

TIBOR FABINY

## Augustine's Appropriation and / or Misunderstanding of Tyconius' Idea of the Bipartite Church

(Double Word, Double Church, Double Rules)

### 1. Introduction

#### 1.1. The Mystery of Tyconius

Tyconius, the 4th century North African layman (ca. 330–390), was one of the most original and perhaps least discussed figures in patristic theology. All that we know about him is, that he belonged to the Donatists but at the same time criticized the ecclesiastical doctrines of his own party and therefore he was condemned by the Donatist church around 380. Donatism became a burning issue in the 4th century in North Africa after the persecution of the Christians came to an end with the edict of Constantine in 313. The followers of Bishop Donatus insisted that who had become weak in faith during the time of persecution by 'handing over' the church's properties to the state (*traditores*) were to be excluded from the church unless they repented. If they did repent they had to be rebaptized since lapsed believers lost the sacrament of baptism just as lapsed priests lost the sacrament of ordination.

Tyconius is said to be the author of four works: ›De bello intestino‹ (ca. 370?), ›Expositiones diversarum causa‹ (ca. 375?), ›Liber regularum‹ (ca. 382) and a Commentary on the Apocalypse (ca. 385) (Simonetti 1986). The only surviving work is ›Liber regularum‹ and fragments have come down to us from his commentary of the Apocalypse. The most significant is the Turin fragment (Lo Bue 1963) and a recent discovery is the Budapest fragment (Mezey 1976, Mezey 1979, Pincherle 1978, Steinhauser 1987). His commentary of the Apocalypse was most popular up to the 9th century (Primasius of Hadrumetum, Caesarius of Arles, Beatus of Liebana and Bede the Venerable). There were some hopes that a relatively authentic text of Tyconius' commentary to the Apocalypse could be reconstructed from the collation of these later adaptations (Bonner 1966, Bonner 1970). However, it was also questioned that the structure of the lost Apocalypse-commentary can

“Augustine's Appropriation and / or Misunderstanding of Tyconius' Idea of the Bipartite Church, in: Paul Michel – Hans Weder (Hrsg.), *Sinnvermittlung Studien zur Geschichte von Exegese und Hermeneutik I*. Pano Verlag, Zürich, 2000, pp. 143–160.

be regained (Steinhauser 1981, 356). The ›Liber regularum‹ is considered to be the oldest manual of biblical hermeneutics written in the Latin West. Moreover, for linguists and textologists this work is a gold mine "of prophetic material for the study of pre-Vulgate Latin Scriptures". (Bright, 1988, 1) My interest, however, is in Tyconius' hermeneutics which became famous by Augustine's appropriation in the ›De Doctrina Christiana‹ III (xxx-xxxvii).

The first biblical hermeneutics written in the Latin West begins as follows:

*Above everything else that came to my mind, I considered it necessary to write a book of rules and so to fashion keys and lamps, as it were, to the secrets of the law. For there are certain mystic rules which obtain in the inner recesses of the entire law and keep the rich treasures of the truth hidden from some people. But if the sense of these rules is accepted without ill will, as we impart it, whatever is closed will be opened, and whatever is dark, will be illumined; and anyone who walks in the vast forest of prophecy guided by these rules, as by pathways of light, will be kept from straying into error.<sup>1</sup>*

In the first half of my paper I shall concentrate on only Rule II out of the seven rules.<sup>2</sup> First, I would like to investigate how and why Augustine reformulated Tyconius' idea of the bipartite church.

<sup>1</sup> *Necessarium duxi ante omnia quae mihi videntur libellum regularem scribere, et secretorum legis veluti claves et luminaria fabricare. Sunt enim quaedam regulae mysticae quae universae legis recessus obtinent et veritatis thesauros aliquibus invisibiles faciunt; quarum si ratio regularum sine invidia ut communicamus accepta fuerit, clausa quaeque patefient et obscura dilucidabuntur, ut quis prophetiae immensam silvam perambulans his regulis quodam modo lucis tramitibus deductus ab errore defendantur.* — All Latin and English quotations from ›Liber regularum‹ (LB) are from Babcock, 1989.

<sup>2</sup> The seven rules are as follows:

- (1) The Lord and His Body (*De Domino et corpore eius*),
- (2) The Lord's Bipartite Body (*De Domini corpore bipertito*)
- (3) The Promises and the Law (*De promissis et lege*),
- (4) The Particular and the General (*De specie et genere*),
- (5) Times (*De temporibus*),
- (6) Recapitulation (*De recapitulatione*)
- (7) The Devil and His Body (*De diabolo et eius corpore*).

For Tyconius the seven rules are "seven mysteries of the prophetic text". (Bright, 1988, 61)

## 1. Tyconius' Rule II and Its Augustinian Interpretation

### 1.1. Tyconius' Rule II: The Lord's Bipartite Body (*De domini corpore bipertito*)

In his first rule 'The Lord and His Body' Tyconius explained that Scripture did not always clearly distinguish between the Lord and his body: it is the reader who has to discern with the help of *ratio* (charismatic reason) whether the reference is to the head (Christ) or to the body (the church). The Incarnation was the advent of his body and the second coming will be the advent of his head.

*Both comings must take place; but first there is the advent of the body, i.e. the church, which comes continuously in the same invisible glory, then the advent of the head, i.e., the Lord, in manifest glory.<sup>3</sup>*

Because of the organic unity of the head and the body the church can be called the *son of God* and God will be the *son of man*.<sup>4</sup> The latter one grows into the holy temple of God which is said to be *bipartite*.

Rule II then elaborates the idea of the church as the *bipartite body Christ*.

*Far more necessary is the rule concerning the bipartite character of the Lord's body; and so we must examine it all the more carefully, keeping it before our eyes through all the scriptures.<sup>5</sup>*

Similarly to the first rule, only by *ratio* (charismatic reason) can we discern the transition from the right side to the left side and vice versa.

