

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for the *Journal of Theological Studies* (old series) can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jts-os\\_01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jts-os_01.php)

pdfs are named: [Volume]\_[1<sup>st</sup> page of article]

## NOTES AND STUDIES

THE *LIBER ECCLESIASTICORUM DOGMATUM*  
ATTRIBUTED TO GENNADIUS.

MY attention was first called to the tract of which a revised (although still quite tentative) text is here given, by the title 'dogma Nicenum' under which it is cited in a MS of Canons (Paris lat. 12444, saec. ix ineunt.). I hope to publish some day a more final form of it—together with other documents, genuine and spurious, that connect themselves with the Nicene council—in the third part of *Ecclesiae Occidentalis Monumenta Iuris Antiquissima*. Meanwhile I want, by printing it in the JOURNAL, to invite the expression of the views of other scholars upon its date and authorship, as well as their assistance in supplementing and rectifying the present rough account of the MS material.

## I. EDITIONS OF THE TREATISE.

The following editions of the treatise are known to me. The gaps in the list will, I believe, be found mainly in regard to the sixteenth and perhaps the seventeenth century: and if so, it is not a little singular that (reckoning Arevalo to belong to the eighteenth century) the nineteenth century produced nothing more than reprints of earlier editions of a tract which during many generations was one of the most popular handbooks of Christian doctrine in the Western Church.

i. *Under the name of St Augustine.*

In the Louvain edition of St Augustine—vol. iii pp. 380, 465 of the Paris reprint of A. D. 1614—the tract is edited from five Flemish MSS, Camb[ronensis], Carth[usianus], Am[andinus], Mart[inensis (St Martin of Tournay ?)], Theolog[orum Collegii Lovaniensis]. As there printed it consists of eighty-eight chapters, instead of the fifty-five or thereabouts of all the early MSS: but the editors note that the additional chapters are not found in their MSS, and print them in different type<sup>1</sup>. They note further that the treatise has nothing whatever to do with Augustine,

<sup>1</sup> These additional chapters, which are meant to balance the teaching of our tract on Grace and Freewill, are derived from (i) Pope Celestine's decretal letter to the bishops of Gaul, (ii) the Council of Carthage of A. D. 418, and (iii) the second Council of Orange.

and accept the attribution to the Semi-Pelagian writer Gennadius of Marseilles, circa 500 A. D.

The Benedictine edition includes our document among the *spuria* of vol. viii—in the Antwerp reprint, viii, appendix 71—and removes the additional chapters altogether. With regard to the authorship, three attributions to writers other than St Augustine are cited from MSS: (a) from a Colbertinus 'optimae notae' *Incipit liber ecclesiasticorum dogmatum Gennadii . . . explicit definitio ecclesiasticorum dogmatum Gennadii*: (b) from a codex Padolironensis (mentioned in the Benedictine *Iter Italicum*<sup>1</sup> p. 208) *Incipiunt definitiones dogmatum ecclesiasticorum Fausti episcopi ecclesiae Maxiliensis*: (c) from a Colbertinus 'about 900 years old' [i. e. circa 800 A. D.] *Incipit dogma sanctorum patrum trecentorum et octo episcoporum congregatis apud Niceam*.

Migne *Patrologia Latina* xlii 1211 is a reprint of the Benedictine edition.

ii. *Under the name of St Isidore of Seville.*

*S. Isidori Hispalensis episcopi opera omnia quae exstant partim aliquando virorum doctissimorum laboribus edita partim nunc primum exscripta et castigata per Margarinum de la Bigne, theologum doctorem Parisiensem.* Parisiis, apud Michaelem Sonnum via Iacobaea sub scuto Basiliensi, A. D. 1580. The editor's justification for including our tract in this edition (of which the Bodleian possesses no copy, nor have I myself seen one) was that he found it under the name of Isidore in a MS belonging to Peter Daniel.

*S. Isidori Hispalensis episcopi Hispaniarum doctoris opera omnia* (7 volumes, Rome, A. D. 1797-1803), the well-known edition of Faustinus Arevalo: the introduction to our tract is contained in vol. ii pp. 31-43, the text in vol. vii (appendix 13) pp. 320-336. The spurious chapters are included, but Arevalo notes that they are absent both from the MSS used by the Benedictine editors of St Augustine and from 'very many other MSS'. He enumerates a dozen MSS or more (mostly from the Vatican library) containing the treatise, but it does not appear to what extent he collated any of them.

Migne *P. L.* lxxxiii 1227 is a reprint of Arevalo.

iii. *Under the name of Gennadius of Marseilles.*

*Gennadii Massiliensis Presbyteri Liber de Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus . . . Geuerhartus Elmenhorstius ex MS. prouulgauit et notas addidit,* Hamburg, A. D. 1614. Elmenhorst too prints the spurious chapters, and he too does so without manuscript authority, 'in MS non extant'.

Franz Oehler includes our treatise in his *Corpus Haeresologicum*

<sup>1</sup> The *Iter Italicum* is vol. i of the *Museum Italicum*, Paris, A. D. 1687. The 'Monasterium Padolironense' was near Mantua.

(Berlin, A.D. 1856) pp. 335 sqq., under the title *Gennadii Massiliensis Liber de Ecclesiasticis Dogmatibus*—distinguishing the spurious chapters from the rest by the use of smaller type—and repeats after the text the full and erudite notes of Elmenhorst.

Of the labours of all these editors the only assured results are that the tract is not Augustine's, and that the long insertion of additional chapters on Grace and Freewill is no part of the original work. But the Benedictine Augustine is the only edition among those enumerated which has had the courage to act on this conclusion and entirely to eject these chapters from a place in the text. To the same edition are due the three references numbered 4-6 in the list which now follows.

## II. SOME ANCIENT CITATIONS OF THE TREATISE.

1. St. Isidore of Seville *de officiis ecclesiasticis* ii 24 'de regula fidei' (Arevalo vi 461) has striking points of contact with our tract: the chapter in fact looks like a free running commentary on it, just as the preceding chapter contains a sort of commentary or paraphrase of the Apostles' Creed; the chapter before that, too, appears to have borne a similar relation to the lost books of Niceta of Remesiana *ad competentes*.

2. A Gallican collection of Canons represented by two extant MSS—Paris lat. 1451 (saec. viii exeunt.: fol. 10 a) and Vat. Reg. 1127 (saec. ix ineunt.: fol. 14 b)—and by an apparently lost one of about the same age, no. 562 of the Jesuit College of Clermont<sup>1</sup>, cites a long passage (chapters x-xviii of the printed text below, omitting c. xvii b) under the title *De concilio Aurilianensi de libro ecclesiasticorum dogmatum*<sup>2</sup>, and immediately afterwards a second passage, cc. xliii-xlv, under the title *Sententia de can.*: in neither passage are the chapters quoted by their numbers.

3. Another Gallican collection of Canons preserved in a ninth-century MS, Paris lat. 1564 ('collection of Pithou'), fol. 23 a, cites a passage of our treatise with the words *Adnotatio excerpta de libro ecclesiasticorum dogmatum quem sanctus Patiens episcopus protulit*, = c. xxi of my printed text.

4. The Council of Frankfort in A. D. 794 in its encyclical letter to

<sup>1</sup> When writing in the JOURNAL (i 437) about the MSS of Canons in the Clermont library, I was unable to identify the collection contained in this MS: but it is now quite clear to me, from the data given in the Benedictine catalogue, that it was the Gallican collection called 'St Maur'. The greater part of the MS (191 leaves out of 227) was still in the Meerman collection at the sale of 1824, being numbered 583 in the sale catalogue.

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps one should connect with this the fact that in Brussels 2493 (saec. viii), fol. 13 b, sections xli, xxii, xxiii of our treatise are cited anonymously in the middle of similar citations from Gallic councils of the second half of the sixth century.

the bishops of Spain (Labbe-Coleti *Concilia* ix 83, Mansi *Concilia* xiii 891), quotes 'sanctus Augustinus in libro Enchiridion . . . item in *expositione catholicae fidei*' [part of c. 2 of our text follows]. It may be presumed that the '*expositio catholicae fidei*' is meant also to be attributed to St Augustine, and it is clear from the evidence of the MSS of the treatise (see below III. iii) that this attribution is as old as the eighth century.

