The Pulse

Undergraduate Journal of Baylor University

VOLUME 9 NUMBER 2 SPRING 2012

Scientia Crescat

Honors College
Baylor University
Waco, Texas

The Pulse
2011-2012

CONTENTS

Foreword...vi

Banking on Friendship: Horace's Defense of Epicurean Friendship in *Odes* 1.24..1
STEPHEN MARGHEIM

Horace's Odes *1.24 defends Epicurean friendship. Addressed specifically to Vergil, the ode pictures the practice of Epicurean frank therapy between two friends, which provides the reader with insight into the friendship that existed between these two poets. By depicting a true Epicurean relationship, the poem is able to subvert Cicero's criticisms of Epicurean friendship. Horace does this both by using mercantile language redolent of the language that Cicero himself uses in his criticisms and by presenting an image of true Epicurean friendship that itself serves as a corrective to Cicero's erroneous portrayals.*

Grain and Chaff: *Contemptus Mundi* and the Emblematic World in the Work of Francis Quarles..26
GRANT SHELLHOUSE

Living in England during the culmination of the conflict that would eventually lead to the English Civil War, the poet Francis Quarles was influenced by both Puritan and Anglican theology. This paper argues that Francis Quarles sought to harmonize the Puritan contempt of the tempting pleasures of the world with the Anglican belief that sought divine grace enacted through the things of the earth. Interpreting Quarles's use of meal imagery, this paper illuminates the notions of both contempus mundi *and* sacramentalia *as seen in the work of Francis Quarles.*

Bede's Pneumatology: Establishing God's House on Earth........45
ERIKA SMITH

This paper attempts to expand the focus of current Bede scholarship from his interest in linguistic diversity and unity to encompass Bede's broader theological purpose in his political and religious writings. Bede's pneumatology, in particular, is central to his conception of the Church, which appears most frequently in the metaphor of building God's house. This paper will explore the Pentecost, Creation, Noah's Ark, and Babel narratives as they relate to the metaphor of building God's house, especially as demonstrations of the importance of language and love as the tools of the Holy Spirit.

Reexamining the Effects of State Religion on Religious Service Attendance..72
MATTHEW SWIFT

This paper reexamines and describes the effects of state religions on religious service attendance across countries through empirical analysis. Using econometric methods to analyze attendance data from the World Values Survey and Gallup World Poll, it pays special attention to the variables used for state religion, regulation of religion, and government favoritism toward religion while utilizing control variables from the World Christian Encyclopedia and CIA World Factbook (among other sources). Because this analysis uses a larger set of data than has been used in many previous studies, it provides a more representative sample of countries and sheds some light on how particular religions may affect the results. The results vary with the measures used for weekly attendance and for state religion, but they uniformly suggest that most previous scholarship is incorrect to establish a simple negative relationship between state religion and religious service attendance.

About the Authors... 100

Cover art created by Vanessa Wyns.

FOREWORD

As the end of the 2011-2012 academic year approaches, *The Pulse* continues to play a critical role in supporting and honoring excellence in undergraduate research at Baylor University. Besides serving as one of the few academic channels through which undergraduates can publish their work, this publication provides a unique opportunity for undergraduates to truly engage in the publishing process as the journal's primary editors, advertisers, and technical specialists. We are extraordinarily proud of the project's success, and we are furthermore pleased to present another outstanding, interdisciplinary spring edition.

The four papers in this issue represent academic excellence from disciplines across the university. We begin with an analysis from the field of Classics as Stephen Margheim discusses Horace's therapeutic depiction of Epicurean friendship. Next, Grant Shellhouse provides a thoughtful synthesis of two theological strains in the poetic and emblematic work of Francis Quarles. Erika Smith continues the issue with an examination of the Venerable Bede's pneumatology and its connections to the metaphor of God's house and language as a tool of the Holy Spirit. Finally, Matthew Swift works within the economics of religion, using econometrics to explore the relationship between state religion and religious service attendance.

Of course, the final product is the result of much diligence on the part of our staff members, who graciously take time out of their already busy schedules as students. The rigors of our faithful editorial board's evaluation, editing, and proofreading processes are both a testimony and a contribution to the excellence of the four featured articles. Besides writing faculty features throughout the semester, the public relations staff works particularly hard at the beginning and end of the editorial process, encouraging paper submissions, publicizing the final product's release, and promoting the student lecture. We owe the simple elegance of the issue's cover design to our talented artistic specialist, Vanessa Wyns. Finally, our IT staff never ceases to amaze with its upkeep of *The Pulse* website, typesetting of articles (even when they include data tables), and all other feats of technological savvy. Each staff member's talent and dedication is crucial to the continued success of our publication.

A number of faculty members have our gratitude, particularly our sponsors Dr. Susan Colón and Dr. Jeffrey Hunt. Dr. Colón's contributions to *The Pulse* have been vital since its beginnings in 2004, and Dr. Hunt has been just as indispensable since joining us in the fall of 2010.

His leadership and guidance have been particularly valuable to the staff over the past three semesters. We cannot thank both of these remarkable individuals enough for their vision and commitment. We are also very grateful to Dean Thomas Hibbs and Baylor University's Honors College for their support of our journal through the years. The release of this journal coincides with *The Pulse* Student Lecture, featuring the winner of the 2011-2012 Wallace L. Daniel Award for Undergraduate Writing, an honor graciously sponsored by Phi Beta Kappa, Zeta of Texas Chapter.

We thank you for reading this issue, and we hope you look forward to our special fall edition which will showcase papers from the field of philosophy. Furthermore, we urge you to visit our website at www.baylor.edu/pulse. Here you can learn more about *The Pulse* and find two new faculty features highlighting the efforts of Dr. William Hillis and Dr. Charles North to support and enable undergraduate research. In addition, you can download and read past issues of the journal in PDF format, as well as in a new e-book format, EPUB, which can be enjoyed on iPad, Nook, or any other electronic reader.

Kelsey Jones
President

Matthew Swift
Chief Editor

Horace's Odes *1.24 defends Epicurean friendship. Addressed specifically to Vergil, the ode pictures the practice of Epicurean frank therapy between two friends, which provides the reader with insight into the friendship that existed between these two poets. By depicting a true Epicurean relationship, the poem is able to subvert Cicero's criticisms of Epicurean friendship. Horace does this both by using mercantile language redolent of the language that Cicero himself uses in his criticisms and by presenting an image of true Epicurean friendship that itself serves as a corrective to Cicero's erroneous portrayals.*

Banking on Friendship: Horace's Defense of Epicurean Friendship in *Odes* 1.24

Stephen Margheim

Though infrequently considered within the canon of ancient philosophy, Augustan-age poets did help to transform and transmit Hellenistic philosophy into a Roman context. For example, both Horace and Vergil integrated their philosophical educations into their poetry, perhaps even into the practice of their friendship.[1] Unfortunately, little is known of their relationship, and few avenues exist by which to illumine its nature.[2] In the twenty-fourth ode of the first book of Horace's *Carmina*, however, one such avenue exists. Here Horace pens a complex consolatory poem addressed to Vergil following the death of their friend Quintilius Varus. As he does throughout his lyric corpus, Horace shares the ode with his readers but also addresses it to one reader in particular—in this instance, Vergil. As a result, the relationship between the poem's narrative persona and addressee offers the perceptive reader insight into Horace and Vergil's friendship and the philosophy that informed it.

In this paper, I argue that this dual audience creates a dual purpose for the ode. On the one hand, Horace aims to cure Vergil of his excessive mourning with Epicurean therapy; on the other, he attempts to counter Cicero's caricatures of Epicurean friendships.[3] These two objectives intertwine as Horace's practice of Epicurean therapy within the poem paints a picture that counters Cicero's faulty representation of

Epicurean friendships. With reference to the ode's explicit audience, Horace attempts to curb Vergil's grief by reminding him that death is unconquerable and frank friends remain. More specifically, Horace suggests his own merit as a friend by practicing active friendship through the poem. With reference to the implicit audience, Horace provides his readers with a counter-analogy to Cicero's anti-Epicurean caricatures by coloring his portrait of friendship with mercantile language. Although Cicero used commercial analogies to suggest that Epicurean friendships were selfish and dehumanizing, Horace subverts Cicero's critiques with metaphors that engage his language, yet counter his conclusions. Offering a vindication of the Epicurean relationship, Horace illuminates for his readers important aspects of his friendship with Vergil. *Odes* 1.24 may thus be read as both a demonstration and defense of Epicurean friendship.

Before more carefully examining the poem itself, let us briefly consider its context. *Odes* 1.24 was published in 23 B.C. as part of the first book of Horace's *Carmina*. Horace likely wrote the poem in the mid-20s B.C. after the death of Quintilius Varus of Cremona, a friend to Vergil and Horace alike. As Michael Putnam points out, the ode conflates the genres of *epicedium* and *consolatio*, of lamentation for Quintilius and condolence for Vergil.[4] These two genres roughly divide the poem in half—the first half is dirge, the second is consolation. Akbar Khan argues that the ode's first half mimics an actual dirge written by Vergil.[5] Aside from generic elements, the poem has an "almost critical tone," which Philip Thibodeau argues Epicurean *parrhesia*, or frank criticism, underpins.[6] Our understanding of frank criticism comes primarily from Philodemus's treatise on the subject, which was recovered from Herculaneum, the site of the Epicurean school he led.[7] As the editors of a recent edition of Philodemus's text state in their introduction, for Epicurean communities, frankness proves to be the *sine qua non* of true friendship:

> Reform of character is requisite for progress in wisdom and requires the correction of errors and passions. The Epicurean ideal of fellowship and mutual aid demanded, accordingly, the active participation of friends in the evaluation and correction of one another.[8]

In *Odes* 1.24, Horace conflates eulogy, consolation, and therapy. As a result, Vergil occupies three roles: he is the addressee in a dirge, the recipient of consolation, and the patient undergoing therapy.[9]

Although commentators have noted the ode's Epicurean tone, only a few consider its portrayal of the inner workings of an Epicurean friendship.[10] These scholars explain the ode's latent Epicurean content and tone via Quintilius's and Vergil's known Epicurean ties. Together they constitute half of a well-attested Roman Epicurean community whose other two members were L. Varius Rufus and Plotius Tucca.[11] Although Horace's own Epicurean leanings are well known, the evidence for his participation in this community is less certain.[12] For example, in *Sat.* 1.5 and 1.10, Horace names Plotius, Varius, and Vergil his "candid" friends. Additionally, Saint Jerome considers Horace a part of this Epicurean community in Italy.[13] Whether or not he was a fully participating member of the group, however, it is beyond dispute that Horace was at least acquainted with this coterie and its mentor, Philodemus of Gadara. Although Horace only names Philodemus at *Sat.* 1.2.121, the philosopher's influence is felt throughout the *Satires* and *Odes*, including in *Odes* 1.24's parrhesiatic tenor. The historical context of *Odes* 1.24 places it squarely within the Epicurean tradition.

Friendship's Demonstration

Having laid the groundwork for this study, let us first elucidate the ode's function as consolatory therapy and then consider how Horace's picture of his relationship with Vergil counters Cicero's depictions of Epicurean friendship. As noted above, frank criticism informs the ode's tone and function. David Armstrong, building upon the work of Martha Nussbaum, outlines nine features necessary for frank speech to function as a means of therapy within Epicurean relationships.[14] Among other requisites, Armstrong points out that *parrhesia* must "be 'individual-relative' rather than based on community values."[15] That is, Horace must address Vergil's particular grief and how to rectify its excess, rather than parade more general Roman ideas on the proper time, place, and extent of mourning. Horace fashions *Odes* 1.24 to be individual-relative by speaking to Vergil as an author and as a reader. Addressing Vergil the author, Horace steeps his parrhesiatic *consolatio* in Vergilian language and imagery. Addressing Vergil the reader, Horace alludes to a Catullan poem on the death of a loved one as well as to a previous ode concerning Vergil. This thick intertextual nexus cements the ode in a more private setting, while simultaneously offering the careful reader a glimpse of Epicurean therapy at work.

As Father Owen Lee astutely points out, *Odes* 1.24 "is giving Virgil Virgilian consolation" through extensive allusion to Vergil's own corpus.[16] For example, Horace opens *Odes* 1.24 with the direct question, "What shame or limit should there be for the longing of one so loved?" (*Quis desiderio sit pudor aut modus / tam cari capitis*, 1-2).[17] Michael Putnam points out that *pudor* and *modus*—shame and limit—are principal themes throughout Vergil's oeuvre.[18] Horace marks their significance in this poem by returning to both terms as the poem continues. He returns first to the theme of shame by personifying *Pudor* (6) in the next stanza:

> ergo Quintilium perpetuus sopor
> urget, cui Pudor et Iustitiae soror
> incorrupta Fides nudaque Veritas
> quando ullum inveniet parem?
> (*Odes* 1.24.5-8)
>
> So, everlasting slumber oppresses Quintilius. When will <u>Shame</u> and uncorrupted Faith, the sister of Justice, and naked Truth find anyone equal to him?

Unlike the normative quality above, here shame is a goddess who personifies one of Quintilius's many virtues. Next, the noun *modus* (1) evolves into the verb *moderere* (14) in the heart of the fourth stanza. This entire stanza and the beginning of the following stanza are saturated with Vergilian language:

> Quid si Threicio blandius Orpheo
> auditam moderere arboribus fidem?
> Num uanae redeat sanguis imagini,
> quam uirga semel horrida,
>
> non lenis precibus fata recludere,
> nigro compulerit Mercurius gregi?
> (*Odes* 1.24.13-18)

> What if you should pluck the lyre-string heard by trees more beautifully than Thracian Orpheus? The blood wouldn't return to the empty shade, which Mercury, who does not easily open the fates to prayers, has herded with his horrid wand once and for all into his black herd, would it?

These stanzas offer an extended allusion to Vergil's Orpheus myths in *Georgics* 4 and *Aeneid* 6.[19] First, the opening of the fifth stanza, *non lenis precibus fata recludere* (17), echoes, in both language and theme, *Georg* 4.470: *nesciaque humanis <u>precibus</u> mansuescere corda* ("hearts that know not how to soften at humanity's prayers"). Second, the initial description of Orpheus closely parallels Vergil's description of him at *Aen.* 6.119-20: *si potuit <u>manis</u> arcessere coniugis Orpheus / <u>Threicia</u> fretus cithara <u>fidibusque</u> conoris* ("if Orpheus was able to summon his wife's shade, trusting his Thracian lyre and melodious strings").[20] These Orphic references advance both the ode's *parrhesia* and its consolation. As frank criticism, the *Georgics* episode reminds Vergil, as David West points out, that "even the great Orpheus, as you [Vergil] know better than anyone, failed to bring Eurydice back to life"; the allusion to *Aeneid* 6 suggests to Vergil that even *pius Aeneas* may only enter the realm of the dead, not return the dead to life.[21] As consolation, however, Horace recalls some of Vergil's most beautiful poetry, reminding him that, like Orpheus, although unable to recall a dead friend, he remains a masterful poet.[22] By alluding to Vergil's corpus, Horace addresses Vergil *qua* poet in order to ensure that the ode is individual-relative.

Horace also appeals to Vergil as a reader. To this end, Horace references both Catullus's and his own poetry.[23] As poets, both Horace and Vergil have a predilection for reading and absorbing their poetic forebears. One of the previous generation's most well-known poets, Catullus offers Horace a common point of reference by which to console Vergil. In his ninety-sixth poem, Catullus addresses his fellow poet Calvus, who is grieving over the death of his wife Quintilia.[24] As consolation, Catullus suggests that poetry can reach beyond the grave and affect the dead:

> Si quicquam mutis gratum acceptumque sepulcris
> accidere a nostro, Calve, dolore potest,
> quo desiderio veteres renovamus amores
> atque olim missas flemus amicitias,
> certe non tanto mors immatura dolori est
> Quintiliae, quantum gaudet amore tuo (Catullus 96).
>
> If it is possible that anything pleasing and acceptable can befall silent graves because of our grief, Calvus, by which longing we renew old loves and lament lost friendships, certainly a premature death is not so much a sadness for Quintilia as her rejoicing in your love.

The opening of *Odes* 1.24, *Quis desiderio* (1), recalls Catullus's *quo desiderio* of line 3, suggesting that Vergil's lamentation of Quintilius's death echoes Calvus's grief over Quintilia's.[25] Yet Horace "will not play Catullus to Vergil's Calvus."[26] Although he begins his ode similarly to Catullus, Horace ends on a much different note:

> durum; sed levius fit patentia
> quicquid corrigere est nefas (*Odes* 1.24.19-20).
>
> It is hard; but whatever is forbidden to correct becomes easier to bear with patience.

Unlike Catullus, Horace regards the afterlife as "forbidden" (*nefas*). If Khan is correct in thinking that the poem's first ten lines mimic Vergil's actual dirge to Quintilius, it would be natural to assume that Vergil's *epicedium* echoed Catullus's sentiments. Under that interpretation, one could understand the ending as saying it is forbidden to think that a deceased loved one can hear or respond to one's grief. Using Catullus as a *comparandum*, Horace attempts to remind Vergil that either raising the dead is impious folly or that poetry has its limits—it cannot cross death's threshold.

Horace extends this idea with a further allusion aimed at Vergil the reader. This time, however, Horace uses an "internal self-reference" that recalls one of his previous odes.[27] In *Odes* 1.24, Horace uses a banking metaphor to recall *Odes* 1.3, a *propempticon*, or bon-voyage poem, to Vergil.[28] In the heart of Horace's ode, he describes the deceased Quintilius as *non ita creditum*:[29]

> Multis ille bonis flebilis occidit,
> nulli flebilior quam tibi, Vergili.
> Tu frustra pius, heu, non ita creditum
> poscis Quintilium deos (*Odes* 1.24.9-12).
>
> He died mourned by many good men, but mourned by none more than by you, Vergil. You, uselessly pious, ask the gods for Quintilius, alas! not entrusted on those terms.

The force of *ita* suggests a referent, yet the poem itself offers none. Within the *Odes*, however, one finds only one other instance of *creditum*—in *Odes* 1.3: *navis, quae tibi creditum / debes Vergilium* ("O ship that owes Vergil, entrusted to you," 5-6).[30] The reference is not only linguistic, but also structural. The *creditum* and *Quintilium* of 1.24 lie in the same approximate metrical positions as the *creditum* and *Vergilium* of 1.3:[31]

> nauis, quae tibi creditum
> debes Vergilium; finibus Atticis (*Odes* 1.3.5-6).
>
> Tu frustra pius, heu, non ita creditum
> poscis Quintilium deos (*Odes* 1.24.11-2).

The *non ita creditum* of 1.24 clearly recalls *Odes* 1.3 via their shared banking metaphor. In order to situate the precise meaning of Horace's metaphor, let us briefly consider its context in Roman banking language. In his *Theory of Credit*, Henry Macleod describes the origins of banking in Rome.[32] Banking began with simple currency exchange in the Forum Romanum, operated by private citizens called *argentarii*. Over time, "it became the custom of private persons to deposit their money with them for the mere purpose of security."[33] The deposited money was termed a *depositum*. This form of banking stands in contrast with a *creditum*. A participial form of the verb *credo* ("entrust"), *creditum* is a more archaic term for a deposit and was eventually replaced by the term *mutuum*.[34] Macleod describes how one transacts a *creditum*: "the persons who placed their money with the *argentarius* as a *creditum* lost all the property in it, and acquired only a credit, debt, or right of action in exchange for it."[35] Horace uses the archaic participle *creditum* to create a complex metaphorical scenario that links *Odes* 1.3 to 1.24. In order to illumine the import of the metaphor in 1.24, then, we must first consider its referent in 1.3.

The commercial language in the second stanza of *Odes* 1.3 portrays Horace as a creditor seeking repayment of the loaned Vergil from an indebted ship:[36]

> nauis, quae tibi creditum
> debes Vergilium finibus Atticis
> reddas incolumem precor
> et serues animae dimidium meae (*Odes* 1.3.5-8).
>
> O ship that owes Vergil, entrusted to you, may you return him unharmed to Attic shores, I pray, and preserve the other half of my soul.

The first line of the stanza represents Vergil as on loan to the ship (*navis, quae tibi creditum*, 5); then, in the last line, Horace famously describes Vergil as "the other half of my soul" (*animae dimidium meae*, 8). Both *creditum* and *dimidium* describe the proper noun *Vergilium*. This stanza-long chiasmus (*tibi creditum* … *Vergilium* … *dimidium meae*) verbally pictures Horace's desire for his friend's safety (*incolumem*, 7) and return (*reddas*, 7), as *tibi* and the possessive *meae* create a tension between Horace and the ship. Placing the metaphor in the situation that Macleod describes, we can better understand Horace's implication:

> "the banker [i.e. the ship] buys the money [Vergil] from his customer [Horace]: and in exchange for it, he gives his customer a credit in his books, which is a right of action to demand back [*debes*] an equivalent amount of money [in this case, that he be "intact"]."[37]

Horace's metaphor is not a *depositum*; it is a *creditum*. The stanza's concluding epithet, *animae dimidium meae*, completes the banking metaphor. T. V. Buttrey has demonstrated that *dimidium* pictures Vergil as a "halved coin circulating so abundantly at the time this Ode was composed."[38] Horace imagines and represents Vergil as money on loan as a *creditum*. The ship now holds half of Horace's soul. This metaphor illustrates the depth of their separation and the cause of Horace's prayer.

Understanding the referent in *Odes* 1.3 illuminates the meaning of the initially ambiguous banking metaphor in 1.24. For example, compare Vergil's roles in the two metaphors. In 1.3, Vergil is the loaned object; in 1.24, the creditor. Horace shifts him from the direct object (*Vergilium*, 1.3.5) to the subject (*Tu*, 1.24.11). As in 1.3, Horace is here concerned with Vergil and the theme of separation from a friend. This time, however, the separation is permanent. Although Vergil "asks the gods for Quintilius" (*poscis Quintilium deos*, 12), the "loan" is not such that any price can repay it (*non ita creditum*, 11), revealing that Quintilius's death was not actually a loan at all.[39] Whereas in the beginning of the poem Horace treats Quintilius's death euphemistically (*perpetuus sopor*, 1.24.5), with the banking metaphor Horace reiterates that blood, and therefore life, will not "return to the empty shade" (*vanae redeat sanguis imagini*, 15). Here lies the thrust of the *ita* in line 11—Horace means to remind Vergil that, unlike his previous departure from Horace, Quintilius's separation cannot be remedied.

