SERMO APOLOGETICUS: THE EVOLUTION AND DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIAN
EXPRESSION IN LATIN UP TO AD 250 AND ITS LATER RECEPTION

by

ANGELA MARY PARKES

A thesis submitted to the University of Birmingham for the degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Classics, Ancient History and Archaeology
School of History and Cultures
College of Arts and Law
University of Birmingham
February 2022

ABSTRACT

This thesis spans several disciplinary boundaries, theology, classics and linguistics, in seeking to trace the early development of Christian writing in Latin and to examine the later reception of this topic. Most studies concerned with this subject have focussed on the period from the fourth century, examining the wealth of primary source material available, particularly by Augustine, Jerome and Ambrose. In the present study I have concentrated my research on the earlier period, from the end of the second to the middle of the third century, which encompasses the works of Tertullian, the earliest extant Christian writer in Latin, and his near contemporary, Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, whose death in 258 forms the *terminus ad quem* of this thesis.

In the first chapter I outline the position of Latin usage in the period under discussion, focussing particularly on North Africa, a region in which Latin formed the language of communication much earlier an in other parts of the Roman Empire. The second chapter considers, against this background, the gradual emergence of Christian expression in Latin and its relationship, to Greek.

A major part of this second chapter is devoted to the examination of the reception of Early Christian Latin, particularly the first study from a linguistic point of view carried out by Monsignor Joseph Schrijnen and Christine Mohrmann at the Catholic University of Nijmegen in the early part of the twentieth century, in which they developed the *Sondersprache* hypothesis, the theory that early Christians developed their own form of Latin.

The third and fourth chapters are devoted to the study of the two major writers of the period mentioned above, Tertullian and Cyprian. This early period of Latin Christian writing thus lays the foundation for the great flowering of Christian writing which would emerge in the fourth century.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Without the help and encouragement of my supervisor, Philip Burton, I would probably never have finally reached the stage of submitting a thesis. During the nine years I have been working on this project Philip has been a constant and patient source of support, advice, suggestions, comments and friendship, for which I am eternally grateful.

In the later stages of the preparation of my thesis I owe many thanks to my good friend and now PhD graduate, Blessin Adams, who sorted out my bibliography and references and also to my former student, Ellen Boekee, and her mother, Ann, who provided sterling proof-reading support.

I want also to thank my daughter, Jo, who has spent many long hours of phone conversations putting up with her mother sounding off about the whole project..

Heartfelt thanks also to all my friends and adult students who have encouraged me to bore them with my thoughts and theories.

Finally, I dedicate this thesis to the memory of my late husband, David Parkes, who I am sure would have supported and encouraged me in this endeavour.

Contents

---

[1] Chin's 2005 monograph was published and is still marketed under the name of Catherine M. Chin. I understand the author now uses the name C. Michael Chin. For ease of reference only, I retain the author's name as it appears on the volume.

Sermo Apologeticus –

The evolution and development of Christian expression in Latin

up to AD 250 and its later reception

Introduction

This thesis seeks to address two main questions; first, how did early Christian Latin writers use and adapt the resources of the language in order to express and communicate their faith, and second, how has this 'Christian Latin' been conceptualised in scholarship over the last few centuries? I examine particularly the *Sondersprache* theory, developed by the Dutch scholars Joseph Schrijnen and Christine Mohrmann at the *Katholiek Universiteit* Nijmegen in the earlier part of the twentieth century, who were the first to approach the study of early Christian expression from a linguistic, rather than a theological, point of view.

Scholarship on the development of Christian Latin, including some of the work of Schrijnen and Mohrmann has concentrated on the fourth century and later, since most of the 'Latin Doctors' such as Augustine, Jerome and Ambrose are fourth century or later. There has, however, been much less investigation of the earlier period, understandably, since there is not so much source material available. In studies of two of the earliest extant Christian writers, Tertullian and Cyprian, the main focus has usually been on their theology rather than their language. Apart from these two writers, primary sources are few.

My discussion is primarily linguistic and focuses on the language as a means of communication; that is to say, as a marker of identity within the Christian community and as a means of explaining and defending the faith to those outside. I mention later the question of 'in-group' dynamics, particularly in relation to the way in which such groups use language to

express their sense of belonging to the group, both within the group and to those outside it.[1]

The division between linguistic and theological approaches is, however, not an absolute one,

and theological matters are touched on as they become relevant.[2]

The Church or early Christianity - Patristics or Early Christian studies?

Throughout my thesis I use terms such as Early Christian writing/expression in Latin,

Christian beliefs, Christian Latin writing, and so on, as general terms. Implicit in these

discussions is the sense that this research belongs within a discipline now frequently termed

'Early Christian Studies'. Until about the later part of the twentieth century individual

specialisms within this general area were known by such terms as Ecclesiastical History,

Early Church History, and Patristics, and as such were regarded as subsections of Theology.

In much of the western world, particularly, most of this study was confessionally based and

mainly undertaken by those who own beliefs had led to an interest in these areas. Whilst

Catholic scholars continued the study of Church History and the Fathers, developments in

Biblical studies from the late nineteenth century onwards, particularly in Protestant circles in

Germany, contributed to an enlarging of the confessional divide. Catholic scholarship tended

to stress continuities between the apostolic age, late antiquity, the Middle Ages and beyond,

with the emphasis on 'the Church', the nexus of individuals, institutions, and doctrines, and on

their unbroken succession to the present. Protestant scholarship, on the other hand, tended to

emphasise 'Christianity' as an abstract, non-institutional body of belief, largely codified in the

Scriptures. Within Protestantism could be distinguished conservative strands, which focused

on stripping away later accretions and recovering the form of the original religion, and the

liberal ones, which allow room for innovation and plurality and which played down the extent

---

[1] See Burton 2008, 149-150

[2] Unless otherwise stated, all Latin citations are from the *Library of Latin Texts A,* Brepols 2020. A list of the sources used is given in the introductory section, 'About - All Titles'. https://about.brepolis.net/library-of-latin-texts/

to which any one form of Christianity might be seen as normative. None of these was a neutral position. However, in the twentieth century, influenced by changing views after two world wars, new vistas, in the field of religious studies as in others, began to open up. Practical considerations often led to religious studies, still mainly Christian, rather than embracing other religions, to be subsumed into the general field of humanities, enabling the traditional areas to be examined from a much broader viewpoint. In the *Prolegomena* to the *Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*, Elizabeth Clark expresses this change thus:

> Scholars of early Christianity, like their counterparts across the Humanities and Social Sciences, analysed the topics of women, sexuality, gender 'the body', power and post-coloniality from historical, theoretical and comparative standpoints.[3]

The discipline of Early Christian Studies aims therefore to approach topics openly, not influenced by assumptions formed by particular beliefs, attempting to understand from within the ideas and motivations of early Christians, which might indeed present different, perhaps competing, versions of Christianity. Artefacts, cultural practices and wider social pressures all figure alongside texts, doctrines and individuals. In the Introduction to *the Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies* (itself a revealing title) it is defined thus:

> …. the study of early Christianity has recently emerged as a distinctive and fully interdisciplinary endeavour in its own right, embracing the fields of Classics, Ancient History, Theology, Religious Studies, Art History and Archaeology, among others.[4]

My researches have embraced several of these fields. Indeed, as a researcher in a UK university I am myself an example of this in that, whilst, with degrees in Theology and Classics, I am in this university a member of the Classics department, which itself includes

---

[3] Clark 2008, 18
[4] Harvey and Hunter 2008, 1

Ancient History and Archaeology, my researches frequently lead me into areas more usually the focus of the department of Theology and Religious Studies.

Languages, Ancient and Modern

One aspect of this wider field of Early Christian Studies is the part played by the various linguistic backgrounds of those examining the reception of early Christianity. In this I include the influence on Early Christian studies of aspects of European history and culture in the twentieth century. Although it is to be expected that a dissertation concerned with the development of Latin to express Christianity would include a considerable number of citations in Latin, with, in some cases, citations in Greek, a significant feature of my studies is that, of necessity, many of the relevant secondary sources are in German, and, to a lesser extent, French, and occasionally Dutch, particularly when discussing the *Sondersprache* hypothesis. The main thrust of my arguments when discussing and evaluating the *Sondersprache* and its later effect is that it concerns a battle of ideas fought out in a distinctive European cultural context at a particular place and time with all the political, social and cultural influences brought to bear upon and therefore influencing these ideas. Moreover, since the ideas proposed and discussed concern an earlier period of history, namely, the second and third centuries of the present era, the same factors, political, social and cultural, similarly influence that period under discussion. Since this study is concerned with a linguistic topic, where careful examination and interpretation of the language under discussion, mainly Latin, with occasional Greek, is paramount, I have retained the original language of the citations used. For this reason, I have felt it important to cite the quotations from nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholars in their original languages as these are, for my purposes, primary sources. Particularly in an era where English had not achieved the dominance it now has as an academic language, I consider that opinions of the scholars I have

examined should be expressed as they wrote them. Schrijnen and Mohrmann, although native Dutch speakers, when commenting upon early Christian writing in Latin, wrote mainly in German or French in order to reach a wider readership, though occasionally using Dutch, and I have therefore normally retained their original languages, though I have also given English translations. However, in my view the very act of translation is itself interpretation and so adds yet another dimension to a citation which, in its original language, can offer subtle nuances which might be lost in translation.[5]

As further explanation and justification of this approach, and as I shall demonstrate in greater detail in the relevant chapters, I submit the view that over the past two centuries debate about the use of Latin to describe and formulate Christian doctrines has been closely linked to the debate about the existence or otherwise of a distinct variety of 'Christian Latin' which reflects and reinforces a sense of community among its speakers. Over the course of the nineteenth century there gradually arose a discrete discipline of linguistics, which was at first heavily rooted in the study of Greek and Latin. By the early twentieth century, however, this discipline had achieved a degree of intellectual autonomy; at which point it was, in the hands of some scholars, re-applied to the classical languages, of which Eduard Norden's *Die antike Kunstprosa,* 1898 and 1911 is an example. The twentieth century was *par excellence* the age of the nation state, which exists in dialogue with notions of linguistic and religious community. Debates on the nature of 'Christian Latin' cannot be understood apart from this context.

Structure

I address my study in four main chapters:

---

[5] Translations are my own, unless acknowledged otherwise.

1   The Latin linguistic milieu of the second and third centuries and its bearing on Christian expression.

2   Christian Latin, its relationship to the environment in which it developed and, in particular, the reception and examination of this period in the *Sondersprache* theory of the early twentieth century.

3   Tertullian, the first extant Christian writer, his style of writing and its relevance to his theology.

4   Cyprian, his life and his writings, shaped by his time and place, with studies of words used by him and others when discussing the Christian Church of the early third century.

Chapter 1 surveys the Latin of the second and early third centuries, focussing particularly on North Africa, from which much of the writing of this period, both Christian and the few examples of non-Christian writing, emanated. This study of necessity involves the use of such terms in relation to Latin as post-classical Latin and 'vulgar' Latin. I explore the background of the Latin language current at the time of the first Christian writings in Latin under two, partially linked, heads. Firstly, I consider, in outline, the matter of 'vulgar' Latin, examining the relevance of this much-used but ill-defined phrase and seeking a particular definition which will suit my purposes in exploring the earliest extant Christian writing. Secondly, I examine the question of the term *Africitas*, as a subsection of 'vulgar Latin', referring to the usages of the language thought at one time to be particular to Africa. This is discussed in detail by the German philologist, Karl Sittl , along with both his supporters, such as Wöfflin and Monceaux, and his detractors, Norden and Kroll. Although much of the work of these late nineteenth century writers has been discounted in modern times, there is, I believe, relevance in the revisiting and re-evaluation of their views.

I also consider such later discussion of African Latin and *Africitas* as exists, both in connection with Latin in general and specifically with relevance to the Latin of North Africa, from which much early Christian writing in Latin arose. In this connection I offer in this first chapter a study of Karl Sittl's *die lokalen Verschiedenheiten der lateinischen Sprache* (1882), in which he explores the concept of *Africitas,* the suggestion that there was a distinct form of Latin which developed in Roman North Africa and which was a particular characteristic of the early examples of Christian Latin.[6] Even in his own day Sittl was criticised for his theories and I discuss briefly his supporters and detractors. The question of *Africitas* has surfaced from time to time in later studies and has largely been discounted. I submit, however, that this forms a significant contribution to the early history of the reception of Christian Latin and is therefore worthy of discussion.

Chapter 2 expounds the key theme of my thesis, the development of the expression of Christian understanding in Latin. I begin by surveying the earliest extant examples of Christian writing in Latin and discussing their reception. However, the major part of this chapter examines the *Sondersprache* hypothesis, a theory which has been criticised and discarded in modern studies but which, in my opinion, forms an important part of the debate about early Christian expression in Latin. This arose in the early part of the twentieth century centred on the city of Nijmegen in the Netherlands. In 1932 Monsignor Joseph Schrijnen, the first *Rector Magnificus* of the Catholic University of Nijmegen, founded in 1923, presented in a monograph, *Charakteristik des altchristlichen Latein,* his hypothesis of a *Sondersprache* which characterised the speech and communication of the early Latin-speaking Christians.[7] Schrijnen's intellectual background was rooted in the newly-enfranchised disciplines of

---

[6] Sittl 1882
[7] Schrijnen 1932

linguistics and ethnography, and his distinctive contribution lies in the way he brings these disciplines to bear on the study of early Christianity.

Important and relevant to his approach was, I submit, the historical and social background of the times in which he lived, and my studies include a brief survey of the European milieu of the early twentieth century, particularly in the Netherlands, the political situation between the two world wars and its relevance to the development of Catholic consciousness in the Netherlands. After Schrijnen's death in 1938 his theories were extended and modified by his student, fellow researcher and later successor to his Chair at Nijmegen, Christine Mohrmann, who continued to write and lecture on Christian Latin studies until her death in 1988. The *Sondersprache* hypothesis has been greatly criticised in modern times and rejected in its original form. Robert Coleman, in a paper given to the first *Latin vulgaire, latin tardif* Colloquium in 1985 wielded the *coup de grâce* both to the *Sondersprache* theory and to *Africitas*: 'The concept of a Christian Latin *Sondersprache* or *langue spéciale* is thus as much a fiction of modern philologists as the African Latinity that was erected more than a century ago on the linguistic features common to Tertullian and Apuleius.'[8] I discuss and evaluate references to the *Sondersprache* which have appeared since Coleman 's paper.

Chapter 3 discusses the writing of Tertullian, generally held to be the first extant major Christian writer in Latin, considering aspects of his language, his relationship to and use of Scripture, and including as an example of his use of language, a study of Tertullian's use of *ratio*, an important word in his thinking. A section of this chapter will also examine the work of Minucius Felix, a contemporary of Tertullian who, in his one extant work *Octavius,* which aims to explain the Christian faith in classical terms, makes extensive use both of Cicero and of Tertullian. In line with my aim of considering later reception of early Christian

---

[8] Coleman 1987, 51

writing I also include in this chapter a study of the nineteenth century writer Henry Woodham and his work on Tertullian's *Apologeticus*.[9] This work is particularly interesting in that it presents the view of nineteenth classical scholarship that the study of patristic writing in its original language was 'different' from the classical tradition and therefore 'difficult'. I also discuss a modern contribution to Tertullian studies, by the theologian and philosopher, Eric Osborn, as an example of much mainstream scholarship on Tertullian which, whilst acknowledging its original expression in Latin, yet does not ascribe great relevance to this aspect of Tertullian's writing.[10]

Chapter 4 consists of a study of the life and writings of Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage. In contrast to Tertullian, Cyprian's writing is ecclesiological rather than theological and gives a picture of the extent to which the Church had developed its own structures by this period. In this context I examine in particular Cyprian's ecclesiastical vocabulary, discussing his words for the Church, ministry and worship and contrasting and comparing these usages with those of Tertullian. I also examine and comment upon Cyprian's use of Scripture and compare this with Tertullian's usages.

Conclusion

I hope in this thesis to have examined a period which often loses out to studies of the fourth and fifth centuries. However, I regard as my most important small contribution to scholarship the discussion of the *Sondersprache* theory and its influence upon the consideration of a linguistic approach to the examination of early Christian Latin writing. I have selected the death of Cyprian in 258 as the *terminus ad quem* of my thesis as this seems to me to bring to a close the early period of Christian expression in Latin and which thus, in my opinion, could be described as the end of an era. There is then no significant Latin

---

[9] Woodham 1843
[10] Osborn 1997

Christian writing until the great 'Latin Fathers', particularly Augustine, Ambrose and Jerome, whose works span the later part of the fourth and earlier part of the fifth centuries and who have, as has been said at the beginning of this introduction, provided the basis for the greater part of scholarship on Christian writing in Latin.

It is a truism to state that the spread of Christianity among Latins led to the rise of new modes of expression. The rise of Christianity in the Latin-speaking world – and the fact that Latin Christianity had by the mid-third century little if any general sense that Greek is the 'true' language of the religion – must necessarily mean that writers such as Tertullian and Cyprian were successful in developing a new idiom. This thesis addresses some aspects of how and whether they succeeded. At the same time, it acknowledges that modern scholarship is not neutral, but is to some extent at least contingent on the circumstances of its day. In my study of the 'Nijmegen school', I attempt to identify which features of its approach spoke mainly to its immediate audience, and which have a lasting value.

Chapter 1 - The Background

The Latin milieu of the second and early third centuries

1.1 What Latin?

Before proceeding to consider how the Latin language was used as an expression of Christian identity, it is relevant to this study to consider in what ways, if any, the Latin of the second and early third century differed from that of earlier, 'classical' Latin. In order to examine this it will be necessary to consider, even if only briefly, what might be understood by several terms frequently discussed and for which there can be no precise definition, 'standard' Latin, 'colloquial' Latin, 'classical' Latin, 'vulgar' Latin, 'Late Latin'. All these have been greatly examined and discussed by scholars working in this area, amongst others, Palmer Löfstedt, Herman, Müller, Adams, Clackson, Burton, Ferri and Probert, some of whose studies and observations will be cited and discussed in this chapter.[1]

One problem we have in discussing a classical language is that we only have the written language. Unlike modern linguists, insofar as we examine sources other than the 'classical' texts, we need perforce to deduce the spoken from the written. However, in an age much less literate than our own, even the written sources were typically designed to be read aloud**.** The Prologue to Apuleius' *Golden Ass* nicely juxtaposes the aural and the written: *auresque tuas benivolas lepido susurro permulcam — modo si papyrum Aegyptiam argutia Nilotici calami inscriptam non spreveris inspicere*.[2] Indeed, if we follow the well-known citation from Augustine's reaction to Ambrose's silent reading: *sed cum legebat, oculi ducebantur per paginas et cor intellectum rimabatur, vox autem et lingua quiescebant* (*Confessiones* 6.3.3), the whole concept of 'silent reading' was largely unknown in the ancient

---

[1]Palmer 1954, Löfstedt 1959, Herman 1967, Rosén 1999, Müller 2001, Adams 2007, 2013, Clackson 2007, 2010, 2011, Horrocks 2007, Burton 2009, 2011, Ferri and Probert 2010,

[2].For a discussion of the attitude to written as compared to spoken, language in the ancient world see Burton, 2007, chapter. 4, 'Talking Books'.

world.[3] My approach will broadly follow that outlined by Adams, '… many of the phenomena traditionally labelled in classical scholarship as vulgar, colloquial, substandard or the like were in reality normal features of standard educated Latin. The mistake is based on a confusion between spelling and speech.'[4] Others, for instance Löfstedt, have expressed the same view.[5]

To consider modern parallels, it is relatively easy to distinguish between different varieties of spoken language, particularly in vocabulary. In the case of English, many of these could well be attributed to transatlantic influence, for instance, the use of an adjective instead of an adverb, particularly 'I'm good', instead of 'I'm well'. There would also appear to have been in recent years a relative drop in the use of the perfect (thus 'I already did it' for 'I've already done it'). Other influences appear to be due to the spread of variations on English developed in other parts of the world and bringing new ways of expression from, for instance, the Caribbean and parts of Africa. In written language these variations tend to manifest themselves only in the context of fairly colloquial or 'popular' writing. However, it could well be argued that due to the internet, that distinction has partly been broken down, resulting in there being much more ephemeral writing than was the case only a few decades ago: who, these days, writes a formal business letter, for instance? As early as the fourteenth century Geoffrey Chaucer urged straightforward language.[6] Gowers' famous *Plain Words,* first published in 1954, and written as a guide for those working in the British Civil Service argued against the use of bureaucratese.[7] Around the same time Richard Hoggart in *The Uses of Literacy* discussed such matters as the influence of popular journalism.[8] New words are

---

[3] See discussion of this topic at 1.1.1, 18
[4] Adams 2013, 11
[5] Löfstedt 1959, 18
[6] Chaucer, c. 1380
[7] Gowers, E., 1974
[8] Hoggart 1957, republished 1990

coined, older words are dropped, or change their meaning, even within a time scale of a

decade or so. One only needs to hear a recording of a speech delivered in, for instance, the

50s, 60s or even 70s, to be well aware of the truth of this. The written word, too, betrays

subtle changes over even a fairly short period of time. Books written in, for instance, the 50s

60s and even later exhibit discernible differences in language from the present day.

If we apply the remarks above about changes in English expression to Latin, the

chronicling of change over time becomes even more difficult since we can only deduce

features of the spoken language from changing features in written Latin and, even then, the

written data may well give a misleading impression of changes which might have occurred in

the spoken form. This will also require interpretation. For example: if we attempt to track the

rise of *civitas* and the decline of *urbs* as Latin words for 'city' the picture will be complicated

by the facts that a) *civitas* can often mean 'citizenship, nationality, nation, people' (and so

presumably overlapped with *urbs* before it replaced it) and b) *urbs* is fossilized in use as a

word for Rome (or Constantinople) so will often occur in that context, even where it is no

longer a 'current' word. Given that, as we have said, language changes over time, the question

arises as to what extent, quite apart from social and cultural aspects, does the Latin of the end

of the second and first half of the third centuries differ from that of the earlier period.

This question is addressed by Nigel Vincent in his examination of *Continuity and

change from Latin to Romance*.[9] Although Vincent is considering the question of the change

from Latin to Romance, much of what he says has relevance to the discussion at this point in

this study. Vincent discusses the relationship between 'classical' Latin and 'vulgar' Latin, both

of which terms will be examined in more detail later.[10] Vincent examines several attempts at

dividing Latin diachronically, and refers to the four stages in the development of Latin

---

[9] Vincent 2016, 1-13
[10] See 1.1.2, 22 and 1.1.4, 33

suggested by Banniard: Stage 0: Classical Spoken Latin, second century BC to second century AD; Stage 1: Late Spoken Latin 1, third-fourth centuries; Stage 2:Late Spoken Latin 2, sixth to seventh centuries; Stage 3: Proto-Romance, eighth to ninth centuries.[11] Behind this lies the influential work of Wright which, although dealing with a period much later than that with which the present study is concerned, greatly influenced views on the diachronic examination of late Latin and which have a certain relevance to the ideas on the development of Christian writing.[12]

In his book Roger Wright challenges the previously widely held 'two-norm theory', the view that two languages were in general currency from the fall of the Western Roman Empire in the fifth century; Latin, in a largely unchanged form, used by the Church and the educated upper classes, and a local vernacular, often termed Proto-French, Proto-Spanish or, encompassing all varieties, Proto-Romance. This arose from Latin but varied according to area, and it was this language which evolved into French, Spanish and so on. Wright, however, proposes that late Latin *was* Proto-Romance and that there was only one language, Latin. This Latin, however, had developed by about AD 800 into slightly different forms, one form arising out of the need to clarify the liturgical pronunciation of Latin by introducing a particular regular system of spelling in Latin. It was this Latin which became mediaeval Latin. On the other hand, the spoken language was the form of Latin particular to the area in which it was spoken, and thus it became local Old French, Old Spanish and so on. According to Wright, it was only after AD 800 in France and even later, from the beginning of the eleventh century, in Spain that there could be the concept of two different languages. Wright asserts 'Latin, as we have known it for the last thousand years, is an invention of the Carolingian

---

[11] Banniard, 2013, 57-106,
[12] Wright 1982

Renaissance'.[13] This theory, for which Wright produces detailed evidence in support, gave rise to a vigorous and prolonged debate which still continues amongst those who study the early Romance linguistic period.

Detailed examination of this area is beyond the scope of the present study but its importance is that it demonstrates, in discussing a period in which linguistic change could certainly be discerned, the dangers and problems involved in attempting to define and codify linguistic changes diachronically. In scholarship dealing with the period covered by my study the same questions arise. What were the main differences between, for instance, the Latin of the 'classical' period where, as Rosén points out, Caesar and Cicero 'must be taken to represent distinctive stages in the crystallisation of Classical Latin' and the language to which is often given the vague term 'vulgar Latin'?[14] If there is a difference, is this diachronic, diaphrasic or, indeed, both? Is it possible to fix the boundaries of so-called 'early' and 'late' Latin and, if so, what are these boundaries? Vincent discusses these questions in the first chapter of *Early and Late Latin* where he makes the point, with which I would agree, that it is not really possible to separate socio-cultural and chronological aspects of language development. [15]

Another aspect of the Latin of the second and third centuries, within which timescale the examination of early Christian expression in Latin will be considered, is the theory, discussed by various modern commentators, that the Latin of this period demonstrates characteristics of 'early' Latin, the Latin of Plautus and Terentius, for example, which had been 'submerged' during the classical period and which re-emerges in later Latin. The term 'submerged' is used by both Vincent and Adams and others. Vincent's understanding of the term is as a description of the way in which the colloquial spoken Latin of, roughly, the first

---

[13] Wright, 1982, 9; the reference is to the Frankish dynasty in France 751-987
[14] Rosén 1999, 13
[15] Vincent 2016, 1

century BC to the second or third century AD then 'goes underground', to use his term, and re-emerges later as a constituent part of the written language. [16] He points out that written language is, of its very nature, more conservative than speech, so a discontinuity between the two would be expected. However, Vincent says of this view that 'submerged' in this interpretation does not simply mean 'hidden from historical view' as, for example, in Adams.[17] Vincent, attributing his argument to F. Marx, asserts that 'in this narrower sense, submerged involves a significant diachronic discontinuity in the historical record'.[18] Adams, however, gives a rather more detailed exposition of his understanding of 'submerged', and notes 'there must always be an element of doubt about the truth of these narratives, given that our sources are written and Latin was a spoken language, and that writing is conservative.'[19] He discusses the possibility, when examining the development of Latin during the centuries prior to the emergence of romance languages, of predicting from available data what changes might eventually take place and concludes that, for instance, whilst the eventual disappearance of the neuter might have been predicted, the disappearance of the classical future might not.[20]

A further example of the relevance to 'submerged' Latin is found in a later chapter of the book under discussion in which Pezzini finds examples of 'comic' and 'archaic' language from Plautus and Terence which re-emerge in later Latin.[21] Amongst other categories of 'comic and late Latin' Pezzini mentions those he terms 'literary revivals' and cites particularly their use in Christian writers such as Tertullian, Jerome, Ambrose, Augustine and others. Burton discusses this topic with particular reference both to *Vetus Latina* and to Augustine. In his study *The Old Latin Gospels,* he considers in particular seven examples of possible

---

[16] Vincent 2016, 10
[17] Adams 2013, 856-62
[18] F. Marx 1909, 434-448, discussed by Vincent 2016, 10
[19] Adams 2013, 856.
[20] Adams 2013, 857
[21] Pezzini 2016, 14-46.

archaic words found in the *Vetus Latina* texts, which, whilst these might be considered

vulgarisms, are chosen, Burton suggests, in order to find an exact translation into Latin of the

original Greek.[22] To consider one such example: *versutia,* used in many manuscripts as a

translation for ἡ ὑπόκρισις at Mark 12.15, is attested in the early writer Livius Andronicus,

virum mihi, Camena, insece versutum (*Fragmentum* 1). Burton suggests that, on the few

occasions it is found in classical Latin it is 'reserved for highly-wrought moralising rhetoric,

as in Apuleius, *versutiam tam insidiosam ....* (*Apologia* 81) and, amongst Christian writers,

by Minucius Felix, *sed in Natali meo versutiam nolo ...* (*Octavius* 16, 2).[23] Burton also

considers other variations of archaisms, as a form of calque, such as *benedicere,* from

εὐλογέω, found in, for example, Plautus, *bene quaeso inter vos dicatis ...* (*Miles* 1341) and

benefacere from ἀγαθαποιέω, in Mark 3.4, also found in Plautus *quoi deos atque homines*

censeam bene facere magis decere.. (*Rudens* 405). In a later book Burton examines in detail

such 'archaic' usages in the writings of Augustine.[24]

      In the above section I have somewhat strayed from the period under consideration,

second and third century, into discussion of the later development of Latin into early

Romance. This is, however, relevant to the study of the earlier period when the emergence of

a new world view, that of Christianity, led to the need to find ways of expressing this new

belief in ways relevant to the Latin milieu out of which it grew. Aspects of this will be

discussed in the next chapter, which will consider Christian Latin in more detail. To conclude

this introductory section it is pertinent to cite Vincent's conclusion to the chapter discussed

above; '…it should be clear that behind the apparent neatness of our traditional labels lies a

series of issues of considerable subtlety and complexity. At the same time, the richness,

---

[22] Burton 2000, 105-109
[23] Burton 2000, 105-6
[24] Burton 2007, 38-61

variety and longevity of the Latin textual inheritance allows us the opportunity to investigate these questions in a degree of detail that is not easily paralleled in the history of other languages'.[25]

Whilst it is possible to detect in Latin writing clues to what might actually have been spoken (as in some of the citations covered in this chapter), in a language which presents no opportunity to associate the written word with any particular accent or manner of speech, what follows is of necessity confined to the written word, which makes it very difficult to chronicle the pace of language change.

For convenience, I have attempted to consider variations in Latin language under heads such as 'classical', 'colloquial', 'standard', 'vulgar', together equivalent Latin descriptions *as sermo cottidianus, sermo humilis, sermo plebeius, sermo vulgaris,* and so on, though these are very far from being specific categories and frequently overlap.

However, first, an *excursus* on an aspect of reading in the Ancient World which I consider has particular relevance to Christian writing, namely, whether the ancients read silently or aloud.

1.1.1 *Excursus* - Reading, silently or aloud?

If we take literally the well-known citation, mentioned above, of Augustine's reaction to Ambrose's silent reading*, sed cum legebat, oculi ducebantur per paginas et cor intellectum rimabatur, vox autem et lingua quiescebant* (*Confessiones* 6.3.3), the impression it gives is that the whole concept of 'silent reading' was largely unknown in the ancient world. However, this view has often been challenged. I include discussion of this here because, in

---

[25] Vincent 2016, 13

.
.
.
.

my opinion, the relationship between reading and writing is relevant to any understanding of ancient texts and, in particular, to the central topic of this study, since the expression of Christian beliefs is essentially a dynamic one. To the modern mind a written text is seen as a convenient method of presenting and communicating ideas and opinions since, in most circumstances, literacy and well-presented written texts are taken for granted. In the ancient world there appears to have been a tension between the spoken and the written word. Whilst it is beyond the scope of this study to discuss the matter in detail, it is relevant to bear in mind that in both the Rabbinic and the Hellenistic traditions the superiority of the spoken over the written word was well accepted and the developing Christian tradition inherited this dichotomy. 'And God said', the understanding of speaking as in itself an act of creation, exemplified Jewish views of speaking and reading.[26] In classical understanding the Platonist tradition was key; for instance, Socrates' suggestion that writing will 'produce forgetfulness' as those who write will cease to exercise their memory (*Phaedrus* 274ff.).

However, to return to the subject not of speaking versus reading but whether reading was silent or aloud, it is clear that most current research on the subject of reading in the ancient world accepts that reading silently was normal and known, though, as discussed below, this was not always the case. William Johnson in *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire* agrees with the general view that the debate originated in Norden's 1898 *Die antike Kunstprosa.*[27] Norden, in discussing Augustine's description, cited above, of Ambrose reading silently, asserts that it was *eine vielleicht wenigsten bekannte Thatsache, daß man in altertum laut zu lesen pflegte* and that Augustine obviously finds it *unbegreiflich* that Ambrose should be reading silently.[28] In the later, 1923 edition of his book Norden

---

[26] See Alexander 1990, 221-247
[27] Johnson 2010, chapter 3
[28] Norden 1898 and 1923

gives, in an appendix, various passages which support *die Gewohnheit lauten Lesens.* This

view, that silent reading was unusual or unknown in the ancient world, held sway for some

time, and was supported by Balogh in 1927, who cited further examples in support of this

view and linked the argument to the practice in the ancient world of *scriptio continua*, in

which texts were written without spaces between words, which would suggest that it would,

indeed, be very difficult to disentangle such a text without reading it aloud.[29]

     This view largely held sway until 1968, when Bernard Knox conclusively

demolished Balogh's arguments, taking his examples and demonstrating that, far from

supporting the view that silent reading was unknown, they show quite the opposite.[30] One

example here will suffice; whilst Balogh, citing the famous passage where Augustine

describes how, in response to hearing the child's voice saying *tolle, lege,* he took up the

Epistle to the Romans*; arripui, aperui et legi **in silentio** capitulum, quo primum coniecti sunt*

oculi mei (*Confessiones,* 8.12) explains *in silentio* as the effect of this moment of great

emotion robbing Augustine of his voice, Knox points out that, in another example of

Augustine being in an ecstatic state he is clearly reading aloud*:*

> audirent ignorante me, utrum audirent, ne me propter se illa dicere putarent, quae
> inter haec verba dixerim, **quia et re vera nec ea dicerem nec sic ea dicerem, si**
> **me ab eis audiri viderique sentirem,** nec, si dicerem, sic acciperent, quomodo
> mecum et mihi coram te de familiari affectu animi mei. (*Confessiones* 9.4.).

     Knox's paper gave rise to a new debate, in connection with three contributions, all

dating from 1997, which should be mentioned. Paul Saenger, in *Spaces between Words,*

analyses what he terms the 'physiology of reading' and concludes that it is not until the tenth

and eleventh centuries, when the practice of *scriptio continua* began to give way to the

practice of leaving spaces between the words, that the custom of reading silently gradually

---

[29] Balogh J., 1927, 84-109, 202-240
[30] Knox 1968, 421-435

developed.[31] In the same year A.K. Gavrilov, applying, like Saenger, insights from cognitive

psychology to the art of reading, demonstrated that what he terms the 'eye-voice span' is

required for anyone reading aloud to be able to scan ahead silently in order to give meaning to

the words being read, and so it is probable that readers in the classical period would have been

trained in this skill. [32] Gavrilov and Burnyeat (1997) give extra evidence in support of the

view that silent reading was normal and accepted.[33] Gavrilov, discussing the Augustine

passage, suggests that Augustine's surprise is occasioned not so much by the fact that

Ambrose is reading silently but that he was doing so in the presence of others, circumstances

in which it would have been more usual to read a passage aloud. Augustine suggests various

reasons for Ambrose's behaviour, indicating, as Gavrilov says, that it was the circumstances,

rather than the fact, of Ambrose's silent reading which occasioned Augustine's surprise.

Augustine understood that Ambrose, who, as he says earlier, was accustomed to being

surrounded by others, would use reading as one way of gaining time to himself: *cum quibus*

quando non erat, quod perexiguum temporis erat, aut corpus reficiebat necessariis

sustentaculis aut lectione animum but appears to expect that Ambrose, when leading a class,

would read aloud to facilitate discussion, and it is this practice of Ambrose's, rather than the

fact that he was able to read silently, which occasioned surprise. Augustine and his

companions clearly hazarded guesses as to why Ambrose behaved in this way and came to the

conclusion either that he was short of time and did not want to be drawn into long discussions

about the meaning of a passage or that he was simply seeking to save his voice which was

liable to become hoarse. To clarify this it is helpful to give the relevant passage in full:

> saepe cum adessemus - …. sic eum legentem vidimus tacite et aliter numquam
> sedentes que in diuturno silentio …. discedebamus et coniectabamus eum parvo ipso
> tempore, quod reparandae menti suae nanciscebatur, feriatum ab strepitu causarum

---

[31] Saenger 1997
[32] Gavrilov 1997, 56-73
[33] Burnyeat 1997

alienarum nolle in aliud avocari et cavere fortasse, ne auditore suspenso et intento, si qua obscurius posuisset ille quem legeret, etiam exponere esset necesse aut de aliquibus difficilioribus dissertare quaestionibus atque huic operi temporibus impensis minus quam vellet voluminum evolueret, quamquam et causa servandae vocis, quae illi facillime obtundebatur, poterat esse iustior tacite legendi. (*Confessiones* 6.3.3)

Much more could be discussed on this subject, which could well influence how one interprets early Christian writers such as Tertullian and Cyprian. However, I continue now to attempt to discuss variations in Latin language.

1.1.2 Classical Latin[34]

Joseph Solodow[35] in his book *Latin Alive,* proposes the familiar argument that 'classical' Latin was an 'artificial' language, which became fossilised:

'Though exemplified in Caesar's histories and Cicero's essays and speeches, it was a language spoken by virtually no one. It was a language that had been deliberately purified ……. And while the natural, spoken language continued to flourish and to change somewhat from generation to generation, as it always had, Classical Latin, once fixed, remained frozen in time, the same in AD 950 or 1950 as in BC 50'. [36]

'The luxuriant abundance of earlier Latin was severely pruned in the first century BC by the classicisers, who artificially created Classical Latin and canonized it for all time. The unregulated, unreformed language used by nearly everyone - Vulgar Latin - continued to develop and change, however, and in time became French, Italian, and Spanish'[37]

Solodow thus follows the well-worn tradition of seeing anticipation of Vulgar Latin and the Romance languages in early Latin, Plautus, and Terence and the like, which then disappeared for a long time until resurfacing in Romance languages. However, this assumption that 'Classical' Latin is widely regarded as a 'standard language' and continued largely unchanged, and that it was some form of 'vulgar Latin' which eventually developed

---

[34] For an excellent discussion of 'Classical Latin' see Clackson 2011
[35] Solodow 2010: 107-123
[36] Solodow 2010, 108
[37] Solodow 2010, 113

into the Romance languages, had frequently been challenged even before the publication of

Solodow's book. Wright's seminal work of 1982 proposing an alternative to the 'two-norm

theory' has already been discussed, and other prominent scholars in the field of the Latin

language, particularly Clackson and Adams, have presented more detailed and considered

views.[38] Clackson defines Classical Latin thus:

> The term Classical Latin can be used in two different senses. Firstly, it may refer
> to a chronological period in the history of the Latin Language, from roughly 100
> BC to 200 AD, ... Secondly, Classical Latin can be used to refer to the
> standardised form of Latin, the variety which is enshrined by dictionaries and
> grammars as 'correct Latin', and so understood by speakers and writers.[39]

J.N. Adams, like Wright, who, as discussed above, had already criticised this theory,

submits that the question to what extent there were two fairly distinct forms of Latin, one of

which later developed into the Romance languages, is an assumption, as exemplified by

Solodow, above, which needs to be examined. Adams maintains that the 'educated' language

was not as fixed as has often been assumed; a comparison between, for example, Tacitus and

Cicero, with one hundred and fifty years between them would suggest not, and he, as also

Wright, submits that we should perhaps be referring to change within Latin in general, instead

of in a particular variety. Indeed, one of Adams' earliest publications was an exemplary study

of how Tacitus' own style develops over the *Annals*.[40] Also to be taken into account is the

matter of idiolect, an aspect which will be discussed in detail later with reference to the style

and characteristics of the Christian writers under examination. Latin writers, particularly

Cicero, Quintilian, Varro and the author of the anonymous *Rhetorica ad Herennium* engaged

in detailed discussions of what constituted correct Latin, which provide the principal

contemporary sources of information about how Latin-speaking writers viewed their

---

[38] Wright 1982
[39] Clackson 2011, 236
[40] Adams 1972, 350-373.

language. Clackson cites the earliest surviving definition of *latinitas* as a form of 'pure' Latin, free from the blemishes of either solecisms or barbarisms:

> Latinitas est quae sermonem purum conservat ab omni vitio remotum. Vitia in sermone, quo minus is Latinus sit, duo possunt esse solecismus et barbarismus, cum in verbis pluribus consequens verbum superius non adcommodatur. Barbarismus est, cum verbis aliquid vitiose efferatur (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4. 12).[41]

Müller discusses the Greek background to this passage, suggesting that, whilst σολοικισμός and βαρβαρισμός must have been familiar to the linguists of the time, *latinitas* appears to be a calque of ἑλληνισμός, first attested in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium.* [42] It has also been suggested that *latinitas* could also even more appropriately be a calque of ἀττικισμός, Attica being the surrounding area around Athens, as Latium was around Rome.[43] Rosén mentions the abundance of primary sources for various registers or styles of Latin of the Classical period and the wide variety of terms used, *sermo rusticus proletarius, plebeius, familiaris, cotidianus urbanus,* and so on and above all, *latinitas,* about which she comments:

> Once *Latinitas,* and likewise *Latinus* (*sermo, verba*) and *Latine* (*loqui, scire*) ridded themselves of the colouring of the source term ἑλληνισμός, they took on a life of their own, signifying matters related to the Romans simply as opposed to other languages or, when the issue was its knowledge or expression as it should be learned or produced by a Roman, always in reference to the literary language or at any rate to the accepted, standard Roman language, which is untainted by the *peregrinus* (or *rusticus*) *sermo*. [44]

However, the suggestion has been made that the original contrast between *sermo rusticus* and *sermo urbanus* echoes the Greek διάλεκτος ἄγροικος and ἀττικὰ in referring to the speech of the city, Athens or Rome, as opposed to the hinterland. Once *rusticus* had

---

[41] Clackson 236-56
[42] Müller 2001, 249-250
[43] For a detailed discussion of *latinitas* see J. Clackson, 2015, 309-330
[44] Rosén 1999, 14

become a term for non-standard Latin, this town/country connection was lost and it became a term for any non-standard Latin.

This concern for correct language also led to the emphasis on the use of 'traditional' language with the avoidance of new coinings or expressions. Once a traditional standard language exists, upwardly mobile and elite speakers feel the need to observe this standard. However, all modes of speech fluctuate over time; words which at one time were in common currency become, in a relatively short space of time, totally incomprehensible. In English, the justification for, and acceptance of, a word appears to be the point at which it is included in *The Oxford English Dictionary.* All speakers will engage in code-switching from time to time, depending upon context. Moreover, norms of linguistic use vary between languages, for instance, there is no equivalent in English, and many other languages, of a guardian of language such as *l'Académie Française.* Similar pressures must have existed in Latin.

1.1.3 'Standard' and 'Colloquial' Latin

'Colloquial' is not a regular description of Latin but can be useful, though its various understandings have, as Clackson remarks, 'fuzzy boundaries', since there can be different varieties of 'colloquial' language, sometimes contrasted, on the one hand, with 'formal' or 'literary' language, or, on the other hand, with 'vulgar' or 'illiterate'. [45]However, the term is not now much used by linguists, though it remains in general use as a term referring usually to spoken rather than written language, and thus is not much help to Latinists. Linguists tend more to speak of 'registers', a general term describing usages of language which will vary according to the circumstances. Another term now frequently used is 'sociolect', describing the use of language, written or spoken, in a group with common interests or aims. As such, it both uses vocabulary appropriate to the interests of the group and also distinguishes it as an 'in

---

[45] Clackson 2010, 7

group', separating it off from everyday language. Examples might be, groups such as adherents of a particular sport, enthusiasts for some particular technology, and so on. The term 'sociolect', therefore, could possibly be applied to Christian terminology, the aim of this study, a possibility which will be considered in more detail later. Clackson points out that it is not possible to discuss 'colloquial' without referring to 'formal' language:

> Formal language to a large extent overlaps with what is referred to as standard language, a concept which is unfortunately itself far from clear-cut … Standard languages show little or no variation, and their status in a society means that speakers usually associate the standard with the 'correct' form of the language, …and consequently other varieties … are seen as deviations'.[46]

Knowledge of a standard language may well enable one to understand and communicate in situations where other varieties are the norm, Standard Arabic being a case in point. Clackson mentions Haugen's enumeration of the four stages through which a 'standard' language passes, and these are expanded by Lodge in his introduction to *French, from Dialect to Standard*: 1) selection: the process whereby a particular language is selected as the form of communication in a given society, 2) codification: which refers to the grammatical prescription of what forms in both grammar and lexis are to be considered 'correct', 3) elaboration: denoting the linguistic tools needed for a wide range of functions, writing and speech, extension of the lexis to deal with descriptions of activity in various differing fields of activity, and, finally, 4) acceptance: whereby the selected language and the way it functions are by and large accepted by the society in which it is used.[47]

Variables of language cannot be neatly divided either by class or area**.** People of all levels change their use of language according to context. This is particularly the case with the more educated, who would vary their expression in order to be understood by their target

---

[46] Clackson 2010
[47] Haugen 1966 cited in Lodge 1993, 25-26

audience. In any society, at any period in time, and in any language, and amongst any particular social class or group, there will be variations of register, both written and spoken, depending upon context. Adams refers to Labov's distinction between 'careful speech' and 'casual speech' and this, I would submit, is common to both 'upper' and 'lower' classes.[48]

We modify our speech depending upon context. An academic would use quite different language when presenting a paper to a conference of peers from giving an informal talk on the topic to a 'lay' audience. Casual conversation is very different from discussion of a mutually understood topic. Correlation with social class is an oversimplification. Many examples from antiquity demonstrate that this was as familiar then as now, some examples of which are cited below.

Burton discusses the problem of the existence or otherwise, in Latin or in any other language, of a 'standard' language and suggests three possible, flexible concepts of the term.[49] Firstly, most mother-tongue speakers of English would recognise, for instance, Scottish or American or Australian English as legitimate variations of the same language; secondly, as mentioned already, all speakers modify their language according to context; thirdly, there is no one term to describe all these languages. Such terms as 'BBC English' or 'received pronunciation' are, in any case, 'loaded' and in modern times, unacceptable. In order to consider any concept of 'standard' language which might have existed in 'classical' time, Burton cites a definition by Cicero, given to Crassus, in which Cicero asserts that the 'rules' for speaking Latin would have been learnt from childhood, by studying earlier orators and poets:

> praetereamus igitur praecepta Latine loquendi, quae puerilis doctrina tradit et subtilior cognitio ac ratio litterarum alit aut consuetudo sermonis cotidiani ac domestici, libri confirmant et lectio veterum oratorum et poetarum. neque vero in illo altero diutius commoremur, ut disputemus, quibus rebus adsequi possimus, ut

---

[48] Labov 2006 cited in Adams 2013 xv
[49] Burton 2009, 44 ff

ea, quae dicamus, intellegantur: Latine scilicet dicendo, verbis usitatis ac proprie demonstrantibus ea, quae significari ac declarari volemus, …..(*De Oratore* 3.48-9)

Thus *latine loqui*, on Cicero's definition cited above, seems to begin with the spoken language and subsequently to be refined (*subtilior*) by one's reading of the classics. But both spoken and written words are important. So *latine loqui/dicere* clearly means not just 'speaking Latin' as distinct from any other language but, 'speaking good Latin' on the pattern of ἀττικῶς λέγειν.[50] The Lewis and Short definition of *latine* is 'to speak with propriety and elegance.'[51] Many citations support this view:

> Latinitas est, quae sermonem purum conservat, ab omni vitio remotum (*rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.12): Latine loqui, est loqui proprie et eleganter.(Cicero, *Brutus* 45.166.)
> Eodem tempore M. Herennius in mediocribus oratoribus Latine et diligenter loquentibus numeratus est. (Cicero *De Optimo Genere Oratorum* 2.4)

There were, therefore, different 'registers', as we should call them, familiar in classical times, some of which clearly overlapped and none of which can be exactly defined. One significant term from the citation above from *de Oratore* (3.48-9), *consuetudo sermonis cotidiani,* clearly refers to the practice of *latine loquendi,* speaking good Latin.

The relevance of 'colloquial' in Latin authors is discussed by Ferri and Probert, who cite examples from the author of *Rhetorica ad Herennium,* a treatise on rhetoric, dating probably from the first century BC and formerly attributed to Cicero.[52] This work, together with writings of Cicero, Quintilian and Varro on the Latin of their time, give an insight into how grammarians viewed and discussed their language. All three refer to the *genera dicendi*, the three rhetorical styles, originally inherited from the Greek; grand, medium and simple, all of which it was regarded as important for an orator to display in the course of a speech. The

---

[50] Burton 2009, 46
[51] Lewis and Short, *latine* 2
[52] Ferri and Probert 2010, 12-41

author of *ad Herennium* distinguishes these three thus: *tria genera, quae genera nos figuras appellamus, in quibus omnis oratio non vitiosa consumitur: unam gravem , alteram mediocrem, tertiam extenuatam vocamus* (4.11) and for all three writers it is clearly important for the appropriate style to be chosen for a given situation. The author of *ad Herennium* gives the following example of the simple style:

> Hoc erit exemplum: 'nam ut forte hic in balineas venit, coepit postquam perfusus est, defricari*;* deinde, ubi visum est, ut in alveum descenderet, ecce tibi iste de traverso: 'heus', inquit, 'adolescens, pueri tui modo me pulsarunt; satis facias oportet'. Hic, qui id aetatis ab ignoto praeter consuetudinem appellatus esset, erubuit. Iste clarius eadem et alia dicere coepit. Hic: 'vix ; tamen', inquit, 'sine me considerare'. Tum vero iste clamare voce ista, quae perfacile cuiuis rubores eicere potest: ita petulans est atque acerba. Ne ad solarium quidem, ut mihi videtur, sed pone scaenam et in eiusmodi locis exercitata. Conturbatus est adolescens: nec mirum, cui etiam nunc pedagogi lites ad oriculas versarentur inperito huiusmodi conviciorum. Ubi enim iste vidisset scurram exhausto rubore, qui se putaret nihil habere, quod de existimatione perderet, <ut> omnia sine famae detrimento facere posset? (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.14)

This demonstrates an example of written language which could well be a reproduction of speech. One could cite several instances in this passage of language usages which the *Auctor* would term *humilis: balineas* - insertion of an epenthetic vowel; *oriculas* - the monophonisation of a dipthong, also, use of the diminutive form of this word; *pulso* for *pello;* heavy use of demonstrative pronouns, especially *iste;* frequent use of present tense. In contrast to most written Latin the sentences are short, very simple in construction with few subsidiary clauses. It also includes direct speech, another feature not normally found in narrative, though of course common in oratorical writing. The *Auctor* advises guarding against falling into the danger of usages associated even with the 'grand' style, particularly the so-called *sufflata,* which is to be avoided:

> Igitur genera figurarum ex ipsis exemplis intellegi poterant.
> Erat enim et adtenuata verborum constructio quaedam et item alia in gravitate, alia posita in mediocritate. Est autem cavendum, ne, dum haec genera consectemur, in finituma et propinqua vit<i>a veniamus. Nam gravi figurae, quae laudanda est,

propinqua est ea, quae fugienda; quae recte videbitur appellari, si sufflata nominabitur. (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.10)

This example is obviously an exaggeration of 'non-standard' or 'lower register' speech. However, this is where things get difficult. The common but unhelpful term 'vulgar' Latin will be discussed later but what is said here overlaps with it, in that, as has often been emphasised, references to 'non-standard' Latin do not necessarily imply that they are to be associated with 'lower-class' speech. As has already been mentioned, it is difficult, if not impossible, to find clear definitions. A detailed examination of such matters is found in Müller, *Sprachbewußtsein und Sprachvariation im lateinischen Schrifttum der Antike*.[53]

Some of the common, almost certainly overlapping, terms, are cited by Burton: *sermo abiectus/demissus/humilis/infimus/summisus*.[54] Although many of the adjectives in these examples seem to have something intrinsically pejorative about them, this appears to be regarded mainly as referring to a register not suitable or desirable in a given rhetorical context. Cicero explains this in detail at *De Oratore* 192 when citing Aristotle in a discussion about speech rhythm.

One example from the above list, *sermo humilis,* will become important in later discussions with relevance to the Christian use of Latin. However, for the present, a few examples of its use might be examined. Burton mentions that it is used to apply to the first, simple, oratorical style, the *extenuatus,* mentioned in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* citation above (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.10), which was suitable for narration.[55] Burton also mentions discussion by Quintilian of *humilis* used, amongst other pejorative adjectives, to describe faults which may appear in speeches: *Ne id quidem inutile, etiam corruptas*

---

[53] Müller 2001, 92-3
[54] Burton 2009, 47
[55] Burton 2009, 48

aliquando et vitiosas orationes, quas tamen plerique iudiciorum pravitate mirentur, legi palam ostendi que in his, quam multa inpropria, obscura, tumida, humilia, sordida, lasciva, effeminata sint: (Quintilian, *institutio oratoria* 2.5.10)*. Humilis* also appears in the comparative: *Mediocris est, quae constat ex humiliore neque tamen ex infuma et pervulgatissima verborum dignitate.* (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.11).

There are also a number of other expressions which are used by classical writers when discussing language. Burton cites a passage from Cicero (*de Oratore* 3, 48-9) where the phrase *consuetudo sermonis cottidiani ac domestici* is used.[56] This and other examples of *sermo cottidianus* would appear to demonstrate that this expression, too, is used to describe 'everyday' speech. The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* provides probably the oldest extant discussion of Latin style. Here a distinction is drawn between the qualities of *mollitudo vocis*: *sermo, contentio* and *amplificatio,* between which the orator would need to decide, depending upon the circumstances and occasion of the speech. Of the first, *sermo,* it is said *sermo est oratio remissa et finitima cottidianae locutioni* (3.23)*,* thus once again using the term *cottidianus* as referring to normal, everyday, speech. As in the first quotation above, also connected with *cottidianus* is the term *consuetudo,* another word which, along with *usus,* appears to refer to normal usage, and which Cicero, elsewhere in *de Oratore,* also couples with the observation: *me autem tuus sonus et subtilitas ista delectat, omitto verborum, quamquam est caput; verum id adfert ratio, docent litterae, confirmat consuetudo et legendi et loquendi*. (*De Oratore* 3.42).

Another expression which would appear to convey the same thought is *sermo plebeius*, clearly used without any of the 'modern' English associations of the latter term, as demonstrated in Cicero's letter to Papirius Paetus: *nonne plebeio sermone agere te cum? nec*

---

[56] Burton 2009, 45

enim semper eodem modo. quin ipsa iudicia non solemus omnia tractare uno modo. privatas

causas et eas tenuis agimus subtilius, capitis aut famae scilicet ornatius. epistulas vero

cottidianis verbis texere solemus …. quid enim simile habet epistula aut iudicio aut contioni?

(*Ad Familiares* 9. 21.1). Cicero goes on to point out that even oratorical styles will vary

according to the case being conducted ... *quin ipsa iudicia non solemus omnia tractare uno*

modo. (*Ad Familiares* 9.21.1). Burton remarks of *sermo plebeius* that in this context 'it is not

so much the speech of the lower classes as the style of speech appropriate to letter-writing'.[57]

Other expressions include *sermo rusticus,* regularly contrasted with *sermo urbanus,*

which is regarded as an approving term (Quintilian. *Instutes.* 6.3.17). However, *rusticus*, often

found with *agrestis,* can have the implication of 'old-time' speech, *rustica vox et agrestis*

quosdam delectat (Cicero, *De Oratore*. 3.42). Additional terms which will be relevant to the

discussion of Christian expression include *sermo humilis/abiectus/dimissus.*

Whilst some of the applications of *sermo ….* have mainly referred to oratorical

language, the most relevant form of language for my purposes will be that of 'everyday

speech.' Herennius is encouraged to study and practise in order to be able to speak like an

orator and not in *vulgaris sermo; in quibus, Herenni, si te diligentius exercueris, et gravitatem*

et dignitatem et suavitatem habere in dicundo poteris, ut oratorie plane loquaris, ne nuda

atque inornata inventio vulgari sermone efferatur. (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.56.69) This

introduces once again the vexed matter of the exact meaning of *sermo vulgaris,* to which I

now turn.

1.1.4 'Vulgar' Latin

The term 'vulgar' Latin, with or without capital letter and/or inverted commas, has

over the past two centuries appeared with depressing regularity in any discussion about Latin

---

[57] Burton 2009, 55

language. As a term it is not open to formal definition, since it can have, and has had, many different meanings at different times and in different places, such as the form of Latin spoken by the *vulgus,* in itself totally imprecise as this could refer to the speech of 'common' i.e. 'lower-class' peoples or merely to everyday speech. In later more detailed discussion I refer to Adams' description of it as 'hopelessly vague'.[58] Cicero uses the term with a derogatory implication: *in dicendo autem vitium vel maximum sit a vulgari genere orationis atque a consuetudine communis sensus abhorrere* (*De Oratore* 1.12), as does Quintilian: *nam et humilibus interim et vulgaribus est opus* (*Institutio Oratoria* 10.1,9).

In attempts to define and discuss this term, I refer to the succinct exploration by József Herman in his *Vulgar Latin*.[59] Herman traces the origin of this term to the nineteenth century development of the comparative study of Romance Languages, particularly by the early investigations of Romance philology by François Juste Marie Raynouard (1761-1836), followed by the German philologist Friedrich Diez (1794-1876).[60] Studies of the origins of Romance detected that, whilst Latin was clearly the origin of these languages, many phonetic and grammatical features differed from the 'classical' Latin of, for instance, Cicero or Vergil. The view emerged that 'classical' Latin was one of many different forms of Latin and that the Latin language existed in much greater variety than had hitherto been thought to be the case.[61] Another factor is the difference between spoken and written language and the fact that, in Latin, the former can only be deduced from written references and a few textual examples, such as the graffiti of Pompeii.[62] However, as Herman points out, whilst the written language 'was continually being influenced by features of speech ...we should not deduce that Vulgar

---

[58] Adams 2014, 4ff.
[59] Herman 2000, chapter 1
[60] Raynouard 1816, Diez 1836, 43
[61] Herman, 2000, 2-4
[62] Herman 2000, chapter 3

Latin is the same thing as spoken Latin merely because the object of study in the case of Vulgar Latin is in essence the spoken variety of Latin'.[63]

In 1891 the German philologist, Karl Sittl, in a surprise retraction of many of the theories he had adduced in his earlier work, which will be discussed later, declared, *das Vulgärlatein, mit welchem die Latinisten operieren, ist ein Phantasiegebilde'.*[64]

It is this somewhat startling statement which I propose to use as my starting point for an attempt to explore this area and later to seek to find its relevance for early expression of Christian beliefs in Latin. Firstly, it will be necessary, in order to be able to use the term 'vulgar Latin' at all, and preferably without quotation marks, to establish some degree of definition of the term. So much has been written and discussed that it has indeed become a *Phantasiegebilde* and it is clearly not possible to produce an exact definition.

Thus 'vulgar' is not necessarily to be understood in any pejorative sense, as Horace, *odi profanum vulgus et arceo* (*Carmina* 3,1), but rather to describe the 'general' everyday spoken and written language of the period, as distinct from either 'colloquial' or 'slang' on the one hand or considered, 'literary' written language on the other. This point has frequently been made in studies in this area, in addition to Herman, notably by Adams,[65] Müller,[66] Ferri and Probert[67] and Burton.[68] It is clear that we have strayed into realms where precise definitions are difficult, if not impossible. Language varies according to social level and group, and even within a particular group various registers will be used, according to context and circumstances.

---

[63] Herman 2000, 6
[64] Sittl 1891, 226-86
[65] Adams 2013, 3
[66] Müller 2001
[67] Ferri and Probert 2010, 12-41
[68] Burton 2009

There will also possibly be a chronological element to the examination of the sort of language underlying the earliest Christian writing in Latin. Whilst the material I am considering will cover a relatively brief period of time, from roughly around AD 180 to about 280, language changes can be discerned. As examples of 'vulgar' writing, in contrast to traditional 'classical' writing, the works of fiction of Petronius and Apuleius, the only extant examples in Latin, are often cited. Yet, whilst elements of the 'colloquial' style are prominent in both writers, since both are writing fiction, which explains the appearance of some aspects of style common to them both, for instance, the speech attributed to the freedmen in Petronius' *Satyricon,* and the dialogue in Apuleius' *Metamorphoses,* they are separated chronologically by a century.[69] P.G. Walsh, in his review of Louis Callebat's comprehensive *Sermo Cotidianus dans les Métamorphoses d'Apulée,* remarks 'The title is carefully chosen in preference to *le latin vulgaire* to embrace not only the language of the lower classes but also the familiar speech of cultivated persons, and this is of some importance for the *Metamorphoses*, where the first-person narrator is a middle-class Greek both at large amongst social equals and in the hands of social inferiors.'[70]

This much discussed term is, therefore, neither entirely clear nor helpful. At all events, it is obvious that there is no one objectively-existing entity called 'Vulgar Latin' awaiting description. However, what is clear is that, as Adams and others point out, it is not limited to the 'lower classes' but used to describe the everyday communication of all levels of society.[71] Any of the terms discussed in the previous section could be applied in the same way. To use 'vulgar' Latin as a term to describe a debased form of Latin in contradistinction to the 'classical' norm is to oversimplify. In any language, at any period of history, language, even

---

[69] Petronius c. 27-66 AD, Apuleius c. 125-170 AD
[70] Walsh, 1972, 128, review of Callebat 1968
[71] Adams 2013, 5 ff

when used by the same speaker, will vary according to the circumstances and the company

being kept. Labov, cited by Adams, distinguishes between 'careful speech' and 'casual speech',

making the point that a member of a high social group, when using casual speech would

depart more frequently from prestige usages than when using careful speech whilst,

conversely, those lower down the social scale might well, when speaking carefully or, indeed

when writing, aspire to using more prestige forms.[72] This change of 'register' is a very familiar

general concept and would have been as common in the ancient world as today. For instance,

Cicero, in a letter to Paetus writes *verum tamen quid tibi ego videor in epistulis? Nonne*

plebeio sermone agere tecum? (9.21.1). Vitruvius apologises for any departure from strict

grammatical rules on the grounds that he is an architect, not a grammarian, *si quid parum ad*

regulam artis grammaticae fuerit explicatum, ignoscatur .... sed ut architectus his litteris

imbutus haec nisus sum scribere (*de Architectura* 1.1.18)

> Quintilian is also familiar with the difference between 'careful' and 'casual speech:
>
> > Adhuc quidam nullam esse naturalem putant eloquentiam, nisi quae sit cotidiano sermoni simillima, quo cum amicis, coniugibus, liberis, servis loquamur, contento promere animi voluntatem nihil que arcessiti et elaborati requirente: quidquid huc sit adiectum, id esse adfectationis et ambitiosae in loquendo iactantiae, remotum a veritate fictumque ipsorum gratia verborum, quibus solum natura sit officium attributum, servire sensibus: ……. nam mihi aliam quandam videtur habere naturam sermo vulgaris, aliam viri eloquentis oratio: cui si res modo indicare satis esset, nihil ultra verborum proprietatem elaboraret: sed cum debeat delectare, movere, in plurimas animum audientis species inpellere, utetur his quoque adiutoriis, quae sunt ab eadem nobis concessa natura. (Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 12.10.40)

'Vulgar Latin' in its many and various definitions, is used to refer to 'everyday' language,

rather than to a form of 'lower-class' Latin, distinct from educated and literary writing. *Sermo*

vulgaris, although a term used in antiquity, is a confusing term with no one clear definition.

Adams makes the point that, whilst the use of *vulgus* and *vulgo* can be used to apply to

---

[72] Labov 2006, 59, cited in Adams 2013, 6.

general and also educated use, a derogatory implication is also well attested.[73] The most detailed recent discussion of *vulgus* and cognates is found in Müller.[74] Some points from this will now be adduced in support of this summary of views of *sermo vulgaris*. Müller attributes the awakening of the interest of Latin language study in words with the prefix *vulg-* to Hugo Schuchardt's *Der Vokalismus des Vulgärlateins* (1866-68).[75] He traces the first usages of the adverb *vulgo* and the adjective *vulgus* back to Plautus; *atque auditavi saepe hoc volgo dicier, solere elephantum gravidam perpetuos decem esse annos* (*Stichus* act 1, scene 3) and Stratippocles, *Nam quid ita?* Epidicus, *Quia ego tuom patrem faciam parenticidam.* Stratippocles, *Quid istúc est verbi?* Epidicus, *Nil moror vetera et volgata verba* (*Epidicus* act 3 scene 3),[76] in which both would appear to carry a negative connotation.

The next appearance of *vulgo-* does not appear until, in the anonymous *ad Herennium* is found: *Omnes rationes honestandae studiose collegimus <e>locutionis: in quibus, Herenni, si te diligentius exercueris, et gravitatem et dignitatem et suavitatem habere in dicundo poteris, ut oratorie plane loquaris, ne nuda atque inornata inventio vulgari sermone efferatur.* (*Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.69), on which Müller comments *mit der sie die "allgemein übliche Sprache" von der Sprache der Redner und der der Dichter sondert.*[77] Müller points out that it is in Cicero where the greatest variety of *vulg-* terms are found, and gives such examples as: *vox vulgaris, vulgaria sunt, vulgaris declamatio, vulgaris sermo, oratio vulgaris,* etc.[78] Quintilian broadly follows Cicero (see citation on previous page).

The views of Aulus Gellius on *vulgus,* discussed by Müller[79] are particularly relevant to the later discussion of Christian usage, since Aulus Gellius (124/5-c.180) is one of only two

---

[73] Adams 2013, 10
[74] Müller 2001, 117-65
[75] Müller 2001, 117
[76] Müller 2001, 118
[77] Müller 2001, 119
[78] for more detailed text see Müller 2001, 119
[79] Müller 2001, 152-154

extant pagan writers, the other being Apuleius (c.124-170) to be roughly contemporary with the earliest Christian writing. He was interested in language and was a pupil of the grammarian C.Sulpicius Apollinaris. His one extant work, *Noctes Atticae,* is a collection of notes on various subjects, including grammar, geometry, philosophy and history, and which provide insights into the life of the times and in addition preserve snippets of otherwise unknown authors. This comprises 20 books, which are all extant, except book 18, of which only the index survives.[80] Müller draws attention to the title of book 6, chapter 11 of *Noctes Atticae; Neque 'levitatem' neque 'nequitiam' ea significatione esse, qua in vulgi sermonibus dicuntur,* as an example of how Gellius uses *vulgus* as a general term. The following citations support this usage. One citation from Aulus Gellius demonstrates an acceptance of 'modern' spoken usage, whilst retaining 'old fashioned' values: *Vive ergo moribus praeteritis, loquere verbis praesentibus atque id, quod a C. Caesare, excellentis ingenii ac prudentiae viro, in primo de analogia libro scriptum est, habe semper in memoria atque in pectore, ut tamquam scopulum, sic fugias inauditum atque insolens verbum.* (*Noctes Atticae* 1.10.4). A further quotation in the same first book of the *Noctes* in the course of a discussion on the correct use of *superesse,* has *.... atque id dicitur non in compitis tantum neque in plebe volgaria, sed in foro, in comitio, apud tribunalia* (*Noctes Atticae* 1.22.2), which would suggest that such 'loose' language was familiar and acceptable in many contexts.

Adams cites the above extract from Gellius in the first chapter of his work *Social variation and the Latin language* and states 'in recent decades the inadequacy of the term 'vulgar Latin' has been increasingly felt with the advance of sociolinguistics as a discipline' and he suggests that the term might well be regarded as 'hopelessly vague'.[81] This, for which one might suggest flexibility rather than hopeless vagueness, could perhaps be regarded as its

---

[80] Holford Strevens 2003
[81] Adams 2013, 4ff

strength in that the term need not be associated with any definite or specific form of the

language. Therefore, in the absence of anything better, I propose to continue to use the term

'vulgar Latin' following Herman's generally accepted definition: ' …the term 'Vulgar Latin',

(henceforth regularly used without these inverted commas) is used to refer to the set of all

those innovations and trends that turned up in the usage, particularly but not exclusively

spoken, of the Latin-speaking population who were little or not at all influenced by school

education and by literary models'.[82]

Clearly, the varieties of Latin covered by this term will have considerable relevance to

discussions of any particular use of Latin in attempts to communicate Christian beliefs.

Moreover, the fact that the earliest extant examples of Latin writing about Christianity

emanate from North Africa makes it necessary to examine how the use of the various types of

Latin discussed above relate to the Latin of North Africa, and the area around Carthage in

particular. I now look at this topic, including an examination of the earliest but still the most

detailed examination of so-called 'African' Latin available, that of Karl Sittl, 1882 and 1891,

and discuss his critics, both of his own period and since, including later comments on the

subject of 'African' Latin by Lancel[83] and Adams.[84]

1.2 Africa

The conquest of North Africa by Rome has been well documented.[85] Rome had been

in Africa since the final destruction of Carthage and the founding of the province of *Africa*

Proconsularis at the end of the third Punic war in 146 BC. In 46 BC Caesar, after the defeat

of Pompey, incorporated most of the old Kingdom of Numidia into a second province, *Africa*

---

[82] Herman 2000, 7
[83] Lancel 1985, 161-182
[84] Adams 2007
[85] Summary from Cambridge Ancient History vols 8 and 9, 1989
and Raven 1993

Nova. After the Battle of Actium in 31 BC and the re-founding of Carthage as a Roman city, Rome's territorial gains increased under Augustus and his successors, with a further two provinces created in Mauretania under Claudius. Roman influence was consolidated during the second century and in AD 193 Septimius Severus became the first African emperor. Latin, introduced probably from the early days of Roman conquest, rather than Greek, became the main lingua franca of the African provinces, alongside Punic and a 'Libyan' (possibly Berber) tongue.