5. Ratram of Corbie, in the ninth century, *contra opposita Graecorum* (printed in vol. ii of d'Achéry's *Spicilegium* [ed. 2, Paris A.D. 1681, p. 127] from a contemporary or possibly even autograph MS in the library of de Thou) iii 5, 'Gennadius Constantinopolitanus episcopus uir multa lectione antiquorum<sup>1</sup> peritus in libro *ecclesiasticorum dogmatum* de Spiritu sancti processione sic loquitur' [what follows is from c. 1 of our treatise].

6. Walafrid Strabo, in the same century, *de rebus ecclesiasticis* § 20, refers to 'Gennadius Massiliensis presbyter in *dogmate ecclesiastico*'. Walafrid was a monk of Reichenau, and we know that the library of Reichenau possessed at a rather earlier date two copies at least of our treatise under a title similar to that given by him: no. 364 in the catalogue of A. D. 822 'Canon et dogmata ecclesiastica Gennadii episcopi et aenigmata Symphorosi in codice 1', and no. 7 in the catalogue of Reginbert's MSS '. . . et dogma sancti Gennadii ecclesiastica' (see Becker *Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui* 6. 364 and 10. 7). Compare also nos. 4 and 5 under III. ii below.

### III. EXTANT MSS OF THE TREATISE<sup>2</sup>.

#### i. *With mention of the Nicene Council in the title.*

1. A MS cited by the Benedictine editors of St Augustine, as mentioned on p. 79 *supra*: 'in antiquissimo omnium codice Colbertino ante annos fere nongentos scripto . . . *Incipit dogma sanctorum patrum trecentorum et octo episcoporum congregatis apud Niceam. In Patre unitas, in Filio aequalitas, in Spiritu sancto unitas aequalitasque substantiae: et haec tria unum propter Patrem, aequalia propter Filium, connexa propter Spiritum sanctum. Credimus unum esse . . .*' If we compare the Benedictine editors' account of the MS with the information given in the catalogue of the Royal Library at Paris A. D. 1740, we find that the only MSS there described which fulfil the three conditions, (a) of containing our treatise, (b) of having belonged to Colbert, (c) of being as old as the

<sup>1</sup> These words are drawn from the account of Gennadius of Constantinople in the *de Viris Illustribus* of Gennadius of Marseilles.

<sup>2</sup> In making out this list I have practically confined myself to those MSS which are of the eleventh century or earlier.

ninth or tenth century, appear to be Paris latt. 1458, 2076 and 2123. Investigation of these three MSS shewed at once that lat. 2076 is the MS referred to by the Benedictines. It is of the tenth century, and contains on foll. 55 *a*–61 *b* our treatise in 49 chapters, of which the last two ('Duodecimo kal . . .' and 'Homo ex duabus . . .') are additional to the printed text.

2. Paris lat. 12444 [see at the commencement of this paper: =G of my edition of the Canons], saec. ix ineunt.: quotes under the title *In dogma Niceno* the following passages: §§ vi, viii (fol. 67 *b*), xxi (fol. 40 *a*), xxii (fol. 44 *b*), xxviii (fol. 69 *a*: quoted as xxviii), xxxviii (fol. 21 *b*: quoted as xxvii?), xxxviii (fol. 52 *a*: quoted as xxxviii), xli (fol. 44 *b*: quoted as xl), xlvi (fol. 63 *b*: quoted as xlv), lii (fol. 48 *a*: quoted as lii [*sic*]).

3. Albi 39, saec. viii–ix: *Doctrina ecclesiastica secundum Nicaenum concilium*.

4. Paris lat. 10612, saec. viii (I should say late eighth), fol. 5 *a*: *Incipit doctrina dogma ecclesiastica secundum Nicenum concilium*. Contains our tract in 53 chapters, c. 53 being equivalent to 53 and 54 of the printed text.

5. Paris lat. 2175, saec. ix (perhaps ix ineunt.), from the library of SS Peter and Paul at Weissenburg, fol. 1 *a*: *Incipit doctrina dogma ecclesiastica secundum Nicenum concilium*. A sister MS to the last preceding, but much less carefully written, and in our tract largely corrected by a second hand from a text of another family.

6. Köln lxxxv, saec. ix, fol. 2 *a*: *Incipit doctrina dogma ecclesiastica secundum Nicenum concilium*. A sister MS to nos. 4 and 5.

7. Brussels 1324 (from the Abbey of St Bertin), saec. x ineunt., fol. 111 *a*: *Incipit doctrina ecclesiastica secundum Nicenum concilium*. The number and the arrangement of the chapters are the same (I think) as in nos. 4–6 above.

8. Orléans 313 (from Fleury), saec. xi, fol. 243 *a*: *Incipit doctrina dogmat̄ ecclesiasticorum secundum Nicaenum concilium*.

9. Vatic. 4162, saec. xii exeunt., fol. 1: *Incipit dogmatum ecclesiasticorum diffinitio Niceni concilii de Trinitate quia non est confusa in una persona*.

10. A manuscript with a compound title, in which mention of the Nicene council is combined with mention of both Augustine and Gennadius, is Milan Ambros. G 58 sup. (from Bobbio), saec. ix–x, fol. 52 *a*: *Incipit liber beati Aug[ustini], siue ut alii uolunt Gennadii pr[es]b[yte]ri Massiliensis, uel certe diffinitio dogmatum ecclesiasticorum Niceni concilii in regulis tvi ad aedificationem catholicae fidei . . . Explicit expositio fidei catholicae*.

ii. *With the name of Gennadius [of Marseilles] in the title.*

1. Verona lx (58) ['collection of Theodosius the deacon': = Θ of my edition of the Canons], saec. viii ineunt., fol. 116 b: *Incipit definitio dogmatum ecclesiasticorum domini Gennadi pr[es]b[yteri] Massiliensis.* Text consists of 55 chapters, the last equivalent to c. 52 of my printed text.

2. Lucca 490 [so-called 'codex Carolinus': = Z of my Canons], saec. viii-ix: *De dogmatibus ecclesiasticis sedis Gennadii episcopi Maxiliensis.*

3. Vienna lat. 16, saec. viii-ix (from Bobbio: palimpsest), fol. 38 a: *Gennadius de dogmatibus ecclesiasticis . . . Explicit expositio fidei catholicae.*

4. Carlsruhe Augiensis XVIII, saec. ix ineunt., fol. 58 a: *Incipit des uel dogma ecclesiastica Gennadii episcopi Masiliensis.*

5. Carlsruhe Augiensis CIX, saec. ix ineunt., fol. 43 b: *Incipit dogma ecclesiastica Gennadii episcopi Massiliensis contra hereticos.*

6. Paris lat. 2796 [Bigotianus: = bi of my Canons], saec. ix: *Incipit dogma eccl[esiasticum] Gennadi episcopi Massiliensis.*

7. Troyes 1064, saec. ix: *Gennadii dogmata ecclesiastica.*

8. Monte Cassino 30, saec. xi, fol. 165 b: *liber Gennadii.*

9. Avranches 105, saec. xi, fol. 142 a: *Incipit dogma ecclesiasticum Gennadii ep[iscop]i Massiliensis.*

Possibly our treatise is also the document indicated by the following references in two Munich MSS.

[10]. Munich lat. 14468, saec. ix ineunt., fol. 1: *Gennadii Massiliensis de fide.*

[11]. Munich lat. 14461, saec. ix, fol. 124: *Confessio fidei in codice Gennadio Massiliensi tributa.*

12. A composite title occurs once more in Vatic. 514, saec. xiii, fol. 64 b: *Incipit liber de diffinitionibus ecclesiasticorum dogmatum Augustini uel Gennadii.* See also no. 10 in the preceding list.

iii. *With the name of Augustine in the title.*

This attribution is of all the most common (though the most certainly erroneous), and in the later Middle Ages any other form of title is quite exceptional. It is not indeed always quite easy to decide, upon the information given in catalogues, in what cases the assignment is definitely made: but in the absence of evidence to the contrary, it seems safe to assume that the occurrence of our treatise in a series of Augustinian writings is intended as an indication of St Augustine's authorship.

