

SOME EXAMPLES OF AUGUSTINE'S INFLUENCE ON MEDIEVAL CHRISTOLOGY

Although Augustine is generally thought to be less original in his theology of Christ than in his teaching on the Trinity, grace, or the sacraments, his influence on medieval Christology was strong and often preponderant. One can see this in a material way simply by looking at the long lists of references to Augustine's works in editions such as, for example, those of Anselm's *Cur Deus homo* or Abelard's *Sic et non* in its Christological chapters (59-60), and even more by seeing how constantly Peter Lombard quotes Augustine concerning Christ in his *Sentences* or by examining Thomas Aquinas' use of Augustine in many of the first fifty-nine questions of the *tertia pars* of his *Summa theologiae*¹).

It would be impossible within the limits of this paper to assess even this material aspect of medieval quotation, much less to examine the full extent of Augustine's doctrinal influence or the degree to which his ideas were modified or even rejected. What is proposed here is to examine a few striking examples showing the role Augustine played in certain areas of medieval Christology. Four such examples will be examined: (1) the union in Christ, especially in relation to the three opinions given by Lombard; (2) the grace of union; (3) Christ's human knowledge; (4) Christ's saving work.

We are fortunate in having for this investigation the excellent background material in Augustine himself provided by the scholar we

¹) For the *Cur Deus homo* see *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi opera omnia*, ed. F.S. Schmitt, vol. 2 (Rome, 1940; Edinburgh, 1946), pp. 39-113, and *Pourquoi Dieu s'est fait homme*, introd., bibl., trans., notes by René ROQUES, Sources Chrétiennes, 91 (Paris, 1963), p. 505 for the references. For Abelard see *Peter Abailard Sic et Non*, eds. Blanche B. Boyer and Richard McKeon (Chicago-London, 1976-77), pp. 235-314. References to Peter will be to his *Sententiae in IV libris distinctae*, 3rd ed., 2 vols., eds. PP. Collegii S. Bonaventurae ad Claras Aquas [= Ignatius Brady] (Grottaferrata [Rome], 1971 [books 1-2] and 1981 [books 3-4]). The section on Christ is found in book 3, dd. 1-22; 2. 23-140; see also the list of references to Augustine, *ibid.*, pp. 572-75. Indexes of patristic quotations in Thomas Aquinas' *Summa contra Gentiles* and *Summa theologiae* are given in the Leonine edition, vol. 16 (Rome, 1948), pp. 194-204 and 255-57. A similar overview can be had from Alexander of Hales, *Glossa in quatuor libros Sententiarum Petri Lombardi*, vol. 3, dd. 1-22, eds. PP. Collegii S. Bonaventurae (Quaracchi, Florence, 1954), pp. 1-262, with excellent indices to Augustine on pp. 569-71.

honour. Professor Dr. van Bavel's study of Augustine's doctrine of the human and divine in Christ treats each of these areas in ways that will illuminate the selective use of Augustine made by representative medieval authors²).

1. THE THREE OPINIONS

When discussing how we are to understand statements such as 'God became man', 'the Son of God became the Son of Man', 'God is man', and 'Man is God', Peter Lombard summarized three differing ways of explaining these expressions, ways that arose from three differing opinions on how to understand (partially) the union of divine and human natures in the person of Christ. In the twelfth century Lombard's *Sentences* was glossed or used for their works by a number of theologians; in the early thirteenth century it began to be used in faculties of theology, and soon bachelors of theology were required to comment on the work before receiving the mastership in theology. Hence the three opinions given by Lombard were foci around which much of the theology of Christ moved.

In presenting the three opinions, Lombard, as usual, introduces many statements from the Fathers. It is not surprising, given the authority of Augustine, that proponents of each opinion sought his backing for their views, and Lombard shows how each group appealed to texts of Augustine for this purpose³). The first opinion, called by

²) See Tarsicius VAN BAVEL, *Recherches sur la christologie de saint Augustin: L'humain et le divin dans le Christ d'après saint Augustin*, Paradosis, 10 (Fribourg, Suisse, 1954). References will be given to his work within each of the following sections.

³) For Augustine himself, see T.J. VAN BAVEL, *Recherches*, chs. 2-3.

Lombard presents the opinions in 3 *Sent.*, dd. 6-7 (2. 49-66). The questions examined in distinction 10 (2. 72-77), whether Christ as man is *aliquid*, is adopted son or is predestined, are intimately linked to but not identical with the discussions of the mode of union according to the three opinions.

Although we speak of three opinions, a reading of the theologians of the late twelfth and early thirteenth century shows that there were not three uniform positions but rather three general groupings or tendencies, each with some common presuppositions and general agreement on answers to the various questions under debate.

For a brief survey of the evolution of these opinions see Walter H. PRINCIPE, *William of Auxerre's Theology of the Hypostatic Union*, vol. 1 of *The Theology of the Hypostatic Union in the Early Thirteenth Century*, Studies and Texts, 7 (Toronto, 1963), pp. 64-70, 196-208; this series (Toronto, 1963-1975) presents the views on the Hypostatic Union, often with reference to the three opinions, from William of Auxerre (vol. 1), Alexander of Hales (vol. 2), Hugh of Saint-Cher (vol. 3), and Philip the Chancellor (vol. 4). These volumes will be cited as *Hypostatic Union* 1, 2, 3, 4 respectively.

modern scholars the 'Assumptus-Theory' or 'Assumptus-Homo Theory'⁴), held, according to Peter Lombard, that a 'certain individual man (*quidam homo*) was constituted as a man from a rational soul and flesh' by a logical but not temporal priority to his being assumed by the Son of God. Early proponents are said to have maintained that this *homo assumptus* was not only united to the Word but *is* the Word; further, the Word began to be that human substance and it began to be God, the two natures nevertheless remaining distinct with their own properties⁵).

In describing the first opinion in distinction 6, Lombard gives eight texts from Augustine and one from Hilary that he finds quoted by proponents of this view. In distinction 7 he returns to some of these texts to show how they were interpreted by those of the other opinions and defended by those of the first opinion; he also adds a few further texts from Augustine that bolster the first opinion. Augustine's texts in distinction 6 speak of the *verus filius hominis* and say that because *ille* or *ipse homo* is constituted as such by intrinsic principles, Christ is 'one thing (*aliud*) on account of the Word and another thing (*aliud*) on account of the man', although the Son of God is one and not two sons. A number of such 'aliud et aliud' texts are added in distinction 7. Several of the texts also affirm that this man *began to be* and *is* the Son of God or one person with the Son of God: these are used to support the view that the man is the Word and is God. One text that will be frequently quoted speaks of Christ having a *gemina substantia* (or, in distinction 7, being a *persona ... geminae substantiae*), that is, the divine substance and the human, without the two 'substances' making Christ two (*utrumque autem simul non duo, sed unus est Christus*). It should be noted, however, that only one of the eight texts quoted in distinction 6 speaks of *ille homo ... assumptus*. On the other hand, in distinction 7 one text from Augustine does use the term *homo ... acceptus* explicitly and another speaks of the *homo* who *divinitati ... accessit*⁶).

