

INTRODUCTION

DE CONSOLATIONE IN ADVERSIS is a treatise in Latin attributed to Basil of Caesarea, found among works of Augustine and Jerome in a ninth-century manuscript, which is the oldest witness I have used for this edition. It is the only work ascribed to Basil found among those pieces. It also appears in an early sixteenth-century codex as part of a collection of documents either by or addressed to Eucherius of Lyons which also contains writings by Jerome. *De consolatione in adversis* (hereafter *Cons.*) is one of three works in Migne's edition of Basil, which are transmitted in Latin with no known Greek original. It largely concerns offering comfort to victims of leprosy. Basil's authorship of *Cons.* began being challenged in the second half of the seventeenth century. Scholars, such as William Cave, Louis Ellies du Pin, Louis-Sébastien Le Nain de Tillemont, and others attributed this work to Victor of Cartenna, an African bishop of the fifth century. The basic argument for this attribution was that a lost treatise by Victor of Cartenna addressed to "a certain Basil" was assigned to Basil of Caesarea on account of confusion. The name of the addressee in Victor's treatise would have become the name of the author, possibly due to ignorance.

In his edition of Basil in the first half of the eighteenth century, Julien Garnier intimates to his readers the conjecture of an unnamed source attributing *Cons.* to "a certain Gaul." In the nineteenth century, the question of authorship was reassessed. Franz Görres both challenged Basil's authorship of *Cons.* and rejected Cave, du Pin, and Tillemont's attribution of this piece to Victor of Cartenna. He referred to the indication in the title of *Cons.*, viz., *incerto sed antiquo interprete* (by an uncertain yet ancient translator; unless otherwise noted, all translations are my own), in Garnier's edition of 1721–1730 as one of the reasons arguing against identifying *Cons.* with Victor's lost work. He also observed that there was no allusion to any Basil in *Cons.* Bruno Czapla upheld again the theory of Victor's authorship of *Cons.*, while Otto Bardenhewer rejected this view. Bardenhewer also made the important remark that the treatise does not address a specific person and noted that the term *frater* (brother), which occurs many times in the text, is in fact a reference to the reader in various plights. In the twentieth century, Eligius Dekkers provisionally assigned the treatise to a Gallic author. It was

Dekkers who, in a communication dated January 1973, singled out the text as one in need of further scholarly investigation and a critical edition. This convinced me to take up the challenge as the subject of my PhD.¹

What Fr. Dekkers's challenge meant for me was that the text's history, its attribution to Basil of Caesarea, its historical interest, its potential for integration into the interdisciplinary field of disability studies, and its relevance to a wider audience deserved launching an inquiry into its literary and historical contents. Such an inquiry would likewise imply an effort to track down the treatise's provenance and, if feasible, to tentatively identify its author as well. My work seeks to make this text more widely available by offering a much-needed modern English translation alongside the Latin original with explanatory notes and a contextual introduction. My research establishes that *Cons.* is a consolatory sermon in overall diatribal style. Considering its hybrid nature, *Cons.* is thus akin to pre-Christian predecessors, such as Plutarch's treatises, the discourses of Dio and Maximus, and the letters of Seneca. I demonstrate that the diatribal features in *Cons.* ought to be construed in the context of its goal of offering moral support to victims of leprosy and of the overall profile of its literary genre, which functions as a medium for disseminating moral-philosophical propaganda. Besides showing the connection of *Cons.* to the Stoic-Cynic diatribe, I also examine the probable direct indebtedness of *Cons.* to a specific Stoic source and point out pertinent Stoic features. The sermon's distinctive Stoic ethical theses are to be expected considering the large-scale amalgamation of Christian and Stoic elements in the early Church.

In closing, I hope to show that not only historical but likewise spiritual value attaches to *Cons.*, which is most likely a homily delivered in a kind of hospice setting by a saintly Frankish queen. I suggest a provisional date of *Cons.* in the sixth century AD. The reason for this claim lies in the character of the piece's Latinity, the analysis of its metrical and accentual features, and its focus on leprosy and lepers. Considering the probable date of the treatise, its content, its concentration on the plight of the lepers, and other stylistic and exegetical components, I reached the conclusion that the probable author of *Cons.* is St. Radegunde of Poitiers.

Finally, I would like to note that all Latin phrases throughout this book, occurring in in-text citations and footnotes, have been translated into English, including all *Cons.* quotations whose translation is important for the argument. However, *Cons.* quotations cited merely to illustrate linguistic or

¹ Synodinos, "A Critical Edition of Ps.-Basil."

metrical idiosyncrasies of the text will remain untranslated. The English rendition of such quotations can be readily found in the translated text, “Solace on Tribulation—Translation.”

The Latinity of *Cons.*

A number of phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical elements in *Cons.* impart an unquestionably Vulgar Latin character to the work—more in line with what we believe to have been colloquial, spoken Latin as opposed to literary or elite Latin.² Moreover, some of the Vulgar Latin elements seem to point tentatively in the direction of Gaul as the likely place of provenance of the text. This assertion is based upon observations stemming from the established text of this edition, which largely relies on Tours, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 281 (hereafter Tours, BM, MS 281).³ Some typical phonological changes and pertinent examples found in *Cons.* are as follows:

2 Vulgar Latin is a term used to designate the form of the Latin tongue that arises from early classical Latin. It is the outgrowth, not a breakaway by-product, of classical Latin and differs from it in encompassing all Latin linguistic phenomena that do not conform to classical Latin norms. It was the medium of communication and expression of the middle classes of the Roman Empire, being more or less distinct to the area where it was used. In other words, consistent with the universal tendency of living tongues to be unsteady and with their fissiparous inclination to diverge, Vulgar Latin grew peculiar to the locality where it evolved, integrating regional elements, such as linguistic mannerisms and physical habits of native speakers, local accent, colloquialisms, etc. But it is important to emphasize that Vulgar Latin is not—as Grandgent puts it in *An Introduction to Vulgar Latin*—“the dialect of the slums or of the fields” and that “it is distinct from the consciously polite utterance of cultivated society, from the brogue of the country, and from the slang of the lowest quarters of the city, though affected by all of these” (3). As regards *Cons.*, it is paramount to establish its Vulgar Latin character, which is fundamental in dating the text, inasmuch as the text comes down to us entirely normalized, meaning in a classical Latin form, which is unguenine and artificial for this text.

3 The Latin text of this edition is a revised version of my dissertation’s Latin text. It is based on two witnesses: Tours, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 281 and Caen, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 34 (373) (hereafter Caen, BM, MS 34 (373)). For Tours, BM, MS 281, see Dorange, *Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque de Tours*, 158; Delisle, *Notices et extraits des manuscrits*, vol. 31.1, pp. 209–10; and Bibliothèque nationale de France, MS nouvelle acquisition latine (nouv. acq. lat.) 445 in Delisle, *Fonds Libri et Barrois*, 24. For Caen, BM, MS 34 (373), see Lavallay, *Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque municipale de Caen*, 191. A new, annotated Spanish and Latin edition of Ps.-Basil’s *Cons.* has recently appeared in the Corpus Christianorum series, edited by Álvaro Cancela Cilleruelo.

ē > i⁴

Cons. 8.357 *sordis* (nom. plur.)

Cons. 12.483, 485 *putridinem*

Cons. 6.283 *diliciis*

ae > i and i > ae

Cons. 3.112 *dulcedo qui* (=quae)

Cons. 4.195–96 *qui* (=quae)...conata est

Cons. 4.135 *quae* (=qui)

ō > u⁵

Cons. 3.87–88 *adversarius* (acc. plur.)

Cons. 12.466 *dubius et incredulus* (acc. plur.)

Cons. 4.174 *tutundit*

ū > i and i > u⁶

Cons. 11.444–45 *sini* (=sinu? sinibus?)

Cons. 3.104 *durissimum* (=dirissimum)

a > e,⁷ a > i⁸

Cons. 8.360 *expellet* (=expellat)

Cons. 10.410 *exponit* (=exponat)

x > cx

Cons. 3.71 *extincxerat*

t > d⁹

Cons. 5.249 *confidere* (=confiteri)

b > v

Cons. 3.60 *scrutaveris*

4 ē > i changes are very common in Gaul. For other such instances in this text, see *Cons.* 3.102, 121; 4.156, 163, 193; 6.278; 11.448; 13.530, 531, 534, 535. See Grandgent, *An Introduction to Vulgar Latin*, 83–84; Väänänen, *Latin vulgaire*, 36.

5 See Väänänen, *Latin vulgaire*, 36.

6 This change is peculiar to the northwest of the Empire and specifically to Northern Italy, Rhaetia, and Northern Gaul. See Schuchardt, *Der Vokalismus des Vulgärlateins*, vol. 2, p. 192.

7 Geyer, “Beiträge zur Kenntnis des gallischen Lateins,” 43–44.

8 Bresslau, *Handbuch*, vol. 2, p. 337.

9 According to Loth, *Les mots latins dans les langues brittoniques*, 26: intervocalic voiceless mutes (c, p, t) did not weaken markedly in Gaul before the second half of the sixth century but were in fact voiced at the onset of the seventh century.

Noteworthy is the consistent use of double l in (*ne*) *vellis* in *Cons.* 1.16 and 12.496 for the possibility that this form may be modeled on an indicative *vellis*, which is peculiar to Gallic Latin.¹⁰ Single and double consonant confusion also occurs, reflecting the gradual weakening of the consonants.¹¹ Some typical morphological changes and pertinent examples found in *Cons.* are as follows:¹²

Grammatical gender change¹³

class.: *dolor, oris*, m.

Cons.: *dolor, oris*, f.

Cons. 8.360 *dolorem...per quam*

class.: *granum, i*, n.

Cons.: *granum, i*, m.

Cons. 12.471–72 *granum...habentem*

class.: *caput, itis*, n.

Cons.: *caput, itis*, m.

Cons. 4.174–75 “ac sui capitis comam tutundit et in eum terrae pulverem sparsit”

Deponent to passive change

class.: *persequor, cutus*, 3, v. dep. act. and neut.

Cons. *persequor, cutus*, 3, v. pass.

Cons. 3.92–93 *ab Esau...persequeretur*

¹⁰ Bresslau, *Handbuch*, vol. 2, p. 337.

¹¹ Bonnet, *Le latin de Grégoire de Tours*, 155–56; cf. *Cons.* 1.6 *accomoda*, 4.190 *tollerantia*, 4.194 *excelentia*, 6.286 *sera linea*: *sera* is reduced from *serra* and *linea* from *linnea*—being itself an instance of assimilation, *linnea* = *lignea*. For *gn* = *nn* or *n*, see Schuchardt, *Der Vokalismus des Vulgärlateins*, vol. 1, pp. 115–16. See also *Visio Pauli*, in James, ed., *Apocrypha Anecdota*, 40: “Ego sum Esayas cui secavit Manasses <c>aput serra linnea.”

¹² For *dolor* turning feminine, in the first *Cons.* sample cited in this section, see Grandgent, *Vulgar Latin*, 144; Bonnet, *Le latin de Grégoire de Tours*, 504.

¹³ For the fusion of masculine and neuter inflections in the second sample cited in this section, see Grandgent, *Vulgar Latin*, 145–46: “[T]he masculine and neuter inflections came to be fused,” [and] “nearly all neuters became masculine”; cf. Rönisch, *Itala und Vulgata*, 277; Bonnet, *Le latin de Grégoire de Tours*, 345, 383; Väänänen, *Latin vulgaire*, 107–12.

Syntax in *Cons.*, no less than phonology and morphology, displays a fair amount of Vulgar Latin and late Vulgar Latin features. Some typical samples containing such features are as follows:

The use of instrumental *in*:¹⁴

Cons. 3.101–2 “in amore adoliscantis turpiter conligata est”

Cons. 4.164–65 *in invidiae livore exarsit*

Use of the superlative for the positive.¹⁵

Cons. 3.64 *carissimum filium*

Cons. 3.92 *maximas tribulationes*

Cons. 5.229–30 *plurima multitudine*

Accusative absolute¹⁶

Cons. 7.322 *interrupta castra Philistinorum*

Confusion in the use of the ablative and the accusative¹⁷

Cons. 1.7–8 *si...paenuriae pondus opprimeris*

Cons. 2.32–33 *cum dei iudicium duris examinatur laboribus*

Cons. 3.97 *scalorem se sacci operiens*

Cons. 3.57–58 *omnem laetitia perfrui*

Confusion in the construction of the prepositions

Cons. 9.388 *ab his perfidiae cogitationes*

Cons. 4.210–11 *ad haec me egestate perducere*

Cons. 8.357 *per huiusmodi languoribus*

14 Mohrmann, *Études sur le latin des chrétiens*, vol. 3, pp. 58–59, 220–22; Löfstedt, *Syntactica*, vol. 2, p. 452; Greenough and Allen, *Allen and Greenough’s New Latin Grammar*, 252n1; Woodcock, *A New Latin Syntax*, 32.

15 Rönsch, *Itala und Vulgata*, 415; Grandgent, *Vulgar Latin*, 33. See also 86n2 in “On Solace in Tribulation—Translation” below.

16 The possibility that this is a case of nominative rather than of an accusative absolute cannot be ruled out.

17 Bonnet, *Le latin de Grégoire de Tours*, 154–55, uses the term “l’ablatif-accusatif.”

Adverbial use of the genitive¹⁸

Cons. 6.276–78 “permittit...ingentium valitudinum membra nostra
pulsare [=pulsari]”

Cons. 5.227 *terrae...sepulturam*

Cons. 9.371 *murorum habitus*

Frequent use of *nominativi pendentes* (“dangling” nominatives)¹⁹

Cons. 4.175–76 “nec tamen, haec faciens, in verba blasphemiae mens
eius inflexa est”

Change in verb constructions²⁰

Cons. 11.426–27 *nec infirmitate aliqua ultra subiacet caro*

To the phonological, morphological, and syntactical evidence attesting to the Vulgar Latin character of *Cons.*, one more component may be added, viz., the occurrence of some Early Latin features among the linguistic elements studied.²¹ The significance of the latter observation rests on the tenet of the close affinity of the Latin of the ancient Church with its contemporary Vulgar Latin, the latter of which had itself retained an abundance of archaic elements.²² Albeit the linguistic evidence produced so far rests solely on Tours, BM, MS 281—the main witness of this edition—and is by no means exhaustive. Nonetheless, it seems to help authenticate the Latinity of the piece and place it more firmly within its own time frame. This time frame is highly likely the sixth century AD, as I will endeavour to show.

18 Norberg, *Beiträge zur spätlateinischen syntax*, 33; Kalén, *Studia in Iordanem Philologica*, 52. This is the so-called *genitivus contra rationem* (counterintuitive genitive); see “*De consolatione in adversis*—Latin Text” below, 72n50.

19 The “dangling” nominative (*nominativus pendens*) is amply evidenced in Augustine’s *Sermones*; see Mohrmann, *Études sur le latin des chrétiens*, vol. 1, pp. 299–321. This nominative is taken as a type of anacoluthon in Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, 672. Cf. *Cons.* 2.44–48; 3.84–86; etc.

20 The *Cons.* reading cited may be defended by analogy to specimens of the same construction collected by Norberg from Frankish and other Germanic literature of the sixth and the seventh centuries; see Norberg, *Syntaktische Forschungen*, 145.

21 Such Early Latin elements in *Cons.* involve the parallel occurrence of the deponent and the active form of the same verb as, for instance, in *Cons.* 6.287 *opera perpetratus est* and *Cons.* 7.305 *crimina perpetravit*; the occasional use of the acc. with *careo* and *indigeo*, verbs that govern the acc. in Early Latin but the abl. in Classical Latin (*Cons.* 1.11–12 *multitudinem, turbas carueris*, *Cons.* 5.245 *indigebat auxilium*) etc.; see Mohrmann, *Études sur le latin des chrétiens*, vol. 3, pp. 39–45, vol. 4, pp. 24–26; and Lindsay, *Syntax of Plautus*, 53–54.

22 Mohrmann, *Études sur le latin des chrétiens*, vol. 4, p. 24; and Marx, “Über die Beziehungen des Altlateins zum Spätlatein,” 434–48.

