

komen voldoende aan bod. Deze bespreking kan zeker de lezing van het artikel zelf niet vervangen. Dit opstel vormt een van de vele belangrijke recente studies over Kappenberg waarmee men in de toekomst zal dienen rekening te houden.

Mankevosstraat 71
B-1860 Meise

W. M. GRAUWEN O. Praem.

Zachary of Besançon and the Bible's contradictions.

Zachary, who taught in the school at Besançon from 1131-4 and who was a Premonstratensian canon of St. Martin's Laon about 1157, was the author of a sequel to Tatian's *Diatessaron* and Augustine's *Concordance of the Gospels* written in the early 1140s, in which he brought together the views of those who had written since Augustine's time¹). It met a need and proved a popular work. (It survives in about a hundred manuscripts, mainly of the thirteenth century).

Zachary had the intention of being comprehensive. It is, he says, proper for him to include a discussion of the excellence of the Gospel and how it differs from the Law; to examine the individual Evangelists and their way of writing (*modus scribendi*) and the points which would be considered by any master when he introduced his pupils to a new book with a short formal *accessus*: the subject-matter (*materia*) of the Gospel; its intention (*intentio*); its purpose (*finis*) and the branches of philosophy it belongs to (*ad quas partes philosophiae spectet*)²). (The subject-matter of the Gospels, for example, is the mystery of the Trinity, Christ in his divine and human nature, his sayings and actions and the sayings and actions of others to him. The intention and purpose is to show men that

¹) On Zachary, see D. Van den Eynde, 'Les «magistri» du commentaire «Unum et Quatuor» de Zacharias Chrysopolitanus', *Antonianum*, 23 (1948), 3-32; 181-220 and 'Note sur la vie et l'oeuvre de Zacharie de Besançon', *Analecta Praemonstratensia*, 41 (1965), 292-309. A. Landgraf, *Introducción a la historia de la literatura teológica de la escolástica incipiente* (Barcelona, 1956), pp. 113-4; De E. Luscombe, *The School of Peter Abelard* (Cambridge, 1970), p. 224. B. Smalley, 'Some Gospel Commentaries of the Early Twelfth Century' *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, 45 (1978), 176-80; Zachary's *Super Unum et Quatuor* dated by Van den Eynde between 1140 and 1145, is in PL 186. 11-620. Augustine's *De Consensu Evangelistarum* is edited by F. Weihrich, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* 43 (1904).

²) PL 186. 11A. On the *accessus* see R.B.C. Huygens, *Accessus ad Auctores* (Leiden, 1970).

Jesus is the Son of God and that men have life through their faith in him.) He also draws upon the doctrinal teaching he found in such contemporary collections as the *Sententie Anselmi* and the *Summa Sententiorum*³). The central difficulty to which Zachary addresses himself is that of the apparent contradictions and discrepancies between the Gospel accounts. It is here that he makes a significant contribution in his discussion of the methods of reconciling them.

He emphasises a point made by Remigius of Auxerre writing on Matthew: that when we say that there are four Gospels we are speaking of four books, not four separate teachings; the doctrine is one. As Bede puts it, the *sententia* is one; the very title Zachary has chosen (taken from Jerome) emphasises the point: *Quatuor Evangelia esse unum, et unum quatuor*⁴).

Zachary would rather speak of divergences as *diversae* than as *adversae*. He begins from Augustine and looks at the way of speaking of the Evangelists. This shows, he suggests, that it is not intended that the words of the Gospel should be difficult to understand or confusing. On the contrary, they are 'accessible to everyone'. The Gospel speaks like a familiar friend to the minds of both learned and simple men. Yet it is also designed to exercise men's minds, to teach them not only what is open and obvious but also secret truth⁶). It does so by means of allegory in such a way that the surface of words covering the deeper meaning is removed⁷): by the use of images, comparisons, proverbs, and above all, by the transference of meaning from its obvious application in the natural world to a special reference to God. When head, eyes, ears, mouth, lips are attributed to God that is not to be taken literally, as though God had a body, but spiritually⁸). It is in the light of this multiple signification of what we read that we should approach the apparent contradictions and contrarities in the text.

In Augustine's *De Consensu Evangelistarum* Zachary finds various kinds of apparent contradiction dismissed. One Evangelist misses out what another includes. They do not keep to the same order. There is no *repugnantia* in these things. It is probable that each of the Evangelists

³) Smalley, *op. cit.*, p. 176-7 discusses Zachary's use of these sources.

⁴) PL 186. 14A

⁵) PL 186. 14C

⁶) PL 186. 16C, from Augustine to Volusian.

⁷) PL 186. 18A

⁸) PL 86. 19D; Augustine *De Cons. Ev.* II. xix. 69, and p. 172-3.

told the story in the order God suggested it to his recollection, says Zachary. If there appear to be conflicting accounts of details, we must look to see whether a different incident is being spoken of in the first account and in the second.

