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ABSTRACT

Antony of Padua (c.1195-1231) was a Portuguese Augustinian canon who joined the Franciscan Order in the lifetime of the Founder. Commissioned by Francis to teach theology to the friars, Antony exercised an itinerant preaching ministry in Italy and France before encapsulating his experience in his *Sermones Dominicales* and *Sermones Festivi*.

This thesis examines what we know from external evidence about Antony’s practice, and what we know from his written works about the models he followed and his own vision of the preacher’s work. It also examines briefly the tradition of Biblical interpretation in which he stood, especially as regards the so-called ‘four senses’ of Scripture (historical, allegorical, moral and anagogic).

The structure of the *Sermones Dominicales* is examined in some detail, and the sources Antony drew upon, both theological and secular, are briefly surveyed.

The heart of the dissertation is the examination of Antony’s use of the terms *concordare* and *concordantia* to express the relationship between the liturgical elements that underpin the Sermones- the Gospel, Introit and Epistle of the Mass, together with the Office reading - and in particular between the Gospel and the Old Testament.

The instances of these terms are enumerated and classified, and recent Antonian scholarship is surveyed in so far as it touches on this subject. Suggestions are offered regarding the origins of Antony’s terminology, and an attempt is made to uncover the theory underlying it, by means of an extensive analysis of the sermons for the Sundays after Pentecost. Some conclusions are drawn.

Finally, the thesis traces Antony’s influence on those who came after him, both preachers and theologians, and suggests reasons for the apparent eclipse of his approach, as well as reasons why it may be of renewed interest to theologians today.
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INTRODUCTION

Saint Antony of Padua is one of the most popular saints of the Catholic calendar. His image is found in countless churches, and even the undevout invoke him as a finder of lost property. In popular piety he is remembered above all as a miracle worker:

‘If, then, you ask for miracles:
death, error, all calamities,
the leprosy and demons fly,
and health succeeds infirmities.
The sea retires, and fetters break;
new life to broken limbs restore!
while what is lost returns again,
when young and old thy aid implore!’¹

It was with some surprise, then, that in 1989 I came across the newly re-edited and published *Sermones Dominicales et Festivi* of St Antony.² Until then, I had not realised that he had left any writings, let alone that they were still extant and available. Even a brief study convinced me of their intrinsic interest, and this work has grown from that initial encounter.

We are fortunate in now possessing a very fine critical edition of the certainly authentic works of St Antony. It has been in the course of preparing an English translation of them that I have been forced to ask a number of questions about Antony’s intentions and methods which I have tried to answer in this critique: in particular, about the nature and scope of his method of concordance, the juxtaposition and correlation of Scriptural passages, so that they illuminate and interpret one another.

---

¹ Responsory at Matins, Office of St Antony by Julian of Spires:
*Si quaeris miracula,*
mors, error, calamitas,
daemon, lepra fugiunt,
aegri surgunt sani.
*Cedunt mare, vincula,*
membra, resque perditas
petunt et accipiunt
iuvenes et cani.

² *Sancti Antonii Patavini Sermones Dominicales et Festivi* (Padua, 1979). For full reference, see Bibliography, and notes to Chapter IV. Referred to throughout as SDF I,II,III and page number; also by title of sermon and paragraph number.
We are fortunate, too, in that the primitive sources for the biography of St Antony have also been edited and published in recent years. The neglect of these sources over the centuries has been in proportion to the accretion of legendary material that has gathered around his memory. We now seem better placed to put Antony back again into his true historical context. This is because (a third piece of good fortune) the earliest sources are very early indeed, and appear to be conscientious in their effort to be accurate. An outline of these sources will be appropriate in this Introduction.

The earliest, written within two years of Antony's death by a friar who had been associated with him in his last years, is the 'Vita Prima' or 'Assidua'. The author says that he consulted Sueiro, bishop of Lisbon, for information about Antony's early life. Sueiro came to Italy for the canonization ceremony in 1232, and had doubtless made sure he was equipped with the relevant facts. The accounts of Antony's last years appear to be from the personal memories of the author. Where he had no information (notably regarding Antony's time in France), he makes no attempt to invent, but merely notes that the Saint visited many other provinces. He recounts in circumstantial detail miracles attributed to Antony's prayers after his death (again, probably, gained from the canonization proceedings), but when due allowance is made for the conventions of hagiographical language, his account of Antony's life is singularly free of the miraculous.

Not long after the 'Vita Prima', friar Julian of Spires composed the rhyming office for the Feast of St Antony which was still used in the Order until the Second Vatican Council. It was a companion to the Offices he composed for other Franciscan feasts. He also paraphrased and abbreviated the 'Vita Prima', and incorporated some material from Thomas of Celano's first 'Life' of St Francis. This

---

forms the ‘Vita Secunda’\(^5\), which became very well known. Other re-workings of this material are known from about the same period, but they do not add anything new.\(^6\)

The first important addition to our information is the work of Jean Rigauld, Franciscan bishop of Trégnier (d. 1323). In his ‘Life’ of St Antony (the ‘Vita Rigaldina’)\(^7\) he appeals to the testimony of friars he had known when he first entered the Order, and who had personally known and heard Antony in France. The material he gives us is anecdotal rather than systematic, and appears to be a little embroidered, but otherwise is of considerable help in filling out our knowledge of Antony's ministry in France, and about the style of his preaching generally.

Other works, which need to be treated with caution but which still add something to our knowledge, are those usually attributed to John Pecham, Franciscan archbishop of Canterbury (d. 1292), the so-called ‘Benignitas’\(^8\); and to the Italian Franciscan Pietro Raymondi (c. 1293), the ‘Legenda Raimundina’\(^9\).

I have made greatest use of these sources in the first chapter of this study, in which I have aimed to give a brief general historical framework for Antony's life, and to consider in particular those points which are most relevant to the study of his writings; namely, his early education, and the influences which shaped his thinking; the circumstances surrounding his appointment by Francis to teach theology to the friars, and his response to it; and, thirdly, some questions relating to the actual composition of the *Sermones*.

---


In my second chapter, I consider Antony as a preacher. What was the context in which the first generation of Franciscans operated? Again, I use the early sources to reveal what can be known of Antony's practice. I also consider the literary influences upon his style, especially the writings of Augustine, Gregory and Bernard, and compare them with some of his contemporaries. Finally, I use Antony's own 'prologues for preachers' to reconstruct after a fashion his own theory of and approach to the work of preaching.

In the third chapter, I survey briefly the tradition of Scriptural interpretation in which Antony worked, particularly regarding the four 'senses' of Scripture. This tradition was not a completely uniform one, and it is necessary to see where Antony stood in relation to other writers of the time.

In the fourth chapter, I consider the structure of the *Sermones Dominicales* in some detail, and its sources; and to a much lesser extent the *Sermones Festivi* which Antony left uncompleted at his death.

Chapter five reaches the heart of this study, the most original and characteristic aspect of Antony's work: his method of 'concordance'. Antony wanted to exhibit the harmony between the liturgical readings of the Mass and the Office, and in particular between the Old Testament and the Gospel. As we enumerate the instances of the terms 'concordare' and 'concordantia', we begin to see how he develops his ideas even as his work progresses. This raises various questions: where did he derive his ideas from? and, even more importantly, on what principles does he base his methodology? In this chapter I also survey and discuss recent work on the subject, and the 'state of the question'

Chapter six undertakes a detailed study of the *Sermones*, with a view to answering some of the questions raised in the previous chapter. I offer some tentative conclusions for discussion.
Finally, in chapter seven, I explore the aftermath of Antony’s work. How was it remembered? Why did it come to be so largely forgotten? How may it prove to have a renewed interest and relevance for some contemporary issues in theology?

Many of the sources I have used exist only in Latin (or at least, not in English) and I have made my own translations, with the original text in the Notes. For the Biblical texts, I have used the Douai-Challoner version, as being (in Ronald Knox’s phrase) ‘a good crib to the Latin’. I have modified it only where Antony’s own interpretation seemed to require it.
CHAPTER ONE

LIFE AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT

1.1 Antony's early life and education

St Antony was born at Lisbon, in 1195 (according to the traditional dating)\(^1\). His family house was probably on the site of the present S. António da Sé church, just west of the Cathedral where he was baptised with the name Fernão\(^2\). An early source\(^3\) calls his father a 'miles', that is, probably, a cavaleiro vilão, possibly the son of one of the crusader-knights settled near Lisbon after its conquest some half a century earlier, with a farm in the country and a house in the town\(^4\). His early education was at the Cathedral school\(^5\), where he would have learned the elements of grammar and rhetoric and the other liberal arts. The simple yet elegant Latin style of his Sermones is good evidence of a sound foundation. Around 1210 he entered the Augustinian monastery of São Vicente da Fora, just outside the city to the east. Here he would have been instructed in the Rule of St Augustine, his teachers probably using the 'De institutione novitiorum' of Hugh of St Victor\(^6\), and at least some Biblical and theological studies. He would also have been trained in the Liturgy, singing the Office daily with the canons. Possibly now, or later at Coimbra, he first

---

\(^1\) The date of Antony's birth cannot be determined precisely. The question has been discussed by G. Abate, 'Quanti anni visse S. Antonio di Padova' (1967, IS 7, 3-66); and by V. Gamboso: 'A proposito dell' età di S. Antonio' (1976, IS 16, 121-129). These authors base their arguments on the early biographies of the Saint. In 1981 a radiographical examination of Antony's remains was made, and the results were published by G. Fornaciari, F. Mallegini, and G. Ragaglini, 'Determinazione dell' età della morte e analisi di alcuni radiologici relativi a segmenti ossei di S. Antonio di Padova'; in V. Meneghelli and A. Poppo (edd): Ricognizione del corpo di S. Antonio di Padova: studi storici e medico-anthropologici (Padua, 1981) 179-188. These tests strongly suggest that Antony was about forty years old at his death in 1231, and that he was therefore born some four or five years earlier than the traditional date.

\(^2\) Abate, 'Fonti, I', 139: Ad cuinis [sc. cathedralis ecclesiae] plagam occidentalem felices beati Antonii progenitores, dignum juxta conditionis suae statum, domicilium possidebant. The crypt of the present church is said to mark the Saint's birthplace

\(^3\) Benignitas, Abate, 'Fonti', VII, 227: Nobili ortus progenie, patre scilicet Martino, Alphonsi milit, mater vero secundum propagationem carnis non infima, Maria nomine. Another early life, the 'Raimundina' says merely that Antony was of 'honestis parentibus'. Abate, 'Fonti, V', 3.

\(^4\) For the general historical background, see H.V. Livermore, A New History of Portugal (Cambridge, 1966), especially 43-72

\(^5\) Abate, 'Fonti, I', 140: Hunc minimum in supra dicta Sancti Dei Genereticis ecclesia sacris litteris imbuedum tradunt, et futurum Christ praecorum, quodam praeraegia, ministrorum Christi educationi committunt.

\(^6\) J. Châtillon, 'Saint Antony of Padua and the Victorines' (Greyfriars Review, 8, no3, 350)
heard and sang some of the Sequences of Adam of St Victor, which he later cited\(^7\), and almost certainly it was here that he first came across the poems of Ovid which he was to quote in his sermons\(^8\). After two years, finding that he was too accessible to his family and friends, Fernando (whom from now on I will refer to as Antony) asked to be transferred to the monastery of Santa Cruz at Coimbra. It may be, too, that he considered this a better place for the academic life to which he was evidently suited.

The School at Coimbra had some eminent Masters and, apparently, a voluminous library\(^9\). The monastery had been founded in 1132. Da Gama Caeiro has shown that during the twelfth and early thirteenth centuries several religious had attended the Paris Schools and obtained the *licentia docendi*. Which schools these were is not known, but as the statutes of Santa Cruz (1162) required members of the community to stay in houses of the Order when away from Coimbra, it is likely that at Paris they resided at the abbey of St Victor. If any went in the first days of Santa Cruz, they could have heard the lectures of some of the most famous Victorines (though Hugh died in 1141), such as Andrew of St Victor (before he became Abbot of Wigmore), Achard (before he became Bishop of Avranches in 1161), and Richard of St Victor. Masters of that generation would not have taught Antony, but they might well have established a Victorine tradition at Santa Cruz. Antony's teachers would have been in Paris around 1200. In 1190 Sancho I had given money to pay for the education of canons in the Paris schools. Prior João and Canon Raimondo are two known names, and they were still active in 1228. At Paris, they could have been contemporaries of Thomas Gallus, of whose association with Antony more will be said below. Of Antony at this period the earliest biography says:

> He always cultivated his innate talents with special eagerness and exercised his mind with meditation. Day and night, whenever the occasion arose, he would not neglect to read the Scriptures. In reading the Bible with attention to its historical truth, he also strengthened his faith with allegorical comparisons; and, in applying the words of the Scriptures to himself, he edified his affections with virtues. In examining, out of healthy curiosity, the deep sense of God's words, he protected his intellect with scriptural testimonies against the pitfalls of error. For this reason, he often returned to the words of the saints with

\(^{7}\) Châtillon, op. cit. 352

\(^{8}\) Ovid's poems (*Ovidius minor*) are known to have been in the library of S. Vicente. See following note.

diligent enquiry. And, indeed, he entrusted to his tenacious memory whatever he read, so
that in a short time he was able to acquire a knowledge of the Scriptures that no one else
hoped to possess.  

We can deduce the authors that Antony studied from his later Sermones, and
confirmation is given by the known contents of the Coimbra library: The Glossa
Ordinaria et Interlinearea, the Historia Scholastica, St Gregory’s Moralia in Job and
Homiliae super Ezechiele, the Sermons of St Augustine, were all available, along
with some Bede, and various scientific works, and the Benjamin Minor of Richard of
St Victor 11. The strong Cistercian influence in Portugal explains his familiarity with
the writings of St Bernard, who had been dead for little more than half a century 12.

How great, and of what kind, was the Victorine influence upon Antony? The
question has been discussed by, for instance, J. Châtillon and A. Pompei 13, who have
been inclined to see such influence in terms of the content of Victorine teaching.
However, explicit references to Victorine authors in Antony’s writings are relatively
few, and he does not seem to pursue the well-known Victorine interest in the literal
sense of the Scriptures 14. Perhaps we should look for Victorine influence in a less
explicit way. Mary Carruthers has noted both the general importance of memory­
training in the Middle Ages, and the particular role of Hugh of St Victor in this
regard 15. It is reasonable to suppose that the Coimbran masters who had studied in
Paris brought back and employed the teaching and learning techniques they had met

10 B. Przewozny, Life of St Anthony ‘Assidua’ (Padua, 1984) 5f., Vita Prima 4.3-6, Abate,
‘Fonti I’, 141-2: Non mediocri autem studio semper colebat ingentium et animum meditationibus
exercebat: nec diebus aut noctibus, pro temporis convenientia, a lectione divina cessabat. Nunc
historiae veritas textum legens, allegorica comparatione roborabat fide; nunc, conversis
Scripturarum verbis, aedificabat moribus affectionem. Hinc, profunda sermonum Dei felici curiositate
percussit, contra eorum foveas testimoniis Scripturae intellectum munivit; hinc Sanctorum dicta
sedula indagatione revoluit. Ita deum lecta tenaci commendabat memoria, ut insperata cunctis
Scripturarum scientia festinato mereretur affluere

11 da Gama Caeiro, op. cit.

12 French Cistercians had been introduced into Portugal by king Afonso Henriques, to settle parts
of the formerly Muslim-held territory between the Mondego and the Tagus after the conquest of Lisbon
in 1147. Their chief house was at Alcobaça (founded 1157, church dedicated 1162), possibly ‘the purest
and most majestic ever created by Cistercian genius’ (cf. S. Rossi & A. De Oliveira, Fatima (Fatima,
1994) 98), and their cultural influence was to be immense.

13 Châtillon, op. cit., and A. Pompei, ‘I ‘sermones’ di S. Antonio e la teologia francese’
(1982, IS 22, 757-86; trans. as ‘The ‘Sermones’ of St Anthony and Franciscan theology’ (Greyfriars
Review 9.3, 277-308)

14 cf. B. Smalley, The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages (Oxford, 1952)
there, and that this Victorine methodology helped to shape the school of Coimbra. If Antony was already naturally endowed with a powerful memory, the mnemonic techniques of the Victorine School will have sharpened that aptitude. When we come to examine Antony’s own methodology in the Sermones, we should bear this background in mind.

There is another point in his life when Antony may have felt Victorine influence. At some time (either before his mission in France, or after his return) Antony was in contact with Thomas Gallus, Abbot of Vercelli. Thomas was an Augustinian canon, trained in Paris among the Victorines, and in all probability a contemporary there of some of Antony’s Coimbra masters; he may even have overlapped with Innocent III. He was invited, around 1218, by Cardinal Bicchieri to found a new Augustinian monastery in Italy, at Vercelli. He was author of a Commentary on Isaiah, in his latter life had a particular interest in the writings of the pseudo-Dionysius. The precise date and circumstances of Antony’s contact with Thomas are controverted16, however, some years later, in one of his writings on the ‘Areopagite’, completed in 1244, Thomas refers to Antony in the context of the holiness and learning suitable for bishops and others who treat of divine mysteries:

I had close experience of this in saint Antony, of the Order of Friars Minor, who was quick to understand mystical theology, and firm in retaining it, even though he was not so well-versed in secular literature. After the example of John the Baptist, he was on fire and gave light from that fire: ‘John was a burning fire and a shining light’ [Jn 5.35]17

This would seem to show that Antony did not cease to study when he became an itinerant preacher. He continued to stock his memory with new information as opportunity offered. The words ‘familiariter expertus sum’ imply a reasonably close acquaintance. Antony was not particularly versed in secular learning (at least by Paris standards) but was quick to understand and tenacious in remembering sacred doctrine. In communicating what he had learnt, he was eminent in both charity and clarity, a

17 *Quod eclairm in sancto Antonio ordinis fratrum Minorum familiariter expertus sum qui misticam theologiam prompte haust et firmiter retinuit, cum ipse litteris secularibus minus habundaret, sed exemplo Johannis Baptistae ardebat et ex ardore lucebat: Ioannes erat lucerna ardens et lucens.* cf. Châtillon, op. cit. 357
'burning and shining lamp' like John the Baptist. What Thomas meant exactly by 'mistica theologia' we are not sure. There are no signs in Antony's works that he shared Thomas's interest in Dionysius. However, Théry has pointed to another of Thomas's 'heroes', Richard of St Victor, and Châtillon has pointed out that while Antony quotes some quite long passages from Richard (though not by name), these are not from works found in the inventories of the S. Vicente and Santa Cruz libraries. Also, Antony's citations from Richard are more numerous and longer in the Festival sermons than in the Sunday Sermons. He therefore concludes (reasonably, as it seems to me) that somewhere between the composition of the two sets Antony had access to a library containing works by Richard. He suggests that Thomas Gallus' eulogy of Antony was prompted by the latter's ready interest in an author he had just been introduced to.

The long and eventful Papacy of Innocent III formed the background to Antony's early life. Antony's later use of his Sermons— he quotes them more often than the works of any other of his contemporaries, once even by name—suggests admiration for the great Pope and a willingness to follow his lead in Church reform. It is said that some of his masters accompanied the bishop of Coimbra to the Fourth Lateran Council. Antony would have been well aware of the need for Church reform and the lines along which it was being promoted by the Papacy. An important part of Innocent's strategy was the encouragement of preaching, and the parallel foundation of the Franciscan and Dominican Orders served to promote this aim. In 1209, Francis of Assisi had received verbal approval of his way of life from Pope Innocent. By 1217 there were Franciscans in Portugal, including a small community at Coimbra, at S. António dos Olivais, on the hill north of the city. The friars would seek alms from the monastery of Santa Cruz, and 'Although they were not learned men, they taught the substance of the Scriptures with their actions.'

---

18 cf. da Gama Caeiro, op. cit.
19 Antony quotes Innocent eighteen times. See Chapter II below.
20 The first friars were received with suspicion, as possible heretics; but they gained the patronage of Queen Urraca, who gave them a site at Coimbra, and her sister-in-law Sancia gave a church at Alenquer, north of Lisbon. From here the Moroccan mission set out.
21 Przewozny 7, Vita Prima, 5.3. Abate, 'Fonti I', 143: litteras quidem nescientes, sed virtutem litterae operibus edocentes.
Part of Francis's (and Innocent's) vision was the mission to Islam\(^{22}\). After Innocent’s death, Francis sent friars westwards to Morocco, and travelled himself to Egypt and Palestine. Although he himself was well received, being recognised as a holy man, Jacques de Vitry (bishop of Acre) noted that the preaching of the friars was sometimes confrontational:

The Saracens gladly listened to the Friars Minor preach as long as they explained faith in Christ and the doctrine of the gospel; but as soon as their preaching attacked Mohammed and openly condemned him as a liar and traitor, then these ungodly men heaped blows upon them and chased them from their cities; they would have killed them if God had not miraculously protected his sons.\(^{23}\)

This was the fate of those sent to the West; they passed through Portugal to reach Muslim territory, but on arrival in Africa were quickly put to death (Jan 16th, 1220). Their bodies were retrieved, and by royal decree were given burial at Santa Cruz\(^{24}\). It may be that Antony was already disillusioned with the political and factional division in the community, and that he compared it unfavourably with the simple life of the friars, but it was certainly this experience that finally inspired him to seek permission to become a friar, and to go and preach the Gospel to the Muslims.

---

\(^{22}\) Regarding the mission to Islam, the Rules of 1221 and 1223 provide as follows (quotations are from \textsc{M.A.Habig (ed) St Francis of Assisi. Writings and Early Biographies. English Omnibus of the Sources for the Life of St Francis} (Chicago, 1973). This is usually cited as 'Omnibus of Sources'; abbreviated OS):

(Rule of 1221, Ch 16) Missionaries among the Saracens and other unbelievers. Our Lord told his apostles: Behold, I am sending you forth like sheep in the midst of wolves. Be therefore wise as serpents, and guileless as doves (Mt 10:16). And so the friars who are inspired by God to work as missionaries among the Saracens and other unbelievers must get permission to go from their minister, who is their servant. The minister, for his part, should give them permission and raise no objection, if he sees they are suitable; he will be held to account for it before God, if he is guilty of imprudence in this or any other matter.

The brothers who go can conduct themselves among them spiritually in two ways. One way is to avoid quarrels or disputes and be subject to every human creature for God's sake (1 Pet 2:13), so bearing witness to the fact that they are Christians. Another way is to proclaim the word of God openly, when they see that it is God's will, calling on their hearers to believe in God almighty, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, the Creator of all, and in the Son, the Redeemer and Saviour, that they may be baptized and become Christians, because unless a man be born again of water, and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God (Jn 3:5).

... No matter where they are, the friars must always remember that they have given themselves up completely and handed over their whole selves to every enemy, visible or invisible, for love of him. [There follow ten texts regarding persecution] (OS 43-44)

(Rule of 1223, Ch 12) Of those who wish to go among the Saracens and other unbelievers.

If any of the friars is inspired by God to go among the Saracens and other unbelievers, he must ask permission from his provincial minister. The ministers, for their part, are to give permission only to those whom they see are fit to be sent. ...

\(^{23}\) \textit{Historia Orientalis}, ch 32 (cf. OS 1609-1613);

\(^{24}\) \textit{Vita Prima} 5.1-2. \textsc{Abate}, 'Fonti 1', 142f
Early biographies stress his desire for martyrdom; but one may wonder whether another motive was also present in one brought up in Lisbon, where Christians, Jews and Muslims had lived together for centuries, and where Moorish merchants were still a familiar sight, even after the liberation of the city. Perhaps Antony felt that he had a better chance of converting the Moors, rather than antagonising them, than did the zealous but uneducated friars who had given their lives. It is likely that by this time he was already a priest, perhaps with the *licentia docendi*.

1.2 The Appointment of Antony to teach theology to the friars.

After the canonical formalities had been completed, but apparently without a new noviciate ( Honorius III only made this compulsory in September 1220\(^26\)), Fernando became a friar, taking the name Antony after the patron saint of the community, and soon received permission to go to Africa; but on reaching Morocco he fell ill, and returning by sea was driven by storms as far as Sicily, from where he made his way to Assisi in time for the Chapter of Pentecost, 1221. This would seem to have been the famous ‘Chapter of the Mats’. According to the custom of the Order, all the friars who were able were supposed to assemble at the Church of St Mary of the Angels (the ‘Porziuncola’) near Assisi at Pentecost. On this occasion the numbers present were estimated to be between three and five thousand\(^27\). When Francis had returned from the East in 1219, he had found controversy among the friars regarding the Rule- that is, the simple form of life approved by Pope Innocent. He had therefore been working on a longer and more detailed Rule, to be presented at this Chapter.

Francis was a sick man. He had already resigned his office in favour of Peter di Catania, a trusted friend, but Peter had died untimely and instead Francis had chosen Elias of Cortona as his Vicar General, a man of very different stamp. The Rule

\(^25\) See F. da Gama Caeiro, ‘A ordenação sacerdotal de Santo Antonio’ (1965, *Itinerarium* 46, 444-60). Arguments about the date of Antony’s ordination have been eased by the recent evidence regarding the date of his birth (see note 1 above).

\(^26\) Bull ‘Cum secundum consilium’; cf Rule of 1221, ch 2 (O.S. 32)

\(^27\) We have a vivid account of the Chapter of 1221 from Giordano da Giano, who was there, and for whom it was a turning point in his life- almost by mistake, he was assigned to the German Mission, and wrote an account of it. (cf. G. Fortini, *Nova Vita di San Francesco* (Assisi, 1959); trans. H. Moak, *Francis of Assisi* (New York, 1985) 477-9
of 1221 was criticized by leading friars, especially in relation to the observance of poverty, and in the event never received Papal approbation. It was replaced by the Rule of 1223, approved by the Bull 'Solet Annuere'.

This, then, was Antony's first experience of being among so many friars at once, and his first (and possibly only) sight of the founder. At the close of the Chapter, when all the other friars were assigned to Provinces, Antony found himself unassigned. He approached the Minister Provincial of upper Italy, Brother Graziano, and sought leave to accompany him. He did not reveal his knowledge of theology, only that he was a priest, and was sent to the hermitage of Montepaolo so that the brethren might have someone to celebrate Mass for them. Here he lived for nearly a year in obscurity, until in 1222, attending an ordination at Forli, he was commanded to preach extempore, and his gifts and learning were manifested. The account of Antony's first sermon as a Franciscan is as follows:

But, when each one [of the Dominican friars] began to say quite resolutely that he neither wanted nor ought to preach something improvised, then the superior turned to friar Anthony and ordered him to proclaim to those who were assembled whatever the Holy Spirit might suggest to him. The superior did not believe that Anthony knew anything of the Scriptures nor thought that he had read anything beyond, perhaps, what concerned the Church's Office. He trusted only one indication, that is, that he had heard him speak Latin when necessity required it. In truth, although Anthony was so industrious that he relied on his memory rather than on books, and although he abundantly overflowed with the grace of mystical language, the friars nonetheless knew him as more skilful in washing kitchen utensils than in expounding the mysteries of Scripture. Why say anything else? Anthony resisted as much and as long as he could. At last, because of the loud insistence of all those present, he began to speak with simplicity. But when that writing-reed of the Holy Spirit (I am referring to Anthony's tongue) began to speak of many topics prudently, in quite a clear manner and using few words, then the friars, struck by wonder and admiration, listened to the orator attentively and unanimously. Indeed, the unexpected depth of his words increased their astonishment; but, to no lesser degree, the spirit with which he spoke and his fervent charity edified them.
We note that ‘the superior had heard him speak Latin’; that is, presumably, not just when saying Mass or Office, but in actual conversation when there was no common vernacular. It was the local superior who was present; the ‘minister’ was informed shortly afterwards\(^{31}\), leading to Antony’s first period of public preaching. From then on, he was constantly preaching in northern Italy.

To understand what happened next, it is necessary to go back a few years. Some members of the great Law School at Bologna had already been attracted by the Franciscan way of life, and we are told that one Doctor of Law, Giovanni da Sciacca, joined the friars while continuing to teach\(^{32}\). The minister Provincial wished to establish a house of studies similar to that of the Dominicans; but when Francis visited Bologna and found that a certain building was called ‘the house of the friars’, he ordered all the friars out of it, including the sick\(^{33}\). Only when Cardinal Ugolino, who was nearby, declared that the building belonged to him, were the friars allowed to return. Francis was in a dilemma. We have a vivid description of his own preaching in Bologna in 1222\(^{34}\), but he must have realised that learned friars could hardly forget their learning, nor would the Church permit to preach those unfit to do so. Even in 1223, the Rule would prescribe that friars should preach only ‘of vice and virtue, punishment and glory’\(^{35}\), but already the campaign against heresy required preachers who could match learned heretics on their own terms. It seems that it was Ugolino who persuaded Francis (how willingly we do not know) to allow the re-opening of the Studium at Bologna, and to permit those friars capable of it to receive proper theological training. One is bound to ask, was it Ugolino who brought Antony to Francis’ attention as a suitable Lector for the Studium? Ugolino had certainly been

---


\(^{32}\) *Fortini*, op. cit. 443

\(^{33}\) *Celano*, *Vita Secunda S. Francisci*, 28; OS 412

\(^{34}\) See below, Chapter II.

---
travelling in northern Italy during the time Antony was first gaining his reputation as a preacher, and it is therefore possible that they had met. Ugolino was a kinsman of Innocent III, and might well have found a rapport with the young friar who admired the great Pope: indeed, it may have been Ugolino who introduced Antony to Innocent’s Sermons. At all events, Francis commissioned Antony to teach theology to the brothers, the accepted text of his letter being

To Brother Antony, my bishop. Brother Francis sends greeting.
It is agreeable to me that you should teach the friars sacred theology, so long as they do not extinguish the spirit of prayer and devotedness over this study, as is contained in the Rule. Farewell\(^{36}\).

How did Antony fulfil the task laid upon him? Despite the claims of some\(^37\), there seems little evidence that he undertook a course of lectures at Bologna or anywhere else. It is true that the *Benignitas* says:

Antony himself was the first lector in the Order to occupy a chair of theology, and that was at Bologna; because at that time this was the most flourishing Studium south of the Alps, and it seemed to the friars to be the most useful place to establish Antony as lector.\(^38\)

The *Vita Raimundina* says:

The wisdom of blessed Antony was perceived to be so great that he was appointed to teach theology publicly, to the friars and to others. He was the first in the Order to exercise the office of an academic teacher, so as to train his successors and to establish study and progress.\(^39\)

and much later Bartholomew of Pisa, writing between 1385 and 1390 says:

\(^{35}\) Rule (1223), ch. 9 (OS, 63)

\(^{36}\) For a brief discussion regarding the authenticity of St Francis’ Letter to Antony, and references to further debate, see OS 162-164. The consensus of opinion seems to be moving towards accepting the letter. Thomas of Celano, in his Second Life of St Francis, composed at the request of the Chapter held at Genoa in 1244 under Crescentius of Jesi, refers to St Francis’ reverence to theologians. Antony, by then canonized, is called ‘Blessed’: (Francis) ‘considered doctors of sacred theology to be worthy of even greater honours. For he once had it written down for all: “All theologians and those who minister to us the words of God we must honour and venerate as those who minister to us spirit and life” (Testament). And when he wrote once to Blessed Anthony, he had this salutation placed at the beginning of the letter: “To Brother Anthony, my bishop.”’ (OS 493)


\(^{38}\) *Benignitas* M.2; *Abate*, ‘Fonti VII’, 233: *Siquidem ipse Antonius primus fuit lector in Ordine qui rexit, et hoc apud Bononiam, in theologica facultate, quia citra montes ibi florebat potioris excellentiae, in cunctis liberalibus modernarum scientis, eodem tempore, Studium; et visum fuit fratribus, maioris utpota sufficientiae, ibidem Antonium instituere pro lector.*

\(^{39}\) *Vita Raimundina* 8.4; *Abate*, ‘Fonti V’, 24: *Beati igitur Antonii tanta sapientia deprehensa, ad doctrinam scholasticam inductus est fratribus et aliis publice impendendam. Primus enim in Ordine doctoris scholastici exercuit officium, ut sequentium informaret ac confirmaret studium et proiectum.*
Even though he did not have a Master's degree, he was lector at Bologna, Toulouse and Padua. 40

However, it seems likely that these authors imagined Antony as occupying a position similar to that of lectors in their own times, when studies in the Order were more systematic. Antony's own teaching ministry was probably much less formal. Not until 1230 was the official prohibition on doctrinal and scriptural preaching by the friars rescinded by Ugolino (by then Pope Gregory IX). We must bear this prohibition in mind when assessing the reason for the very practical and moral thrust of Antony's teaching as revealed by his Sermones. Though qualified to treat Scriptural matters himself (and perhaps this is all that is implied by calling him the first 'lector' in the order), he had to prepare friars for a more limited range of preaching, at least for the moment, while equipping them for a possibly wider apostolate if and when this should be permitted. His first response to Francis' commission, it seems, was to undertake an itinerant ministry that took him from northern Italy to central France. Was he finding out what sort of training was available in different places? Or was he merely widening and deepening his own experience of preaching, especially in regions affected by heresy? It is hard to say, especially in view of the difficulty of establishing an accurate chronology of his life between 1222 and 1226. The Assidua is silent, and later sources are fragmentary and anecdotal. The following outline has some plausibility41, but cannot be regarded as established. In Lent, 1224, Antony seems to have preached at Vercelli, and the following September he seems to have set out for Provence. By Michaelmas he had reached Arles, in time to preach at the Provincial Chapter. This is well-attested, in fact it is recorded in Celano's first 'Life' of St Francis, published in 1229 when Antony was still alive, and yet already able to be alluded to in the expectation that he would be well-known to all.

I will give one example from among many, which I know from reliable witnesses. When at one time Brother John of Florence, who had been appointed by St Francis minister of our brothers in Provence, was celebrating a chapter of the brothers in that same province... Brother Anthony was also present at the chapter, he whose mind the Lord opened that he might understand the Scriptures and speak among all the people words about Jesus that were sweeter than syrup or honey from the comb. While he was preaching very fervently

---


and devoutly to the brothers on this topic, Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews, ... Brother Monaldo... saw with his bodily eyes Blessed Francis raised up into the air, his arms extended as though on a cross, and blessing the brothers.  

He went on to Montpelier, then subject to the King of Aragon, but did not remain long there, although later tradition speaks of him as the first lector of theology there.

The Benignitas speaks of 'tempore quo vir sanctus in Montepessulano legebat,' and a fourteenth century preacher says, 'fuit enim lector in Montepessulano, ut dicitur, primus'. He moved on to Toulouse, the centre of Catharism and capital of Occitania, and remained there for perhaps three months, and in September 1225 he was appointed Guardian of the Friary at Puy-en-Valay, in the Auvergne. In November he attended the Synod at Bourges, which was attended by Papal Legates and resulted in the excommunication of Count Raymond VII (28th Jan, 1226); but all that is recorded of Antony's address to the Synod is a rebuke to the Archbishop, Simon of Sully ('tibi loquar, cornute- I'm talking to you in the mitre!'). He was elected Custos of Limoges, which entailed overseeing several friaries which he visited conscientiously. He founded a hermitage at Brive, where the friars might retreat after the example of Francis. Towards the end of 1226 news was received from Brother Elias that Francis had died, and a successor must be chosen the following Pentecost.

---

42 Celano, Vita prima S. Francisci, ch XVIII (OS 572). The chapter at Arles was probably in 1224, presumably at Michaelmas, according to the custom of the 1221 Rule: Ch 18, 'The ministers in chapter': 'Each year, on the feast of St Michael the Archangel, the ministers and their friars may hold a chapter wherever they wish, to treat of the things of God. All the ministers are bound to attend the chapter at St Mary's of the Porziuncola at Pentecost, those from overseas or beyond the Alps once every three years, and the others once each year, unless the Minister General, who is the servant of the whole Order, has made other arrangements.' (OS 45f). The Rule of 1223, Ch 8, makes the ordinary interval between General Chapters (attended by ministers and custodes) three years, which may be varied by the Minister General, and continues: 'After the Pentecost Chapter, the provincial ministers and custodes may summon their subjects to a chapter in their own territory once in the same year, if they wish and it seems worthwhile.' (OS 62) The province of Provence was established as early as 1219; its provincial was John Bonelli, sent there by Francis. See OS 572, nn 162-171. St Bonaventure tells of this incident (Legenda Major 4.10, OS 660-661) referring to 'the famous preacher whom we now honour as St Anthony', and adding that that 'the saint himself remarked that he had been there, so that they had external proof for what they already believed.' In Legenda Major 13.10 he refers to the incident again, and the fact that St Antony was preaching on the proclamation fixed to the Cross (OS 736). The incident is reported also in Chronica XXIV Generalium (Analecta Franciscana III, 230).

43 Benignitas, S.3. Abate, 'Fonti V', 238

44 cf. V. Gamboso, I tre panegirici Antoniani di Corrado di Sassonia e altri sette di autori sconosciuti, (1974, IS 14, 101)

45 Clasen, op. cit. 26

46 Vita Rigaldina, 8.6. Abate, 'Fonti, VI', 59.
Our primary source of information about Antony’s time in France is the *Vita* written by the Franciscan bishop, Jean Rigauld. He bases himself largely on earlier lives, but includes some fourteen incidents not previously attested. He gives as his authority ‘brothers of proven virtue’ whom he had known personally when he first entered the Order. Rigauld was also familiar with Antony’s own writings, which he quotes directly at one point, linking Antony’s oral preaching with his written work:

> Often when he was preaching to the friars and to the people about poverty, he quoted the Gospel text ‘Foxes have holes, and the birds of the air their nests, but the Son of Man has no-where to lay his head’; and that of Ecclesiasticus, ‘There is nothing more wicked than the love of money’, as for instance in the first sermon of his ‘Sunday Work’. And in the same sermon he says that riches are rightly compared to thorns by the Saviour, because they catch hold, and pierce, and draw blood from whoever possesses them.

Although Antony’s period in France is shrouded in uncertainty, it must have provided much of the experience of preaching which he was to distil in his *Sermones*. His position as Custos would have given him the opportunity to give theological teaching to the friars, and the same would be true when he became a Minister Provincial in Italy. Nevertheless, the commission ‘to teach theology to the friars’ was to be fulfilled not by formal lectures, but by what he and Rigauld call the *Opus Dominicae*.

---

47 *Vita Rigaldina*, Prol. 2. Abate, ‘Fonti VI’, 38: *Verum, quia idem sanctus Antonius in Lemovicensi Custodia, dum adhuc viveret, Custos extitit assignatus, ubi quaedam mirabilia per eum Deus dignatus est operari, quae, a principio quo Ordinem intravi, per Fratrum approbatae virtutis certam relationem didici, quae in Vita eius inserta non repperi; idcirco, non ex praesumptione, sed ex sancti devotione, illa volui ordinare, ne non collecta perirent et paulatim a Fratrum memoria deciderent, et ut audientium intelligentiam ad Sancti maiorem reverentiam excitarent.*

1.3 The writing of the *Sermones Dominicales* and the *Sermones Festivi*.

Because Antony's preaching and writing were conditioned, at least in part, by the need to combat error, something at least needs to be said at this point about contemporary issues. Religious dissent was not uncommon, because the official Church was enmeshed in the established social order, and was badly placed to remedy injustice and abuse. In effect, it was in a similar position to the religious establishment of Judaism at the time of Christ. Those who took the Gospel seriously could not but protest, and such protest came not only from the poor and dispossessed, but even from churchmen and theologians. It was often spread by wandering preachers of an 'evangelical' type, who varied from orthodox, through the merely eccentric, to definitely unorthodox. There were also 'poverty movements' reacting against the wealth and worldliness of the Church. Cistercianism itself had shared this ideal, as did the Franciscan movement later on. As an example of a movement on the fringes of heresy, we may take that instigated in Lyons by Valdès. Though he fell foul of the local episcopate, he met with some sympathy in Rome, and by the end of the century the 'Poor Men of Lyons' or 'Waldenses', together with the similar 'Humiliati' were numerous in southern France and northern Italy. Valdès' own influence was in favour of moderation and reconciliation with the official Church; and Innocent III showed subtlety and understanding in dealing with the phenomenon, seeking to re-integrate it and bring it within the ambit of Canon Law. He allowed those who sought reconciliation to continue a corporate identity akin to a religious order; he permitted them to preach, even lay and married people, as long as they confined themselves to simple moral exhortation, and kept off theology and scriptural interpretation. In Italy at least this policy had a certain success, at least for a time, at the beginning of the thirteenth century. In the Midi and Lombardy Waldenses and Humiliati proved effective preachers against Catharism. Thus there were many who were only (I would say) 'accidentally' heretics, in that their zeal outstripped their education; and it was not only wise ecclesiastics such as Innocent who saw this, but even simple laymen.

---

such as Francis, who accordingly demanded of their followers a submissive loyalty to the Holy See. Francis was by no means alone—Italian hermits such as Giovanni Bruno and Pietro di Morrone also stressed the need for doctrinal authority.\textsuperscript{50}

Antony was entirely in sympathy with the contemporary movement for the reform of abuses in the Church. Time and again in his \textit{Sermones} he is outspoken against corrupt prelates and religious, in a way that can seem astonishing to us. For instance, he follows Jacques de Vitry, Innocent III and others in quoting Isaiah 56.9ff:

\begin{quote}
His watchmen are all blind. They are all ignorant: dumb dogs not able to bark, seeing vain things, sleeping and loving dreams. And most impudent dogs, they never had enough: the shepherds themselves knew no understanding.
\end{quote}

and continues:

The watchmen of the Church are all blind, deprived of the light of life and knowledge. They are dumb dogs, with the devil’s sop in their mouths, and so unable to bark against the wolf... They have all turned aside into their own way, not that of Jesus Christ; every one after his own gain. \textit{This is their dark and slippery way [Ps 34.6]}, from first even to last, from the chief pig down to the smallest piglet.\textsuperscript{51}

Comparing ‘soft-living prelates’ with bears, he says:

We should note, further, that just as the bear’s head is weak, so the mind of the Church’s prelates is weak, unable to resist the temptations of the devil; but in their arms and legs there is great strength for rapine and lust. They creep into the hives of the bees— the houses of the poor— with a great appetite for the honeycombs of praise and vainglory, \textit{salutations in the market-place, the first places at feasts and the first chairs in the synagogues [Mt 23.6-7]}, which they deny to their inferiors.\textsuperscript{52}

Monks and canons do not escape his sharp eye and pen:

Nowadays there is not a market place, not a court—whether secular or ecclesiastical—where you will not find monks and religious... In their lawsuits they gather parties, appear before judges, hire lawyers and barristers, and call witnesses. With these, they are prepared to swear oaths for the sake of transitory things, frivolous and vain. Tell me, you fatuous religious, was it in the prophets, or in the Church’s Gospels, or in St Paul’s Epistles, or in the Rules of St Benedict or St Augustine, that you found these lawsuits,
these disputes about transitory and perishable things, these shouts and protests? Did not rather the Lord say to Apostles, monks and all religious (and not just by way of counsel, but by precept) that they should choose the way of perfection?53

There are many such passages, often with quite amusing analogies (the bad prelate is like ‘an ape on the roof’54), and word-pictures of the behaviour of both clerics and worldly rulers. Thus, as I have said, Antony was a part of the ‘protest movement’ of his time.

Catharism was another matter, a threat to the Church of a very different kind than that posed by the failings of its own members. Whatever its origins, and the circumstances of its arrival in the West, it managed to root itself effectively in Occitania, and especially in the Toulouse region. A detailed survey of its doctrines would take us too far afield, but some summary is necessary. Madaule55 sees its theoretical origin in the Problem of Evil: if God is good, he cannot be responsible for evil, which must therefore derive from some other being. Catharism did not always follow a full-blooded Dualism of two equal and opposite Principles; often, the material world was regarded as the work of a Demiurge, or Sathanas, inferior to God. Souls are created by God (sometimes they are thought to be fallen angels), but they are imprisoned in material bodies from which they need deliverance. This is brought about by Christ, but a Christ very different from that of Catholicism. The Cathar Christ did not come to atone for sin by his sacrificial death; indeed he was not truly incarnate at all, but an Angel with the appearance of a body (so too was the Virgin Mary), who taught how we might be freed from the world of matter. Catharism rejected most of the Old Testament, whose God was the Demiurge, although it esteemed the Prophets who had a more spiritual teaching. Because of this, we shall

53 Lent II(B), 4; SDF I, 106f: Hodie non sunt mundinae, non celebrantur curiae saeculares vel ecclesiasticae, in quibus non invenias monachos et religiosos. ‘Emunt et revendunt, aedificant et destruunt, mutant quadrata rotundis. In causis partes convocant, testes inducunt, cum ipsis parati iurare pro re transitoria, frivola et vana. Dicite mihi. O fatui religiosi, si in prophetis vel Christi evangeliiis, aut Pauli epistolis, si in sancti Benedicti regula, vel beati Augustini, istas litigationes et evagationes et causarum, pro re transitoria et peritura, acclamationes et protestationes invenistis. Immo dicit Dominus apostolis, monachis et omnibus religiosis, non consulendo sed praecipiendo, quia viam elegerunt perfectionis.

54 Pentecost IX, 7; SDF II, 14. 'Simia in tecto'; The phrase is borrowed from Bernard, De consideratione II, 7, 14; PL 182.750

see Antony stressing more than once the identity of the God of the Old and the God of the New Testament; for instance, he says:

The God of the New Testament is one and the same as the God of the Old, and is indeed Jesus Christ the Son of God. We may apply to him the words of Isaiah: I myself that spoke, behold, I am here [Is 52.6]. I spoke to the fathers in the prophets, I am here in the truth of the Incarnation. That is the justification for seeking to concord the scriptures of both Testaments... 56

Again, in reference to Christ’s words, ‘It is my Father that glorifieth me, of whom you say he is your God’ [Jn 6.54], he comments:

This is direct evidence against those heretics who say that the Law of Moses was given by the God of Darkness. ‘The God of the Jews, who gave the Law to Moses, is the Father of Jesus Christ; therefore the Father of Jesus Christ gave the Law to Moses.’ 57

Cathar salvation was through knowledge; not a secret or esoteric knowledge, but knowledge of the Gospel and its moral teaching. The Lord’s prayer was used as a kind of ‘mantra’, and one sacrament, the ‘consolamentum’, administered by laying on of hands, was the key ritual. Those who received it were set apart as ‘perfect’, and obliged to abstain from meat and marriage. Only they could say the Lord’s Prayer and call God ‘Father’. Most ‘Believers’ (the ordinary faithful) put off this step until close to death; Raymund VI is said to have kept two ‘Perfect’ always at hand for this contingency. The ‘consolamentum’ resembled Catholic ordination as well as Baptism, requiring long preparation before, and conferring a quasi-clerical status afterwards. The ‘perfect’ always travelled in twos, and wore long black robes. The higher officers had the title ‘bishop’, and their sees were at Toulouse, Carcassonne, Albi and some other places. Though only the ‘perfect’ were obliged to continence, and though Catholic marriage was rejected, we should treat accusations of moral depravity among the believers with caution. They were supposed, in addition, to reject violence. It is not easy to disentangle the teachings of the Cathars, dependent as we are for the most part on the reports of those opposed to them, who were over-inclined to base

56 Sexagesima, 1; SDF I, 26: ... quia unus et idem est Deus Novi et Veteris Testamenti, Jesus Christus, Dei Filius. Unde dicit in Isaia: Ego ipse qui loquebar, ecce adsum: qui loquenbar patribus in prophetis, adsum veritate Incarnationis. Ideo utrumque Testamentum, ad unius Dei honorem et audientiam utilitatem, secundum quod ipse dabit mihi, concordemus.

57 Lent V, 13; SDF I, 185: Hic habes aperte testimonium contra hereticos, qui legem Moysi a Deo tenibrarum dicunt esse datum. Sed Deus Judaecorum, qui dedit legem Moysi, est Pater Jesu Christi, ergo Pater Jesu Christi dedit legem Moysi. The quotation is from Augustine, In Ioannis Evangelium, Tr. 44,5 (PL 35.1711)
themselves on what Augustine had written about the fourth century Manichees. The Cathar rejection of the material creation and much of the Scriptures made a common basis for discussion hard to find, and one feels that there was as little meeting of minds between Catholic and Cathar as there is nowadays between orthodox Christian and Jehovah's Witness.

The Catholic response to Catharism was much fiercer than that to the movements mentioned earlier. St Bernard preached in southern France in the mid-twelfth century, with little success. Catharism was rife. By the end of the century the campaign against the ‘Albigensians’ had been given the formal status of a Crusade, involving the mobilization of temporal rulers (in particular the French monarchy) and resulting in a blurring of the boundaries between religious and political issues. Madaule’s verdict is that in the long run Papal policy worked ‘less to the profit of the Church than to the profit of the French monarchy.’ However, Antony’s period in France seems to have been during a lull in the anti-Cathar campaign. The main military campaign, under Simon de Montfort, had taken place after the assassination of the Papal Legate Pierre de Castelnau in 1208, and gradually ended with the deaths of Innocent (1216), de Montfort (1218), Count Raymond VI (1222) and King Philip Augustus (1223). All this while, Antony was at Santa Cruz. The establishment of the Inquisition would come about only after he was dead. Though Antony is characterised as a ‘Hammer of the Heretics’, in fact the general histories of the period have virtually nothing to say about him. What his actual success as a preacher may have been, we have to glean from a judicious reading of stories and anecdotes (often embroidered) that are not recorded until some years later.

The death of Francis seems to have set in motion the train of events that led Antony to write the Sermones. As Custos of Limoges, Antony had a voice in the

\[\text{References:} \]

59 Madaule, op. cit. 94
60 cf. Benignitas, [R] 4; Abate, 'Fonti VII', 236f: Illustratus quippe superno Christi famulus iamdum oraculo, ... sic vituperabat haereses abominabiles, quod... in toto latoque orbe terrarum non superatquisquam qui eisdem tam crudelem tamque continuam persecutionis procellam pro illo tempore commoveret, ita quod, vulgato ubique vocabulo, haereticorum indefessus malleus dicebatur.
election of a new Minister General, so he left Limoges in February 1227, travelling
down the Rhône to Marseilles, and so by sea to Rome. Arriving at the end of Lent, he
found that Pope Honorius had just died, and Cardinal Ugolino, that staunch friend of
Francis, had already been elected as Pope Gregory IX. The Pope received him with
kindness and asked him to preach to the pilgrims in Holy Week. A few weeks later,
in Assisi, the Chapter was held at which John Parenti was elected Minister General.
Antony was chosen as Minister Provincial for northern Italy, the Province including
Bologna and Rimini. Here he preached, and around this time seems to have composed
his ‘Sermons for Sundays’- apparently at Padua, which he visited for the first time in
1229.

At the time of the general chapter when the most holy relics of blessed father Francis were
carried to the church where they repose and are duly venerated, the servant of God was
released from the government of the friars and received from the minister general full
freedom to preach. And since on a previous occasion, that is, when he was writing the
sermons for the Sundays of the year, he resided in the city of Padua, and because he was
familiar with the sincere faith of its citizens... he decided to visit them.