Date

The absolute terminus post quem for the composition of *Cons.* must be set at the first quarter of the fifth century AD on the evidence of the *Vetus latina*²³ and Vulgate mix reflected in the Scripture quoted by the author.²⁴ The linguistic evidence, however, advocates the sixth century as the time frame within which the work was composed. This would seem to hold true even if we allowed for an unspecified amount of scribal intervention in the text's transmission: there would still seem to remain enough genuine, trustworthy evidence to link it to the Vulgar Latin literature of the posited period: phonology, morphology, and syntactical evidence in *Cons.* seem to form a mutually supportive network of linguistic items pointing in the same direction, viz., the sixth century AD. This contention is likewise substantiated by additional internal evidence besides the linguistic testimony as will be explained. Let us commence, however, by probing the linguistic evidence. One notable aspect of the text is its intermittent "corrupt" phonology, to wit, its Vulgar Latin phonological irregularities. Granted that *Cons.* is not teeming with Vulgar Latin speech sound changes, such changes do exist and are occasionally salient. This begs the question: if these, or at least some of these, are not authentic, meaning authorial, are they then due to scribal intervention? Even if we allow for intended or inadvertent scribal intervention connected with the "corrupt" phonology of the text, it appears that this phenomenon cannot be attributed to scribal activity wholesale. This is due to the fact that some of these Vulgar Latin speech sound changes are involved in inflectional corruptions that generate novel, Vulgar Latin constructions occurring in *Cons.* The use of such constructions is clearly a deliberate choice on the part of the author; they constitute components of their style and diction. By novel

23 *Vetus Latina* is a global term assigned to the Old Latin translations of the Greek New Testament and the Septuagint produced locally by various Christians for the benefit of their individual communities before Jerome's revision of the Scripture was launched—initially of the *Vetus Latina* Gospels alone—at the behest of Pope Damasus in the late fourth century. Jerome's universal revision of the *Vetus Latina* Bible produced the *Vulgata*, or Vulgate, his late-fourth century Latin translation of the Scripture from Hebrew and Greek, which gradually eclipsed the *Vetus Latina* versions and was solemnly proclaimed the official Latin Bible of the Roman Church at the Council of Trent. Jerome's Vulgate version was itself revised at the end of the sixteenth century, giving rise to the edition of the *Vulgata Clementina*, the Clementine Vulgate. In this modified form, the Vulgate remained the standard Latin Bible of the Roman Church until the late twentieth century, when it was superseded by yet another revised version, the *Nova Vulgata*.

24 See Synodinos, "The Bible in *Cons.*," in "A Critical Edition of Ps.-Basil."

syntactical structures, I mean such as are attested for the posited period to which *Cons.* appears to belong and consistent with the “corrupt” phonology of the period that generates them. Put differently, it seems unlikely that scribal interference alone can account for so decisive an impact on both the morphology and the syntactic makeup of *Cons.* as to give the text its distinct Vulgar Latin character. Granted that an attempt at estimating the extent of scribal responsibility for Vulgar Latin phonology in this text appears to be futile owing to the scantiness of *Cons.* witnesses, nevertheless, it does not seem unreasonable to assume that such a responsibility cannot be entirely scribal but authorial as well.²⁵ The reason for this claim lies in the fact that novel Vulgar Latin syntactic constructions often involve late Latin speech sound changes, namely deviations from classical standards, as is obvious by looking at some of the instances cited in “The Latinity of *Cons.*” Accordingly, to the extent that such novel constructions involve “corrupt” phonology and are advisedly sought out by the author as linguistic components of their diction and style, the responsibility for Vulgar Latin speech sound changes in the text must rest with the author as well. Furthermore, some of the linguistic evidence previously cited provides compelling evidence, I think, of this text’s possible connections with Gaul, and one fleeting indication has even tentatively pointed to the second half of the sixth century as a more precise time frame for its composition.²⁶ Consequently, the data pertaining to fundamental linguistic aspects of *Cons.*, such as phonology and syntax, appear to be mutually supportive in bearing witness, even if broadly, to the accuracy of the general time frame posited for the composition of *Cons.*

However, it is of note that, for all their manifold diversity, the text’s deviations from standards of older Latin are not noticeably high in frequency.

25 Even with an abundance of witnesses available for the establishment of a text of this type, the task of distinguishing what is authorial from what is scribal may turn out to be only partially successful; see, for instance, in Gregory of Tours, *Gregorii Turonensis Opera*, 912, where in the second paragraph of his “Orthographica,” Krusch notes: “Itaque quae infra collegi multum abest quin tota Gregorio tribuam, sed Gregoriana inesse nemo negabit.” [Accordingly, I am far from assigning all the readings that I have collected below to Gregory, yet no one will deny that there are readings of Gregory contained therein.] See “A Case in Point” in “Date” below, 15n40.

26 See 6n9 above. This single lead has only been considered in the context of the overall evidence pointing to the Gallic provenance of this piece. See also 72n50 and 74n60 in “*De consolatione in adversis*—Latin Text” below, and the fact that much of the phonology of the text and a large number of its Vulgar Latin constructions are explained by reference to Bonnet, *Le latin de Grégoire de Tours* and, of course, to Gregory’s *Historia francorum*.

The changes are inconsistent, not sweeping, the usage is mixed, and, despite occasional cases of roughness, a good number of old Latin features are not difficult to find in this plain yet not uncouth text. Bonnet states that revisiting Gregory of Tours after reading authors of the seventh century AD feels like returning to the classics.²⁷ This statement would apply to our text as well if *Cons.* was to be compared with works of the seventh and the eighth centuries AD, such as Fredegar's *Chronicon* and the *Liber historiae francorum*.²⁸ It is fair to reiterate at this point that the fundamental presupposition underlying any analysis of the linguistic data of *Cons.* rests upon the trustworthiness of Tours, BM, MS 281. In this respect, one may take note of the fortunate coincidence that Tours, BM, MS 281 was produced at the scriptorium of Tours by Adalbaldus, an esteemed and highly competent *artifex* (artificer, craftsman) who belonged to the circle of Alcuin and took pride in his own work.²⁹ This fact is in itself some sort of preliminary assurance of quality and trustworthiness—at least at a basic level.³⁰ As regards the *Cons.* text in Tours, BM, MS 281, the grand total of vulgarisms observed in the text is not extravagant, as previously stated, but sufficient to hint in the right direction with reference to the origin of the text. These Vulgar Latin readings in *Cons.*, especially the structurally idiosyncratic ones,³¹ are unlikely to be due to Adalbaldus' own intervention, inasmuch as the Frankish scribes of the ninth century are to be feared not so much for barbarizing as for normalizing the text.³² Blomgren cites the case of a debated reading in Gregory's *Historia francorum*, which eventually proved genuine and which Bonnet mistook as corrupt on account of failing to broaden his view as to what may be authorial.³³

27 Bonnet, *Le latin de Grégoire de Tours*, 85.

28 For the *Liber historiae francorum*, see Pauline Taylor's work, *The Latinity of the Liber historiae francorum*, cited in the Bibliography.

29 Delisle, *Notices et extraits*, vol. 31.1, pp. 208–9, 239.

30 Bonnet, *Le latin de Grégoire de Tours*, 18, states that all of the ninth century MSS of Gregory's *Historia francorum* have been normalized in terms of grammar and orthography, in which the copyists of that century were much better skilled than their colleagues of the foregoing centuries.

31 For instance, those featuring the adverbial genitive, i.e., the *genitivus contra rationem* (counterintuitive genitive), the construction of *subiacere* with the abl., and those of *circumdari aliquid* or of *ab* with the acc. plural, just to name a few. See some of the samples cited at the beginning of this Introduction in "The Latinity of *Cons.*"

32 Sickel, *Lehre von den Urkunden der ersten Karolinger*, 140n5.

33 Blomgren, *Studia Fortunatiana*, 12.

A Case in Point

Seeing that the text of many a MS may happen to be quite flawed, especially when the copying involves many hands, it seemed desirable to get a grasp, at least in some measure, on the quality of Adalbaldus's work—the single, highly competent craftsman, as previously noted, who produced Tours, BM, MS 281. To gauge in a very broad sense the quality his work from a different angle, I carried out a preliminary textual collation of another of Adalbaldus's works, i.e., Jerome's *Contra Iohannem* (henceforth *CI*), also contained in Tours, BM, MS 281, with Jean Louis Feiertag's established text of the same.³⁴ For his edition, Feiertag used Tours, BM, MS 281 along with his other witnesses. The findings of this preliminary investigation may be reduced to two notable facts. The first is that Adalbaldus's "own oversights" in his *CI* copy of Tours, BM, MS 281 are considerably fewer than those this copy shares with other witnesses.³⁵ This is presumably some sort of warranty of the trustworthiness of the copyist's work. There is no reason to assume that Adalbaldus' diligence and high standards, for which he seems to have been reputed, should not likewise reflect in his *Cons.* copy of Tours, BM, MS 281. The second fact is the obvious qualitative difference between the *CI* copy's Vulgar Latin readings in Tours, BM, MS 281 and the Vulgar Latin readings found in the text of *Cons.* of the same MS. The *CI* copy's Vulgar Latin readings are clearly not structural but mere misspellings consistent with Vulgar Latin phonology as far as could be ascertained.³⁶ Nonetheless, even such as they

34 For Feiertag's edition of Jerome's *Contra Iohannem*, see Jerome, *Contra Iohannem*, ed. J. L. Feiertag.

35 I define as Adalbaldus's "own oversights" the rejected readings of Feiertag's *CI* edition that I found assigned exclusively to Tours, BM, MS 281 in Feiertag's apparatus during my preliminary investigation. Even if we assume that the precious scanty rejected variants assigned to Tours, BM, MS 281 alone in Feiertag's apparatus are all peculiar to it, to wit, not shared with other witnesses—that is, other than those collated in Feiertag's edition—and that they are accordingly Adalbaldus' own "blunders," they still amount to an insignificant number.

36 The rejected readings in Feiertag's *CI* apparatus which are peculiar to Tours, BM, MS 281 alone in that edition seem to fall in the main under two categories: a. misspellings involving primarily e > i and i > e confusion; b. omission of syllables. All *CI* rejected variants in Feiertag's apparatus which are shared by Tours, BM, MS 281 and the other witnesses and involve an *m falso omissa* / *m falso adiecta* ("m faultily dropped / m faultily added") reading pertain almost entirely to cases of confusion between acc. and abl. sing. in prepositional constructions requiring the use of the one or the other. *CI* in Tours, BM, MS 281 has not been found involved in an *m falso omissa* / *m falso adiecta* reading in which the accusative encroaches upon the function of the instrumental abl.; this is also true for the acc. plur. of all declensions. No adverbial

are, they are clearly inadmissible for Jerome's text. The same does not apply to the *Cons.* vulgarisms, however, for the reasons previously stated. In the *Cons.* text of Tours, BM, MS 281, the Vulgar Latin readings are not exclusively phonological but significantly structural as well and, above all, consistent with non-linguistic features of the same treatise in terms of time period to which the non-linguistic features point. It is the non-linguistic components of *Cons.*—such as its rhythmic prose or the focus on lepers, which will be dealt with next—and the time frame they appear to imply—namely, the sixth century AD—that warrant the authenticity of its linguistic features and their legitimacy to be in that text.

As regards matters of phonological deviation from classical standards in *Cons.*, it has already been observed that the extent of “corrupt” phonology in the *Cons.* text of Tours, BM, MS 281 is limited in comparison with other texts of the sixth century. One way to explain this may be by allowing for some level of normalizing being carried out in our text, possibly in the course of Adalbaldu's copying or not long before that time.³⁷ But, even so, the question remains of just how far this normalizing was carried out beyond orthography and how consistent and systematic it was, considering that typical Vulgar Latin constructions have remained untouched. It is perhaps telling that the physical *Cons.* copy of Tours, BM, MS 281 is laced with normalizing superscripts and marginalia targeting the Vulgar Latin phonology and syntax of the text. But these are clearly not *prima manu* corrections.³⁸ In this connection, it is significant to note that, to judge from Rand's description, Tours, BM, MS 281 does not bear the certification mark indicating collation of this MS with the originals, as appears to have been occasionally the practice for MSS copied at the scriptorium of Tours.³⁹ All of these considerations

genitives of the type occurring in *Cons.* have been found in the Tours, BM, MS 281 *CI* text in Feiertag's apparatus; likewise, no future active participles used in a passive sense and no constructions of the type of *subiacere* with the abl. have been observed either. The same may be claimed for all the remaining Vulgar Latin constructions peculiar to *Cons.* of the same MS.

37 Norberg, *Syntaktische Forschungen*, 12–13, makes the important observation that while phonology and morphology considerably improved in texts during Pippin's linguistic reform in the second half of the eighth century, syntax remained essentially unchanged.

38 See Synodinos, “Manuscripts and Editions,” in “A Critical Edition of Ps.-Basil.”

39 Rand, *A Survey of the Manuscripts of Tours*, 23. One advantage of such a certification mark among other things—should such an indication have existed—would have been to confirm the weight of some conceivably *prima manu* corrections in the *Cons.* copy of Tours, BM, MS 281.

appear to suggest that even if Adalbalduſ tampered with the text of *Cons.*, the adulteration muſt not have been ſo extenſive or ſignificant as to alter the authentic character of the text. It would ſeem, therefore, that Adalbalduſ's copy of *Cons.* reflects its ſource in a trustworthy manner. Moreover, it ſeems highly unlikely that *Cons.* acquired its baſic Vulgar Latin features on account of ſcribal intervention during the previous ſtages of its transmission leading up to its being copied in Tours, BM, MS 281. For even if this poſſibility were to be conſidered, there ſeems to be no good reaſon to attribute even the text's phonological "corruptions" to the ſcribe any more than to the author.⁴⁰ The Vulgar Latin readings in *Cons.* are of ſuch a nature as to ſuggeſt that they could not have accumulated during the text's transmission unleſs there was ſerious interference with the text over the years and the text kept being repeatedly reproduced. The ſcantineſs of this text's extant witneſſes,⁴¹ however, ſhows that *Cons.* was unlikely to have been copied very often, a fact that clearly makes it much leſs prone to corruption.⁴² At all events, as previously obſerved, the ſyntactical evidence, which is conſiſtent with phonological changes in *Cons.*, is congruent with ſtructural changes found in other Latin authors of the ſixth century as well and is ſimply too overwhelming qualitatively to be bodily diſmiſſed as due to corruption.

Rhythmic Proſe

Let us now proceed beyond the linguistic evidence. As already ſtated, additional internal textual ſupport that may be uſed in conjunction with the linguistic evidence for dating *Cons.* to the ſixth century AD may be derived from two non-linguiſtic components of the text, namely its rhythmic proſe and the focus on lepers. The latter component will be diſcuſſed along with the propoſed author's life and background in the pertinent ſection of this book. Let us begin with the former component, the metrical analysis of this work's proſe.⁴³ My reſearch has demonſtrated that the proſe of *Cons.* is rhythmic and that it is intentionally ſo both at the end of the ſentence and, highly likely, at the interior clause level as well. Rhythmic proſe can

40 Rice, "The Phonology of Gallic Clerical Latin," 3: "[P]aris ſhowed that ſome ſound-changes which had hitherto been conſidered as excluſively popular, took place regularly even in the ſpeech of thoſe who wrote and ſpoke the moſt correct Latin of the Merovingian period."

41 Cf. *Epistula conſolatoria*, 201, 275.

42 Bebb, "Evidence of the Early Versions," 200.

43 See this ſection, 17n50

be distinguished into metrical (quantitative) and accentual (dynamic). In creating rhythm, musical time needs to be segmented into equal units of time, which are also themselves divided into equal parts. The essence of rhythm is the segmentation of musical time into a succession of equal units of time, or measures, marked by a recurrent stress of voice that each of the units receives on one of its parts. This stress of voice is known as ictus, or beat—the pulse of the measure; it is the musical accent. In ancient metrics, beats come in two varieties: metrical and accentual. The metrical beat applies to syllables of quantitative nature, meaning syllables that are either long or short by nature or by position. It has been claimed that the stress of voice which the metrical beat implied was quite kindred with the natural accent of the language. If true, such a contention would suggest an element of intensity being already present in the quantitative, or metrical beat, and it would suffice to follow the evolution of this element further. Be that as it may, the accentual, or dynamic, beat, also known as “*ictus vocal*,” is abundantly attested for the third century AD. It is of the same nature as the stress accent or grammatical accent, also attested for the third century AD, with which, in rhythmic prose, pains are taken for the accentual beat to coincide. The accentual beat gained momentum apparently at the expense of syllable quantity, which grew feebler over time and eventually disappeared. The gradual enfeeblement of quantity along with the corresponding prevalence of the stress accent gave rise to the rhythmized *cursus*. Nicolau notes that the term *cursus* designates accentual rhythmic patterns ensuing from predetermined alternations of unstressed and dynamically stressed syllables found at the end of sentences or sentence components.

