University of Groningen

Calvin's use of the Chevallon edition of Chrysostom's Opera Omnia

Kreijkjes, J.

Published in:
Church history and religious culture

DOI:
[10.1163/18712428-09603045](https://doi.org/10.1163/18712428-09603045)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2016

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Kreijkjes, J. (2016). Calvin's use of the Chevallon edition of Chrysostom's Opera Omnia: The relationship between the marked sections and Calvin's Writings. *Church history and religious culture*, 96(3), 237-265. <https://doi.org/10.1163/18712428-09603045>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Calvin's Use of the Chevallon Edition of Chrysostom's *Opera Omnia*

The Relationship between the Marked Sections and Calvin's Writings

Jeannette Kreijkes*

University of Groningen, The Netherlands

j.h.kreijkes@rug.nl; jhkreijkes@gmail.com

Abstract

Research on the relationship between John Calvin and John Chrysostom has been based on Calvin's alleged use of the 1536 Chevallon edition of Chrysostom's *Opera Omnia* throughout his literary career. This article questions the evidence for Calvin's intensive use of the Chevallon edition by discussing the opinions that underlie Alexandre Ganoczy and Klaus Müller's interpretation of the marked sections and their influence on scholars after them. It argues that at best Calvin used the copy in question as one among others only during his last Genevan period. This challenges future research on the relationship between Calvin and Chrysostom not to focus on one edition that Calvin *always* used to read, but to establish which particular Chrysostom edition or editions Calvin used for each particular work he wrote.

Keywords

Calvin – Chrysostom – marked sections – 1536 Chevallon edition – *Opera Omnia* – Ganoczy and Müller – commentaries – *Institutio*

* PhD student in the field of Reformed Theology at the University of Groningen, The Netherlands. I want to express my thanks to prof. dr. Henk van den Belt for his useful comments on a previous version of this article.

For his exegesis, John Calvin (1509–1564) made an extensive use of the patristic tradition. Since John Chrysostom (ca. 349–407) usually interprets literally, Calvin considered him the best Early Christian exegete. Of all the church fathers, Chrysostom is the most frequently cited in Calvin's New Testament commentaries.¹

For his references to Chrysostom, Calvin is supposed to have used the Chevallon edition.² This collective work of Latin translations of Chrysostom's *Opera Omnia* had been published in Paris in 1536. In the 1960s, Alexandre Ganoczy discovered a copy of this edition—currently in the Geneva Library—with passages underlined and annotated presumably by Calvin. Ganoczy and Klaus Müller published these marked sections (*Calvins handschriftliche Annotationen zu Chrysostomus: ein Beitrag zur Hermeneutik Calvins*) in 1981.³ In the first

- 1 John Calvin, *Praefatio in Chrysostomi Homilias*, CO 9:834: "Sunt autem homiliae, quae quum variis partibus constent, primum tamen in illis locum tenet scripturae interpretatio, in qua Chrysostomus nostrum vetustos omnes scriptores qui hodie exstant antecedere nemo sani iudicii negaverit. Praesertim ubi novum testamentum tractat. Nam quominus in veteri tantum praestaret, obstabat hebraicae linguae imperitia"; trans. W. Ian P. Hazlett, "Calvin's Latin Preface to His Proposed French Edition of Chrysostom's Homilies: Translation and Commentary," in *Humanism and Reform: The Church in Europe, England and Scotland, 1400–1463. Essays in Honour of James K. Cameron*, ed. James Kirk (Oxford, 1991), 129–150, there 144: "Although homilies are something which consist of a variety of elements, the interpretation of Scripture is, however, their priority. In this area no one of sound judgment would deny that our Chrysostom excels all the ancient writers currently extant. This is especially true, when he deals with the New Testament. For the lack of Hebrew prevented him from showing so much expertise in the Old Testament"; John R. Walchenbach, *John Calvin as Biblical Commentator: An Investigation into Calvin's Use of John Chrysostom as an Exegetical Tutor* (Ph.D. diss., University of Pittsburgh, 1974; repr. Eugene, 2010), 49.
- 2 John Chrysostom, *Divi Ioannis Chrysostomi Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani Opera*, 5 vols. (Paris: Claude Chevallon, 1536). Hereafter *CHEV*.
- 3 Cf. the following book reviews: Luc Perrottet, "Calvins handschriftliche Annotationen zu Chrysostomus: ein Beitrag zur Hermeneutik Calvins," *Bibliothèque d'Humanisme et Renaissance* 44.2 (1982), 427–429, who considered that Ganoczy and Müller's ideas were not always entirely convincing; W. Nijenhuis, "Calvins handschriftliche Annotationen zu Chrysostomus: ein Beitrag zur Hermeneutik Calvins," *Dutch Review of Church History* 62.1 (1982), 144–145 interpreted the material provided by Ganoczy and Müller as a confirmation for Calvin of his own theology concerning *humilitas* (humility), *modestas* (modesty), *ordo* (order), and other virtues; Jos E. Vercruysse, "Calvins handschriftliche Annotationen zu Chrysostomus: ein Beitrag zur Hermeneutik Calvins," *Gregorianum*, Princeton 64.2 (1983), 375–376, and Olivier Millet, "Calvins handschriftliche Annotationen zu Chrysostomus: ein Beitrag zur Hermeneu-

three chapters of their publication, they gave an interpretation of this formerly unknown material.

Since this publication, the Chevallon text has been considered as Calvin's *main* source for his references to Chrysostom in his *magnum opus*, the *Institutio*, and in his exegetical works, the commentaries; so much so that it has been even seen as Calvin's *only* possible source for the writings of Chrysostom throughout his literary career.⁴ However, since hardly any of the marked sections appear in Calvin's *Institutio* and commentaries, Calvin also cited from Chrysostom's Greek⁵ and sometimes criticized Chrysostom's understanding of Greek passages, which could not be derived from the Latin text in the Chevallon edition,⁶ one could rightly ask how reliable the conclusion is that the Chevallon text is Calvin's main source for all his Chrysostom quotations. The present article discusses this question, which is an important step in establishing the sources on which all research on the relationship between the two Johns has to be based.

The main objection to the view that the marked sections in this edition reflect Calvin's reliance on it is partly caused by the difficulty of interpretation of this kind of material. Marginal notes and underlinings do not always reflect a relationship between the writings of the reader on the one hand, and the text itself together with the annotations on the other.⁷ As "modern cultural assumptions" inevitably colour the understanding of a Renaissance reading process, the interpretation of annotations is not as easy as it might seem, and it always raises methodological problems. Moreover, the concept of 'reading

tik Calvins," *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 30 (1984), 188–189, agreed with Ganoczy and Müller's findings.

- 4 Irena Backus, "Calvin and the Greek Fathers," in *Continuity and Change: The Harvest of Late Medieval and Reformation History*, ed. Robert J. Bast and Andrew C. Gow (Leiden, 2000), 253–276, there 256–257: Calvin "only ever had recourse to the Latin translation of the works of John Chrysostom, published by Chevallon in Paris in 1536."
- 5 John Calvin, *In Epist. Ad Gal. Comm.* 4:22, COR 11/16, 107: "Et certe Chrysostomus in vocabulo allegoriae fatetur esse catachresin. Quod verissimum est"; transl. T.H.L. Parker, *Calvin's New Testament Commentaries* (1996), 85: "And Chrysostom indeed acknowledges that in the word allegory is κατὰχρησις; which is quite true"; cf. *In Gal. Comm.* 4:24, CHEV, vol. 4, fol. 224 v^o1: "Abusive figuram dixit allegoriam."
- 6 For example, Calvin's reference to Chrysostom in his *Commentary on Ephesians* could not be derived from the Chevallon edition, since it does not mention the argument Calvin referred to. John Calvin, *Comm. Eph.* 4:11, COR XVI, 230; CHEV, vol. 4, fol. 401v^o–402r^o.
- 7 Jennifer Richards and Fred Schurink, "Introduction: The Textuality and Materiality of Reading in Early Modern England," *Huntington Library Quarterly*, 73.3 (2010), 345–361, there 354.

books in the past' is multi-interpretable because of its development until now.⁸ If this is already true for reading books, how much more it goes for dependence on them during a whole career.

The remainder of this article is divided into four sections. The first section questions the evidence for Calvin's intensive use of the Chevallon edition throughout his literary career by discussing the opinions that underlie Ganoczy and Müller's interpretation of the marked sections and its influence on scholars after them. The second section describes the context in which Calvin's book collection had developed in order to determine to what extent it is plausible that Calvin had the Chevallon text at his disposal throughout his literary career. The third one examines the assumed relationship between the marked sections on the one hand and Calvin's commentaries and the *Institutio* on the other. The final section offers some suggestions on how to deal with the uncertainty about the extent to which Calvin used the Chevallon text.

