

My Response to T.D. Barnes: Positivistic Straw Arguments Do
Not Review Books

Lester L. Field, Jr.

J.D. Williams Library
University, Miss.
2002

2nd revised edition 2009

Since positivistic historicism generally regards discourse as epiphenomenal, J.G.A. Pocock observed that positivists habitually accuse intellectual historians "of failing to relate (they mean subordinate) 'ideas' to 'realities.'" Implicit in the positivistic accusation is the assumption that the language of the primary sources hides these positivistic "realities." Since positivists claim culturally unmediated access to realities beyond the language that supposedly hides them, the positivistic accusations usually come in the form of more-competent-than-thou assaults on discourse.

Contemptuous of the language used in the original sources *and* by the historian of ideas, positivists, as Pocock noted, attack the intellectual historian "for saying a number of things you know you never said."¹ Since my book on ancient political theologies hardly subordinated their ancient ideas to positivistic "realities," but instead dared criticize positivistic historicism generally and that of T.D. Barnes explicitly, his polemical response, which accuses my book of asserting things that it never asserted, hardly comes a surprise. Since the positivist views discourse as all the more irrelevant when it pertains to

religion,² his pretense to superior competence likewise hardly arouses amazement.³

Barnes even manages to conflate and so dismiss both intellectual and cultural history--the two historiographical traditions upon which the book draws most--as an "ideological bent." On the one hand, despite the great distance separating what I wrote, or even implied, and what Barnes inferred, I do not begrudge him his right to read sources, both primary and secondary, in any way he wishes. On the other hand, I do contest his right to attribute to them errors that he himself makes in reading. On one thing, Barnes and I agree: the mistakes that he accuses me of making are, in their totality, not the mistakes of a competent historian. Whether or not Barnes constructed these mistakes for ridicule, they are generally ridiculous.

Incompetent Claims to "Accuracy" and "Historical Reality"

Scorning historiographical consensus as an "ideological bent," valorizing his own positivistic ideology, and ignoring my own criticism of his work, Barnes constructs mistakes, which he then attributes to me, so that he charges me with his own "technical incompetence."

Flailing, without landing a blow on any opponent other than one of his own making, he stumbles repeatedly on his ideology, as he asserts that my book is guilty of "pervasive inaccuracy" and "full of inaccuracies," which bear "little resemblance to historical reality."⁴

Inasmuch as I and other serious scholars--indeed, most scholars--regard his positivistic doctrine of "accuracy" as absurd, we necessarily reject the positivistic "historical reality" that derives from it. Unless Barnes converts from positivism, or gives me any good reason to convert to it, I would never want him to call my work "accurate!" Like fundamentalism or outmoded correspondence theories, his "accuracy" presupposes a reading that does not interpret. It not only presupposes that there is a "reality"--that is, an objective abstraction of the real--somewhere outside language, but also supposes direct access to the presupposed links connecting language to this supposed non-linguistic "reality."

Since, by these stubbornly unexamined presuppositions, Barnes has ignored most of the epistemological and historiographical scholarship of the past forty years, his old-fashioned political histories, no less than his polemic against rival historians, assume or ascribe intent utterly absent in the language of his sources. Although by self-

understanding, Barnes remains open to "literary approaches" to the language of the sources, he never embraces or seriously engages any critical theory that postdates the 1960s. Although he seems capable of philological analysis, he nonetheless rarely employs it, and never in areas of doctrine and law--in other words, in those areas that arguably demand it most.⁵

By his ideology, he can instead "probe behind" what I actually wrote, as he did in his work against Athanasius.⁶ For just as Barnes could "find" a dishonesty nowhere evident in what Athanasius wrote, "behind" what he wrote, so too could Barnes "find" a "technical incompetence" nowhere evident in what I wrote. In this way, and for four decades, Barnes has regularly and tautologically absolutized his own assumptions as the "reality" behind what others have written. With such "accuracy," Barnes even postulates that I do not have "any serious acquaintance with" my own book's "subject matter!"

To serious scholars, such specious reading, which somehow divines the intent of the sources, seemed wrong long before it became obsolete. Since positivistic historicism seeks to determine what they "mean" (to the positivist) rather than what they say, philological analysis of the language of the sources now provides a more

rigorous *and* more tolerant understanding of what *others* meant. Though I will treat Barnes's self-serving or self-realizing methodology at length elsewhere, I should here at least note that scholarly consensus, which rejects it, also governs book reviews.

Barnes was able, after all, to peddle his tautological polemic as a book review in a generalists' journal, which either could not or did not check what he wrote against what I wrote. His polemic nonetheless regularly flouts pervasive and long-standing scholarly conventions governing book reviews--even conventions to which the generalists' journal adheres in theory, though obviously not in practice. Reminding scholars who review books of their responsibility and the conventions that govern it, Bruce Mazlish, for example, notes that the "view of the subject, then, accords well with our increasing awareness that the reach for 'objectivity,' as an ideal, requires an increased knowing of ourselves as well as the object under examination."⁷

Such self-awareness precludes what Leibnitz described as the positivists' "view from nowhere." As Gerhart B. Ladner put it more recently, but half a century ago, "the type of objectivity postulated by positivistically inclined historians does not exist."⁸ Since the scholarship on these

substantive questions dwarfs as well as marginalizes Barnes's work, the present examination limits itself to the more manageable task exposing the specious arguments that Barnes constructed against my book. Although a serious reading of my book accomplishes the same end--that is, without the help of any exposé--readers unacquainted with Barnes's positivistic crudity, on the one hand, and my book's positive scholarly reception,⁹ on the other, might well take his reading seriously enough to dismiss my research without reading it.

Positivism, Marxism, and Ancient Self-Understandings

Affecting a hermeneutical and historiographical sophistication belied by his positivism, Barnes claims that my work ignores "significant modern studies whose ideological bent" seems "unsympathetic" as well as "some of the most important achievements of modern historical scholarship." To substantiate *both* claims, he cites *two* books, both irrelevant. Geoffrey de Ste. Croix wrote one, Peter Brown the other. Since my work explicitly pertained to ancient Christian self-understandings of the Latin West, Ste. Croix's Marxist understanding of the Greek East had little to recommend it. Even with respect to the Greek

East, the Marxist's work--however one measures its "most important" status--seems hopelessly dated.

Barnes's allusion to Peter Brown's work seems even more incongruous. Since my book explicitly precluded treatment of Augustine's theology, neither Peter Brown, who edited my book in manuscript, nor I saw any compelling relevance in his biography of Augustine. Although Barnes rightly calls Brown's work a "classic," the period that my book covered explicitly ended with the theologies of Ambrose and Siricius. As I explicitly noted, "Augustine and Jerome--though contemporaries of Ambrose--belong to the next generation of Fathers," so that I "cited both sparingly" and then principally when they shed light on the theologies of preceding generations. After all, Augustine's important doctrines of "original sin" and the "two cities" both postdate 398 and so the period that my book examined, as evidenced by its very title!¹⁰

Barnes likewise claims that my work "belittles and disparages the originality of Augustine" as "the mere affirmation of an existing consensus among the 'Latin Fathers.'" Again the characterization belongs to Barnes, not me and certainly has nothing to do with what little I wrote about Augustine. Nor does Barnes's characterization have anything to do with my present understanding, based on

my still unpublished research into Augustine's political and ecclesiological self-understandings. Unbeknownst to Barnes, even the book manuscript that I first submitted to Peter Brown treated Augustine's theology extensively and discretely, as it deserves.

Yet this extensive treatment added eight chapters and over four-hundred pages to an already large book. Since the depth, originality, and complexity of Augustine's thought in these chapters tended to overwhelm the contributions of its predecessors, both Brown and I decided to separate my study of Augustine's predecessors--the study now published as *Liberty, Dominion, and the Two Swords*--from my still unpublished study of Augustine. *Liberty* (348 n. 28, 356 n. 92) alludes to the unpublished material, which I am now readying for publication as a book entitled *Freedom and Coercion: Hermeneutics of Love, Fear, and the Two Swords in St. Augustine's Church*.

Though Augustine's theologies of *libertas* and empire, and their exceedingly complicated evolution, generally postdate the period covered by *Liberty*, I nonetheless managed to cite relevant studies in anticipation of Augustine's thought and the book that I am now writing on it.¹¹ In other respects, this anticipation seemed necessary. Even as a fifth-century interpreter of earlier traditions

and texts, some of which have not otherwise survived, Augustine also remains an important witness to them; in the case of some fourth-century developments, his witness was even contemporary.

With Augustine, as with all great thinkers, the question is not whether he was original, but how: how did he receive traditions and by his use change them? In casting Pelagianism as heretical novelty, for example, how did he lay claim to catholic tradition, and why did this claim succeed? Whatever the answer, Barnes's reification of Augustine's "originality" deprives it of any historical meaning.¹²

Canones Romanorum ad Gallos and the Case of Ambrose:
The Unbaptized Bishop-Elect and the Cleric Ordained to the
Episcopate

By Barnes's positivistic measure of "accuracy," the judgment of the *Canones Romanorum ad Gallos* that "a lay person could not receive the episcopate, any more than a recruit (*tiro*) could receive the *imperium*" is inaccurate. Conversely, since Barnes's notion of "historical reality" has little to do with the texts that construct it, his sense of "accuracy" did not prevent him from attributing

the authoritative judgment or counsel of the *Canones* to me, despite my citation!¹³

This misrepresentation hardly prevented Barnes from making another straw argument, which he then destroyed, as if it had something to do with the conclusion that I myself had reached with respect to the *Canones Romanorum ad Gallos*. My conclusion reconciled the *Canones'* ban on baptized governors becoming bishops and Ambrose's election to the episcopate from a governorship. Since the ban itself stemmed in large part from governors' official use of torture, I wrote that "according to Paulinus Mediolanensis, the still unbaptized governor Ambrose *contra consuetudinem* ordered torture applied in a criminal case," because he "sought to invalidate his episcopal election."