Tyconius firmly believed that the bipartite body of Christ is composed of both true and false members but he was also convinced that the *wheat and weeds* (Matt. 13, 24-30) must grow together until the final harvest. Several passages are quoted in which the first part is admonition and the second part is comfort or vice versa. The church is both *black and beautiful* (Song of Songs, 1,5). Only the right hand part of the body is *without spot or wrinkle* (Eph. 5,27), the contaminated part is also within the church: *we cannot claim that the tent*

<sup>3</sup> *Utrumque autem fieri necesse est, sed primo corporis est adventus, id est Ecclesiae, iugiter venientis in eadem claritate invisibili, deinde capitis, id est Domini, in manifesta claritate.*

<sup>4</sup> *Corpus itaque in capite suo filius est Dei, et Deus in corpore suo filius est hominis.*

<sup>5</sup> *Regula bipertiti corporis Domini multo necessarior et a nobis tanto diligentius perspicienda et per omnes Scripturas ante oculos habenda est"*

of Kedar is outside the church (Psalm 120,5–7).<sup>6</sup> Especially in Isaiah there are many passages that are meant to praise and blame the same person, city or nation (33,20, 33,23, 42,16, 42,17). "In addressing both comfort and warning to the Church through Scripture, the Spirit reveals the double nature of the Church as a community in which one part is already invisibly separate from their fellow Christians." (Bright 1989a, 27) The most significant proof for Tyconius are the seven letters in the Book of Revelation (2,3), in which we find both praise and admonition. Therefore, the very nature of the bipartite church is that it is sevenfold: *id est Ecclesiam septiformem*. (Bright 1988, 87)

In the bipartite body there are two orders: the order of promise and the order of law. Condition and admonition concern the left part of the body that is under the law, and eternal life and salvation is promised to the right part of the body: the children of promise and covenant.

It is only in Rule III, The Promises and the Law (*De promissis et lege*), where the two lines of the body of Abraham are clearly discerned. According to Tyconius the double nature of the church was prefigured by the fighting of the twins: Esau and Jacob in the womb of Rebekkah. The two in one body (*duo in uno corpore*) are a *figure of the double line of Abraham's descendants*.<sup>7</sup> *Two peoples wrestling in the one womb of their mother, the church. The one, chosen on the basis of foreknowledge, is loved; the other by the choice of its own will, is evil*.<sup>8</sup> Tyconius then emphasizes that Jacob himself is again bipartite: he is both a deceiver and a loved one.

The bipartite temple at the end of Rule I and the idea of the bipartite church of Rule II are the same. In the bipartite temple, as in the body of Christ there is a holy and an unholy part. "The unholy part is, in Tyconius' thought, identified with the 'enemy body'." (Babcock 1989, 15) Similarly, within the left part of the bipartite temple the *man of sin*, the *son of perdition* (2 Thess. 2,4) is lurking. Though the *mystery of lawlessness* is already at work, we have to wait until from the midst the Church may come forth.<sup>9</sup>

Now, the 'doubleness' is not only a key-concept in Tyconius but it also appears in the style of his work: Tyconius' language abounds in word-plays, doublets and parallel constructions. According to Steinhauser, Tyconius uses

<sup>6</sup> *Non possumus autem dicere tabernaculum Cedar praeter Ecclesiam esse.*

<sup>7</sup> *Figura est enim duplicis seminis Abrahae.*

<sup>8</sup> *Id est duorum populorum in uno utero matris Ecclesiae luctantium. Unus est secundum electionem de praescientia dilectus, alter electione suae voluntatis iniquus.*

<sup>9</sup> *Istius nobis iugis adventus cavendus est, donec de medio eius discedat Ecclesia.*

this device for the purpose of clarifying and reinforcing meaning. (Steinhauser 1987, 241–5)

## 1.2. Augustine's Reinterpretation of Tyconius' Rule II

Augustine in his ›De Doctrina Christiana‹ (III, xxx–xxxvii) begins to discuss the significance of Tyconius as follows:

*A certain Tyconius, who although a Donatist himself wrote against the Donatists with irresistible power – and thereby stands convicted of having a split personality since he was unwilling to make a clean break with them – wrote a book which he called ›The Book of Rules‹, because in it he developed seven rules which could be used like keys to open up the secrets of the divine scriptures.*<sup>10</sup>

Augustine acknowledges that the rules of Tyconius *help greatly in penetrating the hidden meaning of Sacred Scripture* but he questions that Tyconius' seven rules solve, as the author claimed, all the obscurities of Scripture.

Concerning Rule II Augustine suggested to change the title of the second and the third rules as *About the True and Mixed Body of our Lord* and *On the Spirit and the Letter* respectively:

*The second rule is 'On the Lord's twofold body', but he should not have given it this title, since something that will not be with God for ever is not in fact the Lord's body. He should rather have said 'On the Lord's true and mixed body', or 'true and apparent body', or perhaps something else, because false Christians should not be said to be with God even at the present time, let alone for eternity, although they appear to be within the church. So that rule should have been entitled 'On the mixed church'.*<sup>11</sup>

<sup>10</sup> *Ticonius quidam qui contra Donatistas invictissime scripsit, cum fuerit Donatista, et illic invenitur absurdissimi cordis ubi eos non omni ex parte relinquere voluit, fecit librum quem Regularum vocavit, quia in eo quasdam septem regulas exsecutus est quibus quasi clavibus divinarum scripturarum aperirentur occulta. (De Doctrina Christiana III, xxx, 42; edited and translated by R. P. H. Green, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1995, pp. 172–3).*

<sup>11</sup> *Secunda est "de domini corpore bipertito", quod quidem non ita debuit appellare. Non enim re vera domini corpus est, quod cum illo non erit in aeternum. Sed dicendum fuit, 'de domini corpore vero atque permixto' aut 'vero atque simulato' vel quid aliud, quia non solum in aeternum verum etiam nunc hypocritae non cum illo esse dicendi sunt, quamvis in eius esse videantur ecclesia. Unde poterat ista regula et sic appellari ut diceretur 'De permixta ecclesia' (III, xxxii, 45; ibid: pp. 176–7).*

The difference between Tyconius' and Augustine's ecclesiology is evident. Augustine speaks about the *seeming* union of the *hypocrites* and the true ones in the Body of Christ. Tyconius, however, does not know the Platonic distinction between *appearance* and *reality*. – Augustine continues:

