

EXEGESIS AND METHOD

IN

HILARY OF POITIERS

George McLeod Newlands

Ph.D. Degree

University of Edinburgh

May, 1970.



ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Name of Candidate George McLeod Nowlands

Address

Degree Ph. D. Date 1970.

Title of Thesis Exegesis and Method in Hilary of Poitiers.

The purpose of the thesis is to analyse Hilary's interpretation of the Bible, particularly in his strictly exegetical works, in order to clarify the relationship between his exegetical method and his systematic theology as a whole.

First the development of the commentary structure in the history of interpretation is traced, with particular reference to matters of structure and interpretation relevant to Hilary's own work. There follows an analysis of the commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel, and of the central role of the interaction of literary structure and basic theological conception in the interpretation of the texts.

Attention then turns to the De Trinitate, in which the interplay of exegesis and theology in the rather different relationship arising from more strictly systematic theology is examined. This study then serves as a guide to consideration of the relationship in Hilary's exegesis of the Psalms.

The results may be summarised as follows: beginning from the traditional western exegetical techniques in the work on St. Matthew, Hilary develops, with the aid of the theological concentration on the incarnation in the De Trinitate, a greater versatility in the use of new techniques, some from the eastern tradition, the latest stages being exemplified in the work on the Psalms.

After the assessment of the various stages of development

Use other side if necessary.

an attempt is made to relate the problem of exegesis and method in Hilary to similar problems in contemporary theology, and to indicate areas in which the use of patristic texts may assist the development of solutions to modern problems.

EXEGESIS AND METHOD IN HILARY OF POITIERS

CONTENTS

| | | |
|----|---|-----|
| 1. | Introduction: Scope of the project. State of research on Hilary. | 1 |
| 2. | Text and Commentary in the historical background to Hilary's exegesis. | 18 |
| 3. | The Commentary on St. Matthew. | 50 |
| | (a) Formal Structure. | 57 |
| | (b) Principles of Interpretation. | 71 |
| | (c) Theological Background. | 92 |
| 4. | The De Trinitate. | 122 |
| | (a) Formal Structure. | 125 |
| | (b) Principles of Interpretation. | 129 |
| | (c) Theological Background. | 152 |
| 5. | The Tractatus in Psalmos. | 165 |
| | (a) Formal Structure. | 175 |
| | (b) Principles of Interpretation. | 181 |
| | (c) Theological Background. | 189 |
| 6. | Comparison and Development. | 198 |
| 7. | Exegesis and Methodology in Hilary and in contemporary theology. | 210 |
| | Note on the latest work on Hilary. | 240 |
| | Bibliography. | 241 |

.....

List of Abbreviations.

(excluding some standard abbreviations listed
in L & S, LSJ, RGG, etc.)

| | |
|---------------------|---|
| BZNW | Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft. |
| CC | Corpus Christianorum. |
| C. Const. | Contra Constantium Imperatorem (Hilary). |
| CHAMPhil. | Cambridge History of Ancient and Mediaeval Philosophy. |
| Comm. | Commentary. |
| CSEL | Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. |
| CUA | Catholic University of America (Washington). |
| DDC | De Doctrina Christiana (Augustine). |
| De Syn. | De Synodis (Hilary). |
| De Trin. | De Trinitate (Hilary). |
| EE | Evangelische Evangelienauslegung (Ebeling). |
| EKL | Evangelisches Kirchenlexikon. |
| Ét. Aug. | Études Augustiniennes. |
| GCS | Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte. |
| GS | Grundfragen Systematischer Theologie (Fannenberg). |
| HTR | Harvard Theological Review. |
| In Matt./ In Mt. | In Matthaeum (Hilary). |
| In Ps. | In Psalmos (Hilary). |
| JSS | Journal of Semitic Studies. |
| JTS | Journal of Theological Studies. |
| L & S | Lewis and Short. A Latin Dictionary. |
| LSJ | Liddell and Scott. A Greek-English Lexicon, revised by Sir Henry Jones. |
| NPNE | A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| PG | Patrologia Graeca (Migne). |
| PL | Patrologia Latina (Migne). |
| PRE | Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche. |
| PWK | Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll. Realencyklopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft. |
| RAC | Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum. |
| RGG | Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart (3rd Edition). |
| RSR | Revue des Sciences Religieuses. |
| SBBAW | Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. |
| SC | Sources Chretiennes. |
| St. Patr. | Studia Patristica. |
| TLL | Thesaurus Linguae Latinae. |
| TLZ | Theologische Literaturzeitung. |
| TTÅK | Tidsskrift for Teologie og Kirke. |
| TU | Texte und Untersuchungen. |
| Vet. Chr. | Vetera Christianorum. |
| WA | Weimarer Ausgabe. |
| WCC | World Council of Churches. |
| WS | Wiener Studien. |
| ZThK | Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche. |

.....

1. INTRODUCTION

General Introduction

Hilary of Poitiers's first extant work is his commentary on St. Matthew's gospel, and all his later theological work is intimately connected, even in the so-called 'historical' works, with the interpretation of scripture.

Throughout the history of theology, and particularly in the patristic period, there has been, with some notable exceptions, a constant interconnection and mutual influence between the process of the exegesis of scripture, the results of that process, and the systematic development of theological thought. The de facto presence of and even the need for some degree of interconnection are not a matter of serious dispute today.

In the past, however, and at no time more acutely than in the present, there have, of course, been great differences concerning the nature of these interconnections, both in understanding and in practice.¹

To explore these interconnections in a theologian of the early Church, will in itself provide no solutions to the problem in the present. If we analyse that theologian simply in the light of modern discussion, the result will

¹ cf. the reports on 'Scripture and Tradition' of the groups on biblical hermeneutics and patristics in 'New Directions in Faith and Order, Bristol 1967' (WCC, 1968).

(N.B. Where not given in the text, details of bibliographical references may be found in the Bibliography.)

tell us little that we did not already know. If we seek to analyse the interconnections in their historical context, then we may reach some new understanding of that context, which though bearing the marks of our own age may provide a new piece of evidence by enabling us to view related problems in a different context to our own. But this will still contribute little to our contemporary theological concerns unless we can make comparative theological assessments of the different contexts, while still recognising the significance for the method we choose to follow of the historical differences. Such a combination of historical and theological considerations is attempted in this study. It is notorious that the two spheres are often confused. One cannot pretend to stand above this danger, but perhaps one may try to remain aware of its presence.

The more precise purpose of this study is to take Hilary as an example of a patristic theologian and to examine matters relevant to the use and place of the Bible in his work, that is to say the nature, background and development of the exegetical process itself, its place in his thought as a whole, and the interconnections between theology and exegesis in detail, in terms both of method and conclusions.

Finally we shall consider briefly the value of information gained from this type of study for the assessment of contemporary theological problems, illustrating

this by a sketch of an example in the field chosen here, of the interrelation of exegesis and systematic theology.²

It is not claimed that the topic and the theologian chosen by us are in any sense representative or paradigmatic for 'patristic theology' as a whole. Had we chosen another theologian, e.g. John Chrysostom or Theodore of Mopsuestia, or another topic, e.g. the doctrine of creation or the understanding of evil, we would probably have found a very different situation which we might wish to relate in a very different manner to contemporary issues. The choice of the present topic and of Hilary stems from the beliefs that a) the role of the Bible in systematic theology remains a matter of great

2

My purpose in beginning this study in September 1966, and in choosing the topic of the interconnections of exegesis and theology, though at that time deflected in other directions, was similar to that suggested in 'Bristol 1967', of a new study of the authority of the Bible in the context of a study of the Fathers and the Bible (op.cit.152,154).

Further examples, each very different from the present study in structure but sharing the concern to illuminate contemporary theological issues from studies in the history of theology, may be seen in John Hick's 'Evil and the God of Love' (Macmillan, 1966) and Paul van Buren's 'Christ in our Place' (Oliver and Boyd, 1957).

The sharp dichotomy between historical and systematic theology which has characterised much research in this century appears to me to have been to the advantage of neither branch of study. ~~[On the Continent at least, one might trace it back to the split between the right (dogmatic) and left (historical) wings of the school of A. Ritschl, Herrmann and Kähler on the one hand, and Loofs, Harnack and Troeltsch on the other: but it has not been without its effect elsewhere.]~~

uncertainty but also of great importance; b) Hilary is a considerable but neglected theologian who remains interesting for his own sake; c) certain aspects of his thought - particularly sections of his doctrine of the incarnation - may be capable of fruitful development today and d) other aspects of his thought, though no less important to Hilary, may well have no value today except in enabling us to clarify our account of why we do not move in certain directions, and e) that the work of past theologians, viewed in its historical context, may provide models for comparison which can play an important role, though not of course an exclusive role, in the development, constructive and critical, of systematic theology. Such an exercise will clearly be of most value to those who share in all or any of these beliefs, but it may be hoped that if consistently carried out, the study may be of use even to those who do not share even in e), as a model case upon which to demonstrate the grounds for the falsity of that belief.

The state of work on Hilary's exegesis to date.

The choice of Hilary, though desirable for the reasons outlined above, complicates our study in one important respect. Compared with e.g. the amount of published material relevant to matters of exegesis and theology in Luther, the work already done on Hilary is still in its infancy, and at the present rate of progress it will be several centuries before many of the issues discussed below can be regarded as established with a comparable degree of certainty. But this does not mean that our exercise, granted its provisional and limited character, is not worth carrying out at the present, as a step in a forward direction.

Previous studies, some of which will require to be evaluated below, consist of 1) attempts to establish the dating and context of the exegetical works, 2) textual studies, still very incomplete, 3) analysis of basic theological themes and the tracing of their historical background - in which the diversity of speculation indicates the paucity of solid evidence, 4) analysis of passages dealing with the different levels of meaning in scripture (especially for the *Tractatus in Psalmos*: which we shall refer to as *In Ps.*) 5) for the *De Trinitate* (hereafter *De Trin.*) apart from analysis of its theology, work begun on the role of biblical

quotations in the argument and in the anti-Arian controversy and 6) an investigation, partly simultaneous with this study, of the theological background of the commentary In Matthaëum (hereafter In Mt.). There is as yet no study which takes into account and correlates the many different strands involved in Hilary's exegesis and theology at different periods and the interconnection between these, the highly complex nature of such a task, involving historical, literary, philosophical and theological questions, can scarcely be underlined enough: as we have said, this present study can provide at best only a step in this direction.

Considered more precisely, previous study may be grouped under a) text and b) interpretation.

a) The MSS tradition^{for Hilary} is exceptionally old and good.

The best discussion is that of Zingerle in his Praefatio to the In Psalmos (CSEL 22). A useful report on the most important of the MSS, D 182 Basilicanus (c. 510) was given by A. Wilmart in the Festschrift for E.K. Rand pp. 293ff 'L' *Odyssee du manuscrit de San Pietro qui referme les oeuvres de Saint Hilaire*'. The gist of Zingerle's discussion is reproduced by Gastaldi, ppx-xii. A scientific account of the text of the In Matthaëum and De Trinitate must await the editions of Doignon (SC) and Hanslik (CSEL) respectively. The text of the Tractatus *Mysteriorum* is ably discussed by Brisson (SC), pp. 61-70.³

³ cf. too the list of MSS in P.L. 9 219-20.

Printed editions begin with that of Leonard Pachel, Milan 1489. Improvements and commentary were added by the Paris edition of 1510, by Erasmus in 1523, and by a series of editions (listed with description in Migne) up to 1789, of which the best, by the Maurists (1693 and 1730) was the basis of the Migne text of 1844. Zingerle produced a critical edition of the Psalms in 1896 (CSEL22) and Feder of some of the historical fragments in 1916 (CSEL 65) The Tractatus Mysteriorum was edited excellently by Brisson in 1947 (SC), and an edition of the De Trinitate is in preparation by Prof Hanslik (CSEL), who tells me that he hopes to complete it in two or three years. There is no modern edition of the In Matthaem.⁴

b) The first modern student of Hilary's exegesis was Richard Simon, in his 'Histoire critique du vieux Testament' (Paris 1680) 439-59 and 'Histoire critique des principeaux commentateurs du Nouveau Testament' (Rotterdam 1693) pp125ff. On the Psalms, Simon follows Erasmus in seeing the widespread influence of Origen and deploring this. 'Cette methode n'est pas exacte: outre que sous pretexte de donner un sens spirituel on va trop avant, et l'on donne ses imaginations pour les spiritualities'. On the exegesis of the New Testament, he noted that the De Trinitate pays more attention to the literal sense of the text than the In Matthaem. For him the commentary on Romans by Hilary the Deacon ^(Ambrosiaster) is also by Hilary of Poitiers.

4

A new edition of the In Mt. is in preparation at present by M. Doignon (SC)

The fundamental monograph of J.H. Reinkens, (Schaffhausen 1864) superseded all previous work, and provides still, along with Loofs' article in PRE³ (largely dependent on it) the best introduction. At the same time Diestel added some insights on the In Psalmos in his excellent 'Geschichte der AT in der christlichen Kirche' (1869)_{ff}74-80, as did E.W. Watson rather later in the excellent introduction to his translation of the De Trin and three of the Psalms (NPNF 1898) cf/_pxl-xliv.

After a long gap much light has been thrown upon the exegetical situation recently, for the De Trinitate by P. Löffler (1958) (esp. 85ff.) and by Martinez Sierra (1964), and for the In Matthaëum by M. Simonetti in Vet. Chr. i (1964) Bari. 'Note sul commento di Ilario di Poitiers'. Further work on the In Matthaëum and In Psalmos is in preparation by W. Wille (Hamburg) and R.F. Nestor Gastaldi (Argentina/Paris) respectively.^{4a} Work on Hilary's theology as a whole is summarised by Loofs, Löffler and by C.F. Borchardt.

(Diestel's work supersedes that of such predecessors as Rosenmüller and Schröckh (Hist. Eccles 12.252f) and often follows Simon; cf. 78n. on the In Ps. 'Die Auslegung eilt gern von dem rein exegetischen Tenor zu dogmatisierende Paränese. Er verräth sich als Schüler des Origenes, doch ohne dessen Geist. Bemüht er sich bisweilen, den Unterschied der Testamente hervortreten zu lassen, so

^{4a}

cf. note on p 240.

bleibt doch der eigentliche Offenbarungsinhaltin beiden derselbe.' Simon we recall followed Erasmus. This example may serve for hundreds to illustrate the striking tendency to repetition, not seldom vain repetition, which characterises the history of Hilariusforschung and is not unlike the formulaic epithets which in heroic verse link the present with the mists of time - pius Aeneas: imitator Hilarius etc.)

Before turning to an analysis of the structure of the works themselves, we shall pause to set them briefly in their context in the events of Hilary's own life and background. The details of Hilary's biography have been described often enough, and we shall repeat only what we consider to be the salient facts for our present purpose.⁵

Hilary was born in Limonum, later Pictavi and today, Poitiers, some time during the second decade of the fourth century.⁶ The high standard of education reflected in his works indicates that he came from a prosperous family. His parents were probably not christian,⁷ and the date of his baptism, like the date of his episcopal consecration, remains unknown. It is not known where he went to school, but the nearest and most likely place for him to have acquired the sound classical education which he possessed would at that time have been Bordeaux.⁸ At the(synod of Arles

⁵ cf. Loofs, Borchardt, Wille etc.

⁷ cf. esp. the account of his conversion, highly stylised, in De Trin. 1.1-14.

⁶ cf. Jerome, Comm. in Gal. 2.3. 'Gallus ipse et Pictavis natus'.

⁸ cf. below p. 78 f.

(353) he appears to have played no major role, and this would suggest that, if already a bishop, he had not long been consecrated at that time.⁹

In the same year (353) Constantius came to power in the West and began to support the Arians, thus bringing to a head the conflict between Arian and anti-Arian parties in the Latin church. Two years later Constantius brought together the synod of Milan, which exiled the old leaders of the Nicene party and so brought Hilary to the head of the Nicene cause. Now with other bishops in Gaul, Hilary dissociated himself officially from Saturninus of Arles, Ursacius and Valens.¹⁰ Saturninus then presided over a synod at Beziers (356) which condemned again Athanasius, only Hilary and one other bishop dissenting.¹¹ This was enough to set in train the emperor's banishment of Hilary (the precise details and official grounds of which are unknown).¹²

Most of Hilary's literary work dates from the period after his banishment. Before then however, he had written the first part at least of the historical work 'Adversus Valentem et Ursacium.' He had also written the commentary In Matthaeum. The detailed evidence for the dating of this work will be discussed below. Though he probably knew

9

This is also the force of the aliquantisper of the famous sentence from De Synodis 91. Regeneratus pridem et in episcopatu aliquantisper manens, fidem Nicaenum numquam nisi exsulaturus audivi.

10

c. Const. 2. (PL 10, 579D)

11

Ibid. (PL 10, 579A)

12

cf. Wille 13 and 237f

something of the Arian controversy at the time of writing, he was clearly not as acutely concerned with it as he was to be later in the *De Trinitate*.¹³ No reference to exile appears in the work. As we shall see in detail in a later section, the influence of Origen and of Greek exegesis is much less direct than in the later *In Psalmos* and even the *De Trinitate*. The lack of mention of the exile, coupled with the comparatively mild influence of Greek exegesis and of the Arian controversy suggests a date after 353, when the controversy began to be discussed widely, but before the events of 355.

Exile produced the challenge and stimulation from eastern theology which was to make Hilary a great theologian. Here he wrote the *De Trinitate*, the separate books being spread over a considerable period, beginning from 356/7. Here too came the *De Synodis*, in which he sought to link the eastern 'homoiousians' and the western 'homoeousians' against the 'homoeans'. Slightly later he produced the '*Ad Constantium*' in which he sought to defend his position and bring the emperor round to the true faith, and the '*Contra Constantium*', in which he attacks the emperor as the Antichrist.

The precise reason for the end of the exile is not clear, but Hilary was back in Gaul around the turn of the

13
cf. below p. 122f

14
He may have returned without permission: cf. c. Const 11. 'fugere mihi sub Nerone licuit.'

year 360/61.¹⁵ The fall of Constantius and the rise of Julian cleared the way for fresh efforts against the Arians. To this period belong the 'Ad praefectum Sallustium sive contra Dioscurum' and the two tracts directed, without success, against the Homoean Auxentius of Milan.

Hilary returned in his last years to the predominantly exegetical concerns of his first work. To this period belong the 'Tractatus super psalmos', extended meditations, which as we shall see, were probably first delivered in church and later put together to be read. Towards the end of the meditations on the Psalms he also produced his 'Liber Mysteriorum', an allegorical meditation on Genesis in the manner of the work on the psalms.¹⁶

Apart from these, Hilary also wrote hymns, though not all of those in his name are authentic.¹⁷ He may have written further exegetical works and even compiled a book of liturgies,¹⁸ but the evidence for such works is only fragmentary. The exact date of his death remains unknown, but it was at the end of 367 or the beginning of 368.¹⁹

Exegesis was done by Hilary in three connected but clearly distinguishable contexts. These also correspond to the early, middle and late periods into which both his

15

Wille makes the very reasonable suggestion of 361/2 for the former and 364/5 for the latter.

16

cf. below and the excellent introduction by Brisson.

17

The best text is that of Bulst.¹⁸ cf. the discussion of Wille op. cit. 16f

19

According to Jerome (Chron. GCS 47,245) and Gregory of Tours (hist. Franc. 1.39) who is probably dependent on him, Hilary died in the fourth year of the reign of Valentinian and Valens. For the details cf Borchardt op. cit. 183. cf. too now A.J. Goemans' article 'La date de la mort de saint Hilaire' in 'Hilaire et son temps' 107-11 G. prefers 1 Nov. 367 but

fortunes as a churchman and his literary career may be usefully divided. The considerable connection between the periods reflects the fact that probably not much more than a decade separates his earliest and latest extant works.

The first of these periods, represented by the commentary on St. Matthew, involves continuous exposition, commentary and theological interpretation of the gospel narrative in groups of verses, corresponding roughly in appearance, if not in method, to a modern exercise in exegesis and biblical theology. It is, of course, for all practical purposes the first extant commentary on a complete book of the Bible from the western Church.

The second period, represented by the *De Trinitate*, involves the use of argument from and exegesis of the Bible in the systematic exposition of doctrine, corresponding roughly to some forms of modern systematic theology. It has been shown that much of the exegesis is done in direct refutation of Arian argument from scripture.

The third period, represented by the tractatus on the Psalms, involves the exposition of scripture in a devotional context, for the moral and spiritual edification of Hilary's congregations, and would correspond to some modern devotional and meditational commentaries. It has long been known that Hilary is here indebted to Origen on the psalms: the nature of this debt will be a matter for our concern.

19 (cont.)

provides no fresh evidence.

Other writings of Hilary, especially the *Tractatus Mysteriorum*, will concern us on occasion, but are not of primary importance for this study.

It will be convenient to conduct our study of Hilary in three main sections corresponding to those outlined above, with a further section on comparison and assessment of results.

The commentary on St. Matthew is as we have said, the first nearly complete extant commentary on a complete book of the Bible in the western Church. The sources of the work are far from clear.²⁰ Was it purely accident that Hilary chose this particular form as a vehicle for his exegesis, and if not, why not? Did the medium itself make any distinctive contribution to the development of his exegesis? It is astonishing to discover that despite a flood of literature on the interpretation of scriptures sacred and profane in the ancient world, there exists, it would appear, not a single investigation of the history of the literary form of the commentary as such. In order to assess the significance of the role played by the commentary form in Hilary's exegetical method, we shall attempt to fill in something of this historical lacuna. It is not however suggested, as an important group of

20

The exact sources of the *In Matthaeum* remain unclear. A search of exegesis on the gospel reveals no direct borrowing by Hilary. Echoes of the western tradition of Tert. and Novatian, of Cyprian and Irenaeus have long been noted, but detailed evidence is lacking. The proposals of Wille, and the possible assistance of the literary structure in providing clues we shall consider below.

patristics scholars long believed,²¹ that the form can provide the 'key' to the nature of the process of interpretation by itself. It is simply not the case, as we shall see, that for Hilary, form determines content.

As with many literary documents, there is an important sense in which the 'content' is the 'form',²² and closer inspection will reveal the existence too of powerful influence from philosophical, theological and historical as well as literary traditions in the final shaping. The content of the In Matthaëum is itself quite remarkable. It has long been observed that the gospel narrative is explained almost entirely in terms of the contrast between the law and the gospel, between faith and unfaith, the disciples and the scribes, the Gentiles and the Jews, the Church and the Synagogue.

21

The real founders of this school were Fr. Overbeck, [cf. 'Über die Anfänge der patristischen Literatur' (1882)], and H. Jordan, 'Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur' (Leipzig, 1911), but its influence in patristics studies is far from dead. The limitations of the approach are well brought out in the conclusion of his dissertation, 'Die paulinische Predigt.' (1910) by the youthful R. Bultmann, who though forced to conclude that similarity in form must indicate 'Ähnlichkeit in Geist', characteristically prefaces this by the comment that 'Wir wollen uns zum Schluss nicht verhehlen, dass der Eindruck der Verschiedenheit grösser ist als der der Ähnlichkeit'. Provided that the method is restricted to the analysis of the technical structures, without thereby forgetting other and often more important factors in the development of a theologian's thought, much useful information may however be gained.

22

cf. R. Jolles, 'Einfache Formen, passim. (Jolles' point is well illustrated in the context of New Testament Formgeschichte by E. Jünger, Paulus und Jesus', 291f).

At the same time, in this particular period, examination of the literary structure may be an important source of new information on the exegetical activity as a whole.

In the all important middle period between the early and late works of strictly exegetical character, the pattern of interconnections changes. This means that the exegesis of the late period cannot be understood adequately except in the light of the exile in Asia Minor and the intense exegetical activity of the *De Trinitate*. The work of the early period, as will be shown below, contains few direct traces of the 'Alexandrian' tradition of exegesis, while that of the tractatus on the Psalms is steeped in that tradition, with its carefully worked out rules of interpretation. The same influence is traceable to some extent in the *De Trinitate*: but here the decisive factor is greater development of strictly dogmatic considerations, both in the course of the exegetical process and in the application of its results. The roots of this movement we shall examine at length.

The exegesis of the late period, principally in the tractatus on the Psalms, (a work made up from homilies spoken in Church) will be considered mainly in terms of its relation to the Alexandrian tradition to which it owes much, but from which it also differs in important respects.

2. Text and Commentary in the historical
background to Hilary's exegesis

Text and Commentary in the historical background to Hilary's exegesis.

Though countless books have been written on the interpretation of scripture in general in the patristic period, and even the detailed interrelations between interpreters are comparatively well established, very little work indeed has been done, as already mentioned, on the history of the commentary as such.¹ Because of the importance of the subject for this and similar studies, we shall attempt to reconstruct a sketch of the relevant factors. In doing so, we shall seek to avoid reduplication of findings in the history of interpretation and of discussions of Hilary's sources which are already available, but we shall include selected aspects of interpretational practice which have a bearing on the development of the commentary form or upon Hilary's own interpretation of scripture both in his commentary and in his other exegetical works, in view of the still problematic nature of his sources.

The question 'what is a commentary?' is not, on the face of it, difficult to answer. In describing those extant works which in ancient and in modern times have

1

On the commentary form as such cf. J. Geffcken 'Zur Entstehung und zum Wesen des griechischen Wissenschaftlichen Kommentars', *Hermes* 67 (1932) 397-412, and the arts. on *Hypomnemata* (very weak) and *Scholien* in *PWK*. I am also indebted for advice on this area to Prof. W. den Boer, Leiden and Prof. A. Dihle, Köln. The evidence for the history of the commentary has never been assembled in detail.

For the standard discussions of Hilary's sources cf. Reinkens, Loofs, Watson, Wille, Borchardt, Gastaldi, Kannengiesser.

been regarded as commentaries (a form which has been described by different words at different times)² we may say that a commentary is an independent literary work which provides a continuous scholarly exposition of a given written text, the continuity distinguishing the commentary from e.g. the scholion.

When however we ask for a fuller description of the form of the commentary in the sense of a detailed literary structure with recognised standard characteristics (as in the case of the dialogue, the written homily, the 18th century novel), problems arise. For the evidence is that, up to the time of the great Byzantine commentaries and with some few exceptions, the commentary need have no essential form whatever beyond the above minimal description.³

2

Typical of modern definitions is that of Heinrici (art. Hermeneutik in PRE³7.741) 'während Glossen und Scholien ein Hilfsmittel für das Verständnis des Einzelnen sind, stellt sich der Kommentar die Aufgabe, das Ganze zu erklären, also das Einzelne als Teil einer literarischen Einheit und das Ganze als in sich zusammenhängendes literarisches Produkt verständlich zu machen'.

3

The salient facts of the ancient usage may be found in L-S-J. Hypomnema is used of Aristarchus' commentaries to Homer (Sch.11 2.420 al.), and these are contrasted with his syngrammata or full treatises. This usage corresponds exactly with Galen's classification of Hippocrates' works (15.424 cf. Hipp. 16.532.543) and with the sense of explanatory notes at Sch. Ar. Av. 1242. (Other uses, as a reminder, mention in a speech etc. need not detain us here). Scholion occurs first in Cicero but was doubtless used earlier. Tomos, used of Origen's work by Jerome, is late also (D.L.6.15 and Mich (cf. Birt, Buchwesen 27f)(2nd Cent. AD) Scholia were short notes (cf. below) Diegeseis were short paraphrases of narratives, and not remnants of commentaries (cf. Pl rep. 392 d, Gräfenhan 3.47, and R. Pfeiffer in SBBAW 1934. 10f.) on the diegeseis to Callimachus. Hyldahl, discussing the hypomnemata of Hegesippus (ST. Theol. 14 (1960)70f.) comments that hypomnemata were essentially incomplete, rough notes considered of little value: (77 op. cit.): his judgement echoes that of Koepke De Hyp. Graec. 1842, 1.3 'Nullam artem adhibebant scriptores in componendis

In practice, the commentary tends to approximate to the nearest literary genre which deals with the same subject matter at the same time: hence the oft repeated observation that the commentary is often difficult to distinguish from the homily, scholion, treatise etc. This means that the tracing of the history of the commentary is a complex process involving a constant process of comparison with related genres and defying rigid differentiation. We must see that development in terms of the use of texts in general and in terms of the relation of the shape of the commentary to the content of the texts.

The problem is complicated by the fact that the commentary was not regarded generally in antiquity as a form worth preserving for its own sake, and so existing commentaries were constantly 'cannibalised', excerpted and so altered that the original structures were speedily rendered unrecognisable. The 'Sources' left today consist largely of a multitude of names of commentators and a smaller collection of fragments bearing scant resemblance to the works from which they were once taken.

hypomnematis'. On the other hand, there were probably different types of H;D.L. 4.1.5 speaks of hypomnemantikous dialogous and taxeis hypomnematon cf too the *exxin* LSJ: clearly there was no single precise meaning for the word H. or single designation for commentaries. Hypomenmata was soon taken over into Latin cf. Cic ad Fam 16.21.8 multum mihi enim eripitur operae in exscribendis hypomnematis (quoted by Bousset 296 nl.): Commentarius in classical Latin never refers to a commentary in the sense in which it is used in this study (cf. PWK IV 1.726-59 and F. Börner De Commentariis in Hermes 81 (1953) 210f. But cf. later e.g. Isid. Orig. Lib. 6.85 'Nam quidquid breviter componitur commentarius dicitur, quid vero elongatur, expositio.'

Why this neglect? A major reason is that there were here no classical models to be preserved and imitated. There grew up indeed the types of the grammatical commentary, which provided a continuous series of scholion-like comments, and the philosophical commentaries of Alexandria, the sections of which were almost monographs in their own right. But the models themselves, e.g. Didymos, canonised the habit of excerpting earlier works and were in turn so used. It was not till after Origen that we find a standard pattern that of Origen himself, used generally in the east, and after Ambrose in the west, and here too, as we shall see, qualifications must be made.

An examination of the extant material indicates, as one might be led to expect in the nature of the case, that the main reasons for the writing of commentary were first that a written text had achieved a considerable, often quasi-legal significance for a community, and secondly, that the meaning of the text was no longer self-evident.⁴ Thus the earliest known commentaries were in Egypt on the Book of the Dead, in Greece on Homer, on Plato, Aristotle and the rhetoricians (disregarding the scholia on the poets) and in Italy on the 12 tables. The text is usually regarded as verbally inspired in religious commentary, and this may explain in part why Old Testament

⁴

On the role of inspired texts of Leipoldt-Morenz, *Heilige Schriften*, 1953 and G. Lanczkowski, H.S. 1956.

commentaries occur first in late Judaism and in the Church in the second century. Finally, it is in education, at an intermediate perhaps even more than at an advanced level, that commentaries are needed: hence the frequent connection between the presence of an educational institution, sacred or secular, and the use of this genre.

All these factors go some way towards explaining the fact that the commentary (appears first) in christian literature in the middle of the second century and suddenly becomes abundant in the second half of the fourth. The nature of the christian public, the lack of texts of the Bible with which the commentaries would often have to be read, and the needs of the day, in practical, often ethical concerns, in worship, in preaching and in controversy rendered other literary forms more attractive. After its first brief appearance in the west, the commentary was swiftly overshadowed, and its later popularity must to some extent, at least be accounted for by the influx of Latin translations of Greek works.

Some further mention of the relation of the commentary to other media may here be made. As already noted, the most immediately related form is that of the scholion, which originated in and reflects grammar rather than rhetoric in the educational process, but may include some philosophical observations (thus Porphyry's scholion-commentary on Horace is in its present ^{form} and probably was also in its origin, predominantly grammatical, whereas Servius' scholia on Virgil have more philosophical

comment). In terms of MSS production, scholia may be interspersed with, added as marginalia to or separated from the text proper, but commentaries are normally independent, do not repeat the text and may be read without it, though this is not always the case. The scholia draw their continuity if any from the text, but the commentary has its own continuity, though of course, it too may contain scholia.⁵

Elements too from the homily, the sermon, the diatribe, oration, historical epitome in various forms (but not the commentarius in its classical sense!) anything which involves exegesis may be present. For example, since the homily and the diatribe deal with the explanation of written texts, introducing a paranetic accent, a commentary may be built up from a series of homilies, as in Philo's commentary on Genesis, and the difference may be more of accent than of formal distinction. Again, there are different types of commentary, homily etc. and variations in structure within a single commentary.

5

On scholia cf. too the art. 'Scholien' in PRE³ 17.732f. For MSS production cf. Zuntz in Byzantium 1938 (13) and 1939 (14) Zcomments, 13.552. Wir dürfen als Regel ableiten: der antike Kommentar, auch der im kometatischen Scholienstil wird als Sonderbuch, unabhängig vom erklärten Text überliefert. But here too there are exceptions. Z too concludes that hypomnemata were on the whole only by-products of oral teaching; and that 'Bei den Kommentatoren fiel der Begriff der individuellen Verfasserschaft fast vollständig' (op.cit.560). There were also economic reasons for not combining text and commentary even in the scholia cf. 'Scolien' in PWK, S.V. 'Die praktische Verbindung von Text u Randkommentar gehört erst einer viel späteren Zeit, etwa dem 3/4 Jahrhundert, als der Pergamentkodex all gemein an die Stelle der kostspieligeren Papyrusrolle trat.' But all books were in fact costly to produce (cf. Birt, Das antike-Buchwesen) and not widely available e.g. for the use of christian communities.

What of the content of the commentary? It is clear that the history of the commentary is closely bound up, as already mentioned, with the history of interpretation of texts, and so particularly with that figural or allegorical method of interpretation which sought to reveal a hidden meaning in texts, and which was to be so significant for the exegesis of the Bible.

It is often said that the development of commentary on Homer runs parallel with the development of the use of allegory in interpretation, but it is now clear that the latter was a comparatively late development, as far as commentaries were concerned.⁶ Despite the mutilated character of the remains, it is clear that the earliest commentators concentrated on grammatical, historical and philological topics. The history of allegorical interpretation, on the other hand, goes back to the presocratic interpretation of Homer in the lyric poets, and later was practised in philosophy and in rhetoric alike (cf too Plato's myths) before being taken up by the commentators (cf Buffiere, Fepin etc.)⁷

The historical development of the commentary outside the Graeco-Roman world remains, it would appear,

6

On the relation of allegory and commentary cf now PRK supp-IV 16f. art. 'Allegorische Dichtererklärung' Wehrli 85f and Grafenhan IV 254. A typical critique of the allegorists is made by Cicero DND 2.335

7

On the interpretation in general of Homer by Plato and his school cf S. Weinstock, Die platonischen Homerkritik, Philologus 82 (1927) 121f.

unexplored, and cannot concern us here.⁸ The beginnings of commentary in the Greek world have been traced to Herodotus' use of the second book of Hecataeus, but in this period the lines of distinction cannot be drawn with a useful degree of precision. The main stream for practical purposes comes in the commentaries to Homer: of these, however, there remain only scholia, and all evidence for the original structures has gone. The pattern of the best of these works, that of Aristarchus, consists of grammatical/lexical comment of a kind that was to be reproduced in hellenistic commentaries, which ranged from marginalia to extensive independent treatises, but are alike in treating the words and phrases examined as unconnected entities. This applies too to the scholiasts' remains of commentaries to Pindar, the tragedians, comic poets and orators down to the time of the schools of Alexandria and Pergamon.⁹

8 Some perfunctory mention of commentary on the Book of the Dead is made by H. Schneider, 'Aegypten'.

9 cf. the fragments edited by A. Ludwig, Aristarch's homerische Textkritik, Leipzig 1884-5, and for the Scholia H. Erbse's edition. For Pindar A.B. Drachmann, Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina, Teubner 1903, which probably contains remains of commentary, and for Didymus on Demosthenes, the best preserved, M. Schmidt. Didymi Chalcenteri fragmenta: Leipzig, 1854 and the edition of Diels/Schubart, Teubner 1914. Typical of the fragments, which no longer refer to consecutive lines is no 16 (D/S p 41) *περιστοιχοί • Δεμοσθένους ἐν τῷ πρὸς Νικουστράτου (LIII.15) περὶ τῶν Ἀρεθούστου ἀνδραπόδων • φυτευτῆρ' ἐλαίῳ περιστοιχῶν καὶ ὡς Φιλόχορος [FHG.139K.62] στοιχάδας προσζυγόμενοι.*

Susemihl II 1-27 lists hundreds of Alexandrian grammatical commentators of whose work scarcely a shred remains.

A very different type of commentary appears in the interpretation of Homer and of other topics too in the schools of the Platonist and slightly later of the Aristotelian traditions. These dealt with aspects of the topic under consideration in what was really a philosophical treatise, and set a pattern for 'scientific' commentary in general; again however, the surviving debris tells us little of the details of the original form. But their existence created precedents which were to be followed in a great flood.¹⁰

A very late (contemporary with Hilary's work) but complete example of this type is provided by Chalcidius' commentary on the Timaeus: here the Latin translation is followed by an extensive philosophical commentary which sticks closely to the text, is clear and precise, and avoids allegory and all extraneous material.¹¹

10

cf. Geffken op. cit. 402 'In der Tat, der wissenschaftliche Kommentar im eigentlichsten Sinne ist eine Schöpfung der Platoniker. Heraklitus Pontikus erklärt den Heraklit, Krantor später den Platonischen Timaeus.' But of these only reports remain (cf. Wehrli op. cit.). Christ 769f. lists lost commentaries to Aristotle. W. Norvin edited the fragments of Olympiodorus on the Timaeus (Teubner 1913) but these, offering glosses of varying length and of a mainly grammatical nature, reveal little of the original. On Poseidonius, whom Switalski showed to be the source for Chalcidius, Gronau in his standard work ^{POSEIDONIUS} could only write 'Das grundlegende Werk, in dem er eine eclectische Vereinigung von Pythagoras, Platon, Stoa und zT auch Aristoteles vornahm, scheint ein Kommentar zum platonischen Timaios gewesen zu sein.'

11

In the same genre cf. Proclus' commentary on the Parmenides (ed. V Cousin 1961) and on the Timaeus (tr. and ed. A.J. Festugiere 1966) in which the main points of difficulty are dealt with in a scholarly manner without exhortation etc. and without any attempt at a reinterpretation of the work as a continuous whole, and Porphyry's Quaestiones Homericae (ed. H. Schraeder Leipzig 1880) which again seek to resolve specific difficulties in interpretation (cf. on P.H. Dorrie in Zetemata 20, München 1959). The last in the classical tradition, Boethius' commentary on Porphyry (CSEL 1906) is really an independent philosophical essay in its own right.

Similar Latin adaptation of Greek forms may be seen in Macrobius' work on the *Somnium Scipionis* and Marius Victorinus' commentary to Cicero (which is however, a grammatical/historical rather than a philosophical commentary).¹²

The considerable scholia-remains of Alexandrian commentary add little to our picture of the literary structure. Philo¹³, an important link in the literary transmission, follows in his biblical works the pattern of the philosophical commentary, even though his Genesis commentary was in all probability built up from homilies. Paraenetic material was a common element in the Alexandrian philosophical commentary, and his predecessor Aristiboulos appears to have been no exception in his work to this general pattern.

12

For Marius Victorinus of Cicero, opera ed Orelli and Halm vol V, Turin 1833. MV seeks to explain the *Rhetorica* for students in short lexical/historical notes cf. p. 479 line 23 'hypothesis, id est, quaestio circa personam propriam'. (Use is made of the rhetorical categories of division, a feature we shall see again in Hilary cf. p. 9 133 'diximus rationem rei gerendi ordinem necessarium.' The same procedure is followed in biblical exegesis cf. PL8, 1146f, Ep. ad Gal: To 1.1 ordo in principio sententiae hic est, etc. Again there is little allegorising and the tone is matter of fact. On the Cicero interpretation Suringar noted that 'non est igitur oratio integra, sed auctor quasi ad marginem notavit Ciceronis verba quasi explicaturus cesset et his suam deinceps explicationem subiunxit'(p.150), and 100 years later Benz seeing the same feature in the biblical exegesis notes independently 'Methodisch ist auffallend dass V nicht mit der allegorischen u typologischen exegese arbeitet, sondern mit der aristotelischen Schulmethode der wörtlichen Exegese! Not the difference between sacred and secular interpretation, but between different types of the use of figural interpretation, characterises the development of commentary. (we may note too in PL 8 1139 the argument for the acceptance of the homoousion 'haec si vera sunt, accipite homoousion' and 1164 to 2.14 ipsa enim fides sola iustificat, justificationem dat et sanctificationem; cf. below cf. too Halm, *Rhet. Lat. Min* 152ff, 422f, and Grafenhan op. cit. 4.90f.

13

For Philo cf. below.

Philo is of course an important link too in the transmission of interpretation, in his use of allegory. Though, as already mentioned, most commentators were not allegorists, it is in connection with commentary on the Iliad that the Stoics, learning from the Platonists (rather than the Aristotelians who in general disapproved and were in turn espoused by the Epicureans against the stoics) first developed allegorical interpretation in the context of commentary. From these controversies the use of allegory and figural expression in general was to follow two distinguishable lines, the one running through Philo, Barnabas, Irenaeus and Origen to the tradition of christian exegesis in general, the other through the Hellenistic and then the Latin schools of rhetoric, to be reunited at different times, notably in Augustin but also, as we shall see, in Hilary, in different ways. These branches used allegory and other forms of figural interpretation in rather different connections with other contexts, the former tending to blend Stoic and Platonic concepts, the latter Stoic and Aristotelian, though never of course, with complete purity of tradition. This nuance was to be of not a little significance for the future, and particularly, as we shall see, for Hilary.

We have seen how Latin letters took over the philosophical and grammatical commentaries of the Greeks. This was the pattern at all stages, with the possible

exception of the Latin legal commentary,¹⁴ which may, beginning from the commentary or scholia on the 12 tables, be a native growth. The fragmentary remains of the early literary grammatical work, particularly of Asconius, Cornutus and Philargyrius, suggest simple grammatical scholia.¹⁵ The most important group apart from the philosophical commentaries already considered is composed of the commentaries to Virgil. The works of Donatus (often revised) and Servius were longer than those of their predecessors, probably commenting on each line but still scholion like, i.e. without a continuity in the exposition itself.¹⁶ Both employ allegorical interpretations

14

For reports on the lost work on the 12 tables cf. Suringar 13f. Classical legal commentaries took the same form as non-legal commentaries (Schulz 185) Gaius' Institutes were at first called commentarii, (cf. Wieacker 187) but these have nothing in common with commentary in Hilary, being more like greatly expanded scholia. The method of interpretation varies. cf. Kübler, Insts. introd. 117 'Meist geht die Erklärung von der Etymologie des Wortes aus, oft gibt sie durch eine Paraphrase den Sinn an.'

15

On Asconius cf. the ed of Th. Stangl in Ciceronis orationum Scholasticarum, and of Gianatano 1967. (1912) Asconius' method is that of Marius Victorinus, who is dependent on him in his work on Cicero. For fragments of the others cf. Keil Gramm. Lat. V, comment by F. Lammert in Bursian's Jahrbuch 251 for 1936, 107f, and Gräfenhan IV. 276f; Suringar 45f lists the names of the main writers. Philargyrius was edited by Hagen in Appendix Serviana. The order of much of this work is reflected by the comment in Spartian. Ant. Gel. 5 that many grammarians put questions in their commentaries 'velut agni balant, porcelli grunniunt'! (Quoted by Gräf. IV. 278n).

1

On Donatus and Servius cf. Thomas, Travis, Funaioli and Jones. On Fulgentius cf. Stroux. For Servius' caution with regard to allegory cf. to Aen 1.292 'alii volunt hos romanos intelligi (in historical characters portrayed in disguise by Virgil): vera tamen oratio haec. cf. on Aen 7.303 sunt propria verba quae nulla ratione mutantur (Thomas compares Quint. 10 1.8.17) Jones finds that Servius uses allegory not to refer to a type of

of different kinds, but these relate to single lines, it appears, rather than to the text as a whole. Servius indeed polemises against writers who do the latter, but unfortunately, nothing of their work remains until the religious allegory of Fulgentius.

It is only really with the arrival of the Byzantine standardised commentary form that a continuity of exposition and conception in a tight literary structure appears. There is then in the Latin non-theological tradition a considerable familiarity with the scholion tradition and, in the mid fourth century, with the philosophical commentary; the literary form depending on the nature of the subject matter itself. With one minor partial exception, which we shall consider below, no significant affinities with Hilary's commentary can be detected: apparent similarities derive more from the common source in Latin rhetoric than from relations between the commentaries themselves.

