



SECOND THESSALONIANS

TWO EARLY MEDIEVAL
APOCALYPTIC COMMENTARIES

Haimo of Auxerre,
Expositio in Epistolam II
ad Thessalonicenses

Thietland of Einsiedeln,
In Epistolam II ad
Thessalonicenses

Introduced and Translated by
Steven R. Cartwright and
Kevin L. Hughes



TEAMS



Commentary Series

SECOND THESSALONIANS

Commentary Series

General Editor

E. Ann Matter, University of Pennsylvania

Advisory Board

John C. Cavadini, University of Notre Dame
James J. O'Donnell, University of Pennsylvania
Thomas H. Seiler, Western Michigan University
Lesley J. Smith, Oxford University
Grover A. Zinn, Oberlin College
Robert A. Harris, Jewish Theological Seminary

The commentary series is designed for classroom use. Its goal is to make available to teachers and students useful examples of the vast tradition of medieval commentary on sacred Scripture. The series will include English translations of works written in a number of medieval languages and from various centuries and religious traditions. The series focuses on treatises which have relevance to many fields of Medieval Studies, including theories of allegory and literature, history of art, music and spirituality, and political thought. The translations strive for clear, straightforward English prose style. Notes are meant to provide sources and to gloss difficult passages rather than to give an exhaustive scholarly commentary on the treatise. The editions include short introductions which set the context and suggest the importance of each work.

**SECOND THESSALONIANS:
TWO EARLY MEDIEVAL APOCALYPTIC
COMMENTARIES**

Haimo of Auxerre,
**Expositio in Epistolam II ad
Thessalonicenses**
Thietland of Einsiedeln,
In Epistolam II ad Thessalonicenses

Introduced and Translated by

Steven R. Cartwright

and

Kevin L. Hughes

Published for TEAMS
(The Consortium for the Teaching
of the Middle Ages)

by
Medieval Institute Publications

WESTERN MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Kalamazoo, Michigan—2001

© 2001 by the Board of The Medieval Institute

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Second Thessalonians : two early medieval apocalyptic commentaries / introduced and translated by Steven R. Cartwright and Kevin L. Hughes.

p. cm. -- (Commentary series)

"Published for TEAMS (The Consortium for the Teaching of the Middle Ages)."

Includes bibliographical references (p.).

Contents: Expositio in Epistolam II ad Thessalonicenses / Haimo of Auxerre -- In Epistolam II ad Thessalonicenses / Thietland of Einsiedeln.

ISBN 1-58044-018-5 (pbk. : alk. paper)

I. Bible. N.T. Thessalonians, 2nd--Commentaries. I. Cartwright, Steven R. II. Hughes, Kevin L. III. Haimo, of Auxerre, d. ca. 855. Expositio in Epistolam II ad Thessalonicenses. English. IV. Thietland, of Einsiedeln, d. 965. In Epistolam II ad Thessalonicenses. English. V. Consortium for the Teaching of the Middle Ages. VI. Series.

BS2725.3 .S43 2001

227'.8107--dc21

2001030072

ISBN 978 1 58044 018 9

Cover design by Linda K. Judy

Printed and bound by CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY

Contents

Introduction Steven R. Cartwright and Kevin L. Hughes	1
Haimo of Auxerre and the Fruition of Carolingian Hermeneutics Kevin L. Hughes	13
Haimo of Auxerre: Exposition of the Second Letter to the Thessalonians Translated by Kevin L. Hughes	21
Thietland of Einsiedeln and Apocalyptic Expectation in the Tenth Century Steven R. Cartwright	35
Thietland of Einsiedeln on 2 Thessalonians Edited and translated by Steven R. Cartwright	41
Select Bibliography	77

This page intentionally left blank.

Introduction

Second Thessalonians has held the attention of the Christian Church and biblical scholars for almost two thousand years. It has been of interest almost exclusively because of its enigmatic description of the signs indicating that the end of the world is at hand. In contrast to 1 Thessalonians, which stresses that the Day of the Lord and the return of Christ will come as a thief in the night, without warning (5:1–3), the second epistle proclaims that certain events must first take place: a rebellion, and the rise of a powerful “man of sin” who will seat himself in the temple of God, presumably the Jewish temple at Jerusalem, and declare himself to be God. He will work false signs, wonders, and miracles that will deceive those who refused to receive the Christian gospel. Ultimately he will be killed by Christ himself at his own coming. This “mystery of iniquity” is already at work, but it is restrained by some unspecified power, and it is yet to be fully revealed (2:1–12).

Like much early Christian literature, 2 Thessalonians assumes that its reader is familiar with the matrix of thought we call “apocalyptic eschatology.” In general, eschatology is theological reflection upon history or time in light of its end.¹ By definition, then, all Christian reflections on history are eschatological in some sense, whether or not they emphasize the imminence of the end

and the events leading up to it. Apocalyptic eschatology is a subtype of that theological reflection which has emerged from a certain genre of texts in biblical and apocryphal literature called “apocalypses.”

The apocalypse as a genre appears in Hellenistic Judaism after ca. 250 BCE and carries over into Christian thought. John Collins has defined the genre as follows:

Apocalypse is a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework in which revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both *temporal*, insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and *spatial* insofar as it involves another, supernatural world.²

Within the genre of apocalypse, two general types can be discerned. One type emphasizes the “spatial” dimension over the “temporal,” often portraying an “otherworldly journey” into heaven. This type will not concern us here. The other type emphasizes the temporal or historical aspect more than the spatial. This historical type generally portrays a fixed course of events determined by God in time. These events generally fit a threefold pattern of “Crisis-Judgment-Reward,” and their imminent approach can usually be discerned in the historical, political, and cosmological events of the present through the revealed wisdom offered in a “sacred book.” Examples of this sort can be found in the Old Testament Book of Daniel and the New Testament Book of Revelation (or “Apocalypse of John”), as well as in brief form in the synoptic Gospels’ “little apocalypse” (Matt. 24–25). Apocalyptic eschatology is the set of ideas, including determinism,

Crisis-Judgment-Reward, etc., generated within the temporal type of apocalypse.

Apocalyptic eschatology's deterministic view of history aims to construe a present situation as either good or evil in light of the final Judgment. This moral message about the present is always a component in apocalyptic texts, and often it takes the shape of a call to believers to reaffirm their commitment to God's will.³ Thus, although the course of history is radically determined, the reader/hearer is free to choose in the present between Good and Evil, between God and God's enemies. This choice is made all the more urgent by the sense of imminence conveyed in the text. For some apocalypses, the imminence of the End is literal, perhaps predicted to the year and heralded by clear signs. Other apocalyptic writings warn explicitly against prediction—"Keep awake, therefore, for you do not know on what day your Lord is coming" (Matt. 24:42). But even without this "literal" imminence, apocalyptic eschatology possesses what Bernard McGinn has called "psychological imminence," the sense that present decisions have an ultimate significance—hence, "Keep awake!" The reader's choices are perceived always in the light of coming judgment.⁴

Apocalyptic eschatology overflows with imaginative images of cosmological cataclysms and violent combat between supernatural characters. Some of these characters are "hyperreal" beasts that stretch the imagination beyond visual composition. It is difficult to picture, for example, a "flying eagle" with "six wings" and "full of eyes all around and inside" (Rev. 4:7–8). Other characters are

anthropomorphic and, indeed, “human, all too human.” Antichrist, Christ’s final adversary, is usually portrayed in this way.⁵ Indeed, it is Antichrist’s human identity that makes him theologically interesting and existentially compelling. Although he possesses supernatural powers and conspires with Satan (supernatural Evil itself), Antichrist represents the consummation of all *human* evil. The development of the tradition is careful to preserve his humanity from the blasphemous notion that he is the incarnation of the devil. He is the personification of human resistance to the work and person of Christ. To understand him is to understand the mystery of human evil.⁶

Second Thessalonians is (arguably) the most significant theological source for the development of the doctrine of Antichrist.⁷ The letter poses something of a mystery to scholars of the New Testament. First Thessalonians is generally considered to be the earliest of Paul’s authentic letters, but contemporary scholars cannot seem to come to consensus over the authorship of 2 Thessalonians. Since medieval commentaries universally assumed that 2 Thessalonians was written by Paul, perhaps we may bracket the question for the present and continue the convention of referring to the author as “Paul.”⁸

Although the medieval exegetical history of the letter focuses upon the figure of Antichrist, this “son of Perdition” is clearly not the center of Paul’s discussion. Refuting those within the Thessalonian community who believe that the “Day of the Lord is at hand,” Paul offers the outline of an eschatological scenario that defers the “coming of the Lord” until after certain signs appear—the

apostasia, the “restraining power” and its/his removal, and the coming of the “lawless one” and all his acts. Paul’s scenario of the last events selects and condenses images from the Hellenistic Jewish apocalyptic tradition, and it has remarkable similarities to the so-called “little apocalypse” of the synoptic Gospels. It is around the frame of this condensed scenario that the doctrinal tradition of Antichrist was constructed. Theories about the “rebellion” of 2 Thess. 2:3, the personal nature of Antichrist, the relationship between Antichrist and Satan, and other doctrines are accepted, rejected, corrected, or adapted by scholars in the process of their commentary upon the text. What appears to be a rough catena of disparate beliefs in the fifth century clearly emerges as tradition (though perhaps still contested) in the ninth, twelfth, and thirteenth centuries. The commentaries on 2 Thessalonians are witness to the development of a coherent, though not univocal, Christian apocalyptic tradition. The commentaries of Haimo of Auxerre (in what is now northeastern central France) and Thietland of Einsiedeln (in today’s eastern Switzerland) represent two particular construals of that tradition.

The Antichrist in Early and Medieval Christian Apocalyptic Thought

Although the “man of sin” has commonly been thought of as the Antichrist, St. Paul himself does not use the term, either in 2 Thessalonians or in his other works. Neither is the term *Antichrist* found in the Book of Revelation or the Gospels. It is found only in the first and second epistles of

John (1 John 2:18, 2:22, 4:3; 2 John 7), where John refers both to an Antichrist and many antichrists. These antichrists were at one time part of the Church but departed from it, denying that Jesus is the Christ and that he came in the flesh. John gives no indication that these antichrists were people of power engaged in the persecution of Christians, which one finds in 2 Thessalonians and Revelation.

Nevertheless, the term *Antichrist* quickly came to be applied to the man of sin, to the beast of Revelation, and to the false christs of the Gospels.⁹ In the second century Irenaeus referred to the beast of Revelation as the Antichrist, and Tertullian applied the term to Paul's man of sin.¹⁰ Other works of that century, such as the *Apocalypse of Peter*, also mention the Antichrist as a person of power. In the early third century Hippolytus wrote two works on him,¹¹ and in the fourth Lactantius, drawing from the Sybilline Oracles (a non-Christian work frequently used by Christian apocalyptists), wrote a work identifying him as an eastern king.¹²

The legalization of Christianity in the fourth century calmed some of the apocalyptic rhetoric. Augustine, in the early fifth century, also identified the man of sin as the Antichrist, who would persecute Christians, though he did not believe that his arrival was imminent and in fact tried to discourage expectations to this effect.¹³ The collapse of Roman power in the West in the sixth century and the rise of Islam in the East in the seventh stirred up popular apocalyptic anticipations, and the legends about who the Antichrist was and what he would do multiplied greatly. By the early Middle Ages many traditions and legends

about the Antichrist had been established, some of which can be found in the commentaries of Haimo and Thietland. These traditions included the land of his origin, whether he would be born of human parents or of the devil, the signs preceding his rule, the release of Gog and Magog, the fall of the Roman Empire, the Antichrist's false teachings and miracles, and the ministries of Enoch and Elias. We can thus see that the Antichrist went from being mere apostates and heretics in the New Testament to being a truly satanic figure, a powerful political leader who would persecute Christians and deceive the rest of the world.

The coming of the Antichrist was but one aspect, albeit an important one, of the apocalyptic expectations of the early and medieval Church. The first Christians expected a quick return of Christ to establish the Kingdom of God and bring about the end of the world, and they were not greatly dismayed when this did not happen, though some began to speculate about when it might. In the second century, some Christians proclaimed that the world would last six thousand years, basing their claims on Bible passages such as Gen. 1:1–2:3, Ps. 90:4, 2 Pet. 3:8, and Heb. 4:1–11.¹⁴ When the world reached this age, it would enter a sabbath rest, in which Christ would come and end the rule of the devil. This belief came to be quite popular and persisted through the eighth century, when the Anno Domini system of dating, still in use today, replaced the age-of-the-world system (Annus Mundi, or AM).

The question was, how old was the world? From the third century on Christians gave different estimates, based on how close they believed they were to the year 6000, and whether they believed that the world would in fact end on

this date.¹⁵ These estimates were based on assigning a date to the year of Jesus' birth; in the third century Hippolytus and Julius Africanus estimated this as 5500 AM. In the fourth century Eusebius and Jerome estimated it as 5228; in the seventh, Bede estimated it as 3952. In the first case, Hippolytus estimated his date looking forward to the year 6000 and the end of the world; in the latter two cases, as the world seemed to approach 6000, those opposing such speculations revised these dates, pushing them farther back, in order to prevent end-of-the-world enthusiasm. Augustine, in the fifth century, strongly discouraged such calculations as dangerous and contrary to the Gospel. He argued against both the millennial week and the view that the thousand years of Rev. 20:1–3 should be taken as a literal number of years, beginning from Christ's passion. The thousand years, he believed, was a symbolic number, referring to the reign of the Church, the actual length of which was known only to God.¹⁶

Such opposition became the official position of clerics and theologians in the early medieval Church. Nevertheless, numerous popular apocalyptic movements arose from time to time, inspired by both genuine religiosity and the cataclysmic events of the fifth through the tenth centuries: the collapse of Rome and a series of invasions by various peoples, Germanic tribes, Arabs, Vikings, and Hungarians, all of whom devastated Europe during this period, so conjuring images of apocalyptic judgments rooted in biblical language. Apocalyptic frames of reference, it seems, are durable structures of Western Christian thought. Apocalyptic speculation, in one form or another, is as persistent at the turn of this millennium as it

was at the last. The commentaries of Haimo of Auxerre and Thietland of Einsiedeln offer glimpses of two links in this unbroken chain of the apocalyptic tradition.