*This rule demands close concentration from the student, since scripture, although actually speaking to another set of people, may seem to be speaking to the actual persons it was addressing before, or may seem to be speaking about the same persons when in fact it is speaking about others as if both kinds formed a single body by virtue of their temporary unity and their participation in the sacraments.*<sup>12</sup>

We cannot but agree with Pamela Bright who writes: "For Tyconius, it is not a question of the 'true church' and the 'counterfeit church'. It is a question of the 'bipartite' Church in which the 'right' and the 'left' will be visibly and irrevocably separated at the Judgment when the time for repentance is over, but until the Judgment there is to be no visible separation (Matt. 13,29) of the membership of the Church. It was this repudiation of the necessity of a withdrawal from a 'tainted' Church that made Tyconius' ecclesiology such an anomaly in Donatist circles." (Bright 1989a, 28)

We may add that Tyconius' idea of the church involves the notion of the interpenetration of the good and the wicked parts while Augustine tries to separate the two entities.

### 1.3. Why did Augustine misinterpret Tyconius? Four models of explanation

Why did Augustine misinterpret Tyconius' views? Why does he distort them? Moreover: why does he recommend them if he is distorting them? Various answers can, or, have already been given to this question. I will suggest four models of explanation.

#### 1.3.1. Exegete Versus the Systematician

Tyconius was a charismatic biblical exegete and Augustine was a systematic theologian. It is true that we will not understand Tyconius' attitude to scripture unless we understand his attitude to the church. (Bright 1988, 68) It is rightly remarked that "Augustine read into Tyconius his own hermeneutic ... he jumped from the notion of *regula* in Tyconius to the notion of *clavis* ... he

<sup>12</sup> *Quae regula intellectorem vigilantem requirit, quando scriptura cum ad alios iam loquatnr tamquam ad eos ipsos, ad quos loquebatur videtur loqui, vel de ipsis cum de aliis iam loquatnr, tamquam unum sit utrorumque corpus, propter temporariam commixtionem et communionem sacramentorum.* (ibid.)

understood Tyconius was offering a system of rules". (Kannengiesser 1989, 68–9) Augustine failed to understand that the rules were mystical ones which the Spirit revealed to the reader, that they were not invented by Tyconius, but, according to him, they were already there and they were only waiting to be unravelled. The Spirit in Scripture and the Spirit in the believing community makes the recognition of these rules possible. Kannengiesser claims that while it is true that Tyconius was lacking (Greek) philosophical background we cannot deny that he was lacking in logic. And this was not a philosophical but a biblical logic, "very close to Semitic biblical understanding of God's revelation in scripture". (Kannengiesser 1989, 73; cf. Dawson 1957, 58) For the Christian exegete of the fourth century the 'spiritus' is at work both in 'scriptura' and 'ecclesia'. For Tyconius being an exegete entailed being an ecclesiologist and pneumatologist at the same time.

#### 1.3.2. Donatist Versus Catholic

The second model explains the difference by their different ecclesiological positions. Augustine believed that by our baptism we become citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem and as a convert to the dynamically developing church he fought against the Donatists who considered themselves *the holy remnant* and thereby separated themselves from mainstream Catholic church. Tyconius being a Donatist, shared the views of his fellow Christians about the spiritual corruption of the church after Constantine. He must have shared the Donatists' belief that you are betraying your martyrs if you refuse to be persecuted. However, his ecclesiology was radically differed from his fellow Donatists. The ›Book of Rules‹ is a firm testimony of his conviction that, based on the parable of the wheat and tares, the church is *katholikos* – the so-called *pure remnants* cannot and should not separate themselves from the rest or from the *wicked*. However, unlike Augustine, Tyconius denied that the hypocrites are only *seemingly* part of the body. Augustine's thinking was not free from the Platonist dualism of the spirit (reality) and the matter (appearance). This was entirely foreign to Tyconius' thinking. While Augustine says that by baptism you become a citizen of that heavenly Jerusalem, "the Donatists speak of the church as the holy remnant waiting for the Second Coming because the rest of the world apostacized. Tyconius refuses both notions and insists that sinner and saint are in the church; there is no way of seeing visibly a difference between sinner and saint." (Bright 1988, 74)

#### 1.3.3. Prophecy Versus Pedagogy

A third model suggests that Augustine's misinterpretation of Tyconius was not accidental but purposeful and typical. Marcia Colish finds that Augustine "omits the 'mystery of evil' dimension of Tyconius' ecclesiology and uses

Tyconius to argue for his own conception of the church in which ecclesiastical wheat is mixed with the tares in this life". (Colish 1988, 43) According to her Augustine adopts a "three-pronged strategy":

- a) He offers his own grammatical and rhetorical rules as a substitute for Tyconius
- b) he reformulates these rules by selections and omissions. In the second rule he deliberately presents Tyconius as a Catholic in spite of himself as he says that Tyconius should have labelled the second rule as *Ecclesia permixta*. "With this redefinition in hand, he proceeds to impose his own conception of the church upon Tyconius, without ever telling the reader what actually Tyconius said." (Colish 1989, 46)
- c) The contradiction that Augustine both distorts and recommends Tyconius to the reader is explained by Colish as a cunning pedagogical-psychological strategy. Augustine "gives the student notice that he need go no farther than the ›de doctrina christiana‹ goes on that subject ... Thus Augustine's reformulations of Tyconius ... was designed to deflect his readers from the temptation to study and to take seriously the real Tyconius ..." (Colish 1989, 47).