Thus Barnes's straw argument that "Paulinus explicitly puts his baptism after his election" not only errs in its claim that I have asserted otherwise, but also misses the point that I actually did make: "when Ambrose received baptism...he acted as bishop-elect, formally or functionally retired from his magistracy." Since Ambrose--at least according to Paulinus--had ordered torture as governor *before* his baptism, he likewise did not fall under the ban of the *Canones*. After his election to the episcopate, Ambrose also remained within their canonical

boundaries, because he received his episcopate not as a layman but as a *clericus*, having been ordained to the lower orders, including the diaconate and presbyterate, *before* his ordination to the episcopate.

At least from a canonical standpoint, Ambrose had resigned his governorship by his baptism, which canonically also entitled him to act as bishop-elect, since he had never been a baptized governor. By the baptism that preceded his lower orders, Ambrose had therefore formally accepted his election to the episcopate. In this respect, Barnes's accusation also ignores the distinction between a bishop-elect and a bishop: canonically, ordination, not election, made a bishop, and Ambrose did not receive his episcopal ordination until he had received ordinations to other *clerical* orders.¹⁴

In this respect, Eastern canon resembled Western, and the election of Nectarius provides a very complicated exception that proves the rule. On the one hand, despite imperial nomination before his baptism, he hardly functioned as bishop-elect or even formally received election until after his baptism, when the entire council at Constantinople elected him. On the other hand, unlike Ambrose's case, there is no evidence that Nectarius

received any clerical ordinations before he was made bishop, that is, by ordination.¹⁵

The *Lex de imperio Vespasiani* and Barnes's Crude
Contextualism

Contrary to Barnes's polemic, I hardly misrepresented "the content of *lex de imperio Vespasiani* by selective quotation," but rather quoted those portions that still seemed "on point" in its fourth-century reception. Fourth-century Christians received the first-century *Lex de imperio Vespasiani* with, and through, the glosses of later jurists, including Ulpian.¹⁶ From a philological and an epistemological standpoint, Barnes's charge likewise presupposes an untenable distinction. Is quotation ever not selective?

A crude contextualism--implicit in Barnes's accusation concerning the *Lex de imperio Vespasiani*--becomes explicit in the charge that I transfer "a letter of Ambrose...from its real historical context into a false one." Since Barnes recognizes but one "real historical context," the letter's juridical and canonical contexts ipso facto become "false" ones.¹⁷ By a kind of militant semi-literacy, then, Barnes again ignores overwhelming scholarly consensus, which

rejects such contextualism as "cracker-barrel logocentrism."¹⁸ No historical contexts exist in themselves. No definite procedure governs their recovery.¹⁹ In the case of Ambrose's letter, Barnes not only rejects linguistic traditions and ideological parallels as contextual but also regards *the* context as so obvious that he does not even mention it. Inasmuch as the positivist dismisses discourse, I can only guess that his "real historical context" refers to a specific incident, or perhaps even a proximate cause, that somehow overpowers the letter's other contexts.

Mistranslation?

In passing, Barnes accuses me of mistranslating a passage by Ambrose of Milan. Especially given the pervasive and egregious character of Barnes's other mistakes, his passing notice here requires a closer look and, at least in some respects, may actually have some merit. Ambrose wrote:

Ubi illud constituimus, imperator, quod iam ipse tuum iudicium declarasti, immo etiam dedidisti leges, ne cui esset liberum alium iudicare? Quod cum praescrpsisti aliis, praescrpsisti et tibi; leges enim imperator fert, quas primus ipse custodiat.

I translated the passage as follows:

When, emperor, have we ever established what you yourself have declared as your judgment? Or have

you rather given laws, so that no one is free to judge? Because you prescribed for others, you also prescribed for yourself. An emperor passes laws which he himself is the first to keep.²⁰

Whatever hermeneutical myopia or lack of philological perspicacity prevented me from translating "cui" and "alium," I now insert a translation both words (in the italicized English):

When, emperor, have we ever established what you yourself have declared as your judgment? Or have you rather given laws, so that, *with respect to it*, no other were free to judge? Because you prescribed for others, you also prescribed for yourself. An emperor passes laws which he himself is the first to keep.

I have also taken the liberty of rendering subjunctive imperfect "esset" as "were," though, grammatically, the continuing action and hypothetical application--especially relative to the perfects--allow "is." Conversely, I should note that I preserve my elision of "Quod cum" ("Because when," since both words can mean "because") as "Because." Not to do so produces a sentence fragment in English:

"Because when you prescribed for others, you also prescribed for yourself."

That Ambrose's fourth-century "sentence" here does not conform to that of modern English hardly absolves the translator of the duty to translate into English. By enduring philological imperative, translations have to make

sense in their new language, which has to mediate precisely--that is, paradoxically, by interpretation--senses of the old language.²¹ Whether viewed in twentieth-century terms of the "incommensurability" of every language or in fifth-century terms of *proprietas* or *idioma*, all translation therefore theoretically remains a paradox or a contradiction--a paradox, if defined within the translator's interpretive framework and its utility; a contradiction, without such contextual definition.²² On the one hand, Barnes does not specify the function and goal of translation, describe and analyze its operations, or relate its goal and operations.²³ On the other hand, neither my old nor my new translation affects my book's conclusions concerning Ambrose's theology--or anything else.

Legal Force and Power of Law

More egregiously, Barnes's polemic misconstrues my assertion concerning the *senatus consultum ultimum*, so that Barnes again resorts to demolishing his own misconception. On the one hand, I never denied that, under "the Roman Republic, the legal force of senatorial decrees was generally acknowledged." On the other hand, Barnes's conflation of what he styles "legal force" with

the juridically specific notions of "the power of law" (*legis vicem* in Gaius and *legis vigor* in Ulpian) involved some very sloppy thinking and, worse, an ignorance of the juridical debate that emerges from the relevant scholarship.

By modern analogy, a stop sign has legal force, but it does not have the power of law, as does a decision by the Supreme Court; and no jurisprudence recognizes either the stop sign or the Supreme Court decision as a law, that is, a legislative enactment. By historiographical consensus, which looks to overwhelming evidence, the *senatus consultum* did not have "the power of law" until the Principate, and even then, as Gaius noted in the second century, some jurisprudence questioned this power. During the Republic, at any rate, only one kind of *senatus consultum* came even remotely close, as my book notes, to the power of law. This *consultum*, which Barnes's calls "the emergency decree," most modern historiography calls the *senatus consultum ultimum*.²⁴

Ulpian as the Author of the Digest?

Nowhere does my work implicitly, explicitly, or ever make "Ulpian the author of Justinian's Digest," as Barnes

infers. The inference not only contradicts common scholarly sense, my own explicit citations of the third-century jurist Ulpian *in* the sixth-century Digest, and my bibliographical citation of the Digest; it also belies my observations on Justinian, the *Corpus iuris civilis*, to which the Digest belongs, and its relevance to third- and fourth-century developments.²⁵ Though one can easily find this evidence by looking at my index under "Justinian" and "Ulpian," Barnes instead seized on his own misreading of a "dictum, attributed to Ulpian's Digest."

From this brief allusion or, more specifically, on the sole basis of its one possessive noun, Barnes concocted a grammatically full and explicit assertion of sole authorship! Since, by the same interpretive paradigm, possessives always indicate sole authorship, Barnes's own accusation turns on itself. It makes Justinian the sole author of the Digest or Digests (*Digesta*)! Since such a reading seems no less inept than Barnes's, it may even pertain to his technical incompetence in Roman jurisprudence. In any event, his reading pertains to his methodology, which, in its rush to judge authors, ignores or dismisses what they have written.

In this respect, I have already noted how Barnes had to ignore all my citations of Ulpian and the Digest to

impute an incompetent's mistake to my allusion. But the negligence does not end here. Barnes even failed to check or mention the very citation of dictum that led to his misreading, so that he ignores the fact that Digest itself attributed the dictum to Ulpian, specifically to the first book of his *Institutes* (*Ulpianus libro primo institutionum*). By common knowledge, perhaps even Barnes's knowledge, what survives of Ulpian's textbook (*Institutiones*) survives only in the comprehensive treatise (*Digesta*), which Justinian promulgated.

That almost third of the Digest derives from Ulpian's texts neither makes him the author of the Digest nor deprives him of authorship of those portions specifically attributed to him by Tribonian and the other sixth-century compilers. Even in the citation for the passage that Barnes misread, I specifically observed, and so he specifically ignored, that the Digest interpreted Ulpian. Since such an interpretation presupposes that the Digest postdates the author whom it interprets, its interpretation of Ulpian hardly befits the Digest's author—a single figure who exists in only Barnes's characterization.

Since Justinian's *Institutes* quote the same dictum that the Digest quotes, but differently and without attribution, even the controversy surrounding the

authenticity of Ulpian's dictum as preserved by the Digest escapes Barnes attention, and in a way that is all the more unnecessary given my citation of Anastos.²⁶ Needless to say--were it not for Barnes's polemic--fourth-century Christians who knew Ulpian's third-century *Institutes* could not have known the sixth-century Digest or *Institutes*. Given my references and my bibliographical entry--which actually *cite* the Digest, that is, as a *whole*, rather than *allude* to a *portion* of it--my partitive allusion falls well within, and so remains protected by, the very conventions of grammar and citation that Barnes had to flout to make his accusation.

Since allusions, as opposed to citations, assume a common knowledge or a shared expertise, my allusion not only presupposed understandings of a scholarly audience--an audience accustomed to reading "Ulp. Dig." in the *apparatus fontium* of legal texts and of commentaries--but also assumed that the less informed would check my reference. Given Barnes's lack of scholarly discipline, I obviously did not account for the possibility of a wild accusation in technically incompetent reading pretending superior competence. In any event, Barnes's inference presupposes a set of assumptions that refute themselves.