Steven R. Cartwright
and Kevin L. Hughes

Notes

1. Note that eschatological reflection may address the history or life of the individual person in light of his or her end, and thus be a reflection on death and “the afterlife.” The history of eschatology shows that emphasis swings from the personal to the social and back again, depending on some “concerns of the age.”— SC
2. John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity* (New York: Crossroad, 1989), p. 4.
3. Bernard McGinn, “John’s Apocalypse and the Apocalyptic Mentality,” in *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, ed. Richard K. Emmerson and Bernard McGinn (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1992), pp. 8ff.
4. McGinn, “John’s Apocalypse,” p. 13.
5. See Bernard McGinn, *Antichrist: Two Thousand Years of the Human Fascination with Evil* (New York: HarperCollins, 1994), pp. 68–70, 72–73, 103–07, for discussion of images and physical descriptions of Antichrist in the patristic and medieval periods.
6. For a more developed discussion of Antichrist’s humanity and why it is theologically significant, see the introduction of McGinn, *Antichrist*, pp. 1–7.

7. Horst-Dieter Rauh, *Das Bild des Antichrist im Mittelalter: von Tyconius zum deutschen Symbolismus* (Münster: Verlag Aschendorff, 1973), p. 55.

8. The classic critique of its Pauline authenticity was offered by Wilhelm Wrede in 1903 (Wilhelm Wrede, *Die Echtheit der zweiten Thessalonischer-Briefs Untersucht*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, neue Folge 9/2 [Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1903]). Wrede argued that the literary dependence of the second letter on the first is unmatched anywhere in the Pauline corpus, and thus not terribly characteristic of Paul. In addition, he pointed to the apparent differences in apocalyptic outlook between 1 Thess. 5:1–11 (with an apparent emphasis on the nearness and unpredictability of the “Day of the Lord”) and 2 Thess. 2:1–13 (with its orientation toward clear signs of the future coming) and argued that they could not credibly be argued to have emerged from the same pen. Wrede’s first argument has proven most durable; scholars of all sorts have failed to refute his analysis persuasively.

Robert Jewett has offered perhaps the most recent and intriguing attempt (Robert Jewett, *The Thessalonian Correspondence: Pauline Rhetoric and Millenarian Piety* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986]). Using traditional historical criticism, rhetorical analysis, and social-model theory, Jewett tries to construct a plausible millenarian setting in Thessalonica in which Paul’s first evangelical strategy backfired, forcing him to use more caution and speak more explicitly of the deferred end. Jewett’s combination of methods builds a most interesting mousetrap, but one which ultimately fails to persuade the reader that Paul would so slavishly echo his own style in a follow-up letter. Wrede’s sharp historical-critical analysis stands.

Scholars also fail to present a plausible alternative scenario for forgery. Frank Witt Hughes has argued that 2 Thessalonians is evidence of conflict between two later Pauline schools (Frank Witt Hughes, “Early Christian Rhetoric and 2 Thessalonians”, *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, Supp. Ser. 30, [1989]). Second Thessalonians is written by the more apocalyptic of the two to refute the more realized eschatology of Ephesians and Colossians. But the letter’s close attention to what seems to be a particular situation in Thessalonica

seems to make that claim questionable. Karl Donfried has argued that the letter, while not written by Paul, comes from his circle, maybe even from Timothy, who shares in the salutation (Karl Donfried and I. Howard Marshal, *The Theology of the Shorter Pauline Letters* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993]). While I can claim no expertise in these matters, I find persuasive Donfried's attention to the similarities and possible connections between the two. In any case, I will side with Donfried and Bernard McGinn and treat both letters as evidence of Pauline eschatology from the late AD 50s, whether or not the text of 2 Thessalonians actually issued from Paul's hand.—KLH

9. For discussion of the development of the Antichrist tradition, see Richard Kenneth Emmerson, *Antichrist in the Middle Ages: A Study of Medieval Apocalypticism, Art, and Literature* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1981); and also McGinn, *Antichrist*. For a specific discussion of the relationship of the Antichrist tradition to 2 Thessalonians, see Kevin L. Hughes, "The Apostle and the Adversary: Paul and Antichrist in the Early Medieval Exegesis of 2 Thessalonians," (Ph.D. Diss., University of Chicago, 1997).

10. Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* 5.29.2 and 5.30.1–3, cited by Emmerson, *Antichrist*, p. 40; and Tertullian, *De carnis resurrectione*, cited by Emmerson, *Antichrist*, p. 21.

11. Hippolytus, *De christo et antichristo*, in *Hippolytus Werke*, ed. G. N. Bonwetsch, Bd. 1/1 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1897), and *Commentaire sur Daniel*, Sources Chrétiennes 14 (Paris: Cerf, 1947).

12. Lactantius, *Divinae institutiones*, ed. S. Brandt, *Corpus Scriptorum, Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, 19/1 (Vienna, 1890), pp. 580–672.

13. *City of God* XX.19, cited extensively by Thietland, as we shall see.

14. See *The Epistle of Barnabas* 13:1–6.

15. For a fuller discussion of this chronology, see Richard Landes, "Lest the Millenium Be Fulfilled: Apocalyptic Expectations and the Pattern of Western Chronography, 100–800 CE," in *The Use and Abuse of*

Eschatology in the Middle Ages, Mediaevalia Lovaniensia, ser. 1, studia 15, ed. Werner Verbeke, Daniel Verhelst, and Andries Welkenhuysen (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1988), pp.137–211, on which this paragraph is based.

16. *City of God* XVIII.53, XX.7, 9.

Haimo of Auxerre and the Fruition of Carolingian Hermeneutics

Kevin L. Hughes

Haimo of Auxerre is a bit of a cipher. Confused with several other contemporary Haimos, especially Haimo, bishop of Halberstadt and disciple of Rabanus Maurus, the Auxerre master was all but forgotten for nearly a millennium. Yet his commentaries on much of Scripture are among the most innovative and learned in the Carolingian era. His commentary on 2 Thessalonians preserves a great deal of the patristic inheritance and is perhaps the most influential of all upon the later medieval world. It is both an exemplary manifestation of the Carolingian Renaissance and the essential link between patristic and high medieval exegesis of Paul and Antichrist.

The monk and master of Auxerre has had something of his own renaissance in twentieth-century scholarship. Since Eduard Riggenbach demonstrated 1907 that the commentaries attributed in the *Patrologia Latina* to Haimo the bishop of Halberstadt were actually the work of another Haimo, at Auxerre,¹ a few scholars have pursued relentlessly a “quest for the historical Haimo.” The gains have been real and measurable, as these scholars have reclaimed many works for the monk of Auxerre and

have found traces and hints of his thought in the work of his Auxerre disciples.² John J. Contreni recovered a sermon on 1 John 5 that indicates that the rumors of Haimo's death in 865 CE may have been wrong, that he in fact became the abbot of Sasceium (Cessy-les-Bois) in or ca. 865, and continued as abbot there until his death ca. 875 CE.³ Through the diligence of four generations of scholars, we may now know more about Haimo than has anyone since his death.

Yet the sum total of biographical details is still scant. He was probably born in the early years of the ninth century in *Francia*. He was a monk of St. Germain at Auxerre. While little is known of his personal life and actions, scattered references in the work of Remigius of Auxerre lead to the conclusion that he was active in the school of Auxerre between 840 and 860 CE. The great majority of his work, including his Pauline commentary, probably dates from this period, but it is difficult to determine which works are authentic or to arrange them in any particular chronological order. As I have noted, it appears that Haimo left the Abbey of St. Germain to become abbot of Sasceium (Cessy-les-Bois) in ca. 865, where he remained until his death ca. 875. But there is no firm evidence of his actions as abbot or any testimony to his role in the doctrinal controversies of his day.

Nevertheless, with the benefit of hindsight, Haimo's exegesis stands out among the work of his contemporaries. Beryl Smalley begrudgingly concedes that Haimo "stands on the line that divides the compiler of select extracts from the author of a commentary,"⁴ plotting him just short of the breakthrough into original biblical

scholarship. As this is more than she is willing to concede to most Carolingians, Haimo gets relatively high marks. Recent scholarship has been more generous. Haimo's scholarship is most distinctively his in its exegetical method. It represents the confluence of theological tradition and methodological innovation, thus, in one scholar's opinion, anticipating scholasticism by nearly three centuries.⁵

The first step in Haimo's method consists of proceeding through the text *lemma* by *lemma*. He does not quote every word of every verse, but rather he draws out the significant portions in each lemma. He gives grammatical and lexical notes to various words in the text, making note of textual variations from the Vulgate and Greek words and their Latin equivalents. To each lemma he gives a clarification, often introduced by his hallmark word, *subaudi*, *subaudis*, *subauditur* ("to be understood as"), or *ac si diceret* ("as if to say"), or *et est sensus* ("and this is the sense").

Haimo rarely quotes his sources directly, instead giving the "sense" or kernel of their teachings. This summary style permits him to contrast the plurality of interpretations among his authorities,⁶ but he rarely makes any attempt to resolve the conflict. Instead, he strings the various interpretations together with a simple transition like *aliter* ("otherwise"). Indeed, Haimo rarely shows any indication that he finds any logical contradiction among the various opinions; he seems to find it unnecessary to give one proper interpretation. While Haimo often introduces *quaestiones* into his exegetical work, these are seldom used to oppose authorities in the manner of "yes"

and “no” answers as Abelard later would; rather, they seem to reflect his curiosity about the details of the text.

The sheer breadth of Haimo’s knowledge testifies to his immersion in and mastery of the Latin theological tradition. The ease with which Haimo weaves his sources into his commentary and his general reluctance to cite his sources by name can obscure the vast variety of resources he brings to bear upon the interpretation of Scripture. His work of course bears the imprint of the major Church Fathers, but he also draws upon more contemporary authorities such as Alcuin, Claudius of Turin, and Rabanus Maurus. His theology is rigorously orthodox; his exegesis often includes summaries of exegetical errors made by various heretics in the history of the Church, including the recent adoptionist error of Felix of Urgel.⁷ He also displays a smattering of knowledge of classical Latin texts (he often quotes Vergil) and apocryphal scriptural sources. Haimo manipulates a tremendous library of resources in order to interpret the great majority of both Testaments of Scripture, proving himself to be one of the virtuoso exegetes in the Carolingian Renaissance and in the history of Christianity as a whole.

The commentary on the Epistles of Paul is a keynote in Haimo’s work. Dominique Iogna-Prat has lauded “the originality of its development and its reasoned use of previous commentaries” and called it “a highpoint in the Pauline exegetical tradition.”⁸ Since Eduard Riggenbach demonstrated the proper attribution in 1907, his work has been the criterion by which other works are attributed to the elusive Haimo.⁹ The work is a comprehensive commentary on the Pauline corpus, including the minor letters

to Titus and Philemon. The text as a whole lacks a preface in the surviving manuscripts, but Haimo begins his exegesis of each letter with an extensive *argumentum* setting it in an historical context. The Migne edition of the text contains some considerable gaps in the commentaries on Galatians, Colossians, and Titus, but Migne's version of the 2 Thessalonians commentary is more or less reliable. In examination of four seemingly-independent manuscripts, I found only minor variations in word order and occasional word choice, and none of these affects the sense of the text dramatically. This translation is based on the Migne text.¹⁰

The commentary on 2 Thessalonians is certainly not the keystone of Haimo's Pauline commentary. The full strength of Haimo's great exegetical prowess is better displayed in his commentaries on Romans and Hebrews, where vital and perennial theological issues at the core of the Christian message arise and where the wealth of source material is so much greater. Nevertheless, Haimo's commentary on this less prominent letter is a highpoint in the history of 2 Thessalonians exegesis. The formidable exegetical hands of Haimo forge earlier traditions into a moderate synthesis of perspectives on the crisis and judgment of the End of the world. Curiously enough, Haimo, whose Apocalypse commentary is *very* Augustinian, excludes the Latin spiritual tradition from his exegesis of 2 Thessalonians. His 2 Thessalonians commentary offers a literal reading of the apocalyptic tradition that he seems to have reserved for Paul alone.¹¹ For Haimo, Paul's second letter to the Thessalonians teaches in a literal fashion the events of the end.

This is not to say that Haimo was an apocalyptic enthusiast, by any estimation. The apocalyptic climate at the time of his writing is probably lost to us. Richard Landes has argued that the fact that Charlemagne's coronation took place on the first day of the year AM (Annus Mundi) 6000 was obscured by the new and popular AD system propagated by Bede and followed by most of the Carolingians.¹² If there were any such stirrings at Charlemagne's coronation, they do not seem to disturb Haimo's tranquility on the subject. Haimo shows no explicit faith in a *translatio imperii* from Rome to Aachen. He states rather matter-of-factly that the Roman Empire has already fallen, and yet Antichrist has not come. He resolves this apparent problem by arguing that the text does not say that Antichrist will follow the fall of Rome immediately, but only that first Rome will fall, and then later Antichrist will come. The text contains chronological sequence but no sense of imminence. Haimo can thus claim that we now live in an intermediate time between two apocalyptic events. The latter event could happen at any time, or it could be forestalled for a long time. In Haimo's work we find neither the prediction of an imminent end nor the aggressive effort to dissuade his audience that the end is not imminent.

Notes

1. Eduard Riggenbach, *Die ältesten lateinischen Kommentare zum Hebräerbrief* (Leipzig: A. Deichert, 1907).

2. See esp. Riggenbach, as above; Riccardo Quadri, "Aimone di Auxerre alla Luce dei 'Collectanea' di Heiric di Auxerre," *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica* 6 (1963), 1–48; H. Barré, "Haymon d'Auxerre," *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité ascétique et mystique: doctrine et histoire*, 7 (Paris: G. Beauchesne, 1969), pp. 91–97; John J. Contreni, "The Biblical Glosses of Haimo of Auxerre and John Scottus Eriugena," *Speculum* 51 (1976), 411–434. Each contains a more complete bibliography.

3. John J. Contreni, "Haimo of Auxerre, Abbot of Sasceium (Cessy-les-Bois), and a New Sermon on I John V, 4–10," *Revue bénédictine* 85 (1975), 303–20.

