



PROJECT MUSE®

Rufinus of Aquileia and Alexandrian Afterlives: Translation
as Origenism

Catherine M. Chin

Journal of Early Christian Studies, Volume 18, Number 4, Winter 2010,
pp. 617-647 (Article)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/earl.2010.a406758>



➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/406758>

Rufinus of Aquileia and Alexandrian Afterlives: Translation as Origenism

CATHERINE M. CHIN

Placing Rufinus of Aquileia's translation projects into the larger theological context of the Origenist controversy suggests a correspondence between Rufinus's methods of textual alteration and restoration and Origen's notion of the fall of souls and their ultimate return to God. This correspondence also parallels an emphasis in Rufinus's work on the idea of a Christian literary aggregate, or the idea of a Christian library, which contrasts with the idea of the Christian author as found in Rufinus's contemporaries, notably Jerome; for Rufinus, the library overshadows individual authors in the same way that God overshadows souls in the final reunification. Thus Rufinus's translations of Christian texts should be read both as contributions to the idea of a body of Christian literature, as this idea became established in the late fourth and early fifth centuries, and as material practices that participate in an Origenist cosmology of fall and return.

Readers of Rufinus of Aquileia's *Ecclesiastical History* will be familiar with his tale of two dismemberments. The first dismemberment, and by far the more famous, is the destruction of the cult statue of Serapis in the year 391, which Rufinus reports as part of the wholesale dismantling of the Alexandrian Serapeum. The second, less often considered, is the dismemberment of the body of John the Baptist, undertaken by a pagan mob in Palestine during the reign of Julian. According to Rufinus, this second dismemberment was foiled by a group of monks from Jerusalem, who

This paper has been presented in several different versions to several different audiences, too numerous to list here. I would like to thank many colleagues, especially in New York, North Carolina, and California, for their advice and suggestions; I would also like to thank the two anonymous readers for JECS, who saved me from many errors, both large and small. The remaining faults are, of course, my own.

Journal of Early Christian Studies 18:4, 617–647 © 2010 The Johns Hopkins University Press

gathered the scattered relics and sent them for safekeeping to Athanasius in Alexandria. As a triumphant end to what Rufinus calls the “death of Serapis,”¹ Rufinus records that these relics were placed in the newly constructed martyr’s shrine on the site of the Serapeum, one body thus replacing another.² These parallel accounts are not, of course, mere records of religious violence. I will argue here that Rufinus of Aquileia, rather than being a simple narrator of change in Alexandria, was himself a key participant in a project of dismemberment and re-memberment closely associated with the physical acts he describes; in Rufinus’s case, however, this project was a grand attempt to displace classical literary culture with a body of Christian literature built on Alexandrian foundations. The Serapeum, after all, was not merely a temple, but an intellectual institution, and possibly also a library complex; certainly its best-known pagan defenders in 391 were grammarians and men of letters.³ Likewise, the movement of Christian objects between Palestine and Alexandria was not limited to relics, but included, in the late fourth century, large numbers of books, many of which were ultimately disseminated to the West by Rufinus himself. Rufinus’s ideological project throughout his public career was a remarkable

1. *Occasum Serapis*: Rufinus, *Hist.* 11.28 (trans. Philip R. Amidon, *The Church History of Rufinus of Aquileia Books 10 and 11* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007], 86). For the Latin texts of Rufinus in this paper, unless otherwise noted I use *Tyrannii Rufini Scripta Varia*, ed. Manlio Simonetti, *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiae Aquileiensis* 5.1–2 (Rome: Città Nuova, 1999–2000). I have also consulted the edition of Theodor Mommsen, *Eusebius Werke, Die Kirchengeschichte*, Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs, 1908), who offers the complete translated text of the *Church History*, where Simonetti offers only Rufinus’s continuation, Books 10 and 11.

2. *Hist.* 11.22–28; Françoise Thelamon discusses this account within the context of Theodosian religious politics in *Pâiens et chrétiens au IVe siècle: L’apport de l’“histoire ecclésiastique” de Rufin d’Aquilée* (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1981), 245–73. For a more detailed account of Christian conversions of space in Egypt, see Elisabeth R. O’Connell, “Transforming Monumental Landscapes in Late Antique Egypt: Monastic Dwellings in Legal Documents from Western Thebes,” *J ECS* 15 (2007): 239–73.

3. Rufinus, *Hist.* 11.22, describes one of the pagan leaders, Olympus, as a philosopher; Socrates, *Historia ecclesiastica* 5.15 notes the presence of grammarians. The intellectual coterie of the Serapeum in the late fourth century is helpfully described in Christopher Hass, *Alexandria in Late Antiquity: Topography and Social Conflict* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997), 159–69; whether the Serapeum itself was part of the famed library complex at Alexandria is a matter of some dispute: see especially Judith McKenzie, Sheila Gibson, and A. T. Reyes, “Reconstructing the Serapeum in Alexandria from the Archeological Evidence,” *JRS* 94 (2004): 73–121, and Roger Bagnall, “Alexandria: Library of Dreams,” *TAPS* 146 (2002): 358, who points out that literary evidence for this claim comes from a single passage in Epiphanius of Salamis.

extension and Christianization of Alexandrian literary and bibliographic ideals. Rufinus calls the destruction of the cult statue at the Serapeum the death of Serapis, but it may be more accurate to call it, for late ancient Christians, the death of the classical library: it is worth considering what the library's afterlife may have been.

My argument here is in three parts: first, I place Rufinus's translation work within the Christian literary and theological context of the 390s and early 400s. This contextualization highlights Rufinus's interest in literary collections as opposed to individual authors, and suggests that the literary and theological dimensions of the Origenist controversy extensively overlap. Secondly, I turn to Rufinus's reception of Origen's theology of the Logos and the *apokatastasis*, primarily in his translation of *On First Principles*, in order to clarify the connections Rufinus finds in Origen between the human writing of words and the human capacity to become a vehicle for *the* Word. Thirdly, based on a close reading of Rufinus's *On the Adulteration of the Works of Origen* and his *Apology to Anastasius*, I suggest that Rufinus's larger project of text transmission should be seen as a contribution to a textualized Origenist theology of the *apokatastasis*. This survey of the theology behind Rufinus's work will demonstrate that the literary culture Rufinus hoped to create was to have been Christian not merely in its subject-matter or in the allegiances of its authors, but in its participation in Christian salvation history.

AUTHORS AND LIBRARIANS

Rufinus was not unique in his bibliographic interests. By the late fourth and early fifth century, many Latin Christian writers had become deeply concerned with the establishment, or at least the recognition, of a specifically Christian literary tradition, or with the existence of a Christian secondary literature. We may helpfully recall that Foucault's essay "What is an Author?" locates the genesis of western European authorship in the *De viris illustribus* of Jerome, written around 392.⁴ In the preface to this work, Jerome claims that his goal is "to do with our writers what [Suetonius] did by listing the illustrious literary men of the Gentiles, that is, I will briefly set out for you all those who have published anything memorable about the holy Scriptures, from Christ's passion up until the fourteenth

4. Michel Foucault, "What is an Author?," in *The Foucault Reader*, ed. Paul Rabinow (New York: Pantheon, 1984), 110–11; for discussion see Mark Vessey, "The Forging of Orthodoxy in Latin Christian Literature: A Case Study," *J ECS* 4 (1996): 507–9.

year of the emperor Theodosius.”⁵ The question of Christian authorship, however, is very much tied to commonplaces about earlier non-Christian learning. Written some years prior to *De viris illustribus*, Jerome’s *Ep.* 34 to Marcella describes the establishment of the episcopal library at Caesarea in Palestine as a Christian attempt to rival the library of Alexandria: “The blessed martyr Pamphilus . . . desired to compete with Demetrius of Phalerum and Pisistratus in his eagerness to have a library of sacred books, and he sought out works of brilliant men, which are their real and eternal monuments. . . .”⁶ In 397, Augustine, writing Book 2 of *De doctrina Christiana*, similarly compiles a list of Christian writers whose work demonstrates a robust Christian written tradition. These are, in an important metaphor, the writers who have come into the promised land bearing the spoils of Egypt.⁷ Later still, in compiling his list of works for the ideal monastic library, Cassiodorus quotes Augustine’s interpretation of the “spoils of Egypt,” and reminds his reader that Moses, after all, was “learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians.”⁸ It is within this Christian imagination of despoiled textual culture that we should place Rufinus. In his preface to the Pseudo-Clementine *Recognitions*, he describes himself as having taken “no little spoil from the libraries of the Greeks.”⁹

5. Jerome, *Vir. ill.* prol. 1 (PL 23:822): *Hortaris me, Dexter, ut Tranquillum sequens, ecclesiasticos Scriptores in ordinem digeram et quod ille in enumerandis Gentilium litterarum viris fecit illustribus, ego in nostris faciam, id est, ut a passione Christi usque ad decimum quartum Theodosii imperatoris annum, omnes qui de Scripturis sanctis memoriae aliquid prodiderunt, tibi breviter exponam.*

6. Jerome, *Ep.* 34; quoted by Rufinus, *Apol.* 2.21 (CSEA 5.1:178): *Beatus Pamphilus martyr . . . cum Demetrium Phalereum et Pisistratum in sacrae bibliothecae studio vellet aequare, imaginesque ingeniorum, quae vera sunt et aeterna monumenta.* Note here the use of *imagines* (which I translate very loosely here as “works”) for representations of the *ingenii*. The question of verbal and mental “images” will have a long afterlife in the Origenist controversy, although it is not clear that Jerome intends a truly technical use here, nor does Rufinus comment on it in his quotation. See Elizabeth A. Clark, *The Origenist Controversy* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992), chap. 2.

7. Augustine, *Doct. chr.* 2.40.60. This reading of the spoils of Egypt is not original with Augustine; for a list of earlier Christian authors who use it, see Christian Gnllka, *Chrësis: Die Methode der Kirchenväter im Umgang mit den antiken Kultur*, vol. 1 (Basel: Schwabe, 1984), 57.