1-8. A group of manuscripts of Canons contain our treatise, among a series of additions to the collection of Dionysius Exiguus, under some such title as *Liber sancti Augustini episcopi de ecclesiasticis regulis capitula lv.* Apparently they omit (with other MSS) the last two chapters

of the text as printed below, but add a new one of their own 'lv contra Pelagium'.

1. Vatic. 5845 [= I of my Canons], saec. viii exeunt.<sup>1</sup>, fol. 291 *b*.
2. Rome, biblioteca Vittorio Emanuele 2102 [Sessorianus lxiii : = 5 of my Canons], saec. viii exeunt.
3. Rome, biblioteca Vallicelliana A 5, saec. ix.
4. Vercelli lxxvi, saec. ix, fol. 286 *b*.
5. Oxford Bodl. Laud. misc. 421 (from Würzburg), saec. ix exeunt., fol. 147 *a*.
6. Munich lat. 14008, saec. ix-x, fol. 253.
7. Munich lat. 3860 A, saec. x-xi, fol. 194.
8. Chartres 193, saec. xi, fol. 155 *b*.

Besides these, the 'Augustinian' group embraces the following MSS of dates from the eighth to the eleventh century (I do not repeat the name Augustine with each MS).

9. Vatic. Barberini lat. 671 (xiv 44), saec. viii-ix, fol. 150 *b*: the title at the head of the treatise is modern, but the colophon is original *Expl[icit] dogmatum s[an]c[t]i Augustini*.

10. Munich lat. 15818, saec. ix : *Definitio ecclesiasticorum dogmatum*.

11. Bamberg B III 30, saec. ix, fol. 1 *a* : *De difinitionibus ecclesiasticorum dogmatum*.

12. Bamberg B III 31, saec. ix-x, fol. 49 *a* : *De definitione dogmatum ecclesiarum*.

13. Laon 265, saec. ix : *De definitionibus ecclesiasticorum dogmatum*.

14. St Gall 677, saec. x, p. 86 : " "

15. Vatic. Palat. 213, saec. x-xi, fol. 65 : " "

16. Dijon 148, saec. xi, fol. 1 : " "

17. Cambrai 485, saec. ix, fol. 2 : *De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus*.

18. Paris lat. 3848 A [following the collection of Canons called after Quesnel : = II of my Canons], saec. ix, fol. 235 *a* : *Incipit liber sancti Augustini de difinitionibus ecclesiasticorum dogmatum*. Text in 54 chapters, the last equivalent to c. 52 of my printed text.

19. Wolfenbüttel 4152 (Weissenburg 68), saec. x, fol. 190 *b* : *De fide et doctrina ecclesiastica*.

Special mention must be made also of the following peculiar title :

20. St Mihiel 29, saec. x : *Incipit definitio dogmatum ecclesiasticorum grecorum*.

See also the composite titles of MSS i 10 and ii 12 above <sup>2</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> I have attributed this MS, in my edition of the Canons, to 'saec. viii' : but I am not sure whether that is not somewhat too early.

<sup>2</sup> In the absence of printed catalogues of most of the Vatican collections, the following supplementary list of some later Vatican MSS of our treatise (in all of which it bears the name of St Augustine) may perhaps be usefully added : Vatic. 458, saec. xiii-xiv, fol. 115 *a* ; Vatic. 466, saec. xii, fol. 1 *a* ; Vatic. 473, saec. xv



Originally no doubt the insertion of the name of St Augustine as author meant that the treatise was circulating anonymously up to the time, or at any rate in the district, of the scribe or scholar to whom the new conjecture was due: but once made, the influence of the name now chosen was so powerful that it began, even as early as the ninth century, to suppress the rival and doubtless earlier ascription to Gennadius. Two of our Gennadius MSS, nos. 1 and 6, bear curious witness to this process: in the former, Verona lx (58), the second hand has written BEATISSIMI AVGVSTINI EPISCOPI over the original Gennadius title: in the latter, Paris lat. 2796, the scribe has faithfully reproduced from his exemplar the name of Gennadius in the heading of the treatise itself, but in the list of contents at the beginning of the MS our treatise appears as DOGMA AECCLESIASTICA SANCTI AVGVSTINI HIPONIRIENSIS.

iv. *Anonymous.*

1. Köln ccxii [= K of my Canons], saec. vii, fol. 62 b: *In Christi nomine definitio ecclesiastici ordinis dogmatum.*

2. Berlin lat. 84 [from Rheims: = R of my Canons], saec. viii, fol. 165 a: *Incipit definitio ecclesiasticorum dogmatum.*

3. Albi 2 [= A of my Canons], saec. ix-x: *Incipit definitio aeclesiasticorum dogmatum.*

4. Albi 29, saec. viii: *Incipit definitio ecclesiasticorum dogmatum.*

It is likely enough that not only no. 3 but no. 4 was copied from the seventh-century MS of Canons written for Albi but now preserved at Toulouse (MS 364 of the public library), which, though now unfortunately defective at the commencement, seems to have originally contained our treatise.

5. Paris lat. 1451 [from St Maur: = F of my Canons], saec. viii exeunt., fol. 33 a: *Definitio ecclesiasticorum dogmatum.* In 50 chapters, the last being the last of the printed text.

6. Vat. Reg. 1127 [from Angoulême: = f of my Canons], saec. ix ineunt., fol. 41 a: a sister MS to the preceding, and with the same title for our tract.

7. Bern lat. 89 [= δ of my Canons], saec. viii-ix, fol. 5 a: same title as nos. 5 and 6. The MS breaks off after chapter 51 of my printed text; but the list of capitula prefixed to the tract shews that the MS when complete ended as our text ends.

8. Paris lat. 1454 and 3842 A [sister MSS of the Quesnel collection of Canons: = Σ of my edition], both of saec. ix-x: same title as nos. 5-7.

ineunt., fol. 118 a; Vat. Reg. 83, saec. xv, fol. 83 b; Vat. Ottob. 459, saec. xiii, fol. 1 a; these five MSS all give the title *De ecclesiasticis dogmatibus.* Vat. Ottob. 612, saec. xiv, fol. 240 a: *Incipit exemplar regule vere fidei sci Augustini.* Vat. Pal. 191, saec. xv, fol. 180 b: *De diffinitione dogmatum ecclesiasticorum.* These references are based on Arevalo's edition of St Isidore, but have been revised and added to by Dr Mercati.

9. Paris lat. 1458, fol. 72 *b*, saec. x: *Definitio ecclesiasticorum dogmatum*. In 52 chapters, the last being the last of the printed text.

It is noticeable that the title of our treatise is identical in nos. 5–8, and with the prefix *Incipit* in nos. 2–4 as well. All these MSS, with the possible exception of no. 7, are French: and all of them, with at most a single exception in no. 4, contain collections of Canons. It may therefore turn out that their texts are not independent of one another: though it must be remembered that as regards their canonical matter nos. 1–3 are widely different from nos. 5 and 6, and these again from no. 7 or no. 8.

10. Milan Ambros. O 212 sup. (from Bobbio), saec. viii ineunt.?<sup>1</sup>, fol. 1 *b*: *In nomine Trinitatis s[an]c[t]ae dogmatis liber incipit*. And in the list of contents on fol. 1 *a*: *Dogmatis liber fidei*. On the chapters in this MS see below, p. 87.

11. St Gall 238, saec. viii, p. 415: *Incip capitula docomae* (corrected into *docma*): then follow 37 capitula, and then *expliciunt capitula et incip docoma*: and the running headline is *docoma* throughout.

12. St Gall 911, saec. viii, p. 292: *Incipit doctrinae fides aeclesie define i: tu aeclesiasticorum dogma*<sup>2</sup>.

13. St Gall 230, saec. ix, p. 498: *Incip doctrinae fides ecclesie* [then follow capitula] *ecclesiasticorum dogma. . . . Expliē dogoma*. This and the previous MS are descended from the same exemplar: but whereas no. 13 is incomplete, no. 14 is complete.