⁴) This and the other names ('Subsistence-Theory' and 'Habitus-Theory') were given the opinions by B. BARTH on p. 423 of his study; 'Ein neues Dokument zur Geschichte der fröhscholastischen Christologie', *Theologische Quartalschrift* 100 (1919) 409-26, and 101 (1920) 235-62. These names have proved useful because medieval theologians sometimes changed Lombard's numbering.

⁵) Lombard, *Sent.* 3, d. 6, c. 2, no. 1; 2. 50. As Brady indicates in the notes to the edition of Lombard, Hugh of St. Victor appears to be the main author envisaged by Lombard; there were undoubtedly others associated with Hugh.

⁶) Ibid., c. 2, nos. 2-7 (2. 50-52), and d. 7, c. 1, nos. 11 and 13 (2. 63), where references are given not only to Augustine's works but also to the medieval works from which Lombard sometimes took them.

The second opinion, given the name 'Subsistence-Theory', seems to derive from Gilbert of Poitiers. According to Lombard, it held that

ille homo is constituted not only from a rational soul and flesh, but from the human and divine nature, that is, from three substances: divinity, flesh, and soul, whom they profess to be Christ and to be only one person — but before the Incarnation a simple person, whereas in the Incarnation made to be a person *composed* from the divinity and humanity.

For this opinion, Lombard adds, the person who was only a person of God becomes also a person of man while remaining one and the same person of God and man. 'Therefore, the person who before was simple and was existing in one nature, *subsists* in two natures and from two natures' or, again, '*subsists* not only from the soul and flesh but also from the divinity'⁷).

Do the supporters of this opinion find help from Augustine? Yes and no. The first text quoted by Lombard is taken from Odo of Lucca's *Summa sententiarum*, which at that time was thought to be from Augustine. It is really from Lanfranc and goes back in part to Berengarius⁸). The text was an apt authority for the second opinion because it compares the Eucharist, constituted from two elements, to 'the person of Christ, which is constituted and confected from God and man, since Christ is true God and true man, because every thing contains in itself the nature and truth of those things from which it is confected'⁹). The most important patristic support for this opinion comes from John Damascene, two of whose texts are quoted at some length: his texts speak of the simple person or hypostasis of the Word who in the Incarnation becomes a 'composite person', composed of the two perfect natures of divinity and humanity¹⁰). The authentic Augustine does, however, provide some help to proponents of this opinion. One text of his *De Trinitate* speaks of Jesus Christ, Son of God and Son of man, as being 'from each substance, divinity and

⁷) See *ibid.*, c. 3, no. 1 (2. 52-53). The word 'subsist' recurs several times and is the basis for the name given the opinion.

Gilbert's doctrine has been analyzed by N.M. HARING, 'The Case of Gilbert de la Porrée', *Mediaeval Studies* 13 (1951) 1-40, and in 'Sprachlogische und philosophische Voraussetzungen zum Verständnis der Christologie Gilberts von Poitiers', *Scholastik* 32 (1957) 373-98.

⁸) Lombard quotes it as 'Augustinus in libro *Sententiarum Prosperi*'. The details are given by Brady in the Quaracchi edition, p. 53, n. 1.

⁹) *Ibid.*, c. 3, no. 2; 2. 53.

¹⁰) *Ibid.*, c. 3, nos. 3-4; 2. 53-54.

humanity'; a second text from the same work speaks of the one person in Christ as coming to be 'from two substances' and therefore as coming to be 'from three: God, the soul, and flesh'¹¹). But once the unauthentic text of Lanfranc is eliminated, the second opinion can appeal to Augustine only for such brief and inconclusive statements.

The third opinion, now called the 'Habitus-Theory', reacted against the first two opinions. Fearing any change or composition in the divine person who became incarnate, it strongly rejected the 'composed person' of the second opinion. Again, fearing that the 'assumed man' of the first opinion would in effect be a human person, it denied that the soul and body of Christ, although united to each other and to the Word, were united *in such a way* as to produce some individual substance that would be a human person.

What was this third opinion's positive statement about the union? According to Lombard's summary, it held that when the human soul and body were united to the divine person, 'the Word of God was clothed with those two as by a garment so that he might fittingly appear to mortal eyes'. Further, 'he is said to become true man because he received the truth of flesh and soul ... When these two came to or 'acceded to' the Word (*illis duobus accedentibus Verbo*), the number of persons was not increased so as to produce a quaternity in the Trinity' and the person of the Word was not divided or changed but remained unchanged. 'Who, they say, was made man according to habitus'¹²).

While this view might have seemed strange and original at first sight, Lombard shows that it could muster a good number of Augustinian texts to support its particular views. The first text given by Lombard shows Augustine saying that the number of persons is not increased when man 'acceded' (*accedit*) to the Word to become one Christ¹³).

A more important Augustinian text now appears. It is the well-known text from Augustine's *De diversis quaestionibus LXXXIII* in which that doctor, discussing the most important scriptural text used by this opinion, *Habitu inventus est ut homo* (Phil 2: 7), distinguishes four species of habitus and applies the fourth species to the Incarnation. Using the example of a garment, which does not change the wearer while taking the form of the wearer, Augustine explains that in the

¹¹) Ibid., no. 5; 2. 54.

¹²) See *ibid.*, c. 4, nos. 1-3; 2. 55.

¹³) See *ibid.*, c. 5; 2. 56. However, Augustine's text as quoted says that *HOMO*, not soul and flesh, *accedit Verbo*.

Incarnation the Son of God was not changed in any way and, by 'having man' (his interpretation of *habitu ... homo*), appeared as man not for himself but for other human beings¹⁴). Four other texts of the bishop of Hippo are added by Lombard; they stress the lack of change in the Word of God when he was said 'to become' or 'to be made' man, or speak of him, the invisible, being 'clothed' with flesh so as to appear visibly and fittingly to persons of flesh¹⁵). One can see that Lombard's summary of the opinion is remarkably close to these texts of Augustine adduced in support of the Habitus-Theory.

