Under the title, *Antike und Christentum*, a new periodical was published during the 'thirties by that singular antiquarian, Franz Joseph Dölger, whose chair at Bonn was defined as being for 'the Church History of Antiquity, Christian Archaeology and Patrology, together with General Religious History'.¹ The journal was as unique as its author, and died with him, for from the start it was designed to contain his contributions alone. 'The sending in of manuscripts is therefore pointless', announced the editorial note. For twenty-five years Dölger had felt his way uneasily towards this point, seeking a means of expressing adequately the method of work he believed his discipline required. For the remaining ten years before his death all his studies were poured out through this channel. But he remained a master of detail who shunned the larger synthesis his efforts called for. It fell to Theodor Klauser, his successor in the Catholic Theological Faculty at Bonn, and an ever-growing circle of collaborators in Germany and abroad, to draw out the ideas implied in his work. This is still being done, in a piece-meal way, through the *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* and the other publications of the independent institute founded in his honour, and affiliated with the University of Bonn.²

¹Written in grateful acknowledgement of help and hospitality received from members of the Dölger-Institut in Bonn and the Institut für Altertumskunde in Cologne, as well as from the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung, while on leave from Macquarie University.


2. Th. Klauser, *Das Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum und das F.J. Dölger-Institut in Bonn*. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 2nd ed., 1970. The *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum*, which continues the tradition of Dölger’s periodical, but on a freer basis, also gives a good view of the field. Its first ten volumes contain (amongst many other things) the serial publication of Klauser’s own ‘Studien zur Entstehungs geschichte der christlichen Kunst’, an epoch-making work to which further reference is made below.
‘Antike und Christentum’ has become the accepted name of a field of study which, because it cuts across existing boundaries and does not have very clear-cut limits of its own, may not be so easy to grasp as its simple title suggests. It has been consciously followed in the naming of the ‘Institute for Antiquity and Christianity’ at Claremont, California. But there is a clear distinction between the projects of the Claremont Institute and the objective of the Dölger-Institut. At Claremont a considerable number of separate enterprises (so far, thirteen), some already under way in other American or European centres, have been drawn together to be more actively promoted under common auspices. They are typically front-line or even emergency research projects (including ones that help towards the conservation and preparation for study of some Ras Shamra tablets, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Nag Hammadi codices, and the Patmos Monastery library). Their common interest is in their having some bearing upon the study of the Bible, and ‘Antiquity and Christianity’ is meant to be a large enough term to cover anything connected with that, and to attract support for it. The Bible certainly comes within the province of the Dölger-Institut, and it, too, has occasionally promoted specific projects (the monograph series, ‘Theophaneia’, for liturgical and other themes, and the excavations at Abu Mena). But its main objective is an analytical one, centred upon a more specific period. The Institute’s purpose is said to be ‘research into late antiquity’, and the RAC is sub-titled ‘An Encyclopedia of the Interaction of Christianity with the Ancient World’. By ‘interaction’ (Auseinandersetzung) is meant the many-sided process by which the classical civilisation, as it existed in the first three centuries, was transformed into the Christianised culture of the four centuries beginning with Constantine. It was Dölger’s belief that this process could never be understood by working from classical or patristic literature alone, and moreover that the way forward was by starting with the particular details of life, thought and behaviour as seen not only in literary sources but in the physical remains of antiquity. His vision has not yet been fulfilled, and it has to be reached across the twin hazards of fragmentation and schematisation, but there is wide recognition that it is a goal worth pursuing.

In another place I hope to report on the current state of studies in this field in general, but it may be of particular interest to readers of Prudentia, in the light of the policies expressed in its sub-title and Foreword, if I draw attention here to several recent projects by people associated with the Institut für Altertumskunde at Cologne. As will be seen, there happen to be individual links between the Cologne Institute and the Dölger-Institut, and the work I mention falls within the latter’s sphere of interest. But my point in setting it out here is to show with what important results one ‘Department of Classics and Ancient History’ (which is what the Cologne Institute amounts to in our terms) has fostered studies in territory often left, in our tradition, to other disciplines, if not allowed to fall between the stools altogether. German studies of the ancient world have of course traditionally been more comprehensive and better inter-related than ours (thanks amongst other things to the fully established status of ancient near eastern, biblical and patristic studies in the universities). But in the changing educational circumstances of today it is especially fitting that the style set in Berlin before the First World War should be developed (I think of the scale on which such men as Wilamowitz, Norden, Harnack and Ed. Meyer draw up their provinces of study). Prudentia has also put its finger on the need to encourage bridge-building work of this type.