Andrew Wilson, in his study of neo-Punic and Latin inscriptions in Roman North Africa, gives a general outline of the position of Latin in North Africa as far as can be ascertained:

> In 146 BC the linguistic landscape of North Africa was a mixture of Punic and Libyan, with Greek as a cultured and trading lingua franca in the Hellenistic cultural *koine* of the central Mediterranean. Latin, introduced initially as the language of the conquerors, eventually became the new lingua franca, but only after a time lag of at least a century. There are a mere five Latin inscriptions from North Africa that pre-date 46 BC, all from the region around Utica, Carthage and Cap Bon; it was only after the wave of Caesarian and Augustan colonisation in Africa that Latin began to dominate the epigraphic habit. But when it did, from the Augustan period onwards, it did so quickly and spectacularly: North Africa is one of the richest regions for Latin inscriptions, especially on stone - some 30,000, as opposed to a few hundred neo-Punic inscriptions.'[86]

Wilson's researches shed light on the gradual changing relationship between Punic and Latin, as exemplified in the many examples he adduces, mostly emanating from the early period of Roman imperial expansion in North Africa. A detailed discussion of the relationship between Punic and Latin will be found in Adams, *Bilingualism and the Latin Language* who concludes:

> What emerges from the bilingual and neo-Punic inscriptions which have survived from Africa is a prolonged vitality of the Punic language well into the Empire, not only in rural areas but also in the cities.[87]

---

[86] Wilson 2012, 265-316
[87] Adams 2003, 200-245

Although Latin had, by the time of the Principate, become the official language of the Roman empire, Greek was still very much the lingua franca of its multifarious inhabitants. However, in North Africa we can discern the emergence of Latin as the main vehicle of writing. This is particularly notable in writings about Christianity; the earliest Christian writings in Latin have a North African provenance and Augustine, perhaps the greatest of the early Latin Fathers, was Bishop of Hippo, in present-day Algeria. During the period under examination in this thesis, from the end of the second to the middle of the third centuries, the only extant Latin literature, Tertullian, Minucius Felix, Apuleius, Aulus Gellius and Cyprian, was African in origin. Moreover, it was all, Apuleius and Aulus Gellius excepted, Christian. The matter of Christian writing will be discussed in detail later, particularly in chapter 2, but before that it is relevant to consider in what ways, if any, the Latin of the second and early third century in that area, particularly in and around Carthage, differed from that of 'classical' Latin.

Studies in this field have focussed upon the fact that variations in written language probably arose out of speech and have attempted to deduce traces of the written language, influenced by speech, which would differentiate it, as a particular accent or dialect, from that of Rome. Whilst such speculation, for it cannot be much more, is valuable and interesting, the focus needs to be on the written word, examining whether regional variations can be discerned in the work of the writers to be considered. It must be noted, however, that the writers under discussion were all educated and trained, mainly as lawyers, in Rome, and it could be said, therefore, that it is unlikely that much regional specific language would be discernible in their writings. This raises the question of the extent to which Latin was a centralised language, either in the way it was actually spoken or the way it was recorded.

To consider briefly modern parallels; whilst it is relatively easy to distinguish between, for example, Australian, American and South African English, their variations, particularly in vocabulary, tend to manifest themselves principally in spoken language and, if in written language, then in the context of fairly colloquial or 'popular' writing. To take an example of vocabulary; to an American 'pants' are what a speaker of British English would call 'trousers', to whom 'pants' would refer to what is worn under them; likewise a 'purse' in British English is a small container for money, whereas for an American 'purse' refers to the receptacle in which the 'purse' is kept, known in the UK as a 'handbag'. Whilst *Schwyzerdütsch*, the everyday spoken language of communication in Switzerland and parts of the surrounding areas, is so far removed from *Hochdeutsch* that native German speakers have great difficulty in understanding the spoken language, written Swiss German is virtually indistinguishable from *Hochdeutsch*.

Apart, then, from variations in vocabulary, such as those adduced above, the differences lie largely in the spoken language. Generally speaking, certainly in 'high register', such as academic writing, it would not normally be apparent from the text whether a book was written by an American, Australian, or a Scot, rather than by an English author. Modern Standard Arabic is understood all over the Arab speaking world but its local variations, Egyptian, Moroccan, Tunisian, Syrian and so on all have their distinct vocabulary and expressions. Stylistic differences in speech can also be influenced by historical and social background. In Northern Ireland, for instance it is possible to distinguish members of the Protestant or Catholic communities by their accent. In the present day, of course, media influence plays a large part in influencing spoken language and is probably one of the main factors in transatlantic influence on modern UK English.

The same factors would probably have been at work in ancient times and it would therefore seem valid to examine some of the theories adduced in support of *Africitas*, looking at the various views of their veracity, in order to ascertain whether any of them have relevance to, or influence on, the written language of Roman Africa . I propose to begin by considering the main ideas put forward by Karl Sittl at the end of the 19th century. Whilst Sittl swiftly retracted many of these views, he was fiercely criticised, even in his own day by, amongst others, Norden, Kroll and, later, Brock, I submit that a consideration of his theories about a specific *Africitas*, whilst later largely discounted, is very relevant to the study of the development of Christian Latin. As Brock pointed out, given that there is, in the period under discussion, no 'non-African' writing, the argument is therefore one *ex silentio* and so cannot be proved.[88]

1.2.1 Africitas

There has been much discussion, particularly in the nineteenth century, of the view that there was in North Africa a distinct variation of Latin, generally referred to as *Africitas.* Strongly held opinions raged for and against the existence of a specific *Africitas* well into the twentieth century until, in the words of Bonniec; *il semble qu'aujourd'hui la querelle de l'Africitas ait cessé faute de combattants.*[89] This discussion is, in my opinion, relevant to the study of early Christian Latin, since, as mentioned above, all early Christian writing in Latin was African in origin. I propose, therefore, to survey in summary the various stages in this argument, from the Renaissance of Erasmus and Vives, to the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries and shall also discuss what has appeared since then. In this, particularly for the period up to and including the nineteenth century, I broadly follow the outline presented in

---

[88] Brock 1911, 163
[89] Le Bonniec 1982, 87

Lancel's 1985 article *Y a-t-il une Africitas*?[90] I shall also refer to the chapter *Apuleius and Africitas* which draws upon and updates Lancel.[91]

The Renaissance scholar, Erasmus, at a time when, for the first time, Latin writing was considered in relation to the land of origin of its authors, discussed the writing of the late second and early third centuries, which emanated almost solely from African writers, and asserted that it was not possible for those from the provinces to use pure Latin unless they had been educated in Rome.[92] However, the word *Africitas* first appears, not in Erasmus, as has sometimes been claimed, but used by his contemporary, Juan Luis Vives, a Spanish humanist, in his treatise *de Tradendis Disciplinis*: *Augustinus multum habet Africitatis in contextu dictionis, non perinde in verbis, praesertim in libro de civitatis dei.*[93] Lancel suggests that, although the sense of this is not totally clear, the immediately preceding phrases show that Vives is not intending *Africitas* as a compliment, and comments; *l'idée de confusion et d'obscurité est ainsi liée à la formulation littéraire des Africains dans l'esprit de Vives.* [94] Another significant expression in this connection was the oft quoted term *tumor Africus*, attributed by Karl Sittl to the French Renaissance scholars Dalmasius (Saumaise) (1588-1653) or Casaubon (1559-1614).[95] Clearly, these earlier references to any possible variations of the Latin used in the provinces appear to the twenty-first century mind as distinctly racist but need, in my opinion to be considered in the context of the norms of the periods in which they appeared rather than as offending against modern sensibilities.

[90] Lancel 1985, 161-182
[91] Mattiacci 2014, 87
[92] Lancel 1985, 163, footnote 8
[93] Vives 1555, vol 1, 482
[94] Lancel 1985 163 footnote 7 *Tertullianus perturbatissime loquitur ut Afer. Cyprianus et Arnobius eiusdem gentis clarius, sed et ipsi nunnumquam Afre.*
[95] See 14ff of this chapter

1.2.1.1 The Atticism/Asianism debate

Of relevance to the question of *Africitas* is another debate, that concerning the two contrasting styles of oratory, Atticism and Asianism. These two styles arose from the 'second Sophistic', the name of which derived from the writer Philostratus in his *Lives of the Sophists* and was used to describe the renaissance of Greek oratory and teaching. Many Greek orators and teachers moved to Rome from the middle of the first century BC onwards and greatly influenced emperors, especially Hadrian, with his keen intellectual interest in all things Greek. This renewed interest in oratory in the Roman society of the time took two forms, Atticism, a traditional style, originating in the Hellenistic culture of the Athens of the past, hence the name, which laid great emphasis on pureness of style and harked back to the language of the past, and Asianism, which exhibited a florid style, with much use made of wordplay and, particularly of prose rhythm, a technique particularly marked at *clausulae,* the end of clauses. The gradual popularity of this form of oratory gave rise to much debate centring round the view that the more bombastic Asiatic oratory corrupted and debased the traditional, formal Attic style which was characterised by the use of archaisms, the deliberate use of words and mannerisms generally regarded as obsolete. The debate focussed on the tendency to exalt the older, Attic, style of Latin oratory over against the more florid and colourful Asiatic style. The first known use of the term in Latin was by Cicero, who discusses both styles but who was himself attacked as championing Asianism as against the purism of austere Attic oratory:

> Sed si quaerimus, cur adulescens magis floruerit dicendo quam senior Hortensius, causas reperiemus verissumas duas. primum, quod genus erat orationis Asiaticum adulescentiae magis concessum quam senectuti. genera autem Asiaticae dictionis duo sunt: unum sententiosum et argutum, sententiis non tam gravibus et severis quam concinnis et venustis, qualis in historia Timaeus, in dicendo autem pueris nobis Hierocles Alabandeus, magis etiam Menecles frater eius fuit, quorum utriusque orationes sunt in primis ut Asiatico in genere laudabiles. (Cicero *Ad Brutum* 325)

Quintilian steers the same line between the two styles as Cicero before him:

> Verba a vetustate repetita non solum magnos adsertores habent, sed etiam adferunt orationi maiestatem aliquam non sine delectatione: nam et auctoritatem antiquitatis habent et, quia intermissa sunt, gratiam novitati similem parant. sed opus est modo, ut neque crebra sint haec nec manifesta, quia nihil est odiosius adfectatione, nec utique ab ultimis et iam oblitteratis repetita temporibus, qualia sunt 'topper' et 'antegerio' et 'exanclare' et 'prosapia' et Saliorum carmina vix sacerdotibus suis satis intellecta.
> (*Institutio Oratoria* 1.40)

This debate continued well into the Empire. The emperor Hadrian was particularly fond of archaic language. The *Historia Augusta*, an anonymous collection of biographies of emperors, probably written around the fourth century, though there has been much debate about its date and origin, describes Hadrian's preferences: *amavit praeterea genus vetustum dicendi ... Ciceroni Catonem, Vergilio Ennium, Sallustio Coelium praetulit eademque iactantia de Homero ac Plautone iudicavit* (*Scriptores Historiae Augustae* 1.16).

Asianism gradually became the style of choice, and traces of its influence in Apuleius, Tertullian and Aulus Gellius led to the association of this style with writers of, probably, African origin (Apuleius and Tertullian, certainly, Aulus Gellius, possibly) and thus to the suggestion that many of the features of Asianism could in fact be *Africitas,* if such a thing could be said to exist. However, there is nothing to suggest either that African writers universally use the Asiatic style, or, on the other hand, that Asianism was unknown outside Africa. Styles in speech and writing change over time, as has been frequently remarked before; as Holford-Strevens remarks, 'The Younger Pliny can no more be confused with Cicero than Statius with Vergil'.[96]

Jonathan Powell, in discussing the Prologue to Apuleius' *Metamorphoses,* makes some significant remarks about the question of whether a distinct African style of Latin existed.[97]

---

[96] Holford-Strevens 2003, 355
[97] Powell 2001, 27-36

He criticises the distinction made by Edward Barber, in chapter 5 of that book, between the 'barbarous dialect of the province' and the literary Latin of North African authors, suggesting that, whilst such authors might well have displayed local nuances when speaking standard Latin, there was no specific African form of the language. 'There is no *a priori* reason why there should not have been a local North African style of Latin, the problem is that it is extremely difficult to identify such a thing in a methodologically rigorous way'.[98] In an analysis of some specific words used in the Prologue he suggests that features in the Prologue often described as 'vulgar' were examples of the 'ordinary contemporary speech of Apuleius' time and place than in the formal and conservative register used, in, for example, the *Apologia'*.[99] The references to Apuleius are, I submit, significant, since Apuleius is the only non-Christian writer roughly contemporary with Tertullian. The language of the *Metamorphoses*, a novel is, as Powell says, clearly different in style from that of the *Apologia* which, in many ways, shares linguistic features with Tertullian's *Apologeticus.*

It would seem that the rediscovery of classical literature at the time of the Renaissance led to the exaltation of the older 'Attic' style of Latin oratory over the more florid and colourful 'Asiatic' style. Apart from the references to *Africitas* in the Renaissance period mentioned above, the question of 'African' language does not surface again until the latter part of the nineteenth century. The next mention of the term *Africitas* appears in 1867 in Michael Zink's discussion of the fifth century African writer Fulgentius.[100] In 1882 the publication of Karl Sittl's *Die Verschiedenheiten der lateinischen Sprache* gave rise to a great debate about African Latin in general and the existence of *Africitas* in particular, details of which I now propose to consider, focussing in particular on Sittl.[101] Whilst it could be argued that, since

---

[98] Powell 2001, 28
[99] Powell 200, 29
[100] Zink 1867, 37-64
[101] Sittl 1882

the work of Sittl, together with the supporters of his theories, such as Wölfflin and Monceaux, and his detractors, Norden, Kroll and Brock, are products of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, they have no relevance to the present day, presenting, to the modern mind, a somewhat rigid and static view of language development, I suggest that their relevance to African writing, which is largely Christian, is significant. The views expressed by Sittl and others need, in my opinion, to be reassessed and examined in the light of the insights of sociolinguistics and contemporary views on language.

Whilst Sittl's views are very much of his time and, as has been said, insofar as they have been studied at all, largely discounted, I would submit that more detailed study of his work is needed, particularly with reference to the relevance of *Africitas* to the existence or not of a specific Christian Latinity. I therefore, in what follows, examine the main tenets Sittl expresses in *Die lokalen Verschiedenheiten der lateinischen Sprache.*

1.2.2 Sittl *Die lokale Verschiedenheiten der lateinischen Sprache*

Sittl puts forward arguments for the existence of a specific African dialect of Latin, quoting contemporary references to the perceived peculiarities of the spoken language, in particular Jerome's reference to *stridor Punicus* (*Epistula* 97) . He refers to the oft quoted term *tumor Africus*, saying that, whilst there have been various attempts to define this term, he would interpret it as referring to certain, mainly pleonastic, Latin usages due possibly to the influence on 'African' Latin of traces of a Semitic language.[102] As mentioned previously, such terms as *stridor Punicus* and *tumor Africus* are not terms the modern mind finds acceptable but need to be recognised as the usage of the times in which they appear, be it the third century (Jerome) or the nineteenth (Sittl). Sittl does not specify the Semitic language to which he is referring but this is probably Punic, the widespread Semitic language referred to by

---

[102] Sittl 1882, 92ff

Apuleius and others. Apuleius, in his *Apologia,* makes frequent reference to his own linguistic competence in Latin and Greek and derides, for instance, the young Sicinius Prudens, *loquitur nunquam nisi Punice et si quid adhuc a matre graecissat, enim Latine loqui neque vult neque potest* (*Apologia* 98.26-7 Butler and Owen text).

One could also mention in this context the reference in the *Historia Augusta* (*Septimius Severus* 15.7) to the sister of Septimius Severus being sent back to Africa since, by *vix Latine loquens,* obviously meaning, in this context, by not being able to speak 'good' Latin, she caused him embarrassment. Modern parallels could be adduced where, although regional variations in speech are, in our twenty-first century, not only tolerated but encouraged, by using varieties of regional speech in the media, for example, there might indeed be problems for someone whose speech did not 'fit in'. Apuleius certainly, and Tertullian and Fronto possibly, were speakers of Punic but since they were Rome-educated professionals, steeped in Ciceronian oratorical techniques, it would seem highly unlikely this would have had much influence on their formal use of Latin, either oral or written . The whole question of bilingualism in the ancient world has been extensively studied by Adams and others.[103]

Juvenal refers to Africa as *nutricula causidicorum. accipiat te Gallia, vel potius nutricula causidicorum Africa, si placuit mercedem ponere linguae* (*VII* 148). John Martyn quotes a definition from Ernout of *nutricula* as a 'diminutive de tendresse' and 'as an example of diminutives "for comic or satiric effect" '. Martyn also observes that Juvenal uses *causidicus* 'as a contemptuous alternative for *orator'.* [104] However, Minucius Felix is described by Jerome as, *Romae insignis causidicus* (*De Viris Illustribus* 58*)* and by Lactantius *Minucius Felix non ignobilis inter causidicos loci fuit* (*Divinae Institutiones* 5.1.21.*)*

---

[103] Adams 2002 and 2003, Rochette 2011, 549-563
[104] Martyn 1964, 121-123

Augustine, writing rather later, observes *per Punicum interpretem* (*Epistula* 108.14*)* and *aptum loco illi congruumque requirebam qui et Punica lingua esset instructus* (*Epistula* 209.3). A knowledge of a local language in order to communicate, teach and preach, however, is a different matter from the local language influencing writing and speech. These comments would suggest a certain extent of monolingualism on both sides, though it is likely that Augustine had some knowledge of Punic.

Many of the examples cited below, which Sittl adduces in support of his proposition that *Africitas* formed a distinct variation of Latin, are found in Apuleius and elsewhere.[105] In order to demonstrate the influence of 'Semitisms' on Latin, Sittl cites, firstly, the use of noun and a synonymous genitive, giving examples from Minucius Felix, whilst admitting that this is a strange source, given Minucius' careful 'classical' style, *inritae policitationis cassa vota* (*Octavius* 12.1), *execrationis horrorem* (*Octavius* 28.6). This device, with the genitive of an abstract noun, where one would expect an adjective, is found frequently in Apuleius and Arnobius, and Sittl cites many examples from Arnobius, for example, *multiplicationis adducat accessio* (*Adversus Nationes* 2.24), *dubitationis ambiguo* (*Adversus Nationes* 1.42) and many more. Sittl admits that this construction is not used by Fronto or Gellius or, significantly, Tertullian, though Sittl's *wie es scheint* with reference to the latter might indicate an element of doubt. Sittl's abundance of further examples from later periods need not concern us here.

Secondly, Sittl describes the extension of the above, which he considers even more 'Semitic', namely the use of a genitive and nominative of the same word, in order to reinforce the relevant concept, for example, *summa summarum, reliquiae reliquiarum,* and, from Tertullian, *episcopus episcoporum* (*De Pudicitia* 1). Sittl cites examples from Augustine and

---

[105] Sittl 1882, 94 ff

from liturgical and Biblical texts, for example, *rex regum, sancta sanctorum,* representing a literal translation of the Hebrew. Sittl admits this 'Hebraic' use is found in the Edda, and, Brock adds, in old German and Lithuanian. Brock cites examples from such wide-ranging sources as Plautus *rex regum* (*Captivi* 825), noting that Cicero employs a similar example: *quod ipsi Agamemnoni, regum regi* (*Ad Familiares* 9.14.2), Martial, *princeps principum* (*Epigrams* VI.4) and Seneca*, ducem ducum* (*Medea* 233)*,* in order to demonstrate that this usage cannot be said to be specifically 'Semitic' or African.[106] One could also recall in this connection, Paul's defence of his credentials: Ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραίων (Philippians 3.5), where the Semitic connection is clearly intended.

Thirdly, Sittl mentions, as examples of the pleonasm which he maintains is a characteristic of African Latin, the combination of a synonymous adjective and noun, and whilst admitting in this instance that this is not exclusively African, cites examples from Arnobius, eg, *incipiens .... nativitas* (1.2), *profundas .... altitudines* (1.38).[107] In this context Sittl also notes the use of several synonyms, both verbs and nouns, citing, significantly, Minucius Felix once more: *aegre se ferre, stomachari, indignari, dolere, inliteratos, pauperes, imperitos ...* (16.5). Although Sittl cites examples from African writers, the use of synonymy, as he admits, is, along with *variatio,* common in literary Latin and examples are not confined to Africa.

Sittl adds to the above, supposed manifestations of the *tumor Africus*, historic infinitives.[108] Whilst admitting the classical provenance of this usage, and the influence of rhetorical practices of the second century, he attributes greater use of this device to the supposed African *Überschwänglichkeit* (exuberance) He notes that, whilst Tacitus makes use

---

[106] Brock 1911, 213-4
[107] Sittl 1882, 95
[108] Sittl 1882, 104

of a chain of 10 (*Agricola* 38), Apuleius has 12 (*Metamorphoses* 8.17), though there appear to be only four in this passage, and Fronto, Sittl asserts, excels them all with 17.[109] Again, one might well argue, following Adams, that this, like the other examples, is not a specific example of *Africitas* but classic archaism, associated particularly with the tradition of Cato and Sallust.[110] Brock also recognises this, citing examples from Plautus, Sallust and Tacitus.[111]

Sittl cites several other syntactical features which he considers typical of 'African' style, particularly the 'well-worn' use of comparatives and superlatives where a positive would suffice. This he ascribes once again to *der Überschwänglichkeit des afrikanischen Temperamentes* (sic), a viewpoint characteristic of his time, which modern sensibilities find totally unacceptable, quite apart from any doubts there may be that this usage is, in fact, 'African', since it appears elsewhere too. Sittl maintains, however, that the greatest number of incidences are 'African'. He also cites examples of a comparative strengthened with *magis*; *magis irritatiores* (Apuleius *Metamorphoses* 9.36)*; magis angustiora* (Terullian *De Spectaculis* 13). *Magis* might not be a strict comparative; it could be more like *potius*, 'but rather a bit irritated' (as, for instance, *mais*, *ma*, etc.in Romance). Of course, Apuleius could be playing with this double meaning. Other variations of degrees of comparison cited are the use of a superlative and positive together, or positive and superlative, comparative and superlative. Such hypercharacterisation is crosslinguistically common. However, any possible variation of comparison is, according to Sittl, more common in African writers than elsewhere. Many of those features discussed by Sittl appear as characteristics of Apuleius,

---

[109] Since Sittl does not give an exact reference I have not been able to check this.
[110] Adams 2007, 517-518
[111] Brock 1911, 219

who, although of African origin, received, as did Tertullian, much of his education and oratorical training in Rome.

A problem in attempting, as Sittl does, to demonstrate a specific 'African' form of Latin would, it seems to me, to be that most literary Latin of the period under discussion emanates to a greater or lesser degree from Africa, with the result that there is very little specifically 'non-African' material extant with which to make a comparison. Thus Adams is, in my opinion, right, to dismiss all these usages as 'widespread, not exclusively African, and not to be attributed to Semitic influence'[112]. However, some of Sittl's theories are still worth considering, even though a present-day world-view is much more flexible and less willing to accept hard and fast conclusions drawn from such evidence as that adduced over a hundred years ago.

Sittl cites various instances from his day in his condemnation of those who deny *Africitas;* Kretschmann doubts the existence of *Africitas*: *fügt jedoch vorsichtig hinzu - si Apulei nostri solius rationem habemus'*;[113] Koziol has as a subtitle *ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis des sogennanten afrikanischen Lateins* and casts doubt on others' belief in *Africitas.* [114] The language of Sittl and of some of those he cites is very forceful; Jordan refers to *Nebelbild, genannt schwülstige Africitas,* and Sittl also cites from him a quote against Mommsen: *Africitatis proprietatis videbor tetigisse eis qui in hoc vastum tanquam sterquilinium omnia coniciunt ... contra urbani sermonis classicitatem indulserunt* (*Vindiciae sermonis Latini antiquissimi, Regim* 1882, 18). He also cites Jordan's student, Becker: *ita vero quae hodie de Africitatis quae dicitur vana imagine dicti viri saepe hariolantur ...* (*Studia Apuleiana* 7ff). [115] Clearly Sittl's views, and those of his opponents, aroused fierce debate in his day. Whilst all

---

[112] Adams 2007, 517
[113] Kretschmann 1865, 33, cited in Sittl 1882, 78
[114] Heinrich Koziol 1872, cited in Sittl 1882, 78-9
[115] Jordan 1882 and Becker 1879, 7 ff., cited in Sittl 1882, 78-9

this derogatory language is unacceptable to twenty-first century ears, yet these ideas are, I would submit, well worth re-examining, at least in outline, since the whole question of 'Christian' Latin is concerned with the need to communicate beliefs and concepts to many different levels of society.

However, in spite of opponents even in his own day, Sittl is insistent upon the existence of *Africitas.* He certainly seeks to make a strong case for his thesis; *Wo so wenige Vorarbeiten vorhanden sind, kann die Kraft eines Einzigen, auch wenn er die fast übermenschliche Geduld besässe, so viele inhaltsleere Bände zu lesen, die ausserordentlich reichen Quellen nicht erschöpfen; aber es dürfte schon in dem blossen Versuche, das afrikanische Latein von einer möglichst breiten Basis aus zu behandeln, ein Verdienst liegen.*[116] (Since so few previous studies are available, even the efforts of one person, even someone with almost superhuman patience, to read so many volumes with very little relevant content, would not exhaust the extraordinary rich sources. However, it should be possible at least to use these sources to make the attempt to deal with African Latin on as wide a basis as possible). It is clear that the debate at the end of the nineteenth century aroused strong views.

In his examination of *Africitas* Sittl refers to 'vulgar' Latin, which I have already discussed. It is significant that, ten years later, possibly with the calmer insights of greater maturity, Sittl should retract many of his former views. However, this retraction is not specifically of *Africitas* but of *Vulgärlatein.* In this recantation, part of a lengthy *Jahresbericht,* Sittl refers almost exclusively to *Vulgärlatein* with only a passing reference to *Africitas,* where however, he admits, *Was ich dagegen für Punismen erklärte (S.92ff.), muss und kann alles auf andere Weise erklärt.*[117] (However, what I described as Punic must and can all be described in a different way).

---

[116] Sittl 1882, 80
[117] Sittl 1891, 246

1.2.3 The Debate for and against *Africitas*

Two scholars of the late nineteenth century, in particular, expressed similar views to Sittl. In 1880 Eduard Wölfflin discussed *Africitas*, in a study of the Latin of Cassius Felix, a fifth century African physician.[118] Wölfflin was editor of the *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik,* in which other articles on the subject appeared, notably one in 1893 by Bernhard Kübler, *Die lateinische Sprache auf afrikanischen Inschriften.*[119] Kübler, writing just over ten years after the appearance of Sittl's monograph, takes, as would be expected in a publication edited by Wölfflin, basically the same line as Sittl. A few points are, however, in my opinion, worth noting. Although referring to the same, so-called 'African' characteristics described by Sittl, Wölfflin and others, characteristics which were supposedly influenced *von der Glut der südlicheren Sonne* (the ardour of the southern sun and in which *hitziges Blut in ihren Adern pulsierte,* (hot blood throbs in their veins) leading to the *Überschwenglichkeit der Ausdrücke,*) (exuberant expressions) which strike the modern mind as distinctly racist, Kübler maintains that these idiosyncrasies of style arose from the traits of individual writers rather than being influenced by local language customs.[120] However, Kübler asserts that, if there are examples of word usage, vocabulary, sentence structure which appear to be common to writers of African origin, and which do not appear in writers from elsewhere in the Roman Empire; *war dann nicht der Beweis geliefert für die Existenz einer eigentümlichen Gestaltung der lateinischen Sprache in Afrika, mit einem Worte der Africitas latina*? (Doesn't this, then, provide proof for the existence of an idiosyncratic form of the Latin language in Africa, in other words, the Latin described as *Africitas*?).[121] Kübler also maintains that, whilst most writers of the period would attempt to write elegant and correct

---

[118] Wöfflin 1880, I, 381-432
[119] Kübler 1893, 162
[120] Kübler 1894, 162
[121] Kübler 1894, 163

Latin, there was a group of notable exceptions to this, namely, the Fathers. He points out that, although there were those, amongst whom he mentions Lactantius and Augustine, who would write in the classical style of Cicero and Quintilian, there were many others who deliberately abandoned the traditional style in order to communicate with local speakers. However, although such writers *vom heiligem Eifer getrieben, ihre früher erlangte Bildung als Eitelkeit der Welt und verderblichen Flitter verachten,* (driven by holy zeal, dismiss their earlier upbringing as worldly conceit and perishable vanity) when seeking to communicate, they could not completely ignore their earlier education.[122] Kübler mentions in this connection, Jerome: *Wie wenig zum Beispiel der heilige Hieronymus seine guten Vorsätze in diese Beziehung zur Ausführung brachte, ist bekannt.*(It is well-known how little, for example, in this connection, Jerome brought his good intentions to fulfilment). [123] This view, I suggest, though not one which is dealt with explicitly by Wölfflin or Sittl, sheds a further light on the question of *Africitas* and is thus worth mentioning. However, since, as the title of this article makes clear, Kübler's main consideration is inscriptions, he then proceeds in the rest of the article to discuss these particular contributions to an African vernacular.

Another scholar expressing similar views to those of Sittl, particularly with reference to the perceived influence of African temperament and climate on the language, was Paul Monceaux, who, in his book *Les africains* of 1894 wrote:

> Dans l'histoire des lettres latines, le génie africain, ses créations originales comme ses bizarreries s'expliquent par la combinaison de la culture gréco-romaine et de l'imagination orientale sous l'action toujours persistante du libre tempérament indigène et du climat. (In the history of Latin writing, the African spirit, its original creations, like its peculiarities, can be explained by the combination of Greco-Roman culture and the oriental imagination under the effect of the always persistent indigenous free temperament and the climate).[124]

---

[122] Kübler 1894, 165
[123] Kübler 1894, 165.
[124] Monceaux 1894, 4

Both Sittl and Monceaux's attitudes strike a distinctly uncomfortable note in the twenty-first century but, provided the social and historical context of the time is borne in mind, shed an interesting light on a time when such linguistic ideas were first being worked out. Silvia Mattiaci rightly comments

> … the risk of racism is clear, as is the lack of historical perspective shown in considering Roman Africa as an organism independent of the Roman Empire and, consequently, African Latinity as an isolated linguistic entity.[125]

Kroll disagrees with many of Sittl's views, though he suggests that in the second century writers of African origin begin to show traces of the influence of an African spoken dialect on written Latin, describing the Latin of Apuleius as a *fremdartiger Eindruck* when compared with, for example, Cicero. Since there is no later Romance form of language in Africa which might have developed from Latin, as in Gaul and Spain, for instance, it is not possible to trace the origins of any specific African dialect of Latin. However, at the end of the second century there was a development demonstrated when Tertullian

> alle Schleusen öffnet und, ohne sich an die bisher geltende, hauptsächlich durch Ciceros Purismus geschaffene Schriftsprachliche Norm im Mindesten zu kehren, so schreibt wie etwa ein Mann aus dem Volke in Karthago sprach.(opened all the floodgates and without in the least returning to the previously accepted norms established through Cicero's 'pure' written language, wrote in the manner of 'the man in the Carthage street'.)[126]

In his article Kroll points out the difficulty of defining a distinct African Latinity and suggests that the features of this are due to more to factors of time rather than place. It is too easy, says Kroll, to come to the false conclusion that, since there are characteristics of Latin writing which are found in writers of known African origin, such as Apuleius, other writings of the period, whose origin is not necessarily known, which exhibit similar characteristics, should

---

[125] Mattiaci, 2014, 89
[126] Kroll 1897, 569-590

also have originated in Africa. He cites as examples Gellius, Porphyry, the *Appendix Probi,* Cassius Felix, the whole of the *Itala* and even Latin translations of *Hermas,* Irenaeus and I Clement.[127]

Kroll's arguments in *das afrikanische Latein* focus on the influence of spoken language on writing and issues such as 'vulgarism', archaism, and the atticism/asianism debate.[128] These matters form the foundations of later debate on the existence or otherwise of *Africitas* and its relationship to other forms of Latin of the late second and early third centuries. Kroll's conclusion to this paper sums this up:

> Ich wiederhole es zum Schlusse noch einmal: es wäre Unrecht zu leugnen, dass in der Zeit des Apuleius und Tertullian die Ansätze zu einer Sonderentwicklung des in Afrika gesprochenen Lateins vorhanden gewesen sein können. Aber das uns überkommene sprachliche Material ist nicht der Art, dass es uns gestattet über diese Dialekticismen (sic) mehr zu erfahren als einige unsichere Einzelheiten. (Finally, I repeat once again: it would be wrong to deny that at the time of Apuleius and Tertullian there could be found signs of the development of a particular form of spoken Latin in Africa. However, the spoken material which has come down to us is not enough to enable us to distinguish more than a few unreliable examples of these 'dialect' words). [129]

Thus, since this study investigates the origins and reception of the early expression of Christian Latin it is, in my opinion, important to consider the wider debate from earlier periods on the Latin of the period under discussion. Sittl's arguments are certainly not convincing to the modern mind but provide a valid insight into the gradual development of the understanding of Latin at that time, as also do Kroll's, whose examination of the same matters clearly lead on to later views.

Another writer, slightly later, in 1911, to cast doubts on Sittl and Monceaux was Dorothy Brock, in her book on Fronto who, as others have also commented, makes the point

---

[127] Kroll 1897, 570-571.
[128] See discussion in earlier sections, 1.1.4, 32 and 1.2.1.1, 44
[129] Kroll 1897, 590

that, since there is virtually no Latin writing from the second and third centuries which was not by writers of African origin, any argument for a specific African Latinity is purely *ex silentio* and that such features as archaisms and vulgarisms attributed to an African form of the language were probably influenced by the spoken language of the time.[130] Brock concludes:

> African Latin was simply the Latin of the whole Empire at that particular time when Classicism was dying out and vulgarism forcing its way into literature.[131]

However, the final condemnation of the *Africitas* theory in this period was by Eduard Norden, who, in his monumental work, *Die antike Kunstprosa*, dismisses *Afrikitas* in no uncertain words:

> Das 'afrikanische' Latein ist unter den argen Phantomen, die in der Stil- und Literaturgeschichte ihr Wesen treiben, eins der ärgsten, und es ist, denke ich, an der Zeit, es endlich wieder in das Dunkel zu bannen, dem es entstiegen ist. ('African' Latin is, among the bad phenomena that have made their presence felt in the history of style and literature, one of the very worst, and in my opinion it is high time to consign this one to the darkness from which it arose.) [132]

The contemporary view might well express a heartfelt 'amen' to this statement. However, in my opinion, there is a place for revisiting and re-evaluating such a concept as *Africitas,* reading it in the context of its time, since this has bearing on my main topic, early Christian Latin writing. As soon as one begins any attempt to explore when, how and whether Christian writing in Latin developed an identity of its own, as distinct from any other Latin writing of the period, one immediately encounters the question of African Latin. The problem is that, in discussing, as I am, the period from the end of the second century to the middle of the third, such writing which is extant, whether Christian or not, appears to originate from

---

[130] Brock 1911, 161-260
[131] Brock 1911, 260
[132] Norden 1898, Band II, 588

North Africa. The lack of Latin literature at this period emanating from Rome, or other

provinces of the Empire such as Gaul, leads inevitably to the consideration of whether early

Christian writing differs from what has gone before because it is Christian, or because it is

African. Bound up with this, therefore, is the question of whether 'African' Latin differs from

any other form of Latin or whether this so-called 'African' Latin is the norm for the language.

It is for this reason, therefore, that I have devoted a considerable part of this introductory

chapter to considerations of *Africitas* and associated matters which might, taken out of

context, be considered not to be relevant to twenty-first century study of the Latin of the

second and third centuries.

In the next chapter of this thesis, where the focus will shift to the examination of

previous scholarship concerned with early Christian Latin, this earlier background exposition

will prove to be important, particularly as a necessary foundation to the examination of the

work of the first two major Christian writers, Tertullian and Cyprian, both of them originating

from North Africa.

1.2.4 Later views on *Africitas*

The only significant examination of 'African' Latin in modern times is that by J. N.

Adams, who introduces his chapter on Africa thus:

> African Latin, often referred to as *Africitas, …* has had a bad name since Kroll
> (1897) delivered his attack on the material adduced by Sittl (1882, 92-143) to
> demonstrate features of the Latin of the province. Sittl's material is indeed
> unconvincing, but that does not mean that African Latin is without regional
> features.[133]

Adams cites various examples of sub-literary Latin texts emanating from North Africa, which

betray elements of borrowings from Punic or possibly Libyan. These include various medical

texts, an adaptation/translation into Latin of Soranus' *Gynaecia*, Cassius Felix, the Bu Njem

---

[133] Adams 2007, 516

ostraca and the *Tablettes Albertini*, 45 wooden writing tablets discovered in 1928 on the borders of Algeria and Tunisia, consisting largely of deeds of sale, containing many spelling errors and uncertainty in the use of cases, thus demonstrating a low level of Latin, but also including technical terms specific to land distribution and so on which are clearly of African origin.

Adams is not concerned with Christian writing and his remarks here are practically the only contemporary reference to the discussion of any African Latin. Moreover, in his section on 'Africa' Adams deals with very different material from Sittl, material which, while interesting, is not relevant to the purposes of this study;

> 'If one looks beyond the high literary texts discussed by Sittl and others as supposedly exemplifying *Africitas* to more mundane works, such as medical texts and non-literary documents, one finds that it is indeed possible to attribute certain texts to Africa on linguistic grounds and to identify some of the features of the local Latin.[134]

Adams continues, shortly afterwards: 'I will address the question that is the title of Lancel's paper: was there *Africitas*? The answer will be affirmative, but African Latin is not to be found where Sittl looked for it.'[135] However, Adams does admit that 'not all of Sittl's evidence has been totally discredited.'[136] He discusses two usages which, he concedes, might possibly be 'Africanisms'. Firstly, *quantum etiam* (=*sed etiam*) (cited in Sittl 137-8 as appearing in Fulgentius), examples of which Braun also finds in earlier sources and considers this expression to derive from a conflation of *non tantum …. quantum* and *non tantum …. sed etiam.*[137] Lancel concedes that in this rare case Sittl might be right.[138] Adams comments, 'the

---

[134] Adams 2007, 516
[135] Adams 2007, 516
[136] Adams 2007, 519 ff
[137] Braun 1962, 133-5
[138] Lancel 1985, 173

construction might have developed by means of conflation in an African writer and then been picked up by others; it is at best a "literary regionalism".'[139]

Adams' second example from Sittl (132-4) concerns the use of pluperfect subjunctive for imperfect, a characteristic also noted by Lancel, who, citing an example from Optatus, *petiit ut licuisset* (1.26) accepts that this usage is found mainly, even if not exclusively, in African authors, but notes that, as has been pointed out elsewhere in this study, there is a paucity of non-African texts to provide a comparison.[140] Adams notes that, although Sittl maintained that this was a feature of African Latin, he also cited examples from non-African writers and Sittl also noted that the usage had been observed by Koehler in *Bellum Hispaniense*.[141] However, Adams adds in a footnote that he does not consider Koehler's examples 'entirely convincing' and concludes, 'it is not clear why some have thought this usage mainly African'.[142]

Whilst these two examples have little relevance to this study as a whole, I include them as possibly the only instance of a pre-eminent contemporary scholar dealing with the field of Latinity actually considering Sittl.

1.3 *Excursus.* Sittl's Views of Biblical Latin

In view of the topic of this thesis Sittl's views on Biblical Latin are of relevance and I summarise and comment upon them in this final section of the chapter. At the end of *die lokalen Verschiedenheiten* he produces an *excursus, Die Heimat der sogenannten Itala* in which he discusses the origin of the earliest Latin Bible translations, using the term *Itala.*[143] This term derives from a disputed passage in Augustine's *de Doctrina Christina*, where,

---

[139] Adams 2007, 520
[140] Lancel 1985, 168 n. 34
[141] Koehler 1877, 367-476
[142] Adams 2007, 520
[143] Sittl 1882, 46-152

referring to his earlier discussion about Biblical translation and interpretation, Augustine says*: in ipsis autem interpretationibus Itala ceteris praeferatur, nam est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiae* (2.15). It was used by writers of his age, and later, to describe pre-Vulgate Latin Biblical translations.[144] Modern scholarship prefers to use the term *Vetus Latina* to describe pre-Vulgate Latin Biblical translations.

Sittl finds incomprehensible the view of some scholars of his day that the *Itala* had its origin in Africa and betrayed traces of 'African' Latin. The fact that all extant early Christian writing originates from Africa is, he asserts, no reason to suppose that the earliest Bible texts are written in 'African' Latin. He therefore also dismisses the suggestion that all fragments of pre-Tertullian Biblical citations point back to one, original, Latin translation, but concedes that many betray the influence of previous versions.[145] However, Sittl suggests that Tertullian 's Bible was 'African', in support of which he cites examples of word usage quoted by Rönsch and Ziegler. Sittl suggests that Cyprian's Bible, also shows traces of African origin, since his, (presumably Biblical) citations agree with those of Lactantius, Commodianus and Primasius, though he admits that 'African' words are almost completely absent.[146]

Modern views of this would wish to add that it is generally accepted that Tertullian's Biblical citations are not consistent, suggesting that he is either quoting from memory or, more likely, producing his own translation from the Greek, supporting the theory that he was not using a written Latin Biblical translation, whilst Cyprian is consistent in his citations, often separating them from his own comments by using such expressions as *dominus dicit,*

---

[144] Schildenberger 1952, cited in Burton 2000
[145] This same view of the possibility is suggested in modern times by Houghton, though he does admit that the theory is not without its problems, Houghton 2016, 13.
[146] Sittl 1882 149, Also cited in Wordsworth, Sanday and White Oxford 1886

apud, Scriptura sancta, indicating that Cyprian is almost certainly quoting from a known Latin Bible.[147]

In his *Jahresbericht* of 1891, Sittl expresses his view of the Biblical influence on 'vulgar' Latin *Da die Bibel den Christen über der heidnischen Litteratur stehen musse, konnte auch ihre sprachliche Autorität keine geringere sein.* (Since the Christian Bible must stand above pagan literature, its linguistic standing can likewise have the same authority). [148] The problem will be to discover what Sittl means when referring to *die Bibel.* Since my study is concerned with pre-Vulgate citations, this question is very pertinent. Sittl did not, of course, have the advantage of the work, ongoing, of the *Vetus Latina* project, and since the main source of Latin Biblical citations is from the early Fathers, it is not possible to know whether these are quotations from a particular translation, unknown to us, or from memory. The question of the *Itala* has been mentioned earlier. Sittl is well aware of this problem:

> nur sei daran erinnert, daß *Itala* womöglich noch falscher als *Vulgärlatein* ist und daß die von der *Vulgata* abweichenden Übersetzungen lange nicht alle vorhieronymianisch sind; denn übersetzt wurde die griechische Bibel noch im Mittelalter. Vorhieronymianisch dürfen, genau genommen, nur die Citate der alteren Kirchenväter heißen. (In this connection it must be remembered that the *Itala* is possibly even more inaccurate than 'Vulgar Latin' and that the translations which differ from the Vulgate have for a long time not all been considered to be pre-Jerome; for the Greek Bible was not translated until the Middle Ages. Only citations from the Fathers can be said to be termed pre-Jerome.)[149]

Sittl adds some observations on the problems of Biblical translation. He cites Augustine on the strong influence of familiarity;

> quamquam tanta est vis consuetudinis etiam ad discendum, ut, qui in scripturis sanctis quodammodo nutriti educati que sunt, magis alias locutiones mirentur easque minus latinas putent quam illas, quas in scripturis didicerunt neque in latinae linguae auctoribus reperiuntur. (*De Doctrina Christiana,* 2.14)

---

147 See chapter 3, Tertullian and the Bible, 3.4, 153 and chapter 4, 4.6.1, 515, also Houghton, 2016, 6-14.
148 Sittl 1891, 239
149 Sittl 1891, 249

Sittl claims that the less worldly the upbringing of a theologian, the more he sought to express himself in Biblical words. *umgekehrt enthielten sich die Apologeten und überhaupt alle, welche zu der heidnischen Welt oder den Gelehrten sprachen, so viel als möglich der biblischen Anspielungen* (The reverse was the case for the Apologists, and particularly all who were addressing the pagan world or scholars, who refrained as far as possible from using Biblical allusions).[150] Of the Old Testament, only the Psalms were well known, sometimes having been learnt by heart. Characteristics of Biblical Latin varied. Various translations from Greek and occasionally Hebrew led to variations in Latin. A good example of the arguments and disagreements between early translators was the celebrated *cucurbita* incident which concerned the correct botanical meaning of the word used to describe the plant which sheltered Jonah in chapter 4.6, translated in old English as 'gourd' and 'vine' in modern English. At the centre of this argument was Jerome, proud to assert himself a *vir trilinguis,* who translated the Hebrew קִיקָיֹון as *hedera,* ivy, whereas in the Old Latin and in the Septuagint this was rendered *cucurbita.* Jerome's defence was that the plant was *ciceia in* Syriac and Punic, a fast growing bush found in dry areas of Palestine, for which there was no equivalent in Latin, hence, in order to avoid coining a new word, *hedera,* rather than using *cucurbita,* much as the NIV (New International Version) in English has 'vine' or 'leafy plant' rather than the KJV 'gourd' a word which is unfamiliar to most modern English speakers.[151] Augustine comments, in a letter to Jerome:

> Unde illud apud Ionam virgultum, si in Hebraeo nec hedera est nec cucurbita, sed nescio quid aliud quod trunco suo nixum nullis sustentandum adminiculis erigatur, mallem iam in omnibus Latinis cucurbitam legi; non enim frustra hoc puto septuaginta posuisse, nisi quia et huic simile sciebant. (*Ad Hieronymum* Epistula 82)

[150] Sittl 1891, 239
[151] Rebenich 1993, 50-77

There were disagreements between a translator, who wanted to produce a book for reading, and the view of early Christians, who regarded it as a matter of piety to be as true as possible to the holy words. *Ihr Ziel war also zu keiner Zeit eine lesbare lateinische Bibel, sondern eine getreue Interlinear version* (Their goal was to produce an accurate interlinear version rather than a readable Latin Bible.)[152] Luther, Sittl, recalls, had the same sort of problem (as, one might add, do modern translators and interpreters).[153] Sittl also refers to the appearance of a Latin which bore a particular Hebrew character (see his remarks in *'die lokale Verschiedenheiten'* on 'semitisms' such as the *tumor Africus* referred to earlier).[154] He asserts that Jerome was able to lessen this, but not make it disappear completely and expresses the view that the Bible subsequently had an immense influence because it reached a wider audience, hence the similarities between *Bibelsprache* and *Vulgärlatein*; *wären unsere Philologen in der lateinischen Bibel etwas belesener, würden Beobachtungen nicht mangeln.* (If our philologists were more familiar with the Latin Bible there would be no lack of observations about it.) [155] The whole topic of Biblical translation and the wider question of its origins is extremely important but is beyond the scope of the present study. However, some aspects of this subject will be touched on in later chapters.

Sittl mentions the question of how language was used to preach the Christian gospel and refers to the story of Chrysostom being asked by a woman during a sermon to speak in a way which she could understand.[156] In Christian literature can be found many examples of those who were hopefully stronger in belief than in grammar. This problem, which today we would probably describe as a question of register, and which is familiar to those of us who

---

[152] Sittl 1891, 240
[153] Luther 1530
[154] Sittl 1882, 90ff
[155] Sittl 1891, 241
[156] Sittl 1889, 246

seek to interpret Christian beliefs in a manner 'understood of the people' was well known. Augustine, as a preacher, expressed this when he wrote:

> Christus, inquit, Iesus, id est Christus salvator, hoc est enim latine Iesus, nec quaerant grammatici quam sit latinum, sed christiani quam verum. Salus enim latinum nomen est, salvare et salvator non fuerunt haec latina antequam veniret salvator: quando a latinos venit et haec latina fecit. (*Sermones* 299.6).

1.4 Conclusion

In the present day much work has been done on the Latin of the second and third centuries, notably by Adams, Müller, Herman, Rosén and the contributors to the compendium 'Colloquial and Literary Latin' much of which includes discussion of the vexed term 'vulgar Latin' and its definition. A summary of such writing formed the earlier part of this chapter. I then examined the relevance of *Africitas* to the study of early Christian writing. It is clear that the concept of *Africitas*, as discussed by various nineteenth century scholars, is not now considered of relevance or importance, although modern linguistic study refers to it occasionally in the context of discussions about local variations in Latin. I have dealt with it in a certain amount of detail because of its relevance to any discussion of early Christian writing, virtually all of which emanated from North Africa. [157]

As pointed out in the introduction to this thesis, one of my main aims is to examine the reception of early Christian Latin writing and I therefore considered it important to look, probably for the first time since the early twentieth century, at the views of Sittl and his contemporaries. This background study, then, of the position of Latin in the period under discussion will now lead on to a consideration of specifically Christian writing in Latin.

---

[157] Adams 2007

Chapter 2 - Christian Writing in Latin

2.1   Introduction

In the previous chapter of this thesis I discussed the Latin in general use during the first and second centuries. In this chapter I explore the gradual development of Christian writing in Latin during this period and in particular its relationship to the Latin language spoken at the time, as far as this can be established. This will involve looking at such early extant examples of 'Christian' Latin as exist, and considering how scholarship has interpreted them. A major part of the chapter will consist of an examination of the theory, first proposed by Monsignor Joseph Schrijnen and followed and extended by his student, associate, and eventually successor, Christine Mohrmann, at the Catholic University of Nijmegen in the 1930s and after, that the early Christian communities adopted Latin and made it their own, as a *Sondersprache*, a special language which would distinguish them from non-believers. First, however, a general survey of the possible origins of Christian writing in Latin, as distinct from Greek.

As mentioned in chapter one, the Western Mediterranean world of the classical period was largely bilingual Greek/Latin and most Latin writing of the late and early second centuries owes a certain amount to Greek, whether in direct borrowings or calque. This was, according to Norden, particularly the case in North Africa, even though it was here that Latin gained wider currency earlier than elsewhere: *in keinem Lande war im zweiten Jahrhundert und der ersten Hälfte des dritten die Kenntnis des Griechischen mehr verbreitet.* Norden sees the Greek 'asiatic' style as lying behind the so-called 'African' Latin style: *dass der bombastische und zugleich gezierte Stil der Afrikaner nichts ist als der griechische Asianismus in lateinischem Gewande.*(in no other land in the second century and first half of

the third was the knowledge of Greek more widespread …. that the bombastic and, at the same time, affected African style was nothing other than Greek *asianism* in Latin clothing).[1]

However, as Denecker points out, the rise of Christianity changed the situation.[2] Most early Christian writing was in Greek. The canonical Gospels circulated in Greek. In addition, several scholars have made a case for a Syriac or Aramaic Gospel of Thomas, which are discussed and criticised by Gathercole in *The Composition of the Gospel of Thomas*.[3] There have also been suggestions, originating from Papias of Hierapolis, c. AD 125–150 in passages cited in Eusebius (*Ecclesiastical History* 3.39.16) that the Gospel of Matthew originally appeared in Aramaic and/or Hebrew.[4] Paul, the proudly proclaimed Roman citizen (Acts 22, 25-29) wrote in Greek, and all early extant writings, such as the *Didache* (c AD 100), the *Epistle of Barnabas* (c.75-130) and the writings of Ignatius (c 115) and Polycarp (c 126), even though some only survive in a later Latin translation, were written in Greek. In the polyglot multi-ethnic world of the early Empire, in spite of the dominance of Rome as the ruling power, Greek was still widely used.[5] Although there are references to Christianity in the Latin writers of the late first/early second century, for instance, Suetonius, *impulsore Chresto* (*Claudius* 25, 4) (if indeed this is a reference to Christianity), *afflicti suppliciis Christiani* (*Nero* 16), Tacitus ... *quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Christianos appellabat ...* (*Annales* 15, 44) and Pliny to Trajan on how he should deal with Christians (10, 96) it is not until towards the end of the second century AD that any specific Christian writing in Latin appears.

The spread of Christianity gave rise to the need to find a way of communicating the new faith, particularly to those for whom Greek was not their first language. Palmer writes:

---

[1] Norden 1898, Vol. 2, 596, 597
[2] Denecker 2017, 10
[3] Gathercole 212
[4] For an outline of the discussion see Turner 2008, 15
[5] Clackson 2015, 143-170

'there was, of course, a great deal of bilingualism in the Rome of this period. The Good News must soon have been passed on to speakers of Latin. Doubtless there was between friends of different mother tongues much stumbling and confused translation and exposition.'[6] Not, perhaps, a very helpful observation; 'stumbling and confused' was unlikely to have been the norm. Whilst new ideas and concepts require developments and extensions of current language, I hope to demonstrate that the Latin of the early Christian communities, whilst showing such developments, is closely related to the everyday language used by Latin speakers and writers of the time. Although referring to a slightly later period than that with which the present study is concerned, the following examples are relevant. Caesarius, cited by Adams, makes the point that those concerned with communicating the Christian gospel were aware that ordinary people might not be able to understand 'upper-class' or 'literary' Latin; *et haec quidem secundum litteram, sicut in libris sanctorum scriptum invenimus, caritati vestrae rustico et simplici sermone, quem toti intellegere possint, insinuanda credidimus* (*Sermones* 114.2, CC 103, 474-5).[7]

Also mentioned by Adams, and particularly relevant to any discussion of possible African Latin variants, are Augustine's insights into spoken language, for instance, that when speaking to Africans it was no good using *os* for bone, as they were not able to distinguish a short o from long and so *ossum*, as a back form from *ossa*, should be used instead, saying, amongst other references to this matter, *quod vulgo dicitur ossum, latine os dicitur* (*In Psalmos* 138.20 l.3).[8] In the same passage Augustine also makes it clear that communicating the gospel should take precedence over 'correct' speech, *ossum, sic enim potius loquamur, melius est reprehendant nos grammatici, quam non intellegant populi* (*In Psalmos* 138.20

---

[6] Palmer 1954, 184
[7] Adams 2013, 14
[8] Adams 2013, 15

l.7*). Jerome, too, is clearly aware of differences between the vulgus and those who had been taught *Latine loqui; quod -os genere masculino et non neutrali -a dicimus iuxta regulam grammaticorum, et in superioribus docui, non nos ignorantia hoc facere, sed consuetudine propter simplices quoque et indoctos quorum in congregatione ecclesiae maior est numerus.* (*Commentarii in Ezechielem liber* 14.47)

2.2.1   The earliest extant Christian Latin Writing - Acta Sanctorum Scilitanorum.

The first extant dated example of Latin writing is the *Acta Sanctorum Scilitanorum.*[9] This anonymous short account of the trial and execution of a group of Christians from Scili, (modern Chemtou, in Tunisia), probably deriving from court records, is described as being located in *Kartagine,* and it is from North Africa, particularly Carthage and the surrounding area, that most of the early Latin Christian writing emerged. The reference *Praesente bis et Claudiano consulibus, XVI kalendas augustas* (*Acta* 1) dates this to July 17, 180. Hununk comments: 'Being among the very earliest examples of Christian martyr texts from antiquity, the *Acta* is of vital importance for the history of early Christianity in the Roman provinces'.[10] This document, of which several manuscripts survive, with slight variations, appears to have been used as a text to be read on the feast of the martyrs and was known to Augustine, who quotes two separate passages, the first (*Acta Sanctorum Scilitanorum* 7) partially paraphrased but the other (*Actae* 9) corresponding exactly to the text. As Rebillard points out, Augustine thus provides the only *terminus ad quem* for the dating of this document.[11] Tertullian makes no mention of this account but does, however, mention Vigellius Saturninus, named several times in the *Acta,* as the first proconsul to have condemned Christians to death: *Vigellius Saturninus, qui primus hic gladium in nos egit ...* (Tertullian, *Ad Scapulum* 3.4).

---

[9] Text from 'the Scilitan Martyrs' in Rebillard 2017, 351-358
[10] Hunink 2016, 93-112
[11] Rebillard 2017, 351-353

Hunink further points out the straightforward and plain nature of the Latin, with some linguistic features which show influences from both spoken Latin and later Latin. He suggests as examples, the higher frequency of the use of personal pronouns: *ego imperium huius seculi non agnosco* (6) and *et nos religiosi sumus* (3), together with examples of pleonasm: *quod et nos quoque facere debetis* (3).[12] These examples, however, would seem to be inconclusive as such usages of subject pronouns are also to be found in classical Latin.

Another significant point of this document is its reference to what appear to be Biblical manuscripts, S*aturninus proconsul dixit: 'quae sunt res in capsa vestra?' Speratus dixit: 'Libri et epistulae Pauli viri iusti'*(*Acta* 12). There has been discussion about whether Speratus' answer refers solely to the writings of Paul or whether it refers to the Gospels or other documents, and Paul's letters. As Houghton says, the unpunctuated text does not make this clear, and it is also possible that Speratus originally said something like *libri evangeliorum* which the court stenographer simply omitted because he did not understand the word.[13] The word *evangeliorum*, however, does appear in the version of this text in the *Codex Parisinus Latinus* 2179, as Candida Moss, in an exploration of the significance of this document in the context of her main theme of Christian martyrdom, points out.[14] Whilst the court proceedings are in Latin, there is no indication whether the *libri et epistulae* to which Speratus refers are in Latin or Greek. However, as Houghton mentions, the reply of Speratus to the proconsul, quoting from 1 Timothy 6.16: *… magis illi deo servio, quem nemo hominum vidit nec videre his oculis potest*, is not the wording found in *Vetus Latina* manuscripts nor in the Vulgate, yet resembles in this Latin form the wording found in writings of Quodvultdeus, a fifth century Bishop of Carthage, possibly suggesting that Speratus was familiar with a

---

[12] Hunink, 2016, 98. Further analysis of this document may be found in Hunink 2020
[13] Houghton 2016, 4-5.
[14] Moss 2012, 8

Latin version of the New Testament which survived in the later form cited by Quodvultdeus.[15]

Sittl suggests that the *Acta* could also have been originally written in Greek, or, at least

existed in a Greek version.[16]

2.2.2 Passio Sanctarum Perpetuae et Felicitatis

Another significant early Christian text is that known as the *Passion of Perpetua and*

Felicitas, an account, set in North Africa, of the trial and execution of a group of

catechumens, both male and female, the most prominent of whom appears to have been

Perpetua, a young married woman of reasonably high birth. She is aged twenty two and has a

child, whom she is nursing. However, although her relationship with her father, and

marginally with her mother, is mentioned, her husband is totally absent from the story.

Felicitas, another young woman, is described as the *conserva* of Revocatus, one of the other

catechumens, which would normally mean 'fellow slave'. However, there is no clear

indication, apart from this one instance, that either Felicitas or Revocatus were, in fact, slaves.

This text, with its accounts of heavenly visions and dramatic descriptions of

martyrdom in the arena, is an example of a genre which became very popular and widespread

amongst Christian circles from the second century onwards, clearly intended to provide

encouragement for those undergoing persecution. To what extent these accounts were based

on fact, whether there was, indeed, persecution purely on account of Christian belief, and

what other sources might have influenced them, has been widely studied and discussed,

particularly by Candida Moss.[17] The earliest of these accounts, such as the *Martyrdom of*

Polycarp, for which various dates have been adduced, for instance, c.155-160 AD and that of

Justin Martyr c.165, were originally written in Greek, but the *Passio Sanctarum Perpetuae et*

---

[15] Houghton 2016, 5
[16] Sittl 1882 112 citing Aubé, 1881, 499-303
[17] Moss, 2012 and 2013. See also Moss 2010, 539-574

Felicitatis is thought to be the earliest extant example of this genre in Latin, though one of the

manuscripts also has a Greek translation. The question of priority has been much discussed,

but cannot be proven.[18]

The date of the martyrdom of the two women cannot be established with absolute

certainty but the mention in the text that the execution would take place *natale tunc Getae*

Caesaris, (*Passio* 7.9) refers to the brief rule of the emperor Geta, who, following the death of

his father, Septimius Severus, ruled jointly with his brother until his murder by the latter,

Caracalla, in 211-212. A more precise dating can also be inferred from the reference to

Hilarianus, who had replaced the previous proconsul T.Salvius Rufinus Minicius Opimianus

on his death during his year of office 203 or 204, *et Hilarianus procurator, qui tunc loco*

proconsulis Minici Timiniani defuncti ius gladii acceperat ... (*Passio* 6.3). Thus a possible

date could be 203 or 204. The Greek text suggests a later date, placing the execution in the

period of persecution under Valerian and Gallienus (257-262), There are two other shorter

versions of the text, *Acta Brevia* 1 and *Acta Brevia* 2, which also give the text the later date.[19]

However, it appears that the Perpetua account was circulating, and known, in and around

Carthage in the early part of the third century. Tertullian refers in passing to Perpetua,

implying that the account was familiar to his readers: *quomodo Perpetua, fortissima martyr,*

sub die passionis in revelatione paradisi solos illic martyras vidit …. (*de Anima* 55.4).[20] What

is considered to be the first reference to the text as a whole is by Pontius, the deacon and

biographer of Cyprian. Rebillard shows that the prologue to the *Vita Cypriani* bears

similarities to the language used at the beginning of the introduction to the *Passio Perpetuae.*

Although the following citation from the *Vita* cannot provide any proof that Pontius knew the

---

[18] see Rebillard 2017, 295 ff, also Barnes 1971, 263-266
[19] For further details of texts and dating, see Fridh 1968
[20] How is it that the most heroic martyr Perpetua on the day of her passion saw only her fellow-martyrs there, in the revelation which she received of Paradise, …. (translation - Holmes)

Passio Perpetuae it could be taken to indicate that knowledge of the *Passio Perpetuae* was circulating at the time of writing of the *Vita Cypriani* which probably dates from not long after the death of Cyprian on 14 September 258: *Certe durum erat. ut cum maiores nostri plebeis et catecuminis martyrium consecutis tantum honoris pro martyrii ipsius veneratione debuerint, ut de passionibus eorum multa aut ut prope dixerim paene cuncta conscripserint ....(Vita* 1.2).[21]

There are three main features of the uniqueness of this text. Firstly, it recounts the martyrdom of figures otherwise unknown, so that, unlike the accounts of, for instance Polycarp and Justin Martyr, there is no account of their writings nor are there many biographical details; secondly, the two most prominent figures in this account are women, and, thirdly, it is claimed by the editor that a substantial portion was written by Perpetua herself: *haec ordinem totum martyrii sui tam hinc ipsa narravit sicut conscriptum* **manu sua** *et suo sensu reliquit* (2.3). The work consists of three parts; firstly, the two first-person sections ascribed by the editor to Perpetua herself, which describe her visions, secondly, a further first-person section, also describing a vision, ascribed to Saturus, one of the other catechumens and thirdly, the intervening sections written by an anonymous editor who may indeed, from the vividness of his descriptions, have been an eyewitness to the events described, as Moss suggests.[22]

As many have pointed out, this raises the questions as to whether Perpetua really did write the parts ascribed to her, and whether the same was true of the part attributed to Saturus, and also whether the unknown editor presents an accurate account when linking these together. These matters have been widely discussed and will therefore only be referred to in

---

[21] Our ancestors, out of admiration for martyrdom itself, have granted such honour even to lay people and catechumens who obtained martyrdom that they have written much - or should I have, almost everything - about their sufferings …. (translation from Rebillard, 2017, 297)
[22] Moss 2013, 73

outline in this study. However, a very relevant aspect of the debate about early writing in Latin is the question, also debated, as to whether, if, as is widely accepted, the author of two sections in Perpetua herself, there was any difference between material written by women and that written by men. As Kraemer and Lander point out in their article on the *Passio* in *The Early Christian World,* the practice of using a pseudonym, particularly one of a well-know person, was common in the ancient world and therefore the editor's declaration of *sua manu* in the introduction to the *Passio* is no guarantee that this was in fact the case.[23] However, it would seem likely that, whilst the core of the sections attributed to Perpetua may indeed be her work, they have been redacted by the editor. The notes possibly jotted down by Perpetua while in prison would certainly have needed some tidying up before being incorporated into the document as it later circulated. Also referred to by Kraemer and Lander is Augustine's reference to the *Passio* in a discussion about infant baptism where he refers to Perpetua's ability to intercede on behalf of her dead brother and comments: *nec scriptura ipsa canonica est nec illa sic scripsit uel quicumque illud scripsit,* (*De Natura et Origine Animae* 4.10.12).[24] Nevertheless, the question of women's writing is indeed relevant to the main purpose of this study, the examination of early Christian writing in Latin. Although *sua manu* may not be intended in its exact literal sense it well conveys Perpetua's own description and experience of her visions. Dronke comments: 'The author of the *Passio SS Perpetuae ….* included what Perpetua had written within his own hagiographic framework…… Her Latin is colloquial and homely, and this too is a special privilege for us: no emotion, no fantasy of Perpetua's appears disguised by stylistic ornaments.'[25] Any study of 'women's writing' in antiquity, or, indeed, since, would, I submit, want to take issue with Dronke's description of Perpetua's Latin as

---

[23] Kraemer and Lander 2017

[24] it is not itself a canonical writing, whether she herself wrote it or whether anyone else wrote it' (translation from Kraemer and Lander 2000, 1056)

[25] Dronke, 1984, 1

'colloquial and homely', Does he therefore regard these perceived 'characteristics' as exemplifying 'women's writing? It must, however, be noted that the epithet 'homely' also appears in the citation from Sebesta, quoted below. The question of any differences, real or perceived, between male and female writing in literature generally has been widely addressed. There are not, however, many studies of Latin writing by women in early and late antiquity, mainly because, apart from the early example of Sulpicia, *Passio Perperuae* and the *Peregrinatio Aetheriae,* there are few extant examples.

However, I cite below two examples of comments on Perpetua's language, both written by women. In the extract from *Women Writing Latin: Women Writing Latin in Roman Antiquity, Late Antiquity, and the Early Christian Era,* Judith Lynn Sebesta cites Patricia Wilson-Kastner's suggestion that 'Perpetua's diary is evidence that early Christianity gave women an opportunity to exercise their 'voice':

> While one can debate various positions about Christianity's effect on the social standing of women in the Roman Empire, unquestionably it released previously untapped well-springs of energy among women to whom the gospel was preached. Of the writings which we possess or even know about from women in the Roman Empire after the days of Augustus, only some of the poetry of Sulpicia is extant; all the other works are by Christian women.[26]

> Sebesta continues:

> Well educated even for an elite woman— her refutation of her father (3.2) suggests she was familiar with Platonic argument— Perpetua seems to have selected and arranged the episodes of her narrative so that there is "dramatic symmetry between the visions in prison and the realistic, dramatic confrontations with the uncomprehending secular world." Perpetua writes, however, with seemingly unconscious simplicity, even banality: she mentions that her breasts did not become inflamed, that the restoration of her baby made the prison a palace to her. Unlike earlier martyrs, who speak verbosely in their accounts, Perpetua speaks concisely and precisely to her father and to the judge, Hilarianus. Her simple, homely style is far different from that of the author of the introductory chapter, who begins with a rhetorical question and continues with complicated sentences flowing on with many subordinate clauses that are intended to intensify the

---

[26] Wilson-Kastner 1981, viii

strength of his argument. Perpetua, however, lets the content of her words conjure up scenes of intense emotion.[27]

Heffernan discusses the image of the golden cup which, 'had considerable currency in both Christian and non-Christian texts at this time.' He makes the point that, although appearing occasionally in Petronius, the Elder Pliny, Martial and Juvenal, the usual usage for a cup or bowl would be *calix* or *patera.* He also mentions the indebtedness of the 'golden bowl' imagery, one of the complex images in the *Passio,* to the prominence of this imagery in the book of Revelation(e.g. Rev. 15.7), important in the Christian community in Carthage, and conjectures that, since the spelling in *Vetus Latina* is *phialae,* the *fialae* spelling of the *Passio* could possibly indicate a non-extant version of Revelation used by African Christians.[28]

Heffernan addresses the question of into what category Perpetua's accounts should fall and suggests they have elements of both an autobiography and a diary yet fall into the exact category of neither. He suggests that the most appropriate categorisation might be that of a ὑπόμνημα, in Latin, *commentarius,* which avoids 'the hallmarks of formal rhetoric' and points out that this term was used by some classical authors to describe their autobiographical works.[29] He deals particularly with the question of temporal continuity and highlights Perpetua's use of such phrases as *tunc paucis diebus .... in ipso spatio paucorum dierum .... post paucos dies* suggesting narrative composed some time after the events described and using preterite tenses, for example: *tales sollicitudines multis diebus passa sum* (3.9). rather than the present, which would be the case in a diurnal account. There exist also the references to the conditions in prison which would have made it difficult, if not impossible, for her to

---

[27] Sebesta. 2002, 107
[28] Heffernan 1995, 319
[29] Heffernan 1995, 321

write. The expressions *manu sua* and *sensu suo* could both mean the same thing, or could equally well have different meanings, with *manu sua* meaning that she wrote things down in person and *sensu suo* describing an account of her overall meaning but not necessarily in her own exact words. We just do not know. Heffernan comes to the conclusion therefore, with which I concur, that, whilst it is probable that the narrative stems from Perpetua herself it might originally have been a verbal account to the local community which was later reworked by the unknown editor.

The *Passio Sanctarum Perpetuae et Felicitatis* can be considered therefore one of the most significant of the early Christian writings in Latin, one which clearly quickly spread widely in Christian communities, representing encouragement to those who were coping with the conflicting demands of loyalty to family and state and obedience to the demands of Christ.

2.3 Other possible early Latin Christian writing

Christine Mohrmann's views on the development of Christian expression in Latin in general and the *Sondersprache* hypothesis in particular will be considered later, but her support for the theory that possibly both the *Shepherd of Hermas* and the *First Epistle to the Corinthians of Clement* were translated from Greek into Latin at an early date, probably towards the end of the second century, needs to be examined here, in the context of the discussion of the earliest Christian writings in Latin. If right, it would put these two documents at roughly the same time as the Acts of the Scilitan Martyrs. The following sections include a summary of her views on the subject. However, this needs to be considered in the awareness that a characteristic, and, from a later viewpoint, possibly a weakness, of Mohrmann's writing is that she is committed to the understanding that Christian communities developed their own form of Latin expression, a Latin which in due course became the main language of the western Roman Empire. Mohrmann's writings, and that of her mentor, Joseph

Schrijnen, in the first part of the twentieth century and later, form the first major consideration

of the development of Christian Latin, and will be discussed in more detail later in this

chapter.

2.3.1 *The Shepherd of Hermas*

This summary of the relevance of *The Shepherd of Hermas* follows the introduction to

the 2014 edition of the *Vulgata* text.[30] It considers the discussion of the problems of this text

in C.H. Turner's article of 1920.[31] *The Shepherd of Hermas* probably originates from the end

of the second century and contains the 'visions' and 'parables' of a certain Hermas, reflecting

the Christian situation in Rome at the time, probably c.140, when Hermas' brother was elected

Bishop of Rome, as Pius I: *Pastorem vero, nuperrime temporibus nostris, in urbe Roma*

Hermas conscripsit sedente cathedral urbus Romae ecclesiae Pio episcopo fratre eius.[32] This

is also attested in the *Liber Pontificalis*.[33] Although *Hermas* was originally published in

Greek, there are stylistic and lexicographical signs, as Turner points out, that the writer may

well have thought in Latin rather than Greek.[34] Turner discusses in detail such history of the

various partial texts as are known.[35] Only two Greek texts, both partial, exist, and other Greek

fragments, ranging from the third to the seventh centuries, have been found in recent times.