Antony was still in office, then, when he wrote the *Sermones Dominicales*. During the
rest of the year he visited Ferrara and Bologna, and spent Advent in Florence,
returning there the following Lent. He visited his Province, including Milan and
Mantua, centres of Waldensianism. In May 1230 he returned to Assisi for the re-
burial of St Francis (canonized in 1228) in the new Basilica built by Brother Elias.
The Pope is supposed to have wished to make Antony a Cardinal, but Antony was
already a sick man. (There are earlier reports of his illness in France, where he had to
spend time in the infirmary of the Abbey of Solignac, in the Limousin.) In this final
period he seems to have suffered from some kind of dropsy or oedema, resulting in a

61 cf. *Little Flowers of St Francis*, ch 39 (OS 1390). Another example of a Pope inviting a visiting
friar to preach to the curia around this time is the case of Jordan of Saxony, in the time of Honorius III
(1216-27). 'As soon as the Pope heard of the famed Dominican’s arrival, he ordered him to preach in
the curia, allowing the tired Master General time only for a nap and a meal. For Honorius, the arrival of
a celebrated Dominican prelate and preacher provided a perfect opportunity for a curial sermon.'
and 32, n32.)

generalis quo sacratissimo beati Francisci reliquiae ad locum, ubi debita veneratione requiescunt,
translatae sunt, solutus ab administratione Fratrum, servus Dei Antonius generali praedicationis
libertatem a Ministro generali suscepit. Verum, qui alio in tempore, cum videlicet sermones per annum
swelling or ‘bulkiness’ of the body. He visited Mount Alverna, site of Francis’ stigmatization, and probably Rome again. He returned to Padua in the Autumn, having asked to be relieved of the office of Provincial. At the instigation of Cardinal Conti, later Pope Alexander IV, he spent the winter ordering his ‘Sermons for Festivals’.

Later... he decided to apply his mind fully to study during all of winter. At the request of the bishop of Ostia, he dedicated himself to the writing of sermons for the feasts of saints in the yearly liturgical cycle. While the servant of God was busy with such matters of use to his neighbours, the season of Lent approached.\(^{63}\)

The statements of the *Vita Prima*, composed only a year after Antony’s death by a friar who had been associated with him in his Paduan ministry, seem clear enough. However, there has recently been some controversy regarding the time and place of the composition of the *Sermones*, which we must consider. R. Manselli\(^ {64}\) has argued that Antony wrote them as a canon of Coimbra, for a Portuguese clerical audience. He retained them substantially unchanged, to be published in Italy. His main arguments are drawn from a supposed lack of Franciscan reference: there is no mention of Francis himself, nor any ‘rhapsodisation’ of Holy Poverty. Manselli’s view has found little acceptance, and has been replied to by, for instance, A. Rigon.\(^ {65}\) Beryl Smalley has pointed out that:

St Antony resembled the first generation of friars doctors at Paris in the ‘thirties and ‘forties. Neither Hugh of St Cher O.P. nor John of la Rochelle O.Min. mentioned their respective founders or Orders in their Paris lectures on the gospels. Whether their motives in refraining from doing so stemmed from modesty, from the desire not to stir up jealousy among secular clergy, or from sheer conservatism, is not clear. St Antony anticipated them.\(^ {66}\)

\(^{63}\) *Vita Prima*, 11,4-5. *Przewozny*, 15; *Abate*, ‘Fonti I’, 158: *Postquam... per totum hiemis spatium cor studitis honestatis applicuit et, ad preces domini Ostiensis, in festivitatibus sanctorum per ann\(\bar{u}\) circulum sermonum compositioni se contulit.*

\(^{64}\) R. Manselli, ‘La Coscienza minoritica di Antonio di Padova di fronte all’Europa del suo tempo’ (1982, IS 22, 29-35. Translated by E. Hagman, as ‘The Franciscan Consciousness of St Anthony of Padua’ (Greyfriars Review, vol 9 n3, 61-67)


\(^{66}\) B. Smalley, ‘The Use of Scripture in St Antony’s ‘Sermones’’ (1982, IS 22, 285-297)
Antony had had little personal acquaintance with Francis. He had been drawn to the Order by the example of the Coimbra friars, not by Francis himself in his first fervour. The first written ‘Life’ of Francis (Celano’s) was only available in 1229, after the Sermones Dominicales had been written. This seems quite sufficient to explain Antony’s failure to mention Francis. Regarding poverty, there are numerous passages praising it, and occasionally expressions (such as ‘mater paupercula’ for the Blessed Virgin) which have a thoroughly Franciscan ring to them.

R. Huber\(^\text{67}\) has suggested Limoges as the place of composition, around 1226, and says that the sermons were only ‘polished’ at Padua. It is true that Rigauld refers to the composition of the Sermones in these terms, after an explicit mention of the year 1230:

And when, at the prayers of the bishop of Ostia, he undertook the task of compiling his sermons on the saints (having some time previously compiled his Sunday sermons), he chose Padua as the place for compiling the work, because he had previously felt devotion there.\(^\text{68}\)

However, the words ‘\textit{dui ante}’ are vague, and though ‘Padua’ refers grammatically only to the Sanctorales, he does not suggest any other place for the composition of the Dominicales. With his interest in and knowledge of the Limoges region, Rigauld would surely have been more explicit if he had known any tradition of a Limousin origin for Antony’s writings.

Nevertheless, the Opus Dominicale is a considerable work, and it is difficult to imagine it being entirely composed in the relatively short time available after Antony’s return to Italy. Even if the final redaction of the work was completed at Padua, it is not unreasonable to suppose that Antony had begun to compose it, at least in his mind, some time before. C. McCarron, following F. Costa, and basing his arguments on what is known of the liturgical calendars of the period, suggests the following dating:

\(^{67}\) R. Huber, \textit{St Anthony of Padua, Doctor of the Church Universal} (Milwaukee, 1948), 46
\(^{68}\) \textit{Vita Rigaldina} VIII,12. Abate, ‘Fonti V’, 62:Cumque, \textit{ad preces domini Ostiensis}, \textit{SERMONES SANCTORALES} compilare deberet, qui \textit{dui ante DOMINICALES} compilaverat, \textit{locum Paduae, ubi ante devotione senserat, elegit pro hoc opere compilando.}
1223: Sermons from Septuagesima to Easter;  
1223/4: Easter Octave to Pentecost;  
1224: 1st to 12th Sundays after Pentecost;  
1226: 13th to 24th Sundays after Pentecost;  
1227: Advent to Epiphany.\(^{69}\)

I do not think the evidence available is strong enough to sustain such a detailed scheme; and I shall argue in Chapter IV that the arrangement of the post-Pentecost sermons is ideal rather than reflecting any particular year or years. However, as we shall see in Chapter V, internal evidence does suggest some breaks in composition, between the pre-Easter and post-Easter sermons, and even more clearly between Pentecost and the post-Pentecost sermons. This may well reflect the disruption in Antony's life following the death of Francis, and the return to Italy. Certainty is probably unattainable, but a plausible dating would be to place the sermons from Septuagesima to Pentecost prior to 1226, probably at Limoges; with the remaining sermons after 1226, probably at Padua.

There are occasional touches that hint at the contemporary background. For instance, it is known that at the very end of his life Antony went to intercede with Ezzelino, son-in-law of Frederick II, who was threatening the Padua region. The following passage cannot refer to this occasion, but it may well indicate some other time when Antony was called to act as a peacemaker. Comparing a tyrant to a "basilisk", Antony writes:

In this way, any powerful person of this world, who is infected by the poison of wrath, destroys the grass (the poor) with the breath of his malice, kills trees (the rich of this world, merchants and usurers), slays and burns the animals (those of his own household). He even pollutes the air of religious life: *He hath set his mouth against heaven, and his tongue hath passed through the earth* [cf. Ps 72.9]. Even the snakes (his friends and accomplices who know his malice) are terrified by his hissing. When his wrath is kindled, everyone takes flight, in all directions, running to hide themselves even in pig-sties! This savage lord, beside himself and inflamed by a devilish spirit, can be overcome only by 'weasels'- the poor in spirit, who are not afraid of him because they have nothing to lose.

People who are burdened with the dirt of money, who are afraid to approach him, take them to the holes he hides in. 'Speak to him', they say. 'We don't dare to.'

Does this reflect an experience of his own, the tyrant's associates hiding, and the rich people who have commissioned the friar to act as mediator saying, 'You speak to him. We don't dare to.'? Surely it can only have been as a friar, not a canon of Coimbra, that Antony could have met such a situation; and (to my mind) it sounds more like Italy under Frederick II than the relatively orderly France. At any rate, on the occasion we do know of, Antony confronted Ezzelino and gained a humble reply which, however, proved to be insincere. All the same, Antony received a hero's welcome in Padua. From February until Pentecost, he led another Mission in Padua, at the end of which he retired to a dwelling a few miles from the city. On Friday, June 13th, he was taken ill at the mid-day meal, and asked to be taken back to Padua. Too weak to walk, he was put in a cart, but just outside the city he was so ill that he had to be taken to the house of the Poor Clares, where he was anointed and died peacefully. An unseemly dispute arose regarding his burial, but his funeral took place in Padua itself on June 17th. Less than a year later, at Spoleto, the Pope canonized him. Legend says that as the bells of Spoleto rang out in Italy, those of Lisbon rang of their own accord, though the citizens knew not why until two months later.

70 Pentecost VI, 9; SDF I, 524. Sic iracundiae veneno aliquis huius saeculi potens infectus, quasi basiliscus suae flatu malitiae extinguit herbas, idest pauperes; newcat arbores, idest huius saeculi divites, mercatores et usurarios; animalia, idest suos domeesticos, occidit et incendit. Ipsas etiam auras, idest vitam religiosorum corruptum; ponit in caelum os suum et lingua eius transit in terram. Sibilum eius etiam serpentem, idest amici et socii, eius malitiae conscii, perhorrescunt. Cuius cum incanderit ira, quilibet fugam petit, quocumque, etiam porcorum stabulo, se abscondere properant. Iste tam ferus dominus, tam a seipso alienus et spiritu diabolicum inflammatus, a mustelis, idest pauperculis spiritu, qui eum non timent, quia nihil habent quod perdant, vincitur. Quos homines, humo pecuniae onerati, illuc accedere non audentes, inferunt cavernis, in quibus delitescit. Loquimiini, inquint, et, quia nos non audemus.
CHAPTER TWO

ANTONY THE PREACHER

We now have an outline of Antony's life as a background to the writing of the Sermones Dominicales and the Sermones Festivi. In this second chapter I want to focus on Antony as a preacher. Firstly, I want to examine the evidence we have from the early biographies regarding Antony's own preaching ministry, and to set it in the context of contemporary preaching in general, and of early Franciscan preaching in particular. Secondly, I want to look at the evidence from Antony's own writings which bears on the models he himself followed, and on how he saw the role of the preacher, and presented it to his own followers.

Preaching has always been integral to Christianity. J. Longère has defined preaching as: 'Public discourse, based on divine revelation, within the context of an organised society, with a view to the birth or the development of faith and religious understanding; and, correlatively, to the conversion or the spiritual progress of the hearers.' The New Testament itself furnishes examples of both kinds of preaching, namely that aimed at conversion and the birth of faith on the one hand, and at the development of faith and spiritual progress on the other. Throughout Christian history we find both being practised, and by the twelfth century we may distinguish at least three main contexts in which such preaching took place, each with its own distinct style. There was monastic preaching, typically by the abbot to his monks, and rooted in the long tradition of lectio divina, the meditative reading of the Scriptures. More recently, a style of university or scholastic preaching had grown up, notably at Paris, in which praedicatio grew out of lectio and disputatio. Finally, but not least in importance, there was popular preaching, directed to the ordinary faithful, taking place in parish churches and other places, by accredited preachers or by members of the popular movements mentioned in the previous chapter.

J. Longère, La Prédication Médiévale, (Etudes Augustiniennes, Paris, 1983), 12): 'Prêcher, c'est faire un discours public fondé sur une Rédéption divine, dans le cadre d'une société organisée, visant à la naissance ou au développement de la foi et des connaissances religieuses, et, corrélativement, à la conversion ou au progrès spirituel des auditeurs.' Longère's work is an excellent survey of the whole field of medieval preaching. See also: R.H.Rouse and M.A.Rouse, Preachers, Florilegia and Sermons (Toronto, 1979). Much recent work is accessible through the International Medieval Sermon...
2.1 Antony's own preaching

Early Franciscan preaching belonged to this last type, and it followed the example of Francis himself. We have a vivid word-picture of this in the following eye-witness description by Thomas, Archdeacon of Spalato (Split), relating to the year 1222:

In that year, I was residing in the Studium of Bologna, on the feast of the Assumption, I saw St Francis preach in the public square in front of the public palace. Almost the entire city had assembled there. The theme of his sermon was: 'Angels, men, and demons.' He spoke so well and with such sterling clarity on these three classes of spiritual and rational beings that the way in which this untutored man developed his subject aroused even among the scholars in the audience an admiration that knew no bounds. Yet, his discourses did not belong to the great genre of sacred eloquence: rather they were harangues. In reality, throughout his discourse he spoke of the duty of putting an end to hatreds and of arranging a new treaty of peace. He was wearing a ragged habit; his whole person seemed insignificant; he did not have an attractive face. But God conferred so much power on his words that they brought back peace in many a seignorial family torn apart until then by old, cruel, and furious hatreds even to the point of assassinations. The people showed him as much respect as they did devotion; men and women flocked to him; it was a question of who would at least touch the fringe of his clothing or who would tear off a piece of his poor habit.²

The first friars, like the convert Humiliati and Waldensians, were allowed to preach only as long as they kept to simple moral exhortation, and away from Scriptural exposition or theology. The reason for this prohibition is obvious: most of them were laymen, untrained in those disciplines. There were, indeed, some priests—even (as we have seen) some learned lawyers; but early sources strongly suggest that Antony was the first member of the Order who was a trained theologian.

It is instructive to examine the early legislation of the Order as regards preaching. In the Rule of 1221 we have:

Chapter 17: Preachers
No friar may preach contrary to Church law or without the permission of his minister. The minister, for his part, must be careful not to grant permission indiscriminately. All the friars, however, should preach by their example. The ministers and preachers must remember that they do not have the right to the office of serving the friars or of preaching.

² Quoted in Sources for the Life of St Francis (OS), 1601f, from: Lemmens, Testimonia minora saeculi XIII de S. Francisco Assisiensis (Quaracchi, 1926), 10; Thomas, archdeacon of Spalato (Split): Historia Salonitarum
and so they must be prepared to lay it aside without objection the moment they are told to
do so.  

Chapter 19: The friars must be Catholics
All the friars are bound to be Catholics, and live and speak as such. Anyone who
abandons the Catholic faith or practices by word or deed must be absolutely excluded
from the Order, unless he repents. 

The requirement that the Friars must be Catholics is significant. Francis was well
aware of the dangers of heresy, and one of his primary aims was to counteract it by
preaching the Gospel under the auspices of the Church. Unlike Valdès, he did not
even begin to preach until he had the permission, not simply of his local Bishop, but
of the Pope himself. It was precisely because Innocent had given his approval to
Francis’ simple ‘Form of Life’ that the Franciscans escaped the legislation of Lateran
IV forbidding new Rules, whereas the Dominicans had to take the existing Rule of St
Augustine, like the Canons (this was probably no hardship to Dominic, familiar as he
was with the canonical life). We have seen that the Rule of 1221, though drawn up by
Francis and presented to the friars in Chapter, was controversial and never officially
approved. In addition to the points already quoted, there is an exhortation in chapter
seven for the friars ‘not to appear gloomy or depressed like hypocrites’ as they go
about- perhaps a reference to the ways of the Cathars? Yet Francis surely appreciated
the power of the Cathars’ simple way of living, in contrast to the pomp of many
prelates, and this may also explain why, in chapter fifteen, ‘The friars... are also
forbidden to ride horseback, unless they are forced to it by sickness or real necessity.’
(We easily forget that the extensive journeys of Antony were all made on foot: no
wonder he was worn out at a comparatively early age!)

The Rule of 1223 resulted from a revision made by Francis with the help of
Bros Leo and Bonizo (a canon lawyer), and also of Cardinal Ugolino, who helped to
gain Papal approval- the Bull ‘Solet annuere’. Chapter three renews the prohibition
on riding, except in necessity or sickness. The regulation of preaching comes in
Chapter nine:

3 OS 44f
4 OS 46
Of Preachers
The friars are forbidden to preach in any diocese, if the bishop objects to it. No friar should dare to preach to the people unless he has been examined and approved by the Minister General of the Order and has received from him the commission to preach. Moreover, I advise and admonish the friars that in their preaching, their words should be examined and chaste. They should aim only at the advantage and spiritual good of their listeners, telling them briefly about vice and virtue, punishment and glory, because our Lord himself kept his words short on earth.5

It is against this background that we must set the accounts of the preaching of St Antony. As we have seen6, the earliest of these is Celano’s account of the chapter at Arles, published in Antony’s own lifetime. Antony is described as one ‘whose mind the Lord has opened to understand the Scriptures, and to speak among the people words about Jesus.’ His eloquence is described in a conventional, biblical, phrase as ‘sweeter than syrup or honey’, and his fervent devotion is noted. The text he took was Pilate’s inscription on the Cross, ‘Jesus of Nazareth, king of the Jews’, and his audience was a gathering of friars, in ‘the house in which there were many other brothers gathered’.

Only about a year after Antony’s death, the Vita Prima, written by a friar close to Antony in his last years, gives us information about Antony’s preaching in Italy, beginning with the famous sermon at Forli. After his preaching ability had been recognised, he appears to have been sent to the minister provincial (Bro. Graziano), and,

When the duty of preaching was imposed upon him, the faithful dweller of the hermitage was sent out into the world and his lips, closed for so long, were opened to proclaim the glory of God. Sustained, then, by the authority of the one who sent him, he strove so much to fulfil his work of preaching that he merited for his strenuous efforts the title of ‘Evangelist’. Accordingly, going about cities and castles, villages and countryside, he sowed the seed of life most abundantly and fervently.7

Antony’s preaching was itinerant and authorised, and evidently effective. Whether ‘nomen evangelistae compensaret’ implies some formal title, or merely that he ‘made a name for himself’, I am not sure; but from the beginning his activity was associated

5 OS 63
6 see above, Chapter I, p17
with evangelizing, and perhaps even, particularly, with the Gospels themselves. His effectiveness against heresy is quickly noted. At Rimini,

Since he saw there many people deceived by perverse heresy, he soon called together all the inhabitants of the city and began to preach fervently. Although he was not versed in the subtleties of philosophers, he confounded the cunning doctrines of the heretics more lucidly than the sun.8

Not a few were converted, including one famous heretic, Bononillo. The language used is conventional, but there may be a hint in the phrase ‘philosophorum non novit argutias’ that Antony was not inclined to use the dialectical methods of the schools in arguing with heretics. At a later date, Antony was to be sent to the Curia, where he preached before the Pope and the Cardinals:

Indeed, with fluent words, he drew out of Scripture such original and profound meanings that he was called by the pope himself, with a phrase all his own, ‘The Ark of the Testament’.9

The account continues:

The more respectable marvelled that a man who had barely outgrown puberty and who was uncultured could subtly adapt spiritual things to spiritual men; the less respectable were stunned how he plucked out the causes and occasions of sins and how with greater care he sowed the practice of virtue. Men of every condition, class and age were happy to have received from him admonitions suitable for their lives. The social status of people did not influence him at all; no flattering opinion of men charmed him...10

Behind the conventional phrases we can detect historical fact. Well-educated people were somewhat surprised by his style of preaching; it manifested a profound knowledge of Scripture, and yet did not fit into the accepted models of ‘praedicatio’ that they were used to. There was a contrast between the academic style of the Paris schools in which many of the Cardinals had been trained, and that of the young Portuguese who never been to Paris, and who used a more popular idiom. In the same way, ordinary folk were impressed by the way in which he brought home to them the reality of sin and the moral life. With reference to flattery, Antony expresses his

---


10 Przewozny, 13-14; Vita Prima 10.4-6, Abate, ‘Fonti I’, 156: Mirabantur maiores virum pudetemus idiomat spirituallibis spirituallibus subtilem compararentem; stupebant minores peccati causas et occasiones efflentem et virtutum mores cautesius inserentem. Omnis demum conditionis, ordinis et aetatis virt congruentia sibi vitae documenta suspepsisse laetati sunt. Nulla prorsus flecebat eum personarum acceptio; nulla favoris humani permulcebat opinio...
thoughts on how to deal with it in his Sermon for the Fifth Sunday of Lent. He is
discussing the word ‘demon’, and notes that in Greek ‘daimon’ can mean a spirit of
wisdom; he then says,

When someone says to you, by way of flattery or praise, ‘What an expert you are! What a
lot you know!’ he is saying, ‘You have a daimon.’ You should immediately reply with
Christ, ‘I have not a daimon. Of myself, I know nothing; I have nothing good. But I
honour my Father, I attribute everything to him and give him thanks, from whom comes
all wisdom, skill and knowledge. I do not seek my own glory.’

The most remarkable example of Antony’s preaching ministry is the Lenten
mission he preached at Padua towards the end of his life. At the beginning of Lent,
1231,

Seeing, therefore, that the acceptable time and the day of salvation drew near, he set aside
the work he had begun and again directed all his attention to preaching to the people who
thirsted for God’s word. So great a desire to preach inflamed him that he decided to do so
for the next forty days. Truly, he did just that.

At first, Antony preached in the churches, a different one each day; but this system
broke down because of the great numbers desiring to hear him;

As soon as the servant of God saw the door of preaching open to him and the people
flock from everywhere in a swollen mass, like parched terrain in need of water, he decided
to meet them daily in the churches of the city. But, because of the multitude of men and
women who gathered, and because the size of the churches was by no means large enough
to hold so many people, whose numbers always grew, he withdrew to the wide spaces of
open meadows.

The biographer (who clearly was present) tells how people came from the towns and
villages round about, getting up in the middle of the night to be sure of a place, and
coming with lamps. Knights and noble-women could be seen arriving while it was
still dark, and spending a great part of the day with their eyes fixed on the preacher’s
face. Worldly clothes were put away, and religious dress was the norm. The Bishop

---

11 Lent V,7; SDF I, 181: Quando ergo aliquis adulando vel applaudendo dicit tibi: Peritus es et
multa scis, tunc dicit tibi: Daemonium habes. Et tu statim cum Christo respondere: Ego
demonium non habeo. A me ipso nihil scio, nihil boni habeo, sed honorifico Patrem meum. Ipsi totum
attribuo, ipsi gratias ago, a quo est omnis sapiencia, omnis peritia et scientia. Ego gloriam meam non
quaero.

12 Przewozny, 15; Vita Prima 11.5-6, Abate, ‘Fonti 1’, 159: Videns igitur tempus acceptabile et
dies imminere salutis, ab incoepu destititi et ad praedicandum sitienti populo tota mentis occupatione
se contulit. Tantum namque praedicandi eum fervor accenderat ut per continuos quadragesima dies
disponeret; quod et indubitamter fecit.

13 Przewozny, 17; Vita Prima 13.1, Abate, ‘Fonti 1’, 160: Igitur, postquam servus Dei Antonius
ostium sibi sermonis aperiit cernebati et populus in multitudine gravi, quasi area imbreb sientis, ad
eum undique conveniret, cotidianas per civitatis ecclesias stationes fieri constituit; cumque prae
multitudine adventantium virorum et mulierum, ecclesiaram ambitus pro tantorum captu populum
nequaquam sufficeret, ad spatiosa pratorum loca, numero crescente, secessit.
and his clergy devoutly followed Antony, setting an example to the people. The biographer estimates that thirty thousand people were present at a time, without a shout or a murmur. The shopkeepers shut their shops in order to go to the sermons themselves, while women took scissors to snip off pieces of Antony’s habit! So many men and women were induced to go to confession that there were not enough friars, or other priests, to accommodate them. When Antony died, later that same year, it is not surprising that his funeral was marked by unprecedented scenes of grief.

For Antony’s time in France we are largely dependent on Jean Rigauld, who, however, seems to have been conscientious in recording the accounts of eyewitnesses. The episodes that concern Antony’s preaching are as follows:

During the time that he was appointed Custos of the brethren of the Limoges custody, he was in the city of Limoges around midnight on the night of Holy Thursday, in the church called St Peter de Queyroux. This was so that when the Office of Matins was over, which is said there at midnight, he might sow the seed of the word of life to the people gathered in the church. 14

Here, Antony is preaching to lay-people gathered in church for part of the Holy Week ceremonies. The occasion was marked by a ‘bilocation’ of Antony, which Rigauld likens to an incident in the life of St Ambrose. Antony would have been preaching on a Passiontide theme. Elsewhere, as we noted in the previous chapter, Rigauld comments on the frequency with which Antony treated the theme of poverty. Already, Antony often found that there were too many people wanting to hear him to fit into the local church:

On one occasion, at the church of St Junien in the diocese of Limoges, he was preaching, and the congregation was so large that the church was not big enough to hold it, and so the man of God had to transfer to a wide open space, with the crowd that had gathered. A wooden pulpit was improvised, and the man of God climbed up onto it, remarking that he foresaw that the Enemy might soon cause a disturbance in the sermon, but that they should not be frightened, because no-one would be hurt by it. Not long afterwards, the place the saint was standing on collapsed, to everyone’s surprise, and yet neither he nor anyone else was injured. Because of this, the people were brought to even greater

The provision of an improvised wooden pulpit must have been necessary more than once, one imagines. As well as such popular preaching, Antony was in demand at important clerical gatherings:

I learned from a reliable account by certain friars that one occasion he was preaching at a Synod at Bourges. Directing his words to the Archbishop in fervour of spirit, he said, 'It's you I'm talking to, in the mitre.' He began to rebuke, fervently and with well-chosen texts of Scripture, certain vices which troubled the conscience of the Archbishop, so that all at once the Archbishop was moved to compunction, and tears, and devotion, that he had not felt before. When the Synod was over, he took him aside and opened his wounded conscience; and from then on was more devoted both to God and to the friars, and was more conscientious about the service of God.16

Even Archbishops could be reduced to tears by Antony's preaching, and afterwards steered towards confession! The reference to 'Scriptural testimonies' is also to be noted. On the other hand, Rigauld also gives us an instance of Antony using the 'Book of Nature' to drive home his point. The story is a famous one, appearing also in the 'Fioretti', but this appears earlier and less elaborated.

If, sometimes, rational men despised his preaching, God showed that he should be respected, by means of irrational animals, in signs and prodigies. On one occasion, certain heretics near Padua despised his preaching and even laughed at him. He went to the river, which was not far off, and in the hearing of those present said to the heretics, 'Because you show yourselves unworthy of the word of God, see! I will turn to the fishes, that your unbelief may be shown up.' He began in a fervent spirit to preach to the fishes, and tell them of the gifts which God had bestowed on them; how he had created them, given them clear waters, and endowed them with great freedom; how he fed them without any labour on their part. At these words, the fish began to gather and draw near to him, and raise themselves partly out of the water, and look at him attentively, and open their mouths. And as long as the saint was pleased to speak to them, they listened to him attentively as if they were rational creatures; and they did not depart until they had received his blessing.


16 Vita Rigaldina 8.6, Abate, ‘Fonti VI’, 59: Fideli quorumdam Fratrum relatione didici quod, dum semel Bituris in synodo praedicaret, ad Archiepiscopum verbum dirigens in fervore spiritus, dixit: Tibi loquar, cornute. Coepit autem lacrimas solidis Scripturis testimoniis destetari, quod subito coepit Archiepiscopum ad compunctionem et quaedam vita, ex quibus erat Archiepiscopus in conscientia sauciatus, tanto fervore, et tam claris et et devotionem inexpertam hacienus provocari. Finita autem synodo, et humiliiter in partem deducto conscientiae vultus apereuit, et ex tunc, Dee et Fratribus devotior, in Dei servitio se studiosius occupavit. ['cornute', 'horned': almost, 'you in the pointy hat. ']
For he who made the birds attentive to the preaching of the most holy Father Francis, made the fishes gather and attend to the preaching of his son Antony.  

If these heretics were Cathars, we can appreciate why Antony stressed the goodness of the Creator, and the way the material world revealed that goodness. We may note, also, that the story begins with heretics despising and laughing at Antony: his preaching was not always immediately successful. On another occasion, Rigauld records a dispute with heretics about the Eucharist. One final story from Rigauld, which again illustrates the circumstances in which Antony preached to large crowds:

On one occasion he solemnly called together the people of Limoges for a sermon, and the crowd that gathered was so great that every church was reckoned too small to hold such a multitude. He therefore called the people together at a very spacious place, where a pagan palace had once stood, called ‘Creux des Arenes’. There the people could sit down comfortably, and listen quietly to the divine word.  

While Antony was speaking, a thunderstorm arose, and the people began to panic, until Antony called them to order.

The man of God continued his sermon as long as he was pleased, and the people listened attentively. When they got up from the sermon, they found that the ground all around was soaked, but where they had been sitting was completely dry; and they praised the wonderful kindness of God, who is wonderful in his saints. Many friars were still living when I entered the Order of Friars Minor, who had been present at that sermon, and could repeat the gist of his preaching. Their testimony is entirely reliable, because they spoke of what they had seen with their eyes and heard with their ears.

---


18 Vita Rigaldina 8.10, Abate, ‘Fonti VI’, 61: Cum enim semel sollemniter Lemovicis ad praedicationem populum convocasset, et tanta esset multitudo populi congregata quod angusta reputaretur quaelibet ecclesia ad tantam multitudoinem colligendam, ad quemdam locum vehementer spatiosum, ubi oblivatur palatia infidelium paganorum, qui locum dictur Fovea de Arenis, populum convocavit, ut ibi possent populos latius sedere et verbum divinum quietius audire.

19 Vita Rigaldina 8.10, Abate, ‘Fonti VI’, 61-2: Continuavit Vir Dei sermonem quandiu sibi placuit, et populus attente audivit. Cum autem a sermone surgierent, et terram abnantissime compluant et locum, in quo steterant, sine pluvia et madefactione cernerent, Dei, qui in Sanctis suis existit mirabilis, mirabilem magnificentiam extollebant. Multi adhuc fratres vivebant, qui praedicto sermoni interierant; thema de quo praeacaventer rectabat, dum ego Ordinem Fratrum Minorum intravi; quorum relationi fides est per omnia adhibenda, quia de hoc, quod oculis viderant et auribus audierant, testimoniun perhibabant.
Before leaving Antony’s period in France, there is one other source I have come across with some account of Antony’s preaching. Fr de Chérance\textsuperscript{20} cites the Chronicle of Pierre Coral, Abbot of St Martin at Limoges, who records that when Antony arrived there he preached in the cemetery of St Paul’s on the text ‘In the evening weeping shall have place, and in the morning gladness’ (Ps 29.67). The occasion may have been All Souls’ Day, or perhaps a funeral. This text is also treated in the *Sermones Dominicales*, for Septuagesima. The next day he preached in the Abbey on the excellence of monastic life. De Chérancé gives a full text of this sermon, which does not seem to be otherwise known. The style seems to me quite ‘Antonian’, but further than that I cannot say. If it is authentic, it is the only ‘reportatio’ of one of Antony’s sermons known to me.

The early sources give us enough information, then (if only in passing), to draw a reasonable picture of Antony’s preaching activity, as regards its location, its audience, its content, style and effectiveness. As regards location, Antony preached in churches and other religious buildings, including monasteries. He also preached outside churches (sometimes from improvised pulpits), and in open spaces outside towns. His audiences might be friars, other religious and other clergy, often in chapters or synods; they might also be lay people (sometimes in very large numbers), and might include heretics. The content of his sermons was notably Scriptural, and such texts as we have indicate some preference for themes relating to the poverty and Passion of Christ, and to the need for repentance and confession. He did not scruple to rebuke even the higher clergy for their faults. Sometimes he spoke of the goodness of Creation, and our duty of gratitude and praise. His style tended to be clear and brief, and marked by fervent devotion and charity. He impressed the learned with his grasp of doctrine, and he moved all to conversion and penitence. All in all, Antony appears similar to many popular preachers of his time; he was unusual in the breadth and depth of his Scriptural knowledge, but like his fellow friars, he was much occupied with ‘vice and virtue, punishment and glory’. As regards Antony’s oral style, it seems

\textsuperscript{20} L. De Chérance, *St Anthony of Padua* (London, 1895) 82-86. The reference there given is to National Library ms. n. 5452, fol cix
reasonable to assume that many of its characteristics have passed through to his written work, and to apply to it what E. Franceschini has said of his literary style:

> Exclamations, interjections, questions, apostrophe, parallelism, antithesis, alliteration, assonance, plays on words are scattered generously throughout the whole text.\(^{21}\)

There is bound to be a certain subjectivity in judgement, but there are many passages in the written *Sermones* which seem to reflect oral techniques. These are to be found especially in Antony's denunciations of abuse, and in his 'preference for the poor.'

### 2.2 Antony's models

Antony's own writings confirm and strengthen the impression we have gained from the external evidence. I stress again that the *Sermones Dominicales* and the *Sermones Festivi* are not as they stand sermons preached by Antony, although they contain material he preached. They depart from his oral style in important ways, notably in being much longer and more systematic. Antony himself indicates that they contain material, or 'themes', for a number of 'sermons'. There are nevertheless many passages (such as those quoted in the previous chapter) which have the ring of oral style. The *Opus Dominicale* is addressed to Antony's own brethren; many of the 'apostrophes' are clearly directed to clerical and other sinners—especially prelates. Such passages indicate what a powerful and down-to-earth preacher Antony could be.

What I wish to explore in this section is the influence on Antony of earlier preachers. Who were his models? Antony quotes many authors and works in his *Sermones*, but the three main preachers whose sermons he quotes are Augustine, Gregory, and Bernard. Even a cursory examination of the *Sermones* (especially the *Opus Dominicale*) reveals his extensive knowledge of them\(^{22}\). There is scarcely a sermon without at least one quotation from each, often several quotations, often cited by name. Some of the citations of Augustine and Gregory come via the Gloss, or via Peter Lombard's 'Sentences', but the majority appear to be from direct acquaintance with their works. We have independent evidence that some of these were available to

---

\(^{21}\) E. Franceschini, 'L'aspetto letterario nei 'Sermones' di Antonio di Padova' (*JS* 3 (1963)), 164: 'Esclamazioni, interiezioni, interrogazioni, apostrofe, parallelismi, antitesi, alliterazioni, assonanza, giochi di parole, sono profusi a largo mano in tutto il testo.'

\(^{22}\) See Appendix, Table I, below.
Antony in Portugal- Augustine’s sermons, for instance, and Gregory’s *Moralia*-though others he must have found in libraries elsewhere. This gives some indication of how he spent his ‘leisure hours’ when not actually preaching or travelling. The sermons of Bernard were available at Coimbra, and Cistercian influence was strong there through the great abbey of Alcobaça. At this point, I want only to consider the general ‘stylistic’ influence of these great preachers, given that Antony was well acquainted with them. I will also note some contrasts with another preacher whom Antony revered, but quotes less frequently, Pope Innocent III.

2.21 Augustine.

Antony seems to have been influenced by Augustine in two ways: by his theory, as expressed in *De doctrina christiana*, and by his practice as expressed in his actual sermons. Augustine (354-430) would have been important to Antony, if only as the author of the Rule under which he began his religious life, and in a sense the ‘founder’ of the order of Canons. But if piety sent him to Augustine’s sermons in the first place, he must have been struck immediately by their intrinsic power as examples of Christian preaching; and, as he undertook his own ministry, by their practical utility. Augustine had been a city-bishop of Roman north Africa, and his preaching was aimed at a few congregations which he knew well- his own in the cathedral at Hippo, or that at Carthage where he was a regular guest preacher. Yet his ministry was complicated by the presence of the influential Donatist Church, a ‘puritan’ sect not wholly unlike the later Waldensians, and considerably more successful; and in his youth he had been closely connected with the Manichees, who were regarded in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries as the precursors of the Cathars, whatever the doctrinal differences we may now see between them.

Nearly 700 authentic sermons of Augustine are known, and there must have been many more, now lost. A study of these sermons reveals not only much circumstantial detail about contemporary church life, occasions and audiences, but show us how Augustine employed a great variety of stylistic ‘tricks’ to hold his

---

23 T.C. Lawler, *Saint Augustine: sermons for Christmas and Epiphany* (Westminster, Maryland; London; 1952) (Ancient Christian Writers, no. 15) 4, 186; F. Van der Meer,
audience. He was evidently very responsive to his hearers’ mood. He asks rhetorical questions, he constructs imaginary dialogues with an objector, he employs rhythm and rhyme, numerology, parallelism and contrast. He is quite prepared to use ‘slang’ expressions, where they will make his meaning clear and memorable; but he can build up to a powerful and elevated style when he chooses. Even reading his sermons, as clergy and others still do in the course of the Divine Office, we feel something of his personality. For instance, in his homilies on St John’s Gospel, when speaking of the Samaritan woman, he invites his hearers to identify with her: ‘We must listen to ourselves in her. We must recognise ourselves in her person.’

Again, in speaking of John the Baptist, he seems to explain something of his own approach to preaching:

> John was a voice, but the Lord in the beginning was the Word. John was a voice for a time, Christ the eternal Word in the beginning. Take away the word and what is a voice? When it conveys no meaning, it is just an empty sound. A wordless voice strikes the ear, but it does not make the heart grow. However, as we engage in building up our heart, let us pay attention to the order of things. If I think of what I want to say, the word is already in my heart. And if I want to talk to you, I look for some means whereby what is in my heart may also be in yours. So, wanting the word, which is already in my heart, to come over to you, and make its way into your heart, I make use of my voice to talk to you. The sound of the voice brings you to understand the word. And when my voice has done this, it ceases; but the word carried to you by the sound is now already in your heart, and has not left mine.

As well as the examples of his sermons, Augustine left a kind of handbook for preachers in the fourth book of his *De doctrina christiana*. I am not sure whether Antony had actually read *De doctrina christiana* (well-known though it was). Actual quotations from it are hard to identify; but the essence of its teaching is exemplified in his own approach. The fourth book assumes that preachers will be thoroughly conversant with Scriptural interpretation, and its intent is to help them to deliver their Biblical message - the preacher is ‘nothing but an interpreter and expounder of Holy Scripture’. First one should aim to understand, then to know by heart, and finally to present eloquently. The work is not systematic, but contains good advice and examples. Augustine notes that the classical rules of rhetoric (in which he himself had

---


24 *The Divine Office*, vol II, Lent III. *(In Ioann. Tr. 15.10-12, 16-17)*

25 *The Divine Office*, vol I, Advent III *(Serm 293 3)*

26 *De doctrina christiana*, IV,4,6; *Augustine, On Christian Teaching*, trans R.P.H.Green (Oxford, 1997), 103

27 *De doctrina christiana* IV,28,61; Green, 144
been trained), though often useful, are not indispensable: better to read the great authors of the Church, and to listen to good speakers. However, each should develop his own style. This is advice that Antony certainly seems to have followed, rather than the formal rules of the Artes praedicandi of his own time. Augustine was prepared to follow Cicero in his division of the art of speaking. One may simply teach and explain. This is not difficult, with a sympathetic audience. One may need to prove one’s point—this is harder, and it is necessary to hold the hearers’ attention. But the Christian preacher will also wish to move his audience to a change of life, and this will require ‘pathos’, a style that speaks to the heart. Finally, the preacher should recall that the example of his own life speaks loudest—‘Sit eius quasi copia dicendi, forma vivendi.’

2.22 Gregory

The second of Antony’s great models was St Gregory (c.540-604). Living in darker days than Augustine, his spirituality was monastic and apocalyptic, probably in response to the collapse of society. His writings include the Moralia in Job and the Homilies on Ezekiel (aimed at monastic audiences), the Homilies on the Gospels, Pastoral Rule and Dialogues (more popular), and many letters. Gregory took Augustine as a reference-point, but he was also influenced by Greek tradition. He was familiar with classical authors (Cicero, Seneca) and shows traces of Stoic thought. The keynotes of his approach may be said to be balance, equilibrium, and moderation. He drew from many sources, but digested and transformed them.

Antony knew Gregory’s writings well—perhaps even better than those of Augustine. It is from Gregory that he derives his predilection for the Book of Job; and from Gregory he gets an attitude to Creation that is in line with Franciscan spirituality:

If we look carefully at exterior things, they call us back to interior things, for the marvellous works of visible creation are surely the footsteps of our Creator. 28

Gregory wanted to demonstrate the fundamental unity of God’s order, despite its patent divisions and differences. He saw evil as rooted in change and mutability, good

28 Moralia super Job, 26,12,17 (CCL 143B,1277-8)
in reason and stability, and an important virtue for him was ‘discretio’ (discretion, discernment). He used illustrations from the nature of animals to illuminate human characteristics. Animals revealed instincts found, but often hidden, in men: e.g. the ostrich, ass, hedgehog, rhinoceros, eagle, heron, locust, etc. By using the natural world for imparting moral lessons, Gregory demonstrated how it carries a message from God. The structure of the world does likewise: e.g. the setting sun in the west, the dawn in the east, the cold north and warm south; warmth, heat, cold, dryness, dampness, hardness, softness, light, dark. All these are taken up and used regularly by Antony, as is the animal parallelism. Most importantly, in my view, he finds in Gregory his whole rationale of preaching and conversion, which is at the heart of his enterprise.

Gregory differed from Augustine somewhat in his analysis of sin. For Augustine, sin is in the will, the soul; the body is good. For Gregory, sin arises from the conflict between soul and body, reason and sensuality. Bodily desires are irrational and anarchic. In sexual pleasure especially we ‘lose control’. Carole Straw says that Gregory’s idea of monastic life was one of self-sacrifice and self-abnegation; his idea of priesthood was centred on offering the Sacrifice of Christ for the people; the two came together in the ‘monk-bishop’. Gregory also had a very exalted idea of the role of the preacher in rousing sinners to repentance.

Carole Straw has analysed Gregory’s understanding of conversion along these lines. Adversity (or the chastisement of the preacher) is seen as causing men to reflect on the causes of their troubles in the inner court of conscience. A key notion is ‘compunction’. Gregory sees conversion as a two-stage process of reform. Compunction is first focused on emotions of fear and sorrow, then on joy and love. ‘As the soul progresses toward perfection, it moves from a lower, outward, carnal compunction of fear to a higher, inward, spiritual compunction of love.’ These compunctions of fear and love are complementary opposites, each supplying what the other lacks. In the first phase of reform, Gregory uses legal and medical imagery.

---

29 C. Straw, Gregory the Great. Perfection in Imperfection (Berkely, London, 1988)
30 Straw, op. cit. 214
There is both self-judgement and healing. Within the inner courtroom are prosecutor (conscience), judge (reason) and 'exactor' (fear, pain). Though not all suffering is due to sin, the sinner must not be complacent. The sinner is both prosecutor and accused; there is an inner conflict between good and bad, higher and lower, which is resolve when judgement is passed and accepted, with its penalty. The supplementary medical imagery is in terms of the sick soul, festering with wounds that have to be lanced and then poulticed. R. Gillet, in his introduction to Gregory's *Moralia*,\(^{31}\) suggests a double basis for compunction- the religious sense of awe in the face of the 'mysterium tremendum', as well as a deeply felt regret for one's own sins and failings. Gregory himself distinguishes four kinds of compunction:\(^{32}\)

1) that which makes the soul feel 'where it is' - sinful and unfaithful;
2) that which arises from appreciation of the punishment due to sin;
3) that which is evoked by the countless troubles of this present life;
4) that which makes the soul long for 'where it is not', but where it hopes to be by God's grace. This is the best form of compunction, a yearning and longing for God.

Compunction may also be divided into that of sadness and that of joy. It may be expressed in either case by tears, but these are tears of sorrow in the one case, and tears of joy (*laetae lacrimae*) in the other, flowing from love. Gregory emphasises the tears of compunction 'the blood of the soul', an Augustinian phrase Antony is fond of too, the prick of conscience (*com-punctio*) that bursts the boil. Repentance is itself cathartic, grief for sin dissipates the anxiety, fear and guilt. The Christian is cleansed and renewed, and given hope. He yearns for God, and love seeks union with God. Antony echoes all this. The themes of compunction and repentance regularly recur. Here he is at his most 'Gregorian'. Beryl Smalley's comment seems fair:

> The permeating influence upon Antony seems to be St Gregory, marked by gravity, moderation, pessimism, earnestness. He mustered the same flow of quotation, the same preference for spiritual senses.\(^{33}\)


\(^{32}\) *Moralia super Job* 23,41; cf. 5.51

\(^{33}\) B. Smalley, *The Use of Scripture in St Antony's 'Sermones*'; IS 22 (1982), 293
Bernard

This 'Gregorianism' modified the considerable, but very different, influence of Antony's third model, St Bernard (1090-1153). Compared with Augustine and Gregory, Bernard was virtually a contemporary of Antony. His memory would have been still vividly alive among the Cistercians of Alcobaça, and indeed it would have been possible (though hardly likely) for an aged monk there to have seen Bernard in France in his youth, and the young canon Fernando staying a night on his way from Lisbon to Coimbra. Bernard's writings were certainly accessible to Antony, and he made good use of them. G.R. Evans has pointed out that Bernard's training was in a monastic environment, somewhat apart from the University milieu of Paris, where logical studies were developing considerably. Consequently, as his writings testify, he was more at home with a scriptural exegesis based on the lectio divina than one based on dialectic. Bernard's literary skills were expressed in his voluminous correspondence as well as in his more systematic works. The latter include both edited versions of his sermons and treatises written ad hoc. We find in his writings all sorts of literary techniques- climax, assonance, alliteration, repetition, making lists, parallelism and so on. He quotes from classical authors, though no more than was possible with the help of available florilegia and anthologies. His style matured, but was essentially formed at an early age.

If we consider Bernard as a speaker- and Evans emphasises Bernard's strength as a 'talker', calling him 'a live performer rather than a master of the considered statement' we must see his most typical setting as that of an Abbot addressing his monks, in church or in chapter, and illustrating his points with stories and analogies. There are many marks of Bernard's oral style: rhetorical questions to people in his 'story': 'Oh! Dinah, why was it necessary for you to look at the foreign women?'; 'And what about you, Eve?. Why did you want the fruit?'; or dialogue with his listeners: 'Oh! I'm just looking, you may reply'; 'Have you never read?' His aim was not academic, but to encourage them in the fulfilment of their vocation. In this, he exemplifies the revival of monastic preaching in the twelfth century. No longer

35 Evans, op. cit. 137
36 Evans, op. cit. 80; *Opera Omnia* (LTR) VI(2) 130.4-7
content with merely reading the homilies of the Fathers, Abbots such as Anselm and Bernard availed themselves of the Rule’s provision for the Abbot to address his community. A familiarity with the Fathers equipped them to renew the Patristic tradition of exegesis, a continuous exposition of the Scriptures. In this way we have from Bernard seventeen sermons on the Psalm ‘Qui habitat’, and eighty-six sermons on the Song of Solomon. Bernard’s approach differed, on the one hand, from that of the University preachers and, on the other, from that of many popular preachers who were less learned. It was (in University terms) undoubtedly praedicatio, and based strongly on lectio, but there was very little disputatio. On the other hand, it presupposed a familiarity with Scripture that was not to be found among the ordinary laity.

We are dealing, brothers, with the historical sense. History is the doctrinal threshing-floor, on which the good threshers, that is, wise and learned masters, with the flails of diligence and the winnowing-fan of enquiry, separate the grain from the chaff. Just as honey is to be found under the wax of the honeycomb and a kernel under the surface of the grain, so under the ‘cortex historiae’ there lies the sweetness of the moral and allegorical senses. 37

To illustrate Bernard’s influence on Antony’s style (obviously we can only examine his literary, not his oral, style), I will take some examples from De gradibus humilitatis et superbiae 38. Antony seems to allude to this twice, in his Sermones for the second and third Sundays in Lent, although in neither case does he explicitly name Bernard. Referring to the steps of Jacob’s ladder, he says:

The six rungs are the six virtues in which the whole sanctification of soul and body consists: the mortification of self-will, the strictness of discipline, the virtue of abstinence, the consideration of our own weakness, the exercise of the active life and the contemplation of heavenly glory. 39

This is not a direct quotation from Bernard, but reflects closely Bernard’s own references to Jacob’s ladder 40 and the general development of his argument. In Bernard’s Preface to Godfrey, he enumerates among the steps of humility, ‘Not to seek one’s own will’, ‘Obedience and submission to one’s superiors’, ‘Patient

---

37 I have mislaid this reference.
38 PL 182; English translation by H.C. Backhouse, The Twelve Steps of Humility and Pride (London 1985)
39 Lent II, 10; SDF I, 114: Sex gradus sunt illae sex virtutes, in quibus tota animae et corporis sanctificationis consistit: mortificatio scilicet voluntatis propriae, rigor disciplinae, virtutis abstinentiae, consideratio infirmitatis propriae, exercitium vitae activae, contemplatio caelestis gloriae.
40 Backhouse, op. cit. 21,53
endurance'; and in chapter V, ‘Admission of one’s own unworthiness’, ‘Mercy towards others’ and ‘Clearing of spiritual sight’. In the following Sermon, Antony quotes: ‘Pretiosa res humilitas, quae superbia palliari appetit, ne vilescat’ - ‘A fine kind of humility, whereby pride seeks to be cloaked, so as not to be despised!’\(^{41}\) It is unfortunate that Antony attributes this to St Gregory, perhaps an indication that he was relying on his memory, which for once let him down.

Returning to Lent II, we note that Antony has two Sermones, one on the Transfiguration, the other on the Canaanite woman. The Old Testament readings were drawn that week from the history of the Patriarch Jacob, which is why Antony makes use of the story of Jacob’s ladder in both Sermons.\(^{42}\) In the first, Antony explicitly cites Bernard:

> Behold the knowledge of sin, of which blessed Bernard says, ‘Let not God give me any other vision to see, save to know my sins.’\(^{43}\)

For once, the Editors give no reference, but there are similar sentiments in *De gradibus*, where one of the first effects of clear vision, at the top of the ladder, is a knowledge of our own failings.\(^{44}\) Thus the themes of Antony’s and Bernard’s discourses are quite close. In the second Sermon for Lent II, regarding the Canaanite woman, Antony selects a further story from the Jacob-cycle: that of Dinah. Her ravishing by Sichem parallels the demonic possession of the Canaanite’s daughter. How did Antony come to think of this ‘concordance’? Perhaps it was because, in chapter X (the first step of pride), Bernard too uses Dinah as an example.\(^{45}\) It is instructive to compare the way he does so. For Bernard, the story is taken in its literal sense, as an example of inquisitiveness leading to ruin; Antony takes it as a moral allegory of the way the soul is ensnared by the devil.

There is a further point of contact. In enumerating the steps of Pride, Bernard gives several sharp (and amusing) word-pictures of monks and their failings. One can imagine some wry grins in the Chapter-house at Clairvaux. Antony lacks that

\(^{41}\) Lent III, 14; SDF I, 142; *De gradibus* 18, PL182.967; *Backhouse*, op. cit. 63

\(^{42}\) Lent IIA, 5; SDF I, 89-91; Lent IIB, 10; SDF I, 113-4

\(^{43}\) SDF I, 88: Ecce peccati notitiam, de qua dicit beatus Bernardus: Non mihi det Deus aliam visionem videre nisi peccata mea cognoscere.