2 Unproven Opinions Underlying the Interpretation of the Marked Sections

Ganoczy and Müller's interpretation of the marked sections is based on five opinions: 1) this copy was Calvin's, 2) Calvin intensively used this edition, 3) the marked sections were those that aroused Calvin's special interest, 4) Calvin marked the sections in order to use them in his writings, and 5) this copy was Calvin's main source throughout his literary career. The problem of these assertions is that they are unproven, as the current section will demonstrate.

One of Ganoczy and Müller's most important conclusions is that 210 underlinings and fifteen handwritten notes on 3,500 pages prove that Calvin "had been very intensively occupied with Chrysostom."⁹ However, this conclusion is based on two unproven assertions. The first is that the copy was exclusively Calvin's and the second that the small number of marked sections throughout the three volumes of the Chevallon text demonstrates Calvin's "very intensive" use of his copy.

8 William H. Sherman, *Used Books: Marking Readers in Renaissance England* (Philadelphia, 2008), xiii, xiv–xvi.

9 Alexandre Ganoczy and Klaus Müller, *Calvins handschriftliche Annotationen zu Chrysostomus: ein Beitrag zur Hermeneutik Calvins* (Wiesbaden, 1981), 13 (hereafter cited as Ganoczy/Müller): "sich sehr intensiv mit Chrysostomus beschäftigte"; trans. Peter Moore, "Gold Without Dross: Assessing the Debt of John Calvin to the Preaching of John Chrysostom," *Reformed Theological Review* 68 (2009), 109–129, there 116 (hereafter cited as Moore).

The first assertion itself (saying that the copy was Calvin's) is based on two other opinions, namely that Calvin himself made the annotations and underlinings and that he did this alone. Remarkably, Ganoczy and Müller did not pay any attention to the paleographic features of the marked sections. That Calvin was not accustomed to mark up his books emphasizes the need for solid paleographic evidence for Ganoczy and Müller's claim and for sharing their view, although determining who did make these simple underlinings is close to impossible. Additionally, the marked sections together with the appearance of this copy in the 1572 catalogue had played an important role in the conclusion that this copy was Calvin's. After Calvin's death in 1564, the library of the Geneva Academy received many of his books. However, this catalogue, which was produced eight years after Calvin's death, provides nothing more than an insight into the collection of the Library of the Geneva Academy and into what Calvin might have read.¹⁰ Because Calvin hardly ever wrote his name in his books,¹¹ the appearance of the annotated copy in the 1572 catalogue does not necessarily prove his ownership.¹²

Concerning the second assertion (that a relatively small number of marked sections prove a "very intensive" use of the works of Chrysostom), it is important to realize that these marked sections are scattered throughout the three volumes of the Chevallon edition.¹³ The first volume, which encompasses homilies on Old Testament texts (Book One)¹⁴ and on Matthew, Mark, and Luke

10 See also Alexandre Ganoczy, *La bibliothèque de l'Académie de Calvin: Le catalogue de 1572 et ses enseignements* (Geneva, 1969), 17–19.

11 Ganoczy, *La bibliothèque* (see above, n. 10), 19. Only in a collection of three writings (one symbolic book and two polemic books) are Calvin's initials (J.C.) written, although writing names or initials in books was usual at that time.

12 Cf. Paul Nelles, "Renaissance Libraries," *International Dictionary of Library History*, vol. 1, ed. David H. Stam (London, 2001), 151–155, there 151 about the collective use of libraries during the Renaissance: "The ideal of a public library was one treasured by humanists and their patrons. Yet the term *public library* meant something very different to Renaissance scholars than it does today. It did not designate a library open to all comers. First and oldest of the available meanings of the term *public library* was that of a common library. Many libraries and colleges of the late medieval period had public libraries in this sense, usually meaning a collection for the collective use of the institutional community. Second was the notion of a library that served the public utility or was used for the public benefit, largely in a political sense; an archive, for example, or a library meant to support the jurisdictional and diplomatic activities of the ecclesiastical or secular political body it served. Third, a library might be in a public building or within the public space of a house or palace."

13 Ganoczy/Müller (see above, n. 9), 13.

14 *CHEV*, book 1, fols. 1–14 and thereafter fols. 1–214.

(Book Two),¹⁵ contains 1,000 pages; the second volume, which encompasses homilies on John and Acts plus individual homilies (Book Three)¹⁶ and homilies on the Pauline epistles (Book Four),¹⁷ contains 1,500 pages; and the final volume with various other brief writings and an index of all five books (Book Five) contains 1,000 pages.¹⁸ In fact, the 210 underlinings and fifteen handwritten notes comprise only a very small part of the complete edition of 3,500 pages. Moreover, counting the underlinings is difficult. Ganoczy and Müller counted several separate underlinings in a section of Latin text as one underlining and they focused on sections of Latin text, rather than on individual words, phrases, or sentences. In some cases, there are more underlined sections on one page. So, less than 210 pages out of a total of 3,500 pages are underlined, as the following scheme illustrates:¹⁹

Volume	Book	Underlinings	Handwritten notes
1 (1,000 pages, < 9.5 % underlined)	I	90 (43 %)	2 (13.3 %)
	II	5 (2 %)	–
2 (1,500 pages, < 5.2 % underlined)	III	38 (18 %)	2 (13.3 %)
	IV	41 (20 %)	3 (20 %)
3 (1,000 pages, < 3.6 % underlined)	V	36 (17 %)	8 (53.3 %)
3,500 pages, < 6 % underlined		210 (100 %)	15 (99.9 %)

If the underlinings were made by Calvin alone throughout his literary career of about 30 years, the less than 6 % of pages containing marked sections do not legitimize the conclusion that Calvin was “very intensively” occupied with this copy. Furthermore, the annotations and underlinings together can be traced back to only ten series of homilies:²⁰

15

CHEV, book 2, fols. 1–348.

16

CHEV, book 3, fols. 1–243.

17

CHEV, book 4, fols. 1–364 and fols. 365–482 (appendix).

18

CHEV, book 5, fols. 1–372 and an index.

19

Ganoczy/Müller (see above, n. 9), 13, the percentages are mine. Except for three, all handwritten notes appear on pages with underlined sections.

20

This scheme is based on Ganoczy/Müller (see above, n. 9), 18–19, 157–161; the percentages are mine.

Title	Underlinings	Handwritten remarks	Homilies
1. <i>In Gen. hom.</i>	90 (44.8%)	2 (13.3%)	20 (50%)
2. <i>In Ioh. hom.</i>	34 (16.9%)	2 (13.3%)	7 (17.5%)
3. <i>In Eph. hom.</i> ²¹	15 (7.5%)	0	2 (5%)
4. <i>Ad pop. Ant. hom. 60</i> ²²	15 (7.5%)	0	1 (2.5%)
5. <i>Ad pop. Ant. hom. 1</i>	13 (6.5%)	8 (53.3%)	1 (2.5%)
6. <i>Ad pop. Ant. hom. 61</i>	8 (4%)	0	1 (2.5%)
7. <i>In Tit. hom.</i>	6 (3%)	0	1 (2.5%)
8. <i>In 2 Thess. hom.</i>	6 (3%)	0	1 (2.5%)
9. <i>In 1 & 2 Cor. hom.</i>	5 (2.5%)	2 (13.3%)	2 (5%)
10. <i>In Heb. hom.</i>	4 (2%)	0	1 (2.5%)
11. <i>In Col. hom.</i>	3 (1.5%)	0	1 (2.5%)
12. <i>In Rom. hom.</i>	1 (0.5%)	0	1 (2.5%)
13. <i>Ad pop. Ant. hom. 2</i>	1 (0.5%)	1 (6.7%)	1 (2.5%)
	201 ²³	15	40 homilies from ten series of homilies

A close view at the underlined and annotated sections leads to the conclusion that they prove at best that Calvin—provided that he was the only one who had made the underlinings—read passages from only 40 different single homilies from ten series of homilies in the complete Chevallon edition.

All fifteen handwritten notes fit well with the image of Calvin's very selective use of the Chevallon text and do not demonstrate an intensive use of the complete copy either. The following remarks show how Calvin seems to have annotated some passages in the margin to summarize the topics of the different sections:²⁴

21 Partial parallel with the text of *Ad pop. Ant. hom. 61*.

22 Partial parallel with the text of *In Matt. 26 hom. 83* and of *In Matt. 14 hom. 50*.

23 The number of underlinings slightly differs from the total number of 210 underlinings counted by Ganoczy and Müller. As mentioned, Ganoczy and Müller sometimes counted separate underlinings as one. The total number of 201 is based on my own counting of the underlinings in the separate sections as provided by Ganoczy/Müller (see above, n. 9), 50–161.