The two extant Latin versions, the earlier, known as the *Vulgata* and the later *Palatina*, were,

as Tornau and Cecconi note, the only ones to contain the complete text.[36] The *Vulgata* was

published in Paris in 1513, *Liber trium virorum et trium spiritualium virginum*, a collection of

---

[30] Tornau and Cecconi 2014
[31] Turner 1920
[32] *Canon Muratori* line 44
[33] Mommsen 1898
[34] Turner 1920, 198 footnote,
[35] Turner 1920, 199-209
[36] Except for the Ethiopian translation, found in 1847 in a paper manuscript of 1538, see Tornau and Cecconi 2014, 6

six revelations, in which the place of honour is accorded to the *Shepherd - Hermanae discipuli Pauli liber* as the editor calls it on the authority of Jerome.[37]

Many early Christian writings are now only extant in Latin versions, so Turner's detailed discussions of fragments do not shed any light on the date of the original translations. Theodor Zahn, referred to by Mohrmann, and followed by Turner, detects the influence on Greek of Latin with which author was familiar, for instance, ὁδὸς καμπανέ - via campana (*Hermas* Visions, 4,1,2), though this could merely be a place name, which would be unlikely to be translated, and συμψέλιον, *subsellium*, (found several times elsewhere). As Mohrmann admits, this could merely mean that the author is writing in a Latin-speaking milieu.[38] Zahn also has ἑτοιμάζειν (Parables 1,1,2) as a calque of *comparare*, not found anywhere else; also μέρος from *pars*. Mohrmann considers that *Hermas* frequently appears to betray influence of Latin, for example, there is no use at all of the optative, though since it was tending to disappear anyway in the κοινή very little can be read into this. After *Hermas* Tertullian is the first to use *statio*, usually in the sense of *ieiunia*. These examples would appear to indicate that someone who probably mainly used Latin still wrote in Greek at end of the second century, though it could well be that the loan words cited are comparable to some found in the Gospels, e.g. φραγελλώσας (Mt 27, 26), κοδράντης (Mk 12,42), possibly indicative of cultural interaction rather than bilingualism proper. Existing editions are so extraordinarily unsatisfactory. Turner discusses in detail the manuscript evidence for some early Latin translations found in *Hermas* and concludes :

> Of the antiquity of the Vulgate Latin I feel more and more strongly convinced. I believe it to be by far our oldest witness to the text—older probably by at least a century than the Codex Sinaiticus—and to belong to very nearly the oldest stratum of Old Latin versions…... Its language is primitive; it does not yet know *blasphemia* but finds Latin equivalents, nor *paeniteri* for μετανοεῖν .... Instead of *presbyteri* and *diaconii* it uses *seniores* and *ministri*. For ἄγγελος it employs

---

[37] Turner1920, 199

[38] Zahn 1869, 485. cited in Mohrmann, 1949, 75

nuntius, and is almost the only witness to any other rendering than the transliteration *angelus.* We are still in a very early stage of the creation of Christian Latin.[39]

Mohrmann discusses the question of dating in her paper *Les origines de la latinité chrétienne a Rome.*[40] She refers to Bardy's detailed work *la question des langues dans l'Eglise ancienne* in which he suggests that Latin translations of the Epistle of Clement to Corinthians and the *Vulgata* version of the *Shepherd of Hermas*, together with the *Doctrine of the Apostles* were probably made in Rome before the end of the second century; *toutes ces traductions semblent avoir été faites à Rome beaucoup plutôt qu'en Afrique.*(all these translations appear to have been made in Rome far earlier than in Africa).[41] Mohrmann agrees but rightly points out that more solid evidence to support this does not exist and suggests that it is possible that the first Latin translations of these texts could have originated in Africa. Her mention *qui fait l'impression d'être très archaïque* could be taken as following the suggestion that African Latin was characterised by linguistic phenomena which, by the standards of metropolitan Latin, might be seen as archaisms.[42] However, Mohrmann would appear to cover herself in this respect with her *qui le dira*?

> mais où trouver les preuves de l'origine romaine de ces textes, qui sont écrits dans une langue qui a déjà subi l'influence de la pensée chrétienne, mais qui fait l'impression d'être très archaïque? Il faut admettre qu'il n'est pas du tout inconceivable que déjà avant la fin du deuxième siècle l'église africaine ait voulu lire en latin un text romain comme *le Pasteur d'Hermas* ou la lettre de Saint Clément et qu'on ait fait, sur le sol africain, une traduction latine. Qui le dira?[43] (Les origines, 74-75) (But where to find proof of the Roman origin of these texts, which are written in a language already under the influence of Christian thought, but which gives the impression of being very archaic? It must be admitted that it is not at all inconceivable that even before the end of the second century the African Church wanted to read in Latin a Roman text like *The Shepherd of*

---

[39] Turner 1920, 206-207
[40] Mohrmann 1949, 67-106
[41] Bardy, 1948, 107
[42] See chapter 1, 1.2.1.1, 45
[43] Mohrmann 1949a, 74-5

Hermas or the letter of St Clement and thus produced, on African soil, a Latin translation. Who can say?)

2.3.2   1 Clement

In 1894 Dom G. Morin found in the seminary at Namur a Latin version of 1 Clement in an 11th century *codex Florinensis* which he published in 1894 in the second volume of *Anecdota Maredsolana,*under the title *Sancti Clementis Romani ad Corinthios epistulae versio antiquissima Maredsoli* 1894. In this edition Dom Morin cites the following as supporting a date in the second part of the second century: *Itaque his omnibus perpensis, minime, temeritatis insimulandum eum fore existimo, qui Clementis epistulam, ubi primum edita est, parvo intervallo interiecto, ex graeco conversam ac latina voce expressam esse praeiudicaverit.* (Having weighed up all these considerations, I think no-one will be charged with temerity who forms the opinion that following a short interval after the initial publication of Clement's Epistle, it was translated from Greek and put into Latin).[44] It was later published with a reconstructed Greek text.[45]

In the same year (1894) Adolf Harnack presented a paper to the Royal Academy in Berlin in which he argued that Morin's discovery provided evidence that the Latin translation of Clement does indeed stem from first part of 2nd century.[46] In support of this Harnack presented four arguments, briefly summarised as follows:

1. Whilst in the other extant manuscripts, thought to date from the end of the second century, 1 Clement is combined with the spurious 2 Clement, Morin's Latin manuscript represents an earlier tradition which still does not know of 2 Clement, as all writers before

---

[44] Cited by Mohrmann 1949a, 78
[45] Schaeffer 1941, review in *Angelicum* 1943), 337-338
https://www.jstor.org/stable/44622444
[46] Harnack 1894, 261 ff

Origen who cite the Epistle of Clement appear to know only one letter.[47] Mohrmann finds this convincing though neither she nor Harnack produce any firm evidence for this assertion.[48]

2. The language represents the vulgar Latin of the second and third centuries, with Biblical citations agreeing with those of the *Itala*. As mentioned in the previous chapter, this term derives from a disputed passage in Augustine's *de Doctrina Christina*, where, referring to his earlier discussion about Biblical translation and interpretation, Augustine says: *in ipsis autem interpretationibus Itala ceteris praeferatur, nam est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiae* (2.15). *Itala* was used by writers of his age, and later, to describe pre-Vulgate Latin Biblical translations. Modern scholarship prefers to use the term *Vetus Latina* or *Veteres Latinae*. The many solecisms and Graecisms suggest that the translator was more at home in Greek than in Latin.[49] Whilst there may well be truth in these somewhat sweeping assertions, an attempt at dating on linguistic grounds is difficult and cannot be proved with any certainty.[50]

3. The translation of certain words would suggest the first, rather than the second, half of the second century. Harnack claims that the way in which the Latin transliterates, or keeps, Greek words is significant, particularly ἐπίσκοποι, καὶ διάκονοι, which are always transposed to *episcopi et ministri* which, according to Harnack, are for Clement technical terms:

> Da er c. 59 …. Das Wort ἐπίσκοπος, wo es von Gott gebraucht wird, durch **visitator** übersetzt, so kann kein Zweifel sein, dass er in den anderen Fällen deshalb das Wort episcopus gebraucht hat, weil auch die lateinischen Gemeinden zu seiner Zeit ihre Vorsteher episcopi nannten. Aber warum schreibt er dann nicht auch **diaconi**? Man kann das schwerlich anders erklären als durch die Annahme, dass **diaconi** damals in den lateinischen Gemeinden noch kein geläufige Bezeichnung gewesen ist. [51] (Since he …. translated ἐπίσκοπος as used about God, by *visitator* there can be no doubt that he in the other cases therefore used *episcopus* because the Latin-speaking communities of his time also called their

---

[47] Harnack 1894, 262
[48] Mohrmann 1949a, 79
[49] Harnack 1894, 263
[50] See discussion of 'Vulgar Latin' 1.1.4, 32
[51] Harnack 1894, 263

leaders *episcopi* But why does he not then use *diaconi*? It is difficult to explain this in any other way than that *diaconus* was not in current use in the Latin-speaking communities.)

Since there is not enough evidence at this period (early second century) for the precise meaning of 'ministry' words, such usages cannot be used as firm evidence of the Latin. It seems possible that at that time *diaconus* did not have a specific meaning as a degree of ordained ministry, as it does later. However, by the end of second century *diaconus* appears to be used as much as *episcopus.* The same turn of phrase is also found in the Latin version of *Hermas*. *Minister* appears to be an old term, replaced later by *diaconus.* Janssen says of the terms *minister* and *ministerium: die beiden Ausdrücke beziehen sich gelegentlich auf Diakonen, **bezeichnen** sie aber nicht als solche.*[52] Tertullian and Cyprian both use *diaconus* as a technical term. Lactantius speaks of *presbyteri ac ministri* (*de Mortibus Persecutorum* 15.2). Thus whilst *episcopi et ministri* are early terms they cannot be taken as a reason to consider their use in 1 Clement as proof of early date.

As Mohrmann points out, *Cette distinction entre seniores et presbyteri n'est ni exceptionnelle ni archaïque.*[53] Though Harnack thinks this distinction is significant for dating, πρεσβύτεροι is usually *seniores* but in one instance in Clement it is *presbiteris.*[54] Mohrmann does not consider there is significance in this regard between *presbyteri* and *seniores*). One might argue that both *presbys* and *presbyterus* are rather awkward in Latin, although with the sanction of usage behind them. *Senior* is an easier word but rather too general for a Christian usage.[55]

---

[52] Janssen 1938, 99
[53] Mohrmann 1949a, 81
[54] Harnack 1894, 263
[55] See discussion of terms use for ministry by Tertullian and Cyprian in chapter 4, 4.8.2, 267

4. Harnack's final argument, which Mohrman finds conclusive, is the quality of the Latin text, which he considers vastly superior to that of the eleventh century *Codex C*:

> Freilich ist aus der einen durch viele Fehler entstellten Handschrift des 11. Jahrhunderts die Übersetzung des 2. Jahrhunderts nicht überall mehr sicher zu erkennen …. Aber wo immer die Grundschrift sicher erkannt werden kann, erweist sie als ihre Vorlage eine griechische Handschrift, die zwar nicht überall fehlerfrei, doch sogar den Cod. A nicht selten übertrifft, mit S an vielen Stellen gegen AC zusammengeht, die Lesearten des Clemens Alexandrinus häufig gegen alle drei anderen Zeugen bestätigt, und an einigen Stellen allein das Richtige bewahrt hat. Da aber der Archetypus von L jedem der drei anderen Zeugen und dem Clemens Alexandrinus gegenüber völlig selbständig ist, entscheidet er nicht selten in den bisherigen Streitfragen zwischen AC>S und CS>A, und wir kommen zugleich der Zeit des Briefes selbst sehr nahe.[56] (Clearly it is not possible to discern an exact second century translation from an eleventh century manuscript riddled with errors …. But wherever the original can be recognised it shows itself to be based upon a Greek manuscript, itself not free from errors yet frequently outdoing even Codex A, agreeing with S in many instances against AC, which completely confirms the readings of Clemens Alexandrinus when compared with all three other references, and in some instances is the only one to preserve the correct reading. However, because the archetype L is completely independent when compared with the other three references and Clemens Alexandrinus it frequently decides between AC>S and CS>A in the previous points of contention and so we arrive closer to the date of the letter itself).

As has been mentioned earlier, attempts at dating on linguistic grounds cannot be conclusive. Mohrmann refers to an article by Wölfflin, in which he asserts that, based on vocabulary and syntax, the Latin version of Clement was written at the time of Tertullian, i.e. end of the second or beginning of the third century.[57] Mohrmann does not think these are conclusive, though she goes on to examine Wölfflin and emphasises that there is an essential difference between Wölfflin's view of the evolution of Christian Latin and her own in which she, when examining the phase of Christian Latin based on earliest Biblical translations, concludes that *Tertullien est seulement une phase d'une évolution qui a commencé avant lui Pour nous il n'est plus le grand initiateur linguistique, le père de la latinité chrétienne, ni le*

---

[56] Harnack 1894, 264, cited in Mohrmann 1949a, 82
[57] Wölfflin 1884, 81ff

pivot autour duquel la vie linguistique des premiers siècles chrétiens a tourné. (Tertullian is only a phase of evolution which began before him. For us he is not the grand innovator, the 'father of Christian Latin' nor the pivot around which the linguistic life of the first Christian centuries turned). [58] The questions of Mohrmann's relationship to earlier Latin scholars such as Wölfflin and contemporaries such as Löfstedt have been authoritatively explored by Denecker.[59]

Wölfflin bases his argument on the various forms of *salvare, salvator* and says that *salutaris* is older than *salvator*. Mohrmann maintains that these appeared at the same time in the earliest Latin Biblical translations and that, like other scholars (Soden etc.) *salvare* (=*salvum facere)* became the usual Latin translation of σῴζειν. Mohrmann thinks Wölfflin's arguments from syntax are also very weak, for instance, it is not surprising to find the use of the genitive absolute, which appears in any case in *Bellum Hispaniense* 14.1 and 23.5 in a text translated from Greek, and likewise the genitive of comparison which is found in Latin since time of Tiberius, particularly in *langue vulgaire* and which could, in any case, be construed as a partitive genitive.[60] Wölfflin's arguments about word order, in refutation of Morin and Harnack, are, according to Mohrmann, neither conclusive nor even sustainable. However, even Harnack's remarks in this respect are not sustainable: *mais je crois aussi que les arguments d'ordre linguistique ne peuvent rien faire de plus, parce que nous sommes assez mal informés sur le latin vulgaire du deuxième siècle et nous ne savons rien du latin des chrétiens de la première moitié de ce siècle.* (But I also think that the arguments of a linguistic order cannot add anything because we are not well enough informed about the vulgar Latin of the second century and we know nothing about the Christian Latin of the first part of that

---

[58] Mohrmann 1949a, 83
[59] Denecker 2018b, 325-361
[60] Schmalz-Hoffmann 1928, 428

century). This is a very valid point, though somewhat diminished by Mohrmann's usual determination to describe all Latin of the period as Christian.

So, says Mohrmann, it is right to conclude that this Latin text dates from the second century, though it is not possible to say when in the century. If that is true the Latin text of 1 Clement is the oldest extant Latin Christian text, and older than *The Acts of the Scilitan Martyrs.* Its place of origin is probably Rome, though North Africa has also been advanced, mainly, says Mohrmann by Haussleiter, based on linguistic peculiarities considered, at the time of Wöfflin and Sittl, as 'Africanisms'. [61] The earliest text comes from Milan, and Ambrose, and possibly Lactantius, knew it.

2.4 The 'Sondersprache' Theory of the 'Nijmegen School'. A re-examination and re-evaluation of the work of Joseph Schrijnen and his student and fellow researcher Christine Mohrmann.

2.4.1   The History and Reception of Ideas about Early Christian Latin

Following the collapse of the Roman empire in the fifth century and the spread of Christianity throughout Europe, Latin on the one hand gradually evolved into what would become the Romance languages and on the other developed its own written scholarly forms for use in the liturgy and in Christian writing, becoming what is loosely termed 'medieval Latin'.[62] The rise of the Italian humanist movement around AD 1300 led to a new, third stage of Latin development (after the 'classical' and 'medieval' phases,) which, as a reaction to the decaying situation, both ecclesiastical and political, of the time, sought to restore the ancient 'classical' standards of Latin, a stage now termed 'neo-Latin'.[63] Much of the work of the Renaissance humanists, particularly the Dutch, tended to regard 'Christian' writing as

---

[61] Mohrmann 1949a, 85
[62] See chapter 1, 1.1.1,13 ff. for discussion of this topic
[63] Ijsewijn 1990, 22, 27

stylistically inferior to the 'classical' norm, a view also encountered as early as the second and third centuries, in which much Christian writing was denigrated by those steeped in the classical tradition, as acknowledged by Minucius Felix: *Itaque indignandum omnibus, indolescendum est audere quosdam, et hoc studiorum rudes, litterarum profanos expertes artium etiam sordidarum, certum aliquid de summa rerum ac maiestate decernere, de qua tot omnibus saeculis sectarum plurimarum usque adhuc ipsa philosophia deliberat* (Minucius Felix, *Octavius,* V, 4).

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, influenced by the development, particularly amongst German theologians, of form and text criticism, some linguists began to consider the area of Christian Latin. Although not specifically concerned with 'Christian' language, the researches of Hugo Schuchardt, (1842-1927) an eminent linguistic scholar, whose work contributed much to the new field of sociolinguistics, was influential in looking at Christian Latin in a new way. The first attested use of the term sociolinguistics was by Thomas Callan Hodson, first William Wyse Professor of Social Anthropology at Cambridge, 1932-37, in an article entitled *Sociolinguistics in India.*[64] The term came into more general use in the 1960s, pioneered by linguists such as William Labov in the United States and Basil Bernstein in the UK.[65] The application of linguistic ideas to the language of the early development of Christianity took place against the background, particularly in Germany, of the *Kulturkampf* which developed in the newly unified Germany of the 1870s as a result of conflict between the mainly Protestant German imperial government led by Bismarck and the Roman Catholic Church in such areas as public appointments and education, and developed into the whole question of Church and state and the place of religion, and of the Roman

---

[64] Hodson 1939, cited and discussed in Currie, 1980, 407-411
[65] Paulston and Tucker 2003.

Catholic Church in particular, in a modernising world which was becoming increasingly secularised and liberal.

It could well be argued that the category of 'Christian Latin' had various functions for different groups, enabling, for instance, Protestants or those of an essentially secularist bent to carry on doing Latin while studiously avoiding specifically Christian writing. Many of the linguistic scholars of the era were Protestants. Hermann Rönsch (1821-1888), a Lutheran pastor, typifies the early influence of the political background on the application of linguistic research to theological thought of the period. His seminal work, *Itala und Vulgata, das Sprachidiom der urchristlichen Itala und der katholischen Vulgata unter Berücksichtigung der römischen Volkssprache*, clearly demonstrates in its subtitle the continuing confessional divide which characterised theological study in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, expressing here the 'Protestant' view that the early extant Biblical texts, known at the time as the *Itala*, and which will later be discussed as *Vetus Latina*, represented an older and therefore 'purer' text than the Vulgate.

The main contribution of Eduard Norden (1868-1941), a Protestant scholar of a slightly later generation, whose Jewish background led to his eventual flight to Zürich*, Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert vor Christus bis in die Zeit der Renaissance* (1898), whilst not discussing specifically Christian writing, also played a significant part in the development of linguistic study of the period. In the chapter in the above-mentioned work concerned with *das 'afrikanische Latein',* in a section on *der Stil der Predigt in Afrika* Norden discusses the influence of traditional oratorical style and asserts that in this respect the Latin style is not of the level of the Greek: *so eklärt es sich, daß die Predigten etwa des Augustin oder Caesarius von Arles formell betrachtet nicht auf der Höhe derer des Iohannes Chrysostomos oder des Proklos von Konstantinopel stehen: jene konnten ihrem Publikum*

nicht dasselbe zumuten wie diese, sie mußten auf ein niedriges Niveau herabsteigen, um

verstanden zu werden. (It is clear that the sermons of, for instance, Augustine, or Caesarius of

Arles, considered dispassionately, did not reach the level of those of John Chrysostom or of

Proclus of Constantinople: each needed to take into account their hearers and had to lower

their language level in order to be understood).[66] However, Cyprian receives cautious

approval: *Cyprian wurde schon in alter Zeit als Stilist dem Tertullian mit ähnlichen*

Ausdrücken gegenüber gestellt, wie einst Livius dem Sallust.[67]

Antoine Meillet (1866-1936), one of the most influential linguistic scholars of the

early twentieth century, studied with Saussure in Paris, where he met Joseph Schrijnen, with

whom he remained in touch.[68] Meillet wrote *Le langage est éminemment un fait social .... Il*

est probable a priori que toute modification de la structure sociale se traduira par un

changement de conditions dans lesquelles se développent les langages. (Language is

essentially a social act … It is probable *a priori* that every modification of the social structure

results in a change in the conditions under which langages develop).[69]

2.4.2   The Originators of the 'Sondersprache' Hypothesis

In the light of this linguistic background and of the historical and sociological

background of the times in which they lived, which I submit contributed to and formed their

views, I now propose to examine the contribution made to the study of Christian expression in

Latin by Monsignor Joseph Schrijnen and his student, associate and successor, Christine

Mohrmann, at the University of Nijmegen (now Radboud University) in the Netherlands, in

---

[66] Norden 1898, 618
[67] Norden 1898, 618
[68] Correspondence between Meillet and Schrijnen is held in the Katholiek Documentatie Centrum of Radboud University, Nijmegen
[69] Meillet 1906

the early part of the twentieth century. The brief outline of the lives of both Schrijnen and Mohrmann given below is intended to give historical context to the later examination of their work.

Monsignor Joseph Schrijnen 1869-1938

Joseph Schrijnen (1869-1938) came from a family of doctors and chemists long established in Limburg, the southernmost province of the Netherlands. He spent his whole life as priest and scholar in this area, and in the neighbouring province of Gelderland. His elder brother, Laurens, later became the fourth Bishop of Roermond, the southern diocese. Schrijnen wrote his doctoral thesis at the university of Leuven, *Étude sur le phénomène de l's mobile dans les langues classiques et subsidiairement dans les groupes congénites*. Ordained priest in 1894, he held several academic posts, first as *Lector* (1910) and two years later as *Extraordinarius* at the University of Utrecht.[70] In 1923 Schrijnen was appointed the first *Rector Magnificus* of the newly founded Catholic University at Nijmegen and its Professor of Greek and Latin Linguistics and Folklore Studies.[71]

Christine Mohrmann (1903-1988)

Christine Mohrmann first studied under Schrijnen at the University of Utrecht in 1922 before transferring, following him, to the Catholic University of Nijmegen on its opening in 1923, graduating in 1925 and gaining her doctorate in 1932 with a dissertation on the language of the sermons of St Augustine. As a female academic, unusual for the time, she had a certain amount of prejudice and hostility to contend with and, initially being denied a university post because of her gender, spent her everyday working life teaching Latin and Greek at a girls' convent school. However, she continued to work closely with Schrijnen until his death in 1938 and then continued his work, in addition to extending her own researches

---

[70] *Extraordinarius - bijzonder hoogleraar* Denecker 2018b, 338-340
[71] 'Hoogleraar in de Griekse en Latijnse taalkunde, de algemene taalwetenschap en de volkskunde;

into the fields of liturgy and medieval Latin. In spite of having been nominated by Schrijnen as his successor to the Chair of Greek and Latin, the appointment in 1938 of a woman to this post was unacceptable to the board of Dutch Bishops, the *Radboudstichting*, which governed the Catholic University of Nijmegen and it was only in 1961 that she was finally appointed to the Chair formerly occupied by Schrijnen.[72]

2.4.3   The Historical and Social Background to the *Sondersprache*

Before examining the evidence for the *Sondersprache* theory, I propose to explore the extent to which the views of Schrijnen and Mohrmann and others were formed by and reflect the social and ecclesiastical milieu of the time in which they lived and worked. Relevant, therefore, is a very brief outline of the position of Catholics in the Netherlands in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.[73]

The Netherlands were relatively small players in late nineteenth century imperialist scrambles and maintained an uneasy neutrality during World War 1. The unification of the Northern and Southern Netherlands under Willem I (1816-1830) made Catholics the majority until the Belgian uprising of 1830 led to the secession of the Belgian Catholic provinces, leaving Dutch Catholics once again a minority. Since the sixteenth century the Catholic Church in the Netherlands had been administered from Rome as a mission area. However, the introduction of the new constitution of 1848 gave equal rights to all churches and enabled Catholics for the first time to work together with the various Protestant Calvinist groups in the political arena. As a result, in 1853 Rome restored the Dutch Catholic hierarchy with four dioceses under the Archdiocese of Utrecht.

---

[72] Derks and Verhesen-Stegerman, 1998 and Franklin 2005
[73] Wintle 2005 and McLeod 2015

For the first time a Catholic entered parliament and Catholic participation in the political arena was reinforced by the publication in 1891 of the papal encyclical of Leo XIII, *Rerum Novarum,* which dealt with matters of social justice and is regarded as a foundation text of Catholic social teaching. In the 1928 elections Catholics won thirty out of one hundred parliamentary seats and for the first time, the Prime Minister was a Catholic (C. J. Ruijs de Beerenbrouck). However, the growing confidence in the Catholic community led to a more conservative and ultramontane attitude amongst the hierarchy, particularly in the educational field, arising from difficulties in obtaining subsidies from the liberal establishment for special, i.e. Catholic, education. The foundation of the Catholic University of Nijmegen in 1923 was regarded as the pinnacle of efforts which had seen the foundation of many Catholic schools, most of them run by religious orders. Thus it is unsurprising that the development of a distinct Catholic identity should have influenced the academic views of Schrijnen and others.

The nineteenth century saw a development of the study of linguistics in the Netherlands, arising from, and based upon, the close relationship of Dutch to German. Two of the early foremost scholars in this field, Pieter Weiland (1754-1842) and Mathijs Siegenbeek (1774-1854), both originally theologians, were amongst the first to examine and write treatises on Dutch grammar and spelling, both greatly influenced by the works of the German linguist, Johann Christoph Adelung (1732-1806), who, more than anyone else in that period, contributed to the standardisation of German, due particularly to his detailed knowledge of the history and development of German dialects.[74] Even more significant for linguistic study in this generation were Jacob (1785–1863) and Wilhelm Grimm (1786–1859). Later in the same tradition followed Willem Gerard Brill (1811-1896) and Matthias de Vries (1820-1892).

---

[74] van Driel 1992, 221-252

Although all were of an earlier generation, Schrijnen would certainly have studied these scholars.

Others continued the study of Dutch linguistics into the next generation, significantly Schrijnen's colleague, Jacobus (Jac.) van Ginneken (1877-1945), who was also appointed to a chair at Nijmegen, that of Dutch Philology, Indogermanic and Sanskrit, on its foundation in 1923. Like Schrijnen, van Ginneken was a Catholic priest, a Jesuit, in contrast to the other prominent linguistic scholar of that time, Gesinus Gerardus Kloeke, a northern Protestant who had studied in Leipzig and Hamburg. Like Schrijnen, van Ginneken had been a student at Leuven, where he wrote his doctorate *Principes de linguistique psychologique* (1907), later published in Dutch. In 1913 and 1914 respectively van Ginneken published the two volumes of his *Handboek der Nederlandsche taal,* in the first of which he proposed the concept of the connection between national character and linguistic development. In demonstration of this he developed a series of diagrams of 'language circles' showing the overlapping relationships between 'sociolects'.[75] In the second volume appeared the working out by van Ginneken of 'tendency languages' to describe the language used by particular groups, including religious groups.[76] Here it is possible to see van Ginneken's influence on Schrijnen.[77]

It is therefore fitting that such linguistic study as the investigation of Christian Latin should have arisen in Nijmegen, one of the oldest cities in the Netherlands, reputed to have been founded by the emperor Trajan c. AD 98. Situated in the south east of the Netherlands, near the German border, Nijmegen is in the minority Roman Catholic area of the Netherlands and, as has been said, its university, since 2004 known as Radboud University, was founded as the Catholic University of Nijmegen in 1923. It is significant that the growing freedom and

---

[75] van Ginneken 2013
[76] van Ginneken 1914
[77] Information on van Ginneken from Denecker 2018a, 335-357.

influence of the Catholic Church in an area which had previously experienced Protestant domination provided the opportunity for Schrijnen and Mohrmann to explore a feature of the language of the Early Church at a time when Christians were beginning to express and assert their own identity, a time which in some ways could have been considered to parallel the Netherlands in the early part of the twentieth century.

During the Second World War Nijmegen was the first Dutch city to be invaded by Germany, in 1940, and was finally liberated by Allied forces in September 1944. Against this background, of a historically Catholic city in a predominately Protestant land, where, particularly in the earlier part of the 20th century, it was important to stress and maintain this Catholic identity, an interest arose in classical circles in the parallel situation in the Roman Empire of the first few centuries AD, recalling the fact of the status of Nijmegen (Noviomagus) as a city on the Roman *limes*, on the edge of the Roman world.[78]

However, the parallel with Imperial relations in the Roman Empire would be more relevant to a later period. In much of *Charakteristik des altchristlichen Latein* Schrijnen is dealing with a later period than the one within which I am working, and much of what he says about Church/Society/State relationships would appear to reflect this rather than the 2nd/early 3rd century of the period with which this dissertation is concerned. The Second World War put a temporary stop to published scholarship in this area, which was continued, after Schrijnen's death in 1938, by his devoted student and associate, Christine Mohrmann. In her diaries, extracts of which are cited in Derk's biography of Christine Mohrmann, she relates how the department in which she and Schrijnen had worked was bombed, with the resultant loss of much material, and that she, whilst continuing writing, had to keep her library in a

---

[78] Willems and van Enckevort 2009

cellar for safety. She also came under suspicion by the resistance because of her German-sounding name and was not able to publish until after the war.[79]

The task of rebuilding a shattered country after the Second World War left its mark on the Catholic Church as on all areas of society. The new *Katholieke Volkspartij,* founded in 1945, played a prominent part in the post-war government of the Netherlands. The gradual secularisation of Dutch society in the post-war years did not leave the Christian churches unscathed. The Second Vatican Council of 1962, leading to the use of the vernacular in the liturgy and a greater liberalisation of church customs and practices, although rejuvenating the Church in many ways, must have been somewhat threatening for those who valued the traditional forms of Catholic life and worship. Mohrmann continued to research and write extensively, expanding her interests into medieval liturgical and historical studies, some published in English.[80] She also brought extensive linguistic insights into her involvement in the translation of the liturgy into Dutch. She retired from both her professorships at Amsterdam and at Nijmegen in 1973. A full evaluation of her life and work is the subject of an ongoing project at Nijmegen..

2.4.4 The *Sondersprache*

It was in response to Meillet's comment *le langage est éminemment un fait social … il est probable a priori que toute modification de la structure sociale se traduira par un changement de conditions dans lesquelles se développent les langages* that in 1910, in his inaugural speech as Lector in Early Christian History at the University of Utrecht, *de waarde der kulturhistorische methode voor de kennis van de christelijke oudheid*, Schrijnen first suggested that Christian Latin did indeed form a *modification de la structure sociale* and thus introduced the proposition that early Christian writing in Latin developed a *Sondersprache,*

---

[79] Derks and Verheesen-\Stegerman 1998
[80] Mohrmann 1957 and 1961

derived from, but distinct from, the everyday language of the second century AD in order to express the tenets of Christianity. However, it could be argued that Schrijnen's main motive was to claim back for Catholic thought an understanding of Latin as a form of 'popular speech, which had hitherto been regarded as representing a Protestant viewpoint:

> Noodzakelijkerwijze zal de vervorming, die een gedeelte der Oudromeinsche maatschappij herschiep tot Christelijke gemeenschap haar uitdrukking vinden in de hervorming van de taal. De taal is het groote gedenkboek waarin de kultuur historische lotgevallen van het menschdom met zwakker of sprekender schrift staan opgeteekend.
> (The process of transformation, which refashioned a part of Roman society into a Christian community, must needs find its expression in the reformation of the language. Language is a great book of commemoration in which the cultural destiny of mankind is faintly or clearly recorded).[81]

This proposition he reiterated and expanded two years later on the occasion of his appointment as *Extraordinarius* in the same university in his inaugural lecture, *Sociale klassieke taalkunde*. Denecker gives an excellent summary and exposition of this lecture and its relevance to the early development of the language of Christianity and concludes this section:

> Schrijnen's 1912 lecture has received little attention (even from scholars familiar with Dutch) but in my opinion it marks a crucial phase in the development of his sociological approach, by its reference to the radical novelty of Christianity and its explicit usage of the concept and term of a *Sondersprache* - though not as yet with regard to the language of early Christians.[82]

The seminal work which set out the *Sondersprache* theory was the publication in 1932 of Schrijnen's *Charakteristik des altchristlichen Latein* in which he extended and developed his hypothesis. [83] Schrijnen's theory maintains that Latin-speaking Christians from about the end of the second century to the fourth century, developed a 'technical' vocabulary to

---

[81] Schrijnen 1910, 29
[82] Denecker 2018a, , 338-340
[83] Schrijnen 1932

describe Christian belief and practice which evolved into a *Sondersprache,* used by a closely-knit Christian society, a form of speech which related to, but was in many respects different from, the everyday speech of non-Christians. Schrijnen further maintained that this *Sondersprache* later developed into the ordinary speech of the Latin speaking world. In thus recognising speech as a factor of social interaction Schrijnen and his associates, particularly Christine Mohrmann, could well be regarded, certainly in this specific context, as early exponents of sociolinguistics at a time when this had not yet emerged as a distinct discipline.

There is, so far as I can trace, no direct evidence that Schrijnen attended courses in Paris given by the pioneering Swiss linguist, Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913), whose lectures about important principles of language description in Geneva between 1907 and 1911 were collected and published by his pupils posthumously in the famous *Cours de linguistique générale* in 1916.[84] However, given that he was in Paris to pursue his linguistic studies, it is highly plausible that he did so. It is also likely that it was during his time in Paris that Schrijnen came into contact with Antoine Meillet, a pupil of Saussure, and closer to him than Schrijnen. Saussure would provide a model as a scholar who had begun as an Indo-Europeanist but who had branched out into wider intellectual considerations. It is clear that the approach pioneered by Saussure greatly influenced and informed Schrijnen's thinking and in 1921 Schrijnen published *Einführung in das Studium des indogermanischen Sprachwissenschaft*.[85]

A further interest of Schrijnen's was in the fairly new field of Dutch and German *Volkskunde* and in 1915-16 he published his two volume *Nederlandsche Volkskunde*.[86]

---

[84] See for example, 'Ook volgde hij in Parijs colleges van de grote vernieuwer van de algemene taalwetenschap Ferdinand de Saussure en van Victor Henri.' Entry in *Katholiek Documentatie Centrum*, Radboud Universiteit, 2016 Schrijnen, Joseph, *Archiefnummer 619*
[85] Schrijnen 1921.
[86] Schrijnen 1915-1916

Schrijnen, following the earlier linguists mentioned above, and in line with his

contemporaries, such as his colleague at Nijmegen, van Ginneken, whilst developing theories

about Dutch language, considered this in the context of its Germanic roots. In this respect it

could well be argued that in several ways Schrijnen was an inheritor of the Grimm brothers.

Reference to Schrijnen's work on ethnography is made by Margry and Roodenburg:

> …Dutch ethnologists would follow their German colleagues. For example, Joseph
> Schrijnen's work betrays the influence of Gustav Meyer (like Schrijnen both a
> linguist and a folklore scholar,) … Schrijnen was the first ethnologist to write a
> handbook for the discipline, his *Nederlandsche Volkskunde*. In keeping with
> contemporary views, he largely interpreted Dutch folk culture in terms of
> Germanic continuity.[87]

In 1928 Schrijnen, together with Anton Meillet, Cornelius Uhlenbeck and Christine

Mohrmann, organised the first congress of the *Comité International Permanent de Linguistes*

at The Hague. Schrijnen gave the closing summary and address, in which the following

citation attests to the novelty but effectiveness of this first gathering:

> pour la première fois des linguistes venus de toutes les parties du monde … .
> Savants des nationalités les plus diverses et pendant bien des années de guerre et
> d'après-guerre cruellement éloignés les uns des autres, ils ont travaillé ici pendant
> quelques jours fraternellement ensemble …... Et dorénavant on aura tout autant le
> droit de parler de l'esprit des linguistes de la Haye, que de l'esprit de Locarno. Il
> s'en suit, Messieurs et Mesdames, que nous n'emporterons pas seulement, revenus
> à nos foyers, la satisfaction d'avoir accompli un œuvre scientifique de la plus
> grande importance et la conviction d'avoir obtenu des résultats palpables, mais
> aussi d'avoir fondé une mentalité heureuse et féconde en promesses pour l'avenir.
> (For the first time linguists have come together from all parts of the world ….
> Scholars of very many diverse nationalities separated from one another through the
> war and post-war years were able to work amicably here together for several days
> …. And from then on they would have as much right to speak about the spirit of
> the linguists of The Hague as of the spirit of Locarno. It therefore follows, ladies
> and gentlemen, that on returning to our institutions we shall not only carry the
> satisfaction of having obtained clear results but also of having established a
> friendly and successful foundation for the future.) [88]

---

[87] Margry and Roodenburg 2007
[88] Schrijnen, 1928, 259-262

At the Fifth Conference of the *Woche für Religions-Ethnologie* held in Luxemburg in 1929 Schrijnen, at the behest of Pope Pius XI, presented a paper *Volkskunde und religiöse Volkskunde.* This paper does not deal with the consideration of early Christian Latin, being focussed on the much wider concept of 'religious folklore', in which Schrijnen outlines the *Volkskunde* which formed the connection between religion, culture, and national and local identity and which, therefore, Schrijnen deems it necessary to consider as a background to *religiöse Volkskunde.* This would seem to demonstrate Schrijnen's view of the importance of this connection, a factor which played a part in influencing his later formation of the *Sondersprache*:

> Den Namen 'Religiöse Volkskunde' dürfte der Teil der Volkskunde tragen, der sich mit ihrem Verhältnis zur Religionsgeschichte beschäftigt. Jedenfalls ist dieses Verhältnis derart, daß ich nicht umhin kann, auf dieser religions-ethnologischen Versammlung das Wichtigste darüber auseinanderzusetzen.
> (The term 'religious folk studies' can indeed be applied to that part of 'folk studies' which is concerned with the history of religion. However, this relationship is such that, in this conference concerned with religious ethnology, I cannot refrain from explaining the main points of the folk studies which lie behind this relationship.)[89]

Thus it was Schrijnen, greatly criticised since, who for virtually the first time applied insights from linguistics and ethnography to an area which had largely been regarded as the province of theologians. Schrijnen is one of the first scholars to combine these fields effectively, bringing insights from both to bear on the possible relationship between Christian and popular speech.

Schrijnen later observes: (*la langue des chrétiens*) *en n'étant que le résultat d'une différenciation sociologique de la langue commune … d'un système cohérent de différenciations de nature lexicologique, sémantique, morphologique, syntaxique, et même*

---

[89] Schrijnen 1930

métrique.[90] However, Schrijnen appreciates that there are differences of register: *Es muss jedoch entschieden betont werden, daß das Kirchenlatein nur einen geringen Teil des altchristlichen Latein bildet, welches letzten Endes auf der sozialen Schichtenbildung durch Absonderungsbestrebungen beruht.*[91] The expression *soziale Schichtenbildung* is used several times in the introductory chapter to *Charakteristik* which, although it rings strange in our modern ears, reinforces the impression that the ecclesiastical and social environment of Schrijnen's time influenced and informed his views. Earlier I touched on the question of why the consideration of Christian Latin should have arisen at this particular time, early and middle twentieth century, and place, Nijmegen, in the predominately Catholic area of the Netherlands. However, one detects in the writings of both Schrijnen and Mohrmann a somewhat ambivalent attitude to the relationship between so-called 'Christian' Latin and the language used in everyday communication, the *sermo vulgaris* of the period under discussion, the second and third centuries AD.

Schrijnen and Mohrmann founded the 'Nijmegen School' of early Christian Latin, which explored and disseminated the *Sondersprache* proposition. This later found much of its expression in the journal *Vigiliae Christianae* founded by Christine Mohrmann in 1947 together with Jan Hendrik Waszink, professor of Latin at the University of Leiden and an authority on Tertullian.[92] The first article in the first issue is Mohrmann's *Le latin commun et le latin des chrétiens.* [93] Schrijnen also edited another series of monographs, *Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva,* of which *Charakteristik* was the first publication. The

---

[90] Schrijnen 1934
[91] Schrijnen 1932, 6
[92] This journal, which now deals much more broadly with matters of a historical, cultural, linguistic or philological nature relating to early Christian literature is now published by Brill.
[93] Mohrmann 1949: 57-106

Sondersprache theory was modified and developed by Christine Mohrmann in her extensive writings on the subject.[94]

In his inaugural lecture and in *Charakteristik* Schrijnen cites the well-known passage in which Tertullian emphasises that Christians are no different from other people: *non sine foro, non sine macello, non sine balneis, tabernis,officinis, stabulis, nundinis vestris,ceterisque commerciis cohabitamus hoc saeculo* (*Apologeticus* 42, 2-3).[95] He also, in his 1910 inaugural lecture, cites in Dutch the beginning of the 5th chapter of the Epistle to Diognetus which expresses the same concept: *De Christenen verschillen van de overige menschen noch in woonoord, noch in taal, noch in gebruiken. Want zij bewonen geen afzonderlijken steden, spreken geen ongewone taal en voeren geen opvallende levenswijze.*[96] Χριστιανοὶ γὰρ οὔτε γῇ οὔτε φωνῇ οὔτε ἔθεσι διακεκριμένοι τῶν λοιπῶν εἰσιν ἀνθρώπων. 2. οὔτε γάρ που πόλεις ἰδίας κατοικοῦσι οὔτε διαλέκτῳ τινὶ παρηλλαγμένῃ χρῶνται οὔτε βίον παράσημον ἀσκοῦσιν. (For Christians are not distinguished from the rest of mankind either in locality or in speech or in customs. For they dwell not somewhere in cities of their own, neither do they use some different language, nor practise an extraordinary kind of life.)[97]

However, in *Charakteristik,* as Burton notes, although Schrijnen cites this passage as lines 1-9 he omits the above first two lines, where it is explicitly stated that Christians use no διαλέκτῳ τινὶ παρηλλαγμένῃ. [98] However, Schrijnen then goes on to assert (p.7) that Christians soon developed *eine engere Sprachgemeinschaft* and proceeds to emphasise the distinctness, the *Absonderung,* of the Christian community *in der Archaismen sich erhalten*

---

[94] For a list of the most prominent of Mohrmann's writings see the bibliography of this thesis.
[95] Schrijnen 1932, 7
[96] *Epistula ad Diognetum* V, 5-9, in Dutch translation of the Greek in Schrijen's Inaugural Lecture 1910, *De Waarde der kultuurhistorische methode voor de kennis van de christelijke oudheid* 12, C. L. Van Langenhuysen, Amsterdam (German version in *Collectanea Schrijnen*, Nijmegen 1939, 245)
[97] Translation from *Apostolic Fathers,* Lightfoot and Harmer, 1981
[98] Burton P.H., *Revisiting the Christian Latin Sondersprache Hypothesis*, in H. Houghton and D. Parker (ed). *Texts and Studies*, 2008149-151

und Neubildungen aufblühen konnten.[99] This statement is not, in my opinion, borne out by such evidence as exists. For instance, in his review of Schrijnen in *Revue des études latines,* Marouzeau, much of whose own work was concerned with stylistic variations in Latin writing, strongly criticises Schrijnen's assertion that there existed a distinct form of 'Christian' Latin. pointing out that it is totally inappropriate to speak of Tertullian, various inscriptions, Etheria and Augustine as examples of 'a single language' and he suggests that the term *le latin des chrétiens* was a more appropriate term than *le latin chrétien.*[100].

Moreover, one might well ask, if archaisms remain in continuous use, can they then be described as archaisms? As will be seen in the following section where the main points of Schrijnen's *Charakteristik* are considered, there appears to be a certain ambivalence and even contradiction in Schrijnen's writing. Denecker observes, 'Although Schrijnen in his *Charakteristik* fiercely criticises the conceptual and terminological vagueness of other people's work on early Christian Latin, this crucial passage also remains relatively vague'.[101]

One of Schrijnen's problems, I submit, is his attempts to distinguish and define particular terms such as *Kirchenlatein, Kultlatein, Volkslatein* and so on. These will be looked at in more detail below. The ambivalence, I suggest, also owes much both to the milieu of Schrijnen's time, and to his detailed, and linked, studies in both linguistics and ethnography, fields which were developing and evolving out of their background of earlier investigations in Dutch and German linguistics and culture. As Burton says, 'It is tempting, if ultimately unproveable, to see in Schrijnen and Mohrmann's emphasis on the popular roots of Christian Latin something of an ideological dimension.'[102] The encyclical *Rerum Novarum* issued by Pope Leo XIII on 15 May 1891 had reflected a desire to reconnect Roman Catholicism with

---

[99] Schrijnen 1932, 7
[100] J. Marouzeau, Review of Schrijnen, *Revue des études latines,* 10, 1932, 241-242
[101] Denecker 2018a, 344
[102] Schrijnen 1932, 5; Burton, 2008, 152

its popular roots and was still having an influence on the sociological thinking of the Catholic Church during the first part of the twentieth century.

Schrijnen's development of the *Sondersprache* hypothesis was clearly influenced by this movement, amongst other factors. However, there is one aspect of the development of the relationship between popular speech and Christian expression which receives no attention from Schrijnen, namely, the development in the approach to the study of New Testament Greek which first arose in the early part of the nineteenth century and which was continuing in Schrijnen's time. Many parallels can be traced between the discussion of how early Christian expression arose out of the vernacular of its day and the similar place of the influence of koine Greek on the language of the New Testament but, as Mohrmann has pointed out, Schrijnen does not greatly concern himself with Greek.[103] However, there can be discerned distinct parallels between this earlier new approach to the Greek of the New Testament and its relationship to the Greek vernacular of the period in which the Greek manuscripts of the New Testament first came to be written.

In a 1909 article in the *Harvard Theological Review* on methods in New Testament philology, Samuel Angus discusses the developments in the field since the debate between the protagonists of the 'purist' and the 'Hebraist' views of the language of the Greek New Testament, which tended to regard the language of the New Testament as 'sacred' and thus not susceptible of linguistic study[104]. The traditional view of New Testament Greek as a sacred, scriptural language gradually came to be overtaken by new insights which traced the influence of the *koine* on New Testament expression.

One of the earliest contributions to this field was the publication in 1822 of G.R.Winer's *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms*. William Moulton's English

---

[103] See page 117
[104] Angus 1909

translation of this volume (1870) was revised and enlarged in 1882 under the title *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek*.

The later nineteenth century, then, saw a range of developments in Biblical scholarship, mainly emanating from Protestant scholars in Germany.. Alongside these new philological approaches we may set such new critical approaches as source history and form history. All of these we may see as partly driven by theological considerations, and as having theological consequences. If Scripture is no longer seen, even by believers, as being a 'top-down' Word of God bestowed upon humanity from above, it may be seen rather as a 'bottom-up' Word of God, arising through ordinary human processes and using ordinary human language. A key name here is that of Adolf Deissmann (1866-1937) whose work on papyri and ancient inscriptions as a source of understanding of the New Testament., particularly following the discovery by Grenfell and Hunt in 1896 of the Oxyrhyncus papyri, contributed greatly to this developing area.[105] In the grammatical field the work of Alexander Buttmann and Friedrich Blass (1843-1907) demonstrated that New Testament Greek was influenced by the Septuagint and the vernacular Hellenistic Greek which descended from Attic.[106] Cremer's *Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch* of 1902 continued Deissmann's demonstration that the New Testament arose out of, and was part of, the *koine* Greek which largely formed the lingua franca of the Hellenistic-Roman world. A further significant contribution to the debate was that of Albert Thumb (1838-1886), who in his discussion about the relationship between *koine* and New Testament Greek also brought to bear relevant insights from his work on 'modern' Greek (the Greek of the nineteenth century, presumably).[107] Building on Thumb,

---

[105] Deissmann 1895
[106] For a detailed survey of the main writers of the period in the field of New Testament Research see Baird 2003
[107] Thumb 1895 and 1915

James Moulton demonstrated the intimate relationship between the syntax and accidence of the New Testament with that of the vernacular Greek of the time.[108]

Catholic scholarship needed to provide a response to the development of Biblical criticism in Protestant circles in Germany and elsewhere, This came in the form of Pope Leo XIII's 1893 encyclical *Providentissimus Deus*, This, citing patristic authority, strongly defended the divine origin and authority of Holy Scripture: *hoc sane de utriusque Testamenti libris perpetuo tenuit palamque professa est Ecclesia: eaque cognita sunt gravissima veterum documenta, quibut enuntiatur, Deum, prius per prophetas, deinde per seipsum, postea per apostolos locutum, etiam Scripturam condidisse, quae canonica*[109] It propounded a cautious and reverential approach to Biblical study and warned against external attempts both in earlier times and at the present time to attack the traditional Catholic confessional approach: *Neque, ex illa demum aetate, desiderata est nostrorum sollerti; quum clari subinde viri de iisdem studiis bene sint meriti, sacrasque Litteras contra rationalismi commenta, ex philologia et finitimis disciplinis detorta, simili argumentorum genere vindicarint.*[110] In spite of the encyclical's constant emphasis on the sanctity of the text and the care with which it should be approached by those who would study it, nevertheless it did have the effect of opening up a distinctive Catholic approach to Biblical study. One aspect of this was clearly a renewed interest in the original texts: *Revecta deinde ad nos eruditione Graecorum …* and gave impetus to Biblical study amongst Catholic scholars which led to the institution in 1902 by Pope Leo of the Pontifical Biblical Commission.

The encyclical came at a time of considerable tension in Europe. In Germany the Catholic authorities were considering how best to regroup following their defeat in the

---

[108] Moulton 1906
[109] Leo XIII 1893, citation in bold from Augustine *de Civitate Dei* X1, 3
[110] Leo XIII 1893

Kulturkampf. In France the anti-church attitude of the Third Republic culminated in *the Loi du 9 décembre 1905 concernant la séparation des Églises et de l'État* which repealed Napoleon's 1801 *Concordat* and established French *laicité*. This, together with earlier expulsions of religious orders in France, resulted in many French Catholic scholars working elsewhere in Europe.

Bernard Cabrol (1855-1897), a Benedictine, was from 1890 to 1895 prior at Solesmes Abbey and professor of ecclesiastical history at the University of Angers. However, the hostility in France to religious orders led to his emigration to England where he became prior of St Michael's Abbey in Farnborough, in England, which had been founded in 1881 by the former French Empress, Eugénie de Montijo. Another prominent Benedictine historian, Henri Leclercq (1869-1945) joined the Abbey of Solesmes and also accompanied Cabrol to Farnborough. There Leclercq wrote various works of ecclesiastical history, the most prominent of which is the *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie,* which he co-founded with Cabrol and which he edited alone after Cabrol's death.

The most significant contribution of Catholic Biblical scholarship was that of the Dominican Marie-Joseph Lagrange (1855-1938). Expelled from France with the Dominican Order in 1880 Lagrange joined the Spanish Dominican house of St Stephen in the major university city of Salamanca. As a professor of Church history and Holy Scripture he studied oriental languages in Vienna and in 1889 was sent by his Order to Jerusalem where he opened what he termed the *École Pratique d'Études Bibliques* (now the *École biblique et archéologique française de Jérusalem*) which received the authorisation of Pope Leo XIII in 1892. Also in this year, Lagrange founded the *Revue Biblique* to examine and discuss matters of critical Biblical scholarship. However, reaction to the 1893 encyclical led to a certain amount of suspicion that some scholars, including Lagrange, interpreted scripture more

broadly than Pope Leo would have wished. Lagrange was suspected of being a 'Modernist' and the Pontifical Biblical Commission issued caution about his methods.

The 1920 encyclical *Spiritus Paracletus*, issued by Pope Benedict XV, in commemoration of the fifteenth centenary of the death of St Jerome, whilst commending in a guarded way Biblical scholarship, could be said to be a reaction to *Providentissimus Deus*. However, Lagrange returned to France, and in 1935 published *Critique textuelle: Vol. 2, La critique rationnelle*, a handbook of textual theory relating to the textual criticism of the New Testament. He died in Paris in 1938, but his remains were returned for burial in Jerusalem.

. There is no mention of such Biblical scholarship in Schrijnen's writing, possibly because his interest in language led him to develop the *Sondersprache* theory rather than to examine Biblical scholarship. Apart from the citation from Diognetus in Schrijnen's 1910 inaugural lecture, repeated at the beginning of *Charakteristik*, which was discussed earlier, and an occasional reference to a Greek word, the language does not figure at all.[111] However, he must surely have been aware of the developments in Biblical studies arising in Germany and France both before and during his lifetime. By the early part of the twentieth century, when Schrijnen was writing, much scholarship demonstrated that the Greek of the New Testament, like the early Christian expression in Latin, with which Schrijnen was concerned, had risen out of, and was closely connected with, the everyday spoken language of the places and times in which it arose. Schrijnen seeks to demonstrate that whilst originally Latin expression about Christianity arose out of the 'vulgar Latin' of everyday speech it gradually developed a character of its own, hence the *Sondersprache*. This has been discussed already and will be surveyed later in the course of my examination of the specific sections of

---

[111] Above 103, Schrijnen 1910, 1932, 7

Charakteristik. The question of the gradual shift from Greek to Latin has also briefly been discussed, particularly in connection with 1 Clement and *The Shepherd of Hermas*.[112]

Angus, writing at the beginning of the twentieth century, emphasises the way in which the development of philology has 'broken down the wall of partition for the language of the New Testament and removed its erstwhile isolation' and notes that 'such words and expressions as σωτήρ, κύριος, υἱὸς θεοῦ, εὐαγγέλιον are not of Christian coinage, but are taken from the religious language of the surrounding heathen or Jewish world'.[113] A study and evaluation of such an assertion would be valuable but is not relevant in the present context of the background to Schrijnen's studies of the development of Christian Latin . However, another citation from Angus' paper could equally well be applied to Latin as well as to Greek: 'Christianity did little in her early days to increase the number of words to be registered in a Greek lexicon: her work was to enrich and deepen their meaning. Later on, in the ecclesiastical period of dogma and apologetics, the word-minting capacity of the church was considerably increased'. [114]

It is clear, then, that the trends in late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century scholarship to emphasise the vernacular elements in early Christianity did not arise in a cultural vacuum. They reflect a theological-political move towards inclusivity and anti-obscurantism. Certainly on the Greek side, they are also very firmly rooted in analysis of the new linguistic data coming out of Egypt. An interest in vernacularism might by the early twentieth century traditionally be associated with Protestantism. At the same time, however, developments within Roman Catholicism – notably *Rerum Novarum*, but also the tensions in

---

[112] See 81 ff and also 114
[113] Angus 1909, 450
[114] Angus 1909, 451

church-state relations in Bismarckian Germany and Third Republic France – had led to a rise

of interest among Catholic scholars in the popular roots of their religion.

2.4.5 An Examination of *Charakteristik des Altchristlichen Latein*

Earlier in this chapter I outlined the background to the development of Schrijnen's

views, as proposed in *Charakteristik des Altchristlichen Latein.* I now propose to examine this

in more detail, following Schrijnen's chapter divisions, and to include observations and

evaluations of this by Christine Mohrmann, made in her 1973 final lecture at Nijmegen and in

her 1977 paper *Nach Vierzig Jahren*.[115]

In the introduction to her opinions on Schrijnen's hypothesis expressed in the 1973

lecture, Mohrmann suggests that it was not until the writing of *Charakteristik,* towards the

end of his life, that Schrijnen came to the conclusion that structural changes had led to early

Christian Latin developing into a distinct *Sondersprache*:

> la preuve n'était pas donnée que la nouvelle religion et la nouvelle mentalité aient
> marqué l'usage au point qu'on puisse parler de changements structurels dans la
> langue. Cette preuve, Schrijnen ne l'a livrée que vers la fin de sa vie, dans sa
> 'Charakteristik' ….
> ('Proof was not provided that the new religion and the new mentality had made
> their mark on linguistic usage, to the point where one could speak of 'structural
> changes in the language'It was not until, towards the end of his life, that Schrijnen
> presented this proof, in *Charakteristik ...*)[116]

It is worth noting that here, more than in *Nach vierzig Jahren* Mohrmann expresses a

view of the *Sondersprache* with which one could agree; that Christian expression in Latin,

like any new field of activity, would need to develop new expressions, whilst still retaining

the normal vernacular Latin of the time. Mohrmann suggests that two questions need to be

posed; firstly, how to judge Schrijnen's theory at her present (1973) time and, secondly, how

to evaluate this in the light of recent linguistic developments. These two both seem to me to

---

[115] Mohrmann1977, 91-110, 111-140
[116] Mohrmann 1973, 93

be saying the same thing. She points out that Schrijnen, having been influenced by Saussure in Paris, (*l'influence de Saussure est, elle aussi, manifeste)* was considering *la langue paléochrétienne*. This appears to be the first time this word has been used in connection with the discussion of the language of early Christianity. There do not appear to be any instances of it in this sense either before or since Mohrmann in 1973. The term is usually applied to early Christian art in its various forms, rather than language. However, in this, Mohrmann's last lecture, delivered in French, she is clearly using *paléochrétienne* as a translation of Schrijnen's *altchristliche*.

Mohrmann refers to Schrijnen's work, *Uit Het Leven der Oude Kerk,* which appeared in 1919, written together with three of his students, as describing for the first time the idiom of early Christians as a group language. However, she emphasises that Schrijnen did not intend to say that it was possible for this group language to be thought of as demonstrating structural changes, a view which, according to Mohrmann, Schrijnen does eventually arrive at towards the end of *Charakteristik*. She points out that Schrijnen considered general linguistics as one of the ways of understanding a text and so renewing and reanimating the world behind the text: *nous entendons être des linguistes, mais aussi de philologues dans le sens traditional du mot.*[117]

Mohrmann then makes the point, which I have mentioned before, that the problem in studying Christian texts from a linguistic point of view is that early Christian texts have become the province of theologians, who, not being linguists, have misunderstood the term *langue spéciale*: *on crut que Schrijnen propageait la théorie que les Chrétiens avaient une 'langue à eux', ce qui aurait évidemment été une absurdité*. (It was believed that Christians had their own 'in-group language', which was clearly absurd.)[118] She asserts that it has taken

---

[117] Mohrmann 1973, 94
[118] Mohrmann 1973, 94

twenty-five years to make non-linguists understand that the term 'group language' or 'special language' does not mean a particular, and certainly not, 'secret' language but a variety of the common language; *cela veut donc dire que ceux qui utilisent une langue spéciale, participent aussi à l'usage commun, au sein duquel se manifeste la variété en question*. (That is to say, then, that who used a 'special language' also took part in a common usage, which showed itself in the particular variety of language in question.)[119] This, it would seem to me, is exactly the problem still encountered whenever the topic of *Sondersprache* arises.

There is a paradox here. Schrijnen and Mohrmann both suggest that one source at least of 'Christian Latin' is the attempt of (primarily Greek-speaking) early believers to evangelise (primarily Latin-speaking) friends; in other words, that it arises from an attempt to find a sort of religious common ground. At the same time, they emphasise the distinctiveness of Christian Latin and its opacity (at least partial) to the uninitiate. Therefore it seems that both, and particularly Mohrmann, meant that Christian Latin was essentially a subset of the wider language in the sense that, for instance, scientific, legal or technical forms of English are in the present day. However, the essential and important difference is that, whilst a 'group language' is confined to the group in question and either is not understood, or does not need to be understood, by those who use the general language, the essential of early Christian Latin was to enable Christian believers to communicate the faith to the population at large. Denecker discusses this problem again with reference to the Marouzeau paper mentioned earlier and comments, 'Although the antithesis which Marouzeau here creates is to some extent rhetorical, it aptly summarises the difference in perspective between Schrijnen and Mohrmann's 'monolithic' approach to 'Christian Latin' on the one hand and, on the other, the room for complexity in the study of 'late Latin'.[120] In her last Nijmegen lecture, Mohrmann

---

[119] Mohrmann 1973, 95
[120] Denecker 2018b, 330-332

uses for the first time the term polysemy *(polysémie)* to describe what has often variously been called semantic borrowing, loan shift, *emprunt sémantique*, or *Lehnübersetzung,* where a familiar word receives a new semantic meaning, pointing out that this is very common in Greek and Latin, and suggests as examples, λόγος, *verbum*, σωτηρία, *salus*, εἰρήνη, *pax*.[121]

In the paper, *Nach vierzig Jahren*, written in 1977, Mohrmann says she will seek to answer such questions as to whether new insights and modifications have been brought to bear on Schrijnen's theory and the position of the *Sondersprache* in the forty years since its publication in 1932 and whether any modifications or expansion, or new lines of further research can be detected. Mohrmann declares that it is not her intention to give a critical summary of studies of early Christian Latin in the intervening years, but simply to pursue the development outlined above. This, I think, is a pity, since most of her paper does not add very much to Schrijnen's ideas. She declares:

> Es ist nicht meine Absicht, eine kritische Zusammenfassung der auf dem Gebiet des altchristlichen Latein in den vergangenen Jahren durchgeführten Untersuchungen zu geben. ….. Ich setze mich ausschliesslich zum Ziel, die sich aus den Arbeiten der direkten und indirekten Schüler Schrijnens ergebende Entwicklung seiner Theorie zu verfolgen.
> (It is not my intention here to present a critical summary of the studies of early Christian Latin which have appeared in recent years. …. I aim simply to track and examine the result of the development of his theory in the work of followers of Schrijnen, whether directly or indirectly.)[122]

My own aim, however, is, as will have become clear, different, in that, in surveying the gradual development of Christian expression in Latin in its earliest stages of development, I have deliberately confined myself to the period up to about the middle of the third century, that is, up to the death of Cyprian. The greatest flowering of Latin Christian writing, in Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose and others, for example, Prudentius and Sulpicius Severus, is

---

[121] Mohrmann 1977b, 95
[122] Mohrmann 1977c, 112

yet to come. Although Schrijnen, Mohrmann and their school also include this later period in

their studies, (Mohrmann in particular, in that her doctoral thesis was on the *Sondersprache* in

the sermons of Augustine, to which she constantly refers), I have attempted to confine the

relevance of their conclusions to my own, restricted period. The Nijmegen school is, in my

opinion, important and valuable precisely because, in the entire period from the second to the

early twentieth centuries, it provides the only detailed study of early Christian Latin, even if it

comes to conclusions with which the present state of scholarship would not agree, which is

why my study has focussed on this comparatively brief period of examination of the subject. I

shall also endeavour, in what follows, to discuss any developments during the further forty

plus years since Mohrmann's paper in 1977. The following section will consider Schrijnen's

exposition of his *Sondersprache* theory in his *Charakteristik des altchristlichen Latein.*

2.4.5.1 Chapter 1 *Die Bildung des altchristlichen Latein*

Schrijnen recognises that the origins of Christian expression lie in the Latin

vernacular: *die Differenzierung ergab keinen besonderen Dialekt, denn es wird öfters betont,*

dass die Christen sich in ihrer Sprache von ihren Mitbürgern nicht unterscheiden and with

this I would agree However, he follows this with what, to modern ears, appears to draw too

concrete a conclusion about what would now possibly be called the expressions of an 'in

group'. He continues:

> aber sie schuf eine engere Sprachgemeinschaft, in der Archaismen sich erhalten
> und Neubildungen aufblühen konnten, in der Bedeutungsdifferenzierungen und
> Entlehnungen an der Tagesordnung waren, in der dem Volkslatein aus praktischen
> Gründen Vorschub geleistet werden konnte, in der auch besondere Redensarten
> und morphologische und syntaktische Eigentümlichkeiten gedeihen konnten, und
> in der insbesondere sich vielfache Differenzierungen entfalteten, die aus der
> Kultsprache entlehnt waren.
> (but they created a closer speech community, in which archaisms could continue
> and new coinings flourish, in which differences in meaning and borrowings were
> on the menu, and in which, for practical reasons, *Volkslatein* was encouraged, and
> particular ways of speaking and morphological and syntactical idiosyncrasies

could thrive and in which the great variety of particular expressions borrowed from 'liturgical' language could find their home.[123]

It is this, in my opinion, somewhat rigid, conclusion which leads to the formulation of the *Sondersprache* hypothesis. In our modern world we accept without question that different fields of activity have their own specialist language, language which would not be totally understood by those not involved in that activity though some of the specialist language is more widely known; British English speakers at least, will have heard of, say 'offside' and know it has relevance to football, without having any idea what it means. Computer technology has led to English expressions such as software, online, apps, and so on, featuring in general conversation in various languages, for instance, in English, 'I was offline a minute ago' meaning 'I wasn't paying attention' and 'I haven't got the bandwidth right now', meaning 'I'm too busy at the moment'. On the other hand, citations from the King James Bible, which are familiar common currency for those of an older English speaking generation, are now, in a more secular age, dropping out of use. Language is indeed, as Meillet says, *un fait social* and as such susceptible to change. I outlined earlier the background of the times in which Schrijnen and Mohrmann lived and worked, which, I would submit, had an effect on their views. In the Netherlands in the twenties and thirties of the twentieth century it was important for Catholics to gain a distinctive identity in society, a need which contributed, I suggest, to Schrijnen's particular views of early Christian Latin. This colours Schrijnen's view of the emergence of Christianity in the second and third centuries AD. Christians would need gradually to develop their own identity.

Schrijnen refers to the similarities yet differences between Tertullian and his pagan contemporary, Apuleius. The difference lies not so much in their style of writing as in the new

---

[123]Schrijnen 1932, 7

world-view for which Tertullian was struggling to find expression in Latin. Schrijnen makes the valid point that whilst this difference is not so marked in modern, particularly indo-European, languages, because Christian expressions have long influenced their development, in the Roman Empire the difference must have been astounding.

This development, however, was gradual, and can be traced from Tertullian to Isidore of Seville (560-636).[124] If Hoppe had recognised this, says Schrijnen, he would not have said *wie es aber möglich war, daß Tertullian die allgemein übliche Bedeutung vieler Wörter gänzlich änderte, ist und bleibt ein schwer zu lösendes Rätsel.*[125] Schrijnen sums up his view of Tertullian thus:

> von Tertullian bis Isidor von Sevilla gibt es einen weiten Entwicklungsgang, und dies wird umso deutlicher, wenn man bedenkt, dass manche Wortschöpfungen und Bedeutungsänderung Tertullians ganz persönlicher Art sind, kein Fortleben und keinen Nachwuchs haben und nicht auf dem Gefühl der nationalen Zusammengehörigkeit der Sprachgemeinde beruhen; sie sind also individueller, nicht kollektiver Natur ...sie sind rein stilistisch, nicht gemeinsprachlich.
> (from Tertullian to Isidore of Seville there was a further phase of development and this becomes even clearer when one considers that many of Tertullian's word coinings and changes of meaning were of a personal nature, did not continue to be used as expressions, had no further development and did not disturb the sense of the cohesion of the speech community. They were of an individual and not collective nature …thus they were purely stylistic and were not in communal use.)[126]

One of Mohrmann's main criticisms is that Schrijnen takes too little account of various factors which led up to the gradual development of a specifically Christian form of Latin. In particular she emphasises, a factor with which anyone reading *Charakteristik* would agree, that Schrijnen takes little or no account of the influence in Greek in this development. Both everyday Greek and Septuagint Greek, and particularly the influence of Greek-speaking Jewish Christians, played a large part in the dissemination of Christian beliefs. Christian

---

[124] For the latest discussion of the matter of language at the period see Denecker 2017
[125] Hoppe 1903, 117
[126] Schrijnen 1932, 8

preaching was, in the early stages, in Greek (as, of course, were the earliest Christian writings) and as Mohrmann says, *Von dem Augenblick an, da die Heilsbotschaft die Grenzen Palestinas überschritt, hat die griechische Koiné sie in Worte gefasst ...und Judeo-Christiani ... haben sicherlich ihre Spuren im ältesten christlichen Griechisch hinterlassen.*[127]

In her paper *Les origines de la latinité chrétienne à Rome,* Mohrmann discusses the matter of the gradual shift from Greek to Latin amongst the early Christian community in Rome.[128] In this she relies to a large extent on Bardy's 1948 book, *la Question des langues dans l'Eglise ancienne.*[129] Clearly, the early language of Christianity, as it spread from Palestine, was Greek and probably preaching, readings, and the nascent liturgy were also in Greek. This, says Mohrmann, was largely due to the fact that many of the earliest Christian communities were Jewish in origin, using the Septuagint and the early Biblical documents. However, there soon arose, in the multicultural milieu of Rome, Christians who were mainly or solely Latin speakers, leading both to the earliest Latin Biblical translations and to the questions of whether such documents as *The Shepherd of Hermas* and the *First Epistle of Clement* were originally in Greek and then appeared in Latin translations, or vice versa.[130]

Mohrmann returns to this topic in *Nach Vierzig Jahren,* where she traces a gradual process of Latinisation both in society at large and in Christian groups, leading to a bilingual phase which left traces in the earliest Christian Latin, not just in the number of borrowings from Greek to describe and explain Christian usages. Mohrmann uses *Einrichtungen* and then "*Sachen*" (her speech marks)[131], but also mentions *semantische Neubildungen* which she

---

[127] Mohrmann 1977
[128] Mohrmann 1949, 67-106
[129] Bardy 1948
[130] See discussion in Chapter 2, 2.3.1 and 2.3.2, 72
[131] It is possible that Mohrmann is here referring to or influenced by the *Wörter und Sachen* philological movement of the early twentieth centur, based largely in Germany and Austria, whose proponents believed that the etymology of words should be studied in close association or in parallel with the study of the artefacts and cultural concepts which the words had denoted in order to enable researchers to study linguistic data more

maintains arose in a casual (*schroff*) way and which could often not be explained in terms of the usual Latin way of speech. Thus arose not only borrowings but also Latin words for Greek words already known in secular Latin, for example, *gloria* was already familiar as Latin for δόξα and hence δόξα in the Biblical sense also became *gloria*. Relevant to this is also that, through Jewish Christian influence, Hebrew influences can be traced, and so the use in the Septuagint of δόξα as a translation of the Hebrew כבד is also significant. A.J. Vermeulen's work, *The semantic development of Gloria in early Christian Latin*, another monograph in the Nijmegen series, *Latinitas Christianorum Primaevorum,* mentioned earlier, gives a detailed exposition of this example of borrowing and traces *gloria* from its Roman secular understanding through both the earlier period of Christian Latin, Tertullian and Cyprian, and the later, Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose, and St. Leo the Great, to its depiction in the Christian art of the fifth century.[132]

Mohrmann discerns a gradual process of Latinisation during which the bilingual element gradually disappeared. Already discussed in this connection is her examination of the Latin translation of *The Shepherd of Hermas* and 1 Clement, according to Mohrmann the first examples of Latinisation. She mentions the Scilitan martyrs and the *Passio Felicitatis et Perpetuae* as other examples of this. Latin received its full working out in Tertullian, and a 'classical' version in Minucius Felix. Half a century later Cyprian's correspondence shows the great development of Christian Latin and its variety. Mohrmann also makes the point that liturgy was still in Greek, even in Rome, until the time of Pope Damasus (366-384). She maintains that, although at the beginning, the development of Christian Greek followed the

---

effectively. Many of the principles and the theories of the *Wörter und Sachen* movement have since been incorporated into modern historical linguistics

[132] Vermeulen 1956

same path as Latin, later purist influences, such as Atticism, led to Christian Greek developing its own direction, at any rate in literature.[133]

Mohrmann also raises the question, which has played a large part in this study, but which Schrijnen does not discuss, namely, what part did the early Latinisation of the church in North Africa play in the Latinisation of the church at large and particularly in Rome? All Cyprian's correspondence, with Rome and elsewhere, together with his other writing, is in Latin. In about 250 the anti-pope Novatian published his treatise *de Trinitate* in Latin. What part did the Roman Church play in the general shift from Greek to Latin? Did this evolution, which up to now has been studied exclusively in texts of North African origin, begin in North Africa? Did Rome adopt a ready-made language or did it play from the beginning an active role and make a contribution? In discussing this it must be remembered that for Mohrmann it was solely the Christian Church which formed the Latin that became the language of the Empire: …… *Rome a-t-elle adopté à un moment donné une langue 'baptisée' déjà toute faite, ou bien a-t-elle joué dès le commencement un rôle actif et a-t-elle contribué ainsi à la formation de 'l'idiome des chrétiens, qui, un jour, sera la langue commune de tout le territoire latin?* (Did Rome adopt at one given moment a language 'baptised' and already fully formed or did it play from the beginning an active role and did it likewise contribute to the formation of a Christian idiom which, one day, would become the common language of the whole territory where Latin was spoken?). [134] Can it be established that there were differences between the earliest Christian idiom in Rome and that in North Africa, differences which disappeared later? My opinion here is that it is not possible to give a satisfactory answer to this. It would seem probable that linguistic development amongst Christians followed and reflected that of general speech, a view which was also broadly followed by Mohrmann.

