

PATRVN VESTIGIA SEQVENS
THE TRANSMISSION AND RECEPTION OF AUGUSTINE'S
EXEGESIS OF EPH. 3:17–18 IN THE VENERABLE BEDE'S
COLLECTIO EX OPVSCVLIS SANCTI AVGVSTINI IN
EPISTVLAS PAVLI APOSTOLI

BY NICOLAS DE MAEYER AND ANTHONY DUPONT

The Collectio ex opusculis sancti Augustini in epistulas Pauli apostoli is an exegetical commentary on the Pauline letters that consists of 457 fragments from the works of Augustine of Hippo. The Collectio was compiled by the Northumbrian scholar Beda Venerabilis (672/73–735), whose biblical commentaries heavily rely on patristic exegesis and theology, and, as such, function as an important mediator between patristic and medieval exegesis and theology. Though many scholars have stressed the importance of the Collectio for the study of the transmission and reception of Augustine's writings and thinking in Anglo-Saxon England, the commentary has never been edited nor have its contents been thoroughly studied. The following contribution offers the first detailed study of the Collectio's contents by analysing the ways in which Bede presents Augustine's Pauline exegesis in his own commentary on Paul's letters. Specifically, this article will study Bede's compilation methods by means of a close analysis of one of the Collectio's fragments, fr. 315, which offers an exegetical commentary of Eph. 3:17–18. By studying the textual channels through which Bede had access to Augustine's writings as well as by considering other passages in Bede's biblical commentaries that discuss Eph. 3:17–18, this contribution seeks to demonstrate how Bede uses, adapts, and presents Augustine's exegesis of this pericope.

INTRODUCTION

One of the most intriguing yet unstudied works of the Venerable Bede (672/73–735) is the *Collectio ex opusculis sancti Augustini in epistulas Pauli apostoli*.¹ The *Collectio* is a compilation of 457 fragments,² all authored by Augustine of Hippo

¹ This contribution is part of the research project “Augustine’s Paul through the eyes of Bede: Critical edition, content analysis and reception study of the Venerable Bede’s *Collectio ex opusculis sancti Augustini in epistulas Pauli apostoli*,” supervised by Gert Partoens (KU Leuven, Arts) and Anthony Dupont (KU Leuven, Theology). This project will result in the publication of the *editio princeps* of Bede’s Pauline commentary in the *Series Latina* of the *Corpus Christianorum*, which will be buttressed by extensive research on the text’s contents and its reception in the Middle Ages. We would like to thank Shari Boodts, Jérémy Delmulle, and Gert Partoens for their valuable remarks and suggestions concerning this article.

² The following description of Bede’s *Collectio* is mainly based on G. Partoens, “The Sources and Manuscript Transmission of the Venerable Bede’s Commentary on the *Corpus Paulinum*; Starting Points for Further Research,” in *La trasmissione dei testi patristici*

(354–430)³ and extracted by Bede to offer a verse-by-verse commentary on the Pauline epistles. The said fragments derive from thirty-eight⁴ different works of

latini: problemi e prospettive, ed. E. Colombi, *Instrumenta Patristica et Mediaevalia* 60 (Turnhout, 2012), 201–51, where an extensive *status quaestionis* of the scholarship on Bede's Pauline commentary can be found. See also P.-I. Fransen, "Description de la collection de Bède le Vénérable sur l'Apôtre," *Revue Bénédictine* 71 (1961): 22–70; A. Wilmart, "La collection de Bède le Vénérable sur l'Apôtre," *Revue Bénédictine* 38 (1926): 16–52; J. Delmulle, "La *Collectio in Apostolum* de Bède le Vénérable: Tradition manuscrite, codicologie et critique d'authenticité," *Scriptorium* 70 (2016): 199–251; idem, "Le florilège augustinien de Bède le Vénérable et les discussions tardoantiques sur la grâce, le libre arbitre et la prédestination," *Revue d'études augustinienes et patristiques* 63 (2017): forthcoming.

³ The *Collectio* contains only a few pseudo-Augustinian fragments (for example, fr. 1, which derives from Quodulthdeus's *Aduersus quinque haereses*). Furthermore, during its transmission the *Collectio* received some interpolations. This is the case, for example, for fr. 394: this fragment, the only quotation from *De opere monachorum* in Bede's works, is found in only one of the *Collectio*'s witnesses, namely, Monte Cassino 178, and is a later addition (Partoens, "The Sources and Manuscript Transmission," 242).

⁴ According to Partoens, "The Sources and Manuscript Transmission," 210–14, the *Collectio*'s fragments derive from thirty-eight different Augustinian works (some of which Bede only knew indirectly, cf. *infra*). A few changes, however, should be made to Partoens's list of Augustinian works quoted in the *Collectio*:

Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum. Bede identified *Coll.* fr. 48 and 49 as excerpts from *Contra Iulianum [opus imperfectum]* (fr. 48 being entitled *Ex libro contra Iulianum I* and fr. 49 *Item ex eodem libro*). This attribution has been contested: Florus of Lyon, who inserted *Coll.* fr. 48–49 into his own Augustinian Pauline commentary, identified them as *Ex libro ad Bonifatium papam Vrbsis*, another title for *Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum*. Fransen, "Description de la collection," 29 n. 3, probably relying on Florus, attributed fr. 49 to *C. ep. Pel.*, stating that Bede's attribution of this fragment was erroneous. Subsequently, D. Hurst, *Bede the Venerable: Excerpts from the Works of Saint Augustine on the Letters of the Blessed Apostle Paul*, Cistercian Studies Series 183 (Kalamazoo, MI, 1999), 54 and Partoens, "The Sources and Manuscript Transmission," 215 claimed that not fr. 49 but fr. 48 was extracted from *C. ep. Pel.* This fragment would then be the only extract from *C. ep. Pel.* in Bede's *Collectio* (according to F. Dolbeau, Bede also quotes *C. ep. Pel.* in *Comm. Marc.* 4, CCL 120, 645, 1962–64. See Dolbeau, "Bède, lecteur des sermons d'Augustin," in *Augustin et la prédication en Afrique: Recherches sur divers sermons authentiques, apocryphes ou anonymes*, Collection des Études Augustiniennes: Série Antiquité 179 [Paris, 2005], 495–523, at 497 n. 10). In fact, *Coll.* fr. 48 and fr. 49 were correctly attributed to *C. Iul. [imp.]* by Bede: fr. 48 was excerpted from *C. Iul. imp.* 1, 94 (CSEL 85/1, p. 107, 11–28; 108, 33; 44–47), fr. 49 from *C. Iul. imp.* 1, 86 (CSEL 85/1, p. 98, 5–99, 13). The text of fr. 48 does correspond to a passage in *C. ep. Pel.* 1, 2, 5; 3, 7, but this passage also occurs in *C. Iul. imp.* 1, 94. Comparison of both *loci* with fr. 48 reveals that Bede's extract shows more similarities with the text as given in *C. Iul. imp.* than with the analogous passage in *C. ep. Pel.*: First, the interjection "et item post modicum" is found only in *C. Iul. imp.* Second, in *C. Iul. imp.* the different parts that Bede quotes are grouped together in one paragraph, which is not the case in *C. ep. Pel.*, where the parts quoted by Bede are dispersed over several paragraphs. In this way, Bede's titles for fr. 48 and fr. 49 prove to be correct, and *C. ep. Pel.* has to be removed from the list of Augustinian works quoted in Bede's *Collectio*.

De Genesi contra Manichaeos. Partoens considered *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* as a work that Bede refers to only outside the *Collectio* ("The Sources and Manuscript Transmission,"

the bishop of Hippo. In linking three key authorities from western intellectual history (Paul, Augustine, and Bede), the *Collectio* is an important document for the transmission of Augustine's Pauline exegesis in the early Middle Ages. The *Collectio* influenced several Carolingian scholars, such as Florus of Lyon (ca. 785/90–ca. 860), Rabanus Maurus (ca. 780–856), and Sedulius Scottus (fl. ca. 850–860), who used the work in their own Pauline commentaries.⁵ Clear traces of the *Collectio* can also be found in the Romans commentary preserved in MS Paris, BNF, lat. 11574 (ninth century), traditionally attributed to Helisachar of St.-Riquier († before 840).⁶

THE *COLLECTIO EX OPUSCULIS SANCTI AVGVSTINI IN EPISTVLAS PAVLI APOSTOLI*

The Collectio among Bede's Works

The *Collectio* is a commentary on Paul's letters in the form of an Augustinian florilegium. More specifically, Bede selected 457 fragments from Augustine's oeuvre to serve as verse-by-verse explanations of the text of thirteen Pauline

213), despite the fact that a genuine quotation from it can be found in *Coll. fr.* 141. By consequence, this work should be added to the list of Augustine's writings cited in the *Collectio*, which brings the total number of quoted Augustinian works in Bede's Pauline commentary again to thirty-eight.

⁵ For Florus's, Rabanus's, and Sedulius's commentaries, see P.-I. Fransen, "Le florilège augustinien de Florus de Lyon," in *Saint Augustin et la Bible*, ed. G. Nauroy and M.-A. Vannier (Bern, 2008), 313–24; S. Boodts and G. Partoens, "The Critical Edition of Florus of Lyon's *Expositio epistolarum beati Pauli apostoli*: State of the Art and New Results," in *Commentaries, Catenae and Biblical Tradition*, ed. H. Houghton, Texts and Studies 3.13 (Piscataway, NJ, 2016), 253–76; S. Boodts, "Florus of Lyon's *Expositio epistolarum beati Pauli apostoli* and the Transmission of Augustine's *Sermones ad populum*," in *On Good Authority: Tradition, Compilation and the Construction of Authority in Literature from Antiquity to the Renaissance*, ed. R. Ceulemans and P. De Leemans, LECTIO Studies on the Transmission of Texts and Ideas 2 (Turnhout, 2015), 141–55; S. Cantelli Berarducci, *Hrabani Mauri opera exegetica: Repertorium fontium*, Instrumenta Patristica et Mediaevalia 38–38B (Turnhout, 2006); N. De Maeyer and G. Partoens, "A New Identification of the Pauline Commentary in the Manuscript Oxford Bodleian Library Laud. Misc. 106," *Sacris Erudiri* 53 (2014): 7–15; Partoens, "The Sources and Manuscript Transmission," 207–10; H. J. Frede and H. Stanjek, eds., *Sedulii Scotti Collectaneum in Apostolum*, Vetust Latina, die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel; Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 31–32 (Freiburg, 1996–97); M. C. Sloan, *The Harmonious Organ of Sedulius Scottus: Introduction to his Collectaneum in Apostolum and Translation of Its Prologue and Commentaries on Galatians and Ephesians*, Millennium Studies 39 (Berlin and Boston, 2012).

⁶ P.-I. Fransen, "Le dossier patristique d'Hélisachar: Le manuscrit Paris, BNF, lat. 11574 et l'une de ses sources," *Revue Bénédictine* 111 (2001): 464–82.

Epistles.⁷ Among Bede's biblical commentaries, only the *Collectio* and the last book of his commentary on the Song of Songs (which consists entirely of excerpts from the works of Gregory the Great) are florilegia. His other exegetical commentaries consist of a combination of Bede's own words with quotations and paraphrases from passages from the works of the Church Fathers.

When commenting on Paul's letters, Bede proceeds in a systematic way. The *Collectio's* Augustinian fragments are all arranged according to the order of the Pauline verses. When explaining a Pauline passage, Bede usually starts by quoting the biblical verse that will be explained in the Augustinian fragment (the lemma). He subsequently identifies the source of the Augustinian excerpt by means of a title, followed by the excerpt itself. Bede carefully indicated the source of his fragments, providing above each fragment not only the title of the work the fragment derives from but often also the number of the book and chapter/paragraph where the excerpt is located. Normally, one Augustinian fragment in the *Collectio* corresponds to one Pauline verse. Sometimes, several Pauline verses are being explained in one Augustinian fragment (as is the case in fr. 315, which will be the subject of this article). Verses of special importance are usually explained via a series of fragments (for example, Rom. 5:12, to which Bede devotes six fragments). Some verses remain uncommented.

The library Bede had at his disposal in the double monastery of Wearmouth-Jarrow, where he lived and worked, was of unparalleled quality and quantity.⁸ The richness of the library's book collection, especially in patristic literature, is reflected in the innumerable (patristic) quotations that can be found scattered throughout Bede's writings.⁹ The Anglo-Saxon monk's library included the works of many pagan and patristic authors, chief among which was Augustine.¹⁰ Many of the latter's major works as well as various of his lesser known writings were available to Bede,¹¹ including

⁷ Rom., 1–2 Cor., Gal., Eph., Philipp., Col., 1–2 Thess., 1–2 Tim., Tit., Hebr. Notice that the *Collectio* does not contain a section on Paul's letter to Philemon. On the other hand, the commentary does include a section on the epistle to the Hebrews, which was already in Antiquity questioned for its authenticity, among others by Augustine.

⁸ For Bede's library, see M. L. W. Laistner, "The Library of the Venerable Bede," in *Bede, His Life, Times, and Writings: Essays in Commemoration of the Twelfth Centenary of his Death*, ed. A. Hamilton Thompson (Oxford, 1935; repr., 1969), 237–66; M. Lapidge, *The Anglo-Saxon Library* (Oxford, 2006; repr., 2008), 191–228. For the Augustinian works quoted in the *Collectio*, see esp. Partoens, "The Sources and Manuscript Transmission," 210–15; Dolbeau, "Bède, lecteur des sermons d'Augustin"; Fransen, "Description de la collection."

⁹ See Lapidge, *The Anglo-Saxon Library*, 196–204 as well as the indices in the various editions of Bede's works.

¹⁰ Apart from Augustine's writings, Bede had access to the works of, among others, Ambrose, Gregory the Great, Jerome, Isidore, Caesarius of Arles, John Cassian, Cyprian, Orosius, Pelagius, and Paulinus of Nola. See Lapidge, *The Anglo-Saxon Library*, 191–227.

¹¹ E.g., *De ciuitate Dei*, *Confessiones*, *De trinitate*, *De genesi ad litteram*, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, *Contra Iulianum opus imperfectum*, *Retractiones*.

some rare texts, such as the sermons from the Mainz-Grande-Chartreuse collection.¹² Bede, however, did not have access to all of the Church Father's works. Several of Augustine's writings were not available at all to him, others only indirectly — that is, through intermediary sources, such as florilegia. The most important intermediary source for Bede's knowledge of Augustine's oeuvre is Eugippius's *Excerpta ex operibus sancti Augustini*, which served as the source for several of the *Collectio*'s fragments.¹³ The *Excerpta* is a collection of some 348 fragments,¹⁴ compiled from Augustine's works by Eugippius († after 533), abbot of Castellum Lucullanum (near Naples), to present his readers (primarily his fellow monks) with a succinct but representative selection from the works of the African Church Father.¹⁵ Eugippius's florilegium offers a wide overview of the main theological and pastoral themes in Augustine's oeuvre. Any serious study of Bede's knowledge and use of Augustine's theology and exegesis needs to take its departure in an analysis of the Augustinian writings available to Bede and the textual channels via which he had access to them, especially Eugippius's *Excerpta*. For this reason, the following contribution will deal extensively with the value of the *Excerpta* for Bede's presentation of Augustine's exegesis of Eph. 3:17–18 in the *Collectio* (cf. infra).

About the *Collectio*'s genesis, purpose(s), addressee(s), intended audience, and date we know painstakingly little. Unlike most of Bede's other biblical commentaries, the *Collectio* does not contain a prologue, which would be the ideal place to learn more about the work's genesis and its author's intentions. The *Collectio* is only once referred to in the rest of Bede's oeuvre, namely, in the list of his own writings Bede attached to the *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*: "In apostolum quaecumque in opusculis sancti Augustini exposita inueni, cuncta per ordinem transcribere curavi" (*HE* 5, 24). The latter passage offers a short description of the method Bede followed when compiling the *Collectio*, namely, that of selecting passages from Augustine's writings and rearranging them according to the structure of the Pauline letters. Apart from this explicit reference, we have

¹² F. Dolbeau, "Le sermonnaire augustinien de Mayence (Mainz, Stadtbibliothek I 9): Analyse et histoire," *Revue Bénédictine* 106 (1996): 5–52.

