

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:



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



<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

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[1st page of article]

DOCUMENTS

ANOTHER NEW FRAGMENT OF PELAGIUS.

IN a paper entitled 'The Commentary of Pelagius on the Epistles of Paul: the Problem of its Restoration',¹ which appeared in January 1907, I printed two fragments of Pelagius in controversy with Jerome, which I had found in MS lat. 653 of the Bibliothèque Nationale. In this JOURNAL (July 1907, pp. 526ff) Dr Mercati explained the genesis of these fragments, and offered some corrections of the text. My discovery, such as it was, was the result of a hasty examination of the MS, and in 1909 my plans did not permit me to examine it any further. This year, however, I have made a fairly minute study of it, with the satisfactory result that yet a third fragment has turned up, also of controversy with Jerome, and in vigorous eloquence decidedly superior to the other two. I also had the satisfaction of learning from the *Nouveau Traité de Diplomatique* t. iii p. 78 (Paris 1757) that my new fragment and the first of my older ones had been observed by the Benedictine authors of that work, who do not appear however to have realized or cared to realize their significance.² In consequence they had remained unprinted.

This manuscript 653, which on the strength of some 'Anglo-Hibernian' initials I ventured to attribute to an insular scribe, must have had quite a different origin. The Benedictines say, 'il paroît venir d'Italie', and Dümmler, apparently without himself seeing the MS, has endorsed this opinion. A study of the contractions used in it and of the palaeography generally has led me to agree, and I should go farther and suggest that it was written at Verona, and the high authority of Dr E. A. Loew is emphatic against any South or Central Italian scriptorium. Certainly it does not come from Bobbio, as it is in no way related to the Bobbio MSS of the same age, which have been closely studied by Prof. W. M. Lindsay.³

Our book contains at the beginning a dedicatory poem, addressed

¹ *Proceedings of the British Academy* vol. ii pp. 409-439.

² I was put on the track of the *Nouveau Traité* by Dümmler, *Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini* tom. i (Berol. 1881) p. 89, which reference I owe to the kindness of Prof. W. M. Lindsay.

³ *Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen* xxvi (1909) p. 295, &c.

probably to Charlemagne, and the Benedictines conjectured that the book was presented to him. Somehow, perhaps through his wife, Catherine de Médicis, the book eventually passed into the possession of Henri II of France (1547-1559), whose arms it bears, and since then it has been one of the treasures of what is now the Bibliothèque Nationale. It is marked at once as a royal book by the gilt edges of the vellum: I fancy vellum was seldom gilded in this way.

The MS, written about the end of the eighth century or the beginning of the ninth, is of extreme accuracy, in orthography as in everything else, and there can be little doubt that it was copied from an original not later than the sixth century. We may conjecture that this original was a book something like the well-known Ambrosiaster at Monte Cassino. The anonymous compiler of this form of the Pelagian commentary would appear to be later than the Pseudo-Jerome, because he embodies all or nearly all the additions made by the Pseudo-Jerome. He was perhaps not earlier than Cassiodorus, as Cassiodorus knows nothing of him: it is improbable that he was later. He obviously had access to earlier literature which has now perished: the three fragments of Pelagius are sufficient proof of this. Roughly, his method appears to have been to copy into a codex of the Epistles the entire commentary of Pelagius, with the supplements of Pseudo-Jerome, which amount to about a twelfth of the matter in the original Pelagius. To this he added further explanations, introduced, not like those of Pseudo-Jerome by *Item*, but by *Aliter*. The question as to the sources of these must be deferred. He would appear to have regarded the commentary as in a sense Jerome's: otherwise he would not have introduced him in controversy with Pelagius. He does not seem to have connected Pelagius in any way with it, in spite of the fact that he alone has preserved the three fragments! It will be observed that in each case Jerome comes first. We may be thankful that the compiler's aim was so exclusively exegetical. This compilation is, next to the MS of the original form of Pelagius himself, Augiensis cxix at Karlsruhe, the purest and most valuable for the restoration of Pelagius's text, as the Pseudo-Jerome, at least in its oldest extant MSS, is considerably tainted with corruption.

I have thought it best to have this fragment printed as nearly as possible as it appears in the MS, so that the reader may have a better idea of the quality of the MS.¹ The extract of Jerome comes from

¹ I may be permitted to point out that in a fragment from the same MS, which seems to have some connexion with Nestorius (cf. Bethune-Baker *Nestorius and his Teaching* p. 95), published *Proc. Brit. Acad.* ii 435 (= 27), the word *homo* has been accidentally omitted after *appellatione* in the second last line; also in the first line of the fragment on p. 438 (= 30) *op. cit.* read *ais* for *ait*.

Epist. cxxxiii § 2, addressed to Ctesiphon (Vallarsi pp. 1026 f, Migne *P. L.* xxii 1148f).