As we have seen, Horace frames much of his therapeutic criticism with allusions to Vergil's own work, to one of Catullus's poems, and to Horace's earlier ode concerning Vergil. These references help to cement the poem in a shared personal context, a key to Epicurean *parrhesia*. Commentators have noted that Horace's advice conforms to the standard elements of the *consolatio* genre: "that mourning is pointless, death irrevocable, and fortitude the best relief."[40] Yet by couching his admonition in familiar allusions, Horace transforms consolatory poetry into Epicurean therapy.

The therapeutic function of the ode sheds light on an aspect of Horace and Vergil's friendship. Acting as an Epicurean therapist, Horace demonstrates to Vergil his virtue as a friend. The poem itself is thus a response to the question, "when will [the goddesses] find anyone equal to him?" (*cui … quando ullum inveniet parem*, 1.24.6, 8). Insofar as the poem demonstrates that Horace is willing and able to offer frank criticism when needed, Horace is able to remind Vergil that he is a friend capable of being Quintilius's equal.

If frankness is the quintessential quality of Epicurean friendships, then Quintilius himself is the quintessential friend.[41] For proof, one need not look beyond Horace's corpus. First, the phrase *nuda Veritas* (7) in *Odes* 1.24 captures the meaning of the Greek term *parrhesia*, as both terms denote blunt honesty.[42] Along with shame, faith, and justice, frankness is one of Quintilius's primary virtues. Second, Horace references Quintilius's oft-used imperative *corrigere* (correct it!) to conclude 1.24, reminding Vergil of Quintilius's literary frankness.[43] In his *Ars Poetica*, Horace recalls how Quintilius would reduce lines of poetry to rubble with this single word, always willing to offer his critical, but desired, opinion. Finally, at *Sat.* 1.5.40-42, Quintilius, Vergil, and Plotius are described as *candidiores*, "which underscores both their charm *and* their frankness."[44] By practicing the very art that defined so much of Quintilius's character, Horace deftly positions himself as the friend that Vergil can receive and has received from the gods. Thibodeau sums up Horace's appropriation of Quintilius's role as parrhesiatic therapist:

> Vergil's original complaint was that he would never find Quintilius' equal in the categories of modesty, trust, fairness, and frankness. Yet without openly saying so, Horace has demonstrated that Vergil's complaint has no basis: the remarkable traits of modesty, trustworthiness, a sense of what is right, and, above all, frankness, are all traits Horace displays in spades in this poem.[45]

While mourning Quintilius's lost friendship, Vergil must not forget the *dimidium* who remains his friend.

Friendship's Defense

In *Odes* 1.24, Horace represents his bond with Vergil in its truest form: one friend openly correcting another in a spirit of good will. The primary purpose of the ode is to cure Vergil, the ode's addressee, of his excessive mourning with Epicurean therapy. Through the poem's persona, Horace practices frank criticism, thus picturing a vital aspect of his friendship with Vergil. A question remains, however: Why publish this ode if it were meant solely to help Vergil? Philodemus advises Epicureans to practice frank criticism among peers, "not in the presence of all."[46] There seems little reason for Horace to make this *parrhesia* public unless the ode has another, secondary purpose. In order to illumine this other function, we must focus our attention on the ode's other audience—Horace's general readership.

I contend that Horace presents an active picture of his and Vergil's relationship in order to counter Cicero's caricatures of Epicurean friendship. Aside from relating his point about death and mourning, Horace uses language taken from the marketplace to subvert Cicero's critiques, which had used mercantile language to suggest that Epicurean friendships are selfish and dehumanizing. By engaging with Cicero's language, Horace enters the debate over the merit of the Epicurean form of *amicitia*.

To tease out Horace's subtle intertextual conversation with Cicero, we must first assess Cicero's arguments against Epicurean friendship. Writing a generation before Horace, Cicero frequently lampoons the Epicureans and their strange practices. Indeed, standard Roman *mores* led many to reject Epicureanism. For example, Plutarch and Seneca wrote extensive polemics against Epicurus and his followers, although they infrequently consider Epicurean friendship itself. Albeit one of Epicureanism's most dogged critics, Plutarch examines Epicurean friendship only once.[47] Seneca discusses Epicurean friendship explicitly in his Ninth Epistle, and, like nearly all ancient critics, his rejection of Epicureanism centers on its hedonistic calculus: "that which you describe is business, not friendship" (*ista, quam tu describis, negotiatio est, non amicitia*, Ep. 9.10). Cicero, however, often criticizes Epicurean relationships. His stature as an author and thinker, even in Horace's time, makes him paradigmatic of Roman anti-Epicureans.

For his part, Cicero faults Epicurean friendship for two related reasons: it objectifies the friend, and it promotes selfishness. Both criticisms are presented throughout his corpus using mercantile language. As Daniel Hanchey points out, Cicero consistently associates Epicureans and practical measuring:

> In *De Orat.* 3.285, *Fin.* 2.58, and *Fin.* 5.93, the Epicureans are described as measuring on a calculus of pleasure (*voluptas*); at *Fin.* 2.85 they measure by profit and payment (*emolumentum* and *mercedes*); in *Leg.* 1.41, they measure by their own benefit (*sua commoda*); in *Nat. Deor.* 1.113 they use their stomachs (*venter*) to measure.[48]

Cicero sees insufficiencies in measurement based on any of these standards when assessing value in a social context such as friendship. A friendship founded on measuring necessarily objectifies the friend, reducing him to benefits received. Measuring friendships also leads to selfishness, as each friend will quantify the benefits likely to be received in order to weigh the health of the friendship as a whole.

Cicero favors the language of mercantile measurement to satirize Epicurean relationships. For the sake of brevity, I offer only two prime examples. First, he distinguishes true friendship that seeks benefits *for* the other with Epicurean friendship, which seeks benefits *from* one another: [49]

> quam si ad fructum nostrum referemus, non ad illius commoda, quem diligemus, non erit ista amicitia, sed mercatura quaedam utilitatum suarum.[50]
> (*Nat. Deor.* 1.122)
>
> If we will refer it to our own benefit, and not to the advantage of another, whom we esteem, then this will not be friendship, but some mercantile calculation of its own utility.

Next, Cicero compares Epicurean friendship, which is sought for the "hope of profit" (*spe mercedis*), to lending good deeds at interest (*beneficium faeneramur*):

> Ut enim benefici liberalesque sumus, non ut exigamus gratiam (neque enim beneficium faeneramur sed natura propensi ad liberalitatem sumus), sic amicitiam non spe mercedis adducti sed quod omnis eius fructus in ipso amore inest, expetendam putamus. Ab his qui pecudum ritu ad voluptatem omnia referunt longe dissentiunt (*Laelius* 31).
>
> For just as we do not do good and show generosity so that we may extract favor (for we do not lend good deeds at interest, but are naturally prone to generosity), so too we think friendship should be sought not because we are drawn by a hope for profit, but because its every benefit is contained in love itself.

> These ideas differ sharply from the ideas of those who, in the manner of cattle, base everything on pleasure.

The implication of this banking metaphor is clear: Epicureans treat friendship like an investment.[51] Whereas commercial exchange, by definition, takes into account some measurement of utility, one ought to engage in friendship only for its own sake. For Cicero, Epicurean friendship is base precisely because it is sought for the sake of an external benefit.

Various characters in Cicero's dialogues attempt to defend Epicurean friendship. For example, in *De finibus*, the Epicurean Torquatus attempts to justify the Epicurean conceptions of friendship by pointing out that Epicureans make a pact to ensure equity in the relationship. Cicero will have none of it:

> Posuisti etiam dicere alios foedus quoddam inter se facere sapientis, ut, quem ad modum sint in se ipsos animati, eodem modo sint erga amicos; . . . an vero, si fructibus et emolumentis et utilitatibus amicitias colemus, si nulla caritas erit, quae faciat amicitiam ipsam sua sponte, vi sua, ex se et propter se expetendam, dubium est, quin fundos et insulas amicis anteponamus?
> (*Fin.* 2.83)
> You proposed that some (Epicureans) say that wise men make some pact among themselves in order to be disposed toward their friends just as they are toward themselves. . . . But if we cultivate friendships for benefits, gains, and utility, and if there is no charity that produces friendship of its own accord and by its own force, to be sought from and for its own sake, then is there any question that we would prefer estates and apartment buildings to friends?

Cicero questions how Torquatus's pact could produce the charity "that produces friendship itself of its own accord" (*quae faciat amicitiam ipsam sua sponte*) and simultaneously avoid a selfish desire for "benefits, gains, and utility" (*fructibus et emolumentis et utilitatibus*). Once again, Cicero utilizes commercial imagery to suggest that Epicurean friends will always, in the end, place one another on the same level as real estate—a means to an end.

Yet one may reasonably ask whether Cicero's caricature conforms to Epicurus's own picture of his followers' friendships. A number of Epicurus's *Vatican Sayings* (*VS*) deal with friendship. Let us consider only three. At the conclusion of *VS* 28, Epicurus says, "it is necessary to risk some pleasure for the pleasures of friendship."[52] Contrary to Cicero's account, where Epicurean friends are "drawn by a hope for profit" (*Laelius* 31), Epicurus admits that friendship is likely to bring pain, yet is still desirable. Cicero also faults the Epicureans for their supposed selfish desire for "benefits, gains, and utility" (*Fin*. 2.83). In *VS* 34, however, Epicurus clearly states, "the use of friends is not that they are useful, but that we can trust in their usefulness."[53] It is not a desire for utility that draws us to our friends, even if our trust in their continued utility helps perpetuate our relationship. These two statements put a considerable dent in Cicero's account of Epicurean friendship. Yet perhaps the most telling of Epicurus's dicta defines what a friend is not:

> A friend is not one who is constantly seeking some benefit, nor one who never connects friendship with utility; for the former trades kindness for compensation, while the latter cuts off all hope for the future.[54] (*Vatican Sayings* 39)

In the first phrase, Epicurus offers a picture of friendship that is explicitly contrary to Cicero's account: "A friend is not one who is constantly seeking some benefit." In the second phrase, however, Epicurus appears to agree with Cicero: "[A friend is not] one who never connects friendship with utility." To reconcile these apparent contradictory statements, one can look to Horace's picture of his friendship with Vergil.

As we attempt to reconstruct Horace's defense, we must proceed with caution because the intertextual relationship between Horace and Cicero is complex.[55] Rather than a single, direct linguistic reference, Horace offers an extended allusion to Cicero's caricatures throughout both *Odes* 1.24 and 1.3. Horace does not directly echo the specifics of Cicero's language. The content, tone, and themes of *Odes* 1.24, however, place it in conversation with such critical caricatures of Epicurean friendships. In response to these negative images, Horace aims instead to paint a picture of a correct, active friendship. On the one hand, his mercantile metaphors situate the poem within Cicero's anti-Epicurean critiques, yet on the other hand, these images co-opt, rather than adopt, such language in order to counter Cicero's caricatures.

Contrary to Cicero, Horace portrays his Epicurean friendship with Vergil as a relationship in which both friends seek benefits for one another. In 1.24, Quintilius's objectification and Vergil's selfishness are the result of grief (*nulli flebilior quam tibi*, *Vergili*, 10). That is the point of Horace's *parrhesia*. Moreover, it is entirely human to want "one so loved" back. In 1.3, Horace does not only seek his own benefit when he prays for Vergil's safe return; he also seeks the continued health of a beloved friend. Furthermore, when Horace calls Vergil "the other half of his soul," he to some degree gives Vergil ownership of half of himself. The picture in *Odes* 1.24 reveals that Horace cares for the emotional well-being of Vergil, sharing in lament for a lost friend and acting for the betterment of another. That Horace wrote a poem to help a friend is itself evidence for the health of his friendship with Vergil. To his general readership, the activity of *Odes* 1.24, when mixed with the mercantile language, presents a counter-analogy to Cicero's underlying argument.

In effect, Horace's portrait of an Epicurean relationship argues that even if Epicurean relationships are based on an exchange of benefits, it is a mutual exchange. That is, exchange drives the relationship, not its effectual benefits. Horace's friendship with Vergil allows him to criticize excessive emotion openly. Their relationship is founded upon the free exchange of ideas between friends. Are there benefits? Of course, but one does not enter into a friendship *for* the benefits, as Cicero claims. We may recall what Epicurus says about the false Epicurean friend: "A friend is not one who is constantly seeking some benefit, nor one who never connects friendship with utility." There is a strange balance to be kept in the practice of Epicurean relationships. One ought not to seek benefit as an end in itself, but to disregard the utility of friendship is likewise foolish. Cicero was correct in thinking that "friendship should be sought not because we are drawn by a hope for profit, but because its every benefit is contained in love itself." His mistake was to believe that Epicurus and his followers disagreed.

In sum, it appears that something can be discovered concerning the inner workings of Horace's friendship with Vergil. It was a lively, open, honest relationship shared with others of like mind and, in this case, even with the world. The reader senses this relationship through the relationship between the narrative persona and the addressee. The narrative persona of *Odes* 1.24 is Horace the friend and practitioner of Epicurean *parrhesia*; the addressee is Vergil, the grieving poet. Writing for the ode's dual audience, Horace aims to use the poem both to cure Vergil of his excessive mourning and to counter Ciceronian caricatures of Epicurean friendships. To paint a picture of his relationship with Vergil, Horace utilizes his practice of Epicurean therapy to image the proper Epicurean relationship. With the infused color of mercantile language, Horace is able to remind Vergil that death is permanent, but true friends, such as Horace himself, remain. The context, tone, and content of *Odes* 1.24 place it squarely within an evolving Epicurean tradition concerning the practice of friendship. As Horace himself admits, "it is hard" (*durum*, 1.24.19), but if we bank on friendship, we may soon understand, in the words of Epicurus, that "friendship dances around the world, announcing to each of us that we must awaken to happiness."[56]

NOTES

[1] Thomas, *Virgil and the Augustan Reception*, 55-73 argues that Horace and Vergil were merely acquaintances, not close friends. For consideration of the philosophical underpinnings in both Horace and Vergil, see Armstrong, introduction to *Vergil, Philodemus, and the Augustans*.

[2] For considerations of their friendship, see Campbell "*Animae Dimidium Meae*: Horace's Tribute to Vergil,"314-318 and Duckworth, "*Animae Dimidium Meae*: Two Poets of Rome," 281-316.

[3] The bibliography on Cicero's anti-Epicureanism is extensive. For a summary of Cicero's role as the chief voice against Epicureanism in antiquity, see Nicgorski, "Cicero, Citizenship, and the Epicurean Temptation." See also Stokes,"Cicero on Epicurean Pleasures," Striker, "Epicurean Hedonism," Griffin, "Philosophy, Politics and Politicians," Maslowski, "The Chronology of Cicero's Anti-Epicureanism," 55-78. Cicero's specific distaste for the pleasure calculus appears in *In Pisonem passim*, *Pro Sestio* 23, 138-39, and *Pro Caelio* 39-42.

[4] Putnam, ""The Languages of Horace *Odes* 1.24," 123; for similar treatment of the rhetoric of consolation in 1.24, see Pasquali, *Orazio lirico*, 249-57.

[5] Khan, "Horace's Ode to Vergil," 73-84.
[6] Thibodeau, "Can Vergil Cry?," 244; for further analysis of the poem's parrhesiatic tone, see Armstrong, "Be Angry and Sin Not," 97-99.
[7] *PHerc*. 1471, entitled *peri parrhesias*. For a general introduction, see Konstan et al., *Philodemus On Frank Criticism*, 1-24. Philodemus, a former pupil of Zeno of Sidon, the scholarch of Athens' Epicurean school, was known for the breadth of his learning; e.g. Cicero's *Fin*. 2.119; *Fam*. 15.16.1, 15.19.2; *Acad*. 1.5; *Tusc*. 4.7.
[8] Konstan et al., *Philodemus on Frank Criticism*, 6.
[9] These roles are not mutually exclusive. In *Vatican Sayings* 66, Epicurus says, "we sympathize with our friends, not through lamentation, but through thoughtful concern"(συμπαθῶμεν τοῖς φίλοις οὐ θρηνοῦντες ἀλλὰ φροντίζοντες). Horace conflates these personae in such a way as to sympathize with Vergil and simultaneously show him his error.
[10] For bibliography, see Putnam, "The Languages of Horace *Odes* 1.24," 123 n. 1 and Thibodeau, "Can Vergil Cry," 243 n. 1. For various commentators' readings, see Commager, *The Odes of Horace*, 287-90, Khan, "Horace's Ode to Vergil," Nisbet and Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace* Odes *Book 1*, 279-89, Lowrie, "Lyric's 'Elegos' and the Aristotelian Mean," 377-394, Putnam, "The Languages of Horace *Odes* 1.24," and West, *Horace Odes I. Carpe Diem*, 112-15.
[11] For a detailed account of the sources that attest their foursome, see Thibodeau, "Can Vergil Cry?," 248; For further discussion of a Roman Epicurean quartet, see Armstrong, *Introduction to Vergil, Philodemus, and the Augustans*, 2-3; for Philodemus's papyri (P.Herc. Paris. 2, P.Herc. 1082, and P.Herc. 253) that name Vergil, Quintilius, Varius, and Plotius as addressees, see Sider, The Epigrams of Philodemus,19-21; for discussion of the papyri, see Gigante and Capasso, "Il ritorno di Virgilio a Ercolano."
[12] For the position that Horace was merely an acquaintance of the quartette, see Oberhelman and Armstrong, "Satire as Poetry."
[13] In his *Chronicon*, under the heading of the Roman year 27, in the 190th Olympiad, Jerome writes: "The poets Varius and Tucca, companions of Vergil and Horace, are considered illustrious, who later corrected the book of the *Aeneid* under this condition: that they added nothing" (*Varius et Tucca, Vergilii et Horatii contubernales, poetae habentur illustres, qui Aeneidum libros postea emendaverunt sub lege ea, ut nihil adderent*). For *contubernales* as a Roman term for Epicurean friendship, see DeWitt, "Parresiastic Poems of Horace,"55-63.

[14] Nussbaum , "Therapeutic Arguments,"1986: 31-74.
[15] Armstrong, "The Addressees of the Ars Poetica," 193-4.
[16] Owen Lee, *Word, Sound, and Image*, 84.
[17] Unless otherwise noted, Latin texts are those of Garrison, *Epodes and Odes*, and translations are my own. For interpreting the subjunctive as "should" instead of "could," see Commager, *The Odes of Horace*, 288 and Putnam, "The Languages of Horace *Odes* 1.24," 126.
[18] Putnam, "The Language of Horace *Odes* 1.24," 126.
[19] For further commentary on the allusion, see West, *Horace Odes I. Carpe Diem*, 113 and Putnam, "The Languages of Horace *Odes* 1.24," 129.
[20] Putnam, "The Languages of Horace *Odes* 1.24," 130; for a quick argument supporting Horace's knowledge of at least parts of the *Aeneid* before its publication, see p. 129 n15.
[21] West, *Horace Odes I. Carpe Diem*, 113. One may compare *pius Aeneus* to the description of Vergil in line 11, *frustra pius*.
[22] For this reading, see Putnam, "The Languages of Horace Odes 1.24," 129, Owen Lee, *Word, Sound, and Image*, 86-9, and *Commager, The Odes of Horace: A Critical Study* 289-90.
[23] Putnam, "The Languages of Horace *Odes* 1.24,": passim. For an examination of Catullus 96, see Davis, "*Quo Desiderio*," 297-302.
[24] Whether Quintilia was his mistress or wife remains open to debate. I follow Lyne, *Collected Papers on Latin Poetry*, 74.
[25] Putnam, "The Languages of Horace *Odes* 1.24," 125 suggests that the similarity in name is not purely accidental and extends Horace's allusion.
[26] Ibid., 126.
[27] Such an "internal self-reference" sends the reader to a work within that author's corpus, rather than to another author. See Thomas, "Virgil's Georgics," 190.
[28] For detailed bibliography, see Elder, "Horace, C., I, 3," 140 and Basto, "Horaces Proemption to Vergil," 30.
[29] Note the shift from *flebilis* to *flebilior*, and see Armstrong, "Be Angry and Sin Not," 79-121 on the Epicurean allowance of emotion but prohibition of emotional excesses.
[30] See *OLD* s.v. 1.a; and cf. *Odes* 2.4, 2.8, 2.13, 2.19, 3.5, 3.27 and 4.9 for other instances of the verb *credo*.
[31] The two poems are in slightly different meters; 1.3 is in Second Asclepiadean, while 1.24 is in Third Asclepiadean.