24 Ganoczy/Müller (see above, n. 9), 50, 92, 96, 98, 112–113, 118–119, 137–138, 141–143, trans. JHK.

1. T.I, fol. 2v^o, G (*In Gen. 1 hom. 2*): *Quando tunc ieiunium fuerit* ("when it was the time of fasting");
2. T.I, fol. 131v^o, M; fol. 132 r^o (*In Gen. 47 hom. 66*): *De sumptuosis sepulturis* ("about sumptuous burials");
3. T.III, fol. 7 v^o, H/I (*In Ioh. 1, hom. 2*): *Contra vanam gloriam* ("against vainglory");
4. T.III, fol. 9 r^o, E/F (*In Ioh. 1, hom. 3*): *Contra iracundiam* ("against irascibility");
5. T.IV, fol. 131r^o, F; 131v^o, G (*In 1 Cor. 14, hom. 36*): *Umbras dumtaxat earum virtutum, quibus ecclesia vetus florebat, suo tempore manere queritur* ("he [Chrysostom] complains vehemently that in his time only shadows of those virtues have remained, in which the early church flourished.");
6. T.IV, fol. 131v^o, I (*In 1 Cor. 14, hom. 36*): *Quanta ἀταξία Constantinop.* ("how much disorder [in] Constantinop.");
7. T.IV, fol. 280r^o, A–E (*In Tit. 1, hom. 1*): *Morositas plebis in pastores* ("the moroseness of the common people towards the pastors");
8. T.V, fol. 226v^o, L/M (*Ad pop. Ant. hom. 1 vino modico utere*, "use wine modestly"): *Contra ebrietatem* ("against drunkenness");
9. T.V, fol. 227r^o, D/E (*Ad pop. Ant. hom. 1*): *Probationes* ("proofs");
10. T.V, fol. 227r^o, D/E (*Ad pop. Ant. hom. 1*): *Primae causae* ("of the first reason");
11. T.V, fol. 227r^o, F, 227r^o, G (*Ad pop. Ant. hom. 1*): *Secundae* ("of the second [reason]");
12. T.V, fol. 227v^o, I/K (*Ad pop. Ant. hom. 1*): *Tertiae* ("of the third [reason]");
13. T.V, fol. 227v^o, L (*Ad pop. Ant. hom. 1*): 4;
14. T.V, fol. 227v^o, M; 228r^o, A (*Ad pop. Ant. hom. 1*): 5;
15. T.V, fol. 228r^o, C (*Ad pop. Ant. hom. 1*): 6.

The last six remarks concern only a numbering of the reasons that Chrysostom had given for the benefits (i.e. moderation and humility) of *tribulatio* ("tribulation"). Half of the remarks (numbers 8–15) are made in just one single homily and all annotations appear in only six different homilies.²⁵ This is too small a basis for the conclusion that Calvin intensively used this copy. Although it is possible that Calvin read more of this text than the sections he marked—if he did so—indicate, they only legitimize the conclusion that Calvin read and

25 A quick search in the *CO* for matches with numbers 9–15 of the annotated sections did not reveal parallels with Chrysostom's approbations of six reasons for the benefits of tribulation. In general however, the benefits *moderatio* (moderation) and *humilitas* (humility) fit well with Calvin's theology.

summarized topics in only six single homilies of the complete Chevallon edition consisting of 3,500 pages.

However, the opinion that Calvin had been very intensively occupied with his own copy of the works of Chrysostom formed the starting point for Ganoczy and Müller's hermeneutic-systematic evaluation of the marked sections. Furthermore, Ganoczy and Müller introduced a third unproven opinion by stating: "Without any doubt, the marked sections were those which aroused the reformer's special interest."²⁶ More strongly than Backus, according to whom the marked sections only show what captured Calvin's attention,²⁷ Moore rightly mentioned the lack of evidence for the conclusion of Calvin's special interest in the underlined passages. According to him, the marked sections only demonstrate that Calvin carefully read these sections. Calvin might not have had a special interest in the marked sections, since the marked sections might have been "the subject of specific questions received from a colleague," or a sign of "boredom rather than fascination."²⁸ Underlining passages might have helped Calvin to concentrate on the text he was reading. Although Ganoczy and Müller themselves warned against drawing rash conclusions based on the annotations, they grouped the marked sections in a coherent list of twelve topics of Calvin's assumed "special interest":²⁹

1. Questions about Christian conduct and asceticism;
2. Religious instruction and scripture reading;
3. God, his power as creator, providence and goodness;
4. The relationship between humankind and God;
5. The relationship with neighbour;
6. Sin, consequences of sin, confession;
7. Church life and customs, public worship;
8. Consecration and receipt of the Lord's supper;
9. Sacrifice of Christ;
10. Pastoral Ministry;
11. Symbols and comparisons;
12. Exegetical questions.

26 Ganoczy/Müller (see above, n. 9), 18: "Denn zweifelsohne deuten die Unterstreichungen und Randbemerkungen darauf hin, daß diese Textstellen das besondere Interesse des Reformators geweckt haben"; trans. Moore (see above, n. 9), 116.

27 Backus, "Calvin and the Greek Fathers" (see above, n. 4), 259.

28 Moore (see above, n. 9), 116–117.

29 Ganoczy/Müller (see above, n. 9), 18–19; trans. of the topics: Moore (see above, n. 9), 118.

Ganoczy and Müller's first conclusion from this list was that Calvin had little exegetical interest in Chrysostom.³⁰ Except for four passages,³¹ these underlinings and handwritten notes seemed to show a paraenetic-ascetic interest. Ganoczy and Müller themselves had already noticed that the conclusion that Calvin had little exegetical interest in Chrysostom contradicts Calvin's expressed admiration for the church father's exegesis in the *Praefatio*. Therefore, they offered the following explanation: the topics of special interest identified from the marked sections are mostly "questions of church life", a theme to which Calvin paid attention also in the *Praefatio*.³² One could question whether this explanation suffices. Firstly, Calvin considered Chrysostom's attention to church life as being subordinate to his chief merit, the interpretation of scripture.³³ Moreover, in the *Praefatio* Calvin took more room to caution the reader against Chrysostom's view of free will,³⁴ one of the two most frequently discussed topics in the *Institutio*,³⁵ than to any topic from this list. Therefore, it is astonishing that the topic of free will is missed on a list containing the topics of Calvin's special interest in Chrysostom and is not supported by what Calvin wrote himself in his *Praefatio* and the *Institutio*.

After Ganoczy and Müller, Hazlett took over this conclusion and went even a step further by arguing: "It would seem that Calvin was using Chrysostom as a means of learning how to preach sermons with practical relevance."³⁶ This illustrates the overinterpretation of Ganoczy and Müller's publication in subsequent scholarship and introduces the second part of this section.

An important aspect of both Calvin's negative interest in Chrysostom (his view on free will) and his positive interest in the church father (his exegesis) do not correlate with Ganoczy and Müller's list. The fact that this is considered problematic, reveals a fourth and a fifth unproven opinion: that Calvin marked the sections in order to use them in his writings and that Calvin used one single copy of the works by Chrysostom throughout his literary career. It is on the

30 Ganoczy/Müller (see above, n. 9), 19.

31 CHEV, book 1, fol. 12v^o, I/K; book 3, fol. 6r^o, F; book 3, fol. 25r^o, A and book 3, fol. 26v^o, I; Ganoczy/Müller (see above, n. 9), 19.

32 Ganoczy/Müller (see above, n. 9), 19, 22; Moore (see above, n. 9), 119–120.

33 *Praefatio in Chrysostomi Homilias*, CO 9:834–835; Hazlett, "Calvin's Latin Preface" (see above, n. 1), 143–146.

34 *Praef. in Chry. Hom.*, CO 9:836–837. In the autograph (Geneva, Bibliothèque publique et universitaire, fr. 145, fols. 160r^o–162v^o), Calvin starts with warning the reader in the margin and continues on the following two *folia*.

35 John R. Walchenbach, *John Calvin as Biblical Commentator* (see above n. 1), 126–127.

36 Hazlett, "Calvin's Latin Preface" (see above, n. 1), 133.

basis of these assertions that we find recommendations such as: "We should distinguish between the reading and underlining of the Chrysostom edition by the young Calvin and a later distinct use of it (without underlining) in the preparation of his New Testament commentaries."³⁷ The suggestion that Calvin was young, when he would have underlined these passages is inevitable when one relies strongly on Ganoczy and Müller's findings. Before considering the context and development of Calvin's book possession, the fourth opinion will be briefly discussed and after that the fifth more comprehensively.

According to the fourth opinion, Calvin would first have underlined the passages in the Chevallon text and then have used them.³⁸ However, there is nothing to say that it was not the other way round. It is possible that Calvin had first referred to Chrysostom from anthologies, other editions, or intermediate sources and that he underlined the sections he afterwards recognized from his own or from somebody else's work. When relating the marked sections to Calvin's commentaries and the *Institutio*, this possibility must also be considered.

The final unproven assertion, discussed in the present study, concerns the idea that Calvin would have only ever used one single copy of Chrysostom's *Opera*. For this opinion, Ganoczy and Müller cannot be blamed. According to them, Calvin obviously might have used other Chrysostom sources as well. They mentioned two passages in which Calvin might have referred to the *Decretum Gratiani* and other sources, such as Peter Lombard's *Sententiae* and Melancthon's *Loci communes*.³⁹ Ganoczy and Müller supposed that already in 1533/1534 Calvin had come into contact with the patristic literature, during his stay with Louis du Tillet in Angoulême—where he had access to three or four thousand volumes⁴⁰—and that he deepened this knowledge in Basel.⁴¹

37 Anthony N.S. Lane, *John Calvin: Student of the Church Fathers* (Edinburgh, 1999), 234, n. 210 (hereafter cited as Lane).

