TERTULLIANUS

DE IDOLOLATRIA

CRITICAL TEXT, TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

BY

J. H. WASZINK AND J. C. M. VAN WINDEN



SUPPLEMENTS TO

VIGILIAE CHRISTIANAE

Formerly Philosophia Patrum

TEXTS AND STUDIES OF EARLY CHRISTIAN LIFE AND LANGUAGE

EDITORS

A. F. J. KLIJN - CHRISTINE MOHRMANN - G. QUISPEL
J. H. WASZINK - J. C. M. VAN WINDEN

VOLUME I



TERTULLIANUS

DE IDOLOLATRIA

CRITICAL TEXT, TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

BY

J. H. WASZINK AND J. C. M. VAN WINDEN

PARTLY BASED ON A MANUSCRIPT LEFT BEHIND BY
P. G. VAN DER NAT



E. J. BRILL
LEIDEN • NEW YORK • KØBENHAVN • KÖLN
1987

It has become clear to the publishers of *Philosophia Patrum* that the title of this series has misled some people into thinking that it treats the 'philosophy' of the Fathers in the technical sense, rather than their 'thought' in the most general sense of the word. For this reason it has been decided to change the title of the series.

We felt at the same time that it would be sensible to link the series closer to the journal *Vigiliae Christianae*, with which it shares an editorial board. It will thus now be known as *Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae.*

J. H. Waszink
J. C. M. van Winden
for the editorial board

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Tertullian, ca. 160-ca. 230.
De idololatria.

(Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae; v. 1)
"Partly based on a manuscript left behind by P.G. Van der Nat".
English and Latin.
Bibliography: p.
Includes indexes.
1. Idolatry. I. Waszink, Jan Hendrik, 1908- . II. Winden, J. C. M. van. III. Nat, P. G. van der. IV. Title. V. Series.
BR65.T34913 1987 241' .0413 87-6566
ISBN 90-04-08105-4

ISSN 0920-623X
ISBN 90 04 08105 4

© *Copyright 1987 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands*

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher.

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS BY E. J. BRILL

EEHAN MEMORIAL LIBRARY
MARY OF THE LAKE SEMINARY
MUNDELEIN, ILLINOIS

CONTENTS

Preface VII

Lists of Abbreviations XI

Introduction 1
Manuscripts, editions, commentaries and translations 1
The purpose of *De idololatria* 9
Date of *De idololatria* 10
Analysis 13

Text and translation 19

Commentary 73

Bibliography 297

Indexes 305
I. Index of texts 307
II. Index of latin terms and of grammar 309
III. General index 314

PREFACE

The first obligation that the co-authors have to the reader is to explain the meaning of the words on the title-page: 'partly based on a manuscript left behind by P. G. van der Nat'.

On May 7th 1977 our friend and colleague, Pieter G. van der Nat, professor of Latin at Leiden University, died suddenly. In September 1960 he had defended his doctoral thesis containing a critical edition with translation and commentary of chapters 1-9 of Tertullian's *De idololatria*. The work was published in a provisory (stencilled) form, since it was the author's purpose to deal with the whole treatise and to offer a complete edition in normal printed form within a short time. In the preface to his dissertation he spoke of 'in about a year'.

In *Vigiliae Christianae* 17 (1963) 71-84 Van der Nat published an article entitled 'Some Observations on Tertullian's Treatise on Idolatry', in which he discussed six passages containing special difficulties with regard to the constitution of the text. Herewith the author wanted to disencumber the commentary on the whole work which was to appear in the course of that year. The notes concerned chapters 4, 5, 8, 11, 12. To our regret we have to establish that Dr. van der Nat did not succeed in carrying out his plans. Probably the burden was too great, when combined with the many other tasks which he dutifully took upon himself.

In the days following his death the first-named of the co-authors, who had been Dr. van der Nat's promotor, expressed to his widow the plan to accomplish the work *pietatis causa*. He expected that this enterprise would not involve too much labour, because he thought that the commentary, with the exception of one or two chapters, was complete. On examining the papers left behind, however, he found the following state of affairs.

The critical text had almost been completed. Only chapter 23 was not yet drawn up, obviously because of the difficulties with regard to the constitution of the text. In *Vigiliae Christianae* 36 (1983) 15-23 we have tried to find a solution for these problems. An English translation had been prepared. The commentary, however, did not go further than chapter 12. In other words, apart from the thesis concerning chapters 1-9, only 3 chapters had been commented on. This had been done in the same extensive, meticulous manner as in the dissertation. As to the chapters 13-24 no commentary, and also no preliminary notes, were found.

The first three years did not allow Dr. van der Nat's promotor to carry out his intention. Then we discussed the matter and decided to undertake the work together. It soon emerged that the enterprise involved much more labour than

had been expected. Not only did we have to prepare a commentary on the chapters 13-24, but our researches on the treatise itself also made revisions of the first part necessary. Moreover, the treatment in the commentary on chs. 1-12 was so extensive and detailed that a continuation in the same measure would have resulted in a far too expensive book.

We decided therefore to adopt the following method:

1. Of the introductory chapters we retained the first which dealt with manuscripts, etc. (with some supplementary additions to the notes). The other chapters (Survey, Purpose of the Treatise, Date) were rewritten.

2. The critical text and apparatus were retained, apart from some details which have been mentioned in the apparatus.

3. The translation required revision. In the process of revision we made, needless to say, extensive use of Van der Nat's (and Thelwall's) version.

4. In the commentary we made a tripartition: 'Survey', 'Remarks', 'Commentary'. The functions of the first and the third part are self-evident. In the Remarks we wish to draw attention to the coherence of the text, which is often intricate in Tertullian, and to other general questions. We hope that this will contribute to a better understanding of a difficult text. The Surveys and the Remarks have been written by the co-authors. With regard to the commentary proper, it should be noted that chs. 1-12 derive from the manuscript of Dr. van der Nat, except those passages where we enter in discussion with him. As was said above, we felt the need to shorten his text on many places. The commentary on chs. 13-24 is solely the work of the co-authors.

5. A final observation has still to be made concerning the division of Tertullian's text. The division in chapters was the work of Pamelius (1579). The subdivision in paragraphs was not introduced until the publication of the text in the series Corpus Christianorum (1954) by Dom. E. Dekkers, who for the rest copied that by Reifferscheid-Wissowa in CSEL (see, however, p. 6, note 30). In his dissertation Dr. van der Nat decided to make another division which was more in agreement with the treatise's line of thought. Although Van der Nat's new division was clearly superior, we decided not to follow him in the interest of avoiding confusion. We are aware of the fact that neither the division in chapters nor that in paragraphs is ideal, but are at the same time persuaded that the most important function of those divisions is to facilitate references to the text. This use is certainly best served by the existence of one set of divisions. The Latin text has thus been printed in the traditional way, divided into the usual chapters and paragraphs. However, in order to take away any wrong impressions to which these divisions could give rise, we have decided to divide the *translation* into paragraphs which give a better insight in the treatise's line of thought.

The publication of this long and laborious work would not have been possible without the never-flagging assistance of Mrs. Dr. Hetty van Rooijen-Dijkman, who not only typed the entire text of the detail commentary in its continually altered versions, but also controlled it with an ever-wakeful eye, both with regard to the contents and their formulation. We are quite unable to give adequate expression to our gratitude for the devotion she showed in carrying out this task.

Our sincere thanks go also to Mrs. C. S. Rikkers-Krantz, who typed with great care the revised Latin text with the critical apparatus, the English translation and the Surveys and Remarks, to Dr. R. W. Daniel (Bonn) who corrected the English of the translation, the Surveys and the Remarks, and to Dr. D. T. Runia (Soest) who performed the same task with regard to the Introduction.

Last but not least, we would like to express our gratitude to the Publishing House of E. J. Brill, which was prepared to take the risk of publishing this complex work, and has produced it with the attention to qualitative excellence which has given the House its deservedly high reputation.

LISTS OF ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations of Book Titles

ACW	Ancient Christian Writers (Westminster, Maryland-London)
ALL	Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik (Leipzig)
ANRW	Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschungen. Herausgegeben von Hildegard Temporini und Wolfgang Haase (Berlin-New York)
ARW	Archiv für Religionswissenschaft (Berlin)
CC	Corpus Christianorum (Turnhout)
CGL	Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum
CIL	Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum (Wien)
DACL	Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie (Paris)
DS	C. Daremberg – E. Saglio, Dictionnaire des Antiquités grecques et romaines (Paris)
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller (Leipzig)
GL	Grammatici Latini
HdbNT	Handbuch zum Neuen Testament ... herausgegeben von Hans Lietzmann (Tübingen)
Mnem.	Mnemosyne (Leiden)
OLD	Oxford Latin Dictionary (Oxford)
PG	Patrologia Graeca
PL	Patrologia Latina
RAC	Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum (Stuttgart)
RE	Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft (Stuttgart)
REL	Revue des Études Latines (Paris)
RVV	Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten (Giessen)
SC	Sources Chrétiennes (Paris)
TLL	Thesaurus Linguae Latinae (Leipzig)
Vig. Chr.	Vigiliae Christianae (Amsterdam)
ZNTW	Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft (Berlin)

Abbreviated titles of the works of Tertullian

an.	De anima
apol.	Apologeticum
bapt.	De baptismo
carn. Chr.	De carne Christi
cor.	De corona
cult. fem.	De cultu feminarum
exh. cast.	De exhortatione castitatis
fuga	De fuga in persecutione
Herm.	Adversus Hermogenem
idol.	De idololatria
ieiun.	De ieiunio
Iud.	Adversus Iudaeos
Marc.	Adversus Marcionem
mart.	Ad martyras
mon.	De monogamia
nat.	Ad nationes
orat.	De oratione
paen.	De paenitentia
pall.	De pallio
pat.	De patientia
praescr.	De praescriptione haereticorum
Prax.	Adversus Praxean
pud.	De pudicitia
res.	De resurrectione mortuorum
Scap.	Ad Scapulam
scorp.	Scorpiace
spect.	De spectaculis
test. an.	De testimonio animae
ux.	Ad uxorem
Valent.	Adversus Valentinianos
virg. vel.	De virginibus velandis

INTRODUCTION

MANUSCRIPTS, EDITIONS, COMMENTARIES AND TRANSLATIONS*

The study of the manuscripts of Tert. has established that in the Middle Ages several collections of works of this author were in existence[1]:

1. The collection of the *Codex Agobardinus*, the oldest extant manuscript of Tert.[2].

2. The collection of the manuscript of Troyes 523 (*Codex Trecensis*) of the twelfth century[3].

3. A collection represented by a number of manuscripts, which derive from a lost *Codex Cluniacensis* and a likewise lost manuscript from Hirsau (Württemberg), the *Hirsaugiensis*[4].

---

* [In this chapter the text of Van der Nat has been maintained, but since the research of the manuscript tradition of Tert.'s works has made some progress during the last 25 years, some additional remarks have been added within square brackets.]

[1] Cf. especially E. Kroymann, *Die Tertullian-Überlieferung in Italien* (Sitz. Ber. Akad. Wien 138, 1898); *Kritische Vorarbeiten für den III. und IV. Band der neuen Tertullian-Ausgabe* (ib. 143, 1901); Prefaces CSEL XLVII and LXX. More literature will be given in the next notes. For summaries, see Gerlo, 1, 1 ff.; Diercks, V ff.; Mohrm., *Tert. Apol.*, XI, XLI ff.; Corp. Christ., ser. Lat. I, p. VI ff.; especially Waszink's introduction to the translation of *Adversus Hermogenem* (ACW 24, Westminster, Maryland-London 1956). For the textual history of the *Apologeticum*. constituting a problem by itself which is left out of consideration here, see Hoppe's preface to CSEL LXIX; Becker, *Tert. Apol.*, 105 ff.

[2] Possibly a fragment of a *Codex Ambrosianus* (G 58 sup., olim *Bobiensis*, s. X-XI) also derives from this collection, see Diercks, X-XII. The *Codex Agobardinus* will be discussed more elaborately below.

[3] Cf. J. W. P. Borleffs, *Mnem.* N.S. 59 (1932), 1 ff.; ib. N.S. 60 (1933), 41 ff.; 'La valeur du codex Trecensis de Tertullien pour la critique du texte dans le traité *De baptismo*', *Vig. Chr.* 2 (1948), 185 ff.; cf. also the preface to his edition of *De patientia*, *De baptismo* and *De paenitentia* (The Hague 1938), p. 8 ff. [For the evaluation of the *Trecensis* see now H. Tränkle's observations in his edition of *Adv. Iudaeos*: "...sie ist zugleich sehr gut und sehr schlecht" (p. CXVIII); "masslos überschätzt" (p. CXXV).]

[4] Cf. also J. W. P. Borleffs, 'Zur Luxemburger Tertullianhandschrift', *Mnem.* ser. III 2 (1935), 299 ff. [Tränkle (*op. cit.*, see n. 3) argues that it is incorrect to give a central place to a (lost) *codex Cluniacensis* in this collection. According to him, this collection stems from a hyparchetype θ which parted into two families: α and β. Tränkle identifies β with the lost *codex Hirsaugiensis*: the lost *codex Cluniacensis* should not be identified with α or θ, as some authors have done. It should be considered as just one member of the family α. Tränkle advises, therefore, to stop speaking of a *corpus Cluniacense*, since this gives a wrong impression of the importance of this member of the family. This advice has not been followed by J. Cl. Frédouille (in his edition of *Adv. Valent.*, S.C. 280, p. 48 ff., and *De patientia*, S.C. 310, p. 39) and Ch. Munier (*Vig. Chr.* 38, 1984, p. 313), who continue speaking of a 'so-called' *corpus Cluniacense*. In our vision, Van der Nat's formulation "which derive from a lost *Codex Cluniacensis* should be changed into "to which belonged a lost *codex Cluniacensis*".]

4. A collection which was found, together with Novatian's *De Trinitate*, in three lost manuscripts, a *Coloniensis*, a *Corbeiensis* and the *Codex Ioannis Clementis Angli*, used by Pamelius for his edition (1579)[5].

5. Recently traces of a fifth collection were found in the fragments contained in the *Codex Ottobonianus 25* of the fourteenth century[6].

A Of all these manuscripts it is only the first which contains the *De idololatria*. The *Codex Parisinus latinus 1622* of the *Bibliothèque Nationale* at Paris, called *Codex Agobardinus* after its first possessor, Agobardus, bishop of Lyons[7], is a parchment manuscript dating from the beginning of the ninth century. It was described in detail by M. Klussmann[8]. The siglum is *A*. The text of *De idololatria* is found on fol. 105^{v} up to and including fol. 118^{v}, where, at the beginning of the last line but one, after the word *evitandum* (18, 9) an abrupt beginning is made with *De anima* 6, 7 (the first words are *de minutiloquio Aristotelis*)[9]. From this it follows that the latter part of the *De idololatria* and the beginning of the *De anima* were already absent in the manuscript used by the copyist of the *Agobardinus*[10]. The manuscript has been seriously damaged by damp. However, the damage to *De idololatria* is far less than, for instance, that to *Ad nationes*: the edges of fol. 105^{v} up to and including fol. 109^{v} have been strongly affected and they have also been cut off, so that in many cases letters or words have become illegible or have even disappeared entirely; although fol. 110 and the following ones also show traces of damp, it is not to such an extent that the writing has become illegible. The text of *De idololatria* confirms the qualities and defects of this manuscript which have already been frequently noted: on the one hand it contains a great number of omissions and many cases of haplography, on the other hand it is free from learned emendations and interpolations[11]. Especially the works of

[5] Cf. E. Dekkers, 'Note sur les fragments récemment découverts de Tertullien', *Sacris Erudiri* 4 (1952), 372-383, especially 372-6; G. I. Lieftinck, 'Un fragment de *De spectaculis* de Tertullien provenant d'un manuscrit du neuvième siècle', *Vig. Chr.* 5 (1951), 193 ff. Lieftinck has identified a fragment of *De spectaculis*. His hypothesis that this fragment has been part of the Cologne manuscript was confirmed by Dom Dekkers.

[6] Cf. J. W. P. Borleffs, 'Un nouveau manuscrit de Tertullien', *Vig. Chr.* 5 (1951), 65 ff.; preface to the edition of *De paenitentia*, CSEL LXXVI, 129 ff.

[7] He lived from 779 to 840/1; in 816 he became a bishop. See E. Debroise, 'Agobard', *DACL* I, 1: 971-9.

[8] M. Klussmann, *Curarum Tertullianearum particulae tres* (Gotha 1887); cf. also Borleffs' preface to the edition of *Ad nationes* (Leyden 1929), V ff.; the preface to CSEL XX by Hartel and Wissowa, VI ff.; V. d. Vliet, 64-6. Originally the manuscript contained 21 treatises, but the latter part has been lost. This part contained more than half of *De carne Christi* and 8 other treatises (of which 5 do not occur in any other manuscript). [See also the Additional Note below.]

[9] A later hand has underlined *evitandum* and added *De Anima cap. VI* in the margin.

[10] A same case is found in fol. 171^{r}, where *per ecclesias quas<i>* (*orat.* 21, 1) is followed by *disposita utensilitas* (*cult. fem.* 1, 5, 2); see Diercks, IX-X.

[11] Kroymann's view (CSEL LXX, p. XI ff., and *QC*, 10) that the *Agobardinus* should contain interpolations was also contested by Waszink, 2*, n. 2.

Löfstedt and Thörnell have shown that in those cases where the *Agobardinus* deviates from other sources, the readings of this manuscript are mostly the correct ones.

It is beyond doubt that at least one more manuscript has existed which contained the *De idololatria*, since we find the complete text in the *editio princeps* of the treatise and in another edition for which a manuscript has been used.

B In 1545 an edition appeared at Paris, which for a long time was attributed to Ioannes Gangneius, but which actually was the work of Martinus Mesnartius[12]. The siglum is *B*. This is a reprint of the third edition of Beatus Rhenanus[13], however, with the addition of Novatian's *De trinitate* and *De cibis iudaicis*, a part of *De patientia* which was absent in Rhenanus, and nine other works of Tert.[14]. Mesnart declared that these were *opuscula ... ex vetustissimo codice desumpta*. In the margin Mesnart gives divergent readings

ıg (*Bmg*), often taken from the *Agobardinus*[15].

It is generally assumed that by the *vetustissimus codex* is meant the *Agobardinus*[16]. This, however, is incorrect: Mesnart edited treatises which have never been part of the *Agobardinus*[17], he fills up lacunae in this manuscript and puts the works of which he is the first editor in a different order[18]. Nevertheless it is certain that he has used the *Agobardinus*, and also the *Trecensis*[19]. For the rest the whole matter remains problematic[20]. Dom Elegius Dekkers thinks that actually Mesnart did not follow one manuscript, but made a rather haphazard use of various manuscripts[21]. For the constitu-

[12] An acrostic on the reverse of the title-page reveals the name of the real author, see Kroymann, CSEL XLVII, p. XII; Gerlo, 1, 10-1.

[13] The first edition appeared in 1521, the second in 1528, the third in 1539, all at Basle. They do not contain *De idololatria*.

[14] That is, *De testimonio animae*, *De anima*, *De spectaculis*, *De baptismo*, *Scorpiace*, *De idololatria*, *De pudicitia*, *De ieiunio*, *De oratione* (up to and including chapter 19).

[15] In *De idololatria* 6 out of 14, in *De anima* 62 out of 120 (Waszink, 2*).

[16] Thus Hartel-Wissowa, CSEL XX, pp. IX-XI; Kroymann, *QC*, 7 ff., and also Dekkers, *art. cit.*, 379. For the text of *De oratione* the *Agobardinus* did indeed serve as a basis, but this is an exceptional case, see Diercks, XIII ff.

[17] That is, *De baptismo*, *De pudicitia*, *De ieiunio*.

[18] The text of *De idololatria*, too, was based by Mesnart on another manuscript: not only does he give the latter part which is absent in the *Agobardinus*, but he also fills up most of the omissions of this manuscript and in several passages he gives a more extensive version of the text than the *Agobardinus* (whereas the opposite is not found anywhere).

[19] For the *Agobardinus*, cf. the preceding note and note 15; for the *Trecensis*, cf. Borleffs, *Mnem.* N.S. 59 (1932), 4 and the edition of *De patientia* etc., p. 10-1.

[20] The text of the *Codex Ottobonianus* shows a relationship with that of Mesnart and Gelenius (cf. n. 6), just as that of the fragment identified by Lieftinck and Dekkers (cf. n. 5).

[21] *Art. cit.*, 378-81, especially 381: "Mesnart a disposé, en dehors de l'Agobardinus, du Trecensis, du manuscrit de Sainte-Geneviève (i.e., for Novatian's *De cibis Iudaicis*) et d'un exemplaire de la collection de Corbie (i.e., for Novatian's *De trinitate*), encore d'un ou, plus probablement, de plusieurs autres manuscrits. Ce qu'il décrit d'un mot fort laconique *ex vetustissimo codice desumpta* a été en réalité une opération bien complexe".

tion of the text of *De idololatria* this edition is especially important, because it fills up lacunae and supplies the concluding chapters. In the cases where it diverges from the *Agobardinus* the latter is mostly correct[22].

Gel The second edition containing the complete text of the present treatise is that of Sigismundus GELENIUS (Basle 1550). It is based on Mesnart's edition, but Gelenius assures us that for the text of twelve works[23], including *De idololatria*, he has used a *Codex Masburensis*, which he had obtained *ex ultima Britannia*[24]. Not once, however, does Gelenius indicate whether his deviations from the text of Mesnart are derived from his manuscript or must be regarded as his own conjectures. Consequently concerning the value of this manuscript nothing can be established with certainty. Its identity, too, remains uncertain. After Diercks had argued persuasively that the manuscript Gelenius used was the same as that of Mesnart[25], Dom Dekkers has expressed the view that, apart from relying on Mesnart's edition, Gelenius only used the *Coloniensis*[26]. From the text of *De idololatria* we can establish a close relationship between Gelenius and Mesnart: frequently they show the same divergencies from the *Agobardinus*. But in addition to this they also show a great number of differences. However, these differences are all constituted by real or supposed corrections of Gelenius; nowhere in the latter do we find a reading of a totally different nature (in 22, 1 Mesnart's reading is so absurd, that a radical alteration is inevitable). For this reason it is probable that—apart from his own conjectures—Gelenius made a better use of Mesnart's manuscript (it is even possible that he relied on the latter's edition alone). However, only a detailed examination of all relevant materials can solve this problem, if it can be solved at all. In any case Gelenius' edition remains important for the constitution of the text of *De idololatria*, although Hoppe's praise[27] is certainly exaggerated.

In the case of the *De idololatria* later editions have not been based on other manuscripts, so that they only contain conjectures. As they have already been

[22] See above. Hoppe's view that against *A* the correct reading is frequently given by *B* (*Beitr.*, 10) is incorrect.

[23] That is, the nine treatises first edited by Mesnart and *De resurrectione mortuorum*, *De praescriptione haereticorum*, *De monogamia*.

[24] The manuscript was procured for him by one Ioannes Lelandus, who had found it *in Masburensi coenobio gentis eius vetustissimo*. The suggestion that by this the Abbey of Malmesbury (Wiltshire) was meant was first put forward by J. M. Lupton in his edition of *De baptismo* (Cambridge 1908), p. XXXVI.

[25] Diercks, XIX ff.; his view was adopted by Borleffs (edition of *De patientia* etc., 11 n. 1; *Vig. Chr.* 5 (1951), 77; CSEL LXXVI, 134). The possibility had already been suggested by Hartel-Wissowa, CSEL XX, p. XI.

[26] *Art. cit.*, 382. As *De idololatria* did not occur in the *Coloniensis*, this would mean that for the text of this treatise Gelenius made use of Mesnart's edition only. Consequently the divergencies would all be his own conjectures.

[27] *Beitr.*, 11-2.

elaborately described by others[28], the following summary of the most important facts may suffice.

The edition of Jacobus PAMELIUS (Antwerp 1579) is based on that of Gelenius. In his *Adnotationes* he mentions a few emendations of HARRISIUS. This edition went through many reprints, of which the one appearing at Franeker in 1597 deserves special mention: it was edited by Franciscus IUNIUS, who added notes of his own instead of those of Pamelius. In its turn the Pameliana served as a basis for the edition of Ioannes Ludovicus DE LA CERDA (Paris 1624-1630); however, De la Cerda was acquainted with the corrections and conjectures by Iunius, Latinius and Ursinus, and he adopted some of their suggestions. Of the many conjectures made by these editors only a few are correct (mostly those of Iunius).

Nicolaus RIGALTIUS was the first to base his edition (Paris 1634) on the *Agobardinus*. His collation of this manuscript is fairly accurate. He adopts a great number of the emendations by Ursinus. Although many of his own conjectures are incorrect, he was on the whole more successful than his predecessors. This edition, too, was reprinted many times. The reprint which appeared in 1664 was edited by Ph. PRIORIUS, whose notes (at least with respect to *De idololatria*) are of no value.

The editions of J. S. SEMLER (Halle 1771) and E. F. LEOPOLD (Leipsic 1839) have no value for the constitution of the text. They are arbitrary mixtures of the Pameliana of 1597 and the Rigaltiana; the few conjectures which they contain are all erroneous.

The edition of F. OEHLER (Leipsic 1853-54) has sometimes been criticized all too severely. In spite of its many deficiencies, of which the principal one is the highly unreliable *adnotatio critica*, it remains indispensable, especially because of Oehler's unquestionable gift for textual criticism and interpretation (Waszink, 3*-4*) by which the present treatise, too, has profited more than once.

G. CURREY edited *De idololatria* together with *De spectaculis* and *De corona* (Cambridge 1954), using Oehler's *adnotatio critica*. His text 'does not precisely agree with that of any edition that has hitherto appeared' (p. XIII). He does not introduce any conjectures of his own.

It has been the merit of A. REIFFERSCHEID (CSEL XX, Vienna 1890) to have given the first reliable notation of the readings of the *Agobardinus*[29] and (to a lesser extent) of the edition of Gelenius. However, as regards the other editions his *adnotatio critica* is incomplete and, in the case of Mesnart, not seldom faulty. In his text many of his own erroneous conjections are

[28] Cf. Gerlo, 1, 9 ff.; Waszink, 3*-4*; very elaborately Diercks, XXII ff.

[29] However, he is inconsistent as regards orthographic variants, which are sometimes recorded but mostly left out.

included[30]. Two collections of conjectures deserve notice. The one of Latinus Latinius (Rome 1677) contains a few real corrections. He adds four conjectures of Petrus Ciacconius, two of which are correct. The conjectures of Fulvius Ursinus were edited by Ioannes à Wouwer (Frankfurt 1603), who alleges that they derive from an old manuscript[31]. This remains a problematic question deserving further examination[32]. In any case Ursinus provides a few remarkable corrections (e.g. 9, 3; 22, 2-3).

Finally we may mention an inaccurate collation of the *Agobardinus* by Iosias Mercerus, found in a copy of the Pameliana of 1584 preserved in the Library of Leiden University (it derives from the library of Isaac Vossius). Mercerus made this collation in 1625[33]; he added one conjecture of his own, which is incorrect (10, 1).

The present edition is based on a repeated collation of the *Agobardinus* (I have also made use of a photographic reproduction) and of the editions. In order to give a complete picture of the text of the only extant manuscript I have also included orthographic divergencies in the *adnotatio critica*. [See, however, the Additional Note below.] In those places where the text has been lost or is illegible the estimated number of letters which have disappeared has been indicated by dots. Dots have been placed under letters which are only barely legible. I have striven to mention everything that has been contributed by scholars to the emendation of the text. The orthography of compound words is a difficult question. The *Agobardinus* is inconsistent in this matter. I have given the prepositions in compounds in the assimilated form[34], but I have not used assimilation in the case of other words[35].

Of the existing commentaries that of De la Cerda deserves to be mentioned first. He is the only commentator who has tried to enter into the structure of Tert.'s work and into his manner of reasoning, as was justly remarked by Waszink (p. 4*). Oehler, who adopted several valuable notes from his predecessors, especially from Rigaltius, has already been mentioned. Currey's commentary is likewise based on the work of earlier scholars, but he adds some correct observations of his own.

[30] A just criticism of Reifferscheid's work was given by Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 6. We may pass by the edition of *De idololatria* in Corp. Christ., ser. Lat. II (1954) which is only a reprint of Reifferscheid's edition. [One should, however, not neglect the observations added by Dekkers at the bottom of the pages.]

[31] Wouwer even distinguishes readings of Ursinus' manuscript and emendations of Ursinus himself (cf. e.g. *idol.* 5, 2).

[32] Cf. Kroymann, CSEL XLVII, p. XXVII ff.; Borleffs, *Mnem.* N.S. 59 (1932), 10-1 and edition of *De patientia* etc., 12 n. 1; Diercks, XXVII; Dekkers, *art. cit.*, 377 n. 6.

[33] Cf. Diercks, XXVI.

[34] With the exception of *ad-* before *m* and *ob-* before *s* and *t*.

[35] So I read e.g. *quamquam*, *quidquid*, *quicumque*. However, this does not apply to quotations from other editions of Tert.; only, my reading is always *idololatria* (Kroymann in CSEL XLVII *idolatria*; see the note on the title).

There are two mainly reliable translations, a German one by K. A. H. Kellner[36], and an English one by S. Thelwall[37]. Both are based on Oehler's text. Their value does not greatly differ. That of Thelwall is more old-fashioned and rather stiff because of its literalistic character[38].

Additional Note

The *Agobardinus* has some features which, as far as we can see, have not been noticed until now. There is a difference in the handwriting between the first part (f. 105^{v}-111^{v} = *idol.* 1,1-10,2) and the second (f. 112^{r}-118^{v} = *idol.* 10, 2-18, 9). In the second part the size of the letters is somewhat smaller; hence in that part the number of the lines per page is one more than in the first part (23 instead of 22). The different hands manifest themselves *inter alia* in the way of writing the capital S. In the first part it has a large upper part and a small lower part; in the second the upper part is small, the lower large. Another difference is in the manner of writing the diphtong *ae*. In both parts there is variation: sometimes it is written in full, sometimes the well-known abbreviation (an *e* with little stroke underneath (*ę*)) is used. But whereas in the first part this abbreviation is used only ten times, in the second part it is much more frequent; it appears already eight times in the first five lines. These divergencies in the orthography of the *ae* are not noted in the apparatus. We only mention the cases in which a single *e* is written instead of *ae*, or when *ae* is written instead of *e* (e.g. *grece* in 3, 4 and *aevitandum* in 18, 9).

Also in another respect the second part is different from the first: whereas in the first part the upper margin is empty, from f. 112^{r} onwards one reads on the recto side of the pages :IDOLATRIA:, on the opposite verso side :DE: (this means that the first :DE: is on f. 111^{v}, which page still belongs to the first part).

The situation at the end of the text of *De idololatria* is complex. As was said above, after the word *evitandum* in *idol.* 18, 9—thus in the middle of a sentence—an abrupt beginning is made with the text of *De anima* 6, 7. (A later hand has written in the margin: *De anima cap. VI*). This happens in the last line but one of f. 118^{v}. But in the upper margin of 118^{v}-119^{r} one still reads: DE - IDOLATRIA, even though 119^{r} contains the text of *De anima*. Moreover in the upper margin of 119^{v}-120^{r} the title DE - IDOLATRIA was again

[36] *Tertullianus, Sämtliche Schriften* (Köln) 1882. For the new edition of this translation (*Tertullians Ausgewählte Schriften* I: Private und Katechetische Schriften, Kempten-München 1912) use was also made of Reifferscheid's edition.

[37] *The Writings of Tertullian*. Translated by S. Thelwall and P. Holmes. Vol. I, Edinburgh 1869 (Ante-Nicene Christ. Library vol. XI).

[38] We may pass by the French translation by M. de Genoude (Paris 1852) and the Dutch one by H. U. Meyboom (Leyden 1931), which are entirely unreliable.

written, but there IDOLATRIA has been struck out and ANIMA has been written instead. (Further on the title is: DE CENSU - ANIMAE). Finally we note that the table of contents at the beginning of the *Agobardinus* says that on f. 105 DE IDOLATRIA begins and on f. 119 DE CENSU ANIMAE. It is difficult to explain this situation. It is obvious that the scribe of the *Agobardinus* was not aware of the fact that in the last but one line of f. 118^{v} he passed over from *De idololatria* 18, 9 to *De anima* 6, 7. He must have been copying as example a text in which a fascicle, containing the last six chapters of *idol.* and the first six of *an.*, was missing. But for the rest the course of events can hardly be traced. Who was responsible for writing the titles in the upper margins? Who corrected the title on f. 120^{r} and why did he not correct that of f. 119^{r}? Several hypotheses are possible; not one of these can be considered as certain.

The reader will have noticed that in all these titles we find written *idolatria*, not *idololatria*. This way of writing does not occur in the treatise itself except at the beginning of the second part. There the situation is as follows: the first time that the term appears in the second part one reads *idolatria* (10, 6) but *lo* has been written above; the second time one reads *idolatria* (11, 1), the third time *idololatria* (11, 2) and the fourth *idolalatria* (11, 2). Further on one finds *idololatria*, as in the first part, except in 16, 3. It seems that the irregularity at the beginning of the second part is connected with the change of scribe. He may have written the titles in the upper margin in advance and begun by writing *idolatria* in the text as well, but obviously he adapted himself to the reading of his example later on.

Finally, in the margin of f. 112^{r} and the following pages one finds a certain number of indicators with corresponding signs in the text. The indicators are N 2, N 3, N 5, N 6 on f. 112^{r}, 114^{r}, 117^{r}, 118^{v}. The corresponding signs in the text are breaking off signs, located at N 2 between *idolis* and *catechisat* (10, 6), at N 3 between *habeo* and *dixit* (12, 4), at N 5 between *vero* and *privatarum*. (N 6 has no corresponding sign in the text.) These indicators and signs must have been applied by someone who gave the text to a printer or by the printer himself, to mark the end of successive pages. (We thank Prof. P. F. J. Obbema of the Leiden University Library for this suggestion.)

In the edition of Mesnart the folia 281-4 have at the bottom of the recto sides: N, N ij, N iij, N iiij. Remarkably the letter N is the same as what was found in the *Agobardinus*, but the numbers added to this letter do not agree in the two texts. The distances between N 2, N 3, etc. in the *Agobardinus* disclose that the page size of the intended printing would have been smaller than in the actual printed edition of Mesnart. At any rate these indicators and signs are of no concern for the constitution of the text.

THE PURPOSE OF *DE IDOLOLATRIA*

The title of this treatise could give the impression that it concerns a well-defined subject matter, viz., the veneration of images of gods (or of the gods themselves). The question could then arise, whether it is not quite clear beforehand that such a veneration is disallowed for a Christian. What is the point of writing a treatise about it?

The answer is that for Tertullian idolatry has a wider range. In the introduction (ch. 2) he argues that the concept of idolatry is not restricted to the exercise of priestly functions and bringing sacrifices to the gods. The heathen religion has a great number of ramifications in social life, and wherever the Christian comes into contact with these ramifications he is in danger of perpetrating idolatry. *De idololatria* is a treatise on the practice of Christian life in relation to the (often hidden) religious elements in the heathen world.

Tertullian sees the dangers approaching from many sides. Two main categories are discerned: dangers that arise in the exercise of an occupation or profession, e.g. that of sculptor, astrologer, teacher, trader; and, secondly, dangers caused by social contacts. Is it permissible for a Christian to make images of gods? Is he allowed to be a teacher? How should he behave at heathen festivities? Is he allowed to participate in public celebrations? Is he allowed to be present at private ceremonies, e.g. at the marriage of the son or daughter of his neighbour? And what about occupations in the public sphere? Can the Christian be or become a soldier? In all these situations Tertullian finds vestiges, hidden to a greater or lesser extent, of the heathen religion. The task he sets himself is to warn his readers about the dangers involved.

Tertullian's instructions are directed to two groups of fellow-Christians: to the simple believers who are not aware of the dangers threatening them on all sides; and, secondly, to those who are quite well aware of them but close their eyes, in other words to those who do not want to see the dangers (see ch. 2, 1: *ignorata ... dissimulata*). His aim is to convince both these groups of the validity of his radical viewpoint.

Of course, he is quite well aware of the arguments which can be alleged against his view. 'A Christian has to live', 'he needs instruction' etc. Such objections are often put into the mouth of the imaginary opponents. Sometimes the objection is easily recognizable, sometimes it has to be reconstructed by means of a close analysis of the text. This way of writing gives the treatise a vivid character. One could speak of a dialogue in disguise. (In the translation we have made the objections more easily identifiable by placing them between single quotation-marks.)

Everyone knows Tertullian's radical attitude towards the heathen (Greek) philosophy. It has been unforgettably worded in the famous rhetorical ques-

tions in *De praescriptione haereticorum: Quid ergo Athenis et Hierosolymis? Quid academiae et ecclesiae?* What Tertullian states there in terms of *theoria*, he argues in *De idololatria* in relation to Christian *praxis*. Just as there is a radical opposition between Athens and Jerusalem in the domain of thinking, so there is an opposition between Rome and Jerusalem in daily life. (Rome stands for 'not Christian'; cf. *apol.* 35, 9.) He could have formulated it this way: *Quid Romae et Hierosolymis? Quid vitae paganae et vitae Christianae?*

Tertullian lives at a time, in which the Christian community is experiencing considerable growth. Such growth could easily lead to an increasing superficiality in the practice of Christian life. Tertullian sets out a standard (cf. 24, 3 *Haec erit lex nostra*) for those who are living as Christians in that world, as well as for those who want to join the Christian community. His radical viewpoint should not be confused with Montanism. Tertullian draws attention to many dangers and possible misuses, but nowhere in this treatise does he take a stand against the Church. Yet this opportunity stood wide open to him, e.g. in chapter 7, where he observes that even idol-makers are given a place in the *ordo ecclesiasticus*. His aim is to exhort his fellow Christians to give clear testimony of their faith. This aim is carried out in a not unsuitable manner, especially when one recalls that he is writing at the time when the idea of martyrdom is a vivid presence in every Christian's mind.

DATE OF *DE IDOLOLATRIA*

"Although the literature on the chronology of Tert.'s works is extensive, the dates of many of his writings remain uncertain. One of the most controversial datings is that of *De idololatria*." With these words written in 1960 Van der Nat began his discussion of the problems with regard to the dating of this treatise, and they retain their validity up to the present day. *De idololatria* has been located in practically every period of Tert.'s literary activity. Some authors give it a very early dating, i.e. before the *Apologeticum* (197), others regard it as Montanist and affirm that it dates either from the period in which Tert.'s thinking moved in the direction of Montanism (after 208) or from the time when he turned completely away from the catholic Church (after 211); a third group places it in the middle period. For the representatives of these viewpoints see R. Braun, 'Chronologia Tertullianea: Le *De carne Christi* et le *De idololatria*', *Annales de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences humaines de Nice*, n° 21, 1974, 274-81, and Van der Nat's introductory chapter on the date of *De idololatria*, p. 14*, n. 2.

Those who advocate a late date base this primarily on the intolerant viewpoint with regard to the military service of a Christian put forward in *idol.* ch. 19. Since this viewpoint is even more rigorous than that found in *De*

corona, written in 211, it is considered that *De idololatria* represents a further step on the path of intolerance in Tert.'s Montanist thinking. Moreover, *idol.* 19, 1 seems to contain a reference to *De corona*; thus it must have been written after 211.

In his introduction Van der Nat opposes this line of argumentation. He states first of all that there is no reference to *De corona* in *idol.* 19, 1: *at nunc de isto quaeritur*. (R. Braun, *art. cit.*, 279, joins Van der Nat in this interpretation. See also our Remarks at ch. 19.) He agrees with his opponents that in *De idololatria* Tert. is more radical than in *De corona*, but adds that it is very dangerous to use these kinds of differences as a standard for chronological order. In his Montanist works Tert. is by no means always more rigorous than in earlier treatises. One needs to take the nature of his writings into account, and this is closely related to his personality. Tert. writes in order to dispute, not in order to theorize; and he is a man with a highly aggressive temperament. Moreover, the immediate object at which he is aiming in a certain line of argument often dominates him to such an extent, that it is to this alone that his attention is directed, to the neglect of all other concerns. On this it is worth citing Van der Nat at some length. "The natural result of this tendency is that contrary views are found even within the same work. The present treatise provides us with a good example. In ch. 4 Tert. declares the makers of idols and the worshippers to be equally at fault, but in ch. 6 he argues that it is actually the makers of idols who are the worshippers *par excellence* and in fact practise idolatry to a greater degree than the ordinary worshippers. After this he declares that the making of attributes belonging to idols is even more important and, accordingly, an even more grievous sin (ch. 8). Finally in ch. 11, however, it is the trade in frankincense which is considered to be the principal form of idolatry ... Another significant example is found in *idol.* 8. There Tert. is completely dominated by his desire to prove that artisans can provide for themselves sufficiently without having to enter the service of idols. One of his examples is that more wreaths are needed for purposes of luxurious living than for religious ceremonies. Evidently it escapes Tert.'s notice that in this way he sanctions—and even recommends—the occupation of a maker of wreaths, although elsewhere he regards the wearing of wreaths as unlawful in any circumstances and forbids Christians to be of assistance to others in what they themselves are not allowed to do." (p. 12*) In a note Van der Nat refers to *apol.* 42, 6. He could have referred also to chs. 5-6 of *De corona*, where wreaths are said to be contrary to nature and, therefore, forbidden to Christians. A reference to *De corona* would have been interesting, since here the viewpoint of *De corona* is more rigorous than that of *De idololatria*, in contradistinction to the above-mentioned case of the military service. This confirms the thesis that such a difference cannot be used as a decisive argument for a certain chronological order.

We are of the opinion that Van der Nat was right in arguing that the difference between *De idololatria* and *De corona* can easily be explained by the different purposes of the two treatises. In *De idololatria* Tert. intended not only to give the Christian a set of rules, but also to provide a viewpoint with regard to the admission of converts. In *De corona*, on the other hand, he exclusively addresses those who are already Christians but refuse to accept the necessary consequences of their faith.

"It is true", says Van der Nat, "that Tert. takes a severe view of the participation of Christians in the life of heathen society. But severity and Montanism are not the same thing! Tert. emphasizes the difference that exists (or should exist) between Christians and heathens: this is also the case in *De spectaculis* and in the second book of *De cultu feminarum*, which were written before Tert. took the side of the Montanists. He gives evidence of a negative attitude towards life and the world; but the same mentality is found in *De spectaculis* and even in the *Apologeticum*. On the other hand it should be acknowledged that he takes a very mild view of the participation in family-festivals of the heathens, even if they are religious in character (*idol.* 16). To arrive at a just criticism of the work as a whole the value of this point should not be depreciated. However, this argument is conclusive: not only are his views on the most important subjects coming up for discussion shared by non-Montanist sources (e.g. Hippolytus' *Traditio apostolica*), but also symptoms of Montanism are absent precisely in those passages where they would be expected (*idol.* 7). Finally it must be pointed out that, although Tert. opposes the *rudes* and *dissimulantes*, he never breaks the unity and solidarity in the common struggle against heathendom, which is quite in contrast even with those works which were written when Tert., though already in sympathy with Montanism, had not yet severed his relations with the Church" (e.g. *De virginibus velandis*; cf. De Vries, *Bijdrage*, 39) (p. 13*).

We agree with Van der Nat that all this leads to the conclusion that *De idololatria* is not a Montanist work. It must have been written before 208. But how long before 208? Van der Nat advocates a very early date, even before that of the *Apologeticum* (197). The words of *idol.* 18, 8 (*supplicia consulta sunt*) seem to point to a time shortly before a persecution, and we know that a persecution took place in 197-8. Further, in his *Apologeticum* Tert. speaks of a decoration of houses, which makes them look like brothels. The manner in which this comparison is made in *apol.* 35, 4 might seem to betray a dependence on *idol.* 15, 8; particularly the use of the possessive pronoun of the second person (*tuae*) is more appropriate to the context of *idol.* 15, 8 and, therefore, must be earlier. In our view, however, there is a considerable difference between the two texts just mentioned. In *apol.* 35, 4 Tert. opposes the heathens and identifies himself with the Christian community (*cur die laeto non laureis postes obumbramus nec lucernis diem infringimus?*). In *idol.* 15, 8, on the other hand, he reproaches his fellow Christians that they are even more eager than the heathens to decorate their doors with lamps and wreaths. There is a great difference between these two texts.

Van der Nat's early dating was followed by T. D. Barnes, *Tertullian: a Historical and Literary Study*, in the first edition (1971), and Th. Klauser, 'Sind der christlichen Oberschicht seit Mark Aurel die höheren Posten im Heer und in der Verwaltung zugänglich gemacht worden?', *JbAC* 16 (1979) 60-6. Some years earlier C. Becker, *Tertullians Apologeticum, Werden und Leistung* (1954) had defended the same opinion. In the second edition of his work, however, Barnes changed his mind. Influenced *inter alia* by Braun's article mentioned above, he now takes the view that on the basis of a comparison of parallel passages it follows that the *De spectaculis* and *De idololatria* both postdate the *Apologeticum*. Braun proposes a date between 203 and 206. We regard his opinion as the most attractive one, although a greater range remains possible, i.e. between 198 and 208. The only certain point in the relative chronology is the priority of *De spectaculis* in relation to *De idololatria* (see *idol.* 13, 1). For the rest one remains in the sphere of probability.

ANALYSIS

A. INTRODUCTION: *the subject matter*

1. Idolatry, in a broad sense, is the summit and summary of all sins: it is the main sin and includes all other sins; all sins are idolatry. (1)
2. The author will confine himself to idolatry in its proper sense. This will afford sufficient material for a treatise, since idolatry is not restricted to such open acts as bringing sacrifices and burning incense, but extends to a very large domain of ramifications. These hidden forms of idolatry will be the main subject-matter of the treatise. (2)

B. THE MAIN PART: *the ramifications of idolatry* (3-23)

I. *Idolatry by exercising arts or professions* (3-11)

1. *The art of making idols* (3-7)

a) *The maker of idols is guilty of idolatry.* (3)

Although idolatry can exist without idols, it only received its name and increase after the devil had brought the makers of images into the world. Every art that produces idols in whatever way has become a summit of idolatry. (3, 1-2)

The kind of art and the kind of matter used in it are of no consequence. Every service (worship) of every image whatsoever is idolatry. Hence the maker of every idol is guilty of idolatry. (3, 3-4)

b) *The testimony of Scripture* (4)

God forbids the making of idols, and he forbids it as much as he does the worshipping of them. Since the making of something precedes the worshipping of it, the prohibition to make idols is also earlier, i.e. more fundamental, than the precept not to worship them. Thus the making of idols is even a more grievous sin. (4)

c) *The excuses of the makers of idols* (5)

The idol makers argue that they must be allowed to exercise their art because (i) they have nothing else to live from, (ii) St Paul allows them to stay in their art, (iii) the same apostle commands his Christians to earn their livelihood by the work of their hands. Tertullian refutes these arguments by a *deductio ad absurdum*. (5, 1-3a). Finally the makers of idols refer to Moses who made the bronze serpent. Tertullian answers that this is a prefiguration and therefore stands apart. Against those who do not believe in the prefigurative nature of the serpent, Tertullian argues that the same God gave the general commandment not to make idols and to Moses that of making the bronze serpent. Follow Moses in not making an idol, unless God commands otherwise. (5, 3b-4)

d) *The sacrament of baptism is a sufficient argument in itself* (6)

How can one maintain to renounce the devil and his angels (the demons) if one makes their images? (6, 1-2a)

The argument 'I make them but I do not worship them' is not valid. (6, 2b-3)

e) *The complaint of the zealous believer* (7)

The zealous believer will complain when he sees the maker of idols entering the church and touching the body of Christ with hands that made the idols. (7, 1)

The idol maker is even chosen into the ecclesiastical order, which is a truly great shame. (7, 2-3)

2. *The arts of making other objects in connection with the service of the gods* (8)

Other arts not making idols but manufacturing their attributes are equally guilty of idolatry. (8, 1)

The excuse of having to secure maintenance is not valid here either. The more so because the practisers of those arts can easily win their living by applying their skill to other objects. (8, 2-5a)

3. *The profession of astrologer* (9)

About the idolatrous nature of the profession of astrology (and magic) there can be no doubt; it was taught by the fallen angels. The measures of the worldly authorities confirm the divine sentence. (9, 1-2)

The magi who announced the birth of Christ and worshipped Him do not justify the present, idolatrous, astrology. They were in fact the last men to be allowed to practise this profession. (9, 3-6a)

After the appearance of the gospel one finds that all magi, astrologers, etc. are punished. (9, 6b-7)

The fact that astrology did not foresee its own future proves its worthlessness.

4. *The profession of teacher* (10)

A Christian is not allowed to be a schoolmaster or to teach language and literature, because, first, he should have to catechize about the idols and, second, he should have to participate in heathen festivities with their idolatrous acts. (10, 1-4a)

The study of language and literature is not forbidden to the Christians, because the situation of him who learns is quite different from that of him who teaches. Moreover, the *studia saecularia* are a necessary basis for the *studia divina*. (10, 4b-7)

5. *The function of trader* (11)

As it is based on covetousness, which St Paul also calls idolatry, and on deceit, trade is already in itself of a dubious legality. (11, 1)

But even if in some cases it can take place without those sins, certainly that form of trade is forbidden which provides articles to be offered as a sacrifice to idols, such as incense. Idolatry is more easily carried on without an idol than without frankincense. A dealer in frankincense is a servant of the demons and, in consequence, comes into conflict with the Christian faith. (11, 2-8a)

Summary of ch. 3-11: no handicraft, profession or trade taking part in the manufacture or the provision of idols is free from idolatry. (11, 8b)

6. *On the excuse of the necessity of a living* (12)

This excuse, if uttered by a Christian, comes too late. He should have deliberated before he accepted the faith. (12, 1)

But even now, after baptism, he has the sayings of the Lord and the examples given by Him. (12, 2-4a)

Although it may be difficult, idolatry has to be avoided like a pestilence. (12, 4b-5)

II. *Idolatry by participation in social life* (13-23)

1. *Idolatry in deeds* (13-19)

a) *Festivities* (13, 1-17, 1)

aa) *Public festivals* (13, 1-14, 5)

Sacrifices and priestly offices need not even be discussed.

The visiting of spectacles has been dealt with in a special treatise. Hence participation in pagan festivities has to be discussed, which we allow sometimes to ourselves either out of lustfulness or out of fear of making ourselves known as Christians. (13, 1)

(1) *Celebrations together with the heathens* (13, 2-14, 5)

Christians should not share in the pleasures of the heathens as Scripture shows clearly. (13, 2-4a)

Pagan holidays of giving and rejoicing should not be observed by a Christian. Show that you are a Christian by not conforming to the rules of the heathens. Otherwise the Lord would be ashamed of you. (13, 4b-6)

Neither the Scriptural precept to avoid blasphemy of the Name, nor St Paul's assertions that he wished to please all by all means and that he has become all things to all can be adduced in support of a communion with the celebrations of heathens. (14, 1-5)

(2) *Celebrations of the Christians on their own* (14, 6-15, 11)

A fortiori the Christian is not allowed to celebrate festivals like the Saturnalia *on their own*. (14, 6) The heathens would never do the same with a Christian feast. They show more fidelity to their own religion. (14, 7)

The decoration of doors with lamps and laurel-wreaths is an idolatrous act, not only if it is meant as an homage to an idol, but equally if it is intended in honour of a human being, viz., the emperor. (15, 1-4)

Romans and Greeks know gods of doors. Enoch speaks about this form of superstition. If we decorate our doors, we give honour to the idols. (15, 5-7a)

Confirmation from experience: the dream of one of the brethren. (15, 7b-8a)

Examples for our attitude towards those in authority may be found in the stories of the three brothers and Daniel in Dan 3 and 6. (15, 8b-10a)

Final adhortation not to do the works of the heathens. (15, 10b-11)

bb) *Private festivities* (16, 1-17, 1)

Christians may take part in family-festivals, since the matters concerned (*toga virilis*, matrimony etc.) are not tainted by idolatry. They may not, however, partake in the religious part of the festivity. (16, 1-5) Otherwise the position of the Christian servants of heathen masters would become untenable. According to the same rule, we may obey magistrates and powers as long as we do not perpetrate idolatry. (17, 1)

b) *Functions of dignity and power* (17, 2-18, 9)

Are Christians allowed to exercise these functions, if they succeed in avoiding idolatry and other forbidden actions? The examples of Joseph and Daniel seem to suggest a positive answer. (17, 2)

As to the condition mentioned just now, let us assume that this is possible. (17, 3)

However, the dress and the insignia belonging to these offices are tainted with idolatry, which makes these functions forbidden for Christians. The cases of Joseph and Daniel were different. (18, 1-4a)

Moreover, one should bear in mind that old and new are not always comparable. Joseph and Daniel were slaves, the Christian is nobody's slave but Christ's; he should follow the example of the Lord. (18, 4b-7)

The worldly powers are hostile to God. Besides, birth and fortune are in themselves obstacles in the fight against idolatry, a sin which a Christian has to avoid even at the cost of his life. (18, 8-9)

c) *Military service as a common soldier* (19)

The higher ranks belong to the offices of power and dignity discussed just now. The lower ranks and common soldiers, however, are not less forbidden. The divine and human sacrament do not tolerate each other. Examples taken from Old and New Testament which seem to point in the other direction are refuted. In St Peter Christ has disarmed every soldier. (19, 1-3)

2. *Idolatry in words* (20-22)

Not only in deeds but also in words idolatry threatens our Christian way of life. These words originate either from custom or from timidity. (20, 1)

Praenotandum: The prohibition of Scripture not to name the gods of the heathens does not mean that we may not pronounce them, but that we may not call them 'gods'. (20, 2-4)

a) *Idolatry because of custom* (20, 4)

Expressions like *mehercule* are in fact formulas of swearing by heathen gods. (20, 4)

b) *Idolatry because of timidity* (21-22)

Timidity to make ourselves known as Christians occasions often *a wrong reaction* to somebody's else's words. This reaction may also be that of silence. Tertullian presents three cases.

aa) Somebody binds us by an oath by pagan gods and we do not protest. This silence makes us guilty of idolatry. (21, 1-3)

bb) Somebody utters a malediction and we retort it. This is, of course, an act of idolatry. Even if we should not retort it, but show ourselves indignant, we would perpetrate idolatry. The Christian should react by a benediction in the name of God. (21, 4-5)

cc) Somebody blesses us in the name of the gods of the heathens and we keep silence. Here, too, this silence makes us guilty of idolatry, because it means a denial of our faith. (22, 1-4)

3. *Idolatry in deed and word* (23)

The Christian who borrows money from a heathen has to give a written guarantee under oath. This means idolatry in deed and word. He may try to exculpate himself by sagacious arguments, but these are not valid. We ought rather to pray the Lord not to come in such a necessity or, if we do, to find another solution. (23, 1-7)

C. Epilogue: *avoid all idolatry* (24)

Amid these dangers the ship of faith has to sail. We have to safeguard ourselves against them at all costs. (24, 1-2)

This law should be imprinted upon the catechumens and candidates for baptism. (24, 3)

For idolaters there is no place in the Church. (24, 2)

TEXT AND TRANSLATION

INDEX SIGLORUM

A	Codex Agobardinus (Parisinus latinus 1622) saec. IX, fol. 105^{v}-fol. 118^{v}.
B	ed. Martini Mesnart (Parisiis 1545), vulgo Gangneiana, pp. 279^{v}-284^{r}.
Bmg	margo editionis Mesnartianae.
Gel	ed. Sigismundi Gelenii (Basileae 1550), pp. 728-42.
Pam	ed. Iacobi Pamelii (Antverpiae 1579), pp. 279-90 (adnott.: pp. 291-300).
LaC	ed. Ludovici de la Cerda, I (Lutetiae 1624), pp. 478-550 (adnotationes singulis capitibus adiectae sunt).
Rig	ed. Nicolai Rigaltii (Lutetiae 1634), pp. 104-19 (adnott.: pp. 20-5).
Rig 1664	Rigaltiana iterata (ib. 1664), pp. 85-100 (adnotationes singulis capitibus adiectae sunt).
Seml	ed. J. S. Semleri, IV (Halae Magdeburgicae 1771), pp. 145-83.
Leop	ed. E. F. Leopoldii (Bibl. Patr. Eccles. Latin. selecta, cur. E. G. Gersdorf, vol. IV), pars I (Lipsiae 1839), pp. 29-53.
Oehl	ed. Fr. Oehleri, I (Lipsiae 1853), pp. 65-107.
Currey	G. Currey, Tertulliani libri tres, De Spectaculis, De Idololatria et De Corona Militis (Cantabrigiae 1854), pp. 56-110.
Rfd	ed. Aug. Reifferscheidii (Corpus Script. Eccles. Latin., vol. XX, Vindobonae 1890), pp. 30-58.
Harrisius	coniecturae Harrisii a Pamelio adservatae.
Iun	notae Francisci Iunii editioni Pamelianae iteratae (Franekerae 1597) additae, pp. 101-11.
Scal	notae Josephi Justi Scaligeri manu adscriptae exemplari editionis Iunianae, quod in bibliotheca Academiae Lugduno-Batavae adservatur.
Urs	Fulvii Ursini lectiones, adservatae a Ioa. a Wouwer, Ad Q. Septimii Florentis Tertulliani opera emendationes epidicticae (Francofurti 1603), pp. 40-4.
Mercerus	Iosiae Merceri collatio Codicis Agobardini (vide p. 6).
Lat	Latini Latinii Bibliotheca Sacra et Profana, a Dominico Macro Melitensi e Bibliotheca Brancaccia in lucem edita (Romae 1677), p. 195.
Ciacconius	coniecturae Petri Ciacconii Toletani a Latinio adservatae.
Hartel ap. Rfd	coniecturae Guilelmi Hartelii, in adnotatione critica editionis Reifferscheidianae memoratae.
Wissowa	coniecturae Georgii Wissowa, in adnotatione critica editionis Reifferscheidianae memoratae.
Heraldus	Desiderii Heraldi adnotationes editioni Arnobii Adversus gentes 11. VII (Lugduni Batavorum 1651) additae.
Kellner	vide p. 7.

Gomperz, *Hartel*, *Hoppe*, *Klussmann*, *Kroym(ann)*, *Löfst(edt)*, *Thörn(ell)*, *vdVliet*: vide Indicem librorum.

* = litera erasa.

DE IDOLOLATRIA

f. 105^{v} **1.** 1. Principale crimen generis humani, summus saeculi reatus, tota causa iudicii idololatria. Nam etsi suam speciem tenet unumquodque delictum, etsi suo quoque nomine iudicio destinatur, in idololatriae tamen crimine expungitur. Omitte titulos, operas recognosce. Idololatres idem homicida est. Quaeris, quem occiderit? Si quid ad elogii ambitionem facit, non extraneum nec inimicum, sed ipsum se. Quibus insidiis? Erroris sui. Quo telo? Offensa dei. Quot plagis? Quotquot idololatriis. 2. Qui negat idololatren perisse, is negabit idololatren homicidium fecisse. Proinde adulterium et stuprum in eodem recognoscas. Nam qui falsis deis servit, sine dubio adulter est veritatis, quia omne falsum adulterium est. Sic et stupro mergitur. Quis enim immundis spiritibus cooperator non conspurcatus et constupratus incedit? Atque adeo scripturae sanctae stupri vocabulo utuntur in idololatriae exprobratione. 3. Fraudis condicio ea est, opinor, si quis alienum rapiat aut alii debitum deneget, et utique erga hominem admissa fraus maximi criminis nomen est; at enim idololatria fraudem deo facit honores illi suos denegans et conferens aliis, ut fraudi etiam contumeliam coniungat. Quodsi tam fraus quam /
f. 106 stuprum atque adulterium mortem afferunt, iam in his aeque idololatria de homicidii reatu non liberatur. 4. Post talia crimina, tam exitiosa, tam devoratoria salutis, cetera quoque ad aliquem modum et seorsum proinde disposita in idololatria condicionem suam repraesentant. In illa et concupiscentiae saeculi. Quae enim idololatriae sollemnitas sine ambitione cultus et ornatus? In illa lasciviae et ebrietates, cum plurimum victus et ventris et libidinis causa frequententur. In illa iniustitia. Quid enim iniustius ea, quae iustitiae patrem nescit? In illa etiam vanitas, cum tota eius ratio vana sit. In illa mendacium,

12. Ezech. 16; 23. Os. 2; 3; 4, 10 seqq.

Titulus: in spatio, quod supra textum librarius vacuum reliquerat, scripsit De idololatria *m. rec. in A.* **1.** Principale crimen generis humani. sum *uncialibus litteris (*P *minio) A* **2.** et si *Gel alt.* etsi *Pam 1597*] ... *A* et si *B Gel* **3.** quodque *Iun Scal*; *lectionem traditam vindicat Gomperz 21* tamen *A* **4.** opera *Lat*; *dubitanter repudiat Hoppe Beitr. 76* recog..sce *A* item *Oehl* **5.** occi..rit *A* occiderit *Gel*] occident *B hoc modo distinguens*: occident si quid...facit? non extrane.m *A* neque *LaC* **6.** seipsum *B Gel* sui *B Gel*] ... *A* Quo] Quod *A* **7.** idololatriis *B Gel*] idolo..... *A* negavit *A* **8.** idololatren *B Gel*] idolola.... *A* Perinde *Gel* stuprum *B Gel*] stu.... *A* **9.** sine dubio *B Gel*] si.....io *A* veritatis ... est *(10) om. A* **10.** in stupro *B Gel* immundis *B Gel*] ....ndis *A* **11.** cooperator *A Bmg*] operatus *B Gel* conspurgatus *A* constupratus *B Gel*] cons....atus *A* **12.** vocabulo *B Gel*] voca.... *A* **13.** conditio *B Gel*] .....*cio A* ea est *B Gel*] est ea *LaC*; *A om.* est deneget *B Gel*] ..... *A* **14.** arga *A* maxi.....inis *A* **14-15.** Atenim adidololatria *A* **15.** fraudem deo *Rig*] deo fraudem *B Gel* deo

IDOLATRY

1. 1. Idolatry is the chief crime of mankind, the supreme guilt of the world, the entire case put before judgement. For even if every sin retains its own identity and even if each is destined for judgement under its own name, each is still committed within idolatry.

Do not observe the rubrics, just examine the deeds. The idolater is at the same time a murderer. Do you ask whom he has killed? Not a stranger nor an enemy, but himself—if this contributes anything to the extent of the indictment. By what schemes? Those of his error. With what weapon? Affront to God. With how many strokes? As many as his idolatries. 2. Only he who denies that the idolater is dead will deny that the idolater has committed murder. Likewise you may perceive in the same person adultery and fornication. For whoever serves false gods undoubtedly commits adultery against truth, since all falsehood is adultery. He thus also sinks into fornication, for what person cooperating with impure spirits does not go about as a man tainted and dishonoured? And this is why Holy Scripture uses the word 'fornication' in its censure of idolatry. 3. One has to do with fraud, I think, if somebody steals another's property or denies him a debt; and, of course, fraud, already if it is committed against a human being, is a name of a very grievous offence. Idolatry, however, commits fraud against God by denying Him the honours due to Him and offering them to others, thus adding contumely to fraud.

And if fraud as well as fornication and adultery cause death, then equally because of these sins idolatry cannot be claimed innocent of murder.

4. Like these so pernicious sins, so destructive of salvation, the other ones, too, have also separate existences in idolatry and show in one way or another their nature in it. In idolatry are also the concupiscences of the world, for what idolatrous ceremony lacks the pomp of dress and finery? In it is lustfulness and drunkenness, for mostly the ceremonies are visited for the sake of gluttony, carousing and lust. In it is unrighteousness, for what is more unrighteous than that which does not know the Father of righteousness? In it is also vanity, for its whole nature is vain. In it is mendacity, for its entire

om. A facit *B Gel*] ..... *A* **17.** in *delet Iun* aeque *B Gel*] ... *A* **18.** homicidi *A* crimina *A* **19.** ad aliquem modum *B Gel*] ad aliquem admodum *A* aliquem ad modum *Rig* perinde *Rfd* **20.** conditionem *A* repraesentat *A B* concupiscenti. *A* **21.** sollempnitas *A* ambitione *A* **22.** ebrietates cum plurimum, victus *Iun distinguit* **23.** frequentantur *Pam* frequentatur *LaC post* frequententur *virgulam exhibet B* illa *A* patrem *A* **24.** *alt.* in] i. *A* mendatium *A*

cum tota substantia eius mendax sit. 5. Ita fit, ut omnia in idololatria et in omnibus idololatria deprehendatur. Sed et alias, dum universa delicta adversus deum sapiant, nihil autem, quod adversus deum sapiat, non daemoniis et immundis spiritibus deputetur, quibus idola mancipantur, sine dubio idololatrian admittit quicumque delinquit. Id enim facit, quod ad idolorum mancipes pertinet.

2. 1. Sed universa nomina criminum discedant in operum suorum proprietates, remaneat idololatria in eo, quod ipsa est. Sufficit sibi tam inimicum deo nomen, tam locuples substantia criminis, quae tot ramos porrigit, tot venas
f. 106^{v} defundit, ut de hoc cum maxime materia / suscepta sit, quot modis nobis praecavenda sit idololatriae latitudo, quoniam multifariam servos dei nec tantum ignorata, sed etiam dissimulata subvertit. 2. Plerique idololatrian simpliciter existimant his solis modis interpretandam, si quid aut incendat aut immolet aut polluceat aut sacris aliquibus aut sacerdotiis obligetur, quemadmodum si quis existimet adulterium in osculis et in amplexibus et in ipsa carnis congressione censendum aut homicidium in sola sanguinis profusione et in animae ereptione reputandum. 3. At enim dominus quam extensius ista disponat, certi sumus, cum adulterium etiam in concupiscentia designat, si oculum quis impegerit libidinose et animam commoverit impudice, cum homicidium etiam in verbo maledicti vel convicii iudicat et in omni impetu irae et in negle-
gentia caritatis in fratrem, 4. sicut Iohannes docet homicidam esse qui oderit fratrem. Alioquin in modico consisteret et diaboli ingenium de malitia et dei domini de disciplina, qua nos adversus diaboli altitudines munit, si in his tantum delictis iudicaremur, quae etiam nationes decreverunt vindicanda. 5. Quomodo abundabit iustitia nostra super scribas et pharisaeos, ut dominus praescripsit, nisi abundantiam adversariae eius, id est iniustitiae, perspexeri-
f. 107 mus? Quodsi caput iniustitiae idololatria est, / prius est, uti adversus abundantiam idololatriae praemuniamur, dum illam non solum in manifestis recognoscimus.

12. Mtth. 5, 28. **13-14.** Mtth. 5, 22-4. **15.** 1 Ioh. 3, 15. **17.** Apoc. 2, 24. **19.** Mtth. 5, 20.

25. sit. Ita *B Gel*] ṣ..... *A* **25-26.** idololaṭ..... praehendatur *A* **26-27.** adversus *B Gel*] .....sus *A* **27.** deum *A*] dominum *B Gel post* sapiant *punctum exhibent A B alt.* deum *A*] dominum *B Gel* non *B Gel*] ... *A* **28.** idola *B Gel*] ..... *A* idololatriam *B Gel (ut semper)* **29.** qui...que *A* **29-30.** manci.....tinet *A*

1. in operum *B Gel*] .....rum *A* **2.** remaneant. Idololatria *A* ịn *A* **3.** nomẹn..m *A* porrigịt *A* **4.** diffundit *Urs Rig* sụscepta *B Gel*] .ụṣçẹpta *A* **5.** idololatrae *Pam 1597* latitudo *B Gel*] .ạtịtudo *A* **7.** existimant his *B Gel*] existimantes *A* si quid *A*] Si quis *B Gel* in.endat *A* **8.** polluceat *Harrisius Pam*] proluceat *A B Gel* **8.** sacerdotiis *Bmg Gel*] .acerdotibus *A* sacerdotibus *B* **10.** congres..one *A* **11.** enim] etiam *LaC* .xtensius *A* **12.** con.....ẹntia *A* **13.** animam *B Gel*] .....m *A* **14.** verbo *B Gel*] ....o *A* convitii iudicii iudicat *B*; *'al. deest* iudicii' *Bmg* indicat *Iun* et in negligentia *B Gel*] .....glegentia *A* **15.** Ioannes *B Gel* do....ọmicidam *A* **16.** modico *B Gel*] ...ịco *A* **17.** domini *B Gel*] do.... *A* dominium *Iun, quem refutat Kroym Q. C.* 25 dẹ *A* latitudines *Urs Rig; lectionem traditam vindicat Hartel P. S. 1, 39, quem*

substance is mendacious. 5. Thus it happens that all sins are found in idolatry and idolatry in all sins.

But this also holds true in another way: since all sins are directed against God and everything directed against God is allotted to the demons and impure spirits, to whom the idols are subject, it is beyond doubt that everybody who sins makes himself guilty of idolatry, for he does that which is in the realm of the masters of the idols.

2. 1. But let all the names of crimes withdraw to their own specific deeds, and let idolatry remain limited to that which it is itself. A name so hostile to God and a substance so rife with crime is sufficient to itself; it extends so many branches and pours forth so many veins, that I have undertaken to expound mainly on the many ways we must guard against the extensive domain of idolatry, since it variously overthrows the servants of God both when it is not recognized and when people turn a blind eye to it.

2. Most people simply think that idolatry is only then to be assumed, if somebody makes a burnt offering or brings a sacrifice or organizes a sacrificial banquet or makes himself guilty of certain other sacred actions or priesthoods. Accordingly one could regard adultery as to be restricted to kisses and embraces and carnal union itself, or murder as to be restricted to bloodshed and the actual taking away of life.

3. However, we clearly know how much wider meaning the Lord assigns to these sins. For He even indicates adultery in desire, namely when somebody casts a lascivious glance and rouses a lecherous excitement in his soul; and He considers murder to be present even in a word of imprecation or abuse and in every access of anger and in the neglect of charity towards a brother; 4. so John teaches that he is a murderer who hates his brother.

Otherwise the devil's ingenuity in wickedness would have but a limited extent, as would the ingenuity of the Lord God in the discipline by which He fortifies us against the *depths of the devil*, if we were to be judged only for those crimes which the heathens, too, have decreed punishable.

5. How will our *righteousness be more abundant than that of the scribes and pharisees*, as the Lord commanded, unless we have seen through the abundance of its adversary, that is unrighteousness? But if idolatry is the summit of unrighteousness, then all the more must we safeguard ourselves against the abundance of idolatry by not only recognizing it in its conspicuous manifestations.

---

approbat Kroym Q. C. 25 munit] innuit *B* **17-18.** si in his tantum *B Gel*] *(4 vel 5 litt.)*ṣ tantum *A 'alii* si his tantum' *Iun* **18.** ḍ....verunt *A* **19.** nostra super *B Gel*] .....per *A* **20.** ạbundantiam *A* **20-21.** *interrogationis signum post* perspexerimus *primus posuit Pam* **21.** capud *A* **22.** pṛ....niamur *A* in *om. B Gel* **23.** recognoscịm.. *A*

3. 1. Idolum aliquamdiu retro non erat. Priusquam huius monstri artifices ebullissent, sola templa et vacuae aedes erant, sicut in hodiernum quibusdam locis vetustatis vestigia permanent. Tamen idololatria agebatur, non isto nomine, sed in isto opere; nam et hodie extra templum et sine idolo agi potest. 2. At ubi artifices statuarum et imaginum et omnis generis simulacrorum diabolus saeculo intulit, rude illud negotium humanae calamitatis et nomen de idolis consecutum est et profectum, et inde iam caput facta est idololatriae ars omnis, quae idolum quoquomodo edit. Neque enim interest, an plastes effingat, an caelator exsculpat, an phrygio detexat, quia nec de materia refert, an gypso, an coloribus, an lapide, an aere, an argento, an filo formetur idolum. 3. Quando enim et sine idolo idololatria fiat, utique, cum adest idolum, nihil interest, quale sit quam de materia quam de effigie, ne qui putet id solum idolum habendum, quod humana effigie sit consecratum. 4. Ad hoc necessaria est vocabuli interpretatio. Εἶδος Graece formam sonat; ab eo per diminutionem εἰδωλον deductum aeque apud nos formulam fecit. Igitur omnis
f. 107^{v} forma vel formula idolum se dici exposcit. Inde idololatria omnis circa / omne idolum famulatus et servitus. Inde et omnis idoli artifex eiusdem et unius est criminis, nisi parum idololatrian populus admisit, quia simulacrum vituli et non hominis sibi consecravit.

4. 1. Idolum tam fieri quam coli deus prohibet. Quanto praecedit, ut fiat quod coli possit, tanto prius est, ne fiat, si coli non licet. Propter hanc causam, ad eradicandam scilicet materiam idololatriae, lex divina proclamat: *ne feceris idolum*, et coniungens: *neque similitudinem eorum, quae in caelo sunt et quae in terra et quae in mari*, toto mundo eiusmodi artibus interdixit servis dei. 2. Antecesserat Enoch praedicens omnia elementa, omnem mundi censum, quae caelo, quae mari, quae terra continentur, in idololatrian versuros

18. Exod. 32, 4 seqq.

14-16. Isid. etym. 8, 11, 13-4.

3. Exod. 20, 4. Deut. 5, 8. **6-9.** Cf. comm.

1. aliquandiu *A* aliquando *LaC* mo..tri *A* **2.** ebulissent *A* erant *B Gel*] era.. *A* **3-4.** in isto nomine *B Gel* **7.** *pr.* est *om. Rig 1664* , et inde *A*] . Exinde *B Gel* **8.** omnis quae *B Gel*] om (*4 vel 5 litt.*) *A* plastes *B Gel*] p..... *A* plastes aut pictor *susp. Pam, quem refutat Iun* **9.** celator *A* exculpat *A* phrygrio testexat *A* quia *B Gel*] .... *A* **10.** lapide an *B Gel*] lapi.... *A* filo *Gel 'al.* filo*' Bmg*] figulo *A B* figlino *coni. Kellner BKV 1912, 141* **11.** enim *B Gel*] .... *A* **12.** nihil *B Gel*] ..... *A* quam de (*bis*) *A*] qua de (*bis*) *B Gel* qua de...quave *mavult Iun* ne qui putet *B Gel*] n(*5 vel 6 litt.*)tet *A* ne quis putet *Leop* **13.** effigie..... secratum *A* Ad hoc *B Gel*] At *A* **14.** εἶδος *B Gel*] .... *A* grece *A* **15.** deminutionem *Iun* idolum *A* deductum aeque apud nos formulam fecit *A ut vid.* (de..... aeque aput); *Leop*; *vindicat J. H. Waszink Mnemos. 3a ser. 3 (1936), 171*] deductum, aeque apud nos formulam fecit *B Gel* deductum atque apud nos formulam faciunt *Klussmann Exc. Tert. 23* deductum; aeque apud nos forma formulam fecit *Rfd* deductum, quae (*sc. diminutio*) aeque a.n.f.f. *Hartel apud Rfd* deductum, quae apud n.f.f. *vel* deductum aeque quae a.n.f.f. *Hartel P. S. 1, 39* fecit] facit *Pam* **16.** exposuit *LaC* **16-17.** omne idolum *B Gel*] .....dolum *A* eiusdem *A* **18.** quia] qui *Oehl* **19.** hominis] omnis *B*

3. 1. There was a time, long ago, when there existed no idol. Before the makers of this monstrosity made their boisterous appearance, temples and sanctuaries were bare and empty, as in some places traces of the old state of affairs have maintained themselves up to our day. Yet idolatry was practised, not under that name but in actual fact. For even today it may be practised outside a temple and without an idol.

2. But as soon as the devil had brought into the world the makers of statues, portraits and every kind of representation, that former primitive practice so pernicious to man received from the idols both its name and its increase. Thenceforth every form of art producing an idol in any way became a summit of idolatry.

For it makes no difference whether a modeller forms the idol, an engraver chisels it out or an embroiderer weaves it, because it is also not important whether the idol is made of gypsum or colours or stone or bronze or silver or thread. 3. For since even without an idol there may be idolatry, certainly, when the idol is present, its material and formal nature makes no difference, lest one should think that only that must be regarded as an idol which has been consecrated in human shape.

4. To illustrate this an explanation of the word is necessary. Εἶδος is the Greek word for *forma*; the diminutive εἰδωλον derived from this has in a corresponding way produced the word *formula* in our language. Thus every *forma* or *formula* lays claim to the name 'idol'. Hence every attendance and service of every idol is idolatry. Hence, also, every maker of an idol is guilty of one and the same sin; or it should be that the People had committed idolatry to a lesser extent, since they consecrated for themselves the image of a calf and not of a human being.

4. 1. God forbids the making as much as the worship of an idol. If it is forbidden to worship a thing, then, to the extent that making it precedes worshipping it, does the prohibition to make it have priority over the prohibition to worship it. It is for this reason, namely to root out the material occasion for idolatry, that Divine Law proclaims: *you shall make no idol*; and by adding, *nor a likeness of the things which are in the heaven and which are on the earth and which are in the sea*, it has denied the whole world to the servants of God for the practice of these arts. 2. Already earlier Enoch had prophesied that the demons and spirits, that is the apostate angels, would employ all elements, everything belonging to the world, everything that the heaven, the sea and the

1. tam *B Gel*] tamen *A* **4.** feceritis *B Gel* **4-6.** idolum. Et...mari. Toto mundo· eiusmodi...dei. *A* idolum. Et...mari. Toto...dei. *B Gel* idolum: et...mari, toto mundo, eiusmodi...dei. *Iun*; *primus recte distinxit Oehl* **6.** Enoch praedicens *Rig*] enim hoc praedicens *A* (.nim) *B Gel vdNat* enim hoc praedicens Enoch *Harrisius Pam* praedicens Enoch *Seml* enim Enoch praedicens *Leop.* **6-7.** censum *A*; *restituit Ciacconius A non inspecto*] sensum *B Gel* **7.** *pr.* quae *B Gel*] .uae *A* continetur *A* versuros *B Gel*] ...ṣuros *A*

daemonas et spiritus desertorum angelorum, ut pro deo adversus deum consecrarentur. Omnia igitur colit humanus error praeter ipsum omnium conditorem; eorum imagines idola, imaginum consecratio idololatria. Quidquid idololatria committit, in artificem quemcumque et cuiuscumque idoli deputetur necesse est. Denique idem Enoch simul et cultores idoli et fabricatores in comminatione praedamnat: 3. *et rursus iuro vobis, peccatores, quod in diem sanguinis perditionis <in>iustitia parata est. Qui servitis lapidibus et qui imagines facitis aureas et argenteas et ligneas et lapideas et fictiles et servitis*
f. 108 *phantasmatibus et daemoniis et spiritibus in fanis et omnibus / erroribus non secundum scientiam, nullum ab iis invenietis auxilium.* 4. Esaias vero *testes*, ait, *vos estis, si est deus absque me. Et non erant tunc qui fingunt et exsculpunt, omnes vani, qui faciunt libita sibi, quae illis non proderunt.* Et deinceps tota illa pronuntiatio quam artifices quam cultores detestatur, cuius clausula est: *cognoscite, quod cinis sit cor illorum et terra et nemo animam suam liberare possit.* Ubi aeque David et factores, *tales fiant*, inquit, *qui faciunt ea.* 5. Et quid ego, modicae memoriae homo, ultra quid suggeram, quid recolam de scripturis? Quasi aut non sufficiat vox spiritus sancti aut ultra deliberandum sit, an maledixerit atque damnaverit dominus ipsos prius artifices eorum, quorum cultores maledicit et damnat.

5. 1. Plane impensius respondebo ad excusationes huiusmodi artificum, quos numquam in domum dei admitti oportet, si quis eam disciplinam norit. Iam illa obici solita vox 'non habeo aliud, quo vivam' destrictius repercuti potest: 'vivere ergo habes? Quid tibi cum deo est, si tuis legibus vivis?' Tum quod et de scripturis audent argumentari, dixisse apostolum: *ut quisque fuerit inventus, ita perseveret*, possumus igitur omnes in peccatis perseverare ex ista interpretatione; 2. nec quisquam nostrum non peccator inventus est, cum Christus non alia ex causa descenderit quam peccatorum liberandorum. Item eundem
f. 108^{v} praecepisse dicunt secundum suum exemplum, uti manibus / suis unusquisque

13. Enoch 99, 6-7. **17.** Is. 44, 8-9. **21.** Is. 44, 20. **22.** Ps. 115, 8; 135, 18.
5. 1 Cor. 7, 20. **7.** cf. 1 Tim. 1, 15.

8. adversus *B Gel*] .....sus *A* dominum *B Gel* **9.** error *B Gel*] er... *A* **10.** idola *B Gel*] ido.. *A* quicquid *A* **11.** idololatria *LaC*] idolola (*3 vel 4 litt.*) *A* idololatra *B Gel* **11-12.** deputetur *B Gel*] ...utetur *A* **12.** idoli *B Gel*] ...li *A* **13.** praedamnat. Et rursus iuro *A* (rur.....ro) *B*] praedamnat. Et rursus: Iuro *Gel* praedamnat prorsus: Iuro *Iun* **14.** sanguinis et perditionis *Iun post* perditionis *virgulam ponit LaC* iniustitia *vdNat*] ...ţitia *A* tristitia *A teste Rfd* poenitentia *B Gel* iustitia *Rig* **16.** demoniis *A* in fanis *Oehl*] infamis *A B Gel* infamibus *Lat teste Pam* insanis *Urs* infernis *Harrisius* **17.** hab *A* his *LaC* invenieţ.. *A* Eseias *A* Isaias *LaC* **18-19.** me, et...exsculpunt. *Rig distinguit* exculpunt *A post* exsculpunt *interrogationis signum ponit LaC* **20.** pronunciatio *A* quam...quam *A (cf. Hoppe Synt. 77)*] qua in...qua in *B Gel* **21.** terra] errant *Pam* **22.** ubi] uti *Iun* possit. Ubi...factores· Tales *A*; *rectam distinctionem restituit Hartel P. S. 1, 40*; *post* factores *punctum ponunt Rig Oehl, quos secutus est Rfd ante* ubi *tamen crucem ponens*; Ubi... David, Et factores tales *B Gel distinguunt, quo modo distinguens* factores *del. Pam* **23.** Ecquid *dub. LaC post* homo *interrogationis signum ponit Rig post* suggeram *interrogationis signum ponunt Iun Rig* **24.** suffiat *A*

earth contain, for idolatrous purposes, so that they were hallowed, instead of God, against God. Everything, therefore, is worshipped by human error except the Creator of everything Himself. The images of these things are idols, the consecration of the images is idolatry. Every offence committed by idolatry must of necessity be imputed to every maker of every idol.

After all, the same Enoch threatens and forejudges at the same time both the worshippers and the makers of an idol: 3. *and again I swear to you, sinners, that unrighteousness has been prepared for the day of the destruction of blood. You, who serve stones and who make images of gold and silver and wood and stone and clay, and serve ghosts and demons and spirits in sanctuaries and all errors, not according to knowledge, you will not find any help from them.* 4. Further Isaiah says: *you are My witnesses whether there is a God except Me. And at that time there did not exist those who model and sculpt, all vain fools, who make things to their liking which will not avail them.* And the whole subsequent pronouncement execrates makers and worshippers alike, ending with: *know that their heart is ashes and earth, and that nobody can deliver his own soul.* David equally includes the makers there, saying: *may those who make these things become such.* 5. And why should I, a man of limited memory, suggest anything more, why remind you of anything more from Scripture? As if the voice of the Holy Spirit were not sufficient, or as if it deserved any further consideration whether the Lord has not rather cursed and damned the makers themselves of those things, whose worshippers He curses and damns.

5. 1. Quite special care I shall take to answer the excuses of artists of this kind, who ought never to be admitted to the house of God, if one knows this discipline.

The objection usually raised, 'I have nothing else to live by', can be more severely retorted: 'So you have to live? What have you to do with God, if you live according to your own laws?'

Further, in that they also dare to argue from Scripture, *as everybody is found, so let him remain*, as the Apostle said,—according to that explanation we may all persist in our sins. 2. For not one of us has not been found as a sinner, since Christ descended for no other reason than to save the sinners.

---

1. respondebimus *B Gel* **2.** dei *B Gel*] .. *A* oportet. Si...norit, iam...vivam. Districtius *distinguit B* eam] eius *Iun* **3.** ob.....ta *A* vivam: *Gel* districtius *A* repercu....test *A* **4.** habes] aves *E.Klussmann Ztschr. f. wiss. Theol. 3 (1860), 382*; *post* habes *interrogationis signum ponit Iun* si tuis *A Gel*] sit vis *B* sit vis tuis *Ms. Ursini* fit vis tuis *Urs* vivis *A teste Rfd* (y...ş)] *om. B Gel* **5.** apo...lum *A* **5-6.** inventus fuerit, ita et *LaC* **6.** *post* perseveret *virgulam primus posuit Rfd*; perseveret. *A B* perseveret: *Gel* igitu. *A* **6-7.** interpraetatione *A* **7.** nec quisquam *A u.v.*; *B Gel*] nec enim quisquam *Pam* **8.** alia *B Gel*] ...a *A* eundem *B Gel*] ... dem *A* **9.** ut *B Gel* suis *om. B Gel* unusque *A*

operetur ad victum. Si hoc praeceptum ab omnibus manibus defenditur, credo et fures balneatores manibus suis vivere et ipsos latrones manibus agere quo vivant, item falsarios utique non pedibus, sed manibus operari malas litteras, histriones vero non manibus solis, sed totis membris victum elaborare. 3. Pateat igitur ecclesia omnibus, qui manibus et suo opere tolerantur, si nulla exceptio est artium, quas dei disciplina non recipit. Sed ait quidam adversus similitudinis interdictae propositionem: 'cur ergo Moses in eremo simulacrum serpentis ex aere fecit?' Seorsum figurae, quae dispositioni alicui arcanae praestruebantur, non ad erogationem legis, sed ad exemplarium causae suae. Alioquin, si haec ut adversarii legis interpretemur, numquid et nos, quod et Marcionitae, inconstantiam ascribimus omnipotenti, quem illi hoc modo destruunt ut mutabilem, dum alibi vetat, alibi mandat? 4. Si quis autem dissimulat illam effigiem aerei serpentis suspensi in modum figuram designasse dominicae crucis a serpentibus, id est, ab angelis diaboli, liberaturae nos, dum per semetipsam diabolum, id est serpentem, interfectum suspendit, sive quae alia figurae istius expositio dignioribus revelata est, dummodo apostolus affirmet omnia tunc figurate populo accidisse, bene, quod idem deus et lege vetuit similitudinem fieri et extraordinario praecepto serpentis similitudinem indixit.
f. 109 Si eundem / deum observas, habes legem eius: *ne feceris similitudinem*. Si et praeceptum factae postea similitudinis respicis, et tu imitare Moysen, ne facias adversus legem simulacrum aliquod, nisi et tibi deus iusserit.

6. 1. Si nulla lex dei prohibuisset idola fieri a nobis, nulla vox spiritus sancti fabricatoribus idolorum non minus quam cultoribus comminaretur, de ipso sacramento nostro interpretaremur nobis adversas esse fidei eiusmodi artes. 2. Quomodo enim renuntiavimus diabolo et angelis eius, si eos facimus? Quod repudium diximus iis, non dico cum quibus, sed de quibus vivimus? Quam discordiam suscepimus in eos quibus exhibitionis nostrae gratia obligati sumus? Potes lingua negasse quod manu confiteris? Verbo destruere quod

9. cf. 2 Thess. 3, 7-12; 1 Cor. 4, 12-6; 1 Thess. 4, 11 (Eph. 4, 28). **16-17.** cf. Num. 21, 8-9. **25.** 1 Cor. 10, 6. 11. **28.** Exod. 20, 4.

10. manibus *del. Scal om. LaC* defendatur *B Gel* **11.** balneatores *A B*] balnearios *Gel* balneares *Oehl* et aleatores *Rig* **14.** tolerant *Rfd*; *damnat Gomperz 21* **15.** recepit *Pam 1597* **17.** ex aere *Gel*] ex ea re *A B* **18.** derogationem *Iun dubitanter*; *Scal Rig* **19.** adversaria *Wissowa* **20.** adscribimus *A* quem *Gel Rig*] .... *A* quod *B Urs* **21.** ali....ndat *A* **22.** serpen....uspensi *A* figuratam *inter* modum *et* figuram *suppl. Kroym Q. C. 25* **23.** ą ș.rpentibus *A* **24.** semet. psam *A* ąlią *A* **25.** figura *LaC* dummodo ut *Iun* ..ostolus *A* **26.** *post* accidisse *punctum ponit Rfd*; *approbat Hartel P. S. 1, 40*; *damnat Kroym Q. C. 24*; *refutat Thörn St. T. 1, 29* et *A B Gel*] ut *Oehl* qui *Lat Rig* **27.** et *add. Iun* indixit *Rig*] interdixit *A B Gel* interduxit *Iun* *'alii* introduxit' *LaC* iussit *Lat* fieri iussit *Lat teste Pam* **30.** adversum *LaC*
1. nobis, si nulla *Lat Rig* **3.** *virgulam post* nobis *ponit Rig*; *Iun iudicat aut virgulam post* nobis *ponendam aut (quod mavult)* nobis adversas esse et fidei *legendum esse* **5.** his *B Gel*

Likewise they say that the same apostle advised in accordance with his own example that everybody should work with his hands for his living. If this precept is adduced in defence by all hands, I believe that thievish bath-attendants live by the work of their hands, and that even brigands work with their hands for their living, and likewise that forgers make false documents by no means with their feet, but with their hands, whereas actors indeed procure a living not only with their hands, but with all their limbs together. 3. So let the Church be open to all who support themselves by the work of their own hands, if there is no exception of the arts which God's discipline does not allow.

But against the proposition that an image is forbidden someone submits: 'Why, then, did Moses in the desert make an image of a serpent out of bronze?' In a class by themselves are the symbols which were created as a prefiguration of a certain secret ordinance, not for the purpose of destroying the Law, but as an example of that which caused them. Otherwise, if we should explain these things in the same way as the adversaries of the Law, do not we too, then, just like the Marcionites, ascribe inconsistency to the Almighty, whom they thus misconstrue as mutable, since here He forbids a thing and there He commands it?

4. But even if one disregards the fact that the well-known image of the bronze serpent in the position of a hanged man prefigured the Lord's cross which was to deliver us from the serpents, i.e., from the angels of the devil (for by itself it hung the devil, i.e. the serpent, after he had been slain), or if a different explanation of that symbol may have been revealed to worthier men, provided that the apostle's assertion holds good that everything then occurring to the People had a figurative meaning: fortunately, the fact remains that it is the same God who both forbade in the Law to make a likeness and, by way of an exceptional commandment, ordered the image of the serpent to be made.

If you respect the same God, you have got His Law: *you shall make no likeness*. If you also take account of the commandment of the likeness made afterwards, you must also imitate Moses: do not make an image against the Law unless God commands so also to you.

6. 1. If no law of God had forbidden us to make idols, if no pronouncement of the Holy Spirit threatened the makers of idols no less than their worshippers, we should infer simply from our sacrament that such arts are opposed to our faith. 2. For how have we renounced the devil and his angels, if we make them? What repudiation have we declared against them, I do not say 'with whom', but from whom we live? What discord have we entered into with those to whom we are bound for the sake of our subsistence? Can you have denied with your tongue what you profess with your hands? Demolish

facto struis? Unum deum praedicare, qui tantos efficis? Verum deum praedicare qui falsos facis? 'Facio', ait quidam, 'et non colo.' Quasi ob aliquam causam colere non audeat, nisi ob quam et facere non debeat, scilicet ob dei offensam utrubique. 3. Immo tu colis, qui facis, ut coli possit. Colis autem non spiritu vilissimi nidoris alicuius, sed tuo proprio, nec anima pecudis impensa, sed anima tua. Illis ingenium tuum immolas, illis sudorem tuum libas, illis prudentiam tuam accendis. Plus es illis quam sacerdos, cum per te habeant sacerdotem; diligentia tua nomen illorum est. Negas te quod facis colere? Sed illi non negant, quibus hanc saginatiorem et auratiorem et maiorem hostiam caedis, salutem tuam, tota die.

f. 109ᵛ **7.** 1. Ad hanc partem zelus fidei perora/bit ingemens Christianum ab idolis in ecclesiam venire, de adversaria officina in domum dei venire, attollere ad deum patrem manus matres idolorum, his manibus adorare, quae foris adversus deum adorantur, eas manus admovere corpori domini, quae daemoniis corpora conferunt. 2. Nec hoc sufficit. Parum sit, si ab aliis manibus accipiant quod contaminant, sed etiam ipsae tradunt aliis quod contaminaverunt: 3. alleguntur in ordinem ecclesiasticum artifices idolorum. Pro scelus! Semel Iudaei Christo manus intulerunt, isti quotidie corpus eius lacessunt. O manus praecidendae! Viderit iam, an per similitudinem dictum: *si te manus tua scandalizat, amputa eam*. Quae magis amputandae quam in quibus domini corpus scandalizatur?

8. 1. Sunt et aliae complurium artium species, quae etsi non contingunt idolorum fabricationem, tamen ea, sine quibus idola non possunt, eodem crimine expediunt. Nec enim differt, an exstruas vel exornes, si templum, si aram, si aediculam eius instruxeris, si bratteam expresseris aut insignia aut etiam donum fabricaveris. Maior est eiusmodi opera, quae non effigiem confert, sed auctoritatem. 2. Si ita necessitas exhibitionis extenditur, habent et alias species, quae sine exorbitatione disciplinae, id est sine idoli confictura, opem vic-

7,9. Mtth. 18, 8. Marc. 9, 43 (cf. Mtth. 5, 30).

9. aitq:uidam *A* et *A*] sed *B Gel* ob aliquam *Gel*] ali aliquam *A* aliquam *B* obliquam *Bmg* ob aliam *Lat Pam, quod defendit Kroym Q. C. 25 putans Gel* ob aliam *exhibere, quod falso renuntiat Rfd* **10.** et *om. LaC* non debeat *A* (no...beat) *B Gel*] debebat *Oehl, quod defendit Kroym Q. C. 26 putans B* debebat *exhibere, quod falso renuntiat Rfd* **11.** facis] fa... *A* possit *A*; *vindicat Kroym Q. C. 26*] possint *B Gel* **12.** nidoris] odoris *Bmg* tuo *B Gel*] ... *A* **13.** ingenium *B Gel*] ing.... *A* **13-14.** *alt.* illis...libas *om. A* **15.** nomen *A* (no...); *vindicat Hartel P. S. 1, 42*] numen *B Gel* **16.** et auratiorem *om. Oehl* **17.** tota die *in ultimo cap. VI ponit Rfd, quod mavult Iun; approbat Hartel P. S. 1, 41*] *in capite sententiae sequentis ponunt A B Gel cett., quod approbat vdNat*

1. Christianum] Christum *Bmg* **2.** de adversarii (*sic*) ...venire *Rig 1664 del. ut gloss.* venire *librarii imprudentis manum adiecisse putat Iun* **4.** adorantur *A B Gel*; *vindicat Hartel P. S. 1, 42*] adornantur *Iun et Heraldus (p. 33-4) dubitanter* operantur *Wissowa* **5.** *post* conferunt *interrogationis signum ponit Rfd* **6.** contaminent *Urs* ipsi *Urs Rig* ipsae&radunt *A corr.* **7.** adleguntur *A* **9.** praecidendae? *B* viderint *Gel* dictum *A*; *vindicat Löfst Z. Spr. Tert. 57*] dictum sit *B Gel* **10.** ampute *A* in quibus] quibus *mavult Iun*

with words what in deed you build up? Preach the one God, you who make so many? Preach the true God, you who make false ones?

A person may say, 'I make, but I do not worship'. As if the reason why he dare not worship were other than that why he also should not make: offence to God, namely, in both cases. 3. On the contrary, it is exactly you makers who worship, since you make the worship of idols possible. You worship, however, not with the exhalation of a vile sacrificial vapour, but with your own breath of life, not at the cost of an animal's soul, but of your own. To the idols you sacrifice your talent; for them your sweat is a libation; for them you kindle the light of your intelligence. You are more to them than their priests, since it is owing to you that they have a priest; to your diligence they owe their name. Do you deny that you worship what you make? But they do not deny it, to whom you slay this fatter, more heavily gilded and greater sacrifice, your salvation, the whole day.

7. 1. At this point zeal for the faith will give a final argument, complaining that a Christian comes from the idols into the church, comes from the workshop of the enemy into the house of God, raises to God the Father the hands that are mothers of the idols, adores Him with the very hands which outside are adored (i.e. for their products) against God, applies to the Lord's body those hands which give a body to the demons.

2. Nor does it stop with this. The hands of the idol-makers are not content to receive from other hands something what they defile, but they themselves even transmit to others what they have defiled: 3. makers of idols are chosen into the ecclesiastical order. What a crime! The Jews only once laid violent hand on Christ, but the makers of idols ill-treat His body daily. O hands deserving to be cut off! It is immaterial to me if the dictum, *if your hand scandalizes you, cut it off*, has been said as a similitude. What hands are more worthy to be cut off than those in which scandal is done to the Lord's body?

8. 1. There are also other branches of art which, although they do not concern the making of idols, are the same crime in that they still provide those things which the idols cannot do without. For it makes no difference whether you erect or equip, if you have furnished a temple, an altar or a chapel for it, if you have modeled gold-leaf or made insignia or even a votive offering. Since the result is not form, but authority, such work is of greater consequence.

2. If the necessity of sustenance is given such emphasis, they have other branches providing the means to live without transgression of the discipline,

1. conplurium *A* et si *B Gel* **2.** non *vdNat*] ... *A* nil *Gel* nihil *Rig om. B* **3.** impediunt *LaC dubitanter* exstruas] ..truas *A* **4.** ins..uxeris *A* **5.** donum *Hartel P. S. 1, 42*] do.. *A* domum *B Gel* **6.** auctoritatem, si...extenditur. Habent *B distinguit* exten..tur *A* obtenditur *Urs Rig* attenditur *Iun* **7.** discipli.ae *A* confectura *Lat*

tus praestent. Scit albarius tector et tecta sarcire et tectoria inducere et
f. 110 cisternam liare et cymatia distendere et multa alia ornamenta / praeter simula-
10 cra parietibus incrispare. Scit et pictor et marmorarius et aerarius et quicumque caelator latitudines suas et utique multo faciliores. 3. Nam qui signum describit, quanto facilius abacum linit! Qui de tilia Martem exsculpit, quanto citius armarium compingit! Nulla ars non alterius artis aut mater aut propinqua est. Nihil alterius vacat. Tot sunt artium venae, quot hominum con-
15 cupiscentiae. 'Sed de mercedibus et manus pretiis interest.' Proinde interest et de labore. Minor merces frequentiore actu repensatur. 4. Quot parietes signa desiderant? Quot templa et aedes idolis aedificantur? Domus vero et praetoria et balnea et insulae quantae! Soccus et baxa quotidie deauratur, Mercurius et Serapis non quotidie. Sufficiat ad quaestum artificiorum. Fre-
20 quentior est omni superstitione luxuria et ambitio. Lances et scyphos facilius ambitio quam superstitio desiderabit. 5. Coronas quoque magis luxuria quam sollemnitas erogat. Cum igitur ad haec artificiorum genera cohortemur, quae idolum quidem et quae idolo competunt non attingant, sunt autem et hominibus communia saepe quae et idolis, hoc quoque cavere debemus, ne quid
25 scientibus nobis ab aliquibus de manibus nostris in rem idolorum postuletur. Quod si concesserimus et non remediis tam usitatis egerimus, non puto nos a contagio idololatriae vacare, quorum manus non ignorantium in officio /
f. 110v vel in honore et usu daemoniorum deprehenduntur.

9. 1. Animadvertimus inter artes etiam professiones quasdam obnoxias idololatriae. De astrologis ne loquendum quidem est, sed quoniam quidam istis diebus provocavit defendens sibi perseverantiam professionis istius, paucis utar. Non allego, quod idola honoret, quorum nomina caelo inscripsit, quibus
5 omnem dei potestatem addixit, quod propterea homines non putant deum requirendum praesumentes stellarum nos immutabili arbitrio agi. Unum propono, angelos esse illos desertores dei, amatores feminarum, proditores etiam huius curiositatis, propterea quoque damnatos a deo. 2. O divina sententia usque ad terram pertinax, cui etiam ignorantes testimonium reddunt:
10 expelluntur mathematici, sicut angeli eorum; urbs et Italia interdicitur mathe-

8. praestent *Gel*] praestet *A B* albaruis *A* **9.** liare] ligare *Pam 'alii* litare' *LaC, qui has coniecturas refutat* cymathia *A* **10.** incrispare] incrustare *Pam* ingypsare *Rfd susp.* **11.** latitudines] alitudines *Hartel apud Rfd et P. S. 1, 39* et utique *A*] utique *B Gel* **12.** discribit *Iun* tilia] thya *Pam susp.* exculpit *A* **15.** manuspretiis *Gel* manuspraetis *A* manu spretis *B* manupretiis *Iun* perinde *Rfd* **18.** deaurantur *Pam* **19-20.** sufficiant... artificiorum, frequentiores omni *Gel* questum *A* *post* artificiorum *virgulam ponere vult vdNat* **20.** est *del. Leop distinctionem post* artificiorum *tollens* scyfos *A* **21.** superstit.. *A* **22.** sollempnit.. *A* cohortem.. *A* quae] equae *A* **23.** adtingant *A* sunt *A B*; *vindicat Thörn St. T. 2, 14*] sint *Gel* **24.** idolis. Hoc *A B* **25.** de] d. *A* idolorum] dolorum *A* **26.** concesserimus *A* tam] iam *Lat Rig* usitatis *A B Gel*] usi satis *Hartel apud Rfd*; *repudiat et lectionem traditam vindicat P. S. 1, 43* usi paenitentias *Rfd susp.*

1. *post* etiam *virgulam exhibet B* **1-2.** idolatriae *A* **2.** quidam] quidem *A* **5.** putent *Iun* **9.** pertinens *Wissowa* **10.** Expelluntur...angeli eorum *delendum putat Rig 1664* et *om. A* corum *A*

that is without the fashioning of an idol. The stucco-worker also knows how to mend buildings, apply plaster, put a coating on a cistern, trace ogees and decorate the walls, apart from the images, with many curling decorations. The painter, too, and the marble-mason and the bronze-worker and any engraver know applications of their respective arts which are surely much easier than making idols. 3. For he who designs an image, how much more easily does he plaster a panel? He who carves a Mars from lime-wood, how much more quickly does he construct a chest? There is no art which is not either the mother or the relative of another. Nothing is without companion. The veins of the arts are as numerous as the desires of men.

'But as to payment and wages there is a difference.' Likewise there is also a difference in the labour required. The compensation for a smaller wage is that one performs one's work more often. 4. How many walls need images? How many temples and chapels are built for idols? On the other hand how countless are the dwellings, country houses, baths and tenement-houses? Fine slippers and sandals are gilded daily, but not a Mercury and a Serapis. Let that suffice for the gain of artisans. Luxury and ostentation are more frequent than any form of superstition. Dishes and cups will be needed sooner by ostentation than by superstition. 5. Wreaths, too, are more required by luxury than by religious ceremonies.

Thus we recommend the persuit of such handicrafts as do not come in contact with an idol and with the things which pertain to an idol. However, we frequently find that some things are common both to men and idols. Therefore, we must guard also against this, that with our knowledge a product of our manual work be demanded by any one for the service of idols. And if we make concessions and if we do not make use of the so obvious remedies, then, to my mind, we are not free from the contamination of idolatry, because it is by no means without our knowledge that our hands are caught in serving the demons, or in treating them respectfully.

9. 1. Among the arts we also find certain professions guilty of idolatry. About the astrologers one should not even have to speak; but since the other day somebody challenged us by claiming the right to continue this profession, I shall devote a few words to it.

I do not adduce that that man worships the idols, whose names he has written on the firmament, to whom he has assigned all the power of God; nor that people think that they need not seek God for the very reason that they presume that we are subject to the unalterable rule of the stars. I only put forward one thing: that it is those angels, apostates from God, lovers of women, who introduced also this inquisitiveness and who are, also for this reason, damned by God. 2. Oh divine sentence which in its working even reaches the earth and to which even those ignorant of it bear testimony: the astrologers are banned just like their angels; Rome and Italy are denied to the astrologers,

maticis, sicut caelum et angelis eorum: eadem poena est exilii discipulis et magistris. 3. 'Sed *magi* [et astrologi] *ab oriente venerunt*.' Scimus magiae et astrologiae inter se societatem. Primi igitur stellarum interpretes natum Christum annuntiaverunt, primi muneraverunt. Hoc nomine Christum, opinor, sibi obligaverunt. Quid tum? Ideo nunc et mathematicis patrocinabitur illorum magorum religio? De Christo scilicet est mathesis hodie, stellam Christi, non Saturni et Martis et cuiusque ex eodem ordine mortuorum observat et praedicat. 4. At enim scientia ista / usque ad evangelium fuit concessa, f. 111
ut Christo edito nemo exinde nativitatem alicuius de caelo interpretetur. Nam et tus illud et myrram et aurum ideo infanti tunc domino obtulerunt quasi clausulam sacrificationis et gloriae saecularis, quam Christus erat adempturus. 5. Quod igitur isdem magis somnium sine dubio ex dei voluntate suggessit, ut irent in sua, sed alia, non qua venerant via, id est ne pristina secta sua incederent, non, ne illos Herodes persequeretur, qui nec persecutus est etiam ignorans alia via digressos, quoniam et qua venerant ignorabat; adeo viam sectam et disciplinam intellegere debemus. 6. Itaque magis praeceptum, ut exinde aliter incederent. Sic et alia illa species magiae, quae miraculis operatur, etiam adversus Moysen aemulata patientia dei traxit ad evangelium usque. Nam exinde et Simon Magus iamiam fidelis, quoniam aliquid adhuc de circulatoria secta cogitaret, ut scilicet inter miracula professionis suae etiam spiritum sanctum per manuum impositionem enundinaret, maledictus ab apostolis de fide eiectus est; alter magus, qui cum Sergio Paulo, quoniam isdem adversabatur apostolis, luminum amissione multatus est. 7. Hoc et astrologi rettulissent, credo, si qui in apostolos incidisset. Attamen cum magia punitur, cuius est species astrologia, utique et species in genere damnatur. Post evangelium nusquam invenias aut / sophistas aut Chaldaeos aut incantatores aut coniectores aut magos nisi plane punitos. *Ubi sapiens, ubi litterator, ubi conquisitor huius aevi? Nonne infatuavit deus sapientiam huius saeculi?* f. 111ᵛ

12. Mtth. 2, 1. **13-14.** Mtth. 2, 2. 5-7. 11. **20.** Mtth. 2, 11. **23.** Mtth. 2, 12. **28.** Exod. 7, 8-12. 19-22; 8, 5-7. 16-8 (cf. 2 Tim. 3, 8). **29.** Act. ap. 8, 9-24. **32.** Act. ap. 13, 6-11. **37.** 1 Cor. 1, 20.

13. Isid. etym. 8, 9, 25. **18-20.** Isid. etym. 8, 9, 26.

11. exilii *Gel*] exitii *A B*; *vide comm.* **12.** et astrologi *secludit Rfd, quod reicit Thörn St. T. 1, 4*; ut astrologi *Gomperz 21*; *vide comm.* **13.** primum *B* **15.** obligarunt *LaC* **16.** mathesis: hodie stellas *mavult Iun, scribit LaC* stellam *Urs Rig*] stellarum *A B* stellas *Gel* **22.** igitur *om. Gel* iisdem *B Gel* **23.** in pristina secta *Hartel P. S. 1, 45* **24.** incederent: non ne *Gel*] incederent. Nonne *A B*; *Rig 1664 signum interrogationis post* persequeretur *ponens* incederent, ne *Pam, quem refutant Iun LaC* **25.** ignorabat, adeo *Rfd, contra quem disputat Hartel P. S. 1, 45* ignorabat. Adeo *A B Gel*; *vide comm.* **26.** sectam *Iun (virgulam post* viam *ponens); approbat LaC*] rectam *A B Gel* ut *om. B Gel* **27.** aliam illam speciem *Pam* magiae, quae *Gel*] magi aequae *A* magi aeque *B* **28.** et iam *B* patientiam *Rig* **29.** iam *Gel* **31.** inpositionem *A* **32.** deiectus *Iun* et alter *Gel* **33.** iisdem *B Gel* amissionem ultatus *A* **34.** si qui *A*] si quid *B* si quis *Gel* incidissent *Rig* **35.** cuius species est, utique ea species *LaC* **36.** sophistas *om. A* caldeos *A*

as heaven is to their angels: the same penalty of exile applies to disciples and masters.

3. 'But *magi came from the East*.' We know the mutual relationship between magic and astrology. Interpreters of stars, then, were the first to announce Christ's birth, the first to honour Him with gifts. In this way, I think, they established a pious bond between themselves and Christ. But what of that? Will, therefore, the piety of those magi protect today's astrologers? Shall we say that nowadays astrology occupies itself with Christ, that it observes and proclaims the star of Christ, not those of Saturn and Mars and anyone else from that same class of dead people? 4. In fact, that science was only permitted until the Gospel, in order that after Christ's birth no one should thenceforth interpret a person's nativity from the stars. For they also presented the incense, myrrh and gold to the then new-born Lord as a termination of worldly offerings and glory, with which Christ was about to do away.

5. So, that it was what the dream advised those magi, no doubt in accordance with the will of God, saying that they should go to their country, but by another way and not the one by which they had come, i.e. that they should leave the 'path' of (their) old (doctrine)—that dream was not intended to prevent Herod from pursuing them; he did not pursue them, since he did not even know that they returned by another way, because he was also ignorant of the way by which they had come—; therefore we have to understand by 'way': 'doctrine and discipline'. 6. So the magi were commanded to walk another path of life from then on.

Similarly that other kind of magic, the working of miracles, which even competed with Moses, lasted until the Gospel because of God's leniency. For afterwards Simon Magus, just become a believer, was cursed by the apostles and cast out from faith, because he was still cherishing a plan originating from his system of quackery, namely to barter away the Holy Spirit through laying on of hands, as one of the miracles of his profession; a second magician, who was in the company of Sergius Paulus, was punished with the loss of his eyesight because of his opposition to the same apostles. 7. The same, I think, would also have befallen the astrologers, if any had come in the way of the apostles. But at any rate, if magic, of which astrology is a species, is punished, of course the species is also condemned in the genus. After the Gospel you will nowhere find either wizards, astrologers, enchanters, soothsayers or magicians, unless as clearly punished. *Where is the sage, where the teacher, where the examiner of this age? Has not God made foolish the wisdom of this world?*

8. Nihil scis, mathematice, si nesciebas te futurum Christianum. Si sciebas, hoc quoque scire debueras, nihil tibi futurum cum ista professione. Ipsa te de periculo suo instrueret, quae aliorum climacterica praecanit. *Non est tibi pars neque sors in ista ratione*. Non potest regna caelorum sperare cuius digitus aut radius abutitur caelo.

10. 1. Quaerendum autem est etiam de ludimagistris, sed et ceteris professoribus litterarum. Immo non dubitandum affines illos esse multimodae idololatriae: primum quibus necesse est deos nationum praedicare, nomina, genealogias, fabulas, ornamenta honorifica quaeque eorum enuntiare, tum sollemnia festaque eorundem observare, ut quibus vectigalia sua suppetent. 2. Quis ludimagister sine tabula septem idolorum Quinquatria tamen frequentabit? Ipsam primam novi discipuli stipem Minervae et honori et nomini consecrat, ut, etsi non profanatus alicui idolo verbo tenus de idolothyto esse
f. 112 dicatur, pro idololatria vitetur. Quid? Minus est inquinamenti / eoque praestat quaestus et nominibus et honoribus idolorum nuncupatus? 3. Quam Minervalia Minervae quam Saturnalia Saturni, quem etiam serviculis sub tempore Saturnalium celebrari necesse est. Etiam strenae captandae et Septimontium, et Brumae et Carae Cognationis honoraria exigenda omnia. Florae scholae coronandae. Flaminicae et aediles sacrificant creati: schola honoratur feriis. 4. Idem fit idoli natali. Omnis diaboli pompa frequentatur. Quis haec competere Christiano existimabit, nisi qui putabit convenire etiam non magistro? Scimus dici posse: 'si docere litteras dei servis non licet, etiam nec discere licebit, et quomodo quis institueretur ad prudentiam interim humanam vel ad quemcumque sensum vel actum, cum instrumentum sit ad omnem vitam litteratura? Quomodo repudiamus saecularia studia, sine qui-

41. Act. ap. 8, 21.

39. matematice *A corr.* si sciebas *A*] si nesciebas *B* sin sciebas *Gel* **41.** praecavit, *B Gel* **1.** sed et] sed et de *Lat* et de *Lat teste Pam* et *Rig* **2.** essem ultimo deidololatriae *A* **4.** ornamenta, hon. q. *'ut sit universe quidquid eis est honorificum' Iun* **5.** suppetent *A B*] suppetant *Gel* supputent *Mercerus* **6.** *'ante* sine *videtur vocem* etsi *excidisse' Leop* sine tabula ·VII· idolorum *A B*], si non tabularia idolorum, *Gel* tamen] tamen non *Lat Rig*; *repudiat LaC* non Q. tamen *Iun*; *repudiat LaC* frequentabit? *Gel Rig*] frequentabit. *A B aut* idolorum? Q. tamen ... frequentabit. *aut* idolorum, Q. tamen non ... frequentabit? *legendum esse putat Rig in adnot.*; *illud vindicat Hartel P. S. 1, 43-4, quem approbat Kroym Q. C. 26* **7-8.** *post* consecrat *punctum ponit Kroym Q. C. 26* (consecrat: *A*) **8.** etsi *A Pam*] et si *B Gel post* idolo *punctum exhibet A, virgulam B Gel*; *distinctionem delent Iun Oehl* **8-9.** verbo tenus ... dicatur *uncinis includit Scal* **9.** idololatra *Gel* vitetur *Gel*] vitatur *A B* pro...vitetur *del. Rig punctum post* dicatur *ponens post* vitetur *virgulam ponit LaC* Quid? Minus *susp. Iun, scribit Rfd, approbat Hartel P. S. 1, 4-5*] quid minus *A B Gel* inquinamenti eoque *Rfd (signum interrogationis post* inq. *ponens)*] inquinamenti eo quem *A B*; *tuetur Hartel P. S. 1, 44-5 (vocem* eo *dat. sing. putans, quod damnat Hoppe Beitr. 21)* inquinamento quod *Gel* inquinamenti eo quod *Pam* inquinamenti eo, quam *Oehl* **10.** idolorum *Hartel P. S. 1, 44-5*] idolo *A B Gel* idoli *Iun*; *approbat LaC* nuncupatus? *Gel*] nuncupat.. *A* nuncupatis, *B totum locum Kroym Q. C. 26 hoc modo immutat*: Ut etsi non profanatus (*sc. aliquis*) alicui idolo verbotenus, cum de idolothyto esse (*i.q. edere*) dicatur, pro idololatra vitatur, quid minus est inquinamenti in eo, quem praestat (*sc. idololatram*)

8. You know nothing, astrologer, if you did not know that you would become a Christian. If you did know it, you should also have known this, that you would have nothing to do with this profession. The profession itself, which presages the critical moments of others, would have taught you about the danger bound up with itself. *You have neither part nor lot in this science*. He can never entertain hopes for the Kingdom of heaven, whose finger or rod abuses the heaven.

10. 1. One should, however, also inquire about schoolmasters and other teachers of literature. Indeed, there can be no doubt that they are bordering on idolatry in its various modes. To begin with, they must proclaim the gods of the heathens and make known their names, genealogies, fabulous myths and every one of their marks of honour; further they must observe their solemnities and festivals, since it is on these that their incomes will await them. 2. What schoolmaster, if he is without the list of the seven idols, will still celebrate the *Quinquatria*? The very first fee from a new pupil he dedicates both to the honour and to the name of Minerva, so that, even if it may be said that he is not in so many words dedicated to an idol because of (consuming) a sacrifice to an idol, he ought to be avoided because of idolatry. I ask you, is the latter less a contamination? Are, therefore, earnings dedicated both to the name and to the honour of idols better? 3. *Minervalia* belong as much to Minerva as the *Saturnalia* to Saturn, whom even the humblest slaves have to celebrate at the time of the *Saturnalia*. Also one has to angle for the New Year's gifts and the *Septimontium*-present, and all the gifts in honour of Midwinter and the festival of the 'Dear Kinship' have to be exacted. For Flora the school must be garlanded. The *flaminicae* and *aediles* make a sacrifice when they have been elected: the school is honoured by means of a holiday. 4. The same happens on the birthday of an idol. All the pomp of the devil is participated in. Who will think that these things become a Christian? Only he who will believe that they also befit one who is not a schoolmaster.

We know that the following objections could be made: 'If teaching literature is not permitted to God's servants, learning it will not be allowed either; and how could one nevertheless be instructed in human insight or in whatever understanding or activity, considering that literature constitutes the equipment for every province of life? How could we reject the secular studies, which the divine studies cannot do without?'

---

quaestus et nominibus et honoribus idolorum nuncupatus? (in eo *approbat Hoppe Beitr. 21*) quam *A B*; *vindicat Hoppe Beitr. 125*] tam *Gel* **11.** quem *A B*; *vindicat Kroym Q. C. 26*] quae *Gel* serviculis *Gel*] serviculi *A B* **11-12.** sub tempore *B Gel*] subtempr̄ *A* sub tempus *Rig* **12.** strenae *Gel*] strenuae *A* strennae *B* **13-14.** omnia. Florae scholae *Rig*; *Rfd (virgulam post* omnia *ponens)*] omnia, Florescolae *A B* omnia, flore scholae *Gel* ediles *A* flore scholae, coronandae Flaminicae; et aedile sacrificante Cereri, schola *Iun*; *repudiat LaC* **14.** sacrificant creati: schola *Rfd (punctum cum virgula post* creati *ponens)*] sacrificant; creatiscola *A* sacrificant, Cereatiscola *B* sacrificant Cereri, schola *Gel* sacrificant; creatis schola *Rig* **15.** idolis *mavult Iun, quod approbat LaC* **18.** *post* et *virgulam ponit Rig* instituetur *Scal*

bus divina non possunt?' 5. Videamus igitur necessitatem litteratoriae eruditionis, respiciamus ex parte eam admitti non posse, ex parte vitari. Fideles magis discere quam docere litteras capit; diversa est enim ratio discendi et docendi. Si fidelis litteras doceat, insertas idolorum praedicationes sine dubio, dum docet, commendat, dum tradit, affirmat, dum commemorat, testimonium dicit. 6. Deos ipsos hoc nomine obsignat, cum lex prohibeat, ut diximus, deos pronuntiari et nomen hoc in vano collocari. Hinc prima diabolo fides aedificatur ab initiis eruditionis. Quaere, an idololatrian committat qui de idolis catechizat. At cum fidelis haec discit, si iam sapit, qui sit, neque recipit
f. 112^{v} neque admittit; / multo magis, si nondum sapit aut ubi coeperit sapere, prius sapiat oportet quod prius didicit, id est de deo et fide. Proinde illa respuet nec recipiet, et erit tam tutus quam qui sciens venenum ab ignaro accipit nec bibit. 7. Huic necessitas ad excusationem deputatur, quia aliter discere non potest. Tanto autem facilius est litteras non docere quam non discere, quanto et reliqua scholarum de publicis propriis sollemnitatibus inquinamenta facilius discipulus fidelis non adibit quam magister non frequentabit.

11. 1. [De generationibus] Si cetera delictorum recogitemus, imprimis cupiditatem, radicem omnium malorum, qua quidam irretiti circa fidem naufragium sunt passi — quamvis et idololatria ab eodem apostolo dicta sit cupiditas —, tum mendacium, cupiditatis ministrum — taceo de periurio, quando ne iurare quidem liceat —, negotiatio servo dei apta est? Ceterum si cupiditas abscedat, quae est causa acquirendi? Cessante causa acquirendi non erit necessitas negotiandi. 2. Sit nunc aliqua iustitia quaestus secura de cupiditatis et mendacii observatione, in crimen offendere idololatriae eam opinor, quae ad ipsam idolorum animam et spiritum pertinet, quae omne daemonium saginat. Sane non

26-27. Exod. 20, 7.
1-2. 1 Tim. 6, 10 *et* 1 Tim. 1, 19. **3.** Col. 3, 5 (cf. Eph. 5, 5). **4-5.** Mtth. 5, 3-4 (cf. Iac. 5, 12).

21. litteraturiae *A B* **22.** non *secludit Rfd, quem refutat Hartel P. S. 1, 46* vitari: *LaC distinxit*; *A B Gel virgulam*, *Rig Oehl Rfd punctum post* vitari *ponunt* **24.** fideles *B* insertas *Gel*] incertas *A B* infertas *mavult Iun* inserta *Urs* praedicationes *A B*] praedicatione *Gel Urs* praedicationis *Scal* **27.** conlocari *A* **28.** idolatrian *A corr.* qui] quid *Pam preli lapsu u.v.* **29.** qui sit *A B Gel*] *LaC de recta interpretatione vocis* qui *dubitans etiam* qui sint *aut* quid sit *legi posse putat* quid sit *Oehl* **30.** multo] .ulto *A* nondum *A B Gel*; *vindicat Hartel P. S. 1, 46-8*] dudum *Rig* sapit aut *Hartel P. S. 1, 46-8*] sapit. Aut *A B Gel* sapit, aut *Iun* aut] nam *LaC* sapere *Gel*] capere *A B* sapere: *dist. vdNat* sapere. *Hartel P. S. 1, 46-8* sapere, *cett.* **31.** sapiat oportet] sapit *Scal* **32.** ab ignaro] aut ignarus *Hartel P. S. 1, 46-8* 33. quia] qui *LaC Rig* **35.** scolarum *A* scholarum: de *Iun distinguit inter* publicis *et* propriis *Iun Scal* et *Rig Urs* ac *inserunt*; *lectio tradita an recta sit dubitat Hoppe Beitr. 53*
1. *Verba* De generationibus, *quae A B Gel exhibent*, *secludit vdNat*; Degenerabimus *Pam* De gravioribus *Lat* De negotiationibus *Rig* De negotiatione vero *Urs Heraldus* De generalibus rationibus *susp. Rfd crucem ante* De generationibus *ponens*; *vide etiam comm.* si *del. Rig* delictorum. Recogitemus inprimis *A B distinguunt* **2.** inretiti *A* **3.** quamvis] quum bis *Heraldus* cum bis *Rfd* idolatria *A* quamvis ... cupiditas *notis parentheseos inclusit primus Iun* **3-4.** cupiditas. Tum *Rig distinguit* **4-5.** ministrum (taceo ... liceat) negotiatio *Iun Heraldus*] ministrum. Taceo

5. Let us, then, look at the necessity of instruction in literature, and let us take into account that it is not possible that one partly admits it, partly avoids it. Learning literature is allowable for believers rather than teaching it; for learning and teaching are quite different activities.

If a believer teaches literature, then it goes without saying that, with regard to the idols which he proclaims as a part of that instruction, by teaching it he recommends them, by passing on the information he confirms them, by mentioning them he testifies to them. 6. He seals the gods themselves with this name, whereas, as we said before, the Law forbids us to call them gods and to apply this name in vain. Hence the first belief is built up for the devil from the beginnings of the instruction. Consider whether he is not guilty of idolatry who catechizes about idols!

But when a believer is instructed in these things, if he already realizes who he is, he neither accepts nor receives them; if he does not yet realize it or is only beginning to realize it, all the more should he realize first what he has first learnt, that is, about God and the faith. Therefore he will loathe those things and not accept them, and he will be as safe as someone who wittingly accepts poison from a person ignorant of this fact, but does not drink it.

7. The latter may be excused by reason of necessity, because he cannot receive instruction in any other way. Besides, in so far that it is easier for the believing pupil not to attend the public and special solemnities, from which the further contamination of the schools arises, than it is for the believing schoolmaster not to frequent them, to this extent it is easier not to teach literature than not to learn it.