We have yet to consider the tradition of biblical commentary and interpretation in the Church. In the Old Testament, there is of course, much exegesis of earlier parts of the biblical tradition, but no use is made of the commentary for this purpose. It is not till

interpretation but to 'the figure which arises from a succession of metaphors' (i.e. the rhetorical tradition) and divides these into four categories: historical, moral, physical, euhemeristic and 'ex ritu romano': this division cannot detain us here, except to note that no significant affinities in form and interpretation with Hilary can be shown: the rhetorical tradition is not sufficient in itself to explain Hilary's methods.

the 2nd century B.C. that traces of the form are found, both in hellenistic and rabbinic Judaism. The first source for the former is Aristoboulos, whose allegorical interpretation of the Torah is not however a full commentary.¹⁷ Infinitely more significant was the work of his pupil Philo. We recall that Philo's commentaries were probably built up from a series of homilies, such as were held in the hellenistic synagogue: these in turn were influenced by the general Cynic/Stoic homily of late hellenistic popular ethics. It is then inaccurate to suggest, as has been done, that the commentary was a hellenising literary adaptation of the originally Hebraic material from the preaching activity of the Church. Both streams of homily and commentary, grew up together in the common context of hellenistic culture.¹⁸

17

On the background to Philo cf. Walter's edition of the Aristoboulos fragments: these probably consisted in form of *aporiai kai luseis* (Walter, 124f). The letter of Aristeas (cf. Michaelis in RGG, sv Aristeasbrief) may be a source of the glorification of the LXX, later so striking in Hilary. E. Stein in 'Die allegorische Exegese des Philo aus Alexandrien' (BZNW 51.1929) has noted stoic influence on Aristeas, in the use of 'Tropologein' for in allegorical interpretation, and in the presence of figural equivalents e.g. Egypt as a symbol of the body, many of which recur in Philo.

18

In his Quaestiones in Genesim Philo's interpretation varies between speculation with only the remotest connection with the text, eg. on Gen. 4.9f (p. 41 Markus) and exaggerated adherence to the literal text, out of which then a deeper meaning must be produced in order to make sense e.g. Gen. 18.10 (p. 293 Markus). Much use is made of explanation of etymological detail e.g. *καρποφορία καλεῖται ὁ Εὐφράτης ποταμὸς* (p. 194 Markus); the frequent questions in the text e.g. on Gen. 2.15 p. 205 Markus, recall Hippolytus (but not Hilary!). Adler finds three main types of structure - short explanation of a word, explanation with biblical citations,

Philo used different types of commentary for the exegesis of different passages, and different varieties of allegory. In terms of form and structure, Origen shows nothing that is not already in Philo, who was also a main source of inspiration for the Gnostic commentators. It was to be of great significance for Latin Christian literature that the direct influence of Philo was limited until Ambrose took up his techniques with the enthusiasm of the discoverer. The indirect influence of Philo, and especially of his theological understanding of scripture as a verbally inspired medium in which nothing is accidental or superfluous, and all may reveal the secrets of God, was of course all pervasive.

Though the beginnings of rabbinic Jewish commentary may also be traced back to the 2nd century B.C., the earliest recognisable fragments are from the first century A.D. The influence of this stream on Gentile Christianity in the first three centuries A.D. was minimal: it is only

expanded explanation, to which may be added a combination of 2 and 3 and a longer complex series of citations. He concludes (72) that the style of the work is devotional rather than scholarly. On the homiletic element cf. Thyen 7-11. Siegfried (196-7) notes the stoic division into physical and ethical allegory. For Philo's influence on the Gnostics cf. Sagnard 598f, 622f, on Ambrose Siegfried 371, and on Hilary 398. (The explanation of Edom in Ps 137 - probably indirect). On Philo's interpretation in general cf. Goppelt, *Typos*, 48f, Heinisch ch. 7, 69f and Hanson 37f. The central point is well summarised by Ebeling EE100 'Im Unterschied zur Homerallégorie ist das besondere der alexandrinische Allegorese (Philo) das nicht nur der postulierte Inhalt, sondern der Auslegungsvorgang als solcher eine grundsätzliche religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung hat. Sie wird aus einer formalen zu einer existentiellen, aus einer rationalen zu einer mystischen Methode. Das prägt das alexandrinische Verständnis von Offenbarung'.

with the influence of literature in Hebrew on Jerome that rabbinic influence becomes a possible real factor, though here again, the structure is that of the Philonic/Origenist tradition.¹⁹

For Jewish Christianity the only remaining evidence is for the commentaries of Symmachus the so-called Ebionite; this allows little to be said of the structure of the work, and increasing suspicion of the orthodoxy of this stream ensured that its influence was to be negligible. Symmachus' work, if indeed a commentary, appears to have pursued a purely theological aim, namely that ^{of} distinguishing of true and false pericopes in a gospel, probably that of St. Matthew.²⁰

Also of little wider influence is the Qumran commentary tradition. Of particular interest for the history of the commentary structure is the Habakkuk commentary, which combines a highly developed, unified interpretation on a line by line basis with great concision, and in this respect, anticipates Hilary's achievement in some ways.

19

cf. F. Maas, Von der Ursprung der rabbinischen Schriftauslegung, ZThK52 (1955) 129-61, and for Jerome's knowledge and use of Hebrew cf. J. Barr in JSS, Jan. 1968 lff.

20

On Symmachus, text and interpretation, cf. H.J. Schoeps, Theologie des Judentums, 366ff. Eusebius 6.17 refers to a commentary (hypomnemata) on St. Matthew's gospel. These may have been worked into the Kerugma Petri., and would have been interpretation of logia from an ebionite version of the gospel. The fragments suggest short unconnected scholia, usually beginning 'tout'estin ...' As Schoeps has it (379) 'Es muss also einstweilen bei der Vermutung bleiben.'

The basic purpose of the interpretation is not that of scholarship as in the rabbinic commentaries or in the philosophical tradition, but of comforting the writer's congregation and exhorting them to stand firm in the final hour, a message based on the claim of the writer to a special prophetic illumination.²¹

It is a remarkable fact that there are no biblical commentaries, for some of the reasons set out above, before those of the gnostics, with the possible exception of Symmachus who also sought to impose a 'special interpretation' on the texts: though many of the fruits of the exegetical tradition of the time were to be incorporated in commentaries when these appeared.

Papias and Hegesippus have been thought to have written commentaries, but this description is probably inaccurate. The books of the New Testament were still being made and spread, read and accepted: these appear to have played little part in the development of principles of interpretation, but served rather to confirm from select references the validity of procedures already established. The scriptures of the Old Testament were used more as a source of the demonstration of the fulfilment of prophecy than as continuous literary works in

21

cf. the excellent analysis by Elliger. The work is extremely condensed, the 64 lines of text being divided into 35 parts, each with an exposition generally of 3/4 lines. The exposition is determined by the author's own overall interpretation, in which the original accent of a text in its context is much altered. As in Hilary's *In Matthaeum*, extraneous material is carefully avoided for the sake of continuity and brevity.

themselves. Contact between the christian communities and the hellenistic literary world was still limited, and contact with the rabbinic tradition was broken off, as we saw, just when commentary writing began to flourish there.²²

Thus it happened that the first christian commentaries were produced by the Gnostics, who were in the relevant cases in closer contact with the literary world, were interested in applying a particular line of interpretation consistently to the New Testament, were less interested in the traditional use of the Old Testament as a source of proof texts, and shared Philo's doctrine of the mystical inspiration of scripture which was to lead Marcion to stress the idea of the canon of holy scripture.

The first hint of Gnostic commentary has been seen in the letter of Ptolemy to Flora, but here the commentary form is not explicit. Fragments and information on others including Basileides allow no firm conclusion. But Heracleon wrote at least one commentary, on St. John's gospel, which is thus the earliest extant commentary in ancient christian literature.²³

22

On Papias cf Jordan op. cit. 377f. and on Hegesippus Hyldahl op. cit. passim. On the role of the New Testament in the hermeneutical tradition cf Ebeling EE 101f, and for the interpretation of scripture in the NT Hanson 65f, Ellis, 'Paul's use of the Old Testament', Dodd 'According to the scriptures etc.

23

Attribution of commentary to Ptolemy is made by Iren A.H. 1.85. On the letter cf Sagnard 615f. Eusebius HE IV 716f. speaks of Basileides 'exegetika eis to evangelion (Windisch, Das Ev. des Basileides, 245).

Origen speaks of Heracleon's work as hypomnemata, and for him it is too succinct. It may be that he commented only upon those verses for which he wished to introduce a special interpretation, but the large fragment on Jn⁴ suggests a comprehensive, practically verse by verse treatment. Heracleon avoids all grammatical, historical and other issues, concentrating on theological exposition, often in the form of explanatory paraphrase. Unlike Philo he offers no homiletic material, concentrating on exposition. He makes much use of allegory, often centred on the figure of Christ, as in the episode of the Samaritan woman; as is usual in the period, no explanation of the figural interpretation is given, but the equivalents are simply stated.²⁴

24

For the fragments of Heracleon cf Stählin's edition (TU 6.3) and Völker, Quellen 63-87. In the fragments, which may be fairly well preserved, the expositions are usually on a line by line basis, and concern single words. The interpretation is a 'pneumatic' one which takes little account of the original context cf to Jn 2.19; ten triten (phesi) ten pneumatiken hemeran etc. It is difficult in the absence of the original complete context to generalise on the form. Preuschen speaks of 'Knappgefasste Glossen' (82) but Origen may have made drastic cuts, v. Lowenich (Johannes verständnis 92) suggests that where Origen doesn't mention H's exposition he probably agreed with it: on occasion he describes H's version as 'ouk apithanos'. Origen himself refers to hypomnemata (cf. Fr. 4 'en hois kataleleloipen hypomnematois' Simonetti (Heracleone et Origene) agreed that these were probably very short. Janssens notes the lack of extra biblical citations, but these might have been cut by Origen. Heracleon too stresses the Church (the Samaritan woman in Fr. 4) and for him as for Origen the middle point of the exegesis is Christ, however understood. Carola Barth, p54, has noted allegorical interpretation 1) where the honour of the Saviour seems at risk, 2) where words are obscure and odd, 3) where there are contradictions 4) where the words are of a key theological nature and 5) where etymology suggests allegory i.e. the Stoic/Platonic method. 'eine Interesse, das Leben des Erlösers historisch zu erfassen, besteht nicht'. cf. too Sagnard 306-20 and 451-79, also Heinrici, Die Val. Gnosis.

The next commentator, who played a crucial role in the development of genre in the west, is Hippolytus. Hippolytus was however deeply indebted, as was the whole western tradition, to his master, Irenaeus. Whether or not Irenaeus' exegetical works once included commentaries - and this is not clear - his use of the Bible in theology and his principles of interpretation, much of which bore Philo's influence but which had its own theological character, were to be an important influence, direct or indirect in the western Church, and many echoes of Irenaeus are to be found in Hilary: the importance of the scriptures, the inspired nature of the text, the reflection in it of the history of salvation.

25

25

Much early exegesis is carried on in controversy with heretics, and Irenaeus' is no exception. Scripture is of the greatest importance. Flessemann op. cit. 196 concludes that for I., 'Scripture can be rightly understood only by tradition, but also, interpretation of scripture constitutes tradition'. Many of the accents familiar from Hilary are present. cf. A.H. 4.18.2^(H.I. p. 101) of Scripture *
 'Nihil ^{enim} otiosum nec sine signo nec sine argumento ^{apud eum.}
 The interpreter must note the context (so 1.8.1; 1.19.1^(H.I. p. 205)
 5.13.2 etc. cited by Hoh); Scripture has its own perspicuitas
 A.H. 2.27.2; 2.28.3^(H.I. p. 352) etc. Yet, as Brox (p. 78) notes, I. says that Jesus himself had spoken only in Parables and riddles; against this Tert., (De Res. Mort. 33) polemizes, and Hilary clearly is aware of the passage in Tert. (cf below p. 43 n. 31) Irenaeus himself borrows much from Barnabas, including his scriptural quotations on occasion (Benoit, p. 185) For him all scripture has a spiritual significance A.H. 2.28.3, and there is much use of types (cf. A.H. 4.30.4^(H.I. p. 51)) where the exodus is a type of the people of God) For 'Cognitio veritatis context cf. PG 7 Frags. p. 1246A^(H.I. p. 493)
 The date of the Latin translation remains unclear. It was used by Augustine in 421 (Lundstrom). Lundstrom's last conclusion (New Studies) was 'not more than 100 years after 300'. Examination of the Latin and Greek versions produces no positive evidence for direct use by Hilary, but the similarity of many interpretational principles and the theological affinities suggest a connection.

* H. - page references are to the edition of W. W. Harvey, 2 vols. Cambridge, 1857.

Hippolytus shows no advance on Heracleon in structure, but there is a unifying factor in much of his interpretation, the history of the *populus Dei* from the Old Israel to the New, to the disadvantage of the Jews, which anticipates Hilary's use of the motif.²⁶ After his death, doubts as to his orthodoxy led to the neglect of his work. The christian community in Rome went over to the Latin language and new works were produced for new purposes: with the reintroduction of commentaries in the 4th century, it was to Origen rather than to Hippolytus that writers were to turn for inspiration. In this period too fall numerous exegetical activities from which commentators may have learned, but which cannot detain us here -

26

Hippolytus' commentary has little formal structure. Sometimes he uses the second person singular in bursts of exhortation. Often the exposition is introduced by a question, e.g. on Dan. 13.3 (GCS 1 1897, p20) *dei oun epizetein to aition*. The main points of the narrative are selected for comment and theological interpretation. The Song of Songs is interpreted in terms of the resurrection hope. The fragments are all in a revised condition, so that it is difficult to speculate on literary structure but the addresses in the second person suggest close links with the homily (so Hamel, 15f) Hippolytus appears to have been entirely independent of Origen cf. Danielou Message 237 'Mais nous ne trouvons chez Hippolyte aucune trace d'exégèse alexandrine'. This does not preclude the use of allegory however cf. Schol. in Dan. PG10 673C *quattuor regna allegorice significat, etc, etc*. The fragments on St. Matthew (ch. 24.15f. in GCS 1/2 1887) show no parallels in substance with Hilary on Matthew.

cf. too Bonwetsch TU 16.2 1897 59f. for the work on Daniel and in general the arts. on H. in Schmidt-Stählin 1331-46 and Christ 2.1105f.

the enormous anti-gnostic exegetical interest in Genesis, notably in Theophilus and in Justin's Dialogue, the lost work of the mysterious Rhodon, Candidus and Apion, and the work of Melito of Sardis.²⁷

Of commentary production in Egypt before Origen, we know nothing. Nag Hammadi has yielded no commentaries. Clement of Alexandria wrote homilies, perhaps even in series, and glosses, and ^{his} interpretation prepared the way for his famous pupil:²⁸ but the commentary proper appears first with Origen.

Origen never gives reasons for the writing of commentaries: we may point to the presence of the grammatical and philosophical commentaries of the school tradition, and above all to the influence of Philo. Apart from the biblical commentaries, the contra Celsus has many of the features of the philosophical commentary. He is said to have written homilies, commentaries and scholia,²⁷

On the exegesis of Genesis cf. G. Armstrong, Die Genesis in der alten Kirche, on Rhodon art. sv. in FRE³, and of Candidus and Apion Altaner 148 and Redepenning 378.

Melito speaks of a typos aletheias, but his exact influence on later exegetical work is hard to determine precisely. It appears ^{possibly} that e.g. Hilary was influenced directly by him: already Eusebius of Caesarea regarded him with reserve (H.E. 4.26)

²⁸ The references to Clement's 'hypotyposes' tell us nothing of the original (on these cf. Zahn, Forschung zur Gesch.d. NTKanon 5.136). Clement's exegesis too is developed in controversy with opponents, whom he seeks to refute by floods of scriptural citation (cf. Kutter 13f) He uses the methods of stoic polemic and even Valentinus' allegory, turning it back on him (Kutter 91f) in this anticipating Origen (cf. Str. 5 passim) For him the whole of scripture is parabolic (Str. 6.15.126) The law may be understood in 4 ways (Str. 1.28.136) to historikon, to nomothetikon, to hierourgikon, to logikon anticipating the later 4 fold sense of scripture. Like Irenaeus he makes much use of Barnabas. E. Schwartz (2 Predigten p31) notes that C. on occasion uses allegory not as hyponoia but as in Quint. 8.6.44, an instance of the meeting of the two strands mentioned above.

the remains of which are notoriously difficult to distinguish. In structure his work combines the methods of the grammatical and the philosophical commentators, in interpretation he sets Philo's rules in a christian framework and imports the Platonic trichotomist schema of body, soul and spirit (in theory, but not always in practice) for the articulation of the self revelation of its secrets by scripture: the details of the latter will concern us below in considering his influence on various stages of Hilary's work.²⁹

29

For the division of Origen's work cf. Jerome, Praef. Hom. Ezech. (PLG 25.586A) 'Origenis opuscula in omnem scripturam triplicia. Primum eius opus excerpta, quae Graece scholia nuncupantur, in quibus ea, quae sibi videbantur obscura atque habere aliquid difficultatis, summam breviterque perstrinxit: secundum homileticum genus: tertium quod ipse inscripsit tomoi.' The scholia are today all lost (cf. Zuntz 554). The difference between commentary and homily is at most of accent only. (compare the commentary on Mt. (PG 13.829f) with the homilies on Lk. (GCS 9) or on the psalms (PG 12.1053f) cf. too Klostermann, Formen, Partly because of the much larger scale and expansive style, the structure of the commentary does not play the important role of the structure in Hilary or e.g. in Qumran. The details of Origen's interpretation we shall reconsider below. Origen unlike Hilary, deals with practically every word in the text cf. on Mt. 13.36f (PG 13.829f) Like Hilary he differentiates between parable and similitudes (PG 13.843) justifying this by reference to scripture (Mk. 4.30). He too is concerned with the centrality of Christ in scripture cf. PG 13.859 'instituta sunt ad perfecte intelligendum evangelium et omnem de Jesu Christi factis et dictis mensum (ergon kai logon) cf. Hom. 2 in Ps. 36 (PG 12) Jesus Christus veritas est (cf. on veritas and Marcionite influence below!) and yet as Molland puts it 'there are certain central thoughts of the NT for which Clement and Origen have no understanding, viz. the Pauline thought of Christ as the end of the law.' This is inter alia due to the influence of Philo. In commenting on John Origen probably had Philo before him (Förster 30). On Origen's use of allegory cf. too Pepin 461f, Harl 155f, Daniélou Message 156f.

In the Greek world Origen's interpretational principles though not always his precise literary structure were, as is well known, to be followed by friend and foe alike. Of this tradition, only Eusebius of Caesarea can be shown to have had a direct influence on Hilary. Though the 'Antiochenes' sought to stress the grammatical-historical element against the 'spiritualising' of the 'Alexandrians', the structure, in line by line commentary in the manner of Origen, remained the same, and this pattern continued in the Greek tradition into Byzantine times.³⁰

30

For Eusebius and Hilary of the sect. on the In Psalmos below. The connection with Athanasius remains unclear: Athan in MR (s.g. p. 27.1362) offered ^{it seems} ~~a much~~ fuller commentary than Hil, and the few resemblances in phraseology between the two e.g. Jesus as rex et sacerdos/Basileus kai hierous, may be coincidence. Altaner (altlat, Übersetzung) thought that Hilary possibly knew some of Athan's writing. The Vita Antonii was tr. by Evagrius Ponticus in c370. None of the other commentators of this period show connections with Hilary, nor does their work advance the development of the commentary. For the Greek Mt. comms. cf. Reuss (esp. Theodore of Heraclea, p55f) and Theodore of Mopsuestia (96f. too Greer). On theoria cf. Vaccari in Biblica I 1920 3-36. As might be expected, Hilary's practices are often paralleled without any connection being present. Thus like him Diodore of Tarsus orders his ~~theses~~ according to the titles of the psalms (Maries p60), and Basil makes much use of the theme of humilitas and the need for silence in speaking of God (cf. Vischer p105f), borrowing on occasion straight from Philo without using Origen (Bousset p392). Opposition to Origen did not necessarily mean renunciation of his methods: cf. Methodius of Olympus' use of anagoge and tropologia in De Lepra l.4 (Bonwetsch M. of O.) Weight of biblical quotation was no guarantee of biblically orientated theology: cf. the floods of citations in the Pss. commentary of Asterius the Sophist (ed. Richard) - this may indicate the presence of concordances. On the use of parable in the Alexandrian school cf. Kerrigan 210f. (Cyril). (Despite the stress in the De. Trin. upon the literal rather than the allegorical, direct evidence of the influence of anti-Origenist exegesis on Hilary is lacking, but cf. p.254 below on Eusebius of Emesa.)

In the west, by the time the Church turned to the Latin language the great battle with the gnostics was practically over: none of the Gnostics wrote Latin commentaries, and so none were written to refute them. The problems of the day in Rome and in Africa were tackled in other literary forms. Exegesis in Tertullian, Cyprian and Novatian is in the context of sermon, homily or tractate, always applied to some practical purpose rather than in scholarly explanation as such. Though their methods of interpretation were to influence commentators including Hilary in different forms of his exegesis, to the structure they contributed nothing. Apart from the direct connection with the *De Oratore*, Tertullian's understanding of figural interpretation and the key to the illumination of the gospels, were, as we shall see further below, important for Hilary's interpretation.³¹

31

Examination of all references to St. Matthew in Tert. produces no unquestionable connections. Again, Tert. never applied his exegetical use of figural interpretation and of the rhetorical tradition in general to the construction of a commentary. But his works are full of material clearly echoed by Hilary. Quite apart from surface resemblances (*navis-ecclesia* Pud. 13.20 Res. 6.6 cf. Hil. In Mt. 12.31, *umbrae futurarum* Marc. 5.19.9. etc) the same principles are stated, esp in *De Res Mort*, which Hilary clearly knew cf 33. 'It is not true that our Lord spoke all things in parables: he spoke some things plainly, and must be taken to have meant what he said.' In any given parable text (33.5) Christ will interpret for us, or the evangelist will do so or the parable will be self-interpreting. On the whole the interpretation in *De Res. Mort.* is not however allegorical; T does not object to allegory as such, but only when e.g. the resurrection of the flesh is to be interpreted spiritually (cf. CC 1957) In the *De Oratore*, which Hilary also knew and which is T's nearest approach to commentary, he divides the '*sermones Domini*' into *parabola*e, *exempla*, *praecepta* (CCI 263) For his principles of interpretation cf. too Pud 17 '*pauca multis, dubia certis, obscura manifestis adumbrantur*'.

31 (cont)

Scorp.9 'Verba non solum sapient, sed et sensu, nec auribus tantummodo audienda sunt sed et mentibus'
Jud.9 'Non ex parabolis materias commentamur, sed ex materiis parabolas interpretamur (cf. Hil. non sermoni res etc.) Marc.4.4 (cf. 3.16) hoc est corpus meum. figura autem non fuisset, nisi veritatis esset corpus'
on which Auerbach (Figura 550) aptly comments that, for Tert. 'Figura ist etwas wirkliches, geschichtliches welches etwas anderes, ebenfalls wirkliches und geschichtliches darstellt und ankündigt'.
Scripture is interpreted according to the regula fidei cf. Marc. 3.24 'quomodo allegorica interpretatio in Christum et in ecclesiam et habitum et fructum eius spiritaliter competat', but it is going much too far to say (Karpp.196) that 'bei der Schriftauslegung brauchte Tertullian die Glaubensregel nicht anders als der römische Jurist seine regula iuris'. His concern was rather to avoid the speculation of e.g. Marcion, for whom all was 'per allegorias et figuras et aenigmatum nebulas obumbrata' as he saw it (Marc.4.25) For him, 'Res in litteris tenentur, ut litterae in rebus leguntur (Res.20) Atque ita corporalia defenduntur corporalibus destinata, id est non spiritalia, quia non figurata.' The tensions reflected in these quotations reflect in my view, very closely those of the In Matthaum. For Tert cf. on rhetoric Welter, on legal terms Beck (exaggerated), and in general, Karpp, Hanson in JTS 1961, D'Ales esp 242ff. and Zimmermann 8ff.
Tert. was also of course a channel of the Stoic tradition cf. De An. 20, Seneca saepe noster etc.

The influence of the exegesis of Cyprian ³² and Novatian ³³ is less pervasive, concerning only occasional passages.

Of other western writers, Tyconius appears to have had no influence on the commentary form itself or upon Hilary in particular, despite his importance for Augustine. Of Rheticius of Autun and Fortunatianus ^{of Aquileia} only their names remain, though they testify to some Latin commentary in Gaul before Hilary; possibly they were influenced by Origen, of whom something, impossible to state precisely, must have been known even in Gaul in the early fourth century: though again the lack of testimony, and the evident surprise which Rufinus' translation ^{produced,} suggest that this influence was indirect. Iuvencus, Commodianus add

32

It is not impossible that Hilary had read Cyprian on the Lord's Prayer (CSEL 3.1.2 and ed. Reveillard). cf. l. 11 'evangelica praecepta' echoed in In Mt. but the form of the works are different. Cyprian's work is no close knit commentary in the manner of the In Mt. Its content is heavily dependent on Tert De Oratione, in thought if not in words, and this was probably known to Hilary himself. (Cyprian rearranged the order of Tertullian's paragraphs of the analysis of O'Donnell, diss. CUA 1960) Cyprian too took over many of the loci communes of the rhetorical tradition (cf. Quacquarelli) Koch thought that he knew a Latin tr. of Irenaeus (Cypr. Unt. 475) but this was demolished by Lundstrom op cit. Examination of the refs. to St. Matthew in the Testimonia etc. show no connection with Hilary. Geertz' work showed that his works though exciting for modern historians speedily passed into neglect before being revived in the late 4th century. His influence on Hilary if any, would have been in devotional rather than on technical interpretational matters. On his exegesis cf D'Ales 33-75: there is no appreciable advance on Tertullian.

33

On the influence of Novatian cf: below.

nothing to our purpose.³⁴

We must note however the commentaries in Latin of Victorinus, at Pettau on the fringe of the Roman world. From the remains of his rather disorganised work, it is clear that Victorinus, influenced by both Origen and Hippolytus, was more at home in Greek than in Latin, and that his use of Latin is something of a geographical accident: in the west he appears to have been unnoticed until the inrush of eastern commentary in general.³⁵

The only other evidence for Latin commentary is the frequent mention of aliqui etc. in the *In Matthaeum* itself. If these writers had been widely popular in Gaul, we might perhaps have expected Hilary to deal with

34

Wohlenberg's text, whether or not by Fortunatianus (very probably not) bears no resemblance to Hilary's work. ^(cf. Jordan, p. 400) Tyconius' rules appear to have been unknown to Hilary. Like Hilary, Tyconius has a single theme: 'Nihil est enim quid praeter ecclesiam describat' ch. 23 Hahn, but this is pursued with less theological perception than in the *In Matthaeum*. 'In jedem Kapitel wird etwa dasselbe gesagt!' (Hahn 20). Iuvenius (CSEL 24) and Commodianus (CSEL 15) assist us not at all, though the latter's *carmen apologeticum* echoes Hilary's concern with the transfer of the inheritance of the Jews to the Gentiles.

35

The commentary on the Apocalypse (CSEL 49 ed. Haussleiter) is short, and consists of short glosses, dealing with the text almost verse by verse (as far as can be seen from the remains). The larger unity and unifying interpretation of Hilary is not present. It may be as Jerome suggests (*De Vir Ill* 74) that Origen was a main source for Vict. Occasional echoes, *ratio veritatis* (in *De Fabr. Mundi*) types, *ordo dictorum*, etc are not enough to confirm a connection with Hilary, to whom he is much inferior in every respect as an exegete and theologian.

On Vict. cf. Haussleiter in *PRE*³ sv.

them in more detail than he did, but this question must remain open.³⁶

After Hilary, in the west commentary continued in the tradition of Origen, as seen in Ambrosiaster, Ambrose and Jerome, but with the theological accent of the western tradition not entirely lost. In the work of Augustine all was taken up and transformed, and a basis was set up which was to be definitive in the west for a thousand years and indeed, though the Reformation brought changes in historical understanding, up to the rise of the historical-critical method in the eighteenth century. In the east, Origen's structures and, even in reaction against it, much of his theological framework of interpretation, held the field and in many respects, holds it today, though here too for a short period, Augustine in Greek translation, still played a role, though a very minor one.³⁷ Hilary's role in the future, though largely overshadowed by Ambrose,

36

aliqui etc. cf below.

37

Zeno of Verona (PL 27.1) clearly borrows from the In Pss and possibly from the In Mt. with modification: e.g. at 27.418 'navis typus est synagogae'. Ambrosiaster (CSEL 50 and PL 17 45-508) shows a large advance qua exegetical detail upon Hilary, offering long and scholarly notes (probably under the stimulus of Origen in structure, but western in its pauline emphases), almost verse by verse and word by word (cf. 17.489 on Tim) Ambrose (cf. Comm. in Luc. CSEL 62) works in the tradition of Origen, though he clearly knows Hilary's in Pss. (Seibel lists reminiscence). Jerome blends both the eastern tradition with the Latin grammarians, using e.g. Asper, Donatus and Marius Victorinus (Penna), as Hilary had done: he knew Hilary's work well, (cf. Ep. 5.2. on copying 2 books of Hilary for Rufinus at Treves). On Augustine's references to and echoes of Hilary in individual exegesis cf. Comeau 40f. While Hilary had worked with a twofold meaning in scripture, Ambrose reverted to Origen's

and Augustine, was as we shall see to provide theological foundations for interpretation rather than technical structures for commentary or even schemata for interpretational rules.³⁸

The place of Hilary in this tradition, his debt and his contribution to the tradition in terms of structure and interpretation, will best be seen in the light of the detailed analysis of his own work in the following sections, in the course of which we shall also deal critically with previous estimates of this. But already, from the factors indicated in the text and cited in more detail in the notes, a preliminary picture begins to emerge. With the special exception of Victorinus of Pettau, it is possible that the first extant nearly complete western Latin biblical commentary, the *In Matthaëum*, was also one of the first to be written. The techniques of commentary and also many of the characteristic interpretational principles are given: Hilary has added the theological conception of the unity of the work in the service of which he then uses the techniques available to spell out this unity, demonstrating the internal connections. The techniques themselves however have functions and historical associations which themselves in turn affect the final

threefold division (into *historia*, *mores*, *mysterium* in his *In Lk.* (PL 15.1603 C and 1792 B etc - Burghardt) while Augustine developed a fourfold sense (in two quite different versions) *De Gen. ad Lit.* and *De Gen. opus imperfectum*), which was to be the basis of mediaeval interpretation in the West. On Augustine in Greek translation cf Altaner's essays, now collected in his *'Kleine patristische Schriften'*, Berlin 1968.

38

cf. below p. 221 ff.

interpretation. This process we must now attempt to 'unpack' for the In Matthaëum, beginning from the gospel texts and seeking to distinguish the inter-related layers of interpretation. The particular role of the commentary form in achieving continuity and consistency of interpretation, and the difference caused by the direct and indirect influence of the tradition of Origen, will be seen by comparing the results obtained for the early and the late periods. At the same time, we shall have to take into account the influence on the entire process of different period of factors arising not from the tradition but from the historical philosophical, theological and cultural situation in which the writing was done.

3. The Early Period:

The commentary on St. Matthew.

B. The early period: the commentary on
St. Matthew.

Introduction

We have mentioned that all Hilary's extant works were written within a decade, when the author was already a mature stylist and theologian. The exact dates have not been established, but the approximate datings are clear: the In Matt. was probably written in 353-5, the De Trin. in 356-7, the In Ps. after 361, and the Tractatus Mysteriorum towards the end of the work on the psalms.¹ The exact sources for the In Matthaëum are, as we have seen, very difficult to establish, its precise influence no less so, and the public for which it was written, is never referred to in the work itself.² The prologue which might have

1

As Buttell M, The Rhetoric of Hilary of Poitiers, 171. Dates: On internal evidence (the lack of mention of the Greek text and of explicit reference to the arian controversy, the less direct influence of Origen in interpretation, the traditional western features of the exegesis), the In Matthaëum is dated before the exile, which followed the synod of Beziers in 356. The De Trinitate was written largely during the exile (though Hilary may have begun it before his exile and may have finished it on his return): cf Borchardt 40-2 where the debate is summarised. The In Psalmos cannot be dated more precisely than somewhere between his return from exile and his death, which came at the end of 367 or the beginning of 368. That the Tractatus Mysteriorum was written towards the end of the In Psalmos is deduced from the In Psalmos itself (references to the work as still to be done in Ps. CXXXVIII. and as completed in CXLVI cf. Brisson, 13n2).

2

cf. Loofs op cit. 59ff. cf. below.



provided such information has long since been lost,³ and other sources for Hilary are late and notoriously unreliable.⁴

What are the general characteristics of the work? Perhaps the most striking is the extremely close knit and concise structure. Whatever latent influences we may detect, it is clear from the first that the commentary has a very different character from that of the minute scholarly investigations of the large commentaries of the Alexandrian tradition, of the close attention to historical and philological detail of e.g. Jerome, of the psychological realism of Chrysostom - and it is not a 'learned' work, like the commentary of Hippolytus. Even the wealth of scriptural quotation characteristic of most early christian literature is almost entirely absent, indeed all extra-contextual reference seems to have been avoided with deliberate care.⁵

³ This prologue clearly existed. It is almost certainly mentioned at 1.2 (diximus), and by Cassiodorus De Inc. 7.24 cf. Jeanotte in *Bibl. Zeitschr.* for 1912 op. cit.

⁴ Basic to the lives is that of Venantius Fortunatus (PL 88)(cf 535-600 - cf. art. sv in PRE3), which is, as Loofs put it 'fast ohne jeden Wert'. Fortunatus used Sulpicius Severus as his main source. There is no other primary source. How far local legend at Poitiers where Fortunatus became bishop at the end of his life, may be reflected in the Life, is impossible to say.

⁵ In Mt. 5.1 (PL9.943A) referring to Cyprian and Tertullian 'De orationis autem sacramento necessitate nos commentandi Cyprianus viri sanctae memoriae liberavit: Quamquam et Tertullianus hinc volumen aptissimum scripserit: sed consequens error hominis, detraxit scriptis probabilibus auctoritatem.'

For whom was the commentary written? It uses few apologetic motifs, it assumes belief and indeed considerable familiarity with the Bible and the christian faith on the part of its readers.⁶ It is not primarily of a homiletic nature, and though individual portions of it may have been used in sermons, it is clearly not constructed out of a series of homilies.⁷ Whether it was intended for private use as an aid to diocesan clergy in the preparation of sermons, for clergy or laity, for Gaul or for the church at large, is never indicated. There are no local and no direct contemporary references whatever.⁸

6

cf. the detailed references to the book of Kings in 1.2 (PL9.920), or to the problems for the faithful after baptism at 3.1 (PL9.928C) 'tentatur igitur statim post baptismum Dominus, tentatione sua indicans in sanctificatis nobis maxime diaboli tentamenta grassari: quia ei est magis exoptata de sanctis', and many similar passages.

7

cf. the homilies of Chrysostom or Zeno of Verona, Hilary never uses 'vos' but always 'nos', does not always end on a homiletic point, shows no traces of sermonic introduction, ascription, etc. (contrast the In Psalmos below) and is clearly constructing in terms of a continuous narrative.

8

The references to Cyprian might suggest that this work is intended for a congregation in a didactic, non-learned context, as the treatments by both Tertullian and Cyprian suggest that their work was intended. This would be supported further by the exhortational material (present in nearly all early Christian literature.) But this remains only an indication, not a proof.

It soon becomes clear that for the purpose of his commentary (and we may take this to reflect both Hilary's own understanding of the text and his understanding of the evangelist's intention) the entire text of the gospel is to be understood in terms of the relationship between law and gospel. This may also be expressed in terms of a contrast between the law and faith (faith sometimes complemented by *bona opera caritatis*), between the Jews and the Gentiles or the Church and the Synagogue, and by the types of the apostles and the preaching of the need for faith.⁹ This theme is understood by means of the illumination of the interior significantia of the text.¹⁰ The text is itself a witness to the history of God's actions in transferring salvation from the Jews to the Gentiles, from the inheritance of the law to the inheritance of faith. The pivot of this movement is Jesus Christ, God and man, the sinless Son of God who in faith, reverses the effect of the sins of Adam through

9

cf. In. Mt. 4.22 (PL 9.939C) (*Quicumque dimiserit uxorem suam, det illi repudium etc. Nam cum lex libertatem dandi repudii ex libelli auctoritate tribuisset, nunc marito fides evangelica non solum voluntatem pacis indixit verum etiam reatum coactae in adulterium uxoris imposuit, si alio ex discessionis necessitate nubenda sit.*) Also (PL 9.963) on John the Baptist '*Usque in eum enim lex et prophetae sunt; et, nisi lege finita, in fidem evangelicam eorum nemo concederet,*' and numerous others at 5.6; 8.4; 9.2; 12.4; 14.11; 18.11; 19.10; 20.4; 20.9; etc.

10

cf. 2.2 (PL 9.924C) *In Johanne locus, praedicatio, vestitus, cibus est contuendus: atque ita, ut meminerimus gestorum veritatem non idcirco corrumpi, si gerendis rebus interioris intelligentiae ratio subjecta sit.* etc.

the law.¹¹ Apart from a few references to angels and demons, and, in the first chapter only, a discussion of Mary's virginity, of the brothers of Jesus and an explanation of Dt. 25.6, and later a gloss on 'Rachel' and one on 'Hosanna', the commentary contains NO OTHER THEMES!¹² Such a strict economy in subject matter would appear to be unique among ancient commentaries (with the possible exception of the special case of Tyconius). A survey of all ancient commentaries on St. Matthew shows a comparable concision and unity of material elsewhere only in the (incomplete) fifth century scholia of Arnobius the younger (MPL 53) (Indeed an examination of the relevant texts shows no evidence of direct connection with any single patristic exegete of St. Matthew.)¹³

11
cf. 3.5 (PL 9.930) where Christ prevails over the temptations to which Adam succumbed, and 8.5-7 (PL 9.960-1) ending 'postremo reditu in domum propriam iter in paradisum credentibus esse redhibendum, ex quo Adam parens universorum peccati labè dissolutus excesserat.'

12
cf. ch. 1.; 4.17; and 21.3.

13
Some evidence for this conclusion has been given in ch. 2 above (sv. Irenaeus, note, etc) A sample of the situation in the commentaries, especially those on St. Matthew, might be set out as follows:
1. The western Church. Hippolytus - no connection with the fragments on Mt 24f can be shown. Unlike Hippol. Hilary makes no mention of the eikon of the emperor. For Hippolytus the sabbath signifies the end of mankind, for Hilary, otium bonorum operum etc. The fig tree for Hippolytus is like any other tree.
Novatian, references to Mt. in the De Trin. show no parallels, but in the western tradition there are references to 'scriptura' 'coelestis', 'deus per scripturas ostenditur' etc. Tertullian's references to the gospel of St Mt. appear to have no similarity

Interior significantia, the substantia of Jesus Christ as vere Deus, vere homo, lex/fides - inevitably discussion of the commentary has focussed on Hilary's relation to the Alexandrian tradition and to Origen, to the Arian controversy, and on his Paulinism. Our own first concern however, is an examination of the commentary structure as such, seen against the background of the previous chapter, in order to find out what effects if any, this structure has had on his exegesis. We shall examine

to those of Hilary, likewise with Cyprian, except for the single reference to 'evangelica praecepta'.

2. The East. Origen (GCS 10) is very different, e.g. in his treatment of the episode of the loaves and fishes; none of the familiar equivalents navis=ecclesia, pueri=gentes, mater=lex, ficus=synagoga, occur in Origen on St. Matthew. Athanasius (MPG 27) has only one parallel, to l.1 where in Hilary, Jesus Christ is referred to as rex et sacerdos cf. Athan, kai hieres kai basileus ho Christos etgchanen, which possibly comes from a common source in credal formulation.

Theodore of Heraclea (Reuss 55f) Theodore of Mopsuestia (Reuss 96f) and Apollinarius of Laodicea (Reuss) are very different both in general scope and particular use of figural expressions.

Likewise, Theophilus of Alexandria (Reuss 150) and Cyril of Alexandria (MPG 72)

A completely different treatment is provided by John Chrysostom (MPG 57, 58)

the relation of the biblical text to the exposition, to see how the text was treated by and appeared to Hilary as he began its exegesis. How far if at all, was the text already seen as a characteristically fourth century document by Hilary before he began his further interpretation of it? At a later stage, we shall then attempt to distinguish in the wider interpretation of the text those categories which derived originally from the literary tradition and those which derive from more strictly theological and philosophical traditions - without of course suggesting that any of these streams remain pure and unaffected by the others.

a). The structure of the commentary.

In writing the commentary on St. Matthew in Gaul around 353-5, why did Hilary choose this particular gospel for exposition and this particular literary form? No direct answer is given in the text. It may be that he had preached a series of sermons on the text of the gospel, but there is no trace of these in the commentary.¹⁴ Hilary describes his work as a book, and cross references reveal

14

Earliest evidence for a *lectio continua* in Gaul is from the mid-fifth century (Gennadius of Marseilles in *De Script. Eccles.* 79 (IPL 58)). On liturgy in Gaul cf Jungmann 1.37f. But sermons in series on texts are common before this, cf Chrysostom's homilies on Genesis (cf. A. Niebergall in *Leiturgia II*, (1955) 181-353) and arts. *Perikopen* and '*Geschichte der christliche Predigt*' in PRE 3.

that it was intended to be read through as a continuous work.¹⁵ Paraphrases in the text would allow the work to be read with or without the text of the gospel to hand.¹⁶ Gaul was at this time the scene of a magnificent late flowering of the Latin language, yet with the exception of certain technical terms which we shall consider below, the work shows no affinity with any distinctly Gallic literary genre. Its language is elegant but not elaborate.¹⁷

We have seen that Hilary was not the first to write commentary in Latin,¹⁸ and that he himself sought to correct previous misinterpretation.¹⁹ Yet the general

15 esp. 19.11 (PL 9.1027B) 'sed in primordio libri (2.2) sub vestitu Johannis, in camelo gentes significari admonuimus' cf. too below.

16 cf. ch. 21 (PL 9.1034C) Duo discipuli ad vicum mittuntur, etc.

17 a characteristic piece is to be found at 21.1 (PL 9.1035B) 'Pullum verò idem Dominus ascendit, novellum contumacem, durum; atque haec omnia gentilis ignorantiae vitia dominantur, et tot animae ferocitates vectio Deo factae sunt (reading the lectio difficilior with the Migne text).

18 on Rheticius and others cf. section 2 above.

19 cf. 12.18 (PL 9.990A) In futurum vero omnem fidei perversitatem coarguit, eorum scilicet qui .. in diversa hereseos studia efferbuerunt. cf. 31.3 (PL 9.1066D) Sed eorum omnis hic sensus est etc. In this connection it is worth bearing in mind that much of Gaul was opened to mission really only in the first half of the 4th century. cf. Frend in 'Mullus', Festschrift Klauser, 128 'It was not till a generation after Constantine that a native Latin christianity owing, as Hilary of Poitiers suggests, little to the east, began to make its presence felt in Southern Gaul' cf. too 4.19 quid enim a pluribus in hoc capite sensum est. 1.3. plures irreligiosi et a spiritali doctrina admodum alieni 31.2 aliquorum opinio est. cf. too 26.5 on heretical opinions.

custom in the west had been to expound the biblical text in the form of homilies, or when developing a particular theme to use the looser form of a tractate.²⁰ There is, it seems to me, a close connection between the choice of the commentary form and Hilary's understanding of the nature and purpose of the text itself. The concise, strictly interrelated nature of the exposition corresponds to his conviction of the continuity and single purpose of the gospel narrative itself - a purpose which we shall examine later in detail²¹ - namely the history of the acts of God in transferring the inheritance of faith through Jesus Christ from the old people of God to the new. He admits, partly in deference to a literalist tradition in the west, that the text has a valid literal and open meaning²² (the relation of this to the theological concept of an 'externa claritas' we shall have to explore): but beyond this there is an inner meaning in the movement of the history of faith, which can be understood through the Spirit of God, which can be understood by paying attention to the hidden continuities and significant points

20

cf. sect. 2 above on the homilies and tractate of Iren., Tertullian and Cyprian.

21

on the unity of the text cf. below.

22

7.1 (PL 9.954B) Nihil enim veritati detrahit, imitationem veritas consecuta cf. 10.1 (PL 9.966B) Paria in dictis atque in factis significationum momenta consistunt (though the stress here is on the future significance of the words.)

within the narrative itself.²³

It will be our first main object to analyse these technical means by which Hilary extracts his interpretation, as a consistent whole and in its constituent parts, from the text of the gospel, and to assess the consequences for his exposition involved in the procedure followed, i.e. to look at the resultant state of the basic data. We shall then go on to consider the wider contexts in which the interpretation is developed. (This procedural model is of course, of heuristic value only, for the hermeneutical process is always a complex whole from start to finish).

a) The shape of the commentary.