38 Cf. H.J. Jackson, *Marginalia: Readers writing in Books* (New Haven, 2001), 51: Jackson argued that early sixteenth-century readers annotated passages mostly for similar reasons as we do today, e.g. "(...) as a way of learning and remembering what they contain (...)."

39 *CO* 1:701 and *CO* 1:729; Ganoczy/Müller (see above, n. 9), 24–25.

40 John T. Slotemaker, "John Calvin's Trinitarian Theology in the 1536 *Institutes*: The Distinction of Persons as a Key to His Theological Sources," in *Philosophy and Theology in the Long Middle Ages: A contribution to Stephan F. Brown*, ed. Kent Emery, Jr., Russell L. Friedman, Andreas Speer, and Maxime Mauriège (Leiden, 2011), 781–810, there 801 n. 75.

41 Wulfert de Greef, *Johannes Calvijn, zijn werk en zijn geschriften*, Kampen 2006, 25, 28–30; Wilhelm H. Neuser, "Stations—France and Basel," *The Calvin Handbook*, ed. H.J. Selderhuis and Henry J. Baron (Grand Rapids, 2009), 23–30, there 27; Ganoczy/Müller (see above, n. 9), 2, 24–25.

However, Lane explicitly contradicted Ganoczy and Müller at this point. According to him, there is no need to suggest that Calvin used any other Chrysostom source.⁴² Remarkably, in the context of Calvin's reading of Augustine, Lane himself called an assertion of this kind a "presumption" and stated: "We might reasonably suppose that while in one place Calvin used just the one edition, though if that edition was not his own personal copy there is no guarantee that he might always have had access to the same one." And even when he possessed his own copy, he probably had to part with it, because of his itinerant life.⁴³

If Calvin indeed owned the copy with the marked sections, it is important to know *when* it came into his possession, because as Lane rightly noticed: "Where there is evidence that Calvin used a specific edition at a certain stage after his return to Geneva it is fairly safe to assume that he continued to use that edition. It cannot be assumed that he used a specific edition earlier than the evidence indicates and it certainly cannot be assumed without evidence that he used the same editions in Strassburg as in Geneva."⁴⁴ In the light of the fact that this edition has been discovered in the Geneva Library, this would mean that Calvin could have used this copy only during his last Genevan period (1541–1564) and that he must have used other editions as well.

3 The Context and Development of Calvin's Book Possession

There is a causal relationship between Calvin's financial situation and his book collection. Due to his itinerant life and the lack of money, which meant that he sold his books several times, Calvin's book collection often changed. The context and development of Calvin's book possession shed light on the period during which he might have had the Chevallon edition at his disposal and on his need for other editions, which were available in the different humanistic centers he stayed in.

When Calvin for the first time arrived in Geneva in July 1536, he did not possess many books, but during his stay there, his book collection significantly increased. The exile decree of 23 April 1538 caused Calvin to leave Geneva for Basel. Until August 1538, Calvin stayed in that humanistic center, where he busied himself with studying. His brother, Antoine, who had remained in

⁴² Lane (see above, n. 37), 234, n. 210.

⁴³ Ibid., 158.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 11 n. 49.

Geneva, sent him a trunk containing “things used on a daily basis.”⁴⁵ In Basel, Calvin had to deal with a lack of money. In a letter from July 1538, he thanked Louis du Tillet for his gift of money, so that he would be able to live for a time on this money and “on some books.”⁴⁶ It appears from further passages that Calvin intended to sell the books he had left in Geneva.⁴⁷ In August 1538, Calvin settled in Strassburg. His brother Antoine, who visited him in January 1539, did not seem to have brought with him any of Calvin's books from Geneva.⁴⁸ Calvin's share of the 70 books (among which was a Latin edition of the *Opera* by Chrysostom),⁴⁹ which he together with his brother inherited from Olivétan in about January 1539, was not brought to Strassburg either. In September of the same year, Calvin asked the executor to sell these books as well, except a Hebrew Bible.⁵⁰ This indicates that if Calvin had owned the copy of the Chevallon edition before his stay in Strassburg, it is improbable that he used it during his Strassburg years.

Apart from the sale of these books inherited from Olivétan, in a letter of April 1539 Calvin told Farel that “in my books that are still in Geneva, there is enough to satisfy my landlord until next winter.”⁵¹ So, Calvin thought he would be able to cover the cost of his rent until the end of the year by selling some books he had left in Geneva. In a letter of December 1539, Calvin asked Farel to sell as much as he could in Neuchâtel of the remainder of his own books and of his brother's clothes.⁵² Calvin explicitly mentioned his “lack of books” during his Basel and early Strassburg periods. In his 1542 *De libero hominis arbitrio et divina gratia libri decem*—a general condemnation of the Reformation—Pighius had blamed Calvin for not having cited Chrysostom or Jerome in his 1539 edition of the *Institutio*. Calvin had said that apart from Augustine, the church fathers wrote so confusingly about free will that nothing

45 CO 10:225; A.-L. Herminjard, *Correspondance des Reformateurs dans les pays de langue Française* (Paris, 1878), 5:56; Jean-François Gilmont, *Jean Calvin et le livre imprimé* (Geneva, 1997), 184; J.-F. Gilmont, *John Calvin and the Printed Book*, trans. Karin Maag (Kirkville, 2005), 135.

46 Gilmont, *Jean Calvin et le livre* (see above, n. 45), 184.

47 Ibid.

48 Ibid.

49 CO 10:367; the year of publication is not mentioned.

50 CO 10:343 and 371–372; Herminjard, *Correspondance* (see above, n. 45), 5:307 and 6:30–31; Gilmont, *Jean Calvin et le livre* (see above, n. 45), 185.

51 CO 10:340; Herminjard, *Correspondance* (see above, n. 45), 5:291; Gilmont, *Jean Calvin et le livre* (see above, n. 45), 185; trans. Maag (see above, n. 45), 137.

52 CO 10:441; Herminjard, *Correspondance* (see above, n. 45), 6:156; Gilmont, *Jean Calvin et le livre* (see above, n. 45), 185.

could be concluded with certainty from their works.⁵³ Calvin replied in his 1543 *Defensio sanae et orthodoxae doctrinae de servitute et liberatione humani arbitrii adversus calumnias Alberti Pighii Campensis* (*The Bondage and Liberation of the Will, A Defence of the Orthodox Doctrine of Human Choice against Pighius*): "Why therefore did Pighius not provide me with books? At the time I did not have any of these works, apart from a volume by Saint Augustine that had been lent to me. I deserve to be forgiven because of my lack of books if I named two authors that I recalled had held an opinion, and left out the others that I had forgotten about at the time."⁵⁴ Although given the context of this statement an element of rhetorical exaggeration has to be taken into account, this remark can be considered a reminder that Calvin did not have a complete library of the early church at his disposal either, when he wrote the 1539 *Institutio* and the *Defensio sanae et orthodoxae doctrinae*. Consequently, Calvin does not seem to have had the copy of the Chevallon edition to hand, when he wrote the 1539 *Institutio* and the *Defensio sanae et orthodoxae doctrinae*.⁵⁵

According to Gilmont, the largest part of the 1539 *Institutio* was written in Geneva, which is before Calvin's exile in 1538. It is certainly the case that Calvin seems to have owned sufficient books in Geneva. As Gilmont suggested, Calvin might have needed this excuse to defend himself against Pighius's attack, but it is also possible that Calvin wrote the offending passage about free will in Basel. In that case, Calvin might have referred to his short stay in Basel where he revised this edition, which appears from a letter to Du Pinet in which Calvin urged him to retranscribe the text of his first draft to a clean copy. After his arrival in Strassburg, Calvin appeared to be impatient to get this edition published.⁵⁶

53 John Calvin, *Institutes* 11.2.4, OS 3:245; *Inst.* 11.2.9, OS 3:251; Albertus Pighius, *De libero hominis arbitrio et divina gratia* (Cologne, 1542), 10b, 28a, 32b, 35b, 36b; Lane (see above, n. 37), 152; Gilmont, *Jean Calvin et le livre* (see above, n. 45), 185.

54 CO 6:336; Gilmont, *Jean Calvin et le livre* (see above, n. 45), 185–186; trans. Maag (see above, n. 45), 137; cf. trans. A.N.S. Lane and G.I. Davies, *The Bondage and Liberation of the Will: A Defence of the Orthodox Doctrine of Human Choice against Pighius* (Grand Rapids, 1996), 151: "Why then did Pighius not keep me supplied with books, of which I had none to hand at that time except one volume of Augustine which had been given to me on loan? I myself consider that I deserve to be excused for naming the two proponents of a single view whom, at a time when I was so short of books, I could remember, and for leaving out the others who did not then come to mind."

