

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]

The Journal of Theological Studies

JANUARY, 1916

DOCUMENTS

A THEOLOGICAL TRACTATE ON THE DIVINITY OF THE SON, FROM PARIS MS B. N. LAT. 653.

MS Paris B. N. lat. 653, written towards the close of the eighth century in Northern Italy, and possibly at Verona,¹ contains a unique anonymous expansion of Pelagius's commentary on the Epistles of St Paul. For the most part the additional comments are of somewhat similar compass to the brief notes of Pelagius himself. But here and there throughout the manuscript we find much longer interpolations. I have already recovered from it three portions of a lost work of Pelagius himself, the *De Libero Arbitrio*, with the author's name attached.² A fourth interpolation, this time anonymous, I ventured to publish in the JOURNAL for July 1913 under the title, 'The Com-monitorium of Fulgentius of Ruspe on the Holy Spirit.'³ No published criticism of my view has come to my notice. One or two scholars have suggested privately that, if it be not by Fulgentius, it at any rate belongs to the same *milieu*. I have hoped in vain for an expression of opinion from Dr O. Friebe, the author of a useful monograph on the style of the admitted works of Fulgentius. Dom Donatien de Bruyne, O.S.B., in an unpublished paper, with a copy of which he favoured me, has expressed the view that the tractate could be regarded, with more reason, as an extract from the lost books of Pelagius's *De Fide Trinitatis*.

It cannot be said that an examination of the language of the treatise, side by side with the vast collections made for the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* at Munich, which I was most courteously permitted to inspect in July or August 1913, has led to a definite conclusion for or against my view. The word *efficientia* (p. 484, l. 29) is quoted once from Fulgentius, but occurs often in Hilary, and is also found in Jerome (e. g. *epist.* 120, § 12, p. 514, l. 17 ed. Hilberg) in the same connexion as in our passage. Again, the word *omnipotentia* (p. 486, l. 34) is found

¹ See W. M. Lindsay *Notae Latinae* (Cambridge 1915) p. 471.

² Published in the *Proceedings of the British Academy* vol. ii pp. 435-439 (=27-31); *Journal of Theological Studies* vol. xii (1910-1911) pp. 34 f; cf. vol. xiv (1912-1913) p. 481 n.

³ Vol. xiv pp. 481-488.

oftener in Fulgentius than elsewhere, but occurs already in Hilary and others, as well as in Cassiodorus, &c. But *probamentum* (p. 488, l. 2), though found as early as Ambrosiaster and Pacian, is not cited from Fulgentius; and the same is true of *praesumptive* (p. 488, l. 8), which can be traced back as far. I have found another instance of the same form of Matt. xxviii 19 (see p. 482) in Fulgentius, namely in Migné *P. L.* lxxv 506 D. It is instructive also to compare Migne pp. 716 ff with the tractate as a whole. If the extract be by Pelagius, why did the scribe not indicate the fact, as in the three other cases, by adding the name? On the other side, however, I can make Dom de Bruyne a present of a very striking parallel with genuine words of Pelagius:—

Tractate :

p. 488, ll. 7 ff.

Pelagius ap. Augustin. :

De Natura et Gratia 37, 44.

Quid inueniri iniquius potest	Credamus igitur quod legimus et
quam simpliciter me credere nolle	quod non legimus nefas credamus
quod lego, et praesumptive credere	adstruere.
uelle quod non lego ?	

Leaving the final decision in this matter of authorship to a later period, I wish here to print another tractate or fragment, which is undoubtedly by the same author as that with which we have been dealing, whosoever he may have been. This piece is, like the other, anonymous. It occurs on ff. 108 v-110 v of the same MS, immediately after the undoubted Pelagian comment on 1 Cor. viii 6, and is introduced in the same simple way as the other, by the word *Aliter*.

