

# Biblical Interpretation in the Middle Ages and the Reformation

By Dr. Kenneth Hagen

[Bethany Lutheran College, S. C. Ylvisaker Fine Arts Center, Mankato, Minnesota, October 26 and 27, 2000]

## Introduction

We are going to take a ride on our *chariot* and see where it (she) takes us.

The most common assertion about biblical interpretation in the Middle Ages and the Reformation is that medieval theologians employed the fourfold method of interpreting Scripture known as the *quadriga* and the reformers rejected it: the four senses were history, allegory, tropology, and anagogy.

“The medieval *quadriga*” is the common coinage.<sup>i</sup> But if you look in your classical Latin dictionary you will find that *quadriga* means “A chariot with its team of four horses running abreast,” or “a team of four chariot horses,” “four abreast,” “a four-horse team,” “four-horse chariot,” or just “chariot.” We might say a four-horse rig. Medieval and ecclesiastical Latin dictionaries continue defining *quadriga* as “chariot” or “wagon.”

How do we go then from a four-horse rig to the four senses of Scripture? I had a colleague who always bugged me about where this *quadriga* came from. “Well, it’s medieval and comes from John Cassian,” I would reply; all histories of hermeneutics will tell you that. All medievals used a threefold or fourfold scheme to designate the multiple senses of Scripture. The fourfold scheme is the *quadriga*. Right? Well, it not only is not so easy; it may not be true. And then there is Luther; he rejected allegory and the whole *quadriga*, right? Well, here again it is not so easy and may not be true.

## I. Data on *Quadriga*

If you want to know the meaning and use of a word in medieval theology, you must know its usage in the Vulgate because the Latin of medieval theology is the Latin of the Bible. The Latin Vulgate permeated the style and vocabulary of most medieval literature and certainly all of medieval theology. Medieval theologians have been described as “walking concordances” because they carried the whole of Scripture in their heads and hearts. Melancthon said that Luther had memorized the whole Bible.

### Meaning of *Quadriga* in the Latin Bible

The six instances of *quadriga* in the nominative singular in the Vulgate all translate “chariot.”

Zech. 6:1-5 is cited throughout the Middle Ages:

*NRSV Zech. 6:1. And again I looked up and saw four chariots coming out from between two mountains—mountains of bronze. The first chariot had red horses, the second chariot black horses, the third chariot white horses, and the fourth chariot dappled gray horses. Then I said to the angel who talked with me, “What are these, my lord?” The angel answered me, “These are the four winds of heaven going out, after presenting themselves before the Lord of all the earth.”*<sup>iii</sup>

There are eight instances of *quadrigae* in the plural, all mean chariots. Example:

*NRSV Isa. 66:15. For the LORD will come in fire, and his chariots like the whirlwind, to pay back his anger in fury, and his rebuke in flames of fire.*<sup>iv</sup>

The four instances of *quadrigam* (in accusative singular) all mean chariot:

*NRSV Isa. 43:17. ...who brings out chariot and horse, army and warrior; they lie down, they cannot rise, they are extinguished, quenched like a wick.*<sup>v</sup>

The eleven instances of *quadrigarum* (genitive plural) all translate chariots:

*NRSV 1 Sam. 8:11. He said, “These will be the ways of the king who will reign over you: he will take your sons and appoint them to his chariots and to be his horsemen, and to run before his chariots.”*<sup>vi</sup>

The four instances of quadrigas (accusative plural) mean chariots:

*NRSV 1 Chron. 18:4. David took from him one thousand chariots, seven thousand cavalry, and twenty thousand foot soldiers. David hamstringed all the chariot horses, but left one hundred of them.*<sup>vii</sup>

Five instances of quadrigis (ablative plural), all chariots:

*NRSV 2 Chron. 16:8. Were not the Ethiopians and the Libyans a huge army with exceedingly many chariots and cavalry? Yet because you relied on the LORD, he gave them into your hand.*<sup>viii</sup>

### **Conclusion regarding quadriga in the Vulgate:**

The thirty-eight instances of quadriga (in various case endings) in the Latin Vulgata all translate and mean chariot(s). Plain old rigs, all connoting horses, charioteers, battles, blood and guts. No connection to senses or meaning of anything, let alone Scripture. As I imagine sitting behind a “stink-en” old four-horse team, what flies in my face is anything but the sweetness of Scripture.

### **What happens to the word “quadriga,” chariot, in the Middle Ages?**

In the *Patrologia Latina Database* (PLD) are 311 instances of quadriga in the nominative singular. There is some variation on quadriga in the Middle Ages. Beyond the biblical references to chariots on earth engaged in battles, using horses and soldiers, the word “quadriga” takes on a figure of speech beyond the temporal world. To use Patristic language, it becomes an image, a symbol, a metaphor.<sup>ix</sup>

Martyrs are carried away in chariots to glory (PLD, vol. 17).

The New Testament—Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John—is the chariot of the Lord (vol. 22 and elsewhere).

The Lord sits in the heavens in his chariot and the angels praise him (26).

Lie (falsehood) is the chariot of the demons (39).

Spousal obedience, you are a perfect ladder to heaven, you a chariot by which Elijah was carried to heaven, you are the gateway to paradise (40).

Prudence, justice, temperance, fortitude—these are enclosed in the regions of heaven; you chariot as charioteer of Christ carries to the goal (30).

Virtues, four cardinal virtues: chariot of the virtues of heaven (46).

Chariot of friends, full of love (100).

Ancient customs are brought together into one chariot—Richard, Hugo, Willelmus, Hamo (163).

The chariot of Christ (*Quadriga Christi*) is the Gospel; the four wheels are the four evangelists. The chariot of Aminadab are the four Gospels (172).

### **Conclusions regarding quadriga in Scripture and the Middle Ages:**

In Scripture and throughout the Middle Ages, quadriga means chariot (singular or plural), a four-horse chariot. Most often in the Middle Ages, quadriga means one of the chariots of battle cited in Scripture. Less often but sometimes in the Middle Ages, quadriga takes on metaphoric usage, the four horses become four

virtues, four vices, four Gospels. One could say that it would be a short step from quadriga as four Gospels to quadriga as the four senses of Scripture. The question is “Who first took that step and when?”

The fourfold sense or meaning (*quadrifariam*) of Scripture goes back to the early period (Jerome, Cassian).<sup>x</sup> A threefold division goes back to Origen’s anthropology of body, soul, and spirit, hence historical, moral, and mystical senses of Scripture. Images of three and four abound. One threefold, classic image, having to do with building a house, came from Gregory the Great and was used by Hugh of St. Victor: the historical sense is the foundation, the structure built thereon is the allegorical sense, the decoration is the tropological sense.<sup>xi</sup> Configurations of four abound: four Gospels, four corners of the world, four winds, four rivers of paradise, four legs of the table in the temple. The fourfold division emerged as the dominant practice by the end of the Middle Ages.