\(^{44}\) cf. *Backhouse*, op. cit. 24,36

\(^{45}\) *Backhouse*, op. cit. 48
immediacy, but not totally. Consider the following passage, which is also a fine example of the rhythm and balance of his style. He is speaking, on the first Sunday in Lent, of the devil’s three temptations:

*Item, tentat nos diabolus in templo de vana gloria.*
*Dum enim sumus in oratione, officio et praedicatione,*
*vanae gloriae iaculis a diabolo impetimur,*
et multoies, heu! vulneramur.
*Sunt enim quidem, qui, dum orant et genua flectunt et suspiria emittunt, volunt videri.*
*Sunt alii, qui, dum in choro cantant, voces frangunt et in gutture citharizant,*
desiderant audiri.
*Sunt etiam alii, dum praedicant, dum vocibus intonant, dum auctoritates multiplicant et ad sensum suum glossant se circumgirant,*
appetunt laudari.
*Omnes isti mercenarii, credite mihi, receperunt mercedem suam,*
*filiam suam ponentes in prostitulo.*

The rhetoric is powerful: the progression ‘oratio, officium, praedicatio’, each a more public act than the one before; the variation ‘volunt, desiderant, appetunt’, with the alliteration of ‘volunt videri’, ‘desiderant audiri’; the piling up of words evoking the vainglorious- genuflecting and sighing in their prayers, straining and warbling in choir, thundering, multiplying texts and twisting them as they go round in circles in the pulpit; and finally the contemptuous dismissal of them as hirelings prostituting their gifts: they have their reward. It is not exactly Bernard, but it is (I suggest) Bernard-like.

2.24 ‘Paris style’

In contrast to these ‘classical’ models, contemporary Parisian theories of preaching seem to have had very little influence on Antony, even when he made use of their sermons (as in the case of Pope Innocent). Before coming to Innocent, however, there is another alleged mentor whom I would like to examine briefly. According to D.R. Lesnick⁴⁷, a major influence on Antony was Guibert, Abbot of Nogent (1053-1124), in his *Liber quo ordine sermo fieri debeat*. This seems to me an exaggerated claim, for the following reasons. Although the index of the *Sermones* indicates two possible citations of Guibert, neither is verbatim. One concerns the allegorical meanings of ‘Jerusalem’, and owes as much to Bede as to Guibert; while

---

⁴⁶ Lent I, 25; SDF I, 83; cf. Franceschini, op.cit. 164
the other, though echoing Guibert's thought on the greater usefulness of moral preaching over doctrinal, is expressed in different words. Guibert says:

By God's grace the faith is now well known to all hearts, so that although it needs to be taught often and repeated to those who hear it, yet it is not less appropriate, but more so, to speak of those matters which instruct behaviour. 48

Antony has:

We should stick more to morality, which instructs behaviour, than to allegory which instructs faith; for by God's grace the faith is spread all over the world. 49

Nevertheless, Guibert's work is interesting as an example of an approach to preaching very like Antony's own, and although a detailed analysis of Guibert would be out of place here, a short summary will illustrate what I mean. Guibert's work is in fact a preamble to his Scriptural commentary, and opens with a remark on the need of 'doctrine' in those who have the duty of preaching. Some who have this duty neglect it, from pride or idleness, to the harm of themselves and of those committed to their care. In any case, even if someone is not a bishop or abbot, or of any importance, he should do as St Augustine says, in accordance with his position: if he wants to live as a Christian, he should make the Christian name shine in others, as in himself. Guibert then launches into a longish discussion of good and bad people, apologising if he has spoken to excess, but his point being that the difference between good and bad lies in the inward disposition, not in outward circumstances. The book from which we preach should therefore be a pure conscience, lest while we preach good things to others, our own sinfulness blunts the force of what we say. We need to be on fire with divine love, if we are to set fire to others' hearts. A lukewarm sermon is no use either to preacher or to hearer. On the other hand, one should not let one's enthusiasm run away with one's tongue! An overlong sermon will not be remembered, and will leave people bored: as St Ambrose says, 'A boring sermon makes people cross.' Too many rich words are like too much rich food, that upsets and sickens the stomach. The preacher should adapt his words to his hearers, keeping things simple for the uneducated, but offering something more to the learned. When dealing with the Gospels, it is good to bring in the Old Testament. It is particularly useful for those

48 PL 156.26B: Dei vero gratia jam fides omnium cordium innotuit, quam etsi inculcare saepius ac retractare auditoribus oportuit, non minus tamen, imo multo crebrius ea quae mores eorum instituere possint, dicere convenit.
who desire a fuller knowledge of the Bible, but even just re-telling the stories will help to ‘colour in’ the picture. None of this is very original.

It is at this point that Guibert reviews the general rules of interpretation, and comments that moral preaching is more useful than purely doctrinal. Moral teaching needs to be repeated, because simple and uneducated people easily forget what they are told, and are more used to thinking about their material needs than their spiritual needs. One should explain vice as well as virtue, just as we need to know what foods to avoid as well as those that are wholesome. He then says that it seems to him that no preaching is more helpful than to show a man to himself, and confront him with his own portrait. He suggests that there are parts of the Gospels which are often applied to the Jewish people but which, if looked at carefully and studiously, apply much closer to home! This is in many ways similar to Antony’s approach, which is indebted to the tradition of monastic preaching, but it is probably going too far to claim a direct influence, let alone a major one. Lesnick himself notes that early Franciscan preaching was closer to the older models than to the newer, scholastic, methods.50

Such methods were expounded in many ‘artes praedicandi’ around this time, such as that of the Englishman, Thomas of Chobham, who was an almost exact contemporary of Antony, and had studied in Paris under Peter the Chanter, becoming sub-dean of Salisbury around 1208. During the 1220s he wrote his Summa de arte praedicandi51 to instruct the parish clergy in preparing sermons according to the norms of Lateran IV. All that needs to be said of this type of thing is that it is highly theoretical and highly analytic. Written with the same general purpose as Antony’s Opus Dominical, and at almost exactly the same time, it comes from a different intellectual world. Antony sought to prepare preachers for their work, not by theorising, but by attempting to encapsulate his own practice.

49 Pentecost IX, 1; SDF II, 5: Moralitati, quae mores instruit, magis est inhaerendum, quam allegorice, quae fides instruit: fides enim per Dei gratiam ubique terrarum est diffusa.
50 Lesnick, op. cit. 135
51 Thomas of Chobham, Summa de arte predicandi; (ed. F.Morenzoni). Corpus Christianorum, continuatio mediaevalis, LXXXII. (Turnhout, 1988)
2.25 Innocent III

A notable product of the Paris schools, whose sermons were undoubtedly known to Antony, was Pope Innocent III (1160-1216). Like Thomas of Chobham, he is said to have been in the 'circle' of Peter the Chanter, though probably only the 'outer circle'. As part of his programme of reform, he issued a number of his own sermons as aids to preachers. He wrote:

I am not suffered to contemplate, nor even to stop to take breath; I am so given over to others, that I am almost taken away from myself. But that I may not, through solicitude for things temporal which in the exigency of these evil times weigh heavily upon me, altogether neglect the care of things spiritual (which is the more incumbent upon me owing to my duty of apostolic service), I have prepared certain sermons for the clergy and the people ...

The setting for Innocent's preaching was the Papal Court itself. This is confirmed, for instance, by words of his in one of his sermons for Advent:

You know, I'm sure, because you have often seen it, that the Pope does not wear his golden mitre in Lent or in Advent (except for the middle Sundays, when we sing the Introits 'Laetare' or 'Gaudete').

This can only have been preached to an audience familiar, having seen it often, with the minutiae of Papal ceremonial.

Migne's *Patrologia Latina* contains around eighty of these Sermons, thirty-odd 'De Tempore', thirty-odd 'De Sanctis', and the rest for the Commons of Saints or for particular occasions. That Antony knew at least some of these sermons is certain; but did they have much influence on his own style as a preacher? If we want to answer this, perhaps we should compare their treatments of the same subject. A convenient choice will be their sermons on the Gospel of the Transfiguration.

---

54 Serm 6, Dom III in Adv., PL 217.337: Nostis, ut credimus, quia saepe vidistis, quod Romanus Pontifex, tam in Quadragesima, quam in Adventu ausfragiata mitra non ustitur, nisi tantum in illa media Dominicba Quadragesimae, quando cantatur ad introitum, Laetare Hierusalem; nec non in media Dominicba de Adventu, quando cantatur ad introitum, Gaudeite in Domino semper
55 PL 217.313 onwards
Innocent deals with this in his sermon for Ember Saturday in Lent, 56 Antony in his first sermon for the second Sunday in Lent. 57

Innocent begins with his text (Matthew 17.1), and gives a reason for this incident. It was to fulfil the promise made in the preceding verse (Matthew 16.28), that some of those present would not taste death until they had seen the Son of Man coming in his kingdom. He then deals with an apparent 'discordance': Matthew says it was after six days that the Transfiguration happened, Luke that it was about eight days after. Both periods have the same meaning: 'after six days' suggests the sabbath rest, while the 'eighth day' suggests the 'eighth age', that of the resurrection (this a rather 'Joachist' touch). The contradiction is resolved by saying that Matthew counted only the days between, Luke counted the first and last days of the octave as well.

He then raises a 'quaestio': what kind of vision was this, spiritual only, or corporeal? He suggests reasons for the former view, then reasons for the latter opinion. He decides in favour of the latter, and solves the objections before returning to his original text. Having established the reality of the vision, he then emphasises the number and variety of witnesses to it: God, two prophets, and three Apostles; heaven and earth, paradise (Elias) and hell (Moses), past and present, etc. He makes another passing reference to the final tribulation, and to Antichrist. He then considers Peter's remark about making three tabernacles, and explains why it was inappropriate but not blameworthy. He explains the significance of the Voice 'from the cloud', why the Apostles were terrified and fell down, and why when Jesus roused them they saw him alone.

So far- and this is already nearly two-thirds of the sermon- Innocent has been concerned with an exposition of the literal sense of the Gospel, what actually happened, and why. He then moves on to a more allegorical approach, prefacing his remarks with words that sound to me almost apologetic: 'Brothers and sons, I know you like a literal exposition; but I think you will be even more pleased with a spiritual

---

56 PL 217.375-382
57 SDF I, 85-101
exposition.' He then quotes his text again, and explains that Peter, James and John stand for three classes of people in the Church, prelates, continents and married people. These classes are also represented by Noah, Daniel and Job, as referred to in Ezekiel (14.20), and by the ‘two in the field, two in bed and two at the mill’ of whom ‘one will be taken and one left’ (Matthew 34). There is no automatic salvation for any group in the Church: ‘It is not the place that sanctifies the man, but the man the place.’

In the final part of the sermon, Innocent relates the Transfiguration of Christ, ‘His face like the sun, his garments white as snow,’ to the nature of the resurrection. He distinguishes a ‘double robe’, the glory of the risen body and that of the spirit. The body, made of the four elements, will have four properties (claritas, subtilitas, agilitas, impassibilitas), like the properties of the sun, while the spirit will be glorified by cognitio, dilectio and delectatio, which he relates to the Father’s words, ‘Hear’, ‘Beloved’ and ‘well-pleased’. He concludes with a short exhortation: if we want to be clothed with glory, we must go up ‘de valle ad montem’, must seek the things that are above until, rising from virtue to virtue, we see the God of gods in Sion, through Christ, blessed for ever.

Antony’s Sermon is about twice as long as Innocent’s (and of course, it is not really a ‘sermon’), and begins in Antony’s usual way with a prologue addressed to preachers, in which he compares their calling with that of Moses receiving the Law on Sinai. The main sermon opens with Christ taking Peter, James and John up the mountain. Straightaway the disciples are allegorized, but given a moral interpretation. They stand for the acknowledgement of sins, the uprooting of vices, and perseverance in the grace of God. He then relates them to the three men whom Saul met at Tabor when he was on his way to sacrifice at Bethel (1Sam 10.3). In accordance with his usual procedure, he also relates the Gospel text to the story of Jacob (the Old Testament reading for the week), and in particular to Jacob’s dream of the ladder. Sleep is contemplation, and the ladder is Christ, whose moral virtues (humility, poverty, wisdom, mercy, patience and obedience) are the rungs. He exhorts his hearers to climb Tabor by means of this ladder.
In the second main part of the sermon, Antony considers the Transfiguration itself. He refers to the vision of God which Moses and the elders had on Sinai (Ex 24.9-10). Moses, Aaron, Nadab and Abiu stand for religious, prelates, lesser clergy and married people; while the seventy elders are all the baptized. There is a digression on the sapphire pavement (Ex 24.10), relating it to Apostles, martyrs, confessors and virgins. There is another digression on the senses of sight, smell and taste (faith, discretion and contemplation), which are related to the properties of the sun (brightness, whiteness and heat). The garments of the soul are virtues, and remind us of the clothes which Rebecca prepared for Jacob.

The third section deals, fairly briefly, with Moses and Elijah, seen not so much as ‘Law’ and ‘Prophet’, but as types of meekness or mercy (Moses), and of zeal (Elijah). These in particular should be the virtues of a bishop. The final section is also brief. The bright cloud recall the cloud that overshadowed the Tabernacle (Ex 40), and this enables Antony to digress on the furnishings of the Tabernacle, the candlestick, the table, the ark and the altar, again given a moral application to the individual christian. The Father’s words provide only a final encouragement (like Elijah’s ‘gentle breeze’) to heed Christ. Like Innocent, Antony concludes with a wish (indeed, a formal prayer) to Christ that we may ascend ‘de valle ad montem’, to be imprinted with the form of the Passion rather than with glory, and with mercy and zeal. Then we will be able to hear Christ say, ‘Come, ye blessed of my Father.’

There are a number of Innocentian echoes in Antony: the three orders in the church, the properties of the sun, the garments of the soul, for instance; but they all seem slightly distorted echoes. Antony has an ecclesiological allegory (Moses and the elders), but it is different from Innocent’s (Peter, James and John). Antony knows of the Noah-Daniel-Job trio (it comes from Gregory); but he does not introduce it here. Again, he picks up the theme of the sun, but from a different point of view. One might wonder if Antony knew this particular sermon. He certainly did; he follows Innocent quite closely in what he has to say about the ‘double robe’ of glory, and about the properties of the glorified body; but he does not do so in this sermon, but in those for
Septuagesima⁵⁸ and for the fourth Sunday after Pentecost.⁵⁹ The main difference is in interest and tone. Innocent is mainly concerned about the literal meaning of the Gospel, together with shorter ecclesiological and anagogic interpretations. Antony simply presupposes the literal sense, and is overwhelmingly concerned with (a) showing that it is foreshadowed in the Old Testament; and (b) applying it to the moral and spiritual life of the individual believer.

In conclusion, I would say that Antony was certainly influenced by Innocent, but in his preaching, he followed his own way. There is a wide difference in style between the Paris-trained, aristocratic statesman, and the Portuguese canon who became an itinerant evangelist. Antony found his real masters not in the school-room nor in the Curia, but in the library, in the manuscripts of Augustine, Gregory and Bernard, whose sermons in fact left a much deeper mark upon his own.

2.3 Antony’s prologi consonantes

In his general prologue to the Opus Dominicale, Antony laments that,

Nowadays, preachers and congregations are so shallow that if a sermon is not full of polished and studied phrases, and a dash of novelty, they are too critical to take any notice of it. So in order that the word of the Lord should come to them in a way they will not disdain or scorn, to the peril of their souls, I have prefaced each Gospel with a suitable prologue...⁶⁰

These prologi consonantes vary considerably in length. Some (e.g. for Lent III) are just a short paragraph. Others (e.g. for Pentecost XX) extend to several pages. Antony also refers in the general prologue to a ‘table of themes’:

I have brought together in one place the headings of all the texts quoted, from which the theme for a sermon may be readily gathered; and I have noted beforehand, at the beginning of the book, the places in which they are to be found, and whatever things are appropriate to the matter.⁶¹

An examination of this tabula thematum gives us a ‘subtitle’ for each of the prologi; for instance, ‘a sermon for forming the heart of a sinner’, ‘a sermon for preachers’, ‘a sermon for preachers and prelates of the Church’, ‘the theme for a sermon on the
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three-fold temple’. In the first half of the work, the *tabula* speaks usually of a ‘sermon’ (*sermo*); in the second half, it also use the phrase ‘theme for a sermon’ (*thema sermonis*), as in the general prologue. This looser phrase suggests that Antony expected his readers to develop these ‘themes’ in their own way.

A large proportion of the *prologi* are addressed to ‘the preacher’ or to ‘the preacher or prelate of the Church’. In Antony’s time, the term ‘prelate’ had a wider meaning than it does today. As well as bishops and other higher clergy, it could include parish priests who, in virtue of their office, had pastoral authority over the people, and a duty to preach to them. Other priests (such as the friars) might have permission to preach, but they did not have the prelate’s canonical authority over the people. Antony’s use of the term suggests that he intended his work to be utilised not only by the friars, but by parochial clergy too (and even bishops).

The term ‘consonans’ applied to these *prologi* has an affinity with another term used frequently by Antony: ‘concordans’, which will be discussed in much greater detail in Chapter Five. It indicates that each prologue is in some way appropriate to the Gospel it is attached to, and in practice it means that each prologue begins with a text from the same book of the Bible as that used in the main body of the commentary to explain the Gospel.

In these prologues, then, Antony intended to give some preliminary advice to preachers regarding their work. In that sense, they embody his own theory of preaching. Can we, by examining them, determine what this theory was? In the first place, we notice that ‘theorizing’ (in the sense of abstract analysis, found in many *artes praedicandi*) was quite alien to Antony. What he offers is a series of images or analogies for the preacher’s task. Sometimes he uses these to instruct, sometimes to motivate the preacher.

---
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In the very first prologue, for Septuagesima\textsuperscript{63}, Antony considers the text where Ezekiel is told to take a tile, and write or draw upon it 'Jerusalem'. The preacher is like Ezekiel: he must take the 'tile' of the human heart, and inscribe upon it the City of God. Tiles are made by taking a piece of clay, flattening it out between boards, and baking it in an oven until it is hard and red. In the same way, the human clay has to be re-shaped and 'broadened' by charity, under the pressure of the two boards of the Old and New Testaments. It is hardened in the fire of tribulation, and becomes 'red' with zeal to serve God. 'Jerusalem' may be understood in three ways: as the Church on earth (allegory), as the soul itself (morality), and as the heavenly homeland (anagogy). In this way, the simple image of writing on a tile is 'unpacked', and important themes such as the role of the Scriptures and of suffering, in the sacramental, moral and 'mystical' dimensions of the christian life, are revealed. Related images recur: preaching is the 'writing reed' that inscribes God's word upon the soul\textsuperscript{64}; it is also the 'book' sweet in the mouth but bitter in the belly\textsuperscript{65}.

The images Antony employs may be grouped in several ways, and what follows is only a general summary. Even when images recur, they are often given a different slant by the context.

The sower.

A biblical image that Antony in fact uses sparingly is that of the 'sower'. The parable of the sower was the Gospel for Sexagesima, and Antony treats it at length; but in the prologue to that Gospel he takes a phrase from Isaiah, 'Blessed are ye that sow upon the waters.'\textsuperscript{66} These 'waters' represent the peoples of the earth, restless and unstable. Rivers originate in the sea, and return to it: humanity begins in the salt and bitter sea of original sin, and returns to the bitterness of death and the grave. In between, the preacher casts upon them the seed of God's word, Christ himself, and the Scriptures of the two Testaments. For Lent IV, he takes a similar phrase, 'casting bread upon the waters'\textsuperscript{67}. He contrasts these waters with 'the waters of Siloe', the

\textsuperscript{63} Septuagesima, 1; SDF I, 6
\textsuperscript{64} Easter II, 1; SDF I, 248
\textsuperscript{65} Easter III, 1; SDF I, 280
\textsuperscript{66} Is 32.20; Sexagesima, 1, SDF I, 25
\textsuperscript{67} Lent IV, 1; SDF I, 165-6
teachings of Christ, which the world rejects in favour of ‘Rasin and Phacee’, pride and lust.

Other agricultural imagery occurs. The preacher is a forester, clearing the beast-infested wilderness of the sinner’s heart, with the axe of Christ (iron head of divinity, and wooden haft of humanity). Then the ground can be cultivated and made fruitful\textsuperscript{68}. The preacher is like a farmer, tilling the soil of the soul with the hoe of preaching, yet dependent upon the early rains of grace to make the ground fruitful, and bring forth its harvest in the latter rains of glory\textsuperscript{69}. The role of the Spirit is often referred to: in this context, under the images of rain and dew.

\textbf{The warrior.}

This image is used in several ways. The preacher is ‘Israel’, fighting against the Philistines who represent sometimes the demonic forces of evil, which prey upon mankind\textsuperscript{70}, sometimes the rich and powerful of this world\textsuperscript{71}. Sometimes the preacher is ‘David’, going to battle with his staff (the Cross), five stones in a leather bag (the Old Testament in the context of the New), and a sling (an equal balance of words and example). Before attacking the enemy, the preacher ‘camps by the Stone of Help’, resting his mind upon Christ\textsuperscript{72}. The preacher is like the warrior Banaias, who went down into a pit in the time of snow, to kill a lion. The preacher must ‘go down’ from his own understanding of God, into the ‘frozen soul of the sinner’, to slay the lion of sin, or the devil\textsuperscript{73}. He is like Judas Maccabaeus putting on his armour\textsuperscript{74}.

\textbf{The herald.}

Sometimes the preacher is represented as the herald who summons the army to battle by sounding the trumpet. Commenting on the text ‘Strengthen yourselves, sons of Benjamin, in the midst of Jerusalem, and sound the trumpet in Thecua, and set up the standard over Bethacarem’, Antony says:
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Strengthen yourselves in the midst of Jerusalem, of the Church Militant in which is the ‘vision of peace’, the reconciliation of sinners. In the midst, yes, because at the heart of the Church is charity, which extends to friend and foe alike. The preacher must strengthen the faithful of the Church to hold on to that ‘midst’. In Thecua (in those who, when they do anything, blow a trumpet before them like the hypocrites...) sound the trumpet of preaching... And over Bethacarem, the sterile house of those dried up of the moisture of grace... set up the standard of the Cross, preach the Passion of the Son of God.\textsuperscript{75}

The trumpet of preaching summons to battle, but also to banqueting and festivity\textsuperscript{76}. The preacher is the herald of good tidings, who must get up on a high mountain: that is, his own life must be exemplary\textsuperscript{77}. He is also at times a chastiser, rebuking the sinner, pricking him with goads that will draw forth the blood of compunction\textsuperscript{78}. Peter, in his vision of the sheet full of unclean animals, was told to ‘Rise, kill and eat’. The preacher must stir himself to kill the beasts of lust, wrath, avarice and pride, and bring sinners back into the living Body of the Church\textsuperscript{79}.

The artist and craftsman.

The preacher is like a mason, who, with the trowel of preaching, joins together the living stones of the Church with the mortar of God’s word\textsuperscript{80}. He is a musician, like David playing on his harp to sooth the tormented spirit of Saul\textsuperscript{81}, preaching being ‘like a concert of music in a banquet of wine\textsuperscript{82}, and sometimes sad, sometimes joyful. Sometimes he is the instrument which is played upon by God’s Spirit\textsuperscript{83}. Sometimes the preacher himself is a product of craftsmanship. He is like the doors of Solomon’s Temple, or the bases of its pillars, intricately carved with symbols of angelic knowledge, victory, and good example\textsuperscript{84}. Elsewhere, he himself decorates and furnishes the temple of the Church with virtuous souls\textsuperscript{85}. In another prologue, the preacher is a blacksmith, shaping souls upon the anvil of God’s word, with a keen eye for the required design, and skilful in tempering the metal by coating it with the virtues and Passion of Christ, so that it will not rust.
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The healer and apothecary.

This image recurs, in a variety of ways. There is Samuel with his (four-sided) vial of oil, anointing Saul, whose name Antony interprets as ‘abuser’, and represents as the sinner. The preacher must take his ‘four-sided vial’ (the Gospels) and pour oil upon the sinner’s mind. Oil is used for healing, for strengthening, and for giving light. Antony says to the preacher, in effect, ‘Picture yourself as Samuel, anointing Saul to heal his wounds, strengthen his body and enlighten his mind.’ 86. The image is repeated with Zadok and Nathan anointing Solomon 87. On Palm Sunday 88, he speaks of the ‘balm of Galaaad’. Galaaad (the ‘mound of witness’) represents the Cross, and balm is the resin (the ‘tears’) of a tree, the Blood of Christ which flows from the Cross for healing. The terebinth tree occurs also in the prologue for Pentecost II 89, with the same significance. Elsewhere, the balm represents the penitent’s own tears of compunction. In an extended image 90, Antony represents the preacher as an ‘apothecary’, mixing up ingredients to make healing ointments. The myrrh of penitence, the storax of contrition, the galbanum of confession, the onycha of satisfaction, are pounded in the mortar of the sinner’s heart with the pestle of preaching. The wine of Christ’s Blood and the oil of the Holy Spirit are also part of the recipe. God’s word brings healing to the soul 91.

The wise teacher.

This may be ‘Moses on the mountain’, receiving the two tables 92. The ‘mountain’ is the preacher’s own life; he should leave the valley of sin, and mount higher, if he is to receive God’s teaching and be fit to teach others. The ‘wise teacher’ is also David, sitting in his chair 93. ‘Sitting’ implies lowering oneself, an image of humility.

86 Quinquagesima, 1; SDF I, 39
87 Easter V, 1; SDF I, 332
88 Palm Sunday, 1; SDF I, 189
89 Pentecost II, 1; SDF I, 416
90 Easter, SDF I, 1; 206
91 Epiphany II, 1; SDF II, 584
92 Lent IIA, 1; SDF I, 83
93 Pentecost IV, SDF I, 458
The ‘woodworm’.

An amusing image is the ‘woodworm’ to which David is likened, in a corrupt reading of 2 Sam (Kg) 23.8: ‘David, sitting in the chair was the wisest chief among the three: he was like the most tender little worm of the wood; who killed eight hundred men at one onset.’ The preacher must gnaw away at the ‘hard wood’ of the obstinate sinner’s heart, though he himself must have a ‘soft body’, to bear insults gently. We may be grateful to the mis-reading of the Vulgate for such a charming analogy, which we would never have derived from the real meaning: ‘David’s champions: Ishbaal the Hachmorite, leader of the three; it was he who wielded his battle-axe against eight hundred whom he killed at one time.’

All such image are cumulative. The preacher’s mission is many-sided. He is a warrior against the powers of darkness, which afflict both the Church community and the individual soul. He is also a healer of the soul’s sickness, and must know how to concoct medicine as well as how to apply it. He needs the skill of a craftsman, and the hard-work of a farmer. Antony (at any rate in these prologues) seems more concerned to help the preacher to see himself and his work in a certain kind of way, than to give him detailed instruction on how to carry it out. This method of parable and analogy is itself, of course, very ‘biblical’, very ‘evangelical’. It is the way Christ himself taught, and it sets Antony apart from many others who wanted to aid preachers in their work. It is not ‘intellectual’, it aims to evoke in the preacher an ‘insight’ into his vocation. As we shall see, this approach is followed, but developed much more elaborately, in the main part of Antony’s work on the Gospels, where he aims to provide the preacher with material for preaching.

94 Pentecost IV, SDF I, 458
CHAPTER THREE
ANTONY AND THE EXEGETICAL TRADITION

3.1 Background

The main thrust of this thesis is to exhibit St Antony as a Biblical theologian, and as far as possible to uncover his method of handling Scripture so as to explain it and then preach it. To do this, we must first see how medieval theologians in general understood their task. The motto ‘Contemplata aliis tradere’ is a not inapt expression of their understanding. The prayerful study of the Sacred Page led to a sharing of what had been gained from it with others. Scripture provided the theologian with his raw data; prayer gave him an empathy with this material in his study of it; but the need to communicate its teaching exposed a difficulty, which I will state as follows:

Every religion that gives a central place to a Sacred Book or Books must, sooner or later, confront the problem of how to find in the unchanging word a continuing relevance and application to a changing world. The Jews faced this problem in an acute form at the Exile, and again after the destruction of the Second Temple in AD70. The Christian Church, which also grew out of Second Temple Judaism, faced this problem in parallel with the Rabbis, and there was from the beginning a cross-fertilization of the two strains of exegesis. One technique for solving the basic problem, common to many religions, is to ‘allegorize’ the text—that is, to take the sacred text in a non-literal way, so that what originally referred to concrete historical facts now (also or instead) refers to timeless spiritual truths. Neither Rabbinic Judaism nor Christianity was willing to abandon its Abrahamic, Mosaic and Davidic heritage; but what was its continuing significance?

Characteristic of Judeo-Christian theology is a concept of history as linear rather than cyclic, running from the beginning of time to its end under the rule of God creator and perfector. A cyclic element is present in the liturgical year growing out of the agricultural year, but this is seen in the context of the overarching linear progress. The time process derives its meaning from the fact that through it God reveals himself; from this derives the importance of particular happenings and human
choices. In Christianity, there is added the idea of prophecy fulfilled in Christ’s first coming, or to be fulfilled in his second.

Christianity therefore developed a typological method, seeing God’s revelation of himself to the prophets and patriarchs of the Old Testament as foreshadowing his complete self-disclosure in the life and teaching of Jesus. This emphasis on types and fulfilment

1) gives an eternal meaning to the particularities of history;
2) implies a divinely ordained progress through history.

As I see it, the exegetical problem may be summarised as follows:

1. ‘Sacred History’ is not the same as ‘Sacred Scripture’. With regard to history, we may ask not only ‘What happened?’ but ‘Why did it happen?’ This second question is ambiguous. It may mean, ‘What were the antecedents? What led up to this event?’ - and this is a purely historical question, even though we may have no means of answering it.

2. However, the question ‘Why?’ may mean ‘To what end? For what purpose?’, referring not merely to human intentions but to something wider. It is then a question for the philosophy or theology of history: ‘What are God’s purposes?’

3. One of the (human) purposes in writing ‘Scripture’ is to express, as far as one can, one’s beliefs about these Divine purposes. The stories of the Exodus, or of the kings of Israel and Judah, for instance, are told in the way they are told not simply to describe what happened, but also to explain why it happened in the broader sense.

4. The task of the exegete is, to start with, to determine what the author is trying to convey. Here he is like the historian who is trying to determine ‘what happened’. However, there is a further task that the exegete may or may not undertake, or even believe in, which may be expressed as follows.

5. If Scripture is (in whatever sense) ‘inspired’, ‘having God for its Author’¹ over and above the various human authors, we may ask whether God intends anything that transcends the intentions of those authors, and, if so, what? This task is like that

¹ Vatican Council II, Constitution on Divine Revelation, par 11
of the philosopher or theologian of history: it is essentially a theological task, one that involves our understanding of God.

Medieval writers were not always clear about the distinction between ‘historical’ and ‘meta-historical’ questions on the one hand, or between ‘exegetical’ and (if may coin the term) ‘meta-exegetical’ questions on the other; but broadly speaking I think they would have accepted the validity of these distinctions. The difficulty comes in applying them in practice. The broad lines of development of Christian Scriptural interpretation up to the Middle Ages are now well established, not least due to the work of Beryl Smalley. Christian methods of interpretation grew out of first-century Jewish methods. The technique of the ‘allegorization’ of the Scripture which Philo began was continued and developed by, for instance, Origen of Alexandria. As a Christian, Origen was concerned to safeguard the basic historicity of the Scriptures (above all the Gospels), but he distinguished four ways in which they might have further significance:

1) Christological: prophecies (in the Old Testament) of the coming of Christ;
2) Ecclesiological: prophecies of the Church and its Sacraments;
3) Eschatological: prophecies of the Last Things and of the world-to-come;
4) Moral: figures of the relationship between God and the individual soul.

The last two ways applied to the New Testament, as well as the Old. The Alexandrian School, as it came to be, was content to accept that some passages in Scripture had no ‘bodily’ meaning; but all had a ‘spiritual’ meaning. As Beryl Smalley puts it, ‘By no other means, at that time, could the taboos of primitive tribes, as described in the Law, have been spiritualized for the benefit of men who were hardly less primitive.’

A caveat: there is an ambiguity about taking the term ‘literal sense’ as meaning ‘what the text says’. The text says nothing; it is the author who says something in and through the text. The Fathers did not have the means to answer (or even raise) many of the questions modern exegetes ask about the ‘literal sense’- what the human author meant- but we can exaggerate their ‘literalism’. They knew how historians wrote in their own time, how they had to ‘reconstruct’ events from the

---

B. Smalley, The Study of the Bible in the Middle Ages (Oxford, 1952)
traditions they had received, how they would, for instance, compose suitable speeches to express the intentions of historical figures as they believed them to have been. These were the conventions of historical writing.

3.2 Augustine and Antony

At the root of Augustine’s influence on Antony is *De doctrina christiana*, which we mentioned in the previous chapter. This work was enormously influential throughout the Middle Ages. Antony twice quotes Augustine’s definition of ‘charity’ from this work, but a comparison between it and the *Sermones* shows that in the latter Antony was carrying out scrupulously the recommendations of Augustine.

*De doctrina christiana* is in four books, the first three on understanding the faith, the fourth on teaching it. It is, in fact, not a manual of Christian doctrine, rather a methodology for Christian education.

He who explains to listeners what he understands in the Scriptures is like a reader who pronounces the words he knows, but he who teaches how the Scriptures are to be understood is like a teacher who advises how the words are to be read. Of the first three books, the first is on ‘Things’ and the other two on ‘Signs’, or as we might say, on objective reality and the language we use to talk about it. ‘Things’ are divided into those we ‘enjoy’ and those we ‘use’. The latter are our means to the former: ‘To enjoy something is to cling to it with love for its own sake’, and the ultimate object of our love and joy is God. Sin arises when we get our priorities wrong, pursuing what ought to be a means as an end, and not as it leads to God. In all our study of Scripture we must remember that it is meant to arouse and increase our love and desire for God, and of everything else for his sake.

This ‘Augustinian’ approach was fundamental to Franciscan theology as we see it expressed in its greatest exponents, Bonaventure and John Duns Scotus. Love, rather than knowledge, was the keynote of Francis’ own life, the essence of the ‘Seraphic’ way (the Seraphim were regarded as the spirits of Love, *par excellence*, in

---

3 Smalley, *op.cit.*, 11
4 SDF I,48 (Quinquagesima) and II,217 (Pentecost XIV). Augustine is cited by name.
distinction from the Cherubim who were characterised by knowledge, the predilection of the Dominican Order). Antony was not a systematic theologian after the pattern of those just mentioned, but his grasp of Augustinian methodology laid the foundations for Franciscan theology as it developed.

It is in the second book of *De doctrina christiana* that we see most clearly the particular influences that shape the *Sermones*. For Augustine, a sign is 'a thing which causes us to think of something beyond the impression the thing itself makes upon our senses.' Some signs are natural, some conventional - the latter are those which living creatures show to one another to manifest their thoughts and feelings. In particular, Holy Scripture is the sign whereby God (through human authors) conveys his message to us. The original Scriptures have been translated into many languages, and this both helps and impedes our understanding. We have to work to ensure we understand the true meaning intended by God. This requires a moral preparation, starting with the fear of the Lord and mounting through piety, knowledge, strength, mercy, and purity to wisdom.

Returning to our particular knowledge of the Scriptures, Augustine reminds his readers that the Canon of Scripture is established by the Church. Here is our field of study. Ideally, we should have a knowledge of the original languages in which the Scriptures were written. In practice, we must at least compare the various translations, and utilize the work of scholars regarding the precise meanings of words and expressions. Language can be used figuratively as well as literally, so to understand the force of the various similes, analogies etc. found in Scripture, we need knowledge of those things which form the basis of the similes - animals, plants, minerals, the natural world generally. We need to understand something of number and music, and to have some acquaintance with human institutions. This requires historical knowledge, and some grasp of human art and technology. Above all, we need to be able to reason correctly if we are to draw inferences from what we know.

---

6 DDC II.1, Robertson, 34
Even a cursory glance at the *Sermones* reveals how conscientiously Antony follows all this advice. He constantly refers to Jerome and Isidore of Seville on philology, to Aristotle, Pliny and Solinus on Natural History, and so on. Augustine had warned,

Because of those whose fastidiousness is not pleased by truth if it is stated in any other way except in that way in which the words are also pleasing, delight has no small place in the art of eloquence.  

Antony too laments, in his Prologue, the ‘insipida sapientia’ of his contemporaries which ‘legere fastidit’ what is not ‘polita, exquisita et novum quid resonantia’. That is why he includes ‘illustrations from physics and natural history, and explanations of words expounded from the standpoint of morality’. Above all, Antony follows the Augustinian precept of interpreting Scripture by Scripture.

Even when every effort has been made to understand the meaning of the Scripture, some ambiguities will remain. This is particularly true of the figurative language. In Book III Augustine offers some advice, although it is limited in scope. First, any true interpretation must be subservient to the rule of charity- it must promote virtuous behaviour. But since the Author of Scripture is God, who foresees all possible interpretations, we can say that God’s intention includes all that can (saving charity) be legitimately derived from the text. Augustine makes a passing reference to particular linguistic forms- allegory, metaphor etc.- but does not pursue them in detail. The development of a fully-fledged ‘allegorical’ system of interpretation was the work of later writers, following the Alexandrians more closely than Augustine did.

3.3 The Development of Allegory: Gregory

We are not concerned in this thesis with giving a detailed survey of the evolution of medieval theories of allegory in Scripture, but only with it as it influenced Antony. After Augustine (in order of time, not necessarily of importance) was St Gregory. Whereas Augustine had emphasised the importance of linguistic and scientific knowledge in understanding figurative language, Gregory offered more...
precise guidance on how such language might be understood. Antony had a thorough acquaintance with the *Moralia in Job*, and from this work in particular we can see how the principles outlined earlier by the Alexandrians were developed towards their medieval form. In his prefatory letter to Bishop Leander, Gregory wrote:

> Because I wanted to accede to so many requests, I have completed this work of thirty-five books in six volumes: partly by a literal exposition, partly by one rising towards contemplation, partly by moral teaching. In this work, then, I seem sometimes to depart from straightforward exposition, and to dwell longer and more broadly on contemplation and morality. ¹⁰

A little further on he wrote:

> You should know that we pass quickly over some passages with an historical exposition, and examine others by means of allegory in a typical sense; while we discuss others only in terms of moral allegory, and sometimes we enquire more fully by all three together. First we lay an historical foundation, then by typology we raise a mental structure as a citadel of faith, and finally we decorate the building, as it were, with the grace of morality. ¹¹

But he warned:

> Sometimes someone who neglects to take the historical expression literally obscures the light of truth offered him; and while he tries laboriously to find a deeper meaning, he misses what he could find quite easily on the surface. For while the divine word does stretch educated minds by its mysteries, it often nurtures the simple by its surface meaning. It is able to nourish little ones publicly, while in secret keeping the means to raise minds to the contemplation of the highest truths. If I may so express it, it is like a river both broad and deep, in which a lamb may paddle and an elephant may swim. That is why, as each passage requires, there is a varied manner of exposition, adapted as the subject requires to express more truly the meaning of God’s word. ¹²

The search for further meaning is justified on the assumption of divine authorship of the Scriptures. In the Preface proper, discussing the authorship of the Book of Job, Gregory wrote:

¹⁰ PL 75.513: *Quibus nimirum multa iubentibus dum parere modo per expositionis ministerium, modo per contemplationis ascensum, modo per moralitatis instrumentum volui, opus hoc per xxxv volumina extensum in vi codicibus explevi.*

¹¹ PL 75.513: *Sciendum vero est, quod quaedam historica expositione transcurrimus et per allegoriam quaedam typica investigatione perscrutamur, quaedam per sola allegoricæ moralitatis instrumenta discutimus, nonnulla autem per cuncta simul sollicitius exquirentes tripliciter indagamus. Nam primum quidem fundamenta historiae ponimus; deinde per significationem typicam in arcem fidei fabricam mentis erigimus; ad extremum quoque per moralitatis gratiam, quasi superducto aedificium colore vestimus.*

¹² PL 75.514: *Aliquando autem qui verba accipere historiae iuxta litteram neglegit, oblatum sibi veritatis humen abscondit, cumque laborioso invenire in eis aliquid intrinsecus appetit, hoc, quod foris sine difficiatate assequi poterat, amittit. Divinus etenim sermo sicut mysterii prudentes exercet, sic plerumque superficie simplices refovet. Habet in publico, unde parvulos naturat, servat in secreto, unde mentes sublimium in ammiratone suspendat. Quasi quidam quippe est fluvius, ut ita dixerim, planus et altus, in quo et aegros ambulet et elephas natet. Ut ergo uniusquisque loci opportunitias postulat, ita se per studium expositionis ordo immutat, quatenus tanto verius sensum divinae locutionis inveniat, quanto, ut res quaeque exegerit, per causarum species alterna.*
It is an entirely pointless question to ask who wrote these things: since faith assures us that the author of the book is the Holy Spirit... He wrote it, who caused it to be written. He wrote it, who was both the inspirer of the work and who, by means of the writer, conveyed to us what we should imitate.  

One might as well worry about what pen a human writer used, as about the identity of the human author of a sacred book.

Precisely how Gregory understood his principles must be learned from seeing how he applied them. ‘First we must plant the root of history, so as to satisfy the mind afterwards with the fruit of allegory.’ The first two books of the Moralia cover only the first chapter of Job. In each book, Gregory gives an historical exposition of the text first. Then he says: ‘We believe these things as historical facts: but now by allegory we must see how they are fulfilled.’ He returns to the beginning, and interprets Job as a type of Christ; his (former) house is the synagogue, whose four corners are the priests, scribes, elders and Pharisees, and which is destroyed by the devil’s whirlwind. After this, he starts yet a third time from the beginning, interpreting Job as a type of every good man who suffers; the house of his soul should be built on the four virtues, prudence, temperance, fortitude and justice. ‘Holy Scripture as it were holds up a mirror to our mind’s eye, wherein we may see our inner countenance.’ The relation of the allegorical and moral senses is that, in the former, we apply the Scriptures to our Head; then, to build up his Body, we copy the pattern morally, so that what was done outwardly in Him we perform inwardly in our hearts. In fact, Gregory does not carry out this plan in its fulness beyond the first few books; then the literal sense is passed over more and more cursorily, and the allegorical and moral senses come to predominate. In this way, the Moralia differs
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13 PL75.517: Sed quis hic scripsit, valde supervacue quaeritur: cum tamen auctor libro Spiritus Sanctus fideliter credatur... Ipse igitur hic scripsit, qui scribenda dictavit. Ipse scripsit, qui et in illius opere inspirator exsult, et per scribentis vocem imitanda ad nos eius facta transmisit.  
14 PL75.528: Debemus prius historiae radicem figere, ut valeamus mentem postmodum de allegoriarum fructu satiare.  
15 PL75.533: Haec per historicam facta credimus, sed per allegoriam iam qualiter sint impleta, videamus.  
16 cf. PL75.572  
17 cf. PL75.542  
18 cf. PL75.592  
19 PL75.553: Scriptura sacra mentis oculis quasi quoddam speculum opponitur, ut interna nostra facies in ipsa videatur  
20 cf. PL75.586  
considerably from a modern commentary on Job, and yet it is still anchored in the
text, and never become a purely systematic treatment of mystical or moral topics.

3.4 Hugh of St Victor

The Gregorian tradition was developed considerably by the Victorines. I
suggested in Chapter I. that Antony’s debt to the Victorine tradition was not as great
as some (Châtillon, for instance) have supposed. This may be an appropriate point to
give some reasons for this suggestion. Scholars such as Beryl Smalley have made
much of the fact that Hugh of St Victor and his disciples were much concerned with
the literal sense of Scripture, as opposed to the allegorical interpretations favoured by
many of their predecessors and contemporaries. In his Sermones, Antony shows very
little interest in the literal sense, and this alone should give us pause before suggesting
a strong Victorine influence upon his thought. However, it is worth examining Hugh’s
development of the Gregorian tradition in a little more detail. In his De scripturis,22
Hugh begins his treatment of the interpretation of Scripture by distinguishing three
ways in which it may be understood:

Sacred Scripture may be explained according to a threefold meaning. The first exposition
is historical, in which first the meaning of the words is considered in reference to the
matters treated... The second exposition is allegorical. Allegory is when by what is literally
signified, something else is meant, either past, present or future. This is divided into
simple allegory and anagoge. It is simple allegory when by a visible fact another visible
fact is signified. Anagoge is 'leading above', when by a visible fact an invisible is
declared.23

He gives the example of Job: historically, a rich man brought low; allegorically,
Christ coming down to share our misery; and when we ask what we are to do, Job is
the penitent weeping for his sins. Hugh clearly uses 'anagoge' here to indicate
'moral':

We will inquire what, by this fact, is signified as to be done: that is, what it is right to
do.24

---

22 PL 176.9-28
23 PL 175.11-12: Secundum triplicem intelligentiam exponitur sacrum eloquium. Prima expositio
est historic a, in qua consideratur prima verborum significatio ad res ipsas de quibus agitur...Secunda
expositio est allegorica. Est autem allegoria, cum per id quod ex littera significatum proponitur, aliiud
aliquid sive in praeterito sive in praesenti sive in futuro factum significatur... quae subdividitur in
simplicem allegoriam et anagogen. Et est simplex allegoria, cum per visibile factum aliiud invisibile
[f?visible?] factum significatur. Anagoge id est sursum ductio, cum per visibile invisible factum
declaratur.
24 Ibid: Quid per hoc factum, faciendum, id est dignum fieri significetur, inquiramus.
He then goes on to say that we cannot apply this three-fold method to every passage:

Obviously, not all the things contained in Holy Scripture can be related to this threefold interpretation, so that each may be regarded as containing at the same time history, allegory and tropology.25

Here Hugh uses the term 'tropologia' instead of 'anagoge', but he evidently means the same by each. He continues:

In the divine word, some things are found which only require a spiritual understanding, some serve a moral purpose, some are said according to simple historical sense; but there are some which can be explained appropriately according to history and allegory and tropology.26

The distinction now seems to be between 'spiritual', 'moral' and 'historical' senses: not every passage deals with 'history', in the sense of describing events which have happened. Some only refer to spiritual or moral truths; but some can mean all three (or presumably, any two). It looks as if Hugh has been taking as his paradigm the narrative parts of Scripture, which tell of ostensibly historical events; however, there are other parts of Scripture (the Wisdom literature, or much of the prophets, for instance) which is not 'historical' in that way, but which give spiritual or ethical teaching. However, he realises that 'historical' is not the same as 'literal'.

Therefore since mystical understanding is gathered only from what is, in the first instance, proposed by the letter, I am amazed by the effrontery of those who claim to be teachers of allegory, but who do not know the meaning of the basic letter!27

He is amazed at the 'cheek' of people who claim to be teachers of allegory, when they are ignorant of the primary, literal sense. Hugh seems to be making a new point: there is always a literal significance of the words, and any allegorical meanings must build upon that literal meaning.

Do not boast about understanding Scripture if you do not know the letter. To be ignorant of the letter is to be ignorant of what the letter stands for, and what is understood by the letter. The meaning of the first itself represents a third thing. So since those things which the letter signifies are signs of spiritual understanding, how can they be signs to you if they
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25 Ibid: Sane non omnia, quae in divino reperiuntur eloquio, ad hanc triplicem torquenda sunt interpretationem, ut singula historiam, allegoriam et tropologiam simul continere credantur.

26 PL 175.12-13: In divinis eloquis quaedam postea sunt, quae tantum spiritualiter intelligi volunt; quaedam vero morum gravitati deservunt; quaedam etiam secundum simplicem historiae sensum dicit sunt: nonnulla vero, quae secundum historiam et allegoriam et tropologiam convenienter exponi possunt.

27 PL 175.13: Cum igitur mystica intelligentia non nisi ex iis quae primo loco littera proponit colligatur: miror qua fronte quidam allegoriarum se doctores Jaciant, qui ipsam adhuc primam litterae significationem ignorant.
have not yet signified anything to you? Do not jump ahead, or you will fall into a hole. One goes rightly if one goes in an orderly way. First take care, by reading, to gain thorough knowledge of those things which Holy Scripture proposes to you as having mystical significance; when you have understood what is on the surface, you can gather by further meditation what you need for the building up of faith or for the instruction of good behaviour, by way of similitude.  

The 'literal meaning' is a middle term between the words of the text, and the 'spiritual meaning'. You cannot 'jump' over it. You must carefully compare the 'face meaning' of the text with the 'mystical meaning' pertaining to faith or morals. The literal sense is the means whereby the Holy Spirit conveys spiritual truths to minds that are dependent upon the bodily senses. If we were able to by-pass it, most of the imagery of Scripture would be quite pointless. He concludes this argument:

Read Scripture, then, and first learn carefully what it narrates in a bodily way. If you studiously impress the shape of this on your mind, according to the order in which the story is set forth, afterwards you will, by meditation, press out the sweetness of spiritual meaning as though from a honeycomb.

Later in the treatise Hugh gives some principles for deriving inner significance from outward meaning. He distinguishes ‘sounds’ (voces) from ‘meaning’ (significatio).

The conscientious student of Holy Scripture should by no means neglect the meanings of things; because just as knowledge of the first things is gained from sounds, so understanding of these same things is gained from the meaning of the words, which are perceived by spiritual knowing; and it is made manifest perfectly.

The meaning of ‘sounds’ is dependent upon human conventions; but the significance of ‘things’ derives from the will of the Creator. It is therefore much wider. Few words may have more than two or three meanings, but things have a multiple significance, deriving from their many different properties. He considers ‘things’, with their
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28 Ibid: Noli itaque de intelligentia Scripturarum gloriaris, quandiu litteram ignoras. Litteram autem ignorare est ignorare quid littera significet, et quid significetur a littera. Nam quod significatur a primo, tertium significat. Cum igitur res illae quas littera significat, spiritualis intelligentiae signa sint, quomodo signa tibi esse possunt, quae necdum tibi significata sunt? Noli ergo saltum Jacere, ne in praecipilium incidos. /lie rectissime incedit, qui incedit ordinate. Primum igitur illarum rerum quas libi sacrum eloquium proponit, ad mysticam significationem stude legendo comparare notiliam, ut ex iis specie cognitis, postmodum meditando colligas quod vel ad fidei aedificacionem, vel ad instructionem honorum morum per similitudinem adducas.

29 PL 175.15: Lege ergo Scripturam, et disce primum diligenter quae corporaliter narrat. Si enim formam horum secundum seriem narrationis propositae studiose animo impresseris, quasi ex favo quodam postmodum meditando spiritualis intelligentiae dulcedinem fuges.

30 PL 175.20: Diligens scrutator sacri eloqui rerum significaciones nequaquam negligere debet, quia scit per voces primarum rerum notitia acquiritur, ita per significacionem rerum earundem intelligentia, quae spirituali notificatione percipiuntur, et manifestatio perfectur.
sensible qualities; 'persons', with their social relationships; 'numbers' (devoting a whole chapter to their meanings); 'place'; 'time'; and 'action' (*gestum*).