Thus, the key component on which the *cursus* relies for generating dynamic rhythmic patterns is the grammatical accent. It is also clear that to produce a rhythmic effect at least two stressed syllables are required and a number of unstressed ones as well. Accordingly, inasmuch as each word contains only one stressed syllable, it follows that the dynamic, or accentual, clausula,⁴⁴ will require at least two words comprising one stressed syllable each. My rhythmic investigation of *Cons.* was systematic for final clausulae,

44 In rhythmized prose, orally delivered, clausulae are rhetorical and punctuation devices designed to occur for effect whenever the voice halts. They are clusters of alternating stressed and unstressed word syllables systematically arranged so as to produce a repeated pattern of sound within the cluster on account of the periodic recurrence of syllables pronounced with more stress than those falling in between. Sources for some of the material cited in the text of this page are Nicolau, *L'origine du “cursus” rythmique*, 1–2, 45ff; and Clark, *Cursus*, 10.

showing results for a grand total of 202 clausulae. Slightly over half of the final clausulae were found to be quantitative, or metrical. The patterns in the metrical clausulae are mainly the cretic trochee ('— U — '— X), the double cretic ('— U — '— U X), and the cretic dichoree ('— U — — U '— U). Of the remaining ones, one portion is made up of two elements, one metrical and one accentual;⁴⁵ the other portion comprises clausulae which admit of an accentual explanation only. Although the assessment of the findings resulting from the final clausulae study shows the overall balance slightly tilting in favor of the purely metrical clausula, there should be no doubt that the organizing principle behind all clausula construction in *Cons.* is dynamic, not quantitative. I have therefore opted to subsume all clausulae under the three fundamental heads of *cursus*—the accentual, subsequent counterpart of quantitative rhythm⁴⁶—namely under *cursus planus*, *cursus tardus*, and *cursus velox*.⁴⁷ The fact that virtually all of the clausulae that have been examined fall under the three principal forms of the *cursus*—the *planus*, the *tardus*, and the *velox*—demonstrates the author's deliberate effort to intersperse the prose of *Cons.* with rhythmic cadences.⁴⁸ Insofar as in *Cons.* these three main principal forms of *cursus* contain metrical and accentual clausulae as well as clausulae consisting of both metrical and accentual components, the prose of the *Cons.* may be subsumed under the heading *cursus mixtus*.⁴⁹ The *cursus mixtus* is a term that applies to the early stages of *cursus*.⁵⁰

45 For the gradually increasing importance of the grammatical accent in beating time during the transitional period between metrical and accentual rhythmic prose, see de Groot, *La prose métrique des anciens*, 57; and Nicolau, *L'origine du "cursus" rythmique*, 48–56, 57ff.

46 Hagendahl, *La prose métrique d'Arnobé*, 13, 24; Havet, *La prose métrique de Symmaque*, 1; Nicolau, *L'origine du "cursus" rythmique*, 1.

47 The correspondence between the basic *cursus* clausula types and the metrical, or quantitative, clausula types is as follows: the *cursus planus*, ' ~ ~ ~ ' ~ ~ (*retributióne merétur*) corresponds to the cretic trochee, '— U — '— X (*víncla perfrégit*), for which it substitutes. The *cursus tardus*, ' ~ ~ ~ ' ~ ~ ~ (*felicitátis percipient*) corresponds to the double cretic, '— U — '— U X (*víncla perfrégerat*), for which it substitutes. The *cursus velox*, ' ~ ~ ~ ~ ' ~ ~ (*exíbitum reputábo*) corresponds to the cretic dichoree, '— U — — U '— U (*vínculum fregerámus*), for which it substitutes. See Nicolau, *L'origine du "cursus" rythmique*, 1–2; Clark, *Cursus*, 10.

48 If at least 60 per cent of an author's clausulae can be subsumed under the three principal forms, viz., the *planus*, *tardus*, and *velox*, it may be said that the author is consciously striving for the *cursus*. See Mann, *The Clausulae of St. Hilary*, 75–76.

49 Cf. Clark, *Cursus*, 10–12.

50 Mann, *Clausulae of St. Hilary*, 127: "Most writers from the third to the sixth centuries, both pagan and Christian, used prose which is at once characterized by

The study of interior clause in *Cons.* was not systematic and pertains to both accentual and metrical analysis of samples derived from two randomly selected sections, yielding results that are consistent with those of the systematic final clausulae investigation.

A few remarks may be made regarding the accentual character of the purely metrical clausulae. The accentual rhythm of such clausulae is evinced by the nearly unfailing ictus and accent coincidence in all but a couple of metrical forms,⁵¹ although laws of quantity are overall closely adhered to.⁵² In comparison, coincidence of accent and ictus in the Ciceronian clausula, according to Zander and Zielinski is a mere tendency, while de Groot maintains that the evidence is inconsistent with such a tendency.⁵³ Typological uniformity ensuring ictus and accent harmony in nearly all of the specimens examined in this study is yet another indication of the author's effort to achieve an accentual effect in the rhythmized prose of *Cons.*⁵⁴ Moreover, the metrical consideration of the two dominant specimen sets and types falling under the *tardus*, viz., the cretic trochee with resolution of the third long and the caesura falling after the second syllable, and the double cretic with the caesura falling after the second syllable,⁵⁵ which seem to provide further proof that the author strove for accentual rather than for metrical effect. Even if uncertainty were to be entertained as to whether the accentual effect was deliberate in the case of the double cretic forms subsumed under the *tardus*, the high frequency of the specimens of the cretic trochee with resolution of the third long and the caesura falling after the second syllable,

metrical and accentual tendencies." Albeit accent predominated during the first phase of the *cursus*, which extended from the third to the seventh century, "yet careful attention was given by some authors to quantity and strictly determined types were sought". See Mann, *Clausulae of St. Hilary*, 5.

51 *Cons.* 3.116 *castitatēm mēām pērdērēm* and *Cons.* 5.235 *cibos suōs sōlūs sūmērē*.

52 The same phenomenon occurs in Jerome. See Herron, *A Study of the Clausulae in the Writings of St. Jerome*, 127.

53 De Groot, *Prose métrique des anciens*, 8.

54 In the *cursus planus* metrical clausulae of the text, the dominant type, viz., the double cretic with the caesura falling after the second syllable, is also Cicero's favourite type. See Clark, *Cursus*, 18. In the *cursus velox* metrical clausulae, the dominant type is the cretic dichoree with the caesura falling after the third syllable.

55 See Clark, *Cursus*, 18–19. For the double cretic with the caesura falling after the second syllable in *Cons.*, see, for instance, some *cursus tardus* metrical clausulae: *Cons.* 3.70–71 *omnem dolōrēm ēxstīncxērāt*, 13.542–43 *expellitur et vitā ādqūirītūr*; for the cretic trochee with resolution of the third long and the caesura falling after the second syllable, see *Cons.* 4.136–37 *roborārē sūfficiāt*, 6.294–95 *prosunt dāmnā cārnālīř*.

the second dominant set under the same heading, seems to leave no room for doubt. This is because form and typological uniformity ensure ictus and accent harmonization in this type of clausula, which, for this reason, seems to be deliberately sought,⁵⁶ whereas in the other clausula type, to wit, the double cretic with the caesura falling after the second syllable in the double cretic specimens, the same harmonization is naturally frequent. On the other hand, typological uniformity as observed in the purely metrical clausulae of *Cons.* results in the use of final trisyllables and tetrasyllables in the clausula structure, which use is consistent with *cursus* requirements, that is with dynamic stress rather than with quantitative requirements.⁵⁷ The tendency in the early phase of the *cursus* to disregard hiatus,⁵⁸ a tendency which in the later phase evolved into perfect indifference to this phenomenon,⁵⁹ is also occasionally observed in the clausulae of *Cons.*⁶⁰

Author

I will start with the most obvious as well as the most unusual feature of *Cons.*, the lepers. The limelighting of this dreaded disease and of its unfortunate victims, triggering an abundant outpour of compassion on the part of the *Cons.* speaker, seems to be the only concrete piece of internal evidence which, in conjunction with the linguistic facts and the treatise's rhythmic prose, may ultimately function as a historical type of reference. An outbreak of leprosy in sixth-century Gaul is documented by two local councils at least:⁶¹ the *concilium Aurelianense*, AD 549, and the *concilium Lugdunense*, AD 583, which

56 See Delaunay, *Clausulae in the works of St. Ambrose*, 147, who comes to a very similar conclusion, although the author regards the cretic trochee with resolution of the third long and the caesura falling after the second syllable as a trochee-first peon.

57 Mann, *Clausulae of St. Hilary*, 73, states that "there is a general avoidance of final words which do not have three and four syllables" in the system of Sacerdos, a grammarian who flourished possibly in the third century AD. See also Mann, *Clausulae of St. Hilary*, 82: "The *Cursus Planus* of the early period consists of a trisyllable accented on the penult and preceded by a proparoxytone, as *vota convertens*. The *Cursus Tardus* is composed of a final tetrasyllable accented on the antepenult and preceded by a paroxytone, as *terra laetabitur*. The *Cursus Velox* consists of a final tetrasyllable accented on the penult and preceded by a proparoxytone, as *praemium consequatur*."

58 Mann, *Clausulae of St. Hilary*, 73.

59 Mann, *Clausulae of St. Hilary*, 73.

60 *Cons.* 8.360 *mors generārē expēllēt* and 9.387–88 *ineruditā ācquirīt*; 13.542–43 *expellitur et vitā ādquirītūr*; and 4.207 *tua potētīā ārguātūr*.

61 *Concilia Galliae A. 511–A. 695*, 147–57, 231–33.

witness the growing concern of the Church in dealing with this plague and to the measures taken to keep it contained within the individual dioceses of the several bishops. An urgent appeal was issued to the faithful and the individual bishops to provide means of subsistence to the afflicted both to assist them and to eliminate the need for wandering along with the risk of allowing the spread of the disease.⁶² One important member of the council of Orléans, AD 549, whose signature appears on the list of the undersigned members subscribed to the council, is Agricola of Cabillonum.⁶³ Agricola is significant for his contribution in light of this social plague and the human suffering it caused. His evangelical activity and his ministry's consonance with the measures endorsed by the council have been felicitously documented by St. Gregory of Tours. In his *Historia francorum*, Gregory records the founding of Agricola's *exsinodochio*,⁶⁴ a leprosarium, which was a facility complete with a rather large basilica attached to it, set up in the outskirts of Cabillonum by this energetic, apostolic man. Other facts, however, registered about Agricola in the *Historia francorum* are precious scanty. Gregory seems to have been impressed by him. We are broadly aware of some specifics about his person, such as the fact that he was a senatorial bishop and that he channeled at least part of his energy into carrying out a construction project, including the assembling of ecclesiastical infrastructure.⁶⁵ The extent of his education, however, is a point of contention, or at least open to interpretation, depending on whether *humanitatis exiguae* in Gregory's passage of *Historia francorum* 5.45 is to be taken in the sense of "small stature," as construed by Giesebrecht and Bordier,⁶⁶ or in the sense that he was either "little versed in the humanities," or that "his acquaintance with polite learning was slender," as Thorpe and Dalton construe the phrase.⁶⁷ In light of this ambiguity,

62 *Concilia Galliae A. 511–A. 695*, 156.

63 *Concilia Galliae A. 511–A. 695*, 158.

64 Gregory of Tours, *Liber in gloria confessorum*, 352–53: "Post haec aedificato exsinodochio leprosorum sacerdos suburban...beatum corpus transtulit et in basilica superius memorata summo studio sepelivit." [Subsequently, he [Agricola] erected a leper-hospital in the suburbs...translated the blessed body, and buried it with the outmost reverence in the aforementioned church.]

65 Gregory of Tours, *Historia francorum*, 254–56.

66 Gregory of Tours, *Historia francorum*, 256. For Giesebrecht, see *Zehn Bücher fränkischer Geschichte*, 288. For Bordier, see Grégoire de Tours, *Histoire ecclésiastique des Francs*, 279.

67 For Thorpe, see Gregory of Tours, *The History of the Franks*, 312. For Dalton see, Gregory of Tours, *The History of the Franks*, 218.

Gregory's silence regarding any literary activity of this man and of the overall paucity of factual information about his person, it is difficult to see how he can qualify as a *Cons.* authorship candidate despite his general merits.

One other prominent figure in ecclesiastical history of sixth century Gaul, a person of refined culture, broad education, and compassion toward the destitute, especially toward lepers, was St. Radegunde of Poitiers (ca. 520–587). A depiction of this Frankish queen's life and details of her funeral are given by Gregory of Tours in *Historia francorum*, *Liber in gloria martyrum*, and *Liber in gloria confessorum*.⁶⁸ One other prelate, the poet-bishop St. Venantius Fortunatus of Poitiers (ca. 530–609), Radegunde's long-time friend, and Baudonivia (ca. 610), a nun of Radegunde's monastic community in Poitiers, living in the convent of the Holy Cross, which St. Radegunde founded, each wrote a full-scale *vita* of the sovereign monastic.⁶⁹ I will endeavor to show that *Cons.* is highly likely a composition of this remarkable woman. The primary sources of information regarding Radegunde's life are her biography by Fortunatus and to a lesser extent Baudonivia's account of her life,⁷⁰ supplementing Fortunatus' biography with details of a curious nature at times.⁷¹ Further insight and data are provided by poems which Fortunatus dedicated to her.⁷² Two

68 For various references to her life and activities in Gregory's *Historia francorum*, see Gregory of Tours, *Historia francorum*, 560; Gregory of Tours, *Liber in gloria martyrum*, 39–40. For her falling asleep in the Lord, see Gregory of Tours, *Liber in gloria confessorum*, 364.

69 Venantius Fortunatus, *Vita sanctae Radegundis*, 38–49. For Baudonivia's account, see *Vita sanctae Radegundis*, 364–95. A third author, Hildebert of Lavardin, Bishop of Le Mans, Archbishop of Tours, has no source value, inasmuch as he relies for his information on Fortunatus and Baudonivia. For his account of Radegunde's life, see Hildebert of Lavardin, *Vita s. Radegundis reginae*, cols. 967–88.

70 For modern accounts of her life, see *Writings of Medieval Women*, 25–36; Van Dam, *Saints and Their Miracles in Late Antique Gaul*, 30–40. Additional bibliography on Radegunde may be found in Brennan, "St. Radegund and the Early Development of her Cult at Poitiers," 340n1. The reader may refer to the works cited for a full account of her life.

71 See, for instance, the curious incident of the screech owl in the nighttime. See Baudonivia in *Vita sanctae Radegundis*, 390.

72 See Roberts, *The Humblest Sparrow*, 285: "These poems are distributed through three books, 8, 11, and the *appendix carminum* in Fortunatus, *Opera poetica*, MGH: Auctorum antiquissimorum 4.1. This appendix was put together by the editor from poems appearing in a single manuscript (Parisinus lat. 13048)." A source of potentially special importance, indicating the breadth of her education that as reflected in her reading list, is Fort. *carm.* 8.1.53–59 in Venantius Fortunatus, *Opera*

poems,⁷³ whose attribution to the artistry of Radegunde has been equally vigorously upheld by some and disputed by others,⁷⁴ are likewise data sources contributing to the biographical sketch of this visionary woman. Yet, they can contribute little as regards literary output which can be uncontestedly assigned to her;⁷⁵ nor is our knowledge of her Latin and style furthered in any tangible way by a formal letter which she addressed to all area bishops in reference to concerns pertaining to the Abbey of the Holy Cross at Poitiers.⁷⁶ This letter, which was recorded by Gregory of Tours in the *Historia francorum* is,⁷⁷ to say the least, a document of the royal

Poetica, 179–80: “cuius sunt epulae quicquid pia regula pangit, / quidquid Gregorius Basiliusque docent, / acer Athanasius, quod lenis Hilarius edunt, / quos causae socios lux tenet una duos, quod tonat Ambrosius, / Hieronymus atque coruscat, / sive Augustinus fonte fluente rigat, / Sedulius dulcis, quod Orosius edit acutus. [Her feast consists of all that which the holy rule prescribes: whatever Gregory and Basil teach, that which fervent Athanasius and gentle Hilary proclaim—partners in a common cause, on both of whom the selfsame light shines—that which Ambrose in speaking thunders out, and which Jerome reveals in fulminating speech, or Augustine with flowing fountain streams bedews, sweet Sedulius, that which astute Orosius declares.] An attempt at reconstructing her portrait must rely upon glimpses into her character and behavioural details gleaned from the poems that Fortunatus dedicated to her since, according to Watkin, neither Fortunatus nor Baudonivia has left a fully satisfactory account of her life. See Watkin, “St. Radegund,” 97–98.

73 *De excidio Thoringiae* and *Ad Artachin*. Both poems may be found in Venantius Fortunatus, *Opera poetica*, 271–75, 278–79. Leo publishes these two poems in the *appendix carminum*, not in the *carminum spuriorum appendix*.

74 See *Sainted Women of the Dark Ages*, 65n22: “Nisard...believed that she wrote the poem wholly or in part, and this opinion has been also embraced by Thiebaux...Allen and Calder...[attribute] it without discussion to Fortunatus. Cherewatuk, ‘Female Personae,’ analyzed the piece as a direct expression of Radegund’s voice; Wallace-Hadrill...defends Fortunatus’ authorship.” See also George, *Venantius Fortunatus*, 164–66, 164n61. George attributes these poems to Fortunatus in light of “close parallels with Fortunatus’ techniques in other poems.”

75 As regards the two poems under discussion, even if Radegunde was not solely Fortunatus’s assumed writing persona—as has been claimed—in composing the two disputed poems but was in fact somehow personally involved in the composition of the disputed works, as seems to be the consensus today, it still seems unwise to make stylistic and compositional assessments on scanty evidence.