14. Bern 224, saec. x, fol. 186 *b*: *Incipit doctrina et fides ecclesiastici definitio ecclesiasticorum dogmatum . . . Explicit liber dogmatum hoc est sentent. lv*.

15. Laon 113, saec. ix: *Incipit dogma fidei catholicae*.

16. Köln ccxi, saec. ix, fol. 77 *a*: *Incipit expositio fidei*. A bad text.

17. Paris lat. 3848 B, saec. ix, fol. 24 *b*: *Incipiunt capitula libri dogmatum . . . Incp dogma id est doctrina uel definitio de fide*. In 51 chapters, the last being the last of the printed text.

18. Paris lat. 4281 (from Limoges), saec. ix, fol. 106 *a*: *Incipiunt capitula libri dogma . . . Incip dogma id est doctrina uel definicio de fide*. The text breaks off in the middle of c. 51, which is c. 54 (and last) of my printed text.

19. Paris lat. 2123, saec. ix–x, fol. 6 *a*: *Incipit dogma id est doctrina uel definitio de fide*. In 51 chapters, the last being the last of the printed text.

Nos. 17–19, owing to their agreement in the title and in the numeration of the chapters, obviously form a single family.

20. Troyes 1165, saec. ix–x: *De dogmatibus ecclesiasticis liber*.

<sup>1</sup> It is extraordinarily difficult to date Irish handwriting: but I do not think the MS can be later than this.

<sup>2</sup> This MS contains only the first seventeen chapters.

21. Troyes 1979, saec. x: *Definitio ecclesiasticorum dogmatum.*  
 22. Metz 145, saec. x:  
 23. Chartres 31, saec. ix, fol. 187 b: *Capitula diffinitionum ecclesiasticorum dogmatum.*  
 24. Angers 284, saec. xi, fol. 39: *Capitula diffinitionum ecclesiasticorum dogmatum.*  
 In view of the uniqueness of this title, it would seem probable that no. 24 was copied from no. 23.  
 25. Avranches 109, saec. xi, fol. 134 b: *Diffinitio ecclesiasticorum dogmatum.*

Besides the MSS cited above under their respective titles, the Paris catalogue of A. D. 1740 supplies the two following MSS, but without sufficient details to shew in which of our four classes they ought to be ranked, nor had I time in Paris to examine any but the earlier MSS :

Paris lat. 2787, saec. xi.

Paris lat. 2833 A, saec. xi.

In view of the fact that our treatise is found under so many different titles, and sometimes under titles as indeterminate as *Expositio catholicae fidei*, it is probable that many MSS, especially of the anonymous type, have escaped my notice even in the catalogues that I have examined. I shall therefore be deeply grateful for information about any further MSS of the tract of the tenth century or earlier, or about any MSS at all (irrespective of date) which contain in the title any mention of the Nicene council:

In addition to the grouping by titles, as carried out above, it would have been worth while, if the material had been at my disposal, to attempt a grouping according to the number of chapters. Unfortunately the mere statement of the cypher attached to the final chapter in any MS is not in itself sufficient evidence for this purpose, as the MSS differ from one another to some extent in combining or separating various chapters. Thus the Milan MS O 212 sup. (iv, no. 9 above), though it omits nothing (save ch. xvii b) of the text printed below, numbers the last chapter not liiii<sup>1</sup> but l, because it omits (perhaps by accident) the number for ch. xii, runs on ch. xxx and xxxi without break from ch. xxviii, and ch. li without break from ch. l. So too it would not have been possible to say without inspection of the MSS that the whole tract is found in two MSS of St Gall (230 and 238: iv, nos. 13 and 11 above), when the printed catalogue only says that the number of chapters in them is respectively thirty and thirty-seven. It is more significant that the two MSS of the Gennadius group which I have collated (ii, nos. 1 and 5), as well as the

<sup>1</sup> I have arranged the text not as the editions do in 55 chapters, but in 54, because chapter 18 of the editions is absent from the best MSS and appears to be an early insertion: I have therefore numbered it 17 b.

Augustine MS Paris lat. 3848 A, are all found to omit the two final chapters. Other MSS make additions of their own at the close of the treatise: one such has been noted already in the case of nos. 1-8 of the Augustine group, and another in the case of no. 1 of the Nicene group: while yet another is printed by Oehler (p. 355) from the Vienna MS (ii, no. 3 above).

#### IV. THE TEXT OF THE TREATISE AS HERE PRINTED.

The text printed below is taken mainly from no. 10 of the anonymous group, Milan Ambros. O 212 sup.: but I have consulted also no. 7 of the same group (Bern 89), nos. 1 and 5 of the Gennadius group (Verona lx [58] and Carlsruhe Augiensis CIX), nos. 4 and 7 and the first part of no. 5 of the Nicene group (Paris lat. 10612: Brussels 1324: Paris lat. 2175)<sup>1</sup>. My justification for offering a new text, admittedly tentative and based on so small a proportion of the extant material, must rest on the claim that the Milan and Berne MSS (and for the most part the Nicene group also) present in comparison with the printed editions what is really a quite distinct and as it seems more primitive recension. Several of the proper names disappear from the text, and, most remarkable of all, the assertion of the Double Procession of the Holy Spirit in ch. i is replaced by the statement of the Single Procession from the Father. It has been seen above (p. 81) that Ratram of Corbie, attributing our treatise to Gennadius (not of Marseilles but) of Constantinople, and familiar only with what we may call the vulgate text of it, quoted its testimony to the Double Procession as convicting the Greeks out of the mouth of a Greek. I have not so far found any evidence in the MSS for this attribution (though attention was called above, p. 84, to the title of the St Mihiel MS, *Incipit definitio dogmatum ecclesiasticorum grecorum*), but the Benedictine editors of St Augustine remark with truth that there are features in the tract which would suit well enough with a Greek origin<sup>2</sup>; nor is the chronological evidence unfavourable to Gennadius, since he was patriarch from 458 to 471 A.D., and the most recent heretics of whom mention is made in the text as now recovered are Eutyches and the Timothians—presumably the partisans of the monophysite Timothy Aelurus of Alexandria. But an alternative explanation of the name of Gennadius is perhaps rather suggested by the evidence of the MSS—namely that to Gennadius of Marseilles is due a recension of the tract which gave it

<sup>1</sup> Since the above was in type, I have collated the three St Gall MSS, nos. 11-13, of the anonymous group. All of them definitely support the new type of text: and St Gall 238, ascribed to the hand of Winithar, has some remarkable points of contact with the Milan MS, together with countless minor errors and alterations of its own.

<sup>2</sup> A comparison of c. xxiii with line 2 of c. vi 'fabulat somniator' (the reading of the Bobbio MS) seems to make it probable that our author rejected the Apocalypse, in which case he must certainly have been an Eastern.

the form it bears (apart from the spurious chapters) in all previous editions, while the original (but on this hypothesis only slightly earlier) recension was anonymous. For the introduction of the name of the Nicene council in the title I have at present no special explanation to offer, nor am I prepared to say at what stage of the textual tradition (though I am sure it was at an early one) it first appeared. But for further answer to this and other questions we must wait until the evidence of the MSS has been more fully examined: the present undertaking aims only at recalling attention to a primitive and interesting, as well as wide-spread, summary of Christian doctrine.

### LIBER SIVE DEFINITIO ECCLESIASTICORVM DOGMATVM.

I CREDIMVS unum esse Deum, patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum: patrem eo quod habeat filium, filium eo quod habeat patrem, spiritum sanctum eo quod sit ex patre procedens, patri et filio coaeternus. pater ergo principium deitatis, qui sicut numquam fuit non deus ita numquam fuit non pater; a quo filius natus; a quo spiritus sanctus, non natus 5 (quia non est filius) neque ingenitus (quia non est pater) nec factus, sed ex deo patre deus procedens. pater aeternus, eo quod aeternum habeat filium cuius aeternus sit pater: filius aeternus, eo quod sit patri co-aeternus: spiritus sanctus aeternus, eo quod sit patri et filio coaeternus: non confusa in unam personam trinitas, ut Sabellius dicit, neque 10 separata aut diuersa in natura diuinitas, ut Arrius blasphematur, sed alter in persona pater, alter in persona filius, alter in persona spiritus sanctus, unus natura in sancta trinitate deus pater et filius et spiritus sanctus.