[32] Macleod, *The Theory of Credit*, 349-68.
[33] Ibid., 349.
[34] For examples, see Sall. C. 25.4; Liv. 6.15.5, 6.27.3, 8.28.3; Sen. Ben. 2.34.1; and Quint. 5.10.105, 5.10.117. For a Glossary of Roman banking terminology, see Andreau, *Banking and Business in the Roman World*, xii-xvi. Unfortunately, he does not list or discuss *creditum* or its cognate verb form, *credo*.
[35] Macleod, *The Theory of Credit*, 350.
[36] Garrison, *Epodes and Odes*, 207.
[37] Macleod, *The Theory of Credit*, 357.
[38] Buttrey, "Halved Coins," 47 outlines Augustus' monetary reform, in which he institutionalized halved *asses*, cut from newly defined *dupondii*, as currency. Buttrey considers Horace's metaphor as a key literary attestation of this monetary phenomenon.
[39] *Creditum* shifts the meaning of *poscis* from the realm of pleading to the marketplace, where Vergil is attempting to buy back Quintilius.
[40] Nisbet and Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace* Odes *Book 1*, 281. For the reading of this ode as *consolatio*, see Nisbet and Hubbard, *A Commentary on Horace* Odes *Book 1*, 280-1 and Putnam, "The Languages of Horace *Odes* 1.24,"130.
[41] Thibodeau, "Can Vergil Cry?," 251.
[42] For *veritas* and *candor* as Latin translations of *parrhesia*, see DeWitt, "Parresiastic Poems of Horace," 313-4.
[43] See *AP* 438-44 and *Odes* 1.24.20. This word is a further point of reference, revealing Horace surreptitiously sliding into Quintilius's role.
[44] Thibodeau, "Can Vergil Cry?," 251.
[45] Ibid., 255.
[46] Fr. 82 (=85 N). For text and translation, see Konstan et al., *Philodemus On Frank Criticism*, 87.
[47] *Adv. Colot.* 1111B: "he chooses friends for the pleasure he gets, but says that he assumes the greatest pains on their behalf." For his consideration of other Epicurean relations, see *De. frat. amore* 487d and *De latenter vivendo* 1129A, where Plutarch mentions that Epicurus honored his deceased brothers; at *Non posse* 1097E, he discusses the female members of the Garden. None of these reports are presented in a positive light.
[48] Hanchey, "Commercial Exchange." I am grateful to Dr. Hanchey for allowing me to read his forthcoming paper.

[49] O'Connor, "The Invulnerable Pleasures of Epicurean Friendship," 177-81, suggests that at the heart of nearly all Roman criticism of Epicurean friendship is the view that it is necessarily ignoble and lacks virility.
[50] Epicurus is named shortly following this passage in 1.123:"But still Epicurus' book concerns sanctity" (At etiam liber est Epicuri de sanctitate).
[51] Seneca uses a banking motif throughout Ep. 9 when speaking directly to Lucilius: "that I may pay my debt at once and square the account, so far as this letter is concerned" (*ut statim tibi solvam, quod debeo, et quantum ad hanc epistulam paria faciamus*, Ep. 9.6); "put it down to my credit, though I have already wiped out my debt for the present day" (*quam tu boni consule, etiam si hunc diem iam expunxi*, Ep. 9.20). This may be a play on the same motif seen here.
[52] δεῖ δὲ καὶ παρακινδυνεῦσαι χάριν, χάριν φίλιας.
All of Epicurus's Greek text and translation are from Monadnock Press, trans. Peter Saint-Andre.
[53] οὐκ οὕτως χρείαν ἔχομεν τῆς χρείας <τῆς> παρὰ τῶν φίλων ὡς τῆς πίστεως τῆς περὶ τῆς χρείας.
[54] οὔθ' ὁ τὴν χρείαν ἐπιζητῶν διὰ παντὸς φίλος, οὔθ' ὁ μηδέποτε συνάπτων· ὁ μὲν γὰρ καπηλεύει τῇ χάριτι τὴν ἀμοιβήν, ὁ δὲ ἀποκόπτει τὴν περὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος εὐελπιστίαν.
[55] Aside from mercantile language, Cicero frequently depicts Epicureans as animals, e.g. Fin. 2.110. Horace alludes to Ciceronian parodies of Epicureans in Ep. 1.4.16, calling himself "a hog of Epicurus' herd" (*Epicuri de grege porcum*).
[56] ἡ φιλία περιχορεύει τὴν οἰκουμένην κηρύττουσα δὴ πᾶσιν ἡμῖν ἐγείρεσθαι ἐπὶ τὸν μακαρισμόν (*VS* 52).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andreau, Jean. *Banking and Business in the Roman World.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Armstrong, David. "The Addressees of the Ars Poetica: Herculaneum, the Pisones and Epicurean Protreptic." *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 31 (1993): 185-230.3.

———. Introduction to *Vergil, Philodemus, and the Augustans*, edited by David Armstrong, Jeff Fish, Patricia A. Johnston, and Marilyn B. Skinner. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2003.

———. "'Be Angry and Sin Not': Philodemus Versus the Stoics on Natural Bites and Natural Emotions." In *Passions and Moral Progress in Greco-Roman Thought*. Edited by J. T. Fitzgerald. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Barchiesi, Alessandro. "*Carmina: Odes and Carmen Saeculare*." In *The Cambridge Companion to Horace*. Edited by Stephen Harrison. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Basto, Ronald. "Horace's Propempticon to Vergil: A Re-examination." *Vergilius* 28 (1982): 30- 43.

Belmont, David. "The Vergilius of Horace, Ode 4.12." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 110 (1980): 1-20.

Bowra, Cecil M. "Horace, Odes IV. 12." *Classical Review* 42, no. 5 (1928): 165-67.

Buttrey, Theodore V. "Halved Coins, The Augustan Reform, and Horace, Odes 1.3." *American Journal of Archaeology* 76 (1972): 31-48.

Campbell, John S. "*Animae Dimidium Meae*: Horace's Tribute to Vergil." *Classical Journal* 82.4 (1987): 314-18.

Commager, Steele. *The Odes of Horace: A Critical Study*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1995.

Culler, Jonathan. "Apostrophe." In *The Pursuit of Signs: Semiotics, Literature, Deconstruction*. By Jonathan Culler. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981.

Davis, John T. "*Quo Desiderio*: The Structure of Catullus 96." *Hermes* 99, no. 3 (1971): 297-302.

DeWitt, Norman W. "Parresiastic Poems of Horace." *Classical Philology* 30, no. 4 (1935): 312-19.

Duckworth, George. "*Animae Dimidium Meae*: Two Poets of Rome," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 87 (1956): 281-316.

Elder, John P. "Horace, C., I, 3," *American Journal of Philology* 73, no. 2 (1952): 140-58.

Epicurus. *Vatican Sayings*. Trans. Peter Saint-Andre. Monadnock Press, 2010.

Freudenburg, Kirk. *The Walking Muse: Horace on the Theory of Satire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

Garrison, Daniel, ed. *Epodes and Odes*. Norman: Oklahoma University Press, 1991.

Gigante, Marcello and Mario Capasso. "Il ritorno di Virgilio a Ercolano." *Studi Italiani di Filologia Classica*, 3d ser., 7 (1989): 3-6.

Griffin, Miriam. "Philosophy, Politics, and Politicians at Rome." In *Philosophia Togata*. Edited by Miriam Griffin and Jonathan Barnes. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Hanchey, Daniel. "Commercial Exchange and Epicurean Value-Judgment in Cicero's Dialogues." Forthcoming.

Khan, H. Akbar. "Horace's ode to Vergil on the Death of Quintilius: 1.24." In *Why Horace? A Collection of Interpretations*. Edited by William Anderson. Wauconda, IL: Bolchazy-Carducci Publishers, 1999.

Konstan, David, Diskin Clay, Clarence E. Glad, Johan Thom, and James Ware, eds. *Philodemus On Frank Criticism*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1998.

Lowrie, Michelle. "Lyric's 'Elegos' and the Aristotelian Mean: Horace, C. 1.24, 1.33, and 2.9." *The Classical World* 87, no. 5 (1994): 377-94.

Lyne, R. O. A. M. *Collected Papers on Latin Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Macleod, Henry D. *The Theory of Credit: Volume II*, Part I. London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1890.

Maslowski, Tadeusz. "The Chronology of Cicero's Anti-Epicureanism." *Eos* 62 (1974): 55-78.

Nicgorski, Walter. "Cicero, Citizenship, and the Epicurean Temptation." In *Cultivating Citizens: Soulcraft and Citizenship in Contemporary America*. Edited by Dwight Allman and Michael Beaty. Oxford: Lexington Books, 2002.

Nisbet, Robert G. M. and Hubbard, Margaret. *A Commentary on Horace* Odes *Book 1*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Nussbaum, Martha. "Therapeutic arguments: Epicurus and Aristotle." In *The Norms of Nature: Studies in Hellenistic Ethics*. Edited by Malcolm Schofield and Gisela Striker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

O'Connor, David K. "The Invulnerable Pleasures of Epicurean Friendship." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 30, no. 2 (1989): 165-86.

Oberhelman, Steven and David Armstrong. "Satire as Poetry and the Impossibility of Metathesis in Horace's Satires." In *Philodemus and Poetry*. Edited by Dirk Obbink. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Owen Lee, Father M. *Word, Sound, and Image in the Odes of Horace*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1969.

Pasquali, Giorgio. *Orazio Lirico*. Firenze: Le Monnier, 1920.

Putnam, Michael. "The Languages of Horace Odes 1.24." *Classical Journal* 88, no. 2 (1993): 123-35.

——. *Poetic Interplay: Catullus & Horace*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.

Santirocco, Matthew S. *Unity and Design in Horace's Odes*. Chapel Hill: UNC Press Books, 1986.

Sider, David. *The Epigrams of Philodemus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Stokes, Michael. "Cicero on Epicurean Pleasures." In *Cicero the Philosopher*. Edited by Jonathan Powell. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.

Striker, Gisela. "Epicurean Hedonism." In *Essays on Hellenistic Epistemology and Ethics*. Edited by Gisela Striker. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Thibodeau, Philip. "Can Vergil Cry? Epicureanism in Horace Odes 1.24." *Classical Journal* 98, no. 3 (2003): 243-56.

Thomas, Richard F. "Virgil's Georgics and the Art of Reference." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 90 (1986): 171-98.

——. *Virgil and the Augustan Reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Tsakiropoulou-Summers, Tatiana. "Horace, Philodemus and the Epicureans at Herculaneum," *Mnemosyne* 5, no. 4, 51 (1998): 20-29.

Waters, William. *Poetry's Touch: On Lyric Address*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003.

Welch, Tara. "Horace's Journey through Arcadia." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 138, no. 1 (2008): 47-74.

West, David A. *Horace* Odes *I. Carpe Diem. Text, Translation and Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Living in England during the culmination of the conflict that would eventually lead to the English Civil War, the poet Francis Quarles was influenced by both Puritan and Anglican theology. This paper argues that Francis Quarles sought to harmonize the Puritan contempt of the tempting pleasures of the world with the Anglican belief that sought divine grace enacted through the things of the earth. Interpreting Quarles's use of meal imagery, this paper illuminates the notions of both contempus mundi *and* sacramentalia *as seen in the work of Francis Quarles.*

Grain and Chaff: *Contemptus Mundi* and the Emblematic World in the Work of Francis Quarles

Grant Shellhouse

Baptized on May 8, 1592, Francis Quarles would come to be considered by some as the first divine poet of England.[1] Quarles's dedicated piety—he was known to study and meditate on Scripture as late as three o'clock in the morning—manifests itself both in his poems and in the emblems that accompany many of his works.[2] These are filled with "uncommon turns of thought; the quaintness of his poetic style; but above all the depth of evangelic fervour, the ardent piety, and the rich experience of the heart."[3] In this paper, I will examine the tension between two theological ideas, *contemptus mundi* and sacramentality, which belong to Quarles's Puritan and Anglican theological strains, respectively. First, I will give an overview of Quarles's theological background and examine each concept as it appears in Quarles's thought and poetry. Finally, focusing on meal imagery, I will elucidate how Quarles has contempt for the world while also seeing it as a sacramental means of grace.

Before examining the theology of Quarles's poetry and emblems, it is necessary to consider briefly the context in which his theology was cultivated. Quarles was a loyal member of the Church of England in a period when two predominant factions were straining the Anglican Church: the dissenting Calvinists and the generally more royalist Arminian and Laudian parties.[4] Though some forms of Puritanism may have influenced him, he remained a faithful Anglican and subject of the king, straying neither into the "Papist nor Sectarie" parties.[5] While Quarles does reveal a clear tendency towards anti-Arminianism at times, he still remained loyal to King Charles (who, incidentally and apparently unbeknownst to Quarles, promoted "the Laudian and Arminian party in the Church of England").[6] Quarles settled firmly on this allegiance during the early rumblings of the First English Civil War. Though "his sympathies lay with the moderate Calvinist wing of the Church of England," Quarles—after serious contemplation of Holy Scripture—remained "throughly convinced" that he should support the new royalist party.[7] It should be noted that, in his careful decision to ally himself with one party, Quarles was not arming himself for battle against the other. He did not view the church as divided into warring factions, but rather as "temporarily fallen into the control of radical Puritans, but destined to find its way back to its lawful master, the king"—just as he believed the whole Christian Church would one day find *its* way back to *its* King.[8] This makes Quarles a man with a "foot in both camps," so to speak; he is influenced by both Puritan and Anglican theology and he seeks to synthesize the two when tensions arise.

The Beguiling World: Quarles's *Contemptus Mundi*

One facet of Quarles's poetry that arises largely from his Puritan influences, but is by no means foreign to Anglican or other Christian theologies, is his *contemptus mundi* (contempt for the world). The command of 1 John 2:15-16 illuminates the source of this contempt: "Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man loves the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all this is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world."[9] Quarles expresses such contempt for the world in two ways in his poetry. Firstly, he sees the world as a distraction from God; secondly, he sees it as a transient reality that, like man's own life, passes quickly away.

Quarles depicts the first strand of *contemptus mundi* frequently in terms of a battle between the flesh and the spirit. In the introduction of his translation of Jacob Cats's *Self-conflict, or, The Powerful Motions between the Flesh & Spirit*, Quarles describes the subject of the work as "Christian Warfare."[10] Quarles writes, "If thou art a Christian indeed, thou art a Souldier, and must fight continually; not Sensually with Earthly Powers, but Spiritually with all the Powers of Darkness where thou wilt find the most puissant and dangerous Enemy thou hast to grapple with, thine own self."[11] Contempt for the world is not sheer hatred of the world, for as fallen as the world may be, it is still created by God. Rather, Quarles's contempt is equally against the wiles of the world and his own tendencies to succumb to them, trading temporary pleasures and satisfactions for eternal glory.

Quarles sees such surrender in the story of Esau selling his birthright for a pot of stew, and the poem "On Jacob's Purchase" describes the exchange between the brothers.[12] In offering such a disproportionate exchange—a "mess of porridge for inheritance" (3)—Jacob plays the role of the world to Esau. Jacob appeals to Esau's physical weakness, enticing his brother by means of the stew. Quarles then sarcastically mocks Esau's failure to "strive t' enhance / His price a little" (4) by failing to haggle for "bread and drink to boot" (5). Throughout the poem, the reader is drawn into contempt for Jacob's unfairness and derision of Esau's folly. Jacob, playing the world, has set a disastrous table for Esau; Esau in turn has sacrificed his birthright for the immediate physical gratification found in the meal. Quarles does not simply recount the biblical narrative, however, for he sharply turns the terse poem back upon the reader and himself in the middle of the seventh line: "An easy price! The case is even our own; / For toys we often sell our Heaven, our Crown" (7-8). Just as Esau, driven by his physical hunger, trades his birthright for temporary satisfaction, so too, Quarles suggests, does man trade his crown in Heaven for the satisfaction of the lusts of his flesh, the lusts of his eyes, and the pride of life.

Quarles's "Galatians 6. 14" reflects further on the same confrontation between the desires of the flesh and the soul and, unlike "On Jacob's Purchase," offers an alternative to pursue, not merely a prohibition. This alternative is the cross of Christ, as demonstrated in the poem's title Scripture: "But God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world."[13] The poem begins with a hunger akin to Esau's: "Can nothing settle my uncertain breast / And fix my rambling love?" (1-2).[14] The speaker has sought some "good, than which there's nothing higher" (7) to bless and fulfill his "full desire" (8), but has yet to find such satisfaction in the first stanza. In the second stanza, the speaker enters into a worldly litany, listing his desires with their fulfillments immediately following. However, as quickly as Earth grants each of his former wishes, they disappear:

I wanted wealth; and at my dear request
Earth lent a quick supply;
I wanted mirth to charm my sullen breast;
And who more brisk than I?
I wanted fame to glorify the rest;
My fame flew eagle-high:
My joy not fully ripe, but all decayed;
Wealth vanished like a shade,
My mirth began to flag, my fame began to fade
(Galatians 6.14, 10-18).

Here we see the second strand of Quarles's *contemptus mundi* emerge: the consideration that our lives are short, uncertain, "subject to a Thousand Frailties and Casualties, and to Death every moment."[15] He turns from the world not only because it is a snare for the man seeking after God, but also because it is ephemeral, mutable, and vain. Its fruits decay, and all of the brief pleasures that it grants fade and vanish. Its "lustful steams, when either ebb or flow, / Are tides of man's vexation: / They alter daily" (21-23).[16] Alluding to the language of Ecclesiastes, which calls seeking the things of the world a "striving after wind" or a "vexation of spirit," Quarles depicts the passing pleasure of the world as merely a "precious wind" (26); the only shelter ("lee") it offers is its own "worldly treasure" (27).[17]

It is here in the fourth stanza of "Galatians 6. 14" that Quarles at last points to the place of peace and security for the "restless dove" of his soul from the first stanza: "My trust is in the Cross" (28). In the tumult of the winds of the world, this line stands fast (39-40); indeed, it is repeated twice more in the remaining seventeen lines of the poem. Quarles writes that in the Cross—by which he is dead to the world, and it to him—"lies my rest; / My fast, my sole delight," despite whatever "troops of fiends surround" him (37-38, 44). The speaker finds lasting delight in imitating Christ by taking up his Cross, dying to the world, and regarding the world as dead to himself, an expression of sheer *contemptus mundi*.[18] In this turn from the world, he finds fulfillment in the Cross—a theme that the emblem accompanying "Galatians 6. 14" embodies.[19] This emblem bears the Latin motto, *In cruce stat securus amor*, translatable either as "Love stands secure (or safe) on the Cross" or "An abiding love bases itself on the Cross."[20] The emblem depicts love on a cross, which stands on a wheel, implying a connection to the wheel of Fortune.[21] In his contempt for the ephemeral world and its lures and luxuries, Quarles turns away from "many of Fortune's traditional gifts, such as 'wealth,' 'fame,' and 'honour,' as well as 'mirth,' 'joy,' and 'beauty.'" The only place where Love may rest without being subject to the four blowing winds, the earth's motions, or Fortune's turning wheel is on the Cross, which is set immovably upon the world's axis and "the center of the wheel of Fortune (the place formerly reserved for the goddess herself)."[22]

The Emblematic World: Quarles's Sacramentality

A grievous misreading of Francis Quarles's *contemptus mundi* would be to identify him with radical Puritanism, which goes beyond disciplined contempt for the world and crosses into utter detestation. Though Quarles may include passages such as, "the Soul must have Prehemency over the Body, because it is more Noble, and infinitly more to be valu'd than the Body," he is neither a radical Puritan nor a dualist; rather, Quarles expresses a clear *union* of the body and spirit.[23] A concluding poem added to Jacob Cats's *Self-conflict*—presumably written by Quarles and added to his translation, as it includes an emblem in his style—contains the lines,

> Awake, dull Saint, learn what's within thy heart;
> The Spirit's not alone, nor th' flesh apart:
> Their powers are mixed, as together grown;
> Both in thee are interwove in one (37-40).[24]

The unity of flesh and spirit, for Quarles, means that the physical world has a profound effect on the spiritual state of man, for better or for worse.

In this emphasis on the unity of flesh and spirit, Quarles works within the rich Anglican tradition (though again, not necessarily exclusively Anglican) of sacramentality. Beyond the official Sacraments of the church, Quarles saw all of nature as potentially sacramental. This means that, using Thomas Cartwright's definition of sacrament, by nature's "outward things done according to the ordinance of God, inward [i.e. spiritual] things being betokened, Christ and his benefits are offered to all."[25] While Puritans observed the sacraments as well (Cartwright is a Puritan, in fact), Quarles's sacramentality is of a distinctly Anglican strain. In *Anglican and Puritan: The Basis of Their Opposition*, John New differentiates between the two:

> By and large, the stated doctrines of Puritans and Anglicans were identical, yet their attitudes to the sacraments were radically dissimilar because their expectations of grace were remote from each other. Anglicans had a dynamic concept of sacramental power, and Puritans a static one.[26]

Quarles, in a very Anglican fashion, saw "in all the beauties of earth shadows of the more glorious realities in heaven by an analogy of ascent, for there was no fundamental dichotomy for him between nature and grace."[27] That is to say that the things of the natural world, though they may function as tempting distractions from seeking God, may also be miraculously taken into God's own grace and used by Him to draw man to Him. Thus, *contemptus mundi* and sacramentalism are integrated and harmonized: by becoming sacramental, the same facet of nature that one should hold in contempt as a stumbling block may now serve as a means of grace.

Perhaps Quarles's most famous and most sacramentally charged work is his book of *Emblemes*, originally published in 1635. The nature of emblems themselves, as Quarles understands them, is sacramental: they stand for and enact a meaning and reality beyond themselves. Quarles's definition of an emblem in his opening "To the Reader" clarifies this:

> An *Embleme* is but a silent Parable. Let not the tender Eye check, to see the allusion to our blessed Saviour figured in these Types. In holy Scripture, he is sometimes called a Sower; sometimes, a Fisher; sometimes a Physician: And why not presented so as well to the eye and eare? … And, indeed, what are the Heavens, the Earth, nay every Creature, but *Hieroglyphicks* and *Emblemes* of His Glory?[28]

For Quarles, all of the world may serve as an emblem, and therefore may be treated as "*sacramentalia* or quasi-sacramental": a sacred object that may serve as an aid to the Christian life.[29] For Quarles, his own emblems and poems especially may function as *sacramentalia*, since he is self-dedicated "to an exalted concept of divine poetry."[30] Quarles believes that the meeting of heaven and earth in his verse occurs not by his own excellence, just as the priest's personal ability does not sanctify the bread and wine of the Eucharist, but rather by God's grace.