4. Beryl Smalley, *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1964), p. 40.

5. E. Bertola, "I commentario paolino di Haimo de Halberstadt o di Auxerre e gli inizi del metodo scolastico," *Pier Lombardo* 5 (1961), 29–54; idem, "I precedenti storici del metodo del *Sic et non* di Abelardo," *Rivista di filosofia neoscolastica* 53 (1961), 255–80.

6. This sets him apart from Rabanus, who quotes his authorities in large chunks of text addressing several lemmata at once. It also sets him even further apart from the Lyons school, where different commentaries were developed for each Church Father.

7. Indeed, Riggenbach considers that his overarching concern to defend against heresy is one of the definitive elements in Haimo's thought. Riggenbach and Contreni have accumulated lists of several hundred texts that refer to heretics in general, to Donatists, Novatians, Arians, Sabellians, Photinians, etc. See Riggenbach, *Die ältesten lateinischen Kommentare*, p. 69; and John J. Contreni, "Haimo of Auxerre," p. 309. It should be noted that while Haimo and his contemporaries had no doubt that Felix's adoptionism was evidence of the resurgence of heretical Nestorianism, John C. Cavadini's study of so-called "Spanish Adoptionism" has shed serious doubt upon this judgment. See John C. Cavadini, *The Last Christology of the West: Adoptionism in Spain and Gaul, 785–820* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993).

8. Dominique Iogna-Prat, "L'Œuvre d'Haymon d'Auxerre: État de la question," in *L'École Carolingienne d'Auxerre: de Murethach à Rémi, 830–908*, ed. D. Iogna-Prat, Colette Jeudy, and Guy Lobrichon (Paris: Beauchesne, 1991) p. 161.

9. Iogna-Prat, "L'œuvre d'Haymon d'Auxerre," p. 161.

10. *Patrologia Latina*, 117:765–84. My study of manuscripts was in no way comprehensive. The text survives in some form in 166 manuscripts, and a thorough critical evaluation of most or even the majority of these manuscripts was beyond the scope of this project. The manuscripts I consulted were: (A) Admont 160, (B) Bonn (Koblenz, Jesuiten) 288, (C) Bonn (Eberhardsklausen) 289, and (D) Schlägl 194. A and D are twelfth-century Gothic *textualis* on parchment; B and C are fifteenth-century, on paper. The variants are few and insignificant. My thanks to the Hill Monastic Manuscript Library and especially Father Gregory Sebastian, OSB, for their assistance.

11. This conclusion is provisional, since it awaits study of the Matthew commentary that may be Haimo's. I have not seen the text, nor have I seen any study of the "little apocalypse" of Matt. 24. If it is authentic, and if the interpretation favors an apocalyptic realist interpretation (as I suspect it would), then apocalyptic realism is not Pauline, and the discrepancy between the Apocalypse commentary and that on 2 Thessalonians tells us more about the former than the latter. My initial exploration of the contrast between these two texts came at the suggestion of E. Ann Matter in her article "The Apocalypse in Early Medieval Exegesis," in *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, ed. Richard K. Emmerson and Bernard McGinn (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1992), pp. 38–50.

12. Richard Landes, "Lest the Millennium Be Fulfilled: Apocalyptic Expectations and the Pattern of Western Chronography, 100–800 CE" in *The Use and Abuse of Eschatology in the Middle Ages*, *Mediaevalia Lovaniensia*, ser. 1, studia 15, ed. Werner Verbeke, Daniel Verhelst, and Andries Welkenhuysen (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1988).

**HAIMO OF AUXERRE
EXPOSITION OF THE SECOND LETTER
TO THE THESSALONIANS**

. Edited and translated by Kevin L. Hughes

Prologue

The Thessalonians had received the first letter [1 Thessalonians], and as they read, they came to the place where the Apostle speaks of the role of the elect who are still alive on the Day of Judgment. There he says, “Then we who are alive, who are left, suddenly will be caught up with them [the resurrected] to meet Christ in the air” (1 Thess. 4:17). When they had read this, they were upset and utterly terrified, since they thought that the Apostle was saying that in his own lifetime, and thus in theirs, too, the Lord would come in judgment. They were afraid that they would be cast into the dungeon of eternal punishment with the devil, because, as latecomers to the faith, they were imperfect. So the Apostle wrote this second letter to them as soon as he learned of their despair. In it, he indicated to them that the Day of Judgment was not yet imminent in their lifetime. He then showed them that first the Kingdom of the Romans must be destroyed [before the Day of Judgment], although he did this secretly and obscurely. For he did not dare to write openly about the destruction of the Roman kingdom, lest he stir up

persecution of the believers.¹ He also announces the coming of Antichrist and his death.

Chapter 1

(1:1) **Paul and Silvanus:** The beginning is the same [as that of 1 Thessalonians], and so is the sense that we have already discussed.

(1:3) **Your faith grows:** Faith needs to grow, as when the apostles say to the Lord, “Increase our faith” (Luke 17:5), and so in another place: “I believe, Lord, help my unbelief” (Mark 9:23).

(1:4) **We ourselves boast in the tribulations which you have endured as an example of the just judgment of God.** As we are able to gather from the words of Prosper and the other doctors, nothing happens in this world unless it is done or permitted by God.² Thus the holy martyrs and other faithful people endured many dangers and adversities in this world by God’s allowance as an example of the just judgment of God, since through them it was shown that if those who were loved by God suffered such things, how much greater and more severe things will the reprobate and enemies of the martyrs receive on the Day of the Just Judgment of God. He calls the judgment of God “just” because then God will judge the world equally.

(1:6) **If indeed [*si tamen*] it is just for God to repay** bad things for bad and good things for good. **If**, a conjunction of cause, is used in this case not for the purpose of

doubting but for affirmation, as if he were saying, “Since [*quoniam*] it is just for God to do thus.” (1:7) **In the revelation**, that is, manifestation, **of the Lord Jesus from heaven**, coming to judge, **with the angels of his power**, just as he himself says: “When the Son of Man will come, and all the angels with him” (Matt. 25:31). and in the revelation of the Lord Jesus (1:8) **bringing judgment** to the reprobate, **in the flame of fire to those who do not know God**, that is, the pagans **and who do not obey the Gospel**, evidently, the heretics, the false Christians, and the Jews. Well does he say that the Lord will deliver vengeance upon the reprobate “in the flame of fire” since fire will precede him, filling as much space in the air as water did in the Flood. This fire will burn the earth and the thickness of the air, and it will purify the elect. But the reprobate, hearing from the Lord, “Go into the eternal fire” (Matt. 25:41), will be overwhelmed by that very fire and be swept away to the torments of Hell.

(1:9) **They**, the reprobate, **will give eternal punishment in death** They will give punishment to others, but they also will give it to and inflict it upon themselves: since they do evil things for which they receive in like measure. Also, “to give” is in some cases substituted for “to suffer or bear,” as in Virgil: “And for blood-red locks, Scylla gives punishment,”³ that is, bears or suffers punishment. So likewise these reprobate will “give punishment”—they will suffer it. (1:10) **when he will come to be glorified in his saints**, that is, to appear to them, brilliant and enticing, but to the reprobate terrible and fierce. **Since our testimony has been believed among you**, that is, since we received the Gospel and you believed our

preaching, **on that day**, that is, because of that day, that he may present the Gospel as testimony of your belief on that day, and that you may receive eternal reward. (1:11) **For which**— in other words, in this matter, **we pray**, or we pray for this, **always for you**, etc.

Chapter 2

(2:1) **We beseech you, brothers, as to the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ and of our gathering into him.** We read of two comings of the Lord, the first in humility, the second in power, when he will come in judgment.⁴ This account is given of the latter. He calls the multitude of the elect this “gathering,” either that crowd which will come with him or which will meet with him for judgment. *Into him* he says as if it were *in him*, since all the elect are in Christ, as members joined to him. **We beseech you, brothers, as to the coming of the Lord Jesus**, for judgment, and as to the coming of our gathering into him, that is, of all the saints who remain in him, (2:2) **that you not be easily moved**, that is, that you not easily be disturbed, **nor be frightened, as if the day of the Lord approaches, by spirit**, that is if someone will say that he has been warned by the Holy Spirit that the Day of the Lord is imminent, do not believe him and do not be frightened by his words, **nor by word**, that is, by a pamphlet. If someone says to you that he is an exegete and interpreter of prophecies: “I have gathered the meaning of the prophet Isaiah and Daniel and the other prophets, and I foresee that the Day of Judgment is imminent and that

Christ is coming to judge,” likewise, do not be afraid.⁵ **And not by some letter supposedly sent by us.** If some pseudo-apostle should forge such a thing, do not believe him.

(2:3) **Since, unless the desertion comes first,** that every kingdom may desert the reign and authority of the Romans: **and the man of sin** obviously Antichrist, who, though he is a man, will be the source of all sins **the son of damnation** that is, the son of the devil, not by nature, but through imitation. The devil is called “damnation,” since damnation came through him and he himself damned the human race **is revealed** or, is made manifest.

(2:4) **The one who opposes** that is, he is against Christ and all his members, **and is exalted** or is lifted up in pride **above everything that is called “God” or is worshiped;** What he [Antichrist] claims is not true: *above what is called “God” or what is worshiped.* Antichrist will extoll himself above everything which is called “God,” that is, above all the gods of the Gentiles: Hercules, for example, and Apollo and Jove, who falsely are called “gods,” and also above all the elect, who are formally called gods, as in Moses, who says, “Behold, I make you the god of Pharaoh”(Exod. 7:1). And in the law: “Do not revile the gods” (Exod. 22:28), that is, the priests; and, finally, “I say, ‘You are gods’”(Ps. 81[82]:6). Thus will Antichrist extoll himself over all these and claim that he is greater than they. Not only greater than these, but also (which is more important) [he will claim to be] **above everything that is worshiped,** that is, above the Holy Trinity which alone should be worshiped and adored by all creatures. He will extoll himself so much **that he will sit in the temple**

of God, displaying himself as if he were a god. We can understand this phrase in two ways: Antichrist will be born in Babylon from the tribe of Dan, like what Jacob says: “May Dan be a serpent on the road, a viper on the path”(Gen. 46:17). He will come to Jerusalem and circumcise himself, telling the Jews, “I am the messiah promised to you.” Then all the Jews will flood to him. They will rebuild the temple that the Romans destroyed, and he will sit there saying that he is Christ.⁶ Or also, he will sit **in the temple of God**, that is, the Church, **displaying himself as if he were a god.** For just as every fullness of divinity reposed in Christ, so the fullness of vice and every iniquity will dwell in that person called Antichrist, because he is the opposite of Christ. Indeed, the devil, the head of all the evil ones, king over all the sons of pride, will be in him. With these words, the Apostle demonstrates to the Thessalonians that the Lord will not come in judgment before the collapse of Roman rule, which we already see completed, and the appearance in the world of Antichrist, who will kill the witnesses of Christ.

(2:5) Do you not remember that I told you this when I was with you? About the coming of Antichrist and the Day of Judgment.

(2:6) So now you know what restrains, that he may be revealed in his own time. He says “You know what restrains” and he does not show what it is. But the best way to understand this is as signifying the destruction of the reign of the Romans. He speaks of this obscurely lest some Roman would read this letter and rouse up a persecution against him and other Christians among those

who thought that they would always reign over the whole world. **You know**, he says, **what restrains** that Antichrist, that is, what delays him, since the rule of the Romans is not yet destroyed, nor have all the nations deserted them. **That he may be revealed**, or Antichrist himself made manifest, **in his own time**, that is, at the proper time set by God, after all the kingdoms have deserted the Roman Empire.

(2:7) **For the mystery of iniquity is already at work** *Mysterium* in Greek is something hidden and secret in the Latin vocabulary. Thus, he calls the murder of the holy martyrs and the persecution of Christ's faithful carried out by Nero and his princes the 'mystery of iniquity.' This is called a 'mystery' because what the devil works openly through Antichrist when he kills the holy martyrs Elijah and Enoch and all the rest, this he already does secretly through his own members, Nero and his princes, killing through those princes the apostolic martyrs. Thus the mystery of iniquity was begun by Nero, who, with his father the devil secretly urging him on, killed the holy martyrs in his zeal for idols. It continued up to Diocletian and Julian the Apostate, who slew many saints.⁷ So just as Christ, who is the head of all the elect, was prefigured secretly and in mystery long before his coming in the death of Abel, in the sacrifice of Isaac, and in King David, who slew Goliath (Goliath represented the devil, whom Christ subdued in his death and suffering), so too the devil who will be in Antichrist is prefigured secretly and in mystery in his members—obviously, in evil kings. **So what now holds may hold until it be taken from the midst.** That is, this alone remains, that Nero, who now

holds all authority in the world, will hold it long enough until the power of the Romans is taken from the center of the world. In “Nero,” he includes every Roman emperor who held the imperial scepter after him. And so he says, “Until it is taken from the midst,” since from all sides, from every nation things converge at Rome, and, as if it were at the center of the world, it has every nation in its circle. Or what is between the beginning and the end can be called the midst.