The fourfold meaning was put to rhyme, nobody knows exactly when for the first time, and called a “verse” by Lyra; Lyra refers to these four senses (*istorum quatuor sensuum*). The most comprehensive and respected survey of medieval exegesis by Henri De Lubac finds the earliest usage of the rhyme (distich) to come from a Dane, Augustine (Aage) of Denmark, in a document published around 1260.<sup>xii</sup> Lyra’s dates are 1270-1349.

The verse (distich, a verse couplet) is as follows:

*Littera gesta docet, quid credas allegoria,  
Moralis quid agas, quo tendas anagogia.*

The letter teaches what happened, the allegorical what you are to believe, the moral what you are to do, the anagogical where you are going.

Jerusalem (literally) is the city; Jerusalem (allegorically) is the church; Jerusalem (morally) is the human soul; Jerusalem (anagogically) is heaven.

Nobody up to Lyra applies the word “quadriga” to the well-known verse (from my research); neither does Lyra. Lyra says, “Sacred Scripture has quadruplicem sensum [fourfold meaning]” and later cites “the verse.”<sup>xiii</sup> I think it is safe to say that if anyone were to assign the verse (distich) to quadriga the greatest biblical scholar of the age, Nicholas of Lyra, would have done so. Lyra, like Luther’s amanuensis Rörer, was a vacuum cleaner that sucked up the wealth of medieval biblical learning.

Now mind you that Lyra is not just some fourteenth-century manuscript, though many copies were made of his commentaries (*Postillae*). *Lyra was in the Bible, Luther’s Bible* (literally!). That is, when the Great Froben Bibles were printed, starting in 1498 and continuing to 1508, Lyra’s commentaries occupied the whole right side of the page of the Bible. [see appendix] The Froben Bible (1506-1508) was the edition available to Luther in Wittenberg. So when Luther opened his Bible to his favorite Epistle, Galatians, there he saw Lyra say, “Sacred Scripture has quadruplicem sensum [fourfold meaning]”; quadruplex not quadriga.

## Quadriga in Luther

What we have then is that at the end of the Middle Ages the famous “verse” is given by the best-known and most influential biblical scholar, Lyra. The word used by everyone to describe this verse, quadriga, cannot be located and connected to the verse (before 1508). The first person to use the verse and the word “quadriga” is Luther (between 1517 and 1521). You might think that this is an acceptable solution, Luther put quadriga on the map; Luther is more well-known and more influential than Lyra. The problem with this is that when Luther does refer to “quadriga” he does so in a manner that seems to indicate it is a well-known word descriptive of the four senses. Furthermore, Luther’s use and comments about quadriga are not unequivocal (he vacillates somewhat): at first he is critical of quadriga, calling it a game and saying it does not lead to true understanding of Scripture. About two years later he is mildly supportive of quadriga. Then about two years later still he attacks quadriga. Then after 1521, he reverts to the medieval usage of quadriga as “chariot” in the biblical sense of the word and not the four senses of Scripture (see below).

In 1516, as in 1513, Luther uses the traditional four senses, then in 1516 (On Galatians) he recites the verse (distich) as well. However, no word “quadriga” is attached. In his 1516 comments on Gal. 4:24, Luther introduces the distich with these words: *Quadruplex sensus scripturae habetur in usu* (there is a fourfold

meaning of Scripture in use today).<sup>xiv</sup> Note that Luther says quadruplex, not quadriga; quadruplex was the customary word (Lyra's word).<sup>xv</sup> In 1516 he sees problems with the usual delimitation of the four senses as too narrow and too inconsistent.

The first usage of "quadriga" comes in a Sermon on the Ten Commandments early in 1517. Here, he is negative, saying that the most impious deal with "that quadriga."<sup>xvi</sup> "The most impious" are called Scholastic doctors. Their most accurate name, however, is "stage actors," "humorists," and "mockers" because they make inept games out of the literal, allegorical, moral, and anagogical senses.<sup>xvii</sup>

The word "that" (*illam*) denotes that famous quadriga, as though everyone knew what Luther was talking about. The demonstrative pronoun (that) puzzles me since I cannot (nor can anyone else) find "quadriga" as the "famous fourfold meaning" in print. In 1519, when he gives mild approval, he refers again to "that quadriga" with a different demonstrative pronoun (*ista*) as though it is well-known (in this case he seems to use *ista* with a negative connotation).

In 1519 (on Gal. 4:24), Luther again knows and uses the word "quadriga" applied to the four senses of Scripture.<sup>xviii</sup> He does so in a way that indicates that he is not making any of this up. He speaks of the usual interpretation of the four senses and even calls it a "game" played by some, which is okay if it is not used to the extreme and if it adds ornamentation to the legitimate sense. Often for Luther allegory means an example for the not well-instructed, or a "milky teaching." Then Luther's next point is: "That *quadriga*, though I do not disapprove of it, is not sufficiently supported by the authority of Scripture, by the custom of the Fathers, or by grammatical principles" (LW 27:311). The American Edition translates quadriga as "four-horse team" which makes no sense as translation but is correct as to its classical usage.

Soon after 1519, in his second commentary on the Psalms from 1519-21, Luther has another thought about the quadriga, this time completely unfavorable. His concern here is with those who slice up Scripture into various pieces, going back to Origen and Jerome and continuing up to Scholasticism and the Antichrist. Actually Luther's term is very strong; he attacks those corrupters who "lacerate," mangle, Scripture into four parts and "divide the robe of Christ."

To paraphrase, toward the end of the *Operationes in Psalmos*:

Scripture began to be lacerated with the falling apart (down) of the Fathers and to deteriorate in succeeding generations. Then with the Universities and the reigning of the Antichrist, confirmed in the hand of the Roman Pontiff, came not the mystery of iniquity but iniquity itself in control and its abomination standing in the holy place openly, as Christ and his Apostles became extinct. Soon Saint Thomas with Lyra and his kind began to publish to the world *quadrigam illam sensuum scripturae, literalem, tropologicum, allegoricum et anagogicum*, and thus divide the robe of Christ into four parts; and all the authors, doctors, inquistors were audacious corrupters of Scripture.<sup>xix</sup>

Luther sees the "quadriga" to be so named (made known to the world) by Thomas, then Lyra and others. He goes on to repeat that the Scholastics in their lacerations of Scripture know nothing of the legitimate meaning of Scripture. What we may have here I have seen elsewhere in medieval theology, namely, that some position is attributed to someone and that attribution continues to be repeated without any basis in fact. I cannot see where quadriga in Thomas is used in any way other than chariots and horses.<sup>xx</sup>

These three references, 1517, 1519, 1521, are the only three references in all of Luther's works where he connects quadriga with the four senses of Scripture; otherwise, in thirteen other uses "quadriga" refers to chariot(s);<sup>xxi</sup> except in one place where it means "fourfold meaning of sins."<sup>xxii</sup>

Something tells me that I must conclude that Luther in 1517 is the first to use quadriga in print as applied to the fourfold meaning of Scripture. You could even say the four-horse chariot has become the fourfold meaning of Scripture, a logical extension of medieval metaphor. Now mind you that Luther is not terribly excited about the fourfold meaning (now called quadriga by him), and says that it cannot be used to establish a doctrine of faith (which is Aquinas's position as well). Plus he says that the distinctions among the four senses are not clearly and consistently made among the Fathers. Nevertheless, Luther uses the three spiritual senses off and on throughout his life, not for doctrine but for example and ornamentation.