After Migne *P. L.* xxx 677 D old issue (= 703 D new issue) (Rom. vii 14-15) following the words *quod inuitus admitto* (cod. *committo*):

Hieronimus; Ecce quod non uult apostolus
operatur · quomodo stare potest hoc quod dicitur · posse ho
minem sine peccato esse si uelit qua ratione potest esse quod
uelit, cum apostolus asserat se quod cupiat implere non
5 posse;] Pelagius; O uocem temerariā immo sacrilegā:
quid non audeant dicere homines cum semel ueritatē in pug
nare coeperunt · Quā inpudenter falsa · quā inperitae ab
surda · quam impie sacrilega defendunt: Cū eos nec a menda
ciis reuerentia · nec ab stultitia pudor nec ab impietate reli
10 gio abducit: Ergo ne apostolus paulus uas electionis &
peculiare quoddā xp̄i templū · qui etiā in mandatis ueteris
testamenti sine querella conuersatū esse se dicit sub xp̄o ha
bitaculū peccati fuit: Quodq; docuit implere non potuit:
Qui dicebat aliis · non ergo regn& peccatū in uestro mortali
15 corpore · & peccatū in uob̄ non dominabitur · ipse uitiorū seruus
effectus · & captiuus in peccati uincla deductus est · atq; in se
regnantib; uitiiis · non faciebat bonū quod diligebat · sed malū
quod oderat · nec cogitatione aut sermone tantū · sed ipso etiā

hic contra
pelagium
disputat

fol. 42 r

opere peccabat: Si enim secundū te apostolus quod n̄ uult
20 facit · quod n̄ uult operatur · manifesta criminū actione
non caruit: & ut singulas denueremus species · Oderat
apostolus libidinem · castus esse cupiebat · sed faciebat
quod oderat, dominari uolebat auaritiæ · sed seruiebat;
Inuidiā conabatur uincere · sed ab inuidia uincebatur:
25 odiū habere nolebat · sed cogebatur odisse: atq; ita ge
neraliter quā omne bonū uell& · & omne e diuerso odiss&
malū: si non bonū quod uolebat · sed malū quod ode
rat operabatur · nullū omnino bonū · & e contrario
omne malū iuxta tuū sensū apostolus uidetur egisse;
30 Quod si ipse uas electionis & ecclesiarū magister qui
secundum sp̄m bonū facere desiderabat · necessitate
carnis ad malū se dicit impelli · d̄ū dicit non habitare
in carne sua bonū · apta ipsius apostoli auctoritate ma
nicheo dextrā porregimus · qui carnem malā esse con
35 tendit: & hinc iā imus in creatoris iniuriā · qui aliq̄id
malū conciderit; sicq; illud coniunxerit bono id est

carne spūi · ut bonorū sub mali rediger& potestatem ;
 nec fier& quid desiderar& & sp̄s · sed quod caro compelle
 r& : Deinde ut quasi oblitus quā contrarias quamque
 40 in pugnantes se in unū substantias copulass& manda
 ta homini dederit · Quae quā uis sp̄s implere p se

fol. 42 v

cuper& · carne tamen cogente contempn& ; Quis ergo
 ita temerarius quisue tam demens sit, qui cum tantas
 in apostolo legat fuisse uirtutes · eum nihilo minus uitiiis
 45 seruisse contendat : nec eum bonum quod uoluit · sed
 malū quod noluit dicat operatū ; Hoc enim quod tu
 de apostolo intellegi cupis , omnes aecclesiasti^{ca} uiri
 in peccatoris & sub lege adhuc positi asserunt eū dixisse
 psonā : Quo nimia uitiorum consuetudine uelut
 50 quadā teneretur necessitate peccandi ; Et quā uis bo
 num appetet& uoluntate · usu tamen praecipitaretur
 in malū ; In psona aū unius hominis designat popu
 lū sub uetere adhuc lege peccantem · quem ab hoc con
 suetudinis malo dicit liberatū esse p xp̄m , qui creden
 55 tib; sibi primo omnia p baptismum peccata dimittit ·
 deinde imitatione sui ad pfectā incitat sc̄itatem :
 & uitiorum consuetudinē uirtutū uincit exemplo ;

then follows :—

Si aū quod nolo illud facio · consentio legi qm̄ bona ;
 si ipsum malū nolo facere quod committo ubique cum *etc*

(*four lines from foot of p. 677 (old style) p. 703 D (new style)*).

NOTES :—*line 10* : for *ne* read *nec*.

line 21 : read *dinumere*mus.

line 37 : read *carnem* and *bonum*.

line 38 : read *quod* (for *quid*) and omit &.

line 49 : read *Qua*.

ALEX. SOUTER.