8. Cassiodorus, *Inst.* 1.28.4 (ed. R. A. B. Mynors, *Cassiodori Senatoris Institutiones* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1937], 71; trans. James Halporn, *Cassiodorus, Institutes of Divine and Secular Learning and On the Soul* [Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2004], 160: *eruditus fuerit omni sapientia Aegyptiorum*).

9. *Clem.* prol. 9–10 (CSEA 5.1:258): *Praedamque . . . non parvam Graecorum bibliothecis direptam.*

We know that Rufinus possessed a large library of earlier Christian writings. Jerome's *Ep.* 5 to Florentinus is a request for several books to be copied from Rufinus's library and sent to Jerome. It is probably the case that Rufinus's early library was primarily composed of Latin works, as the works Jerome requests are by Latins.¹⁰ By the late 390s, however, Rufinus had expanded his collection into the Greek Christian literary world. Rufinus's surviving writings begin to appear in the year 397 or 398, at about the same time that Augustine was writing *De doctrina christiana*. Rufinus at this point had already taken certain Christian spoils of Egypt to the Holy Land, having studied for eight years with Didymus the Blind in Alexandria, toured the Egyptian desert in search of ascetic teachers, and then founded a monastic community in Jerusalem. His literary career began by taking eastern textual goods to Italy, translating into Latin the work of Demetrius of Phalerum's rival librarian, Pamphilus of Caesarea. Between the year 398 and his death in late 410 or early 411, Rufinus produced a large body of Latin translations of Greek Christian texts, diffusing the writings of Greek-speaking Christianity to the West, particularly to readers in north and central Italy. The works that Rufinus had translated by the end of his life were in the genres of homily, apologetics, dialogue, history, moral maxims, biblical commentary, ascetic rule, theological treatise, and a christianized response to the Greek romance novel.¹¹ These works span

10. Caroline P. Hammond, "A Product of a Fifth-Century Scriptorium Preserving Conventions Used by Rufinus of Aquileia," *JTS* n.s. 29 (1978): 368, article reprinted in Caroline P. Hammond Bammel, *Origeniana et Rufiniana* (Freiburg: Herder, 1996), section V. See also the discussion of this letter in Megan Hale Williams, *The Monk and the Book: Jerome and the Making of Christian Scholarship* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 34.

11. The standard account of Rufinus's life remains Francis X. Murphy, *Rufinus of Aquileia (345–410): His Life and Works* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1945), on which I rely heavily for biographical detail. For the chronology of Rufinus's translations, however, see Caroline P. Hammond, "The Last Ten Years of Rufinus's Life and the Date of his Move South from Aquileia," *JTS* n.s. 28 (1977): 428–29, also reprinted in Hammond Bammel, *Origeniana et Rufiniana*, section IV. Hammond Bammel's chronology departs in several particulars from that reconstructed by Murphy; in general here I rely on Hammond Bammel. For an excellent overview of Rufinus's translation practice, see Hammond Bammel, *Der Römerbrieftext des Rufin und seine Origenes-Übersetzung* (Freiburg: Herder, 1985), 43–58; more generally, F. Winkelmann, "Einige Bemerkungen zu den Aussagen des Rufinus von Aquileia und des Hieronymus über ihre Übersetzungstheorie und -methode," in *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten*, ed. Patrick Granfield and Josef A. Jungmann, vol. 2 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1970), 532–47; Antonio Grappone, *Omelle origeniane nella traduzione di Rufino: un confronto con i testi greci* (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 2007), chap. 1; and M. Monica Wagner, *Rufinus*

the second through the fourth centuries, and Rufinus's output should, I think, be placed alongside Jerome's *De viris illustribus* and Augustine's *De doctrina christiana* as a late fourth- and early fifth-century exploration of the question of Christian writing.

Unlike Jerome and Augustine, however, Rufinus does not expend much effort in augmenting the list of Christian authors with his own name. Where Jerome's concern with authors as great men is clear from *De viris illustribus*, and from his placement of himself at the culmination of this tradition, and Augustine's interest in his own authorial status is overt in the *Retractationes*, in Rufinus we see a move away from the authorial position. His contribution is almost exclusively in the realm of translation and transmission, and it is here that Rufinus's work becomes quite usefully idiosyncratic. Although Rufinus certainly did translate material in response to individual requests, if we consider Rufinus's literary output as more than a series of *ad hoc* translations for friends and patrons, we may begin to see how Rufinus was using the idea of the library, rather than the idea of the author, as his literary agenda. In distinguishing the idea of the library from the idea of the author, I do not mean to suggest that Rufinus denied the importance of authors in a structuralist or poststructuralist sense, nor do I mean to imply that Jerome and Augustine were not interested in large collections of books.¹² Instead, Rufinus's refusal to claim authorial status emphasizes the role of the writer as a transmitter of matter for which the writer is not the originary point. In expanding that matter to include the contents of a collection, the writer becomes a transmitter of matter for which no single author can serve as the sole originary point.¹³ The writer is thus subordinated to the collectivity of matter in transmission. In contrast, Jerome's stance in *De viris illustribus* privileges the authorial figure as

the Translator: A Study of his Theory and Practice as Illustrated in his Version of the Apologetica of St. Gregory Nazianzen (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1945).

12. For discussion of Jerome's library, see especially Williams, *The Monk and the Book*, chap. 4. More generally, on Jerome's own translation work and engagement with the prior Christian literary tradition, see Williams, *The Monk and the Book*, chap. 2 and 3; J. N. D. Kelly, *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies* (London: Duckworth, 1975), chap. 14 and 15; Adam Kamesar, *Jerome, Greek Scholarship, and the Hebrew Bible: A Study of the Quaestiones Hebraicae in Genesim* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993); Dennis Brown, *Vir Trilinguis: A Study in the Biblical Exegesis of St. Jerome* (Leuven: Peeters, 1992).

13. See the classic discussion in Roger Chartier, *The Order of Books*, trans. Lydia G. Cochrane (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1994), chap. 3.

the possessor and originator of the matter that the author writes, and lays emphasis on the individuation of authors who will produce libraries. The act of transmission has a much smaller role to play in this scheme, since the importance of the written matter is placed at its putative origin, and the transmitters are erased. Of course the ideas of “author” and “library” are not mutually exclusive: Rufinus does accept that individual writers play roles in contributing to the aggregate, and Jerome’s own translation work indicates a complex relationship to the idea of Christian literature broadly understood. At the same time, Jerome’s crafting of his authorial position stands in high relief next to Rufinus’s apparent self-effacement, and so stark a contrast calls for explanation.

Another Alexandrian example might helpfully illustrate the implications of the shift in emphasis from author to transmitted collectivity. As a later Byzantine author described it, Ptolemy II Philadelphus’s aim in establishing the library at Alexandria was to “[collect] the books of all the Greeks, Chaldeans, Egyptians, and Romans, [and render] those written in a foreign language into Greek.”¹⁴ In other words, the library complex whose disintegration Rufinus echoes in his account of the death of Serapis was retrospectively imagined to be not merely a repository of knowledge, but a repository of physically and linguistically translatable knowledge. Of course the specific contents and extent of translated works in the Alexandrian library must remain a matter of conjecture,¹⁵ but what is important for my purposes is the figure of the library in the imagination of later readers and writers. This figure privileges the collection and the corpus of universalized knowledge over the individual author. Note, then, the traditions surrounding the most famous religious text in the library, in accounts with which we know Rufinus was familiar. This was of course the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible, known significantly by the number of its translators as the Septuagint. By the late fourth century, long-standing Christian tradition, following the lead of the Alexandrian Jewish community, credited Ptolemy II with commissioning the Septuagint as part

14. George Synkellos, *Chronography*, trans. Paul Tuffin and William Adler, *The Chronography of George Synkellos* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 395; also quoted in Elias Bickerman, “The Septuagint as a Translation,” *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 28 (1959): 10 n. 17. The same universalizing sentiment is found in other ancient and postclassical writers; for a collection and insightful discussion of this trope, see Daniel Heller-Roazen, “Tradition’s Destruction: On the Library of Alexandria,” *October* 100 (2002): 140–43.

15. Bagnall, “Alexandria: Library of Dreams,” 351–56, describes the difficulty in obtaining any sort of accurate numbers for the contents of the library as a whole.

of his incorporation of “foreign” wisdom into the Alexandrian library.¹⁶ This is the tradition that Rufinus would later defend, with the important supplement that the use of the Septuagint by the apostles and other early Christians corroborates its divine status.¹⁷ Importantly, Rufinus’s case for the primacy of the Septuagint as the Christian Old Testament is based on the translation of the entire Hebrew Bible, rather than only the books traditionally attributed to the single author Moses. In contrast, Jerome, who is more concerned with authorial individuation, insists that the original seventy translators worked only on the Pentateuch, as in fact the *Letter of Aristeas* suggests.¹⁸ Where Jerome is concerned with the status of Christian authors, Rufinus shifts the emphasis to a divinely inspired collectivity of textual users and transmitters. Rufinus’s own translation work may thus express more optimism about Christian writing as part of an aggregate, rather than about writing as an individual undertaking. By focusing on Rufinus’s translations as theoretical contributions to a debate over authorship, we can see more clearly the alternative to Jerome’s celebration of the Christian author in *De viris illustribus*, namely the dream of the library without authors, that is, of a freestanding expansive knowledge that exists independently of human creation.¹⁹ The imagination and production of a Latin Christian literary canon can thus be seen as intimately connected to

16. See discussion in Bickerman, “The Septuagint as a Translation,” 5–6; on different Jewish theories of translation in accounts of the Septuagint, see Naomi Janowitz, “The Rhetoric of Translation: Three Early Perspectives on Translating Torah,” *HTR* 84 (1991): 129–40.

17. Rufinus, *Apol.* 2.34–40. Andrew S. Jacobs, *Remains of the Jews: The Holy Land and Christian Empire in Late Antiquity* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2004), chap. 3, examines Rufinus and Jerome’s debate over the “Jewish” or “Christian” character of the Hebrew Bible or Old Testament in terms of the politics of early Christian supersessionist claims.