(i) POPULAR ETHICS

It is now twenty years since Albrecht Dihle published his first study of popular ethics, as a means of opening up the question of ‘Antike und Christentum’. His successive contributions have worked along lines clearly thought out at an early stage, so that although they are scattered they constitute together a very substantial and coherent analysis of the subject. It is marked both by the skilful balance with which diverse ideas from different traditions and levels of culture are


5. The following works of A. Dihle are relevant to this discussion:- ‘Antike Höflichkeit und christliche Demut’, SIFC xxvi (1952), 169-90;
set in relation to each other, and by the illuminating treatment of individual authors and topics which this new vantage point makes possible. My impression is that the full consequences of this achievement have by no means been appreciated, even in Germany. The fact is that few people now possess the familiarity with the whole range of ancient literature, biblical, classical and patristic, which is needed to judge it, nor the appetite for the multifarious petty literature of antiquity which the study of popular ethics particularly draws upon. Dihle himself has set a notable example of how to tackle such a task. Although his own range is exceptionally wide (quite apart from our subject he writes upon topics reaching from Homeric vocabulary to the ancient exploration of the East), he does not hesitate to seek out and incorporate the knowledge of specialists in particular matters, as he acknowledges at various points. In Britain and America, although he is personally well known, there seem to be few who have recognised the force of what he has done in this field (his work has not often been reviewed in English). The forthcoming Sather lectures, however, will certainly alter this, and it will be surprising if we do not hear much more of the subject in the coming twenty years than we have in the past.

The study of humility (‘Demut’) not only made clear the style of Dihle’s work, but brought forward the quality which he has continued to see as basic to the new way of life, and therefore a touch-stone for tracing the complex patterns of popular ethics. In spite of the efforts of the Greek Fathers to relate it to classical ethics (e.g. by identifying it with ‘apathy’), the ‘humility’ of the New Testament does not have any formal precedent, and indeed is not properly represented at all by the attempt to make it a measurable item in a system of ethics (here one sees the force and difficulty

‘Demut’, *RAC*, Vol. III, Fasc. 21 (1956);


‘Ethik’, *RAC*, Vol. VI, Fasc. 45 (1964);

*Der Kanon der zwei Tugenden*, Köln und Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag, 1968;

‘Gerechtigkeit’, to appear in *RAC*;

Sather Classical Lectures, to be given in 1974 on the origin of the concept of the will.
of the notion of 'popular ethics', which are by definition attitudes not neatly classified in an intellectual order). All classical systems are based upon the specific self-appreciation of the individual, and such practices as the recognition of one's natural limits, the cultivation of politeness, or the adoption of a low posture for utilitarian purposes, are not to be confused with self-renunciation. *Philanthropia*, *comitas* and *clementia*, for example, all commence with the superiority of the party exercising the virtue. In post-exilic Judaism developed the belief that the 'poor', because they were obedient to God, would eventually be exalted. The New Testament radicalised this attitude by transferring it to the neighbour, in whom God is seen. This subjection is not ethically measurable, but because of its centrality to the preaching of grace, it became increasingly the subject of definition as the need for conceptual security grew. The prodigal son was replaced by the ritualised penitent, and in the end John Chrysostom could argue that the tax-gatherer of the parable was not practising humility because he was merely recognising his true baseness. The hierarchical ranking system of late antiquity provided opportunities for the exercise of humility as a formal virtue, but this accommodation to the classical pattern was upset in the fourth century by two developments, monasticism and the thought of St Augustine. In monasticism the development of coenobitic life soon reintroduced opportunities for the formalisation of humility after the drastic reversion of the first hermits to the tax-gatherer's model. Augustine brought the conceptual refinement of the theme to its full development in such a way that the absolute subjection to God and one's neighbour is preserved through making it the *sine qua non* of all virtues, which would otherwise be spoiled by pride.