(2:8) **And now** meaning when power will have been stripped away from the Roman Empire **that man of iniquity** Antichrist **will be revealed** or made manifest, **whom the Lord Jesus will kill with the breath of his mouth**. Whether the Lord Jesus will kill him with the power of his cry or Michael will kill him, he will be killed by the power of the Lord Jesus.⁸ And so he will be killed (as the doctors hand on to us) on his throne on the Mount Olivet in Babylon, in the place across from where the Lord ascended into heaven.⁹ Indeed, when the Apostle says that the man of iniquity will be revealed after the Roman Empire has been destroyed, we should not think that he said that he will come immediately, but that first the empire will be destroyed, and afterwards Antichrist will come at a time set by God. **And in the brilliance** or brightness **of his coming, he** the Lord **Jesus will destroy him**, that is, Antichrist (2:9) **whose coming is according to the work of Satan**. This pertains to the Day of Judgment itself, when Antichrist will be destroyed with all his members. For they will hear from the Lord: Go into the eternal fire! (Matt. 25:41). It should be noted that the Lord will not come immediately to judge when Antichrist

has been killed, but, as we learn from the Book of Daniel, after his death the elect will be given forty-five days for penance. Indeed, it is completely unknown how long the span of time may be before the Lord comes.¹⁰ And when he says, **whose coming is according to the work of Satan**, it should be understood that whatever he does, with the devil inciting him and cooperating with him, the devil will complete. The devil will possess him completely, but he will not give up his senses, so that he might say foolishly that he does not know God, nor will he be seized by the devil like madmen. For if he were, he would have no sin in whatever he does, just as those who suffer madness do not, for they do not know what they do.¹¹ **In all power, with lying signs and prodigies** meaning the coming of Antichrist will be ‘in all power,’ etc. Signs and prodigies are one and the same. Thus he will work in lying signs and prodigies when he will appear to resurrect the dead and do many other signs, but these are lies and foreign to the truth since he will delude men through magical art and illusion, just as Simon Magus deceived the one who, thinking he was killing Simon, beheaded a ram in his place.¹² Or also his coming will be in lying signs and prodigies because he will hand people over to false worship, that is, to worshipping him who is the lie and the father of lies, through false signs and prodigies. (2:10) **And with every seduction or deception of iniquity** he will be **for those who are perishing**, that is, the Jews and pagans, because they did not welcome the love of truth that they may be saved, that is, the spirit of Christ who said, “I am the truth,” the Holy Spirit through whom the love of God is poured forth deep in our hearts.¹³ And

so since they wish to receive neither Christ nor the Holy Spirit, (2:11) **God will send to them the work of error**, that is, he will permit Antichrist, the worker of lies, to come to them. It is better that he says 'work' than 'worker,' since he will send the very thing to them, that is, the lie itself and the father of all lies and iniquities. (2:12) **That all who have not believed in the truth, Christ, but have consented to iniquity, the devil, may believe in the lie**, that is, the devil **in order to be judged** or damned . . . (2:13) **because God has chosen us** apostles, **the firstfruits of salvation** of all the nations. Apostles are the firstfruits because they were the first to believe. (2:14) . . . **to acquire the glory of the Lord Jesus**, that is, that you, gathered into the faith through our preaching, may work to increase the body of Christ, and that he may be glorified and praised through you in this manner: That they may see your good works and glorify your Father who is in heaven. (2:16) **God the Father who has loved us** so much that he gave his own Son for us **and has given us eternal consolation** by promising to us the Kingdom of Heaven, **and good hope**, the expectation of the good things to come, **in His grace**, not in our merit, (2:17) **may encourage**, that is, instruct **our hearts**.

Chapter 3

(3:1) **As for the rest, brothers, pray for us, that the Word of the Lord may hasten** from our mouth to your ears, and from your ears to your heart, and thus be turned into works. (3:2) **That we may be freed from troublesome people** who are not standing at the gate of peace. (3:5) **May the Lord direct your hearts**, that is, whatever strength you have, he may strengthen you and make you walk the straight path of life, fixing your steps firmly in doing good. **In the love of God and next in the patience of Christ** that you may be patient among the adversities of this world, just as Christ bore patiently the reproaches, the mockeries, the scourging, and the cross. Or, as some texts have it, **in the expectation of Christ**, that you may await the coming of Christ in judgment. (3:8) **We have not eaten bread for free**, that is, without labor. (3.14) **If some do not obey the word**—meaning ours or yours, that they not be lazy **through this letter**—meaning yours—**make note of this** to us, and we will rebuke them. (3:17) **This greeting is in my hand, the hand of Paul, which is the seal on every letter.** At the end of every letter he wrote his name both in Hebrew letters and in the Greek, lest what may come from one of the pseudo-apostles may be allowed to corrupt them. **Thus I write:** in the same way (3:18) **The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.**

Notes

1. This commonplace assertion in the tradition can be found in Jerome, *Epistle 121*, CSEL 56:54, and in Ambrosiaster, *In epistolam beati Pauli ad Thessalonicenses secundam*, CSEL 81:235.

2. Note that Haimo here cites the authoritative interpreter of Augustine, Prosper of Aquitaine, rather than Augustine himself. For Prosper, and for the Council of Orange (CE529) that depended upon his writings, the notion that Augustine seemed to permit, that God willed the damnation of the reprobate, was anathema. Thus, providence required that God either do *or permit* all things to happen in the world. Though he had no public role in the predestinarian controversy around Gottschalk of Orbais, it is clear from this text and others that Haimo subscribed to the moderate mainstream position represented by Hincmar of Rheims and his party. See Haimo, *Expositio in epistolam ad romanos*, PL 117:456C, for a clearer statement of Haimo's doctrine of predestination. For a more general discussion of the "predestinarian controversy" of the ninth century, see Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition, 3: The Growth of Medieval Theology 600–1300* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), pp. 80–99.

3. Virgil, *Georgics*, ed. Richard F. Thomas (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 1.405.

4. In Jerome, *Ep. 121*, CSEL 56:54.

5. Jerome, *Ep. 121*, CSEL 56:54.

6. Cf. Hippolytus, *De Christo et Antichristo* 14–15. in *Hippolytus Werke*, ed. G. N. Bonwetsch, Bd. 1/1 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1897).

7. Ambrosiaster, CSEL 81.2.7, p. 240.

8. This confusion, whether Michael or Christ himself will kill Antichrist, is rooted in Gregory the Great, who asserted both the former (*Homilies on the Gospels* 2.34.9, PL 76:1251B) and the latter (*Moralia in iob* 32.15.27, CCSL 143B:1650).

9. Cf. Jerome, *Commentariorum in Danielelem*, CCSL 75A:933–34.

10. As Robert Lerner has shown, the seeds of this notion of delay before the Last Judgment are sown in Hippolytus and Jerome. Haimo is the first to bring the teaching into the tradition of 2 Thessalonians commentary, and he adds his own editorial comment. He seems to suggest that the forty-five days deduced from Daniel may symbolize an undetermined period of time. Robert E. Lerner, “The Refreshment of the Saints: The Time after Antichrist as a Station for Earthly Progress in Medieval Thought,” *Traditio* 32 (1976), 97–144. Lerner interprets Haimo’s comment to mean that there will be forty-five days *and then* a “span of time, however small.” I disagree with this reading of the text, but the disagreement is insignificant. Either way, Haimo’s point is to make the duration of the delay elastic.

11. Many classical and early Christian medical dictionaries discuss *phrenesis* as demonic possession, but I have been unable to locate a specific reference to the issue of moral culpability.

12. This vignette can be found in the apocryphal “Acts of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul,” in *Twelve Patriarchs, Excerpts and Epistles* . . . , ed. C. Richardson, Ante-Nicene Fathers, 8 (Grand Rapids, Mich.: William B. Eerdmans, 1981), p. 482. This is the first appearance of this story I have been able to find in the exegetical traditions concerning Antichrist and the End.

13. Cf. Jerome, *Epistle 121*, CSEL 56:58.

This page intentionally left blank.

Thietland of Einsiedeln and Apocalyptic Expectation in the Tenth Century

Steven R. Cartwright

The speculation that the world would end in the year 6000 had largely died out by time the Anno Domini system of dating was adopted by the Carolingians. This allowed the old speculation that the millennium began either with Christ's birth or ascension to revive, and in the tenth century concern mounted among some—but by no means all—clerics that the world would end and the Antichrist be released either in 1000 or 1033. There is evidence of popular preachers, fueled by the violence of the time as well as by unusual natural phenomena, proclaiming even earlier ends. It can be argued that those arguing for 1000 or 1033, such as Thietland did, were themselves trying to suppress these popular movements, though in fact they also were teaching contrary to the accepted doctrine that this thousand years was not to be taken literally. Even those who did not predict any kind of end added to speculation.

Perhaps the most prominent example of this sort of anxious conservatism is the treatise *On the Origin and Time of the Antichrist*, written by Thietland's contemporary Adso of Montier-en-Der.¹ Unlike Thietland, Adso made no predictions or statements about when the

Antichrist would come, only that he would come, and with what signs. In this sense Adso was following the well-established Augustinian tradition of scrupulously avoiding any such predictions, a tradition followed by almost every commentator on the Antichrist and the apocalyptic passages of the Bible up to the tenth century. But to this rather conservative discussion of Antichrist, Adso adds a note that one of the signs of the End will be the failure of the “Frankish kings” a startling observation in the unsteady political climate of the tenth century. It seems that the best conservative estimate that Adso could offer was that Antichrist’s arrival would be forestalled for at least a few years.² Adso’s treatise was so widely read that one may conclude a strong interest even among the small number of literate people living in the tenth century.

The year 1000, and then 1033, came and went with no apocalypse. Apocalyptic fever waned for a time, though it was always present, and it began to return in the thirteenth century and flourished in the fourteenth, inspired by wars, social turmoil, and the Black Death. As the year 2000 approaches it continues to thrive, and doubtless will after the millennium turns in 2001.

We know little about Thietland; he arrived at the monastery of Einsiedeln, in Swabia, modern-day eastern Switzerland, sometime between 943 and 945, nine to eleven years after it was founded in 934. He gradually assumed positions of greater and greater importance in the abbey, which itself was becoming an important monastery in the Holy Roman Empire, favored by the emperor Otto with gifts of land and money as well as privileges. He became abbot around 958, resigned around 964, and died

in 965. He wrote commentaries on several of the Epistles of St. Paul: Romans, 1 Corinthians, Ephesians, Philippians, and 1 and 2 Thessalonians. The manuscripts containing these commentaries also contain commentaries on 2nd Corinthians and Galatians, but these are the works of Atto, bishop of Vercelli (d. 960), on whose own Pauline commentaries Thietland based the first four of his own.

The latter two commentaries, on Paul's Thessalonian correspondence, are not based on Atto's works, since Atto commented only through Philippians. Although they are thoroughly rooted in patristic thought, they show Thietland doing his own research and exposition and are all the more interesting for that; one finds in them occasional vague references to the difficulties of mid-tenth-century Swabia, which included Arab and Hungarian raids as well as noble feuds. For example, in his commentary on 1 Thessalonians, Thietland describes the Thessalonians, who suffered persecutions after accepting Paul's gospel, as examples of how his monks should endure persecutions, should they themselves experience them, either at the hands of locals or of outsiders.

In this commentary on 2 Thessalonians, Thietland alludes to other difficulties. He complains about "evil Catholics" who do not live according to their beliefs, and who will be judged accordingly. He notes how the good and the evil are mixed together in the world. He also mentions "heretics" who go about proclaiming that the Day of the Lord is at hand. Although one may see this latter concern simply as an exposition of the text without

reference to any current events, one may also consider it in the light of the popular apocalyptic preaching in the early Middle Ages that often proclaimed an imminent end. If Thietland did know of preachers proclaiming in the middle of the tenth century that the end of the world was close at hand, then we have a context within which to understand his lengthy description of the coming of the Antichrist, and his assertion that he would not come until the millennium had ended and the devil had been released from the abyss to perform his final acts of deception and persecution. Thietland would thus be allaying fears sparked by such preachers, demonstrating by a literal interpretation of Revelation 20 that the End was some seventy to eighty years in the future.

Thietland's interpretation of 2:1–11, into which his exposition of Revelation 20 was inserted, is heavily drawn from Augustine's *City of God*, even though the abbot departs from Augustine's disapproval of literal millennialism. He seems aware of certain themes of the early medieval Antichrist tradition, such as his human origins and the nature of his miracles, and also Thietland seems to have read the expositions of Ambrosiaster (fourth century) and Haimo of Auxerre (ninth century) on 2 Thessalonians. It is at 2:8 that Thietland suddenly switches to the exposition of Revelation 20:1–3 and 7, a highly unusual move, but a perfectly natural one that links the two biblical apocalypses and allows each to expound the other.

This digression on Revelation is itself based on earlier interpretations of the passage, though Thietland ultimately weaves his own explanation of it. Borrowing heavily from

Haimo's commentary on Revelation as well as from Augustine, Thietland turns their symbolic interpretations of the millennium into a literal one, discarding their view that the thousand years are merely symbolic of the Church's reign on earth. He believes that at the end of the thousand years the devil will be let loose for three-and-a-half years to persecute the saints and lead astray the wicked. With the devil will come Gog and Magog, whom Thietland, following Augustine, interprets as the devil and those evil people in whom the devil works.

Unlike other medieval commentators on 2 Thessalonians and the Antichrist, Thietland spends little time describing the Antichrist's death, simply noting that he will be killed by Christ. His recognition of Christ's victory is tempered by the reality of his own evil times, in which many supposedly Christian peoples act in evil ways, in which the good are mixed with the bad, and violence from within and without is constant. His commentary is a witness to the troubles—political, social, and religious—of the mid-tenth century.

There is currently no printed edition of the Latin text of Thietland's commentaries, though one is currently being prepared for the series *Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Medievalis* (CCCM). I have based this translation on my own transcription of the two known manuscripts containing the commentaries, one of which is housed at Einsiedeln (which means "the hermitage"), the other at Bamberg in Bavaria.³ As a work of tenth century Latin, Thietland's commentary is difficult at points; the abbot did not write smoothly flowing Latin, and his meaning is sometimes uncertain. I have had to make

educated guesses on some passages, and I have tried to make the text as clear as possible. At times his awkward Latin will be apparent in the translation. I have noted his quotations of Scripture and Church Fathers in the notes following the translation, though not all of them are identifiable.

Notes

1. *Adso Dervensis: De ortu et tempore Antichristi, nec non et tractatus qui ab eo dependunt*, ed. Daniel Verhelst, *Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Medievalis*, 45 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1976). For an English translation see Bernard McGinn, ed., *Apocalyptic Spirituality: Treatises and Letters of Lactantius, Adso of Montier-en-Der, Joachim of Fiore, The Franciscan Spirituals, Savonarola* (Mahwah, N. J.: Paulist Press, 1979), pp. 81–96. This volume also has a very good bibliography on apocalypticism.

2. For further discussion of Adso's treatise see Daniel Verhelst, "La Préhistoire des conceptions d'Adson concernant l'Antichrist," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 40 (1973), 52–103; Robert Konrad, *De ortu et tempore Antichristi: Antichristvorstellung und Geschichtsbild des Abtes Adso von Montier-en-Der* (Kallmünz, Opf., 1964); Kevin L. Hughes, "Apocalyptic Conservatism in an Age of Anxiety: The Exegetical Options of Adso of Montier-en-Der," in *The Apocalyptic Year 1000*, ed. Richard Landes and David Van Meter (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001).