¹³ Ed. P. Knöll, CSEL 9/1 (Vienna, 1885). When reference is made to Eugippius's text, this edition is being used.

¹⁴ The CSEL edition lists 348 fragments. Some manuscripts, however, only contain about 338 fragments, while other witnesses offer more than 348 excerpts. See J. Hofmann, "Das Werk des Abtes Eugippius: Zum literarischen Vermächtnis eines spätantiken Augustinus-Kenners an die frühmittelalterliche Kirche des Abendlandes," *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 109 (1998): 293–305, at 299 n. 43.

¹⁵ P.-I. Fransen, "D'Eugippius à Bède le Vénérable, à propos de leurs florilèges augustiniens," *Revue Bénédictine* 97 (1987): 187–94, at 187–89. Cf. A. Fürst, "Eugippius," in *The Oxford Guide to the Historical Reception of Augustine*, 3 vols., ed. K. Pollmann (Oxford, 2013), 2:954–59.

no external information about the *Collectio*. As the work is mentioned among Bede's other commentaries in the *Historia ecclesiastica*, it certainly predates 731 (the year Bede finished his *magnum opus*), although it cannot be excluded that, at that date, the commentary was still unfinished.

Many of Bede's biblical commentaries were conceived as practical introductions to patristic theology and exegesis, intended for readers with varying levels of proficiency in these subjects, who wanted to acquaint themselves with the main patristic thinkers and their writings. The *Collectio*, with its clear structure, instructive titles (which enable the reader to look up passages easily), and lucid presentation, probably had a similar pedagogical purpose, serving as a useful introduction to Augustinian Pauline exegesis (cf. the *Excerpta*, which were intended for the instruction of Eugippius's fellow monks at Castellum Lucullanum).¹⁶

Aim of the Present Contribution

In his biblical commentaries, Bede's primary concern was to follow in the footsteps of the Church Fathers, especially Augustine, Gregory the Great, Ambrose, and Jerome. Bede alludes to his fidelity to the *patres* on several occasions, stating that he proceeds *iuxta uestigia patrum* or *patrum uestigia sequens*.¹⁷ As the *Collectio* consists entirely and solely of passages excerpted from Augustine's oeuvre, it differs, at first sight, from the rest of Bede's biblical commentaries (with the exception of the last book of his commentary on the Song of Songs, cf. *supra*), where we clearly hear the Anglo-Saxon's own authorial voice next to his patristic sources. In his Pauline commentary Augustine is omnipresent and — except for the titles indicating the provenance of the passages and short interjections by means of which Bede links different parts from Augustine's excerpts with each other (for example, *et paulo post*; *et cetera, usque dum ait*) — not a single word originates from Bede. However, the fact that Bede's active role in the *Collectio* was restricted to the act of extracting and rearranging fragments from Augustine's works does not necessarily mean that his Pauline commentary offers merely "copy-paste" work or that it is restricted to a "passive" pastiche of Augustine's Pauline exegesis. On the contrary, Bede's textual choices seem to be well sustained and driven by didactic, theological, and

¹⁶ Fransen, "D'Eugippius à Bède le Vénérable," 188.

¹⁷ See, for example, *In Sam.*, CCL 119, p. 10, 53–54; *In Cant.*, CCL 119b, p. 180, 503; *Exp. act. apost.*, CCL 121, p. 3, 9–10. Cf. Dolbeau, "Bède, lecteur des sermons d'Augustin," 495 n. 1; M. L. W. Laistner, "Bede as a Classical and a Patristic Scholar," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 16 (1933): 69–94; C. Jenkins, "Bede as Exegete and Theologian," in *Bede, His Life, Times, and Writings*, 152–200; R. Ray, "Who Did Bede Think He Was?" in *Innovation and Tradition in the Writings of The Venerable Bede*, ed. S. DeGregorio (Morgantown, WV, 2006), 11–35.

exegetical objectives. Over the past decades, research on patristic florilegia has demonstrated that the ways in which specific fragments are selected, adapted, and combined in florilegia are indicative of the theological/philosophical positions of their authors.¹⁸ By carefully selecting or ignoring certain phrases or passages from Augustine's texts, Bede was able to place his proper accents, thus emphasizing or obscuring specific aspects of the Church Father's interpretations.¹⁹ This way of adapting and presenting Augustine's Pauline exegesis in a specific way can also be observed in significant inversions of specific phrases or passages, the length of the fragments, the order in which they follow each other, the frequency with which Bede quotes from certain Augustinian works, etc.

Despite its importance for the study of the early medieval transmission and reception of Augustine's writings and thinking in England, Bede's Pauline commentary has long been neglected by scholars, not in the least due to the lack of a critical edition.²⁰ A thorough examination of Bede's *Collectio*, however, could

¹⁸ M. Garrison, "The *Collectanea* and Medieval Florilegia," in *Collectanea Pseudo-Bedae*, ed. M. Bayless and M. Lapidge, *Scriptores Latini Hiberniae* 14 (Dublin, 1998), 42–83; F. Martello, "Paterio, *alter Gregorius*, e la redazione del *Liber testimoniorum*," in *Gregorio Magno e le origini dell'Europa; Atti del Convegno internazionale Firenze, 13–17 maggio 2006 sotto la direzione di Claudio Leonardi*, ed. C. Leonardi, *Millennio Medievale* 100, *Strumenti e studie* n. s. 37 (Florence, 2014), 397–423; S. Boodts, "The Reception of Augustine in a Ninth-Century Commentary on Romans (Paris, BNF, lat. 11574)," in *Felici curiositate: Studies in Latin Literature and Textual Criticism from Antiquity to the Twentieth Century in Honour of Rita Beyers*, ed. G. Guldentops, C. Laes, and G. Partoens, *Instrumenta Patristica et Mediaevalia* 72 (Turnhout, 2017), 437–57.

¹⁹ R. Ray, "Bede," in *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*, ed. J. H. Hayes (Nashville, 1999), 115–16; M. Karsten, *Beda Venerabilis, in epistulam Iacobi expositio*, *Fontes Christiani* 40 (Freiburg, 2000), 29–37; G. H. Brown, *A Companion to Bede*, *Anglo-Saxon Studies* 12 (Woodbridge, Suffolk and Rochester, NY, 2009; repr., 2010), 33–42; S. DeGregorio, "Introduction: The New Bede," in *Innovation and Tradition in the Writings of The Venerable Bede*, 1–10.

²⁰ Recent publications on Bede's biblical commentaries as well as on his theological and exegetical thinking show that the *Collectio* remains almost completely unstudied. See Brown, *A Companion to Bede*; A. Thacker, *Bede and Augustine of Hippo: History and Figure in Sacred Text* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 2005) and A. J. Kleist, *Striving with Grace: Views of Free Will in Anglo-Saxon England* (Toronto, Buffalo, and London, 2008). Likewise, Bede and the *Collectio* do not, or only superficially, figure in studies on the early medieval reception of Augustine's thinking or in studies on early medieval and/or Anglo-Saxon (Pauline) exegesis. See B. J. Matz, "Augustine, the Carolingians, and Double Predestination," in *Grace for Grace, the Debates after Augustine and Pelagius*, ed. A. Y. Hwang, B. J. Matz, and A. Casiday (Washington, DC, 2014), 235–70; J. Heil, *Kompilation oder Konstruktion? Die Juden in den Pauluskommentaren des 9. Jahrhunderts* (Hannover, 1998) and V. Heuchan, "The Apostle Paul in Anglo-Saxon England: All Things to All Men," in *A Companion to St. Paul in the Middle Ages*, ed. S. R. Cartwright, *Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition: A Series of Handbooks and Reference Works on the Intellectual and Religious Life of Europe, 500–1800* 39 (Leiden and Boston, 2013), 425–47. Those few studies that consider the *Collectio*, refer to the work very summarily and sometimes misrepresent its contents by stating, for instance, that it largely consists of a recapitulation of Eusebius's *Excerpta* "with additions of his

provide interesting insights into the Anglo-Saxon scholar's theological agenda in general and his approach to Augustine's Pauline exegesis in particular.

The following contribution offers a first step into the examination of the way(s) in which Bede selects, adapts, and presents his Augustinian source texts, constructs his own digest of Augustine's exegesis in the *Collectio*, and develops his own exegesis of the Pauline epistles through this Augustinian prism. Bede's *modus operandi* will be evaluated by means of a case study, which focuses on the Anglo-Saxon's presentation of Augustine's exegesis of Eph. 3:17–18 in the *Collectio*. The first part of this contribution analyzes Augustine's exegesis of this pericope throughout his writings. The second part of the article examines Bede's use of Augustine's interpretation of these verses in the *Collectio* and in his other biblical commentaries.

In the letter to the Ephesians,²¹ the themes of Christology and ecclesiology are intricately linked with each other via the concept of the Church as body of Christ. God's previously hidden decision to save mankind in Christ is now disclosed and realized through the apostolic preaching of the Gospel, as the (Deutero-)Pauline author of the letter states. The faithful acceptance of this message establishes the Church as Christ's body. Christ gathers the whole of humanity (Gentiles included) "under one head" in and through the Church. For this reason the author of the letter urges his readers to preserve the Church's unity and purity.

[Bede's] own" (Heuchan, "The Apostle Paul," 428). The relevant articles on Bede and (Augustinian) florilegia in the *Oxford Guide to the Historical Reception of Augustine* deal with the *Collectio* very briefly and superficially: G. H. Brown, "Bede, the Venerable," in *The Oxford Guide to the Historical Reception of Augustine*, 2:642–44; J. C. Thompson, "The Medieval Manuscript Tradition of Augustine's Works: An Overview from 400 to 1200," in *ibid.*, 1:51–58. The *Collectio* is transmitted in twelve manuscripts, all of continental origin: Rouen, Bibl. Mun. 147 (A 437) (IX); Florence, Bibl. Med. Laur. San Marco 648 (IX–XI); Cologne, Dombibl. 104 (IX^{1–2/4}); Schaffhausen, Ministerialbibl. 64 (XII^{1/2}); Schaffhausen, Ministerialbibl. 65 (XII); Orléans, Bibl. Mun. 81 (78) (IX^{1/3}); Orléans, Bibl. Mun. 84 (81) (IX^{2/4}); St.-Omer, Bibl. Mun. 91 (IX¹); Boulogne, Bibl. Mun. 64 (71) (XIIⁱⁿ); Würzburg, Universitätsbibl. Mp. th. f. 63 (IX^{2/3}); Monte Cassino, Bibl. Abb. 178 (1075–80); Vatican City, Bibl. Apost. Vat. Urb. lat. 102 (between 1474 and 1482) (cf. appendix of this article).

²¹ Despite its generally accepted title, the epistle was probably not — at least not solely — addressed to the Christian community of Ephesus. It served perhaps as a circular letter for several communities in the province of Asia Proconsularis. Since its contents seem to attest to a further development of Paul's thinking and clearly make use of Colossians, Ephesians was probably not written before ca. AD 90. There is a broad consensus that the epistle was not written by Paul himself, but has a Deutero-Pauline origin. See P. T. O'Brien, *The Letter to the Ephesians*, The Pillar New Testament Commentary (Grand Rapids, MI, and Cambridge, 1999); H. W. Hoehner, *Ephesians: An Exegetical Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI, 2002); S. E. Fowl, *Ephesians, A Commentary*, The New Testament Library (Louisville, KY, 2012); G. Sellin, *Der Brief an die Epheser*, Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das neue Testament 8 (Göttingen, 2008); C. Reynier, *L'épître aux Ephésiens*, Commentaire biblique: Nouveau Testament 10 (Paris, 2004).

The broader context of Eph. 3:17–18 is the change in the Gentiles' eschatological role thanks to Christ. The author explains how Paul was called to become the apostle of the Gentiles, in order to encourage the Gentiles to accept and follow the Gospel's message. The verses 3:17–18 (“habitare Christum per fidem in cordibus uestris, ut in caritate radicati et fundati praeualeatis comprehendere cum omnibus sanctis, quae sit latitudo et longitudo et altitudo et profundum”)²² are part of the prayer in Eph. 3:14–19, where God is asked to strengthen the Ephesians in their inner being in order that Christ may dwell in their heart (16–17) so that they may understand the depth of Christ's love (18–19).

AUGUSTINE'S EXEGESIS OF EPH. 3:17–18

Augustine highly respected Paul, whose epistles are one of the main sources for the Church Father's theology. The image of the Church as body of Christ, central to Ephesians, evidently features in Augustine's (anti-Donatist) emphasis on ecclesial unity. Furthermore, Paul plays a central role in the development of Augustine's doctrine of grace (especially in the debates with the Pelagians), as can already be witnessed from the fact that he honored the Apostle with the title of *gratiae magnus defensor*.²³ Augustine's use of Ephesians, too, is to be situated in the context of his writings on divine grace, predestination, and free will.²⁴ A search in Brepols's databases shows, for instance, that Augustine refers to Eph. 1:4 in the context of predestination, to Eph. 2:3 and 5:25–27 to reflect upon original sin, to Eph. 2:8–9, 3:17(–18) (cf. infra), and 6:23 to argue that faith is an unmerited, divine gift.

Augustine's use of Eph. 3:17–18 is relatively limited and, moreover, almost entirely confined to his *Sermones ad populum*, *Enarrationes in Psalmos*, *In*

²² Aug., *ep.* 140, 62 (CSEL 44, p. 209, 8–12).

²³ s. 168, 2: “Audi apostolum ipsum fidei disputatorem, et gratiae magnum defensorem: audi eum dicentem, *pax fratribus, et caritas cum fide* [Eph. 6:23]” (PL 38, col. 912, 3–6).

²⁴ Augustine's exegesis of Ephesians has not yet received a thorough and comprehensive treatment. For the moment, there are only isolated studies of individual verses from Ephesians in Augustine's works: T. J. van Bavel, “No one ever hated his own flesh: Eph. 5:29 in Augustine,” *Augustiniana* 45 (1995): 45–93; J. Doignon, “Serui ... facientes uoluntatem Dei ex animo (Eph. 6:6): Un éclatement de la notion de servitude chez Ambroise, Jérôme, Augustin?” *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 68 (1984): 201–11; A.-M. La Bonnardière, “L'interprétation augustinienne du *magnum sacramentum* de Ephés. 5, 32,” *Recherches augustinienes et patristiques* 12 (1977): 3–45; eadem, “Le combat chrétien; Exégèse augustinienne d'Ephes. 6, 12,” *Revue d'études augustinienes et patristiques* 11 (1965): 235–38; A. P. Manrique, “Presencia de Cristo en los corazones por la fe (Ef. 3,17), según San Agustín,” *Revista agustiniana de espiritualidad* 14 (1973): 41–61; and A. Zumkeller, “Eph. 5, 27 im Verständnis Augustins und seiner donatistischen und pelagianischen Gegner,” *Augustinianum* 16 (1976): 457–74.

Iohannis euangelium tractatus, and *Epistulae*.²⁵ Only on some occasions does Augustine explicitly link Eph. 3:17 and 3:18 with each other. As our main interest will be Bede's exegesis of the two verses together, our analysis concentrates on those passages where both verses occur combined (*en. Ps.* 103, 1, 14; *s.* 165, 2–5; *s.* 53, 15–16; *ep.* 140, 62–64; *ep.* 55, 25), leaving out those in which only one of the two verses figures (these latter will be referred to only as an additional illustration of Augustine's use of Eph. 3:17 or 3:18). Furthermore, our analysis is restricted to passages in which Augustine explains Eph. 3:17–18, leaving out all *loci* that merely quote the pericope, without any further explanation.²⁶ In the following presentation we distinguish between, on the one hand, the *Enarrationes* and *Sermones* (which both belong to Augustine's pastoral activities as a preacher), and, on the other hand, the *Epistulae*.²⁷

Eph. 3:17–18 in the Sermones and Enarrationes in Psalmos

Three passages in Augustine's *Sermones* and *Enarrationes* discuss the combination of Eph. 3:17–18. In the *Enarrationes*, Eph. 3:17–18 is explained in *en.*

²⁵ The following analysis of Augustine's exegesis of Eph. 3:17–18 is based on A. Dupont, "Habitaré Christum per fidem in cordibus uestris (Eph. 3,17): Brève présentation de l'approche biblique d'Augustin sur les questions doctrinales de ses Sermons," *Bulletin de littérature ecclésiastique* 111 (2010): 367–76 and idem, *Gratia in Augustine's Sermones ad Populum during the Pelagian Controversy: Do Different Contexts Furnish Different Insights?* Brill's Series in Church History 59 (Leiden and Boston, 2013), 178–82. See also E. TeSelle, "Faith," in *Augustine through the Ages: An Encyclopedia*, ed. A. D. Fitzgerald (Grand Rapids, MI, and Cambridge, 1999), 347–50, at 348; idem, "Fides," *Augustinus-Lexikon*, vol. 2 (Basel, 1996–2002), cols. 1333–40; and idem, "Crederé," *Augustinus-Lexikon*, vol. 2 (Basel, 1996–2002), cols. 119–31.