I see three possibilities. One is that he found and adopted the word “quadriga” from an, as yet, unknown source (after Lyra). Two, he heard it used in the lecture hall as an oral shorthand reference to the fourfold meaning, sort of as a figure of speech, much the same way the word “quadriga” apparently has been used from the sixteenth century on. You say “quadriga” and everyone knew and knows that you mean the traditional medieval fourfold meaning of Scripture. He even ascribes its origin to Thomas and Lyra who were most likely sources, believable and repeatable by everyone. I say from the sixteenth century on, since quadriga is so defined in Muller’s *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms, Drawn Principally from Protestant Scholastic Theology* (see note 2). The way Luther and this Latin Dictionary for the sixteenth century read, quadriga as the fourfold meaning was a kind of oral tradition never put in print.

For my third possibility, Lyra again unlocks the door I have been trying to open. Once it dawned on me that in Luther’s Bible quadruplex and not quadriga was used, Luther had to be the first to use the term “quadriga” as the medieval fourfold meaning of Scripture. Or, to put it another way, if anyone was going to use quadriga prior to Luther it would have been Lyra. Luther is famous for making up German words; why not Latin? And the demonstrative pronouns were good Luther rhetoric.

Perhaps Luther was not aware of the importance of his use of quadriga for Scripture at that instance in 1517. Nevertheless, his use of the word is consistent with his new understanding of Scripture. For the medievals, and this is Luther’s consistent complaint, the four senses of Scripture could and did become an exegetical game, a spiritual game without the Spirit. Scripture could be manipulated by the clever allegorist. How many allegories can you find? For Luther, Scripture is not to be interpreted; it is not up to the interpreter to show off the many meanings of Scripture. Scripture is a performative force that drives, propels, promotes, transports Christ. The interpreter is to get out of the way and let the moving force of God’s Word do God’s work (law and Gospel). The other consistent criticism of Luther is that the quadriga slices up the wholeness of Scripture into bits and pieces. He goes on in the *Operationes* to say that Scripture has one, most simple sense; Scripture remains the most simple doctrine of faith, hope, and charity. The word “most simple” (*simplicissima*) means most plain, open, straightforward, frank, and honest. No hidden mysteries that require the scholastic doctors to cull and carve out the meanings of Scripture.

### I. Another Ride

Let’s back up our wagon and take another run at this topic. We have seen our chariot take some lumps and bumps over the Middle Ages up to Luther as far as the fourfold meaning of Scripture is concerned. I would like to suggest that in our next ride through the Middle Ages and Luther we extend the medieval metaphor a bit and consider the quadriga, chariot, in the sense of journey. Specifically Scripture becomes a means of transportation to God, both in the Middle Ages and in a different way in Luther.

Biblical Interpretation in the Middle Ages and Reformation begins and ends on a journey. The image of a journey and carriage is not just a metaphor or symbolic language. It is the actual language of understanding and interpreting the Bible in the early church and Middle Ages, continuing into the Reformation.

The language of journey is actually the first term used to describe those who also became known as “Christian.” Those who followed Jesus were known as followers of the “Way” or those who belonged to the Way (see six references in Acts).

Acts 9:2. ...and asked him for letters to the synagogues at Damascus, so that if he found any belonging to *the Way*, men or women, he might bring them bound to Jerusalem.

Acts 19:9. ...but when some were stubborn and disbelieved, speaking evil of *the Way* before the congregation, he withdrew from them, taking the disciples with him, and argued daily in the hall of Tyrannus.

Acts 19:23. About that time there arose no little stir concerning *the Way*.

Acts 22:4. I persecuted this *Way* to the death, binding and delivering to prison both men and women.

Acts 24:14. But this I admit to you, that according to *the Way*, which they call a sect, I worship the God of our fathers, believing everything laid down by the law or written in the prophets.

Acts 24:22. But Felix, having a rather accurate knowledge of *the Way*, put them off, saying, “When Lysias the tribune comes down, I will decide your case.”

Augustine set the stage for understanding the Christian life as a journey, a journey home to God. The medieval believer was described as a *viator* (pilgrim), on the way, on a journey, the goal of the journey is home, home is the Trinity (in Augustine’s terms).

What I am suggesting is that the medievals viewed the understanding and interpretation of Scripture as a journey into the depth of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God. As the journey home to God is a lifelong effort, so the understanding of God’s Word is a lifelong quest. As one never gets to the bottom of God, so one never gets to the bottom of Scripture.

The medieval four senses was/is often maligned as an escape from the letter of Scripture into fairy tale and allegory. This criticism is actually as old as the Middle Ages; that is, the criticism of excesses in allegory is a constant in the Middle Ages and Reformation. The twelfth century Victorines were critical of the allegorists of their day.

Two points in defense of allegory: One, allegory is used in Scripture. Two, it is an attempt to penetrate the spiritual depths of meaning in Scripture; for Luther, allegory is an example, a good story. Plus, for Aquinas no doctrine could be based on allegory or any of the spiritual senses, but only on the literal sense of Scripture.

The point of the four senses is not the horse but the number. The number four, as stated earlier, was very suggestive and symbolic. As far as I can tell, the first use of the “quadradic” word was in Cassian, where he uses *quadrifariam*, an adverb descriptive of the action in penetrating the depths of Scripture.

By the end of the Middle Ages the number four was firmly in place; Luther used the word “quadriga.” In the earlier Middle Ages the senses and rules for understanding Scripture could very often be three or even seven. At the end of the Middle Ages two senses of Scripture were offered by Aquinas and Lyra. The importance of these numbers is that they are more than one. The reason was the oft-cited verse: “The letter kills, but the Spirit gives life.” That verse was understood to mean that the letter of Scripture, while inspired by God, was not the end of Scripture. The end of Scripture is the spirit of God, life in God. Second Corinthians 3:6: “who has made us competent to be ministers of a new covenant, not of letter but of spirit; for the letter kills, but the Spirit gives life.” The combination of this verse and Augustine’s famous letter/Spirit dichotomy led to a sharp distinction between letter/spirit, exterior/ interior, flesh/spirit, OT/NT.

In the background of the early medieval view of the multiple senses of Scripture was neo-Platonic philosophy, that reality lies above and beyond the historical particular. As Aristotle came into medieval theology, the value of the historical entity, the letter of Scripture, increased to the point that all spiritual meaning was seen contained in the letter (double-literal sense).

