

M. Roques, 'Le Glossaire latin-français du P. Labbe', *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (1937) 264–76.
A. Serrai, *Storia della bibliografia* 4 (Rome 1993).

Labour

I. LABOUR IN AUG.'S THOUGHT

In one of his commentaries on Genesis, Aug. describes God as 'the almighty craftsman' (*Gn. litt. inp.* 1.1). In Aug.'s thought, there is evidently a relation between the work of God and that of human beings made in the *imago Dei* (*conf.* 11.5.7, *Gn. litt.* 8.10.23 and 8.12.25–7; see ANTHROPOLOGY; CREATION). At the same time, however, there is a vast disparity between the nature of divine and human action. As Aug. affirms later in *Gn. litt. inp.*: 'God does not make in the way human beings do' (13.41). Aug. is fond of quoting 1 Cor. 3:7–8 in affirming that only God creates *ex nihilo* (*Trin.* 3.8; *Gn. litt.* 5.6.18, 8.8.16; cf. *div. qu.* 83.78; *mus.* 1.3.4–6). Since human beings do not create out of nothing but out of materials made available to them, Aug. concludes that 'we do not call parents the creators of men, nor farmers the creators of their crops, although the power of God working within them utilizes their outwards movements for creating these things' (*Gn. litt. inp.* 8.14). For this same reason, he emphasizes the contingency of all creation with respect to the Creator God, who does not merely make raw materials for humans to use independently, but also keeps all creation subject to his providential care.

a. Fall and resurrection: Aug.'s narrative approach to work

Aug. maintains that there was work in paradise before the fall into sin (cf. *Gn. adv. Man.* 2.11.15). Consequently, work is a natural aspect of human life. Even so, he takes seriously the repercussions of the postlapsarian curse of toilsome labour (Gen. 3:17). Aug. conceives the implications of 'toil' broadly, arguing that the Fall affects human work by rendering created realities perishable (or 'contingent'). For Aug., discussion of contingency is never far from another more ultimate category, namely, that of resurrection (cf. *civ.* 19.17). He holds (following 1 Cor. 15:42) that persons are born to die in this present order and await their resurrection bodies. The concept of resurrection is of ultimate significance in terms of shaping Aug.'s understanding of the impact of the curse on work.

This is the case in an extended reflection in *civ.* 22.24, where Aug. argues that there is some limited continuity between the goodness of the original created order and the present one which awaits judgement and redemption, such that he is ready to defend the goodness of our everyday working lives (*civ.* 22.24; cf. *Gn. adv. Man.* 1.22.35). As a result, Aug. sees the curse of toil as having a redemptive function: it improves us and draws us nearer to God, offering a foretaste of our coming resurrection. Consequently, no one is to avoid labour when health permits it (*civ.* 22.22), not even the wealthy (*Gn. adv. Man.* 2.20.30). Further, the curse is not arbitrary, but rather the mirroring in nature of human disobedience back onto persons (*Gn. litt. inp.* 1.3).

Consequently, labour is an avenue by which to pursue Christian discipline and cultivate virtue (*civ.* 18.51; *Gn. adv. Man.* 2.20.30). In this present life, then, we are to work, pursue excellence in it, and along with this, enjoy the fruit of our labour (cf. *Eccl.* 2:24–5).

b. Forms of work and the use of products

Given this flexible theology of work, it is not surprising to find that Aug. has a mixed account of particular professions. He is roundly positive about manual labour, following Paul's statements in his epistles regarding self-support (*Gn. litt.* 8.8.16; cf. 1 Cor. 4:12; 1 Thess. 4:10–12; 2 Thess. 3:7–12). He appeals to John the Baptist's attitude towards soldiers, allowing that service in the Roman army may be a virtuous vocation (*s.* 302.15; *ep.* 189.4, 220.12; *en. Ps.* 124.3.7). This advice extends to other forms of work for the Roman civil government, including that of policemen and customs agents. But elsewhere, Aug. has strong words for bankers who charge interest: 'do not be a money-lender', he exhorts (*en. Ps.* 128.6). His list of other unacceptable vocations includes thieves, prostitutes, pimps, and sorcerers; in his view, the need for income never justifies involvement in the activities of such as these (*en. Ps.* 128.6; cf. *en. Ps.* 36.6c). Incidentally, Aug.'s concern for ordinary work does not rule out 'non-productive' trades. He indirectly praises the artist in one instance, drawing an analogy to God's work as an artist bestowing beauty on the creation (*en. Ps.* 26.2.12; see also *en. Ps.* 41.4, 76.14, 134.3.5; see also Fortin).