18. Jerome, *Ezech.* 5.12, noted in Bickerman, “The Septuagint as a Translation,” 6 n. 10.

19. Williams, *The Monk and the Book*, chap. 1, offers an excellent discussion of Jerome’s construction of the “Christian writer.” Note important differences to the early modern fantasy of the library as described by Roger Chartier, *Order of Books*, 61–88, in which authors remain distinct, if subsumed to an extent in the collection; Williams refers to Chartier in her fifth chapter, “Towards a Monastic Order of Books,” but does not pursue the question of tensions between authors and libraries. A better early modern parallel to Rufinus might be found in one of the future translators of the King James Bible, Lancelot Andrewes, who in a 1603 sermon condemned the desire “to be Authors, and inventors of somewhat, that so we may seem to be as wise as God, if not wiser.” Passages from Andrewes’s 1603 sermons are quoted in Adam Nicholson, *God’s Secretaries: The Making of the King James Bible* (New York: HarperCollins, 2003), 30.

late fourth-century theological disputation, even if the idea of a “patristic canon” is not fully exploited until Augustine’s engagement with Pelagius and his followers some years later.²⁰

These general questions of the relationship of the author to the library become more pointed when placed in the context of the Origenist controversy in its Latin phase of the late 390s and early 400s. That the Origenist controversy was about the status of one particular author may seem clear. The acrimony raised by the deployment of earlier texts in the course of the controversy makes clear that it was also about authorship more broadly. Already in Rufinus’s first translated work, the *Apology for Origen* of Pamphilus and Eusebius of Caesarea, Pamphilus and Eusebius are responding to attacks on Origen by quoting extensively the words of Origen himself. These words are rearranged and excerpted to make a coherent and orthodox whole. As Pamphilus says, “What, for judges, is a surer and stronger defense for someone who is dead than the letters and writings of the dead man himself?”²¹ The *Apology* is a reconstructed Origen, on the one hand the source of his own defense, but on the other obviously altered through collation to make a case that he never in fact made.²² The alteration is more dramatic in Rufinus’s translation, which shortens the original five books of the *Apology* to just one, the first book. On one level, the controversy may still be about Origen, but in this case it is clearly also about the status of a writer whose task is the rearrangement of the words of another.²³ Jerome takes what we might call a robust view of authorial presence in the *Apology for Origen*, in the sense that he identifies two authorial figures—Eusebius and Origen—and holds each of them responsible for the heretical

20. Éric Rebillard, “A New Style of Argument in Christian Polemic: Augustine and the Use of Patristic Citations,” *J ECS* 8 (2000): 559–78.

21. *Apol. Orig.* 19 (ed. R. Amacker and Éric Junod, SC 464 [Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2002], 58): *quid apud homines iudices pro defuncto firmitus ac fortius valere debet quam litterae et scripta defuncti?* I would like to thank Jeremy M. Schott for providing me with a copy of his unpublished talk, “Intertextuality and the Production of Orthodox Discourse: The Case of Eusebius of Caesarea,” presented at the American Society of Church History 2008 meeting, in which this text is analyzed.

22. See the overview of Pamphilus’s textual activity in Anthony Grafton and Megan Williams, *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 2006), 179–95; compare also the activity of contemporary writers of literary *centones*, lucidly described in Scott McGill, *Virgil Recomposed: The Mythological and Secular Centos in Antiquity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), chap. 1.

23. For an excellent introductory discussion of the theoretical problems raised by the practice of quotation, see Marjorie Garber, “ ” (Quotation Marks),” *Critical Inquiry* 25 (1999): 653–79.

content of the work.²⁴ This view of authorial presence also explains why Jerome exempts Pamphilus from authorship, since Pamphilus's status as a martyr makes him, to Jerome, unlikely to have been a heretic, and hence unlikely to have participated in heretical authorship. What seems at first like a sleight-of-hand removal of Pamphilus from the authorial list is part of a very specific argument about authorial presence: writers, even writers of the words of others, are authors. Thus it appears that, for Jerome, original authorial status or intent can be attributed to a later writer who quotes that author. The result in the case of the *Apology for Origen* is multiple authors who are all incorrect.

Rufinus neatly turns this notion of authorship to his own polemical use in the *Apology against Jerome*. The bulk the *Apology* is devoted to the argument that if Origen is a heretic, and if quoting a heretic confers the status of heretic on the quoter, Jerome stands self-condemned. Thus 1.22–42 consists of quotation after quotation from Jerome's own works in which Jerome quotes or paraphrases Origen,²⁵ and 2.13–22 consists of quotations from Jerome in which he praises Origen. Interestingly, however, Rufinus applies the same argument to Jerome's quotation of classical authors, and we should place his condemnation of Jerome's classicizing in the context of this debate over authorship, writing, and quotation, rather than, as is traditional, in a separate discussion of Rufinus's and Jerome's views of classical literature. Rufinus freely admits that copies of works of Cicero and Plato circulated in his monastery in Jerusalem,²⁶ so it cannot be claimed simply that Rufinus represents a strictly "anti-classical" view here. His attack, rather, is on Jerome's claim not to have used such authors in his work, a claim that Rufinus asserts is patently false: "Read over again what he has written, if you please, if there is one page of his work which does not proclaim him a Ciceronian; where he does not say, 'But our Cicero, our Horace, and Virgil.'" ²⁷ Rufinus's argument is the same in the case of both Origen and classical authors, simply that the robust view of authorship, in which quoters are accountable as authors, leads to dishonesty and self-condemnation.

24. Jerome, *Ruf.* 1.8–10.

25. See discussion in Murphy, *Rufinus of Aquileia*, 143–47, and Elizabeth A. Clark, "The Place of Jerome's Commentary on Ephesians in the Origenist Controversy: The Apokatastasis and Ascetic Ideals," *VC* 41 (1987): 154–71.

26. *Apol.* 2.8.

27. *Apol.* 2.7 (CSEA 5.1:162): *Relegantur nunc, quaeso, quae scribit: si una operis eius pagina est, quae non eum iterum ciceronianum pronuntiet, ubi non dicat: Sed Tullius noster, sed Flaccus noster, et Maro.*

Rufinus's cleverness in quoting Jerome against himself has often been noted,²⁸ but what is sometimes obscured by this cleverness is the alternative model of writing that Rufinus is proposing, namely that authorship should not accrue to the writer whose work quotes another, and that quotation therefore does not make the quoter liable to the same judgments that an author might face. In other words, it is possible, and perhaps preferable, for Rufinus, to be a writer without being an author. In the epilogue to his translation of Origen's *Commentary on Romans*, completed in 406, Rufinus makes his position clear, in a passage worth quoting at length:

[My detractors] say to me: Since, in what you write, there is a great deal of your own in his works, use a title with your own name, and write, for example, "Rufinus's Commentary on the letter to the Romans," just like amongst pagan authors, the title has the name, not of the one who was translated from Greek, but of the one who translated it. [. . .] I, however, give more weight to my conscience than to my name; and even if I seem to have added some things or left things out, or to have shortened what was too long, I do not think it would be right for the title to be stolen from the one who laid the foundation for the work and provided the materials for constructing the building.²⁹

Here are two competing notions of authorship: on the one hand, those who wish the translator to have authorial status and thus share authorial praise or blame, and on the other, an insistence that credit taken for transmitting prior material constitutes literary theft.³⁰ Rufinus insists on remaining a transmitter. As Rufinus argues in defense of his translation

28. See Murphy, *Rufinus of Aquileia*, 140: "Its principal virtue is its reliance upon documentary proof for its assertions, and a relatively rigid logic." Similarly, Kelly, *Jerome*, 251: ". . . with its massive, mainly accurate use of documents and its relentless logic it made a formidable polemical pamphlet." See also Clark, *Origenist Controversy*, 177–78, on the way in which Rufinus forces Jerome either to identify with the author whom Jerome quotes (Origen) in defense of God's justice or to repudiate the idea of divine justice entirely.

29. *Orig. Rom.* epilogue, 49–58 (CSEA 5.1:254): *Aiunt enim mihi: In his quae scribes, quoniam plurima in eis tui operis habentur, da titulum nominis tui, et scribe: Rufini—uerbi gratia—in epistolam ad Romanos explanationum libri, sicut apud auctores—inquiunt—saeculares, non illius qui ex Graeco translatus est, sed illius qui transtulit nomen titulus tenet. [. . .] Verum ego, qui plus conscientiae meae quam nomini defero, etiam si addere aliqua uideor et explere quae desunt, aut breuiare quae longa sunt, furari tamen titulum eius qui fundamenta operis iecit et construendi aedificii materiam praebuit, rectum non puto.* See also the discussion of this passage in Hammond Bammel, *Römerbrieftext des Rufin*, 43–44.

30. See Richard A. Layton's excellent discussion of plagiarism charges in Jerome, "Plagiarism and Lay Patronage of Ascetic Scholarship: Jerome, Ambrose, and Rufinus," *J ECS* 10 (2002): 489–522.

work, in the *Apology to Anastasius*, “If there is something displeasing in the author, why should it be held against the translator? [. . .] If there is something praiseworthy in [the original Greek], the praise is not for me; if there is some fault, it is likewise not mine.”³¹ In contrast, Jerome, Rufinus suggests elsewhere, is enamored of his own authorial status: “I see that he enjoys the works of his own pen, and pursues something more glorious, to be a father of the word rather than a translator.”³² In fact, the decoupling of writership from authorship seems to have served Rufinus reasonably well. Despite Anastasius’s ultimately negative judgment of Origen, who, Anastasius claims, “wished to destroy . . . the apostolic faith,” Anastasius’s letter to John of Jerusalem leaves the condemnation of Rufinus as a matter between Rufinus and God.³³ Rufinus the translator is ultimately stripped of individual significance.

The Origenist controversy thus involved the opposition of a robust notion of authorship, in which authorship accrues to translators and quoters, to a valorization of transmission over authorship, in which the transmitter does not claim originary status. It was, of course, no less a theological controversy for its elaboration of these literary-theoretical positions. Rather, the Origenist controversy continually circles around what might be called a theology of authorship, or more broadly a theology of textuality. It is important to recall that two of the primary issues at stake were Origen’s subordinationism and his theology of the fall and return of souls to unity with God, the *apokatastasis*. I will now turn to these theological issues as they seem to have been received by Rufinus.