Eschatological Liberty as Political Theology

To the extent that Barnes generally constructs mistakes concerning issues other than those that pertained to Latin theologies of liberty, dominion, and the two swords in the Christian West of Late Antiquity, he generally ignores my book and its "subject matter," to which he otherwise claims "serious acquaintance." Thus theologies of "liberty" and the "two swords" receive a few sentences between them and without reference to any theology, while ancient notions of dominion remain unmentioned in any context. More than this polemically convenient reduction of my book's "subject matter," however, the methodological reductionism warrants further notice.

By reducing Christian *libertas* to a "concern for personal or political liberty," Barnes restricts his description to a predicate that passes muster only under positivistic criteria of meaningfulness.²⁷ These criteria preclude having to account for the changing theologies of liberty or my book's treatment of them. In this respect, the positivist's reification of "liberty" as a political and anthropological constant not only ignores Wittgenstein's warning that "the meaning of a word is its

use in the language,"²⁸ but also rests on the essentialist premise that "liberty" exists independent of language.

By denying any cultural specificity to *libertas*, the positivist separates discourse from the massive ancient data and so elevates his positivistic "liberty" to a discursive domain where the real presents itself without credential.²⁹ All "liberty" seems the same. Generically "personal or political," it remains indistinguishable from the bourgeois liberty that emerged from the Enlightenment. Thus static anachronism displaces historical change and in a way that extends well beyond the history of liberty and the history of Christianity. Examining similar problems in the history of Judaism, for example, Jacob Neusner notes that "once history's components, one-time events, lose their distinctiveness, then history as a didactic construct...loses all pertinence."³⁰

Since language defines both the events and their reality, Barnes's positivistic "reality," which rejects close readings, does not survive them.³¹ It dissolves into contradiction. On the one hand, by conflating all "liberty," Barnes confuses "the earliest Christians" and the Christians of Late Antiquity, and, by a crude proof-texting of Titus 2:9, dismisses the abundant scriptural use of ἔλευθερία or *libertas*--in 2 Cor. 3:17, for example. On

the other hand, "liberty," now rendered as linguistically unproblematic, has something to do with Titus 2:9, which never mentions it!

In this respect, and in other respects, I obviously prefer my heavy reading--"almost eighty pages" of bibliography and "170 pages of endnotes," even by Barnes's hostile count--and what Barnes describes as my "leadен prose" to his light reading and tinny prose. By historiographical consensus, however, more than critical reading or good writing is at stake here. As Mary J. Carruthers observes, "people do not 'have' ideas, they 'make' them."³² Against philological approaches old and new, the crude positivistic notion that languages merely (mis)represent "historical reality" allows language to change but not ideas.³³

More specifically, since no idea exists independent of its expression, positivistic "liberty" remains woefully inadequate as a description and arguably worthless as an explanation of "liberty" in Classical Antiquity,³⁴ Late Antiquity,³⁵ the Middle Ages,³⁶ and even Modernity.³⁷ Given serious consensus on this "subject matter," my book seems neither as "original" nor as "misguided" as Barnes claims, and not just because, in positivistic fashion, he absolutizes both judgments.

In late second- and early third-century Africa, Tertullian and others translated σώζειν (to save) as *liberare* (to free). Not until the middle of the third century did the African primate Cyprian coin the term *salvare* (to save).³⁸ Especially since the association of salvation and freedom had, with different nuance, already occurred in the Christian Greek, which likewise transmitted it long afterward,³⁹ Christian *libertas* emphatically referred to freedom from sin, death, and damnation. "Ancient Christians," as I noted, "regarded liberty as humanity's greatest gift and highest goal."

Since these words appear in my book's introduction, which I wrote after the rest of my book, I certainly did not begin the book, as a matter of research, writing, or conviction, from this "proposition," as Barnes asserts. As his positivism had already reduced this proposition's "liberty" to "personal or political liberty," he evidently did not need to read further or, at any rate, account for any further reading. "Given, yet still hoped for," as even my introduction noted, "this 'liberty' paradoxically and simultaneously pertained to human will as well as divine grace and to the present as well as the 'end time' (*eschaton*)."⁴⁰

Early in the third century, then, the martyr Perpetua equated her eschatological *libertas* not with earthly freedom but with her salvation. Tertullian even called it "Christian liberty" (*libertas christiana*), scorning "secular liberty" (*libertas saecularis*).⁴¹ Scholarly consensus has long recognized such ancient Christian jargon (*altchristliche Sondersprache*)⁴² or Late Latinity.⁴³ Since ancient Christians linguistically equated their freedom with their moral and eschatological servitude to Christ, they theologically distinguished it from servitude to the devil. By the same token, since idolatry variously entailed eschatological enslavement or damnation, imperial policy that sought to impose idolatry also entailed Christians' "spiritual" opposition.

On the one hand, as I noted, "Martyrdom thus marked the boundary between state and Church or--to use two terms derived from late fourth-century Latin--between 'paganism' and 'Christianity.'"⁴⁴ On the other hand, contrary to Barnes's claims, eschatological freedom had little to do with slavery, as a *temporal* institution. Though Christian notions of freedom did variously prompt some Christians to free slaves, and though Roman law accommodated such desires, neither doctrine nor law prompted moves to abolish

slavery, which seemed a God-ordained remedy to the sin that produced human servitude.⁴⁵

Whatever else "liberty" meant to ancient Christians, it was neither merely "political" nor merely "personal." If "personal liberty" describes a subjective rather than an objective right, then it did not even exist before the fourteenth century!⁴⁶ For most centuries, then, the liberty that Thomas Jefferson and Timothy Barnes regarded as self-evident had not seemed so!⁴⁷ Its history, as all history, pertains to a reality defined by the original sources, in their own terms. To say there is another "historical reality"--a positivistic one, for example--not only succumbs to truism but also fails to acknowledge ancient realities, informed by their own language, had nothing to do with positivism.

The Two Swords

Though Barnes does not bother himself with the theological notions of dominion that defined Christian freedom, he does manage to throw a few ill-conceived sentences at the "two swords." Since Barnes ignores scholarly consensus on the "two swords,"⁴⁸ it comes as no great surprise that he ignores the manner in which Gerard

Caspary broke with this consensus and suggested that the "medieval" problem of the "two swords" predates the Middle Ages. On the one hand, Caspary attributed the genesis of the "spiritual sword" and the "temporal sword"--which did become preeminent medieval symbols of Church and monarchy--to the third-century Greek Father, Origen. On the other hand, the structuralism of Lévi-Strauss made the attribution possible, so that both the method and the conclusion became problematic.

Since the "structure" of the two swords seemed "primary and self-regarding," it also seemed uncaused in a historical sense.⁴⁹ If Origen exegetically implied the structure of the two swords, when, where, how, and why did they become so politically explicit in the Latin West? My work answered these questions, and, contrary to the teleological interpretation that Barnes imposes on it, has *nothing* to do with "the late medieval interpretation of the gospel text 'Behold, we have two swords' (Luke 22:38)." Contrary to this assertion by Barnes, the political exegesis of Luke 22:38 actually began in the eleventh century, so that this exegesis is--by historiographical convention--high medieval, not "late medieval."⁵⁰

As my research discovered, and again in a way that Barnes manages to ignore, the first Latin exegesis of Luke

22:38 dates to the end of the fourth century. Perhaps more importantly, given Barnes's inattention, I explicitly stated that the differences between this exegesis and medieval exegeses "seem as profound as the similarities."⁵¹ As I also noted and so in a way that Barnes again ignores, each of the "two swords" predated this fourth-century exegesis: the "spiritual sword" (*gladius spiritalis* or *machaera spiritalis*) predated this exegesis by a century!

By that fact, or by the texts that transmitted it, the "spiritual sword" emerged in historical, and linguistically attestable, relation to the sword (*gladius* or *machaera*). Since Barnes either did not read my book in its entirety or does not understand much of it, he likewise does not understand why Christians regarded this singular sword as important enough for me to document. I will therefore have to repeat a point that my book made—a point that other scholarship has independently corroborated. To Christians, the sword initially needed no further description. This sword, *the sword*, uniquely symbolized and actualized Roman coercion.

Typologically the sword made martyrs. Since it linked them as sacrifices to their *liberator*, Christ, the early fourth-century description of the sword as the "temporal sword" (*gladius temporalis*) presupposed the eternal

"reality" of the spiritual sword. Such late fourth-century formulations as the "material sword" and the "world's sword" (*gladius materialis* and the *gladius saeculi*) similarly emerged in antithesis to the spiritual sword, without which these later expressions have no referential validity.⁵² I leave the reader to decide whether the two swords were "ubiquitous"—again Barnes's characterization, not mine.

Conclusions

Since this ideological juxtaposition or linguistic derivation of two swords occurred without any allusion to Luke 22:38, Barnes, as usual, turns his own judgment about textual significance into an affirmation of textual content, thus absolutizing his own interpretation as *the* meaning of the text. The question is therefore not one of "accuracy," as Barnes so crudely and so often puts it.⁵³ The meaning of one text can never correspond exactly to another or, worse, to some unverifiable and metalinguistic "reality," to which Barnes pretends special access. No referents exist outside language.

Since no reality exists independent of its expression, the truth does not pertain to "accuracy" but pertains to referential validity. Though Barnes suggests otherwise--

most notoriously in his work against Athanasius--polemic is not itself inherently false. If, for example, by impugning competence or honesty, Athanasius and his opponents were merely cheap-shot artists, then so too is Barnes.⁵⁴ Hence Barnes's polemic against my work is not "false" because it apes a book review; it is "false" because it has no referential connection to my book, save the citations and quotations by which Barnes proof-texts his own positivistic convictions.

Put differently, Barnes, like other positivists, ignores his role as a signifier, even as he resignifies referents as "real" somewhere "behind" or "outside" the text. He thereby claims a self-evident "reality" that tautologically totalizes self-evidence, self-realization, or auto-reference.⁵⁵ However interesting Barnes's polemic may seem as an exercise in self-realization, the mistakes that it makes are his. The "reality" that it claims has no relationship with what I wrote.