Since there are six circumstances which are regarded as significant, each of them has its meaning: either a fact signifies a fact, and this is allegory; or a fact signifies what is to be done, and this is morality. In these two we are instructed in knowledge of the truth (integrity of faith) and in love of goodness (the perfection of good works). Divine Scripture is to be read for these two purposes: that we may believe sincerely, and act well.\(^3\)

Although Hugh begins with some apparent confusion between 'historical' and 'literal', it soon becomes clear what he means. The text has a literal meaning (intended by the human author). It is upon this meaning that further meanings (intended by God) are built. If the further meaning is a 'fact' (a truth of faith), we have allegory; if it refers to what we ought to do, we have morality. Hugh does not suggest that the literal meaning is more important than the others; only that we cannot reach the others without it: it is in that sense fundamental.

Whether Antony had read Hugh's *De scripturis*, or his *Didascalicon* in which he makes similar points, is doubtful. He certainly did not follow Hugh in concerning himself overmuch with the 'literal' sense of the Scriptures in his *Sermones*; on the other hand, his allegorical and moral comments do grow naturally out of the literal sense, and in no way seek to 'by-pass' it. However, he does prefer (in theory) a fourfold division of senses (literal, allegorical, moral and anagogical) in which 'anagoge' is not the same as 'morality, and the term 'tropological' is not used at all. This does not suggest that he bases himself on Hugh, even if he did know his work. One work he almost certainly did know, however, was Hugh's *De institutione novitiorum*, which was used at São Vicente. Here Hugh advises novices:

> But you brothers who have just entered the school of discipline should, in divine reading, first seek what instructs morals in virtue, rather than what sharpens the mind in subtlety; you should want to be shaped by the precepts of Scripture rather than hindered by questions. When you read the Scriptures, pay careful attention to what is said there to arouse the love of God in you, and contempt for the world; what is said to warn against the snares of the Enemy, what nourishes good affections and extinguishes evil desires; what swiftly inflames the heart with the ardour of compunction; what teaches discipline...

---

\(^3\) PL 175.24: *Cum totque sex circumsitante, quae dicuntur significare, quaeuncque earum significet, aut factum significat factum et est allegoria; aut factum faciendum significat, et est moralitas. In his duobus ad cognitionem veritatis, id est integritatem fidei, et ad amorem bonitatis, id est ad perfectionem bonorum operum, instruamus. Propter quae duo legenda est divina Scriptura, scilicet ut credamus sincere, et bene operemur.*
action, humility in thought and patience in adversity- in short, what teaches how to ensure doing good, and avoiding evil. When read in this way, Scripture bestows a saving understanding, and through virtue you will find better, later on, that very wisdom which (for virtues sake) you gladly despise now. 32

This advice Antony certainly followed wholeheartedly.

3.5 Antony

Both Gregory and Hugh envisage a three-fold manner of understanding Scripture: the literal interpretation, and two ‘non-literal’ senses, one concerned with the truths of faith (allegory), and the other with human moral activity (‘tropology’, or ‘anagoge’). However, the number of senses varies with different authors. Beryl Smalley notes that Angelom of Luxeuil discovered no less than seven senses in parts of the Bible. 33 By Antony’s time four senses seem to have been widely distinguished, the three mentioned above, and an ‘anagogic’ sense that related to the Last Things (a sense of the term that went back at least to Cassian 34). For instance, Guibert of Nogent says,

We should say what treatment is most suitable for the teacher. There are four rules of Scripture, on which the whole of Holy Writ turns as on four wheels. They are history, which tells what happened; allegory, in which from one thing another is understood; tropology, that is moral discourse, in which the principles of morality are treated; and anagogy, that is, spiritual understanding, whereby from studying the high and heavenly things we are drawn above. 35

This analogy of the chariot or waggon with four wheels seems to have been widespread. It appears also in Chobham:

---

32 PL 176.933-4: Vos autem fratres, qui scholam disciplinae iam intrastis, in lectione divina prius debitis quaerere, quod mores instruat ad virtutem, quam quod sensum acuat ad subtilitatem, magisque velle informari proeceptis Scripturarum, quam quaestionibus impediri. Cum igitur divinas Scripturas legitis, solerter perpendite quid ibi dictum sit ad excitandum in vobis amorern Dei, quid ad contemptum saeculi, quid ad cavendas insidias inimici, quid ad bonos affectus nutriendo., et parva desideria extinguenda valeat, et quid citius cor per compunctionis ardores accendat. Quid disciplinam in opere, quid humilitatem in cogitatione, quid patientiam in adversis habere doceat, quid denique ad agenda bona securum, et ad mala cavenda doceat esse circumspectum. Hoc modo lecta Seriptura intelligentiam conferat salutarem, et hanc ipsam sapientiam (quam pro virtute libenter despicitis) melius postmodum per virtutem inventis.

33 Smalley, The Study.... 41

34 Smalley, The Study.... 28

35 Guibert of Nogent. Quo ordine sermo fieri debeat. PL 156. 25-26: Dicendum etiam nobis est quis tractatus doctor? proeceptum habendus sit. Quatuor sunt regulae Scripturarum, quibus quasi quibusdam rotis volvitur omnis sacra pagina: hoc est historia, quae res gestas loquitur; allegoria, in qua ex alio alius intelligitur; tropologia, id est moralis locutio, in qua de moribus componendis ordinandisque tractatur; anagoge, spiritualis scilicet intellectus, per quem de summis et caelestibus tractatur ad superiora ducimur.
In order that the grain of God's word be rightly sown in the human heart, we must consider what is written in the Book of Kings, namely that Elijah was taken up into heaven in a fiery chariot. This chariot is holy preaching, by which the faithful soul is transported to heaven as on four wheels. The first wheel is history, the second tropology, the third allegory, the fourth anagogy.36

He connects these four means of understanding with the four powers of the soul: by sense we attend to history; by reason we comprehend tropology, the moral sense; by understanding we take note of allegory, signifying the Church and its members; by wisdom we consider anagogy, the heavenly love of God and things above.37

Antony certainly prefers the four-fold division, here departing from his mentor Gregory, but he has his own metaphor, of a more organic character:

Holy Scripture is 'the earth which of itself bringeth forth fruit, first the blade, then the ear, afterwards the full corn in the ear.' By the blade we understand the allegorical sense of Scripture, which builds up faith in accordance with the words, 'Let the earth bring forth the green herb.' By the ear we understand the moral sense, which gives form to our behaviour and pierces the mind with its sweetness; and by the full grain is represented the anagogical sense, which treats of the fulness of joy and of angelic blessedness.38

Elsewhere, in considering the text of Proverbs: He that strongly squeezeth the paps to bring out milk straineth out butter; and he that draineth violently bringeth out blood (Prov 30.33), Antony says:

We squeeze the paps strongly when we consider the sacred words with a subtle mind; by doing so, though we seek milk, we get butter: for while we are looking to be nourished with a meagre understanding, we are given inwardly something much richer. He who drains violently brings out blood: we need to be careful lest trying to hard to get milk

37 Chobham, op. cit. p4: Tot enim modis littera sacre Scripture, a qua predicatio elicienda est, exponitur; et ipsis quatuor modis intelligientie quatuor virtutes anime subserviunt secundum unam sui distinctionem, scilicet sensus, ratio, intellectus et sapientia. Sensu enim, scilicet visu vel auditu, hystorias attendimus. Ratione vero tropologiam, id est moralem sensum, comprehendimus. Intellectu vero allegoriam, id est alienam significationem de ecclesia et membris ecclesie, advertimus. Sapientia vero anagogen, id est supernam dilectionem de Deo et de rebus celestibus, consideramus. Hystoria igitur philosophie et theologie communis est; tropologiam vero et anagogen et allegoriam, sacra pagina sibi specialiter reservavit.
38 SDF I, 1, Prologue, 2. Sacram Scripturam, quae est terra primo parturiens herbam, deinde spicam, deinde plenum granum in spica. In herba allegoria, quae sidem aedificat: Germinet, inquit, terra herbam virentem; in spica, a spiculo dicta, moralitas, quae mores informat et sua dulcedine animum transverberat: in pleno grano anagoge figuratur, quae de gaudii plenitudine et angelica beatitudine tractat.
from the udders, we draw blood. Squeezing too hard and drawing blood means that too much discussion may produce a carnal understanding rather than a spiritual. 39

This passage appears in only one manuscript; but Antony certainly continues by interpreting the ‘paps’ as the Old and New Testaments, the ‘milk’ as allegory, and the ‘butter’ as morality. The ‘blood’ is then interpreted as sorrow leading to tears, suggesting that anagoge has at this point been forgotten, and Antony is more concerned with the idea of moral teaching leading to compunction and repentance. He goes on:

He squeezes the paps strongly, who puts the hand of action to the knowledge of both Testaments which he preaches;

in other words, his life must be in accord with his knowledge.

The preacher, then, must draw from the breasts the milk of history, so that he may derive from it the delicious butter of morality. Note that milk is made up of three elements. First there is the watery matter, the ‘whey’. Secondly, the curds from which cheese is made. The third is butter. The whey is the historical meaning, the cheese is allegory, the butter is morality. The tastier this last is, the more it is relished by the minds of those who hear it, because their practice is undermined. Therefore, we should stick more to morality, which instructs behaviour, than to allegory which instructs faith; for by God’s grace the faith is spread all over the world. 40

This last sentence is the passage allegedly deriving from Guibert, which we considered in the last Chapter. Here too Antony seems to envisage only ‘history’, ‘allegory’ and ‘morality’; he was evidently not wholly committed to a four-fold division, although when it suits him he occasionally offers an ‘anagogic’ interpretation. Antony’s preference for morality is nevertheless clear.

39 SDF II, 3; Pentecost IX, 1: Ubera quippe fortiter premimus cum verba sacra subtili intellectu pensamus, qua pressione dam lac quaerimus butyrum invenimus, quia dum nutriri tenui intellectu volumus ube riate internae pinguedinis ungimur. Et qui vehementer emungit elicit sanguinem. Cavendum est ne dum nimis ab uberibus emulgeatur lac sanguis eliciatur. Sanguinem quippe elicit qui vehementer emulget, quia carnalis efficitur dum hoc n imia discussione spiritus sentitur, et qui vehementer emungit elicit sanguinem

40 Pentecost IX, 1; SDF II, 4: Ille fortiter ubera premit qui scientiae utriusque Testamenti, quam praedicat, manum operationis apponit.... Praedicator igitur ex uberibus debet elicere lac historiae, ut ex ipso possit colligere butyrum moralitatis suavissimum. Nota quod lac constat ex tribus substantiis. Prima est quae dicitur serum aquosum; secunda, quae dicitur caseus; tertia butyrum. Serum aquosum historiam, caseus allegoriam, butyrum moralitatem significat, quae quanto est suavieri tanto suavior afficit mentes audientium, quia mores destructi sunt. *ideo moralitati, quae mores instruit, magis est inhaerendum, quam allegoriae, quae fidem instruit; fides enim per Dei gratiam ubique terrarum est diffusa. (*mores destructi sunt- could this be a misreading of instructi, as in the next sentence? It would make more sense.)
3.6 Objective Allegory

The finding of allegories was not a matter for the arbitrary taste of preachers: there were recognised rules and conventions. For instance, the *Patrologia Latina* contains a work entitled: *Allegoriae in universam sacram Scripturam*,\(^\text{41}\) which Migne attributed to Rabanus Maurus, although it is now thought to be by the Cistercian Garnier de Rochefort. The author begins by saying, 'whoever wants to gain knowledge of holy Scripture must first consider carefully when it is speaking historically, when allegorically, when anagogically and when tropologically.' He calls these four ways of understanding, the 'daughters of mother Wisdom'. Through them, mother Wisdom feeds her adopted children, giving the 'milk' of history to those young and inexperienced, the 'bread' of allegory to those making progress in faith, the 'savoury meat' of tropology to those making great efforts and sweating in good works; and, finally, with the 'wine' of anagogy, she gives a 'sober inebriation' to those who despise earthly things and seek to rise above by the desire of what is heavenly.

History is just telling what happened. It is the superficial meaning of the words, and we understand it as we read it. Allegory contains something more; it imparts the truths of faith, the mysteries of holy Church—whether present or future. One thing is said, another is meant, so that truth is expressed by figures, in a veiled way. Tropology is much the same, but here the words or facts build up moral life, rather than faith. Anagogy, whether veiled or open, is to do with the joys of our heavenly home, and the rewards awaiting right faith and right living.

History, by telling the stories of the perfect, stirs the reader to imitate their holiness; allegory, by revealing the faith, moves to knowledge of the truth; tropology teaches us to love virtue in our moral lives; anagogy manifests heavenly joys and makes us desire them. In the house of our soul, history lays the foundations, allegory raises the walls and anagogy puts on the roof; while tropology decorates the building by inner affections, and outwardly by good deeds.

\(^{41}\) PL 112. 849-1088
The author goes on to consider when texts should be understood in only one sense, and when in two, three or all four. He notes that the same word or figure does not always have the same meaning, in every context—for instance, the water that is said to flow from the heart of a believer is not the same as that which the Psalmist prays will not overwhelm him; nor is the victorious lion of the tribe of Judah the one that goes round seeking whom he may devour! In general, one must examine the context, the natural qualities of things, the Hebrew or Greek etymology, and so on.

The main part of the work is an extensive (almost exhaustive) list of figures, how they are used and what they mean: there are over seventy under the letter 'A', for instance, including 'angel', 'abyss', 'abies' (fir-tree), 'accipiter' (hawk), 'acetum' (vinegar) and so on. What is clear is that for the author, 'allegorization' was not arbitrary or fanciful. It rested on clear principles, and there were accepted conventions regarding individual cases. In a very basic sense, it was 'scientific' in the sense of a clear and systematic method, resting on principles and the scholarship of earlier writers; and if Antony did not know and use this work, he evidently used something similar.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE SERMONES DOMINICALES ET FESTIVI

4.1 The structure of the Sermones.

Having reviewed in Chapter One the historical background to Antony's writings, and having examined in Chapters Two and Three the traditions of preaching and exegesis in which he worked, it is now time to look more closely at the structure of his written work, and in particular at the Sermones Dominicales (or Opus Dominicale, to give it a more accurate title).

This study is based on the Critical Edition of the Sunday and Festival Sermons of St Antony published at Padua in 1979. This is equipped with full critical apparatus, indices, and a helpful introduction in six parts by the Editors. It is based on no less than seventeen codices, the earliest being of the late thirteenth century, the latest of the fifteenth century. Some other codices are known via earlier editions, although the manuscripts themselves are no longer extant. Printed editions of the Sermons appeared in 1520 and 1641 (Paris), 1634 (Avignon), 1883-5 (Bologna and Padua) and 1895-1913 (Padua). The last is the 'Locatelli' edition on which much work earlier this century was based. It seems unlikely that the present edition will be superseded in the foreseeable future.

---


Vol II: Sermones Dominicales et Mariani (a dominicam IX post Pentecosten ad dominicam III post octavam Epiphaniae).


This will be cited in the notes as SDF I, II, III and page number. When quoted in English, it will also be cited by the title of the sermon and the paragraph number.
4.11 The General Prologue.

At the beginning of the *Sermones Dominicales*, Antony sets out his intentions and methodology in a Prologue, basing himself on this text from the first book of Chronicles:

David gave the purest gold: to make the likeness of the chariot of the cherubims, spreading their wings and veiling the ark of the covenant of the Lord.¹

The key words or phrases which he proposes to examine are ‘gold’, ‘David’, and ‘the chariot of the cherubims’. Under ‘gold’, he discusses the four senses of Scripture, as we saw in Chapter Three. Scripture is, as it were, the ‘gold-mine’ from which he draws his raw material. It is ‘the purest’, refined ‘from every defilement of heretical perversity’. In other words, Antony specifically offers his work in the context of the contemporary struggle against heresy, and especially (I have suggested earlier) against Catharism.

Under the term ‘David’ (who represents Christ), Antony briefly considers the development of the spiritual life:

The soul is a garden, in which Christ, like a gardener, plants the sacraments of the faith, and which he then waters when he makes it fertile with the grace of repentance.⁴

This grace is poured out even upon ‘beginners’. Changing the metaphor, Christ gives birth to us like a mother, in the agony of his Passion. Then,

he carries souls onward from strength to strength, especially those who are making progress in the faith... Just as a loving mother of a little child, when he wants to climb the stairs, takes his hand in hers so that he can climb after her, so the Lord takes the hand of the humble penitent with the hand of love, that he may climb by the ladder of the cross to the state of perfection.⁵

Although the *Opus Dominicale* was intended for the guidance of friars who were primarily concerned with preaching repentance, and who were therefore mostly dealing with ‘beginners’ in the Christian life, Antony never loses sight of the ‘pilgrim’s progress’ as a whole. His terminology (of ‘beginners’, ‘proficients’, and ‘perfect’) is conventional, and does not hint at any particular characteristics of these stages, as other writers did by speaking of ‘purgative’, ‘illuminative’ and ‘unitive’

---

¹ 1 Chron 28.18
² Prologue, 2; SDF I, 1
³ Prologue, 2; SDF I, 2
ways. Two beautiful images, of Christ the gardener and Christ the mother, dominate this section.

It is when he comes to speak of 'the chariot of the cherubims, spreading their wings and veiling the ark of the covenant of the Lord', that Antony gives us his vision of the nature and purpose of his work. The biblical image of the 'ark of the covenant' was a popular one with medieval writers. Richard of St Victor famously uses it in his *Benjamin Major* ('The Mystical Ark')⁶ as the foundation for his teaching on contemplation. To understand Antony's use of the image, we need to remember just what the ark was, and what it looked like as described in Exodus. Essentially, it was a wooden chest containing the stone tablets of the Law, Aaron's staff, and a jar of manna. It was equipped with rings and poles enabling it to be carried, as the Israelites journeyed through the wilderness. But the ark was more than just a container. It was surmounted with a golden structure in the form of two 'cherubim'. These figures from Babylonian mythology had the form of winged bulls. They seem to have been placed facing inwards, with their outstretched wings covering what was called the 'mercy seat': evidently the spot where God was imagined as invisibly enthroned. Thus the ark was also a kind of 'portable throne' for God. This at any rate seems to be how Antony envisaged it, and he frequently connects it with the other 'mobile throne' described by Ezekiel, although it is not easy to say exactly how this is to be imagined. The base in this case consisted of four winged bull-like creatures (whom we may refer to as 'cherubim') and also of four 'wheels'. Above this was a platform or 'firmament' upon which was a throne upon which the Lord sat. In his sermon for Pentecost, Antony interprets the 'wheels' as the apostolic preaching upon which the Church goes forward, and connects the whole structure with 'the chariots of Aminadab' in Canticles 6.11, and the 'chariots of the Lord which are salvation' of Habbakuk 3.8. The word the Vulgate uses in both these cases is 'quadriga'.

Antony proposes to use the gold of Scripture to construct a 'quadriga' of his own. The two cherubim represent the two Testaments, whose wings are 'spread out' when they are expounded by the three spiritual senses mentioned before. The 'ark'
itself is the faithful soul, in the 'covenant' of Baptism, protected by the scriptural teaching from the world, the flesh and the devil— or, as Antony puts it more poetically, from the heat of worldly prosperity, from the rain of carnal desire, and from the thunder of diabolic temptation.7

The ark of the covenant was carried on poles, but the chariot throne of Ezekiel had wheels, and it is this image that Antony develops.

And so we have made this 'chariot-throne' to the honour of God, to the building up of souls, and to the comfort of reader and listener; from the understanding of Holy Scripture and from the authorities of either Testament, so that in it, with Elijah, the soul may be lifted up from earthly things and borne away into the heaven of celestial conversation. And note that as on a chariot there are four wheels, so in this work four matters are dealt with, namely: the Lord's Gospels, the history of the Old Testament as it is read in Church, the Introit, and the Epistle of the Sunday Mass. I have collected together and correlated each of these, as divine grace has granted and 'as far as my slender and paltry knowledge allows, following the reapers with Ruth the Moabitess, to gather the fallen ears in the field of Boaz.8

In this last phrase, Antony neatly uses a common image for the work of a Scriptural commentator, and picks up the image of scripture as the 'grain of wheat' which he had used at the beginning.

Antony's use of the term 'quadriga' was not original— we have noticed it already in, for instance, Guibert and Chobham. Gregory somewhere speaks of the two Testaments as the two wheels of the Church's chariot, presumably because he still knew that the Roman 'quadriga' was a two-wheeled vehicle drawn by four horses. In the middle ages it was imagined as a four-wheeled waggon, like those used in many Italian cities in civic ceremonies. Antony's originality consisted in using the 'quadriga' not as an image of the four senses of Scripture, but to refer to the liturgical readings around which he would build his commentaries. In doing so, he gives his whole work a practical and pastoral framework, relating it to the weekly and annual round of the Church's worship, as experienced by the ordinary Christian at Mass, and by the preacher in the Divine Office.

6 Richard of St Victor, The Twelve Patriarchs, the Mystical Ark, the Trinity (Book III); translation and Introduction by G. Zinn (N.Y., London, )
7 Prologue, 4; SDF I, 3
8 Prologue, 5; SDF I, 4. The quotation is reminiscent of Gregory (PL79.187-8) and Bernard. The 'Ruth' analogy was also used by Stephen Langton and Jacques de Vitry, following Peter the Chanter. cf Baldwin, Masters, Princes and Merchants, 88-9
4.12 The *tabula thematum*. 

This was referred to in passing in Chapter Two. It is a list of texts (*auctoritatum huius operis principia*) from which *'elici potest thema sermonis'*. In the Critical Edition, it is broken down by the Editors, and printed section by section before the relevant Sunday, so that its significance is not at first sight evident; but in its original form it was a single list, beginning with Septuagesima. In certain mss. the order is different, but internal evidence suggests strongly that this was a later rearrangement, perhaps to follow the liturgical practice of beginning the year with Advent, and, in the case of the Sundays after Pentecost, to accommodate local variations in the Lectionary. The table gives us straightaway some information about the shape and scope of the work as Antony envisaged it. For each Sunday, the Gospel *'principium'* is given, and subdivided into *'clausulae'* (usually three or four, occasionally fewer or more). Each division then contains several *'sermones'* , related to a text. In the case of Septuagesima and Sexagesima, the table also gives the Introit, Epistle and *'History'*, as well as the Gospel, but this practice is not continued, and is the main indication that the Septuagesima beginning is original. For Septuagesima, Antony also writes: 'In the first section of this gospel you will find at least these themes for sermons, or texts for preaching on.' As this is the most elaborate section of the *tabula*, I will quote it in full:

First, the Gospel for Septuagesima: The kingdom of heaven is like to a householder, which is divided into two clauses. The Introit of the Mass: They have surrounded me. The Epistle: Know you not that they that run in the stadium. The History: In the beginning God created heaven and earth. In the first clause of this Gospel you will find at least these themes for sermons or principles for preaching:

First, a sermon for forming the heart of a sinner and on the property of a tile, on: Take thee a tile.
Again, a sermon on the seven articles of faith, on: The first day, God said: Be light made.
Again, a sermon on the Nativity of the Lord, on: The first day, God said: Be light made.
Again, a sermon on Baptism and those who violate it, on: Let there be a firmament.
Again, a sermon on the Passion of Christ and the faith of the Church, on: Let the earth bring forth, etc.

On the second clause. In the second clause of the Gospel, first a sermon on contrition of heart for penitents, on: God said: Be light made, and light was made.
Again, a sermon for penitents, on: Saul came in.

---

9 On liturgical influences on the *Sermones*, see: T. Lorenzini, 'I sermoni Antoniani e la Lectio Divina' (1989, *IS* 29, 197-212); P. Pedone, 'La tematica liturgica nei 'Sermones' Antoniani' (1987, *IS* 27, 3-75); SDF I, Introduction, cxix
10 Septuagesima, SDF I, 5
Again, a sermon against the rich, on: The Lord prepared a worm.
Again, a sermon for those confessing, on: Let there be a firmament.
Again, a sermon for penitents or enclosed religious, on: Who hath sent out the wild ass.
Again, a sermon on the love of God and neighbour, on: Let there be two lights. And note that from this text there can be drawn a sermon for the feast of the Apostles Peter and Paul. Peter was the greater light, to rule the day, that is the Jews; Paul was the lesser light, to rule the night, that is the Gentiles.
Again, a sermon for contemplatives and on the property of the bird, on: Man is born to labour.
Again, a sermon on the two-fold glorification, namely of soul and body, on: There shall be month after month.

Thereafter, the formula is fairly constant:

The Gospel for Sunday N.... which is divided into (x) clauses.
First, a sermon for (or on).... [This is always the 'prologus consonans']
Again (item), a sermon on... [repeated as many times as necessary]
On the (second, etc.) clause, a sermon on...
Again, a sermon on...

As the table proceeds, the word 'sermon' is often omitted, and we have just: ‘Again (item), on...’. From the Ninth Sunday after Pentecost (the halfway point of the work), a further variation is introduced: ‘A theme for a sermon on...’, ‘A theme on...’, although the earlier forms still occur, especially the simple ‘item’. Possibly this change marks some break in composition (at least of the table).

The tabula gives us an indication of the way Antony intended to relate his Opus Evangeliorum to the needs of individual preachers. In no way was the material compiled for any given Sunday to be regarded as ‘a sermon’. It was a resource from which a number of possible sermons might be drawn, a ‘text-book’ (in several senses) of materia praedicabilis. Before we move on, I would offer one small word of warning about the Critical Edition. As well as breaking up the tabula into sections, the Editors number the paragraphs of the main text, ostensibly according to the sermones suggested in the tabula. While this is true in principle, a close reading of the text suggests (to me at least) that the Editors’ subdivisions are not the only ones possible.

4.13 The prologi consonantes.

I discussed these at some length in Chapter Three and therefore I will not repeat what was said there. Those prologi which are not specifically addressed (in the tabula thematum) to the work of the preacher (such as those on the Nativity or the
Passion, on the Blessed Virgin, on penitence or confession) seem nevertheless to have been intended to give a general orientation to the preacher. J.G. Bougerol has called the prologi a species or subspecies of ‘prothema’ and suggests, with plausibility, that they were written by Antony at the time he was compiling and organizing his material for a given Gospel.

The second part of the prologus consonans is a brief outline of what is to follow: the divisions of the Gospel, the corresponding divisions of the Epistle, the Introit and the source of the Historiae. This is not followed absolutely always: there are exceptions. For instance, in the prologue to the third Sunday in Lent, four parts of the story of Joseph are referred to, but in the main body of the sermon the second of these is divided into two, while the third and fourth are run together.


Neither time nor space permit a comprehensive discussion of every point treated in Antony’s work, so I will limit myself to a reasonably broad survey. As mentioned previously, Antony begins with Septuagesima. This is unusual, since the ecclesiastical year began then, as now, with Advent. In the Festival cycle of sermons (to which we shall return), he begins with Christmas. However, on Septuagesima the Mattins readings returned to the first chapter of Genesis, beginning a course preparing for Easter. By beginning here, Antony was able to start with a consideration of Creation. This may indicate that he saw his work as a comprehensive theological treatment: it certainly reflects the fact that this was a fundamental point of issue between Catholicism and Catharism. Here and elsewhere Antony balances allegorical (Christological or Ecclesiological) and moral interpretations. The allegory based on the Creation story concerns the mysteries of Christ’s life- his Birth, Baptism, Passion, Resurrection, Ascension, sending of the Spirit and coming in Judgement. The moral teaching deals with contrition, confession, satisfaction, the love of God and neighbour, the active and contemplative lives and final perseverance. The Gospel of the day is that of the labourers in the vineyard, but on this first Sunday it takes a subordinate place.

J.G. Bougerol, 'La Struttura del 'Sermo' Antoniano' (1982, IS 22, 93-108) 100f
Usually, the Gospel is primary. For Sexagesima it is that of the sower. Although the general application of the ‘sower’ image is to Christ (allegory), the interpretation of the types of soil follows a moral pattern. On Quinquagesima, the consideration of the blind man is also predominantly moral, and includes two other blind men, Tobit and the bishop of Laodicea. When we come to Lent, the Editors divide the material for the first Sunday into two ‘Sermones’, but this is not in accord with the \textit{tabula thematum}; rather, there is first a Christological allegory regarding the ‘desert’ theme, and Adam, followed by a moral treatment of penitence, with some quite detailed advice for confessors. On the second Sunday, there really are two treatments, one of the Transfiguration and the other of the Canaanite woman. This reflects different liturgical practice. At the beginning, the Franciscans followed the liturgical usage of the Roman Curia, whereas the Dominicans followed that of the French dioceses. Here and elsewhere, Antony’s approach may reflect partly Franciscan usage, partly that of the Church in the Bologna-Padua region\textsuperscript{12}. On this Sunday, the treatment of both Gospels is mainly moral, as it is on the third and fourth Sundays in Lent. On the fifth Sunday, and on Palm Sunday, the emphasis shifts towards a consideration of the Passion of Christ, but moral interpretation is never far away. Only very occasionally do we find any concern for the literal sense, and then it is usually only in passing. For instance, in commenting on the Gospel for the fifth Sunday in Lent (John 8.48-50), Antony explains the origin of the Samaritans\textsuperscript{13}; and on Palm Sunday he has a little about the situation of the Mount of Olives relative to Jerusalem, and about apparent disagreements regarding Mary's anointing of Jesus at Bethany\textsuperscript{14}; but such literal interpretations are few in number and short in extent. There are rather more instances of anagogic interpretation, such as quotations from Innocent III on the glorified body on Septuagesima and Pentecost IV\textsuperscript{15}, but this too is

\textsuperscript{12} Bougerol, \textit{ibid.} 97-8. Bougerol refers to several discussions of liturgical practice: M.O’Carroll, ‘The Lectionary for the Proper of the Year in the Dominican and Franciscan Rites for the Thirteenth Century’ (1979, \textit{Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum}, 49, 79-105; S.T.J.P. Van Dijk, \textit{Sources of the Modern Roman Liturgy} (Leiden, 1963), \textit{The Ordinal of the Papal Court from Innocent III to Boniface VIII and related Documents} (Fribourg, 1975)

\textsuperscript{13} Lent V, ; SDF I,178

\textsuperscript{14} Palm Sunday, ; SDF I,193-4,

\textsuperscript{15} Septuagesima, ; SDF I, 22; Pentecost IV, ; SDF I, 468
of marginal interest to Antony. This survey of the pre-Easter 'Sermones' is sufficient to give an idea of Antony's approach.

Antony's 'quadriga' would seem to be a compilation, in which he combines pre-existing material (quite probably such as he had himself preached) with passages written for the work itself. Bougerol offers an analysis of the sermon for Low Sunday, which seeks to differentiate these two elements; I do not think it is necessary to follow him in any detail here. I am content to agree with his general conclusion, namely that

The personality of the Antonian 'Sermo' witnesses to the personality of its author. St Antony was first of all a preacher, and if under obedience he had received the responsibility of teaching theology at Bologna, he fulfilled the task in his own way: that is, without the influence of the surrounding Parisian and English university culture, but mainly in the context of the first Franciscan generation, that is, with the simplicity of which 2 Celano speaks when he explains why Francis called Antony 'my bishop'. In writing the Quadriga, Antony wanted only to assemble- 'colligens', he says in the Prologue- but with a quite precise aim, that of offering a 'materia praedicabilis' to his brethren.16

4.15 Minor prologues and Epilogue

Antony gives minor prologues to introduce the months in the latter part of the year (June to November), and for Advent. These outline the themes for the period. The Opus Dominicale ends with a brief Epilogue. A recent study17 suggests some echoes of the 1221 Rule and the 'Testament' of St Francis (his final message to his friars), which would fit well with the date of completion of the work.

4.16 The Sermones Festivi.

As the Festival Sermons are of marginal relevance to the study of Antony's technique of 'concordance' - it scarcely appears in them- I shall note only that this latter series is incomplete (in the sense of not containing the later festivals of the year) and it may be that even the sermons we have are not in the form Antony would have given them if he had lived longer. For each festival there is an exposition of the Gospel of the day, though less elaborate than those for the Sunday Gospels, followed by what the Editors describe as a 'sermo allegoricus' and a 'sermo moralis', and

16 Bougerol, l.c. 103
17 C. Paolazzi, 'Antonio cita Francesco: l'epilogo dei 'Sermones Dominicales' e la 'Regula non Bullata' XVII' (1996, IS 36, 445-455)
occasionally also a 'sermo anagogicus'. The term 'festival' is taken broadly—it includes, for instance, Ash Wednesday and Rogation-tide. It could well be that the material in these sermons is closer to what Antony actually preached than that in the more highly edited Sunday sermons.

4.2 The theological sources of the Sermones.

If Antony's 'Quadriga' is an assembly or collection, of what materials is it composed? What are Antony's sources? I will divide them into theological and secular, and try to show how Antony handles them.18

4.21 The Bible.

The Bible is the first, most extensive and most easily identified of all Antony's sources.19 The Scriptural Index of the Critical Edition fills more than one hundred columns, over sixty for the Old Testament, about forty for the New. In general, Antony quotes from the Vulgate, but he not infrequently adopts readings and versions found in the Liturgy or the Fathers. When he cites Scripture in the Sermones Dominicales, he gives only the Book; in the Sermones Festivi he gives Book and chapter, indicating that between the composition of the two sets he became acquainted with the recent developments in the division and referencing of Scripture. In my own translations of the Sermones I have used the Douai-Challenor version, with minor adjustments, as it provides the closest available parallel with the grammatical

18 On the general sources of the Sermones, see: G. Cantini, 'De fontibus sermonum S. Antonii, qui in Editione Locatelli continentur' (1931, Ant 6, 327-360); B. Costa, 'Le fonti dei ‘Sermones’ di Sant’ Antonio' (1981, IS 21, 3-27)

structure of the Latin. As Chapter Five will be particularly concerned with Antony's handling of Scripture, I will say no more here.

4.22 Jerome and Isidore

Antony uses Jerome (over a hundred times) and Isidore (over four hundred and fifty times) to furnish definitions and meanings of words: I will give just a few samples:

a) *bestiae quae dictur quasi vastiae* (Easter I; SDF 1.248), from Isidore's 'bestiae... a vastando dictae' (*Differentiae verborum et rerum*, PL 83.36)

b) *Speculum dictum, quod splendorem reddat, vel quod ibi feminae intuentes considerant speciem sui vultus* (Easter V; SDF 1.340);

cf. Isidore, *Etymologiae* XVI,16,1; PL 82.582

c) *mulier, a mollitie sic dicta* (Easter III; SDF 1.285) cf. *Etymologiae* XI,2,18 PL 82.417

d) *stercus dictum, quia stratum in agrum* (ibid.) cf. *Etymologiae* XVIII,2,3 PL 82.598

e) *Agrippa, congregatio subita: Berenice filia eleganter commota interpretatur*.


f) *Aaron interpretatur monsfortis* (Easter, SDF 1.224)

cf. Jerome, *De nominibus hebraicis* PL 23.830

g) *Taboc, torrens pulveris* (Easter VI; SDF 1.362) cf. Jerome, *op. cit.* PL 23.825

Antony makes occasional use of other ancient authors, such as Bede. G. Gasparotto has recently suggested that Antony's copious use of Isidore was not least because Isidore was a follower of Gregory, and is part of the Gregorian programme followed by Antony.20

4.23 The 'Gloss', 'Sentences' and 'Historia Scholastica'

After the Bible, in terms of volume, comes the Gloss, which is also accorded its own Index in the Critical Edition, of more than twenty columns. Antony does not always refer to it explicitly, but it is a constant presence- in Beryl Smalley's words, 'Antony turned to the Gloss on almost every quotation which needed some exposition if it were to serve his purpose.'21 Of the other standard reference books, the 'Sentences' of Peter Lombard and the *Historia Scholastica* of Peter Comestor are used sparingly, although when they are used, some quite substantial passages are


21 Smalley, 'The Use... ' 286.; See also B. Costa, 'Sant' Antonio e la Glossa' (1981, *IS* 21, 147-172
Antony makes virtually no use of Gratian, whose Decretals were often quarried by other writers for Patristic quotations. He makes a little use of other 'modern' authors, such as Beleth and Neckham. At one time, Antony's use of these works was held to show that he was very much influenced by the spirit of the Biblical renaissance that marked the twelfth century in Paris. More recently, writers such as Pompei and Smalley have stressed that Antony is much more faithful to the monastic ethos in which he was trained at Coimbra, than to the methods of disputatio and dialectic that marked the non-monastic schools.

**4.24 Possible Jewish influences.**

It is well-known that there was considerable intellectual cross-fertilization between Jewish and Christian scholars in northern France in the twelfth century. The Gloss itself (in its basic conception and lay-out) may be inspired by the Talmud, with its core-text surrounded by comments by recognised authorities. The school of Rashi was untypical of rabbinic scholarship generally in its concern for the literal meaning of Scripture, having this in common with the Victorines. Given the strong Jewish presence in Iberia, it is tempting to ask whether we can detect any similar influence upon Antony. Maimonides was born in Cordoba in 1135, and though he died in Egypt, his influence was strong in the west. T. Lorenzin has recently claimed to find traces of rabbinic methods in the *Sermones*, although I have to say that I do not find his arguments entirely convincing. Further research in this area would be very welcome.

**4.25 Augustine, Gregory and Bernard**

Regarding these, I have already said much in Chapter Two. In the appendix, Table I shows the frequency of citation from Augustine, Gregory, Bernard and Innocent, demonstrating how much more often Antony uses Gregory than the others.

---

22 Balduinus de Amsterdam, "Libri IV Sententiarum" Petri Lombardi in 'Sermonibus' S. Antonii Patavini' (1956, CF 26, 113-15); "Historia Scholastica" Petri Comestoris in 'Sermonibus' S. Antonii Patavini' (1954, CF 24, 83-109)

23 cf. Rohr, op.cit.

24 A.M. Pompei, 'The Sermons of St Anthony and Theology' (GR 9.3, 277-308); Smalley, 'The Use... ', 287ff.


26 T. Lorenzin, 'Spunti de esegesi rabbinica nei Sermones di S. Antonio' (1982, IS 22 375-378)
It is also possible to see that Antony quotes these authors substantially more often in the first half of the *Sermones Dominicales* than in the second; and the frequency drops still further in the Marian and Festival Sermons, apart from St Bernard. 27

I speak of Antony ‘quoting’ his authorities; in fact, he more often uses them allusively, or in paraphrase possibly relying on his memory. To illustrate, I will give some samples from Augustine:

a) **Augustine**: Amarum poculum prior medicus bibit, ne bibere timeat aegrotus. (Enn. in Ps 98.3, PL 37.1259)

   **Antony**: Potionem amaram, ut dicit Augustinus, prius bibit medicus, ut non abhorreat bibere aegrotus (Lent II; SDF I.90f)

b) **Augustine**: Caritatem voco motum animi ad fruendum Deo propknt seipsum et se atque proximo Deum propknt ipsum. (De Doct. Chr. III, 10, 16 PL 34.72)

   **Antony**: Dicit Augustinus: Caritatem voco motum animi ad fruendum Deo propknt ipsum, et se atque proximo Deum propknt ipsum. (Quinquagesima; SDF I.48)

c) **Augustine**: Muscipula diaboli crux Domini: esca qua caperetur mors Domini. (Serm 263, De ascensione Dni. PL 38.1209)

   **Antony**: De qua dicit Augustinus: Redemptor noster letendit muscipulum crucem suam; possit ibi escapum. Ile autem sanguinem fudit non debitoris, per quod recessit a debitoribus. (Palm Sunday; SDF I.199)

d) **Augustine**: Atque ita constituto in corde iudicio, ad sit accusatrix cogitatio, testis conscientia, carnifex timor. Inde quidem sanguis animi confitentis per lacrymas profuat. (Serm 351 PL 39.1542; cf also Epist 262.11 PL 33.1081)

   **Antony** refers to this several times, in varying forms:

   - Dicit Augustinus: Ascende, o homo, tribunal mentis tuae; sit ratio iudicans, conscientia accusans, timor carnifex, dolor crucians, locum testium obtineant opera. (Easter IV; SDF I.323)
   - Dicit Augustinus: Ascende tribunal mentis tuae, sit ratio iudicans, conscientia accusans, timor carnifex, dolor crucians, locum testium obtineant opera. (Pentecost XIX; SDF II.322)
   - De qua dicit Augustinus: Ascende tribunal mentis tuae, sit ratio iudex, conscientia accusans, timor carnifex, dolor crucians, locum testium obtineant opera. (Ss. Innocents; SDF III.44)

   sanguinem lacrimarum educere, quae, ut dicit Augustinus, sunt sanguis animae. (Easter II; SDF I.248)

   Animae, inquit Augustinus, sanguis lacrimae. (Pentecost IX; SDF II.5)

   ... lacrimarum effusione, quae, ut dicit Augustinus, sunt sanguis animae. (Lent II; SDF I.99)

   (lacrimae) quae sunt, ut dicit Augustinus, sanguis animae. (Christmas II; SDF II.556)

   sanguis enim animae lacrimae. (Nativity; SDF III.9)

One can find similar examples from Gregory and Bernard.

---

4.3 Secular Sources of the Sermones; the ‘Concordance of Nature’.

As he had noted in his Prologue, Antony ornamented his Sermones with copious illustrations from Natural History—animals, birds and insects, plants and minerals, are in constant evidence. Where did he get this material from, and how did he use it? This would make a fascinating study in itself, but here we can only look at a few examples, in order to give depth and perspective to our understanding of his Biblical technique. To begin with, the identification of his sources is not straightforward, as I will try to show from what I call:

4.31 ‘The Case of the Curious Curlew’

In his Sermo for the third Sunday of Lent, Antony refers to a certain bird, whose name he does not give; in the tabula thematum for this Sunday, however, he offers a sermon ‘de natura avis caladriae’. What was this ‘caladrius’? Another version of the word is ‘charadrius’, and Liddell & Scott gives ‘χαραδρίας’, a bird dwelling in clefts (χαράδρας), whence its name, the curlew.’ What Antony says about it is:

It is said that there is a certain bird which, if it looks with the straight and direct gaze of its eyes into the face of a sick person, the sick person will be entirely freed; but if the bird turns its gaze aside from the face of the sick person, or looks at him on one side, it is a sign of death.

An obvious place to start looking is that root of most Medieval science, Aristotle’s Historia Animalium. The first Latin translation, by Michael Scot from a ninth century Arabic version, ‘was certainly finished before 1217’, so it could have been known to Antony (and I strongly suspect it was); but all Aristotle says about the curlew is

Some (sc. wild birds) make their dwellings around the gullies, others around hollows and rocks, for example the so-called charadrio; the charadrio is poor both in colouring and voice, and is seen at night but runs away in daytime.

Pliny calls it the ‘avis icterus’, and adds ‘If it is looked at, they say that a sick person is healed and the bird dies’, while Aelianus gives the further information

---

29 Lent III, 3, SDF I, 125: Fertur esse quamdam avem, quae si recto et directo intuitu oculorum infirmi faciem aspexerit, infirmus omnino liberabitur; si vero ab ipsis facie infirmi oculorum suorum intuitum averterit, vel in obliquam partem aspexerit, signum est moris.
31 Peck, op. cit. 1.269.
32 Pliny, Naturalis Historia XXX, 28: Si spectetur, sanari id malum tradunt, et avem mori.
The *charadrius* bird is affected by a remarkable gift of nature, for if anyone jaundiced looks intently on it, and the bird gazes back again in angry fashion, with its eyes fixed, it restores the affected man to health by its gaze.\(^{33}\)

This gives us a bird whose gaze has healing properties, but Antony claims more: its averted gaze signifies death. Furthermore, he returns to this curious bird in his Festival Sermon for the Litanies, and tells us more:

Natural History says that the calandrius, a completely white bird, the inside of which cures blindness of the eyes, looks fixedly on a sick man if he is going to live, and this is an indication of his health; and the bird itself approaches the face of the sick man and draws out his sickness and takes it into itself, and afterwards it flies into the air and consumes it all in the burning rays of the sun. Thus, too, is Christ our friend wholly white, because clean from all stain of sin, from whose open side flows the blood which cures the blindness of our souls, which previously were unable to see clearly.\(^{34}\)

This goes far beyond anything we have found in our sources: we must search further.

Among the books in the library of São Vicente was *'Hugo, de bestiis*', almost certainly the *'De bestiis et aliis rebus'* of Hugo de Folieto, often attributed (even by Migne) to Hugh of St Victor. In chapter XLVIII we find:

The *Physiologus* says of the calandrius that it is wholly white, and the inner part of its thigh takes darkness from the eyes. The nature of the calandrius is said to be such that if it be sometime brought to a sick man, it indicates certainly to those standing by whether the sick man will live or die. If it looks at the man's face and does not turn aside its eyes, but gazes diligently on the face of the sick man, it is a sign that he will live. But if it turns its eyes away from the face of the sick man, it is a sign of death. By the calandrius we understand Christ, who came into the world to save the human race. He is said to be the colour of snow, because he is free from all sin. With the inner part of his thigh he washes the obscuring darkness from our eyes. By the thigh is understood the propagation of the race. The inner part of the thigh is the Incarnation of the Saviour. The Incarnation of the Saviour was 'inner' and hidden, being concealed from the devil. Christ came into the world to save the human race. He turned his face away from the Jews, and looked at the Gentiles, bearing our iniquities, and who had committed no sin bore our sins upon the wood of the Cross. But the aforesaid calandrius visits our infirmities daily, looks upon the mind by confession, and heals those in whom the grace of repentance is present; but he turns his face from those whose heart he knows to be impenitent. He spews them out, but heals those face which he looks upon.\(^{35}\)

---

\(^{33}\) cf. SDF I, 125,n.19: *Charadrius avis eximio naturae beneficio affecta est, nam si quis ictericus ["\varepsilon\tau\epsilon\pi\kappa\nu\acute{o}s, jaundiced"] in eam acerrime tueatur, illa contra oculis fixis, tamquam vicissim et succensens, respiciat, sic affectum hominum suo obtutu ad sanitatem reducit.*

\(^{34}\) SDF III, 221f: *Dicitur in naturalibus, quod "calandrius, avis tota alba, cuius interiora oculorum curant caliginem, in infirmum fixe aspicit si vivere debet, quod sanitatis ipsius est indicium; et tunc ipsa avis accedit ad faciem infirmi, et eius infirmitatem haeret et in se recipit, et postea volat in aera et ibi in ferventis radio solis totalis consumit." Sic Christus, noster amicus, totus albus, quia ab omni labe peccati mundus, ex cuius lateris apertura sanguis defluens nostrae animae, quae prius clare videre non poterat, curavit caliginem.*

\(^{35}\) PL177.48: *Physiologus de caladrio dicit quod totus albus sit, cujus femoris pars interior caliginem anvertit ab oculis. Natura igitur caladriti talis esse dicitur, ut si ad infirmum hominem aliquoties adducerat, urum infirmus mori, an vivere debeat, astantes certos reddat. Si enim faciem hominis respicit, nec oculos avertit, sed infirmi faciems diligenter consideret, signum est quod vivet. Si autem oculos a faciee infirmi avertat, signum est mortis. Per caladrium intelligimus Christum, qui venit in mundum, ut salvum faceret genus humanum. Qui dicitur esse nivei coloris, quia ab omni*
Here at last we find the ‘averted gaze’ as a sign of death, and a specific parallel with Christ, but we are still not quite at our goal. Antony refers to the curlew ‘drawing out’ the sickness, and flying with it into the sun’s rays, where it is consumed. It is in Peter Damian’s ‘De bono religioso statu’ that we find some more about the curlew, including:

Otherwise, if the sick person is to live, at once the charadrius fixes his gaze on his face, and conceives in itself all his sickness; then it flies vigorously into the heat of the sun, and casting the disease of the sick person together with itself into the sun, is burnt up, and disperses it as it flies through the air... Reason shows by a clear light that the figure of this bird agrees with our Redeemer.36

We are clearly dealing with bestiary lore that was wide-spread and well-known. It may be that Antony ‘litteris secularibus minus abundaverat’ according to Thomas Gallus’ lights, but he was clearly well-versed in popular science, and knew where to find it.

4.32 The Book of Creation

As I noted earlier, most of such medieval science stemmed, directly or indirectly, from Aristotle; yet Antony is very reticent about his pagan sources, which are referred to by general terms such as ‘Naturalia’, ‘Philosophus’, ‘Poeta’. He mentions Solinus by name four times in all (though he uses him more often), Pliny is never named, and Aristotle (along with Cicero) is named only in a passage about unbelievers whose eloquence or wisdom will not save them: ‘Argentum eloquentiae et aurum sapientiae non liberabit Tullium et Aristotelem in die furoris Domini’37, and even this sounds like a quotation. Unlike Augustine, Gregory and Bernard, the pagans could not be ‘authorities’, and were included only to pander to the ‘fastidiousness’ of


36 PL145.772: Alioquin si languidus illa victurus est, praesto charadrius obtutum suum in eius ora defigit, ac intra se omnem illius oegruntudinem concepit; deinde contra solis ardorem impiger evolat, aegroti valitudinem soli se objiciendo comburit, ac per aarem volitando dispersit... Quod Redemptori nostro volucris huius figura conveniat, luce clarius ratio manifestat. (cf. also Isidore, Etymologiae Appendix XVI,6; PL82.757)
contemporary taste. Yet cited they were, and in abundance. While it is not always easy to identify the precise sources, Antony handles them with confidence and freedom. In fact, I am inclined to think that this material was far more than ‘embellishment’, but yet another way of subtly counteracting the Cathars disdain for the created world, as well as a transposition into a mode more characteristic of Antony’s learned background of St Francis’ spontaneous delight in the natural world.

Some years after Antony’s death, the Dominican master-general, Humbert of Romans, wrote of him:

Someone else has knowledge of created things. For God pours forth his wisdom upon all his works, wherefore blessed Antony said that creatures are a book; and from this book those who know how to read it properly draw many lessons, which are very useful for preaching.\(^38\)

The book of creation was second only to the Scriptures themselves as a means to understanding the Divine message. Just as Antony ‘concorded’ the Old Testament with the New in order to exhibit the unity of the Scriptures, so he ‘concorded’ the world of Nature with the Gospel to exhibit the harmony of nature and grace. To see how he did this, and as a point of comparison with the analysis of Scriptural ‘concordance’ in the next chapter, let us look at just a few examples: the Dung-beetle, the Spider, and the Ear, together with the corresponding passages from the *Historia Animalium*.

**The Dung Beetle (Scarabaeus pili/arius)**

Aristotle wrote:

> The dung-beetle rolls dung into a ball, lies hid in it during the winter, produces small larvae in it, and out of these come more dung-beetles.\(^39\)

In his Sermon for the feast of St Stephen, Antony writes:

> The miser acts like the dung-beetle, ‘which gathers much dung and with great labour forms a round ball’; but then an ass passing by treads on beetle and ball, and in a moment destroys both it and what it had laboured long over. In the same way the miser or usurer gathers the dung of money for a long time, and labours long; but when he least expects it the devil throttles him, and so he gives his soul to the demons, his body to worms and his money to his family.\(^40\)

A good Franciscan moral!

---

37 Pentecost XXI; SDF II, 367
38 Quoted in Franceschini, ‘L’aspetto...’ 161: *Alii est scientia creaturarum. Effudit enim Deus sapientiam suam super omnia opera sua, propter quod beatus Antonius dixit creaturas esse librum; et ex isto libro qui scint bene legere eliciunt multa, quae multum valent ad praedicationem.*
39 Peck, op. cit II, 1810
40 SDF III, 19-20
The Spider.