A cursory comparison of the language of the two tractates will at once shew the identity of authorship. *Denegent* (p. 133, l. 5, &c. = p. 488, l. 4), *scripturarum testimoniis* (p. 133, l. 5 = p. 487, l. 13), *illud . . . propheticum* (p. 133, l. 7 = p. 483, l. 28 *illud Dauiticum*), *deitatem* (p. 133, l. 11, p. 134, l. 23, p. 135, l. 15 = p. 486, ll. 10, 31, 34), *nuncupari* (p. 133, l. 12, &c. = p. 485, l. 31), *beati apostoli* (p. 133, l. 12 = p. 486, l. 4), *euidentiis* (p. 134, l. 8, &c. = p. 486, l. 12), *unam atque eandem* (p. 134, l. 8, &c. = p. 484, l. 6, p. 485, l. 30), *certe* beginning a clause (p. 134, l. 11 = p. 484, l. 37), *non igitur* (p. 134, l. 14, &c. = p. 484, l. 24), *conprobendam* (p. 134, l. 23 = p. 486, l. 13), *deus . . . adorandus* (p. 135, l. 9 = p. 487, l. 37), *idem*, beginning its clause (p. 135, l. 9, &c. = p. 483, l. 33), *conueniunt* (p. 135, l. 13, &c. = p. 488, l. 3), *sine dubio* (p. 135, l. 13 = p. 483, l. 1), *proprie* (p. 135, l. 16 = p. 485, l. 6), *competunt* (p. 135, l. 17, &c. = p. 485, l. 1), *diligenter, quaeso te, lector, attende* (p. 135, l. 23 = p. 487, l. 4), *et reliqua* (p. 135, l. 27 = p. 486, l. 8), *contendant* (p. 135, l. 33, &c. = p. 485, l. 6), *quisnam* (p. 135, l. 33 = p. 484, l. 27), *procul dubio* (p. 136, l. 1 = p. 484, l. 38, p. 485, l. 12), *tam . . . quam* (p. 136, ll. 2-3 = p. 485, ll. 30-31, p. 487, ll. 19, 39), *illud* anticipatory (p. 136, l. 7 = p. 486, l. 22), *fas non* (p. 136, l. 14 = *nefas* p. 487, l. 35).

It will be admitted that this is a long list, considering the brevity of the present document. It is right, however, to call attention to the fact that, while in the previously published document *consubstantialis* (p. 484, ll. 19, 23) is the word used, and in this it is *consubstantiuus* (p. 136, l. 14), yet Tertullian and Marius Mercator use both words.

The quotations from scripture in the present document are fewer in number and perhaps of inferior interest to those found in the previous tractate. A number of them are short, and can be passed over as not disagreeing with the Vulgate text. There remain about eight, which are worthy of closer study.

Esai. xliiii 10 **fuit alius** Old-Latin: est formatus deus *vg.*

xlv 14 This verse, either in whole or in part, is habitually employed as a proof-text by writers on the Divinity of our Lord from Tertullian downwards. A study of the numerous passages given by Sabatier will shew to what group our citation inclines. Certain variants without special significance are here unmentioned, in order to throw the significant variants into greater relief.

haec dicit dominus

fatigata est Aegyptus

et negotiatio Aethiopum

et Saba (Sabai) uiri excelsi

5 ad te **transgredientur** (-untur)

et tui erunt serui

et post te **ambulabunt**

uincti conpedibus

et adorabunt te

10 et in te **precabuntur**

quia (quoniam) in te deus est

et non est deus **alius**

praeter te.

Every one of these characteristic variants is to be found in the Cyprianic form of the verse (Hartel 68). At the same time the writer of our tractate did not copy the citation from the *Testimonia*: for in l. 1 Cyprian has *sic* for *haec*, and *dominus deus sabaoth* for *dominus*, and in l. 4 he has *Sabaim* and *alti* respectively. In every other respect the two citations agree absolutely. The detailed evidence for the significant variants is as follows:—

2. *fatigata est Cypr.* : laborauit *Hil. Vict-Af.*¹ *Ambr. Hier. Ps-Vigil.*

¹ A most independent quoter, who, when he uses a Latin Bible at all, appears to employ a European text.