II Non pater carnem adsumpsit, neque spiritus sanctus, sed filius tantum; ut qui erat in diuinitate dei filius ipse fieret in homine hominis filius, ne filii nomen ad alterum transiret qui non erat natiuitate filius. dei ergo filius hominis factus est filius, natus secundum ueritatem naturae ex deo dei filius et secundum ueritatem naturae ex homine 5 hominis filius; ut ueritas geniti non adoptione, non appellatione, sed in utraque natiuitate filii nomen nascendo haberet, et esset uerus deus et uerus homo unus filius. non ergo duos Christos neque duos filios, sed deum et hominem unum filium, quem propterea [et] unigenitum dicimus, manentem in duabus substantiis, sicut ei naturae ueritas contulit, non 10 confusis naturis neque inmixtis, sicut Timothiani uolunt, sed societate unitis. deus ergo hominem adsumpsit, homo in deum transiuit, non naturae uersibilitate sed dei dignatione; ut nec deus mutaretur in humanam substantiam adsumendo hominem, nec homo in diuinam glorificatus in deum; quia mutatio uel uersibilitas naturae et deminu- 15

1 4. principium: *alias* principale nomen    11. diuersa: *alias* diuisa    13. unus  
... sanctus: *alias* pater et filius et spiritus sanctus unus natura in sancta trinitate

tionem et abolitionem substantiae facit. natus ergo dei filius ex homine, non per hominem, id est non ex uiri coitu, sicut Ebion dicit, sed ex uirgine; carnem ex uirginis corpore trahens, et non de caelo secum adferens, sicut Marcion et Eutyches adfirmant; neque in fantasia, id est absque carne, sicut Valentinus dicit, neque ΔΟΚΗC[ε], id est putatiue imaginatum, sed corpus uerum; non tamen carnem ex carne, sicut Marcianus; sed uerus deus ex diuinitate et uerus homo ex carne. unus filius, in diuinitate uerbum patris et deus, in homine anima et caro: anima non absque sensu et ratione, ut Apollinaris, neque caro absque anima, ut Anomaeus, sed anima cum ratione sua et corpus cum sensibus suis, per quos sensus ueros in passione et ante passionem carnis suae dolores sustenuit.

III Neque sic est natus ex uirgine ut deitatis initium nascendo homo acceperit, quasi antequam ex uirgine nasceretur deus non fuerit, sicut Artemon et Berillus et Marcellus docuerunt, sed aeternus deus homo ex uirgine natus.

IIII Nihil creatum aut seruiens in trinitate credendum, ut uult Dionisius fons Arrii; nihil inaequale, ut Eunomius; nihil gratiae inaequale, ut Aetius; nihil anterius posteriusue aut minus, ut Arrius; nihil extraneum aut officiale alteri, ut Macedonius; nihil persuasione aut subreptione insertum, ut Manicheus; nihil corporeum, ut Melito et Tertullianus; nihil corporaliter effigiatum, ut Anthropomorfus; nihil sibi inuisibile, ut Origenes; nihil creaturis uisibile, ut Fortunatus; nihil moribus uel uoluntate diuersum, ut Marcion; nihil ex trinitatis essentia ad creaturarum naturam deductum, ut Plato et Tertullianus; nihil officio singulare nec alteri communicabile, ut Origenes; nihil confusum, ut Sabellius: sed totum perfectum, quia totum ex uno et unum; non tamen solitarium, ut praesumit Siluanus et Praxeas, Pentapolitana damnabilis illa doctrina.

V Omousius ergo (id est coessentialis) in diuinitate patri filius: omousius patri et filio spiritus sanctus: omousius deo et homini unus filius, manens deus in homine suo in gloria patris, desiderabilis uideri ab angelis; sicut pater et spiritus sanctus adoratur ab angelis et ab omni creatura non homo propter deum, uel Christus cum deo, sicut Nestorius blasfemat, sed homo in deo et in homine deus.

VI Erit resurrectio mortuorum hominum, sed una et in semel; non prima iustorum et secunda peccatorum, ut fabulat somniator, sed una omnium. et si id resurgere dicitur quod cadit, caro ergo nostra in

II *Initium huius capituli ad l 16* Natus ergo transferunt codices alii 20.  
 ΔΟΚΗC[ε] id est: *optimi codices habent uel ΔΟΥΚΗC[ε] id est uel a uinici id est: alii om*  
 25. Anomaeus scripsi: Anomoca uel Anomocus uel Anomacus codices optimi IIII 2.  
 gratiae inaequale codices optimi: gratia aequale alii V 1. Omousius ter: alias  
 Omousion ter VI 2. fabulat somniator: alias fabula somniatur alias fabula  
 somniatorum alias fabulas somniantur

ueritate resurgit sicut in ueritate cadit; et non secundum Origenem inmutatio corporum erit, id est non aliud nouum corpus pro carne sed eadem caro corruptibilis quae cadit resurgit incorruptibilis: tam iustorum quam iniustorum caro incorruptibilis resurget, ut uel poenam sufferre possit pro peccatis uel in gloria aeterna manere pro meritis.

VII Omnium hominum erit resurrectio. si omnium erit, ergo omnes moriuntur, ut mors in Adam data omnibus filiis [eius] dominetur, et maneat illud priuilegium in Domino quod de eo specialiter dicitur NON DABIS SANCTVM TVVM VIDERE CORRPTIONEM et CARO EIVS NON VIDIT CORRPTIONEM. hanc rationem maxima patrum turba tradente suscepimus: uerum quia sunt et alii aequae catholici et eruditi uiri qui credunt anima in corpore manente INMVTANDOS ad incorruptionem et immortalitatem eos qui in aduentum Domini uiui inueniendi sunt, et hoc eis reputari pro resurrectione ex mortuis quod mortalitatem inmutatione deponant non morte, quolibet quis adquiescat modo; non est hereticus, nisi ex contentione hereticus fiat. sufficit enim in ecclesiae lege CARNIS RESVRRECTIONEM credere futuram de morte.

VIII Quod autem dicimus in Symbolo, in aduentum Domini VIVOS AC MORTVOS IVDICANDOS, non 'iustos ac peccatores iudicari,' sicut Diodorus significari putat, sed VIVOS eos qui in carne inueniendi sunt dicit, qui ad hoc morituri creduntur (uel inmutandi, sicut alii uolunt) ut suscitati continuo (uel reformati) cum ante mortuis iudicentur.

VIII Post resurrectionem et iudicium non credamus restitutionem futuram quam Origenes delirat, ut demones uel impii homines post tormenta quasi suppliciis expurgati uel illi in angelicam qua creati sunt redeant dignitatem uel isti iustorum societate donentur, quod hoc diuinae conueniat pietati ne quid ex rationabilibus pereat creaturis sed quolibet modo saluentur. sed nos credamus ipsi iudici omnium et retributori iusto qui dixit IBVNT IMPII IN SVPLIICIVM AETERNVM IUSTI AVTEM IN VITAM AETERNAM, ut percipiant fructum operum suorum.

X IN PRINCIPIO CREAVIT DEVS CAELVM ET TERRAM et aquam ex nihilo. et cum adhuc tenebrae ipsam aquam occultarent et aqua terram absconderet, facti sunt angeli et omnes caelestes uirtutes, ut non esset otiosa Dei bonitas sed haberet in quibus per multa ante spatia bonitatem ostenderet; et ita hic uisibilis mundus ex his quae [tunc] creata fuerant factus est et ornatus.

XI Nihil incorporeum et inuisibile natura credendum nisi solum Deum, id est patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum; qui ideo incor-

VII 4. Ps. xv (xvi) 10; ACT II 27; ACT II 31 7. I COR. XV 51 12. SYMBO-  
LVM APOSTOLORVM VIII 7. MATT. XXV 46 X I. GEN. I I

VII 3. dicitur: *alias* dictum est 5. suscepimus: *alias* suscipimus VIII 4.  
ad hoc: *alias* adhuc VIII 5. ex: *alias* de X 5. tunc: *alias* non; *alias* om  
XI 2. ideo: *alias* eo uel ex eo

poreus creditur quia ubique est et omnia inplet adque constringit, **ideo** inuisibilis omnibus creaturis quia incorporeus est.