He has, he says, taken his own rules for resolving these discrepancies from Augustine and other authorities. He has observed the following characteristics in the writing of the Evangelists. They often recall the reader to a past narrative or incident, as Matthew does in his account of the Sermon on the Mount (5.1) where he begins by saying that Jesus went up into the mountain and ends by saying that he came down from the mountain (8.1). Similarly, Mary Magdelene reappears in the account of the Passion (28.1). Conversely, they often mention something which is to come, as Luke does when he describes Jesus' baptism and refers to the time when Herod was to imprison John the Baptist (3.20). These will not seem like inconsistencies or oddities if we understand that they follow a rule⁹). The awareness that this will be so removes any difficulty about such statements as that of Luke (2.48) where Mary finds Jesus in the Temple and says to him: 'Your father and I have sought you sorrowing'. 'Father' here means 'he who was thought to be the father of Jesus'. In Matthew 14.9 we read that Herod was sorry when the head of John the Baptist was presented to him on a dish as he had ordered. 'That is', says Zachary, 'he was thought to be sorry'¹⁰). In such cases what we read is an opinion, not a fact, an expression chosen because it represents what was thought or believed by those present at the time: *iuxta opinionem ... rerum appellationes*.

These reflections are developed at some length and Zachary has a good deal more to add of a more technical nature in which he makes use of some elementary principles of grammar and dialectic. It is here that he points the way to a method of analysis of Biblical language which Peter the Chanter was to take substantially further within a few decades, a rearrangement of the Augustinian approach into something systematically adapted to twelfth century study¹¹). Zachary sets out to show in what ways the language of the Bible differs from ordinary usage so that

⁹) PL 196. 20A-B, cf. *De Cons. Ev.* II. xvii. 36, pp. 136-7, where Augustine makes a related point and II. xiv. 93, pp. 199. 23-5.

¹⁰) PL 186. 20B

¹¹) On Peter's *De Tropis Loquendi* see my articles, 'Peter the Chanter's *De Tropis Loquendi*: the Problem of the Text', *New Scholasticism* SS (1981), 95-104, and 'A Work of Terminist Theology?', *Vivarium* 20 (1982), 40-58.

the reader will become alert to its attempts to point him to what it has to teach him. The unconventional ways of putting things we find in the Bible are there as signposts.

Many of Zachary's points are simple, and most of them come from Augustine or one of his other sources. His own contribution is to place a new, twelfth-century emphasis on their possibilities. It is often the case, for example, that a cause is spoken of in the Gospels by the name of its effect. In Mark 9.25: 'Go out, deaf and dumb spirit', the spirit itself is not deaf and dumb but it causes him whom it possesses to be deaf and dumb, so: *surde et mute* would read: *faciens surdum et mutum* if this were an ordinary piece of writing¹². Equally, the word for a cause is sometimes given for the effect. Mark's Gospel says that the Lord cast demons out of Mary but it means literally that he cast out the vices which had been introduced into her by the demons, that is, the effects the demons had had upon her¹³). In both these examples Zachary's concern is to adjust the language to the facts, the *verba* to the *res*.

A further type of apparent anomaly may arise where someone is said to have done something which he did not himself do but his ancestors or successors (*De diversis in eadem successione positis*). Zachary refers to the passage where Jesus says that the blood of all the righteous which has been shed upon the earth from Abel's blood to that of Zacharias: 'whom you slew between the temple and the altar', shall be upon the present generation. The present generation did not slay Zacharias but their fathers (Matthew 23.35). Similarly, when Jesus said: 'I am with you to the end of the world' (Matthew 28.20) He did not mean the 'you' of the generation then living only, but also those who came after them¹⁴).

Often 'the thing signified takes its name from a likeness to the thing signifying' (*significata res ex similitudine rei significantis nomen suscipit*). When Jesus says: 'I am the Vine' and in other cases where Christ is said to be a lamb, a lion, an eagle, and so on¹⁵), he is being described by the name of something which is in some way like him. Conversely, the thing signifying is understood sometimes by the thing signified. When John the Baptist saw the heavens opened and the Spirit descending like a dove (Matthew 3.16; Mark 1.10; Luke 3.22; John 1.32), he was seeing the Spirit in reality, but the reader understands what he saw by way of

¹²) PL 186. 20B

¹³) PL 186. 20C-D

¹⁴) PL 186. 20D

¹⁵) PL 186. 21A

the dove which signifies the Spirit and which is brought in here for comparison ('like a dove'). When we read that 'some of those standing here will not taste death until they see the Son of Man coming in His Kingdom' (Mark 9.1), we understand by the transfiguration the future coming of Christ in glory.

Sometimes the whole is understood by a reference to a part. 'The Word was made flesh'; this 'flesh' must be understood to be 'man' (John 1.14). Sometimes specific numbers are given, then what is meant is 'all'. The seven demons who were cast out from Mary stand for the whole collection of vices which were cast out from her. Sometimes a plural is given for a singular. In Matthew and Mark two robbers crucified with Christ mock Him, but in Luke only one (Mark 15.32; Luke 23.39). Luke says that soldiers came and offered the dying Jesus vinegar (23.36); Matthew and Mark mention only one (Matthew 27.48; Mark 15.36).

Zachary's list of those usages which unless we understand their function may lead us to think there are contradictions in Scripture, is not a long one; nor does he attempt, as Peter the Chanter was to do, to provide Scriptural examples for all the technical devices discovered by contemporary grammarians and dialecticians. But in placing an emphasis on the resolution of apparent contradictions by technical rules of signification theory in the text of the Gospels he shows himself to have been something of a pioneer in this area. The continuing popularity of his work into the thirteenth century suggests that his treatise proved to be of lasting value in an even more technically-minded age.

Sidney Sussex College
Cambridge, England.

G.R. EVANS.