All these forms of work have one thing in common, which is that they produce things which can be used to enjoy God or express love for God, as Aug. hints with another famous distinction (see UTI/FRUI DISTINCTION; cf. O'Donovan 1982; 2004). In earlier writing, Aug. draws a strong contrast; we use the things of this earth, while enjoyment is reserved for God alone (*doct. Chr.* 1.7–10, 2.18–20). In later writing, particularly in *civ.* (19.17, 24), Aug. seems to subordinate the categories of use and enjoyment to the more dynamic Christian notion of love. In this way, love of God can order and enable other subordinate loves which contribute to human sociality in the city of heaven, particularly love for 'common objects' (*civ.* 19.24; cf. *Gn. litt.* 8.8.16). When we love God above all else, we are enabled to treat his creatures in a manner appropriate to their different natures and needs. This ordered love for creatures, conversely, becomes an expression of our love for God and our Christian hope for the final consummation of that Love that will occur at our resurrection (*ep.* 167.11). Far from producing an account of work that is excessively austere, Aug.'s theocentric account of charitable simplicity (cf. *ep. Io. tr.* 7.1, 7.8; *mor.* 67–8; *en. Ps.* 103.1.19; *s.* 78.6) leaves room for the appreciation of beauty and the exploration of reality through human work (see IV.b below). In *en. Ps.* 86.9.11, Aug. suggests along these lines that, 'material things must not be eliminated from human dealings. Let them be there, and let there be a proper use of good things.'

c. Monastic work

The idea of the working monk was by no means original to Aug. It had well-established Christian precedents in desert monasticism, as is

confirmed by Aug.'s praise of Antony (*conf.* 8.6.14; cf. *mor.* 31), and before that in rabbinic Judaism. However, the sustained and powerful defence of the importance of labour for members of monastic communities which Aug. offers in his work *op. mon.* finds few parallels in early Christian literature. This work distinguishes Aug. as 'the only author of antiquity from whose pen we have a treatise on manual labor' (Arbesmann 245). Furthermore, this work affirms Aug.'s status as an African authority on cenobitic monastic life and practice. For this reason, prior to the rule of *Benedict of Nursia (for influences, see II.a below), Aug.'s reflections on monastic labour (cf. *reg.* 1–3; *mor.* 1.65–8; and *op. mon.*) serve as the primary reference point for handbooks on monastic labour in the Western tradition. Even after the Benedictine Rule was composed, the citation of Aug. continues by commentators seeking to clarify Benedict's approach and to appeal to Aug.'s moderate *asceticism (see also REGULA).

In Aug.'s writing, monks serve as an exemplar of charitable simplicity sustained by labour (described in I.b above). In his writings on monastic work (*op. mon.*; *reg.* and *mor.* 31), labour enables self-sufficiency and is guided by love towards acts of charity. Reflecting on the monastic context, Aug. further contends (following Paul in 1 Thess. 4:11–12; 2 Thess. 3:6–11; Eph. 4:28; cf. *op. mon.* 3 ff.) that all who are able ought to work so that charitable provision might be made out of the ensuing abundance (*op. mon.* 3–4 ff.; *mor.* 69–70). In Aug.'s conception, monastic labour is ordered more strictly than work in the non-monastic context. Ministers are entitled to receive payment (*op. mon.* 6) while monks are not (*op. mon.* 19).

By his affirmation of monastic labour, Aug. does not mean to denigrate non-monastic work. In his treatise titled *mor.*, he praises presbyters, deacons, and ministers, 'whose virtue seems to me more admirable and more worthy of commendation on account of the greater difficulty of preserving it amidst the manifold varieties of men, and in this life of turmoil' (*mor.* 69; cf. *b. coniug.* 23,30). Aug. does not offer the labour of cenobitic monks as an unattainable alternative ideal but rather as a practical model for the shape of non-monastic work. Aug.'s approach to Christian asceticism, construed particularly in contrast to the Manichees, stresses the basic coherence of the Christian life across various social and vocational contexts. What we find in Aug. is a complex affirmation of both monastic and non-monastic life (Zumkeller).