The theme of a work being sanctified for and by God's grace, particularly poetry and emblems, is evident in the first lines of the opening "Invocation" of *Emblemes*:

> Rowze thee, my soul; and drein thee from the dregs
> Of vulgar thoughts: Skrue up the heightned pegs
> Of thy sublime Theorboe foure notes higher,
> And higher yet; that so, the shrill-mouth'd Quire
> Of swift-wing'd Seraphims may come and joyn,
> And make thy consort more than halfe divine.
> Invoke no Muse; Let heav'n be thy Apollo;
> And let his sacred influences hallow
> Thy high-bred strains (1-9).[31]

Here, Quarles enjoins his creative soul to rise from vulgarity and meet Heaven halfway in his composition. H. Neville Davies uses music theory to find this joining of heaven and earth: Quarles hopes that by raising "the pitch of his soul's 'sublime Theorboe'"—a bass lute designed to accompany choirs or play in concert—it may ascend halfway up "the heavenly register."[32] The "foure notes higher" that Quarles speaks of would be halfway up the octave on a musical scale (3). Thus, meeting the poet's half-ascent, "the 'swift-wing'd seraphims' may fly down to this mid-point and so 'may come and joyn' in his music."[33] Strikingly, four notes above the tonic pitch is not the *mechanical* midpoint between the earthly and heavenly registers; it is the *musical* mid-point. It places the poet a semi-tone higher than would a mechanical division, therefore making "the consort more than halfe divine" (6). Davies notes that this results in a pun: the music becomes both a "high-bred" and a "hybrid" strain.[34] It is a high-bred strain—"strain" both meaning music and depicting the tension in the tightened strings—for the heavenly qualities granted it in its tonal ascent. However, the song is also a hybrid strain, a new breed of art made of both the earthly and the divine. Doubtlessly the silent parables of his emblems, as well as the half-divine poems that strain towards heaven, attempt to serve as a means of God's grace by which He draws man to Himself. The inscription beneath his introductory emblem attests this:

> Reader, this Book shall teach the pious Heart
> To soar from Earth, and better Views impart;
> Flaming with Zeal to rise to Heav'n above,
> And make the Tri-une God the Object of its Love.[35]

Separating the Grain from the Chaff: Quarles's Reconciliation of Worlds

Some may see a tension between Quarles's *contemptus mundi* and his sacramentality. Perhaps a postlapsarian world that is "now degenerated" cannot serve as a means of grace.[36] Man may "be caught with pleasure to his own Soul's advantage," or he may be led astray by pleasures, but it seems contradictory to suggest that they may do both.[37] However, this is not a contradiction for Quarles, but rather a tension made navigable by the grace of God. Therefore, in terms of meal imagery, a table set with a single meal may simultaneously be understood either as a sacramental feast or as a spiritually entrapping bowl of stew.

Quarles comes to describe the former sort of feast in his lengthy poetical adaption of the story of Jonah, *A Feast for Wormes* (1620). In his customary address to the reader, he encourages his audience to "Wonder not at the Title (*A Feast for Wormes*:) for it is a *Song* of *Mercy*: What greater *Feast* than *Mercy*? And what are *Men* but *Wormes*?"[38] The degenerate worm, man, is thus enabled *by* mercy to partake in the great Feast *of* Mercy—the "*Paschall Lambe*, whose dearest *Blood* / Is soueraigne *Drinke*, whose *Flesh* is sauing *Food*" ("Proposition" 31-32).[39] Yet because man abides in such a worm-like state, Quarles invokes the fear that he is perhaps too lowly and appetitive to bring himself to the Feast of Mercy. Fortunately, to compel him to come, God uses man's hunger and the fleeting pleasures of the world themselves to draw man *beyond* worldly pleasure and into heavenly feasting. As Saint Augustine, whose works Quarles knew extensively, writes in his *On Christian Doctrine*, "this world must be used, not enjoyed" as an end unto itself "so the invisible things of God may be clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made—that is that by means of what is material and temporary we may lay hold upon that which is spiritual and eternal."[40]

Quarles writes in the "Meditatio duodecima," between sections twelve and thirteen of *A Feast for Wormes*, that "The pleasures of the world, (which soone abate) / Are liuely Emblems of our own estate" (1557-1558).[41] The transience of pleasures, even wholesome ones such as "a morning Sun" which "euery day is dun" (1583-1584), reminds man of his own state—his life is "contained in a span" (1570). In addition to revealing to man the brevity of his mortal life, the dissatisfaction found in worldly delights may increase man's appetite for the heavenly; they are a "golden dreame, / Which (waking) makes our wants the more extreme" (1575-1576). To adapt another phrase from Saint Augustine, not only is man's heart restless until he finds rest in God, but unrest in worldly pleasure stirs him all the more to find heavenly rest; "With his Thoughts he must enjoy God, or he can enjoy nothing, nor himself; for nothing will satisfie him but the Glory of his great Creator."[42]

Quarles concludes in his "Meditatio ultima" that when man orders his appetites towards God, he then may feast fully:

> Eate what thou can'st, and pocket up the rest:
> These precious viands are Restoritie,
> Eate then; and if the sweetnesse make thee drie,
> Drinke large Carouses out of Mercie's cup,
> The best lies in the bottome, Drinke all up:
> . . . Eat, and drinke thy fill (1758-62, 1765).[43]

However, this is not merely a depiction of the eternal heavenly feast. It is also provided "in time" where the "time of banqueting is short" and the "Banquet's now begun" (1767, 1769). Even in the fallen world, the emblematic pleasures of this life may be *sacramentalia* through which man may taste of the grace of God.[44] God uses worldly joys both to bring man into humility—in which he "howerly bemoanes / His dearest sinnes" and with a "gentle heart reformes"—and then to give him a "feast of Mercy, and of Grace" (1775-1777, 1771). This interpretation is expressed with elegance and clarity in Quarles's *Discourse of the Mortality of the Body, and Immortality, and Excellency of the Soul*:

> [Grace shines] in all Places of the World, and makes it self seen loved and adored by all Hearts, in all Ages for these all preceed from the glimmering and glances of God's Original Beauty, which is so amicable by

> it self, that as Corrupt as we are . . . Our poor Soul goes groping through all the Bodies, who environs it, searching for a Pleasure and Contentment, which should satisfie it, but no Pleasure nor Treasure can give the Soul true satisfaction, but God, who is the alone Sovereign Pleasure, which makes the Soul thus search after him and him alone it is we ought to regard.[45]

Francis Quarles's poetry and emblems vividly express the convergence of two seemingly antithetical streams of his theology. In his verse we see the integration of his *contemptus mundi* as well as his sense of the sacramentality of the whole of Creation. Rejecting the fleeting pleasures of the world, he places his hope in the Cross of Christ instead of his own transient state. However, Quarles also believes that the world and its pleasures may serve as means by which God's grace may work to draw mankind to Him; they are emblems through which man may experience, learn of, and receive the mercy of God. In doing so, he is saved from the dissatisfying indulgences of the world and given a taste of the heavenly Feast to come.

NOTES

[1] Höltgen, "Two Francis Quarleses," 134; Nethercot, "Literary Legend," 234.
[2] Höltgen and Horden, introduction to Emblemes and Hieroglyphikes, 2.
[3] Nethercot, "Literary Legend," 234.
[4] Höltgen, "Two Francis Quarleses," 134.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Ibid., 145.
[7] Wilcher, "Francis Quarles and the Crisis of Royalism," 254, 256.
[8] Ibid., 258.
[9] 1 John 2:15-16 (King James Version).
[10] Cats, *Self-conflict,* A4.
[11] Ibid.
[12] Genesis 25:29-34 (KJV).

[13] Galatians 6:14 (KJV).
[14] Quarles, "Galatians 6. 14," 290. Reproduced in appendix.
[15] Quarles, *Discourse*, 32.
[16] Quarles, "Galatians 6. 14," 291.
[17] Ecclesiastes 1:14 (New American Standard Bible and KJV, respectively).
[18] Matthew 16:24-26 (NASB). Cf. Galatians 5:24, Colossians 2:20-23.
[19] Quarles, *Emblems divine and moral,* 120. See appendix for a copy of the emblem.
[20] Campbell, *Fortune's Wheel,* 41.
[21] Ibid.
[22] Ibid., 42.
[23] Quarles, *Discourse*, 34.
[24] If Quarles is not in fact the author, we can at least presume he is in agreement with the concluding emblem and poem, for it complements the lengthy work that he translated. See Cats, *Self-conflict,* 109.
[25] Cartwright, Treatise of Christian Religion, 212, quoted in Davies, *Worship and Theology,* 62.
[26] New, *Anglican and Puritan,* 68.
[27] Davies, *Worship and Theology,* 71.
[28] Quarles, *Emblemes in Complete Works,* 45.
[29] Davies, *Worship and Theology*, 63.
[30] Höltgen, "Two Francis Quarleses," 142.
[31] Quarles, *Emblemes in Complete Works,* 46.
[32] Davies, "Quarles's Hybrid Strain," 267, 268.
[33] Ibid., 267.
[34] Ibid., 267-268.
[35] Quarles, *Emblems*, 8. See appendix for copy of emblem.
[36] Quarles, *Emblemes in Complete Works,* 47.
[37] Cats, *Self-conflict*, A5.
[38] Quarles, *A Feast for Wormes,* in Complete Works, 5.
[39] Ibid., 6 (emphasis in original).
[40] Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, ed. James J. O'Donnell, chap. 4. Quarles quotes Augustine repeatedly in his *Discourse.*
[41] Ibid., 23.
[42] Quarles, *Discourse*, 37-38.
[43] Quarles, *A Feast for Wormes*, 25.

[44] The greatest "course" of this feast, so to speak, is obviously the Eucharist. It is undoubtedly the most important sacrament in Anglicanism, and the sacramentalia of the world cannot for Quarles be equated to it. However, I believe that Quarles suggests that the entirety of the emblematic creation may serve as a portion of the grace-filled feast he describes.
[45] Quarles, *Discourse*, 58-59.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Augustine. *On Christian Doctrine*. In *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, Vol. 2 (St. Augustin's City of God and Christian Doctrine)*. Edited by Philip Schaff. Buffalo: The Christian Literature Co., 1887.

Campbell, Elizabeth A. *Fortune's Wheel: Dickens and the Iconography of Women's Time*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2003.

Cartwright, Thomas. *A Treatise of Christian Religion or The Whole Bodie and substance of Divinitie*. Imprinted by Felix Kyngston for Thomas Man, 1616.

Cats, Jacob. *Self-conflict, or, The Powerful Motions between the Flesh & Spirit*. Translated by Francis Quarles. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1973.

Davies, Horton. *Worship and Theology in England Volume I-II: From Cranmer to Baxter and Fox, 1534-1690*. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1996.

Davies, H. Neville. "Quarles's Hybrid Strain." *English Language Notes* 4, no. 4 (1967): 266-68.

Höltgen, Karl Josef. "Two Francis Quarleses: The Emblem Poet And The Suffolk Parson." *English Manuscript Studies 1100-1700* 7 (1998): 131-61.

Höltgen, Karl Josef, and John Horden. *Introduction to Emblemes and Hieroglyphickes of the Life of Man*. New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 1993.

Nethercot, Arthur H. "The Literary Legend of Francis Quarles." *Modern Philology* 20, no. 3 (1923): 225-40.

New, John F.H. *Anglican and Puritan: The Basis of Their Opposition, 1558-1640*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1964.

Quarles, Francis. *Emblemes*. In *The Complete Works in Prose and Verse of Francis Quarles*: *Vol. III*. Edited by Alexander B. Grosart. New York: AMS Press, 1967.

———. *Emblems divine and moral: together with Hieroglyphics of the life of man*. London, 1778. *Eighteenth Century Collections Online*. Gale facsimile e-book, Document #CW122242895.

———. *A Feast for Wormes*. In *The Complete Works in Prose and Verse of Francis Quarles: Vol. II*. Edited by Alexander B. Grosart. New York: AMS Press, 1967.

———. "Galatians 6. 14." In *Chapters into Verse: Poetry in English Inspired by the Bible, Vol. II*. Edited by Robert Atwan and Laurance Wieder. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

———. "On Jacob's Purchase." In *Chapters into Verse: Poetry in English Inspired by the Bible, Vol. I*. Edited by Robert Atwan and Laurance Wieder. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

———. *A short Discourse of the Mortality of the Body, and Immortality, and Excellency of the Soul*. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1966.

Wilcher, Robert. "Francis Quarles and the Crisis of Royalism." *Critical Survey* 5, no. 3 (1993): 252-62.

APPENDIX

On Jacob's Purchase

How poor was Jacob's motion, and how strange
His offer! How unequal was th' exchange!
A mess of porridge for inheritance?
Why could not hungry Esau strive t' enhance
His price a little? So much underfoot?
Well might he give him bread and drink to boot:
An easy price! The case is even our own;
For toys we often sell our Heaven, our Crown.

Galatians 6. 14

Can nothing settle my uncertain breast
And fix my rambling love?
Can my affections find out nothing blessed?
But still and still remove?
Has earth no mercy? Will no ark of rest
Receive my restless dove?
Is there no good, than which there's nothing higher,
To bless my full desire
With joys that never change; with joys that never expire?

I wanted wealth; and at my dear request
Earth lent a quick supply;
I wanted mirth to charm my sullen breast;
And who more brisk than I?
I wanted fame to glorify the rest;
My fame flew eagle-high:
My joy not fully ripe, but all decayed;
Wealth vanished like a shade,
My mirth began to flag, my fame began to fade.

The world's an ocean, hurried to and fro
With every blast of passion:
Her lustful streams, when either ebb or flow,
Are tides of man's vexation:

They alter daily, and they daily grow
    The worse by alteration:
The earth's a cask full-tunned, yet wanting measure;
    Her precious wind, is pleasure;
Her yeast is honor's puff; her lees are worldly treasure.

My trust is in the Cross: let beauty flag
    Her loose, her wanton sail;
Let countenance-gilding honor cease to brag
    In courtly terms, and veil;
Let ditch-bred wealth henceforth forget to wag
    Her base though golden tail;
False beauty's conquest is but reall loss,
    And wealth but golden dross;
Best honor's but a blast: my trust is in the Cross.

My trust is in the Cross: There lies my rest;
    My fast, my sole delight:
Let cold-mouthed Boreas, or hot-mouthed East
    Blow till they burst with spite:
Let earth and hell conspire their worst, their best,
    And join their twisted might:
Let showers of thunderbolts dart down and wound me,
    And troops of fiends surround me,
All this may well confront; all this shall never confound me.

In Cruce ſtat ſecurus Amor.

'Tis thus alone, Security we prove;
While on the bleſsed Croſs we rest our Love.

Emblem for "Galatians 6. 14"

Reader, this Book shall teach the pious Heart
To soar from Earth, and better Views impart;
Flaming with Zeal to rise to Heav'n above,
And make the Tri-une God the Object of its Love.

Introductory Emblem for *Emblems*

"Meditatio duodecima" from A Feast for Wormes

The pleasures of the world, (which soon abate)
Are liuely Emblems of our owne estate,
Which (Like a Banquet at a Fun'rall show)
But sweeten griefe, and serue to flatter woe.
Pleasure is fleeting still, and makes no stay,
It lends a smile or twaine, and steales away:
Man's life is fickle, full of winged haste,
It mocks the sense with ioy, and soone does waste.
Pleasure does crowne thy youth, and lulls thy wants,
But (sullen age approching) straight auaunts:
Man's life is Ioy, and Sorry seeks to banish,
It doth lament and mourne in age, and vanish.
The time of pleasure's like the life of Man;
Both ioyfull, both contained in a span;
Both highly priz'd, and both on sudden lost,
When most we trust them, they deceiue us most;
What fit of madnesse makes us loue them thus?
We leaue our liues, and pleasure leaueth us:
Why what are Pleasures? But a golden dreame,
Which (waking) makes our wants the more extreme?
And what is Life? A bubble full of care,
Which (prickt by death) straight empties into ayre:
The flowers (clad in farre mor rich array,
Then e're was Salomon) doe soone decay;
What thing more sweet, or fairer then a flower?
Nath'les, it blooms, and fades within an howre;
What greater pleasure then a morning Sun?
And yet this pleasure euery day is dun:
But thou art heire to Croesus, and thy treasure
Being great, and endlesse, endlesse is thy pleasure;
But thou (thou Croesus' heire) consider must,
Thy wealth, and thou, came from, and goes to dust;
Another's noble, and his name is great,
And takes his place upon a lofty seat;
True 'tis, but yet his many wants are such,
That better 'twere he were not knowne so much.
Another binds his soule in Hymen's knot,

His Spouse is chaste, unblemisht with a spot,
But yet his comfort is bedasht, and done,
His grounds are stock't, and now he wants a sonne.
How fickle, and unconstant's man's Estate!
Man faine would haue, but hen he knows not what;
And hauing, rightly knows not how to prise it,
But like that foolish Dunghill-cock imploys it:
But who desires to lieu a life content,
Wherein his Cruze of joy shall ne'er be spent,
With fierce pursuit, let him that good desire,
Whose date no change, no Fortune can expire:
For that's not worth the crauing, to obtaine
A happinesse, that must be lost againe;
Nor that which most doe couet most, is best;
Best are the goods, mixt with contented rest;
Gasp not for Honour, wish no blazing glory,
For these will perish in an age's story;
Nor yet for pow'r, power may be caru'd
To fooles, as well as thee, that hast deseru'd.
Thirst not for Lands, nor Mony; wish for none,
For Wealth is neither lasting, nor our owne:
Riches are faire inticements, to deceiue us;
They flatter, while we liue, and dying, leaue us.

This paper attempts to expand the focus of current Bede scholarship from his interest in linguistic diversity and unity to encompass Bede's broader theological purpose in his political and religious writings. Bede's pneumatology, in particular, is central to his conception of the Church, which appears most frequently in the metaphor of building God's house. This paper will explore the Pentecost, Creation, Noah's Ark, and Babel narratives as they relate to the metaphor of building God's house, especially as demonstrations of the importance of language and love as the tools of the Holy Spirit.

Bede's Pneumatology: Establishing God's House on Earth

Erika Smith

The Venerable Bede, by all accounts the first major scholar amongst the Anglo-Saxons, is most famous for his *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*. As a monk, Bede hoped, in all aspects of his work, to further the national and ecclesiastical unity of the English people. While his interest in establishing spiritual and national unity through language has received a great deal of scholarly attention, ultimately language is only one element of the unity promoted by Bede's broader pneumatology, the full scope of which has been largely overlooked in critical discourse.[1] This study intends to examine Bede's pneumatology by tracing his continual insistence on the Holy Spirit's coequal creative status with the Father and Son in relation to the motif of the establishment of God's house.

Because Bede read Scripture canonically, meaning that he interpreted all the various parts of Scripture as in dialogue with one another toward a consensus, a coherent understanding of his pneumatology can only be reached by considering his commentaries in relation to one another. Accordingly, the motif of building God's house will be explored in reference to Bede's discussions of Pentecost, Creation, 1 Peter 2, Noah's Ark, and the Tower of Babel. Each of these narratives represents for Bede an essential instance of the Spirit at work among God's people. At the same time, Bede's treatment of each narrative demonstrates the continuity of his pneumatology throughout his corpus as a whole by presenting a complementary but distinct manifestation of the Holy Spirit's power. The motif of the Spirit as the founder and sanctifier of God's house is so prevalent throughout the corpus of Bede's exegetical work that this paper will limit itself in scope to the tropological and allegorical levels of interpretation in the few key passages listed previously.[2]

Before discussing Bede's historical account of Pentecost, it will be necessary to consider the various levels of scriptural interpretation he employs, particularly in regard to his early commentary on Acts.[3] More literal than Bede's subsequent commentaries, it establishes a useful framework for understanding the motifs and doctrines central to Bede's pneumatological exegesis. Next, this study will trace the motif of building God's house as Bede addresses it in his exegetical commentary on the accounts of Creation (Gen 1–2), 1 Peter 2, Noah's Ark (Gen 6–8), followed by the Tower of Babel (Gen 11). These narratives treat, respectively, God's creation of earth and humankind, sanctification of believers, unity of the church, and the humble use of language that furthers unity, all in relation to God's house. Having developed the theme of building God's house by exploring Bede's work canonically (in imitation of Bede's own view of Scripture), this paper will return to Pentecost in Bede's hymn "In Die Sancto Pentecostes" to explore the influence of his pneumatology on its form and content.

Levels of Scriptural Interpretation

Bede himself provides a clear explication of the levels of Scriptural interpretation as they refer to the house of God:

> In Holy Scripture there are three levels of meaning: namely, the historical [*historicus*], the typological [*allegoricus*], and the anagogical [*anagogicus*]. For example: *I have loved, O Lord, the beauty of your house*. On the historical level David desired the beauty of the house, which Solomon made for the Lord, to remain inviolable, praising him in it to his people. On the typological level he desired the beauty of the holy Church, to whom the Apostle says, "For you are the temple of God," to shine through the whole world. On the

> anagogical level, that is, the sense leading to higher things, he wished to see the beauty of the house of the heavenly fatherland, which is, of course, not made by the hand of man, but is eternal in heaven.[4]

The work of the Holy Spirit in building God's literal house on earth (the Tabernacle followed by the Temple) is implicit in Bede, as it is in standard patristic exegesis, and needs little explanation. Likewise the anagogical interpretation of Scripture is implied throughout all of Bede's exegesis, since for Bede, heaven signified the unity of the souls of believers with God and the fulfillment of the virtuous Christian life. In contrast to the historical and anagogical levels, the allegorical interpretation of Scripture in Bede's writing is more complex, and thus this paper will treat it more extensively. This study will also focus on an additional level of interpretation that Bede omits from the passage presented above, although he discusses it in *De schematibus et tropis*: the tropological or moral [*moralis*].[5] The tropological understanding of God's house consists of the necessity for individual believers to prepare themselves as suitable dwellings and servants of God. Consequently, this study will focus primarily on the tropological and allegorical interpretations of God's house because they are more dependent on the system of imagery concerning the Holy Spirit, primarily relating to God's work displayed throughout his creation.