Lombard's summary of the three opinions and his marshalling of texts present a remarkable case of the way Augustine's authority was respected and invoked by theologians of differing opinions. We cannot follow the vicissitudes of the three opinions here. Although both the second and third opinions taught a related but distinct doctrine that 'Christ as man is not «something» (*aliquid*)', papal condemnations of this proposition in 1170 and 1177 seemed to many to be directed against the Habitus-Theory; this seems to be the reason the Habitus-Theory faded away rather quickly. Those holding the second opinion, the Subsistence-Theory, managed to reinterpret their 'non-est-aliquid' teaching so as to avoid the condemnation. At the same time, its proponents criticized the first opinion, the Assumptus-Homo Theory, so effectively that this second opinion became the commonly held opinion in the schools of the thirteenth century¹⁶).

The way theological opinion accepted or rejected the opinions had an interesting effect on the role of Augustine's authority. On the one hand, a strong supporter of the 'Assumptus-Theory' such as John of Cornwall not only repeated Lombard's many texts favoring that opinion but added a considerable number of others, some culled directly from Augustine, others drawn from writings such as Peter Lombard's commentaries on the Psalms or on the Pauline letters¹⁷).

On the other hand, the loss of active support for the Habitus-Theory meant that the Augustinian texts associated with it were quoted

¹⁴) See *ibid.*, c. 6, nos. 1-3; 2. 56-57.

¹⁵) See *ibid.*, nos. 4 and 6; 2. 57, 58.

¹⁶) On Pope Alexander III's condemnations, the import of the *aliquid*-question, and the development of these theories after Lombard, see *Hypostatic Union* 1. 64-70, 196-208, as well as the views of the four authors studied in our series. See also Walter H. PRINCIPE, 'St. Thomas on the Habitus-Theory of the Incarnation', in *St. Thomas Aquinas, 1274-1974: Commemorative Studies*, 2 vols., eds. Armand Maurer et al. (Toronto, 1974) 1. 381-418.

¹⁷) See his *Eulogium ad Alexandrum Papam tertium*, ed. N.M. Haring, *Mediaeval Studies* 13 (1951) 256-300, esp. pp. 268-70.

less frequently. His long analysis of *habitus*, however, was to reappear in Thomas Aquinas, who paradoxically rejects the *Habitus-Theory* while accepting Augustine's teaching in this text about the lack of change in the divine person — one of the major concerns of the *Habitus-Theory*. Thus when an opening argument uses Paul's text, *habitu inventus est ut homo*, to show that there was an accidental union in Christ, Aquinas refutes the argument by quoting Augustine's text on *habitus*¹⁸).

Support for the first opinion, the *Assumptus-Homo Theory*, faded more gradually, but by the early decades of the thirteenth century this theory was generally rejected. This meant that the many Augustinian texts quoted by Lombard and John of Cornwall also diminished in importance. Most often they appear in arguments against the position adopted by the theologians who quote them. The reason is not hard to see. These theologians, strongly influenced both by the philosophy of Boethius as developed by Gilbert of Poitiers and by their increased use of John Damascene's *De fide orthodoxa*, opted for the *Subsistence-Theory*. In opposing the first opinion, they were led to reject or at least to reinterpret the Augustinian passages used to support this opinion¹⁹).

It is quite remarkable to read the commentaries on the *Sentences* of Alexander of Hales, Hugh of Saint-Cher, Bonaventure, and Thomas Aquinas concerning the mode of union in Christ and to discover how rarely Augustine is quoted. In Aquinas, Damascene and Boethius, together with some elements from Aristotle, dominate the field. In this area, then, one must note a considerable decline in the influence of Augustine; undoubtedly his authority was seen as too closely linked with the two opinions that fell out of favour in the thirteenth century.

2. THE GRACE OF UNION

Again we begin with Peter Lombard, who seems to be the first to have used the precise term *gratia unionis* in relation to the Incarnation, although Abelard, Gilbert of Poitiers, and their schools had taught the

¹⁸) See *Summa theologiae* 3, q. 2, a. 6, 1m and ad 1m. In fact, Thomas constantly sees the *Habitus-Theory* itself as teaching an accidental union. In this and other views he misinterprets the theory as it was taught in Lombard's time. See PRINCIPE, 'St. Thomas on the *Habitus-Theory*' (supra, n. 16).

¹⁹) See PRINCIPE, *Hypostatic Union* 4, pp. 191-205, for a summary of the evolution of opinions in the thirteenth century into the 1230's.

doctrine without using the term. This term and the concept it expresses entered debates about whether Christ was predestined to be Son of God, whether as man he was Son of God by nature or by adoption, whether he was impeccable, and whether the union was indissoluble²⁰).

In several places in his *Sentences* Lombard quotes texts of Augustine referring to the grace by which the union of man to God took place. When speaking of Christ's conception by the Holy Spirit and birth from Mary, Lombard gives a text from the *Enchiridion* in which Augustine says that

that mode by which Christ was born — from Mary as a son and from the Holy Spirit not as a son — indicates to us the *grace of God* by which the man, with no preceding merits, in the very beginning of his nature whereby he began to be, was joined to the Word of God in such a unity of person that the Son of God should be the same as the son of man and the son of man the same as the Son of God²¹).

Another text from the same work is cited in which Augustine speaks of 'that grace...' by which man 'is linked in a wondrous and ineffable mode to the Word of God'²²).

Two of the texts, already mentioned, that were used by supporters of the first opinion, include references to God's grace in relation to the Incarnation. The first quotes Augustine as saying:

In the Word I understand the true Son of God and in the flesh I acknowledge the true son of man, and each at the same time one person, God and man, joined together by the largesse of an ineffable grace²³).

²⁰) T.J. VAN BAVEL, *Recherches* (cit. supra, n. 2), pp. 37-41 and 93-101, presents different aspects of Augustine's views on grace in relation to the union in Christ and to his impeccability and predestination.

On the medieval context of the discussions, see Artur Michael LANDGRAF, 'Die Stellungnahme zum Adoptianismus', in his *Dogmengeschichte der Frühscholastik*, part 2, vol. 2 (Regensburg, 1954), pp. 7-43, and 'Die Unsündbarkeit Christi', *ibid.*, part 2, vol. 1 (Regensburg, 1953), pp. 320-70, as well as Ant. VUGTS, *La grâce d'union d'après s. Thomas d'Aquin: Essai historique et doctrinal* (Tilburg, 1946).