Systemically and referentially, my work rejects the very premises of his polemic: that a modern biography of Augustine and a Marxist study of the ancient Greek world have something to do with Latin-Christian self-understandings before Augustine; that a study of traditions upon which Augustine drew ipso facto "belittles and

disparages" his originality; that possessive nouns always indicate sole authorship; that numerous and explicit references to the contrary, including full bibliographical citation, are always irrelevant; that ideas exist outside language and had no historical origins, evolution, or use worthy of study; that liberty was not theological; that every text has but one historical context; that election rather than ordination made bishops; that Ambrose received no clerical ordinations prior to his episcopate; that quotation is never selective; that "power of law" really just means "legal force"; that authors have not understood what they themselves have written as well as Barnes understands it.

These premises either refute themselves or contradict the very sources that Barnes cites as evidence. In either case, his contempt for linguistic constructions of "historical reality," past and present, not only allows gross misreading of the sources, primary and secondary, but also ignores present revivals of rhetorical awareness, which itself sheds light on how the ancients constructed their historical truths. As Paul Veyne observes, "information is an illocution that can be completed only if the receiver recognizes the speaker's competence and honesty beforehand, so that, from the very outset, a piece

of information is situated beyond the alternative between truth and falsehood."⁵⁶

Whether by malign neglect or polemical convenience, Barnes not only failed to inform readers how my book carried out its "task, as defined in the author's own terms," but also provided disturbing "evidences that he did read the book carefully...errors of fact or nomenclature that fly in the face of the book's own assertions." Scorning these scholarly norms, which legitimate book reviews as such, Barnes never mentioned his own historiographical "school," my criticism of it, "his self-interest in the reviewing situation,"⁵⁷ the mistakes that I found in his work, and my citation of scholarly consensus that marginalizes his work.⁵⁸ By flouting pervasive and long-standing conventions, which mandate such disclosure, Barnes cannot escape the appearance of impropriety, namely, the appearance of offering a retaliatory polemic in place of a book review.

Since the mistakes that he attributes to my work are of his own making, the alternative explanation is gross, even systemic, negligence. That my work not only attempted to cite all relevant studies, but dared criticize "unsympathetic" studies by Barnes, makes his historiographical malfeasance at best incompetent, at worst

disingenuous. Since his specious readings unfortunately extend to rest of his "scholarship," it "depicts a Roman Empire and an early Christianity that very often bear little resemblance to historical reality" as constructed in the original sources. Thus his own words indict his contempt for historical realities other than his own.

As Janet Nelson suggests, original sources themselves provide "slippery (re)sources for positivists," who postulate *the* historical reality even as their sources' claims on truth "can hardly be considered outside genre."⁵⁹ Since the production of knowledge in history as well the other sciences proceeds as an effort to explain phenomena anomalous to the knowledge already gleaned by received paradigm, dismissing the anomalies as false by postulating one's own science as "accurate" merely succumbs to an epistemologically vain, but historically pervasive, reflex to stave off the impending failure of the received paradigm.⁶⁰

This reflex, to use Barnes's own words "is both anachronistic and perverse." Conversely, the principal difference between his work against Athanasius or Ammianus Marcellinus and Barnes's wanton misreading of historians who read and write with more philological rigor than Barnes is that living historians can still defend or reclaim their

own understanding of their own words. Though he certainly misrepresents both the linguistic evidence and the work that conveys it, my certainty does not feign the positivists' "empirical" or "objective" criteria. Their discredited "objectivist and scientific ideology" rightly lies outside the scholarly mainstream.⁶¹

By the same conventions of grammar, citation, and translation that I employed when I wrote *Liberty*, I merely reclaim my own words as I still understand them. As still evidenced by the conventions of my usage, Barnes's historiographical self-understanding merely mugged mine. If he aimed to analyze what I actually wrote, then he failed, and his polemic affirms the misgivings that my book already expressed regarding to his "scholarship." I have never subscribed to Barnes's "historical reality." I find his "accuracy" absurd in theory and in practice. I reject as bogus Barnes's ability to divine the intent of past and present authors, *despite* what they wrote.

To "probe behind" their texts to discredit their authors' honesty or competence succumbs to a pretext that is vain in every sense of the word.⁶² Such a procedure not only abdicates the historians' humble interpretive role but also arrogantly usurps an oracular one.⁶³ Far from recognizing the language of a text or conceding aporia when

texts contradict one another, this rush to certain judgment remains a salient, even guiding, feature of the positivist's method. "Doxography," as Barnes puts it, "can never be a substitute for evidence and argument," even if such a pronouncement itself "sounds suspiciously like special pleading."⁶⁴ Responding to this truism with another, I should note that doxography is preferable to imposing argument on evidence that cannot support it.

By linguistic construction, an historical truth is either a past truth or a present truth about the past. Since no truth can be both at once, all truths lose the transhistorical guarantee that positivism ascribes to them. Perhaps more importantly, no past truth can seem counterfeit by a positivistic currency that has itself lost that guarantee. Inasmuch as the positivist's "historical reality" exists as an "accurate" absolute, a plenary presence, an overriding meaning, it exists as an atemporal denial or displacement of the very past that it purports to save from the sources.⁶⁵

In this respect, Augustine's prayerful praise to God, whose knowledge of the past and future seemed always present, indicts the positivist:

All your years at once stand still, because they stand still, they are not separated, the going from the coming, because they do not pass....

Your years are one day, and your day is not daily but today, because your today does not give place to tomorrow; nor does it follow yesterday.⁶⁶

Whatever else it is, positivistic "historical reality" is not an eternal verity fully present to the positivist as to God.

Since Barnes neither recognizes interpretive frameworks other than his own nor recognizes his own "reality" as an interpretation, "competent scholars," by his own reckoning, agree with him! They "correctly" or "rightly" make truth claims, not conventionally but objectively and so regardless of interpretive framework. Conversely, the "accuracy" of the sources becomes an exercise in positivistic plausibility, so that there are sources, "which," Barnes writes, "I believe to be accurate." Other sources, "it must be suspected, exaggerate."⁶⁷

In this way, for four decades, Barnes has cast aspersions on the veracity of the sources and the competence of scholars, so that his "accuracy" makes them conform to his own pre-critical convictions. Positivistic self-understanding--or "positivistic self-misunderstanding," to use Dominic LaCapra's words--recognizes no "historical reality" but its own. As Averil Cameron notes, then, Barnes's disagreement with much

contemporary historiography "is not real disagreement at all" but rather a failure to recognize other historians' "markers" and "diagnostic tools."⁶⁸

Since positivism denies its own identity as a self-understanding, it cannot recognize the alterity of other self-understandings, past and present. As Karl Mannheim noted, "positivism...took great pains to conceal from itself the abyss which lies behind all particularist thought."⁶⁹ Since "historical reality" derives from ideological contests and remains methodologically contested, the danger of confusing history here with ideology seems not so methodologically risky as the positivistic assumption that either is ever entirely immune from the other.

This "simplistic positivism," to use Edith Wyschogrod's description, succumbs to a "scientism in history that purports to transcend politics"—even such a philologically defined politics of interpretation as my own. As Hayden White and Hannah Arendt variously warn, positivistic scientism and its lack of political self-awareness start as self-congratulation and end as totalitarianism.⁷⁰ Barnes never speaks in the name of his ideology. He speaks in the name of "historical reality," so that he arrogates to himself and dictates to others.⁷¹

That most scholars--especially those who, like myself, come from a graduate program more theoretically sophisticated and more technically rigorous than the one that produced Barnes--regard this pretense to superior competence as a sham does not make it any less dangerous. After all, it passed for a book review in an otherwise respectable journal. After four decades of claiming "historical reality" with relative impunity, Barnes has, by virtue of that fact, so often duped the uncritical and polemically assaulted the thoughtful that he has just as frequently retarded serious research into Late Antiquity.

Since I reject positivism and hold no degree in psychology, I cannot impute intent to others. In this respect, even psychologists acknowledge that their science is not an exact one. By my professional discipline as a historian, I can only examine what others have written. Since judgments about it are not judgments about them, I can only guess what prompted Barnes's polemic. Yet I cannot ignore what seem obvious and alternative possibilities. Either Barnes's hostility toward my work derived from his obsolete methodology, or Barnes offered his polemic in retaliation for my critique of his work.

Given what I wrote, and what Barnes said I wrote, this stark choice defines boundaries of integrity or expertise

"behind" his polemic. If he understood my book, then he lied about it. If he did not understand my book, then he was not competent to judge it. Yet these two possibilities are not final judgments. Given the complexity of human thought and the historical accidents that have linguistically shaped it, I dare not accept or absolutize either of these alternatives as definitive, exclusive, exhaustive, simple, pure, or true. Rather than "probe behind" what Barnes wrote in a vain effort to find the "reality" of his deceit or ineptitude, I recognize that there may be other possibilities and that they may better define his motivation. They may even mitigate his incompetence.

NOTES

¹ J.G.A. Pocock, "A New Bark Up an Old Tree," *Intellectual History Newsletter* (April 1986) 3-9 at 8-9; Dominick LaCapra, *Soundings in Critical Theory* (Ithaca, London 1989) 200-201.

² See, for example, Thomas Kselman, "Introduction," *Belief in History: Innovative Approaches to European and American Religion*, ed. Thomas Kselman (Notre Dame, London 1991) 1-15. Cf., for example, T.D. Barnes, *Constantine and Eusebius* (Cambridge, Mass., London 1981) v-vi.

³ Cf. T.D. Barnes's "review" of my book in *The American Historical Review* 105 (2000) 983-84. See, however, Lester L. Field, Jr., *Liberty, Dominion, and the Two Swords: On the Origins of Western Political Theology (180-398)* *Publications in Medieval Studies* 28, ed. John Van Engen (Notre Dame 1998). Abbreviations used in this article are the same as those used in my book.

⁴ Cf. T.D. Barnes's polemic against Field, *Liberty*, in *The American Historical Review* 105 (2000) 983-84.