11. 1. If we consider the other sins, especially covetousness, *the root of all evil*, ensnared by which some *have been shipwrecked with regard to their faith* —although covetousness has also been called idolatry by the same apostle—, and if we consider mendacity, the accomplice of covetousness—I am silent about perjury, since not even swearing is allowed—, is then trade an occupation fitting for a servant of God? Moreover, if covetousness disappears, what is the motive for acquiring? When the motive for acquiring ceases, there will be no necessity for trading.

2. But let us grant now that there exists some righteous form of gain which is safe because it carefully guards against covetousness and mendacity, even then I think that that form of trade runs aground on the sin of idolatry, which is related to nothing less than the soul and spirit of the idols, which fattens

... liceat. Negociatio *A B Gel* **5.** nec negotiatio ... apta est. *Hartel P. S. 1, 48*; *post* apta est *virgulam ponit Scal* **6.** adquirendi *A*; *post prius* acquirendi *interrogationis signum ponunt Pam Leop Oehl Rfd*; *lectionem traditam vindicat Hartel P. S. 1, 48, quem approbant Kroym Q. C. 26 et vdNat*; *vid. comm.* non erit] noverit *A* **7.** iustitit *A corr.* **9.** sane *A B*] an *Gel* sane an *Seml Leop* **9-10.** pertinet: quae ... saginat, annon ... idololatria? *Iun*; pertinet. Quae ... saginat, sane non ... idololatria? *Kroym Q. C. 26*

illa principalis idololatria? Viderint, si eaedem merces — tura dico et cetera peregrinitatis, sacrificium idolorum — etiam hominibus ad pigmenta medicinalia, nobis quoque insuper ad solacia sepulturae usui sunt. Certe cum pompae, cum sacerdotia, cum sacrificia idolorum de periculis, de damnis, de incommodis, de cogitationibus, de discursibus negotiationis tuae instruuntur,
f. 113 quid aliud / quam procurator idolorum demonstraris? Nemo contendat posse hoc modo omnibus negotiationibus controversiam fieri. 3. Graviora delicta quaeque pro magnitudine periculi diligentiam extendunt observationis, ut non ab his tantum abscedamus, sed et ab iis, per quae fiunt. Licet enim ab aliis fiat, non interest, si per me. 4. In nullo necessarius esse debeo alii, cum facit quod mihi non licet. Ex hoc, quod vetor facere, intellegere debeo curandum mihi esse, ne fiat per me. Denique in alia causa non levioris reatus praeiudicium istud observo. Nam quod mihi de stupro interdictum sit, aliis ad eam rem nihil aut operae aut conscientiae exhibeo; 5. nam quod ipsam carnem meam a lupanaribus segregavi, agnosco me neque lenocinium neque id genus locorum alterius causa exercere posse. Sic et homicidii interdictio ostendit mihi lanistam quoque ab ecclesia arceri: nec per se non faciet quod faciendum aliis subministrat. Ecce magis proximum praeiudicium: 6. si publicarum victimarum redemptor ad fidem accedat, permittes ei in eo negotio permanere? Aut si iam fidelis id agere susceperit, retinendum in ecclesia putabis? Non opinor, nisi si quis et de turario dissimulabit; scilicet ad alios pervenit procuratio sanguinis, ad alios odorum. Si, antequam idola in saeculo essent, his mercibus adhuc informis idololatria transigebatur, si et nunc fere sine idolo opus idololatriae incendiis odorum perpetratur, ecquid maioris operae et erga daemonia turarius? 7. Nam facilius sine idolo idololatria quam sine turarii merce. Ipsius
f. 113^{v} fidei conscientiam perrogemus. / Quo ore Christianus turarius, si per templa transibit, quo ore fumantes aras despuet et exsufflabit, quibus ipse prospexit?

22. Exod. 20, 14. Lev. 18, 6 seqq.; 19, 29. Deut. 5, 18; 23, 17. Act. ap. 15, 29; 21, 25. **25.** Exod. 20, 13. Deut. 5, 17.

10. idolalatria *A* idololatria viderint *A B Gel*; *interrogationis signum post* idololatria *primus posuit Iun* eadem *A B* **11.** peregrinitatis, sacrificium *Gel Hartel P.S. 1,49*] peregrinitatis sacrificium *A B Oehl* peregrinitatis, ad sacrificium *Iun Rfd (virgulam tollens)* idolorum, etiam *Iun*; *post* idolorum *A B Gel punctum exhibent*; *distinctionem tollunt Oehl Rfd* **12.** sepulture *A* **14.** negotiationis tuae *ex* negotiationibus tuae *A*, *quod primus intellexit Kroym Q. C. 27* negotiationibusve *B Gel* **16.** negociationibus *A* **18.** et ab iis] ab his *LaC* **19.** si] nisi *Iun* **22.** strupo *A corr.* **23.** cardinem *A corr.* **25.** locorum *A B*] lucrum *Gel* **26.** eclea *A* *arceri *A* per se *Gel*] posse *A B* **27.** aliis *Gel*; *dubitanter vindicat Hoppe Beitr. 21*] alio *A* alios *B* subministrat? *susp. LaC* **28.** in eo] meo *B* *post* permanere *interrogationis signum primus posuit Gel* **29.** id *om. Rig 1664* eclesia *A* *post* putabis *interrogationis signum primus posuit Gel* **30.** si *supra lin. add. A m. ead.* **32.** fere et sine *LaC* **33.** perpetratur, ecquid *Gel*] perpetratur; Ecquid *A B (.)* ecquid] et quid *Oehl post* turarius *punctum ponens, contra quem disputat Hoppe Beitr. 117* demonia *A* **33-34.** *interrogationis signum post* turarius *primus posuit Lat*; turarius. *A* turarius: *B Gel* ecquid maioris operae est erga daemonia quam turarius? *susp. Leop* **34.** *post* sine *primus LaC add.* idolo *post* merce *distinctionem om. B* **35.** *post* perroge-

every demon. Is not that, in fact, the principal idolatry? It is immaterial to me, if the same wares—I mean incense and the other exotic articles, which are a sacrifice to the idols—are also used by men as healing ointments and by us, moreover, for solace at a funeral. At any rate, when processions, when priesthoods, when sacrifices to idols are provided with what they need by means of the dangers, the damages, the troubles, the plans and the bustling activity of your trade, what else then do you show yourself to be than an agent of the idols?

Let no one contend that in this way all forms of trade may be combated. 3. It is precisely the graver sins which, because of the magnitude of the danger, require a more extensive scrupulousness, so that we not only abstain from these sins themselves but also from those things by means of which they come to pass. For it makes no difference that a sin be committed by others, if I acted as the agent. 4. In no respect may I be indispensable to another, when he is doing what is not allowed to me. From what I am forbidden to do I should understand that I must be careful that the same is not done by my agency.

After all, in another case of no lighter guilt I apply this standard. For, because fornication has been forbidden to me, I do not lend any assistance or complicity to others for that purpose; 5. and because I have separated my own flesh from brothels, I acknowledge that I can neither exercise the trade of a pander nor exploit such places for the sake of somebody else. In the same way the prohibition of murder makes it clear to me that also a trainer of gladiators is barred from the Church; he will not fail to be the means of doing what he aids another to do.

Here is a more obvious standard case: 6. if a supplier of public victims joins the faith, will you allow him to remain in that trade? Or if somebody who is already a believer has taken up this occupation, will you think that he is to be retained in the Church? No, I think, unless somebody will shut his eyes also in the case of the incense-dealer. For the one is concerned with the supplying of blood, the other with that of perfumes. If a still formless idolatry was practised with the help of these wares before the idols were in the world, and if nowadays, too, the work of idolatry is almost carried out without an idol by means of the burning of incense, does not then the incense-dealer also do a greater service to the demons? 7. For idolatry can more easily do without an idol than without the wares of the incense-dealer.

Let us ask the conscience of faith itself. With what mouth will a Christian incense-dealer, when passing through the temples, with what mouth, I ask, will he spit and puff in front of the fuming altars for which he himself

---

mus *virgulam ponit Gel* si *del. Lat*; *approbat Iun, qui tamen mavult* Quo ... turarius? Si **36.** quo ore *del. LaC*; *vindicat Löfst Z. Spr. T. 74*; *aut distinguendum* Quo ... transibit? Quo ore *aut (quod mavult) post.* quo ore *delendum censet Rig*

Qua constantia exorcizabit alumnos suos, quibus domum suam cellarium praestat? Ille quidem si excluserit daemonium, non sibi placeat de fide: neque enim inimicum exclusit. 8. Facile debuit de eo impetrare, quem quotidie pascit. Nulla igitur ars, nulla professio, nulla negotiatio, quae quid aut instruendis aut formandis idolis administrat, carere poterit titulo idololatriae, nisi si aliud omnino interpretemur idololatrian quam famulatum idolorum colendorum.

12. 1. Male nobis de necessitatibus humanae exhibitionis supplaudimus, si post fidem obsignatam dicimus: 'non habeo quo vivam'. Iam hic enim plenius illi abruptae propositioni respondebo. Sero dicitur. Ante enim fuit deliberandum ex similitudine providentissimi aedificis illius, qui prius sumptus operis cum viribus suis supputat, ne, ubi coeperit, defunctus postea erubescat. 2. Sed et nunc habes dicta domini, exempla adimentia tibi omnem causationem. Quid enim dicis? 'Egebo.' Sed felices egenos dominus appellat. 'Victum non habebo.' Sed *nolite*, inquit, *cogitare de victu*; et vestitus habemus exemplum lilia. 'Substantia mihi opus erat.' Atquin omnia vendenda sunt et egentibus dividenda. 'Sed filiis et posteritati providendum.' *Nemo aratro manum imponens et retro spectans aptus est* operi. 'Sed condicionalis eram.' *Nemo duobus dominis servire potest*. Si vis domini discipulus esse, crucem tuam tollas et dominum sequaris necesse est, id est, angustias et cruciatus tuos vel corpus solum, quod in modum crucis est. 3. Parentes, coniuges, liberi propter deum
f. 114 relinquendi / erunt; de artibus et negotiationibus et de professionibus etiam
16 liberorum et parentum causa dubitas? Iam tunc demonstratum est nobis et pignera et artificia et negotia propter dominum derelinquenda, cum Iacobus et Iohannes vocati a domino et patrem navemque derelinquunt, cum Matthaeus de telonio suscitatur, cum etiam sepelire patrem tardum fuit fidei. 4. Nemo eorum, quos dominus allegit, 'non habeo', dixit, 'quo vivam.' Fides famem non timet; scit etiam famem non minus sibi contemnendam propter

4. Luc. 14, 28-9. **7.** Luc. 6, 20. Mtth. 5, 3. **8.** Mtth. 6, 25. 31. Luc. 12, 22. **8-9.** Mtth. 6, 28. Luc. 12, 27. **9.** Luc. 18, 22 (cf. Mtth. 19, 21. Marc. 10, 21). **10.** Luc. 9, 62. **11.** Mtth. 6, 24. Luc. 16, 13. **12.** Luc. 14, 27 (cf. Mtth. 10, 38; 16, 24. Marc. 8, 34. Luc. 9, 23). **14.** Mtth. 19, 29. Marc. 10, 29. Luc. 18, 29 (cf. Mtth. 10, 37. Luc. 14, 26). **17.** Mtth. 4, 21-2. Marc. 1, 19-20 (Luc. 5, 10-1). **18-19.** Mtth. 9, 9. Marc. 2, 14. Luc. 5, 27-8. **19.** Mtth. 8, 21-2. Luc. 9, 59-60. **21-22.** cf. Mtth. 10, 28. Luc. 14, 26.

37. cellariam *Gel* **39.** quotidie *ex* cotidie *A* **40.** negociatio *A* **41.** potest *LaC* **42.** interpraetemur *A*

2. hic enim] enim hic *LaC* **3.** *post* respondebo *punctum primus posuit Iun*; respondebo; Sero *A* respondebo, Sero *B Gel* **5.** sui *A* defectus *susp. Iun*; *scribit Rig* **6.** dicta domini et exempla *susp. Iun*; *Urs Rig*; *lectionem traditam vindicat Hoppe Beitr. 53* **8.** habeo *LaC* Et vestitus (*sc. non habebo*): habemus exempla lilia *Kroym Q. C. 27* **11.** est operi. Sed *Rig*] est. Operis et *A (;) B* est. Opera et *Gel* est. Opera *LaC* conductionalis *susp. Iun*; *'aliqui* conductionalis, *non est necesse' LaC* **12.** crucem *om. A inter* esse *et* tuam *spatio vacuo relicto* **13.** *post* tuos *punctum ponit Iun* **14.** in modum crucis *Rig*] in modum xp̄s *A* in modum Christus *B* in domum Christi

provided? With what constancy will he exorcise his foster-children, the idols, for whom he offers his own house as a store-room? Let him not, indeed, be self-complacent about his faith when he has cast out a demon; for what he cast out was not his enemy. 8. He easily ought to have his way with him whom he feeds every day.

No craft, therefore, no profession, no form of trade contributing anything to the equipment or formation of idols will be free from the charge of idolatry, unless we give an explanation to idolatry which is completely different from 'the service consisting in idol-worship'.

12. 1. Wrongly do we ease our conscience with respect to the necessities of human sustenance, if after sealing the faith (by baptism) we say: 'I have nothing to live by'. Here namely I shall answer this inconsiderate proposition more fully.

This excuse comes too late. One should have considered the matter beforehand, imitating that most prudent builder, who first calculates the costs of the work and the means at his disposal, lest, when he had begun, he should have to give up later and be ashamed.

2. But now, too, you have the Lord's sayings and the examples He has given, taking away from you all excuse. For what is it you say? 'I shall suffer poverty.' But the Lord calls the poor happy. 'I shall have no food.' But He says: *do not think of food*; and as an example in the matter of dress we have the lilies. 'I needed fortune.' On the contrary, one should sell everything and distribute the proceeds among the poor. 'But children and posterity should be provided for.' *No one who puts his hand on the plough and looks back is fit* for the work. 'But I was under contract.' *No one can serve two masters*. If you want to be a disciple of the Lord, you must take up your cross and follow Him, that is, take up your straits and vexations, or your body only, which is after the manner of a cross. 3. Parents, wives, children have to be left for the sake of God; do you doubt this in the case of the crafts, trades and professions even for the sake of your children and parents? Already then it was shown to us that both dear ones and handicrafts and business are to be left behind for the Lord's sake, when James and John were called by the Lord and left behind both father and ship, when Matthew was roused up from the toll-house, when even the burial of a father took too long for faith. 4. None of those who were chosen to Himself by the Lord said: 'I have nothing to live by'. Faith does not fear hunger. It knows that for the sake of God it must no

Gel in modum Christi *LaC* in domino Christi *Iun post* est *virgulam ponens* **15.** negociationibus *A* **16.** *post* liberorum *virgulam ponit Scal* dubitas? *Rig*] dubitas. *A B Gel*; *del. Scal post* nobis *virgulam ponens* tum *LaC* **17.** dominum *B Gel*] dn̄o *A* deum *Mercerus* Iacobus *B Gel*] iacob *A* **18.** Ioannes *B Gel* mattheus *A* **19.** theloneo *A* **21.** contempnendam *A*

deum quam omne mortis genus. Didicit non respicere vitam, quanto magis victum! 'Quotusquisque haec adimplevit?' Sed *quae penes homines difficilia, penes deum facilia*. 5. Sic tamen nobis de mansuetudine et clementia dei blandiamur, ut non usque ad idololatriae affinitates necessitatibus largiamur, sed omnem afflatum eius vice pestis etiam de longinquo vitemus, non in his tantum, quae praemisimus, sed in universa serie humanae superstitionis, sive deis suis sive defunctis sive regibus mancipatae, ut ad eosdem spiritus immundos pertinentis, modo per sacrificia et sacerdotia, modo per spectacula et hoc genus, modo per festos dies.

13. 1. Sed de sacrificiis et sacerdotiis quid loquar? De spectaculis autem et voluptatibus eiusmodi suum iam volumen implevimus. Hoc loco retractari oportet de festis diebus et aliis extraordinariis sollemnitatibus, quas interdum lasciviae interdum timiditati nostrae subscribimus adversus fidem disciplinamque communem. 2. De hoc quidem primo consistam, an cum ipsis quoque
f. 114^{v} nationibus communicare in huiusmodi servus dei debeat / sive habitu sive victu vel quo alio genere laetitiae earum. *Gaudere cum gaudentibus et lugere cum lugentibus* de fratribus dictum est ab apostolo ad unanimitatem cohortante. 3. Ceterum ad haec nihil communionis est lumini et tenebris, vitae et morti, aut scindimus quod est scriptum: *saeculum gaudebit, vos vero lugebitis*. Si cum saeculo gaudemus, verendum est, ne cum saeculo et lugeamus. 4. Saeculo autem gaudente lugeamus, et saeculo postea lugente gaudebimus. Sic et Eleazar apud inferos in sinu Abrahae refrigerium consecutus, contra dives in tormento ignis constitutus alternas malorum et bonorum vices aemula retributione compensant. 'Sunt quidam dies munerum, quae apud alios honoris titulum, apud alios mercedis debitum expungunt. 5. Non ergo', inquis, 'recipiam meum vel rependam alienum?' Si hunc morem sibi homines de superstitione consecraverunt, tu extraneus ab omni eorum vanitate quid participas idolothyta sollemnia, quasi tibi quoque praescriptum sit de die, quominus id, quod homini debes vel tibi ab homine debetur, citra diei observationem luas

23. Luc. 18, 27 (cf. 1, 37). Mtth. 19, 26. Marc. 10, 27.
7. Rom. 12, 15. **9.** cf. 2 Cor. 6, 14. **10.** Ioh. 16, 20. **12-15.** cf. Luc. 16, 19-31.

23. quotuquisque *A corr.* adimplebit *Kroym Q. C. 27* **24.** sic] si *Oehl — inde a verbis* Sic tamen *incipit cap. XIII Rig 1664 (ante* sic *signum † posuit m. rec. in A)* **25.** largiamur. Sed *A B Gel; recte primus distinxit Rig inde a verbis* sed omnem *incipiunt cap. XIII Pam Rig; refutat Iun* **26.** devitemus *B Gel* in *om. Pam 1597* **27.** deis *ex* dehis *per rasuram A*
1. Sed de sacrificiis *ab his verbis cap. XIII incipere primus intellexit Iun* de sacerdotiis *B Gel* **4.** lasciviae interdum *om. A* **4-5.** fidem disciplinamque communem *A Bmg; vindicat Kroym Q. C. 27-8*] fidei disciplinam communicantes nationibus in idolicis rebus *B Gel* fidem disciplinamque communicantes nat. in id. reb. *Rfd* **5.** prima *A* **6.** huiusmodi *B Gel*] huius mundi *A* abitu *A* **9.** adhec. *A* vite *A* **10.** rescindimus *LaC* est *supra lin. add. m. ead. A* scriptum est *LaC* **11.** gaudemus *B Gel*] gaudebimus *ex* gaudebis *per rasuram A* **12.** saeculo autem gaudente lugeamus et saeculo *B Gel*] Sed saeculo *A* gaudebimus *ex* gaudemus *A* **13.** Lazarus *Pam* insinus *A* **14.** et bonorum *om. A* **15.** compensat *Pam 1597* quidem *Pam; corr. Iun* **16.** debitum

less despise hunger than any kind of death. It has learnt not to care for life, how much less for food.

'How few have accomplished this?' But *what is difficult with men is easy with God*. 5. At any rate, let us ease our conscience on account of the mildness and clemency of God in such a manner that we do not indulge our 'necessities' so that we approach the domain of idolatry, but avoid even from afar every breath of it as if it were a pestilence; and this not only in the cases mentioned above, but in the whole array of human superstition, regardless of whether it serves gods or the dead or kings, since it pertains to the same impure spirits, sometimes by way of sacrifices and priesthoods, sometimes with spectacles and the like, sometimes with festivals.

13. 1. But why should I speak about sacrifices and priesthoods? Further, about spectacles and pleasures of that sort we have already filled a special volume of its own. Here we have to discuss the holidays and other extraordinary festivals, which we allow sometimes to our lasciviousness, sometimes to our timidity, contrary to the faith and the common discipline.

2. Now the first point on which I shall join issue is this: whether a servant of God is allowed to share with the pagans themselves in matters of this kind, either in dress, or in food, or in any other kind of their rejoicings.

To rejoice with the rejoicing and to mourn with the mourning was said about the brethren by the Apostle, when he exhorted them to be of one mind. 3. But as concerns the matters at hand, nothing is shared between light and darkness, between life and death; otherwise we rescind what is written, *the world will rejoice, you, however, will mourn*. If we rejoice with the world, it is to be feared that we shall also mourn with the world. 4. But let us mourn while the world rejoices, and we shall rejoice when afterwards the world mourns. Thus, too, the fate of Eleazar in hell, obtaining refreshment in Abraham's bosom and, on the other hand, that of the rich man, set in the torment of fire, provide a balance of alternate vicissitudes of evil and good by means of an equalizing retribution.

'There are certain days on which presents are given, nullifying for some a reason to pay homage, for others a debt of wages. 5. Should not I then', you say, 'receive what is my due or pay to another what is due to him?' If people have sanctified this custom for themselves out of superstition, why do you, who are beyond every one of their vanities, take part in festive offerings to the idols, as if also for you there existed a rule concerning a day, i.e. that you should not pay or receive what you owe to a person or what a person owes

---

B Gel; vindicat Thörnell Eranos 7 (1907), 96-7 titulum *A* non *Bmg; vindicant Kroym Q. C. 28 (interrogationis signum post* alienum *ponens) et Gomperz 2* nunc *A B Gel* **17.** rependam] reddam *LaC* **19.** solennia? quasi *Rig* quo minus *A 'non tamen negligo viri docti iudicium, qui hic mavult legere* munus' *LaC*

vel recipias? 6. Da formam, in quam velis agi tecum. Cur enim et lateas, cum ignorantia alterius tuam conscientiam contamines? Si non ignoraris, quod sis Christianus, temptaris et contra conscientiam alterius agis tamquam non Christianus — enimvero et dissimulaberis —: temptatus addictus es. Certe sive hac sive illac, reus es confusionis in domino. *Qui autem confusus super me fuerit penes homines, et ego confundar super illo*, inquit, *penes patrem meum, qui est in caelis.*

14. 1. Sed enim plerique iam induxerunt animo agnoscendum esse, si quando, f. 115 quae / ethnici, faciunt, ne nomen blasphemetur. Porro blasphemia, quae nobis omni modo devitanda est, haec, opinor, est, si qui nostrum ad iustam blasphemiam ethnicum deducat aut fraude aut iniuria aut contumelia aliave materia dignae querellae, in qua nomen merito percutitur, ut merito irascatur et dominus. 2. Ceterum si de omni blasphemia dictum est: *vestri causa nomen meum blasphematur*, perimus universi, cum totus circus scelestis suffragiis nullo merito nomen lacessit. Desinamus, et non blasphemabitur. Immo dum sumus, blasphemetur in observatione, non in exorbitatione disciplinae, dum probamur, non, dum reprobamur. 3. O blasphemiam martyrii affinem, quae tunc me testatur Christianum, cum propterea me detestatur! Benedictio est nominis maledictio custoditae disciplinae. *Si hominibus*, inquit, *velim placere, servus Christi non essem*. 'Sed idem alibi iubet, omnibus placere curemus, *quemadmodum ego*, inquit, *omnibus per omnia placeo*.' 4. Nimirum Saturnalia et Kalendas Ianuarias celebrans hominibus placebat! An modestia et patientia? An gravitate, an humanitate, an integritate? Proinde cum dicit: *omnibus omnia factus sum, ut omnes lucrifaciam*, numquid idololatris idolo-

25. Mtth. 10, 33. Marc. 8, 38. Luc. 9, 26 (cf. 2 Tim. 2, 12).
6. Rom. 2, 24 (cf. Is. 52, 5. Ezech. 36, 20. 23. 2 Sam. 12, 14). **12.** Gal. 1, 10. **14.** 1 Cor. 10, 32-3. **17.** 1 Cor. 9, 22.

21. recipias? Da *LaC*] respicias da *A* recipias, da *B Gel* recipias. Da *Iun Rig* in quam velis *B Gel*; *vindicat Hoppe Beitr. 28-9*] qualemvis *A* qua velis *Rig* in qua velis *Seml Rfd* et *om. LaC* **22.** contamines? Si *Lat*; *approbant Iun LaC Rig*] contamines; Si *A* contamines, si *B Gel*; *Scal*, *qui verba* si non ignoraris ... tentaris *post* tamquam non Christianus *(24) collocat* Si non] Non, si *Havercamp (ap. Oehler) Leop* **23.** temptaris· et *A* tentaris. Et *B Gel* **24.** Christianus — enimvero et dissimulaberis —: *vdNat*] Christianus. Enimvero et dissimulaberis, *A B Gel*; *Rig post* dissimulaberis *punctum ponens* Christianus. Enimvero etsi simulaveris, *Pam LaC* Christianus. Sin vero et dissimulaveris, *Lat Iun Rfd* (Christianus:) Christianus? Enimvero etsi dissimulaveris *Leop* Christianus: sin vero et dissimulaberis, *Oehl* Christianus. Enimvero etsi simulaveris tentatus, *Scal* **25.** in *delendum esse susp. Iun, quem repudiat LaC* domino *A*] deo *B Gel* **1.** agnoscendum *Oehl*] agnoscendam *A* ad cognoscendam *B* ignoscendum *Gel* id ignoscendum *Urs* **1-2.** si quando quae ethnici faciunt *Rig Urs*] si quandoque ethnici faciunt *A* si quandoque et ethnici faciunt *B* quandoque his quae ethnici faciunt *Gel* **3.** omnimodo *A*] omnino *B Gel*; *om. LaC* si quis *B Gel* **5.** dignae querelae, in qua nomen merito percutitur, ut merito irascatur *B Gel*] digna quae cui non inmerito irascatur *A 'legerem libenter* materia digna querelae' *LaC* **6.** et ei *Leop* vestri causa *A Bmg*; *tuetur Hoppe Beitr. 18*] vestra causa *Leop Oehl Rfd* vae, cuius *B Gel* **7.** scelestis] coelestis *Bmg* **8.** lacessit. Desinamus *Rig*] lacessit, Desinamus *A* lacessit, desinamus *B Gel* blasphemetur, dum sumus *Rig Rfd* **9.** discipline *A* **10.** non dum reproba-

to you except on the day of observance? 6. You yourself should set the rule by which you wish to be dealt with. For why should you conceal yourself, thus contaminating your conscience because of the other man's ignorance? If it is not unknown that you are a Christian, you are put on trial and act contrary to the other's knowledge as if you were not a Christian — certainly people will even pretend not to know you are a Christian —; you have been tested and condemned.

In any case, either in the latter or in the former way, you are guilty of shame in the Lord, who says: *But whoever will have been ashamed about Me before men, about him I shall also be ashamed before my Father, who is in heaven.*

14. 1. However, a great many have by this time ascribed to the notion that it is pardonable if they sometimes do what the heathens do, lest the name be blasphemed.

Now the blasphemy which we should avoid at all costs only occurs then, I think, when one of us gives occasion to a pagan for justified blasphemy, either by fraud or by injustice, or by contumely, or by any other cause for a well-founded complaint, on which the name is deservedly cursed, so that the Lord, too, is deservedly angered. 2. But if of all blasphemy it has been said, *Because of you my name is dishonoured*, we are all lost without exception, since the whole circus assaults the name with its wicked suffrages, without this being in any way deserved. Let us cease to be (viz., Christians), and the name will not be blasphemed. On the contrary, while we exist, let it be blasphemed because of our observance and not our transgression of the discipline, because we are approved and not because we are reprobated.

3. Oh blasphemy verging on martyrdom! It attests that I am a Christian, at the moment that it detests me for the same reason. It is a blessing of the name that observance of the discipline is cursed. *If I wished to please men, I should not be a servant of Christ*, says Paul.

'But elsewhere the same apostle commends us to endeavour to please all, *just as I please everybody in everything*.' 4. Would you assert that he used to please men by observing the *Saturnalia* and New Year's Day? Was it not by modesty and patience? Was it not by dignity, humanity and integrity? Likewise when he says, *I have become everything to everybody in order to win*

---

mur *Gel (virgulam inter* non *et* dum *ponit vdNat)*] *om. A* nondum reprobamur *B post* probamur *distinctionem om. A*, *post* reprobamur *virgulam exhibent B Gel*; *primus recte distinxit Rig* O blasphemiam *Urs Rig*] ob blasphemiam *A B Gel* adfinem *A* que *A* **11.** cristianum *A* propterea me *mavult Iun*; *scribit LaC*] propter eam *A B Gel* propter ea me *Oehl post* detestatur *nullam distinctionem exhibet B* **12.** custodite discipline *A* velim *A*] vellem *B Gel* **13.** *post* curemus *omnes libri et edd. punctum exhibent* **14.** siturnalia *A* **15.** placeat *ex* placebat *A post* placebat *punctum ponit vdNat*; *A punctum cum virgula, B Gel virgulam, Rig Oehl Rfd interrogationis signum exhibent* **15-16.** et patientia *om. A interrogationis signum post* integritate *primus posuit LaC*; *A virgulam, B Gel punctum exhibent* **17.** omnia omnibus *Gel* omnes *B Gel*] omnibus *A* **17-18.** idololatres *om. A*

latres, numquid ethnicis ethnicus, numquid saecularibus saecularis? 5. Sed etsi non prohibet nos conversari cum idolatris et adulteris et ceteris criminosis dicens: *ceterum de mundo exiretis*, non utique eas habenas conversationis immitit, ut, quoniam necesse est et convivere nos, et commisceri cum peccatoribus, idem et compeccare possimus. Ubi est commercium vitae, quod apostolus concedit, ibi peccare, quod nemo permittit. Licet convivere cum ethnicis, f. 115^{v} / commori non licet. Convivamus cum omnibus, conlaetemur ex communione naturae, non superstitionis; pares anima sumus, non disciplina, compossessores mundi, non erroris. 6. Quodsi nobis nullum ius esset communionis in huiusmodi cum extraneis, quanto scelestius est haec inter fratres frequentare! Quis hoc sustinere aut defendere potest? Iudaeis dies suos festos exprobrat spiritus sanctus: *sabbata*, inquit, *vestra et numenias et ceremonias odit anima mea*. Nobis, quibus sabbata extranea sunt et numeniae et feriae a deo aliquando dilectae, Saturnalia et Ianuariae et Brumae et Matronales frequentantur, munera commeant, strenae, consonant lusus, convivia constrepunt. 7. O melior fides nationum in suam sectam, quae nullam sollemnitatem Christianorum sibi vindicat! Non dominicum diem, non pentecosten, etiam si nossent, nobiscum communicassent; timerent enim, ne Christiani viderentur. Nos ne ethnici pronuntiemur, non veremur. Si quid et carni indulgendum est, habes non dicam tuos dies tantum, sed et plures. Nam ethnicis semel annuus dies quisque festus est, tibi octavo quoque die. Excerpe singulas sollemnitates nationum et in ordinem exsere: pentecosten implere non poterunt.

15. 1. Sed *luceant*, inquit, *operae*. At nunc lucent tabernae et ianuae nostrae. Plures iam invenias ethnicorum fores sine lucernis et laureis quam Christianorum. De ista quoque specie quid videtur? Si idoli honor est, sine dubio idoli

20. 1 Cor. 5, 10. **25.** cf. 1 Cor. 3, 22. **29.** Is. 1, 14.
1. Mtth. 5, 16.

18. &thnicis *A corr.* ethnicus *B Gel*] & *A* **19.** et si *Gel* **20.** caeterum *A* exiretis *A B Gel*; *restituit Ciacconius* exissetis *Pam* **21.** immittit *Ciacconius*; *approbant Iun LaC Löfst Z. Spr. T. 9*] inmutat *A* immutat *B Gel* imputat *susp. Oehl*; *damnat Löfst l.l.* est *A*] sit *B Gel* et commisceri *B Gel*] et *om. A* et commiscere *Pam* **22.** idem *A B*] ideo *Gel* compeccare *A*] cum peccare *B* cum eis peccare *Gel distinctionem post* possimus *om. B* ubi *A B*] ibi *Gel* commertium *A* **23.** ibi] sibi *B* hic *Gel ante* peccare *lacunam signat Rfd, quem refutat Hartel P. S. 1, 50. Denuo lacunam defendit Stramonio, Nuovo Didaskaleion 1964* **24.** commoveri *A* cum omnibus *Gel*] communibus *A B* laetemur *A* **25.** paris animae *A* **26.** esset *A B*] est *Pam om. Gel 'al. non legitur* est, *et abesse potest' Iun* **27.** huiusmodi cum *A*] eius modicum *B* eiusmodi cum *Gel* frequentari *Iun mavult, LaC susp.* **28.** fastos *Pam* 1597 *corr. Seml* **29.** numenias *Rfd*] numenia *A* neomenias *B Gel* et ceremonias *om. A* **30.** numeniae *A*] neomenia *B Gel* neomeniae *Rig* **31.** Ianuaria *LaC post* frequentantur *interrogationis signum ponit Rig* **32.** et strenae *Iun Scal A B Gel hoc modo distinguunt*: commeant, ... consonant, lusus, ... constrepunt. *(pro virgulis et puncto Rig signa interrogationis ponit); recte primi distinxerunt Iun Scal*; *asyndeton* munera commeant, strenae *restituit primus Oehl* conviva *A corr.* **33.** fides *om. A* **34.** vindicat! Non *Rig*] vindicat; Non *A* vindicat, non *B Gel* pentecostem *B LaC*; *post* pentecosten *punctum ponit Gel* **35.** non communicassent *Gel* **36.** *post* habes *Rig punctum, Oehl punctum cum*

everybody, did he perhaps mean to the idolaters an idolater, to the heathens a heathen, to the worldly a man of the world? 5. True, he does not forbid us to have intercourse with idolaters and adulterers and the other sinners, saying: *otherwise you should have to go out of the world*; but of course, he does not slacken the reins of intercourse to such a degree that, while it is inevitable that we live and mingle with the sinners, we may also sin with them. Where there is social intercourse, which is permitted by the apostle, there is also sinning, which is permitted by no one. We may live with the heathens, die with them we may not. Let us live together with all, let us rejoice together on account of the community of nature, not that of superstition. We are alike in soul and not in discipline, fellow-possessors of the world, not of error.

6. But if we do not have any right to communion with outsiders in such things, how much more criminal is it to practice these things among brethren! Who can tolerate or defend this? The Holy Spirit reproaches the Jews with their holidays: *your sabbaths*, it says, *and new months and solemnities are hated by my soul*. But we, to whom the sabbaths are foreign and also the new months and the festivals which were once loved by God, we celebrate the *Saturnalia*, the festivals of New Year and Midwinter, and the *Matronalia*: presents, New Year's gifts are exchanged, the games roar on, the din of banquets fills the air.

7. Oh, how much better is the loyalty of the heathens to their discipline: it appropriates none of the solemnities of the Christians! Lord's Day and Pentecost they would not have shared with us even if they knew them; for they would be afraid to be regarded as Christians. We, however, do not fear to be declared heathens.

If some indulgence is to be granted also to the flesh, you have, I say, not only the days due to you but even more. For while each festive day of the heathens occurs but once annually, you have one every seven days. Take out every single solemnity of the heathens and set them in a row: together they will not amount to one Pentecost.

15. 1. Scripture, however, says: *Let works shine*. But now what shines are our shops and doors. Already you may find more doors of heathens without lamps and laurel-wreaths than of Christians. What is our opinion about this issue?

If it is honour to an idol, then undoubtedly this honour to an idol is

virgula ponit **37.** dicam *om. A* tuos *B Gel*] tamen *A* duos *Lat Kellner (BKV 1912, 160)* suos *Ciacconius, quem approbant Iun, Hartel P. S. 1, 36* tantos *Wissowa* **38.** festus ... die *om. A* octavus quisque dies *Urs*; *inter hanc coniecturam et* octavo quoque die *dubitat LaC* **39.** exsere *A* exere *Bmg*] texe *B Gel* pentecostem *B LaC*
1. operae *A*] opera vestra *B Gel* operae vestrae *vdNat* lucent *Lat*] luceant *A B Gel* **2.** invenies *B Gel* **3.** spetie *A* **3-4.** *post.* idoli honor *ex praecedente membro a librario repetitum esse putant Iun LaC*

honor idololatria est. Si hominis causa est, recogitemus omnem idololatrian
5 in hominis causam esse; 2. recogitemus omnem idololatrian in homines esse culturam, cum et ipsos deos nationum homines retro fuisse etiam apud suos
f. 116 constet. Itaque nihil / interest, superioris an huius saeculi viris superstitio ista praestetur. Idololatria non propter personas, quae opponuntur, sed propter officia ista damnata est, quae ad daemonas pertinent. 3. 'Reddenda sunt
10 *Caesari quae sunt Caesaris*.' Bene, quod apposuit: *et quae sunt dei deo*. Quae ergo sunt Caesaris? Scilicet de quibus tunc consultatio movebatur, praestandusne esset census Caesari an non. Ideo monetam ostendi sibi dominus postulavit et de imagine, cuius esset, requisivit et, cum audisset Caesaris, *reddite*, ait, *quae sunt Caesaris Caesari et quae sunt dei deo*, id est imaginem Caesaris
15 Caesari, quae in nummo est, et imaginem dei deo, quae in homine est, ut Caesari quidem pecuniam reddas, deo temetipsum. 4. Alioquin quid erit dei, si omnia Caesaris? 'Ergo inquis, honor dei est lucernae pro foribus et laurus in postibus?' Non utique quod dei honor est, sed quod eius, qui pro deo eiusmodi officiis honoratur quantum in manifesto est salva operatione quae est
20 in occulto ad daemonia perveniens. 5. Certi enim esse debemus, si quos latet per ignorantiam litteraturae saecularis, etiam ostiorum deos apud Romanos, Carnam a cardinibus appellatam et Forculum a foribus et Limentinum a limine et ipsum Ianum a ianua; et utique scimus, licet nomina inania atque conficta sint, cum tamen in superstitionem deducuntur, rapere ad se daemo-
25 nia et omnem spiritum immundum per consecrationis obligamentum. 6. Alioquin daemonia nullum habent nomen singillatim, sed ibi nomen inveniunt, ubi et pignus. Etiam apud Graecos Apollinem Thyraeum et Antelios daemonas ostiorum praesides legimus. Haec igitur ab initio praevidens spiritus sanctus etiam ostia in superstitionem ventura praececinit per antiquissimum
f. 116^{v} propheten Enoch. / Nam et alia ostia in balneis adorari videmus. 7. Si autem
31 sunt qui in ostiis adorentur, ad eos et lucernae et laureae pertinebunt. Idolo

9-10. Mtth. 22, 16-21. Marc. 12, 14-7. Luc. 20, 21-5. **15.** cf. Gen. 1, 26-7; 9, 6. **28-30.** vid. comment.

4-5. recogitemus ... causam esse *om. LaC*; *corruptum iudicat Lfst Apol. 114*; *vindicat Thörn St. T. 1, 17* idololatriam *B* (*bis*) **6.** et ipsos *A*; *vindicat Thörn St. T. 2, 83*] ipsos *B Gel Oehl* **8.** apponuntur *Lat* **9.** daemones *B Gel post* pertinent *interrogationis signum ponit LaC* **11-12.** praestandus neesset *A* **12.** ideo et *B Gel Oehl* **13.** *distinctionem post* requisivit *sustulit vdNat*; *A B Gel punctum, Oehl virgulam exhibent* **15.** numo *A* **17-18.** *post* postibus *B Scal virgulam, LaC punctum ponunt*; est? Lucernae ... postibus. *susp. vdNat (in manuscripto)* **18.** *post* honor est *Kroym Q. C. 29* eum (*sc. honorem lucernae et lauri*) praestari nolo *vel simile quid intercidisse putat* pro eo *LaC* **18-19.** huiusmodi *Gel* **19.** in manifesto est salva operatione *B Gel*] in manifesta est operatione *A*; vindicat *Kroym Q. C. 29, quod approbant Dekkers (CC) et vdNat* **20.** hocculto *A corr. post* occulto *virgulam ponunt Pam 1579 Oehl Rfd*; *damnat Kroym Q. C. 29* enim *om. A* siquo *A* **21.** ^{h}ostiorum *A* **22.** Carnam *Wasz Wind*] Cardeam *A B Gel cett. Vide comm.* pellatum *A* appellatum *Iun* *'in antiquis exemplaribus legitur* Foriculum *et* Foreculum*' Rig* (Forculum *A*) **24.** rapere* *A* **25-26.** alioquin et *LaC* singulatim *B Gel*

idolatry. If it is for the sake of a human being, then let us recollect that all idolatry is aimed at a human being; 2. let us recollect that all idolatry is worship done to a human being, since it is an established fact, even among their own worshippers, that the gods of the heathens have formerly been men. Therefore, it does not make a difference whether this superstitious worship is offered to human beings of an earlier age or of the present one. Idolatry has not been condemned because of the persons presented for adoration, but because of those observances which pertain to the demons.

3. 'One has *to render to Caesar what is Caesar's*.' Fortunately He added: *and what is God's to God*. What, then, are the things of Caesar? They were, namely, those things which gave rise to the discussion, whether the poll-tax should be paid to the emperor or not. It is for this reason that the Lord demanded to be shown a coin and asked about the image on it, whose it was. When He had heard that it was Caesar's he said: *render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's*. He meant that the image of the emperor, which is on the coin, should be rendered to the emperor and the image of God, which is in man, to God. Consequently you should render to the emperor your money, to God yourself. Otherwise, what shall belong to God, if everything belongs to the emperor?

4. 'So you say that the lamps before the doors and the laurel-wreaths at the doorposts are a homage to God?' No, not, of course, that they are a homage to God, but that they are a homage to him, who is honoured instead of God by means of these homages, as far as the external appearance is concerned, whereas secretly this activity pertains to the demons.

5. For we should be certain of the fact, although it escapes some in consequence of their ignorance of pagan literature, that the Romans, too, have gods of doors: Carna, called after the *cardines* [door-pins], Forculus, after the *fores* [door-wings], Limentinus, after the *limen* [threshold] and Janus himself, after the *ianua* [door]; and, of course, we know that, though these are empty and fictitious names, nevertheless, when they are used for superstition, they draw to themselves the demons and every impure spirit by means of the bond brought about by consecration. 6. Moreover, demons have no name individually but they find a name where they also find a pledge. The Greeks, too, as we read, have in Apollo Thyraeus and the Antelian demons protectors of entrances. Therefore the Holy Spirit, foreseeing this from the beginning, predicted through the intermediary of the oldest prophet, Enoch, that even entrances were to become objects of superstition. For we see that other entrances, too, are worshipped, viz., in the baths. 7. Now, if there are beings which are worshipped in entrances, it is to them that both the lamps and the

27. Thyraeum *Rig*] tyreum *A* θυραῖον *B Gel* **29.** hostia *A* venturam *B post* ventura *virgulam ponere vult Iun* **30.** prophenenoch *A* prophetam *LaC* et alias *Rig*^{2} **31.** eorum sunt *Gel* qui *Scal*] quae *A B Gel* hostiis *A* adornentur *Iun*

feceris, quicquid ostio feceris. Hoc in loco ex auctoritate quoque dei contestor, quia nec tutum est subtrahere quodcumque uni fuerit ostensum utique omnium causa. Scio fratrem per visionem eadem nocte castigatum graviter, quod ianuam eius subito adnuntiatis gaudiis publicis servi coronassent. 8. Et tamen non ipse coronaverat aut praeceperat; nam ante processerat et regressus reprehenderat factum. Adeo apud deum in huiusmodi etiam disciplina familiae nostrae aestimamur. Igitur quod attineat ad honores regum vel imperatorum, satis praescriptum habemus in omni obsequio esse nos oportere, secundum apostoli praeceptum subditos magistratibus et principibus et potestatibus, sed intra limites disciplinae, quousque ab idololatria separamur. 9. Propterea enim et illud exemplum trium fratrum praecucurrit, qui alias obsequentes erga regem Nabuchodonosor honorem imaginis eius constantissime respuerunt, probantes idololatrian esse quicquid ultra humani honoris modum ad instar divinae sublimitatis extollit. 10. Sic et Daniel cetera Dario subnixus tamdiu fuit in officio, quamdiu a periculo disciplinae vacaret. Nam ne id subiret, non magis leones regios timuit quam illi regios ignes. Accendant igitur quotidie lucernas, quibus lux nulla est, affigant postibus lauros postmodum arsuras, quibus ignes imminent; illis competunt et testimonia tenebra-
f. 117 rum et auspicia poenarum. / 11. Tu lumen es mundi et arbor virens semper.
51 Si templis renuntiasti, ne feceris templum ianuam tuam. Minus dixi: si lupanaribus renuntiasti, ne indueris domui tuae faciem novi lupanaris.

16. 1. Circa officia vero privatarum et communium sollemnitatum, ut togae purae, ut sponsalium, ut nuptialium, ut nominalium, nullum putem periculum observari de flatu idololatriae, quae intervenit. 2. Causae enim sunt considerandae, quibus praestatur officium. Eas mundas esse opinor per semetipsas, quia neque vestitus virilis neque anulus aut coniunctio maritalis de alicuius idoli honore descendit. Nullum denique cultum a deo maledictum invenio nisi muliebrem in viro. *Maledictus enim*, inquit, *omnis, qui muliebribus induitur*. Toga vero etiam appellationis virilis est. 3. Nuptias quoque

39. Rom. 13, 1 seqq. Tit. 3, 1 (cf. 1 Petr. 2, 13-4). **42.** Dan. 3, 12-4. **45.** Dan. 6, 5-7. **50.** Mtth. 5, 14 (cf. Phil. 2, 15). Ps. 1, 3; 92, 13-5.
7. Deut. 22, 5.

33. nectu tum *A* **35.** coronassent] coronaverint *A* **36-37.** *A* preceperat; Nam ... processerat. et *B Gel* praeceperat, nam ... processerat, et *Iun* praeceperat (nam ... processerat) et *distinguunt*; *distinctionem Oehleri secuti sumus* **37.** deprehenderat *Lat*; *lectionem traditam vindicat Hoppe Beitr. 105* dominum *B Gel* de disciplina *Oehl* in disciplina *Wissowa* **38.** aestimantur *B* aestimatur *Gel* attinet *Iun* **40.** *post* praeceptum *virgulam ponunt Seml Leop* **41.** potestatibus. Sed *A B Gel distinguunt*; *virgulam primus posuit Iun* **42.** fratruum *A* **43.** nabucodonosor *A* **44.** respuerint *B Gel* ultra *om. A* **45.** extollit *A*] extollitur *B Gel*; *dubitanter defendit Hoppe Beitr. 99* extolli *Rig*[3] Dareo *B* Dareio *Gel* **46.** disciplina *Iun* **47.** id ne *Gel* illi *A Bmg Gel*] ille *B* accedant *A* **48.** cotidie *B* **49.** et *om. A* tenebrarum *om. A* **50.** *pr.* et *B Gel*] aut *A* **52.** domi *B Gel*; *corr. Iun A non inspecto*
1. privatarum vero *ex* vero privatarum *corr. A m. rec.* communi*um *A* **2.** nuptialium *B Gel*]

laurel-wreaths must pertain. It is for an idol that you will have done everything which you will have done for an entrance.

Here I derive a testimony also from God's authority, since it is not safe to keep back whatever has been shown to one person, certainly in the interest of all. I know a brother who, because his slaves had wreathed his door after a sudden proclamation of public rejoicings, was heavily punished in a dream that same night. 8. And yet he had not himself put up those wreaths or given orders to do so, for he had gone out before, and after his return he had reprehended the fact that this had been done. To such a degree we are appraised by God in such matters, even because of the behaviour of our servants.

So as regards homages to kings or emperors, we have been sufficiently enjoined that we are to be in complete obedience, being, according to the precept of the apostle, submitted to magistrates, princes and powers, but within the limits of the discipline, i.e., as long as we keep at distance from idolatry. 9. For it is for this reason, too, that the famous example of the three brothers precedes us, who, though in other respects obedient to the king Nebuchadnezzar refused with the utmost firmness to do homage to his image, thus showing that everything must be regarded as idolatry which elevates someone beyond the measure of human honour unto the likeness of divine majesty. 10. Thus Daniel, too, who in other respects subjected himself to Darius, functioned in this way only as long as he was free from endangering his religious obligations. For in order not to be exposed to this danger, he feared the king's lions as little as the three brothers feared the king's fires.

Therefore, let them who have no light at all light lamps every day and let them who are menaced by the fires of hell attach to their doorposts laurel-wreaths which are to be burnt afterwards. They are the people who befit both the testimonies of darkness and the forebodings of punishments. 11. You are the light of the world and the ever verdant tree. If you have renounced the temples, do not make a temple of your door. Or rather: if you have renounced the brothels, do not give your house the appearance of a new brothel.

16. 1. As regards the attendance, however, at private and public ceremonies, such as that of donning the white toga, betrothals, weddings and name-givings, I should think that no danger can be noticed in the breath of idolatry which is mixed up with them. 2. For one should consider the reasons that social duties are fulfilled. They are in themselves pure, I think, since neither manly dress nor the marital ring or union proceed from a homage to some idol. After all, I do not find any dress cursed by God except that of women worn by men. *For cursed*, it is written, *is every man who clothes himself in a woman's garment*. Now the toga is even called manly (*virilis*). 3. Further,

nuptalium *A* nuptiarum *Bmg* **3.** adflatu *mavult Iun* idolatriae *A* quae *om. A* **8.** appellatione *Gel*

celebrari non magis deus prohibet quam nomen imponi. 'Sed his accommodantur sacrificia.' Sim vocatus nec ad sacrificium sit titulus officii, et operae meae expunctio quantum sibi libet. 4. Utinam quantum sibi quidem, nec videre possemus quae facere nobis nefas est. Sed quoniam ita malus circumdedit saeculum idololatria, licebit adesse in quibusdam, quae nos homini, non idolo, officiosos habent. Plane ad sacerdotium et sacrificium vocatus non ibo —proprium enim idoli est officium—, sed neque consilio neque sumptu aliave opera in eiusmodi fungar. 5. Si propter sacrificium vocatus adsistam, ero particeps idololatriae; si me alia causa coniungit sacrificanti, ero tantum spectator sacrificii.

17. 1. Ceterum quid facient servi vel liberti fideles, item officiales sacrificantibus dominis vel patronis vel praesidibus suis adhaerentes? Sed si merum quis
f. 117v sacrificanti tradiderit, immo si verbo / quoque aliquo sacrificio necessario adiuverit, minister habebitur idololatriae. Huius regulae memores etiam magistratibus officium possumus reddere secundum patriarchas et ceteros maiores, qui regibus idololatris usque ad finem idololatriae apparuerunt. 2. Hinc proxime disputatio oborta est, an servus dei alicuius dignitatis aut potestatis administrationem capiat, si ab omni specie idololatriae intactum se aut gratia aliqua aut astutia etiam praestare possit, secundum quod et Ioseph et Daniel mundi ab idololatria et dignitatem et potestatem administraverunt in ornamento et purpura praefecturae totius Aegypti sive Babyloniae. 3. Cedamus itaque succedere alicui posse, ut in quoquo honore in solo honoris nomine incedat neque sacrificet neque sacrificiis auctoritatem suam accommodet, non hostias locet, non curas templorum deleget, non vectigalia eorum procuret, non spectacula edat de suo aut de publico aut edendis praesit, nihil sollemne pronuntiet vel edicat, ne iuret quidem; iam vero quae sunt potestatis, neque iudicet de capite alicuius vel pudore — feras enim de pecunia — neque

17,9-10. Gen. 41, 39 seqq. Dan. 2, 48 seqq.

10. *post* sacrificia *virgulam exhibet B* sim vocatus *A*] si invocatus *B* si in vocatu *Gel* si nec in vocatu *Lat*; *approbant Iun Scal* si vim vocatus *Urs*; *approbat LaC, tamen* sin vocatus *suspicans* ad sacrificium *vdNat*] adsacrificiis *A* in sacrificiis *B Gel* adsacrificii *Rig* **11.** expunctio quantum sibi libet *A*] expunctio quae tum sibi libet *B* expunctio, quid tum? si libet *Gel*; *inter hanc lectionem et* expunctio, quid tum, si libet? *dubitat Scal post.* quantum sibi *om. B Gel* **12.** possimus *B Gel* malis *Gel* **15.** officium est *B Gel* sed *delet Leop* aliavera *A* **16.** huiusmodi *LaC*

1. quid] id *LaC punctum post* adhaerentes *ponens* liberti *Iun*] liberi *A B Gel* **2.** suis *om. A* **2-3.** mirum quid sacrificantis *A* **3.** vero *A* quoque *om. LaC* aliquos *ex* alios quos *A m. al.* **5.** magistratibus et potestatibus *B Gel* patri archas *A* **7.** *inde a verbis* hinc proxime *cap. XVII incipere putat Iun*; *approbat LaC* suborta *Gel* **8.** spetiae *A* **9.** possit; secundum *A* possit: secundum *B Gel* possit. Secundum *Rig distinguunt*; *virgulam post* possit *primus posuit Oehl* **10.** administraverint *B* **11.** in ornamento et purpura praefecturae *Oehl*] in ornamento exturae *A* in ornamento et purpura extitere *B Gel* et in ornamento et purpura extitere *Iun LaC* (extiterunt) in ornamento praefecturae *Rig* **12.** credamus *B Gel* et in quoquo honore *mavult Iun dubitanter LaC* in solo *A*; *restituit Scal A non inspecto*] ut in solo *B Gel* **13-14.** accomodat *A* **14.**

the celebration of weddings, too, is no more forbidden by God than name-givings.

'But sacrifices are attached to these solemnities.' Let me be invited and let the reason for my social service be not connected with a sacrifice, then the fulfilment of my service can also take place at pleasure. 4. Alas, could it be at pleasure, indeed, and were it possible for us not to see the things which we are not allowed to do. But since the Evil One has so surrounded the world with idolatry, it will be allowed to be present on some occasions which have us render a service to a human being, not to an idol.

Of course, if I am invited to a priestly service and a sacrifice, I shall not go, for this is a typical service to an idol; but neither shall I in such a case furnish advice or expenses or any other assistance of this sort. 5. If I am invited because of a sacrifice and I attend, I shall take part in idolatry; if a different reason brings me into the presence of a man who is performing a sacrifice, I shall be no more than a spectator of the sacrifice.

17. 1. Moreover, what shall believing slaves or freedmen do, and likewise civil servants, in the train of their masters, patrons or superiors when they are sacrificing? But if someone hands the wine to a man who sacrifices, if he even assists by saying a word that is necessary for the sacrifice, he will be regarded as a minister of idolatry,

As long as we keep this rule in mind we can also serve under magistrates after the example of the patriarchs and the other forefathers who served idolatrous kings up to the boundary of idolatry.

2. Hence a dispute has lately arisen as to whether a servant of God may accept the exercise of a dignity or a power, if he can keep himself pure of every form of idolatry, either by some special favour or careful wisdom, just as both Joseph and Daniel, untainted by idolatry, exercised dignity and power, wearing the insignia and the purple of the governorship of the whole of Egypt and Babylonia, respectively.

3. Thus, let us admit that a man may succeed in any post of honour in bearing only its name without sacrificing or lending his authority to sacrifices, without contracting for public victims, without giving assignments for the care of temples, without having charge of their taxes, without giving games at his own cost or that of the state or presiding over the giving of them, without proclaiming or announcing any solemnity, without even taking an oath; further, with regard to what pertains to power, without passing judgement on a man's life or honour—for as to money you might be tolerant—,

---

[h]ostias *A* temporum *A* **15.** spectaculae dat *A* **16-17.** quidem: iam vero (quae sunt potestatis) neque iudicia de capite alicuius vel pudore ferat, etiam de pecunia, neque *Iun*; *approbat Leop tamen* neminem *pro* etiam *legendum esse putans* **17.** pudore (feras ... pecunia?) neque *LaC* pudore: feras ... pecunia neque *B*

damnet neque praedamnet, neminem vinciat, neminem recludat aut torqueat, si haec credibile est fieri posse.

18. 1. Iam vero de solo suggestu et apparatu honoris retractandum. Proprius habitus uniuscuiusque est tam ad usum quotidianum quam ad honorem et dignitatem. Igitur purpura illa et aurum cervicis ornamentum eodem more apud Aegyptios et Babylonios insignia erant dignitatis, quo more nunc praetextae vel trabeae vel palmatae et coronae aureae sacerdotum provincialium, sed non
f. 118 eadem condicione. 2. Tantum enim / honoris nomine conferebatur his, qui familiaritatem regum merebantur — unde et purpurati regum memorabantur a purpura, sicut apud nos a toga candidati —, sed non ut suggestus ille sacerdotiis quoque aut aliquibus idolorum officiis adstringeretur. Nam si ita esset, utique tantae sanctitatis et constantiae viri statim habitus inquinatos recusassent statimque apparuisset Danielem idolis non deservisse nec Belem nec draconem colere, quod multo postea apparuit. 3. Simplex igitur purpura illa nec iam dignitatis erat, sed ingenuitatis apud barbaros insigne — quodammodo enim et Ioseph, qui servus fuerat, et Daniel, qui per captivitatem statum verterat, civitatem Babyloniam et Aegyptiam sunt consecuti per habitum barbaricae ingenuitatis —. Sic penes nos quoque fideli, si necesse fuerit, poterit et puerilis praetexta concedi et puerilis stola, nativitatis insignia, non potestatis, generis, non honoris, ordinis, non superstitionis. Ceterum purpura vel cetera insignia dignitatum et potestatum insertae dignitatibus et potestatibus idololatriae ab initio dicata habent profanationis suae maculam, cum praeterea ipsis etiam idolis induantur praetextae et trabeae et lati clavi, fasces quoque et virgae praeferantur, et merito. Nam daemonia magistratus sunt saeculi huius; unius collegii insignia, fasces et purpuras gestant. 4. Quid ergo proficies, si suggestu quidem utaris, opera eius vero non administres? Nemo immundis mundus videri potest. Tunicam si induas inquinatam per se, poterit forsitan illa non inquinari per te, sed tu per illam mundus esse non poteris.

3-4. Gen. 41, 42. Dan. 5, 29. **11.** vid. comment. **13-15.** Gen. 39, 1. Dan. 5, 13; 6, 14. **22.** cf. Ephes. 6, 12.

19. posse: *Leop* posse, *Seml distinguit*
1. appratu *A* **2.** cotidianus *B* ad *in marg. add. A m. ead.* **5.** *virgulam post* sacerdotum *ponit Rig; approbat K. Baus, Der Kranz in Antike u. Christentum 57-8* **6.** conditione *A* conferebantur *Rig* his *Gel*] is *A* iis *Rfd* **7-8.** merebantur — unde ... candidati —, sed *dist. vdNat*] merebantur, Unde ... candidati, Sed *A* merebantur. Unde ... candidati: sed *B Gel* merebantur. Unde ... candidati, sed *Oehl Rfd* **7.** vocabantur *B Gel* **8.** sicuti *LaC* toga candida *B Gel* **12.** poste *A* **13.** dignitati *A* erat sed ingenuitatis *om. A* **13-16.** insigne — quodammodo ... ingenuitatis —. Sic *dist. vdNat*] insigne; quodammodo ... ingenuitatis, Sic *A* insigne. Quodammodo ... ingenuitatis, sic *B Gel* (:sic) insigne; quodammodo ... ingenuitatis. Sic *Hartel P. S. 1, 51* **13-14.** quodammodo *A B Gel*; *vindicat Hartel P. S. 1, 51*] quemadmodum *Pam* **14.** statim *B* **15.** Aegyptiam *Rig*] Aegyptum *A B Gel* **16.** Fideli *A*; *vindicat Gomperz* 22] fideles *B Gel* si] sic *Rig* **17.** *prius* puerilis *A*; *vindicat Gomperz* 22] pueris *B Gel post.* puerilis *A B*; *vindicat Gomperz* 22] puellis *Gel* **18.** *Inde a verbis* ceterum purpura *cap. XVIII incipere putat Iun*; *approbat LaC* **19.** insertae *A B Gel*] inserta *Hartel P. S. 1, 51, qui post* dignitatem *virgulam ponit post* insertae *virgulam ponit Scal* dignitatibus *vdNat*] dignitati *A B Gel* **20-21.** propterea *LaC* **21.** induantur *Lat*; *approbat Iun*] in quantum *B Gel om. A* **23.** *distinctionem post* huius *tollit B* unius *om. Rig hoc modo distinguens*: saeculi. huius collegii (summi *add. Wissowa*) fascias *mavult Pam* **24.** vero eius *Gel interrogationis signum post* administres *primus posuit Pam* **25.** in inmundis *Rig* poteris *B Gel* **26.** illam ... inquinare *B Gel*

without condemning or forejudging, without putting anybody in irons, without emprisoning or torturing, if it is believable that all this is possible.

18. 1. But now we should draw our attention only to the attire and pomp of a high office. There is an appropriate wear for everyone, both for daily use and for office and dignity (high function). Thus the well-known purple and the gold as an ornament for the neck were among the Egyptians and Babylonians insignia of dignity, comparable to the *togae praetextae*, the *trabeae* and the *tunicae palmatae* and the golden wreaths of the provincial priests, but not on the same terms. 2. For it was only for the sake of honour that these ornaments used to be granted to those who by merit became intimates of kings and hence they were called 'the purpled men of kings' after the purple, just as we have *candidati*, 'men in white', called so after the *toga candida*, the 'white toga'. The purpose was not that this splendid attire should also be bound up with priestly duties or any services to idols. If this were the case, undoubtedly men of such holiness and steadfastness would at once have refused these tainted vestments, and it would at once have become evident that Daniel had not been a servant of idols nor a worshipper of Bel or the dragon, as became evident much later.

3. That purple, then, was something simple among the barbarians, not yet a sign of a high function, but of free birth. For in a sense both Joseph, who had been a slave, and Daniel, who had changed his status through captivity, attained Babylonian and Egyptian citizenship by receiving the dress of foreign nobility. In the same way in our Christian community, if it is necessary, the boy's *praetexta* can be worn and the girl's *stola*, signs of descent, not of power, of lineage, not of office, of class, not of superstition. But the purple or the rest of the insignia of high rank and power, which from the beginning have been consecrated to the idolatry involved in these dignities and powers, carry with them the taint of their own dedication. Hence, the idols themselves are also robed in *praetextae*, *trabeae* and *lati clavi*, and *fasces* and rods are carried before them, and rightly so; for the demons are the magistrates of this world: *fasces* and purple are worn by them as the insignia of one and the same league.

4. So what will you accomplish, if you use this attire but do not perform the functions connected with it? Nobody can give an impression of cleanness in unclean clothes. If you put on a tunic soiled of itself, it may perhaps not be soiled through you, but certainly you will not be able to be clean because of it.

Iam nunc qui de Ioseph et Daniel argumentaris, scito non semper compa-
f. 118v randa esse vetera et nova, rudia et polita, coepta et explicita, servilia / et libe-
ralia. 5. Nam illi etiam condicione servi erant; tu vero nullius, in quantum
30 solius Christi, qui te etiam captivitate saeculi liberavit; ex forma dominica
agere debebis. Ille dominus in humilitate et ignobilitate incessit domicilio
incertus — nam *filius*, inquit, *hominis non habet, ubi caput collocet* —,
vestitu incultus — neque enim dixisset: *ecce qui teneris vestiuntur, in domibus
regum sunt* —, vultu denique et aspectu inglorius, sicut et Esaias pronuntiave-
35 rat. 6. Si potestatis ius quoque nullum ne in suos quidem exercuit, quibus sor-
dido ministerio functus est, si regem denique fieri conscius sui regni refugit,
plenissime dedit formam suis dirigendo omni fastigio et suggestu quam digni-
tatis quam potestatis. 7. Quis enim magis iis usus fuisset quam dei filius?
Quales et quanti eum fasces producerent, qualis purpura de umeris eius flore-
40 ret, quale aurum de capite radiaret, nisi gloriam saeculi alienam et sibi et suis
iudicasset? Igitur quam noluit, reiecit, quam reiecit, damnavit, quam dam-
navit, in pompa diaboli deputavit. Non enim damnasset, nisi non sua; alterius
autem esse non possent, nisi diaboli, quae dei non sunt. 8. Tu si diaboli pom-
pam eierasti, quicquid ex ea attigeris, id scias esse idololatrian. Vel hoc te
45 commonefaciat omnes huius saeculi potestates et dignitates non solum alie-
nas, verum et inimicas dei esse, quod per illas adversus dei servos supplicia
consulta sunt, per illas et poenae ad impios paratae ignorantur. 9. 'Sed et nati-
vitas et substantia tua molestae tibi sunt adversus idololatrian.' Ad evitandum
/ remedia deesse non possunt, cum et, si defuerint, supersit unicum illud, quo
50 felicior factus non in terris magistratus, sed in caelis.

19. 1. Posset in isto capitulo etiam de militia definitum videri, quae inter

32. Mtth. 8, 20. Luc. 9, 58. **33.** Mtth. 11, 8. Luc. 7, 25. **34.** Is. 53, 2. **35-36.** Ioh. 13, 4-16. **36.** Ioh. 18, 36; 6, 15.

27. nunc qui de *Scal Rig*] nunc quid de *B Gel* numquid *A* *post* argumentaris *interrogationis signum ponit LaC* **29.** conditione *A* servi conditione *Gel* nullius *A*; *vindicat Hartel P. S. 1, 52; 3, 62*] nullius servus *B Gel* in quantum *Gel B* (inquantum); *vindicat Hartel P. S. 1, 52*] inquillinatum *A* **30.** solus *B* *post* liberavit *punctum ponit Iun* ex *A*; *restituerunt Lat Iun A non inspecto*] et *B Gel* **31.** et ignobilitate *om. A* domicilii *Ciacconius*; *lectionem traditam vindicant Iun LaC Hoppe Beitr. 30* **32.** caput *A B*; *mavult Iun*] caput suum *Gel* **34.** *alt.* et *om. A* **35.** potestatis ius ... nullum *A*] potestatem ... nullam *B Gel* **36.** regem *A*; *restituit LaC A non inspecto*] regem se *B Gel* **37.** dirigendo *A B Gel*] derigendo *Iun Oehl Hoppe Beitr. 96* de reiciendo *Mercurus* deiciendo *vel* derogando *susp. Rfd*; *utrum* dir- *an* der- *an* de regendo *legendum sit dubitat LaC* fastidio *A corr.* quam *A*; *vindicat Hoppe Beitr. 125*] tam *B Gel* **38.** iis *A*] his *B Gel* his magis *LaC* **39.** quales ante eum *susp. Leop* deum eris *A* de humeris *B Gel* **41.** *primum* quam *A Rig*] quae *B Gel* reiecit, quam reiecit, damnavit, quam damnavit *Rig*] reiecit. quam reiecit. quam damnavit. damnavit: *A* reiecit, quae reiecit damnavit, quae damnavit, *B Gel* **43.** possunt *Leop Wissowa*; *lectionem traditam vindicat Hoppe Beitr. 36* **44.** *post* idololatriam *virgulam exhibet B* **46.** inimica *A* **47.** convulta *A* irrogantur *Lat*; *approbat Iun* dignorantur *LaC* Sed et *B Gel*] Sed *A* **48.** tua *ex* sua *A* molesta &ibi *A* tibi molesta *LaC* *post* sunt *punctum ponit Iun distinctionem post* idololatrian *tollens* *post* idololatriam *virgulam*

Further, you, who take an argument from the cases of Joseph and Daniel, you must know that we cannot always compare things old and new, rude and polished, only begun and fully developed, servile and free. 5. For these men, even by their circumstances, were slaves. But you are nobody's slave, in so far as you are solely the slave of Christ, who even freed you from the imprisonment of this world. You will thus have to act according to your Lord as pattern. He walked in humility and obscurity, uncertain about his dwelling-place, for He said: *the Son of men has nowhere to lay his head*. He was uncared for in his dress, for otherwise He would not have said: *Behold, they who are clad in soft raiment are in kings' houses*. He was, indeed, inglorious in countenance and appearance, as Isaiah had predicted. 6. Furthermore, if He exercised no right of power even towards His own followers, for whom He performed a menial service, and, above all, if He, though aware of His kingship, avoided being made king, we may conclude that He most fully gave an example to His followers by putting into its proper place all the pomp and splendour of both dignity and power. 7. For who should have used these rather than God's son? What kind and what number of *fasces* would have accompanied Him, what kind of purple would have gleamed on His shoulders, what kind of gold would have beamed upon His head, had He not considered wordly splendour to be alien both to Himself and to His followers? He thus rejected the worldly splendour which He did not want, and He condemned what He rejected, and what He condemned, He consigned to the pomp of the devil. For He would not have condemned anything except what was not of Him; but things that are not God's could be of nobody's but the devil's. 8. If you have sworn off the devil's pomp, know then that all that you touch of it is idolatry.

Let moreover this fact remind you that all the powers and dignities of this world are not only foreign but even hostile to God: that by their agency punishments have been fixed against God's servants and also that by their agency the punishments prepared for the impious remain unknown.

9. 'But both your birth and your property are a burden to you in the fight against idolatry.' To avoid it, remedies cannot be absent since even if they would fail, there would remain that one thing by which you will be made a happier magistrate, not on earth but in heaven.

19. 1. In the last chapter a decision might also seem to have been given con-

---

exhibent B Gel; *punctum primi posuerunt Scal LaC* aevitandum *A Reliqua in A desunt*; *post* evitandum *liber De anima incipit a verbis* de minutiloquio aristotelis (*cap. VI, 7*) **49.** *post* possunt *interrogationis signum ponit Pam 1597*; *virgulam restituit Scal* et, si *Iun*] et si *B* etsi *Gel* quod *Rig* **50.** in terris eris magistratus *Kroym Q. C. 29*; *repudiat et lectionem traditam vindicat Hoppe Beitr. 45* in terris magistrabis *Fr. Leo ap. Kroym*

1. possit *Leop Oehl Rfd, quod tuetur Hoppe Beitr. 36 putans* possit *traditum esse* intra *Scal*

dignitatem et potestatem est. At nunc de isto quaeritur, an fidelis ad militiam converti possit et an militia ad fidem admitti, etiam caligata vel inferior quaeque, cui non sit necessitas immolationum vel capitalium iudiciorum. 2. Non convenit sacramento divino et humano, signo Christi et signo diaboli, castris lucis et castris tenebrarum; non potest una anima duobus deberi, deo et Caesari. 'Et virgam portavit Moyses, fibulam et Aaron, cingitur loro et Iohannes, agmen agit et Iesus Nave', — bellavit et Petrus, si placet ludere. 3. Quomodo autem bellabit, immo quomodo etiam in pace militabit sine gladio, quem dominus abstulit? Nam etsi adierant milites ad Iohannem et formam observationis acceperant, si etiam centurio crediderat, omnem postea militem dominus in Petro exarmando discinxit. Nullus habitus licitus est apud nos inlicito actui adscriptus.

20. 1. Sed enim cum conversatio divinae disciplinae non factis tantum, verum etiam verbis periclitetur (nam sicut et scriptum est: *ecce homo et facta eius*, ita: *ex ore tuo iustificaberis*), meminisse debemus etiam in verbis quoque idololatriae incursum praecavendum aut de consuetudinis vitio aut timiditatis. 2. Deos nationum nominari lex prohibet, non utique, ne nomina eorum pronuntiemus, quae nobis ut dicamus conversatio extorquet. Nam id plerumque dicendum est: 'in templo Aesculapii illum habes', et: 'in vico Isidis habito', et: 'sacerdos Iovis factus est', et multa alia in hunc modum, quando et hominibus hoc genus nomina inducuntur. Neque enim Saturnum honoro, si ita vocavero eum suo nomine; tam non honoro, quam Marcum, si vocavero Marcum. 3. Sed ait: *nomen aliorum deorum ne commemoremini neque audiatur de tuo ore*. Hoc praecepit, ne deos vocemus illos. Nam et in prima parte legis *non sumes*, inquit, *nomen domini dei tui in vano*, id est idolo. Cecidit igitur in idololatrian qui idolum nomine dei honoraverit. 4. Quodsi deos dicendum erit, adiciendum est aliquid, quo appareat, quia non ego illos deos dico. Nam et scriptura deos nominat, sed adicit 'suos' vel 'nationum'; sicut

5-6. cf. 2 Cor. 6, 14. Mtth. 6, 24. Luc. 16, 13. **7-8.** Exod. 4, 2; 17, 5; 28, 12. Mtth. 3, 4. Exod. 17, 9. **9-10.** Mtth. 26, 52. Ioh. 18, 11. **10-11.** Luc. 3, 14. **11.** Mtth. 8, 5-10. Luc. 7, 2-10. **12.** Ioh. 18, 11.
2-3. vid. comment. Mtth. 12, 37. **5.** Exod. 23, 13. **11.** Exod. 23, 13. **13.** Exod. 20, 7.

3-4. quoque *Urs* **7.** virgam quoque *LaC* portavit *Gel cett.*] portabit *B* cingitur *Gel cett.*] cingetur *B* **8.** Ioannes *B Gel* agit *Gel cett.*] aget *B* Petrus *vdVliet St. Eccl. 1, 41; Th. Birt Philol. 83 (1928) 176; approbat Dekkers CC*] populus *B Gel cett.* **9.** bellabit *Gel*] bellavit *B* bellabit iam? quomodo *mavult Iun* bellabit in pace? imo quomodo etiam militabit sine gladio? *scribere vult LaC* **10.** quem *Gel*] quae *B* et si *Gel* Ioannem *B Gel* **12.** dominus *Gel*] domini *B* exarmando *Gel*] examinando *B*
2. sicut et *B*; *vindicant Löfst Krit. Apol. 94, Thörn St. T. 2, 77*] sicut *Gel* **3.** etiam] esse *Urs* **5.** prohibet, non utique ne nomina *Gel*] prohibet, non utique nomina *B* prohibet non utique: nomina *Rfd* **7.** *B hoc modo distinguit*: dicendum est in templo Aesculapii, illum habes *alt.* in *add. Rig* **9-10.** si ita quem vocavero suo nomine *Urs* si quem ita vocavero suo nomine *Rig* **11.** commemoremini *B Gel*] commemorabitur *Urs* neque commemorabitur *LaC* comminiscamini

cerning that part of military service which pertains to the ranks of dignity and power. But now the question at issue is whether a believer may enlist and whether military men can be admitted to the faith, even the private soldier or every lower rank, for whom there is no necessity to sacrifice or to pass capital judgement.

2. Incompatible are the human oath of allegiance (*sacramentum*) and the divine sacrament, the standard of Christ and the standard of the devil, the legions of light and the legions of darkness. One soul cannot serve two lords: God and Caesar.

'Moses wore a rod and Aaron a buckle, John girded himself with a belt, Jesus Nave led an army'—and Peter waged war, if I may sport with the matter. 3. But how will he wage war, nay, how will he even in peace do military service without the sword, which the Lord has taken away? For though soldiers had come to John and received a rule to be guided by, although even a centurio had come to faith, every soldier of later times was ungirded by the Lord, when He disarmed Peter. With us no dress is allowed which belongs to a forbidden action.

20. 1. Living according to divine discipline, however, is not only endangered by deeds but also by words. For it is written, *Behold man and his deeds*, as well as, *Out of your mouth you will be justified*. We should thus also keep in mind that we must prevent idolatry from attacking us in words, too, which it can do owing to our vice of habit or that of timidity.

2. The Law forbids us to mention the gods of the heathens. Its sense, of course, is not that we should not pronounce their names, which every-day life forces us to use. For quite often one has to say things like: 'You will find him in the temple of Asclepius', or 'I live in the Quarter of Isis', or 'He has become a priest of Jupiter', and many other expressions of this nature, since such names are also given to men. For clearly I am not honouring Saturn, if I so call him by his name; I honour him no more than Marcus, if I call him Marcus.

3. But Scripture says: *Make no mention of the names of other gods, nor let such be heard out of your mouth*. The precept given here is that we do not call them 'gods'. For in the first part of the Law, too, is written: *You shall not take the name of the Lord your God in vain*, that is, in connection with an idol. So whoever honours an idol with the name of 'god' has lapsed into idolatry. 4. And if I have to speak of 'gods', something should be added to make it clear that I am not the one who calls them 'gods'. For Scripture also mentions gods but adds 'their' or 'of the heathens'. This is how David spoke,

susp. Rfd, quem refutant et lectionem traditam vindicant Hartel P. S. 1, 52, Hoppe Synt. 61 audietur *Rig* **12.** de ore tuo *Gel* **16.** dico] voco *LaC* **16-17.** sicut et *B*] sicut *Pam* sic et *Gel*

et David cum deos nominasset, ubi ait: *dei autem nationum daemonia*. Sed hoc mihi ad sequentia magis praestructum est. 5. Ceterum consuetudinis vitium est 'Mehercule' dicere, 'Medius Fidius' accedente ignorantia quorundam, qui ignorant iusiurandum esse per Herculem. Porro quid erit deieratio, si per eos, quos eierasti, quam praevaricatio fidei cum idololatria? Quis enim, per quos deierat, non honorat?

21. 1. Timiditatis est autem, cum te alius per deos suos obligat iuratione vel aliqua testificatione et tu, ne intellegaris, quiescis. Nam aeque quiescendo confirmas maiestatem eorum, cuius causa videberis obligatus. 2. Quid refert, deos nationum dicendo deos an audiendo confirmes, iures per idola an ab alio adiuratus adquiescas? Cur non agnoscamus versutias satanae, qui, quod ore nostro perficere non potest, id agit, ut suorum ore perficiat per aures inferens nobis idololatrian? Certe quisquis ille est, aut amica aut inimica congressione adstringit. 3. Si inimica, iam ad pugnam vocaris et scis tibi dimicandum esse; si amica, quanto securius in dominum transferes sponsionem tuam, ut dissolvas obligationem eius, per quem te malus honori idolorum, id est idololatriae, quaerebat adnectere. 4. Omnis patientia eiusmodi idololatria: honoras eos, quibus impositis obsequium praestitisti. Scio quendam, cui dominus ignoscat, cum illi in publico per litem dictum esset: 'Iuppiter tibi sit iratus', respondisse: 'immo tibi'. Quid aliter fecisset ethnicus, qui Iovem deum credidit? Etiamsi non per eundem retorsisset maledictum nec per ullum Iovis similem, confirmaverat Iovem deum, per quem se maledictum indigne tulisse demonstraverat remaledicens. 5. Ad quid enim indigneris per eum, quem scis nihil esse? Nam si insanis, iam esse confirmas et erit idololatriae professio timoris tui; quanto magis, cum per ipsum remaledicis, eodem Iovis honorem facis, quo et ille, qui te provocavit. Fidelis autem in eiusmodi ridere debet, non insanire, immo secundum praeceptum ne per deum quidem remaledicere, sed plane benedicere per deum, ut et idola destruas et deum praedices et adimpleas disciplinam.

17. Ps. 96, 5 (LXX 95, 5).
21,21-22. 1 Petr. 2, 23 *et* 1 Petr. 3, 9 (cf. Mtth. 5, 44. Luc. 6, 28).

17. dei *Rig*] dii *B Gel* **18.** *Inde a verbo* Ceterum *cap. XXI incipere iudicat Iun* **20.** ignorantius iurandum *B* erit *Lat*] erat *B Gel* **21.** si per eos *B Gel*] per eos *Lat* si per eos deierasti *Harrisius* **2.** *B hoc modo distinguit*: testificatione. Et ... quiescis, nam **3.** videris *Iun 'ita habebam ad oram mei libri. Alii scribunt* videberis, *alii* videbaris' *LaC* **4.** iures *B Pam*] iuret *Gel* **6-7.** perficiat? per aures inferes nobis idololatriam *B* **8.** te adstringit *Lat*; *lectionem traditam vindicat Löfst Spr. Tert. 55* **9.** transfers *mavult Iun* responsionem *Gel*; *dubitat Pam* **14.** quid aliud *Lat* credit *susp. Iun post* credidit *virgulam exhibet B* **15.** illum *B* **16.** per eum maledictus *Urs* **18.** insanus *B* idololatria *Lat*; *Iun dubitat* timor tuus *LaC* **18-19.** quanto magis, si, cum ... maledicis, eodem ... facis *Kroym Q. C. 30* **19.** Iovis *B Gel*; *vindicat Löfst Spr. Tert. 9*] Iovi *Scal Urs* honore *Iun 'alii* eodem Iovem honore facis' *LaC* **21.** et maledicere *B* **23-22, 1.** disciplinam aeque ... nationum. *distinguit B*

when he had mentioned the gods, saying: *the gods of the heathens, however, are demons*.—But I have put this here rather as an introduction to what follows.

5. Well then, it is a vice of habit to say 'By Hercules' or 'So help me the god of faith', even if ignorance clings to the use of the latter on the part of some people who are unaware that it is an oath by Hercules. Moreover, if you swear by beings whom you have renounced, what else will this oath be than faith being in league with idolatry? For who does not honour those by whom he swears?

21. 1. On the other hand, it is a sign of timidity, when somebody else puts you under an obligation in the name of his gods by means of an oath or a solemn declaration and you keep silent out of fear of being recognized. For equally by your silence you confirm their divine majesty on account of which you will seem to be bound. 2. What does it matter whether you confirm the gods of the heathens by calling them 'gods' or by hearing them so called, whether you swear by the idols or, when somebody else swears to you by them, keep silent? Why not let us recognize the wiles of Satan, who is intent on accomplishing through the mouth of his servants what he cannot accomplish through our mouth, thus introducing idolatry into us through our ears?

At all events, whoever it is who binds you, he does so either through friendly or hostile contact. 3. If it is through hostile contact, you are now challenged unto battle and know that you must fight; if it is through friendly contact, then how much more safely may you transfer your pledge to the Lord, in order that you dissolve the obligation of him through whom the Evil One sought to bind you to the honour of the idols, that is, to idolatry. 4. All passivity of this kind is idolatry: you honour them in that you show submission to them when they are laid upon you.

I know someone—may the lord forgive him—who, when it was said to him during a quarrel in the street: 'May Jupiter be angry with you', answered: 'No, with you'. What else would a heathen have done, who believes Jupiter to be a god? Even if he had not flung back the curse in the name of the same god or in the name of an equal of Jupiter, he would have confirmed Jupiter as a god, since by returning the curse he had shown that he was indignant about such a curse in his name. 5. For why should you be made indignant because of him whom you know to be nothing? For if you are angry, you already confirm his existence, and the manifestation of your fear will count as idolatry; how much more so, when you even curse back in his name, thus honouring Jupiter in the same way as he who defied you?

A believer, however, ought to laugh in a situation like this, and not be angry; rather, according to the commandment he should not curse back even in God's name but openly bless in the name of God, in order that you destroy the idols and preach God and fulfil the discipline.

22. 1. Aeque benedici per deos nationum Christo initiatus non sustinebit, ut non semper reiciat immundam benedictionem et eam sibi in deum convertens emundet. Benedici per deos nationum maledici est per deum. 2. Si dedero eleemosynam vel aliquid praestitero beneficii et ille mihi deos suos vel coloniae genium propitios imprecetur, iam oblatio mea vel operatio idolorum honor erit, per quae benedictionis gratiam compensat. 3. Cur autem non sciat me dei causa fecisse, ut et deus potius glorificetur et daemonia non honorentur in eo, quod propter deum feci? 'Sed deus videt, quoniam propter ipsum feci.' Pariter videt, quoniam propter ipsum fecisse me nolui ostendere et praeceptum eius idolothytum quodammodo feci. 4. Multi dicunt: 'Nemo se debet promulgare.' Puto autem nec negare. Negat enim quicumque dissimulat in quacumque causa pro ethnico habitus, et utique omnis negatio idololatria est, sicut omnis idololatria negatio sive in factis sive in verbis.

23. 1. Sed est quaedam eiusmodi species in facto et in verbo, bis acuta et infesta utrimque, licet tibi blandiatur, quasi vacet in utroque, dum factum non videtur, quia dictum non tenetur. Pecuniam de ethnicis mutuantes sub pignoribus fiduciati, iurati cavent, etsi negant se scire; volunt scilicet tempus persecutionis et locus tribunalis et persona praesidis. 2. Praescribit Christus non esse iurandum. 'Scripsi', inquit, 'sed nihil dixi. Lingua, non littera occidit.' Hic ego naturam et conscientiam advoco: naturam, quia nihil potest manus scribere, etiamsi lingua in dictando cessat immobilis et quieta, quod non anima dictaverit — quamquam et ipsi linguae anima dictaverit aut a se conceptum aut ab alio traditum —. 3. Iam ne dicatur: 'Alius dictavit'; hic conscientiam appello, an quod alius dictavit anima suscipiat et sive comitante sive residente lingua ad manum transmittat. Et bene, quod in animo et conscientia delinqui dominus dixit. Si, inquit, concupiscentia vel malitia in cor

23,1. bis acuta: Apoc. 2, 12. Hebr. 4, 12. **5.** cf. Mtth. 5, 34. **13-14.** cf. Mtth. 5, 28.

1. atque *LaC* per *om. B* Christo initiatus *Gel*] Christum Sationistus *B* **2.** non *delet Pam, quem refutat LaC* **3.** Si cui dedero *Urs*; *'vix necessarium' Kroym Q. C. 30* **6.** per quae *B Gel*; *vindicant Hartel P. S. 1, 52, Kroym Q. C. 30*] quem per *susp. Rfd* compensat *Urs*] compensant *B Gel*; *vindicat Kroym Q. C. 30 legens*: per quae benedictiones gratiam compensant **7.** honorantur *B* **8.** feci? Sed deus *Rig Urs* (feci.)] fecisse deus *B* feci deus *Gel* feci? deus *LaC* feci? Si deus *Oehl* **9.** *post* feci *punctum primus posuit Rig* feci: *B Gel* feci, *Oehl* et contra *Rfd, quem refutat lectionem traditam vindicans Hartel P. S. 1, 53*

1. *post* species *virgulam ponit LaC* in verbo, bis acuta *B Gel*] in verbis acuta *Iun mavult*; *Rig in observ. et Rig*^{3} in verbo, bisacuta *Rig*^{1} in verbis, acute *Rig sec. Leop* 'in verbis cauta *alii' Oehl qui virgulam post* verbo *tollit* **2.** utrimque] utrinque *Gel* utrique *B* **3.** *post* tenetur *distinctionem om. B* **4.** fiduciatis *Rig*^{2} *post* fiduciati *virgulam exhibet B* etsi (*aut* et rem) negant se scire; volunt *Hartel P. S. 1, 53-4*; *quod approbant Kroym Q. C. 30 et Dekkers*] et se necant, se scire volunt *B* et sic negant, scire volunt *Gel* et sic negant scire. Volunt *Iun* et se negant; se scire volunt *Oehl* 'se scire nolunt, scitur *fort.' Rfd* et se negant, sed scire volunt *Hartel ap. Rfd* **5.** locus *B Oehl*] locum *Gel* persona *B Oehl*] personam *Gel* **6.** dixit *B* **7.** ego *B Urs*; *susp. Iun*] ergo *Gel* **8.** dictando *B*; *restituit Lat*] dictitando *Gel* **9.** quamquam] tamquam *Hartel P. S. 1, 54*; *contra disp. Kroym Q. C. 30* animae *B* **10.** *post* traditum *distinctionem om. B* alius *Gel*] aliquis *B* dictavit *Gel*] dictarit *B post* dictavit *punctum cum virgula ponit Oehl* **12.** *post* transmittat *virgulam exhibet B*; *interrogationis signum ponit LaC* **13.** delinquit. Dominus dixit, *B*; *post* dixit *interrogationis signum ponit Pam*; *punctum restituit Scal* concupiscentiae vel malitiae *B*

22. 1. Equally one who has been initiated into the religion of Christ will not tolerate to be blessed in the name of the gods of the heathens, so as not always to reject the impure blessing, and purify it for himself by transferring it to God. To be blessed in the name of the gods of the heathens is to be cursed in the name of God.

2. If I give someone an alms or confer a benefit on him, and that man prays that his gods or the genius of the colony may be propitious to me, my gift or benefit will therewith be a homage to the idols in whose name he returns to me his blessing, which is his thank. 3. But why should he not know that I acted for the sake of God, in order that it is rather God who is glorified, and that it is not the demons who are honoured by that which I have done for the sake of God?

'But God sees that I did it for His sake.' Likewise, then, He sees that I did not want to show that I did it for His sake, and thus in a sense I turned His commandmant into a sacrifice to the idols.

Many say: 'Nobody ought to make himself known'. Nor, in my opinion, should anyone deny. For clearly he denies who dissembles when he is taken for a heathen on any occasion, and, of course, every denial is idolatry, just as every form of idolatry is a denial, either in words or in deeds.

23. 1. But there is a certain species of that kind (of hidden idolatry) in deed and word, double-edged and threatening on both sides. Nevertheless, it appeals to you because it is as if it were not there in both respects, since nothing seems to have been done, because no word is heard. When they borrow money from the heathens under pledged securities, they give a guarantee under oath, though they deny to be conscious of this: but, of course, this knowledge is required by the time of the legal proceedings, the place of the law-court and the person of the president. 2. Now Christ prescribes that swearing is forbidden.

'I have written', one objects, 'but I have not said anything; it is the tongue, not the letter which kills.' Here I appeal to nature and human consciousness. I appeal to nature, because the hand cannot write anything which the soul has not dictated, even if the tongue remains motionless and quiet during this dictation;—although the soul has also dictated to the tongue itself something which is either conceived by the soul itself or passed on to it by another being.—3. Further, lest it be said, 'Another dictated', I appeal here to consciousness as to whether what another dictated is not taken up by the soul and transmitted to the hand, whether the tongue accompanies this action or whether it is at rest. Fortunately, the Lord has said that sins are committed in the mind and in the consciousness. He says that if concupiscence or malice

hominis ascenderit, pro facto teneri. 4. Cavisti igitur, quod in cor tuum plane ascendit, quod neque ignorasse te contendere potes neque noluisse — 5. nam cum caveres, scisti, cum scires, utique voluisti —, et est tam facto quam cogitatu. Nec potes leviore crimine maius excludere, ut dicas: 'Falsum plane feci cavendo, quod <Christianus> non facit; tamen non negavi, quia non iuravi', quoniam, etsi nihil tale fecisses, tamen dicereris deierare, fecisse si consenseris. 'Non valet tacita vox in stilo et mutus in litteris sonus.' 6. At enim Zacharias temporali vocis orbatione multatus cum animo conlocutus linguam inritam transit; nam manibus suis a corde dictat et nomen filii sine ore pronuntiat: loquitur in stilo, auditur in cera, manus omni sono conclarior, littera omni ore vocalior. Quaero, an dixerit qui dixisse compertus est. 7. Dominum oremus, ne qua nos eiusmodi contractus necessitas circumsistat et, si ita evenerit, det fratribus operandi copiam vel nobis abrumpendae omnis necessitatis constantiam, ne illae litterae negatrices vicariae oris nostri in die iudicii adversus nos proferantur signatae signis non iam advocatorum, sed angelorum.

24. 1. Inter hos scopulos et sinus, inter haec vada et freta idololatriae velificata spiritu dei fides navigat, tuta si cauta, secura si attonita. Ceterum inenatabile excussis profundum est, inextricabile impactis naufragium est, inrespirabile devoratis hypobrychium in idololatria: quicumque fluctus eius offocant, omnis vertex eius ad inferos desorbet. 2. Nemo dicat: 'quis tam tuto praecavebit? Exeundum de saeculo erit!' Quasi non tanti sit exire, quam idolatren in saeculo stare. Nihil esse facilius potest quam cautio idololatriae, si timor eius in capite sit. Quaecumque necessitas minor est periculo tanto comparata. 3. Propterea spiritus sanctus consultantibus tunc apostolis vincu-

20-22. cf. Luc. 1, 20. 62 seqq.
6. cf. 1 Cor. 5, 10. **9.** cf. Act. ap. 15, 10. 20.

14. teneri *B Urs*] teneris *Gel* **15.** potes *Lat Urs*] potest *B Gel* 'potes *Lat*; *si ex Mss recte*; *sin minus legerim* pot' est, *id est*, δυνατόν, *possibile' Iun* **16.** et est *B*; *approbat Hartel P. S. 1, 54*] et es *Gel* et haeres *Lat*; *approbat Iun* egisti *Oehl* facto *B*; *approbat Hartel P. S. 1, 54*] in facto *Gel* in facto ... in cogitatu *Leop*; *post* cogitatu *virgulam exhibent B Gel*; *punctum primus posuit LaC* **17.** maius *Lat*] manus *B Gel* dicas: falsum *Kroym Q. C. 30-1*] dicas falsum *cett.* **17-18.** feci ... facit; tamen ... iuravi *Kroym Q. C. 30-1 ('Minus recte, ut videtur' Dekkers)*] effici ... facit tamen, ... iuravi *LaC* Christianus (*vel* fidelis) *excidisse putant Wasz Wind* **19.** quoniam *B Oehl*] Imo *Gel* quin immo *Rfd* quinam? *Hartel ap. Rfd et P. S. 1, 54-5* **19-20.** quoniam et (*sc. tunc negavisses*), si ... fecisses, si tamen ... deierare. Si fecisse consenseris, non ... sonus? *Kroym Q. C. 50-1* **19.** etsi *Pam*] et si *B Gel* fecisses, tamen *Gel*] fecisses. Si tamen *B* fecisses, sic tamen *Oehl* fecisse *om. Gel.* **20.** *post* consenseris *distinctionem om. B post* sonus *interrogationis signum ponit Lat* **22.** nam *Hartel P. S. 1, 55 ('recte' Dekkers)*] eam *B om. Gel*, cum *Oehl* iam *susp. Rfd* **23.** manu *B* conclarior *B*] clarior *Gel cett.* **24.** Quaere *Pam Rig Oehl Rfd post* est *virgulam exhibet B* **25.** circumsistat et, si *Oehl*] circumsistat. Etsi *B* circumsistat et si *Gel* **26.** det *Gel*] de *B* operandis *B* copia *B* **27.** constantia *B*
2. attenta *susp. Iun*, *'nulla necessitate' LaC* **3.** in pactis *B* **4.** *post* devoratis *punctum exhibet B* in idololatria] idololatria *mavult LaC*; *post* idololatria *distinctionem tollit B* **5.** vortex

rises into the heart of a man, this is held as a deed. 4. Thus you have given a guarantee, a thing which clearly has risen into your heart, a thing which you can neither contend that you did not know or did not want. 5. For when you gave the guarantee, you were conscious of it, and when you were conscious of it, you were, of course, willing; and therewith this is real both in deed and in thought.

Nor can you by a lighter crime exclude a greater one, viz., by saying: 'I clearly committed a fraud by giving a guarantee, a thing which a Christian does not do; yet I have not denied my faith, because I did not swear'; for, even if you had done nothing of the kind, you still would be said to have sworn, if you would have consented to have done it.

'The silent voice of the pen and the mute sound of the letters do not count.' 6. But this is not true, for Zacharias, punished by a temporary privation of voice, converses with his mind and passes by his useless tongue; with the help of his hands he dictates from his heart and pronounces the name of his son without using his mouth. In his pen there speaks a hand which rings more clearly than any sound, in the wax one hears a letter more eloquent than any voice. I ask, whether a man has not spoken who is ascertained to have spoken.

7. Let us pray the Lord that the necessity for such a contract may never come over us and that, if such a thing should happen, He may confer on our brethren the means for helping, or give to us the constancy for breaking off the bonds of all necessity, lest those letters which deny the faith, and which took the place of our mouth, be brought forward against us on the day of judgement, sealed no longer with the seals of witnesses, but of angels.

24. 1. Amid these cliffs and bays, amid these shallows and straits of idolatry navigates the faith, its sails filled by God's breath, safe if cautious, secure if sharply watchful. But so perilous is idolatry that for those who have been washed overboard there is a depth from which one cannot swim away, for those who have struck the rocks there is shipwreck without rescue, for those who have been swallowed up there is a vortex admitting of no respiration. Every one of the waves of idolatry is choking, every one of its whirlpools sucks down to the depths of hell.

2. Let no one say: 'Who can be so precautious with such a degree of security? He will have to leave the world'. As if it were not as well to leave the world, as to stay in the world as an idolater! Nothing can be easier than to guard against idolatry, if the fear of it is put above everything else. Every necessity, whatever it may be, is of less importance if compared to such a danger.

3. Therefore at the time of the council of the apostles, the Holy Spirit

Rig tam] iam *mavult Iun* **8.** in capite sunt quaecumque *B post* periculo *virgulam ponit Pam*; *corr. Iun comparato B*

lum et iugum nobis relaxavit, ut idololatriae devitandae vacaremus. Haec erit lex nostra, quo expedita hoc plenius administranda, propria Christianorum, per quam ab ethnicis agnoscimur et examinamur; haec accedentibus ad fidem proponenda et ingredientibus in fidem inculcanda est, ut accedentes deliberent, observantes perseverent, non observantes renuntient sibi. 4. Viderimus enim si secundum archetypum et corvus et milvus et lupus et canis et serpens in ecclesia erit; certe idololatres in archetypo non habetur: nullum animal in idololatren figuratum est. Quod in arca non fuit, in ecclesia non sit.

11. quo *B Gel*] quod *Hartel P. S. 1, 55, quem refutat lectionem traditam vindicans Thörn St. T. 2, 2-3 (cf. Hoppe Serm. 51)* Christianum *B* **13.** in fide *Iun* **14.** perseverent, non observantes *om. Rig* videbimus *susp. Rfd, quem refutat lectionem traditam vindicans Hartel P. S. 1, 56* **15-16.** archetypum ... archetypo *B Gel*] arcae typum ... arcae typo *Lat 'sed nihil mutandum' Scal* **16.** habet *B* nullum] nec ullum *Leop* **17.** *distinctionem post* est *tollit B*

relieved our fetters and our yoke, in order that we should devote ourselves to the shunning of idolatry. This shall be our law. Since it is so light, it must be carried out more fully. It is a law peculiar to the Christians and by it the heathens recognize and test us. It must be held up to those who are joining the faith and must be inculcated in those who enter the faith, in order that they consider it when they join, persevere in observing, and renounce themselves, when they do not observe it.

4. It may be that raven, kite, wolf, dog and serpent are in the Church in accordance with the archetype (the Ark of Noah). At any rate the idolater is not found in the archetype. No animal figures as a symbol of the idolater. Let not that be in the Church which was not in the Ark.

COMMENTARY

Ch. 1. *Idolatry: summit and summary of all sins*

'Idolatry is the chief sin. It also includes all other sins, for though every sin retains its proper features and will have to be accounted for in its own name on the day of judgement, it is also included in idolatry.

The idolater is a murderer, since by his idolatrous acts he has killed himself (§ 1); he commits adultery, because he serves false gods and every falsehood is adultery; he makes himself guilty of fornication by cooperating with impure spirits—accordingly Scripture calls idolatry fornication (§ 2); the idolater is also guilty of fraud, since he refuses to God the honours due to Him, and to refuse another his due is fraud; and because he confers this honour to others he adds contumely to the fraud.—Since fraud, fornication and adultery cause death, the idolater is for this reason once more guilty of murder (§ 3).

Also all other crimes, each in its own feature, are present in idolatry, viz., concupiscences of the world, lasciviousness and drunkenness, injustice, vanity, mendacity (§ 4). So it is clear that all sins are found in idolatry and idolatry in all sins.

There is, furthermore, a second reason why every sin is in idolatry: all sins are directed against God. Now everything directed against God is allotted to the demons and impure spirits, to whom the idols are subject. Therefore, every sinner serves the possessors of the idols and, in consequence, commits idolatry (§ 5).'

Remarks

a. *Idolatry includes all other sins.* Owing to his tendency to give the greatest possible emphasis and prominence to the subject under discussion, Tertullian in this introductory chapter forcibly extends the concept of idolatry. He advances as his proposition: *omnia* (*crimina*) *in idololatria et idololatria in omnibus* (*criminibus*) (1, 5). The first part of this proposition, namely that whoever commits idolatry is as a consequence guilty of all sins, is supported in 1, 1-4. The argument consists of two parts. First Tertullian argues that idolatry includes four capital sins: murder, adultery, fornication, fraud (with contumely). Then he asserts that also the other sins (*cetera*) are present in idolatry, and he enumerates what obviously must represent the totality of all other sins: concupiscence of the world, lasciviousness and drunkenness, injustice, vanity and mendacity.

The difference between the two groups is that the first group is of a more serious nature. Tertullian states first that idolatry is murder, which is, of

course, the most serious crime. But the other three are not less serious, for after arguing that idolatry is adultery, fornication and fraud, he goes on to say that these three sins cause death and are, in consequence, murder as well. Hence the whole group is qualified as *exitiosa*, *devoratoria salutis*.

All other sins, too, are in one way or another (*ad aliquem modum*) discernible in idolatry (*in idololatria*). Five times Tertullian reiterates *in illa*, which is an elaboration of *in idololatriae crimine expungitur* of 1, 1.

Van der Nat (p. 21) gives another explanation of the distinction in two groups. According to him Tertullian distinguishes between sins that are *identical* with idolatry (the first group) and sins that are not identical with idolatry but which are *closely related to it or result from it*. This distinction was perhaps suggested to him by the adjunct *ad aliquem modum* (1, 4), which could seem to point to a lower degree of identity. But we think that the text does not allow such an interpretation. Tertullian does not speak of identity or non-identity between idolatry and the other sins. He states (in 1, 1) that *all* other sins are committed *in idololatriae crimine* and elaborates this thesis in 1, 1-4. With regard to the second group he reiterates *in illa* five times. He thus emphasizes that the relation between idolatry and the sins of the second group consists in the fact that those sins *are in idolatry*, just as was said of the totality of other sins in 1, 1. Van der Nat comes in conflict with his own interpretation when he elsewhere (p. 22) states that the other sins, in Tertullian's opinion, are 'species of idolatry'. For how could e.g. murder be at the same time identical with idolatry and a species of idolatry? In our view, one should stick to Tertullian's own formulation and say that all other sins are *present in*, or are *discernible in* idolatry.

b. *All (other) sins are idolatry*. Having argued that idolatry includes all other sins, Tertullian adds as the counterpart of this proposition that all sins are idolatry. One should, however, notice that this counterpart does not follow logically from 1, 1-4.

It is merely a rhetorical inversion so characteristic of Tertullian's writings (e.g. 22, 3). In this case, however, the inversion was aimed at from the beginning, to wit the phrase in the first sentence: *tota causa iudicii idololatria*. That ultimately all sins are idolatry is not proven until the next section. This is announced as a second demonstration (*sed et alias*), which is in fact incorrect.

The argument in which the major and minor are given in inversed order, runs as follows:

— Everything directed against God is allotted to the demons.
— All sins are directed against God.
— Thus all sins are allotted to the demons.

For Tertullian every sin is idolatry, because every sin takes honour away from God and gives it to the demons, and to give honour to the demons is idolatry. Tertullian is not the first author who gives such a large extension to the concept of idolatry. In his article 'Götzendienst' in *RAC* XI col. 869, Fredouille states: "Wenn die Väter schon früh (bereits bei den apostolischen Vätern) Götzendienst (= *idololatria*) nicht nur im eigentlichen, sondern auch im weiteren Sinn, d.h. als ein gegen Gottes Willen verstossendes Handeln oder Verlangen, begreifen, so folgen sie damit nur einer bereits im NT erkennbaren Entwicklung".

It should be noticed that herewith the term 'idolatry' has shifted away from its etymological fundament. It does not mean any more 'worship of idols' but 'worship of demons'. When Tertullian speaks of 'idolatry' he actually means 'demonolatry'. ('Demons' is used here as the equivalent of *immundi spiritus*.) As Tertullian will say in 3, 1-2, there was idolatry before there were idols, i.e. images of gods; but then the devil brought into the world the makers of images, and this practice of idol-making gave to idolatry both its name and its increase.

In other words: idolatry is, strictly speaking, a wrong term. Idolatry is in fact demonolatry. It has got its name from that form of demonolatry which is the most spectacular one, viz. the worship of 'idols', i.e. images of gods.

c. *Tertullian on idols*. As was already stated above, *idola* are, in Tertullian's vision, not essential for idolatry in the sense of demonolatry. There was idolatry before the *idola* came to existence.

The concept of *idolum* in Tertullian demands closer examination. Its first meaning is, of course, that of 'image', i.e. image of a god. But *idolum* has a much wider significance in Tertullian.

As was stated above, the idol is not the real object of worship in Tertullian's view. The real object of worship are the demons. The idol is something that serves as an intermediate entity between man and demon. The image of a god is one of those intermediate entities, but it is not the only one. Every thing that fulfils that function of intermediate entity is, in Tertullian's view, a *idolum*. Not only is the image of a god an idol, but also the god himself, who, according to the theory of Euhemerus, is a dead king or hero. Even during his life that king, being honoured as a god, was then a *idolum*. The now living king, too, may become a *idolum*, if he is honoured as a god. The gods of doors like Carna, Limentinus, Forculus, Ianus, those well-known *numina*, who are, according to Tertullian, just idle and fictitious names, are, in his view, *idola*. Even a doctrine or a word may become an idol, because it draws the worship of man away from the one true God to the demons. (See J. C. M. van Winden, '*Idolum* and *idololatria* in Tertullian', *Vig. Chr.* 36 (1982), 108-14.)

Thus *idolum* has a subordinate place in idolatry. It may be described as the visible point of contact between man and demon. From the human side this contact is realised by consecration (cf. 15, 5 fin.). If one considers the situation from the side of the demons, one may say that the demon uses those idols in order to draw the veneration of man away from God to themselves. The idols are, so to speak, instruments in the hands of the demons. Hence in the present chapter, § 5, *quibus idola mancipantur*. (The way in which the demons use these instruments can be described differently. The demon can be said to hide himself in the image or move around it, etc. See e.g. ad 11, 2.)

It may be clear that, for Tertullian, the problem of the relationship between the gods and their images—a vexed question in antiquity—is of minor importance. Gods and images are both idols. They are instruments of the demons to draw the human veneration from the one true God to themselves.

d. *Idolum and idololatria: paradigmatic terms*. With regard to both terms, one may say that they cover a wide domain, but that they have got their name from one outstanding feature in that domain. *Idololatria* covers the whole domain of demonolatry but is called so, since mainly in *the worship of idola* (images) does *demonolatria* become visible. *Idolum* covers the whole domain of intermediate entities between man and demon, but it is called so since the *idola* (= images) are the intermediate entities *par excellence*. Or to put it otherwise, the two terms, *idololatria* and *idolum*, may be called paradigmatic terms. Etymologically they signify something quite special: 'worship of an image', 'image'. But these terms are used for a very large domain of acts or things which are supposed to have the same nature. 'The worship of an image' has become the paradigm of all acts of false worship, i.e. worship not given to the one true God, i.e. demonolatry. 'Image' has become the paradigm of everything that misleads man's veneration, drawing it away from God to the demons.

In modern discussions one finds much obscurity and confusion in the descriptions of these concepts. The recent article 'Götzendienst' in *RAC* XI col. 828-895 by Fredouille is a good example. Dealing with the concept of εἴδωλον (col. 867) he says: "Die Begriffe εἴδωλον, εἰδωλολάτρης, εἰδωλολατρ(ε)ία meinen im NT ein doppeltes: 1. '*Götze*'. Einerseits verwenden die ntl. Autoren εἴδωλον im Sinne der LXX: es bezeichnet die heidn. Götter u. ihre figürliche Darstellung, εἰδωλολατρ(ε)ία u. εἰδωλολάτρης demnach den ihnen dargebrachten Kult bzw. den sie verehrenden Gläubigen ... 2. '*Gottlosigkeit*'. Da Götzendienst ein Fehlverhalten ist, wird das Wort anscheinend sogar zum Synonym von 'Sünde': εἴδωλον bezeichnet dann nicht mehr die heidn. Gottheit, ihre figürliche Darstellung und Verehrung, sondern jede unreine Tat, jede Haltung die von Gott wegführt". Fredouille is right in observing that εἴδωλον and εἰδωλολατρεία have undergone a great extension of meaning, but

he is wrong in describing their evolutions as running parallel to each other. Εἰδωλολατρεία has, indeed, become the equivalent of sin. The reason given by him ("da Götzendienst ein Fehlverhalten ist") could be formulated somewhat more precisely as follows: "because every sin draws the honour due to God away from Him and gives it to the demons". Fredouille observes rightly that for Paul the *demons* are the true "Nutzniesser des heidnischen Kultus und der Opfer zu Ehren falscher Götter". But he goes wrong in stating that εἴδωλον also becomes the equivalent of 'sin' and so making εἴδωλον follow the same path as εἰδωλολατρεία, saying that εἴδωλον has received "eine stärkere vergeistigte Deutung" (col. 867, and again col. 868). *A priori* this is very improbable. What should εἰδωλολατρεία mean, if εἴδωλον means 'sin'? Εἴδωλον has something to do with the *object* of worship, λατρεία is in the *subject*. The two terms cannot have the same meaning. The New Testament texts referred to by the author in support of his thesis, e.g. I Thess. 1, 9 πῶς ἀπεστρέψατε πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἀπὸ τῶν εἰδώλων, do not point in his direction. The apostle does not say 'how did you turn away from *the sins* to God?' but 'how did you turn away from *the idols* (= the false object of worship) to God (= the true object of worship)'. Also here *idola* indicates the object of worship, not (something in) the subject.

With regard to the concept of *idololatria*, the first chapter of *De idol.* shows already the same large extension of this term as Fredouille indicated for the NT and the early Christian literature.

The term *idolum* also has here a large extent. It indicates all those entities that function as intermediaries in the worship of the demons, that is, any worship not directed to the one true God. Tertullian repeatedly stresses the fact that in itself the *idolum* is of no importance. It becomes important because it receives a function in the *latria* of the demons. Three illustrative texts:
De corona 7, 8: *non quasi aliquid sit idolum, sed quoniam quae idolis ab aliis fiunt ad daemones pertinent* (cf. *idol.* 15, 2 *quae ad daemonas pertinent*; ib. 15, 4 *ad daemonia perveniens*).
Spect. 13, 2: *Non quod idolum sit aliquid, ut apostolus ait* (cf. I Cor. 8, 4; 10, 19), *sed quoniam quae faciunt daemoniis faciunt consistentibus scilicet in consecrationibus idolorum sive mortuorum sive, ut putant, deorum.*
Spect. 10, 10: *Scimus nihil esse nomina mortuorum, sicut et ipsa simulacra eorum, sed non ignoramus, qui sub istis nominibus institutis simulacris operentur et gaudeant et divinitatem mentiantur, nequam spiritus scilicet, daemones.*

We have dwelled somewhat longer on this question of *idola* in order to emphasize Tertullian's clear distinctions in a matter which, in other authors, is often rather indistinct.

e. *The list of sins*. As Van der Nat observed in his commentary, extensive lists

of sins are found in Old and New Testament and in Patristic literature. Obviously one finds murder, adultery, fornication etc. mentioned there. Elsewhere in Tertullian they are found as well, e.g. *Marc.* 4, 9, *6* (CC 1, 559 f): ... *lumine earum, quae septem maculis capitalium delictorum inhorrerent: idololatria blasphemia homicidio adulterio stupro falso testimonio fraude.*

But the proper nature of the present text is not in the summing up of sins but in subsuming all other sins under the head 'idolatry'. Tertullian could find support for his thesis in some particular cases; so from Hosea and Ezechiel onwards it is a commonplace that idolatry is fornication. Tertullian refers to this scriptural use in 1, 2. He also knew the Christian tenet that sin results in the death of the soul. But that sin means murder, viz., murder of oneself, is Tertullian's own idea. The inclusion of *all* other sins in idolatry is a consequence drawn by Tertullian himself, an extreme consequence such as he likes to draw; cf. *pat.* 5, 21 *omne peccatum impatientiae adscribendum.*

With regard to Tertullian's list of sins some observations should still be made. Adultery and fornication are named in one breath. However, Tertullian makes a sharp distinction between the two: adultery is qualified as *falsehood*, i.e. as a sin against the truth (this truth is the 'true' relationship between God and man, which is violated by the worship of false gods; the correspondence with the relation between man and wife is evident); fornication is qualified as *impurity*.—Tertullian uses the juridical term *fraus* with a complex meaning comprising robbery or theft (*si quis alienum rapiat*) and denying to another one's debt or due (*debitum deneget*). By giving the honour due to God to another being, viz., the demon, one adds contumely to *fraus*; just as by refusing his love to his wife a man commits 'fraud' and by giving his love to another he adds contumely to it.—In the second part of the list Tertullian mentions first three sins which bear on the external circumstances of idolatry (external pomp, meals), while the last three concern again the essence of idolatry (unrighteousness, vanity, mendacity).

f. *The initial sentence.* The opening sentence is a striking example of lapidary style. It contains three concepts: *crimen*, *reatus*, *causa iudicii*. With these concepts Tertullian summarizes human evil and its consequences: the deed, the guilt, the retribution (by judgement). Idolatry represents all this to the highest degree: it is the *main crime*, resulting in the *greatest guilt*, which will be the *entire case* of Judgement.

The first two qualifications (*principale crimen*, *summus reatus*) indicate idolatry as the *summit* of all evil, the third (*tota causa iudicii*) makes it the *summary* of evil. The rest of the chapter enlarges upon the last item, viz., idolatry being the summary of all evil. One should notice that *nam* in the second sentence in fact refers mainly to *tota causa iudicii*. The fact that idolatry

is the *principale crimen* and the *summus reatus* does not mean that it includes all other sins. This holds good only for *tota causa iudicii*, for this means that idolatry is, strictly speaking, the only sin.

Title

The word εἰδωλολατρία (for the spelling of the Greek word, see F. Büchsel, art. 'εἴδωλον', etc. in Kittel 2, 377, 5 seqq.) has a Greek-Jewish origin, though it does not yet occur in the LXX, Philo and Josephus. That it should only be found in the New Testament and the literature depending on it (Souter, 276; Büchsel, 1.1.) is incorrect, cf. *Test. Jud.* 19, 1 (*carm. Sibyll.* 2, 259 and 3, 38, where εἰδωλολάτρης is found, may not be referred to; for the date and composition of these books, see J. Felten, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte* (Ratisbon 1910), 1, 524-7; Bousset, *Jud.*[3], 24. 38; cf. Vögtle, 223, n. 116). In Latin *idololatria* is first found in the North-African versions of the Bible (see Mohrmann, *Tert. Apol.*, LXXXVIII) and in Tert. Often, however, equivalents occur, such as *idolorum cultura*, *idolorum servitus*, *idolorum cultus*, *simulacrorum servitus* (similarly for *idololatres* more than once *idolorum cultor*, *idolis serviens*, etc.). It is not known with certainty, when the shortened form *idolatria* became predominant, cf. *TLL* VII, 1: 224, 3-6: 'formae breviores et longiores ... ita variant in codd. et edd. ... ut nihil certi elici possit'. Wölfflin (*ALL* 5, 496) wants to read the short form as early as in Cyprian; A. Souter, *Miscellanea Latina, Raccolta di scritti in onore di F. Ramorino* (Milan 1927), 278, however, thinks that the short form cannot be admitted before texts of the sixth century. In opposition to the latter view Mohrm., *Aug.*, 117, justly remarks that it is unthinkable that a tongue-twister like *idololatria* should have maintained its position for so many centuries, whereas more easily pronounceable forms did in fact become shortened by haplology. In any case it is probable that Tert. used the longer form and that, therefore, Kroymann is wrong in preferring *idolatria* everywhere in CSEL XLVII: in the first place, the haplology has started in vulgar usage of which Tert. is by no means a recorder (see Norden, *Kunstpr.*, 2, 610 seqq.; Löfst., *Synt.*, 2, 459, n. 3); secondly, Tert. takes an interest in the etymology and the exact meaning of words (cf. e.g. 3, 4). Further, he is still very well aware that *idololatria* is a Greek word, as is evident from 3, 4. Finally the *Agobardinus* has the longer form everywhere with the exception of 11, 1 (see however, the Additional Note, p. 7). Cf. Souter, 276-8; Wölfflin, *ALL* 5, 496 and 8, 6; Mohrm., *Aug.*, 116-8; Svennung, *Oros.*, 163.

1. **Principale crimen:** for *crimen* = *peccatum*, a meaning frequent in Tert., derived from juridical idiom, see Beck, 116-7. We also find *principale delictum*, e.g. *pat.* 5, 21; *pud.* 5, 5. — **saeculi:** already at an early date this word has a rather unfavourable connotation, which facilitated the development of

the meaning 'the sinful pagan world'. See especially Löfst., *Synt.*, 2, 470-3; cf. also Tidner, *Did.*, 141; Waltz., *Comm.*, 47; Teeuwen, 27. — **reatus:** this word, which, according to Quintilian (*instit.* 8, 3, 34), was first used by Messala, originally means *condicio rerum*, hence *culpa*; cf. also Böhm, 61. — **tota causa iudicii:** Rigaltius correctly paraphrases: 'quod in se complectitur omnia, quae in iudicium venient. Illo nimirum supremi iudicii die'.Thus *causa* means 'matter'. For *iudicium* = *iudicium ultimum*, see Teeuwen, 26. 71. Cf. *res.* 14, 11: *Vita est enim causa iudicii.* Further instances of *substantiva nuda* are mentioned by V. Bulhart, CSEL 71, XLII; Böhm, 61. — **idololatria:** Tert. likes to begin a treatise with a striking sentence in which the principal word of the title is repeated, as for instance *fuga* 1, 1: *Quaesisti proxime, Fabi frater, fugiendum necne sit in persecutione.* This is found in eighteen treatises. The complete material is given by Waszink, 82. — **delictum:** = *peccatum*. This meaning has been derived from the idiom of the law; it is very frequent in Tert.'s works (Beck, 116-7), who even prefers it to *peccatum*, as is evident from the following list:

	bapt.	*ux.*	*fuga*	*an.*	*paen.*	*idol.*
delictum	15	3	2	9	20	5
peccatum	4	–	2	2	6	1

In *pud.*, too, *delictum* is much more frequent than *peccatum*, see De Labriolle's edition, XXVII seqq. and Index. The same applies to his quotations from Holy Scripture. He does not make the distinction found in the old Latin versions of the Bible, where ἁμαρτία is generally rendered by *peccatum* and ἁμάρτημα by *delictum*, although there is no semantic difference between the Greek words (see Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, s.v. and G. Stählin, art. 'ἁμαρτάνω' in Kittel 1, 295-9). Rufin.-Orig. *hom. in Levit.* 5, 4: *videtur quidem in scripturis divinis frequenter peccatum pro delicto et delictum pro peccato indifferenter et absque aliqua distinctione nominari*; in the same treatise, however, *delictum* is called the less, *peccatum* the more serious offence, ib. 6, 31 seq. Augustine, too, in *Quaest. in Heptateuch.* 3, 20 makes a distinction, though somewhat hesitantly: *fortassis ergo peccatum est perpetratio mali, delictum autem desertio boni.* Tert. is equally unconcerned about this latter distinction; for instance, in *pud.* the most serious sins, *moechia* and *homicidium*, are described as *principalia delicta* (5, 5) and even the sins that are directly aimed at God are called *delicta* (2, 10; 21, 2; 21, 15). Perhaps Tert.'s preference for *delictum* does not only spring from his training as a lawyer, but should also be explained psychologically; for a Roman *delictum* is a more strict and concrete term and, therefore, it has more deterrent force, which makes it the more suitable word in the eyes of the rigorist Tertullian. See Waszink, 232-3; Teeuwen, 71; Aalders, 90; B. Luiselli, *Riv. di cult. class. e medioevale* 2 (1960), 214-5. On the evolution of the meaning of *peccatum* cf. A. E. Wilhelm-Hooybergh, *Peccatum. Sin and Guilt in Ancient Rome* (thesis Utrecht, Groningen 1954). — **suo quoque nomine:** Reifferscheid reads *quodque* with Scaliger and Iunius, but this conjecture is unnecessary; Gomperz's interpretation, 'quoque = etiam', is possible but it is much more probable that we have here an attraction of the indefinite pronoun; see Löfst., *Synt.* 2, 113-4, and cf. e.g. *an.* 35, 6: *hae ... substantiae sui cuiusque sunt hominis*; *Marc.* 1, 4, 1: *in suis quibusque regionibus*; *res.* 2, 11: *suo quoque titulo.* From other authors cf. e.g. Caes. *bell. civ.* 1, 83, 2: *suae cuiusque legionis*; Liv. 33, 46, 9: *suo quoque anno.* — **expungitur:** = *perficitur.* This meaning does not occur before Tert., see *TLL* V, 2: 1814, 21 seqq.; cf. 16, 3: *operae meae expunctio*; *nat.*, 1, 7, 33: *haec cum expunxeris, vives in aevum.* This term, derived from book-keeping, also means 'to strike out (by placing dots) from a list or a ledger' and 'to settle (an account)'; the latter meaning we find e.g. in 13, 4: *sunt quidam dies munerum, quae apud alios honoris titulum, apud alios mercedis debitum expungunt.* See Diercks, note on *orat.* 9, 1 (p. 130); Oehler's note on *scorp.* 10 (p. 524 r) and *apol.* 35 (p. 242 l); Rönsch, *It.* 1385-6 and Waszink, 297. The interpretations of Currey ('is disposed of under the charge of idolatry') and Thelwall ('is marked off under the (general) count of idolatry') are incorrect, because they give rise to a contradiction both with the preceding words *suo quoque nomine iudicio destinatur* and with what follows. In the present passage Tert. does not argue that all sins come under the head of idolatry (this is not done until the conclusion of this chapter in par. 5), but that the idolater commits all other sins at the same time. — **titulos:** in the idiom of lawyers *titulus* (actually 'superscription, inscription, rubric': cf. e.g. *Marc.* 1, 9, 2) means 'name, qualification of the crime', also 'charge, indictment' (cf. 11, 8); in these senses it is synonymous with *elogium*. In Tert. the word also occurs with the meaning of '(title >) name, book' (e.g. *an.* 3, 4; *pud.* 20, 2) and 'cause, motive' (cf. 13, 4; 16, 3; this meaning is found from Livy onwards). See Hoppe, *Serm. Tert.*, 79; Beck, 90; Hartel, 4, 13; Oehler's note on *apol.* 1 (p. 114 m); Waltz., *Comm.*, 19. 26; Waszink, 110. 120. 409. — **operas:** it is unnecessary to follow Latinius in reading *opera* on the strength of 2, 1, cf. e.g. *res.* 16, 5: *iam ergo innocens caro ex ea parte, qua non reputabuntur illi operae malae ... Licet enim nec bona opera deputentur illi sicut nec mala*, etc. See for this use in Tert. Hoppe, *Beitr.* 75-6; Waltz., *Ét.*, 356; Waszink, 192, where more literature is given for the later period in general. Cf. also 15, 1 with the note. — **Idololatres:** this form of the word occurs from the *Vetus Latina* (1 Cor. 5, 10, cod. d; ib. 10, 7, codd. r 9) and Tert. onwards. The accusative-form is *idololatren*. By the side of it we find the form *idololatra* as early as *Vetus Latina* 1 Cor. 5, 11 = Iren. *adv. haer.* 4, 43, 2 (2, 243 Harvey), see *TLL* VII, 1: 223, 7 seqq. With respect to the haplology the same obtains as in the case of *idololatria* (see p. 79 the note on the title). — **idem:** it is incorrect to change this into *item* with

Oehler, cf. e.g. *apol.* 44, 2: *quis illic sicarius, quis manticularius,* etc. ... *idem etiam Christianus ascribitur*? Thus already Cicero, *De orat.* 3, 143: *quem* (oratorem) *si patiuntur eundem esse philosophum, sublata controversia est*; see the instances collected in *TLL* VII, 1: 191, 27 seqq. and Kühn.-Stegm. 1, 627. Of course, this use of *idem* is something different from the *idem = item* which we find in vulgar late Latin, for which see Hofm., *Synt.*, 479 and Löfst., *Per.*, 295. — **elogii:** 'indictment', the report containing data about the name, age and crime of the accused which is sent to the authorities. See for this meaning Hoppe, *Serm. Tert.*, 75; Beck, 126, and Waszink, 248-9. Waltz., *Comm.*, 26, justly distinguishes the following meanings of this word in Tert.: a) 'inscription of honour' (*apol.* 50, 11); b) the present meaning (cf. *scorp.* 15, 2; *Scap.* 4, 3); c) 'qualification, name of the crime' = *titulus criminis* (in this case often accompanied by a genitive, e.g. *cor.* 5, 4: *elogium sacrilegii*); d) 'charge' and the 'crime' itself (*apol.* 2, 4 *de nostris elogiis*). From b), moreover, the meaning 'name, denomination' (especially 'ill name') has developed, e.g. *Marc.* 1, 22, 8 and 2, 10, 1. — **ambitionem:** = *ambitum*, see *TLL* I: 1851, 74 seqq.; Waszink, 323; Oehler's note on this passage (p. 67 d); Gerlo 2, 163. For the idea, cf. *nat.* 1, 2, 7: *porro de nobis, quos atrocioribus ac pluribus criminibus deputatis, breviora ac leviora elogia conficitis.* — **Si...facit:** 'if it contributes to'. For this meaning of *facere ad*, which is very frequent in Tert., see *TLL* VI, 1: 122, 42 seqq.; Thörn., 2, 43; Waszink, 433-4. — **non extraneum:** here we have a brachylogy: *si quid ad elogii ambitionem facit, <dico:> non extraneum <idololatres occidit>* ...; cf. *apol.* 23, 8: *nec utique divinitas deputanda est, quae subdita est homini et, si quid ad dedecus facit,* (sc. amplius dico) *aemulo suo*. More instances are given by Thörn., 1, 11. — **idololatriis:** the plural is very rare, just as in Greek (according to Bauer, *Wörterbuch* s.v., only 1 Petr. 4, 3 and *Did.* 5, 1; we may add Theophil. *ad Autol.* 1, 14). In Tert. also *spect.* 8, 2 and 20, 3; *cor.* 7, 8 (*idolislatriae* A, *idolis latriae* Kroymann) and 13, 7; *pud.* 5, 12. Further the plural only occurs in Cypr. *test.* 3, 119 (184, 7) = Acts 15, 29: *abstinere vos ab idololatriis* (ἀπέχεσθαι εἰδωλοθύτων: Vulg. *ut abstineatis vos ab immolatis simulacrorum*).