3. Einsiedeln MS 38 and Bamberg Msc. Bibl. 89.

Thietland of Einsiedeln on 2 Thessalonians

Edited and translated by Steven R. Cartwright

Prologue

Paul wrote the first epistle to the Thessalonians because of these things which he knows are clear to us, among which he claimed a few things concerning the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ and the future resurrection of the bodies. Indeed, he even writes a second letter to the same people in which intentions are especially made; namely, first, concerning the destruction of the kingdom of the Romans; second, concerning the coming of the Antichrist and the killing of the same; and third, concerning the rebuke and correction of those who dash around restlessly through peoples' homes. For he foresaw, the grace of the Holy Spirit revealing it, that there would be some heretics who would say that the Day of the Lord is approaching. Seeing that they had been disturbed by this narration and were being drawn to a certain error, he dictated this letter to them and gave to them a candid disclosure of the coming of the Antichrist.

Chapter 1

(1:1) **Paul**, he says, **and Silvanus and Timothy**. He associates these with himself and to these themes which we brought up in the first letter. Nevertheless, for the purpose of enlarging, they tell those **of the church of the Thessalonians** that they pray for the peace and grace which was **in Christ Jesus and God the Father**.

(1:3) When the greeting is finished, he begins with thanksgiving, saying, **We must give thanks to God for you always, brothers**. Indeed, we must note that in the first letter he does not say “we must give thanks,” but “we give thanks.” For truly there is a greater virtue in what he says: “we must give thanks,” because indeed somebody can freely give thanks for some thing; but truly he who says that he must, shows that he, too, is a debtor. Therefore the Apostle shows that he is a debtor. And lest by chance you should likewise count it a small thing, he next adds the following: **It is thus fitting**, as though they should say, “For his immense gifts we ought to give immense thanks; and for his unspeakable kindnesses we ought to render unspeakable praises.” Why should they do so? **Because**, he says, **your faith superabounds, and the charity of each one of you abounds toward each other**. Certainly with these words they show that the Thessalonians have made progress since the connection and narration of the first letter, since they show to them the progress of the same persons, in order that they might love the good things which they were more devotedly doing. In this act preachers are instructed that, while they

know that their hearers have made progress, they must desire to show to them the same progress. To the extent that they give attention to their own progress, they should also love more firmly the good things which they do, and they should try to be imitators of the Thessalonians.

(1.4–5) There follows: **Thus we also take pride in you among the churches of God for your patience and faith, in all your persecutions and tribulations which you endure, in the example of the just judgment of God.** As if they should say, “You have thus far made progress in faith and patience, so that not only the children in the Church but we also, apostolic men, may take pride in the same faith and patience.” Note that he says that their faith and patience are glory from God, that he may put forward the same thing to be imitated to the other churches, to the extent that the faithful of these same churches may desire to become imitators of them. They truly call those “tribulations” and “persecutions” which, brought by their own fellow citizens, they endured patiently. From this there follows, **which you endured in the example of the just judgment of God.** Note that he calls persecutions and tribulations an example of the just judgment of God, and rightly so, because they were for the reward of the good but the eternal damnation of the wicked. Nevertheless, some understand this passage in this way, that this may be the meaning: “which you endured, that you may give an example, without the terror of expecting the just judgment of God.” There follows: **that you may be held worthy in the Kingdom of God for which you also suffer.** Note that they say that they can be held worthy on account of the persecutions and

tribulations which they were suffering. But it can be asked why he elsewhere says, “the sufferings of this time are not worthy to be compared to the future glory which is to be revealed in us, etc.” (Rom. 8:18). And indeed, because he says in that place, the sufferings of this time are not worthy to be compared to the future glory which shall be revealed in us, it is also true that in no way can earthly things be compared to heavenly, perishable to measurable, and temporal to eternal. Nevertheless, lest that seem to be contrary to this passage, we must understand it in this way: that persecutions and tribulations did not make them worthy, but rather the grace of God that bestows to them the power of enduring those things patiently. Therefore if they were held worthy of the Kingdom of God by patiently enduring persecutions, let each Christian see what he endures or what he may suffer of persecution, of adversity, or of work, or that he indeed practices fasting or prayer, to the extent that he may be able to be held worthy in the Kingdom of God. But what is worse, let him not only not patiently endure anything of these, but rather either let them be employed or mentioned with some good intention toward him. He is annoyed because he “understands badly,” and therefore such a Christian is not to be mentioned.

(1.6–7a) There follows, **If it is nevertheless just with God to pay back retribution or tribulation to those who afflict you, and to give rest with us to you who are afflicted.** If . . . nevertheless”: this is not of doubt but of affirmation, as though they should say, if nevertheless the source of justice can give a just judgment and the source of piety can be moved by piety, or, just as we are

accustomed to say, “if nevertheless the sun can shine.” He had just said before that the judgment of God is just; he repeats this when he says, “If it is nevertheless just with God to pay back retribution to those who afflict you.” And this is the sense: Nothing is more just than when they are afflicted who cause affliction to the good, and they who suffer receive rest. But with whom? **With us**, they say. Beautifully do they say “with us”; to the extent that they who were imitators of the apostles shall have fellowship with them in the Kingdom of Heaven. Therefore John says “that you may have fellowship with us,” etc. (1 John 1:3). And because this is rest, it is conferred not here, but in the future, to the saints.

(1:7b–8) Therefore there follows next, **in the revelation of our Lord from heaven with his angels of power in flames of fire, to inflict punishment on those who do not know God, and who do not obey the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.** He says “revelation,” or the day of death of each individual or, what is more, the day decided for judgment. But how it will come, the same revelation shows, “with his angels of power.” Such also is that passage: “You shall see the Son of Man coming with great power and majesty”(Matt. 24:30). And truly, not only with the angels of power, but he is even to come **in flames of fire.** According to that passage, “fire shall burn in his sight” (Ps. 49:3). But why is that fire to come? Namely, to give vengeance. And this is what he says: **inflicting punishment.** And on whom? **On those**, he says, **who do not obey the Gospel**, etc. Note that they make two distinctions. Perhaps they say **they who do not know God** concerning the pagans. But concerning the evil

Catholics who do not obey the Gospel of our Lord they say that God avenges himself not only on those who did not believe, but even on those who did not live according to what they believed. Nevertheless, we must consider who that fire is. Perhaps it is he about whom it is read in the Apocalypse of John, “and fire came down from heaven and consumed them” (Rev. 20:9), that is, those adversaries. There also the fire of zeal can be understood, since the good are consumed by the fire of holy zeal, according to that passage, “zeal for your house has consumed me” (Ps. 68:10; John 2:17). So also the impious are consumed by the fire of evil zeal, because the city of this world will not be able to have the upper hand against the city of God. By the fire of his zeal it is consumed. Otherwise, that fire can rightly be understood as that which shall accompany his coming, by which even the elements shall be melted. Nevertheless, neither the former nor the latter will be perpetual, even if the fire which shall accompany his coming shall remain until the impious cross over to eternity. But perhaps someone asks how the saints will be rescued, that they may not be touched by that fire with which the evil shall be cremated. That power also knows they are to be freed and protected unhurt, by which power the three boys of the Hebrews in the middle of the furnace were protected unhurt by the fire.¹ Likewise perhaps someone asks how God can be a just judge or how he is to judge justly, since on account of sins committed in a brief moment a man might be about to struggle with eternal punishments. For example, in a short space of time someone committed a murder, on account of which, unless he cleanses himself through penitence, he

will suffer punishments forever. For this reason blessed Augustine says, “No author of the laws of humans ever searched for this, nor did he determine it to be worthy, that an evil person should be punished according to a quantity of time. For example: someone commits a murder, on account of which he is condemned to perpetual exile. If, therefore, this is not sought for in human laws, then a great deal less in divine ones.”² For this reason blessed Pope Gregory says, “God punishes the evil not according to the quantity of time by which they worked evil, but rather according to the intention of the heart, since indeed the evil always wished to live and always to do evil.”³

(1:9a) There follows, **who will be punished with eternal destruction**. It depends on the above statements. He had said above, “inflicting punishment on those who do not know God, and who do not obey the Gospel of the Lord.” Concerning the same he says “who will be punished,” that is, they will suffer, they will endure, he says, to their **eternal destruction**. They say that after a thousand years the devil is to be let loose with his own and is to cross over to a partnership of the chosen. He says **to destruction** because there death will be without death, destruction without weakening, and fire without light.

(1:9b) There follows, **from the face of the Lord and from the glory of his majesty**, by whose power they shall be condemned. Some indeed thus understand the passage: **from the face of the Lord and from the glory of his power**, “they shall be distant” being understood, on account of that passage: “The impious shall be removed, lest he see the majesty of the Lord” (Isa. 26:10). Others

understand it in this way: “from the face of the Lord and from the glory of his power,” the sentence goes out condemning the impious, when the same Lord says, “Go, you cursed ones, into the eternal fire” (Matt. 25:41).

(1:10) But when does this sentence go out? **When he comes to be glorified among his saints and to be made wonderful among all who believed.** He says “to be glorified,” that is, to be made glorious. But to whom should he appear glorious and wonderful? He says, “to his saints and to all who believed.” For when the Lord comes for judgment he will be glorious to the gentle and pleasant to the just; but terrible to the pitiless and severe to the unjust. He says, “among all who believed,” that is, they who lived according to what they believed, the Gospel being maintained for them as a testimony on that day. Therefore there follows, **Because our testimony to you was believed.** They also call their testimony evangelical teaching, that which indeed was entrusted to them, because they received evangelical teaching from those preaching it. For this teaching will repeat the testimony for them on the Day of the Lord, because they lived according to what they believed. Therefore the crown of the hearers will be the glory of the teachers, and naturally their truth will be the condemnation of the evil.

(1:11a) There follows, **in which also we pray**, that is, because of which, or for the purpose of which? **that God may honor you with his calling**, understood: to make worthy.⁴ Here he asks that that calling be understood according to a purpose. On this account, in order that they might separate what is universal—concerning which even the Lord says, “Many are called, but few are chosen”

(Matt. 22:14)—from that which is special, they added, “his.” In order that they might show that there is not power or merit in man, but in God alone (because whoever is called, is called with his calling), they also added “Our God.”

(1:11b) There follows, **and may he fulfill every desire for goodness**. Note that they join prayer to thanksgiving, so that, because they began to be faithful, help and power might be bestowed on them by God, to the extent that they might bring their devotion to a laudable end. Therefore they say “may he fulfill,” that is, may he cause you to fulfill the will for his goodness and the goodness of his will, since goodness is in the will and the will is in goodness. For to be is not one thing for him and the will to be something else, because there is nothing happening in that simple nature. Otherwise, may he fulfill the will for his goodness, that is, may he transform all of you to be able to know and understand for the purpose of fulfilling his will.

(1.11c–12a) There follows, **and the work of faith in power that the name of our Lord Jesus Christ may be made known among you**. As though they should say, May power be bestowed upon you by God, that through it your faith may be filled up with effort. Next, lest by chance they should fulfill the will of God and faith with effort and not seek the glory of God instead, they followed the words **that it may be glorified, with the name of the Lord . . . among you**,⁵ according to that passage, “that they may see your good works and glorify your father who is in heaven” (Matt. 5:16).

(1:12b) There follows, **and you in them, according to**

the grace of our God and our Lord Jesus Christ. That is, that you may be seen to be his worshipers, and therefore that you may be glorified in him. And lest, when glorying in the Lord, they should perhaps attribute this to their own merits rather than to the grace of God, therefore they fittingly say, **according to the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.** After the thanksgiving and praises and prayer they begin to make clear their intentions to those to whom they wrote out the letter:

Chapter 2

(2:1) **We beg you, they say, brothers, in view of the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ and our being gathered to him.** He restrained them with an adjuration, because he foresaw that some heretics would come who would say that the Day of the Lord is at hand. On account of this they were troubled, and they would be led into some unlawful error. Therefore he also gave a clear proof of the coming of the Antichrist.

(2:2a) There follows, **that you may not quickly be shaken in your mind,** that is, that you may neither be shaken in your mind from the teaching which you received from us, nor terrified.

(2:2b) There follows, **neither through the Spirit,** that is, by anyone speaking through the Spirit; that is, he who may appear to predict future events through the Spirit, or that the day of the Lord is at hand.

(2:2c) There follows, **neither through a word,** that is, through some treatise.

(2:2d) There follows, **nor through a letter, as if sent by**

us. They say this on account of heretics, who under the assumed title of the holy apostles might write false epistles.

(2:2e) There follows, **as if the Day of the Lord was at hand**. This refers to the things above, that is, “that you might not be disturbed as if the Day of the Lord was at hand.” Thus it can also refer to individual things; the meaning of this passage is similar to that other one in which he says “but even if we or an angel from heaven should preach another gospel, let him be cursed” (Gal. 1:8).

(2:3) There follows, **Let no one lead you astray in any manner**. He repeats what he had said, that he feared lest they be deceived. Such is that saying of the Lord, “If someone should say to you, ‘Behold, here is the Christ,’ or ‘there,’ do not believe it” (Matt. 24:23). As if responding to those asking why they should not be disturbed if someone says that the Day of the Lord is at hand, he gave a clear indication: **unless the rebellion should come first**, he says, that is, a departure of the nations from the Roman Empire. **And the man of sin should be revealed**, etc. He therefore says that it will be a man, that the Antichrist truly will be a man born from man. “Of sin,” he truly says, because just as the fullness of divinity dwells in Christ, so also the fullness of deception and malice will dwell in him. **The son of destruction**, he says, in contrast to the sons of reconciliation and of man, that is, of Christ.

(2:4a) There follows, **Who opposes**, that is, he goes against, **and is exalted**, that is, elevated, **over everything which is called God, or which is worshiped**. Blessed Pope Gregory says that there are those who are called

gods, but who are not worshiped, like Moses, who was called God to Pharaoh (Exod. 7:1)⁶ and the Psalmist says, “I have said, ‘you are gods’” (Ps. 81:6). For the Trinity alone is called and worshiped as God. But the Antichrist himself will not only exalt himself above the saints, but even over the Son of God himself, who is called and worshiped as God.