d. Working and knowing

Aug. departed from much of the classical tradition in affirming the unqualified goodness of manual labour. Disdain for non-agricultural work as an 'illiberal' art can be found across non-Christian classical thought (Plato, *Republic* 495e; Aristotle, *Politics* 8.2.1337b; Cicero, *On Duties* 1.42). Even more moderate classical accounts tend to place various forms of work in a hierarchical order. At the top are the forms of work which make one learned or wise, and at the bottom are the banal arts which are antithetical to wisdom (cf. Plato, *Phaedrus* 248a). When Aug. lists vocations (cf. *doctr. Chr.* 2.30.47; *an. quant.* 32.72; *civ.* 22.24), his approach resonates with *Stoic reformulations which, in

contrast to other classical approaches, affirm the place of 'mechanical arts' within these hierarchies of knowledge and the epistemological legitimacy of 'working' knowledge as contributing to the acquisition of wisdom and virtue (Plotinus, *Enneads* 4.31; see ETHICS; PLATONIC AND NEO-PLATONIC TRADITION). Aug.'s affirmation of manual art is not unequivocal (see his description of stone-masonry as 'vulgar art' in *vera rel.* 30.54 and *retr.* 1.3.2) but the influence of his work can be seen as largely positive in this regard (see *mus.* 1.3.4, 1.4.6; see also Fortin).

II. EARLY AND MEDIEVAL RECEPTION

a. Monasticism

Benedict of Nursia was significantly influenced by *Cassian and Basil (referenced explicitly in Rule of St Benedict 73). However, several features of the Benedictine Rule (RB) betray distinctively Aug. provenance. One aspect of Aug.'s influence that is often noted by Benedictine scholars is the emphasis on fraternal *love (cf. *en. Ps.* 132.6 and I.b–I.c above). More specifically, Benedict tends to draw on Aug.'s social realism (in contrast to Pachomius' more absolute egalitarianism) in providing guidance for the particular details of monastic sociality and work, including rules governing the supervision of shared tools by the cellarer (RB 31.1, referring to *reg.* 3 5.2) and the asymmetrical nature of work duties (RB 34, following Acts 4:35 and Aug. *reg.* 3, 5.4–9; cf. *op. mon.* 23–4). References to Aug. in RB are thoroughly documented in Kardong.

The medieval reception of Aug.'s shaping of the monastic *opus Dei* is complex. Aug. exerted a wide theological influence, but the use of his approach to labour is eclectic. This is demonstrated in an exchange of letters about the subject of monastic work between the Cluniac Abbot Peter and *Bernard of Clairvaux (Abbot Peter, *ep.* 16; cf. Bernard, *ep.* 228–9). Surprisingly, it is the Cluniac abbot who makes appeal to Aug.'s statement 'have charity and do what you will' (*ep. Io. tr.* 7.8) in arguing that charity requires flexibility in the economic ordering of monastic activity. Abbot Peter pursues the trajectory offered in *ep. Io. tr.* 7.8 alongside the flexibility given abbots in their division of monastic labour (RB 41). In this way the leadership of the abbot is given priority over the egalitarian distribution of work (RB 34). As noted above, a major influence of Aug.'s *regula* was his social realism (in the monastic context, accommodating the sick and elderly by mitigating their work duties). Bernard of Clairvaux makes similar reference to charity (though without direct reference to Aug.) in *ep.* 397. Amidst the more frequent appeals by later Cistercians to Paul's epistles, Cassian, and Benedict, one finds appeal to Aug. as well. Idung of Prüfening, in his *Dialogue* (*Dialogus duorum monachorum* 11, see analysis by Overman), cites *op. mon.* in his defence of monastic labour.

*Thomas Aquinas's view of monastic labour might seem to stand in contrast to Aug.'s more universal commendation of labour, given his privileging of the *vita contemplativa* (ST 1.91.3, 2-2.182). Troubling too simple a contrast, however, Aquinas makes appeal to Aug. in

expressing the superiority of the *vita contemplativa* over the *vita activa* with appeal to a sermon by Aug. (*s. Dom. m.* 103). It is important to note that Aquinas sees his reflection as being in some continuity with Aug., following his emphasis on charity and flexibility in practice (*ST* 1-2.16.3), while occasionally leaving aside his emphasis on the pursuit of manual labour. This is affirmed by Aquinas's suggestion (citing Aug., *ep.* 189, 220) that 'a religious order may be established not only for the works of the contemplative life, but also for the works of the active life, insofar as they are concerned in helping our neighbor and in the service of God, but not insofar as they are directed to a worldly object' (*ST* 2-2.188.3). On display here are several distinctively Aug. approaches outlined above (I.a–I.b above). See Sherwin for further analysis of the influence of Aug. on Aquinas.