²⁶ E.g. *mor.* 1, 18, 33–34; *retr.* 2, 36; *Io. eu. tr.* 96, 5; *en. Ps.* 51, 12; *s.* 72 auct. (=Dolb. 16), 3; *diu. qu.* 68, 2; *agon.* 35.

²⁷ In this way, we follow the threefold division into *libri* (systematic writings), *tractatus* (sermons), and *epistulae* (letters) of Augustine's writings as maintained by the Church Father in his *Retractationes*. The category of the sermons consists of the *sermones ad populum*, the *enarrationes in Psalmos* (dedicated to the Psalms), and the *In Iohannis euangelium/epistulam tractatus* (explaining the Gospel and first Letter of John). The *sermones ad populum* were orally delivered and simultaneously noted down by *notarii*. In general, they were not corrected or revised by Augustine afterwards. For the *enarrationes* and *tractatus* this is not always the case: various of these texts were written as model sermons, to comment upon certain Psalms and Johannine passages that Augustine did not preach on or to serve as examples for other preachers. The *enarrationes* and *tractatus* that were delivered orally were usually revised afterwards. Both Augustine's homiletic texts (*sermones*, *tractatus*, *enarrationes*) and his *epistulae* were tools for immediate communication, have a public character (letters were intended for public circulation), and are rhetorically well structured. While many sermons were intended for a local, often very mixed audience with varying levels of education, the letters were addressed to a specific person or group with (at least) a classical and (usually) a biblical formation. See Dupont, *Gratia in Augustine's Sermones ad Populum*, 5–12.

Ps. 103, 1, 14, which was probably preached before the Pelagian controversy.²⁸ In this *enarratio*, the verses occur as part of Augustine's reflections on the relation between divine and human activity in the process of salvation. According to Augustine's exposition in *en. Ps.* 103, 1, 14, Paul prayed in Eph. 3:17 that Christ might live in our inner person through faith, so that we would be able to understand the four dimensions of the cross upon which Christ was crucified (Eph. 3:18).²⁹ Having made this connection between the two verses, Augustine then explains these four dimensions: the breadth of the cross (*latitudo*) refers to man's good works during his earthly life, the length of the cross (*longitudo*) refers to perseverance in these works, its height (*altitudo*) to the elevation of the heart, and its depth (*profundum*) to the sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist. The first three dimensions are man's responsibility, the depth of the cross, however — which forms the basis of the three previous dimensions — is God's responsibility.³⁰ In this way, man's works (the *latitudo*, *longitudo*, and *altitudo* of the cross) are all fundamentally rooted in God's grace. Augustine, however, does not explicitly refer to divine grace on this point; he only describes the *profundum* as the invisible basis of the rest of the cross and links it with the sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist, which form the basis of man's *bona opera*.³¹

Sermo 165 (417)³² is one of Augustine's most polemical anti-Pelagian sermons. In this sermon, Augustine systematically attacks Pelagian doctrine, while

²⁸ Dupont, *Gratia in Augustine's Sermones ad Populum*, 179. Müller: —, Zarb: September–December 412, Rondet: late summer–autumn 411, La Bonnardière: 409, Dolbeau: winter 403–404?, Hombert: December 403, Boulding: 411 or 404/409. The different proposed dates of the *enarrationes* are those found in H. Müller, "Enarrationes in Psalmos, A: Philologische Aspekte," *Augustinus-Lexikon*, vol. 2 (Basel, 1996–2002), cols. 804–38.

²⁹ "Iam dicebat quibusdam apostolus: *flecto genua mea pro uobis ad Patrem, ut det uobis secundum interiorem hominem habitare Christum per fidem in cordibus uestris, ut in caritate radicati et fundati* [Eph. 3:14–17]. Iam dat illis caritatem: iam dat illis alas et pennas. *Vt possitis*, inquit, *comprehendere quae sit latitudo, longitudo, altitudo et profundum* [Eph. 3:18]"; *en. Ps.* 103, 1, 14 (CCL 40, p. 1487, 1–6). Dupont, *Gratia in Augustine's Sermones ad Populum*, 180.

³⁰ "Latitudo enim est in bonis operibus, longitudo in perseuerando usque in finem, altitudo propter sursum cor, ut omnia bona opera nostra, in quibus perseueramus usque in finem, habentes latitudinem qua bene operamur, et longitudinem qua perseueramus usque in finem, non faciamus nisi spe caelestium praemiorum. Ipsa est enim altitudo, non hic quaerere mercedem, sed sursum; ne dicatur nobis: *Amen dico uobis, perceperunt mercedem suam* [Matt. 6, 2]. Profundum autem quod dixi, ubi fixa erat pars crucis, et non uidebatur; inde surgebant quae uidebantur. Quid est quod occultum est, et non publicum in ecclesia? Sacramentum baptismi, sacramentum eucharistiae"; *en. Ps.* 103, 1, 14 (CCL 40, p. 1487, 10–21). Dupont, *Gratia in Augustine's Sermones ad Populum*, 180.

³¹ "Profundum autem quod dixi, ubi fixa erat pars crucis, et non uidebatur; inde surgebant quae uidebantur. Quid est quod occultum est, et non publicum in ecclesia? Sacramentum baptismi, sacramentum eucharistiae"; *en. Ps.* 103, 1, 14 (CCL 40, p. 1487, 18–25).

³² Rebillard: ca. 417, Gryson: 417, Hombert: —. For the dating of the *sermones*, we refer to the chronological overviews of É. Rebillard, R. Gryson, and P.-M. Hombert (in some cases supplemented by that of E. Hill). É. Rebillard, "Sermones," in *Augustine through the Ages*,

referring to the Pelagians in satirical terms (for example, in s. 165, 6, where he designates them by means of the term *nouelli*).³³ In this anti-Pelagian context, *Sermo* 165, 2–5 offers another explanation of Eph. 3:13–18, in which the preacher analyzes the relation between human and divine involvement in the act of faith. Augustine explains that man should open his will in order to receive God’s grace and to be strengthened by his Spirit.³⁴ For this strengthening he refers to Eph. 3:16–18. It is, however, not clear whether the faith from 3:17, through which man opens his will, is the result of God’s grace or of man’s own initiative.³⁵ As the rest of the *Sermo*, however, considers faith the result of grace and as Augustine argues that man’s ability to understand the four dimensions of the cross in Eph. 3:18 is God’s gift, the overall interpretation of Eph. 3:17–18 in this *Sermo* is that faith is primarily a divine gift.³⁶ Man should always bear in mind that charity, love for God, and perseverance (the three visible dimensions of the cross) are based on the *profundum crucis*. The latter symbolizes the gratuitous character of God’s grace and the inscrutability of God’s judgment, which makes it impossible for man to understand why some humans are elected by his grace and others not.

In a similar way Augustine discusses the relation between faith and good works in *Sermo* 53, 15–16 (413), a sermon that reflects on the beatitudes by means of an exegetical commentary on Mt. 5, 3–8.³⁷ A person with good faith, he argues, cannot perceive God in a bodily way. Therefore, God must be seen with the heart. To corroborate this point, Augustine partly quotes Eph. 3:17–19 (§15).³⁸ During man’s earthly life, Christ dwells in the heart through faith, whereas in the hereafter we will see him in full divine presence (“*praesentia diuinitatis suae*”), when we have reached a complete understanding of the four dimensions of the cross. Again, Augustine clarifies these four dimensions: breadth consists in good works, length in perseverance in these works, and height in the expectation of heavenly rewards. Man should perform

773–92; R. Gryson, *Répertoire général des auteurs ecclésiastiques latins de l’antiquité et du haut moyen âge, 5e édition mise à jour du Verzeichnis der Sigel für Kirchenschriftsteller*, *Vetus Latina*, die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel 1,1⁵ (Freiburg, 2007); P.-M. Hombert, *Nouvelles recherches de chronologie augustiniennne*, Collection des Études Augustiniennes; Série Antiquité 163 (Paris, 2000); E. Hill, *The Works of Saint Augustine: A Translation for the 21st Century; Sermons*, III/3 (51–94), *on the New Testament* (New York, 1991).

³³ Dupont, *Gratia in Augustine’s Sermones ad Populum*, 78.

³⁴ Idem, “*Habitare Christum per fidem in cordibus uestris*,” 372.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ Cf. G. Partoens and A. Dupont, “Augustine’s Preaching on Grace and Predestination,” during *Society of Biblical Literature, SBL-subsection: Christianity in North Africa (2nd–7th centuries)*, Baltimore, 23–26 November 2013 (unpublished conference paper).

³⁷ Rebillard: 21 January 413, Gryson: 21 January 413, Hombert: —, Hill: 413–16.

³⁸ “Interior est homo, ubi habitat Christus interim per fidem [cf. Eph. 3:17], ibi habitaturus praesentia diuinitatis suae; cum cognouerimus quae sit *latitudo longitudo altitudo profundum* [Eph. 3:18], cognouerimus etiam *supereminentem scientiam caritatis Christi*, ut impleamur *in omnem plenitudinem Dei* [Eph. 3:19];” s. 53, 15 (CCL 41Aa, p. 102, 306–10).

good works with perseverance in the expectation of receiving heavenly rewards. The fourth dimension, the *profundum crucis*, is again identified as God's hidden grace, which cannot be perceived or understood by man.³⁹ In short, just as in s. 165, Augustine emphasizes the dependence of human works on divine grace in his exegesis of Eph. 3:17–18 — man should perform good works (“breadth”) in a perseverant way (“length”), with the expectation of earning divine (not earthly) rewards (“height”). Man cannot achieve this without “depth,” God's grace that enables him to do good works and to persevere in them.

Examining these three passages *in globo*, a distinction can be made between *en. Ps.* 103, 1, 14 on the one hand, and s. 53, 15–16 and s. 165, 2–5 on the other hand. Whereas the former passage only briefly refers to the fact that faith is rooted in divine grace, s. 53, 15–16 and s. 165, 2–5 explicitly discuss the relation between human and divine intervention in faith.⁴⁰ The main focus in *en. Ps.* 103, 1, 14 is the identification of faith in Christ with Christ himself. Obviously, this does not mean that *en. Ps.* 103, 1, 14 denies the fact that faith is a divine gift; it simply does not stress the point, whereas in s. 53, 15–16 and s. 165, 2–5 such emphasis is clearly present.⁴¹ This shift towards a stronger emphasis on man's dependence on divine grace for receiving faith could perhaps be explained by a chronological difference between these texts. *En. Ps.* 103, 1 probably predates the Pelagian controversy, which could explain why this text does not explicitly stress the divine character of faith. *Sermo* 165 (417), alternatively, can be situated after the start of the Pelagian controversy, which could be an explanation for its clear emphasis on the fact that human faith is rooted in divine grace.⁴² An identical focus is present in s. 53, which probably dates from the earliest stages of the debates surrounding Pelagianism (413).⁴³

³⁹ “Attende profundum: gratia Dei est in occulto uoluntatis eius. *Quis enim cognouit sensum Domini? Aut quis consiliarius eius fuit?* [Rom. 11:34] Et: *Iudicia tua sicut multa abyssus* [Ps. 35, 7];” s. 53, 15 (CCL 41Aa, p. 103, 326–28).

⁴⁰ Furthermore, s. 53 and s. 165 show close similarities regarding their formulation and tone. In both sermons Augustine extensively analyzes the four dimensions of the cross, which contrasts with the rather brief passage in *en. Ps.* 103, 1 dealing with the four dimensions. In s. 53 and s. 165 the Church Father repeatedly explains the four dimensions, stressing the significance of the cross as a metaphor for man's life. The tone in these sermons is more rhetorical than in *en. Ps.* 103, 1 (which could perhaps be explained by the anti-Pelagian context of these sermons) and is characterized by the use of exhortations, rhetorical questions, anaphoras, and other stylistic features, which are less apparent in *en. Ps.* 103, 1.

⁴¹ Dupont, “*Habitare Christum per fidem in cordibus uestris*,” 373–74; idem, *Gratia in Augustine's Sermones ad Populum*, 182.

⁴² Dupont, “*Habitare Christum per fidem in cordibus uestris*,” 374; idem, *Gratia in Augustine's Sermones ad Populum*, 182.

⁴³ Rebillard: 21 January 413, Gryson: 21 January 413, Hombert: —, Hill: 413–16.

The same characteristic distinction can be observed in sermons that quote Eph. 3:17 without Eph. 3:18. *Sermo* 174 (411–13),⁴⁴ for example, stresses man's incapacity to live a good life without God's assistance and emphasizes the necessity of Christ's entering man's sick heart in order to heal it.⁴⁵ Referring to Eph. 3:17, Augustine invokes the example of Zacchaeus, who welcomed Christ in his house but in order to do so already carried Christ in his heart. First, Christ placed faith in Zacchaeus's heart. Second, Zacchaeus responded to Christ's initiative. Thus, Zacchaeus welcomed Christ into his heart, while Christ was already there, precisely because he had enabled Zacchaeus to open his heart. Again, the bishop of Hippo emphasizes that grace precedes human works and that Christ lives in the heart of the believer through faith. The same emphasis on grace preceding human works is present in s. 158 (ca. 418).⁴⁶ Faith, Augustine argues in this sermon, is the result of divine intervention prior to the initiative of man, who, with the help of the Holy Spirit, must respond to God's gift.⁴⁷ By contrast, ss. 64A, 81, 105, 361, and *Io. eu. tr.* 49⁴⁸ quote Eph. 3:17 only to identify faith in Christ with Christ himself, emphasizing that man should keep his faith awake, without overtly discussing the exact relation between human and divine intervention in faith.

Analogous to this difference between *en. Ps.* 103, 1, 14 and s. 53, 15–16/s. 165, 2–5 is a difference in interpretation of the *profundum crucis*, the fourth dimension of the cross, as was noted by Hombert.⁴⁹ Whereas the fourth dimension refers to the sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist in *en. Ps.* 103, 1, 14,⁵⁰ the *profundum crucis* acquires a new meaning from the Pelagian controversy onwards as referring both to God's judgments, which are hidden from man, and to the fact that faith is a gratuitous divine gift. This second interpretation, which emphasizes the divine

⁴⁴ Rebillard: 411–13, Gryson: 413, Hombert: 411–13. *Sermo* 174 discusses a central tenet of Augustine's theology of grace, namely, the idea that man is incapable of attaining salvation on his own, as he fundamentally depends upon divine grace for this. This idea is concretized in the need to baptize infants on account of original sin.

⁴⁵ Dupont, "*Habitare Christum per fidem in cordibus uestris*," 370–71.

⁴⁶ Rebillard: after 418, Gryson: ca. 418, Hombert: —. In s. 158 Augustine, discussing Rom. 8:30–31, emphasizes that faith is a divine gift and does not result from man's initiative.

⁴⁷ Dupont, "*Habitare Christum per fidem in cordibus uestris*," 371.

⁴⁸ s. 64A (= s. Mai 20): Rebillard: —, Gryson: —, Hombert: —, Hill: 396–99.

s. 81: Rebillard: 410–11, Gryson: October/November 410, Hombert: —.

s. 105: Rebillard: 410–11, Gryson: 412, Hombert: 412.

s. 361: Rebillard: winter 410–11, Gryson: December 403, Hombert: —.

Io. eu. tr. 49: Berrouard: 414. M.-F. Berrouard, "La date des *Tractatus I–LIV in Iohannis Euangelium* de saint Augustin," *Recherches Augustiniennes* 7 (1971): 105–68.

⁴⁹ P.-M. Hombert, "Augustin, prédicateur de la grâce au début de son épiscopat," in *Augustin Prédicateur (395–411): Actes du Colloque International de Chantilly, 5–7 septembre, 1996*, Collection des Études Augustiniennes; Série Antiquité 159 (Paris, 1998), 217–45, at 229.