---

[133] Mohrmann 1977, 24
[134] Mohrmann, 1949, 71

Mohrmann, however, refers solely to the Christian community and does not discuss its relationship to the population at large. *Dans la première phase de la latinisation le latin est devenu de plus en plus la langue courante de la communauté chrétienne. Cette phase se dérobe presque complètement à nos regards, mais c'est elle qui détermine toute l'évolution suivante.* In the first phase of latinisation Latin became more and more the normal language of Christians. This phase did not completely disappear from our sight but it is this which determines the evolution which follows.)[135] She admits she has little or no direct evidence for this first phase . This second sentence seems to me to be a strange assertion. In the cosmopolitan population of Rome, it may well have been that Latin speakers were in the minority amongst the faithful, as maybe still in the population at large. Whilst inscriptions might be interesting in this respect it is not, as Bardy, cited by Mohrmann, points out, possible to attempt to draw conclusions from names on Christian inscriptions, as a name does not necessarily indicate nationality.[136] All one can say is that gradually Latin speakers from various places, including, of course, North Africa, became part of the Christian community in Rome. So in the course of the second century Greek Christian writings gradually became translated into Latin, demonstrating already a degree of evolution. The phase when Latin becomes the official language of the church does not appear until about the end of the third century onwards when destination of correspondence dictated what language should be used. Official inscriptions, for instance, of popes, are Greek up to end of the 3rd century, though that of Pope Cornelius, who died in 253, was in Latin.

2.4.5.2 Chapter 2. Christianisms, integral and partial, direct and indirect

In this chapter Schrijnen attempts to define several categories of word usages which he terms 'Christianisms'. He asserts:

---

[135] Mohrmann 1949, 72
[136] Mohrmann 1949, 73

Das altchristliche Latein ist eine ganz besondere Form des Spätlateins, es ist eben 'getauftes' Spätlatein. Ob man das Spätlatein schon mit dem Tod Ciceros (43 BC) oder des Augustus (14 AD) oder erst mit M. Cornelius Fronto anfangen lässt, kommt hier weniger in Betracht. Seiner Natur nach hat das nachklassische oder das Spätlatein mit dem Christentum selbstverständlich keine Beziehung: es war durch die Zeitverhältnisse bedingt, dass das altchristliche Latein die Merkmale des Spätlatein tragen musste.

(Early Christian Latin is a very particular variety of Late Latin, it is, in fact, 'baptised' Latin. Whether one regards Late Latin as beginning as early as the death of Cicero (43 BC) or of Augustine (AD 14) or not until M. Cornelius Fronto, is irrelevant. From its very nature post-classical or Late Latin clearly had no connection with Christianity: it was as a result of the passage of time that early Christian Latin came to display the traits of Late Latin.)[137]

Thus he claims that the *Sondersprache* can't disassociate itself from general language development, a view with which one would agree. However, Schrijnen then describes this development as a *Sprachverderbnis*.[138] This view, I would submit, betrays the general view of classicists of his time towards 'later Latin', and it needs to be borne in mind that Schrijnen was one of the first to apply insights from linguistics and ethnology to the study of Latin. Modern studies would, as outlined earlier, take a different view.[139]

Schrijnen maintains that, through researches in the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* in Munich, he has established that it is notable that certain word forms are attested only in Christian writers, not in secular literature.[140] He cites various examples, which he then attempts to divide into categories, using his system of 'Christianisms'.

Schrijnen defines as 'absolute' or 'íntegral' Christianisms, words and usages which only appear in Christian documents. He cites many examples, for example, *honorifico, sepultor, multiplicitas*, together with the writings in which they are found, such as what he refers to as

---

[137] Schrijnen 1932, 13
[138] Schrijnen 1932, 13
[139] Chapter 2, 2.4.4., 88ff
[140] *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae,* based on work begun in 1880s, first fascicle published 1900. This is the largest Latin dictionary in the world, and the only one to cover all Latin texts from the Classical period up to about 600 AD. This very valuable research tool, the work of the Bayerische Akademie (Thesaurusbüro München), whilst still not totally complete, is far more extensive than in Schrijnen's day and is now available online https://tll.degruyter.com/.

the *Itala*, but which we should now refer to as *Vetus Latina*, Tertullian, Cyprian and Augustine, etc. However, he admits that some examples are also to be found in the philosophical works of Cicero and Seneca.

Schrijnen then introduces his second category, 'partial Christianisms', which he defines as words which, whilst frequently appearing in Christian writing are also found, though not so frequently, in secular writing. He does not, however, give any specific examples here, though one would have thought that several of the above examples cited as 'absolute' might well fit into this category.

However, according to Schrijnen, these two categories are not sufficient to capture the full essence of Christianisms. He therefore introduces two further categories, which he calls direct (*unmittelbar*) and indirect (*mittelbar*) Christianisms. Direct Christianisms he describes as: *diejenigen Eigentümlichkeiten der altchristlichen Sondersprache, welche als Ausdrucksmittel für christliche "Sachen" im weitesten Sinne des Wortes Dienst leisten:* (those characteristics of early Christian special language, which serve as expressions for Christian 'matters' in the widest sense of the word). He suggests as examples such words as *trinitas, incarnatio, salvator* etc. [141]

Indirect Christianisms he would describe as words which are used semantically in a new way to describe Christian concepts, but which do not have a specific Christian meaning.:

> Unter mittelbaren Christianismen verstehe ich alle die sprachlichen Erscheinungen, bzw. Differenzierungen, welche nicht ihrem Wesen nach mit dem Christentum verknüpft, aber doch christlichem Einfluss zu verdanken sind.
> (I use the term direct Christianisms to apply to all phenomena or varieties of language which are not in essence related to Christianity but yet demonstrate Christian influence)[142]

---

[141] Schrijnen 1932, 15-16
[142] Schrijnen 1932, 18

Borrowings from *Itala* and the Vulgate, says Schrijnen, whether Graecisms, calques from Greek, or Hebraisms, are also indirect Christianisms. He gives, amongst other examples, *aspernamentum, agniculus, nativitas, speciositas*.[143] Schrijnen adds:

> Natürlich hat die *Itala* grossen Einfluss geübt. Aber man sollte doch bedenken, dass der oder die Verfasser der *Itala* selbst der niedrigen oder mittleren Volksklasse entstammten, und dass ihre Einzelbildungen keine Fortdauer und kein Nachleben gehabt haben könnten, wenn sie nicht in der Muttererde der Volkssprache gewürzelt hätten.
> (Certainly the *Itala* exerted a great influence. However, it should be remembered that the editor or editors of the *Itala* themselves came from the lower or middle classes and that their unique expressions would not have continued unless they had been rooted in common speech).[144]

So he would maintain that new expressions appeared in the *Volkssprache* because most early Christians belonged to lower and middle classes, a form of speech much more flexible and less formal than the *Kultursprache*. This assertion is, in my opinion, dubious, but for Schrijnen is related to his attempts to establish categories of language, in chapters 3 and 5 of his writing, which will be discussed below.

In both *Entstehung und Entwicklung* and *Nach vierzig Jahren* Mohrmann discusses, clarifies and slightly modifies Schrijnen's categories. In the former she would, for instance, whilst categorising most integral Christianisms as morphological, regard others as semantic, though these are fewer in number than those found as morphological (but she does not give examples).[145] In the case of partial Christianisms she says, this division is reversed, with more from the semantic sphere than from the morphological (again, no examples). However, by far the most important division of categories, according to Mohrmann, is that between direct and indirect Christianisms.

---

[143] Schrijnen 1932, 16
[144] Schrijnen 1932, 17
[145] Mohrmann 1959 and 1977, 126

Mohrmann extends Schrijnen's definition of 'direct' Christianisms thus: *unmittelbare* (*direkte*) *Christianismen sind diejenigen, deren Entstehen durch eine direkte, sofort ersehliche, durch christliche Lehre, Lebens- oder Denkweise veranlasste Ursache enstanden sind.*(Direct Christianisms are those which had their origin in a direct, immediate connection with Christian teaching, life or concept.) [146] She would apply this to all words and expressions which refer to specifically Christian concepts, whether these are newly coined words or borrowings (lexicological Christianisms), or when they acquire a new Christian understanding (semantic Christianisms). As an example of this process she cites the search for an expression for *Offenbarung*, where, in order to express this aspect of Christian belief, the word *apocalypsis* was borrowed from Greek, thereby enriching Latin with a direct lexicological Christianism, and when *revelatio* was coined as a Latin equivalent, this also was a direct lexicological Christianism. However, when the existing word *confiteri* is used in the sense of 'to confess the Christian faith' this is an example of a direct semantic Christianism.[147]

In summing up Schrijnen's discussion of Christianisms, and Mohrmann's comments upon them, it would seem that, whilst there might be a certain usefulness in attempting to categorise in this way one may well feel that, in attempts to clarify, Schrijnen only succeeds in obfuscating.

2.4.5.3 Chapter 3 *Altchristliches Latein und Kirchenlatein*

One of the main problems in trying to 'unpack' Schrijnen's writing is that much depends upon the use of terminology which, as Mohrmann also admits, it is not possible to define exactly and which therefore, rather than clarifying his points, tend to cloud them. In this chapter Schrijnen contrasts and compares the following two terms in an attempt to codify what he perceives to be different manifestations of Latin used in a Christian context:

---

[146] Mohrmann 1939, 346 ff
[147] Mohrmann 1939, 347

altchristliches Latein, which he employs as a general term, and *Kirchenlatein*, which he describes as the language of the *Itala* and the *Vulgate*, apocryphal writings, *Acta martyrum, Passiones*, proceedings of Councils, and the Muratorian Fragment, and in which more 'christianisms' are found than in *altchristliches Latein*. By *Kirchenlatein*, Schrijnen appears to be meaning what might in English be termed 'church Latin', a term used to refer to the language of the liturgy and of church order.

Earlier in this book Schrijnen declared: *es muss jedoch entschieden betont werden, dass das Kirchenlatein nur einen geringen Teil des altchristlichen Latein bildet, welches letzten Endes auf der sozialen Schichtenbildung durch Absonderungsbestrebungen beruht.* (However, it should be strongly emphasised that 'church Latin' formed only a very small part of early Christian Latin, which ultimately had an influence on the social structure through attempts at disassociation).[148] Schrijnen is probably right, at least to a certain extent, when he asserts that it was only later *daß die Umgangssprache der christlichen Gemeinschaft allmählich die nötige Reife gewonnen hatte, um als hinlängliches und würdiges Ausdrucksmittel für den offiziellen Verkehr mit der Gottheit zu dienen.* (that the everyday speech of the Christian community gradually attained the necessary weight to be able to serve as an adequate and sufficient mode of expression for official communication with the Godhead.)[149]

However, the conviction of both Schrijnen and Mohrmann was that it was the *Sondersprache* of the early Christian communities which developed into both the later liturgical Latin and the general Latin of the fourth century and beyond. Schrijnen criticises Löfstedt for describing Tertullian's language as *Kirchenlatein* and describes as *ganz richtig* Teeuwen's assertion that perhaps theologians and philologists don't distinguish between

---

[148] Schrijnen 1932, 17
[149] Schrijnen 1932, 27

Kirchenlatein and *altchristlichen Latein*.[150] He suggests that perhaps philologists could ask whether there existed in the Early Church, as in pagan religion, a specific *Kultussprache*, (another term of Schrijnen's) which should be distinguished, as a *Sondersprache,* from Christian general language, *Allgemeinsprache*, which could well itself be described as a *Sondersprache*.

Schrijnen also mentions what he terms *altchristliche Kultsprache* or *Kultussprache*. There is no clear definition of this, though he appears to use it refer to the 'educated' writing of people, like Tertullian: *Tertullian war weder der Vater des Kirchenlatein noch des altchristlichen Latein, wieviel er auch zur Bildung der altchristlichen Kultursprache beigesteuert haben mag*.[151] Schrijnen declares he cannot completely agree with Norden's description of Tertullian as *so recht eigentlich der Typus des christlichen Sprachschöpfers gewesen aus den gewalttätigen Neuprägungen atmet der Geist eines Mannes, der von dem Glauben durchdrungen war, dass das Christentum als eine neue Grösse in die Welt gekommen sei und daher neue Faktoren für seine Ausdrucksweise beanspruchen dürfte.* ((Tertullian became so absolutely the supreme example of the creator of Christian language that Christianity achieved a new important position in the world and therefore was able to claim new elements in its mode of expression).[152]

Mohrmann would not describe these terms in the same way as Schrijnen. She particularly deals with *Kirchenlatein*. Writing in 1977, she mentions the Beuron edition of *Vetus Latina*, which, she says, is gradually becoming more accessible. Now, of course, we can access later developments of this online. However, Mohrmann criticises Schrijnen's inclusion of the Martyr Acts as *Kirchenlatein*. She, as we in the present day also, would include them as

---

[150] Teeuwen 1926
[151] Schrijnen 1932, 35
[152] Norden 1898, 607

part of general Christian Latin *allgemeine altchristliche Latein*, which term she defines as follows:

> Als altchristliches Latein im eigentlichen Sinne des Wortes bezeichnet man all die Erscheinungsformen des Latein, welche zur Umgangssprache der christlichen Gemeinde gehören, ob diese zum kultur -oder volkssprachlicher Art ist. Diese Umgangssprache wurde dann auch in die christliche Literatur übernommen, in der sie mehrere stilistische Formen annehmen konnte. (Early Christian Latin in the precise meaning of the word is taken to mean all Latin attested forms which belong to the everyday speech of the Christian community, whether these are cultural or everyday expressions. This everyday language was then carried over into Christian writing, in which it could take on more stylistic forms.)[153]

2.4.5.4 Chapter 4 *Das altchristliche Latein und die anderen Sondersprachen*

In this brief chapter Schrijnen assembles various factors which he considers do not fit elsewhere in his arguments. What follows is an attempt to summarize the main opinions put forward by Schrijnen and Mohrmann. Schrijnen's interest and research in comparative linguistics comes to the fore as he attempts to gather various strands of evidence that there also exist other *Sondersprachen*, which will overlap and influence each other. He refers to his detailed examination of these factors in his work on comparative linguistics of 1905.[154] He also asserts in this connection that early Christian Latin owed very little to *Kunst und Wissenschaft* because Tertullian, and others in his Montanist circle rejected art as idolatry. However, Christians from quite an early date used images.

In a footnote Schrijnen quotes Teeuwen's opinion that Tertullian didn't use much *Kultsprache* because he wasn't a priest. [155] Although he would be familiar with the *Kirchensprache* and would retain its general meaning, *weil er aber kein Priester war, blieben diese Termini für ihn das, was sie waren, und behielten ihren kirchlichen Begriffsinhalt, ohne dass eine Begriffsschattierung hervortritt* … (but because he was not a priest these terms

---

[153] Mohrmann 1977, 131
[154] Schrijnen 1905
[155] Schrijnen 1932, 30 footnote 1

remained for him what they were and retained their ecclesiastical concept, without betraying any particular nuance…).[156]

This would appear to be a rather strange assertion. It is not possible to ascertain whether or not Tertullian was ordained and presumably 'ordained' here means 'to one of the higher orders'. Jerome writes: *usque ad mediam aetatem presbyter fuit ecclesiae Africanae, invidia postea et contumeliis clericorum Romanae ecclesiae ad Montani dogma delapsus* (*de Viris Illustribus* 53), suggesting that his ordination as a presbyter was invalidated by his association with the Montanists. Relevant to this is the word study of *presbyter* in this thesis which will be found in the chapter on Cyprian.[157] However, this assertion of Teeuwen's, of which Schrijnen seems to approve, could be attributed at least in part to the influence of the attempts in Schrijnen and Teeuwen's day to establish a firm establishment of clericalism as part of the growth in influence of the Catholic Church of the time.[158]

Schrijnen also mentions that, as has been pointed out earlier in this study, another influence on early Christian Latin was oratory. Tertullian, Cyprian, and, later, Augustine, were all trained rhetoricians and the use of oratorical devices characterises their terminology. There was amongst the Roman educated classes a strong tradition of using legal language: *Vor allem gab es eine Tradition des Staats- und Rechtslebens, welche jedem civis Romanus im Blut steckte.*(Above all a political and legal way of life remained in the blood of every Roman citizen).[159] However, Schrijnen is talking generalities and adds *In Rom ist ja 'the man in the street' Rechtshandler*.[160]

---

[156] Teeuwen 1926, 35
[157] Chapter 4, 4.8.2, 263
[158] Chapter 2, 2.4.3, 94
[159] Schrijnen 1932, 31, Rechtslebens (stet)
[160] Schrijnen 1932, 31

Mohrmann obviously also finds this chapter a collection of various brief notes and declares that Schrijnen's assertion that there was a relationship between early Christian Latin and other *Sondersprachen* hardly appears in the later researches of the Nijmegen school and cannot be maintained.[161] She also refers to Teeuwen's dissertation *Sprachlicher Bedeutungswandel bei Tertullian*.[162] Since this dissertation was published in 1926 these ideas must have been current before Schrijnen published *Charakteristik* in 1932. In this paper, Teeuwen traces the use in Tertullian of words with a legal or military provenance. Mohrmann is of the opinion that, although it is reasonable to ask whether the use of these words in Tertullian is due both to his legal training and the other probability that he was the son of a Roman centurion, several of the words from these areas used by Tertullian were already used in a Christian sense. Words such as *sacramentum* and *statio*, whilst both familiar in their respective original military meanings as 'military oath' and 'watch-post' respectively, appear already to have taken on a Christian meaning, with *sacramentum* as a calque of μυστήριον while *statio* could be regarded as a reborrowing into Latin from Greek.[163]

Mohrmann comments on Schrijnen's assertion that it was the *Sondersprachen* of *Unterschichten* such as trade and economy which became the starting point for new Christian expressions and observes that expressions which Schrijnen adduces, such as *operatio, pascua, piscina, plantatio*, had been part of everyday speech for a long time before passing into Christian Latin.[164] However, *operatio,* according to TLL, appears almost exclusively in Christian writers and in *Itala/Vulgata*; *pascua* appears occasionally in Cicero and Ovid and frequently in Columella; *piscina* is common both in classical and later Latin; *plantatio*, apart

---

[161]Mohrmann 1977, 136
[162] Teeuwen (1892-1960) studied at Nijmegen and also Paderborn, where he produced his dissertation *Sprachlicher Bedeutungswandel bei Tertullian* 1926
[163] Mohrmann 1977, 134
[164] Mohrmann 1977, 135

from a few mentions in Pliny the Elder and others, is mainly found in a metaphorical Scriptural sense: *adulterinae plantationes non dabunt radices altas* (Augustine *de Doctrina Christiana* 2.42). Isaiah 61:3: *plantatio Domini ad glorificandum* (Vulgate) and Matthew 15:13 *omnis plantatio quam non plantavit Pater meus coelestis, eradicabitur* are probably key passages here.

According to the general rules of speech development, says Mohrmann, expressions from a *Sondersprache* would pass into everyday speech. However, the converse could also happen, when developments in a particular field led to general words being taken over into a *Sondersprache* and being used in a specialised sense. This specialised use then often returned into everyday speech as such expressions became generally familiar. Mohrmann considers that this two-way process was the way in which early Christian Latin developed from other *Sondersprachen* and that not so much emphasis should be placed upon the relationship between early Christian Latin and other *Sondersprachen* as Schrijnen does.[165] This certainly seems reasonable. Phrases from technical registers do find their way into popular language, sometimes with a different meaning and one knows also of the popular misuse of scientific terms such as 'half-life'. At the same time, of course, English is (because of its heavy use of Greek and Latin borrowings and derivations) relatively immune to the 'technicalisation' of everyday words. English has 'nucleus', 'hydrogen' and 'oxygen' where German uses adaptations of everyday words, *Kern, Wasserstoff, Sauerstoff.*

These comments of Mohrmann, I suggest, are significant, in that, for practically the first time in *Nach Vierzig Jahren*, she seems to be writing from the viewpoint of someone living in the seventies, when technology was beginning to develop and to spread into general use. In the world of the twenties and early thirties, when Schrijnen was developing his ideas,

---

[165] Mohrmann 1977, 135

this sort of cross-cultural fertilisation was much less well-known. It was, of course, the Second World War which led to such technological developments. Now, general use of many technical terms is a very familiar concept, particularly in English, leading, sadly, in my opinion, to the universal use of such English expressions in other languages, especially in the field of information technology.

2.4.5.5 Chapter 5 *Kulturlatein, Volkslatein und altchristliches Latein*

Schrijnen suggests that, whilst to a large degree *Kultursprache* represented the speech of the 'upper classes' and *Volkssprache* the 'lower classes', both formed part of the *Sondersprache* and both were written and spoken.[166] These terms of Schrijnen's seem to correspond roughly to *sermo urbanus* and *sermo plebeius* as already discussed in chapter 1.[167] However, as Ferri and Probert, along with Schrijnen, observe, they were not antitheses but overlapped and were not the possession of one particular 'class'.[168]

In discussing the relationship between *Volkslatein* and *altchristliche Sondersprache* mentioned earlier, Schrijnen thinks that the view that Christian preachers had to use *Volksprache* to be understood by their listeners is wrong. Such a view, says Schrijnen, does justice neither to *Volkslatein* nor to the early Christian *Sondersprache* and the examples of this are continually misinterpreted, such as Augustine's remarks about *os* and *ossum*: *os suum dicit; quod vulgo dicitur ossum, latine os dicitur, melius est reprehendant nos grammatici quam non intelligant populi* (*Enarrationes in Psalmos*, 138) and cited by Schrijnen. He maintains that most of these 'vulgar elements' were a normal part of everyday speech, not only in *Volkssprache* but also in *Kultursprache,* which then passed into Christian usage.

---

[166] Denecker, in a personal communication, suggests that this was 'probably to do with the fact that Schrijnen, more so than Mohrmann, worked in a time of increasing specialisation and terminological proliferation'
[167] Chapter 1, 1.1.3, 25
[168] Ferri and Probert 2010, chapter 2 12ff.

Mohrmann asks how the availability and frequency of these 'vulgar' elements can be explained. Schrijnen has already said that such elements are a general feature of late Latin and that certain 'vulgarisms' are influenced by Christian-inspired emphasis. However, any preacher, teacher, communicator, will use language relevant to the situation in which he/she is working, so it seems logical that Augustine would have adopted this approach.[169]

Schrijnen maintains that the so-called archaisms in early Christian Latin must be regarded as vulgarisms because it is *Volkslatein* which has best preserved the old Latin forms. It is generally accepted that in the classical period Latin underwent a process of standardisation, which tended to marginalise certain forms which reappear in Later Latin/Romance: *portare* versus *ferre* is one case in point, *eccistum* is another. Schrijnen observes:

> und weiterhin möchte ich bemerken, dass - was ja eigentlich selbstverständlich ist - seit Tertullian der vulgärische Bestandteil in der altchristlichen Sondersprache fortwährend zunimmt, und zwar in der Sprache der Unterschicht intensiver als in der Sprache der Oberschicht. (and furthermore, I should like to point out something which is in fact self evident, that after Tertullian the 'vulgar' element in early Christian expression greatly expanded and was more marked in the language of the 'lower' classes than in 'upper-class' speech.)[170]

Mohrmann thinks this does not answer the question of how Christian Latin acquired these 'vulgar' elements and adduces several factors. She suggests that firstly, it was necessary to find suitable words to communicate the new Christian belief and practice, and the 'freedom' of the 'vulgar' speech provided the opportunity of coining new words to express this. Secondly, since many of the early Christians came from the lower strata of society their mode of speech would have influenced Christian expression.

---

[169] Other references by Augustine on the topic of communication which Schrijnen discusses in this chapter are beyond the scope of this study and so will not be discussed here.
[170] Schrijnen 1932, 38

Traces of this preference for *Volkssprache* can clearly be discerned in the earliest Latin Biblical translations, says Mohrmann, with the result that these vulgarisms, since they appear in the Bible, therefore appear to have received a certain 'sanctity', as in Jerome *cum que inebriatus fuerit et repletus in caelo, hoc est in aere, qui consuetudine scripturarum caelum dicitur* (*In Isaiam* 10,34).

2.4.5.6 Chapter 6 *Schlussfolgerung*

Schrijnen compares the early Christian community's use of Latin to that of the process of language acquisition in the family. Latin speaking Christian communities had their own language which he terms, as previously, *altchristliches Latein.* Only by recognising this, declares Schrijnen, can one understand the character of the legacy of this language, which is not *Spätlatein, Volkslatein, Kulturlatein, Kirchenlatein* and even the influence of Biblical language is not relevant. Tertullian, Cyprian, Minucius Felix, and later, Lactantius, Arnobius and Salvian belong to the *Kulturlatein* group, in contrast to other Latin writings. As examples of the *Volkslatein group* Schrijnen refers to the 'pseudo-Cyprian' treatise *Adversus Aleatores* or *de Aleatoribus*,[171] Commodian, Lucifer Calaritanus, Victor Vitensis, and Egeria represent the *Volkslatein* group.[172] Augustine is the clearest example of the use of both styles. Christian writers found in their *Sondersprache* a natural way of expressing their religious convictions. This, therefore, can also, says Schrijnen, be used to ascertain authorship.

Schrijnen expresses the hope in this exposition to have introduced a new way of looking at the development of later Latinity. In this, I suggest, he has succeeded, though his particular views and expressions are actually quite different from more recent views.

---

[171] Probably of African provenance, emanating from any time between the third and fourth centuries, see Sanday 1889, 126-128
[172] Schrijnen 1932, 43

2.4.6   The Later Reception of the *Sondersprache*

Having discussed the work and life of Joseph Schrijnen and Christine Mohrmann I now propose to look at the effect, if any, their studies have had on scholarship in the area of early Christian writing since the end of the seventies. Schrijnen died in 1938. Christine Mohrmann continued to travel, teach and write until her death in 1988, though much of her later writing focussed more on liturgical and medieval Latin than on the *Sondersprache*. Schrijnen's approach to 'Christian' Latin appears to have gained some acceptance as the twentieth century continued, the greatest homage to it being paid by L.R.Palmer, in his study *The Latin Language*, in which the chapter 'Christian Latin', one of several under the general head 'Special Languages', closely follows Schrijnen.[173] However, not all earlier Latin linguists agreed with Schrijnen. Burton cites Jules Marouzeau who, in his review of Schrijnen's book, observes that the term should be 'Christians' Latin' rather than 'Christian Latin' since there were not enough distinctive features to suggest a *Sondersprache*.[174] Another review, by de Ghellinck, considered that more linguistic features were needed to distinguish 'Christian' Latin from any other type of Latin, if it were to be described as a *Sondersprache'*.[175]

Thus it would appear that the 'Nijmegen School' did not long outlast its founders and their students. This field of study became rather a niche area, associated particularly with Catholic studies, not helped by the fact that the journal *Vigiliae Christianae*, founded by Christine Mohrmann and Jan Hendrik Waszink in 1947, became the 'house journal' of the school. Other series of publications produced by the Nijmegen scholars were the *Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva,* of which the first was Schrijnen's *Charakteristik des Altchristlichen*

---

[173] Palmer 1958, reprinted 1990, 181
[174] Marouzeau1932, 241-242, cited in Burton 2008, 152 note 7
[175] de Ghellinck 1939 449 ff

Latein in 1932, *Graecitas Christianorum Primaeva*, 1964, edited by Christine Mohrmann, and also *Graecitas et Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva.*

One difficulty in examining and discussing 'Christian' Latin is that it falls between the two disciplines of classical studies and historical theology, as has previously been observed. Burton points out that it was probably the founding of the Nijmegen school's 'house' journal *Vigiliae Christianae* which led to the 'ghettoisation' of the study of 'Christian' Latin in the area of early Christian studies rather than in Latin linguistics. This journal, now published yearly by Brill, includes linguistic articles on Christian Latin.[176] Though it is often to be found in theological rather than classical sections of academic libraries it continues to publish articles of interest to theologians and linguists alike. Until recently this area has, to a large extent, been ignored by classicists on the one hand, and appropriated by theologians on the other. Theologians are much more interested in the content and meaning of Christian writers than in their language. Classicists have plenty of fields of study available and even those concerned with linguistic study tend not to be concerned with what one might suggest is an important factor in the writing of later Latin. However, the continuing divide between the work of classicists and theologians in recent years does seem to be breaking down and has led to what is now termed 'Early Christian Studies.' In the introduction to *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies* the editors comment thus:

> 'Once pursued primarily as a sub-speciality within ecclesiastical History or Theology (that is, as 'Patristics'), the study of early Christianity has recently emerged as a distinctive and fully interdisciplinary endeavour in its own right, embracing Classics, Ancient History, Theology, Religious Studies, Art History and Archaeology, among others.'[177]

---

[176] It also publishes *Vigiliae Christianae Supplements* which contain scholarly translations, commentary and critical studies of texts and issues relating to language in early Christianity, of which Denecker's *Ideas on language in Early Latin Christianity,* Brill, 2017, is an excellent example

[177] Harvey. and Hunter 2008, 1.

The first chapter of this handbook examines the Patristics/Early Christian Studies divide.[178] The earlier definition of this field, patristics, largely confined itself to theology, and does not always appear to consider the linguistic aspects of early Christian writing to be of importance. The significant point would appear to be that, although in recent times there has been much research into what is often termed 'late' Latin or 'neo-Latin', comparatively little has appeared on the subject of the early development of Christian writing in Latin. Even the gradual development, referred to earlier, of linguistics in general and sociolinguistics in particular, has not generally managed to find a place for this area. The great flowering of Latin language study in recent years, such as the masterly works of J. N. Adams, James Clackson, Roman Müller, the essays in *Colloquial and Literary Latin,* and Roger Wright's *Sociophilological Study of Late Latin* do not concern themselves with Christian Latin. The work of Schrijnen and Mohrmann in the early part of the twentieth century in promulgating their theories of 'Christian Latin' has not played a large part in the general Latin studies mentioned above. It is, of course, difficult to propose reasons why this or that scholar should choose not to mention their views, if that scholar does not offer an explicit rationale. However, we may propose various possibilities. One may be that, by the standards of more recent sociolinguists, their work asked the wrong questions, or asked questions it could not answer; there is an obvious contrast between the fieldwork of Labov and the desk-based approach of the Nijmegen scholars. It may be that later Latin itself was, from the point of view of later scholars, too much of a niche area at an institutional level. Its leading scholars typically worked in departments of classics or theology rather than languages and linguistics. They disseminated their work through journals and conferences which were simply off the radar of the emerging discipline of sociolinguistics; and, where sociolinguists did notice them,

---

[178] Clark 2008, 7-41

they were more likely to be struck by the differences between their approaches than by the similarities. However, Schrijnen and Mohrmann could well be regarded as pioneers in the field of sociolinguistics. Today, whilst we would want to apply a more nuanced and less rigid approach to the reading of earlier texts I feel there is still much to be gained by re-evaluating their insights.

In the following section I consider a few examples of some aspects of the development of Christian Latin as discussed by Robert Coleman, (1985 and 1989), Roman Müller (2001), Philip Burton (2008 and 2011) and Tim Denecker (2017).

2.4.6.1 Robert Coleman 'Vulgar Latin and the Diversity of Christian Latin' and 'The Formation of Specialised Vocabularies in Philosophy, Grammar and Rhetoric: Winners and Losers'

In papers presented to the two regular colloquia at which the topic of Christian Latin might receive a sympathetic hearing, the first of these being the inaugural colloquium, Robert Coleman presented *Vulgar Latin and the Diversity of Christian Latin* (1985)[179] and also discussed some aspects of Christian Latin in *Winners and Losers* (1989).[180]

Once again, the term, Vulgar Latin, with the manifold attempts at definition, as already discussed in chapter one of this thesis, appears.[181] In his 1985 paper Coleman defines it as '… the usage of illiterate Latin speakers', a definition with which I would not agree but will accept for the purposes of comments on this paper.[182] Coleman is dealing mainly with what I would describe as later Christian Latin, the Latin of liturgy and ecclesiastical organisation, emanating from the fourth century and later, and thus forming a gap between that type of Latin and 'the forms of Latin spoken by the illiterate masses; but we do not know

---

[179]Coleman 1987, 37-52
[180]Coleman 1989
[181] Chapter 1, 1.1.4, 33
[182] Coleman 1985, 37 note 2

how far they were apart at the start. The early converts, though speaking Vulgar Latin, would have understood Classical Latin when it was orally delivered …. we need therefore to allow for the possibility that early Christian Latin was not uniformly vulgarised'.[183] Coleman begins with Biblical Latin and enumerates and discusses the familiar topic of expressions he terms 'vulgarisms'. This was a common view of early Christian Latin, following Schrijnen and the Nijmegen School, and also discussed by Müller (see next section).[184] Coleman cites Augustine's view, already mentioned: *os suum dicit; quod vulgo dicitur ossum, latine os dicitur, melius est reprehendant nos grammatici quam non intelligant populi* (*Enarrationes In Psalmos,* 138) thus 'close adherence to the original text and clarity of meaning, rather than classical correctness, continued to be the criteria by which textual variants were assessed'.[185] Whilst most of this paper deals with later Christian Latin Coleman does briefly acknowledge the importance of Tertullian: '… the first important post-Biblical expositor was the African Tertullian, a professional rhetorician capable of ranging, as the occasion demanded, from high rhetoric to colloquial and even vulgar forms of expression' and compares him with his pagan contemporary, Apuleius.[186] This is, I would submit, a very accurate description of Tertullian's writing, which will be discussed in more detail in chapter 3, and Coleman makes the point that Tertullian, along with his later contemporaries, Minucius Felix, and Cyprian, develops a type of Christian literary Latin which 'gradually began to develop out of the elements of the Christian colloquial Latin.'[187] Tertullian could be regarded, as Coleman says, as a pioneer in developing a Christian theological vocabulary. However, Coleman concludes by asserting, 'the concept of a Christian Latin *Sondersprache* or *langue spéciale* is thus as much a fiction of

---

[183] Coleman 1985, 38
[184] Müller 2001
[185] Coleman 1985, 41
[186] Coleman 1985, 47-8
[187] Coleman 1985, 48. Coleman puts this last clause in inverted commas but does not give a reference.

modern philologists as the African Latinity that was erected more than a century ago on the linguistic features common to Tertullian and Apuleius,'[188] thus virtually dismissing much of the discussion I am attempting to survey.

The paper *Winners and Losers* discusses the 'three types of linguistic innovation for subjects only previously treated in Greek,' namely, borrowings from Greek, semantic extensions of Latin words which already shared other meanings with the Greek term, and calques, defined by Coleman as 'creating a new Latin word, using the Greek term as a lexico-morphological model'.[189] This paper includes a few relevant terms, such as Lucretius' translation of *simulacrum* for εἴδωλον (4.34) and Cicero's coining of *beatitas* and *beatitudo* (*de Natura Deorum*. 1.96) to describe the Epicurean idea of happiness.[190]

2.4.6.2 Roman Müller *Sprachbewußtsein und Sprachvariation im lateinischen Schriftum der Antike* [191]

In recent times, the seminal works on later Latin by, above all, J. N. Adams (2002, 2003, 2007, 2013, 2016) and others, such as Dickey and Chahoud (2010), have produced only fleeting mentions of Christian Latin. [192] García de la Fuente's study *Latin biblico y latin cristiano* broadly follows the *Sondersprache* line, as Burton points out. [193]

Müller gives slightly more space to the subject, though strictly under the particular *Sprachvariationen* into which he divides his book. He cites sources already mentioned, Schrijnen, Mohrmann and Coleman and does not, in my view, add much that is new to the examination of early Christian Latin. His discussions of Christian Latin are found in the

---

[188] Coleman 1985, 51
[189] Coleman 1989, 77
[190] Coleman 1989, 80 and 81
[191] Müller 2001
[192] Dickey and Chahoud, 2010
[193] de la Fuente 1994, cited in Burton 2008, 154

sections *Sermo rusticus*: *das 'rustike' Latein der Christen*; *Sermo humilis*: *Die augustinische wende: Sermo humilis im latein der Christen,* and *Standard und Variatäten*: *Niveauhebung im Latein der Christen*.[194] I propose a brief examination of the first and third of these, since in the second of these, *sermo humilis,* Müller deals only with the period of Augustine and beyond.

2.4.6.2.1 *Das 'rustike' Latein der Christen*[195]

Müller maintains that *sermo rusticus* as used in Christian speech demonstrates a new approach to 'rustic speech', which he terms *diaphasisch*, as distinct from his descriptions of other types of rustic speech, *diatopisch* and *diastratisch*, in that this speech is characterising a specific form of language designed with the pragmatic aim of sharing the Christian gospel with the 'less educated masses'.[196] This, Müller says, was already employed by the Apologists in using the language of the (presumably Latin) New Testament, in support of which he cites Norden.[197] He also cites Lactantius: *ut omnes intellegerent quae ipse omnibus loquebatur* (*Divinae Institutiones* 6.21). Müller quotes many references to *rusticus* in writers early and late, in support of his demonstration that Augustine and others, although classically learned, used 'lower level' speech in order to communicate the gospel (see, for example the much cited *os/ossum* passage already referred to) and adds another citation from Augustine: *quid ad nos quid grammatici velint? melius in barbarismo nostro vos intellegitis, quam in nostra disertitudine vos deserti eritis*? (*Enarrationes in Psalmos* 36, sermo 3) which is clearly making the same point.

---

[194] Müller 2001, 1.5, 64-78; 4.4, 111-116; 2.4.2, 315-320
[195] Müller 2001, 64-70
[196] Müller 2001, 64 *Die Suche nach der bestgeeigneten Sprachform, der wenig gebildeten Masse die christliche Botschaft faßlich naherzubringen*
[197] Norden 1898, 521

2.4.6.2.2 *Niveauhebung im Latein der Christen.*[198]

In addition to briefly mentioning Schrijnen and Mohrmannn, Müller then cites Herman who, he says, must have found a certain 'linguistic embarrassment' *(Verlegenheit)* when he included *langue des chrétiens* under *variétés de groupe*, whilst at the same time emphasising that the vocabulary of this 'special group' was, on the contrary, derived from general intellectual Latin usage.[199]

Müller suggests that the way to finding a satisfactory solution to the question of the relationship between these variations is to divide them into two points: one, the level of the speech area/range (*Sprachbereich)* and two, the point in time with which the speech is concerned. With reference to the first of these Müller cites Coleman's 'four registers' mentioned in his 1985 paper 'the vulgarised Latin of Bible and Psalter, the plain but unvulgarised style of ecclesiastical administration, the more sophisticated idiom of expository and hortatory literature, the products of high literary culture - the hymns and collects of the Liturgy and Offices.'[200] However, Müller points out that it is also necessary to consider the Latin of the sermon and Christian teaching in the second and third centuries, which were also examples of .. 'lower level Latin'. All in all, says Müller, it is only possible to refer to a 'special Christian Latin' with reference to vocabulary, since the syntax and morphology were, apart from Biblical Hebrew-Greek influence, the same as in non-Christian Late Latin.[201] The second point mentioned above, the time element, Müller maintains, is therefore very important since during the period from the end of the second into the third centuries, when Latin was gradually replacing Greek as the language of communication and Christians were a minority, Latin functioned as 'group speech'. Therefore, says Müller, early Christian speech

---

[198] Müller 2001, 314-320
[199] Müller 2001, citing Herman 1975
[200] Coleman 1985, 52
[201] Müller 2001, 316

was *rusticus* because it had its roots in the 'lower classes' and Müller refers to Cicero's division between *sermo rusticus* and *sermo urbanus* as the dividing line between 'upper' and 'lower' speech.[202] It was therefore even more remarkable that Christian Latin developed from the negative to the positive, so that all such terms as *sermo humilis, sermo simplex, sermo vulgaris* and *sermo rusticus* were regarded as just various aspects of the language but meant one and the same: *… aber ein und dieselbe Dimension der Sprache meinten: den spezifischen Gebrauchsstandard einer Minderheit, die zur Mehrheit werden und mit ihrer Legitimierung volksnaher Ausdrucksregister den allgemeinen Gebrauchsstandard nach unten hin öffnen sollte.* (… but meant one and the same dimension of the language, the specific usage of a minority which became a majority and, having thus become legitimised, could open a more 'people friendly' level of general language use.)[203]

2.4.6.3 Two Chapters by Philip H. Burton

Insofar as the *Sondersprache* theory has been revisited in modern times, it has been questioned. As mentioned above, in 1985 in his address to the colloquium *Latin tardif, Latin vulgaire*, Robert Coleman dismissed the *Sondersprache* idea thus: 'the concept of a Christian Latin *Sondersprache* or *langue spéciale* is thus as much a fiction of modern philologists as the African Latinity that was erected more than a century ago on the linguistic features common to Tertullian and Apuleius.'[204] Burton, however, has looked again at this topic and takes a more sympathetic view: 'What we have not done is to identify a distinctly Christian "special language". However, I would suggest that earlier emphasis on radically new departures – the coinage of new words, and the creation of new senses for existing words – may have led us to

---

[202] Müller 2001, 319
[203] Müller 2001, 320
[204] Coleman 1985, 51

overlook the specialisation and the increasing frequency with which some terms are used within Christian Latin. There is very much still to be explored here'.[205]

Burton suggests four reasons for reconsidering this corner of Latin linguistic scholarship: firstly, whilst this area has largely been disregarded in Latin linguistic studies, it has continued to be assumed to a greater or lesser extent in the field of patristics and early Christian studies; secondly, modern Latin linguistics has investigated specialised registers or technical usages of Latin, (much as the modern world has become accustomed to such registers and, indeed, this has tended to lead to the over-dominance of English, particularly in technical fields); thirdly, sociolinguistics offers a new way of examining and understanding the insights of the earlier scholars, which may, at first sight, appear dated; fourthly, the development of digital technology has opened up ways of examining data unheard of even in Coleman's day, let alone Schrijnen's.

Burton highlights the practice of religious groups to use particular forms of language, in order to associate themselves with others in their group and to identify this group in relation to others. He makes the point that what studies there have been of this aspect have tended to focus on the use of such language rather than on the language itself, being in the main confined to the fields of patristics and Biblical studies, and that Christian Latin is largely absent from modern scholarship.

The only attempt to approach this from a linguistic standpoint was that of Schrijnen and Mohrmann and their development of the *Sondersprache* hypothesis. In summarising reactions to the *Sondersprache* Burton refers to Palmer, already mentioned, as the 'high-water mark' for the *Sondersprache* and also Coleman's *coup de grâce* to the *Sondersprache* in describing Christian Latin as a 'fiction'.[206]

---

[205] Burton 2008, 149-170
[206] Burton 2008, 153

Burton suggests that it is now time to reconsider this area in the light of modern studies of specialised registers in Latin linguistics, such as those of Adams, later insights in sociolinguistics and, in particular, the advances in digital technology which have made linguistic study much more accessible, even in the period since Coleman's remarks in 1985.

Burton's other study on the topic, *Christian Latin,* considers the relationships between Christian Latin, Biblical Latin and, once again, the difficult, vague term 'vulgar Latin'. [207] He points out that, in the New Testament, apart from a few Latin loanwords, mainly those connected with the *Imperium Romanum*, such as κῆνσος, κουστωδία, λεγιών, φραγελλόω, Christian writing in Latin did not appear until the late second century. From that time onwards the unbroken line of Christian writings stems from the fourth century. As in the previous paper, Burton, like Müller, stresses that the main difference between Christian expression and any other type lies in the lexis. As with any new area of experience, Christianity needed to evolve a new vocabulary, usually involving one or more of the three processes already mentioned earlier in this thesis, of lexical borrowing, usually from Greek, such as *baptizo*, from Greek βαπτίζω, calques, sometimes described as 'loan extensions' in which a Greek term forms the model for a new Latin expression, for instance, *glorifico* from δοξάζω, and semantic extensions, in which an existing Latin translation of a Greek word receives a new sense, as in *virtus* from δύναμις. Burton also provides a short word study of *episcopus* and offers as examples of Christian writing a passage from Lactantius, (*Divinae Institutiones* 2.1) and the *Itinerarium Antonini Placentini* (c 570). Burton, then, offers a partial rehabilitation of Christian Latin hypothesis. It should be stressed, however, that this is only partial. In calling attention to what he regards as a distinctly Christian lexis, running across a range of literary texts and genres, Burton does not address the more thoroughgoing claims of the Nijmegen

---

[207] Burton 2011, 485-501

school: namely, that Christian Latin was a 'special language' in a stronger sense, including such features as syntax and pronunciation. For our purposes too it is notable that Burton, like Schrijnen and Mohrmann, concentrates on fourth-century authors and later (even if he also considers earlier evidence). Burton acknowledges (personal communication) that his suggestions might be more cogent if grounded in modern theoretical approaches to in-group and out-group language.

Burton's two papers offer a very useful summary of what recent scholarship there has been in the field of Christian Latin. However, as is the case with the *Sondersprache* material and the other studies surveyed here, his examples and case studies relate to the much better documented period of the fourth century onwards.

2.4.6.4 Catherine Chin, Grammar and Christianity in the Late Roman World

In an attempt at completeness in enumerating recent studies on early Christian Latin, I mention the latest two works to appear on the subject. Chin's book, *Grammar and Christianity,* describes the many contributions made by the literary education of the time which showed that people of the Roman Empire were able to convert from classical to Christian culture and examines the tensions discerned in the two cultures. However, this study does not have relevance to the period covered by the present thesis, being concerned with the timescale from 350 to 500 AD, referring to texts by writers such as Donatus, Charisius and Servius.[208]

2.4.6.5 Tim Denecker, Ideas on language in Early Latin Christianity[209]

No survey concerned with Christian Latin would be complete without reference to the most recent work in this area, Denecker's *Ideas on Language in Early Latin Christianity*, to

---

[208] Chin 2008. This work originally appeared under the name of Catherine Chin, and the publisher seems still to be using this name; so for ease of reference I use it here. I understand the author now prefers to use the form C. Michael Chin.
[209] Denecker 2017

which I have already referred.[210] However, this masterly book is concerned with areas very different from those under investigation in the current study. The clue lies in the title; as Denecker writes at the beginning of the introduction: 'This study aims to provide a history of the linguistic ideas held by early Christian authors …. due to the interaction between the 'classical' and 'Biblical' frameworks within which they are working'.[211] Moreover, as is the case with so many studies of early Christian expression in Latin referred to in the present study, most focus on the writing of later periods, often centring upon, as Denecker points out, the person of Augustine as, citing Burton, 'the single most important exponent of Christian language theory in the West'.[212] Therefore, as might be expected, in spite of the subtitle, 'from Tertullian to Isidore of Seville' the discussion of language will be very largely concerned with the period from the fourth century onwards. In the introduction Denecker makes clear that he is encompassing the period from the birth of Tertullian (c.160) to the death of Isidore of Seville (636) but, although Tertullian is mentioned several times, as the earliest writer under discussion, he does not play a very large part in the 'ideas on language' referred to in the title. Cyprian, likewise, does not figure in this study.

What is relevant to this chapter on the *Sondersprache* and associated matters is that Denecker's book appears in the *Vigiliae Christianae Supplements*, an excellent series of scholarly translations, commentary and critical studies of texts and issues relating to early Christianity. This is the supplement to *Vigiliae hristianae,* the journal founded by Mohrmann and Waszink in 1948 to publish and promulgate the researches and ideas of the Nijmegen scholars.

---

[210] See pp 1,2,17,25
[211] Denecker 2017, 1
[212] Burton 2007, 9

2.4.7　Conclusion

This chapter has attempted to survey the early development of Christian expression in Latin, deliberately limiting the study to the short period from the end of the second century to the death of Cyprian in the middle of the third century. The reasoning behind this decision was that most studies of early Latin Christian writing concentrate on the fourth and fifth centuries, beginning with wealth of material in the writings of Augustine and then continuing with the study of Jerome, Ambrose, and those that followed them, providing researchers with the plentiful source material available in the work of these and other writers. Although the short earlier period upon which I have concentrated provides fewer primary sources, my conviction that the material which does exist, together with its reception, forms a good topic for research, has led me to limit my studies to this particular period.

The main focus of this period in later times is that of Joseph Schrijnen and Christine Mohrmann in the earlier twentieth century, a study which produced the *Sondersprache* hypothesis, a view which, having been warmly received in some quarters when first promulgated, has become largely marginal in recent years, and which, it seems to me, merits further investigation. The research of these two scholars, and the milieu in which they lived and worked, as I have suggested, have much bearing on the conclusions they came to, and is therefore the reason why much of this chapter has been devoted to these aspects of their work. Recent years have seen a certain amount of revisiting and reassessing of this particular period, to which hopefully the present study makes a contribution.

The period under discussion in this thesis does, however, include two prominent Latin Christian writers, who provide what is probably the first extant substantial writing about Christianity in Latin, Tertullian and Cyprian, and it is to consideration of these two writers that the attention of this study will now turn.

Chapter 3 The Language of Tertullian

3.1 Introduction

Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus (c 155 - c 240 AD) has been mentioned

earlier. This chapter will examine his place in the development of Christian expression in

Latin. The earliest mentions of Tertullian by name are two references in Jerome. One is a

brief entry in Jerome's translation and expansion of Eusebius' *Chronicon* composed circa 380

in Constantinople. This is a translation into Latin of the chronological tables which compose

the second part of the *Chronicon of Eusebius*, which is for year XVI of the reign of Severus,

Tertullianus Afer, centurionis proconsularis filius, omnium ecclesiarum sermone celebratur.[1]

The other is from *De Viris Illustribus* chapter 53, probably written in Bethlehem 392 or early

393, *Tertullianus presbyter, nunc demum primus post Victorem et Apolloniam Latinorum*

ponitur, provinciae Africae, civitatis Cathaginiensis, patre centurione proconsulari. [2]

Tertullian is also mentioned in book 1 of the *Praedestinatus,* an anonymous three-

volume work found amongst the works of Augustine and in some sources assigned to

Arnobius the Younger.[3] This book, by an anonymous author, is a catalogue of 90 heresies,

most copied from Augustine, but it also includes other information referring to the Montanists

and possibly emanating from Rome.[4] In this document Tertullian is criticised for his

Montanist views, though he may merely be criticised for clashing with the Bishop of Rome,

rather than for propounding Montanist beliefs. There is no evidence for the suggestion that he

founded his own 'Tertullianist' sect and the statement *nihil tamen in fide mutavit* could refer

---

[1] Helm 1956,. 212

[2] Booth 1981, 237-59

[3] In the *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina* (25B) this work is ascribed to Arnobius Junior but although there have been various attempts at ascribing authorship it is now generally accepted that this is unknown.

[4] The text was first printed by J. Sirmond in 1643 and 1644 and reprinted in Migne, *Patrologia Latina,* vol 53, col. 587.ff.

equally well to Montanist or to orthodox beliefs. In any case the whole question of doubts about Tertullian's orthodoxy are open to debate, as will be discussed below:

> Scripsit contra eos librum sanctus Soter papa Urbis, et Apollonius Ephesiorum antistes. Contra quos scripsit Tertullianus presbyter Carthaginiensis (1.26) …. Tertullianistas olim a Sotere papa Romano damnatos legimus …. Tertullianus autem fuit civis et presbyter Carthaginiensis: opuscula eloquentissima et ferventia in defensione edidit veritatis. …. et contra Soterem papam urbis Romae, ut supra diximus, dum Cataphryges haereticos detegeremus: a quibus postea divisus, ne plebs Montani nomen Tertulliani videretur excludere, fundit a se omnem Phrygiae vanitatem et Tertullianistarum conventicula propagavit: nihil tamen in fide mutavit. (*Praedestinatus* 1.86)

As the earliest extant Christian writer in Latin, Tertullian is clearly important for the study of the language, as is probably the fact that he, along with the other major Christian writer to be discussed, Cyprian, was associated with North Africa. The relevance of Africa to the spread of Latin as a the main language of communication has been discussed in chapter 1.[5] As was said there, the theory that there was a specific 'African' form of Latinity is now widely regarded as discredited. However, given the position of Roman Carthage as the pre-eminent city in North Africa, it is not surprising that the first attested writing in Latin about Christianity should originate from there.

The only other clues to Tertullian's life are from references in his works. If, as Jerome attests (see above), Tertullian was indeed the son of a serving army officer, it could be that he originally came from somewhere other than Carthage, though that does not give any further information. Certainly, as in the *Praedestinatus,* Tertullian is often referred to as a citizen of Carthage, *Tertullianus autem fuit civis et presbyter Carthaginiensis.* It seems possible that he had the usual Roman education in law and oratory and so would have been steeped in the Latin 'classics' with a facility in oratorical techniques.[6] However, this cannot be established

---

[5] Chapter 1 1.2, 40

[6] Inter alia: Teeuwen 1926, 33. Stefan Teeuwen (1892-1960) studied at Nijmegen and also Paderborn, where he produced this work as his dissertation. This somewhat shadowy figure could well merit further investigation.

either, and may arise from the fact that he is often confused with, or even identified with, the jurist Tertullianus, referred to in the *Codex Justinianus,* part of the collection of Roman laws known as the *Corpus Iuris Civilis* ordered by the emperor Justinian early in the sixth century, where '*Tertullianus'* is said to have written a book *de Castrensi Peculio,* and eight books of *Quaestiones*.[7]

In the world of the Roman Empire, even in North Africa, Greek seems to have been widely used for everyday purposes and Tertullian's writing is greatly influenced by Greek, both from general use (reading, writing and speaking) and, above all, from Biblical sources.[8] Sittl suggests that the use of Greek in North Africa was even more widespread than in other parts of the Empire: … *Gräecismen, welche an Zahl und Umfang die in den anderen Ländern des Westens üblichen weit übertreffen*.[9] However, Adams says of this, '..there are African grecisms, supposedly more numerous and extensive than are to be found in other areas of the west' which he says 'can be exemplified from all over the Empire if one troubles to look'.[10] There have been suggestions that Tertullian wrote several books in Greek, though none of these survive.

The ascription to Tertullian of 'The father of Latin Christianity', 'The Founder of Christian Literature', or 'The Father of Christian Latin' has in the past been bandied around in various sources, occasionally with the ascription of this remark to Jerome. None of these titles have an exact origin in the primary sources, and the earliest ascription in English appears to have derived from Henry Hart Milman's *History of Latin Christianity,*

> 'Africa, not Rome, gave birth to Latin Christianity. Tertullian was the first Latin writer, at least the first who commanded the public ear; and there is strong ground for supposing that, since Tertullian quotes the sacred writings perpetually and

---

[7] Mommsen and Kruger 1898b. See also discussion in Barnes 1971, 22-29
[8] See section on Tertullian and the Bible, 3.4, 152
[9] Sittl 1882, 112
[10] Adams 2007, 517-8, see also 55-61 in the present study

copiously, the earliest of those many Latin versions noticed by Augustine, and on which Jerome grounded his Vulgate, were African.' [11]

There is no primary evidence for this specific formula appearing in Jerome, though perhaps it might possibly be derived from Jerome's remark that Cyprian referred to Tertullian as 'my master'.[12]

The *Sondersprache* hypothesis, which maintained that the early Christians had their own special language, has already been discussed in detail and is not particularly relevant to a discussion of Tertullian's Latin, which features infrequently in the *Sondersprache* writings. In *Characteristik* Schrijnen only refers to Tertullian once, and then not in connection with his language but citing the quotation from the *Apologeticus* where Tertullian stresses that Christians share the same daily life as their contemporaries (*Apologeticus* 42).[13] Mohrmann occasionally mentions him in passing but her concern is with later Latin, particularly with Augustine, on whom she wrote her doctoral dissertation and to which she frequently refers.[14] She wrote a short paper about Jerome and Augustine on Tertullian, the opening sentence of which gives the reason why the adherents of the Nijmegen School, the first Catholic University in the Netherlands, and committed to confirming the position of Catholics in that country, should follow the traditional view of Tertullian as a heretic: *Le fait que Tertullian a rompu avec l'église et qu'il est mort hérétique a compromis sa mémoire dans l'église ancienne*.[15] The question of the status of the Montanists, as far as it can be ascertained, will be dealt with below.

---

[11] Milman 1855, 35
[12] 3.2.1, 138
[13] Schrijnen, 1932, 6
[14] Mohrmann 1932
[15] Mohrmann 1951, 1.

There is no denying that Tertullian's vigorous style of writing is *sui generis* but the distinctive features of Tertullian's Latin may be a matter of idiolect as much as of sociolect. Tertullian seems to have written a lot, rather fast, with the linguistic consequences of that being familiar to all. In the detailed examination of Tertullian's language which will follow this preliminary survey I shall seek to demonstrate that, rather than being part of a Christian 'special language' it is likely that Tertullian is largely using the educated language of his time, adapting and extending this where necessary in discussion of the tenets of Christianity, as in the *Apologeticus.* His language in his theological works is clearly more 'technical' since he is addressing those who, like him, are versed in the language of the faith. The question of whether his language is influenced by his African heritage has already been discussed as part of the whole disputed question of *Africitas*.[16]

The obvious way to examine the 'Christian' element in Tertullian's writing would be to compare him with other contemporaries but the paucity of extant Latin literature during the same period, the only significant contenders being Apuleius and, perhaps, Aulus Gellius, makes it difficult to evaluate his literary style in a wider context. Later in this chapter I shall examine the use made of Tertullian's writing by Minucius Felix, a lawyer and contemporary of Tertullian, a writer endeavouring to use a more 'classical' style in order to commend Christianity to his peers, and I shall consider the significant differences between the two writers when addressing the same material.

Tertullian's style of writing is certainly very different from that of the 'mainstream' classical writers. Clearly, even 'educated' writing in Latin, for such is Tertullian's genre, at the end of the second century and the beginning of the third, will differ from that of the 'classical' period. As is the case with any writer, Tertullian's style varies according to the nature of a

---

[16] See chapter 1, 1.2.1, 43

particular work; his apologetic writing, such as the *Apologeticus* and *Ad Nationes,* requires a different approach to those works aimed at combatting the views of fellow theologians, for instance, *Adversus Praxean*, where it is clear that Tertullian's mode of expression is also familiar to his protagonist.[17] Yet another style is required for the pastoral works such as *De Oratione* and *De Pallio*. The same could apply, for instance, to Cicero, in oratorical writings, philosophical treatises and letters. It is possible to discern a common style for a writer but the main point of my investigations is to establish to what extent Tertullian extended and developed the Latin of his day to express the 'new' Christian beliefs.

Below I outline and discuss examples of the reception of Tertullian and attitudes to his use of Latin, from Jerome and Augustine to assessments from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Tertullian's Latin has frequently been described by many commentators as 'difficult', a somewhat subjective description which could be disputed. Different, maybe, for those who have been brought up solely on a diet of the 'classical' writings, but reasonably readable for anyone with a competent knowledge of Latin and a familiarity with Christian thought.

3.2 Tertullian's language and style

3.2.1 Jerome and Augustine

Jerome mentions Tertullian forty-seven times in his writings. Whilst some of these are merely references in his commentaries to Tertullian's Biblical writings, others demonstrate Jerome's opinions. Jerome appears to have a high regard for Tertullian, *eruditus et ardens vir* (*Epistula* 84. 2) and *Tertullianus creber est in sententiis, sed difficilis in loquendo.* (*Epistula* 58.10), though he does not offer any explanation of why he finds Tertullian's style *difficilis.* Many shades of expression could be meant here and so any translation is bound to be an

---

[17] See section on Praxeas in word study on *ratio,* 3.7.5.2, 192

interpretation. In more modern terms one might say, 'Tertullian is packed with pithy points but rhetorically awkward'.[18] All that might possibly be drawn from this is that even writers nearer Tertullian's time found it necessary to comment upon his idiosyncratic style. Lactantius expresses the opinion that Tertullian's style is the reason he is little known: *Septimius quoque Tertullianus fuit omni genere litterarum peritus, sed in eloquendo parum facilis et minus comptus et multum obscurus fuit. ergo ne hic quidem satis celebritatis invenit* (*Institutiones Divinae* 5.1.23).

Jerome very much disapproves of Tertullian's insistence on monogamy after the death of a first spouse, pointing out that this was contrary to Paul's teaching: *Scripsit et Tertullianus de Monogamia librum haereticum, quem Apostolo contraire nemo qui Apostolum legerit ignorabit.* (*Commentarii in Epistulas Paulinas, Ad Titum,* 1, 6-7.)

There are several instances of Jerome's opinion that Tertullian's views were heretical, due to his Montanist leanings: *et de Tertulliano quidem nihil amplius dico, quam ecclesiae hominem non fuisse* (*Aduersus Helvidium de Mariae virginitate perpetua* par.17); and, particularly: *in Tertulliano laudamus ingenium, sed damnamus haeresim* (*Liber Tertius Adversus Libros Rufini*, 27).

Many views of Tertullian, then as now, stem from the view of him as a heretic, something which, although his Montanist sympathies were clearly known, could be disputed, especially in view of the theory that Montanists were in fact regarded as part of the Christian Church in Carthage. Much has been written about this matter and it has never been clear whether there was a specific excommunication of Montanist adherents, and in many places, as at Carthage, they appear to have maintained their standing within the orthodox community or, indeed, formed a separate, parallel, church. According to Tertullian:

---

[18] Philip Burton, unpublished, 2019

> Novitatem igitur obiectant, de cuius inlicito praescribant aut haeresin iudicandam, si humana praesumptio, est, aut pseudoprophetiam pronuntiandam, si spiritalis indictio est, dum quaque ex parte anathema audiamus, qui aliter adnuntiamus (*De Ieunio*.5).

In a detailed paper on this subject, Douglas Powell summarises it thus: 'Originally, we would suggest, the *Tertullianistae* formed, not a schismatic body, but an *ecclesiola in ecclesia* - not, indeed, content to be such, but prepared to be such while they strove still to secure the official recognition of that New Prophecy which they themselves obeyed. There are plentiful analogies in ecclesiastical history'.[19] In her short paper, *Saint Jérôme et Saint Augustin sur Tertullien,* Mohrmann maintains that Tertullian's Montanist beliefs were the reason why, apart from Jerome's comment cited below, Cyprian never mentions him, and that Augustine omits Tertullian from his enumeration of Christian writers.[20]

Cyprian never refers to Tertullian by name in his writings. However, according to Jerome, Cyprian calls Tertullian 'the master':

> Vidi ego quemdam Paulum Concordiae, quod oppidum Italiae est, senem, qui se beati Cypriani, iam grandis aetatis, notarium, cum ipse admodum esset adolescens, Romae vidisse diceret, referreque sibi solitum numquam Cyprianum absque Tertulliani lectione unum diem praeterisse, ac sibi crebro dicere Da magistrum: Tertullianum videlicet significans (Jerome, *De Viris Illustribus* 53).

Jerome mentions Cyprian's attitude to Tertullian again, though in this instance with a negative reference to Tertullian's Montanist sympathies: *et beatus Cyprianus Tertulliano magistro utitur, ut eius scripta probant; cum que eruditi et ardentis viri delectetur ingenio, montanum cum eo maximillam que non sequitur (Epistula* 84).

Augustine has 15 references to Tertullian, amongst which there are three in which, like Jerome, he condemns Tertullian's view of second marriage:

---

[19] Powell 1975, 33-54
[20] Mohrmann 1951

hinc enim maxime Cataphrygarum ac Novatianorum haereses tumuerunt, quas buccis sonantibus, non sapientibus etiam tertullianus inflavit, dum secundas nuptias tamquam inlicitas maledico dente concidit quas omnino licitas apostolus sobria mente concedit (*De Bono Viduitatis* 4);

alioquin etiam primas nuptias condemnabimus, quas nec Cataphryges nec Novatiani nec disertissimus eorum astipulator Tertullianus turpes ausus est dicere (*De Bono Viduitatis*);

non ergo ideo est Tertullianus factus haereticus, sed quia transiens ad cataphrygas, quos ante destruxerat, coepit etiam secundas nuptias contra apostolicam doctrinam tamquam stupra damnare, (*De Haeresibus* 86).

However, none of Augustine's citations comment upon Tertullian's style. I submit that his vigorous and direct style is a result of a) putting his own stamp on the contemporary manner of writing and adapting and extending meanings to describe Christianity, b) his use, extension and adaptation of Greek words and expressions (current anyway in a largely bilingual society), c) his coining of new words, from Greek and Latin, and d) the extent to which he is influenced by Biblical texts, both Greek and such Latin translations as existed at the time.

3.2.2 Tertullian's background and his relationship with his target audience

Highly significant is the particular readership of Tertullian. Some works are clearly addressed to those who are already Christians, or at any rate familiar with the Christian faith and with Biblical texts. Others, such as *Adversus Praxean* and, above all, *Adversus Marcionem,* are polemical and demonstrate detailed theological argument with particular reference, in the case of the latter, to Marcion's heterodox collection of Biblical texts. The apologetic works, principally the *Apologeticus*, and its previous working out in *Ad Nationes,* and *De Spectaculis,* and others, are clearly aimed at a non-Christian readership where specific New Testament references would not have been relevant. The exposition of the life of Christ in chapter of the *Apologeticus,* for example, makes a comparison with the pagan

stories, *recipite interim hanc fabulam, similis est vestris* (*Apologeticus* 21.14). However, it also appears to assume some knowledge of the Jewish Scriptures … *sciebant et Iudaei venturum esse Christum, scilicet quibus prophetae loquebatur …* (*Apologeticus* 21.15).

As has previously been observed, it is highly likely, even though not proven, that Tertullian had undergone at least to a certain extent, the usual Roman rhetorical and legal education. This becomes clear in many of his works. As Braun demonstrates, Tertullian describes Scripture as an *instrumentum,* a legal term, which Tertullian is the first to use in this sense, describing a written document which would *instruere* the case and provide a proof.[21] This sense is described by Quintilian: *ideoque opus est intueri omne litis instrumentum: quod videre non est satis, perlegendum erit.* (*Institutio Oratoria* 12. 8.12).[22] It can therefore be regarded as significant that Tertullian uses it to refer to Scripture. This usage is found more than eighty times in his writings, particularly in the apologetic words, for example: *Sed quo plenius et impressius tam ipsum quam dispositiones eius et voluntates adiremus, adiecit instrumentum litteraturae, si qui velit de deo inquirere, et inquisito invenire, et invento credere, et credito deseruire.* (*Apologeticus* 18), and in the polemical works against Marcion, for instance: *Constituimus inprimis evangelicum instrumentum apostolos auctores habere, quibus hoc munus evangelii promulgandi ab ipso domino sit impositum* (*Adversus Marcionem* 4).

Another facet of the use of *instrumentum litteraturae,* discussed by Haupt, is that of the emphasis which Tertullian lays on the antiquity of the Scriptures.[23] Antiquity was a quality much valued in Roman thought. One has only to consider titles such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus' Ῥωμαϊκὴ Ἀρχαιολογία, Varro's *Antiquitates rerum humanarum et divinarum*

---

[21] Braun 1962, 463-473
[22] Haupt 2019. Haupt points out that Braun's reference to this passage is incorrect. That given above is Haupt's corrected reference.
[23] Haupt 2019, 106

and Josephus' Ἰουδαϊκὴ ἀρχαιολογία, for instance, to be aware of that fact. Tertullian, when writing in *Apologeticus* about the Roman gods which Christians have been accused of violating, using *instrumentum* as before, describes them as *antiquitatum instrumentis* (*Apologeticus* 10,4). In chapter 18 Tertullian stresses the antiquity of the Scriptures: *sed quo plenius et inpressius tam ipsum quam dispositiones eius et coluntates adiremus adiecit instrumentum litteraturae, si qui velit de deo inquirere, et inquisito invenire, et invento credere, et credito deservire* (*Apologeticus* 18.1). He continues by emphasising that it was from the very beginning that God *viros iustitiae innocentia dignos deum nosse et ostendere a primordio in saeculum emisit spiritu divino inundatos, quo praedicarent deum unicum esse, qui universa condiderit ....* (18.2). This antiquity of the Scriptures is argued again in chapter 46, as part of what would, had the *Apologeticus* been pleaded as a legal charge, have been part of the 'summing up': *Ostendimus totum statum nostrum, et quibus modis probare possimus ita esse sicut ostendimus, ex fide scilicet et antiquitate divinarum litterarum, item ex confessione spiritualium potestatum* (46.1).