The text of the gospel and of the commentary is divided up in the *Higne* text into a number of sections - 33 in the authentic portion of the text²⁴ - each with a self-contained segment of text and exposition; but this division, as *Jeanotte* has shown, is mediaeval. A guide to the beginning of each new chapter can be seen in the

23

cf. 7.8 (PL 9.957A) ergo rerum tantarum, et tam diversarum ratio promenda est; atque ita, ut secundum continentem rerum ordinem, et gravissimas veritatis ipsius causas, interioris significantiae intelligentia explicetur.

24

The final section of ch. 33 (PL 9.1066f) has long been recognised to be from *Jerome*, and to have been added much later.

sections of the gospel which end with et reliqua,²⁵ but this guide is not infallible.²⁶

Since the material makes up not a series of scholia but a continuous commentary, each piece of text, though not each single verse, is taken up after the other and explained, often in terms of adjacent sections.²⁷ Not all of the gospel text is covered in this way, however. Apart from the missing prologue and ending, there is a system of choice of texts for exposition, which leaves out some and includes others.²⁸ Those left out are all classified (where mentioned at all) as intelligible absolute, and so requiring no further explanation. Those included have a hidden spiritual meaning, the unfolding of which is the purpose of the work. What this meaning is will concern us in a later section.

25

cf. H. Jeanotte in *Bibl. Zeitschr.* 10 (1912) 36-48. The capitula, which begin to correspond to Hilary's own divisions after ch. 24, were probably edited in the 5th or 6th century (Jeanotte op.cit.)

26

A division by episodes might be made as follows: 1.1-2.1; 2.2-2.4; 2.5; 3.1-3.6; 4.1-4.8; 4.9-12; 4.13-22; 4.23-27; 4.28-5.4; 5.5; 6; 7; 8.1-2; 8.3-end; 9; 10.1-5; 10.6-21; 10.22-end; 11; 12.1-17; 12.18-20; 12.21-end; etc.

27

In chs. 1 and 2 the only verses precisely quoted are 1.1; 1.18; 1.20; 1.25; 2.1f; 2.13; 2.18; 2.21. The whole has an inner ordo of 1.2 'sequens est, secundum rerum fidem generationis istius ordinem nec numero sibi nec successione constare: huius quoque rei ratio afferatur etc.

28

e.g. 24.9 (FL 9.1051) *Judicii forma in absoluto et etc.* cf. the list below.

Each section always begins with a portion of the gospel text, usually the beginning of an episode in the narrative. One or two verses are cited, and followed by an exposition into which following verses of the gospel text are then drawn. The relation in size between text and commentary depends, as does the lengths of the text and commentary themselves, entirely on the content of the material.²⁹

The connections between the sections are not simply those of the gospel narrative, but there are definite references backwards (though never forwards) showing how the continuity of the sections is to be understood.³⁰ The absence of forward reference may, but need not necessarily suggest original delivery of the material to an audience, who could recall but not anticipate.

There is always a definite break between sections, which is often underlined by the use of formulaic phrases.³¹

29

Here there is no fixed proportion. The lengths of Hilary's chapters themselves vary considerably, becoming much shorter towards the end (cf chs 26-8), perhaps an indication of haste.

30

cf. the reference to continuity at 5.4 (PL 9.944) *continens sensus est*, 18.4 (PL 9.1020A) *Superius autem in abscindendis manu vel pede propinquitatum contineri nomina exposuimus*, 4.21 *atque ideo etc.* 27.3 *dictis superioribus tractatum est*, 14.6 *sermo igitur ad originem propositionis referendus est* 21 *post superiorem competenter nunc*, and a rather different but connected use at 10.8 *quae ergo dictum proprietatis monstranda est.* cf. 20.5; 32.4; 19.11.

31

notably the connectives *post quae* 2.1 etc, *post haec* (1.7) and the instances in 30 above.

Within the sections themselves, too, much of the exposition has stereotyped characteristics, though complex patterns are not found repeated. We do not find large differences in the shape of these patterns, of the kind found by Adler in Philo, rather, there is a fairly consistent structure of text, exposition and citation of further verses within the text of the rest of the episode being dealt with, though there are differences e.g. in the formulae introducing the citations. Occasionally there are no extra citations, and here the exposition often consists of paraphrase of the text.³²

Biblical citations in the exposition are taken on occasion from outside the episode being commented upon. Sometimes single words from citations are singled out and stressed, but the usual practice is simply citation as a 'proof text'. The function of all these citations is not to add something new to the sense, but to confirm, illustrate, prove, underline the meaning of the text under consideration. This use of additional citations

32

cf. 8.3. First a list of the events of the narrative is repeated. *All hanc habet causam.* The whole is then explained in detail, epitomising phrase after epitomising phrase; not only does the passage as a whole have a thematic theological meaning, but there are key phrases which must be picked out as indicative pointers to the theme. These pointers may each in themselves sum up the theme of the whole episode. This is a consequence of the theological conception of the gospel text; cf. below.

Occasionally we find verse by verse exposition e.g. of the beatitudes at 4.3ff.

to stress main points helps to provide a unifying element and to balance the atomising tendency of much of the technique of exposition.

Sometimes individual words from citations are singled out and stressed. The texts of the citations are more often cited as proofs, confirmations and illustrations than actually exegeted. Thus in 1.1 Lk. 3.2 is cited as a piece of evidence for the purpose of historical explanation. Jn. 19.26-7 is used as a proof of the explanation of the position regarding ^{the} brothers of Jesus at 1.4 (cf. Tert. De virg. vel. 6, De Carne Christi 6, for whom Jesus' brothers are the sons of Mary) and at 1.7 Jer. 31.15 and Mt. 2.18 are used as 'proof exists' for the illustration of the fulfilment of prophecy. In the commentary there are 67 explicit citations of texts apart from the gospel text under consideration in each episode (not all entirely accurate), 23 from the OT (7 from Genesis, 6 from Is., 3 from Ex. and from Ezech., and one each from Lev. Kings, Dan. and Jonah) and 41 from the NT (13 from Mt., 10 from Jn., 4 each from Lk., Acts and Cor., 2 from Eph. and 1 Pet., 1 each from Rom. and Rev.) Bonassieux counted 236 vv of Mt. cited out of 1060 i.e. 21.27%. Though many of the citations are of traditional doctrinal proof texts e.g. I Pet. 2.22 and I Pet. 4.8, sometimes the link may be simply that of association of ideas e.g. calceamenta suggests Is. 52.7 at 2.3 and Ex. 3.5 at 10.5.

Attempts to determine from citations the actual text of

the Bible used by Hilary have been a matter of considerable and largely fruitless speculation. Bonassieux's attempt to establish the text of the synoptic gospels used (1906) was demolished by Jülicher almost at once (TLZ 1907) and this judgement is confirmed by Feder (WS 1919) It is not clear for example that Hilary used the same text in Gaul and in Asia minor, and in any event, he may often cite from memory.³³

The order of the episodes into which the material is divided is reinforced too by the use of technical distinctions from the rhetorical tradition - ordo, ratio, proprietas etc. the details of which we shall consider in a later section. An important feature of the In Matthaicum is that the text is divided according to the main themes as Hilary sees them, and not simply line by line as in any other commentaries e.g. those of Jerome and Origen.³⁴

33

cf. Reinkens' 'Beilage' to his work on 'Die Lateinischen Übersetzungen der Bibel in der Mitte der IV Jhdt'. cf. Souter, Text and Canon 81 'Hilary used in the gospels a text having points of contact with the Irish Latin codex Usserianus of the VIth century. (r) No doubt Britain and Ireland first got the gospel from Gaul.' cf. too Engelbrecht.

34

How is the choice between different interpretations to be made? For Hilary the text has its own ordo, which may be unfolded. cf. 1.3 generationis ordo simplex est. 2.2 In Johanne locus contuendus... atque ita ut meminimus gestorum veritatem non idcirco corrumpi, si gerendis rebus interioris intelligentiae ratio subjecta sit. 2.11 typica ratio servata est 21.12 rationem quaerere coelestis intelligentiae admonemur, 25.5 momenta praeceptorum coelestium consequamur.

This brings us to the question of the kind of explanation given. The exposition is no scholiast's explanation of obscure words and grammatical oddities: Hilary's concern is with the gospel as a theological whole, and with each section as part of a wider context. For this reason he does not normally go through the passage phrase by phrase as e.g. Origen does, and so avoids much of the atomisation of the text endemic in much ancient commentary. But the penalty is a frequent alteration of the accent laid on the several facets of given episodes by the evangelist, in favour of harmonisation with Hilary's own total concept of the work.³⁵

We have noted that a basic feature of the explanation given is its exclusively theological nature. This distinguishes sharply the shape of the work from that of Origen, with its many historical geographical and other details - Hilary's is not in that sense erudite.³⁶ When an

35

This is especially evident in e.g. his treatment of the miracles of Jesus; cf. 14.9f the episode of the feeding of the 5000 where the elements of awe and wonder and the cosmic significance of Jesus disappear in the relation of all to the law/gospel axis (on this R.M. Grant, *Miracle and Natural Law*, 211ff. also comments) cf. too ch. 32. the treatment of the betrayal: 'sed in osculo Judae haec fuit ratio: ut doceremur inimicos omnes eosque quos sciremus desaevituros in nos esse, diligere. Osculum enim Dominus non respuit.' The passion takes the form of a celestial play, in which the depth of the issues of betrayal and suffering are lost. This is also strikingly evident in ch. 33, the narrative of the crucifixion, in which the detailed typology obscures the scandalum crucis.

36

cf. Origen in Mt. 13.42f (GCS 10) where there is a long report on pearl fishing in India, Britain and in the Bosphorus (the Latin translation of Origen in Mt. dates from c600) cf. Hil. In Mt. 13.8 margarita a lege ad evangelium transiens.

obscurity in the text is explained, this is at once related to a theological point.³⁷ The whole work is explained in terms of basic principles for the theological interpretation which is applied to and extracted from the text according to given hermeneutical rules. These principles are never argued for but referred to as given.³⁸ To this second stage of the interpretational process we now turn, at first continuing with analysis of formal structure, and then to the principles as theological criteria.

We have already noted the division of the text into material whose significance was plain absolute and that which was not. The former may be classified in three sections, referring to the fulfilment of prophecy, historical details about the life of Jesus which are not of direct interest for the exposition of the history of salvation, and some parables.³⁹ The latter has a deep but hidden meaning, indicated by several synonymous phrases, the most common of which is *coelestis significantia*,

37 as in the explanation of racha at 4.17, the linguistic gloss on hosanna at 26.3 and the historical gloss on Samaria at 26.1.

38 cf. below.

39 absolutus. cf. 22.1 quæstio omnis in absoluto est; 15.1 absoluta ratio; cf. 18.11; 19.9; 22.1; 24.8; 27.3; etc. Within the context of a purely spiritual sense, a passage with a 'simple' sense may also occur; cf. 20.3 omnis itaque hic sermo est spiritalis. Sed Dominus brevi absolutaque ratione dicens. i.e. the absolute is not contrasted in every case with the spiritual sense. 'Absolutus' is applied to parables and to actions of Jesus which are self-explanatory.

which as mentioned is assumed to indicate the key to the interpretation. Such a principle is, as we saw in section 2 above, common to most early biblical exegesis: important for us is the nature of its interconnection with the structure of the commentary form and the theological motifs which govern Hilary's conception of the text, and which, of course, vary from exegete to exegete. For Hilary, these key motifs consist in the dialectic (for these themes always occur in balancing pairs) between the law and faith, the Jews and the Gentiles, the Synagogue and the Church, those who deny the divinity of the eternal Son of God and those who do not. There is then no attempt to argue in principle from the literal words of the text towards a reconstruction of the hidden significance; rather this is known and is the key to the illumination of the literal course of the text. Whatever we may think of its usefulness, the reciprocal relation between the text and the inner significance, which is brought about by the Spirit, constitutes a legitimate hermeneutical circle, in which, for Hilary as for

Usually mention of an 'absolute' sense implies only brief mention. Connected with the passages whose significance is clear 'absolute' is the complete omission of some passages: these refer either to (a) the fulfilment of prophecy or to (b) historical events in the narrative which are not of direct interest for the main line of interpretation or (c) to some parables, and occur at 1.22-7 (a); 2.5-6 (a); 2.7-8 (b); 2.23 (a); 3.5 (b); etc. 6.7-15 (b -because of treatment by Tert. and Cypn.) 13.24-30 (c); 26.27f (b) etc. and 28.10ff (missing/lost)

Cyprian and for Augustine, a vital link in the chain of understanding is membership of the church.⁴⁰

What then of the relation between the inner significance and the external commentary structures examined at the beginning of this section? We might illustrate the position by suggesting that in the first stage the bricks are constructed from the raw material of the text, and can then be used to build the arches of the hermeneutical design. The processing of the raw material is essential to the nature of the building as it is conceived, but in the process the original colour and texture of that raw material, the gospel text, has been altered drastically.

Finally, in this formal section, we may mention the manner in which Hilary seeks to present the material to his readers. Clearly he is not presenting this for learning in school, or for the information of experts on biblical background; he is simply concerned to explain the sequence of events in terms of the movement from the law to faith.

40

cf. ch.14. ego Dei Verbum lege finita navem conscendens Ecclesiam adit, et in desertam concedit, de synagoga videlicet ad ecclesiam concedit' and numerous others. For the spiritual significance in general cf. 2.6 ordo ~~etiam in eo~~ arcani coelestis exprimitur; 5.13 totius sub dictis coelestis significantia continetur; 20.15 rationem quaerere coelestis intelligentiae admonemur; 19.4 in scripturis coelestibus; 14.9 responsio ad spiritalis intelligentiae ordinem tendit; 20.1 ut ratio spiritalis plana esset; i.e. Hilary makes changes for stylistic reasons rather than to suggest nuances of meaning. On the hermeneutical condition of membership of the Church cf. 13.1 significat eos qui extra ecclesiam positi sunt nullam divini sermonis capere posse intelligentiam.

The peculiar character of Hilary's method of presentation may be further illustrated by comparison with related literary forms. Porphyrius's scholion-commentary for example, uses the categories of the literary tradition in the same ways as Hilary does, but here there is no literary unity whatever, and no continuity of theme.⁴¹ Zeno of Verona's near contemporary homilies contain a fair amount of material on subjects outside the biblical narrative: Hilary's commentary, despite its homiletic elements has none, and though there is a certain amount of ethical exhortation⁴² there is no direct appeal to the reader in the second person, and no long diatribe-like excurses of the kind frequent in homilies. The stress is more on the attainment of *cognitio Dei* through faith than of moral excellences. Again the series of questions and answers and the refutation of objections real or assumed which characterised the dialogue and some forms of commentary *are* absent from the *In Matt*; in Hilary the divisions of the narrative are for a better understanding of the theological themes, and not for analysis for its own sake, as for example in that highly sophisticated Alexandrian product, the systematic scientific textbook.

41

Wessner, (*Quaestiones Porphyrianae*, p 159f) showed that the work, being cited by C. Iulius Romanus, must have been written approximately at the beginning of the third century.

42

mainly in the context of the Sermon on the Mount. cf. ch.4 *passim*. cf. too 5,3,13,9 etc. *contemptum saeculi*.

The above then are the basic formal characteristics of the commentary and the effects which these characteristics have on the biblical text itself. The next step must be to examine in detail the theoretical aspects of the main interpretational principles, and to attempt to clarify the processes of hermeneutical interconnection involved in the application of these principles to the structure of the text in its 'prepared' form in the commentary.

b) The nature of the hermeneutical principles.

In this section we shall consider factors deriving mainly from the exegetical tradition of the church and the rhetorical tradition of the schools. This subject matter is obviously closely related to the previous section on commentary structures and to the following section on theological and philosophical background, but will be considered in the first instance as far as possible as an independent area of concern.

We have seen that both the exegetical tradition of the church and the rhetorical tradition of the schools developed sophisticated systems for the interpretation of texts, to both of which Hilary was indebted.⁴³

43

cf. sect. 2 above and summaries of the exegetical tradition in PRE³ art. Hermeneutik, RGG³ Schriftauslegung, Hermeneutik, Geist und Buchstabe, EKL Hermeneutik. On the rhetorical tradition, Gräfenhan and Steinthal are still useful.

The basic concept expressed by the phrase 'coelestis significantia' is of course, a corollary of the idea of a sacred book, and as such was taken for granted in the early church, referring from the beginning of the third century at least to the status of the material within the canon of old and new Testaments.⁴⁴ For Hilary the scriptures were in a literal sense divinely inspired. What was not so obvious for some of his readers was that the coelestis significantia was not always to be identified with the literal meaning of the text.⁴⁵ For Hilary the text has two levels of meaning. In principle any given text may have both, but usually he draws particular attention to one or the other. Both levels may be used by God in illuminating our understanding, but the inner meaning relates specifically, in this gospel, to the movement from the law to faith. There is not, as in Origen,

44

on the formation of the canon cf. now H. v. Campenhausen, *Die Entstehung des Neuen Testaments*, Tübingen 1968.

45

despite the references to *divinus sermo* (13), *sermo Dei* etc, and the literalist tradition of the fusion of the *virtus* of the Spirit with the inspired text, scripture is not explicitly described as the *Verbum Dei*. Jesus is however so referred to, and his words are themselves the *Verbum*; so 6.1 *ergo et concorporationem Verbi Dei, passionis mysterium et civitatem resurrectionis non promiscue tractari nos convenit*; 7.2 *adest leprosus .. Verbi virtute curatur*; 5.8 *In dictis Dei veritas est, et rerum creandarum efficientia omnis in verbo ist.* Scripture itself has a special *coelestis significantia* which is given by God and confers divine truth upon its meaning in both literal and spiritual senses cf. 7.1 *nihil enim veritati detrahit, imitationem veritas consecuta*; as at 7.1 again, *ne quis forte existimaret aliquid rerum gestarum fidei detrahendum etc.* Sometimes both senses are employed in the interpretation as at 19.10 *et haec quidem ad simplicis sensus intelligentiam pertinent.*

Verum eodem cursu interioris causae ordo retinendus est. But at 20.2 only one sense is relevant, *omnis itaque hic sermo est spiritualis*

a series of steps towards our deeper illumination and perfection, but the illumination as *cognitio Dei* consists in the understanding of the relation of prophecy to fulfilment in the church, in the history of the saving acts of God. The pivot of this movement from the law to faith is the recognition of the divine sonship of Christ.

Thus in 1.5 *nihil a Judaea petere scientiae agnitionisque permittimur, sed in Christo salutem omnem et spem locantes, admonemur prioris vitae itinere abstinere. Fides brings cognitio Dei, but the infideles are lost in ignorantia. cf. 4.11 (935B) Igitur mundus extra cognitionem Dei positus obscurabatur ignorantiae tenebris; cui per apostolos scientiae lumen invehitur, et cognitio Dei claret; 7.11 (958A) filium autem hominis, se scilicet cui caput Deus sit, non reperire in quos collocata Dei cognitione requiescat; 9.9 Dei quippe cognitione superstitionum omnium vesania effugata, et visus et auditus et sermo salutis invehitur cum, cui per legem nihil afferri opis poterat, verbi virtute salvari; 23.6 Proprium enim Domini nostri Jesus Christi officium est, cognitionem Dei afferre, et intelligentiam nominis eius potestatisque praestare; (24.1 in omnibus enim Christi meditabatur adventum. Quidquid enim in ea continebatur, in profectum manifestandae eius cognitionis assumptum est); 25.6 sed perinde hic etiam infirmitatem animarum, quae ad cognitionem Dei tamquam lacte adhuc alantur ostendit; quae perfecti/cibi virtute indigentes, tenui divinae cognitionis*

infirmoque gustatu imbuantur; 33.4 locus tanquam in vertice huius universitatis insistens, ad capessendam Dei cognitionem universis gestibus esset aequalis. cf. too 20.13 Atque ut typus crediturarum gentium expleretur, coelestis gratiae cognitione percepta, qui caeci fuerant, videntes Dominum suum sunt secuti. Traces however of the western moralising tradition remain, at 4.1 exemplo docuit ut boni sumus, or at 2.3 sed subest gestis rebus exemplum.. ut ad omne ministerium Christi voluntate simus accincti.⁴⁶

The centre of the lex/fides axis, which is the essence of the history of salvation, is the history of the dicta and facta of Jesus.⁴⁷ These themselves create faith, with the aid of the agency of the Spirit, and meditation upon the whole coelestis significantia unveiled within the scripture will deepen the faith of the reader, under the action of the Spirit as the virtus inspiring the words themselves. The text has its own spiritual significance and mediates the knowledge of God in Jesus, who is the object of its witness, to the reader.

It is because of this stress upon the coelestis significantia of the texts themselves in mediating the knowledge of God in Jesus, rather than a stress being upon God revealing himself in the context of scriptures,

⁴⁶

Here Luther who has borrowed much from the In Matthaem explicitly contradicts Hilary, without mentioning him; Johannes non gestat haec vestimenta ut exemplum nobis donet. Es war um sein predigampt zu thun! WA 27.458.2-4 (apud Ebeling EE 443).

⁴⁷

cf. too below the references in the lex/fides citations and in the work of Jesus in dicta and facta.

(cf. the De Trin) that the special hermeneutical principles of the rhetorical and exegetical tradition play such an important role, as much as in the final process of the understanding of scripture as the medium of revelation as in the intermediate stage of the correlation with the lex/fides central motif and in the preliminary stage of the preparation of the narrative into a suitably pointed series of narratives bearing on the Heilsgeschichte.

A variety of means are used in this intermediate stage to relate the conception of the Heilsgeschichte to the narratives and to the texts, the most striking of these being the lex/fides model, which is applied throughout the work. The Jews stand under the condemnation of the law, Jesus came under the judgement of the law and himself pronounced judgement upon it. Faith brings freedom from condemnation and saving knowledge of God, and is the inheritance which has passed from the Old Israel to the New. Further illustration may be found in almost every section of the work.⁴⁸

48

cf. 4.22-25 where lex is contrasted throughout with fides evangelica. cf. too 5.1 justificatio ex fide; 8.6 fides enim sola justificat; 9.3 usque enim in eum (Johannes) lex et prophetae sunt; et, nisi lege finita, in fidem evangelicam eorum (Johannis discipuli) nemo concederet. ac sic consummatum justitia ex fide; 12.3 evangelica fides operetur in Christo; 18.11 sed lex, ut scimus, futurorum umbra est; 19.10 iactura legis with fides evangelica; 20.9 apostoli quidem iam ex lege crediderant, quae eos in fidem evangelicam nutriverat; cf. too 20.15, 21.15; 26.5; 27.9; 32.2; 32.7; and characteristically 9.2 nam si iustitia fuisset, ex lege, venia per gratiam necessaria non fuisset.

cf. too for complementary motifs 2.1 admoniti per visum, sancti scilicet Spiritus donum in gentibus

The sources of this strong Pauline tradition have been much debated. A recent carefully argued suggestion would trace it, and the apparent 'Pauline renaissance' in the Latin west in general, to a continuing Marcionite stream in the western tradition: this we shall examine in detail below. But the problem remains. One factor was probably simply reaction from the moralising quasi-legalist strain in western christianity deriving from Tertullian particularly and the influence of popular Stoicism. But as we have seen above there were also traditional sources of the law/gospel, people of faith/people of the law motif in the west. The concept of the *populus Dei* was central in western ecclesiology e.g. in Hippolytus, and the classic theologian of the *oikonomia* of the *Heilsgeschichte* was Irenaeus, whose continuing influence especially in Gaul can hardly be doubted, despite the relatively late date of the first extant Latin translation. The tradition too of the movement of the people of God in the letter to the Hebrews played a much greater role in the west than in the east in the first four centuries,

contemplantes, ad eas transferrunt Christum, Judaeæ missum sed vitam et salutem gentium nuncupatum; 11.11 fides gentium cf. 18.4 iudaicum populum; 8.5 gentilium universitas; 15.5 fides in gentibus; 13.5 mulier-synagoga; 14.7 passim on the Jews and the Gentiles; 7.3 tribunus.. principem esse gentium crediturarum; 12.23 grace for the gentes; 5.12 sub foeni nomine gentes etc; 2.1 magi-gentes crediturae. 12.18-25 ecclesia/synagoga, fides gentium/infidelitas Iudaeorum. cf. too 5.6 justitia ex fides nulla est ... etc. 3.11 legis opus inefficax, 11.11; 12.13; 14.8 finitis igitur legis temporibus)

and there was another side even to Tertullian, in his stress on the fides motif.⁴⁹

However that may be, and we shall return to the problem, our present concern is with the use rather than the source of the motif. For Hilary in this work the christian gospel is par excellence the gospel of faith and the Matthean text is a mirror/microcosm of this gospel.

The means by which Hilary's special interpretation of the concept of spiritual meaning are connected with the structure of the narrative are various. We consider first those categories of the rhetorical tradition, especially ordo, ratio, proprietas and exemplum.

The use of these categories is not of course confined to the rhetorical tradition. In most classical allegorical interpretation e.g. of Homer, or of the Old Testament by Justin, a lack of proprietas or ordo in the literal sense of the text is a sign of a hidden inner meaning.⁵⁰ The use of ordo in Hilary has important theological connotations, in underlining that the inner interpretation is itself part of God's eternal saving history; so too with ratio, when illumined by faith (without which, according to Hilary, we can understand nothing of God.)⁵¹

49

cf. the discussion of Wille below, and the references in the notes to sect 2 above from Iren., Hippol., and Tert. For *populus Dei* cf too Q. Cepke, *Das neue Gottesvolk*, 255f on Hippolytus. The thesis is also found, as indicated above, in Tertullian, Clement, Origen and Lactantius. But it is never used in a manner so concentrated as that of the In Mt. The refutation of the Jews and of the teaching of the synagogue was of course

In the rhetorical tradition these concepts have not only descriptive but also hermeneutical functions, which are reflected in the commentary in the ease with which the transition from matters of literary form to matters of theological interpretation is made.⁵²

That Hilary was familiar with the methods of classical rhetoric is clear both from the nature of his own background and from the works themselves. Where precisely he was educated is not clear, but there is no reasonable doubt that he was brought up in that classical tradition which

a standard part of early christian apologetic: Oepke (r287) cites Constantine's letter to the churches after Nicaea (FL 8.501-6).

50

cf. sect. 2 above (details for Homer cf Buffiere, for Justin cf. Shotwell op. cit. 29ff - largely from Philo cf. p. 35 above)

51

cf. 15.8 ordo igitur idem in sermone Domini est, qui in consequenda gratia manet,; 2.6 ordo coelestis.; 3.6 rei gestae ordo; 8.6 veritatis ordo; 9.8 sed manet nunc ordo mysterii; 11.27 ordo gratiarum. For ratio cf 15.1 absoluta ratio est; 17.12 subest praesentibus rebus ratio inferior; 17.2 where ratio is connected with exemplum - et in hoc quidem facti genere, servatur et ratio, et numerus, et exemplum. 14.1 inferioris intelligentiae ratio; 9.9 ratio praefigurationis; 19.1 typica ratio etc. It will be clear from the above examples that ratio and ordo are often used in a practically synonymous way. (This we shall see, may also be the case, but is not always so, with typus and exemplum). Sensus, cf. 6.6 sensus est superioribus coniunctus, and causa cf. 8.3 dum hominum occursus etc hanc habent causam may also be closely connected with the above. The importance of these terms lies more in the continuity which they suggest than in the precise use of the individual terms.

52

cf. the discussion of the individual cases below.

enjoyed its brilliant Indian summer in Gaul in the middle of the fourth century.⁵³ Evidence for the courses pursued in the schools is from the second half of the century, but undoubtedly in Hilary's day Quintilian, and textbooks based on him, formed a major part of the standard literature in literary criticism. My own reading of the results of the long controversy on the influence of Quintilian on Hilary is that though there are no deliberate reminiscences of Quintilian, yet the influence of his categories of literary criticism is to be affirmed. That there may have been intermediate sources is not excluded: that there were other influences in the use of the rhetorical terms as well, notably Cicero (cf. *De Orat.* 3.18 etc) Seneca perhaps and Tertullian, is highly probable.⁵⁴

53

On the background to the church in Gaul and Hilary's relation to this cf Scott Holmes esp. 143f. and Jullian op.cit. 6.104-15, 123-8 and VII 246-64.

54

Hilary and Quintilian. H. Kling (*De Hil. Pict artis rhetoricae ipsiusque ut fertur institutionis oratoriae Quintilianae studioso.*, Freiburg 1909/diss. HD 1910) suggested (op.cit.12) that if Hilary had studied at the nearest high school to Poitiers at Burdigald, then he might have known Quintilian's *Institutio* through Ausonius, who valued Quint. and taught there from 334-8; but for this there is no evidence. Kling finds parallels with the institutes in the *De Trin.* (*Trin.* 2.81 = *Inst.* 12.3) and (*Trin.* 1.20- *Inst.* 12.10) (K 78 and 83) But the case for direct usage has not been proved (so Buttell and Schanz Hosius). It seems unlikely that Hilary had Quintilian before him, took him into exile or modelled his work on Quintilian. On the other hand, literary training based on the work is almost certain, and comes out in the use of hermeneutical categories which share, with the whole tradition of Latin rhetoric many of Quintilian's assumptions of below. Colson op.cit 44 finds few references to Q before the IVth century but this is not very significant. On rhetoric in Gaul cf too Haarhof and Courcelle

The possible influence of this tradition in mediating theories of knowledge (reflected in Quintilian's use of res in the interplay of philosophical and literary terminology in Cicero etc) will concern us in a later section. The first main effect to be noted here of the transference of these categories to the interpretation of the structure of an originally semitic narrative is the distinct latinising influence. In Gaul this was the age of the declamationes and the panegyrici; the use of the colores rhetorici was expected, and it was no accident that Hilary was in Norden's judgement one of the two best stylists of later Latin. In the declamation schools men learned to divide narratives into the *σχέματα λέξεως* into events and categories, to isolate the element of the surprising, the apparently absurd, for the purpose of effect, to conceive the guiding lines for a speech. The influence of rhetoric has long been acknowledged in e.g.

Les Lettres Grecques 210f, and Fichon, 958-9, where the scene in Gaul is set out in tabular form. Quillacq (worthless) Roger (150-1 on Hilary) and Feder (Kulturgeschichtliches) add nothing to the information available; cf. too Arbusow, Colores Rhetorici. On Poitiers cf. Griffé 127f Jerome's comment on Hilary (ep. in Gal. praef. Gallus ipse et Pictavis natus') has no external support. Nothing is known of the church at Poitiers before Hilary - even whether he had predecessors. The reference in Ps. 67.20 'Quotidie autem per populi credentis/accessionem' may refer to baptisms in quantity and so to a fairly young church community (Griffé).

Tertullian and in Gregory of Nyssa: it is also used as a technical tool by Hilary.⁵⁵

The presence of the rhetorical element has many side-effects. For example, the rhetoricians were accustomed to give citations not exactly, but only according to the general sense, and this procedure is followed by Hilary in his method of citation.⁵⁶ Favourite topoi of the schools, e.g. the humilitas motif, recur. The concepts of allegory and similitude, of typos, imago, figura and cognates have a history in rhetoric, partly through Stoic influence, as well as in the tradition of biblical exegesis, to which we shall return.

Another accompaniment of grammar and rhetoric was the production of lexicographical material, and it is possible that concordances of the Bible were available to Hilary. Stimulated by the flourishing of rhetoric, there sprang up too a new school of historiography in the west, which Hilary's interpretation may partly reflect. There is some evidence of his knowledge of Sallust.

55

The formal and interpretational aspects of a speech were in rhetoric dealt with in relation to each other. Thus the student learned to divide speeches for analysis into *genos*, *meros*, *typos*, *schema* and *tropos* (cf. the excellent discussions in Fuhrmann and in Krause) and within these categories to distinguish times and persons in the narrative: cf. In Mt 22.3 et haec quidem parabola distinguenda temporibus est et dignoscenda personis. Interpretatio is discussed in a classic passage at length in Ad Herr. 4.28f.

56

On the loose manner of citation in the rhetorical tradition cf. Peter and Hagendahl. This is an added reason for the problematic nature of the attempts to establish which texts of the Bible Hilary used.

This too was above all the time of 'historical outlines' and pericopes, of condensed presentations of large works in narrative form: the *In Matthaeum* is an example of a highly condensed narrative, and it is probably not without significance that Hilary's work was given to the public in this form.⁵⁷

The rhetorical tradition has then a considerable influence on the commentary. Apart from the detailed incidental effects, it serves to prepare the text for interpretation, as we saw in examining the formal structure above: it serves too to latinise and render intelligible in contemporary terms the thought of the narrative both as a literary whole and in terms of the individual concepts: and in addition as we shall see in detail in the next section of our study, it plays a role in moulding the framework of the theological and philosophical orientation of the work. Here we concentrate on the intermediate stage of the articulation of the hermeneutical principles in relation to the text. A good illustration of the interconnections here is provided by the term *exemplum*, which has a long history in the Greek (*paradeigma*) and Latin literary traditions (cf. Tertullian etc), and is much

57

cf. *Humilitas* at 18.10; 20.12 and 24.2 and Auerbach *Publikum*. (cf. too on Basil above). On rhetoric in Gregory of Nyssa cf. Meridier, and for Tertullian Welter. ^{passim} For the panegyrici cf. Monnard, 41f, and on *epitomae* and *periochae* Peter, *Geschichtsschreibung* P. 341f. Nothing can be said definitely for the use of concordances by Hilary. For Origen cf. Cadiou and for the beginnings in the middle ages art. *Bibelkoncordanz* in PRE3.

used by Hilary. As we look upon the exempla of the narratives, these are transfusa by the Spirit to reveal the inner sense. The exempla explain the dicta and vice versa. The exempla of Jesus have an inherent virtus which creates faith; in faith, we are then brought to follow Jesus' exempla in our actions and so faith and works are not in tension. We are justified only by faith, and at the same time, we remain in faith by producing bona exempla caritatis (an anticipation of the classic mediaeval resolution of the relation of faith and works, which reflects the fusion of a Pauline doctrine of faith with popular, originally Stoic moral teaching).⁵⁸ We see too that in speaking of res of events, Hilary is speaking not only in terms of the Irenean tradition of the oikonomia of God (though that too is important to recall) but also in the classical tradition of the res in the rhetorical division of the elements of speeches and in the eclectic stoic-influenced philosophy of the later empire which it partially reflects: likewise with ordo, ratio and possibly even finis (notably in the In Ps.) may owe something of its interpretation as much to Cicero as to the theological

58

On the use of exemplum in rhetoric and in christian exegesis see the studies of Petre, Kornhardt and Welter (Tert.) For Hilary cf. In Mt. 2.5 exempli sui auct^{or}itate; 10 ut exempli se passionis subsequatur; 2.3 operum exempla; 18.6 comparationis exemplum; 18.10 ad similitudinem nos humilitatis instruit, et confirmat exemplo. cf. too 5.9; 9.16; 13.7. For discussion of exempla in the rhetorical tradition cf. Cicero De Inv 20.49, where exemplum is connected with ordo, res and virtus; and Quint. Inst. Crat. 10.5.2.

59

cf. too in the In Mt. the uses of ordo and ratio cited above; and in the De Trin. 2.27 tenet autem ordinem prophetiae evangelica doctrina and ~~In Mt. 2~~ veritatem non idcirco corrumpi si gerendis rebus interioris significantia ratio subjecta sit.

tradition of Pauline eschatology. On the detail of these interconnections, a great deal of study remains to be done.⁶⁰

A second important set of images employed in articulating the *coelestis significantia* in the texts consists of those related to typology, allegory and metaphor on general. These too are to be found in the rhetorical tradition, and are clearly related to the categories taken from that tradition by Hilary.⁶¹ Hilary's usage is also

60

We have already noted the close connection of *exemplum* with *similitudo* in Hilary. This connection is to be found already in *Ar. Rhet.* 2.20 (in which *parabole* is included in the class of *paradeigmata*); cf. too Cicero *de Orat.* 2.41; *De Inv.* 1.30.46; *Quint. Inst. Orat.* 5, 2, 25 and also 8.8; 8.14; 8.46; 8.49 and 8.54 (discussed by *Petre passim* and *Pirot* 3.6f) On *similitudo* cf. *Quint. Inst. Orat.* 2.2.22 and on *analogia* 5, 2, 34 *ibid.* On the other hand there is a different use in *Quint.*: cf. for a parable, as metaphor: *inst. Orat.* 8.6.5f; 8.6.14 and 8.6.4-9 in general (cf. *Hermaniuk* 177) These different interpretations were to lead to different lines of biblical interpretations which come together again in Augustine, in Hilary and to a lesser extent in e.g. Tert. (cf. sect. 2 above, and below). To *Quint.* too we may trace Hilary's concern with *proprietas* (cf. *Inst. Orat.* 8.2.1f 'quare proprietas non ad nomen, sed ad vim significandi refert, nec auditu, sed intellectu perpendenda est. In *Quintilian* too we find the *res/verba* contrast e.g. *Inst. Orat.* 8. proem. 6. cf. too the *ex* from TLL below.

61

Discussion for and against allegorising was a major topic of the late hellenistic philosophical and rhetorical schools. The most ancient word for allegory was probably *hyponoia* (*TL Rep.* 2.378D etc. - cf. *LSJ* and *Buffiere* 45f.) Cicero who uses the Latin word *allegoria* (*Orator* 27.94) opposes the allegories of the Stoics. *Quint. Inst. Orat.* 1.61 54-60 translates *allegoria* by *inversio*; for discussions of the Alexandrian/Antiochene controversy on allegory cf. *Hanson*, *Greer*, and esp. *Barr* 103ff; for the use of *historia* in rhetoric cf. *Arbusow* 109f. v. *Dobschütz* (*Harnack Ehrung* op. cit) pinpoints the significance of the Philonic stream of allegory in Christian exegesis 'wurde alles früher auf das Gesetz oder den logos bezogen, so jetzt auf Christus'. For almost all writers, the problems lay not in the fact but in the nature of the christological application.

however here derived (and probably more generally so) from the exegetical tradition of the church and particularly (cf. too the notes to Section 2 above) from Tertullian, and possibly Irenaeus. Though we shall seek to consider these motifs here in themselves, as we shall see later their use is intimately basic epistemological and ontological categories of Hilary's theological thought. (Neglect of these areas accounts for much of the tedium of a great deal of discussion of the history of patristic biblical interpretation!)

Allegory, typology and parable may be dealt with together. After much confused discussion, it has become clear that types and allegories may belong, and usually do belong, to the same category of material, and that there is no 'necessary' distinction based on the fact that typologies are more 'historical' and so more legitimate than allegories. At the same time, these concepts have often been used to express, and have in fact, often corresponded to, a distinction between more and less 'historical' lines of interpretation.

Hilary in the *In Matthaeum* neither discusses, defines nor distinguishes his use of allegory and typology. He never mentions allegory, and hardly ever uses the form without reference to types. His use of *typus* and cognates is far from precise, and these may be exchanged synonymously with different models from the rhetorical tradition. Yet in accordance with a long western tradition he uses

the concept of typology to elicit in 'cash value' the details of his interpretation of the Heilsgeschichte, in the sense of the Irenaeian oikonomia rather than in the common modern sense of the term. In this sense, Hilary's understanding, like that of Tertullian noted above, may be said to be typological rather than allegorical in the terms of the popular distinction, in that he supposed a historical (historisch and at the same time heilsgeschichtlich) relation between the events involved in the types.

Hilary himself again uses a number of different terms synonymously. For this reason it is misleading to read too much into any one of them (cf. below on Interpretations of species.) cf. 7.1 *sensus allegoricus nihil detrahit litterae veritati*; 12.11 *imago futurae veritatis*; 21.2 *species futuri* cf. 19.3 *futuri species*; 11.2 *legis forma*; 19.3 *infantes gentium forma*; 19.6 Christ shows the *umbra veritatis*; 32.3 *vestis=velamentum legis*; 9.2 *velamenta verba legis*. The most frequent figure however is that of *typus* (or *typicus*, as at 2.1; 7.9; 8.4; 12.24; 14.6; 17.8; 19.7; e.g. 8.4 *typica ratio*) cf. 20.13 *duo caeci are typus crediturarum gentium*; 2.7 *in genesi ecclesiae typus*; 15.4 *typum ecclesiae Chananaeam filiam* cf. too *typus* at 7.8; 7.9; 12.1; 14.3. Often used instead of *typus* is *praefiguratio*, as at 12.4 *praefiguratio futurorum dictis praesentibus continetur*. This says nothing different from 21.2 *omnis autem haec species futuri ordinem tenet*. cf. too 8.8 *sed manet etiam nunc ordo mysterii; ut veritas praesentium, futurorum species adiecta sit dictorum et*

factorum Domini virtutem turbae timent. *Mysterium* is here used in the same sense as *sacramentum*, as in e.g. *prophetiae sacramentum*. Further exx may be seen at 9.9 *praefiguratio*; 15.4 *interior mysterium*; 17.2 *praefigurare*; also at 18.12 and 18.13; 1.1 *forma*; 1.8 *species*; 7.9 *ordo typicae significationis*; 8.4 *typica ratio*; as at 14.9; 14.10 *typicus ordo*. 17.8, 19.1 and 7 *typica ratio*. 20.11 *typicus ordo*; 33.3 *typica ratio*. Connected too is *imitatio* e.g. 7.1 *nihil enim veritati detrahit, imitationem veritas consecuta*.

In his special study of *sacramentum* in Hilary, Malunowicz noted 537 instances of the word, of which 68 translate the Greek *mysterion*, 36 refer to an oath, 305 to doctrine (284 to specific doctrines) 44 to a figural sense, 29 to worship and 57 to other miscellaneous objects. He offers the following comparative list:

| | Hil. | Tert. | Cypr. | Ambr. | Lact. |
|--------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| <i>sacramentum</i> | 537 | 136 | 64 | 4 | 26 |
| <i>mysterium</i> | 84 | 6 | 1 | - | 27 |

For the In Matthaem cf 20.8 *iam sine scandalo auditoris apostolis sacramentum crucis Dominus exponit*; 28.2 *ut sacramentum crucis admixtum esse gloriae aeternitatis agnoscerent*; 20.9 *de calice sacramenti passionis*; 23.4 *sacramentum scripturarum*; 32.6 *in hoc prophetiae sacramentum*; 33.6 *occultum mysterium totius creationis*; 10.9 *sacramentum pacis coelestis*. v. Soden, *Mysterium* 225, notes that the oldest Latin Bible translations seems to have translated *mysterion* by *sacramentum*. The Vulgate version is usually *mysterium*.

Interior is used in the same way as spiritualis to refer to the figural meaning cf. 19.10 rerum eodem cursu interioris causae ordo retinendus est; 9.2 Matthaeus interioris eius habitatione illuminatus cf. interioris conscientiae nitor. One is tempted to see definite Neoplatonic influence here; on the other hand Cicero uses interior of mental feelings e.g. de Or. 3.49.190 ne insistat interius oratio etc. and so this does not amount to a direct indication of such influence in a degree significant for the moulding of a given interpretation.

In the process of relating the figural interpretation by means of the literary categories of the rhetorical tradition to the gospel text, there are certain characteristic features of the narrative to which this interpretation may be connected. Thus people nearly always represent more than simply their persons (Joseph is a type of the gentiles etc). Places may have no particular significance (there is little interpretation of Nazareth, Bethlehem or Golgotha) but movements between places have a typical ratio e.g. from Judaea to Egypt = from the Jews to the gentiles etc. The ordo temporum always has a coelestis ratio, relating either to Jesus himself (to the time of his passion, ascension or resurrection) or to the time of the end of the world (the theme of judgement recurs). Dress is significant. Numbers indicate a coelestis ratio. The presence of a ship on the water is the Church sailing over the hazardous waters of the world. In these cases, often the categories of figural languages are omitted, and the equivalents are simply stated. Simonetti, who

has also noticed these 'signposts' adds the figurative significance which is always attached to the presence of animals. This last is common elsewhere, e.g. in Philo and in Prudentius' *Peristephanon* (for this I am indebted to a seminar of Prof. Courcelle on the latter). Simonetti also notes that Hilary's interpretation often begins with exaggerated literalness, which he then resolves by invoking the *coelestis significantia*.⁶²

Typus and cognates are used strictly of the main line of interior significantia and are not applied to other metaphorical interpretations in the gospel text. The literary categories of the rhetorical tradition give shape to the typological illustrations, which are then related to the *lex/fides* motif. Many of the types are traditional, Hilary's contribution lying in the continuity and in the exclusive nature of the interpretation.