⁵⁰ Cf. *doctr. chr.* 2, 41, 62.

roots of human works, is, apart from s. 53, 15–16 and s. 165, 2–5, also present in *ep.* 140, 64, *ep.* 147, 34 (cf. *infra*), and *Io. eu. tr.* 118, 5, which also date from the Pelagian controversy.

Eph. 3:17–18 in the Epistulae

Ep. 55 (around 400) offers an analysis of the Paschal Triduum with references to the second part of *Eph.* 3:17, and 3:18.⁵¹ Augustine interprets the day of Christ’s crucifixion as a symbol for the present life, his burial as referring to faith, and Easter, the resurrection, as indicating hope. When analyzing the meaning of Christ’s passion and subsequent crucifixion (*ep.* 55, 24–25), Augustine describes the four dimensions of the cross, the height of the cross referring to man’s expectation of the future reward granted by God, the breadth signifying the joy man experiences when practicing his human duties in the light of this reward, and the length of the cross symbolizing the perseverance he has to exercise when waiting for the divine reward. Augustine perceives the depth of the cross as a reference to the sacramental secret (*secretum sacramenti*), which is symbolized in the second and third days of the Triduum, both of which respectively refer to faith and hope. In this way, faith and hope are linked — as it seems — to the works man has to perform during his earthly life.

Ep. 140 (411/412) is addressed to Honoratus, a Carthaginian catechumen, and entitled *De gratia Noui Testamenti*. The letter forms an early response to Pelagianism.⁵² In *ep.* 140, 62–64 Augustine quotes *Eph.* 3:17–18 to analyze the exact nature of human responsibilities.⁵³ In his exposition of *Eph.* 3:16–17, Augustine states that Christ’s dwelling in the heart is given by God (“*ubi fundati quodam modo et radicati* [*Eph.* 3:17] *sumus;*” §62) and does not result from good works performed by man (“*cuius gratia sumus salui facti non ex operibus iustitiae, quae nos fecimus, sed secundum eius misericordiam* [*Tit.* 3:5];” §62).⁵⁴ Good works are the result of love, which comes from Christ and is related to the four dimensions of

⁵¹ In *ep.* 55 Augustine discusses man’s eschatological transition from death to life in Christ via faith. Faith leads man to forgiveness of his sins in the hope of eternal life. The believer shares, first, in Christ’s death via baptism (cf. *Col.* 3:2–4) and, subsequently, in Christ’s resurrection (cf. *Rom.* 8:10–11). As he discusses Christ’s death on the cross and explains that faith is an unmerited gift (*Rom.* 1:17), Augustine analyzes the four dimensions of the cross (*Eph.* 3:18–19). Dupont, *Gratia in Augustine’s Sermones ad Populum*, 161–62.

⁵² In *ep.* 140 Augustine discusses the moral virtues of the Pelagians, while, at the same time, criticizing their theological position, as they (according to Augustine) emphasize that man is able to achieve salvation without God’s help. Dupont, *Gratia in Augustine’s Sermones ad Populum*, 39.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 180; *idem*, “*Habitare Christum per fidem in cordibus uestris,*” 372.

⁵⁴ “*Hoc ergo eis optat, ut non infirmentur in tribulationibus apostoli, quas pro illis sustinebat, et propter hoc genua flectebat ad Patrem. Proinde non infirmari unde illis sit, sequitur et dicit: ut det uobis secundum diuitias gloriae suae uirtute corroborari per Spiritum eius* [*Eph.* 3:16]. *Hae sunt diuitiae, de quibus dicit: O altitudo diuitiarum!* [*Rom.* 11:33] *Abditas*

the cross.⁵⁵ The first three dimensions (good works, perseverance, and the focus on the final reward), which are all human duties, are founded in the fourth, which stands for divine grace and the inscrutability of God's judgment.⁵⁶ Human works are in this way fundamentally dependent on God's grace. Via the combination of Eph. 3:17–18 Augustine is able to stress this point.

As was the case with Augustine's treatment of Eph. 3:17–18 in the *Sermones* and *Enarrationes*, a clear distinction can be made between *ep.* 55 on the one hand and *ep.* 140 on the other. Whereas Augustine refers to Eph. 3:17–18 in *ep.* 55 mainly to state that faith in Christ is identified with Christ himself, without manifestly elaborating the fact that human faith is a gratuitous divine gift, *ep.* 140 uses Eph. 3:17–18 to explicitly demonstrate that human works, patience, and the expectation of the final reward (breadth, length, and height of the cross) are fundamentally rooted in divine grace (the depth of the cross). In contrast to this overtly divine orientation in *ep.* 140, *ep.* 55 sees *fides* rather as a part of man's works. Again, this distinction could be viewed in light of the question of whether these passages belong to or are prior to the Pelagian controversy: *ep.* 55 (around 400) was written before the debates between Augustine and the Pelagians, whereas *ep.* 140 (411/412) was composed at the outset of the Pelagian controversy. This distinction is in keeping with the division between *en. Ps.* 103, 1 on the one hand and *s.* 53/s. 165 on the other hand. In *ep.* 140 the *profundum crucis* is considered to be a clear reference to God's grace, contrary to *en. Ps.* 103, 1, where the fourth dimension refers to the sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist. The latter interpretation is also present in *ep.* 55, where Augustine identifies the *profundum crucis* with the *secretum sacramenti*.

Conclusion

The essential message Augustine conveys by linking Eph. 3:17 and 3:18 is that human duties (the first, second, and third dimensions of the cross) are all fundamentally the effect of divine grace (the fourth dimension). In this way, *ep.* 140 can be read together with *ss.* 53, 158, 165, and 174, which use Eph. 3:17 (and 3:18 in

enim habent causas, ubi nullis meritis praecedentibus quid habemus, quod non accepimus?" *ep.* 140, 63 (CSEL 44, p. 209, 20–210, 5).

⁵⁵ Dupont, "*Habitare Christum per fidem in cordibus uestris*," 372; idem, *Gratia in Augustine's Sermones ad Populum*, 181.

⁵⁶ "Vnde ipsa caritas nunc in bonis operibus dilectionis exercetur, qua se ad subueniendum, quaqua uersum potest, porrigit, et haec latitudo est; nunc longanimitate aduersa tolerat et in eo, quod ueraciter tenuit, perseuerat, et haec longitudo est; hoc autem totum propter adipiscendam uitam facit aeternam, quae illi promittitur in excelso, et haec altitudo est. Existit uero ex occulto ista caritas, ubi *fundati* quodam modo *et radicati* [Eph. 3:17] sumus, ubi causae uoluntatis Dei non uestigantur, cuius gratia sumus salui facti *non ex operibus iustitiae, quae nos fecimus, sed secundum eius misericordiam* [Tit. 3:5];" *ep.* 140, 62 (CSEL 44, p. 208, 3–13).

ss. 53 and 165) to stress the necessity of grace in human life. All of these texts likely date from Augustine's anti-Pelagian period. By contrast, the passages considering this verse (probably) in the period prior to 411 (ss. 64A, 81, [105.] 361, [*Io. eu. tr.* 49,] and *en. Ps.* 103, 1) use Eph. 3:17 (and 3:18 in *en. Ps.* 103, 1) especially to identify faith in Christ with Christ himself, without stressing the fact that human works are the result of divine grace, which is also the case for *ep.* 55. However, concerning the question of whether the passages discussed are prior to or belong to the period of the Pelagian controversy, a methodological *caveat* should be added: we should be extremely careful so as not to overemphasize the supposed dating of these passages, as these datings may have been based on the (presumed) anti-Pelagian character of the content of the said passages, or, conversely, on the absence of clear references to Pelagianism and/or to the role of divine grace. The proposed datings of the texts analyzed are therefore to be taken with caution.

BEDE'S PRESENTATION OF AUGUSTINE'S EXEGESIS OF EPH. 3:17–18 IN THE *COLLECTIO*

In the *Collectio* Bede offers an exegetical commentary on Eph. 3:17–18 in fr. 315,⁵⁷ one of the thirty-one Augustinian excerpts that together constitute Bede's commentary on Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians (fr. 308–38).⁵⁸ Bede's exegesis of Eph. 3 is divided over three different excerpts: fr. 314 (Eph. 3:9–10), fr. 315 (Eph. 3:13–19), and fr. 316 (Eph. 3:19), which focus on the central part of Eph. 3 (verses 9–19). The source of fr. 315 is Augustine's *ep.* 140, 62–65, which Bede refers to only in the *Collectio* (cf. *infra*). Within the passage taken from *ep.* 140, the analysis of Eph. 3:17–18 is enclosed by Augustine's exegesis of Eph. 3:13–19. In this way, fr. 315 offers an explanation of several scriptural verses together. The excerpt is not only by far the longest of the thirty-one fragments from Bede's commentary on Ephesians; it also contains the largest quantity of explained verses within these thirty-one fragments.

As mentioned earlier, Bede compiles his fragments in a systematic way. Usually (but not always) he starts by giving the biblical verse(s) that will be explained in the fragment, followed by an identification of the fragment's source in the title, after which comes the fragment itself as an explanation of the Pauline lemma (ta).⁵⁹ In fr. 315 this procedure is slightly modified. The scriptural verses

⁵⁷ We follow the numbering of the fragments in Bede's *Collectio* as given by Fransen ("Description de la collection," [n. 2 above], 25–62). In Hurst's translation of the *Collectio*, fr. 315 (Fransen) takes number 316 (for this difference in numbering, see Hurst, *Bede the Venerable* [n. 4 above], 235–38).

⁵⁸ A critical edition of *Coll.* fr. 315 can be found in the appendix to this article.

⁵⁹ Bede uses the same procedure in the last book of his commentary on the Song of Songs, which consists of fragments extracted from the works of Gregory the Great to explain the biblical text. Bede here explicitly refers to the example of Paterius, Gregory's secretary,

quoted by Bede before the *incipit* of the fragment are Eph. 3:14–17a, whereas the text itself presents an explanation of Eph. 3:13–18 and quotes Eph. 3:19, which is, however, not explained in fr. 315 but in fr. 316. Furthermore, Augustine’s exegesis does not entirely follow the sequence of the verses in Ephesians. In *ep.* 140, 62 Augustine starts with an explanation of Eph. 3:18, followed by 3:14–15. In the next paragraph (§63) he proceeds with an analysis of 3:13, followed by 3:16–18, and 3:19 (which is not explained). In §64 Augustine returns once more to the four dimensions of the cross mentioned in 3:18.

Augustine’s quotations of Eph. 3:17–18 are, on the whole, relatively uniform in his writings. The part “in caritate radicati et fundati” occasionally appears in an altered form (for example, “*fundati quodam modo et radicati sumus*” [*ep.* 140, 62]; “*ibi enim radicati, ibi fundati sumus*” [*ep.* 140, 63]). The words “cum omnibus sanctis” are sometimes omitted from Eph. 3:18 (for example, *en. Ps.* 103, 1, 14). Normally, Augustine reads “possitis comprehendere,” whereas in *ep.* 140 he gives “praeualeatis comprehendere” (*s.* 72 auct. [= Dolb. 16], 3 reads “ualeatis apprehendere”). Sporadically, the *altitudo* is named as the first of the four dimensions of the cross (for example, *Mor.* 1, 18, 33; *en. Ps.* 51, 12). Bede’s quotations of the pericope in *Coll.* fr. 315 do not show any major changes with respect to Augustine’s reading of the verses in *ep.* 140.

As mentioned earlier, Bede selected various of the *Collectio*’s fragments from Eugippius of Lucullanum’s *Excerpta ex operibus sancti Augustini*. In Eugippius’s Augustinian florilegium each fragment is preceded by a short summary of its main theme and an identification of its source. Of the 457 fragments the *Collectio* contains, 104 (partly or integrally) overlap with fragments from Eugippius’s commentary, according to Fransen.⁶⁰ For some of Augustine’s works, the *Collectio* relies entirely upon Eugippius’s *Excerpta*.⁶¹ For other writings of Augustine Bede used Eugippius as well as the direct Augustinian transmission.

Coll. fr. 315 corresponds to fr. 220 in Eugippius’s *Excerpta*.⁶² *Coll.* fr. 315 is the only instance in Bede’s oeuvre where *ep.* 140 is quoted.⁶³ Furthermore, the *incipit*

who proceeded in a similar way when preparing a biblical commentary for which he used fragments from his master’s works (Partoens, “The Sources and Manuscript Transmission” [n. 2 above], 205–6).

⁶⁰ Fransen, “D’Eugippius à Bède le Vénérable” (n. 15 above), 193–94.

⁶¹ According to Partoens, who based his analysis on Fransen’s comparison of Eugippius’s *Excerpta* and Bede’s *Collectio* (Partoens, “The Sources and Manuscript Transmission,” 214; Fransen, “D’Eugippius à Bède le Vénérable,” 193–94), this is the case for *Ad Orosium contra Priscillianistas et Origenistas*, *De bono coniugali*, *De dono perseverantiae*, *De gratia et libero arbitrio*, *De moribus Ecclesiae et de moribus Manichaeorum*, and *De perfectione iustitiae hominis*.

⁶² CSEL 9/1, p. 701, 12–702, 8; 15–19; 703, 4–705, 8. Fransen, “D’Eugippius à Bède le Vénérable,” 190 and 194. On p. 191 Fransen erroneously states that *ep.* 140 is also quoted in *Coll.* fr. 319, 372, 374, 376, and 405. These passages were not taken from *ep.* 140 but from *ep.* 149.

⁶³ Lapidge, *The Anglo-Saxon Library* (n. 8 above), 201; Hurst, *Bede the Venerable*, 347.

and *explicit* of Bede's fr. are exactly the same as those in Eugippius's excerpt.⁶⁴ It can thus be assumed that Bede did not have direct access to Augustine's *ep.* 140, but knew this letter only via Eugippius's *Excerpta* and, by consequence, that Bede's knowledge of *ep.* 140 was confined to the sections of this letter he found in Eugippius's collection.⁶⁵ If we want to examine Bede's presentation of *ep.* 140 in the *Collectio*, it is therefore necessary to analyze *Coll.* fr. 315 in comparison with both Augustine's *ep.* 140 and Eug. fr. 220.⁶⁶ We start by comparing Eug. fr. 220 with *ep.* 140,⁶⁷ to evaluate Eugippius's selection of the material. Subsequently, we will examine Bede's use of Eug. fr. 220 to compile *Coll.* fr. 315. We end our analysis by evaluating Bede's presentation of the Augustinian material in *Coll.* fr. 315 and his possible reasons for selecting *ep.* 140 to present Augustine's exegesis of Eph. 3:17–18 in the *Collectio*.

Coll. fr. 315 in Comparison with Eug. fr. 220 and Augustine's ep. 140

Eug. fr. 220 is entitled *Ex libro de gratia Noui Testamenti ad Honoratum*, the same title as the one introducing Bede's fragment.⁶⁸ In Eug. fr. 220, this title is followed by a brief summary of the excerpt's content: "Quae sit latitudo et longitudo et altitudo et profundum, quod ait apostolus." Eugippius's excerpt is restricted to *ep.* 140, 62–65 ("merito ergo ... societate gaudentium"), the only part of *ep.* 140 in which Augustine discusses Eph. 3:17–18 and the four dimensions of the cross. The rest of the letter considers other scriptural passages, which Augustine elucidates to the catechumen Honoratus. As Eugippius quotes §§62–65 almost in full (leaving out only a few sentences from the beginning of §62 and the end of §65), his presentation of Augustine's exegesis of Eph. 3:17–18 (and more broadly, 3:13–19) in *ep.* 140 is exhaustive. Moreover, his selection turns out to be faithful to the original, leaving out nothing from the quoted passages and showing no major variant readings. Given the explicit identification of *ep.* 140 in the fragment's title and the apt summary of the excerpt's central theme (the four dimensions

⁶⁴ From a comparison of the text of *Coll.* fr. 315 with the text of Eug. fr. 220 and that of Augustine's *ep.* 140 it is not possible to identify positively Eugippius or the direct Augustinian transmission as the source of *Coll.* fr. 315, as there are no significant secondary readings shared by Eugippius and Bede or significant secondary readings in Eugippius on places where Bede and Augustine share the same reading.