Pentecost and the Early Church

Bede's *Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* was one of his first, written between 709 and 716 C.E., and represents an early stage of his Trinitarian theology and emphasis on the work of the Holy Spirit.[6] Previous scholars have noted that Bede identified strongly with the position of the new church in Acts, which is likely the reason he interacted most frequently with the book of Acts throughout his career as an exegete. One common objection to many of Bede's later commentaries concerns the contrast between their much more allegorical style and his more historical *Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. This shift in focus occurs primarily because in *Acts* Bede seeks to shed light on the literal gift of the Spirit at Pentecost and the effects of the Spirit at that time, and after having done so he is able to relate these events allegorically to the Old Testament.[7] Bede's exegesis of the miracle of Pentecost introduces four crucial themes in connection with his pneumatology and the establishment of the house of God: the house, the upper room, and both fire and language as the means of construction.

The allegorical motif of building the house of God on earth originates with Bede's *Commentary on Acts* in the form of the literal house in which the disciples and their companions were gathered on the day of Pentecost. Bede accepts this figure as a matter of course and proceeds to elaborate on Peter's reference to Christ as the cornerstone of the house in Acts 4:11. Peter recites the Scripture, "This is the stone which was rejected by you, the builders, which is become the head of the corner," drawing from Psalm 118:22, which Christ references himself in Matthew 21:42, Mark 12:10, and Luke 20:17. Isaiah 28:16 contains the same concept but adds that the stone will be laid "in the foundations of Sion, a tried stone, a corner stone, a precious stone, founded in the foundation" (Douay-Rheims Version). This additional material is the basis for Bede's claim that the cornerstone "embraces two walls" and that "God by himself placed this [stone] at the chief position in the corner so that from two testaments and two peoples there might rise up a building of one and the same faith."[8] Bede writes again in one of his later commentaries that "just as a cornerstone joins two walls, so the Lord has united to himself the people of the Jews and gentiles in one company of faith," namely, the Church.[9]

In his subsequent discussion of Christ as the living stone (*lapidem vivum*) in 1 Peter 2:4 and in 2:7 as the corner stone (*lapis . . . caput anguli*), Bede again hearkens to the same passages of Scripture Christ cited, this time concluding that the original texts of Isaiah and Psalms could not have referred to the materials for "the building of some earthly house." Instead, Bede asserts that the sense of the passages always referred to Christ, who "deigned to insert himself into the building of his holy Church that he might strengthen it."[10]

Having established that the Church of God might be understood as God's house and that Christ is the cornerstone or foundation, Bede's commentary on Acts 1:13 connects the imagery of the house with the Holy Spirit, both tropologically and allegorically. The Vulgate reads, *Et cum introissent, in cenaculum ascenderunt ubi manebant* [And when they had entered (Jerusalem), they went up to the upper room where they were staying]. Bede explains: "[Luke] designates a place in the upper [part of the house] because having already been raised up from an earthly way of life [*conversationem*] they had mounted up to greater heights of knowledge and virtue."[11] It is significant that Bede says "having already been raised up . . . they had mounted up to greater heights," meaning that even before receiving the gifts of the Spirit they had grown in virtue. Additionally, concerning Acts 2:1 Bede declares that on the day of Pentecost the Apostles and their companions were *omnes pariter in eodem loco* [all in the same place], which he takes to be "in the upper room to which they had gone up." These are vital details, Bede asserts, because "whoever desires to be filled with the Holy Spirit must transcend the abode of the flesh by contemplation of the mind."[12] In essence, not only does Bede think believers should separate themselves from earthly things before receiving the Holy Spirit, but they should also begin the process of building virtues in order to merit the gift of the Holy Spirit.

Bede's use of the word *conversatio* in his comment on Acts 3:13 also warrants attention as the same root appears in various forms in his exegesis of Acts 1:3, 1:20, 2:1, 10:9a, and 24:27. While the instance in Acts 3:13 means something like "way of life," in Acts 1:3 Bede refers to the time Christ spent with his disciples: "by this forty-day period of association [*conversationem*] with his disciples, he signified that by his hidden presence he would fulfill what he had promised—*Behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world*."[13] By his Spirit the Word would remain perpetually present to his followers. Likewise, Bede regards the indwelling of the Word by the Spirit as the gift that makes man capable of *conversatio* with the Trinity, in which he could not otherwise participate. It is also significant that the term *conversatio* does not occur in the biblical texts Bede comments upon, but in each case Bede's commentary highlights this concept. The implications of Bede's choice of this term will be more fully discussed in relation to his commentary on Creation.

The concept of *conversatio* unites Bede's emphases on the imagery of the house and the upper room, which represent participation with the Trinity, with the spiritual gifts of language and affection. Bede interprets the miraculous tongues of fire and the wind at Pentecost as the means by which the Holy Spirit establishes and supports God's house. The description of the event in Acts follows:

> [2]And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a mighty wind coming, and it filled the whole house where they were sitting. [3]And there appeared to them parted tongues as it were of fire, and it sat upon every one of them: [4]and they were all filled with

> the Holy Ghost, and they began to speak with divers tongues, according as the Holy Ghost gave them to speak. (Douay-Rheims Version)[14]

Bede relies almost wholly on Gregory the Great for his interpretation of Acts 2:2, although he then grafts the ideas into his own formulation of the tongues of fire and the wind as the means of founding and sanctifying the house of God. Gregory explained, "The Lord appeared indeed through fire, but by his own interior [presence] he caused speech to be produced" with the purpose that "those who in their bodies perceived fire and sound might indeed be taught in their hearts by invisible fire and by a voice without sound."[15] The connection between the Spirit's "voice without sound" and the Apostles' ability to speak in many languages encapsulates Bede's conviction that the Spirit inspired communication of God's Word and facilitated the unity of the Church through translation and the shared "invisible fire" in the hearts of all believers. Bede asserts that by filling those in the house, the Spirit indicated "that the holy church, when it had spread to the ends of the earth, was to speak in the languages of all nations." The Spirit caused those he filled to "burn because of him and to speak about him," which for Bede indicates that the fire is the love of God.[16] Thus, the coming of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost established the Church by signifying that the Spirit's resting place was among God's saints, and at the same time provided gifts of the Spirit, symbolized by the fire and wind, as the means for enabling unity within diversity in the "two walls" of the Church.[17]

Creation

Within Bede's exegesis of the Genesis creation account, two events in particular highlight the participation of the Holy Spirit, namely, the creation of the earth and the creation of mankind. The Spirit of God plays an active role in the creation of both of these entities, both of which, according to the canonical understanding of Bede's exegesis, can be understood as God's dwelling place.

In terms of the earth constituting God's house, Bede explicates his pneumatology through imagery of building and vivifying God's creation. Bede introduces the motif of building at the very start of his commentary, under Genesis 1:1. When humans build a house, he says,

> We prepare the building materials, and after this beginning we dig down into the earth; then we set stones into the foundation, and then we build up the walls with rising courses of stone; and so, progressing slowly, we come to the completion of the work that has been planned.[18]

At each step God's process was distinct from that followed by humans. For instance, God had no need to observe those steps in his creation of the world because he is omnipotent, declares Bede; for God "to have willed is to have done." Bede's concept of creation as the house God built even influences his use of other exegetical sources. For instance, Bede quotes St. Clement only once in *On Genesis*, and the central insight of the borrowed passage is that:

> God created heaven and earth like a structure . . . and he divided the fabric of the whole world, although it is one structure, into two regions. This was the reason for the division, so that the upper region would serve as a home for the angels and the lower for men.[19]

In keeping with this motif, Bede explicates Genesis 1:2 by saying that "the whole Trinity at once worked together in the creation of the world," and that the Holy Spirit in particular arranged created things "according to its own will, rather like a workman whose intended design is customarily transferred to the things which are constructed."[20] To support this reading, Bede quotes Psalm 33:6, *verbo Domini caeli facti sunt et spiritu oris eius omnis ornatus eorum* [By the word of the Lord the heavens were established; and all the power of them by the spirit of his mouth (Douay-Rheims)]. Thus, although for God "to have willed is to have done," Bede identifies the Holy Spirit in particular as the one who transfers the designs to the materials, acting in partnership with the other members of the Trinity to create the structure. The twofold nature of the structure of creation borrowed from St. Clement contributes to the implicit anagogical sense of the house of God, since Bede elsewhere quotes 2 Corinthians 5:1, "the earthly house in which [the saints] dwell may be destroyed, they have a building from God, an eternal house in heaven not made by human hands."

In addition to earth, Bede's exegesis also interprets man himself as the house of God from the moment of creation because the Spirit imparts to him the image of God. In his exegesis of 1 Peter 3:18, Bede asserts in reaction to the Arian controversy that the Holy Trinity is coequal, especially because Father, Son, and Holy Spirit vivify the spirit of man, and as such "the substance or essence of those whose operation is one cannot be unequal."[21] Quickening, described in Genesis, involves receiving the breath of life (*spiraculum vitae*) from God. The breath also seems to confer the image of God to man by the power of the Spirit. The breath of life (*spiraculum vitae*) in Bede's text has the same root as the term for the Spirit of God (*spiritus Dei*)—the same word used for the spirit of man (*spiritus*). Thus, Bede understood that the Spirit of God effectively fashioned man's soul and spirit in God's image, and because of that work is understood to be the "life-bringer."[22]

Such a connection only heightens the significance of Pentecost in conjunction with the incarnation and resurrection of Christ, because Bede also believed that even though man was made in the image of God, he lost that likeness and the life conferred by it when Adam "corrupted this most beautiful newness of the divine image in himself by sinning."[23] For that reason Pentecost constituted a renewal of that "which we lost in our first parent," bestowed again by the "grace of the same Creator."[24] Bede's exegesis of the creation of man is consistent with his sources in affirming the power of God's Spirit to consecrate the image of God in men. Gregory's statement that the wind signified the Lord's "interior presence," the voice without sound beginning to teach the believers, aligns with Bede's exegesis of the creation narrative by confirming that the image of God lost at the fall of Adam and Eve was once again imparted by the Spirit at Pentecost. Bede agrees with Gregory's interpretation that believers belong to God, "in the sense that through his Spirit we are both created by his will and re-created by his adoption."[25]

Thus, Bede's exegesis of the creation of man illuminates another level of significance in his interpretation of the miracle at Pentecost. The wind that enters the house where the disciples and their companions are praying is likewise called *spiritus*, signifying simultaneously the presence of the Holy Spirit and the conferral of the breath of life again upon the assembled believers. However, this emphasis is certainly not original to the Latin versions of the text Bede depended on. The Greek text of Acts 2:2 says that a great wind (πνοή) filled the house, and that the disciples were filled with the Holy Spirit (πνεῦμα ἁγίου). The same root for "breathe" or "blow" (πνέω) is likewise found in the Septuagint, Genesis 2:7, when God breathed into man the breath of life (πνοὴν ζωῆς) and made man a rational and immortal living soul (ψυχὴν ζῶσαν). The same interchangeability is not quite found in the Hebrew, in which the Spirit of God is רוּח (*rûach*), whereas the creation of man in Genesis 2:7 utilizes the word נָפַח (*nâphach*) for "God breathed," and נְשָׁמָה (*neshâmâh*) for the breath (of life) given to make man a living soul. Thus Bede is aware that at Pentecost, the Spirit of God again gave men the breath of life, which on a tropological level means that since "we were created in the image of our Creator as far as concerns the essence of the breath of life, . . . we should fear to destroy the same image that is in us by sinning."[26] Thus, the breath of life given by the Spirit at Pentecost is connected linguistically and figuratively to the creation of mankind, which marks Pentecost as a re-creation or renewal of Creation.

The image of God conveyed by the *spiraculum*, or breath, as understood by Bede, is rational in the sense of being capable of *conversatio*, more particularly to "enjoy the knowledge of the One who created all things" by means of the power of word and language.[27] It is likewise significant for Bede that God creates man through deliberative action, "Let us make man in our image and likeness."[28] This emphasis leads him to quote Gregory the Great, saying, "[Man] is formed from the earth as if by study, and he is raised up by the breath of the Creator through the power of the vital Spirit," so that again the plans of the Creator are put into effect by the Spirit.[29] Moreover, in reference to 1 Peter 1:24-25, Bede writes that "the word of the Lord . . . gives eternal life in the body and soul at the same time to those whom it creates anew from water," again emphasizing that after sinning, man had to be re-created by the baptism of the Spirit. As such, Bede comments on 1 Peter 1:12 that God, "for the sake of human salvation, sent to the earth his spirit, . . . and poured him forth to enlighten the minds of the faithful." This light was the Spirit's majesty and glory "just as that of the Father himself and of the Son, which is undoubtedly the same."[30] Pentecost's place in Bede's theology can be more fully understood by placing it in dialogue with his exegesis of the creation of man and earth, and by recognizing the Spirit's establishment of the Church and the restoration of the image of God in man as rebuilding the house of God by grace after all was lost by man's sin. The examination of Bede's exegeses of

Pentecost and creation established the basis for the tropological and allegorical manifestations of God's house—the Church and believers themselves—which will be unified in 1 Peter 2.

1 Peter 2

Bede most fully explores the tropological manifestation of the building metaphor in his exegesis of 1 Peter 2, in the sense that individual believers are enlightened and kindled by the Spirit so that they become living stones in the house of God. The tropological force of the house motif is strongest in Bede's interpretation of Paul's injunction that believers make themselves worthy to be incorporated into the structure by reception of the Spirit: "And you yourselves as living stones are built up, a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ."[31] Believers deserve the name "living stones," Bede says, in order to indicate the "struggle of good intent or action in which they ought always to be engaged with the grace of God preceding and accompanying them."[32] In this way the stones of God's house are not like physical stones, which "cannot help the builder's work in any way and can do nothing but fall," because believers may work together with Christ to build his house, "with the help of his grace, namely, by living soberly and righteously and godly."[33] In this way, Bede complements the introduction of the building motif from Genesis 1:1 where he indicates that God does not build as human builders, indicating here that the materials are likewise not the same as those employed by human builders. Bede therefore concludes that "anyone who with his gift [of grace] and help takes care to press on untiringly in his good works is being built by Christ as a living stone into his house," and strives "to labor diligently lest he have received the grace of God in vain."[34] As with stones in a physical wall, Bede points out, those whom the Holy Spirit equips to be teachers support those who come after them in the effort to live virtuously by the tools of the Word and love, although all depend ultimately on the foundation of Christ.

Only through the striving of each individual stone can the whole structure be built into "one house of Christ made up of all the elect angels and human beings."[35] Bede goes on to clarify that although there are many "churches," there is one Church. This comment is one of Bede's explicit acknowledgments that both linguistic diversity and geographic distance are permissible in God's house because the members possess unified purpose. On the other hand, any who reject Christ as the capstone, "just as they rejected him when they were building their actions by being unwilling to lay him in the foundation of their heart," so also will Christ "be unwilling to accept [them] into the building of his house which is in heaven."[36] In this schema, the moral injunctions set out by Bede's exegesis are twofold: to accept Christ as the foundation for one's individual actions and to strive to increase in virtue in order to be worthy of the grace bestowed by the Holy Spirit. The one house of God can only be accomplished if individual believers become "spiritual houses" themselves, restoring with the Spirit's help the damage done at the fall of Adam and Eve. The exact nature of the striving of believers is more thoroughly allegorized in accordance with its various forms and levels in Bede's exegesis of Noah's Ark.

Noah's Ark

The narrative of Noah's ark held a particular interest for Bede in relation to the condition of God's house on earth. While in 1 Peter 2 Bede emphasizes the responsibilities of individual believers in building God's house, Bede explores the physical construction of the ark to demonstrate the states of holiness amongst believers in the Church and the centrality of the work of the Holy Spirit in building God's house.[37]

The various levels of the ark specifically hark back to Bede's discussions of creation and the upper room at Pentecost. The shape of the ark allegorically represents the condition of the Church on earth:

> For just as the ark was broader in the lower parts, where it is thought to have held the animals, it was narrower in the upper parts where it contained the men and the birds, until it reached one cubit at the top, so the Church has in it more unspiritual than spiritual persons.[38]

Bede, writing in the early period of the English church, recognized that in his culture the majority of the people lived in the secular status, guided by a smaller number of more spiritual persons responsible for teaching them. The difference between the various states for him was analogous to the differences between the animals and men on the ark, primarily in the sense that those on the lowest levels were still subject to earthly desires while the more spiritual sought virtue and heavenly *conversatio*. Bede repeats God's command to Noah in building the ark, "Middle storeys [*cenacula*] and third storeys [*tristega*] shall you make in it."[39] Bede interprets the etymology of the phrases employed in describing the ark to show the importance of specificity in the plans. Rooms "were made in the ark so that living creatures of unlike kind would remain in various separate places," meaning allegorically that the Church would be equipped with the proper structure so that those more virtuous would instruct the rest and edify the whole building.[40] This formulation echoes the correlation of height and virtue in Bede's emphasis on the importance of the company of believers praying in the upper room (*cenaculum*) at Pentecost. Later, Peter's movement to the upper part of the house to pray also serves as an allegory of the Church which leaves behind worldly desires and signifies her *conversatio* in heaven.[41]

All of the various levels of faith cohere in one building for Bede in the same way that Noah's schematic for the ark must logically have been the best arrangement for the animals and humans. It follows from Bede's recognition that "the ark plainly signifies the Church, [and] Noah signifies the Lord who builds the Church in his saints," that the plans for the shape of the ark signify the work of the Holy Spirit in building the church.[42] The 50 cubit breadth of the ark Bede interprets as a reference to the Holy Spirit, corresponding with the 50 days before Pentecost. The length of the ark, 300 cubits, corresponds to the love of God diffused into the hearts of believers by the Holy Spirit. Finally, the height of the ark, 30 cubits, signifies the hope of the elect, which is that they may ascend to the contemplation of the holy Trinity, which was demonstrated in 1 Peter 2 to be enabled by the ministrations of the Spirit.[43] In these ways, the Holy Spirit is responsible for the shaping the house of God, and his purpose permeates the structure of the Church in ways similar to the plans implemented by Noah on the ark.

The Tower of Babel

Having considered the instances of the Spirit's role in vivifying man and establishing the house of God in the Pentecost, Creation, 1 Peter 2, and Noah's ark narratives, this paper has demonstrated how important the concepts of language, word, and *conversatio* were for

Bede in relation to humanity. More importantly, these concepts were crucial to understanding the indwelling image of God in mankind. As Robert Stanton notes, Bede in his account of Babel "does not dwell on the literal fact of Pentecost, namely universal comprehension of languages; instead, he skirts the language issue by allegorizing it into the one language of faith."[44] Indeed, for Bede, the primary significance of Pentecost was the all-important establishment of God's house on earth, his Church, and language constituted only one manifestation of that establishment. Likewise, Bede's discussion of Babel was principally concerned with the prideful abuse of communication and human unity which led to divine punishment, incidentally represented by the division of languages.

Given the discrepancy between the unity of those who share a "language of faith" and the division of the people at Babel, Bede is particularly interested in allegorizing the structural differences between the Church and the Tower of Babel. Bede begins by allegorizing the difference in building materials used for the Tower of Babel and the house of God: the tower was built of bricks, which Bede says represent "muddy, dirty, and earthly deeds," while the Church, which Bede connects to Jerusalem, is made of stone.[45] Again Bede affirms that the living stones of 1 Peter 2 are "souls strong in faith and deed" by the power of the Holy Spirit. The folly of the people at Babel is evident, Bede says, in the fact that "they are attempting to build the whiteness of innocence, the strength of faith, and the harmony of brotherhood, with the argumentative bricks of disputation."[46] Here again Bede implements the motif of building God's house in connection with the composition of the building materials.

The character of the metaphorical building materials in the case of both Babel and the Church is equally dependent on the use made of language. Bede contrasts the unity of language employed to demonstrate love at Pentecost, featured here as the proper material for establishing God's Church, with the bricks of the Tower of Babel which are dependent on the "composition and ornamentation of secular eloquence, whether fallacious philosophy or heretical subtlety."[47] Secular eloquence characteristically abuses the unity of language in order to manipulate people without regard to the unity of the people in love. In contrast, as Bernard F. Huppé recognizes, Bede imitates Augustine in his recognition that Christian rhetoric depends on Scripture, "in whatever language it is properly translated, [as] the human image of divine eloquence."[48]

Christian rhetoric, then, ought to be the opposite of secular rhetoric in that the Holy Spirit makes communication within the Church possible even through diversity of languages.

Bede clarifies that the Church, depicted as Jerusalem, which Bede calls the "Vision of Peace," uses language only to further unity and not as an end in itself. Indeed, God

> Sent the grace of the Holy Spirit to confer on [the believers] the knowledge of all languages, so that, imbued with these, they might summon all the peoples speaking different languages to the construction with one accord of that holy city, that is, the Church of Christ.[49]

Translation and speech in and of themselves are of no value, Bede ultimately concludes, unless "with the diversity of languages made one, the peoples gathered *from every nation which is under heaven* [echo back] the praises and miracles of God with one single and undivided confession and faith."[50] Thus language is only useful insofar as it furthers the raising of the *conversatio* of those on earth to participate in God's praise; but as long as believers share a unified purpose, the disparity of languages is immaterial. By supplying language, the Holy Spirit provides the Church with mortar to "bind [believers] mutually with the tie of love."[51]

The tongues of fire over the disciples, representing *caritas*, reappear in Bede's allegorical reading of Jerusalem in contrast to the Tower of Babel: "As long as men remain in this light," meaning the light shed by God's Holy Spirit, "they are of one tongue and of the same speech, because truly the confession of faith is one, and purity of action is the same, as is universal love and the hope of eternal things; because all who are steadfast in Christ are illuminated."[52] The mortar of God's house is the shared purpose of love of the same God, illuminated by the Holy Spirit as figured by the tongues of fire. It is also the speech in many languages, bestowed by the *spiritus* to those in the house, as the means of praising God and urging others on toward a better *conversatio* with the Trinity.