(2:4b) There follows, **so that he may sit in the Temple of God**. These things spoken about the Antichrist are most plainly understood. Nevertheless, because it is said that he is to be seated in the temple, it is uncertain whether he is to be seated in that ruin of the temple which was built by Solomon or, indeed, in the Church of God, wherefore some have decreed that by the term *man of sin* not only should *Antichrist* be understood, but even the entire mass of evil people belonging to his body. Therefore they rightly think that it should be read in Latin just as it is rendered in the Greek: “so that he may sit as the Temple of God” (*in templum*), inasmuch as he should not be said to sit in the temple, but that he may be the temple who is seated;⁷ and by that kind of speaking it should be said, to sit in relation to the temple, that is, as though it were the temple of God, by which we are accustomed to say, to sit in relation to a friend, that is, as though with friends.

(2:4c) There follows, **showing himself just as if he is God**, because he will scorn to say that he is the Son of God. Therefore the Lord says, “I have come in the name of my Father,” etc. (John 5:43).

(2:5) **Do you not recall**, that is, remember, **that while I was still with you, I told you these things?** that is, that Christ would not come unless the Antichrist preceded?⁸

(2:6) There follows, **and you know what now detains him, that he may be revealed in his own time.** As if he should say openly, that which detains him that he may not be revealed in his own time, you know, since with me teaching, you learned. Blessed Augustine says about this, “The Apostle says that they know; what he would not show to them openly in this epistle, therefore also remains hidden to us. We, on account of that, wish to arrive at his meaning with effort, but we are entirely unable, especially since the following words make this passage more obscure.”⁹ With which it is said:

(2:7a) **for the mystery of iniquity is now at work.** For what might the Apostle have intended to mean? I do not at all know. Nevertheless, I will not be silent about the opinions of others, which I have been able either to hear or to read. There were some who say that the Apostle spoke of the abolition of the Roman Empire; and therefore he declined to describe this openly, lest perhaps he should incur a calumnious charge. Therefore there are some who think that “the mystery of iniquity now at work” was said concerning Nero, whose actions seemed then to be the Antichrist’s. On account of which, some think that he is about to be resurrected and that the Antichrist is about to come. Therefore some even say that he may not be dead, but rather when he seems murdered, he is not murdered, but raised up, and in the same liveliness of the age he may be served, while he is restored to rule. Of these, as blessed Augustine says, rashness is to be admired.¹⁰

(2:7b) But truly what is said, **so that he who now holds, may hold until he is taken out of the way.** In short, he says, it is spoken concerning the judgment of the Roman

Empire, as is the sense: He who now holds the kingdom of the Romans, let him hold it until he should be withdrawn from the midst of the peoples. There are even some who, just as he says, understand that passage which says “for the mystery of iniquity is now at work” to mean that the Apostle spoke of falsehoods and phoneyisms in the Church. And because this mystery now also remains hidden, therefore he particularly took care to warn the saints that he who now holds the faith, let him hold it firmly until that mystery of iniquity should be withdrawn from the midst of the faithful. The witness of John seems to refer to this passage: “Little children, it is the last hour,” etc. (1 John 2:18). For they say that just as in this last hour before the Day of Judgment (what he calls, in part, the last hour of the world), many heretics left, whom he calls “many antichrists.” Thus even when the Antichrist appears before the coming of the Lord for the Judgment, the evil shall be separated from the midst of the good, and shall be joined to his head. But blessed Augustine likewise says that some in one way, others in another expounded this obscure passage of the apostles, each according to his own opinion.¹¹ Nevertheless we must know that the intention of the Apostle was to make plain, indeed, that the Lord is not to come first to judge the living and the dead; rather, the Antichrist comes to deceive the dead in soul.

(2:8a) There follows, **and then that wicked one shall be revealed**. In certain copies, “shall be loosed” is found.¹² Therefore we must see whether he is to be revealed or loosed (Rev. 20:1). I say, John makes it plain in the Apocalypse where he says, “I saw an angel of God descending from heaven,” etc. (Rev. 20:1). That angel is

the Lord Jesus Christ, an angel of great prudence, who descended from heaven through the mystery of the Incarnation, appearing visibly to the world. "Who also has the key to the abyss," because he has in his power the hearts of those whom he hardens, and of those whom he opens to believing. Therefore there is that passage, "You open and no one closes; you close, and no one opens" (Rev. 3:7). For he opens the hearts of those whom none of the doctors is able to close, that is, to harden. Those he truly closes, no one can open. "He has also a great chain in his hand." For a chain is a fetter, which indeed ties more tightly. Therefore by a great chain is the great quantity of his power represented (Rev. 20:2). There follows, "and he seized the dragon, the ancient serpent." The devil is rightly called "serpent," because he deceived the first man through the serpent, and also rightly called "ancient" on account of the antiquity of the time, because at the beginning of created things he was created by God, as it says in Ezekiel, "and you, cherub, were the first of the ways of God."¹³ There follows, "and he bound him," that is, he held back his power, and sent him into the abyss. We must inquire what he wished to be understood by the term *abyss*. Clearly he meant the great number of faithful peoples, because just as the abyss is incomprehensible, so also is the great number of peoples. Why therefore does it say to send into the abyss? It is said, clearly, because he was rejected by the faithful. But was he not in the abyss before? He was indeed. But it is therefore said, "sent," because he is now found to have greater power among the infidels. For it is one thing not to believe, and another to persecute the members of Christ

(Rev. 20:3). There follows, “and he closed,” namely that he might not touch prohibited things. He sealed them up because he wished them to remain hidden to him. Why might it pertain to his members? For the reason that many good people became evil, and many evil people became good. There follows, “that he might not lead astray the nations any more.” He means those nations whom he wanted to be understood by the name of nations, that is, the faithful. There follows, “until a thousand years are past.” Note that the words appear to sound as though after a thousand years he can lead astray the faithful, but it is not so, because while he is placed for infinity—just as you have many examples—or such can be the order of the words, closed and sealed up, until a thousand years are past, so that he may not lead astray. “A thousand years”—He calls this the last part of the world, and claims it is from the suffering of our Lord and our redemption to the coming of the Antichrist. He therefore fixed the number of a thousand years for the completion of this entire time. There follows, “after this it is necessary that he be released for a brief time, that is, for a time of three-and-a-half years”¹⁴ (Rev. 2:7). Then, after many things, he adds “when the thousand years had been completed, he will be set free from his prison,” that is, power will be given to him, “and he will lead the nations astray.” He does not want those nations to be understood here whom he called “nations” above but the infidels, because although he will have the power of persecuting the saints, he nevertheless will not have the power of deceiving them. There follows, “Gog and Magog.” We ought not to understand the peoples especially dwelling in another part

of the earth, just as some, considering only the beginnings of letters, said that “Gog” means “Getes” and “Magog” means “Massagetes,” because they contradict his words by which he says, “these are above the four corners of the earth.” But a better meaning can be understood through the interpretation of names, for Gog is interpreted as “covered,” and Magog as “uncovered.” By Gog, therefore, all evil persons should be understood, in the hearts of whom the devil lies hidden. By Magog the very devil himself should be understood, because it is he who lies hidden in the hearts of evil persons. He himself will persecute the saints as though openly going on to the Day of Judgment. But if perhaps this exposition is displeasing to someone, because he says that Gog and Magog are nations, it can also be understood differently, that by Gog and Magog those evil persons are meant, because in their hearts hatred and envy lie hidden, who rage against the Church of God. They are like Magog, that is, going openly, and showing envy. They openly pursue the good people.¹⁵

(2:8b) There follows, **whom the Lord Jesus will slay with the breath of his mouth**, that is, by the power of his virtue.

(2:8c) There follows, **and destroy by the appearance of his coming**, because his coming will be in a flash of lightning, as that passage says, “just as a flash of lightning goes forth from the east” (Matt. 24:27).

(2:9) There follows, **him whose coming is according to the workings of Satan**. For he says well that his coming is according to the operation of Satan, because the devil shall be released, and he will enter, that is, into that man

of sin, and miraculously, though deceptively, perform many things. But blessed Augustine says it is accustomed to be uncertain, because the Apostle says, **in all power, with lying signs and wonders**. Indeed, let those signs be false, and let them happen in a fantastic manner, that they may appear to be signs and not be, or certainly truly be signs, and therefore be called lies, because they lead on to falsehood, that is, that he who is the man of sin may be believed to be God. And we must know that he who consumed the flocks and sons of Job by fire, and who with a whirlwind shattered his house which, falling down, crushed his freedmen (they were true signs), allows the works of the devil, to whom this power of working was given by God. Nevertheless, they who then will be faithful will recognize, in whatever way they may become. Likewise, in whatever way they may become, others will not be deceived, except they who shall deserve to be deceived.¹⁶

(2:10b) Therefore there follows next: **to those who are perishing because they did not receive the charity of truth**. The charity of truth, he says, because it is the charity of falseness that does not save. Or, he says, of truth; that is, of the Son of God who is the truth. They who did not receive nor believe nor desire to imitate that charity by which he, loving us, came down from heaven to the earth that he might redeem us, deserve to be deceived.

(2.10c–11) Therefore there follows next, **Therefore God allows to them the working of error, that they may believe a lie. And all who did not believe the truth, but consented to iniquity will be judged**. Note that the

Apostle did not hesitate to say that God sends to them the working of error, since then God is said to send it, when he allows to send it with the devil. For God permits the devil to do this with a just and hidden judgment, because he acts with unjust and uneven intention. But what follows, **that they may believe a lie**, is similar to that passage of the same Apostle: “Because though they knew God they did not worship him as God or give him thanks” (Rom. 1:21). And soon after: **For that reason God gave them over to a reprobate frame of mind, that they may do those things which are not fitting.**¹⁷ Nevertheless, we must note that those who were judged shall be deceived, secretly by the just judgments of God and justly by the secret judgments of God, whom God himself did not cease to judge since the beginning of the sin of the rational creature. Even those who were deceived and led astray shall be justified at the last and open judgment of God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, who, having been judged most unjustly, shall judge most justly.

(2:12a) There follows, **But we should always give thanks to God for you, brothers, beloved by God.** We should note, of course, that he had said this at the beginning of the epistle. The meaning which is had there is included in this passage, for what he says there is fitting. This is what follows here: “brothers, beloved by God,” as if he should say, his unspeakable and immeasurable graces should be attributed to his unspeakable and immeasurable gifts. But note that those who are said to be about to be loved by God are shown to be of great merit; for the judgments of men are often mistaken, but the judgment of God cannot in any way be mistaken. No one, therefore, disputes that they are

of great merit; wherefore the Apostle calls them beloved in the judgment of him who can neither deceive nor be deceived.

(2:12b) There follows, **Because God chose you as firstfruits unto salvation.** In some versions of the text one finds “from the beginning,” *ab initio*, and in others, “from the start,” *ab principio*, which is the same thing.¹⁸ But in a few versions one finds “firstfruits.” For the beginning of some thing is its inception, if you read “from the beginning.” The Apostle therefore shows with these words that God foreknows future things. This is said of God metaphorically, because with him, nothing is yet to be, but all things are in the present. For God foresaw that such things were to be, or rather, that he was about to do such things. Therefore he chose them not only before their birth, according to that passage, “I knew you before I formed you in the womb, even before the founding of the world” (Jer. 1:5). Just as it says, “He chose us in him before the founding of the world”(Eph. 1:4). But if you read “firstfruits,” the meaning is this, that God chose you, so that you might believe before the other nations. For they believed before the others to whom the Apostle sent his epistles. Nevertheless he says where this choosing took place: **in the sanctification of the Spirit.** He added “of the Spirit” because this sanctification is in the Spirit and is acquired in the Spirit. For the body is often accustomed to being kept clean, and the soul is corrupted with different carnal desires. Or “in the sanctification of the Spirit” can mean spiritual, done by the Holy Spirit.

(2:12c) There follows, **and in the faith of truth.** He adds “of truth” because there was a faith of falseness. Or

“truth” can mean “Son of God.”

(2:13) There follows, **In which**, that is, faith, **he called you through our Gospel**. With these words they show that they were converted to faith by his teaching. And for what purpose? **To obtain the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ**. As if he should say, “Therefore you were drawn to the faith by our teaching, so that you might obtain for yourselves the glory of the Lord.” But because in some versions of the text one finds “to increase the body of the Lord,”¹⁹ the meaning can be such: You converted to the faith by our teaching, so that you might cause the increase in the body of the Lord. For Paul himself says elsewhere, “From whom the whole body, furnished and constructed through ligaments and joints, grows into the increase of God”(Col. 2:19).

(2:14a) There follows, **Therefore, brothers, stand firm**. He shows that they stand firm with these words, but lest they fall, he reminded them, as if he should say, “You who stand, see that you do not fall.” This is what he says elsewhere, “He who stands, let him watch lest he fall” (1 Cor. 10:12). For he stood firm who said “He set my feet upon a rock” (Ps. 39:3).

(2:14b) There follows, **And hold to our traditions**. He beautifully said before that they stand firm, because unless they stood, they could not have held to the traditions. And we should know that while they urged that the traditions be held, they exclude strange things. Therefore this apostolic exhortation is necessary not only for those Christians but for all, that is, they urge everyone to hold to the apostolic traditions, because without them there can be no salvation; the health of the whole Church depends

on them. If the heretics held to them, they would not remain segregated from the fellowship of the Church. For just as baptism is a unique sign of salvation, so also apostolic teaching is a special sign of the same thing.

(2:14c) There follows, . . . **which you learned either through a word or an epistle from us.** They learned through a word, *sermonem*, in his presence, through an epistle in his absence. But we should know that in some versions one finds, through a word, *verbum*.²⁰ Nevertheless, there is a difference between *verbum* and *sermo*. *Verbum* is a part, but *sermo* is the connection of many words. Therefore *sermo* is also called “an explanation,” *dissertio*, from “connecting,” *serendo*.²¹

(2:15a) There follows, **But our Lord Jesus Christ himself, our God and Father. . .** To the thanksgiving and exhortation he adds a prayer, saying, “But our Lord Jesus Christ himself,” etc. But note that now he places the Father before the Son, now the Son before the Father, and therefore acknowledges that there is one nature of Father and Son. This is effective against the Arians, who say that the Son is lesser than the Father, because they claim that the Father is always placed before the Son in the Holy Scriptures. God is called our Father by grace, not by a partnership in nature. For he is called Father of grace and compassion, and of our progress.