⁶⁵ Cf. Fransen, "D'Eugippius à Bède le Vénérable," 192.

⁶⁶ Furthermore, we should bear in mind that, apart from Eugippius's compilation, other Augustinian florilegia may have found their way to Wearmouth-Jarrow, where they could have been used by Bede. This may be the case for the Pauline commentary attributed to Peter of Tripoli, which has been attested to by Cassiodorus in the *Institutiones* (1, 8, 9) and, although the work has probably been lost, could have traveled to Northumbria via south Italy, which had excellent connections with England (Partoens, "The Sources and Manuscript Transmission," 202–4, 214; Lapidge, *The Anglo-Saxon Library*, 24–30).

⁶⁷ CSEL 44, p. 207, 23–212, 6.

⁶⁸ Fransen, "D'Eugippius à Bède le Vénérable," 191.

of the cross), Eugippius clearly intended this fragment as a straightforward presentation of Augustine's interpretation of the four dimensions of the cross in *ep.* 140, which corresponds to the didactic purposes of his Augustinian anthology.

A comparison between Augustine's text and Eugippius's adaptation shows that the latter's selection is exhaustive and representative of Augustine's exegesis of Eph 3:17–18 in *ep.* 140. A comparison between *Coll. fr.* 315 and Eug. fr. 220 leads to the same conclusion. As Bede quotes *ep.* 140 in his writings only in *Coll. fr.* 315 and as he selected this fragment from Eugippius's *Excerpta* (cf. *supra*), his knowledge of *ep.* 140 was most likely confined to those sections of the letter quoted by Eugippius. Bede took up Eugippius's fragment in full, leaving out only two passages from Augustine's text as presented by Eugippius. Between *profundum* and *hinc* on line 19 in our critical edition (see appendix), the following *passus* has been omitted:

Altitudo quippe commune nomen est excelso et profundo, sed cum in excelso dicitur, sublimitatis eminentia commendatur, cum autem in profundo, difficultas inuestigationis et cognitionis. Vnde et illud Deo dicitur: *quam magnificata sunt opera tua, Domine; nimis profundae factae sunt cogitationes tuae* [Ps. 91, 6]. Et iterum: *iudicia tua uelut multa abyssus* [Ps. 35, 7].⁶⁹

Just before this passage, Augustine elaborately explains the four dimensions of the cross along with their significance (Eph. 3:18). This analysis starts with the *latitudo*, continues with the *longitudo* and the *altitudo*, and ends with the *profundum*. Augustine then returns to the *altitudo*, which he contrasts with the *profundum* (see quotation). Bede leaves out this last passage, which forms in part a recapitulation and a further specification of what has been said before. In order to give a linear and straightforward presentation of Augustine's interpretation of the said dimensions, he omits this last addition, preferring to end the explanation of the cross with the *profundum* on line 19.

The second omission occurs only a few lines later, when Bede leaves out the following section (line 21–22, between *nominatur* and *quaeris* in our edition):

Ut det uobis secundum diuitias gloriae suae uirtute corroborari per Spiritum eius in interiorum hominum, habitare Christum per fidem in cordibus uestris, ut in caritate radicati et fundati praeualeatis comprehendere cum omnibus sanctis, quae sit latitudo et longitudo et altitudo et profundum, scire etiam supereminentem scientiam caritatis Christi, ut impleamini in omnem plenitudinem Dei [Eph. 3:16–19]. Attende omnia diligenter. *Huius rei gratia*, inquit, *flecto genua cordis mea ad Patrem Domini nostri Iesu Christi, ex quo omnis paternitas in caelo et in terra nominatur* [Eph. 3:14–15].⁷⁰

The omitted verses 3:16–19 belong to a full quotation of Eph. 3:14–19, from which Bede retains only 3:14–15 (immediately prior to the omission). Since Bede already quoted Eph. 3:14–17a before the *incipit* of the fragment, there is no need to repeat

⁶⁹ CSEL 9/1, p. 702, 8–15.

⁷⁰ CSEL 9/1, p. 702, 19–703, 4.

these verses here in full. Moreover, the omission allows Bede to move directly from the first part of Eph. 3:14 (“huius rei gratia flecto genua mea ad Patrem ...”) to Augustine’s corresponding question “cuius rei gratia?” immediately after the omitted section. In this way, the omission enables Bede to present the explanations of the different verses from Eph. 3:13–19 in a more linear order: starting with Eph. 3:18 and 3:14–15 (prior to the omission and continuing with “cuius rei gratia?”), he then proceeds to Eph. 3:13, followed by 3:16–19, which follow each other according to their sequence in Ephesians. By omitting Eph. 3:16–19 in the beginning, Bede reinforces the fragment’s linear structure, thus rendering the presentation of Augustine’s explanations of the different Pauline verses more straightforward. As such, although both of Bede’s interventions in the text of Eug. fr. 220 are rather small, they seem to be motivated by the intention to systematize the arrangement of the different Pauline lemmata and their corresponding Augustinian explanations, with the aim of rendering the fragment’s overall composition and internal order more transparent and accessible.

From a text-critical point of view, a comparison of *Coll.* fr. 315 with its direct source, Eug. fr. 220, reveals next to no significant changes. Those instances where there is textual variation between *Coll.* fr. 315 and Eug. fr. 220 are only smaller differences,⁷¹ which do not imply significant content-related changes between both texts. Moreover, in cases where Bede’s text differs from Eugippius’s (which, in Knöll’s edition, is primarily based on Vat. lat. 3375; cf. *infra*), the former’s reading can sometimes be found in the critical apparatus of Knöll’s edition, which means that Bede in these cases offers a specific reading attested in other witnesses of the *Excerpta*. These readings (which can be found in the lower critical apparatus of our edition) seem to correspond mainly to three witnesses of the *Excerpta*: MSS Ambrosianus C 73 inf. (seventh century [Knöll], eighth century [Gorman]) (*A*); Vercellensis XXX 94 (tenth century) (*v*), and (partly) Parisinus, lat. 11642 (ninth century) (*P*).⁷² However, as these variants are on the whole relatively insignificant (cf. *supra*), they are insufficient to determine more precisely the relation between the text of Eug. fr. 220 as used by Bede and the textual transmission of the *Excerpta*.⁷³ In the CSEL edition, these

⁷¹ Such as different prepositions (for example, line 13 in our edition: *in occulto*, where Eugippius reads *ex occulto*), or transpositions of words (for example, line 15 in our edition: *fecimus nos*, where Eugippius reads *nos fecimus*).

⁷² CSEL 9/1, x–xiii, xxii–xxiii, and xxviii; M. M. Gorman, “The Manuscript Tradition of Eugippius’s ‘Excerpta ex operibus sancti Augustini,’” *Revue Bénédictine* 92 (1982): 7–32 and 229–64, at 22–26 and 234–45. We refer to the sigla used by Knöll; Gorman partly uses other sigla: *P* Parisinus, *f*^B Ambrosianus, *H* Vercellensis, *V* Vaticanus.

⁷³ Only by means of a large-scale comparison of Bede’s *Collectio* with Eugippius’s *Excerpta* could it be possible to ascertain where Bede’s text of the *Excerpta* should be located within the direct transmission of Eugippius’s collection. We should also bear in mind that new manuscripts of the *Excerpta* have been discovered since Knöll’s edition.

variants were grouped together in the apparatus, thus forming a group of secondary readings according to Knöll, who based his edition principally on a sixth-century codex, Vat. lat. 3375 (*V*). Knöll almost gave this manuscript the status of archetype of the *Excerpta*,⁷⁴ but it proves, in fact, to be a testimony of highly questionable quality, which does not deserve a privileged position in the reconstruction of the archetype.⁷⁵ As such, it is possible that some of the readings mentioned in Knöll's critical apparatus should be considered as constituting the correct text stemming from the archetype, whereas the corresponding readings in Knöll's reconstructed text (based on the Vatican codex) should be transferred to the apparatus. In this case, those readings in our reconstructed text of *Coll.* fr. 315 that differ from Knöll's reconstructed text of *Eug.* fr. 220 probably correspond to Eugippius's text as transmitted through the consensus of the manuscripts.⁷⁶ In any case, it is always necessary to evaluate carefully the readings offered in the CSEL edition of the *Excerpta*.

A comparative analysis of Augustine's *ep.* 140, *Eug.* fr. 220, and *Coll.* fr. 315 reveals an intact transmission from Augustine's exegesis of Eph. 3:17–18 through Eugippius to Bede's *Collectio*. There are no important changes on the level of the text itself, nor on the level of the particular selection of passages from Augustine's text (Eugippius's selection is exhaustive and Bede's omissions are rather insignificant from theological and exegetical points of view). As such, it is clear that Augustine's interpretation of Eph. 3:17–18 in *ep.* 140 (as described in the first part of this article) is, on the whole, faithfully represented in the *Collectio*.

Coll. fr. 315 in Comparison with en. Ps. 103, 1; s. 53; s. 165, and ep. 55

Bede in *Coll.* fr. 315 faithfully reproduced Augustine's exegesis of Eph. 3:17–18 from *ep.* 140 (via Eugippius's *Excerpta*). By consequence, in *Coll.* fr. 315 Bede emphasizes the fact that faith and human merits are ultimately rooted in and dependent on God's grace, which, according to Augustine, is symbolized by the Pauline *profundum crucis*. The following part of our analysis explores the possible reasons behind Bede's preference for *ep.* 140, with its specific and explicit interpretation of the depth of the cross in reference to God's grace, over the other Augustinian texts dedicated to Eph. 3:17–18 and described earlier.

⁷⁴ CSEL 9/1, i–x; Gorman, "The Manuscript Tradition," 25. Angelo Mai already erroneously believed that *V* was the archetype of the *Excerpta* and probably even Eugippius's autograph. See Gorman, "The Manuscript Tradition," 240–41.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 241–43.

⁷⁶ As Gorman pointed out, *A* contains several chapters that are omitted in *V* (and related MSS). As these chapters have also been preserved in all other MSS, they are part of the archetype ("The Manuscript Tradition," 243). This evidence further undermines the authority given to *V* by Knöll.

A first step in reconstructing the reasons for Bede's choice for *ep.* 140, 62–65 consists in considering the Augustinian library that he had at his disposal at Wearmouth-Jarrow in order to establish which of Augustine's interpretations of Eph. 3:17–18 (*en. Ps.* 103, 1; s. 53; s. 165; *ep.* 55; *ep.* 140) could have been known to the Anglo-Saxon monk. Of the five Augustinian texts analyzed above, Bede is certain to have known the following three: *en. Ps.* 103, 1; *ep.* 55, and *ep.* 140 (the latter by means of Eugippius's *Excerpta*).⁷⁷

En. Ps. 103, 1 is only found once in Bede's works, namely, in *Coll. fr.* 444, where he quotes *en. Ps.* 103, 1, 15 to explain Heb. 1:7.⁷⁸ In Augustine's *enarratio*, this paragraph is immediately preceded by the one in which the Church Father treats Eph. 3:17–18 (*en. Ps.* 103, 1, 14). *En. Ps.* 103, 1 was not transmitted to Bede through Eugippius's *Excerpta*. We can thus assume that he probably knew Augustine's explanation of Eph. 3:17–18 in *en. Ps.* 103, 1, 14.

Ep. 55 occurs in several of Bede's writings. In *Coll. fr.* 352 he quotes *ep.* 55, 26 to explain Phil. 3:12–13. This paragraph (*ep.* 55, 26) immediately follows on *ep.* 55, 25, which, as said earlier, constitutes one of the five cases where Augustine explains Eph. 3:17–18. The passage from *ep.* 55, 26 excerpted as *Coll. fr.* 352 was not transmitted to Bede by means of the *Excerpta*, which means that Bede probably also knew §25 (cf. *infra*). Outside the *Collectio*, Bede quotes *ep.* 55 in *De natura rerum* 20;⁷⁹ *De temporum ratione* 11,⁸⁰ 25,⁸¹ 27,⁸² 64,⁸³ *Expositio actuum apostolorum*,⁸⁴ and *Expositio apocalypseos* 19.⁸⁵

Ep. 140 is quoted only in *Coll. fr.* 315 (cf. *supra*). Whether Bede was acquainted with s. 53 and/or s. 165 cannot be determined, as there seem to be no references to these sermons in his works.⁸⁶

It may be safely assumed that Bede knew Augustine's explanations of Eph. 3:17–18 in *en. Ps.* 103, 1, 14 and *ep.* 55, 25. The fact that he drew on *ep.* 55 on several occasions indicates that this letter had value for him. Only for *Coll. fr.*

⁷⁷ Based on Lapidge, *The Anglo-Saxon Library* (n. 8 above), 201–3 and Hurst, *Bede the Venerable* (n. 4 above), 345–47.

⁷⁸ According to Lapidge, *The Anglo-Saxon Library*, 201, Bede quotes *en. Ps.* 103, 1, 8 in *Comm. Gen.* (CCL 118a, p. 69, 2218–20). This passage, however, seems to be a direct quotation, not from *en. Ps.* 103, 1, 8, but from Augustine's *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* 2, 21, 32. The CCL edition refers to *en. Ps.* 103, 1, 8 only as a parallel place. We therefore exclude this passage from our analysis, as it cannot prove Bede's knowledge of *en. Ps.* 103, 1.

⁷⁹ CCL 123a, p. 212, 11–213, 13.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 123b, p. 314, 33–315, 45.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, p. 357, 20–358, 26.

⁸² *Ibid.*, p. 362, 4–363, 19.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, p. 457, 42–45; 459, 102–6.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 121, p. 16, 29.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 121a, p. 385, 19–387, 23.

⁸⁶ Dolbeau, "Bède, lecteur des sermons d'Augustin" (n. 4 above), 521; Hurst, *Bede the Venerable*, 347; Lapidge, *The Anglo-Saxon Library*, 203.

315, however, did Bede choose *ep.* 140, whereas he had the possibility to select similar passages from *en. Ps.* 103, 1 or *ep.* 55. Why did he pick out this specific passage from Augustine's writings, whereas he could have chosen from other similar expositions in the Church Father's works?

It is possible that Bede's choice might have been motivated by the more overt elaboration on the theme of grace in *ep.* 140, in which this letter differs from earlier texts, where Augustine mainly stresses the identification of faith in Christ with Christ himself. This focus on the divine origin of faith and the dependence of human merits on God's grace, symbolized by the *profundum crucis*, adds an explicit emphasis on divine grace to *Coll. fr.* 315. We should, however, not overestimate the importance of the differences in emphasis between the various passages where Augustine explains Eph. 3:17–18. Although these shifts in focus and emphasis between Augustine's explanations of Eph. 3:17–18 as sketched in the first part of this contribution are not to be overlooked, the question arises of whether they were as clear or as important to an author like Bede as they are to modern interpreters of Augustine's works. It is possible that to Bede the differences between Augustine's explanations of Eph. 3:17–18 in *ep.* 140, *en. Ps.* 103, 1, 14, and *ep.* 55, 25 were of minor importance or without relevant implications for Augustine's thinking on a more general level. Medieval readers of Augustine's writings such as Bede likely read the Church Father's works from the perspective of continuity, instead of looking for specific differences between Augustine's earlier and later exegetical and theological explanations. The issue of whether some of the shifts in focus between the texts discussed relate to the question of whether they are prior to or belong to the Pelagian controversy, too, was probably of minor interest to Bede, whose primary aim in the *Collectio* was to present a clear overview of Augustine's most relevant exegetical explanations of the Pauline epistles. In any case, further research on the *Collectio*'s contents (when a critical edition of the entire commentary will be available) and Bede's Pauline exegesis in general will have to shed more light on the compiler's *modus operandi* and his intentions in selecting certain Augustinian passages for his Pauline commentary, whether or not because of their explicit emphasis on the theme of grace (or on other relevant theological and exegetical themes).