2. **perisse:** the thought that death is the result of sin (an idea which Christianity shares with Judaism, see R. Bultmann, art. 'ζάω', Kittel, 2, 857, 16 seqq.) is expressed innumerable times, e.g. Rom. 6, 16. 21. 23; James 1, 15-6; *Barn.* 12, 2. 5; 1 *Clem.* 3, 4; 2 *Clem.* 1, 6; *Herm. vis.* 2, 3, 1; *mand.* 12, 6, 2; *sim.* 8, 8, 5. Further see the passages collected by Bultmann, art. 'θάνατος', in Kittel 3, 15, n. 67. Many instances may be added, e.g. *Herm. vis.* 1, 1, 8; *sim.* 9, 18, 2; 9, 19, 1; 10, 2, 4. The underlying idea is that not the natural, transient life is the true life, but the undestructible, eternal life which is granted by God at the resurrection. By his behaviour in this life man can become worthy of this true ζωή. We find this view expressed in the figures of

'the way of life' and 'the way of death', e.g. *Did.*1, 1: ὁδοὶ δύο εἰσί, μία τῆς ζωῆς καὶ μία τοῦ θανάτου (cf. Knopf's note *ad loc.*, *HdbNT, Erg. Bd.*, 4-5); cf. *Barn.* 19, 1; 20, 1. For the origin and development of the 'two ways', see Windisch, *HdbNT, Erg. Bd. III. Der Barnabasbrief*, 404-406 and Lietzmann's excursus to Rom. 1, 25 and 1, 31 (*HdbNT*, 8, 33 and 35-36); Bousset, *Jud.*[3], 406; Bultmann, art. 'ζάω', D., in Kittel, 2, 857, n. 182; Vögtle, 113-120. For the same theme in Greek philosophical literature (cf. e.g. the myth narrated by Prodicus in Xen. *Memor.* 2, 1, 21-34) and elsewhere, see Rohde, *Psyche*, 2, 220-221, note; Festugière, *Idéal*, 80, n. 9 and 120, n. 6. The figure is so obvious that it appears spontaneously in different places, see Norden, *Kunstprosa*, 466-7. Instead of θάνατος the terms ἀπώλεια and ἀπολλύναι (-σθαι) are also used (cf. the present use of *perisse*), cf. Matth. 7, 13: ἡ ὁδὸς ἡ ἀπάγουσα εἰς τὴν ἀπώλειαν (see Klostermann's note, *HdbNT*, 4, 68-9); Rom. 9, 22; Phil. 3, 19. — **negabit:** here the reading of Mesnart and Gelenius deserves to be preferred. The meaning is: '<only> he who <is so foolish, that he> denies that the idolater is dead will <consequently> deny that the idolater has committed a murder'. *Negare idololatren homicidium fecisse* is the consequence of *negare idololatren perisse*, which, according to Tert., is impossible. This is much more forceful and pertinent than the meaning furnished by the perfect *negavit* found in *Agob.*: 'he who denies that the idolater is dead has <therefore> denied that the idolater has committed a murder'. This is merely an identification of the two parts of the sentence. A confusion between *b* and *v* occurs innumerable times (cf. e.g. 19, 4: *bellabit/bellavit*); a few cases in Thörn., 3, 8; Waltz., *Ét.*, 113. 126; cf. also *orat.* 17, 1 *commendabimus* Rig, *-avimus ABD*; ib. 29, 1 with Diercks' note; *Prax.* 1, 3 *exprobrabit* Rhen.[3], *-avit* codd.; *an.* 6, 6 *fraudavit* Gel, *-abit B* (*an.* 4 *erravimus*, where Borleffs proposes to read *errabimus*, is a case of a different nature, see Waszink, 122). — **homicidium fecisse:** by this, of course, Tert. is not putting forward anything new: if the idolater causes his own death by his sin, he is indeed a murderer (viz., of himself)—it is only a sharper formulation. Cf. *pud.* 5, 12: *ibidem est et homicidium, ubi homo, cum inquinatur, occiditur*. More or less similarly Hermas, *mand.* 4, 1, 2 and *sim.* 10, 2, 4. The fact that Tert. gives this formulation does not only spring from his endeavour to give the sharpest possible formulation but also from his strongly juridical treatment of the subject: he wants to mention properly juridical *delicta* as *causae* for the *iudicium*. For this reason it seems unlikely that he should have borrowed his formulation from the *Pastor Hermae*, though he did know this book. As to the entire enumeration, cf. *pud.* 5, 6: *pompam quandam atque suggestum aspicio moechiae, hinc ducatum idololatriae antecedentis, hinc comitatum homicidii insequentis.* — **Proinde:** it is not necessary to adopt Gelenius' conjecture *perinde*, as Reifferscheid does here and everywhere else, for *proinde* (which is about seven times more frequent in Tert.'s works than *perinde*) occurs very

frequently in Tert. as an equivalent of *perinde*. See Currey's note on *spect.* 2; Waltz., *Comm.*, 58; Thörn., *Eranos* 16 (1916), 123-4. — **adulterium et stuprum:** these two terms are found together very frequently, e.g. Cic. *Pis.* 70; *Flacc.* 34; *Tusc.* 4, 75; also in Tert., e.g. *nat.* 1, 16, 12; 2, 13, 6. In *pud.* Tert. follows the Christian *usus* and speaks systematically of *moechia* and *fornicatio* (*pud.* 4, 1-2: *In primis quod moechiam et fornicationem nominamus, usus expostulat. Habet et fides quorundam nominum familiaritatem. Ita in omni opusculo usum custodimus*). But he observes: *Ceterum si adulterium et si stuprum dixero, unum erit contaminatae carnis elogium. Nec enim interest nuptam alienam an viduam quis incurset, dum non suam feminam.* From these words it appears that: 1) Tert. considers *adulterium* and *stuprum* as the equivalents of *moechia* and *fornicatio* (which terms have come into usage in Latin through the translations of the Bible); 2) Tert. is aware of the fact that *adulterium* distinguishes itself from *stuprum* in the fact that it concerns a *nupta*. (To Tert. this distinction does not matter in the context of *pud.*, but he shows that he is aware of it.) In the present text, in which the two terms are used metaphorically, he expresses the difference by associating *adulterium* with falsity (*not* the *true* wife), and *stuprum* with impurity.—It stands to reason that the distinction between the two terms was not always observed. *Adulterium* could easily be named *stuprum*, i.e. a special kind of 'impurity'; and it also happened the other way round. The situation is clearly described in the following juridical text: *Lex* (sc. Julia) *stuprum et adulterium promiscue et καταχρηστικώτερον appellat. Sed proprie adulterium in nupta committitur, propter partum ex altero conceptum composito nomine; stuprum vero in virginem viduamve committitur, quod Graeci φθοράν appellant* (Papin. *dig.* 48, 5, 6, 1). See *RE* II, 4, 1 s.v. 'stuprum'; Mommsen, *Strafrecht*, 694, n.r.; *TLL* I: 882, 43 ff.—The metaphorical usage of *adulterium* (*fornicatio*) is much more frequent in Tert. than that of *stuprum* (see below, p. 87). — **recognoscas:** this verb, which is very frequent in Tert., often occurs at the end of a sentence instead of *cognoscere* for the sake of the clausula (also in 2, 5); see Waszink, 245. For the loss of meaning of *re-* in compounds, cf. the note on 2, 2: *reputandum*. A list of the meanings of *recognoscere* in Tert. is given by Diercks in his note on *orat.* 2, 6 (p. 76); cf. also Thörn., 2, 26-7. — **falsis deis servit:** = εἰδωλολατρεῖ. In the Vulgate *idolis serviens* is the usual translation of εἰδωλολάτρης, e.g. 1 Cor. 5, 10. — **Nam qui falsis deis servit ... adulterium est:** *A* omits the words *est veritatis quia omne falsum adulterium*, an omission evidently caused by a homoeoteleuton. Tert.'s argumentation runs as follows: 'Every falseness is adultery, viz., of the truth'. Or, to formulate it with regard to the person who perpetrates falseness: 'every falsifier is adultering the truth. Thus whoever serves false gods (i.e. whoever falsifies the service of the true God) is adultering the truth.' In a figurative sense both *adulter* and *adulterium* may have an active and a passive

sense: *adulter* is equivalent to a) *falsarius* and b) *falsus*, *adulterium* to a) *falsum facere* and b) *falsum fieri*. For *adulter* with an active sense cf. *Herm.* 1, 2: (Hermogenes) *totus adulter, et praedicationis et carnis* (of course in *adulter carnis* the literal sense is also present here) and *praescr.* 30, 12 *adulteri veritatis*, which is an indication of the heretics (one should not think that, as Teeuwen, 124, asserts, *adulter* is only used by Tert. in connection with the heretics). In *apol.* 47, 10 the philosophers are called *adulteri nostri*. *Adulter* with a passive sense (= *falsus*) is found in Latin from Ovid *ars* 3, 643, *adultera clavis*, onwards; from Tert. cf. e.g. *an.* 16, 7 *naturae alterius ... adulterae*; *praescr.* 6, 2 and 17, 2; see *TLL* I: 881, 42-57; Waszink, 235-6; Oehler's note on *nat.* 1, 16 (p. 337 d). *Adulterium* used figuratively with an active sense ('the act of falsifying') is found from Pliny maior downwards, e.g. *n.h.* 14, 80: *omnia in adulterium mellis excogitata* (*TLL* I: 883, 46-52); from Tert. cf. *cult. fem.* 1, 8, 2: *quis enim est vestium honor iustus de adulterio colorum iniustorum?*; *praescr.* 31, 1: *avenarum sterilis feni adulterium*; *apol.* 47, 11: *adulteria ... salutaris disciplinae*. The passive meaning ('the falsified object') is found e.g. in *spect.* 23, 5: *non amat falsum auctor veritatis*; *adulterium est apud illum omne quod fingitur*. In the present passage the heathens are meant, for, although *De idololatria* is addressed to Christians, in the present chapter Tert. is speaking about idolatry in general, which in the first place includes heathendom (cf. also par. 4). — **Sic et:** frequent in Tert. as an equivalent of *item*, see Thörn., 2, 95-6. — **stupro mergitur:** *mergere* (*-i*) instead of *demergere* (*-i*) occurs more than once in Tert., see Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 107. The addition of *in* (Gelenius) is unnecessary, as is evident from passages such as *res.* 58, 5: *diabolo ... ignibus merso*; *paen.* 4, 3: *peccatorum fluctibus mersum*; however, the preposition is added in *Iud.* 13, 19: *duritia huius saeculi mersa est in profundo erroris*; *nat.* 1, 9, 6: (insulam) *in Atlantico mari mersam.* — **immundis spiritibus cooperator:** here Tert. speaks of *immundis spiritibus*, in 1, 5 of *daemoniis et immundis spiritibus* and in 15, 3 of *daemonia et omnem spiritum immundum*. Obviously he has the same realities in mind. *Immundi spiritus* is the wider notion; it is applicable to all the powers of evil, which are elsewhere summarized in the terms of the baptism formula: 'the devil and his angels' (cf. 6, 1). Those angels of the devil are sometimes distinguished in two groups: the fallen angels and the offspring of those fallen angels who, according to an erroneous interpretation of Gen. 6, 2, had intercourse with mortal women (cf. the note ad 4, 2). *Cooperator* is found from the *Vetus Latina* and Tert. onwards (see *TLL* IV: 892, 3-21). According to Hoppe (*Synt.*, 26) *immundis spiritibus* is a *dativus commodi*. However, this dative should be explained from the construction *cooperari alicui*, as was pointed out by Löfstedt (*Synt.*, 1, 213). In Tert. a strictly attributive dative only occurs by way of exception (*an.* 29, 2: *ille ... origini fons*; ib. 48, 3: *inflatui pabulum*, where the final dative

corresponds to the Greek adject. πνευματῶδες). In the instances mentioned by Löfstedt, e.g. *spect.* 12, 4: *haec muneri origo*, the substantive in the dative is the logical subject of the sentence (*haec muneri origo = hanc munus originem habuit*), see the detailed treatment by Waszink (p. 365). Moreover, in the instances given by *TLL* the substantive added to *cooperator* is always in the genitive (the only exceptions are Cassiod. *hist.* 9, 4 (PL 69, 1126 A): *nequissimis cultoribus fuit cooperator*; Ambr. *s. spir.* 3, 18, 140: *qui patri et filio cooperator est omnium*; there, however, we find *cooperator* joined to a form of *esse*, which combination is practically equivalent to the verb *cooperari* governing a dative; in the second passage, moreover, we should make allowance for the tendency to avoid a repetition of genitives). So we must compare *immundis spiritibus cooperator* with expressions such as *Christo servus = Christo serviens* (*paen.* 7, 8). See Borleffs, *Mnemos.*, NS, 60 (1933) 69, n. 3; cf. also Apul. *met.* 11, 27 (288, 13 Helm): *magno ... deo famulum* (cf. Médan, 42). — **conspurcatus et constupratus:** *conspurcare* is a very rare verb (eight times in *TLL* IV: 503, 29-39). Before Tert. it only occurs in Lucr. 6, 22: *taetro quasi conspurcare sapore omnia* and Colum. 8, 3, 9. In Tert. it also occurs in *spect.* 11, 2 (also in connection with idolatry): *quid ergo mirum, si et apparatus agonem idololatria conspurcat de coronis profanis*, etc. The verb *constuprare* is considerably more frequent (*TLL* IV: 548, 30-56). It occurs for the first time in *Rhet. Her.* 4, 8, 12 and 4, 39, 51. Three more instances can be quoted from Tert.: *nat.* 1, 10, 45: *constuprantur coram vobis maiestates in corpore impuro* and in the similar passage *apol.* 15, 3: *nonne violatur maiestas* (sc. deorum) *et divinitas constupratur plaudentibus vobis?*; further *spect.* 27, 4: *Non ergo fugies ... ipsum ... aerem* (sc. in amphitheatro) *qui desuper incubat scelestis vocibus constupratum?* (*conspurcatum* Reifferscheid). That the two verbs are strongly connected is shown by the fact that *conspurcare* is used twice as a transitive verb with the meaning of *constuprare*, viz., Suet. *Nero* 35, and schol. Iuven. 2, 16 (*TLL* IV: 503, 38-9). For Tert.'s remarkable partiality to substantives, adjectives and verbs composed with *con-*, see Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 134. 141. 146 (among them are found numerous *hapax legomena*; see ad 23, 6 *conclarior*). — **incedit:** 'in quibusdam locis *incedere* plus minus euanida propria not. copulae vice positum esse videtur', *TLL* VII, 1: 858, 95 seqq.; see also Marouzeau, *Styl.*, 145-7. In this sense *incedere* is used in Verg. *Aen.* 1, 46-7, where Iuno says: *ast ego, quae divum incedo regina Iovisque et soror et coniunx.* Heyne explains: 'incedo, h.e. quae sum; sed illud maiore cum dignitate ...'. That *incedere* contains an element of dignity and stateliness was already said by Servius *ad loc.*: *incedere proprie est nobilium personarum, hoc est cum aliqua dignitate ambulare*; cf. also *Aen.* 5, 68. Consequently we find it used of gods in Prop. 2, 2, 5-6. In this connection we might also mention Aug. *c.d.* 19, 23 (2, 395, 4 Domb.): *immortalis anima post corpus incedit.* A borderline case is Tert. *carn. Chr.* 11, 6:

(Christus) *qui homo voluerit incedere.* It is used of human beings in Verg. *Aen.* 5, 67-8; with unfavourable connotation ('*cum superbia*') in Hor. *epod.* 15, 18. In the present passage the verb is used in a completely neutral sense, for which cf. e.g. Caelius ap. Cic. *ep. ad fam.* 8, 9, 1; Mart. 6, 39, 6; Vulg. Ps. 41, 10, and Baruch 2, 18. For the rest we should not forget that in several instances (just as in the present passage) the original meaning is still perceptible: 'walks about, goes through life'. Cf. also the notes on 9, 5 and 17, 3. The use of *venire* and *vadere* instead of *esse* (first in the *coniugatio periphrastica*) comes from colloquial Latin, as is shown by the continuation of this phenomenon in the Romance languages; Propertius quite often has *venire* in this function; he, too, must have borrowed it from colloquial Latin. The reason for this use is to be found in the wish to avoid the monosyllabic forms of *esse*; cf. Hofmann, *Synt.*, 610, and Hofm.-Szant., *Synt.*, 395 (who does not suppose that *venire* already has this function in Propertius). — **Atque adeo:** literally: 'and in so far' = 'and thus'. This expression introduces an illustration. It is first found in Plautus and is frequent in Terent., see *TLL* I: 612, 58 seqq. (for Tert. 613, 31 seqq.), and II: 1077, 58 seqq.; Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 114 seqq.; Thierry, 224-5; Thörn., 2, 89, n. 1. — **scripturae ... exprobratione:** the concept of the worship of foreign gods as fornication is of Jewish origin. Hosea is the first to conceive the relation of God to the people as a marriage, and apostasy from God as adultery (ch. 1-4). This metaphor is also used by Jeremiah (e.g. 5, 7), Isaiah (e.g. 57, 3) and especially Ezekiel (ch. 16 and 23); cf. also Deut. 31, 16 with S. R. Driver's note (*Internat. Crit. Comm.*, 339-40). From the NT we may quote Matth. 12, 39: γενεὰ πονηρὰ καὶ μοιχαλίς (cf. ib. 16, 4 and Mark, 8, 38); 2 Cor. 11, 2 (see Lietzmann's note, *HdbNT*, 9, 145); James 4, 4 (see Windisch's note, ib., 15, 27). Quite explicit is Hermas, *mand.* 4, 1, 9 (see Dibelius' note, ib. *Erg. Bd.*, 507). Cf. also F. Hauck in the art. 'μοιχεύω', etc., Kittel 4, 738, 31 seqq. and 742, 37 seqq.; R. Seeberg, *Die beiden Wege*, 56 seqq. In Tert. we also find this figure in *praescr.* 44, 2; *scorp.* 3, 4; *pud.* 5, 2 and especially 5, 4: *itaque moechia adfinis idololatriae — nam et idololatria moechiae nomine et fornicationis saepe populo exprobrata.* In *an.* 41, 1 this concept is connected with that of baptism as a marriage of the soul and the Holy Spirit. See Waszink's comm. (456-8); he compares i.a. Clem. *recogn.* 9, 3, where the devil is called *adulter*, because he entices the soul away from Christ, the *verus sponsus.* For the devil as *adulter*, cf. also Commod. *instr.* 1, 36, 3 (see Dombart's note) and *carm. apol.* 179. 206. 985.

3. **Fraudis condicio ea est, si:** lit.: 'The condition for the existence (occurrence) of fraud is fulfilled, if ...'. *Condicio* is here almost equivalent to *status* (*TLL* s.v., ch. III, IV: 130, 53-135, 46); this meaning is particularly frequent in Roman law (ib., 132, 40-133, 53). — **ea est:** *A* has only *ea*, which reading

was accepted by Van der Nat. However, the literature which he quotes in this connection, does not give one real parallel (for instance, Hoppe, *Synt.*, 144, only mentions passages in which the infinitive is omitted in the acc.c. inf.). Löfstedt (*Krit. Apol.*, 8, 2) quotes *apol.* 17, 2: *ideo verus et tantus* (sc. est deus); however, in this sentence the nominal consists of two adjectives, whereas in the present case the nominal is only one pronoun. Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 45, writes: "Auch idol. 1 ..., fraudis condicio ea (sc. est) kann mit dem Agob. richtig sein" but adds immediately in a note: "Manchmal hat diese Hs. es auch irrtümlich weggelassen ... Entscheiden lässt sich das oft nicht". He does not add any argument in favour of an ellipsis of *est* in this passage. — **alienum rapiat:** by this definition *fraus* acquires the meaning of *furtum*, *peculatus* (gloss. (ἀπο)στέρησις), see *TLL* VI: 1270, 67 seqq.; cf. *spect.* 3, 2 = Exod. 20, 14: *non fraudem admittes* (οὐ κλέψεις), where the Vulgate has: *non furtum facies*; Vulg. Mark 10, 19: *ne fureris ... ne fraudem feceris* (μὴ κλέψῃς ... μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς); Vulg. 1 Cor. 6, 7-8: *fraudem patimini ... fraudatis* (ἀποστερεῖσθε ... ἀποστερεῖτε); cf. also *pud.* 14, 24. — **debitum deneget:** time and again the Christians protest their honesty (see the numerous passages collected by Lortz, 1, 103, n. 90), often with the special assertion that they profess to abstain from *depositum abnegare* ('to deny (under oath) having received anything *in deposito*'); we find this already in Pliny's famous letter to Trajan, further e.g. Aristides, *apol.* 15, 4; cf. also Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 87-8, who points to the Jewish tradition. From Tert. cf. *Scap.* 4, 7: *depositum non abnegamus*; cf. *apol.* 42, 9. It seems probable that this expression served Tert. as a model for *debitum deneget* in the present passage, where *depositum* could not be used because of the *honores dei*. The alteration of *abnegare* to *denegare*, too, may not be unintentional (though in *apol.* 46, 14 Tert. writes: *Anaxagoras depositum hospitibus denegavit*). In this connection *abnegare* always means 'to deny' (*infitiari*, *negare*; see *TLL* I: 111, 26-38) and, consequently, *depositum abnegare* is the usual expression (e.g. Plin. *ep.* 10, 96, 7; *Dig.* 47, 2, 1, 2; 12, 3, 3; 16, 3, 11); it is true that *denegare* may be equivalent to *negare* (*TLL* V, 1: 523, 68. 84; in Tert. *Herm.* 15, 2; *res.* 52, 11) but in juridical writings it occurs especially with the meaning 'to refuse' (*recusare*, ib., 525, 6-28), and accordingly only few instances of *depositum denegare* are found, e.g. *Cod. Theod.* 9, 40, 21; 11, 1, 32; however, cf. *apol.* 46, 14 (quoted above). In the present passage both meanings play a part: in *debitum deneget* the meaning 'to deny' is the primary one, whereas in *honores illi suos denegans* the meaning is 'to refuse'. — **utique:** a juridical term, first found in laws and inscriptions; only through the letters of Cicero the word gained acceptance in literary language. From this Hofmann concluded that the word belonged to vulgar usage. However, literary language does not only contrast to vulgar usage, but also to special technical idioms, in this case to the idiom of the law. Being a lawyer, Tert. uses *utique* very frequently (in *apol.* alone

it occurs forty times). See Hofm., *Synt.*, 669; Hofm.-Szant., 492-3; Blokhuis, 116-9; Waltz., *Comm.*, 20; Thörn., 2, 31. — **fraudem deo:** this conjecture by Rigaltius is to be preferred to the reading given by *B* and Gel (*deo fraudem*), because the omission of *deo* in the *Agob.* is much more easy to understand, if the original order was *fraudem deo* than if we assume that *deo* stood before *fraudem*. — **fraudem deo facit:** this matter-of-fact view of idolatry, worded in strictly juridical terms, is Tert.'s own. It was probably suggested to him by Matth. 22, 21, for we find the same words which he uses here in *fuga* 12, 10, where he discusses (and quotes) this NT passage in connection with his prohibition to buy off a persecution; he may also have been thinking of Rom. 13, 7. In this connection it should also be mentioned that baptism is characterized more than once by Tert. as a *negotium* between God and man, cf. especially *an.* 35, 3: *pactus es ... renuntiasse ipsi* (sc. diabolo) *et pompae et angelis eius. Convenit inter vos* (i.e. inter te et diabolum) *de isto. Haec erit amicitia observatione sponsionis, ne quid eius postea resumas ex his quae eierasti, quae illi reddidisti, ne te ut fraudatorem, ut pacti transgressorem iudici deo obiciat*, etc. See Waszink *ad loc.* (414); Beck 49-50 and 53-4; Refoulé, *Bapt.*, 50-1; Dekkers, 195-6; de Backer, *Sacramentum*, 141 seqq. Of course an estimation like the one expressed here by Tert. is only possible, if idolatry is regarded as a conscious, deliberate apostasy from God. — **suos:** = *proprios*. See Hoppe, *Synt.*, 103; Löfst., *Krit. Apol.*, 95-6; Hartel, 1, 36-7; Waltz., *Ét.*, 67; Hofm., *Synt.*, 470; Hofm.-Szant., *Synt.*, 758. The opposite also occurs, see Thörn., 4, 127; Waszink, 100. The promiscuous use of *suus* and *proprius* originates from juridical idiom, see Kalb, *Juristenlat.*, 57; Lebreton, *Ét. Cic.*, 134. — **contumeliam:** a law term, denoting *iniuria* in the narrower sense, viz., 'defamation'; see Jörs - Kunkel, 259. The same motif is found in the polemics against the heathens in *nat.* 1, 10, 11 and *apol.* 13, 2: *praelatio alterius sine alterius contumelia non potest*; cf. also *apol.* 13, 9. — **Quodsi ... afferunt:** see the note on par. 2: *perisse*. — **in his:** sc. *criminibus*. For *in*, see the note on 3, 1. — **de ... reatu ... liberatur:** *liberare* with the meaning of *absolvere* is frequent in Tert., see Oehler's note on *carn. Chr.* 7 (p. 440 b); Hoppe, *Serm. Tert.*, 82; Kalb, *Juristenlat.*, 32; Waszink, 249.

4. **exitiosa:** cf. *pud.* 19, 25: *Sunt autem et contraria istis* (sc. delictis cotidianae incursionis), *ut graviora et exitiosa, quae veniam non capiant, homicidium, idololatria, fraus, negatio, blasphemia, utique et moechia et fornicatio et si qua alia violatio templi dei* (cf. the note on 1, 2: *perisse*). In *pud.* Tert. connects the doctrine of mortal sins with the proposition that these are unforgivable; the present passage, however, contains no reference whatever to this view; no more does the highly rhetorical epilogue imply it (24, 4). So Adam (*Chronol.*, 417) is wrong in asserting that in these passages Tert. shows Montanist sympathies. For the contrast with the following *salus*, cf. *scorp.*

5, 5: *Est et haec perversitas hominum salutaria excutere, exitiosa suscipere*; cf. also *spect.* 25, 4: *Avertat deus a suis tantam voluptatis exitiosae cupiditatem!* — **devoratoria salutis:** the adj. *devoratorius* occurs only here and in Eustathius' translation of St. Basil's *In hexaem.* 3, 5 (ed. de Mendieta-Rudberg, p. 38, 10). Also the substantives *devoratio* (*pud.* 14, 22) and *devorator* (*res.* 32, 2) occur for the first time in Tert. (Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 135); it is more than probable that all three these words did not belong to the Christian idiom but were created by Tert.; the same seems to hold good of the remarkably great number of adjectives on *-torius* which occur in Tert.'s works (cf. the list in Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 141-5; see also Waltz., *Comm.*, 160). — **salutis:** = σωτηρίας, 'eternal salvation' (= *vitae aeternae*). For this specially Christian meaning of *salus* see Teeuwen, index s.v. Just as *vita* (ζωή), this notion is also applicable to the present, see the note on 1, 2 *perisse*, Knopf's note on 2 Clem. 1, 1 (*HdbNT, Erg. Bd.*, 153), and Lietzmann's notes on Rom. 1, 16 (ib. 8, 30) and 2 Cor. 7, 10 (ib. 9, 132). Sometimes we find σωτηρία as 'preservation from death' connected with ζωή, e.g. 2 Clem. 19, 1 and Ignat. *ad Ephes.* 18, 1; cf. also Rom. 5, 10 and *an.* 57, 2 (about the devil): *salutis pariter animaeque vastatorem* (see Waszink, 577). — **cetera ... repraesentant:** after arguing that the major sins just mentioned are present in the act of idolatry Tert. continues stating that also the other sins to a certain degree (*ad aliquem modum*) are discernible in idolatry (*in idololatria condicionem suam repraesentant).* The expression *condicionem suam repraesentant* literally means 'they show their features', which is a remarkable kind of personification. These sins are said to show themselves in idolatry which means, of course, that they can be discerned within it. The words *et seorsum proinde disposita* raise a problem. Van der Nat translates: 'although they each have their own separate place as much as the previous ones'. In his opinion, these words point to what was said earlier about the separate existence of the other sins outside idolatry: *etsi suam speciem tenet unumquodque delictum, etsi suo quoque nomine iudicio destinatur* (1, 1). He concludes: 'Like the serious sins, the less serious ones mentioned here occur also separately (outside idolatry) but in some way or another they are committed as a part of idolatry' (*ad loc.*). This interpretation could perhaps be acceptable, if the statement of 1, 1 concerned those serious sins (murder, adultery, fornication, and fraud) only: then Tert. could say that in the same way (*proinde* = *perinde*) the less serious sins also existed outside idolatry. But the statement of 1, 1 concerned *all sins*, in other words, it concerned already the sins to be discussed now. In our view, *proinde* must point to something that was said of the four major sins. Thus it can only concern the fact that those sins are discernible in idolatry. The words *et seorsum proinde disposita* must be considered to be an elaboration of what was said in the words *in idololatria condicionem suam repraesentant.* They are discernible *in idolatry*, because they are in it as a separate (moral) entity

(*seorsum disposita*), just like the above mentioned sins. Van der Nat speaks of 'a part of idolatry' (see the quotation above), which is, in our opinion, not correct: the other sins are not 'a part of idolatry' but are 'discernible *in* idolatry': note that the words *in illa* occur here no less than five times. The various meanings in Tert. of the verb *repraesentare* are fully discussed by d'Alès, *Théol.*, 356-60. The meaning found in the present passage occurs no less than sixteen times. A particular concrete example is *an.* 57, 12: *in resurrectionis exemplis, cum dei virtus sive per prophetas sive per Christum sive per apostolos in corpora animas repraesentat.* — **concupiscentiae saeculi:** *concupiscentia* is a Christianism, first occurring in the *Vetus Latina* and Tert., see *TLL* IV: 102, 63 seqq.; Hauschild, *Wortbild.*, 33 seqq.; Rönsch, *It.*, 49. For Tert.'s neologisms in *-entia* and *-antia*, see Demmel, passim (117-22 for *concupiscentia*); cf. also Säflund, 144-5. The genitive *saeculi* has the function of an adjective, as is evident from *ux.* 1, 4, 2-6, where Tert. first uses *concupiscentia carnis* and *concupiscentia saeculi* and afterwards denotes the same notions by *concupiscentia carnalis* and *concupiscentia saecularis*; cf. also *spect.* 14, 2 *concupiscentiae saeculi.* — **sollemnitas:** 'festival, solemnity'. For a study of the meanings of *sollemnis* and *-tas* in Tert., see Schümmer, 52, n. 7. — **ambitione:** cf. *cult. fem.* 1, 9, 2: *haec erit ambitio, unde et nomen eius interpretandum est, quod concupiscentia apud animam ambiente nascatur.* The opposite is *frugalitas* (*nat.* 2, 4, 15; *spect.* 7, 5; *ux.* 1, 8, 3). — **lasciviae ... libidinis:** instead of the alliterative combination *victus et venter*—which is rather surprising, since nothing negative is implied by *victus*—we mostly find *gula et venter*, e.g. *spect.* 13, 5; before Tert. e.g. Sen. *ep.* 108, 14 and 114, 25; Mart. 1, 20, 3. Tert. associates these notions closely with *libido*, *luxuria*, and *lascivia*, cf. e.g. *Marc.* 2, 18, 2: *Agnosce simul et comitibus gulae, libidini scilicet atque luxuriae, prospectum* (i.e. in the law), *quae vera ventris castigatione frigescunt*; *ieiun.* 17, 3: *Appendices ... gulae lasciviae atque luxuriae*; *spect.* 2, 10; very coarse is *ieiun.* 1, 1-2. For the association with idolatry, cf. *an.* 40, 3: *Caro ... increpatur in scripturis, quia nihil anima sine carne in operatione libidinis gulae vinulentiae saevitiae idololatriae ceterisque carnalibus non sensibus, sed effectibus*, and especially *pud.* 5, 10 (*pud.* contains a remarkably high number of *loci similes* of passages in *idol.*): *Ego quidem idololatria saepissime moechiae occasionem subministro. Sciunt luci mei et mei montes et vivae aquae ipsaque in urbibus templa, quantum evertendae pudicitiae procurem.* Of course the excesses occurring during pagan festivals also play an important part in apologetic literature: the gluttony which leaves only the inedible parts of the sacrifices to the gods (*nat.* 1, 10, 35-6), the carousals during the *Parentalia*, from which the participants return home drunk (*test. an.* 4, 4), the immorality in the temples (*apol.* 15, 7; cf. *pud.* 5, 10); cf. also Min. Fel. 25, 10-1. On the other hand, the strict morality in the Christian gatherings are strongly emphasized;

e.g. *apol.* 39; Min. Fel. 31, 5; see Lortz, 1, 106 (rules of conduct to be observed during the agape and the *mortuorum memoriae* are found in *Constit. eccles. Aegypt.* 20 (Funk, *Didascalia*, 2, 113) and *Constit. Apost.* 8, 44 (ib., 1, 555-6); cf. also Hauler, *Didasc. Apost. fragmenta Veronensia*, Leipzig 1900, LXXV seq.). The sins mentioned here also have a permanent place in the lists of sins of the NT (cf. in this connection especially 1 Petr. 4, 3) and of Jewish-Hellenistic apologetics (see Remark e; cf. also 2 Macc. 6, 4; 2 Enoch 10 (Eth.); a particularly circumstantial account of the immorality during pagan festivals is given by Philo *cherub.* 92-3; cf. Wendland, *Philo Diatr.*, 41-3). We should not forget, however, that these matters were also an object of criticism in pagan philosophy (particularly in the diatribe of the Cynics and the Stoics), cf. e.g. Sen. *ep.* 18, 1-4 about the Saturnalia, and see Vögtle, 64 seqq. — **plurimum:** = *plerumque*, *saepissime*, see Waltz., *Comm.*, 61; Hartel, 2, 34, n. 2 ex. — **frequententur:** of course the subject is not *lasciviae et ebrietates*, but *sollemnitates* should be supplied as the subject from the preceding *quae ... idololatriae sollemnitas*, which expresses a plural notion. More instances of this kind of construction in Tert. are given by Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 50-1. For such changes of subject, where, moreover, this subject has to be supplied from the context, see Wahlén, 1 seqq.; Sörbom, 137 seqq.; Petterson, 53 seqq. — **iniustitia:** the characterization of idolatry as unrighteousness is elaborately argued in Rom. 1, cf. especially vss. 18-9 (cf. 1 Cor. 13, 6); thus also Theophilus *ad Autol.* 1, 14, where he alludes to Rom. 2, 8. Cf. the note on 2, 5. — **iustitiae patrem nescit:** idolatry means a rejection of the one true God, who is the source of justice. On the δικαιοσύνη of God, cf. the art. 'δικαιοσύνη' by G. Schenk in Kittel 2, 194-214, especially pp. 206-8. — **ratio ... substantia:** Braun, 177, n. 4, rightly observes that here the expressions *tota eius ratio* and *tota substantia eius* are entirely synonymous (cf. also ib., 174). — **mendacium:** cf. *apol.* 15, 8: *Iam quidem intellegi subiacet veritatis esse cultores qui mendacii non sint*; cf. ib. 24, 2 and *scorp.* 3, 1. According to Tert., the heathens only worship a *mendacium divinitatis*, behind which the devil and the demons are hiding, see comm. on 1, 2 *falsis deis ... veritatis*. The qualification of the heathen gods as falsehood occurs already at an early date, cf. e.g. Is. 44, 20; Ier. 13, 25; Rom. 1, 25 (see Lietzmann's note, *HdbNT*, 8, 33); cf. also epist. Ier. 7, 50, and numerous passages from Philo, e.g. *spec. leg.* 1, 332. It is noteworthy that the same thought is also found in Lucilius, fr. 486-9 Marx.

5. **alias:** = *alioquin*, *aliter*, as frequently in the juridical idiom and hence in Tert.'s works; see *TLL* I: 1549, 26 seqq.; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 110-1; Waszink, 322. — **sapiant:** since the dictionaries and also the commentaries contain very little information about the various meanings of this verb in Tert.'s works,

where it is remarkably frequent, a survey of these meanings is given here, with a quotation of the most important or the clearest instances.

I. 'to taste': literally: *an.* 17, 7: *si ... minus sapit vinum.*
with *remedia* as a subj.: *pud.* 10, 2 and 6; figur.: *spect.* 15, 3.

II. purely intellectually: 'to be wise, to have insight into, to understand, to know' (gr. γιγνώσκειν, εἰδέναι):
absolute: *orat.* 22, 8: *Adam et Eva, ubi eis contigit sapere*; *nat.* 2, 29; *Marc.* 1, 19, 3; *an.* 12, 1. 3. 4; 15, 2. 4; 18, 2; 19, 2. 4. 6. 9; 30, 3; *res.* 3, 1; 5, 1. As a subst.: *an.* 45, 6: *sapere nostrum.*
with the accus. of a pronoun: *quid* (interrog.): *nat.* 2, 4, 17; *an.* 1, 2. — *quid* (indefin.): *an.* 40, 2; *orat.* 16, 6. — *aliquid*: *res.* 46, 5. — *quod*: *ux.* 2, 1, 2. — *hoc*: *an.* 9, 7; *hoc ipsum*: *ieiun.* 9, 2; *haec*: *an.* 15, 6. — *nihil*: *res.* 16, 3. 12.
with an adverb added: *an.* 1, 2 (*liquido*); *ux.* 2, 1, 2 (*integre*).
with the accus. of a subst.: *apol.* 22, 10 (*caelestes sapere paraturas*); *test. an.* 6, 6.
with an accus. c. inf.: *nat.* 2, 9, 14; *scorp.* 1, 5.
with an indirect question: *idol.* 10, 6.

III. 'to be imbued with, to have a certain disposition' (gr. φρονεῖν):
as a translation of φρονεῖν: *res.* 23, 4 (Col. 3, 2); *pud.* 1, 12 (1 Cor. 13, 11); 17, 11 (Rom. 8, 5); *praescr.* 5, 5 (1 Cor. 1, 10); tr. of περπερεύεσθαι: *pat.* 12, 9 (1 Cor. 13, 4): *protervum sapit.*
with an adverb: *Marc.* 1, 14, 3: *sublimius illo* (sc. domino) *sapis.*
with the accus. of a pronoun: *scorp.* 1, 12; *pud.* 18, 2.
with the neutral accus. of an adj.: *spect.* 19, 3: *si ... bonum sapiunt.*
with a dative: *pat.* 5, 13: *deo sapere* (cf. Thörn., 2, 44).
with a preposition: *ad* finale: *ieiun.* 6, 1: *ad lasciviam sapere.* — *ad* = *secundum*: *res.* 39, 3: *ad Saducaeos.* — *secundum*: *exh. cast.* 10, 28-9: *secundum spiritum sapere.* — *cum*: *bapt.* 12, 5: *cum aemulis sapuisse.* — *contra*: *exh. cast.* 3, 25: *contra voluntatem dei sapiendo.*

IV. Hence *sapere* is used with a non-personal subject with the meaning 'to have a certain meaning, certain contents, a certain intention, to make something clear, to express' (see Hartel, 3, 52-3; Büchner, 56):
absolute: *scorp.* 7, 5: *verba non sono solo sapiunt, sed et sensu*; *ib.* 11, 4 (same sense).
with an adverb: *spect.* 3, 7: *Nam et specialiter quaedam pronuntiata generaliter sapiunt*; *an.* 32, 10: *sic et divina pronuntiatio sapit*; *res.* 33, 6; *pud.* 8, 9.
with an accusative (mostly with the meaning 'to mean'): *nat.* 1, 3, 7: *cum quid aut barbarum sonat, aut infaustum sapit*; *ieiun.* 2, 2: *adgnoscat quid sapiat 'lex et prophetae usque ad Iohannem'*; *ib.* 17, 1; *virg. vel.* 7, 7; *res.* 38, 1; 44, 10; *carn. Chr.* 19, 4; *Marc.* 2, 18, 1; 2, 24, 1.

with a preposition: *ad*: *ieiun.* 10, 8: *Hoc si magis ad religionem sapit Christianam.* — *adversus*: *idol.* 1, 5; *virg. vel.* 1, 2: *Quodcumque adversus veritatem sapit.* — *contra*: *praescr.* 21, 5. — *cum*: *res.* 3, 6: *quae cum ethnicis sapiunt* (sc. haeretici). — *de*: *nat.* 2, 8, 14; *virg. vel.* 5, 2; *pud.* 19, 8.

A double meaning of *sapere* is found in *pud.* 9, 22: *Sed malumus in scripturis minus, si forte, sapere quam contra* (meanings II and III).

— **daemoniis:** *daemonium* occurs as a Latin word since Apuleius, who in *apol.* 27 (31, 25-6 H.) writes *Socrati daemonion*, but ib. 63 (71, 16-7): *hoccine est, quod appellitabatis daemonium?*; cf. in Tert. *apol.* 22, 1 and *an.* 1, 4: *daemonium* (sc. Socratis). In the sense of *malus daemon* we find the word for the first time in Tert., see *TLL* V, 1: 6, 77 seqq. Tert. uses *daemonium* and *daemon* promiscuously (cf. Thörn., 1, 11, n. 1). Actually, *daemonium* is regarded as the diminutive, cf. *apol.* 32, 2: *nescitis genios daemonas dici et inde diminutiva voce daemonia?* (in reality it is the neutral form of the adjective). For *genius* as a translation of δαίμων, cf. *an.* 39, 3: *sic et omnibus genii deputantur, quod daemonum nomen est*; Min. Fel. 29, 5; Lact. *d.i.* 2, 14, 12; this identification occurs for the first time in Apuleius (*de deo Socr.* 15 and *Plat.* 1, 12 = 96, 13 Thom.). See Waszink, 445; Waltz., *Comm.*, 219; Andres, art. 'Daimon', *RE* Suppl. III 292. — **daemoniis et immundis spiritibus:** see the note on 1, 2 *immundis spiritibus cooperator.* — **nihil ... deputetur:** everything directed against God is directed to (in favour of) the devil and the fallen angels, since these are the only important adversaries of God, cf. e.g. *cult. fem.* 1, 8, 3: *alius ... praeter diabolum et angelos eius aemulus dei non est*; *spect.* 2, 5 (see the passages collected by Waszink, 287; Lortz, 2, 37. 39. 43-4; cf. also comm. on 18, 7). Hence the idolater could be qualified above as *immundis spiritibus cooperator.* — **deputetur:** the verb *deputare* is extremely frequent in Tert.'s works; in Claesson's index 230 certain instances are mentioned. With the meanings *ascribere, attribuere* (*TLL* s.v. sub II B, V, 1: 621, 78 seqq.), *adnumerare* (ib. sub II C, col. 623, 34 seqq.), and *imputare* (ib. sub II D, col. 623, 15 seqq.) it occurs for the first time in Tert. For *deputare in* with an accus., see the note on 4, 2. — **quibus idola mancipantur:** from these words the relation between idols and demons becomes clear. The idols are instruments in the hands of the demons; they serve as a means to distract human veneration from the one true God. As was stated above (see Remarks, p. 77), for Tertullian the concept of idol embraces not only the images of the heathen gods but also the gods themselves, who are in his view human beings who became venerated after their death (Euhemerism). Among the heathens themselves, the significance of these images and the relation between the gods and their images constituted a vexed problem; see Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, XX seqq. and 77-8; Clerc, *Culte*, 91-122 and 171-258; Wendland, *Kultur*, 391-2: obviously Euhemerus' opinion

about the nature of the gods reduced this problem to small proportions. The images of the gods, who had been human beings, did not essentially differ from those of other human beings. The Jews and the Christians were, of course, strongly opposed to the heathen gods and their idols. Among the Jews various views on heathen religion developed; the gods were either identified with their images and so became an easy object of mockery (e.g. Ps. 115, 4-7 "Their idols are silver and gold, made by the hands of men. They have mouths that cannot speak, and eyes that cannot see", etc.) or regarded as demons (e.g. ibut. 32, 17; Ps. 96, 5 etc.). These views can also be combined: in their own interest the demons have tempted men to worship idols; cf. *Enoch* 19, 1, *Iub.* 11, 3. See O. Eissfeldt, 'Gott und Götzen im Alten Testament', *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 103 (1931), 151-60; Strack-B., 3, 48-60; G. Quell, art. 'θεός', Kittel 3, esp. 87-90; E. Fascher, 'Gott und die Götter', *Theol. Lit. Zeit.* 81 (1956), 279-308. In the NT too, one finds a two-sided view: on the one hand the heathen gods are lifeless idols (e.g. 1 Cor. 12, 2 τὰ εἴδωλα τὰ ἄφωνα); on the other hand idolatry establishes a communion with the demons (1 Cor. 10, 14-21 with Lietzmann's comm., *HdbNT* 9, 49; cf. also 1 Cor. 8, 4-5 with Lietzmann's note, ib. 37). Among the Christian Apologists the same views are found, often in combination with the Euhemeristic idea that the heathen gods are deified human beings. See Waszink, 578. However, nowhere such a clear distinction between images, gods, and demons is found as in Tertullian. To him the only object of false human worship are the demons; the images of the heathen gods and the gods themselves are equally 'idols', used by the demons to distract human worship from the one true God to themselves: hence *quibus idola mancipantur.* — **mancipantur:** for this law-term, see Beck, 104. 166; cf. e.g. 12, 5; *spect.* 2, 4; 4, 3; *an.* 33, 9; *adv. Iud.* 1, 7. — **mancipes:** for *manceps* in the sense of 'possessor', cf. *apol.* 11, 2: *inprimis ... necesse est concedatis esse aliquem sublimiorem deum et mancipem quendam divinitatis*; *nat.* 2, 2, 1: *auctoritas philosophorum ut mancipium sapientiae*; *nat.* 1, 9, 1; *spect.* 10, 9. Apart from Tert. this meaning only occurs in [Orig.] *tract. de script. sacr.* 8 (94, 22 Batiffol): *mancipe malitiae, id est diabolo, sublato* (these treatises show also elsewhere an influence of Tert., cf. e.g. Waszink, 148-9). Further see *TLL* VII: 252, 29 seqq.; Hoppe, *Serm. Tert.*, 76; Beck, 104.

Ch. 2. *The subject-matter of the treatise*

'But we will confine ourselves to idolatry in its proper sense, which, on its own, affords sufficient material for a treatise. For apart from its open manifestations, idolatry has a great number of ramifications by which it ruins the servants of God. This happens because the servants of God do not notice the fact or shut their eyes to it (§ 1).

Many people think that idolatry consists only of open manifestations such as bringing sacrifices and burning incense; this is the same as thinking that adultery is nothing else than kissing, embracing and sexual intercourse, and murder nothing else than the killing of another (§ 2). But we know from Holy Scripture that this is not correct: according to the Lord these vices have a much broader scope (§ 3). Otherwise the domain of evil and that of virtue would be rather narrow (§ 4). And our righteousness would not exceed that of the scribes and pharisees, if we did not understand how large the domain of unrighteousness is. Now idolatry is the summit of unrighteousness. Thus we must understand how large its domain is, and not confine it to its immediately evident manifestations only (§ 5).'

Remarks

a. *The subject-matter*. In the first chapter Tertullian greatly extended the concept of idolatry in order to emphasize the importance of the matter under discussion. But it is evident that idolatry, if understood in that sense, is much too large a subject-matter for a treatise. This is why Tertullian now states that he will limit himself to a less extensive subject, viz., idolatry in its proper sense.

Here the question may arise, whether idolatry in its proper sense affords sufficient material for a treatise. If one understands 'idolatry in its proper sense' as the equivalent of 'open acts of idolatry', this question should perhaps be answered in the negative. But 'idolatry in its proper sense' is not restricted to these open acts which do not need much discussion, but has a great number of ramifications. These hidden forms of idolatry afford enough material for a treatise (*sufficit sibi*) and they will be the main subject (*cum maxime*) of Tertullian's argument.

b. *Its extension*. In 2, 2-5 Tertullian argues against those who think that idolatry is restricted to such open deeds as mentioned above. His argument runs as follows:

(a) First he compares the case of idolatry with that of adultery and murder. Just as the Lord sees these sins as existing within a range broader than the respective manifest deeds, so idolatry extends much further than those manifest deeds.

(b) Then he makes use of a *deductio ad absurdum*: if idolatry (and adultery and murder) would have such a restricted extent, this would mean that the same standard of evil would apply to Christians and heathens; they would be judged for the same sins. This is impossible. *Ergo*.

Tertullian elaborates the argument a bit more. Instead of saying that, if the opinion of his opponents were true, the domain of evil would be rather small, he says: ''the ingenuity of the devil with regard to wickedness would have a rather small range''. This means: the devil's ingenuity would have only a small

domain (*in modico consisteret*) in which man could be brought to sin (*de malitia*). And to the ingenuity of the devil with regard to wickedness he opposes the ingenuity of God with regard to *disciplina*, the instrument of virtue. The idea behind this argument is that the extent of the domain of virtue corresponds to that of sin. The larger the one, the larger the other. If not only adulterous acts but also adulterous thoughts are sinful, then virtue does not only extend itself to deeds of chastity but also to thoughts.

(c) Finally Tertullian refers to another passage of Scripture according to which the righteousness of the Christians must be greater than that of the others, *i.e.* the scribes and pharisees. In terms of the previous paragraph, the idea may be formulated as follows: for the Christian the domain of the virtue of righteousness is larger than for others. In consequence the domain of the opposite vice, viz., unrighteousness, must be larger as well. Now idolatry is a form of unrighteousness, it is even the summit of it. Thus what the Lord said with regard to righteousness, and in consequence with regard to unrighteousness, holds good *a fortiori* of idolatry. So the Christian has to safeguard himself against the large domain of idolatry (*adversus abundantiam idololatriae*) even more (*prius*) than against the large domain of unrighteousness in its proper sense; and he will do so by (*dum*) not confining himself to the manifest forms of idolatry (*non solum in manifestis*).

c. *Place of chapter 2 in the treatise*. In paragraphs 2-5 Tertullian argued against those who gave too restricted a sense to idolatry. Herewith he substantiated his thesis of paragraph 1 saying that idolatry in its proper sense affords sufficient material for a treatise. The subject-matter has been determined now: it will mainly be the hidden forms of idolatry. The treatise proper may start.

In his book *Ancient Rhetoric and the Art of Tertullian* (Oxford 1971) R. D. Sider states about the present treatise: ''he (Tertullian) devotes the whole of chapters 2 and 3 to a prejudicial definition of idolatry''. This is a serious misinterpretation. Chapters 2 and 3 do not belong together, and Tertullian does not give a definition in the introductory chapter 2. He states that idolatry in its proper sense has a very wide range because of its manifold hidden forms and that he will occupy himself mainly with these hidden forms of idolatry. Chapter 3 does not belong to the introduction.

1. **proprietates:** 'special natures', as in *an.* 2, 2: *proprietatibus etiam inter similia diversis*; ib. 8, 1: *et ubi proprietatum privata discrimina ... ?*; *Prax.* 27, 11 (cf. *idol.* 1, 1: *suam speciem tenet unumquodque delictum*). — **Sufficit sibi:** idolatry in its proper sense (*quod ipsa est*), being so great an evil (*tam inimicum deo nomen*) 'is self-sufficient', viz., as subject-matter of a treatise; there is no need of taking it in the larger sense of ch. 1. — **locuples substantia:** for *substantia*, cf. 1, 4 *tota substantia eius*; *cult. fem.* 2, 2, 2: *tota fidei*

substantia. Here *substantia* contrasts with *nomen*, as in *an.* 11, 1 and 14, 4 with *opera* (see Waszink, 192 and 195), in *Marc.* 5, 14, 4 with the plural *opera*, and in *Prax.* 2, 4 with *forma*. For the various meanings of *substantia* in Tert.'s works, see especially Evans, 39 seqq.; Beck, 72-5; Daniélou, *Origines* 280-2; Thierry, 133-4 and 185-6. The juridical term *locuples* is not frequently used of things, see *TLL* VII, 2: 1571, 34 seqq.; here the original sense, for which cf. e.g. Quintil. *instit.* 5, 10, 55: *locupletem a locorum copia* is still perceptible, as appears from the following *idololatriae latitudo*. From Tert. is still to be mentioned *spect.* 7, 5: *quaevis idololatria sordide instructa vel modice, locuples et splendida est censu criminis sui*; *TLL* ib. under the heading 'transfertur ad res fere naturales': *Herm.* 8, 2: *materia ... se deo praestitit divitem et locupletem et liberalem*; *nat.* 1, 12, 6 ('fere i.q. pretiosus'): *seu ligno seu lapide ... seu alia locupletiore materia.* — **venas defundit:** Ursinus' conjecture *diffundit* is seductive, if we compare passages like *pat.* 11, 1: *lata atque diffusa est operatio mali*; *paen.* 4, 5: *de bono paenitentiae enumerando diffusa ... materia est*, and the following *idololatriae latitudo*, the more as *defundere* and *diffundere* are frequently confused in MSS. (*TLL* V, 1: 1107, 25 seqq.). Nevertheless the *lectio tradita* is correct. Tert. has first compared idolatry with a tree which spreads many branches; he now uses a similar figure (which is also suggested by the formal parallelism: twice an active verb with an object), viz., that of a source which pours forth numerous veins of water. The same metaphor is developed in *pat.* 5, 18: *si prima deliquit* (sc. impatientia), *consequens est, ut, quia prima, idcirco et sola sit matrix in omne delictum, defundens de suo fonte varias criminum venas*. Moreover, *diffundere* is not said of a source but of a liquid only (in this case always with a reflexive pronoun or in the passive voice with a preposition, cf. Cic. *n.d.* 2, 138: *ex his partibus sanguis per venas in omne corpus diffunditur*; Curt. 3, 6, 17: *Ut vero medicamentum se diffudit in venas*; Cypr. *bon. pat.* 20). — **de hoc:** this must refer to the words *quot modis ... latitudo* (which is quite normal, since *hic* usually refers to what follows). Van der Nat is wrong in supposing that these words refer to *tot ramos porrigit* and *tot venas defundit*. — **idololatriae latitudo:** with the meaning 'extent, breadth, compass', *latitudo* also occurs in *spect.* 30, 3: *Quae tunc spectaculi latitudo!*; cf. e.g. Caes. *bell. Gall.* 3, 20, 1: *regionum latitudo*; Cic. *leg. agr.* 2, 68: *latitudinem possessionum*; also Iren. *Adv. haer.*, praef. (p. 6 Harvey): *in latitudine sensus tui* (ἐν τῷ πλάτει σου τοῦ νοῦ); cf. LXX 3 Regn. 2, 35 a: καὶ ἔδωκεν κύριος φρόνησιν τῷ Σαλωμων καὶ σοφίαν πολλὴν σφόδρα καὶ πλάτος καρδίας. The word has the sense of 'large domain' in *nat.* 2, 9, 2: *alia iam nobis ineunda est humani erroris latitudo, immo silva caedenda* (cf. Hartel, 1, 39). *Latitudines* has concrete meaning in 8, 2 (see comm.). — **servos dei:** frequently used to denote the Christians, cf. e.g. 11, 1; 13, 2; 14, 4 (Gal. 1, 10); 17, 2; *spect.* 1, 1; *ux.* 1, 4, 2; *fuga* 1, 3; *res.* 52, 12. It is a translation of δοῦλος

θεοῦ, which in the LXX and in the NT is applied alike to those who are special servants of God (patriarchs, Moses, prophets) and to all the faithful. The concept of man's relation to God which is characterized by this term is Semitic and alien to the Greeks (Eur. *Ion* 309: τοῦ θεοῦ ... δοῦλος is equivalent to ἱερόδουλος; no more do Eur. *Bacch.* 366 and *Or.* 418 express a religious dependence). — **ignorata ... dissimulata:** cf. *spect.* 1, 1: *ne aut ignorando aut dissimulando quis peccet*; *cult. fem.* 2, 1, 2: *pleraeque ... aut ignorantes simpliciter aut dissimulantes audaciter ita ingrediuntur, quasi* etc. The sense is, of course, 'either not knowing or feigning not to know'.

2. **Plerique ... interpretandam:** time and again Tert. opposes himself to the mass of *rudes* and puts forward their ignorance or lack of seriousness as a motive for his writing. The main passages in this connection are *Prax.* 3, 1: *Simplices ... quique, ne dixerim imprudentes et idiotae, quae maior semper credentium pars est*; *bapt.* 1, 1: Tert. mentions *eos qui cum maxime formantur* together with *illos qui similiter credidisse contenti, non exploratis rationibus traditionum temptabilem fidem per imperitiam portant*; *res.* 2, 11 and 17, 11; *scorp.* 1, 5; *Marc.* 1, 9, 1. Heretics are said to avail themselves of this ignorance, cf. *praescr.* 2, 8. See Refoulé's note on *bapt.* 1, 1 (p. 64, n. 4) and, more generally, de Vries, passim; H. Koch, 'Tert. und Cypr. als religiöse Persönlichkeiten', *Intern. kirchl. Zeitschr.* 10 (1920), 48. — **simpliciter:** is to be connected with *interpretandam*, cf. *an.* 35, 2: *totam illam allegorian domini ... primo quidem simpliciter intellegendam* (see Waszink's note, 413); *orat.* 4, 2: *si simpliciter intellegendum est*; *ux.* 2, 2, 2. — **si quid ... obligetur:** this, and not Mesnart's generally accepted conjecture *si quis*, is the correct reading, for the subject of *incedat, immolet* and *obligetur* is *idololatria*. — **polluceat:** Pamelius' emendation (*proluceat A B*) is certainly right; the alteration has been caused by a wrong abbreviation (for similar cases, cf. 11, 5: *per se* Gel, *posse A B*; *orat.* 5, 2 *protulissemus* Rig, *postulissemus A*, *postulassemus B*). *Pollucere* means 'to place upon the altar as a sacrifice to the deity'. So *polluctum* in its proper sense is only that part of a sacrifice which is burned for the deity, and which does not serve as a meal for the offerers and is not sold either. However, since a banquet is closely connected with a sacrifice, *polluctum* is also used with the meaning 'banquet, meal'. The term mostly occurs in relation to the cult of Hercules at the Ara Maxima. There people used to offer *decumae* of what they earned, cf. e.g. Plaut. *Stich.* 233-4: *haec veniisse iam opus est, quantum potest, uti decumam partem Herculi polluceam*; *Bacch.* 665-6; *Most.* 984 with Sonnenschein's note. *Decumae* of the spoils of war were also consecrated. Plut. *Crass.* 2 relates that Crassus went so far as to offer the tenth part of the whole of his fortune to Hercules. Only a small portion of such offerings, however, remained in the temple, most of it being used for a public banquet, *polluctum*

Herculis. Tert. speaks about this in *nat.* 2, 7, 17 and *apol.* 14, 1. See Marquardt, *Staatsverwaltung*, 3, 146-7; Wissowa, *Rel.*, 277-9. — **obligetur:** cf. *an.* 39, 3: *Quis non exinde ... totum filii caput ... aut sacrificio obligat aut sacro obsignat* with Waszink's note (445). Also Cic. *div.* 1, 7: *est enim periculum, ne aut neglectis eis* (sc. auspiciis) *impia fraude aut susceptis anili superstitione obligemur.* — **carnis congressione:** for this expression cf. Cic. *rep.* 1, 38: *a prima congressione maris et feminae ... ordiar*. From Tert. cf. *virg. vel.* 11, 4: *si congressio viri mulierem facit*; *res.* 11, 6; for further instances cf. *TLL* IV: 294, 70-6, and for *congressus* with the same meaning ib. IV: 296, 50-62. — **sanguinis profusione:** the normal expression would be *sanguinis effusione*, cf. *Scap.* 3, 1: *nulla civitas impune latura sit sanguinis nostri effusionem. Sanguinis profusio* occurs as a medical term ('haemorrhage', 'bleeding') in Celsus *medicin.* 2, 7 (40, 12-3 Daremberg) and 7, 21 (302, 23). — **animae ereptione:** cf. *res.* 28, 6: *si occidere carni animam eripere est*; *an.* 43, 11: sleep symbolizes *quasi iam ereptam* (sc. animam); ib. 56, 8: (animas) *vi ereptas.* — **reputandum:** *reputare* is a complete synonym of *putare*; for this use of a meaningles *re-* in compound verbs see the note on 1, 2 *recognoscas*.

3. **quam:** = *quanto*, cf. e.g. *spect.* 19, 3: *quam melius*; *Valent.* 12, 5: *Quam propius fuit*. See Löfst., *Z. Spr. T.*, 36; Böhm, 73. — **ista:** sc. *crimina. ista = haec*, see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 104; Waszink, 83; Hofm., *Synt.*, 476-7; Hofm.-Szant., *Synt.*, 184; Löfst., *Per.*, 123 seqq. and *Apol.* 23. — **extensius ... disponat:** in the present sense ('spectat ad sensum ultra notionem strictam dilatum') this adverb does not seem to occur elsewhere, see *TLL* V, 2: 1980, 37. However, we do find *extendere* with the meaning 'to extend a thing, so that it also relates to something else', 'to extend the scope of a thing'. Although this use of the verb occurs elsewhere (the first examples are Liv. 24, 48, 1; 45, 31, 13; Vell. Pat. 2, 6, 2), it is especially frequent in juridical authors, cf. e.g. Scaevola *Dig.* 32, 41, 6: *posse ad* (suburbanam) ... *quoque* (possessionem) *verborum significationem extendi*; Ulp. *Dig.* 32, 70, 3; see *TLL* V, 2: 1977, 39 and 75 seqq. So in this connection Tert. probably uses this adverb as a juridical term. Cf. also 8, 2 and 11, 3. For *disponere = exponere, disserere*, a very frequent meaning in Tert., see *TLL* V, 1: 1423, 68 seqq. More instances of a similar construction of a verb with an adverb are treated by Löfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 59-60. — **adulterium ... impudice:** Matth. 5, 28 is very often quoted or alluded to in patristic literature, see e.g. Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 231, n. 3; Rambaux, 216, n. 809 (enumeration of the quotations in Tert.). See also Aalders, 35, and cf. *cult. fem.* 2, 2, 4. — **oculum ... impegerit:** cf. *Marc.* 4, 7, 2: *qui semel oculum impegerit in*, etc.; *an.* 6, 3: *ab illa* (sc. anima) *est ... impingi ... oculos in conspectum*; this expression seems to occur only in Tert. (*TLL* VII, 1: 616, 83 seqq.). For the idea, cf. *an.* 38,

2: *concupiscentia oculis arbitris utitur*, see Waszink, 435. Parallel passages from the apologists in Lortz, 1, 110, n. 106, from the Stoic diatribe in Wendland, *Kultur*, 95. — **caritatis:** to denote the concept of charity the Christians avoided *amor*, as this word had a mainly erotic significance in profane language (an exception is Tert. *Marc.* 5, 14, 11 (Rom. 12, 10): *amore fraternitatis invicem adfectuosi* (Vulg.: *caritate fraternitatis invicem adfectuosi*). The difference between *amor* and *caritas* is brought out by passages like Cic. *part.* 36: *aut caritate moventur homines, ut deorum, ut patriae, ut parentum, aut amore, ut fratrum, ut coniugum, ... aut honestate, ut virtutum*; Quint. *inst.* 6, 2, 12: *ut amor* πάθος, *caritas* ἦθος. In this sense, however, Tert. has *caritas* only three times (here and *apol.* 39, 14; *virg. vel.* 14, 2); in other cases he uses the neologism *dilectio*; after him this word is gradually superseded by *caritas*. See H. Pétré, *Caritas*, Louvain 1948; H. Janssen, 202-3; Teeuwen, 32; d'Alès, 309; Mohrm., *Aug.*, 74-6; Diercks, 281-2; cf. also Rambaux, 49, n. 103; Spanneut, 28, n. 1.

4. **Alioquin:** 'otherwise'; see *TLL* I: 1595, 75 seqq. For the pleonasm *alioquin ... si*, cf. 5, 3 and 15, 4. — **diaboli:** as is quite understandable, Tert. uses *diabolus* only in those writings which are addressed to Christians; for the various names of the devil, see Lortz, 2, 39, n. 34, and, more generally, Mohrm., *Aug.*, 99 seqq. — **dei domini:** Böhm, 74, prefers to read *dei dominium* (Iunius' conjecture) on account of the rhyme (*ingenium ... dominium*). However, there is no correspondence between the meanings of these two substantives; moreover the reading of *A* can easily be defended: *dei domini* should be supplied with *ingenium*. For *dominus* as an attribute of *deus*, cf. *an.* 20, 5 and *Herm.* 3, 1. Braun, 96, n. 4 rightly observes that Tert. prefers *deus dominus* to the biblical formula *dominus deus*. — **disciplina:** 'precepts, rules of life' (cf. infra 5, 1; 8, 1; 13, 1). The various meanings of this term in Tert.'s works have frequently been investigated with rather various results, e.g. Teeuwen, 107; Thierry, note on *fuga*, 1, 6 (p. 123); H.-I. Marrou, 'Doctrine et discipline dans la langue des Pères de l'Église', *ALMA* 9 (1934), 5-25, who defines it as "l'ensemble des règles et des rites qui constitue l'unité de l'Église et sépare les fidèles des hérétiques et des païens"; V. Morel, 'Le développement de la 'disciplina' ... chez. Tert.', *Rev. Hist. Ecclés.* 35 (1939), 243-65; id., 'Disciplina. Le mot et l'idée representée par lui dans les oeuvres de Tertullien', ib. 40 (1944-5), 17 seqq.; O. Mauch, *Der lateinische Begriff 'disciplina'* (Freiburg 1941); W. Dürig, 'Disciplina', *Sacris Erudiri* 4 (1952), 245-79; R. Braun, 423-5; J. Fontaine, note on *cor.* 2, 4 (p. 61). — **diaboli altitudines:** Ursinus' conjecture *latitudines*, which was adopted by Rigaltius and Reifferscheid, is evidently wrong. Tert. is here alluding to Apoc. 2, 24 τὰ βάθεα τοῦ Σατανᾶ (Vulg.: *altitudines satanae*); cf. also 1 Cor. 2, 10: τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα πάντα ἐρευνᾷ, καὶ τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ (Vulg.: *profunda dei*);

Iren. *adv. haer.* 2, 22, 3 Harv.: *Admirabiles sophistae et altitudines investigantes incogniti Patris et supercaelestia sacramenta enarrantes*; Arnob. 1, 38: (Christus) *qui ... deus monstravit quid sit, quis, quantus et qualis: qui profundas eius atque inenarrabiles altitudines, quantum nostra quivit mediocritas capere, et intellegere permisit et docuit.* The meaning of this passage is made clear by passages like Arnob. 5, 32: *sub vulgari simplicitate sermonis latet ratio secreta et altitudo involuta mysterii.* The word seems to be especially proper to gnostic usage, cf. the famous passage from *Valent.* 1, 4: *Si bona fide quaeras, concreto vultu, suspenso supercilio 'altum est' aiunt* (sc. Valentiniani); Hippolyt. *refut. omn. haeres.* 5, 6, 4: ἐπεκάλεσαν ἑαυτοὺς γνωστικοὺς φάσκοντες μόνοι τὰ βάθη γιγνώσκειν; Iren. *adv. haer.* 2, 32, 6 Harv.: *qui profunda Bythi adinvenisse se dicunt.* For the concept of Bythos in the doctrine of Valentinus, cf. *Valent.* 7; *an.* 12, 1; see also Knopf's note on 1 Clem. 40, 1: ἐγκεκυφότες εἰς τὰ βάθη τῆς θείας γνώσεως (*HdbNT, Erg. Bd.*, 112-3). We also find this word denoting a human trait of character, e.g. Iudith 8, 14: βάθος καρδίας ἀνθρώπου; Eunap. *Vit. soph.* 197: διὰ τοῦ βάθους τῆς καρδίας. In this connection we are also reminded of Sall. *Iug.* 95, 3: *ad simulanda negotia altitudo ingenii incredibilis* (said of Sulla); Tac. *an.* 3, 44, 4: *tanto impensius in securitatem compositus* (Tiberius), *neque loco neque vultu mutato, sed ut solitum per illos dies egit, altitudine animi, an conpererat modica esse et vulgatis leviora*; *hist.* 4, 86, 3 with Heraeus' note, who also refers to Cic. *off.* 1, 88 and *ad Att.* 4, 6, 3 (βαθύτης). See also H. Schlier, art. 'βάθος', in Kittel, 1, 515-6; Bauer, *Wörterb.* s.v. βάθος; Lohmeyer, note on Apoc. 2, 24 (*HdbNT*, 16, 27). — **in his ... iudicaremur:** in accordance with his *studium variationis*, Tert. uses *in* instead of *propter* or *de*; one could translate: 'in the case of'. There is no reason to follow Böhm, 75, in supposing that *iudicare* is here equivalent to *damnare, punire.*

5. **nisi ... perspexerimus:** the same argumentation occurs in *pat.* 5, 2-3: *Itaque si de aliquo bono sermo est, res postulat contrarium eius quoque boni recensere: quid enim sectandum sit, magis inluminabis, si, quid vitandum sit, proinde digesseris. Consideremus igitur de inpatientia, an sicut patientia in deo ita adversaria eius in adversario nostro* (sc. diabolo) *nata atque comperta sit.* — **caput iniustitiae:** this refers to 1, 4: *in illa* (sc. idololatria) *iniustitia. Quid enim iniustius ea, quae iustitiae patrem nescit?* For the structure of the argument, and for *caput* with the meaning 'summit', see Remark c. On *iniustitia* in Tert. cf. Rambaux, 272-3. — **prius est, ut:** for the meaning of *prius* see Remark c. It is certainly not equivalent with *primum*, as is asserted by Böhm, 76. *Prius est* with *ut* (*ne*) or a subjunctive is very frequent in Tert.'s works, e.g. *idol.* 4, 1; *Marc.* 1, 17, 1; 1, 22, 2; 3, 24, 13; 4, 10, 4; 4, 17, 1. — **dum:** with the meaning 'as, because' or (as in the present case) 'eo, quod' may be joined to either an indicative (*TLL* V, 1: 2208, 25) or a subjunctive

(ib. 2221, 13); cf. Hofm., *Synt.*, 744; Hofm.-Szant., *Synt.*, 614; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 79, and *Beitr.*, 32-3.

Ch. 3. *The maker of any idol is an idolater*

'Idols (images) are not essential for idolatry: long ago there were no images and yet there was idolatry, and even nowadays idolatry exists without idols (§ 1). They are, however, of great importance, because the making of idols has caused an enormous increase of idolatry and has in fact given its name to this bad practice. Hence every art that makes images of whatever sort has become a source (or a summit) of idolatry.

It does not matter of what material the image has been made or what form it has (§ 2). Since even without an image idolatry can be perpetrated, the kind of matter and the sort of form is of no consequence (§ 3).

The term idolum *shows that every* forma *or* formula *(not only a human form) may be an idol. Thus every service (worship) of whatever image is idolatry. Hence the maker of every image is guilty of the same crime, i.e. idolatry. Or do you think that the Jewish people did not commit idolatry, because they consecrated the image of a calf and not of a man? (§ 4).'*

Remarks

a. *Structure.* In this chapter Tertullian opens the attack on one of what he called the ramifications of idolatry, the making of idols. The argument consists of two parts, the first of which ends with the conclusion: every *art* that makes idols of whatever sort is *caput idololatriae.* The conclusion of the second part is: every *artist* who makes idols is guilty of idolatry.

b. *Idolum and idololatria.* Tertullian begins by stressing the fact that idolatry can exist without idols. This statement confirms what we deduced from the end of ch. 1. Idolatry essentially means 'demonolatry', 'the worship of the demons', i.e. the worship of the powers of evil.

Nevertheless the idols are of great importance, i.e. they are a great evil (Tertullian speaks of *monstrum, rude negotium humanae calamitatis*), since they came to existence at the instigation of the devil (*diabolus* is either the leader of the powers of evil or the *Inbegriff* of those powers). Although the idols are not the real object of worship, they are the invention of that real object, viz., the demons; they are the instruments by which the demons draw the human worship away from God to themselves.

c. *Caput idololatriae.* Every art that makes idols is a *caput idololatriae.* With Van der Nat, Thelwall and Kellner one may translate this expression by 'a source of idolatry'. The *TLL* interprets it also in this way (III 415). However, considering the important function of the idols in the domain of idolatry, one

wonders whether Tertullian does not want to say that every art that produces idols is a summit of idolatry (cf. *caput iniustitiae* in 2, 5).

d. *The etymology*. In order to show that 'idol' is not restricted to images of human beings (*Ad hoc* ...), Tertullian refers to the etymology of *idolum*. This etymology leads to the conclusion that *every* form (if used as an idol) must be called idol (*idolum se dici exposcit*).

Tertullian's way of arguing is somewhat peculiar. He first states that *idolum* (= εἴδωλον) is the deminutive of εἶδος and that, just as εἶδος resulted in the Latin word *forma*, εἴδωλον has caused *formula*. Then he draws the above mentioned conclusion. Here a minor has been omitted that could sound as follows: <Now the term *formula*, and also *forma*, does not say a thing about the kind of form>.

e. *The conclusion of the second part*. Tertullian concludes: *inde idololatria omnis circa idolum famulatus et servitus*. Both Van der Nat and Thelwall translate this statement in such a manner that idolatry is its subject: "Accordingly, idolatry is every attendance or servitude to every idol". This would mean that Tertullian gives a definition of idolatry, and Sider, in his above-mentioned book on rhetoric in Tertullian, speaks explicitly of a definition (p. 106). But *a priori* this is improbable, since an author who knows about definitions does not make a definition with *omnis*. This would be the same as defining *homo* as *omne animal rationale*. There is, however, a decisive argument against this interpretation in the context itself. At the beginning of this chapter Tertullian stated that idolatry can exist *without idols*. How could he define now idolatry as "every service of every idol"? The context demands another interpretation, whereby *idololatria* is not subject but predicate: "Every service (worship) of every idol is idolatry". This is exactly the conclusion towards which the whole argument of ch. 3 tended. (Kellner has the correct translation.) And this leads to the further conclusion that the maker of every idol commits idolatry.

f. *Tertullian and Varro*. As was already argued by Eduard Schwartz (*Fleckeisens Jahrb. Suppl.* 16 (1888), 429; cf. also B. de Borries, *Quid veteres philosophi de idololatria senserint* (thesis Göttingen 1918), 63 seqq.), Tert. has borrowed the material for this outline of the history of Roman religion from the first book of Varro's *Antiquitates rerum divinarum*. From this work St. Augustine has preserved the following fragment, *c.d.* 4, 31 (fr. 59 Agahd, fr. 18 Cardauns; we quote the latter edition): *antiquos Romanos plus annos centum et septuaginta deos sine simulacro coluisse. Quod si adhuc ... mansisset, castius dii observarentur* (Cardauns spaces out the words which he regards as a literal quotation) ... *qui primi simulacra deorum posuerunt, eos civitatibus suis et metum dempsisse et errorem addidisse* (cf. also the

various forms of this statement found in *c.d.* which are added by Cardauns *ad loc.*). By general consent this theory can be traced back to Posidonius (see Pohlenz, *Gött. gel. Anz.* 175 (1913), 640-2 and *Die Stoa*, 1, 267; 2, 257-8; Borries, 52-63; Heinemann, *Monatschr. f. Gesch. u. Wiss. des jüd. Volkes* 1919, 113 seqq.; S. Blankert, *Seneca (epist. 90) over natuur en cultuur en Posidonius als zijn bron* (thesis Utrecht, Amsterdam 1940), 148-231; W. Theiler, *Poseidonios. Die Fragmente* (Berlin-New York 1982), 1, fr. 368-369, with the commentary in 2, 275-83).

Posidonius' theory about the evolution of religion, reported more fully in Dio of Prusa's twelfth ('Olympic') oration (of which Theiler has accepted par. 60-61 as fr. 369 of this author) can be summed up as follows: In the primeval age of mankind man lived in immediate contact with the deity; the universe was his temple and he had no need of images, because he possessed an ἔμφυτος ἐπίνοια of the deity that influenced him from every side and especially revealed itself in the visible gods, viz., the sun, the moon, and the stars (Dio 12, 39). Afterwards this direct contact was lost and artificial means were needed to re-establish the broken relationship. Teachers tried to reimpart to man the knowledge of the deity, to give him an ἐπίκτητος ἐπίνοια; these teachers were poets, legislators, sculptors (Dio 12, 39 and 44-6), and finally philosophers who are the only teachers capable of gaining this end who can even give an insight that surpasses the ἐπίκτητος ἐπίνοια. The sculptors (with whom we are here solely concerned) made use of symbols: they could, of course, have represented the divine manifestations which are visible to men (sun, moon, etc.) but those images would have lacked spirit and, therefore, would have missed their aim. For this reason they made use of the human body, which can indeed be regarded as a suitable symbol, because it is the receptacle (ἀγγεῖον) of the human spirit, which is closely related to the divine spirit pervading the universe and giving and governing life (Dio 12, 58-9; cf. Blankert, 157-168). Now, compared to the original situation, this development is a degeneration, as the human symbolization of the deity gives rise to delusions. This train of thought is also found in another fragment of Varro, preserved by Augustine, *c.d.* 7, 5 (XVI fr. 6 Agahd, fr. 225 Cardauns; see Blankert, 190 seqq.). For further particulars see Reinhardt, *Poseidonios* (München 1981), 408-13; id., 'Poseidonios über Ursprung und Entartung', *Orient und Antike* 6 (Heidelberg 1928), 6-24; I. Heinemann, *Poseidonios' metaphysische Schriften* 2 (Breslau 1928; 2nd ed. Hildesheim 1968), 124; Pohlenz, *Die Stoa* 1, 234-6.

Also in the fragment of Varro from which our discussion started we find traces of this elaborate theory. There it is made to fit the case of the oldest phase of Roman culture: absence of images (*sine simulacro coluisse*), a purer form of worship (*castius observarentur*) over a period of about 170 years (the same number of years is mentioned by Plutarch, *Numa*, 8, 14, who also

speaks about a period without temples; according to Borries, 64-7, Plutarch is drawing there upon Varro, whereas Pohlenz, *GGA* 175, 946 supposes that, like Varro, Plutarch is drawing directly upon Posidonius; cf. on this question Theiler 2, 283). By assuming a period of this length Varro alludes to the regal period up to the Tarquinii; in Plin. *n.h.* 35, 157, we find the following note about sculpture: *Varro tradit* (ib. 155) ... *praeterea elaboratam hanc artem Italiae et maxime Etruriae*; *Vulcam Veis accitum, cui locaret Tarquinius Priscus Iovis effigiem in Capitolio dicandam*; *fictilem eum fuisse et ideo miniari solitum*. Here Varro was thinking of the temple on the Capitol which according to the tradition had been vowed by Tarquinius Priscus and built by Tarquinius Superbus, cf. Cic. *rep.* 236 and 44; see Borries, 55-63. By the ancient imageless form of Roman religion Varro (or already Posidonius?) meant the institutions of Numa Pompilius; what he had to say about this theme we find more fully in Tert., *apol.* 25, 12, 3 (= fr. 37 Agahd): *Nam, etsi a Numa Pompilio concepta est curiositas superstitiosa* (from here Cardauns, fr. 38), *nondum tamen aut simulacris aut templis res divina apud Romanos constabat. Frugi religio et pauperes ritus et nulla Capitolia certantia ad caelum, sed temporaria de caespite altaria et vasa adhuc Samia et nidor exilis et deus ipse nusquam. Nondum enim tunc ingenia Graecorum atque Tuscorum fingendis simulacris urbem inundaverant.* A quite similar, but shorter statement is made by Tert. in *nat.* 2, 17, 11-2 (mentioned by Cardauns as one of the *loci similes* of fr. 38, to which he also adds the shorter statements in *apol.* 21, 19 seq., *praescr. haer.* 40, 6 and the present passage).

1. **retro:** in Tert. for the first time fully equivalent to *antea*, see Oehler's note on *spect.* 9 (p. 34 a); Hoppe, *Synt.*, 113; Waltz., *Comm.*, 20; Svennung, *Pallad.* 399-400. For the development of this meaning (the original sense is occasionally still perceptible, e.g. in Cic. *rep.* 1, 58: (reges) *deinceps retro usque ad Romulum*), see Waszink, 302. — **ebullissent:** 'had sprung up like bubbles'. This is a vulgar word, which is very rare in literature before the *Vetus Latina* and Tert. For the meaning, cf. Non. Marc. p. 38, 192: *ebullire est ecfervescere*; *a bullis dictum*. Literally this meaning occurs for the first time in Tert. *Herm.* 41, 1: *ollae undique ebullientis*, before him only metaphorically and mostly transitively, cf. Cic. *fin.* 5, 80 and *Tusc.* 3, 42 (= *iactare*); *animam ebullire* Sen. *apocol.* 4 and Petron. 42, 2; 62, 19 (intrans. *ebullire* with the same meaning Pers. 2, 10). From this use the meaning 'subito aut magna multitudine prorumpere' (*TLL* V, 1: 17, 31-2) developed, which occurs for the first time in Apul. *met.* 2, 30: *dum risus ebullit*; of living beings since the *Vetus Latina* (Ezek. 47, 9 (Weing.): *anima animalium quae ebulliunt ... vivet*) and Tert. (the present instance and *scorp.* 1, 5: *tunc Gnostici erumpunt, tunc Valentiniani proserpunt, tunc omnes martyriorum refragatores ebulliunt*; similarly Hieron. *in Gal.* 1, 1: *Manichaeus et Marcion novelli dogmatis auctor ebulliunt*). In this sense it is also used transitively since Tert. (*Valent.* 8, 1: *alios ebulliunt fetus*) and the *Vetus Latina* (I reg. 5, 6 (Lucifer *Athan.* 1, 12): *et ebullivit* (sc. deus) *illis mures in sedibus*; Ps. 104, 30 (Cas.): *ebullivit terra eorum ranas*; Vulg.: *edidit*, but in Exod. 8, 3: *et ebulliet fluvius ranas*). Moreover Tert., who has a clear preference for this graphic word, uses *ebullire* twice more in a special sense which afterwards occurs only a few times, viz., of an illness in *Scap.* 3, 4: *cum ... convivis vermibus ebullisse* (Claudius Lucius Herminianus), and of passion in *Marc.* 1, 27, 5: *quid non in omnem libidinem ebullis ...?* (imitated by Hieron., *adv. Iovin.* 1, 13: *carnem lascivire et ebullire in libidinem*; for *ebullire vermibus* or *ebullire vermes* numerous similar passages in *TLL* V, 2: 17, 77-18, 9). Obviously the use of the verb *ebullire* expresses Tert.'s deep contempt (cf. *huius monstri*). — **in hodiernum:** is found from Plin. *n.h.* 33, 30 onwards (*TLL* VI, 3: 2855, 30 seqq.). Tert. always writes *in hodiernum (per)manere*, see Waltz., *Ét.*, 119-20; further he mostly uses *ad hodiernum*, which does not occur before him (*TLL*, ib. 22-7); however, *in hodiernum* is found in *Marc.* 3, 7, 8 = *Iud.* 14, 10; *Prax.* 22, 9; *an.* 34, 1 (see Waszink's note, p. 405). — **isto:** = *hoc*, see the note on 2, 3. — **isto nomine ... in isto opere:** as the usual expression is *hoc nomine*, and Tert. more often leaves out the preposition in the first of two corresponding parts of a sentence (e.g. *exh. cast.* 11, 1: *in secundo matrimonio duae uxores eundem circumstant maritum, una spiritu, alia in carne*; numerous instances in Thörn., 1, 5-9), there is no sufficient reason to adopt Mesnart's reading. For this variation of case and prepositional expression in Tacitus, in whose work it is very frequent, see Sörbom, 79-81 (with more literature).

2. **statuarum ... imaginum ... simulacrorum:** these words are often used as synonyms, see *TLL* VII, 1: 405, 11 seqq. *Statuae* are statues, mostly made of metal (cf. Quint. *inst.* 2, 21, 10); the statues of gods are not often called *statuae* (e.g. Sen. *quaest. nat.* 2, 42, 1; Tert. *nat.* 1, 10, 27; Min. Fel. 27, 1). *Imago* is a general word for images of persons (portraits, busts, waxmasks, seals); it is also used of representations of gods (e.g. Varro *r.r.* 1, 1, 4; Lucr. 2, 609; Verg. *Aen.* 7, 179-180; Stat. *Theb.* 10, 105; Tert. *nat.* 1, 12, 15; Min. Fel. 27, 1; see *TLL*, VII, 1: 406, 59 seqq.). *Simulacrum* also can mean both statue and (painted) portrait (the latter e.g. in Cic. *inv.* 2, 1); the general sense is clear from passages such as Cic. *Arch.* 30: *statuas et imagines, non animorum simulacra, sed corporum*; it is especially used of representations of gods (cf. *idol.* 8, 2). — **saeculo intulit:** cf. *ux.* 1, 7, 2: *qui nos mundo infert*. Especially with compound verbs with prefix *in-* Tert. uses a dat., which springs from poetic language. See Hoppe, *Serm. Tert.*, 9-10, and *Synt.*, 27; for this construction in general, cf. Landgraf, *ALL* 8, 69 seqq.; Löfst., *Synt.*, 1, 189-93. — **rude illud negotium calamitatis humanae:** the adjective *rudis*

points to the primitive situation of imageless idolatry, elsewhere (11, 6) called *informis idololatria. Humanae calamitatis* can be understood as a genitivus possessivus or a genitivus qualitatis. In the one case the *humana calamitas* is the cause of the practice, in the other it could be the result. Thelwall chooses the first interpretation ('that former rude business of human desaster'); we prefer the second: 'that rude activity, so pernicious to man'. — **negotium:** cf. *praescr.* 40, 7: (diabolus) *qui ... ipsas res, de quibus sacramenta Christi administrantur, tam aemulanter adfectavit exprimere in negotiis idololatriae*; *pud.* 17, 1: (epistulae Pauli) *omnes in luxuriae et lasciviae et libidinis negotia iaculantur*. For *negotium* used *in malam partem*, see already Cic. *Tusc.* 1, 86. — **et inde iam:** introduces a conclusion, as twice in this very chapter (§ 4) and further in *an.* 45, 3; *apol.* 19, 2. So there is no good reason to prefer Mesnart's reading *exinde iam*, the more so, as in Tert. *exinde* mostly has temporal meaning (= *deinde*): see Löfst., *Krit. Apol.*, 94; Thierry, 175-6. 184; Hofm., *Synt.*, 492. — **Neque enim:** explains both *omnis* (ars) and *quoquo modo*; *neque enim* and *non enim* are used promiscuously, see Kühn.-Stegm. 2, 43, n. 7 and Löfst., *Synt.*, 1, 340. — **plastes:** according to Schöllgen, 90, this term denotes either the artist who makes the plaster cast for a statue in bronze or—less probably—the sculptor. In this connection he quotes Blümner, *Technologie* 2-3, n. 4. — **caelator:** Schöllgen, 90, regards here, too, various meanings as possible. Tert. may mean the chasing or engraving of the image of a god on a metal ground ("auf metallenem Grund") but also—less probably—the art of the sculpture in a wider sense. Here he quotes Blümner, *op. cit.*, 284-5; von Petrovits, *Spezialisierung*, 88. The word also occurs in *idol.* 8, 2. The two substantives are also mentioned together by Porphyrio, *comm. in Hor. sat.* 1, 3, 90: *Euandrum hunc caelatorem ac plasten statuarum.* — **phrygio detexat:** *phrygio*, 'embroiderer', is derived from Φρύγιος (Ernout-Meillet s.v.). The Phrygians were supposed to have first practised this art, cf. Plin. *n.h.* 8, 195-6; in this art they were highly skilled, see Blümner, *Privataltert.*, 253-4, and *Technologie*, 1, 209; Schöllgen, 90-1. The verb *detexere* (for the meaning, cf. Ulp. *dig.* 34, 2, 22: *quod in tela est, nondum pertextum vel detextum, contextum appellatur*; Serv. *ad Verg. ecl.* 2, 72) is used by Tert., because he thinks of the picture as a separate entity; more exact would be *insuere* or *intexere*, cf. *cult. fem.* 1, 1, 3: *age nunc, si ab initio rerum ... Phryges insuerent*; Ovid *met.* 6, 577: *purpureasque notas filis intexuit albis.* — **de materia refert:** for the combinations *refert de* and *interest de* (the latter from Varro *r.r.* 2, 7, 6 onwards, see *TLL* V, 1, 72, 72), which are frequent in Tert., see Hartel, 4, 17; Waszink, 84. — **filo:** in the series of materials *gypso* and *coloribus* correspond with *plastes*, and *lapide*, *aere* and *argento* with *caelator*; so a material must have been mentioned here to correspond with *phrygio*. This can only be *filo* which is found in the margin of Mesnart's edition (*Bmg*). As the present sentence contains all kinds of data

about sculptors, the *figulo* found in *AB* can be understood to be a mistake in writing; if, however, *filo* is to be regarded as a later normalization, it is impossible to explain the evidently erroneous *figulo*. For *filum* in this connection, cf. e.g. Ovid *met.* 6, 68-9: *illic et lentum filis inmittitur aurum*; ib. 577 (quoted above); Apul. *met.* 4, 8 (80, 10 Halm): *vestes ... intextae filis aureis.*

3. **quam ... quam:** it is not necessary to adopt the reading of Mesnart and Gelenius (*qua de ... qua de*) since *quam ... quam* is used still seven times in Tert.'s works: *idol.* 4, 4. 10, 3. 18, 6; *nat.* 1, 10, 48. 2, 9, 8; *orat.* 22, 3; *Marc.* 5, 1, 8. See Oehler's note on *idol.* 4 (p. 71 d); Hoppe, *Synt.*, 77 and *Beitr.*, 125. — **ne:** '<which I say,> lest someone should think ...'; see Waszink, 139-40. — **qui:** for the use of *qui* instead of *quis* after *si* and *ne* see Löfst., *Synt.*, 2, 79-96; Waszink's note on *an.* 25, 8 (331-2). — **humana effigie:** cf. Tac. *hist.* 2, 3: *simulacrum deae non effigie humana.*

4. **Ad hoc ... interpretatio:** in order to support his argument, Tert. frequently discusses the exact meaning of a word, e.g. in *nat.* 2, 4, 1-8 he considers the etymology of θεός (see Lortz, 1, 167-8); in *orat.* 22, 3 he explores the difference in meaning between *mulier* (γυνή) and *femina* (θηλεῖα), and the use of *mulier* to indicate the sex, see Diercks, 217-8. Cf. also *praescr.* 20, 4: *apostoli — quos haec appellatio missos interpretatur —*; *Marc.* 4, 14, 1: *beati mendici* (Luc. 6, 20) *— sic enim exigit interpretatio vocabuli, quod in Graeco est —*; *nat.* 1, 3, 8-10 = *apol.* 3, 5; *spect.* 5, 3; *Herm.* 19-20; *res.* 18, 4-19, 1; *virg. vel.* 4-7. — **sonat:** = *significat, sapit*; cf. *nat.* 1, 3, 7: *ego arbitror nullam esse vocabulo aut homini querellam, nisi cum quid aut barbarum sonat aut infaustum sapit vel impudicum ...*; *apol.* 3, 5: *quae accusatio vocabulorum, nisi si aut barbarum sonat aliqua vox nominis aut infaustum aut maledicum aut impudicum?*; *Herm.* 32, 3. Thus already Cic. *off.* 3, 83: *honestate igitur dirigenda utilitas est, et quidem sic, ut haec duo verbo inter se discrepare, re unum sonare videantur.* See Waltzing, *Comm.*, 38; some instances of a different nature in Hoppe, *Synt.*, 15. — **ab eo ... fecit:** the conjectures of Reifferscheid and others are completely unnecessary. Cf. the discussion of this sentence by Waszink (*Mnem.* ser. III, 3 (1936), 171-2), which for the sake of clearness may be quoted here in full: 'secundum Reiff. ... Tertullianus sic loquitur: 'ut ex voce εἶδος vocabulum εἰδωλον deducitur, ita apud nos *forma formulam* fecit.' Puto verba hoc modo interpretanda esse: 'Latine exstat vocabulum *forma* quod voci Graecae εἶδος respondet; deminutivum εἰδωλον, a vocabulo εἶδος deductum, nos coegit etiam tale deminutivum effingere ut vocem istam Latine reddere possemus: en originem vocabuli *formula*.' Isidorus *etym.* 8, 11, 13-4 also gives the text, as it has been handed down in the *Agob.*, with, as a sole divergence, *facit* instead of *fecit*. The etymology here given by Tert. occurs nowhere else; see H. Funke, art. 'Götterbild', *RAC*

XI, 666; cf. also Büchsel, art. 'εἴδωλον', Kittel 2, 373-5. Isidorus continues with the refutation of an apparently current, fantastic derivation: *quidam ... inperite dicunt idolum ex dolo sumpsisse nomen, quod diabolus creaturae cultum divini nominis invexit*; the same derivation is given by Filastrius, 109, 7 (72, 5-7 Marx), Fulgentius *Mitol.* 1, 1, 15 and Cassiod. *in ps.* 96, 7. For that matter it is also incorrect to call εἴδωλον a diminutive of εἶδος, since it is an independent word derived from the root *ueid-*; cf. Schwyzer 1, 483. Possibly—if he has not invented this etymology *pour le besoin de la cause*—Tert. has been brought to this view by the circumstance that Latin forms diminutives in *-lus/lum* and *-la*, e.g. *servolus, filiolus, lineola.* — **omnis forma vel formula:** *forma* is indeed used to indicate images, both by heathens and Christians, cf. Cic. *orat.* 9: *cum faceret* (sc. Phidias) *Iovis formam aut Minervae*; *leg.* 2, 45; Ovid *Pont.* 2, 8, 62: *colitur pro Iove forma Iovis* (see *TLL* VI, 1: 1082, 16 seqq.). On the other hand, the use of *formula* with this sense is extremely rare, cf. e.g. Filastr. 21, 2 (9, 27-30 M.): *in eo* (sc. lapide) *incisiones et impressiones ... scalpentes Iudaei et formulas diversas tollentes ... baiulabant in collo*; see *TLL*, ib., 1114, 15 seqq. — **circa:** = *erga*, from Cels. *Dig.* 37, 6, 6, 6: *officium avi circa neptem* onwards; see *TLL* III: 1091, 55; Hofm., *Synt.*, 515. — **populus:** = Israel; cf. 5, 4; 19, 2; *an.* 9, 8; 15, 4; *bapt.* 9, 1; *cor.* 9, 3; *res.* 31, 1. Many instances have been collected by Kroymann, *Q.C.*, 104; see also H. Janssen, 57-8. Already in the LXX and the NT we find λαός in the sense of 'Israel', see Strathmann, art. 'λαός' in Kittel 4, 34-7 and 51-3. Löfstedt (*Synt.* 2, 464 seqq.) explains the name *gentes*, used to denote heathens, from the fact that in profane language this word had an unfavourable meaning ('foreign peoples, barbarians, provincials') and was used in contrast with *populus* (*Romanus*); this shade of meaning is already present in Cic. *de orat.* 2, 76: *qui* (sc. Hannibal) ... *cum populo Romano omnium gentium victore certasset*; explicitly in Sall. *ep. ad Caes.* 2, 5, 5: *populus, qui ... cunctis gentibus imperitabat* and Florus 1, 44, 3: *victor gentium populus.* Of course this shade of meaning also explains why we do find *populus* used to indicate the Jewish people.

Ch. 4. *The testimony of Scripture*

'God forbids the making of idols as much as He forbids their worship. In so far as the making of an idol precedes the worship of it, in so far the prohibition to make an idol is even more fundamental than the prohibition to worship them.

The text of Exod. 20, 4 (cf. Deut. 5, 8) shows that God forbids the making of every *idol (§ 1). And Enoch had already earlier stated that the demons had brought to worship* every thing. *Thus human error worships* everything *except God. Of all these things man makes images, and by consecrating these images*

to the demons he perpetrates idolatry (§ 2). Because the makers of idols make this possible, all these sins of idolatry must be imputed to them.

At several places Holy Scripture condemns the idol makers together with the worshippers of idols (§§ 3-4). The idol maker is even a more serious idolater, since, as was argued in the beginning of the chapter, God's condemnation of the maker of idols precedes that of their worshipper (§ 5).'

Remarks

a. *The structure of the argument.* In the previous chapter Tertullian gave the rational fundament of his thesis that the maker of idols is an idolater. The present chapter presents the testimony of Scripture for this thesis. The first sentence contains the thesis: 'God forbids the making of idols as much as He forbids their worship'. Now the worship of idols is, of course, idolatry. Thus making them is so as well.

Tertullian's argument consists of two parts:

1) Scripture forbids the making of idols.
2) Scripture puts those who worship idols and those who make them on the same level.

But before giving his argument Tertullian sharpens his thesis by stating that the making of idols is even a greater evil than their worship, because the making of an idol is prior to, and therefore more fundamental than its worship.

Van der Nat (p. 62) rightly distinguishes two parts in this chapter; but the way he links up the first part with chapter 3 is misleading. The third chapter is not an "introduction to the attack on the makers of idols" (p. 53), but an independent argument. It is a rational argument which is followed now by an argument based on authority, viz., the testimony of Scripture. The words *deus prohibet* could be the title of this chapter. (Tertullian often gives the argument from Scripture *after* the rational argument. Clear instances are *an.* 7 after 6, and *an.* 26 after 25.)

Van der Nat makes a subdistinction in the first part of ch. 4 between 'the making of *idols*' and 'the manufacture of *any likeness*', referring to the two parts of the quotation from Exod. 20, 4 and Deut. 5, 18. In his view Tertullian's argument with regard to the second category is "by no means correct" (p. 63). He states: "notably the sentence *eorum* (= *omnium*) *imagines idola, imaginum consecratio idololatria* serves a mere rhetorical purpose, for if there can only be question of *idololatria* by means of *imaginum consecratio* (see for this notion comm. on 15, 5), then it follows that the *imagines* are by themselves neither idols nor sinful. Therefore, the first part of the sentence (*eorum imagines idola*) is either incorrect (viz., if *idola* has the meaning of 'idols', which is certainly Tert.'s intention) or a tautology (viz., if *idola* is

equivalent to *formae*, in accordance with the definition given in 3, 4). In both cases the sentence furnishes no argument in favour of Tert.'s point of view. Of course Tert. deliberately identifies *imagines* with *idola*, in order to enable himself to designate all images as idols''.

Here one should observe that Tertullian does translate εἴδωλον in Exod. 20, 4 by *idola*, but that for him *idolum* has a much larger sense. It includes all kinds of *images* which are devoted to the demons by *consecratio*. In his view those images are, indeed, by themselves of no importance. The *consecratio* makes them sinful (see J. C. M. van Winden, '*Idolum* and *idololatria* in Tertullian', *Vig. Chr.* 36 (1982), 108-14). This means that to Tertullian the distinction between the 'idols' and the 'other likenesses' in Exodus is not important. They are both covered by the term *idola*, as Tertullian understands it. His argument is as follows: as appears from the *lex divina* (Ex. and Deut.) and Enoch, man makes images of every thing; these images are consecrated to the demons and it is by this *consecratio* that they become an instrument of idolatry. Tertullian expresses this in a very condensed form: *Eorum imagines idola, imaginum consecratio idololatria*.

b. *Enim hoc ~ Enoch*. In § 4, 4 Van der Nat reads *Antecesserat enim hoc praedicens*, trying to save the reading of A: *.nim hoc*. He thinks that *enim* refers to the distinction between *idola* and the *other similitudines* in the Exodus text. This distinction, however, is in our view unimportant to Tertullian, as was argued just now. But *enim* could also refer to every image, including the *idola* in the proper sense. Van der Nat's translation could, then, be maintained: ''For had not he gone before who prophesied ...''.

But there is another, very serious, difficulty against this interpretation. The pronoun *hoc* is intolerable here, since the verb *praedicare* now gets a double object, viz., the pronoun *hoc* and the *acc. c. inf.* See the translation: ''who prophesied *this*, *that* ...''. (One should bear in mind that an acc. c. inf. is not a subordinate clause!)

Because a pronoun *hoc* is unacceptable and *enim* at least unnecessary (it is even somewhat strange that the precept of Exodus is *explained* by words of Enoch), we prefer to follow the conjecture of Pamelius, followed by Rigaltius, who reads *Enoch* instead of *enim hoc*. The corruption is easy to explain if one recalls that *enim* in manuscripts was often abbreviated $\overline{en}$ and the old form of the name *Enoch* was *Enoc* (see *ad* 4, 2 *Enoch*).

Moreover, the verb *antecesserat*, which announces an older authority, demands a subject. Now Van der Nat states that in various places Tertullian is first silent about the name of his authority and then mentions it afterwards with the addition of *idem*. It is true that such cases occur rather frequently in Tert.'s works (many instances are given by Thörnell, 2, 3. 10-12; cf. also Waszink, 365. 516 and *Vig. Chr.* 6 (1952), 189, to which Van der Nat adds

some others). However, in the passages quoted there is usually some indication about the name which is going to be mentioned: for instance, in *an.* 28, 2 the name of Pythagoras is preceded by *Samius sophista*, whereas here it is impossible to understand at once that the subject of *antecesserat* is Enoch.

1. **materiam idololatriae:** 'the material occasion, the means'; cf. e.g. *cult. fem.* 1, 5, 1: *aurum et argentum, principes materiae cultus saecularis*; *exh. cast.* 2, 5: *neque enim diabolus voluntatem ei* (sc. Adam) *imposuit delinquendi, sed materiam voluntati subministravit*. See *TLL* VIII: 464, 14 seqq.; Thierry, 129-30. — **ne ... mari:** the LXX reads: οὐ ποιήσεις σεαυτῷ εἴδωλον οὐδὲ παντὸς ὁμοίωμα, ὅσα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω καὶ ὅσα ἐν τῇ γῇ κάτω καὶ ὅσα ἐν τοῖς ὕδασιν ὑποκάτω τῆς γῆς. A more literal translation of the second part is given in *scorp.* 2, 2: *Non facies tibi simulacrum eorum quae in caelo et quae in terra deorsum et quae in mari infra terram.* — **eiusmodi artibus interdixit servis dei:** according to Claesson's index the verb *interdicere* is found 29 times in Tert.'s works; however, the quotation 'Ux. II 8, 4' is wrong, and in *idol.* 5, 4 we should not read *interdixit* but *indixit*. In the remaining 27 instances we find the ablative of the object (as in *aqua et igni interdicere*) three times, viz., in the present passage, in *apol.* 24, 6: *interdicere optione divinitatis* and *cor.* 7, 1: *rationes ... quae nostro privatim capiti coronamentis, et quidem omnibus, interdicunt*. As a transitive verb *interdicere* is found 21 times, e.g. *paen.* 3, 13: *voluntatis interdicendo delicta*; *spect.* 16, 1: *Cum ergo furor interdicitur nobis*; of these instances 14 contain a part. perf. pass., e.g. *Marc.* 2, 25, 2: *de interdicta fruge sumens*. Finally we find *interdicere de* in three cases, e.g. *idol.* 11, 4: *quod mihi de stupro interdictum sit* (further *mon.* 15, 1 and *apol.* 45, 3).

2. **Antecesserat Enoch:** for the reading *Enoch* see Remark. According to Tert., the book of Enoch precedes the decalogue, as it was written before the Flood, cf. *cult. fem.* 1, 3 (for this reason the *lex divina* mentioned in the preceding sentence can not be the subject of *antecesserat*). In reality this book was composed during the first two centuries B.C., see Charles, *The Apocrypha*, 2, 163-4. 170-1, and *The Book of En.*, X-XI. LII-LVI; see now also Black, 3. In *cult. fem.* 1, 3 Tert. emphatically defends the canonicity of this book, which in *apol.* 22, 3 he assigns to the *litterae sanctae*, and of which in *idol.* 15, 5 he says that it was inspired by the Holy Spirit (*spiritus sanctus ... praececinit per antiquissimum propheten Enoch*); here the book of Enoch is put on one level with Isaiah and the psalms of David. For the value set on this book during the first centuries A.D., see Windisch's notes on Iudas 14-5 (*HdbNT*, 15, 45) and *Barn.* 4, 3 and 16, 5 (ib., *Erg. B.*, 318-9 and 390); Charles, *The Apocrypha*, 2, 165, and *The Book of En.*, XIII-XIV; Tert.'s use of this book is thoroughly discussed by J. Daniélou, *Origines*, 140-9; cf. also J. T. Milik, *The books of Enoch* (Oxford 1976), 78-80. Tert. here follows

Enoch 19, 1; cf. below (p. 115) the note on *daemonas et spiritus desertorum angelorum*. Cf. also Rambaux, 22, n. 82. — **omnia elementa:** here, as usually in apologetic literature, the word *elementa* does not only indicate the four primal substances, but is used in the wider sense frequently found in later authors, also indicating the heavenly bodies and elementary powers (sun, moon, planets, earth, sea, winds), cf. e.g. *virg. vel.* 4, 5; *nat.* 2, 3, 4; 2, 3, 7; 2, 5, 2 (cf. also Waltz., *Ét.*, 228). For the history and semantic development of this word, see Diels, *Elementum* (Leipzig 1899), especially 41 seqq.; O. Lagercrantz, *Elementum* (Uppsala 1911); Dibelius, *Geisterwelt*, 227-30, and his note on Col. 2, 20 (*HdbNT*, 12, 27-8); Cumont, *Rel. or.*, 189-90 with the notes (especially n. 18, p. 298); Lortz, 1, 166, n. 160; H. Koller, 'Stoicheion', *Glotta* 34 (1955), 161-74; W. Burkert, 'Στοιχεῖον, Eine semasiologische Studie', *Philologus* 103 (1959) 167-97; W. Vollgraff, 'Elementum', *Mnem.*, ser. IV, 2 (1949), 89-115; A. Lumpe, art. 'Elementum', *RAC* 4, 1073-1100; id., 'Der Begriff "Element" im Altertum', *Arch. f. Begriffsgeschichte* 7 (1962), 285-93; A. Adam, 'Die sprachliche Herkunft des Wortes elementum', *Nov. Test.* 6 (1962), 229-32. *Elementum* as a translation of στοιχεῖον was first introduced into Latin by Lucretius, see Diels, *op. cit.*, 5-12 (especially 9) and 68-70. Worship of the elements, though sometimes regarded as the least objectionable error (see Wendland, *Kultur*, 392; Lortz, 1, 166), has been combated from old. Short warnings already in Deut. 4, 19; Ier. 10, 2 seqq.; it is elaborately discussed in Sap. 13, 1-9; Philo *vita contempl.* 3; *decal.* 53 and 66 (see the collected passages in Wendland, *Die Therapeuten*, 706-7); in the NT Gal. 4, 3. 9; Col. 2, 8 (here the angels governing the elements are especially thought of: everything in the world has its angel, see Lietzmann's note on Gal. 4, 3 (*HdbNT* 10, 24-5); Dibelius on Col. 2, 8 (ib., 12, 19-21 and 28-30), and *Geisterwelt*, 78-88; Diels, *Elem.* 50-7; Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 50, n. 1; Schürer, *ZNTW* 6 (1905), 21, n. 2). In Christian apologetics one finds an uninterrupted tradition, cf. Arist. *apol.* 3-6 (see Geffcken's comm., 49-59); Athenag. *legat.* 16 and 22 (Geffcken's comm., 191-3 and 207-8); Tat. *orat.* 4 (5, 6-9 Schw.) and 21 (24, 4-10): Theophil. *ad Autol.* 1, 4 and 2, 15; Tert. *nat.* 2, 3, 6; Lact. *d.i.* 2, 5, 1 seqq. The arguments are mainly derived from the polemics of the Sceptics against the Stoa (i.a. transience and mutability); see the discussion by Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, XIX-XX. 51-2. 207. — **omnem mundi censum:** here *census* has the meaning of *apparatus*, as e.g. in *Prax.* 3, 5: *totum censum monarchiae* (see Evans, 200-1), a meaning derived from that of *opes, divitiae*, e.g. Cic. *Flacc.* 52: *homini egenti, sine censu* (*TLL* III: 809, 28 seqq.). Before Tert. this metaphorical use only occurs in a few passages in Manilius, i.a. 2, 69 and 4, 877 (in both cases there is a divergent reading *sensum* (*-us*), just as in the passage under discussion); see *TLL* III: 810, 48 seqq. Here, *census* cannot have the meaning 'class, group, number', which occurs for the first time in Tert. (see *TLL* ib.: 808, 70-80; Waszink, 155), as

in that case the word is accompanied by a noun in the genitive or by an adjective denoting the members of the group, cf. *an.* 8, 1: *corporalium ... censu*; *nat.* 2, 1, 10: *deorum censum*; *virg. vel.* 4, 5: *omnis census elementorum*; *Marc.* 2, 10, 5 and *pud.* 4, 1: *delictorum ... censum*; *Valent.* 32, 1: *census animalis* (also ib. 29, 3); *carn. Chr.* 8, 4: *de peccatorio censu*. Only *an.* 31, 5: *de tanto Graeciae censu* shows a resemblance to the present passage but it is still essentially different, since there *census* should be supplied with the genitive *animarum*. For *Prax.* 8, 1 where, according to Waszink, *census* also has this meaning, see also Evans, 240. *Census* as a synonym of *origo* is found almost 50 times in Tert., and further only once in Arnobius and Filastrius and twice in Rufinus (who, like Jerome, was well acquainted with Tert.'s works); see *TLL* III: 808, 70-809, 27. — **daemonas et spiritus desertorum angelorum:** these words have in some way to do with that explanation of Gen. 6, 2 in which the υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ in the LXX were interpreted as the 'angels of God' (the Codex Alexandrinus even reads ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ). Those (fallen) angels had intercourse with mortal women and got children by them, who were giants. Sometimes those giants are said to be demons, sometimes it is said that they have been destroyed but that their spirits remained on the earth, and that those 'spirits' are the demons. It stands to reason that these 'spirits of the giants' are in fact the 'spirits of the deserted angels' (cf. R. Bauckham, 'The Fall of the Angels as the Source of Philosophy in Hermias and Clement of Alexandria', *Vig. Chr.* 39 (1985), 313-30). And herewith we come to one possibility of explaining Tertullian's words under discussion here: the *spiritus desertorum angelorum* are the *daemones*. In other words, *et* is explicative: 'the demons, i.e. the spirits of the deserting angels'. According to Van der Nat, *desertorum angelorum* is a *genetivus inhaerentiae*: 'the spirits, who are the fallen angels'. In combination with the interpretation of *et* as explicative one comes to an equalization of *daemones* = *spiritus* = *desertores angeli*. Most time, however, fallen angels and demons are distinguished, as in Tert., *apol.* 22, 3 where the demons are a *gens* more corrupted than the fallen angels: *sed quomodo de angelis quibusdam sua sponte corruptis corruptior gens daemonum evaserit, damnata a deo cum generis auctoribus et, quem diximus, principe, apud litteras sanctas ordo cognoscitur*. Tert. obviously refers to the Book of Enoch, which he considers as canonical. For the history of this remarkable interpretation of Gen. 6, 2, see Waszink's note on *an.* 2, 3 (p. 105). — *Desertorum* is an attribute to *angelorum*. Tert. often uses nouns, especially those in *-tor* and *-trix*, as adjectives; cf. e.g. *cult. fem.* 1, 2, 2: *desertores spiritus*; *apol.* 35, 12: *angelis desertoribus*; *cult. fem.* 2, 10, 2: *angeli peccatores*; *an.* 2, 3: *apostatarum spirituum*. See Hoppe, *Synt.*, 94-5; Hofm., *Synt.*, 458-9. *Angelus* (ἄγγελος; see for this conception Dibelius, *Geisterwelt*, 209-21; G. Kittel, art. 'ἄγγελος', etc. in Kittel, 1, 72-86) had its specific meaning already in Greek, at the time when it was adopted in Latin; it occurs

already in the old North-African versions of the Bible, see Mohrm., *Aug.*, 79-80, and *Tert. Apol.*, LXXXVIII. For more particulars on Tert's demonology, see 1, 5. — **adversus deum:** in Tert.'s works this prepositional expression always means *contra Deum*, 'against God', cf. 7, 1; *spect.* 2, 9; *praescr.* 40, 9. — **praedicens ... consecrarentur:** according to Charles (*The Apocrypha*, 2, 182, and *The Book of Enoch*, 42), Tert. here follows Enoch 19, 1: Καὶ εἶπέν μοι Οὐριήλ· ἐνθάδε οἱ μιγέντες ἄγγελοι ταῖς γυναιξὶν στήσονται, καὶ τὰ πνεύματα αὐτῶν πολύμορφα γενόμενα λυμαίνεται τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ πλανήσει αὐτοὺς ἐπιθύειν τοῖς δαιμονίοις μέχρι τῆς μεγάλης κρίσεως. In Charles' translation this passage reads as follows: 'and Uriel said to me: here shall stand the angels who have connected themselves with women, and their spirits assuming different forms are defiling mankind and shall lead them astray into sacrificing to demons <as gods, *Eth.*>, here shall they stand, till <the day of, *Eth.*> the great judgment in which they shall be judged till they are made an end of'. (In his new edition Black refers also to this Tertullianean passage (p. 161).) It is true that this is the only passage of the book of Enoch which shows a resemblance to Tert.'s words. However, the similarity is insufficient to warrant the conclusion that Tert. had this passage exclusively in mind; for instance, the elements, which he mentions first, are not found in this passage of Enoch; however, Enoch does discuss the worship of the elements in 80, 2-8. Therefore we do best to assume that Tert. is here expressing in his own words a combination of ideas which he had found in the book of Enoch. That the formulation is entirely his own is also evident from the structure of the sentence, which bears the stamp of Tert.'s style, especially the climax built up by the successive parts of the sentence: *omnia elementa — omnem mundi censum*; *quae caelo, quae mari, quae terra continentur*, and the opposition *pro deo — adversus deum.* — **Omnia ... conditorem:** cf. *apol.* 24, 10: *sed apud vos* (sc. Romanos) *quodvis colere ius est praeter deum verum*; *Marc.* 5, 19, 6: (Deus) *cuius admiseramus offensam colentes conditionem* (i.e., the creation) *adversus creatorem*; *spect.* 2, 9. It is a commonplace in apologetics against the worship of elements, cf. e.g. Arist. *apol.* 3, 2; Athenag. *legat.* 15-6; Lact. *d.i.* 2, 5, 5. 2, 6, 1. Cf. also Sap. 13; Rom. 1, 25: καὶ ἐλάτρευσαν τῇ κτίσει παρὰ τὸν κτίσαντα (see Lietzmann's note, *HdbNT* 8, 33, and Käseman's note, ib. 8a, 43-4. The same theme is found in Philo, see Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 50. 189-93; Wendland, *Die Therapeuten*, 706 seqq. — **omnium conditorem:** τὸν κτίστην τῶν ὅλων, cf. e.g. *paen.* 1, 2. The translation of κτίστης in its specifically Christian sense by *conditor* was greatly facilitated by the circumstance that in philosophical Latin literature, too, this substantive was already used with the meaning 'creator', cf. e.g. Manil. 2, 701: *conditor mundi*; Sen. *provid.* 5, 8: *omnium conditor*; see *TLL* IV: 146, 83 seqq.; Teeuwen, 129; Mohrm., *Aug.*, 173. — **idololatria:** Mesnart's and Gelenius' reading *idololatra* cannot be correct, since everywhere else Tert. has the nominative *idololatres* (in total five times; three times in *idol.*: 1, 1; 14, 4; 24, 4). In 10, 2 Gelenius' conjecture *idololatra* is, of course, also wrong. — **in artificem ... deputetur:** for Tert.'s use of *deputare* in general, see the note on 1, 5. *Deputare* connected with *in* followed by an accusative also occurs for the first time in Tert.'s works. The usual meaning of this expression is 'to reckon with, to attribute to': *Herm.* 32, 2: *eum spiritum conditum ostendens* (sc. Amos 4, 13) *qui in terras conditas deputabatur* ('showing that that spirit was created which was reckoned to belong to the <equally> created earth', Waszink's translation, 69); *Marc.* 4, 34, 12: *nationum in Abrahae censum deputandarum*; *an.* 13, 1: *ut ... id ..., cui massa substantiae praeerit, in officium naturale substantiae deputetur*; *Marc.* 5, 19, 11; *pud.* 14, 27. Rather frequently *deputare in* is connected with words denoting the death-penalty or other forms of punishment, e.g. Tert. *cult. fem.* 1, 2, 1: *et illi ... damnati in poenam mortis deputantur* (Sulp. Sev. *epist. app.* 2, 3: *in mortem*; Alcim. Avit. *hom.* 16, 2: *in interitum*); *Lex Visigoth.* 6, 4, 8: *in carcerem*; *Mirac. Theclae* 7: *in exilium.* — **Denique:** as the English 'after all' *denique* introduces a sentence which contains a decisive confirmation of what precedes. — **praedamnat:** 'pre-damnations' are all norms or judgements which precede (and determine) the proper damnation. Cf. e.g. *apol.* 3, 2: *cum sit iustius occulta de manifestis praeiudicare quam manifesta de occultis praedamnare. Praedamnare* is a rather rare verb, which is found for the first time in Livy (4, 41, 11 and 27, 18, 8). Cf. especially Suet. *Aug.* 52, 6: *ne ... destituere ac praedamnare amicum existimaretur.* This verb is found no less than fifteen times in Tert.'s works; it also occurs in *idol.* 17, 3.

3. **et rursus:** Tert. is quoting Enoch 99, 6-7; Gelenius, Oehler and Reifferscheid make the quotation begin at the word *iuro*. It is true that Tert. often introduces a second quotation from a book with *et rursus* (e.g. *poen.* 4, 2; *scorp.* 2, 3; 12, 3; 13, 4; *res.* 23, 2; 24, 2; 47, 4; *pud.* 2, 5; *an.* 11, 3); for this and similar formulae, see Borleffs, *Mnem., N.S.* 60 (1933), 85, n. 4 and 86, n. 1. In this case, however, the words *et rursus* belong to the text of Enoch, as is evident from Charles' translation of the Ethiopic version (from the Greek version of Enoch only fragments have been preserved, for which cf. the edition of Flemming-Radermacher (GCS), 13-5): 'and again I swear to you, ye sinners, that sin is prepared for a day of unceasing bloodshed. And they who worship impure spirits and demons and all kinds of idols not according to knowledge, shall get no manner of help from them'. Black's translation begins with 'Again', leaving out 'and'. — **quod:** the first certain instance of *quod* with a subjunctive instead of an acc. c. inf. is found in the *Bellum Hispan.* 36, 1: *legati renuntiaverunt, quod Pompeium in potestate haberent.* Next it occurs in Petronius, Tacitus (very rarely), Plinius minor and Suetonius; see Hofm., *Synt.*, 721; Hofm.-Szant., *Synt.*, 576-7; G. Mayen, *De particulis quod quia quoniam* (thesis Kiel 1889), 47, states that in quotations

from the *Vetus Latina* Tert. has 44 instances of the acc. c. inf., 48 of *quod*, 13 of *quia*, 3 of *quoniam*, and in other passages 2500 instances of the acc. c. inf., 56 of *quod*, 11 of *quia* and 7 of *quoniam*. For further material see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 75-6 (*quod* with a subj. is much more frequent than *quod* with an ind.); Böhm, 86-7, who rightly underlines the importance in this context of the Greek text of the NT. — **in diem sanguinis perditionis:** in his commentary Charles explains the divergence from the Ethiopic text as follows (*The Book of En.*, 245): 'it will be observed here that Tert.'s *in diem sanguinis perditionis* = εἰς ἡμέραν αἵματος ἀπωλείας = lĕ-jom dam lĕ-id, where lĕ-id is corrupt for lĕ-ad = ἀδιαλείπτου as in our text.' *Sanguinis* is a genitive of quality without an attribute, here of course under the influence of Hebrew (see Löfst., *Synt.*, 1, 281), cf. *bapt.* 8, 3: *animal simplicitatis et innocentiae*; ib. 28, 5 *res sanguinis*; *an.* 1, 2: *philosophus, gloriae animal*, with Waszink's note (p. 87). — **iniustitia:** for the justification of this reading we refer to Van der Nat, *Vig. Chr.* 17 (1963), 71-4. — **Qui servitis lapidibus:** on the one hand Enoch speaks of 'serving (worshipping) stones', on the other hand of 'serving phantoms, demons and evil spirits'. For Tert.'s view on the relationship between images and demons, see our Remarks at ch. 1. — **imagines ... fictiles:** elaborate enumerations of the materials of which the idols consist are a commonplace in Jewish and Christian apologetics, cf. e.g. Ps. 113, 12; 134, 15; Dan. 5, 23; Sap. 13, 10; Jub. 11, 4; Acts 17, 29; *carm. Sibyll.* 5, 80 seqq.; Apoc. 9, 20-1 (see Lohmeyer's note, *HdbNT* 16, 80); 2 Clem. 1, 6 (see Knopf's note, ib., *Erg. Bd.*, 154-5); Theophil. *ad Autol.* 1, 1; *ep. ad Diogn.* 2, 2-3; Min. Fel. 24, 7-8; Clem. Alex. *protr.* 4, 56; Arnob. 6, 14-6, cf. also 2, 39; Prud. *cathem.* 12, 198-9, likewise Athenag. *legat.* 15 (in 17, however, he uses the philosophical term ὕλη, see Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 196; cf. Theophil. *ad Autol.* 1, 10). — **phantasmatibus:** this word, which is frequent in Tert. (e.g. *apol.* 22, 12; 23, 1; *an.* 17, 14; 57, 6. 9; *Marc.* 1, 27, 1; 5, 14, 3; *res.* 2, 5), does not seem to occur before Plinius minor, see Rönsch, *It.*, 244. — **in fanis:** Oehler's emendation of the traditional *infamis* is undoubtedly correct, as it is supported by the group of younger Ethiopic MSS. (siglum β in Charles), which instead of 'not according to knowledge' (= *non secundum scientiam*) read 'in idols' temples'. So Tert.'s text may derive from a MS. in which both expressions occurred, of which the two groups of Ethiopic MSS. have only one each. This does not seem impossible, because, as we already observed, the text of Tert. contains more divergences from the Ethiopic text, viz., (apart from *iniustitia*) *sanguinis perditionis*; *lapideas* (Charles: 'and stone, inserted from Tert.'); *phantasmatibus*: no parallel in the Ethiopic version; *daemoniis et spiritibus*: in inverse order in the Ethiopic; *erroribus*. Charles, moreover, remarks (with reference to 'impure spirits', based on β, whereas the other group (α) has 'evil'): 'corruption is native to the Ethiopic'; see also Black's commentary, p. 305. The word *fanum* is also used by Tert.

in *nat.* 1, 10, 14; 2, 9, 7. 23; *an.* 49, 2. — **nullum ... auxilium:** likewise e.g. Sap. 13, 16 seqq.; Arist. *apol.* 3, 2 and 13, 2; Cypr. *Dem.* 14; Lact. *d.i.* 5, 20, 4; Euseb. *praepar. evang.* 6, 2, 2. The powerlessness of idols is often demonstrated by pointing out that they are not even able to protect themselves against enemies, robbers or animals, cf. e.g. Tert. *apol.* 12, 7; 25, 14 seqq.; 29, 2; Min. Fel. 24, 9; Cypr. *Dem.* 14; Arnob. 6, 16; Lact. *d.i.* 2, 4, 1-6; Clem. Alex. *protr.* 4, 52; *ep. ad Diogn.* 2, 7; Justin, *apol.* 1, 9, 5; on the pagan side: *Batrachom.* 181 seqq.; Lucian. *Iup. conf.* 8; *Gallus* 24. See Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, XX-XXI. 51, and *Bilderstreit*, 290-1; Borries, 95-7; Lortz, 1, 144-5; E. H. Blakeney, *The Epistle to Diognetus* (London 1943), 36-7.