5. *transgredientur Cypr.* : *transibunt Tert. Hil. Faustin. Ambr. Hier. Ps-Vigil.*
: *transient Greg.-Illib.*
7. *ambulabunt Cypr.* : *sequentur Tert. Hil. Faustin. Ambst. Ambr. Hier. Ps-Vigil.*
8. *uincti conpedibus Cypr.* : *alligati uinculis Hil. Faustin. Ambst. Ambr. Ps-Vigil.*
10. *precabuntur Cypr.* : *deprecabuntur Hil. Faustin. Ambst. Ambr. Greg.-Illib. Ps-Vigil.*
12. *alius Cypr.* : *om. Hil. Faustin. Ambst. Ambr. Hier.*

The evidence points clearly to Africa, or to Spain, the daughter of Africa, as the origin of our fragment. It is not, however, favourable to the authorship of Fulgentius, unless we suppose that he used two totally different types of text at different times; for Sabatier notes that in his citation of this verse Fulgentius *resp. c. Arian.* pp. 66, 67 agrees exactly with Ambrose *de fide* lib. i (tom. ii p. 448 A). Of course Fulgentius may have taken the citation bodily from Ambrose.

Bar. iii 36-38 is like the previous citation, in that it constantly occurs in such a context as we have here. Also there is little doubt that so well known a passage was quoted sometimes from an earlier author, sometimes from memory. It is not possible to distinguish two branches of readings so easily as in the last case. The most significant renderings would appear to be:—

- aestimabitur** *Ambst. vg Aug. Fulg.* : *deputabitur Cypr. Hil. Faustin. Greg.-Illib. Ps-Fulg. Vigil. ½.*
: *reputabitur Ambr. Rufin.*
- alius** *Cypr. vg Ambr. Aug. ½ Ps-Prosp.* : *alter Hil. Ambst. Rufin. Aug. ½ Ps-Fulg. Vigil. ½ Ps-Vigil.*
- absque** *Cypr. Ps-Prosp. Ps-Fulg. Vigil.* : *ad Hil. Ambst. Rufin. Paulin.-Cassiod. Nol. Aug. ½ Fulg. ½ Vigil. ½ Ps-Vigil.*
: *praeter Fulg. ½.*
: *aduersus vg*
- eo** *Rufin. Ps-Prosp. Ps-Fulg.* : *illo Cypr. Faustin. Greg.-Illib. Vigil. ½ Cassiod.*
: *eum Hil. Ambst. vg Rufin. Paulin.-Nol. Aug. ½ Fulg. Vigil. ½ Ps-Vigil.*
: *illum cod-Sang. Fulg. ½.*
- inuenit** *cod-Sang. Cypr. Hil. Faustin.* : *adinuenit Ambst. vg Ambr. Greg.-Illib. Aug. Ps-Prosp. Fulg. ⅔. Ps-Fulg. Ps-Vigil.*

ENIM COGNOUIT SENSUM DOMINI, AUT QUIS EIUS CONSILIARIUS FUIT? AUT QUIS PRIOR DEDIT EI ET RETRIBUETUR ILLI? QUONIAM EX IPSO ET PER IPSUM ET IN IPSO SUNT OMNIA. quaero itaque de quo hoc apostolus dixerit: de patre an de filio? si de patre, et ipse DOMINUS dicitur: QUIS, inquit, COGNOUIT SENSUM DOMINI? si de filio, DEUS et ipse nuncupatur: O ALTITUDO, inquit, DIUITIARUM SAPIENTIAE ET SCIENTIAE DEI!

Et ut euentius unam atque eandem substantiam operationemque monstraret, hic propter unitatem substantiae ad unam personam refert, quod alibi duarum esse significat, quoniam ait: EX IPSO ET PER IPSUM ET IN IPSO SUNT OMNIA. certe hic unum atque eundem dicit, EX QUO ET PER QUEM OMNIA SUNT, cum alibi EX PATRE OMNIA ET CUNCTA DICAT ESSE PER FILIUM. unde iterum interrogandi sunt, de quo hoc dictum putent: si de patre, PER IPSUM OMNIA, sicut et PER filium, non igitur maior est pater; si de filio, EX IPSO OMNIA, sicut EX PATRE, non igitur minor est filius. si autem dixerint in hoc maiorem intellegi patrem, quod ubique prior filio nuncupatur, ostendendum est ad amputandam huius opinionis impietatem quodam loco ab apostolo filium priorem nuncupatum esse quam patrem, ut ibi: IPSE AUTEM DOMINUS NOSTER IESUS CHRISTUS ET DEUS PATER NOSTER, QUI DILEXIT NOS ET DEDIT CONSOLATIONEM AETERNAM ET SPEM BONAM IN GRATIA, EXHORTETUR CORDA UESTRA.