3.3 Minucius Felix - an 'upmarket' rendering of Tertullian's apologetic

3.3.1 Minucius Felix

The *Octavius* of Minucius Felix is a defence of Christianity which aims to demonstrate that the faith is reasonable for and relevant to cultured and educated Romans. It is couched in the form of a dialogue with two protagonists, Caecilius, the pagan, and Octavius, the Christian, with the author, Minucius Felix, as an impartial arbiter. Whilst Minucius deliberately adopts the dialogue form, following fairly closely the pattern of Cicero's *de Natura Deorum,* though with only two protagonists, as against Cicero's three, the shape it takes, with Octavius' reply to Caecilius in defence of Christianity taking up nearly two-thirds of the whole, leads it away from philosophical discussion towards apologetic. In

the introduction, entitled 'why don't Christians do dialogue?' to his book, *The End of Dialogue in Antiquity,* Simon Goldhill asserts, 'Early Christianity, however, appears to have little time for dialogue. Augustine, although he did write some short dialogues early in his career, explicitly rejects the form for serious theological thinking, and all his major works are in treatise form, even when there are obvious antecedents in Platonic or Ciceronian prose'.[24] This, in my opinion, is not entirely fair to Augustine, who came to conceptualise all learning as inner dialogue with Christ and who therefore should not be considered to be 'rejecting' this form.[25] Martin Claes, in his paper, *Limitations to 'Exercitatio Mentis': changes in rhetorical style in Augustine's dialogues,* explores how, although Augustine's dialogue moves from *oratio obliqua* to *oratio perpetua* it is in one sense still using a dialogue form. Referring to *de Magistro* (10:32-33) Claes writes, 'Within this discourse the function of the conventional teacher - who teaches with help of signs – is explained as a stimulus for the student to return into his self in order to consult his inner Teacher. Augustine identifies this Teacher as Christ.'[26] Goldhill, as is the case with many general writers on early Christian writing, only discusses the later Fathers, such as Augustine. However, Goldhill has a point, which is why the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix is significant. The uniqueness of *Octavius* lies in its comparatively conciliatory character, since the purpose is to appeal to traditional educated pagans, well versed in the philosophical tradition, with no interest in, or regard for, such Christian apologetic as had been produced at this time (e.g. Justin Martyr, *Apologiae*, Tertullian, *Apologeticus*). The work is derivative, owing much in content and form both to Cicero's *de Natura Deorum* and to the Christian Apologists, particularly Tertullian's

---

[24] Goldhill 2008, 5

[25] *Confessiones* is a case in point. It is certainly not a 'treatise' and could, indeed be considered a 'dialogue'.

[26] Claes 2007, 387-398

Apologeticus. However, the tone of the Octavius is throughout far less polemical than that of Tertullian, as will be demonstrated.

Minucius Felix is mentioned by Lactantius (*Institutiones Divinae* 1.11.55 and 5.1.31) and, following him, Jerome (*De Viris Illustribus* 58, *Epistulae* 49.13, 60.10, 70.5,) who both identify him as a lawyer, a *causidicus*. Considered as a work of Christian apologetic, Minucius' text is remarkable for its almost total lack of mention of Christian doctrine; there are only occasional implied references to Christ: *et qui hominem summo supplicio pro facinore punitum et crucis ligna ferialia eorum caerimonias fabulatur congruentia perditis sceleratisque tribuit altaria, ut id colant quod merentur* (*Octavius* 9.4) and to Christian belief: *Itaque quod pertineat ad summam quaestionis, et de providentia fateor et de deo cedo et de sectae iam nostrae sinceritate consentio* (*Octavius* 40.2).

However, in addition to *de Natura Deorum* there are manifold classical references, indicating a writer who is well acquainted with classical literature, Greek as well as Latin. Minucius writes in a fluent and elegant style, as befits one who has received the thorough grounding of a traditional philosophical and oratorical education. Minucius, referring to the imminent arrival of his friend Caecilius, implies that he was practising in Rome: *Nam negotii et visendi mei gratia Romam contenderat, relicta domo, coniuge, liberis ...* (*Octavius* 2.2). This is also attested by Lactantius who may, however, himself be referring to the text just mentioned. The background of this work cannot be established for certain. Juvenal describes Roman Africa as *nutricula causidicorum* (*Satira* 7.148) and most writers on Minuciana suggest that there is a North African connection. This is based particularly on the references, *Cirtensis nostri* (*Octavius* 9.6) and *tuus Fronto* (*Octavius* 31.2) to M. Cornelius Fronto, the eminent rhetorician and tutor to Marcus Aurelius and his son Commodus, who was born at

Cirta in Numidia.[27] The familiarity with the writings of Tertullian and the fact that this work

is in Latin would add verisimilitude to this assertion, since it was in North Africa that Latin

Christianity, as distinct from Greek, developed in the second and third centuries A.D.[28]

The first extant copy of the *Octavius* was discovered in an edition of Arnobius'

Adversus Nationes, acquired by the Vatican Library in the sixteenth century and now in Paris,

probably originating from the ninth century, where it appeared as the final and eighth book of

Arnobius, the title clearly having been mistaken for the numerical reference. In 1560 the

French scholar François Bauduin (Franciscus Baldinus) published in Heidelberg an edition of

Octavius with its true authorship ascription.[29]

There have been many attempts at a precise dating, none of them conclusive. The few

possible allusions in the text to contemporary events, such as Caecilius' veneration of Serapis

(2.5) the references to Fronto, and to *societas regni* (8.6) give rise to speculation, but nothing

more. The predominantly pacific tone of the *Octavius*, couched as it is in the terms of

classical philosophical dialogue, would seem to confirm a time of comparative freedom from

persecution of Christians. The question of dating has focussed upon the relationship of

Octavius to Tertullian, particularly to the *Apologeticus*, for which the generally accepted date

is around 197 A.D., though no precise evidence for this can be adduced.[30] Some, particularly

nineteenth century, scholars, have argued that Minucius preceded Tertullian and that the

striking similarities between the two authors at many points in the *Octavius* are the result of

Tertullian following Minucius.[31] However, the general consensus, followed in this study, is

that Minucius is dependent upon Tertullian. This is the position of such commentators as

---

[27] Haines 1955, x, 2ff
[28] Lane Fox 1986, 291; Raven, 1993, 150 ff.
[29] This edition is preceded by a dissertation in which Bauduin proved that the so-called eighth book was in fact the work of Minucius Felix . The only other manuscript is an eleventh century copy, now in Brussels.
[30] Beaujeu, 1964, liv; Clarke, 1974, 9-10
[31] e.g. Behr 1870 and list in Holden, 1853, 24

Holden, Beaujeu, and Clarke. [32] The tone of *Octavius* is derivative and Minucius uses Tertullian in a very similar way to that in which he uses Cicero, in that, whilst he frequently summarises material from these sources, he comes very near to almost verbatim quotations, for instance, *Octavius* 30. 3-6, closely following *Apologeticus* 9.2-13. Given, then, the premise referred to above, that the *Octavius* is later than Tertullian, and taking into account the other sparse allusions, a reasonable surmise would be that this work originates from the early part of the third century. [33]

A problem for the dissemination of Christianity was the educated person's preference for elegance, verbal dexterity and rhetorical flourishes. Classical models were read, admired and imitated for instance by Aulus Gellius (*Noctes Atticae* 2.26, 13.19, 19.8,10,13) and his contemporary, Fronto. Fronto, in particular, is known for his strongly archaising attitude. [34] Antiquity was revered, and references to and quotations from classical models, Greek and Latin, were part of the education of anyone who aspired to be a man of letters. Aulus Gellius lists titles in use in his day (*Noctes Atticae, Praefatio* 6-10). Much later, Augustine comments upon his own education *multae philosophorum legeram memoriaeque mandata retinebam* (*Confessiones* 5.3.3). Consequently, the validity of religious belief lay in its antiquity, on the *auctoritas maiorum.* Suetonius reports that Augustus *peregrinarum caerimoniarum sicut veteres ac praeceptas reverentissime coluit, ita ceteras contemptui habuit* (*Augustus* 93). Jewish apologetic literature also emphasised its antiquity, Josephus even entitling the second of his apologetic works Ἰουδαϊκὴ ἀρχαιολογία, *Antiquitates Judaicae.* Tertullian, too, in his conclusion to the *Apologeticus,* appeals to the antiquity of the 'sacred literature' *ex fide scilicet et antiquitate divinarum litterarum ….* (*Apologeticus* 46.1)

---

[32] See discussions in Holden, 1853, Beaujeu, 1964, Clark, 1974
[33] A detailed discussion of the question can be found in Axelson 1941.
[34] For detailed discussion on Fronto, see van den Hout 1999

Such Latin Scriptural documents as were in circulation were not likely to appeal to the educated classes, who despised the quality of the language, resulting in a disparagement of any validity of Christianity. Minucius Felix is therefore probably the only early extant example of an attempt to present Christian beliefs in terms his peers would accept. Lactantius and Arnobius could be considered comparable examples but both are outside the period I am examining. Whether *Octavius* is indeed 'Christian' writing could be debated. However, throughout Christian history there are numerous examples of attempts to express Christianity in terms intelligible and acceptable to the target audience. To this end Minucius, as mentioned above, on the one hand gives weight to his credentials by using a Ciceronian model, and on the other, expresses Tertullian's effective and direct, yet non-classical, language, in terms acceptable to his peers.

3.3.2 Usages made by Minucius Felix of Tertullian's *Apologeticus*

I shall explore the differences in language and tone between Minucius Felix and Tertullian by comparing some of the passages in *Octavius* with those in Tertullian's *Apologeticus* where clear similarities of subject matter may be discerned. As described above, I am taking the now generally accepted view that Minucius knew Tertullian rather than the reverse. Beaujeu also mentions, but rejects, the view of Hartel and Wilhelm and others, that both rely on a common source, *Écartons d'abord l'hypothèse selon laquelle Minucius et Tertullian auraient l'un et l'autre puisé à une source commune aujourd'hui perdue.*[35] Beaujeu does not give reasons for this opinion, which, in any case, never gained much support and we may suppose it is simply on grounds of intellectual parsimony, an example of Occam's razor.

Beaujeu repeats the view that Tertullian's style is original and creative: *Tertullien était une personnalité vigoureuse, dont tous les critiques anciens et modernes s'accordent à*

---

[35] Beaujeu, 1964, liv; Hartel 1869, 348; Wilhelm 1887

souligner l'originalité puissante, le génie créateur.[36] Minucius, on the other hand, is a writer in the classical tradition, elegant, yet not very inventive or original, making use, as was the practice in the style in which he would have been trained, of elements from various authors.[37] When Tertullian refers to other writers he puts his own individual stamp on them.

Minucius Felix only makes use of two works of Tertullian, the *Apologeticus* and, to a lesser extent, *Ad Nationes*, which served as a first draft for the *Apologeticus.* It has been suggested that these were the only writings of Tertullian with which Minucius was familiar. Whilst this might well have been the case, it seems likely that, since Minucius is writing apologetic, albeit in a different style from Tertullian, he should find the *Apologeticus* the most relevant text for his purpose.[38]

Most examinations of the similarities and differences between Minucius Felix and Tertullian have focussed upon attempts to settle the much-discussed matter of the priority of Tertullian and Minucius, as in Ebert,[39] Heinze,[40] Axelson[41] and others. Although I shall refer to these scholars, the purpose of the brief discussion of a selection of passages in *Octavius* demonstrating the use made of passages in Tertullian's *Apologeticus* and, in some cases, *Ad Nationes,* below, aims to detect in these similarities clues to usages of the late second and early third centuries and is not concerned with the question of priority. As will become clear, in order to make explanations of Christian acceptable to those more receptive to 'classical' expressions, in comparison to Tertullian, Minucius Felix in *Octavius* 'plays down' specific Christian expressions, The list of parallels/borrowings between the *Octavius* and the

---

[36] Beaujeu, lvi

[37] Beaujeu lvi *Minucius Felix apparaît comme un compilateur ingénieux, un écrivain élégant mais dépourvu d'invention, ...ces emprunts respectent souvent la form littérale des modèles, seul l'assemblage présente quelque originalité; Tertullien, lui, même lorsqu'il met à contribution Justin ou Tatien, imprime sa marque personnelle à l'ideé emprunteé*

[38] Beaujeu lvii

[39] Ebert 1870, 319 ff),

[40] Heinze 1910, 281 ff

[41] Axelson 194.

Apologeticus, from which the instances below are taken, is based on that drawn up by

Pellegrino and cited in Beaujeu and is not intended to be exhaustive.[42]

3.3.2.1 *Octavius* **18, 7-11 and** *Apologeticus* **17**[43]

Octavius is here presenting typically Stoic examples from nature, including the

mistaken belief in antiquity that the head of a beehive was masculine: *rex unus apibus,* cf.

nam saepe duobus regibus incessit magno discordia motu (Vergil, *Georgics,* 4.68) but then

moves from this, illogically, as Beaujeu points out, to discuss the eternity of God: *transition*

illogique, qui montre bien la faiblesse du raisonnement chez Minucius.[44] As pointed out in my

dissertation, this illogicality demonstrates that 'Minucius, although obviously well-read, well-

educated and well-versed in classical literature and philosophy, often demonstrates a

somewhat confused or, as here, illogical, use of this knowledge. ….'However, it must be

accepted that Minucius is tolerably successful in using his academic background to convince

those with a similar background and training of the rightness of his ideas.'[45]

In comparing this section of Octavius with Tertullian, *Apologeticus* 17, of much of

which it is a paraphrase, it is clear that Minucius, whilst broadly following Tertullian in

chapter 17, 'avoids using too much specifically apologetic language as this would detract from

his aim of emphasising the reasonableness of Christian belief to those with a traditional pagan

background.'[46] Tertullian, too, is familiar with, and uses, Stoic ideas, but yet manages to

develop them into Christian concepts. Octavius, whilst emphasising the omnipotence of God;

nec nomen deo quaeras: deus nomen est. ... Quem si patrem dixero, carnalem opineris; si

regem, terrenum suspiceris; si dominum, intelleges utique mortalem. (18.10) is careful to

---

[42] Pellegrino 1947 9-10; Beaujeu 1964, liv.
[43] In this example I make reference to suggestions explored in my Master's dissertation, Parkes, 2012, Trinity St David, University of Wales
[44] Beaujeu, 1964, 105
[45] Parkes 2012, 17
[46] Parkes, 2012, 18

avoid the Tertullianic unequivocable paean of praise, when talking of the soul's naming of
God:

> …. deum nominat, hoc solo, quia proprie verus hic unus. Deus bonus et magnus,
> et quod deus dederit omnium vox est. Iudicem quoque contestatur illum deus
> videt, et deo commendo, et deus mihi reddet. O testimonium animae naturaliter
> Christianae (*Apologeticus* 18. 5-6)

3.3.2.2 *Octavius* 24.1 and *Apologeticus* 10.10-11.1[47]

This example is a further instance of the way in which Minucius appears deliberately
to 'tone down' Tertullian's characteristically direct style. Tertullian has been discussing and
disproving the general pagan view of divinity, summed up in the first sentence of ch 11.

> Taceo quod ita rudes tunc homines agebant, ut cuiuslibet novi viri adspectu quasi
> divino commoverentur, cum hodie iam politi, quos ante paucos dies luctu publico
> mortuos sint confessi, in deos consecrent. Satis iam de Saturno, licet paucis. Etiam
> Iovem ostendemus tam hominem quam ex homine, et deinceps totum generis
> examen tam mortale quam seminis sui par. Et quoniam, sicut illos homines fuisse
> non audetis negare, <u>ita post mortem deos factos instituistis asseverare</u>, causas,
> quae hoc exegerint, retractemus (*Apologeticus* 10.10-11.1).

In the *Octavius* Minucius rephrases Tertullian's vigorous language, in particular being
careful to avoid direct assertions, hence *nisi forte post mortem deos fingitis,* as against
Tertullian's *deos factos instituistis asseverare*, citing well-known instances of dubious
(Proculus) or reluctant (Tiberius and Vespasian) attitudes to divinity:[48]

> otiosum est ire per singulos et totam seriem generis istius explicare, cum in primis
> parentibus probata mortalitas in ceteros ipso ordine successionis influxerit.
> <u>Nisi forte post mortem deos fingitis</u>, et perierante Proculo deus Romulus et Iuba
> Mauris volentibus deus est et divi ceteri reges, qui consecrantur non ad fidem
> numinis, sed ad honorem emeritae potestatis.2. invitis his denique hoc nomen
> adscribitur; optant in homine perseverare, fieri se deos metuunt, etsi iam senes
> nolunt.3. ergo nec de mortuis dii, quoniam deus mori non potest, nec de natis,
> quoniam moritur omne quod nascitur; divinum autem id est, quod nec ortum habet
> nec occasum *(Octavius* 24. 1-3).

---

[47]There are differences in the numbering system of chapters 24-28 of the Octavius between that used by Beaujeu,
Clarke, and the *Library of Latin Texts* and that of the Walzing/Oehler text used in the Glover edition in the Loeb
series. References below to these chapters refer to the numberings in Beaujeu and *Library of Latin Texts*
[48] Livy 1.16; Tacitus *Annales*, iv, 38; Suetonius *Vespasian* 23

Minucius' assertion that rulers do not want divinity (24.2 above) is also reminiscent of Tertullian in *ad Nationes: qui deum Caesarem dicitis, et deridetis dicendo quod non est, et maledicitis, quia non vult esse quod dicitis: mavult enim vivere quam deus fieri* (*Ad Nationes.* 1.17.8).

This example is discussed in more detail by van Wageningen in his article *Minucius Felix et Tertullianus,* which in this instance concentrates mainly on historical elements in order to refute the assertion by Walzing that the above comparison demonstrates that Minucius Felix preceded Tertullian.[49] As already said, the present study follows the now usual opinion that Tertullian clearly precedes Minucius Felix.

3.3.2.3 *Octavius* 25.11 and *Apologeticus* 15.7

In *ubi autem magis quam a sacerdotibus inter aras et delubra conducuntur stupra, tractantur lenocinia, adulteria meditantur* (*Octavius* 25.11), as van Wageningen says, it appears that, once again, Minucius' attempt to paraphrase Tertullian leads to a certain amount of obscurity, the Tertullian passage in question being *ceterum si adiciam, quae non minus conscientiae omnium recognoscent, in templis adulteria conponi, inter aras lenocinia tractari* (15.7). Van Wageningen comments *Minucius autem ex duabus locutionibus in templis et inter aras suo more unam conflans inter aras et delubra non intellexit se absurda loqui.*[50]

The differences which van Wageningen enumerates serve, in my opinion, to show that, in his attempts to paraphrase Tertullian in order to make Tertullian's writing more acceptable to his legal peers and others, Minucius often demonstrates that he does not fully understand his source. This may well contribute to the discussion about the sources of *Octavius,* though this is not relevant to the present topic.

---

[49] van Wageningen 1923, 223-228 ,
[50] van Wageningen, 1923, 227

3.3.2.4 *Octavius* 31.6 and *Apologeticus* 1.1

This further example of the differences between Minucius and Tertullian, demonstrates that often more clarity is found in the Tertullian passage which Minucius paraphrases, than in Minucius' version. To the objections of the pagan Caecilius that Christians are a *latebrosa et lucifuga natio, in publicum muta, in angulis garrula* (8.4), Octavius responds *nec in angulis garruli, si audire nos publice aut erubescitis aut timetis.* (31.6). As van Wageningen points out, Minucius' attempt in Octavius' *si audire nos publice ….. to abbreviate Tertullian's *si ad hoc solam speciem auctoritas vestra de iustitiae diligentia in publico aut timet aut erubescit inquirere*, (1.1) obscures the force of the assertion that it is illogical to term Christians *in angulis garruli* if the authorities are not prepared to give them a public hearing.

3.3.2.5 *Octavius* 37.1 and *Apologeticus* 50.2

Vicit enim qui, quod contendit, obtinuit (37.1) In this chapter Octavius begins with what Clarke rightly describes as a 'purple passage' praising Christian martyrdom. However, when comparing this with a similar context in the *Apologeticus,* it is notable, as Clarke points out, that, as is so often the case in the *Octavius,* the result of the prize obtained by this martyrdom is omitted, either in an attempt to 'tone down' any direct Christian reference or, as suggested by van Wageningen and mentioned above, Octavius does not fully understand what Tertullian is saying. Tertullian, in contrast, makes this clear; *victoria est autem pro quo certaveris obtinere. Ea victoria habet et gloriam placendi deo et praedam vivendi in aeternum* (50.2).[51]

A pertinent summing up of the way in which Minucius Felix makes use of Tertullian is provided by Beaujeu: *Le texte fournit plusieurs exemples analogues de la déformation d'un*

---

[51] Clarke 1974, 365

raisonnement solide de Tertullian par l'éclectisme littéraire de son imitateur. [52] This, I would

submit, describes exactly the difference in expression between the two writers. In the general

scheme of discussing the development of Christian expression in Latin, the *Octavius* of

Minucius Felix provides an interesting example of attempts to defend and explain Christian

beliefs to those who might well have found Tertullian's language rough and uncongenial.

3.4 Tertullian and the Bible

Tertullian's writing is suffused with Biblical citations and commentary. However,

before considering any examples of this, two important questions need to be addressed; what

Bible, and what language? This study confines itself to the period up to the middle of the 3rd

century AD, before the availability of fuller information about early Biblical texts from the

study of Augustine and Jerome and others. The earliest Biblical texts, it is clear, were in

Greek; Tertullian is writing in Latin. What, therefore, is his source, or sources? Moreover, a

characteristic of Tertullian's Biblical citations is that many of them appear more than once in

his writings, and whilst clearly referring to the same passage, their wording is not identical.

For instance, as pointed out by Houghton, in *Adversus Praxean* 13.3 the beginning of John 1

is *in principio*, whilst in the same work at 16.1 it is *a primordio*. Houghton also cites the two

different versions of John 3.5 in *De Anima* and *De Baptismo*, both of which, as Houghton

says, correspond to known Greek forms*: nisi quis nascitur ex aqua et spiritu non inibit in*

regnum dei (*De Anima* 39)*; nisi qui renatus fuerit ex aqua et spiritu sancto non intrabit in*

regno caelorum (*De Baptismo* 13.3).

Thus the first question to be examined is, did Tertullian have access to a written text?

If so, it seems unlikely it was in Latin, since his citations of the same text vary. Is it, then,

possible, or even probable, that Tertullian is producing his own Latin version/paraphrase or

---

[52] Beaujeu 1964, lxi

translation of the Greek text? Tertullian was certainly bilingual: *at ego, si quid utriusque linguae praecerpsi* (*Adversus Praxean* 3.2) as many of his readers would have been. The question of the origins of Christianity in North Africa is one that cannot be satisfactorily answered and the generally accepted view that the use of Latin seems to have become current in North Africa earlier than elsewhere has not been explored in detail. The question whether 'African' Latin differed from that of Rome, has been discussed in a previous chapter.[53] For most educated people Greek would still play an important part, as emphasised, for example, by Apuleius: *accusamus apud te philosophum formosum et tam Graece quam Latine ... dissertissimum.* (*Apologia,* 4.1).

It is likely that in the multilingual world of the second century Roman Empire various attempts were made to produce Latin versions of the nascent New Testament documents, some of which, if they existed, may have been known to Tertullian. However, there is no evidence that there existed a 'Latin Bible' as such and, as was pointed out above, Tertullian's citations vary. Houghton summarises the relationship between Tertullian and the Bible and notes that attempts by various scholars have been made to demonstrate that Tertullian did have and use a text.[54] Clearly, there are places where Tertullian appears to be citing a translation not made by him, and from which he sometimes seeks to distance himself. This is particularly relevant in Tertullian's arguments against Marcion, where he appears to know not only his 'own' Scriptures but also Marcion's New Testament canon. The question also arises here, whether Marcion's 'version' of the New Testament was in Greek or Latin. O'Malley, in his book on Tertullian and the Bible, discusses the distinction between the use of Biblical citations in Tertullian's writings, and in *adversus Marcionem*, particularly in books 4 and 5

---

[53] Chapter 1, 1.2, 40
[54] Houghton 2016, 6

where Tertullian is criticising Marcion's selective version of the New Testament.[55] It should also be noted that the Bible, when considering Tertullian's citations, refers to the Old Testament as well as the New Testament. Tertullian would probably have been familiar with the Septuagint, which he may well have regarded as the authoritative version, since there is no evidence that he knew Hebrew.

As already discussed in chapter two, the first mention in Latin of Biblical documents is in the *Acts of the Scilitan Martyrs.* I include a summary again here because of its relevance to discussions of the possible existence, or otherwise, of a New Testament text which may have been known to Tertullian.

This account, probably based upon court records, tells of the trial of 12 Christians in Scilla near Carthage, on 17 July, 180, where the following passage occurs: *Saturninus proconsul dixit*; *Quae sunt res in capsa vestra? Speratus* [the spokesman for the group] *dixit: Libri et epistulae Pauli viri iusti.* To what is Speratus referring? Did he mean 'the books and epistles of Paul', or, as seems more likely, suggested by Houghton, following Elliott, does the sense require a comma after *libri*, meaning, possibly '(Gospel) books, and the epistles of Paul.' A further suggestion by Houghton is that Speratus originally said, maybe, *libri evangelorum* and, since *evangelorum* meant nothing to the court stenographer, it was simply left out.[56] The second question, also unanswered, is, in what language were the books and letters to which Speratus is referring? As mentioned, although the official administrative language of North Africa, as a Roman province, was Latin, Greek was widely understood and spoken and so it does not automatically follow that the documents referred to by Speratus were in Latin rather than Greek. Houghton mentions, following Barnes, that the reply of Speratus, *magis illi deo servio, quem nemo hominum vidit nec videre his oculis potest* contains a quotation of 1

---

[55] O'Malley 1967, 7ff
[56] Houghton, 2016, 5

Timothy 6.16 which is cited in the exact same words, with the exception of *his oculis,* by Quodvultdeus.[57] Tertullian, citing the same passage in *Adversus Praxean* 15.2, has almost the same wording: *quem nemo vidit hominum sed nec videre potest.* However, this possibility is not very strong, since there are only a limited number of ways of rendering the Greek: ὃν εἶδεν οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ ἰδεῖν δύναται. Tertullian makes no mention of this account but does, however, mention Vigellius Saturninus, mentioned several times in the *Acta*, as the first proconsul to have condemned Christians to death: *Vigellius Saturninus, qui primus hic gladium in nos egit ....* (*Ad Scapulum* 3.4).

We are therefore no further on in consideration of the source of Tertullian's Biblical citations. In fact, the reverse might be said to be true in one sense, in that the new *Vetus Latina* edition of the earliest Old Latin Biblical texts could be accused of being unduly preoccupied with reconstructing text types, at the expense of considering what the term means. Thus Tertullian's citations, when presented as the only example of a particular Biblical text, failing any other evidence as the 'type' of that particular Biblical citation, are presented not just as his citations, but as representative of something more. Indeed, as Burton points out, 'Tertullian's text is represented in the *Vetus Latina* editions by the symbol X, which, it should be noted, does not represent an identifiable text type, but rather is used as catch-all for material that cannot be slotted into any particular text type'.[58] It is necessary to attempt to clarify the position of such Latin Biblical texts as might have been known by Tertullian. Pre-Vulgate texts have, in earlier times, been referred to as the *Itala,* following Augustine:

> Qui enim scripturas ex hebraea in graecam verterunt, numerari possunt, latini autem interpretes nullo modo. Ut enim cuique primis fidei temporibus in manus venit codex graecus et aliquantulum facultatis sibi utriusque linguae habere videbatur, ausus est interpretari … (*de Doctrina Christiana* 2.15.22) …… in ipsis autem interpretationibus, itala ceteris praeferatur; nam est verborum tenacior cum perspicuitate sententiae (*de Doctrina Christiana* 2.11.16).

[57] Bishop of Carthage 437-453, *Sermo* III. 3 (PL XL 662).
[58] Burton 2012, 178

Burton observes, 'whatever the historical value of this account - and it is notable that Augustine is so vague about the dates and particulars that we may reasonably regard this as pure speculation on his part - the reference to the *Itala* has proved particularly vexed'.[59]

The Benedictine monk, Dom Pierre Sabatier, produced the first printed editions of what he called *Bibliorum sacrorum versiones antiquae.* These were finally published in 1749, seven years after Sabatier's death and have now largely been superseded by the work of the *Vetus Latina* editions, work on the production of which has continued at irregular intervals, with now more and more of this available online. These texts, carrying on the work of Sabatier, have now been collated, commented on and extended. Further discussion of Latin Biblical texts are beyond the remit of the present dissertation but useful studies will be found in the Burton paper already cited, also Burton's *The Old Latin Gospels* (2000) and the outline of Old Latin Bible editions in Houghton, *The Latin New Testament* (2016).

3.4.1 Some examples of Biblical citations

The examples of Biblical citations, which I propose to examine as part of this section on Tertullian and the Bible, will be drawn from those adduced in what still appears to be the principle examination of the subject, the book with that name by Thomas O'Malley SJ.[60] This book was published in 1967 in the *Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva* series, the first of which was Schrijnen's *Charakteristik des Altchristlichen Latein.* It should, therefore, be born in mind that O'Malley, a Jesuit, approaches Christian Latin in the Schrijnen/ Mohrmann tradition.

With the caveat mentioned above, O'Malley's detailed and systematic examination of examples of Tertullian's Biblical citations is well worth considering and I discuss below a few examples. My particular purpose is, however, different from that of O'Malley, in that I am

---

[59] Burton 2012, 138
[60] O'Malley 1967

examining this material in the light of its relevance or otherwise to my main thesis, the development of Christian expression in Latin, where early traces of Biblical expressions may play a significant part.

O'Malley divides Tertullian's texts into several categories: a) non-glossing texts, that is, the use of a Biblical citation which may or may not be Tertullian's own translation; b) glossing texts, examples of the vocabulary used in texts where Tertullian glosses or explains a Biblical text, and c) Tertullian's citations in *Adversus Marcionem* where it is likely that Tertullian is using Marcion's own collection of Biblical texts. [61] I examine below an example from each of the first two of these categories, considering them from a linguistic point of view.

3.4.1.1 A non-glossing text, that is, one which does not include comments upon the text itself

de baptismo, **18.1** Tertullian cites the last words of 1 Timothy 5. 22 as *manus ne facile inposueritis nec **amartiis** alienis communicaveritis.* As O'Malley has discovered, *(h)amartia*, from ἁμαρτίαις of the Greek text, only occurs in one other instance in Latin, in a catacomb inscription *ut possit ... (h)amartias meas indulgere.*[62] A more natural translation would be *delictum* (from *delinquo*), *peccatum* or *error,* with *delictum* being more frequent and which, although used by most classical writers, appears more frequently in Tertullian than in any other writer, as in the other instance where 1 Timothy 5.22 is cited, *manus nemini cito imponas neque communices **delictis** alienis.* (*De Pudicitia* 18.9).[63] However, Kilpatrick, cited by O'Malley, argues that the use of *hamartia* in *Codex Trecentis* suggests that Tertullian is

---

[61] O'Malley 1967, 8 ff

[62] *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* VI,3, 2521 line 24, text in E. Diehl *Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres,* Berlin 1961, 1, 1158)

[63] *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae,* vol. V 1, 458, 83 463, 76

quoting a known Latin translation.[64] *Delinquentia* is also found, frequently in *De Resurrectione* and *De Pudicitia* but elsewhere only once, in *Adversus Marcionem* book 4. The difference in words supports the point made earlier, that even if Tertullian knows a translation, he either paraphrases or uses his own words.[65]

3.4.1.2 A glossing text

By far the most important of those citations which O'Malley terms glossing texts, those which contain Tertullian's own comments in addition to the Biblical text, in my view, appears in *Adversus Praxean* 5, 2-3, where Tertullian, in this polemic against the Monarchian Praxeas, is commenting upon *John* 1.1. Since, however, this significant text forms part of the detailed study of Tertullian's use of *ratio, verbum, sermo,* λὸγος, considered elsewhere in this study, I address it under that heading.[66]

A further significant example is found in *De Pudicitia.* O'Malley writes, 'this text, cited by several authors, has never been central in a discussion of Tertullian and a possible Latin translation of the Scriptures'[67] However, O'Malley suggests that there is more to be said here, with which I agree, as it demonstrates Tertullian's usages of *moechia, fornicatio, stuprum, adulterium,* along with the verbs *stuprare and adultare.* The passage under consideration is:

> 1. Possumus igitur demandata paenitentiae distinctionem ad ipsorum iam delictorum regredi censum, an ea sint, quae veniam ab hominibus consequi possint. Inprimis quod moechiam et fornicationem nominamus, usus expostulate. 2. habet et fides quorundam nominum familiaritatem. Ita in omni opusculo usum custodimus. Ceterum si adulterium et si stuprum dixero, unum erit contaminatae carnis elogium. (*De Pudicitia* 4, 1-2)

---

[64] Kilpatrick1965, 127-128, cited in O'Malley, 1967, 8
[65] O'Malley 1967, 8-9
[66] See word study on *ratio* 3.7.5.2, 192
[67] O'Malley 1967, 20

De Pudicitia is generally thought to be commenting upon an *edictum* of a bishop, identified as Agrippinus in Carthage, not Callistus in Rome, which Tertullian cites, possibly, according to O'Malley, to the letter.[68] *Audio etiam edictum esse propositum, et quidem peremptorium. Pontifex scilicet maximus, quod (est) episcopus episcoporum, edicit: "ego et* **moechiae et fornicationis** *delicta paenitentia functis dimitto"*. Other citations show that Tertullian seems to prefer *stuprum* and *adulterium*, *stuprare* and *adulterare* to *moechia* and *fornicatio.* O'Malley suggests that Tertullian prefers to avoid the Latin borrowing of μοιχεία and μοιχεύω and cites in support of this the theory that Tertullian adopts the language of the edicts; Exodus 20. 14 which is cited in *De Pudicitia* as *non moechaberis* and also, once in *Adversus Iudaeos* 2.3, but is expressed in terms of *non adulterium ...* in *De Spectaculis* 3.2 and in a reference to Matthew 5.27 which cites Exodus 20.14, in *Adversus Marcionem* 5.17.15 as *non adulterabis,* whereas *De Pudicitia* 6.6. has *non moechaberis.* However, whilst Tertullian only uses the verb *moechor,* three times, the noun, *moechia* appears twenty-nine times in all, twenty-seven of these in *De Pudicitia.*

O'Malley's theory, therefore, is that, particularly in *De Pudicitia,* Tertullian is following the language of his episcopal opponent, in using *moechia* and *fornicator,* rather than (for instance) *adulter* or *adulterium.* All instances of *moechia* cited in the *Thesaurus* are post-classical, the majority occurring in Tertullian's *De Pudicitia,* as might be expected. This Latin borrowing could, therefore, be considered as one of the words arising from Christian usage. The same is true of *fornicatio.* However, *adulterium* is a normal 'classical' word, appearing in, amongst others, Cicero, Pliny, Seneca and Tacitus. This would support my own view that Tertullian, unless there is good reason to the contrary, as in the case of *De Pudicitia,*

---

[68] O'Malley 1967, 21, details in footnote 1.

as far as possible uses words familiar to his readers, and is not, as the *Sondersprache*
supporters would maintain, using a separate Christian language

3.4.2 Conclusion

Tertullian clearly has a wide knowledge and understanding of the Bible and
accommodates his style and vocabulary to suit his readers, glossing and explaining where
necessary. This is particularly marked in his communication with Marcion, a topic which will
not be discussed in this dissertation, where Tertullian uses and comments upon Marcion's
selective canon, in which Tertullian uses Marcion's version of Luke and the Pauline letters.
Although there have been suggestions, notably by Adolf von Harnack in 1921, that Tertullian
knew Marcion's version on the New Testament canon in a Latin version, rather than in Greek,
a view which became very popular at the time but is now largely discounted, there is no
evidence to demonstrate that Tertullian knew any written Latin sources of the Bible.[69]

The comparison of citations which Tertullian uses more than once makes clear that he
is using his own translations, which differ from one another, employing widely known
vocabulary, though he often transforms a word and gives it a deeper meaning. In considering
the language of Tertullian's Biblical citations it has to be said that there is no external
evidence to demonstrate either that Tertullian is using specific 'Biblical' or 'Christian'
language, or that he is amending 'Biblical' language to make it intelligible and comprehensible
to those not familiar with it. Tertullian uses whatever language is appropriate for his purpose,
the language, one would assume, of an educated Roman communicating with others, using
vocabulary familiar to his readers, whether Christian or not.

---

[69] Harnack 1921

3.5 An Analysis of Tertullian's Style - Heinrich Hoppe

Heinrich Hoppe's 1903 book, *Syntax und Stil des Tertullian,* contains a substantial and detailed examination of Tertullian's language for which there is still no more modern replacement.[70] I therefore offer below a summary of Hoppe's work.

In the foreword to his detailed examination of Tertullian's language Hoppe describes Tertullian's language thus: *die Sprache des wegen seiner Dunkelheit berüchtigten Afrikaners bietet dem Leser ungewöhnliche und mannigfaltige Schwierigkeiten.* (The language of this African, notorious for its obscurity, presents the reader with unusual and multifarious difficulties).[71] This view appears to be typical of the opinion of Tertullian in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, reflecting the emphasis of the time on a classical education, though one with very little familiarity with Latin outside the 'classical' period. Hoppe's judgement echoes the traditional views of Tertullian's Latin which reflect the notion of Christian Latin as representing not just post- but sub-classical standards. There is perhaps also an insinuation that, as a provincial, Tertullian was naturally somewhat unpolished in his uses. Such judgements might well feel less self-evidently true today, and it should be frankly acknowledged that the shift in underlying assumptions means we are not always ideal readers of such older works of scholarship.[72]

However, Hoppe recognises the importance of the appearance of Tertullian on the scene: *Daß unter den lateinisch schreibenden Apologeten des Christentums fast unvermittelt ein so schöpferisches theologisches Genie als erster in die Arena tritt, bleibt immer ein seltenes, bewundernswertes Schauspiel* (that amongst the Latin apologists of Christentum such a creative theological genius should almost unexpectedly appear as the first in the field

---

[70] Hoppe 1903
[71] Hoppe 1903, iv
[72] These remarks are also relevant to the discussion of Woodham,3.5.1, 17 ff

continues to remain a singular and astounding phenomenon). He also acknowledges his major

relevance to the history of the Latin language: *Die schwierige Aufgabe, die neuen Ideen des*

Christentums in lateinische Sprache wiederzugeben, zu deren Lösung kaum nennenswerte

Versuche vorlagen, sehen wir hier mit einem Male so gelöst, daß der Folgerzeit nicht mehr

viel zu tun übrig blieb.(We see here the difficult task of reworking the new Christian ideas in

Latin, of which almost no previous significant attempts had been made, solved so

successfully, that they left nothing for future writers to do).[73] Whilst one might well feel that

the suggestion that 'Christian Latin' sprang fully-armed from the head of Tertullian is an

overstatement, there is, in my opinion, some truth in it.

      Hoppe makes the point, one which is still unfortunately valid, that most work on

Tertullian is by theologians rather than philologists. He cites Norden:*… er sei ohne Frage der*

schwierigste Autor in lateinischer Sprache, keiner stelle so rücksichtslose Anforderungen an

an den Leser and who also says of *De Pallio,* that this is the most difficult Latin he has ever

read, on which Hoppe comments: *und das will etwas sagen*![74] Hoppe's view of Tertullian is

that, *es wird kaum einen anderen Schriftsteller geben bei dem der Still ein so treues Abbild*

einer originellen Individualität ist.[75] In support of this Hoppe cites Lactantius' comment:

Septimius quoque Tertullianus fuit omni genere litterarum peritus; sed in eloquendo parum

facilis et minus comtus et multum obscura fuit. Ergo ne hic quidem satis celebritatis invenit'

(*Institutiones Divinae* 5.1.23) Underlying this would seem to be a possible uncertainty about

whether Tertullian writes 'good' or 'bad' Latin. It is difficult to evaluate this as such terms are

subjective and are tied in with ideas on the relative value of 'Christian' and 'classical' culture,

and implicit narratives of decline and fall.

---

[73] Hoppe 1903, 1-2
[74] Norden 1898, 606 and 315
[75] Hoppe 1903, 3

The view of the 'hot-blooded African', racist to modern ears, but familiar from other literature of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, is predictably followed by Hoppe, who cites Harnack's description of Tertullian as *dieser heißblütige Afrikaner, dieser strenge Ketzerbestreiter, dieser entschlossene Vertreter der auctoritas und ratio, dieser rechthaberische Advokat, dieser Kirchenmann und Enthusiast zugleich.* (This hot-blooded African, this strong challenger of heresy, this convinced representative of *auctoritas* and *ratio* this dogmatic advocate, this churchman and enthusiast all rolled into one).[76] Another pertinent observation is that Tertullian's differences with opponents are followed by personal invective, as, for example: *deus tibi venter est et pulmo templum et aqualiculus altare et sacerdos cocus et sanctus spiritus nidor et condimenta charismata et ructus prophetia* (*De Ieiunio* CSEL 296, line 14), and particularly:

> Hermogenis autem doctrina tam novella est, † denique ad hodiernum homo in saeculo, et natura quoque haereticus, etiam turbulentus, qui loquacitatem facundiam existimet et impudentiam constantiam deputet et maledicere singulis officium bonae conscientiae iudicet. Praeterea pingit <in>licite, nubit adsidue, legem dei in libidinem defendit, in artem contemnit, bis falsarius, et cauterio et stilo, totus adulter, et praedicationis et carnis.
> (Now, the doctrine of Hermogenes has this taint of novelty. He is, in short, a man living in the world at the present time; by his very nature a heretic, and turbulent withal, who mistakes loquacity for eloquence, and supposes impudence to be firmness, and judges it to be the duty of a good conscience to speak ill of individuals.5 Moreover, he despises God's law in his painting,6 maintaining repeated marriages,7 alleges the law of God in defence of lust,8 and yet despises it in respect of his art.9 He falsifies by a twofold process-with his cautery and his pen.10 He is a thorough adulterer, both doctrinally and carnally.) (*Adversus Hermogenem* 1 CSEL 126. 3).[77]

Another characteristic of Tertullian's language referred to by Hoppe is the often discussed *asianismus*, the 'new style' of rhetoric, which had its origin in the sophistic prose of Plato's

---

[76] Harnack 1901, 135
[77] Translation by Peter Holmes, Ante-Nicene Fathers Vol III. The overall sense of what appears to be a corrupt text seems clear

time.[78] This rhetorical style arose in Greek in the third century BC and was called 'asianism' after the Asian Hegesias and termed by the old theorists νέα ῥητορική as against the ἀρχαία ῥητορική. In later literature the two styles differed from each other not only in Greek but also in Latin. Asianism was a florid style which rejected the austerity of the 'attic' style of oratory. It was characterised by the use of words previously regarded as archaisms, especially in Africa, its most extreme exponent being Fronto, and which was later transposed into Latin, first discussed by Cicero:

> Sed si quaerimus, cur adulescens magis floruerit dicendo quam senior Hortensius, causas reperiemus verissumas duas. primum, quod genus erat orationis Asiaticum adulescentiae magis concessum quam senectuti. genera autem Asiaticae dictionis duo sunt: unum sententiosum et argutum, sententiis non tam gravibus et severis quam concinnis et venustis, qualis in historia Timaeus, in dicendo autem pueris nobis Hierocles Alabandeus, magis etiam Menecles frater eius fuit, quorum utriusque orationes sunt in primis ut Asiatico in genere laudabiles.
> (But if we mean to inquire, why Hortensius was more admired for his eloquence in the younger part of his life, than in his latter years, we shall find it owing to the following causes. The first was, that an Asiatic style is more allowable in a young man than in an old one. Of this there are two different kinds. The former is sententious and sprightly, and abounds in those turns of sentiment which are not so much distinguished by their weight and solidity as by their neatness and elegance; of this cast was Timaeus the historian, and the two orators so much talked of in our younger days, Hierocles of Alabanda, and his brother Menecles, but particularly the latter; both whose orations may be reckoned master-pieces of the kind. The other sort is not so remarkable for the plenty and richness of its sentiments, as for its rapid volubility of expression, which at present is the ruling taste in Asia). (Cicero, *ad Brutum* 325).[79]

Hoppe maintains that such characteristics are most marked in Tertullian's contemporary, Apuleius.[80] He asserts that it was because of him that the humanists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries spoke of the *tumor africus*, the African style, a lack of clarity which has led to much discussion and strife, hence Sittl's reference to *Apuleianische*

---

[78] Chapter 1, 1.2.1.1, 54
[79] Translation by Wiliam Melmoth, 1808
[80] Hoppe 1903, 11

Rhetorik.[81] Tertullian's Latin has, according to Hoppe, even been described as 'Punic Latin' although Hoppe points out that it is clear from *Adversus Praxean* 5 that Tertullian knew no Hebrew, and possibly no Punic, either. Hoppe attacks such suggestions and says an author's style depends on 1) the author's own psychological character and 2) the literary tradition of the author, which, he says, in antiquity had much more influence than *bei uns* (referring, presumably, to the end of nineteenth century.) Hoppe maintains, with reason, I would submit, that Tertullian is a product of the 'new style' and dependent upon the rules of that style, though, as has previously been pointed out, this style will vary according to the intended readers; apologetic, polemic and pastoral writing will demand different approaches. However, Hoppe does seem to regard Tertullian's style as odd and idiosyncratic, and cites his contemporary, Watson, 'he is the most reckless of writers in the adoption of words of vulgar life and in their invention for any momentary need'.[82]

In the second part of his book Hoppe analyses examples of features he considers to exemplify Tertullian's style.[83] One might well have reservations about much of this but I adduce here a few examples, drawn from two chapters in this part of the work.[84]

a) Tertullian's use of neologisms, clearly coined from known words but used only by Tertullian:

> **nouns**: advocator: debeo creatorem divitum quoque aspernatorem probare, sicut probavi mendicorum advocatorem, ut christum in hac quoque sententia creatoris ostendam. (*Adversus Marcionem* 4,15), compassio: compassionem scilicet quam communicationem (*De Pudicitia* 3)
> **verbs**: condulescere: verum pro temporis ratione remoratur coalescens et coadulescens robori suo, (*De Anima* 19) (demonstrating also Tertullian's use of wordplay on coalesco/coadulesco/condulesco - this last a neologism of Tertullian's, of which the only example appears in Ainsworth's *Thesaurus* of 1715).[85]

---

[81] See discussion of *Afrikitas* in chapter 1, 1.2.1, 43
[82] Watson 1896, 197
[83] Hoppe, 1903, 84-220
[84] Hoppe 1903, 114-140, 140-146, 146-172
[85] Hoppe 1903, 115-6

> **adjectives**: defarinatus: tum ad molas delatum et defarinatum in consparsionis alutacia absconderit, donec totum confrequentetur, tunc consummatio urgebit. (*Adversus Valentianos* 31): fluxilis: (sed ex invisibili corpore materiae, illius scilicet philosophicae, de fluxili et fusili eius, quod unde fuerit audeo aestimare, quia nusquam est. Si enim fusile et fluxile liquoris est qualitas, liquor autem omnis de sophiae fletibus fluxit, sequitur, ut limum ex pituitis et gramis sophiae constitisse credamus, quae lacrimarum proinde sunt faeces, sicut aquarum quod desidet limus est (*Adversus Valentianos* 24)

Both *defarinatus* and *fluxilis* are, according to Hoppe, *hapax legomena* and appear in *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* and dictionaries as such, with just these two references to *Ad Valentinos* cited.

b) Alliteration or rhyme:

> aversatrix/adulatrix: Alia est autem ratio pietatis istius, non reliquiis animae adulatrix, sed crudelitatis etiam corporis nomine aversatrix, quod et ipsum homo non utique mereatur poenali exitu impendi (*De Anima* 51);
> operator/negotiator etc: adeo quid simile philosophus et christianus, graeciae discipulus et caeli, famae negotiator et salutis vitae, verborum et factorum operator, et rerum aedificator et destructor, et interpolator et integrator ueritatis, furator eius et custos? (*Apologeticus* 51)

c) Tertullian's use of brevity:

Hoppe observes that it is Tertullian's brevity which, apart from his idiosyncratic vocabulary, makes his expression difficult to understand, and condemns the earlier (relative to his, Hoppe's own time) statements about 'Punic style':

> Diese sind es vor allem, die seinem Stile den Vorwurf der Dunkelheit eingebracht haben, und was man früher mit dem unklaren Ausdrucke 'punischer Stil' meinte, geht gewiß zu Tertullian auf Rechnung der durch jene veranlaßten Unklarheit. (It is this brevity which, above all, has led to the accusation of obscurity in his style, and every example of what was earlier vaguely termed 'Punic style' can be attributed to Tertullian on account of the many occasions of ambiguities.[86]
> (It is these things above all else which have brought the accusation of obscurity and what previously was described with the vague expression 'punic style' should surely be reckoned to Tertullian on the score of obscurity.)

---

[86] Hoppe 1903, 140

The attitude of Hoppe, and others of his generation, seems to me to owe much to the literary and spoken style of the time, late nineteenth century, in which Hoppe is writing. Woodham's commentary on the *Apologeticus*, discussed below, expresses similar views. A modern detailed investigation of Tertullian's style, would, I submit, take a different view and come to somewhat different conclusions.

Even now, over 100 years later, Hoppe's book remains the only detailed examination of Tertullian's language. I suggest that, whilst taking into consideration the difference from modern thought of over a century, his evaluation is accurate and acceptable:

> Tertullian ist nun durchaus ein Vertreter des 'neuen Stils' so gut wie Apuleius, und von den Grundsätzen dieser Stilrichtung abhängig. Sein Stil ist in so fern ein Kunstprodukt. Bei aller Leidenschaftlichkeit des Tones die oft elementar hervorbricht, gebraucht er die Mittel und steht er unter dem Einflusse dieser rhetorischen Kunst. (Tertullian is now as much a representative of the 'new style' as Apuleius and dependent on the principles of this type of style. To this extent his style is artificial. This is the method he uses in every passionate nuance which frequently appears, clearly demonstrating the influence of this rhetorical art).[87]

3.6 Other Examples of the Reception of Tertullian's Language

In this section I discuss two works on Tertullian which, whilst not dealing specifically with his language, present, in my opinion, views of Tertullian and his use of language relevant to the current study. Both works, one nineteenth-century and one recent, each in their own way, provide examples of the continuing reception of the development of Christian communication and thus provide insights relevant to my examination of Tertullian's language.

3.6.1 Henry Woodham - A Nineteenth Century view of Tertullian

The commentary on Tertullian's *Apologeticus* (1843) by Henry Woodham is not a work normally considered in the main corpus of works concerned with the reception of Tertullian. I include it here, however, as it seems to me to offer a view of this work differing

---

[87] Hoppe 1903, 11

from that of the mainstream. Henry Annesley Woodham (1813-1875) was a Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge, who combined that post with being a writer for *The Times of London*. As such he is an example of English academia of the early nineteenth century, a brief outline of which is necessary for an understanding of his writing. This century would see great and important changes in university education in England, with the demand for the creation of provincial and civic universities, which, unlike Oxford and Cambridge, would be open to 'Dissenters' and also establish the beginnings of a professional rather than a liberal education. One of the first of these was establishment of the University of London (later University College) in 1827. Approaches to university education in Scotland, and in many parts of Europe would also play a large part in later reforms

However, the Cambridge of which Woodham was a part, offered, in the early nineteenth century, a 'liberal' education rooted firmly in the classics, following the traditional definition of a 'liberal', derived from *liber,* as 'of or befitting a man of free birth'. Cambridge, unlike Oxford, at this period also laid emphasis on pure mathematics. Undergraduates would have come up to Cambridge typically from English public schools (some would have had private tutors) with a good training in Latin and Greek literature and some expertise in translation and prose and verse composition, to receive a liberal university education, not aimed at any particular professional training but one which enabled them to enter the ministry of the Church of England and/or teach in the major public schools, itself often a way of preferment in the Church. The close association of the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge with the Anglican Church required all College Fellows to be ordained, whether or not they functioned as such, and no undergraduates could graduate at Cambridge, or matriculate at Oxford, without subscribing to the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion as stated in the Book of Common Prayer 1662. It was not until the Universities' Test Act of 1871 that 'Dissenters'

(nonconformists) and also, theoretically, Catholics, were allowed to graduate and to be admitted to university Fellowships.

It is against this background, therefore, that Woodham would have approached the task of expanding the classical education of his students, at a time when patristic study, at any rate from a linguistic point of view, was all but unknown. At Oxford, the Tractarian movement in the Church of the 1830s and 1840s, a name derived from the publication of a series of *Tracts for the Times* published from 1833 to 1841 following John Keble's celebrated assize sermon on 'National Apostasy' on 14 July 1833 at St Mary's, the University Church in Oxford, began to enable the re-evaluation of early Christian history, the rediscovery of traditional liturgy in the Anglican Church and the foundation of Anglican religious orders. A certain amount of the influence of this movement spread to Cambridge, leading to the foundation of the Campden Society in the 1840s, though this focussed mainly on church architecture. The Oxford Movement would probably not, however, had much influence on the Cambridge of Woodham's generation or, if it did, would not have met with his approval.

Thus the classical scholars of the period, almost all clergy, seem on the whole not to have made much connection between linguistic study of the Fathers and the study of their theology. Woodham, therefore, could well be regarded as ahead of his time in deciding to provide for his students a commentary on the *Apologeticus* of *Tertullian,* of whom many would probably not have heard, being more concerned with developing a detailed knowledge of Vergil and Cicero and being able to produce Latin verse composition in the style of Ovid or Horace. I propose to look at some of Woodham's remarks in the introduction to his commentary which, in his entry in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* is described as 'a competent rather than a distinguished performance, apparently intended for

undergraduate use.'[88] I submit that it represents an interesting and, maybe, characteristic, attitude of the nineteenth century to such Patristic study as existed at the time and is therefore worth discussing here. Woodham is writing from the point of view of his time, appearing to aim to expand the breadth of his student's knowledge of Latin writing.[89] He is not approaching his commentary from the point of view of a modern, specialist, scholar,

In the first chapter of his introduction, entitled 'On the Plan of the Edition', Woodham refers to the fact that study of the classics does not (in the nineteenth century) usually include study of the Fathers so it is not surprising that so much difficulty should be found in reading them. He asserts that this is particularly so for 'the less proficient class of student, who have no other preparatory information than that furnished by a respectable classical degree, or a good school education, and who, with an interval of perhaps three years from the one, and six from the other, commence the study of these writers, the perplexities are so great as to be almost effectually discouraging.'[90] (p ii-iii) This, I would suggest, shows, to a modern reader, a strange attitude to the writings of the Latin Fathers. It would appear to contribute to the later view, exemplified in the Nijmegen school already discussed, that 'Christian' writing was different, and suggests that at this period there was no attempt to regard 'later Latin' as a continuation of the 'classical' writers.

However, Woodham does seem to be aware that this area of scholarship had been neglected: 'it seems not inopportune to call attention to the language of those writers whose historical and doctrinal information have been so earnestly insisted on ... and to apply to this branch also of literature, that critical exactness and accuracy which has always so peculiarly

---

[88] Brogan, 2004
[89] For further information about this period see Sanderson 1975 and Stray 1998
[90] Woodham 1843, ii-iii

characterised the classical scholarship of our University'.[91] To this end Woodham declares

that in his commentary on the *Apologeticus* he will devote himself to 'the literal explanation

of the text.' One might assume that 'literal' here means 'grammatical', though this is not made

clear.[92]

Woodham frequently refers to what he regards as the declining nature of Latin of the

period - 'at the very outset he [the student of Tertullian] meets all the peculiarities of a

declining language, of provincial, theological and polemical Latin.'[93] He defends his taking of

one of the apologetical works as his example of Tertullian's language, 'there is quite enough to

engage us in Tertullian, considered as an African of the age of Severus, without at once

introducing him also as a theologian, a schismatic, and a controversialist'.[94] These

unsupported views of Tertullian, though maybe characteristic of the view of classicists of the

time, might well offend the sensibilities of the modern reader. Having denigrated the Latin of

Tertullian's period, a view which presents an insight into the evaluation of 'late Latin' of his

time, he also appears to disapprove of Tertullian theologically, in that Tertullian's robust, and

sometimes controversial, expression seemed to Woodham, to be in rather 'bad taste'. In view

of the times in which he wrote, it could possibly be that Woodham, a Cambridge man, and

theologically a liberal, is concerned to distance himself from what was happening in Oxford,

in the 'Oxford Movement' and the Tractarian revival of interest in Early Church History and

the Fathers.

Woodham remarks of the *Apologeticus*, 'it is no theological work, though written by a

Christian and a presbyter' (the understanding of such terms as 'presbyter' will be discussed

---

[91] Woodham 1843, iii
[92] Woodham 1843, iii
[93] Woodham 1843, iv
[94] Woodham 1843, v

later in the chapter on Cyprian.)[95] Speaking of the *Apologeticus* Woodham remarks, 'In one chapter only (21) is there any approach to theological language or style; the rest is like any ethical composition of the age, and capable of illustration in precisely the same manner ….' [96] Woodham seems not to be taking into account that the *Apologeticus* is just that; it is not intended as a theological work. He does not refer to any other of Tertullian's writings, whether because he does not consider them relevant, or, indeed because he does not know them. (Woodham would, presumably, have undergone the same public school and university education as that described earlier.) However, Woodham has also compared Cyprian, Arnobius and Lactantius with the language of Tertullian and admits that they continue in the same vein ….'They all to a greater or less extent exerted themselves as the apologists of their fellow Christians.' Woodham also cites Apuleius as giving 'the most important information concerning Carthage and the provinces' and compares the *Apologia* of Apuleius with Tertullian's *Apologeticus*.[97]

The second chapter of Woodham's introduction is entitled, 'On the Latinity of the African Fathers.' The background to the whole matter of African Latinity has been discussed earlier in this study and it is significant that Woodham should be discussing it in this work, forty years before Sittl's *Die lokalen Verschiedenheiten der lateinischen Sprache*.[98] Woodham confesses that at first he had hoped to produce a general illustration of African Latinity but that the further he advanced the more it became clear that this would not be possible. Since Woodham died in 1875 he would not have known of any of the discussions about *Africitas* by Kroll, Monceaux and Sittl, so it is significant that he should have been interested in this topic.

---

[95] Woodham 1843, vi
[96] Woodham 1843, vi
[97] Woodham 1843, vii
[98] Sittl 1882

He goes on to deal with those aspects already discussed, such as the impossibility of finding ground for concluding that certain expressions are Africanisms, rhetoric, such as Juvenal's comment *nutricula causidicorum,* and the influence of rhetorical training on Tertullian and also Cyprian, Arnobius and Lactantius. In this respect Woodham says 'We can conjecture pretty accurately what would be the result of such a state of things as this, when, with a declining language and a corrupt age, the ordinary years of study were monopolized by the exercises of the schools'.[99] Whilst Woodham condemns much of the language of the late second and early third century as 'declining', he very much approves of Apuleius, commenting upon 'his celebrated apology, the masterpiece of the day, the admiration of even Christian writers, is a deliberate display of all the arts, powers and subtleties of rhetoric; truth, though repeatedly appealed to, is virtually put out of the question:'.[100]

There is yet more emphasis on 'a language, already advanced in its decline'.[101] Woodham makes reference to several features, discussed earlier in this thesis, of supposed 'African' Latin, for instance, archaisms, and the so-called *tumor africus*, though Woodham does admit that neither this nor so-called 'archaisms', are particularly African, a point that has also been made before.[102] However, he also asserts that the main characteristic (of the Latin Fathers, presumably) 'which appears to me most idiomatic in character is not in words, nor in their government, but in the construction of sentences of which the involution is sometimes so intricate and strange, that ... we are compelled to refer it to some other influence, and, most probably, that of another tongue.'[103] This supposition that another language, which it has been

---

[99] Woodham 1843, xii-xiii
[100] Woodham 1843, xiii
[101] Woodham 1843, xiv
[102] Chapter 1, 1.2,40 and 1.2.1, 43
[103] Woodham xvii

suggested is Punic, lies behind this 'so-called 'African' Latin has also been mentioned earlier. These views have their relevance, since they are adduced 40 years before Sittl's seminal work.

However, Woodham defends Tertullian's language in the *Apologeticus*. He says that 'many scholars have stood up in defence of Tertullian's arguments, but all, except Gilbert Wakefield have joined in decrying his Latinity as pre-eminently vicious.'[104] Woodham's opinion is that 'some chapters of this treatise ...are equal to anything in ancient Latin and it seems really difficult to imagine that they were not actually spoken, or at all events written for oral delivery.'[105] It is encouraging to read this remark in a scholar of Woodham's generation.

I consider that this commentary is significant for the reception of Tertullian's use of language, at a time when this aspect of his writing was all but ignored. I conclude my examination of Woodham with one further quotation, 'But especially must I differ from any opinion that Latin is not a fitting language for theological or ecclesiastical purposes ...'.[106] Yes, indeed. One wonders, however, against whom he was arguing.

3.6.2 Eric Osborn - a twentieth century theologian's observations on Tertullian's language

I include a short examination of some points made in this book as it seems to me to present a view of Tertullian, which, whilst not totally ignoring his language, does not really take its significance into account, an approach which is typical of a work discussing theology, in which, strangely in my opinion, the original language in which the theology is expressed does not appear to be relevant.

---

[104] Gilbert Wakefield, 1756-1801 was a scholar whose writings often gave rise to controversy. Ordained in the Anglican Church he left the ministry to become a Unitarian. It could well be that it is to his *Early Christian Writers on the Person of Christ,* 1784, that Woodham is referring.
[105] Woodham xxii
[106] Woodham xxiii

In the preface to this book, written from a theological, not a linguistic, point of view, Osborn makes some points about Tertullian's language, which I discuss below.[107] Firstly. 'he purified a dialect, by framing a vocabulary which enabled him to challenge the opponents of his kind of Christianity.'[108] It is not clear what Osborn means by 'a dialect', though following the OED definition this could well describe Tertullian's very individual use of Latin.[109] The matter of whether there existed a specifically 'African' form of Latin and also Tertullian's particular style has already been discussed and possibly 'dialect' could be a suitable description of his expression..[110] However, there is no indication of what is meant by 'purifying' this dialect, since it would appear, following the definition above, to refer solely to Tertullian. 'Framing a vocabulary …' could certainly describe many of Tertullian's usages and one could well agree that Tertullian demonstrated the characteristic features of early Christian writing, borrowings from Greek, calques, and new coinings. One needs also to ask what is meant by 'his kind of Christianity'. Whilst Tertullian's writing provides the first extant examples of one theologian discussing and dismantling the views of another, as in *Adversus Praxean* and *Adversus Marcionem*, to describe this as 'his kind of Christianity' is, I feel, inappropriate. Possibly, however, Osborn is referring here to Tertullian's later association with the 'New Prophecy' movement, often referred to as Montanism, after its founder. The extent to which this is reflected in Tertullian's writing has been much discussed but certainly a term such as 'his unique style of expressing Christianity' or something similar, might be more accurate than 'his kind of Christianity'.

---

[107] Eric Osborn 1997
[108] Osborn 1997, xiii
[109] In the OED,sense 3a, 'dialect' is defined as manner of speaking, language, speech; esp. the mode of speech peculiar to, or characteristic of, a particular person or group; phraseology, idiom; jargon; a particular variety of any of these.'
[110] 135

'Tertullian's perpetual argumentation (*ratio* is his favourite word) enables us to understand his conclusions.'[111] Whilst I would quibble about what is meant by 'understand his conclusions' Osborn's observation about the frequency of Tertullian's use of *ratio*, is indeed true, and it is that remark which suggested to me a study on Tertullian's use of *ratio* which follows later in this chapter.

'There is no way in which we can understand what any writer is saying if we neglect his final vocabulary, if we isolate a proposition from the arguments which define its meaning.'[112] Osborn acknowledges that the study of the language of a writer is essential to the understanding of his ideas, that the theological examination of a writer like Tertullian cannot clearly express his concepts without a detailed examination of his language:

> 'Philosophers have continued to show, from Wittgenstein onwards, that meaning is inaccessible without context, language-game, final vocabulary, verbal constellation, dialect, universe of discourse or whatever imperfect name we choose to call it. The more useful theologians have said the same. That is why this book seeks to identify the final vocabulary which Tertullian created and used in different arguments. Such an analysis assumes that Tertullian is talking sense and sets out the way in which he arranges words.'[113]

The concept of a 'final vocabulary' is one which has been particularly examined and developed by the philosopher Richard Rorty:

> All human beings carry about a set of words which they employ to justify their actions, their beliefs, and their lives. These are the words in which we formulate praise of our friends and contempt for our enemies, our long-term projects, our deepest self-doubts and highest hopes. They are the words in which we tell, sometimes prospectively and sometimes retrospectively, the story of our lives. I shall call these words a person's 'final vocabulary'.[114]

---

[111] Osborn 1997, xv
[112] Osborn 1997, xv
[113] Osborn 1997, xvi
[114] Rorty1989, 73-95

It is this sense of the phrase which Osborne very effectively uses to describe Tertullian in his very being, which characterises his modes of expression and informs the way in which he expresses his theological arguments and ideas. At the end of the preface to this book Osborne concludes, No translation can do justice to Tertullian's splendid Latin.'[115] It is good to note that Osborn appreciates Tertullian's Latin, which has often been denigrated by classical scholars such as Palmer, who, claiming to summarise Norden, declares, 'yet his passionate and impetuous spirit did violence to the Latin language'.[116] Whilst I find it a pity that Tertullian's Latin does not feature more largely in Osborn's discussion of his theology I accept that detailed linguistic examination of Tertullian's use of Latin in Osborn's study theology would not be appropriate in this particular study of Tertullian..

3.7 *Ratio* in Tertullian - a study

3.7.1 Introduction

As an example of Tertullian's use of Latin to communicate and explain Christian ideas I propose to look at a noun, *ratio,* which Tertullian uses frequently, examining some of its uses in the classical period and after, in order to ascertain whether Tertullian uses the word in a similar sense to those generally employed, or whether any new nuances can be discerned. *Ratio* is derived from *ratus,* the past participle of the verb *reor, reri,* whose basic senses, 'count, account, reckon, evaluate' are preserved in the noun, though largely displaced in the verb by the wider sense, 'adjudge, think'.[117] *Ratio* appears frequently throughout Latin literature and therefore, like its root verb, is also found in many contexts, from the mathematical to the philosophical. Since we are considering usages of Latin to communicate Christian ideas, whilst 'mathematical' and 'philosophical' senses of *ratio* may be regarded as

---

[115] Osborn 1997, xvii
[116] Palmer, 1954, reprinted 1990, p 200, paraphrasing Norden, *die Antike Kunstprosa* 1898, 608 ff.
[117] Ernout et Meillet 1932, 294. Forcellini says *Reor est idem ac computo; atque hinc puto, opinor, existimo, censeo, arbitror, νομίζω, οἶμαι, ἡγέομαι.*

points on a single spectrum rather than mutually exclusive alternatives, it is the more

distinctly philosophical sense which will be most closely considered here.

One of the most important senses of an examination of *ratio* is as a translation of the

Greek λόγος. It will therefore be necessary to consider briefly usages of meanings of λόγος

which are, like *ratio*, many and varied, including, 'computation', 'opinion', 'word', 'speech',

'account' 'reason.' The word λόγος/λέγω exists in many compounds but *ratio/reor* in few.

The word is frequently found in Greek writings from Homer onwards but it is in the area of

philosophical discourse that the term begins, for our purposes here at least, to be important. It

is clear that the relationship between λόγος and *ratio* is important and relevant to Tertullian,

who on three occasions (discussed below, p 51) quotes the Greek word itself.[118] The writing

throughout the ages on λόγος forms part of the much wider debate about the relationship

between Christianity, Greek philosophy and Jewish thought. With the spread of the Roman

Empire into areas greatly formed and influenced by Greek thought the various Greek

philosophical schools found their way into a new world 'which shaped a new composite

Graeco-Roman culture'.[119] By the time of the birth of Christianity this culture of

'Hellenisation' clearly influenced the new Christian world view and throughout Christian

history there have been many theories about the relationship between Christianity, its Jewish

roots, and Greek philosophy. The debate has raged for many centuries as many opinions have

been adduced, discussed and disputed. The literature, both primary and secondary, is vast, and

---

[118] *Apol.* 21. *Apud uestros quoque sapientes λόγον, id est sermonem atque rationem, constat artificem uideri uniuersitatis.*
Adversus Praxean 5. *Hanc graeci λόγον dicunt, quo uocabulo etiam sermonem appellamus ideo que iam in usu est nostrorum per simplicitatem interpretationis sermonem dicere in primordio apud deum fuisse,*
De Anima 14. *Diuiditur autem in partes, nunc in duas a platone, nunc in tres a zenone, nunc in quinque ab aristotele et in sex a panaetio, in septem a sorano, etiam in octo penes chrysippum, etiam in nouem penes apollophanen, sed et in duodecim apud quosdam stoicorum, et in duas amplius apud posidonium, qui a duobus exorsus titulis, principali, quod aiunt ἡγεμονικόν, et a rationali, quod aiunt λογικόν, in decem septem exinde prosecuit; ita aliae ex aliis species diuidunt animam.*
[119] Drobner 2008, 672

lies well beyond the scope of the present study.[120] All that is offered here is a summary of the key points relating to λόγος and its relevance to our understanding of Tertullian's use of *ratio* considered against his intellectual and theological background.

3.7.2 The early history of λόγος

3.7.2.1 The Pre-Socratics

It is generally accepted, and endorsed by modern scholarship, that the earliest extant usages of λόγος in a philosophical sense can be attributed to Heraclitus of Ephesus (died c. 475 BC.) One of the pre-Socratics, his works survive only as fragments in other writers.[121] These are discussed and analysed in Kirk and Raven's *The Pre-Socratic Philosophers*, who suggest the following understanding of λόγος in Heraclitus' thought: '…the Logos …. is to be interpreted as the unifying formula or proportionate method of arrangement of things, … the structural plan of things both individual and in sum.'[122] This is suggested to be demonstrated from the following examples, cited in Kirk and Raven:[123]

> 197 Fr. 1 Sextus *adv. math.* VII, 132 τοῦ δὲ λόγου τοῦδ' ἀεὶ ἀξύωετοι γίνονται ἄνθρωποι καὶ πρόσθεν ἢ ἀκοῦσαι καὶ ἀκούσαντες τὸ πρῶτον
> (although this logos always exists, men are ignorant (of it) both before and after they have once heard)

> 198 Fr. 2, Sextus, *adv. math,* VII, 133 διὸ δεῖ ἕπεσθαι τῷ (ξυνῷ) τοῦ λόγου δ' ἐόντος ξυνοῦ ζώουσιν οἱ πολλοὶ ὡς ἰδίαν ἔχοντες φρόνησιν.
> (… it is necessary to follow the common. However, although the logos is common, the many live as if they had a private understanding)

> 199 Fr. 50, Hippolytus *Ref.* ix, 9, 1 οὐκ ἐμοῦ ἀλλὰ τοῦ λόγου ἀκούσαντας ὁμολογεῖν σοφὸν ἐστιν ἐν πάντα εἶναι
> (Listening not to me but to the logos it is wise to agree that all things are one.)