4. **testes ... proderunt:** Tert. is quoting the text of the LXX of Is. 44, 8-9: μάρτυρες ὑμεῖς ἐστε ... ἃ οὐκ ὠφελήσει αὐτούς. — **absque:** = *praeter*, as always in Tert.'s quotations from Holy Scripture, cf. *Marc.* 2, 26, 1; *Prax.* 18, 5; *carn. Chr.* 24, 7. In the sense of *sine*, occurring from Plautus onwards but not frequent until the second century A.D., the word is rare in Tert. (e.g. *an.* 43, 7; *Marc.* 3, 10, 5; 5, 14, 5. See *TLL* I: 185, 78 seqq.; Hoppe, *Serm. Tert.*, 44-5; Waszink, 465). — **quam ... quam:** cf. the note on 3, 3. — **cognoscite ... possit:** Is. 44, 20: γνῶτε ὅτι σποδὸς ἡ καρδία αὐτῶν, καὶ πλανῶνται, καὶ οὐδεὶς δύναται ἐξελέσθαι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ... . Pamelius emended *terra* into *errant* on the strength of the Greek text. However, as Tert. more often quotes inaccurately (see e.g. Diercks, 72. 74. 108. 133; Thierry, 148-9; cf. Aalders, 115-7 and the long list of errors in *an.* in the index of Waszink's edition, 632), no alteration is necessary. The mistake may be caused by passages like Sap. 15, 10: σποδὸς ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ, καὶ γῆς εὐτελεστέρα ἡ ἐλπὶς αὐτοῦ, πηλοῦ τε ἀτιμότερος ὁ βίος αὐτοῦ. — **Ubi ... factores:** Hartel, 1, 40, rightly supplies *detestatur* from the foregoing sentence. *Ubi* refers to the Bible, *where* the previous quotations are found. (Thelwall: 'In which sentence...', Kellner: 'Fast ebenso'. Both renderings are incorrect.) For Tert.'s use of *factor*, see Braun, 335-6: he uses the word twelve times, and almost exclusively in philosophic treatises: *Herm.*, *Marc.* and *an.*). — **tales ... ea:** here again Tert. is following the LXX (Ps. 113, 16 = Masor. Ps. 115, 8; Ps. 134, 18 = Masor. Ps. 135, 18), ὅμοιοι αὐτοῖς γένοιντο οἱ ποιοῦντες αὐτὰ καὶ πάντες οἱ πεποιθότες ἐπ' αὐτοῖς. A different reading is found in *scorp.* 2, 14: *similes erunt illis, qui ea faciunt et qui fidunt in illis*; *cor.* 10, 4: *Quod si tales edicit futuros, qui idola fabricantur* ... The same text is quoted by Theophil. *ad Autolyc.* 1, 10.

5. **quid ... ultra quid ... quid:** only the first *quid* is interrogative (= *cur*?); the third is indefinite, just as the second, and so should also be joined on to *ultra*. — **modicae memoriae homo:** a formula of modesty, as occurs more often in Tert., cf. 5, 4: *dignioribus*; *bapt.* 10, 1: *Diximus quantum mediocritati nostrae licuit de universis quae baptismi religionem instruunt*;

paen. 6, 1: *mediocritas nostra*; *nat.* 27, 1; *orat.* 20, 1 and 22, 10, on which see Diercks, LXI, who rightly disputes Noeldechen's and Adam's assertions that these formulae indicate an early date of the composition of *orat.* (according to Braun, 'Chron. Tert.', 279 such formulae do not occur any more in the Montanistic period). However, these utterances should be explained in the first place from the context (it is no accident that they are fairly numerous in *paen.*); thus in the present passage the formula only serves to cut off further discussion and to strengthen the authority of the pronouncements of the prophets. — **vox spiritus sancti:** this term returns in 6, 1. Roberts (p. 19) quite wrongly explains: 'the voice of the Spirit is sufficient without the support of the written word' (the same view is put forward by Noeldechen, *Abf.*, 16. 36, who regards these words as 'phrygische Ansätze', and by Adam, *Chronol.*, 418). By *vox spiritus sancti* Tert. means the biblical passages he has quoted; cf. Bender, 117. That the Holy Spirit is active in the prophets is stated by Tert. in e.g. *apol.* 18, 2. From the other apologists cf. e.g. Athenag. *legat.* 10 (127, 34-5 G); Justin *apol.* 1, 36, 1: the revelations do not come from the inspired persons themselves but ἀπὸ τοῦ κινοῦντος αὐτοὺς θείου λόγου; Theophil. *ad Autol.* 2, 30: ταῦτα δὲ πάντα ἡμᾶς διδάσκει τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ διὰ Μωσέως καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν προφητῶν; cf. 2, 33; Just. *apol.* 1, 32, 2; for the qualification of Moses as a prophet, already occurring in LXX Deut. 34, 10 and Philo, e.g. *vita Mos.* 2, 292 (cf. Leisegang's Index, p. 692-3), see Waszink, 355-6, on *an.* 28, 1; J. Jeremias, art. 'Μωυσῆς', Kittel, 4, 869, 8 seqq. and 857, 17 seqq. See Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 176-80; cf. also Lortz, 1, 251. David can be put on a level with the prophets Jeremiah and Enoch, as the whole of the Old Testament is regarded as a *prophetica paratura* (*an.* 2, 3); see Waszink, 105, and Lietzmann's note (*HdbNT*, 8, 130) on Rom. 16, 26: γραφαὶ προφητικαί, which already has this meaning; cf. also from Tert. *scorp.* 2, 14. By Justin David is called a prophet more than once, cf. e.g. *apol.* 1, 35, 6: ὁ ... Δαυιδ ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ προφήτης; 1, 40, 1 and 5; likewise by Lactantius (e.g. *d.i.* 4, 8, 13; 4, 12, 17; 4, 18, 31) and Augustine (*de magistro* 2, 4; *civ. dei* 10, 25; 17, 11 and 18). — **deliberandum:** here the meaning of *deliberare* approaches that of *dubitare* (Non. Marc. p. 282, 8 M.: *deliberare est dubitare*), especially because of the addition of *ultra*; a much more advanced stage of the development in this direction is found in *an.* 17, 13: *non licet, non licet nobis in dubium sensus istos devocare, ne et in Christo de fide eorum deliberetur*; Min. Fel. 35, 4: *eos ... merito torqueri, qui deum nesciunt, ... nisi profanus nemo deliberat*; see Waszink, 252. — **an:** often used instead of *num* in indirect questions, also by Tert., see Hofm., *Synt.*, 696; Waszink, 221. The use of *an* is here the more natural, as *ultra deliberandum sit* approaches the meaning of *dubitandum sit*, and *an* introducing an indirect question after *dubitare* is classical, see e.g. Hofm., *Synt.*, 696. — **maledixerit:** the active use of *maledicere* followed by an accus. occurs for the first time in Petron. 58, 13; 96, 7 (vulgar); after him it is found in the *Vetus Latina* and in Tert. The personal passive occurs from then onwards (cf. *idol.* 9, 6; 16, 2; 22, 1). See *TLL* VIII: 164, 24 seqq., Löfst., *Per.*, 217-9; Salonius, *Vit. Patr.*, 143 seqq.; Hoppe, *Serm. Tert.*, 10.

Ch. 5. *The excuses of the makers of idols.*

'But I will certainly answer the excuses (arguments) afforded by the makers of idols who strive for continuing the exercise of their art after conversion and therefore should never be admitted into the Church.

First they say "We have nothing else to live from". Our answer is, that they have no right to live, if they do not live according to the laws of God (§ 1a).

Then they refer to the words of St. Paul in 1 Cor. 7, 20 saying that everybody should remain in the condition in which he was before his conversion, and to texts like 2 Thess. 3, 7-12, where the Christians are incited to work with their hands. If these precepts are interpreted in such a manner, they lead to the absurd conclusions that the Christians could remain in sin and were allowed to be thieves and robbers (§§ 1b-2).

Finally they refer to the example of Moses who made the image of a serpent (Num. 21, 8-9). However, this is a fact of completely different order, for this serpent was the figura *of a secret dispensation, i.e. the prefiguration of the Lord's cross, not a repeal of the given Law. Otherwise we make God changeable, since at different times He would forbid and command the same thing.*

But even if one shuts one's eyes to the interpretation of this image of a serpent as a prefiguration of the Lord's cross or if one adheres to a different interpretation, thus sticking to the apostle's assertion that everything that happened to Israel had a symbolic meaning, it stands firm that it is the same God who, on the one hand, forbade the making of an image and, on the other hand, commanded by a special precept the making of the image of a serpent. So if you worship the same God (as Moses), follow Moses' example also in observing the precept of not making images, unless He expressly command you to do so (§§ 3-4).'

Remarks

a. *Non habeo quo vivam.* 'I *have* nothing *to live* by'. Playing on the verb *habeo* Tert. answers 'So you *have to live*?' The English admits the same word-play. And he continues 'What have you to do with God, if you live according to your laws?' Here some connecting thought has been omitted: 'Life can only be asked from God'.

b. "*Ut quisque inventus est*". If one takes this statement of St. Paul in an absolute sense, we can remain in our sins, Tert. argues. Here the *deductio ad*

absurdum could end; but Tert. stresses his point by adding: 'and everybody is a sinner (*peccator inventus est* refers to *ut quisque inventus est* in the quotation), because Christ descended for no other reason than to set free (= to set free from sin = salvum facere, σώζειν) the sinners'. The presupposition is, of course, that Christ descended for everybody.

c. *manibus suis unusquisque operetur*. Tert.'s argument is clear. If one applies these words to everything done with the hands, it leads to absurd conclusions. The wording of the argument, however, is remarkable: *si hoc praeceptum ab omnibus manibus defenditur*. If one understands *ab* as the equivalent of *de*, it means: "If this precept is adduced as a defence *with regard to* all hands" (cf. transl. Thelwall). It is, however, also possible to take *ab* in its normal sense and interpret these words as a strong personification: "If this precept is adduced as a defence *by all hands*". One could paraphrase Tert.'s words as follows: 'If one takes the words of St. Paul in an absolute sense, every hand (even that of a robber etc.) may use it in defence of its evil practice'.

d. *Si hoc*. Again Tert. uses the *deductio ad absurdum*. His wording is sarcastic. *Credo et fures*: as if he says: 'If I am not mistaken, people like thieves, robbers, etc., also earn their livehood by the work of their hands'. The same sarcastic tone is in *utique non pedibus, sed manibus*, and in *non manibus solis, sed totis membris*. With regard to the actors Tert.'s argument could be elaborated as follows: 'If the idol-maker is right in saying that everyone who earns his livelihood by the work of his hands is praised by St. Paul, the actor would be so *a fortiori*, because he uses not only his hands but all his limbs'. A really Tertullianean mockery!

e. *Pateat igitur ... tolerantur* is the conclusion drawn by Tertullian from the supposition *si hoc praeceptum ... defenditur*, that is to say, if one accepts this defence. The words *si nulla exceptio ... recipit* reiterate this supposition in other words: 'if no art is expected (so that the argument of the idol-makers is right), let then the Church be open to everyone who, in whatever way, earns his livelihood by the work of his hands'.

f. *The example of Moses*. Finally the opponents appeal to the case of Moses, who made the image of a bronze serpent in the desert. Why would Christians not be allowed to do what Moses did? The structure of Tert.'s answer is as follows: first he states that the serpent made by Moses was one of the prefigurations of the things to come and therefore should be considered as belonging to a separate category: *seorsum* (sc. *ponantur*) *figurae*. But, he adds, if one does not accept this interpretation, it stands firm that it is the same God, who on the one hand by His law forbade the making of an image and on the other hand by an extraordinary command ordered the image of the serpent.

These two arguments should be considered somewhat more closely.

(1) *Seorsum figurae quae ...* Tert. intends to say that here one has to do with one of the *figurae* (τύποι) which 'were prepared beforehand (*praestruebantur*) for a mysterious ordinance', viz., that of the redemption. Therefore these *figurae* should be put in a separate category, in other words they do not fall under the normal rules. Thus the *figura* of the bronze serpent should not be considered as an abrogation of the law not to make images, but as a prefiguration of something else, viz., the cross of the Lord, which is in fact *the reason of its existence*. This is a remarkable way of thinking: the events of the OT are prefigurations of those of the NT, that is to say that the latter events are the reason of the existence of the earlier ones. Thus the events of the OT are the model (*exemplarium* = *figura*) of their later realization, which is the reason of their existence (*exemplarium causae suae*).

(2) *Si quis autem dissimulat*. Here Tert. considers the case that his opponent does not admit the 'figurative' interpretation given just now. Even then, he argues, his thesis stands firm, since it is the same God who gave both orders. But the words *sive quae alia figurae istius expositio dignioribus revelata est, dummodo apostolus affirmet omnia tunc figurate populo accidisse* cause a problem. The difficulty lies in *sive*: is it on a level with *si* (*quis dissimulat*) or not? In the second case, which is defended by Van der Nat, *sive quae alia* should be joined to *illam effigiem ... figuram designasse dominicae crucis*. The whole sentence can be summarized, then, as follows: "If somebody closes his eyes for this 'figurative' exegesis or for any other higher explanation". In itself this is not impossible, but how to explain then the *dummodo*-clause, which obviously means "provided that one saves the apostle's statement that everything that happened to the Jewish people has a deeper sense". Who refuses to give a 'figurative' sense cannot at the same time save the apostle's statement.

In our view *sive* is on a level with *si quis*. Tertullian first refers to those who do not accept the bronze serpent as a prefiguration of the cross, and then directs his attention to those who give a different exegesis; obviously he thinks of an exegesis of a higher sort (*dignioribus revelata est*). And he adds: *dummodo ... accidisse*. Obviously Tert. wants to say that it does not matter which higher exegesis is chosen, "provided that one sticks to the apostle's statement". Curiously Van der Nat's translation can very well be understood in this sense: "However, if somebody disregards the fact that that image of the bronze serpent in the position of a hanged man provided a symbol of the Lord's cross which was to deliver us from the serpents, that is from the angels of the devil, as by itself it hung the devil who is the serpent, after he had been slain, or if some different explanation of that symbol may have been revealed to worthier men, <which is immaterial>, provided that we stick to the assurance of the apostle ..." (p. 17).

g. *figuram dominicae crucis*. The serpent hung like a hanged man upon a cross (*suspensi in modum*). This refers to the cross of the Lord. Of course not in the sense that the serpent prefigured the Lord on the cross, but the serpent represents the devil, whose death is caused by the cross of the Lord. Therewith it liberates us from the 'angels of the devil', i.e. from the powers of evil. It should be noticed that the liberation of evil, i.e. the redemption, is ascribed not to the Lord on the cross but to the cross of the Lord. This way of speaking should be seen in connection with the veneration of the Cross. See G. Q. Reiners, *The Terminology of the Holy Cross in early Christian Literature as based upon Old Testament Typology* (Graecitas Christiana Primaeva, 2), Nijmegen 1965.

1. **Plane:** at the beginning of a sentence is often equivalent to *sane* ('certainly, to be sure'); cf. Waszink, 98. It is an adverb appropriate to the assertive style of Tert. Here it stresses the contrast with the end of ch. 4, where he said that he would *not* enlarge upon the texts from Scripture. We do not discover irony here, although *plane* not seldom has this tone in Tert. See Waszink, 138, with literature; Böhm, 90. — **impensius respondebo:** 'I will enlarge upon answering'. Cf. Sen. *benef.* 2, 24, 4 *loquendum est pro magnitudine impensius.* — **domum dei:** 'the Christian community', as e.g. in *ux.* 2, 8, 3. For this notion, see Dibelius' notes on Eph. 2, 20-2 (*HdbNT*, 12, 53-4) and 1 Tim. 3, 15 (ib., 13, 38); Windisch's notes on 1 Petr. 2, 5 (ib., 15, 59-60) and Barn. 4, 11 (ib., *Erg. Bd.*, 325); cf. also Ignat. *ad Ephes.* 9, 1, and Koch, *Bilderfrage*, 95, and *Ztschr. f. Kirchengeschichte* 45 (N.F. 8), 1927, 524. — **oportet ... vivam:** Kellner follows Mesnart in putting a full stop after *oportet* and *vivam*, and a comma after *norit*; he translates: 'wenn einmal einer diese Künste versteht, alsdann pflegt die bekannte Redensart vorgeschützt zu werden: ich habe nichts anderes zu leben'. However, this interpretation presents insuperable drawbacks. To begin with, the point is not whether the person in question understands these arts (even if this could be the meaning of *eam disciplinam norit*) but whether he does follow this occupation. Moreover, the change of subject (*quis* in the clause, *vox* in the main sentence) is surprising, and the word-order *illa obici solita vox* shows that *solita* is a participle used attributively, and not a finite verb. Further, this interpretation disturbs the parallelism of *iam ... tum ... item*. On the other hand, the interpunction of the *Agob.* yields correct sentences. — **si quis ... norit:** who is the subject of *norit*? Van der Nat thinks of the artists, who are indicated by *quos*. For the variation of plural and singular (*quos ... si quis*) he refers to 9, 7: *hoc et astrologi retulissent, ... si qui in apostolos incidisset*. However, the words *si quis ... norit* must point here to a knowledge which is accompanied by a Christian practice: "if somebody knows this discipline *and lives accordingly*". Now, the artists under discussion are not supposed to do so, otherwise Tert.

could not say that they should not be admitted to the church. Thus the subject must be the person who admits him: *si quis* is equivalent to *ab eo, qui.* — **eam disciplinam:** sc., *divinam*, which should be supplied from the preceding *dei* (cf. *dei disciplinam* in 5, 3). On *disciplina*, see the note on 2, 4. — **destrictius:** this, and not *districtius* is the correct form, see Krebs-Schmalz, *Antibarbarus*, s.v. The adverb *destricte* is found several times in Ulpianus (e.g. *dig.* 3, 3, 13: *destricte deneganda*) but further it is relatively rare (*TLL* V, 1: 722, 7 seqq.). Tert. probably knew it as a juridical term. It is also found in *Marc.* 1, 3, 1 and *pud.* 19, 22 (with *negare*). The comparative also occurs in Apul. *apol.* 79 (87, 17 H.), likewise with an augmentative meaning. — **vivere ... vivis?:** for parallels of this sentence, see Fredouille, 322. — **habes:** in Tert. *habere* with an infinitive means either 'must', 'have to' (cf. e.g. *cult. fem.* 1, 1, 2: *filius dei mori habuit*) or 'can' or it denotes a future sense (often equivalent to μέλλειν), cf. the instances in Hoppe, *Synt.*, 43-4. This subject was thoroughly discussed by Ph. Thielmann, *ALL* 2, 64 seqq. and 157 seqq. — **vivis:** left out by Mesnart and Gelenius (under the influence of the erroneous interpretation of *habes*?). However, the word is indispensable to the meaning; besides, it is guaranteed by the clausula (1 δ). — **quod ... interpretatione:** this sentence is rather laboured, because Tert. is arguing two things at the same time. The most natural interpretation of the clause *quod ... argumentari* is that *quod* is a conjunction ('as regards the fact that'), and that *argumentari* is used absolutely. Especially the words *et de scripturis* are in favour of this interpretation, because they fit badly into the sentence, if *quod* is regarded as a relative pronoun; cf. also the analogous passage *virg. vel.* 4, 1: *Quatenus autem et de scripturis adversus veritatem argumentari consuetudo est, ...* . So here Tert. takes his stand against the fact that these people use the Bible for their defence. Yet it is not only the fact that they abuse Holy Scripture which he combats but also (and particularly) their special interpretation of 1 Cor. 7, 20, as is evident from the concluding main sentence (*igitur ... ex ista interpretatione*); this interpretation is their argument. This is expressed by the words *dixisse apostolum*, etc., which should be joined to *argumentari*. So we have to assume a sort of contamination: *argumentari* is used in two ways, as it were, both absolutely and joined to an accus. c. inf. An approximately similar case is found in *an.* 57, 11, where the sentence *dominus in argumento illo ... sanxit* is joined to two accus. c. inf. (see Waszink's note, 585-6). As usually in Tert., *argumentari* has an unfavourable meaning; this is clearly demonstrated e.g. by *spect.* 4, 1: *Ne quis argumentari nos putet* and *Herm.* 3, 4: *argumentari tibi videor, Hermogenes*? The same applies to the words *argumentum* and *argumentatio*, see *TLL* II: 541, 6 seqq. and 542, 22 seqq.; Oehler's note on *spect.* 4 (p. 24 a); Löfst., *Arnob.*, 65; Waszink, 109; Büchner, 57; Evans, 290. — **possumus ... interpretatione:** an analogous line of argument is found in *pud.* 19, 10; *Dictum est: 'Sanguis Filii eius emundat*

nos ab omni delicto' (1 John, 1, 7). *Semper ergo et omnifariam delinquemus, si semper et ab omni delicto emundat nos ille; aut si non semper, non etiam post fidem, et si non ab <omni> delicto, non etiam a fornicatione.* Tert.'s own conviction is expressed in *paen.* 6, 17: *non ideo abluimur ut delinquere desinamus, sed quia desiimus, quoniam iam corde loti sumus.* — **ex:** in later Latin *ex* is the usual form, *e* mainly occurring in standing formulae. In Tert.'s works, too, *e* is quite rare; its use is practically confined to the expression *e contrario* (on the other hand, *an.* 8, 1: *ex contrario*; see the lists in Löfst., *Krit. Apol.*, 51, n. 1). In *idol. ex* occurs thirteen times (seven times before a vowel, six times before a consonant), *e* not once. See Löfst., *Per.* 89-91, and *Krit. Apol.*, 50-1; Hofm., *Synt.*, 528.

2. **praecepisse ... victum:** this is not a quotation, as is suggested by Reifferscheid, for Tert. reproduces the contents of a few passages in which St. Paul exhorts the Christians to follow his example, and to work for their daily bread. Tert.'s words correspond most closely to 2 Thess. 3, 7-12 and 1 Cor. 4, 12. 16; in 1 Thess. 4, 10-1 and Eph. 4, 28. St. Paul does spur on to work but he does not set up himself as an example. For the proverbial character of this exhortation, see Dibelius' note on 1 Thess. 4, 11-2, *HdbNT*, 11, 22-3. — **ad victum:** the use of *ad* with the accusative of a noun instead of a final clause or an accus. followed by a gerund or a gerundive (e.g. *apol.* 18, 5: *ad fidem divinitatis* instead of *ad fidem divinitatis creandam*) to denote the purpose of an action is not uncommon (numerous instances may be found in *TLL* I: 529, 15 seqq.; cf. also Sörbom, 111-2, and Wahlén, 51). Tert. has a remarkably strong partiality for this and other short nominal expressions formed with the help of a preposition, cf. e.g. from the *Apologeticum*: 22, 11 *remedia ... ad miraculum nova*; 23, 17; 37, 3. See Hoppe, *Synt.*, 140-2; cf. also comm. on 9, 7 *post evangelium.* — **Si ... ab omnibus manibus defenditur:** *defendere* has the meaning of *ad defensionem adferre* (since *Rhet. Her.* 4, 19, see *TLL* V, 1: 298, 75 seqq.; as a law term since Cic. *Verr.* 2, 4, 28, cf. *TLL* ib., 304, 20 seqq.; cf. *Marc.* 5, 9, 13: *hunc psalmum ... ad meam sententiam defendi*; *bapt.* 17, 5. For *ab* see Remark c. — **fures ... balneatores:** for the interpretation of this expression, cf. Van der Nat, *Vig. Chr.* 17 (1963), 74-6. — **operari ... litteras:** as a transitive verb *operari* does not seem to occur until Tert.; see the passages collected by Waszink, 258; to these may be added *cor.* 7, 8; *carn. Chr.* 14, 2. — **histriones:** here in the sense of *pantomimi* (cf. *totis membris*). During the empire *histrio*, originally 'actor', is used particularly to denote the pantomimist, since the latter's performances were by far the most popular and pushed into the background all other kinds of dramatic art. See Friedländer, 2, 135-6; *TLL* VI, 3: 2844, 43 seqq.; 81 seqq.; Heinze, 364, n. 2. Tert. strongly condemns the theatre and everything connected with it: his treatise *De spectaculis* is devoted to this subject in its entirety (cf. especially chapters 10, 17 and 23); cf. also *apol.* 15, 1-3; 38, 4; *cor.* 6, 3; *Marc.* 1, 27, 5; *pud.* 7, 15. Further, see A. Boulanger's excellent commented edition of *De spectaculis*, passim, especially 15-20. For further details, see Bigelmair, 258-83 and 311-3; Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 234-5. For the *infamia* of actors with the heathens, see Friedländer, 2, 137 seqq.

3. **tolerantur:** it is not clear why Reifferscheid changed this passive form into an active one; *tolerare* with the meaning 'to maintain, to nourish' is rare, but it is occasionally found, e.g. Plin. *n.h.* 33, 136: *quem* (sc. Ptolemaeum) *Varro tradit Pompeio res agente ... octona milia equitum sua pecunia toleravisse*; Caes. *bell. civ.* 3, 49, 2; Tac. *ann.* 2, 24, 4 (used of the nourishing of horses; see Draeger's note); *dig.* 50, 16, 203. Here it is best to give a reflexive interpretation to the passive form (= *se tolerant*). — **in eremo:** ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ; *eremus* occurs since the *Vetus Latina* and Tert. (*TLL* V, 2: 747, 64 seqq.). As Christian authors are practically the only ones to use this word, it may be regarded as an 'indirect Christianism' (see for this term Mohrm., *Aug.*, 211-3). It is especially used of the desert that was traversed by the Jews, and the desert as a dwelling-place of anchorites. For the way in which Tert. translates ἔρημος in quotations from Holy Scripture, see Aalders, 90. — **figurae:** *figura* with the meaning 'symbol, emblem' (= *exemplum, typus*) is a Christianism, first occurring in Tert., see *TLL* VI, 1: 734, 81 seqq.; Thierry, 205-6. — **dispositioni:** Christian authors often use this word with the meaning 'divine dispensation, divine ordinance'. It is already used in this sense by pagan authors, e.g. Apul. *met.* 9, 1: *nec consilio ... divinae prudentiae fatalis dispositio subverti ... potest*; the Hermetic treatise *Asclepius*, 6: *caelesti dispositione* (cf. Tert. *apol.* 21, 10). See *TLL* V, 1: 1434, 21 seqq.; Evans, 193. 204; cf. on this term the monograph by S. Otto, *Nature and Dispositio. Untersuchungen zum Naturbegriff und zur Denkform Tertullians* (Münchener theol. Stud., 2. Folge XIX), München 1960. — **arcanae:** the use of *arcanus* in connection with a Christian concept is less frequent in Tert.'s works than that in connection with heretics, especially Gnostics, and heathens. It refers to Christian subjects in *nat.* 1, 7, 19: *in arcanis congregationibus detinemur*; *Marc.* 2, 19, 1: *ut nihil de arcanis adtingam significantiis legis, spiritalis et propheticae*; ib. 4, 35, 7; *praescr.* 22, 3 (referring to μυστήρια in Luke 8, 10); *ux.* 2, 5, 3; the fire of the *gehenna* is called an *ignis arcanus subterraneus* in *apol.* 47, 12 (likewise ib., 48, 14). For *arcanus* referring to the doctrines of the heretics, especially the Valentinians, cf. e.g. *scorp.* 10, 1: *arcana illa haereticorum sacramenta*; *Valent.* 6, 1; 8, 4; *carn. Chr.* 19, 1; *an.* 18, 4: *veritatem illam arcanam et superiorem et apud pleroma constitutam*; ib., 50, 2. As a substantive *arcanum* is, with one exception: *praescr.* 22, 3, always used by Tert. in connection with the μυστήρια of the heretics, e.g. *bapt.* 2, 2: *idolorum sollemnia vel arcana*; *res.* 19, 6: *arcana haeretica*. Cf. also von

Soden, *ZNTW* 12 (1911), 218. — **ad erogationem legis:** Tert.'s preference for nominal expressions to verbal ones (cf. 5, 2 *ad victum*) is also evident from his frequent use of a verbal substantive instead of a gerundive, cf. e.g. *mart.* 4, 9: *ad consecutionem gloriae caelestis*; *orat.* 4, 5: *ad demonstrationem sufferentiae*; ib., 11, 1: *ad remissionem debitorum*; ib., 9, 2: *in postulatione tutelae*; 13, 2: *in domini deditione*; *fuga* 1, 2: *de obitu eius* (sc. persecutionis) = *de ea obeunda*. Cf. Thierry, 111; Blokhuis, 88-9; Stephan, 102; Schmidt, *De Latin. Tert.*, 1, 19. — **erogationem:** the use of *erogatio* with the meaning of *abrogatio* is confined to the present passage (*TLL* V, 2: 799, 12); cf. Paul. ex Festo p. 82: *exrogare est ex lege vetere aliquid eximere per novam legem*. This meaning is related to the use of *erogare* in the sense of *delere*, which is found for the first time in Val. Max. 9, 3, 8, and which is frequent in Tert., e.g. *apol.* 48, 14 (likewise Min. Fel. 35, 3); *an.* 30, 5; 51, 3 (*TLL* V, 2: 803, 36 seqq.). The meaning 'to kill', which first occurs in Tert. (e.g. *apol.* 44, 1), has developed from this use. See Hartel, 2, 63, n. 3; Oehler's note on *scorp.* 6 (p. 512 k); Waszink, 377. — **legis:** = *legis divinae*, i.e. the decalogue, especially (Exod. 20, 4): *ne feceris similitudinem*. — **ad exemplarium causae suae:** '<to serve> as an example of <the later occurrence which is> their cause'. In the case of the bronze serpent the *causa* is the *dominica crux* (5, 4). *Ad* is used for the sake of parallelism with *ad erogationem legis*. However, the parallelism is not complete, since *erogatio* expresses a verbal notion, and *exemplarium* does not (therefore, Thierry, 127-8, is wrong in putting these expressions on one level). The function of *ad exemplarium* is the same as that of a predicative nominative; the same construction is found in 11, 2: *viderint, si eaedem merces ... etiam hominibus ad pigmenta medicinalia, nobis quoque insuper ad solacia sepulturae usui sunt*. Cf. *fuga* 6, 1: *ut eam* (sc. pronuntiationem domini) *ad velamentum timiditatis suae utantur*; ib. 2, 1: *sequi ... diaboli iniquitatem ad instrumentum persecutionis*; *apol.* 36, 2; *nat.* 1, 16, 19. Since *figura* is identical with *exemplarium*, just as *iniquitas* with *instrumentum* and *merces* with *pigmenta*, *solacia*, we may speak here of '*ad* identitatis' (cf. Hofm., *Synt.*, 537 on *in* identitatis = *velut*). As the origin and development of this use of *ad* has, as far as our knowledge goes, not yet been investigated satisfactorily, a somewhat longer note may be indicated. Of course the use of *ad* identitatis originates from the final sense of *ad*, which is found in passages such as Plaut. *Epid.* 615: *quin tu mihi adornas ad fugam viaticum*; Plin. *n.h.* 15, 123: *folia* (myrti) ... *siccantur in farinam ad ulcerum remedia*. The determining factor is that in the present case the purpose is the same thing as the object or subject of the action. An illustrative case is Vitr. 2, 9, 4: *cum eae* (sc. arbores) *ad materiam deiciuntur* ('in order to previde wood for building' > 'as wood for building'). Plin. *n.h.* 13, 105-6 uses this expression alongside of a final dative: the fruit of the lotus-tree is *dulcis ... cibo* (105) but <it is to be added, 106> *bacas ... concisas cum alica ad cibos*

doliis condi. In the earlier period only isolated instances occur, mostly in *scriptores rustici*, e.g. Varro *r.r.* 2, 1, 4; Colum. 5, 8, 4. Besides, we find only one instance, viz., Petron. 75, 11: *tamen ad delicias ipsimi annos XIV fui* (cf. on this passage G. Süss, *De eo quem dicunt inesse Trimalchionis cenae sermone vulgari* (Dorpat 1926), 36; Nelson, 173; Hofm., *Synt.*, 497). From a much later period Bourciez, 255, mentions some more instances, e.g. *Concil. Suess.* (A.D. 744) 9: *nullus sacratam feminam ad mulierem habeat*; *Leg. Alam.* 2, 1: *et illos ad testes advocasset*. For a similar use of '*in* identitatis' see Waszink's notes on *an.* 19, 6 and 33, 3, and *Mnem.*, ser. IV, 2 (1950), 237-8; particularly clear examples are Sen. *epist.* 86, 4: *turres ... in propugnaculum villae ... subrectas* and *an.* 19, 6: *cuius* (sc. hominis) *anima velut surculus quidam ex matrice Adam in propaginem deducta* ('derived to be a layer' > 'derived *as* a layer'); for some further material, see Thierry, 141-2; Süss, *op. cit.*, 35-6; Nelson, 173-4; Bourciez, 255. — **exemplarium:** this word does not occur until Tert., cf. *Herm.* 38, 3; 40, 1; *Marc.* 1, 1, 1; 1, 16, 1; afterwards in e.g. Arnob. 6, 13; Priscill. *tract.* 10, 125; 10, 141. It is formed from the plural *exemplaria* of *exemplar*, which, in its turn, is a substantivation of the adj. *exemplaris* (Lucr. 2, 124 still has the original form *exemplare*). See M. Leumann, *Die lat. Adiectiva auf -lis* (Strassburg 1917), 29 and 36; *TLL* V, 2: 1320, 36 seqq. — **Alioquin, si:** for the pleonasm, cf. 2, 4 and 15, 4. — **adversarii legis:** Tert. is alluding to Marcion and his followers, who radically rejected the Old Testament. They opposed the judging and wrathful God of the Jews, the *creator*, to the God of love, unknown till then, who revealed Himself in Christ, whom they considered to have had only an apparent body. *Lex* denotes the whole of the OT, just as in e.g. *Marc.* 1, 19, 4: *Antithesis Marcionis ... quae conantur discordiam evangelii cum lege committere, ut ex diversitate sententiarum utriusque instrumenti diversitatem quoque argumententur deorum*. With the same meaning *ieiun.* 11, 3: *adversarii veterum*. — **numquid:** in later Latin this word gradually comes to replace *num*, undoubtedly on account of the growing aversion from monosyllables. Here it is equivalent to *nonne*, as, for instance, in *nat.* 2, 9, 7; *fuga* 4, 1. More instances in Thörn., 2, 41-2; see also Hofm., *Synt.*, 649; Thierry, 153; Stephan, 118 and 126. — **quod et Marcionitae:** we have to assume an ellipsis of *facere*, as, for instance, in *apol.* 21, 30: *non qua rupices ... ad humanitatem temperaret, quod Numa*; *pud.* 21, 4: *nam et mortuos suscitaverunt* (sc. apostoli), *quod deus solus, et debiles redintegraverunt, quod nemo nisi Christus*; more instances in Hoppe, *Synt.*, 145, and Waszink, 189-90. More frequent is the ellipsis of *esse* after *quod*, cf. e.g. *res.* 34, 6: *si et anima interibilis, id est non inmortalis, quod et caro*; *apol.* 8, 5: *homo es et ipse, quod et Christianus ... Homo est ... et Christianus, quod et tu*. However, there are cases where it is not so easy to supply a verb, cf. e.g. *scorp.* 9, 5: *Nemo ... eorum aut fratrem aut patrem passus est traditorem, quod plerique*

iam nostri. Waszink (*loc. cit.*), giving a few other examples, points out that here *quod* is developing into an equivalent of *ut*, and that this use of the relative pronoun has facilitated the later use of the conjunction *quod* as an equivalent of *ut* ('as'); for this, see Hofm., *Synt.*, 723; Löfst., *Beitr.*, 18 seqq.; *Spätlat. Stud.*, 9 seqq. For more particulars, see Waszink, *loc. cit.* — **omnipotenti:** as a substantive this adjective, which occurs more than 20 times in Tert.'s works (especially frequent in *Adversus Praxean*), is only used here and in *Prax.* 17, 4. — **dum** = *eo, quod*; cf. 2, 5. — **inconstantiam ... mandat:** the Marcionites made a point of discovering inconsistencies in God's precepts in the OT. On this point Tert. opposes them in *Marc.* 2, 21 seqq., cf. 2, 21, 1: *Sic et in ceteris contrarietates praeceptorum ei* (sc. deo) *exprobras ut mobili et instabili*, etc. Thus they also set Num. 21, 8-9 (God's order to Moses to make a bronze image of a serpent) against Exod. 20, 4 (the prohibition to make any image at all). In *Marc.* 2, 22, 1 Tert. argues against Marcion in a manner quite similar to that of the present passage: *proinde et similitudinem vetans fieri omnium, quae in caelo et in terra et in aquis, ostendit et causas, idololatriae scilicet substantiam cohibentes. Subicit enim: non adorabitis ea neque servietis illis. Serpentis autem aenei effigies postea praecepta Moysi a domino non ad idololatriae titulum pertinebat, sed ad remediandos eos, qui a serpentibus infestabantur. Et taceo de figura remedii.* (About this *figura* Tert. is more explicit in the present passage.) See on this subject also Meijering, 107; cf. also Iren. *adv. haer.* 1, 27, 2: *Marcion Ponticus ... et inconstantem quoque sententia et contrarium sibi ipsum dicens* (sc. deum prophetarum).

4. **dissimulat:** cf. 2, 1. — **suspensi in modum** should be joined to *effigiem aerei serpentis*, cf. *Marc.* 3, 18, 7 (= *Iud.* 10, 75): *aereum serpentem ligno impositum pendentis habitu*; for the expression, cf. 12, 2: *corpus ... quod in modum crucis est*. As the words *suspensi in modum* express the characteristic feature that made the image of the serpent into a *figura dominicae crucis* (cf. *dum per semetipsam diabolum, id est serpentem, interfectum suspendit*), we do best to regard these words as a predicative adjunct, and, accordingly, to supply ὄντος (or possibly οὖσαν); this interpretation is supported by the fact that these words are an addition by Tert. to the account of Numeri. For such constructions, cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 142 and 144; Thörn., 1, 21. 45. 51-2, and *Eranos* 16 (1916), 102; Waszink, 129 and 531. — **dominicae crucis:** for the semantic development of *crux* in Christian Latin, see Teeuwen, 46 and 75, n. 1. *Dominicae* = *domini*; for the use of an adj. instead of the genitive of a subst.—a use wide-spread in later Latin, especially with *dominicus*—see Löfst., *Per.*, 76-81 and *Synt.*, 1, 107-24; Salonius, *Vit. Patr.*, 179 seqq.; Thörn., 2, 34-7; Böhm, 96-7. — **id est:** used already by Cicero in his later writings instead of *hoc est*, in accordance with the current spoken idiom; very

frequent in Tert. (e.g. *idol.* 9, 5). See Thörn., 1, 80-2; Löfst., *Per.*, 91-2. — **figuram designasse ... suspendit:** this interpretation of the serpent made by Moses is also presented by Tert. in *Marc.* 3, 18, 7 (= *Iud.* 10, 73 seqq.). We find an allusion to it in the passage *Marc.* 2, 22, 1 mentioned above: *et taceo de figura remedii*. The same interpretation, also in connection with Exod. 20, 41, is found in *Barn.* 12, 5-7; Just. *dial.* 94, 1.4; cf. also Just. *apol.* 1, 60, 2-5 and *dial.* 112, 1-3; *Carm. adv. Marc.* 2, 166-71. An allegorical interpretation is already given by Philo *leg. alleg.* 2, 76-81. In John 3, 14-5, too, Num. 21, 4-9 is associated with the crucifixion (see Bauer's note, *HdbNT*, 6, 56-7). The use of a serpent or dragon as a mythological embodiment of the power hostile to God is wide-spread. In Jewish tradition, too, the devil is not only represented as an evil spirit in opposition to God, but also as a monster, a dragon, as 'the old serpent' (a trace of this idea is found in Apoc. 12, 3 seqq. and 20, 2). In late Judaism we find an increasing tendency to identify the serpent of paradise (Gen. 3) with the devil (cf. e.g. Sap. 2, 24). In 2 Cor. 11, 3 St. Paul joins this tradition; of the early Christian authors we may mention Just. *apol.* 1, 28, 1: Παρ' ἡμῖν ... ὁ ἀρχηγέτης τῶν κακῶν δαιμόνων ὄφις καλεῖται καὶ σατανᾶς καὶ διάβολος (cf. *dial.* 103, 5; 124, 3); Theophil. *ad Autolyc.* 2, 28; *epist. ad Diogn.* 12, 3. 6. 8; Cyprian *ad Demetr.* 16 (62, 20-2). In Tert. *cult. fem.* 1, 6, 3; *spect.* 9, 3 (see Büchner, 101-2) and 18, 3; *res.* 28, 2; *cor.* 10, 7; *Marc.* 2, 7, 3; *Prax.* 1, 1; cf. also *Pass. Perp.* 4, 4-7. That this was a quite current conception is illustrated by the great number of passages where *coluber* is used to denote the devil (*TLL* III: 1728, 68 seqq.). See Bauer, *Wörterbuch*, s.vv. δράκων and ὄφις; Foerster, art. 'δράκων', Kittel 2, 284-6, and art. 'ὄφις', ib. 5, 566-582; Lietzmann on 2 Cor. 11, 3, *HdbNT*, 9, 145; Lohmeyer on Apoc. 12, 7-8, ib., 16, 96-7 and 99; Windisch on *Barn.* 12, 5, ib., *Erg. Bd.*, 370-1; Bousset, *Jud.*, 408. 516; Dibelius, *Geisterwelt*, 37-8. 50-1; Dölger, *Sonne*, 52. 54-5. Here, as in the passage from *Marc.* 3, 18 quoted above, we do not only find the devil described as a serpent, but also his angels; undoubtedly the demons are also included in these, cf. *Marc.* 4, 24, 9-10, especially 10: *et utique scimus ... figurate scorpios et colubros portendi spiritalia malitiae, quorum ipse quoque princeps in serpentis et draconis et eminentissimae cuiusque bestiae nomine deputetur penes creatorem.* For *spiritalia malitiae* as a denomination also used of the demons, cf. *Valent.* 22, 1: *angelorum et daemonum et omnium spiritalium malitiarum genituras*; *ieiun.* 17, 8: *spiritalia malitiae* as translation of Eph. 6, 12: τὰ πνευμάτικα τῆς πονηρίας; in *fuga* 1, 5 and 12, 3 the same words are translated *spiritalia nequitiae*; cf. also *apol.* 22, 4: *malitia spiritalis*. Moreover, this passage furnishes one more proof of the fact that Tert. uses the term 'the devil' as 'collective singular': the serpent is a *figura* of the *diabolus* and of the *angeli diaboli* alike; the cross rescues mankind from both at the same time. The principle underlying the interpretation of the physical healing of the Israelites by means

of the image of the bronze serpent as a symbol of the spiritual healing (*salus*) granted by the *dominica crux* is formulated by Tert. in *bapt.* 5, 5 with reference to John 5, 2 seqq.; in the healing power of the water of the *piscina Bethsaida* he sees a *figura* of the power of the baptismal water: *Figura ista medicinae corporalis spiritalem medicinam praedicabat, ex forma qua semper carnalia in figuram spiritalium antecedunt.* — **istius:** = *huius*, as in 2, 3. — **expositio:** in the sense of 'interpretation, explanation' first used by Tert., cf. *TLL* V, 2: 1774, 28 seqq. Cf. e.g. *praescr.* 38, 1; *Prax.* 14, 6; *pud.* 9, 1. — **dignioribus:** a formula of modesty, cf. 4, 5 *modicae memoriae homo* with the note. The word is deliberately chosen, since revelation is a *dignatio dei*, cf. *an.* 47, 2 with Waszink's note (p. 504). The condition for such a privilege is a good moral character, cf. *apol.* 18, 2; 21, 4. — **revelata est:** in the sense of *detegere* we also find *revelare* in Apul. *met.* 9, 26: *detectis ac revelatis fraudibus*; cf. Tert. *apol.* 7, 13: *omnia tempus revelat.* In the present passage it is used in the specifically Christian sense of divine revelation. *Revelatio*, *revelator* and *revelatorius* are also Christian neologisms. Cf. Teeuwen, 18; Matzkow, 16-18; Mohrm., *Aug.*, 144; J. de Ghellinck, *RSR* 6 (1916), 149-57; Waszink, 562. — **figurate:** 'with symbolic significance'. This meaning occurs first in Tert., and is only found in Christian literature (*TLL* VI, 1: 746, 20 seqq.). The same holds good for the verb *figurare* 'to symbolize, to represent symbolically' (ib. 743, 48 seqq.; see Waszink, 259). As a synonym of *figurate* we also find *figuraliter* (for the first time in Tert., e.g. *ux.* 1, 2, 2), for which word see *TLL* VI, 1: 738, 30 seqq.; Mohrm., *Aug.*, 181. — **populo** here again means 'Israel'; cf. 3, 4 with the note. — **omnia ... accidisse:** this point of view is set out in detail in *Marc.* 4, 9 and 5, 6. Tert. follows the common conviction of the early Christians; especially Barnabas, Justin and Clement of Alexandria have gone far in their allegorical explanation of the OT. See Windisch's note on *Barn.* 12, 7, *HdbNT, Erg. Bd.*, 371 and Lietzmann's note on 1 Cor. 10, 11 (ib., 9, 47). — **bene, quod:** Reifferscheid wrongly puts a full stop after *accidisse*; the correct interpretation was given by Oehler and Thörnell. As was pointed out by the latter (1, 29-30), *bene, quod ... indixit* is the apodosis of *si quis autem dissimulat ... suspendit.* A similar construction is found in e.g. *Marc.* 4, 14, 8: *Nam et si putas creatoris quidem terrenas promissiones fuisse, Christi vero caelestes, bene, quod caelum nullius alterius usque adhuc dei apparet, nisi cuius et terra.* The expression *bene, quod* (with ellipsis of *est*) occurs since Cicero, and is very frequent in Tert.'s works (thirty-four times i.a. *idol.* 23,3), cf. *TLL* II: 2212, 60 seqq. See also Oehler's notes on the present passage (p. 73 l) and on *pud.* 19 (p. 835 a); Waszink, 142. — **et ... vetuit ... et ... indixit:** the second *et*, inserted by Iunius, is indeed indispensable. Rigaltius' emendation *indixit*, too, is to be preferred to the reading of *A B* (*interdixit*). Oehler tries to explain the *lectio tradita* as follows: 'etiam sic bene est, ... si quidem hoc ipso quod extraordinario praecepto

serpentem deus suspendi iussit, simulacra interdicta pridem et vetita a se esse significavit'. Even apart from the fact that this explanation is forced, we should, in that case, have to join *similitudinem* to *interdixit* as an object, and *serpentis* to *praecepto*; however, *praecepto serpentis* is a rather strange expression. Besides, *indixit* yields a better clausula. Further, the contrast between *lex* and *extraordinarium praeceptum* as both proceeding from the same God, which is accentuated by the deliberate initial position of *idem*, is lost in Oehler's interpretation. Finally, the fact that in the following sentence, too, mention is made of a special command (*ne facias ... nisi ... deus iusserit*) is an indication in favour of *indixit.* — **ne feceris similitudinem:** at the end of this part of his argumentation Tert. emphatically repeats the text of Exod. 20, 4, which was his starting-point in 4, 1. — **respicis:** approximatively equivalent to *observas* ('if you take account of'), see Thörn., 2, 56-7. — **et tu imitare Moysen:** according to Van der Nat, *et* belongs to *imitare Moysen.* He translates: "then also follow Moses", thereby underrating the pronoun *tu.* In our view, the phrase should be considered as a contamination of *et tu idem fac* and *imitare Moysen.* For the declension of the name *Moses* (*Moyses*), see the literature in J. Jeremias, art. 'Μωυσῆς' in Kittel 4, 853, n. 1. The inverse line of argument against the heretics is found in *carn. Chr.* 6, 4: *quid illi cum Moyse quae deum Moysi reicit? Si alius deus est, aliter sint res eius.* — **tibi ... iusserit:** the dative after *iubere* (on the analogy of *imperare*) is recorded once in Catullus (64, 140; see Kroll's note, and R. Sydow, *De recensione Catulli carminum* (thesis Berlin 1881), 42) and in Cicero (*ep. ad Att.* 9, 13, 2); it certainly occurs in Statius (*Theb.* 7, 32. 373), Tacitus (*ann.* 4, 72, 2; 13, 15, 3; 13, 40, 3) and in later Latin. See Löfst., *Per.*, 151-2, and *Synt.* 1, 200 seqq.; Hofm., *Synt.*, 376. 411; cf. also Tert. *Prax.* 12, 7 (for the constitution of the text of this difficult passage, see Waszink, *Vig. Chr.* 7 (1953), 247-9). A curious contamination is found in *pud.* 21, 3: *nam tibi quae in te reatum habeant etiam septuagies septies iuberis indulgere in persona Petri.*

Ch. 6. *The sacrament of baptism is a sufficient argument in itself*

'Even if no law of God and no voice of the Holy Spirit had forbidden us to make idols, the sacrament of baptism would by itself be sufficient to make us interpret such arts as contrary to our faith (§ 1). In baptism we renounced the devil and his angels. How could we maintain that we fulfil this, if we manufacture them, i.e. their images? How, if we live from them? How could we maintain to be in discord with them, if we bind ourselves to them for our livelihood? Here our deeds would contradict our words (§ 2a).

The objection of the idol-maker 'I make them, I do not worship them' is not valid, because, first, worshipping and making idols are forbidden for exactly the same reason, viz., since they both offend God. Further, the idol-

maker is a worshipper, since he makes worship possible. He is even more a worshipper of the gods than the others are, because he spends his skill, sweat and intelligence on them. He is for them more than a priest, because he is the reason that they have a priest. To his diligence they owe their name, i.e. their being. ("Your diligence is (the cause of) their name"). You may deny that you worship, the demons will not do so, because they get from you the best you have, the life of your soul, from the morning until the evening.'

Remarks

a. *The way of arguing*. In the first part of this chapter Tertullian emphasizes that the renunciation of the devil and his angels at baptism is in itself a sufficient argument against these idol-makers. In the second part he refuses their thesis that one can make idols without worshipping them.

In the first part Tertullian shows that the making of idols is incompatible with the statement 'I renounce the devil and his angels (demons)', in the second part that the making of idols is incompatible with the statement 'I do not worship them'. In a way characteristic of him, Tertullian shows that the maker of idols is even the greatest worshipper.

b. *Tota die*. The *Agobardinus* and the early editions put this adjunct at the beginning of the next sentence, that means, after the division in chapters by Pamelius, at the beginning of a new chapter. Iunius was the first scholar who suggested to put it at the end of ch. 6. He was followed i.a. by Reifferscheid. Van der Nat rejected this alteration, mainly because of the spoiled clausula. However, *tota die* (whether it means 'the whole day', or, as Van der Nat thinks, 'every day') does not suit very well *perorabit ingemiscens*; on the other hand it makes a very good opposition between the man who at a certain moment perpetrates an idolatrous act and the artist who works *the whole day* on the making of idols. The adjunct *tota die* may not give a first class clausula; by its position it stresses a point which to Tertullian is very important. One should read it emphatically after *salutem tuam*, almost as an argument in addition, as a final blow.

1. **Si ... comminaretur:** this is a recapitulation of chapter 4. — **de ipso sacramento nostro interpretaretur:** cf. 9, 4: *ut ... nemo ... nativitatem alicuius de caelo interpretaretur*. Here *de* has the meaning 'starting from', which is mostly expressed by means of *ex*, e.g. Cic. *inv.* 1, 68 (cf. *TLL* VII, 1: 2250, 69-71). The accus. c. inf. after *interpretari* is found for the first time in Cicero, e.g. *dom.* 128: *quae ... interpretaris de nostris aedibus ... scripta esse* (and still five times in Cic.); from Tert. one more instance can be quoted, viz., *Marc.* 3, 3, 3; see *TLL* VII, 1: 2260, 55-71. — **sacramento nostro:** this is equivalent to *fidei sacramentum* (cf. here *adversas esse fidei*), which in its turn is

equivalent to *baptisma*, cf. e.g. *an.* 1, 4: *cui spiritus sanctus accommodatus sine fidei sacramento?*; *Marc.* 1, 28, 1-2: *O deum* (sc. Marcionis) *usquequaque perversum ...!* (2) *Cuius non statum, non condicionem ... video consistere, iam nec ipsum fidei eius sacramentum. Cui enim rei baptisma quoque apud eum exigitur?* Here *sacramentum* has special reference to the oath taken in baptism, as in *mart.* 3, 1: *cum in sacramenti verba respondimus*; *cor.* 13, 7: *omnes* (sc. causae coronarum) *alienae, profanae, illicitae, semel iam in sacramenti testatione eieratae*; cf. also 19, 2. About the meaning of *sacramentum* in Tert. the literature is extensive. From the older literature the most important publications are: J. de Ghellinck, *Pour l'histoire du mot sacramentum*, 66 seqq.; E. de Backer, *Sacramentum. Le mot et l'idée ... dans l'œuvre de Tert.*; for the further literature up to 1947 see Waszink's note on *an.* 1, 4 (pp. 90-1); moreover, cf. especially A. Kolping, *Sacramentum Tertullianeum. Erster Teil* (Münster i.W. 1948); Chr. Mohrmann, 'Sacramentum dans les plus anciens textes chrétiens latins', *Harv. Theol. Rev.*, 47 (1954), 141-52; Refoulé, *Bapt.*, 48-53. — **fidei:** for the Christianism *fides* = 'faith', see *TLL* VI, 1: 689, 43 seqq.; Teeuwen, 30.

2. **Quomodo ... eius:** Tert. is alluding to the baptismal oath, cf. *spect.* 4, 1: *cum aquam ingressi Christianam fidem in legis suae verba profitemur, renuntiasse nos diabolo et pompae et angelis eius de ore nostro contestamur*; *an.* 35, 3: *pactus es ... renuntiasse ipsi* (sc. diabolo) *et pompae et angelis eius*. For a collection of such baptismal formulas, see Waszink, 'Pompa Diaboli', 13, n. 2, and the literature mentioned there; see also Dölger, *Sonne*, 1 seqq. *renuntiare* (ἀποτάσσεσθαι) has received a permanent place in the idiom of ascetes: the ascetes have abandoned all their earthly possessions, their homes and their families; cf. Schlier, 146 (on Ignat. *ad Philem.* 11); Reitzenstein, *Hist. monach.*, 104. 125. 258. For the liturgy of baptism, see Dekkers, 163-216 (especially 180-5); Refoulé, *Bapt.*, 36 seqq. — **renuntiavimus:** *renuntiare* with a dative ('to part with, to break away from, to abandon') is post-classical, see e.g. Krebs-Schmalz s.v.; Rönsch, *Sem.*, 3, 72 and *It.*, 379-80; Goelzer, *Jér.*, 316. Like the other verbs in this passage *renuntiavimus* is a *pluralis inclusivus*: the speaker includes himself (cf. 12, 1. 5; 13, 1). — **diabolo et angelis eius:** this expression is taken from the baptismal formula and indicates the powers of evil in their totality. Sometimes Tert. discerns demons and fallen angels (cf. the note on 4, 2) but here the demons are included in *angeli eius*, just as in *spect.* 8, 9: *ceterum et plateae et forum et balneae et stabula et ipsae domus nostrae sine idolis omnino non sunt: totum saeculum satanas et angeli eius repleverunt.* — **si eos facimus:** Tert. points, of course, to the making of idols. But by saying 'if we make them', i.e. the devil and his angels, he is not just using a forced way of speaking. By making idols man can be said to 'make' the evil spirits themselves in so far as he makes them

visible; hence *manus, quae daemoniis corpora confert* (7, 1); one can also say that by making idols man gives the evil spirit a name (= being); hence *diligentia tua nomen illorum est* (6, 2), and *ibi nomen inveniunt, ubi pignus* (15, 6).— **repudium diximus:** *repudium* is actually 'divorce', cf. *apol.* 6, 6: *per annos ferme sexcentos ab urbe condita nulla repudium domus scripsit* (see Waltzing's comm. *ad loc.*); *mon.* 10, 3; likewise e.g. Tac. *ann.* 3, 22, 3: *post dictum repudium* (the most usual expression seems to have been *repudium mittere*). It is possible that this meaning should be still present here, considering the following *cum quibus ... vivimus* (however, cf. *apol.* 42, 3, quoted below); in that case this passage would be an argument in favour of Waszink's supposition (note on *an.* 41, 4, p. 458-9) that the expression *renuntiare diabolo* is related to a view regarding idolatry as adultery (cf. 1, 3 with the comm.): *renuntiare* is often equivalent to *repudium dicere* (see Köhne, 22; compare in this connection also *apol.* 27, 4: *ille ... spiritus daemonicae et angelicae paraturae ... noster ob divortium aemulus et ob dei gratiam invidus* (Waltzing's interpretation of *ob divortium*: 'à cause de sa révolte contre dieu' is incorrect)). For *repudium* and *divortium* as terms of divorce, see Sohm–Mitteis–Wenger, 524-5; M. Kaser, *Röm. Privatrecht* (²München and Berlin 1962), 58. — **cum quibus ... vivimus:** cf. *apol.* 42, 3: *Quomodo infructuosi videmur negotiis vestris, cum quibus et de quibus vivimus, non scio*; *Marc.* 1, 18, 1: *nam et mathematici plurimum Marcionitae, nec hoc erubescentes, de ipsis etiam stellis vivere creatoris*; ib. 1, 23, 7: *de ipsius adhuc horreis vivens.* — **exhibitionis:** 'maintenance, subsistence'; also in 8, 2 and 12, 1; *cor.* 8, 1; *mon.* 16, 2; cf. e.g. Ulp. *dig.* 27, 2, 3: *quod exhibitioni frugaliter sufficit, modum alimentjs dabit.* It is a juridical term, occurring (apart from jurists and Tert.) only in *Vetus Latina* 1 Tim. 6, 8 (= Cypr. *test.* 3, 61; *hom. orat.* 19; *eleem.* 10): *habentes ... exhibitionem* (Vulg.: *alimenta*) *et vestitum, his contenti sumus*; Priscill. *can.* 37 (126, 1 Schepss); see *TLL* V, 2: 1435, 19-35; Oehler's note on *cor.* 8 (p. 435 c). *Exhibere* as an equivalent of *alere, victum praebere* (*ieiun.* 6, 1) has also been borrowed from juridical language, see *TLL* ib. 1432, 72 seqq.; Rönsch, *It.*, 364. — **negasse:** a perfect infinitive instead of a present infinitive after *posse* occurs once in Plautus (*Aul.* 828: *non potes probasse nugas*), after him in the poets of the Augustan period (frequently for the sake of the metre), e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 6, 78: *magnum si pectore possit excussisse deum*. From Tert. cf. e.g. *Marc.* 2, 29, 1: *possum antithesis* (sc. Marcionis) *retudisse*; ib. 5, 11, 10: *possum ... contentionem hanc praeterisse*; 4, 14, 9: *Possem ... transmisisse*. After the perfect and pluperfect both of auxiliaries (e.g. *posse, velle, nolle, malle*) and of other verbs Tert. often has a perfect infinitive instead of a present infinitive. See Oehler's note on *scorp.* 5 (p. 508 c); Hoppe, *Synt.*, 52-4, and *Beitr.*, 40; Thierry, 178-9; Waszink, 414; Hofm., *Synt.*, 591-2; Hofm.-Szant., 351 seq. — **confiteris:** for the meanings of this word in Tert., see Teeuwen, 38-9 and 74-87; Thierry, 162-

3. — **praedicare:** in Tert. either 'to proclaim' (κηρύσσειν) or 'to predict' (= *praedicere*), cf. Waltz., *Ét.*, 478, and *Comm.*, 125; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 136; Hartel, *ALL*, 3, 28; Goelzer, *Jér.*, 241. — **tantos:** cf. 8, 4 *quantae*. For *tanti, quanti = tot, quot* see Hofm., *Synt.*, 490-1; Hofm.-Szant., *Synt.*, 136; Löfst., *Per.*, 147, and *Synt.*, 2, 43; Svennung, *Oros.*, 75-6; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 106; Waltz., *Ét.*, 188, and *Comm.*, 20; Waszink, 174; Böhm, 99. — **Verum deum ... falsos:** for this contrast, cf. 1, 2 and 1, 5. About the making of the other gods (= demons), see the note on 6, 2 *si eos facimus.* — **Facio ... et non colo:** it is not clear why the editors read *sed non* here with Mesnart, for the use of *et non* is by no means extraordinary, if the emphasis is on the negation (especially in corrections), see Hofm., *Synt.*, 659 (with lit.); *TLL* V, 2: 905, 65 seqq.; Salonius, *Vit. Patr.*, 334 seqq.; Tidner, *Part. cop.*, 62 seqq. (with more literature). — **Quasi:** used to introduce the refutation, cf. 4, 5. — **ob aliquam causam:** *aliquam = aliam quam*, see Waszink, 286-7 (with more literature).— **debeat:** the *lectio tradita* (it was not Mesnart who first wrote *debebat*, as Reifferscheid and Kroymann think, but Oehler, cf. the apparatus) is certainly correct. The subjunctive can easily be explained from the assimilation of the mood to the preceding *quasi ... audeat*, which governs the whole sentence (see about this Löfst., *Synt.*, 2, 119-21; Hofm., *Synt.*, 700 and 708). Besides, we should not forget that in later Latin *debeat* often occurs instead of *debet* 'durch formale Angleichung an den vorschwebenden Jussiv' (Hofm., *Synt.*, 572); cf. also Hofm.-Szant., *Synt.*, 335 (with lit.); Löfst., *Festschr. Wackernagel*, 336 seqq., and *Synt.*, 2, 129-31. An instance in Tert. which is found in all mss. is *praescr.* 40, 8: *et ideo neque a diabolo inmissa esse spiritalia nequitiae ... dubitare quis debeat* (all editors with Gelenius read *debet*).

3. **qui facis:** the relative clause has causal force; numerous instances of this practice are given by Thörn., 2, 67 seqq.; cf. also Löfst., *Krit. Apol.* 69; Waszink, 164. 371. — **coli possit:** this reading of the *Agob.* (*possint B* Gel) deserves to be preferred, since throughout this passage *colere* and *facere* are used absolutely. For the idea, cf. 4, 2; more generally *nat.* 2, 5, 12: *certum ... est, quodcumque fit, ei adscribendum, non per quod fit, sed a quo fit, quia is est caput facti, qui et ut fiat et per quod fiat, instituit*, etc. (see Borleffs' *adnot. crit.*). — **Colis ... tuo proprio:** Tert. is here playing upon two different meanings of *spiritus*, viz., a) 'exhalation, smell' (e.g. *an.* 17, 13: *unguenti ... spiritum*; Lucr. 3, 222: *spiritus unguenti suavis*) and b) 'breath of life, soul, life' (for the identification with regard to the function of *spiritus* and *anima* in Tert., see *an.* 10-1 with Waszink's comm.). These puns, in which Tert. often indulges, are called ἀντανάκλασις (Quint. *inst.* 9, 3, 68, who defines: *eiusdem verbi contraria significatio*, 'where the same word is used in two different meanings' (transl. H. E. Butler) or ἀντιμετάθεσις, in Latin *ambiguum* (Cic. *de orat.* 2, 253). More instances are given by Hoppe, *Synt.*, 171; cf. also

e.g. *an.* 28, 1 (*divinus* = both 'divine' and 'prophesying', Waszink, 355). 32, 1-2 (*thamnus*, id., 386). 55, 4 (*Endymiones*, id., 560). A similar case is found in *ieiun.* 16, 8: *deus ... tibi venter est et pulmo templum et aqualiculus altare et sacerdos cocus et sanctus spiritus nidor et condimenta charismata et ructus prophetia.* By *colis ... tuo proprio* (sc. spiritu) Tert. means: 'you worship at the cost of your life', i.e., 'you kill yourself by your idolatry'. — **pecudis:** for the meanings of *pecus, -udis* and *pecus, -oris* in Tert., see Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 78-9. — **anima tua:** cf. *apol.* 24, 5: *alius suam animam deo suo voveat, alius hirci*; Lact. *d.i.* 5, 20, 1: the heathens *animas suas cum ture ipso cremandas aris detestabilibus imponunt.* Tert. is again alluding to the death of the sinner: 'you are not sacrifying to them the life of an animal but your own'. Schümmer, 22, mentions this passage in order to prove that Tert. regards blood as the seat of the soul (he also refers, 23, n. 62, to *an.* 53, 2 but see Waszink, 541). It is true that Tert. is here alluding to bloody sacrifices; however, it is incorrect to draw such a far-reaching conclusion from an artificial passage like the present one. Moreover, Tert.'s terminology is too vague for this: he does not say that, as Schümmer asserts, 'den Heidengöttern die Seele des Tieres geopfert wird' but: 'you worship the gods *anima pecudis impensa*', which, in connection with the corresponding *anima tua* (sc. *impensa*), can only mean: 'by killing an animal'. — **ingenium ... immolas:** the first of three metaphors derived from the practice of sacrifice. Tert. is the first to use *immolare* metaphorically, and quite frequently at that, see *TLL* VII, 1: 489, 77 seqq.; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 188. So, for example, he regards prayer and penitence as sacrifices to God, cf. *paen.* 12, 7: *paenitentiam domino immolaret*; *ieiun.* 10, 13; *apol.* 30, 5; *orat.* 27: *saturatam orationem velut opimam hostiam admovere* (sc. deo). Cf. Waltz., *Comm.* 214; Waszink, 400; Diercks, 139. Applied more loosely, as in the present passage, *apol.* 6, 10: *licet Baccho ... furias vestras immoletis*; *pat.* 13, 4; *spect.* 10, 8. — **sudorem ... libas:** Tert. also uses *libare* metaphorically in *pat.* 13, 2: *sordes cum angustia victus domino libat.* — **prudentiam ... accendis:** *accendere* is used of the lighting of torches and lanterns (cf. *TLL* I: 273, 55 seqq.), of the thing which is burned (e.g. Liv. 29, 14, 33: *accenso ture*; cf. *TLL*, ib. 273, 76 seqq.), and of the fire itself (e.g. Ovid *met.* 12, 12: *accensis incanduit ignibus ara*, cf. *TLL*, ib., 277, 17 seqq.). Here it is used metaphorically as a synonym of *sacrificare.* — **diligentia tua nomen illorum est:** we prefer the reading *nomen* of *A* to *numen* of *B* because of Tert.'s statement in *idol.* 15, 6. Dealing with the Roman gods (*numina*) like Carna, Forculus etc., and after saying that these are in fact *nomina inania atque conficta*, which, however, are objects of superstition, he states: *Alioquin daemonia nullum habent nomen singillatim, sed ibi nomen inveniunt ubi et pignus.* In those *numina* the demons get a pied-à-terre, and therewith a name. In the same manner they get a pied-à-terre in the images made by the idol-makers, and therewith a name, a personality. The noun

nomen has a tendency to become an indication of the thing or person of that name, and Tert. makes a frequent use of it (cf. *idol.* 2, 1; *tam inimicum deo nomen*). For further particulars see Waszink on *an.* 40, 2; Chr. Mohrmann, *Vig. Chr.* 8 (1954) 167-73. We think that Tert. would not be willing to ascribe *numen* (in the sense of 'divine power') to the demons. — **illi non negant:** *illi* are the demons, who are honoured in the images. — **saginatiorem et auratiorem et maiorem:** as *maiorem* follows the other two comparatives, it is not likely that we should have here the technical term *hostia maior* (opposite: *hostia minor*); it is preferable that all three comparatives have an augmentative meaning 'extra-fat and extra-gilded and extra-large' (cf. e.g. 5, 1 *impensius*). The comparative of the participle *saginatus* is also found in *ieiun.* 17, 9; *auratior* occurs only here (*TLL* II: 1520, 18); cf. *orat.* 17, 2 *iustificatior* with Diercks' note; *an.* 13, 2 *nominatior* (see Waszink, 207); *Prax.* 2, 1 *instructiores*; *Marc.* 3, 24, 8 *praelatioris populi.* More instances are given by Kellner, *Spr. Tert.*, 232. For the comparative of the participle of a deponent, see Waszink, 580, on *an.* 57, 6 *operatior.* — **tota die:** see Remark above.

Ch. 7. *The complaint of the zealous believer*

'It is a source of irritation to zealous Christians when they see makers of idols coming into the church, raising hands that make idols in prayer to God, even receiving with those very hands the body of Christ (§ 1). However, the worst thing of all is that manufacturers of idols become members of the clergy, and so at the Eucharist pass on to others what their hands have before polluted (§§ 2-3a). These people do not lay hands on Christ only once, as the Jews did, but every day. It may be that Matt. 18, 8 was meant figuratively; it applies particularly to these people (7, 3b).'

Remark

With this chapter Tertullian's plea against the makers of idols comes to an end. The last argument is the testimony of the zealous Christian (*zelus fidei* is an abstractum pro concreto). The verb *perorabit* in the first sentence is not used without purpose: this chapter is a kind of 'peroration' of the argument against makers of idols. One could say that this peroration is put in the mouth of the zealous Christians: hence *zelus fidei perorabit.*

1. **Ad hanc partem:** 'at this part' of the argument, i.e., the argument against the makers of idols. Thelwall: 'at this quarter'; Kellner: 'hier'. Van der Nat's 'about the following point' is incorrect. — **zelus fidei:** *zelus* (ζῆλος) with the meaning of 'zeal, fervour' does not occur before Tert. (with the meaning 'jealousy' it is found in Vitruvius and Hyginus). Cf. the excellent article 'ζῆλος, etc.' by A. Strumpff in Kittel 2, 879-90 (especially 882-4: 'ζῆλος

im NT'). — **perorabit:** according to Van der Nat, *perorare* means here, as elsewhere in Tert., 'to set forth in detail' (cf. *apol.* 12, 6) and 'to argue, to speak' (*apol.* 18, 6). We think that Tert. wants to say that by their complaints the zealous Christians 'bring the argument to an end (by way of a peroration)'. — **ecclesiam:** it is evident from the context that *ecclesia* here denotes the locality used for religious worship. Tert. is the first to use *ecclesia* (which does not occur in profane Latin) in this sense. See H. Janssen, 7-34 (especially 29 seqq.; to the passages collected by him *spect.* 25, 5 may be added) and the literature given there; Dekkers, 105-8. — **domum dei:** = *ecclesiam*, the locality, here not the community of Christians, as in 5, 1. — **venire ... venire:** Tert. is fond of repeating a word in corresponding sentences or parts of sentences in order to stress either an antithesis or an identity, cf. e.g. 15, 5; 19, 3. Countless instances have been collected by Thörn., 2, 3-10. — **attollere ... manus:** this expression describes the usual attitude of prayer of both Christians and pagans, cf. *orat.* 14: *nos ... non attollimus* (sc. manus) *tantum, sed etiam expandimus et, dominica passione modulata, tum et orantes confitemur Christo* (cf. Diercks ad loc.); *Marc.* 1, 23, 9; *apol.* 30, 4 (for the similarity with *carm. Sibyll.* 3, 59, cf. Lortz, 2, 65, n. 26). So this attitude was interpreted as a *signum* of the cross; cf. in this context also *nat.* 1, 12, 7; *orat.* 29, 4; Min. Fel. 29, 8; *Od. Salom.* 42, 1-2a = 27 (Hennecke, p. 623. 608); Ambros., *sacr.* 6, 4. 8; Aug. *serm.* 342, 1 (P.L. 39, 1501): *in extensione manuum agnoscimus crucem*; *enarr. in ps.* 62, 13. Also Moses' attitude of prayer with extended arms (Exod. 17, 9-12) was regarded as a *figura* of the crucified Christ, cf. *Marc.* 3, 18, 6 (= *Iud.* 10, 10); Just. *dial.* 90, 4 and 111, 1 (see Archambault's comm., 2, 84, n. 2); *Barn.* 12, 2-3 (see Windisch's note in *HdbNT, Erg. Bd.*, 369-70, where more instances are mentioned). For further particulars, see *DACL* s.v. 'Orante', XII, 2291 seqq.; Waltz., *Comm.*, 212-3; Dekkers, 82-7; Dölger, *Sol sal.*, 313; Dibelius' note on 1 Tim. 2, 8 (*HdbNT* 13, 36-7), G. Appel, *De Romanorum precationibus* (RVV 7, 2, Giessen 1902), 194-7; Herzog, *Prudentius*, 90, n. 125. — **manus matres idolorum:** of course the wording has been influenced by the wish to establish a contrast to *deum patrem*. Tert. also uses this image in *an.* 4: *nam et factor ipse parens facti potest dici*; *sic et Plato utitur* (sc., in *Tim.* 28 c); cf. also *Prax.* 8, 5; Lact. *d.i.* 2, 2, 12: *homo ... illorum* (sc. simulacrorum) *quasi parens putandus est, per cuius manus nata sunt, per quem figuram speciem pulchritudinem habere coeperunt*; for the use of this passage in patristic literature in general see Waszink's note on *an.* 4 (124-5). — **his manibus ... quae:** *hic* as an antecedent is either emphatic or equivalent to *hic talis* or identical with *is*, see Waszink, 379-80. Tert.'s works contain numerous instances of all these three possibilities, e.g. *nat.* 2, 5, 8 (emphatic), *apol.* 36, 2 (= *hic talis*), *bapt.* 2, 3 (= *is*). In the present passage we have the first case; also in the corresponding *eas manus ... quae* the adjectival *eas* has been added for the sake of emphasis:

'pray to god with the very hands which'. — **quae ... adorantur:** cf. *res.* 6, 6: *Phidiae manus Iovem Olympium ex ebore molitae adorantur.* The use of *manus* with the meaning 'work (of art)' is probably found already in Cic. *leg.*2, 28: *bene vero, quod Mens ... consecratur manu*; cf. for this passage Bulhart's note in *TLL* VIII: 357, 51-4. To the passages quoted in *TLL* (ib., 54-64) we may add Stat. *silv.* 1, 3, 47: *vidi artes veterumque manus*; from Tert. cf. *scorp.* 6, 8: *quibus* (sc. carne et anima) *in homine carius nihil est, alterum manus dei, alterum flatus* (cf. Stat. *Theb.* 8, 305: *Prometheas ... manus = homines Promethei manibus factos*; Tert. calls God *verus Prometheus* in *apol.* 18, 2 and *Marc.* 1, 1, 4). Likewise Athenag. *leg.* 17: ἡ δὲ ἐν Σάμῳ Ἥρα καὶ ἐν Ἄργει Σμιλίδος χεῖρες. Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 195, n. 3, observes that he knows only one more passage in Greek where χεῖρες = *opus*, viz., Planudes XVI 262, 3. More than once the idols are designated emphatically as no more than the work of human hands, cf. from Tert. *pat.* 2, 3: God is *ostendens patientiae exemplum: sustinens ingratissimas nationes ludibria artium et opera manuum suarum adorantes*; *nat.* 1, 4, 15; Cypr. *ad Demetr.* 12; Lact. *d.i.* 2, 1, 19; 4, 1, 2; 5, 22, 21; 7, 19, 9; 7, 22, 12; Just. *apol.* 1, 53, 6; Theoph. *ad Autol.* 1, 1; 2 Clem. 1, 6; likewise already Deut. 4, 28; Is. 2, 8; Sap. 13, 10; ep. Ier. 50. 52; Sib. 3, 722; see Strack - B., 3, 55-6. We find the same idea in Plut. *tranq. an.* 20, 477 c: man is not meant to be χειροκμήτων and ἀκινήτων ἀγαλμάτων θεατής (see Geffcken, *Bilderstreit*, 295); Just. *apol.* 1, 20 refers to Menander and others who had the same opinion. — **manus ... domini:** by *corpus domini* (we also find *corpus dominicum, corpus Christi*) Tert. means the Eucharist, cf. *res.* 8, 3; *Marc.* 4, 40, 4; *pud.* 9, 16: *opimitate dominici corporis vescitur, eucharistia scilicet*; *orat.* 19, 1 and 4: *accepto corpore domini* (cf. *idol.* 7, 2: *accipiant*). The Eucharist was handed out by the person who conducted the liturgy (cf. *cor.* 3, 3: *Eucharistiae sacramentum ... nec de aliorum manu quam praesidentium sumimus*), and it was manually received by the communicant (the words *manus admovere corpori domini* allude to this; cf. 7, 2: *si ab aliis manibus accipiant*). The consecrated bread was partaken either on the spot or later at home. See *DACL* s.v. 'Communion'; Schrijnen, *Collectanea*, 309 seqq.; Dekkers, 49 seqq. (especially 61-6); Diercks, 196-8; Stephan, 139; Böhm, 103. — **quae ... conferunt:** cf. 6, 1; Aug. *c.d.* 8, 26 (1, 365, 24-5 Domb.): *ut pro anima sit daemon, pro corpore simulacrum.* Although the false adoration ultimately concerns the demons, here Tert. says that the images are adored; he can do so because the images are as it were the bodies of the demons. See about Tert.'s opinion of the *idola* as intermediate entities the Remarks at ch. 1.

2. **Parum sit, si:** for this and similar expressions, which are frequent in Tert., see Thörn., 1, 63-7; Oehler's note on *apol.* 6 (p. 134 g). — **ab aliis**

manibus ... contaminant: cf. supra; *accipiant* should not be supplied with *ore* but with *manu*. For the idea behind *contaminant*, cf. *orat.* 13, 1. — **etiam ipsae ... aliis:** sc. *manus ... manibus*. The pleonastic *etiam ipse* is frequent in Tert., e.g. *orat.* 16, 6; *exh. cast.* 2, 2; *Marc.* 4, 12, 7; see Thörn., 3, 16. 18. 22.

3. **alleguntur ... ecclesiasticum:** *allegere, allectio* are technical terms for the admission into a college, especially into the senate. Tert. uses them for the admission into the clergy (*mon.* 12, 1; *exh. cast.* 7, 2. 6) or into the *ordo viduarum* (*ux.* 1, 7, 4), for the choice of the apostles (*bapt.* 12, 8), and for the election of the heathens (*res.* 22, 4; *pud.* 12, 3; *apol.* 21, 6); see Teeuwen, 70; Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 90-1; Stephan, 105; Tränkle, 50; *TLL* I: 1666, 28 seqq. — **isti quotidie ... lacessunt:** the adverb *quotidie* has raised a question. Tert. asserts that these idol-makers do *every day* what the Jews perpetrated once, viz., to ill-treat the body of Christ. This seems to point to a daily participation in the eucharistic synaxis. However, in Tert.'s time this synaxis was only held on Sundays, and the days of the *statio*, viz., Wednesday and Friday (see Dekkers, 66 seqq.). How could Tert. say *quotidie*? Several authors, i.a. Van der Nat, think that this *quotidie* can be explained by the fact that the consecrated bread was not always consumed in church but could be taken home and eaten there. (See Teeuwen, 115 seqq.; Schümmer, 105 seqq.; Diercks, 109-10. 191; Dekkers, 66-7). So the house-communion must fill up the gaps in order to make those people come in contact with the holy bread *daily*. We think that this is an over-interpretation of *quotidie*. It may be true that normally the Eucharist was held three times a week, but, as Dekkers (167) observes, it could also take place at the burial of a Christian and on memorial days, that is to say, in principle on every day. Why, then, could Tert. not say: 'what the Jews did once, they do every day'? In fact *quotidie* stands here for 'very often'. It has been chosen as a strong opposition to *semel*. One should also notice that frequence of the house-communion is not clear from the sources. The holy bread was taken home for the ill people. In *orat.* 19, 4 Tert. also advises those who are afraid to break their fasting (*statio*) by eating the holy bread to take it home and eat it there after the ninth hour (the end of the *statio*). So there was a practice of house-communion for different situations. But is there any testimony for a daily communion at home? We think there is not, although it may have taken place rather frequently (cf. E. Dekkers, 'De reservatie der Eucharistie in de oudheid', in *Pro regno, pro sanctuario*, Festschr. G. van der Leeuw, Nijkerk 1951). Decisive, however, is the fact that the whole present chapter points to the eucharistic synaxis: the zealous Christian is offended by the fact that the idol-maker is admitted into the church, that he receives the body of Christ on his polluted hands, that he is even ordained and gives the holy bread to others. Then Tert. says: 'They do daily what the Jews did once'. In our view this statement cannot but point

to the behaviour of those people (*isti*) which has been described just now, i.e. in the church at the Eucharist. For *lacessunt* cf. Cypr. *laps.* 15: *a diaboli aris revertentes ad sanctum domini sordidis et infectis nidore manibus accedunt, ... domini corpus invadunt*; ib., 16: *vis infertur corpori eius* (sc. domini) *et sanguini et plus modo in dominum manibus atque ore delinquunt quam cum dominum negaverunt.* — **manus praecidendae:** we find the same expression with regard to the heretics in *Marc.* 5, 18, 1: *de manibus haereticis praecidendis non miror, si syllabas subtrahit, cum paginas totas plerumque subducit.* Thörnell, 2, 64-5, compares Suet. *Claud.* 15, 5: *proclamante quodam praecidendas falsario manus.* For another meaning of *praecidere* in Tert., see Waszink, 235. — **Viderit ... an ... dictum:** the correct reading is *viderit* (not *viderint*); the right interpretation was given by Oehler: 'ipsum dictum viderit'. This expression, which is very frequent in Tert., means 'does not matter, is immaterial to me', cf. e.g. *cor.* 13, 12: *viderint et publici equi cum coronis suis*; *an.* 10, 1: *viderint disciplinae et artes, viderint et effigies.* For *an* instead of *num*, see the note on 3, 3. *Videri(n)t* is often followed by an indirect question, mostly introduced by *si*, cf. 11, 2; *paen.* 2, 10: *viderit ingratia hominum, si etiam bonis factis paenitentiam cogit*; *test. an.* 1, 4: *viderint, si qui de unico et solo deo pronuntiaverunt*; see Oehler's note on *cor.* 13 (p. 450 f); Hartel, 1, 15; Rönsch, *N.T. Tert.*, 598; Gerlo, 2, 37; Waszink, 112; Stephan, 71. *Dictum*, the reading of the *Agob.*, is certainly preferable to *dictum sit* (Mesnart), because the former furnishes a better clausula (1 δ); besides, Tert. often leaves out forms of *esse* (see, however, the note on 1, 3) both in main sentences and in clauses; also the present subjunct. and the imperfect subjunct. in indirect questions may be left out, e.g. *mon.* 3, 1: *an onerosa monogamia, viderit adhuc impudens infirmitas carnis, an autem nova, de hoc interim constet*, see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 144; Hartel, 1, 9. — **scandalizat ... scandalizatur:** this verb and the noun *scandalum* only occur in Christian Latin (since the *Vetus Latina*); from Tert., cf. e.g. *res.* 30, 9; *Marc.* 4, 43, 5; *ieiun.* 5, 2; *praescr.* 1, 2; 2, 5. An elaborate study of the occurrence and the semitic development of the Greek word is given by G. Stählin, *Skandalon* (Gütersloh 1930; cf. especially 367 seqq. and 424 seqq., and for the present passage 265-70. 450. 455), and his art. 'σκάνδαλον' in Kittel 7, 338-58 (the most important literature ib., 338-9, note, and Kittel 10/2, 1265). Concerning the Latin loanword, cf. Rönsch, *It.*, 245. 249; Mohrm., *Aug.*, 148-50; *Études*, 2, 17.

Ch. 8. *The arts of making other objects*

'Besides the arts that make idols, there are also those which furnish the necessary attributes of the idols; these are even more guilty of idolatry, since the former only lend an image to the idols, the latter give them authority (§ 1).

If the necessity of securing maintenance is adduced as an excuse, this is not valid, because these craftsmen always have other arts at their disposal, by

which they can earn their livelihoods. There are as many arts as there are ramifications of the human desires (§§ 2-3a).

The making of an idolatrous attribute may be very remunerative, but a livelihood gotten by other things is easier. The smaller reward fetched by the latter individual products is compensated for by one's work being performed more frequently. Luxuria *and* ambitio *have always been more frequent than* superstitio *(§§ 3b-5a).*

Thus we must avoid those arts which have something to do with idolatry. But even if we do so, we should bear in mind that many things are common to men and idols. If we should be aware that products from our hands in fact are asked for an idolatrous purpose, we have to refuse. Otherwise we are still guilty of idolatry (§ 5b).'

Remarks

a. This chapter, in particular the first paragraph, illustrates again Tertullian's tendency to attach exaggerated importance to the subject under discussion. After declaring, in chapter 4, the makers of idols more guilty of idolatry than the worshippers, he now designates the artisans who make the attributes of idols as even more grievous sinners, because they give the idols authority, while the former give them an image only.

b. In paragraphs 2 and 3 Tertullian argues that the artisans under discussion need not abandon their crafts, but can always find other ways to win their livelihoods. The way in which he formulates this view is remarkable. In paragraph 3 he states by way of example: "He who carves a Mars from lime-wood, how much more quickly does he put together a chest?" And he continues: "There is no art which is not the mother or the relative of another one; there is nothing (= no art) which is not accompanied by a second one". Obviously this is an explanation of the previous statements about the different possibilities the artisans have to apply their crafts.

Thus Tertullian considers the different aspects of these crafts *as different arts*: there is an art of making an image; there is another art which enables the same artisan to make a chest. So this artisan disposes of a number of arts, and that is why Tertullian can say: you can always switch to *another art*. If he considered the craft of, e.g., a painter as one art, he could not say: 'no art is not the mother or the relative of another', in other words, 'who possesses one art always has a second'. This would mean that a painter possesses always another craft, e.g. that of image-making, which is obviously not true. Thus in the domain of the crafts under discussion in this chapter, one artisan always disposes of several arts; if the art of image-making is forbidden to him, he may win his livelihood by practising the art of making chests, etc.

Remarkably Tertullian does not speak of the possibility that an image-maker applies his art to a non-idolatrous object, so that he makes an image, not of a god, but of a human being, e.g. of Cicero. Perhaps he considered the art of making images as being a too dangerous occupation, since the demand of images of gods must have been much greater than that of profane images.

Our interpretation of Tertullian's concept of art in ch. 8, viz., that one craft embraces a number of arts, is confirmed by the opening sentence of chapter 9. There Tertullian states that "among the arts there are also professions", that is to say: there are also arts which coincide with a profession. In other words: there are cases in which a profession consists of *one* art. Tertullian discusses two of these professions: that of astrologer and that of teacher. These are automatically forbidden. In this case there is no possibility of switching to another art within the profession, as in the cases of chapter 8.

1. **complurium artium species** = *complures artium species*. For a similar hypallage of adjectives belonging in sense to *genus*, see *TLL* VI, 2: 1906, 30-53; Löfst., *Synt.*, 2, 109-11; Waszink, 477-8. — **sine quibus ... non possunt:** all editors have *nil possunt*. However, this reading of Gelenius is evidently incorrect, as *nil* is never found in Tert.'s works (in *A* the relevant part of the leaf has been damaged, so that it is no longer possible to ascertain the reading; Mesnart omits the word). On the other hand, (*non*) *posse sine* is a very common expression in Tert., cf. e.g. *test. an.* 5, 5; *apol.* 13, 2; *cult. fem.* 1, 5, 3; 2, 12, 2. In this expression *posse* means *esse posse*; see Hartel, 2, 46; 4, 60; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 144, and *Beitr.*, 46; Löfst., *Krit. Apol.*, 89-91, *Synt.*, 2, 269-72, and *Verm. Stud.*, 92; Thierry, 127; Waszink 263 (with more lit.). — **eodem crimine:** this modal ablative has the function of an apposition: 'they make things that idols cannot do without—which is the same sin (as the *fabricatio idolorum*)'. Certain instances of this ablative also are *cult. fem.* 2, 7, 1: *aliae* (sc. crines gestiunt), *ut vagi et volucres elabantur, non bona simplicitate*; *ieiun.* 10, 4: *hinc itaque et Petrum dicam ex vetere potius usu nonam observasse tertio orantem supremae orationis munere*. A similar appositional ablative occurs fairly often in Pliny, see Koch, *Rhein. Mus. N.F.* 78 (1929), 427-32, e.g. *n.h.* 11, 197: *dracones emicuisse de extis laeto prodigio*. Isolated instances, however, are also found in other authors, e.g. Liv. 21, 11, 8: *caementa non calce durata erant, sed interlita luto structurae antiquo genere*; 43, 1, 4: *per Illyricum ducere legiones in Macedoniam vano incepto est conatus*; Tac. *ann.* 14, 14, 2: *clausumque valle Vaticana spatium, in quo equos regeret, haud promiscuo spectaculo*; 12, 65, 3; more instances are given by Waszink, 274-5. Cyprian, too, uses the modal ablative loosely; in his writings, however, this ablative mostly does not have the function of an apposition, as is supposed by Koch; it rather indicates usually the result of the

action of the predicate, see Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.* 1, 123-140; Merkx, 65-71. For the development of this use see Waszink, ib.; cf. also Kok, 167-8. — **Nec enim** explains *eodem crimine*. — **differt, an ... vel:** an impersonal *differt* followed by an indirect question occurs since Cicero (*Caec.* 39; *top.* 16; *fat.* 32; see *TLL* V, 1: 1079, 8-20). The combination *an ... vel* instead of *utrum ... an* (or *an ... an*, which is found since Verg. *Aen.* 10, 680-3) is not dealt with by Hofmann (*Synt.*, 651. 676. 699; for *an ... aut* see Hofm.-Szant., 546). *TLL* II: 9, 58-61 gives six instances, four of which are derived from juridical texts, viz., Iulian. *dig.* 24, 2, 6; Scaev. *dig.* 12, 6, 61; Ulp. *dig.* 12, 2, 3, 3 and 36, 4, 3, 2 (the other two are Terent. Maur. 106, 2; *Physiognom.* 34 = 2, 52, 7-9 Foerster). We may, therefore, assume that Tert. has borrowed this combination from the idiom of lawyers. — **exstruas ... exornes:** the interpretation of *exstruas* presents difficulties. According to *TLL* V, 1: 1078, 20, *templum* should be supplied as the object, a view which is shared by Oehler and Kellner. However, an unforced interpretation requires that we regard the words *nec enim differt* as an explanation of the preceding sentence, and especially of the words *eodem crimine*, and so once more juxtapose the fabrication of the idols themselves and that of their necessary attributes in the indirect question, i.e., that we connect *exstruas* with *idolorum fabricationem*, and *exornes* with *ea, sine quibus idola non possunt, ... expediunt*. Moreover, Tert. is definitely not opposing the builders of temples: in 8, 2 he only mentions those whose work is of a decorative nature; to describe their activity he uses the verb *instruere*, which does not mean 'to build'; besides, if those whom Tert. is combating would build the temples themselves, it is surprising that in 8, 4 *quot templa ... aedificantur* he should use a passive form instead of an active one. On the other hand, the relation of the last-mentioned sentence to the preceding one points to the fact that, just as these artisans provide the *signa* for the *parietes* made by others, they in the same manner decorate temples built by others. For these reasons we have to assume (as was already expressly done by De la Cerda) that *exstruere* is here equivalent to *fabricare*. In fact, the usual meaning of *exstruere* is 'to build' (*TLL* V, 2: 1939, 38 seqq.). — **aram:** for the denomination of the heathen altar by heathens and Christians, and for the denomination of the Christian altar, see Diercks, 195-6; Stephan, 106. — **aediculam** may here mean 'chapel' (*sacellum*) or 'niche' (in which a statue is placed), see *TLL* I: 916, 19 seqq. The first meaning is the more likely one here, cf. 8, 4: *quot templa et aedes idolis aedificantur*? — **eius:** sc. *idoli*. In connection with *templum* the singular was necessary, but still the transition from plural (*idolorum ... idola*) to singular remains remarkable, cf. e.g. *apol.* 23, 8, and see Thörn., 1, 11-2; Böhm, 104. — **instruxeris:** 'to furnish, to decorate' ('embellish' Thellwall). — **donum:** the end of the word is illegible in *A*. Mesnart and Gelenius have *domum*. Hartel 1, 42-3 points out that this reading is open to objection; the things mentioned are divided into two groups: the

first contains *templum*, *aram* and *aediculam*, the second *bratteam* and *insignia*, after which *domum* fits in badly, as it would properly belong to the first group. Moreover, *aut etiam* ('or even') favours the assumption that the following object is less important than *bratteam* and *insignia*, which *domum* certainly is not. Therefore, we do best to adopt Hartel's conjecture *donum*; for *donum* used to denote a gift to a god, cf. e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 3, 439; 4, 453; 7, 86; Liv. 21, 62; Lact. *d.i.* 5, 13, 8. — **auctoritatem:** cf. Min. Fel. 24, 5: *quis ergo dubitat horum imagines consecratas vulgus orare et publice colere, dum opinio et mens imperitorum artis concinnitate decipitur, auri fulgore praestringitur, argenti nitore et candore eboris hebetatur?* Lact. *d.i.* 2, 6, 6 (cf. ib. 2-3); Arnob. 6, 16 (327, 11 March.): (dei) *quos exterior levitas lenocinio fulgoris augustat*, 'those gods to whom the artificial sheen of a smooth exterior lends majesty' (transl. McCracken, ACW, 8, p. 468); *augustare* is a hapax, cf. *TLL* II: 1380, 34; cf. ib. 6, 24 (338, 2-13). More generally Tert. *bapt.* 2, 2: *mentior si non idolorum sollemnia vel arcana de suggestu et apparatu deque sumptu fidem et auctoritatem sibi exstruunt*.

2. **Si ... extenditur:** Tert. returns to the excuse which he has already rejected in 5, 2 and which he is going to discuss again in detail in chapter 12. Here, however, the matter is given not only a negative, but also a positive treatment. For *exhibitio*, cf. 6, 2; for *extendere*, cf. 2, 3 and 11, 3; *cult. fem.* 2, 3, 1. — **habent:** sc. *artes*. — **exorbitatione:** 'transgression, aberration' (also 14, 2; *Marc.* 1, 29, 4) does not occur before Tert., see *TLL* V, 2: 1552, 83 seqq.; cf. Oehler's note on *apol.* 20 (p. 194 h); Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 136. The verb *exorbitare* also occurs since Tert., see *TLL*, ib., 1553, 27. — **disciplinae:** sc. *christianae*; cf. the note on 2, 4. — **sine idoli confictura:** the substantive *confictura* is not found elsewhere (*TLL* IV: 205, 24-6; Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 134). The verb *confingere* is used by Arnobius 6, 12 and Lactantius (*d.i.* 1, 11, 29) to denote the fabrication of images (*TLL*, ib., 214, 70) but not by Tert. (with another meaning e.g. 15, 5; *an.* 56, 2; *pud.* 8, 12; *nat.* 1, 7, 14). By *idoli confictura* we should not, as is evident from the following sentences, understand the fabrication of a cult-image but the representation of a god or a mythological scene as a decoration (reliefs, murals; for the latter, cf. e.g. Prud. *c. Symm.* 2, 39. 56). Tert. chooses the term that enables him to combat the practice most sharply. In doing so he leaves out of consideration whether these images are made in temples or elsewhere, since they are to be found everywhere, cf. e.g. *spect.* 8, 9: *ceterum et plateae et forum et balneae et stabula et ipsae domus nostrae sine idolis omnino non sunt: totum saeculum satanas et angeli eius repleverunt*. The decoration of temples and of the statues of gods is again dealt with in 8, 4. — **albarius tector:** 'worker in stucco, plasterer'. In this combination these words do not occur elsewhere (*TLL* I: 1487, 84 seqq.); we find either *albarius* (*Cod. Theod.* 13, 4, 2; *CIL* VI: 9139) or *tector* (Varro *r.r.* 3,

2, 9; Vitr. 7, 3, 10). Böhm, 106: 'Diese Worte bezeichnen den Beruf eines Wandmalers beziehungsweise eines Stukkateurs, der die Wanden mit weisser Farbe überdeckt'. *Tector* refers to the activity, *albarius* to the material (cf. Nicole Blanc, 'Les stucateurs romains: témoignages littéraires, épigraphiques et juridiques', MEFRA 95 (1985), 868. Their work is called (*opus*) *albarium*, by which according to Blümner (*Technologie*, 2, 147) is understood 'jedwede Übertünchung von Stein- oder Ziegelmauern, mag dieselbe nun in einfacher, glatter Übermörtelung bestehen, mag ein kunstvoller complicirterer Stuck zur Anbringung von Wandgemälden aufgetragen, oder mag endlich der aufgetragene Stuck plastisch verziert sein'. We also find the term (*opus*) *tectorium* used to denote the same (e.g. Varro *r.r.* 1, 57, 1; 3, 2, 9; Cic. *div.* 2, 58; Vitr. 5, 10, 3; *Inferior ... pars* (sc. *camararum*) *... opere albario sive tectorio poliatur*); cf. also Schöllgen, 92, with notes 458-9. — **cisternam liare:** *cisterna* is a subterranean reservoir for liquids, especially drinking-water; it was given a smooth coating of plaster with rounded corners, see Puchstein, art. 'cisterna', *RE* III: 2606-7, and Schöllgen, 92, n. 463. Tert. has the word also in *bapt.* 5, 4; *Valent.* 15, 4. *Liare* (λειοῦν) must mean 'to polish', 'to plaster' (cf. Rönsch, *It.*, 256); in this sense it does not occur elsewhere; Vitruv. 2, 4, 3 and 7, 3, 7, however, mentions a polishing tool called *liaculum* (= λεαντήρ/λιαντήρ). Apic. 5, 1, 1 uses *liare* of the stirring of sauces in order to prevent lumpiness. — **cymatia:** a technical term of architecture (*TLL* IV: 1587, 40-50) for an ogee with leaf-decoration. For the name, cf. Hesych. s.v. κυμάτια, τὰ χείλη, διὰ τὸ κυμαίνειν ἢ αἱ ὑπεροχαὶ παρὰ τέκτοσι καὶ λιθοποιοῖς. There were three types, a Doric (Vitruv. 4, 6, 2), a Ionic (id., 3, 5, 10-1) and a Lesbian one (id., 4, 6, 2). For further particulars, see Ebert, art. 'Kymation', *RE* XI: 2462-74; Schöllgen, 92, n. 464; Böhm, 106. — **incrispare:** the only other instance of this verb is found in Marcell. *medicam.* 7 titulus: *capillo nigrando et incrispando* (*TLL* VII, 1: 1059, 14-7, where *incrispare* is wrongly said to be 'falso trad.' in the present passage). The conjectures by Pamelius (*incrustare*) and Reifferscheid (*ingypsare*) are superfluous: the correct interpretation was already given by Iunius: 'opus crispans indere'. Oehler paraphrases: 'incrispare parietes dicit marmore varii coloris picturis crispo incrustare.' Pliny (*n.h.* 36, 55) does indeed mention a kind of marble which is *undatim crispum*; likewise he uses *crispus* to indicate the veining of wood (*n.h.* 13, 62; see *TLL* IV: 1208, 76-83). In that case we should have to think of stucco imitations of marble slabs. However, such imitations are not mentioned until the following sentence; here we are concerned with plastic decorations (*cymatia*, *simulacra*). Besides, it is improbable that the words *ornamenta incrispare* could be used to indicate the fitting of stucco imitations of marble slabs (for this we invariably find the verb *incrustare* used). *Incrispare* must refer to the curling forms of the ornaments; cf. also Schöllgen, 92, n. 465; Böhm, 107. — **pictor ... caelator:** for these artisans, see Schöllgen, 92-3. —

latitudines: Oehler correctly interprets: 'opera suae artis quam latissime diffusa'. The word *faciliores* shows that *latitudines* must perforce be concrete: 'extensions', i.e., 'activities extending the scope of their trade'. To our knowledge, this meaning does not occur elsewhere. See also the note on 2, 1 *idololatriae latitudo*.

3. **signum describit:** *signum* means *imaginem*, *simulacrum*. Tert. has the *pictor* in mind here, cf. e.g. Plaut. *Asin.* 402: *non potuit pictor rectius describere eius formam*. For this meaning of *describere*, see *TLL* V, 1: 656, 69 seqq. — **abacum linit:** The word *abacus* may denote several things, cf. Mau, art. 'Abacus'; *RE* I: 5-6. According to *TLL* I: 42, 22-5, Tert. is here thinking of a table on which earthenware was put. These, however, were show-tables, often made of costly wood or stone (Blümner, *Privataltertümer*, 126), so that it is not very likely that they were also painted. It is preferable to interpret *abacus* as the marble slab imitated in stucco, which was used as a wall-decoration (see Mau, *RE* I: 4, nr. 7; Fiechter, art. 'Abacus', *RE* Suppl. III: 3-4). The real marble slabs (which, when quadrangular, were called *abaci*, when round, *orbes*) were made by the *marmorarii*, who are also mentioned here by Tert. (Blümner, *Technologie*, 3, 185); the stucco imitations were executed by plasterers and painters, cf. Vitr. 7, 3, 10, who, after observing that the *Graecorum tectores* produce excellent work, says: *Itaque veteribus parietibus nonnulli crustas excidentes pro abacis utuntur, ipsaque tectoria abacorum et speculorum divisionibus circa se prominentes habent expressiones* ('therefore some cut out panels from old walls and use them like easel pictures. For the plasterwork itself being divided into panels and mirrors furnishes images which seem to stand out from it', Granger); Pliny *n.h.* 33, 159; 35, 3 (cf. Vitr. 7, 3, 5). *Linere* is the general term for 'to plaster', cf. *TLL* VII, 2: 1457, 26-47. — **tilia:** the lime-tree was frequently used for the production of furniture, see Blümner, *Technologie*, 2, 277-8. For use in sculpture, too, this wood had some attractive qualities, cf. Vitr. 2, 9, 9: *Populus alba et nigra, item salix tilia vitex ..., cum non sint dura terreni mixtione, propter raritatem sunt candida et in sculpturis commodam praestant tractabilitatem.* Pliny *n.h.* 16, 209 (about this and a few other kinds of wood): *habent et candorem, rigorem et in sculpturis facilitatem*; cf. also Verg. *georg.* 2, 449-50. — **Qui ... compingit:** here Tert. comes near to an old argument of apologetic literature, viz., that the material of the images of gods can be used for a variety of other purposes, and that, therefore, it depends on the will of the artisan whether a 'god' is produced or an object of utility; cf. already Sap. 15, 7; ep. Ierem. 45 (= Baruch 6). Is 44, 9 (quoted in 4, 3) also alludes to this. On the pagan side this idea is expressed in Horace's well-known lines (*sat.* 1, 8, 1-3): *olim truncus eram ficulnus, inutile lignum, | cum faber, incertus, scamnum faceretne Priapum, | maluit esse deum* (see Heinze's note). Horace

was inspired by a Greek saying, occurring in Epicharmus (fr. 13, Kaibel): ἐκ παντὸς ξύλου κλοιὸς γένοιτ' ἂν καὶ θεός. An adaptation of it is also found in Herodotus' story about the gold ποδανιπτήρ of King Amasis, in which the Egyptians used to ἐνεμέειν τε καὶ ἐνουρέειν καὶ πόδας ἐναπονίζεσθαι, and of which the material was worked up into the image of a god (2, 172). Herodotus' story has been eagerly used (but only in general terms) by Jewish and Christian apologetics from Philo (*vit. contempl.* 7) onwards; cf. e.g. Just. *apol.* 1, 9, 2; Athenag. *leg.* 26; Theophil. *ad Autol.* 1, 10; *ep. ad Diogn.* 2, 2, 4; Tert. *apol.* 12, 2; Min. Fel. 24, 7; *Act. Apoll.* 17; Arnob. 6, 14; Prud. *perist.* 10, 296-300. Lactantius, *d.i.* 2, 4, 1, uses and quotes the above-mentioned passage from Horace. See Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, XXI, n. 1; XXIII; XXVI-VII; 102; 188, n. 3; id., *Bilderstreit*, 288-9; Clerc, 130. — **Nulla ars ... est:** a similar thought but expressed with completely different intentions, is found in Cicero, *De oratore* 3, 21: *est etiam illa Platonis vera ... vox omnem doctrinam harum ingenuarum et humanarum artium uno quodam societatis vinculo contineri* (cf. Plato *Epin.* 992 a); cf. also Cic. *Arch.* 2: *omnes artes, quae ad humanitatem pertinent, habent quoddam commune vinculum et quasi cognatione quadam inter se continentur.* Cicero says that all arts are generally connected with each other on account of a certain relationship, whereas Tert. states that every single art is connected especially with one other, so that to every artist several ways are open to apply his skill. About the idea of art behind his argument, see the Remarks at this chapter. — **quot hominum concupiscentiae:** man's desires are the main source of income for the artists, even a more important one than idolatry, for, as Tert. says in *idol.* 8, 4, *frequentior est omni superstitione luxuria et ambitio.* — **artium venae:** in Tert. *vena* usually means 'that which flows away from something', and so becomes equivalent to 'ramification': cf. from the present treatise 2, 1: *tam locuples substantia criminis, quae tot ramos porrigit, tot venas defundit*, and further *pat.* 5, 18: (inpatientia) *defundens de suo fonte varias criminum venas*, and, in accordance with this passage, ib. 12, 2: *iram dolorem duritiam amaritudinem, venas* (Ew. Bruhn ap. Kroym.; *venena P M X*) *scilicet inpatientiae.* The meaning *origo* occurs in *apol.* 19, 2: *Omnes itaque substantias omnesque materias, origines, ordines, venas veterani cuiusque stili vestri*, and *nat.* 1, 16, 13: *Unde adeo mimis et comoedis argumentorum venae fluunt* (''C'est là précisement la source où mimes et comédiens puisent la matière de leurs spectacles'', Paschoud in his edition, p. 103). See also Rambaux, 135, n. 61. — **alterius vacat:** cf. *pall.* 2, 6: (terra) *cassa et vacans hominum*; see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 25; Gerlo, 2, 60. Elsewhere in Tert. *vacare* governs an ablative with or without *a* (cf. with *a* in 8, 5). Hofmann, *Synt.*, does not mention the present construction, nor does Hofm.-Szant. Probably the use of the genitive is due to an analogy of the genitive found both after *vacuus* (Terent. *Heaut.* 90; also in Sallust, Tacitus and Apuleius; see Hofm., *Synt.*, 404; Hofm.-Szant., 78 and 107) and after related verbs and adjectives, such as *egere, indigere, egenus, carere* (e.g. Terent. *Heaut.* 400; Plin. *n.h.* 32, 59; see *TLL* III: 455, 11-14), *nudus* (e.g. Sall. *Iug.* 79, 6; also in Ovid, Quintilian, and Apuleius), and *liber* (in Horace, Valerius Maximus, Plin. minor, Apuleius).

— **Sed:** for the purpose of introducing an *occupatio*, *sed* is already used a few times by Cicero; it is especially used by Seneca to replace the classical *at* or *atenim*, see Hofm., *Synt.*, 666. The *occupatio* plays an important part in Tert.'s writings: it is a characteristic feature of his way of arguing to introduce a speaking opponent (in *idol.* e.g. 6, 2; 9, 4; 12, 2). See Norden, *Kunstpr.*, 1, 129 and 2, 611-2; Diercks, 227-8; Waszink, 557. The meaning of the present *occupatio* is: 'Yes' (the fictitious opponent says) 'but as to payment and wages for the handiwork there is a difference' (i.e.: 'for the statue of an idol you get considerably more money'). To which Tert. replies: 'Sure, but there is also a difference in labour: a smaller reward for 'everyday-work' is compensated by the fact that this work is done more frequently'. — **mercedibus:** According to Rambaux, 85, n. 154, this word is used here and in the sentence after, as also in 13, 4, in a pejorative sense. We see no reason not to assume a neutral sense.

4. **Quot parietes ... quantae:** The point is that there are much more profane buildings which have to be decorated than temples and chapels for which the same work has to be done (to *parietes* a genitive *templorum* is, of course, to be added). — **signa:** = images of gods. — **praetoria:** 'country-houses, residences', called by Ulpianus, *dig.* 50, 16, 198, *voluptati tantum deservientia.* This meaning dates from the imperial period; the instance which is probably the earliest occurs in an edict of Claudius of A.D. 46 (*CIL* 11, 1222). The explanation of the term is uncertain. According to Vollmer (note on Stat. *silv.* 1, 3, 25), this use is derived from the meaning 'official residence' of the praetor in the province. Mommsen (*Hermes* 4 (1870), 105; ib. 35 (1900), 437-42, especially 437-8) thinks that there is a connection with the meaning 'headquarters'; he advances as an argument that in earlier times *praetorium* with the meaning 'country-house' is especially used with regard to the emperor: probably all the imperial villas in Italy were provided with quarters for the guard escorting the emperor, and from these the residence itself came to derive its name, which afterwards was also applied to big country-houses in general ('das von dem Gutsbesitzer nicht für wirtschaftliche Zwecke angelegte, sondern für persönliche Benutzung reservirte Landhaus'). — **balnea:** so these are innocent. Still they were not free from idols either, cf. *spect.* 8, 9: *et plateae et forum et balneae et stabula et ipsae domus nostrae sine idolis omnino non sunt*, and idolatry was practised there, too. Nevertheless, the Christians regularly made use of this hygienic institute, cf. e.g. *apol.* 42, 2: *non sine foro, non sine macello, non sine balneis tabernis officinis*

stabulis nundinis vestris ceterisque commerciis cohabitamus hoc saeculum. The daily bath, which the vast majority certainly took in one of the public baths, was a habit only interrupted by penitents and during one week after baptism, cf. *paen.* 11, 1; *cor.* 3, 3: *ex ... ea die* (of baptism) *lavacro quotidiano per totam ebdomadem abstinemus*. So one of the most unpleasant matters reported by the Christians from Lugdunum and Vienna is the fact that they are excluded from the baths (Euseb. *h.e.* 5, 1, 5). Clement of Alexandria devotes an entire chapter to the use of the bath, *paed.* 3, 9: τίνος ἕνεκεν τὸ λουτρὸν παραληπτέον. For the use of the public baths by the early Christians and their opinion on them, cf. J. Zellinger, *Bad und Bäder in der altchristlichen Kirche* (Munich 1928), 1-46; cf. also Dekkers, 138-9. — **quantae:** = *quot*. Note the chiasm *quot parietes ... quot templa — domus ... quantae*, and the variation. That Tert. here uses *quantae* must be explained from the fact that the sentence *domus ... quantae!* refers to a considerably greater number than *quot parietes and quot templa*, and that in the present sentence *quantae* has special stress and is, therefore, deliberately given final position. Because of this Tert. prefers the longer and, therefore, stronger *quantae* to the monosyllabic and toneless *quot* (for the tendency to avoid unduly short forms, which played an important part in the development of the Romance languages, see Löfst., *Synt.*, 2, 35-62, especially 43). Moreover, we should take into account the desire to make a good clausula (1 δ). — **Soccus:** a light, low Greek shoe of which, however, the actual Greek name is unknown (cf. Ernout-Meillet, s.v.). At Rome it was originally worn by women (Plin. *n.h.* 37, 17; Suet. *Cal.* 52), afterwards also by dandies (Sen. *benef.* 2, 12, 2); it was often richly decorated with gold and pearls (Sen. l.l.; Plin. *n.h.* 9, 114 and 37, 17; Apul. *met.* 11, 8). See Hug, art. 'soccus', *RE* XXVII: 771-2. — **baxa:** this form is also found in *pall.* 4, 7 and in glossaries; elsewhere only *baxea* is found, see *TLL* II: 1792, 50-67. Cf. e.g. *Gramm. Lat.* V: 572, 21 Keil: *baxeas calciamenta feminarum, ut Varro dicit*. However, they are also mentioned as footwear of priests (Apul. *met.* 2, 28) and philosophers (Apul. *met.* 11, 8; cf. from Tert. *pall.* 4, 7: *si philosophus in purpura, cur non et in baxa?*). The *bax(e)ae* were a kind of sandals, made from palm-leaves (Apul. *met.* 2, 28), papyrus, etc.; they have often been found in Egypt. From the present passage it may be inferred that they, too, were fancy footwear; this is also clear from *pall.* 4, 7, where the gilding is mentioned implicitly (see Gerlo's note). See Blümner, *Privatalter-tümer*, 227; Mau, art. 'baxeae', *RE* III 176 and Suppl. I: 245. — **Mercurius ... non quotidie:** sc. *deauratur*. The faces of the images of the gods were often gilded (cf. schol. on Pers. 2, 55-6: *auro sacras quod ovato | perducis facies*). In the case of Mercury one would rather think of a gilt shoe; that is perhaps why he is mentioned here first after the profane *soccus et baxa*. As far as our knowledge goes, no relevant detail from the cult of Serapis is known. — **Sufficiat ... ambitio:** with Oehler and Reifferscheid we follow *A* and put a full

stop after *artificiorum*. Gelenius was the first scholar who took offence at this interpunction, obviously because he could not accept *sufficiat* without either a pronoun or an infinitive as subject. Therefore, he put a semicolon after *artificiorum*, thereby creating the possibility of making the substantives *luxuria et ambitio* in the following sentence the subject of *sufficiat*, for which he substituted the plural *sufficiant*; further, he read *frequentiores* instead of *frequentior est*. Van der Nat regarded these drastic conjectures as incorrect but in his opinion Gelenius had come near to a correct interpretation. To him *luxuria et ambitio* are the subject of both *sufficiat* and *frequentior est*. In our conviction one should not ascribe to Tert. such an awkward construction, unless it is evidently unavoidable. Which is the subject of *sufficiat*? If it cannot be found in what follows, it must be present in what precedes. One could think of the subject of the previous sentence, which in Tert.'s view should suffice, viz., *soccus et baxa*; but this is not so easy to understand, because the sentence contains still another subject, viz., *Mercurius et Serapis*. In our view, one should recall to mind that *sufficiat* introduces the conclusion of a previous argument: 'Let that suffice'. What should suffice? Obviously the profane exercise of the arts, which is not so lucrative but which compensates the lower reward for a single activity by its more frequent use. In other words, the idea '*minor merces quae frequentiore actu compensatur*', which dominates the entire passage, is the subject of *sufficiat*. After this conclusion Tert. expands on the *frequentior actus*, stating that *luxuria et ambitio* are the causes of the higher frequency; in the two following phrases he shows how *ambitio* and *luxuria* supply more work to the artists than the needs of pagan religion. — **Frequentior ... erogat:** The renewed argument consists of three sentences, of which the first contains the general statement, the second and third the argumentation in two parallel statements, of which the first has *ambitio* as its subject, the second *luxuria*. Moreover, *superstitio* corresponds with *sollemnitas*, and *facilius* with *magis*. — **facilius:** = *saepius, citius, potius*. This meaning occurs only in Tert., see *TLL* VI: 68, 45 seqq., and, further, Hartel, 2, 49, n. 4; 4, 72-3; Waltz., *Comm.*, 52; Oehler's index s.v.; Waszink, 91.

5. **Coronas ... erogat:** for a survey of the use of wreaths in the cult, see Baus, 2-33, for the profane use see ib., 34. It is remarkable that Tert. who strictly forbids the use of wreaths, and even devoted a whole treatise to the matter (*De corona*) in which he declares the wearing of wreaths at whatever occasion and for whatever reason to be unlawful for the Christians, is here seen to tolerate the trade of the *coronarius*. He merely urges caution: it is only permitted to make wreaths for profane (*luxuria*), not for religious purposes (*superstitio*). In chapter 11, on the other hand, he condemns the trade of the *turarius*, and rejects the argument that incense is also used by people in

general, and even by Christians. Tert. is once more completely dominated by that with which he is immediately concerned. — **erogat:** *erogare* is often synonymous with *impendere* (e.g. *mart.* 4, 9); here, however, it is equivalent with the simplex *rogare*; see *TLL* V, 2: 803, 58-61. — **Cum ... cohortemur, ... sunt:** the reading *sunt* of the *Agob.* and Mesnart has been rightly defended by Thörnell, 2, 13-4. To begin with, Tert. does not only use the subjunctive, but also the indicative after causal and concessive *cum*, see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 80, and *Beitr.*, 31; Waltz., *Comm.*, 19; Hofm., *Synt.*, 747 (cf. 2, 3; 9, 7). Besides, we more often find *variatio modorum* in Tert., both in relative causes (e.g. *apol.* 13, 1; 41, 1) and after conjunctions, e.g. *ux.* 1, 7, 4: *cum digamos non sinit* (sc. apostolus) *praesidere, cum viduam adlegi in ordinem nisi univiram non concedat*; *apol.* 6, 4; without repetition of the conjunction e.g. *carn. Chr.* 18, 7: *ita cum sit ipse de spiritu dei et spiritus deus est, ex deo natus ipse est* (Kroymans alters the text, Evans the interpunction). — **haec:** for *hic* as an antecedent (here equivalent to *hic talis*), see the note on 7, 1. — **de manibus ... postuletur:** *TLL* V, 1: 51, 20-2 is not correct in combining this *de* with *postulare*. Tert. does not speak of people 'who demand something from our hands', which would be equivalent to 'something from us'; if he meant this, the addition *scientibus nobis* would be superfluous. *De* should be combined with *quid*: 'something that is the product of our hands'. In his commentary Van der Nat follows the *TLL* but his translation ('that ... anything of our manual work is asked from us') is correct. — **remediis tam usitatis:** *remedia* are the means by which to escape the danger of idol-worship, cf. 18, 9: *Ad evitandum remedia deesse non possunt*. Hartel's interpretation (1, 43): *remedia* = 'Mittel des Erwerbs' and *agere* = *vivere* is incorrect. The addition of *usitatis* suggests that there were a number of methods current among Christians to avoid activities and situations which were incompatible with the faith. Although Latinius' conjecture *iam* (instead of *tam*) is attractive, the manuscript reading is certainly defendable. — **non puto** = *puto non*: the negation belongs to the infinitive (cf. Greek οὐκ οἴομαι). See Waszink, 189; Diercks, 193; Wackernagel, *Synt.*, 2, 262. — **a contagio ... vacare:** *vacare ab*, which does not occur often in other authors (see Kühn.-Stegm. 1, 373), is rather frequent in Tert.; see the passages collected by Waszink, 483 (to these may be added *idol.* 15, 10). As to the thought, cf. *pud.* 7, 15: *Perit igitur et fidelis ..., si in officium, in ministerium alienae idololatriae aliquas artes adhibuit*, etc. — **concesserimus ... egerimus, non puto ... vacare:** for the variation of tenses, cf. e.g. *pat.* 8, 2: *si manu quis temptaverit provocare, praesto est dominica monela*; *ux.* 2, 5, 2: *si sciverit panem, non illum credit* (credet Kroymann) *esse, qui dicitur?*; *an.* 51, 8: *si quid animae remanserit, vita est*; *scorp.* 4, 5: *par sum illis, nisi illis manus dedero*. More instances in Hoppe, *Synt.*, 66; see also Hofm., *Synt.*, 564. — **in officio ... daemoniorum:** cf. 11, 8, where idolatry is defined as a *famulatus idolorum colendorum*; 3, 4: *idololatria omnis circa omne idolum famulatus et servitus*. — **vel in honore et usu:** this should be understood as a hendiadis in which *usus* has the meaning 'intercourse', which is found rather frequently in Cicero, Nepos, Livy and Tacitus (cf. the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* s.v., par. 10). The (hands of the) idol-makers are said either to serve (*in officio*) the demons or to hold intercourse (*usus*) with them in a manner that betrays respect (*honor*). The really interested and favoured group according to Tert. are the demons who make use of the images; see Remarks at ch. 1.

Ch. 9. *The profession of astrologer*

'It seems self-evident that the profession of astrologer is forbidden to a Christian. However, the fact that recently somebody defended his persistence in astrology after his conversion causes me to devote a few words to this subject.

I shall not speak about the fact that the astrologer worships the idols (thus perpetrating idolatry) by giving their names to the stars and ascribing to them the power that belongs to God, thus making people believe that they are ruled by the stars and, in consequence, need not search God. The only argument which I adduce is the origin of this art: it stems from the fallen angels, who are, also for this reason, condemned by God (§ 1). This divine sentence has its earthly counterpart in the banishment of the astrologers from Rome and Italy (§ 2).

One may object with the words of Scripture: "Magi came from the East". Indeed, they were astrologers and were the first to announce the birth of Christ and to give Him presents. Herewith they established a pious bond between themselves and Christ. But this does not protect the astrologers of today. Or would you assert that the latter are concerned with Christ and His star, and not with those of Saturn, Mars and other dead people? (§ 3). It was only until the coming of Christ that this science was permitted: the announcement of the birth of Christ by the magi was the last permitted act of this sort; the same holds true for their offerings (§ 4). The command given to the magi, to return home by another way than the one by which they had come, should be understood in this sense. It was not given to safeguard them against a persecution of Herodes, who did not even know the way by which they had come. The other way indicates another way of life, i.e. another science, another discipline.

Likewise that other kind of magic, viz., the one working with miracles, which also competed with Moses, was only tolerated until the gospel. This is proven by the punishments of the magi in Acts 8, 9-24 and 13, 6-11. Now astrology is a species of the genus magic: when the genus is punished, the species is so too. Since the gospel, we find the magi being punished everywhere (§§ 5-7).

You, astrologer, if you know the future, you must have known that you would become a Christian. And if you knew this you should also have known that, as a Christian, you would have nothing to do with this profession of yours. By itself it would have instructed you of its own dangers. The hope for the kingdom of heaven cannot exist with the abuse of heaven (§ 8).'

Remarks

a. From its beginning Christianity had to do with astrology and magic. As to magic, see the stories of Simon Magus and the sorcerer Elymas in Acts 8, 9-24 and 13, 6-12. Astrology is not explicitly condemned in the New Testament. In several passages, however, astrological notions do play a part, thus proving the confrontation with this important factor in the civilisation of the time; see the passages collected by Gundel in *RAC* I: 825-7 (for a correction of his views, cf. comm. *ad loc.* in *HdbNT*; Dibelius, *Geisterwelt*; Festugière, *Idéal*, 107, 110 n. 3).