Often connected with the treatment of allegorical interpretation is the treatment of parable. But for Hilary all the parables are designated 'absolutus', and receive no further interpretation. This concept of 'absolute' significance is used by Cicero and Quintilian to designate passages where no figural meaning is present.⁶³ The meaning of the parable in Hilary is made clear either by the text itself or by the words of Jesus or by the actions of the characters in the narrative. There is no hidden

62 cf. Simonetti note, op cit.

63 On 'absolutus' in Quintilian and Cicero cf. Cic. *Inv.* 2.57. 170 *necessitudines quasdam simplices et absolutas*, and Quint. 9.3.19.

sense, possibly because the direct words of Jesus are thought themselves to speak to faith, and to require no interpretation pointing to the source of faith.

There are in the text of the gospel, of course, many other non-allegorical metaphorical expressions, some of which are taken up into the inner significance by Hilary and some of which are not. Hilary's concern is not so much with the surface texture of the text, in terms of metaphorical and non metaphorical language as such, as with the points for which the content of the episodes themselves suggests a special interpretation.⁶⁴

The relationship between the interpretational principles from the rhetorical and exegetical tradition and the events in the history of salvation past and present for Hilary is complex and its full significance will be best seen in the light of the analyses of the next section. Some aspects may however be clarified from the above analyses.

64

On the relation of allegory to metaphor in general Lausberg (op.cit.421f) expresses the basic relationship neatly 'Die Allegorie ist für den Gedanken, was die Metaphor für das Einzelwort ist: die Allegorie ist eine durch einen ganzen Satz (darüber hinaus) durchgeführte Metapher.' In distinguishing allegory from typology - 'Die Typologie ist wie eine Semantik der Realitäten, die Allegorie wie eine Semantik der Worte'. Lausberg describes in semantic terms the concern of those who have sought to distinguish allegory from typology, by stressing that typology is and should be grounded in historical events, and not open to the whims of metaphysical speculation. In the In Mt. Hilary stresses that the whole of the gospel narrative is rooted in the events of the Heilsgeschichte, but he is not, as in the De Trin consciously opposing certain types of allegorical interpretation. For good discussions of typology and allegory in exegesis cf. apart from Goppelt, Hanson etc. J. Barr in 'Old and New in Interpretation' 103-48 and A. Bjorndalen in TThK 1966 129ff.

How do we come to understand the inner meaning of the text? Understanding comes through perception of the correlation of the dicta and facta of Jesus which is present in the text itself. But this understanding comes only through faith, which is given by the Spirit. The manner in which this is done is described in concepts taken from the rhetorical tradition itself, and from biblical exegesis which has already drawn on that tradition. There is interestingly no trace of the res/signa dialectic of Augustine. Instead Hilary, like Tertullian, in many respects uses the concept of 'Virtus' in a manner which clearly comes from originally Stoic influenced sources through the rhetorical schools to christian exegesis.⁶⁵ (as too in Cyprian and Lactantius in the Latin tradition). A particular theological anthropology is created (and also partly presupposed) in the conception of the transfusion of the exempla of the text into our understanding by the Spirit to reveal the inner significance, the advantages and disadvantages of which we shall consider in our next section. For in dealing with these issues, Hilary is

65

An examination of the background of the main concepts examined above in TLL produces the following results: the dicta/facta contrast is stressed by Cic. Att. 2.1.3; Quint. inst. Orat. 1.4.2a; 1.4.29; 6.1.14; 10.5.10; Seneca Oed 520; Ennius Ann 31.4; Ter. Andr. 328; Tert. Spec. 17; ib. idol. 23; Sall. Cat. 32; Cic. Inv. 2.117; i.e. this was a rhetorical figure in widespread use at all periods. Gentes: many refs in Tert. Lact; Arnob; Vict. Pet.; Cypr; Aug; Imago is used by Quint; Tert; Rufin; Cypr; Aug; etc. Coelestis: Tert; Frisc; Panegyrici etc. Competenter: Chalcid; Rufin etc. Absolutus: Rufin; Donat; Cassiod etc. Intelligentia: Rufin; Tert; Cypr; Mar; Vict.. Interior: apart from Cicero, Tert, adv. Marc. Porphyrius. Panegyrici: Orig. in MT. (Lat, P. Suet: Sulp. Sev. etc) i.e. the technical terms used in his interpretation by Hilary are part of the common language of 4th century Latin literature and in no way unusual in occurrence or in usage.

involved in question not only of epistemology and hermeneutics but in questions of ontology and general metaphysics, and of the basic theological issues which relate to knowledge and existence and their relations to each other. The man who is transformed by the virtue of the dicta and facta through the Spirit and comes to cognitio Dei is ontologically affected by this, and this view of the Heilsgeschichte has more than only epistemological implications, both in Hilary's theology and in the background of fourth century philosophy, ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ against which his work is done. These wider implications, and their effect on the details of his interpretation, we must now seek to analyse.

c) The theological conception of the gospel in its intellectual milieu.

To see the In Matthaëum in terms of the application of hermeneutical principles of exegesis to texts is indispensable for an understanding in depth of the work, but it is not to see the text as Hilary saw it in the first instance. For him the primary issues are purely theological issues, even issues of systematic theology - of God's dealings with his people in bringing them from the bondage of the law to faith through his eternal son, Jesus Christ, in kindling faith and thus bringing men salvation through cognitio Dei. Until we have explored the approach to the commentary in terms of Hilary's over-riding theological concerns, our picture of the whole will be incomplete and even misleading.

At the same time, the theological reflection is related to the philosophical and also the theological background of the fourth century, its prevailing tendencies and its controversies, in agreement and disagreement, conscious and unconscious, implicit and explicit, (mainly implicit), with these. In this section of our study, we shall attempt to limit ourselves as far as possible to matters which are explicit in the commentary itself or implied in its construction, in the belief that too much hypothesis has been built on too little evidence in this area in the past. The systematic development of Hilary's theology in detail we shall postpone for discussion in the context of its development at length in the *De Trinitate*, where there is more evidence on which to work.

Though the *In Matthaëum* displays a clear theological unity of conception, it is an exercise in biblical interpretation and not in systematic theology as such. Having no other evidence than the *In Matthaëum* for the development of Hilary's thought before exile, we shall seek to be cautious in reading too much into or out of the work, for establishing of general conclusions about Hilary's theology. Since the time of Irenaeus, there had been no first rate theologian in the west, with the possible exception of Tertullian, and the immense developments of the fourth century itself are not widely reflected in the commentary with the partial exception of the stress on the eternal Sonship of Christ. It has been customary to see the work as a continuation of the theology of Tertullian

and Novatian, and we have seen that influence from that quarter is to be affirmed - yet this stream does not explain the stress on the centrality of the history of the incarnation, in the events of the Heilsgeschichte. It has been noted that there is no developed doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the work, nor indeed as we shall see, in the De Trinitate and this has been seen here as an example of a gnostic dualism and for the De Trinitate as deriving from a stoic metaphysic which led to Unitarian characteristics. Yet not all theologians writing in the west or in the east before the full development of trinitarian theology were Unitarian - cf. Irenaeus, and we shall seek to remain within the evidence of the texts.

The focal point of the movement from the law to faith which is the main theme of the work, is, as we have seen above, Jesus Christ himself. Faith in God is faith in Christ the Son of God. In this process, the dicta and the facta together are equally important cf. 10.1f. *paria in dictis atque in factis significationum momenta consistunt.* cf. at 24.5 the stress on *perspicuitas verborum et locorum.* The words as we have said above, possess their own virtue cf. 10.1 *verborum virtutes non minus oportet introspicere quam rerum.* (cf. 6.7 in *verborum virtutibus*, 8.3 *verborum virtus* etc) The combination of dicta and facta constitutes the *res evangelica*: cf. 19.3 *res evangelica, ut diximus, inter praesentis et futuri effectum, mediam utrique rei et congruam rationem temperavit ut his, quae efficiebantur, futuri species adhaereret.* To this *res* we are not to bring our own theories, but we are

to observe: cf. 7.8 neque enim res intelligentiae, sed rei intelligentia subsecundat. To this res the words point and are secondary. The centre of the res evangelica is Jesus himself. cf. 12.7 quæstio omnis in verbo est. 12.4 evangelica fides operatur in Christo: 13.7 thesaurus enim in agro, ut diximus, Christus intelligetur in carne.; cf. 23.6 proprium enim Domini nostri Jesu Christi officium est cognitionem Dei afferre, et intelligentiam nominis eius potestatisque præstare. cf. 16.3 ne doctrina pharisaorum Christum nesciens, effectus veritatis evangelicæ corrumperet.

Christ is Deum ex Deo, Filium extra patris substantia atque intra patris substantiam consistentem (5.14) de infinitate paternæ substantiæ (31.3) has eadem substantia as the father (substantia here does not mean a 'material' state as in naive Stoic realism, as may be seen in 10.20 substantiam spiritalis animæ). His is the mediatoris officium (Simonetti op. cit 57 derives this from Tert. De Res. Mort. 63.1 and adv. Prax. 27.15 cf. on Wille below). The height of blasphemy is in Christo negare quod Deus sit (12.17).

Stress is laid upon the fact that Christ is eadem substantia with the Father, and is the aeternus filius of the Father, points which may reflect the Nicene and Serdikan formulae and indirectly too the Arian controversy, Christ is vere Deus, vere homo.⁶⁶

66

The question of sources and antecedents will be dealt with in detail in discussing Wille's thesis below.

The Spirit is spoken of as the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ. It has been suggested that Hilary echoes here a 'Geisteschristologie' in which the Spirit represents the divine nature in the human Jesus, but it is not clear that this leads Hilary into all the consequences imagined. The Spirit acting on man created faith: this has been thought to be heavily indebted to the Stoic tradition, but it is not clear that this tradition actually dictates the theological development, (we shall examine this matter more closely in the *De Trinitate*, and sketch here only the essentials.)

There are indeed only scattered references to the work of the Holy Spirit in the *In Mt.* cf. 1.3 in the credal phrase: *Nam conceptum ex spiritu sancto* and 9.6 of the woman with the issue of blood '*Fimbriam vestis per fidem festinat attingere, donum scilicet spiritus sancti*': this episode is recalled at 14.19, in which the virtue of the Spirit is linked with Jesus Christ. *Sed ut ex veste tota fimbriae, ita ex domino nostro Jesu Christo sancti Spiritus virtus exiit.* Connection of the Spirit with Christ and with God occurs too at 12.15; *ergo si discipuli operantur in Christo, et ex spiritu Dei Christus operatur; adest Dei regnum, iam in apostolis mediatoris officium transfusum:* and 12.17 *quid enim tam extra veniam est, quam in Christo negare quod Deus est, et consistentem paterni spiritus substantiam adimere. i.e.* there is no systematic development of a 'Geisteschristologie'.

Though the texts in question would not be irreconcilable with such a position, it is difficult to affirm this without further evidence: entia non sunt multiplicanda! (cf too the discussion of the De Trin. below).⁶⁷

The suggestion of on the one hand the reduction of the trinitarian concept to a Gnostic/Stoic dualism in metaphysical background, in which the world and God are

67

cf. too the further connections of spiritus at 3.3. quia ipse non solum homo, sed et Deus, licet usque in tentationis diem cibo hominis abstineret, Dei tamen spiritu alebatur; ostendens non in pane hoc solitario, sed in verbo Dei alimoniam aeternitatis esse sperandam.

4.17 racha vacuitatis opprobrium est; et qui sancto spiritu plenum convicio insimulat, fit reus concilio sanctorum; contumeliam spiritus sancti sanctorum iudicium animadversione luiturus.

10.12 plebem Dominus miseratur, quia nullus adhuc eius pastor esset, custodiam sancti spiritus redditurus donum Spiritus sancti, messorum copiam Deus praestet;

10.14 spiritus Dei; 11.2 spiriti sancti gloria in carcere. cf. too 13.5, which tells positively against the 'Geisteschristologie' quamquam ad fidei sacramentum, id est ad Patris et Filii et spiritus sancti unitatem etc;

in patri autem et filio et spiritu sancto, sine admixti extrinsecus fermenti necessitate in Christo, omnia unum sint.

17.3 sed loquente adhuc eo, nubes eos candida inumbravit et divinae virtutis spiritu ambiuntur;

19.3 manus enim et donum spiritus sancti, per impositionem manus et precationem, cessante legis opere erat gentibus largiendum.

32.7 vestis autem nuptialis est gloria spiritus sancti, et candor habitus coelestis.

irrevocably separated, and on the other hand a monist epistemology also from Stoic sources (the combination is indeed difficult) in which faith and knowledge are in fact no longer distinguishable, since faith in God is without remainder direct, immediate knowledge of God, is consistent with the charges of docetism with regard to the person of Jesus as the Christ, on the one hand, and Christomonism on the other, which have been brought against his theology, and also with the corollary at large (since scripture is understood in terms of the pivot of the Heilsgeschichte in Jesus.) of a docetic separation in exegesis of the spiritual and the corporal in the principles, and an inability to interpret in practice such matters as the pain of Jesus, on the one hand, and on the other, a naive understanding of the effect of the inspired scripture on the reader.

Evidence for some of these charges may be found in the text.⁶⁸ There are specific problems which he failed to appreciate. Yet particularly in the light of the high degree of strictly theological reflection on the doctrine of the incarnation of the De Trinitate a year or two later, (cf. below) it seems improbable that his thought in the *In Matthaeum* was in fact so strongly under the influence of a strict philosophical system of this kind.

Some further light is shed on the problem by considering the question of Hilary's doctrine of scripture as such,

68

cf. below on Wille, and in sect. 4 below.

as these point to him and his significance for us, the dicta and facta explaining each other and through the Spirit provoking faith. This stress upon the efficacy of the events themselves is, as we shall see in Sect. 4 below, one reason for the Reformers' attraction to Hilary, though their own positions are in fact rather different.

It is never actually said that the whole of scripture is to be interpreted in terms of the *lex/fides* concept, as in some Lutheran interpretations of scripture (though not always in Luther). Rather, the purpose of this particular gospel is to shed light on the relation of *lex* and *fides*.

Again, though the impropriety of disparaging one sense or the other is mentioned, there is no statement of the relation of inner and outer sense (or *interna* and *externa claritas*) to each other. The inner sense where detected is simply stated to be there. There is neither a progression in steps to a higher state of knowledge nor a relation of inner and outer in analogy with the incarnation. Such traces of the distinction between the spiritual and the corporeal as are present may be to be attributed as much to the commonplace expression of the age as to the influence of any one given source, Origenist, Marcionite etc.

As we have already mentioned, and will reconsider at length in analysing the *De Trinitate*, understanding of the *cognitio Dei* in the *In Matthaem* is pictured in terms

which borrow from the originally Stoic epistemological model of the efficacy/virtus of the events themselves, qualified by the words of Jesus,⁷⁰ rather than in terms of the Neoplatonic schema of events and signs pointing to them. The modified realism of this model, later to appeal to mediaeval and Reformation exegetes, is to be distinguished (as has not always been the case) from the naive realism of the Stoic schema as it is sometimes found in e.g. Tertullian and Methodius, in which everything that is real is material. Since the Middle Platonism of the apologists at least, it had been perfectly possible to conceive of non corporeal reality within such a schema.⁷¹ But if Hilary has only succeeded by replacing realist monism by an idealist monism, then the results are equally disastrous, and the incarnation is merely a particular case of the general Stoic schema of transcendence and immanence. He is however concerned to stress that it is because the events are the events of the incarnation and the words are the words of Jesus, that they create faith and bring cognitio Dei.

The question of the Stoic-derived influence on Hilary is extraordinarily hard to answer precisely. We believe that Löffler overstates his case in seeing Hilary's

70

Apart from the references given above and discussed in connection with Wille below, cf. 8.6 *veritatis deinde ordo succedit in gestis, quamvis futuri species expleatur in dictis.* cf. 8.8 *Atque non nos intelligentiam fingimus, sed gesta ipsa intelligentiam nobis impertiuntur.* cf. 10.17 *constanter enim Dei ingerenda cognitio est, et profundum doctrinae evangelicae secretum lumine praedicationi apostolicae revelandum.*

71

cf. Holte 'Spermatikos Logos' in *St. Theologica* 14 for 1961.

whole doctrine of God in terms of Stoic influence (and so basically, trinitarian), yet that the Stoic factor (with strong Neoplatonic additions) is indeed most important for the understanding of some of Hilary's most characteristic thought. One may look in vain for direct borrowings from Stoic sources. Yet the cumulative evidence is strong: the main points are 1) the frequent use in the *In Matthaem* of categories from rhetoric, and especially the preoccupation with the *res* concept, echoing Tertullian, Quintilian, Cicero and Seneca, all of whom were much influenced by Stoic ideas. 2) the consequent extension of this strongly realist strain to the theological concentration on the event of the incarnation itself. 3) The theology of knowledge in the *In Mt.* in which the concept of 'virtus' plays a prominent role. 4) The assumption that the words and events produce without interpretation through a special sign theory their own instant effect on the mind, bringing *cognitio Dei* through the Holy Spirit. 5) Hilary's use of the *imago* concept. 6) The use of the rhetorical categories in close conjunction with typology. In the *In Matthaem* the Stoic influence leads Hilary to concentrate on the *dicta* and *facta* of Jesus; in the *De Trinitate* the concept of the incarnation becomes the controlling category in its own right, and controls much more directly the role of the rhetorical categories, the typology etc.

In adopting this model rather than that of a Neoplatonic sign theory Hilary avoids some of the theological difficulties of the latter, as seen in Augustine.⁷²

72 On Augustine cf. Strauss, Duchrow and Schindler, and the discussion on the *De Trin.* below.

in the mediaeval tradition of exegesis and in much contemporary hermeneutics, namely that of positing a special language of the incarnation which has to be learned by the theologian and then retranslated for the people, and in which the dualism between sign and thing signified was to bring immense theological problems. It seems reasonable to suggest on the basis of his work as a whole, that it was theological insight into the nature of the incarnation rather than fortuitous accident which led him to stress these elements from the fourth century synthesis which avoided these particular dangers. (though, of course, he could not foresee all the implications involved in the choice).

The methods of the *In Matthaeum* were still however only a first stage. Here the action of the Spirit in illuminating the events of the incarnation is still tied to the inspired text of scripture in a literal sense. The words and events are those of the narrative itself, which has its own *virtus*; still a special hermeneutic of the scriptures is required to articulate the operation of the *virtus* within the scriptures. Thus, though he does not share the dualism of the Platonic and Neoplatonic sign theories of Origen and Augustine, Hilary in the *In Matthaeum* still uses, as Augustine was to use, the whole hermeneutic of the rhetorical tradition, along with its metaphysical implications with regard to the inspired text of the Stoic theory to which in Quintilian and in rhetoric in general it is indebted.

The problems are not yet solved, and as we shall see in examining the 'De Trinitate', Hilary was himself to produce hints (along with a large number of mutually contradictory other usages alongside these hints) of a further step. The concept of incarnation makes possible a new and special theory of knowledge in the Greek world. This was to be taken up and combined with existing theories in different ways. The concept of a special hermeneutic of the incarnation is however theologically problematic, since the incarnation qua incarnation is to be understood in the same way as any other event, and the truth of its happening is of the same kind as any other truth. The continuing apparent difference between the truth of the world as God's world and the reality of the world as man's world, which accounts for the indeed 'odd' nature of religious language and the apparent 'special' character of a hermeneutic of the incarnation reflects the tension of the life of faith between being 'in the truth' and being 'in the world'. For Augustine however this problem was in any case resolved in the dialectic between *civitas terrena* and *civitas aeterna*, and for Origen in the realisation of eschatology in mystical illumination, and so never arose in an acute form. In the mediaeval world, Platonic dualism was to provoke an Aristotelian dualism in understandable reaction: the alternatives in mysticism and or alternative position of mysticism, characteristically ever present in the world of later mediaeval Platonism, being theologically suspect as leading to monism and so hazarding the uniqueness of the incarnation.

In the *De Trinitate*, there are elements which go some way, as we shall see, towards a further step in the solution of the problems, and it was not for nothing that the Reformers, not indeed seeking for a new hermeneutic but under the impulse of their unsystematic rediscovery of the eschatological dimensions of faith, were to look with interest to Hilary again.

However that may be, the insistence in the *In Matthaeum* that in the words and deeds of Jesus, man is brought *coram Deo*, that God acts directly in word and event, and not simply in signs of his presence, in creating faith and knowledge of himself in faith, was an important insight in the history of interpretation which even Augustine was not to surpass. That the material for its articulation may have been fortuitously to hand in part in Stoic-derived theories of knowledge does not detract from the acumen of the dogmatic decisions made in the nature of the application of these.

In the nature of the case, we do not find in this short commentary an explicit exposition of the relationship between the doctrine of God and the doctrine of scripture. The issue is however worth pursuing for the light which it throws to form a different angle upon Hilary's method. Though there is no explicit analogy e.g. christological analogy between the two, yet christological considerations play the same dominant role in the development of the interpretation that they play in the theological

basis of that interpretation; the pivot on which the understanding and the events themselves turn, is faith in Jesus Christ, God and man. It has been remarked that a great deal of early exegesis is christocentric, even 'staurocentric'; important is how the christology operates. It is through the illumination of the events of the Heilsgeschichte which culminates in the incarnation that the Holy Spirit brings faith and cognitio Dei, to which we then respond in producing bona opera caritatis (the lack of emphasis on the relation of the incarnation to the atonement leaving room for that characteristically western tradition which was later developed by Pelagius). In this picture, several strands of thought are involved, the connection between them not yet being made precise. On the one hand it is the peculiar nature of the Heilsgeschichte and of the deeds and acts of Jesus himself, which have their own special capacity to evoke faith. On the other hand, the Spirit, which is related as closely to the inspired text itself as it is to Christ and to God, creates faith and so, understanding.⁷³ The presence of different conceptions

73

In addition to those discussed above, the following comments in the In Matthaëum aptly illustrate the main themes of Hilary's theology: cf. on Wille and in Sect. 4 below.

1.1 (Jesus Christus) qui est aeternus et rex et sacerdos, etiam in carnali ortu utriusque generis gloriam probavit.

4.3 quia per mansuetudinem mentis nostrae habitaverit Christus in nobis, nos quoque gloria clarificati eius corporis vestiemur. (note the tense - which is future rather than present)

4.14 Lex autem sub velamento verborum spiritualium nativitatem Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et corporalitatem, et passionem, et resurrectionem locuta est. Jesus enim Domino nostro nomen ex corpore est, atque et

side by side and unresolved ambiguities doubtless accounts for the wide variety of more or less plausible theories on the nature of Hilary's theology which have been constructed. Some steps towards the resolution of the tensions will be found in the De Trinitate.

corporalitas eius et passio, voluntas Dei et salus saeculi est; et ultra humani sermonis eloquium est, Deum ex Deo, Filium ex patris substantia atque intra Patris substantiam consistentem, primum in hominem corporatum dehinc morti hominis condicione subjectum, postremo post triduum in vitam ex morte redeuntem, consociatam Spiritus et substantiae suae aeternitati materiem ad coelum assumpti corporis retulisse.

5.15 peccatum autem in Spiritum est, Deo virtutis potestatem negare, et Christo substantiam adimere aeternitatis: per quem, quia in hominem Deus venit, homo rursus fiet in Deum.

6.1 porcorum vero haereticis est nomen; quia quamvis unguulae bifidae sint, acceptam tamen Dei cognitionem non ruminando disponunt. Ergo et concorporationem Verbi Dei, et passionis mysterium, et virtutem resurrectionis non promiscue tractare nos convenit.

8.8 sed hoc soli Christi erat debitum, soli de communione paternae substantiae haec agere erat familiare.

10.5 in sancta terra, et peccatorum spinis atque aculeis non obsessa, ut Moysi dictum est, nudis pedibus staturi; admonemur non alium ingressus nostri habere, quam quem Christo accepimus, apparatus.

11.4 numquid existis videre hominem cognitione Dei vacuum et ad immundorum spirituum flatum vagantem?

11.9 plures enim eludere dictum apostolicum, quo ait Christum Dei sapientiam et Dei virtutem (1 Cor. 1.24) his modis solent.

11.12 atque ita in hoc mutuae cognitionis secreto (of Father and Son)

12.18 abnegata paternae substantiae communione decerpas etc.

16.4 est ergo filius Dei ex Deo Deus.

23.7 quia lex et prophetia omnis Christi deputabatur adventui, et adventus eius per supplementum eorum cognoscendi Dei intelligentiam praestabat.

23.8 significabat et de consortio nominis substantiae unitatem.

25.2 evangelii veritas

33.5 in his autem omnibus Christus dum illuditur adoratur.

Throughout the foregoing analysis we have referred to suggestions of influence on the exegetical process deriving from the philosophical background of the age in which he wrote, an aspect of the thought which has been the subject of widely varying speculation. We have already seen how the gospel text itself, the document as Hilary sees it, has taken on many colourings foreign to the original, which then affect the interpretation even where Hilary remains true to his own theological intention. The unconscious translation of the gospel into the terms of the fourth century, the closing of the gap of strangeness due to the absence of historical perspective, is the price paid for the continuity and consistency of interpretation achieved by the technical apparatus of the commentary form. Some kind of translation is of course the price of relevance in any age: our task here is simply to assess the cost in this particular instance.

Quite apart however, from the matter of his conception of the gospel text itself, it has often been suggested that Hilary's whole understanding of theology and its application to exegesis is a reflection of various philosophical systems: the manner of this reflection we must now consider. It is clear that Hilary like any other human being makes use of the thought forms of his age in developing his thought. Is the result of this process then faithful to his theological intentions, or are these intentions deflected by compulsions arising from the original contexts of the ideas made use of? Are his

theological intentions themselves the reflection, and if so to what extent, of contemporary philosophical problems? How far is he conscious of the problems involved in the interrelation of philosophy and theology? Full answers to these questions must await the *De Trinitate*, but some preliminary comments may be made on the basis of the *In Matthaëum*.

In the nature of the work, that of concise exposition of the Heilsgeschichte in the context of the gospel text, no explicit reference to philosophical problems is made. Nevertheless, we have seen that Hilary develops a stoic stream in contemporary theory of knowledge in his explanation of the process of understanding scripture. This explanation is in accord with his purpose of showing how understanding comes through faith, and it would clearly be inaccurate to suggest that the latter is really a product of the former. Theories of Hilary's large scale dependence on the details of any one philosophical system appear to me to fail for both internal and external reasons, which we shall explore in detail in considering the *De Trinitate*. Hilary's theological anthropology is clearly much indebted to Stoic anthropology, both in terms of epistemology and in its stress on moral values and the need for good works. Proposals of large scale dependence on Marcionite and Gnostic systems, which we shall examine in detail below, (cf. chapt. 4) ^{raise rather more} problems that they solve, much of the 'Marcionite' evidence being better explained in terms of ~~xxx~~ Platonic influence, which I believe to be

clear.⁷⁴ But this is more a general colouring than a use of the technical theories of a system, as may be seen from a comparison with e.g. Origen, and there are divergences too at vital points.⁷⁵ By accident perhaps more than by design, Hilary is eclectic in his philosophical choices. This enables him to develop his theological thought, which centres upon his understanding of the history of the incarnation and the explication of the consequences of this in the relations of God and man, with considerable freedom from the pressures of any given system of philosophical principles. Yet in using various philosophical concepts for the articulation of and under the controlling category of the witness of scripture itself to God in the words and deeds of Jesus, he also demonstrated considerable theological insight. For what matters in theology is not the presence or non-presence of philosophical concepts but the nature of the decisions taken, concerning the sphere of their application.

In the preceding analysis we have examined the means by which the text is used in making dogmatic points and dogma is used in explaining the meaning of the text: this interplay we shall again examine in the context of the De Trinitate. At this point it will perhaps be pertinent to

74

especially in the juxtaposition of the realm of the spiritual and the realm of the corporal, and in the understanding of substantia (cf. on De Trin. below and Huber etc. ad loc.).

75

e.g. in the power of the dicta and facta of Jesus in carne. cf. above.

consider the relation of the text to the doctrine. We have already seen in examining the formal structure and principles of interpretation how in the harmonisation of the text into a consistent whole, Hilary loses many of the individual emphases of the gospel, how themes apart from the lex/fides context are rarely mentioned. In expounding the text in terms of the Pauline Heilsgeschichte, he gives the narrative a consistency different to that of the evangelist's narrative, even though the latter too was concerned to insist on the transfer of the inheritance from the Jews who remain under the law to the Church.

Despite this Hilary has produced a profound meditation on the text which is no less concerned than was the evangelist to bring out the central significance of the words and deeds of Jesus, the Son of God, however that relationship may be at different times expressed - messiah, Son of Man, vere Deus, vere homo. Though he completely missed many of the particular insights of the gospel,⁷⁶ and though we must look elsewhere to understand the message of the evangelist in its historical context, yet quite apart from his interpretation as a whole, he was able to make significant improvements on the theological understanding of the gospel in the history of the exegesis on individual episodes, a full enumeration of which we cannot attempt here.⁷⁷ That

76

A good example, showing the Neoplatonic and possibly an anti-Arian influence, is the comment in 33.5 quoted at_A73 above.

77

For the parables cf. Fonck. *le Parabole*, who provides a large number of comparisons: for Romans cf. the references in Schelkle, 'Paulus'. Schelkle notes (193) how in the

is why his interpretation was valued by so many later theologians. At the same time, its value today lies more in its function as a model to compare with other methodological models in analysing the ongoing task of interpretation than as a guide to St. Matthew's gospel.

In the commentary we have been dealing with a situation in which systematic theology is used in the service of exegesis. In the *De Trinitate* though the relationship changes, it remains as fluid and reciprocal as before, the one concern illuminating the other. Without duplication of detail, we must now attempt to see what fresh light may be thrown on the relation of exegesis and theology in Hilary's exegetical method from an analysis of the *De Trinitate*.

Before turning to the *De Trinitate* however, it will be convenient to take up, on the basis of the previous two sections, the question of the sources direct and indirect of the *In Matthaeum*, and the influence if any, of these sources upon it. Some of the matters in question, as far as they relate to Hilary's theology as a whole, will be further discussed in our next section, and others relating specifically to the *Psalms* in Section 5. A certain amount may however be said here. It will be useful to discuss these matters in the context of an examination of the

In *Ps* (in contrast with the *In Mt*) Hilary attempts to soften the accent of R.5.20, in order to stress now the value of the law. Hilary often in the *In Ps* interprets Romans with Origen. Köppen, *Versuchungsgeschichte*, stresses the importance for Hilary of continuity in the treatment of the temptation narratives, and his work brings out the independence of much of Hilary's characteristic exegesis.

recent thesis of W. Wille on the *In Matthaeum* and its sources, parts of which Dr. Wille most generously made available to me in advance of the completion of the whole, and upon which the following critique rests.⁷⁸

Wille begins his painstaking, thorough and exhaustive analysis of the *In Matthaeum*, in which he deals with all aspects except that of the literary structure of the commentary form itself and its hermeneutical implications, by noting the striking absence of the concept of 'nova lex' in the work (16). For Hilary exegesis is 'heilsgeschichtliche Selbstvergewisserung an Hand des Evangeliumtext': this need for assurance comes 'primär aus der ^eW_Aiterexistenz des jüdischen Volkes'. The text has two levels of meaning (42). The movement of the text is not from the aistheta to the noeta, but is 'ein erkennendes Fortschreiten von der Gegenwart zur Zukunft.' Hilary's use of 'species' in his interpretation suggests contact with the Platonic tradition, being also found in Chalcidius (*Tim. Komm.* 5.304.9f).

The discussion of the relations of Father and Son suggest the influence of Novatian (*De Trin.* 31). The stress on the eternity and consubstantiality of the Son suggest indirect traces of the Arian controversy (59-62). The presence of a *Geisteschristologie* (Hilary nowhere speaks of the Spirit as a person) suggests the use of Victorinus of Pettau and Ps. Cyprian de montibus Sina. In discussing

78

Diss. Hamburg, Spring 1969.

the eternity of the Son (1066D) 'Hilarius hat hier offensichtlich auf hermetische Aion-Spekulation zurückgegriffen'. In such speculation the incarnation is understood as a 'Spezialfall des weltdurchdringenden, welterhaltenden Handelns Gottes'(75) i.e. Hilary takes up archaic, philosophical positions (77). This is confirmed by his anthropology (81) 'wir halten fest, Hilary hat offensichtlich eine stark dualistisch geprägte Tradition aufgenommen' which he then tried to break away from. Typical of the influence in the work of this tradition is that salvation is understood as 'Erkenntnismitteilung' which is realised in mystical illumination (cognitio Dei) and salvation is fulfilled as 'Vergottung der menschlichen Natur'. The body of the believer is transformed into the substance of the soul (91). This may indicate the influence of Lactantius, and certainly reflects the hermetic tradition.

In a further section, the sources of the understanding of history in terms of the Pauline contrast between law and gospel are considered. Wille notes a tendency to 'Entjuridisierung der Frommigkeit'. This depends basically on a Marcionite tradition (not actually upon Marcion himself) which has been seen too in Arnobius the Elder. Agreement with such a tradition is found in the use of language, in the understanding of Paul, and in the antithetic use of the lex/fides motif. The Marcionite tradition too speaks of veritas evangelii. Exegesis of details also corresponds with this tradition (though there are also traces of an antimarcionite tradition). The

interpretation of 'homocousios' is a further indication of the influence of the aion concept (p.104) Some further sources may be seen: on Mt. 8.5 he is 'offensichtlich' influenced by Victorinus of Pettau, and 'gratia als terminus technicus für den inneren Sinn der Texte.... wird durch die Abhängigkeit von de Montibus verständlich.' Some indirect influence of the Heilsgeschichte theology of Irenaeus, and of the populus^{dei} concept of Hippolytus, is also likely.

No summary can do justice to the careful, detailed argument of Wille's thesis, from which the author of the present study has gained a very great deal, both from the clarification of the issues and from the constructive suggestions made. Nevertheless, he finds grave difficulty with some of the main conclusions of the work, adumbrated above.

In the first instance, it appears from our own analysis of the In Matthaëum that the scope of the work is much more than simply 'heilsgeschichtliche Selbstvergewisserung': as set out above, the interpretation is an exposition of the events and acts of salvation in history in the context of the creation of faith, the emphasis being as much on the description of the historical and theological 'state of things as they are' as upon personal reassurances. We have seen that Hilary uses many terms of figurative expression interchangeably: it is then perhaps less than prudent to build too much on the presence of a word such as 'species': though the

general neoplatonic atmosphere of this commentary as a fourth century document is beyond dispute, it is far from clear that this particular tradition plays a definitive role in his exegetical method.⁷⁹ Some connection with Novatian, or knowledge of his work, there may well have been:⁸⁰ yet Hilary was soon to range far beyond Novatian in his own *De Trinitate*, and so was presumably not entirely dependent upon him, or even significantly dependent a year or two before. There is no evidence of determinative influence. Indirect traces of the Arian controversy there may well be, as Wille suggests with others,⁸¹ and even influence of that rather nebulous phenomenon, a 'Geisteschristologie' (in the sense that the doctrine of the third person of the Trinity remains comparatively undeveloped). The fragmentary state of the works of Victorinus of Pettau and their undistinguished quality, indicated above, suggest a need for caution in attributing significant influence to that quarter: in any case Wille's instances scarcely

79

On Neoplatonism cf. Wille (3); species and imago in Hilary and Chalcidius (W. does not suggest that Hilary actually knew Chalc.)

The alleged echoes of Novatian (A24) in substance but not in expression (exc. *deus ex Deo Trin.* 22) show no more than common membership of the western theological tradition of Tert. and Iren. Wille's relation of the formula at 4.14 *Deus ex Deo*, etc to the Nicene creed (63) is probably correct. The odd mention of *theotes* may as W. suggests (64) reflect the creed of Serdika.

80 On Novatian cf. now Gastaldi 28-31. Though Hilary may well have read Novatian's *De Trinitate*, Novatian does not appear to have influenced Hilary's exegesis to any significant extent.

81 Hilary could have learned of the Arian controversy e.g. at Arles in 353. In the absence of conclusive evidence, the balance favours a knowledge of the controversy at this period, but no primary preoccupation with this as yet. This would be supported by the strong emphasis on the consubstantiality of the Son, and the stress upon the eternity of the Son. Simonetti op. cit. deduced from the latter references that 'Ilario polemizza apertamente con gli Ariani!' (55) cf. Wille 56

amount to proof. The evidence for Ps. Cyprian, though amounting only to a few verbal similarities (which may readily be found with other sources where no connection is likely) is rather better.⁸²

On the other hand, the strong influence attributed to the Hermetic aion speculation appears to the present writer to be definitely improbable. The De Trinitate, written soon after, shows no such influence, where it might naturally be expected if the theory were correct. Neither Lactantius nor Arnobius the Elder were figures of the theological stature of Hilary: one fears that these apparent parallel instances have misled Wille. Likewise, the Hermetical/mystical explanation of illumination by God in faith, though demonstrated in masterly fashion by Dr. Wlosok for Lactantius, is highly implausible in Hilary. Hilary was again too much of a theologian for this. None of the evidence in any case, is unequivocal. As we have mentioned, even the taking up of an outdated system in all its ramifications is in any event, historically improbable for Hilary.⁸³

82

The evidence for a Geisteschristologie (p.67f) does not take into account the references to the father, Son and Spirit cited above, and Hilary's imprecision in expressing the relation of the two natures in Christ in 4.1 is not in itself decisive. The parallels with the De Montibus (p.69f)(CSEL 3.3 104ff) and with Vict. Pett. (A33n93) I find weak, e.g. De Mont. 4 Caro dominica a deo patre Jesu vocit^{est} spiritus, qui de coelo descendit Christus. etc. cf. Hil. 4.14 Jesus enim domino nostro nomen ex corpore est. cf. too the context of 4.44 cited above.

Wille's characterisation of Hilary's work as 'Entjuridisierung der Frömmigkeit' fits well the general religious situation of the age: weariness of Tertullianist moralism, longing for something less banal. On the other hand, the evidence for a strong Marcionite influence on Hilary, at least to the extent suggested by Wille, is exceedingly thin. Veritas, eternitas, lex and fides may be found in combination in many non-Marcionite traditions as we have seen above, e.g. in Tertullian, Irenaeus and Origen. The suggestion of a dualism from which Hilary sought to break away is helpful and probably reflects at least some of the facts: on the other hand it is not clear that this dualism was as radical and as consistent as he suggests. The temptation to reduce a complex situation with a large number of unknowns or partially unknowns to a precise pattern is great, but it does not reduce the complexity of unclarity of the facts.

83

On Hermetic aion speculation cf 72f Wille's parallels with Asclepius are drawn, with the exception of cf 31.2 (1066D) from the adv. Val. et Urs. In both cases Hilary is correcting assertions made by opponents (the parallel of Kraft's analysis of Hermetic influence in Novatian and Constantine's use of homousios is not really relevant for Hilary. Whether the dualist tradition reflected in the distinction between body and soul in the In Mt. (80-83) reflects more than current Neoplatonic sensus communis is also doubtful. (W. perhaps relies too much here on Seeberg.) Again Lactantius (cf. A39.144A) is not Hilary. Wille's evidence for mysticism (84 cf. an 159) (A42) again relies on the Hermetic tradition and Lactantius). There is however, no unambiguous mysticism in this sense in the In Mt. The exx quoted for 'Heil als Vergottung des menschlichen Natur'; all refer to Jesus, describing his two natures, and not to the state in the present of the christian (949B. 1056C) The formulation is more likely to have some (not as yet demonstrable) connection with Irenaeus rather than with Lactantius.

On the matter of Marcionite influence, the possibility of a Marcionite strain in Vict. Pett. (223 cf B57) is as we have seen of negligible value for the determination of this factor in Hilary. This applies to its presence in Arnobius the Elder too. Though Hilary uses *lex* and *fides* in contrast as well as the adjective *evangelicam*, he does not use precisely the same formulation as e.g. the Marc. prologue to Paul 'verbum veritatis' etc. Frequent use of *veritas* is found in connections (cf sect 2 above) where no Marcionite influence is likely. The alleged exegetical parallels though they would serve as confirmation given direct evidence, fail to do so in its absence, just as the single occurrence of *lumen scientiæ* (p84. A42) fails to demonstrate the presence of an originally hermetic theory of mystical illumination (despite its possible presence in Lactantius.) It cannot be proved that some influence from these Hermetic and Marcionite sources suggested by Wille has not occurred, but I think the uncertainty of the foundations of these has been shown. This however does not detract from the value of the careful manner in which most of the theological issues of the gospel are discussed, in much greater detail than in the present study.

The precise answers to the question of Hilary's sources and the influence of various traditions on the *In Matthaeum* remain unknown. The tradition of Tertullian and Novatian in theology is clearly followed, though at a distance and with considerable independence on Hilary's part. Traces of anti-Arian exegesis are present, though

this was not yet the burning issue of the period of the De Trinitate. From Tertullian and Novatian and probably other sources certainly including Neoplatonic influence came dualist traits, though these may not be exaggerated. Some indirect influence of Origen is likely.⁸⁴ The marks of the rhetorical tradition throughout are clear. Hilary may have known Hippolytus' work, though this cannot be proved. The most likely single source of much of the inspiration of his theology of the Heilsgeschichte of the incarnation is Irenaeus: direct evidence for this is however entirely lacking.

Much of the characteristic force of the work may however be understood from the examination of the work itself, of the

84

Wille concluded that a direct knowledge of the Alexandrian terminology was unlikely, and that the Platonism was that of the fourth century Latin variety. Loofs 58f. thought that there was no Greek influence in the In Mt, but Watson 8f. concluded that Hilary was here already a disciple of Origen. The In Mt. shows no use of a Greek text and this is a better indication than Jerome's remarks (Ep. ad Marc. 3 (PL23.49); cf. Hilary's difficulty with the language of little knowledge of Greek on his part at the time (and so almost certainly no direct reading of Origen-(cf. sect. 2 on the Latin trans. of Origen). Hilary must have learned Greek quickly (or relearned what he had learned at school and then forgotten) for as Bardy remarks, all the translations of the De Synodis are by Hilary himself. (Langues p. 211f) i.e. direct influence of Origen is improbable but indirect influence is likely to have been everywhere felt in some degree - though that has not been significant for the determination of the main themes of the In Mt. The above criticisms of specific conclusions by no means detract from the great value of Dr. Wille's thesis, from which I have gained much and which must henceforth be the major secondary source for students of the In Matthaem.

literary structure and its effects on the text, of the principles of interpretation in conjunction with that structure, in the context of the rhetorical tradition, and in the exegetical tradition of the Church, and of the interplay of theological decision and philosophical concept which it reveals.

4. THE MIDDLE PERIOD:

DE TRINITATE

C. The middle Period: De Trinitate.

In order to facilitate comparison with the previous section, we shall follow in our analysis the order adopted there, making appropriate adjustments and revisions where the subject matter suggests this.

The De Trinitate, or more probably De Fide,¹ differs in many respects from the In Matthaëum. It was written not in Gaul but in Hilary's place of exile in Asia Minor;² it is not a commentary on a book of the Bible but a theological treatise. It would today be described as a work of systematic rather than of biblical theology. Yet its purpose, of setting out a particular doctrine in the context of the biblical teaching on the subject, and in doing so, of defending the doctrine, that of the divinity of Jesus Christ against Arian attack,³ is by no means

1 Hilary does ^{not} in fact mention the title in his work. Cassian (de inc. Dom. contra Nest. VII 24) and Rufinus (HE 10.32) refer to it as the De Fide. Jerome speaks of it as the adversus Arianos, Venantius Fortunatianus and Cassiodorus as the De Trinitate (6th cent.) of the discussion in Reinkens 137 and Borchardt 40. The word trinitas occurs within the work only ~~once~~, at 1.36. and 1.22. ^{twice}

2 The beginning and end may have been written in Gaul before and after the exile. The problem has been much debated; cf. the summary in Borchardt 40f. cf. 10.4 loquemur enim exsulès per hos libros (PL10.346C). The evidence does not permit of a firm conclusion, except that part of the work was written in exile, and there is no evidence to suggest that the remainder was not written there too. The exact place of exile in Asia Minor is also ^{un}known.

3 cf. De Trin. 2.2 (PL10.51A) (sufficiebat credentibus Dei sermo) sed compellimur haereticorum et blasphemantium vitiis, illicita agere, ardua scandere, ineffabilia eloqui, inconcessa praesumere. etc. cf. too 1.16 where two groups of opponents, Sabellians and Arians are characterised.

remote from that of the previous work.