For the texts in Lombard see his *Sententiae* 1, d. 37, c. 1, no. 3 (l. 264), and 3, d. 10, c. 2, no. 5 (l. 76); cf. *ibid.* 3, d. 7, c. 1, no. 1 (l. 59) and c. 2, no. 1 (l. 65).

²¹) *Ibid.* 3, d. 4, c. 2, no. 3 (p. 39); from *Enchiridion* 12. 40 (CCL 46. 72; PL 40. 252). In the rest of the quotation Augustine is quoted as linking this grace with Christ's impeccability: 'that grace was in a certain way natural to that man so that it could admit no sin' (loc. cit.).

²²) Loc. cit.; from *Enchiridion* 13. 41 (CCL 46. 72; PL 40. 252-53).

²³) *Sent.* 3, d. 6, c. 2, no. 2 (l. 51); from *De Trinitate* 13. 19. 24 (CCL 50A. 415-16; PL 42. 1033). Augustine's text differs slightly from that of Lombard: it speaks of the Son of God and son of man as 'utrumque simul in unam personam dei et hominis ... coniunctum'.

The second compares the grace of each Christian to the grace of the Incarnation: 'Each person becomes a Christian by grace in the way that that man was made Christ from the beginning by grace'²⁴).

When opposing the idea that Christ might be the adopted son of God, Lombard again quotes a text of Augustine that sees the Incarnation as coming from grace: 'That the Only-begotten is equal to the Father is not from grace but from nature; but that the man is assumed in a unity of the person of the Only-begotten Son is from grace and not from nature'²⁵).

All these texts view God's grace or graciousness as the source of the Incarnation. The comparison of an ordinary person's grace with that of Christ in one of the texts does not, of course, put the two on an equal footing. What Augustine is stressing is the gratuity, the unmerited derivation, of each. It is interesting to note that in several of these texts Augustine's main concern is to show the utter gratuity of the gifts to ordinary Christians, and that within this concern he uses the Incarnation as a model. The medieval theologians, on the other hand, seized upon these texts as a starting-point for their speculations about the grace of union in Christ.

A text in this area, quoted by many but not by Lombard, was ascribed by some to Ambrose but by others to Augustine. It said: 'Quicquid convenit Filio Dei per naturam convenit [or inest] filio hominis per gratiam'. This text evidently refers to the Incarnation, although in this form it could be open to misinterpretation as tending to Monophysitism. The dictum as such is not found in Augustine but seems to be based on a text in his *Enchiridion*²⁶).

²⁴) Ibid., no. 6 (3, 52); from *De praedestinatione sanctorum* 15, 31 (PL 44, 982). Augustine's text reads: 'Ea gratia fit ab initio fidei suae homo quicumque Christianus, qua gratia homo ille ab initio suo factus est Christus'.

²⁵) *Sent.* 10, c. 2, no. 3 (p. 75); from *Tractatus in Ioannem*, tr. 74, no. 3 (CCL 36, 514; PL 35, 1828).

²⁶) For a list of some of the many authors who quoted this text in the twelfth century, see the editors' notes in *Summa Fratris Alexandri* 3, 139, n. 2, and Alexander of Hales, *Glossa ... Lombardi* (cit. supra, n. 1), 3.

The closest I have found is *Contra sermonem Arianorum*, 8 (PL 42, 688): 'Ipse namque unus Christus et Dei Filius semper natura, et hominis filius qui ex tempore assumptus est gratia...'. Cf. also *Enchiridion* 12, 40 (CCL 46, 72; PL 40, 252). Thomas Aquinas says it is in *De Trinitate* 1 (*Summa theologiae* 3, 1, 10, 3m; the editors give c. 13 [CCL 50, 69-79; PL 42, 840-44]).

See also Jean CHÂTILLON, '«Quidquid convenit Filio Dei per naturam convenit Filio Hominis per gratiam»: A propos de Jean de Ripa...', in *Miscellanea André Combes*, vol. 2 (Rome-Paris, 1967), pp. 319-31. It was constantly cited as an authority in the thirteenth century as well.

Although some texts from other authors are occasionally quoted, it seems quite certain that it was this group of Augustinian texts that led medieval theologians to speak of the union of the human and divine natures in the person of the Word as itself the result of God's grace. If Augustine did not use the actual term 'grace of union', he provided the basis for such an expression.

Within this Augustinian background as developed in the twelfth century, thirteenth-century theologians would ask further refined questions about the grace of union and its relation to the other graces of Christ, but these further questions generally found no authoritative basis in Augustine. One important development growing out of this problematic was to see the grace of union not only as the graciousness of God in giving but also as the effect itself produced. William of Auxerre seems to be the first to do this clearly²⁷). This, however, seems to go beyond Augustine's own statements. In any case, his influence was more significant for the general theme than for this and other later refinements such as whether Christ's human nature needed a grace preparing it to be worthy to be assumed in the Incarnation²⁸).

3. CHRIST'S HUMAN KNOWLEDGE

With respect to Christ's human knowledge, Augustine's most profound influence on western theology was through his viewing ignorance as the cause and also the result of sin; this doctrine he expressed most clearly in his *De peccatorum meritis et remissione*²⁹). Following his lead, theologians in the west rejected ignorance in Christ and by the same token found it difficult to see any growth in Christ's human knowledge other than by his concrete experience of what he already knew³⁰).

²⁷) See PRINCIPE, *Hypostatic Union* 1 (cit. supra, n. 3), pp. 106-109.

²⁸) On this question see PRINCIPE, *Hypostatic Union* 2. 157-73; 4. 114-22, and idem, 'Quaestiones concerning Christ from the First Half of the Thirteenth Century: I', *Mediaeval Studies* 39 (1977) 1-59, especially pp. 23-25 and 56-59.

²⁹) See 2. 29. 48; CSEL 60. 118-19; PL 44. 179-80.

³⁰) On Christ's human knowledge according to Augustine himself, see T.J. VAN BAVEL, *Recherches* (cit. supra, n. 2), ch. 6.