Patristic literature shows a continuous polemic against the two practices. Astrology and magic being closely related (cf. comm. on 9, 4), they are mostly combated together, as e.g. in *Didache* 3, 4 τέκνον μου, μὴ γίνου οἰωνοσκόπος, ἐπειδὴ ὁδηγεῖ εἰς τὴν εἰδωλολατρίαν, μηδὲ ἐπαοιδὸς μηδὲ μαθηματικὸς μηδὲ περικαθαίρων μηδὲ θέλε αὐτὰ βλέπειν μηδὲ ἀκούειν· ἐκ γὰρ τούτων ἁπάντων εἰδωλολατρία γεννᾶται. See further Leclercq, *DCAL* X: 1071 ff. The repeated opposition proves the obstinate vitality of those practices. St Augustin still repeatedly complains about those who consult *mathematici*; it is interesting to see how he, at the end of his sermon on Psalm 61, reintroduces into the community a Christian who had become an astrologer but had come to conversion now (*Enarr. in Ps.* 61, 23). From passages in other works of Tertullian, too, the important position of these pseudo-sciences is clear: in *praescr.* 43, 1 he refers to the relation of heretics with astrologers, magi, etc. (cf. 33, 12; *an.* 34, 2; 35, 1; 50, 2; *Marc.* 1, 18, 1). In *apol.* 35, 12 he mentions the consulting of astrologers, magi and other charlatans with reference to the life of the emperor. (It is highly significant—also for his style of debating—that in *ad Scap.* 3, 3 Tertullian himself quotes an astrological explanation in technical terms, and that he uses the calculating-method of the horoscope as an argument in *an.* 25, 9.)

b. Tertullian's way of arguing has several rhetorical aspects. First he states that the matter, being self-evident, requires hardly any treatment, but because of a certain man who continued his profession after his conversion, he will devote a few words to it. In fact he devotes a long chapter to it. This is a well-known rhetorical pattern. At the end he addresses himself directly to that certain man in a remarkably *ad hominem* argument.

c. At the beginning Tertullian states that he will not adduce as an argument that the astrologer *idola honorat*, i.e. worships the idols. This seems to be a remarkable *praeteritio* in a treatise *De idololatria*. It is, however, in line with his argument, since Tert. does not discuss here the open forms of idolatry. Now astrology is an open form of idol-worship.

Is the argument which he does adduce, viz., the fact that astrology stems from the fallen angels, a serious one? Yes, because the fallen angels are the source of idolatry; just as the demons do, they draw the worship of men from the one true God to themselves.

d. Tertullian distinguishes two species of the genus magic, viz., astrology and the working of miracles. Members of both groups may be called magi (the *magi* from the East and Simon *Magus*).

1. **professiones** is used chiefly, though not exclusively, of scientific *artes* (Lewis-Short, s.v., II B 2). In the present treatise it is used to indicate the *ars* of the *astrologus*, the *magus* (ch. 9), and the *professor litterarum* (ch. 10). As was exposed in the Remarks at chapter 8, Tert. regards these three professions as containing one *ars* each, whereas in ch. 8 his entire argument is founded on the fact that usually a *professio* comprehends more than one *ars*, so that no *artifex* is obliged, for the sake of his living, to make idolatrous objects. — **astrologis:** 'astrologers', as in *apol.* 35, 12 and *an. 25, 9*. That in ancient civilisation no sharp distinction was made between astrology and astronomy is evident from the fact that the terms *astrologus* (ἀστρολόγος) and *astrologia* (ἀστρολογία) were also used to denote the astronomer, resp. astronomy. The first time the word occurs in Latin *astrologus* has the meaning 'astronomer' (Enn. *scen.* 242 V.²; Varro *ling.* 9, 24; Lucr. 5, 728 with Bailey's note), and this meaning is still found in later Latin, e.g. Vitruv. 9, 8, 1; Min. Fel. 17, 6; Calc. *in Tim.* 124 (167, 22 Waszink-Jensen); Mart. Cap. 8, 858; Sidon. Apollin. *epist. ante carm.* 22, 2. Side by side with this sense the meaning 'astrologer' occurs repeatedly since Cic. *div.* 1, 12. The same authors even use both meanings promiscuously, cf. e.g. Cic. *Verr.* II, 2, 129; *div.* 2, 146; Aug. *c.d.* 21, 8; *pecc. orig.* 23, 27 ('astronomer') and Cic. *div.* 1, 12. 85. 132; 2, 88; *fat.* 12; Aug. *c.d.* 5, 5 ('astrologer'). Both *astrologus* and *astronomus* are used by Hier. *ep.* 53, 6: *taceo de ... musicis astronomis astrologis medicis*. The date at which the semantic distinction became established cannot be ascertained from the available material. See *TLL* II: 966, 77 seqq. (the data require some correction), and the note on 9, 3 (the same holds good for Greek, see Bouché-Leclercq, art. 'mathematici', *DS* 3, 1634-5 and Liddell-Scott, s.v.). The reverse, viz., *astronomia* with the meaning 'astrology' is extremely rare: Cassiod. *Ios. c. Ap.* 1, 129: *de astronomia et de Chaldaeorum philosophia*; cf. also Serv. *ad Georg.* 1, 229 (185, 11-2 G.): *insertis tam astronomiae quam*

geometriae partibus, and shortly after (13-4): *frustra culpari a plerisque Vergilium quasi ignarum astrologiae. Astronomus* is exceedingly rare (*TLL* II: 968, 37-44 mentions only six cases, the earliest being Hier. *ep.* 53, 6 which is quoted above). As was to be expected on account of this confusion in the terminology, in practice no sharp distinction was made between astronomy and astrology; they often went also together in reality; Ptolemaeus wrote a purely scientific astronomic work (*Almagest*) but also an astrological manual (*Tetrabiblos*); we may refer here to the double activity of Kepler. Characteristic of this lack of distinction is also the fact that in *pall.* 6, 2 among the students of the *artes liberales* are included: *qui stellarem* (sc. artem) *et qui volaticam spectat*; in this context the former can only be the astrologer (cf. Gerlo 2, 205-6; for the expression, cf. 9, 7 *coniectores* with the note). See Cumont, *Rel. or.*, 153 and 157; Marrou, *Éducation*, 251-2; Wendland, *Kultur*, 133. In 9, 3 Tert. calls the astrologer *stellarum interpres*; cf. also *cult. fem.* 1, 2, 1: *stellarum interpretationem*. — **quidam** must be a Christian astrologer. — **istis diebus:** *istis* = *his*, cf. 2, 3 with the note. Such expressions, showing that Tert. is writing under the influence of actual cases and events, occur frequently, cf. e.g. 17, 2; *bapt.* 1, 2; *cor.* 1, 1 seqq.; *ux.* 2, 2, 1. — **provocavit** is used here in an absolute sense: 'has uttered a provocation'. — **nomina ... inscripsit:** cf. Manil. 1, 109: *attribuitque suas formas, sua nomina signis* (sc. ratio humana); Macrob. *somn. Scip.* 1, 19, 18: *nomina haec non esse inventa ex natura sed hominum commenta significationi distinctionis accommoda*; more relevant passages are quoted by Housman in the note on Manil. 1, 34. — **quibus ... addixit:** in Tert. the verb *addicere* has usually one of two meanings: a) 'to assign', as in *nat.* 2, 7, 3: *si addicenda mortuis divinitas erat*; 1, 10, 22; 2, 14, 2; *scorp.* 3, 1; *ieiun.* 4, 2. b) 'to enslave, to subordinate', as in *an.* 40, 3 (caro) *addicta ... animae ut supellex* (cf. in 40, 2 the comparison with *ministerium*); *orat.* 22, 10; *an.* 43, 12 and 52, 2; *ieiun.* 10, 6. Both meanings are found side by side in *an.* 18, 10: *cum ... sequitur et adducitur* (sc. animae animus), *perinde intellectus animae addicitur quam sequitur animus, cui addicitur intellectus*. In *TLL* I: 576, 78 seqq. ('= *tradere vel dedere*') and 577, 45 seqq. ('= *attribuere*') the uses of this verb are distinguished too formally and, for Tert. at least, often incorrectly. In the present passage the first-mentioned interpretation ('to assign') is the correct one. The astrologer absolutely fails to recognize God's power, cf. the words *homines ... non putant deum requirendum*. — **quod propterea:** this second *quod*, too, should be joined to *allego*. In both cases *quod* in this sentence means 'the fact that'. For the *variatio modorum* (*quod ... honoret ..., quod ... putant*) see the note on 8, 5. For *non putant* = *putant non*, cf. 8, 5 with the note. It is possible to connect *propterea* with the immediately preceding *addixit* but since *quod ... non putant* has been put as an second argument after *quod ... honoret*, it seems preferable to interpret *propterea* as an emphatic announcement of

praesumentes; this harmonizes with the emotional nature of Tert.'s argument. — **deum requirendum:** the conception of searching and, as a consequence, of finding God occurs already in the OT, e.g. Deut. 4, 29; Ps. 9, 11; Is. 55, 6; Amos 5, 6; Sap. 1, 1-2 (cf. Tert. *praescr.* 7, 10); 13, 6. In the NT especially Acta 17, 26-7: ἐποίησεν (ὁ θεὸς) ... ἐξ ἑνὸς αἵματος πᾶν ἔθνος ἀνθρώπων ... ζητεῖν τὸν θεόν, εἰ ἄρα γε ψηλαφήσειαν αὐτὸν καὶ εὕροιεν, καί γε οὐ μακρὰν ἀπὸ ἑνὸς ἑκάστου ἡμῶν ὑπάρχοντα. Among the Apologists the conviction of having found the Truth plays an important part. More than once it is expressly stated that this is the result of searching and that the search for Truth was a factor in the conversion, cf. Aristides *apol.* 15, 3: 'Die Christen ... da sie umhergingen und suchten, haben die Wahrheit gefunden'; 16, 1; Just. *dial.* 2; Tat. *orat.* 29; Theophil. *ad Autol.* 1, 14. See Lortz, 1, 224-30 and 248-9; Heinze, 373-4; Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 85-6; Norden, *Agn. Th.*, 14-8; Bardy, *Conversion*, 121-34. — **stellarum ... agi:** the Christians have fiercely combated the belief in fate, cf. Just. *apol.* 1, 43; 2, 6 (7), especially directed against the Stoa; Tat. *orat.* 8-9, who considers the εἱμαρμένη to be the work of the demons. Tert. wrote a treatise *De fato* (quoted in Fulg. *serm. ant.* 16 (116, 18-20 Helm); he alludes to it in *an.* 20, 5; see Waszink, 287-9); likewise Min. Fel. (cf. *Octav.* 36; Hier. *vir. ill.* 58; Bardenhewer, *Gesch.*, 315; Krüger, 263-4). For more works and relevant passages, see Gundel, art. 'Heimarmene', *RE* VII: 2625 and 2644-5, and art. 'Astrologie II. Kirchenväter und Konzilien', *RAC* I: 828-9; Cumont, *Rel. or.*, 166-7; 289, n. 61; 291, n. 69; id., 'La polémique de l'Ambrosiaster contre les païens', *RHLR* 8 (1903), 431-6; Wendland, *Kultur*, 176-7. 399-400; Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 102-3. 244; de Vreese, *Aug.*, 23-70; Bouché-Leclercq, 617-23; Schürer, *ZNTW* 6 (1905), 45-6; Lortz, 2, 59, n. 10. All Christian authors argue that fatalism renders the belief in Christ's doctrine of salvation and in God's providence meaningless; they use the arguments of philosophers who combated astrology. By far the most important of these was Carneades: his numerous acute arguments are repeated as τόποι by heathens and Christians alike. For these philosophical polemics, see Wendland, *Philo Vors.*, 24 seqq.; Bouché-Leclercq, 570-609; Cumont, *Rel. or.*, 155-6; Gundel, art. 'Heimarmene', *RE* VII: 2643-5; Amand, 29 seqq.; Cramer, 50 seqq. — **desertores ... feminarum:** apposition to *angelos*. For the story of the fallen angels who had had intercourse with women, see comm. on 4, 2. — **proditores:** in spite of the homoeoteleuton, *proditores* cannot be on a level with *desertores* and *amatores*, since, together with *damnatos*, it constitutes the core of Tert.'s argument; moreover, if *proditores* is an apposition, the words *propterea quoque*, which only refer to *proditores etiam huius curiositatis*, are disconnected from the sentence. Therefore, *proditores* should be joined to *esse* as a predicative noun. Nevertheless *proditores* is also closely connected with *desertores* and *amatores* by means of the homoeoteleuton. So we have here an incongruity between rhetorical form and meaning. A rather similar

case may be found in *an.* 50, 3, where of three clauses, which are similar in rhetorical form, the third is different in meaning from the first two: *aut ebriosos reddit Lyncestarum vena vinosa aut lymphaticos efficit Colophonis scaturigo daemonica aut Alexandrum occidit Nonacris Arcadiae venenata* (see Waszink's note (p. 522), who refers to Norden, *De Minucii Felicis aetate et genere dicendi*, Greifswald 1897, 18 seqq.). The meaning of *proditores* in this passage is not 'traitors' but 'teachers' (the *OLD* only mentions the meaning 'betrayer, traitor'); with this sense it is, of course, the *nomen actoris* of *prodere* in the sense of (*OLD*, sub 5): 'to hand down, transmit (tradition, custom, etc.)'; in Tert. this meaning is found in *nat.* 1, 7, 6 and *res.* 44, 7. — **proditores etiam huius curiositatis:** the fallen angels had taught men astrology, magic, the fabrication of weapons and cosmetics and many other things according to the book of Enoch 8, where i.a. it is said (3): ('Εδίδαξεν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους) 'Ρακιὴλ ἀστρολογίας. From Tert. cf. *apol.* 35, 12: *qui astrologos et haruspices et augures et magos de Caesarum capite consultant. Quas artes, ut ab angelis desertoribus proditas et a deo interdictas, ne suis quidem causis adhibent Christiani*; in *cult. fem.* 1, 2, 1 Tert. mentions as gifts of the fallen angels: *metallorum opera, herbarum ingenia, incantationum vires, omnem curiositatem usque ad stellarum interpretationem, instrumentum ... muliebris gloriae*; ib. 2, 10, 3; *an.* 2, 3 (the apocryphal books). This story is also found in Just. *apol.* 2, 4 (5), 3 (i.a. μαγικαὶ γραφαί); Tat. *orat.* 8 (8, 5 Schw.): διάγραμμα ... αὐτοῖς (viz., men) ἀστροθεσίας ἀναδείξαντες (viz., the demons); Iren. *epideixis* 18 (i.a. magic); Clem. Alex. *eclog. prophet.* 53, 3 (ἀστρονομίαν καὶ μαντικὴν καὶ ἄλλας τέχνας); [Clem.] *hom.* 8, 14: καὶ μαγείαν συναπέδειξαν καὶ ἀστρονομίαν ἐδίδαξαν; Lact. *epit.* 23, 5 (astrology, divination, magic; in *d.i.* 2, 16, 1 he mentions the demons as the inventors; however, this amounts to the same thing, since, according to Lactantius, the fallen angels have also become demons, cf. *d.i.* 2, 14, 3-6); Commod. *instr.* 1, 3. See Waszink, 106 (with more literature). — **curiositatis:** in *an.* 58, 9 Tert. makes a distinction between *iusta ac necessaria curiositas* and *enormis et otiosa curiositas*; often, however, *curiositas* without an attribute is found with this latter sense: 'superfluous (dangerous) curiosity', περιεργία (see *TLL* IV: 1490, 81 seqq.; for instance, it indicates philosophy in *nat.* 2, 4, 19: *philosophos ... eos, qui stupidam exerceant curiositatem*; *praescr.* 7, 12; 14, 1. 4; and heresy (which, according to Tert., is closely related to philosophy or even has sprung from it; see *an.* 3) in *praescr.* 30, 2 and *Marc.* 1, 2, 2; all three notions are combined in *praescr.* 43, 1: *Notata sunt etiam commercia haereticorum cum magis quam pluribus, cum circulatoribus, cum astrologis, cum philosophis, curiositati scilicet et deditis.* In the present passage *curiositas* is used with reference to astrology. Again in *praescr.* 40, 6 *curiositas* is a synonym of *superstitio* (a meaning which does not occur before Tert.), and it has a concrete meaning in *apol.* 5, 7: *Hadrianus ... omnium curiositatum explorator*, and *an.* 28, 4 ('magic trick').

For the importance of the conception of *curiositas* in Tert.'s works, cf. especially A. Labhardt, 'Curiositas. Notes sur l'histoire d'un mot et d'une notion', *Mus. Helvet.* 17 (1960), 213-24; J.-Cl. Fredouille, ch. 8 (411-42) "Curiosité et Conversion", especially 417; L. F. Pizzolato, 'Tertulliano e la dialettica', in: *Paradoxos politeia. Studi patristici in onore di Giuseppe Lazzati* (Milano 1979), 145-77, especially 154 seqq. (with an excellent bibliography on p. 154, note 56). The notion *curiositas* has also been discussed frequently by Augustine; cf. H.-I. Marrou, *Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique* (Paris 1938), 148-57; 278-80; 350-52; P. Courcelle, *Les Confessions de Saint Augustin dans la tradition littéraire* (Paris 1963), 101-9; H. Blumenberg, 'Augustins Anteil an der Geschichte des Begriffs der Geschichte des Begriffs der theoretischen Neugierde', *Rev. Ét. Aug.* 7 (1961), 35-70; cf. also E. P. Meijering, *Calvin wider die Neugierde. Ein Beitrag zum Vergleich zwischen reformatorischem und patristischem Denken* (Nieuwkoop 1980). — **damnatos a deo:** for God's judgment and punishment of the fallen angels (banishment from heaven), see comm. on 9, 2: *poena ... exilii.*

2. **divina sententia** refers to the immediately preceding words *damnatos a deo.* — **usque ad terram pertinax:** the adjective *pertinax* is used instead of the participle *pertinens*, cf. *res.* 24, 8: *maiestas spiritus sancti perspicax eiusmodi sensuum*; Min. Fel. 8, 5: *pavorem fallax spes.* The latter instance also shows that the adjective is regarded as equivalent to a present participle (= *fallens*) and so may be joined to an accusative, just like the corresponding verb, cf. Tert. *scorp.* 3, 2: *populus tam necessariam absentiam eius impatiens* and *res.* 31, 1: *populus ... dispositionis exitium querulus* (= *querens*; an exceptional case, since mostly this verbal function of adjectives is limited to adjectives in *-ax*). Of course the use of an adjective instead of a participle and its construction with an accusative was promoted by the use of a substantive or an adjective with *esse* as the equivalent of a transitive verb; the earliest instance is Plaut. *Most.* 100: *gnaruris vos volo esse hanc rem*, on which see Sonnenschein's note. See Löfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 11-2; *Synt.*, 1, 255-7 and *Eranos* 8 (1908) 112-3; C. F. W. Müller, *Synt. d. Nom. u. Akk.*, 158-9; W. Heraeus, *ALL* 15, 560-4; Hofm., *Synt.*, 378; Hofm.-Szant., *Synt.*, 34. For Tert.'s fairly frequent use of forms in *-bundus* as equivalents of a present participle, see Waszink's note on *an.* 39, 1 (p. 442). The meaning of the sentence is that God's verdict, which had banished the angels from heaven, also extended to ('*pertinebat ad*') the earth, where the pupils of these angels, viz., the astrologers, were banned from Rome and Italy by the Roman senate, which so, without knowing it (*ignorantes*), was in line with the divine sentence and confirmed it. We must punctuate: *reddunt: expelluntur ... eorum*; *urbs ... eorum: eadem ... magistris.* — **mathematici:** 'astrologers', as in *apol.* 43, 1. This word, which in Latin is found for the first time in Cicero and

Vitruvius, occurs with reference to astrology as an adjective since Plin. *n.h.* 30, 2: *artes mathematicas* and 29, 9, as a substantive (synonym: *Chaldaei*) since Seneca (*apocol.* 3, 2: *patere mathematicos aliquando verum dicere*) and Petronius (39, 6; 76, 10; 126, 3); cf. *TLL* VIII: 471, 34-40 and 81 seqq. This term was especially used in vulgar speech to denote the astrologers, cf. Gell. 1, 9, 6: *vulgus ... quos gentilicio vocabulo 'Chaldaeos' dicere oportet, 'mathematicos' dicit* (cf. Porphyr. *Vit. Pyth.* 37; Iamblich. *Vit. Pyth.* 81-2); Hier. *in Dan.* 2, 2: γενεθλιαλόγους ... *quos vulgus mathematicos vocat*; Aug. *doctr. christ.* 2, 21, 32 and *div. quaest.* 45, 1-2; Amm. Marc. 29, 2, 6. For this semantic development, see Bouché-Leclercq, *op. cit.*, 5, n. 1; 64, n. 1; 566; 620, n. 4; 624, n. 2 and art. 'Mathematici' in *DS* 3, 1633-5; cf. also comm. on 9, 4. — **urbs ... interdicitur:** for the construction of *interdicere*, see the note on 4, 1. — **poena ... exilii:** Gelenius' conjecture *exilii* is, in our opinion, unavoidable. Van der Nat, who defends the reading *exitii* of *A B*, mentions as one of his objections against the reading *exilii* that it offers us "the same thing thrice in succession, which seems rather too much of a good thing". However, the sentence *eadem poena est exilii discipulis* (= astrologers) *et magistris* (= the fallen angels) is not a reiteration but a conclusion of the argument. In this conclusion the idea of banishment is essential. Van der Nat's second argument runs as follows: "this reading (viz., *exilii*) sets forth in detail the *testimonium ignorantium*, but it does not give us an explanation of what the *sententia dei* itself means with respect to the astrologers who are surely the first to be aimed at by Tert.". Against this we must observe that in the two preceding propositions Tert. has argued that the *divina sententia* means banishment, both with regard to the fallen angels and, on earth (*usque ad terram pertinax*), to the astrologers. The sentence is indeed not "on a level with *expelluntur ... eorum*", being the conclusion of the entire argument. It is true that Tert. speaks elsewhere of the *poena mortis* for the fallen angels, cf. *cult. fem.* 1, 2, 1: *Nam et illi, qui ea constituerunt, damnati in poenam mortis deputantur, illi scilicet angeli, qui ad filias hominum de caelo ruerunt, ut haec quoque ignominia feminae accedat* (derived from Enoch, e.g. 10, 11-3). However, in the present context a transition from the punishment of exile to the punishment of death would require at least one sentence in which this transition would be announced.

3. **Sed magi ... obligaverunt:** the words *sed magi ... venerunt* are an *occupatio*, in which the words *magi ab oriente venerunt* are a quotation of Scripture, viz., Matth. 2, 1. This scriptural text seems to imply that the magical art cannot be rejected totally by a Christian. About *et astrologi*, see below. *Scimus*, which is either the equivalent of *scio* or means 'we, Christians', is the beginning of Tert.'s answer. This could be paraphrased as follows: '<I know what you mean.> I know that magic and astrology belong together <, so

that Scripture speaking of *magi* includes the astrologer whom we are dealing with>. Those *magi* were, indeed, the first announcers of Christ's birth. So they have obliged Christ to themselves'. Until now Tert.'s answer follows up the line of argument of his opponent. But after this concession he reacts: 'but what of that?'.—The words *et astrologi* raise a problem. It is as if they intrude into the quotation of Scripture and therewith weaken the force of that quotation. Reifferscheid deleted them. In the second apparatus of the CC edition Dekkers notes: *non secludendum*. Van der Nat adheres to the latter opinion and takes *et* as explicative: '*magi, i.e. astrologi*', and refers to the following *primi stellarum interpretes* and 9, 7 *sic et alia species magiae*. The difference between the two opinions is the following: if one deletes *et astrologi* the identification of *magi* and *astrologi* remains implicit in the *occupatio*. It is spoken out by Tertullian himself in his answer. See our paraphrase above. If one maintains *et astrologi*, the words *scimus magiae et astrologiae inter se societatem* mean: 'I know <what you *say*, viz.,> that magic and astrology belong together'. This interpretation makes sense and it has the advantage that the reading of *A* can be maintained. On the other hand Reifferscheid's proposal to delete *et astrologi* is very attractive for the following reasons: a) without *et astrologi* the text is much more pointed, much more Tertullianean. He likes to make his readers think by saying things implicitly. See the difference in our paraphrases: 'I know what you *mean*' 'I know what you *say*'. In the latter case he says things almost twice. b) the strength of the *occupatio* lies in the fact that a quotation of Scripture is afforded. If one maintains *et astrologi*, one must assume that the imaginary opponent while quoting the Scripture text feels inclined to give an explanation and says: 'But *magi* (and *astrologi*) came from the East" '. From a rhetorical point of view such an addition weakens the argument. c) In this addition *et* may, indeed, be considered as explicative. However, for the kind of explanation given here Tert. would rather have chosen *qui et astrologi*, for *magia* is the larger concept, which includes astrology. d) *et astrologi* can easily be explained as an insertion. Either it was inserted into the text by a scribe who thought that this was necessary because of the following *scimus ... societatem*, which he understood in the sense of 'we know what you *say*, viz., that magic and astrology belong together' (then *astrologi* must have been mentioned before); or *et astrologi* resulted from a marginal note *i.e. astrologi*, which was inserted into the text in a somewhat different form (not a different meaning, if *et* is explicative). For these reasons we decided to follow Reifferscheid. — **magi ab oriente venerunt:** probably Matthew meant Babylonian astrologers (see Klostermann, ad loc., *HdbNT*, 4, 13). Often this vague indication is adopted without comment, since most Christian authors are not interested in the nature of the 'science' practised by the Magi nor in their land of origin, emphasis being laid on the fact that they were *primitiae gentium*. — **ab oriente:** Tert. is quoting

Matthew, so that ethnical associations are absent here. Elsewhere, in the elaborate exposition *Marc.* 3, 16 (= *Iud.* 9), where he associates Is. 8, 4 with Matth. 2, he identifies the Magi as Arabs. (In this discussion he also includes Ps. 71, 10. 15 and uses this passage as an argument for making them kings, an identification which afterwards became generally accepted, see Klostermann's note on Matth. 2, 1, *HdbNT*, 4, 13-4; H. Leclercq, *DACL* X: 985.) There Tert.'s source is Justin, *dial.* 77-8, who speaks of μάγοι ἀπὸ 'Αραβίας. Mostly, however, Persia is mentioned as their native country, cf. e.g. Prudentius, *cathem.* 12, 25-8: *en, Persici ex orbis sinu ... cernunt periti interpretes / regale vexillum magi*; Joh. Chrysost. *hom. in Matth.* 6, 3 (PG 57, 65); Basil. *hom. in s. Chr. gener.* 5 (PG 31, 1469 A): Clem. Alex. *strom.* 1, 15, 71, 4. On the monuments, too, they are by their dress represented as Persians. The identification as Chaldaeans (cf. Hieron. *in Dan.* 2 (PL 25, 498 C-99 A), Calc., *in Tim.* 126 (170, 1-5 Wasz.-Jens.), Greg. Naz. *carm.* 1, 5, 58-9 (PG 37, 428)) is much less frequent. A curious contamination is offered by Prudentius, *apotheos.* 611-8: *quis ... nuntius Aurorae populos atque ultima Bactra / attigit ...? ... diriguit trepidans Chaldaeo in vertice pernox / astrologus.* For further literature see H. Leclercq, *DACL* X: 891; Bouché-Leclercq, 611, n. 2; Dieterich, *Kl. Schr.*, 274-6; Bidez-Cumont, *Mages*, 1, 51, n. 2; Messina, *Magi*, 22-6. — **magiae:** *magia* is found from Apuleius onwards (*TLL* VIII: 51, 1-2). — **magiae ... societatem:** in Tert.'s time the magical practices concern especially the performance of miracles, the conjuring up of dead persons (cf. 9, 7; *an.* 57), and mischievous magic, which caused *magus* (this word is found in Latin since Cicero and Catullus; in Tert. it occurs 35 times, cf. *TLL* VIII: 150, 9-12) gradually to become a synonym of *maleficus* (cf. e.g. Hier. *in Dan.* 2: *consuetudo ... et sermo communis magos pro maleficis accipit*; Lact. *d.i.* 2, 16, 4; *Cod. Theod.* 9, 16, 4; Tert. *apol.* 43, 1: *sicarii, venenarii, magi*; *pud.* 5, 11 (together with *venenarii*). See Mommsen, *Strafrecht*, 639-40; Abt, *Apol.*, 16-7; Rönsch, *It.*, 316-7. It was not the Persian *magi* (who constituted the priestly cast of Persia) but the μαγουσαῖοι, priests from Mazdaistic colonies spreading West over the whole of Asia minor, who practised magic, and also astrology under the influence of Babylon (on the origin of this name cf. Bidez-Cumont, *Mages*, 1, 35, n. 3). It is only in them that the connection magician-astrologer appears, which e.g. Basil, *hom. in s. Chr. gener.* 5, wrongly considers to be a characteristic of the Persian μάγοι, and which is sometimes ascribed to the mythical 'first magician' Zoroaster, cf. e.g. Just. *epit.* 1, 1, 9: (Z.) *qui primus dicitur artes magicas invenisse et mundi principia siderumque motus diligentissime spectavisse* (cf. on this passage Bidez-Cumont, *op. cit.*, 2, 41-2); see further the chapter concerning Zoroaster in this book. In practice this association of magic and astrology has remained in existence for a very long time: many magicians were at the same time astrologers. The Christians had another, special reason to associate magic and astrology: after their conviction both, as is discussed in the present chapter, were taught by the fallen angels. On this account they were also condemned and combated together (cf. 9, 2, p. 161-2). Literature: Bidez-Cumont, *Mages*, 1, VI seqq. 33-6. 57 seqq. 131-4. 143-50; index s.v. Mages, Magie (1, 271-2); Abt, *Apol.*, 32 seqq.; Messina, *Ursprung*, passim; Clemen, art. 'Μάγοι', *RE* XIV: 509-18. — **stellarum interpretes:** cf. *cult. fem.* 1, 2, 1: *stellarum interpretationem*; in *pall.* 6, 2 Tert. calls the astrologer *qui stellarem* (*stellariam* Säflund, 25, n. 13, probably correct) *coniectat* (see Oehler, 955 h; Gerlo, 2, 205); Cic. *div.* 2, 92 speaks of *interpretes ... caeli* (cf. 9, 4: *ut ... nemo ... nativitatem alicuius de caelo interpretetur*). — **annuntiaverunt:** just as in 15, 7; *bapt.* 8, 4; *ieiun.* 7, 3 synonymous with *nuntiare* (*TLL* I: 787, 81 seqq.). Tert. is the first to use *annuntiare* also in the sense of *praenuntiare, prophetari*, cf. *fuga* 1, 1; *Marc.* 2, 24, 2; 3, 4, 2, and see *TLL* ib. 788, 44 seqq.; Thierry, 108. It has the meaning *praedicare* in *fuga* 6, 4; *nat.* 1, 19, 5; cf. *TLL*, ib. 788, 83 seqq. — **Hoc nomine:** as in the present passage, Tert. often uses *nomine* with a genitive or a pronoun with instrumental (= *hac re*) or causal (= *hac de causa*) meaning; see the numerous instances in Hoppe, *Synt.*, 30-1; Thörn., 1, 57-8; cf. also Thierry, 113. 222; Stephan, 56; for the classical period, see Krebs-Schmalz, 2, 155. Tert. even uses this expression in a limitative sense, cf. e.g. *an.* 53, 3; *Prax.* 12, 6; *Marc.* 2, 14, 3, and see Thörn., 1, 56-7. — **Quid tum?:** Tert. could not but acknowledge that astrologers knew by their science Christ's birth and offered gifts to Him, but he does not assent to the conclusions drawn by his opponents from these facts. Hence 'What at that?'. — **patrocinabitur:** this verb, which is avoided by the authors of the classical period, is very frequent in the works of lawyers, see Beck, 89; Waszink, 109. — **religio** = *religiositas*, as already in Cic. *Font.* 40: *hominem plenum religionis*; Liv. 1, 18, 1; cf. *apol.* 33, 1; 25, 2 (in the *Fuldensis*). See Waltz., *Ét.*, 278; Löfst., *Krit. Apol.*, 65-6. — **mathesis:** 'astrology' (*CGL* 5, 422, 61: *doctrina astrologiae*). Tert. is the first to use the word in this sense, see *TLL* VIII: 473, 13 seqq. — **stellam Christi:** the preceding words *de Christo ... est mathesis* and the antithesis *Christi, non Saturni et Martis* make the reading *stellarum* of *A B* impossible. Ursinus' conjecture *stellam* is by far to be preferred to Gelenius' *stellas*: only the *one* 'star of Bethlehem' is concerned, and the reading *stellarum* is best explained as a corruption of *stellam*. — **stellam ... Saturni et Martis:** Tert. uses *stella* with the genitive of the name of the god and not simply *Saturnum* and *Martem* because of the parallelism with *stellam Christi*, and also because he regards the gods as *mortui*. — **mortuorum:** cf. 15, 2: *Recogitemus omnem idololatrian in homines esse culturam, cum ipsos deos nationum homines retro fuisse etiam apud suos constet*; *apol.* 12, 1: *quantum igitur de deis vestris, nomina solummodo video quorundam veterum mortuorum*; *apol.* 10, 3; 11, 1. 13; *spect.* 6, 4: *Sed de idololatria nihil differt apud nos, sub quo nomine et titulo, dum ad eosdem spiritus perveniat, quibus*

renuntiamus. Licebit mortuis, licebit deis suis faciant, perinde mortuis suis ut diis faciunt; *an.* 57, 2. This is the well-known view of Euhemerus (who is mentioned by Min. Fel. 21, 1, Arnob. 4, 29 and Lact. *d.i.* 1, 11, 33) which was adopted by the Christian apologists, cf. Min. Fel. 21-4; Theophil. *ad Autolyc.* 1, 9: καὶ τὰ μὲν ὀνόματα ὧν φῆς σέβεσθαι θεῶν ὀνόματά ἐστιν νεκρῶν ἀνθρώπων; Athenag. *legat.* 28-30; Arnob. 1, 36-7 and 4, 28-9; very sharply Lact. *d.i.* 2, 1, 5: *equidem ... admirari soleo ... homines ... ipsos ad tantam caecitatem esse deductos, ut vero ac vivo deo mortuos praeferant, terrenos autem sepultosque in terra ei, qui fundator ipsius terrae fuit* (cf. also 1, 8, 3 seqq.; 1, 15; 2, 17, 6-7; for more passages, see Brandt's index, 301). See Lortz, 1, 132 seqq.; Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 223 seqq.; cf. also comm. on 1, 5; 12, 5, and the note by Böhm, 113-4. Against these dead people God is put as the *deus vivus*, cf. e.g. *apol.* 30, 1-2.

4. **At enim scientia ... interpretetur:** after elaborating *Quid tum?* in the two negative sentences (*Ideo nunc*, etc., and *De Christo scilicet*, etc.) Tert. now pronounces his own thesis: 'Astrology was allowed until the coming of Christ and no longer'. There seems to be some tension between this concession and the unfavourable judgment about astrology elsewhere ('species of idolatry', 'work of the fallen angels'). In the present passage Tert. takes a legal standpoint. He has to admit that astrology, a knowledge coming from the fallen angels, can provide the truth, as in the case of the *magi*. One must assume that in that case God allowed to make use of this knowledge. But this was the last case: hence the statement about *alia via*, see below. Astrology is not lawful any more. Tert. dispatches the business in a quasi-juridical manner without entering thoroughly into the matter. — **At enim:** a usual brachylogy: 'But <this is not true,> for ...'. — **usque ad evangelium:** a formulation (repeated in 9, 6: *ad evangelium usque*) like the famous *lex et prophetae usque ad Iohannem* (Matth. 11, 13; Luc. 16, 16), which is rather frequently quoted by Tert.: *ieiun.* 2, 2. 11, 6; *Marc.* 3, 23, 3; *Iud.* 8, 14. 13, 26; *pud.* 6, 2. For the expression, cf. 9, 7 *post evangelium* with the note. — **fuit concessa:** this is not an instance of a shifted passive perfect (see Hofm., *Synt.*, 562-3): *concessus*, like here, often has the meaning and function of an adjective (found since Cicero, see *TLL* IV: 17, 68 seqq.). — **Christo edito ... exinde:** *exinde* is superfluous after *Christo edito*, cf. in the next sentence: *ideo ... quasi*. It is striking that Tert. formulates pleonastically up to three times; this clearly demonstrates the emotional intensity of this argument, which is also evident from the elaborate way of reasoning in par. 5. — **nativitatem:** 'birth', a meaning found since Tert. and Minucius Felix, and especially frequent in the legal idiom (from which, of course, Tert. has borrowed it). See Waszink, 199, and cf. 18, 9. As in the present passage astrology is discussed in general, *nativitas* probably has the connotation 'horoscope' (= *genitura*, cf. *an.* 25, 9, and see

TLL VI: 1825, 70 seqq.; on the Greek term γένεσις, see Gundel, art. 'Heimarmene', *RE* VII: 2633). Besides, the Magi, too, did not only know that Christ had been born, but they also knew His dignity. Hence their question: Ποῦ ἐστιν ὁ τεχθεὶς βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων; (Matth. 2, 2). The knowledge and prediction of the future circumstances of a new-born person are the special province of astrology. — **Nam et:** for this combination, cf. 3, 1. Tert. argues as follows: 'this science (viz., astrology) was allowed until the Gospel, but after the birth of Christ nobody is any longer permitted to calculate a *nativitas* with the help of the stars. <This episode of Christ and the Magi signified the termination of this practice, as the Magi marked a conclusion also in another field.> For their presents, too, marked an end, viz., that of the *sacrificatio et gloria saecularis*, which also were to be abolished by Christ'. — **infanti tunc domino:** cf. *pat.* 5, 18: *inpatientiae tunc infantis*. The offerings of presents by the Magi symbolizes the homage paid to the Messiah (*domino*) by the heathens. The conviction that by this the calling of the heathens and their subjection to the Truth was announced has been strongly felt; the Magi are *primitiae gentium* (Aug. *serm.* 200, 1), οἱ τῆς ἐκκλησίας πρόγονοι (Joh. Chrysost. *hom. in Matth.* 7, 4); cf. Basil. *hom. in s. Chr. gener.* 5-6; Joh. Chrysost. ib. 6, 3; Ambr. *expos. ev. sec. Luc.* 2, 47; Hilar. *in Matth.* 1, 5; Hier. *in Matth.* 1, 14; Aug. *serm.* 199, 1-2; 200, 3; 202, 1. 3; 203, 3; 204, 1; Fulg. *serm.* 4, 2; Leo Magn. *serm.* 31-33; 35-6; Maxim. Taur. *hom.* 18-28 (especially 28 = 287 C-288 C). In *Marc.* 3, 13, 8 Tert. connects Is. 8, 4 with the story of the Magi and interprets the gifts as *virtus Damasci*, and the Magi as *spolia Samariae*, and continues (par. 8-9): *qui cum illum cognovissent et muneribus honorassent et genu posito adorassent quasi deum et regem sub testimonio indicis et ducis stellae, spolia sunt facti Samariae, id est idololatriae, credentes videlicet in Christum. Idololatriam enim Samariae nomine notavit, ut ignominiosae ob idololatriam, qua desciverat tunc a deo sub rege Hieroboam*; in this passage his source is Justin, *dial.* 77-8; cf. Aug. *serm.* 202, 2. — **clausulam:** in the sense of 'end' (of a certain thing) it occurs since Sen. *ep.* 66, 48: *beatae vitae clausulam*; 77, 20; from Tert. cf. *apol.* 32, 1: *clausulam saeculi*; *Scorp.* 8, 3: *Ipse* (sc. John the Baptist) *clausula legis et prophetarum*; *res.* 24, 5: *sub omni clausula temporum*; *ieiun.* 10, 2; *fuga* 6, 6; *an.* 58, 1; *Marc.* 5, 7, 14; 5, 14, 14. See *TLL* III: 1326, 54 seqq.; Oehler's note on the present passage (p. 78 h). — **sacrificationis et gloriae saecularis:** in the presents of the Magi, which were the normal offerings to the heathen gods (*sacrificatio* refers to *tus* and *myrra*, *gloria* to *aurum*), these offerings are turned away from the heathen gods and given to Christ. Herewith they are the end of the worldly offering and glory.—The gold contrasts with the humility shown by Christ and required of the believers; cf. the discussion in 18, 6-7, esp. 18, 7: *quale aurum de capite* (sc. Christi) *radiaret, nisi gloriam saeculi*

alienam et sibi et suis iudicasset? Perhaps Tert. alludes to the golden wreath as a token of homage to Hellenistic princes and, afterwards, to the emperors. This usage also influenced the way in which the three Magi were represented on monuments: on these we sometimes find one of them (or even all three) offering a wreath; see Cumont, *L'Adoration des Mages et l'art triomphal de Rome* (Atti della Pont. Accad. Rom. di Archeol., ser. III Memorie, vol. 3, Roma 1932-3, 81-105); Vermeulen, 117-8. The classification of the presents given here and alluded to in *Marc.* 3, 13, 8 (*deum et regem*) is also found, for instance, in Joh. Chrysost. *hom. in Matth.* 8, 1 (PG 57, 83), and, though differently interpreted,in chapters 8-12 of a sermon of Optat. Milev. edited by Wilmart (*Rev. Sc. Rel.* 2 (1922), 271 seqq.), which is the oldest extant sermon for Christmas. Tert. does not yet know—or at least mention—the symbolic interpretation of each of the three gifts, although this was developed already at an early date, cf. Iren. *Adv. haer.*—a book well-known to Tert.—3, 10 (2, 32 Harvey): ... *myrrham quidem, quod ipse erat, qui pro mortali humano genere moreretur et sepeliretur; aurum vero, quoniam rex* (sc. erat), *cuius regni finis non est; thus vero, quoniam deus, qui et notus in Iudaea factus est et manifestus eis, qui non quaerebant eum*; Clem. Alex. *paed.* 2, 8, 63, 5; Orig. *c. Cels.* 1, 60 (111, 20-4); for more passages, see O. Bardenhewer, 'Der Name Maria', *Bibl. Stud.* 1 (1895), 42-4 Anm.; Th. Mayr, *Studien zu dem Paschale Carmen des christl. Dichters Sedulius* (thesis Munich-Augsburg 1916), 59; C. Weyman, *Beitr. zur Gesch. der christl. lat. Poesie* (Munich 1926), 133; W. Theiler, *Die chaldäischen Orakel und die Hymnen des Synesios* (Schrift. d. Königsb. Gel. Gesellschaft, Geisteswiss. Kl., 18. Jahr, Heft 1; Halle 1942), 38; Kievits' note on Iuvenc. 1, 250; Herzog, *Prud.*, 86, n. 117. Tert.'s interpretation of the gifts as a *clausula sacrificationis et gloria saecularis* is only found in one other passage, viz., in Maxim. Taurin. *hom.* 21 (PL 57, 270 AB). After giving the just mentioned symbolical interpretation of the gifts Maximus proceeds as follows: *non enim otiose factum est, quod magi ad dominum cum suis muneribus advenerunt. Invenientes enim curiositate superstitionis suae Christum omnibus regnaturum detulerunt ad eum cunctorum elementorum insignia: aurum, quo terrena vincuntur, thus, quo placari putantur caelestia, myrrham qua condiuntur inferna, ostendentes utique a nativitate Christi horum nihil opus esse, quoniam per Christum constaret et victoria in terris et propitiatio in caelis et requies in infernis. Magi ergo curiositate sua repererunt a nativitate Christi curiosos esse ulterius non debere; et hoc illis magica ars profuit, ut scirent eam sibi ulterius non prodesse*; cf. *hom.* 26 (283A-284A), especially: *in thure ... et daemoniorum superstitio cessatura et futurus verae religionis cultus aperitur.* Here the astrology (*curiositas superstitionis*) and the gifts of the Magi are found together, as in Tert.

5. **Quod igitur ... intellegere debemus:** the overall meaning of this passage is clear. The advice given to the Magi in the dream to return home by another way has an allegorical meaning: 'way' means 'way of life'. The construction of the sentence, however, causes great difficulties. The question is: where do we find the main sentence? All interpreters agree in taking *quod* as a relative pronoun; the content of *quod* is given in *ut irent* ... (see Thelwall: 'What, then, the dream ... suggested ..., namely that they should go home'). But now the question arises: where does the main sentence begin? Some authors think that *id est* has this function (Thelwall: 'What the dream ... suggested ... is this: that they should ...'). Hartel, too, adheres to this opinion. But nowhere else does Tert. use *id est* in this way. Here, too, *id est* seems to explain only the words *alia via*. So the search for the main sentence is still open. It cannot be found before *ignorabat*, and here the early editions have a semicolon. Obviously in order to solve this problem, Reifferscheid put a comma after *ignorabat*, thus opening the way to find an appropriate main sentence. However, this main sentence, *adeo viam sectam et disciplinam intellegere debemus*, does not link up with the relative clause *quod ... suggessit* etc. Hence Van der Nat, who adheres to Reifferscheid's interpunction, proposed to consider the sentence as an anacoluthon. The words *adeo ... debemus* have nothing to do with the subclause introduced by *quod*; they have to be connected with *non, ne illos ... ignorabat* as a conclusion. Here one should observe that, if *adeo ... debemus* 'has nothing to do with the *quod*-clause', why should we not maintain the interpunction of the Agobardinus and the other editions? One could indicate the anacoluthon by a stroke after *ignorabat*. However, one has then to ascribe to Tert. a rather awkward phrase. We think that there is a way to solve all problems, viz., by taking *quod* as a relative junction (*quod = et id*). In other words, *quod* is not explained in *ut irent* but refers to the contents of the previous sentence, where it was said that the old practices of the magi had come to an end (the astrology, the gifts). Now Tert. says that therefore (*igitur*) the advice in the dream has to be interpreted in an allegorical way: 'And that it was, in consequence, what the dream advised (saying) that they should return by another way.' The allegorical interpretation is presented here *as a confirmation of the previous argument.* — **somnium ... suggessit:** in Tert.'s day there was a generally accepted division (definitely established by Posidonius) of prophetic dreams in three classes as to their origin: dreams sent by God, by the demons, and those originating from the activity of the soul itself. Among the Christians we find the same classification, in which, however, the demons are regarded as evil spirits (or the devil) and gradually all dreams, not only the prophetic ones, came to be included; we find this division already in Tert. (although he is doubtful about the third group), cf. *an.* 47 with Waszink's comm. (p. 500 seqq.). That the dream of the Magi was sent by God has certainly been a general Christian con-

viction, although this is not often explicitly stated; cf. Sedul. *op. pasch.* 2, 101-2: *caelitus per somnum moniti* (sc. magi); Fulgent. *serm.* 4, 11: the dream was a *divinum mandatum*. Justin, *dial.* 78, 2, speaks of a ἀποκάλυψις. According to Origen, *c. Cels.* 1, 60, it was an angel who warned the Magi not to return by the same way; likewise Joh. Chrysostom, *hom. in Matth.* 6, 3 and 7, 5 (PG 37, 65. 78). St. Jerome gives the event the character of an ancient oracle, *in Matth.* 1, 14-5 (PL 26, 26 c): *qui munera obtulerant domino, consequenter responsum accipiunt. Responsum autem (quod Graece dicitur* χρηματισθέντες*) non per angelum fit, sed per ipsum dominum, ut meritorum Ioseph privilegium demonstraretur.* — **suggessit:** *suggerere* in the sense of *memoriae suggerere, commemorare* and *suadere* is post-classical, cf. in Tert. e.g. *apol.* 25, 17 and 47, 9 (= *commemorare*); *apol.* 27, 3 and 33, 4 (= *suadere*). In *apol.* 18, 5 we also find the substantive *suggestus* in a corresponding sense. See Engelbrecht, *Neue Beitr.*, 156-7; Goelzer, *Jér.*, 259; Waltz., *Comm.*, 127. — **ut irent in sua, sed alia ... via:** the words (*ut irent*) *in sua, sed* seem to be superfluous, but Tert. is quoting here Matth. 2, 13: (ἀνεχώρησαν) εἰς τὴν χώραν αὐτῶν. — **pristina secta incedere:** *incedere* used in a metaphorical sense is very frequent in Christian authors (see *TLL* VII, 1: 854 seqq., and cf. infra the note on 9, 6 *aliter incederent*). It is unnecessary to follow Hartel in adding *in*; it is true that *incedere in* occurs frequently (cf. 17, 3), but cf. *cult. fem.* 2, 2, 2: *sancte et tota fidei substantia incedere.* For *incedere* with an accusative, see Waszink, 413, on *an.* 35, 2; for the Christian use of *secta*, see H. Janssen, 113; Teeuwen, 120; Waltz., *Comm.*, 17. — **ne pristina secta ... persequeretur:** the interpretation of the dream which is rejected here is not given anywhere else; all authors follow Matth. 2, 12, where no persecution is mentioned but where it is said that the dream commanded the Magi not to return to Herod. This was intended to prevent Herod from receiving the message for which he was waiting, so that Joseph should be able to fly in the meantime, see Klostermann, on Matth. 2, 12 seqq., *HdbNT* 4, 17 (unless the return by another way, too, belongs to the legendary elements of the story, see Klostermann, ib. 11. 17; Dietrich, *Kl. Schr.*, 279-83). Probably we find here one more mistake of Tert. (cf. the note on 4, 3: *cognoscite*), for in *Marc.* 3, 13, 10, where he associates Is. 8, 4 with the story of the Magi, he does mention the fact that they did not return to Herod: *'adversum regem' autem 'Assyriorum' adversus Herodem intellege, cui utique adversati sunt magi tunc non renuntiando de Christo, quem intercipere quaerebat* (cf. Just. *dial.* 78, 2. 7; Justin also give reasons for the identification of the king of the Assyrians with Herod, ib. 77, 4: (Herod) ὃν ὁ λόγος καλεῖ βασιλέα Ἀσσυρίων διὰ τὴν ἄθεον καὶ ἄνομον αὐτοῦ γνώμην). A non-symbolical interpretation, in which, however, the purpose of the dream is considered to be the protection of the Magi (and not of the child Jesus) against Herod, is given by Orig. *c. Cels.* 1, 60 (111, 24-8); Iuvenc. 1, 251-4; Joh. Chrysost. *hom. in Matth.* 8, 1 (83).

Others do not discuss what the dream meant to the Magi themselves, but interpret the Magi who had to return by another way as a *figura* of those who are converted to Christianity (the Magi are *primitiae gentium*); cf. Hilar. *in Matth.* 1, 5: *quod vero repetere iter atque ad Herodem in Iudaeam redire prohibentur: nihil a Iudaea petere scientiae agnitionisque permittimur, sed in Christo salutem omnem et spem locantes admonemur prioris vitae itinere abstinere*; Sedul. *carm. pasch.* 2, 201 seqq.; *Op. pasch.* 2, 9; Arnob. min. *ex Matth.* 1 (PL 53, 471 D). Herod is a symbol of the devil (*iniquus, huius mundi princeps*, Sedul.; *diaboli figura*, Arnob. min.). Tert. is the first to assume that for the Magi themselves, too, the dream had a symbolical significance; likewise Ambr. *expos. ev. sec. Luc.* 2, 46: *alia venerunt via magi, alia redeunt; qui enim Christum viderant, Christum intellexerant, meliores utique quam venerant revertuntur. Duae quippe sunt viae, una quae ducit ad interitum, alia quae ducit ad regnum. Illa peccatorum est, quae ducit ad Herodem, haec via Christus est, qua reditur ad patriam; hic enim temporalis est incolatus ... . Caveamus igitur Herodem mundanae ad tempus praesulem potestatis, ut patriae caelestis aeternum consequamur habitaculum.* Hier. *in Matth.* 1, 14-5: *revertuntur autem per aliam viam, quia infidelitati miscendi non erant ethnicorum et Iudaeorum*; Leo Magn. *serm.* 33 (= 14, 4 Leclercq-Dolle): *magi ... secundum admonitionem somnii non eodem quo venerant itinere revertuntur. Oportebat enim ut iam in Christum credentes non per antiquae conversationis semitas ambularent, sed novam ingressi viam a relictis erroribus abstinerent. Tum ut etiam Herodis vacuarentur insidiae, qui in puerum Iesum impietatem doli per simulationem disponebat officii*; cf. Aug. *serm.* 202, 3; Maxim. Taur. *hom.* 19 (PL 57, 264 B); 20 (266 AB); 21 (270 BC); 25 (280 D-281 A); 27 (285 C-286 A); Optat. Milev. 2; 12. — **ignorans ... digressos:** for the omission of a pronoun in an accus. c. infin., which is particularly common in Tert., see Löfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 52-4; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 49-50; Wahlén, 25-8 (with more literature). — **viam sectam et disciplinam:** it is necessary to adopt this emendation of Iunius, which palaeographically is only a minor correction. Less weighty objections against *viam rectam et disciplinam* are that we have to supply *aliam viam* to *intellegere* as an object-accusative (while the rest of the argument only deals with the interpretation of *via*), and that the combination of these words is surprising (why is *disciplina* not accompanied by an attribute?). The conclusive argument, however, is that, if we read *viam rectam et disciplinam*, Tert. would without warning use *via recta* figuratively as one conception in the very passage where he is trying to establish the right interpretation of *via*, which has already been explained as *secta*. Moreover, the next sentence becomes superfluous and *aliter* does not fit in with the foregoing (*alia via = via recta*, so *alia via incedere = aliter incedere*; one would expect: = *via recta incedere*). In adopting Iunius' conjecture the argument proceeds satisfactorily. The con-

nection *secta-disciplina* also occurs in *pall.*6, 2: *divinae sectae et disciplinae*. For the image cf. *Marc.* 4, 24, 11: *cum 'viam' fidem demonstret* (scil. Is. 35, 8-9), *per quam ad deum perveniemus*; *orat.* 11, 2: *alias ... via cognominatur disciplina nostratum*; Act. apost. 9, 2; see also Michaelis' detailed article ''Οδός', Kittel 5, 43 seqq.

6. **aliter incederent:** for *incedere* in a metaphorical sense accompanied by an adverb (often = περιπατεῖν, Vulg. *ambulare*), cf. *cult. fem.* 2, 1, 2: *qualiter vos incedere oporteat*; 2, 2, 2: *sancte ... incedere*; *Marc.* 5, 10, 11: *volens nos sicut ipse incessit ita incedere*; *pud.* 18, 11: *ab otiose incedente fratre*; *mon.* 3, 7: *Ioannes monens sic nos incedere debere quemadmodum et dominus, utique etiam secundum sanctitatem carnis admonuit incedere*. With *secundum*, as in the last passage quoted, also *orat.* 4, 2; *an.* 40, 2; *pud.* 17, 11 (= Rom. 8, 4). See *TLL* VII, 2: 854, 71 seqq.; cf. also 17, 3. For *incedere* with an adj. cf. the note on 1, 2: *conspurcatus et constupratus incedit*. — **Sic et:** cf. 1, 2 with the note. — **alia ... operatur:** cf. *an.* 57, 6: *sic et in illa alia specie magiae, quae ...* . By *alia illa species magiae* is implied what is stated at the end of this section: *magia ..., cuius est species astrologia*, which goes further than: *Scimus magiae et astrologiae inter se societatem* (9, 3). — **adversus Moysen aemulata:** the only instance given by *TLL* I: 975, 45 seqq. of this construction of *aemulari*. The present passage refers to the miracles performed in Egypt by Moses and the sorcerers competing with him, cf. Just. *dial.* 79, 4: Καὶ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ὅτι μάγοι ἐπείρησαν ἐξισοῦσθαι τῇ δυνάμει τῇ ἐνεργουμένῃ διὰ τοῦ πιστοῦ θεράποντος Μωϋσέως ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ, ἔγνωμεν; likewise, *apol.* 1, 62, 4. Jewish tradition knew the names of these Egyptian magicians, who, according to *Jubil.* 48, 1-3, were helped by Satan himself: cf. e.g. 2 Tim. 3, 8: ... Ἰαννῆς καὶ Ἰαμβρῆς ἀντέστησαν Μωϋσεῖ. Moses himself, too, because of this episode received the name of a magician (cf. e.g. Apul. *apol.* 90 (100, 10-3 H.); Celsus in Orig. *c. Cels.* 1, 21. 26; 2, 50); in Plin. *n.h.* 30, 11 Moses and his competitors are even mentioned as the founders of a certain type of magic. For more details and literature, see Abt, *Apol.*, 247-9; Messina, *Ursprung*, 15-6; Heinemann, art. 'Moses', *RE* XVI: 363-4. Cf. also the monograph by J. G. Gager, *Moses in Greco-Roman Paganism* (Nashville-New York 1972). Tert. also mentions this episode (likewise connected with the story of Simon Magus and Elymas) in *an.* 57, 7: *Corpora denique videbantur Pharaoni et Aegyptiis magicarum virgarum dracones*; *sed Mosei veritas mendacium devorat*. Tert. here contrasts the miracles of the magicians and those of Moses as appearance against reality; the serpents conjured by the magicians were only phantoms, those of Moses were real (cf. Waszink, 581). So Tert. denies the reality of the phenomena produced by the magicians, but not the existence of a phantom or its perception. The same holds good for the spirits of dead people, even of prophets, conjured up by magicians; they are only phantoms brought

about by the demons; cf. *an.* 57, 2 (quoted above) and ib. §§ 4-5 (for details, see Waszink's commentary). Origen, who disputes that Moses was a magician (*c. Cels.* 1, 26; 2, 50), also contrasts miracles brought about by the demons and by divine power; his distinctive criterium is the moral conduct and the character of the person performing the miracle, and the effect of the miracle itself (ib. 2, 51). This criterium also applies in his opinion to the miracles of Jesus, who was also regarded as a magician (ib. 2, 48 seqq.); similarly Arnobius 1, 43-4. As concerns Jesus' miracles, a different mark of distinction is given by Justin, *apol.* 1, 30. 31, 7-8, and Lactantius, *d.i.* 5, 3 and especially 4, 15: his miracles have evidential force, because they have been prophesied; cf. also Aug. *in Joh. ev. tract.* 35, 8. The same is argued by Tert. in *Marc.* 3, 3; an allusion to it is found in *apol.* 21, 17. See Bardy, *Conversion*, 184-5. — **patientia dei** is also found in *res.* 14, 10; *Scap.* 2, 10 and *pud.* 2, 7; on Tert.'s use of *patientia* and *tolerantia* cf. Fredouille, 407. — **traxit:** all alterations of the text (*aliam illam speciem*, Pamelius; *patientiam*, Rigaltius) are unnecessary: *trahere* is used intransitively in the sense of 'to last, to remain in existence, to subsist', cf. e.g. Flor. 2, 13, 13 (141, 2 Rossb.): *decem annos traxit ista dominatio*, and see Löfst., *Synt.*, 2, 258-60. — **ad evangelium usque:** for the expression, see the note on 9, 7: *post evangelium*; for the idea, cf. 9, 4. — **Simon magus ... alter magus:** by *alter magus* Elymas is meant. The passages in the Acts about these two figures (8, 9-25 and 13, 6-12 resp.) are also mentioned together (likewise in connection with Moses) in *an.* 57, 7: *multa utique et adversus apostolos Simon et Elymas magi*; *sed plaga caecitatis de praestigiis non fuit*. The story of Simon Magus is also mentioned in *an.* 34, 2; *fuga* 12, 4; *praescr.* 33, 12; that of Elymas in *pud.* 21, 4. For the life and system of Simon Magus see L. Cerfaux, 'La gnose simonienne', *Rev. Sc. Rel.* 15 (1925), 489 seqq.; ib. 16 (1926), 5-28. 265-85. 481-503, and id., 'Simon le magicien à Samaria', ib. 27 (1937), 615-7; G. Quispel, *Gnosis als Weltreligion*, 51-70; R. McWilson, *Vig. Chr.* 9 (1955), 193 seqq.; id., 'Simeon, Dositheos and the Dead Sea Scrolls', *Ztschr. für Religion und Geistesgeschichte* 9 (1957), 21-40; A. D. Nock, 'Gnosticism', (*Harvard Theol. Rev.* 57 (1964), 255-79), 277 (also in *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, ed. by Zeph Stewart, 957); J. Daniélou, *L'Église des premiers temps* (Paris 1985), 26-7 and 70-2; cf. also the literature mentioned by H. Conzelmann, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (*HdbNT*, 7, Tübingen 1963), 53-4. — **aliquid ... de circulatoria secta:** for *circulatorius* in connection with magic, cf. *apol.* 23, 1: *si multa miracula circulatoriis praestigiis ludunt* (sc. magi); cf. *carn. Chr.* 5, 10: *Ergo iam Christum non de caelo deferre debueras, sed de aliquo circulatorio coetu, nec deum praeter hominem sed magum hominem*; *praescr.* 43, 1: *Notata sunt etiam commercia haereticorum cum magis quam pluribus, cum circulatoribus, cum astrologis, cum philosophis, curiositati scilicet et deditis*. — **professionis suae:** i.e. magic; cf. *an.* 34, 2: (Simon) *fultus etiam*

artis suae viribus. For magic as an *ars*, cf. 9, 1, and see *TLL* II: 665, 34-66; Abt, *Apol.*, 30-1; Waszink, 406. — **enundinaret:** this verb does not occur anywhere else, see *TLL* V, 2: 620, 39-42. The meaning is depreciatory: 'to barter away'. Tert. is thinking of Acts 8, 20: τὸ ἀργύριόν σου σὺν σοὶ εἴη εἰς ἀπώλειαν, ὅτι τὴν δωρεὰν τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνόμισας διὰ χρημάτων κτᾶσθαι; cf. *an.* 34, 2. For the idea that a gift of God cannot be sold or bought, cf. 2 Clem. 20, 4; *Did.* 12, 5 with Knopf's note (*HdbNT, Erg. Bd.*, 34); Klostermann's note on Matth. 10, 9 (ib. 4, 87). To let oneself be paid is a mark of charlatanism, cf. *negotiatio* in *apol.* 23, 1 (quoted above); thus of false prophets and teachers in 2 Cor. 2, 17; 1 Tim. 6, 5; 1 Thess. 2, 5-6 with Dibelius' note (*HdbNT*, 11, 7-8); Jud. 11. 16 with Windisch's note (ib. 15, 43); *Did.* 11, 5-6. 9. 12; Herm. *mand.* 11, 12; cf. also Lucian, *Peregr.* 16. Likewise in philosophy, cf. e.g. Sen. *ep.* 29, 7: *circulatores, qui philosophiam honestius neglexissent quam vendunt*; Just. *dial.* 3, 2; Philo *Gig.* 39; *vit. Mos.* 2, 212; in a philosopher, for that matter, (apart from the contents of his doctrine) the accepting of money is regarded as undignified, cf. e.g. Plato *Prot.* 313 e; *Soph.* 223 d seqq. See Windisch, Καπηλεύειν, Kittel, 3, 606-9; Waszink's note on *an.* 3, 1: *sapientiae ... caupones*. — **de fide eiectus est:** Tert. often uses *de* in connection with compounds with prefix *ex*, cf. e.g. *apol.* 2, 18: *de isto nomine excludamur*; *paen.* 12, 6: *de vulnere expellat*; *ux.* 1, 7, 1: *de saeculo educi*; *res.* 13, 3; see also Henen's index, and Borleffs' index on *nat.* Instances of this use occur already at an early date, e.g. Cato *agric.* 42: *eximito de dolio* (see Krumbiegel's index s.v. *de*); Cic. *off.* 3, 89: *eicere de navi*. See Löfst., *Per.*, 103; Halm-Laubmann ad Cic. *Verr.* II, 5, 22.—According to *TLL* VI: 690, 26-32, *fides* here and in 11, 5 and 19, 2 is equivalent to *secta, ecclesia*. However, this is highly doubtful, as is justly argued by Thierry, 122-3. A better instance of this meaning is found in *scorp.* 15, 3: *orientem fidem Romae primus Nero cruentavit*, cf. *apol.* 5, 3: *consulite commentarios vestros; illic reperietis primum Neronem in hanc sectam cum maxime Romae orientem Caesariano gladio ferocisse*. — **qui cum Sergio Paulo:** cf. *praescr.* 23, 1 and *ieiun.* 10, 2: *Petrus et qui cum eo*; *Valent.* 9, 2: *in illis aliis, qui circa Nun.* — **isdem ... apostolis:** this is incorrect: Simon Magus was punished by Petrus and John, whereas Elymas resisted Saul/Paul and Barnabas. We find an identical mistake in *fuga* 2, 7 (see Thierry's note, p. 145). — **luminum amissione:** cf. *Scap.* 3, 4: *Vigellius Saturninus, qui primus hic gladium in nos egit, lumina amisit*.

7. **Hoc** = *luminum amissionem*. Tert. often uses *hoc* to denote one or more words from the preceding sentence, cf. 2, 1; *apol.* 12, 5: *Ignibus urimur; hoc et illi a prima quidem massa*; *Prax.* 26, 8: *hoc* (sc. filium dei esse) *et satanas eum in temptationibus novit*. See Waltz., *Ét.*, 362; Thörnell, 2, 9 and *Eranos* 7 (1907), 99-100. — **credo:** in parenthesis, cf. *TLL* IV: 1137, 19 seqq.;

Thierry, 167; Waszink, 339. — **qui:** frequent in Tert. instead of *quis* after *si* and *ne*, cf. 14, 1; *spect.* 15, 5; *apol.* 3, 7; 18, 1. See the note on 3, 3. — **magia ... cuius est species astrologia:** cf. supra. — **species in genere damnatur:** cf. *bapt.* 4, 2: *quod autem generi adtributum est, etiam in species redundat*; *spect.* 14, 2. The distinction between *species* and *genus* is found since Varro *r.r.* 1, 8, 1, see *TLL* VI, 2: 1902, 49 seqq.; Waszink, 157. — **Post evangelium:** Tert. often uses the preposition *post* accompanied by a substantive not expressing time instead of a clause introduced by *postquam*, cf. e.g. *nat.* 2, 12, 27: *post plurimas terras et Attica hospitia Italiae ... consedit* (Saturnus); *bapt.* 20, 4: *dominus post aquam* (= post baptismum) *segregatus in deserta*; *scorp.* 11, 3: *in parabola seminis post cespitem arefacti*; *apol.* 2, 17: *post tribunal vestrum*. Although not frequent, this use does occur more than once in other authors, cf. already Cic. *Verr.* I, 46: *vident adhuc post legem tribuniciam unum senatorem vel tenuissimum esse damnatum*. A similar brachylogical use of the preposition *ante* is found e.g. in *nat.* 1, 4, 11: *alii, quos retro ante hoc nomen vagos viles improbos norant*; *apol.* 12, 4: *ante plumbum et glutinum et gomphos sine capite sunt dei vestri*; *an.* 24, 8: *tanti ante corpus* ('before the incorporation of the soul') *aevi*; *Herm.* 3, 4. In this connection the expression *usque ad evangelium* (9, 5 and 7) should also be mentioned. In these expressions the meaning of *post* sometimes develops into 'after the setting in, the beginning of a certain state of affairs', cf. *pud.* 18, 15: *Porro cum in omnibus epistolis et post fidem talem prohibeat admitti ..., nostrae magis sententiae adsistit, eam paenitentiam ostendens dominum malle, quae ante fidem, quae ante baptisma morte peccatoris potior habeatur*; cf. Sen. *ep.* 3, 2: *post amicitiam credendum est, ante amicitiam iudicandum*. Thus already Cicero *Verr.* II, 1, 18: *post hunc statum rei publicae, quo nunc utimur*; Sallust, *Cat.* 5, 6 and *Iug.* 5, 4. Other instances of this preference for a substantival to a verbal expression are found in 5, 2 (1 Thess. 4, 11): *ad victum* and 5, 3: *ad erogationem*. — **sophistas ... magos:** a similar enumeration is found in *praescr.* 43, 1: *Notata sunt etiam commercia haereticorum cum magis quam pluribus, cum circulatoribus, cum astrologis, cum philosophis, curiositati scilicet et deditis*. — **sophistas:** used in the sense of 'student of occult sciences', just as *ieiun.* 7, 7, where it denotes the magicians of the king of Babylon. According to Waszink (note on *an.* 28, 2) it expresses contempt. This is only true so far that Tert. regards all these people as impostors and sinners; the word *sophista* is not in itself depreciatory, as it is more or less a technical term or at least used more than once in this connection. Thus in LXX Exod. 7, 11 we find σοφιστής used of the sorcerers of Pharao, in Dan. 1, 20; 2, 14. 18. 24. 48 of the soothsayers of the Babylonian king (Vulg. *sapientes*); it is also used by Philo *somn.* 1, 220; *vit. Mos.* 1, 92 in connection with Exod. 7, 11. More important, however, is that the word σοφιστής also occurs in magical and astrological texts: for instance, in the great magical

papyrus of Paris, vss. 154 seqq., it is said of the Egyptian King Psammetichus that nature made him ἄριστον σοφιστήν; similar qualifications of magicians are found in a text quoted by A. Dieterich, *Abraxas*, 187, 14-6; Herm Trismeg. in W. Gundel, *Neue astrologische Texte des Herm. Trismeg.* (Abh. Bay. Akad. d. Wiss., N. F. 12, 1936), 78, 13 seqq.: *sophistas, augures, astronomos, astrologos, vaticinatores, divinatores, avium vindicatores*, etc. *Philosophus*, too, is occasionally used in the sense of 'magician', cf. Firm. Mat. *math.* 3, 12, 6: *magos, philosophos et caelestia saepe tractantes*; ib., 3, 3, 18; Apul. *mag.* 27; Rhetorius in *Catal. codd. astrol. graec.* VIII, 4: 147, 13-5; 148, 2; 165, 1-4. See Abt, *Apol.* 171, n. 4; Cumont, *Rel. orient.*, 173-4 and *L'Égypte des astrologues*, 121-2; Bidez-Cumont, *Mages*, 2, 339, n. 3. For the other meanings of *sophista* in Tert., see Waszink, 356-7. — **Chaldaeos:** 'astrologers', just as in *apol.* 19, 5-6. It is the oldest Latin denomination of these people (Cato *agric.* 5, 4; cf. Val. Max. 1, 3, 3). For the semantic development of this ethnical name, which eventually became a professional designation, see Cumont, *Astr. Rel.*, 26-7; Baumstark, art. 'Chaldaioi', *RE* III: 2058-61; *TLL, Onomast.* II: 367, 34 seqq. — **incantatores:** occurs for the first time in Tert., like *incantatio* (*cult. fem.* 1, 2, 1), see *TLL* VII 1: 846, 8 seqq.; Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 136. Their working-method is described by Hier. *in Dan.* 2, 2 (498 C): *videntur mihi incantatores esse, qui verbis rem peragunt* (as opposed to the *magi et malefici, 'qui factis rem peragunt'*). The *incantatio* was an essential feature of magic, cf. Apul. *mag.* 47: *igitur* (sc. magia) *et occulta non minus quam taetra et horribilis plerumque noctibus vigilata et tenebris abstrusa et arbitris solitaria et carminibus murmurata*. For more particulars, see Pfaff, art. 'Incantatio', *RE* IX: 1241-4, Pfister, art 'Epode' (ἐπῳδή), *RE*, Suppl. IV: 323-44; Abt, *Apol.*, 41-4. — **coniectores:** a name of predictors of the future and interpreters of dreams already found several times in Plautus (e.g. *Amph.* 428) and Cicero (e.g. *part.* 2, 6; *div.* 1, 45). Enumerations similar to the present one are found in Cic. *nat. d.* 1, 55: *haruspices augures harioli vates coniectores*; *div.* 1, 132: *non habeo ... nauci Marsum augurem, non vicanos haruspices, non de circo astrologos, non Isiacos coniectores, non interpretes somniorum*; Quint. *instit.* 5, 7, 36: *haruspicum augurum coniectorum mathematicorum fides*; Arnob. 1, 24: *haruspices ... coniectores harioli vates et numquam non vani ... fanatici*. The verb *coniectare* is used in *an.* 46, 5 of the interpretation of dreams (see Waszink, 493), in connection with astrology in *pall.* 6, 2: *qui stellarem* (sc. artem) *coniectat*, and Suet. *Nero* 6, 2: *De genitura eius statim multa et formidolosa multis coniectantibus*. See *TLL* IV: 313, 43-56. — **litterator:** the Greek text has γραμματεύς, usually—also by Tert.—translated *scriba*, which is accordingly used in all other Latin translations of 1 Cor. 1, 20 (cf. *Vetus Latina* codd. *d e g*; Ambrosiast. = PL 17, 199 A; Aug. *c.d.* 10, 28 (1, 447, 7-9 D.); Vulg.). Possibly Tert. has here avoided the term *scriba* deliberately, because he thought the usual sense of this

word ('scribe') too narrow in this connection, where the *sapientia saeculi* is generally disqualified. Besides, it is quite probable that here Tert. offers his own translation of the whole passage, as it contains some more divergences from the other translations: *aevi ... saeculi* instead of *saeculi ... mundi* (however, *Marc.* 5, 5, 7: *nonne infatuavit deus sapientiam mundi?*; cf. also 5, 6, 1), *infatuavit* instead of *stultam fecit*. — **conquisitor huius aevi:** *conquisitor* as a translation of συζητητής (= *disputator*) is found from *Vetus Latina* and Tert. onwards, see *TLL* IV: 357, 17-27; Lietzmann's comm. on 1 Cor. 1, 20 (*HdbNT* 9, 9). *Huius aevi* = τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου; for the notion ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος, see H. Sasse, art. 'αἰών, αἰώνιος', in Kittel 1, 197-209 (especially 202-7). For the various meanings of *aevum* in Tert., see Waltz., *Comm.*, 66. An interesting interpretation is found in the Ambrosiaster (PL 17, 199 A): *conquisitor ... saeculi hic est, qui constellationibus agi mundum et duodecim signis ortus et occasus fieri decernit calculis, nihil omnino sine horum motu putans posse fieri.* — **infatuavit:** this verb, which is particularly frequent in Christian Latin literature (see *TLL* VII, 1: 1354, 69 – 55, 19), is found with a personal object since Cic. *Flacc.* 47: *neminem ... adeo infatuare potuit, ut ...*; with a non-personal object it is first found in the present quotation of the second half of 1 Cor. 1, 20 (LXX ἐμώρανεν, Vulg. *stultam fecit*) and in quotations of or allusions to Is. 44, 25 (μωραίνων, Vulg. *stultam faciens*) in Tert. in *Marc.* 4, 25, 5: *avertens in posteriora sapientes et cogitationes eorum infatuans*; 5, 5, 7 (obj. *sapientiam*); 5, 6, 1 (*sapientia*: neuter plural of adj.); *Prax.* 19, 4 (*consilium*). An allusion to this part of 1 Cor. 1, 20, in which the verb *infatuare* is not used, occurs in *res.* 3, 3: *tunc meminero ... ipsam sapientiam saeculi stultitiam nominatam*. It should be observed that it is only in the present passage that Tert. applies the words *sapientiam saeculi* of the quotation to the occult pseudo-sciences, not to human wisdom in general. The same is done by the Ambrosiaster, ib., with regard to astrology. — **huius saeculi:** τοῦ κόσμου: for the notion of ὁ κόσμος (οὗτος), see H. Sasse, art. 'κοσμέω, κόσμος', etc., Kittel 3, 867-98 (especially 889 seqq.).

8. **mathematice:** Tert. winds up with a direct attack on the Christian (9, 1 *quidam*) who has been the occasion of this whole argument. — **Nihil scis:** 'If you, astrologer, were really clairvoyant, you would have seen (before your conversion) that you would become a Christian and, then, as a Christian would have to give up astrology. But obviously you did not see that. *Ergo: nihil scis.*' This is, of course, a Tertullianean sophism, or rather a mockery. This way of thought is different from that of e.g. Jerome (*in Is.* 4, 7, 12) and Augustine (*serm.* 119, 2; *enarr. in Ps.* 140 (141)), where the astrologers are said to be blind with regard to what is really important to themselves. — **debueras:** the pluperfect instead of the imperfect is frequently found (see Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 39-40); it 'emphasizes the remoteness of the event' (Waszink,

179). — **Ipsa ... quae:** 'in Tert.'s works *ipse* is frequently almost equivalent to *idem*, but in most cases its original meaning still obtains, especially before a relative clause ('the *very* same')', Waszink 193 (there also literature on this subject); see also Löfst., *Per.*, 65; Svennung, *Oros.*, 67-8. — **te de periculo suo instrueret:** 'would instruct (inform) you of its own danger'; the expression is also found in Ulpian, cf. *dig.* 27, 9, 5, 11: *requirere debet eum, qui se instruat de fortunis pupilli*; ib. 27, 8, 1, 3. — **climacterica:** since the days of Hippocrates physicians considered the uneven days, and of these especially the seventh, to be critical in the course of an illness, and in the case of prolonged diseases the corresponding months and years (κρίσιμοι ἡμέραι, μῆνες, ἐνιαυτοί). Under the influence of old traditions and Pythagorean ideas this theory developed into a division of the whole span of human life into periods of seven or nine years, of which the last was considered to be critical for being the transition between one period and another. Since the Pythagoreans attached a special value to squares, the forty-ninth and the eighty-first years of a person's life were particularly feared. The sixty-third year, however, was regarded as preeminently dangerous, since it was critical according to both divisions; consequently it received the name ἀνδρόκλας, ἀνδροκλάστης, '*quod omnem viri substantiam frangat atque debilitet*', cf. Firm. Mat. *math.* 4, 20, 3; Censorin. *d. nat.* 14, 9-15. Although astrology adopted this theory, it developed at the same time its own system of 'critical periods' (κλιμακτῆρες, κλιμακτηρικοὶ ἐνιαυτοί, μῆνες, ἡμέραι, ὧραι), based on astrological calculations and divided irregularly over the whole of life. A striking illustration is offered by the ironical description of the visit of a certain Regulus to the sick wife of Piso, given by Plin. *ep.*, 2, 20, 2 seqq.: *ille ... quo die, qua hora nata esset, interrogavit ... 'habes', inquit, 'climactericum tempus, sed evades'*. He then consults a haruspex, after which he sacrifices and then asserts *exta cum siderum significatione congruere*. This theory was also applied to all dangers threatening human existence, cf. Gell. 3, 10, 9: *pericula quoque vitae fortunarumque omnium, quae climacteras Chaldaei appellant*. It is in this sense that Tert. is using *climacterica* here. We find *climactericus* as an adj. in Plin. min., Censorinus and Sidon. *ep.* 8, 11, 9; the only other instances of the substantival use of the neuter plural *climacterica* = κλιμακτῆρες, are [Ambros.] *acta Sebast.* 16, 55 (PL 17, 1137 C) and probably 16, 56 (1138 A), cf. *TLL* III: 1349, 17-28. See Bouché-Leclercq, 316-32; Gundel, *Sterne*, 275-300; Boll, art. 'κλιμακτῆρες', *RE* XI: 843-4; Kroll, art. 'Iatromathematike', *RE* IX: 802-4. — **praecanit:** Mesnart's reading *praecavit* is incorrect: precognition, not prevention is the province of the astrologer; note also the parallelism with *instrueret*. For the form, cf. *Marc.* 4, 40, 2: *praecanit* (without variants); also in *carn. Chr.* 6, 1 Kroymann reads *praecanebat* following the Trecensis (*praecinebat* rell.) but in *Iud.* 10, 18 he reads *praecinebat* also following the Trecensis (*praecanebat P N F R*). — **Non est tibi ... ratione:** Acts 8, 21: οὐκ ἔστιν σοι μερὶς οὐδὲ κλῆρος ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ. Λόγος has here the meaning 'teaching', 'Gospel', cf. ib. 8, 4. 14 (by some, e.g. Overbeck, *Leyden Translation*, *Canisius-translation*, Conzelmann in his commentary (*HdbNT*, 7, 54-5), λόγος is interpreted as meaning 'the matter', i.e. the subject under discussion, which is the conferring of the Holy Spirit by means of the imposition of hands; however, this does not produce an essential change of the meaning of the passage); see Preuschen's note on Acts 8, 21 (*HdbNT*, 7, 51). It is striking that here the translation of λόγος is *ratio*, which in this connection can only mean 'system, theory, science' (all other versions have *sermo*). This and the context in which the quotation is given (cf. especially the preceding words *nihil tibi futurum cum ista professione*) point to the fact that Tert. interprets the passage in the sense that a Christian is not allowed to practise astrology and magic. So this is exactly the reverse of what St. Peter means by these words, spoken to Simon Magus: 'you have nothing to do with the Gospel'. Are we here once more concerned with an inaccuracy of Tert. caused by quoting from memory (cf. the note on 9, 6 *isdem ... apostolis*) or has he deliberately changed the tenor of the passage? — **regna caelorum:** for the plural *caelorum* see Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.* 1, 12 and 64-5. The expression is chosen for the sake of parallelism with the following *caelo*. *Regna caelorum* is the translation of βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν which is used in the NT by Matthew instead of, but with the same content as, the customary βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (also found in Matth. 12, 28; 21, 31. 43); see K. L. Schmidt, art. 'βασιλεία', Kittel 1, 582, 15 seqq. The loss of the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ is identical with the loss of the ζωή, with the θάνατος, cf. the list of sins 1 Cor. 6, 9-10; Gal. 5, 19-21, and see comm. on 1, 2: *perisse*. So Tert. argues that the astrologer need not hope to be saved, that Death (*mors secunda*) will be his share. — **digitus:** used in calculating, cf. *apol.* 19, 5: *multis instrumentis cum digitorum subputatoriis gesticulis asserendum (E) est*, and see *TLL* V, 1: 1125, 12 seqq.; here especially used of astrological calculations (*Babylonii numeri*, Hor. *carm.* 1, 11, 2-3), cf. the passage of Pliny's letter quoted above; see also [Ambr.] *acta Sebast.* 16, 54 (PL 17, 1137 A). — **radius:** a small rod, used by mathematicians and astronomers (astrologers) to make drawings on a board strewed with fine sand, cf. e.g. Verg. *Aen.* 6, 849-50: *caelique meatus / describent radio et surgentia sidera dicent*; Hier. *in Ezech.* 4; Hug, art. 'Radius', *RE* XXV: 39. — **abutitur caelo:** the astrologer uses heaven for an unlawful purpose, that is, he abuses the creation, which is one of the reasons for his damnation. For a further elaboration of this idea see *spect.* 2; *cult. fem.* 1, 8, 3-6; *apol.* 42, 2; *cor.* 6, 3 seqq.

Ch. 10. *The profession of schoolmaster and teacher*

'Undoubtedly Christians are not allowed to be schoolmasters or teachers since such men are involved in a variety of idolatrous practices: first they have to

make known the gods, their names, genealogies, etc. which, of course, contributes to idolatry, and, second, they have to observe the heathen festivals for the sake of their incomes (§ 1). A schoolmaster cannot take part in the Quinquatria *without the tablet with the names of the seven idols (planets). He has to dedicate the first fee of a new pupil to Minerva; and when he eats from it, although he does not eat something belonging to a sacrifice, he perpetrates an idolatrous act (§ 2). The same holds good of other honoraria, like* strenae, Septimontium, *etc. Moreover, he has to take part in other idolatrous activities. In honour of Flora the school has to be garlanded, etc. (§ 3). The whole pomp of the devil has to be assisted by him. Who could maintain that this is allowed to any Christian?*

One may object: 'If teaching is not allowed to a Christian, then learning is not so either. This means denying him admittance not only to human education but also to the studia divina*' (§ 4). We must, indeed, admit that a Christian cannot do without literary instruction and also that he cannot make a division into acceptable and unacceptable parts, admitting the one and refusing the other. So a Christian may go to school. This is not inconsequent, since the situation of the pupil is different from that of the teacher; hence it is understandable that the Christian is allowed to be the one and not the other. If a Christian* teaches, *he confirms the preaching of the heathen gods contained in literature (§ 5); he calls them 'gods', which the Bible forbids. So from the very beginning he builds up the faith in the devil. How could he, being a catechist of the idols, not be guilty of idolatry? As a pupil, however, a Christian will behave like the man who receives a cup with poisoned contents from somebody not aware of this fact; he will accept it, but not drink from it (§ 6).*

The necessity of instruction, then, is a valid excuse. Moreover, just as it is easier for a Christian student to avoid the heathen festivities than for a teacher, it is easier not to teach literature, than not to study it (§ 7).'

Remarks

a. *The ludimagister and the Quinquatria.* 'What schoolmaster, if he is without the list of the seven idols, will still celebrate the *Quinquatria*?' The implications of this question are (1) that the schoolmaster has to partake in the festivities of the *Quinquatria* and (2) that he cannot do so without a tablet with the seven idols (= planets) on it. Two questions arise: why did the schoolmaster have to partake in these festivities? What is the function of the tablet with the seven idols? (Obviously the carrying of this tablet is considered by Tertullian as an idolatrous act and hence forbidden to a Christian.) The schoolmaster had to partake in the *Quinquatria*, because at that occasion he earned a part of his (slender) income in the form of a tip. Moreover, the

Quinquatria were of special importance, because school began in March and at this festival the schoolmaster had to strive for new pupils. Ovid, *Fasti* III 829-30, advises the *magistri* not to despise Minerva, because she attracts new pupils (*discipulos attrahit illa novos*).—The schoolmaster had, of course, to manifest himself as such at the festivity. The *tabula VII idolorum* must have had that function. It must have been a kind of emblem of the schoolmaster.

b. *Ipsam primam novi discipuli stipem.* The first fee of the new pupil, paid at the *Quinquatria*, had to be dedicated "to the honour and the name of Minerva". One should notice the pronoun *ipsa* here. It links this second sentence with the previous one: "That first fee *itself* (about which I spoke just now) has to be dedicated...".

c. *What does this dedication mean*? Some authors think that the schoolmaster had to *give* the first fee to Minerva, e.g. J. G. Frazer in his note on Ovid. *Fasti* III 830: "... which it appears he had to hand over to Minerva" (Loeb ed.). But the rest of the sentence implies that the schoolmaster uses this money for his maintenance. Tertullian argues: even if one may say that it is not an *idolothytum* (i.e. something formally *sacrificed* to the idols), which of course a Christian may not eat, it nevertheless contaminates the schoolmaster when he eats from what he has dedicated "to the name and the honour of Minerva". Obviously this dedication does not mean a sacrificial offering, but the schoolmaster calls the fee *Minerval*, thus giving *honour* to the *name* of Minerva.

d. *Elaboration of the argument.* The next two sentences are an elaboration of the argument with regard to the *Minerval*. First he says: "I ask you (*Quid*?), is there less contamination (in this than in a *idololythum* in the strict sense of the word)—and are, therefore, earnings dedicated to the name and the honour of the idols better?" And he continues: *Quam Minervalia, quam Saturnalia* (= *Tam Minervalia, quam Saturnalia*) ... In other words: *Minervalia* are as bad as *Saturnalia*. It is obvious that this statement is connected with what precedes, because by itself it seems senseless. Now Tertullian was dealing with the *Quinquatria*, a festival in honour of Minerva. Does *Minervalia* refer to this feast? However, *Minervalia* is not an official name (see below). Moreover, the *Quinquatria* as such were not the subject of the previous passage, but the behaviour of the schoolmasters on this occasion, especially the *prima stips*, called *Minerval*. We think that Tertullian is playing on this word and says: Those *Minervalia*, i.e. those *stipes*, are as idolatrous as the *Saturnalia* are idolatrous. Now the heathen festivity *par excellence* was the *Saturnalia*. Even the humblest slave was involved in it. How could those *Minervalia* not contaminate the schoolmaster who takes part in the *Quinquatria*?

e. *Teacher: no—Student: yes.* If it is not allowed to a Christian to be a teacher *because of the contacts with idolatry implied*, it seems consequent to state that it is not allowed to be a pupil of somebody who teaches those matters. When Tertullian maintains that, because of the necessity of learning, it is allowed for a Christian to be a student of literature, his attitude seems to be inconsistent. However, Tertullian is convinced that it is not. He argues that *the ways of contact* with idolatry on the part of teacher and student are different, because the mental process of teaching is different from that of learning (*diversa est enim ratio discendi et docendi*). The student can keep at a distance from certain parts of the instructed matter; the teacher can not. The teacher is a kind of catechist of the idols; the pupil can act like the man who accepts a poison, but does not drink it.

f. *The attitude of the pupil.* Describing the attitude of the pupil who is instructed in heathen matters (*At cum fidelis haec discit*), Tertullian distinguishes two cases. The first is, *si iam sapit, qui sit*, "if he already understand who he is", i.e. if he already understands what it means to be a Christian (there is no reason to conjecture with Oehler *quid sit*, which would mean that the student understands the subject of instruction); in this case he will, of course, not accept the instruction. The second case is that the pupil does not yet understand 'who he is' or is only beginning to understand his being a Christian. What will he do, according to Tertullian? He says: *prius oportet sapere quod prius didicit, id est de deo et fide.* Here Tert. does not say what the pupil *will* do but what he *ought to* do. Formally the argument loses herewith its stringency. The reason of this turn lies in the fact that Tert. is thinking here of children. Only children can be said to have been instructed *first* about God and faith. So the verb *oportet* refers to what *as a matter of course will happen* in those children. Hence he can assert that what will happen in the first case (*si iam sapit*) will happen *a fortiori* (*multo magis*) in the second (*si nondum sapit*).

g. Recently C. M. M. Bayer put the question as to the kind of instruction which Tertullian had in mind in this chapter ('Tertullian zur Schulbildung der Christen: Welche Art des Unterrichts ist Gegenstand der Erörterungen im 10. Kapitel des Werkes De idololatria?', *Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte* 78 (1983), 186-191). He discusses the terms used in this chapter (*litterae, eruditio, litteratura* and *saecularia studia*) and comes to the conclusion that it is elementary instruction which he has in mind and which he allows the Christian to follow. He admits that it is indeed the *professores litterarum* who are mentioned in 10, 1 but, according to the author, Tert. does not deal with them in the rest of the chapter. He admits also that *saecularia studia* seems to point in the direction of a more advanced kind of instruction, but the expression stands in a context in which only the

elementary instruction is under discussion. It should be explained as a rhetorical element.

We do not agree with this interpretation. Apart from the fact that Tert. speaks of *sed et ceteris professoribus litterarum* and of *saecularia studia*, which cannot be explained away as the author tries to do, we think that the phrase *Videamus igitur necessitatem litteratoriae eruditionis, respiciamus ex parte eam admitti non posse, ex parte vitari* cannot be understood as referring to the instruction in reading and writing. (See our explanation of this phrase, below 196). Moreover, if Tert. had only the art of reading and writing in mind, his argument in 10, 6 (*At cum fidelis haec discit, si iam sapit, qui sit* ...) would be pointless. In our view it is obvious that Tert. is referring to the dangers of the idolatrous *contents* of heathen instruction, particularly of the *saecularia studia*, which, as Bayer himself agrees, means 'literarische Bildungskultur', i.e. the higher studies.

1. **de ludimagistris ... ceteris professoribus litterarum:** from their seventh till approximately their twelfth year children were given their primary schooling (*primae litterae*) by the *ludimagister*, who taught them reading, writing and the elements of arithmetic (cf. *pall.* 6, 2: *de meo* (sc. pallio) *vestiuntur et primus informator litterarum et primus enodator vocis et primus numerorum harenarius et grammaticus et rhetor*, etc.). After the letters, syllables, words and small sentences, practice-matter consisted of *versus, dicta clarorum virorum* and *electi ex poetis maxime loci* (Quint. *inst.* 1, 1, 35-6), which were learnt by heart and recited, often after having been dictated. After this and until accepting the *toga virilis* children could attend the lessons of the *grammaticus*, whose program consisted of *recte loquendi scientia* and *poetarum enarratio* (Quint. *inst.* 1, 4, 2), i.e. language and literature. The explanation of the texts was concerned both with form and content (*poetarum pertractatio, verborum interpretatio* and *historiarum cognitio*, Cic. *de orat.* 1, 187). The latter department included history, geography and other sciences; the emphasis, however, was on mythology (see below). With the *grammaticus*, too, the texts were learnt by heart and recited. St. Augustine gives a good characterization of these forms of tuition (*conf.* 1, 13; in this and the following chapters the instruction in mythology is elaborately rejected). Finally, one could attend the lessons of the *rhetor*, lasting for an indefinite period of time. This was a formal schooling, only concerning itself with the technical side of oratory (Cicero's and Quintilian's ideal of a broad cultural education of the orator has not been realized in practice). See Marrou, *Éducation*, 258-89, and *St. Aug.*, 3-157; Vergeest, 13 seqq. It is clear from the argument that Tert. is concerned with schoolmasters as well as with teachers. The word *litterae* has the complex meaning of 'reading, writing, language and literature (with everything connected with it)'; for the omission of *de* before

ceteris, see Löfstedt, *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 61. — **affines ... idololatriae:** in Tert. *affinis* with a genitive (found from Terent. *Heaut.* 215 onwards) means either 'related to, akin to' (e.g. *Herm.* 29, 2: *affinis eius* (sc. terrae) *caro nostra*; *pud.* 5, 4: *moechia affinis idololatriae* (cf. *idol.* 12, 5: *idololatriae affinitates*; *idol.* 14, 3) or 'having a part in' (e.g. *pat.* 11, 8: *numquid inpatientes pacis affines?*), 'capable of' (e.g. *an.* 24, 2: (animam) *oblivionis affinem*, but ib. 1: *oblivionis capacem animam*) or, as in the present passage, in connection with an offence or crime, 'involved in, implicated in, guilty of' (cf. *pat.* 7, 6: *affines cupiditatis*; thus already *Rhet. Her.* 4, 12: *huius sceleris qui sunt affines*; Landgraf's note on Cic. *Rosc. Amer.* 18, p. 50); in *res.* 32, 5: *discendi magis affinis quam praesumendi*, the adjective is almost equivalent to *cupidus*. See *TLL* I: 1218, 55 seqq., and 1219, 3 seqq.; Waszink, 308. — **multimodae:** the adj. *multimodus*, which is a retrograde formation from the adverb *multimodis* (cf. *TLL* VIII: 1589, 54) is found for the first time in Tert. (also *an.* 52, 3), unless we are to assume that in Lucr. 3, 855-6: *motus materiai / multimodis quam sint* the reading *multimodi* of the two main mss. *O* and *Q* is the correct one (Diels and Martin accept this reading; Bailey rejects it with the not particularly valid argument: 'there is no other trace of the adj.'). — **deos nationum praedicare:** these words are explained by the subsequent *nomina ... enuntiare*. Of course the *ludimagister*, too, provided mythological explanations of his text, but as a part of the *poetarum enarratio*, this explication was the special province of the *grammaticus*; cf. Sen. *ep.* 88, 3; Quint. *inst.* 1, 2, 14; Cic. *Verr.* II 1, 47-8. With regard to the knowledge in this field high standards were imposed on the teacher, cf. Iuv. 7, 229 seqq.; Tiberius was fond of testing it by questions, cf. Suet. *Tib.* 70, 5. Quintilian censured exaggeration in this matter (*inst.* 1, 8, 18-21). See Marrou, *St. Aug.*, 128-31, and *Éducation*, 377-8; Vergeest, 72-3. — **genealogias, fabulas:** apart from a fragment of Suetonius in Diomedes (1, 482, 33 Keil = Suet. frg. p. 16, 8 R.) *genealogia* occurs for the first time in Tert., especially with reference to the Gnostics, e.g. *praescr.* 33, 8; *carn. Chr.* 24, 9; *an.* 18, 4 (see *TLL* VI, 2: 1769, 35 seqq.). The characterization of their doctrine as *fabulae et genealogiae interminabiles* (*praescr.* 7, 7; cf. *Valent.* 3, 4) was familiar to Tert. from 1 Tim. 1, 4 (see Dibelius' note, *HdbNT*, 13, 10). In the present passage the two notions are connected with reference to heathendom, as often in apologetic literature. This is easy to understand, since genealogies are an essential part of the myths. In both cases *fabulae* has a derogatory meaning, cf. *apol.* 12, 1: *quantum ... de deis vestris, nomina solummodo video quorundam veterum mortuorum et fabulas audio et sacra de fabulis recognosco.* — **quaeque:** cf. the note on 11, 3. — **sollemnia festaque:** *festum* is equivalent to *dies festus*; *sollemne* means *id quod die festo agitur*, cf. Colum. 2, 21, 5: *sollemnia festorum*; Suet. *Nero*, 34, 3: *sollemnia Quinquatruum.* — **ut quibus ... suppetent:** It is unnecessary to alter the *lectio tradita*, as the established practice that

at festivals schoolmasters received gifts in money can quite well be expressed by means of the verb *suppetere* 'to be present, to be in store'. Several scholars wrongly supposed that during or with the help of these festivals schoolmasters calculated their incomes; it is on this account that Mercerus conjectured *supputent*, which was adopted by Oehler and Reifferscheid. As after *ut qui* Tert. not only uses a subjunctive but also an indicative (e.g. *apol.* 21, 3; 24, 11; 46, 7; *orat.* 6, 4; see Waltzing, *Comm.*, 94; Hofm., *Synt.*, 713) Gelenius' reading *suppetant* is unnecessary: *suppetent* is a gnomic future; cf. in the next sentence *Quis ludimagister ... Quinquatria frequentabit*?

2. **tabula septem idolorum:** 'the list of the seven idols', i.e. of the seven planet-gods, after which the days of the week were called, cf. Petron. 30, 3: *duae tabulae in utroque poste defixae, quarum ... altera lunae cursum stellarumque septem imagines pictas* (sc. habebat); *et qui dies boni quique incommodi essent ... notabantur*; see also Tib. 1, 3, 18, and from Tert. *nat.* 1, 13, 3: *vos ..., qui etiam in laterculum septem dierum solem recepistis* (in *TLL* VII, 2: 1002, 21 wrongly quoted as *bapt.* 1, 13, 3); Schneider *ad loc.* observes that *laterculus* with the meaning 'register', 'list' is used for the first time by Tert. in this passage and in *Valent.* 29, 4. The planetary week, which came into use in Hellenistic times, has its origin in the astrological belief that each day is subject to the power of one of the planet-gods. Consequently, its propagation accompanied that of the astral religions and astrology (cf. comm. on ch. 9). This propagation can be traced back to the age of Augustus. On this subject are of fundamental importance F. Boll, art. 'Hebdomas', *RE* VII: 2547-78, and E. Schürer, 'Die siebentägige Woche im Gebrauch der christlichen Kirche der ersten drei Jahrhunderte', *ZNTW* 6 (1905), 1-66; cf. also E. Maass, *Tagesgötter*, 263-83; Cumont, *Ant. Class.* 4 (1935), 43, and *Rel. or.*, 155. 287, n. 25: Wendland, *Kultur*, 157-8 and 177. — **Quinquatria:** a variant of *Quinquatrus*, formed on the analogy of the names of other festivals: it is found not only in later literature (the first instances are Suet. *Nero* 34, 2; *Domit.* 4, 4) and in glosses (e.g. *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* 2, p. 167, 31; 4, p. 384, 8 *Quinquatria Minervalia*; cf. the note on 10, 3 *Minervalia*), but also in the calendars of Philocalus and Silvius (*CIL* I², p. 260-1) and the *Menol. Rust. Colot.* (ib. p. 280). The form is censured by Charisius (1, 81, 20 Keil) but accepted by Priscianus (2, 309, 12-7 Keil). Originally it was a festival in honour of Mars, celebrated on the 19th of March. However, this day came to be considered as a Minerva-festival, because the temple of this goddess on the Aventine was consecrated on this day. Afterwards we find the Quinquatrus extended to five days (19 till 23 March; it is uncertain whether this was already the case in 168 B.C., as is implied by Livy, 44, 20, 1: *legati ex Macedonia Quinquatribus ultimis ... venerunt* (the wording may be Livy's own or that of his source). Related to this is the fact that the name, which

actually meant *post diem quintum Idus*, was erroneously considered to refer to the period of five days (cf. e.g. Ovid *fast.* 3, 810); for the explanation and refutation of this incorrect interpretation, see Varro *ling.* 6, 14; Gell. 2, 21, 7; Festus p. 304-6 Lindsay. As Minerva was the patroness of handicraft and artistic skill, the festival was celebrated not only by artisans, artists (cf. Fasti Praen., *CIL* I², p. 234: *artificum dies*) and doctors, but also, and enthusiastically, by schoolmasters, cf. Ovid *fast.* 3, 829-30: *nec vos, turba fere censu fraudata, magistri, spernite* (sc. Pallada): *discipulos adtrahit illa novos*. Still in late antiquity pupils had a holiday during this festival, cf. Symm. *ep.* 5, 85, 3. See Wissowa, *Rel.*, 253-4 and art. 'Minerva', *Roscher*, 2, 2985-7; Altheim, art. 'Minerva', *RE* XV, 2: 1778-80 and *Röm. Rel. Gesch.* 1, 196-9; Warde Fowler, *Festivals*, 57-62; Latte, *RRG*, 361 seqq. See also the commentaries of Frazer and Bömer on Ovid *fast.* 3, 809 seqq. — **tamen frequentabit:** it has been attempted to eliminate the difficulties offered by this sentence by reading *tamen non* instead of *tamen* or by splitting up the sentence and putting a question-mark after *idolorum* and a full stop after *frequentabit*. The former attempt serves no purpose: it is only the meaning which is changed (which, as will appear, is unnecessary), and the structure of the sentence, which is responsible for the trouble, remains the same. The second solution, which was elaborately defended by Hartel, 1, 43-4, is impossible, because in that case *tamen* must be restrictive (cf. 12, 5), as is pointed out by Hartel himself (he paraphrases: 'jeder benützt die heidnische Wochentafel und besucht als Mitglied der Zunft wenigstens das Zunftfest'). However, this restriction is incompatible with the preceding words *sollemnia festaque* (plural!) *observare* and with the subsequent argument, from which it is clear that the schoolmasters had to celebrate a variety of heathen festivals (cf. especially the conclusion: *omnis diaboli pompa frequentatur*). However, there is no need for any alteration. *Sine tabula septem idolorum* is a (predicative) adjunct to *ludimagister*, i.e. we have to supply ὤν; for this, see the note on 5, 4: *suspensi in modum*. The meaning is: 'what schoolmaster will celebrate the Quinquatria, if he does not use the heathen weekly calendar?', or, as Oehler correctly paraphrases: 'nullus magister tabulam septem idolorum non habet, qui Quinquatria frequentare seque in censu et numero ludimagistrorum haberi vult.' So *Quinquatria frequentabit* is a paraphrase of 'will still be able to be a schoolmaster'. This paraphrase was possible, because the *Quinquatria* were the special festival of the schoolmasters (see above). The intention is clear: to be a schoolmaster implies already in itself the practice of idolatry. — **Ipsam ... consecrat:** Tert. is alluding to the *Minervale munus* or *Minerval*, which schoolmasters received on occasion of the *Quinquatria*, cf. Hier. *in Eph.* 3, 6, 4 (PL 26, 573 C-574 A): *legant* (viz., Eph. 6, 4) *episcopi atque presbyteri, qui filios suos saecularibus litteris erudiunt et faciunt comoedias legere et mimorum turpia scripta cantare, de ecclesiasticis forsitan sumptibus eruditos; et quod in corbonam pro peccato virgo vel vidua vel totam substantiam suam effundens quilibet pauper obtulerat, hoc Kalendariam strenam et Saturnaliciam sportulam et Minervale munus grammaticus et orator aut in sumptus domesticos aut in templi stipes aut in sordida scorta convertit*; Varro *r.r.* 3, 2, 18, where Axius says: *recipe me quaeso discipulum villaticae pastionis*, and Merula answers: *qui simulac promiseris Minerval, incipiam* (it is beyond doubt that Iuv. 10, 114-7 does not refer to this, but for the rest the interpretation of this passage is a difficult question, see the notes of Friedländer and Duff). The *Minerval* was not the yearly wages (thus Altheim), but a gift in money (thus Wissowa). This is not only evident from the way in which it is discussed by St. Jerome, but also from the present passage. It is indicated by the word *stips*, which does not mean 'wages' but 'tip, small gift in money' (see E. Flinck, *Ann. Acad. Scient. Fennicae*, ser. B tom. XI, 10 (Helsingfors 1921), 63-70; L. Deubner, *Glotta* 3 (1912), 39), it is put on one level with the *strenae* (for *stips* used to denote *strena*, cf. e.g. Ovid *fast.* 1, 189. 192. 219) and with the presents given on the occasion of other festivals. These gifts were welcome to the schoolmasters, for their wages were slender (cf. Ovid *fast.* 3, 829, quoted on p. 186); see Marrou, *Éducation*, 362. 370. 380-1 (the *rhetor* earned more than the *ludimagister* and the *grammaticus*); Vergeest, 18-9; Marquardt, *Privatleben*, 94-6. For that matter, the use of the terms *vectigalia* and *quaestus* (10, 1-2) might point to the fact that these gifts were considered as wages; see also the note on 13, 4: *sunt quidam dies munerum, quae apud alios honoris titulum, apud alios mercedis debitum expungunt*. Literature: see the note on *Quinquatria*, and cf. also Marquardt, *Privatleben*, 94-6; Blümner, *Privataltertümer*, 315-6. 324-5. 334. — **ut ... vitetur:** *ut ... pro idololatria vitetur* is a consecutive clause to *ipsam ... consecrat*; *etsi ... dicatur* should be joined to *ut ... vitetur*: 'so that, even if it may be said that in name he is not contaminated by <consuming> a sacrifice to an idol and dedicated to an idol, he ought to be avoided on account of idolatry, because in fact he is contaminated by living from a tip dedicated to a goddess, which is *something like* an *idolothytum* (i.e. food or drink which is formally dedicated to an idol)'. — **etsi ... dicatur:** of *etsi* with a subjunctive hardly any certain instances are found before the *Dig.*, 'ubi hunc usum vigere iam ex eo apparet quod ind. et coni. promiscue ponuntur' (*TLL* V, 2: 977, 4-5; cf. the material ib. 977, 5-51). It is evident that Tert. has adopted this construction from the idiom of lawyers. Cf. also Kühn.-Stegm. 2, 440 (this subject is not clearly discussed in Hofmann and Hofm.-Szant.; it is to be regretted that Claesson does not make any distinction between the various functions of *etsi*. In *an. etsi* is found 20 times with an ind., 5 times with a subj., and 11 times *sine verbo*). — **non profanatus alicui idolo:** from the dative it is clear that *profanatus* must have the meaning 'dedicated to'; we do not know of any other passage where the old-fashioned verb *profanare* is used

referring to a person. Perhaps we may compare Salv. *De gubern. dei* 8, 2, 10: *quis ... illi idolo* (viz., the African *virgo Caelestis*) *non initiatus? Quis non a stirpe ipsa forsitan ac nativitate votus? Nec loquor de hominibus sicut vita ita etiam professione paganis, et qui sicut profani erant errore, sic nomine.* Cf. also *Acta SS. Agapes, Chionae, Irenes*, etc. 3 (p. 393 Ruinart), where, when asked why the martyrs refuse to eat the sacrificial meat, Agape replies: *minime decet satanae devotam me esse.* It can not be doubted that Tert. uses this rare word in order to make a pun on *profanatus* in the sense of *pollutus* ('desecrated, defiled'), with which it is often connected, cf. e.g. Lact. *d.i.* 5, 9, 17: *qui sanctissimam quoque corporis sui partem contra fas omne polluant ac profanent*; Gaudent. *tract.* 15, 21, 147-51 Glueck; Rufin. *Arrian.* 5, 3 (270, 22, 3 Engelbrecht): *aures profanas et pollutas conscientias.* A similar pun is probably found in Sulp. Sev. *chron.* 2, 20, 1: *Hic* (sc. Matthatias, Iohannis filius) *cum a regiis cogeretur edicto parere, egregia constantia profana contemnens, Hebraeum publice profanantem in ore omnium iugulavit* (the victim *profanavit*, 'profaned', but he did so *profanando* 'by sacrificing' (two sentences before we read: *per universas urbes palam in plateis litabatur*)). Thus, according to Tert., it is only in name that the schoolmaster is not 'dedicated to an idol' and, therefore, 'desecrated' and 'defiled' as a Christian. — **verbo tenus:** 'in name, nominally'; the expression is formed for the first time in Cic. *leg.* 3, 14. See Wölfflin, *ALL* 1, 421 seqq. (especially 424). The words should be joined to *non profanatus de idolothyto*: in name the schoolmaster is not contaminated by <consuming> a sacrifice to an idol. — **de idolothyto:** the word *idolothytum* only occurs in Latin from the *Vetus Latina* and Tert. onwards. It is one of the demands made by the apostles assembled in council that one should abstain from things sacrified to idols (Acts 15, 29 and 21, 25; cf. *idol.* 24, 3). This rule was rigidly enforced all times, cf. Apoc. 2, 20; *Did.* 6, 3 (see the note by R. Knopf, *HdbNT, Erg. Bd.*, 21). St. Augustine remarks that it is better to starve to death than to eat what has been sacrified to an idol (*bon. coniug.* 16, 18; cf. *ep.* 46, 11; 47, 6); in Tert. e.g. *spect.* 13, 4; *ieiun.* 15, 5. The reason for this was found in the exposition of St. Paul in 1 Cor. 10, 14 seqq. (especially 19-20): by sacrificing to the gods and especially by partaking of that which has been sacrificed to them a more intimate communion with the demons is established (see Lietzmann's comm. *ad loc.*, *HdbNT*, 9, 47-52; Dölger, 'Der Kelch der Dämonen', *AC* 4 (1934), 266-70, and *Exorz.*, 20-2). — **esse:** Oehler, Hartel, Kroymann and Böhm regard this infinitive not as an auxiliary to *profanatus* but as an equivalent of *edere*. In that case, however, the construction of the clause *etsi ... dicatur* becomes very forced. Besides, Tert. never uses this form (he does use *edere*, e.g. *spect.* 13, 4; *Marc.* 2, 10, 1; *an.* 16, 4). It is true, in the present passage the form *esse* might have been chosen for metrical reasons (*esse dicatur*, the excellent clausula 1 γ). However, it is unnecessary to interpret *esse*

in this way, because *profanatus de idolothyto* in itself implies the consumption of the offering. — **pro idololatria:** for *pro* used with the meaning *propter*, see Hofm., *Synt.*, 534; Hofm.-Szant., *Synt.*, 270, where much literature is mentioned. Gelenius' conjecture *pro idololatra* is quite superfluous and grammatically incorrect, since Tert. would have written *ut idololatres*. It is worth while to state that the forms *idololatres* and *-en* only occur in the present treatise and in *De pudicitia*, cf. Claesson s.v., 706 (the forms *-ae* and *-as*, which Claesson rightly regards as belonging to *-es*, not to *-a*, which is found nowhere in Tert., also occur in *pud.* only). — **Quid ... nuncupatus?:** this sentence has come down to us in a corrupt form; undoubtedly the main fault is *eo quem* (*A B*). Kroymann's conjecture (... *pro idololatria vitatur, quid minus est inquinamenti in eo, quem praestat* (sc. idololatrem) *quaestus*, etc.) is too violent to be correct. The interpretation of Oehler, who reads *eo quam*, is incomprehensible. Hartel, 1, 44-5, retains the *eo quem* of *A B*; he supposes *eo* to be a dative in the singular and joins *quem* to *praestat* as an object, supplying *idololatran* (*sic*) from the preceding sentence ('Wie, ist jener weniger befleckt, welchen der dem Namen und der Ehre der Götzen geweihte Erwerb zum Götzendiener macht?'). However, as was remarked by Hoppe (*Beitr.*, 21), *eo* cannot be a dat. sing., since this is inconsistent with Tert.'s usage. The only way to obtain a comprehensible sentence which fits the context is to follow Reifferscheid in putting a question-mark after *quid* and reading *eoque* instead of *eo quem* (which is only a very slight alteration): 'What do you think? Is there less contamination <in this than in a *idolothytum* in the strict sense of the word> and are, therefore, earnings, which are dedicated to the name and the honour of the idols, better?' So *eo* refers to the words *minus est inquinamenti*. The current of thought of the entire passage runs as follows: 'the dedication of the *prima stips* to Minerva is an act of idolatry, even if it may be said that the money does not, on account of this dedication, become a *idolothytum* in the strict sense of the word. But is there an *essential* difference between these two acts? Do earnings dedicated to pagan gods contaminate less than a *idolothytum* in the strict sense, in other words: is it better to partake of food bought with this money than to eat from what has been sacrificed to the heathen gods (*idolothytum*)?' So this last sentence is especially connected with *etsi ... dicatur*. Here Tert. revokes in its entirety the restriction which he made before (but which was already robbed of its sting by the addition of *verbo tenus*). He even lends a more general character to his proposition by speaking of *quaestus*. From the use of this word it is clear that he is not only thinking of the *Minerval*. This is confirmed by the next sentence: there are more heathen festivals during which the schoolmasters receive gratuities. As, consequently, *quaestus* also refers to these presents, Hartel's *idolorum* instead of *idolo* (*A B*) is certainly correct. Besides, this emendation is supported by the plural *nominibus et honoribus* (on the other

hand, in the case of Minerva we find the singular: *honori et nomini*; Kellner, who retains *idolo*, is forced to give the impossible translation: 'der Erwerb ..., der durch Namen und Ehrenerweisungen den Götzen geweiht ist').—In the literal sense *inquinamentum* is found since Vitruvius, figuratively only since the *Vetus Latina* and Tert., see *TLL* VII, 1: 1810, 12-3; Diercks, 148; Stephan, 123. — **nuncupatus:** this verb is perhaps used here on purpose, in order to suggest that the *stips* was only 'in name' given to the goddess.

3. **Quam ... quam** = *tam ... quam*, cf. 3, 3 with the note. — **Minervalia** may be put here instead of *Quinquatria* for the sake of the parallelism with *Saturnalia*. This unofficial name of the festival is further found only in Serv. (Serg.) *comm. in Donat.* (*GL* 4, 434, 32) and in glosses, e.g. *CGL* 3, 239, 32: τὰ παναθήναια *quinquatries Minervalia* and ib. 2, 393, 15; 4, 384, 8; 5, 311, 1. However, see Remark d. — **Saturnalia:** the original day of the *Saturnalia* was December 17th, but as a popular festival it had been extended to seven days already in the first century B.C. (cf. Macr. *Sat.* 1, 10, 3). During the empire the popularity of the festival first increased; later, however, it was overshadowed by the *Kalendae Ianuariae*. Yet it was celebrated as late as the fifth century, as is evident from the calendar of Polemius Silvius (A.D. 448-9), where, however, it is no longer designated by the original heathen name but is called *feriae servorum* (*CIL* I², p. 279); cf. Auson. *fer.* 15-6 (p. 105 Peiper): *Saturnalia ... festa ... servorum, cum famulantur eri.* — **quem:** Kroymann (*Q.C.*, 26) justly remarks: 'inepta est Gelenii coniectura *quae* pro *quem*; Saturnalia enim sub tempore Saturnalium celebrari, id dicere dementis est'. *Quem* refers, of course, to *Saturni*. For this use of *celebrare* (*TLL* III: 745, 40: 'i.q. deos, numina religiose colere') see ib. 40-62. The first instance of this use is Verg. *Aen.*8, 76: *semper honore meo, semper celebrabere donis.* — **etiam serviculis:** *serviculus* is a hapax (Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 140). Tert. created this diminutive in order to emphasize that 'even the humblest slaves have to participate in this celebration'. — **strenae:** this word denotes the gifts that were exchanged on New Year's Day. They mainly consisted of money (for which the term *stips* was used, e.g. Ovid *fast.* 1, 189 seqq.; Suet. *Cal.* 42; Audollent, *Defix. tab.*, 137). That on this occasion schoolmasters received a gift in money from (the parents of) their pupils is mentioned, apart from the present passage and Hier. *loc. cit.* on p. 186-7 (*Kalendariam strenam*), by Liban. *or.* 9, 16-7 (1, 397, 11 Foerster) and *descr. Kal.* 9 (8, 475, 6-9 F.). For further particulars, see the note on 14, 6. Here (but not in 14, 6) the *Agob.* has the form *strenuae*. However, *strenae* is the normal form of the word, which is also found in the glosses (*CGL* 2, XXXVII. 316, 21. 494, 12. 520, 25; only 2, 189, the form *strenna*, as in the present passage in Mesnart's edition), which gave rise to the later derivations *strenicus* (= *strenarum cupidus*) and *strenare* (= *strenam mittere*), and which has been incorporated in

Romance. It seems to be a Sabine word meaning 'health' (cf. Lyd. *mens.* 4, 4 (68, 16-8 W.): ὁ δὲ Ἐλπιδιανὸς ἐν τῷ περὶ ἑορτῶν στρήναν τὴν ὑγίειαν τῇ Σαβίνων φωνῇ λέγεσθαί φησι; Symm. *rel.* 15, 1. The form *strenuae* already occurs in an inscription from Hadrian's time (*CIL* VI: 33885, 8; cf. also ib. 10234, 14). Consentius censures it as a barbarism (*GL* 5, 396, 26-9, 397, 34 seq.).This form seems to have arisen, because the word was connected with *strenuus* (to which it is indeed etymologically related), cf. Symm. *rel.* 15, 1: *nomen* (strenarum) *indicio est viris strenuis haec convenire virtute*; Non. 16, 32 (p. 24 L.): *strena dicta est a strenuitate. Pomponius Pictoribus: adside, siqua ventura est alia strena strenuae*; a 10th cent. gloss. in Nonius' *cod. Harleianus* (cf. Lindsay, *ALL* 9, 598): *strenuis hominibus solet accidere aliquid prosperum, unde strena dicitur etiam vulgo*. See Deubner, *Glotta* 3 (1912), 38-9; Ernout, *Élem. dial.* 34. 231-2; Ernout-Meillet, s.v.; Walde-Hofm., s.v.; J. v. Ooteghem, 'Étrennes', *Les études classiques* 8 (1939), 86-7; Flinck, *Ann. Acad. Scient. Fennicae*, ser. B tom. XI, 10 (Helsingfors 1921), 50-74. — **Septimontium:** almost certainly Tert. refers to the festival of the seven mountains, celebrated on December 11th. It was originally related to the seven mountain-communities from the time before the wall traditionally assigned to Servius Tullius enclosed the city, cf. Antistius Labeo *ap.* Festus pp. 474-6 L.; Festus p. 458 L. (in this context it is understandable that F. Muller in one of the theses added to his inaugural dissertation *De veterum, inprimis Romanorum, studiis etymologicis* (Utrecht 1910) proposed a derivation of the first part of the word from *s(a)eptum*, not from *septem*). Varro already explains the name *ab his septem montibus, in quis sita urbs est* (*ling.* 6, 24), and during the empire this festival was regarded as a commemoration of the completion of the *synoikismos* by the incorporation of the seventh hill, cf. Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 69: τὸ δὲ Σεπτομούντιον ἄγουσιν ἐπὶ τῷ τὸν ἕβδομον λόφον τῇ πόλει προσκατανεμηθῆναι καὶ τὴν Ῥώμην ἑπταλόφον γενέσθαι; Lydus, *mens.* 4, 155 (172, 23 seqq. W.). It is clear from the present passage that in Tert.'s days this festival was also celebrated in Africa; this is easy to understand in view of the interpretation given to it. That schoolmasters received a gratuity, which was also called *septimontium*, is not mentioned anywhere else. That the school had a holiday on this day (Wissowa, *Ges. Abh.*, 230—who in n. 1 quotes only the present passage—considers this probable) cannot be ascertained from the present passage (as is also impossible in the case of *Bruma* and *Cara Cognatio*). — **Brumae:** this word does not denote the *Saturnalia*, as was asserted by Marquardt, *Privatleben*, 94, n. 6 (probably on the strength of the fact that Martial repeatedly connects *Bruma* and *Saturnalia*, e.g. 12, 81: *Brumae diebus feriisque Saturni*; more passages are given by Crawford, *Byzant. Ztschr.* 23 (1921), 365 seqq.). It was a separate festival but, apart from Tert., it is mentioned neither in Latin literature nor in the inscriptions. We do find it, however, in the calendars of Philocalus and Silvius (*CIL* I²,

pp. 276-7), marked against November 24th. Mommsen's assertion (*CIL* I², p. 287) that these recordings do not refer to the festival has been refuted by Crawford, p. 368-9; cf. also Nilsson, art. 'Saturnalia' *RE* XXVI: 210. — **Carae Cognationis:** this name is also found in *Menol. Rust. Colot.* and *Vall.* (*CIL* I², p. 287), in the calendar of Silvius (ib. p. 259), and in *CIL* VI: 10234, 13; cf. also Ovid *fast.* 2, 617; Mart. 9, 54-5. In Philocalus (*CIL* I², p. 258), Ovid *fast.* 2, 617 and Val. Max. 2, 1, 8 the festival is called *Caristia* (cf. also *TLL* III: 459, 75-82). It was celebrated on February 22nd by means of a common meal of the members of a family, *ut, si qua inter necessarias personas querella esset orta, apud sacra mensae et inter hilaritatem animorum et fautoribus concordiae adhibitis tolleretur* (Val. Max. l.l.); hence in glosses the denominations τιμὴ συγγενική, τ. συγγενείας, τ. συγγενειῶν and τιμία συγγένεια (*TLL* III: 1478, 53-4). Besides, the festival had the meaning of a commemoration of the dead and the meal that of a meal in commemoration of the dead (on this account Silvius includes it in the *tempus obitus*). As such it linked up directly with the official *Parentalia*, which were celebrated from February 13th to 21st (Lydus *de mens.* 4, 24, still numbers the *Caristia* among the *dies parentales*). Klauser has made it highly probable that the Christian festival of the *Cathedra Petri*, celebrated on the same date, originally had the same character. That on the occasion of this festival schoolmasters received a gratuity is only known from the present passage. However, it does appear from Mart. 9, 54-5 that people sent each other food (i.c. poultry); for this day the *lex collegi Aesculapi et Hygiae* provides a distribution of *money*, bread and wine (*CIL* VI: 10234, 13). See Wissowa, *Rel.*, 232-3 and art. 'Caristia', *RE* III: 1592-3; Warde Fowler, *Festivals*, 308-9; Marquardt, *Staatsverwalt.*, 3, 127; Klauser, *Cathedra*, 152-83; Cumont, *Lux*, 435-6; Bömer, comm. on Ovid *fast.* 2, 617 and *Ahnenkult*, 30, n. 2. — **honoraria:** this is the only passage where this word denotes a present given to schoolmasters on the occasion of a festival (*TLL* VI, 3: 2935, 84). Usually it means 'gift of honour' (e.g. to the magistrate who governs a province) or it is synonymous with the *summa honoraria*, which was paid to the municipal treasury on being admitted to an office or a priesthood (e.g. Trajan in Plin. *ep.* 10, 113; cf. Tert. *apol.* 39, 5). In the technical juridical idiom the word illustrates the contrast between *artes liberales* and *artes sordidae*: the former can only be remunerated by a *honorarium*, the latter are paid with *merces* (which belongs to a *illiberalis et sordidus quaestus*, cf. e.g. Cic. *off.* 1, 150-1). Sometimes *merces* is used in the sense of *honorarium* (e.g. Ulp. *dig.* 50, 13, 1 pr.); the inverse case, however, does not occur. During the empire claims for *honorarium* were acknowledged and protected. This protection was also received by *praeceptores*, but only by those who taught *artes liberales*; among these Ulpian does reckon the *rhetores* and *grammatici*, but he does not include the *ludimagistri*. Yet he makes the protection also apply to them, even though only as an extension: *ludi quoque litterarii magistris, licet non sint professores, tamen usurpatum est, ut his quoque ius dicatur* (ib. 6); see Klingmüller, art. 'Honorarium', *RE* VIII: 2270-5. — **Florae ... coronandae:** as in this and the next two sentences Tert. no longer speaks about the income of the schoolmaster, we have to follow Rigaltius in putting a full stop after *omnia* (so this is not a case of asyndeton, as was suggested by Löfstedt (*Z. Spr. Tert.*, 32) on the strength of Reifferscheid's interpunction). Undoubtedly we must read *Florae* with Rigaltius and Reifferscheid (besides, this is most in accordance with the reading of *A B*); *flore*, the reading of Gelenius and Oehler, is either a superfluous addition or an incomprehensible restriction of *coronandae*: it would not be easy to understand why it is exactly the garlanding with flowers that is censured and why the quite popular and to Tert. very unsympathetic *laureis coronare* (cf. ch. 15) should not even be mentioned. In *cor.* 13, 8, too, this practice is mentioned in general terms: *a saeculo coronantur et lupanaria et latrinae et pistrinae et carcer et ludus et ipsa amphitheatra et ipsa spoliaria ipsaeque libitinae*. On the other hand, the reading *Florae* does not involve a restriction of *coronandae* (there have been more occasions on which the schools were wreathed, just as other buildings, cf. ch. 15): that it is precisely for the honour of Flora (*Florae* has been given an emphatic frontposition in the sentence!) that the schools must be wreathed is mentioned as a particularly horrifying example. The *ludi Florales* (since 173 B.C. a fixed festival, lasting in Caesar's time from April 28th to May 3rd) were specially hated by the Christians because of their lascivious character (cf. e.g. *spect.* 17 (see Büchner, 77. 132); [Cypr.] *quod idola* 4; Arnob. *adv. nat.* 7, 33; Aug. *c.d.* 2, 27); they regarded Flora as a *meretrix* (cf. e.g. Min. Fel. 25, 8; [Cypr.] ib.; Lact. *d.i.* 1, 20, 6; Prud. *c. Symm.* 1, 266. An inscription from Constantine (Cirta) proves that during the empire the *Floralia* were celebrated in Africa (*CIL* VIII: 6958). See Wissowa, *Rel.*, 197-8. 455-6, and art. 'Flora' and 'Floralia', *RE* VI: 2747-52; Habel, art. 'Ludi publici', nr. 5, *RE* Suppl. V: 625-6; *DS* 2, 1189-91; J. Heckenbach, *De nuditate sacra sacrisque vinculis* (RVV 9, Giessen 1911), 59-61. In this connection it deserves mention that Tert. concludes his argumentation against the wreathing of houses with the words: *ne indueris domui tuae faciem novi lupanaris* (15, 11). — **flaminicae ... feriis:** at the day of the sacrifice by the *flaminicae* and the *aediles* 'the school is honoured by a holiday'. The holiday is said to be an honour to the school, just as in the previous phrase the wreaths were said to be an ornament of the school. In fact the honour concerns, of course, the gods (alternately the demons). The festivity mentioned here refers to Africa (and to other provinces?), not to Rome. This is clear from the use of the plural *flaminicae*, and from the fact that these priestesses are denoted as official figures because they are mentioned together with *aediles*. In Rome the *flaminica Dialis* was the only one of the wives of the *flamines* who had a religious function (see Wissowa, *Rel.*,

506), and she alone was indicated by means of *flaminica* without an attribute (see Wissowa, *Rel.*, 506, n. 5; *TLL* VI, 1: 862, 45 seqq.). Here we should think of the emperor-cult (thus Bickel, *TLL*, ib. 863, 4); in the provinces the priests and priestesses of the living emperor and of his wife were often indicated by *flamen* and *flaminica* without an attribute, see Riewald, art. 'Sacerdotes', *RE* XXV: 1651-2; F. Geiger, *De sacerdotibus Augustorum municipalibus*, thesis Halle 1913, 21-3. For the *aediles* in the provincial cities, see Marquardt, *Staatsverw.*, 1, 166-7; Kubitschek, art. 'Aedilis', *RE* I: 458-63; more literature is given in the *Oxf. Class. Dict.*, 582-3. It is most plausible that *creati* belongs both to *flaminicae* and to *aediles* (for the choice of the former, see Geiger, 57-9). Several questions remain. Does this custom only refer to the sacrifice of the *flaminicae* and *aediles*, and not to that of the *flamines* and *duoviri iuri dicundo*? Are the *flaminicae* and *aediles* only mentioned by way of example or has their mentioning a special significance? In the latter case the point might be that, compared to the *duoviri iuri dicundo*, the *aediles* were minor officials and that the cult of the emperor's wife at Carthage was less important than that of the emperor himself and, for instance, the *virgo Caelestis* (for the cult of the latter, see Dölger, *AC* 1 (1929), 92-106); in that case Tert.'s argument would be that the schools even got a holiday, when the less important officials made the sacrifice on the occasion of their election (and that, accordingly, this would certainly happen when this was done by the more important officials).