XII Creatura omnis corporea: angeli et omnes caelestes uirtutes corpore, licet non carne, subsistunt. ex eo autem corporeas esse credimus intellectuales naturas, quod localitate circumscribuntur, sicut et anima humana quae carne clauditur, et demones qui per substantiam angelicae  
5 naturae sunt.

XIII Inmortales esse credimus intellectuales naturas, quae carne carent nec habent quod cadat, ut resurrectione egeat post ruinam necessaria.

XIII Animas hominum non esse ab initio inter ceteras intellectuales naturas nec insemel creatas, sicut Origenes fingit; neque cum corporibus per coitum seminantur, sicut Luciferiani et Cirillus et aliqui latinorum praesumentes adfirmant, quasi naturae consequentia seruiente. sed  
5 dicimus corpus tantum per coniugii copulam seminari, creationem uero animae solum creatorem omnium nosse.

XV Neque duas animas esse dicimus in [uno] homine, sicut quidam Syrorum scribunt, unam animalem, qua animetur corpus et inmixta sit sanguini, et alteram spiritaalem, quae rationem ministret: sed dicimus unam esse eandemque animam in homine, quae et corpus sua societate  
5 uiuificet et semetipsam sua ratione disponat, habens in se libertatem arbitrii ut in sua substantia elegat cogitatione quod uult.

XVI Solum hominem credimus habere animam substantiuam, quae exuta corpore uiuit et sensus suos adque ingenia uiuaciter tenet; neque cum corpore moritur, sicut Arabs adserit, neque post modicum interuallum, sicut Zeno, quia substantialiter uiuit.

XVII Animalium uero animae non sunt substantiuae, sed cum carne ipsa carnis uiuacitate nascuntur et cum carnis morte finiuntur; et ideo nec ratione reguntur, sicut Plato et Alexander putant, sed ad omnia naturae incitamento ducuntur.

[XVII b Anima humana non cum carne moritur, quia nec cum carne (ut superius diximus) seminatur, sed formato in uentre matris corpore Dei iudicio creati et infundi, ut uiuat homo intus in utero et sic procedat natiuitate in mundo.]

XVIII Duabus substantiis constat homo, anima tantum et corpore, anima cum ratione sua et corpus cum sensibus suis; quos tamen sensus absque animae societate non mouet corpus, anima uero et sine corpore rationale suum tenet.

XIII 5. seminari: *addunt alii* Dei uero iudicio coagulari [*uel animari*] in uulua et conpingi adque formari, ac formato iam corpore animam creati et infundi, ut uiuat in utero homo ex anima constans et corpore et [*uel ut*] egrediatur uiuus ex utero plenus humana substantia XV 2. animetur: *alias* animatur XVII 4. incitamento: *alias* incitamenta XVII b *Capitulum hoc omittunt codices Bobiensis (= Mediol. Amb. O 212 sup.) Paris. 1451, Bern. 89, Sangall. 238, colon. cccxii: illum (ut putat) sapit auctorem cui comma capitulo XIII supra insertum tribuendum est*



XVIII Non est tertius in substantia hominis spiritus, ut Didymus contendit, sed spiritus ipse est anima, pro spiritali natura uel pro eo quod anima spiret in corpore 'spiritus' appellata; 'animam' uero ex eo uocari quod ad uiuendum uel ad uiuificandum animet corpus. tertium uero quod ab apostolo cum anima et corpore introducit, 'spiritum,' gratiam sancti spiritus esse intellegamus, quam orat apostolus ut INTEGRA PERSEVERET in nobis nec nostro uitio aut minuatur aut fugetur a nobis, quia SPIRITVS SANCTVS EFFVGIET FICTVM.

XX Libertati arbitrii sui commissus est homo statim prima conditione, ut sola uigilantia mentis adnitente etiam praecepti custodia perseueraret, si uellet, in id quod creatus fuerat. postquam uero seductione serpentis per Euam cecidit a naturae bono, perdidit pariter [et] uigorem arbitrii, non tamen electionem; ne non esset suum quod emendaret peccatum, nec merito indulgeretur quod non arbitrio diluisset. manet [ergo] ad salutem arbitrii libertas, id est rationabilis uoluntas, sed admonente prius Deo et inuitante ad salutem, ut uel elegat uel sequatur uel agat occasione[m] salutis, hoc est inspiratione Dei: ut autem consequatur quod elegit uel quod occasione[m] agit, Dei esse libere confitemur. initium ergo salutis nostrae habemus Deo largiente: ut adquiescamus salutiferae inspirationi, nostrae potestatis est: ut adipiscamur quod adquiescendo admonitioni cupimus, diuini muneris est: ut non labamur ab adepto salutis munere, sollicitudinis nostrae est et caelestis pariter adiutorii: ut labamur, potestatis nostrae est et ignauiae.

XXI BAPTISMA VNVM est, sed in ecclesia, ubi VNA est FIDES, ubi IN NOMINE PATRIS ET FILII ET SPIRITVS SANCTI datur. et ideo si qui apud illos hereticos baptizati sunt qui in sanctae trinitatis confessione baptizant, et ueniunt ad nos, recipiantur quidem quasi baptizati, ne sanctae trinitatis inuocatio uel confessio adnulletur, sed doceantur ante et instruantur quo sensu sanctae trinitatis mysterium in ecclesia teneatur; et si consentiunt credere uel adquiescunt confiteri, purgati iam fidei integritate confirmentur manus inpositione: si uero paruuli sunt uel hebetes qui doctrinam non capiant, respondeant pro illis qui eos offerunt iuxta

XVIII 6, 7. I THESS. v 23  
xxviii 19

8. SAP. i 5

XXI I. EPH. iv 5; MATT.

XVIII 3. animam: *alias* anima 7. minuatur aut fugetur: *alias* minuatur aut fugatur

XX 7. manet [ergo] ad salutem *usque ad* salutis munere (l. 14): *alias* manet itaque ad quaerendam salutem arbitrii libertas, non tamen ad obtinendam sine illo qui quaerentes facit inuenire, qui pulsantibus aperit, qui petentibus donat. sicut ergo initium salutis nostrae Deo miserante et inspirante habere nos credimus, ita arbitrium naturae nostrae sequax esse diuinae inspirationis libere confitemur. igitur ut non labamur a bono uel naturae uel muneris (*quae omnia non nostrum sapiunt auctorem, neque apud ullos adhuc codices inueni nisi apud eos qui nomen Gennadii prae se ferunt*) XXI 9. capiant: *alias* capiunt

10 morem baptizandi, et sic manus inpositione et chrismate communiti  
 eucharistiae mysteriis admittantur. illos autem qui non in sanctae  
 trinitatis inuocatione apud hereticos baptizati sunt, et ueniunt ad nos,  
 baptizari debere pronuntiamus—non rebaptizari, neque enim credendum  
 est eos fuisse baptizatos qui non in nomine patris et filii et spiritus  
 15 sancti iuxta regulam a Domino positam tincti sunt : ut sunt Paulianitae  
 Procliani Borboritae Sipuri Fotiniaci (qui nunc uocantur Bonosiani)  
 Montani et Manichei, uariata impietatis germina, uel ceterae istorum  
 originis siue ordinis pestes, quae duo principia sibi ignota introducunt, ut  
 Cerdo et Marcion; uel contraria, ut Manicheus; uel tria, ut Theudotus;  
 20 uel multa, ut Valentinus; uel Christum hominem fuisse absque deo, ut  
 Cerinthus Ebion Artemon et Fotinus—ex istis, inquam, si qui ad nos  
 uenerint, non requirendum ab eis utrum baptizati sint an non, sed hoc  
 tantum, si credant ecclesiae fidem, et baptizentur ecclesiastico baptismate.