Another noteworthy recognition of Aug.'s emphasis on monastic life involving manual labour appears in a satirical setting in Geoffrey *Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales* (*CT*). Chaucer's concern is with monastic hypocrisy in contrast to the Aug. ideal of a working monk, who does 'labour with his hands and swink and sweat | As Aug. bids?' (*CT*, Prologue 184–7). The monk in the *CT* is a parody, 'one made for mastery | An outrider, who loved his venery' (165–6). Here is a possible double entendre criticizing the monk's leisurely pursuit of hunting (180) and lack of proper ascetic discipline, alluding to Aug.'s *civ.* 16.4.

b. Working and knowing

Another thread by which the reception of Aug.'s approach to labour can be traced concerns the relation of manual work and theory of knowledge (see I.d above). Against a reading that attempts to attribute to Aug. a Cartesian exaltation of rational faculty above all other ways of knowing, particularly through experience, Aug. actually affirms the contribution of labour to knowing, and the relation of ideas to the material world (cf. Schumacher; divine ***Illumination**). This strand is picked up by Gaunilo of Marmoutiers (eleventh century), who takes note of Aug.'s account of box-making (cf. *Io ev. tr.* 1.17) in a refutation of Anselm's *Proslogion*, countering that sensible experience is inexplicably related to knowing (Gaunilo, *Pro Insipiente* 3).

***Hugh of St Victor**, an Augustinian canon, offers a noteworthy example of one who follows and develops the received version of Aug.'s ideas about labour in a broader philosophical context. Hugh gives work a similar place in the Christian narrative (see I.a above). He preserves Aug.'s absolute distinction between divine and human work and likewise affirms the contingency of human beings (*Didascalicon* 1.7–9). Further, for Hugh ascetic practice is a prerequisite for wisdom and right practice (2.1).

The tone of these two accounts also differs in important ways. Hugh develops his affirmation of work formally by adding a fourth philosophical division of *artes mechanicae* with its own seven sciences (*Didascalicon* 2.20; see also Taylor, introduction; Whitney 87–9; Kleinz). Though conceived of as in continuity with Aug., Hugh's approach follows Aristotle's twofold division (practical and theoretical; cf. Aristotle, *Topics* 7.1; *Metaphysics* 2.1) in contrast to the

Platonic threefold epistemology which Aug. seems to prefer (cf. *civ.* 8.4, 11.25; *retr.* 1.3.2; Taylor 8). In spite of this strong debt to Aug., Hugh's enthusiasm for the material arts stands in contrast to Aug.'s more moderate outlook on the matter. For Hugh 'the philosophic quest is the restoration in man of that form of the divine nature or Wisdom, lost to him through the fall' (Taylor 29; cf. *Didascalicon* 1.8, 2.1; *contra Aug., Trin.* 14.17). For Aug., contingency is to be met with labour as a part of prayerful penitential piety, whereas for Hugh, the meeting of human needs serves to spur humans on to greater excellence (*Didascalicon* 1.9).

Later citation of Aug. with regards to the *arts* can be found in ***Vincent of Beauvais**, who quotes Aug.'s description in *civ.* 22.24 (*speculum doctrinale* 1.8). As with Hugh, however, Vincent's understanding of the relation between eschatology and labour stands in some contrast to Aug. (see I.a). As Whitney argues, Vincent ties knowledge 'to the mandate given to the human race to restore itself to its pre-lapsarian condition' (Whitney 115–16). ***Bonaventure** may also be making indirect reference to the famous *civ.* 22.24 passage in *De reductione artium ad theologiam* 2. See Whitney for relevant examination of Aug. influence in medieval vocation lists (45–50, 110–20).

III. REFORMATION RECEPTION

While the main figures of the Reformation period relied heavily on Aug. for doctrinal insight, explicit recourse to Aug. with regard to the subject of work is less frequent. Major secondary studies of work in Reformation thought offer little commentary on areas of indirect influence by Aug. It would be wrong to assume, however, that Aug. exerted no influence in Reformation thought on this subject (see *POLITICAL THOUGHT*, for relevant commentary on Aug. influence in Reformation thought).

Martin *Luther's debt to Aug. is significant, both as an Augustinian canon and as a theologian. The Augustinian commitment to monastic labour was familiar to Luther. This becomes evident in his occasional reminiscences and praise of the flexible but consistent approach to labour found in Aug.'s rule ('On the Councils and the Church', *LW* 41:129; 'Letters', *LW* 48:20, 39). In general, Luther's approach to labour can be seen as generally following Aug., but laying emphases where Aug. held concepts in tension. To start, Luther's comments on labour in his 'lectures on Genesis' generally agree with Aug.'s commentary. Along these lines, Luther paraphrases Aug.'s *De Genesi ad litteram* 8.10.22 and suggests that 'some traces remain' in the present state of labour from the prelapsarian experience (*LW* 1:102). The impact of the Fall is significant: 'in endless ways each of the two activities [to work and guard] has been disfigured' (*LW* 1:102). Echoing Aug.'s reflection in *civ.* 22.24, Luther notes how enjoyment in labour, though muted, remains (*LW* 1:212; cf. 3:129, 7:66). Work in the ideal conception represents something like play, as 'if Adam had not sinned, the earth would have produced all things', 'unsown and uncultivated' (*LW* 1:205). Luther agrees also