(2:15b) There follows, **who loved us.** He loved us to such a degree that he gave the creator in exchange for the creature, his own son for the adopted sons, the lord for the slaves.

(2:15c) There follows, **and gave eternal consolation and good hope in grace.** For he is their father, he consoles

them, and they cannot be his sons without consolation. And because there is consolation in prosperous lands, he adds “eternal,” so that he might separate earthly consolation from that which is in eternal things. Truly, because the saints have a foretaste of this eternal consolation here in hope, he added, “and hope.” And because there is hope in prosperous times, he added “good,” so that he might separate earthly hope from that which is in heavenly things. And because eternal consolation is ascribed to the grace of God as much as good hope is, he adds “in grace.”

(2:16a) There follows, **May he encourage your hearts.** Since he had said above that they were consoled with eternal consolation, it is to be seen why he adds, “may he encourage.” The saints, of course, also have eternal consolation, as much in prosperity as in adversity. He therefore said, “May he encourage” in order that he might show that it was their own, because they had the same consolation in adversity.

(2:16b) There follows, **and confirm you.** Where is this confirmation? **In every good work and word,** he says. For every work is not also good, and every word is not also good. Therefore he adds, “good.” And through this, in order that he might show that he desires their perfection to be clothed, he therefore said in addition, “in every good work and word.”

Chapter 3

(3:1a) After the thanksgiving and exhortation, he asks them to pray for him, saying, **Finally, brothers, pray for us.** Behold, the apostle of such extraordinary merit asks

his hearers to pray for him. In this act of humility he leaves an example. If, therefore, he who was certain of his calling and who was the vessel of election asked his hearers to pray for him, what should we say about those who are evil and uncertain of their calling and are neither eager to be loved nor do they commit themselves to the prayers of others? We should call this a deep blindness. Nevertheless, we should know that it is the manner not only of these but also of all the saints that to the extent they are higher and closer to God, the more humble and cast down they are before him. Therefore the one to whom God says that no one is like him said, "If I were to wash with snowy water, and my hands gleamed as if very clean, etc." (Job 9:30).²² We should note that he does not say "with water" but "with snow," for there are those who are pricked and pushed to tears for those things to be gained which they lost and for these things to be obtained which they do not have. They are washed with earthly water. Likewise, there are those who are stirred to tears by love of the heavenly kingdom and consideration of its creator. They also are washed with snowy, that is, heavenly water. There follows, "and my hands gleamed." Just as the pouring out of tears is described by the waters, so a very clean act is described by the hands. And this is the meaning: If I thus have clean works, so that I may be criticized by no one. Nevertheless, "You plunge me in filth" (Job 9:31). For why does God plunge a man in filth, except to demonstrate uncleanness? For everyone who considers and examines the cleanliness of his creator reproaches and despises his own filthiness. There follows, "and my own clothes will detest me" (Job 9:31). By

clothes the members of the body are designated, for a man's clothes detest him whenever they make him detestable. For it was said of Judas, with such a figure of speech, "He possessed a field from the reward of iniquity" (Acts 1:18), although he himself did not possess it but caused it to be possessed. Concerning these clothes, Isaiah says, "clothes mixed with blood," etc. (Isa. 9:5). For clothes mixed with blood means there is a body polluted with some filthiness. He prayed to be freed from this blood who said, "Free me from bloodshed" (Ps. 50:16). Concerning these clothes it was said to the angel of Sardis, "You have a few people at Sardis [who have not fouled their clothes]" (Rev. 3:4). As if he were to say, you have a few people who have polluted their bodies with no filthiness. On this account Solomon also says, "At all times let your clothes be pure" (Eccles. 9:8). Therefore, just as he to whom no one is alike, who also says "I have not sinned" (Job 17:2), and again, "If I were to wash with snowy water," turn your eyes to consider the frailty of him who says "my eye lingers on bitter things" (Job 17:2), and "you plunge me in filth," etc. Just as even he who says that he "was caught up to the third heaven" (2 Cor. 12:2), and elsewhere, "I have fought the good fight" (2 Tim. 4:7), even he turns his eye to consider his own frailty when he says "I am not worthy to be called an apostle" (1 Cor. 15:9), etc., and elsewhere, "lest perhaps, when I have preached to others, I myself should be made reprobate" (1 Cor. 9:27), etc. For, shaken by this terror, he asked his hearers to pray for him.

(3:1b) There follows, **so that the word of the Lord may run**, that is, be completed and become acceptable.

(3:1c) There follows, **and be glorified, just as it was among you**. As if he were to say, because I cannot prevail with my eloquence and merits, pray that the word of the Lord may be glorified at least by your prayers. To such a degree the word of the Lord was glorified among them, that they might show that they understood their teaching was God's.

(3:2a) There follows, **and that we might be freed from importunate and evil men**. He is called importunate because he is without a port, that is, without tranquility. But "evil" has different meanings. It can mean a work which we either do or suffer.

(3:2b) There follows, **For not everyone believes**. As if he were to say, if everyone believed, there would be no opposition to believing. Because not everyone believes, pray that the hearts of the wicked may be checked and calmed, to the extent that the word of the Lord may be able to run.

(3:3a) There follows, **But God is faithful**. He says that God is faithful, so that they may become more certain of the promises.

(3:3b) There follows, **Who also will strengthen you**. As if he were to say, You are strong, but he will strengthen you constantly **and guard you from evil** and strengthen you by guarding you. With these words he shows that he is certain of their perseverance.

(3:4) Therefore, there follows directly, **But we are confident of you in the Lord, since you both do**, at the present time, **and will do**, in the future, **what we teach**. But from where does such confidence come to the Apostle? Obviously from the faithfulness and truth of the

Lord, and certainly from their devotion. And we should know this, that he says that he is certain that those who heard this would strive according to his purpose, and always be eager to persist.

(3:5) And note that after giving thanks and praises, he adds a prayer, saying, **May the Lord direct your hearts in the charity of God and the steadfastness of Christ.**

In the passage where he said they were predestined and called,²³ he added a prayer, teaching them to pray. He wished to show that they were predestined and called in such a way that they might obtain this with prayers, because God so predestined some that they might be preserved with prayers, just as he promised a son to Abraham, to whom he gave a sterile wife, to the extent that he might obtain a son with prayers. Note that he desires that their hearts, not their bodies, be directed by the Lord, because the direction of the Lord especially pertains to the interior man. There follows, **in the charity of God.** It was the great charity of God which came down to earth from heaven for our salvation. There follows, **and the steadfastness of Christ.** For it was the great steadfastness of Christ that steadfastly bore death for us. And because he wished them to be imitators of these virtues, therefore he desired that their hearts be directed in the charity of God and the steadfastness of Christ.

(3:6) There follows, **But we admonish you, brothers, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that you withdraw yourselves from every brother who walks in a disorderly way, and not according to the tradition which they received from us.** For this is that special purpose of this epistle, which he commends in the first

epistle. He calls his teaching, which he taught to them with words and deeds, “tradition.” Note also that he says, to the elevation of his narration, “we admonish.” To be sure, in that passage which says “from every brother,” he denounces those who restlessly ran about through peoples’ homes and sought from the unfaithful those things which were not consistent with their faith.

(3:7–8a) There follows, **For you yourselves know how you ought to imitate us.** He says that they know how they should imitate them, and why they know he shows, saying, **since we were not restless among you, neither did we freely eat anybody’s bread, but we worked night and day in all labor and toil,** it was known among them that they were not restless among them, neither did they freely eat anybody’s bread, but they sweated day and night in labor and toil; whereby we should note that he said in anticipation, “for you yourselves know.” We should also note that labor refers to night and toil to day, as above.

(3:8b–9a) There follows, **lest we burden any of you.** We should know, certainly, that he received from the Thessalonians with one intention and from the Corinthians with another. For he did not receive from the Corinthians, because they did not wish to offer freely. Therefore he later withdrew from them. He scolded their foolishness, but he did not wish to receive from them, because if he received, he would have burdened them at the time that he gave to the false apostles the opportunity to burden them. And, in order to prove that his work was pleasing and devoted, he added, **not as if we did not have the power.** He reaches for the preacher’s praise, if he also might

abstain from these things which are permitted, and fulfill those things which are not commanded.

(3:9b) There follows, **but that we might give ourselves to you as an example [to be imitated]**. For the life and conduct of the teachers ought to be the model and example of the hearers. On this account they show that it is necessary that the things which they forbid with their actions must not be done, and they show that it is proper that the things which they teach should be done with their actions must be done.

(3:10) There follows, **For when we were with you, we admonished you about this, that if someone does not wish to work, let him not eat**. He remembers his presence, truly because he knew that they could not exist without food. Therefore he compelled them, saying, “If someone does not wish to work, let him not eat.” To the extent that, compelled at that time, they persisted in working, they sustained their own need and that of others.

(3:11) There follows, **For we have heard that certain among you walk restlessly, doing nothing but being busybodies**. Behold, now he explains what he touched on before in the usual manner. Nevertheless, with these words he denounces the false apostles, who represented themselves as preachers, in order to eat the bread of someone slain. But we should note that when he said “restlessly,” he rightly added “being busybodies,” because they who run about restlessly are simply busybodies, because they skillfully take note of those things which may be done in this or that region, city, or village, and they diligently consider that they might proclaim those things to their hearers which are pleasing to them, in order

that they might be received and fed more willingly. And if they do not devise true things, then by all means they conceive false things. On this account Solomon says, "Take your foot away from your friend's door, etc." (Prov. 4:27). For curiosity is a great evil. "Curiosity" comes from *cura*, or concern, and *cura* comes from *corurat*, "the heart burns." But Blessed Augustine says that there is a difference between curiosity and anxiety. He says that anxiety is restrained concern, but curiosity is excessive concern.²⁴

(3:12a) There follows, **But we warn those who do such things, and we appeal to them in the Lord Jesus.** Note who gives orders and appeals, with the name of Jesus added. But why did he do this? Plainly, so that when they heard the name of Jesus they might be frightened and turn away from conduct of this sort.

(3:12b) There follows, **so that they may eat their bread with silence.** Blessed Augustine says that silence is the removal of the voice,²⁵ just as evil is the privation of good²⁶ and darkness the privation of light.²⁷ Note that he says "their bread" and not another's. Why therefore does he direct them to eat their bread in silence? Plainly, lest they lose by immoderation of language the work which they acquired for their sustenance and that of others. For no member is stirred so easily in the head. Therefore it is evil to be immoderate. Therefore James says that the tongue "is full of deadly poison," etc. (James 3:8). And lest those who wickedly interpret this apostolic precept cease from works of mercy, he therefore directly added, (3:13) **But you, brothers, do not abandon doing good.** As if he should say, Do not repay of this sort, so that

being compelled they might persist in works. Nevertheless, strive to give to those to whom it is necessary.

(3:14a) There follows, **Accordingly, if someone does not obey our word**. Behold, he warns them a third time. The first time was when he was present with them, the second was through the first epistle, and now through the second epistle, according to the Lord's commandment. "Obedience" comes from *ab aure*, "from the ear," since he rightly obeys who fulfills what he perceives with the ear.

(3:14b) There follows, **take note of him**, that is, make him conspicuous. But this was a criticism, which he shows when he adds, **Do not mix with him**, that is, you should have no fellowship or familiarity with him. Indeed, it is necessary that in each community and church there should be the greater and the lesser, the strong and the weak, the quiet and the restless. On this account this apostolic exhortation is appropriate not only for them but also for us and for all Christians, since it is necessary that they who desire to obey evangelical or apostolic teachings be separated from those who are hostile to them. And why does he show this? **That he may be ashamed**, he says, that is, that while he sees himself separated from the community of the good, he may be ashamed. And when he has been shamed, he is therefore corrected, lest perhaps this separation seem to be not from love but from hate. And the one whom they humbled once they now would never restore; and he who could be corrected, when pursued, became worse.

(3:15) He adds, **And do not reckon him as an enemy, but reprove him as a brother**. This teaching is not contrary to itself, because he said before, "do not mix with

him,” since it is from the Holy Spirit, who cannot err. Therefore, such is the meaning: “Do not mix with him,” that is, you should have no intimate acquaintance or fellowship with him. Nevertheless, if it should develop, so that the passage should read, **reprove him as a brother**. He calls him a brother in faith only, not in devotion.

(3:16a) There follows, **May the Lord of peace give you everlasting peace in every place**. He calls Jesus Christ the Lord of peace, who says, “My peace I leave with you; my peace I give to you,” etc. (John 14:27). He prays that peace be given to them by the Lord, which is a great virtue to such a degree, that through it they may become the sons of God, according to that passage, “Blessed are the peacemakers, because they shall be called the sons of God” (Matt. 5:9).

(3:16b) There follows, **The Lord be with you all**. Note that in the usual manner, just as a father his sons, he follows up by praying many good things for them, his hearers. It was not enough for him “that he give you peace,” but he also adds, “The Lord be with you.” And note that he says “with you all,” that is, not only with the wise and the rich, but rightly, with those who believe; as if he should say, you are not a rebel or an apostate if the Lord is always with you. Since the mind cannot be idle, it will be the dwelling place either of God or certainly of the devil.

(3:17–18) There follows, **This salutation is in my own hand, Paul. This is my mark in every epistle; this is the way I write. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen**. As Augustine says, “salutation” comes from *salute*, health.²⁸ Thus did the ancients greet

each other, by wishing health. Nevertheless, there is a difference between health and prosperity. Health of the body is soundness; prosperity is that by which health is preserved, or certainly recovered. The hand, *manus*, is so-called because it is the special function, *munus*, of the body. A mark, *signum*, marks something that is one's own. It must be known, of course, that there were heretics who, using the title of good preachers, sent epistles, so that they might be able to corrupt their hearers. On account of them blessed Paul the apostle did not write in his own hand in these epistles which are his own, but wrote underneath in Hebrew letters. There follows, **This is the way I write. The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen.** Note that he does not pray for the grace of God the Father, but of the Son, either because there were many disputes and questions concerning Christ, and he wished to manifest his eminence, or because they had confidence in the grace of Christ, by whose blood he knew that all the faithful had been redeemed. He wanted them to have this same confidence, because he is greatly to be confided in who says, "He who believes in me, even if he has died, shall live; and everyone who lives and believes in me shall not die eternally" (John 11:25–26). He even wished them to make progress to such a degree that they, having been perfected, might merit the grace of the Lord. Therefore he prayed for grace for them.