Studies of the theology of Christ's human knowledge by twelfth and thirteenth-century authors include the following: Artur Michael LANDGRAF, 'Das Wissen der Seele Christi', in his *Dogmengeschichte der Frühscholastik* 2. 2 (Regensburg, 1954), pp. 44-131; Laurence S. VAUGHAN, *The Acquired Knowledge of Christ according to the Theologians of the 12th and 13th Centuries* (Rome, 1957); William J. FORSTER, *The Beatific Knowledge of*

Abelard, for instance, quotes Augustine's text from the *De peccatorum meritis* in his *Sic et non*. It is somewhat surprising, however, that of the twenty-five authoritative texts Abelard gives in his chapter on Christ's human knowledge this is the only text from Augustine that he quotes³¹). Lombard also is sparing in his quotations of Augustine when, in distinctions 13 and 14 of book 3, he examines Christ's human knowledge. A text that he takes from his own *Glossa* is partly Augustine's; it deals with Christ's fullness of grace and leads Lombard into his own statements about Christ's fullness of knowledge³²). Later, when reporting the opinion of those who deny that Christ's knowledge was equal to God's or that Christ knew all that God knows, Lombard says they rely on the principle that 'the creature is in no way equal to the Creator', a statement that goes back to Augustine³³). Despite the Augustinian authority they use, Lombard rejects their opinion. He maintains that the soul of Christ, through the gift of wisdom and as united to the Word, knew all that God knows although not so clearly; hence Christ's knowledge is as extensive as God's but is not equal to God's knowledge and is less noble and less perfect than God's divine knowledge³⁴).

Others seem to have gone further than Lombard by asserting that Christ received the divine omniscience in his human nature. In both the twelfth and thirteenth centuries one meets this position argued on the basis of the text 'Whatever befits the Son of God by nature befits the Son of Man by grace', often assigned to Augustine³⁵).

Christ in the Theology of the 12th and 13th Centuries (Rome, 1958); John C. MURRAY, *The Infused Knowledge of Christ in the Theology of the 12th and 13th Centuries* (Windsor, Ont., Canada, 1963); Johannes T. ERNST, *Die Lehre der hochmittelalterlichen Theologen von der vollkommenen Erkenntnis Christi...*, Freiburger Theologischen Studien, 89 (Freiburg, 1971); Walter H. PRINCIPE, 'Quaestiones concerning Christ from the First Half of the Thirteenth Century: V: Quaestiones from Douai Ms. 434: Christ's Knowledge', *Mediaeval Studies* 50 (1988) 1-45.

³¹) See *Sic et non*, q. 73; ed. cit. (supra, n. 1), pp. 261-68; Augustine's text is on p. 166.

³²) See *Sent.* 3, d. 13, c. 1, no. 2 (2. 84); the text is partly from Augustine's *Epist.* 187, c. 13, no. 40 (CSEL 57. 117; PL 33. 847), and partly from Gilbert of Poitiers (thus Brady in his note on the sources, 2. 84).

³³) See *De natura et gratia*, c. 33, no. 37; CSEL 60. 261; PL 44. 265. In his edition of d. 15 Brady notes that the actual words are from Walter of Mortagne but that they reflect Augustine; see p. 89, n. 2.

In the thirteenth century Robert Kilwardby will appeal to this authoritative text of Augustine to assert that the Word is incomprehensible to the soul of Christ as well as to every other creature. See FORSTER, p. 62, n. 147.

³⁴) See *Sent.* 3, d. 14, c. 1, no. 3 (2. 90).

³⁵) On this text see above p. 963 and n. 26.

In the twelfth century, for example, Rolandus Bandinelli quotes it in an argument

Augustine wrestled several times with the text of Mark 13: 32, in which Christ is presented as saying that not even the Son knows the day or hour of the last judgment³⁶). Medieval authors frequently followed his view that because Christ had no ignorance, he really knew the day and hour, but did not know it in the sense that it was not his to teach what he knew to his disciples or others. Those, such as Odo Rigaldus, who wished to see some limitation in Christ's human knowledge, had to come to terms with Augustine's position³⁷). Again it is curious that both Abelard's *Sic et non* and Lombard's *Sentences* ignore the Augustinian texts on this subject³⁸). Augustine's solution nevertheless is quoted by later authors, for example, Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas³⁹).

After Lombard's time, the topics examined in relation to Christ's human knowledge became increasingly varied; in the thirteenth century these developments were crystallised into the distinction of three kinds of human knowledge in Christ, beatific, infused, and acquired knowledge. With respect to the beatific knowledge of Christ, the scholar we honour in this collection has contributed important views concerning the question whether Augustine held for such knowledge in Christ⁴⁰). In medieval discussions of Christ's beatific knowledge, several texts from Augustine seem to have influenced theologians to deny that this knowledge, which they accepted, involved comprehension of the divine essence. Bonaventure, for example, quotes Augustine's statement, 'That is comprehended whose limits can be circumscribed'. Using this authority, he argues that since no one can circumscribe the

that he himself rejects; see MURRAY, pp. 11-12. In the thirteenth century Thomas Aquinas likewise meets it as an argument; see *Summa theologiae* 3. 10. 1. 3m.

Some proponents of the first opinion seem to have held that Christ in his human nature possessed the divine omniscience. Lombard says that for this opinion 'that man had it by grace alone, and not from merits or nature, that he should be God or the Son of God [and] that he should have all the knowledge and power possessed by the Word, with whom he is one person' (*Sent.* 3, d. 6, c. 2, no. 9 [2. 52]).

³⁶) E.g., in *De Trinitate* 1. 12. 23 (CCL 50. 61; PL 42. 836); *Enar. in Ps.* 6: 1 (CCL 38. 27; PL 36. 90); *Enar. in Ps.* 36: 1 (CCL 38. 336; PL 36. 355).

³⁷) See FORSTER, p. 51.

³⁸) See *Sic et non*, q. 76 (ed. cit. [supra, n. 1], pp. 273-74), where seven authoritative texts are given. The text of Mark does not appear in the *Sentences*.

³⁹) For Albert see FORSTER, p. 58; for Aquinas see his *Summa theologiae* 3. 10. 2 ad 1m.

⁴⁰) T.J. VAN BAVEL, *Recherches* (cit. supra, n. 2), pp. 161-69, holds that for Augustine Christ in his human nature had the vision of God; in this he distances himself from A.-M. DUBARLE, 'La science humaine du Christ selon saint Augustin', *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques* 29 (1940) 244-63 (cf. idem, 'La connaissance humaine du Christ d'après saint Augustin', *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 18 [1941] 5-25).

divine immensity, no soul, not even Christ's, can comprehend God⁴¹). Robert Kilwardby quotes the same text at greater length in order to show the difference between seeing God and having a comprehensive knowledge of God⁴²).

A statement by Augustine that in heaven our thoughts will not be revolving (*volubiles*) or moving from one thing to another enters discussions about Christ's beatific knowledge or his knowledge of all things in the Word. In a question whether Christ knew all things 'under one aspect', Alexander of Hales gives an argument that quotes Augustine's text and concludes that since Christ was a *comprehensor*, he knew all things under one aspect⁴³). Alexander agrees with the argument when there is question of Christ's knowledge as *comprehensor* (and by a knowledge that he says is *secundum gratiam unionis*). But he also sees other types of knowledge in Christ in which there is discourse from one known thing to another although not from one unknown thing to another (here one is aware that, continuing the Augustinian tradition, he wishes to avoid any ignorance in Christ)⁴⁴).