with Aug.'s appreciation of the hard work of ministers and statesmen (*LW* 1:211; cf. Aug. *mor.* 69 and I.b–I.c above) and though he does not issue a universal call to manual labour, he comes close with his suggestion that 'there ought to be no one who does not feel this sweat' (*LW* 1:210; cf. 3:129).

In spite of these resonances, Luther's most distinctive contribution to the theology of labour, namely, the category of 'vocation', can be seen as a departure from Aug. Though the theme of *vocatio* is developed in Aug.'s writing, this takes place within a different context (*praed. sanct.*; see FAITH AND WORKS), and this term rarely appears within Aug.'s reflections on labour. In this way, Luther's concept of *vocatio* dissolves some of the ascetic differentiation that one finds in Aug.'s reflections on labour. Particularly in his later writings on monastic vows, Luther troubles any distinction between work in the monastic and non-monastic contexts, coming into conflict with Aug.'s embrace of a differentiated social context for labour (see I.c above).

In spite of John *Calvin's dislike of Aug.'s Platonism (cf. *Comm. John* 1:3), he follows Aug. in preserving the place of natural desire which is ordered by love of God through worship (*Inst.* 3.3.12; *Comm. Jonah* 2:8). Consequently, we find that Calvin's approach to enjoyment is similar to Aug.'s described above (I.b; cf. Tilmouth). Most often, Calvin appeals to Aug.'s flexibility with regards to wealth and work (cf. *Comm. Luke* 6:24). Calvin commends Aug.'s depiction of diligent but moderate labour as enabling charity. He cites *mor.* 31 and 33 at length in *Inst.* 4.13.9, and defends Aug.'s suggestion in *op. mon.* that all should labour in *Inst.* 4.13.10 (see also *Comm. 2 Thess.* 3:11). Calvin sees contemporary monastic practice as having fallen far from the ideal depicted by Aug., but he nevertheless follows Aug. in commending the monastic example for secular life. In general, Calvin follows Aug. but, like Luther, tends to dissolve some of Aug.'s tensions. Along these lines, Aug.'s approach to the vocations is not democratic enough for Calvin's taste. Calvin affirms Aug.'s approach to magistrates (*Comm. 1 Cor.* 6:7), but criticizes Aug.'s exegesis of 1 Cor. 6:3–4 (*op. mon.* 37) for not leaving proper resource to secular courts (*Comm. 1 Cor.* 6:3–4) as 'a well-regulated commonwealth is a singular gift of God' (*Comm. Is.* 3:4). Further example of departure from Aug. can be found in Calvin's allowance of limited usury in *Letters of Advice* 6.1.

Ultimately, what one finds in the writing of Protestant Reformers is the fragmentation of Aug.'s reflection on work. While there is an emphasis on Aug. as a source for reflection on the subject of labour, his thought is appropriated selectively and often in parallel with pronouncements on monastic or ascetic life, which dissolve tensions held by Aug. which are intrinsic to his approach to labour. Post-Reformation Protestant thinkers continue to follow this trajectory (cf. Appold's study of Abraham Calov). The result is that in modern Protestant thought, Aug.'s reflection on labour is appropriated inasmuch as it resonates with the vocation model and can resource the *ordo salutis* (cf. *praed. sanct.*; *persev.*). Wider and more concrete moral reflection by Aug. is neglected, and in some cases, Aug.'s approach to labour is identified as essentially problematic (see NYGREN, ANDERS).