The spiritual senses allowed the medieval pilgrim to penetrate the heights and depths of the mysteries of God. The quest for meaning was the search for God. The monastic quest was a human quest aided by the graces of God. Scripture and the sacraments of the Church were the means for living the Christian life of piety and service. Augustine said that the proper end of Scripture was charity. If you had correct interpretation but not charity, you had misused the Bible. On the other hand, if your interpretation was not accurate but your reading led to charity, that was the proper use of the Bible.

I have tried here to suggest that the medieval perception of Scripture as a means of transportation home to God, as a means to another end, was cast in terms of reaching beyond the letter of Scripture and searching for God in spiritual realms. The search for God in spiritual realms was to lead to a life of virtue.

Within the monastery the Bible was also a *regula vivendi*. It was God’s supreme directive guiding the monk along the *via regia* to his heavenly homeland. This principle is clearly enunciated in St. Benedict’s Rule (chap. 73): “For what page or what saying of the divinely inspired books of the Old and New Testament is not a most correct rule of human life?” The Bible was, therefore, in monastic circles not

only a source of truth but also a source book of morality which proposed to the monk the virtues to be acquired in his religious life. The fourth chapter of St. Benedict's Rule presents a list of monastic virtues, derived from the Bible, which the monk is to acquire and exercise.

The prayer of St. Benedict is constructed on the Bible, especially on the Psalms. The monastic *lectio divina*, originally designating Holy Scripture itself, came later to be synonymous with the act of reading it. This sacred reading was a religious experience, involving such careful meditation on the words of the text that they became permanently imprinted on the mind and spirit. The result of long years of this monastic prayer was a total interior saturation with the words and ideas of Scripture. The *lectio divina* was the foundation and the beginning of all monastic *meditatio* and *contemplatio*, just as at a later date it would be the foundation and beginning of all *quaestio* and *disputatio*. Just as Scholasticism was orientated towards *scientia scripturarum*, so was monasticism orientated towards *sapientia scripturarum*.

All monastic education, therefore, was directed towards understanding the Holy Scriptures, in which the triad, prayer, perfection, and service of God, was rooted.<sup>xxiii</sup>

With Luther, Scripture as carrier ends with a different focus. One of his rules for reading Scripture was *was christum treibet*. Scripture is what carries Christ. And what carries or promotes Christ is at the heart of Scripture. Treiben is an old Germanic word connoting transportation. To change metaphors a bit, Scripture is the manger that carries the babe for Luther. The journey image with Luther ends up right at the heart and letter of Scripture. For Luther the move is not away from the letter but directly to the letter as the conveyer of Christ.

### **Conclusion to Part Two:**

The situation is this. We have allegory in Scripture, typology, moral application, and heaven as the end of it all. Scripture resonates with Scripture; Scripture is full of echo, repetition, explanation, commentary. As Luther says, Scripture interprets itself. This inner scriptural action of comment and application continues in the history of the Church. Add the ingredient of 2 Cor. 3:6, "The letter kills, but the Spirit gives life," and you have the extension of multiple senses of Scripture. The lifelong search for God is the search for the spiritual meaning of Scripture in medieval theology. For Luther, however, the Second Corinthian passage is not license for allegory, nor is it a diminution of the letter, but rather teaches the distinction between law and Gospel, the law which kills and the Gospel that gives life.

What I have tried to do so far is to dissect the details that go into the customary picture of biblical interpretation in the Middle Ages and Reformation, namely, the picture of the distich, the quadriga, Cassian, chariot, and Luther. I have suggested that the picture was not complete until Luther, who was the first to have all the details together in one place.

Scripture was by far the most influential book in the Middle Ages. The Bible affected every aspect of life, culture, art, architecture, language, literature, world view, and liturgy. Even a bad joke was based on the Bible:

Who died but was never born? (Adam)

Who gave but did not receive? (Eve, Milk)

Who was born but did not die? (Elias and Enoch)

Who was born twice and died once? (Jonas, the prophet, who for three days and three nights prayed in the belly of the whale. He neither saw the heavens nor touched the earth.)

How many languages are there? (Seventy-two)

Who spoke with a dog? (St. Peter)

Who spoke with an ass? (Balaam, the prophet)

Who was the first woman to commit adultery? (Eve with the serpent)<sup>xxiv</sup>

### III. Scripture as Sacred Page, Sacred Doctrine, Sacred Letter, Sacred Page

I think our horses need a rest and it best that we park our chariots and move to my third and final section.

#### Sacred Page, Augustine

The predominant view of Scripture coming out of the early Church and continuing well into the Reformation was that Scripture is *sacra pagina* (in spite of what Scholasticism and Humanism tried to do). Scripture as sacred page meant the text itself, reading the text, the Word of God, the presence of God, the power of God, the footprints of God in human history. “Sacred page” says it all.

When I think of *pagina* I think of the etymology of the word from *pago*, *pango*, *pactum*, *pagina*. You can hear the linguistics, the *pango bango*, the *pago pagina*, the smudge on paper, the very imprint of God’s hand on the page.

For about the first thousand years all of theology was *sacra pagina* (sacred page). From the age of the Fathers up to the rise of the schools (Scholasticism), the source of theology was the sacred page of Scripture. Theology was all wrapped up in the study of God’s sacred imprint in Holy Writ. Think of monastic life. It was the monastic community (more so in the West) that preserved learning up to the time of the schools or universities. They were the bearers of classical and Christian civilization. Think of the monk in the Scriptorium working with Scripture before the movable printing press and the photocopier. The disciplined life entailed copying Scripture, singing it in the holy office, praying it, carrying it in the heart the whole day. The monk and nun lived in the world of the Bible. Their whole life was connected with Scripture. It was sometime in the Renaissance that people began to see a difference between their contemporary culture and the age of the Bible. The monastics could not disassociate themselves from Scripture. It is hard for us to imagine that because we have the Bible in a black book, we can take it off the shelf, read it, and then put the book back (out of sight, out of mind). The monastic could not put the Bible away. The Bible was not a book. The Bible was in the heart.

From the earliest times onward, the place of the Bible in theology was that the Bible was theology and theology was the Bible. The Fathers refuted heresies, the monks preserved the Scriptures and traditions, all on the basis of the Bible. Theology was not some separate discipline as it became in the high Middle Ages and as it is today. For the early period the Bible was the source of all that is—God’s work in his creation and in his Church, and that work is encapsulated in the monastic community.

Augustine pulled together the various strands of biblical study in the early period and became the pillar on which medieval theology was built, well into the sixteenth century. Now we consider how Augustine put Scripture together.