Notes

1. Daniel 3:1–30.
2. I have not been able to determine the source of this citation in Augustine or any other writer.
3. I have not been able to determine the source of this citation in Gregory or any other writer.
4. Here Thietland is clarifying the meaning of *dignetur*, which can mean “to honor” or “to condescend,” with *dignos facere*, a literal rendering of *dignari*.
5. In Latin the biblical passage reads “ut clarifecetur nomen Domini nostri Ihesu Christi in vobis” with the verb preceding the subject, contrary to English word order. Thietland has also substituted *glorificetur*, “glorified,” for *clarifecetur*.
6. I have not been able to determine the source of the citation in Gregory or any other writer.
7. This is based on Augustine’s *City of God* XX.19.
8. This comment on 2:5 is found only in the Bamberg manuscript.
9. Augustine, *City of God* XX.19.
10. Augustine, *City of God* XX.19.
11. Augustine, *City of God* XX.19.
12. Thietland is here distinguishing between the Latin terms *revelabitur*, which is the standard Vulgate reading, and *solvetur*, which he claims to have found in other manuscripts of the Vulgate, though no critical edition lists it as an alternative reading. *Solvetur* is found, however, at Rev. 20:7, where St. John speaks of Satan being released from his chains at the end of the thousand years. Thietland uses this apparent textual question—and he may well have invented it—to

introduce his exposition of Rev. 20:1–3, 7. As noted in the introduction, much of this exposition is rooted in a long tradition of interpretation of Revelation, and it particularly makes use of the commentary on Revelation by Haimo of Auxerre, although Thietland diverges significantly from Haimo on key points.

13. Thietland seems here to have conflated Ezek. 28:14–16 and Job 40:14. This latter passage was often applied either to Christ or to the devil by patristic and medieval commentators.

14. This three-and-a-half years is not mentioned in Revelation, but in Dan. 7:25 and 12:7–12, as well as in Augustine, *City of God* XX.13.

15. Compare Augustine's discussion of Gog and Magog in *City of God* XX.11. Thietland here returns to the text of 2 Thessalonians.

16. This is based largely on Augustine, *City of God* XX.19.

17. Romans 1:28.

18. Thietland again discusses variants in the Latin text of 2 Thessalonians, and again the critical editions of the Vulgate do not list them. This indicates either that they are extremely rare or insignificant variants, that Thietland is mistaken about the passage of Scripture containing these variant readings, or that he is inventing them for some reason.

19. Again the critical editions give no support to this variant reading.

20. Again, the critical editions of the Vulgate do not support this variant.

21. Thietland draws this etymology from Isidore, *De differentiis verborum* 578.

22. The following comment is based heavily on Gregory the Great's *Moralia in Iob* IX.36.

23. Romans 8:29–30?

24. The definition of curiosity and concern comes from Isidore of Seville's *De differentiis verborum* 88. I have found no reference to this in Augustine.

25. *De dialectica* 8.

26. Numerous places in Augustine's works; see for example the *Enchiridion*, chaps. 3 and 8.

27. *De Genesis ad litteram* 5.

28. Sermons 101 and 116.

Select Bibliography

General Introductions to Apocalypticism and History of Biblical Exegesis

Collins, John J. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to the Jewish Matrix of Christianity*. New York: Crossroad, 1989.

Emmerson, Richard K. *Antichrist in the Middle Ages: A Study of Medieval Apocalypticism, Art, and Literature*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1981.

Emmerson, Richard K., and Bernard McGinn, eds. *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1992.

Grant, Robert, and David Tracy. *A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible*. 2nd ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.

McGinn, Bernard. *Antichrist: Two Thousand Years of the Human Fascination with Evil*. San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1994.

_____, trans. *Apocalyptic Spirituality: Treatises and Letters of Lactantius, Adso of Montier-en-Der, Joachim of Fiore,*

the Franciscan Spirituals, Savonarola. Mahwah, N.J.:
Paulist Press, 1979.

Smalley, Beryl. *The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages.* Notre
Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1967.

Primary Texts

“Acts of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul,” in *Twelve
Patriarchs, Excerpts and Epistles . . .*, Ante-Nicene Fathers
8:477–86, edited by C. Richardson. Grand Rapids, Mich.:
William B. Eerdmans, 1951.

“Acts of Peter.” in *New Testament Apocrypha*, edited by
Wilhelm Schneemelcher. rev. ed., 2:271–321. Louisville:
Westminster-John Knox Press, 1992.

Adso Dervensis. *De ortu et tempore Antichristi, necnon et
tractatus qui ab eo dependunt.* Edited by Daniel Verhelst.
Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Medievalis, 45.
Turnhout: Brepols, 1976.

Augustine of Hippo, Saint. *De doctrina christiana.* English
translation: *On Christian Doctrine.* Translated by D. W.
Robertson, Jr. New York: Macmillan, 1964.

_____. *De civitate Dei.* Edited by Bernard Dombart and
Alphonsus Kalb. Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina,
47–48. Turnhout: Brepols, 1955. English translation:
Concerning the City of God against the Pagans. Translated
by Henry Bettenson. New York: Penguin, 1972.

_____. *Epistolae*. in *Patrologia Latina* 33. English translation in *Letters of Saint Augustine*. Fathers of the Church, 12, 18, 20, 30, 32. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1951–56.

Irenaeus of Lyons, Saint. *Adversus haereses*. Edited by W. W. Harvey. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1857.

Jerome. *Letters*. Edited by I. Hillberg. *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, 56. Vienna: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky,

Origen of Alexandria. *On First Principles*. Translated with an introd. and notes by G. W. Butterworth. New York: Peter Smith, 1973.

Second Thessalonians Commentaries

Ambrosiaster. *Commentarius in epistulas Paulinas*. Edited by Henry Joseph Vogels. *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*, 81/3. Vienna: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1969.

Florus of Lyons. *Expositio in epistolam secundam ad thessalonicenses PL*, 119:545–49.

Haimo of Auxerre [Haimo of Halberstadt]. *PL* 117:765–84.

MS Admont 160

MS Bonn 288 (Koblenz, Jesuiten) fols. 173–183.

MS Bonn 289 (Eberhardsklausen) fols. 221–230.

MS Schlägl 194 (120) fols. 113–122.

Rabanus Maurus. *PL*, 112:565–80.

Atto of Vercelli. *PL*, 134:655–64.

Pelagius. *Pelagius's Expositions of Thirteen Epistles of Saint Paul*. Edited with introduction by Alexander Souter. 3 vols. Texts and Studies, 9. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922–31.

Theodore of Mopsuestia. *In epistolas beati Pauli commentarii*. Edited by H. B. Swete. Vol. 2. Cambridge: University Press, 1882.

Thietland of Einsiedeln.

MS Einsiedeln Ms. 38

MS Bamberg Msc. Bibl. 89

Studies and Background Works

Babcock, William S. "Augustine and Tyconius: A Study in the Latin Appropriation of Paul." In *Studia Patristica*, 17/3:1209–15. Oxford: Pergamon, 1982.

_____, ed. *Paul and the Legacies of Paul*. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990.

Bredero, Adriaan H. "The Announcement of the Coming of the Antichrist and the Medieval Concept of Time." In *Prophecy and Eschatology*, Edited by Michael Wilks, pp. 3–14. Studies in Church History, Subsidia 10. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1994.

Brünholzl, Franz. *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*. 2 vols. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1975.

The Cambridge History of the Bible. Edited by P. R. Ackroyd, C. F. Evans, G. W. H. Lampe, and S. L. Greenslade, 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963–70.

Cavadini, John C. *The Last Christology of the West: Adoptionism in Spain and Gaul, 785-820*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1993.

_____. "The Sources and Theology of Alcuin's Treatise *De Fide*." *Traditio* 46 (1991), 123–46.

Contreni, John J. "The Biblical Glosses of Haimo of Auxerre and John Scottus Eriugena." *Speculum* 51 (1976), 411–34.

_____. "Carolingian Biblical Culture." In *Iohannes Scottus Eriugena: The Bible and Hermeneutics*, edited by Gerd van Riel, Carlos J. Steel, and James McEvoy. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1996.

_____. "Carolingian Biblical Studies." In *Carolingian Essays*, edited by Uta-Renate Blumenthal, pp. 71–98. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1983.

_____. "The Carolingian School. Letters from the Classroom." In *Giovanni Scoto nel suo tempo*. Edited by E. Menesto and Claudio Leonardi, pp. 81–111. Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo, 1989.

_____. "Haimo of Auxerre, Abbot of Sasceium (Cessy-les-Bois) and a New Sermon on I John 5. 4–10." *Revue bénédictine* 85 (1975), 303–20.

Daley, Brian E., S. J. *The Hope of the Early Church: A Handbook of Patristic Eschatology*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Döbschutz, Ernst von. *Die Thessalonischer-Briefe*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1974.

Evans, G. R.. *The Language and Logic of the Bible: The Early Middle Ages*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Froelich, Karlfried. "The Medieval Exegesis of Biblical Texts: Understanding an Understanding." Unpublished, 1994.

_____. "Which Paul? Observations on the Image of the Apostle in the History of Biblical Exegesis." In *New Perspectives on Historical Theology in Memory of John Meyendorff*, ed. Bradley Nassif, pp. 279–99. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1996.

Gibson, Margaret T. *The Bible in the Latin West*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1993.

Henry, Waast Barthélemy. *Histoire de l'Abbaye de Saint-Germain d'Auxerre*. Auxerre: C. Gallot, 1853.

- Higgelbacher, Othmar. "Beziehung zwischen Ambrosiaster und Maximus von Turin? Ein Gegenüberstellung." *Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie* 41 (1994), 5–44.
- Hill, Charles E. "Antichrist from the Tribe of Dan." *Journal of Theological Studies* 46 (1995), 99–117.
- _____. *Regnum Caelorum: Patterns of Future Hope in Early Christianity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Holland, Glenn S. *The Tradition that You Received from Us: 2 Thessalonians in the Pauline Tradition*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1988.
- Iogna-Prat, Dominique, Colette Jeudy, and Guy Lobrichon, eds. *L'École carolingienne d'Auxerre: de Muretach à Rémi, 830–908*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1991.
- Kermode, Frank. *The Sense of an Ending: Studies in the Theory of Fiction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Konrad, Robert. *De ortu et tempore Antichristi: Antichristvorstellung und Geschichtsbild des Abtes Adso von Montier-en-Der*. Kallmünz, Opf.: Michael Lassleben, 1964.
- Ladner, Gerhart B. *God, Cosmos, and Humankind: The World of Early Christian Symbolism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

- Landes, Richard. "Lest the Millennium Be Fulfilled: Apocalyptic Expectations and the Pattern of Western Chronography, 100–800 CE." In *The Use and Abuse of Eschatology in the Middle Ages*, Mediaevalia Lovaniensia, ser. 1, studia 15, edited by Werner Verbeke, Daniel Verhelst, and Adries Welkenhuysen. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1988.
- Lobrichon, Guy, and Pierre Riché, eds. *Le Moyen Âge et la Bible*. Paris: Beauchesne, 1984.
- Lubac, Henri de. *Corpus mysticum: l'eucharistie et l'Église au Moyen âge. Étude historique*. 2nd ed. Paris: Aubier, 1949.
- _____. *Exégèse médiévale: les quatre sens de l'Écriture*. 4 vols. Paris: Aubier, 1959–62.
- _____. *Histoire et esprit*. Paris: Aubier, 1950.
- Margerie, Bertrand de. *Introduction à l'histoire de l'exégèse*. 4 vols. Paris: Cerf, 1980–90.
- Matter, E. Ann. "Exegesis and Christian Education: The Carolingian Model." In *Schools of Thought in the Christian Tradition*, edited by Patrick Henry, pp. 90–105. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984.
- _____. "The Apocalypse in Early Medieval Exegesis." In *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, edited by Richard K. Emmerson and Bernard McGinn, pp. 38–50. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1992.

_____. *The Voice of My Beloved. The Song of Songs in Western Medieval Christianity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990.

McKitterick, Rosamond. *The Frankish Kingdoms under the Carolingians, 751–987*. New York: Longman, 1983.

McNally, Robert E., S. J. *The Bible in the Early Middle Ages*. Woodstock Papers: Occasional Essays for Theology, no. 4. Westminster, Md.: Newman Press, 1959.

Musée d'Art et d'Histoire (Auxerre, France). *Saint-Germain d'Auxerre: intellectuels et artistes dans l'Europe carolingienne, IXe – XIe siècles*. Auxerre: Musée d'Art et d'Histoire, 1990.

Quadri, Riccardo. "Aimone di Auxerre alla luce dei 'Collectanea' di Heiric di Auxerre." *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica* 6 (1963), 1–48.

Rangheri, Maurizio. "La 'Epistola ad Gerbergam reginam de ortu et tempore Antichristi' di Adsoni di Montier-en-Der e le sue fonti." *Studi Medievali*, 3rd sér. 14/2 (1973), 677–732.

Rauh, Horst-Dieter. *Das Bild des Antichrist im Mittelalter: von Tyconius zum deutschen Symbolismus*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1973.

Rigáux, Beda, and L.-M. Dewailly, trans. *Les Epîtres de Saint Paul aux Thessaloniens*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1954.

Savon, Hervé. "L'Antéchrist dans l'oeuvre de Grégoire le Grand." In *Grégoire le Grand*, edited by Jacques Fontaine, Robert Gillet, and Stan Pellistrandi, pp. 389–405. Paris: CNRS, 1986.

Verhelst, Daniel. "La Préhistoire des conceptions d'Adson concernant l'Antichrist." *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 40 (1973), 52–103.

This page intentionally left blank.

This page intentionally left blank.

This page intentionally left blank.

This page intentionally left blank.

ISBN 978-1-879288-78-2



9 781879 288782