IV. MODERN RECEPTION AND RESEARCH

a. Monasticism

The modern reception of Aug.'s writing on monasticism and asceticism is complex. Conversely, contemporary research in the history of thought on labour does not always distinguish between Aug. and other patristic thinkers. In contemporary scholarship that specifically analyses the reception of Aug. by later medieval thinkers, Christian asceticism is seen in a purely negative light. In one example of this approach, Ovitt argues that while the call to labour for monks is unequivocal in Aug.'s writings, his commitment to monastic asceticism actually prevents the persistence of monastic labour in the later medieval period: 'this labor is penitential rather than productive' (101; cf. 106; *conf.* 10.16.25). In this interpretation, the abandonment of a universal monastic manual work requirement by the tenth century represents not a repudiation of Aug.'s vision, but its natural maturation. This 'asceticism versus labour' approach relies on a definition of ascetic discipline which is less than robust, and (in what is an otherwise insightful study) Ovitt fails to note that asceticism need not be pitted against material involvement, but can be seen as enabling engagement with the world in a spiritually ordered way. In this way, Aug.'s theology does not commend a unidirectional movement from *praxis* to *ascesis*, but from *ascesis* to *praxis* as well. This conclusion is supported both by the naturally social character of monasticism to Aug. and by the importance of charity as an outcome of work, more generally (cf. *op. mon.* 32).

b. Forms of work

Over the past half-century scholars have increasingly sought to locate the early roots of the development of the Western scientific mind in the medieval development of science and technology. Within this discourse, Aug. has been identified as a decisive influence on Renaissance thought in the history of science and its transformation of work (cf. Whitney; Ovitt 19–47; Mitcham). This discourse has involved scrutiny of the impact of the theological renderings of two relationships: first, that between human labour and the natural world; and second, the one between God's creative work and human productive activity and the potential that these conferred religious significance on human work (see I above). This discourse has yet to crystallize, and one finds contradictory interpretations of the impact of Augustinian attitudes towards work. For instance, Le Goff finds the penitential attitude towards labour (surveyed in Aug.'s thought above) as contempt and hostility for manual labour and trade which is only overcome in twelfth-century thought, while White holds that Latin Christianity was particularly amenable to technology given its construal of the human/natural relationship and the monastic relation of work with worship. Whitney concludes that Aug.'s legacy is ambivalent, though he notes 'the fundamental Augustinian premise that the pursuit of technology was a part of the fallen soul's progress toward God' (Whitney 114). Fortin offers the most theologically sensitive account of Aug.'s treatment of the 'arts' (in the classical sense, including liberal

arts). He concludes that an art for Aug. does occupy a privileged position, but this celebration of the arts is not absolute. Artistic (or technological) progress is not necessarily accompanied by a corresponding increase in moral goodness' on either a social or individual level (200–2). The primacy of worship and secondarily the pursuit of charity is Aug.'s main concern.

Along slightly different lines, Soly argues that Aug. is unique among the early Christian writers in that his flexible approach to vocation enables him to introduce 'mercantile activity as a [legitimate] form of work' (Soly 324; see *beata v.* 21.26; *s.* 177.5, 302.16–18; *en. Ps.* 70). As noted above (I.b), for Aug. most occupations provide a suitable context for virtuous activity. Soly notes that Aug. interprets Jesus' cleansing of the temple as not unilaterally chasing merchants from the temple, but rather the swindlers among them. Aquinas may be seen to offer a contrast to this position in his prohibition for clerics to participate in commercial exchange (*ST* 2-2.77.4 ad 3), though Soly prefers to see Aug.'s influence on Aquinas in commending a merchant's work 'as a legitimate entitlement to commercial profit' (325). In affirming the merchant's trade as potentially legitimate, Soly suggests, Aug. creates an opening for moral regulation of conduct in trade, profit-seeking work which should only be pursued in order to enable charity. For this reason, Soly attributes the late medieval use of merchant manuals, which offer a catalogue of spiritual and moral issues behind the virtue that a merchant was intended to observe, to an impulse originating in Aug.'s thought.

c. Aug. as precursor to industrialization?

Until the early twentieth century, historians generally accepted that throughout the Middle Ages, 'the idea of the universe which prevailed... and the general orientation of men's thoughts were incompatible with some of the fundamental assumptions which are required by the idea of progress' (Bury 20). More recently, however, historians have sought to identify a precursor to progress in Christian conceptualizations of linear *time and providence, suggesting that the Enlightenment idea of progress represents a secularized version of the Christian doctrine of providence. Aug. has been identified as a primary proponent, aiding in the transposition of Eusebius' strong notions of providence to accommodate the new social/political reality after the fall of Rome. As Mommsen puts it, 'from Aug.'s conception of the course of history, it follows that every particular event that takes place in time, every human life and human action, is a unique phenomenon which happens under the auspices of divine providence and must therefore have a definite meaning' (Mommsen 355, cf. *civ.* 12.13–15). While Mommsen goes on to suggest that Aug. is not to be considered a Christian progressivist (373), others including Whitney and Ovitt contend to the contrary. Whitney's reading is limited by his assumption that Aug.'s theology of work is oriented towards a return to paradise (See Ladner 153 ff. for a refutation of Aug.'s approach as a return eschatology). Whitney rightly notes the ambiguity of the vocation list provided in *civ.* 22.24: 'his list of the arts... includes heresy,