Aristotle wrote:

There is another, third, kind of (spider), the most skilful and smoothest. It weaves by first stretching thread to the extremities in every direction, then it lays down the radii from the middle (it takes the middle with fair accuracy) and on these lays down the woof, so to speak, and then weaves them together. Now the bed and storage of such prey she arranges elsewhere, but she does her hunting at the centre where she keeps watch. Then when something has fallen in and the centre has been moved, first she binds it round and enwraps it with webs until she has made it helpless, then she lifts it up and carries it away, and if she happens to be hungry she sucks out its juice (for that is what she gains from it)…

Antony uses this as follows, following Aristotle quite closely:

The devil spins his web like a spider, of which the Natural History tells us: 'The spider first puts forth the thread of her web, and fastens it at the ends. Then she weaves in the middle, as one lying in wait for some small beast. If some fly, or the like, falls in, at once the spider moves, leaving her place and starting to bind it and wind it round with the web, until she reaches the point where her prey is helpless. Then, when she is hungry, she sucks the moisture from it; and without that moisture she cannot live.' In the same way, when the devil wants to catch a man, he first puts out the slender thread of subtle thought, and fixes it at the 'ends', the senses of the body. By this, he can craftily find out to which vice the man is most susceptible. Then, in the midst, the heart, he weaves a web of temptation, 'sufficiently strong and in a conveniently prepared place for hunting.' He comes to the middle, as one lying in wait for some small creature. The devil finds no member, in all the human body, which is so suitable for hunting, lying in wait and deceiving, as the human heart: for that is the very source of life. And if he see any fly- anything carnal, that may be called a fly- fall into the web of his suggestion by the consent of the heart, then straightway he begins to bind it with all sorts of temptations, to wind it in darkness until it becomes helpless and enfeebled in mind. So he bears away that fly, the sinner, to a place where he keeps what he has caught. The devil's own place is the commission of an evil action, and in it he puts what he has ensnared by the web of temptation. So he sucks their moisture, the compunction of the soul; for while the soul has that, the devil cannot hurt it.

The Ear

Aristotle’s description is:

One part of the ear has no special name, the other is called the lobe; the whole consists of gristle and flesh. The natural structure of the interior of the ear is like the spiral-shell's: the innermost part is a bone similar to the ear, and into this ultimately the sound penetrates, as into a vessel. There is no passage from this to the brain, but there is a passage to the roof of the mouth, and a blood-vessel passes to it from the brain. Of all animals which possess ears, man is the only one which is unable to move them…

When Antony wants to talk about the sense of hearing to make a moral point, he says:

Note that 'the ear is composed of flesh and gristle. Inside the ear is a winding passage, ending in a bone which in form and substance is like the ear itself. Every noise and sound comes here, and so passes to the brain. A single vein goes from the brain to the right ear,

---

41 D.A. Balme, Aristotelis Historia Animalium (Loeb, vol III) 331
42 Lent III, 9; SDF I, 35
43 Peck, op.cit. I,43
and another to the left. And apart from man, every animal that has ears is able to move them.' Gristle looks like bone, but is not as strong. In Latin the words for 'flesh' (caro) and 'dear' (carus) are very similar. The flesh and gristle from which the ear is made stand for meekness and humility, than which nothing is more dear to God and men. These two must combine in every act of human hearing, so that to every injurious, vexing or contemptuous word, a meek and humble reply is made. Nature itself teaches us this, nature which makes the inner passage of the ear winding and not straight, so that when you hear something displeasing it does not strike your mind suddenly, but comes as by a winding route, impeding its passage so that its force is spent and it becomes weak, prickling you little or not at all. The two veins which go from the brain, one to the right ear and the other to the left, are temperance and obedience. 'The right stands for prosperity, the left for adversity.' When you hear something advantageous and pleasant, you need temperance; when you are commanded what you do not like, or when you hear something adverse, you need obedience even more, because it is even more fruitful. And every animal that has ears is able to move them, apart from man. He is truly deserving the title of humanity, who does not have mobile ear - that is, who is not moved from the stability of reason by windy words. The man with itching ears, who believes everything he hears, who readily turns his eager ear to flattery: he is not worth calling a man. He is just a brute. 44

As I say, it would make a fascinating study in itself to examine how far Antony depends directly on Aristotle, how far on Pliny, Solinus, Hugo or whoever, but I have only wanted to illustrate the very skilful way in which Antony uses 'Natural History' in order to make his points, and to hold the attention of audiences who would have had a great appetite for such knowledge.

4.33 'Philosophus' and 'Poeta'

While Antony's knowledge of the natural sciences seems quite extensive, it is not perhaps this that Thomas Gallus meant by 'litterae saeculares'. Antony is much less conversant with pagan literature and pagan authors in general. They appear seldom, and usually under the guise of 'Philosophus' or 'Poeta'. 'Philosophus' is generally either Cicero, Seneca or Publius Syrus; occasionally Aristotle, and once (surprisingly) Isidore. He is cited twenty times, but there are other quotations from Cicero, for instance, that are not credited. 'Poeta' is an even rarer character, making only four appearances; twice (but the same line) for Ovid, once for Horace and once (but only in a quotation from Innocent III) for Vergil. Ovid is quoted in several other places: Antony likes the lines from the Remedium Amoris:

Quaeritur Aegisthus quare sit factus adulter?
In promptu causa est: desidiosus erat.

44 Pentecost, 8: SDF I, 374
and as São Vicente possessed a copy of Ovid, it is not unlikely that it formed part of Antony's early education; but apart from that he probably knew both 'Philosophus' and 'Poeta' only from florilegia.\footnote{Cantini, \textit{op. cit.} 334-5; 352-8}
CHAPTER FIVE

CONCORDANTIA: EXTENT AND ORIGIN

The Rule and life of the Friars Minor is this, namely, to observe the holy Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ by living in obedience, without property, and in chastity. (Rule of 1223, ch. 1)

The Rule and life of the friars is to live in obedience, in chastity and without property, following the teaching and footsteps of our Lord Jesus Christ. (Rule of 1221, ch. 1)

I suggested in Chapter One that Antony's primary purpose in composing his Opus Dominical was to fulfil Francis's commission to teach the friars, preparing them for the work of preaching, especially against the background of contemporary abuses and the Cathar heresy. However, if we look more closely at the work as it developed, I believe we can see it also as a sustained meditation upon the Gospel, and an attempt to answer the question, "What is it, to observe the holy Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ?" Antony's other term for his work, in the Epilogue, is Opus Evangeliorum, which expresses this very well. The regular appeal to his 'carissimi fratres' suggests that he never lost sight of his immediate audience, the members of the fledgling Order of Friars Minor.

Francis's spirituality and that of his Order was (and is) strongly Christocentric, 'following the teaching and footsteps of our Lord Jesus Christ.' It was also profoundly Eucharistic and liturgical, so that the Gospel was situated normatively within the context of the Mass. It was from the Mass-gospel that Francis first received his vision of imitating Christ in his poverty. 1 Antony was therefore following a thoroughly Franciscan precedent in giving his own Gospel commentary a liturgical pattern, weaving together the texts of Mass and Office. The life and teaching of Jesus provided a central axis around which the Scriptures, Creation and the Christian life revolved harmoniously.

---

1 cf. Celano, First Life of St Francis, ch. 9 (OS 246); Bonaventure, Legenda Maior, ch. 3 (OS 646)
5.1 The method and terminology of concordance.

In this section I want mainly to examine the development and extent of Antony's terminology, but this cannot be done (especially in the early stages of this development) without some reflection upon his methodology. Setting aside for the moment the General Prologue (which at least in its references to concordance seems to have been written after the rest of the work), I will begin with a consideration of Antony's method and terminology in the *Sermones* up to and including Easter.

5.11 From Septuagesima to Easter.

In the first *Sermo*, for Septuagesima, Antony has the opportunity to give a 'cosmic' dimension to his work, which we should bear in mind throughout. He develops a parallel between the Creation, in its seven days, and the life of Christ in seven stages. Then, in the second part of the *Sermo*, using the Gospel of the labourers in the vineyard, he draws a further analogy with the development of the Christian life, from conversion to heavenly reward. It is as he begins this parallel, the 'moral sense' as opposed to the 'allegorical' development in the first part, that Antony first uses the term 'concordance'. He will 'concord' the six hours of the Gospel-day with the six days of Creation; and immediately he bids his readers, 'Hear the concordance of the first hour...' There is no sense that the words *concordare* and *concordantia* are here being used in any technical way. It is in the *prologus* of the second *Sermo*, for Sexagesima, that he seems to become aware in advance, as it were, of his programme: 'Therefore we will concord each Testament, for the honour of the one God and the utility of our hearers...'; 'In the Lord's name, then, we will concord all these things.' The main 'concordance' is between the story of Noah and the parable of the sower. The chambers of the Ark and the kinds of soil each stand for kinds of sinner (the lustful, hypocritical religious, and the avaricious: paradigms of offenders against chastity, obedience and poverty) and for good penitents; this word could have a technical as well as a general sense, since Francis's first companions were known as 'penitent men of Assisi', and the term was widely used for men and women, celibate or married, who had devoted themselves to a religious way of life. In the body of the

---

2 SDF I, 5-23  
3 SDF I, 13
Sermo, the term concordare occurs only twice: 'The wild animals are concordant with these thorns,' and 'See how well the good earth, the tame animals, men and birds are concordant.'

In the next three Sermones, the term is rare; in one Antony says 'We will concord all these things for God's honour and your enlightenment,' in the next, 'See the concordance of each temptation in Genesis and Matthew;' and in the third, 'Note the individual words, and there will be a concordance with the Gospel.' Again, there is no sense of the term being particularly technical. However, in the three Sermones that follow (Lent IIB, Lent III and Lent IV) there is a slight move towards consistency, in that the expression 'habes concordantiam' is introduced and used more often than not, often with the qualification 'de hoc', 'de his' or 'de qua'. The context implies a comparison between specific texts of the Old and New Testaments. However, in the final three Sermones of this sequence, the term disappears altogether, which suggests that Antony had not as yet settled upon it as a technical term for his method. The method itself, however, is followed consistently; the stories of the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph and Moses being utilised according to the pattern of the Office, followed by examples from Jeremiah in Passiontide.

5.12 From Easter to Pentecost.

From the Octave of Easter there is a considerable development in consistency. Not only do the terms concordare and concordantia reappear, but one or both is used in every Sermo of the sequence, and almost every clause. Antony regularly announces in the prologi his intention to concord the Office lesson with the Gospel (volumus concordare), divided into clauses, and regularly proposes specific comparisons (habes concordantiam). In the case of comparisons between the Epistle and the Gospel, in two cases he uses the form concordat, and in one habes concordantiam. There is a slight diminution in frequency in the Sermo for Pentecost, but this is anomalous in

---

4 SDF I, 27
5 SDF I, 33 & 35
6 SDF I, 40
7 SDF I, 60
8 SDF I, 88
other ways, because the key-text is not the Gospel but the Epistle reading from Acts about the coming of the Spirit. There are two concordances (habes concordantiam) from Exodus and one from Lamentations. On the whole, the evidence seems to suggest a conscious decision by Antony to use his terms in a more consistent and technical way, although I would stress again that this is only a development in terminology, while the basic method it refers to was used from the beginning. Following the pattern of the Office, fewer examples are taken from the Old Testament; instead, the Apocalypse and the Epistles of James and Peter are prominent. The instances of concordare and concordantia for the Sermones from Septuagesima to Pentecost will be found in the Appendix, Table II.

5.13 From Pentecost to Epiphany.

If there appears to be some break in the development of the terminology between Lent IV and the Octave of Easter, there is a much greater one between the Sermones for Pentecost and the first Sunday after Pentecost. This is the main reason for suggesting a break in composition, possibly corresponding to Antony's return to Italy after the death of Francis. Antony introduces a series of short prologues to groups of Sermones, but as these appear to have been composed with the General Prologue, I will leave them on one side for the moment. From the Sunday after Pentecost to the third Sunday after the Octave of the Epiphany there are thirty-three Sermones. It would be tedious to consider each and every occurrence of concordare or concordantia; it is also unnecessary, because from this point onwards the formulae become quite stereotyped. In the prologi consonantes Antony sets out the divisions of the Gospels into clausulae; he then says something like: 'His N. clausulis quasdam historias libri M. concordabimus'; and after mentioning the introit and the source of the epistle, he adds 'quam in N. particularis dividere et cum N. evangelii clausulis volumus concordare'. In the body of the sermon, in reference to the clause of the Gospel being considered, he writes 'super hoc habes concordantiam in libro M', and quotes the relevant passage of the Old Testament; in regard to the epistle, the formula is 'huic n° clausulae evangelii concordat n° particula hodiernae epistolae'. Only very rarely does he use either 'habes concordantiam' or 'concordat' in regard to the introit; it is only mentioned briefly, and in passing. Since the formulae are so
constant, in the Appendix, Table III, I shall set out schematically only the references to the passages which are concorded.

5.14 The Prologues; the Marian and Festival Sermones.

My principal reason for supposing that the General Prologue and the lesser prologues referred to above were composed after the Sermones themselves is based on grammar: while in the prologi consonanties Antony always uses the future tense or the subjunctive mood of concordare (concordabimus, concordemus) to indicate what he intends to do in the body of the Sermo, the General Prologue uses the perfect tense (concordavi, concordavimus) to indicate what he has already done. The same is true of other verbs (divisimus, etc.). The prologue for the first Sunday after Pentecost, although it uses a form of the future (volumus concordare), refers to the intention which ‘in principio operis propositusimus’ to concord the readings of Mass and Office. Antony stresses the Liturgical influence on his concordances— it is the Scriptures ‘as they are read in Church’ that are to be related to the Gospels, while the Epistles and Introits are to be considered ‘at least half-fully’. It would seem, then, that this and the other short prologues for August, September, October, November and Advent were also composed after the General Prologue. The very neat division of precisely twenty-four Sundays after Pentecost, divided into months of exactly four Sundays, strongly suggests that we have an artificial and ‘ideal’ scheme in these months, and that we should not look for clues to the year or years in which the Sermones were composed. In the prologues, Antony announces a programme which he has in fact already completed. The general scheme is to divide the Gospels and Epistles into corresponding clausulae and particulae, and this is to prevent the variety of ‘concordances’ leading to confusion or forgetfulness. In particular, in the time after Pentecost concordances will be drawn from the Old Testament book or books currently being read at Matins, and these are noted in the short prologues. Antony will

9 cf. the prologue placed before the first Sunday after Pentecost (SDF I, 387): In principio operis propositusimus cum evangeliiis dominicalibus per annis circulum historias Veteris ac Novi Testamenti, prout in Ecclesia leguntur, et epistolae dominicales cum introitu missae dominicalis, etsi non plenarie saltem semiplene, concordare. Unde notandum quod ab hac dominica prima post Pentecosten usque ad primum dominicanum Augusti legitur in Ecclesia liber Regum, qui in quattuor libris dividitur, et in isto tempore sunt octo dominicae. Volumus ergo quattuor cum octo sic concordare, scilicet unus libri aliasquas historias, prout melius viderimus, cum duobus evangeliiis, et sic de ceteris, adaptando.
be selective; only 'aliquas historias, prout melius viderimus' will be concorded with the Gospels.

The four Marian Sermons, with their own Prologue, are included among the *Sermones Dominicales* in the critical edition, coming between the twelfth and the thirteenth Sundays after Pentecost. Whether or not Antony himself intended them to be incorporated here, stylistic considerations suggest that they were not composed as part of the sequence, which they interrupt. There is some use of the term 'concordance', mostly in the form 'habes concordantiam', but it is not a notable feature of these *Sermones*. The same is even more true of the *Sermones Festivi*. The term is used four times in the first *Sermo*, for the Nativity, and only a very few times in all the rest. The scheme of 'concording' Mass and Office readings in a systematic way is missing from these *Sermones*, and so too, therefore, is the terminology. The references are given in the Appendix, Table IV.

5.2 The origins of Antony's use of *concordare* and *concordantia*.

The extent of Antony's use of *concordare* and *concordantia* to express a relationship of agreement or harmony between Scriptural passages is now clear. We can now enquire from what sources he derived this usage, and what he understood by it.

5.2.1 Augustine and Gregory

A computer search of the literature prior to Antony reveals more than two thousand instances of the verb *concordare* or the noun *concordia*. Most of these instances refer to agreement or harmony between individuals, or within communities; but there is a significant number of cases which refer to an agreement of the Scriptures: for instance, Cassiodorus refers in his exposition of the psalms to a *concordia evangeliorum*, and an anonymous author says, 'S. Augustinus concordiam evangelistorum visus est fecisse'. In fact, the largest number of instances of *concordia* or *concordare* is to be found in Augustine, nearly eight hundred in all. There are two hundred more in Gregory, and between forty and a hundred each in Caesarius of Arles, St Ambrose, Cassiodorus, Bede and Bernard (although, as I have said, these are generally not in reference to Scriptural agreement). However, it seems safe to say that
there is precedent, especially in his favourite authors, for Antony’s use of *concordare* and *concordia* to refer to Scriptural harmony.

In fact, as we have seen, although Antony regularly uses *concordare* in this way, he hardly ever uses the word *concordia*. His overwhelmingly preferred term, when he requires a noun form, is *concordantia*; and when we search for this word, we find that it is very rare indeed before Antony. There seem to be three instances in Augustine, one each in Cassiodorus and Isidore, and a few in Aelred (which do not refer particularly to Scripture). The three examples from Augustine are these:

(1) Are they not like the two Seraphim who cry out to one another, singing together the praises of the Most High: Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of Hosts? Thus do the two Testaments, faithfully concordant, sing together the sacred truth. A sheep is killed, the Pasch is celebrated, and after fifty days the Law is given for fear, written by the finger of God; Christ is killed, who was led like a sheep to sacrifice (as the prophet Isaiah testifies), the true Pasch is celebrated, and after fifty days the Holy Spirit, who is the finger of God, is given for charity.10

Here *concordantia* is adjectival (‘*duo testamenta concordanlia*’), but it clearly refers to the harmony between the two Testaments, and in particular between the passover and the giving of the Law on the one hand, and the death of Christ and the giving of the Spirit on the other. The two Testaments are concordant, like the choirs of angels: the words of Isaiah with the Gospel.

(2) In this way he said some things by Isaiah, some by Jeremiah, some by this or that prophet; or, in another way, he said the same things by this one and that, as he willed. But whatever is found in each, one and the same Spirit willed to speak by each one; but in such a way that the former went beforehand, prophesying, and the latter followed, interpreting them prophetically, because just as there was one Spirit of peace in the former, as they spoke true and concordant things, so the same Spirit appeared also in the latter, who though they did not confer among themselves, yet they interpreted everything as with one mouth.11

---

10 *Nonne tamquam duo seraphin clamant ad invicem concinentia laudes altissimi: sanctus, sanctus, sanctus dominus deus sabaoth? Ia duo testamenta fideliter concordanlia sacraiam concinunt uritatem. occiditur ouis, celebratur pascha et interpositis quinquaginta diebus datur lex ad timorem scripta digito dei: occiditur christus, qui tamquam ouis ad immolandum duchos est, sicut essais propheta testatur, celebratur urerum pascha et interpositis quinquaginta diebus datur ad caritatem spiritus sanctus, qui est digitus dei. (Epistola 55, ch XVI, 29; PL 33,218-9)*

11 *Isto enim modo alia per esaiam, alia per hieremiam, alia per alium aliquem prophetam vel aliam cadem per hunc ac per illum dixit, ut veluti, quidquid posito aperu utrosque invenit; per utrosque dicere veluit unus atque idem spiritus; sed ita ut illi praeecedent prophetando, isti sequerentur prophetice illos interpretando: quia sit in illis uera et concordanlia dicentibus unus pacis spiritus fuit, sic et in istis non se cum conferentibus et tamen tamquam ore uno cuncta interpretantibus idem spiritus unus apparuit. (De ciuitate Dei, Lib XVIII, ch 43; PL 41 604)*
The reference here is to the agreement between the prophets (who spoke by the
Spirit), and the Greek translators (who interpreted by the Spirit).

(3) Nor have I compared it to a precious stone, because in comparison with it all
gold is as a little sand, and silver is reckoned as mud compared with it. If they read these
things (or read them not impiously) they will see that all things in the Scriptures of both
Testaments, whether for seeking or avoiding, for receiving or refusing, are concordant
among themselves and ordered in their proper way. 12

Augustine asserts that if one reads the Scriptures, one sees that all things in either
Testament are concordant among themselves (‘omnia... sibi concordantia’) and
properly ordered (‘in suis gradibus ordinata’). (1) and (3) certainly refer (at least in a
general way) to the harmony of the Scriptures themselves. (2) refers to the prophets
speaking ‘vera et concordantia’, but by implication this must include the written
records of their prophecies.

It is impossible to say whether Antony knew these particular passages, or
derived the word concordantia from them. All that we can say is that there is a
precedent. The only other precedent I can think of is the proper title of Gratian’s
‘Decretals’: Concordantia discordantium canonum. As we have seen, Antony makes
virtually no use of Gratian, but at least the title of his work must have been known to
him. Unlike Gratian, however, he was not concerned with the harmonisation of
apparent disharmonies. In sum, the word concordantia does not seem to have been in
common use before Antony, and is fairly safe to say that he was using it in a new way,
and indeed a way which he himself only developed in the course of composing his
Sermones.

If the word was newly coined, what of the method? We noticed in Chapter
Three how St Gregory calls the two Testaments the ‘two wheels of the chariot of the
Church’ 13, and they are also the ‘new and old apples’ of Canticles 7.13, which the
Church keeps for her Beloved.

By the apples, we understand here the senses of the holy Scriptures, which, coming from
the holy Fathers even to us, and being believed, are like apples ripening on the trees to

12 Nec comparavi illi lapidem pretiosum, quoniam omne aurum in comparatione illius arena est
exigua et tamquam lutum aestimabatur argentum ad illam. haec isti si aut legerent aut non impie
legerent, uiderent omnia in utriusque testamenti scripturis et ad expetendum et ad fugiendum et ad
sumendum et ad reiicendum sibi concordantia et suis gradibus ordinata. (Contra Adimantium , XIX,
PL 42.164)
13 PL 79, 187-8
refresh our souls. In this way the Bride serves all the apples, new and old, to her beloved: because the Catholic Church receives the New Testament in such a way as not to reject the Old; and so venerates the Old, in its carnal sacrifices, as always, by the Spirit, to understand the New; rejoicing in the New with Christ-having-come, and always awaiting his coming, in the Old.\(^\text{14}\)

In commenting on one part of Scripture, Gregory often cites another passage to shed light on the first; for instance, he quotes Genesis in the context of Job. His followers collected such passages together, in order to make Gregory’s comments more accessible. For instance, Migne’s *Patrologia Latina* contains the following work: *Sancti Gregorii Magni, Romani Pontificis, Concordia quorundam testimoniorum S. Scripturae*\(^\text{15}\). It consists of the examination of some 34 apparent disagreements between passages of Scripture (drawn mainly from the New Testament) in order to show that they can be reconciled. In each section, the two passages are set side by side. In the *Interrogatio* the apparent disagreement is discussed, and in the *Responsio* the contradiction is solved. This is an example of the use of *concordia* to refer to a juxtaposition of Scriptural texts. It clearly means ‘agreement’, and the purpose of the work is to solve difficulties arising from apparent inconsistencies in Scripture.

Two works follow the *Concordia* in Migne: *Sancti Paterii: De expositione Veteris ac Novi Testamenti, de diversis libris S. Gregorii Magni concinnatus*\(^\text{16}\), and *Alulfii: De expositione Novi Testamenti*\(^\text{17}\). Both these works collate passages in the works of Gregory referring to passages in Scripture which have a bearing on the one he is discussing. Thus in Gregory’s commentary on Job, he discusses texts from Genesis, and other books. Paterius and Alulfus arrange these according to the order of the Biblical books (e.g. in Paterius: the passage in Acts 8.20, ‘Pecunia tecum sit in perditionem’, is expounded by reference to 4 Kings 1.10, fire descending on behalf of Elisha). Alulfus deals only with the New Testament books, where his choice of

\(^{14}\) ibid 538; *Hic per poma, sensus Scripturarum sanctarum intelliguntur: quae dum ex Patribus sanctis ad nos usque pervenit, et creduntur, quasi ex arboribus poma exsurgunt, quibus animae delectantur. Omnia ergo poma, nova et vetera, dilecto suo Sponsa servat; quia sic Novum Testamentum Ecclesia Catholica recipit, ut Vetus non abiciat: sic Vetus veneratur, ut Novum semper in ipsis sacrificiis carnalibus per spiritum intelligat; in Novo scilicet Christum venisse congaudens, in Veteri autem semper venturum expectans...*

\(^{15}\) PL 79, 659-678

\(^{16}\) PL 79, 683-1136. Paterius is described as a ‘disciple’ of Gregory to whom he wrote a letter (cf. PL 79.677-8).

\(^{17}\) PL 79, 1137-1424. Alulfus was a monk of Tours, c. 1092 (cf. PL 79.679-80).
passages does not coincide with that of Paterius: his work would therefore seem to be
independent of the former’s, not simply an expansion of it. Beryl Smalley sees no
evidence that Antony knew Paterius. Nevertheless, both Paterius and Alulfus are
examples of a technique of ‘concordance’, even though the term is not used, in that
they systematically juxtapose texts so that one illustrates another.

5.22 Joachim of Fiore and the *Concordia novi et veteris testamenti*.

I would like at this point to digress slightly, in order to examine an author only
just prior to Antony, and whose terminology has some resemblance to his. I said at the
beginning of Chapter Three that emphasis on types and
fulfilment gives an eternal meaning to the particularities of history;
2) implies a divinely ordained progress through history.
The question arises, to what end are the events of the ‘contemporary’ period (from
Christ onwards) leading? Late Jewish apocalyptic writings regarding the ‘Messianic
Age’ were influential in forming Christian theories; and in particular Apoc 20.1-3 (the
‘thousand years’ or millennium). Was such an age the End of History, or just its final
stage? Montanus linked the concept with the idea of a ‘Third Dispensation’, an Age
of the Spirit, which would succeed the Ages of the Father and the Son.

In the fifth century Augustine opposed such views. The People of God are
alien pilgrims in this world, journeying through time to a destination beyond time.
The *millennium* has already begun at the Incarnation, and the *saeculum* is dying.
Augustine took Paul’s division of time (*ante legem, sub lege and sub gratia*), and sub-
divided these periods into six *aetates* symbolised by the six days of Creation, with
Christ inaugurating the sixth. The ‘sabbath age’ to come is not a further stage in
history, but a rest from time, although it is not yet the ‘eighth day’ of Eternity. The
period between Christ’s two comings is a time of waiting, not progress.

However, Augustine’s influence did not totally stem millenarian
speculation; and a very small crack in the Augustinian view derived from the curious
discrepancy (noticed by Jerome) in Daniel 12.11-12 between the 1335 days till the

18 B. Smalley, ‘The Use of Scripture in the ‘Sermo’ of St Antony’, 287
19 M. Reeves, ‘The originality and influence of Joachim of Fiore’ (*Traditio* XXXVI,1980), 272
End, and the 1290 days of the 'abomination'. The *Glossa Ordinaria* on this text would later comment:

\[ \text{dies quietis et pacs post mortem Antichristi xlv superioribus adduntur ad refrigerium sanctorum et ad penitentiam subversorum.} \]

In the early twelfth century, Honorius of Autun in his *Gemma Animae* took over the sixfold division of time, the time *ante legem* being divided into the periods from Adam to Noah, Noah to Abraham and Abraham to Moses; the time *sub lege* into the periods from Moses to David and David to Christ, the time *sub gratia* being that from the Incarnation to the second Coming. The Victorine Anselm of Havelburg in his 'Dialogues' divided the period of the Incarnation into seven *status*, symbolised by the seven seals of the Apocalypse; another Victorine, Rupert of Deutz, gave a Trinitarian division to the whole of history: the Age of the Father was from the Creation to the Fall; that of the Son from the Fall to the Passion; and that of the Holy Spirit would run from the Resurrection until the general resurrection at the end of time. The idea of a period of conversion and peace before the last day is found in Hildegard of Bingen (1098-1179), but she does not seem to have worked out a full philosophy of history.

Joachim of Fiore was a Cistercian Abbot in Calabria. He was born between 1135 and 1145, and died in 1202. Of the works regarded as certainly by him, the principal are: *Concordia novi et veteris testamenti; Expositio in Apocalypsim*; and *Psalterium decem chordarum*. Practically all his writings are in the form of commentaries on Scripture, and he seems to have regarded himself as primarily an exegete. He claimed his *Concordia* to be a new kind of exegesis, and that is why I think it is worth looking at Joachim’s method, and comparing it with Antony’s.

Joachim began his writings on the ‘concord’ between the Old and New Testaments in the early 1180s, and in 1190 he separated from the Cistercians to found

---

20 J. Lerner, 'Refreshment of the Saints: the time after Antichrist as a station for earthly progress' (1976, *Traditio* XXXII) 109
21 cf. Reeves, *art. cit.*
22 M. Bloomfield, 'Joachim of Flora; a critical survey of his canon, teaching, biography and influence' (1957, *Traditio* XIII) 291: according to Ralph Coggshill (*Chronicon Anglicanum*) he 'looked about sixty' in 1195.
23 cf. Bloomfield, *art. cit.* 260, 262
his own Order at S. Giovanni da Fiore in Calabria. He had already acquired a reputation as a prophet, and was favoured by several Popes, actually presenting his *Concordiae* to the Pope in person (maybe to Pope Celestine III in 1196)\(^{24}\). His dominant theological interests were in the theory of the senses of Scripture, in the nature of the Trinity, and in the meaning of history. He broke with the traditional four-fold division of the senses of Scripture (literal, allegorical, tropological and anagogic), expanding them to twelve, and particularly emphasising the seven ‘typical’ senses, by which events in each of the seven ages of history had literal ‘concordances’ in the other six. To Joachim, the ability to work out such types or concords between the ages was not so much prophecy as the Gift of Understanding. Everything was there in Scripture for the God-enlightened exegete to discover. He looked for patterns, particularly numerical patterns of twos, threes, sevens and twelves, of which the patterns of threes came to predominate in his system. He opposed the Scholastic approach of Peter Lombard especially, accusing him of Sabellianism and Arianism, in that he overemphasised the unity of God and, by implication, underemphasised the Trinitarian nature of the Divinity. Joachim wanted to regard the Divine Persons as somehow ‘substances’, not merely ‘relations’\(^{25}\). His Trinitarian views were later censured. However, his application of Biblical exegesis to history became extremely influential. Broadly speaking, basing himself on analogies between the Old Testament and the New, and on various New Testament texts, he held that Scripture prophesied a ‘Third Age’ to succeed the Ages of the Father (the Old Testament) and of the Son (from Christ to an unspecified future time, probably not far ahead). The first two Ages had been those of Law and of Grace; the third, that of the Holy Spirit, would be characterised by Love. Each Age had its precursor: Adam was by his sin the precursor of the Law initiated by Moses; King Uzziah was the precursor of the Age of Grace that began with Zechariah and the birth of the Baptist; the precursor of the third Age was St Benedict. The ages were also characterised as those of marriage; of clericalism; and of monasticism\(^{26}\).

---


\(^{25}\) cf. *Bloomfield*, art. cit. 264

\(^{26}\) *Primus status seculi initatus est ab Adam, fructificavit ab Abraham, consumavit in Christo. Secundus initatus ab Ocia, fructificavit ab Zacharia patre Ioannis baptiste accepturus consummationem in temporis istis. Tertius sumens initium a beato Benedicto, cepit proferre fructum 22a generatione ab eodem sancto viro, consumandus et ipse in consummatione seculi. Et primus quidem*
Joachim seems to have regarded the second age, in which he lived, as characterised by secular interference with the spiritual, just as Uzziah King of Judah was punished for laying sacrilegious hands on priest and altar. In the age to come, the spiritual would rule. His calculations of the time were based on the idea that there were forty generations from Adam to Christ; hence there would be the same number in the second age (bringing it up to about 1260 A.D.), and presumably another forty to the final Judgement. As the Gospel had superseded the Law, so the Spirit would in some sense supersede the Gospel. The great imaginative step he took was to put the full manifestation of the Third Person of the Trinity into the future, a decisive break with Augustine; but he was concerned to interpret the whole of history, not just the period at the end. He agreed that all three Persons were operative at all times, the Persons being co-eternal, interpenetrating one another with no ‘before’ or ‘after’, but the core of ‘Joachimism’ was the belief that the inner mystery of the Trinitarian relations was reflected in the working out of history. The double procession of the Spirit from Father AND Son created two parallel histories of the Spirit, one beginning with Elijah and Elisha in the first status, the other with St Benedict in the second. This was not to diminish the importance of Christ, who has a central position dominating both the second and the third status (symbolised by Moses and Elijah at the Transfiguration). The inner relationship of Son and Spirit in history was expressed by the diamond-shaped pavimentum expounded in the Liber Concordiae. Horizontal progress through history was plotted by the seven seals, each marked by a pair of persons typifying Son and Spirit as sent by the Father. The final age would still be an age in history, the logical climax to the historical process and not just a divine intervention or ‘pause’ from history. It comes before Eternity in God’s Presence, and it will end with Antichrist and the Last Judgement. The ‘Third Age’ was to be seen as a time of Renewal of the Church, not a superseding of it as the Church had superseded the Synagogue. Melchisedech, the priest-king, was a prefiguration of the

---

27 2 Chron 26.16-21
papacy, with its spiritual and temporal jurisdiction. There would be a transformation of people and institutions, not a substitution.

Joachim, in his theology of history, managed to combine cyclical and repeated patterns with the unique, linear view of history at the heart of the Judaeo-Christian tradition. Joachim illustrated the mystery of the Church with a spiral figure. The Old Testament provided a key to the whole of history. Joachim was not original in finding types in Scripture, but he employed the traditional typology (stemming from Origen) in a new way. Particularly in his interpretation of the Apocalypse, he shifted the emphasis from the moral interpretations favoured by St Augustine (though he quotes Augustine extensively), to an historical and prophetic application. The allegorical meaning of the text was not simply within the realm of personal moral and spiritual life, but in history itself. Also, by concretizing the allegory in this way, he made the literal meaning of the text more, not less, important. St Paul had spoken of three ages (ante legem, sub lege, sub gratia), but these do not correspond to the three ages of Joachim, though they provide a model for his tri-partite division. For St Paul, the Gospel was God’s final word; for Joachim it was not final, but could be superseded (in some sense).

The novelty of Joachim’s position lay in postulating a coming ‘Third Age’ as an historical period, rather than in Paradise. He shared with other twelfth century writers a system of symbols and types. He employed Augustine’s sevenfold division, but placed the seventh within time. In the mid thirteenth century he would be particularly opposed by St Thomas Aquinas, who argued that the comparison between Old and New Testaments can only be general, in that all figures in the Old Testament find their fulfilment in Christ, noting that St Augustine had already refuted those who, for example, regarded the ten plagues of Exodus as types of the ten persecutions of the early Church. And the same seems true about the sayings of the Abbot.

---

29 cf. Reeves, art. cit. Also: M. Reeves, ‘The ‘Liber Figurarum’ of Joachim of Fiore’ (1950, Medieval and Renaissance Studies II, 57-81)
30 cf. Bloomfield, art. cit. 270
Joachim.\(^{31}\) The present dispensation is to last to the end of the world \(^{32}\). In this view, St Bonaventure concurred\(^{33}\).

The main legacy of Joachim's ideas was the expectation of a future Age, rather than his Trinitarian philosophy of history as a whole. Around the middle of the thirteenth century, Joachim's views came to have an enormous influence in the Franciscan Order, particularly in what came to be called the 'Spiritual' movement. Beginning as a dispute over the observance of poverty, the movement developed into a radical protest against every sort of worldliness in the Church, and the apocalyptic theories of Joachim provided a theoretical basis for criticism of the Papacy and for hope that a new age would soon dawn for the Church. Even Bonaventure saw Francis as 'the Angel of the Sixth Seal', herald of a new era for the Church. However, it is important to stress that 'Joachimism' was a phenomenon of the mid and late thirteenth century. It must be obvious that this 'idealisation' of Francis could only develop after his death, and a period of reflection on the meaning of his life, as well as an elaboration of a vision of the Order's future. It would be an anachronism to read it back into writers even a little earlier, such as Antony. Antony, who died only six years after Francis, most of which he spent in preaching and in the editing of his homiletic material, does not seem to have contributed to this development in any way. His technique of 'concordance' bears little resemblance to Joachim's concordiae, the latter being concerned with broad resemblances of historical types, rather than the interpretation and application of texts for individual life. It has been suggested that Joachim influenced Pope Innocent III \(^{34}\), who first authorised St Francis and his companions to preach, but though Antony does on occasion quote Innocent, it is unlikely that the Calabrian, who died in 1202, was well-known to him as he did his studies in Lisbon and Coimbra between 1210 and 1220. The terminology of 'concordance' is also similar, but not identical. Joachim uses the term concordia, while Antony speaks of concordantia; and Antony's interests are far more the moral applications common to the tradition, than the new historical applications of Joachim.

\(^{31}\) McGinn, art. cit. (cf. Commentary on the Sentences (1256), d43. q1, a3, qla4, sol II. ad3)

\(^{32}\) McGinn, art. cit. (cf. S.T. Ia IIae, q106, a4)

\(^{33}\) McGinn, art. cit. (Post novum testamentum non est aliud, nec aliquod sacramentum novae legis subrari potest, quia illud testamentum aeternum est. (Opera Omnia, V 403))

\(^{34}\) cf. R.E. Lerner, art. cit.
It is safer to say that in Scriptural interpretation they both stood in a well-established tradition, which Antony developed in a less radical way than Joachim.

5.3 Modern studies: the ‘state of the question’

The fact and the extent of Antony’s use of the terms concordare and concordantia has now been adequately demonstrated. Before going on to a fuller analysis of their meaning and justification, however, it will be helpful to survey the work that has already been done on this topic. We do not yet have a major study of Antony’s work; nothing, for instance, to compare with Gilson’s volumes on Bonaventure and on Duns Scotus. There have nevertheless been number of shorter studies of various aspects of Antony’s theology, occasioned principally by his naming as a Doctor of the Church in 1946, and again following the publication of the critical edition of his writings in 1979. Several of these studies have already been mentioned in the course of this present work. More recently, an English translation of the Sermones for the Easter period has been accompanied by a useful introduction by Charles McCarron. A number of these studies touch upon Antony’s ‘concordances’, and it is this material that I want to review briefly at this point.

One of the fullest treatments is also among the earliest, that by Fr L. Gonzaga da Fonseca: ‘La sacra Scrittura negli scritti di S. Antonio’. I will outline his position as a base-line from which to measure what has been said since. He includes a section (about nine pages) on Antony’s method of concordance, noting that the first thing that strikes the reader is the huge number of Scriptural passages adduced: ‘His preaching appears to be a veritable mosaic of biblical texts, juxtaposed, combined, concorded, interlinked and intertwined,’ while his whole style is pervaded with a biblical flavour by the continuous scriptural allusions. He calls concordance (the harmonization of the liturgical readings) Antony’s ‘idea geniale’. Whether the idea was entirely original, or derived from some previous example, he is not prepared to say. Augustine occasionally quotes the epistle or psalm when commenting on the Sunday gospel, but not in any systematic way. Antony’s ‘magnificent idea (founded upon the sound

36 L. Gonzaga da Fonseca, La sacra Scrittura negli scritti di S. Antonio (Rome, 1947)
assumption that the Church’s wisdom in ordering the liturgy was guided by a principle of harmony, whereby the combination of various parts gives the total expression) was an unfailing well-spring of resources, newness and efficacy for the preacher, and for the faithful, whether educated or not, a means of gaining familiarity with the word of God.' Fonseca notes that some concordances are suggested by the primary text itself, while others are introduced to supply what is not to be found there. Sometimes they are a means to explain and expand the text, sometimes they serve to introduce a new idea. In principle, the method is no different from that of other preachers: but few others achieved the same effect, since they lacked Antony’s phenomenal Biblical memory. Antony was helped by an accepted methodology that allowed him to see parallels and harmonies where we, perhaps, would see none. Fonseca calls him ‘a living Concordance, even before the first recorded Concordance was published.’ This is true, but in a sense underestimates Antony’s achievement. Concordances, as they came to be developed from the mid-thirteenth century, are based on words; Antony’s ‘concordances’, as we shall see, are founded on a harmony of meanings.

Shortly after Fonseca’s study, R. Huber included an interesting chapter on ‘The Sermons of St Anthony’ in his ‘St Anthony of Padua. A critical study’,37 the nearest there has been to a general critique of St Antony, but unfortunately now rather out of date. He notes that Antony strove to make a concordance of the Gospel with the Epistle and Introit of the Mass, together with the Lessons of the Divine Office. He adds:

However, not to make his sermons too long the saint does not devote the same amount of space to each category. He enters more profusely (1) into the homiletic explanation of the Gospels, less profusely (2) into the history of the Old Testament excepting, e.g., in his sermon for Septuagesima Sunday; and deals still more briefly, as it were only summarily, (3) with the Introit and (4) with the Epistles.38

This seems to betray some misunderstanding of Antony’s method. The homiletic explanation of the Gospels is the overarching framework of the whole work, not a category within it; and while it is true that usually the Introits and Epistles are treated only briefly, the amount of Old Testament reference is immense, although it is not

---

37 R. Huber, St Anthony of Padua, Doctor of the Church. A critical study (Milwaukee, 1948).
38 Ibid, 73
(and is not intended to be) a commentary on the entire Old Testament book being read concurrently with the Mass readings. Huber goes on to say that Antony delights in particular in making 'concordances' or comparisons with other Scriptural texts, especially the Canticle of Canticles,\(^{39}\) and,

In his sermons St Anthony most frequently makes use of allegories and continually refers to other texts (concordance), e.g., of the Old Testament to explain the sacred mysteries of the New Testament. Thus the 'Canticle of Canticles' is repeatedly drawn upon to explain the prerogatives of the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Mother of Christ.\(^{40}\)

This is quite misleading, as in fact Antony has no particular predilection for the Canticles, even in the rather few sermons particularly devoted to Mary. While Huber is quite right in saying that the *Sermones* 'may not be looked upon as his *Summa Theologica*', I think he goes too far in adding 'nor as a... collection of commentaries on the Sacred Scriptures compared and placed in juxtaposition (concordance)';\(^{41}\). They do not pretend to be commentaries on the whole of Scripture, but they are most certainly a collection of commentaries on the Sunday Gospels. Although they are intended for use by preachers, the term 'commentary' seems to me to describe them better than Huber's preferred category, 'a manual or a model for preachers.'

At about the same time, in his doctoral thesis\(^{42}\), L.F. Rohr calls the *Sermones* a mosaic which is made of Scripture texts that are so worked together as to present a unified whole to all who come into contact with them. At first sight the pattern among the Biblical texts found in the writings of the Saint of Padua is so intricate that it is somewhat mystifying. However, throughout his sermons St Anthony has intertwined a thread of unity that draws those works closely together.\(^{43}\)

This is well said, and Rohr has also noted Antony's motivation in employing this method, as a counter to the Cathar rejection of the Old Testament.\(^{44}\) It is therefore disappointing to find that in this final summary he merely says,

St Anthony's own method of harmonizing the Sunday Gospels and Epistles with the Introit of the Sunday Mass and the lessons from the Breviary is of interest. He uses this system constantly, with the purpose of opposing the errors of his times...\(^{45}\)

\(^{39}\) *Ibid.*, 74

\(^{40}\) *Ibid.*, 75

\(^{41}\) *Ibid.*, 76

\(^{42}\) L.F. Rohr, *The Use of Sacred Scripture in the Sermons of St Anthony of Padua* (Washington, 1948)

\(^{43}\) *Ibid.*, 35

\(^{44}\) *Ibid.*, 37

\(^{45}\) *Ibid.*, 81
It is indeed of interest, and it deserves much closer consideration if some of the 'mystifying' aspects of Antony's approach are to be made clear.

Again, S. Doimi has made similar points about Antony's method in general, and its particular relevance to the teachings of the Cathars. He says that the saint certainly intended, with his system of concordance, to oppose the theory of contemporary heretics who thought that the author of the Old Testament was the evil principle.

He intended, as we know from his contemporary Guibert, to make his exposition more acceptable; but he intended above all to affirm the complete pre-eminence of the Gospel with respect to the Old Testament, and its centrality with respect to the biblical and liturgical branches of the Epistle and the Introit.

He adds that in order to oppose the heretics,

the saint in his writings provides himself with an abundance of 'auctoritates' passages of the Old Testament, and continuously concords them with the texts of the Gospel. He thoughtfully underlines the connection and concordance of the two Testaments.

Referring to the hermeneutical method which Antony follows, he says that Antonian sermons appear to be an endless sequence of themes and arguments which change, succeed one another, interlink and repeat in a variety that disconcerts and disorients the most patient reader. 'We are evidently dealing', he says, 'with a mentality and method very different from ours, and we must go back to the mentality, methods and tastes of that time.' Undoubtedly, patience is necessary in disentangling the logic of Antony's method, but we have already seen a good deal of pattern in it, and we must hope to elucidate it still further.

A. Pompei makes the interesting point that the ethos of monastic biblical study, the tradition in which Antony was trained, was far less preoccupied with disputatio than the non-monastic schools were. Rooted in the rhythm of the religious observance of the Divine Office, it was marked by a desire for harmony rather than for opposition. Francis's commission to Antony was to teach theology in such a way as not to extinguish the spirit of prayer and devotion. Although Franciscan preaching
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46 S. Doimi, 'S. Antonio di Padova Dottore 'Evangelico' (1961, IS 1) 286. The reference is to Guibert, PL 156.25
47 Ibid, 291
48 Ibid, 287
49 A. Pompei: 'The Sermones of St Anthony and Franciscan Theology' (1983, GR 9, 277-308)
was much concerned with conversion and repentance, the friars were not to be condemnatory or disputacious, but (as the Rule commanded) ‘gentle, peaceful, and unassuming, courteous and humble, speaking respectfully to everyone.’ Although Antony was familiar with the free way of expounding Scripture used by Bernard, he preferred the method of harmonizations or ‘concordances’. This means that he surrounded the text on which he was commenting with verbal citations of other passages. Borrowing the procedure from Gregory the Great, he justifies it scientifically by an appeal to the doctrine of the unity of the two Testaments. For this reason his choice of biblical and liturgical texts on which he built his sermons cannot be regarded as arbitrary. This method was meant to make it easier for a more sophisticated public, one that was less taken in by technique, to hear and accept his message.

I would qualify the final point: I do not believe that the *Sermones* were intended for the ‘public’, sophisticated or not, in the first instance. They were directed towards friars who were for the most part untrained and unsophisticated, to help them deliver a sound biblical message to audiences who might be either more or less sophisticated than themselves. Pompei says that Antony was proposing a new method to his students: I agree, but again this needs qualification. The friars were always supposed to preach more by the example of their lives than by their words; their words were always supposed to be aimed at evoking sorrow for sin and amendment of life, motivated above all by the example of Christ’s poverty and Passion. What Antony clearly wanted was for the friars to be well-grounded in Scripture, so as to preach the true Gospel and not their private enthusiasms. Francis’s own preaching was entirely based on the Gospel; the *Opus Evangeliorum* was meant to ensure that this was so for the friars who followed Francis. Pompei also rightly notes the context of heretical teaching, particularly Cathar, found in many areas. As we have seen, the Cathars were noted for their simple and austere life-style; the friars had to match this, as a minimum requirement for being heard; but they also had to match the Cathars in the intellectual debate, above all in commending the whole of Scripture as God’s word, and commending the material creation as his work.

The pervasiveness of Antony’s use of concordance has been emphasised by several writers. For instance, P. Pedone notes that ‘la concordanza è elemento

50 cf. Chapter Three, 3.1; OS 60
51 Pompei, 289
52 P. Pedone, ‘La tematica liturgica nei ‘Sermones’’ (1987, IS 27, 3-75)
costante dei sermoni antoniani", and Claudio Leonardi\textsuperscript{53} writes, ‘In this sense concordare is the term- continually reprise and repeated to express a cultural awareness- which reveals a situation and explicitly defines it: because the Bible is read through this filter, and the mediation of this tool. Antony’s Bible is one expressed by concordance.’ It is ‘a literary and intellectual technique which is used constantly.’\textsuperscript{54}

Mainly, writers seem to have been content to note only the broad outline of the method of concordance, viewed as a treatment of the liturgical texts. Leonardi, for instance, says, ‘In the logic of the Quadrigal concordance, the theme set out from the liturgy comes to be illustrated almost exclusively by the Bible, but it is also held by a thread which may be solely biblical, but which often is not.’ ‘The Old Testament is the key which opens the spiritual sense contained in the New.’ Antony uses the analogy of a bow: if the Old Testament is the wood, and the New Testament is the string, it is the tension in the wood that enables the string to drive the arrow (of preaching) to its mark. Pedone has gone a little further in classifying concordances, dividing them into numerical, verbal, etymological and objective. That is, sometimes the basis for choosing a concordant passage is a numerical correspondence (seven virtues, ten commandments, etc); sometimes it is based on a coincidence of words themselves; sometimes on the meanings of words (especially proper names); and sometimes there is an analogy in the events or matters described. On the whole, modern writers have tended, like Fonseca, to regard Antony’s method as over-elaborate and of little intrinsic interest. Giovanni Leonardi\textsuperscript{55} accepts that the general principle of concordance is ‘Scripture interpreting Scripture’, and that historically it is related to anti-Cathar polemic, but he regards Antony’s method as ‘perplexing’, calling it a specific taste of Antony’s that is unprecedented. He cites Nicholas of Lyra in the late13th/ early 14th cent., that Antony’s sermons are ‘unusable as they stand’- which suggests to me that they were misunderstood from an early period, since I feel sure that they were not meant to be used (i.e. preached) ‘as they stand’.

\textsuperscript{53} C. Leonardi. ‘Vangelo di Francesco e Bibbia di Antonio’ (1982, IS 22, 299-318)
\textsuperscript{54} Ibid, 309
Noting that verbal Concordances to the whole Bible were produced 'after a long process of trial and error' by the Paris Dominicans, Beryl Smalley\textsuperscript{56} points out that these were preceded by '\textit{distinctiones}', lists of Biblical words, which Antony may have used. We have already noticed this possibility at the end of Chapter Three. She speculates that Antony may have devised such a list for his own use, but admits that probably his prodigious memory made this unnecessary. Whatever the case may be, it seems clear that 'concordance' as Antony conceives it means far more than verbal agreement, and the coincidence of terminology may be no more than that-coincidence. On the other hand, it may even be that the later use of the word 'concordance', in the sense of a Biblical index, came indirectly from Antony's own use of the term.

While there has been increasing interest in Antony in recent years, scholarship has tended to concern itself with the content of Antony's teaching (his treatment of penitence, for example, or of the blessed Virgin) rather than on his method. This is a pity in one way, since it is in his methodology that he shows originality, whereas in content he tends mainly to re-state established positions.

\textsuperscript{55} G. Leonardi, 'Fedeltà al testo Evangelico e alla vita nell' ermeneutico biblica di S. Antonio' (1982, \textit{IS} 22, 319-340)
\textsuperscript{56} Smalley, 'The Use... ', 287
CHAPTER SIX

CONCORDANTIA: ANALYSIS

In this chapter we will first survey, in as comprehensive a way as space permits, the various contexts in which Antony uses his terminology of 'concordance'; and then we will attempt (however tentatively) to draw some conclusions about the underlying principles and purpose of his method.