4. **idoli natali:** cf. e.g. Cic. *ad Att.* 4, 1, 4: *idem natalis erat et Brundisinae coloniae et tuae vicinae Salutis*; Ovid *fast.* 3, 837-8: *Captae delubra Minervae, / quae dea natali coepit habere suo* (see Bömer's note on ib. 812); Arnob. *adv. nat.* 7, 32: *Telluris natalis*; Lact. *d.i.* 6, 20, 34: *ludorum celebrationes deorum festa sunt, siquidem ob natales eorum vel templorum novorum dedicationes sunt constituti*. So by the birthday of a god the day of the dedication of his temple was meant. See Wissowa, *Rel.*, 56-7. 459. 474-5; Keyssner, 'Natalis templi', *RE* XVI: 1800-2; W. Schmidt, *Geburtstag im Altertum* (RVV 7), Giessen 1908, 116 seqq. It cannot be decided what god or gods Tert. has in mind here. In view of the vague way of phrasing it is by no means necessary that it is only Minerva who is referred to (cf. P. de Labriolle, *Arch. Lat. Med. Aevi* 2 (1926), 180); it is even little probable that here, without any further explication, Tert. should again refer to Minerva and her *Quinquatria*, after having mentioned several other divinities and festivals in the preceding sentences. One is even tempted, for the very reason that the *flaminicae* are mentioned in the preceding sentence, to think again of the emperor-cult (in Philocalus' calendar the birthdays of the consecrated emperors are indicated in the same way as the dedication-days of temples, see Wissowa, *Rel.*, 344-5. 447. 459. 474, n. 6; Schmidt, 59 seqq.). — **Omnis diaboli pompa frequentatur:**

this is the climax of the argument and at the same time the conclusion of the preceding survey of idolatrous practices in scholastic life. These are characterized as *pompa diaboli* 'pomp of the devil', i.e. 'works of the devil' or 'idolatry'. For more particulars, see Waszink, 'Pompa diaboli' (especially 29); cf. also 18, 8: *Tu si diaboli pompam eierasti, quicquid ex ea attigeris, id scias esse idololatrian*. For the expression, cf. Commod. *instr.* 2, 18, 4: *cuncta Zabuli pompa*. In this passage *frequentare* is used in a way already found in the classical period, but afterwards becoming more frequent, in which the verb only indicates the repetition, but the nature of the action appears from the context (= *usurpari, usui esse*). Cf. in Tert. e.g. *orat.* 22, 3: *vocabulum istud frequentatur*; *carn. Chr.* 7, 9: *cum Martha et Maria aliaeque in commercio eius* (sc. Christi) *frequententur* ('are frequently mentioned'); *apol.* 22, 2 (see Waltz., *Ét.*, 260); *test. an.* 4, 10; *bapt.* 5, 5; *ux.* 1, 8, 5; *paen.* 9, 2. — **non magistro:** ὑφ' ἕν, which in Tert.'s works is quite frequent; see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 107; Hartel, 4, 80; Thörn., 1, 59-60; 2, 63; 3, 14. — **instrumentum ... ad omnem vitam:** cf. Cic. *de orat.* 3, 195; *ad quorum* (sc. operum artis) *intellegentiam a natura minus habent instrumenti.* — **litteratura:** this word indicates both the instruction by the *ludimagister* and by the *grammaticus*, cf. e.g. Sen. *ep.* 88, 20: *prima illa, ut antiqui vocabant, litteratura, per quam pueris elementa traduntur*; Quint. *i.o.* 2, 1, 4: *grammatica, quam in Latinum transferentes litteraturam vocaverunt.* — **Quomodo ... possunt:** for the idea, cf. *cor.* 8, 1-2: *iam ... audio dici et alia multa* (apart from wreaths), *ab eis prolata, quos saeculum deos credidit, tamen et in nostris hodie usibus et in pristinorum sanctorum et in dei rebus et in ipso Christo deprehendi, non alias scilicet hominem functo quam per communia ista instrumenta exhibitionis humanae ... . Primus litteras Mercurius enarraverit: necessarias confitebor et commerciis rerum et nostris erga deum studiis.* We may not attach a too far-reaching significance to the present passage. By *studia divina* or, as he says in *cor.* 8, *studia erga deum* Tert. certainly does not mean more than the reading and study of the Bible, about which he is also talking in *apol.* 18-20, cf. especially *apol.* 18, 1: *sed quo plenius et inpressius tam ipsum quam dispositiones eius et voluntates adiremus, adiecit instrumentum litteraturae, si qui velit de deo inquirere et inquisito invenire et invento credere et credito deservire.* Of the *saecularia studia*, too, we should not form a too high conception: in this connection no more is meant by it than the things one could learn from the *ludimagister* and the *grammaticus*; in the next sentence Tert. indicates them by *litteratoria eruditio*. At any rate an interpretation as that of Lortz (1, 370): 'Ganz allgemein und grundsätzlich proklamiert die Möglichkeit einer philosophischen Erkenntnis in Glaubenssachen der ... folgenschwere Satz idol. 10: *quomodo ... esse non possunt*', exceeds by far the tenor of this passage. The study of profane learning as preparatory to the study of Holy Scripture, recommended and practised by the Alexandrian

school of Clement and Origen, was most elaborately and profoundly discussed by St. Augustine in his *De doctrina christiana* (see especially Marrou, *St. Aug.*, 387 seqq.). — **sine quibus ... non possunt,** cf. 8, 1.

5. **necessitatem:** on the statement that *studia litterarum* are unavoidable for a Christian, cf. Rambaux, 75, n. 85. — **respiciamus:** cf. 5, 4 and 12, 4. — **ex parte ... vitari:** Van der Nat remarked: 'to *vitari* we have to supply *non posse*: the instruction is partly unacceptable, viz., in so far as it provides knowledge of the pagan gods and of mythology (*insertae idolorum praedicationes*), but also partly indispensable, viz., in so far as it provides knowledge which is necessary to daily life'. Obviously he meant to say the same as Böhm, who observes here: 'Die literarische Bildung kann *einerseits* nicht erlaubt und *andererseits* nicht vermieden werden'. We think, however, that *ex parte ... ex parte* has to be interpreted literally, and that one should not supply *non posse* to *vitari*. Tert. intends to say that this *eruditio* is one great whole, which cannot be divided into an acceptable and an unacceptable part. In other words, *non posse* refers to both *ex parte admitti* and *ex parte vitari*. The construction of the sentence is remarkable in so far as *non posse* has been put in the center; one would rather have expected: *non posse eam ex parte admitti, ex parte vitari* or *eam ex parte admitti, ex parte vitari non posse.* — **Fideles ... capit:** in connection with this statement cf. Hagen, *Antike und Abendland* 24 (1978), 83 with note 18; see also the paper by P. Scholl in: H. Th. Johann (ed.), *Erziehung und Bildung in der heidn. und christl. Antike* (Darmstadt 1976), 503-26, especially 509 seq. — **capit** renders ἐνδέχεται, 'it is possible', which is very frequent in Tert. It is not possible (*non capit*) at the same time to be a Christian and to teach literature. — **insertas ... praedicationes:** cf. 18, 3: *purpura vel cetera insignia dignitatum et potestatum insertae dignitatibus et potestatibus idololatriae ... dicata*. Tert. occasionally uses *praedicatio* to indicate sermons by heretics; Braun, 434, n. 2 quotes *Herm.* 1, 2 and *praescr.* 34, 8; 44, 6.

6. **Deos ... obsignat:** for *obsignare* 'to seal', see the note on 12, 1. *Hoc nomine*, sc. *deorum*: by calling them 'gods' he 'seals', i.e. confirms, their divinity. — **ut diximus:** this is a mistake; it is only in chapter 20 that Tert. discusses this point. — **deos pronuntiari** must have the meaning of *deos 'deos' vocari.* — **nomen ... collocari:** *nomen hoc*, sc. *deorum*. For *in vano collocari*, see comm. on 20, 3. — **prima ... aedificatur:** *diabolo* is a *dat. commodi*: by this instruction the belief in the heathen gods is built up, which is in the interest of the devil, since it is his purpose to keep or to lead people away from the Christian faith. The original meaning of *aedificare* is still clearly present, as nearly always in Tert. The only instance of the specifically Christian sense 'to edify' in his works is *cult. fem.* 2, 11, 2: *ut exemplo sitis illis, ut aedificentur in vobis*, see Waszink's note on *an.* 26, 1. — **de idolis catechizat:** apart from the present passage, Tert. only uses the verb *catechizare* in *cor.* 11, 4 and *Marc.* 4, 29, 10. As in none of these cases the verb refers to catechumens, Janssen (p. 40) concludes: 'seine Bedeutung ist also nicht technisch'. However, the present passage only reveals its point and significance, if we think of the religious instruction of the candidates for baptism: by the instruction in mythology the belief in the heathen gods is fostered; it is as it were a 'heathen catechumenate'. — **At cum fidelis haec discit:** *haec* refers to the contents of the *litterae* in *si fidelis litteras doceat.* — **si iam sapit, qui sit:** sc. *Christianus*. An alteration of *qui* (Oehler wrote *quid*) is not necessary. — **si nondum sapit aut ubi coeperit sapere, prius sapiat oportet:** Hartel, 1, 46-8, justly deletes the full stop found after *sapit* in *A* and in all editions. By that interpunction the assertion that a pupil who is not yet a conscious Christian rejects the instruction about the heathen gods would go without an explanation. In this case, however, an explanation is even more necessary than in the case of *ubi coeperit sapere* (it is probable that the faulty interpunction led Rigaltius to read *dudum* instead of *nondum*). After *sapere*, too, we must not put a full stop but a colon, for *prius sapiat oportet* seqq. explains *multo magis ... sapere*. For *oportet* see Remark f. — **ab ignaro:** Hartel, 1, 46-8, accepting Oehler's conjecture *quid sit*, wants to read *an ignarus*; he connects *sciens* with *si iam sapit, quid sit*, and *ignarus* with *si nondum sapit aut ibi coeperit sapere* (sc., quid sit). However, *sciens* denotes the Christian pupil (also in the second case, for *prius sapiat oportet, quod prius didicit, id est de deo et fide*), *ignarus* the heathen teacher. The latter is ignorant of the fact that the things which he teaches (the *idolorum praedicationes*) are poison to the spirit. The pupil listens to his reading (*ab ignaro accipit*), but he does not accept it (*nec bibit*). The simile alludes to the characterization of the heathens as *ignorantes.* — **et erit:** *et* is not a copulative but it introduces a conclusion.

7. **Huic ... deputatur:** for *deputare* as an equivalent of *attribuere*, see the note on 1, 5. As to *excusatio*, cf. e.g. *Marc.* 4, 38, 1: *Refer ... et haec ad excusationem creatoris et ad comparationem Christi*; Cic. *rep.* 1, 9: *perfugia quae sumunt sibi ad excusationem*; Plin. *ep.* 4, 17, 11; Tac. *hist.* 2, 30, 2. For Tert.'s partiality to this kind of prepositional expressions, see the note on 5, 3. — **necessitas** refers to 10, 5. — **publicis propriis:** for the biarticulate asyndeton in Tert., see Thörn., 2, 19-21; Hartel, 2, 4, 8; Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 51-4 (who, however, regards the present instance as 'Nicht ganz zweifellos'); Säflund, 65 seqq.; Waszink, 138, and, more generally, Hofm., *Synt.*, 846-7; Tidner, *Part. cop.*, 29 seqq.; Wahlén, 75 seqq.

Ch. 11. *The function of trader*

'Already because of the other sins, first of all covetousness—which is also

called idolatry by St. Paul!—and its servant, mendacity, not to speak of perjury, it may be doubted whether trade is a fitting occupation for a Christian. By the way, as soon as covetousness disappears the pursuit of gain disappears, and with it the need for trade (§ 1).

But let us for the moment assume that there is a pursuit of gain which is free from the sins mentioned above; trade is certainly guilty of idolatry, if it supplies such foreign wares as frankincense, which are of vital importance to the idols. And it does not matter that these wares are also used for other purposes, even by Christians.

One should not adduce as a counter-argument that in this way all trade might be combated (§ 2). The more serious the sin, the more carefully one should guard against it and against everything that renders it possible (§ 3). Even if the sin is committed by another, the person who creates the possibility is equally guilty (§ 4a). This principle is recognized in other cases of serious delicts, for instance, in the case of the leno *(who makes fornication possible) and the* lanista *(who teaches gladiators how to kill) (§§ 4b-5). We should no more admit the incense-trader into the Church than the supplier of public victims, for the only difference between the two is that the latter procures meat, the former incense for the demons.*

One should, moreover, notice that incense was offered even before the images of gods (idols) existed, and also now incense is offered without an idol being present. This shows the importance of incense (§§ 6-7a).

The incense-trader cannot avoid inner conflict. How can he show his abhorrence of temples and altars, for which he himself provided? How can he exorcise the demons whom he daily feeds? (§§ 7b-8a).

[Conclusion of chapters 3-11, 7]

We conclude: no handcraft, profession *or* trade, *which plays a part in either the making or the provision of idols, is free from idolatry, i.e. the service existing in the worship of idols (§ 8b).'*

Remarks

a. *The construction of the text of 11, 1.* The text of the first sentence of this chapter is in disorder in *A* and *B*, which have full stops after *delictorum*, *ministrum* and *liceat*. A first correction was made by Gelenius, who removed the full stop after *delictorum* and put a comma after *recogitemus*. As there was still no main sentence after the clause *si ... recogitemus*, Rigaltius deleted *si*. However, Iunius had already seen that *negotiatio ... apta est*? is the main sentence, and that *imprimis ... liceat* is an extensive elaboration of *cetera delictorum*. Reduced to its essential elements the sentence runs as follows: *si cetera delictorum recogitemus, ..., negotiatio servo dei apta est*? Literally: "if we consider the other sins, ..., is trade, then, an occupation which suits a servant of God (a Christian)"?

b. *The meaning of 'cetera'.* Apart from *De generationibus* at the beginning, the sentence has one great difficulty, viz. *cetera delictorum*. To what are 'the other sins' opposed? Hartel opposes them to what precedes, and, moreover, he counts *negotatio* among these other sins. He translates: "wenn wir die noch übrigen sündhaften Handlungen nach ihren Ursprüngen und Motiven (*de generationibus = secundum generationes*) erwägen, wenn wir vor Allem erwägen, dass die Begierde die Wurzel alles Bösen, dann dass die Lüge die Dienerin der Begierde sei — der Meineid kann übergangen werden, da dem Christen auch nur zu schwören verboten ist —, so ist selbst Handelserwerb dem Diener Gottes nicht angemessen". He misses an interrogative particle in the question *negotiatio ... apta est*? and, therefore, reads *nec negotiatio ... apta est*. He explains: "denn es wird von Tertullian aus der Zahl der noch nicht erörterten Delicte nur eines mehr, die *negotiatio*, herausgegriffen und näher untersucht". This remark shows that, according to Hartel, *cetera delictorum* indicate all the sins not yet dealt with in the previous chapters, and of all these sins Tertullian will discuss *negotiatio* only. This would imply that, from the beginning, *negotiatio* is considered as a *delictum*, which is not in agreement with the contents of the present chapter. It is, moreover, very improbable that *cetera delictorum* is opposed to what precedes, since in the previous chapters Tertullian did not discuss *delicta* like *cupiditas*, *mendacium*, *periurium*, but professions not allowed to Christians. The same objection can be made against putting *negotiatio* on a level with *cupiditas* etc., as Hartel does.

Thus *cetera* cannot be opposed to what precedes. It is not opposed to what follows, viz., *negotiatio*, either. Otherwise *negotiatio* would be considered as a *delictum* from the beginning, which is not true.

Cetera delictorum are opposed to the sin which dominates the whole treatise, viz., idolatry. Tertullian is going to discuss the question, whether trade can exist without idolatry. But before he comes to this question he says: 'if <apart from the question of idolatry> one considers the *other* sins <which accompany trade>, ..., is trade, then, allowed to a Christian?' The first sin of the *cetera*, cupidity, will, moreover, appear to be called 'idolatry' by St. Paul. In this way the argument becomes typically Tertullianean: apart from the question of idolatry, trade means cupidity, which is idolatry!

c. *De generationibus.* Hartel tried to give a sense to *de generationibus*, namely that it should be the equivalent of *secundum generationes*: "nach ihren Ursprüngen und Motiven". Already from a linguistic point of view this seems to be inadmissible. It would, moreover, mean that Tertullian dealt here with the motives of the *cetera delictorum*, which is not true. The first *delictum*, cupidity, is itself the motive of trade.

If it means something here, *generatio* must have the meaning of '*id quod generatum est*', thus 'fruit' or 'product'. But this does not fit into the context, since Tertullian does not discuss the 'fruits' of trade, but the sins accompanying it. Moreover, the construction would be odd, as Van der Nat observed in *Vig. Chr.* 17 (1963), 80, where he discussed this text extensively. He comes to the conclusion that *De generationibus* must be the corrupt form of a sub-title. The original reading probably was *De negotiationibus*, which was erroneously inserted in the text by a copyist.

Recently R. W. Daniel made an ingenious suggestion in *Vig. Chr.* 39 (1985), 63-4, arguing that *De generationibus* originally belongs behind *de discursibus* in 11, 2. It would have been omitted in an old manuscript under the influence of the following *negotiationis* (hence *negotiationibus* in A before the correction), and added in the margin; then it was inserted in the text on a wrong place.

1. **recogitemus:** the verb *recogitare* occurs more than once in Plautus, is unusual in the classical period but is used more frequently again in the first century A.D.; in Tert. it is fairly frequent (e.g. in *an.* seven times). It is used as a synonym of *cogitare*, cf. e.g. *an.* 10, 5: *Hoc magis credas, si deum recogites tantum artificem in modicis quantum et in maximis.* For this weakening of the meaning of *re-* in compounds, cf. Waszink's note on *an.* 46, 2: *respicere est enim, inquiunt, per cornu*, where further literature is quoted. Waltzing, *Ét.*, 363, wrongly asserts that *recogitare* is only accompanied by the neuter of a pronoun in the accusative (otherwise by *de* with an ablative), cf. e.g. *an.* 9, 7. 10, 6. 25, 8; *test. an.* 5, 2; *Marc.* 4, 16, 3 (= Zach. 8, 17); *exh. cast.* 10, 2. — **cupiditatem ... sunt passi:** a contamination of 1 Tim. 6, 10: ῥίζα γὰρ πάντων τῶν κακῶν ἐστιν ἡ φιλαργυρία, ἧς τινες ὀρεγόμενοι ἀπεπλανήθησαν ἀπὸ τῆς πίστεως καὶ ἑαυτοὺς περιέπειραν ὀδύναις πολλαῖς, and 1 Tim. 1, 19: ἔχων πίστιν καὶ ἀγαθὴν συνείδησιν, ἣν τινες ἀπωσάμενοι περὶ τὴν πίστιν ἐναυάγησαν. — **cupiditatem radicem omnium malorum:** similarly Polyc. *ad Phil.* 4, 1: ἀρχὴ δὲ πάντων χαλέπων φιλαργυρία, which need not hark back to St. Paul (see Dibelius, *HdbNT*, 13, 53-4), since it is a frequently occurring apophthegm which by its form is typical of the diatribe (see Geffcken, *Kyn.*, 40), where it is used in relation to the attack of the rich, cf. e.g. Stob. *eclog.* 3, 10, 37 (417 Hense): Βίων ὁ σοφιστὴς τὴν φιλαργυρίαν μητρόπολιν ἔλεγε πάσης κακίας εἶναι; Diog. Laert. 6, 50: τὴν φιλαργυρίαν εἶπε (sc. Diogenes of Sinope) μητρόπολιν πάντων τῶν κακῶν; Ps. Phocyl. 42: ἡ φιλοχρημοσύνη μήτηρ κακότητος ἁπάσης; *orac. Sibyll.* 8, 17: ἀρχὴ πᾶσι κακῶν φολοχρημοσύνη καὶ ἄνοια. Some more passages are given by Dibelius, l.l.; see also Geffcken, *Kyn.*, 41-4. Similarly at a much later date Ioh. Chrysostom. *in Matth. hom.* 63 (64) = PG 58, 608: οἱ μὲν ἔξωθεν ἀκρόπολιν κακῶν τὴν φιλαργυρίαν ἐκάλουν. — **naufragium sunt passi:** the metaphor of shipwreck is a favourite one both in Greek philosophy and

poetry, especially epigrams (see G. A. Gerhardt, *Phoinix von Kolophon* (Leipzig-Berlin 1909), 98-103), and in Latin literature (there particularly for the loss of fortune, see Lewis-Short s.vv. *naufragium* and *naufragus*); Tert., too, uses it repeatedly, cf. ad 24, 1. — **quamvis ... dicta sit cupiditas:** Heraldus' conjecture *quum bis*, adopted by Reifferscheid (*cum bis*), is unnecessary. This parenthesis is a correction of *cetera* (sc. delictorum) and especially of *cupiditatem*. Its insertion at this point in the sentence is to be explained psychologically by the association with idolatry produced by the words *circa fidem naufragium sunt passi*. The train of thought is as follows: 'if we think of the other sins <outside idolatry>, especially of covetousness, the root of all evil, which, according to St. Paul, has made some lose their faith—although actually this is *no other* sin than idolatry, as the same apostle calls covetousness also idolatry—etc.' The intention is to give extra emphasis to the wickedness of covetousness, and at the same time to connect the discussion of this sin more closely with the subject of the treatise, viz., idolatry. — **ab eodem apostolo:** i.e. St. Paul, who was twice quoted before without his name being mentioned. — **idololatria ... dicta sit cupiditas:** Col. 3, 5: τὴν πλεονεξίαν, ἥτις ἐστὶν εἰδωλολατρεία; Eph. 5, 5: πλεονέκτης, ὅς ἐστιν εἰδωλολάτρης. So πλεονεξία is translated by Tert. *cupiditas*, just as by Cyprian, *ep.* 55, 27, and Hier. *ep.* 14, 5, 1-2 (who yet renders πλεονέκτης by *fraudator*); Vulg.: *avaritia, avarus.* — **mendacium, cupiditatis ministrum ... periurio:** for the theme of the perfidy of cupidity, cf. e.g. Cic. *parad.* 6, 43; Hor. *carm.* 3, 24, 59: *periura ... fides*; Phaedr. 4, 20, 24: *caelum fatigas sordido periurio* (sc. avarus); Lact. *d.i.* 1, 4, 5: *voluntas fingendi ac mentiendi eorum est, qui opes adpetunt, qui lucra desiderant*; Basil. *homil. in divit.* 7 (PG 31, 297 C): Τίς ἐστιν ὁ ψεύδους πατήρ; τίς ὁ πλαστογραφίας δημιουργός; τίς ὁ τὴν ἐπιορκίαν γεννήσας; οὐχ ὁ πλοῦτος; οὐχ ἡ περὶ τοῦτον σπουδή; Aster. Amas. *homil.* 3 (PG 40, 209 B). That trade is based on cupidity is a theme of popular philosophy cf. e.g. Hor. *sat.* 1, 1, 37-40 and *ep.* 1, 1, 42-6 with Heinze's comm.; Philo *q. omn. prob. lib.* 78: (the Essenes) ἐμπορίας ... ἢ καπηλείας ἢ ναυκληρίας οὐδ' ὄναρ ἴσασι, τὰς εἰς πλεονεξίαν ἀφορμὰς ἀποδιοπομπούμενοι. Similarly Tat. *orat.* 11 (11, 28 Schw.): ναυτίλλεσθαι διὰ τὴν ἀπληστίαν οὐκ ἐπιτηδεύω; Arnob. 2, 40; Lact. *d.i.* 5, 17, 10 seqq. Trade is already charged with fraud in Hdt. 1, 153; cf. also Wendland, *Philo Diatr.*, 40. — **ne iurare quidem liceat:** cf. ad 23, 2; cf. also *Marc.* 2, 19, 3 and Rambaux, 273. — **Ceterum:** not adversative but with the meaning 'besides'. The train of thought is: 'the lawfulness of trade is dubious. And, besides, trade is unnecessary, if the sin of covetousness, from which it springs, is absent'. The same meaning of *ceterum* is found in 17, 1. — **si cupiditas ... necessitas negotiandi:** according to Van der Nat, the *lectio tradita* (no question-mark after the first *acquirendi*) was justly restored by Hartel, 1, 48, and the question-mark placed by Leopold, Oehler and Reifferscheid on the strength of a note by Pamelius, destroys the argument. Hartel and Van der

Nat interpret this passage as one sentence, in which the words *quae est causa acquirendi* are a relative clause and *cessante causa acquirendi* is a repetition of the contents of the previous part of the sentence. We think that the question-mark is required indeed and that the passage consists of two sentences which constitute the following kind of argument: 'if a, then b; if b, then c': If there is no *cupiditas*, there is no *causa acquirendi* (the rhetorical question is the equivalent of a negation); if there is no *causa acquirendi*, there is no *necessitas negotiandi*. Thus the question-mark does not destroy the argument and there is no repetition either. One should moreover observe that the *Agobardinus* often has a full stop (or rather a point) at the end of a question (e.g. *Quibus insidiis.* and *quibus plagis.* in ch. 1, fol. 105^{v}). Mesnart and Gelenius have a colon after the first *acquirendi* and a comma after the second, which shows that they consider the passage to consist of *two* sentences. This can only mean that they, too, interpret *quae est causa acquirendi* as a rhetorical question. — **Cessante:** for *cessare* with the meaning of *deficere*, *deesse*, *desinere*, cf. e.g. *test. an.* 5, 5; *Marc.* 1, 11, 7; *nat.* 1, 1, 10. This meaning is particularly frequent in juridical literature. See *TLL* III: 960, 21 seqq.; Thierry, 176; Goelzer, *Jér.*, 274.

2. **iustitia quaestus** = *quaestus iustus*, cf. e.g. *orat.* 7, 2: *iustitiam exactionis*. For this use of the genitive Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 1, 86, have proposed the term *genitivus inversus*. A reversal of functions takes place in consequence of the fact that the notion expressed by the abstract substantive is dominating. See also Merkx, 17-9 (with more literature); Waszink, 388-9; Diercks, 131-2. Much, though unshifted, material for Tert. is given by Hoppe, *Synt.*, 85 seqq. (cf. also Gerlo, 2, 55; Kok, 111 and 131 (but on p. 147 his note is wrong); Stephan, 72-3). — **secura de ... observatione:** for *securus de*, cf. *nat.* 2, 1, 5; *cult fem.* 2, 2, 2; *ux.* 1, 5, 2; *bapt.* 18, 6; *res.* 13, 4; *cor.* 2, 2; see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 34. *Observatio* means 'the guarding against, the avoidance of', just as in 11, 3; see Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 102-3. For the corresponding meaning of *observare* (wrongly postulated by Hoppe in *pat.* 10, 4; see Borleffs' *adnotatio critica*), cf. *pud.* 12, 4 (= Acta 15, 29): *a quibus observando* (= *abstinendo*, as is evident from the context), and see Rönsch, *It.*, 374, and *Sem.* 3, 61; Svennung, *Oros.*, 31, n. 1. — **in crimen offendere idololatriae:** this expression does not seem to occur elsewhere. For the underlying image we may think of the proverb *bis ad eundem lapidem offendere* (Cic. *ep. ad fam.* 10, 20, 2; Auson. *ep.* 11; see Otto, 186) or the equally proverbial shipwreck, cf. Ribbeck, *trag. inc.*, 139: *neque me patiar iterum ad unum scopulum ... offendere*; Ovid *Pont.* 4, 14, 21-2; see Otto, 314. The latter alternative is here much more likely, since it corresponds with 11, 1: *naufragium sunt passi* (cf. also the argument in *pud.* 13) and with 24, 1: *inter hos scopulos et sinus, inter haec vada et freta idololatriae velificata spiritu dei fides navigat ... inextricabile impactis naufragium est*, where *impactis* denotes *eos qui impegerunt in scopulos* (cf. also *TLL* VII, 1: 616, 59-61); this use of *impingere* is also found in *pud.* 13, 20: *qui de fide in blasphemiam impegerunt*; we may also compare the use of *incursare* with the name of a crime in the accus.: *nat.* 1, 2, 8: *quotiens in tenebris incursasset incesta*; *ieiun.* 12, 1: *delicta incursantes*. — **eam:** formally this pronoun refers back to *iustitia quaestus* but in reality it denotes the notion of *negotatio*, which is the present theme of discussion and which has already been mentioned; besides, it is also present in the expression *iustitia quaestus*. — **ipsam ... idolorum animam et spiritum ... daemonium:** for a discussion of the notions *anima* and *spiritus* in Tert.'s works, see Waszink's commentary on *an.* 10-11. Cf. also Aug. *c.d.* 8, 26 (referring to the doctrine of Hermes): *ut pro anima sit daemon, pro corpore simulacrum*; also cf. 7, 1: *manus matres idolorum*. The idols—both in the sense of 'images of deities' and of 'false gods'—are lifeless; that what makes them appear to be living beings is the demons' hiding *sub istis nominibus institutis simulacris*; these are the *auctores* of the *signa*, *miracula* and *oracula* ascribed to the gods or their images; see Remarks at ch. 1. — **omne daemonium saginat:** the sacrifices are the food of the demons; cf. *apol.* 23, 14: *renuant* (daemones) *se immundos spiritus esse, quod vel ex pabulis eorum, sanguine et fumo et putidis rogis pecorum et impuratissimis linguis ipsorum vatum intellegi debuit*. They are said to occupy the images for the very purpose of receiving these sacrifices and to lie in wait for them: *eadem ... obscuritate contagionis adspiratio daemonum et angelorum mentis quoque corruptelas agit ... erroribus variis, quorum iste potissimus, quo deos istos captis et circumscriptis mentibus commendat, ut et sibi pabula propria nidoris et sanguinis curet simulacris et imaginibus oblata* (*apol.* 22, 6). Likewise Athenag. *legat.* 26 (145, 16-8 G.): οἱ δαίμονες ... οἱ προστετηκότες τῷ ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερείων αἵματι καὶ ταῦτα περιλιχμώμενοι; ib. 27 (146, 22-3); Clem. Alex. *protr.* 2, 40, 1; Orig. *c. Cels.* 3, 29 (226, 25 seqq.); 3, 37 (223, 20 seqq.); *Acta Thomae* 76 (191, 13-6 Bonnet); 77 (192, 4-10); Min Fel. 27, 2; Lact. *d.i.* 2, 16, 10-4; cf. also 1 Cor. 10, 20-1 with Lietzmann's note (*HdbNT*, 9, 49); Dibelius, *Geisterwelt*, 67-71; Dölger, *AC* 4 (1934), 266-70. — **non** = *nonne*, as more than once in Tert. (who also uses *nonne* rather frequently, see Claesson's Index, 1046). See for this use Hofm., *Synt.*, 648-9. — **Viderint, si ... usui erit:** cf. 7, 3. The subject of *viderint* is not the traders, as Oehler thought, but *merces*, as was observed by Hartel (1, 49-50: 'es mögen immerhin dieselben Waaren dienen'). — **tura:** for Tert.'s attack of the *turarii*, see Schöllgen, 217-8. — **cetera peregrinitatis:** here *peregrinitas* means 'foreign wares', cf. *cult. fem.* 2, 10, 2: *libidinem possidendae pretiositatis* (Kok, 185). For the use of *abstractum pro concreto* in Tert., see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 91-4; Löfstedt, *Apol.*, 96, n. 1; generally, Hofm., *Synt.*, 792-3; Löfstedt, *Per.*, 111-4, and *Verm. Stud.*, 211-6; Wahlén, 186-7. — **cetera peregrinitatis,**

sacrificium idolorum: this is the reading of *A B* and Gelenius, whose interpunction, however, is erroneous (cf. the critical apparatus). Iunius corrected the punctuation but read *ad sacrificium idolorum*, undoubtedly because he thought the singular *sacrificium* odd as an apposition to *cetera peregrinitatis*. His conjecture was adopted by Reifferscheid, who, however, did not put a comma after *idolorum*. Probably this does not mean that he connected *ad sacrificium*, just as *ad pigmenta medicinalia* and *ad solacia sepulturae*, with *usui sunt*, an interpretation which would already have to be rejected because of the singular *sacrificium* (against the plural in the two other adjuncts; however, in the next sentence we find *pompae ... sacerdotia ... sacrificia*). Hoppe, *Synt.*, 146, too, follows Iunius, and wants to supply *pertinentia* to *ad sacrificium idolorum*. However, the other instances of an ellipsis of *pertinere* quoted by him are of a different nature: in those a verbal form is omitted, e.g. *pud.* 8, 11: *Nihil enim ad Andromacham*; *Prax.* 22, 5; *an.* 42, 1 (caused by the δόξα of Epicurus quoted there: ὁ θάνατος οὐδὲν πρὸς ἡμᾶς). Yet it is not impossible to join *ad sacrificium* to *cetera peregrinitatis*, since Tert. has a partiality to short prepositional adjuncts, also used attributively, cf. e.g. *mart.* 4, 9: *passiones ad consecutionem gloriae caelestis*; *an.* 24, 8: *illo in spatio ante tempora oblivionis*; ib.: *tanti ante corpus aevi*. However, in that case, too, the singular remains unusual. Therefore, it seems preferable to preserve the *lectio tradita*, and to follow Hartel, 1, 49-50, and Oehler (in spite of the latter's unwieldy translation) in regarding *sacrificium idolorum* as a qualifying apposition to *tura et cetera peregrinitatis*. The same unusual incongruence is found in Liv. 5, 47, 3: *canes ..., sollicitum animal ad nocturnos strepitus*; 22, 57, 6: *locum ... iam ante hostiis humanis, minime Romano sacro, inbutum*; 27, 48, 10: *Hispani, vetus miles peritusque Romanae pugnae*; Tac. *hist.* 2, 46: *praetoriani ..., proprius Othonis miles*. Also Verg. *Aen.* 8, 729: *clipeum Volcani, dona parentis*, though of a somewhat different nature, proves the license in this respect permitted (for a general discussion of the use of the singular instead of the plural and the reverse, see Löfst., *Synt.*, 1, 12-26. 27-65). For the use of *odores* in heathen cults, cf. 11, 6. — **pigmenta medicinalia:** *pigmentum* in the sense of 'ointment, balm' also in *scorp.* 1, 12; *medicinalis* also in *cor.* 8, 2; cf. Firm. Mat. *math.* 3, 12, 10: *pigmentorum medicinalium inventores. Pigmentum* has the original meaning 'pigment' in *cult. fem.* 2, 8, 2. The word acquired this double meaning, because the trade in perfumes usually went together with that in pigments and medicaments, see Blümner, *Technologie*, 1, 361-2, and *Privataltertümer*, 481-2; Marquardt, *Privatleben*, 782. For incense, myrrh and cassia as medicines, see Abt, *Apol.*, 131 (with more literature); S. Eitrem, *Opferritus und Voropfer der Griechen und Römer* (Kristiania 1915), 253-9. For the three ways of using them, cf. Apul. *apol.* 32: *ut si tus et casiam et myrram ... funeri tantum emptos arbitreris, cum et medicamento parentur et sacrificio.* — **solacia sepulturae:** in Tert.'s time the

Christians kept incense out of their worship (it is not until the second half of the fourth century that there are certain testimonies of its ritual use), cf. *apol.* 30, 5-6: *qui ei* (sc. deo) *offero opimam et maiorem hostiam quam ipse mandavit, orationem de carne pudica, de anima innocenti, de spiritu sancto profectam, non grana turis unius assis, Arabicae arboris lacrimas*; more passages are given by C. F. Atchley, *A History of the use of incense* (London 1909), 81-96. From the present passage and from *apol.* 42, 7 it is clear that *odores* were used in funerals. The exact nature of this use is not mentioned. The earliest testimonies of burning perfumes at the side of the corpse and during the funeral date from the fourth century (but we should not forget that our information about burial-practices of the time before Constantine is extremely scanty). — **ad pigmenta ... ad solacia ... usui sunt:** for the use of *ad*, see the note on 5, 3. Cf. Lact. *d.i.* 2, 10, 1: *ut usui esse homini possent* (animalia), *alia nimirum ad cibos, alia vero ad vestitum.* — **pompae:** for the use of perfumes in processions, cf., for instance, the description of the *pompa* in the *ludi Romani* by Dion. Hal. *Antiq.* 7, 72, 13: καὶ μετ' αὐτοῖς (scil. the cither- and flute-players) οἵ τε τὰ θυμιατήρια κομίζοντες ἐφ' ὧν ἀρώματα καὶ λιβανωτὸς παρ' ὅλην ὁδὸν ἐθυμιᾶτο. A good survey of the various *pompae* is given by F. Bömer, art. 'Pompa', *RE* XXI: 1878-1994. — **periculis ... discursibus:** the risks and nervous agitation of the trader pressed by cupidity constitute a τόπος, which was eagerly employed, especially in popular philosophy and in literature influenced by it. Thus already Cato in the first sentence of his *De agri cultura: Est interdum praestare mercaturis rem quaerere nisi tam periculosum sit*; further e.g. Hor. *sat.* 1, 1, 6-7. 29-31. 38-9; *ep.* 1, 1, 45; *carm.* 3, 24, 36-44 with Heinze's notes; Sen. *brev. vit.* 2, 1; Basil. *hom. in div.* 1 (PG 31, 279 B); in Tert. *pat.* 7, 11-2: *gentilium est omnibus detrimentis impatientiam adhibere qui rem pecuniariam fortasse animae anteponant. Nam et faciunt, cum lucri cupiditatibus quaestuosa pericula mercimoniorum in mari exercent.* — **negotiationis tuae:** see apparatus criticus and Remark c. — **procurator idolorum:** cf. *ux.* 2, 4, 1: *habens in latere diaboli servum, procuratorem domini sui*. The *procurator* is a slave or a freedman controlling the possessions of his master, 'manager, agent', see Blümner, *Privataltertümer*, 282-3.

3. **Graviora ... quaeque:** Tert. often joins *quisque* to a comparative instead of a superlative, both in the singular and in the plural, cf. e.g. *apol.* 50, 13: *exquisitior quaeque crudelitas vestra*; *pud.* 8, 7: *condicio gratior quaeque*; *ux.* 2, 4, 2: *pauperiora quaeque tuguria*; *an.* 9, 1: *sollemniora quaeque*. This use occurs for the first time in Apul. *mund.* 25: *propiores quosque*; cf. Waszink's note on *an.* 9, 1 (p. 165). Sometimes Tert. joins it also to a positive degree, cf. Waszink on *an.* 2, 4 (108-9). — **extendunt:** cf. 2, 3 *extensius.* — **non interest:** Tert. is very partial to this expression, especially in the combination

de loco non interest, which is frequently found in juridical literature; cf. Waszink's note on *an.* 1, 2 (84) and F. Norden, *Apuleius und das römische Privatrecht*, 102-3. Here the meaning: 'it does not make any difference' is practically equivalent to: 'it does not make the situation any better (less serious)'.

4. **Denique:** Van der Nat translates 'for instance'. However, in that case something must have been mentioned of which an instance is given, which is not the case here. As in 4, 2 it should be rendered by 'after all'. — **reatus:** cf. 1, 1. — **istud** = *hoc*, cf. 2, 3. — **quod mihi de stupro interdictum sit:** for this construction of *interdicere* (already found in Cato *ad fil.* fr. 1: *interdixi tibi de medicis*; Cic. *Caecin.* 23), cf. *apol.* 45, 3: *quid eruditius, de maleficio an et de maliloquio interdicere?* ; *mon.* 15, 1: *de cibis interdicebant*; see *TLL* VII, 1: 2175, 21-33; Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 21-2; cf. the note on 4, 1 at the end. In later Latin the subjunctive and the indicative are used promiscuously after the causal *quod* (just as after *quia* and *quoniam*), see Hofm., *Synt.*, 722; Thierry, 108; Kok, 177; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 76-7; Goelzer, *Jér.*, 360. In the next sentence we find an indicative again (*quod ... segregavi*); cf. *an.* 17, 2 (in one sentence): *quod ... adseverat ..., quod ... persuadeat, quod ... infamet, quod ... iungat.* — **nihil ... operae ... exhibeo:** a juridical expression, cf. e.g. Papin. *dig.* 50, 1, 17 pr.: *an operas patrono vel ministerium capto luminibus exhibeat*; see *TLL* V, 2: 1425, 71 seqq. For *exhibere, exhibitio*, cf. the note on 6, 2.

5. **Nam quod:** the anaphora—to which Tert. has a partiality, cf. 1, 4—enhances the vehemence of the argument; cf. also in 11, 2 *cum* (three times) and *de* (five times), and in 11, 7 *quo ore ... quo ore.* — **lenocinium:** for a long time there were no penal provisions against the *lenones*, although they were considered to be *infames*, cf. Ulpianus *dig.* 23, 2, 43, 6-9; Suet. *Tib.* 35; moreover they had to pay a special tax, cf. Suet. *Cal.* 40; Tert. *fuga* 13, 3. The occupation was not absolutely forbidden until Theodosius and Valentinianus, cf. *Cod. Theod.* 15, 8, 2. See Kleinfeller, art. 'Lenocinium', *RE* XII: 1942-3; Blümner, *Privataltertümer*, 369. 615. However, sexual sins were fiercely combated by Jews and Christians; see, for instance, the lists of sins referred to in Remark e at ch. 1; the provision that the *leno* should not be admitted into the Church was already made by Hippol. *Trad. apostol.* = *Const. eccles. Aeg.* 11, 2 (Funk, *Didascalia*, 2, 106): *si quis leno est, id est meretrices sustinens, aut desinat aut reiciatur*; cf. *Epit.* 22, 7 (ib. 2, 86); *Const. apostol.* 8, 32, 7 (ib. 1, 534). — **id genus locorum:** i.e. *lupanaria.* This, and not Gelenius' odd conjecture *id genus lucrum alterius causa* (a *contradictio in adiecto*) is the correct reading, cf. *an.* 34, 2: *Helenam quandam Tyriam de loco libidinis publicae ... redemit* (Simon Magus); *mart.* 2, 7: *non in loca libidinum publicarum oculi tui impingunt.* Moreover, the general term

locorum has a parallel in the indication of *stuprum* by the vague term *rem* (for the general tendency to use euphemisms in sexual matters, see Waszink's comm. on *an.* 38, 2 *intellegit quae sint*, and *fines*, p. 435-6). For the construction with *exercere*, cf. e.g. Ulp. *dig.* 5, 3, 27, 1: *nam et in multorum honestorum virorum praediis lupanaria exercentur.* For *lenocinium exercere*, cf. Ulp. *dig.* 48, 5, 30, 3: *qui lenocinium in uxore exercuit.* — **Sic et:** the *leno* and the *lanista* are in the same situation: the *leno* does not commit *stuprum* himself, but he makes it possible to commit *stuprum*; in the same way, the *lanista*, who is the drill-sergeant of the gladiators, does not commit murders himself, but he teaches his pupils to do so. — **lanistam ... arceri:** for the *lanista*, see Friedländer, 2, 64 seqq.; Schöllgen, 96, n. 489. Among the heathens the gladiatorial games were chiefly censured by the philosophers, cf. e.g. Sen. *ep.* 7, 3 seqq.; 90, 45; 95, 33. However, they were not forbidden until Constantine, cf. *Cod. Theod.* 15, 11, 1; *Cod. Iustin.* 11, 44, 1. The Christians combated them fiercely from the first, cf. in Tert. *spect.* 12 and 19; *apol.* 15, 4-6 and 38, 4; *pud.* 7, 15; also Athenag. *legat.* 35; Theophil. *ad Autol.* 3, 15; Tat. *orat.* 23; Iren. *adv. haer.* 1, 1, 12 (1, 55 Harvey); Min. Fel. 30, 6 and 37, 11; Cypr. *ad Donat.* 7; [Cypr.] *de spect.* 5; Lact. *d.i.* 6, 20, 9-15; Salvian. *gub. d.* 6, 2, 10-1; Prud. *c. Symm.* 1, 379 seqq.; 2, 1091 seqq. and 1122-9. Consequently, both the *lanista* and the *gladiator* were kept out of the Church in Church-orders and by councils, cf. Hippol. *Trad. apost.* = *Const. eccles. Aeg.* 11, 7 (Funk, *Didascalia*, 2, 107): *qui gladiator est vel gladiatores pugnare docet vel venator est venans vel famulus publicus in ludo gladiatorio occupatus, aut desinant aut reiciantur*; *Didasc.* 2, 62, 1-2 (ib. 1, 176); *Epit.* 22, 9 (ib. 2, 86); *Const. apost.* 8, 32, 9 (ib. 1, 534); *Syn. Arel.* I c. 3 (ib. 282-3). See Bigelmair, 260 seqq. 311-3; Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 234-5; Büchner, 6-13. 116-7. — **nec:** according to Van der Nat, this word is here equivalent to *ne ... quidem*, which in our opinion is not the case, since the translation 'and ... not' is quite satisfying, as also in 3, 2; it is only in 7, 2 that the meaning *ne ... quidem* is to be supposed. — **per se:** this conjecture by Gelenius is certainly correct; '*posse*' which is found in *A B* is either due to the preceding *posse* or it has originated from a wrong abbreviation (ꝑ instead of p; for a similar case, cf. 2, 2 *polluceret*). — **aliis:** this is the reading of Gelenius, hesitantly defended by Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 21 ('vielleicht richtig'); *A* has *alio*, *B alios. Alio* as a dative of *alius* is to be rejected here; it is true that this form actually occurs (see *TLL* I: 1623, 17 seqq.), but we do not find such morphological pecularities in Tert. (the *Thes.* refers interrogatively to *mon.* 3, 4: *si alio bono comparatum adumbretur* (sc. bonum) but there *alio bono* is undoubtedly an ablative; in *pat.* 5, 25 Borleffs and Kroymann are wrong, to our mind, in reading *ipso* with *M N F X*, which they interpret as a dative, as against *ipsi P*). *Alio* as an adverb is impossible; the instances given in *TLL* I: 1589, 27 seqq. are of a completely different nature (the same applies to *eo*

in e.g. *orat.* 8, 6; 22, 6, see Diercks, 127. 222). *Alios* is out of the question. For these reasons, we best adopt the reading given by Gelenius. It may find support in the preceding variation of plural and singular, if we may assume that this variation is deliberately regular: in 11, 3: *ab aliis — per me*; in 11, 4: *aliis ... mihi*; *mihi ... aliis*; in 11, 5: *carnem meam ... me — alterius causa*: so now again it is the turn of the plural against *per se*! The corruption may have been due to the fact that *subministrare* was joined to an accusative on the analogy of *docere*, which it here closely approaches in meaning. — **magis proximum:** 'more obvious' (Currey: 'More to the point'); the superlative is fully equivalent here to a positive (= *manifestus*); cf. *nat.* 2, 12, 37; *apol.* 23, 17; *res.* 7, 10; *Marc.* 4, 19, 11. Similarly *tam proximus*, e.g. *test. an.* 5, 5; *quam proximus*, e.g. *bapt.* 17, 5; *proximus* in Min. Fel. 19, 2. See Hoppe, *Serm. Tert.*, 48-50, and *Beitr.*, 87; Löfst., *Synt.*, 2, 199-208 (with more literature).

6. **publicarum victimarum redemptor:** he who farms the supply of sacrificial animals from the state, 'supplier of public victims'; cf. also 17, 3. — **de turario dissimulabit:** *dissimulare de* is a rare construction: according to *TLL* V, 1: 1481, 46-8, it only occurs in Sall. *Cat.* 47, 1, Paulus *dig.* 40, 13, 4: *servus de condicione sua dissimulat*, and in two more passages in Tert., viz., *Marc.* 4, 43, 3 and *fuga* 8, 2. It seems probable that here too Tert. adopted the idiom of lawyers. — **his mercibus**, viz., *odoribus*. — **informis idololatria:** this ancient form of idolatry was performed without images (*informis* = *sine formis*, i.e. *sine idolis*; cf. 3, 4: *omnis forma vel formula idolum se dici exposcit*); see for this meaning *TLL* VII, 1: 1475, 14 seqq. In 3, 2 Tert. spoke of this phase of idolatry as *rude illud negotium humanae calamitatis*, where *rudis* has the same meaning as *informis* in the present passage. These two adjectives are fairly frequently found together, e.g. Flor. *epit.* 3, 10, 5: (naves) *rudes et informes*; Tac. *Germ.* 45, 5 and *ann.* 12, 35, 2; Tert. *adv. Herm.* 25, 2: *terram ... illam informem et invisibilem et rudem*; *virg. vel.* 1, 6: (fructus) *rudis aliquamdiu et informis*; *bapt.* 3, 2). — **opus idololatriae:** cf. 3, 1: *idololatria agebatur* (sc. in ancient times) *non isto nomine, sed in isto opere*. — **ecquid** = *nonne*, just as in *an.* 18, 12; *Marc.* 1, 9, 7; 4, 7, 1; *res.* 53, 13; *exh. cast.* 9, 9. It has the meaning of *num* e.g. in *praescr.* 28, 1. See *TLL* V, 2: 55, 34 seqq.; Waszink, 267; Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 117, n. 2, who rightly rejects Oehler's alteration into *et quid*; for *ecquis* and *et quis*, see the literature mentioned by Waszink and Fr. Gruenler, *De ecquis sive etquis pronomine quaestiones orthographicae* (thesis Marburg 1911). — **maioris operae:** i.e. than the maker of idols, as is clear from the reason stated: *nam facilius sine idololatria quam sine turarii merce*; cf. 11, 2: *sane non illa principalis idololatria*?

7. **facilius:** cf. the note on 8, 4. — **idolo:** dropt out because of haplography in *A B*; it was only restored by the observant reader De la Cerda. — **fidei conscientiam:** Van der Nat translates: 'the certainty of faith' and adds: 'which gives *constantia* (*qua constantia exorcizabit alumnos suos?*); cf. *praescr.* 31, 4: (haereses) *quibus nulla constantia de conscientia competit ad defendendam sibi veritatem* ('aucune assurance de leur conviction', Refoulé).' We prefer Thelwall's translation: 'the conscience of the faith itself', since it is the conscience of the faith, i.e. of being a Christian, which gives the *constantia*. For the notion of *conscientia fidei* cf. *Valent.* 3, 4: *sed qui ex aliqua conscientia venerit fidei*; Hil. *in Matth.* 4, 28 (PL 9, 942 B); *syn.* 4 (PL 10, 483 A); likewise *iustitiae conscientia* in *nat.* 1, 1, 5; 1, 6, 5; *apol.* 4, 13. See *TLL* IV: 364, 61 seqq. — **Quo ore ... quo ore:** the second *quo ore* was wrongly deleted by De la Cerda, since Tert. has more than once such a pathetical repetition, especially at the beginning of a sentence. Cf. e.g. *pud.* 1, 8, *Marc.* 1, 27, 5 and *res.* 9, 2: *Absit, absit*; *an.* 17, 13: *Non licet, non licet*; *Prax.* 29, 1: *Obmutescat, obmutescat ista blasphemia*; *paen.* 8, 3: *ille est scilicet, ille est, qui ...* . See Löfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 74-5; Waszink, 252; Stephan, 65. For *quo ore* cf. e.g. *Marc.* 2, 12, 1: *... quo ore constitues diversitatem duorum deorum in separatione ... ?* — **si per templa transibit:** 'if he passes through the temples'. Dölger, 'Heidnische Begrüßung und christliche Verhöhnung der Heidentempel. *Despuere* und *exsufflare* in der Dämonenbeschwörung', *AC* 3 (1932), 192-203, translates: 'wenn er an den (heidnischen) Tempeln vorübergeht' (likewise Kellner). Although the usual meaning of *transire per* is 'to pass through', Dölger's translation seems indeed possible, if we compare passages like Aug. *Enarr. in Ps.* 128, 13 (*PL* 37, 1695): *nostis enim, fratres, quando transitur per operantes, est consuetudo ut dicatur illis: benedictio domini super vos*. Nevertheless this interpretation is incorrect, for though the temples, too, were treated by the Christians with the same marks of abhorrence (cf. *spect.* 13, 4: *nec minus templa quam monumenta despuimus*), there is in the present passage only mention of the altar which is placed in front of the image of the deity *within* the temple. — **despuet et exsufflabit:** although Tert. uses *despuere* often metaphorically (e.g. *nat.* 1, 6, 6: (leges) *despuuntur*; ib. 1, 10, 10; *Marc.* 1, 29, 3; see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 184; Waszink, 520), it is here intended literally, as is already suggested by its connection with *exsufflare*. Spitting was a mark of ridicule and scorn; consequently it was considered a criminal offence to spit in a sanctuary, cf. e.g. on the *locus Doliola in urbe* Varro *ling.* 5, 157: *locus ... ubi non licet despuere*; Liv. 5, 40, 8; Paul. ex Fest. p. 60 L. For its survival in Christian ritual, see Dölger, *Sonne*, 30-3, and *AC* 3 (1932) 202 and 5 (1936), 50-1; Dekkers, 181, n. 3; Canon 96 Basil.; cf. W. Riedel, *Die Kirchenrechtsquellen des Patriarchats Alexandrien* (Leipzig 1900), 273. In the conflict between the religions the sacred objects were mutually spit upon as mark of utter abhorrence. Thus the Christians spat on

seeing a heathen image, altar or sanctuary, cf. *spect.* 13, 4 (quoted above); Min. Fel. 8, 4: *deos despuunt*; Prud. *c. Symm.* 1, 578-9: *quota pars* (scil. populi) *est / quae Iovis infectam sanie non despuat aram*? We should not forget in this connection that the heathens showed veneration when passing an image or a temple, cf. e.g. Min. Fel. 2, 4; Apul. *apol.* 56. However, spitting is at the same time an exorcizing gesture: saliva was thought to have a healing and an apotropaic power. It is an ancient custom to spit on seeing an epileptic or a *furiosus*, cf. e.g. Plin. *n.h.* 10, 69; 28, 35: *despuimus comitiales morbos, hoc est, contagia regerimus*; Tert. *an.* 50, 2: *ut haeretici magi Menandri Samaritani furor conspuetur*. Blowing (*exsufflare*), too, is—at least in the Orient—a customary practice to ward off evil, particularly demons: Lucian, *Philops.* 12, tells of a Babylonian sorcerer blowing at some serpents which were burnt ὑπὸ τῷ φυσήματι; Celsus *ap.* Orig. *c. Cels.* 1, 68 (122, 8-10) of Egyptian magicians: καὶ δαίμονας ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων ἐξελαυνόντων καὶ νόσους ἀποφυσώντων; *magi* cure possessed persons by blowing, cf. the recipe in the great magic papyrus of Paris, 3080-3: ὁρκίζων δὲ φύσα [α] ἀπὸ τῶν ἀκρῶν καὶ (del. Tambornino) τῶν ποδῶν ἀφαιρῶν (ἀφαιρῶν instead of ἀπαίρων, Deissmann, *Licht*, 221, n. 10) τὸ φύσημα ἕως τοῦ προσώπου εἰσκριθήσεται (viz., the demon; ἐκκριθήσεται Dieterich but cf. Deissmann, ib., 220, n. 1); see Dieterich, *Abraxas*, 141; Tambornino, 12. 81; Deissmann, *Licht*, 216 seqq., especially 221. The verb *exsufflare* occurs since *Vet. Lat.* and Tert.; Sulp. Sev. still apologizes for using it (*dial.* 3, 8, 2): *quem* (daemonem) *eminus, ut verbo, quia ita necesse est, parum Latino loquamur, exsufflans* (scil. Martinus); see *TLL* V, 2: 1943, 42-5. — **exorcizabit:** the verb *exorcizare*, which is found since Tert., occurs only once outside Christian literature, viz., in the curious passage Ulp. *dig.* 50, 13, 1, 3, where an enumeration of people who might be regarded as *medici* (*medicos fortassis quis accipiet eos qui* ...) is concluded as follows: *non tamen si incantavit, si inprecatus est, si, ut vulgari verbo impostorum utar, si exorcizavit: non sunt ista medicinae genera, tametsi sint, qui hos sibi profuisse cum praedicatione adfirment*; see *TLL* V, 2: 1557, 39 seqq. A description of exorcizing is found in *apol.* 23 (especially 4-6. 15-6); for further particulars, see the literature mentioned in the preceding note, and Wendland, *Kultur*, 216-9; Tambornino, 107-9. That Tert. should suggest the possibility that a *turarius* works as an exorcizer is not surprising: every Christian is capable of doing so, cf. *apol.* 23, 4: *edatur hic aliqui ibidem sub tribunali vestro, quem daemone agi constet: iussus a quolibet Christiano loqui spiritus ille tam se daemonem confitebitur, <quod> in vero est, quam alibi deum, quod in falso est*; *cor.* 11, 3; *Scap.* 2, 9; thus already Mark 16, 17 (see Klostermann's note, *HdbNT*, 3, 173-4); cf. also Orig. *c. Cels.* 1, 6 (59, 16-7) about exorcism: τοσοῦτον μέν γε δύναται τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Ἰησοῦ κατὰ τῶν δαιμόνων, ὡς ἔσθ' ὅτε καὶ ὑπὸ φαύλων ὀνομαζόμενον ἀνύειν. Tert. does not yet know a separate class of *exorcistae* (this term does not occur until Cyprian, e.g. *ep.*

69, 15; see H. Janssen, 100-1). — **Qua constantia ... praestat?:** an analogous argument against the soldier occurs in *cor.* 11, 3: *Et excubabit pro templis, quibus renuntiavit? Et cenabit illic, ubi apostolo non placet? Et quos interdum exorcismis fugavit, noctibus defensabit, incumbens et requiescens super pilum, quo perfossum est latus Christi*? — **alumnos suos:** the demons, cf. 11, 2: *omne daemonium saginat.* — **cellarium:** 'pantry', a synonym of *cella*; it is found since Scaev. *dig.* 32, 41, 1: *cellarium iunctum diaetae*; in Tert. also *res.* 27, 6. See *TLL* III: 762, 63 seqq.; Rönsch, *It.*, 31; Olck, art. 'Cella', *RE* III: 1871-8. — **excluserit:** *excludere* is a technical term for exorcizing, see *TLL* V, 2: 1268, 72 seqq.; Waszink, 109. — **sibi placeat de fide:** for *de* added to a causal ablative, see *TLL* V, 1: 65, 45 seqq. For *sibi placere de*, cf. *Marc.* 4, 35, 9. — **inimicum:** cf. *an.* 2: *Christianos, qui spiritalia nequitiae, non quidem socia conscientia, sed inimica scientia novimus, nec invitatoria operatione, sed expugnatoria dominatione tractamus* ... .

8. **de eo impetrare:** Tert. is the first to use *de* instead of *ab* with *impetrare*, cf. *fuga* 2, 6; *ieiun.* 9, 2; see *TLL* VII, 1: 601, 42-9; Thierry, 138. — **Nulla igitur ars ... idolorum colendorum:** this section gives a summary with a conclusion of the preceding chapters: *ars*: ch. 3-8, *professio*: ch. 9-10, *negotiatio*: ch. 11, 1-7. On this passage cf. also Monceaux, *Histoire littéraire*, 278-9, and the comments of Rambaux, 157, n. 279. — **famulatum idolorum colendorum:** the heavy, rhyming endings (see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 162 seqq.) and the clausula (1 β) constitute an impressive conclusion. Obviously Tert. intends to give a rendering of the term *idololatria*. What he wants to say is: 'Unless we state that 'idolatry' is something else than 'the service consisting in the veneration (*colere*) of the idols.' The genitive *idolorum colendorum* is an explicative one; the concepts of *colere* and *famulatus* coincide. In 3, 4 Tert. states that every *idolorum famulatus et servitus* is idolatry; there *idolorum* is, of course, an objective genitive.

Ch. 12. *A second refutation of those who plead the necessity of securing sustenance*

'Now I shall go into a fuller consideration of the excuse based on the necessity of securing sustenance.

First, this excuse comes too late. You should have thought of it before you became a Christian (§ 1).

But also now the sayings of the Lord show all your pleas of poverty, provision for posterity and slavery to be unfounded. To be the Lord's disciple means to take your cross and to follow Him (§ 2). If the Lord commands to leave parents, wives and children, how could those parents and children be a reason not to leave crafts, trades and professions? James, John and Matthew

show us that for the sake of God we have to abandon even our dearest relations (§ 3). None of those who were chosen by the Lord were concerned about their livelihood. Faith fears starvation no more than any kind of death for the sake of God (§ 4).

This may seem to be difficult, but whatever is difficult with man is easy with God. At any rate, let us not flatter ourselves with His clemency to such an extent that we let ourselves be tempted to idolatry by the necessity of securing sustenance, not only in the cases discussed up till now, but with regard to all forms of superstition (§§ 4b-5).'

Remarks

a. *Structure of the argument*. The argumentation consists of two parts. First Tertullian states: 'you are too late. You ought to have looked before you leapt, like that prudent man of the Gospel who wants to build a house' (Luke 14, 28-30). In the second part Tertullian argues that also now (*et nunc*), i.e. now that he has become a Christian, his opponent has the *dicta* and the *exempla* of the Lord preventing him to make such excuses.

In a diatribe style Tertullian lets his opponent make objections which he answers by quoting a *dictum* of the Lord. Then he refers to the *exemplum* of the Lord who carried His cross and whom his disciples have to follow. He also refers to the examples of the apostles James, John and Matthew. Nobody of them said: 'I have nothing to live from'. And Tertullian continues: faith does not fear starvation, it does not even fear death.

b. *Survey*. At the end of the chapter Tertullian emphasizes that the Christian should avoid like a pestilence all kinds of idolatry, not only those discussed above, but the whole array of human superstition. He then discerns the following species: service of gods, dead people or kings. This is a remarkable distinction for an author who adheres to Euhemerism, which theory says that the gods have been men, often kings, who received divine veneration after death or already during their earthly lives. The gods then are in fact dead people, as Tertullian often says. They are idols (see Remarks at c. 1) and "pertain to the impure spirits". That is to say that they are intermediary entities between those spirits and men. In the present text Tertullian probably aims at the cult of the dead and of the (living) king. In *cor.* 10, 2 he qualifies the worship of the dead as a 'second idolatry': *nam et mortuorum est ita coronari, quoniam et ipsi idola statim fiunt et habitu et cultu consecrationis, quae apud nos secunda idololatria est*. There is no essential difference between the cult of the gods and that of the dead, cf. *spect.* 12, 4-5: *Quoniam et idololatria parentationis est species: tam haec quam illa mortuis ministrat. In mortuorum autem idolis daemonia consistunt*; ib. 13, 2-3 *daemoniis ... scilicet consistentibus in consecrationibus idolorum sive mortuorum sive, ut putant,*

deorum. Propterea igitur, quoniam utraque species idolorum condicionis unius est, dum mortui et dii unum sunt, utraque idololatria abstinemus.

Finally Tertullian sums up the ways in which superstition is perpetrated, or otherwise said, the diverse species of idolatrous acts. First, there are sacrifices and priesthoods, two kinds of *manifest* idolatry. Then spectacles and the like, and the festivals; these are kinds of *hidden* idolatry. In the introduction to the following part of the treatise Tertullian will state that manifest idolatry needs no discussion and that the spectacles already have been dealt with (in the treatise *De spectaculis*), so that only the festivities have to be discussed here. This final passage of the first part of *De idololatria* affords an interesting survey of the whole subject matter.

1. **necessitatibus humanae exhibitionis:** this refers to the refutation in 5, 1-2, which is elaborated in ch. 8, of the assertion that it may be necessary to make an image of a pagan divinity in order to be able to live (in 8, 2 we find the expression *necessitas exhibitionis*; cf. the note on *exhibitionis* in 6, 2). — **nobis ... supplaudimus:** the same expression with the meaning 'to be self-satisfied' is found in the above-mentioned 14th letter of St. Jerome: *nec sibi quisquam de corporis tantum mundi castitate supplaudat* (9, 2), and in his *comm. in Eph.* 2, 3 (PL 26, 480 B): *qui sibi de sapientia supplaudebat*. Here we have a slightly different shade of meaning: 'to flatter oneself with', cf. *pud.* 19, 1: *quando etiam Iohannes nescio quid diversae parti supplaudere videatur* ('to applaud'). A similar expression is found in 12, 5: *Sic tamen nobis de mansuetudine et clementia dei blandiamur.* — **post fidem obsignatam:** 'after the sealing of faith', i.e. after baptism. Faith precedes baptism, which is 'the seal of faith', e.g. *spect.* 24, 2: *hoc erit pompa diaboli, adversus quam in signaculo fidei eieramus*; cf. ib. 4, 1; *bapt.* 6, 1: (abolitio delictorum) *quam fides impetrat obsignata in patre et filio et spiritu sancto*; ib. 13, 2 a lengthy argument against those who assert (13, 1): *baptismum non est necessarium quibus fides satis est* (see Refoulé's note, p. 86, n. 1); *paen.* 6, 16: *lavacrum illud obsignatio est fidei*; *praescr.* 36, 5: *eam* (scil. fidem) *aqua signat* (scil. ecclesia Romana); *an.* 41, 4. We should remember that already by themselves these words provide an argument, which to Tert. is decisive. *Obsignare* is a juridical term denoting the sealing of a contract, a testament, etc., as a guarantee of authenticity and inviolability. In the same way, baptism is the sealing of faith. Besides, baptism (and especially the baptismal oath (ἀπόταξις) and the confession of faith (σύνταξις)) constitutes by itself a contract between God and man, carrying contractual obligations; this is most clearly shown in *an.* 35, 3; cf. also *spect.* 4, 1 and 24, 2; *bapt.* 6, 2. For further particulars, see Dölger, *Sphragis*, 99-104, and *Sonne*, 119-24; Refoulé, *Bapt.*, 48-53; G. H. W. Lampe, *The Seal of the Spirit* (London 1951), 157 seqq.; cf. also Waszink, 455. For the paralleling of baptism with the *sacramentum militiae*,

see comm. on 19, 2. — **non habeo quo vivam:** Tert. repeats the excuse of the *artifices* for making images of pagan divinities which was mentioned in 5, 1, and which he is now going to refute more fully. Cf. for this passage also Schöllgen, 233. For such repetitions, which are fairly frequent in Tert.'s works, especially after excursions, cf. *an.* 25, 1 with Waszink's note. — **abruptae:** 'inconsiderate, rash' (Gloss. *praeceps, inmoderatus vel infrenatus, inconsideratus, TLL* I: 142, 3-5) is found since Sen. *controv.* 2 pr. 2 as a qualification of style, since Val. Max. 8, 1 *abs.* 3 to denote a trait of character. In Tert. cf. *an.* 8, 1: *Abruptum alioquin et absurdum est* (sc., to make a certain statement); in *Marc.* 4, 29, 4 *abruptus* is almost synonymous with *absurdus*: *Adhibenda tamen ... etiam abrupta defensio est adversus abruptam provocationem*. See the passages quoted by Waszink on *an.* 8, 1 (155). — **Ante:** Tert. avoids *antea* even in correspondence with *postea*, cf. e.g. *res.* 47, 13 and 53, 10; also in the present passage we find *postea* at the end of the sentence. See Löfst., *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 88-9, and, for other authors, *Per.* 74-5; Hofm., *Synt.*, 499 seqq.; Schrijn.-Mohrm., 1, 132. — **aedifex** is a *hapax*, see *TLL* I: 917, 1-3. — **defunctus:** Rigaltius (followed by all later editors except Oehler) here reads *defectus*, a suggestion by Iunius. Both were probably led to this conjecture by the absense of an ablative (or an accusative, see *TLL* V, 1: 378, 47 seqq.; Borleffs, *Mnem. N.S.* 60 (1933), 87, n. 1; Diercks, 221 on *orat.* 22, 5) after *defunctus*. However, *defungi* is more than once used absolutely with the meaning 'to have done with, to acquit oneself of', which shows a variety of shades. Most frequent is the use in the sense of 'to die' (especially the perfect participle), said of things 'to cease (to exist)'. The verb is strikingly frequent in Tert.: Claesson in his index quotes 46 instances.

2. **dicta domini, exempla:** the asyndeton has been justly defended by Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 53; cf. 10, 7: *de publicis, propriis sollemnitatibus*. — **exempla:** for this word, see Pétré's monograph (for the present passage pp. 47. 119. 129). — **causationem:** this word is used as an equivalent of *excusatio* from Tert. and the *Vetus Latina* onwards, cf. *cor.* 11, 7; *exh. cast.* 12, 1. In *Marc.* 5, 20, 1 (= Phil. 1, 18) we find *causatione* as a translation of προφάσει (Vulg.: *per occasionem*). It does not seem to be a law term. See *TLL* III: 702, 30 seqq.; Hoppe, *Serm. Tert.*, 74. For *causari*, see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 35; Thierry, 190. — **felices egenos dominus appellat:** Tert. refers to the first words of the beatitudes of Luke 6, 20 μακάριοι οἱ πτωχοί. Matthew has the same words but adds τῷ πνεύματι. Tert. here clearly speaks of purely material poverty. — **egenos:** although the word occurs in Plautus, and after him again from Vergil and Livy onwards, it does not become more frequent until Tert. and later authors, see *TLL* V, 2: 231, 34-6. As Ulpian uses it more than once (*TLL* ib. 231, 82 seqq.) and the word is also frequent in early versions of the Bible, Norden's remark (on Verg. *Aen.* 6, 91: *in rebus egenis*) that it is an archaism

may be corrected in the sense that it is a word from colloquial language, from which Plautus, the old versions of the Bible and the idiom of lawyers used to borrow numerous words and expressions. The present use of *egenus* as a translation of πτωχός was undoubtedly influenced by the preceding *Egebo* (not the opposite: the opponent wants to say: '*non habeo quo vivam*': this is *egebo*, not *pauper ero*). — **Sed nolite ... lilia:** Kroymann wants to read: *Sed nolite ... victu. 'Et vestitus'* (scil. non habeo): *habemus exempla* (this is probably a slip of the pen) *lilia*. The reason is probably that in this passage Tert. is answering the objections one at a time. If we retain the traditional interpunction, this is the only answer where something is added which had not been mentioned by the opponent. However, in Kroymann's reading we miss the adversative conjunction which introduces the first answers. *Vestitus*, too, is awkward as a plural accusative. The most important objection, however, is that also in Matth. 6, 25 (cf. ib. 31; Luke 12, 22), to which Tert. alludes in the present passage, food and clothing are mentioned together. It stands to reason that here, too, the remark about clothing is added as it were in the same breath. For this reason a change of interpunction is unnecessary. The only remarkable fact is that instead of the simple admonition from Matth. 6, 25 we find the example of the lilies from Matth. 6, 28 (Luke 12, 27) added. — **cogitare** is the translation of μεριμνᾶν (Matth. 6, 25); see Rönsch, *It.*, 352 (cf. 308); Stephan, 78. Cf. the preceding note. — **Substantia** with the meaning 'property' is a juridical term, see the literature mentioned in the note on 2, 1; Koffmane, 59; Rönsch, *It.*, 325. *Substantia* may be a nominative (cf. *ux.* 1, 4, 5-6; *fuga* 14, 1) as well as an ablative (cf. *nat.* 2, 15, 7; *an.* 2, 7). — **omnia ... dividenda:** cf. *mon.* 14, 7: *discessit et ille dives, qui non ceperat substantiae dividendae egenis praeceptum*. Tert. is the only Latin author to use *dividere* in the translation of this passage: all other versions have *dare*. Tertullian here clearly adopts the variant reading in Luke 18, 22, viz., διάδος; most Greek MSS have δός, which is also found in Matth. 19, 21 and Mark 10, 21; see Aalders, *Luc.*, 273 (cf. 256-7). Aalders rightly leaves the quotations occurring in *Marc.* out of consideration, as being derived from Marcion's Gospel. There, in 4, 36, 4, we find: *omnia, quaecumque habes, vende et da pauperibus*, and a little further on (36, 7): *vende ... quae habes ... et da ... egenis*. — **Nemo ... operi:** *operi* does not belong to the quotation; it is rather a variation on the text of Luke: βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ. It can be explained in two ways: 1° *operi* = 'the Christian way of life'. Tert. chooses a neutral term instead of the Biblical 'kingdom of God'. 2° *operi* = 'the activity of the plougher'. In this case Tert. changes the meaning of the text, making it refer totally to the work of the plougher and leaving to the reader the task to work out the comparison. — **condicionalis:** a juridical term, denoting, both as an adjective to *servus* (e.g. *cod. Theod.* 10, 1, 5 and *cod. Iust.* 10, 1, 7, 1: *per condicionales servos*; cf. Aug. *Enarr. in Ps.* 145, 3: *ita serviat* (scil. caro) *nobis*

sicut condicionale mancipium) and as a substantive (e.g. *cod. Iust.* 8, 17, 11: (testes) *licet condicionales sint, quos vulgo tabellarios appellant*; Aug. *c. Faust.* 22, 55 (650, 17-8): *ut etiam per hanc condicionalem libera illa uxor Iacob laborans filios heredes regni suscipiat*), a slave who cannot become free ('einer der persönlich und für immer zu einem gewissen Amte verpflichtet ist', Heumann-Seckel, s.v.); see *TLL* IV: 138, 1 seqq. With a different meaning we find *condicionalis* e.g. in *an.* 52, 2, see Waszink, *ad loc.* (p. 535). — **duobus dominis:** the Christian is a *servus dei*, cf. 2, 1 with the note. On this sentence (Matth. 6, 24) cf. Rambaux 134, n. 47; Tert. quotes this sentence rather frequently: *spect.* 26, 4; *ux.* 2, 3, 4; *an.* 16, 7; *cor.* 1, 1; 12, 4.5. — **Si vis ... necesse est:** this corresponds most closely to Luke 14, 27, not, as Aalders thinks, to Matth. 16, 24 in which the word μαθητής (here: *discipulus*) fails. The use of *tollere* is remarkable indeed, the Greek text having βαστάζει (one would expect *portare*, cf. Rönsch, *N.T. Tert.*, 594), however, cf. *fuga* 7, 2: *qui pluris fecerit animam suam quam me* (~ Luke 14, 26; cf. *an.* 13, 3), *non est me dignus* (Matth. 10, 38) *et qui non tollit crucem suam et sequitur me non potest esse meus discipulus* (Luke 14, 27). This last passage also clearly illustrates how Tert. blends various related passages from Holy Scripture (cf. 11, 1 with the note; for the mutual influencing of parallel passages in quotations generally, see E. Jacquier, *Le Nouveau Testament dans l'Église chrétienne*, 1[3] (1911), 10 seqq.); similarly, *scorp.* 11, 1: *qui pluris ... fecerit etiam animam suam quam me* (~ Luke 14, 26), *non est me dignus* (Matth. 10, 38) ... *et qui animam suam invenerit perdet illam, qui vero perdiderit mei causa inveniet illam* (Matth. 10, 39). Therefore, it is also incorrect that Aalders (p. 59. 95) relates *an.* 55, 5: *si crucem tuam tollas et sequaris dominum* particularly to Matth. 10, 38 (although he admits influence of Matth. 16, 24); it may just as well be regarded as an allusion to Matth. 16, 24 (Mark 8, 34; Luke 14, 27; perhaps even Luke 9, 23). Tert. merely reproduces the contents of these passages without exactly realizing the different particulars of form in each of them. — **id est, angustias ... crucis est:** this explanation (*id est*) strictly refers to the words *crucem tuam* in the previous free quotation of Scripture. One might, however, also suppose that the words *crucem tuam tollas et dominum sequaris necesse est* represent to Tert. one idea, viz., 'to carry your cross behind the Lord'. This cross is explained in two ways: 1. *crux = angustiae et cruciatus*; 2. *crux = corpus*. The first explication is usual; as to the second, the idea that the body which one has to carry is like a cross is a remarkable adaptation of an idea that is not unknown to Platonism (cf. the opening sentence of Porphyry's *Vita Plotini*). One should notice the circular composition of the sentence: *crucem tuam ... in modum crucis est*. The idea, that the human body *in modum crucis est*, is also mentioned by Tert. in *nat.* 1, 12, 7 and *orat.* 14: *Nos vero non attollimus* (sc. manus) *tantum, sed etiam expandimus et, dominica pas-*

sione modulata, tum et orantes confitemur Christo. For the interpretation of this text see F. J. Dölger, 'Beiträge zur Geschichte des Kreuzzeichens', *JbAC* 5 (1962), 5 seqq. and, for the explication of this entire passage, Maria Ko Ha Fong, *Crucem tollendo Christum sequi. Untersuchung zum Verständnis eines Logions Jesu in der alten Kirche* (Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie, 52, Münster 1984), 68-70. — **corpus ... quod in modum crucis est:** Rigaltius' emendation *crucis* instead of the reading χρς which is handed down in *A* and *B*, is undoubtedly correct, cf. *nat.* 1, 12, 7: *ipsi quoque corpori nostro tacita et secreta linea crucis situs est, quod caput emicat, quod spina dirigitur, quod umerorum obliquatio* <.....>. For a similar confusion of *Christus* (χρς) and *spiritus* (ςρς), see Thörn., 1, 65, n. 1; Evans, 265, on *Prax.* 13, 2 and Kroymann's adnot. crit. on *Marc.* 4, 42, 6. For *in modum*, cf. 5, 4. The modes of appearance of the cross in the world are a favourite theme. For the human body as a *figura* of the cross, cf. Just. *apol.* 1, 55, 4: τὸ δὲ ἀνθρώπειον σχῆμα ... οὐδὲν ἄλλο δείκνυσιν ἢ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ σταυροῦ; Maximus of Turin writes in his fiftieth homily, which is entirely devoted to the subject of this appearance of the cross everywhere (PL 57, 342 C-343 A), 343 A: *ipsius enim incessus hominis, cum manus levaverit, crucem pingit atque ideo elevatis manibus orare praecipimur, ut ipso quoque membrorum gestu passionem domini fateamur; tunc enim citius nostra exauditur oratio, cum Christum, quem mens loquitur, etiam corpus imitatur*. Justin devotes the entire chapter *apol.* 1, 55 to a detailed exposition of the ubiquitous appearance of the cross in the world. He begins by stating that the meaning of the cross has not been recognized by the demons, and that this is the reason why it has not been imitated by them; then he continues: κατανοήσατε ... πάντα τὰ ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, εἰ ἄνευ τοῦ σχήματος τούτου (viz., of the cross) διοικεῖται ἢ κοινωνίαν ἔχειν δύναται. Similarly, Maximus of Turin, towards the end of the homily just quoted: *hoc igitur dominico signo scinditur mare, terra colitur, caelum regitur, homines conservantur*. The *signum crucis, salutis* is seen in nature by Tert. (birds: *orat.* 29, 4; bull: *Marc.* 3, 18, 3-4 = *Iud.* 10, 7) and further in the quarters of the heavens (Maxim., *op. cit.*, p. 341 C) and in a number of objects (statues: Just., *loc. cit.*, 7; Tert. *nat.*1, 12, 5-13; *signa vexillorum* and *tropaea*: Just., *loc. cit.*, 6; *nat.* 1, 12, 14-6; *apol.* 16, 8; ship: *Marc.* 3, 18, 3-4 = *Iud.* 10, 7; Just., *loc. cit.*, 7; Tert. *nat.* 1, 12, 5-13; *signa vexillorum* and *tropaea*: Just., *loc. cit.*, 3; Min. Fel., *loc. cit.*; Maxim., *op. cit.*, p. 342 B). See *DACL* s.v. 'Orante', XII: 2293, and the literature mentioned by Diercks, 292.

3. **Parentes ... relinquendi erunt:** this argument, which is derived from Holy Scripture (viz., Matth. 10, 37—this text stands immediately before *Et qui non accipit crucem suam*—and ib. 19, 29), is not an expression of Tert.'s rigorism. In his time it certainly had persuasive power, since the rupture of family-ties was often a consequence of conversion, and was accepted as such,

cf. e.g. *apol.* 3, 4; *Pass. Perpet. et Felic.* 3, 3; 5-6. See Bardy, *Conversion*, 220-9. — **de artibus ... negotiationibus ... professionibus:** once more the enumeration which we found in 11, 8; cf. the note on that passage. — **pignera:** as is evident from the preceding words *liberorum et parentum causa* and from the following examples, not 'children' (as in *nat.* 1, 15, 5), but 'beloved ones, relations', cf. *nat.* 2, 9, 14: *qui pro salute principum et domus eorum adversus liberos et coniuges et <omne> pignus suum deierant*; *orat.* 8, 3. For *Prax.* 3, 5, see Evans, *Prax.*, 200. The spelling of *A* is inconsistent: in *nat.* 1, 15, 5 and *orat.* 8, 3 we find *pignora*. Cf. also Oehler's note on the present passage (p. 86 g). — **pignera et artificia et negotia:** for this enumeration, see below at *cum ... fidei*. — **derelinquenda:** this verb is rarely used until the first century of our era, in which it occurs a number of times in Pliny (more frequently than in Columella, cf. Waszink, 130). It is a technical term in juridical literature (= *omittere, neglegere possessionem*, *TLL* V, 1: 627, 72 seqq.). However, that this should be the reason for its first frequent occurrence in Tert. does not seem certain, since this verb is also very common in other Christian authors. At all events, an important reason for its frequency is the fact that it gives the excellent clausula 1α, i.e. the entire clausula 1 in one word; cf. in this connection Waszink, 'The Technique of the Clausula in Tertullian's De anima' (*Vig. Chr.* 4 (1950), 212-45), 214. — **cum ... vocati ... tardum fuit fidei:** Here the first thing to be explained is how the *pignera, artificia* and *negotia* are included in the three quotations from Holy Scripture. In the first passage a leaving of all three factors is meant (*pater* = *pignus, navis* = both *artificium* (the art of fishing) and *negotium*); in the second passage *teloneum* = *negotium*, in the third *sepelire patrem* = *pignus*. In *bapt.* 12, 9 Tert. gives the same examples in the same order: *id* (sc. faith) *si apostolis defuit, nescio quorum fides tuta sit*; *uno verbo domini suscitatur a teloneo* (sc. *fides* Borleffs; *suscitatus BT*; Borleffs' conjecture is supported by *tardum fuit fidei* in the present passage, and by *fides famem non timet* in 12, 4), *dereliquit* (*derelinquit* Borleffs, unnecessarily, cf. infra) *patrem et navem et* (*del.* Borleffs) *artem qua vitam sustentabat deseruit, patris exsequias despexit*; *summum illud domini praeceptum Qui patrem aut matrem mihi praeposuerit non est me dignus ante perfecit quam audivit*. So in this passage the examples are given as an illustration of Matth. 10, 37. We find the same thought with reference to Matth. 12, 48 in *carn. Chr.* 7, 8 seqq., particularly ib. 7, 13: *negavit* (Christus) *itaque parentes quomodo docuit negandos, pro dei opere*. Matth. 12, 48 and Luke 8, 21 are brought together in *Marc.* 4, 19, 11. The present passage (not the one from *De baptismo*) was imitated by Hier. *ep.* 38, 5, 1: *patrem senem cum navicula et rete dimittunt*; *publicanus a teloneo surgit et sequitur salvatorem*; *volens discipulus reverti domum et suis ante renuntiare magistri voce prohibetur*; *sepultura non datur patri et pietatis genus est impium esse pro domino* (the order of Luke 9, 59-60

and 60-1 is changed for the sake of the climax). — **cum ... derelinquunt, cum ... suscitatur, cum ... fuit:** variation of tenses is quite common in Tert., cf. the numerous instances collected by Löfstedt, *Krit. Apol.*, 103-5, and *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 23-5. 80-1; see also Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 38-9; Waszink, 102; Sörbom, 100-2 (with more literature). Therefore Borleffs' alteration of the text in *bapt.* 12, 9 (quoted above) is unnecessary. — **Iacobus:** it is necessary to adopt this reading of Mesnart and Gelenius, since always (also in Tert.) *Iacob*, the reading of *A*, is the name of the patriarch. Moreover, cf. *Marc.* 4, 3, 3: *Petrus et Iohannes et Iacobus*; ib. 5, 3, 6; *Prax.* 15, 8. — **teloneo:** this word, borrowed from Greek, is not found before the *Vetus Latina* and Tert. (also in *bapt.* 12, 9); cf. Rönsch, *It.*, 246. The word occurs in Vulg. Matth. 9, 9, Mark 2, 14, and Luke 2, 17 as a translation of τελώνιον. — **tardum fuit fidei:** Oehler gives a correct paraphrase: 'Vel in re tam pia, ut patris sepultura, immorari tardum est visum ad capessandam fidem'. The adj. *tardus* is used here with a causative sense, = 'retarding', 'delaying', as, for instance, in Prop. 1, 10, 16: *dominae tardas ... aperire fores*; for further instances, see *OLD* s.v., par. 3 (not all the passages quoted there are relevant). *Fidei* is a brachylogical expression instead of *fidei capessendae*, as was rightly observed by Oehler. Tert. not rarely puts a single subst. instead of a subst. connected with a participle or a gerundivum, e.g. *Valent.* 1, 1: *Valentiniani, frequentissimum plane collegium inter haereticos, quia ... ad fabulas* (sc. inveniendas) *facile est...* .

4. **Nemo:** in this paragraph the extreme consequence of the preceding argument is put forward, while it is at the same time an explication of the starting-point, which was already briefly stated in 5, 1: 'if necessary, the physical life should be sacrified'. Cf. also 23, 7: *det* (sc. dominus) ... *nobis abrumpendae omnis necessitatis constantiam*. The readiness to die for one's faith is often expressed very generally, for instance in Aristid. *apol.* 15, 10: ἕτοιμοί εἰσιν ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν προέσθαι, in most cases, however, with a special reference to martyrium, cf. e.g. Just. *apol.* 1, 39, 3-5; 1, 57, 1-2; *ep. ad Diogn.* 1 and 10, 7; Lact. *d.i.* 5, 13, 5. Bardy (*Conversion*, 170-1) justly remarks: 'au IIIe siècle comme au IIe, il faut être prêt à accepter le martyre si l'on désire être disciple du Christ'. Therefore, the heathens characterized the Christians as an *expeditum morti genus* (*spect.* 1, 5; cf. Min. Fel. 8, 5; Just. *apol.* 2, 2, 19-3 (4), 1). They regarded the Christian attitude as *obstinatio*, cf. *apol.* 50, 15; *nat.* 1, 18, 1; thus already in Plin. *ep. ad Trai.* 96, 3; Marc. Aur. 11, 5; cf. also Lucian. *Peregr.* 13. For further literature, see Bardy, *Conversion*, 167-71; H. Delehaye, *Les origines du culte des martyrs* (Brussels 1912), 1-26; Bauer, *HdbNT, Erg. Bd.*, 247-8; Geffcken, *Zw. gr. Apol.*, 162-3; Büchner, 36. — **Fides famem non timet:** this sentence was copied by Hier. *ep.* 14, 10, 3: *De cibo cogitas? Sed fides famem non timet.* — **famem non minus ... con-**

temnendam ... quam omne mortis genus: here *fames* has the meaning of 'death from starvation', cf. Sall. *ep. Pomp.* 1: *fame, miserrima omnium morte*; Liv. 27, 44, 8: *fame ac frigore, quae miserrima mortis genera sint*; 4, 9, 3; 21, 41, 11; Amm. Marc. 17, 9, 4: *fame, ignavissimo mortis genere. Omne = omne aliud*; for this meaning, which is frequent in later Latin, see Löfst., *Beitr.*, 113-5, and *Per.*, 174; Tidner, *Part. copul.*, 2, n. 1; Svennung, *Oros.*, 76, n. 1; Waszink, 250. Related to this is the use of *aliquis* in the sense of *alius quis*, and of *ullus* in the sense of *ullus alius*, see the note on 6, 2. — **Didicit ...:** an allusion to Luke 14, 26 (cf. the note on 12, 3: *si vis ... necesse est*) or to Matth. 10, 28. For *respicere* 'to take into account, to trouble about', cf. 5, 4. — **quanto magis:** viz., *non respicere*. Ellipsis of a verb after *quanto magis* is very frequent, cf. e.g. *spect.* 3, 5 and 23, 5; *nat.* 1, 7, 13. 15; 2, 8, 3; *ux.* 1, 6, 2; *fuga* 5, 3; *an.* 6, 3; 17, 10; 58, 5. '*quo magis* and *quanto magis* usually introduce an *argumentum a fortiori*', Waszink, 276; cf. also Hartel, 1, 47. — **Quotusquisque haec adimplevit?:** it is unnecessary to adopt Kroymann's alteration *adimplebit*. The opponent is thinking of the small number of (stereotype) examples that has been cited, and uses this fact as a ground for his excuse: 'only very few persons have fulfilled these conditions', i.e. the examples only concern exceptional cases and cannot be regarded as a generally applicable standard; the strength of a normal human being is inadequate to these requirements. — **quae ... facilia:** in spite of the divergence from the Greek (Luke 18, 27: τὰ ἀδύνατα παρὰ ἀνθρώποις δύνατα παρὰ τῷ θεῷ ἐστιν), this sentence should be regarded as a quotation, cf. *bapt.* 2, 2-3: *miratur* (sc. incredulitas) ... *simplicia quasi vana, magnifica quasi impossibilia. Et sit plane ut putas: satis ad utrumque divina pronuntiatio praecucurrit: 'Stulta mundi elegit deus, ut confundat sapientiam eius'* (1 Cor. 1, 27), *et: 'Quae difficilia penes homines, facilia penes deum'* (Luke 18, 27). In conformity with the Greek text is *res.* 57, 11: *Quae impossibilia apud homines, possibilia apud deum*. Note the slight difference among these quotations: Tert. is clearly quoting from memory. See Aalders, *Luc.* 248. 256-7. 273. — **penes:** Tert. uses *penes* and *apud* promiscuously and even likes to vary them (e.g. *an.* 14, 2; *fuga* 1, 1; 2, 4); for more particulars and literature see Waszink, 214-5; Thierry, 110. 136.

5. **Sic tamen ... blandiamur:** *sic* has restrictive meaning: 'only in so far'. *Tamen* is adversative to a concession which was not expressed, e.g. 'even if it remains very difficult'. *Tamen* here becomes more or less synonymous with *certe*. For this use of *tamen*, see Hofm., *Synt.*, 672; Wahlén, 61-3 (with further literature). — **nobis de mansuetudine ... blandiamur:** *sibi blandiri* means 'to have (false) illusions, to delude oneself' (the same meaning in 23, 1; cf. also 12, 1 *nobis supplaudimus*). It is first used by [Quint.] *decl.* 330 (297, 15); Plin. *ep.* 51, 11, see *TLL* II: 2033, 1 seqq.; followed by *de*, as in the

present passage, also in e.g. *ux.* 2, 2, 1; Min. Fel. 33, 1. In *spect.* 14, 1 it is joined to *quod*, in *mart.* 4, 1 to *quia*. The word *mansuetudo* occurs four more times in Tert.'s works: *Marc.* 4, 9, 10 and 4, 29, 10; *an.* 24, 5; *virg. vel.* 1, 6. Rambaux, 299, n. 55, rightly observes that Tert. nowhere recommends this virtue to human beings. — **idololatriae affinitates:** cf. 10, 1: *affines illos esse multimodae idololatriae*. 'The domain of idolatry': in this metaphor the *abstractum* is used *pro concreto*. — **afflatum eius:** sc., *idololatriae*, cf. *idol.* 16, 1: *nullum autem periculum observari de flatu idololatriae*. The use of this term is explained by the words *vice pestis*, for Tert. is thinking of the contagion caused by a disease, cf. Ovid *met.* 7, 551: *dilapsa* (sc. corpora) *liquescunt adflatuque nocent et agunt contagia late* (for more similar passages see *TLL* I: 1228, 46 seqq.); cf. also *apol.* 23, 16: *de contactu deque afflatu nostro*; *Herm.* 14, 5: *Plus bonum floruisset sine mali afflatu*. Moreover, Tert. frequently uses this substantive on account of his definition of the human soul as *afflatus* or *flatus dei*: *an.* 16, 1; 27, 4; 36, 4; *Marc.* 1, 24, 5; 5, 6, 11; *mon.* 16, 2; *Valent.* 24, 2. — **vice pestis:** *vice* 'like' is not found before Plin. min.; in Tert. e.g. *cult. fem.* 2, 10, 1; *apol.* 27, 7; 48, 12. For the simile, cf. Ovid *met.* 7, 547-53: *silvisque agrisque viisque / corpora foeda iacent, vitiantur odoribus aurae. / ... dilapsa liquescunt / adflatuque nocent et agunt contagia late. / pervenit ad miseros damno graviore colonos / pestis*; Val. Max. 1, 8 *ext.* 19: *corporis ... iacentis pestifero adflatu*. The simile is the more striking as such phenomena were ascribed to the demons, cf. *apol.* 22, 4-5; the demons are frequently said by the Christians to cure diseases which they first had caused themselves; cf. Courcelle, art. 'Divinatio', *RAC* 3, 1245. The passage from the *Apologeticum* also testifies to the strongly material conception, which Tert. has both of the constitution of the demons and of their *afflatus*; see about this d'Alès, 154-5; Lortz, *Apol.*, 2, 41. — **de longinquo:** this prepositional expression does not occur before Tert. (*TLL* V, 1: 79, 72-3), who uses it frequently, just as many other expressions with *de*, see Hoppe, *Synt.*, 101, and *Beitr.*, 87-8; Waltz., *Comm.*, 20. 203. — **vitemus:** this is the reading of *A*, whereas *B* and Gelenius read *devitemus*. As Tert. shows no distinct preference for either verb (in *idol.* 10, 2 we find *vitare*, in 14, 1 and 24, 3 *devitare*), it is preferable to adopt the reading of the only extant MS. The alteration of *vitemus* into *devitemus* after *de longinquo* is more probable than the reverse. — **in his ..., quae:** for *hic* as an antecedent (here = *hic talis*), cf. 7, 1 with the note. — **deis suis:** the possessive pronoun is added with a quite deliberate intention, cf. 20, 3. — **defunctis:** see above Remark b. For the survival of the worship of the dead among the Christians, see Dölger, *AC*, 2 (1930), 90-1 and 98-9 with more literature. — **regibus:** cf. the definition of the emperor-cult in *nat.* 1, 17, 2: *secunda a deis religio ... Caesarianae maiestatis*; *apol.* 35, 5. Of course Tert. is thinking here, too, of the dead beings who were deified according to Euhemerus (cf. the preceding note). For a detailed discus-

sion, see 15 (especially 15, 2 and 15, 7) with the comm. — **mancipatae:** cf. 1, 5 with the note. — **ad eosdem spiritus immundos pertinentis:** the *immundi spiritus* are the devil, the demons and the fallen angels, see the notes on 1, 5 and 4, 2. For the part they play in idolatry, cf. also 11, 2; 15, 2; *spect.* 6, 4: *Sed de idololatria nihil differt apud nos, sub quo nomine et titulo, dum ad eosdem spiritus perveniat, quibus renuntiamus. Licebit mortuis, licebit deis suis faciant, perinde mortuis suis ut diis faciunt; una condicio partis utriusque est, una idololatria, una renuntiatio nostra adversus idololatrian.* — **hoc genus:** this should not be supplied with the genitive of a noun: this expression, which is to be regarded as a fossilized apposition, is also used substantively in *apol.* 2, 7: *Traianus rescripsit hoc genus* (= *homines huius generis*) *inquirendos quidem non esse, oblatos vero puniri oportere* (for a similar use of the genitive *huiusmodi*, cf. 13, 2). For *hoc genus* with a substantive, cf. 20, 2: *hoc genus nomina*; *orat.* 27: *hoc genus psalmos*; *an.* 32, 2; *apol.* 27, 7. See Hoppe, *Synt.*, 17; Waltz., *Ét.*, 160; Hofm., *Synt.*, 385; Löfst., *Per.*, 293, and *Synt.*, 1, 261-2; 2, 31.

Chs. 13-14. *On taking part in pagan holidays and extraordinary festivities*

*'Sacrifices and priesthoods need not to be discussed. The spectacles have already been dealt with. What remains are the holidays and extraordinary festivals. There we are indulgent, sometimes to our wantonness, sometimes to our timidity, in opposition to the faith and the discipline which we all have accepted (*communem*) (§ 1).*

The first point of discussion will be whether a Christian is allowed to join the pagans. The Scriptural 'Rejoice with the rejoicing and grieve with the grieving' is no argument in favour of this, because it is an adhortation of the apostle to the brethren to be unanimous among themselves. *In the matter under discussion (*ad haec*) there is no communion between pagans and Christians, just as there is no communion between light and darkness, life and death. Otherwise the word of Scripture "The world will rejoice but you will mourn" would become untrue. Look at the example of Eleazar and the rich man (§§ 2-4).*

Some of those days, one objects, are an occasion for gifts, sometimes as an homage, sometimes as a discharge of debt. Do you mean that I shall not accept what is due to me or restore what is due to somebody else?—If this custom was started on account of superstition, you have to keep yourself far from it. You should not do as if you are bound to this particular day for paying debts or receiving what is due to you (§ 5). You yourself should set the rule by which you wish to be dealt with. If you join the pagans in order to hide that you are a Christian, you contaminate your conscience; on the other hand, if the others know that you are a Christian, your taking part will make them consider you as not being a Christian: so you have been tested, and condemned. In both cases the Lord will be ashamed of you (§ 6).

14. *Many Christians think that they are allowed to do sometimes what the heathens do in order to avoid that "the name" is blasphemed (§ 1), but the only blasphemy to be avoided is the justified blasphemy, e.g. on account of fraud or injury. The blasphemy for observing the Christian rules should not be avoided; on the contrary it may exist as long as we exist (§ 3a).*

Neither Paul's adhortation to please all nor his assertion that he has become everything to everybody may be used as an argument to join the heathens in their idolatry (§§ 3b-4).

True, Paul allows us to live together with the sinners, otherwise we would have to leave the world, he says. But he does not allow us to sin together with them. The unity in nature, not that in superstition, should be the source of our gladness (§ 5).

If we are not allowed to celebrate the festivities with the pagans, we are certainly not allowed to celebrate them among ourselves. Even the Jewish celebrations, which once were agreeable to God, are now forbidden; this holds a fortiori *true of the pagan festivities (§ 6). The Christians should take example by the heathens, who would never take part in the festivities of the Christians.*

If a Christian would argue that some indulgence must be granted to the flesh, i.e. that the flesh must have its relaxation in the festivities, I answer: you have your festive days, even more than the heathens have (§ 7).'

Remarks

Chapters 13 and 14 are a unity. They contain one series of arguments against those Christians who wish to take part in the heathen festivities.

In the introductory paragraph Tertullian gives two motifs, wantonness or timidity, i.e. the desire on the dissipation of those festivities or the fear to be recognized as Christian. With regard to the first motif, one could object: do those festivities not have an element of relaxation which is not unallowed to a Christian? This objection is actually referred to in 14, 7, where Tertullian says: *si quid et carni indulgendum est*. His answer is: yes, but you do have your own festivities. About the *timiditas* Tertullian will speak in 13, 6 and again 20, 1 and 21-22.

Tertullian discusses two main points: 1. A Christian's taking part in heathen festivities together with heathens (13, 2-14, 5; to this the beginning words, *De hoc primo consistam*, refer); 2. the celebration of these festivities by the Christians among themselves (14, 6-7).

The arguments of those who think that they are allowed to celebrate the festivities together with the heathens are nearly all references to Scriptural

texts. Tertullian refutes them easily. Only one argument is of a different nature: *Sunt quidam dies munerum* (14, 4b) 'There are', the opponent says, 'certain days, on which gifts are spent and debts are paid. Is it not allowed to me to take part in this social behaviour, which is in fact a question of social justice?' (Tertullian undoubtedly aims at the *Saturnalia*, which he mentions in 14, 4 together with the *Kalendae Ianuariae*, which was another gift-day, cf. 14, 6; 10, 3).

Tertullian's answer is: if this institution has an idolatrous origin, you have to keep distance from it. You must, of course, pay your debts and you may receive what is due to you, but why should you not do that at another time (*citra diei observationem*) and so avoid this idolatrous environment? You yourself should set the rule, i.e. the time of paying and being paid.

The following passage (*Cur enim et lateas*) deals with what was indicated by *timiditati indulgere* in the introductory passage of 15, 1: the Christian takes part in the festivities in order to hide that he is a Christian. Tertullian's argument against him is rather complex. First he discusses the case that the Christian tries to hide his being a Christian, while the other does not know it. In this case the ignorance of the other is a contamination of your conscience, Tertullian says. The ignorance of the heathen (which is an ignorance of something that should not be unknown) throws a slur on the conscience of the Christian. Then Tertullian discusses the case in which the Christian tries to hide his being a Christian, while the other knows that he is one (*Si non ignoraris quod sis Christianus*). Now Tertullian evokes the image of a trial, in which that Christian acts against the conscience of the other and is so put to the test. But, Tertullian continues, the other party will surely (*enimvero*) not insist; he will rather pretend not to know that you are a Christian (*dissimulaberis* is the passive form of *dissimulabit te esse Christianum* 'he (= the opponent) will indeed do as if you are not a Christian'). And he concludes: *temptatus addictus es*, i.e. 'having been tested you have been condemned, because you have shown yourself not to be a Christian and the adversary has admitted that you are not indeed'.

In 14, 6-7 Tertullian speaks of celebration of heathen festivities among the Christians themselves. What does he have in mind here? We think of the possibility that at heathen gift-days Christians took part in the festivity by giving presents to each other and to have meals with each other. Tertullian's words, *Saturnalia et Ianuariae* etc., point in this direction.

1. **De spectaculis ... eiusmodi:** Tert. often uses *eiusmodi* and *huiusmodi* instead of *talis*, both with a substantive, as is the case here, or on itself as in 13, 2; 14, 6; 16, 4. — **suum iam volumen implevimus:** cf. *cult. fem.* 1, 8, 4: *sicut de illis suum volumen edidimus*, which also refers to *De spectaculis* (similarly *an.* 3, 4 on the treatise *De censu animae ad Hermogenem: habet*

suum titulum et suum haereticum). See the chapter on the datation (Introd., p. 10). — **retractari:** De la Cerda rightly observes: '*Retractari* est, tractari accurate, non, iterum tractari'. — **interdum lasciviae, interdum timiditati:** two motives profoundly despised by the severe and fervent Tert. About the *timiditas* (i.e. the fear to be detected as a Christian), see ch. 21-22, and the announcement in 20, 1. — **subscribimus:** *subscribere* with the meaning *dare, concedere*, is a law term. This sense is the usual one in Tert. — **adversus fidem disciplinamque communem:** it seems that *fides* denotes the *regula fidei* and *disciplina* the rules of life. One could say that *fides* is the *logos* and *disciplina* the *nomos*. For *disciplina* see the note on 2, 4. As to the addition *communem* one should notice that *adversus fidem disciplinamque* asks for a complement. Tert. could have used *nostram* but he chooses the stronger adjective *communem* in order to underline the *gravitas delicti*. The reading adopted here is that of *A* which is also found in *Bmg*. *B* and Gelenius read *communicantes nationibus in idolicis rebus* ('thus communicating with the heathens in idolatry') which represents an entirely different text whose origin is obscure. The adj. *idolicus* is found here for the first time (the Greek adj. εἰδωλικός occurs in the scholia on Plato, *Gorg.* 452 d; Syrian. *in Arist. Metaphys.* 7, 32; Damasc. *de princip.* 453; Iamblich. *de myst.* 3, 13; the adv. -κῶς in Porphyr. *Sent.* 10 and schol. on Plato, *Gorg.* 456 a). Afterwards, *idolicus* is found only in Priscillianus (4 times), Paulin. Nol. (once) and Paulin. Petricordius (5 times).

2. **De hoc quidem primo:** on account of the question whether it is allowed for a Christian to take part in such festivities Tert. now puts his first question: 'Is a Christian allowed to join the pagans in external behaviour?'. In a second part of this section the question arises, whether it is allowed to join them in the practice of giving and receiving gifts at certain gift-days. — **consistam:** as a legal term *consistere* means *iudicio congredi, actione experiri* (Oehler's formulation; cf. *TLL* IV: 465, 48-66: '2 speciatim: a) *de partibus litis, in primis de accusatore*'). In Tert.'s works this meaning is very frequently found, e.g. *apol.* 4, 1: *iam de causa innocentiae consistam*; ib. 46, 1: *constitimus adversus omnium criminum intentationem*; 46, 15: *si de simplicitate consistam.* — **debeat:** here it goes in the direction of *liceat* ('is allowed' in the translation). — **Gaudere cum gaudentibus:** Tert. had already worked out this thought in the slightly earlier treatise *De spectaculis*, mentioned just now, where he speaks of 'the alternate succession of things' in the following way: *Vicibus disposita res est: nunc illi laetantur, nos conflictamur. 'Saeculum', inquit, 'gaudebit, vos tristes eritis'* (Ioh. 16, 20). *Lugeamus ergo, dum ethnici gaudent, ut, cum lugere coeperint, gaudeamus, ne pariter nunc gaudentes tunc quoque pariter lugeamus* (28, 1-2). Cf. on this passage Rambaux 396, n. 246 and 397, n. 248.

3. **Ceterum ad haec ... et morti:** these words have a model in a passage from *spect.* 26, 4: *Quid luci et tenebris? Quid vitae et morti?* — **nihil communionis:** The word *communio* refers to *unanimitas* in the previous sentence. As to the sense of the passage, cf. 19, 2: *Non convenit sacramento divino et humano*. Numerous similar passages have been collected by Fredouille, 320-3. — **aut scindimus quod est scriptum:** 'otherwise', i.e. in the case of taking part in the festivities of the pagans, 'we (i.e. the Christians) rescind the word of Christ: the world will rejoice, but you will mourn'. The verb *scindere* must be understood in the sense of 'to make untrue'. In *De corona* 13, 4 Tert. quotes the same Scripture text. In his commentary Fontaine observes that Tert. deforms the words of the Lord here in a twofold way: he makes a prophetic future to a moral commandment and he transforms an allusion to Christ's passion and resurrection into a precept concerning the attitude with regard to persecution. In our view, this is too strong a verdict. There is no need for saying that Tert. interprets the future tenses as imperatives. One may even state that, with regard to *gaudebit*, such an interpretation is hardly possible. We agree with Fontaine that the text is used in a context which is different from the original one. But we think that in both cases Tert.'s way of arguing is the following: 'if we rejoice with the pagans by partaking in their festivities or ceremonies, *we make untrue what the Lord has said*. Hence let us not do so'. The text of *De spectaculis* confirms this interpretation. There the context does not admit us to understand the Scripture words as a commandment, because it speaks of how things go: *vicibus disposita res est*, etc. On the other side one finds the same adhortation there (*lugeamus*). — **scindimus:** here De la Cerda writes *rescindimus*, which is a quite probable conjecture, since the verb *rescindere*, a law term, is frequently used by Tert. (Claesson quotes 24 instances). It is practically always a synonym of *delere*, whereas *scindere*, which is found 13 times, usually has a concrete sense, e.g. *Marc.* 2, 24, 7 (1 Reg. 15, 28): *et scindetur Israel in duas partes* (id. in *apol.* 38, 2); ib. 4, 42, 5: *scissum est et templi velum* (id. in *Iud.* 13, 14). With an accus. of the intern object it occurs *Marc.* 4, 6, 3 and 5, 19, 3: *differentiam scindit* (*-at*; pass. *Valent.* 39, 1: *quanta diversitas scinditur*). The only instance of *scindere* with the meaning *rescindere*, *delere* is *Scap.* 4, 3: *scisso eodem elogio*; this one instance is sufficient to retain the *lectio tradita*.

4. **Eleazar ... compensant:** the meaning of this difficultly construed sentence is clear: there is a compensation in the hereafter for the good and the evil experienced in this life, so that the sum of good and evil for every individual is equal. This is illustrated in the cases of Eleazar (Lazarus) and the rich man. For a correct understanding of the sentence one should recall to mind that the subjects of *compensant* are *Eleazar ... refrigerium consecutus* and *dives in tormento constitutus*, i.e. 'the refreshment which Eleazar retains'

and 'the torment to which the rich man is condemned'. These refreshment and torment 'bring on a level' the alternate vicissitudes of evil and good. The words *aemula retributione* give a nearer qualification of this process: 'by way of a retribution which strives to equality'. One may also interpret this ablative as appositional (the ablative = 'which is'); cf. the note on 8, 1 *eodem crimine*. The relevant material (also for the 'resultative ablative') has been collected in Waszink's note on *an.* 19, 5 (271-5). On the conception of *compensatio*, which plays a fairly important part in Tert.'s works, cf. Rambaux, 87 and the passages collected ib. n. 171. — **Eleazar ... dives:** it seems to be probable that here already Tert. regards the story of Lazarus and the rich man (Luc. 16, 9 seqq.) as the description of a real event, as he was to assert a few years later in *an.* 7, where he was certainly influenced by Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* 2, 55 (cf. Waszink *ad loc.*, 146-9). The Hebraic form *Eleazar* also occurs in *an.* 7, 2; the Syriac form *Lazarus* is used in *res.* 17, 2; cf. the note of Iunius. — **apud inferos:** Iunius: 'Observandum autem quod ait *apud inferos* etiam de Lazaro. Nam inferos Latini Patres, ut Graeci ἅδην pro omni loco aut statu mortuorum dixerunt promiscue atque in hunc sensum Lazarus et dives apud inferos collocantur'. — **in sinu Abrahae:** for the explication of the term *sinus Abrahae* cf., apart from the literature quoted by Waszink, *loc. cit.*, J. E. Niederhuber, *Die Eschatologie des hl. Ambrosius* (Paderborn 1907), 62 ss. — **Sunt quidam ... expungunt:** this sentence should be considered as introducing the objection of the opponent in '*Non ergo ...*'. Thus they belong to the words of the opponent, which, in consequence, do not begin at *Non ergo*. The opponent wants to justify his behaviour by stating that there are certain gift-days; now this is a question of social behaviour, even of social justice; by forbidding a Christian to take part in this usage, Tert. prevents him from doing justice to someone else and receiving what is his. — **dies munerum:** Tert. undoubtedly means the Saturnalia, which he is going to discuss in the next chapter (14, 4). — **honoris ... expungunt:** Oehler interprets: 'Per honoris titulum significantur praemia honoraria illa, quorum supra mentio facta erat cap. 10, pro quibus in ignobilioris ordinis hominibus simplici nomine mercedes dici ait'. — **titulum:** 'motive, reason'; cf. comm. on 1, 2. — **mercedis debitum expungunt:** Rigaltius (quoted by Oehler) observes: 'Unde et Mercedonius seu Mercedinus mensis dictus, posteaque dies Mercedini, in tres menses tributi'. Oehler quotes in addition: 'Paul. ex Festo p. 124 (= p. 111, 15 Lindsay): 'Mercedonios dixerunt a mercedem solvendo'; gloss. Isid.: 'Mercedonius, qui solvit mercedem'; V. Scaliger, De emendatione temporum 2, 77'. Cf. further Agnes Kirsopp Michels, *The Calendar of the Roman Republic* (Princeton 1967), 18: 'The correct name of the intercalary months was *mensis intercalaris*. The name *Mercedonius*, mentioned only by Plutarch (*Numa* 18, 3, *Caesar* 59, 2), must have been a popular nickname'. In the article 'Mercedonius', *TLL* VIII: 791, 49-62, V. Bulhart quotes a third passage, viz., Lyd. *De mens.* 4, 92 (144),

p. 164, 18 Wünsch, under the heading: 'November, quo conductor domino fundi mercedem solvebat'. (Cf. Sontheimer, *RE* XVI: 59, 65). — **expungunt:** see 1, 1.

5. **Non:** we adopt the reading of *Bmg*, because the way of arguing does not admit *nunc* (*A B*). *Non ... alienum* should be understood as a conclusion from the previous introductory observation, in the form of a question. — **consecraverunt:** by consecration a link is made between man and demon. This may be the consecration of an idol (cf. 15, 5); here it is the consecration of a *mos*. This is an utterance of superstition, and means, in consequence, idolatry (= demonolatry). — **extraneus ab omni eorum vanitate:** every act of idolatry is *vanitas*, because it worships what is unworthy of being worshipped. Cf. 1, 4. — **idolothyta:** because of the context of idolatry the gifts became 'offerings to the demons'. In *cor.* 10, 5 Tert. says the same of the crown worn by the soldiers at a *donativum* ceremony: *et corona idolothytum efficitur* (see the note by Fontaine). Cf. also Clem. Alex. *Paed.* 2, 8, 72, 2, where Marrou notes (SC 108, p. 144, n. 1): 'Très heureusement, Clément transpose au cas de la couronne les conseils formulés par Saint Paul au sujet des idolothytes'; he then refers to Tert. *cor.* 10 and Gussen, 84, n. 3. — **citra:** 'apart from, except'. Cf. *pud.* 9, 21: *sed plus est, quod nihil aliud argumentari licet citra id de quo agebatur*. See Lewis and Short s.v. *citra*, IIIa 3, and Waszink's note on *an.* 20, 4 (286).

6. **conscientiam:** the word is here a synonym of *scientia*, as is not rarely the case in Tert.'s works (cf. *TLL* IV: 364, 22-60 ('I: *communis complurium scientia*') and some passages in 364, 61-365, 37 ('II: *is animi status quo quis alicuius rei sibi ipse conscius est*')). The clearest instance is found in *an.* 17, 2: *mendacium visui obicitur, quod remos in aqua inflexos vel infractos adseverat adversus conscientiam integritatis*. In *TLL* IV: 368, 24 seqq. several passages are adduced from Tert. but the only further instance of this meaning of *conscientia* in his works is *orat.* 22, 9: *interest nostra, quod dei gratia exerceatur, solius dei conscientiae commendare*. — **Si non ignoraris ... addictus es:** of the first part of this sentence a correct paraphrase is given by Oehler: 'Si te Christianum esse ab ethnicis non ignoratur, contra alterius conscientiam agis, quippe aliter agens, quam tibi ex fide Christiana agendum esse ethnicus non ignoret'. More difficult is the way of thought in the second part. *A* and *B* read here: *enim vero et dissimulaberis*, instead of which Latinius conjectured *sin vero et dissimulaveris*, which was adopted by Iunius and Reifferscheid, whereas Oehler combines the two readings and reads: *sin vero et dissimulaberis*. In the opinion of Van der Nat, shown by his constitution of the text, the reading of *A B* can be maintained—an opinion shared by us. In this context it is worthy of mention that *enimvero* is used 19 times by

Tert. and that it is also frequent in juridical texts. The words *enimvero et dissimulaberis* are then to be interpreted as a parenthetic clause (in the translation we write 'certainly (or 'indeed') people will even (*et*) pretend not to know that you are a Christian'). The *et* is contrasted by the words *contra conscientiam alterius agis*: the situation is this that a man acting in this way does not only act contrary to the knowledge of the pagan in question but that he will also cause an opposite reaction of that pagan: the latter will treat him as if he were, indeed, a non-Christian. — **temptatus addictus es:** Currey quotes a lengthy note by De la Cerda who wants to prove that *tentari* is used by early Christian writers to signify: 'to be overcome by temptation' (which is not quite correct: in this rather unclear note De la Cerda also observes that several times St. Jerome in *Adv. Iovin.* II uses *tentatio* with the meaning *peccatum*). Currey concludes: '*tentare* is used in the peculiar sense expressed by our English *tempt*. Here *tentatus* is 'tempted'; *addictus*, 'given over to the power of the tempter, overcome by the temptation'.' This explication is not correct. *temptatus* certainly means 'tested' and *addictus*, to which Oehler supplied *peccato* and De la Cerda *diabolo*, is an abbreviate expression instead of *addictus poenae*, as was observed by A. Klotz in his article 'addico' in *TLL*, where under the heading 'aliquem alicui rei dicare, idem fere quod damnare' (I: 575, 33) the present passage is quoted in the first place in the second part of this group, which has the heading: '2. *omissa poenae notione*'. This rubric contains a considerable amount of passages from later Latin (about 35). The next passage in time is Cypr. *Ad Demetr.* 24: *cremabit addictos* (clearly = *damnatos*) *ardens semper gehenna*. Remarkable is also Vulg. Iacob 5, 6: *addixistis et occidistis istum* (NT: κατεδικάσατε); cf. also Vulg. 2 Petr. 2, 19: *a quo enim quis superatus est, huius et servus est*. Tert. compares the Christian who hides his belief before somebody else who knows that he is a Christian with somebody who stands his trial. He is tested (*temptaris*), and ascertains that he is not a Christian. The 'judge' (= the other person) knows that he is a Christian, but (as it was often the case in actions against Christians) he is willing to do as if he were not (*enimvero et dissimulaberis*). This means, in fact, a condemnation, i.e. the condemnation of not being a Christian. Thus: *temptatus, addictus es*. 'You were tested, and condemned' (this is not an asyndeton, as Böhm says: the condemnation is a *consequence* of the test). On this condemnation a punishment must follow. On the denial of being a Christian cf. also 22, 3 and Rambaux, 274, with n. 103. — **Certe ... in caelis:** *hac* refers to the possibility that one is known to be a Christian, *illac* to the opposite. In both cases the person in question tries to hide the fact that he is a Christian; obviously, Tert. supposes, because he is ashamed of Christ. Now, Christ has said: 'Whoever will be ashamed of me before men, of him I, too, will be ashamed before my Father in heaven'. Thus in both cases mentioned above the person who is ashamed of Christ before men, is

guilty of *Christ being ashamed* before his Father, so he is guilty of *shame in the Lord* (*confusio in domino*). The Bible quotation of Tert. has something remarkable. In the Vulgate Matth. 10, 33 reads: *qui autem negaverit me coram hominibus, negabo et ego coram Patre meo qui in caelis est*; Mark 8, 38: *Qui enim me confusus fuerit ... et filius hominis confundetur eum cum venerit in gloria patris*. In Tert.'s version the construction is exactly that of Matthew but the verb *negare* (ἀρνέομαι) has been changed into that of Mark, viz., *confundi* (ἐπαισχύνομαι, which is also found in the parallel verse Luke 9, 26). A still shorter form is found in *fuga* 7, 1: *Qui mei confusus fuerit, et ego confundar eius coram patre meo*. In *Marc.* 4, 21, 12 only the first part of Luke 9, 26 is quoted: *qui mei confusus fuerit*.

14,1. **Sed enim:** these particles show that Tert. continues the discussion of the previous chapter: 'But <I have to say something more> for a very great number of Christians (on *plerique* see the note on 2, 2) think that a more indulgent attitude is suggested by Holy Scripture'. Tert. will discuss three texts: 1. *ne nomen blasphemetur*; 2. *omnibus per omnia placeo*; 3. *ceterum de mundo exiretis*. — **induxerunt animo:** in classical Latin one finds only *inducere in animum*, 'to suppose', 'to imagine'. — **agnoscendum** is here practically equivalent of *(ap)probandum*, as was asserted by Oehler and Currey ('that we should acknowledge with approbation'); cf. the material collected in *TLL* I: 1359, 63-1361, 37 (under the heading: 'III. ad probandi, approbandi notionem accedit'). Among the first group of instances (cf. 'iam talia', 1359, 63-1360, 4) two passages from Tert. are quoted, viz., *orat.* 12: *neque enim agnosci poterit <a> spiritu sancto spiritus inquinatus*, and *ieiun.* 16, 5: *Sed et omnem* ταπεινοφροσύνην *ethnici agnoscunt*. From the instances quoted next under the heading '*aliquid*' (1360, 5-78) it is evident that Tert. had got accustomed to this use of *agnoscere*, which he certainly borrowed from the legal idiom (*TLL* l.c. 1360, 43: 'ICTI passim'. In this connection six passages from Tert. are quoted, e.g. *an.* 9, 3: *quia spiritalia charismata agnoscimus*). — **ne nomen blasphemetur:** this is partly a quotation of 1 Tim. 6, 1: *Ne nomen domini et doctrina blasphemetur*. What 'name' is Tert. speaking of? One could argue that he thinks of the *nomen Christianum* (the name 'Christian') and that he purposely leaves out the word *Domini*. However, in the Scripture text quoted some lines further on *nomen meum* is the name of God (*nomen dei blasphemare* also occurs in Vulg. Lev. 24, 11, *n. domini b.* ib. 24, 16; Rom. 2, 24 in *Marc.* 5, 13, 7 and *Iud.* 13, 26). One could object that the *suffragia* in the *circus* were aimed at the Christians, thus *nomen Christianum*. But in *spect.* 27, 1 Tert. says: *Odisse debemus istos conventus et coetus ethnicorum, quoniam illic nomen dei blasphematur, illic in nos quotidiani leones expostulantur*. A striking parallel of the present passage is found in *cult. fem.* 2, 11, 3, where Tert. lets the women make the following

objection against his condemnation of splendid dress, etc.: *Sed enim a quibusdam dicitur: ne blasphemetur nomen in nobis, si quid de pristino habitu et cultu detrahamus*. Tert. reacts there in the same manner as in the present text: Thus let us then also persist in our sinful life, then the heathens will not blaspheme: *Non auferamus ergo <a> nobis et vitia pristina; simus et moribus isdem, si et superficie eadem: et tunc vere non blasphemabunt nationes.* (Kroymann reads *nomen* instead of *non*; Dom Dekkers, CC I, p. 367, considers this an excellent conjecture; in the Sources Chrétiennes edition of *cult. fem.* M. Turcán maintains the manuscript reading which is in our vision correct, because the negation is essential here; the statement is in perfect agreement with *idol.* 14, 2: *Desinamus et non blasphemabitur.*) Tert. continues: *Grandis blasphemia, <si> de qua dicatur: 'Ex quo facta est Christiana, pauperius incedit'*. Such a *blasphemia* is a grandiose one, in Tert.'s opinion. This agrees with *O blasphemiam martyrii affinem* in 14, 3. The only *blasphemia* which is to be avoided is the *iusta blasphemia*, mentioned in the next sentence; in *cult. fem.* 2, 12, 1 Tert. observes: *Optemus tantummodo, ne iustae blasphemationis causa simus.* — **Porro:** here 'on the other hand', 'but'. — **materia dignae querellae** = *materia digna querellae* (or *querellā*). An enallage to avoid too many *a*-endings.