55 Lane/Davies, *The Bondage and Liberation of the Will* (see above, n. 54), 151 n. 94.

56 CO 10:261; Herminjard, *Correspondance* (see above, n. 45), 5:134; Gilmont, *Jean Calvin et le livre* (see above, n. 45), 65; According to Lane (see above, n. 37), 158–159, Calvin accomplished the 1539 edition in Strassburg.

Calvin's book collection in Basel was meagre. Remarkably, it was exactly in this Basel period that he wrote the *Praefatio in Chrysostomi Homilias* (*Preface to the Homilies of Chrysostom*).⁵⁷ How could he intend to translate Chrysostom's homilies if he had no access to the works by this church father? A plausible explanation is that, for this project, Calvin used Chrysostom editions held in the library of the printer Oporinus during his stay with him.⁵⁸ He also might have used Chrysostom editions via the *Bibliothèque de l'Université* and the *sodalitas Basiliensis*, such as Greek editions, which were available in Basel,⁵⁹ Strassburg,⁶⁰ and Geneva.⁶¹

So, on the basis of both Calvin's small book collection and the many available Chrysostom editions in the humanistic centers he stayed, it is not plausible that Calvin only used the Chevallon edition throughout his literary career.

4 The Marked Sections and Calvin's Commentaries and the *Institutio*

Further support for the argument that Calvin used other editions of Chrysostom can be found when the marked sections are compared to the commentaries and the *Institutio*. This section relates the marked sections firstly to the commentaries and secondly to the *Institutio*.

In his commentaries, Calvin referred to Chrysostom (about 100 times) more often than in the *Institutio* (about 43 times). However, when Calvin in his commentaries referred to Chrysostom as an authority, none of the passages

57 The year in which Calvin is supposed to have written the *Praefatio* is controversial. In my dissertation on the exegetical relationship between John Chrysostom and John Calvin, I hope to explain my choice for 1538.

58 Gilmont, *Jean Calvin et le livre* (see above, n. 45), 185–186.

59 E.g. *De orando Deum* (1525, Greek-Latin) and *De sacerdotio* (1525, Greek), *Coniunculae perquam elegantes sex de fato & providentia Dei* (1526, Greek), *In epistolam ad Philippenses homiliae duae* (1526, Greek-Latin), *Libellum perquam elegantem D. Ioannis Chrysostomi Graecum, de Babyla martyre* (1527, Greek) and *Aliquot opuscula* (1529, Greek). For these and other sixteenth-century (Latin) editions, see Ueli Dill, "Johannes Chrysostomos im Basler Buchdruck des 16. Jahrhunderts," in *Chrysostomosbilder in 1600 Jahren: Facetten der Wirkungsgeschichte eines Kirchenvaters*, ed. Martin Wallraff and Rudolf Brändle (Berlin, 2008), 255–265, there 260–264; Lane (see above, n. 37), 5.

60 Lane (see above, n. 37), 5.

61 The 1572 catalogue of the Geneva Academy Library contains besides the copy of the 1536 Chevallon edition, Chrysostom's *Liturgia* (1526) and the *Opera Chrysostomi, graece, In Paulum* (Verona, 1529); Ganoczy, *La bibliothèque*, 41–42, 167, 170–171, 176, 182.

referred to are underlined or annotated in the Chevallon text. Ganoczy and Müller gave three examples.

The first example is derived from Calvin's commentary on Romans, which contains five references to Chrysostom.⁶² Calvin did not mention where he had found the passages he referred to. In Chrysostom's *In Rom. hom.*, there is in the Chevallon edition only one underlining,⁶³ which is not referred to in Calvin's commentary on the concerned Bible text. It is possible that the fifth quotation concerning Rom. 16,16 *Salutate vos in osculo sancto* ("Greet one another with a holy kiss")⁶⁴ in which Calvin explicitly referred to Chrysostom: *quemadmodum apparet ex quadam Chrysostomi homilia* ("as we see in one of the homilies of Chrysostom")⁶⁵ has been taken from the passage in *De proditiōe Iudae*. In this homily, the sentence *Sanctum osculum teneamus, quod animas sociat, reconciliat mentes, ut unum corpus ostendit* ("Let us hold on to the holy kiss, because it unites souls, reconciles minds, and displays [us as] one body") is marked.⁶⁶ However, the inference of literary dependence is somewhat speculative.

The second illustration given by Ganoczy and Müller to support the view that Calvin did not use the marked sections for his exegesis, is that although almost half of Calvin's underlinings in the Chevallon text appear in the Genesis homilies, practically none of them are taken up in Calvin's commentary on Genesis. Moreover, in Calvin's commentaries on Genesis, Chrysostom is mentioned only once, but again the passage referred to is not marked in the Chevallon edition.⁶⁷

Finally, the third example: from the 34 underlinings and two handwritten remarks in the *In Ioh. hom.* only one can be traced back to Calvin's commentaries.⁶⁸ The other references to Chrysostom in Calvin's commentary on John are not found in the marked sections in the Chevallon text.

These examples led Ganoczy and Müller to the following conclusion: "Calvin has hardly used the sections marked by himself as quotations for his most

62 CO 49:56; CO 49:107; CO 49:139–140; CO 49:171; CO 49:287.

63 CHEV, book 4, fol. 6r^o, E/F; Ganoczy/Müller (see above, n. 9), 23.

64 CO 49:287.

65 Ganoczy/Müller (see above, n. 9), 22–23; CO 49:287; John Calvin, *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Romans and to the Thessalonians* (Calvin's Commentaries, vol. 8), ed. David W. Torrance and Thomas F. Torrance, trans. Ross Mackenzie (Grand Rapids, 1960), 323.

66 CHEV, book 3, fol. 118v^o, L, trans. JHK; Ganoczy/Müller (see above, n. 9), 23.

67 CO 23:26; Ganoczy/Müller (see above, n. 9), 23.

68 CHEV, book 3, fol. 25r^o, A; CO 47:26; Ganoczy/Müller (see above, n. 9), 23.

important exegetical references to Chrysostom. Occasional resemblances cannot change this view.”⁶⁹

Ganoczy and Müller rightly acknowledged “that Calvin did not use these marked sections for his own exegetical studies.”⁷⁰ This is important, because Calvin's commentaries were written during a significant part of his literary career and comprise a relatively large portion of his complete *corpus*. Since there is no evidence that Calvin used the marked sections in his commentaries, Backus's argument that Calvin based most of the references to Chrysostom in his works—including his commentaries—on the Chevallon text⁷¹ has not been proven either. Therefore, in research on Chrysostom's *Nachleben* in Calvin's commentaries, the Chevallon text should be considered one of Calvin's possible sources, but not more than that.

There are, however, more parallels with the marked sections in the *Institutio*, as Ganoczy and Müller have already demonstrated. The increase of references to Chrysostom in the subsequent editions of the *Institutio* is often considered an indicator that Calvin read more of Chrysostom during the periods between the separate editions. According to Lane, in combination with information concerning the availability of Chrysostom editions, this might be helpful to determine when Calvin read Chrysostom.⁷²

Counting the quotations is just as difficult as it was to count the underlinings. In this study, the references meant are those that Calvin explicitly introduced by: “according to Chrysostom” or “Chrysostom says: [a, b, and c].” The counting of the quotations in the just mentioned examples leads to a total number of four. The quotations in which Calvin unknowingly quoted pseudo-Chrysostom—but explicitly mentions Chrysostom's name—are also included. In the 1536 edition of the *Institutio*, Calvin only listed Chrysostom's name, without quoting him. In the 1539 and 1543 editions, there are respectively 32 and seven more references to Chrysostom. In the 1543 edition, there are also two mentions of his name. Finally, in the 1559 edition one new reference is given.

69 Ganoczy/Müller (see above, n. 9), 23: “Calvin hat die von ihm selbst hervorgehobenen Chrysostomustexte so gut wie gar nicht als Belegstellen für seine häufigen exegetischen Hinweise auf Chrysostomus verwendet. Gelegentliche Übereinstimmungen vermögen daran nichts zu ändern”; trans. JHK.

70 Ganoczy/Müller (see above, n. 9), 22: “daß Calvin diese handschriftlich hervorgehobenen Textstellen nicht für seine eigenen exegetischen Studien verwendete”; trans. JHK.