A high proportion of the text consists of the theological interpretation of biblical texts:⁴ indeed it has been shown by Martinez Sierra that much of Hilary's argument includes a direct refutation of arguments based by Arians upon the same biblical texts.⁵

Apart however, from its occasional character the work was clearly intended to be a theological treatise in its own right, and as such was constructed with careful attention to style and structure.⁶ As with the *In Matthaeum*, it is notoriously difficult to say which sources, oral or written, Hilary may have drawn upon: at all events it seems clear that his theological horizons had broadened considerably since the days of the *In Matthaeum*.⁷ The order of the composition of the books remains debateable.⁸

4

Löffler op.cit.p88f. counted 1272 biblical quotations, 231 from the OT and 1041 from the NT; including the following: Genesis 62, Exodus 26, Dt. 22, Psalms 39, Isaiah 43. Synoptic Gospels 255, Johannine corpus 428, Pauline writings and pastorals 324.

5

Martinez Sierra op.cit Bardy too (Paul de Samosate) stresses the Arians' concern with clarity. On Arian exegesis cf. too Athan. v the tropici in Ep. ad Serap. 2 (PG 26.532) quoted by Pollard.

6

Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa*, notes the 'auf stärkste sallustisch gefarbten Einleitung' to the *De Trin.* and Hilary's desire to seek for God in his work 'verborum significationem, intelligentiae lumen, dictorum honorem (*De Trin.* 1.38 *In Ps.* 13.1)

7

On the sources of the *De Trin.* cf. below and Loofs, Löffler passim and Borchardt 136f..

That the autobiographical character of the prologue contains at least an element of historical truth need not be doubted.⁹

a) The structure of the work.

Much less need be said of this aspect here than in the In Matthaëum, since the literary structure, being much less rigorous in form, has considerably less impact on the methodology. The texts are exegeted in a rather different way than in the In Matthaëum, the differences lying in part at least in the absence of the pressures for continuity and consistency of the commentary form which had affected the exegesis of individual texts in the commentary.¹⁰ There is a marked lessening in the

8

cf. Borchardt's discussion, op.cit. p.40f. In 4.1 there is a reference to the books which 'iam pridem conscripsimus'. In 4.2 there is a reference to the first book, and 1.19 is intended; 5.3 the fifth book is called the second book. In 6.4 book 4 is described as the first and then as the 6th book in 10.4 Hilary says 'loquemur enim exsules per hos libros'. In 4.2 there is a reference to 1.19 and in 9.10 to 1.13. Evidence from the subject matter is inconclusive. There is no basis for Watson's conclusion (xxxiii) that the first book was written last.

9

The prologue compares well with the biographical comments of Jerome and Fortunatianus, who may of course have derived their information in turn from the prologue itself.

10

We have seen that in the In Mt. though individual phrases were often treated in an epitomising manner with little regard for the original sense, nevertheless the whole is still exegeted in the context of the gospel narrative as Hilary understands this. Now, the same epitomising method is used but without the context being an integral part of the exegesis. By 'epitomising method' we mean a procedure in which a text is used as a summation of or pointer to a sense which is already given, being either assumed, or established by some other means. The text itself is here hardly ever exegeted (as it often was in the In Mt.) Instead all is referred to the main theme of the work, to the divinity of Jesus. The result is that though the exegetical method is not far removed from that of In Mt. the total effect of the exegetical operation is very different.

use of figural interpretation in the De Trinitate. The relationship may be illustrated by a random sample: we shall choose book 7 of the De Trin.

The first thing that strikes us is the rarity of the occasions upon which the text is actually exegeted in detail. Usually the text is used as an 'epitome', in condensed reiteration and scriptural confirmation of a theological point which is being made.¹¹ This means that even fewer extra scriptural citations than were occasionally brought in in the In Mt. to explain particular points in given passages, need to be invoked.¹² Here further citations in which follow the main text being cited as an epitome are more frequently used in confirmation of the theological point at issue rather than in explanation of the text. For this epitomising use of scripture it matters little whether whole passages, parts of verses or individual words are cited. Many of the texts involved are cited as showing the opposite of what the arians wish them to prove; though Hilary demonstrates this more by doctrinal assertion than from an analysis of the contents of the texts themselves.

11

Both the shaping of the text through the literary categories, from the In Matt., and the linguistic and textual work of the In Psalmos are absent. Compare e.g. Trin. 7.22 with In Matt. 3.1f and In Ps. 124.4f.

12

Thus in book 7 all but four of the scriptural citations (Ps. 76.6 at 7.10, Rom. 1.2 at 7.24, Mal. 3.6 at 7.27 and Ex. 7.1 at 7.10) are from St. John's gospel.

These texts are usually introduced by means of a phrase of introduction: the formulae of recapitulation and repetition familiar in the In Matthaëum tend to disappear in the nature of the case.¹³

Where single words are stressed atomisation of the text still occurs, yet since the role of epitome is essentially different from that of continuous exegesis, this matters less.¹⁴ The main theme is introduced in an epitomising text, and thereafter the argument proceeds, on occasion over several paragraphs, as a meditation upon the adduced text.¹⁵ Such an approach differs distinctly from that of an evaluation of the text in its biblical context and an exegesis based on the strict content of the text itself. In terms of method it is not so much the biblical context as the context in his argument which determined the meaning of the text for Hilary; these need not of course differ violently, since Hilary usually has the biblical context in mind, but they do lead to changes in the accentuation of the given text in whole and in part.¹⁶

13

e.g. at 7.5 hoc dictum Domini; 7.9 legimus enim; 7.10 dictum est, ubi dicitur; 7.15 in quo scriptum est; 7.17 ait; 7.19 ait.

14

cf. the treatment of 'ego et Pater unum sumus' at 7.24. The fact that the texts involved are almost all doctrinal texts from St. John, and not narrative episodes or parables, helps to lessen the effect of the splitting up into single words in the De Trin.

15

Extended meditation on a single text is seen at e.g. 7.10f; 7.16f; 7.22-27; 7.39-41.

16

So in 7.5 the phrase 'I and the Father are one' is treated as if the gospel writer knew in advance of the heresies to come. In 7.22 Jn. 10.27-30 is read as if it were part of a 4th century theological treatise, and 7.23 the roles of the Jews and the heretics are exactly identified.

(This factor clearly occurs to some extent in all theology and is not necessarily always harmful to theology, but awareness of its existence is important for the understanding of a given writer's thought.)

Common to the exegesis of the De Trin. and the In Mt. is the central strictly theological concern: apart from this the special features of exegesis in commentary-continuity, cross-references and the like are no longer necessary in the structure of the De Trin.. But the importance of the biblical texts in the doing of theology, as Hilary understands this, is in no sense reduced.¹⁷

Elements of other literary forms may also be found in this work. In an important sense the whole of the De Trin. is a theological and exegetical dialogue with the Arians,¹⁸ except that the formal structure and the introductory setting of the scene is not present, as in the classical dialogue. Again, the work exhibits strands of homiletic paranesis, with elevated exhortations concerning what we ought to do¹⁹ - we have mentioned that theology without a homiletic strain was practically unknown in the early Church. The use of this element was to be developed considerably in the final period of Hilary's writing, in the tractatus on the psalms.

17

As at 7.33 Non enim fides, ex arbitrio nostro, sed ex dictorum est ^{ut}ineunda virtutibus.

18

This was well brought out by Martinez Sierra, cf. below.

19

Exhortation is addressed either directly to the heretic, in the manner of classical rhetoric as at 7.23 at 'tu vero, heretice, quid agas ac profitearis agnosce' etc or to the believer, as at 8.69-70 throughout.

b] Principles of interpretation, especially interpretation of scripture.

A striking feature of the *De Trinitate* is the relative infrequency of *coelestis significantia* and cognates in comparison with the *In Matthaem*.²⁰ This is a consequence of the epitomising use of scripture explained in the previous section, in which the first object is not to draw out a hidden sense by exegesis, but to support an argument which is held to be equally evident in open and hidden senses alike;²¹ since the Arians made use of allegorical interpretation to defend their positions (like the Gnostics and indeed most defenders of special interpretations), Hilary is concerned to show that his interpretation is clear from the simple sense of the text. Typology is, as we shall see below, limited to the interpretation of Old Testament prophecy.

This lack of detailed exegesis (except in special cases) reflects the fact that Hilary is here concerned not with the theology of the Old and New Testament as such, but with the use of biblical texts to illuminate matters of general systematic theology.

20

There are in fact no references in Bk. 7 to *coelestis significantia*. Hilary prefers to speak instead of scripture as *Dei sermo*, as at 7.38.

21

cf. 10.1 *Non est ambiguum, omnem humani eloqui sermonem contradictioni obnoxium semper fuisse. This is contrasted with veritatis sermo (ibid) which is the veritas Dei patris (10.3) The importance of the context is stressed at 4.14 and 9.59. cf too 2.3 and 7.4, where the faith of the Church is contrasted with the misinterpretation of the heretics.*

In the De Trinitate the *lex/fides* motif has receded entirely from the foreground.²² The leading motif is now the divinity of the Son, Jesus Christ; but since the use of texts is different, the apparatus used in the In Matthaëum for making the inner sense refer exclusively to the main motif is no longer required.²³ Whatever Marcionite influence there may have been is now gone, another indication that its supposed earlier presence may have been due more to the character of the interpretation which he wanted to make specifically of St. Matthew's gospel than to his general theological outlook at that time. At the same time, there is no trace in the De Trinitate of the traditional Alexandrian doctrine of a series of steps towards the deeper mystical illumination of scripture: the Alexandrian concept of the divinisation of man is taken up, but divinisation comes as we shall see below through the divinisation of man in the man Jesus Christ, and the language referring to our divinisation has a doxological as well as an ontological character, though both are involved.

Though as we have seen scripture is normally used in the De Trinitate in a manner different from that of the In Matthaëum, the question of how scripture is to be understood correctly is still involved, and may be looked at from a number of different angles. An important feature of the work is that it presupposes faith, which

22

cf. the relations of gospel and law at 5.17-18-23 and 9.28. These are now no longer contrasted but complementary.

23

References to *ordo* still appear as at 7.16 *propositionis ordo*, and 8.40 *doctrinae ordo*, but the category itself no longer plays a significant role.

brings as a corollary with itself the illumination of scripture by the Holy Spirit.²⁴ The change in the role of scripture brings in its train changes in the setting out of the manner of its functioning. The category of exemplum is much less frequent,²⁵ and there is less stress upon the virtus of the words. The dicta/facta dialectic of the rhetorical tradition now being bridged by the one Verbum of the incarnation: 'at verò hic verbum Deus est: res existit in Verbo, Verbi res enuntiatur in nomine'.²⁶ Thus the literal sense could refer as much to the verbum as the spiritual sense, and there was no need for constant invocation of the inner sense. One could see this as a decisive breakthrough comparable to the change in the understanding of hermeneutics at the Reformation (the Reformers themselves clearly did) but, as we shall see,

24

It is from God that we can learn about God cf 8.38 esp. It is from faith that we learn to deepen faith (1.18-19) (Grabmann 1.121f sees this as an important anticipation of Anselm's famous 'fides quaerens intellectum'). It is in the Holy Spirit that faith is nourished (cf 3.31, 8.34, 2.33) Faith depends on the spirit of Christ rather than the spirit of heresy (8.25).

25

Again the change in character of the narrative, and the absence of a long series of historical narrative episodes, largely explains the lack of exempla. The word is not however deliberately avoided, e.g. at 8.9 Christ gives an exemplum unitatis.

26

Virtus still appears too e.g. at 7.33 Non enim fides ex arbitrio nostro, sed ex dictorum est ineunda virtutibus. But the central preoccupations have changed. Apart from the explicit references to the Verbum, the whole emphasis throughout on the centrality of faith in the Son of God, not always directly related to scripture, plays a major role in revealing God and guiding men to faith may be seen at 1.18-19, 3.9; 9.52 and 12.45. The incarnation is THE res of scripture, and in Hilary's basic dictum, non sermoni res, sed rei est sermo subiectus (4.14). The verba lead to the ratio and so to the veritas who is God (5.36). The whole word is a sermo veritatis (6.4).

there is need for caution: with Hilary all is still in flux, and different modes of thought exist side by side and even intermingle.²⁷

Hilary is much concerned to stress that God can only be known through God: *Non potest Deus nisi per Deum intelligi, sicuti nec honorem a nobis nisi per Deum accepit (5.20) cf. 5.21 neque enim nobis ea natura est, ut se in coelestem cognitionem suis viribus efferat.* More precisely, God is only known in Jesus Christ: *dum eo cognito Pater cognitus est, dum eo viso Pater visus est.* (8.18. cf. 7.31, 5.27 and 5.20 above).

The scriptures point to God (cf. 6.19) and he in turn illuminates the meaning of the scriptures. Without God's initiative scripture cannot be rightly understood. The important implications of this shift from the divinely inspired scripture as itself the creator of faith to

27

In an important sense, the Reformers were right. With them Hilary shared the insight that Christ was the interpreter of his own word, though the manner of interpretation naturally differed. The reasons for the differences are varied. 1) Differences in other areas of theology related to this, e.g. the doctrine of man and of eschatology were also involved, so that Hilary was not as close to Luther on grace and justification as Luther himself thought. Their realist emphasis brings points of convergence; Luther's realism is articulated within a nominalist (and so despite his strictures in some ways Aristotelian) framework, Hilary's and Calvin's within a Platonist framework. 2) Though Hilary stresses that God is only known through God in Christ, it is important to bear in mind that he does not always draw the explicit conclusions that Christ reveals himself through the scriptures. The influence of the general patristic understanding of scripture deriving from Philo remains, though here again the greatest problems raised by the Philonic theory of verbal inspiration are partially resolved by the stress on the events themselves rather than the words.

Christ as the one who initiates the disclosure of the knowledge of God in scripture we shall explore below. Here we must attempt to understand why Hilary came to take such a step. If of course his previous thinking had been on entirely different lines to those of his new conception, he would never have been able to move as he did. But the crucial factor which prompted his revised conception was clearly the pressure of the Arians' argument.²⁸

Contrary to the popular belief that makes all heretics first fools then impious fools, the Arians were probably neither. As theologians they were well aware that theology was not simply to be equated with philosophy and even bad philosophy, and they sought as much as did their opponents to work for the glory of God. Therefore an appeal to scripture as the basis of his position (cf. De Trin. 6.19 and 1.17) was not enough, for the Arians too based their case on scripture.

The problem for Hilary lay in a correct understanding of scripture, which would yield the true interpretation if not read with false presuppositions (cf. 7.4; 2.3; 8.6; 10.1-2;

28

In the De Trin. as in all Hilary's work it is important to recall that his central concerns are practical rather than theoretical. He is here concerned to refute the argument of the Arians and to stress the divine sonship of Christ. He is NOT concerned to develop a systematic hermeneutic of scripture. Hence his comments are scattered and unsystematic, and each insight is not systematically applied to the whole. Nevertheless his practical concern forced him to develop a theory of understanding in general and of scripture in particular alongside existing theories, and the scattered nature of his basic points need not detract from their often great theological acumen.

12.3; 3.21); attention must be paid to the proper context and to understanding the words in the light of the events which they indicate, and not vice versa (9.2; 4.14). In any case, the words have their own virtus, which may be understood provided that we avoid imposing our own preoccupations upon them (7.33). The intention of the speaker must be considered (6.41) and where the sense appears ambiguous comparisons must be made (11.22-31) and parallel texts must be used (9.58f). If this is done, then scripture will be sufficient for the disclosure of the knowledge of God (11.7) and is so when interpreted within the Church (7.4). The Church in interpreting scripture does so correctly in the light of its confession of Christ as the Son of God. God reveals himself as the Word in the scriptures: hence the scriptures point to Christ and are illuminated by God in creating faith.

Having said this however, it must be stressed that though we may detect here the beginnings of a new understanding of scripture not present in the In Matt., this understanding is not always carried through into the exegetical practice. Much of the exegesis of the De Trin- follows traditional lines, continuing the pattern of the In Matt. without the features peculiar to the commentary structure. It is mainly in specific anti-Arian expositions that the new accent is carried through. But at the same time, the factor of christological reference remains an important element in the thought of the work as a whole.

Hilary's understanding agreed with the Antiochene tradition (though apparently without any anti-Origenist²⁹ intention), in referring the literal sense direct to Christ, but went beyond this in its understanding of the validating function of the Verbum (to be distinguished both from Augustine's detailed doctrine of the 'inner word' and from the Reformers' understanding of the hearing of the Word alike). It is distinguishable too from Origen's ontological understanding of the allegorical process and from the popular 'Origenist' simplification of this.

Augustine like Hilary (through the same latin rhetorical tradition) sees the difference between the literal and the spiritual senses in scripture more in terms of res and signum than of the spiritalis/corporalis distinction of Origen. But the sign theory which he elaborates, and which was to be the basis of mediaeval exegesis, involving a dualism of signa and res, was in important respects closer to Origen than to Hilary. It was therefore no coincidence that the Reformers, especially Luther, were to see Hilary's understanding of the self-authenticating function of the Verbum, as being essentially their own criterion 'was Christum treibet'.²⁹

29

For Augustine's theory of the interpretation of scripture cf. *De Doctr. Christ.* esp. III *De ambiguitatibus in scriptura enodandis* and also *De Trin.* 15.10f; also the studies by Duchrow esp. 213f, Schindler 95ff. and G. Strauss 84f (cf. too 96f. and 147ff), also Gadamer 397ff. Ebeling, art. *Hermeneutik* in *RGK*, offers an excellent short summary of Augustine's method.

29 (cont.)

'It becomes clear in the wider context of his epistemology, ontology and philosophy of language why he made the relationship between sign and thing signified (signum and res) the basis of his hermeneutics. In doing this, he combined a theory of the purely significative character of language with the metaphysical idea of sign-giving property of the reality of time and space which must be transcended (and which to this extent has linguistic character and becomes as the object in the foreground the sign of the true thing signified). This schema, based on the double concept of signum and res, provides two possibilities: an exact concern for the literal sense coupled with an interpretation by extrapolation from the sensible to the intelligible world. The bridge is formed by the fact, known from rhetoric, that words may act as signa in a double way; in their own right (propria) and in a transferred sense (translata). Difficulties for both interpretations arise from the fact that words may be unknown (ignota) or have two meanings. In the first instance, the artes liberales may be adduced to provide explanation (including the rhetorical theory of tropes) and in the second case, there is need of a criterion for the understanding of what should be understood literally and what metaphorically; because so intended by the author.'

Ebeling characterises thus the relation between Augustine and Origen (RGG art. Geist u. Buchstabe) 'The schema of a double sense of scripture is retained by Augustine, but for A. the sensus litteralis is the rule, and the sensus spiritualis (mysticus) is the exception. It is not the ontological difference between the corporeal and the spiritual, but the (not always sharply differentiated) language event (signum res) which is the basis of Augustine's hermeneutic and allows more attention to be paid to the literal sense and the narrative itself. Corresponding to this the scopus is not the spiritual alone, but faith and love. Nevertheless, Augustine's hermeneutic like his understanding of the letter and the spirit, remains in close affinity with neoplatonic thought.' The works of Strauss, Duchrow and Schindler (like that of Krause on Luther referred to above) are essentially expanded paraphrases of the work of Ebeling.

(Augustine was also of course much indebted to Aristotelian sources for his doctrine of the Word and the dualism which it involved. Quite apart from the important indirect influence through Cicero's *Hortensius* in his early years, he had read the *Categories* and in his work on the Trinity made extensive use of the psychology of the *De Anima*, possibly in a Latin translation but conceivably directly. His understanding of *verba* as *signa* of a hidden *res* has its roots, if only indirectly in the beginning of Aristotle's *De Interpretatione*. On the relations of Augustine and Aristotle, in general cf. D. Ritschl, *Memory and Hope*, 105ff. and *lit. cit. ad loc.*)

Hilary, for reasons which will become clear in the treatment of the *De Trinitate*, cannot however be easily subsumed entirely within the categories which Ebeling employs, though this study too is much indebted to his work and thought.

The wider consequences of Augustine's work are excellently summarised by Gadamer, *op. cit.* p. 397. 'The external word, and with it the whole problem of the multiplicity of languages, is expressly depreciated in value by Augustine, who nevertheless still mentions it. The external word, like the external word which is merely reproduced within (the recipient) is bound to a particular language (*lingua*). The fact that the *verbum* can be said in different ways in different languages means however only this, that it is unable to show itself in its true

being to the human tongue. Augustine says in entirely Platonic devaluation of the appearance in the sensible world 'non dicitur, sicuti est, sed sicut potest videri audiri per corpus'. The 'true' word, the *verbum cordis*, is entirely independent of such an appearance. It is neither *prolativum* nor *cognativum in similitudine soni*. Thus this inner word is the mirror and picture of the divine word. When Augustine and the scholastics deal with the problem of the *verbum*, in order to find the (appropriate) conceptual apparatus for the mystery of the Trinity, it is exclusively the inner word, the word of the heart and its relation to the *intelligentia*, which they make their theme.

Hilary's method of understanding scripture and of understanding theology in general arises as mentioned in Sect. 3 above and in the discussion of the anti-Arian element in exegesis in response to and in reflection upon important elements in the theological and philosophical climate of his age. These may be introduced by means of a sketch in formal terms. We have already seen how in the *In Matthaeum* Hilary uses models derived from what was originally Stoic epistemological theory. Stoicism itself had early absorbed much Platonic material (at least since Poseidonius) and in the Neoplatonic tradition there was a general complete blending of the old Platonist and Aristotelian schools (often but not exclusively taking the form of a combination of Aristotelian epistemology and Platonist ontology.)

The importance of this blending of the traditions, which in itself combined to produce all kinds of new possibilities, cannot be sufficiently underlined. From this it follows that the many dissertations on Hilary which seek to interpret his thought, and its basis in theological and philosophical traditions, in neat schemata of pure or nearly pure Stoicism, or Hermetic dualism, or 'Aristotelian' (not necessarily Aristotle's) categories of substance, are inaccurate for purely historical reasons. Reconstructions, too, which see the 'key' to fourth century discussions philosophical and theological, and not simply individual strains in this, in terms of the strict applications of conceptual categories and distinctions from Plato and Aristotle themselves, are often untenable, though of course they may stimulate further study of the precise nature of the problems involved.

We have already mentioned that the fourth century synthesis often contained elements derived from an originally Stoic epistemology, and have examined traces of such elements in the *In Matthaeum*. Epistemology was for the Stoics intimately connected with the theory of language and with logic, which, according to Mates, was a logic of propositions and of inference schemas, in contrast to the Aristotelian logic of classes and of logically true matrices. In understanding there are three main factors for the Stoic - the significans, the significate and that which exists: cf *Sext. Adv. Math.* 8.11f

οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Στοᾶς τρία φάκτοροι συζυγῆν ἀλλήλοις,
τὸ τε σημαζόμενον καὶ τὸ σημαζόμενον καὶ τὸ
τυχεῖον.

Where the impression of an object formed in the soul corresponds to the object itself, this is a true impression and the soul itself immediately grasps the reality and is in harmony with the world, inner logos corresponding to outer logos. The Stoics appear to have distinguished several different meanings for the true and the truth (the true, according to Sextus, differing from the truth in essence, in constitution and in meaning). A distinction was made between the truth of being equivalent with to hyparchon, and the truth of statement. Correspondence to the truth is established by the general logos itself, which infuses all matter and the soul, so that the object of perception itself becomes an active sign signifying itself and setting up a corresponding image (imago) in the soul of the observer. This relationship has corporeal substantial character - later through Middle Platonism modified to incorporeal substance - and sets the soul of the observer in harmony with the nomos of the universe, in a general monist framework (realist or idealist as the case may be). Knowledge of the truth then produces virtue.³⁰

30

On Stoic epistemology and logic of Bochenski, Ancient Formal Logic_{pp}77-100. History of logic_{pp}114f, also Mates, Stoic logic, Merlin in CHAMphil.126f, Prantl, Geschichte der Logik 1.6.401f. On Latin Neoplatonism esp. Huber op. cit, and the arts in RGG3 Platonismus, Aristotelismus. For the De Trin. cf. esp. the notes on p. 143 and_{pp} 160ff. In stressing the presence of Stoic vocabulary and epistemology in the In Matt. and the continuing realist

Whatever the dilemmas of monism, the Stoic model certainly avoided the equal disadvantages of Platonic dualism, with its unbridgeable gap between the sensible and the intelligible world, between the sign and the reality signified, between words and things in themselves.

There was however a further alternative to ^{or} radical modification of the conceptual world of Platonic (and likewise of course Aristotelian) dualism available, namely that provided by the event of the incarnation itself. Reflection upon this event introduced into the world of Greek philosophy and theology new possibilities for the understanding of the relation between knowledge and being, and for the understanding of the manner of perception, which might be taken up in various ways. The significance of this concept for epistemology has been well expressed by Gadamer (Wand M. 396, cf 395ff and 405) 'Wenn das Wort Fleisch wird und erst in dieser Inkarnation die Wirklichkeit des Geistes sich vollendet, so wird damit der Logos aus seiner Spiritualität, die zugleich seine kosmische Potentialität bedeutet, befreit. Die Einmaligkeit des Erlösungsgeschehens führt den Einzug des geschichtlichen Wesens in das abendländischen Denken herauf und lässt auch das Phänomen der Sprache aus seiner Versenkung in die Idealität des Sinnes heraustreten und

emphasis throughout Hilary's work, it should not be forgotten that Neoplatonist logic sought to relate itself to Plato's logic as well as Aristotle's logic, and to questions of general metaphysics (cf A.C. Lloyd in *Phronesis* 1.58ff. and 146ff.) and that Aristotle too tried always to obey the Platonic injunction to look to the thing rather than the word (cf. W. M. Kneale, *The Development of Logic*, 21).

sich dem philosophischen Nachdenken dararbeiten. Denn im Unterschied zum griechischen Logos gilt: das Wort ist reines Geschehen (verbum proprie dicitur personaliter tantum Thomas Iq³⁴) As we have mentioned, Stoic epistemology, Platonic dualism and incarnation could be thought together in different ways along with additional ingredients as required.

The obvious and attractive combination of the realism of Stoic materialism with the concept of the incarnation into the flesh simply led to a disastrous 'christomonist' system in which the difference between the divine and human in God and man, in Jesus Christ in particular and in other men in general was confused to the detriment of all concerned: Hilary has himself been accused of this, but as we shall see the Arian controversy caused him in fact to lean in the opposite direction.³¹

The tradition provided examples of numerous other options, which we cannot elaborate here, but the existence of which is important for the understanding of the fourth century situation.

In the apologists, the logos doctrine of the Stoics had been used to show how God could become incarnate and still remain God. But if monism was avoided, the basic Platonic dualism between the material and the spiritual between God and men, inherited from Philo (and which was

³¹

cf. too below p.162f.

not the biblical differentiation between creator and creature) made it difficult to articulate the biblical emphasis on the saving significance of the incarnation. Of course for the apologists that saving significance of the incarnation consisted in bringing knowledge of God to men, and since in the Platonist tradition it is knowledge which brings virtue and so transformation of being, they felt no serious difficulty. But though the importance of knowledge in transforming existence has been stressed by all theologians in the Platonist tradition including Hilary, that sphere alone has been felt to be inadequate to express all that the incarnation has brought about.

In the work of Origen, the basic dualism of the Platonic sign theory remains in epistemology (and so in the understanding of scripture) and the significance of the incarnation for the interpretation of scripture is articulated in terms of this background. Thus Philo's allegorical interpretation can be taken over and 'baptised' by christological imagery without reconstruction. But the metaphysical element involved (also present in Philo) makes use of the incarnation concept in effecting the unification of the human and the divine: attempting to avoid both the problems for theology of a Stoic monism and a Platonic schema of immanence and transcendence Origen uses the incarnation as the pivot which unites the divided elements, a union expressed epistemologically as mystical

illumination and ontologically (and also doxologically) as deification.

Opinions differed even in his own time about Origen's relation to his Platonic heritage and its effect on his theology. ~~It seems clear that Athanasius,~~ It seems clear that Athanasius, taking up the Stoic legacy of the logos doctrine as it had come through Philo and the apologists to Origen, and using it to reinterpret the incarnation in such a way as to avoid the dualist dangers which led to Arianism intended not so much to contradict Origen as to remove the ambiguities.³²

Hilary shares with early Latin theology in general the originally Stoic influenced legacy of the logos doctrine, along with the Platonic exegetical and metaphysical tradition, as this had come through the Apostolic fathers (esp. Barnabas) to Irenaeus and so to Tertullian. Part of the legacy may have come to Hilary through the direct though not proven influence of Irenaeus, who in fighting the Gnostics was conscious of the difficulties raised by the kind of Platonic dualism used by the apologists. For Hilary too the Stoicised epistemology of the In Matt, coming from Tertullian, with its tendency to monism and

32

Coulange, *Metamorphose* p199, concluded that 'Hilaire ne semble pas rien devoir a 'Athanasie, il n'a probablement rien de lui'. But that Hilary might have been encouraged in his fight by Athanasius' stand and on Athanasius and his relation to Middle Platonism cf now E.P. Meijering 'Orthodoxy and Platonism in Athanasius' Leiden 1968. The doctrine of the Inc as logos/verbum is discussed by Hilary at 2.13-21: 7.11 and 10.21, 50 and 54.

still without the intense Neoplatonism of the later Latin west, coupled too with the res/verba dialectic and the use of virtus etc. (cf. sects. 2 and 3 above) of the rhetorical tradition of Cicero and Quintilian, avoids the dualism of the Origenist/Augustinian pattern, while the traditional exegetical distinction between the literal and the spiritual (from Philo through Irenaeus) help to preserve him from monism. These affect his understanding of the incarnation and of scripture, of understanding and of being in general. At the same time there is no doubt that Hilary's reflection upon the incarnation itself in faith and in the witness to faith of scripture and tradition (especially Irenaeus on the incarnation) enabled him to combine and derive from the concept available in the fourth century in articulating the meaning of the faith to his contemporaries.

It may perhaps be added, on the use of different formal epistemological frameworks at different times, that though of little significance in themselves, these frameworks gain their significance when applied to the solution of specific problems in understanding of the world, of God, or as here in the interpretation of the scripture. The history of doctrine would appear to show that none of the above frameworks is in itself 'to be preferred' in theology, nor indeed are formal ways of approaching problems necessarily better than informal approaches. Different frameworks may be used in different circumstances to articulate clearly the Christian conviction

of the action of God in Jesus Christ in creation, in history and in the lives of men. Often a 'realist' framework of some kind, Platonist or Aristotelian, has been used in a useful way to express in objective terms the significance of the incarnation - as with Athanasius in combating the theological legacy of Arianism, or with Luther in combating the abstractions of a late scholasticism in which the living God appeared to have been removed and obscured from men in a late mediaeval 'death of a thousand qualifications'. Yet realism may also be corrupted into a positivism, in which the infinite difference between the divine and the human is obscured, as in Tertullian and Methodius of Olympus on the resurrection of the body, or in the 17th century understanding of sacramental grace, Catholic or Protestant. Different problems have been approached at different times by espousing one such framework for a specific purpose or by being eclectic. The two conditions for the effective use of one or many frameworks would appear to be first the awareness that all of them partake of the limitation of the human, so that their usefulness depends not on a supposed appropriateness to the divine per se but on the theological situation of the time, and secondly that the incarnation itself (understood in a manner appropriate to the biblical witness) must remain the criterion against which the appropriateness of christian discourse about God will be measured (this criterion not being like any other criterion and not being dependent on the state of

philosophical discussion about the legitimacy or possibility of the concept of criterion at any given time: i.e. truth conditions for the understanding of the incarnation are not to be found outside the witness of the incarnation itself!)

b) The principles of interpretation

Having sketched the general background to the issues involved in the hermeneutical focus of the *De Trinitate*, we must now return to the details of the hermeneutical principles themselves. At the beginning however, some further factors may be mentioned briefly. Origen had selected arguments from one school of philosophy to refute the arguments of another opposing school with great versatility;³³ Hilary too, though with less intellectual virtuosity, selects out elements in the fourth century synthesis which originally came from varied traditions to suit his purposes. At the same time and quite apart from their epistemological formulation, many questions such as that of the status of scripture in theological construction, clearly require theological decisions which cannot come out of the philosophical traditions alone, and must be seen in the light of the ductus of the theological argument itself (cf. below). As we have said, the *De Trinitate* shows Hilary's thought in development, in which contradictions and strictly incompatible elements may be found together: but the lack of finished consistency does not obscure the basic direction of his thought.

33

On Origen's relation to the Stoa cf. esp. H. Chadwick, *Origen, Celsus and the Stoa*, HTR 1947.

In the description of the process of understanding scripture, as we saw above, the event of the incarnation of God in Christ, as reflected in the biblical witness to it, is now explicitly the key to our understanding of scripture and so of God. Traces of the earlier explanation of the transformation of the words and exempla into our understanding by the spirit in the Stoic tradition are still present. But now the role of the Holy Spirit, which is not central in the *De Trinitate* despite the popular title, is now in illumination of the incarnation as the key to scripture rather than in the immediate illumination of the words as in Philonic theory.³⁴ It is often pointed out in this connection³⁵ as part of general theories on Hilary's 'system' that the idea that God can only be understood through God himself reflects the Aristotelian view of the aseity and impassibility of God. But this is not peculiar to Aristotle, and in Hilary's case is more likely to be a product of direct reflection on the incarnation itself. After all the proposal that like can only be known through like is a locus communis of all ancient philosophy from the Eleatics onwards.

From the rhetorical tradition, the literary categories of *ordo*, *ratio* and *proprietas* play a much diminished role in the exegetical work.

³⁴ A full list of references to *Gloria in Hilary*, many of which come from the *In Natv.* is given by *Beacro* *op cit.*, esp p 74n2. References in the *De Trinitate* include 2.26f; 3.18; 9.4f; 9.38ff; 10.7. cf. *Trin.* 2.33 'fidem nostram de Dei incarnatione difficilem, sancti Spiritus ~~XXXXXX~~ quodam intercessionis suae foedere ^{VI} luminat' Further references to the Spirit of God are found at 1.36; 2.1; 2.4; 8.20f; 12.55f.

³⁵ cf. pp 160ff below.

Now their role is largely limited to the literary function of stressing the consistency and reasonableness of the interpretation in the classical manner, complementing the highly polished prose and careful stylistic construction, e.g. of the prologue.

Since in the *De Trinitate* scripture is rarely exegeted as fully as in the *In Matthaem*, and since, as we saw above, the Arians resorted to allegory, Hilary himself makes sparing use of allegory and typology in this work. Had it not been used by the Arians, he might have learned to use allegory more fully as in the Alexandrian tradition without embarrassment and with modifications for his own purposes, as he was later to do in the treatise on the *Psalms*. Typology, not as important as it had been in the *In Matthaem*, in articulating the movement from past to present, is here almost entirely limited to the traditional role of pointing to the fulfilment of the Old Testament promise in Christ and in his Church.³⁶ The problems involved in the understanding of the realisation in the Church now of the Pauline eschatology, despite the distinction between ontological and doxological categories undoubtedly made, existed neither for Hilary nor for his opponents, as indeed they had not yet arisen for the community around which the fourth gospel itself arose.³⁷

36

Figurae. Particularly important is the typological use of Abraham as the type of justification by faith. cf esp 4.23ff and also 5.15-36 (also *In Matt.* 2.3, *Ps.* 127.7, 134, 51 etc.) But *figurae* are not to be used to distort the plain sense of the text, by heretics even if the Lord did on occasion speak *parabolicis et allegoricis dictis* (9.70). Analogy is discussed by Hil. at 1.19; 4.2; 6.9 and 7.29f. On

Corresponding to the freedom gained, in contact with the eastern tradition and from the use of the stress on the divinity of the Son as a focal point, from the rigidity of the interpretation, of the *In Matthaëum*, we find a greater use of all kinds of illustrative material, which is used in the same way as biblical parables and similitudes in illustrating aspects of the doctrine of the incarnation, often by direct analogy: though again Hilary stresses the limitations of all human analogies.

Figural illustrations, both in the rhetorical tradition of Stoic descent and in the Platonic tradition from Philo have an ontological significance, which if applied in the same way to the incarnation by Hilary would give grounds for supporting the suggestion of the presence of the beginnings of the mediaeval doctrine of substantial grace made possible by *analogia entis*: it appears however that Hilary's use of *figurae* in analogies has a strong doxological as well as an ontological element.

In addition, though in Origen and in the *tractatus* on the *Psalms* we often find a point by point correspondence between the analogans and the analogate, the incarnation; in the *De Trinitate*, in the analogies for scripture, this is not the case.

analogy in the ancient world cf Lyttkens op.cit.
On the special significance of the words of Christ himself cf. l.32 (*Trin*). These are illuminated by the Holy Spirit to awaken faith in us: cf. 2.32-33.

37

Stuhlmacher op.cit.13, concludes that 'Die paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre verschwindet darum, weil die Situation verschwand, für die sie geschaffen war.'

In the De Trinitate as in the In Matthaem there are passages where the word 'absolutus' shows that the meaning of the biblical passage cited is in itself clear. Due to the epitomising use of scripture, the lack of allegory of detailed exegesis of a continuous theme in the biblical narrative, and the consequent use of the incarnation rather than the rhetorical categories as the main 'key', these passages are here more frequent, and in contrast to the In Matt. are not limited to the parables of Jesus and the fulfilment of prophecy, but can be supplied to any type of passage. Indeed one of the pivotal passages of the De Trin. Ex. 3.14 (De Trinl.5) is described as 'absolutus' in meaning. It is significant that whereas in the period of the In Matt. and of the rules from the rhetorical tradition for the understanding of scripture, only some parables and some of the words of Jesus were alone clear 'absolute' in the midst of the darkness of the rest, now in the De Trinitate, the meaning of any part of scripture may be seen in the light of the incarnation. In the De Trinitate, the purpose of scripture is to induce true faith by pointing to God in Christ. In the In Psalmos this scope of scripture is extended to include the life of man in the light of the incarnation, specific detailed information being extracted with the aid of the Alexandrian rules, as we shall see below. Where further information, on ethics and on all aspects of human activity and questions about the world in general has been brought from the Bible, as in some mediaeval

interpretation further resort to detailed allegorical rules has been required. It may then be that elements of the understanding of scripture in the De Trinitate can illuminate problems of interpretation in a context in which the framework of allegorical interpretation has in general collapsed (cf. sect. 6 below).

c). The theological background.

Before going further into the examination of the hermeneutical principles themselves it will be convenient to recall the structure of the theological argument in the De Trinitate. The argument fairly straightforward in outline, has often been summarised. The first three books opened in a quasi-autobiographical manner, are concerned with a general and mainly non polemical introduction to the nature of the christian faith, and the way in which Hilary came, and we come to faith, not through philosophy but through the guidance of God who reveals himself through the scriptures. The roles of faith and reason, of scripture and philosophy and their relations to one another are explained.

Hilary then turns to the arguments of the Arians from scripture in detail, and proceeds to refute them individually.³⁸ Despite Deuteronomy 6.4 there is a distinction within the Godhead. The other person is the Son who is God, Christ is the true Son of God. The Son is God

³⁸

Martinez Sierra lists the following as texts used by the Arians and defended for orthodoxy by Hilary (op cit 152) Dt.6.4; Mk.12.29; 1 Tim.2.5; Rom.16.25f; Is.65.16; Jn.17.3; Mk.10.18; 1 Tim.6.15; Mal.3.6; James 1.17; Ps.7.12; Mt.6.26; Mt.10.29; Dan.13.42; Is.6.61; Ac.17.28; Ps.138.7f; Jn.4.24; 1 Tim.6.16; Jnl.18; Ex 3.14 and Jerem.1.6.

by nature, the Son is eternal. The Father and the Son are perfectly one, Christ is true God and true man, Christ's passibility is discussed. The equality of the Father and the Son is stated, and in conclusion that argument is summarised and Hilary prays to God, asking that he may remain in the faith of three persons in one God.³⁹

Hilary is concerned in this work to stress the full manhood and the true Godhead of Christ. He is not concerned with the doctrine of the Trinity or with that of the Holy Spirit, and though this lack of an explicit trinitarian framework was to bring problems, many hypotheses built on the argument *ex silentio* have been rather too sweeping.

He sees Christ in terms of the three times of pre-existence, kenosis and exaltation. Against the Arian stresses on the weakness of the man Jesus, he insisted on the impassibility of the logos, and of Christ's soul and body (a feature we have already encountered in the *In Matthaeum*) and made much use of the Johannine concept of gloria in explaining the incarnation (though he never uses the word *incarnatio*). At the resurrection Christ enters into the glory of God himself and in him man has entered. Thus we may say doxologically that men have already become the sons of God, but only through adoption in Christ, who was God

39

For the refutation of the concept of a distinction in the godhead cf. *Trin.* 5.23-24. The Son Jesus Christ is the true Son of God (5.25-26) and is thus divine 6.36ff. The Son is God by nature (7.9f) and is eternal (12.17f). The Father and the Son are in all senses a unity (9.43ff). Any indication of suffering or madness on Christ's part was no indication of weakness (9.70f. and 10, *passim*). Father and Son are in all things equal (11.2ff).

before he became man; the nature of the union of Godhead and manhood in Christ, and the nature of our relationship to the risen Christ were to be the subject of much revised formulation over the next hundred years.

The structure of the treatise is not that of a formal system of dogmatics. Like Luther and other great theologians, Hilary never wrote a 'systematic' theology: rather, the case against the Arians is built up point by point in answer to their own case, by theological reflection on the texts cited by them. At the same time the material scattered throughout the first three books provide a kind of prolegomena to his theology. It would be anachronistic to regard this as a theory of hermeneutics, though hermeneutical questions are also involved. Still less is it simply a hermeneutic of scripture, for the theological process is not for him simply the interpretation of scripture.

Hilary begins with an area often overlooked but always vital to theology, that of theological anthropology. Man cannot arrive at knowledge of God by himself. This has important consequences for the language we use in speaking of God. Knowledge of God must come from God himself: God has revealed himself, in Israel and especially in the incarnation of his Son Jesus Christ.⁴⁰ The record of this revelation is the scriptures, and the

40

cf. esp. I 18-19 (also sect 6 below) also 4.4 Nemini autem dubium esse oportet, ~~ad divinorum seram loquitur~~ ~~tonem divinis utendum esse doctrinis etc.~~
ad divinorum rerum cognitionem divinis utendum esse doctrinis etc.

occasion of the awakening of faith is the reading of them.⁴¹
The names in scripture are not empty names, but through
them the things which they signify are themselves revealed.⁴²
Through them Christ reveals himself, and understanding of
Christ, and reflection upon this, brings understanding of
all else in the Bible and in creation. This approach has
been described as Christomonism but for Hilary, knowledge
of Christ is at the same time always knowledge of God,
and the separation between Christ and creation is not
forgotten.

It will be seen that the role of the bible here is
of basic ontological significance and not simply as a
source of information. The life of faith is awakened in
the context of scripture by Christ. But the theological
task is the reflection upon Christ himself in the context
of his church, though the indispensable guide to the art-
iculation of this activity remains the meditation of the
events portrayed in scripture, and is developed accordingly
in the *De Trinitate* by the epitomising use of the Bible
to suggest directions in which talk about God can proceed
(such talk then becomes not biblical language about God
but language in which the specific concerns of the biblical

41

Hilary was never tired of insisting of the primacy of
scripture in fighting the Arians cf. 9.8 *sequimur ergo,
adversus irreligiosas et impias de Deo institutiones,
ipsas illas divinorum dictorum auctoritates*, cf too in
addition to the references already given 2.1; 11.7;
5.7; 1.6; 2.2. 11.7 is by implication a warning against
Arian allegories. *Quae enim simpliciter et ad eruditionem
fidei divinitus dicta sint, ut ad id quod dicta sunt, non
alienorum atque extrinsecus dictorum confirmemur exemplis.*

42

For the stress on the name of God (a feature found already
in Philo) cf. esp. 1.5 on Ex. 3.14 cf. too in I: 18-19 *passim.*

witness are regarded (cf. the discussion of 'pointiertes Reden von Gott' sect. 7 below).

Many problems have been felt to exist in the De Trinitate and consideration of some of these will take us further into the heart of Hilary's thought. God, it has often been felt, is regarded by Hilary as being in himself impassible and unknowable. This is so both in the Neoplatonic tradition of fourth century Greek theology and in the Stoic/Aristotelian/Latin tradition. Nevertheless God inspires the words of scripture, so that the words and the things to which they point are ontologically related. The Spirit sends knowledge of Christ as God and man in the incarnation, and infuses us so that we may rise on the knowledge of the risen Christ to God.