TRANSMISSION AND SUBORDINATION

Although Rufinus strenuously denied any Trinitarian error on Origen’s part, Origen’s statements on the nature of the Son of God clearly lend themselves to a subordinationist view of the relationship between Father and Son.³⁴ Rufinus’s reception of Origen’s views on the Son are readily

31. *Anast.* 7 (CSEA 5.1:72): *Si enim aliquid est quod displiceat in auctore, quare id ad interpretem detorquetur? [. . .] Siue ergo in illis sensibus laus inest aliqua, non est mea; siue culpa, similiter non est mea.*

32. *Orig. Princ.* pref. 1 (ed. Henri Crouzel and Manlio Simonetti, *Origène. Traité des principes*, SC 252 [Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1978], 68): *Sed ille, ut uideo, in stilo proprio placens rem maioris gloriae sequitur, ut pater uerbi sit potius quam interpres.*

33. Anastasius, *Ep.* 1.2–3 (PL 21:629A–B): *fidem Apostolorum . . . uoluisse dissolvere.*

34. The literature on Origen’s subordinationism, and its possible relationship to later Arianism, is vast; for a good representative account, see Aloys Grillmeier’s classic *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 1, trans. John Bowden (Louisville, KY: Westminster

available in his translation of *On First Principles*. In *On First Principles* 1.2.2–4, the role of the Son is described as follows: first, “the only begotten Son of God is God’s wisdom hypostatically existing,” and this wisdom “was created as a ‘beginning of the ways’ of God, which means that she contains within herself both the beginnings and causes and species of the whole creation.”³⁵ Then, Origen claims, in Rufinus’s translation, “in the same manner also must wisdom be understood to be the Word of God. For wisdom opens to all other beings . . . the meaning of the mysteries and secrets which are contained within the wisdom of God, and so she is called the Word, because she is as it were an interpreter of the mind’s secrets.”³⁶ The Son, then, as wisdom and Word, is the medium, the “interpreter,” between divine mysteries and creation. Origen further claims, in Rufinus’s translation, that this mediating and communicative function is the reason Christ is called “the express image of his substance” in Hebrews 1.3: “See then, whether the Son of God, who is called God’s word and wisdom . . . may not be said to express the image of God’s substance or subsistence for this reason, that he makes God understood and known.”³⁷ The defining characteristic of the Son, in this account, is his mediating and communicative role. It follows that the Son cannot be held to be the sole originator of that which is communicated, since wisdom is, in Origen’s quotation of the Wisdom of Solomon, “a breath of the power of God and a pure effluence

John Knox, 1975), 138–48. For more detailed discussion of Origen’s Christology, see especially J. Nigel Rowe, *Origen’s Doctrine of Subordination: A Study in Origen’s Christology* (Berne: Peter Lang, 1987); Rolf Gögler, *Zur Theologie des Biblischen Wortes bei Origenes* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1963) and Marguerite Harl, *Origène et la fonction révélatrice du Verbe Incarné* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1958). More detailed with regard to Rufinus’s translation practices is Basil Studer, “Zur Frage der Dogmatischen Terminologie in der Lateinischen Übersetzung von Origenes’ *De Principiis*,” in *Epektasis: Mélanges patristiques offerts au Cardinal Jean Daniélou*, ed. J. Fontaine and Charles Kannengiesser (Paris: Beauchesne, 1972), 403–14.

35. *Orig. Princ.* 1.2.2 (SC 252:112–14; trans. G. Butterworth, *Origen, On First Principles* [Gloucester: Peter Smith, 1973], 15–16): *unigenitum filium dei sapientiam eius esse substantialiter subsistentem*, and *creatam esse sapientiam initium uiarum dei continens scilicet in semet ipsa uniuersae creaturae uel initia uel rationes uel species*.

36. *Orig. Princ.* 1.2.3 (SC 252:114–16; trans. Butterworth 16): *hoc modo etiam uerbum dei eam esse intellegendum est per hoc, quod ipsa ceteris omnibus . . . mysteriorum et arcanorum rationem quae utique intra dei sapientiam continentur, aperiat; et per hoc uerbum dicitur, quia sit tamquam arcanorum mentis interpretis*.

37. *Orig. Princ.* 1.2.8 (SC 252:126; trans. Butterworth 21): *Et uide ne forte, quoniam filius dei, qui et uerbum eius et sapientia dicitur . . . secundum hoc ipsum, quod intellegi atque agnosci facit deum, figuram substantiae uel subsistentiae eius dicitur exprimere*.

(that is, emanation) of the glory of the Almighty.”³⁸ While in Rufinus’s account, Origen insists on the eternal existence of this emanation,³⁹ it is clear that the Son’s communicative role here is not described as an originary point for what is communicated.

This emphasis on communication and non-origination continues in Origen’s account of the incarnation. Origen’s doctrine of the human soul of Christ suggests that the rational soul that became the soul of Jesus of Nazareth was joined with the Logos, the Son of God. He writes that the soul of Christ was “in its nature indeed like our souls, but in will and virtue like himself, and of such a kind that it could unswervingly carry into effect all the wishes and plans of the Word and Wisdom.”⁴⁰ This soul was “united in a spotless partnership with the Word of God and thereby alone among all souls became incapable of sin, because it was well and fully capable of receiving the Son of God, and on that account is even one with him.”⁴¹ We see here an exemplary human conjunction with the Word that is not in any sense authorial. And although it is identified with what it conveys, it ultimately loses its own significance: “It is of this soul . . . that I think the apostle spoke when he said, ‘Your life is hid with Christ in God.’”⁴² The human soul of Christ obviously participates in salvation, but it is not to be taken for the author of salvation.

What is more, in being submerged in the Logos, the human soul of Christ models the transformation and improvement of other human souls, who ought themselves to become vehicles for the Word as far as possible.⁴³ Notoriously, for Origen, the possibility of human improvement is linked to the notion of universal salvation, or the restoration of all rational beings to unity with the divine. Interpreting Paul’s statement that, in the end, God will be “all things and in all,” Origen suggests that

38. *Orig. Princ.* 1.2.9 (SC 252:128; trans. Butterworth 22): *uapor est quidam uirtutis dei et aporrhoeia (id est manatio) omnipotentis gloriae.*

39. *Orig. Princ.* 1.2.9–10.

40. *Orig. Princ.* 4.4.4 (ed. Henri Crouzel and Manlio Simonetti, SC 268 [Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1980], 408; trans. Butterworth 318): *nostrarum quidem animarum similem per naturam, proposito uero et uirtute similem sibi et talem, qualis omnes uoluntates et dispensationes uerbi et sapientiae indeclinabiliter posset implere.*

41. *Orig. Princ.* 4.4.4 (SC 268:410; trans. Butterworth 319): *cum uerbo dei immaculata foederatione coniuncta est et per hoc sola omnium animarum peccati incapax fuit; ideoque et unum cum ipso est.*

42. *Orig. Princ.* 4.4.4 (SC 268:410; trans. Butterworth 319): *De qua anima . . . etiam illud arbitrator dixisse apostolum, quod ait quoniam uita uestra abscondita est cum Christo in deo.*

43. *Orig. Princ.* 4.4.2.

this will be the case when “he will be all things in each person—in such a way that everything which the rational mind . . . can feel or understand or think will be all God, and that the mind will no longer be conscious of anything besides or other than God.”⁴⁴ Unity with the divine on the part of all persons mirrors, if it does not exactly reproduce, the unity of the soul of Christ with the Logos in the incarnation. In this sense, although it is certainly the case that Origen sees this unity as an act of will and hence as a matter of individual merit, what he is advocating for all humans is ultimately a vehicular role that returns the individual soul to its original unity with God. The individual rational soul thus has no originary function, free though it may be to rise or fall.

The return of souls to unity with the divine leads, of course, to an account of individual movement, fall and return, and here again Origen moves into territory that would be hotly contested in the later controversy. Although in Rufinus’s account Origen holds to the eternity of the Word, the movement of individual souls is construed as a problem of change over time. Hence in Rufinus’s somewhat convoluted translation of *On First Principles* 2.8.3, Origen writes,

just as that which was lost, undoubtedly existed before it was lost, when it was something, I know not what, other than lost, and just as there will also certainly be a time when it will not be lost; so the soul, which is said to have become lost, will apparently have been something at a time when it was not yet lost and may have been called a soul from the fact of its becoming lost, but when delivered from its lost condition it can once again be that which it was before it became lost and was called a soul.⁴⁵

Souls are ultimately the products of negative change over time. Individual differentiation is also a product of negative change over time, as each soul falls to a different degree.⁴⁶ A reverse process of change over time, however, is a positive and necessary development: in explaining 1 Cor 15.51, “We shall all be changed,” Rufinus’s Origen asserts that “this change

44. *Orig. Princ.* 3.6.3 (SC 268:240; trans. Butterworth 248): *Per singulos autem omnia erit hoc modo, ut quidquid rationalis mens . . . uel sentire uel intellegere uel cogitare potest, omnia deus sit, nec ultra iam aliquid aliud nisi deum sentiat.*

45. *Orig. Princ.* 2.8.3 (SC 252:342–44; trans. Butterworth 123): *quia sicut hoc, quod perditum est, erat sine dubio antequam periret, cum aliud nescio quid erat quam perditum, sicut et erit utique cum iam non est perditum: ita etiam anima, quae perisse dicitur, uidebitur fuisse quid aliquando, cum nondum perisset et propter hoc anima diceretur, quae rursum ex perditione liberata potest iterum illud esse quod fuit, antequam periret et anima diceretur.*

46. *Orig. Princ.* 2.9.5–8.

. . . we must certainly look forward to, and we are undoubtedly right in expecting it to consist in some act that is worthy of the divine grace.”⁴⁷ The most dramatic of these changes is the change at the resurrection from a corruptible to an incorruptible body.⁴⁸ Change continues after this in the medicinal punishments of the wicked and the continuing education of the good in heaven.⁴⁹ The goal of this change, however, is the erasure of differentiation, as Rufinus’s Origen establishes in Book 1 of *On First Principles*: “For the end is always like the beginning . . . and as there is one end of many things, so from one beginning arise many differences and varieties, which in their turn are restored, though God’s goodness . . . to one end, which is like the beginning.”⁵⁰ Thus for Rufinus’s Origen, the drama of the human soul is the drama of change over time, which first leads to differentiation and corruption, but continues on into sameness and incorruption.