We would argue that a more probable explanation of Bede's textual choice lies perhaps in a pragmatic and didactic, rather than in a (purely) content-related motivation. *Ep.* 140, 62–65 offers a concise, well-structured, and transparent exposition of a cluster of biblical verses (Eph. 3:13–19) in merely three paragraphs. This gave Bede the opportunity to concentrate seven lemmata in only one fragment. As such, the passage quoted forms an appealing portion of clear-cut Augustinian exegesis, which could easily fit the didactic purposes of the *Collectio*, being probably intended as a manageable introduction to Augustinian Pauline exegesis and theology. The fact that the passage selected from *ep.* 140

contains a considerable portion of exegesis of Ephesians 3 could explain why Bede limited himself to a mere quotation, leaving out almost nothing from his source material, as he did not feel the need to intervene on a large scale in this fragment. In this case, the choice for *ep.* 140 could have been primarily a pragmatic or didactic one, rather than being guided chiefly by theological or exegetical considerations. Of course, this does not exclude the possibility that a combination of both motivations (the pragmatic/didactic and the theological/exegetical ones) was at play in the process of selection. However, we should be cautious in trying to explain Bede's textual choice merely or principally in light of his theological or exegetical preoccupations. That Bede was concerned with presenting his reader with a straightforward, well-structured portion of Augustinian exegesis can also be witnessed in the two passages he omitted from the text of *ep.* 140 as represented in *Coll.* fr. 315. As discussed earlier, the first passage omitted by Bede forms a digression and the second contains a long quotation of Bible verses, several of which were already quoted earlier in the fragment. These passages divert the reader from the main argumentation and disrupt the linear presentation of Augustine's exegetical explanations. The first passage in particular forms a very specific digression, discussing the different meanings of the word *altitudo* (which can refer both to height and to depth), and as such is of no use to Bede. This again seems to suggest that Bede was first and foremost concerned with offering his reader an accessible introduction to Augustinian Pauline exegesis.

Furthermore, apart from offering a concise exposition of several Pauline verses in a well-structured sequence (which is even further improved by Bede's omissions), *ep.* 140, 62–65 forms an exemplary biblical-hermeneutic lesson, as the passage explores the nature of human duties by analyzing the relation between Eph. 3:17 and 3:18 and as such clearly links the two verses with each other.⁸⁷ Augustine explains Eph. 3:13–19 to illustrate the point that man's works ultimately rely on God's hidden grace, a point that is rhetorically emphasized via the repeated Pauline verse “O altitudo diuitiarum sapientiae et scientiae Dei, quam inscrutabilia sunt iudicia eius et inuestigabiles viae eius!” (Rom. 11:33). Augustine explains that everything is rooted in the *occultum* or *profundum* (Eph. 3:18) by stating that this *profundum* consists of the *caritas* in which man is rooted (Eph. 3:17).⁸⁸ The same link between Eph. 3:17 and 3:18 occurs when the Church Father asserts again that we are “radicati et fundati” (Eph. 3:17) in the

⁸⁷ Cf. Dupont, “*Habitare Christum per fidem in cordibus uestris*” (n. 25 above), 372: “cette lettre [*ep.* 140] est centrée sur le thème du devoir humain par le rapport entre Eph. 3. 17 et Eph. 3. 18.”

⁸⁸ “Exsistit uero in occulto ista caritas, ubi fundati quodammodo et radicati sumus [cf. Eph. 3:17], ubi causae uoluntatis Dei non uestigantur, cuius gratia sumus salui facti, *non ex operibus iustitiae quae fecimus nos, sed secundum misericordiam eius* [Tit. 3:5]” (lines 13–15 in our edition).

profundum (Eph. 3:18), stressing just as before that man's actions are determined by God's hidden grace.⁸⁹ In this way, Augustine does not offer his addressee a mere linear exegesis of succeeding verses. The explanations of Eph. 3:17 and 3:18 (and more globally, Eph. 3:13–19) are intertwined with each other. In this way, Augustine develops an argumentation in which the divine character of man's *bona opera* is repeatedly accentuated. A culmination is reached near the end of the passage, where the Church Father emphasizes his statement by referring to Rom. 9:20 ("O homo, tu quis es qui respondeas Deo?").⁹⁰

EPH. 3:17–18 IN THE REST OF BEDE'S OEUVRE

Bede's choice for *ep.* 140, 62–65 in the *Collectio* becomes all the more interesting when comparing *Coll.* fr. 315 with other passages in Bede's works that offer an explanation of Eph. 3:17–18. A search in Brepols's online databases enabled us to identify, in total, five allusions to or direct quotations of Eph. 3:17–18 in Bede's oeuvre outside the *Collectio*. Three of these passages merely quote or allude to Eph. 3:17 and/or 3:18. As the verses are referred to in these passages only to illustrate a particular point, without being further explained, they are left out from the present analysis.⁹¹ The other two *loci*, which are found in Bede's commentaries on Luke and Mark, offer a full quotation of Eph. 3:17–18 in combination with an explanation of the four dimensions of the cross.

Eph. 3:17–18 in Bede's Commentary on Luke

In book six of his *In Lucae euangelium expositio* (*Comm. Luc.*) Bede explains Lk. 23:33a ("et postquam uenerunt in locum qui uocatur Caluariae, ibi crucifixerunt eum").⁹² After a topographical description of mount Calvary, the Anglo-Saxon scholar continues with an explanation of Christ's position on the Cross,

⁸⁹ "Quid ergo *comprehendere?* *Quae sit*, inquit, *latitudo* (sicut iam dixi, in bonis operibus beneuolentia porrigitur usque ad diligendos inimicos) *et longitudo* (ut longanimitate pro hac latitudine molestiae tolerantur) *et altitudo* (ut pro his aeternum quod in supernis est praemium, non uanum aliquid temporale speretur) *et profundum* [Eph. 3:18] (unde gratuita gratia Dei secundum secretum et abditum uoluntatis eius existit). Ibi enim *radicati et fundati* [Eph. 3:17] sumus" (lines 36–41 in our edition).

⁹⁰ "Iam uero illud ex ligno quod non apparet, quod fixum occultatur, unde totum illud exsurgit, *profunditatem* significat gratuita gratiae, in qua multorum ingenia conteruntur, id est, uestigare conantia, ut ad extremum eis dicatur: *O homo, tu quis es qui respondeas Deo?* [Rom. 9:20] *Viuent ergo corda saturatorum pauperum in saeculum saeculi, hoc est, humilium caritate flagrantium, non sua quaerentium, sed sanctorum societate gaudentium*" (lines 58–63 in our edition).

⁹¹ These passages are: *De tabernaculo* 3, CCL 119a, p. 123, 1181–83 (Eph. 3:16–17); *In Ezram et Neemiam* 1, CCL 119a, p. 272, 1234 (Eph. 3:17); *In epistolas septem catholicas*, Iud. 1:12 CCL 121, p. 339, 159 (Eph. 3:17).

⁹² CCL 120, p. 401, 1525–402, 1568; ed. D. Hurst.

quoting from Coelius Sedulius's *Carmen Paschale* (5, 188–95). Bede subsequently adds:

Moralem quoque sacrosanctae crucis figuram describit apostolus ubi ait: *In caritatem radicati et fundati ut possitis comprehendere cum omnibus sanctis quae sit latitudo et longitudo altitudo et profundum cognoscere etiam supereminentem scientiae caritatem Christi* [Eph. 3:17–19].⁹³

In the remainder of his explanation of Lk. 23:33a (1549–1568),⁹⁴ Bede discusses the four dimensions of the cross at length. His interpretation of the said dimensions is entirely in line with s. 53, s. 165, and *ep.* 140: *latitudo* refers to good works, *longitudo* to perseverance in these works, *altitudo* to hope for eternal rewards, and *profundum* to the “inscrutabilia iudicia Dei unde ista gratia in homines uenit.”⁹⁵ At first sight, there seems to be no direct Augustinian source for the explanation in *Comm. Luc.*⁹⁶ In Hurst's *apparatus fontium*, reference is made only to *Io. eu. tr.* 118, 5.⁹⁷ This sermon of Augustine on the Gospel of John indeed offers a similar explanation of the cross but is not the source of Bede's passage, as the parallels between these *loci* are merely content-related. In fact, Bede's entire explanation⁹⁸ is a quotation from Augustine's *ep.* 147, 34, where the Church Father discusses the dimensions of the cross (cf. *supra*).⁹⁹

⁹³ CCL 120, p. 401, 1545–402, 1549.

⁹⁴ “Moralem quoque sacrosanctae crucis figuram describit apostolus ubi ait: *In caritate radicati et fundati ut possitis comprehendere cum omnibus sanctis quae sit latitudo et longitudo altitudo et profundum cognoscere etiam supereminentem scientiae caritatem Christi* [Eph. 3:17–19]. In latitudine quippe bona opera caritatis significat in longitudine perseuerantiam sanctae conuersationis usque in finem in altitudine spem caelestium praemiorum in profundo inscrutabilia iudicia Dei unde ista gratia in homines uenit. Et haec ita coaptantur sacramento crucis ut in latitudine accipiatur trauersum lignum quo extenduntur manus propter operum significationem in longitudine ab ipso usque in terram ubi totum corpus crucifixum stare uidetur quod significat persistere, hoc est longanimitate permanere, in altitudine ab ipso trauerso ligno sursum uersus quod ad caput eminet propter expectationem supernorum ne illa opera bona atque in eis perseuerantia propter beneficia Dei terrena ac temporalia facienda credantur sed potius propter illud quod desuper sempiternum sperat *fides quae per dilectionem operatur* [Gal. 5:6] in profundo autem pars illa ligni quae in terrae abdita defixa latet sed inde consurgit illud omne quod eminet sicut ex occulta Dei uoluntate uocatur homo ad participationem tantae gratiae *alius sic alius* autem *sic* [1 Cor. 7:7] supereminentem uero scientiae caritatem Christi eam profecto ubi pax illa est quae praecellit omnem intellectum” (CCL 120, p. 401, 1545–402, 1568).

⁹⁵ *Comm. Luc.* p. 402, 1552–53.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 401, 1545–402, 1568.

⁹⁷ CCL 36, p. 657, 5–20.

⁹⁸ *Comm. Luc.* p. 402, 1549–68.

⁹⁹ “Ego haec uerba apostoli Pauli sic intellegere soleo: in latitudine bona opera caritatis, in longitudine perseuerantiam usque in finem, in altitudine spem caelestium praemiorum, in profundo inscrutabilia iudicia Dei, unde ista gratia in homines uenit, et hunc intellectum coaptare etiam sacramento crucis, ut in latitudine accipiatur transuersum lignum, quo extenduntur manus, propter operum significationem; in longitudine ab ipso usque in terram, ubi

Neither Hurst's edition nor Lapidge's list of Augustinian works quoted by Bede¹⁰⁰ refer to this passage, but the identification was made by Löfstedt.¹⁰¹ We can, therefore, add *Comm. Luc.* p. 402, 1549–68 to the list of passages in Bede's works that quote from *ep.* 147. As described in the first part of this article, Augustine's interpretation of the cross in *ep.* 147, 34 is in keeping with his exegesis of Eph. 3:18 in s. 53, s. 165, and *ep.* 140, stressing the fact that human merits ultimately depend on God's grace (the *profundum crucis*). Again, just as was the case for *Coll. fr.* 315, Bede in his Commentary on Luke emphasizes the dependence of man's *bona opera* on divine grace.

Eph. 3:17–18 in Bede's Commentary on Mark

In his *In Marci euangelium expositio* (*Comm. Marc.*) Bede proceeds in a different way. In *Comm. Marc.* 4,¹⁰² Bede explains Mk. 15:24 (“et crucifigentes eum diuiserunt uestimenta eius mittentes sortem super eis quis quid tolleret”). After the quotation of the lemma, Bede allegorizes the division of Christ's clothes, quoting at length from *Io. eu. tr.* 118, 4. He starts with a comparison of Christ's death on the cross with man's purification from sin, quoting Rom. 6:6: “uetus homo noster simul crucifixus est cruci cum illo ut euacuetur corpus peccati ut ultra non seruiamus peccato” (1376–78). He continues with an explanation of the four dimensions of the cross (1384–98), at the end of which he refers to Eph. 3:17–18 (1396–98).¹⁰³ Again, as for the passage in *Comm. Luc.* analyzed

totum corpus crucifixum stare uidetur, quod significat persistere, hoc est longanimiter permanere; in altitudine ab ipso transuerso ligno sursum uersus, quod ad caput eminet, propter expectationem supernorum, ne illa opera bona atque in eis perseuerantia propter beneficia Dei terrena ac temporalia facienda credantur sed potius propter illud, quod desuper sempiternum sperat *fides, quae per dilectionem operatur* [Gal. 5:6]; in profundo autem pars illa ligni, quae in terrae abdito defixa latet, sed inde consurgit omne illud, quod eminet, sicut ex occulta Dei uoluntate uocatur homo ad participationem tantae gratiae *alius sic alius* autem *sic* [1 Cor. 7:7]; supereminentem uero scientiae caritatem Christi eam profecto, ubi pax illa est, quae praecellit omnem intellectum. Sed siue hoc in istis apostolicis uerbis etiam ille senserit euangelicus disputator siue aliud aliquid fortasse congruentius, uides tamen etiam hoc, ni fallor, a regula fidei non abhorrere”; *ep.* 147, 34 (CSEL 44, p. 307, 16–308, 16).

¹⁰⁰ Lapidge, *The Anglo-Saxon Library* (n. 8 above), 201.

¹⁰¹ B. Löfstedt, “Zu Bedas Evangelienkommentaren,” *Arctos* 21 (1987): 61–72, at 64.

¹⁰² CCL 120, p. 630, 1360–631, 1398; ed. D. Hurst.

¹⁰³ “Et quia sicut dicit apostolus, *Vetus homo noster simul crucifixus est cruci cum illo ut euacuetur corpus peccati ut ultra non seruiamus peccato* [Rom. 6:6], quamdiu id agunt opera nostra *ut euacuetur corpus peccati* quamdiu exterior homo corrumpitur ut interior renouetur de die in diem tempus est crucis. Haec sunt etiam bona opera quidem tamen adhuc laboriosa quorum merces requies est. Sed ideo dicitur, *spe gaudentes* [Rom. 12:12], ut requiem futuram cum hilaritate in laboribus operemur. Hanc hilaritatem significat crucis latitudo in transuerso ligno ubi figuntur manus. Per manus enim opera intellegimus per latitudinem hilaritatem operantis quia tristitia facit angustias. Per altitudinem autem cui caput adiungitur

above, Hurst does not indicate any direct Augustinian source for this passage. In fact, *Comm. Marc.* p. 630, 1376–631, 1398 was taken entirely, with hardly any changes, from Augustine’s *ep.* 55, 24–25. The quotation is absent from Lapidge’s list (201) but was identified by Dolbeau.¹⁰⁴ Our earlier conclusion that Bede probably knew *ep.* 55, 25 since he quotes *ep.* 55, 26 as *Coll. fr.* 352 becomes thus corroborated by textual evidence. This reinforces our statement that Bede deliberately chose *ep.* 140 to explain Eph. 3:17–18 in the *Collectio* and not *ep.* 55 (or *en. Ps.* 103, 1), whether or not his motivation in selecting the excerpt from *ep.* 140 was to stress the dependence of man’s faith and good works on grace. As said in the first part of this contribution, Augustine refers to Eph. 3:17–18 in *ep.* 55 primarily to identify faith in Christ with Christ himself without explicitly stressing the divine origin of faith. We further argued that the interpretation of the fourth dimension of the cross in *ep.* 55, 25 differs from that in *s.* 53, *s.* 165, and *ep.* 140. Whereas depth refers to God’s grace in the latter passages, in *ep.* 55 the *profundum* is explained as a reference to the sacramental secret, which is symbolized in the second and third days of the Triduum.

Conclusion

The previous analysis of Bede’s treatment of Eph. 3:17–18 in his exegetical writings outside the *Collectio* demonstrated that Bede had access to both of Augustine’s interpretations of the cross and used them in his writings. Did Bede present the two Augustinian explanations in his exegetical works because he was interested in their different theological and exegetical emphases, or were his textual choices determined by other reasons? Again, as was the case for the presence of *ep.* 140 in the *Collectio*, his choice for *ep.* 55 and *ep.* 147 in his commentaries on Mark and Luke may have been motivated by a theological/exegetical reason, by a pragmatic/didactic one, or by a combination of both.