⁵ Cf. Timothy D. Barnes, "The Collapse of the Homoeans in the East," *Papers presented at the Twelfth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in*

Oxford 1995, ed. Elizabeth A. Livingstone, SP 29-33 (5 vols. Leuven 1997), 29.3-16 at 10-12; *idem*, "Was heisst Fälschung?" *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 89 (1997) 259-67; *idem*, *Ammianus Marcellinus and the Representation of Historical Reality* Cornell Studies in Classical Philology 56, ed. Frederick M. Ahl et al. (Ithaca, London 1998) esp. 19, 65-78.

⁶ Cf. Timothy D. Barnes, *Athanasius and Constantius: Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (Cambridge, Mass. 1993) esp. ix. See Field, *Liberty* esp. 146-47, 362-63 n. 53; Khaled Anatolios, *Athanasius: The Coherence of His Thought* (London, New York 1998) esp. 26-29, 85-88, 96, 215 nn. 17-18, 228 n. 10, 230 n. 46; Annik Martin, *Athanase d'Alexandrie et l'église d'Égypte au IV^e siècle (328-373)* Collection de l'École française de Rome 216 (Rome 1996) esp. 2-4; Duane Wade-Hampton Arnold, *The Early Episcopal Career of Athanasius of Alexandria* Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 6, ed. Charles Kannengiesser (Notre Dame, London 1991) esp. 11-99, 164-67, 179, 183.

⁷ Bruce Mazlish, "The Art of Reviewing," *Perspectives: American Historical Association Newsletter* 39.2 (February 2001) 15-18 at 16.

⁸ See esp. Gerhart B. Ladner, *The Idea of Reform: Its Impact on Christian Thought and Action in the Age of the Fathers* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), 435; *idem*, "Medieval and Modern Understanding of Symbolism: A Comparison," *Images and Ideas in the Middle Ages: Selected Studies in History and Art* *Storia e letteratura: Raccolta di studi e testi* 155-56 (2 vols. Rome 1983) 1.239-82. See also John Van Engen, "Images and Ideas: The Achievements of Gerhart Burian Ladner, with a Bibliography of his Published Works," *Viator* 20 (1989) 85-115.

⁹ The first-rate historians, who variously read *Liberty* before its publication, included Peter Brown, Gerhart B. Ladner, Robert L. Benson, Rowan A. Greer, Jeremy duQ. Adams, Amos Funkenstein, John Van Engen, and Robert Brentano. Though these historians hardly share an "ideological bent," there is nonetheless not a positivist among them. See also the reviews by Louis H. Feldman in *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 571 (2000) 203-204; James A. Keim in *Perspectives on Political Science* 29 (2000) 241-42; Joseph F. Kelly in *Theological Studies* 60 (1999) 755-57; Andrew McGowan in *Anglican Theological Review* 82 (2000) 404-406; James V.

Schall in *The Thomist* 65 (2001) 157-60; Louis Swift in *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 8 (2000) 106-107.

¹⁰ See Field, *Liberty* esp. xi, xiv, 268 n. 7; Arnaldo Marcone, "Il *De Civitate Dei* e il suo pubblico," *Pagani e cristiani de Giuliano l'Apostata al sacco di Roma: Atti del Convegno Internazionale di Studi (Rende, 12/13 novembre 1993)*, ed. Franca Ela Consolino, *Studi di Filologia Antica e Moderna* 1 (Soveria Mannelli, Messina 1995) 267-77; R.A. Markus, "L'autorité épiscopale et la définition de la chrétienté," *Vescovi e pastori in epoca teodosiana: In occasione del XVI centenario della consecrazione episcopale di S. Agostino, 396-1996. XXV Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Roma, 8-11 maggio 1996* *Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum* 58 (2 vols. Rome 1997) 1.37-43; G.E.M. de Ste. Croix, *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World from the Archaic Age to the Arab Conquests* (Ithaca 1981); Peter Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography* (Berkeley, Los Angeles 1967).

¹¹ See, for example, Hans Jonas, *Augustin und das paulinische Freiheitsproblem: Eine philosophische Studie zum pelagianischen Streit* (Göttingen 1965 2nd ed.); Gisbert Greshake, *Gnade als konkrete Freiheit: Eine Untersuchung zur Gnadenlehre des Pelagius* (Mainz 1972); R.A. Markus,

Saeculum: History and Society in the Theology of Saint Augustine (Cambridge 1970). See also Marcone, "Il *De Civitate*."

¹² See, for example, Brigitte Basdevant-Gaudemet, "Évêques de la chrétienté et évêque de Rome du milieu du III^e au milieu du V^e siècle," *Nonagesimo anno: Mélanges en hommage à Jean Gaudemet*, ed. Claude Bontems (Paris 1999) 23-54 at 46-47; Vittorino Grossi, "Sant' Ambrogio e sant' Agostino," *Nec timeo mori: Atti del Congresso internazionale di studi ambrosiani nel XVI centenario della morte di sant' Ambrogio, Milano, 4-11 Aprile 1997*, ed. Luigi F. Pizzolato and Marco Rizzi, *Studia patristica mediolanensia* 21 (Milan 1998) 405-62; Pier Franco Beatrice, *Tradux peccati: Alle fonti della dottrina agostiniana del peccato originale* *Studia patristica mediolanensia* 8, ed. Giuseppe Lazzati and Raniero Cantalamessa (Milan 1978) esp. 123-202; Giuseppe Zecchini, "Ambrogio nella tradizione storiografica tardoantica," *Nec timeo* 93-106 esp. 98-99; Nello Cipriani, "Le opere di Sant' Ambrogio negli scritti di Sant' Agostino anteriori all' episcopato," *La scuola cattolica* 125 (1997) 763-800; Elena Zocca, "La Vita *Ambrosii* alla luce dei rapporti fra Paolino, Agostino e Ambrogio," *Nec timeo* 803-26 esp. 808-19; Ernst Dassmann,

"`Tam Ambrosius quam Cyprianus' (c. Iul. imp. 4, 112): Augustins Helfer im pelagianischen Streit," *Oecumenica et Patristica: Festschrift für Wilhelm Schneemelcher zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. Damaskinos Papandreou, Wolfgang A. Bienert, Knut Schäferdiek (Stuttgart, Berlin, Cologne 1989) 259-68; Matilde Caltabiano, "Ambrogio, Agostino e gli scritti sui martiri," *Nec timeo* 585-93; Gérald Bonner, "Some remarks on Letters 4* and 6*," *Les Lettres de Saint Augustin découvertes par Johannes Divjak: Communications présentées au colloque des 20 et 21 Septembre 1982 Études Augustiniennes* (Paris 1983) 155-64 at 158-64; Michaela Zelzer, "Quem iudicem potes Ambrosio reperire meliorem? (Augustinus, op. impf. 1,2)," *Papers presented to the Twelfth*, SP 33.280-88. See also Robert Crouse, "Summae auctoritatis magister: The Influence of St. Ambrose in Medieval Theology," *Nec timeo* 463-71.

¹³ See *Canones Romanorum ad Gallos episcopos* 5, 7, 13, 15, ed. Ernst Ch. Babut, *La plus ancienne décrétale* (Paris 1904) 75, 77, 81-83; Field, *Liberty* 249, 431 n. 59. See also the following note.

¹⁴ Paulinus Mediolanensis, *Vita Ambrosii* 7.1, 9.3, ed. A.A.R. Bastiaensen, trans. Luca Canali and Carlo Carena, *Vita di Cipriano, Vita di Ambrogio, Vita di*

Agostino Vite dei santi 3, ed. Christine Mohrmann (Rome 1989 3rd ed.) 60-62; Hervé Savon, *Ambroise de Milan* (Paris 1997) 42-45; Cesare Pasini, *Ambrogio di Milano: Azione e pensiero di un vescovo* (Milan, Turin 1996) 16-17; F.L. Ganshof, "Note sur l'élection des évêques dans l'empire romain au IV^{me} et pendant la première moitié du V^{me} siècle," *Revue internationale des droits de l'antiquité* 4 (1950) 467-98 esp. 478-80, 497-98.

¹⁵ See Roger Gryson, "Les élections épiscopales en Orient au IV^e siècle," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique* 74 (1979) 301-45 esp. 320-21.

¹⁶ Field, *Liberty* 215-17, 407 n. 5; Marta Sordi, "I rapporti di Ambrogio con gli imperatori del suo tempo," *Nec timeo* 107-18 at 118; H.A Drake, *Constantine and the Bishops: The Politics of Intolerance Ancient Society and History* (Baltimore, London 2000) 41, 282; Alexander Demandt "Kaisertum und Reichsidee in der Spätantike," *Spätantike und Christentum: Beiträge zur Religions- und Geistesgeschichte der griechisch-römischen Kultur und Zivilisation der Kaiserzeit*, ed. Carsten Colpe, Ludger Honnefelder, Matthias Lutz-Bachmann (Berlin 1992) 9-22 at 15; Wolfgang Waldstein, "Recht und Gesellschaftsordnung in der Spätantike," *Spätantike und Christentum* 23-36 at 25-27,

29; Johannes Irmischer, "Inhalte und Institutionen der Bildung in der Spätantike," *Spätantike und Christentum* 159-72 at 164; Milton V. Anastos, "Byzantine Political Theory: Its Classical Precedents and Legal Embodiment," *The "Past" in Medieval and Modern Greek Culture*, ed. Speros Vryonis, *Byzantina kai Metabyzantina* 1 (Malibu 1978) 13-53; Martin Schanz, Carl Hosius, and Gustav Krüger, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian* Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft in systematischer Darstellung 8.1-4.2 (4 vols. in 5 pts. Munich 1907-35, 2⁴, 3³, 4.1-2²) 4.1.315-65 esp. 361.

¹⁷ See Ambrose, *Ep.* 75.9, ed. Otto Faller and Michaela Zelzer, *Epistulae et acta* CSEL 82.1-4 (4 vols. Vienna, 1968-96) 82.3.77; Field, *Liberty* 217, 408 n. 8.