In *Die goldene Regel* Dihle then supplied an 'Introduction to the History of Popular Ethics in Antiquity and Early Christianity' (as the book is sub-titled) from a quite different angle. The Golden Rule is not, like the principle of humility, a new idea that was being worked into various relationships with existing systems of ethics, both modifying them and being itself modified. It is the relic of the primeval law of retaliation, persisting, in spite of the development of more adequate ways of thinking about man in society, thanks to the apparent loftiness supplied by its gnomic form and its availability to cap an argument proceeding on other grounds. It is a mistake to think that it was changed from a negative to a positive form in the teaching of Jesus. The particular variety is a matter of convenience,
and both are widely attested in various traditions. It occurs first amongst the Greeks and then enjoys something of a vogue in late Jewish ethics thanks to its somewhat greater compatibility with principles of the Jewish law. Jesus did not enforce it, but merely cited it (not ‘Do unto others . . . ’ but ‘You do unto others . . . ’). Reactions to this have differed, and the definition of ‘parallels’ in such a field is a tricky matter. But the book remains a most valuable contribution not only for its assembly of material (some of which, of course, has long been pointed out in connection with New Testament exegesis), but for its main purpose, the study of the way popular ethical ideas interact with more formal religious or philosophical systems. This goes far beyond the analysis of terms and ideas, moreover, for the strength of Dihle’s work lies in his capacity to use literary material to read the story of the social order itself. The substance of this book is not a catena of maxims, but the analysis of the breakdown of retaliation as a norm of behaviour and its replacement by other forms of relationship (from the household and its extensions to the acceptance of all men as neighbours), which do more justice to what one man expects of and owes to another.

Yet another way in which popular ideas interact with more established systems is discussed in Der Kanon der zwei Tugenden, a little book of the widest interest, but so far virtually unnoticed in the literature of our discipline. Dihle opens his study by referring to the reinterpretation of the two familiar figures of ‘Christian’ iconography, the Good Shepherd and the Orans (Woman in Prayer), advanced in recent years in Jhrb.AC by Theodor Klauser. These are not Christ and the Soul, but Philanthropy and Piety. The identification is disputed, but fits better with the fact that the symbols are not confined to Christian monuments. Dihle’s own demonstration of the importance of the ‘canon of the two virtues’ in popular thought will do much to strengthen Klauser’s case. We are dealing here with a norm of popular ethics which ran more or less continuously through classical antiquity, and successfully bridged the gaps between Greek, Jewish and Christian ways of thinking. The development of philosophical ethics from the time of Plato as a science of human behaviour drove piety from its accepted place (though it was retained as part of social behaviour). This ensured the freedom of the schools to concentrate upon man. But the old dual obligation lived on in popular ethics, and enjoyed the support of the growing art of rhetoric. In Judaism and Christianity it found ready
acceptance as a formula that gathered up their stress upon the unity of one's duty to God and man. Dihle argues that it was concurrently finding its way back into philosophy proper as a result of the work of Posidonius. It was he moreover, in response to the ideals of the Hellenistic rulers, who replaced Righteousness with Philanthropy as the man-ward duty, a change vital to its acceptability amongst Christians. In this way the dual canon was able to cater for the assimilation of Christian attitudes to classical society in the first three centuries, pending the full engagement between theology and philosophy in the fourth.

All of this material and much more has been systematically discussed in Dihle's comprehensive treatment of 'Ethik' in the RAC. The entry runs to 150 columns, and is an important work in its own right, quite apart from its function in the encyclopaedia. Graeco-Roman philosophy is treated typologically, particular attention being given to the various ways in which it adopts an individualistic approach to man, to the interaction between philosophy and popular ethics, to the distinctive developments of later antiquity, and to certain elements lacking in classical ethics (namely the conception of radical evil, the concept of the will, that of the conscience, the duty to one's neighbour, and the attitude of humility). Later Judaism is handled with separate analysis of rabbinic ethics, the attitudes of the sects, and of Hellenistic Judaism. In the case of the New Testament most of the space is given not to Jesus, nor to Paul and John (who are subordinated, following Bultmann), but to the development of distinctive ethical attitudes in the primitive community. This reflects the importance Dihle attributes to popular ethics in the history of the subject. Gnosticism is also given careful attention, as a possible way forward in the intellectualisation of Christian belief, and then, as the alternative to this, the progressive adaptation of theology to philosophy through the work of patristic scholars.

The idea of using the distinction between popular ethics and the doctrines of the philosophical schools as a framework for discussing the interaction of 'Antike und Christentum' has already proved exceptionally fruitful. It provides a system by which materials from philosophy and theology, from social, religious and literary history can be related to each other, and shows how the joint study of both great traditions of antiquity will yet contribute much more to our understanding of them. Here is a method by which Professor Dihle certainly has more to give, and which lies open to exploitation by others.
To study ‘Antike und Christentum’ under the miscellaneous headings of an encyclopaedia may seem a somewhat haphazard approach to the question. The usual problems of determining a list of entries are compounded here by the novelty of the enterprise, and the policy of the editors has had to be adapted with experience. Even Germans, I gather, find it difficult to predict the entries under which a particular topic is likely to be handled. But there is another side to this. One is frequently confronted with a topic which one would not oneself have envisaged, and which has never perhaps before been systematically treated. Literary falsification is a notable case in point.