71 Backus, “Calvin and the Greek Fathers” (see above, n. 4), 256–257.

72 Lane (see above, n. 37), 12, 168.

This results in a total number of roughly 43 references to Chrysostom in the 1559 edition of the *Institutio*.⁷³

Ganoczy and Müller highlighted that six references to Chrysostom—out of the 33 references counted by them—are almost word for word taken from the underlined passages. These six references all appear for the first time in the 1543 edition of the *Institutio*, which Calvin probably wrote in Strassburg and maybe in the first few months in Geneva.⁷⁴ According to Ganoczy and Müller, Calvin connected similar passages by underlining them in different homilies, as the following scheme demonstrates.⁷⁵

CO1	CO2	Marked sections in the Chevallon edition 1536	
660	907	T.v, fol. 326v ^o , G	T.II, 175v ^o , L
940	943	T.v, fol. 326r ^o , C	T.II, 175v ^o , G:
1000	1006	T.v, fol. 326r ^o , D	T.II, 175v ^o , H
1019	1047	T.v, fol. 328r ^o , C	T.IV, 356v ^o , M
1020	1048	T.v, fol. 328r ^o , A	T.IV, 356v ^o , L
1022	1050	T.IV, fol. 190v ^o , H	

The seventh quotation first used in the 1543 edition⁷⁶ is not found in the underlined sections, neither are the passages in which Calvin only listed Chrysostom's name.⁷⁷ Ganoczy and Müller acknowledged that as is the case with Calvin's exegetical works, most of the references to Chrysostom cannot be traced back to the underlined sections in the copy of the Chevallon text. However, they supposed that Calvin used the Chevallon edition during his Strassburg period, in order to write his 1543 edition of the *Institutio* and his com-

73 These figures are based on my own counting. I used Walchenbach, *John Calvin as Biblical Commentator* (see above, n. 1), 124–127, the search program in the digital CO, and John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, ed. John T. McNeill, trans. Ford Lewis Battles (AGES Software, Albany, 1998). I compared these finding with those of Moore (see above, n. 9), 113–114, who worked with roughly the same figures.

74 T.H.L. Parker, *John Calvin: A Biography* (Philadelphia, 1975), 105; Lane (see above, n. 37), 117; Moore (see above, n. 9), 121.

75 Ganoczy/Müller (see above, n. 9), 24.

76 *Inst.* IV.12.8, CO 2:911.

77 *Inst.* IV.13.8, CO 2:930; *Inst.* IV.18.10, CO 2:1059.

mentary on Romans (1540). Their argument for this view is that the underlined parts had first appeared in the 1543 edition of the *Institutio*. Calvin's use of the Chevallon text in his earlier editions cannot be proven.⁷⁸

It is tempting to interpret the close parallels from the *Institutio* with the marked sections in the 1536 Chevallon text as strong evidence that Calvin marked these sections in order to write the 1543 edition of the *Institutio*.⁷⁹ However, three arguments can be given against this assumed evidence.

The first argument is that there are no differences between most of these passages in the 1536 Chevallon edition and in other, earlier, Latin editions of Chrysostom's works or in the Basel 1539 edition of Chrysostom's *Opera Omnia*. The passages referred to from the *Ad pop. Ant. hom.* and from the *In Matt. hom.* are the same as in for example the Basel editions, published in 1517,⁸⁰ 1522,⁸¹ 1530,⁸² and 1539.⁸³ The passage referred to from the *In 1Cor. hom.* had already been published before 1530. Via the 1530 Basel edition, the *In 1Cor. hom.* and *In 2Cor. hom.*, which was translated by Oecolampadius and others, was integrated word-for-word in the Chevallon edition.⁸⁴ Additionally, the passage is exactly the same as in Musculus's translation, which was published in Basel in 1536⁸⁵ and also adopted in the already mentioned 1539 Basel edi-

78 Ganoczy/Müller (see above, n. 9), 27.

79 As is done by Ganoczy/Müller (see above, n. 9), 24; Lane (see above, n. 34), 168; Moore (see above, n. 9), 121.

80 *Operum Ioannis Chrysostomi Constantinopolitani, habet Homilias LXXX. Ad populum Antiochenum potissimum habitas, Bernardo Brixiano Interprete* (Basel, 1517), *Ad pop. Ant. hom.* 60–61, fols. 87–89; *Incipit prologus Aniani in expositionem beati Ioannis Chrysostom Episcopi Constantinopolitani super Evangelium beati Matthaei* (Basel, 1517), *In Matt. hom.* 83, fols. 149–150.

81 *Operum Ioannis Chrysostomi Constantinopolitani, habet Homilias LXXX. Ad populum Antiochenum potissimum habitas, Bernardo Brixiano Interprete* (Basel, 1522), *Ad pop. Ant. hom.* 60–61, 209–215; *Homilias complectens LXXXIX. in Matthaum. Quarum octo priores Anianus ad Horontium e Graeco uertit: Reliquas Georgius Trapezontius latinitate donauit* (Basel, 1522), *In Matt. hom.* 83, 356–360.

82 *D. Ioannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani opera quae hactenus versa sunt omnia, ad Grecorum codicum collationem multis in locis per utriusque linguae peritus emendata. Accessere ... aliquot Homiliae in Acta apostolorum* (Basel, 1530).

83 *Opera D. Ioannis Chrysostomi Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani: quotquot per Graecorum exemplarium facultatem in Latinam linguam hactenus traduci potuerunt, ad vetustissimorum codicum fidem nativae integritate decorique suo reddita, per viros in utraque lingua insigniter exercitatus, idque citra ulla novi aut peregrini dogmatis aspergines, quorum Catalogus sub principium explicabitur* (Basel, 1539).

84 CHEV, book 1, fol. 4v°, G; Ganoczy/Müller (see above, n. 9), 4–5.

85 *D. Ioannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani in omnes D. Pauli epistolas com-*

tion. Because it is not known if Calvin marked a number of sections in the Chevallon text before or after referring to Chrysostom, the close parallels of the quotations with the 1536 Chevallon edition do not necessarily prove that Calvin studied these particular sections prior to the completion of his 1543 revision of the *Institutio*.⁸⁶ In the quotation from *Institutio* IV.17.45 (CO 2:1047/CO 1:1019), Calvin explicitly mentioned the *In Eph. hom.* He did not speak about the parallels with the *Ad pop. Ant. hom.*, although he made several annotations and handwritten remarks in that homily. The underlining might also indicate that he had reread Chrysostom after referring to him from another edition in which Chrysostom's homilies were thematically structured.⁸⁷ He might have had such an edition at his disposal before the copy of the 1536 Chevallon text.

The second argument is, that three out of the six references (see appendix) to the marked sections had already appeared in Calvin's French translation (*Les actes de la journée impériale, tenue en la cité de Regespourg* or: *Actes de Ratisbonne*, 1541) of documents from Bucer's not yet published report in Latin on the Diet of Regensburg (*Acta colloquii in comitiis imperii Ratisponae habiti*, 1541).⁸⁸ This might be the strongest argument against the opinion that Calvin first read and marked the sections in his copy of the Chevallon text and that he later used them in order to write the 1543 edition of the *Institutio*. The fact that the 1543 edition of the *Institutio* (552 pages) contains 82 more pages than the 1539 edition (470 pages) can be explained by Calvin's participation in religious discussions in Worms and Regensburg (1540 and 1541). The substantial increase in the quotations of the church fathers was probably caused by these discussions.⁸⁹

The third argument is that the *Defensio sanae et orthodoxae doctrinae*, which Calvin wrote shortly after the 1543 *Institutio*, contains no more references to Chrysostom than the 1539 *Institutio*, apart from one reference quoted by Pighius. Lane explained this by assuming that Calvin did not need the Chevallon text that he had at hand. In the light of an assumed intensive use of the

mentarii, quotquot apud Graecos extant latinitate donati, quorum bona pars quae hactenus desiderabatur, recens a D. Wolfgango Musculo traducta est (Basel, 1536), 573.

86 Moore (see above, n. 9), 121.

87 Ganoczy/Müller (see above, n. 9), 7.

88 CO 5:509–684; Johannes Maarten Stolk, *Johannes Calvijn en de godsdienstgesprekken tussen Rooms-Katholieken en Protestanten in Hagenau, Worms en Regensburg (1540–1541)* (Kampen, 2004), 295–296.

89 Herman J. Selderhuis, "Types—The Institutes," *The Calvin Handbook* (see above, n. 41), 199–206, there 203.

Chevallon edition in order to write the 1543 *Institutio*, this is remarkable.⁹⁰ Together with the already mentioned quotations derived from the *Actes de Ratisbonne*, this observation rather confirms that one should be careful not to consider the six references to Chrysostom that are paralleled in the marked sections as an indication that Calvin used the Chevallon edition for his Chrysostom quotations in the 1543 edition of the *Institutio*.

Furthermore, if Calvin marked sections in order to use them for any edition of the *Institutio*, one wonders why there are no such parallels with the references to Chrysostom in the 1539 edition of the *Institutio*, given that this edition shows the largest increase of references to Chrysostom. If the marked sections in the Chevallon text proved that this copy was really Calvin's only possible resource, statistically speaking one would expect to find more parallels between them and the references in the 1539 edition.

So, the year in which Calvin introduced the marked sections into the *Institutio* cannot be considered as evidence for the *terminus a quo* for Calvin's use of this text. In the light of Calvin's lack of books, it is plausible that he took these references from his memory or from passages from the *Acta*, which he had translated himself.