#### 1.3.4. Allegory Versus Typology

Most recently, Maureen A. Tilley has provided a brief but substantial contribution to this subject. I wish to subscribe to her main point suggesting that the Augustinian hermeneutic was allegorical and the Tyconian or Donatist hermeneutic typological. She elucidates the different contexts of the two hermeneutics. Augustine proposed a manual for educated preachers and his hermeneutic is based on the epistemology that the "words of Scripture are *signa* of the greater *res* behind the words ... It allowed for and actually encouraged the allegorization of biblical passages for which the literal interpretation would have been offensive". (Tilley 1993, 405)<sup>13</sup> The context of Tyconius' hermeneutics is the Donatist tradition. "Donatist hermeneutics

<sup>13</sup> Tilley (1993) classifies Augustine's explanations in three descending categories of adequacy:

- a) Coherence. This is valid for Rule V on numbers. Here the hermeneutical problems can be explained both typologically and allegorically.
- b) Misapplication. Tyconius used the language of rhetoric but gave them non-standard meaning in Rule IV *De specie et genere* and Rule VI *De recapitulacione*. In interpreting these rules Augustine, however, used the standard meaning.
- c) Substitution. In Rules II and III (*De Domini corpore bipertito* and *De promissis et lege*) Tyconius depended entirely on typology. In both cases Augustine substituted the title.

relied not on allegorical interpretation of the Scriptures but on a heavily typological one. Scripture was not a problem; life as a persecuted church was. The obscurities were not in the meaning of biblical verses, but in current events. It was not the correspondence between allegorical *signa* and their *significata* which drove the engine of typology. It was the correlation between the current situation of the local church in North Africa and the properly corresponding biblical situation." (Tilley 1993, 406) As for the second rule "Tyconius used biblical types of good and evil to recognize their antitypes within the right and left sides of the body of the Lord, the church of North Africa. For this rule Augustine substituted his own teaching on the place of evil persons outside the eternal body of Christ, but inside the *permixta ecclesia*. In addition, Augustine's exposition is devoid of the temporal referents so important to Tyconius' overall program." (Tilley 1993, 408) As for the third rule Augustine was unable to discern its similar typological implications and therefore substituted his own anti-Pelagian program with the new title of ›On the Spirit and the Letter‹. Tilley concludes: "Tyconius wants his audience to be able to make sense of their lives, their places in history. The Bible provides the key ... Augustine ... was providing his audience with methods to interpret the Bible for their lives of the individual souls entrusted to their pastors' care. The eschaton has receded far into the future. So eternal verities of allegory were more valuable. Where Tyconius' rule were helpful, Augustine used them; where they were not he interpreted them to support his own program." (Tilley 1993, 408)

To Tilley's extremely lucid presentation we can only add Bright's observation that Tyconius' (typological) logic is concentric while Augustine's (sometimes allegorical) reasoning is sequential. It seems to be hard for them to tolerate one-another. (Bright, 1988)

## 2. The relationship Between the Tyconius' Bipartite Church and the Two Cities in Augustine's ›De Civitate Dei‹

Now we have arrived at the point where we can raise the question whether Tyconius' idea of the bipartite body (*corpus bipartitus*) has anything to do with Augustine's idea of the two cities (*civitates duas*). True, the ›Liber regularum‹ speaks of *corpora* rather than *civitates* (Ladner 1959, 261), ecclesiology in both cases is based upon a dualism: 'doubleness' seems to be a characteristic feature of the church both in Tyconius and Augustine. Miika Ruokanen is right in saying that "Ecclesiology has in Augustine's ›Civitas Dei‹ only a peripheral position". (Ruokanen 1993, 87) However, a closer scrutiny of some crucial passages will soon clarify the difference for us. By way of case studies I shall concentrate on the different exegesis of two key-passages that

are central to their ecclesiology: (1) The story of Esau and Jacob (Genesis 25) and (2) Man of Iniquity or Antichrist (2 Thes. 2).

## 2.1. Genesis 25: DUO IN UNO CORPORE or Prefiguration of *civitas diaboli* and *civitas dei* ?

### 2.1.1. Tyconian Typology

Tyconius concludes Rule II that *the one body is both god and evil*<sup>14</sup> and *in all the scriptures, the Lord gives testimony that the one body of Abraham's line, in every case, both grows and flourishes and goes to ruin.*<sup>15</sup>

At the end of Rule III the fighting of Esau and Jacob in the womb of Rebecca are interpreted as the two in one body (*duo in uno corpore*) are a figure of the double line of Abraham's descendants (*figura est enim duplicis seminis Abrahæ*).

*Two peoples wrestling in the one womb of their mother, the church. The one, chosen on the basis of foreknowledge, is loved, the other by the choice of its own will, is evil.*<sup>16</sup> And Tyconius continues: *Moreover Jacob and Esau are in one body and come from one line of descent; but the fact that they clearly came to birth as two individuals shows forth the two peoples. Yet, lest anyone think, as a result, that the two peoples would be sharply separated, it was made plain that both would be in one body, in Jacob who was both said to be LOVED and termed a SUPPLANTER OF HIS BROTHER. In the two, therefore, a quantity is expressed not a quality of separation.*<sup>17</sup>

It is important to notice that Jacob is not the 'pure' one against the 'wicked' and therefore rightly rejected Esau but Jacob himself is also 'mixed' as he is both a *loved* one and a *supplanter*. That is to say the double line of the church now continues in Jacob, who appropriated Esau in himself by usurping his

<sup>14</sup> *unum corpus et bonum esse et malum dicens*

<sup>15</sup> *Ita Dominus in omnibus Scripturis unum corpus seminis Abrahæ in omnibus crescere et florere atque perire testatur.*

<sup>16</sup> *Id est duorum populorum in uno utero matris Ecclesiae luctantium. Unus est secundum electionem de praescientia dilectus, alter electione suae voluntatis iniquus."*

<sup>17</sup> *Iacob autem et Esau in uno sunt corpore ex uno semine sed quod perspicue duo procreati sunt ostensio est duorum populorum. Et ne quis putaret ita perspicue fore separatos duos populos, ostensum est ambos in uno corpore futuros in Iacob, qui et DILECTUS vocatus est et FRATRIS SUPPLANTATOR expressus. Itaque in duobus quantitas expressa est non qualitas separationis.*

blessing. Therefore Isaac was not willing to withdraw the blessing after learning that he was deceived. Esau has become a part of Jacob now. From now on he will be the figure of carrying on the mixed nature of the church:

*Jacob, i. e. the church, never comes for blessing without concomitant deceit, i. e. without false brethren. But the fact that innocence and deceit come for blessing together does not mean that they are blessed together, for, »he who is able to receive« (Mt 19,12) receives and the one seed grows up according to the quality of the ground.*<sup>18</sup>

We may conclude that Tyconius' vision of the double nature of the church is synchronic, the church as the body of Christ will always be mixed: good and evil members will simultaneously be present until the final judgment when the separation of the wheat and the tares will eventually take place. Tyconius' (in)carnational ecclesiology maintains the reality of the 'body'. He is not aware of any spiritual higher substance: his monistic view claims that the body is one, though there are two antithetical parts in it: *duo in uno corpore*.