In Die Sancto Pentecostes

Bede's hymn *In Die Sancto Pentecostes* strengthens his depiction of the role of the Spirit in the Church by engaging the same motifs of language, love, and the Church as one structure explored throughout his biblical exegesis.[53] (The Latin text of the hymn and a translation are attached in Appendix A.)[54] As F. J. E. Raby writes, "[Bede] was above all a student of history and theology, and a teacher, whose aim it was to equip his pupils with the knowledge necessary both to salvation and to the understanding of Christian theology and history."[55] Bede's hymn on Pentecost communicates his belief that the gift of the Spirit of God allows for unity of the Church on earth, not only eschatologically. This unity is not dependent on gathering in a central physical location, as with the Temple or even the Anglo-Saxon lord's hall, but instead the "truly holy city, true vision of peace" came about "When into one heart / The light of faith gathered the many" (stanza 14). As concluded in the discussion of the Tower of Babel, the mortar that unifies the Church is both love and the knowledge of the glory of God, which is illuminated by the gift of language:

> Sweetest grace came with a sound,
> And most fervent grace
> Came in flaming vision
> Shining from on high.
>
> Which grace is accustomed
> To illuminate us by the flame
> Of knowledge and by the torch of
> Intimate love to ignite our souls (stanzas 6-7).

The love ignited in the soul forms the basis of reciprocal love between believers and God, which is the foundation of the Church. Likewise, the knowledge imparted by the Spirit and shared in many tongues on Pentecost forms the second building block of the Church. Bede's hymn links the miraculous wind and tongues of flame at Pentecost with the language and love they signify; together these marked the establishment of the Church. Indeed, Bede's hymn displays allegory in the medieval method, identified by James H. Wilson as "more an appeal to reason than to the senses. Since reasonable thought was so exclusively defined by its adherence to established doctrine, reason itself was subject to rigorous limitation."[56] In the same way, Bede's hymn on Pentecost presupposes the allegorical and tropological understandings of God's house in accordance with his doctrine of the Holy Spirit. Thus the light and language which feature so prevalently in Bede's pneumatology are relevant to his celebration of the unity of believers because they are the means and manifestation of the establishment of God's house.

The ninth stanza of Bede's hymn, which in many ways echoes Gregory the Great's interpretation, provides an apt summation of the role of the Spirit at Pentecost:

> He offered the teachers at the same time
> Language and the sacred hearth [*larem*];
> Those he instructs to speak words
> He also teaches to love in their hearts.

Bede clearly states that the Holy Spirit offered the Apostles words to teach and love to unify, by which they would establish the church. However, the other gift mentioned is the work that the Holy Spirit would bring about: the *larem*. *Larem* is a strange word choice in this context because it refers to the Roman household gods or gods of the hearth, the *lares*.[57] By metonymy the singular form can mean hearth, home, or dwelling. In this particular instance I have translated it "sacred hearth" because "hearth" for the Anglo-Saxons carried notions of community and allegiance; but *larem* also seems to highlight the unification of the believers into the Church, the house of the Lord, which the Holy Spirit established that day.[58] The essence of this gift, then, is the unification of God's people, which the teachers could not accomplish on their own even with the gifts of speech and love. The gift of the *larem* is the gathering of God's people as one, at home in the presence of God.

The last six stanzas are particularly noteworthy because the phrasing and punctuation are such that stanzas 11 and 12, as well as 15 and 16, are joined as two halves of the same thought. Additionally, stanzas 13 and 14 are complementary in that they deal with the same theme, the unity of the spirit of believers, each beginning with an "O."[59] Michael Lapidge asserts that Bede often constructed his hymns in sets of 8 stanzas so that they could be sung antiphonally. In accordance with this analysis, the punctuation of the last six stanzas has the effect of unifying the two halves of the chorus while simultaneously linking the dual themes of language and love. Thus, Bede structured his hymn so that the singers would embody in themselves the unity of the Church depicted in the lyrics. Although Bede's main work was exegesis, he purposefully employed techniques unique to the medium of his poetry to teach his people the same theology he emphasized in biblical texts.

Conclusion

The analysis of the building motif in Bede's exegetical commentary and his hymn on Pentecost depends upon the presupposition that, contrary to the loyalty that bound the Anglo-Saxon hall or home (*comitatus*), believers in Christ could be part of the same house of God even when in different locations. Ultimately, Bede demonstrates that God builds his house neither in the manner of men, nor with the materials of men, nor on the foundations available to men. Instead, God enacts his plans for the Church through the Holy Spirit, enables believers to participate with him in the building by making them living stones, and establishes the *conversatio* of believers with the foundation—Christ. Although the disciples were in one physical house at the time of the giving of the Spirit, having received the Spirit they were equipped to travel throughout the world. Thus, Bede represents the Holy Spirit as the link between the physical dispersion of the Church on earth and the allegiance Anglo-Saxons owed their lords, which was solidified by and centered on the shared space of the hall. Bede's pneumatology canonically understood depends on the whole structure of the Church being, as Bede closes his hymn, *uno in spiritu*—in one spirit—but more significantly, one in *the* Spirit.

NOTES

[1] The scholarship on Bede's commentaries emphasizes Bede's attitude toward language and translation, especially in of language is accomplished. For Pentecost, see Kees Dekker, "Pentecost and Linguistic Self-Consciousness in Anglo-Saxon England: Bede and Ælfric," *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 104, no. 3 (2005): 345–72; Dekker writes "[Bede's] subsequent relation to his depictions of Babel and Pentecost. However, the role of the Holy Spirit in Pentecost, and to a greater extent in the remainder

of Bede's commentaries, is discussed infrequently, and often only as the vehicle by which the unification Biblical account of human language and languages is governed by two all-important miracles: the events at the Tower of Babel and the miracle of Pentecost." See also Robert Stanton, "Linguistic Fragmentation and Redemption before King Alfred," *The Yearbook of English Studies* 36, no. 1 (2006): 12–26. For Babel, see Arno Borst, *Der Turmbau von Babel*, 4 vol., in 6 (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1957–1963) and Tristan Gary Major, *Literary Developments of the Table of Nations and the Tower of Babel in Anglo-Saxon England*, Dissertation for the Centre for Medieval Studies at the University of Toronto, 2010.

[2] The exposition of the literal house of God in Bede's *On the Tabernacle*, *On the Temple*, *Commentary on Ezra and Nehemiah*, and *Commentary on the Song of Songs* has been excluded from this study due to space, although many of the same motifs of building appear in connection with the Holy Spirit in those works as well.

[3] The current accepted dating for Bede's commentaries places the writing of *Acts* from 709–716 C.E.; *Genesis*, 720–725 C.E.; *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*, 731 C.E.; See Kendall, *On Genesis*, 45–53; See also Laistner, who dates *On the Temple*, *Retractio* (of Acts), and *Commentary on Ezra* to 725–731 C.E. (*Hand-List*, 20, 39, 75, 78, 94, 112).

[4] English translation from Bede, *On Genesis*, Translated Texts for Historians, Vol. 48, trans. Calvin B. Kendall (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2008). For the Latin text, see Bede, *In Genesim*, in *Libri quattuor in principium Genesis usque ad nativitatem Isaac et eiectionem Ismahelis adnotationum,* Corpus Christianorum Series Latina (CCSL) 118A, ed. C. W. Jones (Turnhout: Brepols, 1967): 213. For the sake of space, where an English translation has been made available I will only cite the English, unless the word choice in the original is pertinent.

[5] CCSL 123A, 166.

[6] *The Venerable Bede: Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, trans. Lawrence T. Martin (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1989). For the Latin see Bede, *Expositio Actuum Apostolorum*, *Retractatio in Actus Apostolorum*, 2.4, ed. M. L. W. Laistner, CCSL 121 (Turnhout: Brepols: 1983), 16–17.

[7] Kees Dekker confirms that Pentecost was a prevalent theme throughout Bede's corpus, and suggests that it was particularly significant for Bede because of the connection to the linguistic and theological unity of God's people. Dekker notes that

"[Bede] regularly discussed it [Pentecost] in relation to the power of the Holy Spirit and the origin of the Church." Dekker, "Pentecost and Linguistic Self-Consciousness," 347.
[8] Bede, *Acts*, 4.11, 50.
[9] Bede, *Commentary on the Seven Catholic Epistles*, trans. by Dom David Hurst, O.S.B. (Kalamazoo, Mich.: Cistercian Publications, 1985), 1 Peter 2.7, 86.
[10] Bede, *Comm. on the Sev. Cath. Ep.,* 1 Peter 2.4, 82.
[11] Bede, *Acts*, 1.13, 15.
[12] Bede, *Acts*, 2.1, 27.
[13] Bede, *Acts* 1.3, 10; citing Matt. 28:20. Italics are original to translation (Martin's edition). The phrase is italicized because it is a citation from Matt. 28:20.
[14] "2 et factus est repente de cælo sonus, tamquam advenientis spiritus vehementis, et replevit totam domum ubi erant sedentes. 3 Et apparuerunt illis dispertitæ linguæ tamquam ignis, seditque supra singulos eorum: 4 et repleti sunt omnes Spiritu Sancto, et cœperunt loqui variis linguis, prout Spiritus Sanctus dabat eloqui illis." (Vulgate)
[15] Bede, *Acts*, 2.2, 28, quoting Gregory, *Moralia on Job*, 28, 1, 2 (PL 76:447D–448A).
[16] Bede, *Acts*, 2.3a, 29.
[17] Bede, *Acts*, 2.3b, 29.
[18] Bede, *On Genesis*, I.1.1.
[19] Bede, *On Genesis*, I.1.8, quoting Ps.-Clement/Rufinus *Recognitiones* 1.27.
[20] Bede, *On Genesis*, I.1.2.
[21] 1 Peter 3.18, 102.
[22] Bede*, On Genesis*, II.8.1, 190.
[23] Bede*, On Genesis*, I.1.26.
[24] Bede, *On Genesis*, I.1.26, 90.
[25] In Bede's commentary on Acts 17:28c, from Gregory's *Moralia on Job*, 20, 16, 41 (CCSL 143A:1033, 27/28).
[26] *On Genesis*, II.9.6b, 207.
[27] *On Genesis*, I.1.26.
[28] Genesis 1:26a.
[29] *On Genesis* I.1.26a, quoting Gregory, *Moralia* 9.49.75 (CCSEL 143, 509).
[30] Bede, *Comm. on the Sev. Cath. Ep.*, 1 Peter 1.3, 1.12; 71, 77.

[31] 1 Peter 2:5. "et ipsi tamquam lapides vivi superædificamini, domus spiritualis, sacerdotium sanctum, offerre spirituales hostias, acceptabiles Deo per Jesum Christum." (Vulgate)
[32] Bede, *Comm. on the Sev. Cath. Ep.*, 1 Peter 2.5, 83.
[33] Ibid.
[34] Ibid.
[35] Bede, *Comm. on the Sev. Cath. Ep.,* 1 Peter 2.5, 84.
[36] Bede, *Comm. on the Sev. Cath. Ep.,* 1 Peter 2.7, 86.
[37] Bede, *On Genesis*, II.6.13-14a, 172–73. "And indeed the construction of the ark, which went on for a hundred years, signifies the whole time of this age in which the holy Church is built and brought to its perfect end."
[38] Bede, *On Genesis*, II.6.16a, 178.
[39] Bede, *On Genesis*, II.6.16c, 180.
[40] Bede, *On Genesis*, II.6.16c, 180. "*Tristega* signifies a triple storey, for *stege* means 'storey' [*tectum*] in Greek. Hence the old translators used *tricamerata* in place of this term. . . . But middle storeys and third storeys (or, as the old translators said, *bicamerata* and *tricamerata*) . . ."
[41] Bede, *Acts*, 10.9a, 96.
[42] Bede, *On Genesis*, II.6.13-14a, 172–73.
[43] Bede, *On Genesis*, II.16.15, 176. For a full explanation of how Bede arrives at the symbolism of these numbers see the relevant passage.
[44] Stanton, "Linguistic Fragmentation," 20.
[45] *On Genesis*, III.11.8-9b, 234.
[46] Bede, *On Genesis*, III.11.8-9b, 237, 235.
[47] Bede, *On Genesis*, III.11.8-9b, 237, 235.
[48] Huppé, *Doctrine and Poetry Augustine's Influence on Old English Poetry* (New York: State University of New York Press, 1959), 36.
[49] Bede, *On Genesis*, III.11.8-9b, 231.
[50] Bede, *On Genesis*, III.11.1, 228. Italics are original to translation (Kendall's edition). The phrase is italicized because it is a citation from Acts 2:5.
[51] Bede, *On Genesis*, III.11.8-9b, 236.
[52] Bede, *On Genesis*, III.11.8-9b, 233.
[53] Latin text taken from CCSL 424–25. Preserved in the manuscript *De laude Dei* by Alcuin, now kept in Bamberg, Staatsbibliothek, Misc. Patr. 17 (B. II. 10) (Bamberg s. x ex). Six existing Anglo-Saxon hymns deal with Pentecost; see Inge B. Milfull, *The Hymns of the Anglo-Saxon Church: A Study and Edition of the "Durham Hymnal,"* Cambridge Studies

in Anglo-Saxon England 17 (Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 1996): 304–17. For the liturgical significance of Pentecost in Anglo-Saxon England, see M. Bradford Bedingfield, *The Dramatic Liturgy of Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge: Boydell, 2002): 210–17.

[54] I have been unable to locate any complete existing translation of this hymn, and so have provided my own. The poem presented numerous syntactical difficulties, specifically in case function and agreement. The nature of some of the translation difficulties and the strong rhythm of the lines indicate that the hymn is likely a Latin translation of an Anglo-Saxon original composed to be sung in the church. Based on this conjecture I have modified my translation to fit Anglo-Saxon syntax wherever it fits more comfortably with the sense of the poem than strict adherence to Latin word order. My thanks to Dr. Alden Smith and Dr. David Lyle Jeffrey for their invaluable assistance.

[55] F. J. E. Raby, *A History of Christian-Latin Poetry from the Beginnings to the Close of the Middle Ages* (Oxford, U.K.: Oxford University Press, 1927), 146. Raby's general characterization of Bede's poetry as relatively unimportant does not sufficiently consider the circumstances and purpose of Bede's poetry. Raby's initial assessment is correct—that Bede was primarily interested in communicating theology in all of his works—but it neglects to give sufficient weight to the fact that Bede considered it important enough to supply his people with adequate and sound materials for worship that he took the risk of composing hymns in Latin, which was not his native tongue. Furthermore, while Bede's poetry may have been less technically advanced than other secular and even Christian poets, Bede was capable enough in poetry that even the form of his poems contributed to his broader theological purpose.

[56] James H. Wilson, *Christian Theology and Old English Poetry* (The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton & Co., 1974), 84.

[57] The word *lares* appears also in Bede's *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum* V.7, also in a poem, in this case an epitaph for Caedwalla. This usage is frequently rendered "home."

[58] However, *larem* bears striking similarity to the Anglo-Saxon feminine noun *lār*, which can mean "lore, learning, teaching, or doctrine." While the borrowing of an Anglo-Saxon root into Latin grammar and syntax seems unlikely, the meaning of *lār* seems to provide an apt parallel to the gift of language to the teachers.

[59] Michael Lapidge, *Anglo-Latin Literature 600-899* (Rio Grande, Oh.: 1996), 313-38, here 320-32.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Allen, Michael J. B., and Daniel G. Calder, trans. and eds. *Sources and Analogues of Old English Poetry: Major Latin Texts in Translation*. Cambridge, UK: D. S. Brewer, 1976.

Bede, the Venerable. *Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. Translated by Lawrence T. Martin. Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1989.

———. *Commentary on the Seven Catholic Epistles*. Translated by Dom David Hurst, O.S.B. Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1985.

———. *Expositio Actuum Apostolorum*, *Retractatio in Actus Apostolorum*. Edited by M. L. W. Laistner. Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 121. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1983.

———. *In Genesim*. Edited by C. W. Jones, *Libri quatuor in principium Genesis usque ad nativitatem Isaac et eiectionem Ismahelis adnotationum*, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 118A. Turnhout, Belgium: Brepols, 1967.

———. *On Genesis*. Translated and edited by Calvin B. Kendall. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2008.

Bedingfield, M. Bradford. *The Dramatic Liturgy of Anglo-Saxon England.* Cambridge, UK: Boydell, 2002.

Borst, Arno. *Der Turmbau von Babel*, Vol. 4. Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1957–1963.

Dekker, Kees. "Pentecost and Linguistic Self-Consciousness in Anglo-Saxon England: Bede and Ælfric." *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 104, no. 3 (2005): 345–72.

Garde, Judith N. *Old English Poetry in Medieval Christian Perspective: A*

Doctrinal Approach. Cambridge, UK: D. S. Brewer, 1991.

The Holy Bible: Douay-Rheims Version. Charlotte, NC: Saint Benedict Press, 1899.

Huppé, Bernard F. *Doctrine and Poetry: Augustine's Influence on Old English Poetry*. New York: State University of New York Press, 1959.

Jones, Charles W. "Some Introductory Remarks on Bede's Commentary on Genesis." *Sacris Erudiri* 19 (1969-1970): 115-98.

Laistner, M. L. W. *A Hand-List of Bede Manuscripts*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1943.

Lapidge, Michael. *Anglo-Latin Literature 600-899*. London and Rio Grande, OH: Continuum International Publishing Group, 1996.

Major, Tristan Gary. *Literary Developments of the Table of Nations and the Tower of Babel in Anglo-Saxon England*. Dissertation for the Centre for Medieval Studies at the University of Toronto, 2010.

Milfull, Inge B. *The Hymns of the Anglo-Saxon Church: A Study and Edition of the "Durham Hymnal."* Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 17. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Raby, F. J. E. *A History of Christian-Latin Poetry from the Beginnings to the Close of the Middle Ages*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1927.

Stanton, Robert. "Linguistic Fragmentation and Redemption before King Alfred." *The Yearbook of English Studies* 36, no. 1 (2006): 12–26.

Wilson, James H. *Christian Theology and Old English Poetry*. The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton & Co., 1974.

APPENDIX A: IN DIE SANCTO PENTECOSTES

1 Emitte, Christe, Spiritus
Donum tui Paracliti,
Quo nos replente munera
Rite canamus ipsius.

2 Elegit hanc qui primitus
Sacratiorem ceteris
Diem, dicaret qua suo
Ecclesiam charismate.

3 Cuius semel mirabilis
Nos edocet descensio,
Pios sacra perenniter
Ut lampet omnes gratia.

4 Erantque in uno cum suis
Apostoli consortibus
Solario sublimibus
Dei uacantes laudibus,

5 Cum missus alto Spiritus
Aduenit ad throno Patris
Seseque collaudantium
Impleuit almus pectora

6 Venit sono suauissima
Venitque feruentissima
In uisione flammea
Lucens ab alto gratia.

7 Quae nos solet scientiae
Lustrare flamma ac lampade
Dilectionis intimae
Ignire nostra pectora.

8 Linguis in altus igneis
Linguae Creator Spiritus
Apparuit credentibus
Verbique donum contulit.

1 Send forth, Christ, the Spirit,
The gift of your Paraclete,
Who fills us with gifts;
Let us sing of himself.

2 He who was in the beginning
Chose this day more sacred than the rest,
That he would consecrate the Church
His own by grace.

3 Whose marvelous descent
On one occasion teaches us,
That eternally sacred grace
May enlighten all the pious.

4 And the Apostles in one upper room
Together with their companions
Were abandoned
To the sublime praises of God,

5 When the Spirit sent from on high
Came from the throne of the Father
And nurture from his own breast
Filled the breasts of the worshippers.

6 Sweetest grace came with a sound,
And most fervent grace
Came in flaming vision
shining from on high.

7 Which grace is accustomed
To illuminate us by the flame
Of knowledge and by the torch of
Intimate love to ignite our souls.

8 In tongues of heavenly fire
Creator Spirit of language
Appeared to believers
And bestowed the gift of the word.

9 Linguam simul doctoribus
Laremque sacrum praebuit,
Quos se loqui uerbis docet
Seseque amare in cordibus.

10 Linguas habent qui flammeas
Cum caritatis spiritu,
Ardore mentem proximi
Christum sonando suggerunt.

11 Maiore qui miraculo
Quorum repleuit pectora,
His omnium mox contulit
Late loquelam gentium,

12 Cunctis per orbem ut gentibus
Lingua canentes propria,
Iesu, tuam potentiam
Laudesque dicerent tuas.

13 O pulchra rerum gratia,
Cum dissonas et moribus
Et uoce plebes antea
Nectebat unus spiritus!

14 O sancta vere ciuitas
Et uera pacis uisio,
Cum lux fidei plurimos
Iam cor in unum cogeret!

15 Haec Iudeam beatitas
Primo repleuit munere,
Haec usque mundi terminos
Terris refulget omnibus,

16 Unamque Christi gloriam
Linguae sonis distantibus
Par mentium deuotio
Collaudat uno in spiritu.

9 He offered the teachers at the same time
Language and the sacred hearth;
Those he instructs to speak words
He also teaches to love in their hearts.

10 Those who have tongues
Flaming with the spirit of love,
Ardently, in their inner mind,
Speaking with Christ, they edify.

11 He who by a greater miracle,
Filled their breasts,
Soon bestowed on them widely
The speech of all nations,

12 So that throughout the world
Singing with their own tongue
To nations all together, Jesus, your power
And your praises they would declare.

13 O beautiful grace of things,
One spirit unified
With character and voice
Peoples formerly dissonant!

14 O truly holy city,
And true vision of peace,
When into one heart
The light of faith gathered the many!

15 By the gift this blessedness
Replenished Judea first;
It shines in all the world
Even to the ends of the earth,

16 And the devotion of their minds
Equally in diverse sounds of the tongue
Worships in one spirit
One and the same glory of Christ.