Pre-Socratic thought clearly informed and influenced the later important figures in Greek philosophy, including Plato, whose views of λόγος will be considered briefly.

---

[120] Dillon 1977 and 1996, Hengel 1973, Rist 1985 and 1996, Cameron 1971, Dillon 1988
[121] Preserved in Diels 1952
[122] Kirk and Raven 1971, 187-188
[123] Kirk and Raven 1971, 187-188

3.7.2.2 Plato and Aristotle

D. H. Williams, in his paper 'The Career of the Logos: a Brief Biography' maintains that it is a generally held opinion amongst pre-Socratic scholars that Plato, and also Aristotle, often misunderstood and misrepresented the pre-Socratics, though no reference is given.[124] Plato uses λόγος as 'reason': … πρὸς τὴν κατὰ λόγον δόξαν …. ὅταν οὖν ἐπιστήμαις ἢ δόξαις ἢ λόγῳ ἐναντιῶται, τοῖς φύσει ἀρχικοῖς, ἡ ψυχή, (*Laws* 698D) 'with the rational judgement …. so whenever this part opposes what are by nature the ruling principles-knowledge, opinion, or reason' (transl R.G. Bury 1967). Plato also uses λόγος to describe that which makes true opinion knowledge: ὅ γε ἐγώ, ὦ Σώκρατες, εἰπόντος του ἀκούσας ἐπελελήσμην, νῦν δ᾽ ἐννοῶ· ἔφη δὲ τὴν μὲν μετὰ λόγου (*Theaetetus* 201.C) (Oh yes, I remember now, Socrates, having heard someone make the distinction, but I had forgotten it. He said that knowledge was true opinion accompanied by reason) (transl. Harold N. Fowler, 1921). Aristotle describes λόγος as definition and essence: ἐπεὶ καὶ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς ὀστοῦν τῷ λόγῳ φησὶν εἶναι, τοῦτο δ᾽ ἐστὶ τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι καὶ ἡ οὐσία τοῦ πράγματος (*Metaphysics* 993a,17), (Even Empedocles says that bone exists by virtue of its ratio, which is the definition or essence of a thing) (transl. H. Tredennick, 1933).

These several interpretations of λόγος will be very relevant to the word's later understandings in both Judaism and Christianity and will appear in the guise of *ratio* in the present study of Tertullian's use of the Latin term.

3.7.2.3.Stoicism

Whilst λόγος gradually acquired special significance in all the main philosophical schools it is in Stoicism that it takes on an importance in the way that would influence early Christian thought and expression. In particular, Stoic thought took up and developed the

---

[124] Williams 2016, 209-219

Heraclitean λόγος concept, which in Stoicism is seen as divine reason, permeating man, the material universe, and heavenly bodies, understanding the world as the body and god/reason as the soul.

A significant, and well-known, example of early Stoicism is Cleanthes' *Hymn to Zeus*. Cleanthes (c 330-230BC) studied in Athens under Zeno, considered the founder of Stoicism, whom he succeeded as leader of the Stoic school of philosophy. This hymn sees one source, reason, λόγος as the foundation of all life:

1   κύδιστ᾽ ἀθανάτων, πολυώνυμε, παγκρατὲς αἰεί,

Ζεῦ, φύσεως ἀρχηγέ, νόμου μέτα πάντα κυβερνῶν,

χαῖρε· σὲ γὰρ πάντεσσι θέμις θνητοῖσι προσαυδᾶν

Most glorious of the immortals, invoked by many names, ever all-powerful,
Zeus, the First Cause of Nature, who rules all things with Law,
Hail! It is right for mortals to call upon you,   ...

12   ᾧ σὺ κατευθύνεις κοινὸν λόγον ὅς διὰ πάντων

φοιτᾶ, μιγνύμενος μεγάλοις μικροῖς τε φάεσσιν

and with it you guide the universal Word of Reason which moves through all creation,
mingling with the great sun and the small stars.

20   ὧδε γὰρ εἰς ἕν ἅπαντα συνήρμοκας ἐσθλὰ κακοῖσιν

ὥσθ' ἕνα γίγνεσθαι πάντων λόγον αἰὲν ἐόντα

For thus you have joined all things, the good with the bad, into one,
so that the eternal Word of all came to be one.[125]

The Stoic concept of the λόγος is neatly summed up for the purposes of this study by Tertullian's remark about the reputed founder of Stoicism, Zeno of Citium, that: *ecce enim Zeno quoque materiam mundialem a deo separat, uel sic <eu>m per illam tamquam mel per*

---

[125] Translation: M. A. C. Ellery, 1976, published in Monmouth College, Illinois, Department of Classics 2003

favos transisse dicit. (For see how even Zeno separates the matter of the world from God: he says that the latter has percolated through the former, like honey through the comb) (transl. Peter Holmes, *Ante-Nicene Fathers* vol 3)

3.7.2.4 Middle Platonism

From about 90 BC there can be detected a fusion of the main philosophical schools already mentioned, together with the Peripatetics, a period which lasted until the end of the third century AD, now termed Middle Platonism. This period is usually held to have begun with Antiochus of Ascalon (ca.130-68 BC), who rejected the scepticism of the New Academy, and to have ended with Plotinus AD (204-270, considered the founder of Neoplatonism, which continued into the Middle Ages.[126] Middle Platonism is frequently described as 'eclectic' but Dillon rightly, in my opinion, considers this term erroneous, implying 'the assembling of doctrines from various schools on the basis of the personal preferences of the thinker concerned, rather than on the basis of any coherent theory as to the historical development of philosophy.'[127] Dillon suggests that Antiochus and his successors used material from the Peripatetics and Stoics to express Plato's ideas and thus were, in a sense, 'modernising' Plato. Amongst the various philosophers and writers of the later part of this period a significant figure for the purpose of this study is Philo. No precise dates are extant but he was a member of a wealthy and prominent Jewish family in Alexandria, living between the end of the first century BC and the middle of the first century AD. Rome had replaced the Greeks, who had denied citizenship to nearly all Jews, as the ruling power and the only precise date associated with Philo is the account in Josephus of Philo's leading of a delegation of Alexandrian Jews to Caligula in AD 39.[128] At the beginning of his work, *De Legatione ad Gaium,* Philo refers to

---

[126] Dillon 1996
[127] Dillon 1996, xiv
[128] Josephus *Antiquities* 18, 257-260,

himself as an old man: Ἄχρι τίνος ἡμεῖς οἱ γέροντες ἔτι παῖδές ἐσμεν, τὰ μὲν σώματα χρόνου μήκει πολιοί, … (How long shall we the aged continue to be children grown grey in our bodies through length of years, …) (suggesting that he might have been born sometime around 15-20 BC.[129] Philo was clearly steeped in Plato, together with Stoic ideas and his importance for the eventual development of Christianity is his harmonisation of Greek philosophy with Judaism. He is thus regarded as one of the leading figures in which is termed Hellenistic Judaism and it is therefore under this head that I now consider him.

3.7.2.5 Hellenistic Judaism

The original, Heraclitean, understanding of λόγος appealed to Hellenistic Jewish thought. Both the Stoic and the Platonic ideas of λόγος influenced Philo of Alexandria. Philo used Stoic philosophy, particularly the concept of allegory, in his attempts to harmonise Jewish Scripture, mainly the Torah, with Greek philosophy. He was also influenced by Plato and, following the Platonic concept of a distinction between imperfect matter and the perfect form, posited the existence of an intermediary divine being, a demiurge: τοῦτον μὲν γὰρ πρεσβύτατον υἱὸν ὁ τῶν ὅλων ἀνέτειλε πατήρ, ὃν ἑτέρωθι πρωτόγονον ὠνόμασε, καὶ ὁ γεννηθεὶς μέντοι, μιμούμενος τὰς τοῦ πατρὸς ὁδούς, πρὸς παραδείγματα ἀρχέτυπα ἐκείνου βλέπων ἐμόρφου τὰ εἴδη. 'for the Father of the universe has caused him to spring up as the eldest son, whom, in another passage, he calls the firstborn, and he who is thus born, imitating the ways of his father, has formed such and such species, looking to his archetypal patterns' (Philo *De Confusione Linguarum* 1.63). Logos is imperishable: ἄν, ὦ γενναῖοι, πολέμῳ μὲν δυσχεραίνειν, εἰρήνην δὲ ἀγαπᾶν, ἕνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐπιγεγραμμένοι πατέρα οὐ θνητὸν ἀλλ᾽ ἀθάνατον, ἄνθρωπον θεοῦ, ὃς τοῦ ἀιδίου λόγος ὢν ἐξ ἀνάγκης καὶ αὐτός ἐστιν ἄφθαρτος; '….since how, I should say, could you, O excellent men, avoid being grieved at war, and

---

[129] Translation, F.H.Colson, Loeb Library, Heinemann. Further details in Dillon 1996, 139 ff.

delighted in peace, being the sons of one and the same father, and he not mortal but immortal, the man of God, who being the reason of the everlasting God, is of necessity himself also immortal?' (Philo, *De Confusione Linguarum* 11,41).[130] The Septuagint translates the Hebrew דָּבָר as λὸγος or ῥῆμα.

Although the term 'Stoic Theology' might not be considered appropriate, as what is known of this consists largely of later summaries and quotations from other writers, since in Stoicism God is co-extensive with the world (and arguably not transcendent), there appears to be a consensus that Stoic thinkers in general regarded God and the world as commensurate, and theology and philosophy likewise.[131] Thus Stoicism is, in a certain sense a 'religious' philosophy and, in addition, shows, particularly in later Stoicism, the influence not only of Hellenic but also of Hebrew thought. The first part of the fourth book of Maccabees, which might be considered to be on the fringes of the Judeo-Christian canon, advances philosophical concepts closely related to Stoicism in support of Jewish piety and thus demonstrated the influence of Stoicism on Hellenic Judaism.[132] The philosophical introduction begins: φιλοσοφώτατον λόγον ἐπιδείκνυσθαι μέλλων εἰ αὐτοδέσποτὸς ἐστιν τῶν παθῶν ὁ εὐσεβὴς λογισμός συμβουλεύσαιμ' ἂν ὑμῖν ὀρθῶς ὅπως προσέχητε προθύμως τῇ φιλοσοφίᾳ. Once again, the use of λόγος and related words, both in the sense of 'knowledge', ἐπιστήμη (1.2) and 'reason', for which the writer uses λογισμός, (1.13) is noticeably Stoic.

The Stoic/Jewish λόγος theology forms a part of the gradual conversion to Christianity of Justin Martyr (c. 100- 130 AD) one of the earliest Christian apologists.. According to his own account in his search for meaning in life Justin explored not only Stoicism but also other Greek philosophical schools, the Peripatetics, the Pythagoreans and, finally, Platonism,

---

[130] Translations of Philo C.D. Yonge 1854
[131]. Brunschwig and Sedley 2003, 151-183
[132] 4 Maccabees appears in the *Codex Sinaiticus* text but not, for instance, in *Codex Vaticanus*

before, according to his account at the beginning of his *Dialogue with Trypho*, he encountered Christianity. His background, therefore, equipped him to explore the relationship between the main Greek philosophical schools, particularly Platonism and Stoicism, and Christian beliefs. He develops the λόγος concept in detail in his two *Apologies* and the *Dialogue with Trypho*, influenced particularly by the Stoic idea of λόγος σπερματικός. Platonism also plays a large part in his theology. For Justin, whilst the λόγος is numerically distinct from the Father it/he is of one substance with the Father and thus he develops the Christian understanding of the incarnate Jesus as the Word of God: Οὐ γάρ μόνον Ἕλλησι διὰ Σωκράτους ὑπὸ Λόγου ἠλέγχθη ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν βαρβάροις ὑπ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Λόγου μορφωθέντος καὶ ἀνθρώπου γενομένου, καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κληθέντος (For not only among the Greeks did reason (Logos) prevail to condemn these things through Socrates, but also among the barbarians were they condemned by Reason (or the Word, the Logos) Himself, who took shape, and became man, and was called Jesus Christ. (*Apology.* 1, 5)

Although one might consider Platonism as the primary contribution of Greek philosophy to Christian thought, the Stoic understanding of the λόγος plays an important part in the development of the understanding of Christ as the word of God. The Apostle Paul's birthplace of Tarsus was a centre of Stoic thought, and Stoic ideas can be discerned in Paul's writings. In the first chapter of St John's Gospel λόγος refers first to the pre-incarnate λόγος, with clear echoes of Genesis 1 and continues with probably the earliest and clearest statement of the Christian λόγος as the Incarnate Son of God.

> Ἐν αρχῇ ἦν ὁ λόγος και ὁ λόγος ἦν πρὸς τὸν θεόν και θεός ἦν ὁ λογος .... καί ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο καὶ ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν (John 1.14)

The λόγος theology of this passage has been exhaustively examined and discussed elsewhere. I shall consider it again later in connection with Tertullian's *Adversus Praxean*.

Having very briefly considered λόγος as the background to *ratio* I now turn to the main focus of this study, *ratio* and Tertullian's use of it.

3.7.3 *Ratio* in Classical Latin

Apart from *Hymn to Zeus* of Cleanthes we are largely dependent for our knowledge of Stoicism on later authors rather than on the primary texts of the founding fathers. It is in the later period of Stoicism up to about the end of the 2nd century AD, that longer extant texts, particularly those of Cicero and Seneca, provide a deeper understanding of Stoic ideas. Thus it is largely through the medium of Latin that the next phase of the development of Stoic thought is transmitted, in which *ratio* is found to be the usual, though not exclusive, Latin translation of λόγος. Before considering its use in Tertullian, for whom it is a frequently used word, it is necessary to look at ways in which this term is used elsewhere in classical writers, particularly in Cicero and Seneca.

Since *ratio* is a common as well as a technical term it is not always possible to discern in which exact sense it is being used. Moreover, the very nature of the word lends itself to what might be perceived as double meanings and word play, enabling both a general and a specialised meaning to be contained in the same expression, a useful device, particularly in apologetic writing, with which we shall be concerned when considering usages in Tertullian, as will be demonstrated. The exhaustive entry in *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* and the entry in Lewis and Short examine the many facets of *ratio*, in which, over the course of time, semantic extensions can be discerned. These range from 'account, calculation', to 'matter, affair, type, condition, sense, school of thought, system, advice', and so on. Similar usages appear in Tertullian and elsewhere, often in compounds, in the same way that, for instance, the German *-wissenschaft* can be used to describe a wide range of areas of study, such as *Altertumswissenschaft* and *Sprachwissenschaft.* However *ratio* is also used in much deeper

and philosophical contexts and it is this particular usage which will be examined in Tertullian. Since Latin philosophy is largely derived from Greek, Latin philosophical writing needed to develop a vocabulary for translating and expressing theological and philosophical concepts associated with particular Greek words.

Gerald Bray, in his article 'The Legal Concept of Ratio in Tertullian' observes 'The poverty of the Latin language, as seen for instance in its comparative inability to coin new words, especially abstract words, meant that there was an inevitable tendency to amplify and extend the meaning of words already in existence, or alternatively, to fall back on Graecisms'.[133] This, I would submit, grossly overstated opinion, yet contains some grains of truth in that there are frequent examples in Tertullian, and others, of two or more Latin words being required to convey the sense of the Greek. For instance, Lucretius, not a Stoic, appeals frequently to *ratio* and, describing his language, coined the phrase *patrii sermonis egestas* (*De Rerum Natura* 1. 832).

Cicero, whilst not declaring himself a Stoic as such, is clearly sympathetic to Stoicism and it is his philosophical writings which give substantial insights into Stoic ideas, using *ratio*, for instance: *Homo autem quod rationis est particeps .... Eademque natura vi rationis hominem conciliat homini et ad orationis et ad vitae societatem.* (*De Officiis* 4.11. et 12). Noticeable here is the wordplay on *ratio* and *oratio*. Thus the orator is the exponent of reason, which forms a common bond between humans. This echoes in Latin, though cannot reproduce exactly, the connection in Greek between λέγω and λόγος.

In a passage criticising the traditional Stoic view of ratio, as expressed by its founder, Zeno, and one of the most important of his successors, Chrysippus. Cicero uses both *animus* and *mens* as virtual synonyms for *ratio*:

---

[133] Bray 1977, 116.

> Iam vero Chrysippus, qui Stoicorum somniorum vaferrumus habetur interpres, magnam turbam congregat ignotorum deorum, atque ita ignotorum ut eos ne coniectura quidem informare possimus, cum mens nostra quidvis videatur cogitatione posse depingere. ait enim vim divinam in ratione esse positam et in universae naturae animo atque mente … (*De Natura Deorum* 1.39).

Cicero also uses *ratio* to mean 'ground for belief, argument, proof': *Non deest hoc loco copia rationum, quibus docere velitis, humanas esse formas deorum. ..... tertiam rationem affertis, quod nulla in alia figura domicilium mentis esse possit* (*De Natura Deorum* 1.76).

Bray, in the article cited earlier, advances the view that Cicero's use of *ratio* owes much more to his legal background, using *ratio* in the sense of 'method', than to his understanding of the Stoic λόγος, and that this produces evidence that *ratio* was developing a more technical and legal meaning. He admits, however, that, although, in his opinion, Cicero's use of *ratio* owes more to its Latin origins than to the Stoic idea of a divine λόγος, it 'does give the word a philosophical significance it had not previously had'.[134]

The single most important extant Stoic writing in Latin is found in Seneca, who makes frequent use of *ratio* in various senses, as in the following example, where *ratio* and *natura* are presented as inseparable ideas: *Bonum sine ratione nullum est: sequitur autem ratio naturam. Quid est ergo ratio? naturae imitatio.* (*Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales* 66. 39).

3.7.4 *Ratio* in Tertullian

There are some three hundred instances of the word *ratio* in the works of Tertullian. Since, as had been demonstrated, *ratio* is used in classical and secular later Latin in many varying senses, in addition to its significant use as one of the Latin translations of λὀγος, the purpose of an examination of its appearances in Tertullian is to establish whether his use of the word corresponds to those found in Latin writing generally, whether he always uses *ratio*

---

[134] Bray, 1977, 102, bearing in mind that Bray is concerned primarily with *ratio* in a legal sense, as his title makes clear.

as an equivalent of λόγος, whether it is possible to discern in his usages a specific Christian accent, or whether, as would seem probable, all these instances are present in his writing.[135]

In this study I propose to examine *ratio* in two very different works of Tertullian, the *Apologeticus* (twenty-four instances of *ratio*) and *Adversus Praxean,* Tertullian's exposition and development of the doctrine of the Trinity against the Monarchian, Praxeas, (also twenty-four instances).[136] The purpose in selecting these particular works is to make it possible to discern any possible difference between a work of apologetic and a work of theological exposition and disputation. Given the very different nature of these works, I shall examine whether Tertullian's use of *ratio* likewise differs across them.

Although very little can be established with any great certainty about Tertullian's life and background, it is clear from his writings that he had received a traditional education and was therefore well schooled in Greek with a good understanding of Greek philosophy, particularly Stoicism, in addition to having been educated in oratory.[137] One would therefore expect Tertullian to demonstrate in his writing a relationship between the λὸγος and the use of *ratio* as a Latin equivalent. Thus, when Tertullian is using *ratio* in connection with λὸγος it will often be the case that he finds a simple *ratio*/λὸγος substitution insufficient to express the full meaning of either. How Tertullian deals with this in addition to other uses of *ratio* will be examined below.

3.7.5 *Ratio* in the *Apologeticus*

In apologetic works we might detect different word usages from those in writings of a more theological nature, such as *Adversus Praxean*. Since the aim and essence of apologetic

---

[135] Ideally we might compare Tertullian's usage in statistical terms with that of other Latin authors, using the Perseus frequency per 10k function. Unfortunately, in this case the comparison cannot be easily done, as the Perseus corpus includes only the *Apologeticus* – a nice illustration in itself of the marginal status of Tertullian's writings compared to those of 'classical' Latin.
[136] Frequency count from *Library of Latin Texts,* Brepols
[137] See sections 3.1 and 3.2 of this chapter.

writing is to express and defend concepts of the new Christian movement for those either unfamiliar with it or hostile towards it, there will be a need to find common ground between the two sides. Words familiar in other contexts need to be used and, where necessary, clarified as to their new nuances. In examining Tertullian's use of *ratio* I first give instances where he is clearly using the word in contexts in which the word would be familiar in some of its many usages, such as 'reason': *sequitur ut eadem ratione pro aliis non sacrificemus, quia …….* (*Apologeticus* 10.1); *compar exitus furoris, et una ratio est instigationis ….. (Apologeticus* 23.3); *redde, si potes, rationem, qua factus es, et tunc require, qua fies (Apologeticus 46.6).*

There are also examples of the familiar usage of *ratio* to mean 'account' in a financial sense. In a passage concerning pagan temple dues, Tertullian exploits the punning possibilities of the word: … *ut, si ineatur quantum vectigalibus pereat fraude et mendacio vestrarum professionum, facile ratio haberi possit, unius specie querela conpensata pro commodo ceterarum rationum (Apologeticus* 42.9). It could well be that here, Tertullian is playing with the boundaries of acceptable Latin in that he uses analogy (*ratio*) instead of usage (*usus, consuetudo*).

In some contexts, however, Tertullian's use treads a boundary between 'classical' and more distinctly 'Christian' or philosophical senses:

> sed nomen, quod quaedam ratio aemulae operationis insequitur, hoc primum agens, ut homines nolint scire pro certo quod se nescire pro certo sciunt. Ideo et credunt de nobis quae non probantur, et nolunt inquiri, ne probentur non esse quae malunt credisse, ut nomen illius aemulae rationis inimicum praesumptis,non probatis criminibus de sua sola confessione damnetur. (*Apologeticus* 2.18)

In the above example, Tertullian is arguing that Christians are judged in completely the opposite way to other criminals in that, whilst others are tortured to make them confess, Christians are tortured to make them deny (2.10). He thus posits the *ratio aemulae rationis* as expressing a second category of reasoning, *inimicum* to the Christian *nomen* in order to create

confusion when Christians are condemned. In his translation T. R. Glover renders *ratio*

aemulae operationis as 'a certain rational agency' and adds, in a footnote, the explanation as

'the demon-world'. [138] However, this is rather an odd phrase. *Aemulatio* has a variety of

meanings and can be used both in a good and a bad sense (hence, presumably, Glover's

'demon-world'). It is a word used in many classical writers. Cicero defines it as follows:

> aemulatio autem dupliciter illa quidem dicitur, ut et in laude et in vitio nomen hoc
> sit; nam et imitatio virtutis aemulatio dicitu - sed ea nihil hoc loco utimur; est enim
> laudis - et est aemulatio aegritudo, si eo quod concupierit alius potiatur, ipse
> careat. obtrectatio autem est, ea quam intellegi ζηλοτυπίαν volo, aegritudo ex eo,
> quod alter quoque potiatur eo quod ipse concupiverit. (*Tusculanae Disputationes*
> 4.17*)*

Biblical usages of *aemulatio* demonstrate both negative and positive senses, though

the majority, and all examples in the Old Testament, are used in a sense which could be said

to straddle the line between positive and negative, for instance, *noli adorare deum alienum*

Dominus Zelotes nomen eius Deus est aemulator (Exodus 34.14 Vulgate), and in the

Septuagint, οὐ γὰρ μὴ προσκυνήσητε θεῷ ἑτέρῳ ὁ γὰρ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ζηλωτὸν ὄνομα θεὸς

ζηλωτής ἐστιν, (Exodus 34. 14 LXX). This 'double meaning' carries over into the New

Testament, *aemulatio*, as a translation of ζῆλος.[139] Whilst the following example suggests an

ambivalent usage, μαρτυρῶ γὰρ αὐτοῖς ὅτι ζῆλον θεοῦ ἔχουσιν ἀλλ᾽ οὐ κατ᾽ ἐπίγνωσιν:

testimonium enim perhibeo illis quod aemulationem Dei habent sed non secundum scientiam

(Romans 10.2), both negative: ὡς ἐν ἡμέρᾳ εὐσχημόνως περιπατήσωμεν, μὴ κώμοις καὶ

μέθαις, μὴ κοίταις καὶ ἀσελγείαις, μὴ ἔριδι καὶ **ζήλῳ**, *Sicut in die honeste ambulemus: non in*

comessationibus, et ebrietatibus, non in cubilibus, et impudicitiis, non in contentione, et

aemulatione*:* (Romans 13, 13) and positive: οὐ μόνον δὲ ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν

τῇ παρακλήσει ᾗ παρεκλήθη ἐφ᾽ ὑμῖν, ἀναγγέλλων ἡμῖν τὴν ὑμῶν ἐπιπόθησιν, τὸν ὑμῶν

---

[138].Glover 1966, 16

[139] Konstan and Rutter 2003

ὀδυρμόν, τὸν ὑμῶν **ζῆλον** ὑπὲρ ἐμοῦ, ὥστε με μᾶλλον χαρῆναι. *Non solum autem in adventu ejus, sed etiam in consolatione, qua consolatus est in vobis, referens nobis vestrum desiderium, vestrum fletum, vestram **aemulationem** pro me, ita ut magis gauderem.* (II Cor. 7,7) So the double meaning suits Tertullian's purpose very well here. Glover provides another footnote, 'This intolerable antithesis seems to mean that the demons wish men (who really know themselves to be ignorant as to Christianity) to avoid clearing up their minds with definite knowledge about it.' [140] Tertullian is thus continuing with his argument in this early part of the *Apologeticus,* that Christians are being forced to deny the faith by those who know nothing about it.

The *Apologeticus* is directed at pagans, and it is likely that his readership, would, like Tertullian himself, be familiar with the Stoic λόγος concept, the broad outline of which is that the world is rational in that it works by strict chains of cause and effect, and also that it is governed by a rational principle which is coextensive with itself. It is not necessary to posit a god who interferes in the machinery of the world, because the λόγος of the god can be one of attitude, λόγος ἐνδιάθετος, or one of expression, λόγος προφορικός, in the same way that a thought or phrase may exist in our minds before we utter it. Such a god would be external to the world, which the Stoic god is not. It is not possible to say to what extent Stoic thought would have been known and understood in antiquity but it is likely that some degree if Stoic understanding would have been fairly widespread. Certainly, in Acts 17.28 Paul is presented as assuming that his audience will be familiar with the Stoicising cosmology of Aratus. Consequently, although Tertullian's working out of the λόγος concept as a description of the Second Person of the Trinity is not as prominent in this work as it will be seen to be in *Adversus Praxean*, it is nevertheless significant as an extension of the influence of Stoic ideas

---

[140] Glover, 1966, 16

as Christian belief gradually feels its way to the eventual concept of the Trinity, a development in which Tertullian plays a major part.[141]

A significant exposition of Christian belief is found early in the *Apologeticus* in the following passage, where *ratio* appears alongside *verbum* and *virtus* in a tricolon, providing also an interesting juxtaposition of masculine and neuter:

> quod colimus, deus unus est, qui totam molem istam cum omni instrumento elementorum, corporum, spiritum, verbo quo iussit, ratione qua disposuit, virtute qua potuit, de nihilo expressit in ornamentum maiestatis suae, unde et Graeci κὸσμον accommodaverunt. (*1Apologeticus* 7.1)[142]

This passage demonstrates a close association with the Stoic λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and λόγος προφορικός. In addition to *verbum* and *ratio* Tertullian here also uses as the third element in his tricolon, *virtus*, a word which, whilst not such an obvious translation of λὸγος, yet bears a similar sense and, in addition, is a term familiar in classical Latin as summing up the qualities desired in a Roman, and which therefore lends itself to its extended use here. In addition, in Biblical Latin *virtus* is the regular equivalent of δυνάμις, so the phrase in Latin and Greek would be something like *virtute qua potuit* = δύναμις ᾗ ἐδυνήθη .

The connection here with verbum is significant, as it appears as such in other works. In her paper, *'Verbum, le 'verbe divin'* Sophie Roesch makes the point that λόγος in Latin can be *verbum* or *ratio*.[143] She cites Augustine, who preferring *verbum* to *ratio* as a translation of *λόγος* comments on John 1.1: *Quod graece λόγος dicitur, latine et rationem et verbum significat. Sed hoc loco melius verbum interpretamur, ut significetur non solum ad Patrem*

---

[141] For a detailed exposition of Tertullian's working out of the λόγος as extending the Stoic concept to describing the Divine Word, see Braun 1962, 256-266

[142] Note here two of only three instances of Tertullian citing Greek. The third appears in *Adversus Praxean* and will be dealt with below

[143] Roesch 2006, 317-332

respectus, sed ad illa etiam etiam quae per verbum sunt operativa potentia. Ratio autem, etsi

nihil per illam fiat recte ratio dicitur. (Augustine, *de Diversis Quaestionibus 83*)

Whilst Tertullian rarely cites Greek terms, and typically with a Latin translation, there are three instances, two in the passage of the *Apologeticus* under discussion, and one in *Adversus Praxean*, where Tertullian uses λόγος itself, in Greek.[144] In addition, he uses λογικόν in *De Anima* 14. In the first of the λόγος passages mentioned, *Apologeticus* 21.10-11, the same three words, *ratio, verbum, virtus* appear again as Tertullian expounds the classic Stoic concept of λόγος, citing Zeno, the founder of Stoicism, and his successor, Cleanthes, in support of the orthodoxy of this position, later extending it, in a fusion of Biblical and Stoic ideas, to apply to the Christian understanding of what, even at this early stage of the development of Christian doctrine, could, with the use of *spiritus*, be seen as moving towards a Trinitarian understanding. Certainly Tertullian, with *nam et deus spiritus* is moving in that direction. It is not, however, either here or in the section on *Adversus Praxean*, the intention to discuss the early development of Trinitarian theology, which has been extensively written about elsewhere and which lies outside the scope of this dissertation.[145]

> idcirco filium dei et deum dictum ex unitate substantiae: nam et deus spiritus iam diximus deum universitatem hanc mundi verbo et ratione et virtute molitum. Apud vestros quoque sapientes **λόγον, id est sermonem atque rationem,** constat artificem videri universitatis.
> Hunc enim Zeno determinat factitatorem, qui cuncta in dispositione endiathesis formaverit; eundem et fatum vocari et deum et animum Iovis et necessitatem omnium rerum.
> (*Apologeticus* 21.10-11)

The second usage by Tertullian in *Apologeticus* of λὸγος in its Greek form presents a problem as the highlighted phrase does not appear in many of the manuscripts, including the manuscript tradition of the *Apologeticus,* based on the *Codex Fuldensis*, discovered in the

---

[144] 3.7.4.2, 217
[145] McGowan 2009, Hanson 1988

Benedictine Abbey of Fulda in 1584 by François de Maulde. The citation below is from the

Oehler text, used in the Loeb edition:

> ostendens se esse verbum dei, **id est λόγον**, illud primordiale, primogenitum, virtute et ratione comitatum et spiritu fultum, eundem qui verbo omnia et faceret et fecisset. (21.17)[146]

The text used in the Library of Latin Texts is that from Dekkers, and has the following

variation:

> ostendens se esse filium illum, et olim a deo praedicatum et ad omnium salutem natum, verbum dei illud primordiale, primogenitum, virtute et ratione comitatum et spiritu fultum.[147]

Braun suggests that it is possible the phrase **id est λόγον** in the *recensio vulgata*

represents a revision by Tertullian himself:

> Un peu plus loin, nous retrouverons le terme grec, du moins dans le texte de la recension vulgata: Si cette recension est bien le produit d'une revision par l'auteur lui-même d'une redaction plus ancienne que nous aurait conservé la recension Fuldensis, les mots **id est λόγον**, qui ne figurant pas au texte de celle-ci ont dû être insérés par Tertullien pour éclairer parfaitement le sens de verbum dei, locution chrétienne mystérieuse pour un païen non initié au langage de la religion nouvelle.' (A little further on we shall meet the Greek term again, at least in the Vulgate version, *verbum dei id est λόγον* (21.17). If this version is indeed the product of a revision by the author himself, which the Fulda recension has preserved for us, the words **id est λόγον, which** do not appear at all in that text in which had to be inserted by Tertullian in order to clarify perfectly the sense of *verbum dei,* a Christian expression mysterious for a pagan who had not been initiated into the language of the new religion). [148]

Alternatively, this could have arisen when a copyist with very moderate Greek could have

supplied an interlinear or marginal gloss, which then became incorporated into the main text.

---

[146] Glover 1966, xxi
[147] *Library of Latin Texts 2020),* Dekkers, 1954, CPL 0003 CC SL, 1 85-171, based on an earlier edition
[148] Braun, 1962, 257-8

The use of *spiritu fultum* is significant. The concept of πνεῦμα was an important one in Stoic physics, πνεῦμα being understood as the moving force pervading all substances, and as such conceived of as part of the divine πνεῦμα, permeating and directing the cosmos. This same thought is also found in Vergil, *spiritus intus alit, totamque effusa per artus, mens agitat molem et magno se corpore miscet* (*Aeneid* 6.724) and echoed in Tennyson 'thou that seest Universal/Nature moved by Universal Mind'.[149] Applied to the human form this was understood as God within man, giving reason and intelligence.[150] This idea, therefore, is clearly of use in the development of the eventual Trinitarian concept. However, there is a difference between *comitatum* - accompanied, and *fultum* - support, hold up, strengthen, so the question arises, is there theological significance in *comitatum* being applied to *virtute* and *ratione,* whilst *spiritu* is accompanied by *fultum,* or is Tertullian merely using the two words, in order to achieve some variation? It seems to me that the difference is indeed of theological importance in the development of Trinitarian understanding. Here *ratio* is 'reason', not a translation of λόγος, which is clearly *verbum,* thus 'showing himself to be the word of God (that is, the λόγος), that which was in the beginning, the first-begotten (so, Father and Son), accompanied by power and reason, upheld by the Spirit, the same which by the word creates and has created everything'.[151] Here, I would suggest, is one of many examples of the fusion of both Platonic and Stoic concepts in the gradual development of Christian theology.

There is one further example from the *Apologeticus* where Tertullian uses *ratio* in a sense similar to those cited above. There are textual variations between *Fuldensis* and Oehler here, too, but in both *ratio* is used in close connection again with *virtus*, also *spiritus* and, for first time in *Apologeticus*, with *deus*.

---

[149] Tennyson 1882
[150] Pigliucci 1995 https://www.iep.utm.edu/, accessed 10.08.2019
[151] Engberg-Pedersen 2010
https://blog.oup.com/2017/09/stoicism-platonism-judaism-early-christianity/

ut dei virtus et dei spiritus et <dei> ratio, ut dei filius et dei omnia *Apologeticus* 23.12)Text in *Library of Latin Texts* A.[152]

ut dei virtus et dei spiritus et sermo et sapientia et ratio et dei filius. (23.12) Text in Glover (Oehler, *Fuldensis*). [153]

However, it is in the Dekkers' text which, in coupling *ratio* with *deus*, seems to me to show a closer relationship of *ratio,* hence, 'reason' or λὸγος of God, so that the Son of God is all of God. This could be described as a distinctly 'Nicene' reading of Tertullian, whilst the *Fuldensis* text could be read as suggesting a lower Christology than that of the Dekkers text, since there is less emphasis on *dei* and no explicit reference to the Son having all the attributes of God. Working on the assumption that early Christianity tends to move from a 'low' to a 'high' understanding of Christology, it could be that the *Fuldensis* text might be the earlier form after all. However, this question is ultimately irresolvable and in any case, further discussion of Christology is beyond the scope of the present study.

It will be seen, therefore, that in the *Apologeticus* Tertullian extends the Stoic understanding of *ratio* to demonstrate that the Christian understanding of Christ is as co-equal Son of God. He can assume in his readers, the Roman *imperii antistites* (1.1) a familiarity with Stoicism, and one detects that he makes use of familiar concepts such as *ratio* in order to present Christianity in an acceptable form to those either unfamiliar with or hostile to it. He does not, however, use *ratio* in the theological and, possibly, scriptural, sense which he demonstrates in *Adversus Praxean.*

3.7.6 *Ratio* in *Adversus Praxean*

In *Adversus Praxean,* Tertullian is presented with different challenges. Praxeas, only known from this work of Tertullian, was an exponent of Monarchianism, a theological

---

[152] *Library of Latin Texts* (2020) Dekkers (1954) CPL0003, CC SL, 1, 85-171)
[153] Glover 1966, 128

movement which arose in the second and third centuries, and which, broadly, proposed an understanding of Christianity which denied the Divinity of Christ. This movement formed one of the many attempts in the early Church to seek to clarify the relationship between the Father and the Son, and split into two main groups, the Adoptionist, or Dynamic, Monarchians, which maintained that Christ was merely a man, albeit miraculously conceived, and the Modalist Monarchians, who maintained that Father and Son were merely different designations of the one God. It was this latter group of which Praxeas was an exponent.[154] The various manifestations of this position differed but all demonstrated a clear denial of the divinity of Christ, which was at odds with the λὸγος concept. According to Tertullian, Praxeas came originally from Asia Minor and propounded his views in Rome, gaining the support of the Bishop of Rome, probably Victor c.189 (*Adversus Praxean* 1. 4ff). By this time Tertullian had been attracted to the 'New Prophecy' movement propounded by Montanus which was apparently gaining favour generally in the Church until, according to Tertullian, the influence of Praxeas and his views led to support of this movement being withdrawn*: Ita duo negotia diaboli Praxeas Romae procuravit, prophetiam expulit et haeresim intulit, paracletum fugavit et patrem crucifixit*. (1.5)

Tertullian's attacks on and repudiation of Praxeas' position produce one of the earliest expositions of orthodox Trinitarian doctrine. It should be noted, however, that the representation of Praxeas may well have been coloured by Tertullian's hostility and that Tertullian himself was becoming more and more attracted to the Montanist position.[155]

---

[154]:, McGrath 2013, 200

[155] Jerome *De Viris Illustribus 53 Hic cum usque ad mediam aetatem presbyter Ecclesiae permansisset, invidia postea et contumeliis clericorum Romanae Ecclesiae, ad Montani dogma delapsus, in multis libris Novae Prophetiae meminit.*

The present purpose is to examine how Tertullian uses *ratio*, together with *sermo*, to expound and emphasise to Praxeas his understanding of the relationship between the first two persons of the Trinity. A key passage, and the other instance of λόγος, is cited in full below:

> Ante omnia enim deus erat solus, ipse sibi et mundus et locus et omnia. Solus autem quia nihil aliud extrinsecus praeter illum, ceterum ne tunc quidem solus: habebat enim secum quam habebat in semetipso rationem, suam scilicet, rationalis enim deus, et ratio in ipso prius, et ita ab ipso omnia: quae ratio sensus ipsius est. **hanc Graeci λόγον dicunt, quo vocabulo etiam sermonem appellamus**: ideoque iam in usu est nostrorum per simplicitatem interpretationis sermonem dicere in primordio apud deum fuisse, cum magis rationem competat antiquiorem haberi, quia (non) sermonalis a principio sed rationalis deus etiam ante principium, et quia ipse quoque sermo ratione consistens priorem eam ut substantiam suam ostendat. tamen et sic nihil interest (*Adversus Praxean* 5, 2-4)

It is clear that Tertullian is at pains to analyse λόγος in detail and that, in using *ratio* he also finds it necessary to add *sermo* in order to convey the full meaning of the Greek. Braun notes that, as has already been seen, Tertullian feels the need to use a hendiadys, albeit an imprecise one, *sermo atque ratio* (*Apologeticus* 21.10) in order to convey in Latin the full understanding of λόγος.[156] Though the use of hendiadys to express a Latin equivalent is a common device, Braun draws from this passage the understanding that Tertullian's *ratio atque sermo* denotes, not two states of the Word, but two aspects, though this would appear to add nothing significant to the traditional distinction between λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and λόγος προφορικός:

> Loin qu'il conçoive deux Verbes divins, ou même deux états du Verbe divin, - donc l'un serait Raison λόγος ἐνδιάθετος et l'autre Parole λόγος προφορικός -, tout l'effort de Tertullien au contraire consiste à montrer, en partant d'une distinction normale entre *ratio* et *sermo* , que le λόγος de la théologie chrétienne définit une réalité complexe dont *ratio* et *sermo* sont pour ainsi dire les deux faces, dont l'un est le fond, l'autre la forme. (Far from conceiving of two 'divine Words' or even two states of the divine Word, of which one would be Reason, λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and the other Word, λόγος προφορικός – all Tertullian's effort consists of demonstrating quite the opposite, beginning from a normal distinction between *ratio* and *sermo* that the λόγος of Christian theology defines a complex reality of

---

[156] Braun, 1962, 260

which *ratio* and *sermo* are two aspects, one of which is the origin and the other the form.) [157]

If, in the passage from *Adversus Praxean* cited above, Tertullian is referring to John 1.1, it would seem from *in usu est nostrorum* that some translations had *sermo* instead of *verbum*. It is not clear to whom *nostrorum* applies; whether it means, as in Souter's translation 'it is now our (Latin) custom…' in which case, is Tertullian referring to all (orthodox) Christians, or just to his fellow adherents of the 'New Prophecy'? Or is the implication that current Latin translations of John 1.1 use *sermo* rather than *ratio* because the latter would not be correctly understood and interpreted by 'ordinary' Latin speaking Christians? These questions are not susceptible of a satisfactory answer. Moreover, Tertullian here appears to be citing a Latin translation which not only has *sermo*, rather than *verbum*, but also *in primordio* rather than *in principio*. Possibly *primordium* might suggest a more distinctly 'temporal' understanding 'in the beginning', rather than *in principio* which could be translated as 'in authority'. It could also be argued that *primordium* is stronger and more poetic than *principio*. A search in *TLL* shows that, whilst there are many more instances of *principium* than *primordium* in Latin literature generally, Tertullian appears to prefer *primordium* (one hundred and twenty examples) as against *principium* (ten examples), though in Latin literature in general *principium* is much more common.

The *verbum* versus *sermo* usage by Tertullian is discussed by Braun, who suggests that a comparison of the Bibles of Cyprian and Novatian show clearly that in the third century λὸγος was translated by *sermo* in Africa but *verbum* in Rome.[158] However, this comparison cannot show that the usage of *sermo* and *verbum* corresponded to the African and Roman usage respectively, but only that Cyprian appears to prefer *sermo* and Novatian *verbum*.

---

[157] Braun 1962, 261
[158] Braun 1962, 267

Braun also suggests that Tertullian was familiar with a translation of John 1 in which *sermo* was used as a translation of λόγος instead of *verbum*. He cites von Soden: *Tertullian braucht beides, sermo und verbum, ziemlich gleichmässig: das leztere war wohl ihm, das andere seiner Bibel geläufiger, eine bei ihm häufig anzutreffende Kombination.*[159] Tertullian's usages, however, are, according to Braun, more complex and it is therefore an oversimplification to state that Tertullian prefers *sermo* in all usages, other than in Biblical practice, where he uses *verbum.*[160].

Tertullian then expounds the concept that *ratio* precedes *sermo* as God was rational from the beginning and *sermo* depends upon *ratio*, yet, having then declared *sic nihil interest*, he goes on to imply that both are inextricably bound with each other, as Braun, cited above, points out. Thus, *sermo atque ratio* is necessary in Latin to convey the full understanding of the divine λόγος. The use of *sermonalis* strikes an odd note but is a neologism (also a hapax legomenon), coined by Tertullian to balance *rationalis*. The same distinction as before, from the two Stoic understandings of λόγος, is found in the following:

> quodcumque cogitaveris sermo est, quodcumque senseris, ratio est (*Adversus Praxean* 5.6)
> quanto ergo plenius hoc agitur in deo cuius tu quoque imago et similitudine censeris, quod habeat in se etiam tacendo rationem et in ratione sermonem? (*Adversus Praxean* 5.7)

The same reasoning, *ratio* and *sermo* are the two properties of God, once again λόγος ἐνδιάθετος and λόγος προφορικός. The same thought is reiterated later in the chapter:

> possum itaque non temere praestruxisse et tunc deum ante universitatis constitutionem solum non fuisse, habentem in semetipso proinde rationem et in ratione sermonem quem secundum a se fecerat agitando intra se. (Adversus Praxean 5.7)

---

[159] von Soden 1909, 72, cited in Braun 1962, 269
[160] For further discussion of the *verbum/sermo* question see Braun 1962, 264-272

There has been discussion about the meaning of *agitando* here. Souter translates it 'by exercising' whereas Evans has 'by activity'. We might expect a meaning along the lines of 'by thinking' (this being a purely internal, reflexive action), in which case *cogitando* might be expected; but as the *co-* element could suggest plurality, it may be that the simple form *agitando* seemed to Tertullian more appropriate.

Although most of the usages of *ratio* in this treatise are to be found in chapter five, a few significant instances are also found in chapters six and seven, where Tertullian refers to the wisdom literature of the Old Testament and uses *ratio* also as *sophia/sapientia*. The gender is possibly significant; *ratio*, feminine, is here equated not only with *sermo* (masculine) or *verbum* (neuter) but *sophia*, or *sapientia,* (feminine) though Tertullian obviously prefers the Greek term (thirteen instances) to the Latin (three), plus *sapientius,* as in the following:

> Haec vis et haec divini sensus dispositio apud scripturas etiam in sophiae nomine ostenditur. quid enim sapientius ratione dei sive sermone? itaque sophiam quoque exaudi ut secundam personam conditam; (*Adversus Praxean* 6.1)

The *sophia* concept is a central idea in Platonism and Hellenistic philosophy and in the earlier wisdom literature of the Old Testament . Philo expresses *sophia* thus: ἔστι γὰρ φιλοσοφία ἐπιτήδευσις σοφίας, σοφία δὲ ἐπιστήμη θείων καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων καὶ τῶν τούτων αἰτίων. (For philosophy is the practice or study of wisdom, and wisdom is the knowledge of things divine and human and their causes) (translation F.H.Colson from Loeb, Heinemann Direct influence on this point from Theophilus of Antioch (died c. 185) is possible, if hard to prove. The *Ad Autolycum*, his only extant work, uses the word σοφία in connection with τριάς, thus providing a very early hint of a Trinitarian, relationship: In his commentary on creation Theophilus writes: Ὡσαύτως καὶ αἱ τρεῖς ἡμέραι πρὸ τῶν φωστήρων γεγονυῖαι τύποι εἰσὶν τῆς τριάδος, τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ λόγου αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς σοφίας αὐτοῦ. (*Ad Autolycum* 15)

Tertullian continues the *sophia* analogy in chapter 7 of *Adversus Praxean,* with references to Psalm 32.6, and Proverbs 8:

> Apparet unam eandemque vim esse, nunc in nomine sophiae, nunc in appellatione sermonis, quae initium accepit viarum in dei opera, et quae caelum confirmavit per quam omnia facta sunt et sine qua nihil factum est (*Adversus Praxean* 7.24)

> nec diutius de isto, quasi non ipse sit sermo et in sophiae et in rationis et in omnis divini animi et spiritus nomine qui filius factus est dei, de quo prodeundo generatus est. Ergo, inquis, das aliquam substantiam esse sermonem, spiritu et sophia et ratione constructam (*Adversus Praxean* 7,27)

3.7.7 *Ratio* summing up

I have from time to time endeavoured here to use quantitative approaches to evaluate the saliency of this or that Latin word as an equivalent of a Greek word. However, I acknowledge the limitations of this approach, in cases where it is simply not possible to draw a neat distinction between a word such as *ratio* or *verbum* when used in a technical or non-technical sense, or as something in between. Many other instances of Tertullian's use of *ratio* could be examined. The selection above is offered as an example of a common and widely used Latin word extended to explain concepts either new to Tertullian's readers, as in the *Apologeticus*, or, as in *Adversus Praxean,* to correct views which, in Tertullian's opinion, are wrong. Whilst many other words could have been selected for a study such as this, it was felt that *ratio,* with its close relationship to λόγος and thus to the Stoic ideas which contributed to Christian understanding, will have made a helpful contribution to the attempts of Christian writers, and particularly Tertullian, to expound the new faith in the Latin language.

3.7.8 Conclusion

This chapter has aimed to provide an overview of Tertullian's use of Latin to express Christian concepts. Since Tertullian's writings provide the earliest extant examples of extended Christian expression in Latin it is tempting to regard these as providing a 'standard'

for such Christian writing. However, as I have attempted to indicate, whilst Tertullian does indeed demonstrate use of the Latin language in a Christian context it cannot, and should not, be taken as a 'norm' for such writing. Unfortunately we don't have the replies of those against whom Tertullian is railing, such as Praxeas, Marcion or Hermogenes. We cannot, therefore, say that Tertullian represents the norm for Christian writing in his era and location. What we can say, however, is that Tertullian provides us with extended and varied insights into how a committed and educated Christian writer expounds and explains Christian concepts in the language in common use at the end of the second century, albeit in a style of writing which appears to be individual and idiosyncratic and which yet manages to communicate concepts which, particularly in the *Apologeticus,* would have been unfamiliar to many. The next significant development in Christian writing is found in Tertullian's later contemporary, Cyprian, who will now be considered.

Chapter 4: Cyprian

4.1 Introduction

The next significant extant Christian writer in Latin is Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, c.200/210-September 258. The literature on Cyprian is vast and various sources will be cited and referred to in the course of this chapter. However, most of these sources are concerned with Cyprian's life and theology, and there has been very little specific investigation of Cyprian's language. This chapter will therefore seek to examine linguistic features of Cyprian's writing in the light of his life and times, and to consider his place in the development of Christian writing in Latin.

Before considering Cyprian's language in detail, I present an outline of his life and work to serve as a background to the evaluation of his writing.[1] As will be discussed, the relevance of his writing in this respect will play a very different part to that of Tertullian's. I shall argue that in Cyprian is found a style of writing which is informed by and based upon an education and upbringing which included the study of rhetoric and classical Latin expression. This background equipped him to develop the communicative style necessary to serve the needs of the evolving Christian Church of the first half of the third century.

Following the section on sources, and an outline of his life and times which formed the style of his writings, consideration of Cyprian's language takes the form of an examination as test cases of words appearing in Cyprian's writing relevant to Christian expression in Latin, comparing them with Tertullian's use of such vocabulary, and with their appearance in other writers of Cyprian's time, particularly his biographer, Pontius. There are also instances in the letters attributed to Novatian and Cornelius, which are preserved in the corpus of Cyprian's correspondence.

---

[1] For much of the summary of Cyprian's life and times I refer to the following sources: Henk Bakker et al. 2010; Brent 2010; Heine 2004; Chadwick 2001; Clarke 1984.

4.2 Primary Sources

Most of what is known about Cyprian's life, and about the events of the turbulent period through which he lived, comes from Cyprian's own writings, together with a few examples of letters from those with whom he corresponded. In addition, there are two extant external sources for the life of Cyprian. the *Acta Proconsularia Cypriani,* probably a Christian reworking of court records, and *de Vita et Passione Sancti Caecilii Cypriani Episcopi Carthaginensis et Martyris,* ascribed to Cyprian's deacon, Pontius. Both in their own way are useful but need to be used with care. For the following summary of the *Acta* and the *Vita*, mentioned above, I broadly follow Rebillard.[2] He bases the Latin text of the *Vita* on that of Bastiaensen, which in its turn partly relies on Pellegrino, and for the *Acta* also that of Bastiaensen 1987.[3]

4.2.1 *Acta Proconsularia Cypriani*

There are two extant texts of the Acta. The longer (*Bibliotheca Hagiographica* 2037a) contains Cyprian's trial of 257 before Aspasius Paternus, when Cyprian is sent into exile in Curbis, his return and the trial of 238 before Galerius Maximus, in which he is condemned to death, and is the only extant account of Cyprian's execution. The shorter (BHL.2039) copied with the works of Cyprian, and considered to be the older, reports only the trial of 258, though some of the manuscripts also include the account of the execution.[4] All manuscripts bear the title *Passio Cypriani*, though they are usually known by the title *Acta Proconsularia,*.[5] The *Acta* are written in a factual style and, apart from occasionally describing Cyprian as *beatissimus* or *sanctus martyr*, are restrained and contain no adulatory language, suggesting

---

[2] Rebillard 2017, 197-201
[3] Bastiaensen 1975 and 1987
[4] Text A in Reitzenstein 1913 ,12-17, recensio 2 in Bastiaensen 1987, Text B in Reitzenstein 1913, 20-21 and recensio 1 in Bastiaensen
[5] Considered by Rebillard as erroneous. For details of the mss see Rebillard 2017, 197-201 and notes

they are based upon court records. As mentioned above, the longer version contains the only account of the exile of Cyprian to Curbis and, on his return, his trial and his subsequent execution. The bare reference in the last sentence of this version of the *Acta* to the death of Galerius Maximus, the official responsible for the death sentence for Cyprian, *post paucos autem dies Galerius Maximus proconsul decessit*, would seem to betray a restrained, but clear, Christian verdict on the whole affair. As Hunink observes, this genre, originating as formal court records, was adopted by Christians and extended to provide accounts of martyrs as examples of the steadfast holding to Christian belief in the face of torture and death.[6] However, Rebillard, whilst admitting that records of trials could have existed, disagrees on the whole that such court records formed the basis of martyr accounts, 'the theory - now long discarded - that *notarii* appointed by the church recorded the proceedings during the trials of the martyrs was based on a few entries in the *Liber Pontificalis*.'[7] The first attested references to this work are found several times in the sermons of Augustine, who also refers extensively to what appears to be the longer version of the *Acta* in *Epistula* 29 *….. sicut legitur a nescio quo conscriptum etiam de beatissimo martyre Cypriano ….* (*Epistula* 29.2). Other martyrologies, such as the *Martyrdom of Polycarp, Passio Perpetuae et Felicitatis* and the *Passio Pionii.* betray an exaggerated and idealised approach, suggesting that these accounts had gradually been embellished as they spread throughout Christian communities. Moss, in *The Myth of Persecution,* outlines three types of descriptions of Christian martyrdom, 'evidence for persecution from Roman sources and archaeology, stories about martyrs, and descriptions of Christian martyrdom in the writings of church historians'.[8] The *Acta* are one of

---

[6] Hunink. 2010, 31
[7] Rebillard 2017, 15-21
[8] Moss 2013, 15

the very few extant examples of the first of these, another being the *Acts of the Scilitan Martyrs* already mentioned.[9]

4.2.2 *Vita Sancti Cypriani*

This work is in a totally different style from the *Acta*. Hunink describes it as 'hagiographic' and points out that in the *Vita* Pontius presents a picture of Cyprian as a Roman aristocrat, skilled in the traditional skills of oratory and rhetoric: *fuerint licet studia et bonae artes devotum pectus imbuerint …* (*Vita* 2.2), who may even have had experience of secular office which would have informed his later work as a bishop: *etsi eloquentiae eius ac Dei gratiae larga fecunditas ita se copia et ubertate sermonis extendit …*(*Vita* 1.1).[10] His attitude as a bishop to his people appears to reflect that of a Roman *patronus* to his *clientes*. Harnack dates this work to 259, so shortly after Cyprian's death.[11] However, Schmidt suggests that it was written later when few had known Cyprian personally.[12] The Latin is unremarkable and straightforward, and I use it as an example of the educated prose style of the period.. However, its eulogistic style is in the tradition, later a very common characteristic of hagiographical and martyrological writing, of exaggerated and overblown descriptions:

> Unde igitur incipiam? Unde et exordium bonorum eius aggrediar,nisi a principio fidei, et nativitate coelesti? Siquis hominis Dei facta non debent aliunde numerari, nisi ex quo Deo natus est. Fuerint licet studia, et bonae artes devotum pectus imbuerint, tamen illa praetereo (*Vita* 2).

It does not, however, give the detailed account of Cyprian's death found in the *Acta*, suggesting, therefore, that the *Acta* were well known to Pontius's readers. The use of words which become frequent in Christian writing is significant and to that end, before considering examples of Cyprian's vocabulary, some of Pontius' usages will be examined as examples of

---

[9] Chapter 2, 2.2,1, 72
[10] Hunink 2010, 35
[11] Harnack 1913
[12] Schmidt 1997

what might be assumed to be the normal Latin style of an educated writer of the time.

Nothing, apart from the brief reference in Jerome mentioned below, is known of Pontius, and

I therefore later adduce examples of his writing in order to suggest that the style and

vocabulary can serve as an example of the period under discussion. The words to be discussed

would appear to be in common circulation, although some, maybe, derive from Cyprian. The

Vita is listed without author in the 4th century *Cheltenham List*, also known as *Canon*

Mommsenianus or *Indicium (Veteris et Novi Testamenti)* and it appears anonymously in

manuscripts until the twelfth century.[13]

The ascription of the *Vita* to Pontius is found in Jerome: *Pontius, diaconus Cypriani,*

usque ad diem passionis eius cum ipso exsilium sustinens egregium volumen vitae et passionis

Cypriani reliquit. (*de Viris Illustribus*, 68). Jerome is clearly referring to the *Vita*, to which he

adds *et passio,* Pontius entitling it merely *Vita Cypriani*. Pontius refers to accounts of what is

obviously the trial of 257, sending Cyprian into exile, which, from this reference, would

appear to be widely known: *et quid sacerdos Dei, proconsule interrogante, responderit, sunt*

Acta quae referant. (*Vita* 11). However, Pontius makes no reference to such *Acta* for the

second trial, reporting, following a description of Cyprian's appearing before the judge: *legit*

itaque de tabula iam sententiam iudex ..... sententiam episcopo tali et tali teste condignam,

sententiam gloriosam …… Moreover, in the prologue to the *Vita* Pontius implies that there

exists no account of Cyprian's execution: *….. tamen, quia operibus eius ac meritis etiam haec*

praerogativa debetur, placuit summatim pauca conscribere, non quo aliquem vel gentilium

lateat tanti viri vita, sed ut ad posteros quoque nostros incomparabile et grande documentum

in immortalem memoriam porrigatur et ad exemplum sui litteris digeratur (*Vita* 1.1).

Rebillard cites one reference which, he suggests, could possibly imply that the *Acta*

---

[13] Rebillard 2017, 199, text and note. 22 The usual sense of the Greek word is translated in Latin as *testimonium*

were composed after the *Vita*, 'the passing reference to Cyprian's vision in the *Acta* seems to assume it is well-known (*Acta* 2.1), the only actual record of the vision is that of Pontius'.[14] There is therefore no convincing evidence that Pontius, or whoever wrote the *Vita*, was familiar with the *Acta*, and thus there is no clear suggestion for the dating of either work.

4.3 Cyprian's Life and Work

As previously mentioned, the literature on Cyprian is extensive. This section attempts a brief summary of Cyprian's life and the times in which he lived in order to understand the subject matter and style which formed his mode of expression.

The date of Cyprian's birth is unknown, his conversion to Christianity, as described in his *Ad Donatum* probably 245-6, his execution 258.[15] According to Cyprian's biographer, probably his deacon, Pontius, Cyprian was elected Bishop very early in his Christian life. Pontius relates that Cyprian's very rapid progress from convert to presbyter to bishop was not without controversy, as it was held by some to be contrary to Scripture (1 Timothy 3.6) 'he must not be a recent convert or he will become conceited and fall under the same judgement as the devil.'[16] but defends this action: … *parum dixi: presbyterium et sacerdotium statim accepit. Quis enim non omnes honorum gradus crederet tali mente credenti? Multa sunt quae adhuc plebeius, multa quae iam presbyter fecit* ..... (*Vita* 3.3).

Cyprian's life and ministry were played out against the turbulent background of the third century. In 249, shortly after becoming emperor, Decius introduced an edict which required all in the Roman Empire to provide proof from a local official that they had sacrificed to the traditional gods. Documentary evidence for this decree is provided by various papyrus *libelli,* mainly from Egypt, certificates which recorded the required sacrificial

---

[14] Rebillard 2017, 201
[15] Brent 2010, 2
[16] English translation from the *New International Version*

evidence. References to this edict are found in the letters of Cyprian, and in the treatise *de Lapsis,* and also quotations in Eusebius' history from Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria. The motives for this decree, by all the evidence short-lived, probably lasting less than a year, are disputed, but it appeared that, in a time of unrest and threats from outside the Empire, it was an attempt at unity. Although there is no evidence that this edict was particularly directed at Christians, it inevitably produced difficulties for those whose faith led them to a refusal to comply with the emperor's decree.[17] Cyprian went into hiding, an action condemned by many (though greatly defended by his deacon, Pontius, in the *Vita*), and returned for the Council of Carthage in 251, set up to discuss the vexed question of the *lapsi,* those who had lapsed during the persecution and then wanted to return to the Faith, followed by further councils in 252-4.

It was this issue, and Cyprian's attitude to various degrees of apostasy which led, amongst other things, to his disagreements with Stephen, Bishop of Rome. There were three main categories of those regarded as apostates by the Church. Firstly were the *libellatici,* who had obeyed the decree of Decius that all should obtain a *libellus*, a document signed and attested by a local official that they had offered sacrifice to the deified emperors and to the pagan gods. Many of these might well have been obtained by bribery, salving the conscience of those who were secretly Christians. The second category, the *thurificati*, had burnt incense only to Caesar, not to the other gods of the pagan pantheon, whilst the third group, the *sacrificati,* had participated fully in pagan rites and had offered sacrifice. It was the issue of how to deal with those from all three categories who now wished to return to the Christian fold which dominated Cyprian's time as bishop and which led to divisions into two main factions, the more rigorous one maintaining that those lapsed could not return to the Christian

---

[17] Rives 1999, 135-154

fold without a due period of penance and the more laxist, which readmitted *lapsi* without penance.

There was also disagreement over the question of whether the *lapsi* needed to be rebaptised. Cyprian's tract, *de Lapsis*, in which he countered the lax faction, was issued by him shortly after his return to Carthage in 251. Following the execution of Fabian, Bishop of Rome, at the beginning of the Decian persecution, and the ensuing vacancy of the see, there were problems over the succession. When the theologian Novatian, a leading presbyter in Rome, was passed over in the ensuing election in favour of Cornelius, he, with the support of other Roman *confessores*, set himself up as an 'antipope', taking the strict position with regard to the lapsed. After investigating the matter, Cyprian finally decided in favour of Cornelius. Cyprian's treatise *de Ecclesiae Catholicae Unitate*, written probably early in 251, addresses this vexed question in detail. Another contentious matter was that of the position of the *confessores*, those who had been tortured for their faith during the persecution and who consequently received special authority and veneration in the Church. These matters, particularly the question of baptism which led to Cyprian's disagreements with Stephen, who followed Cornelius' successor, Lucius, as Bishop of Rome in 254, would characterise the rest of Cyprian's episcopate until the execution of Stephen in 257 and Cyprian's own execution the following year. The baptism controversy forms the subject of much of Cyprian's extensive correspondence.[18] The two edicts of Decius' successor, Valerian, led to Cyprian's exile to Curbis in 257, his recall in 258, and his execution on 14 September of that year. A full (and probably exaggerated) account of Cyprian's execution and the reception of his body by his followers is given in the *Acta*.[19]

---

[18] For text (in English translation) and detailed discussion see Clarke 1984.
[19] *Acta* 4-5

The picture of the Christian Church which emerges from Cyprian's writings is that of a movement which was developing into an institution, inevitably one which divided into various shifting factions. Heine observes, 'most of Cyprian's literary activity was generated by crises'.[20] There was a gradual development of the threefold structure of degrees of ministry, bishops, priests and deacons, supplemented by Cyprian's day by the lesser orders of subdeacons, acolytes and so on. However, the shifting situation of the times, particularly the Decian persecution and its aftermath, meant that patterns of leadership and ministry were constantly in flux. Angelo di Berardino, in his preface to the excellent collection, *Cyprian of Carthage*, comments, 'The terminology, the sociological patterns, and the organisational structure, which remained in place until the Second Vatican Council, were constituted in essence in the second and third centuries. Cyprian was one of their founding fathers'.[21] The terms for these patterns, and their precise meanings, as far as can be established, will be examined as test cases in the word studies later in this chapter.

4.4 Cyprian's writings

The Cyprianic corpus consists of treatises and letters written at various points in his life. Whilst the exact chronology of Cyprian's writings is not central to the discussion of his language, it is useful to survey this briefly, although this subject has been greatly discussed and even now there is no definitive dating. In the *Vita,* Pontius appears to make reference to some of the treatises in the following order: *Ad Donatum, de habitu virginum, de lapsis, de unitate ecclesiae, de dominica oratione, ad Demetrianum, de mortalitate, de opere et eleemosynis, de bono patientiae, de zelo et livore, ad Fortunatum* (*Vita* 7, 3-11).[22] However, there is no suggestion that this was meant to be chronological. There is another list in the

---

[20] Heine, 2004, 152
[21] di Berardino 2010, viii
[22] Rebillard 2017, 215 footnotes 67-78

fourth century *Cheltenham List* mentioned earlier, and others have also been found. The earliest authoritative critical edition of Cyprian's works is that of W. Hartel, which appeared as one of the first publications of what became known as the *Vienna Corpus* between 1868-1871, in three volumes, complete with indices of Cyprian's work, which many nineteenth and early twentieth century writers on Cyprian cite.[23] Later scholarship has, however, pointed out inaccuracies in Hartel's work. The definitive edition used by most writers on Cyprian now is in the *Corpus Christianorum Series Latina* (CCSL).[24] It is this text which is cited in the present study. For details of the editors of the various works see the list in the *Library of Latin Texts A*.[25]

Cyprian appears as a Roman aristocrat, with views of order and authority informed both by his legal training and church traditions, and by wider cultural values. This is attested in the *Vita,* and in Jerome, as well as in Cyprian's own writings.[26]

> Fuerint licet studia, et bonae artes devotum pectus imbuerint, tamen illa praetereo. nondum enim ad utilitatem nisi saeculi pertineant. Postquam et sacras litteras didicit et mundi nube discussa, in lucem sapientiae spiritalis emersit … …(*Vita* 2)

> Cyprianus Afer primum gloriose rhetoricam docuit, exinde, suadente presbytero Caecilio, a quo et cognomentum sortitus est, Christianus factus omnem substantiam suam pauperibus erogavit, ac post non multum temporis adlectus in presbyterium etiam episcopus Carthaginiensis constitutus est. huius ingenii superfluum est indicem texere, cum sole clariora sint eius opera. passus est sub Valeriano et Gallieno principibus persecutione octava, eo die quo Romae Cornelius, sed non eodem anno. (Jerome, *de Viris Illustribus* 67)

The view of church order presented in Cyprian's writings is further developed and established than that of Tertullian and, as Brent points out, reflects and parallels to some

---

[23] The *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* (CSEL) was founded in 1864 by the *Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften* in Vienna, in order to produce critical editions of Latin patristic texts. Hartel was the chairman of this commission from 1891-1907.
[24] Cyprian's works are found in CCSL Series 3, 1972 and Series 3, 1976
[25] Details in 'about' section, *Library of Latin Texts A*, Brepols, 2020
[26] 1951 inwards. For a detailed discussion of this aspect of Cyprian see Hunink 2010, 30 ff

degree contemporary secular attempts to restore a new golden age in the society of the Roman Empire, recalling its past glories.[27] Tertullian is not concerned with Church order so much as theological doctrine and, in any case, it could be argued that his conversion to the 'New Prophecy' movement meant that church order was less directly relevant to him. Cyprian's writing is coloured by his attempts to deal with the fallout in Christian beliefs and practice following the Decian persecution (252 to Decius' death in 254), particularly his disagreement with Stephen, Bishop of Rome, over the question of whether those who had lapsed during the persecution needed to be rebaptised in order to be admitted into the Christian community.[28]

As has been noted before, Jerome briefly refers to Cyprian, suggesting that he greatly valued the writing of Tertullian:

> Vidi ego quemdam Paulum Concordiae, quod oppidum Italiae est, senem, qui se beati Cypriani, iam grandis aetatis, notarium, cum ipse admodum esset adolescens, Romae vidisse diceret, referreque sibi solitum numquam Cyprianum absque Tertulliani lectione unum diem praeterisse, ac sibi crebro dicere, Da magistrum: Tertullianum videlicet significans. (Jerome, *de Viris Illustribus* 53).

Augustine mentions the name of Cyprian over five hundred times, most of which appear in works written after 405. Cyprian's writings, therefore, had reached wide circulation by the time of Jerome's writing (c.347-420)) and of Augustine (354-430). That Augustine held Cyprian in high regard is demonstrated by the extent and detail of his citations. Clearly Augustine had a detailed knowledge of Cyprian's writings and he presents him as the main authority in his controversies with the Donatists, which dominated Augustine's episcopate. He usually refers to Cyprian as *beatus* or *beatissimus* and *martyr*. During Cyprian's time as Bishop of Carthage, Novatian, a Roman priest, held that those Christians who had lapsed under persecution could not be received back into the Church. Novatian was consecrated by

---

[27] Brent 2010, 4 ff
[28] See 232

three bishops and presented himself as Bishop of Rome, in opposition to Cornelius, elected

Pope in 251, whom Novatian considered too liberal in the matter of the lapsed. However in

that same year Novatian and his followers were excommunicated as heretics at the Synod of

Rome, called by Cyprian to discuss the vexed question of the *lapsi.*

At a later date, during the episcopate of Augustine, the Donatist controversy, which

had its roots in the controversy of Cyprian's time, extended this to the question of authority,

and whether this was vested in the bishop or priest by virtue of his office, or whether it

depended upon his own beliefs. The Donatist position was that the holiness and worthiness of

a minister affected the validity of the sacraments performed by him. Cyprian's earlier rigorous

approach to the question of baptism, particularly of those baptised outside the Church, led to

him being claimed by both protagonists in the Donatist controversy. Augustine appears to

claim Cyprian as a source for the Donatist position as well as for the Catholic. Gaumer

expresses the dilemma thus, 'Augustine of Hippo effectively, albeit not without complications,

appropriated and then re-appropriated Cyprian for his perspective based on the situatedness

and needs of his theology in relation to the challenges he faced'.[29] It is clear from the citation

from *de Doctrina Christiana* below that Augustine regarded Cyprian's use of language, in this

case *submisso dicendi genere* as important and significant. Further consideration of Cyprian's

place in the Donatist controversy is not relevant to the purpose of the present study, which is

to consider Cyprian's language. However, the following brief selection of citations from

Augustine are adduced to demonstrate Augustine's view of Cyprian and his use of his writing.