First, Augustine, as was typical throughout this period, saw two eras of salvation represented by the two great books of Scripture. The Old and New Testaments represent the old and new era of salvation. God had a plan for his people; he gave revelation progressively as the people were prepared and able to accept what it was that God had in mind. A progressive revelation went on in Scripture. The ages of Scripture correspond to a person growing up; corporately it is the human race growing up. In the Old Testament the human race was in its infancy or in adolescence, and only as the human race (Israel) became more mature was it ready to receive Christ and the higher revelation. By implication then the fuller understanding of revelation continues in the Church.

Another concept that Augustine used was that God is the “doctor of medicine” and is healing his people. Salvation is health (well-being). The goal of creation, revelation, and finally salvation is final and complete healing. So God the doctor prescribed medicine to the extent that the people would respond and grow until the

coming of Christ, who is both the medicine and the cure. Christ is the cure as well as the curer. The healing process continues in the life of the Church. As Augustine, then, looked at Scripture, he saw God's plan, God's providence. He saw two eras of this plan, and in these two eras God is the doctor healing his people.

Augustine looked at the Bible in terms of salvation-medicine and healing. He looked at the Bible as a theologian and saw a unity geared towards the superiority of the New Testament as the fulfillment of the Jewish Scriptures. When Augustine looked at Scripture, he did so in terms of salvation; he saw the two Testaments as two types of people, two ways of life. This is another level on which he looked at Scripture and saw that there is not only the chronological development of the whole race and the whole doctrine, but there is also the situation that some people of faith back in Old Testament times were actually living ahead of themselves (John 8:56, [Jesus] "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw it, and was glad."). The ancestors of faith were actually living the New Testament because they believed Christian doctrine (They saw the promise, embraced it, and died in faith; Heb. 11:13). It was common in the early and medieval Church to say that Moses was a Christian, along with all the faithful described in Hebrews 11. Augustine also said that in New Testament times there were people who had not believed the message and were still living the Old Testament because they were living according to the flesh and not according to the Spirit. We live either according to the letter or according to the Spirit. "The letter kills, but the Spirit gives life." So if we live according to the letter, according to the desires of the flesh, we are Old Testament. It does not matter when we live, chronologically speaking, but soteriologically speaking we are old, Augustine said. Or, if we live according to the Spirit and you see the Spirit in the letter of Scripture and can see through the veil to the pure light of Christ and Christian doctrine, then we belong to the New Testament and are new, no matter whether we are Abraham or someone in the New Testament or someone today. So, on balance, what we have from Augustine is a fairly complicated view of Scripture, a multinuanced view of Scripture; and it is these various strands of putting Scripture together and interpreting Scripture that continued through the medieval period.

### **The Victorines**

In between the early period and the high Middle Ages is something of a transitional period focused on the abbey of Saint Victor in Paris, namely, the twelfth-century Victorines. In going from Augustine to Thomas Aquinas via these Victorines, we see that something of a shift in the approach to Scripture was underway, a shift that is developed in Thomas. The important thing about the Victorines is that some of them were oriented towards the literal sense of Scripture, toward the historical sense, and used Jewish exegesis for the understanding of the Old Testament. What we had in the Victorines was not so much a theoretical change; that is, they were really not developing a new hermeneutic. They were simply preoccupied with the literal historical sense apart from the allegorical or spiritualizing senses.

### **Sacred Doctrine, Aquinas**

From the eleventh century onward it is important to think of the school, the university, for it is at the schools that theology takes on a new focus. This period is known as Scholasticism because theology increasingly became school-theology at the newly founded universities. Theology and the study of Scripture underwent quite a shift as they moved from the monastery to the university classroom. We have pictured the monastics living, praying, eating, and sleeping Scripture, living their lives, as they continue to do to this day, in the context of the life of Scripture. Whereas in the schools, not unlike our contemporary colleges and universities, Scripture became a subject of academic study. In the school approach was a distinction or separation between theology and exegesis, a distinction or separation between the discipline of theology and the discipline of biblical interpretation. This is partly because of the influence of Aristotelian philosophy away from Platonic philosophy. With Aristotle, reality is seen contained in the thing itself. Hence in scriptural study, attention shifts to the sense of the letter. With the reality seen in the thing itself, rather than being mirrored into some other-worldly realm of the spiritual, Scripture itself becomes the object of study. What the Holy Spirit intended to say is there in Scripture, and all the levels of meaning are in the letter of the text, not in some other levels of meaning.

With a shift in scriptural study there is a shift in theology. While work on the Bible becomes more “literal” and “historical” (though, remember, we are still in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries), theology becomes speculative. An important influence on this shift in theology is the interest in dialectic (a part of logic). In the university situation, dialectic is the analysis of a question. Speculation is looking into something. It could and did have mystical overtones because theology first and foremost is looking into God. A question is posed, alternatives analyzed, often followed by a resolution. The shift in theology is a shift away from *sacra pagina* (sacred page) to *sacra doctrina* (sacred doctrine). The first question in Thomas’s *Summa theologiae* is: What is sacred doctrine? Work on the sacred page is contained in the Commentaries on Scripture. Theological questions are dealt with in the *Summaries* of Theology (there were summaries in other disciplines as well). Theology then took on a life of its own. Scripture and the Fathers are the authorities (footnotes). The method is philosophical, faith seeking understanding.

In the modern period Thomas is famous for his *Summa theologiae* (Summary of Theology). In the century following his own, his commentaries on Scripture were more influential. Note that the Aristotelian Thomas wrote on Scripture, and in a separate literary genre he wrote on theology.

For Thomas, there is an organic unity between Old and New. Augustine’s view of the progress of revelation is expanded by Thomas to include everything from beginning to end, from creation to history, through the history of Israel, Old and New, to the end of time. Thomas’s view of revelation is that it is salvation history developing organically. God is working salvation in history, and so the history of God’s people is salvation history. The history of salvation in Scripture is the development from Old to New, old law to evangelical law. The unity is based on God. The organic continuum goes on in the Church to “eternal glory.”

The main focus of Thomas on the Old and New Testament is on their organic development, a part of the larger focus of salvation history. In terms of Augustine’s approach and categories, Thomas’s approach is a blend of the providential and hermeneutical *foci*. The blend is seeing Testament as both era and book. Certain things concerning Christ are prefigured in the Old Testament through figures like David and Solomon. This is so because things of Christ are of such magnitude and power that they could not have been introduced “suddenly”: “The things of Christ are so great that they would not have been believed unless they had first been disseminated gradually through the growth of time.” The development in time (era of salvation) is the development from imperfect to perfect. Also the Old Testament is a “figure” of the New Testament. The New Testament Church is a “figure” of the glory of heaven. With the development of “figure,” Old to New and New to glory, the Old Testament is a “figure of the figure.” The development is the development of clarity. Thomas also refers the relationship of Old and New Law to the relationship of seed to tree, implicit to explicit, fear to love. The growth is continual.