76 The letter may have been addressed to the bishops attending the Council of Tours in 565. See *Sainted Women of the Dark Ages*, 62n10. The convent of the Holy Cross was initially dedicated to Mary but was subsequently rededicated, when Emperor Justin II and Augusta Sophia dispatched a piece of the True Cross to her from Constantinople upon her request.

77 Gregory of Tours, *Historia francorum*, 464–65.

chancery;⁷⁸ consequently, it cannot be relied upon as a trustworthy witness in matters of Radegunde's diction and style, although the voice is certainly hers. Yet, even if production of literary works by her remains a matter of conjecture, we know that she was capable of composing poetry,⁷⁹ and there is clearly no doubt that she received a thorough education.⁸⁰ Moreover, the level of her learning appears to have gradually peaked, inasmuch as she seems, based on Fortunatus' evidence, to have been quite an avid reader of ecclesiastical literature. However that is, her deeply ingrained propensity for learning could not help but be enhanced by her adoption of the monastic rule of St. Caesarius of Arles, which stressed learning for nuns.⁸¹ One cannot help but reflect on the fact that besides other, more decisive reasons that may have dictated her choice of monastic rule,⁸² she ought to have felt

78 See, Martin, "A Contribution to the Lexicography of Certain Merovingian Charters," 252: "This charter is duplicated in Gregory of Tours, *Hist. Fr.* IX, 42, where it is stated that the abbess read this, Radegundis' letter, to the assembled bishops." Cf. *Diplomatum imperii*, 9–11.

79 Fortunatus acknowledges receipt of epistolary poems composed and dispatched by Radegunde to him in Venantius Fortunatus, *Opera poetica*, 290 (*carm.* 31.1–8). This piece of evidence, which is the only tangible proof we have of her literary output, has prompted some scholars to speak of "her exchange of *poems* and *letters* with Fortunatus" [*italics are mine*]. For a different view, see Roberts, *The Humblest Sparrow*, 292: "The poems [sent by Fortunatus to Radegund and Agnes] presuppose regular and frequent contacts. Because of this, Radegund and Agnes do not have to rely on letters to maintain their side of the relationship. They see and speak to the poet regularly. Indeed, only once does Fortunatus refer to a written communication from either of them, a poem written and sent by Radegund (App. 31.1–8)."

80 See *Sainted Women of the Dark Ages*, 65n22; Watkin, "St. Radegund," 99; Venantius Fortunatus, *Vita sanctae Radegundis*, 38. "Aigrain, *Sainte Radegonde, vers 520–587*, 29 is skeptical of the intensive patristic studies Fortunatus claims for her but concurs that Radegunde was well educated.

81 Watkin, "St. Radegund," in Luce, *Saints for Now*, 104: "The Caesarean rule encouraged, indeed demanded, education. Every nun must be able to read—she must also know the Psalter by heart. And two hours every day were to be spent in reading. This was congenial to Radegund, who loved books. She read Gregory either of Nyssa or Nazianzen, Basil, Athanasius, Hilary, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Sedulius, and Orosius. Whether she read the Greek Fathers in the original or in a Latin translation we are not told." See also the admonition of Caesaria II, Abbess of St. Jean of Arles to Radegunde in Hen, *Culture and Religion in Merovingian Gaul, AD 481–751*, 39n98: "*Epistulae Aevi Merovingici Collectae* 11, *MGH Epistulae* III. pp. 450–453 at p. 451 – 'nulla sit de intrantibus quae literas non discat.'" [Let no novice nun among those entering be unschooled.]

82 See Gregory of Tours, *Historia francorum*, 464–65. Gregory makes it clear that the local bishop, Maroveus of Poitiers, to whom she turned for guidance in matters

at home with St. Caesarius's *regula* and its distinct educational profile that suited her learning predisposition to perfection.⁸³ We are aware therefore of her excellent education—if we can trust Fortunatus' panegyric style—of her literary pursuits and of yet another important aspect of her character to which her biographers attest: her love for the destitute and the sick, especially the lepers.⁸⁴ As a young queen, she launched her philanthropy program by founding a charitable institution for the sick and destitute at Athies, attending personally to the needs of all who came to her for protection and comfort⁸⁵—as she continued to do throughout her life. When she fled the court, following her brother's murder by her husband, King Clothar, leaving "Noyon Radegund traveled to Tours as a pilgrim to St. Martin's tomb. She then went to live at the villa Clothar had given her at Saix, where she tended and administered baths to the sick."⁸⁶ And again, when she finally retired to Poitiers, where she founded her monastic community, she provided that the convent's baths be used by the workers who offered their services to her community.⁸⁷ It is a characteristic feature, therefore, of the way she con-

of her convent, took a particular dislike to her for unknown reasons and maintained it consistently throughout his tenure, even refusing to assist at her funeral, let alone conduct it; see Van Dam, *Saints and Their Miracles*, 32–35. Obviously, he refused to have anything to do with her convent or to assist her in any way. The bishop's spite may have arisen from fear that the presence of the royal abbess with her nunnery and her relic of the True Cross in his diocese constituted a threat to the local cult of St. Hilary over which he alone had jurisdiction, according to Van Dam, *Saints and Their Miracles*, 31–35; it may be. Or it may have been fear combined with a strong dose of envy. She was therefore forced to seek guidance elsewhere and did so by travelling to the convent of St. Caesarius in Arles. Her journey to Arles is disputed by Van Dam, *Saints and Their Miracles*, 32 and 32n109, and questioned in *Sainted Women of the Dark Ages*, 99n120. However, Aigrain, in *Sainte Radegonde* (119–20), believes that the trip was made; and so does also Krusch in *Vita sanctae Radegundis*, 359. St. Caesarius's Rule, which Radegunde adopted, "insisted upon the autonomy of the convent from episcopal interference". See Van Dam, *Saints and Their Miracles*, 32.

83 Thiébaux, *Writings of Medieval Women*, 27.

84 Venantius Fortunatus, *Vita sanctae Radegundis*, 42–43.

85 Venantius Fortunatus, *Vita sanctae Radegundis*, 39; cf. *Sainted Women of the Dark Ages*, 72n40: "A hospice dedicated to Radegund still exists at Athies."

86 Thiébaux, *Writings of Medieval Women*, 27. For the episode of her brother's murder by Clothar and the finalization of her long-conceived plan to abandon her husband and the court and take the monastic vows, see Venantius Fortunatus, *Vita sanctae Radegundis*, 4; *Sainted Women of the Dark Ages*, 62; and Van Dam, *Saints and Their Miracles*, 30. For the time during which she took up residence in Saix, Vienne, see Baudonivia's account in *Vita sanctae Radegundis*, 386.

87 Gregory of Tours, *Historia francorum*, 505–6.

ceived her evangelical agenda and of how she perceived taking hygiene and sanitation measures as part of her special ministry to the sick and helpless, and she provided accordingly⁸⁸—even at a time when bathing and personal hygiene could not have been very popular in her country. Public baths must have been in decline in sixth century Gaul and, anyhow, not much in demand, especially considering the difficulty to ensure sustainable water supply.⁸⁹

These are then broadly the facts concerning Radegunde's life, education, and highlights of her social charity program. Some observed affinities between these facts and facts gleaned from the *Cons.* text proper at a preliminary level seem to warrant investigating the possibility of tentatively assigning authorship of *Cons.* to St. Radegunde of Poitiers. In support of this claim, potentially important factual and literary considerations will be taken into account with an eye to the *Cons.* content, which is gentle in tone,⁹⁰ moving in its appeals,⁹¹ untiring in its entreaties to have a steady hope in an everlasting life,⁹² and unyielding in providing support for a group of terminally ill people, yet without offering so much as a glimmer of hope for miraculous healing in an age of miracles.⁹³ The factual and literary considerations which will be addressed pertinent to the text are construed in the broad sense of linguistic and stylistic features whose presence and function in *Cons.* appear to

88 Fortunatus must have been impressed by this aspect of her pastoral care, inasmuch as he keeps taking note of these hygienic instances, of which he had been made aware or which he had himself observed in her ministry; see Venantius Fortunatus, *Vita sanctae Radegundis*, 38–39, 42–43, 45.

89 *Franks and Alamanni*, 260: “The custom of bathing persisted in ecclesiastical and private contexts (e.g. LH V.20; X.16) but public baths would have gone out of use with the failure to maintain their supply systems; Gregory mentions only a single aqueduct, and that in a context of ca 500 (LH II.33).”

90 *Cons.* 8.341–45.

91 *Cons.* 1.16 *frater dilectissime* (beloved brother), 8.341 *dilectissime* (beloved), 9.379 *carissime* (dearest), 10.397 *frater carissime* (dearest brother), and so on.

92 *Cons.* 8.241–44; 9.379–81; 11.423–24, 451–53; 12.504–6.

93 Not once in the entire sermon does the author bring up the issue of belief in miraculous healing from leprosy but only champions the need to resign to the dispensations of divine providence. Nor does she need to provide hope for extraordinary recovery against the odds. It seems to be a foregone conclusion both for the preacher and the audience that the disease will inevitably take its course. The author obviously believed both in redemptive suffering and in extraordinary healing. Nonetheless, she must have realized that what made practical sense in this desperate situation was stressing the kind of hope that could not be disproved. In terms of theological priorities, the kind of solace she was offering was laying the very ground for grace to work miraculously as the sick might have implicitly wished.

be better grasped in light of Radegunde's manner of life, moral choices, literary formation, and ministry. First, the subject matter facts. The most obvious factual link between Radegunde and *Cons.* is unquestionably the common focus on lepers. As previously stated,⁹⁴ Radegunde is the only person we know in sixth century Gaul who took such a keen interest in this class of social outcasts in their desperate illness and their personal agony. It is also important to emphasize that her service to lepers was prompted by an outpour of compassion, not by the categorical imperative of evangelical duty. The tone of the *Cons.* address, as referenced earlier, is not inconsistent with the author perhaps being a woman, and this point will be promptly taken up again in due time, when literary connections are discussed. Another fact that can be gleaned from the text is a vague reference to the town in which, or in the outskirts of which, the sermon was delivered.⁹⁵ This town could very well have been Saix or Poitiers. I now come to the connection with the linguistic and literary evidence. This piece's linguistic analysis, which has been carried out in the first section of the Introduction provides the necessary link connecting *Cons.* with the time of Radegunde's floruit. It is hoped that the study of our sermon's linguistic features has sufficiently shown its Vulgar Latin character—in the sense that this term was construed⁹⁶—and that it has reasonably demonstrated its connection to sixth century Gaul in broad terms. Significant proof corroborating this chronological placement has also been afforded by the metrical study of this piece's clausulae, which were found to be of a mixed quantitative and accentual rhythmical nature—a type that died out roughly at the end of the seventh century AD.⁹⁷ In the course of this metrical analysis, a strong sense of rhythm was discovered in *Cons.*, which does not merely dictate the metrical makeup of the final clausulae but frequently extends to other parts of the sentence or clause,

94 See discussion on Agricola of Cabillonum above in this section.

95 *Cons.* 9.373–74. Would Radegunde have the authority to deliver a sermon? In discussing the life of St. Brigid, abbess of Kildare, on the basis of sources cited as well as the power and authority that ancient monasteries in northern Europe and Britain afforded to their early abbesses, Schulenburg, *Forgetful of Their Sex*, 95–96 states: “Thus, taken together, these sources clearly serve to underscore the immense authority, the prominence, and the preeminent public position—equal to that of abbot or a “quasi-episcopal” power—which some of these abbesses assumed during this early period.... They also exercised “quasi-sacerdotal” functions: they preached, heard confession, and gave absolution and benediction to their nuns and monks.” See also “*Cons.* and Stoicism” below, 31n121.

96 See “The Latinity of *Cons.*” above, 5n2.

97 See “Rhythmic Prose” above, 16n44 and 17n50.

thereby giving rise to a rhythmic feel permeating entire sections of the sermon.⁹⁸ These internal rhythms at times impart a sense of rhythmical continuity which is characteristic of poetry.⁹⁹ They also suggest an additional link to Radegunde's cadence aptitude, seeing that, according to Venantius Fortunatus, she sent him poems, even if the evidence amounts to little in terms of production.¹⁰⁰ But then again, a strong sense of rhythm may merely demonstrate a person's propensity for writing metrically correct poetry—which we know that Radegunde pursued—without necessarily resulting in a wealth of poetic output as well. A final note with respect to this refined feature of prosaic cadences in a piece of late sixth century literature: looking at Radegunde's reading list her friend Fortunatus has left us, one realizes that one of her favorite authors was Hilary of Poitiers,¹⁰¹ a student of Quintilian, *ut fertur*—so it is said, according to Kling's important study¹⁰²—and a man whom Radegunde seems to have held in high esteem.¹⁰³ Finally, it ought to be noted that the largest group of scriptural quotations among those cited in *Cons.* derives from the Psalter. This fact seems reminiscent of the stress St. Caesarius's rule laid upon the Book of Psalms, and the requirement that every nun must "know the Psalter by heart."¹⁰⁴ Also, significantly perhaps, education, which carries a lot of weight with St. Caesarius, appears to do so with the *Cons.* speaker as well. The only healing strategy in *Cons.* consists of implementing scriptural curative education. This is its entire therapeutic program. Standing tall in the face of dire calamity or overwhelming odds

98 See section on the metrical prose of *Cons.* in "Rhythmic Prose" above.

99 Mann, *Clausulae of St. Hilary*, 2, which says that "the preferred metrical cadences seem to have been employed under the influence of poetical forms."

100 See this section, 23n79.

101 See this section, 21n72.

102 For the reference to Hermann Kling and his important work on St. Hilary, see Kling, *De Hilario pictavensi artis rhetoricae*.

103 Radegunde may have felt close to St. Hilary not only on account of his local cult in Poitiers, where her convent was located, but also in light of the quality of his metrical prose and the affinity of its cadences to poetic forms—something that Radegunde must have highly appreciated and felt at home with. St. Hilary's name shows up on Norden's canon of old-style authors along with those of Sulpicius Severus and Lactantius; see also Mann, *Clausulae of St. Hilary*, 13, and above, 23n79 and 26n97.

104 See this section, 23n81. Of the four large clusters of scriptural quotations cited in *Cons.*, the largest one is that of the Psalter, containing twenty quotations. The other clusters are as follows: a cluster of twelve quotations from the Book of Job, a group of ten Pauline quotations, and a group of nine Genesis quotations.

requires *mentem divinis eloquiis eruditam* (a mind trained in the Scriptures).¹⁰⁵ To reach safe harbor, scriptural instruction, to wit, being *verbis dominicis instructus* (instructed in the words of the Lord),¹⁰⁶ is the prerequisite which the addressee must meet. They must study the Scripture *assidue* (unremittingly), or at least pay attention to someone reading it,¹⁰⁷ inasmuch as it is the ultimate dispensary of *materia medica*.¹⁰⁸ Scriptural illiteracy is blamed for misconceptions that occasion deep despair,¹⁰⁹ inexperience fosters an enormous disaster, and unlettered minds sustain fiercely brutal wounds: “O quantam perniciem animae imperitia generat! O quam saevissimum vulnus mens inerudita acquirit!” [O what a heavy damage for the soul ensues from ignorance! O what a truly brutal wound does the illiterate mind sustain!].¹¹⁰

The study of scriptural quotations, which are meant to afford discursive strategy or mere grace in *Cons.*, has revealed another intriguing aspect of this sermon, namely that the author consulted either eclipsed Old Latin sources—a question that will be hopefully settled when more critical editions of Old Latin Scripture become available—or original Greek sources in the light of variants that point to such sources.¹¹¹ The connection of these *Cons.* quotations with Greek readings, or variants thereof, seems to be of the kind that rules out the possibility of coincidence or quotation from memory. This unexpected piece of evidence, if ultimately corroborated, would not be incongruent with Radegunde’s level of education and learning propensity, or even her curriculum vitae: we are told by Fortunatus that she read Basil and Gregory;¹¹² we may just have to specify that she likely read them in the original if she took Greek during her early schooling.¹¹³ In fact, it is not

105 *Cons.* 1.3–4.

106 *Cons.* 1.14.

107 *Cons.* 10.395.

108 *Cons.* 10.413–14.

109 *Cons.* 8.346–49.

110 *Cons.* 9.386–88.

111 See Tob. 2.2, Job 1.2–3, and Job 1.20 in Synodinos, “The Bible in *Cons.*,” in “A Critical Edition of Ps.-Basil.” See also “*De consolatione in adversis*—Latin Text” below, 69n30 and 75n74.