In this process it has been thought that the humanity of Christ plays no role in the communication of knowledge of God - because this was the starting point of knowledge of Jesus for the Arians. This position does not of course take into account Hilary's description of Christ as witness (cf. De Trin. 3.9) which is for him an important element in the divine dispensation. The result of what has been thought of as an immanentism of the Spirit, a counterpart as it were of the Aristotelian view of the aseity of God would be to reduce the role of the incarnation to that of providing merely descriptive knowledge of God. There being no real gulf between God and man which knowledge cannot remove, the significance of the cross is gone and

is characteristically replaced by the motif of glorification.⁴³

The roots of this problem have been traced to Hilary's use of the imago concept.⁴⁴ Here is found the Stoic/platonic doctrine of the one perfect archetype which can only have one perfect copy. In such a basically binitarian system there is then no room left for the Holy Spirit, which is relegated to a role of immanentism in the world, with the result that the doctrines of creation and redemption are confused. Further, because of the ontological nature of Christ's relation to us through the Spirit, our knowledge of him partakes^{of} a character corresponding

43

p. 74 n. 2

Apart from Fierro op. cit. cf. the many references to gloria cited in the Migne index ll. 960f. It is above all in Christ that our glory is to be found. cf. Trin. 9.36 subdimur autem gloriae corporis sui, ut in ea simus claritate, qua regnat in corpore; quia corpori conformes erimus.

The word 'substantia' and cognates is frequently used in the De Trin. (cf. P. L. 11.1025) But cf. Waszink's warning, quoted above about the frequent change in the meaning of Latin words in classical and patristical usage. At any rate the case for 'massive use of Aristotelianism' has not been proved.

Against the stress on full knowledge, glorification and sanctification must be set Hilary's stress on the feebleness of our own minds and the constant need of God's grace cf. Trin. 4.2; 4.14.

Löffler's summary of Hilary's effort against the Arians is worth citing: 'Auf jeden Fall hat er sich bemüht, das offenbarte Geheimnis dessen, was Gott selber ist, nicht an die halbe Wahrheit einer menschlichen Denkform zu verraten'.

44

For imago Dei cf. 10.16; 11.16 and for the general background apart from Löffler and Wille, Jervell, Imago Dei.

to his own substantia, which means that faith once acquired is a concrete permanent possession whose contingent character has been lost, along with the relation to eschatology, while the asymmetry of God's knowledge of men and man's knowledge of God is lost in what has been seen, a massive use of the Aristotelian category of substance. Here is analogia entis disguised as analogia fidei, docetism unbounded. In his zeal to overcome the extremes of the Arians, Hilary has himself gone to opposite extremes which themselves reproduce by antitheses the very errors and dualisms which he sought to combat.

Seen in the fourth century context the De Trinitate is far from being the perfect answer to all the problems of the day, but it is perhaps after Athanasius' De Incarnatione the best contribution made to their solution. Considering first the interpretation with the weakest historical claim, one may note the mutually exclusive character of the many attempts to explain Hilary in terms of one particular system: we have already seen that it would be exceedingly odd in the fourth century synthesis if the entire thinking of a man like Hilary, for whom there is no evidence of his previously having been a professional philosopher, were entirely governed by a detailed philosophical system which had long since been out of general use. There is however a general agreement on the presence of elements in the fourth century synthesis which indeed lead to particular difficulties in presenting

a doctrine of the incarnation. On the one hand because of his aseity God cannot become a real man, and the transmission in incarnation can only be of knowledge, the humanity of Christ being of negligible importance, and on the other hand the ontological relation set up between God, the risen Christ and the believer is such that the eschatological orientation of the Church is lost. Much of the depth of the Pauline understanding of man, of grace and of eschatology is lost in the transformation into a different historical situation and a different context of Greek philosophical terms. Yet within this framework, Hilary is careful to stress the difference between the ontological and the doxological in such a way as to retain the difference between the life of faith now in the Church and the union with God in Christ which comes only at the end of time. This framework like all others raises particular problems: but in intention at least Hilary did not go beyond reflection upon the biblical witness to the incarnation.

Returning to the role of scripture in the work, we have noted that there is no point by point analogy between his doctrine of scripture and his doctrine of God. ~~Therefore~~, The purpose is to establish the interpretation of scripture, as a part of the task of theology as a whole, upon the basis of the Father-Son relationship, upon the fact of the incarnation as the focus of the dispensatio of Father, Son and Spirit.

Monism, docetism, binitarianism - other charges reflect the above - Hilary's refusal to admit that the son of God could suffer, his alleged doctrines of analogia entis, of the divinisation of man, the suggestion that for Hilary the maxim holds 'anima Christi habet per gratiam, quae Deus per naturam. Neoplatonist mysticism is deprecated by one critic (Wille) while the lack of the mystical is deprecated by another (Grillmeier). Evidence of binitarian tendencies is found by Löffler at 2.26; 10.15; 12.56; 4.41, of monism at 1.16, of Stoic doctrine of the imago at 10.16 and 11.16, of the assertion that the Son of God in Jesus did not suffer at 10.27 cf 11.2 and 10.22 and of man being able to know God as new being at 2.35.

It will be desirable to consider the texts cited in support of these assessments in some detail (as far as this is possible in a work dealing with exegesis and not with Hilary's theology in general).

Examination of 2.26, 10.15 and 12.56 and 4.41 shows that when the theory of an all comprehending Stoic metaphysic (which as we have seen is inherently less likely than e.g. a Stoic influenced epistemology in the fourth century) is removed, the evidence collapses. Where the stress is upon the sonship of Christ this is clearly to be seen as a rebuttal of Arian claims. Where it is said that the Holy Spirit is incomprehensible, this need only mean that like many of his predecessors, e.g. Irenaeus and Cyprian, Hilary is not yet working on a theological basis into which the implications of the doctrine of the

third person of the Trinity are fully integrated: it does not mean that a third person is a priori unthinkable, and indeed there is no need to conclude this on the basis of Hilary's statements. Though at 1.6 there is language reminiscent of monist theory e.g. *ut circumfusus et infusus in omnia nosceretur*, this is not then developed in an explicitly monist direction. As Waszink has shown, similarity of Latin language does not always indicate identity of subject matter in this period (Waszink in *Fondation Hardt, Entretiens*, p.158 'schon bald wird es klar, dass Sätze, die auf den ersten Blick völlig neuplatonisch scheinen, in Wirklichkeit ein spezifisch christlich Bedeutung haben, weil dieselben Worte allmählig ganz andere Begriffe zu bezeichnen haben.'). On the other hand, one does find in the use of *virtus* in connection with the spirit (e.g. at 10.26) traces of the Stoic epistemology which was so marked in the *In Matthaëum*.

There is of course no reason why Hilary should not have made use of Stoic concepts, as Origen had done, in answering his opponents, but there happens to be no evidence for the kind of large scale dependence in the *De Trin* which has been suggested: occasional echoes may also be found in other works of Hilary: Hadot (p.88) cited *De Syn* 35 '*ut latitudo deducta quodam naturae suae tractu assumensque hominem filius nuncuparetur*'.

The suffering of Christ is dealt with at 10.27f; 11.22 and 11.2. Hilary says at 10.35 '*collatis igitur*

dictorum atque gestorum virtutibus, demonstrari non ambiguum est, in natura eius corporis infirmitatem naturae corporeae non fuisse, cui in virtute naturae fuerit omnem corporum depellere infirmitatem: et passionem illam, licet illata corpori sit, non tamen naturam dolendi corpori intulisse: quia quamquam forma corporis nostri esset in Domino, non tamen in vitiosae infirmitatis nostrae esset corpore, qui non esset in origine, quod ex conceptu Spiritus sancti Virgo progenuit. This need not however imply that his thought is docetic throughout. In discussing Christ's suffering Hilary always has in mind the Arian argument from that suffering of 10.27; 10.28; 11.2, and he occasionally takes care to add a specifically anti-docetic qualification e.g. at 10.24 (neque enim tum, cum sitivit aut esurivit aut flevit, bibisse aut manducasse aut doluisse monstratus est; sed ad demonstrandam corporis veritatem, corporis consuetudo suscepta est, ita ut naturae nostrae consuetudine consuetudini sit corporis satisfactum (cf. too 10.27)).

How far does Hilary anticipate the eschaton in teaching that man may come to the full knowledge of the glory of God here and now? There are many passages in which the emphasis on gloria and on the gift of the Spirit which led to the suggestion of such an anticipation, involving a Gnostic understanding of faith (Beumer) and a mystical doctrine of illumination by knowledge. A characteristic reference is to 2.35, in which it is said of the gift of Spirit 'hoc usque in consummationem saeculi nobiscum.

Hoc exspectionis nostrae solatium, hoc in donorum operationibus futurae spei/pignus est, hoc mentium lumen, hic splendor animorum est.' Yet even here a clear distinction is drawn between what we possess in via and what we shall know at the end of time. Again, Hilary is prepared to describe faith as *fides crucis*⁴⁵ - 'placuit Deo praedicatione stultitiae salvos facere credentes, id est crucis fide aeternitatem mortalibus provenire.' The situation may be summed up by saying that though the desire to refute his opponents decisively occasionally leads him into extreme positions, these positions characterise the limits rather than the central strains of his thought,⁴⁶ and that the presence of Gnostic and other vocabulary is not necessarily indicative of Gnostic or monist orientation (on this cf. G. Bornkamm *Zur Interpretation des Johannesevangeliums* in *Ev. Theol.* 1968.1.8ff). At the same time, it is clear that the role of the human nature of Christ in the atonement and the role of the Holy Spirit were left largely unexplored by Hilary: in this he reflects the state of fourth century Latin theology in general.

It might be thought from the foregoing that Hilary's use of the Bible was only occasional to the development of his theological thought, present in order to refute

45

Fides crucis cf. *De Trin.* 3.25

46

Hilary can be flexible when not standing in *statu confessionis* cf. *De Syn.* 71. 'potest una substantia pie dici et pie taceri.'

the Arians' use of the Bible, and that it was only the weight of quotation, the colouring given by the presence of so many instances of biblical imagery which lend the biblical tone to the work. This would be confirmed by the numerous instances of interpretation contrary to the intended meaning of the text in its exegetical context.

Yet for Hilary, theology without the direction of the biblical text is impossible. There is no other single authority which has such a bearing upon christian reflection upon God as scripture. He seeks to support all his arguments from the Bible. Allegory even is unnecessary because the truth of his position may be seen from the open meaning of the texts. It is through the scriptures that God intended to convey the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, pre-existent, incarnate, risen. The relation of the Old Testament to the new is seen in terms of the relation of witness to the pre-existent Christ and that to the incarnate Christ: thus the whole of the Old Testament, and not simply the passages referring specifically to prophecy, becomes a witness to the incarnation. Though the Johannine tradition is predominant through the use of the concept of gloria, the Pauline doctrine of the pre-existence of Christ serves too to illuminate the divinity of Christ as the Pauline doctrine of justification served to illuminate the doctrine of the Heilsgeschichte in the In Matthaem: a reminder of the continuities with the earlier period which remain despite the important differences.

5. The Late Period:

Tractatus in Psalmos

5. The Late Period: Tractatus in Psalmos.

The Tractatus in Psalmos has been, at least in modern times, the most neglected of Hilary's works.¹ The In Matthaicum has interested scholars as a prelude to the De Trinitate and because of its unique position as a commentary: the De Trinitate has long been a source of reference for the historian or dogma: but the In Psalmos has usually been seen as a pale imitation in devotional form of Origen's exegesis, of no particular interest in itself.² This view is questioned in the following analysis, in which the attempt is made to show that the work is of considerable significance for the assessment of the role of exegesis in Hilary's methodology seen as a whole.

The Tractatus was written in the years of comparative calm after Hilary's return from the east, some time after 361.³ The contents are best described perhaps as a series

1

As usual the chapter in Reinkens is excellent. A study in detail of the use of the different senses of scripture in the In Psalmos is in preparation by my friend R.P. Nestor Gastaldi (Paris/Argentina) Pere Gastaldi has most generously made available several sections of his work in advance of completion, and these have illuminated many aspects of the work for me.

2

Following Jerome (cf. apol. in Ruf. 1.2; Vall. 2.1) The view of uncritical following of Origen has already been questioned by Watson in his excellent short notice on the In Psalmos (xliii-v and 235). Pere Gastaldi confines himself strictly to the analysis of the different levels of significance of scripture.

3

Dates. Hilary died in 367/8. Ps. 67.15 (PL9.453) refers to De Trin. 1.15. From this it is clear that the work on the Psalmos was written after the exile.

of devotional meditations. This is not a commentary like the *In Matthaeum*, in which an inner sense involving a single consistent motif of interpretation is brought out. It is probable, despite the gaps in the work as preserved, that Hilary commented on all of the psalms.⁴ The work contains many homiletic elements, and is clearly written for use within the christian community. Its tone is devotional meditational throughout, rather than explanatory, philological or theological in the strict sense. It most probably came into existence as the expansion of a series of homilies in church. Again as in the *In Matthaeum* there are practically no references to contemporary events, and it is never said for whom the work is intended.⁵

The formal scope and method of the *In Psalmos* is set out in the prologue, which is in this instance preserved. Much is derived from Origen: the rules set out are not strictly adhered to throughout the work.⁶ The main points may be summarised as follows: the book of the psalms is a unity, *secundum apostolicam auctoritatem*,⁷ but is composed by many authors.⁸ The whole book *secundum evangelicam praedicationem intelligi oportet*⁹... *totum illud ad cognitionem adventus Domini nostri Jesu Christi referatur.*

⁴ The authentic commentaries by Hilary preserved are those on Ps. 1; 2; 9; 13; 14; 51-69; 118-150. Inauthentic are 15; 31; 41.

⁵ Though there are no direct references to recipients, there are frequent references to activities which go on in church, e.g. 'psalmus qui lectus est', the ref in Ps 67 to baptisms etc, which suggest the context of a congregation in church. cf. n. 42, p 70, above.

⁶ cf. below, where it appears from the evidence that Hilary was more independent than Jerome suggests.

⁷ Prol. 1.1 ⁸ Prol. 1.2 ⁹ Prol. 1.5
(=CSEL 22, p. 113) (ibid p. 4, l. 4f.) (ibid p. 6, l. 2f.)

This understanding is not however at once apparent to the reader: sunt enim ~~quia~~ ^{quia} ~~universa~~ allegoricis et typicis contexta virtutibus.¹⁰ There is however a clavis scientiae, per fidem adventus eius.¹¹ It is then always correct to look for the key in Christ (cf. the In Matthaeum, where the key (never mentioned as such) lay rather in the whole history of the incarnation and of the people of God to faith). The whole is carefully supported by quotations from scripture.

The Hebrew text is sine ordinis adnotatione:¹² all was put in order by the LXX seniores, who, spiritali et coelestis scientia virtutes psalmodum intelligentes ... in numerum eos atque ordinem redegerunt.¹³ Yet in theory the importance of the literal sense of the text is also affirmed: tamen absolutissime in gestorum et temporum historia edocemur.¹⁴

The psalter has a threefold purpose: cum enim primus gradus sit ad salutem, in novum hominem post peccatorum remissionem renasci, sitque post poenitentiae confessionem regnum illud Domini in sanctae illius civitatis et coelestis Jerusalem tempora reservatum. et postea consummata in nos coelesti gloria in Dei patris regnum per regnum filii proficiamus¹⁵ (in psalms with the number 8 there is a special rule, as also in the case of Ps 118; these are

¹⁰ Prol. 1.5 (*ibid.* p.6. l.18)

¹¹ Prol. 1.5 and 6
(*ibid.* p.7. l.5 and 12)

¹² Prol. 1.8 (*ibid.* p.9. l.18). —

¹³ Prol. 1.8 (*ibid.* p.9. l.25f)

¹⁴ Prol. 1.9
(*ibid.* p.10. l.6)

¹⁵ Prol. 1.11 (*ibid.* p.10. l.5ff.)

secundum ogdoadem evangelicam destinatus.¹⁶ et hoc istius textus et sermo testatur). These are directed ad percipiendos fructos evangelicos.

The titles also have a special meaning: non enim sine causa tanta rerum diversitate hic titulorum ordo convertitur.¹⁷ For example 'at vero cum Canticum tantum in titulo praeponitur, scientia in eo spiritalis, et intelligentia coelestis arcani.'¹⁸ or, 'per corporalem superscriptionum significationem spiritalis psalmi intelligatur editio'.¹⁹ Where there is a diapsalma, cognoscendum est, demutationem aut personae aut sensus sub conversione modi musici incitari.²⁰

Some preliminary indication of the effect of these rules on the treatment of the text, the exceptions made to them, the change in the shape of the work in comparison with that of the previous periods, may be gained from a brief analysis of selected psalms.

Psalm 1 begins with an introduction. Ex cuius persona does the work come?²¹ Here we note the technical

16

(*ibid.* p.12.19)

Prol. 1.13 cf. Ps. 118 which 'perfectum virum secundum doctrinam evangelicam consummat'. The three languages of the Old Testament have a special significance (1.15) (*ibid.* p.13) and the last 15 Pss. have also a special significance 'qui ogdoadis et praesenti religione et sperata expectatione perficitur, isto cantico graduum in coelestia et aeterna conscenditur.'

17

1.17 (*ibid.* p.15.16)

18

1.20 (*ibid.* p.16.15)

19

1.22 (*ibid.* p.18.2)

20

1.23 (*ibid.* p.18.19)

21

In Ps. 1.1 (CSEL 22. p.19.6)

structure of the literary criticism of the schools common to Rome and Alexandria alike. Nunc...ex persona Filii non posse intelligi, res ipsa absolute docet.²² Despite the emphasis in the prologue on the significance of the title, the explanation of the correct interpretation is grounded at once too in the text itself.²³ Despite the stress of the prologue that all may have a coelestis significantia, and though Christ is the key to the understanding of the book as a whole, this does not mean that every detail, or even the interpretation of each psalm, is to be related directly to him.²⁴ This is an important distinction.²⁵ The whole is a reflection not simply of Christ but of the life of man in relation to Christ. What the criteria for direct reference to Christ himself are, we shall consider in detail below. The next question runs: de quo viro?²⁶ This cannot be Christ, for the contents do not correspond to the dignity of his person.²⁷ This characteristic argument, which we have already encountered in the In Matthaem, is supported by a citation from that gospel (though without reference to the commentary).

Here the Tractatus proper begins. It is interpreted in terms of the forgiveness of sins, in accordance with the three tier structure of the whole book as set out in the general prologue. An exemplum is given, and then

- 22 1.1 (*ibid.* p. 19 l. 22) 23 1.1 (*ibid.*)
24 1.1 ex persona filii non posse intelligi, res ipsa
absolute docet. (*ibid.*)
25 1.2 sed ubi et quando ad eum prophetiae ipsius sermo se
referat, rationabilis scientiae discernendum est veritate.
26 1.2 (*ibid.* p. 20 l. 24ff) 27 1.3 (*ibid.* p. 21 l. 34ff)

treated as a moral illustration²⁸ (and not as in the In Matthaem) as a key to the structure of the whole text). The mention of cathedra pestilentiae evokes a quotation from St. Matthew,²⁹ and is then interpreted in relation to the words of Jesus. The concept of perpetua meditatio, connected by association of ideas with similar thought in Paul and in John, provides a christologically orientated meditation on the life of man before God which corresponds to the Old Testament prophecy and is interpreted along the lines of that prophecy.³⁰

The reference to 'lignum'³¹ apparently irreconcilable with the literal sense, is illuminated by reference to Genesis 2 and Proverbs (both of immense significance for the theology of the early church). The reference to Proverbs now provides a link with St. Luke's gospel³² (a reminder that the tractatus can only be understood in the light of the enormous exegetical activity of the De Trinitate) and to a meditation on Christ, commented upon further by Isaiah and by Paul. The plants of the psalm are analysed allegorically (like the fig tree in the In Matthaem) so that its leaves are the verba Dei.³³ The tree

28

1.6 this is an exemplum not as always in the In Mt. from scripture, but ex usu conscientiae communis. (ibid. p. 23 l. 20.)

29

1.10 Mt. 23.2 (ibid. p. 25 l. 14f) ³⁰ 1.11-12 (ibid. p. 26-7) ³¹ 1.13 (ibid. p. 28 l. 4f.)

32

1.14 Lk. 23.43. cf. De Trin. 1.32; 10.34 and 10.60 (ibid. p. 29 l. 6f.)

33

1.16 ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ (ibid. p. 31 l. 12)

is related to the redemptio ligni vitae of the cross,³⁴ and through a reference to iudicium to the last judgement (a reminder that even in the late period the themes of the cross and judgement are not entirely lost in the gloria of the resurrection, as is often suggested).³⁵

A short reference to hearers³⁶ and readers reminds us that the first audience was very probably 'live', and the use of the formula 'virtus ipsa verborum proprietatem dicti et intelligentiam continet'³⁷ indicates that the concern for the literal sense has by no means entirely disappeared. The ductus of the whole is completed in the Church, in the name 'christians' and in Christ.³⁸ The knowledge of man by God and of God by man is articulated in terms of the Pauline Adam/Christ typology³⁹ (as in the contemporary Tractatus Mysteriorum) and the whole is brought to a close with a christological text from the fourth gospel, familiar to us from the De Trinitate:⁴⁰ i.e. both Paul and John lend their witness to that of the psalms and the prophets in testimony to Christ.

The above sample from the prologue and the first psalm provides a typical example of the nature of the whole.

34 1.18 (ibid. p.32 l.11.)

35 1.20 (p.33.125/)

36 1.21 (ibid. p.34 l.7.)
neglegentem audientium et incuriosam legentium
facilitatem dicti dominici sermo perturbat.

37 1.21 (ibid. p.34 l.19) 38 1.22 (ibid. p.35 l.7ff. 39 1.24 (ibid. p.36 l.26/)

40 1.24. Jn. 5.22 cf De Trin. 4.29; 7.20; 11.12 cf for the other two sections in Hilary's division of the psalter Pss. 53 and 130 (ET in Watson, op. cit.).

The general prologue suggests a close connection with Origen, and since the first mention of this by Jerome, it has often been said that Hilary's work here is a translation or rough translation of Origen's commentaries on the psalms. Points of similarity and of difference have been assessed. Relations with Origen are complicated however by the uncertainty as to which of his works on the psalms Hilary used, and by the lack of extant material from Origen dealing with the particular psalms extant from Hilary. Rather more helpful is the often forgotten suggestion that Hilary and Eusebius of Vercelli translated the commentary on the psalms of Eusebius of Caesarea, which was itself a revised version of the work of Origen. Hilary's version is often nearer to Eusebius of Caesarea than to Origen, but it cannot be said to be a translation of either, for there are as many decisive differences, both in method and in content, as there are similarities.⁴¹

In the psalms chosen above for illustration, Hilary follows the main lines of the rules in the prologue (from Origen) as a general framework for his interpretation. But within these general guiding lines there is ample scope for Hilary's individual interpretation. Before going on to consider these relationships in the context of the tractatus as a whole, it may be mentioned that

41

Origen, Hilary and Eusebius (cf. Jerome *Vir.* 111.81; ep. 61.2; 112.20 cf. PL 12.948) cf. Origen in PG 12 1053-1685, Eusebius of Caesarea PG 23.21-1457. The few fragments of Eusebius of Vercelli surviving (PL12) tell us nothing in this matter.

many of the differences from previous works in the *In Psalmos* derive essentially from the nature of the material itself. Here there is no history of salvation to be explained in terms of the *lex/fides* motif of the *In Matthaeum*: as in the *De Trinitate*, the wider theme, with the additional freedom derived from acquaintance with the eastern tradition enables Hilary to use a much wider range of imagery and technique.

Comparison with Origen is complicated, as already mentioned, by the fact that we do not have the corresponding homilies/commentaries of Origen for the surviving work on the psalms by Hilary, and it is not entirely certain which of Origen's works Hilary is supposed by Jerome to have used. Many features of Origen recall Hilary: cf. the three homilies on Ps. 36, in which the christological emphasis is clear, 'Jesus Christus veritas est, Dominus noster Jesus Christus justitia est etc., the heretici are those who non spiritualiter intelligunt (671D) etc. A comparison of Origen's commentary and homilies with those of Hilary show some similarities and many differences. In the general prologue Hilary follows Origen in having one book of psalms and not five, but there is nothing in Origen's prologue on the *diapsalma*. The relation with Eusebius of Caesarea appears closer. In Ps. one there are no real parallels, and the explanations are often very different e.g. in 1.4. On Ps. 13.7 there is a close parallel, and in Ps. 14 the quotations are the same but the explanations given differ. Ps. 66 is

very different in both but Pss. 59, 65 2nd 68 show many similarities. E. had very little on Ps. 118. In Ps. 121 Hilary is close to E but in Ps. 124 very different. Ps. 132.1 offers an exact verbal parallel and 136 has parallels. In Ps. 138 the general sense is parallel but the words are not. Taking the cross-section used before, in Ps. 1 and 53 there are close parallels neither with O nor with E. In Ps. 130 Hilary's stress is found in E. but not in O. i.e. in none of these cases can we speak of translation, and of adaptation only in the widest sense. Comparison of the biblical citations provides a similar picture: in Pss. 1-2 Hilary gives nearly all Origen's and nearly all Eusebius' citations. In Ps. 64 Hilary's quotations are nearly all in Eusebius but not in Origen. The balance would indicate that Hilary's use of Origen probably comes through Eusebius on the Psalms. The details for the individual psalms compared follow the above sample: occasional striking similarities, often no resemblance whatever, and the resemblances more often with Eusebius than with Origen.

a). The structure of the work.

Because of its very loose nature, the literary structure of the work no longer plays the important role of the *In Matthaeum* but an examination of it may still shed light on the development of Hilary's exegesis as a whole.

It is clear that the *In Psalmos* arose from a series of homilies delivered in Church - cf. the reference as

already mentioned to readings e.g. 14. | psalmus qui lectus est, 135.1. cum in lectionis tempore, etc, and the frequent formulae of exhortation. These homilies were themselves composed by reference to the homilies (probably not the commentaries) of Origen, probably in the version of the homilies of Eusebius of Caesarea. At a later date these were all put together by Hilary. It is likely that he preached only on one section of each psalm on a given occasion. It is very unlikely that the long textual discussions, refer~~ring~~^{ing} to the different Mss versions in different languages, listed above, e.g. 138.37, in quibusdam codibus legimus etc, were mentioned in Church. But in the revision no attempt was made to delete the references to the live situation and to produce a polished unit in the manner of the De Trinitate. Possibly Hilary would have done so if he had lived longer. It seems probable that the homilies in Church, complete with ascriptions at the end, were left more or less unaltered, and connections and extra notes were simply inserted at the appropriate place, much of this coming from Hilary's sources.

At the same time, it would appear that Hilary himself used 'tractare' and cognates in the technical, classical sense of 'to treat, investigate, as it was frequently used by Quintilian, rather than in the later sense indicated by the well known line from Augustine 'tractatus populares quos Graeci homilias vocant' (Aug. haer. 4 pref). This idea of investigation, careful

treatment of a theme, is used of the psalmist himself at 67.23 Sed suscipiendae ab unigenito Deo carnis, adeundaeque mortis, et per Apostolum, et nunc per Prophetam grandior profundiorque ratio tractatur. For Hilary it may also imply something close to exegesis of a text, as at Ps.130**1** brevis psalmus est, et distinctione magis quam tractatu explicandus. The relation of written and spoken tractatus in Augustine is dealt with in A.J.H. Van Weegen's *Freek en Dictaat bij Sint Augustinus* (cf. esp. p. 8 n. 4), for which I am indebted to D.F. Wright. Hilary's use would be close to Augustine's second use of the word, as at DDC 4.4.6 tractator divinarum scripturarum, and in Sermo 170.3 scripturarum tractatores dicimur, non nostrarum opinionum affirmatores. (v. Weegen op cit. *ibid*) (The articles on Tractare by Bardy in *RSR* 33, 1946, 211-235 and Mohrmann in *La Maison-Dieu* 39, 1954, 97-107, were unfortunately not accessible to me.)

Further details of the literary structure (which for our purpose are more important for comparison with the *In Matt.* than for the direct understanding of the *In Psalmos* itself) may be further illustrated as follows:

Usually as in Ps.1 the exposition begins with a prologue in which the main themes are stated. These may be set out in a series of questions regarding speaker and addressee as in the above example. The length of the text varies; in Ps.1, two verses are taken together at the beginning then each verse is dealt with separately.

The end of each section is marked by a rhetorical finish. Each psalm may originally have been divided up and covered in several homilies. Despite the presence, examined below, of much philological material, Hilary clearly has in mind a devotional rather than an academic context in this work.

The division of the text into verses to be dealt with 'absolute' and verses to be explained in terms of a hidden meaning, as in the *In Matthaem*, has gone, and is not replaced by the epitomising method of the *De Trinitate*. Open and inner senses are no longer dealt with distinctly, nor is all referred to the incarnation directly, as was often the case in the *De Trinitate*: all this is replaced by the heavily modified framework of Origen's rules, the details of which are discussed below.

Each psalm being naturally a single unit, and the range of interpretation being much less strict than in the *In Matthaem*, the use of the rhetorical structure by building up references and cross references and in shaping the episodes for interpretation, though present, no longer plays a significant role. Typical too of the looser framework is the presence in quantity of quotations from the OT and NT throughout. The division of the material in units of single words or verses depending on the course of the meditation and not upon the strict sense of the text, as usual in the early Church, again leads to the phenomenon of atomisation and change in the accentuation

of specific episodes which we noted in the *In Matthaeum*. A certain amount of new material (for Hilary) in the form of grammatical, historical and philological explanation is present (doubtless a fruit of the exile) but this is always subordinated to the theological purpose and does not indicate a change in the essentially pastoral character of the work.

As in the *In Matthaeum* and the *De Trinitate*, due regard is paid to continuity of context, as at 64.1 *opportune superiore psalmo hic qui subiacet consecutus est*, 67.30 *quid illud sit, mox continuat ordo dictorum etc.*

The old categories of the rhetorical schools are again evident, but their presence is no longer so vitally important for the interpretation of the whole. This may be illustrated from *Ps. 1* on exemplum:

1.1 *et sumamus ex usu conscientiae communis exemplum*

1.2 *igitur secundum hoc propositum exemplum, impium...est*

1.6 *et quem in magnis aeternae beatitudinis constituat exemplis.*

1.8 *Ridiculum hoc forte et ineptum comparatae beatitudinis credebatur exemplum.* But the taut structure of the *In Matthaeum* in which the rhetorical categories plays a central role is no longer to be observed.

Much work has been done on the biblical quotations of the *In Psalmos*. According to H. Jeanotte, Hilary cites 1002 of the 2515 vv. of the psalter in the work, i.e. nearly 40%. Schellauf's analysis showed that Hilary often quoted

from memory. He distinguished the biblical citations apart from the text actually being commented upon as used to clarify, to stress and to abbreviate. The imprecision in the form of the citation makes identification of the text which he used difficult. Zingerle in WS 1889 noted that Hilary's text was often close to that of the LXX, and elsewhere (Comm. Wolfflin) suggested that Hilary probably had a Graeco-Latin glossary before him. On the other hand Hilary on occasions used texts other than that of the LXX (Buttell cites 118 Dalth, 118 He 13; 138.37; 43.2; 146.10)

A list of the comments made by Hilary on the Latin translation of the Pss. is given by Feder (Studien III 110f) incl. non satis proprie, non ita absolute, ambigua significatione, minus propria etc. The whole question of Hilary's text, comments on the text and philological work in the In Psalmos has been examined recently by Goffinet, who simply concludes (31f) that Hilary probably used the version of the biblical text current in Gaul in the 4th century. Critical comments are to be found at In Ps. 2.35; 51.38; 54.1; 54.11; 55.1; 56.1; 65.3; 65.15 etc; 118 (8 refs); 130; 136; 137; 138; 143. Goffinet draws the conclusion that 'Origenes dat hij dit kritisch-filologisch element in zijn Psalmencommentaar' but he has not considered the possible role of Eusebius. Jeanotte, Le Psaultier, noted Hilary's habit of referring occasionally to minute details in the text e.g. at Ps. 137.2 ad templum not in templo, and of discussing carefully the details of translations e.g. at Ps. 54.10; 118 Lamed 2.14 etc. and variant

readings e.g. at 78.13; 138.6 etc. ^{41a.}

b). The principles of interpretation.

The analysis of the first psalm has already revealed several of the distinctive features of the principles of interpretation in the In Psalmos. Notable among these and particularly important for the In Psalmos is the suggestion (present along with other suggestions) that scripture takes the forma dominici corporis:⁴² its importance is increased by the fact that here Hilary returns to the more explicit exegesis of continuous texts after the epitomising use of the Bible in the De Trinitate. The concept of the Bible having the form of Christ's body is from Origen, but the manner in which it is developed diverges in important respects from Origen's treatment. We never find in Hilary a trichotomist treatment of scripture (which is present theoretically at least in Origen) but a dualism of spiritalis and corporalis. This distinction, which resembles in some respects (but is not identical with) the inner and outer senses of the In Matthaëum, leads to a renewed emphasis on the 'spiritual interpretation' which was noticeably much reduced in the De Trinitate.⁴³

The details may be illustrated as follows:

Coelestis is very frequent cf. 13.1 exemplum nobis
coelestis doctrinae etc. For spiritalis cf. 62.3 sed nos
^{41a.} See note, mis placed, on p. 189.

⁴²

cf. Prol. 7 and cf below

⁴³

Though Hilary does divide the psalms into three parts this is a rather different matter. On Origen's division of scripture cf. sect. 2. above.

spiritualibus doctrinis eruditi, 67.11 animalia cum essent, facta sunt spiritalia 118.A.5 in reference to Romans 7.14 quia lex et spiritalis est, et umbra futurorum; 118.7.10 dona praecipue spiritalium gratiarum: 123.9 spiritalis enim sumus. This is contrasted on occasion with corporalis e.g. at 134.13 et in his quae corporaliter gesta esse memorantur, spiritalia significari meminimus, 134.16 Moyses non iam spiritaliter per doctrinam, sed corporaliter per gloriam fulgens ita meminit etc. cf. too 139.17 Recti autem habitantes cum facie Dei nihil in se corporale retinere intelliguntur. It is clear from the above that in the In Psalmos, the spiritual is much more important than the corporeal, a further indication of the influence of Origen.

In addition to the contrast between the corporalis and the spiritalis which, as we have seen, tends to depreciate the corporalis per se and clearly comes from Origen, many passages indicate a simultaneous continuation of the relation from the In Matt., now less sharply stated, between the literal and the spiritual. On the one hand Hilary can write, as in 1.9 absolutissimo in gestorum et temporum historia; 123.5 fides historiae non periclitatur, si rebus effectis, inesse connexam sibi extrinsecus significantiam existimemus; 13.3 sed in singulis verbis singulae virtutes sunt explicandae. But on the other hand, as at Ps. 55.1: multa psalmi superscriptio comprehendit, quae praeter rerum gestarum notionem alterius intelligentiae intimant sensum, and as in In Matt., vellem percontari

eos, qui otiosas esse spirituales psalmoreum intelligentias existimant. cf. too 124.1 and 131.11 volunt ergo Iudaei, 138.39 sed aliqui etc. In 125.1 there appears to be no literal sense at all. Occasionally the spiritual sense is justified by reference to the New Testament with the comment, 'quia per Dominum dictum est' as at 1.11.

A major reason for this new accent is undoubtedly the problem posed by the material itself. In the In Matthaem, Hilary stressed the abolition of the law. Now he returns to the law, in order to stress the role of the spiritual law in ordering the life of man as seen in the light of Christ.⁴⁴ (There are similarities here to the tertius usus legis of 17th century theology.) As mentioned in the prologue, not all of the psalms can be brought simply under the motif of promise and fulfilment, though this theme is certainly present. Apart from the prophecy of Christ which they contain, they form a mirror, prototype and guide to the progress of man towards the finis of the kingdom of God. Some parts of a single psalm may refer to Christ directly, others to the life of man in the light of Christ. Technically, this change of reference is made by the Spirit in the individual psalm, and the change is indicated by the diapsalma.⁴⁵ Again, though much of Origen's language of mystical illumination and transformation is used, the ontological completion of that transformation of man takes place, not now,

⁴⁴ this theme is well illustrated by Ps. 118 A.5, passim.

⁴⁵ cf. the references above to the diapsalma Typical, is 54.8.

but in the future finis of the kingdom of God.⁴⁶

At the same time remnants of the trichotomist division of nature and of the Alexandrian concept of deification remain in the threefold division of the psalms in terms of the progression of the soul, which Hilary retains.⁴⁷ It is characteristic of Hilary that alongside this model traces remain not only of the facta/dicta contrast and the virtus model of the In Matthaëum but also and more importantly, of the epitomising use of scripture in reflection of the De Trinitate. Hilary's strength as an exegete, like that of Luther, lay paradoxically in the fact that he was absolutely uninterested in a theory of hermeneutics for its own sake. The basic concern was the theological articulation of the gospel itself. To this end all means might be used. With this basic intention in mind, it is possible to see the In Psalmos not simply as a step back to the vagaries of Alexandrian allegorism but as the mark of a stage of theological development in which, (given the premise that scripture is what Hilary thought it was) all kinds of means of articulating the gospel in the context of human life may be employed without any kind of self conscious inhibition.

⁴⁶ The final consummation is discussed, in accordance with the plan of the prologue, in the context of Pss. 148-150.

⁴⁷ as at Ps. 14.7 Sometimes he uses the Pauline twofold division of man as soul and body as at Ps-158 7-8 cf M.J. Rondeau in St. Patr. VI 197-210 'Remarques sur l'anthropologie de St. Hilaire.'

This is also the case with the *lex/fides* dialectic of the *In Matthaeum*, which here influences several passages but no longer plays a central role: cf the references at 51.2 to *evangelica fides*, 59.3 *justificans ex fide*, 67.9 *evangelia legis supplementa*, 68.1 *evangelicae spei fideles*, 123.5 *quia lex spiritalis* etc. *Evangelica doctrina* can refer to almost anything in the New Testament, e.g. at 513.1 in a reference to Matt. 24:23. Even the *ecclesia/synagoga* contrast may be found, e.g. at 67.28 *non ad synagogae confessionem, sed ad ecclesiae benedictionem nos cohortatur propheta*.

An important result of this theologically based eclectic-ism in method is that though the presence of all of them may be traced, neither the stoicised doctrine of inspiration of the *In Matthaeum* nor Origen's doctrine of inspiration nor indeed the categories of the rhetorical tradition can be said to play the significant role of the early period. They may lead the ductus of the interpretation on occasion but they do not reflect Hilary's major concerns.

Such matters as the *ordo* are important, and as before the rhetorical categories are interwoven in the spiritual interpretation: cf 118.1 *dictorum ordo non neglegendus est*. But since the whole structure is much less rigidly organised than that of the *In Matthaeum*, the impact on the whole interpretation is less. Further examples may be seen at 54.15 *talis autem temporum ordo non nisi ex prophetica scientia distributus est*; 69.3 *et idem est dictorum ordo, qui et rerum*; 63.3 *spiritalis ordo*;

65.7 Confessionis nostrae ordinem, 65.2 rationem atque ordinem, 118B 10 sed retentus hic ordo rationis est. cf too 59.5, 67.3, 118A1, 118B7 etc. For ratio cf. 65.1 res ipsa et ratio demonstrat cf. 126.18. Exemplum, cf. 67.7. idque exemplum omne ad ecclesiam etc cf. 122.8. comparationis exemplum etc. For proprietas cf. 136.10. nos secundum graecitatis proprietatem, 53.4. proprietates autem virtutesque verborum. cf. 138.22, 138.38 etc. For dicta cf. 1.12, 2.2, 2.15, 2.23, 51.5 etc. Gesta 51.2, 68.1, 141.3, Demutatio 2.9, 2.13, 53.6, 65.16 etc. Diapsalma 53.9, 59.3, 60.4, 66.2 etc. Sensus 53.4, 65.25, 69.9.

As the commentary in the In Pss is usually verse by verse, the need for the strict, condensed organisation of narrative is less, and this too tends to lessen the role of the rhetorical categories. For the res/verba pair, cf the exx above and e.g. 1.5. nunc et res ipsas et eorum verba tractemus.

It is in accordance with this new freedom of expression rather than in terms of a conscious espousal of a key technique that we may regard the use of allegory in the In Psalmos, employed now on a larger scale than ever before. The formal characteristics of Hilary's use of allegory cannot be distinguished in any essential point from those of Origen, and can be used in any exegetical context. The actual instances are developed by Hilary independently, and usually in terms of his own christology, but Hilary is in no sense consciously 'anti-Origen'.

Allegory and typology are used in the In Psalmos almost interchangeably.

Hilary makes uninhibited reference to allegoria in the In Psalmos in addition to the use of types as before cf. 5.13 secundum prophetiam et allegoricam intelligentiam but 62.8 quia litterae ac legis allegoricae praescriptio cessante, Deus vivae intelligentisque hostiae sit laudibus honorandus; 67.1 allegoricorum dictorum interpretatio Gal 4.21 is cited at 118. ~~Pl.~~ 3 as a justificatio n for the use of allegory, cf. too 146.9 parabolicam tamen, sive, ut apostolus ait, allegorumenam nobis doctrinam ita commemorata praebent. The reference twice to Gal. 4.21 may indicate Hilary's awareness of general misgivings regarding allegory. We have seen that it was not his custom to justify his use of figural interpretation in the In Matt. or the De Trin. cf. too for allegory the references at 147.10 and 13 to allegorica doctrina and allegorice, and at 147.5. allegoroumeni consuetudinem. cf. too 118. ~~Pl.~~ 3 and 134.1.

Typus is found at e.g. 133.5, typicus at 146.7 and 54.9 etc. praefigurare at 59.6 and 63.1 David qui passionem Domini praefiguravit.⁴⁸ cf. too 124.6 futuri species and De Tit. 91.1 lex meditatio veritatis. On occasion too the figural significance may be indicated by significare e.g. 124.5 cum enim et montem significare Ecclesiam, id est Dominum in corpore legimus. cf. too 65.11, 65.12; 67.24 etc.

Parallel again with the In Matt. is the stress on
⁴⁸ On David as the types of faith cf. 56.4; 121.10; 142.10; 141.3; 141.1; 139; 62.1; 14.1; 55.1; 55.2; 58.1; cf. list in Reinkens, 298.

veritas e.g. 67.21 de divina veritatis scientia, 118.5.5. veritatis verba, verbum veritatis etc. and virtus, cf 138.32 interius verbi huius virtutem. For parabola cf 68.2 - this is now equivalent to allegoria cf. 146.9 above. New is the use of textus (Prol. to Ps. 1.13), sanctus of christians e.g. at 60.1, 67.2 (common in Origen) and revelatio at 25.7.

Apart from the general prologue, esp. 5 and 6, a further report on Hilary's method is given at 150.1. On the role of prophecy cf. 63.3, and 62.4, which recalls the In Matthaem prophetiae scientia est pro gerendis gesta memorare. We have seen that in the In Matthaem only those figurae which were interpreted non-metaphorically were taken up into the Heilsgeschichte. In the In Psalmos as in the De Trinitate, this is no longer the case. All figurae may now be referred directly to Christ or to the life of man in the light of the gospel. The meditational/mystical effect created by this piece of exegetical procedure adds to the impression of much greater freedom in the use of texts than either in the De Trinitate or in the In Matthaem.

To some extent, as we have already seen, the use of certain of the above principles rather than others, depend on the nature of the psalm according to the divisions of the book in the prologue.

This is also reflected e.g. in the use of the

designation 'absolutus'.⁴⁹

Because of the great freedom in the use of figurae, the examination of the hermeneutical principles themselves is of less immediate value in assessing the work than the wider context of the role of scripture in the theological conception of the work as a whole: to this we now must turn.

c). The theological background.

The theological background of the In Psalmos is basically that of the De Trinitate: differences in detail are of a complementary rather than a contradictory nature (as far as Hilary is ever completely consistent) and arise from differences in the nature of the main themes, which in the De Trinitate might be summed up as the defence of orthodox Christology, in the In Psalmos as devotional meditation upon the life of man coram Deo. In the De Trinitate

49

References to absolutus and cognates are found at e.g. 118 Heth.(8) 8 et sane absolutior ita sensus videbatur; 118 Daleth 4 quod utrumque absolute docetur, 136.1 absoluta quaedam verborum species, 134.1. secundum simplicitatem audientium absolutus etc. 137.5 absolutissime, cf. 131.4, 131.1P, 135.14, 140.12, etc. At 134.1 the usual contrast between corporeal and spiritual is replaced by that between absolutus and allegoroumena.