XXII Cotidie eucharistiae communionem percipere nec laudo nec  
 uitupero : omnibus tamen dominicis diebus communicandum hortor, si  
 tamen mens in affectu peccandi non sit, nam habentem adhuc uolunta-  
 tem peccandi grauari magis dico eucharistiae perceptione quam puri-  
 5 ficari. et ideo quamuis quis peccato mordeatur, peccandi non habeat  
 de cetero uoluntatem et communicaturus satisfaciat lacrimis et orationi-  
 bus et confidens de Domini miseratione, qui peccata pie confessioni  
 donare consueuit, accedat ad eucharistiam intrepidus et securus. sed  
 hoc de illo dico quem capitalia et mortalia peccata non grauant : nam  
 10 quem mortalia post baptismum crimina commissa premunt, hortor prius  
 publica paenitentia satisfacere et ita sacerdotis iudicio reconciliatum  
 communioni sociari, si uult NON AD IVDICIVM et condemnationem sui  
 eucharistiam percipere. sed [et] secreta satisfactione solui mortalia  
 crimina non negamus, sed mutato prius saeculari habitu et confesso  
 15 religionis studio per uitae correctionem et iugi, immo perpetuo, luctu,  
 miserante Deo : ita dumtaxat ut contraria pro his quae paenitet agat et  
 eucharistiam omnibus dominicis [diebus] supplex et submissus usque  
 ad mortem percipiat.

XXIII Paenitentia uera est paenitenda non admittere sed admissa  
 deflere. satisfactio paenitentiae est causas peccatorum excidere nec  
 earum suggestionibus aditum indulgere.

XXIII In diuinis repositionibus nihil terrenum uel transitorium  
 exspectemus, sicut Meletiani sperant; non nuptiarum copulam, sicut  
 Cerinthus et Marcus delectantur; non quod ad cibum uel potum

## XXII 12. 1 COR. XI 34

XXI 10. communiti : *alias* communiti      11. admittantur : *alias* adinstruantur  
 13. non rebaptizari : *alias* non baptizatos      15. Paulianitae : *alias* Paulionitae  
*alias* Paulianistae      XXII 4. perceptione : *alias* participatione      7. misericordia :  
*alias* miseratione

pertinet, sicut Papia auctore Ireneus et Tertulianus et Lactantius adquiescunt. neque per MILLE ANNOS post resurrectionem regnum Christi in terra futurum et sanctos cum illo in deliciis regnuros speremus, sicut Nepus docuit, qui primam iustorum et secundam impiorum confinxit et inter has duas mortuorum resurrectiones gentes ignorantes Deum IN ANGLIIS TERRARVM in carne reseruandas, quae post mille annos regni in terra iustorum instigante diabolo mouendae sunt ad pugnam contra iustos regnantes, et Domino pro iustis pugnante imbre igneo conpescendas, adque ita mortuas cum ceteris in impietate mortuis ad aeterna supplicia [in] incorruptibili carne resuscitandas.

XXV Nullum credimus ad salutem nisi Deo inuitante uenire, nullum inuitatum salutem suam nisi Deo auxiliante operari, nullum nisi orantem auxilium promereri, nullum Dei uoluntate perire, sed permissum pro electione arbitrii, ne ingenuitas potestatis semel homini adtributa ad seruilem cogatur necessitatem.

XXVI Malum uel malitiam non esse a Deo creatam sed a diabolo inuentam; qui et ipse bonus a Deo creatus est, sed quia libero arbitrio, utpote rationabilis creatura, commissus est et cogitandi acceperat facultatem, scientiam boni uertit ad malum et multa cogitando factus est inuentor mali. quod in se perdiderat inuidit in aliis, nec contentus solus perire suasit aliis, ut qui esset suae malitiae inuentor fieret et aliorum auctor; ex eo malum uel malitia percurrit in ceteras rationabiles creaturas.

XXVII Vnde cognoscimus nihil esse natura inmutabile nisi solum Deum, patrem et filium et spiritum sanctum; qui mutari non potest a bono, quia natura possidet bonum nec potest aliud quid esse quam bonus.

XXVIII Angeli uero qui in illa qua creati sunt beatitudine perseverant non natura possident bonum (ut non mutarentur cum ceteris) sed arbitrio, seruantes bona uoluntate bonum conditionis et fidem domino suo: unde et merito ab ipso Domino SANCTI ANGELI uocantur, quod tenuerint arbitrio sanctitatem nec sociorum exemplo deuiauerint a bono.

XXVIII Bona sunt nuptiae, sed causa filiorum et conpescendae fornicationis obtentu.

XXX Melior est continentia; sed non sibi sufficit ad beatitudinem, si pro solo amore pudicitiae retinetur, sed et si cum hoc affectu causa uacandi Domino elegatur [alioquin diuortium magis coniugii uidebitur esse quam castitas].

XXIII 5-13. APOC. XX 4-10      XXVIII 4. MARC viii 38; LUC. ix 26 [MATT. xv 31]

XXIII 6. Christi: *alias* Dei      XXV 1. inuitante: *alias* adiuuante

XXXI Virginitas utroque bono praecelsior est, quia et naturam uincit et pugnam, naturam corporis integritate, pugnam castimoniae pace.

XXXII Bonum est in cibum CVM GRATIARVM ACTIONE sumere quidquid Deus edendum praecipit. abstinere autem ab aliquibus, non quasi a malis sed quasi [a] non necessariis, non est malum. moderari uero earum usum pro necessitate et tempore proprie christianorum est.

XXXIII Malas dicere nuptias uel fornicationi comparandas aut stupro, cibos quoque credere malos uel mali causam creare percipientibus, non est christianorum sed proprie Encratarum et Manicheorum est.

XXXIII Sacratae Deo uirginitati nuptias coequare, aut pro amore castigandi corporis abstinentibus uino uel carnibus nihil credere meriti ad crescere, nec hoc christiani sed Iouiniani est.

XXXV Integra fide credendum beatam Mariam dei Christi matrem et uirginem genuisse et post partum uirginem permansisse, nec blasphemiae Heluidii adquiescendum qui dixit 'Virgo ante partum, non uirgo post partum'.

XXXVI Elementa, id est caelum et terram, non credamus abolenda per ignem sed in melius commutanda, FIGVRAM autem MVNDI id est imaginem, non substantiam, TRANSITVRAM.

XXXVII Bonum est facultates cum dispensatione pauperibus erogare: melius est pro intentione sequendi Dominum in semel donare et absolutum sollicitudine cum Christo egere.

XXXVIII Maritum duarum post baptismum matronarum clericum non ordinandum, neque eum qui unam quidem sed concubinam non matronam habuit, nec illum qui uiduam aut repudiatam aut meretricem in matrimonium sumpsit, neque eum qui semetipsum quolibet corporis sui membro indignatione aliqua uel iusto uel iniusto timore superatus truncauerit, neque illum qui usuras accepisse conuincitur aut in scena lusisse noscitur, neque eum qui publica paenitentia mortalia crimina deflet, nec illum qui per ambitionem ad imitationem Simonis magi PECVNIAM OFFERT.

XXXVIII Sanctorum corpora, et praecipue beatorum martyrum reliquias, ac si Christi membra sincerissima honoranda; et basilicas eorum nomine appellatas, uelut loca sancta diuino cultui mancipata, affectu piissimo et deuotione fidelissima adeundas [esse]. si quis contra hanc 5 sententiam uenit, non christianus sed Vigilantianus credatur.

XL Baptizatis tantum iter esse salutis, nullum catechumenum (quamuis in bonis operibus defunctum) uitam aeternam habere, credamus;

XXXII 1. 1 TIM. iv 3    XXXVI 2. 1 COR. vii 31    XXXVIII 9. ACT viii 18

XXXVIII 8. nec illum qui: *addunt alii (sed non optimi) testes* aliquando in furiam uersus insaniuit uel afflictione diaboli uexatus est neque eum qui 9. offert: *alias defert*

excepto martyrio, ubi tota baptismi sacramenta complentur. baptizatus confitetur fidem suam coram sacerdote et interrogatus respondet: hoc et martyr coram persecutore facit, qui et confitetur fidem et interrogatus respondet. ille post confessionem uel aspargitur aqua uel intinguitur: et hic uel aspargitur sanguine uel tinguitur igne. ille manus inpositione [pontificis] accipit spiritum sanctum: hic locutorium efficitur spiritus sancti, dum NON EST ipse QVI LOQVITVR SED SPIRITVS PATRIS QVI LOQVITVR IN ipso. ille communicat eucharistiae in commemoratione[m] 10 mortis Domini: hic ipsi Christo commoritur. ille confitetur se mundi actibus renuntiaturum: hic ipsi renuntiat uitae. illi peccata omnia dimittuntur: in isto extinguuntur.