Illud sane ad ueram deitatem filii conprobendam inter cetera demonstrandum est, quod quaecumque magna et non nisi DEO digna de patre dicuntur, eadem etiam inueniantur dici aequae de filio. pater DEUS dicitur, idem etiam et filius: ET EX QUIBUS CHRISTUS inquit apostolus SECUNDUM CARNEM, QUI EST SUPER OMNIA DEUS BENEDICTUS IN SAECULA. DOMINUS ET DEUS pater dicitur, idem etiam et filius: DOMINUS MEUS inquit Thomas ET DEUS MEUS. NON ESSE DEUS ALIUS PRAETER patrem dicitur; hoc etiam de filio significatur: QUONIAM IN TE inquit Esaias DEUS EST, ET NON EST DEUS ALIUS PRAETER TE. quod de filio dictum esse inferius demonstraui. item apud Hieremiam: HIC DEUS NOSTER, ET NON AESTIMABITUR ALIUS ABSQUE EO, QUI INUENIT OMNEM UIAM IUSTITIAE, ET DEDIT EAM IACOB PUERO SUO ET ISRAHEL DILECTO SUO: POST HAEC IN TERRIS UISUS EST, ET CUM HOMINIBUS CONUERSATUS EST. OMNIPOTENS pater dicitur, id etiam filius in Apocalypsi: HAEC DICIT QUI EST ET QUI ERAT ET QUI UENTURUS EST OMNIPOTENS. UENTURUM enim filium ESSE

5 Rom. xi 34
xi 36

12, 14 1 Cor. viii 6

25 cf. Sap. 3, 5
32 de] ne *cod.*

5, 6 inquit *cod.*

26 Rom. ix 5
33 Bar. iii 36-38

6 Rom. xi 33

15 Rom. xi 36

29 Ioh. xx 28

36 Apoc. xix 15

10, 12, 14 Rom.

19 2 Thess. ii 16, 17

29, 31 Esai. xlv 14

37 apocalypsin

quis dubitet? ALTISSIMUS pater dicitur, hoc etiam filius in euangelio Lucae: ET TU PUER PROPHETA ALTISSIMI UOCABERIS; PRAEIBIS ENIM ANTE FACIEM DOMINI. de patre dicitur quod SIT DEUS OMNIA IN OMNIBUS, hoc et de filio: SED OMNIA inquit apostolus ET IN OMNIBUS CHRISTUS. DOMINUS MAIESTATIS pater creditur, hoc et filius ab apostolo 5 dicitur: SI ENIM COGNOUISSENT, NUMQUAM DOMINUM MAIESTATIS CRUCIFIXISSENT. IN DEUM PATREM CREDENDUM est, similiter ET IN FILIUM: nam ipse dicit: HOC EST OPUS DEI, UT CREDATIS EUM, QUEM MISIT ILLE. deus pater adorandus est, idem et filius: ET ADORENT EUM inquit Moses OMNES ANGELI DEI. deus PATER SUSCITAT MORTUOS ET UIUI- 10 FICAT, idem et filius, ut ipse ait: SICUT ENIM PATER SUSCITAT MORTUOS ET UIUIFICAT, SIC ET FILIUS QUOS UULT UIUIFICAT.