### 2.1.2. Augustinian (allegorical) Typology

Augustine in *De Civitate Dei* also gives a figurative, ecclesiological meaning to the colorful stories of enemy brothers: Cain and Abel (Book XV,v) and Esau and Jacob (XVI,xxxv). However, Augustine uses a somewhat simplistic and dualistic typology, which is, in fact, allegory. The elder brother represents the body, the devil, the *civitas diaboli*, while the younger one the spirit, the heavenly inclination, i. e. the *civitas dei*. Moreover, Augustine goes further than that: in the mystical prophecy Rebecca received TWO NATIONS ARE IN YOUR WOMB [...], the clause THE ELDER SHALL SERVE THE YOUNGER is applied to the relationship of the Jews and Christians. Now as Cain was the symbol of the Jews who slew Christ (XV,v) the elder brother Esau serving the younger one likewise prefigures the relationship of the Jews and Christians. Similarly, Jacob's 'crossed blessing' of Joseph's two sons Manasseh and Ephraim (Gen. 48,18) are given the same meaning: *The elder typifies the Jews and the younger the Christians*. Let us suffice to quote these examples and the dangers of the simplistic antijudaistic typology and Christian triumphalism can be easily seen.

<sup>18</sup> *Nunquam autem Iacob, id est Ecclesia, venit ad benedictionem non comitante dolo, id est falsis fratribus. Sed non quia innocentia et dolo simul veniunt ad benedictionem simul benedicentur, quia »qui potest capere« capit, et unum semen pro qualitate terrae provenit.*

## 2.2. Tyconius and Augustine on 2 Thes 2, 1–12: THE MAN OF INIQUITY – Antichrist within the Church

### 2.2.1. The Tyconian ‘Leitmotif’

Both Tyconius and Augustine are explicitly concerned with this passage. In Tyconius’ ›Liber regularum‹ the enemy body (*adversus corpus*) seems to be a leitmotif throughout the work culminating in Rule VII and Augustine also provides a scrutiny of it in Book XX, xix. of ›De civitate Dei‹.

For Tyconius the Antichrist is in the midst of the Church. “There must be a constant awareness of evil ‘in the midst’ until the Church departs ‘from the midst’. These two phrases, ‘in the midst’ and ‘from the midst’ become the linchpin for Tyconius’ ecclesiology.” (Bright 1988, 49) According to W. S. Babcock “over the entire treatise ... hovers the vision of the end-time ... The most important is 2 Thessalonians 2,3–10. ... [Tyconius] construes it as the church’s departure from the mixed condition in which it presently exists as the bipartite body of Christ. The end-time, therefore, represents the moment of separation, the moment when the mingled bodies of Christ and Satan are at last untangled and each stand forth in its true character, undiluted and undisguised.” (Babcock 1989, xi)

Tyconius is fully aware of the deceptive power of Satan therefore he uses this passage (MAN OF SIN, SON OF PERDITION, THE MYSTERY OF LAWLESSNESS etc.) most creatively throughout his work. He knows that it is a long process until the Antichrist is recognized and distinguished. It will take place only when the church shall depart from the midst of it.<sup>19</sup>

### 2.2.2. The Augustinian Puzzle

2 Thes. 2,2–12 is given a detailed exegesis in Book XX, xix: *What the apostle Paul wrote to the Thessalonians about the appearance of Antichrist which is to precede in time the day of the Lord.* The most critical part of the passage is 2,3–4:

FOR THERE MUST FIRST COME A RENEGADE (REFUGA in Augustine, DISCESSIO in Vulgate, APOSTASIA in Greek) AND THAT MAN OF SIN, THE SON OF PERDITION, MUST BE REVEALED WHO OPPOSES AND EXALTS HIMSELF ABOVE ALL THAT IS CALLED GOD, OR THAT IS

<sup>19</sup> *donec de medio eius discedat Ecclesia*

WORSHIPPED, SO AS TO SIT IN THE TEMPLE OF GOD SHOWING HIMSELF AS HE WERE GOD.<sup>20</sup>

Who is this RENEGADE? It is interesting to observe how different Augustine’s sincere embarrassment is from Tyconius’ prophetic certainty with regard to the same passage. Augustine does not hesitate to confess his lack of certainty in interpreting this obscure passage. He does not know in which temple the renegade is going to sit, whether in the ruins of the temple built by Solomon or in the church. But Augustine, just like Tyconius, is aware of the *body of the Antichrist* which means *the multitude of men belonging to him as well as himself, their prince*.<sup>21</sup> Augustine’s sincere puzzling strikes one as quite human:

*For what does he mean by: FOR THE SECRET POWER OF LAWLESSNESS IS ALREADY AT WORK ... ? I admit that I am completely at a loss to his meaning. Nevertheless, I will not refrain from mentioning such suggestions as I have been able to hear or to read.*<sup>22</sup>

Then Augustine enumerates some interpretations: (1) Some think of Nero and suggest that Nero will rise again and prove himself the very Antichrist. *But I am amazed at the great audacity of those who hold these opinions.* (2) In the church: *the secret power of lawlessness ... refer only to the wicked and the impostors who are in the church, until they become so numerous as to provide the Antichrist with a great people.*<sup>23</sup> And this is the secret power of lawlessness because it seems to be concealed. Those men will be led astray who received not *the love of truth for their salvation.* And the Apostle did not hesitate to add *and for this cause God shall send them a misleading influence, that they may believe a lie.*<sup>24</sup>

<sup>20</sup> NISI VENERIT REFUGA PRIMUM ET REVELATUS FUERIT HOMO PECCATI, FILIUS INTERITUS, QUI ADVERSATUR ET SUPEREXTOLLITUR SUPRA OMNE QUOD DICITUR DEUS AUT QUOD COLITUR, ITA UT IN TEMPLO DEI SEDEAT, OSTENTANS SE TAMQUAM SIT DEUS. (2 Thes. 2,3–4 cited by Augustine, Civitas Dei XX, xix).