This paper reexamines and describes the effects of state religions on religious service attendance across countries through empirical analysis. Using econometric methods to analyze attendance data from the World Values Survey and Gallup World Poll, it pays special attention to the variables used for state religion, regulation of religion, and government favoritism toward religion while utilizing control variables from the World Christian Encyclopedia and CIA World Factbook (among other sources). Because this analysis uses a larger set of data than has been used in many previous studies, it provides a more representative sample of countries and sheds some light on how particular religions may affect the results. The results vary with the measures used for weekly attendance and for state religion, but they uniformly suggest that most previous scholarship is incorrect to establish a simple negative relationship between state religion and religious service attendance.

Reexamining the Effects of State Religion on Religious Service Attendance

Matthew Swift

Introduction

The nature of the relationships between state and religion, though certainly complicated and often obscure, has been the subject of renewed interest among scholars since it became clear that religion's demise is not an imminent reality. Perhaps because much modern political theory focuses on these relationships, issues of religion in the public sphere are particularly contentious among legal scholars in the Western world, producing controversies over the use of religious language on United States currency, France's ban of face-coverings in public, and a host of other public expressions of religion. Particularly in the United States, a large body of legal research focuses on the acceptability of government support or regulation of religion based on conformity to constitutional standards, eschewing the question of what effects the support or regulation generally has on religion. Granted, that question is more difficult to answer and requires both theoretical and empirical evidence, but it is a worthwhile study since those who support the existence and practice of religion generally should not support government policies and practices that undermine religiosity. One branch in the study of the economics of religion has begun to provide broad answers by analyzing the effect of state religion on religious service attendance.

Scholarship regarding religious participation and state religion, for the most part, suggests that the presence of a state religion decreases attendance at religious services, particularly those of the state religion, and therefore that supporters of religion should oppose state religion. This paper reexamines the question of a state religion's effects on religious service attendance by using more current and more representative data, controlling for a number of supply- and demand-side variables, and paying particular attention to the variables used for or instead of state religion. This analysis thereby overcomes some limitations of previous studies and sheds some light on the complicated relationships between state religion, regulation of and favoritism toward religion, and religious belief and practice.

Literature Review

The notion that public religious institutions hinder religiosity is no new thesis. As early as the eighteenth century, thinkers such as Adam Smith and James Madison suggested that close relationships between church and state were more harmful than helpful to religious fervor. The thesis began to take more rigorous, specific forms in the latter part of the twentieth century as quantitative analysis allowed for the empirical testing of both culture- and market-based theories of religious participation.

Smith includes one of the first discussions of the economics of religion in *The Wealth of Nations*, taking a distinctly rational conception of human motivation and applying it to religious choice. Smith begins by describing micro-level decisions in the supply of religion but quickly moves to macro-level issues with an established religion. Because religious leaders are subject to self-interest just as other individuals are, Smith reasons, they tend to promote their particular denominations to the point of encouraging "the most violent abhorrence of all other sects," sacrificing "truth, morals, [and] decency" in the meantime.[1] Thus, Smith rejects the notion that the state needs to subsidize religions for their positive externalities. By analogizing individual churches and profit-seeking companies, Smith develops a theory of religious markets in which competition prevents the dominance of a large entity that can subsequently take advantage of consumers. However, Smith's theory has several flaws that are exposed as his analogy breaks down. One of the assumptions of perfect competition, for example, is the existence of homogeneous products. If people did prefer the same religion or if religious benefits were identical across religions, Smith's vision of eventual agreement on a "pure and rational religion" might be a reality.[2] But contrary to Smith's theory, small radical sects with remarkable differences can and do survive even in an age with thousands of competing religious denominations. Smith's characterization of state religions as monopolies also assumes that these institutions necessarily create barriers to entry for other religious groups, but not all countries with state religions also have regulation targeted at the practice or funding of other religions. In fact, some countries have several official religions.

After Smith, the economics of religion took quite some time to gain popularity among academics, but this paper now continues a major line of scholarship by asking how state religion and regulation of religion affect attendance of religious services. Although country-level data are the vehicle for seeing these effects, the analysis is not limited to factors that operate with direct national effects. Scholarship approaches the factors affecting religious service attendance from both the demand side and the supply side. On the demand side, much research is devoted to factors that affect individuals' choices to attend religious services, such as age, economic climate, the opportunity cost of wages, expected benefits after life, and expected immediate benefits such as moral education. On the supply side, scholars examine the effects of national influences from state religions, government regulation, constitutional protection, religious competition, social pressures, and a number of other factors.

As part of the scholarship using religious market approaches, many studies have focused on pluralism measures such as the Herfindahl index as signals of a country's religious health or stagnation.[3] In response to secularization theory, which posits that increasing pluralism is a sign of decreasing religiosity, many scholars with a more market-based approach to religious participation argue that, just as highly concentrated economic market structures often indicate healthy competition, religious pluralism should further religious participation. However, more recent scholarship challenges both sides by questioning the validity of pluralism measures. Rodney Stark and Roger Finke demonstrate that pluralism does not necessarily entail competition with the fictional example of a society under a strict caste system, with a particular religion for each caste.[4] In that case, the society would lack religious competition even though it exhibits religious pluralism. Mark Chaves and Philip Gorski, as well as David Voas, Daniel Olson, and Alasdair Crockett, further discourage the use of religious pluralism in studies of religiosity by demonstrating some of the key mathematical problems with using the Herfindahl index when measures for religious participation rates are included as dependent or independent variables. Because the Herfindahl index is, by definition, the sum of the squares of the religious shares in a country, using both it and religious shares themselves as control variables introduces noncausal, nonzero correlations that distort the true effects of each.[5] Similarly, including pluralism measures as independent variables in equations featuring an indicator of overall religiosity as the dependent variable is statistically problematic because both are related to participation rates for specific religious groups.[6]

Limited data has been a significant problem with many previous studies of this topic.[7] Data on church attendance itself has usually been limited to about 59 countries, as in Robert Barro and Rachel McCleary's "Religion and Economic Growth across Countries" and Charles North and Carl Gwin's "Religious Freedom and the Unintended Consequences of State Religion." Over time, new rounds of the World Values Survey and European Values Survey (WVS/EVS), in particular, have expanded to include more countries. Like North and Gwin, I use the most recent data available for each country from these surveys, drawing from the aggregated fourth and fifth waves. This is an improvement compared to North and Gwin's "quite diverse" sample of countries, introducing data for 37 new countries, 26 of which are African or Asian. I have also run some key regressions on weekly attendance data from the Gallup World Poll (GWP), which provides 70 new countries, 30 of which are African and 26 of which are Asian. This broader spectrum of data should provide a more global picture by decreasing the proportion of Western countries in the sample.[8] One recent study that takes partial advantage of the new breadth of data is Jonathan Fox and Ephraim Tabory's "Contemporary Evidence Regarding the Impact of State Regulation of

Religion on Religious Participation and Belief." Their analysis uses 205 observations from 81 countries, almost all of which are included in this paper.[9]

Scholarship in this area has been improving through the creation of measures for the interaction between states and religions, but significant gaps still exist, particularly in creating the variables for state religion itself. This issue arises partly from the inherent difficulty in defining and identifying state religions. Barro and McCleary note that David Barrett, George Kurian, and Todd Johnson (henceforth BKJ) do not define a state religion merely as the constitutionally established, official religion of a country.[10] Although Barro and McCleary use BKJ's coding of state religions, they also briefly note that disagreements over this coding exist.[11] North and Gwin do their own legal research to code a stricter definition of state religion, relying on "research into the existence of legally instituted provisions setting a particular religion as the official or traditional religion of a country," but mention that the differing definitions were ultimately irrelevant to their conclusions.[12] However, North and Gwin note that their results sometimes changed in significance depending on the definition used for state religion. Even the seemingly simple definition of a state religion as the official religion of a country leaves room for interpretation. For example, using only countries with specific state religions excludes "religious" countries such as Australia, which allows established religions at the state level, but not the national level. A simple comparison of BKJ's coding and Fox's coding of state religions in 2000 and 2002, respectively, revealed only a 52% correlation between the 130 common observations.[13] Thus, as my study will confirm, the definitions of state religion variables may influence what an empirical study suggests about the effects of state religion on religious service attendance.

Theoretical Considerations and Empirical Strategy

At its most basic level, economic theory suggests that religious service attendance should increase as the net social and political benefits of attending increase. Although the establishment of a state religion may decrease the costs of providing and attending those religious services, Smith's theory suggests that the individual benefits of supporting and attending a state-sponsored religious service vary inversely with state support. More specifically, he posits that religious leaders and their congregations will lose the urgency that comes with recognizing the precarious positions that their religions would otherwise hold in society. Most research into supply-side economics of religion concludes that the detriments of state religion to religious participation outweigh the benefits.[14]

Of course, a key problem for this analysis is the definitional entanglement of a state religion with its effects. An entirely (or perhaps, merely) nominal state religion would certainly seem irrelevant to religious service attendance. Some scholars have opted to study the effects of governments' more general interactions with religion on religiosity instead, developing indices to pool different expressions of governments' favor, disfavor, or general regulation of religion. Grim and Finke contribute by creating the Government Regulation of Religion Index (GRI), the Government Favoritism of Religion Index (GFI), and the Social Regulation of Religion Index (SRI).[15] Fox and Tabory use six variables which are composed of a variety of measures from the Religion and State (RAS) dataset: "official support" of one or more religions, "general restrictions" of religious practices, "religious discrimination" against minority religions, "religious regulation" on the majority religion or all religions, "religious legislation" including funding of religious organizations, and "general GIR" (government involvement in religion), which combines the five previous variables.[16] To examine the relationship between government interaction with religion and religious participation more thoroughly, I use three sets of regressions to analyze the effects of six state religion variables, Grim and Finke's indices, and Fox and Tabory's variables, respectively.

This analysis utilizes multivariate ordinary least squares regressions, with the generalized formula $Y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \ldots + \beta_k x_k$, to analyze cross-sectional data from 92 countries using data from WVS/EVS and 116 countries using data from the GWP. Because of the number of issues to address and thus regressions to explain them, a limited number of key regressions will be presented in detail, but results from several other regressions lead to some key insights. Because the distribution of values for the variable measuring attendance weekly or more was limited between values of 0 and 100, I created a new attendance variable: ln[attendance rate / (100 – attendance rate)].[17] This variable accounts for extreme values of religious participation that may not fit a linear model. It also increases explanatory power for regressions using WVS/EVS data, but its effects on GWP data are mixed. Since a linear model provides more easily interpreted results, I include tables for regressions using both the logit transformation of the WVS/EVS data and the unchanged GWP data.

In an attempt to minimize omitted variable bias and maximize explanatory power, this analysis tests a number of confounding variables that, though they are not the primary focus of the paper, may affect the supply or demand of religious services, including religious pluralism, median age, population density, Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per capita, adult literacy rate, fertility rate, life expectancy, and supermajority religion. I ran a series of preliminary regressions and confirmed cases of multicollinearity between several of these variables with high correlation coefficients. I also compared the R-squared of regressions using each of these variables to determine whether their inclusion would decrease the efficiency of estimators without adding explanatory power.

Data

The median age of a country's population is a 2011 estimate from the CIA World Factbook. If it follows the trend of previous scholarship, median age will probably have a negative or U-shaped effect on attendance because of the opportunity cost of wages. 2005 life expectancy data are taken from the World Christian Database (WCD) but are originally from the United Nations; shorter life expectancy may influence greater attendance because of greater expected benefits from religion.[18] The adult literacy rates, from the United Nations (2007) via the WCD, are indicators of educational outcomes, which are generally expected to have an inverse relationship with religiosity. 2008 GDP per capita figures, reported in US dollars and adjusted for purchasing power parity, are from the United Nations; these serve as a proxy for the incomes of a country's population. As North and Gwin note, studies of the effect of income on religious service attendance have been mixed.[19] Fertility rates and life expectancies are from the 2011 edition of the CIA World Factbook online. Higher fertility rates, although they can indicate a higher opportunity cost of attendance, may also indicate a greater perceived benefit to religious services in the form of spiritual or moral education for children. Population density is calculated by dividing 2005 population (WCD) by the land area in square miles (originally from the 2003 U.S. State Department International Religious Freedom Reports); higher population density suggests that religious adherents will have a shorter distance to travel to services and find communities of fellow believers. Finally, dummy variables for supermajority religions were chosen instead of dummy variables for the largest religion (by the number of self-described members) in each country to limit the number of religions in regressions without being entirely arbitrary in deciding which religions are "important" enough to keep. Using binary variables rather than religious shares also helps to avoid some of the problematic correlations with overall participation rates discussed above. These variables are from the *World Christian Encyclopedia*.[20]

The key independent variables in this analysis are the measures of state religion, government regulation or protection of religion, government favoritism of religion, and social regulation of religion. BKJ coded governments as secular, atheistic, religious, or having a specific state religion. They evaluated countries in 1900, 1970, 1990, and 2000; these data also appear in BKJ's *World Christian Encyclopedia*. Scholars typically only consider those countries with specific state religions as having a state religion for quantitative purposes. I created a version of North and Gwin's date of constitutional protection variable for my sample by researching the earliest date of official protection of religious liberty mentioned in the *World Christian Encyclopedia* for every country in my sample. This variable serves as an indicator of religious freedom and should have a negative effect on religious service attendance. I also extended North and Gwin's binary Communism variable to cover my entire sample; this dummy variable identifies which countries currently have or have had Marxist and Leninist governments. Because scholars generally accept that, in theory, state religions can have both positive and negative effects, I analyzed several indices in an attempt to differentiate these effects. Grim and Finke's GRI, GFI, and SRI for measures of regulation and favoritism are developed from the answers to six, five, and five questions, respectively. These indices use data from the United States State Department's *2003 International Freedom Report* to capture information beyond "national constitutions and formal government publications."[21] The GIR variables used by Fox and Tabory have differing levels of complexity: "official support" is based on two variables, "general restrictions" on one, "religious discrimination" on sixteen, "religious regulation" on eleven, and "religious legislation" on thirty-three.[22]

Regression Results

First are some results regarding the more peripheral variables. Unfortunately, high correlations between many of these variables create multicollinearity, which prohibits using them simultaneously. In particular, median age seems to subsume many of the effects that might otherwise be evident in GDP per capita, life expectancy, literacy rates, and fertility rates. Preliminary regressions indicated that the coefficients of all of these variables had the expected signs. Since median age provides the most explanatory power and has intuitive causal explanations for its correlation to other variables, I chose it to be included in reported regressions. The effect of median age is always negative, and regressions using GWP data produce a range of coefficients, depending on the particular regression, which indicate that every year added to median age decreases attendance by between 1.79% and 2.22% ($p < 0.01$). Because the observations for median age are between 15.1 and 44.9 inclusive, this supports previous scholarship by demonstrating the negatively sloped portion of age's U-shaped effect on religious service attendance.

Date of constitutional protection of religion, currently or formerly Communist government, and population density are also used as control variables, although not all of them appear in all regressions. As the results below demonstrate, each of these has a significant effect; the former two have negative coefficients and the latter one a positive coefficient. Unfortunately, a high correlation between date of constitutional protection and currently or formerly Communist government causes multicollinearity when both are included, so I used the variable providing the greatest explanatory power in each set of regressions. To avoid unnecessarily reducing the efficiency of other estimators, population density is not included when evaluating state religion dummy variables; unreported regressions confirm that it is consistently insignificant in these regressions.

Taking this screening of confounding variables into account, the first set of key regressions focuses on the effects of six state religion variables while controlling for median age, currently or formerly Communist government, and sometimes supermajority religions (see Tables 1 through 4).[23] Because WVS/EVS religious service attendance data include responses from 1996 to 2008 and WP data from 2010, one might suppose that using the state religion variable from 1900 or 1970 rather than 1990 or 2000 might be helpful for reducing any endogeneity that results from circular effects between church attendance, or religiosity in general, and state religion. Surprisingly, however, the coefficients on all state religion variables are insignificant. BKJ's state religion dummy variables for 1900, 1970, 1990, and 2000 all have negative coefficients, which, if significant, would indicate that having a state religion decreases attendance, but they also all have p-values of 0.211 or greater. Expanding the state religion variable to include countries coded as "religious" yields an insignificant coefficient regardless of which attendance variable is used. Finally, Fox's official state religion variable had a significant negative effect at the 10% level, but only on the WVS/EVS measure of attendance, and only when supermajority religions were not included. One key factor to consider when comparing these results with North and Gwin's study is the cultural and religious breadth of the countries in this sample. When controlling for the sample by regressing on only those countries used in North and Gwin's analysis, the effects of all six state religion variables are negative, and they are significant at the 10% level in twelve out of twenty-four regressions.[24] This result reflects the large majority of theoretical and empirical research on the effect of state religion on religious participation, which either suggests or finds that the relationship is negative. Ironically, the statistical insignificance of the state religion coefficients in this study, although they make my results ultimately inconclusive, marks a significant departure from other scholarship.

Including dummy variables for supermajority religions both increases the explanatory power of the regressions and reveals some insights into the influence of religion on attendance. Regressions with GWP attendance as the dependent variable suggest that, on average, a Protestant supermajority decreases religious service attendance by at least 14.36% and up to 19.43%. The effect of Catholic supermajorities is not always significant, but when it is, the coefficients range from 7.41 to 7.70.[25] Because only one country, Greece, has an Orthodox supermajority, the significance (both statistical and practical) of the positive coefficient should be treated with caution. As with Catholicism, the coefficients for Buddhism are sometimes insignificant, but the significant coefficients suggest that the average Buddhist supermajority increases attendance by 17.72% to 19.90%. Surprisingly, Islamic supermajorities had no statistically significant effect in any regression.

To see how supermajority religions might influence the effect of state religion on religious participation, I created two sets of interaction variables between BKJ's measurement of state religion and supermajority religions (coded for 1900 and 2000). Unreported regressions reveal that both Protestant interaction variables are consistently negative and significant at the 1% level using WVS/EVS data.[26] The Catholic interaction variable for 1900 has a positive and significant effect at the 10% level in two out of fourteen regressions. The 1900 Islamic interaction variable has a negative effect that is significant at the 1% level for six out of seven regressions. These results indicate that, compared to other state religions, both current and past Protestant state religions are more prone to be associated with policies and practices which decrease religious service attendance. The cultures fostered by Islamic state religions a century ago also may have a negative effect on religious participation.

The next set of key regressions focuses on the indices created by Grim and Finke (see Tables 5 and 6). Oddly, SRI is only significant once in eight regressions at the 10% level, and the effect in that regression is positive. It appears that these attitudes and actions, or at least Grim and Finke's coding of them, have no measurable effect on religious participation, especially since SRI is meant to be a measure of negative social attitudes and actions toward religion. Government favoritism toward religion as measured by GFI has a significant positive influence on religious service attendance at the 10% significance level at least.[27] This suggests that the portion of Smith's theory dealing with government support should be qualified: government favoritism toward religion, in and of itself, does not harm attendance rates, but we must consider both favoritism and regulation as factors. GRI, on the other hand, has a significant negative coefficient when included with GFI only, SRI only, or both GFI and SRI. These regressions yield a range of R-squared values indicating that using these measures in conjunction with median age, date of constitutional protection, and population density explains about 52.75% to 61.27% of the variation in attendance data.

The final set of key regressions focuses on the variables used by Fox and Tabory (see Tables 7 and 8). I began by running each of the six variables in its own regression with median age and population density as controls. Although the results for some specific variables vary slightly with which attendance measure is used as the dependent variable, the overall implications are consistent with my other results. When using WVS/EVS data, religious discrimination and religious regulation have significant negative effects at the 5% level, while official support, general restrictions, and general GIR are significant at the 10% level. In an interesting echo of the analysis of Grim and Finke's GFI and GRI, religious legislation (which includes funding of religious institutions) has a significant positive effect only when combined with any other variable except official support. When using GWP data for these individual regressions, religious regulation is significant at the 1% level, religious legislation at the 5% level, and official support at the 10% level. A number of unreported regressions helped to determine that official support, general restrictions, and general GIR sometimes created multicollinearity with each other and with religious discrimination or religious regulation. However, Fox's official state religion variable (which is part of official support) did not exhibit these problems; in fact, it was both negative and significant when included in the last regressions listed in Table 7 and Table 8. This result should be attributed to the narrower definition of this state religion variable and perhaps the simultaneous control for many positive effects associated with state religion. These last regressions also include the remaining three GIR variables. Depending on whether WVS/EVS data or GWP data is used, religious regulation is significant at the 5% level or 1% level, and Fox's state religion variable is significant at the 1% or 10% level. For both attendance measures, religious discrimination's effect is negative and significant at the 5% level, and religious legislation's effect is positive and significant at the 1% level. These results confirm the analysis of Grim and Finke's indices: regulatory or restrictive influences tend to decrease religious participation, but government support of religion, be that legal or financial, tends to increase it.

Conclusion

The answer to the original question of a state religion's effects on religious service attendance, then, is unclear. Contrary to most previous studies on this topic, these results support that, on average, state religion has no effect on religious service attendance, although a very narrow coding of state religion may yield a significant coefficient depending on what other control variables are included. Somewhat unsurprisingly, state religion provides both support for and obstacles to religiosity, at least insofar as it can be measured by religious service attendance. This analysis reveals that the net influence of an official state religion is statistically insignificant, although the elements comprising state religion seem to have significant effects. I confirmed North and Gwin's results that additional years of constitutional protection of religion (and related measures of religious freedom) tend to increase religiosity, whereas Communism, regulation, and other restrictive influences tend to decrease religiosity. Challenging part of Smith's theory, I did not find that government favoritism toward a religion negatively affected religious participation; rather, regressions including Grim and Finke's GFI or Fox's religious legislation index demonstrate the opposite. While recognizing the danger inherent in creating a "lazy" clergy and congregation by decreasing religious competition, Smith seems to have overemphasized the reasonable but unnecessary implication that government favoritism must harm religion. Given the change in results caused simply by surveying a more culturally and geographically diverse range of countries, the effects of cultural idiosyncrasies also appear to play an important role. As the coefficients on supermajority religion variables and interaction variables suggest, particular religions may have both a direct impact on overall religious service attendance and an indirect effect by influencing the effects of state religion.