112 See this section, 21n72.

113 That is, at Athies where she was taken as child to be reared after Clothar had wrought havoc in her homeland, and she had fallen to his lot. See *Vita sanctae Radegundis*, 365. For relations maintained between Frankish kings and the imperial court at Constantinople, see Wallace-Hadrill, *The Long-Haired Kings*, 160–85. Gundobad of Burgundy had been elevated to the office of *magister militum Galliarum*,

unlikely that she learned Greek early on, but even if she did not, then she had ample opportunity and would also have had an interest to do so subsequently when she took up residence in Saix or Poitiers. Her relation to the monastic community of Arles, a city close to Poitiers, is documented and so is her journey to that city.¹¹⁴ It is also equally documented that there was a Greek speaking population in sixth century Arles¹¹⁵—possibly a Greek community—and accordingly either Arles or even Marseilles—a “Greek” city still in fourth century Gaul¹¹⁶—could have easily provided her with a tutor. A command of Greek would have been highly desirable—and feasible—for Radegunde, a devotee of ecclesiastical literature, with a cousin in the service of the emperor, connections at the imperial court in Constantinople, and a keen interest in the East. As already stated, some of her Latin Bible quoted in *Cons.* appears to be a direct translation from the Greek.¹¹⁷ If that is true, then it would appear that she did acquire at least a working knowledge of Greek which was enough to allow her to access the original and even to work out with her own translation as needed. In fact, it is not unthinkable that the false attribution of *Cons.* to Basil may have arisen in the transmission of the text from some misunderstanding or corruption involving Radegunde’s authorship of *Cons.* as reflected in the work’s original title. A very early witness or the archetype itself may have attributed the work to “basilia” or “basilissa”

and Anastasius I conferred on Clovis, Radegunde’s father-in-law, the title of consul inside St. Martin’s Church, at Tours, by envoy; see Wallace-Hadrill, *The Long-Haired Kings*, 175. Radegunde seems to have always maintained connections to the East. At the destruction of her native Thuringia by the Franks, her aunt Amalberga and her cousin Amalfred had escaped to Constantinople, where the latter entered the service of the emperor. Later in her life, when she conceived the idea of acquiring a piece from the True Cross for her monastery in Poitiers, at the intervention of King Sigebert, she requested and was able to obtain this holy relic from the East, from emperor Justin II and Augusta Sophia, in Constantinople. She also sent emissaries on missions to Jerusalem and throughout the East to collect holy relics. For the occasion of installing the relic of the Cross in Poitiers in 569, Fortunatus composed two hymns, “*Vexilla regis prodeunt*” and “*Pange lingua gloriosi*.” See Venantius Fortunatus, *Opera poetica*, 275–78; Gregory of Tours, *Liber in gloria martyrum*, 39–40; and *Sainted Women of the Dark Ages*, 63.

114 See this section, 23n82.

115 Brightman, “The Marginal Notes of Lections,” 452.

116 Jullian, “Les premières universités françaises,” 21: “Marseille, c’est la cité grecque, avec ses médecins, ses grammairiens, ses rhéteurs, ses philosophes. Les jeunes Italiens y viennent apprendre la langue d’Homère. C’est presque une rivale d’Athènes. L’aristocratie la préfère aux villes grecques pour y envoyer ses enfants.”

117 See this section, 28n111.

in the title—a wordplay on Radegunde’s title used in deference due to her status as substitute for her given name or as an address among her inner intellectual circle. This term, if in circulation among her innermost circle of friends on account of her connections to the East, would suggest an even match with the empress at Constantinople. Misconstrued, however, in the transmission of the text, it would occasion its replacement by Basil’s name, especially if that original witness or archetype containing it was found in the company of other works by Basil of Caesaria. We may have a textual echo of this pun in a line or two of one of Fortunatus’s poems. The poet-bishop is rhapsodizing about a group of holy women enjoying the bliss of paradise. Although Radegunde is referred to by name in that composition, she seems to have been anticipated earlier in the poem by way of indirect reference to her title when, in a list of holy women’s names likewise cited, St. Basilissa’s name comes immediately next to that of St. Agnes, whose closeness and intimate friendship in Christ with Radegunde were well known. The choice of St. Basilissa is apparently inadvertent, and it may well be. But the fact is that there is no metrical need for her to show up where she does, while, metrically, the name of Radegunde would also work as a perfect match and make sense in term of the facts: *Basilissa / Radegundis*.¹¹⁸

These are then the evidence and ethical claims in support of assigning the authorship of *Cons.* to St. Radegunde of Poitiers. Facts, of course, can admit of different interpretations, and ethical claims are not immune to scrutiny. Yet even if the arguments marshalled here tilt the balance in favour of claiming authorship of this sermon for Radegunde, there seem to be two lingering questions that require an answer: a) where was this sermon delivered; b) why do her biographers, Fortunatus and Baudonivia, not mention it? Here, we can only offer conjecture. *Cons.* was likely composed and delivered in Poitou—possibly at Saix. Villa Suedas, modern Saix, was given to her by Clothar, her husband, along with Athies and Peronne. Thiébaux states that, while at Saix, “she [Radegunde] tended and administered baths to the sick.” Had she founded a charitable institution at Saix as well, like the one at Athies, where she could also tend her lepers and preach to them?¹¹⁹ As to the

118 See Venantius Fortunatus, *Opera poetica*, 182 (*carm.* 8.3.35): “hic Paulina Agnes Basilissa Eugenia regnant.” [Here Paulina, Agnes, Basilissa, and Eugenia reign.] See also *carm.* 8.3.47–48.

119 Villa Suedas, modern Saix, in Poitou–Charentes, was given to her by Clothar, along with Athies and Peronne. For Thiébaux’s statement cited here, see Thiébaux, *Writings of Medieval Women*, 27. For the institution at Athies, see 24n85. For the time during which she took up residence in Saix, see Baudonivia’s account in *Vita*

silence of Fortunatus over the composition and delivery of this sermon in his account of Radegunde's life, this is no obstacle. Radegunde's engagement in poetic composition on Fortunatus's evidence is evinced from one of his poems,¹²⁰ not gleaned from his account of her life. Fortunatus makes no reference to any of her sermons either, albeit Baudonivia reports that she regularly preached to her nuns.¹²¹ Accordingly, granted that Baudonivia does not mention any of Radegunde's sermons by title, she does record the fact that she preached to her nuns. These sermons could not have been all improvised and delivered extemporaneously; surely, some of them must have been committed to writing. Furthermore, Fortunatus is likewise silent about the authorship of two poems which are traditionally attributed to him but which modern scholarship reassigns fully or in part to Radegunde.¹²² Consequently, Fortunatus's account of Radegunde's life seems like an unreliable source for this type of information. The same may be said of Radegunde's biography by Baudonivia.¹²³

Cons. and Stoicism

Inter alia, the string of adversities cited at the beginning of *Cons.* (i.e., the *peristasis* list in *Cons.* 1.7–12, a stock theme in *consolationes* and diatribes) is redolent as well of the scent of Stoicism in *Cons.*¹²⁴ Accordingly, the detection of Stoic echoes in the *Cons.* approach to leprosy, as well as in dealing with it, ought not to come as a surprise. This is especially true in light of the impact of Seneca's thought on ecclesiastical scholarship and of his authority, which was "quoted with a deference generally accorded only to fathers of the Church" in the Council held at Tours in the year 567.¹²⁵ There is an addi-

sanctae Radegundis, 386. Saix lies midway between Tours to the East and Angers to the West. The oldest extant witnesses for *Cons.* were each copied at Tours and Angers respectively.

120 See "Author" above, 23n79.

121 Baudonivia states that Radegunde used to preach to her nuns: see *Vita sanctae Radegundis*, 383.

122 See "Author" above, 22nn73–75.

123 According to Watkin, neither Fortunatus nor Baudonivia has left a fully satisfactory account of her life. See Watkin, "St. Radegund," 97–98.

124 See discussion under "Further Stoic Echoes" in "Literary Genre" below.

125 See Hurst and Whiting, *Treatises*, 33–34: "'From the age of St. Jerome,' says Lightfoot, 'Seneca was commonly regarded as standing on the very threshold of the Christian Church, even if he had not actually passed within its portals. In one

tional instance for consideration pertinent to the Stoic echoes in the *Cons.* author's approach to and dealing with leprosy and lepers: Martin of Braga (ca. 520–580)—who authored the *Formulae vitae honestae*, a virtual copy of a Senecan work¹²⁶—was known to be in communication with Fortunatus. Fortunatus held Martin in high esteem and sang the praises of his philosophical erudition.¹²⁷ Accordingly, besides other pieces of Stoic literature that Radegunde as the author of *Cons.* may have had access to, she may have been likewise aware of Martin's output and may have even obtained copies of his works through Fortunatus. It is also important to note that Martin "was fully convinced," according to Colish, "of the complete parity between Stoic and Christian ethics."¹²⁸

Correspondingly, if one endorses the argument in favor of the Stoic thought's impact on *Cons.* and its treatment of lepers, it is difficult to see how this impact can be restricted in scope to an ideological level alone and not spill over to Stoic diction and imagery as well. Connected with the character of *Cons.* as a sermon is therefore the question of its choice of imagery. Speaking in general terms, one may think of a wide range of reasons involved in an author's choice of imagery. All the same, even with hackneyed tropes, there could be a psychological motive behind selecting a specific set of images over another, implying perhaps familiarity with certain things that may have impressed the mind or shaped one's experience. To give an instance, consider the difference between Seneca's amputation imagery in *De providentia* (hereafter *De prov.*),¹²⁹ which is graphic and detailed, and another writer's, say, Gaudentius of Brescia's, vaguer surgical trope.¹³⁰ We may conjecture, but it seems unsafe to claim knowledge of Seneca's choice to be more graphic. In the case of our sermon—which appears to follow Seneca's amputation imagery in *De prov.*,¹³¹ as I will argue—I suggest that references to such imagery in *Cons.* may in fact reflect Senecan imagery in light of additional

ecclesiastical council at least, held at Tours in the year 567, his authority is quoted with a deference generally accorded only to fathers of the Church."

126 Possibly the no longer extant *De officiis*; see Colish, *Stoic Tradition*, 297–98.

127 See Colish, *The Stoic Tradition*, vol. 2, p. 298. Colish claims that Martin was "a native of the region of Tours."

128 Colish, *The Stoic Tradition*, vol. 2, p. 297.

129 *De prov.* 3.2.

130 See, for instance, Gaudentius of Brescia, "Praefatio," 12.

131 *Cons.* 8.357–60; 12.482–85.

points of contact between the two works.¹³² Yet, one cannot help but reflect that someone like Radegunde, writing this sermon, would probably have a specific type of amputation imagery in mind in using a surgical trope: some familiar medical procedure she was aware of.¹³³ The same applies the *Cons.* imagery of baths and bathing in connection with sanitation, to which Radegunde attached so much weight, viewing it as an essential aspect of her pastoral care for the sick and the destitute.¹³⁴ And even with the stock image of the ship in the maritime imagery at the outset of the sermon, even with such a hackneyed literary icon, the simile is not without outstanding significance for Radegunde by reason of its association with Christ. To cite Baudonivia, Radegunde had a mystical experience while sojourning in Saix, beholding Christ in a vision as a man-shaped ship.¹³⁵ This *visio beatifica*, about which she only spoke privately during her lifetime, prompted her to remain firm in her resolution to stand her ground against the overtures of her husband who had been determined to reclaim her. True, the three major instances of *Cons.* figurative imagery mentioned above can be variously connected with anybody's life and experiences at any historical period. Notwithstanding, we do know how they could be specifically connected with Radegunde's own life and personal experience.

Such links can also be possibly detected at subtler levels as medicinal imagery, which *Cons.* shares with the diatribe, may take in *Cons.* a more ominous twist and give way to gruesome clinical descriptions. For instance, in the case of Job, an outstanding embodiment of Stoic virtue in Christian thought, is one to read the maggots detail in Job's address to the devil as a literary convention or as social commentary reflecting a gruesome reality? Job claims that throngs of maggots emerge from his putrefied flesh. This detail occurs only in the Septuagint and the Old Latin Bible but with a significant difference; in the scriptural version, Job is sitting in some sort of "decayed matter of worms,"¹³⁶ which looks like a hendiadys for "rot and

132 See discussion under "The Rhetorical Element" in "Literary Genre" below.

133 Reovalis, Radegunde's personal friend, a physician from Poitiers who studied medicine in Constantinople and was later ordained presbyter, had performed testicular excision on a young boy at Radegunde's request. Gregory of Tours, *Historia francorum*, 504; cf. *Cons.* 8.357–60, 12.482–85.

134 *Cons.* 8.356–57; cf. "Author" above, 24nn84–86 and 25nn88–89.

135 *Vita sanctae Radegundis*, 380.

136 Rahlfs, ed., *Ἡ Παλαιὰ Διαθήκη κατὰ τοὺς ο΄*, vol. 2, p. 275 (Job 2.9c): "σύ τε αὐτός ἐν σαπρίᾳ σκωλήκων κάθησαι διανυκτερεύων αἴθριος" [and you yourself sit down among the corruption of worms, passing the night in the open air]; Sabatier, ed.,

worms,” whereas in *Cons.* the maggots are emerging from Job’s flesh. If we want to look upon this as a literary twist of conventional trivia, how are we to interpret the detail in Fortunatus’s account of Radegunde’s life that in washing and scrubbing the heads of the poor and the sick, Radegunde was occasionally hand-picking worms off of the diseased skin?¹³⁷ It would sound as if an aspect of some repulsive reality was reflected in a literary paraphrase of a scriptural incident. In the same manner, the speaker’s own statement manifesting personal care and affection towards the lepers makes better sense in light of Radegunde’s deep and fearless affection for her lepers, whom, on Fortunatus’s evidence, she would often embrace and kiss prompting occasional indignation among her domestics.¹³⁸ And it is in the same spirit that must perhaps be construed the incident in the Lazarus story, *Cons.* 11.447–49: “Ecce quem paulo ante superelatus dispiciebat, cuius vulneribus et carnes tabefactas horrebat, nunc ab eo solatii patrocini-um, oppraessus cruciatibus postolat” (Behold, he whom he looked down upon a little earlier, being on his high horse, for fear of whose sores and at whose festered flesh he used to shudder—now he requests from him assistance for relief, crushed, as he is, under torture.) Here, the speaker’s description of Lazarus’s diseased flesh appears to involve personal commentary. What comes after *dispiciebat* is the author’s reference to horror—the horror which Lazarus’ open wounds inspired to the dives (*horrebat*, meaning “tremble,” “shudder,” “quake with fright”). This comment is not warranted by the scriptural context or by any Patristic interpretation of the Ancient Church that I am aware of.¹³⁹ Rather than a quotation from memory, this comment seems to involve personal hermeneutics, reflecting the author’s objection to the marginalizing, stigmatizing behaviour that lepers as dis-

Bibliorum Sacrorum latinae versiones, vol. 1, p. 836 (Job 2:9): “tuque in putredine vermium sedes, pernoctans sub divo.” [and you are sitting among the corruption of worms and spend the night in the open air]. The only variant for “in putredine vermium sedes” cited in Sabatier under “Notae ad Versionem Antiquam” is “sedes in putretudine vermium.”

137 Venantius Fortunatus, *Vita sanctae Radegundis*, 42–43.

138 *Cons.* 8.347; cf. Venantius Fortunatus, *Vita sanctae Radegundi*, 43; see also Watkin, “St. Radegund,” 102: “But her special delight was to serve lepers. She laid their table, washed their faces, hands, nails, and sores with warm water, waited on each of her guests, and sent them away with a present of money or clothing. The leprous women she embraced and kissed their faces. A maid ventured to remonstrate: ‘Most reverend lady, who will kiss you if you embrace lepers in this way?’ ‘If you don’t kiss me,’ was her reply, ‘I couldn’t care less.’”

139 Just, *Luke*, 260–64.

abled people were exposed to in their chance dealings with non-disabled people.¹⁴⁰ It is likewise a normative exegesis of sorts in that it suggests to all wishing to avoid the rich man's lot an opposite, inspired attitude of boldness in the face of grim horror at the outcast's disease. The context in which this remark is made implies that in addition to indifference and contempt, it was also fright and disgust for Lazarus's ulcerated sores that may have conditioned the dive's dispatch to his place of torment.¹⁴¹ This sounds like a fresh twist in the story, introducing a new aspect in the traditional tendency to attribute the dive's behaviour to selfish indifference or arrogant contempt alone. It suggests that fear, too, may be a powerful motive for selfishness in this context, stemming as it does, in a scriptural sense, from lack of compassion: "Timor non est in caritate; sed perfecta caritas foras mittit timorem"¹⁴² (There is no fear in love; but perfect love casts out fear.) In any case, it ultimately leads straight to hell on the evidence of the dives' lot. The slight deviation from the conventional line of interpretation, the suggestion of a personal touch in the choice of comment in light perhaps of the author's opposite attitude in similar circumstances, the graphic diction implying familiarity with this setting—everything points to a preacher who is fully aware of the theological imperative to overcome the horror of contagion as an ultimate manifestation of compassion for the infected outcast. The stand that the author took in the face of such a challenge is well documented: "*perfecta caritas foras mittit timorem*." This is precisely the kind of behaviour that one would expect from St. Radegunde as well.