2. **vestri** (*A Bmg*) is the correct reading, cf. Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 18, on *mei, sui, nostri causa.* — **scelestis suffragiis:** Oehler comments: 'Suffragia igitur non sunt favores populi in circo speculantis, ut quidam interpretati sunt, sed praeiudicia et detestationes sectae Christianae, quae ibi vulgo audiebantur'. In *spect.* 27, 2 Tert., arguing that a Christian may not attend those spectacles, asks his Christian confrater: *Quid facies in illo suffragiorum impiorum aestuario reprehensus*? In *cor.* 1, 2 he mentions another case of unfavourable *suffragia*, viz., the reaction of the other soldiers on the heroic conduct of the Christian colleague who refuses to wear the crown at a *donativum* ceremony and openly declares that he is a Christian: *Suffragia exinde.* — **Desinamus, et non blasphemabitur:** in the previous sentence Tert. has stated: 'If we are to avoid *any* blasphemy of the name, we are all lost (i.e. we are completely wrong in what we do), for the whole circus is full of blasphemies, undeserved blasphemies it is true, but blasphemies'. Now Tert. draws the conclusion: 'The only way to stop this blasphemy is that we cease to exist'. He puts it in his lapidary manner: 'Let us cease (to exist), and the blasphemy will stop'. The verb, *desinamus*, may be understood in two senses: 'let us cease to exist as Christians' or 'let us cease to exist as human beings'. Oehler interprets it in the first sense: '*Desinamus*, sc. esse'. The same explication is given by Currey: 'Immo dum sumus, sc. dum sumus Christiani', opposed to 'desinamus, sc. esse'. From a logical point of view this interpretation seems to be see most plausible one, because the fulfillment of this simpler condition suf-

fices to stop the blasphemy. But Tert. always prefers the stronger statement. At any rate, it is evident that this sentence is closely connected with the previous passage. The division in paragraphs is misleading here. — **Immo dum sumus:** one could even think that this sentence, too, should be put together with the previous paragraph. But this is not true. Tert. starts here what one could call 'an eulogy of that kind of blasphemy'. 'No', he says, <there is no reason for putting an end to that blasphemy>, 'let there be blasphemy as long as we live, but then a blasphemy on account of our observance of the rules of our religion, not on account of transgressing them'. Arguing along this way Tert. will come to the exclamation: *O blasphemiam martyrii affinem.* — **in exorbitatione:** 'by deviating from the orbit which one should follow', a vivid metaphor. About the term, see the note on 8, 2 (p. 147). — **dum probamur:** sc. *a Deo*. Cf. 1 Thess. 2, 4: ... *probati sumus a Deo* and *Deo, qui probat corda nostra.*

3. **O blasphemiam martyrii affinem;** as Currey rightly observes, *martyrium* is equivalent here to 'testimony'. For this use he quotes *cor.* 9, 1, where Tert. mentions the *tabernaculum martyrii*, which is a reference to Apoc. 15, 5. The Vulgate has here *tabernaculum testimonii*, but *Vetus Latina* Cod. *a* reads *tabernaculum martyrii*. (Cf. *TLL* VIII: 419,78 - 420,9. At the beginning of this passage is observed: '*locis Italae in Vulg. respondet* testimonium'). Another relevant instance in *Vetus Latina* 2 Tim. 1, 8, quoted by Tert. in *Scorp.* 13, 10. Currey also quotes *cor.* 1, 3 *de martyrii candida laurea*, but there *martyrium* certainly means 'martyrdom'. (See Fontaine's note *ad loc.*). The latter sense is normal in Tert., but we should remain aware of the fact that in the Latin word *martyrium* the original meaning of the Greek, viz., 'testimony', was still felt: Tert.'s use of the word in this sense was certainly influenced by the *Vetus Latina*. For *affinis* with a genitive, see note on 10, 1. — **quae tunc me testatur:** here Tert. explains how the blasphemy is almost a testimony: if one is blasphemed (detested) because of being a Christian (*propterea*), this is a testimony that one is a Christian. — **Benedictio est nominis:** the substantive *maledictio* corresponds, of course, to *blasphemia. Maledictio custoditae disciplinae* corresponds to *blasphemetur in observatione ... disciplinae* at the beginning of this paragraph. The placing of the predicate noun, *benedictio*, at the beginning of the sentence gives it a special emphasis, just as in Tert.'s most famous sentence: *Semen est sanguis Christianorum* (*apol.* 50, 13). One should read the passage from *O blasphemiam* until *disciplinae* as a kind of peroration, in which speech strives to a climax. First Tert. states that this kind of blasphemy is a 'testimony', then he calls it even a benediction. And then, as it were at a lower voice, he quotes a word of St. Paul: 'If I would want to please men, I would not be a servant of Christ'. In the previous passage Tert. fought against the argument: *ne nomen*

blasphemetur. The present words of St. Paul have nothing to do with this argument. Tert. seems to point here to a deeper feeling which, in his view, leads his opponents in their conduct towards the heathens: *placere hominibus*. One could also say that this quotation does not belong to the previous paragraphs but introduces the argument of par. 4. On the quotation of Gal. 1, 10, cf. Rambaux, 134, n. 48, who refers to a similar quotation from Holy Scripture, viz., Rom. 8, 8, which is quoted in *Marc.* 5, 10, 11; *res.* 10, 3 and 46, 2; *ieiun.* 7, 6; *pud.* 17, 12. The second Scripture text adduced by the opponents is that of St. Paul in which he states: *omnibus per omnia placeo* (1 Cor. 10, 33). Tert. sweeps this argument from the table by some suggestive questions.

4. **Nimirum:** 'certainly', introducing an ironic observation. — **Saturnalia:** see 10, 3. — **Kalendas Ianuarias:** see 10, 3. — **modestia ... integritate:** a number of similar enumerations of virtues in Tert.'s works are mentioned by Fredouille, 404, n. 147 (*paen.* 1, 4; *an.* 40, 4; *carn. Chr.* 4, 6; *res.* 44, 8). — **patientia:** Tert. wrote a special treatise about this virtue which, as he states himself, he did not possess at all (1, 1: *Confiteor ad dominum Deum satis temere me, si non etiam impudenter, de patientia componere ausum, cui praestandae idoneus omnino non sim*). — **humanitate:** Rambaux, 292, n. 7, quotes three other instances of this substantive, which might lead to the erroneous idea that in Tert. it is rather rare; however, Claesson quotes no less than 17 instances.

5. **Sed etsi:** here Tert. answers to a possible objection of his opponents, who would refer to St. Paul's statement: 'I do not forbid you to have contacts with idolatrous and adulterous people, otherwise you should have to leave this world' (1 Cor. 5, 10). Why, they could ask, do we not take part in their festivities? Tert. answers: 'yes, we are allowed to *live* with them but we are not allowed to *sin* with them'. On this theme of what one could call 'the Christian in the world'—'world' is understood here in the biblical sense—Tert. gives some further explanation. — **Sed:** in the previous paragraph Tert. argued that the Christian should *not* become pagan with the pagans. Such an argument is naturally continued by a 'but'. However, this 'but'-phrase becomes again a negative one (*non utique ... immittit ut ...*), so that the opposition with the previous phrase disappears. — **ceterum de mundo exiretis:** in the Vulgate the quotation of 1 Cor. 5, 10 runs as follows: *Alioquin debueratis de hoc mundo exiisse.* In *pud.* 18, 7 Tert. cites the text in this fashion: *ceterum oportebat vos exire de mundo* (cf. *an.* 35, 2: *Ceterum oportebat* nos *de mundo exire*). For *ceterum* = *alioquin* cf. *TLL* III: 972, 52 seqq.; see also 17, 1. — **eas habenas conversationis immittit, ut:** 'he does not slacken the reins (= the rules) of contact *so*, that ...'. A remarkable case of

the use of *is* for *talis* or rather *tali modo*. Ciacconius' conjecture *immittit* should be retained; it is in agreement with the love of metaphorical speech, which Tert. always shows. The expression *habenas immittere* occurs for the first time in Lucr. 5, 787; cf. *TLL* s. vv. *immitto* (VII: 471, 50 seqq.) and *habena* (VI: 2392, 63). See especially Norden's note on Verg. *Aen.* 6, 1 *classique inmittit habenas* (p. 111). The genitive *conversationis* belongs to *habenas*. Tert. does not mention the indirect object of *immittit* (sc. *nobis*). Currey retains *immutat* and translates: 'There is no such inversion of the laws of discipline', which is certainly wrong. — **compeccare:** this verb is very rarely used in Latin: apart from the present passage it is found twice in Caelius Aurelianus. Here Tert. chose it, as Böhm, 139, justly observes, for the sake of parallelism with *convivere* and *commisceri*. — **Ubi est commercium ... permittit:** Tert. explains the thesis formulated just now: 'one is allowed to live with, not allowed to sin with'. He states: 'Wherever is *commercium vitae*, i.e. wherever people live together, there is sin; but in the first we may partake, in the second we may not'. In other words: 'A Christian cannot avoid to come in contact with sinners (*apostolus concedit*), because there is sin wherever is common life; but nobody will allow the Christian himself to sin'. There is no reason to assume a lacuna between *ibi* and *peccare*; cf. Böhm, 139-41. — **Licet convivere ... commori non licet:** because 'sin' means 'death', this statement is another wording of the previous one. — **conlaetemur ex communione naturae, non superstitionis:** the concept of 'nature' comes here instead of that of 'life' (*communio naturae* instead of *commercium vitae*), and 'superstition' instead of 'sin'. The term 'nature' is, in this view, neutral; the same holds good of *anima* and *mundus* in the following phrases. At *conlaetemur* one should recall to mind that Tert. is still thinking of the participation in heathen festivals. — **disciplina:** 'rule of life', '*nomos*'. Cf. 2, 4; 13, 1. — **compossessores:** a rare word from later Latin. *TLL* s.v. (III: 2143, 40-52) mentions two passages from glosses, one from an inscription of the emperor Gordianus (*CIL* III 12339, *anno* 238-40), the present passage and four from Augustine. So the word occurs for the first time here; it clearly belongs to the legal idiom.

6. **Quodsi:** here Tert. passes into another subject-matter: the celebration of those heathen festivities among the Christians themselves. In other words: the Christians themselves are the organizers of the feasts. After having stated that this is worse than only to take part in the festivities organized by the heathens, Tert. argues: even the Jewish feasts, which were once beloved by God, are forbidden, let alone the *Saturnalia*, etc. — **esset ... est:** there is no need to follow Pamelius in substituting *est* for *esset*, as was shown by Thörnell, *Eranos* 6 (1916), 114 seqq. and by Tränkle in his note on *Iud.* 8, 7 (p. 73). — **ius ... communionis:** one should notice the legal terminology: instead of

'allowedness' Tert. speaks of *ius*. — **Iudaeis:** this Scripture text played an important role in the question between the Jews and the Christians, whether the latter had to observe the Jewish feasts; see Justin, *Dialogue with Trypho*, passim. From Tert. cf. *orat.* 2, 3: *Hoc est quod Israeli exprobratur, quod caelum ac terram spiritus contestatur, 'filios', dicens, 'genui et illi me non agnoverunt'* (Is. 1, 2). Cf. Bender, 122. Because of this reprobation these feasts are *extranea* for the Christians. This holds good *a fortiori* for the heathen festivities. For polemics against the Sabbath, cf. Schenkel, *Rh. Mus.* 66 (1911), 399 seqq. Cf. also *Herm.* 45. — **feriae,** of course, indicates the *ceremoniae* mentioned in Is. 1, 13-4. Is. 1, 13 is also quoted in *Marc.* 1, 20, 5, where we find the form *neomeniam*. — **Saturnalia ... Matronales:** of the *feriae* mentioned here the first three belong to the festivals at which the schools were free. Cf. the note on 10, 3, p. 191, where the *Saturnalia* and the *Brumae* are mentioned. By *Ianuariae* Tert. means, of course, the *Kalendae Ianuariae*, at which the *strenae* were given (cf. the note on 10, 3). The *Matronalia* (1 March), at which the schools were not free, as it seems, are added because this was regarded as a particular important festival; cf. Wissowa, *Rel.*, 185 and Warde Fowler, *Festivals*, 38. As to the form of the name (*-les*) which seems to occur only in the present passage, cf. Wissowa, *Rel.*, 185, n. 7: one should supply *feriae*, which word is found in the preceding clause. — **munera ... constrepunt:** obviously Tert. wants to give a vivid sketch of those unallowed festivities in the Christian houses. It is not quite clear how this sentence has to be punctuated. Before Oehler the usual punctuation was: *munera commeant, strenae consonant, lusus, convivia constrepunt*, but then the second phrase '*strenae consonant*' is entirely senseless. Oehler writes: *munera commeant, strenae, consonant lusus, convivia constrepunt*. Indeed *strenae*, since it has to be separated from *consonant* must be connected with what precedes. So Tert. must have said that what is exchanged (*commeant*) is the gifts in general (*munera*) and the gifts of the New Year (*strenae*) in particular. Currey considers Oehler's punctuation to be strange. He maintains the punctuation first mentioned above and refers to Scaliger's conjecture *et strenae*. Obviously Scaliger is reluctant to accept the phrase *strenae consonant*, nor is he willing to accept the asyndeton which arises, when *consonant* is combined with *lusus*.

7. **O. melior:** Tert. reproaches his fellow Christians to be less faithful to their principles than the heathens to theirs. This comparison is, of course, meant by Tert. as an argument. — **vindicat:** 'to lay claim to as one's own, appropriate' (L & S). — **Non dominicum diem ... communicassent:** 'Even if they knew those Christian festivities (as in the case under discussion the Christians 'know' the heathen festivities which the heathens celebrate among themselves), the heathens would not do what those Christians do.' Tert.

makes this supposition 'even if they knew those festivities' in order to prevent the Christians saying 'we are making our own festivities'. The *dies dominicus* (here masculine) is, of course, the Sunday, called *dies solis* in *apol.* 16, 11 (cf. Waltzing ad loc., p. 117) and *nat.* 1, 13, 1. See also Teeuwen, 41, and Bartelink, *Vig. Chr.* 19 (1965), 200. Kellner (*BKV* 7², 160, n. 2) thought that *dominicum diem* means 'Eastern'; for that reason he erroneously read in the sequel (like Latinius) *duos dies* instead of *tuos dies*. Cf. on the whole question L. Koep, ' "Religion" und "Ritus" als Problem des frühen Christentums', *JbAC* 5 (1962), 53 with n. 73. — **tuos:** this reading of *B* and Gel is certainly preferable to *tamen* of *A*. *Tuus* is used in a pregnant sense here: 'right for you'. — **pentecosten implere non poterunt:** the fifty days after Eastern were regarded as one great festivity. Cf. E. Dekkers, 154, who quotes *ieiun.* 14, 2: *Cur quinquaginta exinde* (viz., after Eastern) *diebus in omni exultatione decurrimus?* and *cor.* 3, 4: *Die dominico ieiunium nefas ducimus vel de geniculis adorare. Eadem immunitate a die Paschae in Pentecosten usque gaudemus.* The term *Pentecoste* can indicate the period of fifty days after Easter and also the feast at the end of the fifty days. Here Tert. states that the pagans with all their festivities do not attain the number of fifty festive days which the Christians have after Easter; hence *habes tuos dies*, which is correctly explained by Böhm, 142.

Ch. 15. *The decoration of doors with lamps and wreaths*

'Another pagan habit comes up for discussion, viz., the decoration of doors with lamps and wreaths. What to think of it?

If it is a homage to an idol, it is evidently a form of idolatry. If it is a homage to a human being, one should bear in mind that every form of idolatry is directed toward human beings (§ 1), for the pagan gods had been men, as the heathens themselves agree. Now it makes no difference whether one worships human beings from the past or of the present time. The condemnable element of idolatry does not lie in the persons who are its direct object but in the fact that the acts concerned pertain to the demons (§ 2).

It is true that Christ says that one should render the things which are Caesar's to Caesar; but he adds that the things which belong to God should be given to God. In fact, Scripture itself shows what should be given to Caesar, viz., the money. Thus you must give to Caesar what bears the image of Caesar and to God what bears the image of God, that is yourself as a human being (§ 4). Otherwise nothing is left to God.

Does this mean that I consider those lamps and wreaths as a homage to God? Of course not. In outward appearance they pertain to Caesar, who is honoured by them as a god, but secretely they pertain to the demons (§ 5).

One should see this adornment of doors in connection with the fact that Romans as well as Greeks know gods of doors. Although these are idle and fictitious names, by consecration they cause a bond between men and demons. Enoch spoke already about this kind of superstition (§ 6). Now, if demons are adored at the doors, those lamps and wreaths cannot but pertain to them (§ 7a).

How severe God's judgment is in these matters appears from a dream which He sent to one of our brethren, whose slaves had, without his knowledge, adorned his door (§§ 7b-8a).

Thus we have to obey the secular magistrates, as the Apostle commands us to do, and to honour them, but without committing idolatry (§ 8b). A good example was given by the three brothers in their behaviour towards Nebuchadnezzar and by Daniel towards Darius (§§ 9-10a).

Let the heathens have their lamps and wreaths, the lamps denoting their lack of true light, the fading wreaths their being destined to the fire. You are the light of the world and the ever verdant tree.—Do not give your house the appearance of things that you have renounced, viz., temples and brothels (§§ 10b-11).'

Remark

The way of arguing. In the previous two chapters Tertullian showed that Christians are not allowed to take part in the festivals of the heathens. They should not show their participation in those festivities in outward appearance or behaviour: *sive habitu sive victu vel quo alio genere laetitiae.* To the outward glance of those festivities he opposes now the *deeds* which, according to Scripture, should shine (hence: *sed*).

The verb *lucere* leads Tertullian's thought to the lamps at the doors at the festivals in honour of the emperor. Thus he comes to speak about the decoration of the doors with lamps and wreaths at that occasion.

For the understanding of Tertullian's argumentation in this chapter one should bear in mind that to him (1) those lamps and wreaths have in themselves an idolatrous nature, and (2) that there is a relationship between this decoration and the fact that, according to the belief of Romans and Greeks, there are gods of the door.

Tertullian discusses first the nature of the pagan activity of decorating doors at the occasion of a festivity in honour of the emperor. If it is a homage to an idol (as the activity in itself seems to suggest), one has of course to do with idolatry. But the opponent may object that what he is doing is just to give honour to a human being (viz., the emperor). Tertullian answers: we should not forget that all idolatry is worship to men, because the so-called gods have been human beings (Euhemerism). Thus the fact that this decoration is meant to be a homage to a human being does not *per se* free it from being idolatrous. It is not the person to whom the homage is given (*personas*,

quae opponuntur) that makes this homage idolatrous but the kind of activity. And in this case that activity is something idolatrous, i.e. pertaining to the demons. One can put it also in this way: he who decorates his door in honour of the emperor commits an idolatrous act and honours the demons. The emperor is, in fact, an idol just like the god whose image is honoured. The emperor functions here as an entity between man and demon. By means of the emperor the demon draws man's worship away from the one God to Himself (cf. Remark c at ch. 1 'Tertullian on idols').

The opponent then refers to the Lord's saying: "Give what is Caesar's to Caesar". Tertullian answers: 'Yes, but the Lord also says "Give to God what is God's" '. If one gives everything to Caesar, nothing remains for God.

Here the opponent reacts: 'Are, then, according to you (*inquis*), these lamps and wreaths an honour to God?' In other words: 'Do you, Tertullian, then, mean to say that those lamps and wreaths are an honour to God?' Tertullian answers: 'Of course I do not say that; I say that they are a homage to him (the emperor) who is honoured by them instead of God. However, this is only the outward side (*quantum in manifesto est*) of the activity; secretly it pertains to the demons.' Again it becomes evident that to Tertullian the decoration of the door is intrinsically an act of worship. Because this act of worship is not directed to the one true God, it must be directed to the demons. He who asserts that it is a homage to the emperor only touches the outward side.

Then Tertullian lays a connection between the habit of decorating the doors and the Roman belief in gods of the door, like Carna, Forculus, Limentinus and Ianus. These are in themselves no more than idle and fictitious names, Tertullian says, but they are again a point of contact between man and the demons. Thus the doors have a function in superstition, as Enoch already predicted. Those lamps and wreaths, which were said to be a homage to the emperor, actually are a homage to idols in the doors. *Idolo feceris, quidquid ostio feceris.* 'Idol' is here again the entity between man and demon, i.e. the gods of the door, which are, it is true, empty names, function as an intermediate entity between man and demon.

After the argumentation of 15, 1-7a Tertullian refers to the dream of one of the brethren to illustrate his case. Then he draws the conclusion: *Igitur* ... one should honour the magistrates, but within the limits of the Christian discipline. Two examples from the OT confirm this conclusion.

The final part (§§ 10b-11) is highly rhetorical. It looks like a peroration.

1. **Sed luceant, inquit, operae:** a rather free quotation of Matth. 5, 16 which in the Vulgate runs as follows: *Sic luceat lux vestra coram hominibus, ut videant opera vestra bona.* As to the reading of this quotation, *A* omits *vestrae*. All editors, also Van der Nat, add the pronoun. But it seems probable

that Tert. has written *Sed luceant, inquit, operae*, just because he is quoting freely; he is opposing the *operae* to the *habitus*, etc., in the previous chapters: strictly speaking the pronoun is superfluous, and Tert. usually likes the shortest formulation. On the other hand, in *cult. fem.* 2, 13, 1 he writes: *Luceant operae vestrae*; this parallel confirms at least the reading *operae* of the present text. For the use of *opera* with the meaning of *opus* (or rather the plural *operae* instead of *opera*), which is quite usual in Tert.'s works (in *an.* it occurs four times), cf. Waszink's note on *an.* 10, 8 (192), where further literature is mentioned. — **tabernae et ianuae nostrae:** Tert. means '<the doors of> our shops and houses'. The reason for this way of expression could be that *ianua* was used only of the proper *house* and that the *taberna* had a *ostium*. Tert. avoids the longer *ostia tabernarum nostrarum*. — **Plures iam:** before starting the discussion of the question whether this practice is allowed to Christians, Tert. observes that at the moment the decoration of doors is even more common among Christians than among pagans. This observation is not without purpose. If the practice will appear to be unallowed to a Christian, the absence of a social constraint, which would exist if everybody else kept up this practice, makes the behaviour of those Christians the more objectionable. — **lucernis et laureis:** this combination is also found in 15, 10 and in *apol.* 35, 4. 11. — **De ista quoque specie:** sc. *idololatriae*. Böhm thinks that *species* means here 'case' (Germ. 'Fall'), a meaning which stems from the idiom of lawyers; she refers to Ulpian, *Dig.* 9, 2, 5: *proponitur apud eum species talis.* — **Si idoli honor ... idololatria est:** the repetition of *idoli honor* in the apodosis emphasizes the evidence of the argument (*idoli honor = idololatria*). — **Si hominis ... in causam esse:** for the way of arguing, see Remark. — **recogitemus ... in hominis causam esse:** Löfstedt, *Tert. Apol.*, 114, n. 1, thinks that these words are a corruption conflated partly from what follows (*recogitemus omnem idololatriam*) and partly from what precedes (*in hominis causam = hominis causa*). Thörnell, 1, 17-8, rejects this interpretation. We, too, think that the tradition should be accepted. Tert. is arguing here very emphatically. The objection of the opponent, which is included in *si hominis causa est*, is retorted first by a phrase in which the same words *hominis causa* are used, just as in the previous phrase *idoli honor* was repeated. Then he reiterates the phrase, changing *causa* into *cultura*, which term betrays the religious (= idolatrous) nature of the activity. — **in hominis causam:** this expression is quite rare; two passages quoted in *TLL* III: 670, 68-9 are of a different nature, because in both cases the main verb requires *in* with an accusative of direction: Sen. *ben.* 5, 12, 6: *omne alimentum in causam doloris trahit*, and Florus *epit.* 2, 6, 3: *in causam belli Saguntos electa est*. The same holds good for three instances of *in causam* in Tert. which are quoted by Böhm, 143: *an.* 38, 4; *res.* 37, 3; *ieiun.* 12, 2. One might, however, refer to *apol.* 40, 1 where a number of manuscripts read: *omnis popularis incommodi*

... *Christianos in causam esse* (*RSPF*; *in causa FZVL*; *causam* the rest of the mss.). But perhaps the explanation of the present *in causam* lies in the fact that *in hominis causa est* corresponds to *si idoli honor est*; thus *causa* takes the place of *honor*. If Tert. had used *honor*, he would have written *in hominis honorem*, now he uses *causa* and writes *in hominis causam*.

2. **in homines ... culturam:** *cultura* with the meaning 'religious worship' is late Latin and is mostly found in Christian authors; see *TLL* IV: 1323, 56-1324, 30. In Tert. it is found seven times, always with this meaning, e.g. *nat.* 1, 10, 8: *deorum dico culturam*; *carn. Chr.* 4, 6: *culturam veri dei*; *scorp.* 2, 14: *ab omni factura atque cultura idolorum.* — **et ipsos** is the reading of *A*; *B* and Gel, followed by Oehler and Reifferscheid, omit *et*. Böhm thinks that *et* can be maintained notwithstanding the fact that *etiam* occurs in the same sentence. This observation is based on the supposition that *etiam* is a duplication. However, *et* belongs to *ipsos deos*, *etiam* to *apud suos*; so there is no reason not to follow *A*. — **deos nationum:** cf. 10, 1 and 2, 4. — **retro:** cf. 3, 1. — **suos:** i.e. the heathens (they are *sui* with regard to the *deos nationum*). — **opponuntur:** this verb should be taken in its literal sense 'to set before' but it has a pregnant sense here, viz., 'to set before the eyes (or the mind) *for adoration*'. Hence the translation of Currey: 'are presented for adoration', and Thelwall: 'are set up for worship' (Kellner: 'die ihr Objekt sind'). This is the only instance of this pregnant meaning mentioned in *TLL* (IX, 2: 764, 6-7, where the dative *venerationi* is supplied).

3. **Reddenda sunt:** next there follows an objection in the form of a quotation of Matth. 22, 21: 'You must give to the emperor what belongs to the emperor'. This objection is in the line of thought of the opponent who in the previous paragraph defended the thesis that the decoration of doors was just *in hominis causam*. Tert.'s reaction consists of two elements: first he draws attention to the fact that the quotation is incomplete: Christ also says that one should give to God what belongs to God. Moreover, he says, the Bible text makes it perfectly clear what Christ wants to be given to the emperor, viz., the money, that is to say: that which bears the image of the emperor. That is why he asked those who interrogated him to show the money. Now just as the precept to give Caesar what is Caesar's means that one has to give Caesar what bears his image, so the precept to give to God what belongs to God means that one has to give to God what bears God's image, i.e. man. That means that man has to give himself to God. The presupposition of this argument is, of course, that a religious act is a giving of oneself. If the adornment of doors is a religious—or rather, an idolatrous—act (and Tert. is convinced of it), man is giving himself to the emperor. Then one gives all things to Caesar (*omnia Caesaris*) and nothing remains for God. This verse is also

quoted in *Marc.* 4, 38, 3 and *cor.* 12, 4; see Braun's article quoted in the Introduction, p. 10. — **Bene, quod:** cf. 5, 4. — **consultatio movebatur:** a studied expression for *interrogabatur*. — **praestandusne ... an non:** cf. Matth. 22, 17: ἔξεστιν δοῦναι κῆνσον Καίσαρι ἢ οὔ; — **monetam ... et de imagine** refers to the two texts, Matth. 22, 19 and 20. — **imaginem dei:** cf. Gen. 1, 26. This text has had an enormous influence in early Christian thinking about man, in connection with Plato's famous conception of ὁμοίωσις θεῷ (*Theaet.* 176 b 1). See H. Merki, art. 'Ebenbildlichkeit', *RAC* 4, 459-79.

4. **Ergo inquis:** this use of *inquis* is very remarkable. It is put into the mouth of the opponent. Tert. has his opponent say: 'So you, Tertullian, say that ...'. A strong case of diatribe style. See Remark above. — **Ergo ... honor dei est lucernae ...?:** one should retain the punctuation of Oehler. *Lucernae* and *laurus* are the subjects of the sentence, but the verb has already become singular under the influence of the predicate noun *honor* at the beginning of the sentence. — **Non utique quod** = *non utique inquam, quod* (answer to *ergo inquis?*). — **quantum in manifesto ... ad daemonia perveniens:** *A* reads *quantum in manifesta est operatione, quae est in occulto* ..., which reading was defended by Kroymann and approved by Dom Dekkers. We think, however, that the reading of *B* and Gelenius is to be preferred because 1° it avoids the almost contradictory phrase *in manifesta ... operatione, quae est in occulto*, which only can be saved from contradiction, if one assumes that *quae* refers to *operatione* only, 2° it presents an obvious opposition between *in manifesto* and *in occulto*, and 3° it is in agreement with Tert.'s opinion that the proper *operatio* consists in what happens *in occulto*; the outward appearance (*in manifesto*) is opposed to the real activity which pertains to the demons and which is *in occulto*. Externally this act is directed to the emperor, but *in occulto* it concerns the demons. The emperor functions as idol (cf. Remark c at ch. 1).

5. **Certi enim esse debemus:** here Tert. brings a new element into the discussion, viz., the fact that Romans and Greeks worship also (*etiam*) gods of doors. Now those lamps and wreaths placed at the doors in honour of the emperor appeared to be a manifestation of religion. Thus they cannot but have something to do with those gods who are idols just like the emperor (see Remark c at ch. 1). Hence the statement: *quidquid ostio feceris, idolo feceris*; and what has been done for an idol is in fact done for the demons. Thus the *operatio manifesta* of the decoration of doors appears again to pertain *in occulto* to the demons. Hence *enim*. — **si quos latet ... litteraturae saecularis:** the conjunction *si* is here almost equivalent to *etsi*. This observation shows that Tert. is here addressing people to whom the Roman *numina* are not known from daily life, i.e., non-Romans. In *cor.* 7, 3 he also refers to the

literature of the pagan world: *litterae ad hoc saeculares necessariae* (see Fontaine's note). The impersonal *latet* with an accus. (evidently caused by the similar use of *fugit*, *fallit*, and *praeterit*) is found for the first time in Vitruv. 9, 2, 3; see *TLL* VII, 2: 997, 27-9; Hoppe, *Synt.*, 14, who quotes *test. an.* 2, 2: *De natura quoque dei, quem praedicamus, nec te latet.* — **Carnam ... Ianum:** this enumeration, which undoubtedly was borrowed by Tert. from Varro's *Antiquitates Divinae* (cf. Peter, art. 'Indigitamentsgötter', Roscher, *Mythol. Lex.* 2, 146), is found more than once in Tert.'s works. The earliest passage is *nat.* 2, 15, 5 (in a long list of *indigitamenta: taceo deos Forculum a foribus* et *Car* <lacuna of 10 spaces for letters> *nibus et liminum Limentinum*. Gothofredus, followed by Borleffs, conjectured *Car<deam a cardi>nibus*. An entirely similar sentence is found in *cor.*—a treatise which contains numerous parallels to the text of *idol.*—13, 9: *quantos deos etiam ostiis diabolus adfinxerit* (Fontaine rightly observes: 'adfix- *fortasse legendum conicio*'): *Ianum a ianua, Limentinum a limine, Forculum et Carnam* (codd. *A R B*; the only *lectio varia* is *Carna* in *NF*) *a foribus atque cardinibus*. Finally we have to mention *scorp.* 10, 6: *Quas mihi potestates ianitrices adfirmas iuxta Romanam superstitionem,* † *Barnum* † (*A B*; *Cardum* Gel, *Cardeam* Pam, *Ianum* Rig, *Carnum* Hildebrand) *quendam et Forculum et Limentinum*? The form *Cardea*, which in the present passage occurs in *A B* is also found in a very similar passage in [Cypr.] *quod idola* 4: *Est et Scansus ab ascensibus dictus et Forculus a foribus et a liminibus Limentius et Cardea a cardinibus*, and, though with variants, in a passage of Aug., *civ. dei* 4, 8: *tres deos isti posuerunt, Forculum foribus, Cardeam* (*Carneam* b^1 K^1r) *cardini, Limentinum limini. Di sunt saeculi, atque inter hos Cardea* (*Carnea* C^1d α^1f *Cardines* a b^1) *femina est, quae cardinem servat*. On account of these data Walter Otto in his article 'Carna' (*TLL Onom.* II: 200, 42-201, 5) arrives at the following conclusion: 'Videtur igitur et Tertullianus et Augustinus scripsisse *Carna*, mutatum autem in nonnullis codicibus esse hoc nomen, ut cardini similius fieret, modo in *Carda*, modo in *Cardea* vel *Cardines*.' A direct connection of *Carna* with *cardo* occurs for the first time in Ovid *fast.* 6, 101-2 (on June 1): *Prima dies tibi, Carna, datur: dea cardinis haec est: / numine clausa aperit, claudit aperta suo* (since in this work Ovid draws heavily on Varro's pupil Verrius Flaccus, it is possible that this connection was already found in Varro). Otto defended his interpretation in *RE* Suppl. 3, 1184 and *Rh. Mus.* 64 (1909), 459 seqq. His final conclusion is that there has never been in Roman religion a goddess *Cardea*, a conclusion which was adopted by Wissowa, *Rel.*, 107, n. 3 and *Gesamm. Abhandl.*, 138 seqq., and by F. Bömer in his edition of Ovid *fast.* 2, 343. In Walde-Hofmann, 1, 166, *Carna* is qualified as an Etruscan goddess of death; Bömer, too, takes into account the possibility that the name is Etruscan. On the other hand, Warde Fowler, *Festivals*, 130-2, does not doubt the correctness of the name *Cardea*. In our

opinion it is to be assumed that Varro in his *Antiquitates divinae* did mention the name *Carna* (as we already supposed *supra* when quoting Ovid *fast.* 6, 101-2). At all events, the passages from Tert. are favourable to this supposition: *cor.* 13, 9 has *Carnam*, *scorp.* 10, 6 has *Barnum*, which contains the sequel *-arn-*, and in *nat.* 15, 5 the lacuna of ten letter-spaces in *A* is better filled by *-nā a cardi-*, which has exactly ten spaces, than by *-deā a cardi-*. Since the present sentence and *cor.* 13, 9 are practically identical (in *cor.* 13 the Greek gods *Apollo Thyraeus* and *Antelii dei*, which we find here, are mentioned immediately after the passage quoted), it is evident that in both sentences the same goddess must be mentioned. — **Forculum:** *Forculus* is only mentioned in the passages quoted sub *Carna*; see Peter, art. 'Indigitamenta', Roscher, 2, 199. — **Limentinum:** cf. Schur, art. 'Limentinus', *RE* 13, 571-2; Peter, art. 'Indigitamenta', Roscher, 2, 202; Latte, 208, n. 4. This god is mentioned in all the passages from Tert. and Augustine quoted sub *Carna*, and further in Arnob. 4, 9. 11. 12 (cf. ib. 1, 28). A goddess Lima (Arnob. 4, 9) is not quite certain; with regard to the name, cf. Peter in Roscher 2, 167 seqq. — **et utique scimus ... obligamentum:** 'and, of course, we know', Tert. says, 'that these names are (apart from the part of the door which they indicate) just empty names. But when, by means of a *consecratio*, those objects are declared to be holy (*cum tamen in superstitionem deducuntur*), they attract the demons (*rapere ad se daemonia*). The consecration makes those names function as idols, which constitute a point of contact, the band (*obligamentum*) between man and demon'. Another case of consecration is described and discussed in *cor.* 10, 2: *Quid autem tam dignum idolo quam quod et mortuo? Nam et mortuorum est ita coronari, quoniam et ipsi idola statim fiunt et habitu et cultu consecrationis, quae apud nos secunda idololatria est*. See the article 'Consecratio I (allgemein)' by L. Koep in *RAC* 3, 269-83. — **obligamentum:** cf. *cor.* 14, 1: (caput viri Christiani) *ne velamento quidem obnoxium, nedum obligamento. Obligamentum* is a rare word (9 instances in *TLL*) which is found for the first time in the *Vetus Latina* (Lev. 26, 13 (Lugd.); IV Reg. 12, 20 (Legion.)) and Tert. (here, *cor.*, *loc. cit.*, and *Marc.* 3, 22, 3: *legis obligamenta et onera*). The meaning found here (in *TLL* under the heading *speciatim pertinet ad devotionem*) occurs in one more passage, Oros. *hist.* 4, 13, 4: (decemviri quosdam) *viros defoderunt*; *sed obligamentum hoc magicum in contrarium ... versum est*).

6. **Alioquin daemonia nullum habent nomen:** in order to avoid that the reader would think that those names of *numina* were names of demons (and thus not *nomina inania*), Tert. adds: 'Moreover (*Alioquin*), the demons have no names by themselves: they get a name where they get a hold in the visible world, but this is not a proper name'. — **pignus:** a metaphor from the juridical sphere. That name gives, as was said just now, the demon a point of contact

with the sensible world. Now this point of contact, which is the consequence of the *consecratio*, is for the demon a basis of certainty just like a pledge, viz., the certainty that he will receive the veneration of the human beings (see Remark c at ch. 1). — **Etiam apud Graecos ... legimus:** the verb *legimus* contains a reference to the *litteratura saecularis*. The fact that also the Greeks know gods of doors confirms Tert.'s feeling that this decoration of doors has something to do with idolatry. — **Apollinem Thyraeum et Antelios daemonas:** these same gods are mentioned in *cor.* 13, 9, where Tert. writes immediately behind *Forculum et Carnam a foribus atque cardinibus: etiam apud Graecos Thyraeum Apollinem et Antelios daemonas*. For Apollo Θυραῖος (not mentioned in Nilsson, *Gesch. d. griech. Religion*) cf. Macrob. *Saturn.* 1, 9, 6 (quoting Nigidius Figulus); Schol. in Soph. *El.* 637 (ad προστατήριος): ὅτι πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν ἵδρυται. — **Antelios daemonas:** mentioned in Aeschyl. *Agam.* 519: δαίμονές τ' ἀντήλιοι; Soph. *Ai.* 805; Eurip. *Ion* 1550 and fr. 538. These demons are οἱ εἰς ἀνατολὴν ὁρῶντες (Schol. Aeschyl. *ad loc.*), οἱ πρὸ τῶν πυλῶν ἱδρυμένοι (Hesych., s.v. ἀντήλιοι). Cf. Fontaine, note on *cor.* 13, 9. — **Haec igitur ... Enoch:** cf. the note on 4, 2: *Antecesserat Enoch* (*enim hoc* Van der Nat with *A*) *praedicens omnia elementa, omnem mundi censum, quae caelo, quae mari, quae terra continentur, in idololatrian versuros daemonas et spiritus desertorum angelorum, ut pro deo adversus deum consecrarentur*. In this enumeration Tert. wants to say: 'Enoch also predicts the adoration of doors': hence *etiam ostia*. And as a confirmation he adds: 'we experience that also the doors of bath-houses are adored' (this statement is only found here).

7. **Si autem ... pertinebunt:** this is the conclusion of the passage which begins at *Certi enim esse debemus*. See our comment at 15, 3. The division of the paragraphs is faulty here. — **Hoc in loco:** here Tert. quotes an instance from his personal experience, a thing which he does more than once. Cf. the autoptic description of the vision of a Montanist sister in *an.* 9, 4 and the miracle described in the same treatise 51, 6 (with the remark: *de meo didici*); see also *spect.* 26. — The description of this punishment in a dream reminds us of the famous dream of St. Jerome, in which he was punished for being 'a Ciceronian, not a Christian'. The *castigatum graviter* may refer to a flagellation (as seems also to be the case in the dream of St. Jerome). Here a further motive is added for the mentioning of this dream, viz., that it was certainly 'shown to one man for the sake of all'. — **gaudiis publicis:** cf. Barnes, 248: 'The legend *gaudia publica* first appears on the imperial coinage in 207; but 207 is not the date of the *De idololatria*'. (Barnes defended then a very early datation of the present treatise; see, however, p. 13)'.

8. **factum:** a very brief formulation for *id quod factum erat*. — **disciplina:** here equivalent to 'behaviour', 'way of life'. — **familiae nostrae** does not refer

to the family, but to the servants of the *pater familias* (cf. *servi* a few lines earlier). For passages mentioning the presence of slaves in Christian families, see Schöllgen, 223. 242. 254. — **Igitur quod attineat ad honores regum:** after the excursion about the *numina* of doors Tert. returns to the proper subject-matter of this chapter: the honouring of the emperor. For the subjunctive *attineat*, cf. *an.* 38, 1: *quod faciat ad*, with the comment of Waszink who says: '*quod faciat ad = quod pertineat ad*' (433). Most times the indicative is used: *quod facit / attinet ad* (see *TLL*). The difference between the two is that by the subjunctive the expression gets a general nature: 'what*ever* pertains to ...'. (Cf. the *coniunctivus generalis* of the Greek). The subjunctive of *an.* 18, 2: *quod dictum sit* = ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν seems to have a different nature, being the equivalent of *ut ita dicam* (see Waszink, p. 257). — **intra limites disciplinae:** 'serve the emperor but do not transgress the rules of Christian life'. This rule is illustrated by two examples from the OT. For *disciplina*, see the note on 2, 4.

9. **illud exemplum trium fratrum:** if one compares the present text with that of the book Daniel, where the story is told, one observes that the latter, in the Vulgate version, speaks of *deos tuos non colimus, et statuam auream, quam erexisti, non adorabimus* (Dan. 3, 18; cf. 3, 12), whereas Tert. speaks of *honorem imaginis eius* (i.e. Nebuchadnezzar himself). In *scorp.* 8, 6 Tert. quotes the Bible text, and this quotation is revealing: *tunc manifestum fiet tibi, quod neque idolo tuo famulabimur nec imaginem tuam auream, quam statuisti, adorabimus*. Where the Vulgate has *deos tuos* (*non colimus*) Tert. writes *idolo tuo* (*neque ... famulabimur*). Now the original text has a plural form (Hebrew: *ĕlōhîm*, Aramaic: *ĕlāhîn*). This plural is used either for 'the God of Israel', in which case it should, of course, be rendered by the singular 'God', or it is not used for the God of Israel; in this case two possibilities of rendering are open: 'the god' or 'the gods' (we owe this information to dr. P.A.M. de Boer, emeritus professor of exegesis of the Old Testament at Leiden University). In the present case one finds, in the modern translations, either 'your gods' or 'your god'. Tert. has chosen the second rendering and understands 'your god' as applying to the 'image of gold' which Nebuchadnezzar had erected (Dan. 3, 1) and which must have been an image of himself. In Tert.'s view the image of a living being can be an *idolum* (see J. C. M. van Winden, '*Idolum* and *Idololatria* in Tertullian', *Vig. Chr.* 36 (1982), 105 seqq.). One finds the same interpretation in the commentary of A. Bentzen, in the series *Handbuch z. AT* (Tübingen, ²1952). See further L. Koep, 'Kaisertum und Christenbekenntnis im Widerspruch' (*JbAC* 4 (1961), 58-76) 62, n. 28, and the literature quoted there, especially H. Kruse, *Studien zur offiziellen Geltung des Kaiserbildes im römischen Reiche* (Paderborn 1934), 84-89. — **alias:** 'at all other occasions' (i.e. except the honouring of the image of the king). — **quicquid ... extollit:** *extollit* is the reading of *A. B*

and Gelenius, followed by Oehler and Reifferscheid, read *extollitur*. The latter reading can only be admitted, if *quicquid* is the equivalent of *si quid*: 'one has to do with idolatry, if something is extolled'. Otherwise it makes Tert. say nonsense, viz., *idololatria est id quod extollitur*. Böhm regards the reading of *A* as possible but thinks that the transitive verb has here a reflexive or mediopassive sense; this, however, results in a statement like *idololatria est quicquid se ... extollit*, which gives no sense either. We think that idolatry, i.e. the *latreia* of idols, is an activity which can very well be described by *extollere* in the active sense. The strange element in the description is *quicquid*. Perhaps this strange element becomes understandable, if one assumes that Tert. has transposed here a definition of *idolatres* (idolater) into that of idolatry. *Idolatres* would be very well described as: *quisquis ... extollit* (the object *aliquid* is omitted). To describe *idololatria* Tert. changed *quisquis* into *quicquid*. For the omission of the object, see 15, 8 (*coronaverat*; *praeceperat*).

10. **Sic et Daniel:** Daniel is mentioned for more than one reason by Tert. (cf. Daniélou, *Origines*, 259-60). — **tamdiu:** 'only as long as'; cf. 18, 1, where Tert. argues that Daniel would not have stood in office so long, if this office would have made him guilty of idolatry. — **illi:** sc. the three brothers just mentioned. — **Accendant igitur:** the final paragraph, which looks like a peroration, contains two arguments, or rather two sarcastic moves. The first runs as follows: 'Let those who are in the dark lighten their lamps every day.' Thereby they themselves testify that they are in the dark (*testimonium tenebrarum*). The sarcasm of Tert. lies, of course, in the fact that, in his opinion, this light does not enlighten the darkness in which the heathens are. 'And let those who are destined for the fire (of hell) themselves, affix to their door the laurels doomed presently to burn'. Therewith they give an omen of their future punishment (*suspicia poenarum*). 'But you, Christians, are a light of the world (Matth. 4, 15) and an evergreen tree. So you have nothing to do with that light that does not enlighten, and the laurel which is fading away. The second 'argument' has the nature of an adhortation: 'You have renounced the temples (this was implicated in renouncing the Satan at baptism), so do not make your door a temple <which you are doing by making it a place of false worship>'. Then Tert., who always is looking for a stronger formulation, continues: 'You have renounced the brothels (this was implicated in your renouncing 'the works of Satan' at baptism), so do not give your house the appearance of a new brothel <which you are doing by making it a place of adultery in a religious sense>'. — **illis competunt ... poenarum:** this sentence is in the same strain as the famous final chapter of *De spectaculis* (c. 30). Oehler also compares *cult. fem.* 2, 6, 1, where Tert. says about women who have the habit of *capillum croco vertere: male ac pessime sibi auspicantur flammeo capite*. This passage was evidently imitated by St. Jerome in his letter

to Laeta (quoted by Oehler): *nec capillum irrufes, et aliquid ei de gehennae ignibus auspiceris*. Cf. also Tert. *ux.* 1, 6, 3: *Romae quidem quae ignis illius inextinguibilis imaginem tractant, auspicia poenae suae cum ipso dracone curantes*.

11. **lumen mundi ... arbor virens semper:** the lamps at the doors remind Tert. of the well-known Gospel text: 'you are the light of the world'. The *arbor virens semper* is an image that has come up in Tert.'s mind because of the fading laurel wreaths. — **ne feceris templum ianuam tuam:** this is clearly an allusion to the adorning with wreaths of the doors of temples, a practice explicitly forbidden in *Cod. Justin.* 1, 11, 7 (Valentinianus and Marcianus): *absit a saeculo nostro ... redimiri sertis templorum impios postes.* — **si lupanaribus ... novi lupanaris:** cf. *apol.* 35, 4: *Cur die laeto non laureis postes obumbramus nec lucernis diem infringimus? Honesta res est, sollemnitate publica exigente, induere domui tuae habitum alicuius novi lupanaris*? Obviously Tert. deals here with the same question as in the present text of *idol.* In *ux.* 2, 6, 1 he sneers: *Et procedet* (sc. ancilla dei) *de ianua laureata et lucernata, ut de novo consistorio libidinum publicarum*? Tert. speaks of 'the appearance of a new brothel'. One could, of course, understand this 'new' in opposition to 'old' in time. This would imply that new brothels were decorated in this manner. But it seems better to understand it in the sense of 'a new kind of brothel', which agrees with the interpretation of this sentence given above. It is another case of Tert.'s sarcasm. As to the idea behind this passage—that of idolatry as spiritual fornication—, see *scorp.* 3, 4: *invitantur ad idola, ut et spiritu fornicarentur*.

Chs. 16-17, 1. *Participation in private festivities*

'There is no objection against visits at private and social festivities, like those of the assuming of the toga virilis, *of betrothals, of weddings and name-givings, although there is some breath of idolatry around them (§ 1). Here the reasons of our attendance are to be considered. Now these reasons are a vestment (*toga*), a marriage, etc., which are not condemned by any word of Holy Scripture. Thus as long as we are invited just for those reasons, our presence there is not objectionable. But if I am invited to participate in the sacrifice that takes place at that occasion, I am not allowed to go (§§ 2-5). [17] What else can slaves, freedmen and servants of magistrates do, who have to accompany their masters when they are sacrificing? But if they give assistance in the sacrifice, they are guilty of idolatry. According to this rule we can also be in the service of a magistrate just as the patriarch and other forefathers were in the service of idolatrous kings, without, however, passing the border of idolatry (§ 1).'*

Remarks

In the present section Tertullian deals with several kinds of social duties, which may be ranged under one rule (see *huius regulae* in 17, 1). In our view ch. 17, 1 belongs to ch. 16; Pamelius' division in chapters is misleading here.

First Tertullian discusses the question of whether a Christian is allowed to take part in family festivities. He is aware of the fact that these festivities involve idolatrous acts, viz., sacrifices. But, he says, as long as the Christian does not participate in that part of the feast, he is allowed to take part in it.

The cases of Christian slaves, freedmen and servants are adduced as *a confirmation* of the thesis defended in ch. 16: 'Moreover, how will slaves, etc., be able to function?' Just as this slave is allowed to accompany his master, also when he is sacrificing, a Christian is allowed to take part in a family festivity. *Sed si merum* ... 'but the slave is not allowed to assist in the sacrifice itself'. Thus to the slaves and the other Christians the same rule holds good: service is allowed, but idolatrous acts should be avoided. This is the rule referred to by Tertullian in the next sentence (*Huius regulae*). Here one has the example of those 'royal' slaves like Joseph and Daniel who served their kings, but without perpetrating idolatry.

1. **Circa officia vero:** in the case of festivals in the private sphere, Tert. makes a sharp distinction between the reason of the festivity itself and the accompanying religious acts, the sacrifices. If the proper object of the festivity is 'pure', a Christian is allowed to take part in it, notwithstanding the *flatus idololatriae* which is around it because of the sacrifice. — **togae purae:** this is a usual designation of the *toga virilis*. The term occurs for the first time in Cicero, *Ep. ad Att.* 6, 1, 12 and 7, 8, 5; also in Catullus 68, 15: *vestis ... pura*. The use of *purae* is not without purpose here (see the observation just made). — **nominalium:** this festival is identical with the *dies lustricus*, on which children received their name (girls on the eighth day, boys on the ninth). The name *nominalia* also occurs in Corp. Gloss. Lat. II: 134, 22 Goetz-Schoell with the translation ὀνοματοθεσία; cf. J. H. Waszink and S. Breemer, 'Fata Scribunda', *Mnem.* III, 13 (1947), 254-70, also in Waszink, *Opuscula selecta* (Leiden 1979), 238-54, especially p. 257, resp. 241. — **de flatu idololatriae:** see the note on 12, 5 *omnem afflatum eius* (sc. *idololatriae*).

2. **Eas mundas esse:** *eas* refers to *causae*, i.e. the reasons of the festivities (= *toga virilis* etc.), which are also the reasons for taking part in the festivities. These *causae*, in Tert.'s view, are the 'material causes' of the festivities: the toga, the ring, etc. In themselves they have nothing to do with idolatry. — **de alicuius idoli honore:** cf. 15, 1: *Si idoli honor est.* — **Nullum denique cultum:** Scripture is adduced as a decisive argument (hence *denique*).

As to the dress, it only forbids travesty; now the name of the *toga virilis* shows clearly that this is not the case here. Weddings and name-givings are not forbidden either. It should be noted that the Scripture text quoted (Deut. 22, 5) has nothing to do with idolatry. This passage is a remarkable instance of Tert.'s associative thinking. Deut. 22, 5 is also quoted in *spect.* 23, 6: *cum in lege praescribit maledictum esse qui muliebribus* (in CC I, p. 247, 22 erroneously *mulieribus*) *vestietur* (LXX στολὴν γυναικείαν, *Vetus Latina* (Lugd.) *stolam mulie<b>rem*, Vulg. *veste feminea*). The neuter plural used as a subst. is also found in Plin. *nat. hist.* 37, 17: *qui super cetera muliebria soccos induebat*; Paulus *dig.* 34, 2, 32, 4: *si qua alia muliebria apparuerint* (*TLL* VIII: 1569, 21-5). — **Toga ... etiam appellationis virilis est:** even (*etiam*) the name of the toga shows that it is worn by men only. Tert. points to the fact that the *toga pura* is also called *toga virilis*. *Appellationis virilis* is, of course, a genitive of quality.

3. **Sed his ... sacrificia:** this is an objection of the imaginary opponent, who figures so often in this treatise. It was already anticipated in the first sentence: *de flatu idololatriae, quae intervenit.* — **Sim vocatus ... quantum sibi libet:** in this paragraph Tert. discusses the case that he is invited without any danger for participation in the religious acts which accompany the festivities. The first sentence has the nature of a hypothetical period, of which the *apodosis* has been left out, because it is evident. 'Suppose, I am invited without any mentioning of the sacrifice, and the fulfilment of my duty takes place at pleasure, <then there is no objection>'. One could also put it in the following manner: the opponent said: 'But <do you realize that> these festivities do not go without sacrifices?' Tert. answers: '<Yes, but I start from the supposition> that I am invited without any mentioning etc.'. The words *Sim vocatus ... titulus officii* refer to the invitation, either written or spoken. In this invitation there should not be any indication that the sacrifice is the reason of the attendance (*titulus officii*). The words *et operae ... libet* refer to the actual presence at the festivity. This presence should not carry any religious obligation. It must be allowed to the Christian to behave there as he likes (*quantum sibi libet*). — **ad sacrificium:** this conjecture by Van der Nat is unavoidable. *A* has the impossible reading *ad sacrificiis*, *B* and Gel *in sacrificiis*; Rigaltius conjectures *adsacrificii* in one word with the following explication: 'Sim vocatus, inquit, dum officium meum aut opera mea non possit haberi pro adsacrificio, id est administratione seu participatione aut concessu sacrificii.' This conjecture is accepted by Oehler and regarded as very probable by Böhm, 147. However, there does not seem to exist a Latin substantive *adsacrificium* (cf. Max. Ihm s.v. (*TLL* II: 847, 30-4) who only quotes the present passage with a question mark). In support of this conjecture Oehler quotes the verbs *adinvenire* and *advivere* used by Tert.—which do

not prove anything in favour of the existence of a substantive—and two pseudo-substantives, viz., *adtradux* (*pat.* 5, 10: a similar haphazard conjecture by Rigaltius) and *admilitia* (not in *TLL*). The only possibility (but far from plausible) for retaining the reading of *A* is that the text of the invitation for the rendering of the service (*titulus officii*) could begin with or contain the words *ad sacrificii participationem*, and that only the first two of these words were used in every-day speech to indicate the text as a whole (as is nowadays usual for the quoting of papal bulls): *nec 'ad sacrificii' sit titulus officii*. But no traces of the use of such a *compendium* seem to be known. — **expunctio:** of this substantive only seven instances are mentioned in *TLL* V, 2: 1813, 13-23. It occurs three times in Tert.'s works (apart from the present passage in *ieiun.* 10, 2 and *praescr.* 10, 7); he is the first to use it. This is certainly not a Christianism, since the verb *expungere* is a technical term of book-keeping; see the note on 1, 1 (p. 81). *Operae meae expunctio*: 'the fulfilment of the service', i.e. 'my actual presence'. — **quantum sibi libet:** for this expression Oehler refers to *Herm.* 23, 22: *Fuerit licet materia quantum sibi libet vel potius Hermogeni* (instead of *libet* the mss. have *licet*, which was accepted by Waszink in his edition; but one should certainly accept Van der Vliet's conjecture *libet*, which was also translated by Waszink in his translation, p. 58: 'Matter may have existed as much as it likes—or rather as much as Hermogenes likes'). In the explanation given above the expression has been rendered by 'at pleasure'. The question is: at whose pleasure? In our opinion the answer must be: of the person who is speaking here; which means that *quantum sibi libet* is equivalent here to *quantum nobis libet*. Oehler and Thelwall, however, have a different opinion. Thelwall translates: 'and the discharge of my good offices is at the service <of my friends>'. Oehler paraphrases: *utatur ille opera mea et officio meo, quantum sibi libet*. Obviously he makes the heathen already the (psychological) subject of the words *et operae meae expunctio* by interpreting these words as the beginning of the *apodosis* of the hypothetical construction. ('Suppose I am invited, etc., let then the performance of my duties be at his pleasure.') However, in that case Tert. would assert that the condition for taking part in the festivity of a heathen is that he will take part 'in so far as the inviting heathen wishes that he takes part'. But Tert. cannot but assert that he will take part in it only in so far as he himself wishes to do so. (Oehler's misinterpretation is probably caused by the fact that he thinks that Tert. speaks here about slaves who are summoned to be present at the festivity. But the case of the slaves is not introduced until 17, 1, as was rightly noticed by Currey in his instructive note, p. 93 ff.) The expression *quantum sibi libet* seems to have been a standing expression felt as a whole in which the question to whom it referred is open; it could be rendered by 'at one's pleasure'. To determine whose pleasure is meant, one has to ask: who is the (psychological) subject of the sentence? Of whom is the author thinking? In theory there are two possibilities here: Tert. himself (the invited Christian) or the heathen who invites him. Our analysis given above leads to the conclusion that Tert. himself is meant.

4. **Utinam quantum sibi quidem:** 'Oh, if it were at our pleasure indeed, and it were possible for us not to see what we are forbidden to do'. Here Tert. extends, as it were, the 'at pleasure' from his own participation in the festivity to the festivity in its totality. He utters the wish that not only there would not be a need to take part in the forbidden part of the festivity but that there would not be a need of seeing it. This means that he wishes that this part did not exist at all.—Oehler, who did refer *quantum sibi libet* to the inviting heathen, must, of course, give a different explanation of the present sentence. After the paraphrase just quoted (*utatur ille opera mea et officio meo, quantum sibi libet*) he continues as follows: 'Mox voto dictum castigat. Utinam quantum sibi quidem, quasi diceret: utinam illud quod proxime dixi, quantum sibi quidem, disiungi queat ab officio operave mea, ut iam dominus ille gentilis ad eas sollemnitates neminem vocaret Christianum, nec videre possemus quod facere nobis nefas est'. To him Tert.'s wish would imply that the heathen's 'pleasure' had the consequence that he did not invite any Christian who, then, would not have to see what is forbidden to him. However, the words '*disiungi queat ab* officio operave mea' have no fundament in the text. Moreover, Oehler has to assume that, while the invited Christian is the subject of the first part of the first sentence (*sim vocatus ... expunctio*) and of the second part of the second sentence (*nec videre possemus ... nefas est*), the words *quantum sibi libet* refer to another subject, viz., the inviting heathen. (The above given interpretation shows that the reading of *A* gives a good sense and should be maintained. Böhm gives a faulty description of the situation. She considers the reading *licet*, which is no more than a printer's error in CC, to be correct and seems to think that *A* has *quidam* in the last sentence of 16, 3.) — **nec videre possemus:** one should notice that the negation belongs to *videre*. Tert. utters the wish that it would be possible *not to see* what is forbidden to the Christian. We prefer the reading of *A* (*possemus*), because Tert. utters a wish which can not be fulfilled. — **Sed quoniam ... officiosos habent:** because the Evil One has filled the whole world with idolatry, the Christians cannot avoid every contact with it. (He could also here (cf. 14, 5) have referred to St. Paul in his first letter to the Corinthians, 5, 10: 'Otherwise you had to leave this world'.) Hence they are allowed to take part in some activities of the heathens. The condition however is that these activities are a service to the (pagan) man, not to the idol. One should notice that *adesse in quibusdam* does not mean 'to be present at some actions' but 'to take part in some actions'. In other words, Tert. has in view the actions of the Christian at such a festivity. Those actions must be so that they do not make him a

servant (*officiosus*) of a pagan god (*aliquem officiosum habere* = 'to render somebody ready to serve'). — **malus:** for the various denominations of the devil cf. Bartelink, *Vig. Chr.* 19 (1965), 198-9, where further literature is quoted. — **Plane:** 'certainly', 'evidently', 'I will not go, if I am invited to a priestly activity and to a sacrifice', Tert. says, 'because this is serving the idols in its proper sense'. 'But', he adds, 'I shall also not contribute to it by advice or by financial support or otherwise'. — **consilio ... fungar:** the verb *fungi* has unusual objects here. This seems to have been caused by the previous *sacerdotium*. Tert. wants to say: *Plane non fungar sacerdotio, sed neque consilio*, etc. — **in eiusmodi:** sc. *re* or *casu*; see the note on 13, 1 *eiusmodi*.

5. **Si ... sacrificii:** Tert. formulates his conclusions in a summary.

17, 1. **Ceterum ... sed:** in the previous chapter Tert. spoke about the free presence of a Christian at a private festivity of a heathen who invited him. Now he comes to a case in which this presence is not free, viz., the case of a slave, freedman or servant who, because of his status, has to be close to his superior. How could this be allowed, if the presence discussed in ch. 16 is forbidden? Obviously Tert. assumes that everybody will agree that this presence is allowed. The first sentence may be interpreted in two ways: 1. '*Moreover*, how will slaves be able to function?' The case of the slaves is advanced as an additional argument. 2. '*Otherwise* (i.e. if what I said above is not true), how could the slaves function?' For *ceterum* = *alioquin* see the note at 14, 5. But here, too, the restriction of ch. 16 holds good; hence the following *sed*. Apparently Pamelius did not understand this, otherwise he would not have made a new chapter begin here. — **servi ... praesidibus:** the *domini* and *patroni* correspond to the *servi* and *liberti*, the *praesides* to the *officiales*. *Officiales* are those who fulfil an *officium*, in service of a *praeses*. *Officialis* is a late Latin word, occurring for the first time in Apuleius (*met.* 1, 25, 4), Tert. and Ulpian; it belongs to the legal idiom. As to Christian *officiales* at Carthage, see Schöllgen, 162 and 247 ss. One should observe that the *praesides*, who are opposed here to the *officiales* must not necessarily be the governors of provinces; we also find the *officialis* of an *aedilis* (Apul. *met.* 1, 25, 4) and *officiales iudicum* (*Cod. Theodos.* 8, 4, 25, 1, cf. *TLL* IX, 2: 512, 54-5). This statement is important for the interpretation of the *nomen praesidis* in 23, 2. — **liberti:** this conjecture by Iunius must be the correct reading, since it corresponds with *patronis*. Currey wants to retain the *liberi* of *A B* Gel, writing: 'But Dion. Hal. (II, 22) tells us that the priests were assisted by their children, if they had any, and if not, by the children of other families called *camilli*. Probably *liberi* refers to these'. It is, however, questionable whether this custom still existed in the time of Tertullian. — **merum:** the 'pure wine' which has to be used at sacrifices. — **immo si verbo:** even the

pronunciation of a word that belongs to the ritual, and which is for that reason necessary, is forbidden. — **minister ... idololatriae:** the use of the word *minister* in this context of people who are in a subordinate status is, of course, intentional. Instead of *minister domini vel patroni vel praesidis* (cf. the text of the first sentence of par. 1), they become *minister idololatriae*. — **Huius regulae ... apparuerunt:** after discussing the case of a free presence of a Christian at private pagan festivities, and the case of the forced presence of slaves and freedmen with their masters at such festivities, Tert. now passes on to the case of the voluntary service by Christians of pagan magistrates. — **secundum patriarchas et ceteros maiores:** obviously Tert. has in mind one of the patriarchs, viz., Joseph, and one of the great prophets, viz., Daniel. Hence the word *Hinc* in the next sentence. Joseph and Daniel are examples of men not only serving heathen magistrates but also functioning as magistrates themselves. This subject is going to be discussed in par. 2-3. — **usque ad finem idololatriae:** the image is that of two areas: one is pure, the other idolatrous. A Christian has to stay within the first area and must not pass the border of the second. — **apparuerunt:** Joseph and Daniel, however august, are still qualified as servants. The verb *apparere* means here: 'to appear as a servant, to attend, wait upon, serve'; for this sense of the verb see *TLL* II: 267, 62-268, 13; with a dative it is found for the first time in Calpurn. Piso *hist.* fr. 27, 2 and in several laws. In Tert. it occurs with a dative in *apol.* 13, 7: *haruspex mortuis apparet*; *spect.* 17, 5; *nat.* 2, 5, 17; *mon.*17, 3.

Chs. 17, 2-18. *Are Christians allowed to take posts of honour or power?*

'Here arises a question, which recently has become actual. If a Christian can keep himself free of idolatrous acts, is he then allowed to take a post of honour or power? The cases of Joseph and Daniel seem to suggest a positive answer (§ 2). Let us suppose that in a function of honour he can avoid every act contrary to Christian ethics, which is hardly credible (§ 3).

18. *But we will confine ourselves to the attire and pomp of these offices. There is a correspondence between one's dress and one's function. Among the Egyptians and Babylonians (Joseph and Daniel) the purple and gold ornaments were signs of dignity just as the* togae praetextae *etc. and the wreaths of provincial priests, but the situation of Joseph and Daniel was different (§ 1). In their case the purple was a sheer mark of honour, bestowed upon the confidents of the king. It was in no way connected with idolatrous acts; otherwise they would have refused it instantly. So the purple of Joseph and Daniel was a sign of distinction, not of dignity. It may be compared with the* toga *of boys and the* stola *of girls, which are also signs of distinction, not of power, of status, not of superstition (§§ 2-3a).*

But the purple and other signs of our dignitaries are soiled by the idolatry which is inherent in their dignities and powers. This is confirmed by the fact

that the same insignia are given to the idols; and rightly so, for the demons are 'the magistrates of this world' (§ 3b). Thus you are already soiled by the ornaments alone, even if you do not perform the idolatrous acts belonging to them (§ 4a).

As to your reference to the example of Joseph and Daniel, you should bear in mind that old and new are not always comparable. There is a great difference between their situation and yours (§ 4b). They were slaves, whereas you are slave of nobody, except Christ. You should follow the example given by your Lord. He was humble, unpretentious in dress, inglorious in countenance (§ 5). He did not exercise power even over his own people. He refused to become king. In this way he gave an example to his followers, turning them away from all pomp and splendour both of dignity and power (§ 6). In fact, more than everybody else the son of God would have made use of this pomp and magnificence, were it not that he regarded it as foreign to himself and his followers. And he did so because he regarded it as part of the pomp of the devil (§ 7). Now you have renounced the devil's pomp; if you nevertheless touch those things, you perpetrate idolatry.

Moreover the hostile behaviour of the magistrates towards God and his servants should warn you (§ 8).

But even your (high) birth and wealth are a hindrance in the fight against idolatry. There are, however, always means to avoid it, because, if other means fail, the way to martyrdom, which makes you a magistrate of heaven, is open (§ 9).'

Remarks

In 17, 2 Tert. brings up a new question: Is a Christian allowed to take a post of honour or power? Evidently the cases of Joseph and Daniel, who came already up for discussion in the previous section about the functioning of slaves, occasioned this question. Joseph and Daniel were on the one hand slaves or servants of their kings, but they functioned also as magistrates. Are Christians allowed to do so?

Tertullian's answer consists of four parts (the division of chapters is misleading again). 1) The Christian must avoid every idolatrous act which is normally connected with these functions of honour and power. Joseph and Daniel achieved this. Tertullian is ready to admit that this possibility exists, although he has his doubts. 2) The attire and pomp, however, belonging to those functions, make it for the Christian impossible to take those posts, for there is an intrinsic relationship between those ornaments and the idolatrous acts pertaining to those functions. The fact that the idols are adorned with the same insignia clearly shows the nature of the latter. In the case of Joseph and Daniel the insignia had an different status. 3) As to the comparison with

Joseph and Daniel, one should bear in mind that old and new (i.c. old and new covenant) are not always comparable. For the Christians Christ is the example, who refused all dignity and power, which he considered as pomp of the devil. You, Christian, have renounced that pomp. 4) The fact that the worldly powers are hostile to Christianity confirms his thesis.

The last paragraph is a kind of appendix, in which he says that not only high functions but also (high) birth and (great) possessions include the danger of idolatry, obviously through social contacts and duties. But, Tert. adds, there is always a way out.

2. **Hinc:** Tert. refers to a question which has been raised recently and which is closely connected with the previous one; but here the emphasis is laid upon the high function as such, not on its subordination to a pagan king. — **servus dei:** again an intentional use of this qualification of the Christian, on account of the context in which was spoken of servants of lords or magistrates. About the question whether a Christ could be a magistrate, cf. especially Schöllgen, 171-5, 182, 192, 247. — **dignitatis aut potestatis administrationem:** cf. in the same sentence *et dignitatem et potestatem administraverunt. Administrare* = 'to practise'. Joseph and Daniel combined *dignitas* and *potestas* (*et ... et*), but the two are discernible, as appears from *aut*. See also par. 3. — **secundum quod** = *sicut* (see Böhm, 150-1). For Tert.'s use of *quod* = (or almost =) *sicut*, cf. Waszink's note on *an.* 10, 6 (189-90). — **in ornamento et purpura:** cf. Dan. 5, 29: *tunc iubente rege indutus est Daniel purpura. Purpura* is a specification of *ornamentum*. See Gen. 41, 39 seqq., Dan. 2, 48 seqq.

3. **Cedamus itaque:** Tert. has to grant that for a Christian the exercise of such a function must be possible, since it has been achieved by Joseph and Daniel. Hence *itaque*. On the other hand, the verb *cedere* already indicates that Tert.'s feelings go in the opposite direction. Therefore the reading *cedamus* of *A* is to be preferred to the reading *credamus* of *B* and Gel. *Cedere* does not mean here 'to permit' but 'to concede', 'to grant (an actual fact)'. Hence it is constructed with an acc. c. inf., as in *an.* 24, 1: *oblivionis capacem animam non cedam* (sc. Platoni). — **in quoquo honore ... iam vero quae sunt potestatis:** a distinction is made here between the functions of *honor* and *potestas*. In the case of *potestas* Tert. is thinking of power in the domain of jurisdiction, whereas the term *honor* comprehends all other functions of the *honores*, among which the *aedilitates* have a prominent place. — **ut ... in solo honoris nomine incedat:** he may just bear the name of the office, but is not allowed to act as such. This prohibition is worked out in detail, in order to make it clear that this condition can hardly be fulfilled. — **neque ... accommodet:** he may, of course, not make a sacrifice himself; but neither is he allowed to make others sacrifice on his authority. Nevertheless sacrifices must

be made! — **non hostias locet:** sc. *emendas*. Currey notes: *locare* 'to put out the contract', *redimere* 'to take it up'. He then quotes 11, 6: *publicarum victimarum redemptor*. — **non curas templorum deleget:** he may, of course, not take care himself of these temples, but neither is he allowed to delegate this care to others. Nevertheless it must be done! — **non vectigalia ... procuret:** contributions had to be paid to a magistrate, to games, and to holy places: a source of income for keeping up the temple. — **non spectacula ... praesit:** he is not allowed to contribute in any way to spectacles, the main amusement of the people. In *spect.* Tert. has argued that the spectacles are forbidden for Christians. They belong to the *pompa diaboli*, they stem from the pagan religion, they are opposed to Christian ethics. A Christian magistrate would not be allowed to give these spectacles either at his own costs or at public expenses. Neither would he be allowed to preside them. — **nihil sollemne pronuntiet vel edicat:** the meaning of *sollemne* is 'a religious rite or formula' (cf. the next note). This is, by definition, an idolatrous act. Thus the Christian dignitary would not be allowed to pronounce it himself or publish it by proclamation. — **ne iuret quidem:** to swear = to invoke the gods, which means idolatry, because of the official formula. Cf. also the comm. on 23, 2. — **iam vero quae sunt potestatis:** here Tert. sums up what is forbidden to a Christian, who would have accepted a function with power of jurisdiction. He is not allowed to function as judge in a case of life or death, honour or dishonour; in a case of money it could be tolerated. — **neque iudicet ... torqueat:** as to the nature of these restrictions one should notice that they have no connections with idolatry. There is no idolatrous aspect in an action or legislation *de capite*, etc. The exercise of *potestas* seems to be forbidden for a Christian because of the precept of charity with which the magistrate may come into conflict. — **pudore:** *pudor* means here 'ignominy', cf. *apol.* 4, 9: *in pudoris notam capitis poena conversa est*: 'The penalty of death was changed into that of ignominy'. — **praedamnet:** Rigaltius observes: 'Damnat iudex, praedamnat legislator. Utroque abstineat Christianus, neque de capite (one should add *vel de pudore*) cuiusquam aut legem aut sententiam ferat'; Oehler and Currey agree with this interpretation. Although this is correct, the legislator is not the only instance who *praedamnat*; in 4, 3 (cf. the note) Enoch's swearing to the sinners is qualified as *praedamnare*; every authoritative text may contain a *praedamnatio*. See further on this verb the note on 4, 2 at the end. — **recludat:** as an equivalent of *claudere*, *includere*, this verb, which usually means 'to open', is only found in legal texts (cf. *OLD* s.v., 7). Tert. uses it only in the present passage. — **si haec credibile est fieri posse:** this addition, which seems to concern the restrictions with regard to both *honor* and *potestas*, shows that Tert. is highly sceptical about the possibility of realizing these conditions, which were postulated in the verb *Cedamus*. In fact these restrictions make the concession unreal. Ch. 18 will

give a positive argument for the incompatibility between these functions and Christian life.

1. **Iam vero:** as in 17, 3 *iam vero* indicates a continuation of the argument. Currey gives a different, adversative interpretation, paraphrasing the argument as follows: 'Suppose, for argument's sake, that a Christian magistrate could avoid all the duties, ordinary and extra-ordinary, which are the special functions of magistrates, *yet* an examination of the mere insignia of office will show them to be idolatrous, and therefore the office to be unlawful.' However, one should notice that in 17, 3 Tert.'s argument already tended in the direction of a negative answer, so that one could paraphrase also as follows: 'Let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that a Christian magistrate could avoid idolatrous acts in the exercise of his function <but this is, in fact, impossible>; now an examination of the mere insignia of office will show them to be idolatrous, etc.' — **de solo suggestu:** *suggestus* means 'pomp' here. The substantive is much used by Tert., with a number of different meanings, for which cf. A. Engelbrecht, *Wien. Stud.* 28 (1906), 50-58 and Waszink's note on *an.* 1, 1 (83). The *suggestus* is the only aspect of a high function which Tert. takes into consideration here. — **Proprius habitus ... condicione:** Tert. has stated that he will deal with the pomp and attire of the magistrates, obviously as a decisive argument against the permissibility of those functions for a Christian. Now it stands to reason that his opponent also here will refer to the examples of Joseph and Daniel. The present text should be understood as an anticipation of this objection. 'There is <, I admit,> an appropriate dressing for different occasions. This means that (*Igitur*) there is an agreement between the purple and gold of Joseph and Daniel on one hand and the insignia under discussion on the other hand. <So far I agree> but there is an essential difference between the two (*sed non eadem condicione*)'. The difference is, as will be made clear in 18, 2, that in the cases of Joseph and Daniel there was no connection with idolatry, whereas such a connection is to be stated in the case of the offices under discussion. — **ad honorem et dignitatem:** these substantives are frequently connected with each other since Cicero, *De lege agr.*, 1, 27; cf. *TLL* V, 1: 1139, 58-67. They have in the time of Tert. roughly the same meaning and are regularly opposed to *potestas* (the difference being that between magistrates *sine et cum imperio*). — **purpura illa et aurum cervicis ornamentum:** cf. 17, 2 and Dan. 5, 29: *Tunc iubente rege indutus est Daniel purpura et circumdata est torques aurea collo eius*. The combination of the purple and the golden necklace is only found in Scripture with regard to Daniel. About Joseph Gen. 41, 42 (Vulg.) says: *Tulit anulum de manu sua* (sc. Pharao) *et dedit in manu eius; vestivitque eum stola byssina et collo torquem auream circumposuit*. It is noteworthy that Tert. does not use the adjective *aureus*, as the Scripture texts have, but the substantive

aurum, to which *cervicis ornamentum* seems to be an apposition. — **dignitatis:** 'of dignity' (= honour) and nothing else. In 18, 3 Tert. will argue that this is not applicable to the Roman insignia. — **praetextae ... provincialium:** see Iunius' note: 'Praetextae magistratuum, trabeae deorum, regum sive imperatorum et augurum, palmatae triumphantium. Coronarum aurearum, quas sacerdotes provinciales gestabant, exempla habentur Antonini Elagabali et Aquileiensium apud Herodianum Libro V et VIII', quoted by Oehler. — **praetextae:** for the connection of the *toga praetexta* with idolatry Currey quotes a remarkable passage from Livy, viz., 10, 7, 9 seqq. — **trabeae:** this must refer to the *trabea* with purple and white stripes which was worn by consuls and knights in their *transvectio*; cf. Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsrecht* III 1, 513, E. Schuppe, art. 'Trabea', *RE* VI, 1860-2, Currey's note *ad loc.* (who mentions two other kinds of *trabea*, viz., that used for the gods and that used by augurs), and Friedländer's note on Iuv. *Sat.* 10, 35. Currey adds: 'The procession of knights started from the temple of Mars, and so was connected with idolworship'. — **palmatae:** this refers to the purple *tunica* and the *toga palmata* worn by the statue of Jupiter Capitolinus, and by the triumphator on the day of his triumph (Iuv. *Sat.* 10, 38 *in tunica Iovis*). For further details, see Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsrecht* I 3, 411 s.; Marquardt, *Privatleben*, 542 s.; Wissowa, *Rel.*, 127. The *toga palmata* is also mentioned in *cor.* 13, 1, which passage shows still other similarities with the present text. — **coronae aureae sacerdotum provincialium:** Rigaltius, followed by Currey, puts a comma after *sacerdotum*. Currey observes: 'There is no reason for limiting the crowns to *provincial* priests'. However, the parallel passage *cor.* 13, 1 shows this interpretation to be erroneous. Tert. says there, in a survey of several kinds of crowns: *sunt et provinciales aureae*. Fontaine refers in his note to Aug., *ep.* 138, 4, 19, where Augustine says that Apuleius has been *sacerdos provinciae*, so in the present passage *provincialium* must be connected with *sacerdotum*. — **non eadem condicione:** *eadem condicione* is opposed here to *eodem more*. As to the meaning of *condicio*, cf. *idol.* 1, 3: *Fraudis condicio ea est, opinor, si ...*; 1, 4: *cetera* (crimina) ... *in idololatria condicionem suam repraesentant*; *Marc.* 2, 22, 2: *longe diversas habendo causas ab idololatriae condicione. Condicio* denotes here 'the conditions that make a thing what it is', 'the essential element', 'the essence'. Hence one could even translate: 'but there is an essential difference'.

2. **Tantum enim honoris nomine:** the position of *tantum*, at the beginning of the sentence, is remarkable. *Honoris* is, as was stated above, the equivalent of *dignitatis* in the previous sentence. — **familiaritatem:** the equivalent of *amicitiam*. We may add that Tert. uses the substantive *familiaritas* particularly to denote the relation of a man to a king or to God or Christ; for instance, in *bapt.* 12, 8 he speaks about the *primae adlectionis et exinde*

individuae familiaritatis praerogativa of the apostles. Cf. further *res.* 18, 12: *Abraham, patrem fidei, divinae familiaritatis virum*. The word *familiaritas* has undoubtedly been chosen by Tert. because it is frequently used in connection with Daniel, who in Bel et Draco LXX (II, p. 936-7 ed. Rahlfs) is called (in the 'altera versio') συμβιωτὴς τοῦ βασιλέως (Vulg. Dan. 14, 1 *conviva regis*). Interesting in this context is the following sentence from *an.* 48, 4, where Tert. is discussing the connection between fasting and dreaming, and evidently already for some time has in mind Daniel 2, 16 seqq. Now in 48, 4 Tert. first observes that a connection between fasting and dreaming is also found in pagan religion (which for him, of course, is superstition): *Sic enim et daemonia expostulant eam a suis somniatoribus, ad lenocinium scilicet divinitatis, quia familiarem dei norunt, quia et Daniel rursus trium hebdomadum statione aruit victu*; it seems to be evident that the choice of the adjective *familiaris* has been evoked by the fact that Tert. is thinking of Daniel, the *familiaris* (συμβιωτής) *dei* (in his comm. on *an.* 48, 4 (p. 513) Waszink assumes that *familiaris* has a causative sense there; however, since such a sense of this adj. occurs nowhere else, it is preferable to interpret: 'that the *sobrietas* is *amica, percara deo*'). — **purpurati:** this word designs 'an official at a royal (esp. eastern) court' (*OLD* s.v.); it is rather frequent in this sense in Livy and Curtius. — **candidati:** in Tert.'s works this word is found ten times connected with a genitive, e.g. *orat.* 3, 3: *nos, angelorum, si meruerimus, candidati*; *Marc.* 2, 25, 5: *restitutionis candidatos* (*TLL* III: 238, 53-6); the earliest instances of this use are found in Val. Max., Sen. and Quintil. — **Danielem:** see the note on 15, 10. — **nec Belem nec draconem:** the story of the fraud of the priests of Bel which was revealed to the king by Daniel is told in the same chapter (LXX vss. 3-12; Vulg. 14, 2-22), that concerning the dragon in LXX vss. 23-42 (Vulg. 14, 22-41).

3. **Simplex igitur:** Tert. gives a forced extension to his argument as he likes to do so many times. He states: 'Thus that purple was something simple' (i.e. without any association of idolatry); and he goes on: 'it is not even a mark of dignity' (in the previous paragraph he has said that the purple and gold were *insignia divinitatis*; now he tries to make a stronger case by stating that the purple is not even that) 'but a sign of free citizenship among the barbarians'. 'For', he explains, 'in a certain sense Joseph who had been slave, and Daniel, who had become captive—and therewith also a slave (cf. Gaius, *Inst.*, 1, 3, 2)—obtained the citizenship of Babylon and Egypt by means of the dress of barbarian freedom'. Tert. makes this move in order to compare the ornaments of Joseph and Daniel with the Roman *toga puerilis praetexta* (for boys) and the *stola puerilis* (for girls) which are given as a sign of descent, not of power or honor, of status, and not of superstition. Thus there is no connection at all with idolatry and, in consequence, they are allowed for

Christians. — **nec iam dignitatis erat:** after *dignitatis* Hartel, 1, 51, wants to supply *sacerdotalis* (in thought, as it seems, not putting it in the text, since he writes 'erg. *sacerdotalis*'). But here *dignitatis* certainly has the same meaning as in par. 1, where it is used as synonymous to *honor*. — **qui per captivitatem statum verterat:** lit. 'who through captivity had changed his status', i.e. 'who had fallen into a lower status through captivity'. — **puerilis praetexta ... et puerilis stola** seems to be the correct reading (defended by Heinrich Gomperz, 22). The first *puerilis* is found in *A* alone (*pueris B* Gel), the second in *A B* (*puellis* Gel). *Puerilis praetexta* as the ordinary vestment of a boy is frequently mentioned, e.g. Tac. *ann.* 1, 3, 2: *necdum posita puerili praetexta*. The *puerilis stola* must be the vestment of a girl; on *stola* cf. *Dig.* 34, 2, 23: (vestimenta) *muliebria ... veluti stolae, pallia, tunicae*, etc. The use of *puerilis* with the meaning 'belonging to a girl' is extremely rare, as is formulated in the *OLD*: 'never or at least very rarely of a girl'; a doubtful case is Apul. *met.* 3, 20: *mihi ... Fotis puerile obtulit corollarium*'; further Martial. 9, 67, 3 (an unclear case) is quoted. We may add with Böhm, 154, n. 3, Ovid *met.* 5, 400, where it is said of Proserpine: *tantaque simplicitas puerilibus adfuit annis*, though the more general meaning 'childish' is also possible there. — **nativitatis insignia:** cf. *apol.* 6, 2: *honestorum natalium insignia*. — **nativitatis ... generis ... ordinis:** terms for a social status. — **Ceterum:** in contradiction to the Egyptian and Babylonian situation, the Roman purple and other insignia have a strong connection with idolatry. Thus to accept those dignities means to be contaminated with idolatry. This is confirmed by the fact that the idols themselves are adorned with the same insignia. (*Cum praeterea* introduces a second argument; Tert. occasionally calls such an argument *secundo gradu*, e.g. *an.* 24, 4: *Secundo gradu opponam*; cf. Waszink's note *ad loc.*, p. 310). Then Tert. adds: this is done rightly (*merito*), for the demons (to which the idols belong) are the magistrates of this world. He omits a necessary sentence: 'Thus the high dignitaries and the demons are colleagues, for they are both magistrates, and so they belong to one and the same *collegium*, and for that reason they wear *unius collegii insignia*'. — **dignitatum et potestatum:** for this differentiation, cf. the note on par. 1 *honorem et dignitatem*. — **insertae:** Hartel's conjecture *inserta* is wrong. Tert. is speaking about the purple and the further *insignia dignitatum et potestatum* which are dedicated from the beginning to the idolatry which is involved in (*insertae* with dat.) those high functions, and thus they have *profanationis suae maculam*. — **profanationis:** this substantive is omitted in the *OLD*; Lewis and Short only quote the present passage. The *insignia* are said to be 'dedicated to idolatry' and for that reason they have 'the stain of their *profanatio*': thus the *profanatio* is caused by the dedication to the idols. Now *profanare* has, apart from the meaning 'to render profane' also that of 'to bring to a god before the temple', 'to dedicate'. So *profanatio* means here 'dedication (viz., to a pagan god)', and it belongs to the domain of idolatry. — **cum praeterea:** Böhm, 155, follows Löfstedt, *Verm. Stud.*, 162 seq., who thinks that here an evolution in the meaning of *praeterea* from 'moreover' to 'above all' (= *praesertim*) becomes visible: *cum praeterea* would mean 'above all because' (one should note the sequence: in the translation *cum* comes after *praeterea*). We think that Tert. introduces here a further argument (see above) which is not put 'above all others' (Löfstedt's statement may have been caused by the fact that *cum praesertim* is found throughout Latin texts with *cum* at the second place ('especially because')). — **praetextae et trabeae:** cf. the note on par. 1. — **lati clavi:** all editions have *laticlavi*, but Hübner in *TLL* VII, 2: 1005, 67 rightly observes that we must read *lati clavi*, since Tert. is speaking of the well-known adornment of the tunica of Roman senators and knights, on which cf. *TLL* III: 1330, 44 seqq. and Hula, art. 'Clavus', *RE* IV: 4-9. The adj. *laticlavus* used as a subst. is found in *Cod. Theod.* 6, 4, 17, 1: *dedecus videtur mulieres ad laticlavum atque insignia procedere* (*TLL* VII, 2: 1005, 62-4). — **fasces ... et virgae:** the well-known attributes of the lictors. — **daemonia magistratus sunt huius saeculi:** this statement was probably caused by the designation of the devil as ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου in Joh. 12, 31 and 16, 11 (cf. W. Bauer on 12, 31 in *HdbNT*, 6, p. 163).

4. **Quid ... administres?:** 'If there is such a close connection between that pomp and idolatry, what is then the point in wearing these insignia, without explicitly offering sacrifices, etc.? In this way one does not avoid idolatry, since merely to wear those dresses means to be idolatrous, for *nemo inmundis mundus videri potest*'. Tert. illustrates this with the example of dirty clothes. 'If one puts on a tunic which is dirty, it may perhaps be that this dress is not soiled through you, but it is impossible that the dirty clothes keep you clean'. This illustration is remarkable. Tert. wants to show that the dress of the high functions necessarily soils the person who wears it. In the example of the dirty tunic this would mean: 'you cannot wear a dirty tunic without becoming dirty yourself'. However, Tert. states: *sed tu per illam mundus esse non poteris*. This seems to mean: 'the dirty tunic does not make one clean'. This meaning is also suggested by the context: *poterit illa non inquinari per te ~ tu mundus esse non poteris per illam*. If this is the correct interpretation, it has a consequence for the previous sentence: *Nemo inmundis mundus videri potest*. If *per illam* is not the equivalent of *in illa*, in other words, if *per illam* has a causative meaning, this may apply also to *inmundis* ('Nobody can be seen as pure *through* impure things'). In this case there is no reason to follow Rigaltius, who conjectured *in in*mundis (haplology), which is in itself a very attractive conjecture. — **administres:** Tert. does not say '*opera facere*' but '*opera administrare*', because he thinks of the *opera* of high dignitaries, who have to 'administrate'. — **immundis mundus:** for the word-play Böhm, 155, refers

to *cult. fem.* 1, 4, 2: *cultum dicimus, quem mundum muliebrem vocant, ornatum, quem immundum muliebrem convenit dici.* — **videri:** h.l. seems to be an equivalent of *esse* ('to be seen as ...'). — **Iam nunc:** the argument of Tert.'s imaginary opponent was based on the examples of Joseph and Daniel. Until now Tert. has accepted these examples as an argument. Now he states that this is not always a valid argument (therewith *iam nunc* receives an almost adversative sense). 'There is a difference between the old and the new, the crude and the perfect, the initial and the fully developed, the servile and the free.' By these opposites Tert. wants to describe the differences between Old and New Testament, the latter being the fulfilling of the first; the New Testament is freedom through the liberating deeds of Christ. That means that Joseph and Daniel were still slaves, 'You, Christian, are not, unless you want to say that you are 'a slave of Christ',—but Christ has also liberated you from the captivity of the world. Therefore, you should behave in accordance with the example given by the Lord'. Thus the essence of Tert.'s argument in this paragraph is this: the example of Christ who was humble (without *honour*) and did not exercise *power* forbids the Christian to accept functions of *honour* and *power*. One should notice that this argument would be valid, even if honour and power had nothing to do with idolatry.

5. **etiam condicione servi erant:** *condicio* is a law-term, cf. Gaius, *Inst.* 1, 3, 5: *in servorum condicione nulla differentia est.* — **tu vero nullius servus ... liberavit:** the Christian is the slave of nobody (= of no human being); in so far as he is still a slave, he is a slave of Christ only, who has liberated him from the captivity of the world. In this context we should first of all notice the (faulty) etymology of *servus* found in Gaius, *inst.* 1, 3, 3: *Servi autem ex eo appellati sunt, quod imperatores captivos vendere iubent ac per hoc servare nec occidere solent.* Thus the Christians are free, because Christ has liberated them from the *captivity* of the world (the captivity being regarded as the origin of slavery). However, they remain slaves of Christ, because every slave has a *dominus*, and the Christians venerate *Dominum Iesum Christum* (Tert. plays with the two meanings of d(D)ominus). — **in quantum:** the expression *in quantum* (... *in tantum*) is found for the first time in Tacitus; Tert. uses it in *an.* 7, 4. — **ex forma dominica:** 'in accordance with the norm established by the Lord'; cf. 13, 6: *da formam.* — **in humilitate ... incessit:** for this use of *incedere* (almost as a copulative verb), see the note on 1, 2. For *humilitate* cf. Philipp. 2, 8: *humiliavit semet ipsum factus oboediens usque ad mortem* (Vulg.). — **vestitu incultus:** this is concluded from a word of Christ (Matth. 11, 8; Luke 7, 25), which does not deal with himself but with John the Baptist. — **vultu denique et aspectu inglorius:** this statement is based on two sentences in Isaiah, viz., 52, 14 (LXX: ὃν τρόπον ἐκστήσονται ἐπὶ σὲ πολλοί — οὕτως ἀδοξήσει ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπων τὸ εἶδός σου καὶ ἡ δόξα σου ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, Vulg.: *sicut*

obstipuerunt super te multi, sic inglorius erit inter viros aspectus eius, et forma eius inter filios hominum) and 53, 2 (LXX: οὐκ ἔστιν εἶδος αὐτῷ οὐδὲ δόξα· καὶ εἴδομεν αὐτόν, καὶ οὐκ εἶχεν εἶδος οὐδὲ κάλλος, Vulg.: *non est species ei neque decor et vidimus eum et non erat aspectus*). In *TLL* s.v. *inglorius* Is. 52, 14 is connected (VII, 1: 1555, 70) with *Marc.* 3, 17, 2: *Si inglorius, si ignobilis, si inhonorabilis, meus erit Christus*, and the present passage (ib. 1556, 36-8) with ib. 53, 2. Further passages to be quoted in this context are *Marc.* 3, 7, 2, *Iud.* 14, 2, *Prax.* 11, 8 (all three quoting Is. 53, 2). Cf. on this subject the monograph by J. Kollwitz, *Das Christusbild des dritten Jahrhunderts* (Münster i.W. 1953); cf. also W. J. A. Visser, *Die Entwicklung des Christusbildes* (Bonn 1934).

6. **Si potestatis ... functus est:** the *sordidum ministerium* is, of course, the washing of the feet of the apostles at the last supper. From this gesture Tert. concludes that Christ did not exercise power, not even over his followers. How could these followers be allowed to exercise power? Perhaps Tert. is also thinking of Luke 22, 27, where Jesus says: ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν εἰμι ὡς ὁ διακονῶν. — **si regem ... refugit:** Tert. combines John 18, 36-7, where Christ before Pilatus declares that he is king but that his kingdom is not of this world (*conscius sui regni*) with John 6, 15, where Christ, aware that the enthusiast masses would come and seize him to proclaim him king, withdrew to the hills by himself. — **dedit formam:** cf. par. 5: *ex forma dominica* and 13, 6: *Da formam, in qua velis agi tecum: forma* means *regula, norma.* — **dirigendo omni fastigio et suggestu:** this passage has given rise to a number of conjectures all of which are superfluous, since *dirigere* here clearly means, as is formulated in *TLL* VI: 1237, 38: 'i.q. *ad rectam normam accommodare, revocare*' (a meaning probably common in the idiom of lawyers, cf. ib. 1239, 45-56). The relevant passages are mentioned ib. 1237,58 - 1238,15; in Tert.'s works this meaning is fairly frequent; it occurs three times in the well-known first chapter of his treatise *De virginibus velandis*, where the *nova disciplina* is described (one should bear in mind that the text under discussion here is speaking about that *nova disciplina* of the Christians in comparison with the old one, under which Joseph and Daniel lived): *ut ... paulatim dirigeretur et ordinaretur et ad perfectum perduceretur disciplina a ... spiritu sancto; est paracleti administratio ... quod disciplina dirigitur...; is* (sc. fructus) *rudis* (cf. *rudia* in *idol.* 18, 4) *... et informis paulatim aetatem suam dirigens eruditur in mansuetudinem saporis*; further, cf. *resurr.* 2, 1: *Christo ... servabatur ... dubitata dirigere.* In the next part of the article in *TLL* (p. 1238, 16-32) with the title 'i.q. *stabilire, confirmare*', five passages from Tert. are quoted. Here the meaning is very near to *corrigere*, for which six passages are cited (ib. 1237,80 - 1238,1; no passages from Tert.). Although the conjectures made instead of *dirigendo* are thus shown to be unnecessary, we shall discuss them

briefly here. Clearly impossible are Mercerus' *de reiciendo* and the *deiciendo* or *derogando* supposed by Reifferscheid. Iunius reads *derigendo* which he explains as *deponendo* or *destituendo*. Concerning Rigaltius Currey writes: 'Rigalt says that *rigeo* is applied to the stiffness of gold and ornaments; *dirigere* (from *dirigeo*) or *derigere* may mean, 'to dissolve that stiffness'; *dirigendo omni fastigio ac suggestu*, 'for the dissipation of all pride and grandeur'.' On this Currey observes: 'But Rigalt gives no example of this usage of *dirigere*, nor does he account for such a construction of the gerund of a neuter verb'. Oehler reads *derigendo*; he translates the verb *derigere* by 'to be cold, without feeling towards something' and supposes *fastigio* and *suggestu* to be datives, thus translating: 'being without feeling towards pride and pomp'. Against Oehler Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 96, rightly observes that in Tert. the dative of the fourth declension always ends in *-ui*. Hoppe accepts *dirigendo* but takes *fastigio* and *suggestu* to be separate ablatives, observing: 'Wenn man jedoch, die Praeposition *de* betonend, als Bedeutung 'ablenken' annimmt, erklärt sich dieser' (viz., the separate ablative). Apparently Hoppe's interpretation is: 'leading away from pride and pomp'. Currey rightly takes *dirigere* to mean 'measure', 'adapt to a rule', 'bring to a level'. — **quam ... quam** = *tam ... quam*; cf. the note on 4, 4.

7. **Quis enim:** the argument in this paragraph runs as follows: 'If this pomp were something desirable, it would have been appropriate to Christ. But obviously Christ did not want it for himself. And he did not want it, because he regarded it as not belonging to him, and herewith—since things belong either to God (Christ) or to the devil—as part of the pomp of the devil. Now it is this very pomp of the devil which is abjured in baptism. And therewith you have abjured also these functions of honour and power, which are in fact idolatry'. In the introductory note of par. 5 we observed that the reference to the example of Christ, who refused honour and power, was an argument that as such has nothing to do with idolatry. In the present paragraph, however, Tert. argues that not to follow the example of Christ means idolatry. Was our observation incorrect? We think it was not. The explanation lies in the fact that in the present text idolatry is taken in the larger sense of 'anything not belonging to God (Christ)', just as in the first chapter of *idol.* Tert. states that every sin is idolatry, because whatever is not given to God is given to the devil. In our observation idolatry was meant in the stricter sense of actions directed explicitly to the idols (demons). Not to follow Christ in his humility and powerlessness is idolatry in the second sense, not in the first. — **usus fuisset:** this abundant form of the pluperfect seems to be the result of a tendency to elucidation in popular speech, as is stated by Böhm, 158; she refers to Plautus *Poen.* 40 *oblitus fui* (alongside *oblitus sum* ib. 118) and Tert. *Marc.* 4, 23, 4: *si non ... in credulos semper fuisset expertus.* From the literature quoted ib.

n. 3, we mention Hoppe, *Synt.*, 60; Löfstedt, *Per.*, 153 seqq.; Salonius, *Vitae Patr.*, 291; Schrijn.-Mohrm., *Cypr.*, 2, 35 seqq. A similarly abundant form of the future, as in *an.* 1, 1 *videbor dimicaturus* seems to be peculiar to Tert., cf. Waszink's note (p. 83). — **quanti** = *quot*; cf. 8, 4: *quot parietes ... insulae quantae?*; 6, 2: *qui tantos efficis.* The rendering 'so great' is impossible, since the *fasces* had a fixed measure. — **quam noluit ... deputavit:** Tert. enlarges his argumentation in short paratactic sentences, which have a causal nature in themselves: 'He did not want it, *because* he rejected it; he rejected it, *because* he condemned it; he condemned it, *because* he regarded it as belonging to the *pompa diaboli*.' — **pompa diaboli:** cf. the note on 10, 4. — **possent:** Wissowa conjectures *possunt*, obviously in view of the following *dei non sunt*; however, the reading *possent* of *A* should be maintained, because the irrealis can be continued until the relative clause: *non enim damnasset, nisi non sua <essent>; alterius autem esse non possent, nisi diaboli <essent>, quae dei non sunt.*

8. **Vel hoc:** Tert. adds still another argument why the functions of power and honour of this world should be refused by the Christians. Not without reason *potestates* stands in front here, because those who have power decide to punish the Christians: *per illas* (sc. potestates) *... supplicia consulta sunt.* — **per illas ... ignorantur:** Latinius, followed by Iunius, reads *irrogantur.* Rigaltius rightly defends the *lectio tradita.* For the sake of clearness we give Currey's paraphrase: 'It is owing to the powers of the world that punishments are devised against the Christians; it is owing to them that the penalties decreed by God against the impious are unknown (because their persecutions prevent the spread of Christianity, which reveals these penalties)'. Of course, Tert. is thinking of punishments in the here-after (cf. e.g. *an.* 27).

9. The first sentence is again the formulation of an objection that could be made by the opponent: 'But, then, both high birth and property (*substantia*) hinder us from avoiding idolatry'. To say it in Thelwall's words (p. 170, n. 2): 'From your birth and means, you will be expected to fill offices which are in some way connected with idolatry'. Tert. answers, radically as always: 'We can always avoid it, because in the end there always remains the way of martyrdom'. The correct interpretation of this sentence was first given by De la Cerda, whose words are quoted by Oehler and may be repeated here: 'Non deerunt remedia in ecclesia et apud Christianos contra hoc malum. Sed esto: nullum sit remedium, ut aliter vitam agas, nisi cum his insignibus idololatricis, certo tibi deesse non potest, quo in caelis regnaturus es feliciore multo purpura et magistratu'. And he adds: 'Puto indicari martyrium q.d. Remedio passionis pro Christo obitae habebis in caelis purpuram martyris, cui magistratus terrenus nullus comparandus'. — **magistratus ... in caelis:** for this

idea Thelwall refers to Matth. 19, 28: *sedebitis et vos super sedes duodecim, iudicantes duodecim tribus Israel* and Luke 22, 30 (parallel to the Matthew text); 1 Cor. 6, 2: *An nescitis quoniam sancti de hoc mundo iudicabunt?*; Apoc. 3, 21: *Qui vicerit, dabo ei sedere mecum in throno meo* (cf. ib. 2, 26-7). As to the form of the quotation, cf. the passages collected by Rambaux, 146, n. 1, especially *apol.* 1, 2: *Scit* (sc. veritas) *se peregrinam in terris agere ... dignitatem in caelis habere.*

Ch. 19. *The Christian and the military service*

'It might seem that herewith also a decision has been given about the compatibility of Christianity and the higher military ranks.

But now the question is raised whether being a Christian is compatible with being a soldier at all, even if it concerns the lower ranks, who do not run the risk of being obliged to sacrifice or to pass capital sentences (§ 1).

The answer is in the negative: divine oath and human oath do not go together; one soul cannot serve both God and Caesar.

Biblical examples seem to indicate that the Christians are allowed to wage war (§ 2). But how will they be allowed to do so, how will they even be allowed to do military service in peace without the sword, which the Lord has taken away? It is true, the soldiers who came to John the Baptist received from him a rule of life and the centurio came to faith <and obviously remained a soldier>; but in Peter all later soldiers were disarmed by Christ. The military dress belongs to actions forbidden to a Christian and is, therefore, forbidden itself (§ 3).

Remarks

a. *The meaning of the text of 19, 1.* The two first sentences of this chapter contain various elements which admit various interpretations. Hence the diversity of opinions about this chapter among modern authors.
1. de militia ... quae inter dignitatem et potestatem est. The relative clause may have an explicative or a restrictive nature. In the first supposition Tertullian says that the military service *in its totality* is something *inter dignitatem et potestatem*. In the second he points to *a part* of the militia, namely that *inter dignitatem et potestatem* (the higher ranks). W. Rordorf ('Tertullians Beurteilung des Soldatenstandes', *Vig. Chr.* 23, 1969, 109) seems to adhere to the first interpretation. According to him, Tertullian states here that the previous chapters implicitly contain his opinion with regard to the military service, *at least* with regard to the higher ranks. This 'at least' seems to imply that *also* the lower ranks are comprehended in the formula *inter dignitatem et potestatem*. His observation in note 4, p. 108, with regard to the construction of the sentence points into the same direction. With R. Braun

('Chronologia Tertullianea. Le *De carne Christi* et le *De idololatria*', *Annales de la Faculté des Lettres et Sciences humaines de Nice* n° 21, 1974, 279) we think that Tertullian speaks of a part of the army, viz., the higher ranks and so we prefer to give to the relative clause a restrictive nature.
2. inter dignitatem et potestatem. Here again two possibilities exist: does Tertullian speak of the *militia* as something *between* dignity and power or as something *belonging to the domain of* 'dignity and power'? Rordorf adheres to the first opinion (''eine Mittelstellung zwischen Würde und Amtsgewalt'' p. 109, cf. the translation on p. 107). We think that Scaliger was right when he wrote *intra* in the margin of the edition of Iunius as an equivalent of *inter*. Tertullian speaks here of that part of the army, which is *within the domain of dignity and power*, i.e. the higher ranks. So Braun, *l.c.* 279.
3. At nunc de isto quaeritur. Here the adjunct *nunc* admits two interpretations. It may point to the inner structure of the treatise ('now' = 'at this point of the treatise') or to the time in which Tertullian wrote the work ('now' = 'in these days'); Rordorf advocates the second explanation ('gegenwärtig', p. 107; 118; 119 n. 35; 120). In his view this *nunc* refers to a political situation which lies some years before the time in which Tertullian wrote *De corona* (p. 118, cf. 119 n. 35). In the time of *De idol.* ''the question is raised'' whether a Christian is allowed to be a military man at all. Tertullian flatly says 'no'. Some years later, when he writes *De corona* (see below) he cannot maintain this intolerant standpoint any more, because he had to face the undeniable fact that Christians were serving in the army in great numbers. This change was caused by the militarizing of the Roman State in the early 3rd century. Soldiers were assumed in civil services in large numbers. These functions were attractive to Christians, too, particularly since there was no danger that they came in a situation which was forbidden to them, viz., war with the necessity to kill people.—We would like to draw attention to the fact that this interesting explanation of the difference between *idol.* and *cor.* does not oblige us to follow the author in his interpretation of *nunc*. In other words, one may follow the author in that explanation and nevertheless interpret *nunc* as 'at this point in the treatise'. Also elsewhere *nunc* has this meaning; e.g. *Marc.* 3, 18, 1: (*praedicatione crucis*) *de qua nunc maxime quaeritur*; *Prax.* 8, 2: *iam nunc quaeritur quis quomodo utatur aliqua re et vocabulo eius.*

b. *The text of 19, 2^b (Et virgam ... ludere).* In 19, 2^a Tert. stated that military service, even that of the common soldier, is incompatible with the Christian belief: *non convenit*. The structure of the rest of this chapter is as follows: 19, 2^b contains an objection against this thesis, put in the mouth of an imaginary opponent who refers to examples from the OT which point in another direction; in 19, 3 Tert. answers this objection.

Now the answer of Tert. is clear, but the objection in 19, 2^b is far from clear. First there is uncertainty with regard to the reading. The oldest testimony, the Mesnart edition of 1545 (the *Agobardinus* ends at 18, 9), reads as follows: Et virgam porta*bit* Moyses, fibulam et Aaron, cinge*tur* loro et Ioannes, agmen age*t* et Iesus Nave, bella*vit* et populus, si placet ludere. The second edition, viz., that of Gelenius of 1550, reads: Et virgam porta*vit* Moyses, fibulam et Aaron, cingi*tur* loro et Ioannes, agmen agi*t* et Iesus Nave, bella*vit* et populus, si placet ludere.

The reading of Mesnart has an irregularity in the perfect tense of bella*vit* after three future tenses. In Gelenius' reading the succession of perfect, present, present, perfect is remarkable. As to the latter observation, such a succession is not unknown in Tertullian's work (cf. 12, 3; *Herm.* 26, 1; *cor.* 11, 4; *nat.* 2, 8, 13 and Löfstedt, *Krit. Apol.*, 102-5 and *Z. Spr. Tert.*, 23 seqq. Dr. J. den Boeft, with whom we discussed the present matter, drew our attention to these parallels and this literature). On the other hand, the irregularity in Mesnart cannot be maintained. If the three future tenses are correct, there must be a mistake in bella*vit* (an interchange of b and v is not unusual, cf. *ad* 1, 2 *negabit*). Thus one should read either *portabit, cingetur, aget, bellabit* or *portavit, cingitur, agit, bellavit.*

Obviously the reading of Mesnart is the *lectio difficilior*, and should be maintained, if possible (with the 'correction' bella*bit*). One has to assume, then, that Tertullian refers to precedents from the past but that he does not mention those facts from the past as things that have taken place (*virgam portavit Moyses*), but lets them function as arguments as follows: "Moyses *will* carry a rod, Aaron a buckle etc." (Tert. uses this figure of style also in *cor.* 8, 4: habe*bit* etiam paenulam Paulus). This argumentation asks for a consequence like this: "Moses *will* carry a rod, etc., *will the Christian not do the same?*", in other words, "if Moses will carry a rod, ... how will the Christian not do the same?" Such an argument may be discovered in the present text, if one interprets *bellabit et populus* as a consequence: "Moses will carry a rod, etc., — *then* the people (= the Christians) will wage war". There are three objections against this interpretation: 1) the words *bellabit et populus* seem to be on a level with the preceding statements (one should notice the repeated *et* which suggests parallelism: *Et* ... Moyses, *et* Aaron, *et* Iohannes, *et* Iesus Nave, *et* populus). 2) *populus* is a usual term for the Jewish people and it is obvious here after *agmen aget Iesus Nave*; but is it used already in this time for the Christian people? 3) how to explain *si placet ludere?*; unless one assumes that Tert. qualifies the whole argument as a joke, which seems to be incorrect. We think, therefore, that the reading of Mesnart cannot be maintained. The wrong element in the anomaly is not in *bellavit* but in *portabit*, which has come instead of *portavit* and has caused the future tense of the following two verbs.

Then the argument runs as follows: "Moses carried a rod, Aaron a buckle, John girded himself with a belt, Jesus Nave led an army and the people waged war, if I may play with the matter". Obviously the people is the Jewish people. But now there exists a discrepancy between the objection and Tertullian's answer: "How will they (the people) wage war?", etc., where the subject is, of course, the *Christian* (people). Moreover, also here Tert. would speak of a *populus Christianus* (subject of *bellabit*), which is improbable. And also here *si placet ludere* remains problematic.

All problems disappear, if one reads *Petrus* instead of *populus* with Van der Vliet, Birt and Dekkers (see second apparatus in CC). Then the text runs as follows. First Tertullian lets the opponent refer to precedents in the OT: "Moses carried a rod, Aaron wore a buckle, John girded himself with a belt, Jesus Nave led an army"; here Tertullian himself comes in adding "and Peter waged war, if I may permit myself a joke". Tertullian points to Peter cutting off Malchus' ear in the garden of Gethsemane; the joke is of course in qualifying this deed as waging war. (Now the joke is in the immediately preceding element of the sentence just as in *an.* 32, 2; cf. comm. of Waszink *ad loc.*, p. 386). And Tertullian answers: "But how will he wage war any more ..., without the sword that the Lord has taken away?" *Just like Peter, the Christian is not allowed* to be a warrior any more.—The reading *populus* may have been caused by a scribe who read *petrus* in his manuscript as an abbreviation of *populus* (pl̃us); after *agmen agit et Iesus Nave* the statement *populus bellavit* is something to be expected.

c. *The argument of ch. 19.* One should consider the argument of ch. 19 in connection with that of 17, 2-18, 9. The words *in isto capitulo* at the beginning of ch. 19 are a clear indication of this. From the previous argument Tertullian concludes that the higher ranks in the army are forbidden for Christians. But what about the lower ranks of the common soldiers? Are they also (*etiam*) forbidden? The answer seems to be 'no', since for the common soldier there is no need of sacrificing or passing capital sentences. One should notice that this observation agrees with that in ch. 17, 3 regarding the higher functions. There it was said that those higher functions could perhaps be conceded, if there was no danger of sacrificing and passing capital sentences. But then, in ch. 18, it appeared that nevertheless those functions were forbidden because of the 'ornaments' of those dignitaries, which were idolatrous. In ch. 19 Tertullian immediately states that divine and human 'sacrament' do not go together, but after that he comes to speak about the 'ornaments' of soldiers and concludes at the end: "No dress (*habitus*) is lawful for us, if it is connected with an unlawful action".

The question arises, what activity Tertullian has in mind. In ch. 18 he pointed to idolatrous acts. Here he seems to have in mind the killing of other

people, since he is dealing with, among others, the sword (see also ch. 17, end). However, this would be quite unusual in early Christian literature. Elsewhere what is objectionable in the army is in the idolatrous acts, which the soldiers have to take part in. (See J. Helgeland, 'Christians and the Roman Army from Marcus Aurelius to Constantine' in *ANRW* II 23, 1, p. 740. In this large contribution Helgeland gives a good survey of the opinions of the early Christians with regard to the service in the army.) And does Tertullian's statement in 19, 2 *Non convenit ... signo Christi et signo diaboli, castris lucis et castris tenebrarum* not point in the same direction? One should, moreover, not forget that Tertullian in this treatise deals with idolatry. That is why we think that he also here points to the idolatrous actions, with which those military attributes are connected.

d. *De idololatria* and *De corona*. Tertullian's standpoint with regard to the compatibility of military service and Christian belief in *De idololatria* is different from that in *De corona*. It differs also from that of the Church in those days. The difference is in the fact that in *De corona* and in the *Constitutiones apostolicae* (from the beginning of the 3rd century) a distinction is made between two cases: a Christian who wants to become a soldier and a soldier who wants to become a Christian and remain a soldier. About the first case there is no difference of opinion; it is not allowed. With respect to the second, *De corona* and the *Const. Apost.* regard it as allowed, provided that one avoids idolatry. In *De idololatria* Tertullian distinguishes both cases explicitly and rejects them both.

Various questions may be posed here. How to explain this difference of opinion within the works of Tertullian himself? Was there an evolution in his thinking about these matters? In what direction did this evolution go? An answer to the latter question is also an answer to the question of the relative chronology of the two works under discussion.

As was already mentioned above, Rordorf explains the difference by assuming that Tertullian had to leave his intolerant standpoint of *De idololatria* because of the changes in the society of his days, in particular the militarizing of the administration. He thus assumes that the more tolerant *De corona* is of a later date than the *De idololatria*. Braun, who does not follow the argument of Rordorf, agrees with him in situating the *De corona* after *De idololatria*; he thinks even that it is considerably later. His arguments are of a stylistic order (see *art. cit.*). According to him there is a chronological order between *De idololatria*, *Adv. Marc. IV* and *De corona*. Here Braun differs from the majority of French authors who consider *De corona* as the earlier work. We, too, think that *De idololatria* is the earlier treatise. Our arguments, however, are somewhat different from those mentioned just now.

First and foremost one should bear in mind that in *De corona* Tertullian discusses the case of a soldier, a Christian soldier, who refused to put the *corona* on his head at the occasion of a *donativum*. So he had to deal with a Christian who, at any rate, had not left the army at his conversion. If Tertullian had taken the position of *idol.* 19, 1-2, he could, of course, have had admiration for the heroic behaviour of that soldier, but he should have stated that this soldier had been wrong in not leaving the army at his conversion. The treatise *De corona* would not have been written, then. Now that he started writing on that soldier, he had to take a nuanced position. And one can hardly imagine that after writing this treatise Tertullian discussed the matter in the way he did in *De idololatria*.

One should, however, notice how near Tert. is to an intolerant standpoint, also in *De corona*. In ch. 11 he deals with the problem of compatibility of Christian faith with military service. He uses there in a longer context the same formulas as in *De idololatria* 19, 2:

De idololatria 19, 2	*De corona* 11
Non convenit sacramento divino et humano,	(1) Credimusne humanum sacramentum divino superduci licere ...
signo Christi et signo diaboli,	(3) Et signum postulabit a principe, qui iam a Deo accepit ...
castris lucis et castris tenebrarum.	(4) Ipsum de castris lucis in castra tenebrarum nomen deferre transgressionis est.

After that he concedes that the situation of those who came to faith while they were already serving in the army is different (*Plane*, si quos militia praeventos fides posterior invenit, alia condicio est); and he compares these soldiers with those who came to John the Baptist and the centurio who was praised by Christ (see the same references in 19, 3), who were obviously allowed to remain soldiers. But, he continues, he has to leave the service as soon as it makes him come into conflict with his service of God. And he expands on these duties in such a way that it seems hardly possible to combine the two services. At the end he states: *Puta denique licere militiam usque ad causam coronae*. Fontaine puts the question: "cette position formelle d'une hypothèse exprime-t-elle le fond de la pensée de Tertullien?" ... And he states "Mais Tertullien ne se range certainement qu'à regret à cette «hypothèse»". One feels Tertullian's reluctance, although he can not deny the compatibility of Christian faith and military service here. For if he did so, he says, the question of the *corona* would not have come up for discussion (*si omni ope expulero militiam, frustra iam de corona militari provocaverim*). Thus the position of *De idololatria* is not so much more intolerant that that of *De cor-*

ona. We think that *De idololatria* has been written before *De corona*, but there need not be much time between the two.

1. **Posset:** this reading of *B* and Gel (the text of *A* after 18, 9 *evitandum* is lost) was rejected by Leopold, who read *possit*; he was followed by Oehler and Reifferscheid. However, if one decides that an irrealis is not defendable here, we would conjecture *potest* rather than *possit*. But in our view the reading *posset* can be maintained. The argument runs as follows: 'One could think that herewith the case of military service ... has been dealt with <so that no further discussion is necessary> but ...'. — **in isto capitulo:** Tert. evidently had made himself a division of the treatise into chapters. It seems probable that he made the present chapter begin at 17, 2: *Hinc proxime dissertatio oborta est.* — **inter:** here practically = *intra*, which seems to be conjectured by Scaliger (see the Remarks, p. 267). Such a use of *inter* occurs also elsewhere in Tert.'s works. A clear example is *an.* 42, 2: *hominem, in quo inter omnia finiendo et ipsa finitur* (sc. mors): 'man, in the destruction of whom among all things (= as a part of all things) death is also destroyed itself'. A similar case is *Marc.* 5, 7, 10: *ab eo* (sc. deo) *igitur inter omnia* ('as a part of all things' = 'just as everything in general') *et Christus* (see Waszink's note on *an.* 42, 2, p. 460). A third case is *an.* 9, 5, where *inter illa* means 'as one of those things' (ib. 173). Similar expressions are found in *TLL* VII, 1: 2133, 15-68 (*inter omnia ... et* is only quoted from *an.* 42, 2 and *Marc.* 5, 7, 10). For *inter* = *intra* in later Latin, see Löfstedt, *Spätlat. Stud.*, 82 and *Verm. Stud.*, 176 seq. — **caligata:** this adjective, which occurs for the first time in Suetonius, *Aug.* 25, 3 and *Vitell.* 7, 6, is found three times in the *Digests* (Venul., 48, 3, 9; Men., 49, 16, 65; Ulpian. 3, 2, 2 pr.). That it is an official term from Roman law is evident from Novell. Justin. 74, 4, 3: *milites armatos, quos lex caligatos appellat* (καλιγατούς); furthermore, the word occurs in ten funeral inscriptions of soldiers. — **necessitas immolationum vel capitalium iudiciorum:** these are the main dangers threatening those Christians who are in dignity resp. in power, as appeared from 17, 2-3.

2. **Non convenit sacramento divino et humano:** in a lapidary style Tert. formulates his decision. Iunius observes: 'Hellenismus est, ut Ioan. 2 (obviously he means Ioh. 2, 4: τί ἐμοὶ καὶ σοί) et passim: pro eo quod est, Sacramento divino cum humano'. This is the outcome of Tert.'s very thorough argument in the treatise *De corona*, cf. especially 11, 1: *Credimusne humanum sacramentum divino superduci licere, et in alium dominum respondere post Christum, et eierare patrem ac matrem et omnem proximum, quos et lex honorari et post deum diligi praecepit, quos et evangelium, solum Christum pluris faciens, sic quoque honoravit*? Of course, *sacramentum humanum* refers to the military oath, *sacramentum divinum* to the sacrament of faith, the baptism, at which one binds oneself to God. From the vast literature on this subject we quote only the well-known monographs by E. de Backer, *Sacramentum* and J. de Ghellinck, *Pour l'histoire du mot sacramentum* (Louvain 1924), 66 seqq., also F. J. Dölger, 'Sacramentum militiae', *AC* 2 (1930), 268-80 and *Sonne*, par. 15: 'Der Treueid für Christus. Sacramentum', pp. 110-9. For further literature, see Waszink's comm. on *an.* 1, 4: *fidei sacramentum* (= baptism), p. 90-1. — **castris lucis et castris tenebrarum:** an allusion to 2 Cor. 6, 15, which is rendered more literally in *pud.* 15, 5: *Quae autem communicatio luci et tenebris?* Two further allusions are found in *idol.* 13, 3: *nihil communionis est lumini et tenebris, vitae et morti* and *spect.* 26, 4: *Quid luci et tenebris? Quid vitae et morti?* Cf. on this entire passage J. Helgeland, 'Christians and the Roman Army from Marcus Aurelius to Constantine', *ANRW* II 23, 1, 738-40, where the present passage is discussed; we quote here the following statement on p. 739: 'When he (i.e. Tert.) mentioned the phrase 'camp of light and camp of darkness', his point is to compare the Church, which met in conventional houses, with the cult of Mithra celebrated most frequently in subterranean sanctuaries which are, therefore, dark'. — **non potest una anima duobus deberi:** cf. Matth. 6, 24 (Luke 16, 13). By the addition *deo et Caesari* Tert. combines this Scripture text with Matth. 22, 21 and parallels discussed in the note on 15, 3. — **Et virgam ... si placet ludere:** on this entire passage cf. the Remarks, p. 267-9. Here we only want to add that in the first three instances quoted Tert. plays upon the double sense of the words *virga*, *fibula* and *lorum*. *Virga* can denote both the rod of Moses, mentioned in Exod. 4, 2 and 17, 5, and the rod of the Roman centurio which is more frequently called *vitis*. This use of *virga* occurs e.g. in Tac. *Ann.* 1, 23; Juvenal 8, 247 and 14, 63; Sil. Ital. 6, 43. *Fibula* denotes the buckle worn by the high-priest Aaron (Exod. 28, 12: *et pones in utroque latere superumeralis memoriale filiis Israhel*). A golden *fibula* is also mentioned with regard to another high-priest, viz., Simon, in 1 Macc. 14, 44, where it is said that, besides the high-priest, nobody is allowed to wear it (it is forbidden *ulli ex populo et sacerdotibus ... et vestiri purpura et uti fibula aurea*). Further golden *fibulae* were worn by *tribuni militum*, cf. Plin. *nat.* 33, 39: *M. Bruti ... frementis fibulas tribunicias ex auro geri* (*TLL* VI: 644, 54-61); Aurelianus also allowed soldiers to wear golden *fibulae* (Vopisc. *Aurelian.* 46, 5); finally, the present passage is quoted in *TLL*, *loc. cit.*, preceded by the words *huc pertinere videtur*. *Lorum* refers to both the girdle worn by soldiers and the girdle worn by John the Baptist, Matth. 3, 4 and Mark 1, 6: ζώνην δερματίνην; the Vulgate has *zona(m) pellicia(m)*, the *Vetus Latina* (cod. k) *zonam coream*. The translation *lorum* is also found in *Vitae patrum* 5, 8, 17 and other passages (*TLL* VII, 2: 1682, 5 seqq.).