Perhaps because scholarship regarding the measurement of religious regulation (both governmental and social) is still limited, discussion of the shortcomings of current definitions of state religion and measures for religious regulation seems to have been neglected. If the religious variable indices used in this analysis are any indication, variables that focus on particular practices and policies rather than nonspecific attitudes and laws provide more statistically significant information for researchers. Future work may focus on establishing which regulatory, restrictive, or favorable practices are typically the effects of official state religions, perhaps making progress toward isolating the influence of state religion from other cultural influences. A related, more overarching problem is the significant amount of endogeneity which probably occurs in these studies simply because of the interconnected natures of religious participation, government, and culture. Scholarship seems largely to have neglected the search for instrumental variables in this area.

Furthermore, future research efforts may have sufficient resources available to create panel data and thereby control for fixed effects across countries and time. Because religious participation at any given point depends partially on prior religious participation, incorporating strong statistical controls for time effects may prove important. Fox and Tabory's analysis includes a variable for the date of survey which had a significant effect, but unreported regressions in this study found a similar variable to be insignificant. The Religion and State project from which Fox's GIR index sprung already spans thirteen years, and it is also in the process of gaining another round of data. Another wave of the World Values Survey and European Values Survey is due to be released in the near future, and this may present an opportunity to examine some countries at several points over a 30-year period.

In closing, this study, which incorporates data from more countries than any other analysis I have read, seems to diverge from most other research on the issue, although it relies heavily on that research in its empirical methods and sources of data. State religion has long been vilified as damaging to the very institutions it supports, and while this analysis concurs that regulatory influences often associated with state religion decrease religious participation, results also indicate that these costs do not necessarily outweigh the benefits afforded by a state religion. Whether this is the result of an overarching change in the nature of state religion over time or simply a more representative sample of the international average, it raises questions about the actual effects of government support of religion and how these might vary across countries. Especially as an interdisciplinary study, the economics of religion still has many interesting, even controversial, facets that remain to be explored, and we can expect it to become a more precise and meaningful area of study as both data and definitions improve.

Table 1.[28] Effects of dummy variables for state religion: WVS/EVS data.

	BKJ 1900	BKJ 1970	BKJ 1990	BKJ 2000	Religious	Fox (RAS)
State religion	-0.1540	-0.0696	-0.0914	-0.1331	0.0077	-0.3418
	(0.261)	(0.646)	(0.528)	(0.356)	(0.956)	(0.076)
Median age	-0.0722	-0.0723	-0.0722	-0.072	-0.0724	-0.0732
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Communist	-0.3455	-0.3785	-0.3679	-0.3536	-0.3479	-0.4106
	(0.073)	(0.037)	(0.048)	(0.063)	(0.071)	(0.031)
Constant	5.7092	5.6546	5.6587	5.6730	5.6195	5.7514
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
R-squared	0.5214	0.5162	0.5173	0.5200	0.5152	0.5237
F-statistic	51.53	52.15	51.39	50.50	52.43	44.54

Table 2.[29] Effects of dummy variables for state religion: World Poll data.

	BKJ 1900	BKJ 1970	BKJ 1990	BKJ 2000	Religious	Fox (RAS)
State religion	-3.0631	2.5956	-3.2674	-3.1676	-0.5884	-0.4870
	(0.271)	(0.314)	(0.249)	(0.240)	(0.823)	(0.881)
Median age	-1.8237	-1.8277	-1.8072	-1.8064	-1.8252	-1.8689
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Communist	-14.584	-14.345	-15.858	-15.383	-15.15	-15.631
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Constant	107.99	105.01	107.16	107.09	106.53	107.79
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
R-squared	0.6278	0.6267	0.6283	0.6283	0.6239	0.6272
F-statistic	81.43	75.77	74.25	75.09	73.51	71.52

Table 3.[30] Effects of dummy variables for state religion with supermajority religions: WVS/EVS data.

	BKJ 1900	BKJ 1970	BKJ 1990	BKJ 2000	Religious	Fox (RAS)
State religion	-0.1703	-0.1048	-0.1147	-0.1318	-0.0204	-0.0955
	(0.259)	(0.586)	(0.492)	(0.406)	(0.884)	(0.711)
Median age	-0.0724	-0.0722	-0.072	-0.0716	-0.0719	-0.0721
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Communist	-0.3981	-0.4592	-0.4339	-0.4099	-0.4341	-0.4443
	(0.047)	(0.012)	(0.022)	(0.036)	(0.022)	(0.019)
Protestant	-1.2045	-1.2275	-1.2185	-1.2071	-1.3014	-1.2255
	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.002)
Catholic	0.5784	0.5574	0.5643	0.5667	0.5145	0.5197
	(0.006)	(0.009)	(0.007)	(0.005)	(0.011)	(0.005)
Orthodox	0.6410	0.6785	0.6618	0.6482	0.5790	0.6657
	(0.000)	(0.005)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.021)
Islamic	-0.006	-0.0043	0.003	0.0245	-0.0542	-0.0008
	(0.974)	(0.985)	(0.990)	(0.903)	(0.759)	(0.998)
Buddhist	0.7504	0.7285	0.7386	0.7519	0.6558	0.6352
	(0.000)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Constant	5.6421	5.5912	5.5848	5.5767	5.5723	5.579
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
R-squared	0.6803	0.6756	0.6764	0.6774	0.6743	0.6705
F-statistic	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 4.[31] Effects of dummy variables for state religion with supermajority religions: World Poll data.

	BKJ 1900	BKJ 1970	BKJ 1990	BKJ 2000	Religious	Fox (RAS)
State religion	-3.7357	2.6837	-3.7500	-3.4825	-1.1014	3.1121
	(0.211)	(0.374)	(0.214)	(0.239)	(0.712)	(0.449)
Median age	-1.8173	-1.7970	-1.7969	-1.7921	-1.8070	-1.8573
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Communist	-14.606	-15.044	-15.972	-15.414	-15.519	-15.699
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Protestant	-14.897	-19.049	-14.357	-14.549	-16.299	-19.434
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Catholic	7.4131	4.9352	7.6957	7.5799	6.7308	5.7597
	(0.085)	(0.275)	(0.072)	(0.077)	(0.140)	(0.166)
Orthodox	-		-	-	-	-
	-		-	-	-	-
Islamic	-0.6048	-2.1835	0.0841	0.3673	-0.8602	-3.3047
	(0.868)	(0.571)	(0.982)	(0.923)	(0.819)	(0.412)
Buddhist	19.103	15.397	18.674	18.396	17.722	16.22
	(0.053)	(0.116)	(0.079)	(0.085)	(0.072)	(0.134)
Constant	107.17	104.09	105.84	105.57	105.53	106.45
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
R-squared	0.6716	0.6685	0.6712	0.6706	0.6666	0.6722
F-statistic	110.83	99.75	106.58	107.17	103.11	101.57

Table 5.[32] Effects of Grim and Finke's GRI, GFI, SRI: WVS/EVS data.

Regression	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Government regulation	-0.0355	-	-	-0.0652	-0.0793	-	-0.0954
	(0.207)	-	-	(0.063)	(0.038)	-	(0.021)
Government favoritism	-	0.0271	-	0.0556	-	0.0345	0.0494
	-	(0.278)	-	(0.087)	-	(0.294)	(0.245)
Social regulation	-	-	0.0005	-	0.0504	-0.0148	0.0385
	-	-	(0.982)	-	(0.103)	(0.615)	(0.228)
Median age	-0.0864	-0.0844	-0.0835	-0.0906	-0.0863	-0.0857	-0.09
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Date of protection	-0.0022	-0.0032	-0.0029	-0.0021	-0.0018	-0.0031	-0.0018
	(0.092)	(0.013)	(0.018)	(0.092)	(0.147)	(0.015)	(0.143)
Population density	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001
	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.000)
Constant	10.2422	11.905	11.512	10.014	9.563	11.758	9.52
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
R-squared	0.536	0.5335	0.5275	0.5554	0.5467	0.5351	0.5614
F-statistic	44.80	38.14	37.93	37.02	38.55	30.97	32.83

Table 6.[33] Effects of Grim and Finke's GRI, GFI, SRI: World Poll data.

Regression	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Government regulation	-0.8232	-	-	-1.5395	-2.0469	-	-2.2992
	(0.134)	-	-	(0.016)	(0.018)	-	(0.010)
Government favoritism	-	0.8696	-	1.4678	-	1.0994	1.2927
	-	(0.070)	-	(0.010)	-	(0.070)	(0.028)
Social regulation	-	-	0.0359	-	1.304	-0.4401	0.9006
	-	-	(0.935)	-	(0.058)	(0.415)	(0.206)
Median age	-2.0928	-2.1254	-2.0659	-2.2151	-2.1106	-2.1482	-2.2128
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Date of protection	-0.0291	-0.0539	-0.0474	-0.0254	-0.0203	-0.0498	-0.0197
	(0.340)	(0.068)	(0.127)	(0.363)	(0.499)	(0.090)	(0.488)
Population density	0.0022	0.0021	0.002	0.0026	0.0025	0.0022	0.0027
	(0.041)	(0.043)	(0.065)	(0.011)	(0.022)	(0.038)	(0.008)
Constant	168.57	211.31	200.99	159.83	150.79	204.39	148.59
	(0.006)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.004)	(0.012)	(0.001)	(0.009)
R-squared	0.5771	0.5807	0.5681	0.6063	0.5915	0.5838	0.6127
F-statistic	62.60	56.18	52.61	53.66	55.88	44.29	49.30

Table 7.[34] Effects of Fox and Tabory's GIR variables: WVS/EVS data.

Regression	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Official support	0.0041	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(0.090)	-	-	-	-	-	-
General restrictions	-	-0.1160	-	-	-	-	-
	-	(0.090)	-	-	-	-	-
Religious discrimination	-	-	-0.0161	-	-	-	-0.0297
	-	-	(0.033)	-	-	-	(0.017)
Religious regulation	-	-	-	-0.0480	-	-	-0.0469
	-	-	-	(0.034)	-	-	(0.032)
Religious legislation	-	-	-	-	0.0137	-	0.0855
	-	-	-	-	(0.185)	-	(0.000)
General GRI	-	-	-	-	-	-0.0063	-
	-	-	-	-	-	(0.097)	-
Official state religion	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.6774
	-	-	-	-	-	-	(0.002)
Median age	-0.0796	-0.0826	-0.0815	-0.0882	-0.0777	-0.0821	-0.0839
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Population density	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0001
	(0.010)	(0.001)	(0.006)	(0.002)	(0.007)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Constant	5.7121	5.9494	5.8738	6.1167	5.5637	5.9534	5.7080
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
R-squared	0.4962	0.5104	0.5121	0.5224	0.5014	0.5069	0.6164
F-statistic	44.29	59.58	60.21	54.66	43.41	51.80	32.49

Table 8.[35] Effects of Fox and Tabory's GIR variables: World Poll data.

Regression	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Official support	1.3539	-	-	-	-	-	-
	(0.080)	-	-	-	-	-	-
General restrictions	-	-1.6281	-	-	-	-	-
	-	(0.273)	-	-	-	-	-
Religious discrimination	-	-	-0.2263	-	-	-	-0.4953
	-	-	(0.299)	-	-	-	(0.044)
Religious regulation	-	-	-	-1.2271	-	-	-1.524
	-	-	-	(0.005)	-	-	(0.002)
Religious legislation	-	-	-	-	0.4959	-	1.6824
	-	-	-	-	(0.056)	-	(0.000)
General GRI	-	-	-	-	-	-0.0288	-
	-	-	-	-	-	(0.738)	-
Official state religion	-	-	-	-	-	-	-7.7680
	-	-	-	-	-	-	(0.073)
Median age	-2.0125	-2.0082	-1.9869	-2.1107	-1.9768	-1.9881	-2.1164
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
Population density	0.0021	0.0021	0.0019	0.0021	0.0019	0.0019	0.0021
	(0.046)	(0.051)	(0.075)	(0.037)	(0.068)	(0.077)	(0.023)
Constant	104.14	108.93	107.66	113.33	102.87	107.23	107.25
	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.000)
R-squared	0.5711	0.5637	0.5633	0.5945	0.5714	0.5590	0.6509
F-statistic	73.78	71.60	69.99	84.73	68.72	68.37	50.41

NOTES

[1] Smith 1934, 6.
[2] Ibid., 8.
[3] Barro and McCleary 2003, 764. According to Barro and McCleary, the Herfindahl index "can be interpreted as the probability that two randomly selected persons in a country . . . belong to the same religion."
[4] Finke and Stark 2000, 218-219.
[5] Chaves and Gorski 2001, 267.
[6] Voas, Olson, and Crockett 2002, 217-218.
[7] There are studies which purposely focus on the effects of disestablishment in particular areas, but the work that most closely relates to this paper usually emphasizes having a large and diverse sample of countries, attempting to get an accurate global view of how state religion or regulation effects religiosity.
[8] The remaining eleven countries for WVS/EVS data may also contribute to this de-Westernization of the sample since they include mostly Eastern European and Mediterranean countries such as Albania, Greece, Macedonia, and Bosnia and Herzegovina. When using current data from either WVS/EVS or the GWP, I lose four countries by consolidating countries in North and Gwin's sample (East and West Germany, Puerto Rico and the USA, Northern Ireland and Great Britain, Serbia and Montenegro). Nine countries which appear in North and Gwin's sample are not included in the World Poll. In regressions which include supermajority religions, I lose three countries when using WVS/EVS and one country when using GWP.
[9] Israel is not included, and I use Serbia and Montenegro rather than Yugoslavia.
[10] Barro and McCleary 2003, 764-765.
[11] Ibid., 764.
[12] North and Gwin 2004, 113-115.
[13] Fox's RAS data seems to involve a much stricter definition of official state religion than BKJ uses.
[14] North and Gwin 2004, 113. Barro and McCleary are an exception.
[15] Grim and Finke 2006, 3-6.
[16] Fox and Tabory 2008, 252-255.

[17] Attendance is reported in terms of the percent of the population attending weekly or more. This logit transformation is similar to that used in North and Gwin's "Religious Freedom and the Unintended Consequences of State Religion." Since no country had an attendance rate of zero, the logit transformation did not require the loss of any observations.
[18] Although the World Christian Database and the World Christian Encyclopedia on which it is based were originally compiled as part of an overall effort focused on Christian missionary work, they are some of the most respected scholarly sources of information regarding international religious institutions and practice.
[19] North and Gwin 2004, 106.
[20] All variables relating to large, majority, and supermajority religion are kindly provided by Dr. Charles North. They were used in North, Gwin, and Orman's "Religion, Corruption, and the Rule of Law" (working paper, July 31, 2009).
[21] Grim and Finke 2006, 8. Grim and Finke's article describes and justifies these variables in much greater detail and with much greater rigor than I can hope to address in this paper.
[22] Fox and Tabory 2008, 252-255; Fox 2004. Oddly, "official support" consists both of an official state religion variable and unofficial support.
[23] To reiterate, this variable focuses on countries with specifically Marxist or Leninist Communist governments. Other socialist countries, including several Latin American, South American, and African countries, are not included.
[24] Six of these were also significant at the 5% level; the three of them that were significant at the 1% level were all related to Fox's variable. Regressing on only new countries yields mostly positive coefficients.
[25] These coefficients are only significant at the 10% level, but the coefficients of regressions on WVS/EVS attendance are significant at the 1% level.
[26] In five of seven regressions using GWP data, the 2000 interaction variable was only significant at the 5% level.
[27] As Table 6 shows, GFI is significant at the 1% level in one regression, the 5% level in another, and the 10% level in two regressions. Regardless of which attendance measure is the dependent variable, GFI is most significant when it and GRI, but not SRI, are included in the regression.

[28] Dependent variable is a logit transformation of the percentage of the population that attends religious services once or more per week as measured by the WVS/EVS. Regressions use 92 observations. P-values are in parentheses immediately below their respective coefficients. Standard errors used to calculate p-values are robust to heteroscedasticity. All F-statistics are highly significant ($p < 0.0001$).
[29] Dependent variable is the percentage of the population that attends religious services once or more per week as measured by the World Poll. Regressions use 116 observations. P-values are in parentheses immediately below their respective coefficients. Standard errors used to calculate p-values are robust to heteroscedasticity. All F-statistics are highly significant ($p < 0.0001$).
[30] Dependent variable is a logit transformation of the percentage of the population that attends religious services once or more per week as measured by the WVS/EVS. Regressions use 89 observations. P-values are in parentheses immediately below their respective coefficients. Standard errors used to calculate p-values are robust to heteroscedasticity. All F-statistics are highly significant ($p < 0.0001$).
[31] Dependent variable is the percentage of the population that attends religious services once or more per week as measured by the World Poll. Regressions use 115 observations. P-values are in parentheses immediately below their respective coefficients. Standard errors used to calculate p-values are robust to heteroscedasticity. All F-statistics are highly significant ($p < 0.0001$).
[32] Dependent variable is a logit transformation of the percentage of the population that attends religious services once or more per week, as measured by the WVS/EVS. Regressions use 91 observations. P-values are in parentheses immediately below their respective coefficients. All F-statistics are highly significant ($p < 0.0001$). Standard errors used to calculate p-values are robust to heteroscedasticity.
[33] Dependent variable is the percentage of the population that attends religious services once or more per week as measured by the World Poll. Regressions use 114 observations. P-values are in parentheses immediately below their respective coefficients. Standard errors used to calculate p-values are robust to heteroscedasticity. All F-statistics are highly significant ($p < 0.0001$).
[34] Dependent variable is a logit transformation of the percentage of the population that attends religious services once or more per week, as measured by the WVS/EVS. Regressions use 90 observations.

P-values are in parentheses immediately below their respective coefficients. All F-statistics are highly significant ($p < 0.0001$). Standard errors used to calculate p-values are robust to heteroscedasticity.

[35] Dependent variable is the percentage of the population that attends religious services once or more per week as measured by the World Poll. Regressions use 114 observations. P-values are in parentheses immediately below their respective coefficients. Standard errors used to calculate p-values are robust to heteroscedasticity. All F-statistics are highly significant ($p < 0.0001$).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barrett, David, George Kurian, and Todd Johnson. 2001. *World Christian Encyclopedia*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

Barro, Robert J., and Rachel M. McCleary. 2003. "Religion and Economic Growth across Countries." *American Sociological Review* 68: 760-81.

Chaves, Mark, and Philip S. Gorski. 2001. "Religious Pluralism and Religious Participation." *Annual Review of Sociology* 27: 261-81.

Central Intelligence Agency. 2012. "The World Factbook." https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook.

Fox, Jonathan. "The Religion and State Project." 2004. http://www.religionandstate.org.

Fox, Jonathan, and Ephraim Tabory. 2008. "Contemporary Evidence Regarding the Impact of State Regulation of Religion on Religious Participation and Belief." *Sociology of Religion* 69: 245-271.

Gallup, Inc. 2012. "Gallup WorldView Login." https://worldview.gallup.com.

Gordon-Conwell Theological Seminary. 2004. "World Christian Database." Center for the Study of Global Christianity. http://www.worldchristiandatabase.org/wcd/default.asp.

Grim, Brian J., and Roger Finke. 2006. "International Religion Indexes: Government Regulation, Government Favoritism, and Social Regulation of Religion." *Interdisciplinary Journal of Research on Religion* 2: 3-41. http://www.religjournal.com.

North, Charles M., and Carl R. Gwin. 2004. "Religious Freedom and the Unintended Consequences of State Religion." *Southern Economic Journal* 71: 103-17.

North, Charles M., Carl R. Gwin, and Wafa H. Orman. "Religion, Corruption, and the Rule of Law." Working paper, July 31, 2009.

Smith, Adam. 1934. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations.* New York: E.P. Dutton & Co. V.i.g.1-42.

Stark, Rodney, and Roger Finke. 2000. "Religious Competition and Commitment: An International Assessment." In *Acts of Faith: Explaining the Human Side of Religion,* 218-248. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Voas, David, Daniel V. A. Olson, and Alasdair Crockett. 2002. "Religious Pluralism and Participation: Why Previous Research Is Wrong." *American Sociological Review* 67: 212-30.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

STEPHEN MARGHEIM is a senior from Alexandria, Louisiana. He will graduate this May as a University Scholar with concentrations in Greek, Latin, and philosophy. Having traveled across the United States giving papers at various academic conferences, Stephen has found a passion for writing and presenting. Stephen is also the current president of Eta Sigma Phi, the classics honors society, and a member of the William Carey Crane Scholars Program. After graduation, he will pursue a graduate degree in classics.

GRANT SHELLHOUSE is a senior University Scholars major from Kingwood, Texas, with concentrations in theology and literature. Academically, he is fascinated by themes ranging from sacramentality to the author-reader relationship and is currently completing a thesis on contemplative prayer and the Virgin Mary. When able, he enjoys traveling, hiking, poetry, and concerts. Although he is unsure of his future plans, he hopes to teach after graduating in May.

ERIKA SMITH, a senior from Minnesota, is a University Scholars major with concentrations in literature and languages. After graduating, she will be attending graduate school to pursue a Masters and Ph.D. in English. Erika is involved with both the William Carey Crane Scholars program and the Green Scholars Initiative, and enjoys her job at the Baylor University Press. She speaks both Spanish and Italian "passably" and reads Spanish, Italian, Old English, Latin, and Greek. In her spare time, Erika is an avid soccer player and a member of the Swing Dance Society.

MATTHEW SWIFT, a native of Pollock Pines, California, is a senior Baylor Business Fellow studying economics, finance, and church-state studies. His time in the Honors Program and William Carey Crane Scholars Program has only furthered his interest in interdisciplinary studies, which he hopes to apply to a future career in law. In the rare moments in which he is not writing his thesis, volunteering at church, or serving as Chief Editor of *The Pulse,* Matthew also enjoys singing, playing piano, and spending time with close friends and family.