Literary Genre

The Dialogical Element

The dialogical elements of *Cons.* are in accordance with its whole tenor as a sermon, and even if they function as a literary device,¹⁴³ they do not disqualify the *Cons.* from being an address to a live audience. Likewise, the rhythmic cadences with which *Cons.* is advisedly adorned for rhetorical effect also appear to attest to the orality of the text. The reason for the contention that

140 The author claims to know lepers; see *Cons.* 8.346–47.

141 *Cons.* 11.447–49.

142 1 John 4:18.

143 See Stowers, *Diatribes*, 18. In the words of Margaret Amy Schatkin, speaking about the early fifth century, "in the literature of the time the boundaries between written and oral discourse were very blurred"; see Jean Chrysostome, *Sur Babylas*,

Cons. is a sermon lies mainly in the oral elements embedded in its dialogical framework,¹⁴⁴ which is patterned in the main on the diatribal model. In addition, *Cons.* shares some of the features of the pre-Christian *consolatio*. Therefore, it may be designated as a hybrid between the conventional pre-Christian *consolatio* and the diatribe. As genre, the diatribe in its original form may be styled a literary medium for disseminating moral-philosophical propaganda in a setting of preaching to the populace. Stowers states that the diatribe's two major categories are the "dialogical" and the "rhetorical" characters. This is consistent with the generally held view on the diatribe's origin, which is that it arises from a cross between the philosophical dialogue and rhetorical declamation. In some parts of the diatribe, the dialogical element is elaborated and fully developed; in others, it remains at a rudimentary level. At the rudimentary level, the dialogical element involves the speaker's direct address to a real addressee, i.e., the audience, whom the speaker does not name. The audience's supposed dialogical engagement with the speaker is never evinced by its own reciprocal direct reaction to the speaker's apostrophe but is reflected in and surmised from that apostrophe's formal features and content. In its developed form, the dialogical element is likewise characterized by a set of formal features. The most salient among these features is the fictitious interlocutor—an imaginary addressee who interrupts the speaker's disquisition, is in general as the mouthpiece for the common opinion, and may have a succinct dialogical exchange with the speaker. As a rule, the interruption of the fictitious interlocutor amounts to an objection or a false conclusion, the first of which is raised and the sec-

23. The term *tractatus*, "sermon" or "homily" in ecclesiastical Latin, was introduced into the work's title for the first time in DuDuc-Morel's reprint of 1618, thus: *Tractatus Sancti Basilii de consolatione in adversis, incerto sed antiquo interprete*. It appears to reflect the oratorical character of *Cons.*, which was in fact at length noted, and was retained in subsequent editions. For DuDuc-Morel's *Cons.* reprint of 1618, see Fedwick, *Bibliotheca Basiliana universalis*, vol. 1, p. 269.

144 A piece of evidence pointing to oral delivery, especially when assessed in conjunction with other elements of the text, occurs in *Cons.* 13.546 "quod si libenter animo haec a me dicta perceperis." [but if you heed my advice cheerfully.] Other indications which may be considered together with *Cons.* 13.546 are: *Cons.* 2.34, 10.409, 12.454 *audi* [listen]; *Cons.* 11.419, 12.457 *ausculta* [give ear to], etc. *Cons.* 9.373–74 "et tu, cum sis in plagis ac doloribus constitutus, et ab hac lutea urbe exclusus" [and you, because you live in sorrow and affliction and are shut out from this clay city] seems to be a reference to a specific city within the ambit of which this sermon is being delivered; cf. also *Cons.* 10.395. An additional element apparently indicative of oral delivery is the occurrence of "dangling" nominatives; see "The Latinity of *Cons.*" above.

ond stated, again, in conformity with a set of formal features, such as the use of dedicated particles, introductory phrases, etc. Frequently, the apostrophe of the speaker to the fictitious, or fantastic, interlocutor “occurs unexpectedly within an expository or discursive section of the discourse.” It involves, “[t]ypically...a *sudden turning* to address them.” At times, “the address to the interlocutor with a command is characteristically a short, snappy turning toward or retort to the interlocutor.” The speaker’s reply to the fictitious interlocutor likewise follows similar formal patterns. A notable trait in the interaction of the fantastic interlocutor with the speaker is that an intentional confusion may be occasionally caused to arise about the identity of the addressee. It has been rightly observed that the motive behind this “ambiguous depiction of the real audience and the fictitious interlocutor” is to indict the audience indirectly, especially, one assumes, when strong censure is intended and equally strong terms of address come into play. The “indictment-protreptic” method is a corrective two-mode process in Stoic pedagogy, intended to rectify not only the error of the fantastic interlocutor but also, in reality, the members of the audience. The fantastic interlocutor is first addressed to be indicted and retorted for the error of their ways. By shifting next to the protreptic mode, a way out of error and flawed behaviour is offered as the interlocutor is now encouraged to endorse virtuous conduct instead.¹⁴⁵ Some characteristic diatribal features in *Cons.* are as follows:

1. Indirect contact with the audience in the second person singular by way of addressing an imaginary *frater*. The apostrophe *frater* in(*mate*) *Cons.* replaces formal terms of pre-Christian diatribal address, such as ὦ ἄνθρωπε (*sirrah!* you sir!), ὦ ἑταῖρε (*mate!*), ταλαίπωρε (*wretched man!*), ὦ γενναῖε (*noble sir!*), infelix (*unhappy fellow!*), *miser* (*wretched man!*), *stulte* (*silly!*), etc.¹⁴⁶ The term *frater* (*brother*) occurs in *Cons.* with or without a qualifier as follows:

Cons. 1.16 *frater dilectissime* (*dearest brother*)

Cons. 7.326 *frater* (*brother*)

Cons. 8.356 *frater* (*brother*)

145 See Stowers, *Diatribes*, 24, 73, 86, 88, 105–6, and 110. For the fact that the diatribe can be a hybrid in combining with other literary genres, see Stowers, *Diatribes*, 76.

146 Stowers, *Diatribes*, 85.

2. Indirect contact with the audience in the second person singular by way of addressing an imaginary *frater* (brother) in conjunction with typical diatribal phrases or keywords, such as:¹⁴⁷

Cons. 12.504 *rogo* (I beg you)

Cons. 13.538 *omnibus modis rogo* (I beg you in every way possible)

Cons. 1.5; 8.343; 9.379, 388 *peto* (I beseech, I entreat, I ask)

Cons. 8.356 *crede mihi* (believe me)

3. Indirect contact with the audience in the second person singular without any accompanying term of address:¹⁴⁸

Cons. 10.394–96 *cupis...invenies* ([if] you wish...you will find)

Cons. 6.291 *vides quomodo* (you see how)

Cons. 6.292 *vides quod* (you see that)

4. Sudden apostrophe to the fictitious interlocutor in brisk diatribal style; the speaker turns and lashes out at the imaginary addressee with an indicting rhetorical question, followed by two indicting statements in *Cons.* 9.383–86:

dic mihi quisquis ille es qui ista adfirmas, ex mentis arbitrio loqueris, an alicubi in divinis paginis scriptum esse legisti? Sed apparet mihi numquam te divinarum Scripturarum verba legisse; nam si huiusmodi rebus studium habuisses, numquam te morbus perfidiae invasisset.

[Now tell me, you, whoever you are, who assert this view: are you speaking from your own mind's point of view or have you found this written somewhere on the holy pages? But it appears to me that you have never read the words of the holy Scripture. For if you had had any zeal for such things, the disease of misinformation would never have laid hold upon you.]

As regards argumentation, *Cons.* follows the logic of the diatribe which is not interested in constructing arguments but rather relies on personal conviction.¹⁴⁹ The point is driven home by means of rhetorical questions,¹⁵⁰

147 Bultmann, *Stil*, 13; and Weber, *De Senecae genere dicendi*, 36.

148 Bultmann, *Stil*, 13.

149 Bultmann, *Stil*, 54.

150 *Cons.* 3.58–59; 6.291–94.

exempla (samples for imitation, instruction; here: scriptural precedents) and imagery,¹⁵¹ appeals to divine authority,¹⁵² etc. Besides these methods of proof, there occurs also in *Cons.* a piece of diatribal dialectical reasoning consisting of an argument *a fortiori*,¹⁵³ which occurs both in its *a minore ad maius* and its *a maiore ad minus* types in *Cons.* 11.417–23 and *Cons.* 11.429–34, respectively.

The Rhetorical Element

The idea that Stoicism impacts *Cons.* both at an ideological level and at the level of diction and metaphor as well has been previously introduced in general terms. This section will detail this impact further with reference to the literary genre to which *Cons.* belongs, i.e., the diatribe, and the rhetorical aspect of its diatribal character. I will endeavour to show that *Cons.* shares much of its stock of rhetorical figures and imagery with the diatribe—or rather the “Cynic-Stoic diatribe,” a term often used to reflect the long-established connection of this genre with the Cynic and Stoic schools. In *Cons.*, the specifically Stoic imagery—in the sense of the figurative topoi of the Stoic tradition—are the maritime and medicinal imageries,¹⁵⁴ while extensive agrarian *Cons.* tropes are not without precedent in Latin Stoic literature.¹⁵⁵ As one would expect in a consolatory piece of rhetoric in diatribal style like *Cons.*, whose intended audience is incurably sick people, when the indictment-protreptic process goes into the censure mode, the tone is not bitter or sarcastic but cautious, philanthropic, and gentle; occasionally the stress seems to lie more on the protreptic—namely the therapeutic mode—and this results in the prominence of the medicinal imagery, whose use is considerably more frequent than that of any other type of imagery. Instances of the medicinal type of imagery, which is typically Stoic,¹⁵⁶ are varied and many.¹⁵⁷ Although the occurrence of Stoic tropes

151 For *exempla*, see *Cons.* 2.34–38, 43–54; 3.63–5.256; 6.280–7.340 for imagery, see “Further Stoic Echoes” below. Cf. Bultmann, *Stil*, 55.

152 As regards divine authority, the speaker relies on scriptural quotations.

153 Cf. Bultmann, *Stil*, 55.

154 See, for instance, Seneca’s maritime and medicinal imagery in Steyns, *Métaphores et comparaisons*, 51–71.

155 *Cons.* 2.39–43; see Steyns, *Métaphores et comparaisons*, 103–10.

156 See Weber, *De Senecae dicendi genere*, 17.

157 See *Cons.* 3.109–10; 6.270–76; 8.357–63; 10.396–404, 412–14.

in *Cons.* may be broadly attributed to the perseverance of the Stoic tradition in and permeating impact on even consolatory rhetoric,¹⁵⁸ it seems probable that the model for some of our sermon's imagery, diction, and ideas was supplied by a more concrete source, viz., Seneca's *De prov.*, as previously discussed. *De prov.* is a work whose central thesis, viz., "quare aliqua incommoda bonis viris accidunt cum providentia sit" (why do certain misfortunes befall good men in spite of the existence of Providence)—an aspect of the perennial problem of theodicy—is also a main theme of *Cons.*, which, surprisingly, generally shares the term *adversa* with *De prov.* more frequently than any other term used in both works with reference to hardships.¹⁵⁹ *Cons.* begins by comparing a person in the face of misfortune to the sea captain caught unawares by the fury of the storm. The *peristasis* list in *Cons.* 1.7–12 comprises a string of adversities in which any person may well find themselves entangled. The same thematic sequence and some suggestive similarity in the maritime imagery diction are found in *De prov.* 4.5,¹⁶⁰ where the comparison is likewise, at least in part, between the *gubernatorem in tempestate* (a helmsman in a storm) and the person whom various misfortunes befall. Such are *paupertas* (poverty), *ignominia* (disgrace), *infamia* (ill repute), *odium* (ill will), and *orbitas* (bereavement), some of which clearly correspond to those occurring in *Cons.* 1.7–12; but the diction and correspondence are even more suggestive between *De prov.* 3.2 (e.g., *in exilium proici* (to be driven into exile); *in egestatem deduci* (to be reduced to indigence); *liberos coniugem ecferr* (to bear children and spouse to the grave); *ignominia adfici* (to suffer disgrace); *debilitari* (become disabled)) and *Cons.* 1.7–12 (e.g., *aegestate* (indigence); *ignobilitatis* (want of fame); *debilitat* (impairs); *extinctis caris et liberis* (with children and loved ones deceased); *populi multitudinem...carueris* (deprived of human crowds)).

A further technical stylistic aspect of the diatribe that *Cons.* features is the rhetorical use of peremptory forms of address. Two such instances of authoritative expression of will among others bearing a rhetorical character in *Cons.* are *Cons.* 4.218 *tu licet...inferas cruciatus* (albeit you may plague me with torments) and *Cons.* 4.220–21 *tu licet multiplicata inferas temptamenta* (although you may multiply the trials and harass me). True, both constructions do not strictly involve an imperative, as is the case in

158 Spanneut, *Le stoïcisme des pères de l'église*, 32.

159 See, for instance, Sen. *De prov.* 2.1, 3.1, 4.4; cf. *Cons.* 1.3, 5; 2.34; 4.181, etc.

160 Sen. *De prov.* 4.5.

diatribe; the subjunctive in the concessive clauses, however, is hortatory in origin, technically amounting to an utterance whose original underlying peremptory tone is evoked in light of the circumstances in which it is used. To put it simply, note must be taken of the circumstances in which these utterances assume their authoritative tone, as the speaker, Job, launches an offensive against the devil, daring him to unleash yet another round of crushing blows. It is in this setting that Job's challenge assumes a peremptory tone, conjuring up the original hortatory nature of the subordinate subjunctive introduced by the *licet*-clause: *Cons.* 4.218 *tu licet...inferas cruciatus*, etc. (Plague me with torments!—you may!). A double imperative occurs in *Cons.* 7.326 *considera...ac perspice* (look closely...and observe), and a “pathetic imperative” (“pathetische Imperativ”) in *Cons.* 3.107 *concumbe mecum* (lie with me).

In addition to those already mentioned, *Cons.* likewise features other rhetorical stylistic elements favoured by the diatribe, such as parallelism and anaphora (as in *Cons.* 1.1–5, 7–12; 3.109–11, to cite just a few), antithesis, and so forth. Moreover, as one would expect, these and similar rhetorical stylistic features are very frequently laced together with the dialogical element as well; so, for instance, personification, paradox, and *squalida dictio* (coarse language), the first of which is a foundational component in the makeup of the Joseph and Job sketches, *Cons.* 3.103–23 and 4.206–22 respectively. In the former, personification may be construed as being applied to enliven Potiphar's wife, a scriptural figure, as *dramatis persona* of the sketch, personifying herself in the guise of Joseph's fantastic addressee. The same applies to the persona of the devil, embodying Job's imaginary opponent in *Cons.* 4.206–22, viz., the Job sketch. Personifications taking part in dialogue are consistent with the diatribe's makeup, and these *Cons.* instances just cited may illustrate this type of connection between the diatribe and early Christian literature. On the other hand, the paradox as yet another rhetorical stylistic feature may be availed of to add weight to the contrast contained in an antithesis. Moreover, the idea of freedom is not infrequently impressed by way of contrast and paradox. So, for instance, *Cons.* 3.120 “*licet indumento corporis nudus, castitatis gloria coopertus*” (although stripped of his body clothes, yet clad in the glory of chastity) and 3.127–29 “*et licet retrusus humiliaretur in vinculis, liberabat eum puritas mentis; et si squalore ergastuli membra horrebant, pudicitia animae refulgebat*” (and albeit he was confined, outraged, and shackled, the purity of his heart kept him free; and if his limbs looked hideous in the filth of the prison, the chastity of his soul shone bright). In *Cons.* there are likewise markedly frequent occurrences of *squalida dictio*, occasion-

ally combining with parallelism as in *Cons.* 4.218–22. Passages displaying *squalida dictio* in *Cons.* often involve references to leprotic symptomatology but not exclusively so.¹⁶¹

Further Stoic Echoes

A discussion on the affinity between *Cons.* and Stoicism has now been earnestly underway and a preliminary connection of *Cons.* with Stoic literature, specifically with Seneca's *De prov.*, has hopefully been established with reference to imagery and diction and some thematic common ground as well. The double sketch in *Cons.* 3.103–23 and 4.206–22, viz., Joseph's encounter with Potiphar's wife and Job's encounter with the devil, has afforded illustrations of how the rhetorical element in *Cons.* is intertwined with the dialogical element. This salient *Cons.* feature, the double sketch involving scriptural figures, can now further be harnessed to instance key thematic ties between *Cons.* and Stoic literature in more detail. Accordingly, if we were to initiate our query by turning to the Job *exemplum* first, a mere superficial look would indicate that it makes for great connection with a leper audience. By contrast, Joseph *exemplum* seems a slightly puzzling choice as such in terms of generating contact with the addressees. The link between the two choices may lie in the importance of the Stoic themes of *castitas* (chastity) and *constantia* (steadfastness), which they each exemplify. Job refers specifically to his *stabilitas animae*,¹⁶² his unswerving firmness of mind, while the theme of chastity—in particular of conjugal chastity—is a well-known Stoic diatribal theme with extensive treatment in early Patristic literature.¹⁶³ The concept of *apatheia* in general, including control of carnal desire, does not apply merely to the unwed sage,¹⁶⁴ as seems to be the case in the Joseph *exemplum*. Rather, it also extends to the conjugal status of the Christian *sapiens*.¹⁶⁵ Job's *stabilitas animae*, on the other hand, elevates him to the status of Hercules or Odysseus, the Cynic-Stoic embodiments of these virtues.¹⁶⁶ Notwithstanding, it is Job alone who is explicitly designated as *vir philosophicus*, a likely implicit synonym for

161 See *Cons.* 1.11; 4.191–92, 212–13, 219–20.

162 *Cons.* 4.213–15.