6.1 Pentecost XI

Before examining his usage in extenso, there is a particular passage in the Sermon for Pentecost XI which illustrates both the technical and non-technical use of the word. Antony is considering the Gospel story of the pharisee and the publican.\(^1\) The publican stood far off and would not lift up his eyes to heaven; he beat his breast and asked for mercy. After discussing these physical expressions of penitence, Antony remarks:

\[
\text{Attende et diligenter inspice, in quanta concordia erat secum iste poenitens.}
\]
\[
\text{Humilitas in eius mente praefulgebat, cui oculorum humilitas consonabat;}
\]
\[
\text{cor de commissis dolebat, manus percutiebat,}
\]
\[
\text{lingua resonabat: Deus, propitius esto mihi peccatori.}
\]

Super hac concordia habes concordantiam in Ecclesiastico:

\[
\text{In tribus, inquit, placitum est spiritui meo, quae sunt probata coram Deo et hominibus: concordia fratrum, amor proximorum, et vir et mulier sibi consentientes.}\(^2\)
\]

Quid fratres, quid proximi, quid vir et mulier significant videamus.

Fratres sunt quinque corporis sensus, de quibus dicitur in Genesi:

\[
\text{Iuda, te laudabant fratres tui.}\(^3\)
\]


Iudas est poenitens, quem quinque corporis sensus, si inter eos concordia fuerit, laudant, idest laudabilem faciunt...

Istorum fratrum concordia Deo et hominibus est placita.

'Concordia dicitur a con-junctione cordis'; concordare, unius cordis fieri.\(^4\)

To be 'concordant' is to be 'of one heart'. As well as being an example of his method, this passage also gives us a clue to the rationale of that method. In comparing passages, Antony sought a unity of 'heart' in them. We need to bear in mind that, since medieval knowledge of anatomy and biology was undeveloped in comparison

1. Lk 18.13
2. Ecclus 25.1-2
3. Gen 49.8
4. Isidore, Etymologiae X,37; PL 82.371
5. SDF II, 71
with our own, the associations of certain words were different then too. The heart was not regarded as simply the source of emotion and feeling, as we now figuratively contrast 'heart' and 'head'. That was associated more with the liver, leading to what we feel to be some incongruity in the over-literal translation of some texts! The heart was the seat of 'understanding', so that what Antony looked for was a unity of inner meaning, based on the conviction that all parts of Scripture were expressions of God's self-revelation. We should recall what has been referred to earlier, that Antony was less interested in the logical and metaphysical developments and discoveries being made at Paris and Oxford, for instance, than in the moral and spiritual application of Biblical truth to the lives of ordinary believers. His method of 'concordance' does have its own inner logic, but we shall discover it best by observing it as he developed it, rather than by trying to fit it in to the categories of the Aristotelianism which so signally influenced other twelfth and thirteenth century writers. It is only by familiarity with an author's writings that one can hope to gain an insight into the way his or her mind works. Accordingly, we must now look in some detail at the way Antony employs his method.

6.2 Case study: the structure of an Antonian 'Sermo'- Pentecost I

Before going further, it will be useful to give a detailed analysis of a complete 'sermo', in order to identify the various constituent elements, and how they relate to one another. I shall take the sermon for the first Sunday after Pentecost, because, as I pointed out earlier, this marks the beginning of a new phase in Antony's handling of his material. The twenty-four Sundays after Pentecost form a distinct and consistent group which exemplify Antony's methodology very clearly, and the first of the sequence exhibits virtually all the features which we need to consider.

[PROLOGUE]

Text: IN ILLO TEMPORE: (Lk 16-19) There was a certain rich man...
Auxiliary text: DICITUR: (1Kg 17.40) David took his staff.
Distinctions: NOTA ISTA QUATTUOR:
staff = cross of Christ
five stones = knowledge of Old Testament (five books of Moses)
scrip, bag = grace of New Testament
sling = equal balance of judgement

Interpretation: Further elaboration of the auxiliary text; David = the preacher; references to Jacob's staff (cf. Gen 32.40) and to Hab 3.4, introduced by DICITUR or UNDE.
In interpreting the five stones, an alternative is offered, introduced by VEL.
(the preacher casts stones of rebuke against sins of five senses). The sling, having two equal thongs, represents a balance of doctrine and life; i.e. the preacher’s life should match his words. The Philistine is the rich worldling, drunk with gluttony and lust. (Introductory words: INTERPRETATUR, SIGNIFICAT)

Divisions of the Gospel and Epistle set out:
NOTA QUOD IN HOC EVANGELIO QUATTUOR NOTANTUR; HIS CLAUSULIS QUASDAM HISTORIAS. CONCORDABIMUS;
NOTA QUOD IN INTOITU CANTATUR;
EPISTOLA... QUAM IN QUATTUOR PARTICULIS VOLUMUS DIVIDERE ET CUM IV EVANGELII CLAUSULIS CONCORDARE.

[FIRST CLAUSE]
Text: DICAMUS ERGO: restatement of (part of) Gospel text.
Auxiliary text: DE QUO DICITUR: Ps 51.9
Distinctions: NOTA ISTA TRIA

non posuit (= dives)
speravit in divitis (= induebatur purpura)
praevaluit in vanitate (= epulabatur splendide)

Concordance: SUPER HOC HABES CONCORDANTIAM: 1Kg 25.2,36,3 (story of Nabal)
Distinctions: Nabal (‘fool’) = the rich man (cf. Mt 16.23)
wilderness of Maon = his isolation (cf. Ps 68.26)
Carmel (‘soft’) = his ‘softness’ and luxury (cf. various texts)
[digression: Is 5.11-12 speaks of five ‘instruments’ which represent senses, to pleasures of which the rich man is devoted

Text: DICAMUS ERGO: return to Gospel text
Distinctions: purple (royal colour, derived from hollow shells ) = oppression of the poor
fine linen
feasting

Concordance: SUPER HOC HABES CONCORDANTIAM;
1Kg 2.13-15 (Eli’s sons feast at expense of poor)
Distinctions: priest = belly
priest’s servant = gluttonous appetite
three-pronged fork = taking what belongs to others;

Summing up: BENE ERGO DICITUR: restatement of (part of) Gospel text.
Distinctions: ‘oppone singula singulis’:
rich man ~ beggar (citation of JEROME, AUGUSTINE)
purple-clad ~ full of sores
feasting ~ desiring to be fed

He lies at the rich man’s gate, like the Ark before Dagon: cf below. (cf. GLOSS)

Introit: ISTE DICTIT IN INTROITU hodiernae missae (Ps 12.6)
Distinctions: NOTA QUOD TRIA DIXIT

speravi - the true poor man hopes in God’s mercy
exulavit cor meum - his heart rejoices amid the world’s misery
cantabo Domino - he will sing to God in eternal glory

Epistle: HUIC PRIMAE CLAUSULAE CONCORDAT PRIMA PARTICULA
HODIERNAE EPISTOLAE (1Jn )
a ‘brief and special’ sermon on charity; cites AUGUSTINE (twice), and BERNARD

Alternative: MORALITAT: Repetition of Gospel text
rich man = the body (homo/humus)
Lazarus = the soul
the body is the earth that brings forth thorns, (cf. Gen 3.18)
the soul is like the beggar at the pool with five porches (Jn) = the senses
the dogs who lick his sores

= preachers, who heal the sores of sin by their tongues (words).
[SECOND CLAUSE]

Text: **SEQUITUR SECUNDUM:** Gospel (Lk 16.22): the deaths of the two men

Auxiliary text: 1Kg 2.4.8 (the fulfilment of Anna’s words)

Concordance: **SUPER HUNC LOCUM EVANGELII HABES CONCORDANTIAM:**

(1Kg 1.2,6,7) Anna and Phenenna

Distinctions: Phenenna (who is fruitful) ~ rich man

(whose children are works of the flesh)

Anna (who is barren) ~ Lazarus

Phenenna ill-treats Ann in four ways:

*affligebat:* the rich man refuses the alms he ought to bestow

*arguebat:* the rich man’s wealth opposes the poverty of the beggar

*exprobrabat:* he offends Lazarus by his luxury

*provocabat:* yet this provokes the just man to love God more

Anna wept and would not eat;

Lazarus wept, and could not eat, because no-one gave to him

Repetition: Text, and auxiliary text, are repeated.

Concordance: **SUPER HOC HABES CONCORDANTIAM** (1Kg 5.45) Dagon falls before the Ark.

 Ark ~ Dagon = Lazarus ~ rich man

Distinctions: *Arca, IN QUO FUERUNT TRIA:*

manna (= patience, suffering)

tables of the Law (= two-fold love, of God and neighbour)

Aaron’s rod (= discipline)

Dagon lies before the Ark (Lazarus in Abraham’s bosom)

Dagon’s head (= temporal excellence)

his two hands (= power and abundance)

the threshold (= life’s exit, the entry to death)

Summing up: **BENE ERGO DICITUR:** repetition of (part) Gospel text.

Repetition: of (part) Text.

Auxiliary text: Jer 22.18-19 The death of the wicked is not mourned

Distinctions: wild beasts = bestial children

serpents = the demons

worms = worms

Epistle: **HUIC SECUNDAE CLAUSULAE CONCORDAT SECUNDA PARTICULA HODIERNAE EPISTOLAE** (1Jn)

Further discussion of charity. Citation of GLOSS

Prayer.

[THIRD CLAUSE]

Text: **SEQUITUR TERTIUM:** Third clause of Gospel. The fate of the two men after death

Auxiliary text: Is 5.30

Auxiliary text: Wisd 5.2-5

Repetition: of first part of Gospel text, and comment.

Text: **SEQUITUR:** continuation of Gospel text, comment on first part.

Repetition of second part and comment.

Text: **SEQUITUR:** continuation of Gospel text.

Concordance: **SUPER HOC HABES CONCORDANTIAM** (1 Kg 26.12-16 (paraphrased))

Distinctions: David (‘strong-armed’) ~ Lazarus

Saul (‘abuser’) ~ the purple-clad rich man

the spear ~ the power of riches

the jug of water ~ the pleasure of gluttony

Epistle: **HUIC TERTIAE CLAUSULAE CONCORDAT TERTIA PARTICULA HODIERNAE EPISTOLAE**

Citation of GLOSS, and comment.

Prayer.
[FOURTH CLAUSE]
Text: SEQUITUR QUARTUM: fourth clause of Gospel, the rich man's prayer for his brothers.

Distinctions: NOTA ISTA TRIA:

house ~ the world
'my father' ~ the devil
five brothers ~ those devoted to the five senses

Concordance: UNDE HABES CONCORDANTIAM (1Kg 25.42): Story of Abigail

Distinctions:

Abigail ~ the penitent soul
the ass ~ the flesh (riding on = controlling)
five maidservants ~ five bodily senses
sight = understanding
hearing = obedience
taste = testing
smell = investigation
touch = operation

David's heralds ~ poverty ) which tell us how
~ humility ) he lived
~ Christ's Passion) here on earth

a wife ~ wed with the ring of a well-formed faith

Text: SEQUITUR: continuation of Gospel text, with short literal comment.

Distinctions: Moses ~ the holy prelate of the Church
prophets ~ preachers
one rising from the dead ~ Christ

Concordance: SIC HABES CONCORDANTIAM (1Kg 28.8,11-13) Saul raises Samuel's ghost

Interpretation: short discussion of literal sense.

Epistle: INDE HUIE QUARTAE CLAUSULAE CONCORDAT QUARTA PARTICULA

Comment, with citation from AUGUSTINE

Prayer.

The general structure of each sermon clause, then, is this:

1. Statement of Gospel text (usually introduced by Dicamus ergo or sequitur).
2. Statement of Auxiliary text
   possibly with identification of key elements (often introduced by, e.g.,
   nota ista [tria], or quid significant [ista] videamus), and interpretation.
3. Statement of Concordance
   usually with identification of key elements, and interpretation, as for
   above.
4. (Reference to Introit, possibly noted as concordant)
5. Reference to part of Epistle as concordant with current clause of Gospel;
   general comment.

[1, 2, and 3 may be repeated]
6.3 The Introits

In making a detailed analysis of Antony’s use of ‘concordance’ I shall concentrate mainly on the sermons for the twenty-four Sundays after Pentecost, as giving the fullest and best examples.

I shall begin with the Introits, since there are fewer explicit examples of concordance among them, and we can compare them with those other cases which are not so termed. The ‘Introit’ is the antiphon to the psalm sung at the beginning of Mass, at the entrance of the clergy. Even when the psalm is reduced to a single verse, with *Gloria*, the antiphon is sung before and after it, setting the tone for the whole celebration. Often, but by no means always, it is taken from the entry-psalm itself, and expresses praise of God, or a plea for mercy. It is not particularly related to the themes of the readings.

We may ask whether we can see a difference between cases where Antony calls the Introit ‘concordant’ with one or other of the readings, and those where he does not. There are only seven of the former in the texts we are considering:

1. Pentecost IV (I.465) *concordat* with Old Testament
2. Pentecost VII (I.541) *habes concordantiam* with Gospel
3. Pentecost X (II.55) *habes concordantiam* with Gospel
4. Pentecost XIII (II.158) *concordat* with Gospel
5. Pentecost XV (II.234) *concordat* with Old Testament
6. Pentecost XVII (II.279) *concordat* with Epistle
7. Pentecost XX (II.385) *concordat* with Gospel

Since there are so few examples, we will look at each in turn.

1. The Gospel contains the words ‘Give, and it shall be given unto you’ (Lk 6.38). Antony suggests a concordance to this in 2Kg(Sm) 17.27-29, where David and his companions are brought gifts by Berzelli and others. Later (19.33), David says to Berzelli, ‘Come with me that thou mayest rest secure in Jerusalem.’ It is this verse to which the Introit, ‘The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? The Lord is the protector of my life; of whom shall I be afraid? My enemies that trouble me have themselves been weakened and have fallen.’ (Ps 26.1-2), is said to be concordant. The basis of the concordance consists in the four words ‘come’, ‘rest’, ‘secure’ and ‘Jerusalem’. No-one can ‘come’ to the Lord unless he is first enlightened, while ‘rest’ comes from salvation. The Lord’s protection gives ‘security’,
and when we are in the heavenly Jerusalem we shall not fear the enemies who trouble us now. Some of this may seem a little forced, but there is an underlying connection, in that the behaviour of David to his benefactor does exemplify ‘Give, and it shall be given to you’; while David’s invitation to accompany him and find security in Jerusalem is parallel to Christ’s invitation to the soul, to which the Introit is a fitting response.

2. The Introit is ‘We have received thy mercy in the midst of thy temple, O God’ (Ps 47.10). This is linked by Antony to the opening words of the Gospel, ‘I have pity upon the multitude’ (Mk 8.2). He comments: ‘De cuius misericordia oplime habes concordantiam in introitu hodiernae missae’, but does not continue with the theme of mercy, preferring to explain the word ‘temple’.

3. The Gospel includes the words: ‘My house shall be called a house of prayer’ (Lk 19.46). The Introit comes from Ps 67.6-7,36: ‘God is in his holy place: God who maketh men of one manner to dwell in a house: he will give power and strength to his people.’ Here, God’s ‘house’ and his ‘place’ are evidently the same; and in a moral interpretation they represent the mind or soul of the righteous, as the dwelling-place of God. Antony quotes Ezekiel’s vision (Ezek 3.12), ‘I heard behind me the voice of a great commotion, saying, Blessed be the glory of the Lord from his place.’ This ‘commotion’ is contrition, the repentance by which we are made God’s dwelling-place, and enabled to bless and glorify him. As God’s dwelling-place, his house, our powers and faculties are made to dwell in harmony, with our sensuality subject to reason and our reason to God. God gives his people virtue so that they do not become too elated in prosperity, and fortitude so that they are not downcast in adversity. ‘He giveth strength to the weary, and increaseth force and might to them that are not’ (Is 40.29). Thus the Gospel and the Introit equally evoke the idea of the soul as the Temple of God.

4. The Gospel is, ‘Blessed are the eyes which see what you see...’ (Lk 10.23), and the Introit is ‘Behold, O God our protector, and look on the face of thy Christ. For better is one day in thy courts above thousands’ (Ps 83.10-11). The basis for the
concordance is the face of Christ. That is what the disciples are blessed in seeing, even when it was bruised in the Passion; and when we call upon God for protection, it is in virtue of Christ's redeeming suffering, which we ask God to look upon rather than upon our sins.

5. The Introit is treated in the context of the second clause of the Gospel, 'Consider the birds of the air' (Mt 6.26), but it is referred not to that, but to part of the Book of Tobit read at Matins (Tob 3.1-2,6; 3.13,21-23). The Introit is, 'Have mercy on me, O Lord, for I have cried to thee all the day; for thou, O Lord, art sweet and mild, and plenteous in mercy to all that call upon thee' (Ps 85.3,5). The general sense of these words is obviously in accord with the fervent prayers of Tobias and Sarah in their trials.

6. The Introit is based on a text of Ecclesiasticus (36.18), slightly altered: 'Give peace, Lord, to them that patiently wait for thee; that thy prophets may be found faithful. Hear the prayers of thy servants and of thy people Israel.' This is echoed in the Epistle (Eph 4.1), where St Paul asks his readers to support one another patiently in charity; while the prayer for peace echoes that at the beginning of 2 Maccabees (the Old Testament reading), that God may send peace to the Jews in Egypt and Palestine. The concordance, then, is based on the words 'patience' and 'peace'.

7. The final concordance is between the lord in the parable of the unforgiving servant, who, 'being moved with pity, let him go and forgave him his debt' (Mt 18.27), and the words of Jeremiah in the Introit, 'I know the thoughts that I think towards you, saith the Lord, thoughts of peace and not of affliction' (Jer 29.11ff). The words, 'You shall call upon me and I will hear you; and I will bring back your captivity,' express the same sequence as in the Gospel: the servant prays, is heard, and is set free. The words sung in the Introit help the believer to identify himself with the servant in the Gospel.

Although the term 'concordance' is only used in these seven cases, the Introit is actually referred to in every one of the twenty-four Sundays except the last, which
has no proper Introit but re-uses the preceding one. In each case the Introit is related briefly to one or other of the readings (for instance, on Pentecost IX the Introit is interpreted as a prayer of the Church against bad prelates who waste the Lord’s goods like the wicked steward in the Gospel). There seems no obvious reason why these too should not be termed ‘concordance’; in other words, the method is constant, even though Antony varies the way in which he introduces the Introit. The basis for the concordance is sometimes verbal- a coincidence of words- and sometimes an underlying harmony of ideas. Because the Introit is so short, and is generally an expression of praise or penitence, it requires no great ingenuity to work it in somewhere in any sermon, or on any Gospel.

6.4 The Epistles

In the Sermons for the Sundays after Pentecost there are sixty-seven Gospel clausulae, and in all but two of them the Epistle concordance is introduced by the formula: ‘huic primae (secundae, tertiae..) clausulae concordat prima (secunda, tertia..) particulae epistolae’. The exceptions are found in the first clause of the Gospel for Pentecost XII, where Antony writes merely: ‘si ergo cum Iesu de finibus Tyri exieris... cum beato Paulo in hodierna epistola dicere poteris...’; and in the Gospel for Pentecost XVIII, where Antony treats only the second clause, and introduces the Epistle with the words: ‘in epistola hodierna sunt tria istis concordantia’, where ‘istis’ refers to the parts of the Introit, not the Gospel.

The Epistles give us far more data than the Introits, in that not only is every Epistle explicitly concorded with its Gospel, but (with the two exceptions noted above) every section of each Epistle is concorded with the corresponding clause of the Gospel. This suggests that considerable artificiality is likely in the detailed comparisons between texts; and this likelihood is increased when we remember that, in Antony’s time, there were a number of lectionary-schemes in use, and even though these were broadly similar, the correspondence of Epistles and Gospels could vary- an easy way for a modern reader to appreciate this is to compare the sequence of Epistles and Gospels in the Book of Common Prayer (based on the Gallican lectionary) on the
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one hand, with that of the post-Tridentine Roman Missal on the other. Antony must have realised that the connection between the two readings was not always planned and chosen by the Church; if there had once been such a plan, it had been distorted over the years. Given his overall intention to relate the Epistles to the Gospels, the only flexibility he could allow himself was in the precise places where he divided the readings.

The themes of the Gospels and Epistles in the time after Pentecost are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Gospel Theme</th>
<th>(Ref)</th>
<th>Epistle theme</th>
<th>(Ref)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Dives and Lazarus</td>
<td>Lk 16</td>
<td>The Love of God</td>
<td>1 Jn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>The Great Supper</td>
<td>Lk 14</td>
<td>Our love for God and neighbour</td>
<td>1 Jn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>The lost sheep and coin</td>
<td>Lk 15</td>
<td>Humility and vigilance</td>
<td>1 Pt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Mercy to our neighbour</td>
<td>Lk 6</td>
<td>Suffering that leads to glory</td>
<td>Rom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>The draught of fishes</td>
<td>Lk 5</td>
<td>Advice to disciples</td>
<td>1 Pt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>Going beyond the law</td>
<td>Mt 5</td>
<td>Baptism, death and resurrection</td>
<td>Rom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.</td>
<td>Feeding the four thousand</td>
<td>Mk 8</td>
<td>Sin and its consequences</td>
<td>Rom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII.</td>
<td>Warnings against hypocrisy</td>
<td>Mt 7</td>
<td>The flesh and the spirit</td>
<td>Rom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX.</td>
<td>The unjust steward</td>
<td>Lk 16</td>
<td>God is faithful, though we sin</td>
<td>1 Cor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X.</td>
<td>Jesus and Jerusalem</td>
<td>Lk 19</td>
<td>Diversity of gifts</td>
<td>1 Cor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI.</td>
<td>The Pharisee and the publican</td>
<td>Lk 18</td>
<td>Paul’s vocation</td>
<td>1 Cor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII.</td>
<td>The deaf-mute</td>
<td>Mk 7</td>
<td>The apostolate</td>
<td>2 Cor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII.</td>
<td>The good Samaritan</td>
<td>Lk 10</td>
<td>Abraham and the covenant</td>
<td>Gal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV.</td>
<td>The ten lepers</td>
<td>Lk 17</td>
<td>The flesh and the spirit</td>
<td>Gal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV.</td>
<td>Do not be anxious</td>
<td>Mt 6</td>
<td>The flesh and the spirit</td>
<td>Gal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI.</td>
<td>The widow’s son</td>
<td>Lk 7</td>
<td>Paul’s trials</td>
<td>Eph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII.</td>
<td>In the house of the Pharisee</td>
<td>Lk 14</td>
<td>The unity of the Spirit</td>
<td>Eph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVIII.</td>
<td>Whose son is Christ?</td>
<td>Mt 22</td>
<td>Paul gives thanks</td>
<td>1 Cor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIX.</td>
<td>The palsied man</td>
<td>Mt 9</td>
<td>Renewal in the Spirit</td>
<td>Eph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX.</td>
<td>The wedding-feast</td>
<td>Mt 22</td>
<td>Renewal in the Spirit</td>
<td>Eph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXI.</td>
<td>The ruler’s son</td>
<td>Jn 4</td>
<td>Strong in the Lord</td>
<td>Eph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXII.</td>
<td>The unforgiving servant</td>
<td>Mt 18</td>
<td>Paul’s love for his converts</td>
<td>Phil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIII.</td>
<td>The plots of the Pharisees</td>
<td>Mt 22</td>
<td>Paul’s advice to his converts</td>
<td>Phil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XXIV.</td>
<td>Jairus’ daughter</td>
<td>Mt 9</td>
<td>Paul’s prayer for his converts</td>
<td>Col</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Gospel themes begin with ideas of judgement, but pass to an outline of Jesus’ teaching and ministry, roughly following the order in the Gospels, starting in Galilee and ending near Jerusalem. The sequence of the Epistles, on the other hand, with only minor deviations, is simply according to the order in which they appear in the New Testament. This in itself suggests no great concern to link the two readings thematically.
To judge how successfully Antony concorded the Epistles with the Gospels, we must take each case in turn. It would be tedious to treat all sixty-seven instances here, a few examples must suffice. For instance, on the first Sunday after Pentecost, the Gospel is that of Dives and Lazarus. The Epistle is from 1 John on ‘God is love’. In treating the first clause, Antony follows Augustine in seeing the right order of love as being God, our soul, our neighbour and our body. The rich man put the last first, and that is why he was damned. The treatment of the other clauses is briefer, but quite successful in contrasting John’s words on confidence in the day of judgement with the respective fates of Dives and Lazarus; John’s words on fear and love with their characters; and his question on how we can love the invisible God without love for our visible neighbour with Dives’ worldly concern for his brothers.

On the second Sunday after Pentecost, the Epistle is from an earlier part of 1 John, but the Gospel is that of the great supper. Again, Antony finds it easy to relate the idea of love to that of preparation for the heavenly Banquet. The excuses offered by the guests, the farm, the yoke of oxen and the wife, are related to the ways in which we fail in love of God, soul and neighbour, by pride, worldliness and lust. Our concern should be for those poor and outcast who were invited to fill the places of those who refused to come.

However, on Pentecost V the connection of Epistle to Gospel seems superficial: Jesus preaches from Peter’s boat, and Peter himself gives good advice in his Epistle. It is the Apostle himself, rather than his precise words, that provides the link. On Pentecost XVI and XVIII, the links between the stories of the raising of the widow’s son and the healing of the dropsical man on the one hand, and passages from Ephesians on Christian discipleship on the other, appear quite tenuous.

As with the Introits, sometimes Antony bases his ‘concordance’ on a verbal coincidence, sometimes on a convergence of theme. Anyone who has tried to preach on the Sunday Mass readings will know the difficulties of ‘bringing in’ the Epistle
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when dealing with the Gospel, and vice versa. It is not surprising that often Antony refers to the Epistle in very cursory fashion. That he felt obliged to do so at all, and never simply to pass it over, reinforces my view that the whole work was intended to give preachable material to his fellow friars, and at least to remind them of the liturgical texts from which they might draw inspiration. Introits and Epistles were 'set texts', admitting no discretion or choice; it is with Antony's use of the Old Testament that we see the full flowering and flexibility of his method.

6.5 **Old Testament Concordances: Examples of three different types.**

The Old Testament contains many different types of literature- narrative, exhortation, psalmody etc. According to his chosen method, Antony draws concordances from the currently read book of the Bible. To understand the underlying principles of the method, we need to consider samples of concordance drawn from different kinds of book. In this section I will take examples from historical narrative, wisdom literature, and prophecy. During the first eight weeks after Pentecost, the books of Kings were read at Matins; during August and September the readings are largely from Wisdom literature, including Job; and in October and November Maccabees and the prophets were read. I have selected clauses from three Sundays, one for each of these three divisions.

6.5.1 **Pentecost III, first clause.**

The Gospel text for the first clause is:

> The publicans and sinners drew near unto Jesus to hear him. And the pharisees and the scribes murmured, saying: This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them. [Lk 15.1-2]

Antony first adduces a text from I Kings (Samuel) 22.2:

> All that were in distress and oppressed with debt, and under affliction of mind, gathered themselves unto David, and he became their prince.

Antony then reverts to the Gospel text, and identifies his four key phrases (*Nota ista quattuor*): 'drew near', 'to hear', 'receiveth' and 'eateth'. He refers these, by way of a moral application to the life of the penitent Christian, to contrition of heart by means of a 'concordance', drawn from the life of

---
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king David as recounted in the Office readings this week, the second book of Kings (or Samuel).

a) Regarding the first element, ‘drew near’, Antony offers this, from II Kings 5.1:

Then came all the tribes of Israel to David in Hebron, saying: Behold, we are thy bone and thy flesh.

Those who are truly contrite and penitent, even now, should approach Christ as truly ‘our flesh and bone’, one of us who knows what it is to be human, and who suffered precisely so that we might be saved. We should flock to him (here is a ‘concordance of Nature’) as bees follow their monarch (Antony thought the principal bee was a ‘king bee’ rather than a queen).

b) Regarding the second element, ‘to hear’, we have II Kings 19.8:

King David arose and sat in the gate: and it was told to all the people that the king sat in the gate. And all the people came before the king.

With the help of a further text from Ezekiel 44, ‘This gate shall be shut... because the Lord God hath entered in by it’, Antony gives an allegorical interpretation whereby the ‘gate’ is Mary, and so ‘David sitting in the gate’ is a type of Christ, incarnate of Mary. The moral significance is then that penitents should approach Christ as Incarnate through Mary, in order (like the people of old) to hear his words and obey them. Antony makes no particular reference to confession of sins at this point: but we are presumably to understand this according to his earlier scheme.

c) Before the next concordance, Antony reminds us that it was the Pharisees who ‘murmured’ that Jesus ‘receives’ sinners, like David who, in II Kings 14.33, called Absalom, and

he went in to the king, and prostrated himself on the ground before him: and the king kissed Absalom.

The tragic outcome of Absalom’s story is irrelevant at this point. All that matters is to see in him the way that Christ receives a sinner, and embraces him with love. The sinner may use the words of the Introit as an expression of his sorrow:

Look thou upon me, O Lord, and have mercy on me: for I am alone and poor. See my abjection and labour: and forgive me all my sins, O my God.
Confession and satisfaction are referred to at this point; but the goal is reconciliation which is initiated by the loving Father.

d) Finally, in this clause, regarding Jesus ‘eating’ with sinners, we have a parallel in II Kings 9:

Mephiboseth ate at David’s table, as one of the sons of the king... and he dwelt in Jerusalem, because he ate always of the kings table.

David’s kindness to the crippled son of Jonathan, counting him as one of his own sons and sharing his table with him, is a type of Christ, who promised his disciples that they would eat and drink at his table in the kingdom of heaven.

The only other matters to be included in the clause are a brief reference to the first part of the Epistle, ‘wherein Peter speaks to converted sinners’, enjoining humility as a prelude to being lifted up by God, and the closing prayer: ‘Dear brothers, let us ask our Lord Jesus Christ to make us sinners draw near to him and hear him; graciously to receive us, and feed us with him at the table of eternal life. May he grant this, who is blessed for ever. Amen.’

The prayer in fact underlines Antony’s moral purpose: the historical facts about Jesus’ ministry and David’s reign are juxtaposed in order that their relevance and application to the life of the contemporary Christian may be more clearly perceived. However interesting the historical facts in themselves (the ‘literal’ or ‘historical’ sense of Scripture), they have no existential significance unless they shed light on the contemporary situation of the believer.

6.52 Pentecost XIV (first clause)

During September, the book of Job was read. We saw earlier the influence of Gregory on Antony, and Gregory’s Moralia in Job are often used by Antony, and are particularly important here. The Gospel text, which is in a sense only a rubric introducing the story of the healing of the ten lepers, is:

As Jesus was going up to Jerusalem, he passed through the midst of Samaria and Galilee.

This is not the only Gospel in which Antony gives prominence to a short sentence referring to Jesus travelling. ‘All the words in this section are worth noting’, he says;
in particular, the words ‘Samaria’, ‘Galilee’ and ‘Jerusalem’. He interprets these as ‘guard’, ‘passing through’ and ‘vision of peace’, respectively. He offers two short passages from Job (neither of them referred to as a concordance) to illustrate how Job ‘passed through Samaria and Galilee’ by keeping watch over his life. He then offers a rather longer passage (Job 22.23-28) as a concordance to Samaria, Galilee and Jerusalem (the speech belongs to Eliphaz, rather than to Job himself):

If thou wilt return to the Almighty, thou shalt be built up, and shalt put away iniquity from thy tabernacle. He shall give for earth flint, and for flint torrents of gold. And the Almighty shall be against thy enemies: and silver shall be heaped together for thee. Then thou shalt abound in delight in the Almighty: and shalt lift up thy face to God. Thou shalt pray to him, and he will hear thee: and thou shalt pay vows. Thou shalt decree a thing, and it shall come to thee: and light shall shine in thy ways.

Antony comments on this passage more or less line by line. The sinner must return to God, if he is to be ‘rebuilt’. Several texts from Isaiah and Zechariah help to fill out the picture of the rebuilding of the temple: the body is the tabernacle of the soul, the mind is the tabernacle of thought: both mind and body need purification, which result from return to God. The words ‘earth’, ‘flint’ and ‘gold’ are then related to ‘Samaria’, ‘Galilee’ and ‘Jerusalem’. Job suggests a progression: flint replaces earth, gold replaces flint. The earth is stable, and suggests the stability that comes from keeping the commandments. But the Latin ‘terra’ has the meaning ‘land’, as well as ‘earth’, and Antony brings in a further text of Job:

The land, out of which bread grew, in its place hath been overturned with fire. The stones of it are the place of sapphires, and the clods of it are gold.

The bread of heavenly nourishment grows from the land, or earth, of keeping the commandments: but in the world as it is, this has been overturned. Antony digresses to a topic which frequently occurs in his writings, the shortcomings of the clergy and religious of his own day. These are the ‘place’ of the Lord’s commandments, where above all they should be seen to be kept; but the fire of lust and avarice, envy and pride, has overturned them. Sky-blue sapphires, reminders of heaven, are become stones; gold has become ‘clods’. (Antony seems to be reversing the obvious sense of Job, in the interest of his point: The devil has made clergy and religious from vessels
of honour to be so much rubbish! He adds (with an air of satisfaction at getting this off his chest) 'But with these dismissed to the rubbish-tip, let us return to our subject!'

'Flint', a hard stone from which sparks can be struck, stands for constancy in virtue. Antony develops this idea with the help of further texts from Ezekiel and Job, including Job 39.27-29:

Will the eagle mount up at thy command, and make her nest in high places?
She abideth among the rocks, and dwelleth among cragged flints,
and stony hills where there is no access.
From thence she looketh for the prey, and her eyes behold afar off.

This is the second 'concordance', linked to the preceding by the word 'flint', but enabling Antony, with a further 'concordance of Nature' on the habits of the eagle (which was supposed among other things to gather amethysts, which had the power of driving serpents away from its nest), to introduce the idea of the saints soaring heavenwards with eyes gazing on the sun, the brightness of the divine splendour.

In this clause, Antony is not so much commenting on the Gospel text as such, as using it as a peg on which to hang an exposition of the Christian life as progress and pilgrimage. Jesus goes via Samaria and Galilee to Jerusalem; the Christian goes by way of keeping the commandments and growing in virtue, to the beatific Vision of Peace. He begins with the solid (but dull) business of earth (the commandments), but makes his nest on the flinty crags of virtue, until soaring heavenwards like an eagle. The images of a journey, of increasingly precious minerals, and of the eagle are 'concordant' or harmonious, because together they illuminate the soul's ascent to God. The Epistle, referring to 'walking in the spirit', is a post-script to this, along with a further brief concordance from Job: The life of man upon earth is a warfare. The prayer is: 'We beg you, Lord Jesus Christ, to make us pass through Samaria by keeping your commandments, and through Galilee by being constant in virtue. So may we reach Jerusalem and be found fit to drink of its golden torrent.'
6.53  Pentecost XXIV (first clause)

In our two previous examples, the Gospel clauses were very brief, little more than introductory scene-setting for the main part of the story, the parables of the lost sheep and the lost coin in Pentecost III, the healing of the ten lepers in Pentecost XIV. In this third example, the Gospel clause consists of a longer narrative, the story of the raising of Jairus’ daughter. This story is interrupted by the story of the woman with the haemorrhage, which is treated in the second clause. Antony announces from the start that both these stories are to be taken as types of the soul’s restoration from the state of sin. We are therefore again dealing with the ‘moral sense’ of Scripture. Five ‘concordances’ are offered in the first clause, but they are secondary to the development of the Gospel interpretation itself: Jairus (meaning ‘enlightened’) represents the Christian, enlightened by God and giving light in turn to those around. A text from Zephaniah helps to develop the idea of ‘four lamps’: God’s word, good deeds, good intention, and Christ’s humanity. Like Jairus, the Christian rules the synagogue of his unruly bodily senses. His ‘daughter’ is his own soul, lying dead through consent to sin, in the house of conscience. The Christian must approach Jesus, and ask him to extend the hand of grace, whereby the soul may be contrite and so be restored to life.

In expounding the role of Jesus in the story, Antony gives his first concordance, Zechariah’s ‘man with a measuring line in his hand’. Jesus extending his hand, and the man measuring Jerusalem, both indicate God’s complete knowledge of us, and the way he makes us know ourselves.

Jesus rises and goes to Jairus’ house with his disciples, where he finds a noisy throng of mourners. This occasions a second concordance from Zechariah, regarding four ‘horns’ which scatter Juda and Israel and Jerusalem. Antony treats these not (as in the original) as horns of wild beasts, but as the musical horns of the mourners: pride and lust in the eyes, prurience in the ears, flattery and detraction in the tongue, robbery and usury in the hands. These sins blow away the laity (Juda), the clergy (Israel) and religious (Jerusalem). Again, Antony allows himself a digression on
contemporary corruption in the Church, and has to recall himself to his main subject—
'Redeamus ad materiam'.

Jairus is Everyman. He ought to rule his house, but it is full of unruly thoughts. When Jesus comes, he must first calm this noise and expel these distractions. He knows that the soul 'sleeps': while the Christian lives, the death of sin is not irreversible. When Jesus is alone with the soul he can raise her. Three concordances express the stages of Jesus' activity. First, he expels the crowd- Hosea: 'I will destroy the bow and the sword and war'. Then he takes the child's hand- Zechariah: 'The hands of Zorobabel have laid the foundations'. Finally, he raises her up- Micah: 'I shall arise when I sit in darkness.'

The concordant Epistle refers to Paul's prayer for his converts, that they may know God's will. This prayer is answered when God draws the soul into the wilderness to speak to her: a further parallel to the idea of abstinence and quiet as a prelude to illumination.

6.6 Further case studies.

The simplest sort of concordance is where one Old Testament text is compared to one Gospel text. For instance, in Pentecost XV, clause 1, Jesus says that no one can serve two masters, God and Mammon. Antony gives the example of Tobias, under kings Salmanasar and Sennacherib. The former looked kindly on him, and he prospered, whereas the latter sought to kill him. The two kings are thus 'concordant' with God and Mammon- God's favour brings happiness, whereas Mammon brings destruction. An even simpler concordance (though with an Introit rather than a Gospel) occurs in Pentecost XV, clause 2, where the whole story of the Maccabees is said to be concordant with the sentiments, 'I cried to the Lord and he heard me.'

Usually, the concordant passages are broken down into their key elements. For instance, in Pentecost I, clause 2, (analysed previously), we have Anna and Phenenna as concordant to Lazarus and Dives. Anna is barren, as Lazarus is destitute. Phenenna
is fruitful, and Dives has many ‘children’ - the works of the flesh (this is a reference to a legend that Phenenna’s children died when Anna’s were born). Phenenna treated Anna badly in four ways, and these are related to the ways in which the rich man oppressed Lazarus. While Anna wept and fasted, poor Lazarus starved because no-one would feed him. In this case, then, the parallels are drawn in some detail; and they clearly apply to the general relationship between the rich and the poor, between ‘haves’ and ‘have nots’.

Another example of one-to-one correspondence is in Pentecost II, clause 1: Anna’s sacrifice as concordant to the ‘banquet’ of penitence. While the Gospel provides no details of the great supper prepared for the guests, the book of Kings does tell us what Anna provided. These details are related to the elements of true penitence, which the Gospel banquet represents. So, while Anna suckles Samuel, until he can be removed from the milk, grace nurtures the believer, to detach him from concupiscence. Anna brings three calves, representing confession, three bushels of flour, which stand for self-examination (sifting into smallest particles), and an amphora (three measures) of wine, which indicate cheerfulness of mind. So again, a number of detailed parallels are drawn, but with the ‘moral’ meaning of the banquet rather than directly with the details of the Gospel parable.

In other cases, a number of different Old Testament passages are cited to illustrate one Gospel text, although these may have a common element, such as David’s behaviour as concordant to Christ’s teaching, in Pentecost IV, clause 1. Here, David’s kindness to Mephiboseth is related to Christ’s words, ‘Be merciful, and you will receive mercy.’ Oza’s officiousness (his ‘judgementalism’) is compared with ‘Judge not, and you will not be judged.’ David’s refusal to condemn Absalom goes with ‘Condemn not, and you will not be condemned;’ David’s forgiveness of Semei with ‘Forgive, and you will be forgiven;’ and David’s generosity to Berzillai with ‘Give, and it will be given to you.’
In Pentecost V, clauses 1-2,\textsuperscript{15} it is Solomon who is concordant to Christ: Solomon discourses on many things, while Jesus teaches; the two harlots come to Solomon, and there are two boats on the lake; Solomon’s fleet brings back treasure, and Jesus sails in the boat. Finally, the description of Solomon’s throne is related to Jesus sitting and teaching. Again, these passages are taken from different stories, but all relate to Solomon, the wise ruler.

In these cases, elements of one story are related to elements of another, or else with the ‘allegorical’ or ‘moral’ meaning of the other. Sometimes, a third story has to be brought in to clarify the elements involved. For instance, in Pentecost VII\textsuperscript{16} Antony wants to consider the siege of Samaria as concordant to the hunger of the crowd before the miraculous feeding. When Benadad besieged Samaria, there was famine, and the crowd following Jesus was hungry. But Kings provides no details, and so Antony turns to a parallel situation in Ecclesiastes, where a poor man saves his city. Many of the detailed comparisons are drawn between the second parallel passage and the Gospel, rather than directly from the ‘concordance’; however, the situations in the two Old Testament passages are very similar.

Another very simple example is from Pentecost IX,\textsuperscript{17} where a single word of the Gospel provides the foundation for a concordance which enables Antony to give several applications of the word. Jesus speaks of ‘this generation’, and the book of Proverbs speaks of four ‘generations’, which Antony gives an ecclesiological interpretation, as follows:

\begin{itemize}
\item A generation which curses its parents
\item A generation which only appears clean
\item A generation with eyes on high
\item A generation with swords for teeth
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\item ~ pervasive prelates
\item ~ hypocritical religious
\item ~ the proud
\item ~ avaricious and usurers.
\end{itemize}

This illustrates the way in which short lists, common in Proverbs (‘there are three things, and a fourth’), lend themselves to this kind of concordance. In other cases, Antony is able to connect the individual items with distinct aspects of the Gospel text, as well as with his allegorical or moral interpretation. For instance, in
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discussing the prayer of the pharisee in Pentecost XI, clause 1, Antony cites 'three hateful things' concordant with characteristics of the pharisee, and also with the permanent enemies of the soul:

A proud poor man  ~ the pharisee lacks true riches of virtue ~ the flesh
A rich liar ~ the pharisee is 'rich' in outward observance, but he lies in self-esteem ~ the world
A foolish old man ~ the pharisee was senseless in his prayer ~ the devil

In another example, Antony succeeds in giving both a moral and an ecclesiological application, as well as a concordance with the Epistle. The Gospel for Pentecost IX is that of the unjust steward, who wasted his master's goods. The Gospel is given a concrete application to contemporary abuses by means of a proverb which speaks of 'four things that shake the earth':

A slave reigning ~ the recalcitrant body ~ idolatry ~ a prelate who is slave to sin
A fool that is full ~ a mind full of folly ~ fornication ~ a gluttonous, lustful prelate
A hateful woman wed ~ an evil thought joined to action ~ tempting God ~ a simoniac prelate
A maid supplanting her mistress ~ sensualit y ousting reason ~ murmuring ~ civil law supplanting theology

In Pentecost XV, clause 3, Jesus bids his followers, 'Seek first the kingdom of heaven.' Using a passage from Tobias, Antony takes Jerusalem as concordant with the kingdom of heaven, and the jewelled gates are given first an allegorical, then a moral, and finally an anagogic interpretation- one of the rare cases where Antony gives all three. The gates of Jerusalem are

of sapphire... ~ Apostles ~ contempt for world ~ contemplation of Trinity
of emerald... ~ martyrs ~ compunction ~ vision of the Church triumphant
of precious stone... ~ confessors ~ patience ~ heavenly joy
of white, clean stone ~ virgins ~ chastity & humility ~ glory of body & soul

Short proverbs are not the only passages from the Wisdom literature that Antony can break down and relate to New Testament parallels. In Pentecost X, the Gospel is Christ's prophecy of the destruction of Jerusalem. The long and picturesque passage beginning, 'Remember thy Creator in the days of thy youth' (which Antony
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uses in several other places) is interpreted in terms of the life, aging and death of the individual man (the body being, as it were, the ‘city of the soul’). Thus, by implication, the Gospel words regarding the fate of Jerusalem are also given a moral application.

Again, in Pentecost XII, various passages are concordant with Christ’s journey from Tyre and Sidon to Galilee, in the region of Decapolis, which is taken as a moral allegory of ‘Everyman’s’ pilgrimage from the world to glory—a ‘Pilgrim’s Progress’. Two passages are taken from Ecclesiasticus. The first relates the ten likenesses of Simon the High Priest to the ‘Decapolis’, as representing ten virtues which should surround our penitential journey: the morning star, the full moon, the sun, the rainbow, spring roses, water-lilies, incense, gold, the budding olive and the lofty cypress. The second is concordant to the Epistle (‘Our sufficiency is from God’) taken as a summary of the spiritual life under the guise of five Scriptural rivers: Phison for beginners, Tigris for proficients, Euphrates for the perfect, Jordan for heavenly glory and Gehon for the vision of God. Taken together, we are presented with Christ’s journeying as representing our moral progress on earth and (anagogically) as an image of our total spiritual journey from earth to heaven.

In some cases, the process of concordance is quite complex. In Pentecost XIII, Antony wants to find concordances in Job to Christ’s summary of the Law. Jesus said, ‘Do this, and live’. The three words indicate doctrine, life and glory, and there is a passage in Job where he says:

1) ‘The lamp of God shone over my head.’ The lamp is preaching, the head is the mind: here, then, we have ‘doctrine’.

2) ‘I washed my feet with butter.’ The feet are the affections of the heart, and butter is compunction of tears, so here we have ‘life’.

3) ‘The rock poured me out rivers of oil.’ The rock is Christ, and oil is the grace of the Holy Spirit, so here we have ‘glory’.

---
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But Antony has not finished. Christ's 'this' refers to the Law: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; and thy neighbour as thyself.' This is concordant with the opening words of Job, 'There was a man in the land of Hus' (the word means 'counsel') 'and that man was simple and upright, and fearing God, and avoiding evil.' Four other passages from Job are brought in (Job 31.26-28, 8.5-7; Job 31.23; 11.14-19) to illustrate these four characteristics, and to relate them to the four phrases of the Law ('all thy heart', etc.)

A feature of Antony's method is that he is quite willing to incorporate alternatives into his general scheme, either in respect to alternative derivations for words, or alternative literal interpretations of a text under discussion. This reinforces the view that Antony does not regard his concordances as expressing 'the' meaning of a text, but only as expressing one possible interpretation, without excluding others. In Pentecost XVIII, clause 2, he considers the text, 'What think you of Christ? Whose son is he?' (Mt 22.42). 'Christ' means 'anointed', and he proposes to take as a concordance the account in 1 Maccabees of the decoration of the Temple: 'They adorned the front of the Temple with gold crowns, and dedicated an altar to the Lord.' (1Mac 4.57). He suggests two derivations of the word 'temple', one connecting it with contemplation, the other (tectum amplum) with it being a large, roofed building. He invokes Paul's words in 1 Corinthians, 'The temple of God is holy, and you are that temple', explaining that Christians are 'temple' if they are (1) contemplative, (2) 'on the roof', denying themselves like those who, on the day of judgement, should not come down to rescue their belongings (a reference to Mt 24.17), and (3) 'ample', overflowing both with contemplation of God and compassion for their neighbours. The front or 'face' of this temple is our works, by which we are recognised, and it should be adorned with the gold crowns of a pure intention. We dedicate an altar by giving our hearts, lifted high (alta) by love, and made a place of sacrifice (ara) by contrition, to God. In short, if we give our hearts to God with contrition and love, and if our works are done with pure intention, so that we overflow with compassion for
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our neighbour, with self-denial and with contemplation of God: then we are 'Christs', anointed with the balm of grace, and sons of David, strong-armed and fair of face (cf. 1Kg 16.12f)

Antony makes great use of etymology in order to fix the significance of the various elements of his parallel passages. For instance, in Pentecost XXI, clause 1, he considers the Gospel, ‘There was a certain ruler, whose son was sick at Capharnaum’. Capharnaum, according to Jerome, means ‘field of fatness’, or ‘farm of consolation’ (ager pinquedinis, or villa consolationis). The four words ‘field’, ‘fatness’, ‘farm’ and ‘consolation’ represent four states of life, or classes of people: clergy, religious, the poor, and the rich. From here, Antony moves to his concordance, the four ‘abominations’ of Ezekiel 8.5-16, which are concordant to these four states:

The idol of jealousy in the entrance of the temple: the pride of the clergy, who stand at the way in to the Church.
The paintings of creeping things on the walls, offered incense by the elders: the concern of religious for property and family.
The women mourning for Adonis: the poor who weep for the worldly wealth they lack.
The men who turn their backs on the altar to worship the sun: the rich who neglect God and seek worldly glory.

Those who commit these ‘abominations’ are ‘sick at Capharnaum’.

Sometimes, Antony seems to wander a long way from the original text. In Pentecost XXIII, clause 2, he is ostensibly discussing the coin of tribute: ‘Whose image and inscription is this? They replied, Caesar’s.’ He begins, conventionally enough, with the statement that the coin represents the soul, stamped with the image of the Trinity, and inscribed with the name of Christ. The concordance he chooses, however, is from Zechariah: ‘I looked, and, behold, a candlestick all of gold, and its lamp on the top of it: and the seven lights thereof upon it: and seven funnels for the lights that were upon the top thereof. And two olive trees over it: one upon the right side and the other upon the left side thereof.’ He says that the candlestick, like the coin, stands for the soul; while the lamp, like the image, stands for the grace of God which enlightens the soul. The seven lamps, he continues, represent the Beatitudes, while the seven funnels which feed them represent the seven words from the Cross:
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the poor in spirit pray for the forgiveness of enemies ('Father, forgive')
the meek will be with Christ in paradise ('This day...')
those who mourn will be comforted like Mary ('Behold thy son.')
those who hunger and thirst for justice (to God, neighbour and self)
cry 'My God' twice, for love of God and neighbour
and 'why have you deserted me', (because of their sins)
cry 'I thirst!'
those who are merciful minister to Christ's cry, 'I thirst!'
the clean in heart have finished their purification ('It is finished')
the peacemakers have commended their souls into God's hands.

Finally, the two olive trees are hope and fear, which keep grace alight, the hope of
cardin on right, and fear of punishment on left. So, both coin and candlestick stand
for the soul; either stamped with God's image or alight with his grace; but the latter
gives greater scope to elaborate the characteristics of the Christian life. It is the
number seven which gives a mnemonic basis for the comparison.