In 1962 Klauser requested Wolfgang Speyer to prepare an entry for the *RAC* on ‘Fälschung, literarische’. Speyer had made himself at Cologne a specialist in the minor literature, especially the poetry, of later antiquity. But the new task soon proved to be one not likely to be satisfied simply by an entry for the encyclopaedia. Above all there proved to be no adequate systematic treatment of the subject at all. Appointed to a research fellowship at the Dölger-Institut, where he still works, Speyer was able to devote several years to a thorough exploration of it. The entry in the *RAC* appeared in 1966 as a digest of a much more comprehensive work, which appeared in 1971 as one of the introductory volumes in Müller’s *Handbuch*. The scale of the new work undertaken is hinted at by the fact that the 350-page work replaces a 20-page sketch in an earlier volume of the *Handbuch*. Speyer nevertheless insists that his study is only a ‘first attempt’ at interpretation of the field. It attempts to define the
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typology of the subject, and is in no sense a history of literary falsification, a far more elaborate task for which Speyer sets out the preconditions in concluding his own contribution. The amount of material to be digested is certainly daunting. Speyer's index refers to a good 350 false works or authors that go under their own name, quite apart from the far greater number of spurious works attached to the names of otherwise genuine authors. There are also indexed the names of some 200 pseudopigraphers responsible for such forgeries, including persons from modern times. With all this Speyer warns us that his collection is by no means complete, especially for the ancient literatures outside Greek and Latin.

The study of forgery in itself may seem at first sight somewhat unrewarding. But many questions of great importance must be tackled in the process. Falsification is to be distinguished, for example, from such phenomena as the composition of documents or speeches for rhetorical ends (as in classical historiography), or from a category which Speyer calls 'genuine religious pseudopigraphy'. This term, the definition of which gave rise to a separate study published in the Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum, applies to works attributed out of religious belief to a god (as with oracles, or scriptural revelations). The matter is not simple, since religious pseudopigraphy is not necessarily 'genuine', but may itself be a vehicle of the intent to deceive, or again be a purely literary device. Some other literary phenomena which are distinguished from falsification in Speyer's sense are 'mystification', plagiarism, pseudonymity, the attribution of official documents to kings or popes, the attribution of the work of disciples to the heads of philosophical or medical schools, and various types of confusion based on error or misunderstanding.

Falsification proper is only possible after the development of the notion of literary property. Speyer puts up a strong case against those who have held that this is a purely modern idea. It clearly began with the Greeks. Falsification then is a pathological form of the claim to ownership of one's work. Its object is deception, but the study of the motives for it opens up many interesting aspects of the changing tradition of 'Antike und Christentum': the idea of classicism, the Hellenistic passion for collecting literary masterpieces, the notion of canonicity in Judaism and Christianity, the struggle over heresy and orthodoxy, and the use of forged documents in later times to secure privileges. In spite of the perversity of the theme, and the instinctive doubt that anything worth while can be achieved
by working on deliberately contaminated material, Speyer rightly claims that the counter-criticism developed in antiquity itself provides a sound foothold on slippery ground. Nor should one forget the positive developments to which falsification is a reaction. The modern concern for authenticity and proper documentation has not a little to do with the painful struggles of late antiquity. Religious dogmatism in particular, however pathetic or poisonous some of its techniques may seem, has nevertheless, in its concern for validation, contributed to the establishment of modern intellectual standards.

Speyer’s work also classifies the techniques of falsification, and he has published a separate monograph on one of these, the discovery of books from the past (in graves, for example). Here again the value of his work in general, in a field depressingly well occupied by religious writers, is to show how many-sided and complex the interconnections of ‘Antike und Christentum’ in fact are.

(iii) THE NEW MANI CODEX

Like many German Classical institutes, that at Cologne has paid particular attention to the study of the documentary sources for the ancient world. The last decade especially has seen the development there of a flourishing school of papyrology, associated in the first instance with Reinhold Merkelbach. His own interests are concentrated upon literature, and he has worked upon subjects as far apart as Hesiod and the Greek romances, for both of which the papyrus finds have become increasingly important. The leader of the papyrological section at Cologne is Ludwig Koenen, who keeps up the vital links with Cairo, and together with Merkelbach edits an active new periodical, the Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik. Its parts appear in rapid succession, affording quick publication to a multitude of often small contributions, both new texts and improved readings. For the edition of larger texts there are two monograph series, Papyrologische Texte und Abhandlungen, devoted to the publication of the biblical commentaries of Didymus the Blind found at Tura in 1941, and Papyrologica Coloniensia, which has recently included the impressive Archiv des Petaus (1969), the reconstruction of a complete village archive of the second century from materials held in Cologne and Michigan, the joint work of the Hagedorns and the Youties.