theatrical spectacles, traps, poisons, weapons and war machines' (54). However, Whitney seemingly fails to note the wider theological framework (I.a above) in which Aug. narrates the purpose and limits of work. As Mommsen notes, though human technological achievement can include advances, progress is not to be located in human history, but rather in divine providence which is *progressively revealed*. As Fortin suggests, 'the sober and less than optimistic view of human progress that emerges from *civ.* was precisely meant to counteract the... Christian idea of progress' (203). With regards to human labour, the idea of progress championed by Sir Francis Bacon, and subsequently in the Enlightenment, does not represent an accurate transmission of Aug. thought.

EVALUATION

As this summary demonstrates, the subject of work is treated rigorously and frequently by Aug. As with his treatment of other practical moral issues, Aug.'s reflection on work is not systematically organized; rather, his approach is pastoral and homiletic. Further, it is clear that Aug.'s moral reflection is closely connected to his theological thought. Aside from his enduring influence on approaches to monastic labour, it can be difficult to substantiate critically the influence of Aug.'s thought on work.

What we find in the transition from medieval to modern is the fragmentation of Aug.'s thought. He continues to be appealed to variously as a resource on the subject of labour, but these appropriations are wide-ranging in their conclusions, drawing selectively on threads of realism, charity, asceticism, and the mixed life. With increasing frequency, we find that the whole complex of Aug.'s reflection on labour is no longer held together. This is even more the case with contemporary writing on labour, which tends to caricature the patristic approach as 'penitential' and neglect the value of Aug.'s narratively realized theological approach to labour. What is clear is that throughout the history of Christian thought, Aug. is recognized to be a significant authority on the subject of work, and modern thinkers are increasingly coming to appreciate the dynamic nature of Aug.'s approach to the subject. Much scholarship remains to be produced as regards a critical study of Aug.'s influence on this subject. We still lack a monograph-length study of Aug.'s approach to work, and scholarly articles often neglect relevant theological dimensions which can illuminate Aug.'s thought on practical matters.

JEREMY H. KIDWELL

ANTHROPOLOGY; ASCETICISM; BENEDICT OF NURSIA; BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX; BONAVENTURE; CALVIN, JOHN; CHAUCER, GEOFFREY; CREATION; ETHICS; FAITH AND WORKS; HUGH OF ST VICTOR; ILLUMINATION, DIVINE; JOHN CASSIAN; LOVE; LUTHER, MARTIN; NYGREN, ANDERS; PLATONIC AND NEO-PLATONIC TRADITION; POLITICAL THOUGHT; *REGULA*; STOIC TRADITION; THOMAS AQUINAS; TIME; *UTI/FRUI* DISTINCTION; VINCENT OF BEAUVAIS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary literature

- Benedict of Nursia, *Rule*, trans. Terrence G. Kardong (Collegeville, PA 1996) [= RB].
- Bernard of Clairvaux, *Works* (London 1889–96).
- Bonaventure, *De reductione atrium ad theologiam*, trans. E. T. Healy (1955).
- J. Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed. J. T. McNeill, 2 vols (Philadelphia 1960).
- , *Commentaries* (Edinburgh 1846–51) [= *Comm.*].
- , ‘Letters of Advice’, in *Calvin’s Ecclesiastical Advice* (Louisville, KY 1991).
- G. Chaucer, *The Riverside Chaucer*, ed. L. D. Benson (3rd edn Boston 1987).
- Gaunilo of Marmoutiers, ‘Pro insipiente’, in B. Davies and G. R. Evans (eds), *Anselm of Canterbury. The Major Works* (Oxford 1998).
- Hugh of St Victor, *Didascalicon*, trans. J. Taylor (New York 1991).
- Martin Luther, *Luther’s Works* (Minneapolis 1957–86) [= *LW*].
- Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae* (Cambridge 2006) [= *ST*].
- Vincent of Beauvais, *Speculum maius* (Douai 1624).