I will give just one more example, showing how Antony at times interweaves
a series of passages. On the last Sunday after Pentecost, in the prologue, he considers
'Jesus talking to the crowds'.28 He cites Amos: 'Israel, prepare to meet thy God. For
behold, he that formeth the mountains and createth the wind and declareth his word to
man, he that maketh the morning mist and walketh upon the high places of the earth:
the Lord, the God of hosts, is his name.' The mountains represent the angels, the wind
human souls; the 'word' is the word of creation, and the cloud is the obscurity of
faith; the 'high places' may be either virtues, or the saints. A good reminder of who
this Jesus is, who talks to the crowds. But then Antony juxtaposes a second Old
Testament text (which he specifies as a 'concordance'), from 2 Kings: 'When thou
shalt hear the sound of one going in the tops of the pear-trees, then thou shalt join
battle: for then will the Lord go out before thy face to strike the army of the
Philistines.' The context of this second passage is David seeking a sign regarding the
advisability of attacking the enemy. Antony interprets the elements of this passage
like this: pears are the same shape as flames (hence 'pyri', from the Greek 'pyr', fire),
so they stand for the saints, aflame with charity. The 'tops' of the pear trees refers to
the sublimity of their lives, while the 'sound' is the infusion of grace, and the
'Philistines' represent evil impulses, or evil spirits. The two passages reinforce one
another. There is a double concordance; first, with Amos (the current Office reading,
but not referred to as a 'concordance'); and, second, with a passage from Kings
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(which is termed a ‘concordance’). Christ speaks to the crowds, God speaks his word to man as he walks on high. Probably the words ‘annuntians eloquium gradiens’ suggest ‘audieris sonitum gradientis’: those who ‘hear the sound of one going in the tops of the pear trees’, that is, who see the effect of God’s grace in the sublime lives of the saints, are those who, like the crowds, hear Jesus speaking and by following his teaching overcome their inward and outward enemies, thus ‘curing the issue of blood’ and ‘raising the dead’.

6.7 Conclusions

It is clear that ‘concordance’ is an important part of Antony’s exposition of the Gospels. But what, exactly, are Antony’s principles and purpose in using this method? This has to be teased out of an extensive and exhaustive study of the Sermones themselves, since Antony does not offer any theoretical justification. I offer the following tentative conclusions.

1. The difference between what I have called an ‘auxiliary text’ and a ‘concordance’ is merely that the latter is taken from the Office reading; whereas the former need not be, and on the whole is not.

2. The concordance of the Epistle (and Introit) with the Gospel is usually of a general character; whereas concordances from the Old Testament are chosen on the basis of some definite correspondence between elements of the chosen passage and elements of the Gospel text. This correspondence may be founded upon some etymological resemblance (the meaning of a name, for instance: e.g. Anna = grace) or on some natural or numerical symbolism (e.g. a spear stands for power; five brothers stand for five senses).

3. Both the elements of the Gospel text and the corresponding elements of the Old Testament text stand for a further reality (‘allegorical’ if it is of a Christological or ecclesiological nature; ‘moral’ if it has to do with the life of the individual person. These may be developed in separate parts of the Sermon.)
4. The ‘reality’ is related to text in a way that differs from the way the ‘literal’ or ‘historical’ meaning is related to the text. The text illuminates the reality, in the way that something concrete and familiar (the ‘literal’ or ‘historical’ meaning) may help in the understanding of what is abstract and unfamiliar (the allegorical or moral meaning). Gospel texts and their Old Testament ‘concordances’ have similar logical structures because they both illustrate the same allegorical or moral truths, rather than because they have an intrinsic relationship to one another. Whether or not these ‘concordances’ are part of the Divine meaning of Scripture (and in so far as they exist at all, they cannot fall outside the Divine intention), they are to a great extent at the discretion of the preacher.

5. The preacher uses them both to illuminate the spiritual and moral truths he is trying to convey; and to make them memorable: he uses them to help his hearers both to understand and to retain these truths. In that sense, they have both an exegetical and a homiletic purpose: to illuminate the truth, and to enable the hearer to grasp it.

6. It seems to me that one of the main purposes of both the Scriptural concordances and the ‘concordance of Nature’ was to counter the Cathar doctrine that the material world and the Old Testament were the work of ‘Satan’, in opposition to the True God from whom Jesus came. Nature, and the Scriptures of both Testaments, are in harmony; and it is by demonstrating this that Catharism must be opposed.

7. However, the method has more than a polemic purpose. The elaborate way in which Antony constructs the *Sermones* suggests that he saw it also as a help to preachers. The work of Mary Carruthers has opened up our understanding of mnemonic techniques in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, and it is entirely probable that part of Antony’s intention was to make his points memorable to preachers, and, indirectly, to their audiences. For this reason, too, he based himself on a liturgical framework to give a commentary on the Gospels, and not simply on the Gospels as written.
8. But I think there was a further purpose. Antony’s approach provided a way of covering a whole range of Christian teachings, especially on the moral and spiritual life. It is not a speculative or theoretical work, such as those produced in Paris during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, but it is in some measure intended as a comprehensive work. The employment of ‘concordances’ enables Antony to build a fuller treatment of a topic than the often slender Gospel foundation would allow by itself.

9. How does Antony select his concordances? He was renowned for his phenomenal memory, and this must go far to explain the wide range of selection. Unlike the written ‘Concordances’ that came into being soon after his time, and which are organised on mechanical, verbal lines, Antony seems to perceive more general and abstract patterns in the texts. He identifies key elements in, say, a Gospel text; and relates them to the (often very different) key-elements in an Old Testament text. It is the pattern, the relationship between the elements in each set, which provides the ‘concordance’. More importantly, both sets are related to non-literary realities: statements about Christ, or the Church, or the individual Christian. This is where Antony develops the traditional doctrine of the ‘senses’ of Scripture. The ‘literal’ or ‘historical’ sense, which was so important to the Victorines, is for Antony the ‘seed’ from which comes ‘first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn.’ The ‘blade’ is the allegorical sense, whereby the ‘letter’ gives rise to Christological teaching in a wide sense (it includes the Church and the Sacraments); then comes the ‘ear’, which relates all this to the moral and spiritual development of the believer, the ‘person in the pew’ so to speak, who is directly addressed by the preacher; finally, the ‘full corn’ is the anagogical sense, which looks beyond this life to the world to come. Antony sometimes treats Scripture in this sense, but more often allegorically, and most of all morally. These allegorical, moral and anagogical interpretations are not original to Antony, they are part of the tradition he has received, especially through writers such as Augustine and Gregory. In an important sense, then, the choice of ‘concordances’ is controlled by the Christological, moral or other doctrine he wishes to expound. If Christ’s journeying is to be taken as a type of the Christian progress in general, then texts will be chosen (limited by the discipline of confining the choice to
the current liturgical readings) which help to express and develop that theme. In other words, the 'concordance' is related to the Gospel text, by a relationship of similarity, because both texts exemplify a pattern to be found in the 'sense' of Scripture under investigation. Antony presents a series of Scriptural images, of which the Gospel is the most important, which mediate truths about God and ourselves which should form and direct our lives. This is the preacher's task and calling: to mediate God's word to the believer, that he or she may be converted, may grow, and may finally be fulfilled.
CHAPTER SEVEN

AFTERMATH

6.1 Antony remembered: sermons on the saint.

After the death and canonization of Antony, it was natural that sermons should be preached in his honour on his Feast Day and other occasions. Over fifty such sermons have been published, drawn mainly from manuscripts in Padua and Assisi. It is highly probable that many more sermons remain to be found, and that there were many others preached which have not survived. However, the sample available is quite large enough to enable some conclusions to be drawn about the way Antony was remembered in the century following his death.

The earliest sermons available have been published twice\(^1\): they are the three Antonian sermons of Jean de la Rochelle, one of the first two Franciscan Masters at Paris, with Alexander of Hales. He died on Feb 8th, 1245, and so the three sermons must have been delivered at the latest in 1242, 1243 and 1244, and possibly earlier. He makes extensive use of the *Vita Secunda*, the revision of the *Assidua* made by Julian of Spires; and this can hardly have been available earlier than the late 1230s. However, much of this use is allusive, and he evidently assumes that his audience will be well-acquainted with the details of Antony’s life. He does not appear to make any use of Antony’s own writings. In the first sermon he starts from the text of Ecclesiasticus [50.6-7]: ‘He shone in his days as the morning star in the midst of a cloud, and as the moon at the full; and as the sun when it shineth, so did he shine in the temple of God’. He develops the ‘cloud’ as an image of Antony’s earthly life, marked by trials and temptations; the ‘moon’ as a symbol of Antony’s teaching; the ‘temple’ as the Church illuminated by his life and teaching. In the second sermon, he takes the next verse [Ecclus 50.8]: ‘As the rainbow giving light in the bright clouds, and as the flower of roses in the days of the spring, and as the lilies that are on the brink of the water’. The rainbow is interpreted as an image of Antony’s doctrine and preaching, and the symbolism is developed with reference to the physics of light as it

---

was then understood. The rose and the lily symbolise his patience and his purity. The latter half of the verse, relating to incense and fire, are promised for treatment on another occasion. However, the third sermon takes its text from Luke 6.40: 'Every one shall be perfect if he is like his master'. Antony is presented as a disciple of Christ, and also of Francis. Jean de la Rochelle may perhaps have heard Antony himself— he says in the second sermon, ‘Whence we have not heard in our days so sweet a consoler of the poor, nor so fierce a scourge of the rich.’ He makes much of Antony’s profound knowledge of the Scriptures, alluding to the Pope’s reference to him as ‘Arca Testamenti’, but commends him also for his compassion, his desire for martyrdom, and his love of poverty. He says, ‘He had extreme poverty... this is the poverty of the Friars Minor, which he had and in which he persevered.’ At one point he gives him the title ‘doctor’, indicating his importance as a teacher of the faith; but the main stress is on Antony’s holiness, on his virtues as a Christian and a Franciscan. The sermons clearly indicate the great esteem in which Antony was held soon after his death.

A little later, we have five sermons by Fra Luca Lettore², a Paduan friar who died in 1269. Three of these are for the Feast of the Saint, the other two commemorate the translation and re-burial of his remains, which took place in 1263. His first text is Is 26.9: ‘My soul hath desired thee in the night: yea, and with my spirit within me in the morning early I will watch to thee’. Antony’s desire for Christ is illustrated by his conversion, progress, perfect contemplation, bodily discipline and glorification; the fulfilment of this desire is shown in his knowledge, love, contemplation, suffering and prayer. Whether Luca had known Antony we cannot be sure, but it is interesting that his own sermons show a preference for the same authorities as Antony’s: above all Augustine, Gregory and Bernard. Luca’s second sermon-text is Ecclus 42.8: ‘Thou shalt be well instructed in all things and well approved in the sight of all men living.’ This is also related to Antony’s teaching and example, and to the honour given him by God and men. The third sermon begins from Ecclus 49.3-4: ‘He was directed by God unto the repentance of the nation: and he took away the abominations of wickedness. And he directed his heart towards the Lord’.

² V. Gamboso, OFMConv., ‘Cinque sermoni inediti di Fra Luca Lettore’ (1969, IS 9, 250-281)
This is applied to the effects of Antony’s great mission at Padua, to the general fruitfulness of his preaching, and to his own remembered characteristics of wisdom and kindness. The first sermon for the translation of Antony’s relics takes the text: ‘He pleased God and was beloved: and living among sinners he was translated’ [Wisd 4.10]; the second begins: ‘Blessed shall be thy relics’ [an adaptation of Dt 28.5]. Allusion is made to the reasons for giving greater honour to the Saint’s earthly remains, based on the example of his life. Luca too quotes Gregory IX’s evocation of Antony as ‘Ark of the Testament’.

Another preacher on St Antony was Conrad of Saxony. Born at Brunswick around 1210, he became a friar, a Master of Theology, and Minister Provincial of Saxony for several years. He died at Bologna on May 30th, 1279, on the way to the General Chapter at Assisi. His three sermons on St Antony centre on the holiness of Antony rather than on particular biographical details, to the extent that he speaks occasionally of ‘Antony, or any holy Doctor’, and in other sermons for the commons of saints he can say, simply, ‘See the sermon on St Antony’. He makes use of the Vita Secunda and the Rhyming Office, in order to present Antony's whole life as a model. In his first sermon, he presents Antony as a ‘wise man’, in his affections, speech, actions and contemplation. In the second, he presents him as a perfect imitator of Francis, having the varying perfections of the soldier, in the battle against temptation; the craftsman, in shaping his own actions; the traveller on life’s pilgrimage; the friend who loves truly; and the spouse whose modesty and beauty is shown in conversation. Each of these qualities is illustrated from Antony’s own life, and with quotations from the saints. The third sermon, on the text ‘No one lights a lamp and puts it under a bushel’, points out that Antony did ‘hide his light’ to begin with, being content to wash the dishes; he left it to God’s providence to manifest his abilities. By his humility, his light confounded demons, enlightened men, gave joy to the angels and glorified God. These points, too, are illustrated with examples drawn from the Vita Secunda. It is clear that by now Antony was generally regarded in the Order as the greatest of Francis’s followers, and that his life and teaching were held up as those of the ideal friar.
At the end of the century, two other friars, Servasanto of Faenza and his
disciple Albertino of Verona, left sermons in honour of Antony. Those of Servasanto are highly polished, and aim to show Antony as an ideal friar, in contrast to Servasanto's own contemporaries. Beginning with Joseph's words to his brothers: 'Is this your little brother, of whom you told me?' [Gen 43.29], he expounds Antony's perfection in terms of his ardent love, his humility and his lasting fame. He explains 'littleness' in terms of readiness to learn, to obey, to love, to forgive and to receive. After treating each of these child-like qualities in an illuminating way, he then presents Antony as an example of it (using the *Vita Secunda*), and laments the lack of this quality in his contemporaries: 'Sed hodie, nulla est caritas... Sed in mundo quis Hodie parvulus?' He recounts one story, not hitherto recorded, but which afterwards was current, of Antony predicting that the heart of a dead miser would be found, not in his body, but in his purse. In his second sermon, Servasanto presents Antony as possessing the wisdom of angels, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs, confessors and virgins; once again expanding each, illustrating it from Antony's life, and lamenting its absence nowadays: 'Sed quis hodie Sanctum hunc sequitur?... Sed non sunt hodie tales nostri... Quis hodie hanc sapientiam quaerit? Quis hodie est patiens? etc.' He follows Antony at one point in using the story of Dina to illustrate the dangers of gadding about.

The two sermons of Albertino are rougher and more like notes- for instance, he writes several times, 'Narra hic quomodo... ', with only a general reference, or, 'Narra hic de miraculis eius, sicut tibi videtur'. He uses not only the *Vita Secunda* and the Rhyming Office to make his points, but seems to draw from other collections of stories about Antony, including possibly that of Rigauld. He presents Antony as a 'just man', loving justice in his heart (as to God), observing it in his actions (as to himself) and preaching it with his mouth (to his neighbour). He is 'beatissimi

---

3 V. Gamboso, OFMConv, 'I tre panegirici Antoniani do Corrado di Sassonia e altri sette di autori sconosciuti (sec XIV)' (1974, IS 14, 63-119)
4 V. Gamboso, OFMConv, 'I due sermoni santantoniani di Servasanto' (1978, IS 18, 270-288)
5 Antony, too, had lamented the decline of good example among preachers: *ubi tam fidelis dispensator potest hodie inventiri*? [Advent IV, 8, SDF II, 515]
6 V. Gamboso, OFMConv, 'I due sermoni in lode di S. Antonio di Albertino di Verona o.min. (sec XIII/2)' (1987, IS 27, 77-111)
Francisci filius. He also compares Francis and Antony to David and Solomon, Antony being 'beati patris Francisci filius sapientissimus'. He emphasises Antony’s scriptural learning, again quoting Pope Gregory’s words about 'Arca Testamenti'. Thus at the end of the century Antony is still seen very much as a living example to later friars, close to the Founder’s ideal and unsullied by the later controversies that had arisen in the Order.

Most of the surviving sermons on St Antony are anonymous, and I shall survey them briefly. They are to be found in the libraries of Padua, and of Assisi and Rome. Fr Gamboso has written something about the dating and origin of the various manuscripts, and I refer the reader to his introductions to them. Those referred to appear all to be of the XIIIth and early XIVth centuries, thus falling roughly within the hundred years following Antony’s death.

In style, these sermons are very diverse. Some are very brief indeed; others, though longer, are still little more than outlines. Others, however, are highly polished works. Some are literary, others much more colloquial in their style. For example: ‘Ask a man, “what would you rather be, strong and stupid, or weak and wise?” He’ll say, “Weak and wise, of course.”’ (sermon 17). Or: ‘If I were to go on, I’m afraid I’d bore you’ (sermon 39). Most exhibit a reasonably good knowledge of Antony’s life, usually dependent upon the Vita Prima ('Assidua') or the Vita Secunda. The Rhyming Office of Julian of Spires is also quoted frequently: it seems to have been almost irresistible as a source of pithy summaries of aspects of Antony’s life and character. There are, however, few clear signs of acquaintance with Antony’s written works. I have found no direct quotation from the Sermones (as there is in the Vita of Jean Rigauld), although in some authors there are strong echoes of Antony’s written style—Luca Lettore, already mentioned, is one such.

7 For numbering and titles, see Appendix, Table V.
This poses a problem: how familiar were these preachers with the actual writings of Antony? Does the absence of explicit quotation indicate that they were not, in fact, known; or that convention forbade their use as auctoritates on a par with Augustine, Gregory and Bernard? Or is it merely that Antony’s writings do not lend themselves to that kind of quotation? Antony’s specific genius lay not in the field of speculative theology, so that his opinion might be cited on particular questions. His gift was an encyclopaedic knowledge of Scripture and certain Fathers (together with Natural History), from which he could select and organise examples so that they illuminated one another. By juxtaposing texts, he enabled them to speak for themselves. He rarely notices controverted points, and if he does so (as in the case of whether sins forgiven in confession ‘revive’ if the sinner relapses), he is content to state the alternatives, and leave it at that. Although there is much in Antony that is very quotable, it is not the kind of thing medieval preachers reckoned to quote. Antony was concerned to motivate his hearers to action, to evoke contrition and repentance; he was happy to base himself on Scripture and Tradition, and avoid theological speculation. It is, nevertheless, disappointing to find no explicit use of his Sermones by preachers who followed him. We are, of course, only looking at their sermons on St Antony (a topic on which Antony never preached!), and we might find quotations from him in their ordinary Sunday sermons (as, later, in Bernardine of Siena). Further research may produce examples.

Allowing for this, there still seem to be in the available material many indications, in the way Antony is presented by these preachers, that his work was known and appreciated. The impression he made upon them seems too deep to be the result only of reading the ‘Vitae’. For instance, in several cases Antony is presented as a familiar figure of recent memory. We have already seen Jean de la Rochelle’s reference to him. Another writer (sermon 44) refers to the time ‘when blessed Antony lived with us in the world’; another again (sermon 46) says that ‘among all the preachers of modern times’ Antony was more effective and more fervent. The translation of his remains in 1263 (when his tongue was found to be incorrupt) created a stir, and this event was ‘recent’ to several preachers (sermons 45,50), who comment on the number of friars and city dignitaries who witnessed it. This is in
contrast to other sermons (e.g. sermon 30) which refer to Antony 'in his time', suggesting a certain remoteness from that of the preacher.

Regardless of his proximity or otherwise in time, Antony was seen as enormously important and influential in the development of the Franciscan Order. This may seem surprising today, because while St Francis was 'rediscovered' in non-Catholic circles in the nineteenth century, and has since become a fashionable patron for, say, animal welfare and ecology, Antony has remained a relatively obscure figure. When Sabatier likened him to Francis's St Paul, he did not mean it as a compliment. However, in the century following his death, Antony was widely regarded in the Franciscan movement as second only to Francis, a 'second foundation stone'.

Albertino of Verona was not the only preacher who made him Solomon to Francis's David. He was (like the young Tobias) the 'blessed son of a good and virtuous man' (sermon 31). He was the 'second angel, blowing the trumpet,' after the first angel, Francis (sermon 48, cf. Apoc 8.8). He followed Francis in way of life, in gospel preaching, and in glory. He is Aaron to Francis's Moses (sermon 46). One preacher begins, 'The holy and immaculate religion of the Friars minor' (‘religion’ here meaning, of course, ‘religious order’) ‘after the fashion of a good mother, rejoices over her children if they are apt for learned study, humble in the radiance of Scripture, and watchful for the good of souls. Seeing blessed Antony abundantly endowed with these qualities, and indeed feeling his absence with sorrow, desiring his presence with a cry, and bearing the influence of his grace in honour, says: Where is the learned? Where is he that pondereth the words of the Law? Where is the teacher of little ones? [Is 33.18]’ (sermon 36).

Antony is regularly presented as an example of the 'wise man' of Scripture, and as filled with Divine Wisdom. ‘Optavi, et datus est mihi sensus; et invocavi, et venit in me spiritus sapientiae’ [Wisd 7.7] is applied to him more than once. Antony’s study and learning is acknowledged, but his wisdom is far more than the product of

---

9 There is a verse, attributed variously to John Pecham (d. 1292) and Guido da Marchia (d. 1315), and quoted by St Bernardine of Siena (Op. Omn. I, 196): Lapis secundarius huius fundamenti/ exstitit Antonius, vir tallt/ momenti/ quod Papa Gregorius, loco cognomenti/ vocavit hunc saeptius Arcam Testamenti.
the library: it is a gift of God. Sermon 29 contrasts the wisdom of the world, the flesh and the devil with that of God, which was sought by Antony. Sermon 39, beginning from the Introit for Doctors, ‘In medio Ecclesiae’, develops the ideas of Antony’s learning, wisdom and glory in relation to the irascible, rational and concupiscible appetites of medieval psychology, and gives them a Trinitarian application. Like Servasanto, the author distinguishes the wisdom of angels, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs and confessors (but not virgins), as exemplified in ministers, travellers, watchmen, merchants, warriors and advocates, and applies them in various ways to Antony and the circumstances of his life. Sermon 42, on ‘Tu vero vigila’, says that ‘Blessed Antony was a member of the Church called to the office of teacher and evangelist’, and those who ‘watch’ include ‘students, that they may find’.

For I say that students have been accustomed to keep watch, that they may find what is true in the sciences. And so it is with the divine study and science, that we may find Christ hidden in the Scriptures, whence he is revealed to anyone studying and keeping watch in them, as the uncreated Wisdom... Why should the deeds of Christ be studied? The answer is, for the sake of beatitude. Some study so as to build up and be built, like Gospel men, and these pursue beatitude. Of their number was the blessed man Antony...
The entrance and door of knowledge is prayer. Blessed Antony found this door... or rather, and chiefly, the door of the Scriptures is Christ.

Whereas logicians, lawyers, scientists etc. study to find their own proper matter, Gospel men study to find Christ. The writer laments that, though many study, few are truly religious. He bids those who enter the schools to learn what instructs morals, rather than what sharpens the intellect in the way of sin. Antony studied with love, so as to retain what he sought. He laboured for the edification of his neighbour, not just by contemplation but by practical action.

Antony is presented as an evangelist- indeed, even as an apostle: the ‘Apostolus Paduanorum’ (sermon 21). His missionary work in Padua is well remembered. ‘Antony was given to the nations by the Lord. He was a word given to teach the ignorant, to lead back the strays, to comfort labourers and to help those who ask’ (sermon 37). He was the bringer of good news upon the mountains (sermon 22), whose ways were beautiful and peaceful (sermon 23). He is remembered as a reconciler, who brought many to repentance (sermon 49), so that there were not enough priests available to hear their confessions (sermon 49).
But above all, Antony is remembered as a master of the Scriptures. ‘He had a knowledge of the Scriptures which he sought ardently and with all desire’ (sermon 29). Time and again preachers refer to Gregory IX’s phrase, ‘Ark of the Testament’, seen as particularly significant not only ‘propter dignitatem imponentis’ but in its own right. The passage quoted above, from sermon 42, is typical. The theme of the ark is explored, and its contents (the tables of the Law, Aaron’s rod and the jar of manna) are applied to Antony’s knowledge of the two Testaments, his rebuking of sin, and his charity (cf sermons 16, 34, 52). Occasionally the ark of the covenant is linked with Noah’s ark, and with the chariot throne of Ezekiel, as Antony himself had linked them. The point is made that Antony’s knowledge was not only the result of his personal study, but of divine illumination.

Although, as I have said, there are no direct quotations from Antony’s writings to be found, there are strong Antonian ‘echoes’ in several sermons, especially those of Fra Luca Lettore and the anonymous sermons 16, 25, 38, 39 and 63. There are a number of places where themes treated by Antony occur—the cedar, thorn, myrtle and olive trees; the lily, the rose and the vine; the pearl; Elisha’s little room, Solomon’s throne, the preacher’s (Antony’s) heart as a mortar in which the Holy Spirit blends spices, and so on. Antony’s ‘Quadriga’ is once turned around, so that sin is represented as a cart pulled by four beasts representing pride, avarice, lust and wrath. Occasionally, an Antonian trick of style surfaces: the phrase, ‘Dicamus ergo’, for instance (sermons 28, 38). Terms based on *concordare* are almost non-existent, and when they do occur are not in relation to Scripture: one writer uses *concordia* in reference to Antony’s work as a peacemaker (sermon 55), another says, ‘He spoke of Holy Scripture, and his life was concordant (*concordabat*) to his teaching’ (sermon 25). If anything, this absence (in any context) points up the distinctiveness of the term in Antony. However, one writer seems to make a tantalisingly elusive reference to the notion (sermon 43). He refers to Antony’s spiritual senses (sight, hearing etc), which enabled him to see and understand the prophets, to hear and perceive ‘harmonies’. ‘He revealed hidden things, and dissolved the mysteries of the Scriptures’. ‘There was given, moreover, to the beloved confessor the most attentive sense of hearing, to the perception of intellectual harmonies (*armonicarum intellectionum*)’. At the least, this
suggests that the writer was acquainted with the character of Antony's approach to Scripture. He is also the only writer I have found who seems to quote Antony directly (unfortunately, I have been unable to find the source):

>This is truly to love God, says the saint, to bear him always in one's heart, to desire him with all one's affections, to delight in him, and to contemplate him with the true gaze of the mind. Truly, beloved confessor, many things beyond the senses have been shown to you.

This note of personal affection ('almus confessor') is found in more than one writer.

Two other sermons have been edited by Fr Gamboso, from about a century after Antony's death. Neither adds any new features to those we have already seen. One is by the Franciscan cardinal, Bertrand de Turre, who died in 1332; the other is by Pope Benedict XII (Jacques Fournier) who was a Cistercian, and had been bishop of two dioceses south of Toulouse, before becoming Pope at Avignon (1342). He had therefore lived in areas influenced by Antony's preaching ministry. His sermon is long and learned (fourteen chapters), with a few references to Antony's life, but mainly dealing with the theme of wisdom. These sermons at least bear witness to the veneration and esteem in which Antony was held, not only among ordinary people, but in the highest levels of the Church.

The only other sermon known to me from this period is that ascribed to St Bonaventure. This is found in at least three mss., two from the thirteenth century, and the Quaracchi editors claim that it agrees with other genuine works of the saint. It is on the text, 'Iste pauper clamavit, et Dominus exaudivit eum' (Ps 33.7), and its main emphasis is on the poverty of Antony. He 'cried out' in his preaching, his confession, his prayer and his exultation. The sermon, whether or not by Bonaventure, is in fact a fairly typical example of a sermon on Antony from this time.

---

10 V. Gamboso, OFMConv, 'Il sermone encomiastico `Spiritu intelligentiae' di Bertrandus de Turre o min. (d ~1332) e altri cinque discorsi per la festa di S. Antonio' (1975, IS 15309-337); 'Il panegirico `Invocavi' di Benedetto XII (†1342) e altre sei sermoni anonimi in onore di S. Antonio' (1971, IS 11, 71-117)

11 S. Bonaventurae Opera Omnia, vol IX, 535-8
6.2 Antony forgotten: the intellectual legacy

Almost as Antony died, Alexander of Hales and Jean de la Rochelle joined the Franciscan Order, giving it its first Masters of Theology at Paris. In a sense, this marks a turning-point in the development of the Order, whose intellectual tradition for the rest of the century and beyond was to be dominated by Paris and Oxford. This was perceived by many in the Order (especially by those who still cherished the primitive simplicity of Francis’s original vision) as a betrayal. It is said that Francis’s companion, brother Leo, lamented, ‘Ah, Paris! You are destroying the Order of St Francis!’ It was from this circle that the ‘Fioretti’, the ‘Little Flowers of St Francis’, emerged, and it may be significant that in a work dedicated to perpetuating what was believed by the ‘Spirituals’ to be the true Franciscanism, there are two stories celebrating the ministry of St Antony. Antony (as we saw in the previous section) was widely seen as Francis’s ‘eldest son’, a man who married true learning with gospel poverty, unlike some others who had come afterwards. Antony was regarded as singularly free of the ‘contamination’ of Paris; and it may be that in return the Parisian and Oxonian friars tended to underestimate what Antony had in fact achieved. When we look at the theological and biblical works of the great Franciscan masters (as opposed to some of their devotional preaching– cf. Jean de la Rochelle, above) it is difficult to detect any Antonian influence, or any acknowledgement of him as a predecessor.

It is more than likely that Alexander of Hales had no acquaintance with Antony’s writings. By the time he entered the Order, he had already achieved his position as a theologian. He gives a clear statement of his understanding of the ‘four senses’, distancing himself somewhat from the Victorine position; his teaching is very like Antony’s, but there is little likelihood that either knew the other’s work. The same goes for Jean de la Rochelle, even though we know he had a great regard for Antony as a friar and as a preacher. It is not until the next generation of friars that there is anything (as far as I have found) that might show a continuing Antonian influence.
A work formerly attributed to Antony himself, but now thought to be by an unknown friar of the mid thirteenth century, is the so-called *Concordantiae morales sacrorum bibliorum*. It is in five books and 567 sections, and gives appropriate texts for preaching on various moral topics. It was translated into English by J.M. Neale in 1856.\(^{12}\) The author may well have drawn on Antony’s *Sermones* in his selection of texts; but at any rate the work provides evidence of the continuing association of Antony’s name with the idea of ‘*concordantiae*’ in the sense of particular texts. Whether we should see any Antonian influence in the choice of the term ‘*concordantiae*’ for the Biblical indexes produced in Paris by the Dominicans must remain highly doubtful.

Among the works attributed to St. Bonaventure, in the Quarracchi edition of his works, is one called *Ars Concionandi* \(^{13}\). Although there is doubt about its authenticity, it has been argued strongly by Harry Hazel\(^{14}\) that it is closely linked in thought with the *Reductio Artium ad Theologiam*. The term *concionare* seems to have been favoured by Franciscans in reference to popular preaching, and the author, speaking of various ways of ‘expanding’ Scripture (*dilatatia*), follows Augustine (and Cicero) in making the aim *utilitas*. Among the ways of expanding Scripture in a useful way, he includes:

The fourth method of expansion is by concordant texts. This method has three variations:

One way is when texts having various meanings agree in common term, though they are not altogether defined by it. Thus the Psalm: *Blessed is the man that goeth not in the way of the wicked* [Ps 1.1]; regarding this man, we have in Job: *Gird your loins like a man* [Job 38.3], and elsewhere: *Blessed is the man that feareth the Lord* [Ps 111.1].

Another way is when texts agree in their meaning, although they do not agree in any term. For instance: *Faith without works is dead* [Jas 2.2]; and in Genesis: *Rachel said to Jacob: Give me children, or else I shall die*. By ‘Rachel’ (meaning ‘seeing the beginning’) faith is meant, by which we see God; by ‘children’ we understand good works done in charity. It is clear how these texts are concordant; but what one says openly, the other says in a hidden way.

The third way is when one text says something less fully which another says more perfectly. For instance: *So run that you may obtain* [1Cor 9.24]; how one should run is determined in the Psalm which says: *I ran in thirst* [Ps 61.5], and elsewhere: *I have run in the way of thy*  

---


\(^{13}\) Bonaventure, *Opera Omnia* IX, 8-21

commandments [Ps 118.32]. Again: Ask and you will receive [Jn 16.24], how the asking should be done is noted in the Apocalypse, where it says that the twenty-four elders fell on their faces, etc. [Apoc 5.14] 

Although this is only one of many methods of dilatatio, and although there is no mention of any earlier authority for this method, it does seem quite close to Antony's method of concordantia. In view of the rarity of the term, I am inclined to think that we do have here an Antonian legacy. A 'concordance' in the contemporary sense of a Biblical index is only concerned with verbal agreement; while for Antony and the author of the Ars concionandi this is only one basis for 'concordance'.

Whether or not the Ars concionandi is by Bonaventure himself, can we detect any Antonian influence in the certainly Bonaventuran works? It must be admitted straight away that Bonaventure does not cite Antony's writings, or utilise the term concordantia. His only explicit references to Antony are in the two Legendae on St Francis, and in the sermon referred to in the previous section. However, we may approach the question less directly. Etienne Gilson and, more recently, Professor Cousins have noted the extensive use made by Bonaventure of symbolism and imagery. In reference to Bonaventure's 'logic', Gilson says:

Where the reader expects syllogisms and formal demonstrations, St Bonaventure usually offers him only correspondences, analogies and conformities, which seem to us hardly satisfactory but which seem to satisfy him entirely.

---

15 Bonaventure, Opera Omnia IX: Quartus modus dilatandis est per auctoritates concordantes. Variatur autem iste modus tripliciter: unus modus est, quando auctoritates varias sententias habentes in aliquo termino conveniunt, per quem omnino definitae non sunt; unde Psalmus: Beatus vir, qui non abiti in consilio impiorum, etc. [Ps 1.1]. De hoc vino habet in lob: Accinge sicut vir lumbos tuos [lob 38.3; 40.2]; et alibi: Beatus vir, qui timet Dominum [Ps 111.1]. Alius modus est, quando auctoritates concordant in sententia, quamvis non conveniant in aliquo termino; verbi gratia: Fides sine operibus mortua est [Jas 2.20], et in Genesi: Dixit Rachel ad Iacob: Da mihi liberos, ahaquin moriar. Per Rachel, quae interpretatur videns principium, significatur fides, qua vidimus Deum; per liberos intelligimus bona opera in cærtate faciæ; palet igitur, quæter concordant istae auctoritates; sed quod una dicit aperte reliqua dicit occulte- Tertius modus est, quando una auctoritas dicit minus plene, alia dicit magis perfecte; verbi gratia: Sic currite, ut comprehendatis [1Cor 9.24]: quomodo autem sit currendum, determinatur in Psalmo, cum dicitur: Cucurri in siti [Ps 61.5], et alibi: Sine iniquitate cucurri et dixi [Ps 58.5]; et alibi: Vitam mandatorem tuorum cucurri [Ps 118.32]. Item: Petite et accipietis [Jo 16.24]; quis autem debet esse petitio, notatur in Apocalypse, ubi dicitur, quod viginti quattuor seniores acciderunt in facies suas, etc [Apoc 5.14].

16 E. Gilson, The Philosophy of St Bonaventure (trans. I.Trethowan and F.J.Sheed, St Anthony's Guild Press, Patterson, N.J., 1965)
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Elsewhere, he remarks that Bonaventure has no rival in the art of inventing proportions and analogies, until his later treatises practically consist of them. In relation to Scripture in particular, he goes on, ‘the sowing of the Scriptures can produce an infinite harvest of theories,’ as seeds can be multiplied to infinity.

Thus the mind passes from correspondence to correspondence without encountering any obstacle; one passage of Scripture, declares the Seraphic Doctor, summons a thousand others; the imagination has therefore no obstacle to fear. And it could not find more in that other book which is nature.19

The similarities to Antony’s treatment of Scripture are obvious. Professor Cousins has discussed the way in which Bonaventure developed the Augustinian tradition, and to some extent distanced himself from the growing Aristotelianism which was coming to dominate the Parisian schools. He says,

This exemplaristic tradition, which reaches a certain climax in the early Franciscan school, is of paramount importance for understanding symbolism in medieval culture. Unfortunately, the predominance of Aristotelian logic throughout the Middle Ages and of Aristotelian metaphysics in the late thirteenth century... has tended to obscure the strong current of exemplarism that permeated the earlier Middle Ages and provided a philosophical and theological basis for the rich symbolic life of the period.20

It is fundamental to Bonaventure’s theological approach, he says, that the truths of faith are not so much deduced by logical argument (not even from Scripture), but somehow ‘perceived’ in both the Book of Scripture and the Book of Creation. This is not the place to embark on a detailed discussion of Bonaventure; however, I would suggest that if writers such as Gilson and Cousins are correct in identifying such a feature in his theological method, then it is legitimate to ask whether, or to what extent, it owes anything to Antony. Neither Gilson nor Cousins show any awareness of Antony’s Sermones, but what they say of Bonaventure must surely remind us of the method that is so marked in them. We must be very cautious; although Bonaventure clearly revered Antony, and although (as Minister General) he might be expected to have some acquaintance with Antony’s writings, this hardly establishes any certain dependence. Bonaventure, especially in his later writings, was concerned to integrate the insights of Francis himself with the theological tradition he had inherited. Antony (in Francis’s own lifetime and immediately after his death) was attempting to do the same. This may be a sufficient reason for the similarities of approach. In his Reductio
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19 The Philosophy..., 211f
20 Bonaventure..., 164
Bonaventure distinguishes faith, morals and the end of both. Augustine, followed by Anselm, is the master of the first; Gregory, followed by Bernard, of the second. We have noted Antony's heavy dependence on three of these four. However, the master of the third way is Dionysius, followed by Richard; and Dionysius was transmitted to Bonaventure notably by the work of Thomas Gallus. But though Thomas was Antony's friend in his latter years, we have already suggested that the Dionysian (and even Ricardian) influence on Antony was marginal. Thus there is an important difference between Antony and Bonaventure in this regard. However, if we admit that Antony was already attempting to develop a specifically 'Franciscan' method, then it may not be illegitimate to read him at least to some extent in the light of later, Bonaventurian, developments. If so, then the Antonian concordantia will be far more than a mnemonic device to help preachers organise their material, but will be intended as an expression of a real feature of the Scriptures themselves, and of the created world. Further discussion of this subject, though tempting, would take us much too far from our present concern. As Antony would say, redeamus ad materiam.

In searching for instances of the word 'concordantia', I found little either before or after Antony, with one massive exception. Under Ramon Llull, there are over two thousand references to concordantia. Llull was a Majorcan, born in 1232, and eventually a Franciscan tertiary, who spent some time studying at Montpelier, where Antony is said to have been the first lector in theology. He was mightily concerned with the means of bringing the Gospel to the Muslim world, and founded a missionary college to further this work. Among his enormous output of works there is one, the Liber de praedicatione, to which is annexed a series of specimen sermons. It is a difficult work to follow, since it seems to have been Llull's aim to reduce the construction of sermons almost to a mechanical process. Overall, it is extremely un-Antonian. But the use of the unusual term (in this context), in the form Antony uses it, does suggest some possible connection. Speaking of various 'principles' of his system (which include bonitas, magnitudo, aeternitas, potestas, sapientia, voluntas, virtus,
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veritas, gloria, differentia, concordantia, contrarietas, principium, medium, finis, maioritas, aequalitas and minoritas), he defines concordantia like this:

Concordance is an entity by reason of which goodness, magnitude etc. agree (concordant) in one and many things. Concordance itself has three species or modes. One is when sensual things agree, as a stone and a rose in a body. Another is when sensual and intellectual things agree, as soul and body which agree in constituting a single being (namely, man). Another is when something intellectual agrees with something intellectual, as the intellect and will which agree in an object. And it is said that they agree 'in one and many things', since being is one and many. In 'one', because many things constitute one thing, as 'many', because one thing has many constituents. By these three modes a preacher can discuss concordances as he pleases, because all concordances are implied in these three ways.22

Llull goes on to explain how each of his ‘principles’ combines with each of the others. For instance,

Goodness is ‘concordable’ in virtue of concordance; the reason is so well and concordantly (directed) to the good, that it performs the concordant good concordantly.23

It would be tedious to pursue this at any length. In the actual sermons, he occasionally uses concordare, but never concordantia, and in any case this is not in reference to scriptural agreement. Sin, for instance, is ‘concordant’ with darkness, and virtue with light.24 Again, ‘when the memory is consentient to and concordant with the understanding, and remembers God, paradise, and the transitory and fallen life of this world, then the will is wonderfully afflicted, and consents with the understanding and memory, and is concordant.25 If Llull is evidence of any Antonian legacy in Montpelier, it is only in respect of terminology. There is no real ‘concordance’ of approach!

The Editors of the Critical Edition note that around 1282/4, Roger Marston briefly quotes twice from Antony’s Sermones in his Quodlibeta.26 Here is evidence of

---


23 Ibid.: Bonitas per concordantiam est concordabilis. Et sic bene et concordanter est ratio bono, quod agat concordanter bonum concordatum.

24 Ibid. Sermon for SS. Philip and James, Serm lxiv, de sanctis vi

25 Ibid. Sermon for S. Benedict, serm lxxvii, de sanctis xix

26 Cf. SDF I, xxvii
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some continuing use of Antony by theologians, but it is rather meagre. More promising in this regard is Jean Rigauld (bishop of Trégnier 1317, d. 1323), whom we have already met as the author of a ‘Vita’ of Antony. Rigauld was a prolific preacher, and J.B. Schneyer lists 280 sermons by him. These are all based on either the Epistles or the Gospels for the Sundays of the year (sometimes with more than one sermon on a particular reading). Although the Repertorium gives only the incipits for these sermons, even so a few interesting points are noticeable.

1) Rigauld frequently begins with an instruction to the preacher, or a reflection on the purpose of preaching.

2) Rigauld appears to divide the Gospels into clausulae (eg: ultima clausula verbi propositi serviet nobis pro sermonis ingressu [112. T21]; Pro ingressu ad sermonem accipiemus primam verbi clausulam [122. T21/6].

3) Rigauld uses the term concordat with respect to agreement between Gospel and Epistle or Old Testament reading (eg: concordat lectio cum epistola [89. T19/4]; Evangelium cum epistola concordat [115. T21/2]; Evangelium hodiernum cum epistola quantum ad praeceptum de honore parentum plene concordat [119. T21/4] Evangelium hodiernum cum epistola concordat [123. T21/6]; Epistola et evangeliurn hodiernum conveniunt et concordant [125. T21/sab]; Evangelium hodiernum concordat cum epistola [139. T22/sab]; Evangelium hodiernum concordat cum epistola hodierna [198. T36]; and, very similar: Epistola et evangeliurn conveniunt sicut duae consonae tubae [184. T30])

The sermons of Rigauld are to be found in ms. Vat.lat.957; I do not know whether they have been edited and published. It would be very interesting to discover whether or not in the body of his sermons Rigauld displays further Antonian characteristics, and further research in this area would be very welcome.

At the end of the century, John Duns Scotus discussed the sufficiency of sacred Scripture for the knowledge necessary for man in this life. He noted that among heretics who reject Scripture in whole or in part there are the Manichees, who
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27 J.B. Schneyer, Repertorium der Lateinischen Sermonses des Mittelalters für die zeit 1150-1350 (Autoren I-J) (Münster Westfalen, 1950) 676-703
28 J. Duns Scotus, Opera Omnia (Vatican City, 1950) I, 62-5. Prologue. Pars 2, q. unica
say that the Old Testament derives from the evil principle. He specifically cites Augustine, *De haeresibus* 46, 29 for this. Among a number of ways of countering these various heretical views he includes *scripturarum concordia*. He argues that people do not agree about matters which are not self-evident or derivable from self-evident principles, unless they are influenced by a cause superior to the intellect itself: *non consonant multi... nisi a causa superiori ipso intellectu inclinentur ad assensum*. Yet the writers of the sacred Canon, coming from various backgrounds and at various times, entirely agree about matters not evident in themselves: *in talibus inevidentibus consonabant omnino*. He cites Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, XVIII c41: 'Our authors had to be few in number, to prevent cheapening by over-production... and yet not so few that there should be nothing remarkable in their agreement. For among the multitude of the philosophers... one would have difficulty in finding any group whose opinions agreed in every particular.' 30 Since theology deals with matters on which natural reason can give no certainty, the agreement of so many must arise from Divine revelation. In the Scriptures, it is not just a case of later writers following earlier, but of independent authors displaying a wonderful harmony.

Scotus does not refer explicitly or implicitly to Antony, and there is no evidence that he knew his work. Later, Bernardine of Siena refers to this passage of Scotus in one of his sermons 31 and to the same passage from Augustine. He adds that Augustine likens 'concordance' to the light of the same sun shining through different windows, although this does not seem to be in the passage adduced, and I cannot find where Bernardine gets it from, though it is a vivid and helpful image. Bernardine does occasionally quote Antony, though unfortunately from works no longer regarded as authentic. The most one can say, then, is that Bernardine was prepared to use Antony as an 'authority' at times. It may well be that there are references to Antony still to be discovered in the writings of preachers and theologians of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. 32 At the moment, it appears that though his popularity as a heavenly patron and wonder-worker grew and grew, the memory of his work as a biblical scholar and preacher was almost entirely eclipsed.
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29 PL42.38
30 Penguin edn. p 816.
31 Bernardine, *Opera Omnia* : (vol I, pp 6-8) *Dominica in Quadragesima, in mane*. Cap II
32 A very few are noted by the Editors in the preface to SDF I.
6.3 Antony recovered? Some modern approaches to theology.

What was the reason for the neglect of Antony as a Biblical theologian and guide to the art of preaching, in the centuries following his death, even as his popularity as a 'wonder worker' and heavenly patron increased? We have already noticed that, in his own day, some of the Paris-trained higher clergy found it difficult to categorize him. Although they recognised the fact of his achievement, they could not altogether understand it. He was, to an extent, an 'outsider' to the Establishment that took the modern advances in biblical studies and in techniques of preaching for granted. So we find that sermons preached in his honour tend to emphasise the heavenly wisdom and inspiration that he had received, rather than the book-learning that he undoubtedly possessed. His holiness was celebrated, while his actual writings were rarely referred to.

The twelfth, and even more the thirteenth, century saw a theological renaissance occasioned at least in part by the rediscovery of Aristotle. First the logic and then the metaphysics of the 'maestro di color che sanno' informed the method and the content of scholastic theology. Alexander of Hales, Albert the Great, Bonaventure, Thomas Aquinas and John Duns Scotus are only the greatest names (all associated with the University of Paris), whose Commentaries and Summas marked the high-water mark of medieval theology, and which to a greater or lesser extent depended directly or through the Arabs on Aristotle's philosophy. Aristotle laid the foundations both of modern logic, and of modern empirical science; and the scholastics brought much of this approach to the study of theology. Revelation (expressed in Scripture, taken according to its literal sense as discovered by scholarship) provided the data, and the methods of syllogistic logic enabled theological conclusions to be drawn from it. Theology was truly 'the Queen of the sciences', divinely revealed truth expounded by human reason.

As science and logic have advanced, however, we have seen Theology dethroned, and both the methods and the conclusions of medieval scholasticism called into question. The enterprise that began with such hope in the twelfth and
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33 Dante, Inferno IV, 131
thirteenth centuries seems at last to have run into the sand. But we are beginning to
hear voices suggesting a different approach to theology, and it may be at this point
that Antony again has something to teach us. I would like to pick up some ideas
expressed by two recent writers in particular, and to see if they can be brought into
dialogue with the Antonian method I have tried to outline in the previous chapter.

The first of these writers is Professor John Tinsley (later Bishop of Bristol).
Tinsley was very concerned about the relationship between theology and the arts, and
he attempted to diagnose the causes of the modern crisis in theology. He speaks of 'a
real crisis in both theology and literature at the present time, centred on the status and
role of metaphor in human thought and sensibility.' He claims that

... the human mind is in general, or for most of the time, ill at ease with ambiguity and
paradox. This is especially the case with the religious mind which has a special impetus to
convert all ambiguities and paradoxes into the most explicit and unequivocal assertions,
while remaining blind to the half-truths it creates in the process.

Elsewhere he says:

The hostility to ambiguity and paradox, to language that deliberately exploits the
multiplicity of meaning which words can evoke, has been reinforced by the influence of
philosophical analysis. If there is to be only one means of "verifying" a statement—i.e. by
subjecting it to scientific analysis and testing—then religion and art are bound to be
regarded as wholly subjective, communicating not objective truth, but simply information
about the states of mind of those who practise religion, paint pictures, write poems, etc.

He warns against 'poetic images and metaphors being used... as premisses upon
which some scheme of logical reasoning can be erected.' I have suggested that this
is precisely the error in which the approach to theology (sometimes called
'scholasticism') which achieved so much in the thirteenth century ended up, making
it virtually unsustainable today. Tinsley looks for an alternative:

One of the perennial difficulties apparent in the history of theology is to find a means of
expressing, in a way that provides as little opportunity for misunderstanding as possible,
the paradox of the Incarnation. The best verbal attempts to do this employ telling
juxtapositions of images or rhythms.

He sees the basis for such an approach in the parabolic method of Jesus himself: In
many cases the parables of Jesus are subtle, elusive, ironic and allegorical—indirect

34 John Tinsley, 'Parable and Allegory' (Church Quarterly, 1970). Reprinted in Tell it Slant:
The Christian Gospel and its Communication (Bristol, Indiana, 1990) (abbreviated: TIS) 127
36 'The Incarnation and Art' (1960). TIS 37
37 Ibid. TIS 37
presentations of the meaning he attached to his times and his own task. He realises that the introduction of the term 'allegorical' is problematic; he elsewhere criticised what he understood of some medieval allegorization as 'fantastic and uncontrolled... whereby any philosophy, any political theory, and any scheme of ethics could be read into any text.' Yet this abuse should not prevent recognition of the legitimate uses of allegory. In discussing the Gospel of Mark, Tinsley says:

In the Marcan parabolic scheme none of the parables is simply elucidatory. They are cryptic sayings and stories with the emphasis on discernment and being ready, morally, to see what is there and act on it. Further, they all have their background in the Old Testament imagery which has as its subject God's purpose with Israel. Finally, the allegorical element is pervasive.

I suggest that this analysis, with its mention of moral preparedness, Old Testament imagery, and pervasive allegory, could also serve as a description of Antony's method in the Sermones. What are the concordantiae but the juxtaposition of Old Testament images and Gospel pericopes, so as to give an allegorical representation of moral principles to be acted upon?

Tinsley attempts to distinguish and relate such terms as 'allegory, 'parable', 'symbol' and 'metaphor'. Each involves a transference of meaning. He follows I.A. Richards in speaking of the 'tenor' (the general abstract idea to be conveyed) and the 'vehicle', which may be a single image, an extended image, a narrative, an historical episode, etc. 'Inferior allegory' is a kind of extended simile, in which everything is deliberately labelled. A writer starts with his theme or 'tenor', and consciously searches for a 'vehicle' to convey it, thus producing a certain artificiality. But (says Tinsley) the best allegory is rather an extended metaphor, in which the 'tenor' and the 'vehicle' arrive together in the mind of the author. He elsewhere points out that

In genuine allegory, image and concept come together, and if anything, image precedes concept... In allegory, image and concept make a simultaneous impact, and cannot properly be separated.

39 Ibid. TIS 65
40 'Parable and Allegory' (1970). TIS 128
43 Ibid. TIS 135
44 'The Christian Religion and Art' TIS 65
It is this simultaneity that enables allegory to express insights which cannot (or at any rate cannot easily and completely) be expressed in a series of logically articulated propositions. Tinsley's interests were primarily Biblical and literary, and he does not seem to have had a wide knowledge of medieval theology, yet he goes far to rehabilitate the basis of medieval allegorism. He has fun at the expense of those who 'find it comical that in the Middle Ages it was thought that words could be used in no less than four senses.' This, he says, 'may be self-evident to the biblical critic, but the literary critic would be surprised if there were no more than four!'