### **Sacred Letter, Humanism**

The fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were a mixture of what went before and new currents of thought and practice. The schools continued to be the main focus of theological and biblical studies. The new currents of spirituality (for example, German mysticism and *Devotio moderna*) approached Scripture more along the monastic lines of *sacra pagina*. Among the Nominalists (a new philosophy-theology) and others, attention was paid to the relation of the Scriptures to the Traditions of the Church. Tension and even conflict between them were posited. The concentration on Scripture as an ancient book and the use of Scripture to criticize the Church was intensified in the (very) late medieval movement of Humanism.

The Humanists were not theologians in the usual sense of the profession at the end of the Middle Ages, that is, they were neither monastics nor scholastics. Often they were independent scholars, sometimes lay, interested in culture and learning and the effects of culture and learning on the reform of Church and society. Interest in Bible and theology was a part of a broader commitment to reap the wisdom of the pagan classics and the Christian Fathers. The discipline of biblical and theological study meant language study, classical Latin and Greek (and Hebrew for some).

The Humanists were involved in all kinds of humane studies. For our purposes we peg their efforts around the printing press and the production of sacred literature (*sacra littera*). So the approaches to Scripture

in the medieval church differed as it was handled by the monks (*sacra pagina*), by the schoolmen (*sacra doctrina*), and by the printers (*sacra littera*). That is an enormous development, the effects of which we are still appropriating: the relation of the Holy Book to the traditions of the Church, to the study of theology, and to the life of faith.

The fourfold method continued. The double-literal sense was used. The imitation of Christ was another emphasis. The use of Jewish resources for a more historical understanding of the Old Testament increased. Study of Hebrew and Greek grew tremendously. All of these interests and approaches were filtered into the Reformation through the Humanists. The most important work on Scripture at the beginning of the sixteenth century was done by the Humanists. In the Catholic Reformation the Humanists led the way for critical editions of Scripture, vernacular translations, and the study of the Greek and Latin classics (as opposed to the Scholastics). In these matters they were defeated at the mid-sixteenth century Council of Trent. It has been in our century that Roman Catholics have adopted Humanist and modern critical approaches to Scripture. The Protestants generally welcomed and used Humanist scholarship.

The effect of the Humanists on the place and interpretation of Scripture in the Church centered around their sense of history, study of the classics, expertise in the biblical (original) languages, preparation of critical printed editions of the Bible, and the use of Scripture for the reform of the Church. (Note that their effect on the place and interpretation of Scripture is on the Church in general, not just on theology, since their programs were broader than monastic and Scholastic theology.)

A growing sense among the Renaissance thinkers (south of the Alps) and Humanists (north) was that the historical past is distant and different from present culture. This sense was not universally accepted, and it took until the nineteenth century for historical consciousness to be widely accepted and then largely only in Western culture. Their sense of history was that the time and place of classical culture was in the ancient world—not their own. In general for the medievals the age of the Bible was their own, a timelessness to it all. The Humanists' perspective was the separation of past from present.

The Humanists were scholars, students of antiquity. The general Renaissance of the time was a revival of the arts, literature, and learning. The Humanists were interested in the learning contained in classical literature. The study of the classics was to go along with the study of Scripture, which also was from the classical world, for the purpose of moral and intellectual reform of the Church, theology, philosophy, education—the whole program. The critical study of the past had the edge to it of informing and often attacking the present. The study of the past included the editing, printing, and learning from the Church Fathers.

The Humanists were a part of the revival of Hebrew and Greek studies. Study of the ancient world meant the recovery of their languages. Study of the original languages of Scripture raised questions about the Latin Bible. The study of the Bible in the original often led to a criticism of the way the Bible had been translated into Latin and interpreted. Study of ancient languages was not what we would call strictly an academic exercise. Ancient literature—classical and Christian—was presumed to have value. The Humanists were often critical of Scholastics and others who concentrated only on the literal meaning of the text.

Humanist interest in original languages included an interest in original manuscripts and codices. With their historical perspective on the editing, translating, and transmission of texts, they were concerned to get as far back as possible to the original version of a writing. For scriptural study, this concern led to the discovery, collating, and printing of early Hebrew and Greek codices of the Bible. In 1516 Erasmus published the first Greek New Testament. The sixteenth century witnessed several critical editions of the Bible, printed by movable type. The new method in printing made possible the multiplication of both critical editions and vernacular translations.

The study of the classics, the Bible, and Church Fathers was critical and scholarly. The purpose of it was to reform the present. The Humanists were among those who were disturbed about corruption, lack of education, and the generally sorry state of society. The Church was often blamed for most of it, blamed for being too interested in money, politics, war, everything but the care of souls. The attacks were bitter and sarcastic. Theology (Scholasticism) was reproached for being interested only in syllogisms and not the simple

piety of Scripture. The goal of their work was the reform of Church and society through education for the purpose of piety and knowledge.

### **Sacred Page, Early Reformers**

The early reformers, for example Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, were very concerned about the place of Bible in everything—Church, theology, and especially preaching. The main point of the Reformation was that the Gospel must be proclaimed. To continue our schematization (monastery, university, printing press), now think pulpit, think of the Evangelical cities (Wittenberg, Zürich, Geneva) where the medium for information was the pulpit (along with the important pamphlets). The Reformation was a movement of the Word: Christ, Scripture, preaching—in that order. They all are the Word of God. The reformers used the printed Word, studied the Word, prayed the Word. Their concern was to bring preaching back into the mass, preaching in the vernacular, and preaching on the text of Scripture. When Luther said that the Church is not a pen-house but a mouth-house, he meant that the good news cannot properly be put in (dead) letters but is to be proclaimed loudly in German.

What the Scholastics separated, namely theology and commentary on Scripture, the early reformers sought to bring together again, along the lines of *sacra pagina* (minus the monastery). Scripture alone is the sole authority for the Church, the discipline of theology, and the life of faith. The reformers continued the call for the reform of the Church on the basis of Scripture. Every office and activity in the Church falls under the judgment of Scripture. All of theology is contained in Scripture. God has revealed all that we need to know about him in Christ. Calvin is especially strong on the knowledge of God, the beginning point of the *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. God is revealed in Scripture, and to see the revelation of God in nature we need the spectacles of Scripture. Theology must be biblical theology; any other kind is human invention.

Scripture is its own authority because it is clear. No other authority is needed to see through its meaning. The early reformers were not concerned about some theory of inspiration. That came later. The Bible is the Word. The reformers were aware of the “critical” discussions among the Humanists about the text, authorship, language, etc. Luther engaged in some of this. The point of the Word is the presence of the Word in Scripture-Church-preaching. The Humanist sense of the distance of Scripture from the present was not accepted. The scholastic separation of theology from Scripture was attacked. The purpose of theology is to serve preaching, the main task of the Church. The vast amount of theological literature from the early Reformation was intended to clear the roadblocks to Scripture and to facilitate the proclamation of that Gospel.