¹⁸ Dominick LaCapra, *History and Criticism* (Ithaca, London 1985) 105, 117-34; Francis Oakley, *Politics and Eternity: Studies in the History of Medieval and Early-Modern Political Thought* Studies in the History of Christian Thought 92, ed. Heiko A. Oberman (Leiden, Boston, Cologne 1999) 18-24, 188-216, 341. See also Maria del Mar Garrido López, "¿La historia intelectual en crisis? El giro lingüístico y la historia social frente a la historia intelectual," *Historia a debate: Actas del Congreso*

Internacional celebrado el 7-11 de julio de 1993 en Santiago de Compostella, ed. Carlos Barros (3 vols. Santiago de Compostela 1995) 2.201-12 at 204-206. Cf. also Barnes, *Ammianus* 14.

¹⁹ See, for example, Mark Bevir, "The Errors of Linguistic Contextualism," *History and Theory* 31 (1992) 276-98; Gabrielle M. Spiegel, *The Past as Text: The Theory and Practice of Medieval Historiography* (Baltimore, London 1997) esp. xix, 44-56.

²⁰ Ambrose, *Ep.* 75.9 (CSEL 82.3.77); Field, *Liberty* 217, 408 n. 8.

²¹ See, for example, Claudio Moreschini, "La traduzione di Rufino dalle *Omellie* di Basilio: Motivi e scopi di una scelta," *La traduzione dei testi religiosi: Atti del convegno tenuto a Trento il 10-11 febbraio 1993*, ed. Claudio Moreschini and Giovanni Menestrino, *Religione e Cultura* 6 (Brescia 1994) 127-48; Enrico V. Maltese, "Appunti su Zaccaria traduttore di Gregorio Magno," *La traduzione* 243-52; Heinrich Marti, *Übersetzer der Augustin-Zeit: Interpretation von Selbstzeugnissen* *Studia et testimonia antiqua* 14, ed. Vinzenz Buchheit (Munich 1974) esp. 9-12, 61-93; Alfred Hermann and W. von Soden, "Dolmetscher," *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*:

Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der antiken Welt 4, ed. Theodor Klauser (Stuttgart 1959) 24-49 at 35-40, 46-59; Eligius Dekkers, "Les traductions grecques des études patristiques latins," *Sacris erudiri* 5 (1953) 193-233 at 224-25.

²² L.G. Kelly, *The True Interpreter: A History of Translation Theory and Practice in the West* (New York 1979) 205-18; Paolo Chiesa, "Ad verbum o ad sensum? Modelli e coscienza metodologica della traduzione tra tarda antichità e alto medioevo," *Medioevo e Rinascimento* 1 (1987) 1-51 esp. 1-4, 19-22, 39-40, 50-51. See also Christoph Elsas et al., "Vorwort," *Tradition und Translation: Zum Problem der interkulturellen Übersetzbarkeit religiöser Phänomene. Festschrift für Carsten Colpe zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Christoph Elsas et al. (Berlin, New York 1994) xv-xix.

²³ See, for example, Kelly, *True* esp. 1.

²⁴ See Gaius, *Institutiones* 1.4-5, ed. and trans. Francis de Zulueta, *The Institutes of Gaius* (Oxford 1946) 2; Barry Nicholas, *An Introduction to Roman Law* (Oxford 1977) 10, 16-17; Theodor Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht* (3rd ed. 3 vols. repr. Gratz 1952) 1.690, 694, 2.140, 3.1022-1271, esp. 1243.

²⁵ Field, *Liberty* 45, 199, 223, 255-57, 260-61, 265, 303 n. 2, 395 n. 55, 434 n. 16. Because I used the Digest frequently, its bibliographical entry appears in my book's Abbreviations.

²⁶ See *Digesta* 1.4.1, ed. Theodor Mommsen, CIC 1 (Hildesheim, 2000 13th ed.) 35; *Institutiones* 1.2.6 (CIC 1.1-2); Anastos, "Byzantine" 27-30, 46 n. 69; Field, *Liberty* 215-17, 407 n. 4; Demandt, "Kaisertum" 15; Waldstein, "Recht" 25-27, 29, 33-35; Detlef Liebs, "Landraub eines Grossgrundbesitzers 384 n. Chr. (Symmachus, Relatio 28)," *Aspects of the Fourth Century A.D.: Proceedings of the Symposium "Power and Possession: State, Society and Church in the Fourth Century A.D."* ed. H.W. Pleket, A.M.F.W. Verhoogt (Leiden 1997) 97-114 at 110 n. 57; Aline Rousselle, "From Sanctuary to Miracle-Worker: Healing in Fourth-Century Gaul," *Ritual, Religion, and the Sacred Selections from the Annales Economies, Sociétés, Civilisations* 7, ed. Robert Forster and Orest Ranum, trans. Elborg Forster and Patricia M. Ranum (Baltimore, London 1982), 95-127 at 103; Schanz, *Geschichte* 3.203-207.

²⁷ See Arthur C. Danto, *Narration and Knowledge* (New York 1985) esp. xv, 303-304; Bruno Latour, *We Have Never*

Been Modern, trans. Catherine Porter (Cambridge, Mass. 1993) esp. 112-16.

²⁸ Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*, trans. G.E.M. Anscombe (New York 1953), 20e. See also Ramsey MacMullen, "Tracking Value Changes," *Aspects of the Fourth* 115-34.

²⁹ Cf., for example, Jean-Pierre Poly, "Le tournant obscur: Foi, liberté et pouvoir dans la Gaule du IV^e siècle," *Nonagesimo anno* 75-125.

³⁰ Jacob Neusner, *Judaism and Christianity in the Age of Constantine: History, Messiah, Israel, and the Initial Confrontation* (Chicago, London 1987) 37.

³¹ See, for example, Danto, *Narration* esp. 298-341.

³² Mary J. Carruthers, *The Craft of Thought: Meditation, Rhetoric, and the Making of Images, 400-1200* Cambridge Studies in Medieval Literature 34 (Cambridge 1998) 4-5; Averil Cameron, "Christianity and Communication in the Fourth Century: The Problem of Diffusion," *Aspects of the Fourth* 23-42 at 29-30, 41; Richard Rorty, *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature* (Princeton 1979) 165-212.

³³ See, for example, Oakley, *Politics* esp. 23-24; Christine Mohrmann, "Wortform und Wortinhalt: Bemerkungen zum Bedeutungswandel im altchristlichen Griechisch und

Latein," *Études sur le latin des chrétiens* 1-4 (4 vols. Rome 1961-77, 1²) 2.11-34; *eadem*, "Transformations linguistiques et évolution sociale et spirituelle," *Études* 3.25-31; *eadem*, "L'étude du grec et du latin de l'antiquité chrétienne: Passé, présent, avenir," *Études* 4.91-110; *eadem*, "Nach vierzig Jahren," *Études* 4.111-40 at 112-16.

³⁴ See, for example, Joël Thomas, "Le sens de la limite chez les Épicuriens et les Stoiciens à Rome (I^{er} s. av. J.-C.-I^{er} s. ap. J.-C.)," *Frontières terrestres, frontières célestes dans l'antiquité*, ed. Aline Rousselle (Paris 1995) 297-308 esp. 304; Florence Dupont, "En Germanie, c'est-à-dire nulle part': Rhétorique de l'alterité et rhétorique de l'identité: L'aporie descriptive d'un territoire barbare dans la *Germanie* de Tacite," *Frontières terrestres* 189-235 esp. 215-16; Karen L. King, "Translating History: Reframing Gnosticism in Postmodernity," *Tradition und Translation* 264-77 at 268, 273-76; Massimiliano Pavan, "Nerone e la libertà de greci," *Atti di Centro ricerche e documentazione sull'antichità classica* 12 (1982-83) 149-165; Jochen Bleicken, "Der Begriff der Freiheit in der letzten Phase der römischen Republik," *Historische Zeitschrift* 195 (1962) 1-20; Chaim

Wirszubski, *Libertas as a Political Idea at Rome during the Late Republic and Early Principate* (Cambridge 1950).

³⁵ Paolo Siniscalco, "Sant'Ambrogio e la Chiesa di Roma," *Nec timeo* 141-60 at 147-49, 159; Heinz Hürten, "Libertas in der Patristik--`libertas episcopalis' im Frühmittelalter," *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 45 (1963) 1-14; François Jacques, *Le privilège de liberté: Politique impériale et autonomie municipale dans les cités de l'Occident romain (161-244)* Collection de l'école française de Rome 76 (Rome 1984); Brigitte Szabó-Bechstein, *Libertas ecclesiae: Ein Schlüsselbegriff des Investiturstreits und seine Vorgeschichte 4.-11. Jahrhundert=Studi gregoriani* 12 (Rome 1985); Domenico Vera, "Le forme del lavoro rurale: Aspetti della trasformazione dell'Europa romana fra tarda antichità e alto medioevo," *Morfologie sociali e culturali in Europa fra tarda antichità e alto medioevo, 3-9 aprile 1997, 1*, Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto medioevo 45 (Spoleto 1998) 293-338 esp. 334-38; Pasini, *Ambrogio* 181-84, 189; Savon, *Ambroise* 235-37, 245-46, 311-12; Claude Lepelley, "Liberté, colonat et esclavage d'après la Lettre 24*: La jurisdiction épiscopale `de liberali causa,'" *Les Lettres* 329-42; Francesco Corsaro, "Il trono e l'altare. Da Costantino a Teodosio: *De obitu*

Theodosii di Ambrogio," Vescovi e pastori in epoca teodosiana: In occasione del XVI centenario della consecrazione episcopale di S. Agostino, 396-1996. XXV Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Roma, 8-11 maggio 1996 Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 58 (2 vols. Rome 1997) 2.601-11 at 605-606; Zecchini, "Ambrogio," 96, 100, 102-103.