XL I In eucharistia[m] non debet aqua pura offerri, ut quidam sobrietatis causa falluntur, sed uinum cum aqua mixtum: quia et uinum fuit in redemptionis nostrae mysterio, cum dicit NON BIBAM AMODO DE HOC GENIMINE VITIS, et aqua mixtum, quod post caenam dabatur. sed et de latere eius quod lancea perfossum est aqua cum sanguine egressa 5 uinum de VERA carnis eius VITE cum aqua expressum ostendit.

XL II Bona est caro nostra, et ualde bona [est], utpote a bono Deo et solo condita: et non est mala, ut uult Sethianus et Offianus, nec mali causa, ut docuit Florinus, nec ex malo et bono compacta, ut Manicheus blasfemat: sed cum sit creatione bona, arbitrio animae efficitur nobis uel bona uel mala, non mutatione substantiae sed executionis mercede. 5 ipsa enim est quae stabit ANTE TRIBVNAL CHRISTI, in qua REFERET propria corporis anima PROVT GESSIT, SIVE BONVM SIVE MALVM.

XL III In resurrectione ex mortuis sexus forma non mutabitur: sed uir mortuus resurget in forma uiri et femina in forma feminae, carens sexu tantum in hac uitae conditione, non specie naturali; ne non sit uera resurrectio, si non id resurget quod cadit.

XL IIII Ante passionem Domini omnes sanctorum animae in inferno sub debito praeuaricationis Adae tenebantur, donec auctoritate Domini per indebitam eius mortem de seruili conditione liberarentur.

XL V Post ascensionem Domini ad caelos omnes sanctorum animae cum Christo sunt, et exeuntes de corpore ad Christum uadunt, EXSPERCTANTES REDEMPTIONEM CORPORIS sui, ut ad integram et perpetuam beatitudinem cum ipso pariter inmutentur: sicut [et] peccatorum animae in inferno sub timore positae expectant resurrectionem corporis [sui], 5 ut cum ipso ad poenam conuertantur aeternam.

XL 9. MATT. x 20      XLI 3. MATT. xxvi 29      6. Io. xv I      XLII 6, 7.  
2 Cor. v 10      XLV 2. ROM. viii 23

XL 4. respondet: *alias* respondit      6. aspargitur . . . intinguitur: *alias* intinguitur . . . aspargitur      7. tinguitur: *alias* intinguitur      10. ipso: *alias* illo  
XLI 6. expressum: *alias* inpressum      XLII 2. Offianus: *scilicet* Ophianus  
6. referet: *alias* refert uel referat

XLVI Paenitentia aboleri peccata indubitanter credimus, etiamsi in ultimo uitae spiritu admissorum paeniteat et publica lamentatione peccata prodantur: quia propositum Dei, qui decreuit SALVARE QVOD PERIERAT, stat immobile; et ideo, quia uoluntas eius non mutatur, siue emendatione uitae (si tempus conceditur) siue supplicii confessione (si continuo uita exceditur) uenia peccatorum fideliter praesumatur ab illo qui NON VVLT MORTEM PECCATORIS SED VT CONVERTATVR A perditione paenitendo ET saluatus miseratione Domini VIVAT. si quis aliter de iustissima Dei pietate sentit, non christianus sed Nouatianus est.

XLVII Internas animae cogitationes diabolium non uidere certissimum, sed motibus eas corporis ab illo et affectionum indicibus colligi experimento didicimus: secreta autem cordis solus ille nouit ad quem dicitur TV SOLVS NOSTI CORDA FILIORVM HOMINVM.

XLVIII Non omnes malae cogitationes nostrae [semper] diaboli instinctu excitantur, sed aliquoties [ex] nostri arbitrii motu emergunt: bonae autem cogitationes semper a Deo sunt.

XLVIII Demones per energiam non credimus substantialiter inlabi animae, sed adplicatione et oppressione uniri. inlabi autem menti illi tantum possibile est qui creauit, qui natura subsistens incorporeus capabilis est suae facturae.

L Signa et prodigia et sanitates etiam peccatores in nomine Domini facere et ab ipso Deo discimus: et cum alios hac praesumptione iuuent, sibi per ambitionem humanae gloriae nocent, qui gloriantur in dato falso, id est non meritis debito.

LI Signis et prodigiis clarum posse fieri christianum, non tamen sanctum si intemperatis et asperis moribus agat; temperatis autem et placidis moribus, etiam absque signorum efficacia, et sanctum et perfectum et hominem Dei fieri recte credimus.

LII Nullus sanctus et iustus caret peccato: nec tamen ex hoc desinet esse iustus uel sanctus, cum affectu teneat sanctitatem; non enim naturae humanae uiribus sed propositi adiumento per Dei gratiam adquirimus sanctitatem. et ideo ueraciter se omnes sancti pronuntiant peccatores, quia in ueritate habent quod plangent, [et] si non reprehensione conscientiae, certe mobilitate conditionis [humanae].

LIII Pascha, id est Dominicæ resurrectionis sollempnitas, ante

XLVI 3. MATT. xviii 11    7. EZECH. xviii 23, xxxiii 11    XLVII 3. 3 RAC. viii 39.

XLVI 3. Dei: *alias* Domini    9. Dei: *alias* Domini    XLVIII 3. Deo: *alias* Domino    XLVIII 1. energiam: *alias* energiam operationem, *ubi uidetur* operationem *glossema esse*; *alias* energiae operationem    2. adplicatione: *alias* compellatione *uel* adligatione    L 4. id est: *alias* et    LI 3. placidis: *alias* placitis    LII 2. uel: *alias* et    6. mobilitate: *alias* add et mutabilitate  
LIII, LIIII *Haec duo capitula omittunt nonnulli (non tamen optimi) codices.*



transgressum uernalis aequinoctii et sextaedecimae lunae initium non potest celebrari, eo tamen [in] mense natae.

LIIII Propter nouellos legislatores, qui ideo animam tantum ad imaginem Dei creatam dicunt ut quia Deus incorporeus recte creditur etiam anima incorporea esse credatur, libere confitemur imaginem in aeternitate similitudinem in moribus inueniri.

C. H. TURNER.

## THE CODEX CORBEIENSIS.

THE following pages were written as an Introduction to the writer's Transcript of the Codex Corbeiensis. The Delegates of the Clarendon Press will include this Transcript in their series of *Old Latin Biblical Texts*; and it is already in the course of publication.

It has been thought well to publish the Introduction separately, and before the appearance of the whole work. In preparing this Essay I have been more anxious to collect and tabulate facts than to propound or defend any theory. Much remains yet to be done in the way of making exact transcripts of the ancient MSS. Editors in the past have silently corrected what they considered as faults in the codex before them. In this way many valuable clues have been lost.

'It is unadvisable', to quote the words of the Rev. H. J. White, 'to dismiss the problem of a peculiarly-spelt word on the ground of carelessness, until other means of solving it have failed. A fuller *comparative* examination of early Latin MSS may strengthen the supposition that cases of apparent careless spelling may be really due, not to accident, but to *different modes of pronunciation* current in the regions to which the MS or its ancestors belonged: and thus the orthography of a MS may throw great light on the origin of the text which it presents.'—*O. L. Texts*, iii p. xv.

It is much to be wished that the Old Latin MSS *a* and *b* were published with the same exactitude as *e*, *k* and *q*. An exact edition of the two famous North Italian codices would be an important contribution to the solution of the vexed problem of the relationship *inter se* of extant Latin MSS.

### *Authorities.*

A brief description of the Codex, together with an imperfect collation (in St John, St Luke, and St Mark only), is given by Bianchini in his *Evangeliarium Quadruplex*, which appeared in 1749.

I quote from Migne's reprint (*Patrol. Lat.* xii p. 354). 'Exhibemus hic codicem vetustissimum Corbeiensis Monasterii n. 195 sexto