The early reformers were premodern; they continued the general medieval understanding of interpretation as commentary, annotation, and exposition. The modern interpreter continues to develop the Humanist perspective of the historical past; thus interpretation in modern times is bridging the gulf between ancient literature and modern thinking. The early reformers continued the monastic approach of total immersion into the thinking and language of Scripture so that there is only one language, one biblical theology.

In their Catholic context, the reformers emphasized that Scripture was its own interpreter (a very old principle, grounded in Scripture itself). Luther argued that the papacy had built a wall of authoritative interpretation around itself so that Scripture could only be read as the papacy saw fit. One late medieval synthesis had it that Scripture is to Tradition as foundation is to interpretation (Occam). Strong in the sixteenth century was the question of an authoritative interpretation of Scripture. The Catholic Council of Trent decreed in midcentury:

that no one, relying on his own skill, in matters of faith, and of morals pertaining to the edification of Christian doctrine, wresting the Sacred Scriptures to his own senses, presume to interpret the said Sacred Scripture contrary to that sense which holy mother church, whose it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scripture, has held and does hold.

For Calvin at this time, the interpretation of Scripture by Scripture alone is aided by the internal testimony of the Holy Spirit. Scripture itself attests to its message and meaning. Christ and the Spirit are at work in the Word. The reformers insisted that postapostolic claims of authoritative interpretation were precisely the reason why the Word of God lost its/his central place in the life of the Church.

The Reformation interpretation of Scripture was caught up in theological polemics. The Humanists used Scripture to attack the Church, but they were not so much interested in the pure doctrines of Scripture as they were in exposing the corruption and folly of the present situation in the light of the piety of Scripture. The early reformers fought for pure doctrine on the basis of Scripture (and the Fathers). The doctrine of justification by faith alone, by grace alone (by Christ alone), was seen as the central doctrine of Scripture. The doctrine of justification by faith is the criterion by which all other doctrines, offices, and practices in the Church are judged. The criteriological priority of justification by faith is established in Scripture. The Church stands or falls, said Luther, on the scriptural teaching of justification. There were other issues, other polemics, but the procedure was the same. Doctrinal reform was forged and pleaded on the basis of Scripture.

Basic for Luther's understanding of Scripture is his distinction between law and Gospel. The Gospel of Jesus Christ is the fulfillment and end of the Mosaic law. Law and Gospel are in all books of the Bible. The Gospel is the good news that salvation is in Christ alone. Abraham and others saw that Gospel in the promises, believed, and were justified. Luther transposes Augustine's distinction between Old and New Testament as ways of salvation to law and Gospel as ways of salvation. The way of the law is do this...and don't do that...The way of the Gospel is believe...and it has already been done for you in Christ. The law is command, the Gospel is gift, the gift of forgiveness. When the law commands, failure results because one cannot fulfill the law on one's own power ("The good I would, I do not," said Paul). The law humbles; the Gospel picks up. One cannot be picked up unless one is put down to size. Being brought low (law) and being raised up (Gospel) are the daily struggles of the Christian life, the experience of sin (brought by the law), and the experience of forgiveness (brought by Christ). The distinction between law and Gospel, the doctrine of justification by faith apart from works, and the understanding of the core of Scripture are all the same for Luther.

The center of Scripture for Luther is Christ, present in both the Old and New Testament. Christ is the eternal Word of God, present in Old Testament times in the form of promise, present in New Testament times in the person of Jesus, and present in the Church through Word and sacrament. In all cases, Christ the Word is the effective means of grace. Christ is at the core of God's plan of salvation. God promises through prophets; God delivers in person. All of Scripture leads to Christ, and Christ leads to salvation.

Luther's response to the various senses of meaning in the Middle Ages (threefold, fourfold, double-literal sense) was that Scripture has one simple sense (most often, Christ). The grammatical sense is the simplest sense and is the meaning of the text, the grammatical-historical meaning and the theological meaning are the same. The literal meaning is the spiritual meaning because the letter is of the Spirit. "The Holy Spirit is the simplest writer and adviser in heaven and on earth" (LW 39:178). Luther's objection to the fourfold meaning is that it is based on a faulty reading of 2 Cor. 3:6, "The letter kills, but the Spirit gives life." The letter doesn't kill, Christ himself used the letter of Scripture. Another of Luther's objection is that the multiple senses of Scripture would mean that Scripture could have more than one meaning. It is unthinkable that Scripture could say one thing and mean something else. Luther's further contention is that the quadriga arbitrarily superimposes a fourfold scheme onto Scripture, which does not come from Scripture itself. For Luther the only rules for interpreting Scripture must come from Scripture itself.

Luther's uniqueness is his construction of Scripture as containing a single testament (will, promise) of Christ. God's last and only will and testament is that he would die for our salvation. The promise is the declaration of the will and testament. The death of the God-Man validates his testament. The inheritance is the forgiveness of sins and eternal life. The (new) testament of Christ is eternal. It is played out in time, but there is no development in the eternal. Augustine and the medievals generally saw a development and transformation within and between the Old and New Testament. Luther held that the New Testament is older than the Old because it is the oldest (eternal). The Old Testament begins and ends in time. The New Testament is the testament of the eternal Christ.

### **Conclusion**

What you have allowed me to do (by your invitation) is to research and try to solve the mystery of where the word "*Quadriga* the fourfold pattern of medieval exegesis" actually came from. Since quadriga in all the

Latin dictionaries I know means a four horse team, a “stink-en” old wagon pulled by four horses under four collars, how do we get the four senses of Scripture out of this word?

The earliest source I have found for you is Luther, and that in a fairly brief time frame in his life, between 1517 and 1521. I have suggested that he may have heard it and certainly used it as a figure of speech. The final history of the word “quadriga” has yet to be written.

I had told myself when I accepted your invitation that I wanted to do some fresh research and not just repeat what I had written elsewhere. I must confess that in my writing (heretofore) I too have repeated what everyone else has repeated, namely, that the medieval approach to Scripture was dominated by the quadriga as the fourfold meaning of Scripture. I have tried to explain the results of this fresh research.

As said, Luther vacillated a bit on his use of quadriga, briefly “not disapproving” though mostly disapproving strenuously. This is not the first instance of Luther shifting his opinion on a Latin or Greek word. The impression I have is that when Luther realized what the quadriga really entailed, that is, finding several meanings for one word and one passage, all his hermeneutical rules came into play. One such prominent rule is that Scripture says what it means and means what it says, and does so in a straightforward manner. Scripture interprets itself and is clear. No need to search for meanings other than what is said. After Luther realized this, he went back to using quadriga in the biblical sense of a four-horse chariot.

Bear in mind that Luther, very much a theologian of his day, continued to use allegory and the other spiritual senses throughout his life. So, it is not fair to say that Luther dumped the quadriga in the sense of dismissing all spiritual senses. His use of the spiritual senses, however, was under tightly controlled rules.