It is possible that the appearance of *ep.* 140 and *ep.* 147 in the *Collectio* and in *Comm. Luc.* results from Bede’s deliberate choice of passages that reflect an overt orientation on the theme of divine grace. But what, then, were Bede’s reasons for presenting the interpretation of *ep.* 55 in *Comm. Marc.*? If there are any deliberate choices from the part of Bede in presenting a picture of Augustine’s exegesis with a

expectatio retributionis de sublimi iustitia Dei qui *reddet unicuique secundum opera sua* [Ps. 61:13; Rom. 2:6] his quidem secundum tolerantiam boni operis gloriam et honorem et incorruptionem quaerentibus uitam aeternam. Itaque etiam longitudo qua totum corpus extenditur ipsam tolerantiam significat unde longanimes dicuntur qui tolerant. Profundum autem quod terrae infixum est secretum sacramenti praefigurat. Recordaris, ni fallor, quae uerba apostoli in ista designatione crucis expedit ubi ait: *In caritate radicati et fundati ut possitis comprehendere cum omnibus sanctis quae sit longitudo latitudo altitudo et profundum* [Eph. 3:17–18]” (CCL 120, p. 630, 1376–631, 1398).

¹⁰⁴ Dolbeau, “Bède, lecteur des sermons d’Augustin,” 498 n. 33.

strong emphasis on grace, this can only be the case for *Coll. fr. 315* and the passage in *Comm. Luc.* The passage in *Comm. Marc.* discussed above, where Bede (intentionally or not) chose an interpretation that does not specifically emphasize the dependence of man's good works on divine grace, indicates that the focus on the latter theme in the *Collectio* and *Comm. Luc.* does not necessarily say anything about Bede's general position towards Augustine's doctrine of grace. Rather, we can only conclude that in those particular passages, Bede could have been primarily oriented towards Augustine's later interpretation of the fourth dimension. With respect to the choice for *ep. 55* in *Comm. Marc.* it is noteworthy that Bede's quotation of *ep. 55* immediately follows his elaborate reference to *Io. eu. tr. 118, 4*. In the paragraph immediately after *Io. eu. tr. 118, 4*, Augustine explains at length the four dimensions according to the interpretation found in *s. 53, s. 165*, and *ep. 140 (Io. eu. tr. 118, 5, cf. supra)*. Why, then, did the Northumbrian monk prefer to continue with an extract from another Augustinian work, containing another explanation of the cross, while he could have just followed Augustine's explanation of Eph. 3:18 in *Io. eu. tr. 118, 5*?

In the case of *Coll. fr. 315* we argued that it seems likely that the compiler's choice for *ep. 140, 62–65* was motivated especially by the fact that Augustine in this passage offers a concise and lucid presentation of a relatively large group of Pauline verses. We would argue that Bede's selection of *ep. 55* for *Comm. Marc.* and of *ep. 147* for *Comm. Luc.* could be viewed in line with our earlier conclusion regarding his choice for *ep. 140* in the *Collectio*. For Bede there were probably no significant differences between Augustine's interpretation of Eph. 3:17–18 in *ep. 55* on the one hand and *ep. 140* or *ep. 147* on the other hand. The fact that he selected the former passage for his commentary on Mark and the latter two for his commentaries on the Pauline Epistles and Luke should therefore not primarily or exclusively be viewed in light of specific theological or exegetical preoccupations but probably results from certain pragmatic and/or didactic motivations such as those discussed earlier. In the excerpt from *Comm. Marc.* analyzed above, Bede's focus lies on offering an explanation of the meaning of Christ's crucifixion and death, which is connected to a discussion of the necessity of man's inner reform (cf. Rom. 6:6). Bede's analysis of the four dimensions of the cross forms an integral part of this broader explanation that does not, or does not specifically, concentrate on the theme of grace and the relation between human and divine involvement in faith. Therefore, if Bede would have quoted on this occasion from *ep. 140* or *ep. 147* instead of *ep. 55*, he would indeed have laid more stress on the dependence of man's works on divine grace, but this would have hardly had any, or any significant, impact on his overall explanation of Mark 15:24, as the specific emphasis on the divine origin of man's works is not at the heart of his exegetical explanation in this passage.

CLOSING REMARKS

The content analysis offered in this contribution considered only one of the *Collectio*'s 457 fragments. This means that the results presented cannot, currently, be used to make general statements about Bede's use and adaptation of Augustine's Pauline exegesis. The aim of this study was rather to offer a first examination of the contents of Bede's Pauline commentary, while pointing to some interesting avenues for further research. From a methodological point of view, this analysis demonstrated that it is necessary for any content analysis of the *Collectio* to start with a thorough examination of Bede's library and the Augustinian texts that were (integrally or partly) available to him.

To resume, we formulate some conclusions, albeit with due caution.

Augustine does not explain Eph. 3:17–18 frequently in his oeuvre, and, when he does, this is mainly the case in works with a specific pastoral or didactic purpose (*Sermones*, *Enarrationes*, and *Epistulae*). From this relatively limited corpus of Augustinian explanations of Eph. 3:17–18, Bede can be said to have known several passages, whether from direct Augustinian sources or by means of Augustinian anthologies such as Eugippius's *Excerpta*. It must be remembered that Bede's acquaintance with Augustinian texts might also derive from anthologies that are now lost.¹⁰⁵

Bede, following Eugippius's fr. 220, did not alter much in comparison with Augustine's original presentation of Eph. 3:17–18 in *ep.* 140. From a text-internal point of view, we can conclude that there are no major changes between *Coll.* fr. 315 and its source texts. On a text-external level, we demonstrated that Bede was acquainted with and used other texts of Augustine discussing Eph. 3:17–18. In the *Collectio*, he quoted *ep.* 140, 62–65, a passage with a strong emphasis on divine grace. Whether or not this specific focus was Bede's primary and/or only reason for selecting this excerpt is difficult to ascertain. A broader survey of the *Collectio*'s full contents will enable us to shed further light on this question.

A comparison with other explanations of Eph. 3:17–18 in Bede's works substantiated our conjectures about Bede's knowledge of some of Augustine's texts, and threw further light on the Anglo-Saxon scholar's use of Augustine's interpretation of the four dimensions of the cross. From a detailed analysis of passages in Bede's commentaries on Luke and Mark, it became clear that Bede quotes and uses different of Augustine's explanations of the considered pericope. While it remains possible that the Anglo-Saxon monk selected these passages specifically for their differences in orientation and emphasis, we argued that his selections should probably not principally be viewed from this perspective, as other reasons may have played an important role in his selection too. This does not mean that Bede had no interest in the specific interpretative nuances and

¹⁰⁵ Cf. the debate surrounding Peter of Tripoli's Augustinian florilegium (cf. n. 66).

emphases of said passages but rather demonstrates that the *Collectio* should not be studied only in light of certain theological or exegetical preoccupations of its compiler.

KU Leuven

Keywords: Augustine of Hippo, Bede (the Venerable), Ephesians 3:17–18, Eugeippius of Lucullanum, Florilegium, Patristic Exegesis, Transmission History

APPENDIX

CRITICAL EDITION OF FR. 315 FROM THE VENERABLE BEDE'S *COLLECTIO EX OPUSCULIS SANCTI AVGVSTINI IN EPISTVLAS PAVLI APOSTOLI*

NICOLAS DE MAEYER

The following critical edition of *Coll.* fr. 315 is part of the *editio princeps* of Bede's *Collectio ex opusculis sancti Augustini in epistulas Pauli apostoli*, which is in preparation at KU Leuven for the *Series Latina* of the *Corpus Christianorum*.¹⁰⁶

There are twelve extant direct witnesses of the *Collectio*:¹⁰⁷

- R* Rouen, Bibl. Mun. 147 (A 437) (IX)
- F* Florence, Bibl. Med. Laur. San Marco 648 (IX–XI)
- V* Vatican City, Bibl. Apost. Vat. Vrb. lat. 102 (between 1474 and 1482)
- C* Cologne, Dombibl. 104 (IX^{1–2/4})
- Sc*¹ Schaffhausen, Ministerialbibl. 64 (XII^{1/2})
- Sc*² Schaffhausen, Ministerialbibl. 65 (XII)
- W* Würzburg, Universitätsbibl. Mp. th. f. 63 (IX^{2/3})
- O*¹ Orléans, Bibl. Mun. 81 (78) (IX^{1/3})
- O*² Orléans, Bibl. Mun. 84 (81) (IX^{2/4})
- So* St.-Omer, Bibl. Mun. 91 (IX¹)
- B* Boulogne, Bibl. Mun. 64 (71) (XIIⁱⁿ) [contains only a selection of fragments]
- M* Monte Cassino, Bibl. Abb. 178 (1075–80)

There are four indirect witnesses of the *Collectio*, which offer a selection of fragments from the commentary:¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁶ I owe many thanks to Gert Partoens for his helpful critical remarks on this introduction and edition.

¹⁰⁷ Partoens, “The Sources and Manuscript Transmission” (n. 2 above), 216–25.

¹⁰⁸ For bibliography on these indirect witnesses, see nn. 5 and 6 in the first part of this contribution.

- hrab* Rabanus Maurus, Pauline commentary (PL 111–112)
hel Helisachar of St.-Riquier (?), Romans commentary preserved in MS Paris, BNF, lat. 11574 (edition in preparation)
flor Florus of Lyon, *Expositio in epistolas beati Pauli ex operibus s. Augustini* (CCM 220B [2 Cor.-Philipp.]; other parts in preparation)
sedul Sedulius Scottus, *Collectaneum in Apostolum* (H. J. Frede, H. Stanjek, eds., *Sedulii Scotti Collectaneum in Apostolum*, *Vetus Latina: Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel*; aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel 31–32 [Freiburg, 1996–97])

From a text-critical point of view, the *Collectio* can be divided into three parts, to each of which a specific number of witnesses and/or a specific stemma applies:

Fr. 1–393: *R F V C Sc^{1.2} W O^{1.2} So B M hrab hel flor sedul* [Rom., 1 Cor., 2 Cor., Gal., Eph., Philipp., Col., 1 Thess., 2 Thess. (beginning)]

Fr. 394–395: *M* [2 Thess. (end)] (later addition)

Fr. 396–457: *R* (expl. fr. 445a) *F V So M sedul* [1 Tim., 2 Tim., Tit., Hebr.]

Fr. 394–95 only occur in the Monte Cassino manuscript and are later additions.¹⁰⁹

Fr. 396–457 have been preserved uniquely in *R F V So M* (and partly in *sedul*); a stemma for this part of the commentary has been presented elsewhere.¹¹⁰

Fr. 1–393 (to which fr. 315 belongs) have been edited according to the stemma established by G. Partoens and subsequently further developed by myself.¹¹¹ With respect to these fragments, it was possible to divide the *Collectio*'s direct witnesses into three distinct branches of related manuscripts: *R F V – C Sc^{1.2} – W O^{1.2} So B M*. Whenever possible, I followed the readings of *R F C W* (and, to a limited extent, *So*),¹¹² which (with the exception of *W*) Partoens also considered valuable witnesses for the reconstruction of the *Collectio*'s archetype.¹¹³ Whenever a specific reading is present in two or more of these manuscripts, distributed over two or more branches of the stemma and confirmed by Augustine's testimony or by one of its branches, I regarded this as the archetype's reading.

¹⁰⁹ Partoens, "The Sources and Manuscript Transmission," 242.

¹¹⁰ N. De Maeyer, "I Tim.-Hebr. in the Venerable Bede's Augustinian Commentary on the Pauline Epistles: A Stemmatological Analysis of its Witnesses" (forthcoming); idem, "Augustinian *auctoritas* in the Venerable Bede's Pauline Commentary: Towards a critical edition of Bede's *Collectio ex opusculis sancti Augustini in epistulas Pauli apostoli*," during *Sicut dicit ... A Methodological Workshop on the Editing of Commentaries on Authoritative Texts*, Leuven, 10 March 2016 (unpublished conference paper); cf. Partoens, "The Sources and Manuscript Transmission," 228 and 242.

¹¹¹ Partoens, "The Sources and Manuscript Transmission," 225–31; De Maeyer, "I Tim.-Hebr.," idem, "Augustinian *auctoritas* in the Venerable Bede's Pauline Commentary."

¹¹² For the text-critical value of *So*, see Wilmart, "La collection de Bède le Vénérable" (n. 2 above), 38–40; Partoens, "The Sources and Manuscript Transmission," pp. 227–51.

¹¹³ Partoens, "The Sources and Manuscript Transmission," 227–51.

These stemmatical results, upon which my text-critical choices have been based, are founded on full collations of ten of the twelve direct witnesses¹¹⁴ and all four indirect witnesses for fr. 1–125 (the *Collectio*'s entire section on Romans). Subsequently, a selection has been made of the most relevant direct and indirect witnesses, based on which fr. 126–393 are currently being edited. These witnesses are: *R F C Sc² W So hrab*. Helisachar offers a commentary only on Paul's letter to the Romans. This explains why the fragments he excerpted from the *Collectio* derive almost exclusively from the *Collectio*'s section on Romans (fr. 1–125). By consequence, this witness can be left out of consideration after fr. 125. Florus's text is closely related to *O²* and is, moreover, strongly contaminated on the basis of the direct Augustinian transmission. As such, there is no added value in using this witness to reconstruct the *Collectio*'s archetype. Sedulius has not been included in our edition after fr. 125 since he uses very few of the *Collectio*'s fragments and manifestly changes the text of Bede's excerpts. The six selected direct witnesses represent either all or the most important witnesses of their branch and can thus be safely used to adequately reconstruct the archetype's text. Since *W* breaks off in fr. 306a, this witness has been replaced by *O¹* from 306b onwards. Consequently, for our edition of *Coll.* fr. 315 the following witnesses have been used: *R F C Sc² O¹ So*. Rabanus Maurus did not use *Coll.* fr. 315 in his own Pauline commentary and has therefore not been considered.¹¹⁵

The reader will find consecutively the *apparatus fontium*, the Bible-apparatus, the *traditio textus*, the *apparatus criticus*, and, at the bottom of the page, the *apparatus criticus* that compares *Coll.* fr. 315 with Eug. fr. 220.¹¹⁶ This final apparatus compares my reconstructed text and critical apparatus of *Coll.* fr. 315 with Knöll's reconstructed text and critical apparatus of Eug. fr. 220. In case of divergence between my reconstructed text and Knöll's, this is indicated as follows: "fecimus nos] nos fecimus *eug*," or, in case the reading in the *Collectio*'s archetype corresponds to certain witnesses of the *Excerpta*: "uestigantur] inuestigantur *eug* (uestigantur *aliquot Eugippii codd.*)."

The Latin orthography of the archetype has been standardized (following Lewis and Short). Significant differences in punctuation between the manuscripts

¹¹⁴ MSS Vat. Urb. lat. 102 (*V*) and Schaffhausen, Ministerialbibl. 64 (*Sc¹*) have not been taken into account for the following reasons: *V* is clearly a descendant of *F* and can therefore be excluded. Both manuscripts from Schaffhausen are closely related to each other. For this reason, only *Sc²* has been taken into account, since this manuscript preserved several fragments that have fallen out of *Sc¹* due to the loss of folia. See Partoens, "The Sources and Manuscript Transmission," 226–27.

¹¹⁵ Cantelli Berarducci, *Hrabani Mauri opera exegetica*, III, *apparatus fontium* (n. 5 above), 1379. For the manuscript transmission of Rabanus's Pauline commentary, see De Maeyer and Partoens, "A New Identification" (n. 5 above), 7–15.

¹¹⁶ CSEL 9/1.

and our edition have been indicated in the *apparatus criticus*. Identifications of Bible verses are based on the Vulgate.¹¹⁷

Conspectus siglorum

- R* Rouen, Bibl. Mun. 147 (A 437), fols. 73v–74v
F Florence, Bibl. Med. Laur. San Marco 648, fols. 82r–83r
C Cologne, Dombibl. 104, fols. 136v–38v
Sc Schaffhausen, Ministerialbibl. 65, fols. 84v–85v
O Orléans, Bibl. Mun. 81 (78), p. 184–85
So St.-Omer, Bibl. Mun. 91, fols. 93r–94r

eug *Excerpta ex operibus sancti Augustini*, fr. 220, CSEL 9/1, p. 701, 12–702, 8; 15–19; 703, 4–705, 8

Conventional signs and abbreviations

* The reconstructed archetype of the *Collectio* is erroneous and the edition offers a corrected reading.