<sup>21</sup> *corpus eius, id est ad eum pertinentem hominum multitudinem simul cum ipso suo principe* Civitas Dei XX, xix (Saint Augustine, The City of God, english translation by William Chase Green, London 1960, vol. VI, p. 358/359).

<sup>22</sup> *Nam quid est: IAM ENIM MYSTERIUM INIQUITATIS OPERATUR. [...] Ergo prosum quid dixerit me fateor ignorare. Suspiciones tamen hominum quae vel audire vel legere potui non tacebol* (p. 360/361)

<sup>23</sup> *Alii vero et quod ait: Quid delineat scitis et mysterium operari iniquitatis non putant dictum nisi de malis et fictis qui sunt in ecclesia, donec perveniant ad tantum numerum qui Antichristo magnum populum faciat.* (p. 361/362)

<sup>24</sup> *ideo mittit illis Deus operationem erroris ut credant mendacio.* (p. 366/367)

But Augustine is thus totally aware that the people of God will be *lead astray* or seduced by the enemy: *so being judged they shall be led astray, and being led astray, they shall be judged.*<sup>25</sup>

### 2.3. Towards a Tentative Conclusion: The Lost Apocalyptic Commentary Perhaps a More Direct Source of the Idea of the 'Two Cities'?

We have seen that Augustine slightly misinterpreted Tyconius' idea of the bipartite body of the Lord and we provided some models of explanation why he did so. Then we have come to ›De Civitate Dei‹ to pursue our investigations further. We have seen that this huge work was far from being a treatise on ecclesiology. Nevertheless Augustine provided exegesis of certain biblical passages that are relevant to ecclesiology. We have given two case studies in comparing Tyconius' and Augustine's exegesis of ecclesiologically relevant passages. We have seen that their understanding of the church's role was rather different: the similarities were rather formal than substantial. Can we now really claim that Augustine is indebted to Tyconius for the idea of the two cities?

In trying to trace the origins of the idea of the Augustinian 'two cities' in Tyconius we should, perhaps, make a cautious step from the ›Liber regularum‹ to his lost commentary to the Apocalypse. We have alluded to the fact that this commentary survived only in fragments, but scholars have attempted to reconstruct something of the original from later adaptations by Primasius, Bede and Beatus of Liebana. (Steinhauser 1987)

It was Christopher Dawson who quoted in English translation Beatus' version of Tyconius' commentary (edited by H. Florez in 1770) to demonstrate the direct impact of Tyconius' views on Augustine's notion of the two cities:

"Behold two cities, the City of God and the City of the Devil ... Of them, one desires to serve the world, and the other to serve Christ, one seeks to reign in this world, the other to fly from this world. One is afflicted, and the other rejoices, one smites, and the other is smitten, one slays, and the other is slain, the one in order to be more justified thereby, the other to fill up the measure of its iniquities. And each of them strive together the one that it may receive damnation, the other that it may acquire salvation." (Dawson 1957, 58–59)<sup>26</sup>

<sup>25</sup> *proinde iudicati seducentur et seducti iudicabuntur.* (p. 366/367)

<sup>26</sup> *Apud Beatus* [ed. Sanders, p. 575]: *Hae duae civitates una mundo et una desiderat servire Christo; una hoc mundo regnum cupit tenere, et una ab hoc mundo fugere; una tristatur, altera laetatur; una flagellat, altera flagellatur; una occidit, altera occiditur;*

A question of vital importance arises, however: were these post-Tyconian commentaries not influenced by Augustine's ›De Civitate Dei‹ in their terminology? Was the Augustinian terminology not imposed upon these adaptations of Tyconius' commentary? Were they not reading Augustine into Tyconius? Gerhard Ladner, though acknowledging that Beatus, for example, incorporated some passages from Augustine's work, finds it "hardly possible" that Tyconius' original phraseology was coloured by Augustine's later terminology. "For, while the conception of the two cities in ›De Civitate Dei‹ is of course not exclusively linked to the *Apocalypse*, the context in which the two cities concept occurs in the post-Tyconian commentaries is always that of the two apocalyptic cities, the 'beloved city,' the Heavenly Jerusalem of Apoc. 20,8 and 21, and its counterpart, Babylon, the great and evil city of Apoc. 14,8 and 16,9 to 19,2. In other words, the conception of the Civitas Dei and the Civitas Diaboli is here quite inseparable from the text of the *Apocalypse*. And above all, the terms in which the conception is expressed are in part very similar in the several commentaries, so that a common source must be assumed this source is not the ›De Civitate Dei‹" (Ladner 1959, 262)

I would like to support Ladner's observation, who found the concepts of the two cities are so similar in the apocalyptic commentaries of Primasius, Apringius, Caesarius, Bede and Beatus, its common source, as they mention, therefore must have been Tyconius' commentary. Moreover, "it would appear then that Augustine could and did find this concept in Tyconius' commentary to the *Apocalypse* ... it would seem probable that Tyconius was the first to apply the apocalyptic terminology of the two cities to the problem of the Church's position in the world and that Augustine availed himself of this great idea of a man whom he esteemed. The magnitude, range, and depth of ›De Civitate Dei‹ nevertheless remain Augustine's own and many other elements beside the Tyconian motif have entered into the *magnum opus et arduum*". (Ladner 1959, 263)

To conclude, we can summarize Augustine's debt to Tyconius with the words of Anderson and Press: "Tyconius and Augustine both have (1) a city of God and a city of the Devil, (2) a double concept of the Church, (3) a belief that the saints in the Church live among a superior number of sinners in the