163 Spanneut, *Stoïcisme*, 258–62.

164 Spanneut, *Stoïcisme*, 261.

165 Spanneut, *Stoïcisme*, 259.

166 Colardeau, *Étude sur Épictète*, 304–5.

sapiens,¹⁶⁷ especially in light of the contrast with his wife, who is addressed in their brief conjugal verbal exchange as having spoken like a silly woman—“tamquam una ex insipientibus mulieribus locuta es.”¹⁶⁸ The suggestion that the author uses the adjective *philosophicus* in *Cons.* 4.197 in the sense of *sapiens* and that *sapiens* seems to be somehow perceived in a Stoic sense is corroborated by an additional fact: Job is designated as *vir philosophicus* in connection with being *totius patientiae magisterio repletus*,¹⁶⁹ two statements that are further linked by way of anaphora.¹⁷⁰ Here, echoes of Senecan imagery and diction emerge again, suggesting an affinity between *De prov.* and *Cons.* A further point of contact between the two works, at least against the canvas of Stoic thought, is the justification of God’s visitation on the righteous or, in the case of Seneca, on good men. In *Cons.* 2.22–23, the stated motive for allowing misfortune to befall righteous people is twofold. The righteous are afflicted a.) that they may prove worthy and b.) that their worth may shine brightly before all people.¹⁷¹ This is particularly true of Job. Thus, Job seems to be depicted not only as a kind of paradigm in whom the principle of *Cons.* 2.22–23, is exemplified, but also as an oblique reflection of the *sapiens* in Seneca’s *De prov.* To wit: God allows the devil to afflict Job severely so that his worth, viz., his endurance, may blazon forth. In like manner, Jupiter assigns to those he loves the *fortuna* appropriate to discipline them¹⁷²—a lot which is in fact the *mala fortuna*¹⁷³—so that the greatness of their worth may be displayed by means of their endurance.¹⁷⁴ Noteworthy in the pertinent passages of both works is also the element of display which is involved in the righteous’, or the *sapiens*’, trial and which necessitates spectators. In *De prov.*, the spectators are explicitly the godhead and implicitly humankind and the world.¹⁷⁵ In *Cons.*, it is the reverse: the spectators are

167 For the connection of *philosophicus* to *sapientia*, see *Thesaurus linguae latinae* (hereafter *TLL*), s.v. “philosophicus,” 10.2030.21–38; for the connection of *philosophus* to *sapiens* and *sapientia* in the Christian sense, see *TLL*, s.v. “philosophus,” 10.2038.17–34.

168 *Cons.* 4.198–99.

169 *Cons.* 4.197–98.

170 *Cons.* 4.197–98.

171 *Cons.* 2.22–23; 4.189–90.

172 *De prov.* 2.5, 4.2.

173 *De prov.* 2.9.

174 *De prov.* 2.3–4.

175 *De prov.* 2.9.

implicitly the divine and explicitly humankind and the world.¹⁷⁶ Both Job and the sage, however, please God by doing his will.¹⁷⁷ Their obedience, construed in the sense of “consent,” is required for revealing the virtue that lies latent in both and needs to blazon forth. This ultimate display of virtue of the righteous, or the *sapiens*, is the reason for the sufferings of both but with a significant difference: In Scripture, obeying God’s will causes the light of the righteous to shine bright unto the world, yet this display is not a goal unto itself. The reason for the righteous’ behaviour is that through the shining of their light before all people, glory may be given to God in heaven.¹⁷⁸

Cons. and Disability Studies

The claim that *Cons.* is a sermon in the diatribal style has been advanced in detail in the preceding section. As regards subject matter, however, *Cons.* is a sermon with a healing agenda: a stock *peristasis* list of grievous or life-threatening afflictions which the speaker promises to cure is ushered in at the outset of the sermon by an ominous maritime trope. The healing mission of the sermon is carried out by proposing the implementation of crisis management techniques which are warranted to assist any afflicted party in neutralizing and overcoming the conditions featuring in the *peristasis* list.¹⁷⁹ The conditions proposed for treatment in the sermon’s introduction—which is typically consolatory in conception—amount to a stock list of afflictions¹⁸⁰—a recurring, hallmark feature in *consolationes* and diatribes,¹⁸¹ save for the condition cited at the end of the list, which is leprosy. This is a unique feature of the piece, monopolizing the speaker’s attention, and it is no doubt the real drive for the composition of the sermon. Its location at the end of the list is likely deliberate: leprosy comes last in a series of commonplace misfortunes that apparently serve to pave the way of an extraordinary condition into an otherwise traditional *peristasis* list. All the afflictions antecedent to leprosy on the list are then dismissed and never receive further individual treatment in the remainder of the sermon, although they are

176 *Cons.* 2.23; 4.189–90.

177 *De prov.* 2.9.

178 Matt. 5:16.

179 *Cons.* 1.7–12.

180 *Cons.* 1.7–12.

181 Favez, *La consolation latine chrétienne*, 11.

vaguely referenced in its healing narrative.¹⁸² Inasmuch as the second half of the sermon caters to the needs of its target audience—i.e., the lepers, whose main concern is the state of their resurrection body in the life to come—*Cons.* is primarily a sermon that belongs with the resurrectional homiletic tradition. The fact that the conditions featured on the *peristasis* list, including leprosy, impairment, and social exclusion, are assumed to levy a heavy mental toll on any afflicted party's quality of life undoubtedly warrants the integration of *Cons.* into the interdisciplinary field of disability studies.¹⁸³

The stance of disability studies toward religion and religious studies has generally been a controversial one. Religion and religious studies have not really found a place at any level of meaningful discussion in disability studies scholarship beyond that of introductory disability studies literature.¹⁸⁴ Imhoff notes that tackling religious topics and ideas with reference to disability is a rare phenomenon in disability studies scholarship, and even when religion is referenced, as a rule it is not portrayed in a favorable light.¹⁸⁵ Honest attempts at a conversation and rapprochement between the two fields have oftentimes failed on account of key differences in the foundational underpinnings of the conversational interaction. Critical conceptual categories that orchestrate the interaction are contested. To give an instance, sin—as a violation of God's commandments, a cardinal category in the Old Testament and one of the major premises that set in motion the events in the New Testament (to speak only of the Judeo-Christian

182 For the most part, the misfortunes cited in *Cons.* 1.7–12 and their remedies are indirectly reflected in the *exempla* sourced from the Hebrew Bible and the New Testament throughout the sermon.

183 Notwithstanding the uneasy, if not controversial, relation of disability studies to the concept of religion, a growing contingent of disability studies scholars have been arguing convincingly for the need to integrate religious studies in disability studies literature research; see, for instance, Anderson, “Bridging Conversations”; Imhoff, “Why Disability Studies Needs to Take Religion Seriously.” In her “Conclusion,” Imhoff states: “For devotees of the social model of disability, religious ideas, texts, communities, and practices must be considered part of the social discourses that construct the disabled body. For those using the medical model, religious ideas, texts, communities, and practices have real effects for mental and bodily status. And for those open to new models, religious studies offers a space from which we might begin to think about the meaning and experience of chronic pain as disability. That is to say, no matter where one stands with respect to disability studies, religious studies has new insight to bring.”

184 Braswell, “Reclaiming the Faith.”

185 Imhoff, “Why Disability Studies Needs to Take Religion Seriously.”

tradition)—amounts to a nonbeing in the field of disability studies,¹⁸⁶ let alone accounting for anything in the framework of disability research. Christian and non-Christian disability advocates alike feel that religion across cultures has been instrumental in generating, or contributing to, an ideology of ability. From an ableist perspective, disability is stigmatized as an abnormality arising from impairment due to “sin or some other distortion”¹⁸⁷ rather than from social conditions and built environments that engender and foster functional limitations for impaired persons. Consequently, people with impairments are marginalized, wronged, and suffer discrimination and exclusion.¹⁸⁸ Still, it would be unfair to single out religion as the prime mover behind crafting the dominant, ableist ideology which generates disability discrimination and leads to the marginalization of impaired persons. Institutional religion interacts with culture, and so its history “reflects the biases of broader culture,” being “marred with layers of cultural sediment”¹⁸⁹ for which, to be sure, religion is accountable to some extent.

This partial accountability of religion would imply, for instance, that the liability for the perception of, say, the Bible as an ableist text biased against the disabled may not lie with the Bible per se but with normative traditions of hermeneutics, as Yong has convincingly argued.¹⁹⁰ This renegade attitude which seeks to destabilize established, conventional, non-inclusive traditions of scriptural interpretation works from the premise of “redeeming” the Bible by recontextualizing its content in the light of contemporary hermeneutics. To put it differently, it is the “hermeneutical experience” of the Bible that warrants the experience of the Bible’s truth “as correct predication” in an inclusive re-reading of the Bible.¹⁹¹ A novel articulation of unconventional hermeneutics that destigmatizes and exonerates disability in line with a new, inclusive set of value structures with a view to “redeem” or “rescue” the Bible from itself or from any modern misperception” is clearly predi-

186 Swinton, “Who is the God We Worship?,” 278: “The originators of the Disability Studies approach were physically disabled sociologists who sat broadly within a Marxist materialist paradigm.”

187 Swinton, “Who is the God We Worship?,” 277.

188 See Albrecht et al., *Handbook of Disability Studies*, 528: “Religion—over time and across societies—has been a particularly potent force in separating people as ‘abnormal.’”

189 Anderson, “Bridging Conversations.”

190 Yong, *The Bible, Disability, and the Church*, 12ff.

191 My wording is borrowed from Theodore George’s statement about philosophical hermeneutics. See *The Stanford Encyclopedia*, s.v. “Hermeneutics.”

cated on the redemptorist perspective in disability research within the field of religious studies.¹⁹² Religious studies has made significant inroads into disability research, while disability scholars' steps forward in gaining a solid footing in religious studies are still sluggish, and this is not on account of being cautious and methodical.¹⁹³ Yet, establishing an honest conversation between the two fields on equal terms is mutually relevant, particularly in practical matters; it could lead secular and religious disability advocates to forge affinities and connections, encourage a meaningful engagement between the disability and the religious communities, promote discussions on social justice and inclusion that have a significant bearing on the wellbeing of the disability community, and cause adherents of religious practices to revisit ableist traditions and biased theological exegesis.¹⁹⁴

It therefore makes sense to infuse *Cons.* and its healing modalities into disability studies, seeing that it is a religious text whose main theme, i.e., the lepers, is all about pain-related disability,¹⁹⁵ impairment, and social exclusion both here and in the afterlife.¹⁹⁶ Moreover, *Cons.*'s integration into disability studies would appear not only appropriate but desirable as well, inasmuch as it is not merely a religious text but more specifically fully qualifies as disability theology in compliance with Swinton's formulation of this term.¹⁹⁷ In brisk but purely diatribal style, disabled and non-disabled Christians—a preacher and her leper audience—engage in a theological debate relative to the resurrection body (although the audience do so through the fantastic interlocutor¹⁹⁸) in an attempt to understand the debated question

192 Avalos, "Redemptionism," 91: "One approach that is emerging is what I would denominate as a 'redemptionist' approach because it seeks to redeem the biblical text, despite any negative stance on disabilities, by recontextualizing it for modern application." For the other two approaches, namely, Rejectionism and Historicism, see Avalos, "Redemptionism," 91–92.

193 See this section, 45n182.

194 Anderson, "Bridging Conversations."

195 *Cons.* 9.373–74, 379–81.

196 The main theme is anticipated of course and also reflects in the case of Job, which strategically precedes the discussion on lepers.

197 Swinton, "Who is the God We Worship?," 275: "As well as being denominationally ecumenical, disability theology also traverses the theological disciplines. Theologians writing in this area have roots in biblical studies, systematic theology, Christian ethics, church history and practical theology." *Cons.* should obviously be subsumed under "patristics."

198 See "The Dialogical Element" in "Literary Genre" above.

against the backdrop of the Bible.¹⁹⁹ The debate is occasioned by the fact that besides the physical ordeal of their disabled persons and their mental distress, the leper audience compound their misfortune by taking it a step further, to the level of resurrection and everlasting life, apparently maintaining that the affliction under which they labour in the present life will somehow spill over into the afterlife and that they will rise disabled for all eternity.²⁰⁰ But other considerations apply as well in deciding in favour of *Cons.*'s integration into disability research. *Cons.* may be deemed a historic text in light of the speaker's reference to a personal experience with a group of lepers, possibly other than those who are being addressed in the sermon.²⁰¹ As a historic text of sorts telling the story of a contingent of lepers, how they were treated,²⁰² how they suffered,²⁰³ and what they feared in their haunting speculations for all eternity, *Cons.* seems to qualify likewise as a manner of story-telling document.²⁰⁴ Ultimately, however, *Cons.* is a literary text; it is therefore a humanities text that is also highly relevant to the study of the history of disability with a view to tracing behaviour patterns in the disposition and conduct towards disabled people in humanities-oriented educational initiatives integrated into disability studies pedagogies.²⁰⁵ The momentous impact of implementing humanities-based approaches in disability theology and disability studies pedagogy has already been evinced by scholars uniquely positioned to evaluate such strategies.²⁰⁶

199 *The Cambridge Dictionary*, 140: "Disability theology is the attempt by disabled and non-disabled Christians to understand and interpret the gospel of Jesus Christ, God, and humanity against the backdrop of the historical and contemporary experiences of people with disabilities. It has come to refer to a variety of perspectives and methods designed to give voice to the rich and diverse theological meanings of the human experience of disability."

200 *Cons.* 11.417–23. See also Synodinos, "Jerome's *Contra Johannem*," 326.

201 *Cons.* 8.346–47. See also Synodinos, "Jerome's *Contra Johannem*," 327.

202 *Cons.* 9.366–69, 375–78.

203 *Cons.* 8.341–49; 13.507–8.

204 Swinton, "Who is the God We Worship?," 275: "The methods of disability theology are similarly diverse, ranging from story-telling to social scientific analysis, through to systematic theological reflection on the nature of Christian doctrine."

205 Freedman et al., "Integrating Disability Studies Pedagogy," under "Tracing the History of Disability."

206 Yong, *Theology and Down Syndrome*, 12: "The credibility of any contemporary theology of disability rests in large part on its capacity to engage both the broad spectrum of the humanities—and the various social, cultural, economic, political and philosophical discourses on disability—and the wide range of medical,

All the adversities on the *Cons. peristasis* list are afflictions,²⁰⁷ or conditions, that result in emotional and psychological trauma, pain-related disability, or both. Therefore, it comes as no surprise that the preacher of *Cons.*—driven, no doubt, by the ethos of *performative theology*²⁰⁸—should assume a clinical attitude in the face of mental and physical suffering and resort to healing strategies of either pain management or lasting relief. As will be explained, the categories within these therapeutics remain theological and yet without so much as a glimmer of hope for miracles or a prayer appeal for healing. What matters is the approach, which is clinical in its conception, not the theological means it lays hold of in being implemented. To put it in modern terms, *Cons.* endorses the medicalized model in its attitude and treatment of people with disabilities. Still, we should not lose sight of the fact that this is a treatise about people with pain-related disabilities. The medicalized response to disability has been challenged and correctly criticized for construing “disability as an individual deficit,” failing to “consider or take seriously alternative conceptualizations.”²⁰⁹ The truth is that, in the case of *Cons.*, one would be hard pressed to prove that the lepers would not have wished to be cured, literally in this life as well as being promised healing in the afterlife. In discussing the merits and weaknesses of the medical and social model approaches to disability, Imhoff cites the case of Sarah Sampter, a polio survivor with persistent, lifelong acute chronic pain,²¹⁰ whose condi-

biogenetic, and evolutionary sciences, all of which continue to shape our understandings of disability. A pneumatological imagination alerts us to seek out, listen to, and discern the presence and activity of the Holy Spirit even in the ‘tongues’ of the sciences, of modern technology, and of humanistic scholarship”; Ware, “A ‘Look’ at the Way We look at Disability,” 288–92; Ware, “Many Possible Futures, Many Different Directions,” 112.