> beatus Cyprianus submisso dicendi genere utitur in eo libro, ubi de sacramento calicis disputat (*de Doctrina Christiana* 4.21).

> contra donatistas auctoritate beatissimi episcopi et martyris cypriani se defendere molientes septem libros de baptismo scripsi (*Retractionum libri duo*).

---

[29]Gaumer 2010, 183

prorsus secundum scripta Cypriani, si peccatis alienis in unitate quisque maculatur, iam ante Cyprianum periit ecclesia nec erat unde existeret ipse Cyprianus. (*Epistula* 93, volume 34.2.10)

isto sensu recte intellegi potest, quod scripsit beatissimus Cyprianus in epistula de lapsis, cum eos, qui tempore persecutionis idolis immolaverant, arguens: ac ne quid deesset, inquit, ad criminis cumulum, infantes quoque parentum manibus inpositi uel adtracti amiserunt parvuli quod in primo statim nativitatis exordio fuerant consecuti. (*Epistula* 98, volume 34.2.3)

4.5 Cyprian's contribution to the development of Christian Latin writing.

As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, although much has been written about Cyprian's life and theology there has been much less investigation of Cyprian's language.[30] What there is dates from the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and for much of what is to follow in the sections on Cyprian's writing I draw largely on the ground-breaking but largely neglected 1896 study by E.W. Watson.[31] I also make some use of the two volumes of Schrijnen and Mohrmann's *Studien zur Syntax der Briefe des heiligen Cypriam.*[32] Cyprian's corpus falls broadly into two categories, treatises and letters. Watson deals with these as a whole, Schrijnen and Mohrmann, in their Cyprianic studies, confine themselves to the letters. The latter volumes, however, are dominated by Schrijnen and Mohrmann's aim of using Cyprian's letters to support their theory of the existence of a specific Christian *Sondersprache.*[33]

Whilst one might feel that the approach of these older scholars is somewhat remote from present thought and approach, there is much to be gained from studying this material, particularly since there is a lack of later evaluation of this older work. The only relatively

---

[30] Brent 2005
[31] Watson 1896, 189-317
[32] Schrijnen/Mohrmann 1937
[33] Chapter 2, 2.4.4, 98

modern scholarship on the language of Cyprian is found in Clarke's four volume commentary on Cyprian's letters.[34]

Cyprian, as mentioned above, appears to have been an upper-class Roman who had undergone the education normal for one who was destined for public life, with its study of the standard Latin classics, rhetoric and jurisprudence. This background obviously greatly influenced Cyprian's style when writing about Christianity. Watson expresses his view of Cyprian's writings thus: 'Written as they were within a period of ten years, and by a man whose style had been formed before his conversion to Christianity, there was no room for development in manner. All that his religion did for him was to change his subjects and to enlarge his vocabulary.'[35] We may not, however, agree completely with Watson here, questioning his assumption that ten years is too short a period to allow for development. There is, I would suggest, much more to be examined in Cyprian's writing than 'changing his subjects and enlarging his vocabulary.' Since, however, there are no extant examples of how Cyprian wrote, or might have written, other than as a Christian Bishop, it is not possible to pursue this line of enquiry. Cyprian's writings are of a pastoral nature and his theological interests are principally in ecclesiology, as he seeks to deal with the various problems and controversies arising during his episcopate.

Thus we may expect from Cyprian no particular 'Christian ' style of writing, but one couched in the predominately rhetorical tradition he would have studied and practised as part of his education. Burton remarks: 'his style is classic high imperial mandarin prose complete with quantitative clausulae.'[36] The only Christian writings which might have influenced his style were those of Tertullian and of a Latin Biblical translation, of which more will be said

---

[34] Clarke 1989
[35] Watson 1896, 192
[36] Unpublished comment, 2020

later. That Cyprian esteemed Tertullian, a writer of very different literary and linguistic stamp, is attested by Jerome.[37] However, Cyprian is in no way influenced in his writing by Tertullian's concise, vigorous, sometimes colloquial, style, owing much to the 'asianism' movement in rhetoric, which is absent from Cyprian's writing. As Watson remarks of the differences between Tertullian and Cyprian: 'It is entirely a dependence of matter, not of manner. No two styles can be more different'.[38]

Watson also finds traces of the influence of Minucius Felix upon Cyprian, particularly wholesale borrowing from him in the *Ad Donatum* and lesser borrowings elsewhere. Watson cites *qui non loquimur magna sed vivimus* (*De Bono Patientia* 3) based on *Octavius* 38.6 which, according to Watson, originally derived from Seneca: *utrum loquar fortiar an sentiam* (*Epistula* 26.5) 'this is so obvious and well indicated already that it need not be retailed here'.[39] Watson also detects another borrowing from the same chapter in the *Octavius*: *nos, non habitu sapientiam sed mente praeferimus* (*Octavius* 38.6), also in *De Bono Patientiae* 3; *Nos autem, fratres dilectissimi, ...nec vestitu sapientiam sed veritate praeferimus.*

4.6 Cyprian and the Bible

There is no conclusive evidence for when the first Latin translation of the New Testament appeared and this question has been widely debated. It may well have been that particular books, for instance, the Gospels, were in circulation separately and earlier than others, for example, Revelation. As has been previously mentioned the first reference to written 'books' is in the report of the trial of the Scilitan Martyrs on 17 July 180 and it is not possible to ascertain whether the reference is solely to the letters of Paul, or to other Scriptural writing, and also whether these books and letters were in Latin or in Greek.[40]

---

[37] *De Viris Illustribus* 53, cited on page 209
[38] Watson 1896, 197
[39] Watson 1896, 199
[40] See Chapter 2, 2.2, 74

Unlike Tertullian's, Cyprian's Biblical citations are consistent and thus suggest that perhaps Cyprian knew and used an extant Biblical translation. The general consensus amongst scholars is that a Latin translation, or Latin translations, of the Bible, or at any rate the New Testament, was in existence and known by Cyprian. As Watson points out, Cyprian did not think much of this translation, disliking its style and its use of Greek words, and is careful to identify Biblical citations as such by introducing them with such phrases as *dicit Dominus*, or *scriptum est*. It is worth citing here Watson's views on Cyprian's attitude to Latin Biblical translations, if such existed. Although he is writing in 1896, well before the wealth of research on Biblical texts familiar today, I consider Watson's words still to have some relevance:

> 'One cannot help being struck by the small respect which Cyprian shows for the language of his Latin Bible, which he quotes so constantly and so precisely. ….In spite of its rich vocabulary, in some respects superior to that of the Vulgate, the Old Latin version was clumsily executed and quite modern.' [41]

In considering Watson's words one might observe that even current scholars have questioned the 'clumsiness' of the Old Latin style. By 'modern' Watson presumably means 'post-classical'; current scholarship has pointed out the post-classical nature of the language of the Old Latin together with what appear to be 'archaic features'.

During the 20th and early 21st centuries modern scholarship, and particularly, the development of technology, has led to more detailed and specific work on the origin of Latin texts. The *Vetus Latina* project, inspired by and a continuation of Sabatier's work, is still in progress and is producing a full modern edition of what evidence survives for early Latin versions of the Bible, in which such early Christian Latin writers as Tertullian and Cyprian figure. Houghton suggests 'the Biblical quotations of Cyprian …provide evidence for a Latin translation of the New Testament in third-century Africa. His numerous works, all in Latin,

---

[41] Watson 1896, 194-5

have a consistency in their Scriptural text which indicates that they derive from a fixed version'.[42] For more detailed information on the early Latin translations of the New Testament see Houghton.[43] For the Gospels in particular, see Burton.[44]

Cyprian produced two *Testimonia* consisting of a series of Biblical extracts under thematic headings. These two collections, *Ad Quirinam* and *Ad Fortunatum* provide an invaluable source for the reconstruction of texts in *Vetus Latina*. Houghton demonstrates that the *Codex Bobiensis*, copied in North Africa in the fourth century, is similar to Cyprian's text, but appears to predate it, thus suggesting that at least one Latin Gospel translation was known to Cyprian.[45] He points out that, although Tertullian's quotations and Cyprian's texts do not overlap much, Cyprian uses 'innovative early forms', later replaced, which have sometimes been considered as specifically 'African' readings. However, as Houghton remarks, and as has been demonstrated earlier in this thesis, most are forms common in Latin authors.[46]

4.6.1 Cyprian's terminology for Scripture

Cyprian is at pains to separate Biblical quotations from his own commentary, and usually also identifies the quotation, demonstrating once more that he had at his disposal a fairly complete text, including the Old Testament. Virtually all canonical books, both Old and New Testament, are cited by Cyprian, the exceptions being, in the Old Testament, Ruth, 1 Chronicles, Judith, Esther, Lamentations, Obadiah, Jonah, Nahum, and in the New Testament, Philemon, Hebrews, James, 2 Peter, 2 John, 3 John, Jude. As far as the Old Testament is concerned, Cyprian appears to be using the canon as set out by Athanasius, later called the

---

[42] Houghton 2016, 9, following Frede 1972
[43] Houghton 2016, 9-14
[44] Burton 2000), 8-11
[45] Houghton 2016, 10
[46] Chapter 1, 1.2, 40

Alexandrian canon. He also cites from the additions in the Greek canon; 1-2 Maccabees, Tobit, Judith, Sirach, Wisdom, Baruch and the appendices to Daniel, and Esther.[47]

Cyprian uses various means of identifying and introducing his quotations, some of which will be outlined below. Watson, as has been mentioned above, maintains, with - it must be admitted - a considerable amount of truth, that Cyprian's rhetorical training and experience led him, as also other educated early Christians, to dislike both the style and the vocabulary of the Latin Biblical translations he used. Cyprian particularly disliked the frequent use of Greek words, using, according to Watson, only *baptisma,* to avoid the heretical associations of *tinctio*, together with *presbyter* and *laicus*, in order to avoid 'the indefiniteness' of *senior* and *plebeius*. A detailed examination of these will be found in the study by Michael Fahey, *Cyprian and the Bible*, some of whose observations, in addition to Watson's brief comments, have contributed to the following outline.

item/apud

The great majority of Cyprian's over five hundred usages of *item* occur in his *testimonium ad Quirinum* when introducing a Biblical citation, usually followed by the reference: for example: *Item, quod prophetis non crediderint et eos interfecerint*. (*Ad Quirinum* 1.2): *Item illic angelus ad pastores: ne timueritis* (*Ad Quirinum* 2.7). A similar use is made of *apud*; about two hundred instances of *apud* used to introduce a Biblical citation, with or without *item*, for example*: Item apud esaiam: de sion enim procedet lex et verbum domini ab hierusalem et iudicabit inter gentes*. (*Ad Quirinum* 1.10); *Apud hieremiam: ecce dies veniunt, dicit dominus, et consummabo domui israhel et domui iuda testamentum novum ….. (Ad Quirinum* 1,11) *Item quod prophetis non crediderint et eos interfecerint. Apud hieremiam dominus dicit: misi ad vos seruos meos propheta*s. (*Ad Quirinum* 1.2).

---

[47] This list is that found in Fahey 1971, 40, in which there are certain contradictions. Detailed examination of these, however, lies outside the scope of the present study.

scriptura/ae

  scriptura is a common word for writings from Plautus onwards, appearing in most classical writers. As might be expected, it is in Tertullian and after that the word is always used to refer to Biblical writings. In Christian authors the plural *scripturae* is also used alongside the singular.

  In Cyprian *scriptura* with or without qualifications such as *divina, sancta,* is his most usual expression when referring to the Bible: … *cum dicat scriptura divina* (*De Habitu Virginum* 10), also often in the plural, when it is usually qualified by *sanctae,* appearing sixty-two times in his writings: *Quod scripturas sanctas intellecturi iudaei non essent* (*Ad Quirinum* 1.4). Two variants are also found: *de scripturis caelestibus et discimus et docemus (de lapsis.* 23) and *exercitatus et in scripturis dominicis peritus* (*Epistula* 25). Tertullian uses *scriptura/ae* without any qualifying words.

  As Fahey observes, Cyprian uses *scriptura* both as the introduction to a citation or, more often, 'as a generic term meaning Christian revelation as contained in the Bible'.[48] The following serve to show Cyprian's usages: *loquitur scriptura divina: stans, inquit, Azarias precatus est et aperuit os suum, et exomologesin faciebat deo simul cum sodalibus suis in medio ignis.* (*De Lapsis* 31): *Obtemperandum fuit, fili carissime, desiderio tuo spiritali inpensissima petitione divina magisteria poscenti, quibus nos dominus per scripturas sanctas erudire et instruere dignatus est …* (*Ad Quirinum* 1, *praefatio*).

lectio

  Whilst there are some examples of classical usage, for instance in Cicero and Livy, the most common usages of the word refer to the reading of Christian Scriptures, usually qualified by *divina, dominica, evangelica* to emphasise that a Biblical citation is being used.

---

[48] Fahey 1971, 30

Cyprian uses this term in three ways; to denote liturgical usage: *Quae nos, fratres dilectissimi, de divina lectione discentes, postquam cognovimus ad orationem qualiter accedere debeamus, cognoscamus docente domino et quid oremus* (*De Dominica Oratione* 7); private reading of Scripture: *sit tibi vel oratio adsidua vel lectio* (*Ad Donatum* 15), or of Scripture itself: *lectionis divinae succinctam diligentiam quaerens, ut animus deo deditus non longis aut multis librorum voluminibus fatigetur* (*Ad Quirinum* 3).

Connected with this are indications that, in the African Church, *lector*, a term which will be discussed later when considering Cyprian's vocabulary, was one of the degrees of ministry, leading eventually to ordination to the priesthood:

> Fecisse me autem sciatis lectorem Saturum et hypodiaconum Optatum confessorem, quos iam pridem communi consilio clero proximos feceramus, quando aut Saturo die Paschae semel atque iterum lectionem dedimus aut modo, cum presbyteris doctoribus lectores diligenter probaremus, Optatum inter lectores doctorum audientium constituimus, examinantes an congruerent illis omnia quae esse deberent in his qui ad clerum parabantur. (*Epistula* 29. 2).

Tertullian only has three examples of *lectio*, none of them referring to Scriptural reading, (*Apologeticus* 22.9; *De Ieunio* 11; *ad Iudaeos* 1.1).

sermo

Cyprian uses both *sermo* and *verbum* almost interchangeably. In the context of references to λόγος theology in general, Cyprian uses both *sermo* and *verbum* (though *sermo* in verbatim citations of John 1). Unlike Tertullian, he never uses λόγος itself. It has been suggested that Cyprian tends not to use Greek terms where a Latin alternative is available (e.g. *misericordia* rather than *eleemosyne*), and even where a Greek word is well established in the Christian Latin lexicon, he will often use Greek and Latin alternatives alongside each other (e.g. *episcopus* alongside *sacerdos*.) There remains, however, a core of Greek loanwords

so well established that Cyprian regularly uses them and only occasionally if at all offers

Latin translations (e.g. *ecclesia, baptisma*).[49]

      There are one hundred and four usages of *sermo*, the majority in *Ad Quirinum*, usually

as part of a Biblical citation: *Item in evangelio cata iohannem: in principio fuit sermo et*

sermo erat apud deum et deus erat sermo. (Ad Quirinum 2. 3 and 6*). Sermo* is also used in

Micah (4.2) as a Latin translation of דָּבָר**.** *Apud Micheam: quoniam lex de Sion proficiscetur*

et sermo domini ab Hierusalem (*Ad Quirinum* 1.10).

      In view of Cyprian's usual avoidance of Greek, the use of *cata* rather than the usual

Latin *secundum* in the introduction to John 1 merits comment. There are eighty-eight

instances, all in *ad Quirinum* and all referring to the Gospels, which would imply that *cata*

Mattheum, cata Ioannem, etc. was the general usage .

      There are also examples of *sermo* used as a term for prayer, whether silent or spoken,

for instance, nine times in this context in *De Dominica Oratione*: *sit autem orantibus sermo et*

precatio cum disciplina, quietem continens et pudorem. (De Dominica Oratione 4): *Et idcirco*

orantibus fuit impetrabilis et efficax sermo, quia promerebatur dum pacifica et simplex et

spiritalis oratio. (*De Dominica Oratione* 8). Tertullian uses *sermo* for speech or discussion.

verbum

      One hundred and nineteen usages. Cyprian often uses *verbum* with *Dei* or *Domini* in

the Old Testament sense of 'word of God' as in the citation from Isaiah: *item apud Esaiam: de*

Sion enim procedet lex et verbum domini ab Hierusalem et iudicabit inter gentes (Isaiah 2.3);

in *Ad Quirinum* 1.10, and from Revelation: *vidi sub ara Dei animas occisorum propter*

---

[49] Watson 1896, 195-6, see this chapter, 4.8, 259 and 277

verbum Dei et martyrium suum (Revelation 6.9, cited in *De Bono Patientiae* 21), which would suggest that this is the translation Cyprian is using.

Cyprian also uses the phrase to mean 'to follow the words of the Lord': *Verbis igitur eius insistere, quaecumque et docuit et fecit discere et facere debemus* (*De Ecclesiae Catholicae Unitate* 2).

ratio

This is not an important word for Cyprian; there are only sixty-two mentions, unlike Tertullian, for whom this is a key word.[50] It is not normally used by Cyprian as a synonym for *sermo* and *verbum* as in Tertullian, but as one of the normal translations of *ratio* as 'reason, thought, speech': *Habenda tamen est, fratres dilectissimi, ratio veritatis, nec sic mentem debet et sensum persecutionis infestae tenebrosa caligo caecasse,* (*De Lapsis* 5).

There are however, two instances in Cyprian of *ratio* coupled with *sermo*: *tunc demum sermo et ratio salutaris efficaciter discitur, si patienter quod dicitur audiatur.* (*De Bono Patientiae* 1); *….. quos tamen sermonis nostri admittere credo rationem* (*Ad Demetrium* 2) which would indicate that just occasionally Cyprian is considering *ratio* in the traditional, philosophical understanding of the word.

praecepta, mandata

These two expressions, particularly *praecepta* (one hundred and thirty-five instances) are found in Cyprian to emphasise utterances in both the Old and the New Testament in the sense of commands: *ad Dei munera per divina praecepta veniamus'* (*De Habitu Virginum* 2). Fahey comments that 'in Cyprian's Old Latin version', *mandatum* is the usual translation of ἐντολή, with two exceptions, in Matthew 19.17b and 1 John 2.3, where the translation is *praeceptum*. He does not explain or discuss to which version he is referring, and we do not, of

---

[50] Chapter 3, 3.7, 176ff.

course, know which version Cyprian had. Fahey also adds that one curious feature of Cyprian's version is that in 1 John 2,3-4, the word ἐντολή, which appears in both verse three and verse four, is translated in verse three as *praecepta* and in verse four as *mandata*. This may well have no more significance than that it was used to provide variety, though it might be an example of a division between an 'African' and a 'European' usage.[51]

lex

Cyprian uses *lex* in its various forms about two hundred times, usually when referring to the Pentateuch, following the Jewish custom: *Haec est enim lex et prophetae.* (*De Dominica Oratione* 28). He occasionally uses it in a New Testament context, though referring to the Old Testament, as in this citation from Romans 2.13: *Item ad Romanos: non auditores legis iusti apud deum, sed factores le.g.is iustificabuntur* (*Ad Quirinum* 3) and also occasionally as the normal word for 'law', 'regulation': *Sed nos, datae legis et observationis inmemores, id egimus per nostra peccata ut, dum domini mandata contemnimus, ad correptionem delicti et probationem fidei remediis severioribus veniremus* (*De Lapsis* 7).

The expression *lex evangelica* appears only once: *ut ubique lex evangelica et traditio dominica servetur et ab eo quod Christus et docuit et fecit non recedatur* (*Epistula* 63.17), and *lex evangelii* twice for example*: illi contra evangelii legem, contra vestram quoque honorificam petitionem, ante actam paenitentiam* (*Epistula* 15.1). Fahey, following Bayard, suggests that these are examples of Cyprian's frequent use of oratorical circumlocutions and doublets.[52]

---

[51] Fahey 1971, 36
[52] Bayard 1902

fons

Cyprian also makes use of the familiar concept of water/fountain when writing about Scripture: *Nam nos nunc de divinis fontibus inplevimus modicum quod tibi interim mitteremus* (*Ad Quirinum* 1.*praefatio*).

The same metaphor, with a very strong emphasis on this theme, also occurs elsewhere: *ut si canalis aquam ducens qui copiose prius et largiter profluebat subito deficiat, nonne ad fontem pergitur, ut illic defectionis ratio noscatur* (*Epistula* 74.10).

Linked with this is the idea of the four Gospels as rivers: *Has arbores rigat quattuor fluminibus id est evangeliis quattuor, quibus baptismi gratiam salutari et caelesti inundatione largitur. Numquid de ecclesiae fontibus rigare potest qui intus in ecclesia non est?* (*Epistula* 73.10)

evangelium

The Latin form of εὐαγγέλιον is used by Cyprian in the singular, with one exception: *Quod enim in evangeliis et in apostolorum epistulis Iesu Christi nomen insinuatur ad remissionem peccatorum .....* (*Epistula* 73.171). Although early uses of the Greek term probably referred to the spoken rather than the written gospel, Cyprian always uses it to refer to the written word. [53] Apart from the example above, the Gospels are treated as one whole, often using the formula *Dominus in evangelio dicit …*, and the vast majority of the two hundred and thirty-seven instances of the word in Cyprian consist of *in evangelio.* Watson observes that, unlike Tertullian, Cyprian never uses the genitive construction *evangelium Matthei* etc. [54] There is only one instance of *evangelium* in the plural, in the citation from *Epistula* 73 given above.[55]

---

[53] E.g. *usque ad mortem tradiderunt animas propter evangelium* (Irenaeus. *Adversus Haereses.* 3.12.13 *secundum translationem latinam*
[54] Watson 1896, 252
[55] For discussion of early usages of the word 'gospel' see Stanton 2004, Pt. 1

Tertullian also uses *evangelium* in the singular, occasionally referring to a specific gospel. However, he also frequently uses the verb *evangelizare*, which appears only once in Cyprian, in a citation from Revelation: *et vidi alium angelum volantem medio caelo habentem evangelium perenne evangelizare sedentibus super terram* (Revelation 14.6.) cited in *Ad Quirinum*. 3.20), presumably following a text of Revelation familiar to Cyprian.

4.7 The vocabulary of Pontius and Cyprian: selected phrases occurring in the *Vita*, words from which may or may not also be used by Cyprian and Tertullian

I present the following section as a selection of test cases for examples of the 'Christian' usages which were in common use in the middle to late third century. The date of the *Vita*, as discussed earlier cannot be ascertained but it would seem to have been written after, but not long after, Cyprian's death.[56]

4.7.1 *cum maiores nostri plebeiis et catechuminis, martyrium consecutis …* (*Vita* 1)

catechumenus (*catecumenus)*

'One who is receiving instruction in religion' from κατεχούμενος, derived from κατηχέω, 'to teach by rote, to instruct, especially in the Christian faith'.[57]

Here is an instance of a specifically 'Christian' word. There are no references in Latin until Tertullian, who has four instances in all: *inprimis quis catechumenus, quis fidelis incertum est, pariter adeunt. (De Praescriptione Haereticorum* 41*). Ante sunt perfecti catechumeni quam edocti (De Praescriptione Haereticorum* 41). *Viderint enim catechumeni eius* (*Adversus Marcionem* 5). Since this last is found in *adversus Marcionem* it could well be that this particular example is intended as an ironical reference to the Marcionites. The use of

---

[56] See above, 4.2.2, 202

[57] There are various spellings. The citations from Tertullian have *catechumenus* and from Cyprian, *catecuminus.* Citations from both writers are from CCSL in *Library of Latin Texts A*

viderint-type clauses can contain an element of contempt: *Omnes ita observant a catechumenis usque ad confessores et martyras, vel negatores* (*De Corona* 2).

There are also four instances in the Cyprianic corpus, one in *Epistula* 8, which is not by Cyprian and appears to emanate from Rome, and has the phrase *catechumini adprehensi infirmitate decepti esse non debebunt* (*Epistula* 8.3.). Cyprian uses the word twice in *Epistula* 73: *catecuminos nobis opponunt catecuminos illos primo integram fidem et ecclesiae veritatem tenere* (*Epistula* 73.22.1); *catecumenum peccare iam non debere* (*Ad Quirinum* 3. 98). Clarke comments that *catechumenus* is a term employed only infrequently by Cyprian, he regularly prefers *audiens* as in *audientibus etiam, si qui fuerint periculo praeventi et in exitu constituti, vigilantia vestra non desit,* (*Epistula* 18.2.2) and *Optatum inter lectores doctorum audientium constituimus* (*Epistula* 29.2).[58] It could be that, as is so often the case with Cyprian, he prefers to avoid a Greek-derived term and also, possibly deliberately makes use of a standard, non-Christian word.

martyrium

From μαρτύριον, witness, μαρτύρεω, bear witness. There are no instances of its use in pagan writing but twenty-five references in Tertullian, and thirty-seven in Cyprian. In all of them the word has already taken on the Christian sense of martyrdom, e.g. *ante haec autem persecutions eis praedicat et passiones eventuras, in martyrium utique et in salute* (Tertullian, *Ad Marcionem.* 4); *primo idoneus esse non potest ad martyrium qui ab ecclesia non armatur ad proelium, et mens deficit quam non recepta eucharistia erigit et accendit* (Cyprian *Epistula* 57. 4) *Martyrium* in Latin is only used of 'martyrdom' in Christian sense. The usual sense of the Greek word μαρτύριον is translated in Latin as *testimonium,* a word used frequently by both Tertullian (one hundred and fifty-six instances) and Cyprian (thirty-nine instances).

---

[58] Clarke 1984, vol 1, 216

Cyprian usually uses *martyr* in the Christian sense, reserving *testis* for its secular sense as 'witness'.

Augustine explains the difference: *unde illos qui propter testimonium christi diversis passionibus humilati sunt, et usque ad mortem pro veritate certarunt, non testes, quod latine utique possemus, sed graece martyres appellamus.* (Augustine, *In Psalmos 118, Sermo.* 9.2.)

4.7.2 *ac imparem me esse confitear ad proferendum digne pro meritorum honore sermonem* (*Vita* **1**). *Verum vobis tamen et simpliciter confitendum est,* (*Vita* **19**)

confiteor

To acknowledge, confess, own. A common verb in classical usage, e.g. *qui confitetur atque ita libenter confitetur ut non solum fateri sed etiam profiteri videatur, recuperatores*: (Cicero *pro A. Caecina* 9.24) Pontius here uses it in a general sense. It is the usual Latin translation for ὁμολογέω, ἐξομολογέομαι, συνομολογέω.

In Christian usage *confiteor* is found not only to describe confession of sins or profession of faith, but also in sense of 'praise' or 'thanks' χάριτας ὁμολογῶ: *gratias confiteor* and 'declare, proclaim, promise' e.g.. *quam confessus erat Deus Abrahae* (Acts 7,17 Vulgate). There are also ninety-seven examples in Tertullian.

Most of Cyprian's fifty-nine usages of *confiteor* are in the sense of 'praise', which would appear also to be the usual Latin translation in the Old Testament of one of the seven Hebrew words for 'praise', שָׁבַח 'to shout, to address in a loud tone, to command, to triumph'

> confitebuntur coeli mirabilia tua (Ps 88.6);
> Item in epistula iohannis: omnis spiritus, qui confitetur Iesum Christum in carne venisse, de deo est. (ad Quirinum 2.8):
> Item illic: quicumque confessus fuerit in me coram hominibus, et ego confitebor in illo coram patre meo qui in caelis est (ad Quirinum 3.16).

Cyprian occasionally also uses *confiteor* in the sense of confession of sins. In the following citation, whilst *confessione* might plausibly refer to public profession of faith, the phrase *venia confitenti* can refer only to confession of sin:

> Tu sub ipso licet exitu et vitae temporalis occasu pro delictis roges et deum qui unus et verus est confessione et fide agnitionis eius inplores, venia confitenti datur et credenti indulgentia salutaris de divina pietate conceditur et ad inmortalitatem sub ipsa morte transitur (*ad Demetrium* 25).

There are three instances of Cyprian, in spite of his perceived dislike of Greek, using the Latin transliteration of the noun ἐξόμολόγησις, all of them Biblical citations: *Dum in carne est quis, exhomologesin facere debere*; *Item in psalmo xxuiii*: *numquid exhomologesin faciet tibi pulvis?*; *item alibi exhomologesin faciendam: mallo peccatoris paenitentiam quam mortem* (*Ad Quirinum* 3.114).

The Christian usage therefore would appear to show a gradual shift from general 'confession' to 'confession of sins' and then the extension to confession in the sense of 'making known, praise, paralleling a similar shift in ὁμολογέω.

By the time of Augustine the 'praise' sense is much more evident, with over two thousand instances in his works, for instance, *hoc est enim confiteri: dicere quod habes in corde: si autem aliud in corde habes, aliud dicis, loqueris, non confiteris* (Augustine *in Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus* 26.2)

4.7.3 *unde igitur incipiam? Unde et exordium bonorum eius aggrediar, nisi a principio fidei, et nativitate coelisti? (ch 2)*

nativitas

From *nativus, nascor.* This word, post-classical according to Lewis and Short, appears only once in Vulgate, *vultum nativitatis in speculo* (James 1.23) translating γένεσις. There are ninety-four citations in Tertullian and twenty-nine in Cyprian. Although usually used with

reference to birth of Christ, *nativitas* also refers to the sense of the Christian's new birth in Christ, in both Tertullian, *Haec est nativitas nova, dum homo nascitur in deo, ex quo in homine natus est deus,* (Tertullian *De Carne Christi* ch 17) and Cyprian, *Illud quoque ineptum ut cum nativitas secunda spiritalis sit, qua in Christo per lavacrum re.g.enerationis nascimur,* (*Epistula* 74.5)

It is also found twice in Minucius Felix.[59]

4.7.4 *Nondum secunda nativitas novum hominem splendore toto divinae lucis oculaverat et iam veteres ac pristinas tenebras sola oucis paratura vincebat* (ch 2)

oculatus

Not a Biblical word, and not often used in Christian writing. However, I include it here as, in addition to Pontius, Tertullian and Cyprian also make use of it. It is frequently found in late classical literature, e.g Pliny *Historia Naturalis* 32, in a list of characteristics of creatures: *murix, oculata, ophidion,* (*Historia Naturalis* Liber 32, para 145, vol 5) also *in qua legatione interfecto senatus statuam poni iussit quam oculatissimo loco, ea que est in rostris* (Liber 34, para 24, vol 5). There are three citations in Apuleius, one in *Apologeticus*: *quem si oculis vidit, ultra Vlixi vota et desideria hic quidem est oculatus* (*Apologeticus* 57) and two in *Florida*.[60] The past participle is also found in Tertullian: *Qui hoc se et cognovit et cognosci ab omnibus voluit fidem hominis, etsi melius oculatam, etsi veri luminis compotem, exteriore quoque visione donavit* (*Adversus Marcionem* 4). The only instance of finite forms of the verb, besides the Pontius citation, appears in Tertullian: *Licuerit et christo commentari*

---

[59] *tu in caelo summam potestatem dividi credas et scindi veri illius ac divini imperii totam maiestatem, cum palam sit parentem omnium deum nec principium habere nec terminum, qui nativitatem omnibus praestet, sibi perpetuitatem, qui ante mundum fuerit sibi ipse pro mundo, qui universa, quaecumque sunt, verbo iubet, ratione dispensat, virtute consummat? (Octavius 18.7); ut saepius factum Aegyptio regi, conflatur, tunditur malleis et incudibus figuratur; et lapideus caeditur, scalpitur et ab inpurato homine levigatur nec sentit suae nativitatis iniuriam, ita ut nec postea de vestra veneratione culturam. (Octavius 24.7)*

[60] *nec ista re cum Plautino milite congruebat, qui ita ait: 'pluris est oculatus testis unus quam auriti decem…..; immo enimuero hunc versum ille ad examinandos homines converterat: pluris est auritus testis unus quam oculati decem. (Florida 2)*

divinitatem, non qua rupices et adhuc feros homines multitudini tot numinum demerendorum attonitos efficiendo ad humanitatem temperaret, quod numa, sed qua iam expolitos et ipsa urbanitate deceptos in agnitionem veritatis ocularet (Tertullian, *Apologeticus* 21). Tertullian also uses the comparative form of the adjective: … *deum puta, de sublimioribus oculatiorem, aliquid subiecti praeterire non posse.* (*Adversus Marcionem* 2)

Cyprian uses the word only once, as a past participle: *Probat beatus Apostolus Paulus qui dignatione divina usque in tertium caelum adque in paradisum raptus audisse se inenarrabilia testatur, qui oculata fide Iesum Dominum vidisse se gloriatur, qui id quod et didicit et vidit maioris conscientiae veritate profitetur* (*ad Fortunam* 13).

4.7.5 *et misericordiam quam Deus etiam sacrificiis suis praetulit* (ch 2)

misericordia

A common word, found frequently in both classical and later writing. Cyprian, often (thirty-five instances) uses the Latin form of the Greek word ἐλεημοσύνη, particularly in the work of which it forms part of the title, *De Opere et Eleemosynis*. *Loquitur in scripturis spiritus sanctus et dicit*: *eleemosynis et fide delicta purge* (*De Opere et Eleemosynis* 2). This provides yet another example of Cyprian, supposedly not kindly disposed to Greek, using a Greek technical term. Both words are frequently found in the Latin Scriptures, both in the Vulgate and in earlier Latin Scriptural texts. However, *misericordia* is more common (Cyprian eighty-nine citations, Tertullian one hundred and fifty-one, plus two of *eleemosyne*). This could provide a further example of a difference between African and European terms, with the translation *misericordia,* more frequently used instead of the loan word *eleemosyne*.

4.7.6 *Aiunt Apostoli litterae (1 Tim. 3, 5) debere neophytos praeteriri*

 neophytus

      This appears in patristic writing only in this citation from Pontius and in one instance in Tertullian, *Nunc neophytos conlocant, nunc saeculo obstrictos, nunc apostatas nostros ut gloria eos obligent quia veritate non possunt* (*De Praescriptione Haereticorum* 41). Pontius is using the Greek νεόφυτος from the text of I Timothy. It is found in Augustine and Jerome and becomes frequently used from the fifth century onwards.

4.7.7 *parum dixi: presbyterium et sacerdotium statim accepit* **(ch 3)**

presbyterium

      Another example of a direct borrowing from the Greek, πρεσβυτέριον, possibly because, while it is possible to use *senior* as a Latin translation of πρέσβυς, there is no Latin corresponding term for πρεσβύτεριον, hence the necessity of using the Greek term. Arguably senatus (< senex) might have fulfilled this function, but perhaps this was too much associated with Roman public life. Both this and *sacerdotium* are early examples of the development of 'specialist' Christian words. The Biblical precedent for *presbyterium* is 1 Timothy 4.14 which demonstrates some of the latest New Testament writing, where in both the *Vetus Latina* and the Vulgate the word is used directly from the Greek. On my calculation there are eleven instances of the word in *Vetus Latina.* There are thirteen instances in Tertullian, fifty-three in Cyprian and two in Pontius. The number then greatly increases as the patristic period continues.[61]

      Sacerdotium, like *sacerdos,* is very commonly found in classical literature and gradually became the term used to describe the Christian understanding of priesthood, along with *presbyterium*. Tertullian uses *sacerdotium* freely, with forty-two instances, as does

---

[61] For this and *sacerdotium* see also the later section on Cyprian's vocabulary for ministry, 4.8.2, 242

Cyprian with seventy-four. Pontius, in addition to the citation above, uses it three times. It is also very common in in the Vulgate.

4.7.8 *imitatione consimili prosecutes, promerendo Dominum totius religionis obsequio praestitit.* **(ch 3)**

promereor/promereo

Pontius uses this verb, a compound of *mereor/mereo,* three times. Both are widely used in classical and patristic writing, though more prominently in Christian authors. Since compounds tend to be more frequent in late Latin, one would expect *promereor* to be more frequent than *mereor.* This is indeed the case with Cyprian, with forty-two instances of *promereor,* as against twenty-two of *mereor.* However, Tertullian's usage is the other way round, forty-four for *mereor* against fifteen for *promereor.* Whilst both authors, particularly Tertullian, frequently use the gerundive form *promerendum,* neither uses the gerundive of *mereor.*

> laetam faciet ecclesiam, nec iam solam dei veniam merebitur sed coronam (Cyprian *de lapsis* 36);
> Haec mites, haec simplices, haec innocentes in promerenda dei maiestate fecerunt (Cyprian *de lapsis* 32);
> timuit enim adhuc delinquere, ne non mereretur accipere. (Tertullian *de paenitentia* 6)[
> …. quibus et docebantur de promerendo deo et non offendendo praemonebantur (Tertullian *Apologeticus* 21).

4.7.9 *non illo baiulo vectus est* **(ch 3)**

baiulus

Carrier of a burden, from which probably derived *baiulo - are* carry a burden. TLL comments, *originis parum certae, fortasse cf. c. gr*. Βαστάζειν. It is found in pre-classical Latin: *ego baiulabo, tu, ut decet dominum, ante me ito inanis* (Plautus *Asinaria* 660), and also several times in classical authors such as Cicero.

In the New Testament it translates βαστάζω, e.g. Mark 14, 13 (cited in Tertullian, *De Baptismo* 19): *hominem aquam baiulantem.* Luke. 11, 27: *beatus venter qui te baiulavit* (βαστάσασα, Vulgate *portavit).*

Matthew 20, 12: *baiulavimus onus diei et aestum (βαστάσασιν,* Vulgate *portavimus)*

Tertullian has it once: *tantarum substantiarum usuram uno et muliebri corpusculo baiulare).* (Tertullian, *De Cultu Feminarum* 1. 9)

It is used only once by Cyprian: *ubi dum erratici palmitum lapsus nexibus pendulis per harundines baiulas repunt, viteam porticum frondea tecta fecerunt* (*ad Donatum* 1).

For discussion of use of *baiulo* in the Gospels see Burton, who makes the interesting point that the Greek and Latin both have the sense of carrying a burden from underneath, i.e. lifting it up, which is exactly the sense Pontius is conveying in the phrase above, in a passage extolling Cyprian's virtues of always responding to calls for help: *nullus debilis gressu non illo baiulo vectus est, nullus nudus auxilio de potentioris manu non illo tutore protectus est.* (3.9). [62]

4.7.10 ***quo tunc ardore plebs aestuans fluctuabat, spiritali desiderio concupiscens* (ch 5)** ***desiderium***

A classical word but more widespread in Christian writing, often translating ἐπιθυμία. In Pontius it is used closely with *concupiscens*. However, there are instances in the New Testament of the uses of *desidero* and its associated forms, often used in the sense of 'to lack, need'. As Burton points out, Christian writers do not appear to demonstrate any difference from the general meaning of 'long for, greatly wish for, desire'.[63] Tertullian has one hundred and four instances of the various forms of the root, mainly of the verb: *cum credimus nihil desideramus ultra credere* (Tertullian *De Praescriptione Haereticorum* 7), and Cyprian

---

[62] Burton 2001, 107-8
[63] Burton 2008, 160

seventy-eight, for instance, citing 1 Peter: *de hoc ipso in epistula Petri: quasi hospites et peregrini abstinete vos a carnalibus desideriis quae militant adversus animam.* (Cyprian *Ad Quirinum* 3.11). There are four usages in Pontius in addition to the one cited above.

4.7.11 *Cyprianum de suo talem accepit cathedra non fecit* **(ch 6)**

cathedra

A Latinisation of Greek καθέδρα. It is used, for example, by Martial, Phaedrus, Horace, as an armchair, especially one with cushions used by women, e.g: *discipularum inter iubeo plorare cathedras. i, puer, atque meo citus haec subscribe libello* (Horace *Satires* 1.10.91). It is used in Vulgate as transliteration of καθέδρα. In its secondary meaning as the seat of an academic it is used by both Juvenal and Martial in an ironic sense *paenituit multos vanae sterilisque cathedrae* (Juvenal, *Satires* 7.203), *circum pulpita nostra/et steriles cathedras basia sola crepant* (Martial 1.76. 14). The word is found eleven times in Tertullian, all in the general sense of a seat, often pejorative, as in, for example: *non ergo fugies sedilia hostium Christi, illam cathedram ...* (*De .pectaculis* 27) and, in the same work, quoting from Ps 1.1: *felix vir, inquit, qui non abiit in concilium impiorum et in via peccatorum non stetit et in cathedra pestium non sedit* (Tertullian *De Spectaculis* 3.11).

The Christian sense of the seat of a bishop is probably an extension of this secondary sense. Cyprian uses *cathedra* in the sense of an episcopal see fourteen times, frequently in connection with the Apostle Peter: *hoc erant utique et ceteri quod fuit Petrus, sed primatus Petro datur et una ecclesia et cathedra una monstratur* (*De Ecclesiae Catholicae Unitate*. 5 - 6 *secundum priorem recensionem*): *Deus unus est et Christus unus et una ecclesia et cathedra una super Petrum domini voce fundata* (*Epistula* 43 5.2)

In a section relevant to the examination of *cathedra* Brent discusses how Cyprian's view of ministry, and especially his episcopate, arises from his traditional and legal

background. Brent demonstrates how Cyprian equates the *cathedra* to the *sella curulis* of a Roman magistrate, as a symbol of the magistrate's *imperium* and develops from this the concept of the occupation of a chair as a symbol of the exercise of *imperium* within a sanctified divine space, which Cyprian terms a *cathedra sacerdotalis,* exercised by a bishop within his *provincia,* the term which Cyprian uses to describe the area of his episcopal authority.[64] It is this understanding which led to the strong opposition of Cyprian to the election of Novatian as Bishop of Rome as a rival to Cornelius:

> Factus est autem Cornelius episcopus de dei et Christi eius iudicio, de clericorum paene omnium testimonio, de plebis quae tunc adfuit suffragio, de sacerdotum antiquorum et bonorum virorum collegio, cum **nemo ante se factus esset, cum Fabiani locus, id est cum locus Petri et gradus cathedrae sacerdotalis vacaret.** 5 Quo occupato et de dei voluntate atque omnium nostrum consensione firmato quisque iam episcopus fieri voluerit **foris fiat necesse est nec habeat ecclesiasticam ordinationem qui ecclesiae non tenet unitatem.** Quisque ille fuerit multum de se licet iactans et sibi plurimum vindicans profanus est, alienus est, foris est. **Et cum post primum secundus esse non possit, quisque post unum qui solus esse debeat factus est non iam secundus ille sed nullus est** (*Epistula* 55.8).

The above consideration of *cathedra* concludes the examination of some examples from the *Vita* and leads on to a discussion of words used by Cyprian arising from his view of the Church and its ministry.

4.8 Cyprian's 'ecclesiastical' vocabulary

As mentioned earlier, Cyprian, as a bishop, is an administrator. Although theological writing plays a part, this usually arises as part of a pastoral problem, for instance, the vexed question of whether the *lapsi* should be rebaptised, and in discussions about ministry. What Cyprian is describing is a structured organisation, which is familiar to members of mainstream Christian churches today. Tertullian, although an older contemporary of Cyprian,

---

[64] Brent 2010, 59-75

as far as can be ascertained, is on the whole concerned with writing about theology, rather than, as is the case with Cyprian, ecclesiology. There could be several reasons why church structure and organisation did not play a very large part in Tertullian's thinking. One may be his different role in the church. Cyprian is a bishop, Tertullian may or may not be a presbyter. Another may be different concerns. Cyprian is, inter alia, an administrator, involved with church organisation and development; Tertullian is more of an independent theologian and apologist.

The following sections of this chapter, therefore, will examine as test cases some examples of Cyprian's terminology in order to trace the etymology of these terms, their exact meaning in Cyprian, and, where relevant, to compare them with Tertullian's use of the same terms.

4.8.1 The Church and the people of God

ecclesia

There is one instance of *ecclesia* in Pliny: *Ecdicus, domine, Amisenorum civitatis petebat apud me a Iulio Pisone denariorum circiter quadraginta milia donata ei publice ante viginti annos bule et ecclesia consentiente utebatur que mandatis tuis, quibus eius modi donationes vetantur.* (*Epistulae* 10, 110) where it is used in conjunction with bule (βουλή), another example of a Greek borrowing. Otherwise the term only appears in Christian writing, where it is the usual word for the gathered Christian community.

This term provides one of several examples where Cyprian, in spite of his reluctance to use Greek, needs to use a Greek derived term because of a near total lack of alternatives in Biblical Latin, and also probably because *ecclesia* appears to have been the way Christians referred to themselves and therefore to be a familiar word in Latin. However, Cyprian will often paraphrase *ecclesia* by such phrases as *domus dei: ..... cum domus dei una sit et nemini*

salus esse nisi in ecclesia possit (*Epistula* 4.4), *domus fidei: hoc est in ecclesia constitutum*

fidem in domo fidei non habere (*De Mortalitate* 6) and will frequently stress the apostolic

origins of the Church.

This is particularly significant in *de Unitate*:

> Probatio est ad fidem facilis conpendio veritatis; loquitur dominus ad petrum: ego tibi dico inquit quia tu es petrus et super istam petram aedificabo ecclesiam meam, et portae inferorum non vincent eam. *(De Ecclesiae Catholicae Unitate 4)*

> Qui ecclesiae renititur et resistit, in ecclesia se esse confidit, quando et beatus apostolus Paulus hoc idem doceat et sacramentum unitatis ostendat dicens: Unum corpus et unus Spiritus, una spes vocationis vestrae, unus Dominus, una fides, unum baptisma, unus Deus? (*De Ecclesiae Catholicae Unitate* 4)

Other words used by Cyprian to describe the church are *matrix, radix: scimus nos*

hortatos eos esse ut ecclesiae catholicae radicem et matricem agnoscerent ac tenerent.

(*Epistula* 48.3) and *origo* and *caput*: *unum tamen caput est et origo una, et una mater*

fecunditatis successibus copiosa (*De Ecclesiae Catholicae Unitate* 5).

Cyprian also uses the adjective *ecclesiasticus* thirty times in addition to using it to

refer to the Biblical book *Ecclesiasticus*

A particular usage is the contrasting *intus/foris* in connection with *ecclesia,* which

appears frequently in the controversy about baptism: *Ecclesia enim una est, quae una et intus*

esse et foris non potest (*Epistula* 6.3). *Quomodo ergo quidam dicunt foris extra ecclesiam*

immo et contra ecclesiam, modo in nomine Iesu Christi, cuiuscumque et quomodocumque

gentilem baptizatum remissionem peccatorum consequi posse, quando ipse Christus gentes

baptizari iubeat in plena et adunata trinitate? (*Epistula* 73, 18) The same *intus/foris* contrast

also appears in the controversy over episcopal authority.[65]

---

[65] 4.7.11, 232

Tertullian uses *ecclesia* in a similar fashion, *Cum autem sub tribus et testatio fidei et sponsio salutis pigneretur necessario adicitur ecclesiae mentio, quoniam ubi tres, id est pater et filius et spiritus sanctus, ibi ecclesia quae trium corpus est* (*De Baptismo,* 6). He has two hundred and twenty-two instances of *ecclesia,* together with nine of the adjective *ecclesiasticus* and three references to the book of *Ecclesiastes* (not *Ecclesiasticus*). However, Cyprian lays emphasis on the unity and formal establishment of the universal Christian body and does not normally use *ecclesia* in the sense of the local church, an attitude which I think is due partly to Cyprian's more firm understanding of the Church as a body, a concept which is much less important for Tertullian, but also to the fact that by the time of Cyprian's writing, the *ecclesia* had become a more visible and established entity. What seems clear is that by Cyprian's time *ecclesia* was the universally accepted term for 'The Church'.

In two instances Cyprian uses *conventiculum* as a pejorative term as opposed to *ecclesia*: *non enim nos ab illis, sed illi a nobis recesserunt et, cum haeresis et schismata postmodum nata sint dum conventicula sibi diversa constituunt, veritatis caput adque originem reliquerunt* (*De Ecclesiae Catholicae Unitate* 12) and *foris sibi extra ecclesiam et contra ecclesiam constituisse conventiculum perditae factionis* (*Epistula* 59.14). *TLL* notes this pejorative usage: *saepe cum contemptu dictum, apud ecclesiasticos praecipue de haereticis.*[66]

Secta

The etymology is uncertain. It is popularly derived either from seco or sequor. As the past participle of *seco,* it is found in classical usage for 'a well-trodden path,' hence 'mode', 'method'.[67] It is often found in the phrase *sectam sequi*: *neque solum apud nos qui hanc sectam rationem que vitae re magis quam verbis secuti sumus* (Cicero, *Pro Marco Caelio*

---

[66] *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*, vol. IV, 844, Burger
[67] Definition from *A Latin Dictionary,* Lewis and Short 1879

104), so developing the sense of a party or faction. It is used several times by Tacitus, for example; *assumpta Stoicorum arrogantia sectaque*, (Tacitus, *Annales* 14,57) . The first extant usages in Christian writing appear in Tertullian: *Nam exinde et Simon Magus iam fidelis, quoniam aliquid adhuc de circulatoria secta cogitaret, ut scilicet inter miracula professionis suae …..* (*De Idolatria* 39.4). Tertullian has over 80 usages of *secta*, together with, as is the case with Cyprian, usages of the verb *sectari*.

It is only occasionally (three times) used by Cyprian: *ut, dum nihil in honore sublimius, nihil in humilitate summissius a fratribus cernitur, hos eosdem fraternitatis secta comitetur* (*Epistula* 39,5). Burton remarks on Cyprian's use of *secta* here, rather than *ecclesia*, 'Here this succinct Latin word (unlike *ecclesia*), helps form the grandiloquent resolved cretic + trochee metre.'[68] *Secta* is also found in the Vulgate: *auctorem seditionis sectae Nazarenorum*, translating αἵρεσις (Acts 24,5).

christianus

The word is rarely found in Greek during the 1st century, the most obvious example being in Acts 11.26 χρηματίσαι τε πρώτως ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τοὺς μαθητὰς Χριστιανούς. The origin of the Greek term is generally attributed to its usage by Evodius, the first Bishop of Antioch (Eusebius *Historia Ecclesiastica* 3.22). Early attestations of the term are found in Greek in Ignatius, the successor of Evodius, (*To the Magnesians* 4) , Justin Martyr (*Dialogue with Trypho* 35.20), and in the *Didache* (12.4).

The first mentions of *Christianus* in Latin are found in secular works of the beginning of the second century. It is found in Tacitus: *quos per flagitia invisos vulgus Christianos appellabat* (Annals 15.44) and in Pliny's correspondence with Trajan: *cognitionibus de Christianis interfui numquam* (10.96), where the term is used six times, which would suggest

---

[68] Burton, P.H., unpublished comment, 2019

that even at this period it was widely known. Whilst there has been much discussion of whether Suetonius' *impulsore Chresto* (*Claudius* 25.4) refers to Christianity, *afflicti suppliciis Christiani* (*Nero* 16), clearly does. It also appears in the first dated example of Christian writing *Passio Sanctorum Scilitanorum* in 180 *Vestia dixit 'Christianus sum' ...Speratus iterum dixit 'Christianus sum'* (9 ff).[69]

There are a few examples in Cyprian, *Quid facit in pectore Christiano luporum feritas et canum rabies et venenum letale serpentium et cruenta saevitia bestiarum* (*De Ecclesiae Catholicae Unitate* 9). It appears to be much more frequently used to connotate a 'good' Christian: *cum dies negantibus praestitutus excessit, quisque professus intra diem non est, christianum se esse confessus est* (*De Lapsis* 3). Tertullian uses the term very frequently, three hundred and ninety-three instances. As might be expected, the vast majority of these instances appear in the apologetic works, *ad Nationes* and the *Apologeticus.* (also in writings such as *Scorpiace, De Pudicitia, De Resurrectionum Mortuorum*) *….in causa Christianorum* (*Apologeticus* 1.1): *…iniquitatis odii erga nomen Christianorum (Apologeticus* 1.4*): Ex his fiunt Christiani ... (Apologeticus* 1.6*): Tunc et christiani puniendi, ...* (*Apologeticus* 10.2)

fidelis

This is a common adjectival term in classical Latin. Christian writers, from Tertullian onwards, adopted the term as a description of a 'believer', of which there are seventy-two instances in Cyprian, both adjectival: *aqua Ecclesiae fidelis et salutaris et sancta corrumpi et adulterari non potest,* (*Epistula* 73, 11); also in Biblical citations *Et iterum scriptum est: esto fidelis usque ad mortem, et dabo tibi coronam vitae (Apocalypsis* II. 10. cited in *Epistula* 12.1) and elsewhere, and also substantival, particularly in the plural, as 'the faithful': *Sic*

---

[69] See Chapter 2, 2.2, 69

probantur fideles, sic perfidi deteguntur, (*De Ecclesiae Catholicae Unitate* 10): *vetus fidelium populus ad quietem vocatur* (*De Mortuis* 15).

fideliter is frequently used*; plebi universae pro honoris sui claritate conspicuus legat praecepta et evangelium domini quae fortiter ac fideliter sequitur* (*Epistula* 39.4).

Tertullian uses *fidelis* (one hundred and ten instances),usually in the sense of the 'believer'. There is one instance where it is used as a contrast with *spiritalis,* in the Montanist sense: *necessarie maxime cum et ista, a quocumque institutore sunt sive spiritali sive tantum fideli, eidem deo currant, cui et vetera. (De Ieunio* 11*)*

Cyprian also uses *fidentes/fidenter*: *cruci eius fortiter ac fidenter adsistere* (*De Dominica Oratione* 15*).* There does not seem to be any support for Watson's suggestion that *fidentes* was 'probably invented by Cyprian as a stronger term for the weaker *fidelis'*: *ne quod circa fidentes tempestas non fecit circa laborantes necessitas faciat* (*Epistula* 14.2).[70] There are in all only seven instances of any forms of *fidenter* in Cyprian. In Tertullian *fidentia* appears once, *fidenter* twice and the comparative *fidentior* once.

laicus

From λαικός. There do not appear to be any instances of either the Latin or the Greek term being used in pre-Christian writing.*TLL* has only instances of Christian usage. It is also the usual translation in the Septuagint of the Hebrew 'am' (e.g.Exodus 6,7) καὶ λήψομαι ἐμαυτῷ ὑμᾶς **λαὸν** ἐμοὶ καὶ ἔσομαι ὑμῶν Θεός, וְלָקַחְתִּ֨י אֶתְכֶ֥ם לִי֙ לְעָ֔ם וְהָיִ֥יתִי לָכֶ֖ם לֵֽאלֹהִ֑ים וִֽידַעְתֶּ֗ם

Tertullian (thirteen instances) like Cyprian, equates it to the laity, as in the following*: Itaque alius hodie episcopus, cras alius; hodie diaconus qui cras lector; hodie presbyter qui cras laicus* (*De Praescriptione Haereticorum* 41). However, Tertullian makes the point that,

---

[70] Watson 1896, 255

in one sense, all are *laici*: *Nonne et laici sacerdotes sumus? scriptum est: regnum quoque nos et sacerdotes deo et patri suo fecit* (*De Exhortatione Castitatis* 70).

Tertullian also refers to laity as *grex,* (8 times in all, 4 of them in the same sentence: *Ceterum si grex fugere deberet, non debere<t> praepositus gregis stare, sine causa staturus ad tutelam gregis, quam grex non desideraret, ex licentia fugae scilicet* (*De Fuga in Persecutione* 11.3), and also as *pecus*: *ceterum christo confirmante figuras suas malus pastor est qui viso lupo fugit et pecora diripienda derelinquit* (*De Fuga in Persecutione* 11.11). However, *grex* is also found in classical usage as describing people as well as animals, for instance: *in hunc igitur gregem P. Sullam ex his honestissimorum hominum gregibus reicietis?* (Cicero, *Pro Sulla* 28.77): *scribe tui gregis hunc,* (Horace *Epistulae* 1.9. 3).

Cyprian seldom uses the term but his few usages clearly differentiate between laity and the various degrees of leadership and ministry: *audituri ab eo quid imperatores super christianorum laicorum et episcoporum nomine mandaverint et dicturi quod ad horam dominus dici voluerit* (*Epistula* 81).

plebs

In classical Latin *plebs* was the usual word for the mass, or common people as distinct from patricians, equestrians and senators, whereas *populus* was the usual term for people at large. *Plebs* appears frequently in Plautus; *Heus tu, quamquam nos videmur tibi plebeii et pauperes* (Plautus, *Poenulus* 515).

In later Latin it is found in the same sense as *populus*, though it is not possible to demonstrate when this usage became common. The acronym SPQR, which first appears in inscriptions from around 80 BC, would seem to indicate that *populus* referred to anyone who

was not a senator. The *Thesaurus* defines it thus: *significatur pars populi longe maior, sed dignitate multo inferior* (*sc. a nobilibus sim. distinguenda*).[71]

There are one hundred and nine instances in Cyprian. He uses *plebs* in Old Testament citations, for instance, cited in: *Post dies illos, dicit dominus, dans leges meas in sensum illorum et in corda illorum scribam illas, et ero illis in deum, et ipsi erunt mihi **in plebem*** (Jeremiah 31.33, cited in *Ad Quirinum* 3.20). However, both extant citations of this verse from *Vetus Latina* and the Vulgate, have *populus.*

Cyprian uses *plebs* frequently, normally to denote laity, as distinct from clergy, particularly in salutation to his letters: *Cyprianus presbyteris et diaconibus et plebi Furnis consistentibus salutem* (*Epistula* 1) It is possible that here, the aristocratic Cyprian is retaining the older sense of 'lower-class person', regarding his flock as his *clientes*, with himself, their Bishop, as their *patronus*: *Deus unus est, et Christus unus, et una Ecclesia eius, et fides una, et plebs una in solidam corporis unitatem concordiae glutino copulata* (*De Ecclesiae Catholicae Unitate* 23).

Tertullian, however, has far fewer instances of the word and uses it both in the sense of people generally*: Ipsos Quirites ipsamque vernaculam septem collium plebem convenio, an alicui Caesari suo parcat illa lingua Romana.* (*Apologeticus* 35,6), and laity as distinct from clergy: *Differentiam inter ordinem et plebem constituit Ecclesiae auctoritas et honor per ordinis consessus sanctificatos deo* (*De Exhortatione Castitatis* 7). This citation could also bear the implication that various levels of laity and clergy were differentiated by where they sat in the *ecclesia,* possibly recalling the usual Roman custom in the arena.

---

[71] *Thesaurus Linguae Latina,* 10.1.2379.70

populus

There are a hundred and fifty-five usages of *populus* in Cyprian. Although, as noted above, Cyprian uses *plebs* for the Old Testament sense of 'people of God', he also frequently uses *populus*, as in the following example: *Item apud oseae: vocabo non populum meum populum meum et non dilectam dilectam* (*Ad Quirinum* 1.19) and the many others cited in *Ad Quirinum,* one of Cyprian's collections of *Testimonia* in which he explains Biblical passages. However, although over a third of Cyprian's citations of *populus* are found in Old Testament quotations, or in exposition of such quotations, he also uses *populus* to describe the Christian community, thus Biblically linking the description of the Church with the Old Testament People of God: *Haec unanimitas sub apostolis olim fuit: sic novus credentium populus domini mandata custodiens caritatem suam tenuit* (*De Ecclesiae Catholicae Unitate* 25). Whilst *populus* is widely used throughout all periods of Latin writing, it has become, by Cyprian's time, a word used to describe Christians. In formal greetings, however, Cyprian always uses *plebs,* as noted above. Burton, in discussing renderings of ὁ λάος in the various manuscript traditions of the synoptic gospels observes that in Matthew *populus* is the preferred translation, though *plebs* also appears, particularly in the Passion narrative, whilst in Luke the reverse is the case, with *plebs* being dominant.[72]

However, in Tertullian's two hundred and forty-five citations, *populus* usually denotes the people in general:

precantes sumus semper pro omnibus imperatoribus, vitam illis prolixam, imperium securum, domum tutam, exercitur fortes, senatum fidelem, populum probum, orbem quietum, quaecumque hominis et Caesaris vota sunt (*Apologeticu* 30).

---

[72] Burton 2000, 52-53

The Old Testament sense also appears. *Ne dilexeritis aurum, in quo iam prima delicta populi Israel denotantur* (*De Cultu Feminarum* 2.13). By the later empire the terms *plebs* and *populus* appear to have been used interchangeably.

. It seems clear that, as the Christian Church developed as an organisation, it reflected the class distinctions still prevalent in the society of the Roman Empire, even though the distinctions in the Republic and the early Empire had largely disappeared. It could also be the case that educated writers like Tertullian and Cyprian instinctively default to more traditional usages.

4.8.2 The Church's Ministry

The following word studies make it clear that Cyprian is describing a developed structure of Church order. However, one recurrent issue encountered in discussing Cyprian's terminology of the Church orders is whether and how far a given term in a given context refers to a specific ecclesiastical dignity qua dignity. This is partly a matter of the overlap between description and title; thus in English one might speak of 'the clergy' (a general class, including certainly all bishops and priests, and probably deacons as well, but not in contemporary use extending to the historic 'lower orders' such as acolytes or readers), or one might speak of 'the bishops' (much more a title, referring to a set of people with very defined roles in the Church). But even in English the distinction is not absolute; thus again in slightly older popular English the term 'parson', or, more exactly, 'clerk in Holy Orders', could be used to describe any Church of England clergyman, but one ministering in another Christian body would be a 'minister of religion'.

Throughout the history of the development of the Christian Church there has been, and still is, much debate about terminology and roles. It is clear that, even in Cyprian's day, such matters were disputed. Cyprian's letters give a picture of the various orders in use in his day,

episcopus, sacerdos, presbyter, diaconus, hypodiaconus, together with the lower orders*, lector, acoluthus, exorcista,* all of which will be examined.

episcopus

A Latin borrowing of ἐπίσκοπος, this word, in the sense of 'one having oversight', does not appear in classical literature except for one example in Cicero, cited in Greek; ἐπίσκοπον: *ad quem dilectus et negotii summa referatur* (Cicero *Ad Atticum* 7.11.5).

How it became the usual word in Christian writing for what is very soon described in English as 'bishop' is, as far as I can ascertain, unknown. All other usages of the word only appear as a Christian term, together with, as synonyms, *praepositus, sacerdos and antistes*. Thus, in discussing Cyprian's use of *episcopus*, and in comparing them with Tertullian's use, I am accepting it as a term for 'bishop'.

It is clear that, when comparing word usages by Cyprian with those by Tertullian, particularly in cases, such as *episcopus,* which refer to the Christian community, Cyprian is writing about a much more structured organisation than that which Tertullian envisages. This could partly be due to the fact that by the time of Cyprian, nearly a generation after Tertullian, the Christian Church has indeed become more structured, but it could also be due to the fact that Cyprian is writing as an administrator and pastor, whose understanding of ecclesiastical structure is, as has previously been noted, formed by his traditional Roman legal background and education, whereas Tertullian is writing as a theologian and, moreover, one whose interest lies not so much in church order as in belief. Cyprian has over one hundred and thirty instances of *episcopus* as against about thirty in Tertullian.

Cyprian frequently uses *episcopus*, but also *sacerdos* and *praepositus*, to describe what one would understand as a 'bishop', sometimes, as below, using *praepositus* and *episcopus* together:

> Meminisse autem diaconi debent quoniam apostolos id est episcopos et praepositos dominus elegit, diaconos autem post ascensum domini in caelos apostoli sibi constituerunt episcopatus sui et ecclesiae ministros (*Epistula* 3.3); sed neque futurum domini iudicium neque nunc sibi praepositum episcopum cogitantes (*Epistula* 16.1).

Praepositus is also used generally for 'those set over us' as in Hebrews 13.7. 7 and 24 where the Vulgate translates ἡγούμενοι as *praepositi.*

For Cyprian, therefore, *episcopus* and *sacerdos* seem to be synonymous, though there are also instances of them being regarded as separate degrees of ministry. For instance, both understandings could be present in the following:

> Hostis altaris, adversus sacrificium Christi rebellis, pro fide perfidus, pro religione sacrilegus, inobsequens servus, filius impius, frater inimicus, contemptis episcopis et dei sacerdotibus derelictis constituere audet aliud altare, precem alteram inlicitis vocibus facere, dominicae hostiae veritatem per falsa sacrificia profanare, nec scire quoniam qui contra ordinationem dei nititur ob temeritatis audaciam divina animadversione punitur (*De Ecclesiae Catholicae Unitate* 17).

It should also, perhaps, be noted that Cyprian regards *sacerdotalis* as describing episcopal authority as in *cathedra sacerdotalis.*

Other cognates for *episcopus* used by Cyprian are *antistes* and *praepositus*, mentioned above. In *Epistula* 66.5 Cyprian uses not only these but also *pastor, gubernator and sacerdos*:

> Quis enim hic est superbiae tumor, quae adrogantia animi, quae mentis inflatio, ad cognitionem suam praepositos et sacerdotes vocare ac nisi apud te purgati fuerimus et sententia tua absoluti, ecce iam sex annis nec fraternitas habuerit episcopum nec plebs praepositum nec grex pastorem nec ecclesia gubernatorem nec Christus antistitem nec deus sacerdotem (*Epistula* 66.5).

Watson gives a useful summary of Cyprian's usages:

> *Episcopus* is not much more common than *sacerdo*s. The latter …. is employed so freely and so naturally that it must have been a current term of unmistakable import. *Antistites*, like *sacerdos* of the priests of the Old Testament, is used frequently of bishops, and of no others.[73]

---

[73] Watson 1896, 257-8

Tertullian clearly does not regard *episcopus* in the same light: *Quid ergo si episcopus, si diaconus, si vidua, si virgo, si doctor, si etiam martyr lapsus a regula fuerit?* (*De Praescriptione Haereticorum* 3)*; Itaque alius hodie episcopus, cras alius; hodie diaconus qui cras lector; hodie presbyter qui cras laicus* (*De Praescriptione Haereticorum* 41); although, in discussing whether the Bishop of Rome has special authority: *Pontifex scilicet maximus, quod <est> episcopus episcoporum, edicit: "ego et moechiae et fornicationis delicta paenitentia functis dimitto*" (*De Pudicitia* 1). Amongst adherents of the 'New Prophecy', with which Tertullian has allied himself, it is clear that leadership was not viewed as important.

sacerdos

The use of *sacerdos* is significant. Whilst Christian writing tends to avoid use of words associated with pagan worship, *sacerdos* is taken over from pagan use and is found in common usage in Christian writing. Of the nearly seven thousand instances of the word in the *Library of Latin Texts,* only seven hundred and forty-two appear in classical as against six thousand two hundred and thirty-seven in Christian contexts. However, the preponderance of Christian over non-Christian authors is a partial, though not complete, explanation for this.

The term is found from ancient times, originally usually to describe a servant of a non-Roman deity, as attested, for instance in Plautus: *Nos apud Theotimum omne aurum depos<i>uimus, Qui illic sacerdos est Dianae Ephesiae* (*Bacchides* 305), and later as the generic term for Roman religious functionaries, particularly members of the priestly colleges. Cicero uses the term for the Vestals: *teque, Vesta mater, cuius castissimas sacerdotes ab hominum amentium furore et scelere defendi* (*De Domo Sua* 144).

Tertullian uses *sacerdos* not only when referring to pagan priests: *sacrificant apud eam Nonis Iuliis sacerdotes publici, XII Kalendas Septembres flamen quirinalis et virgines.*

(*de Spectaculis* 5) but also in the Biblical sense*: iussit ordinem impleri: vade, ostende te sacerdoti et offer munus, quod praecepit moyses.* (*adversus Marcionem* 4) It is in Tertullian that the term then appears as a description of a Christian minister, sometimes, as in Cyprian, equating to *episcopus: Dandi quidem summum habet ius summus sacerdos, si qui est, episcopus; dehinc presbyteri et diaconi, non tamen sine episcopi auctoritate, propter ecclesiae honorem quo salvo salva pax est* (*De Baptismo* 17) and at others in a more general sense: *Nonne et laici sacerdotes sumus? scriptum est: regnum quoque nos et sacerdotes deo et patri suo fecit* (*De Exhoratione Castitiae* 7).

Whilst the first extant usages of *sacerdos* in the sense of a Christian minister are found in Tertullian, it is not possible from these to discern exactly how this came about. Tertullian is not greatly concerned with the matter of Church ministry and organisation. Cyprian demonstrates a very different approach. He, like Tertullian, uses *sacerdos* in its Biblical sense, as in his treatise to Quirinus: *Item in evangelio: iudas paenitentia ductus sacerdotibus et senioribus dixit: peccaui tradens sanguinem iustum.* (*Ad Quirinum* 2.14) However, it is clear that for Cyprian, dealing with church order, *sacerdos* is a normal way of describing a Christian minister, as mentioned above in the section on *episcopus,* where there are instances where Cyprian appears to regard the two terms, *episcopus* and *sacerdos,* as synonymous. However, in other places it would appear that *sacerdos*, whilst clearly regarded by Cyprian as of a higher order than *presbyter,* does not necessarily equate to *episcopus*

In *Epistula* 1, addressed to the church at Furnos concerning a ruling that clergy should not be burdened with the task of administrating a will, Cyprian writes: *ne quis **de clericis et dei ministris** tutorem vel curatorem testamento suo constituat, **quando singuli divino sacerdotio honorati et in clerico ministerio constituti** non nisi altari et sacrificiis deservire et precibus atque orationibus vacare debeant,* where his clarification *de clericis et dei ministris*

with *quando singuli divino sacerdotio honorati et in clerico ministerio constituti* would seem to indicate a high regard for the office of *sacerdos,* which, as Clarke remarks, is regarded by Cyprian as 'high-priestly', so of episcopal rank.[74]

The coupling of *sacerdotes et ministros,* presumably distinguishing between two groups, lends credence to this. In *Epistula* 3, addressed to his fellow bishop, Rogatianus, and dealing with the difficult behaviour of a deacon, Cyprian demonstrates the same high regard for the office, at one point coupling *pontificibus et sacerdotibus.*[75] Other couplings also appear, for example, *nec per episcopos et sacerdotes domino satisfiat,* (*Epistula* 43.3), and *praepositi et sacerdotibus (Epistula* 45.2). In addition, *a sacerdotibus et senioribus* appears in *De Bono Patientiae* 23. Much detailed study could be made of this word but it is clear from the above examples, and the many others found in Cyprian's writings, that *sacerdos,* along with its cognate adjective *sacerdotalis* and abstract noun *sacerdotium* clearly indicate that a 'high priestly' interpretation, sometimes equating to *episcopus,* was common in the Church of Cyprian's time.

presbyter

Another Greek transliteration, from πρεσβύτερος, itself a comparative of πρεσβύς, therefore an older person, hence the Latin translation as *senior*, though the Greek term only appears in Christian writing. Cyprian uses *seniores* in the sense of 'elders' in his Biblical citations: *Item in evangelio: iudas paenitentia ductus sacerdotibus et senioribus dixit: peccavi tradens sanguinem iustum* (*Ad Quirinum* 2.14). Cyprian never uses *presbyter* as a synonym for bishop and frequently couples it with *diaconus: Doleo enim quando audio quosdam improbe et insolenter discurrere, ad ineptias vel ad discordias vacare, Christi membra et iam Christum confessa per concubitus inlicitos inquinare, nec a diaconis aut presbyteris regi*

---

[74] Clarke 1984, vol 1,155, note 11
[75] See also remarks on this passage in discussion of *diaconus* below

posse (*Epistula* 14.3). The two terms frequently form a salutation in his letters: *CYPRIANVS*

PRESBYTERIS ET DIACONIBVS FRATRIBVS SALVTEM (*Epistula* 12). It would therefore

seem that *presbyter* was the usual term for the 'second' degree of ministry.