Bonaventure meets the same text used to support the conclusion that the blessed and the soul of Christ know whatever they know actually and not only habitually. Bonaventure agrees with this argument only in part. For him this authoritative text is true of what is essential to glory but not to other things, and does not exclude the soul's moving from consideration of one thing to another⁴⁵). In a disputed question Thomas Aquinas quotes this same statement and then argues that since there is no succession in understanding the Word and things in the Word, the souls of the blessed and the soul of Christ know all they know in the Word actually and not habitually. Habitual knowledge, when actualized, would involve a succession in their thinking and knowledge. Nevertheless, although — indeed because — the knowledge had by the blessed or by Christ is actual and not

⁴¹) 3 *Sent.*, d. 14, a. 1, q. 2, sc. b; in vol. 3 of *Opera theologica selecta*, eds. PP. Collegii S. Bonaventurae (Quaracchi, Florence, 1941), p. 291. Augustine's text is from his *Epist.* 147 (often called *De videndo Deo*), c. 9, n. 21 (CSEL 44. 295; PL 33. 605).

⁴²) His longer statement is given in FORSTER, p. 61, n. 146. The Augustinian text is from *Epist.* 147, c. 9, no. 21 (CSEL 44. 295; PL 33. 605-606).

⁴³) Q. 42, m. 5, no. 37; in vol. 2 of *Quaestiones disputatae 'antequam esset frater'*, eds. PP. Collegii S. Bonaventurae (Quaracchi, Florence, 1960), pp. 725-26. Augustine's text is from his *De Trinitate* 15. 16. 26 (CCL 50A.501; PL 42. 1079).

⁴⁴) *Ibid.*, 39; p. 726.

⁴⁵) See 3 *Sent.*, d. 14, a. 2, q. 2, 1m and ad 1m; ed. cit. (supra, n. 41), 3. 303, 304-305.

habitual, they cannot know all that God can do. Hence the soul of Christ and those of the blessed do not comprehend God⁴⁶). In his *Summa theologiae* Aquinas quotes another text of Augustine saying that 'what comprehends itself is finite to itself'. On the basis of this text Aquinas argues that because the divine essence is not finite in comparison to the soul of Christ but rather exceeds it infinitely, the soul of Christ cannot comprehend the divine essence⁴⁷).

As theologians in the thirteenth century began to distinguish an infused knowledge and an acquired knowledge in Christ in addition to his beatific knowledge, another doctrine of Augustine had an extraordinary influence. This was his distinction between morning and evening knowledge in the angels⁴⁸). Although Augustine himself never applied this distinction to the human knowledge of Christ, theologians from the third decade of the thirteenth century onwards used it to analyze Christ's knowledge. For these theologians the clearer morning knowledge, by which the angels know things in the Word, was assimilated to Christ's knowledge as *comprehensor* of the divine essence by his beatific knowledge. On the other hand, the angels' less clear evening knowledge, by which they know things in their own natures, was assimilated to the infused knowledge they now discerned in Christ. A clear if somewhat later statement of this theme is given by Thomas Aquinas in his *Summa theologiae*⁴⁹).

While Augustine thus exercised a considerable influence in various questions concerning Christ's human knowledge, it is nevertheless true that in the thirteenth century the influx of psychological data from Aristotle and his commentators led to many new questions and

⁴⁶) See *De veritate*, q. 20, a. 5, Resp. An anonymous question in Douai MS. 434 quotes the text in order to conclude that the soul of Christ knew all things actually and not only habitually. See PRINCIPE, 'Quaestiones' (cit. supra, n. 30), q. 3, no. 15 (p. 36). The same author presents an argument that makes a curious application of a text from Augustine's *De civitate Dei* (22. 29. 2; CCL 48. 858; PL 41. 797) to prove that Christ saw all things before he sensed them and therefore did not have experiential knowledge (ibid., no. 4; p. 34).

⁴⁷) See 3. 10. 1 sc; Augustine's text is from his *De diversis quaestionibus LXXXIII*, q. 15; CCL 44A. 27; PL 40. 14-15.

⁴⁸) He develops this in *De Genesi ad litteram* 4. 23-24. 40-41 (CSEL 28. 122-24; PL 34. 312-13) and 5. 18. 36 (CSEL 28. 161; PL 34. 334).

⁴⁹) See 3. 9. 3. For details on this application of Augustine's teaching see the works cited above, n. 30, especially Murray, Ernst and Principe. Ernst entitles his whole third chapter (pp. 97-129) 'Das Modell «cognitio matutina-vespertina»: von der Angelologie und Protologie zu der Christologie'. In this chapter, dealing with authors from William of Auxerre to the *Summa fratris Alexandri*, he shows the importance of the Augustinian concepts for these theologians in their views on Christ's human knowledge.

solutions. Thus one sees Augustinian themes frequently intertwined with these new approaches.

4. CHRIST'S SAVING WORK

Since Augustine speaks so often and so eloquently about Christ and his saving work, it is no wonder that his name appears constantly in medieval theology concerned with this topic. Here only a few indications of his influence can be given⁵⁰). A concrete illustration of Augustine's influence can be seen by examining Anselm's *Cur Deus homo* and by seeing, through the excellent notes in Schmitt's edition, the Augustinian themes influencing Anselm. In some cases, to be sure, Augustine's ideas are put on the lips of Boso and are used to raise the problems that Anselm will try to settle in his own original way. Early in the work Boso suggests that God could take some man, who is not a divine person and is not from the 'sinful mass', and lead him to the free human race; this is a passing but clear reference to Augustine⁵¹).

In the following chapter Boso presents the objections of those who ask why our liberation is called 'redemption' and who further ask what was our captivity or in what prison we were held that we should need such redemption. Here he introduces a theme frequent among the Fathers, including Augustine, who speak of our captivity by the devil and the consequent need of a Redeemer⁵²). Boso presses Anselm with the argument of others that God could have forgiven and freed us without the suffering and death of Christ: to say he could not do so would be to impute lack of power to God. This may reflect Augustine's statement, which will be frequently quoted, in answer to the same sort of question: 'We show that another way [of liberating us] was not lacking to God, but that there was not, nor there ought to have been, another more fitting way of healing our misery⁵³).