The implications of Origen’s theology of the Word for writing and authorship are suggested elsewhere in works of Origen translated by Rufinus. We see some indication of them in Origen’s much-studied attitude to the textualization of the Word in Scripture. As is well known, Origen does not have a strong conception of individual human authorship of biblical texts. Rather, what might be called his vehicular anthropology tends toward a much stronger account the role of the Word in divine inspiration, not merely in the inspiration of biblical writers, but also the divinely sanctioned verbalization of the Word in preaching, and in the reception and transmission of the Word in biblical commentary. For example, in his *Homily 15* on Numbers, translated by Rufinus, Origen portrays the ambiguous prophetic figure of Balaam as humanly disreputable, but made laudable by being temporarily a vehicle for the word of God: “He seems praiseworthy when the Word of God is placed in his mouth, when the Spirit of God comes over him, when he prophesies about Christ.”⁵¹ Paul

47. *Orig. Princ.* 2.10.3 (SC 252:380; trans. Butterworth 140): *Quae utique immutatio . . . expectanda est, in qua sine dubio dignum aliquid diuina gratia sperare nos conuenit.*

48. *Orig. Princ.* 2.10.3.

49. *Orig. Princ.* 2.10.4–8, 2.11.4–7.

50. *Orig. Princ.* 1.6.2 (SC 252:196; trans. Butterworth 53): *Semper enim similes est finis initiis . . . et sicut multorum unus finis, ita ab uno initio multae differentiae ac uarietates, quae rursus per bonitatem dei . . . in unum finem, qui sit initio similes, reuocantur.*

51. *Orig. Num.* 15.1 (PG 12.683d): *[Rursus laudabilis ostenditur] cum uerbum Dei ponitur in ore eius, cum Spiritus Dei fit super eum, cum de Christo propheta.* See J. R. Baskin’s discussion, “Origen on Balaam: The Dilemma of the Unworthy Prophet,” *VC* 37 (1983): 22–35.

and the apostles serve as vehicles for the Word as well: “undoubtedly Christ, in his character as Word and Wisdom and all the rest, was in Paul, according to Paul’s own statement, ‘Or do you seek a proof of him who speaks in me, even Christ?’”⁵² Paul’s letters and the utterances of Balaam have in common the presence of the Word in a communicative role. While the persons doing this writing and speaking perform a vitally important spiritual role in disseminating the Word, their role cannot be construed as authorship in any traditional sense.

Further, Origen’s larger notion of universal submersion in God not only privileges the position of vehicle, but also returns us to the notion of collectivity—that is, to the notion of the library, in which knowledge is understood as an aggregate rather than as inherently connected to individual production. Following this paradigm, divinely sanctioned writing and speaking become the outworking of the Logos in the world and have a cumulative rather than individual effect. It is important to note that, in Origen’s defense of the inartistic nature of Christian writing, he appeals to the wide diffusion of that writing as its particular strength: “and this is particularly wonderful since its teachers are neither very skilful nor very numerous. For in spite of all, this word is ‘preached in all the world’ (Matt. 24.14), so that Greeks and barbarians, wise and foolish now adopt the Christian religion. Hence there can be no doubt that it is not by human strength or resources that the word of Christ comes to prevail.”⁵³ Thus the numerical spread of Christian words and texts has its own soteriological value: what is important is less the precision or beauty of authorial achievement and more the sheer multiplication of transmissions of the Logos. This movement away from individual authorial action and toward the growth of the aggregate should, I think, be seen as the theological—and perhaps cosmological—framework in use for an Origenist idea of the Christian library. Origen certainly formulates his own conception of the library within the established definitions of the ancient library broadly conceived, but he gives that conception a theological force in his doctrine of the Logos. The twin projects of the Alexandrian library, to collect all

52. *Orig. Princ.* 4.4.2 (SC 268:404; trans. Butterworth 316): *dubium non est quod Christus secundum quod uerbum et sapientia est uel cetera omnia, erat in Paulo, propter quod dicebat: Aut experimentum quaeritis eius, qui in me loquitur Christus?*

53. *Orig. Princ.* 4.1.2 (SC 268:264; trans. Butterworth 258): *et eo maxime mirum est quod ne doctores quidem ipsi uel satis idonei sunt uel satis plures: praedicatur tamen sermo iste in omni orbe terrarum, ita ut Graeci et barbari, sapientes et insipientes religionem Christianae doctrinae suscipiant. Ex quo dubium non est non haec humanis uiribus aut opibus agi, ut . . . sermo Christi Iesu . . . conualescat.*

texts and to bring them to linguistic sameness, take on a special resonance when applied to the Origenist paradigm of universal salvation. The lack of room in this scheme for authorial individuation may explain Rufinus's refusal to adopt the persona of author and prefer the role of translator.⁵⁴ While I will not claim that parallels between Origenist cosmology and the contorted questions of authorship in the Origenist controversy are always exact, I think that they are frequent enough that the theological issues at stake should be read as the literary-theoretical framework of these arguments.

TRANSLATION AND TRANSFORMATION

The afterlife of the library and the afterlife of the soul are joined in Rufinus's work by what Walter Benjamin will later call the afterlife of the text, namely, the practice of translation.⁵⁵ Origen's advocacy of multiple transmissions of the Logos includes a positive account of the transmission of Christian texts into "every foreign nation"⁵⁶; Rufinus's work as a translator should be understood in the light of this theology. It is true that, beginning with Jerome's *Apology against Rufinus*, Rufinus has often been accused of being a dishonest, or at best a naïve, translator.⁵⁷ The reasons for this are relatively clear. In the preface to his translation of *On First Principles*, Rufinus describes his practice as follows: "Wherever . . . I have found in [Origen's] books anything contrary to the reverent statements made by him about the Trinity in other places, I have either omitted it as a corrupt and interpolated passage, or reproduced it in a form that agrees with the

54. Notably, Jerome, whose interest in authorship Rufinus makes clear, is also particularly troubled by the idea that human souls will not be clearly individuated in the afterlife. See discussion in Elizabeth A. Clark, "Place of Jerome's Commentary on Ephesians," 154–71.

55. Walter Benjamin, "The Task of the Translator," trans. Harry Zohn, in *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections*, ed. Hannah Arendt (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1968), 69–82.

56. *Orig. Princ.* 4.1.1 (SC 268:262; trans. Butterworth 257): *uniuersis exteris nationibus*.

57. E.g. Butterworth's introduction to his translation of *On First Principles*, xli: "[Rufinus] has laid himself under the suspicion that fear of heresy is with him a stronger motive than love of truth." This is not to say that Rufinus has not also had defenders. For a useful survey, see Wagner, *Rufinus the Translator*, chap. 1. Wagner's study itself emphasizes Rufinus's aims as a moral instructor, rather than his theological positions. See also E. C. Brooks, "The Translation Techniques of Rufinus of Aquileia (343–411)," *SP* 17 (1982): 357–64.

doctrine that I have found him affirming elsewhere.”⁵⁸ This treatment of unorthodox statements is also followed in Rufinus’s translation of Eusebius’s *Ecclesiastical History*, in which Eusebius’s subordinationist theology is toned down or omitted.⁵⁹ Nor does Rufinus’s technique stop with the smoothing over of unorthodoxy; he also rearranges blocks of text for reasons of coherence or edification, and makes additions or subtractions to the texts that he translates. For example, it is generally accepted that Rufinus added a set of maxims of Evagrius of Pontus to the *Sentences of Sextus*, without mentioning Evagrius specifically, although he does make clear that he has added “a few selected maxims.”⁶⁰ Rufinus has also been accused of deliberate misattribution: he follows the traditional attribution of the *Sentences* to the second-century pope, although Jerome claims that they are the work of a Pythagorean philosopher.⁶¹ Rufinus also assigns the *Dialogue of Adamantius* to Origen, although this attribution is certainly incorrect.⁶²

In many respects, however, Rufinus’s method of translating is not altogether different from Jerome’s own early translations of Origen, as Rufinus asserts in the preface to his translation of *On First Principles*:

For he, when translating into Latin more than seventy treatises of Origen, called homilies, and also a number of his commentaries on St. Paul’s epistles, both of which are known to contain in the original a good many statements likely to cause offence, so smoothed over and emended these in his translation, that a Latin reader would find in them nothing out of harmony with our faith. His example, therefore, I am following to the best of my ability.⁶³

58. *Orig. Princ.* pref. 3 (SC 252:72; trans. Butterworth lxiii): *Sicubi ergo nos in libris eius aliquid contra id inuenimus, quod ab ipso in ceteris locis pie de trinitate fuerat definitum, uelut adulteratum hoc et alienum aut praetermisimus aut secundum eam regulam protulimus, quam ab ipso frequenter inuenimus adfirmatam.*

59. See J. E. L. Oulton, “Rufinus’s Translation of the Church History of Eusebius,” *JTS* n.s. 30 (1929): 150–74. For a much more sympathetic reading of Rufinus’s translation and reworking of Eusebius, see Murphy, *Rufinus of Aquileia*, 158–75; and now Mark Humphries, “Rufinus’s Eusebius: Translation, Continuation, and Edition in the Latin *Ecclesiastical History*,” *J ECS* 16 (2008): 143–64.

60. *Sent. Sext.* pref. (CSEA 5.1:238–40): *addidi praeterea et electa quaedam . . .*; cf. Cassiodorus, *Inst.* 1.8.12, on Rufinus’s abridgment of Origen’s commentary on Romans.

61. See Henry Chadwick’s discussion in *The Sentences of Sextus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 117–37.