5 Conclusion

Since the marked sections comprise only a small part of the entire Chevallon text, they do not necessarily prove that Calvin used this copy very intensively. Because Calvin did not write his name in this copy, the conclusion that it was his only is not demonstrated by its appearance in the 1572 catalogue or by the underlinings as such. At best, the handwritten remarks are the only proof that Calvin used this copy at any given moment in his literary career. Most probably, this moment would have been in his last Genevan period. It is most unlikely that Calvin took this copy of three volumes with him each time he moved city.

In Calvin's exegetical works, none of the marked sections are explicitly mentioned. Only six marked sections are discovered in Calvin's 1543 *Institutio*, but at least half of these references were already known by Calvin when he translated the *Actes de Ratisbonne* into French (1541). So, with a few exceptions the marked sections, which are seen as important evidence for Calvin's use of the entire text as his main source, were insufficiently important for Calvin to use them in his commentaries and the *Institutio*.

⁹⁰ Lane (see above, n. 37), 168.

These findings demonstrate that caution is needed, even when evidence for Calvin's use of a specific edition of a church father is based on indicators such as: dates on which Calvin introduced the material in the *Institutio*, availability of an edition, and the appearance of this copy in the 1572 catalogue.⁹¹ Therefore, it is important for further research on the relationship between Chrysostom and Calvin not to consider the 1536 Chevallon edition as Calvin's only possible source, but as one of the possible sources in only his last Genevan period. It is essential to investigate which Chrysostom editions were or had been available to Calvin at the moment he prepared the writings in question. Relating the moments of Calvin's use of this specific copy to other available Chrysostom editions challenges the current research not to focus on one edition Calvin *always* read, but to establish which *particular* edition or editions Calvin used for each *particular* work he wrote. Only then, it is possible to trace back Calvin's references to Chrysostom's Greek and to Chrysostom's exegeses of passages on which the Chevallon edition contains no homilies.

⁹¹ Lane (see above, n. 37), 12, 168.

**Appendix: Marked Sections in the Chevallon Edition and Parallels
with the *Institutio* (1543) and *Actes de Ratisbonne* (1541)**

<i>Inst.</i> 1543: Reference to Chrysostom ⁹²	CHEVALLON	<i>Actes de Ratisbonne</i>
IV.12.5	T.V, fol. 326v ^o = t.II, 175v ^o	CO 5:635
CO 2:907	T.V, fol. 326v ^o G: <i>Ad pop. Ant. hom.</i>	<i>En laquelle discretion on avoit</i>
CO 1:660	60:	<i>si grand esgard que saint</i>
<i>Quamobrem Chrysostomus</i>	<i>Non parva vobis imminet ultio, si</i>	<i>Chrysostome a escript de sa</i>
<i>graviter invehitur in sacerdotes,</i>	<i>quem cuiuspiam conscium</i>	<i>personne: le bailleray plustost ma</i>
<i>qui dum magnorum potentiam</i>	<i>nequitiae, huius mensae</i>	<i>vie que le Corps du Seigneur à un</i>
<i>formidant neminem audent arcere.</i>	<i>participem esse concedatis,</i>	<i>homme qui en sera indigne, et</i>
<i>Sanguis, inquit, e manibus vestris</i>	<i>sanguis eius de manibus vestris</i>	<i>plustost souffriray qu'on espane</i>
<i>requiretur; si hominem timetis,</i>	<i>exquiretur. Sive quis dux militiae</i>	<i>mon sang, que de conceder ce sang</i>
<i>ille vos deridebit; sin Deum,</i>	<i>sit, sive praefectus, sive princeps</i>	<i>tant sacré à un homme indigne.</i>
<i>eritis hominibus quoque ipsi</i>	<i>diademate coronatus: indigne</i>	<i>Et de vray, si l'homme se rend</i>
<i>venerabiles: non fasces horreamus,</i>	<i>autem accedat, prohibe, maiorem</i>	<i>coupable du Corps et du sang</i>
<i>non purpuram, non diademata,</i>	<i>illo potestatem habes.</i>	<i>de Iesus Christ, en les recevant</i>
<i>maior hic est nobis potestas; ego</i>		<i>indignement, celui qui les donne,</i>
<i>certe corpus meum potius tradam</i>	T.II, 175v ^o L: <i>In Matt. 26 hom. 83:</i>	<i>ou aucunement communie</i>
<i>in mortem, ac sanguinem meum</i>	<i>Non parva vobis imminet poena,</i>	<i>à ceulx qui en sont indignes,</i>
<i>fundi patiar, quam pollutionis</i>	<i>si quem aliqua improbitate</i>	<i>l'enveloppent en semblable</i>
<i>istius fiam particeps.</i>	<i>teneri scientes, et huius mensae</i>	<i>damnation. Pourtant en l'Eglise</i>
	<i>participationem permittatis.</i>	<i>ancienne on ne tiroit point la</i>
On this account, Chrysostom	<i>Sanguis enim eius ex manibus</i>	<i>courtine iusques à ce que toutes</i>
gravely inveighs against priests	<i>requiritur vestris. Si dux igitur</i>	<i>gens de vie impure et dissolue se</i>
who, fearing the power of great	<i>quispiam, si consul ipse, si qui</i>	<i>fussent retirez.</i>
men, dare exclude no one.	<i>diademate ornatur, indigne adeat:</i>	
"Blood," he says, "will be required	<i>cohibe ac coerce, maiorem tu illo</i>	
at your hands. If you fear a man,	<i>habes potestatem.</i>	
he will laugh at you; but if you		
fear God, you will be revered also		
among men. Let us not dread the		

⁹² Translations are derived from John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Ford Lewis Battles (see above, n. 73).

(cont.)

Inst. 1543: Reference to Chrysostom

CHEVALLON

Actes de Ratisbonne

fascēs, the purple, the crowns;
here we have a greater power. I
truly would rather give my body
to death, and let my blood be
poured out, than participate in
that pollution."

IV.14.3

T.V, fol. 326r^o = t.II, 175v^o

CO 2:943

T.V, fol. 326r^oB/C: *Ad pop. Ant.*

CO 1:940

hom. 60:

*Nam si incorporei essemus,
ut Chrysostomus ait, nuda et
incorporea nobis haec ipsa daret.
Nunc quia corporibus insertas
habemus animas, sub visibilibus
spiritualia tradit.*

*Nihil enim sensibile nobis Christus
tradidit, sed res quidem sensibiles,
omnes autem intelligibiles. (...) Si enim incorporeus esses, nuda
& incorporea tibi dedisset ipsa
dona: sed quoniam anima corpori
conserta est, in sensibilibus
intelligibilia tibi praebet.*

For if we were incorporeal (as
Chrysostom says), he would give
us these very things naked and
incorporeal. Now, because we
have souls engrafted in bodies, he
imparts spiritual things under
visible ones.

T.II, 175v^oG: *In Matt.* 26 *hom.*
83: *Nihil enim sensibile traditum
nobis a Christo, sed rebus
sensibilibus: omnia vero quae
tradidit insensibilia sunt: (...) nam
si tu incorporeus esses, nude ipsa
dona incorporea tradisset tibi;
quoniam vero corpori coniuncta
est anima tua, in sensibilibus
intelligenda tibi traduntur.*

IV.17.6

T.V., fol. 326r^o = t.II, 175v^o

CO 2:1006

T.V., fol. 326r^oD: *Ad pop. Ant. hom.*

CO 1:1000

60:

*Atque id ipsum est quod alicubi
scribit Chrysostomus, Christum*

*Nec enim satis fuit, homo fieri,
colaphis caedi, & iugulari: verum*

<i>Inst.</i> 1543: Reference to Chrysostom	CHEVALLON	<i>Actes de Ratisbonne</i>
<i>suum efficere corpus. Neque enim aliunde quam a fide tale bonum consequi intelligit; sed hoc tantum vult excludere, ne quis, dum fidem nominari audit, nudam imaginationem concipiat.</i>	<i>& semetipsum nobis commiscet, & non fide tantum, verum & ipsa re nos suum efficit corpus. Quo non oportet igitur esse puriorem, tali fruentem sacrificio?</i>	
And Chrysostom writes the same thing in another passage: "Christ makes us his body not by faith only but by the very thing itself." For he means that such good is not obtained from any other source than faith; but he only wishes to exclude the possibility that anyone, when he hears faith mentioned, should conceive of it as mere imagining.	T.II, 175 ^v H: <i>In Matt. 26 hom. 83: Non enim sufficit ipsi hominem fieri, flagellis interim caedi: sed nos secum in unam (ut ita dicam) massam reducit, neque id fide solum, sed re ipsa nos corpus suum efficit. Qua igitur re mundiorum esse non oportet eum, qui hoc sacrificio participaturus est.</i>	
IV.17.45 CO 2:1047 CO 1:1019 <i>Tale exemplum est apud Chrysostomum in epistolam ad Ephesios: non est dictum ei qui convivium deonestabat, quare recubuisti? sed, quare ingressus es? quisquis mysteriorum particeps non est, improbus est, et impudens, quod hic adstat. Quaeso, si quis ad convivium vocatus, venerit, manus laverit, discubuerit, visus fuerit se ad edendum comparare, deinde nihil gustet, nonne contumelia et convivium afficiet et convivatorem? sic tu, inter eos stans qui oratione</i>	T.V., fol. 328 ^r = t.IV, 356 ^v T.V., fol. 328 ^r B/C: <i>Ad pop. Ant. hom. 61: Omnis enim qui mysteriorum participio non fruitur, impudens & procax est, si adstat. Propterea qui sunt in peccatis, priores eiiciuntur. Sicut enim ad mensam ciniente domino, servos qui dominum offenderunt, adesse non oportet, sed procul arcentur: (...) Sicut itaque prophanorum fas est adesse neminem, ita nec ullum sacratorum quidem, ac sordidorum. Dic mihi, si quis in convivium vocatus, manus ablueret, & recumberet, & mensae</i>	CO 5:635 <i>Parquoy saint Chrysostome a eu droict iugement, disant que le ministre faict en vain l'oblation et en vain se presente à l'autel, quand nul né communique, veu que tous ceulx qui sont indignes de la communion s'en doivent aller quand la consecration se faict. Ce que aussi le Diacre commandoit en l'autorité de l'Eglise de Christ. Il adioste puis apres que celuy qui est indigne de participer au Sacrement, n'est pas digne d'avoir la communion des prieres.</i>

(cont.)

<i>Inst.</i> 1543: Reference to Chrysostom	CHEVALLON	<i>Actes de Ratisbonne</i>
<p><i>se ad sumendum sacrosanctum cibum praelegant, te unum esse ex eorum numero, eo ipso quod non abscessisti, confessus es, tandem non participas: nonne satius foret te non comparuisse? indignus sum, inquis; ergo nec communione orationis dignus eras, quae est ad sumendum sacrum mysterium praepraeparatio.</i></p> <p>There is an example of this in Chrysostom's homilies on the Letter to the Ephesians: "It is not said to him who dishonored the banquet, 'Why did you recline at Table?' but, 'Why did you come in?' [Matthew 22:12]. Whoever does not partake of the mysteries is wicked and shameless to be present there. I beg of you, if anyone, invited, comes to a banquet, washes his hands, reclines at table, and seems to get ready to eat, and then tastes nothing—does he not dishonor both the banquet and the host? So, when you stand among those who prepare themselves with prayer to receive the most holy food, in the fact that you have not withdrawn, you have confessed that you are one of their number, but at the end you do not partake! Would it not be better for you not</p>	<p><i>paratus adesset, postmodum nihil gustaret, non afficit contumelia vocantem? Nonne melius huiusmodi nec venisse? Ita scilicet & tu, venisti, cecinisti deo laudem, cum omnibus es confessus de dignis esse, cum indignis non secedendo: quomodo mansisti, neque participas de mensa? Indignus sum inquit, igitur & illa quae per preces sit communione.</i></p> <p>T.IV, 356v^oM, 357r^oA/B: <i>In Eph. 1 hom. 3:</i> <i>Omnis enim, qui non est sacramentorum particeps: impudens admodum sit hic oportet, ut qui sic temere adstiterit sacris. Ob hoc enim, qui flagitiis noscentur esse contaminati, prius eliminantur templi foribus, quam communio sumenda dignis proponatur. (...) Proinde ut neminem addecet propius sacris adesse, qui non sit sacris initiatus: sic neque ex iis, quo initiati sunt quidem, sed foetent seclerum sordibus, convenit sacrificio illi interesse. Dic tu mihi: Si quis ad epulum inuitatus manus lauerit, accumbat etiam, seque accomodat mensae, at interim non illi mensae participet: numquid non is inuitatorem suum graui afficit iniuria? An non praestitisset talem</i></p>	

<i>Inst.</i> 1543: Reference to Chrysostom	CHEVALLON	<i>Actes de Ratisbonne</i>
to have been present? I am unworthy, you say. Therefore, you were also not worthy of the communion of prayer, which is the preparation for the receiving of the sacred mystery."	<i>non adesse conuiuio? Sic sane. Et tu aduenisti inuitatus, hymnum cecinisti; cum caeteris confessus es te in eorum numero debere decerni, qui digni sunt sacramenti aditu, non qui cogaris cum indignis secedere domum. Cur remansisti quasi particeps futurus mensae illius venerandae: nec tamen participas? Indignis sum, inquires. Igitur & ea indignus communione es, quae contrahitur inter nos orationum suffragiis.</i>	
IV.17.46 CO 2:1048 CO 1:1020 <i>Videmus quidem perversum hunc abusum Chrysostomi tempore iam obrepisse; sed videre simul licet quantopere ipsi displicuerit. Conqueritur enim gravibus verbis eo quem nuper citavi loco, tantam esse huius rei inaequalitatem, quod aliis anni temporibus saepenumero, nec quum mundi essent, accederent; in paschate, etiam immundi. Deinde exclamat: o consuetudinem, o praesumptionem: frustra ergo habetur quotidiana oblatio; frustra stamus ad altare; nemo est qui simul participet.</i>	T.V., fol. 328r ^o = t.IV, 356v ^o T.V., fol. 328r ^o A: <i>Ad pop. Ant. hom.</i> 61: <i>In aliis quidem temporibus cum puri frequenter sitis, non acceditis: in Pascha vero, licet sit aliquid a vobis patratum acceditis. O consuetudinem, o praesumptionem, sacrificium frustra quotidianum. Incassum assistimus altari, nullus qui communicetur. Haec non ut temere communicemini, dico, sed ut vos dignos reddatis. Non es hostia dignus, vel communione, igitur nec oratione. Astantem audis praeconem, atque dicentem: Quotquot estis in poenitentia, omnes orate. Quicumque non participes fiunt, in poenitentia sunt. Quid stas, si est in poenitentia? Sumere non debes: qui</i>	
Indeed, we see that already in Chrysostom's day this degrading		

(cont.)

<i>Inst.</i> 1543: Reference to Chrysostom	CHEVALLON	<i>Actes de Ratisbonne</i>
abuse had crept in; but we can see at the same time how much it displeased him. For in the passage which I just quoted he sadly complains of great inequality in this matter; at some times of the year they often did not come even when they were clean, but came at Easter, even when they were unclean. Then he exclaims: "O custom, O presumption! In vain, therefore, is a daily offering made; in vain we stand before the altar; there is no one who will partake along with us."	<i>nanque non communicat, ex est poenitentibus.</i> T.IV, 356v ^o L: <i>In Eph. 1 hom. 3: O consuetudinem. O verius temerariam praesumptionem. Frustra ad hunc modum offertur hostia salutaris: nequicquam adsistimus aris. Nemo enim est, qui digne participet. Haec idcirco dixerim, non ut quolibet modo participes sitis hostiae, quin potius ut digne vosipsos adornetis futurae communioni. Indignum te agnoscis, qui vel per te sumas hostiam, aut per alium sumendam accipias? Igitur nec gratione ipsa dignus es.</i>	
IV.17.48 CO 2,1050 CO 1,1022 <i>Chrysostomus: non sicut in veteri lege partem quidem sacerdos comedebat, partem vero populus; verum omnibus corpus unum proponitur et poculum unum. Ea quae sunt eucharistiae, communia sunt omnia inter sacerdotem et populum.</i> Chrysostom says: "Not as in the Old Law the priest ate part, the people part; but one body and one cup are offered to all.	T.IV., fol. 190v ^o H: <i>In 2 Cor. 8 hom. 18: Non sicut in veteri lege, partem quidem sacerdos comedebat, partem autem populus, & non licebat populo participem esse eorum quorum particeps erat sacerdos: sed nunc non sic, verum omnibus unum corpus proponitur & poculum unum. Quin & in precibus, viderit quis populum multum simul offerre, cum pro energumenis, tum pro poenitentibus: communes enim preces a sacerdote & ab illis fiunt, & omnes unam dicunt</i>	CO 5:636 <i>Car ce qu'a escript S. Chrysostome en un aultre passage, est vray, c'est qu'il n'y a pas maintenant une telle raison qu'au viel Testament, qu'il ne soit licite au peuple de participer en tout ce que le prestre receoit, pource que maintenant on presente un mesme Corps et un mesme Calice à tous, que tous font une oraison et action de graces commune, que tous donnent et receoivent mutuellement une mesme paix et qu'il n'y a pas inconvenient si le peuple parle avec le prestre en faisant le mystere,</i>

<i>Inst.</i> 1543: Reference to Chrysostom	CHEVALLON	<i>Actes de Ratisbonne</i>
Those things which pertain to the Eucharist are all common to priest and people."	<i>orationem, orationem misericordia plenam.</i>	<i>veu que lors ilz chantent hymnes spirituelz avec les puissances celestes, Cherubins et Seraphins. Jusques icy sont les motz de saint Iehan Chrysostome.</i>