Si igitur haec omnia non nisi deo uero conueniunt, UERUS sine dubio et ille DEUS est, cui probatur omnia ista conuenire. nescio quid ad assignandam ueram filii deitatem hac luce clarius uel hac ratione 15 inueniri euidentius possit, quam ut nihil eorum quae proprie de deo patri competunt filio deesse monstretur. illud quoque sancti Esaiæ testimonium quo modo intellegant percontandi sunt, quo continetur: HAEC DICIT DOMINUS: FATIGATA EST AEGYPTUS ET NEGOTIATIO AETHIOPUM ET SABA UIRI EXCELSI AD TE TRANSGREDIENTUR, ET TUI 20 ARUNT SERUI, ET POST TE AMBULABUNT UINCTI CONPEDIBUS, ET ADORABUNT TE, ET IN TE PRECABUNTUR, QUIA IN TE DEUS EST, ET NON EST DEUS ALIUS PRAETER TE. diligenter, quaeso te, lector, attende: HAEC DICIT inquit DOMINUS. DOMINUM certe eum asserit esse, qui DICIT: nunc eum cui dicit quid intellegi uelint expecta: FATIGATA EST inquit 25 AEGYPTUS ET NEGOTIATIO AETHIOPUM ET SABAI UIRI EXCELSI AD TE TRANSGREDIUNTUR, et reliqua, QUONIAM IN TE DEUS EST. quis iste est, ad quem DOMINUS DICIT quod IN ipso sit DEUS, ne forte sanctus aliquis (sit) uel propheta: sed NON EST inquit DEUS ALIUS PRAETER TE. hoc ergo si nulli hominum competit, de filio dictum esse quis dubitet? et 30 si hoc de filio dictum est, uide utrumne uerum deum debeamus accipere, PRAETER quem DEUS ALIUS negatur existere. si autem hoc de patre dictum esse contendat, primum quisnam ille sit, a quo dicatur, quem dominum legimus, cogentur ostendere, deinde qua ratione de patre dici conueniat, QUONIAM IN TE DEUS EST, quo modo cum ipse pater deus 35 sit, IN ipso ESSE dicitur DEUS. aut si respondere uoluerint hoc de filio intellegendum esse, quod ipse deus sit, qui ESSE dicatur IN patre, et

1 cf. Num. xxiv 16, &c. 2 Luc. i 76 3 1 Cor. xv 28 4 Col. iii 11
5 cf. Ps. xxviii 3 apostulo *cod.* 6 1 Cor. ii 8 7 Symb. 8 Ioh. vi 29
9 Deut. xxxii 43 10 cf. Ioh. v 21 11 Ioh. v 21 13 cf. Ioh. xvii 3 15 hac
bis] haec *bis cod.* 16 propriae *cod.* 17 monstratur *cod.* 19 &c. Esai.
xlv 14 22 praecabuntur *cod.* 24, 25, 29 inquit *cod.* 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 32,
35 Esai. xlv 14 29 sit *om. cod.*

ipsum procul dubio deum esse dicturi sunt; et nihil refert utrum hoc de patre an de filio dictum intellegant, dum modo tam deum esse, qui in deo est, quam illum deum, in quo deus est, esse consentiant. nos uero ita illud intellegendum putamus, quod de sancto spiritu et filio et patre dicatur, id est quod sanctus spiritus sit, de quo dicitur: HAEC DICIT DOMINUS, et filius, de quo dicitur; IN TE DEUS EST, et pater, qui esse referatur in filio. illud quoque sancti Esaiae quo modo habebunt interrogandi sunt, quod positum est: ANTE ME NON FUIT ALIUS DEUS, ET POST ME NON ERIT. si de patre dictum esse contenderint, posteriorem illo deum affirmare non poterunt: ET POST ME inquit NON ERIT. si de filio, anteriorem alium non habebit: ANTE ME ENIM inquit NON FUIT ALIUS DEUS, et cogendi sunt aut deum penitus filium denegare, et impietatis suae magnitudinem prodere, aut patri consubstantium esse cognoscere. quocirca fas non sit alium anteriorem posterioremue deum dicere, quia diuinitatis patris ac filii una eademque et sempiterna substantia antea posteriorue non recipit.

6 Esai. xlv 14 7 esaie *cod* 8 habebant *cod.* quod] quo *cod.* 8, 11 Esai. xliii 10 11, 12 inquit *cod.* 13 impietati *cod.* 14 quod circa *cod.*