Secondary literature

- K. G. Appold, ‘Abraham Calov’s Doctrine of Vocatio in its Systematic Context’ (Ph.D. diss. New Haven 1994).
- R. Arbesmann, ‘The Attitude of St Augustine Toward Labor’, in *Heritage of the Early Church* (Rome 1973).
- J. B. Bury, *The Idea of Progress. An Inquiry into its Origin and Growth* (London 1920).
- E. L. Fortin, ‘Augustine, the Arts and Human Progress’, in C. Mitcham and J. Grote (eds), *Theology and Technology* (Lanham, MD 1984) 3–20.
- A. T. Geoghegan, *The Attitude towards Labor in Early Christianity and Ancient Culture* (Washington 1945).
- J. P. Kleinz, *The Theory of Knowledge of Hugh of Saint Victor* (Washington 1944).
- G. B. Ladner, *The Idea of Reform. Its Impact on Christian Thought and Action in the Age of the Fathers* (Cambridge, MA 1959).
- J. Le Goff, *Time, Work and Culture in the Middle Ages* (Chicago 1980).
- C. Mitcham, ‘Aspects of Christian Exegesis. Hermeneutics, the Theological Virtues, and Technology’, in *Theology and Technology* (Lanham, MD 1984).
- T. E. Mommsen, ‘St Augustine and the Christian Idea of Progress. The Background of the *City of God*’, *Journal of the History of Ideas* 12/3 (1951) 346–74.
- O. O’Donovan, ‘*Usus* and *Fruitio* in Augustine’s *De doctrina Christiana* I’, *Journal of Theological Studies* 33 (1982) 361–98.
- , ‘The Political Thought of *City of God* 19’, in *Bonds of Imperfection* (Grand Rapids, MI 2004).
- D. R. Overman, ‘Manual Labor. The Twelfth-Century Cistercian Ideal’ (MA thesis, Western Michigan University 1984).

- G. Ovitt Jr, *The Restoration of Perfection* (New Brunswick, NJ 1987).
- L. Schumacher, *Divine Illumination. The History and Future of Augustine’s Theory of Knowledge* (Oxford 2011).
- M. S. Sherwin, *By Knowledge and by Love. Charity and Knowledge in the Moral Theology of St Thomas Aquinas* (Washington 2005).
- H. Soly, ‘Work and Identity of Merchants and Artisans’, in J. Ehmer and C. Li (eds), *The Idea of Work in Europe from Antiquity to Modern Times* (Burlington, VT 2009) 323–30.
- C. Tilmouth, ‘Augustinian and Aristotelian Influences from Herbert to Milton’, in *Passion’s Triumph over Reason* (Oxford 2007).
- L. T. White, *Technology and Invention in the Middle Ages* (Cambridge, MA 1940).
- E. Whitney, ‘Paradise Restored. The Mechanical Arts from Antiquity through the Thirteenth Century’, *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 80/1 (1990) 1–169.
- A. Zumkeller, *Augustine’s Ideal of the Religious Life* (New York 1986).

Lanfranc of Canterbury (c.1010–1089)

L. was born in Pavia, Italy. In early adulthood he left his home country and became a wandering scholar teaching the liberal arts in Burgundy and France. Around 1042, L. became a monk in the monastery of Bec (in Normandy), which had been founded by an illiterate knight a few years earlier. L. served as Prior of Bec for eighteen years (1045–63). Duke William of Normandy then entrusted L. with the foundation of a new monastery at Caen, and L. became its first abbot (1063–70). After the Conquest, L. became the first ‘Norman’ Archbishop of Canterbury (1070–89). While Prior of Bec, L. commented on biblical and patristic texts. The best known and most remarkable of his works is the Eucharistic treatise *De corpore et sanguine Domini* (*De corpore*, c.1063), but it is problematic as a source for L.’s contribution.

De corpore has had a central role in the usual descriptions of L.’s significance. Because of *De corpore*, L. is seen as the leading defendant of the ‘orthodox’ view in the Eucharistic controversy instigated by *Berengar of Tours. *De corpore* has also served as evidence for the quality of the teaching in the school that L. was running at the monastery of Bec. These notions taken together create the framework for the idea that L. exerted a major influence on *Anselm of Canterbury, who came to Bec in 1059. This way of seeing L. and his relation to Anselm is overly charitable toward L. There are various reasons for believing that Anselm already was a competent scholar when he arrived at Bec at the age of 26. On the other hand, *De corpore* proves to be a strongly rhetorical work; in particular, L.’s once celebrated use of logic in *De corpore* can be shown to be entirely sophistical (Gibson 1978, 85–8; Holopainen 59–67). Combining these ideas, it is possible to present the following scenario: as L.’s closest associate in 1059–63, Anselm helped L. make the school of Bec an institution of high standard for a short period of time. Anselm also helped L. compose *De corpore*, which is a rhetorical attack against Berengar. This proposition needs further testing. Assuredly, L. was a well-known teacher in his