Boso raises still another problem. Why should we say that God

⁵⁰) T.J. VAN BAVEL, *Recherches* (cit. supra, n. 2), chs. 4-5, presents several elements of Augustinian doctrine that are related to Christ's saving work.

⁵¹) See *Cur Deus homo* 1. 5; ed. cit. (supra, n. 1), 2. 52. For Augustine see, e.g. *Sermo* 26. 12. 13 (PL 38. 177), and *Sermo* 22. 9. 9 (PL 38. 153-54). All references to Augustine in relation to Anselm's work are taken from Schmitt's edition; chapter references to the work will be followed only by the page reference to volume 2 of Schmitt's edition.

⁵²) *Cur Deus homo* 1. 6; 53. See Augustine, *Sermo* 27. 2. 2 (PL 38. 179).

⁵³) *Cur Deus homo* 1. 6; 53-54. Augustine's text is from his *De Trinitate* 13. 10. 13 (CCL 50A. 399-400; PL 42. 1024).

had to act with justice toward the devil rather than by the simple exercise of his power? Augustine frequently stated that God should have acted with justice rather than with power, and his view would be repeated by many medieval theologians⁵⁴).

Anselm will resolve these issues in his own way, often by delicately side-stepping the Augustinian positions. But he follows Augustine and other Fathers in one theme that is central to his whole structure of *rationes necessariae*. This is the opinion that human beings are to be saved in order to make up for the number of fallen angels who are no longer part of the heavenly city⁵⁵).

Although Abelard stands in strong opposition to several of these Augustinian themes as well as to Anselm's theory, he does in passing admit that if the devil has no rights over the human race, God may have permitted that we be 'handed over to the devil, as to a prison-guard or torturer, for our punishment'⁵⁶). In this respect he echoes one aspect of Augustine's view even while rejecting the idea of expiation or the paying of Christ's blood as a price to anyone⁵⁷).

Peter Lombard's presentation of Christ's saving work in book 3, distinctions 18 to 20, shows no sign of the interventions of either Anselm or Abelard. For the most part, his doctrine is that of Augustine. In addition to his quoting texts concerning the possibility of another mode of salvation and God's acting with the devil out of justice⁵⁸), Lombard also gives a number of Augustinian texts that describe Christ's reconciling work and that speak of Christ as Mediator⁵⁹). Thus, because Lombard's *Sentences* were so frequently glossed or commented on, the Augustinian themes were always present to later theologians.

Anselm's ascendancy does not seem to have occurred until the thirteenth century, and even then Augustine's views and texts continued

⁵⁴) *Cur Deus homo* 1. 7; 55-57. Schmitt refers to many texts (notes, p. 56), chief among them *De Trinitate* 13. 12-14 (CCL 50A. 402-407; PL 42. 1026-28), but also the *Enchiridion*, *De libero arbitrio*, and several sermons.

⁵⁵) See *Cur Deus homo* 1. 16-18; 74-84. Schmitt gives references to several works of Augustine, including his *De civitate Dei* 14. 26 (CCL 48. 450; PL 41. 435).

⁵⁶) *Commentaria in epistolam Pauli ad Romanos*; ed. E.M. Buytaert, CCM 11. 115.

⁵⁷) *Ibid.*; pp. 116-17.

⁵⁸) Augustine's teaching on another mode is given in d. 20, c. 1 (2. 125); that on justice is given in d. 20, cc. 2-3 (2. 125-27).

⁵⁹) See d. 19, c. 6, no. 2 (2. 122-23) on reconciliation, and d. 19, c. 7, no. 1 (2. 123-24) on Christ as Mediator.

to exercise an important influence⁶⁰). The interplay of Augustinian themes with texts from Anselm can be seen in a question of the first part of the thirteenth century (before 1236) by a certain Master Guido who may be Guido of Orchelles. Augustine's views on justice and another possible mode are quoted, but the author seems to favor Anselm's approach, except that, as often happened in the thirteenth century, he softens the necessity that Anselm tried to prove and in a sense returns to Augustine's position that if another mode was possible, none was more fitting to save us⁶¹).

Passing over other authors, we may conclude this survey by examining Thomas Aquinas' *Summa theologiae*. One of the richest collection of Augustinian texts is given by Aquinas when he asks whether the Incarnation was necessary for the reparation of the human race⁶²). After stating that the Incarnation was not absolutely necessary (and thus already rejecting the necessity of Anselm's reasons), Aquinas says that it was necessary as the better and more fitting way to achieve reparation. He begins by quoting Augustine's text that we have seen above⁶³). Aquinas then gives five ways in which the Incarnation promotes our good and five ways in which it helps us against evil. Displaying an extraordinary knowledge of Augustine's works, Thomas supports every one of the ten ways with a text from Augustine; several are from Augustine's *De Trinitate* but five other works are also quoted. This is one of the richest articles in the whole *Summa theologiae*, and its richness and beauty are in great part owing to the presence of so many texts from Augustine.

The following article addresses a question that had arisen only recently in the schools, whether God would have become incarnate if we had not sinned. Two of the opening arguments quote Augustine to back their affirmative reply to the question. One appeals to Augustine's remark that, besides absolution from sin, 'many other things are to be

⁶⁰) On the development of the theology of Christ's saving work see E. DE CLERCK, 'Questions de sotériologie médiévale', *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 13 (1946) 150-84; idem, 'Droits du démon et nécessité de la rédemption', *ibid.* 14 (1947) 32-64; idem, 'Le dogme de la rédemption: de Robert de Melun à Guillaume d'Auxerre', *ibid.* 252-86; Bruno KOROSAK, 'Le principali teorie soteriologiche dell'incipiente e della grande scolastica', *Antoniano* 37 (1962) 327-36, 423-66; Walter H. PRINCIPE, 'Quaestiones concerning Christ from the First Half of the Thirteenth Century: II...: The Need for the Incarnation; The Defects Assumed by Christ', *Mediaeval Studies* 42 (1980) 1-40.

⁶¹) See the analysis of the text and the edition in PRINCIPE, 'Quaestiones ... II' (cit. *supra*, n. 60), 6-14, 21-33.

⁶²) See 3. 1. 2.

⁶³) See p. 969.

considered in Christ's Incarnation'⁶⁴). The other uses Augustine's position that Adam could not know he would fall; yet, the argument says, he knew the mystery of the Incarnation before he fell, so that it would have taken place even if he did not fall⁶⁵).