*una ut iustificatur adhuc, altera ut impie agat adhuc, hae utraeque ita laborant in unum, una ut habeat unde coronetur, altera ut habeat unde damnetur; apud Bede* [PL 93,185A]: *Duae sunt enim in mundo civitates: una de abyssu, altera de coelistibus oriens.* (quoted by Bonner, 1966, 16) – In the Turin Fragments (172. paragraph) we read as follows: *Duo enim populi sunt ecclesia, id est pars dei quae luci est comparata et pars diaboli tenebrarum obscuritatibus circumsepta, sicut scriptura dicit: Nocti adsimilavi matrem uestram.* (Lo Bue, 1963, 96–7)



Church, (4) a firm conviction against separation of the good and evil within the Church, (5) a similar judgement of church discipline, and (6) a similar view of the millennial reign of Christ." (Anderson, 1977,9)

"We may come to see Tyconius ... as a brilliant and original mind to whom Augustine is deeply indebted not only for exegetical principles but for some of the ideas for which he is most famous such as the idea of the two cities, or even for his conversion to Christianity." (Press, 1988,65)

If Käsemann is right in saying that apocalypse is the mother of all theology then this thesis is aptly demonstrated by the debt of Augustine's systematic theology to Tyconius' s apocalyptic hermeneutics.

### Bibliography

- ANDERSON, Douglas L. (1977), *The Book of Rules of Tyconius: An Introduction and Translation with Commentary*, Diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1974 (Ann Arbor and London University Microfilms International).
- BABCOCK, William S. (1979), "Augustine's Interpretation of Romans (A. D. 394-96)", *Augustinian Studies* 10, pp. 55-74.
- BABCOCK, W. (1982), "Augustine and Tyconius: A Study in the Latin Appropriation of Paul", *Studia Patristica* 17, pp. 1209-1215.
- BABCOCK, W. (1989), *Tyconius: The Book of Rules (Liber regularum)*, Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- BONNER, Gerald (1967), *Saint Bede in the Tradition of Western Apocalyptic Commentary* (Jarrow Lecture 1966), Newcastle-upon-Tyne.
- BONNER, Gerald (1970), "Toward a Text of Tyconius", in *Studia Patristica*, pp. 9-13.
- BRIGHT, Pamela (1988), *The Book of Rules of Tyconius: Its Purpose and Inner Logic*, Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 2, Notre Dame.
- BRIGHT, Pamela (1989a), "Tyconius and His Interpreters: A Study of the Epitomes of the Book of Rules", in: Wuellner, pp. 23-41.
- BRIGHT, Pamela (1989b), "The Spiritual World, which is the Church': Hermeneutical Theory in the Book of Rules of Tyconius", *Studia Patristica* 22, pp. 213-218.
- BROWN, Peter (1967), *Augustine of Hippo. A Biography* London, Faber and Faber.
- BURKITT, F. C. (1894), *The Book of Rules of Tyconius: Newly Edited from the Mss.*, Texts and Studies 3:1, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- CAZIER, Pierre (1973), "Le 'Livre des Règles' de Tyconius sa transmission du 'De doctrina christiana' aux 'Sentences' d'Isidore de Séville", *Revue des Etudes Augustiniennes* 19 (1973), pp. 241-261.
- CAZIER, Pierre (1976), "Cassien auteur présumé de l'épitomé des Règles de Tyconius", *Revue des Etudes Augustiniennes* 22, pp. 262-297.
- CHADWICK, Henry (1988), "Tyconius and Augustine", in: Wuellner, pp. 49-55.
- COLISH, Marcia L. (1988), "Augustine's Use and Abuse of Tyconius", in: Wuellner, pp. 42-48.
- CONGAR, Yves (1963), *Traité antidonatistes*, Vol 1, Bibliothèque augustiniennne 28, Paris: Desclée de Brouwer.
- CONLEY, Tom (1988), "Rhetoricae immensam silvam praeambulans", in: Wuellner, pp. 56-59.
- COX, Michael G. (1988), "Augustine, Jerome, Tyconius and the Lingua Punica", *Studia Orientalia* 64, pp. 83-105.
- DAWSON, Christopher (1957), "St. Augustine and His Age", in: M. C. D'Arcy, S.J., Maurice Blondel, Christopher Dawson et al. *Saint Augustine*, New York: Meridian Books, pp. 11-78.
- DUALEY, Martine (1989), "La sixième règle de Tyconius et son résumé dans le 'de doctrina christiana'", *Revue des Etudes Augustiniennes* 35, pp. 83-103.
- DUALEY, Martine (1991), "Tyconius", in: *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, Paris, cols. 1349-1356.
- FORSTER, Karl (1956), "Die ekklesiologische Bedeutung des corpus-Begriffes im Liber Regularum des Tyconius", *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 7-8, pp. 173-83.
- FREDRIKSEN (LANDES), Paola (1982), "Tyconius and the End of the World", *Revue des Etudes Augustiniennes* 28, pp. 59-75.
- FREDRIKSEN, Paula (1992), "Tyconius and Augustine on the Apocalypse", in: R. Emmerston et al. (ed.), *The Apocalypse in the Middle Ages*, Cornell University Press.
- FREND, W. C. H. (1952), *The Donatist Church A Movement of Protest in Roman North Africa* Oxford, At the Clarendon Press.
- FREND, W. C. H. (1985), *Saints and Sinners in the Early Church. Differeng and Conflicting Traditions in the First Six Centuries*, London, Darton, Longman and Todd.
- FRÖHLICH, Karlfried (1984), *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church*, Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- HAHN, Traugot (1900), *Tyconiusstudien. Ein Beitrag zur Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte des 4. Jahrhunderts*, Leipzig.
- KANNENGIESSER, Charles (1989), "A Conflict of Christian Hermeneutics in Roman Africa: Tyconius and Augustine", in: Wuellner, pp. 1-22.
- LADNER, Gerhart B. (1959), *The Idea of Reform. Its Impact of Christian Thought and Action in the Age of the Fathers*, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- LO BUE, Francesco (1963), *The Turin Fragments of Tyconius' Commentary on Revelation*, Cambridge, University Press.
- LOF, L. J. van der (1966), "Warum wurde Tyconius nicht katholisch?", *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der Älteren Kirche* 57, pp. 260-283.
- MARKUS, R. A. (1970), *Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of St Augustine*, Cambridge: University Press.