³⁶ Herbert Grundmann, "Freiheit als religiöses, politisches und persönliches Postulat im Mittelalter," in Hans Freyer et al., *Das Problem der Freiheit in europäischen Denken von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart* (Munich 1958) 25-53; Marcel Pacaut, "Ordre et liberté dans l'église: L'influence de Cluny aux 11^e et 12^e siècles," *The End of Strife: Papers selected from the proceedings of the Colloquium of the Commission Internationale d'Histoire Ecclésiastique Comparée held at the University of Durham 2 to 9 September 1981*, ed. David Loades (Edinburgh 1984) 155-79; Szabó-Bechstein, *Libertas*.

³⁷ François Dagognet, *Comment se sauver de la servitude? Justice, école, religion* (Paris 2000); Claudio Cesa, "Liberté et liberté politique, de Fichte à Hegel," trans. Pierre Osmo, *Autour de Hegel: Hommage à Bernard Bourgeois*, ed. François Dagognet and Pierre Osmo (Paris

2000) 43-57; Yves-Jean Harder, "La liberté de l'interprète," *Autour de Hegel* 187-207; Pierre Osmo, "La liberté du philosophe: Sur la possibilité et la nécessité de l'histoire de la philosophie dans le système de la philosophie hégélienne," *Autour de Hegel* 351-63; Claude Langlois, "Les Martyrs de la Liberté comme contre-modèles de sainteté," *Modelli di santità e modelli di comportamento: Contrasti, intersezioni, complementarità*, ed. Giulia Barone, Marina Caffiero, Francesco Scorza Barcellona (Turin 1994) 415-28; Giovanni Battista Scaglia, *Machiavelli: Passione e rischio della politica* (Rome 1990) esp. 151-64; Edith Wyschogrod, *An Ethics of Remembering: History, Heterology, and the Nameless Others* Religion and Postmodernism, ed. Mark C. Taylor (Chicago, London 1998) 117-19; Latour, *We* 37-38, 43, 50, 112-13, 124-25, 136-38, 140-42.

³⁸ See Walter Berschin, *Greek Letters and the Latin Middle Ages: From Jerome to Nicholas of Cusa*, trans. Jerold C. Frakes (Washington, D.C. 1988 2nd ed.) 42; René Braun, *Deus christianorum: Recherches sur le vocabulaire doctrinale de Tertullien* (Paris 1977 2nd ed.) 501-506; Christine Mohrmann, "Quelques traits caractéristiques de latin des chrétiens," *Études* 1.21-50 at 23-24; eadem, "Le

problème du vocabulaire chrétien: Expériences d'évangélisation paléo-chrétiennes et modernes," *Études* 1.113-22 at 119-20; *eadem*, "Les origines de la latinité chrétienne à Rome," *Études* 3.67-126 at 83; *eadem*, "'Tertium genus': Les relations judaïsme, antiquité, christianisme reflétées dans la langue des chrétiens," *Études* 4.195-210 at 203-205; Joseph Michael Heer, *Die Versio latina des Barnabasbriefes und ihr Verhältnis zur altlateinischen Bibel* (Freiburg im Breisgau 1908) xliv-xlvi, 18, 70, 88. For translation "back" into Greek, see esp. Antonio Garzya, "Traduzioni di testi religiosi latini a Bisanzio," *La traduzione dei testi religiosi: Atti del convegno tenuto a Trento il 10-11 febbraio 1993*, ed. Claudio Moreschini and Giovanni Menestrino, *Religione e Cultura* 6 (Brescia 1994) 171-84 at 175; Cesare Pasini, "Ambrogio di Milano nella tradizione greco-bizantina," *Ambrosius* 73 (1997) 302-13 at 302-303.

³⁹ See Field, *Liberty* esp. xv, xvii-xviii, 8, 12-13, 50, 69, 104, 143, 281-82 nn. 69-70, 286-287 n. 105; Bruno Rochette, *Le latin dans le monde grec: Recherches sur la diffusion de la langue et les lettres latines dans les provinces hellénophones de l'Empire romain* Collection Latomus 233 (Brussels 1997) esp. 22-24; Cesare Pasini,

"Testi innografici bizantini in onore di sant'Ambrogio di Milano," *Bollettino della Badia greca di Grottaferrata* 39 (1985) 113-79 at 133, 137, 149, 166; Anthony Meredith, "Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa on Basil," *Papers presented at the Twelfth*, SP 32.163-69 at 165; Alden A. Mosshammer, "Gregory of Nyssa and Christian Hellenism," *Papers presented at the Twelfth*, SP 32.170-95 esp. 175-77, 180, 182, 184-95; Clementina Mazzucco, "Il significato cristiano della 'libertas' proclamata dai martiri della 'Passio Perpetuae,'" *Forma futuri: Studi in onore del Cardinale Michele Pellegrino* (Turin 1975) 545-65; Roger Berthouzoz, *Liberté et grâce suivant la théologie d'Irénée de Lyon: Le débat avec la gnose aux origines de la théologie chrétienne* *Études d'ethique chrétienne* 8 (Fribourg Suisse 1980); Réal Tremblay, "La liberté selon Saint Irenée de Lyon," *Studia moralia* 15 (1977) 421-44.

⁴⁰ Field, *Liberty* esp. xiii, xvii-xviii, 286-87 n. 105.

⁴¹ See Field, *Liberty* esp. 12-28; Mazzucco, "Il significato."

⁴² See, for example, St. W.J. Teeuwen, *Sprachlicher Bedeutungswandel bei Tertullian: Ein Beitrag zum der christlichen Sondersprache* *Studien zur Geschichte und*

Kultur des Altertums 14.1, ed. E. Derup et al. (Paderborn 1926); Jos. Schrijnen, *Characteristik des altchristlichen Latein* *Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva* 1 (Nijmegen 1932); Jos. Schrijnen and Christine Mohrmann, *Studien zur Syntax der Briefe des hl. Cyprian* *Latinitas Christianorum primaeva: Studia ad sermonem latinum Christianum pertinentia* 5-6 (2 vols. Nijmegen 1936-37); Christine Mohrmann, *Die altchristliche Sondersprache in den Sermones des hl. Augustins* *Latinitas Christianorum Primaeva* 3-4, 6, ed. Jos. Schrijnen (3 vols. Nijmegen 1932); eadem, "Le latin commun et le latin des chrétiens," *Études* 3.13-24; eadem, "Nach vierzig"; MacMullen, "Tracking" 131-34. See also Mohrmann, "Les éléments vulgaires du latin des chrétiens," *Études* 3.33-66.

⁴³ Einar Löfstedt, *Late Latin* Instituttet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning, Serie A, Forelesninger 25 (Oslo, London, Wiesbaden, Paris, Cambridge 1959) esp. 68-119; *idem*, *Syntactica: Studien und Beiträge zur historischen Syntax des Lateins* Skrifter utgiva av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund 10.1-2 (2 vols. 1²-2 Lund, Leipzig, London, Paris, Oxford 1942, 1933) 2.458-73; Ernst Dassmann, "Kirche, geistliches Amt und

Gemeindeverständnis zwischen antikem Erbe und christlichen Impulsen," *Spätantike und Christentum* 249-69 at 249-50.

⁴⁴ Field, *Liberty* esp. 17. See also Augusto Frascchetti, "Trent'anni dopo: *Il conflitto fra paganesimo e cristianesimo nel secolo IV*," *Pagani e cristiani* 5-14.

Since late fourth-century *Christianitas* looked to early second-century Χριστιανισμός, later events extended, bent, and blurred this boundary between Church and state.

⁴⁵ See, for example, Basil, *De Sancto Spiritu* 13.29, 24.55, ed. and trans. Benôit Pruche, SC 17 bis (Paris 1968 2nd ed.) 348-50, 450; Field, *Liberty* 25-26, 53, 55, 61, 77, 88, 127, 136, 148-49, 155, 163-64, 166, 169, 176, 186-91, 196, 211, 221, 227, 230, 239, 285-87; M. Poirier, "Note sur la *Passio Sanctarum Perpetuae et Felicitatis*: Félicité était-elle vraiment l'esclave de Perpétue?" *Papers presented to the Fifth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford, 1967*, ed. F.L. Cross, SP 10-11=TU 107-108 (2 vols. Berlin 1970-72), 1.306-309; Vera, "Le forme" esp. 334-38; Paul-Albert Février, "Discours d'Église et réalité historique dans les nouvelles Lettres d'Augustin," *Les Lettres* 101-15 at 105-109, 113-15; Wolfgang Waldstein, "Recht und Gesellschaftsordnung in der Spätantike," *Spätantike und Christentum* 23-36 at 28-33;

Michel Humbert, "Enfants à louer ou à vendre: Augustin et l'autorité parentale (Ep. 10* et 24*)," *Les Lettres* 189-203; Lepelley, "Liberté."

⁴⁶ Brian Tierney, *The Idea of Natural Rights: Studies on Natural Rights, Natural Law and Church, 1150-1625* Emory University Studies in Law and Religion 5, ed. John Witte, Jr. (Atlanta 1997) esp. 1-6, 13, 36-38, 43-44, 48-49, 53, 63-65, 187-88, 210, 231. See also Brigitte Miriam Bedos-Rezak, "Medieval Identity: A Sign and a Concept," *The American Historical Review* 105 (2000) 1489-1533 esp. 1492, 1509.

⁴⁷ Tierney, *Idea* 1. I dare not allude to Thomas Jefferson's *Declaration of Independence*, for fear that Barnes will accuse me of making Jefferson the sole author!

⁴⁸ See, for example, Wilhelm Levison, "Die mittelalterliche Lehre von den beiden Schwerten," *Deutsches Archiv* 9 (1951) 14-42; Harmut Hoffmann, "Die beiden Schwerten im hohen Mittelalter," *Deutsches Archiv* 20 (1964) 78-114. Cf. Joseph Leclerc, "L'argument des deux glaives," *Recherches de science religieuse* 21 (1931) 299-339; 22 (1932) 151-77, 280-303; Henri Xavier Arquillière, "Origines de la théorie des deux glaives," *Studi gregoriani* 1 (1947) 501-21.