An allegorical story may not be a real event, but Tinsley implies that it too serves to illuminate and give significance to the present situation. The multiplicity of reference which is characteristic of metaphor offers a way of expressing the inexpressible which the linear logic of a syllogism does not.

The second writer I want to consider is Ross Thompson, in his interesting (but sometimes difficult) book, 'Holy Ground: The Spirituality of Matter'. He too is concerned with the difference between 'scientific' and 'religious' language. He discusses the way in which we 'discover' patterns in reality, and do not simply impose them. We may perceive similarities of pattern in material which is in other respects very dissimilar. He uses the terminology of mathematics, whereby one set of elements may be 'mapped' onto another (or onto itself). If there is both a one-to-one correspondence of elements, and if also relationships between elements are preserved, we call the mapping an 'isomorphism'. He coins the term 'interillumination' to describe the process of pattern recognition which is like isomorphism, but which supplies, rather than relies on, an analysis of patterns. He invokes Wittgenstein's notion of 'seeing as': we see one thing 'as' another, a cloud as a face, for instance. In discovering patterns, we suppress or ignore some features of experience, in order to
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give prominence to others. However, while science may regard the features ignored as strictly irrelevant to the model being constructed, when we allow two patterns to interilluminate one another we do not entirely suppress the features not seen as immediately relevant, but allow them to remain present and capable of suggesting further patterns, or modifications to patterns. Metaphor arises when we use the terms proper to one context to ‘interilluminate’ another context to which they do not literally apply (as when we speak of ‘the teeth of the wind’).

After an extended discussion of the way scientific models are used (and science uses metaphors abundantly: ‘waves’ and ‘particles’ in atomic theory, for instance, are mathematical constructs, not at all as we ‘really’ imagine them), Thompson draws a distinction between such models and ‘images’ which express truths that cannot be quantified and expressed mathematically as are the truths of science. Yet there can still be an ‘interillumination’ between the image and the universe at large. Images can be ‘true’ or ‘valid’, depending on whether they rightly capture reality, rather than distorting or misrepresenting it. He says:

Here we raise no longer scientific but religious questions. For the religions may be taken as repositories of images that are accepted- within the tradition- as ‘true’, as holding the secret of the universe and right personal action. The Old Testament, for instance, is full of material objects which are taken as images or symbols of God’s secret purpose... The parables of Jesus seize upon everyday objects and scenes in the same way... Everyday things become images of the cosmos and of how to live within it.50 Images must not be confused with models; but though they do not depict reality in a scientific way, that is not to say that they do not convey reality at all. They contain truth (or, it may be, falsehood), and not merely opinion or ‘personal validity’. But how may this be shown? Thompson continues:

One easy road to showing this would be to unpack imagery into literal statements that could be tested for truth. That is broadly the approach of the liberals- to secularize religious language into plain statements about the world and plain instructions about how to live.51

Another way is the fundamentalist treatment of religious symbols as if they were literally true. Both the reductionist and the fundamentalist fail to accept symbolism on its own terms. He goes on:

My contention will be that we must defy the view that has prevailed in the West since Plato banished the poets from his Republic, that whatever is true can best be expressed as literal truth. I shall suggest that there is a proper procedure for assessing the metaphors of the poets, the imagery of art and the great symbols of the religious traditions, for validity,
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and that these may express truths that literal language cannot capture. Were this not so, the critic’s description would represent an improvement on the work of art, and the commentary could replace Scripture!\footnote{\textit{Ibid} 138f.}

Thompson, like Tinsley, makes use of I.A.Richards terminology of ‘tenor’ and ‘vehicle’ to explain metaphor. Both science with its models, and art with its images, rely on ‘interilluminations’ which link together diverse streams of experience to act as analogies. However, models rely on clearly defined terms and categories, while metaphors do not.

So models lead to experiment in a way that metaphors do not. And models link up with the rest of our conceptual scheme in ways which metaphors do not; which is why models can argue and demonstrate things, while in Wittgenstein’s terms, metaphors and art generally cannot ‘state’, only ‘show’\footnote{\textit{Ibid} 148}.

Thompson uses a phrase from Rilke: we are ‘bees of the invisible’, wringing the honey of the transcendent from the flowers of matter.\footnote{\textit{Ibid} 172} Here certainly is an image and metaphor that cannot easily be translated into simple, literal language - and yet what an illuminating image it is, and how one feels Antony would have appreciated it!

Thompson uses the ‘bee’ image again, taking a passage from Samuel Becket’s \textit{Molloy}:

\begin{quote}
The bees did not dance at any level, haphazard, but there were three or four levels, always the same, at which they danced.\footnote{\textit{Ibid} 268; \textit{S. Becket, Molloy} (Calder & Boyars, 1959) 181}
\end{quote}

Since multiple reference is of the essence of metaphor, I do not think I do any violence to Thompson’s argument by applying this image to the ancient approach to Scripture. Medieval exegetes ‘danced’ at three or four levels (literal, allegorical, moral, and sometimes anagogical), while modern exegetes seem to dance only at one. Neither the literalism of the reductionist nor that of the fundamentalist enables us to penetrate the whole truth intended by the Divine Author. Somehow, the images of Scripture must be allowed to illuminate, or ‘interilluminate’, realities which are not expressible by us in simple propositional form.

Within this context, I would like to suggest that Antony’s method of ‘concordance’ is an instance of ‘interillumination’. Antony juxtaposes the liturgical
readings, identifying elements in each and the relationships between them, in order to exhibit similar patterns, and to allow each one to shed light on the other. The stories become 'vehicles' for theological or moral teaching, not adduced to 'prove' or 'argue', but to exemplify and to show. In an age that was beginning to prize dialectic and demonstration, Antony was allusive and indirect. He offered images in a non-prescriptive way, often himself suggesting alternative ways of looking at them. He invited his readers to enter into their own dialogue with the Scriptures, to look and to see for themselves. In a later age, when the limitations of linear logic are beginning to appear, Antony's approach may seem, once again, an attractive one.
CONCLUSION

What conclusions may we draw at the end of this thesis? First, Antony appears as someone very conscious of standing in a theological tradition whose principal interpreters (for him) had been Augustine, Gregory and Bernard. His own genius lay in condensing and expressing that tradition, so as to make it memorable (in every sense) for those to whom he in turn passed it on.

More precisely, Antony appears as someone who possessed a naturally powerful memory (in the medieval understanding of the term), an ability to assimilate, organise, store and reproduce information; an ability which was further developed by the techniques that he learned from the Victorine traditions of Coimbra. His encyclopaedic familiarity with the Scriptures, and with important parts of the ‘authorities’ previously mentioned, provided a foundation for his own distillation of the Gospel message, both in his personal preaching and in the *Opus Dominicae*.

This present study has been chiefly concerned with that *Opus Dominicae*, which despite its more usual title of *Sermones Dominicales* does not fit neatly into any of the categories generally employed in respect of writings of Antony’s period. It is not, for instance, simply a collection of sermons preached by Antony, nor even of model sermons prepared by Antony for the use of others. It is not a manual of preaching, setting out theoretical guidance for preachers. It is not a straightforward commentary on the Scriptures; and it is certainly not a text-book of theology comparable to the works of Peter Lombard or of later Masters at Paris and elsewhere. Nevertheless, it has some features of all of these, even (though faintly) of the last mentioned, the ‘text-book of theology’.

Conscious of the tradition in which he stood, and conscious of the needs both of the ordinary believers to whom he himself preached, and of the other preachers (especially Franciscans) who were also entrusted with the work of preaching, and who were often relatively inexperienced and uneducated, Antony sought to make his message memorable: that is, easy to assimilate and understand, easy to retain and recall, so as to motivate the every-day lives of believers. In common with his
contemporaries, he regarded 'theology' and 'Scripture' as virtually the same thing. In the Scriptures God spoke his revealing word, which it was the task of the theologian to explain. The text of Scripture had various layers of meaning, which needed to be meditated upon. Theology itself was a kind of 'revelation', or at least an unveiling of the hidden meaning of Scripture. Furthermore, the full understanding of Scripture required not only a grasp of individual texts, taken separately, but of the Scriptures regarded as an integrated whole. It was here that Antony's gifts of memory gave him a particular advantage.

As we have seen, Antony's *Sermones* are in the first place arranged in accordance with the liturgical distribution of the Gospels; and they are then subdivided more or less according to the natural divisions of the text (the *clausulae*). From this point onwards, however, Antony weaves a veritable lace-work of texts and comment, drawn from all over the Scriptures. His memory enabled him to recall relevant passages, and juxtapose them with his principal text, so as to exhibit parallels and patterns that only become evident from such a global grasping of the material.

I have suggested that Antony was motivated, at least in part, by the desire to counter Cathar disparagement of the Old Testament and of the material world. Antony undertakes to show the harmony, the 'concordance', between the Testaments themselves, and between the Scriptures and creation. In this latter respect, I further suggest that he was influenced by the particular vision of St Francis, as regards the manifestation of God in the 'Book of Nature'.

Antony teaches through imagery rather than through logical discourse (which is not to suggest that he is 'illogical'). He 'exhibits' rather than 'proves'; yet his method is just as much a 'demonstration' (a 'showing') of theological truth as that which proceeds by logical analysis and syllogistic reasoning. In this way, too, I suggest that Antony is beginning to exhibit traits which in the succeeding period were to characterise the Franciscan approach to theology. It is not just a regard for the created world, but a conviction that God is somehow to be intuited or perceived in Creation, and not merely to be deduced from it.
It would be anachronistic to ask how Antony 'fits into' the Franciscan tradition, since obviously during the lifetime of the Founder one can hardly as yet speak of a Franciscan tradition into which Antony might fit. If he had thought in those categories at all, he might have regarded himself as 'Augustinian' or 'Gregorian'. Nevertheless, I suggest that Antony was already beginning to seek a theological expression of a distinctly Franciscan way of looking at the world and its Creator, which is not just a theology of Creation but also of Redemption. Christ is the key, and especially in his Passion, to which the note of poverty desired by Francis for his Order is particularly related. All of this would be developed more thoroughly, especially by Bonaventure, but the seeds are already to be found germinating in Antony: 'first the blade, then the ear, then the full corn in the ear.'

It is these features of Antony’s work which, in my opinion, make it of renewed theological interest today. Because the field has, so to speak, lain fallow for so long, there is room for a great deal of research. More could be done to relate Antony to his sources (particularly Augustine, Gregory and Bernard). A further comparison with Innocent III, and the reform of the Church which he promoted, could also prove fruitful, as well as an exploration of more precise links with Joachim of Fiore. Because of the long neglect of Antony as a writer, little has been done to raise questions about his possible influence on those, especially Franciscans, who came after him. If this influence was less in northern Europe, there are signs that it was greater in southern France and in Italy. We need to know more about writers such as Rigauld to trace that influence. There is, then, ample room for further research, and the present study would claim to have done little more than clear the ground to some extent.

Antony’s posthumous fame as a Saint and wonder-worker came to eclipse his life-time achievement as a preacher and writer. This is in one way a pity, because even though he was not a system-builder like Bonaventure or Scotus, he is not devoid of originality in his methodology, to the exploration of which this thesis has been devoted. On the other hand, the long neglect can be seen as in another way as an
advantage, in that we can now approach Antony with fresh eyes and without
preconceptions.

One cannot engage in a study such as the present without immersing oneself in
an author’s thought, and as it were entering his mind and seeing how it works.
Beyond the particular theological issues he discusses, Antony reveals himself as a
passionate critic of abuse in the Church, yet always animated by a spirit of charity and
kindness. He shows a real affection for the ‘dear brothers’ to whom the work is
offered, and an enthusiasm both for Biblical study and for the Book of Nature which
also reveals God. Because Antony’s continuing popularity has rested far more on his
sanctity than on his learning, it would be wrong, in seeking to redress the balance, to
overlook the holiness and devotion also revealed in his writing. If it is “Love that
moves the sun and the other stars” (Paradiso XXXIII), it was love that ultimately
moved Antony and has led so many to seek his patronage. I will end as I began, by
letting Julian of Spires sum up:

\[\text{Pereunt pericula; cessat et necessitas;}
\]
\[\text{narrent hi qui sentiunt, dicant Paduani.}\]

loosely translated:

All perils perish at his prayer,
and even Fate gives way;
“Let them speak out, who know his care!”
That’s what the Paduans say!
APPENDIX

TABLE I:

Citations from Augustine, Gregory, Bernard and Innocent III

This table shows the frequency of citation by Antony of the above-named authors. The table is based on the identification of sources in the Index to the critical edition. In the text, the authors may be quoted by name, especially if the quotation comes via the Gloss or some other collection, but often the quotations have been identified by the editors. I have sought to verify these, for the most part; and only occasionally am I a little dubious about the attribution. In the following table of citations, the columns are to be understood as follows:

Aug 1: citations from Augustine that appear to be taken directly from his sermons etc.
Aug 2: citations from Augustine that come via the Gloss or other collection.
GrMo: citations from Gregory’s *Moralia in Iob.*
GrEz: citations from Gregory’s *Homilies on Ezekiel.*
GrEv: citations from Gregory’s *Homilies on the Gospels*
GrOth: citations of other works of Gregory, or via the Gloss, etc.
Bern1: citations from authentic works of Bernard.
Bern2: citations from works Antony regarded as by Bernard.
Inn: citations from the sermons of Pope Innocent III.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sermon</th>
<th>Aug 1</th>
<th>Aug 2</th>
<th>GrMo</th>
<th>GrEz</th>
<th>GrEv</th>
<th>GrOth</th>
<th>Bern1</th>
<th>Bern2</th>
<th>Inn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>prologue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>septuagesima</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sexagesima</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quinquagesim</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lent 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lent 2a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lent 2b</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lent 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lent 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lent 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>palm sunday</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easter</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easter 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easter 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easter 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easter 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easter 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easter 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pentecost</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pentecost 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pentecost 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pentecost 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pentecost 4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pentecost 5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pentecost 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pentecost 7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pentecost 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pentecost 9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pentecost 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pentecost 11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pentecost 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pentecost 13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pentecost 14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pentecost 15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pentecost 16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pentecost 17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pentecost 18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pentecost 19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pentecost 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pentecost 21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pentecost 22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pentecost 23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pentecost 24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advent 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advent 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advent 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advent 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>christmas 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>christmas 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epiphany 1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epiphany 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epiphany 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marian (4)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>festivals (20)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total | 88 | 26 | 122 | 21 | 38 | 31 | 79 | 37 | 16 |

This table tends to support the claim that Antony relied more on his own direct reading of Augustine and Gregory than on secondary sources (the Gloss, the Sentences, etc). In the case of Bernard, it can be seen that Antony frequently attributes Bernardine authority to works now known to be by other authors. The proportion of Bernardine citations is greater in the Marian and Festival Sermons than in those for Sundays. Though the citations from Innocent III are relatively few, some are of considerable length.
TABLE II

Instances of ‘concordantia’ etc. in the sermons up to Pentecost.

In this table, the instances of ‘concordantia’ and ‘concordare’ are given in their contexts, by Sermon and clause. Where there are no instances, this is indicated also.

The scriptural references are shown where appropriate.

General Prologue

... in hoc opere quattuor tanguntur materiae, scilicet evangelia dominicalia, historiae Veteris Testamenti, sicut in Ecclesia leguntur, introitus et epistolae missae dominicalis.

Quae ad invicem ... colligens concordavi. Et, ne ... concordantiae variety et oblivionem ingeret, evangelia in clauses, prout Deus inspiravit, divisimus et unicuique historiae et epistolae particulas concordavimus.

Septuagesima

(Prol) (no instances)

I. ... sex virtutes fidelis animae, et sex horas lectionis evangelicae, cum denario et sabbato concordantes...

II. Ideo sex horas evangelii cum operibis sex dierum moraliter exponentes, Novum cum Veteri concordemus. Prima ergo die dixit Deus: fiat lux. Et facta est lux. Audi concordiam primae horae: Simile est regnum caelorum patrifamilias, qui exiti primo mane etc.

Sexagesima

(Prol) Ideo utrumque Testamentum, ad unius Dei honorem et auditantium utilitatem, secundum quod ipse dabiti mihi, concordemus... In hac praesenti dominica legitur in Ecclesia evangelium de seminatore et semine, et recitatur et cantatur historia de Noe et ipsius arce fabricatione; et in introitu missae cantatur: Exurge, quare obdormis, Domine? et legitur epistola beati Pauli ad Corinthios: Libenter suffertis insipientes etc. In nomine Domini ergo haec omnia concordemus.

... Sed attende diligentissime, quod quarta et quinta pro una tantum camera in ista concordantia accipitur.

I. His spinis animalia ferocia concordant...

Et vide quam bene concordant bona terra, mitia animalia, homines et volucres...

Quinquagesima

(Prol) Ad honorem ergo Dei et vestrae animae illuminationem haec omnia concordemus

I, II. (no instances)

Lent I

(Prol) (no instances)

I. Vide utriusque tentationis concordantium in Genesi et Matthaeo: (Gen 3.4,5; Mt 4.3)

(Prol), I,II, III, IV, (no instances)
Lent II A

I. *Nota verba singula, et erit evangeli concordantia.* (Gen 28.12-13; Mt 17.1)

II, III, IV (no instances)

Lent II B

I. *Ecce concordia uriusque Testamenti:* (Mt 15.21; Gen 28.10)

II. *De qua vexatione habes concordantiam in historia praesentis dominicae,*

III. (no instances)

Lent III

I. *De his tribus habes concordantiam in prima parte historiae praesentis dominicae,*

II. (no instances)

IV. *Ecce habes in auctoritate Ioelis concordantiam huius sancti evangeli*

   Cum enim dicit Ioel: ... concordat cum prima clausula evangelii: ... Cum vero adiungit: ...

   concordat cum ultima clausula: ...

V. (no instances)

Lent IV

I. *De hoc habes concordantiam in introitu missae:* (In 6.1ff; Is 14.13f)

Lent V

(Prol), I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII (no instances)

Palm Sunday

(Prol), I, II, III, IV (no instances)
Easter

(Prol), I, II, III, IV (no instances)

Easter Octave


I. De his tribus habes concordantiam in hodierna epistola:
    (Acts 2.19-20; Joel 2.30-31; 1Jn 5.8)
    De his habes concordantiam in Exodo, (1Jn 5.8; Ex 19.18-19)
    De hoc congregatione habes concordantiam in Actibus apostolorum:
    (Jn 20.19; Acts 1.12-14)

II. De hoc habes concordantiam in Actibus apostolorum. (Jn 20.19-21; Acts 1.15-16)

III. Super hoc habes concordantiam in Actibus apostolorum, (Jn 20.22-23; Acts 3.6-8)
    Item, super haec habes concordantiam in eisdem Actibus apostolorum, (Jn 20.23; Acts 9.33f)
    Item, concordantia, ibi: (Jn 20.23; Acts 9.40-41)

IV. Unde habes concordantiam in Actibus apostolorum, (Jn 20.24-25; Acts 9.17-19)

V. Unde habes concordantiam in Actibus apostolorum, (Jn 20.27-29; Acts 8.37f)

Easter II

(Prol) Istas quattuor partes volumus concordare cum istius evangelii quattuor particulis. Et istas tres partes, Deo dante, cum tribus particularis evangelii subsequentis dominicae concordabimus.

I. ... de quibus habes concordantiam in Apocalypsi: (Jn 10.11; Apoc 1.10-16)

II. ... de quibus habes concordantiam in Apocalypsi: (Jn 10.11; Apoc 6.2ff)

III. Unde habes concordantiam in Apocalypsi: (Jn 10.14-15; Apoc 7.4-8)

IV. Haec est illa mulier, de qua habes concordantiam in Apocalypsi: (Jn 10.16; Apoc 12.1-2)
    De hoc habes concordantiam in propheta Nahum: (Nah 4.14)

Easter III

(Prol) Huius evangelii tribus clausulis tres ultimas partes Apocalypsis volumus concordare.

I. Unde habes concordantiam in Apocalypsi: (Jn 16.16; Apoc 16.1--17)

II. Haec est illa Babylon, de qua habes concordantiam in Apocalypsi: (Jn 16.20-21; Ap 17.3-4)
    De hoc habes concordantiam in Threnis Jeremiæ: (Jn16.20f; Lam 4.21)

III. De hoc habes concordantiam in ultima parte Apocalypsi: (Jn 16.22; Apoc 22.1f)

IV. (no instances)
Easter IV

(Prol) (epistola) quam in tribus particularis volumus dividere et supradictis tribus evangelii clausulis concordare.

I. *Super hoc habes concordantiam in Tobia, (Jn 16.5; Tob 12.20)*
   ... *de quo habes concordantiam in hodierna epistola beati Iacobi: (Jn 16.5; Jas 1.17)*

II. *Unde super hoc habes concordantiam in libro Numeri: (Phil 3.19; Num 25.1-4)*

III. *Cui concordat tertia particula hodiernae epistolae: (Jn 16.13; Jas 1.21)*

Easter V

(Prol) (epistola) quam volumus dividere in tribus particularis et cum tribus evangelii clausulis concordare.

I. *Huic duplici gaudio... concordat prima particula epistolae. (Jn 16.24; Jas 1.22-24)*

II. *Unde habes concordantiam in libro Numeri (Jn 16.26f; Num 16.46ff)*
   *De hac dilectione habes concordantiam in secunda particula hodiernae epistolae: (Jn 16.26f; Jas 1.25)*

III. *Unde habes concordantiam in primo libro Regum: (Job 9.10; 1Kg(Sm) 6.10-11)*
   *Unde habes concordantiam in tertia particula epistolae hodiernae missae: (Jn 16.29f; Jas 1.26f)*

Easter VI

(Prol) (epistola) quam volumus dividere in duabus particularis et cum duabus evangelii clausulis concordare.

I. *Huic primae clausulae evangelii concordat prima particula hodiernae epistolae: (Jn 15.26; 1Pt 4.7f)*

II. *Huic secundae clausulae concordat secunda particula epistolae: (Jn 16.1-4; 1Pt 4.9-11)*

Pentecost

(Prol) (no instances)

I. *Unde habes concordantiam in Exodo: (Acts 2.1ff; Ex 19.16)*

II. (no instances)

III. *Unde habes concordantiam in Exodo: (Acts 2.1ff; Ex 19.16)*

IV. (no instances)

V. *De his duobus habes concordantiam in Threnis Ieremiae: (Ps 103.30; Lam 1.13)*
   *De quo habes concordantiam in Genesi: (Ac 2.4; Gen 8.1-2)*
   *Super hoc habes concordantiam in secundo libro Paralipomenon: (Gen 8.1-2; 2Chr 32.4)*
TABLE III
Instances of 'concordantia' etc. in the Sermons for the Sundays after Pentecost, and from Advent to Epiphany III.

The table is arranged as follows:
Column 1: the Sunday.
Column 2: the division of the sermon (prologue, or clause of the Gospel).
Column 4: the Old Testament concordantiae, noting any variation of terminology.
Column 5: the Epistle reference, noting variant introductions. (brackets indicate no concordat)
Column 6: the Introit reference, bracketed unless there is an explicit use of concordat or concordantia.

After the 'standard' references, there are listed other occurrences of concordare, etc. which do not fit this pattern. I have not noted the standard occurrences in the prologi consonantes or the minor prologues, which follow the formulae noted above, in Chapter Four.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday Division</th>
<th>Gospel</th>
<th>Old Testament</th>
<th>Epistle</th>
<th>Introit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pent I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Lk 16.19-21</td>
<td>1 Kg (Sm) 25.2ff</td>
<td>1 Jn 4.8-17</td>
<td>(Ps 12.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Kg (Sm) 2.13ff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Kg (Sm) 2.6f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Kg (Sm) 5.4f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Lk 16.22</td>
<td>1 Kg (Sm) 26.12ff</td>
<td>1 Jn 4.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Kg (Sm) 25.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Kg (Sm) 28.8-13</td>
<td>1 Jn 4.19-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Lk 16.23-26</td>
<td>1 Kg (Sm) 25.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Kg (Sm) 28.8-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Lk 16.27-28</td>
<td>1 Kg (Sm) 25.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Kg (Sm) 28.8-13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pent II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Lk 14.16-17</td>
<td>1 Kg (Sm) 1.23f</td>
<td>1 Jn 3.13-14</td>
<td>(Ps 17.19-20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is 25.6 (concordat)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Kg (Sm) 18.29,9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Lk 14.18-21</td>
<td>1 Kg (Sm) 4.4ff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Kg (Sm) 11.6f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Kg (Sm) 30.11-15</td>
<td>1 Jn 3.17-18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Lk 14.21-24</td>
<td>1 Kg (Sm) 30.11-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Kg (Sm) 30.11-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pent III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Lk 15.1-2</td>
<td>(1Kg (Sm) 22.2 de hoc habes)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Ps 24.16,18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Kg (Sm) 5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Kg (Sm) 19.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Kg (Sm) 14.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Kg (Sm) 9.11ff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Lk 15.3-4</td>
<td>2 Kg (Sm) 1.17,21</td>
<td>1 Pt 5.6-7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Kg (Sm) 14.4-7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Lk 15.8</td>
<td>2 Kg (Sm) 1.15-16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2 Kg (Sm) 3.27-29;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2 Kg (Sm) 20.8-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Pt 5.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Pent IV | I. Lk 6.36-38 | 2 Kg (Sm) 9.7 | Rom 8.18 | Ps 26.1- 
<p>| | | 2 Kg (Sm) 6.6-7 | concordat |
| | | 2 Kg (Sm) 18.5.33 | |
| | | 2 Kg (Sm) 16.7-13 | |
| | | 2 Kg (Sm) 19.33 | |
| II. Lk 6.38 | 2 Kg (Sm) 14.25-26 | Rom 8.19-20 |
| III. Lk 6.39-40 | 2 Kg (Sm) 5.8 | Rom 8.22 |
| | | 2 Kg (Sm) 15.23.30 | |
| IV. Lk 6.41-42 | 2 Kg (Sm) 7.12-13 | Rom 8.23 |
| Pent V | I. Lk 5.1-2 | 3 (1) Kg 4.33-34 | 1 Pt 3.8-9 | (Ps 26.7,9 |
| | | 3 (1) Kg 19.19-21 | |
| | | 3 (1) Kg 3.14-27 | |
| | | 3 (1) Kg 10.22 | |
| | | 3 (1) Kg 10.18-20 | |
| | | 3 (1) Kg 18.42-45 | |
| II. Lk 5.3-4 | 1 Pt 3.10 |
| III. Lk 5.5-7 | 1 Pt 3.13-14 |
| IV. Lk 5.8-11 | 1 Pt 3.15 |
| Pent VI | I. Mt 5.20 | 3 (1) Kg 18.25-39 | Rom 6.3-5 | (Ps 27.8-9 |
| | | 3 (1) Kg 1,5 | Rom 6.6-8 |
| | | | Rom 6.9-11 |
| II. Mt 5.21-22 | | |
| III. Mt 5.23-24 | | |
| Pent VII | I. Mk 8.1-3 | (4 (2) Kg 6.24-25 | Rom 6.19 | Ps 47.10-11 |
| | | (4 (2) Kg 7.1 | habes conc. |
| | | (4 (2) Kg 13.18 | |
| | | | |
| II. Mk 8.4-8 | 4 (2) Kg 5.10.15 | Rom 6.20-21 |
| | | 4 (2) Kg 4.30-35 | Rom 6.22-23 |
| III. Mk 8.8-9 | | |
| Pent VIII | I. Mt 7.15-16 | 4 (2) Kg 8.11-12 | Rom 8.12-13 | (Ps 53.6f |
| | | 4 (2) Kg 10.25-28 | |
| | | 4 (2) Kg 20.8-11 | |
| | | 4 (2) Kg 22.11, 23.3ff | |
| II. Mt 7.17-20 | Rom 8.14-15 |
| III. Mt 7.21 | Rom 8.16-17 |
| AUGUST | Pent IX | I. Lk 16.1-4 | Prov 20.14 | (Ps 53.17-20 |
| | | Prov 30.21-23 | 1 Cor 10.6-10 |
| | | Prov 30.11-14 | 1 Cor 10.12-13 |
| | | | 1 Cor 10.13 |
| I. Lk 16.5-8 | | |
| II. Lk 16.5-8 | | |
| III. | | |
| Pent X | I. Lk 19.41-42 | Cant 5.12 | 1 Cor 12.2-3 |
| | | Wisd 2.6-9 | 1 Cor 12.4-6 |
| | | Eccles 12.1-7 | Ps 67.6ff |
| | | Wisd 7.24-27 | habes conc. |
| | | 1 Cor 12.7-8 | |
| II. Lk 19.43-44 | | |
| III. Lk 19.45-47 | | |
| Pent XI | I. Lk 18.10-12 | Ecclus 25.3-4 | 1 Cor 15.1-2 |
| | | Ecclus 25.1-2 | 1 Cor 15.9-10 | (Ps 69.2 |
| | | Ecclus 25.1-2 | |
| | | Ecclus 36.6-10 | |
| | | Ecclus 31.28 | 2 Cor 3.6 |
| | | (2 Cor 3.4-5) | (Ps 73.19ff |
| II. Lk 18.13-14 | | |
| Pent XII | I. Mk 7.31 | Ecclus 21.1-4 | | |
| | | Ecclus 24.35-37 | |
| | | Ecclus 36.6-10 | |
| | | Ecclus 31.28 | |
| II. Mk 7.32-35 | 2 Cor 3.6 | | |
| | | (Ps 73.19ff) | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Series</th>
<th>I.</th>
<th>II.</th>
<th>III.</th>
<th>IV.</th>
<th>V.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEPTEMBER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pent XIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lk 10.23f</td>
<td>Job 33.23-25</td>
<td>Gal 3.16</td>
<td>Ps 83.10-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lk 10.25-28</td>
<td>Job 1.1</td>
<td>Gal 3.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>[concordat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lk 10.30</td>
<td>Job 9.33</td>
<td>Gal 3.20-22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lk 17.11</td>
<td>Job 14.7-9</td>
<td>Gal 5.16</td>
<td>Ps 85.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lk 17.12-14</td>
<td>Job 22.23-28</td>
<td>Gal 5.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pent XIV</td>
<td>Prol.</td>
<td>Lk 17.11</td>
<td>Job 39.27-29</td>
<td>Gal 5.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lk 17.12-14</td>
<td>Job 7.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lk 7.12-15</td>
<td>Job 38.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lk 7.1-12</td>
<td>Tob 1.13f</td>
<td>Gal 5.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lk 7.12-15</td>
<td>Tob 13.21-23</td>
<td>Gal 6.2</td>
<td>Ps 85.3</td>
<td>[concordat]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pent XVI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lk 14.1</td>
<td>1 Mac 1.23</td>
<td>Eph 3.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Ps 118.137,124)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lk 14.2-4</td>
<td>2 Mac 9.7-10</td>
<td>Eph 4.1</td>
<td>Ecclus 36.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lk 14.8-9</td>
<td>1 Mac 9.55f</td>
<td>Eph 4.3f</td>
<td>[concordat]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lk 14.1</td>
<td>1 Mac 1.23</td>
<td>Eph 4.5f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pent XVIII</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt 22.41-44</td>
<td>1 Mac 1.23</td>
<td>{1 Cor 1.4-8}</td>
<td>(Ps 34.3; 90.15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt 22.41-44</td>
<td>1 Mac 5.40f</td>
<td>{sunt tria istis concordantia}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pent XIX</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt 9.1</td>
<td>1 Mac 4.36-40</td>
<td>Eph 4.23f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt 9.2</td>
<td>1 Mac 4.25-27</td>
<td>Eph 4.28</td>
<td>(Dan 3.29-31)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt 9.6-81</td>
<td>1 Mac 2.1-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pent XX</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt 22.2</td>
<td>2 Mac 7.1-19</td>
<td>Eph 5.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt 22.7</td>
<td>1 Mac 16.16-17</td>
<td>Eph 5.18</td>
<td>(Esth 13.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt 22.11</td>
<td>2 Mac 10.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Ps 129.3f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOVEMBER</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jn 4.46</td>
<td>(Ezek 8.5,3,6</td>
<td>Eph 6.10f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pent XXI</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jn 4.50</td>
<td>(Ezek 8.6-12</td>
<td>Eph 6.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Ezek 8.13-15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ezek 10.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pent XXII</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt 18.23</td>
<td>Dan 7.13</td>
<td>Phil 1.6f</td>
<td></td>
<td>(Jer 29.11f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dan 7.9-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       | Mt 18.28  | Dan 3.46  
|       |          | Dan 10.2-3  
|       |          | Amos 6.4,6  
|       |          | Phil 1.8  
|       |          | Phil 1.9  
| Pent XXIII |        | Phil 3.17  
| I.     | Mt 22.15  | Jonah 4.6-8  
|       |          | Hos 4.19  
| II.    | Mt 22.18  | Zech 4.2f  
| (concordance of Beatitudes with words from the Cross  
*quae omnia ad invicem concordemus*) | Phil 3.20(Ps 46.2)  
| Pent XXIV |        |        2 Kg(Sm) 5.24  
| Prol.  |          | Zech 2.1f  
| I.     | Mt 9.18  | Zech 1.18f  
|       |          | Hos 2.18 *concordat*  
|       |          | Zech 4.9  
|       |          | Mic 7.8  
| II.    |          | Col 1.9  
|       |          | Col 1.12 (no proper Introit)  
| Advent I |        | Lk 21.25  
| I.     |          | Is 6.1  
|       |          | Rom 13.11  
| II.    |          | Is 6.1  
|       |          | Rom 13.12  
| III.   |          | Lk 21.25  
| IV.    |          | Lk 21.25  
|       |          | Is 42.13  
|       |          | Is 60.20  
| Advent II |        | Lk 11.2f  
| I.     |          | Is 44.3-5  
|       |          | Is 5.12  
| II.    |          | Is 35.1-2  
|       |          | Rom 15.7  
| III.   |          | Rom 15.13  
| Advent III |       | Is 38.2-3  
|        |          | (Phil 4.4)  
| Advent IV |        | Lk 3.2  
| I.     |          | Is 18.2  
|       |          | 1 Cor 4.1  
| II.    |          | Lk 3.5  
|       |          | Is 37.30  
|       |          | 1 Cor 4.5  
| Nativity I |       | Lk 2.33  
| I.     |          | Ezek 37.1-6  
|       |          | Lev 26.3-5  
| II.    |          | Gal 4.4  
|       |          | *Wisd 18.14-16 concordat*  
| Nativity II |       | Lk 2.42  
| I.     |          | Lev 2.1,4-9  
|       |          | Rom 12.1  
| II.    |          | Lev 2.46  
|       |          | Rom 12.2  
| III.   |          | Lev 2.51  
| Epiphany I |       | Jn 2.1  
|        |          | Ru 1.6; 4.13  
|        |          | Gen 41.33f *concordat*  
|        |          | (Rom 12.11)  
| Epiphany II |       | Mt 8.1-2  
| I.     |          | (Rom 12.20)  
| II.    |          | Mt 8.23ff  
| Epiphany III |       | Mt 8.23ff  
|       |          | Jon 1.4-5,13  
|       |          | (Ps 96.7)  
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As well as the above specific references to textual concordances, there are a few other places where Antony interjects a comment, such as:

Pent II
(I.420): Ecce quomodo concordat evangelium cum Isaia (Is 25.6)
(I.427): Ecce quomodo concordat Isaia cum evangelio (Is 9.4)

Pent IV
(I.459): Ista quinque cum quinque secundi libri Regum historiae volumus concordare.

Pent V
(I.491): His de duabus navibus et earum concordantiis descriptis, ad sequentia accedamus.

Pent VII
(I.536): Et vide quam bene concordant singula singulis.

Pent IX
(II.12): Iste quaternarius superiori concordat quaternario.

Pent XI
(II.72): Ecce quomodo concordat Paulus minimus cum publicano humillimo.

Pent XII
(II.101): Ecce quomodo concordat epistola cum evangelio, et cum epistola introitus missae.

Pent XIII
(II.155): Haec est ratio... quia summa utriusque, evangelii scilicet et epistola, in lege Moysi data concordat.
(II.175): Cum his omnibus auctoritates libri Iob, prout Dominus dederit, concordabimus.

Pent XV
(II.232): Ecce quam egregie concordat historia cum evangelio.
(II.234): Ecce quam congrue concordat cum historia praesentis domillicae introitus hodiernae missae.

Pent XVI
(II.261): Ecce concordantia.
(II.265): Nota quod ista quattuor concordant illis quattuor supradictis

Pent XVI
(II.267): Ista quattuor... possunt concordari, sed retrogrado ordine, cum illis quattuor quae ponuntur in fine evangelii.

Pent XVIII
(II.301): Vide quam bene concordat introitus missae cum historia Machabaeorum.

Pent XX
(II.330): Cum hoc tripli templo tres nuptias volumus concordare et concordando celebrare.
(II.336): Tres vesiculi ponuntur, quae tribus supradictis nuptiis concordant.
(II.338): Tria sunt tabernacula quae tribus nuptiis concordant.
(II.348): Nota ista tria... quae tribus supradictis nuptiis concordant.

Pent XXI
(II.360): Istis quattuor concordant abominationes, quas Dominus ostendit Ezechiel.

Pent XXII
(II.402): Quod bene etymologiae altaris concordat.
(II.423): Ecce iam habes quid significat et quomodo concordant denarius insignitus imagine et candelabrum illuminaturn lampade.

Advent II
(II.489): Festina in iussione, cui concordat 'exulabit'

Epiphany I
(II.568): Sex verba sex hydryis... breviter concordabimus.
TABLE IV
Instances of ‘concordantia’, etc., in the Marian and Festival Sermons

For completeness sake, I will list the instances in the Marian and Festival Sermons, giving volume and page numbers, although there are only a few instances of either ‘habes concordantiam’ or ‘concordat’, namely:

Prologue to Marian Sermons
(II.103): *volumus dividere et ... prout ipsa dederit Domina, concordare.*

Nativity of B.V.M.
(II.107): *super hoc habes concordantiam in hodierno evangelio.* (Is 11.1; Mt 1.1ff)

Purification of B.V.M.
(II.133): *de hoc triplici clausura et oriente, a quo illustratur tabernaculum, abes concordantiam in Ezechiele.* (Cant 4.12; Ezek 44.1)

Assumption of B.V.M.
(II.146): *unde de hoc vase, omni lapide pretioso ornato, habes concordantiam in libro Esther.* (Ecclus 50.10; Esth 2.15ff)
(II.149): *Unde super hoc habes concordanian in Ezechiele* (Ecclus 50.11; Ezek 1.26)

The Nativity.
(III.3) *super hoc habes concordantiam in Isaia XV.* (Lk 2.1; Is 15.5)
(III.7) *super hoc habes concordantiam in Genesi XXI.* (Lk 2.10-11; Gen 21.5-6)
(III.10) *super quo habes concordantiam in secundo Regum XXI.* (Is 9.6; 2 Kg (Sm) 21.19)
(III.10) *super hoc habes concordantiam in Genesi XXII.* (Is 9.6; Gen 22.6)
(III.12) *super quo habes concordantiam in Genesi penultimo:* (Is 9.6; Gen 49.14f)

St Stephen
(III.25): *Super hoc habes concordantiam in tertio libro Regum XXI* (3(1)Kg 21.23)

St John (III.37) *Unde huic loco concordat quod dicitur in lectione hodiernae missae.*
(III.39) *Huic loco concordat quod dicitur in lectione missae.* (Jn 1.14; Ecclus 15.3)
(III.40) *De quibus habes concordantiam in Apocalypsi XII.* (Ezek 17.3; Apoc 12.14)

Ascension
(III.251) *Unde concordat Canticis IV.* (Cant 4.5-6)
ADDENDA

Assumption of B.V.M.
   (II.149) Unde super hoc habes concordantiam in Ezechiele (Ecclus 50.11; Ezek 1.26)

The Nativity
   (III.7) super hoc habes concordantiam in Genesi XXI: (Lk 2.10-11; Gen 21.5-6)

St John
   (III.39) Huic loco concordat quod dicitur in lectione missae. (Jn 1.14, Ecclus 15.3)
   (III.40) De quibus habes concordantiam in Apocalypsi XII. (Ezek 17.3; Apoc 12.14)

Epiphany
   (III.72) Unde concordat Exordus XIII. (Mt 2.9; Ex 13.21)

Purification
   (III.108) Concordat Isaia LII. (Lk 12.31; Is 52.10)

Ash Wednesday
   (III.141) Concordantia Zacharia VIII (Mt 6.17; Zech 8.19)

Annunciation
   (III.153) Concordantia Iudicum V. (Lk 1.28; Jg 4.18)
   (III.154) Concordantia Ioanne V. (Lk 1.29; Jn 5.4)
   (III.154) Unde concordantia Esther V. (Lk 1.29; Esth 5.2)
   (III.165) Unde concordat Iudith XVI. (Lk 1.48; Jdth 15.9)

Maundy Thursday
   (III.171) Super quo habes concordantiam in Ezechiele X. (Jn 13.4-5; Ezek 10.2)

Easter
   (III.181) Unde concordat secundo Regum III. (Eccles 12.5; 2Kgs 3.1)

SS. Philip and James
   (III.199) Haec duo bene concordant. (Ac 1.13; Gen 41.52)

Ascension
   (III.245) Unde concordat Parabolis XXX. (Mk 16.18; Prov 30.4)

SS Peter and Paul
   (III.283) Unde concordat Genesi XXV. (Jn 21.18; Gen 25.8)
   (III.284) Unde concordat Numeri X. (Dt 33.18-19; Num 10.1-2)
   (III.293) Unde concordat Iudicum XVI. (Job 39.5-8; Jg 16.9)
TABLE V

Sermons on Saint Antony

This is a complete list of the sermons mentioned in chapter six, with the enumeration used in that chapter. The abbreviations for the manuscripts are:

PBA Padua, Bibliotheca Antoniana
PBU Padua, Bibliotheca Universitaria
ABC Assisi, Bibliotheca Communale
Vat Vatican Library (Barberini, Borghese mss.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Sermon</th>
<th>PBA</th>
<th>PBU</th>
<th>ABC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jean de la Rochelle</td>
<td>Quasi stella matutina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Luca Lettore</td>
<td>Quasi arcus refugens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5 Luca Lettore</td>
<td>Perfectus autem omnis erit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 Luca Lettore</td>
<td>Anima mea desideravit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 Luca Lettore</td>
<td>Eruditus eris in omnibus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7 Luca Lettore</td>
<td>Ipse directus est</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8 Luca Lettore</td>
<td>Placens Deo factus est dilectus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9 Luca Lettore</td>
<td>Benedictae reliquie tue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10 Luca Lettore</td>
<td>Oculi sapienti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>11 Luca Lettore</td>
<td>Perfectus omnis erit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>12 Luca Lettore</td>
<td>Nemo accendens lucernam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13 Servasanto da Fenza</td>
<td>Iste est frater vester parvulus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14 Albertino da Verona</td>
<td>Invocavi et venit in me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>15 PBU cod.738</td>
<td>Iustus cor suum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>16 PBU cod.738</td>
<td>Benedictus Dominus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17 PBU cod.738</td>
<td>In arca erat una auria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18 PBU ms.949</td>
<td>Optavi et datus est mihi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19 PBU ms.949</td>
<td>Paratus sum et non... turbatus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>20 PBU ms.949</td>
<td>Optavi et datus est mihi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>21 PBU cod.449</td>
<td>Iste pauper clamavit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>22 PBU cod.449</td>
<td>Repletus sum fortitudine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23 PBU cod.449</td>
<td>Ecce super monstes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>24 PBU cod.449</td>
<td>Vie eius vie pulcre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>25 PBA cod.740</td>
<td>Vos estis lux mundi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>26 PBA cod.740</td>
<td>Christi bonus odor sumus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>27 PBA cod.740</td>
<td>Argumentum electum lingua iusti</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>28 PBA cod.740</td>
<td>Bonus homo de bono thesauro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>29 PBA cod.740</td>
<td>Omne preciosum vidit oculos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>30 PBA cod.740</td>
<td>Collaudabant multi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>31 PBA cod.740</td>
<td>Bonum est viro</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>32 PBA cod.740</td>
<td>Benedictio sit tibi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>33 PBA cod.740</td>
<td>Ipse tamquam imgres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>34 PBA cod.740</td>
<td>Sic honorabitur</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>35 PBA ms.506</td>
<td>Requievit archa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>36 PBA ms.506</td>
<td>Ubi est literatus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>37 PBA cod.513</td>
<td>Dedi te in lucem gencium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>38 PBA cod.513</td>
<td>Hic est filius meus dilectus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>39 PBA cod.513</td>
<td>In medio Ecclesiae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>40 PBA cod.513</td>
<td>Quis est hic et laudabimus eum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>41 PBA cod.513</td>
<td>Ecce super montes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>42 PBA cod.513</td>
<td>Tu vero vigilta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>43 PBA cod.513</td>
<td>Optavi et datus est mihi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>44 ABC ms.466</td>
<td>Ecce odor filii mei</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>45 ABC ms.466</td>
<td>Lex veritatis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>46 ABC cod.477</td>
<td>Iste est frater vester parvulus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>47 ABC cod.495</td>
<td>Dedi te in lucem gentium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- The abbreviations for the manuscripts are:
  - PBA: Padua, Bibliotheca Antoniana
  - PBU: Padua, Bibliotheca Universitaria
  - ABC: Assisi, Bibliotheca Communale
  - Vat: Vatican Library (Barberini, Borghese mss.)
Secundus angelus tuba cecinit

[Antonius commendatur]

In medio ecclesie

Afferamus archam

In medio ecclesie

Qui fecerit et docuerit

Lobia sacerdotis custodont

Spiritu intellectuinae

Invocavi et venit

Iste pauper clamavit

Apoc 8.8

IS12 (1972) 197-202

IS14 (1974) 89-94

IS14 (1974) 95-98

IS14 (1974) 98-102

IS14 (1974) 102-107

IS14 (1974) 107-111

IS14 (1974) 112-115

IS15 (1975) 320-322

IS11 (1971) 80-94

Op. Om. IX, 535-8
### ABBREVIATIONS

#### i) Biblical

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>Genesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>Exodus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lev</td>
<td>Leviticus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dt</td>
<td>Deuteronomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jos</td>
<td>Joshua (Josue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jdg</td>
<td>Judges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth</td>
<td>Ruth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1(Sm)Kg</td>
<td>I Samuel (I Kings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(Sm)Kg</td>
<td>II Samuel (II Kings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3(1)Kg</td>
<td>I Kings (III Kings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4(2)Kg</td>
<td>II Kings (IV Kings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Chr</td>
<td>I Chronicles (Paralipomenon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Chr</td>
<td>II Chronicles (Paralipomenon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ez</td>
<td>Ezra (I Esdras)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neh</td>
<td>Nehemiah (II Esdras)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tob</td>
<td>Tobit (Tobias)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jud</td>
<td>Judith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esth</td>
<td>Esther</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job</td>
<td>Job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ps</td>
<td>Psalms (Vulgate numbering)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prov</td>
<td>Proverbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccles</td>
<td>Ecclesiastes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cant</td>
<td>Canticles (Song of Songs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisd</td>
<td>Wisdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccclus</td>
<td>Ecclesiasticus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is</td>
<td>Isaiah (Isaias)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jer</td>
<td>Jeremiah (Jeremias)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lam</td>
<td>Lamentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar</td>
<td>Baruch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ezek</td>
<td>Ezekiel (Ezechiel)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>Daniel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hos</td>
<td>Hosea (Osee)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</td>
<td>Joel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am</td>
<td>Amos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ob</td>
<td>Obadiah (Abdias)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>Jonah (Jonas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mic</td>
<td>Micah (Micheas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nah</td>
<td>Nahum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hab</td>
<td>Habbakuk (Habacuc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeph</td>
<td>Zephaniah (Sophonias)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hag</td>
<td>Haggai (Aggaeus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zech</td>
<td>Zechariah (Zacharias)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mal</td>
<td>Malachi (Malachias)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Mac</td>
<td>I Maccabees (Machabees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Mac</td>
<td>II Maccabees (Machabees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt</td>
<td>Matthew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk</td>
<td>Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk</td>
<td>Luke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jn</td>
<td>John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ac</td>
<td>Acts of the Apostles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rom</td>
<td>Romans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Cor</td>
<td>I Corinthians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Cor</td>
<td>II Corinthians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal</td>
<td>Galatians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eph</td>
<td>Ephesians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil</td>
<td>Philippians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Col</td>
<td>Colossians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Thess</td>
<td>I Thessalonians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Thess</td>
<td>II Thessalonians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Tim</td>
<td>I Timothy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Tim</td>
<td>II Timothy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tit</td>
<td>Titus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philem</td>
<td>Philemon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heb</td>
<td>Hebrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas</td>
<td>James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Pt</td>
<td>I Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Pt</td>
<td>II Peter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1Jn</td>
<td>I John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Jn</td>
<td>II John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Jn</td>
<td>III John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jude</td>
<td>Jude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apoc</td>
<td>Revelation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Apocalypse)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ii) Periodicals

Ant
Antonianum. Periodicum Pontificii Athenaei Antoniani de Urbe (Rome, 1926-)

AHDLM
Archives d'histoire doctrinale et littéraire du Moyen Age. (Paris, Librairie Philosophique J. Vrin, 1926-)

AFH
Archivum Franciscanum Historicum (Grottaferrata, Roma, 1908-)

AFP
Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum (Rome, 1931-)

CF
Collectanea Franciscana (Rome, Istituto Storico dei Cappucini, 1931-)

Cord
The Cord. A Franciscan Spiritual Review (New York, Franciscan Institute, 1951-)

CH
Church History (New York, American Society of Church History, 1932-)

Euph
Euphrosyne. Rivista de filologia classica (1973-)

FF
La France Franciscaine (Lille, 1918-)

FS
Franciscan Studies (New York, Franciscan Institute, 1941-)

GR
Greyfriars Review (New York, Franciscan Institute, 1987-)

Itin
Itinerarium (Braga, 1955-)

IS
Il Santo: Rivista Antoniana de Storia Dottrina Arte. (Padua, Centro Studi Antoniani, 1961-)

MF
Miscellanea Franciscana. Rivista trimestrale di scienze teologiche e di studi francescani, a cura dei professori della Pontificia facoltà teologica 'S. Bonaventura' dei Frati Minori Conventuali (Rome, 1901-)

MRS
Medieval and Renaissance Studies (London, Warburg Institute, 1949-)

MS
Medieval Studies (Toronto, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1939-)

MSS
Medieval Sermon Studies (Leeds, International Medieval Sermon Studies Association, 1977-)

RTAM
Récherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale (Leuven, Peeters, 1934-)

Trad
Traditio (New York, Fordham University, 1943-)

iii) Other

CUP
Cambridge University Press

FHP
Franciscan Herald Press

OUP
Oxford University Press

OS
Omnibus of Sources for the Life of St Francis (ed. Habig; see Bibliography)

PL
Patrologia Latina (ed. Migne; see Bibliography)

SDF
Sermones Dominicales et Festivi (see Bibliography)
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