What I think is important about Luther as a theologian of his day on the issue of Scripture is that medievals used Scripture as a means of spiritual formation, the formation of virtuous habits. Remember that for Augustine the proper end of Scripture is charity. For Luther there is more to Scripture than virtue, charity, and good habits, however desirable they all are. The purpose of Scripture is to promote Christ and Christ alone. Scripture is an end in itself in that there in the heart of the sacred page is Christ himself.

In all of medieval theology there is a sense of life as a journey, a search for God, a journey that takes a lifetime to complete. Justification is a lifelong process. Life is arduous, one must practice virtue, avoid vice, and hope that when the battle is over you at least make it to purgatory, because purgatory is a one-way street to God.

For Luther, when Christ died and rose again, the journey for the pilgrim is over. Salvation is won. Our sins are forgiven; virtue, good habits, hope, charity, daily cleansing, all follow.

---

<sup>i</sup> Quadriga(e) is a contraction from quadrijugae. Quadrijugus is formed from quattuor (4) and jugum. Jugum is a yoke for oxen and a collar for horses. Hence, four-yoked horses making a four-horse team.

<sup>ii</sup> See “*Quadriga* the fourfold pattern of medieval exegesis” in *Dictionary of Latin and Greek Theological Terms*, Drawn Principally from Protestant Scholastic Theology, Richard A. Muller (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998) 254.

<sup>iii</sup> VUL Zech. 6:1. Et converses sum et levavi oculos meos et vidi et ecce quattuor quadrigae egredientes de medio duorum montium et montes aerei<sup>2</sup> in *quadriga* prima equi rufi et in *quadriga* secunda equi nigri<sup>3</sup> et in *quadriga* tertia equi albi et in *quadriga* quarta equi varii fortes<sup>4</sup> et respondi et dixi ad angelum qui loquebatur in me quid sunt haec domine mi<sup>5</sup> et respondit angelus et ait ad me isti sunt quattuor venti caeli qui egrediuntur ut stent coram Dominatore omnis terrae.

<sup>iv</sup> VUL Isa. 66:15. Quia ecce Dominus in igne veniet et quasi turbo *quadrigae* eius reddere in indignatione furorem suum et increpationem suam in flamma ignis.

<sup>v</sup> VUL Isa. 43:17. Qui eduxit *quadrigam* et equum agmen et robustum simul obdormierunt nec resurgent contriti sunt quasi linum et extincti sunt.

<sup>vi</sup> VUL 1 Sam. 8:11. Et ait hoc erit ius regis qui imperaturus est vobis filios vestros tollet et ponet in curribus suis facietque sibi equites et praecursores *quadrigarum* suarum.

<sup>vii</sup> VUL 1 Chron. 18:4. Cepit ergo David mille *quadrigas* eius et septem milia equites ac viginti milia virorum peditum subnervavitque omnes equos curruum exceptis centum quadrigis quas reservavit sibi.

<sup>viii</sup> VUL 2 Chron. 16:8. Nonne Aethiopes et Lybies multo plures erant *quadrigis* et equitibus et multitudine nimia quos cum Domino credidisses tradidit in manu tua.

<sup>ix</sup> Joseph W. Trigg, ed. *Biblical Interpretation* (Wilmington: Glazier, 1988) 65, 115-Origen.

<sup>x</sup> *Quadrifariam* in Ezek. 45:2 is translated in Douay as “foursquare”: VUL Ezek. 45:2. Et erit ex omni parte sanctificatum quingentos per quingentos *quadrifariam* per circuitum et quinquaginta cubitis in suburbana eius per gyrum.

<sup>xi</sup> Rebecca Moore. *Jews and Christians in the Life and Thought of Hugh of St. Victor* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998) 68.

<sup>xii</sup> *Exégèse Médiévale: Les quatre sens de l'écriture* (Paris: Aubier, 1959-64) I,1:23.

<sup>xiii</sup> Lyra on Galatians 4[:24] in *Biblica sacra* (Lugduni, 1545) VI:85v.

<sup>xiv</sup> Clemens/Vogelsang ed. 5:339.31.

<sup>xv</sup> Joannes Cassianus, Collatio 14, Caput VIII, “De spiritali scientia” in *Joannis Cassiani Abbatis Massiliensis Collationum XXIV Collectio in tres partes Divisa* PLD 49:0962B-0965B. Cassian Caput VIII: Jerusalem *quadrifariam* possit intelligi. *Quadrifariam* adverb comes from *quattuor*.

Rabanus Maurus (c. 780-856) has *quattuor* species ad *quadrifariam* sacrae Scripturae intelligentiam, history, tropology, allegory, anagogy (PLD 112).

Lyra has the versus, “Littera gesta docet...quo tendas anagogia” in his first Prologue to the Bible (de commendatione sacrae scripturae), which he describes as *quattuor sensuum* (*Biblia sacra* [Basel: Froben, 1501] I:3v; PLD Lira).

*Quattuor* sunt regulae sacrae scripturae (Bede; see Karlfried Froelich, “Johannes Trithemius on the Fourfold Sense of Scripture,” *Biblical Interpretation in the Era of the Reformation* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996] 41). Gerson: *quadruplicem* (Feld, p. 138 n. 50).

Wycliff: *sensum quadruplicem* and *quattuor* species (*De veritate sacrae scripturae*, ed. R. Buddensieg (London: 1905) vol. 1, ch. 6, pp. 119-121).

Jacobus Faber Stapulensis: *quattuor sensus* (*S. Pauli epistolae XIV*. Faksimilie-Neudruck der Ausgabe Paris 1512. Paul on Gal. 4:24, p. 159a).

<sup>xvi</sup> *Decem praecepta Wittenbergensi praedicata populo*. 1518 (zwischen 29. Juni 1516 und 24. Februar 1517). WA 1:508.3.

<sup>xvii</sup> WA 1:507.35-39.

<sup>xviii</sup> *In epistolam Pauli ad Galatas commentarius*. 1519. WA 2:550.34.

<sup>xix</sup> *Operationes in Psalmos*. 1519-1521. WA 5:644.19-28. Also in 1521, in a German work against Emser, Luther attacks those who out of “ignorance” attribute “four senses” (*vier synn*) to Scripture. “There is no basis for it” (WA 7:652).

<sup>xx</sup> See *quadriga* in *Index Thomisticus* #67561.

<sup>xxi</sup> See *quadriga* in the Index of Latin Words in Luther’s Works WA 67:603.

<sup>xxii</sup> WA 8:82.26.

<sup>xxiii</sup> Robert E. McNally, S.J. *The Bible in the Early Middle Ages* (Westminster: The Newman Press, 1959) 9.

<sup>xxiv</sup> “The translation of a citation from the *loca monachorum*, preserved in an eighth-century manuscript in St. Gall (MS 908), is an example of early medieval Bible study undertaken independently of the Fathers” (McNally, 38-39).