62. Vinzenz Buchheit, “Rufinus von Aquileja als Fälscher des Adamantiosdialogs,” *ByzZ* 51 (1958): 314–28.

63. *Orig. Princ.* pref. 2 (SC 252:70; trans. Butterworth lxiii): *Qui cum ultra septuaginta libellos Origenis, quos homileticos appellauit, aliquantos etiam de tomis*

In the case of Origen, and in the texts surrounding the Origenist controversy, both Jerome and Rufinus's translation methods might be seen as suspect according to a highly literal standard of translation, and in fact their various critics applied this standard when polemically convenient. As Jerome points out in his angry response to such critics, his famous *Ep.* 57, it was typical for ancient writers translating other's works to take liberties with their originals: he offers the examples of Cicero, Terence, Plautus, the translators of the Septuagint, and the apostles.⁶⁴ Given a basic agreement between Jerome and Rufinus that translation necessarily involves the alteration of a text, we should see their quarrel as less about the relative merits or demerits of literal translation than it is about the relationship of authorial claims to written words that change over time, and the relation of those words to the transmissions of the Logos.

Rufinus addresses the problem of textual change over time most directly in the preface to his *Apology for Origen* and in the short treatise at the end of the work, generally known as *On the Adulteration of the Works of Origen*, which were his opening literary bid in the Latin phase of the Origenist controversy, after his initial reconciliation with Jerome, and on his return to Italy from Jerusalem in 397.⁶⁵ The argument of Rufinus's work is relatively straightforward: whatever appears heretical in the works of Origen is likely the result of interpolations by heretics. As evidence, Rufinus adduces a list of other Christian writers of unimpeachable orthodoxy, such as Clement of Rome, Athanasius, and Hilary of Poitiers, whose works have from time to time also been tampered with. He further quotes at length a letter of Origen's that complains of unreliable copies of his work in circulation.⁶⁶ On strictly text-critical grounds, the argument (as Jerome would later point out)⁶⁷ is weak, but it is of interest because it relies on three basic assumptions: first, the instability of texts given the

in apostolum scriptis transtulisset in latinum, in quibus cum aliquanta offencicula inueniantur in graeco, ita elimauit omnia interpretando atque purgauit, ut nihil in illis quod a fide nostra discrepet latinus lector inueniat. Hunc ergo etiam nos . . . in quantum possumus sequimur.

64. *Ep.* 57.5–11. For an excellent discussion of the theoretical implications of this passage, see Douglas Robinson, *Translation and Taboo* (Dekalb, IL: Northern Illinois University Press, 1996), 102–7.

65. For chronology, see Murphy, *Rufinus of Aquileia*, 82–89; Kelly, *Jerome*, chap. 20; Clark, *Origenist Controversy*, chap. 5.

66. Rufinus's statement on adulteration: *Adult.* 2; list of orthodox writers: *Adult.* 3–5, 10–13; Origen's letter: *Adult.* 7.

67. *Ruf.* 3.5.

mechanics of late ancient book production;⁶⁸ second, the presumption of authorial consistency, so that the same author cannot be both orthodox and heretical;⁶⁹ and third, the more general notion that textual corruption necessarily occurs over time, and that it is the task of later readers to restore a text to its original condition. These assumptions make clear that Rufinus is dealing not merely with a set of mechanical problems (which he undoubtedly is) but with such problems as construed specifically temporally, as problems of persistence over time.

This temporal concern on one level places Rufinus well within the bounds of fourth- and fifth-century Latin literary culture broadly speaking, with its concern for text-critical work in the context of a highly self-conscious antiquarianism.⁷⁰ Servius's Virgil commentary, for example, combines text-critical and philological work with explanations of historical practice;⁷¹ it is common for Servius to explain unusual Virgilian locutions or references by appealing to the practices of the *veteres* or *antiqui*, or by using the notion of a *mos veterum* as an explanatory shorthand.⁷² In so doing, Servius is not necessarily claiming that the *mos veterum* should take precedence over contemporary practice, but he is situating readers within a temporal framework that posits a continuity between a literary "then" and a literary "now." That is, whether or not they have the same *mores* as the ancients, Servius's readers are configured as existing within

68. Textual corruption and falsification was of course a problem in antiquity, even if not to the extent that Rufinus claims in the case of Origen. For a general overview, see Wolfgang Speyer, *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum* (Munich: Beck, 1971), part 1; for a consideration of how such issues affected earliest Christianity, see Robert Grant, *Heresy and Criticism* (Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), and Bart D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

69. See P. O'Cleirigh, "Origen's Consistency: An Issue in the Quarrel between Rufinus and Jerome," *Origeniana septima*, ed. W. A. Bienert and U. Kühneweg (Leuven: University Press, 1999), 225–31.

70. On text-critical work in late antiquity, see James E. G. Zetzel, *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity* (New York: Arno, 1981); on literary antiquarianism in late antiquity, see Alan Cameron, "Paganism and Literature in Late Fourth Century Rome," in *Christianisme et formes littéraires de l'antiquité tardive en occident*, ed. M. Fuhrmann (Geneva: Fondation Hardt, 1977), 1–30, and, with more nuance, Charles Hedrick, Jr., *History and Silence: Purge and Rehabilitation of Memory in Late Antiquity* (Austin, TX: University of Texas, 2000).

71. See especially Robert Kaster, *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1988), chap. 5 on Servius.

72. In Servius, *Comm. in Aen.*, *mos* describes both cultural and linguistic "custom," e.g., *Comm. in Aen.* 1.93, 1.233, 1.313, 1.446, 1.632, 1.706, and 2.504.

a literary genealogy in which it is necessary to know both that there are *veteres* and what those *veteres* did.⁷³ This is the kind of genealogical appeal that Rufinus also makes: he refers to his list of orthodox writers as *vet-eres* on several occasions,⁷⁴ and in his translator's prologue he justifies his own status as a keeper of "that which has been handed down to us from the holy fathers."⁷⁵ In this genealogical vein, and perhaps as an indirect response to Jerome's history of literature in *De viris illustribus*, Rufinus's list of writers proceeds chronologically from Clement of Rome, whom he calls "almost an apostle,"⁷⁶ up to, notoriously, Jerome himself, constructing an abbreviated line of Christian writers whose writings, paradoxically, are both authoritative and corruptible. Where Servius can abstract a *mos veterum* from an assortment of earlier writers, Rufinus here in a somewhat more tendentious mode can appeal to a "rule of truth"⁷⁷ exemplified in the genealogy he constructs—so perfectly exemplified, in fact, that anything contradictory to this rule can simply be said to belong outside the genealogy as an interpolation.

The temporal framework to which Rufinus appeals, moreover, in constituting that by which a rule of truth is manifest, has theological implications within the sphere of Origenist thought. Rufinus is concerned with the temporal movement of Christian words, but he is also concerned with cosmological movement and the Christian logos. As noted earlier, the primary issues at stake in this phase of the Origenist controversy were the orthodoxy of the notion that all rational creatures will return to unity with the divine, and the nature of the resurrected body, that is, questions of corruption, restoration, and individual persistence over time.⁷⁸ These issues are prominent in Rufinus's prologue, especially the resurrection of the body, about which Rufinus insists on his own orthodoxy:

We do not speak of the resurrection of the flesh in any trickery, as some people slanderously say, but we believe that this very flesh in which we now live is to be resurrected. [. . .] [But] one must believe in the resurrection of complete and perfect flesh, which both preserves the nature of flesh and does not compromise the state and glory of the uncorrupt and spiritual body. Just as it is written, "Corruption cannot inherit incorruption."⁷⁹

73. Kaster, *Guardians*, 172–78.

74. *Adult.* 2.54, 2.64, 8.188, 13.259–60, 268ff.

75. *Orig. Apol.* prol. 23–24 (CSEA 5.1:24): *sicut traditum nobis est a sanctis patribus.*

76. *Adult.* 3.80 (CSEA 5.1:36): *pene apostolus.*

77. *Adult.* 1.9 (CSEA 5.1:32): *veritatis regula.*

78. See Clark, *Origenist Controversy*, chap. 3 and 4.

79. *Orig. Apol.* prol. 28–44 (CSEA 5.1:26): *Carnis uero resurrectionem non per aliquas praestigias, sicut nonnulli calumniantur, dicimus; sed hanc ipsam carnem, in*

If we take this prologue and the defense of Origen as the immediate theological context of *On the Adulteration of the Works of Origen*, Rufinus's appeal to the *veteres* becomes both an appeal to traditional forms of literary authority and an attempt to situate Latin Christian textuality within the broadly Origenist framework of the *apokatastasis*.

This textual theory is articulated in even more striking form in another late fourth-century Origenist text. Evagrius's *Letter to Melania* (which some have posited may have been a letter to Rufinus), was written at about the same time as Rufinus undertook his translation of Pamphilus's *Apology for Origen* and his work on adulteration. In this short theological sketch, Evagrius compares the material created world to a series of "letters" written as communications from God to humanity: "Now all these things which are done through letters, are a kind of symbol of the things which in truth are done by those who are far apart from God. For those who are far from God have made a separation between themselves and their Creator by their loathsome works. But God, out of his love, has provided creation as a mediator: it is like letters."⁸⁰ In *Kephalaia Gnostica* 3.57, Evagrius pursues this theme of the materialization of the Logos in creation: "As those who teach letters to children trace them on tablets, thus also Christ, teaching his wisdom to the rational beings, has traced it in corporeal nature."⁸¹ The *Letter to Melania* further suggests that the descent of spiritual beings into bodies, which Evagrius simply calls "movement," is concomitant with the production of "names";⁸² that is, for Evagrius, the existence of linguistic signs is both the marker of the fall and the instantiation of the Logos in matter, which Evagrius thus understands as fundamentally textual. In the same vein, Evagrius's Antony in *Praktikos* 92, another text that may have been translated by Rufinus, claims that "my book . . . is the nature of created things, and it is always at hand when I wish to read the words of God."⁸³ The descent

qua nunc uiuimus, resurrecturam credimus [. . .] resurrectio carnis credenda est integrae atque perfectae, ut et natura carnis eadem seruetur, et incorrupti ac spiritualis corporis status et gloria non infringatur. Sic enim scriptum est quia: Corruptio incorruptionem non possidebit.