4/a
(cf. p. 131.)
References are made to the LXX at 2.2, 2.3, 42.1, 118.D6, 118.He 13, 131.24, 133.4 etc. A full list is given by Lindemann. At Ps.69 Hilary refers to Aquila. For translatio cf. 65.26, 67.12, 118.He5, 7 etc. Interpretatio cf. 67.14; translatores 145.1 etc. The differences between Latin and Hebrew thought are discussed at e.g. 138.22. Hilary holds the view that the LXX is the best text of the psalms. A preference for the LXX is expressed at 118.A.4; 59.1; 131.2 and 4; 133.4; 2.3; Prol. 2.1; 142.1; 59.1; 138.32. Reference is often made to the Hebrew e.g. at 65.25, yet the Greek is to be preferred to the Hebrew, as at 138.25, and to the Latin: verbi virtutem latinus sermo non tenet etc. Such comparisons of text may be seen at 133.4; 38.32; 138.43; 142.1; 143.1. Cf. Reinkens' discussion op.cit. 283.

the ground was dictated by his opponents, forcing a concentration on the theme of the divinity of Christ: here Hilary is free to develop a wide variety of themes in the course of meditation on the different motifs of the psalms. At the same time he is able to combine much of the exegetical legacy of Origen with his own exegetical method, developed through the *In Matthaëum* and the *De Trinitate*.

The continuity with the *De Trinitate* is suggested by many of the expressions. Hilary assumes that the celestial significance of the psalms is to convey the message of the gospel: cf. the references to figural expressions above and e.g. 2.23 *tenendus autem idem evangelicorum dictorum ordo, qui psalmi est.*; 53.1 *evangelica doctrina* etc. This is also the case where as in 58.1 *omnis a historia dissentit*. This is the *divinus sermo* (56.5) and *Verba Dei sunt, quaecumque prophetae locuti sunt* (118. ~~118~~2). In the prologue (7) it was said that scripture has the *forma dominici corporis*. Further, *sit totum illud ad cognitionem adventus domini nostri Jesu Christi, et corporationis, et passionis et regni et ad resurrectionis nostrae gloriam virtutemque referatur*(1). Christ is the key to scripture. Of the scribes it is said - *negant enim Christum, cuius adventus opus est prophetarum, clavem scientiae abstulerunt*(5). Occasionally the exemplum of Christ is stressed: *ex his namque hoc præcipuum a se doctrinae sumi voluit exemplum, mansuetudinis, ^{scilicet} humilitatis, operique animabus. requies inveniretur.*

He is the ultimate reference of all the psalms: cf. 138.1
Non est ergo ambiguum, quin in psalmis de eo scriptum
est. Nam tametsi plerumque in his talia sint, ut ad
personam patriarcharum, prophetarum, apostolorum, martyrum,
generationis quoque primae et generationis sequentis referri
oporteat: tamen quia omnia in Christo et per Christum
sunt, quidquid illud in psalmis est sub diversorum
personis prophetarum, omne de ipso est: quia doctrina omnis,
diversis licet praeceptorum generibus multiformis hoc per
diversos praestat ut ipse noscatur. Knowledge of God in
Christ is given by God himself through the scriptures:
Ps. 134.3 per cognitionem nominis Dei ad scientiam eius
perficimus; 129.1 humana infirmitatis confessio... ex
Deo hoc solum nosse, quod Deus est. cf. cognitio dei at
69.1 and 134.27. Here, and not from 'the philosophers',
of whom Hilary is rather scornful, is to be found knowledge
of God: cf. Ps. 64.3 cernimus namque nudis philosophos
corporibus algere... tum hoc inane atque ridiculum est,
et cum ipsis superstitionis causis miserabile. There is
no developed doctrine of the hearing of the Word, as in
Augustine, but the knowledge of God is planted by him in
the hearts of men: cf. 118. Ps. 119.5 corde enim per fidem patente,
et per desiderium ad hauriendum hiante, intelligentia
doctrinae coelestis accipitur. Non animae hoc, sed
cordis officium est.

In the In Matthaicum the strict typological method of
the west was combined with the epistemology of the rhetorical
schools to produce a carefully controlled exegesis. In the

De Trinitate detailed exegesis was succeeded by an epitomising use of scripture referred directly to the incarnation. In the In Psalmos detailed exegesis returns, the whole being seen indirectly, but not always directly in the light of the coming of Christ. Where this basis is secured, it is then possible to make use of the whole range of Origen's exegesis in support of it, to the extent of using his allegory of scripture as having the form of the body of Christ. That is to say, Origen's complex hermeneutical apparatus, though much used by Hilary for framework and interpretational detail, has for Hilary, no theologically compelling importance in itself for him, and can be adapted and used alongside techniques drawn from his previous exegetical works, in the context of Hilary's own theological meditation on each psalm.

The importance of the link both with Origen and with his own previous exegesis may be seen from a consideration of the inter-relation of theology and exegesis in some of the more controversial themes of the work.

It has often been suggested that the In Psalmos shows the culmination of a transition from a western theology to an Origenist position in which deification and mystical illumination are the main themes. This is illustrated from e.g. the lack of emphasis on the *sensus corporalis* of the scriptures, which is thought to reflect Hilary's doctrinal difficulty with the human nature of Jesus, and from the passages in which it is maintained that God cannot suffer.

There are indeed grounds for this suggestion (and for the unease with which it is often accompanied), but they are not the grounds usually given. It is clear that though scripture is said to have the form of the body of Christ, the whole exegesis is not in practice related by detailed analogy with the doctrine of the incarnation, either in Hilary or in Origen himself.

Again, though Origen's schema of mystical illumination is followed and the language of deification is used, the basic theology is that of the *De Trinitate*: the presence of the same structures and the same language does not always imply identity of function and intention. It would however be misleading to suppose that Hilary had any qualms about the use of Origen's ontological categories of deification as such: it is simply that they are usually applied in accordance with the limitations upon human language about God detailed in the *De Trinitate*. Where these limits appear to have been forgotten, it is perhaps worth remembering that the context here is of praise and devotional meditation (though this does not mean that Hilary would have considered any kind of language appropriate in this context.)

For Hilary as for Origen, the scripture provides the ladder of meditation towards perfection. Hilary is careful to stress the concrete nature of the work of God in men now: cf. 51.3. *verbum caro factum habitat in nobis*; 123.9 *spiritalis enim sumus, et evolumus ut passeris*. But at

the same time it seems clear that he did not envisage the achievement of full mystical illumination in this life: cf. 118.7.1, *omnis Dei sermo qui scripturis divinis continetur, in SPEM nos bonorum coelestium vocat.* What is desired here is praise of, but not union with, God: cf. 134.2. *et contuendum in exordio psalmi est quod ad laudem nos Dei advocat, cum in superiore[m] psalmo[m] ad solam benedictionem hortatus sit.* cf. too Pss. 149-150 passim. When we find an expression like that employed at 132.1 *per omnem doctrinae ordinem gradibus scanditur, nam per gradus ad superiora vehimur,* we are at once aware of the background in Origen: but on the other hand the background of such a phrase as at 124.4 *habitemus nunc ecclesiam, coelestem Jerusalem, ut non moveamur in aeternum,* may reflect not so much a conscious Origenist ontology as a word of encouragement to a comparatively young Church in the midst of a still largely pagan population. If it was one of Hilary's main services to Latin theology to have introduced (or reintroduced) the Alexandrian exegetical tradition to the west, and so to prepare the way for the reception of the many translations of Alexandrian commentary which were soon to follow, it was at the same time his achievement to show how this work could be combined with important elements in the western theological tradition, coming from Irenaeus. In this work of adaptation he was to be overshadowed by Jerome, and then by Ambrose. Yet his pioneering work, as later theologians were on occasion to discover, was often done on a much more solid theological

basis than that of many of his distinguished successors.

In this achievement the role of the exegetical tradition, eastern and western, lay largely in preparing text and context: the critical factor was the theological insight which then moulded the available material into interpretation which, however we may view their content today, were often of much greater depth than those of his contemporaries.^{50 501.}

50

E. Gastaldi's thesis now casts further light on some of the issues discussed ~~and~~ above in the following ways. It is possible to interpret Jerome's statement to mean that Hilary and Eusebius of Vercelli worked independently and not jointly in using E. of C.'s commentary on the Pss. So Gastaldi, following Kannengiesser.

The stress on the realities in scripture, which we noted in the In Matt. as an echo of the western tradition, is found too by G. in the In Ps. cf. Ps. 21.1-2 - Tert. Adv. Jud. 10.13: non omnia imagines, sed et veritates. G. has found echoes of Cyprian and Novatian in the In Pss. too. After going thoroughly into the relation of H. on the Psalms to Origen and Eusebius of Caesarea, Gastaldi finds no trace in Hilary of Origen's rabbinic or his gnostic exegesis. G. too found parallels with and differences from E. of C., i.e. agreement on the titles of the psalms, but differences on the value of the LXX .. G. concludes that O's influence is greater than that of E but that the continuity with the In Mt is still very marked. 'la técnica qua usa Hilario para comentar los salmos, se funda en criterios en gran parte ya adquiridos por él antes de su estadía en oriente' (66) Origen brings the linguistic, geographical and historical details, but little else, for G. while the only significant role of Eusebius' work is in providing a source of scriptural quotations appropriate to the various psalms. (op.cit. 68).

The full list of diapsalms^{as} given by G. op.cit. 135f. The ds. indicate 1) the author, or 2) the historical circumstances in which the psalm was written or 3) the circumstances of the translation of the psalms. For Hilary all the material in the psalms can be understood as prophecy of Christ, ~~also~~ may be seen in terms of the life, death and resurrection of Christ cf. esp. Ps. 118.1.3; quia omnia in Christo et per Christum sunt, etc. For the citations of St Paul in Hilary on the Pss. cf. A. Souter in JTS 18, 1917, 73-4.

A note on the exegetical material of the minor works of Hilary.

1.1 Tractatus Mysteriorum;

This work, composed towards the end of the In Psalmos is usually viewed in the context of the alexandrian tradition, because of the numerous allegories in the christological interpretation of Genesis 1 and 2. To this extent its structure is the same as that of the In Psalmos essentially. At the same time however, as Brisson has shown, much of the typology of the In Matthaum is also to be found, another indication of the state of affairs already noted, namely that Hilary in no sense, rejected his earlier views in going on to expand them in new directions in the light of new information. The details as might be expected show features of the theological principles of the In Psalmos and those of the De Trinitate, which as we have seen were also carried forward in the In Psalmos. 51a

50(cont)

A complete list of references to the birth, life, work, death and resurrection of Christ in the In Psalmos is given by Gastaldi, op.cit.pp.291ff.

Gastaldi (295-8) has collected a large number of references in the In Psalmos to the christian hope. This eschatological reference tends to contradict the popular image of the In Psalmos as steeped in Platonist/Origenist theology, in which all is already fulfilled in the present.

~~51~~

~~A note on the exegetical material of the minor works of Hilary.~~

51a

(for the T.M. cf above all the excellent edition by Brisson)
(SC 19)

2. The remaining works of Hilary, of a more historical nature, interest us only in as much as they provide further material with which to compare the results so far obtained. They show no significant differences or changes, but serve to exhibit the extent to which the principles of theology traced in the De Trinitate were thoroughly integrated into all his thought, so that they could be turned easily to application in polemical and political contexts. The primacy of the claims of God in Christ, if need be over against the claims of synods or emperor, remains beyond debate.

b. Comparison and Development.

E. Summary: Comparison and Development.

Constant throughout the works is a concern to relate exegesis to the process of doing theology as a whole.¹ Neither Hilary nor indeed any of the theologians of the early church is concerned to do exegesis 'for its own sake', but the exegesis is always related to a basic theme: in the In Matthaem to the Heilsgeschichte of the populus Dei,² in the De Trinitate to the doctrine of the incarnation,³ or more precisely to the knowledge of God through Christ his eternal Son, in the In Psalmos

1

It is not from our conjectures and opinions but from the gift of understanding given by God himself that knowledge of the meaning of the scriptures proceeds. cf. esp. *De Trin.* 1.17-19 passim: novis enim regenerati ingenii sensibus opus est, ut unumquemque conscientia sua secundum coelestis originis munus illuminet optimus enim lector est, qui dictorum intelligentiam expectet ex dictis potius quam imponat, et retulerit magis quam attulerit, neque cogat id videri dictis contineri, quod ante lectionem praesumpserit intelligendum. omnis igitur comparatio homini potius utilis habeatur, quam Deo apta,

2

cf. the many refs above; typical is In Mt. 8.8 De tribuno ~~per~~quisse me satis est, principem esse gentium crediturarum.

3

cf. *De Trin.* 7.11 Res existit in Verbo, Verbi res enuntiatur in nomine nam cum audio et Deus erat Verbum, non dictum solum audio Verbum Deum, sed demonstratum intelligo quod Deus est (it must be stressed that in the *De Trin* the main concern is with the understanding of the incarnation rather than the scripture text, though the two go together, with the reality to which scripture points rather than the words themselves).

to the progress of man from sin to transfiguration in Christ.⁴

Behind this relation of theology and exegesis lies the conviction common to this and other periods but expressed differently at different times, that beyond the open sense of scripture, or hidden save to the eye of faith in the open sense, there lies a spiritual teaching which may be unfolded, concerning the gospel of the life of man.⁵ But since this theme of the gospel is the subject of all theological reflection, exegesis and theological reflection, act reciprocally together - the key being the nature of the reciprocation.⁶

This concern, on the one hand to recognise the limitations of human language, and on the other hand, not to neglect the means of doing theology which have in fact

4

cf. Prol. 11. qui consummationem diligenter advertat, providentiam dispositorum in hunc ordinem psalmodum cum dispensatione salutis nostrae intelliget convenire. Cum enim primus gradus sit ad salutem, in novum hominem post peccatorum remissionem renasci, sitque post penitentiae confessionem regnum illud Domini in sanctae illius civitatis et coelestis Jerusalem tempora reservatum, et postea consummata in nobis celestis gloria in Dei Patris regnum per regnum Filii proficiamus, in quo debitas Deo laudes universitas spirituum praedicabit et tunc^{ex} cited above.

5

cf. In Matt. 14.3. Frequenter monuimus, omnem diligentiam Evangeliorum lectioni adhiberi oportere: quia in his, quae gesta narrantur, subesse interioris intelligentiae ratio reperiatur.

6

cf. De Trin. 1.17-19 above and e.g. In Matt. 8.8 Atque non nos intelligentiam fingimus, sed gesta ipsa intelligentiam nobis impertiuntur. Neque enim res intelligentiae, sed rei intelligentia subsecundat.

been revealed, in the incarnation, may perhaps be further illuminated by comparison with some very similar themes in the thought of Athanasius.⁷

Athanasius, like Hilary, recognises the limitation imposed by creatureliness on human understanding (Ad Eliah 1.20 cf. De Trin. 1.19) while at the same time acknowledging the means for attaining knowledge of God which have been given by God himself in the incarnation of the word (C. Ar. 3.32). Here as elsewhere Athanasius operates with concepts derived from Middle Platonic rather than Neoplatonic backgrounds. (Contrary to the popular image, not all fourth century thought was Neoplatonic in character).

Like Hilary, Athanasius was convinced that what counted in theology was not the words used but the realities to which the words referred. It was, after all, the Arians who divorced language from reality, who said that 'Word' and 'Son' were only names, and did not belong to the essence of Jesus Christ (C. Ar. 1.25). It is not the words which change the nature of things, but the nature of things which changes the words. In saying this, Athanasius may have had in mind Plato's very similar argument in the Cratylus.⁸

⁷ Though the lack of explicit verbal parallels has led commentators to conclude that Hilary had probably never read the works of Athanasius, their common theological and ecclesiastical concerns suggest that a personal acquaintance, and some direct influence of Athanasius on Hilary, is more than likely. On this relationship cf esp. Meijering, op.cit pp.92ff and T.F. Torrance, *Theology in Reconstruction* pp.30ff, 48ff and *Theological Science* p20f.

A further close parallel with Hilary is provided by Athanasius' use of the person of Christ as the skopos and key to the understanding of scripture. Christ the skopos is at the same time the eternal son and the man Jesus Christ: viewed in this light, no scriptural text can support the Arians' doctrine (cf. c. Ar. 3.28).

The same points against the Arians are made in the correspondence with Serapion. God is not circumscribed by the bounds of human language (Ad Serap. 1.17; 2.1): rather, our thoughts are to be directed towards their proper object in God through the testimony of the Word, by means of the paradigms given in scripture (ibid. 1.19), (cf. De Decretis 12). This direction is the work of the Holy Spirit, yet it is precisely from knowledge of the Son that knowledge of the Spirit comes (Ad Serap. 3.1-3). This insistence that the Spirit is known only through the Son is common to both Athanasius and Hilary. There is a correspondence between the internal life of God and his acts in the created world, and to this corresponds the scripture's twofold way of speaking of Christ (cf. ^{De} Trin 9.5). It is through this correspondence too, that we come to speak of the Spirit through the Son (cf. De Trin 8.20), on the basis of the images used by the Word as he testifies about himself (cf. Ibid. 7.38; 4.14) in accordance with his own dispensatio (11.17)

⁸ This argument was mentioned by e.g. Albinus and Plotinus, and it is not impossible that Hilary too, e.g. in writing of names in the De Trin. cf. 1.21 and 3.17ff, was influenced if only indirectly through the rhetorical schools, by the Cratylus. But if the nature of things changes the words, then a substance can change the meaning of a word, and so words like ktizōn, when applied to God, can have a different meaning than when applied to man.

However much the reflection of the contemporary theological scene may be found in his exegesis, yet scripture itself is for Hilary the basis of all theology: thus the theological excursus of the *De Trinitate* are related to scripture, and those of the more direct exegetical works take their starting point from the exegesis of particular passages. Though the exegesis often reflects the interpretational conventions and philosophical moods of the day,¹⁰ yet at the same time Hilary is concerned to work out his interpretation on the basis of adequate theological relation to his basic concerns, neither self-consciously avoiding nor ^{u^}critically following current philosophical fashion.¹¹

9

This central concern in Hilary (and also in Athanasius) to interpret scripture on the basis of the Father - Son relationship has recently been examined in a chapter entitled 'Hilary and the Filioque' by J. Pelikan in his 'Development of Christian Doctrine' p.120ff. Pelikan, who reaches conclusions very similar to our own, offers a full analysis of the congruence between the immanent and the economic trinity, and of the crucial role played for Hilary by images used by God as he testifies about himself (esp. *De Trin.* 7.38 and 4.14). His analysis of passages relating to the divinity of the Spirit (esp. *De Trin.* 12.55) and to the relation of the Spirit to the Son (esp. *De Trin.* bks. 2 and 8) are a further useful corrective to the interpretations of the place of the Spirit along the lines of 'Geisteschristologie' and 'Stoic monism'.

¹⁰ cf. too e.g. *In Matt.* 17.2. *Et in hoc quidem facti genere, servatur et ratio et numerus, et exemplum.*

¹¹

cf. *De Trin.* 4.14. *Intelligentia enim dictorum ex causis est assumenda dicendi: quia non sermoni res, sed rei est sermo subiectus.*

In the *In Matthaeum*, the concern for an integrated theological interpretation enabled Hilary to produce what was probably the first considerable biblical commentary of the Latin west. In doing so, he was able to use the full resources of the rhetorical schools in the service of theology to prepare the texts themselves for interpretations in terms of this conceptual unity of the Heilsgeschichte as the movement from the law to the Gospel. In this process of ~~exegetical process of~~ exegetical harmonisation, in particular in the early work, many of what would today be considered the key accents and concepts of the biblical passages are either applied in a completely different way from that intended by the biblical writer (not in itself a necessarily fruitless procedure, but still full of problems) or else passed over in silence and so 'lost'.

The process of harmonisation is seen at its strongest in the *In Matthaeum*, because of its special structure.¹² In the *De Trinitate* much of the consistency of interpretation arises from the very high proportion of Johannine texts dealing with the same material in similar ways. In the *In Psalmos* the taking over of the techniques of Alexandrian interpretation enabled Hilary to construct his exegesis in a much less tight fashion. Here was a technique which with modification allowed much more attention to be paid to individual texts than was possible

¹²As mentioned above, the worst example is probably in *Matt.* 31-33 *passim*, in which much of the depth, cosmic significance, anguish and horror of the passion narrative is lost.

in the tradition of western exegesis, which had accompanied a theology operating within a fairly narrow range of basic themes. This is perhaps an additional reason why western theology in general on reaching the complex proportions of the fourth century welcomed so eagerly and often uncritically the eastern techniques now available.

In terms of the theory of exegesis Hilary like Augustine was to break away from the structures of the western rhetorical schools. But unlike Augustine he did not develop a new special theory of hermeneutics, but sought, as we have seen, to relate scripture directly to his doctrine of the incarnation itself.¹³ Yet he never set this method down in formal terms, and in practice used it along with other methods (this indeed was partly a consequence of his own position - the basic point was the focus and not the theory). This was what attracted the reformers to his work, whatever the actual differences: had succeeding generations followed Hilary rather than Augustine, the course of the history of exegesis might have been rather different. But this was impossible because of the fragmentary and multicoloured nature of Hilary's work¹⁴ itself, quite apart from other considerations.

13

cf. e.g. above on ~~De~~ ^{Trin.} and In Matt. 5.8. In dictis Dei veritas est, et rerum creandarum efficientia omnis in verbo est. ita nec quod spondit ambiguum est, nec inefficax quod locutus est. cf. Trin. 7.11. At vero hic Verbum Deus est: res existit in Verbo, Verbi res enuntiatur in nomine. Verbi enim appellatio in Dei filio de sacramento nativitatis est, sicuti sapientiae et virtutis est nomen. De Trin. 5.36 and the passages cited in sect 4 above referring to Christ as the point of reference of the biblical text are also relevant here

14

cf. note 16 on Hilary's influence at end of ch. Aug did however borrow much from Hilary in his De Trin. cf. now Pelikan op. cit.

Perhaps the greatest gulf which separates the exegesis of Hilary, along with that of Augustine and Luther alike, from modern exegesis and the theological use of exegesis today is however the initial 'preparation' of the text for theological interpretation on the basis of the rules of Roman/Hellenistic literary criticism, in which the 'strangeness' of the historical perspective of the world of the biblical narrative, Semitic and Hellenistic alike, is lost. The history of God in Israel, the messianic hope, the prophecy of judgement and promise, the eschatological tension of the earliest communities, the understanding of God's righteousness and his wrath, all these had undergone enormous diffusion and transformation through the application of the techniques of the schools, and could not be recaptured entirely even by so profound a theologian as Hilary. In this sphere, the revival of Hebrew studies in the Renaissance was to be an important aid to Luther and the reformers, though as the case of Jerome illustrated, Hebrew was not enough.

A final illustration of the characteristic strengths and weaknesses of Hilary's exegetical methodology may be seen in his understanding of the relationship of Old and New Testaments, especially of the problem of the Law. The relation of promise to fulfilment, of the law to the gospel, of the Jews to the Gentiles, was from the beginning one of Hilary's special interests. In the *In Matthaeum*, *Lex* is strongly contrasted with *fides*: in the *In Psalmos* the whole of the Old Testament can be seen as a *lex spiritalis*

which is itself part of the gospel.¹⁵ It is tempting to see this as indicating a transition from a strongly eschatologically orientated western Irenaeian tradition to an Alexandrian tradition in which eschatology has been swallowed up in the process of sanctification in the present. But this as we have seen is too simple an explanation to fit the facts (Luther's understanding of the law follows a similar course and would be hard to accommodate in a similar explanation). It is rather a consequence of the theology of the De Trinitate, after which the most unlikely of theological models, that of the *lex spiritualis*, can be taken up and used with a new freedom when understood in the light of the incarnation.

Summing up, we may say that it is his concentration on the establishment of theology upon the Father/Son relationship as disclosed by God himself in the scriptures, as a basis which both recognises the limitations of all human language and accepts the gift of genuine knowledge which God himself through the Spirit provides in the incarnation of the Son, which constitutes the permanent legacy of Hilary as a theological interpreter of scripture. To suggest briefly how this legacy may be integrated by present day theologians in the context of the same area of problems will be the object of our concluding chapter.

15. cf. In Matt. 9.3 *Usque in eum (Johannem) enim lex et prophetarum sunt; et, nisi lege finita, in fidem evangelicam eorum nemo concederet. In Ps. 131.16 Sed haec omnia in se * sacramentum continens legis. Nunc et deitatis spiritu et origine carnis unitum, intus scilicet ac foris aureum est; est enim Dominus noster Jesus Christus in gloria patris .. Testamenti intra se tabulas et legis librum conservans; sunt enim in eo verba vitae. cf. In Ps. 118.13.10 Ea enim lex, quam Moyses scripserat, paedagoga nobis in Christo fuit; et idcirco super docentes se et seniores intellexit, quia legem evangelicam, quae Moysi lege continetur, intelligit. eius, quod Dominus assumpsit, corporis species est, omne*

16

A Note on the influence of Hilary's exegesis and theology. (cf. note 12 above)

Hilary's exegetical achievements were rapidly overshadowed, as mentioned in section 2 above, by the flood of translations of Greek exegetical works in the late fourth century, then by Ambrose and above all by Augustine, whose works set the pattern for all later western exegesis. Hilary's works appear to have remained almost unknown in the East and were never translated into Greek.

Nevertheless his exegesis and his theology were not entirely forgotten, and continued to exert an influence on the western Church.

Ambrose and Zeno of Verona borrowed large quantities of the *In Psalmos* for their own works on the subject and valued Hilary highly. Jerome also borrowed, but was anxious to play down the importance of Hilary's achievement to the advantage of his own. Augustine had read and valued the *De Trinitate*, but did not make great use of Hilary's exegesis. Pelagius often appeals to Hilary (*De Gest. Pel.* 14.31f) (*De Nat. et Grat.* 61, 71, 81,) and John Cassian calls him 'magister ecclesiarum' (*Contra Nest.*, VII 24). Thomas refers to him often and, according to De Lubac (*Exeg. Med.*) derived much of his theology from Hilary. Abelard refers to the *De Trinitate* 14 times and Peter Lombard has 88 references (Numbers in Grabmann *Schol. Meth.* 120-1). Jakob Perez of Valencia refers frequently to the *In Psalmos* (Werbeck p 74).

Luther valued the realist emphasis of Hilary's exegesis and its christological concentration, with its

stress on faith in the gospel and rejection of the law. Hence the dictum 'Nemo illorum sanctorum novit quicquam de spiritu sancto praeter unum Hylarium (WA 15:566.4-5) Ebeling (EE op.cit. 475f, 493) prints parallel paragraphs showing how Luther in his preaching on occasion follows large sections of the In Matthaem almost word for word (many other references in Ebeling op.cit). Calvin too valued Hilary's theology for the same reason as Luther, but used the theology more than the exegesis as such (cf.refs.in McNeill/Battles index 1615). Others have found material of value in Hilary in more recent times, notably Karl Barth (cf.KD 1/1, 373,374,456,461 etc), but it must be said that for reasons which are entirely understandable, Hilary has remained an almost forgotten theologian and exegete, and has not been remembered according to his merits in comparison to those of many better known and much more frequently cited figures in the theological and exegetical tradition.

7. Exegesis and Method in Hilary
and
in Contemporary theology.

Section 7: Exegesis and method in Hilary and in contemporary theology.

In the development of his exegetical methodology and in his use of the Bible in theological work in general Hilary was able, particularly in his use of Origen, to step outside his own exegetical tradition, to find new methods and to use without difficulty methods which in his own tradition of exegesis had for good reasons been rendered suspect, through particular historical associations and misuses. He did not however take over the entire thought structure of a hundred and fifty years before - the theological scene had altered too much for that, bringing its own problems, and these were not to be solved through methods evolved for dealing with a very different situation.

Like Hilary theologians today are bound to use the most up to date tools available, the first of which, the historico-critical method, at once leads to a considerable revision of the manner in which the text is 'prepared' for further interpretation. Many modern theologians will wish too to stress the common concerns of exegesis of biblical material and of systematic theology, which then as now has to work with extra-biblical concepts in reflection on the testimony of the gospel. Not sharing the theory of inspiration of the early Church in general, most 20th century theologians would not wish to answer all the theological questions directly from scripture,

and they are more highly conscious of the earthen nature of the scriptural vessel. Like Hilary they too are concerned to take account of the problems involved in applying analogies expressed in human concepts to God, even when these are drawn from scripture, and yet they often wish to integrate the role of biblical exegesis fully into the doing of systematic theology. But at the same time they will recognise that here there are two intertwined but distinguishable problems, that of the process of exegesis of the biblical texts, and that of integrating the results of that process into systematic theological construction.

To impose solutions upon contemporary problems on the basis of patristic or indeed any other discussion in the past without regard for the development of these present concerns would be arbitrary and highly irrational. Yet it may be that the very distance of a patristic discussion from contemporary concerns can serve to illuminate these because of the unfamiliar light in which the issues (which are not identical but usually in some respects similar) are placed. As the survey cited at the beginning of our study has it 'Today the accent falls on the significance of the (patristic) text, not as a final definition, but on the dogmatic decision which it reveals, a decision with guiding and exemplary character. It is one voice in a choir of voices' while at the same time 'The concept of the authority of the Fathers within the church in her earthly pilgrimage, fraught with conflict, is always characterised by the provisional character of

all christian activity in the aeon before the last judgement. It is relative, not only in its historical conditionedness, but also in its eschatological aspect. This provisional character must not be artificially harmonised or eliminated.¹

At this point it will perhaps be appropriate to survey the key areas of discussion on the process of exegesis of biblical texts and the role of the results of that process in systematic theology. Though many of the different approaches to this subject cut straight across the confessions, others have developed especially in particular confessions of the Church. In assessing and developing aspects of these, the theologian in an ecumenical age (whatever the potential temptations of that may be) is at least in theory freed from the role of sitting in judgement upon the confessional contributions in the service of a 'truly Reformed', 'truly Lutheran', 'truly Anglican' or 'truly Catholic' solution, as the case may be, in order to seek clues from the whole tradition of the Church towards the development of concerns common to christian theology today.

We shall not set up the problems ourselves in order to solve them according to the way in which we have set them up, but shall begin instead from the analysis of the hermeneutical process in the most recent work of the study commission on the subject of the WCC, a group widely representative of theology and Church.

¹

New Directions, op.cit.p. 46-47

The introduction to the report contains the significant remark 'as the findings of the regional groups differed widely from each other, it proved difficult to arrive at a common statement'.² Complex problems are involved, and constructive suggestions towards their solution will clearly avoid simplistic blueprints.

Few theologians would today take issue with the common affirmation of the group that since the Bible is in many of its parts the product of an historical process, coming into being through historical events and experiences, and through reflection upon them, the historico-critical method is necessary for the understanding of this process. The Bible contains a collection of very diverse literary documents, the contents of which often stand in tension with one another: 'where they are, as far as we can see, really contradictory, this may go back to real theological disagreements within the biblical period itself or may have been occasioned by different social or historical situations. The difficulties raised by this for systematic theology have not been solved by us. Although the truth in Christ is one, the human witness to it is manifold.'³

Though theology must in the end strive to present an overall picture which points to the same truth to which the Bible points, clearly forced harmonisation in exegesis must be avoided. For Hilary this problem did not yet exist:

² ibid. p. 32

³ ibid. p. 34

given its presence the presentation of an overall picture is exceedingly difficult. But this does not rule out entirely assistance from the patristic and other past traditions in facing other aspects of the theological problems involved.

How is the text itself to be interpreted after matters of text and transmission have been settled? Assuming that both 'historical' and 'unhistorical' layers of tradition may be of equal theological relevance and may be relevant in different ways, how is the relevance of the possibly several meanings of a passage to be determined and related to systematic theology? How far may this be articulated in terms of different sets of philosophical categories? What kinds of questions may we expect to be answered by reference to scripture? What is the role of our previous knowledge and understanding in the study of the Bible? What of the 'keys' to the interpretation of scripture provided by the various confessions? The finding of the survey cited above is that 'it is doubtful whether any one interpretative principle can be so stated as to become a prescriptive instrument applicable in all circumstances'.⁴ It can be said that particular aspects of scripture come to the fore and demand special attention not by reason of a confessional standpoint, not as a result of the application of interpretational principles, but because a particular historical situation has developed, and Christians must speak to it.

⁴

ibid, p. 39.

In all of this discussion, differences arise on the nature of the relationship of scripture to the Church. For some, scripture is the sole norm of truth on which the Church is entirely dependent. The main principles of interpretation, however difficult to establish, will be dictated by scripture itself. For others, scripture is the product of the same tradition which has had a continuous life in the Church, so that the interpretation of scripture takes place in the context of the whole life of the Church, of creed and sacraments, of christian thinking and cultural values. For yet others, the Church is in dialogue with scripture but is fed from many sources, in the light of which biblical statements may have to be declared inadequate or erroneous, or as 'without meaning' except as modified by truth arrived at from these other sources. Rarely is any one of these positions held exclusively. In conclusion it is suggested that 'the awareness of the differences within the Bible will lead us towards a deeper understanding of our divisions and will help us to interpret them more readily as possible and legitimate interpretations of one and the same gospel; and it may be one of the important theological tasks to draw the right conclusions from the insight that the biblical canon itself bears witness to the unity and diversity at the very beginning of the church.'⁵ The report ended with a recommendation for a study of the problem of authority, upon which hermeneutics in its broader sense depends.

⁵ *ibid.*, p. 41.

In considering the problem in the context of assessing the possible role of patristic material in providing assistance in the discussion, we shall concentrate in the first instance on the question of the status of scripture in Church, and so in the doing of theology, since the details of the historico-critical process, though not the theological controls for this, develop out of modern exegetical methods unknown to the early Church.

Though popular tradition (following Harnack) speaks of the threefold patristic criteria of scripture, the creeds and the episcopal office, it is generally recognised that within these three scripture was foremost in importance as a norm for the church's life and teaching. Origen in taking over Philo's allegorical system clearly believed that all truth was to be found supremely in scripture (facets of this truth being found elsewhere too) and that the system of interpretational principles which he imposed upon the text was to be found already reflected in scripture itself. Provided the key to the enigmas were known, scripture was self-interpreting. This belief he shared with the whole patristic tradition including Hilary and Augustine, though the nature of that self-interpretation was differently understood, different stresses being laid on the literal and the non literal sense, etc. Most early church exegesis was 'christological' in orientation, but in different ways. Thus for Hilary in the De Trinitate, as we have seen, Christ reveals himself through scripture, and not through the medium of christological allegory but

in direct creation of faith; the middle ages however, followed in general the allegorical schema of Augustine, the authority or the allegory being an elaborate series of rules, sanctioned by the Church, under the general heading of fides, spes and caritas, again with differences in nuance between the Platonist and Aristotelian schools. The swift rise of Aristotelian views in the later middle ages brought a new emphasis on the authority of the Church, beside and eventually above scripture; where there were several sets of rules, who was to judge which was correct but the Church?

In the face of this dilemma Luther came upon the solution, already anticipated in some respects by Hilary, that Christ is his own interpreter in the context of scripture, and that the scripture points not to a series of rules but to Christ himself. Instead of an enigmatic mixture of the obscure and the less obscure, to be interpreted by the allegorical key, all is plain when it is seen in faith that the texts of scripture refer ultimately to Christ himself. The preaching of scripture is the preaching of Christ: scripture interprets itself as Christ reveals himself.⁶ Calvin added the important modification that the Holy Spirit reveals Christ through the scriptures in the heart of the believer, so avoiding the limitation of Christ to the word of scripture itself, but not, of course, excluding the place of the written word in the

6

cf. esp. the work of Ebeling and Krause already cited.

process.⁷ In the period of orthodoxy the self-revelation of Christ was encased in a new legalism which was in itself a return to the allegorical interpretation of scripture.^{7a} Theologians of the enlightenment, seeing the sterility of the method, sought by the use of historical research and philosophical method to purify the faith and to return to the pure simplicity of the gospel. Thus was born the historico-critical method, which has been of inestimable value to the Church.⁸ The difficulty was that historicism was to lead to a loss of the awareness that Christ witnessed to in scripture was the living and acting Lord. For Roman Catholic theology the problem was not so acute, for scripture since the Tridentinum had been understood as subordinate to the Church which was in itself a kind of extension of the incarnation. Though the effect of historical method was to make itself felt with the modernists, this was essentially part of a larger and in some ways a different problem.

One response to the problems of historicism came from the 'dialectical' theologians. For Bultmann as for Luther and for Origen, scripture interprets itself (though both Luther and Bultmann reject Origen's doctrine of mechanical inspiration). For Bultmann as for Luther, Christ reveals himself to man from within the text of

7

cf. R.S. Wallace, Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament, and W. Krusche, Das Wirken des Heiligen Geistes bei Calvin.

7a
8

cf. R. Preuss: The Inspiration of Holy Scripture.

cf. K. Scholder: Die Anfänge der historisch-kritischen Methode.

scripture in the act of proclamation. Since man confronted with the text of scripture is not only a sinner who needs to be convicted of sin, but also a modern man for whom the gulf between the thought world of the Bible and his own thought world has to be bridged, this bridge, which removes the false scandal of unintelligibility in order to allow confrontation with the true scandal of the cross, is provided by the programme of demythologising. This programme provides a special theory of hermeneutics, related to but not an integral part of the doctrine of the incarnation itself. The epistemology problem is not simply to be treated as part of the general estrangement of the sinner from the open truth of the gospel (as for Luther) but arises from the difference between the thought world of the Bible and that of our own time. Hence therefore, a *Vorverständnis*, both of the historical particularity of the text and of the nature of the existential decision to which he is summoned, must be reached by the exegete before he can grasp the impact of the gospel: and equally unless he is summoned by Jesus, he will never understand the New Testament in its true historical and theological context.⁹

For Barth, following Luther too but also Calvin, the function of the hermeneutical programme is taken by the doctrine of the Trinity. Like Bultmann and, in part, Luther and Calvin, he rejected the doctrine of mechanical

⁹ as comment on Bultmann's hermeneutics cf. W. Schmidhals, 'Die Theologie Rudolf Bultmanns' and the excellent treatment by Otto Weber, *Dogmatik* 1.370ff.

inspiration. Like Bultmann, he accepted in principle the historico-critical method. Following Calvin, he held (and this difference of nuance is paralleled in many respects in the history of Reformed/Lutheran controversy on the Lord's Supper) that Christ does not actually make himself present from within the text (however understood) but that God reveals himself in the history of Jesus Christ as testified in the scriptures, through the seal in the heart of the believer of the testimony of the Holy Spirit. The manner of God's approach is of waiting and asking, rather than of demand for decision. Unintelligibility to modern man is part of the general problem of man's anthropocentric rather than theocentric way of thinking, and is dealt with by the Holy Spirit in reorientating man's whole life in the context of the proclamation of the Word, and indeed in the ongoing life of the community, for the movement no longer has to be that of sudden demand for decision.¹⁰

While some have followed the one and some the other of the giants, inevitably (as in the ecumenical study of the Lord's Supper controversy) attempts have been made to move to a new understanding which gathers insights from both sides, despite the headshakings of the original protagonists. Reaction against early existentialist dogmatism, as it was thought *inter alia* to be, in both Barth and Bultmann has led to a new quest of the historical

10

On Barth's doctrine of Scripture cf. JKS Reid. *The Authority of the Bible* xx, 194f.

Jesus. Following Luther in seeing Christ as the 'centre' of scripture and all theology as interpretation of scripture, Ebeling has built up a systematic theology around the historical Jesus in which the historical Jesus is the centre of the kerugma of scripture.¹¹ Fuchs has combined this with Barth's concern for ontology and for the charismatic element to provide a new ontology of language in which Jesus reveals himself as language event in the context of the preaching of the gospel from the text of scripture.¹²

In his 'Paulus und Jesus' Jüngel sought to combine more explicitly the exegetical concerns of both Barth and Bultmann. The Pauline theology of justification corresponds exactly to the witness of the gospels to Jesus. God has revealed himself as the trinitarian God in the history of the incarnation in Jesus Christ. Man cannot himself speak of God. But in the parables, which are a pointed, ostensive mode of discourse about the kingship of God which also involves his own person, Jesus reveals himself as a language event, which is repeated in the preaching of the word, as Jesus is brought to expression through human words, as God's Word in the history of the incarnation.¹³

- 11 cf. esp. Gott u. Wort, and 'Jesus and Faith' from 'Word and Faith', pp. 201ff, also pp. 305ff, 'Word of God and hermen^{eu}tics'.
- 12 cf. Studies of the historical Jesus, and his 'Hermeneutik'. cf. too Gadamer, Wahrheit u. Methode op. cit. p. 397f, and J. Fangmeier, 'Ernst Fuchs' in Theologische Studien, Heft 80.
- 13 E. Jüngel, Paulus und Jesus esp. pp. 135ff.

This understanding of parable as the place where God reveals himself in the word of the man Jesus is attractive, particularly in an anglo-saxon context where it could for example, be fruitfully combined with the similar but entirely unrelated ideas of I.M. Crombie.¹⁴ The suggestion is not however without its own problems; still there is a special hermeneutic of parable, when this category is applied outside the parables of Jesus himself. It might be said that the events in the history of the incarnation itself (though not automatically the concept 'incarnation' which is just as vulnerable as any other concept), events in which, Geschehen includes Sprachgeschehen (in preference to Sprachereignis), provides the hinge of discourse. If so, then special hermeneutic is possible, just as all analogies except that of grace, which is not to be understood in the manner of other analogies, break down in reference to the incarnation. On the other hand if God should have chosen some special means of self communication, e.g. the parable, in the time of the incarnation, then this is the way things are. We are not then automatically entitled to extrapolate the concept of parable as the universal category for language about God, but it may be an important indicator among others. Even in the case of scripture, we may have to look for other complementary ways of understanding its use along with that of parable.

¹⁴ cf. I.M. Crombie in 'New Essays' ed. Flew and MacIntyre p. 109ff.

It is possible then to conceive of different ways in which different types of scriptural discourse may be understood. Scripture itself, as far as it is witness to the history of the incarnation in Israel and in the events leading up to and immediately following the Resurrection, is the word of God in that here the history of Jesus Christ the Word is brought to articulation. All the various types of word, including that of parable, are models for the articulation of the Word. The Word is itself a model, but it is given by God himself in and as Jesus Christ who is the Word and whose word is also the Word. This model is qualified by being understood, for a great part of the tradition of the Church, in terms of the doctrine of the Trinity, understood however differently at different times in an essential and not simply an economic frame of reference, in which essence is further understood in terms of the witness of the Word rather than in terms of more classical metaphysical categories.¹⁵

Important hermeneutical consequences follow from the above. It may be possible to make a general use of scripture as witness to the trinitarian God as revealed in the history of the incarnation of Jesus Christ, while at the same time for certain purposes using special models of discourse e.g. parable etc. for the articulation of the content of specific areas of scripture, the nature of the models being

¹⁵ For an imaginative restatement of the doctrine of the Trinity, in this case an interpretation of Barth's doctrine, cf. E. Jüngel, *Gottes Sein ist im Werden*.

determined by the results of historico-critical method, and particularly by Formgeschichte.

Such an understanding would avoid the hinging of the whole process upon the special hermeneutic of parable as in Jüngel's model, in which the word becomes the Word in a Sprach^ereignis through the text itself. Instead the use of the trinitarian category as a key factor and the use of different models in the interpretation of scripture in different contexts, and possibly too in different circumstances, would emphasise the freedom of God through the Holy Spirit to come to articulation as the Word in the Word of Jesus Christ in the context of, but not in bondage, to the texts themselves. Such an understanding would take up and carry further Jüngel's concern for the concerns of both Barth and Bultmann in the context of scripture, enabling the theologian to exegete in the manner of Barth and also in the manner of ^{the} Bultmann school for different purposes at different times, while going beyond both in producing a new understanding of the exegetical procedure itself.

A historical precedent, admittedly not created for precisely the same purpose, is that of Hilary's use of scripture. For certain purposes of systematic theology he employs an epitomising use of scripture in which all is understood as pointing to the incarnation of God in Jesus. For specific areas of exegesis he uses other methods of interpretation including the use of typology, allegory, the rhetorical categories, symbolic of titles,

numbers etc. etc. We noted that in Hilary, the freedom to use all sorts of different interpretations for special purposes is grounded in the fact of the incarnation itself. So, understanding the incarnation in the history of the Trinity, it may be possible to make use of different structures for different purposes in the interpretation of scripture, in which God reveals himself in the history of Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit.

Quite apart from the problem of the multiplanar model for the interpretation of scripture indicated above, there has been much dissatisfaction with the understanding of scripture in the dialectical theology both on the Continent and in the anglo-saxon world. In Britain at least it is not the differences but the similarities between Barth and Bultmann which have rendered them equally unacceptable to their critics.