3. **quomodo etiam in pace militabit:** as Currey observes, this statement is not in accordance with the rule of the early Church; it is even at variance with

the view of Tert. himself, cf. *apol.* 42, 3: *Navigamus et nos vobiscum et vobiscum militamus et rusticamur et mercamur.* — **gladio, quem dominus abstulit:** sc. *Petro*: a reference to Matth. 26, 52, a verse which is frequently quoted by Tert.; in a similar context it occurs in *cor.* 11, 2, further in *pat.* 3, 8, *fuga* 8, 1 (cf. Rambaux, 269, with note 54). An allusion is found in *cor.* 1, 3: *gladium nec dominicae defensioni necessarium.* — **Nam etsi adierant ... discinxit:** the Gospel tells (Luke 3, 14) that soldiers came to John the Baptist asking what they should do. John answered: 'do not bully, do not blackmail', etc., but he did not say: 'leave the army'. Neither did Jesus himself give this command to the centurion in Matth. 8, 5-10. However, these two passages cannot be used as arguments in favour of the permissibility of military service for Christians, for in disarming Peter Christ disarmed all Christians. This argument is a parallel to the refutation of the four *occupationes* found in par. 2, and so confirms our interpretation of that passage. Tert. uses the pluperfects *adierant* and *crediderat*, which in time precede the *discinxit*, in order to show that they are refuted by the later statement. — **Nullus habitus:** see above the Remarks (p. 269) and cf. Helgeland, *loc. cit.*, p. 740.

Ch. 20. *Idolatry in words: Preliminary remark. The vice of habit*

'The Christian way of life is not only threatened by idolatrous deeds but also by idolatrous words, which may have their origin in habit or in timidity (§ 1).

The prohibition of the Law to name the gods of the pagans should not be interpreted in such a manner that we are forbidden to pronounce those names. This would make social life impossible (§ 2). No, the Law forbids us to call them 'gods' (§ 3). And if it is sometimes necessary to speak about them as gods, we must add something to make it clear that we *do not call them gods. Holy Scripture is our example here. These remarks should be made in advance (§ 4).*

Now a vice of custom is to say 'Mechercule' or 'Medius Fidius', even when some are not aware of the fact that this is an act of swearing by Hercules. An oath by the gods whom you have forsworn cannot but be a tampering of faith with idolatry, since it gives honour to those gods (§ 5).'

Remarks

After discussing the various kinds of idolatry in deeds in ch. 3-19, Tertullian now draws attention to the dangers of idolatry in words, which threaten Christian life. Here, too, he deals only with *hidden* forms of idolatry. The open forms, i.e. giving honour to the gods by our words, need of course not be discussed. Having stated that this kind of idolatry is caused either by bad habit or by timidity, he does not immediately bring up the discussion of these vices but first makes a preliminary observation, which he qualifies explicitly as such at the end of it. (*Sed hoc mihi ad sequentia magis praestructum est.*)

This preliminary remark (20, 2-4) concerns the prohibition of the Law to name the gods of the heathens. If one interprets this prohibition strictly, one could not maintain normal social contacts, e.g. by saying "you find him in the temple of Aesculapius", for this would be, then, idolatry in words. No, Tertullian says, we are only forbidden to call them 'gods'. And if we have to speak of them as gods, we must show our standpoint. What a Christian has to avoid is that his words about the heathen gods *imply that he gives honour to them.*

After this introductory remark Tertullian starts discussing the first vice, that of habit, which appears to be the vice of swearing. The division in chapters by Pamelius is also here not ideal. It would have been better to 'give' a chapter to each of the two vices, thus to begin ch. 21 at 20, 4 (see the observation of Iunius mentioned in the apparatus at the text) and make one chapter 22 of ch. 21-22. We will take the chapters 21-22 together.

1. **conversatio** here has the meaning which in *TLL* IV: 852, 27-8 is formulated as *ratio agendi, vivendi, mores, consuetudo, condicio, status.* This meaning occurs almost exclusively in texts of Christian authors, where it is quite frequent. The oldest instances of this meaning are found in Tert.; *TLL* quotes sixteen instances from his works (the quotation '*idol.* 6' should be '*test. an.* 6, 2'). The passages from the *Vetus Latina* occur in texts which are later than Tert.'s works. — **divinae disciplinae:** cf. the note on 2, 4. — **ecce homo et facta eius** and **ex ore tuo iustificaberis** (Matth. 12, 37, also quoted in *Marc.* 2, 25, 3): Tert. quotes these two texts on account of the words *facta* and *ore*, which are to motivate his division of *idololatria in factis* and *idololatria in verbis.* While the second text can be reduced to Matth. 12, 37 (*Ex verbis enim tuis iustificaberis*), the first is found nowhere in Holy Scripture. De la Cerda observed already that it also occurs in (Ps.-)Augustine, *Medit.* 39 (PL 40, 937), 'sed sine adscriptione loci'. This text applies to men at the final judgment: *Vae mihi misero cum venerit dies iudicii et aperti fuerint libri conscientiarum, cum dicetur de me 'ecce homo et opera eius'* (*opera* is used instead of *facta*). It should be noticed that in Matthew the second text, too, functions in the context of 'the day of judgment'. Iunius surmises that the first quotation comes from the Book of Enoch and that it was found in the neighbourhood of the Enoch text quoted in 4, 2. However, Iunius is not able to refer to a definite passage. We think that, if Scripture is not the source, Enoch is an obvious candidate, because his book was regarded by Tert. as belonging to the holy books; moreover, the book of Enoch is full of passages in which the day of judgment is spoken of as a threatening reality for the sinners; but an evident parallel text fails. — **etiam ... quoque:** see the note by Böhm, 164. — **idololatriae incursum:** in the works of Christian Latin authors of the second until the fifth century the substantives *incursus* and *incursio*

rather frequently denote the attack of a demon (and therewith of idolatry). This use was undoubtedly influenced by the wording of Ps. 90, 6: *non timebis ... ab incursu* (LXX ἀπὸ συμπτώματος) *et daemonio meridiano* (Vulg.). From Tert. we may quote *an.* 57, 4: *mortes, quas incursibus* (sc. of demons, mentioned in the beginning of the sentence) *deputant* (see Waszink's note, pp. 578-9); *apol.* 37, 9: *a daemoniorum incursibus*; *res.* 58, 5: *aut ubi incursus infesti apud Christum? ubi daemonici impetus apud spiritum sanctum ... ?* Further cf. for *incursus* Lact. *d.i.* 2, 15, 6; 4, 27, 2. 14; [Clem.] *recogn.* 4, 4. 17, for *incursio* Firm. Mat. *Math.* 8, 11, 4 (cf. 6, 11, 11) and Aug. *c. epist. Fund.* 11 (p. 207, 19): *dextera luminis tueatur et eripiat nos ab omni incursione* (*incursatione* l.v.) *maligna.* — **de consuetudinis vitio:** Tert. regards the power of custom as dangerous for the Christian faith, because it may contain elements of pagan religion. He mentions *consuetudo* between *vetustas* and *necessitas* in the famous enumeration of institutions of pagan civilisation in *nat.* 2, 1, 7: *Adversus haec igitur nobis negotium est, adversus institutiones maiorum, auctoritates receptorum, leges dominantium, argumentationes prudentium, adversus vetustatem, consuetudinem, necessitatem, adversus exempla, prodigia, miracula, quae omnia adulterinam istam divinitatem corroboraverunt.* On the triad *vetustas consuetudo necessitas* see J. Speigl, 'Herkommen und Fortschritt im Christentum nach Tertullian' (*Pietas.* Festschrift für Bernhard Kötting, *JbAC, Erg. Bd.* 8, Münster i.W. 1980, 165-178), 168: 'Vetustas und necessitas können als Synonyme von consuetudo aufgefasst werden, insofern vetustas vor allem den Rückhalt des Herkommens in der weit zurückreichenden Zeit ausdrückt und necessitas den verbindlichen Charakter des Herkommens umschreibt, der aus der langen Übung resultiert', und ib. 169: 'Die consuetudo als abstrakte Bezeichnung für die gesamte alte verbindliche religiöse Überlieferung der Heiden ist für den christlichen Apologeten Tertullian etwas durch und durch Negatives.' After this Speigl discusses the present passage and further quotes *pud.* 14, 27. In his opinion, this pejorative sense of *consuetudo* is mostly found in Tert.'s early treatises. We may compare here the use of συνήθεια by Clement of Alexandria; cf. *Protr.* 46, 1; 62, 4; 72, 3; 75, 4; 89, 2; 99, 1.3; 101, 1.3; 103, 2; 109, 3; 118, 1; particularly 109, 1, where συνήθεια is opposed to ἀλήθεια.

2. **conversatio:** here this substantive obviously means 'intercourse', that is to say: the contact between people is denoted. In the case of par. 1 (*ratio agendi*, etc.) this contact with others is, of course, implied but it is kept in the background. Cf. for the various meanings of *conversatio* in Tert. H. Hoppenbrouwers, 'Conversatio. Une étude sémasiologique', *Graecitas et Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva, Suppl.* 1, Noviomagi 1964, 45-95. — **hoc genus nomina** = *huius generis nomina*; cf. note ad 12, 5: *hoc genus.* — **si ita vocavero eum:** *eum* = 'that man', who has the name Saturnus. Iunius reads: *Si ita quem vocavero*, Ursinus, followed by Rigaltius: *si quem ita vocavero.* Both editors clearly want to get rid of *eum*, which in our opinion is not offensive.

3. **Hoc praecepit, ne:** after saying in par. 2 how this text from Exodus should not be interpreted, Tert. now gives the correct explanation: 'it forbids to call those gods 'gods'.' He finds a confirmation of this thesis (*nam*) in another text, viz., Exod. 20, 7: *non sumes nomen domini dei tui in vano.* These two texts were alluded to in *idol.* 10, 6: *cum lex prohibeat, ut diximus, deos pronuntiari et nomen hoc in vano collocari.* The latter text is referred to in *Prax.* 7, 8: *non sumes nomen dei in vanum.* — **in vano, id est in idolo:** the adverbial expression *in vano* is understood here with its original meaning: 'in something idle' (cf. also 1, 4). On the other hand, *idolum* (εἴδωλον) has the connotation 'unreal': idols are *vana*, i.e. idle entities. The homage to idols is *vanitas*, because they are appearances of beings which do not deserve homages. Jerome interprets, as was observed by Pamelius, 1 Sam. 12, 21: *nolite declinare post vana* as *post idola*, and quotes Acts 14, 15: ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν ματαίων ἐπιστρέφειν ἐπὶ θεὸν ζῶντα (Vulg.: *ab his vanis converti ad Deum vivum*). Lietzmann in the *HdbNT* 7, p. 80, translates: 'ihr sollt euch von diesen Nichtsen dem lebendigen Gott zuwenden' and refers to Rom. 1, 21: ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν, on which he observes (*HdbNT* 8, p. 32): 'μάταιοι sind speziell die Götzen, s. IV Reg. 17, 15 = Jer. 2, 5 Amos 2, 4'. — **Cecidit igitur:** a conclusion from the word of Holy Scripture: 'who applies the name of God to an idol has fallen into idolatry, for in the given context Scripture combats idolatry which is the giving of honour to other beings than the only God'.

4. **deos dicendum erit:** a Graecism which occurs several times in Tert.'s works: *pall.* 3, 4: *multa dicendum fuit*; ib. 4, 5: *Physconem et Sardanapallum tacendum est*; *bapt.* 15, 2: *quae custodiendum sit*; *apol.* 23, 2 (*V*): *quam* (sc. divinitatem) *utique superiorem omni potestate credendum est*; cf. Hoppe, *Synt.*, 17-57. The oldest instance in Latin of this construction is Plautus, *Trin.* 869: *agitandumst vigilias*; in Lucretius, in whose poem it is remarkably frequent (cf. Bailey in the Prolegomena of his edition, ch. V B, par. 13.5.*b* (p. 103) and his note on 1, 111), it is to be regarded as an archaism according to Hofm.-Szant., 372-3. There it is also observed that in late Latin only a few instances, 'z.T. des Gräzismus verdächtigte Fälle', are found, especially in Apuleius, Tert., and in some texts of Roman lawyers (Kalb, *Roms Juristen*, 123). In Tert. we may assume an influence of both Apuleius, whom he imitated frequently (especially in *De pallio*, where the two instances quoted at the beginning of this note are found, but also e.g. in *an.* 52, 3, cf. Waszink's note *ad loc.*, 538) and of the idiom of law. — **quia non ego:** this

sudden transition from an impersonal (*dicendum erit*) into a personal construction (*ego*) makes the statement more vivid. — **nationum** (sc. deos): Tert. uses the same expression in 15, 2. — **Sed hoc ... praestructum est:** the observations of 20, 2-3 are not a discussion of the subject-matter announced in par. 1 but rather (*magis*) a *praestructio* (this rare word, not mentioned in *OLD*, occurs no less than nine times in Tert.'s works), i.e. a preparation of the discussion that follows (*sequentia*).

5. **Ceterum:** 'But to return to our subject-matter announced in par. 1: it is a vice of custom to say: '*Mehercule*' and '*Medius Fidius*'.' To utter these words is, of course, contrary to the precept not to name the gods of the pagans. But it is more: it means no less than an *oath* by Hercules, although many people are not aware of this fact (*accedente ignorantia*). In this context cf. P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo. A Biography* (London-Boston 1967), 149: 'the Africans were notorious swearers of oaths. Augustine's early sermons show how he had to combat this vice in his congregation' (for this statement Brown refers to Augustine's *De serm. Domini in monte* 1, 17, 51 and *Expos. ep. ad Gal.* 9). — **per Herculem:** this is obvious in the case of *Mehercule*. But Tert. seems to combine *Medius Fidius* also with Hercules. For this use cf. Serv. Dan. ad Verg. *Aen.* 4, 204: *fidius, id est* Διὸς υἱός, *Iovis filius, id est Hercules*. Cf. on this subject Wissowa, *Rel.*, 118 and 130-1. — **Porro** denotes a continuation; here this continuation consists of the minor of the argument: '*Now* what else is an oath by those whom you have forsworn than a collision of faith with idolatry' (conclusion: 'Ergo, it is not allowed'). — **quid ... quam** = *quid aliud ... quam*. Cf. e.g. *cor.* 14, 2: *Quid enim est in capite feminae corona quam formae lena, quam summae lasciviae nota?* — **per eos ... per quos:** cf. 21, 1: *per deos suos obligat*; 21, 2: *iures per idola*; 22, 1: *benedici per deos nationum*. After *per eos* we should supply *deieras* (or *fit* after *si*, which amounts to the same thing). The antithesis *deieras ... eierasti* shows the impossible situation for a Christian who says *mehercule*, etc. — **eierasti:** viz., in baptism, where the candidate is asked whether he is willing to *renuntiare satanae et pompae et angelis eius* (= in the first place the pagan gods). Cf. on this the note on 18, 7. — **praevaricatio:** Tert., who frequently uses the verb *praevaricari* and its derivations *praevaricatio* and *praevaricator*, here uses *praevaricatio* in its original sense of 'tempering with the opposing party' as also in *an.* 1, 6 where (to quote Waszink's comment *ad loc.*, 94) 'Socrates is qualified as a *praevaricator*, because, though denying the existence of the gods, he yet admitted their existence by his sacrifice to Aesculapius'. In most cases, however, Tert. uses this verb with the more general meaning 'to deceive'.

Chs. 21-22. *The vice of timidity*

'The vice of timidity is there, first if someone binds you in the name of his gods and you do not protest out of fear to be recognized as a Christian. Herewith you acknowledge the majesty of those gods (§ 1). Do you not see that you are the victim of the tricks of Satan? What he cannot achieve by means of your mouth (= open confession) he achieves by means of your ears (§ 2). If the man who wants to bind you approaches you in an unfriendly way, you have to stand firm and fight; if he is friendly, it is safer for you to transfer your engagement from the gods to the Lord and not to bind yourself to him, who is used by the devil to make you idolatrous (§ 3). Every tolerance in this matter is idolatry.

I know a Christian who at a lawsuit was addressed by a heathen with the malediction 'Jupiter be angry with you' and answered 'no, with you'. This is the reaction of a heathen and thus idolatrous. Even if he had not retorted the malediction, but only had shown himself indignant, he would have perpetrated idolatry. By becoming angry one confirms the existence of the god (§ 4). For why should one become angry because of somebody whom one knows to be nothing? The more so, if one returns the malediction.—The Christian ought to laugh at such a situation or rather return the malediction by a benediction in the name of God, as Holy Scripture commands, thus destroying the idols and honouring God (§ 5).

22. Similarly a Christian may not tolerate that he is blessed in the name of the gods of the heathens. A blessing by the gods is a malediction of God (§ 1). If I give an alms to somebody and he imprecates the blessings of his gods upon me, then my alms becomes an honour to those gods (§ 2). He should know that I did it for the honour of God.—'But God knows my intention'. Yes, but He also sees that I was not willing to show that I did it for Him.—Many say: 'nobody has to make himself known'. But no more has one to deny what one is. For to dissimulate that one is a Christian is to deny one's faith, and every denial is idolatry, just as every act of idolatry is a denial of faith (§ 3).'

Remarks

Tertullian illustrates the vice of timidity by three cases in which the Christian is confronted with idolatrous utterances of others and in consequence of *a wrong reaction* becomes himself guilty of idolatry. In most cases this reaction is one of *silence*. In his view this silence, which originates in fear, is equivalent to a confession. Hence this silence is discussed here under the head of idolatry in *words*.

The three cases are:

1. *A reaction on a binding by oaths, etc.* (21, 1-3)

A heathen binds a Christian by invocation of his gods (*per deos suos obligat*

iuratione vel aliqua testificatione), and the Christian keeps silence out of fear to be recognized as such. Tertullian distinguishes two possibilities with regard to the heathen party: he may be unfriendly or friendly. In both cases the Christian has to react in order to avoid idolatry.

2. *A reaction on a malediction* (21, 4-5)

If a Christian reacts on a malediction by returning it, he perpetrates, of course, idolatry. He behaves as a heathen. This is the only case in which the Christian himself *says* something; and one could assert that it is almost open idolatry, if a Christian says: 'may Jupiter be angry upon you'. But also if he says nothing but becomes angry about the malediction, he is idolatrous, because his becoming angry means in fact that he gives honour to the gods. The Christian should even return the malediction by a benediction in the name of the one true God (Luke 6, 28: *Benedicite maledicentibus vobis*).

3. *A reaction on a benediction* (22, 1-4)

A Christian gives an alms to a heathen. The latter says 'may Jupiter bless you'. Here the Christian may not keep silence but has to say that he did it to honour God. Objections as 'God knows my intention' and 'one has not to make oneself known' do not stand the test.

1. **obligat iuratione:** Tert. discusses the case in which a heathen confirms by an oath (viz., by his gods,) that he will do what he promises to do. This is, of course, a binding of himself to his gods; but Tert. underlines that it is also a binding of the Christian to these gods (viz., through the intermediary of the heathen's binding). This leads to the statement in par. 2: 'it does not matter whether you yourself swear by the idols or whether you are adjured by a pagan and let this pass'. As to *obligat*, cf. Waszink's note on *an.* 39, 3 (p. 445). *Iuratio* is found here for the first time; Hoppe, *Synt.* 93 and 116, rightly supposes that it was coined by Tert. for the rhyme with *testificatio*. — **vel aliqua testificatione:** a *testificatio* is less strong than an oath; for instance, a solemn promise in the name of a god. — **ne intellegaris:** *sc. esse Christianus*. This point has been amply discussed in the second half of ch. 13. — **maiestatem ... cuius causa:** to swear by a being is an acknowledgment of the majesty of that being; the majesty is even the cause of the binding.

2. **dicendo ... an audiendo:** Tert. deals here with idolatry in words. It appears that silence can be equivalent to words; cf. the well-known adagium: *qui tacet, consentire videtur*. — **ab alio adiuratus:** 'when somebody else swears to you by them (i.e. the idols)'. Tert. uses this verb twice with *daemon* or *daemonium* as an object: *apol.* 32, 3: *ceterum daemonas, id est genios, adiurare consuevimus, ut illos de hominibus exigamus*; *exh. cast.* 10, 2: *si daemonium adiurat*; for a similar use in Min. Fel., Cypr., Lact., Aug. see *TLL* I: 713, 49 seqq.; moreover, he uses it twice absolutely: *praescr.* 37, 5: *Sicut caverunt testamento suo, sicut fidei commiserunt, sicut adiuraverunt, ita teneo*; *scorp.* 1, 3; see also Böhm, 167. — **congressione:** here the meaning is simply 'contact'. In *idol.* 2, 2 the word is a synonym of *concubitus*. The meaning of *congressio* most frequently found is '*pugna, certamen*' (in Tert. e.g. *res.* 48, 1).

3. **sponsionem:** 'acceptance of the covenant' (Currey). Gelenius, followed by Pamelius and Rigaltius, conjectured (or found in his Codex Masburensis?) *responsionem*. We best quote here Currey's note in full: '*sponsio*, on the part of him who binds himself, is opposed to *obligatio*, on the part of him who binds him. The party who would bind you to a certain covenant, in the name of a heathen god, meets you either as an enemy, or as a friend; 'if as an enemy, you are called to the battle, and must fight; if as a friend, with how little risk will you transfer your acceptance of the covenant to the name of the Lord, and so do away with the form of binding used by him, through whose instrumentality Satan sought to bind you to the service of idols, i.e. to idolatry'.'

4. **patientia:** by remaining inactive (*quiescendo*, 21, 1) one 'endures' that the idolatrous act takes place, and therewith one becomes guilty of idolatry. — **impositis:** by the oath the majesty of the gods is, as it were, *laid upon* the parties, and by accepting this one subjugates oneself (*obsequium*) to the gods. — **Scio quendam:** cf. *idol.* 15, 7 *Scio fratrem*; *an.* 51, 6 *Scio feminam*. Tert. often refers to experience (cf. also *an.* 9, 4 and *exh. cast.* 12, 6). — **cui dominus ignoscat:** an interjection like the one frequently found in Jewish texts ('blessed be His name'). — **per litem:** 'id est, *inter litigandum*' (Iunius). — **Iupiter tibi sit iratus:** this expression is common since Plautus (e.g., *Amphitr.* 392 and 1022); cf. *TLL* VII, 2: 374, 72-375, 9. — **immo tibi:** De la Cerda rightly refers here to Martial. 5, 63, 5-6 (the poet has just, quite insincerely, praised the poems of a certain Ponticus): *'Hoc sentis?' inquis* (sc. Ponticus) *'faciat tibi sic bene Caesar, sic Capitolinus Iupiter'. Immo tibi.* — **aliter:** Latinius reads *aliud* here, but *facere* is used here in an absolute sense, as is rightly observed by Böhm, 168, who refers to the numerous instances mentioned in *TLL* VI: 120, 99 seqq. — **credidit:** for this use of the perf. *credidi*, often with an ingressive force, cf. Waszink's note on *an.* 50, 5 (p. 526) and Böhm, 168-9. — **remaledicens:** a very rare verb, which seems to have been coined by the emperor Vespasian (Suet. *Vesp.* 9, 3). After Tert. it is only used by Jerome (*ep.* 69, 9), who has borrowed so many words and *locutiones* from Tert.

5. **iam si insanis ... timoris tui:** Latinius conjectures *idololatria* instead of *idololatriae* (*B*); Iunius is uncertain which of these two readings he should

adopt, whereas De la Cerda reads *timor tuus*, thus combining *professio* with *idololatriae* only. Currey observes: 'No change is necessary: 'The profession of your fear will be the profession of idolatry'.' It is far from certain that this explanation is the correct one. If one wants to adopt it, one may also think of a haplography: *erit idololatriae professio <professio> timoris tui*. However, it is also possible to find here an instance of the 'possessive genitive', better formulated as 'genitive of the rubric': 'then the profession of your fear will belong to the domain of idolatry'. For the rest one should bear in mind that the *timor* discussed here is different from the *timiditas* mentioned at the beginning of this chapter. Here the *timor* is the fear of the malediction (which implies that one believes in the existence of the pagan gods), whereas the *timiditas* mentioned above refers to the fear to be recognized as a Christian. — **Iovis honorem facis:** one would expect: *Iovi honorem facis*. Tert. rather frequently uses the genitive instead of the dative. Cf. Waszink's note on *an.* 6, 3 (pp. 137-8) and the index of his edition, p. 643. — **ut et idola destruas:** the use of the expression *idola destruere* is surprising here, if one does not recall to mind that in Tert.'s view 'idols' are not only the images of the gods but also the gods themselves and everything that functions as an intermediary entity between man and demon (see J. C. M. van Winden's paper in *Vig. Chr.* 36, 1982, 108-14). — **deum praedices et adimpleas disciplinam:** these words indicate the confession of the true faith and the life in accordance with Christian law.

22. 1. **Aeque ... sustinebit:** *B* has no distinction between *disciplinam* (21, 5) and *aeque*; its heavily corrupted text runs as follows: ... *disciplinam aeque benedici deos nationum Christum Sationistus non sustinebit*. Gelenius, too, has no distinction between the two first words but he makes two corrections by adding *per* before *deos nationum* and reading *Christo initiatus*. — **Aeque:** De la Cerda reads *atque*, which is certainly wrong, since the reading *aeque* gives an excellent sense: as in the previous chapter a malediction could not remain unanswered, here it is said that, *in the same way*, a benediction may not be endured. — **Christo initiatus:** the reading of *B* (*Christum Sationistus*) is impossible, so that it will be best to follow Gelenius, who provides an entirely acceptable reading. The participle *initiatus* occurs in Tert.'s works with a dative (e.g. *bapt.* 5, 1) and an accusative of the internal object (e.g. *apol.* 8, 4: *talia initiatus*; cf. Waszink's note on *an.* 43, 12 (p. 473)). — **ut non semper reiciat:** Pamelius deletes *non*, which is rightly refuted by De la Cerda. The cause of the difficulties in the interpretation of this passage lies in the fact that the consecutive clause (*ut non semper*, etc.) contains a consequence, not of *non sustinebit* but of *sustinebit* alone. Or to put it in a different way: the negation of the main sentence concerns not the verb *sustinebit* alone but this verb together with the consecutive clause. Tert. states that it should not happen

that a Christian endures to be blessed by a pagan god and therewith omits to reject an impure blessing. — **Benedici per deos nationum est maledici per deum:** an aphorism as Tert. likes them. Every service of the gods of the heathens, i.e. every service of the demons (resulting in their 'blessings'), is an offence to God (resulting in His punishment).

2. **eleemosynam:** for the behaviour in case of alms-giving, see Rambaux, 159, n. 307. — **coloniae genium:** since it is practically certain that Tert. wrote the present treatise at Carthage, which in his time was officially called *Colonia Iulia Carthago*, it seems to be probable that Tert. is referring here to the *genius* of Carthago, which is mentioned several times both in inscriptions and in literature. Cf. *CIL* III 993: *Caelesti* (sc. Iunoni, = Atargatidi) ... *et Aesculapio ... et genio Carthaginis et genio Daciorum*; Aug. *sermo* 62, 6, 10 (quoted in *TLL* VI: 1830, 57-65). For the identification of *genius* with *daemon(ium)*, cf. *an.* 39, 3: *sic et omnibus genii deputantur, quod daemonum nomen est* with Waszink's note (p. 445); cf. also the note on 1, 5 *daemoniis*. The connection of *genius* with the genit. *coloniae* is also found in *CIL* III 4153: *genium c(oloniae) ... cum suo templo ... d.d.d.*; ib. II 6671; ib. VIII 1206: *genio col. Iuliae Hipp(onis) Diarr(hyti)*. — **imprecetur:** De la Cerda observes on this verb: 'Dictum pro *adprecetur*. Sed notanter voluit scribere *imprecetur* indicens adprecationes gentilium esse verius imprecationes'. This observation, though sagacious, is erroneous. De la Cerda supposes that *imprecari* always has a pejorative sense but this is not correct. It is true that the sense mentioned occurs more frequently (*TLL* VII, 1: 675, 42-66; Tert. *test. an.* 4, 5 and *ieiun.* 6, 6) but one can also *imprecari prospera* (ib. ll. 67-73); the oldest instance of this meaning is Apul. *met.* 9, 25, the next one being the present passage. The verb *adprecari* quoted by De la Cerda is extremely rare (Hor. *carm.* 4, 15, 28 and four instances in Apul. *met.*). — **idolorum honor:** = *idololatria*. One should recall to mind that, in Tert.'s view, the gods themselves are *idola*. — **per quae:** *quae* refers to *idolorum*, i.e. the pagan gods by whom he renders the favour of a benediction (*gratiam benedictionis*), thus compensating the alms. So *compensare* means: 'to render by way of compensation'. The thing that one renders is the object of *compensare*, not the thing that one compensates. We have here the same construction as with *mutare: mutare aurum argento* means 'to exchange silver for gold' (= 'to receive gold in exchange for silver').

3. **daemonia non honorentur:** the *idolorum honor* is in fact an honour bestowed on the demons, who use the idols as an intermediate entity between human beings and themselves. — **praeceptum eius idolothytum quodammodo feci:** *praeceptum* should be understood here as 'that which has been commanded' and refers to *Si dedero eleemosynam*, etc.; in other words: the

praeceptum denotes the alms; now this alms becomes in a certain sense a *idolothytum*, i.e. something dedicated to the idols (and thus to the demons), if one silently accepts a blessing in which the name of a pagan god (= a demon) is included. For *idolothytum* cf. 10, 2.

4. **Nemo se debet promulgare:** from the context it is evident that after *se* we should supply: *esse Christianum*; we can also say that *se* stands for *fidem suam*. The same words have to be supplied to *nec negare*, *negat*, and *dissimulat*. — **Negat enim:** by not making oneself known as a Christian one makes other people think that one is not a Christian (= *dissimulare*). This is, in Tert.'s opinion, a denial of faith, which is idolatry. — **utique:** with regard to *negatio* everybody will agree, that it is idolatry; hence *utique*, = 'of course'. — **sive in factis sive in verbis:** these were the two subject-matters treated until now.

Ch. 23. *Idolatry in deed and word: the contract of borrowing*

'There occurs also a kind of hidden idolatry in both deed and word, viz., the act of borrowing money from heathens. Although at first glance this act seems to be something harmless, in actual fact a written guarantee under oath is given here (§ 1). Now Christ forbids swearing.

One may try to escape the verdict by saying 'I have only written, but I have said nothing'. Here an appeal to nature and to human consciousness are indicated. To nature, because the hand cannot write anything, which the soul has not dictated (§ 2); and if one objects that another has dictated, Tertullian appeals to human consciousness, since that, which another has dictated, is taken up by the soul and transmitted to the hand, whether the tongue takes part in this action or remains at rest. This opinion is confirmed by the word of the Lord who says that the act of sin lies in the mind and in consciousness (§ 3). Now since the Christian in question has given a guarantee, he was conscious of it and so he cannot take distance from it saying 'I was not willing to do so' (§ 4).

Nor can it be tried, by means of a lighter crime, to exclude a greater one by saying: 'I do admit that I have acted wrongly by giving a guarantee, a thing forbidden to a Christian; but I have not sworn, and so I have not denied my faith'. Even if you had done nothing of the kind, you were still guilty, if you had consented to have done it (i.e. to give the guarantee).

The Christian may insist saying that the silence in which this act takes place makes it invalid (§ 5). This objection is easily rejected by referring to the case of the mute Zacharias (Luke 1, 20. 62 ff), whose speechless voice was most clearly heard and had full validity (§ 6).

Let us pray the Lord that the necessity for such a contract does not come over us and that, if it should happen, He may either enable our brothers to help us (financially) or confer upon us the courage to break the bonds of necessity, lest our written statement be brought forward against us on the day of judgment (§ 7).'

Remarks

On this chapter we have published a special article in *Vig. Chr.* 36 (1982), 15-23 to which we refer the reader in particular for the establishment of the text.

a. *The structure*. After discussion idolatry in facts (ch. 3-19) and in words (chs. 20-22) Tertullian now in the last chapter before the epilogue deals with a kind of idolatry which consists in both deed and word. Herewith this chapter becomes a climax.

b. *The subject-matter*. The essence of the offensive activity is to be found in the words *Pecuniam de ethnicis mutantes ... iurati cavent* (viz., some Christians). There are Christians who, when borrowing, give a written guarantee (*cavent*) under oath (*iurati*). Now Christ has forbidden to swear. (*Praescribit Christus non esse iurandum.*)

The Christian who borrowed money from a heathen had, of course, to give a guarantee (*pignus*; cf. *sub pignoribus fiduciati*), but, moreover, he had to sign a written declaration which contained a description of those guarantees and also an oath formula. This was, of course, an oath by pagan gods. The Christian had to do nothing else than to sign the document. Now the imaginary opponent in this chapter tries to minimize the weight of this activity. First he states that he did not know about an oath; he just signed the document. Tertullian answers that the document itself testifies against him. Then the opponent says: "I have written (i.e. signed the document), I have not said a word". Tertullian answers that one cannot write something without inner participation. Nor does the objection that somebody else dictated help the opponent to escape. His two further arguments (the *levius crimen* that avoids the *maius*, and the *tacita vox* that would be invalid) are equally rejected by Tertullian.

How can Tertullian call the act under discussion idolatry in deed and word? Here one should recall to mind the cases of idolatry discussed in ch. 21-22. By not reacting against idolatrous words spoken by heathens a Christian became guilty of idolatry in words. In the present case the Christian signs an idolatrous declaration (the signing is, of course, a deed; hence idolatry *in deed*), and therewith he makes the words used by the heathen in the declaration his own words (hence idolatry *in word*).

In a reaction by letter on our article in *Vigiliae Christianae* and recently in his excellent monograph '*Ecclesia sordida?*' Georg Schöllgen (Bonn) objected to the solution of the difficulties with regard to the text at the end of 23, 1

that the juridical praxis of that time does not admit such a solution. If one takes *tempus persecutionis*, *locus tribunalis* and *persona praesidis* as an indication of an official document, one has to assume that such a loan contract would be concluded before a *praeses* (= governor), which is hardly credible. Moreover, private law did not require an *oath* for such a contract in the time round 200. We think that Schöllgen is right when he states that it is hardly imaginable that the governor of the province had something to do with a private contract of the kind discussed here. On the other hand, it is evident from the present text that (1) a written document was made (*scripsi*, and above all *illae litterae negatrices vicariae oris nostri*); (2) this document contained an oath formula (*iurati cavent*); (3) it had to be signed by the borrower and, as it seems, by *advocati* (*signatae signis non iam advocatorum*). Thus there was a document which included an oath.

Was the contract concluded before the *praeses* = governor? Certainly not. But this does not exclude the possibility that the document contained the features mentioned in 23, 1 viz., *tempus persecutionis*, etc. These indications were perhaps taken from other contracts in order to give weight to the one under discussion here. This might be explained as follows. There has been a tendency in Roman law to give more security to the recipient of the pledge. This pledge remained the property of the person who borrowed the money. In order to give more security to the recipient, the property, which in the public sphere remained with the pledger, was transferred to the recipient in the private sphere. This was a question of *fiducia*. Hence perhaps in our text: *sub pignoribus fiduciati*. See A. Beck, *Römisches Recht bei Tertullian und Cyprian*, Halle 1930, ²1970 p. 110, Anm. 1 "Gemeint sind hier durch fiduziarische Eigentumsübertragung gesicherte Darlehen". This would mean that one has to do here with a private document that would have been 'adorned' with official features in order to give more weight to it. Moreover, as we have argued at 17, 1, the term *praeses* seems not to be restricted to *the* praeses, i.e. the governor of a province (cf. the term 'president' in modern languages).

1. In the first sentence of the chapter Tert. compares the act of twofold idolatry, viz., in deed and in word, with a two-edged sword or knife: *bis acuta et infesta utrimque*: we adopt the conjecture, or rather, the reading of Gelenius, since it is not absolutely certain that this is a conjecture, cf. supra, p. 4 (*B* has *utrique*), for it is a case of idolatry with two sides and hence cutting, and therefore dangerous, from both sides; *utrimque* corresponds with the preceding *bis*. As to *bis acuta*, it is worthy of mention that Scaliger wrote in the margin of his copy of Iunius' edition ἀμφίστομος. However, Tert. is thinking here of Apoc. 2, 12: τὴν ῥομφαίαν τὴν δίστομον (Vulg. *utraque parte acutam*) or Hebr. 4, 12: μάχαιραν δίστομον (Vulg. *gladio ancipiti*). *Bis acutus* also occurs in the quotation of Hebr. 4, 12 in *Iud.* 9, 18. — **tibi:** this is, of course, the fictitious Christian who by signing a bond without speaking actually commits idolatry. — **quasi vacet in utroque:** 'because, as they (viz., the opponents) assert (*quasi*), idolatry is absent in both (viz., in deed and in word)'. The same meaning is found in the *Non valet* of par. 5. On the meaning of *vacare*, which in several passages in Tert.'s works is practically equivalent to *non esse*, see Hartel, 4, 78-9, and Waszink's note on *an.* 44, 1 (p. 477). — **dum factum ... non tenetur:** the arguments of the opponents consist in minimizing their inner participation in what is written in the document that they signed ('*dictum non tenetur*'). In what follows the opponent will also try to attain his purpose by stating that he did not know that there was something idolatrous in the document he signed. — **fiduciati:** the deponential form of the verb *fiduciare*, as also its absolute use, only occurs here (see the article by Ed. Fraenkel s.v., *TLL* VI: 703, 30-1). Concerning the details of this form of contract, cf. Leonhard, art. 'Fideicommissum', *RE* VI, 2272-75, and Manigk, art. 'Fiducia', ib. VI, 2287-2316. — **cavent:** 'they give a written guarantee'. The present passage is quoted in *TLL* III 637, 37-9, under the heading '*securitatem, cautionem praestare* ... 2. *alteri*, i.q. *promittere, satisdare stipulatione aut fideiussoribus aut pignoribus aut poena* a. *absolute*'. All other passages quoted as instances of this use of the verb (ib. 637, 37-49) are from legal texts. Currey here quotes Suet. *Cal.* 12, 3: *pollicitus* (sc. Caligula) *et matrimonium suum, si potitus imperio fuisset, deque ea re et iureiurando et syngrapho cavit.* — **etsi negant ... persona praesidis:** in *B* the text runs as follows: *et se necant: se scire volunt scilicet tempus persecutionis et locus tribunalis et persona praesidis*. Oehler adopted this form of the text, only correcting the clearly senseless *necant* into *negant*. Oehler's reading cannot be maintained: perhaps one could explain *se negant* as meaning *se negant esse Christianos*, but how to explain *se* in the next phrase? In his *Patristische Studien*, von Hartel made a conjecture which seems to open the way for a solution of the problem. He proposes to read: *iurati cavent, etsi negant se scire; volunt scilicet*, which is a very good conjecture, existing mainly in a rearranging of words. The phrase *etsi negant se scire* fits well into the context, because further on (par. 4) Tert. is going to argue: *neque ignorasse te contendere potes*. On the other hand, Hartel's explication of the second part of the phrase is quite erroneous. His argument runs as follows: 'das (= *iurari*) verlangt nämlich so die Zeit der gerichtlichen Verfolgung, der Gerichtshof und der Richter, indem eine Verfolgung von Contracten ohne eine auf diese drei Punkte sich beziehende Eidesformel nicht als gesichert gelten kann. Dieser Einwand, welcher das *iurati cavent* entschuldigen soll, wird kurz abgetan: *praescribit Christus non esse iurandum*' (for a more detailed description of Hartel's argument, see our paper, p. 19). In our view the weakness of Hartel's argument lies in the first place in the interpretation of *persecutio* as

'Verfolgung von Contracten'. Apart from the fact that this is a strange idea, Hartel has to assume that not only *tempus* but also *locus tribunalis* and *persona praesidis* must be constructed with *persecutionis*, which is hardly defendable. But, secondly, why should Tert. formulate an excuse for something which the opponent states he does not know? In our opinion the object of *volunt* is not *iurari* but *sciri*. The Christian borrower who signed the legal document said: 'I did not know about an oath'. Tert. replies: '<you may say that you did not know,> but, of course, the document that you signed wants you to know what is in it'. Instead of speaking about 'the document' Tert. sums up three characteristic elements of it. Such a document always had a form like this: 'on that and that day, at that and that place, there appeared before me, the president'; that is to say, it always contained the *tempus persecutionis*, i.e. the time of legal action (*persecutio* does not mean here 'persecution' but, as the *OLD*, s.v., 2, says: 'The carrying through or completion (of an enterprise)', for which is quoted Apuleius (so much imitated by Tert.!) *met.* 10, 27: *incepti negotii persecutionem*), the *locus tribunalis* and the *persona praesidis*. So, instead of saying 'the legal document wants you to know', Tert. says: 'the time of the action, the place of the judgement-seat and the person of the presiding judge want you to know'. It seems worth while to mention here that in the copy of Iunius' edition which contains in the margin copies of Scaliger's notes by Dominicus Baudius (Leiden P.L. 754.A.11) there is a note, viz. *persequentio debiti*, which does not occur in the copy which contains notes in Scaliger's own hand (ib., 754.A.10); so we may suppose that this correct interpretation is due to Baudius himself.—On the use of *persona*, cf. Braun, 210 with n. 1.

2. **Praescribit Christus non esse iurandum:** cf. in this context Dölger, *Sonne*, 113 seqq. (par. 15: 'Der Treueid für Christus'); see also Klostermann on Matth. 5, 34-7 (*HdbNT* 4, 46-7); Windisch on Jac. 5, 10 (*HdbNT* 15, 32-3); Bigelmair 100 seqq.; R. M. Grant, 'Sacrifices and Oaths as Required of Early Christianity', *Kyriakon*, Festschrift Joh. Quasten (München 1970), 1, 12-7. Tert. continues to refute the two attempts of escape of his fictitious opponent, viz., 'I did not say a word' and 'I did not know about the oath'. He starts with the following objection of the opponent in direct speech: 'I wrote (I signed) but I did not say a thing. Now it is the tongue that kills, not the (written) letter'. This is, of course, a variation, or, rather, the opposite of 2 Cor. 3, 6: τὸ γὰρ γράμμα ἀποκτείνει, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα ζωοποιεῖ. Tert. quotes the sentence in *Marc.* 5, 11, 4. He could have replied here that the statement of his opponent does not agree with 2 Cor. 3, 6 of which everyone thinks first in this context but he has probably borne in mind that his opponent referred to what is said about the evil of the tongue in the Epistle of James 3, 5-10. There is, of course, also a possibility that by this totally incorrect reminiscence

of a passage of the New Testament Tert. wants to characterize the unreliable behaviour of a Christian who denies his faith. — **naturam et conscientiam advoco:** an appeal to nature occurs frequently in Tert.'s works. We may say that the entire treatise *De testimonio animae* (with the parallel passages in *apol.* 18 and *an.* 41) is based on it. Further we may mention *an.* 25, 3, where Tert. interrogates pregnant women concerning the question whether the embryo is a living being, this in order to refute the Stoics who asserted that the soul only entered the body at the moment of birth in consequence of the first contact of the body with the cold air (ψυχή — ψῦχος); for all further details see Waszink, *ad loc.* (p. 321). — **conscientiam:** of course this word does not mean here 'conscience' but 'consciousness' = 'the fact of knowing', 'knowledge'. Cf. further the note on 13, 6. In the present passage *conscientia* of course refers to the fallacious statement *negant se scire*. Tert.'s appeal to nature and to awareness (*conscientia*) is an appeal to the process that takes place when one writes, and to the human awareness at this activity. The appeal to nature runs as follows: '<you cannot say that you just wrote, and did not say a thing, suggesting that you did not mentally partake in what you were doing,> because your hand can only write what your soul (mind) has dictated, even in the case that your tongue remains inactive at the dictate (of the mind)'. And Tert. adds: 'although <even in the latter case> the soul also gave its instruction to the tongue, either something conceived by itself or something delivered by somebody else'. In other words: even in the case that the tongue remains inactive, the soul gives its order to it and to the hand that writes. The fact that the tongue does not react is of no consequence. Thus the opponent's attempt to escape by stating that his tongue did not partake in the action is not valid. — **aut a se conceptum aut ab alio traditum:** at the end of the preceding argument Tert. realizes that the opponent could still find the following excuse: 'I admit that I signed the document which contained the text of the oath but it was somebody else who dictated the oath'. This is another way of denying inner participation in what was in the document. It is here that, after the appeal to nature, the appeal to the humane awareness (*conscientia*) is made: Tert. asks whether what someone else has dictated does not result in an activity (i.e. the activity of the hand that writes) *via the mind of the writer*, whether the tongue intervenes or not. Thus the opponent cannot keep free his mind from participation in this manner either, because his mind partakes in the action. 'Hence', Tert. continues, 'the Lord has rightly said that sin lies in the human mind and the human conscience'. He points to Matthew 5, 28 (or rather, as Currey rightly observes, to a mixture of Matth. 5, 21 and 15, 18), where the concupiscence which ascends into the heart of a man is held as a deed.

3. **animo:** suddenly Tert. substitutes *animo* for *anima*. In his early treatises he does not yet make a sharp difference between these two terms, as he will do afterwards in *an.* 12 ('*animus* = νοῦς, *anima* = ψυχή'). It remains, of course, possible that here *animo* is a faulty reading which was already present in the archetypus. — **delinqui** = *peccari*; cf. the note on 1, 1 (p. 80). — **Si ... teneri:** here the correct interpretation was already given by Oehler ('Pendet hic infinitivus ab praecedenti *inquit*') and Currey. *Inquit* is connected with an accus. cum infin. and is put at the place which it usually has in sentences in direct speech. Of this use sixteen examples are quoted in *TLL* VII, 1: 1779, 4-20. The first instance quoted is Paulus *dig.* 10, 3, 19, 4: *nec videre <se> inquit Pomponius, quare*, etc., the second Tert. *Marc.* 5, 18, 1: *Datam inquit sibi apostolus gratiam*, etc. In a great number of passages from legal texts an accus. cum infin. only seems to be connected with *inquam* because, as A. Szantyr, the author of this article in *TLL*, observes (ib. 1775, 34-5), it actually depends on a *verbum dicendi* in the preceding sentences, e.g. Ulpianus *dig.* 6, 1, 5, 1: *idem scribit ... quosdam existimasse ...; sed si deduci, inquit, non possit ... esse vindicandum.*

4. **Cavisti ... noluisse:** Tert. concludes: 'Thus you gave a guarantee and this has evidently ascended into your heart'. The whole previous passage was meant to prove that there was an inner participation in the act of signing the document. 'And', Tert. concludes, 'you cannot contend that you were ignorant or unwilling'. Here it appears that the argument just given also refutes the other objection of the opponent, viz., that he did not know.

5. **nam cum caveres ... quam cogitatu:** Tert. underlines the conclusion by stating: 'For since you gave a guarantee, you knew, and since you knew, you were, of course, willing'. 'And' he adds '<what happened there> is something not only in deed (the signing itself) but also in thought (the inner participation)'. — **et est** (*B*; defended by Hartel 1, 54) is undoubtedly the correct reading: it refers to the *act* of *cavere*, the *cautio*. Currey follows Gelenius, with Pamelius and Rigaltius (*et es tam in facto quam in cogitatu*), observing on all the conjectures (*egisti* Oehl., *haeres* Latinius): 'The sense is the same: 'You are in (i.e. you are convicted in) act as well as thought'.' — **Nec potes ... excludere:** now Tert. anticipates another objection. The opponent could try to justify himself by conceding to have committed a minor crime (this must be the signing of the document, as Hartel, 1, 54, rightly states) in order to exclude the major one, viz., the swearing. Oehler gives an erroneous interpretation: 'Levius crimen est errare, maius negare dominum Christum'. — **Falsum ... non iuravi:** the text of this sentence is in serious disarray. We think that the words *tamen non negavi* must be preceded by another statement in direct speech, and that, in consequence, the main verb must be in the first

person singular: instead of *effici* we should, therefore, read *effeci* or rather *feci*. In consequence, the form *facis* cannot be maintained. Now the oldest testimony (*B*) has *facit*; we suppose the loss of the subject of this verb and read the text as follows: *ut dicas*: '*Falsum plane feci cavendo, quod non facit <Christianus* (or *fidelis*?)*>; tamen non negavi, quia non iuravi.*' Kroymann went in this direction but did not come to a satisfactory solution (see the second apparatus in the CC edition). The opponent admits that he, indeed, has done something 'false' by giving a guarantee (*cavendo*), which is something that a Christian does not do. 'I did', he says, 'do something false, but I did not deny my faith because, in fact, I did not swear'. — **quoniam** (*B*) **... consenseris:** this is a sharp reaction at the argument of the opponent: 'because, even if you had done nothing of the kind (i.e. even if you had not signed at all), but you had consented (i.e. even if you had only *said*) to have done it, you would be said to have sworn'. This establishment of the text makes it unnecessary to read *Quin immo* with Reifferscheid or *Quinam*? with Hartel. The latter scholar writes: 'Diese Zwischenrede (sc. *Tamen non negavi*) macht es unmöglich, das überlieferte *quoniam* zu halten'. With our conjecture there is no *Zwischenrede* any more and the *quoniam*-sentence simply explains the previous *non potes ... excludere.* — **Non valet ... sonus:** In our opinion this sentence must contain a new objection by the fictitious opponent, since the next sentence is opened by *At enim* which is the usual beginning of a refutation. Kellner also supposes that Tert.'s opponent is speaking here but, by assuming that the sentence is a question, he makes him pronounce what is a refutation of his opinion, viz., 'Das lautlose Wort, erlangt es nicht Kraft durch die Feder, der unhörbare Ton nicht in den Buchstaben?'. Thelwall does not suppose an *occupatio* as assumed by us here but lets Tert.'s argument just go on: 'Silence of voice is an unavailing plea in a case of *writing*, and muteness of sound in a case of *letters*'. In our conviction, the opponent tries once more to reduce his activity in signing the document to something without value: 'The voice in the pen is without sound and the sound in the letters is without voice; they are, therefore, without force'. *Non valet* is practically synonymous with *vacat* in par. 1.

6. **At enim Zacharias ... vocalior:** Tert.'s answer to the preceding argument of the opponent is: 'But <this is not true,> because Zacharias, being punished with a temporary privation of his voice, 'pronounced' the name of his son by way of his hand' (Luke 1, 63). And he describes the process as follows: 'Zacharias held a colloquy with his mind, passed by his ruled out tongue, and with the help of his hands dictated the name (John) from his heart.' — **loquitur ... vocalior:** this is an excellent example of the carefully elaborated style of Tert.: two verbs with an adverbial adjunct are followed by two corresponding subjects accompanied by a predicate: *loquitur in stilo ...*

manus omni sono conclarior / auditur in cera ... littera omni ore vocalior. Two things should be noticed here: 1) the exact correspondence of the elements: *loquitur in stilo / auditur in cera* (with the variation in the length of the second syllables of the verbs), and *manus omni sono conclarior / littera omni ore vocalior* (with the variation in the first words); 2) the correspondence with the objections to which it is an answer: *non valet tacita vox in stilo ~ loquitur in stilo manus omni sono conclarior* and *mutus in littera sonus ~ auditur in cera littera omni ore vocalior.* Thelwall adopts the translation by Dodgson, who obviously understood the text in the sense given above ('in his pen there speaks, in his waxed tablet there is heard, a hand clearer than any sound, a letter more vocal than any mouth'). From the note added by Thelwall, in which he proposes a different translation, it seems to follow that he had not seen the merits of Dodgson's translation. As to *conclarior*: though no editor has adopted this reading of *B*, we think that the parallelism with *vocalior* makes this reading very attractive. It is true that this word is found nowhere else in Latin literature; but this is not the only case of Tert.'s use of a hapax with *con-*: cf. *conciliciatus* and *concineratus* (*pud.* 13, 7), *concolorans* (*pud.* 8, 2), *concubitalis* (*nat.* 2, 11, 3), *conresupinatus* (*an.* 48, 2), *compacticius* (*Valent.* 31, 1). It is for this reason that, in our opinion, the reading of *B* should be maintained. — **Quaero ... compertus est:** there seems to be no reason to adopt Gelenius' reading *Quaere*, which was adopted by Pamelius, Rigaltius, Oehler, Currey, Reifferscheid (hence also in the CC-edition) and Thelwall, for Tert. very often gives to his observations the form either of a question or of an appeal (cf., for instance the *advoco* in par. 2 and the *appello* in par. 3; however, it should be noted that *Quaere, an* occurs in 10, 6). *Quaero, an* should be interpreted with a positive sense, like *nescio, an*; the same applies to *appello, an* in par. 3 of this chapter.

7. **Dominum ... angelorum:** Tert. concludes his argument with a kind of peroration: 'Let us pray the Lord', he says, 'that we do not come into the need of such a contract, and, if we come into it, then may God either give to fellow Christians the opportunity to be active (i.e. to help by lending the necessary money, for then no danger of idolatry will exist) or give us the courage to break off the bonds of all this necessity (and so restrain from going to heathens for borrowing money) in order to prevent that those written letters (i.e. the document signed by the Christian), which are a denial of faith (*negatrices*), and which are the substitutes for <the words from> our mouth, be brought forward against us at the day of judgement, signed with the signature, not now of the witnesses but of the angels'. Tert. lets the document signed by the Christian debtor (who, in Tert.'s view, therewith denied his faith) play a part at the final judgement. 'It will be brought forward,' he says, 'signed with the signature, not now of the witnesses but of the angels.' Here we learn something new about the above document, viz., that it was signed not only by the debtor but also by witnesses (*advocati*). At the final judgement this document becomes, in Tert.'s imagination, a charge of idolatry, this time signed by the angels of God.—As to the *necessitas* mentioned twice in par. 7, it should be noticed that in *cor.* 11, 6 Tert. denies its existence for a Christian: *Non admittit status fidei allegationem necessitatis. Nulla est necessitas delinquendi, quibus una est necessitas non delinquendi. Nam et ad sacrificandum et directo negandum necessitate quis premitur tormentorum sive poenarum. Tamen nec illi necessitati disciplina conivet, quia potior est necessitas timendae negationis et obeundi martyrii quam evadendae passionis et implendi officii.*—As the last sentence of this chapter refers to the final judgement, so the final chapter of the somewhat earlier treatise *De spectaculis* contains a vivid description of the enormous *spectaculum* once to be offered by the same event. Also ch. 33 of the *De anima* is finished by a lengthy reference to it (at the end of the refutation of the doctrine of metempsychosis). — **operandi:** Tert. uses a neutral term: he prays that God may give to brethren an opportunity 'to take action'; this action may be a gift or a loan. In *virg. vel.* 13, 2 he speaks of a *eleemosynae operatio*; cf. also *Marc.* 1, 23, 9: *de alienis bonis ... nomine eleemosynae et dilectionis operatur.* — **vel:** the alternative is to be so firm that the necessity (of the need) is broken off, i.e. that one does not yield to the need, even if it is at the cost of one's life. — **litterae negatrices:** this expression is indeed a summary of the contents of the chapter: the act of signing the formulary here described amounts to a denial of the Christian faith, because it contains the oath which implies an invocation of one or more pagan gods. *Negatrix* occurs here for the first time.

Ch. 24. *Peroration*

The ship of faith has to sail amidst these dangers. Who is thrown overboard is lost (§ 1).

Let nobody say that being in this world one can not avoid idolatry. There is always a way out (§ 2).

The Holy Spirit has relieved our obligations in order to make us free for the fight against idolatry. This obligation must be the centre of Christian instruction (§ 3).

The Ark contained many animals, types of human vices. But there was no type of idolatry. Thus there should not be idolatry in the Church (§ 4).

1. The first section of this epilogue is highly rhetorical. The whole previous treatise was a summing up of hidden forms of idolatry which are a danger for the Christian faith. These dangers are compared here with cliffs and bays, shallows and straits, which the ship of faith has to pass. — **velificata spiritu**

dei: 'her sails filled by the spirit of God' (Thelwall). As it seems, we find here the meaning mentioned in the *OLD* as 3b, 'to direct the course (in flight)', of which two instances are quoted from Apuleius, viz., *Flor.* 22: *aquila... velificatas alas quo libuit advertens* and *De deo Socr.* 7: *ut eorum* (sc. daemoniorum) *quisquam ... Atto Navio avem velificet* (this passage is not treated in the commentary by J. Beaujeu, Coll. Budé, Paris 1973). — **velificata ... fides navigat:** much has been written on the comparison of the Church with a ship; we limit ourselves to quoting the most important publications: F. J. Dölger, 'Das Schiff der Kirche', in *Sol Salutis*, 272-9; J. Daniélou, 'Le navire de l'église', in *Les symboles chrétiens primitifs* (Paris 1961), 65-76; E. Peterson, 'Das Schiff als Symbol der Kirche in der Eschatologie', *Theol. Zeitschr.* 1956, 77 seqq., = *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis. Studien und Untersuchungen* (Darmstadt 1982), 92-6; T. P. O'Malley S.J., *Tertullian and the Bible* (Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva, vol. 21, Noviomagi 1967), 78-9 (with more lit.). — **tuta, si cauta:** cf. *cautio idololatriae* in par. 2. — **secura, si attonita:** an oxymoron as Tert. likes it: it combines confidence and fear. Iunius conjectured *attenta* but already De la Cerda observed that there is no need for this; he rightly refers to *fuga*, 1, 5-6: *Sed quando magis creditur, nisi cum magis timetur, nisi in tempore persecutionis? Ecclesia in attonito est, tunc et fides in expeditione sollicitior*, etc. (cf. Thierry's commentary). In *TLL* II: 1157, 25 this passage is not correctly explained, viz., as '*in attonito*, sc. *tempore*', whereas there *in attonito* is clearly equivalent to the simple adjective *attonita*. Oehler also quotes *praescr.* 43, 5: *Ubi metus in Deum, ibi gravitas honesta et diligentia attonita et cura sollicita*, where also the adj. *attonita* and *sollicita* are on the same level. We also draw attention to the fact that in Joann. Cassian. *Collat.* 2, 15 and 12, 1 *attonitus* = *attentus*. For this meaning of *attonitus* see Böhm, 181, who—wrongly in our opinion—follows *TLL* in supposing that *attentus* is the meaning here, as also in *fuga* 1, 5-6. — **inenatabile** and **inrespirabile** are both hapaxes; Tert. has a very marked preference for negative adjectives ending on *-bilis*; cf. the list in Hoppe, *Beitr.*, 142-3, where more than thirty adjectives of this type are enumerated which occur for the first time in Tert.'s works (among them twelve hapaxes). Clearly these adjectives do not stem from the Christian idiom in Latin but are neologisms coined by Tert. — **impactis:** cf. the note on 11, 2. — **naufragium:** on the use of this metaphor by Tert. cf. Schöllgen, 79, n. 357. — **hypobrychium:** *TLL* VI, 3: 3152, 71-4: 'ὑποβρύχιον *Not. Tir.* 110, 21: hippoprigium. *i.q. submersio*: Tert. idol. 24, cf. W. Schulze, *Kl. Schr.* 153.' Evidently Tert. regarded the Greek word as more appropriate to this rhetorical passage than the Latin equivalent *submersio*. Iunius' note deserves to be quoted: 'Quod barathrum est in terra, idem est in aqua vel mari ὑποβρύχιον devorans et exsorbens in submersione homines navigiaque'. — **eius:** sc., *idololatriae* (twice). — **offocant:** the first certain instance of this verb is found in Florus *epit.* 2, 11, 6 (two very uncertain instances in Seneca *dial.* 6, 24, 5 and 10, 2, 4; cf. *TLL* IX, 2: 529, 22-6). Tert. uses this verb in its literal sense, as is evident from Paul. ex Festo p. 211 L: *offucare: aquam in fauces obsorbendam dare.* — **desorbet:** in *TLL* V, 1: 735, 24-6 the explication 'i.q. *devorare*' is given; in our view *de-* was chosen on account of *ad inferos*. The only other passage where this verb occurs is Mart. Cap. 8, 604: *Silenus ... blandum stertens ranae sonitum desorbentis increpuit*. As De la Cerda observes, Tert. may think here of the Charybdis; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 3, 420-2 (a famous passage, which Tert. may have had in mind, it may be subconsciously): *Charybdis ... imo ter gurgite vastos/sorbet in abruptum fluctus.*

2. **quis tam tuto praecavebit?:** 'Who could be careful to such an extent (*tam*) that he avoids every wave of idolatry?' Not without reason Tert. used *quicumque* and *omnis* in the previous sentence. It is not necessary to adopt Iunius' conjecture *iam* instead of *tam*. — **Exeundum de saeculo erit:** these words are a free quotation of 1 Cor. 5, 10 which passage was already cited in 14, 5. A similar use of this verse occurs in *an.* 35, 2; further, 1 Cor. 5, 9-11 is quoted in *pud.* 18, 7. In the present passage the Scripture words are used by the imaginary opponent who argues that, in order to avoid every kind of idolatry, one should have to leave this world. — **Quasi non tanti ... quam:** this is an understatement, in which *non tanti ... quam* is used instead of *potius ... quam*: Tert. actually means that to leave the world is better than to live in it as an idolater. The reading *tanti ... quam* is justly defended by Böhm, 182. — **stare:** here almost = *esse*. Cf. Lucr. 5, 199: *Tanta stat praedita culpa* (sc. natura). — **in capite:** De la Cerda seems to be right with his interpretation: 'Si ante omnia atque in principe loco timor idololatriae sit'. He is followed by Currey: 'If the fear of idolatry be at the head, i.e. be foremost', and Kellner: 'wenn die Furcht davor alles beherrscht'.

3. **consultantibus tunc apostolis:** Tert. refers to the decision of the Counsel of Jerusalem mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles 15, 28; he quotes this passage in *pud.* 12, 4: *Visum est ... Spiritui sancto et nobis nullum amplius vobis adicere pondus quam eorum a quibus necesse est abstineri, a sacrificiis et a fornicationibus et sanguine.* — **ut ... vacaremus:** Tert. interprets the text of the Acts just mentioned in such a way, that the Apostles relaxed for the Christians the burden of the Jewish law, in order to make them free for the fight against idolatry. — **Haec erit lex nostra:** in Tert.'s view the words *abstineri a ... sanguine*, i.e. *ab idololatria* are the Christian law in its entirety. This interpretation is understandable if one recalls to mind that *every* sin is, in Tert.'s opinion (cf. ch. 1), an act of idolatry. — **quo expedita, hoc plenius administranda:** in classical Latin we would expect *Quo magis expedita*. Cf. on this subject Hoppe, *De serm. Tert.*, 48 seqq.; Hofm., *Synt.*, 466; Hofm.-

Szant., *Synt.*, 169-70; Böhm, 182-3. — **expedita:** refers to *relaxavit* in the previous sentence. The Holy Spirit has lightened the burden of the Christians so that they are *expediti*. Tert., however, transfers this qualification to the law itself: it is to be fulfilled easily. — **propria Christianorum:** as Tert. understands it, the *lex devitandae idololatriae* is peculiar to the Christians, because it delineates the whole Christian life. By the observance of this law (*per quam*) we are recognized as Christians by the heathens (cf. 13, 6), and we are tested by them on that observance. — **haec accedentibus ... proponenda:** Tert. stresses the need of serious instruction of the catechumenes; see also 12, 1: *Ante enim fuit deliberandum.* — **ingredientibus ... inculcanda:** here Tert. means the proper baptismal instruction. — **renuntient sibi:** if the instruction in the faith has been as it must be, so that one has identified himself with the faith, a *renuntiatio fidei* means a *renuntiare sibi*.

4. **Viderimus enim si:** 'Let it be so that'; cf. 11, 2 *viderint*. — **archetypum:** this is the reading of *B* Gel, instead of which Latinius conjectured *arcae typum* (and two lines further *arcae typo* instead of *archetypo*). Scaliger wished to maintain the reading of *B* Gel, as appears from a note written in the margin of his copy of the edition of Iunius (Leiden University Library, B.P. 754.10). In our opinion, Scaliger was right. Tert. says that the Church may have ravens, kites, etc., 'in accordance with its model'. The reader is supposed to understand immediately that *archetypus* refers to Noah's ark, which is mentioned in the last sentence. *Archetypus* is the equivalent of *exemplarium* in 5, 3: *exemplarium causae suae.* — **corvus ... serpens:** these animals are considered here as symbols of human vices. Cf. *an.* 32, 8 where it is said that, if Holy Scripture (Ps. 48, 21) says: *assimilatus est homo inrationabilibus iumentis*, therefore not yet *milvi ex rapacibus fient et canes ex spurcis*. The characterization of the kite as rapacious stems from Plato, *Phaedo* 82 a (for further passages see *TLL* VIII: 986, 54-63; Otto, *Sprichw.*, 222). The same is said about the raven (*TLL* IV: 1078, 61-82; Otto, ib. 95) and the wolf (*TLL* VII, 2: 1854, 61-1855, 65; Otto, ib., 198-9; O'Malley, 88). Tert. may here, too, as in *an.* 32, 8, have regarded the dog as dirty; as to Tert.'s statements concerning snakes, cf. O'Malley, 88; Patricia Cox, 'Origen and the Bestial Soul' (*Vig. Chr.* 36 (1982), 115-40), 128-31. More literature is mentioned in G. Friedrich, Kittel 10/2 ('Literaturnachweise'), s.vv. κύων (1154), λύκος (1164), ὄφις (1208).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. WORKS ON TERTULLIAN

Only those works are mentioned which are quoted with abridged titles, or of which only the author is mentioned.

A. *Referring to the contents and chronology of his writings.*

Aalders, G. J. D.: Tertullianus' citaten uit de Evangeliën en de oud-Latijnse Bijbelvertalingen (thesis Amsterdam, Free University), Amsterdam 1932.

——: *Luc.* = Tertullian's quotations from St. Luke, Mnemosyne ser. III, 5 (1937), 241-82.

Adam, K.: *Chronol.* = Die Chronologie der noch vorhandenen Schriften Tertullians, Der Katholik 88 (4. Folge, B. 37), Mainz 1908, 341-70. 416-34.

d'Alès, A.: La théologie de Tertullien, Paris 1905.

Backer, E. de: Sacramentum. Le mot et l'idée représentée par lui dans les œuvres de Tertullien, Louvain 1911.

Barnes, T. D.: Tertullian. A Historical and Literary Study. Reissued with corrections and a postscript, Oxford 1985.

Beck, A.: Römisches Recht bei Tertullian und Cyprian (Schriften der Königsberger gelehrten Gesellschaft, geisteswiss. Klasse, 7. Jahr, Heft 2), Halle 1930.

Becker, C.: *Tert. Apol.* = Tertullians Apologeticum. Werden und Leistung, München 1954.

Bender, W.: Die Lehre über den Heiligen Geist bei Tertullian (Münchener theologische Studien, 2. Reihe XVIII), München 1961.

Dekkers, E.: Tertullianus en de geschiedenis der Liturgie (Catholica VI, 2), Brussel-Amsterdam 1947.

Fredouille, J.-Cl.: Tertullien et la conversion de la culture antique, Paris 1972.

Geest, J. E. L. van der: Le Christ et l'Ancient Testament chez Tertullien (Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva, fasc. 22), Nijmegen 1972.

Guignebert, Ch.: Tertullien. Étude sur ses sentiments à l'egard de l'empire et la société civile, thesis Paris 1901.

Hauck, A.: Tertullians Leben und Schriften, Erlangen 1877.

Heinze, R.: Tertullians Apologeticum (Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Kön. Sachs. Gesellsch. d. Wiss., Phil.-hist. Kl., 62 B, 10. H.), Leipzig 1910.

Klein, R.: Tertullian und das römische Reich, Heidelberg 1968.

Köhne, J.: Tertullians Schrift über die Schauspiele, Münster i.W. 1929.

Lortz, J.: Tertullian als Apologet, 1-2 (Münsterische Beitr. z. Theologie 9-10), Münster 1927-1928.

Meijering, E. P.: Tertullian contra Marcionem. Gotteslehre in der Polemik. Adversus Marcionem I-II (Philosophia Patrum, III), Leiden 1977.

Moingt, J.: Théologie trinitaire de Tertullien. I: Histoire, doctrine, méthodes; II: Substantialité et individualité; III: Unité et processions, Paris 1966.

Neander, A.: Antignosticus. Geist des Tertullianus und Einleitung in dessen Schriften, Berlin ²1849.

Noeldechen, E.: Die Abfassungszeit der Schriften Tertullians (Texte und Untersuchungen V, 2), Leipzig 1888.

Otto, S.: Natura und Dispositio. Untersuchung zum Naturbegriff und zur Denkform Tertullians (Münchener theologische Studien, 2. Reihe XIX), München 1960.

Quispel, G.: De bronnen van Tertullianus' Adversus Marcionem (thesis Utrecht), Leiden 1943.

Rambaux, Cl.: Tertullien face aux morales des trois premiers siècles, Paris 1979.

Roberts, R. E.: The Theology of Tertullian, London 1924.

Schöllgen, G.: Ecclesia sordida? Zur Frage der sozialen Schichtung frühchristlicher Gemeinden am Beispiel Karthagos zur Zeit Tertullians (Jb. für Ant. u. Christentum, Erg. bd. 12), Münster 1984.

SCHÜMMER, J.: Die altchristliche Fastenpraxis mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Schriften Tertullians (Liturgiegeschichtliche Quellen und Forschungen, Heft 27), Münster i.W. 1933.
SIDER, R.: Ancient Rhetoric and the Art of Tertullian, Oxford 1971.
SPANNEUT, M.: Tertullien et les premiers moralistes africains, Gembloux 1969.
STÄGER, L.: Das Leben im römischen Afrika im Spiegel der Schriften Tertullians, thesis Zürich 1973.
TURMEL, J.: Tertullien, Paris 1904.
VECCHIOTTI, I.: La filosofia di Tertulliano, Urbino 1970.
VRIES, G. J. de: Bijdrage tot de psychologie van Tertullianus (thesis Amsterdam, Free University), Utrecht 1929.

B. *Referring to the text of his works and his idiom.*

BLOKHUIS, G.: De Latinitate qua usus est Tertullianus in Apologetico (thesis Utrecht), Velp 1892.
BRAUN, R.: Deus Christianorum. Recherches sur le vocabulaire doctrinal de Tertullien. Seconde édition revue et augmentée, Paris 1977.
DEMMEL, F. A.: Die Neubildungen auf -antia und -entia bei Tertullian, Immensee 1944.
ENGELBRECHT, A.: Neue lexikalische und semasiologische Beiträge aus Tertullian, Wiener Studien 28 (1906), 142-59.
GOMPERZ, H.: Tertullianea, Wien 1895.
HARTEL, W. von: Patristische Studien, 1-4 (Sitz. Ber. Wiener Akad., Philos.-hist. Classe, Bd. CXX, VI; Bd. CXXI, II, VI, XIV), Wien 1890.
HAUSCHILD, G. R.: Die Grundsätze und Mittel der Wortbildung bei Tertullian (Progr. Gymnasium), Frankfurt a.M. 1881.
HOPPE, H.: *Beitr.* = Beiträge zur Sprache und Kritik Tertullians (Skrifter utgav. Vetensk.-soc. i Lund, 14), Lund 1932.
——: *Serm. Tert.* = De sermone Tertullianeo quaestiones selectae, thesis Marburg 1897.
——: *Synt.* = Syntax und Stil des Tertullian, Leipzig 1903.
JANSSEN, H.: Kultur und Sprache. Zur Geschichte der alten Kirche im Spiegel der Sprachentwicklung von Tertullian bis Cyprian (Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva, fasc. VIII), Nijmegen 1938.
KLUSSMANN, M.: *Cur. Tert.* = Curarum Tertullianearum particulae tres, Gotha 1887.
KROYMANN, Aem.: *Q.C.* = Quaestiones Tertullianeae criticae, Innsbruck 1893.
LÖFSTEDT, E.: *Apol.* = Tertullians Apologeticum textkritisch untersucht, Lund (L.U.Å.) 1915.
——: *Krit. Apol.* = Kritische Bemerkungen zu Tertullians Apologeticum, Lund (L.U.Å.) 1918.
——: *Z. Spr. Tert.* = Zur Sprache Tertullians, Lund (L.U.Å.) 1920.
O'MALLEY S.J., T. P.: Tertullian and the Bible. Language - Imagery - Exegesis (Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva, fasc. XXI), Nijmegen 1967.
RÖNSCH H.: *NTT* = Das Neue Testament Tertullians, Leipzig 1871.
SÄFLUND, G.: De Pallio und die stilistische Entwicklung Tertullians (Skrifter utg. av Svenska Institutet i Rom, 8°, VIII), Lund 1955.
SCHMIDT, Aem.: De Latinitate Tertullianea, 1-2, Erlangen 1870-1872.
TEEUWEN, St. W. J.: Sprachlicher Bedeutungswandel bei Tertullian (Stud. z. Gesch. u. Kult. des Altert., XIV), Paderborn 1926.
THÖRNELL, G.: *Stud. Tert.* = Studia Tertullianea, 1-4, Uppsala (U.U.Å.) 1918-1926.
VLIET, J. van der: Studia ecclesiastica. Tertullianus I. Critica et interpretatoria, Leiden 1891.
WALTZING, J. P.: *Ét.* = Étude sur le Codex Fuldensis de l'Apologétique de Tertullien (Bibl. de la Fac. de Philos. et Lettres de l'Univ. de Liège, fasc. XXI), Liège-Paris, 1914-1917.

C. *Special editions and commentaries.*

This list only contains the editions which are used normally. For a complete list of the editions of works of Tertullian see G. Schöllgen, *Ecclesia sordida?* (*JbAC*, Ergänzungsband 12, Münster i.W. 1984), 314-9.

BINDLEY, T. H.: BINDLEY, T. H.: Tertulliani De praescriptione haereticorum, Ad martyras, Ad Scapulam, with introduction and notes, Oxford 1893.

BÖHM, H.: Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus De idololatria. Einleitung, Übersetzung, Kommentar (thesis Wien 1973; not printed).
BOULANGER, A.: Tertullien, De spectaculis, Paris 1933.
BÜCHNER, J.: Tertullian, De spectaculis, Kommentar, Würzburg 1935.
CURREY, G.: Tertulliani libri tres, De spectaculis, De idololatria et De corona militis, Cambridge 1854.
DIERCKS, G. F.: Q. Septimius Florens Tertullianus, De oratione. Kritische uitgave met prolegomena, vertaling en philologisch-exegetisch-liturgisch commentaar (thesis Amsterdam), Bussum 1947.
EVANS, E.: *carn. Chr.* = Tertullian's Treatise on the Incarnation. The Text edited with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary, London 1956.
——: *Prax.* = Tertullian's Treatise against Praxeas. The Text edited with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary, London 1948.
FONTAINE, J.: Tertullien sur la couronne. Édition, introduction et commentaire («Érasme», Collection de textes latins commentés), Paris 1966.
GERLO, A.: Q. S. Fl. Tertullianus, De pallio. Kritische uitgave met vertaling en commentaar, 1-2, Wetteren 1940.
KOK, W.: Tertullianus De cultu feminarum, met inleiding, vertaling en commentaar (thesis Amsterdam, Free University), Dokkum 1934.
LABRIOLLE, P. de: Tertullien, De paenitentia et De pudicitia. Texte latin, traduction française, introduction et index, Paris 1906.
LESAINT, W. P.: Tertullian, Treatises on Marriage and Remarriage, translated and annotated (ACW, 13), Westminster, Maryland-London 1951.
MAHÉ, J.-P.: Tertullien, La Chair du Christ. Introduction, texte critique, traduction et commentaire (Sources Chrétiennes, 216-7), Paris 1975.
MOHRMANN, Chr.: *Tert. Apol.* = Tertullianus, Apologeticum en andere geschriften uit Tertullianus' voor-Montanistische tijd (Monumenta christiana I, 3), Utrecht-Brussel 1951.
REFOULÉ, R. F.: *Bapt.* = Tertullien, Traité du baptême. Texte, introduction et notes de R. F. REFOULÉ, O.P., traduction en collaboration avec M. Drouzy, O.P. (Sources Chrétiennes, 35), Paris 1952.
——: *Praescr.* = Tertullien, Traité de la prescription contre les hérétiques. Introduction, texte critique et notes de R. F. REFOULÉ, O.P., traduction de P. de Labriolle (Sources Chrétiennes, 46), Paris 1957.
SCHNEIDER, A.: Le premier livre *Ad nationes* de Tertullien. Introduction, texte, traduction et commentaire (Bibliotheca Helvetica Romana, IX), Institut Suisse de Rome, 1968.
SCHOLTE, W. A. J. C.: Q. S. Florentis Tertulliani libellum De testimonio animae praefatione translatione adnotationibus instructum edidit (thesis Utrecht), Amsterdam 1934.
STEPHAN, A.: Tertulliani Ad uxorem libri duo denuo editi apparatu critico commentario exegetico Batave scripto indice verborum et nominum instructi (thesis Amsterdam, Free University), Den Haag 1954.
THIERRY, J. J.: Tertullianus, De fuga in persecutione. Met inleiding, vertaling, toelichting en index (thesis Amsterdam, Free University), Hilversum 1941.
TRAENKLE, H.: Q. S. F. Tertulliani Adversus Iudaeos, mit Einleitung und kritischem Kommentar herausgegeben, Wiesbaden 1964.
TURCAN, M.: Tertullien, La toilette des femmes (De cultu feminarum). Introduction, texte critique, traduction et commentaire (Sources Chrétiennes, 173), Paris 1971.
TURCAN, M.: Tertullien, Les spectacles (De spectaculis). Introduction, texte critique, traduction et commentaire (Sources Chrétiennes, 332), Paris 1986.
WALTZING, J. P.: *Comm.* = Tertullien, Apologétique. Commentaire analytique, grammatical et historique, Paris 1931.
WASZINK, J. H.: Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani De anima edited with Introduction and Commentary, Amsterdam 1947.
——: Quinti Septimii Florentis Tertulliani Adversus Hermogenem Liber, quem ad fidem codicum recensuit prolegomenisque instruxit. Ultrajecti/Antverpiae 1956.
——: *Herm.* = The Treatise against Hermogenes. Translated and Annotated (ACW, 24). Westminster, Maryland-London 1956.

II. MORE GENERAL WORKS

A. *Referring to the history of religion, philosophy, daily life and early Christianity.*

ABT, A.: Die Apologie des Apuleius von Madaura und die antike Zauberei (RVV 4), Giessen 1908.

AMAND, D.: Fatalisme et liberté dans l'antiquité grecque, Louvain 1945.

BARDY, G.: La conversion au christianisme durant les premiers siècles, Paris 1949.

BIDEZ, J. – CUMONT, F.: Les mages hellénisés 1-2, Paris 1938.

BIGELMAIR, A.: Die Beteiligung der Christen am öffentlichen Leben im vorconstantinischer Zeit, München 1902.

BLACK, M.: The Book of Enoch or I Enoch. A new English edition with commentary and textual notes, Leiden 1985.

BLÜMNER, H.: *Privataltertümer* = Die römischen Privataltertümer, München ³1911.

——: *Technologie* = Technologie und Terminologie der Gewerbe und Künste bei Griechen und Römern, 1-4, Leipzig 1874-87.

BORRIES, B. von: Quid veteres philosophi de idololatria senserint, Göttingen 1918.

BOUCHÉ-LECLERCQ, A.: L'astrologie grecque, Paris 1899.

BOUSSET, W.: Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter (*HdbNT*, 21), Tübingen ³1966.

CHARLES, R. H.: *Apocrypha* = The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English ..., edited in conjunction with many scholars by R. A. CHARLES, 1-2, Oxford 1913.

——: *The book of En.* = The Book of Enoch translated anew from the Editor's Text with Introduction, Commentary, Critical Notes, and Appendices, Oxford 1912.

CLERC, C.: Les théories relatives au culte des images chez les auteurs grecs du II^{me} siècle après J.-C., Paris 1915.

CRAMER, F. H.: Astrology in Roman Law and Politics. I. Astrology in Rome until the End of the Principate, Philadelphia 1954.

CUMONT, F.: *Astr. Rel.* = Astrology and Religion among the Greeks and Romans, New York-London 1912.

——: *L'Égypte* = L'Égypte des astrologues, Bruxelles 1937.

——: *Lux* = Lux perpetua (publ. par la Marquise de Maillé et Louis Canet), Paris 1949.

——: *Rel. or.* = Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain, Paris ⁴1929.

DANIÉLOU, J.: *Origines* = Les origines du christianisme latin, Paris 1978.

DEISSMANN, A.: Licht vom Osten. Das Neue Testament und die neuentdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Welt, Tübingen ⁴1923.

DIBELIUS, M.: Die Geisterwelt im Glauben des Paulus, Göttingen 1909.

DIETERICH, A.: *Abraxas* = Abraxas. Studien zur Religionsgeschichte des späteren Altertums, Leipzig 1891.

——: *Kl. Schr.* = Kleine Schriften, Leipzig-Berlin 1911.

DÖLGER, F. J.: *AC* = Antike und Christentum, 1-6, Münster i.W. 1929-40.

——: *Exorz.* = Der Exorzismus im altchristlichen Taufritaul (Stud. z. Gesch. u. Kultur des Alt., III B, 1-2), Paderborn 1909.

——: *Ichth.* = ΙΧΘΥΣ, 1²-5, Münster i.W. 1922 seqq.

——: *Sol Sal.* = Sol Salutis (Liturgiegeschichtl. Quellen und Forschungen, Heft 16-7), Münster i.W. 1925 seqq.

——: *Sonne* = Die Sonne der Gerechtigkeit und der Schwarze (Liturgiegeschichtl. Quellen und Forschungen, Heft 14), Münster i.W. 1919.

——: *Sphragis* = Die Sphragis. Eine altchristliche Taufbezeichnung in ihren Beziehungen zur profanen und religiösen Kultur des Altertums (Stud. z. Gesch. u. Kultur des Alt., Heft 3-4), Paderborn 1911.

FRIEDLÄNDER, L.: Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms, 1-4, Leipzig ¹⁰1922.

GEFFCKEN, J.: *Bilderstreit* = Der Bilderstreit des heidnischen Altertums, ARW 19 (1916-19), 285-315.

——: *Zw. gr. Apol.* = Zwei griechische Apologeten, Leipzig-Berlin 1907.

——: *Kyn.* = Kynika und Verwandtes, Heidelberg 1909.

GUNDEL, W.: Sterne und Sternbilder im Glauben des Altertums und der Neuzeit, Bonn 1922.

GUSSEN, P. J. G.: Het leven in Alexandrië volgens de cultuurhistorische gegevens in de Paedagogus (Boek II en III) van Clemens Alexandrinus, Assen 1955.

HEFELE, C. J.: Histoire des Conciles d'après les documents originaux, Paris 1907 seqq.

HEINEMANN, I.: Poseidonios' metaphysische Schriften, 1-2, Breslau 1921. 1928.

HENNECKE, E.: Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung. 3., völlig neubearbeitete Auflage herausgegeben von Wilhelm Schneemelcher, 1-2, Tübingen 1959. 1964.

Inter. Crit. Comm. = The International Critical Commentary on the Holy Scripture of the Old and New Testaments, under the editorship of S. R. DRIVER, A. PLUMMER, and C. A. BRIGGS, Edinburgh 1903.

JÖRS, P. – KUNKEL, W.: Römisches Privatrecht, Berlin-Göttingen-Heidelberg ³1949.

KLAUSER, Th.: Die Cathedra im Totenkult der heidnischen und christlichen Antike (Liturgiegeschichtl. Forschungen, Heft 9), Münster i.W. 1927.

KOCH, H.: Die altchristliche Bilderfrage nach den literarischen Quellen (Forschungen zu Rel. und Lit. des A. und N. Test., N.F., Heft 10), Göttingen 1917.

LATTE, K.: Römische Religionsgeschichte, München 1960.

MARQUARDT, J.: *Privatleben* = Das Privatleben der Römer (2. Aufl. von A. MAU), Leipzig 1886.

——: *Staatsverw.* = Römische Staatsverwaltung, 1-3, Leipzig 1881-85.

MARROU, H.-I.: *Éducation* = Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité, Paris 1948.

——: *St. Aug.* = Saint Augustin et la fin de la culture antique, Paris ⁴1958.

MESSINA, G.: Der Ursprung der Magier und die Zarathustrische Religion (thesis Berlin), Roma 1930.

MOMMSEN, Th.: Das römische Strafrecht, Leipzig 1899.

MONCEAUX, P.: Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique, 1, Paris 1901.

NOCK, A. D.: Conversion, Oxford 1933.

NORDEN, E.: *Agn. Th.* = Agnostos Theos, Leipzig-Berlin 1913.

——: *Ant. Kunstpr.* = Die Antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v.Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance, 5. Aufl., Reprint Darmstadt 1958.

OTTO, A.: Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer, Leipzig 1890.

PREISENDANZ, K.: Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri herausgegeben von K. PREISENDANZ, Leipzig-Berlin 1928.

REITZENSTEIN, R.: *Hist. monach.* = Historia monachorum und Historia Lausiaca, Göttingen 1916.

——: *Poim.* = Poimandres, Leipzig 1904.

SCHLIER, H.: Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Ignatiusbriefen, Giessen 1929.

SCHRIJNEN, J.: Collectanea Schrijnen, Verspreide opstellen van Dr. Jos. Schrijnen, Nijmegen-Utrecht 1939.

SOHM-MITTEIS-WENGER: R. SOHM, Institutiones. Geschichte und System des römischen Privatrechts. Bearbeitet von L. MITTEIS, herausgegeben von L. WENGER, Berlin ¹⁷1939.

STRACK, B.: H. L. STRACK – P. BILLERSBECK, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch, 1-5, München 1922-28.

TAMBORINO, J.: De antiquorum daemonismo (RVV VII), Giessen 1909.

VÖGTLE, A.: Die Tugend- und Lasterkataloge im Neuen Testament (Neutestam. Abh. 16. Bd., 4-5 H.), Münster i.W. 1936.

VREESE, L. C. P. J. de: Augustinus en de astrologie (thesis Amsterdam, Municipal University), Maastricht 1933.

WARDE FOWLER, W.: The Roman Festivals of the Period of the Republic, London 1899.

WENDLAND, P.: *Kultur* = Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zu Judentum und Christentum (*HdbNT* 1, 2. u. 3. Teil), Tübingen ²⁻³1912.

——: *Philo Diatr.* = Philo und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe (Beitr. z. Gesch. d. griech. Philos. u. Rel.), Berlin 1895.

——: *Philo Vors.* = Philos Schrift über die Vorsehung, Berlin 1892.

——: *Die Therapeuten* (Fleckeisens Jahrb., Suppl. 22), Leipzig 1896.

WISSOWA, G.: *Ges. Abh.* = Gesammelte Abhandlungen zur römischen Religions- und Stadtgeschichte, München 1904.

——: *Rel.* = Religion und Kultus der Römer, München ²1912.

b. *Linguistic and grammatical works*

Bourciez, R.: Éléments de linguistique romane. Édition revisée par l'auteur et par les soins de J. Bourciez, Paris ⁴1946.

Ernout, A.: Les éléments dialectaux du vocabulaire latin, Paris 1909.

Ernout-Meillet: Dictionaire étymologique de la langue latine par A. Ernout et A. Meillet, Paris ²1939.

Goelzer, H.: Étude lexicographique et grammaticale de la latinité de Saint Jérôme, Paris 1894.

Heumann-Seckel: Heumanns Handbuch zu den Quellen des römischen Rechts. In neunter Auflage neu bearbeitet von E. Seckel, Jena 1907.

Hofm., *Synt.* = Stolz-Schmalz, 5. Aufl. 2. Lieferung: Syntax und Stilistik, neubearbeitet von J. B. Hofmann, München 1928.

Hofm.-Szant., *Synt.* = Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik von J. B. Hofmann, neubearbeitet von A. Szantyr. Mit dem allgemeinen Teil der lateinischen Grammatik, München 1965.

Kalb, W.: *Jur.* = Roms Juristen nach ihrer Sprache dargestellt, Leipzig 1890.

——: *Juristenlat.* = Das Juristenlatein, Erlangen ²1880.

Krebs-Schmalz: J. Ph. Krebs, Antibarbarus der lateinischen Sprache, 7. ... durchgesehene Auflage von J. H. Schmalz, 1-2, Basel 1905. 1907 (9., unveränderte Auflage, Darmstadt 1984).

Kühn-Stegm.: R. Kühner – C. Stegmann, Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. Satzlehre, 1-2. 3. Auflage, durchgesehen von A. Thierfelder, Leverkusen 1955.

Landgraf, G.: Kommentar zu Ciceros Rede pro Sex. Roscio Amerino, Leipzig-Berlin ²1914.

Lebreton, J.: Étude sur la langue et la grammaire de Cicéron, Paris 1901.

Leumann, M.: Stolz-Schmalz, Lateinische Grammatik. 5. Aufl. 1. Lieferung: Laut- und Formenlehre, neubearbeitet von M. Leumann, München 1929.

Lindsay, W. M.: The Latin Language, Oxford 1894.

Löfstedt, E.: *Arnob.* = Arnobiana, Lund (L.U.Å.) 1917.

——: *Beitr.* = Beiträge zur Kenntnis der späteren Latinität, thesis Uppsala (U.U.Å.) 1907.

——: *Per.* = Philologischer Kommentar zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae, Oxford-Uppsala-Leipzig ²1936.

——: *Spätlat. Stud.* = Spätlateinische Studien, Uppsala 1908.

——: *Synt.* = Syntactica, 1-2 (Acta Reg. Soc. Hum. Litt. Lund, X: 1-2), Lund 1 ²1942; 2 ib. 1933.

——: *Verm. Stud.* = Vermischte Studien zur lateinischen Sprachkunde und Syntax (Acta Reg. Soc. Hum. Litt. Lund, XXIII), Lund 1936.

Matzkow, W.: De vocabulis quibusdam Italae et Vulgatae Christianis, thesis Berlin 1933.

Médan, W.: La latinité d'Apulée dans les Métamorphoses, thesis Paris 1926.

Merkx, P. A. H. J.: Zur Syntax der Kasus und Tempora in den Traktaten des hl. Cyprian (Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva, Fasc. IX), Nijmegen 1939.

Mohrmann, Chr.: *Aug.* = Die altchristliche Sondersprache in den Sermones des hl. Augustin (Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva, Fasc. III), Nijmegen 1932.

——: *Ét.* = Études sur le latin des chrétiens, 1-4 (Storia e letteratura 65. 87. 103. 143), Roma 1958. 1961. 1965. 1977.

Müller, C. F. W.: Syntax des Nominativus und Akkusativus im Lateinischen, Leipzig 1908.

Nelson, H. L. W.: Petronius en zijn 'vulgair' Latijn: I. Inleiding en formeel-grammatische problemen (thesis Utrecht), Alphen aan den Rijn 1947.

Norden, E.: P. Vergilius Maro, Aeneis Buch VI erklärt, Leipzig-Berlin ³1926.

Pettersson, O.: Commentationes Livianae, thesis Uppsala (U.U.Å.) 1930.

Radermacher, L.: Neutestamentliche Grammatik (*HdbNT* 1), Tübingen ²1925.

Rönsch, H.: *It.* = Itala und Vulgata, Marburg ²1875.

——: *Sem.* = Semasiologische Beiträge zum lateinischen Wörterbuch, 1-3, Leipzig 1887-89.

Salonius, A. H.: Vitae Patrum (Acta Soc. Hum. Litt. Lund, II), Lund 1920.

Schrijn.-Mohrm.: Schrijnen, J. – Mohrmann, Chr., Studien zur Syntax der Briefe des hl. Cyprian, 1-2 (Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva, fasc. V-VI), Nijmegen 1936. 1937.

Schwyzer, E.: Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griech. Gramm., 1-3, München 1939-53.

Sörbom, G.: Variatio sermonis Tacitei aliaeque apud eundem quaestiones selectae, thesis Uppsala 1935.

Svennung, J.: *Oros.* = Orosiana, thesis Uppsala (U.U.Å.) 1922.

——: *Pallad.* = Untersuchungen zu Palladius und zur lateinischen Fach- und Volkssprache, Uppsala 1935.

Tidner, E.: *Did.* = Sprachlicher Kommentar zur lateinischen Didascalia apostolorum, Stockholm 1938.

——: *Part. cop.* = De particulis copulativis apud Scriptores Historiae Augustae quaestiones selectae, thesis Uppsala (U.U.Å.) 1922.

Wackernagel, J.: Vorlesungen über Syntax, 1-2, Basel ²1926. 1928.

Wahlén, S.: Studia critica in Declamationes minores quae sub nomine Quintiliani feruntur, thesis Uppsala 1930.

Walde-Hofm.: A. Walde, Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, 3. Auflage von J. B. Hofmann, Heidelberg 1930 seqq.

INDEXES

I. INDEX OF TEXTS FROM HOLY SCRIPTURE QUOTED OR REFERRED TO IN THE *DE IDOLOLATRIA*

Numbers refer to chapter and paragraph of Latin text, p. 22 seqq. Literal quotations have been marked by an asterisk

Gen.	1, 26-7	15, 3
	9, 6	15, 3
	39, 1	18, 3
	41, 39 seqq.	17, 2
	41, 42	18, 1
Exod.	4, 2	19, 2
	5, 28	19, 2
	7, 8 seqq.	9, 6
	17, 5	19, 2
	17, 9	19, 2
	20, 4	4, 1*; 5, 4*
	20, 7	10, 6
	20, 7	20, 3
	20, 13	11, 5
	20, 14	11, 4
	23, 13	20, 3*; 20, 2
	32, 4 seqq.	3, 4
Num.	21, 8-9	5, 3
Lev.	18, 6 seqq.	11, 4
	19, 29	11, 4
Deut.	5, 8	4, 1*
	5, 17	11, 5
	5, 18	11, 4
	22, 5	16, 2*
	23, 17	11, 4
2 Sam.	(12, 14)	14, 2
Ps.	1, 3	15, 11
	92, 13-5	15, 11
	96, 5	21, 5
	115, 8	4, 4*
	135, 18	4, 4*
Is.	1, 14	14, 6*
	44, 8-9	4, 4*
	44, 20	4, 4*
	52, 2	18, 5
	(52, 5)	14, 2
Ezech.	16, 1 seqq.	1, 2
	36, 20 seqq.	14, 2
Dan.	2, 48 seqq.	17, 2
	5, 13	18, 3
	5, 29	18, 1
	6, 5-7	15, 10
	6, 14	18, 3
	13, 12-4	15, 9
Os.	2-4	1, 2
Mtth.	2, 1	9, 3*
	2, 2 seqq.	9, 3-5
	3, 4	19, 2
	4, 21-2	12, 3
	5, 3	12, 2
	5, 3-4	11, 1
	5, 14	15, 11
	5, 16	15, 1*
	5, 20	2, 5
	5, 22-4	2, 3
	5, 28	2, 3; 23, 3
	(5, 30)	7, 3
	5, 34	23, 2
	(5, 44)	21, 5
	6, 24	12, 2*; 19, 2
	6, 25	12, 2*
	6, 28	12, 2
	8, 5-10	19, 3
	8, 20	18, 5*
	8, 21-2	12, 3
	9, 9	12, 3
	10, 28	12, 4
	10, 33	13, 6*
	(10, 37)	12, 3
	(10, 38)	12, 2
	11, 8	18, 5*
	12, 37	20, 1*
	(16, 24)	12, 2
	18, 8	7, 3*
	(19, 21)	12, 2
	19, 26	12, 4
	19, 29	12, 3
	22, 21	15, 3*
	26, 52	19, 3
Marc.	1, 19-20	12, 3
	2, 14	12, 3
	(8, 34)	12, 2
	8, 38	13, 6
	9, 43	7, 3*
	(10, 21)	12, 2
	10, 27	12, 4
	10, 29	12, 3
	12, 17	15, 3*
Luc.	(1, 37)	12, 4
	3, 14	19, 3
	(5, 10-1)	12, 3
	5, 27-8	12, 3
	6, 20	12, 2
	(6, 28)	12, 5

	9, 62	12, 2*
	7, 1-10	19, 3
	7, 25	18, 5*
	(9, 23)	12, 2
	9, 26	13, 6
	9, 55-60	12, 3
	9, 58	18, 5*
	12, 22	12, 2*
	12, 27	12, 2
	14, 26	(12, 3); 12, 4
	14, 27	12, 2
	14, 28-9	12, 1
	16, 13	12, 2*; 19, 2
	16, 19-31	13, 4
	18, 22	12, 2
	18, 27	12, 4*
	18, 29	12, 3
	20, 25	15, 3*
	20, 62 seqq.	23, 6
Ioh.	6, 15	18, 6
	13, 4-16	18, 6
	16, 20	13, 3*
	18, 11	19, 3
	18, 36	18, 6
Act. ap.	8, 9-24	9, 6
	8, 21	9, 8*
	13, 6-11	9, 6
	15, 10	24, 3
	15, 19	11, 4
	15, 20	24, 3
	21, 25	11, 4
Rom.	2, 24	14, 2*
	12, 5	13, 2*
	13, 1 seqq.	15, 8
1 Cor.	1, 20	9, 7*
	3, 22	14, 5
	4, 12-6	5, 2
	5, 10	14, 5*; 24, 2
	7, 20	5, 1*
	9, 22	14, 4*
	10, 6	5, 4
	10, 11	5, 4
	10, 32-3	14, 3*
2 Cor.	6, 14	13, 2; 19, 2
Gal.	1, 10	14, 3*
Ephes.	(4, 28)	5, 2
	(5, 5)	11, 1
	6, 12	18, 3
Phil.	(2, 15)	11, 1
Col.	3, 5	11, 1
1 Thess.	4, 11	5, 2
2 Thess.	3, 7-12	5, 2
1 Tim.	1, 15	5, 2
	1, 19	11, 1
	6, 10	11, 1
2 Tim.	(2, 12)	13, 6
	(3, 8)	9, 6
Tit.	3, 1	15, 8
Hebr.	4, 12	23, 1
Iac.	(5, 12)	11, 1
1 Petr.	(2, 13-4)	15, 8
	2, 23	21, 5
	3, 9	21, 5
1 Joh.	3, 15	2, 4
Apoc.	2, 12	23, 1
	2, 24	2, 4

II. INDEX OF LATIN TERMS AND OF GRAMMAR

Numbers refer to pages

A

abacus 149

Ablative with function of apposition 145-6

abnegare 88

abruptus 'rash', 'inconsiderate' 214

absque = *praeter* 119

accendere metaphor. 138

ad 'identitatis' 128; — with accus. instead of acc. and gerund. (e.g. *ad fidem divinitatis* = *ad fidem divinitatis creandam*) 126, 205

addicere = 'to assign' or 'to enslave, to subordinate' 158

Adjective: used instead of genitive 130; — reigning an accus. 161

administrare 255, 261

adulter metaphor. 85

adulterium metaphor. 84-7

adversus Deum in Tert. always = *contra Deum* 116

aedicula 146

aedifex 214

aedificare metaphor. 196

aemulari adversus 172

affinis c. genit. 184

afflatus 221

agnoscere practically = (*ap*)*probare* 230

albarius (sc. *tector*) 147

alias = *alioquin, aliter* 92; 'at all other occasions' 245

alioquin see *ceterum*

alioquin, si 101, 129

aliquis = *alius quis* 137

allegare 158

allegere 142

altitudo (esp. *diaboli*) 101

ambitio = *ambitus* 82

an in indirect questions 120; — ... *vel* in indirect questions (frequent in juridical texts) 146

animus instead of *anima* 290

annuntiare in Tert. = *nuntiare* or *praenuntiare, prophetari* 165

ἀντανάκλασις 137

antea avoided by Tert. 214

ἀντιμετάθεσις 137

apparare = *servire* 253

arcanum, spec. of heretical doctrines 127-8

archetypus 296

astrologus 157

astronomus 157

Asyndeton 197-214

at enim 166

atque adeo 87

attonitus 294

Attraction (of indefinite pronoun) 81

augustare 147

auratior comparat. 139

-ax: Adject. ending in *-ax* equivalent to present participles 161

B

baxa 152

bene, quod frequent in Tert. 132, 241

blandiri sibi 220-1

blasphemare 230-1

Brachylogy 82, 175, 205

-bundus: 'Adjectives' ending in *-bundus* are since Apuleius in fact present participles 161

C

caelator 108, 148

caligatus 272

candidatus 259

capit = ἐνδέχεται 196

caput 102, 103-4, 306; *in -ite* = *in principe loco* 295

caritas (∿ *amor*) 101

catechizare 197

causa 'matter' 80; *in -m esse* 239

causatio 214

cavere 287, 290 (*bis*)

cellarium 'pantry' 211

census = a) *apparatus*; b) 'class', 'group'; c) *origo* 114-5

cessare = *deficere, deesse, desinere* 202

ceterum = *alioquin* 233, 252

Chaldaeus = *astrologus* 176

circa = *erga* 110

circulatorius (∿ *magic*) 173

citra 'apart from, except' 228

clausula 'end' 167

climacterica 178

colonia (Carthago) 283

Comparativus of perfect pass. partic. (e.g. *auratior*) 139

compeccare 234

compossessor 234

concessus adi. 166

conclarus 292

condicio = *status* 87; cf. 258, 262

conditor = κτίστης 116

confictura 147

confiteri 136-7
congressio 'contact' 281; — *carnis* 100
coniector 176
conquisitor 177
conscientia 228; = 'consciousness', 'the fact of knowing', 'knowledge' 289; — *fidei* 209
consecrare 228
consistere 225
conspurcare 86
constuprare 86
contamination 125, 133
conversatio 275, 276
cooperator 85
corpus domini 'the Eucharist' 141
crimen = *peccatum* 79
crux 130, 216-7
cultura 'religious worship' 240
cum causale and — *concessivum* with indic. 154
cymatium 148

D
daemonium 94
Dative added to a verbal subst. 85
de- instead of *ex-* in compounds 174
defendere = *ad defensionem adferre* 126
defundere (∿ *diffundere*) 98
defungi 214
deliberare almost = *dubitare* 120
delictum = *peccatum* 80
delinquere = *peccare* 80, 290
denegare 88
denique 117, 206, 249
deputare 94; = *attribuere* 197; — *in* with accus. 117
derelinquere 218
describere 149
desertor 115
desorbere 295
despuere 209
destrictus 125
deus dominus 101
devoratorius 90
dignitas cf. sub *honor*
dilectio 101
dirigere 'to adapt to the right form' 263
disciplina 101; — *communis* 225
disponere = *exponere, disserere* 100
dispositio 127
dissimulare 99, 130, 229, 284
domus dei 140
dum 102-3; = *eo, quod* 130

E
ebullire 106
ecclesia 140
ecquid = *nonne* 208
egenus 214-5
eiusmodi = *talis* frequent in Tert. 224
elementum 114
Ellipsis (especially of *esse*) 129-30; after *quanto magis* 220
elogium 82
Enallage of adject. 231
enundinare 174
erogare = *impendere* 154; = *rogare* 154
erogatio = *abrogatio* 128
ex ∿ *e* in Tert. 126
excludere 'to exorcize' 211
exemplarium 129
exhibitio 'maintenance', 'subsistence' 136; 213
exorbitatio 147, 232
exorcizare 210
expositio = *interpretatio* 132
expunctio 250
expungere = *perficere* 81
exstruere 146
exsufflare 209
extendere 100, 147, 205
extensus 100
extollere used absolutely 245-6

F
fabula = μῦθος 184
factor (*'parens facti'*) 119, 140
facere ad 'to contribute to' 82
facilius = *saepius, citius, potius* 153, 209
familia 244-5
familiaritas 258
fanum 118-9
festum = *dies festus* 184
fides 174
fiduciatus 287
figura 130-1
figuraliter 132
figurate 132
filum 108-9
flatus (sc. *idololatriae*; cf. *afflatus*) 248
forma = *regula, norma* 263; = εἶδος 110
formula = εἰδωλον 110
fraus 87-9
frequentare 186
Future, gnomic 185

G
genealogia (esp. of Gnostics) 184
Genitive: with function of adjective 91; — *inversus* (e.g. *iustitia quaestus* = *iustus quaestus*) 202; — *qualitatis* 249; id., without an attribute (under the influence of Hebrew) 118; — instead of dative 233-4, 282
genius 283

genus : *hoc* — as a 'fossilized apposition' 222
Grecism: *deos dicendum erit* 277

H
habere with an infin. (='can' or 'must') 125
Hapax legomena in *idol.*: *aedifex* 214 — *augustare* 147 — comparative *auratior* 139 — *conclarior* 292 (vid. comm.) — *confictura* 147 — *enundinare* 174 — *inenatabilis* 294 — *inrespirabilis* 294 — *serviculus* 190
hic frequently replaced by *iste* 100, 107, 132, 153, 158, 206; as an antecedent (*hic qui* = *is qui*) 154, 221; — used instead of *talis* 140-1; denoting one or more words from a preceding phrase 174; *hoc genus* as a 'fossilized apposition' 222
histrio = *pantomimus* 126
hodiernus: *ad -m* and *in -m* 107
honor combined with *dignitas* 257, 260; both subst. opposed to *potestas* 257
honorarium 192
huiusmodi often used by Tert. instead of *talis* 224
Hypallage of adjectives in Tert. 145
hypobrychium 294

I
id est preferred by Tert. to *hoc est* 130-1
idem almost = *item* 81-2
idolicus 225
idololatres 81
idololatria 76-7; plural of — 82
idolothytum 188, 228, 283
idolum 75-7
imago 107
immolare metaphor. 138
impetrare de 211
impingere 100, 294
imprecari 283
in instead of *propter* or *de* 102; — *modum* with gen. 130 — *hodiernum* 107; — *quantum* 262; — *vano* 277
incantator 176
incedere almost = *esse* 86-7, 170, 172, 262
incrispare 148
incursare in crimen 203
incursus (*daemonis, idololatriae*) 275
inducere animo (instead of *in animum*) 230
inenatabilis 294
infatuare 177
initiatus with dat. or accus. 282
iniustitia 118
inrespirabilis 294
inter = *intra* 272
interdicere 113, 162, 206
interest de 108
interpretari c. accus. c. infin. 134
ipse almost = *idem* 178
is = *talis* (cf. sub *hic*) 233-4
iste = *hic*: vide sub *hic*
iubere c. dat. 133
iudicium = *iudicium ultimum* 80
iuratio 280

L
latet (imperson.) with accus. 242
latitudo 98, 149
latus clavus 261
Law terms
addicere (*addictus*) 229
adiurare 280-1
cavere 287
cessare = *deficere, deesse, desinere* 202
condicio = *status* 87, 262
condicionalis 215
consistere (*de*) 225
defendere = *ad defensionem adferre* 126
denegare = *abnegare* 88
destricte (adv.) 125
etsi with subjunct. 187
excludere 290
exhibere 'to sustain' 136; — *operam* 206
exhibitio 'sustenance' 136
extendere 100; *extensus* ib.
fiduciatus 287
liberare = *absolvere* 89
locuples 97-8
manceps 95; *mancipare* 95, 222
nativitas 'birth' 166
obligare 280
obsignare 196
operam exhibere 206
patrocinari 165
pignus 243-4
praeses 287
praevaricari 278
recludere = *claudere* 256
rescindere 226
species 'case' 239
sponsio 281
subscribere = *dare, concedere* 225
substantia 'property' 215
suus = *proprius* 89
temptare 229
testificatio 280
lex = the whole OT 129
liare 148
libare metaphor. 138
litterator 176
litteratura 195, 241
locare 'to put out the contract for...' 256
longinquus: *de -o* 221

ludimagister 183
lupanar 247

M
magia 164
maledicere with accus. 120-1
malus 'the devil' 252
manus 'work (of art)' 141
marmorarius 149
mater = 'factrix' 140
materia 'the material occasion', 'the means' 113
mathematicus 'astrologer' 161
mathesis 'astrology' 165
mergere = *demergere* 85
minerval 181, 186
Moses or *Moyses* 133
multimodus 184

N
nativitas 'birth', 'horoscope' 166-7
negatrix 293
Neologisms: words used by Tert. for the first time (Tp.). 1. Subst.: *compossessor* 234; *exorbitatio* 147, 232; *expunctio* 250; *idololatres* 81; *incantator* 176; *iuratio* 280; *negatrix* (used as an adject.) 293, 2. Adject.: *conclarus* 292 vid. comm.; *devoratorius* 90; *idolicus* 225, 3. Adverb: *de longinquo* 221. 4. Verb: *compeccare* 234
neque enim = *non enim* 108
Nominal expressions preferred by Tert. to verbal ones 128
non = *nonne* 203; — *tanti quam* = — potius quam 295; — *puto* = *puto* — 154
numquid = *num* 129; = *nonne* 129

O
obligamentum 243
obligare 280
observatio 'the guarding against', 'the avoidance of' 202
obsignare 196, 213
offendere in crimen 202
officialis 252
offocare 294-5
Omission of *esse* 88; of praeposition in the first of two κῶλα 107; of a pronoun in an accus. c. infin. 171; of a comparative after *quo* 295
omne = *omne aliud* 220
omnipotens as subst. 130
opera = *opus* 81, 239
operari transit. 126
opponere 240

P
palmata (sc. *toga*) 258
parens = *factor* 140
parum sit, si 141
patrocinari 165
pecus, -oris and *-udis* 138
penes often used by Tert. instead of *apud* 220
pentecoste 236
peregrinitas 'foreign wares' 203
Perfect infinitive instead of present infinitive 136
perorare 140
pertinax = *pertinens* 161
phantasma 118
phrygio 108
pictor 148
pigmentum 204
pignera 'beloved ones', 'relatives' 218
plane = *sane* 124, 252
plastes 108
Pleonasm: *etiam ipse* 142
Pluperfect instead of imperfect 177
plurimum = *plerumque* 92
pollucere 99-100
pompa diaboli 194-5, 265
populus = Israel 110, 132, cf. 269
porro 278
posse = *esse posse* 145
praecidere manus 143
praedamnare 117, 256
praedicare 'to proclaim', 'to predict' 137
praeses 252, 287
praestructio 278
praestruere 278
praetexta 258
praetorium 'country house' 151
Preposition omitted in the first of two κῶλα 107
prior: *-us est, ut* 102
pro = *propter* 189
procurator 'manager', 'agent' 205
proditor 'teacher' 160
profanare = *devovere* 188; cf. 260-1
profanatio 260-1
professio 157
profusio (sc. *sanguinis*) 100
proinde instead of *perinde* 83
proprietates 'special natures' 97
provincialis 258
provocare with an absolute sense 158
proximus as a positive 208
pudor 'ignominy' 256
puerilis 260; — *stola* 260
purpuratus 259

Q
quam instead of *quanto* 100
quam...quam = *tam...quam* 109, 119, 190, 264
quantum sibi libet 249-50
quantus: vide sub *tantus*
quasi introducing a refutation 137
qui instead of *quis* after *ne* and *si* 109, 175
Quinquatria 180-1; *Quinquatrus* 185
quis: *quid...quam* = *quid aliud ... quam* 278
quisque added to a comparative 205
quod with subjunctive instead of an accus. c. infin. 117-8
quod developing into an equivalent of *ut* 130
quotidie 'very often' 142

R
radius (rod of mathematician and *astrologus*) 179
re- meaningless in compounds 84, 100
reatus 80
recogitare 200
recognoscere 84
refert de 108
Relative clause with causal force 137
religio = *religiositas* 165
renuntiare c. dat. 135
repraesentare 90-1
repudium 136
reputare = *putare* 100
retro = *antea* 106, 240

S
sacramentum 134, 292; — *fidei* = *baptismus* 134
saeculum 79-80
salus 90
sapio: its meanings and constructions 92-4, 197
scandalizare 143
scindere 226
sed as the introduction of an *occupatio* 151
serviculus 190
servus dei 98-9
sic with a restrictive meaning: 'only in so far' 220; — *et* = *item* 85
signum = *imago, simulacrum* 149, 151
simpliciter intellegere 99
simulacrum 107
soccus 152
sollemne 184, 256
sonare = *significare* 109
sophistes 175
spiritus with two meanings 137
stare almost = *esse* 295
statua 107
stren(u)a 190
stuprum 84-7
Subject: change of —, supplying of — 92
Subjunctive: cf. sub *quod*; in *quod attineat* (*pertineat*) *ad* 245; *debeat* instead of *debet* 137
substantia 97-8; = 'property' 215
suffragium 'prejudice', '(unfavourable) opinion' 231
suggerere 170
suggestus 257
supplaudere 213
suus = *proprius* 89

T
talis replaced by *hic* or *is*: vide sub *hic* and *is*
tamdiu with a restrictive meaning: 'only as long as' 246
tanti...quanti = *tot...quot* 137, 152, 265
teloneum 219
temptare 229
teneo: *dictum non -etur* 287
tilia 149
titulus = *elogium* 81; = 'name', 'book' 81; = *causa* 'motive' 81, 227
toga pura = *toga virilis* 248
tolerare 'to maintain', 'to nourish' 127
trabea 258
trahere intrans. 'to last', 'to subsist' 173

U
usus 155
ὑφ' ἕν 195

V
vacare with genit. 150; with *a(b)* 150, 154
vanus: *in -o* 277
Variation of tenses 154, 219; of moods 154, 158; of prepositions 102
vena 150
videri = *esse* 262
videri(n)t, si 'it does not matter' 143, 203, 296
virga 273
vox spiritus sancti 'the biblical passages quoted' 120

Z
zelus 139

III. GENERAL INDEX

Numbers refer to pages

A
Abraham: interpretation of *sinus Abrahae* 227
Adultery: symbol of idolatry 84-7, 136
αἰών 177
Angels, fallen 115-6; taught men astrology 159-60
ante: brachylogy after — 175
Antelii daemones 244
Apollo Thyraeus 244
arcana: vide sub 'secret doctrines'
Ark of Noach containing all kinds of animals, types of human vices, but no type of idolater 296
Art: ideas of Tert. on —: ch. 8, Remarks
Astrology 155-79 (comm. on ch. 9)
astrologus: see Index II s.vv. *astrologus* and *astronomus*; brought to man by the fallen angels 160
astronomus: see Index II s.vv. *astrologus* and *astronomus*
Attitude of prayer (*attollere manus*, as a *signum* of the cross) 140

B
Baptism 133-9
Baptismal oath 135
βασιλεία τοῦ οὐρανοῦ next to βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ 179
Bath-houses 151-2; cf. 126: *fures balneatores*
Betrothals (*sponsalia*) 246-7
Birthday of a pagan god (*idoli natales*) 194
Blasphemy 230-3
Blowing against idols (*exsufflare*) 210
Borrowing: the contract of — is an idolatry in both deed and word 284-293 (comm. on ch. 23), since it contains an oath 286
Brothels: houses of Christians adorned with lamps and wreaths compared to — 246-7
Bruma 191

C
caput 'summit' 97 (Remark b, sub c), 102, 103 (Remark c)
Cara Cognatio 192
Caristia 192
Carna 242
cathedra Petri 192
cavere 'to give a written guarantee' 287
Chaldaeus 176
Chapters: text divided by Tert. himself into — 272
Christ: his humble exterior appearance 262-3
colonia Iulia Carthago 283
concupiscentiae saeculi contained in idolatry 91
conquisitor 177
conscientia used as a synonym of *scientia* 228
consuetudo 276
Contamination of two sentences 125, 133
cor.: relations between the treatises *De corona* and *De idololatria* concerning military service 270-2
corpus domini 'the Eucharist' 141
cosmetics: taught to man by the fallen angels 160
Cross: symbol of the human body 216-7
Cult without images of gods 105-6
cupiditas 200
curiositas: the various meanings of — 160-1
Custom: power of — dangerous for the Christian faith 276

D
Daniel 253-66
Demons 115-6; hiding in the images of gods in order to be able to receive sacrifices 203; causing diseases which they cure afterwards 221; how — get a name 243
Depth as a metaphor 102
Devil 252; symbolized by Herodes 171; *pompa diaboli* 194-5, 265
dies dominicus = *dies Solis* 236
dies lustricus 248
disciplina 101
Divorce: a symbol for apostasy from the Christian faith 136
domus dei = *ecclesia* (both the locality and the community of the Christians) 140; 'the Christian community' 124
Dreams 169-70

E
ecclesia: the locality used for religious worship (Tert. the first to use the word with this meaning) 140
Eleazer and the rich man 226-7
elementum 114; polemics of the Apologists against the cult of the elements 116
Elymas ('*alter magus*') 173
Emperor: how to be honoured? (Matth. 22, 21) 240, 245

enarratio poetarum 183
Enoch 92, 112-4, 244; ch. 8: 160; 19, 1: 116; 99, 6-7: 117-8
Errors of Tert. 174 (ad 9,6 *isdem ... apostolis*); 196 (ad 10,6 *ut diximus*)
Etymologization in Tert. 109
Etymology of *idolum* 104, 109-10
Eucharist 141-3; called *corpus domini* 141
Euhemerism 75, 165-6, 221
Euphemism in sexual matters 207
Exorcism 210

F
factor called *parens* 140
familiaritas 258-9
Fate: the concept of — combated by the Christians 159
Father: vide sub 'makers'
Flagellation in a dream mentioned by Tert. 244
flaminica 193-4
fiduciatus 287
Flora and *Floralia* 193
Forculus 243
fraud 87-9; included in idolatry 78

G
Gen. 1, 26: the influence of — in early Christianity 241
genealogiae (in Gnostic doctrines) 184
genus ∿ *species* 175
Gilding of images of gods 152
Gladiators kept out of the Church 207
Gnostics 127
God: the idea of searching and finding Him 159
Gold 167-8
grammaticus: the task of the — 183

H
'Hands' with the meaning 'works' 141
Hercules mentioned in oaths 278
Herod as a symbol of the devil 171
Holy Ghost 120
honor(es): in how far allowed to Christians 253-66 (esp. 254-5)
honorarium 192

I
Ianus 242
idol: 75 (Remarks c, d); etymology of *idolum* 104, 109-10. Two main motives of Christian Apologetics: a) idols are the work of human hands 141; b) materials used for the fabrication of idols can also be used for other aims 149-50; the idols seen as 'idle' (*vana*) 277; idols are powerless 119
Idolatry is the chief sin ch. 1; it contains all major sins, viz., a) murder (or rather suicide), b) adultery and fornication, c) fraud, d) *concupiscentiae saeculi*, e) drunkenness, f) injustice, g) vanity, h) mendacity 73-95 (comm. on ch. 1); — regarded esp. as adultery 136; — *in verbis* 274-93 (comm. on ch. 20-22); — originally without images 104-8, 208 (*informis i.*). A literal translation of εἰδωλολατρεία: *famulatus idolorum colendorum* 211
idolothytum 189-9, 228
Inaccuracies of Tert. in quotations from Holy Scripture 119
incantatio 176
Incense 168, 204-5
Incongruity between rhetoric form and meaning 159-60
Instruction: public — 183
Interpretation: remarkable —s by Tert. of passages of Holy Scripture:
Exod. 20,4: 133
— 20,41: 131
Isai. 52,14 and 53,2: 262-3
Dan. 3,18: 245
Matth. 2,12: 170
— 5,16: 238-9
— 12,37 and an unfindable text: 275
Luc. 1,63: 291
— 16,9 seqq.: 226-7
Acts 8,20: 174
— 8, 21 (λόγος) 178-9
1 Cor. 1,20: 177

J
Januarius: *kalendae -ae* 233
Joseph 253-66

K
kalendae Januariae 233

L
Lamps at doors rejected 236 (comm. ch. 15)
lanistae kept out of the Church 207
lascivia contained in idolatry 83, 91
latus clavus 261
The Law of the OT: its prohibition to name the gods of the heathens, 275, 277
leno 206
Limentinus 243
litterae: *studia -arum* unavoidable for a Christian 196
litterator 176-7
λόγος = a) *ratio*; b) sermo 179
Love, terms for —: *amor* and *caritas* 101
ludimagister: his task 183

M
Magi ('Les rois mages'): from where they came 162-4; their gifts 167-8; their return 170-1
Magic: two kinds of — distinguished by Tert., viz., astrology and the working of miracles 156; — considered an *ars* 174; — taught to man by the fallen angels 160; — and astrology mutually connected 164-5, 172
Magistrates: functions of — 255-6
Makers of idols are themselves idolaters 103 seqq.; not to be admitted to the Church 139-43 (comm. on ch. 7)
Makers of something regarded as the fathers of that thing (*'factor* = *parens'*) 140; a similar use of *mater* (*manus matres idolorum*) 140
Marcionites; accuse God of inconsistencies in the OT 130
Matronales 235
Medius Fidius as an oath 278
Mercedonius mensis as name of the *mensis intercalaris* 227-8
Military service: allowed for a Christian? 266-76 (esp. 269-70) (comm. on ch. 19); *militia inter potestatem et dignitatem* 266-7
minerval (= *stips magistri*); *Minervale munus* 181, 186-7
Minervalia 181, 190; vide sub *Quinquatrus*
Modesty: expressions of — 119-20, 132
Moses: interpretator of the miracles done by him 172-3
'Mother': vide sub 'makers'
Murder (or rather suicide) contained in idolatry 83-7
Myrrh 168

N
Name-giving 249
natale (of a pagan god) 194
naufragium frequent metaphor 200-1, 294
nomen 138-9
nominalia 248
Numa Pompilius: on religion according to Varro 106

O
Oath, the baptismal — 135; further -s forbidden to Christians 288-9; the -s *Mehercle* and *Medius Fidius* 278; — also forbidden in a hidden form to Christians 285
obligamentum 243
obsignatio fidei 213
occupatio in rhetorics: frequent in Tert. 151, 291
officiales 252
opus albarium 148
opus tectorium: vide sub *opus albarium*

P
Pagan public holidays and festivities: should Christians participate in them? 222-36 (comm. on. ch. 13-14); *idem* for pagan private festivities 247-53 (comm. on ch. 16 and 17,1)
palmata (sc. *tunica*) 258
Pantomime 126
parens = *factor*: vide sub 'makers'
Parentalia 192
Payment of philosophers, etc., considered a mark of charlatanism 174
pentecoste = the 50 days after Easter 236
Perfumes used at funerals 205
Personal experiences of Tert. 244, 281
phrygio 'embroiderer' 108
plastes 108
Poisons: taught by the fallen angels 160
polluctum and *pollucere* 99
populus = Israel 110, 132
Posidonius 105; on origin of religion 105
post: brachylogy after — 175
Power (*potestas*) allowed to Christians? 253-66 (comm. on ch. 17,2 and 18)
praeses = governor? 252, 286
praetexta (sc. *toga*) 258
Prayer: attitude of — 140
profanare 260-1
professio containing either one or more *artes* 157
Prometheus: God called *verus* — by Tert. 141
prophetes: its various meanings in Tert. 120
Prostitution 206
pudor 'ignominy' 256
puerilis stola 260
Puns in Tert. 137-8, 247, 261-2, 268
Purple 255

Q
Quinquatria (*-trus*) 180-1, 185-6

R
Repetition of the same words very frequent in Tert. 140
rhetor: the school of the — 183

S
sacramentum 134-5, 272-3; *fidei* — 'baptism' 134-5
Sacrifices 249, 252; food of the demons 188
Saturnalia 190, 227, 233, 235
Schoolteacher: a profession forbidden for Christians 179-97 (comm. on ch. 10)
Secret doctrines (*arcana*), esp. of Gnostics 127
secta 170-2
Septimontium 191

Serpent 131; as a symbol of the cross of Christ 124
servus Dei as a denomination of the Christians 98, 262
Simon Magus 173
Slaves and subordinates allowed to follow their masters at pagan ceremonies? 252-3
sollemne: a religious rite or formula 256
sophistes: its various meanings in Tert. 175-6
species ∿ *genus* 175
Spitting (*despuere*) at the image of a demon 209-10
sponsio 281
Star: the — of Bethlehem 165-6
Statues (*statuae, imagines, simulacra*) 107
studia litterarum unavoidable for a Christian 196; cf. 195
Stones: images of pagan gods called mere — by the Christian apologists 118
stren(u)ae 190-1
Sunday 236
To swear: vide sub 'oath'

T
Tabula septem idolorum 180-1, 185-6
Timidity: the vice of — in the contact with pagans 279-84 (comm. on ch. 21-2)
trabea 258
Trader: a profession acceptable for Christians? 197-211 (comm. on ch. 11)
Travesty 249

V
Valentinians 127
Varro: his *Antiquitates Divinae* extensively used by Tert. 104-6; in his doctrine of the origin of religion probably depending on Posidonius 105
via = *secta et disciplina* 171

W
Weapons (and in general *metallorum opera*) taught to mankind by the fallen angels 160
Weddings: attending at — not entirely forbidden for Christians 249
Words: idolatry in — 274-93 (comm. on ch. 20-23)
Wreaths at doors 153-4 and comm. on ch. 15

Z
Zacharias: his muteness 291