80. *Ep. ad Melaniam* 2.35–39 (trans. M. Parmentier, "Evagrius of Pontus' 'Letter to Melania' I," in *Bijdragen, tijdschrift voor filosofie en theologie* 46 (1985): 2–38. This passage is discussed by Clark, *Origenist Controversy*, 72–74 and 192–93, and Derek Krueger, *Writing and Holiness* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2004), 7.

81. Quoted in Parmentier, "Evagrius," 22.

82. *Ep. ad Melaniam* 5.174–85.

83. *Cap. pract.* 92 (ed. Antoine and Claire Guillaumont, *Évagre le Pontique: Traité pratique*, SC 171 [Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1971], 694; trans. John Eudes Bamberger,

of the Word into matter and the restoration of matter to pure conformity with its originary Logos is thus a major theological concern behind Rufinus's text-critically weak argument on the history of textual corruption in early Christian writings.

Rufinus in fact attributes the fall to textual corruption, in an idiosyncratic reading of the Genesis account:

Just as their father the devil was eager to falsify the words of God from the beginning and change them from their proper order and insert his own venom, so he has left this skill as the inheritance of his followers. For when God said to Adam, You may eat from every tree of paradise, he, when he wanted to deceive Eve, greatly restricted God's generosity in permitting them to eat everything by the insertion of a single syllable. He said, What is it that he said, that you may not eat from every tree of paradise?⁸⁴

This account introduces Rufinus's list of orthodox authors whose works have been corrupted, so that his appeal to a Christian textual canon is at the same time a description of continued cosmological descent. "The heretics have followed this example of their father, this art of their teacher."⁸⁵ Thus the New Testament writings have been "dirtied," "corrupted," and "stained" just as the works of Origen have been.⁸⁶ This linguistic fall is expressed in highly material terms, and Rufinus's description of it is of course embedded in the physical technologies of late ancient book production. He famously cites the example of Jerome's embarrassment at the hands of an Apollinarist, who tampered with a text of Athanasius during Jerome's period of textual work for Damasus.⁸⁷ He also notes the pitfalls of the book market for orthodox readers, in the following anecdote:

Evagrius Ponticus: The Praktikos and Chapters on Prayer [Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian, 1981], 39). I am grateful to the *J ECS* reviewer for a reminder of this text. Rufinus's translation of the *Praktikos* was suggested by Antoine and Claire Guillaumont, *Évagre le Pontique: Traité pratique*, SC 170 (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1971), 318–19; see Hammond, "The Last Ten Years of Rufinus's Life," 395, and Grappone, *Omélies origénienne*, 16.

84. *Adult.* 2.43–50 (CSEA 5.1:34): *Nam sicut patri ipsorum diabolo ab initio falsare uerba Dei atque inflectere a suo ordine, et sui uenene interserere uirus studium fuit, ita et istis successoribus suis hanc suae artis hereditatem reliquit. Denique cum dixisset Deus ad Adam: Ex omni ligno paradisi manducabitis, ille, cum uellet Euam decipere, liberalitatem Dei omnia edere permittentem, una tantummodo interiecta syllaba, in quantas coartauit angustias! Ait enim: Quid est quod dixit, ut ex omni ligno paradisi non manducetis?*

85. *Adult.* 2.52–53 (CSEA 5.1:34): *Haec exempla patris sui atque hanc artem magistri sui secuti haeretici.*

86. *Adult.* 9.201 (CSEA 5.1:42): *polluerint . . . corroserint . . . maculauerint.*

87. *Adult.* 13; see the reading of this narrative in Vessey, "Forging," 498–505.

It is normal for the body of letters by the holy Cyprian, the martyr, to be written in a single book. Certain heretics, who were blaspheming against the Holy Spirit, inserted into this body a small treatise by Tertullian on the Trinity, which according to the truth of our belief was wrongly written. And making many copies of this book from these exemplars, they distributed them throughout the whole huge city of Constantinople at a very reduced price, so that people who were lured by the low cost readily bought up these hidden and unrecognized traps, by which means the heretics were able to procure belief in their own heresy by using the authority of such a great man.⁸⁸

These graphic anecdotes about the materiality of orthodox teaching, and the corruption to which that materiality is liable, reframes Rufinus's appeal to the Christian *veteres* as a matter of theological or cosmological importance. The production and maintenance of a canon of Christian literature is not an epiphenomenon to the descent of the Logos into materiality and the subsequent restoration of matter, it participates in that process directly.

The intimate connection posited here between embodied texts or textual corpora and their corruptibility is more specifically related to the debates over the resurrected body in the 390s, mentioned earlier. One of the main concerns of the anti-Origenists was the continuity of the resurrected body with the body inhabited in the present life. Anti-Origenists, such as Epiphanius of Salamis, following Methodius of Olympus, took Origen's notion of the transformation of a corporeal body into a spiritual body at the resurrection as a denial that "the same" body was resurrected. The distinction was thus carefully drawn between the presumably more orthodox resurrection of "this body" in the flesh and the more generalized position attributed to Origen, of a resurrection of the body in form only, thus a denial of the total resurrection.⁸⁹ Rufinus first denies that this distinction is valid by appealing to authoritative textual tradition: "If we speak of the resurrection of the body, we are speaking following the apostle, since

88. *Adult.* 12.243–52 (CSEA 5.1:44–46): *Sancti Cypriani martyris solet omne epistularum corpus in uno codice scribi. Huic corpori haeretici quidam, qui in Spiritum Sanctum blasphemant, Tertulliani libellum De Trinitate, reprehensibiliter—quantum ad ueritatem fidei nostrae pertinet—scriptum, inserentes et quamplurimos codices de talibus exemplaribus conscribentes, per totam Constantinopolim urbem maximam distrabi pretio uiliori fecerunt, ut exiguitate pretii homines inlecti ignotos et latentes dolos facilius compararent, quo per hoc inuenirent haeretici perfidiae suae fidem tanti uiri auctoritate conquirere.*

89. See Clark, *Origenist Controversy*, 86–94; a more detailed account is found in Jon F. Dechow, *Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity: Epiphanius of Cyprus and the Legacy of Origen* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988), chap. 12.

he used this word; if we speak of the flesh we are confessing according to the creed. It is a stupid invention of slander to suppose that the human body is something other than flesh.”⁹⁰ The broader question, however, is that of persistence over time. In the case of the resurrected body, the anti-Origenist view of persistence requires that even those bodily characteristics that their possessors might wish to lose must continue to exist. Once he has joined the anti-Origenist camp, Jerome famously ridicules Origenist women for claiming that their femininity will disappear in the resurrection: “What good will the resurrection be [they say] if these frail bodies are to rise again? Are we not to have the bodies of angels?”⁹¹ Rufinus, addressing this larger question, holds that the anti-Origenist view of persistence does not account for the incorruptibility that the Bible promises to the resurrected. “Whether we say the flesh will rise again, according to our common faith, or the body, according to the apostle, we must believe what the apostle declares, that what rises will rise in power and glory; it will rise an incorruptible and a spiritual body.”⁹² Persistence here clearly includes correction as a legitimate part of the continuity of the human person from this life to the resurrected life.

The possibility that correction is part of continuity over time has an obvious correlation to Rufinus’s stance on the correction of the texts of Origen. In an Origenist system, moreover, in which the fall, or movement, is concomitant with the emergence of material textuality, resurrection and corrective textual criticism become difficult to separate. Thus Rufinus’s notion of authorial consistency depends heavily on the persistence of a single authorial persona over time: “I cannot doubt that it would be impossible that a man so learned, so sensible . . . , a man who was neither stupid nor insane, could himself write things that were contrary and completely incompatible with his own ideas.”⁹³ The argument that Ori-

90. *Orig. Apol.* prol. 32–36 (CSEA 5.1:26): *Siue ergo corpus resurrecturum dicimus, secundum apostolum dicimus: hoc enim nomine usus est ille; siue carnem dicimus secundum traditionem symboli confitemur. Stulta enim adinuentio calumniae est corpus humanum aliud putare esse quam carnem.*

91. Jerome, *Ep.* 84.6, noted and translated by E. A. Clark, “Place of Jerome’s Commentary on Ephesians,” 156–57.

92. *Orig. Apol.* prol. 36–40 (CSEA 5.1:26): *Siue ergo caro secundum communem fidem, siue corpus secundum apostolum dicitur quod resurget, ita credendum est sicut apostolus definiuit, quia quod resurget, in uirtute resurgat et in gloria, in incorruptibile resurgat ac spiritale corpus.*

93. *Adult.* 1.15–19 (CSEA 5.1:32): *Dubitari non puto quod hoc nullo genere fieri potuit, ut uir tam eruditus, tam prudens . . . uir neque stultus neque insanus fuerit, ispe sibi contraria et repugnantia suis sentiitiis scriberet.*

gen's works require correction is based in a system in which the faults in the textual body that make it fail to conform to the Logos are basically foreign to that textual body. They are thus necessarily also foreign to the authorial persona that is constituted by the materialization of the Logos in both text and body. Similarly, Rufinus's arguments that other orthodox writers' works have suffered interpolation are based on a notion of human persistence in which such persistence is by definition measured by its conformity to the Logos: what fails to conform cannot be part of the persona that is the materialization of the Logos. Clement of Rome, for example, cannot have deviated from apostolic teaching because he was himself the product of apostolic and divine writing: "What should we believe? That an apostolic man, or rather almost an apostle, since he wrote what the apostles taught, and about whom the apostle Paul gave witness, saying, 'With Clement and my other helpers, whose names are in the book of life,' could such a man have written what was contrary to the book of life?"⁹⁴ Clement's status as written "in the book of life" ensures that his textual self conforms to the Logos. The same is true for Origen: "If anything has been found in these writings that does not agree with the catholic faith, we suppose that it has been inserted by heretics, and take it to be as foreign to his thought as to our faith."⁹⁵ This is the theoretical basis on which Rufinus will go on, in his translation of *On First Principles*, to correct interpolations. Text criticism in this system is undoubtedly a literary activity, but it is a literary activity with a very specific cosmology behind it. Through the lens of the resurrected body, Christian Latin literary acts take on cosmological importance.