For Moltmann the weakness of the dialectical theology is its failure to carry through consistently the programme of eschatological reference which it proclaimed. God for Barth and Bultmann is present, in the context of scripture and elsewhere. But the basic scripture category is hope, promise, the new. Scripture is to be understood entirely in the category of promise, and the presence of God is a hope to be fulfilled at the coming of the kingdom, for which we are now to work in the world. The basic difficulty is that the many other accents in the Bible, and not least the witness to the fact that all has

been accomplished, once and for all, by Jesus in his cross and resurrection, have disappeared in Moltmann's reconstruction.¹⁶

Pannenberg's attitude to the Bible and to the dialectical theology is much more radical. (Indeed it is not for nothing that Barth remarked in one of his last seminars that he would gladly stretch out his hand 'under the table' to protect Bultmann from Pannenberg!) For Pannenberg, 'Die Auflösung der Lehre von der Schrift bildet die Grundlagenkrise der modernen evangelischen Theologie'.¹⁷ Until in the late middle ages the authority of the Church was asserted to be higher than that of scripture and the charge was rebutted, the position of scripture was not a matter of serious controversy. Luther's teaching was a substantiation of the rebuttal. But the principle of sola scriptura meant later that all theological work had to be grounded in historico-critical exegesis, and this led to the modern crisis.¹⁸

'Die Sache' der schrift, die Luther in Sinne hatte, nämlich Person und Geschichte Jesu, ist für unser historisches Bewusstsein nicht mehr in den Texten selber zu finden, sondern muss hinter ihnen erschlossen werden. Dieser Situation kann die Theologie nur gerecht werden,

¹⁶ I hope to examine at length the work of Moltmann, Pannenberg and Ebeling soon in another place.

¹⁷ Pannenberg, Grundfragen systematischer Theologie, 13.

¹⁸ *ibid.*, 13ff.

wenn es gelingt, das neuzeitliche Denken in dem Zusammenhang der christlichen Überlieferungsgeschichte einzuholen .. durch einen Entwurf der beide (Situationen) verbindenden Geschichte sowohl bewahrt, als auch aufgehoben werden.¹⁹

In fact (GS 130) 'Mit einer Mythisierung der allerdings ursprünglich mythischen Rede vom Worte Gottes und mit einer nackten Gehorsamsforderung an den mit der behaupteten Autorität des Gotteswortes bedrohten Hörer allein genügt man der theologischen Aufgabe jedenfalls auf die Dauer nicht.'²⁰

So much for a theology of the Word of God, from Hilary to Moltmann, and the use of the Bible that has followed it. There is no doubt that Pannenberg has provided important insights into weaknesses in the dialectical theology, which can be welcomed without qualification.²¹ At the same time it is clear that his own proposals for an alternative, are in important respects more problematic than the proposals which he wishes to replace. It is not clear that 'history' can or should provide us with anything other than history, and it appears unreasonable to be asked to identify this with the gospel of the New Testament witness.²²

¹⁹ *ibid.* 15

²⁰ *ibid.* 130

²¹ The present is nothing without the future and the past. It is easy for dialectical theology to slide into a 'verbalism' in which the concrete reality of the incarnation Word made flesh is lost in an almost Gnostic preoccupation with 'word'.

²² cf. too the critique by G. Klein. 'Theologie des Wortes Gottes und die Hypothese der Universalgeschichte' Munich, 1964 (Kaiser).

In the anglo-saxon world further objections have been raised, and cannot be disregarded in a search for commonly acceptable solutions to common problems. Here the kerugmatic element in the theology of the Word has been regarded as a legacy of the radical historical scepticism of Kierkegaard, while the account of a divine encounter with man in the self-revelation of God in Jesus Christ is considered logically untenable and so (theologically) unacceptable in Barth and Bultmann alike, the one in objectivising of knowledge of God in revelation, the other in subjectivising of the same. The Bible's role is seen as that of the earliest historical information about Jesus; in the context of the narration of this information the Church lives and worships, faith is created and seeks a new understanding of itself in the reinterpretation of biblical imagery and in the employment of new images through the thought forms available at any given time. In theological enquiry use of appropriate new imagery may disclose new insights, which we then understand in terms of the providence of God, with whom in some sense the initiative remains. If all is seen in terms of kerugma and confrontation, grace alone, how is it possible to find truth conditions, verifiable and falsifiable, for the faith itself?²³

In traditional Roman Catholicism, as in traditional Liberal Protestantism, authority is placed in a variegated

²³ Representative of this point of view, in various forms, are Dietrich Ritschl (Memory and Hope), Van Harvey (The History^{an} and the Believer) and D.M. MacKinnon (cf. Borderlands of Theology, esp. p.p 55-89).

complex sources of Christian truth as understood today, in which scripture is only one element.²⁴ In the Orthodox tradition, authority is placed in scripture as guided by the general ecumenical councils, scripture being the guide of tradition and tradition the protector of scripture.²⁵ In part at least of the Anglican tradition, a historical approach to scripture, critical or precritical, combined with a parallel frame of theological reference in philosophical theology, finds the Protestant emphasis on the key function of scripture as the place of the self-revelation of God obscure.²⁶

Unless we take the view that our own particular tradition possesses the truth and that others are simply blinded, we shall seek not simply to advocate a more palatable variation of our own traditional approaches, but to make suggestions which provide a real basis for a step forward in common discussion, fully aware that a harmonising compromise will be rightly unacceptable on all sides.

Much debate has recently been aroused by the so-called 'recovery of the Bible' of the second Vatican council. To many non-Roman Catholics who at first welcomed this trend, examination of the documents brought

²⁴ For an able Catholic presentation of the traditional position in its modern phase cf. J.R. Geiselman, 'Tradition, Scripture and the Church' in 'Christianity Divided' (Sheed and Ward) pp.39ff.

²⁵ cf. P.N. Trembelas, Dogmatics, I 19f.

²⁶ cf. esp. the comparatively limited role of biblical exegesis and biblical concepts in the 'Soundings' symposium.

deep disillusionment.

For it seemed that despite the high density of scriptural quotation and reference, much of the theological argument was built up, not from the biblical witness, but from theological systems entirely independent of the Bible, the whole then being illustrated by biblical imagery of a largely decorative nature.²⁷

It is clear that agreement in the interpretation of scripture (in terms of the process of exegesis and of its role in theology), like agreement in the understanding of the sacraments, is bound up with agreement on the understanding of the theological task as a whole. In both spheres, different traditions will doubtless long continue to make different interpretations, which, it is to be hoped, may gradually converge, but the process need not be expected to move quickly. In practice, as acts of intercommunion take place without full concurrence in the understanding of these ^{so} different traditions ^{may} make use of studies both in the interpretation of scripture and in theology in which scripture plays different roles in different traditions.

²⁷ cf. the constitution 'Dei Verbum' (Ed. Semmelroth and Zerwick, Stuttgart 1966). The document stresses the central role of scripture in Christ through the scriptures (paras. 1-7) and the whole is documented at every point by scriptural reference. On the other hand the section on the tradition of the Church (paras. 7ff) may be read to suggest that the relationship scripture/tradition has in no way altered since the Council of Trent and is not intended to do so. I am indebted to a seminar led by Prof. K. Barth for much of my understanding of this work.

Yet all truth in Christ is one, and so the inter-relations of these differences must be made clear, and the divergences made precise. We have seen that Hilary made use at different times of different interpretational systems, not indeed always conscious of the contradictions involved. In the *De Trinitate* he makes an epitomising use of scripture, in which detailed exegesis is not involved but in which the passages chosen refer beyond themselves to the incarnation itself. Such a use of scripture to refer in the context of theological construction to the central truths of the faith would be open to many who differed in the process of exegesis of particular passages, and even in the manner of understanding of the incarnation. This would of course be far from universally acceptable, but the basic role of scripture in pointing beyond itself to God in Christ would be a point of departure for many. Such a basis would also be a reminder that though differences of interpretation have always existed, these are part of a common striving of the whole Church towards a deeper understanding of its faith. In this, the value of patristic study would be of permanent value in underlining the historically conditioned and eschatologically limited nature of the differences, showing that progress is made only by taking these differences seriously and thinking them through, yet at the same time pointing in a common witness to a common Lord.

Further note on the role of the Bible in systematic theology.

We cannot know God or understand him except as the God who for man was incarnate. This is so because it is of the nature of God to have been incarnate - and not simply because this is a convenient way of helping men to know him and also because man, created as man can only understand and respond to God as the God who was incarnate. Therefore our understanding of God in the present will include reference to the historical context of the incarnation.

The biblical witness to God's dealings with Israel and to the incarnation is human witness and reflects the distortions and incompleteness of the human. It is nevertheless the chosen channel of God's work, as witness. It follows that scripture is indeed a major part of the context in which the word of God is understood today. Different parts of scripture may function in different ways in witnessing to the incarnation. There is no need for a uniform method of interpretation, nor indeed is this possible.

The fact for example, of Jesus having used the form of the parable does not give this form any 'final' character. It does however illustrate ~~illustrate~~ an important aspect of the texture of theological discourse about God, when seen against the background of the events of the incarnation. On the other hand, Jesus did not

limit himself to this form (cf. the Sermon on the Mount), and in the resurrection all forms of language are made available for discourse, provided that these are used in a manner appropriate to God their creator.

The Bible is the most important single element in the development of christian theology. Its content has normative, guiding and indicative character, dependent on the relation of that content to the total witness to Christ, and the situation in which through the Holy Spirit it is used. But the freedom which christians have in having to do with the living God means that they may use in his service forms of discourse other than those used in the Bible, and images which go beyond the biblical imagery, provided that in everything they seek to be faithful to the central message of salvation.

Again though the Bible is ultimately to be understood in the light of the centre of its witness, God in Christ, it need not be understood in terms of a fixed analogical correspondence to this centre.

Likewise, though theology is ultimately to be understood in the light of the incarnation, it need not be done in any kind of fixed analogical correspondence to that centre. This, in exegesis of scripture and in theology alike, would be a legalist approach to the gospel of the divine freedom.

However one may interpret the theological relationship

between faith's understanding of God and the text of the scriptures, the problem is intimately related to that of the use of human language in speaking of God and in the doing of theology in general. In dealing with this matter the nature of the relationship between the philosophical and theological tools used in the discussion of the theological subject matter, in the present case the role of scripture in theology, is of crucial importance. All human analogies from the things of the creation to God break down, and alleged 'family resemblances' fail quite to bridge the gap between creator and creation. Therefore, for Hilary, God himself provides in the witness of scripture to the incarnation, and in God's speaking himself through scripture to man, the forms, in analogy with the incarnation by which we may learn to speak of him, even though all our speaking remains of a provisional, limited character.

(For those who would retain Hilary's stress upon the incarnation as the ultimate basis of theological reflection this *analogia gratiae* remains of crucial importance. It is however clear that such an *analogia gratiae* has been understood in very different ways in the history of theology. The development of awareness of the problems concerning the nature of perception has brought new complications to the task of attempting to do today what Hilary was able to do in the fourth century. For a theological understanding of the nature of God's action in the context of scripture as underlined above, some new articulation of an *analogia gratiae*, possibly of a multi-dimensional nature, in which

different elements work in different ways for different kinds of language about God, is clearly required: the details of an attempt to meet such a requirement cannot however be set out here.

What then of human analogies outside the reference of the biblical witness to the incarnation? Advance in theological enquiry and also in the context of apologetics often depends on the ability to use and to select from a large number of different images and conceptual models, from which the distinctive characteristics of a particular model may be more clearly understood. For this reason the exercise of imagination in reviewing biblical images in theology in the light of analogies in a non-incarnational context, or in theologies not centred on the biblical witness, and in philosophy or other disciplines, will be important for a theology which seeks to express itself, in terms always of the controls of its own particular concern, in language which takes advantage of the widest possible range of contemporary imagery for purpose of comparison and differentiation. It is clearly better that theology, which is in any case always provisional and historically conditioned, should reflect the conditions of the age for which it seeks to articulate faith in understandable terms than those of the immediately preceding age, or of ages past. At the same time the source of faith's reflection, the history of God in Israel and in the incarnation, has taken place once and is not repeated.

In this context it may in conclusion be noted that the use of scripture in theological construction does not of course entail taking over the particular metaphysical frameworks against which the theological response in witness to the incarnation was first hammered out. Yet at the same time, the witness then within these superseded frameworks (which still retain their value as models for comparison) since it is still in itself part of the original witness to the incarnation, is as such part of the norm for our understanding within very different frameworks, of the action of the same God in the midst of human life today. The crucial point is that the whole theological endeavour has its focal point in God in Christ, as he makes himself known in the context of the total biblical witness to the incarnation.

The thesis that the key to the interpretation of scripture is given by God in the tradition of the Church is much older than its classic formulation by J.H. Newman. It is not indeed scripture in the context of tradition but history itself which is the sphere of the revelation of God, according to Pannenberg, and this history can only be understood in terms of its end. Revelation, according to Ebeling, is in the Bible itself, and the history of the Church is essentially a history of the Church's attempts to interpret the Bible in its thought and in its life. What is the role of history, or more concretely of any given historical situation in revelation, and how is this related to the role of scripture?

It has been suggested that a passage in the Bible may gain a new central importance for a christian community in a given historical situation, e.g. in a situation of Apartheid the text 'in Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek' may become of central importance in pointing to the impact of the incarnation in that setting. For Jesus himself certain passages of the Old Testament clearly gained in given situations crucial importance for his understanding of his mission. Interpretation is historically conditioned. Thus Barth's Römerbrief was written under and made its impact upon the basis of the 1914-18 war. On the other hand, e.g. the Arab-Israeli conflicts and the Nazi régime enabled people in a given historical context to interpret the biblical witness to justify inhuman treatment of the Jews, and indeed, of the Arabs.

It is then clear that God may reveal different aspects of his truth to men in the contexts of scripture at different times in different ways. Yet the given historical situation also provides opportunity for men to distort the witness of scripture. Judgement may and must be made, yet remains provisional and limited between the times. Even a whole Church may be wrong, and the acts of a few may be less wrong. The most perverse activities may be justified by reference to the incarnation in the context of scripture. Ultimately it is only in prayer and in complete dependence upon the grace of God that theology can dare to function and to use scripture at all.

It is possible and necessary for theologians within the Church to set up guidelines for the understanding of faith and of scripture which are of assistance to the Church: but in following them the Church may distort and upturn the whole almost unconsciously. Faithfulness is asked for by God but never imposed. Where theological accuracy and faithful discipleship appear to coincide, only one observation is empirically appropriate: soli Deo gloria.

A note on the most recent work on Hilary.

The following works came to hand after the MS was complete or virtually complete, and could not be dealt with exhaustively here:

Wille, W.: Studien zum Matthäuskommentar des Hilarius von Poitiers Diss. Hamburg, 1968.

Gastaldi, I.N.: Hilario de Poitiers, exegeta del Salterio. These. Paris, 1968.

Hilaire de Poitiers, Évêque et Docteur. Ét. Aug. Paris 1968

Hilaire et Son Temps, Actes du Colloque de Poitiers, 29 Sept-30 Oct. 1968. Ét. Aug. Paris 1969.

Apart from the sections of their theses which Drs. Wille and Gastaldi most generously sent me in advance of completion, and which are dealt with ad loc., notice has been taken of these important works in the notes. The Hilary anniversary publications, though extremely interesting, add little to our knowledge of Hilary's exegesis. Mention should however be made of the article in *Hilaire et Son Temps*, on Hilary's exegesis by Kannengiesser, and of the suggestion by Smulders (*ibid.* p.175f esp. p.185f) which does not however yet amount to proof, that in writing the *De Trinitate* Hilary may have been aware of the work of Eusebius of Emesa. Daniélou, *ibid.* p.143-47 suggests that in the etymologies of the *In Psalmos*, Hilary may be following an Antiochene writer of homilies who knew Hebrew. If this were to prove to be the case, this too would go some way to explain Hilary's marked independence of Origen, even in the *In Psalmos*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Adler, M.: Studien zu Philo v. Alexandrien. Breslau, 1929.
- Aleith, - Hoffmann E.: Paulusverständnis in der alten Kirche. BZNW, Berlin, 1937.
- Altaner, B.: Kleine Patristische Schriften Berlin 1966.
(incl. Altlateinische Übersetzungen von Schriften des Athanasius v. Alexandrien Byz. Zeitschr. 41. 1941)
- Amsler, S.: L'Ancient Testament dans L'Eglise. Neuchâtel, 1960.
- Arbusow, L.: Colores Rhetorici. Göttingen, 1948.
- Aristoboulos, der Thorausleger: Ed. Walter, TU 86, Berlin, 1964.
- Arsfahl, G.: Vergleich und Metaphor bei Quintilian. Stuttgart, 1932.
- Asconius Pedianus: Commentarii. ed. C. Giamatano. Amsterdam, 1967.
- Asconius: Ed. Th. Stangl, 1912.
- Atberger, L.: Geschichte der altchristlichen Eschatologie. Freiburg, 1896.
- Auerbach, E.: Figura. Archivum Romanicum XII 1938, 436-89.
- Auerbach, E.: Literatursprache u. Publikum in der lateinischen Spätantike u. im Mittelalter.
- Bachelet Le: art. Hilaire in DTC VI. 2. Paris, 1947.
- Baltzer, J.: Die Theologie des Hl. Hilarius v. Poitiers. Rottweil, 1879.
- Bardenhewer, O.: Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur. Freiburg, 1912.
- Bardenhewer, O.: Des Hl. Hippolytus Kommentar zum Danielbuch. Freiburg, 1877.
- Bardy, G.: La culture Grecque dans l'Occident Chrétien au IV Siècle. RSR 29.1.1939. 5-59.
- Bardy, G.: Un humaniste Chrétien St. H. de Poitiers. RHEF 27, 1941. 5-25.
- Bardy, G.: Paul de Samosate. Bruges, 1923.
- Bardy, G.: La question des langues dans l'Eglise ancienne. Paris, 1948.

- Bardy, G.: Traducteurs et Adapteurs au IV^e Siècle. RSR 30, 1940. 257-306.
- Barr, J.: Old and New in Interpretation. SCM, 1966.
- Barr, J.: St. Jerome and the sounds of Hebrew. JSS, 1967. 1-37
- Barth, Carola: Die Interpretation des NT in der NT in der valentinischen Gnosis. TU 37.3. Berlin, 1914.
- Barwick, K.: De iunio Filargiri Vergilii interprete. Leipzig, 1908.
- Beck, A.: Römisches Recht bei Tertullian u. Cyprian. Halle, 1930 (Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrtenes. G-W Kl.7.2.)
- Beck, A.: Die Trinitätslehre des H. v. Poitiers. Mainz, 1903.
- Benoit, A.: St. Irénée. Paris, 1960.
- Benrath, G.: Wyclif's Bibelkommentar. ARG 36. Berlin, 1966.
- Benz, E.: Marius Victorinus. Stuttgart, 1933.
- Betti, E.: Allgemeine Auslegungslehre. Tübingen, 1967.
- Betti, E.: Die Hermeneutik als allgemeine Methodik der Geisteswissenschaften. Tübingen, 1962.
- Beumer, J.: Hilarius v. Poitiers, eine Vertreter der christlichen Gnosis. Theol. Quartalschrift, 132 (1952) 170-92.
- Bigelmair, A.: Zeno v. Verona. Münster, 1904.
- Bigg, C.: Christian Platonists of Alexandria. Oxford, 1913.
- Bjorndalen, A.: Metodiske Bemerkninge til Sporsmalet etter allegorier i det gamle Testamente. TTK 1966. 146f. Oslo.
- Bochenski, I.: Ancient Formal Logic. Amsterdam, 1951.
- Bochenski, I.: History of Formal Logic. Notre Dame, 1961.
- Boethius: Commentary on Porphyrius. CSEL, 1906.
- Bonassieux: Les évangiles synoptiques de St. Hilaire. Lyons, 1906. (cf. Jülicher in TLZ, 1907).
- Bonwetsch, (G) N.: Die Theologie v. Methodius v. Olympus. Berlin, 1903.
- Bonwetsch, N.: Die Theologie des Irenaeus. Gütersloh, 1925.
- Borchardt, C.F.A.: Hilary of Poitier's Role in the Arian Struggle. The Hague, 1966.
- Bornocque : Les Declamations et les declamateurs d'après Seneque le Père. Lille, 1902.

- Bousset, W.: Jüdisch-christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria u. Rom. FRLANT NF6. Göttingen, 1915.
- Bréhier, E.: Études de philosophie antique. pp. 97-130. (From 'Histoire de la Philosophie. Paris, 1960.)
- Brisson, J.: Hilaire de Poitiers Traité des Mysteres. SC19. Paris, 1947.
- Brown, R.: Parable and allegory reconsidered. Nov. Test. 5, 1962, 36-45.
- Brox, N.: Offenbarung, Gnosis u. Gnostisches Mythos bei Irenaeus v. Lyon. Salzburg, 1966.
- Buffiere : Les Mythes d'Homere et la pensée grecque. Paris, 1956.
- Bultmann, R.: Der Stil der Paulinischen Predigt u. die Kynisch-Stoischen Diatribe. Göttingen, 1910.
- Bultmann, R.: Ursprung u. Sinn der Typologie als hermeneutischer Methode. TLZ, 1950. 205f.
- Burghardt, W.: On Early Christian Exegesis. Theol. Studies XI, 1950. 78-116.
- Buttell, M.: The Rhetoric of St. H. of Poitiers. CUA Patr. Stud. 38 (1933).
- Bulst, W.: Hymni Latini Antiquissimi, LXXV. Heidelberg, 1956.
- Cadiou, R.: Dictionnaires antiques dans l'oeuvre d'Origène, Rev. Ét. Grec. XLV 281f.
- Ciceronis orationum Scholasticae: ed. Stangl. Leipzig, 1912.
- Comeau, M.: St. Augustin#, Exégète du quatrième Évangile. Paris, 1930.
- Cornutus : ed. Lang, Teubner. Leipzig, 1881.
- Coulange, L.: Metamorphose du consubstantiel, Athanase et Hilaire. RHLR 8, 1922, 169-214.
- D'Ales, A.: La théologie de St. Cyprien. Paris, 1922.
- D'Ales, A.: La théologie de Hippolyte. Paris, 1906.
- D'Ales, A.: La théologie de Tertullian. Paris, 1905.
- Daniélou, J.: Message évangélique et culture hellénistique.
- Den Boer, W.: De Allegoreses in het Werk van Clemens Alexandrinus. Leiden, 1940.

- Didymi Chalcenteri opera: ed. Diels/Schubart. Berlin, 1904.
- Dilthey, W.: Die Entstehung der Hermeneutik. GS V, 1924. 317f.
- Dobschütz, E. von: Vom vierfachen Schriftsinn. Harnack Ehrung. Leipzig, 1921.
- Duchrow, U.: Sprachverständnis u. biblisches Hören bei Augustin. Tübingen, 1965.
- Diestel, L.: Geschichte des AT in der Christlichen Kirche. Jena, 1869.
- Dudden, F. Holmes: Ambrose I. II. Oxford, 1935.
- Ebeling, G.: Evangelische Evangelienauslegung. Munich, 1942. (Darmstadt, 1962).
- Ebeling, G.: Die Anfänge v. Luther's Hermeneutik. ZThK, 1951. 172f.
- Elliger, K.: Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer. Tübingen, 1953.
- Emmenberger, J.: The functions of faith and reason in the theology of St. Hilary of Poitiers. CUA Washington, 1947.
- Engelbrecht, A.: Zur Sprache des H. v. Poitiers u. seine Zeitgenossen. WS, 1927. 135-61.
- Epitome : Art. in RAC 5. also Arts. Evangelium, Exegese, Lesungen in RAC.
- Erbse, H.: Beiträge zur Überlieferung der Ilias scholien, Zetemata 24, 1960.
- Faider, P.: Repertoire des Editions des scholies et commentaires d'auteurs latins. Paris, 1931.
- Favre, R.: La communication des idiomes dans les oeuvres de St. Hilaire de Poitiers Gregorianum 17. 1936. 481-514.
- Feder, A.: Studien zu Hilarius v. Poitiers,
I SBW 164.2 Wien, 1910.
II SBW 165.5 1911.
III SBW 169.5 1912.
- Feder, A.: Epilegomena zu Hil. Pict. I II WS, 1919. 51-60, 167-81.
- Feder, A.: Kulturgeschichtliches in den Werken des hl. H.v.P. Stimmen aus Maria Laach, 81. 1911. 30-45.

- Fierro, A.: Sobre la gloria en san Hilario Anal. Greg. 144.
Rome, 1964.
- Fischer, B.: Die Psalmenfrömmigkeit der Märtyrerkirche. Freiburg,
1949.
- Flessemann van Leer, E.: Scripture and Tradition in the Early
Church. Leiden, 1955.
- Förster, W.: Von Valentin zu Heracleon. BZNW 7. Giessen, 1926.
- Fonck, L.: Le parabole del signore nel evangelio. Rome, 1924³.
- Förster, T.: Zur Theologie des Hilarius. ThStuKrit. 61. 1888.
645-686.
- Fuhrmann, M.: Das systematische Lehrbuch. Göttingen, 1960.
- Funaioli, E.: Esegese virgiliana antica. Milan, 1930.
- Galtier, P.: S. Hilaire de Poitiers. Paris, 1960.
- Gariglio, A.: il commento al salmo 118 in s. Ambroglio e in
s. Ilario (Atti della accademia delle scienze di
Torino Cl2 90 (1955-56) 56 356-70).
- Geffcken, J.: Die Entstehung u. Wesen des griechischen Kommentars
Hermes, 67(1932) 397-412.
- Georgi : Die antike Vergilkritik. Philologus Suppl. 9, 212-39.
- Giamberdini, G.: De divinitate verbi doctrina s. Hil. Pict. 1.
Cairo, 1951.
- Goffinet, E.: Kritisch-filologisch element in de psalmen-
commentaar van de h. Hilarius van Poitiers.
Rev. Belg. de Philol. et d hist. 1960. 130-44.
- Goetz, K.: Geschichte der Cyprianischen Literatur bis zu der
Zeit der ersten erhaltenen Handschriften. Diss.
Marburg, 1890. Basel, 1891.
- Goppelt, L.: Typos. Berlin, 1939.
- Gräfenhan, R.: Geschichte der Klassischen Philologie I-IV.
Bonn, 1843ff.
- Grant, R.: Historical criticisms in the ancient church JR.
1945, 25.183-97.
- Griffe, E.: La Gaule chrétiens a l'époque Romaine I. Paris,
1947.
- Grabmann, M.: Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode
Herder. Freiburg, 1909.

- Gronau, K.: Poseidonius u. die jüdisch-christliche Genesis-exegese. Berlin, 1914.
- Gudeman, A.: Grundriss der Geschichte der klassischen Philologie. 1907.
- Haarhof, T.: Schools of Gaul. Oxford, 1920.
- Hackemann, L.: Servius and his sources in the commentary on the Georgics. Columbia, N.Y., 1940.
- Hadot, P.: Typus: Stoicisme et monarchianisme au IV Siecle. RThAM 18.1951. 177-87.
- Hagendahl, H.: Methods of citation in post classical prose. Eranos, 45, 1947. 114-28.
- Hahn, T.: Tyconiusstudien. Leipzig, 1911.
- Halm, C.: Rhetorici latini minores. Lipsiae, 1863.
- Hamel, A.: Kirche bei Hippolyt von Rom. Gütersloh, 1951.
- Hanson, R.: Allegory and Event. London, 1959.
- Hanson, R.: Notes on Tertullian's use of scripture. JTS NS12. 1961. 273-9.
- Harl, M.: Origène. Paris, 1952.
- Harnack, A.: Der kirchengeschichtliche Ertrag der exegetischen Arbeit des Origenes. TU 42. 1919.
- Harnack, A.: Marcion: Das Evangelium vom fremden Gott. Berlin, 1942².
- Hitchcock, F.: Irenaeus of Lugdunum. Cambridge, 1914.
- Heinisch, P.: Der Einfluss Philos auf die Aelteste christliche Exegese. Münster, 1908.
- Heinrici, G.: Die valentinische Gnosis u. die heilige Schrift. Berlin, 1871.
- Hermaniuk, M.: Le parabole évangélique. Louvain, 1947.
- Herrera, S.: Irenée de Lyon Exégète. These. Paris, 1920.
- Hoffman, M.: Der Dialog bei den christlichen Schriftstellern der ersten vier Jahrhunderten. Diss. Heidelberg, 1960.
- Hoh, J.: Die Lehre des hl. Irenaeus über das NT. Münster, 1918.

- Holl, A.: Augustin's Bergpredigtexegese. Herder, Wien, 1960.
- Holmes, T.S.: The Origin and Development of the Christian Church in Gaul during the First Six Centuries of the Christian Era. London, 1911.
- Huber, G.: Das Sein u. das Absolute: ^{Studien} zur Geschichte der ontologischen Problematik in der spätantiken Philosophie. Basel, 1955.
- Holte, R.: 'Spermatikos Logos' in Studia Theologica 14, 1960.
- Hyl Dahl, N.: 'Hegesippus Hypomnemata' in Studia Theologica 8, 1960, 14.70-113.
- Ivanka, E. v.: Plato Christianus. Einsiedeln, 1964.
- Jannsens, Y.: Heracleon, Commentaire sur l'évangile selon S. Jean in Museion 72(1-2) 1959, 101-157.
- Jeanotte, H.: Le Psautier de S. Hilaire. Paris, 1917.
- Jones, J.: Allegorical interpretation in Servius. Class. Jour. 56, 1961. 217-26.
- Jordan, H.: Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur. Leipzig, 1911.
- Jullian, C.: Histoire de la Gaule, VI VII. Paris, 1926.
- Jungmann, J.: Missarum Sollemnia, I. 1949.
- Jolles, R.: Einfache Formen. Halle, 1956².
- Jüngel, E.: Paulus u. Jesus. Tübingen, 1967³.
- Karpp, H.: Schrift u. Geist bei Tertullian. Gütersloh, 1955.
- Kayser, W.: Das Sprachliche Kunstwerk. Bern u. München, 1963.
- Kihn, H.: Theodore v. Mopsuestia u. Junilius Africanus als Exegeten. 1880.
- Kinnavey, R.: The Vocabulary of St. Hilary of Poitiers. CUA Patr Stud. 47 (1935).
- Klostermann, E.: Formen der exegetischen Arbeit des Origenes. ThLZ Oct. 1947. 203f.
- Klostermann, E.: Zur Überlieferung der Matthäuserklärung des Origenes. TU 47.2. 1931.

- Klotz, A.: Valerius Maximus u. die Exempla. SBAW, 1942.
- Kneale, W. and M.: The Development of Logic. Oxford, 1962.
- Koch, H.: Cyprianische Untersuchungen, AKG 4. Bonn, 1926.
- Koeble, A.: De Hypomnematis Graecis I, II. Berlin, 1842f.
- Koffmann, B.G.: Geschichte der Kirchenlatein. Breslau, 1879.
- Köppen, K.: Die Auslegung der Versuchungsgeschichte unter besonderer Rücksichtung der alten Kirche. Tübingen, 1961.
- Keil, H.: Grammatici Latini V. Lipsiae, 1857.
- Kornhardt, H.: Exemplum: eine bedeutungsgeschichtliche Studie Diss. Phil. Göttingen, 1936.
- Krause, G.: Studien zu Luthers Auslegung der Kleinen Propheten BHT 22. Tübingen, 1962.
- Kronasser, H.: Handbuch der Semasiologie. Heidelberg, 1952.
- v. Kübler : ed. Gaius Institutes. 1935⁷.
- Kutter, H.: Clemens Alexandrinus u. das NT. Giessen, 1897.
- Labriolle Pde: St. Ambroise et l'exégèse allegorique. Annales de phil. chrétienne, IV 5. 1908. 591-603.
- Lammert, F.: Bursian's Jahrbuch 251 for 1936. 107f on latin grammarians.
- Lausberg, H.: Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Munich, 1960.
- Leisegang, H.: Die Gnosis. Stuttgart, 1955.
- Lietzmann, H.: art. Hilarius in PWK VIII. Stuttgart, 1913.
- Lindemann, H.: Des hl. Hilarius v. Poitiers Liber Mysteriorum. Münster, 1905.
- Loewenich, W. v.: Das Johannesverständnis im zweiten Jahrhundert. BZNW 13. Giessen, 1932.
- Löffler, F.: Die Trinitätslehre des Bischofs Hilarius v. Poitiers zwischen Ost u. Westen ev. theol. diss. Bonn, 1959.
- Löffler, F.: Die Trinitätslehre des Bischofs H. v. P. ZKG 71. 1960. 26-36.

- Loofs, F.: art. Hilarius in PRE³. Leipzig, 1900.
- Lorenz, R.: arts. on Augustin in ZKG 1952, 1955, 1956, 1964,
and ThR 1959, 1-75.
- Lubac, H. de: Exégèse Médiévale I. Aubier, Paris, 1959.
- Ludwich, A.: Aristarch's homerische Textkritik. Leipzig, 1884.5.
- Lundström, S.: Studien zur lateinischen Irenaeusübersetzungen.
Lund, 1943.
- Lundström, S.: Neue Studien zur Lat. Iren. Übers. Lunds
Universitets Årsskrift NF 44 (1948).
- Lundström, S.: ibid. NF 51.9/1955. Übersetzungstechnische
Untersuchungen auf den Gebiet der christlichen
Latinität.
- Lyttkens, H.: The Analogy between God and the World.
Uppsal. Univ. Årsskrift, 1953.
- Maas, F.: Von der Ursprung der rabbinischen Schriftauslegung.
ZThK 52 (1955) 129-61.
- Macrobius : cf. Stahl: Macrobius' commentary on the Dream of
Scipio. N.Y., 1952.
- Maier, J.: Die Texte vom Toten Meer. Basel, 1960.
- Malunowicz, L.: De voce sacramenti apud S. Hil. Pict.
Lublin, 1956.
- Mann, M.: The clausulae of St. Hilary of Poitiers. CUA Patr.
Stud. 48. 1936.
- Maries, L.: Études préliminaires a L'Étude de Diodore de Tarse
sur les psaumes. Paris, 1933.
- Marinone, N.: Elio Donato Macrobio e Servio commentatori di
Vergilio. Vercelli, 1946.
- Martinez Sierra, A.: Arian exegesis on St. Hil. In Pss.
Miscelanea Comillas 41. 293-376 and 42.
43-153. 1964.
- Mates, B.: Stoic Logic. University of California Press.
Berkeley, 1961².
- Meijering, E.P.: Orthodoxy and Platonism in Athanasius,
Synthesis or Antithesis? Leiden, 1968.
- Meridier, L.: La seconde sophistique dans l'oeuvre de Gregoire
de Nysse. Paris, 1906.

- Merlan, P.: From Platonism to Neoplatonism. The Hague, 1960.
- Molland, E.: The Conception of the Gospel in Alexandrian Theology. Oslo, 1938.
- Mondesart, C.: Essai sur Clement D'Alexandrie. Paris, 1944.
- Monnard, C.: De Gallorum oratio ingenio, rhetoribus et historicae, romanorum tempore. Bonnae, 1848.
- Morrica, U.: Storia della Letteratura latina christiana, I-III. Torino, 1923-34.
- Neoplatonism : Recherches sur la tradition platonicienne in Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique III. Genève, 1955. (Courcelle, Marrouff, Waszink) Fond. Hardt.
- Neumann, K.J.: Hippolytus v. Rom. Teubner, Leipzig, 1902.
- Norden, E.: Die antike Kunstprosa. Teubner, Leipzig, 1898.
- Oepke, A.: Das neue Gottesvolk. Gütersloh, 1951.
- Olympiodori: Philosophi in Platonis Phaedonem commentaria. ed. W. Norwin. Leipzig, 1913.
- Overbeck, F.: Über die Anfänge der patristischen Literatur. 1882.
- Pannenberg, W.: Analogie u. Offenbarung. Diss. Habil., Heidelberg, 1958.
- Pannenberg, W.: Grundfragen systematischer Theologie. Göttingen, 1968.
- Penna, A.: Principi e carattere dell'Esegesis di S Gerolamo. Roma, 1950.
- Pelikan, J.: Development of Christian Doctrine I. Yale, 1969.
- Pepin, J.: Mythe et allegorie. Paris, 1958.
(rev. by I. Opelt in JAC, 1962, 165f.)
- Pepin, J.: Le challenge Homère/Moïse aux premières Siècle Chrétiens. RSR, 1955. 29.105-22.
- Petre, H.: L'exemplum chez Tertullian. Dijon, 1940.
- Peter, H.: Die geschichtliche Literature über die römische Kaiserzeit I, II. Leipzig, 1897.
- Peter, H.: Wahrheit u. Kunst. Geschichtsschreibung u. Plagiat im klassischen altertum. Leipzig, 1911.

- Pirot, J.: Parables et allegories évangéliques. Paris, 1949.
- Pollard, T.: The exegesis of scripture and the Arian controversy. BJRL 41-2. 1959. 414-29.
- Prigent, P.: Justin et l'ancien Testament. Paris, 1964.
- Probus : apud Hagen, Appendix Serviana, 1902.
- Quacquarelli, A.: La retorica antica al bivio. Roma, 1956.
- Quillacq, J.: Quomodo lingua latina usus est S. Hilarius. Paris, 1903.
- Redepenning, E.: Origenes I, II. Bonn, 1846.
- Reinkens, J.: Hilarius v. Poitiers. Schaffhausen, 1864.
- Reuss, E.: History of the Sacred Scriptures of the New Testament. Edinburgh, 1884.
- Reuss, J.: Matthaeuskommentare der griechischen Kirche. Berlin, 1957.
- Reveillard : Cyprian : L'oraison dominicale. Paris, 1964.
- Richard, M.: Asterius. Oslo, 1956.
- Roche, J.: Die homerische Textkritik im Altertum. 1866.
- Roger, M.: L'enseignement des lettres classiques d'Ausone à Alcuin.
- Rosenmüller : Historia interpretationis libr. sacr. Lipsiae, 1807.
- Sagnard, F.: La Gnose valentinienne et la temoignage de Saint Irénee. Paris, 1947.
- Schanz-Hosius: Römische Literaturgeschichte art. Hilarius. (IV l.277f) etc.
- Schelke, K.: Paulus, Lehrer der Väter. Düsseldorf, 1956.
- Schelke, K.: Wort u. Schrift. Düsseldorf, 1966.
- Simon, R.: Histoire critique du vieux testament. Paris, 1680.
- Simon, R.: Histoire critique des principeaux commentateurs du nouveau testament. Rotterdam, 1693.
- Simonetti, M.: Note sul commento di Ilario di Poitiers Vet. Chr. I. Bari, 1964.

- Schneider, H.: Kultur u. Denken der alten Ägypter. Leipzig, 1907.
- Schellauf, F.: Rationem afferendi locos litterarum divinarum quam in tractatibus super psalmos sequi videtur S. Hil. Graz, 1898.
- Schoeps, H.: Theologie u. Geschichte des Judentums. Mohr, Tübingen, 1949.
- Schulz, F.: History of Roman Legal Science. Oxford, 1946.
- Schwartz, E.: Zu Clemens' *tis ho sozomenos ploutos?* Hermes, 38.1. 1903.
- Schwartz, E.: Zwei Predigten Hippolyts. SBAW ph. hist. cl1936, 75f.
- Seibel, W.: Fleisch u. Geist bei den hl. Ambrosius. Munich, 1959.
- Siegfried, C.: Philo v. Alexandrien. Jena, 1875.
- Simonetti, M.: Eracleone e Origene. Vet. Chr. 3 (1966) 3-76.
- Smulders, P.: La doctrine trinitaire de s. H. de P. Anal. Greg. 32. Rome, 1944.
- Soden, H. v.: *Mysterium u. Sacramentum in den ersten Jahrhunderten der Kirche.* BZNW 12 (1911) 1-7.
- Souter, A.: Text and Canon of the New Testament. London, 1913.
- Spicq, F.: *L'exégèse latine au moyen âge.* Paris, 1944.
- Spanneut, M.: *Le stoïcisme des Pères de l'église.* Lille, 1957.
- Stein, E.: Die allegorische Exegese des Philo von Alexandria. BZN 51. Giessen, 1929.
- Steinthal, H.: Geschichte der Sprachwissenschaft bei den Griechen u. Römern I, II. Berlin, 1890.
- Strauss, G.: Schriftgebrauch, Schriftauslegung u. Schriftbeweis bei Augustin. Tübingen, 1959.
- Schindler, A.: Wort u. Analogie in Augustin's Trinitätslehre. Tübingen, 1965.
- Stroux, J.: Zum allegorischen Deutung Vergils Philologus, 86. 1931. 363f.
- Stuhlmacher, P.L.: Gottes Gerechtigkeit bei Paulus. FRLA NT 87. 1965.
- Suringer, W.: Historia critica scholastorum latinorum. Lugduni Batavorum, 1834.

- Susemihl, F.: Geschichte der griechischen Literatur in der Alexandrinerzeit I, II. Leipzig, 1891².
- Steinmann, J.: S. Jerome. Paris, 1958.
- Schröckh, J.M.: Historia Religionis et Ecclesiae Christianae. (45 vols.) 1768-1812.
- Tate, J.: On the history of allegorism. Class. Quart. 28 (1934) 105-114.
- Thomas, E.: Essai sur Servius. Paris, 1879.
- Thyen, H.: Der Stil der jüdisch//hellenistischen Homilie. Göttingen, 1955.
- Travis, A.: De Serv. carm. verg. interp. 1940.
- Geschichte der Philosophie:
- Überweg, F.-Praechter, K.: Die Philosophie des Altertums. Berlin, 1909.
- Uptrup, K.M.zu: Zur Hermeneutik des Ambrosiaster. Diss. Heidelberg, 1950.
- Vaccari, A.: La theoria nella scuola esegetica di antiocha. Biblica, I. 1920. 1-36.
- Violard, E.: Étude sur le commentaire d'Hippolyte sur le livre de Daniel. Paris, 1903.
- Vischer, L.: Basilius der Grosse. Basel, 1953.
- Völker, C.: Quellen zur Geschichte des christlichen Gnosis. Tübingen, 1932.
- Volkman, R.: Die Rhetorik der Griechen u. Römer. Berlin, 1872.
- Watson, E.: St. Hilary of Poitiers. Select Works ANF IX. Oxford, 1899.
- Wehrli, F.: Zur Geschichte der allegorischen Deutung Homers in Altertum. Leipzig, 1928.
- Weinstock, S.: Die platonischen Homerkritik Philologus 82. 1927. 121f.
- Welter, J.: L'exemplum dans la litt. religieuse et didactique du moyen age. Paris, 1927.
- Wendland, P.: Die hellenistische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum u. Christentum. Tübingen, 1912.

- Werbeck, W.: *Jacobus Perez von Valencia. Untersuchungen zu seinem Psalmenkommentar.* BHTh. Tübingen, 1959.
- Werkner, J.: *Der Paulinismus des Irenaeus.* TU6.2.
- Wieacker, F.: *Textstufen klassischer Juristen.* Göttingen, 1960.
- Wilmart, A.: *L'Odysee du MS de s. Pietro qui referme les oeuvres de s. Hil.* Festschr. for EK Rand, 293-305.
- Windisch, H.: *Das Evangelium des Basileides.* ZNW 7(1906) 236-46.
- Winter, K.: *Bibliographie zur antiken Bildersprache.* Heidelberg, 1964.
- Wlosok, A.: *Laktanz u. die philosophische Gnosis.* Heidelberg, 1960.
- Wohlenberg : *Ein alter lateinischer Kommentar über die vier Evangelien* Festschr. für Th. Zahn. 1909.
- Wolf, E.: *Augustin u. das lateinische Neuplatonismus* Theol. Blätter 12 (1933) 300-8.
- Wunderer, G.: *Polybiosforschung.* Teubner, Leipzig, 1909.
- Zeller, E.: *Stoics, Epicureans and Sceptics.* London, 1892³.
- Zimmermann, G.: *Die hermeneutischen Prinzipien Tertullians.* Diss. phil. Leipzig, 1937.
- Zingerle, A.: *Griech-Lat. Worterklärung aus dem Hilarianischen Pskomm. (Commentiones Wolfflinianae 213-8).*
- Zingerle, A.: *Textual studies in WS 1889, 314-23, and in Kleine Phil. Abhandl. Innsbruck I, 1871, ii 1877, iii 1882, iv 1887, 75-89 (Die lateinischen Bibelzitate bei S. Hil. Pict.)*
- Zuntz, G.: *Die Aristophanes Scholien der Papyri:*
Byzantion 13 (1938) 631-90
Byzantion 14 (1939) 545-632.

Lat