[...] Readings enclosed by square brackets belong to the reconstructed archetype but have been removed.

a.c. *ante correctionem*

p.c. *post correctionem*

sup. l. *supra lineam*

in marg. *in margine*

praem. *praemisit/praemiserunt*

add. *addidit/addiderunt*

ut uid. *ut uidetur*

¹¹⁷ R. Weber, R. Gryson, eds., *Biblia Sacra Iuxta Vulgatam Versionem adiuuantibus B. Fischer, I. Gribomont, H. F. D. Sparks, W. Thiele recensuit et breui apparatu critico instruxit Robertus Weber; Editionem quartam emendam cum sociis B. Fischer, H. I. Frede, H. F. D. Sparks, W. Thiele praeparauit Roger Gryson* (Nördlingen, 1969; repr., 1994).

HVIVS REI GRATIA FLECTO GENVA MEA AD PATREM DOMINI NOSTRI IESV CHRISTI, EX QVO OMNIS PATERNITAS IN CAELIS ET IN TERRA NOMINATVR, VT DET VOBIS SECVNDVM DIVITIAS GLORIAE SVAE CORROBORARI PER SPIRITVM EIVS, IN INTERIOREM HOMINEM HABITARE CHRISTVM PER FIDEM IN CORDIBVS VESTRIS.

(315.) **Ex libro de gratia noui testamenti ad Honoratum.**

Merito ergo istorum qui saturantur, *uiuunt corda in saeculum saeculi*. Vita enim Christus est, qui habitat in cordibus eorum, interim per fidem, post etiam per speciem. Vident enim *per speculum in aenigmate, tunc autem facie ad faciem*. Vnde ipsa caritas nunc in bonis operibus dilectionis exercetur, qua se ad subueniendum quaquauersum potest porrigit, et haec *latitudo* est. Nunc longanimitate aduersa tolerat et in eo quod ueraciter tenuit, perseuerat et haec *longitudo* est. Hoc autem totum propter adipiscendam uitam facit aeternam, quae illi promittitur in excelso, et haec *altitudo* est. Exsistit uero in occulto ista caritas, ubi fundati quodammodo et radicati sumus, ubi causae uoluntatis Dei non uestigantur, cuius gratia sumus salui facti, *non ex operibus*

6/63 merito ... gaudentium] EVGIPP, fr. 220, p. 701, 12–702, 8; 15–19; 703, 4–705, 8 (cf. AVG., *epist.* 140, 25, 62–26, 65)

1/4 huius ... uestris] Eph. 3:14–17 6 uiuent ... saeculi] Ps. 21:27 7 per¹ ... speciem] cf. 2 Cor. 5:7 8 per ... faciem] 1 Cor. 13:12 10/12 latitudo ... altitudo] Eph. 3:18
13 fundati ... radicati] cf. Eph. 3:17 14/15 non² ... eius] Tit. 3:5

Traditio Textus: RF CSc OSo

1 gratia] gratiam O genua] ienua R O, g^{*}nua F nostri] mei F 2/4 ex ... uestris] om. Sc 2 paternitas] fraternitas C, pat<ernitas> So caelis ... in²] caeles ** So^{a.c.} ut uid. cael et in So^{p.c.} ut uid. 2/3 ut ... uobis] om. R 3 spiritum] sanctum add. F
3/4 eius ... habitare] non interpunxerunt R O, inter eius et in interpunxerunt F C So, def. Sc, inter hominem et habitare interpunxit So 3 in] om. O 4 interiorem hominem] ita R C O (cf. aliquot codd. uersionis uulgatae), interiore homine F (cf. uers. uulg.), def. Sc, int<eriores> homin So^{a.c.}, inter homin So^{p.c.} ut uid. uestris] nostris F 5 honoratum] honorat** Sc 6 ergo] enim F saturantur] sarantur O^{a.c.} uiuent] inuenit CSc, uenit O 7 est] om. OSo habitat] ita RF Sc So^{p.c.} ut uid. eug, habitant C O So^{a.c.} (fortasse ex archetypo) interim] iterum C speciem] spe**em C^{a.c.} 8 faciem] facie Sc
9 bonis] nobis CSc subueniendum] subuenidum So^{a.c.} 10 nunc longanimitate] nun* *onganimitate So^{a.c.} ut uid. tolerat] toleret So^{a.c.} 12 adipiscendam] ita RF Sc So^{p.c.} eug, adipiscenda* C^{a.c.}, adipiscenda C^{p.c.} OSo^{a.c.} aeternam] a***rnam So illi] ille O
promittitur] premititur C^{a.c.} 14 uoluntatis ... non¹] uoluntis dei F uestigantur] ita R C OSo^{a.c.} eug (aliquot codd.), inuestigantur F Sc So^{p.c.} eug sumus] post facti Sc

6 uiuent] uiuunt eug (uiuunt aliquot Eugippii codd.) 8 enim] enim nunc eug 13 in] ex eug (in unus Eugippii cod.) 14 uestigantur] inuestigantur eug (uestigantur aliquot Eugippii codd.)

15 *iustitiae quae fecimus nos, sed secundum misericordiam eius. Voluntarie quippe genuit nos*
uerbo ueritatis et haec uoluntas eius in abscondito. Cuius secreti profunditatem
quodammodo expauescens apostolus clamat: O altitudo diuitiarum sapientiae et
scientiae Dei! Quam inscrutabilia sunt iudicia eius et inuestigabiles uiae eius! Quis
enim cognouit sensum Domini? Et hoc est profundum. Hinc igitur est apostoli quod
20 *requirendum inter cetera* posuisti: Huius rei gratia, inquit, flecto genua mea ad Patrem*
Domini nostri Iesu Christi, ex quo omnis paternitas in caelo et in terra nominatur.
Quaeris: “cuius rei gratia?” Hoc supra dixerat: PROPTER QVOD PETO NON INFIRMARI IN
TRIBVLATIONIBVS MEIS PRO VOBIS. Hoc ergo eis optat ut non infirmentur in
25 *tribulationibus apostoli, quas pro illis sustinebat, et propter hoc genua flectebat ad*
Patrem. Proinde non infirmari unde illis, sequitur et dicit: ut det uobis secundum
diuitias gloriae suae uirtute corroborari per Spiritum eius. Hae sunt diuitiae de quibus
dicit: O altitudo diuitiarum! Abditas enim habent causas, ubi nullis meritis
*praecedentibus quid habemus quod non accepimus? Deinde sequitur et quid oportet**
30 *adiungit: in interiore, inquit, homine habitare Christum per fidem in cordibus uestris.*
Haec est uita cordium, qua uiuimus in saeculum saeculi ab initio fidei usque ad finem
speciei. VT IN CARITATE, inquit, RADICATI ET FVN DATI PRAEVALEATIS COMPREHENDERE
CVM OMNIBVS SANCTIS. Ista est communio cuiusdam diuinae caelestisque rei publicae,

15/16 uoluntarie ... ueritatis] Jam. 1:18

17/19 o ... domini] Rom. 11:33–34

19 profundum] Eph. 3:18

22/23 propter ... uobis] Eph. 3:13

28 quid¹ ... accepimus] cf. 1 Cor. 4:7 30/31 fidei ... speciei] cf. 2 Cor. 5:7

31/32 ut ... sanctis] Eph. 3:17–18

15 fecimus nos¹] nos fecimus *eug* misericordiam eius] eius misericordiam *eug* 15 secundum]
add. aliquid quod legere nequeo So^{a.c.} eius] om. So^{a.c.} quippe] om. R^{a.c.}
17 altitudo] altitudo *Sc^{a.c.}* diuitiarum sapientiae] *tr. OSo* (diuitiarum sapientiae *So^{p.c.} ut uid.*)
19 enim] *enim R^{a.c.}* apostoli] apostole *F*, illud *praem. Sc* 20 inter cetera*]
lectionem Eugippii secutus sum, in terra RF C O (intera *So^{a.c.}*) (*ex archetypo*), inter *Sc*, interea
So^{p.c.} inquit] *om. F, post mea Sc* flecto] flecta *R^{a.c.}* genua] *ienua O* 22 propter]
quippe O 23 hoc] haec *CSc* 24 sustinebat] *ante pro Sc* genua] *ienua O* flecte-
bat] flectebam *C*, flectat *O^{a.c.} ut uid.* 25 patrem] *ut add. R^{sup. l.}* infirmari] *<infirmar>*
entur *R^{sup. l.}* unde] *ut de F* illis] *et add. C* dicit] *dicat O^{a.c.}* 26 uirtute] *ita*
R C So eug (cf. *uers. uulg.*), uirtutem *F Sc O* (cf. *aliquot codd. uersionis uulgatae*) hae] *hae**
F, haec *Sc O*, non *leg. So^{a.c.}* (hae *So^{p.c.} ut uid.*) 27 dicit] *dicatur CSc* o altitudo] *oltitudo*
So^{a.c.} 27/28 meritis praecedentibus] *tr. F Sc* 28 habemus] *hamus So^{a.c.}* quod]
quid *C* quid²] *quod F oportet**] *lectionem Eugippii secutus sum, putet RF, potest CSc,*
optet OSo eug (*aliquot codd.*) 29 uestris] *nostris F^{a.c.}* 30 uiuimus] *uiuunt F* ad]
in *O* 31 speciei] *eius add. F* 32 est communio] *tr. Sc* cuiusdam] *cuius OSO*

16 abscondito] *abdito est eug* (abscondito est *unus Eugippii cod.*) 17/18 et ... dei] *dei ac scien-*
tiae eug (et scientiae dei *aliquot Eugippii codd.*) 19 apostoli] *illud apostoli eug* 25
illis] *illis sit eug* 28 oportet*] *optet aliquot Eugippii codd.*

hinc saturantur pauperes non sua quaerentes, sed quae Iesu Christi, id est, non commoda
 priuata sectantes, sed in commune, ubi salus omnium est, consulentes. Nam de ipso
 35 pane quo tales saturantur, quodam loco apostolus dicit: *Vnus panis, unum corpus multi*
sumus in Christo. Quid ergo *comprehendere?* QVAE SIT, inquit, LATITVDO (sicut iam
 dixi, in bonis operibus beneuolentia porrigitur usque ad diligendos inimicos) ET
 LONGITVDO (ut longanimitate pro hac latitudine molestiae tolerentur) ET ALTITVDO (ut
 40 pro his aeternum quod in supernis est praemium, non uanum aliquid temporale speretur)
 ET PROFVNDVM (unde gratuita gratia Dei secundum secretum et abditum uoluntatis eius
 existit). Ibi enim *radicati et fundati* sumus. *Radicati* propter agriculturam, *fundati*
 propter aedificationem, quae quoniam non est ab homine, dicit alio loco idem apostolus:
Dei agricultura, Dei aedificatio estis. Hoc totum agitur, cum in hac nostra
 peregrinatione *fides [cum] per dilectionem operatur*. In futuro autem saeculo perfecta et
 45 plena caritas sine ulla malorum tolerantia non fide credit, quia non uidet, nec spe
 desiderat quod non tenet, sed in aeternum ueritatis incommutabilem speciem
 contemplabitur, cuius sine fine quietum opus erit laudare quod amat, et amare quod
 laudat. De hac consequenter dicit: SCIRE ETIAM SVPEREMINENTEM SCIENTIAM CARITATIS
 CHRISTI, VT IMPLEAMINI IN OMNEM PLENITVDINEM DEI. In hoc mysterio [futura] crucis
 50 ostenditur figura. Qui enim, quia uoluit, mortuus est, quomodo uoluit, mortuus est. Non

33 saturantur pauperes] cf. Ps. 21:27

35/36 unus ... sumus] 1 Cor. 10:17

43 dei¹ ... estis] 1 Cor. 3:9

48/49 scire ... dei] Eph. 3:19

sua ... christi] cf. Philipp. 2:21

36/40 quae ... profundum] Eph. 3:18

44 fides ... operatur] Gal. 5:6

33 commoda] commodam *O* 34 omnium est] *tr. Sc* 36 in christo] *om. CSc So^{p.c.}*
 quid] id est potest *add. F^{sup.l.}* ergo] optat eos *add. R^{sup.l.}* 37 operibus] quibus *add.*
F, dum *add. Sc* beneuolentia] ben* uolentia *O* 38 longanimitate] longanimit<er>
Sc pro ... latitudine] per hac latitudine *R^{a.c.}*, per hanc latitudinem *R^{p.c.}* molestiae]
 molesti *R^{a.c.}F* (molestie *R^{p.c.} ut uid.*) 39 his] hiis *F* aliquid] et *add. F Sc*
 40 gratuita] grauita *O* secundum] *om. Sc* abditum] abditu in *C* 43 agricultura]
 estis *add. Sc* agitur] igitur *O* 44 cum] *secutus sum R^{p.c.}F Sc eug, sed adest hoc*
uerbum in R^{a.c.} C OSo (ex archetypo) 45 non¹] nunc *add. R^{sup.l.}* quia] quae *F*, quod
Sc nec] non *praem. R^{sup.l.}* 46 incommutabilem speciem] *tr. F* 47 quod amat]
 quo clamat *O* 48 dicit] dicitur *Sc* supereminentem] *ita RF Sc eug (cf. uers. uulg.)*, super
 eminentiam *C O^{p.c.} So (fortasse ex archetypo)*, supereminent** *O^{a.c.}* 49 ut impleamini] *it.*
R^{a.c.} futura] secutus sum CSc eug, sed adest hoc uerbum in RF OSo (ex archetypo), figura *add.*
So^{sup.l.} (cf. l. 50 figura) 50 figura] *om. OSo (cf. l. 49 futura)* quomodo ... est²] *om.*
CSc

36 in christo] *abest in eug*

41 et] ibi *eug*

49 futura] *abest in eug*

37 operibus] operibus quibus *eug (operibus unus Eugippii*

44 cum] *abest in eug*

49/50 crucis ... figura] figura crucis ostenditur *eug*

45 quia] quod *eug*

frustra igitur tale genus mortis elegit, nisi quod in eo quoque latitudinis huius et longitudinis et altitudinis et profunditatis Magister existeret. Nam *latitudo* est in eo ligno quod transuersum desuper figitur. Hoc ad bona opera pertinet, quia ibi extenduntur manus. *Longitudo* in eo quod ab ipso ligno usque ad terram conspicuum est. Ibi enim quodammodo statur, id est, persistitur et perseueratur, quod longanimitati* tribuitur. *Altitudo* est in ea ligni parte quae ab illo quod transuersum figitur, sursum uersus relinquitur. Hoc est ad caput crucifixi, quia bene sperantium superna expectatio est. Iam uero illud ex ligno quod non apparet, quod fixum occultatur, unde totum illud exsurgit, *profunditatem* significat gratuitae gratiae, in qua multorum ingenia conteruntur, id est, uestigare conantia*, ut ad extremum eis dicatur: *O homo, tu quis es qui respondeas Deo?* Viuent ergo corda saturatorum pauperum in saeculum saeculi, hoc est, humilium caritate flagrantium, non sua quaerentium, sed sanctorum societate gaudentium.

60/61 o ... deo] Rom. 9:20 **61** uiuent ... saeculi] cf. Ps. 21:27 **62** sua quaerentium] cf. Philipp. 2:21

51 elegit] *elegit *O^{a.c.}* quoque] quod *O* huius] h<uiu>s *R^{a.c.}*, iesus *R^{p.c.}*, h<u>i <us> *So* **52** latitudo est] latitudinem *Sc* **54** usque] *post* terram *CSc* **55** longanimitati*] *secutus sum F Sc eug*, longanimitate (in longanimitate *R*) *C OSo (ex archetypo)* **56** ligni parte] *tr. Sc* transuersum] tranuersum *C* **57** crucifixi] *crux So^{a.c.} ut uid.*, *cruci So^{p.c.1} ut uid.*, *crucifixi So^{p.c.2} ut uid.* quia] qui *CSc* **59** significat] significans *O* ingenia] ingenua *F*, ing*nia *O* **60** uestigare conantia*] *secutus sum R^{p.c.} eug*, uestigia reconantia *R^{a.c.}F CSc OSo (ex archetypo)* eis] eius *F* **62** est] *om. Sc flagrantium*] f**grantium *C^{a.c.}*, f grantium *C^{p.c.}*, gratulantium *Sc*, fragrantium *O sanctorum*] s*orum *F*

51 quod] ut *eug* **53** quod] qua *eug* **60** est] *abest in eug*