- MEZEY, László (1976), "Egy korai Karoling kódextörredék", *Magyar Könyvszemle* 92, 15–24.
- MEZEY, László (1979), "Un fragment d'un codex de la première époque carolingienne [Tyconius in *Apocalypsin*?]", in *Miscellanea Codicologica F. Masai Dicata*, vol. II, Gent, 1979, pp. 41–50.
- MONCEAUX, P. (1920), *Histoire littéraire de l'Afrique Chrétienne: Depuis les origines jusqu'à l'invasion arabe*, Paris, Vol. 5, pp. 165–219.
- MURPHY, James J. (1988), "Pedagogic Paradigms as Factors in Assessing Augustine's Use of Tyconius", in: Wuellner, pp. 60–66.
- POLLMANN, Karla (1996), *Doctrina Christiana. Untersuchungen zu den Anfängen der christlichen Hermeneutik unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Augustinus De Doctrina Christiana*, Freiburg (Schweiz): Universitätsverlag.
- PRESS, Gerald A. (1989), "Tyconius in Augustine's DDC", in: Wuellner, pp. 62–6.
- PINCHERLE, Alberto (1925), "Da Ticonio a Sant'Augustino", *Ricerche Religiose* 1, pp. 443–466.
- PINCHERLE, Alberto (1978), "Alla ricerca di Ticonio", *Studi Storico-Religiosi* 2 (1978), pp. 355–65.
- RATZINGER, J. (1956), "Beobachtungen zum Kirchenbegriff des Tyconius im 'Liber regularum'", *Revue des Etudes Augustiniennes* 2, 177–185.
- RUOKANEN, Miika (1993), *Theology and Social Life in Augustine's De Civitate Dei*, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck, Ruprecht.
- SIMONETTI, Manlio (1986), "Tyconius", in: Angelico di Berardino (ed.) *Patrology* Vol IV, Maryland: Westminster, 119–121.
- STEINHAUSER, Kenneth B. (1981), "The Structure of Tyconius' Apocalypse Commentary. A Correction.", *Vigiliae Christianae* 35, pp. 354–7.
- STEINHAUSER, Kenneth B. (1984), "Recapitulatio in Tyconius and Augustine", *Augustinian Studies* 15, 1–5.
- STEINHAUSER, Kenneth B. (1987), *The Apocalypse Commentary of Tyconius: A History of Its Reception and Influence*, Frankfurt am Main, Bern, New York: Peter Lang.
- STEINHAUSER, Kenneth B. (1993), "Tyconius: Was He Greek?", *Studia Patristica* 27, pp. 394–399.
- TILLEY, Maureen A. (1993), "Understanding Augustine Misunderstanding Tyconius", *Studia Patristica* 27, 405–408.
- WILLIS, Geoffrey Grimshaw (1950), *Saint Augustine and the Donatist Controversy*, London, SPCK.
- WUELLNER (1989), Wilhelm Wuellner (ed.), *Center for Hermeneutical Studies: Protocol of the Fifty-Eighth Colloquy*, Berkeley: Graduate Theological Union and University of California – Berkeley.

EVA TOBLER

## Gregors ›Moralia in Iob‹

### Zur Beziehung zwischen Primär- und Auslegungstext

#### Hinweise zu Person und Werk

Gregor I. wurde um 540 in Rom geboren und starb 604 ebenfalls in Rom. Ab 590 war er Papst. Sein 35 Bücher umfassender Hiobkommentar ist das älteste und umfangreichste seiner Werke. Gregor selbst nannte die Auslegungen *libri morales*. Im Mittelalter waren sie unter dem Titel ›Magna Moralia‹ bekannt. Entstanden sind die Moralia aus Predigten, die Gregor im Jahre 595 vor Mönchen in Konstantinopel gehalten hat. In der uns überlieferten Fassung<sup>1</sup> haben wir aber, formal betrachtet, einen exegetischen Text vor uns und keine Homilien. Die Nähe zur Predigt wird allerdings inhaltlich und durch den präsent gemachten Adressaten spürbar. Gregors Kommentar ist vollständig. Von Hiob 1,1 bis 42,17 wird der Text durchgehend ausgelegt. Dem Werk geht ein Widmungsschreiben voran, das Gregor an Leander, den Metropoliten von Sevilla (gest. 599 / 601) richtet. In diesem Schreiben äussert sich Gregor unter anderem über sein exegetisches Tun und gibt eine hermeneutische Regel an, wann man allegorisch auslegen soll und wann nicht. Als Beispiele dienen Texte aus der Hiob-Dichtung.<sup>2</sup>

Gregors methodisches Instrumentarium ist die mehrfache Exegese aufgrund drei verschiedener Schriftsinne: dem *sensus litteralis*, dem *sensus allegoricus* und dem *sensus moralis*. Gregor verwendet den Ausdruck *allegoriae mysteria* als Gegensatz zu *verba historiae*. In den ersten zwei Büchern (Hiob 1,1 – 1,22) werden drei Auslegungen unterschieden: Die zwei genannten und als drittes fällt der Begriff: *moraliter tractare*. Von Buch III (Hiob 2,1ff) an fällt die dritte Unterscheidung weg. Exegesiert wird noch nach dem *sensus litteralis* und dem *allegoricus*. Diese doppelte Exegese wird bis etwa zur Mitte des

<sup>1</sup> Ich zitiere im Folgenden aus der Ausgabe: S. GREGORII MAGNI OPERA. MORALIA IN IOB. Libri I – XXXV (Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina, 143; 143A; 143B), Brepols (Turnholt) 1979–1985.

<sup>2</sup> Vgl. Paul MICHEL, "Wo das Lamm wadet und der Elefant schwimmt. Eine Darstellung von Gregors des Großen Epistola dedicatoria zu den ›Moralia in Iob‹", in: Henriette Herwig et al. (Hgg.), *Lese-Zeichen*. Festschrift für Peter Rusterholz zum 65. Geburtstag, Tübingen / Basel: Francke 1999, S. 71–86.