In the *sed contra* Thomas quotes for the negative position a passage from Augustine and a text of the *Glossa ordinaria* based on Augustine. In the first Augustine says expressly: 'If man had not sinned, the Son of Man would not have come'⁶⁶). The text of the gloss says that 'there was no cause for Christ the Lord's coming except to save sinners. Remove the sickness, remove the wounds, and there is no need for medicine'⁶⁷). After his own response to the question, based entirely on scripture, Thomas replies to the first argument and its Augustinian text with a passage from Augustine's *Tractatus in Joannem*⁶⁸).

Although Aquinas' long discussions of the life of Christ quote Augustine frequently enough, his texts are surrounded by passages from many other Fathers; the wide range of authorities quoted, including a number of Eastern Fathers, undoubtedly reflects Aquinas' extensive readings preparatory to writing his *Catena aurea*. When Aquinas comes to discuss Christ's saving passion and death, he departs to some extent from Augustine in two important ways. First, he uses Anselm's doctrine of Christ's satisfactory work, albeit with significant modifications. Second, he shows great originality in applying the notion of the instrumental causality of Christ's humanity when analyzing the effects of Christ's passion, death, and resurrection.

Nevertheless, although these themes are not found in Augustine, his influence on Aquinas continues in several ways. For instance, Anselm's approach is modified by Thomas' insistence that Christ's human meriting and satisfying work are done by Christ as Head for his

⁶⁴) *Summa theologiae* 3. 1. 3. 1m. The text is from Augustine's *De Trinitate* 13. 17. 22 (CCL 50A. 412; PL 42. 1031).

⁶⁵) *Ibid.*, 5m. The reference is to Augustine, *Super Genesim ad Litt.* 11. 18. 23-24 (CSEL 28. 350-51; PL 34. 438-39).

⁶⁶) This text occurs in Augustine's *Sermones ad populum*, 174. 2. 2 (PL 38. 940), where he is expounding the text of Luke 19: 10: 'The Son of Man came to seek and save what had been lost'.

⁶⁷) The text is based on Augustine, *Sermones ad populum*, 175. 1. 1; PL 38. 945.

⁶⁸) Tr. 2, no. 16 (in 1: 14) (CCL 36. 19; PL 35. 1395-96): '... caro te caecauerat, caro te sanat ... quoniam sic uenit ut de carne uitia carnis exstingueret'.

members intimately joined to him by faith and the sacraments of faith. This represents an Augustinian correction of what a hasty reader of Anselm might think an extrinsic transactional view of Christ's meriting and satisfying⁶⁹). Equally influential on Thomas are Augustine's texts on priesthood, oblation and sacrifice when the Angelic Doctor discusses Christ's priesthood, mediation, and saving work by way of sacrifice. Augustine's definition of sacrifice as a visible sacrament or sacred sign of an invisible sacrifice heads Aquinas' presentation of Christ as both priest and victim⁷⁰). Another text from Augustine supports Thomas' own argument that 'the daily sacrifice offered in the Church is not other than Christ's own sacrifice but is a commemoration of it'⁷¹). And when Thomas presents Christ's passion as operating by way of sacrifice, he constantly weaves together passages from book 10 of the *De civitate Dei* and book 4 of the *De Trinitate*⁷²). Finally, Augustinian texts also occur fairly regularly in Aquinas' study of Christ's resurrection, ascension, sitting at God's right hand and ruling power⁷³).

CONCLUSION

Although limited to four specific areas and to a relatively small selection of authors, our study indicates the strong influence of Augustine on medieval Christology. At the same time it shows that in

⁶⁹) Although in the *Cur Deus homo* Anselm does not strongly assert an intrinsic link between Christ's satisfactory work and those he saves, he does have some indications of it; see especially *Cur Deus homo* 2. 19-20 (ed. Schmitt, 2. 129-32). Our intrinsic link to Christ as Head, and our sharing his death and resurrection mystically and sacramentally, is expressed far more clearly and beautifully in Anselm's *Oratio* 3 (ed. Schmitt, 3. 10), a prayer to be said in preparation for receiving the Eucharist.

Although Bonaventure is rather sparing in direct quotations, he does include a number of Augustinian texts within his discussion of Christ's meriting. See his 3 *Sent.*, d. 18, aa. 1-2; ed. cit. (supra, n. 41), 3. 372-84.

⁷⁰) See *Summa theologiae* 3. 22. 2. The well-known text of Augustine is from *De civitate Dei* 10. 5 (CCL 47. 277; PL 41. 282).

⁷¹) *Summa theologiae* 3. 22. 3 ad 2m. Cf. the text Thomas quotes from Augustine, *De civitate Dei* 10. 20 (CCL 47. 294; PL 41. 298): 'Per hoc et sacerdos est, ipse offerens, ipse et oblatio. Cuius rei sacramentum cotidianum esse uoluit ecclesiae sacrificium'.

⁷²) See *Summa theologiae* 3. 48. 3, Resp. The texts are from *De civitate Dei* 10. 6 (CCL 47. 278-79; PL 41. 283-84), 10. 20 (CCL 47. 294; PL 41. 298), and *De Trinitate* 4. 14. 19 (CCL 50. 186-87; PL 42. 90). One argument and reply (2m and ad 2m) debates the text of Augustine's definition of sacrifice seen above (cf. n. 70). Another reply is cast almost entirely in terms of Augustine's text on the fittingness of the human, mortal but pure, flesh of Christ being offered in sacrifice; it is from *De Trinitate* 4. 14. 19 (CCL 50. 186; PL 42. 901).

⁷³) See *ibid.*, qq. 53-59 *passim*.

some respects the great doctor's teachings were modified, or his influence lessened, by the advent of other texts. This was already true in the twelfth century but became more pronounced in the thirteenth century. Yet even within these changes Augustine's views often acted as a corrective and even at times served as a catalyst for new insights, as when his views on morning and evening knowledge were applied to Christ's knowledge.

The examples we have given suggest that more extensive and more detailed systematic research into Augustine's influence on medieval Christology (and indeed on other theological topics) would be a fruitful undertaking. For one thing, it would help better to understand the extent and range of Augustine's influence. Also, by clarifying how his doctrines were both received and modified, it would offer insights not only into the development of medieval theology but also into some of the general processes working within the history of theology and historical theology⁷⁴).

Toronto

Walter H. PRINCIPE C.S.B.

⁷⁴ On this last point see our essay, 'The History of Theology: Fortress or Launching Pad?', in *The Sources of Theology. Current Issues in Theology*, 3. Eds. John P. Boyle and George Kilcourse (Louisville, KY 40104: Bellarmine College, 1988), pp. 19-40; also published in *Proceedings of the Forty-Third Annual Convention of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 43 (1988) 19-40.