But for ‘Antike und Christentum’ the crown of this highly productive decade is the new Mani codex, extensively reported
(though not yet fully published) by A. Henrichs and Koenen in 1970. The find is a palaeographical sensation, whose restoration is owed to the technical skill of Anton Fackelmann of Vienna. Only the size of a match-box, it is easily the smallest miniature codex yet found. Its 192 surviving parchment pages generally carry 23 lines of astonishingly tiny writing. A fifth-century production, probably from Oxyrhynchus, it is taken by Henrichs and Koenen to have been written as an amulet. Kurt Treu, however, in a valuable discussion, argues that the exceptionally fine and legible writing, the scale and character of the work, and the fact that the text has been carefully corrected, show that the book was meant to be seriously studied. It confirms the high scholarly standard maintained in the propagation of Manichaeism.

The importance of the new codex for religious history arises partly from the fact that we now have for the first time a Greek work by Manichaean writers, including citations from Mani himself. Until last century the success of the Church in obliterating its rival was virtually complete. Our knowledge was based upon the attacks on the other religion in patristic writers, especially Augustine, and there was a false biography of Mani—a Christian forgery. Early this century there were discovered in Turkestan (where the religion had been established in the eighth century) some thousands of fragments of original Manichaean works, and in the 'thirties an even more important Coptic library was found in Egypt. Of this some parts have been published (a psalm-book, of impressive literary quality, and a theological treatise, the Kephalaia), but others were lost in the war (the letters of Mani, most of a historical work, and a book of Logoi, thought to have been writings of Mani's disciples). The new Greek work shows by the good quality of its expression that the


linguistic difficulties with the oriental texts may be the result of the process of translation and do not qualify the high reputation of Manichaeism as a literary religion.

In terms of content there are considerable advances on the previous state of our knowledge. The biography covers the early part of Mani's life (there may have been a series of several volumes covering the whole), which has been least well known. A number of dates are now established for the first time. Mani was born on 14 April, 216, lived amongst the baptists from his fourth to his twenty-fifth year, and received his two revelations on 1 April, 228, and 19 April 240. Some dates in Sassanid history are also fixed for the last of these years. We now know that Mani's heavenly 'twin' was not some kind of guardian angel, but his heavenly self: the new work is entitled 'The begetting of his body'. Koenen has subsequently interpreted this 'in the Pauline sense' as 'The begetting of his church', but this would be to build far too much on a very contentious element in Pauline exegesis. It is now clear, however, that Mani's connection with Christianity was much closer than could previously be shown. The baptist community turn out not to have been Mandaeans (who were anti-Christian), but Elchasaites (derived from Jewish Christianity). A long history of the prophets and apostles down to Paul provides authentication for Mani's visions, and shows the connections in which he wished to be seen. The opening of Mani's gospel, cited in the codex and reproduced in Henrichs and Koenen, also shows by its Pauline formulae who his predecessors were supposed to be. Paul is, moreover, cited with impressive accuracy, a fact which invites confidence in the citations from Mani himself. The latter comes through clearly as more than an apostle. Although the Greek scribe follows Christian convention in the abbreviation of the divine names, the formula, 'The Lord spoke', refers not to Jesus, but to Mani.

Both Henrichs and Koenen have announced further studies, and the full publication of the codex will open up a remarkable range of

9. Koenen expects shortly to publish a study of the larger work of which he takes the new codex to be a part, and also a study on Augustine and Mani (to appear in Jhrb. AC xv [1972]). Henrichs will report on 'Okzident und Orient: Ein neuer Text zum Ursprung des Manichaismus' in a forthcoming volume of Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt. It is to be assumed that the full publication of the codex itself will take place in the series Papyrologica Coloniensia.
new possibilities in a field tantalisingly circumscribed by the destruction of books in both ancient and modern times. Carsten Colpe has envisaged a counter argument against the apparent implications of the new codex. The originality of the Iranian elements in developed Manichaeism could be defended by arguing that this is an attempt to fabricate a Jewish-Christian origin for Mediterranean consumption. Colpe himself sees now the possibility of tracing the growth of Manichaeism through Jewish heterodoxy into an Iranian dualistic system of gnostic type. The important thing is that it has not hitherto been possible to conduct any adequate enquiry into the development of the religion. Nor need it now be only of antiquarian interest, for it promises to supply a fascinating parallel to the classical debate over the life of Jesus, who is also known to us through Greek documents which reflect the changing interests of his followers and the system of thought and practice they established.