Rufinus's insistence on fidelity to the Logos requires, for him, the alteration of a supposedly corrupt text. In contrast, Jerome's insistence that Pamphilus cannot have been the author of the *Apology for Origen*, discussed earlier, requires the removal of an unalterably "good" author from an unalterably "bad" text. Jerome locates fidelity in an originary authorial figure, where Rufinus locates it in a textual tradition, a vehicle for the Logos, that is subject to both corruption and correction. If we read Rufinus's changes and attributions as based on an Origenist theology of

94. *Adult.* 3.79–83 (CSEA 5.1:36): *Quid, quaeso, de his sentiendum est? quod apostolicus uir, immo pene apostolus (nam ea scribit quae apostoli dicunt), cui Paulus apostolus testimonium dedit dicens: Cum Clemente et ceteris adiutoribus meis, quorum nomina sunt in libro uitae, et scribebat hoc quod libris uitae contrarium est?*

95. *Adult.* 16.317–20 (CSEA 5.1:50): *Si quid autem inuentum fuerit in his quod cum fide catholica non consonat, hoc et ab haereticis suspicamur insertum, et tam ab illius sensu quam a nostra fide ducimus alienum.*

restoration and assimilation, alteration of a text is legitimate if it is done to bring the text, and its possible writers and readers, into closer conformity with the Logos.⁹⁶ Indeed, such textual alteration is no less legitimate than any translation undertaken to help a reader come to a better understanding of divinely authored truth. We might return here to Rufinus's argument for the authority of the Septuagint in the *Apology against Jerome*.⁹⁷ In the face of Jerome's dismissal of certain passages in the Septuagint, such as the story of Susannah and the Elders, on the grounds that they are not present in the original Hebrew, Rufinus argues instead that these passages are authoritative on the grounds of traditional use and edification. He does not engage with Jerome's text-critical arguments, but focuses on the idea that apostolic and later Christian reception of these texts demonstrates their divine status. Whether or not these texts have been altered in their passage from Jewish to Christian use ultimately does not matter to Rufinus's case; indeed removing the Christian Old Testament from its original Jewish context is much preferable to Rufinus than re-situating the text in an ordinary Hebrew setting.

In a system in which textual productions of human souls may undergo a salutary transformation away from what are taken to be their points of origin, the specific claims of authorship are also easily elided. In his preface to his translation of eight homilies of Basil of Caesarea, Rufinus tells his dedicatee, "I want you to know that his Greek style . . . is very similar to that of our blessed Cyprian, and indeed neither do their lives differ greatly in merit."⁹⁸ Rufinus then assimilates Cyprian's martyrdom to Basil's ascetic life, and exhorts his reader to follow Basil's example himself. In so doing,

96. Louis G. Kelly, *The True Interpreter: A History of Translation Theory and Practice in the West* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1979), 26–33, identifies one strand of translation theory as particularly interested in "language as *logos*," where *logos* stands for the creative process, but sees the development of this strand primarily in the work of German translation theorists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and not within Christian *logos*-theology per se. At the same time, it is clear that, e.g., Benjamin's concern with translation and the afterlife, and the presence of "Holy Writ" in "The Task of the Translator" (82), is very much influenced by this tradition; the theological element of translation also finds explicit expression in the work of Martin Buber and Franz Rosenzweig, two of Benjamin's contemporaries, in the essays collected in *Scripture and Translation* (originally published as *Die Schrift und ihre Verdeutschung*), trans. Lawrence Rosenwald with Everett Fox (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1994).

97. *Apol.* 2.34–40.

98. *Basil. hom.* pref. (CSEA 5.1:228): *Hoc autem scire te uolo: quod stilus eius in Graeco . . . multum beato nostro similat Cypriano, quia reuera nec uitae meritis satis discrepant.*

it is not clear whether the reader is becoming Basil, Cyprian, or both, and the distinction may not matter to Rufinus: linguistic assimilation and similarity in virtue make individuation a low priority. Differences in the human transmitters of the Logos might persist for a while, but ultimately they become irrelevant in the face of the knowledge of the aggregate. This merging of texts with each other, and the merging of textual similarity with authorial similarity, returns us to Rufinus's privileging of the collective textual world of the library over the individuated textual world of the author. Given this paradigm, the library is preferable to the author; each individual role is ideally that of librarian or curator.

CONCLUSION

What we see in Rufinus, then, is an attempt to use Origen's theology of the movement of souls through life, and into the afterlife, as a way of understanding the life and afterlife of texts in a newly Christian world. In the work of Rufinus, textual lives and afterlives are filtered through an adaptation of the idea of the library, both as a place of text collection and as a place of textual assimilation—that is, the figure of the library as established preeminently in Alexandria. Of course, Rufinus's theories of translation and transmission had an only partial success in his own lifetime. Origen's works were rejected as heretical by Anastasius, but Rufinus and Jerome, Origen's most prominent Latin quoters and translators, were not. Yet the outcome of the Origenist controversy did not in itself settle the question of the Christian library or of the status of the Christian author. In a neat irony, Cassiodorus, attempting to describe his monastic library, will list the translations of Rufinus amongst the works of various Christian authors, including Jerome. He also notes that Rufinus is sometimes given credit for translating works, like Josephus's *Jewish War*, that we have no other record of Rufinus translating.⁹⁹ Rufinus might have been pleased by the apparent confusion. But Cassiodorus's joining of figures whom we might wish to see as incompatible authors points to what I think is the broader success of the imagination of the library. As Cassiodorus explains,

although many Fathers—St. Hilary, bishop of Poitiers, and Rufinus, a priest of Aquileia, and Epiphanius, bishop of Cyprus, and the Councils of Nicaea and Chalcedon—have said things not contradictory to one another but only different, all have, nevertheless, by their divisions, fitted the sacred books to the appropriate mysteries, as also happens in the harmonies of the Gospels

99. *Inst.* 1.17.1.

where we regard the events with faith although they differ in the way they are told.¹⁰⁰

In their textual afterlives, the pro-Origenist and anti-Origenist camps have been assimilated into markers of sameness, of a similar striving toward union with the divine Word. With Rufinus's help, the Latin monastic library has become the ghost of the library of Alexandria.

The confluence of cosmological and literary acts in late antiquity of course comes as no real surprise, and is not unique to the followers of Origen: Macrobius's *Saturnalia* is an obvious example of the simultaneity of text-criticism and religious exploration; if we take the frame story of Martianus Capella's *Marriage of Philology and Mercury* seriously, we have another striking example of textual erudition understood cosmologically. What is of interest in the literary quarrel between Rufinus and Jerome is the way in which the self-conscious imagination of a Christian literary tradition is fundamentally interconnected with a contested Christian cosmological narrative, an Origenist understanding of the *apokatastasis*, and its textualization of the fall and of restoration. It is perhaps Jerome in his guise as the Latin Origen¹⁰¹ who does most to establish the new Latin literary culture, but his vehement quarrel with Rufinus, who is engaged in the same project, reveals the theological urgency of the issues underlying this literary establishment. The canon of Christian authors, on an Origenist reading, is the continued materialization of the Logos in earthly form, and the attention critical readers pay to this consistency of such authors participates in the process of return to the divine. Rufinus theorizes the new canon of authors as both collectively authoritative and individually corruptible because of their materialization into texts. If Rufinus is working within an Origenist framework of materialized textuality, we can understand Rufinus's work as an important early stage in Christian theorizing on the temporal and textual momentum of the Word.

We may end by returning to the destruction of the Serapeum and its replacement by the martyrrium of John the Baptist. I find it telling that Serapis is replaced, not by the Logos itself, but by the voice crying in the

100. *Inst.* 1.14.3 (Mynors 40; trans. Halporn 138): *unde licet multi Patres, id est sanctus Hilarius, Pictaviensis urbis antistes, et Rufinus presbyter Aquileiensis et Epiphanius episcopus Cypri et synodus Nicaena et Chalcedonensis non contraria dixerint sed diversa, omnes tamen per divisiones suas libros divinos sacramentis competentibus aptaverunt, sicut et in evangelistarum concordia probatur effectum, ubi una quidem fides est rerum et ratio diversa sermonum.*

101. Mark Vessey, "Jerome's Origen: The Making of a Christian Literary Persona," *SP* 28 (1993): 135–45.

wilderness, “Prepare the way of the Lord.” In fact, in Origen’s allegory of language, John the Baptist represents the voice that will become the bearer of rational Logos.¹⁰² The death of Serapis is thus the birth of the Christian library, one in which the notion of individual authorship is subordinated to the Logos-bearing capacity of the collection as a whole. In his epilogue to the destruction of the Serapeum, Rufinus notes that afterwards, other images of Serapis in Alexandria were defaced by Christians, who marked in their places the sign of the cross. This, he reports, had good effect:

When those pagans who were left saw what had been done, they remembered a very great thing that had come down to them through their ancient traditions. They say that the Egyptians have our sign of the Lord’s cross as one of those letters called “hieratic,” which means priestly, that is, it is one of the letters that make up their alphabet. The meaning of this letter or term, they claim, is the life to come. Those therefore who were converted to our faith out of amazement at what had happened, said it had been handed down to them from ancient times that what was now revered would remain in place only until they saw that the sign had come in which there was life.¹⁰³

For Rufinus, this linguistic transposition, like other linguistic alterations, is not a mistake. It is merely another sign of the vitality of the life to come.

Catherine M. Chin is Associate Professor of Religious Studies at the University of California, Davis

102. E.g. at *Cels.* 6.9.

103. *Hist.* 11.29 (CSEA 5.2:306): *Quod cum factum hi, qui superfuerant ex paganis, viderent, in recordationem rei magnae ex traditione sibimet antiquitus commendata venisse perhibentur. Signum hoc nostrum dominicae crucis inter illas, quas dicunt hieraticas, id est sacerdotales litteras, habere Aegypti dicuntur, velut unum ex ceteris litterarum quae apud illis sunt elementis. Cuius litterae seu vocabuli hanc esse adserunt interpretationem: vita ventura. Dicebant ergo hi, qui tunc admiratione rerum gestarum convertiebantur ad fidem, ita sibi ab antiquis traditum, quod haec, quae nunc coluntur, tamdiu starent, quamdiu viderent signum istud venisse, in quo esset vita.*