 571.
385 Mershman, 572–573.
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evidence from M. Geerard, CPG 2, nn. 3846–3848. I however believe Swete’s original proposal of sometime between 544–565 is the better estimation. H.B. Swete furthermore suggested that the Latin translations of the original Greek commentaries were thoroughly accurate and complete (p. lxiv). Though the Latin translations may accurately represent the writing of Theodore, they were (presumably because of his known associations with Pelagians) circulated anonymously and thus the problem of attribution began.

In his introduction to the Latin version of Theodore’s Pauline commentaries (published in 1880), Swete offers a brief account of the history of their circulation. He maintains that Sedulius is the first known writer in the West to have quoted from that text, albeit with the wrong attribution as to authorship (p. xlvi). Frede denotes the correct attribution in his apparatus fontium, but at no point comments on either the issue of attribution or its historical importance. Swete’s dates for Sedulius were wrong, thus affecting his theory: Swete offered the dates, fl. 721 or 813, with the “more probable” as 721; but the correct dates for Sedulius are: fl. 841–874. I can here revise Swete and correctly align Sedulius’ important role in the history of the circulation of the Latin version of Theodore’s commentaries. Furthermore, the attribution itself reveals a number of other important factors about Sedulius and his Collectaneum. Rabanus Maurus (Abbot of Fulda, 825–847; thought to have composed his Pauline commentaries around 842) is actually the first writer from the West to quote from the Latin version of Theodore’s commentaries, though Rabanus also mistakenly attributed the work to Ambrose.

Ambrose is one of the four canonical doctors of the Western Church along with Jerome, Augustine and Gregory the Great, as first labeled by Bede. The corpus of Pauline commentaries with which Rabanus was working actually consisted of two different commentaries by two different authors, neither of whom was Ambrose. Romans through Ephesians were by “Ambrosiaster”, a sobriquet Erasmus cleverly coined – which has ever since been retained – to an otherwise anonymous commentator whose works were often mistakenly attributed to Ambrose. Ambrosiaster wrote commentaries for the entire Pauline corpus, which are thought to originate between 366 and 384. Philippians through Philemon, however, were the focus of Theodore’s commentaries. Sedulius then is the second witness to the Latin version of Theodore’s commentaries. Sedulius also cited works from both Ambrosiaster and Theodore under the name of Ambrose: in the Prologue he intra-textually cited Ambrosiaster’s work on Romans 1:1, in addition to this use of Theodore as Ambrose in Gal 4:25. Using Frede’s apparatus fontium we know that Sedulius only quoted Ambrosiaster’s commentaries on Romans (though pervasively) and 1 Corinthians (six instances), and only quoted from the Latin version of Theodore’s commentaries twice: once at Gal 4:25 and again at 2 Tim 3:16. Thus Sedulius’ use of the Latin version of Theodore’s commentary on Galatians
Serves as the first and only quotation of that text from the time of its original circulation until the eleventh century. 387

Sedulius’ reception of Ambrosiaster’s commentaries on Romans and 1 Corinthians, and his limited use of Theodore’s Pauline commentaries, suggest a number of possible scenarios regarding the circulation of Theodore’s commentaries on Galatians and/or the other Pauline epistles. The easiest solution is to hypothesize that Sedulius only had access to those commentaries which he used. However, since we know the composition of Rabanus’ corpus of commentaries which he attributed to Ambrose (n.b. also above: Romans – Ephesians was from Ambrosiaster, but Philippians – Philemon was from Theodore), and if we take into account the Roman style of Ambrosiaster’s commentaries which Sedulius was apt to follow, and also the occurrence of his exceptional intra-textual citation, I would suggest a revised thesis regarding the circulation of Theodore’s commentaries based on Sedulius’ use of Theodore in Galatians.

Sedulius’ explicit mention of Ambrose in Gal 4:25 is a rare intra-textual citation; he does however occasionally cite an author within the text in this same manner in the other commentaries within his Collectaneum, but those instances too may indicate an exceptional circumstance. Nowhere else in Sedulius’ commentaries on Galatians or Ephesians does Sedulius himself cite the name of the author from whom he is quoting. Twice he names the work from which he is quoting (cf. Eph 2:15 and 4:13), and there are four instances of names appearing within his commentary (Eusebius, Aquila, Jerome and Augustine), but the difference between the citation in Gal 4:25 and those explicit uses of names is that the latter are merely retained from Sedulius’ quotation of his source. It may be that Rabanus had Galatians, but knew it was not Ambrosiaster’s (i.e., for him Ambrose) by comparison of the two manuscripts and therefore did not use it. Sedulius then gained access to the discarded or questioned commentary on Galatians and since he does not have Ambrosiaster’s (again for him Ambrose) commentaries on 2 Corinthians and beyond (as we may deduce from Sedulius’ complete lack of quotations after 1 Corinthians), Sedulius’ citation therefore serves to publicly affirm the Galatians commentary (by Theodore, which he is quoting) as Ambrose’s. In that way, Sedulius avoids any criticism for using a source whose authority is questioned or unknown. Also, the material Sedulius uses from Theodore further demonstrates his affinity to an allegorical type of exegesis, while also revealing his concern for the historical elements, which Theodore’s commentary on this passage offered. Likewise, the fact that Sedulius did not use Theodore’s commentary again until 2 Timothy 3:16 may be attributed to the fact that it is written in a verbose style and that furthermore it is typically a literal exposition. Theodore uncharacteristically offers an allegorical interpretation for Galatians 4:25, hence the
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comment – *apta est similitudo Agar ad vetus testamentum* (“the comparison of Hagar with the Old Covenant is appropriate”). Neither of these two features lends itself to repetitive use by Sedulius.