⁴⁹ Gerard E. Caspary, *Politics and Exegesis: Origen and the Two Swords* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, London 1979). See Karl F. Morrison's review in *Speculum* 56 (1981) 105-109.

⁵⁰ See, for example, Field, *Liberty* esp. 45-56, 200-11.

⁵¹ Field, *Liberty* esp. 208, 310 n. 46.

⁵² See Field, *Liberty* esp. 45-62, 200-11; Aline Rousselle, "Image et texte: Aller et retour," *Santità, culti, agiografia: Temi e prospettive. Atti del I Convegno di studio dell'Associazione italiana per lo studio della santità, dei culti e dell'agiografia Roma, 24-26, ottobre 1996*, ed. Sofia Boesch Gajano (Rome, 1997) 107-27, esp. 115; eadem, "Le glaive d'Abraham," *Le Père: Métaphore paternelle et fonctions du père: L'Interdit, la Filiation, la Transmission L'espace analytique*, ed. Patrick Guyomard and Maud Mannoni (Paris 1989) 481-500 esp. 494-98.

⁵³ Barnes even renders "interpretation" as "accuracy," as he praises Otto Seeck's "alert accuracy," distinguished--as usual, without methodological justification--from Seeck's "prejudices and...errors of historical judgment." Cf. Barnes, *Constantine vi*. Barnes, who inherited much of his positivistic idiom from his

mentor Ronald Syme, likewise cites him: "Even when accurate, statistics can mislead." On the one hand, as a mathematical formula, a statistic is always accurate--that is, by conventional if paradoxical postulate--as an exact, but representational, "copy" of a singular, immutable, and otherwise complete quantitative truth. On the other hand, this mathematical accuracy extends neither to its practical and theoretical applications nor to their interpretive consequences, always plural, culturally conditioned, linguistically incomplete, and otherwise partial as qualitative propositions. See, for example, Ewa Domańska, *Encounters: Philosophy of History after Postmodernism* (Charlottesville, London 1998) 153-54. Cf. T.D. Barnes, "Statistics and Conversion of the Roman Aristocracy," *Journal of Roman Studies* 85 (1995) 135-47 at 135 (and 142 for "accurate prosopography"); Ronald Syme, *Roman Papers*, ed. Anthony R. Birley and E. Badian (7 vols. Oxford, 1979-91), 7.620. For Syme on "accurate history," cf. Barnes, "Was heisst" 265; Syme, *Emperors and Biography: Studies in the Historia Augusta* (Oxford 1971) 283.

⁵⁴ Cf. Barnes, *Athanasius*; *idem*, *Constantine* 230.

⁵⁵ Roland Barthes, "The Discourse of History," *Comparative Criticism: A Yearbook* 3, ed. E.S. Shaffer

(Cambridge, London, New York, New Rochelle, Melbourne, Sydney 1981) 7-20 esp. 14, 17-18; Jean-François Lyotard, "Le seuil de l'histoire," *Poikilia: Études offertes à Jean-Pierre Vernant* Recherches d'histoire et de science sociale 26 (Paris 1987) 313-55 at 339-40; Edith Wyschogrod, *Saints and Postmodernism: Revisioning Moral Philosophy* Religion and Postmodernism, ed. Mark C. Taylor (Chicago, London 1990) 23-25; eadem, *Ethics* esp. 6-8, 18-20, 33-37; Elsas, "Vorwort" esp. xvii-xviii; Richard Rorty, *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature* (Princeton 1979) esp. 156-60, 165-92; Domańska, *Encounters* 67-99, 167-87, esp. 74-75, 178.

⁵⁶ See Paul Veyne, *Did the Greeks Believe Their Myths: An Essay on the Constitutive Imagination?* trans. Paula Wissing (Chicago, London 1988) 23; Latour, *We* esp. 18; Oswald Ducrot, *Dire et ne pas dire: Principes de sémantique linguistique* (Paris, 1980 2nd ed.); Ricca Edmundson, *Rhetoric in Sociology* (London 1984) 13-31.

⁵⁷ See Mazlish, "Art" esp. 16-18.

⁵⁸ See Field, *Liberty* esp. 146-47, 362-63 n. 53; Anatolios, *Athanasius* esp. 85-88, 96, 230 n. 46;; Martin, *Athanasie* esp. 2-4; Arnold, *Early* esp. 11-99, 164-67, 179, 183. Published too soon after Barnes's *Athanasius* to take note of it, Martin's history nonetheless serves as an

excellent corrective treatment. Anatolios (228 n. 10) could respond directly to Barnes's work: "To say that Athanasius must have realized that his own survival was bound up with the reception of Nicaea merely underscores the fact that Athanasius identified himself with the doctrine of Nicaea. Barnes's interpretation of this identification, which presumes that Athanasius himself was doctrinally unconcerned and merely used doctrine to justify his own political self-interest...is, to use a term which Barnes often applies to Athanasius, tendentious." Even if Barnes were right about his dating of Athanasius's *Contra gentes*--*De incarnatione*, as Anatolios (26-29, 215 nn. 17-18) notes, the ulterior motive that he attributes to Athanasius, on the basis of this contested dating, remains pure speculation. Cf. Barnes, *Athanasius* 13. The recent release of Barnes's *Athanasius* in paperback not only delivers a severe blow to serious historiography, but also underlines the conflict of interest inherent in Barnes's polemic against my book. The endnotes of Field, *Liberty* offer a detailed analysis of Barnes's historiography, scholarly disagreements with it, and its relationship to historiography regarding "political theology." For more evidence of Barnes's technical incompetence, see R. Michael

Errington, "Constantine and the Pagans," *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 29 (1988) 309-18.

⁵⁹ Janet L. Nelson's review of Jane Tibbets Schulenburg, *Forgetful of Their Sex: Female Sanctity and Society, ca. 500-1100* (Chicago 1998) in *The American Historical Review* 105 (2000) 1366-67. See also Friedhelm Winkelmann, "Grundprobleme christlicher historiographie in ihrer Frühphase (Eusebios von Kaisareia und Orosius)," *Jahrbuch der österreichischen Byzantinistik* 42 (1992) 13-27; Vincenza Zangara, "Eusebio di Vercelli e Massimo di Torino: Tra storia e agriografia," *Eusebio di Vercelli e il suo tempo*, ed. Enrico Covolo et al. Biblioteca di scienze religiose 133 (Rome 1997) 257-321; Gillian Cloke, *"This Female Man of God": Women and Spiritual Power in the Patristic Age, AD 350-450* (London, New York 1995) 3.

⁶⁰ See Rousselle, *La contamination* 225-40 esp. 226-30; Paul Antony Hayward, "Demystifying the Role of Sanctity in Western Christendom," *The Cult of Saints in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages: Essays on the Contribution of Peter Brown*, ed. James Howard-Johnston and Paul Antony Hayward (Oxford 1999) 115-42 at 131-32; Latour, *We* esp. 70-72, 125-27, 130-36; B. Barnes, "Comparison."

⁶¹ See especially LaCapra, *Soundings* esp. 13; Edith Wyschogrod, *Ethics* 39-40. See also King, "Translating" esp. 272-77.

⁶² Cf., for example, Barnes, *Athanasius* esp. ix.

⁶³ See also Santos Juliá, "¿La historia en crisis?" *Historia* 1.143-45 esp. 145.

⁶⁴ Cf. Barnes, "Collapse" 8, 13.

⁶⁵ See Tamsyn S. Barton, *Power and Knowledge: Astrology, Physiognomics, and Medicine under the Roman Empire* The Body, in *Theory: Histories of Cultural Materialism*, ed. Dalia Judovitz, James I. Porter (Ann Arbor, 1994) esp. 2; Wyschogrod, *Ethics* 152-65; *eadem*, *Saints* xxvi; Latour, *We* 71-77; Gerd Tellenbach, "'Ungeschehene Geschichte' und ihre heuristische Funktion," *Historische Zeitschrift* 258 (1994) 297-316.

⁶⁶ Augustine, *Confessionum libri XIII* 11.13.16, ed. Martinus Skutella, H. Juergens, W. Schaub (Stuttgart, Leipzig 1996) 274-75. See also Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Mystery of Continuity: Time and History, Memory and Eternity in the Thought of Saint Augustine* (Charlottesville 1986) esp. 29-51; Mosshammer, "Gregory" 181-82, 185.

⁶⁷ Cf., for example, Barnes, "Pre-Decian Acta martyrum," *Journal of Theological Studies* 19 (1968) 509-31

at 509; *idem*, *Constantine* v-vi, 230; *idem*, "Collapse" 3-16 at 3 n. 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 13; *idem*, *Ammianus*, esp. 16-18.

⁶⁸ See Averil Cameron, "On Defining the Holy Man," *Cult of Saints* 27-43 at 42; *eadem*, "Christianity" esp. 23-25, 28.

⁶⁹ Karl Mannheim, *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*, trans. Louis Wirth and Edward Shils (New York 1936) 89-96; Ladner, *Idea* esp. 467; Harry Y. Gamble, *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts* (New Haven, London 1995) esp. 13-16, 30-41, 74-81, 95, 108-43.

⁷⁰ Lyotard, "Le seuil" esp. 336-52; Wyschogrod, *Ethics* esp. xiii, 2-3, 7, 24-25, 31; Maria del Mar Garrido López, "¿La historia intelectual en crisis? El giro lingüístico y la historia social frente a la historia intelectual," *Historia* 2.201-12 esp. 211; Jacques Vernant, "Logique, histoire et politique: Réflexions sur le contemporain," *Poikilia* 81-92. Wyschogrod analyses White and Arendt. See also Domańska's interview with White, *Encounters* 13-38 esp. 23. For similar observations from Lionel Gossman, see 188-210.

⁷¹ For the reductionism of "ego-ideología" over "alter-ideología," see Julio Antonio Vaquero Iglesias, "Mentalidades e ideologías," *Historia* 2.25-35 esp. 31.