Cyprian has seventy-four instances of the usage of *presbyter*, as against Tertullian's

seventeen. For Tertullian, too, *presbyter* does not appear to mean bishop. His somewhat

'loose' understanding of ministry means that Tertullian does not appear to regard the various

degrees of ministry as particularly significant, *Itaque alius hodie episcopus, cras alius; hodie*

diaconus qui cras lector; hodie presbyter qui cras laicus (De Praescriptione Haereticorum

41) and also: *Sed cum ipsi actores, id est ipsi diaconi et presbyteri et episcopi, fugiunt,*

quomodo laicus intellegere poterit, qua ratione dictum sit: "fugite de civitate in civitatem"?

(*De Fuga in Persecutione* 11)

Like Cyprian, Tertullian also uses *presbyter* to translate Jewish authorities, 'elders', in

Biblical citations: *Sed aliam silentii causam edixit, quia oporteret filium hominis multa pati et*

reprobari a presbyteris et scribis et sacerdotibus et interfici et post tertium diem resurgere

(Luke 9.22/Mark 8.31 cited in (*Adversus Marcionem* 4).

diaconus

There are sixty-two instances in Cyprian. As mentioned above, it figures as part of the

greeting in many of Cyprian's letters, and though there is no clear indication of its meaning it

appears to be the third degree of ministry; *episcopus/sacerdos, presbyter, diaconus.*

Cyprian's letter to Bishop Rogatianus, giving advice on how to deal with a badly

behaved deacon, gives a very clear insight into the view of the position of deacon as

subordinate to his bishop, and who could be stripped of his office and excommunicated if

necessary. Deacons should know their place:

> Meminisse autem diaconi debent quoniam apostolos id est episcopos et
> praepositos dominus elegit, diaconos autem post ascensum domini in caelos

apostoli sibi constituerunt episcopatus sui et ecclesiae ministros…… Et ideo oportet diaconum de quo scribis agere audaciae suae paenitentiam et honorem sacerdotis agnoscere et episcopo praeposito suo plena humilitate satisfacere. (*Epistula* 3, 1 and 2)[76]

There are only six instances of *diaconus* in Tertullian, though in the passage from *De Praescriptione Haereticorum* 41, already cited, Tertullian appears to accept the three-fold ministry of *episcopus, presbyter, diaconus.*

subdiaconus/hypodiaconus

Although the term *subdiaconus* appears in Epistle 8*,* this is a letter which appears to emanate from Rome and to be addressed to the clergy in Carthage, which seems to have been given to the subdeacon Crementius to deliver. As Clarke, following Watson, points out, this is the earliest recorded use of the word *subdiaconus,* and is the only instance of it, as distinct from *hypodiaconus,* in the Cyprianic correspondence.[77] Clarke also mentions, in the same reference, that subdeacons are first recorded in Hippolytus.[78] He suggests that, as the practical role of a *diaconus*, as originally mentioned in Acts 6, gradually became more liturgical and spiritual, assistants, *subdiaconi* or *hypodiaconi* were needed as trusted messengers to carry out more practical tasks, such delivering letters between churches and officials, particularly since a certain degree of confidentiality was necessary. Most mentions of subdeacons carrying out this role are found in letters addressed to, not from, Cyprian, such as *litteras tuas quas per Fortunatum hypodiaconum miseras* (*Epistula* 36.1), but all use *hypodiaconus*. Cyprian himself always uses *hypodiaconus,* as in his reply to the letter from Rogatinus: *accepi a vobis litteras ad me missas per Crementium hypodiaconum, ….*(*Epistula* 9.1) and in *Epistula* 45 where the office of *acoluthus* is also used: *Exemplaria autem eadem nunc quoque per*

---

[76] For further details see the discussion of this letter in Clarke 1984, vol 1, 164 ff, esp. note 17
[77] Clarke 1984 vol 1, 205; Watson 1896, 261
[78] *Apostolic Tradition,* 13.

Mettium hypodiaconum a me missum et Nicephorum acoluthum transmisi (45.4). Here is possibly another example of an African, as distinct from Roman, usage, though this must remain speculative.

The Minor Orders - lector, acoluthus, exorcista, ostiarius

Several references in Cyprian's correspondence, both in letters written by him and in some received, make mention of the minor orders, a complete list of which first appears in the entry of *Liber Pontificalis* referring to Gaius, Bishop of Rome 283-298; *Hic constituit, ut ordines omnes in ecclesia sic ascenderetur: si quis episcopus mereretur, ut esset ostiarius, lector, exorcista, sequens, subdiaconus, diaconus, presbiter et exinde episcopos ordinaretur*.[79]

Of these it appears that *lector* was the most common of the minor orders, familiar also to Tertullian; *Itaque alius hodie episcopus, cras alius; hodie diaconus qui cras lector; hodie presbyter qui cras laicus. (De Praescriptione Haereticorum* 41*)*. This term was also known in classical times, sometimes referring to a slave who read to his master: *unum aliquem constituere lectorem* (*Quintilian* 2.5) and taken into Christian usage as an office of one appointed particularly to read the Scriptures, installed by a bishop but not ordained with laying on of hands.[80] *Lector* is mentioned eight times inP Cyprian's correspondence, sometimes in connection with other minor orders, for instance, *exorcista*, mentioned in the short letter to Cyprian written by Lucianus; *praesente de clero et exorcista et lectore Lucianus scripsit* (*Epistula* 23) and by Cyprian himself: *Quod hodie etiam geritur, ut per exorcistas*

---

[79] XXVIIII. GAIVS (283-296)

1 Gaius, natione Dalmata, ex genere Diocletiani imperatoris, ex patre Gaio, sedit ann. XI m. IIII d. XII. Fuit autem temporibus Carini, a die XVI kal. Ian., a consulatu Caro II et Carino (283), usque in die X kal. Mai., Diocletiano IIII et Constantio II (296). 2 Hic constituit ut ordines omnes in ecclesia sic ascenderetur : si quis episcopus mereretur, ut esset ostiarius, lector, exorcista, sequens, subdiaconus, diaconus, presbiter, et exinde episcopus ordinaretur. 3 Hic re.giones dividit diaconibus. Hic fugiens persecutionem Diocletiani in criptis habitando, martyrio coronatur post annos VIII. 4 Hic fecit ordinationes IIII per mens. Decemb., presbiteros XXV, diaconos VIII ; episcopos per diversa loca V. [Qui post annos XI, cum Gavinio fratre suo, propter filiam Gavini presbiteri, nomine Susanna, martyrio coronatur.] Quivero sepultus est in cymiterio Calisti, via Appia, X kal. Mai. Et cessavit episcopatus dies XI

[80] Clarke 1984, vol 1, 343 note 6, including discussion of exorcists

voce humana et potestate divina flagelletur et uratur et torqueatur diabolus (*Epistula* 69.15).

Cyprian is also familiar with an even more minor office, that of *acoluthus* (referred to as

sequens in the *Liber Pontificalis)*, normally meaning one who assists at the altar, from Greek,

ἀκόλουθέω. There are six such mentions by Cyprian, all associated with a particular named

person, as, for instance*: Quae quantitas ne forte iam uniuersa erogata sit, misi eidem per*

Naricum acoluthum aliam portionem (*Epistula* 7.2). Clarke comments that Naricus is

otherwise unknown and that this is the first mention of the term. He also suggests that the

term could apply to the servants of presbyters, and that it is clear from Cyprian that they also

served as letter carriers, for example: *Exemplaria autem eadem nunc quoque per Mettium*

hypodiaconum a me missum et Nicephorum acoluthum transmisi (Epistula 45.4) and as

distributors of alms: *quod per Herennianum hypodiaconum et Lucianum et Maximum et*

Amantium acolouthos distribuendum misisti. (*Epistula* 77.3).[81]

Since neither *exorcista* or *acoluthus* feature in Tertullian it could be inferred that

these, even if known, were not relevant to Tertullian, for whom church order was not a prime

concern.

4.8.3 Church Life and Worship

baptisma/baptismus

Another Greek usage by Cyprian, appearing about one hundred and twenty times,

sometimes as *baptisma* and sometimes as *baptismus,* from the other form of the Greek,

βαπτισμός.. Since neither Cyprian nor Tertullian appears to distinguish between the two forms

it would suggest either that both, in their several declension forms, were in general use at the

time, or that manuscript copyings gave rise to the confusion. Cyprian appears only to use

baptisma in the nominative singular, and, occasionally in the Greek form of the nominative

---

[81] Clarke 1984, vol 1, 202, note 13

plural, *baptismata.* There are no instances of *baptismus* in nominative or accusative singular

and oblique cases in the singular are always *baptismi or baptismo.* In the plural, whilst

baptismatis is frequently found in Cyprian, Tertullian and other patristic writers, there are

only three instances of the form *baptismatibus*, in Arnobius Junior, Optatus and one instance

in Augustine.

Cyprian uses a mixture of forms from *baptismus* and *baptisma* to create a sort of a

suppletive declension: nominative and accusative singular typically *baptisma*, genitive

baptismi, dative/ablative *baptismo*, nominative and accusative plural *baptismata.*[82] However

the oblique second declension forms *baptismis* and *baptismorum* do not appear. The

following citation has examples of all these, together also with the verb *baptizare.* Clarke

suggests that in the copious and contentious discussions of baptism Cyprian only uses the

verb *tinguo,* and its cognate adjective *tinctus* when referring to what he considers heretical

baptism.[83] Although this is noticeable, particularly in letters 70-74, for example:

> Porro autem quidam de collegis nostris malunt haereticis honorem dare quam
> nobis consentire, et dum unius baptismi adseveratione baptizare venientes nolunt,
> sic aut duo baptismata ipsi faciunt, dum et apud haereticos baptisma esse dicunt,
> aut certe quod est gravius haereticorum sordidam et profanam tinctionem uero et
> unico et legitimo ecclesiae catholicae baptismo praeponere et praeferre
> contendunt, non considerantes scriptum esse: qui baptizatur a mortuo, quid proficit
> (*Epistula* 71. 1)

it cannot be regarded as a definite conclusion. Moreover, when citing Scriptural references to

baptism, Cyprian uses *tinctio,* presumably following the Latin translation he is using since, as

has been remarked upon before, Cyprian is careful to make clear when he is citing Scripture:

In actis apostolorum: ecce aqua: quid est quod me inpediat tingui? (*Ad Quirinum* 3.43), and

three times, severally in *Epistles* 28, 63 and 73 cites Matthew 28, 19 *Ite ergo et docete gentes*

---

[82] Both forms appear in the same entry in *TLL* - 'baptisma, -atis n. vel baptismus, -ī m., βάπτισμα et βαπτισμός,,
[83] Clark 1984, vol 4, 204 note 15 and 208 note 5

omnes, tinguentes eos in nomine patris et filii et spiritus sancti. However, both *Itala* (*Vetus Latina*) and the Vulgate have *baptizantes*.

Tertullian also uses the verb *ting(u)o* (forty-three instances) and the noun *tinctus* (twenty-one instances), mainly, as might be expected, in *de Baptismo: item soli se paenitentiae tinguere, venturum mox qui tinguet in spiritu et igni, scilicet quia uera et stabilis fides aqua tinguitur in salutem, simulata autem et infirma igni tinguitur in iudicium* (*De Baptismo* 10)

However, at other times he uses *baptisma,* as third declension, nominative and accusative neuter singular (about thirty times) with genitive *baptismatis,* ablative *baptismate.* The *baptisma* form appears mainly, though not exclusively, in *Adversus Marcionem*: *Nuptias non coniungit, coniunctas non admittit, neminem tingit nisi caelibem aut spadonem, morti aut repudio baptisma servat* (*Adversus Marcionem* 4).

Eucharistia

The Greek transliteration, from εὐχαριστία, only appears fifteen times in the corpus. Cyprian writes a long and detailed letter on the Eucharist (63) without using the word *eucharistia* at all. Watson attributes this to Cyprian's distaste for Greek words.[84] However, since this letter is concerned with a discussion of the addition of water to the wine cup it could be argued that *Eucharistia* was not relevant.

Apart from two references in *Ad Quirinum*: *Parum esse baptizari et Eucharistiam accipere, nisi quis factis et opere proficiat* (*Ad Quirinum* 3.26): *cum timore et honore Eucharistiam accipiendam* (*Ad Quirinum* 3.94) and one in *De Lapsis,* (25) two in *De Dominica Oratione* (18) and one in *De Bono Patientiae* (14) the others appear in the letters, often with reference to penitents, worthy or not, receiving the Eucharist, with the verb *dare*:

---

[84] Watson 1896, 195

offerre pro illis et Eucharistiam dare, id est sanctum domini corpus profanare audeant, cum scriptum sit: qui ederit panem aut biberit calicem domini indigne reus erit corporis et sanguinis domini. (*Epistula* 15.1) and one instance with the similar *tradere*: *communicent cum lapsis et offerant et Eucharistiam tradant* (*Epistula* 16.3)..

There are only seven instances in Tertullian, for example: *Eucharistiae sacramentum, et in tempore victus et omnibus mandatum a domino, etiam antelucanis coetibus nec de aliorum manu quam praesidentium sumimus* (*De Corona* 3).

sacrificium

Sacrificium is Cyprian's usual word for the eucharist, either alone or, more often with *divinum* or *dominicum* (one hundred and two instances in total for *sacrificium),* for example: *Et quando in unum cum fratribus convenimus et sacrificia divina cum dei sacerdote celebramus* (*De Dominica Oratione* 4): *Item in sacerdote Melchisedech sacrificii dominici sacramentum praefiguratum videmus* (*Epistula* 63.4).

The verb with *sacrificium* is usually *celebrare,* as above, which is also used in other senses, *orationes celebrare = orare, benedictum celebrare = benedicere*

Cyprian also several times links *officium* and *gratiarum actio* in describing the eucharist:

> Item illic: administratio huius officii non tantum supplebit ea quae sanctis desunt, sed et abundabit per multam gratiarum actionem in Deum (*ad Quirinum* 3.1).

> Dandae laudes deo et beneficia eius ac munera cum gratiarum actione celebranda - quamvis agere gratias nostra vox nec in persecutione cessaverit; cum gloria praedicemus (*De Lapsis* 1).

It could, therefore, be suggested that Cyprian is using the Latin *actio gratiorum* specifically in order to avoid *eucharistia,* though it could also be argued that *actio gratiorum* is not always specifically referring to the Eucharist. However, further discussion of this topic

would of necessity lead to an investigation of Cyprian's theological understanding of the Eucharist, which is beyond the scope of the present study.

In Tertullian *sacrificium* (seventy-three instances) is normally used in the sense of sacrifice generally, and very seldom applied to the Eucharist. However, it is used more frequently for Eucharist than *eucharistia,* though Tertullian's references to the Eucharist are much more infrequent than Cyprian's and he does not use *celebrare* in this connection:

accepto corpore domini et reservato utrumque salvum est, et participatio sacrificii et exsecutio officii. (*De Oratione* 19)

Sacramentum

This word takes on many significant usages in Christian writing, though rarely in the modern English sense of 'sacrament'. In pre-Christian understanding it referred to the Roman military oath and also to initiation rites in the mystery cults. It acquired various meanings in Christian writing, amongst others, though not exclusively, as a Latin translation of μυστήριον, though *mysterium* is found alongside *sacramentum.* It is also found, especially in Tertullian, to refer to a rite of initiation, thus baptism, doctrine, symbol, article of faith, and others. The following brief summary gives examples of some of these usages in Cyprian and Tertullian. Several studies in the early part of the twentieth century offer detailed examination of the term, in particular, that by de Ghellink, *Pour l'Histoire du Mot Sacramentum,* which includes the substantial contributions of de Backer and Poukens on *sacramentum* in Tertullian and Cyprian respectively.[85] As de Ghellinck notes, it is Tertullian who is primarily responsible for the development of the various understandings of the word. Referring to Tertullian he writes:

La plasticité qu'il donne au mot lui assure, ici comme en d'autres occurrences, une place à part dans la création de la terminologie théologiaue de l'occident latin, ... (The flexibility

---

[85] de Ghellinck, De Backer, Poukens, Lebacq 1924. See also Mohrmann 1954, 141-152

which he gives to the word assures it, as in other occurrences, a significant place in the theological language of the Latin west.) There are only half as many usages of *sacramentum* in Cyprian as in Tertullian (sixty-five as against one hundred and thirty-four). However, clearly by the slightly later time in which Cyprian is writing and in an ecclesiastical rather than a theological context the word was still in common use in a variety of contexts.

The following examples from both writers give a flavour of the various contexts in which *sacramentum* was used.

The original military usage taken over into Christian writing as a metaphor for Christian faith is found in both writers: *vocati sumus ad militiam dei vivi iam tunc, cum in sacramenti verba respondemus* (Tertullian, *Ad Martyros*). *O quale illud fuit spectaculum domino, quam sublime, quam magnum, quam dei oculis sacramento ac devotione militis eius acceptum.* (Cyprian, *Epistula* 1.2).

Tertullian also makes frequent use of *sacramentum* in describing rites of initiation. For instance, when referring to Pliny's letter to Trajan about the Christians, Tertullian writes: *Plinius enim secundus, cum provinciam regeret, ... praeter obstinationem non sacrificandi nihil aliud se de sacramentis eorum comperisse* (*Apologeticus* 2). However, Pliny's text is: *seque sacramento non is scelus aliquod obstringere* (Pliny, *Epistula* 10. 96) where Pliny is using the term to approximate to his understanding of what the Christians whom he has interrogated are using to describe their practices. Similarly, when enumerating pagan charges of incest and cannibalism again Christians, he writes: *Dicimur sceleratissimide sacramento infanticidii et pabulo inde, etc post convivium incesto* (*Apologeticus* 7). The term is also applied to baptism itself, for example:

Igitur omnes aquae de pristina originis praerogativa sacramentum sanctificationis consecuntur invocato deo: supervenit enim statim spiritus de caelis et aquis

superest sanctificans eas de semetipso et ita sanctificatae vim sanctificandi conbibunt (*De Baptismo* 4).

De sacramento aquae nostrae qua ablutis delictis pristinae caecitatis in vitam aeternam liberamur (*De Baptismo* 1).

The term is also found in the sense of belief, doctrine: *penes Marcionem a discipulatu Lucae coepit religionis christianae sacramentum* (*Adversus Marcionem* 4,5), in an allegorical and symbolic sense:

Sic et Iesum <autem> ob nominis sui futuri sacramentum; id enim nomen suum confirmauit, quod ipse ei indiderat, quia non [angelum nec] ausen, sed Iesum eum iusserat exinde uocari. (*Adversus Iudaeos* 9)

adhuc huius ligni sacramentum etiam in regnorum legimus celebratum.(*Adversos Iudaeos* 13)

As mentioned earlier, a detailed examination of Tertullian's development of *sacramentum* is found in de Backer's contribution to *Pour L'histoire du mot 'Sacramentum'*.[86]

Although only half the number of examples of *sacramentum* are found in Cyprian as in Tertullian it is clear, as had been mentioned above, that the term was still widely used in many of the meanings developed by Tertullian.

Cyprian continues the original use of *sacramentum* in the military sense, using it as a metaphor for the Christian faith:

certare quidem fortiter volui et sacramenti mei memor devotionis ac fidei arma suscepi, sed me in congressione pugnantem cruciamenta varia et supplicia longa vicerunt (*De Lapsis* 13);

divinae militiae sacramenta solvantur, castrorum caelestium signa dedantur, …. (*Epistula* 74.8);

O quale illud fuit spectaculum domino, quam sublime, quam magnum, quam dei oculis sacramento ac devotione militis eius acceptum (*Epistula* 1.2).

---

[86] de Ghellinck 1924, 59-152

Cyprian also uses the term, an extension of the military sense of duty, to describe obligation, in the letter cited below, of standing united in the face of adversity:

> in evangelio etiam legamus esse praedictum magis domesticos inimicos futuros et qui prius copulati sacramento unanimitatis fuerint ipsos invicem tradituros. (*Epistula* 59.2)

Like Tertullian, Cyprian also uses *sacramentum* in a figurative, future and symbolic sense, as in the following:

> Nam quod in Iudaica circumcisione carnali octauus dies obseruabatur, sacramentum est in umbra atque imagine ante praemissum, sed veniente Christo ueritate conpletum (*Epistula* 64.4);

> Quod exemplum perseverandi et permanendi designatur in exodo, ubi Moyses ad superandum amalech qui figuram portabat diaboli in signo et sacramento crucis adlevabat supinas manus, nec uincere adversarium potuit, nisi postquam stabilis in signo adlevatis iugiter manibus perseverauit et factum est, inquit, cum levabat manus Moyses, praevalebat Israhel: ubi autem submiserat manus, invalescebat Amalech. (*Ad Fortunatum* 8)

By this stage clearly the use of *sacramentum* for baptism was well known and used:

> Mare autem illud sacramentum baptismi fuisse declarat beatus apostolus Paulus dicens: nolo enim uos ignorare, fratres, quia patres nostri omnes sub nube fuerunt, et omnes per mare transierunt, et omnes in Moyse baptizati sunt et in nube et in mari (*Epistula* 69.15).

Like Tertullian Cyprian does not use *sacramentum* specifically for the Eucharist, but in a more general sense of offering, sign, symbol, foreshadowing, bond:

> tres pueros in fide fortes et in captivitate victores horam tertiam sextam nonam, sacramento scilicet trinitatis quae in novissimis temporibus manifestari habebat (*De Dominica Oratione* 13).

> Invenimus enim et in Genesi circa sacramentum Noe hoc idem praecucurrisse et figuram dominicae passionis illic extitisse quod vinum bibit (*Epistula* 63.3).

> De sacramento crucis et cibum sumis et potum (*De Zelo et Livore* 17).

Detailed examination of Cyprian's use of the word is presented by Poukens in *Pour l'histoire du Mot Sacramentum.*[87]

---

[87] de Ghellinck 1924, 157-220

4.9. Conclusion

In the extensive corpus of the works of Cyprian we see a highly sophisticated style of writing in Latin, one clearly owing much to the classical style of Cicero and others, yet one which had been informed and developed by Cyprian's Christian faith and his work as a bishop. Cyprian is the first Christian writer in Latin to deal with the practical problems arising from the developing Christian Church, leading to disagreements and almost to schism. Cyprian's treatises and letters give a clear and vivid picture of the problems and disputes arising both within the church and outside it with the secular authorities, disputes which would ultimately cost him his life.

As has been demonstrated in this chapter, in the works of Cyprian Christian writing achieved a level which, whilst owing much to traditional Latin literature, evolved a vocabulary which would serve the Church for many centuries to come. Cyprian played a seminal role in the development of Christian expression and by his life and writings laid the foundation for the great development of Christian Latin which would follow in the fourth century with Augustine, Jerome and Ambrose.

Thesis Conclusion

In this dissertation I have endeavoured to address two main but connected areas Firstly, I survey the expression of Christian life and beliefs in Latin from the earliest appearances of such writing at the end of the second century AD until the middle of the third century. In this comparatively brief period the gradual use of Latin instead of Greek as the main language of communication and the rise and spread of Christianity around the Roman Empire made it necessary to develop a vernacular which would enable Christian beliefs to be understood by those for whom Latin, rather than Greek, was their normal *lingua franca*. As examples of this I consider the first two main Christian writers of the period, Tertullian and Cyprian. Secondly, I examine the reception of early Christian Latin of this period, focussing on this reception in the nineteenth, twentieth and early twenty-first centuries and considering in particular the work of the 'Nijmegen School' in the early part of the twentieth century.

This thesis has been examined in three main sections. In the first chapter I have surveyed the position of Latin at the time at which Christianity arose, discussing the various forms this took and its relationship to and differences from what is generally known as 'classical Latin'. In doing this I have of necessity had to use such vague and ill-defined terms as 'vulgar Latin, ' and other Latin tags such as *sermo plebeius, sermo vulgaris, sermo urbanus* and so on. I have focussed in particular on the state of Latin in North Africa, from where the earliest extant examples of early Christian writing emanated. To this end, I have surveyed a seminal work concerned with this topic, *Die lokalen Verschiedenheiten der lateinischen Sprache,* by Karl Sittl (1882) which, although dating from the nineteenth century, I consider to be of relevance to the Latin of the early Empire and the various forms of the language which could be observed in different parts of the Empire. In particular, Sittl discusses the differences between so-called *Africitas*, the variety of Latin spoken in North Africa, if indeed

such a variety could be distinguished, and the Latin of Rome. Although the way Sittl, and others whom he cites, discuss this topic appears to modern ears to be clearly racist the fact that the study of Christianity in general and Christian Latin particular was framed in such racialising terms is itself worthy of historical attention. It needs to be noted also that notions of regional variation in language are not *per se* necessarily racist, even if the terms in which they are expressed often appear offensive to later readers. The general rejection of Sittl's theories of *Africitas* rests as much on criticism of his empirical data as on his ethnological assumptions.

Secondly, I have examined the earliest examples of specifically Christian writing, such as the *Acts of the Scilitan Martyrs* and *The Passion of Perpetua and Felicitas* and I also discuss such documents as the *First Epistle of Clement* and T*he Shepherd of Hermas*, which may or may not have appeared as Latin translations of documents originally written in Greek rather than as Latin originals. At the start of this conclusion I mentioned that one of the purposes of this study was to examine the reception of Christian Latin in later periods, particularly during the last hundred and fifty years or so. Then follows therefore what I consider to be the central part of this dissertation, a discussion of the *Sondersprache*, hypothesis proposed by the founders of what became known as the 'Nijmegen School, Joseph Schrijnen and his student and assistant Christine Mohrmann, in the early part of the twentieth century. Significant is, I consider, the fact that up until this period and also from the later part of the twentieth century, there were very few discussions of specifically Christian Latin writing. Christian scholarly work had become largely the province of theologians, rather than linguists, and up to this time there had been very little examination of such writing from a linguistic point of view. Monsignor Joseph Schrijnen, who became the first Rector of the newly founded Catholic University of Nijmegen in the Netherlands, had a background in the

study of linguistics and was the first to approach early Christian writing from a linguistic, rather than a theological, point of view. I therefore considered that the work of Schrijnen and Mohrmann, however dated it might seem today, merited closer scrutiny and evaluation. Moreover, apart from Schrijnen's *Charakteristik des altchristlichen Latein* in 1932 and Christine Mohrmann's writings on the subject up to the 1970s, other than discussion by scholars of Schrijnen's generation, such as de Ghellinck, Ernout, Marouzeau, and Einar Löfstedt there has, until recently, been very little further examination of this topic. In fact, Coleman's 1985 comment that 'the concept of a Christian Latin *Sondersprache* or *langue spéciale* is this as much a fiction of modern philologists as the African Latinity that was erected more than a century ago on the linguistic features common to Tertullian and Apuleius' appeared to draw a line under any further examination or discussion of this area. Fortunately, in recent years this area has been, and continues to be, examined by Tim Denecker and others and I have endeavoured to survey some of these contributions. In my opinion Schrijnen and, slightly later, Mohrmann, were pioneers in their day, approaching the area from a point of view somewhat different from that of any previous view of the writing of the early Christian period. As with any scholarly endeavour, the views and conclusions of the Nijmegen School were greatly coloured by the religious, social and political circumstances of the times in which they lived. I have come to the conclusion that, although modern approaches to both linguistic and theological study would lead to the view that the Nijmegen school's hypothesis that early Christians used a 'special language' to communicate amongst themselves was erroneous, this, in my opinion, was partly due to the fact that, in the early twentieth century, forms of language used by 'in-groups' were not as widespread as in the present day, and this coloured their view of second and third century usages of Latin amongst Christian communities. Although recent years have seen a great flowering of Latin language studies,

particularly by Adams, there has, apart from Denecker's ongoing work, been very little study concerned specifically with Christian language.

Thirdly, in the third and fourth chapters, I have surveyed the work of the first two major Christian writers in Latin, Tertullian and Cyprian, seeking to examine how their contributions shaped the development of a vocabulary and style for Christian expression of theology and ecclesiology which would later result in the work of Augustine, Jerome and Ambrose. As I pointed out in my discussion of the *Sondersprache* most studies of early Christian writing have been approached from a theological rather than a linguistic point of view and I have therefore endeavoured to pick out and focus upon aspects of the writing of both from a linguistic point of view. Apart from the work of Schrijnen and Mohrmann, there had been very little consideration of any sort of Christian linguistics, and the only specific detailed examination of Tertullian's language and syntax is found in Hoppe's 1902 *Syntax und Stil des Tertullian.* As I have discussed, Tertullian's Latin is indeed *sui generis* but his is a major contribution to Christian expression and Osborn's description of his as 'forming a vocabulary' can well be accepted, even if the earlier, and inaccurate, phrase 'father of Christian Latin' would not now be regarded as totally appropriate. Clearly, in this chapter, which forms only part of my overarching study, space precluded more than an outline survey of Tertullian's vocabulary and modes of expression. I have, however, attempted one, more detailed study, in my examination of Tertullian's use of *ratio* and its relationship to aspects of the Greek philosophical ideas from which it is derived, in particular concepts of the λόγος and have briefly considered ways in which Tertullian's writing helped to developed the doctrine of the Trinity.

The other major Christian writer of the period, Cyprian, in many ways complements Tertullian in that he is writing in a totally different style and on a different subject to his

earlier contemporary. Cyprian, as a bishop and administrator, is concerned primarily with ecclesiology, though theology, particularly the problems of the *lapsi* and the resultant baptism controversy, also plays a large part. I have attempted to investigate and evaluate Cyprian's style, and trace the influence on his writing of his upbringing and education in the traditional Roman art of oratory. In the later part of this chapter I have endeavoured to examine the vocabulary familiar in any discussion of the Christian Church, which in many cases first appears, or at any rate is first developed, in the writing of Cyprian. I have also compared these terms with their usage in the totally different style of Tertullian.

To sum up, therefore, this dissertation has sought to draw together the strands of the development of the use of Latin to express Christian beliefs, during the early part of the spread of Christianity in the Roman Empire, and, in particular, in North Africa, since that is the origin of both the two major Christian writers of the period. Prior to that, I have set the scene for the development of this type of writing by surveying the state of Latin out of which specifically Christian writing arose. I moved on in the second chapter to examine extant examples of the earliest Christian writing and then devoted the major part of this chapter to consideration of the reception of early Christian writing, above all to the examination of the *Sondersprache* hypothesis proposed by Joseph Schrijnen and the 'Nijmegen school'. I followed this with a survey of later discussions of the *Sondersprache*. Finally, as shown above, I have examined briefly the first two important writer in Latin, Tertullian and Cyprian.

Of necessity this thesis, in covering a broad canvas, has only included superficial examinations of much of the areas contained in it. I therefore suggest several areas which could form subjects of further research. Firstly, it is clear that the whole area of the contribution to scholarship of the Nijmegen school needs detailed examination in order that that the story of this significant contribution to the reception of the development of Christian

Latin linguistic study can be told. However, I understand that, happily, this is underway. Secondly, it will have become clear that much of what examination there has been of the language on both Tertullian and Cyprian has been based on scholarship from earlier eras. Apart from Hoppe's *Stil und Syntax des Tertullians* of 1902 and Löfstedt's two works of 1918 and 1920 there have been no detailed studies of Tertullian's language. Although the literature on Cyprian is considerable, particularly the extensive studies by Allen Brent, in this instance also there has been no detailed examination of his language since Watson's *Style and Language of St Cyprian* of 1896. I would suggest that studies of each of these major Christian writers, from a primarily linguistic point of view, making use of the resources which modern technology has made available, are greatly overdue.

I hope, therefore, to have contributed, at least in outline, to the study of a period in the history of Christian Latin writing which has often, I feel, been overlooked in favour of the great flowering of such writing in Augustine and his contemporaries.

Postscript

In the last paragraph of her survey of Schrijnen's work Christine Mohrmann quotes his final sentence from *Charakteristik des Altchristlichen Latein*:

> Ich hege die begründete Zuversicht, dass eine nach dieser Richtung hin orientierte Forschung für die Kenntnis der späteren Latinität, für das Verständnis der Eigenart der verschiedenen Sondersprachen, für die richtige Wertschätzung der altchristlichen Denkmäler, und für die altchristliche Kulturforschung im allgemeinen viele schöne Früchte zeitigen wird.

She hopes that her survey of the past 40 years shows a confirmation of this but adds that much work in this area remains to be done.

In this thesis I have endeavoured, more than another 40 years on, to make a contribution to this ongoing field of study.

Bibliography

Adams, J.N. (1972) 'The Language of the Later Books of Tacitus' Annals'
Classical Quarterly, 22 (2), pp. 350-373.

Adams, J.N. (2003) *Bilingualism and the Latin Language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Adams, J.N. (2007) *The Regional Diversification of Latin 200 BC-AD 600.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Adams, J.N. (2013) *Social Variation and the Latin language.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Adams, J.N., Janse, M., Swain S., (eds.) (2002) *Bilingualism in Ancient Society.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Adams, J.N., Vincent, N. and Knight, V. (eds.) (2016) *Early and Late Latin : Continuity or Change?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Adcock, F.E., Charlesworth, M.P., Cook, S.A. and Adcock, F.E., (eds.) (1932) *The Cambridge Ancient history. Vol. 9, The Roman Republic, 133-44 B.C.* Cambridge. Cambridge University Press.

Alexander, Loveday C.A. (1990) 'The Living Voice. Scepticism Towards the Written Word in Early Christian and in Graeco-Roman Texts', in: Clines, David J.A., Fowl, Stephen E., Porter, Stanley E., *The Bible in Three Dimensions. Essays in Celebration of Forty Years of Biblical Studies in the University of Sheffield,* Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Ainsworth, R. (1715) *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Compendiarius.* London.

Astin, A.E. (ed.) (1989) *The Cambridge Ancient history. Vol.8, Rome and the Mediterranean to 133 B.C.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Aubé. B. (1881) 'Les chrétiens dans l'Empire Romain de la fin des Antoins au milieu du troisième siècle.' *Revue Critical,* 44.

Audi, R. (ed.) (1999) *The Cambridge Dictionary of Philosophy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Axelson, B. (1941) *Das Prioritätsproblem Tertullian-Minucius Felix.* Lund: Gleerup.

Bakker, H.A., van Geest, P. and van Loon, H. (eds.) (2010) *Cyprian of Carthage: studies in his life, language and thought.* Leuven: Peeters.

Balogh, J. (1927) 'IX Voces Paginarum', *Philologus*, 82, pp. 204-242.

Banniard, M. (2013) 'The Transition from Latin to the Romance Languages',
in Maiden, M., Smith, J.C. and Ledgeway, A. (eds.) *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages. Vol. 2 57-106.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bardy, G. (1948) *La question des langues dans l'Église ancienne. Tome 1.* Paris: Beauchesne et ses fils.

Barnes, T.D. (1971) *Tertullian: A Historical and Literary Study.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bastiaensen, A.A.R. (1975) *Vita di Cipriano, testo critico e commento.* Milan: Mondadori.

Bastiaensen, A.A.R. (1987) *Atti e Passioni dei martiri.* Milan: Mondadori.

Bayard, L. (1902) *Le Latin de S. Cyprien.* Paris: Hachette.

Beaujeu, J. (ed.) (1964) *The Octavius of Minucius Felix.* Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Becker, H. (1879) *Studia Apuleian.* Berlin: Weidmann.

Bernard, M.W.K. (2003) 'Silent Reading in Antiquity', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies,* 9, pp. 421-43.5.

Blakeney, E.H. (ed.) (1921) *The Hymn of Cleanthes.* London: SPCK.

Booth, A.D. (1981) 'The Chronology of Jerome's Early Years', *Phoenix,* 35 (3), pp. 237-259.

Braun, R. (1962) *Deus Christianorum.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Bray, G. (1977) 'The Legal Concept of Ratio in Tertullian', *Vigiliae Christianae,* 31 (2), pp. 94-116.

Brent, A. (2005) *Cyprian, the Unity of the Church: Select Letters and Treatises.* New York: St Vladimir Press.

Brent, A. (2010) *Cyprian and Roman Carthage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brock, M.A. (1911) *Studies in Fronto and His Age.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Brogan, H. (2004) 'Henrey Annesley Woodham', in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.* Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/58308 (Accessed 15 September 2021).

Brunschwig, J. and Sedley, D. (2003) 'Hellenistic Philosophy' in Hedley, D. (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Philosophy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Burnyeat, M.F. (1997) 'Postscript on Silent Reading', *Classical Quarterly,* 17 (1), pp. 74-76.

Burton, P.H. (2000) *The Old Latin Gospels* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burton, P.H. (2007a) *Language in the Confessions of Augustine.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burton, P.H. (2007b) 'Latin Word Order. Structured Meaning and Information by A. M. Devine, L. D. Stephens', *Journal of Roman Studies,* 97, pp. 299-300.

Burton, P.H. (2008) 'Revisiting the Christian Latin Sondersprache Hypothesis', in Houghton, H., and Parker, D. (eds.) *Texts and Studies 3.6.* New Jersey: Gorgias Press.

Burton, P.H. (2009) 'Itali dicunt ozie', in Caruso, C., and Laird, A. (eds.) *Italy and the Classical Tradition.* London: Bloomsbury.

Burton, P.H.(2011) 'Christian Latin', in Clackson, J. (ed.) *Companion to the Latin Language.* Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Burton, P.H. (2012) 'The Latin Version of the New Testament', in Ehrman, B., Holmes, M. (eds.) *The Text of the New The Text of the New Testament in Contemporary Research: Essays on the Status Quaestiones.* Netherlands: Brill.

Butler, H.E., and A.S. Owen. (1914) *Introduction and commentary on Apulei Apologia sive Pro se de magia liber.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Callebat, L. (1968) *Sermo cotidianus dans las Métamorphoses d'Apulée.* Caen: Université de Caen. Faculté des Lettres et Sciences Humaines.

Cameron, J. M. (1971). Review of L. Dewart's article,'The Foundations of Belief.' *The Journal of Theological Studies*, (22), 2. 672–675.

Chadwick, H. (1967) *The Early Church.* London: Penguin.

Chadwick, H. (2001) 'Cyprian of Carthage', in Chadwick, H. (ed.) *The Church in Ancient Society: from Galilee to Gregory the Great.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chahoud, A., and Dickey, E. (2010) *Colloquial and Literary Latin.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chin, C. (2008) *Grammar and Christianity in the Late Roman World.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Sebesta, J. L. (2002) 'Vibia Perpetua: Mystic and Martyr', in Churchill, L. J., Brown, P. R. and Jeffrey, J. E. (eds.) *Women Writing Latin : Women Writing Latin in Roman Antiquity, Late Antiquity, and the Early Christian Era.* London: Routledge.

Clackson, J. and Horrocks, G. (eds.) (2007) *The Blackwell History of the Latin language.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Clackson, J. (2010) 'Colloquial language in linguistic studies', in Dickey, E.C., Chahoud, A., (eds.) *Colloquial and Literary Latin.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clackson, J. (2015) 'Latinitas, Ἑλληνισμός and Standard Languages', *Studi e Saggi Linguistici,* 53, pp. 350-373.

Clackson, J. (2011) 'Classical Latin' in Clackson, J. (ed.) *A Companion to the Latin Language.* Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Clackson, J. (2015) *Language and Society in the Greek and Roman Worlds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Claes, M. (2007) 'Limitations to "*Exercitatio Mentis*": Changes in Rhetorical Style in Augustine's Dialogues', *Augustiniana,* 57 (3-4), pp. 281-320.

Clark, E.A. (2008) 'From Patristics to Early Christian Studies' in Harvey S. A. and Hunter D. G. (eds.) *Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Clarke, G. W (1974) *The Octavius of Marcus Minucius Felix.* New York: Newman Press.

Clarke, G.W. (1984) *The Letters of St Cyprian,* 4 volumes. New York: Newman Press.

Coleman, R. (1985) 'Vulgar Latin and the diversity of Christian Latin', in Herman, J. (ed.) *Latin vulgaire-latin tardif. Actes du 1er Colloque international sur le Latin vulgaire et tardif.* Berlin: de Gruyter.

Coleman, R. (1989) 'Winners and Losers, the Formation of specialized vocabularies in philosophy, grammar and rhetoric', in Lavency, M. and Longrée, D. (eds.) *Actes du Ve Colloque de Linguistique Latine. ,* Louvain.

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum (CSEL). founded in 1864 by the Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna

Cranmer, T. (1662) *Book of Common Prayer.* London: Robert Barker.

Crook, J.A. (ed.) (1992) *The Cambridge Ancient History, Vol. 9.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cross, F.L. and Livingstone, E.A. (2005) *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church.* Oxford : Oxford University Press.

Currie, H.C. (1980) 'On the Proposal of Sociolinguistics as a Discipline of Research.' *Language in Society 9, no. 3*

de Ghellinck, J. (1924) *Pour l'Histoire du Mot 'SACRAMENTUM'.* Louvain: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense.

de Ghellinck, J. (1939) 'Latin chrétien ou 'langues des chrétiens'' *Les études classiques,* 8, pp. 449.

Deissmann, A. (1895) *Bibelstudien, Beitrõge zumeist aus den Papyri und Inschriften zur Geschichte der Sprache, des Schrifttums un der Religion des hellenistischen Judentums und des Urchristentums,* Marburg: N.G.Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.

Denecker, T. (2017) *Ideas on language in early Latin Christianity from Tertullian to Isidore of Seville.* Leiden: Brill.

Denecker, T. (2018a) 'The Nijmegen School and its 'Sociological' approach to the so-called 'Sondersprache' of Early Christians; A Preliminary Historiographical Study', *Latomus,* 77, pp. 335-357.

Denecker, T. (2018b) 'Among Latinists', *Historica Linguistica,* 45 (3), pp. 325-362.

Derks, M. and Verheesen-Stegeman, S. (1998) *Wetenschap als Roeping - Prof. Dr. Christine Mohrmann (1903-1988).* Nijmegen: Uitgeverij Vantilt.

di Berardino, A. (2010) 'Preface to Cyprian of Carthage' in Bakker, H., van Geest, P. and van Loon, H. (eds.) *Cyprian of Carthage, studies in his life, language and thought.* Leuven: Peeters.

Dickey, E., and Chahoud, A. (eds.) (2010) *Colloquial and Literary Latin.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Diels, H.A. (1952) *Die Fragmente der Vorsokrater* revised Kranz, W. Berlin:Weidemann.

Dillon, J. (1996) *The Middle Platonists: 80 B.C. to A.D. 220.* Duckworth: Cornell University Press.

Dillon, J. (1988) 'Latin Platonism', *The Classical Review,* 38 (1), pp. 71-73.

Drobner, H.R. (2008) 'Christian Philosophy' in Harvey, S. A. and Hunter, D.C. (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dronke, Peter, (1984) *Women Writers of the Middle Ages: A Critical study of Texts from Perpetua* (d.203) *to Marguerite Porete* (d. 1310). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ebert, A. (1870) 'Tertullians Verhältnis zu Minucius Felix', *Abhandlung der königlichen sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft.* Leipzig, 12, p. 319.

Engberg-Pedersen, T. (2000) *Paul and the Stoics.* Edinburgh: T and T Clark.

Engberg-Pedersen, T. (2010) *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul – The Material Spirit.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Engberg-Pedersen, T. (2017) *John and Philosophy: A New Reading of the Fourth Gospel.* Oxford : Oxford University Press.

Ernout, A. and Meillet, A. (1951) *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine.* Paris: C. Klincksieck.

Fahey, M.A. (1971) *Cyprian and the Bible: a study in Third-Century exegesis.* Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, Paul Siebeck.

Ferri, R. and Probert, P. (2010) 'Roman authors on colloquial language', in Dickey, E. and Chahoud, A. (eds.) *Colloquial and Literary Latin.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Forcellini, A. (1771) *Lexicon Totius Latinitatis. Vol. IV.* Padua.

Franklin, C.V. (2005) 'Christine A. F. Mohrmann (1903-1988) and the Study of Christian Latin', in Chance, J. (ed.) *Women Medievalists and the Academy.* Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press.

Frede, H.J. (1972) Die Zitate des Neuen Testaments bei den lateinischen Kirchenväter', in Aland, K. (ed.) *Die Alten Übersetzungen des Neuen Testaments, die Kirchenväterzitäte und Lektionare.* Berlin: De Gruyter.

Fridh, A. (1968) *Le problème de la Passion des saintes Perpetue et Félicité.* Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

García de la Fuente, Garcia, O. (1994) *Latín biblico y latín cristiano.* Madrid: Madrid Editorial

Gathercole, S.J. (2012) 'The Problem of the Original Language of Thomas', in Gathercole, S.J. (ed.) *The Composition of the Gospel of Thomas: original language and influences.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gaumer, M.A. (2010) 'Dealing with the Donatist Church: Augustine of Hippo's Nuanced Claim to the Authority of Cyprian of Carthage', in Bakker, H., van Geest, P. and van Loon, H (eds.) *Cyprian of Carthage, Studies in in his Life, Language and Thought.* Leuven: Peeters.

Gavrilov, A.K. (1997) 'Techniques of reading in classical antiquity', *Classical Quarterly*, 47 (1), pp. 56-73.

Glover, T.R., (1966) *Tertullian, Apologeticus.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Goldhill, S. (2008) *The End of Dialogue in Antiquity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gowers, E. (1973) *The Complete Plain Words.* London: HMSO.

Grice, H. P. (1989) *Studies in the Way of Words.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Haines, C. R. (1955). *The Correspondence of Marcus Cornelius Fronto with Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, Lucius Verus, Antoninus Pius, and Various Friends.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hanson, R.P.C. (1988) *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: The Arian Controversy 318-381.* Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Harnack, A. (1901) *Das Wesen des Christentums.* Leipzig: Mohr Siebeck

Harnack, A. (1913) *Das Leben Cyprians von Pontius.* Leipzig: J. Hinrichs.

Harnack, A. (1921) *Marcion: Das Evangelium von Fremdem Gott: Eine Monographie zur Geschichte der Grundlegund der katholischen Kirche*. Leipzig.

Hartel W. (1869) *Zeitschriften für österreichen Gymnasien.* XX Wien: Druck und Verlag von Carl Gerold's Sohn, pp 348ff

Harvey S.A. and Hunter D. G. (eds.) (2008) *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Haugen, E. (1966) 'Dialect, Language, Nation', *American Anthropologist*, 68, pp. 922-935.

Haupt, B. (2019) *Tertullian and the Bible,* PhD dissertation, Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

Havely, N.R. (ed.) (1994) *The House of Fame, Chaucer*. Durham: Durham Medieval Texts.

Heffernan, T.J. (1995) 'Philology and Authorship in the *Passio Sanctarum Perpetuae et Felicitas'*, in *Traditio: Studies in Ancient and Medieval History, Thought, and Religion, Vol 50.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heine, R. (2004) 'Cyprian and Novatian' in Young, F.M., Ayres, L. and Louth, A. (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heinze, R. (1910) 'Das Prioritätsproblem Tertullian-Minucius Felix', *Bericht der königlichen sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft,* 62, p. 281.

Helm, R. (1956) *Eusebius Werke VII: Die Chronik des Hieronymus: Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte, Vol. 47*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.

Hengel, M. (1973) *Judentum und Hellenismus: Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berucksichtigung Palastinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jahrhunderts vor Christus.* Tübingen: J. C. Mohr.

Herman, J. (2000) *Vulgar Latin.* Translated by Roger White. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsyania Press.

Hodson, T.C. (1939) 'Sociolinguistics in India', *Man in India,* India: Serials Publications Pvt. Ltd.

Hoggart, R. (1990) *The Uses of Literacy: Aspects of Working Class Life with Special Reference to Publications and Entertainments.* London: Penguin.

Holden, H.A. (1853) *M. Minucii Felicis, Octavius.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Holford-Strevens, L. (2004) *Aulus Gellius: An Antonine Scholar and his Achievement.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hoppe, H. (1903) *Syntax und Stil des Tertullian.* Leipzig: Teubner.

Houghton, H.A.G. (1997) *Defining Christianity? Words and Meaning in Tertullian.*, University of Cambridge. unpublished dissertation

Houghton, H.A.G. (2016) *The Latin New Testament.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hunink, V. (2010) 'Cyprian, a Christian and Roman Gentleman', in Bakker, H., van Geest, P. and van Loon, H. (eds.) *Cyprian of Carthage, Studies in his Life, Language and Thought.* Leuven: Peeters.

Hunink, V. (2016) 'Worlds drifting apart', *Commentaria* Classica, 3, pp. 93-112.

Hunink, (2020) *Acta Martyorum Scillitanorum, A Literary Commentary*. Leuven: Brepols.

IJsewijn, J. (1990) *Companion to Neo-Latin Studies Pt.1, History and diffusion of Neo-Latin literature*. (Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Janssen, H.H. (1938) *Kultur und Sprache, zur Geschichte der alten Kirche im Spiegel des Sprachentwicklung von Tertullian bis Cyprian.,* Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva VIII, Nijmegen: Dekker & van de Vegt.

John, R.C.M. (1964) 'Juvenal on Latin Oratory', *Hermes,* 92 (1), pp. 121-123.

Johnson, W.A. (2010b) 'Reading as a Sociological System', in *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire: A Study of Elite Communities.* USA: Oxford University Press.

Jordan, H. (1882) *Vindiciae sermonis Latini Antiquissimi*, Königsberg: Hartung

Jordan, H.(1879 *Kritische Beiträge zur Lateinischen Sprache.* Berlin: Weidmann

Kellner, K.A.H. (1876) 'Über die sprachlichen Eigentümlichkeiten Tertullians', *Tübinger Theologische Quartalschrift,* 58 pp. 229-251.

Kilpatrick, G.D. (1965) '1 Tim. 5, 22 and Tertullian *De Baptismo* XVIII', *Journal of Theological Studies,* Vol.16 (1), pp.127-128.

Kirk, G.S. and Raven, J. E. (1971) *The Pre-Socratic Philosophers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kittel, G. and Bromiley, G.W. (1964) *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament.* Grand Rapids: Erdman.

Knox, B.M.W. (1968) 'Silent Reading in Antiquity', *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies,* Vol 9 (4) pp.421-435.

Koehler, A. (1877*) De auctorum belli Africani et belli Hispaniensis Latinitate* Erlangen: Deichert

Konstan, D. and Rutter N.K. (2003) *Envy, Spite and Jealousy: The Rivalrous Emotions in Ancient Greece.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Koziol, H. (1872) *Der Stil des Apulejus* Vienna: Georg Olms Verlag.

Kraemer, R.S. and Lander, S.L. (2000) 'Perpetua and Felicitas' in Esler, P.F. (ed.) *The Early Christian World.*) Oxford: Routledge.

Kretschmann, H. (1866) *de Latinitate Apulei Madaurensis.* Königsberg: Regimonti Preussen.

Kroll, W. (1897) 'Das afrikanische Latein', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie.* Neue Folge, 52, pp. 569-590.

Kübler, B. (1893) 'die Lateinische Sprache auf afrikanischen Inschriften', *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammati,* Vol.8, p.162

Labov, W. (2006) *The Social Stratification of English in New York City.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lancel, S. (1985) 'Y-a-t-il une Africitas?', *Revue des études latines,* 63, pp. 161-182.

Lane Fox, R. (1988) *Pagans and Christians.* London: Penguin Books.

le Bonniec, H.I. (1982) *Contre les gentils / Arnobe. Livre 1 texte établi, traduit et commenté.* Paris: Société d'Édition Les Belles Lettres.

Leo XIII, (1893) *Providentissimus Deus,* https://www.vatican.va/content/leo-xiii/la/encyclicals/documents/hf_...

Lewis, C.T. (1879) *A Latin dictionary : founded on Andrews' edition of Freund's Latin dictionary / revised, enlarged, and in great part rewritten by Charlton T. Lewis and Charles Short.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Liddell, H.E. and Scott, R. (1940) *A Greek-English Lexicon.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Lodge, R.A. (1993) *French: From Dialect to Standard.* London; Routledge.

Löfstedt, E. (1959) *Late Latin.* Oslo: H. Aschehoug & Co.

Long, A.A. (1974) *Hellenistic Philosophy: Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics.* London: Duckworth.

Luther, M. (1530) *Ein sendbrieff D. M. Luthers, Von Dolmettzchen und Fürbit der heiligenn.*,Nürnberg. Facsimile and Transcription in Taylor Institution Library (shelf mark: Arch.8o.1530.9).

Maiden, M., Smith, J. C and Ledgeway, A. (eds.) (2013) *The Cambridge History of the Romance Languages, Volume 2, Contexts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Margry P.R.H. and Roodenberg, H. (2007) 'A History of Dutch Ethnography in 10 1/2 pages' in Margry P. R. H. and Roodenberg, H. (eds.) *Reframing Dutch Culture: Between Otherness and Authenticity.* London: Routledge.

Marouzeau, J. (1932) 'Schrijnen's Charakteristik des altchristlichen Latein', *Revue des Études Latines,* 10, pp. 241-242.

Martyn, J. (1964) 'Juvenal on Latin Oratory', *Hermes,* 92, pp. 121-123.

Marx, F. (1909) 'Die Beziehung des Altlateins zum Spätlatein', *Neue Jahrbücher*, 23/24, pp. 434-448.

Mattiacci, S. (2014) 'Apuleius and Africitas', in *Apuleius and Africa.* Lee, B.T., Finkelpearl, E. and Graverini, L. (eds.) Oxford: Routledge.

McGowan, A.B. (2009) 'God in Early Latin Theology: Tertullian and the Trinity', in Patterson, L.G, McGowan, A. B., Daley, B. and Gaden, T.J. (eds.) *God in Early Christian Thought: Essays in Memory of Lloyd G. Patterson.* Boston: Brill.

McGrath, A.E. (2013) *Historical Theology: An Introduction to the History of Christian Thought.* Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

McLeod, H. (2015) 'Christianity and Nationalism in the Nineteenth Century', *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church,* 1, pp. 7-22.

Meillet, A. (1906) 'L'état actuel des études de linguistique générale', *leçon d'ouverture du cours de Grammaire comparée au Collège de France,* lue le Mardi, 13 février, 1906. Paris: Durand.

Meillet, A.(1926) *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale.* Paris: Honoré.Champion.

Milman, H.H. (1855) *History of Latin Christianity.* London: John Murray.

Mohrmann, C. (1932) *Die altchristliche Sondersprache in den Sermones des Hl. Augustin.* Nijmegen: Decker & van de Vegt.

Mohrmann, C. (1947) 'Le latin commun et le Latin des Chrétiens', *Vigiliae Christianae*, 1 (1), pp. 1-12.

Mohrmann, C. (1948) 'Les elements vulgaires du latin des Chretiens', *Vigiliae Christianae*, 2, pp. 89-101.

Mohrmann, C. (1949a) 'Les origines de la latinité chrétienne a Rome', *Vigiliae Christianae*, 3 (2), pp. 67-106.

Mohrmann, C. (1949b) 'Les origines de la latinité chrétienne a Rome (suite)', *Vigiliae Christianae,* 3 (3), pp. 163-183.

Mohrmann, C. (1950) 'Les emprunts grecs dans la latinité chrétienne', *Vigiliae Christianae*, 4, pp. 193-211.

Mohrmann, C. (1951a) 'Saint Jérôme et Saint Augustin sur Tertullian', *Vigilae Christianae*, 5 (1), pp. 111-112.

Mohrmann, C. (1951) 'How Latin Came to Be the Language of Early Christendom', *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review,* 40*,* pp. 277-288.

Mohrmann, C. (1953) 'Statio', *Vigiliae Christianae,*7, pp. 221-245.

Mohrmann, C. (1954) 'A propos de deux mots controversés de la latinité chrétienne: tropaeum, nomen', *Vigiliae Christianae,* 8, pp. 154-173.

Mohrmann, C. (1954b) 'Sacramentum dans les plus anciens textes chrétiens', *The Harvard Theological Review,* 47 (3), pp. 141-152.

Mohrmann, C. (1957a) 'Linguistic Problems in the Early Christian Church', *Vigiliae Christianae,* 11 (1), pp. 11-36.

Mohrmann, C. (1957) *Liturgical Latin. Its Origin and Character. Three Lectures.* Washington: Catholic University of America Press

Mohrmann, C. (1961a) *Liturgical Latin; The Latin of St Patrick.* 4 Lectures Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies

Mohrmann, C. (1977a) 'Die Rolle des Lateins in der Kirche des Westens', in *Etudes sur le Latin des Chrétiens. Vol.* 4. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.

Mohrmann, C. (1977b) 'L'étude du grec et du latin de l'antiquité chrétienne', in *Études sur le Latin des Chrétiens. Vol. 4*. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.

Mohrmann, C. (1977c). 'Nach Vierzig Jahren' in *Études sur le Latin des Chrétiens. Vol. 4.* Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.

Mommsen, T. and Krüger, P. (1895) 'Index Auctorum XXII' in *Digesta Justiniani,* 1 Berlin: Weidmann.

Mommsen, T. (1898) 'Gestorum Pontificum Romanorum Vol I: Liber Pontificalis Pars Prior', *Monumenta Germaniae Historica,* 4, Berlin: Weidmann

Monceaux, P. (1894) *Les Africains.* Paris: Lecèns, Oudin.

Moss, C. R. (2010) 'On the Dating of Polycarp: Rethinking the Place of the Martyrdom of Polycarp in the History of Christianity' in *Early Christianity,* 1 (4), pp. 539–574.

Moss, C.R. (2012) *Ancient Christian Martyrdom: Diverse Practices, Theologies, and Traditions.* Yale: Yale University Press.

Moss, C.R. (2013) *The Myth of Persecution.* New York: Harper Collins.

Moulton, J.H.(1906) *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Edinburgh: T &T Clark

Müller, R. (2001) *Sprachbewußtsein und Sprachvariationen im lateinischen Schrifttum der Antike.* Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck.

Norden, E. (1898) *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert vor Christ bis in die Zeit der Renaissance. Vol. 2.* Leipzig: Teubner.

Norden, E. (1954) *Die ömische Literatur.* Leipzig: Teubner.

O'Donnell, J.J. (ed.) (1996) *Apuleius, 'Apologia' Seminar.* Available at: https://faculty.georgetown.edu/jod/apuleius/ (Accessed:multiple times).

O'Malley, T. (1967) *Tertullian and the Bible.* Nijmegen: Dekker & van de Vegt.

Osborn, E. (1997) *Tertullian, First Theologian of the West.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Palmer, L.R. (1954) *The Latin Language.* London: Faber and Faber.

Parkes, A.M. (2012) 'A Commentary on Selected Sections of the Octavius of Minucius Felix', unpublished dissertation, University of Wales Trinity St David.

Paulston, C.B. and Tucker, G.R. (2003) *Sociolinguistics : The Essential Readings.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Pellegrino, M. (1963) *Octavius.* Turin: Paraviae et Sociorum.

Pezzini, G. (2016) 'Comic Lexicon: Searching for 'submerged' Latin from Plautus to Erasmus' in Adams, J. and Vincent, N. (eds.) *Early and Late Latin: Continuity or Change?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pigliucci, M. (1995) 'Stoicism' in Fieser, J. and Dowden, B. (eds.) *Internet Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, [Online] Available at: https://www.iep.utm.edu/ (Accessed: 09.09.21)

Powell, D. (1975) 'Tertullianists and Cataphrygians', *Vigiliae Christianae,* 29, pp. 33-54.

Powell, J.G.F. (2001) 'Some Linguistic Points in the Prologue',
 in Ahuvia, K. and Laird, A. (eds.) *A Companion to the Prologue to Apuleius' Metamorphoses.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Raven, S. (1993) *Rome in Africa.* London: Routledge.

Raynouard, F. (1816) *Éléments de la grammaire de la langue romane, avant l'an 1000, précédés de recherches sur l'origine et la formation de cette langue.* Paris: Didot

Rebenich, S. (1993) 'Jerome, the 'Vir Trilinguis' and the 'Hebraica Veritas', *Vigiliae Christianae,* 47 (1), pp. 50-77.

Rebillard, É. (2017) *Greek and Latin Narratives about the Ancient Martyrs.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rendall, G. H. (1946) *Octavius - Minucius Felix.* Cambridge MA: Heinemann.

Rist, J.M. (1996) *Man, Soul and Body: Essays in Ancient Thought from Plato to Dionysius.* Aldershot: Variorum Collected Studies.

Rives, J. B. (1999) 'The Decree of Decius and the Religion of Empire', *Journal of Roman Studies,* 89, pp. 135-154.

Robertson, A.T. (1919) *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in Light of Historical Research,* London: Hodder and Stoughton

Rochette, B. (2011) 'Language Policies in the Roman Republic and Empire',
in Clackson, J. (ed.) *A Companion to the Latin language.* Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Roesch, S. (2006) 'Verbum, le 'verbe divin', de la langue courante au vocabulaire théologique', in *Latin et langues techniques.* Paris: PUPS.

Rorty, R. (1989) 'Private irony and liberal hope' in *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosén, H. (1999) *Latine loqui: Trends and Directions in the Crystallization of Classical Latin.* München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.

Saenger, P.H. (1997) *Space Between Words: The Origins of Silent Reading.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Sanday, W. (1889) 'Notes on the Text and Date of the *de Aleatoribus', The Classical Review,* 3 (3), pp. 126-128.

Sanderson, M. (1975) *The Universities in the Nineteenth Century.*, London: Routledge.

Schaeffer, C. A. (1941) *S. Clementis Romani Epistula ad Corinthios quae vocatur prima graece et latine* Bonn: Peter Hanstein

Schildenberger, I. (1952) 'Die Itala des Heiligen Augustins', in Fischer, B. and Fiala, V. (eds.) *Colligere Fragmenta: Festschrift Alban Dold.* Beuron: Beuron Kunstverlag.

Schmalz-Hoffmann, (1928) *Lateinische Grammatik* Munich: Beck

Schmidt, P.L. (1997) 'Pontius, Vita Cypriani', in Sallmann, K. (ed.) *Die Literature des Umbruchs von den römischen christlichen Literatur 117 bis 284 nach Christus.* Munich: Beck.

Schrijnen, J. (1905) *Inleiding tot de studie der vergelijkende Indogermaansche Taalwetenschap.* Leiden: Sijthoff

Schrijnen, J. (1910) *De waarde der kultuurhistorische methode voor de kennis van de Christelijke Oudheid.* Amsterdam: Van Langenhuysen

Schrijnen, J. (1912) *Sociale klassieke taalkunde.* Amsterdam: Van Langenhuysen

Schrijnen, J. (1915-1916) *Nederlandsche Volkskunde*. Zutphen: W.J.Thieme &Cie.

Schrijnen, J. (1921) *Einführung in das Studium der Indogermanischen Sprachwissenschaft, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der klassischen und germanischen Sprachen.* Translated by Walter Fischer, Heidelberg

Schrijnen, J. (1928) 'Résumé, donné à la clôture du Congrès du Premier Congrès International de Linguistes à la Haye du 10 à 15 avril', *Anthropos,* 23, pp. 259-262.

Schrijnen, J. (1930) 'Volkskunde und religiöse Volkskunde', *Anthropos,* 25, pp. 239-254.

Schrijnen, J. (1932) *Charakteristik des altchristlichen Latein.* Nijmegen. Leuven: Dekker & van de Vegt

Schrijnen, J. (1934) 'Le latin chrétien devenu langue commune', *Revue des Etudes Latines* XII, 96 ff

Schrijnen, J. and Mohrmann, C. (1937) *Studien zur Briefe des Hl. Cyprian. 2 Vols*. Nijmegen: Dekker & van de Vegt.

Schrijnen, J. (1939) *Collectanea Schrijnen - Verspreide Opsetten von Dr Jos. Schrijnen.* Nijmegen: Dekker & van de Vegt.

Sebesta, J. (2002) 'Vibia Perpetua: Mystic and Martyr', in Churchill, L.J., Brown, P.R. and Jeffrey, J. E. (eds.) *Women Writing Latin in Roman Antiquity, Late Antiquity, and the Early Christian Era.* Abingdon: Taylor & Francis Group.

Sedley, D. (2003) *The Cambridge companion to Greek and Roman Philosophy.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sittl, K. (1882) *Die lokalen Verschiedenheiten der lateinischen Sprache.* Erlangen: Deichert.

Sittl, K. (1891) *Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der classischen Alterthumswissenschaft.* Leipzig.

Solodow, J.B. (2010) *Latin Alive: The Survival of Latin in English and the Romance Languages.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Stanton, G. N. (2004) *Jesus and Gospel.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Stray, C. (1998) *Classics Transformed.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tennyson, A. (1885) 'September 21, To Virgil', in *Tiresias, and Other Poems.* London: Macmillan and Co.

Teeuwen, S.W.J. (1926) *Sprachlicher Bedeutungswandel bei Tertullian.* Paderborn: Druck und Verlag von Ferdinand Schöningh.

Thumb, A. (1895) *Handbuch der neugriechischen Volkssprache. Grammatik, Texte, Glossar.* Strassburg: Trübner.

Thumb, A. (1915) *Grammatik der neugriechischen Volkssprache.* Berlin: G. J. Göschen.

Tornau, C. and Cecconi, P. (eds.) (2014) *The Shepherd of Hermas in Latin: Critical Edition of the Oldest Translation Vulgata.* Berlin: De Gruyter.

Turner, C.H. (1920) 'The Shepherd of Hermas and the problem of its text', *Journal of Theological Studies*, 21 (83), pp. 193-209.

Turner, D.L. (2008) 'Matthew', in Yarbrough, R. and Stein, R. H. (eds.) *Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament.* Michigan: Baker.

van den Hout, T. (1999) *A Commentary on the Letters of M. Cornelius Fronto.* Leiden: Brill.

van Driel, Lodewijk, (1992) '19th Century Linguistics: The Dutch Development and the German Theme', in Nordegraaf, J., Versteegh, K. and Koerner, E.F.K. (eds.) *The History of Linguistics in the Low Countries,* Amsterdam: John Benjamin's Publishing Company.

van Ginneken, J. (1913) *Handboek de Nederlandische Taal, Deel 1, De sociologische structuur der Nederlandische taal.* Nijmegen: L.C.G. Malmberg

van Ginneken, J. and Kea, W. (1914) *Handboek der Nederlandische Taal; Deel 2, de sociologische structuur onzer taal II.* Nijmegen: L.C.G. Malmberg

van Wageningen, J. (1923) 'Minucius Felix et Tertullianus', *Mnemosyne,* 51, pp. 223-228.

Vermeulen, A.J. (1956) *The Semantic Development of Gloria in early-Christian Latin.* Nijmegen: Dekker & van de Vegt.

Vincent, N. (2016) 'Continuity and Change from Latin to Romance' in Adams, J.N., Vincent, N. and Knight, V. (eds.) *Early and Late Latin: Continuity or Change?* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Vives, L. (1552) *de Tradendis Disciplinis*. Lugduni : Apud Ioannem Frellonium,

von Soden, H. (1909) 'das lateinische Neue Testament in Afrika zur Zeit Cyprians nach Bibelhandschriften' in *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur,* Vol.3, Berlin: Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften,

Walsh, P.G. (1972) Review of L.Callebat, 'Sermo Cotidianus dans les Métamorphoses d'Apulée', *The Classical Review*, 22, p. 128.

Waszink, J. (1966) 'Message évangelique et culture hellénistique aux IIe et IIIe siècles', *Vigiliae Christianae*, 20 (1), p. 116.

Watson, E.W. (1896) 'The Style and Language of St Cyprian' in *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica* IV. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Wilfrid, Sister, (1928) 'Is there an Africitas?', *The Classical Weekly,* 22 (10), pp. 73-78.

Wilhelm, F. (1887) *De Minucii Felicis Octavio et Tertulliani Apologetico,* Breslauer philologische Abhandlungen, Breslau: Vratislaviae Koebner

Willems, W. and van Enckevort, H. (2009) 'Ulpia Noviomagus, Roman Nijmegen: The Batavian Capital of the Imperial Frontier', *Journal of Roman Archaeology*, Supplementary Series 73.

Williams, D.H. (2016) 'The Career of the Logos: A Brief Biography', *Philosophies,* 1 (3), pp. 209-219.

Wilson, A. (2012) 'Neo-Punic and Latin Inscriptions in Roman North Africa: Function and Display', in Mullen, A. and James, P. (eds.) *Multilingualism in the Graeco-Roman Worlds.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wilson-Kastner, P. (1981) *A Lost Tradition: Women Writers of the Early Church.* Maryland: University Press of America.

Wintle, M. (2005) 'Protestant Dominance and Confessional Politics', in Gilley, S. (ed.) *Cambridge History of Christianity, vol. 8.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wölfflin, E. (1884) 'Die lateinische Übersetzung des Briefes des Clemens an die Korinther', *Archiv für lateinische. Lexicographie,* 9, p. 81.

Woodham, H.E. (1843) *The Apology of Tertullian.* Cambridge: Deightons.

Wordsworth, J., Sanday, W. and White, H.J. (eds.) (1886) *Portions of the Gospels according to St. Mark and St. Matthew from the Bobbio Ms (k) now numbered G.vii.15 in the National Library at Turin : together with other fragments of the Gospels from six MSS in the libraries of St. Gall, Coire, Milan and Berne.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Wright, R. (1982) *Late Latin and Early Romance in Spain and Carolingian France.* Liverpool: Francis Cairns.

Zahn, T. (1868) *Der Hirt des Hermas.* Gotha: Friedrich Andreas Perthes.

Zink, M. (1867) *Der Mytholog Fulgentius: Ein Beitrag zur römischen Literaturgeschichte und zu Grammatik des afrikanischen Lateins.* Würzburg: Stuber.