207 *Cons.* 1.7–12.

208 I am using the term retrospectively of course. The term *performative theology* was coined by Amos Yong with reference to “the church’s performative engagement with the world.” A *performative theology* is one that “informs, shapes, and guides the practices of the church.” It involves “the connection between the Holy Spirit, Christian doctrine, and the practices of the church.” See Yong, *Theology and Down Syndrome*, 13 and 13n13; see also Swinton, “Who is the God We Worship?,” 273–74.

209 Freedman et al., “Integrating Disability Studies Pedagogy,” under “Challenging Medicalized Constructions of Disability.”

210 Imhoff, “Why Disability Studies Needs to Take Religion Seriously”: “Throughout, the article uses Judaism and the historical figure of Jessie Sampter, a disabled Zionist from the early twentieth century, as examples. Sampter had polio as a child and suffered from chronic pain, fatigue, scoliosis, and deformity of the hands and wrists, as well as what we would now call post-polio syndrome throughout her adult

tion, even if significantly improved in an ideal social model setting, would still require complementary resources endorsed by the medical model.²¹¹ Disability may be a highly nuanced, diverse, and complex experience, but pain is universal, and it “is not a friend to humanity.”²¹² Pain-related disabilities, as in the case of *Cons.*, justify, perhaps even invite, a clinical approach—all the more so because the audience here need to be dissuaded from their conviction that they will rise disabled on the appointed day as well and that they will continue to be tormented and haunted by their pain and suffering for all eternity.²¹³

This is the earliest instance of which I am aware in the resurrectional homiletic tradition where disability is envisioned as being retained *as such* in the afterlife. In a sense, it seems to anticipate the very same notion advanced in disability studies literature today, for instance, by Amos Yong²¹⁴ (albeit Yong’s eschatological vision of disability is predicated on entirely different presuppositions in an entirely different landscape). To be specific, *Cons.* embraces a haunting and disturbing vision of disability, “suffered” here and envisioned to be retained in the afterlife among tormented people, yet

life. She wrote extensively, both privately and for publication, before and after she moved from the United States to Palestine in 1919. Throughout her adult life, she had a deep and complex relationship with Judaism.”

211 Imhoff, “Why Disability Studies Needs to Take Religion Seriously,” under “Social Model, Medical Model, and/or Something Else?”: “No amount of change in Jessie Sampter’s culture and environment could have created the situation where she felt normal and good in her body. Even if there were a bed in every room, and she had her own solar powered hover-car, she still would have felt pain and exhaustion. She may have felt it less often, and so this is not to say that we should dismiss accommodations in the case of people with chronic pain; to the contrary, accommodations are crucial. But when the social model seems to imply that if changing our social expectations and built environments sufficiently would cause all disability would go away, this is a mistaken view.”

212 Siebers, “Disability Theory,” 746: “Physical pain is highly individualistic, unpredictable, and raw as reality.... It offers few resources for resisting ideological constructions of masculinity and femininity, the erotic monopoly of the genitals, the violence of ego, or the power of capital. Pain is not a friend to humanity. It is not a secret resource for political change. It is not a well of delight for the individual. Theories that encourage these interpretations are not only unrealistic about pain; they contribute to an ideology of ability that marginalizes people with disabilities and makes their stories of suffering and victimization both politically impotent and difficult to believe.”

213 *Cons.* 11.417–20, 9.379–90.

214 Yong, *The Bible, Disability, and the Church*, 120–21.

not in connection with the Last Judgment or eternal punishment.²¹⁵ Yong's vision of disability perpetuated into everlasting life, however, is conditioned by *pneumatological imagination* and *performative theology*.²¹⁶ Yong observes that a salient feature in normative visions of the Christian afterlife and in Paul's theology of the resurrection body from an ableist hermeneutics perspective is the eschatological removal of all disability, which reflects "the present, fallen, and broken order of things," inasmuch as "the redemption of this world and its transformation into the coming eon will involve the removal of all symptoms related to the tragic character of life dominated by sin."²¹⁷ However, such a disability-free eschatology, according to Yong, legitimizes an ideology of ability and enhances normative biases by depreciating the importance of

the lives and experiences of such [disabled] people in fact, even if not in rhetoric.... [N]ormate eschatology is generated not necessarily out of concern for alleviating the suffering of such lives but more so out of uncriticized biases and fears that project a certain existential experience onto differently-abled lives in a normate world.²¹⁸

In response, Yong postulates a novel, disability-inclusive process of hermeneutics that champions an inclusive eschatological model, predicated on the uniqueness of the individuality of the person, the pursuit of emancipation, and "identity-constitutive impairments"; in Yong's proposal, "identity-constitutive impairments" cannot apparently be eliminated without dismantling the identity of the impaired person as well. Accordingly, identity-constitutive impairments will be retained in the eschaton.²¹⁹ Clearly, then, what we have in *Cons.* is an early attestation to a vision of disability retained in

215 Cf. *Cons.* 12.495–506.

216 Yong, *Theology and Down Syndrome*, 11–12.

217 Yong, *The Bible, Disability, and the Church*, 119.

218 Yong, *The Bible, Disability, and the Church*, 120–21.

219 Yong, *The Bible, Disability, and the Church*, 120–21: "[A] disability perspective would insist that some impairments are so identity-constitutive that their removal would involve the obliteration of the person as well. Congenital conditions like dwarfism Down syndrome, autistic spectrum disorder, and other types of learning and developmental disabilities are arguably of this sort. But there are also sensory impairments that people live with over the course of their lives which become identity-constitutive, such as blindness or deafness. Last but certainly not least, there are certainly various forms of bodily blemishes and defects, both visible and invisible, which, even if not identity-constitutive, are 'suffered' not in terms of physical pain but in terms of social ostracism."

everlasting life, only it is as a grim and threatening prospect rather than a liberating experience safeguarding the identity of the disabled person.²²⁰

It is obvious, however, that in the case of *Cons.*, Yong's model does not apply on account of the context in which the disability operates: the impairments of the disabled audience in *Cons.* are neither pain-free nor identity-constitutive, and so they warrant the speaker's clinical approach. The methodology applied in implementing this approach is pedagogical with inclusive awareness, together with the preacher's attempts at what might be designated "a media-based approach,"²²¹ due to the impressive visuals of the narrative's rhetorics. Integrating pedagogical methodology into a clinical approach of disability in the face of suffering, disabled people would be perfectly consistent with Radegunde's priorities and lifestyle as Fortunatus's account of her life abundantly illustrates. Her choice to adopt the rule of St. Caesarius of Arles, which laid stress on education (esp. the schooling of nuns)²²² attests to Radegunde's affirmation of pedagogy's superior worth.²²³ In like manner, the *performative*,²²⁴ utilitarian aspect of her character would

220 For a discussion of the marks of Christ, retained in his post-resurrection body of glory as tokens of solidarity with disabled people, identity markers of a disabled God, or both, see Yong, *The Bible, Disability, and the Church*, 128–35; Eiesland, "Encountering the Disabled God," 584–86; Swinton, "Who is the God We Worship?" 281–85. Swinton, "Who is the God We Worship?" 284–85 notes: "It makes perfect sense to talk about the disabled body of Jesus in terms of the incarnation and in particular his experiences of the but in terms of the resurrection it is much more problematic.... If disability is a product of social forces rather than any form of impairment, then what difference does it make that Jesus carried his scars? His scars were not the reason for his oppression or the injustices perpetrated against him. Importantly, within mainstream theology, the scars of Jesus are perceived as a source of hope and salvation as they remind Christians of the meaning of Jesus' sacrifice and the reality of their redemption."

221 Freedman et al., "Integrating Disability Studies Pedagogy," under "Interdisciplinary and Media-based approaches."

222 See "Author" above, 23n81.

223 This is a time when, already in the previous century, in fifth cent. AD, Claudianus Mamertus testifies to a sharp decline in Gallo-Roman education in Gaul, where "hardly anyone wants to learn," not on account of some change in the nature of the human mind but for lack of "enthusiasm and application": *nostro saeculo non ingenia deesse, sed studia*. The conquest of Gaul by the Salian Franks and other German tribes caused the Gallo-Roman schools of rhetoric that had "flourished under Theodoric of Toulouse," to collapse in the general unraveling of the threads of the social fabric; see Haarhoff, *Schools of Gaul*, 3, 243–47.

224 See 24nn85–87, 25n93, and 49n208.

reflect in the sermon's clinical approach.²²⁵ Granted, the speaker's pedagogical methodology operates within a religious studies framework in *Cons.* But is this not true, at least to some extent, of any type of instruction or manner of pedagogy that remained operational in sixth century Gaul? With the rise of the new social order, were not even the senatorial bishops—much pleased at heart with their heathen schooling—“constrained...to discard the style of speech in which they had been trained, and to come closer to the idiom of the masses”?²²⁶ These Christian masses, just as the leper audience in *Cons.*,²²⁷ had access to Christian instruction from the pulpit by way of passive exposure, which is a powerful learning tool. “The polished rhetoric of the schools had become strange”;²²⁸ it would not do. All manner of education, formal and informal, shared Christian instruction to a certain degree.

The speaker's thesis at the outset of *Cons.* is that hope for relief and survival in dealing with devastating disasters of any sort can only spring from the Bible, from theological education, and from scriptural training. These three principles of Biblical studies, theological education, and scriptural training constitute the preacher's notion of pedagogical strategy employed in *Cons.* Randomly sampled wording attesting to the pedagogical approach that serves to implement “the medicalized model” in the context of *Cons.* is as follows:²²⁹ possessing “a mind trained in divine utterances” is paramount in navigating a shipwreck through a storm-tossed life;²³⁰ reading and listening to God's breathed out word and “heeding his teaching” greatly eases pain and suffering;²³¹ to grasp the mechanics of bodily changes as regards resurrection, you must heed “Paul's teaching.”²³² Similar language, evincing the use of this pedagogical methodology is found throughout the sermon. Conversely, the claim of the medicalized model's implementation in *Cons.* is contingent on how the Bible and its inspired, God-breathed words are conceived by the preacher, albeit the Bible is construed as some sort of assistive technology at the disposal of the disabled—a trope that would bring to mind vague references of a social model of disability. The Bible's inspired utter-

225 See “Author” above, 25n93.

226 Haarhoff, *Schools of Gaul*, ix.

227 *Cons.* 10.394–95.

228 Haarhoff, *Schools of Gaul*, ix.

229 “Clinical,” or “medicalized,” as seen from a disability studies perspective.

230 *Cons.* 1.1–5.

231 *Cons.* 10.394–95.

232 *Cons.* 12.464–82.

ances are clearly designated *medicamina* (healing drugs),²³³ *medicamentum* (remedy),²³⁴ *medicamine* (remedy),²³⁵ and Job's paradigm is said to serve as *generalis medella* (a universal drug), a panacea for steadying and invigorating inconstant and weak minds.²³⁶ Incidentally, spiritually healing language is likewise applied within the framework of this treatise's hermeneutics of disability to account for other aspects of the relation between the audience of lepers and Providence.²³⁷ In the latter case, however, spiritually healing wording would appear objectionable, if not offensive, in disability research. This is a point where *Cons.* and disability research would part ways. Disability is a purely physical and, in many cases, specifically biochemical condition. No metaphysics is or can be involved in accounting for it from a social or scientific perspective.

And yet in *Cons.*, the leper audience construe metaphysics as a meaning-making process that helps them come to grips with their disability. They have cleared Providence of liability over the onset of the disease and assign their condition to the enormity of their own transgressions, thereby attaching guilt to personal omissive conduct.²³⁸ This should not come as a surprise. There is no avoiding the fact that a hefty contingent of people with disabilities are religious and tend to construe theology and religious experience as meaning-making agencies,²³⁹ whereby they gain an understanding of themselves, their lives, the world, and often of pain and suffering: "[T]heology and theodicy are primary ways that many people make sense of pain. To overlook these interpretations in studies of pain-related disabilities leaves an impoverished understanding of the experiences of many people with these disabilities," as Sarah Imhoff observes. She goes on to state: "This is not to suggest that religion is always good or ameliorative. It is not. ... Instead it is to suggest that when people say and act as if religion is central to how they understand their own bodies, it is incumbent upon scholars to study

233 *Cons.* 10.396.

234 *Cons.* 10.399.

235 *Cons.* 10.408.

236 *Cons.* 4.135–37.

237 *Cons.* 13.507–10.

238 *Cons.* 13.507–9.

239 Imhoff, "Why Disability Studies Needs to Take Religion Seriously": "Like other populations, disabled people are often religious: current figures say 80–85% of people with disabilities say faith is very important in their lives, a number roughly equal to non-disabled people."

it closely as a source of meaning.”²⁴⁰ One of the most challenging aspects of the lepers’ condition in the sermon is their enforced segregation²⁴¹ and isolation as a public health measure.²⁴² For her part, the preacher evinces inclusive awareness in handling this sensitive topic by revisiting the criteria for “social” inclusion, in alignment with—so to speak—the minority group/civil rights disability model. Being painfully aware that their segregation is due to their infectious disease and that she cannot heal them or provide them with accommodating human-made surroundings for them, Radegunde offers an alternative city, the *civitas dei* (city of God) and with it an alternative social order which focuses not on physical or mental limitations but on inclusion wherein the criteria are personal responsibility and adhering to a new code of conduct and of hermeneutics of reality as best one can.

In a way, her inclusive awareness likewise applies to the pedagogical approach of her methodology, for her pedagogy does not differentiate between able-bodied and disabled people; the outcomes of social inclusion and self-assertion or exclusion and marginalization are not conditioned by social constructs but depend on personal choices.²⁴³ Granted, the notions of “city,” “social inclusion,” and the like are used in an ideal as well as in a literal context in keeping with the preacher’s ideology and presuppositions.²⁴⁴ What matters here, however, is not the preacher’s ideology and its theoretical underpinnings but rather the investigation of her methodology and approach in an effort to integrate this text in disability studies research and attain greater insight into disability through cultural awareness from a more humanities-based perspective. We need to remember that the “city of God” is still *a city*, that its “social order” is still *a social order*, and that these, however nominal, are as real to Radegunde as the lepers whose “faces, hands, nails, and sores she washed with warm water”²⁴⁵ and as the worms and parasites she was picking out of their heads.²⁴⁶ Furthermore, it is with reference to a “nominal” city and a “nominal” social order that Radegunde evinces

240 Imhoff, “Why Disability Studies Needs to Take Religion Seriously,” under “Social Model, Medical Model, and/or Something Else?”

241 I am using this term advisedly as an eerie echo in an early text of a marginalized disability community’s suffering, which would be best construed through the minority group / civil rights disability model today.

242 *Cons.* 9.375–78.

243 *Cons.* 9.370–73.

244 *Cons.* 9.369–75.

245 See “*Cons.* and Stoicism” above, 34n138.

246 See “*Cons.* and Stoicism” above, 34n137.

ideas of inclusion and social justice,²⁴⁷ which are paramount in a present-day social disability model.

Finally, I want to turn to the impressive visuals of the narrative's rhetorics, a singular aspect of the preacher's pedagogical methodology, amounting to a virtual "media-based approach." Interdisciplinary and media-based approaches are strategies espoused by disability studies research for helping us gain more insight into disability through cultural awareness. In this respect as well, *Cons.* shows affinity with present-day disability studies trends and tactics. By lacing the sermon with an abundance of scriptural quotations, the preacher implements an interdisciplinary approach by having recourse to a primary literary source, the Bible, which is integrated into her own text. Furthermore, having no other technology at her disposal save for the technology of the language and being fully cognizant of the power of mental imagery—primarily of the visual and auditory modalities—she employs the resources on hand to generate the stunning visuals of her rhetorics. This is her "media-based" approach. The sermon is enriched with evangelical passion and enlivened by powerful, stimulating, conjured up Biblical scenes, dramatized with short, brisk dialogues in Stoic fashion that make for audience connection—as in the encounter of Joseph and Potiphar's wife. Job's entrance in *Cons.* 4.135–37 is dramatically stage-managed, as is the Dives and Lazarus tableau in *Cons.* 11.434–53, with a series of vivid, monologuing rhetorical questions, setting the scene for the Dives and Abraham exchange and bringing it to life. Superb conversations are forged between Job and his wife to cast them both in character roles of lively, sensational, diatribal dramatic sketches. Job's soliloquy indicting the devil is a masterpiece, an epitome of "episodes of mental imagery...on which the visual system is driven off-line, disconnected from its normal sensory inputs"²⁴⁸ The vibrant, spirited mental imagery generated in brisk, sudden monologue engagements with the fantastic interlocutor, which are designed to indict him, is likewise part of the audience's brain experience and is intended to make for audience connection. In short, *Cons.* is not an aphantasic text.

247 See Sapon-Shevin, "Inclusion: A Matter of Social Justice," 26: "[I]nclusion is not about disability, nor is it only about schools. Inclusion is about social justice."

248 *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, s.v. "Mental Imagery."