

HAEC FIDES EST: OBSERVATIONS ON THE TEXTUAL TRADITION OF PELAGIUS'S "LIBELLUS FIDEI"

For some reason, modern scholarship hasn't shown too much interest in Pelagius's last writing, his work of self-defence called the *Libellus fidei*. Mostly two other writings are used for historical, theological or literary investigations: the *Expositiones XIII Epistularum Pauli* and the letter *Ad Demetriadem*. Further, lots of ink have been spent in debates on the authenticity of some twenty writings supposedly by Pelagius.¹ The confession *Libellus fidei* however is usually mentioned only in passing or banished to the footnotes.²

The most obvious reason for this is the relatively small size of the confession. Of the three writings that are widely accepted as genuine works of Pelagius, the *Libellus fidei* is by far the smallest.³ The *Expositiones* for example occupy 537 pages in Souter's edition, while Pelagius's confession would take approximately 5-6 pages if printed in the same type-setting. It is probably felt that few words mean little content. Yet, if such a suspicion is accurate remains to be seen.

Another reason may be formed by Augustine's efforts to prove Pelagius's unreliability in general and that of the *Libellus fidei* in particular.⁴ The African bishop explicitly quotes two passages from this confession, one on baptism and another on divine aid for doing good works,⁵ arguing that the *Libellus fidei* is deliberately ambiguous and

¹ G. DE PLINVAL, 'Recherches sur l'œuvre littéraire de Pélage', in: *Revue de Philologie de Littérature et d'Histoire Anciennes* 60 (1934), p. 9-41. De Plinval's corpus of writings has been largely abandoned. R.F. Evans has defended the authenticity of four of these writings, but opinions differ on this subject. For a summary of the debate, see: S. THIER, *Kirche bei Pelagius* (Patristische Texte und Studiën 50), Berlin 1999, p. 22-30.

² E.g. R.F. EVANS, *Four Letters of Pelagius*, New York 1968, p. 123, n. 82. Evans might have taken some benefit from including the *Libellus fidei* in his research, for example in his paragraphs on the heavenly mansions (p. 59), the use of *adsumo, secundum* and *iuxta* (p. 64, 87), the gerund (p.106-7) and the mentioning of certain heretics (p. 114). Another example of a work ignoring the *Libellus fidei* largely, even though it might have added some relevant material, is: J. B. VALERO, *Las bases antropológicas de Pelagio en su tratado de las Expositiones*, Madrid 1980.

³ I.e. the *Libellus fidei*, the *Expositiones*, and *Ad Demetriadem*. Evans (ibid.) points to its size as the reason for leaving out the *Libellus fidei*.

⁴ Cf. especially AUGUSTINE, *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* and *De gestis Pelagii, passim*.

⁵ AUGUSTINE, *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali*, I, 35, 36 and II, 24; see below for a discussion of these quotations. I reckon that it was Augustine who introduced the title 'Libellus fidei'; see: *ibid*, I, 30, 33.

misleading.⁶ Such accusations, of course, do not contribute to the status of Pelagius's confession and their echoes can be heard up to modern times.⁷

There are however also reasons to give the *Libellus fidei* a more prominent place in Pelagius-research.

First, there is the aspect of genre. The *Libellus fidei* is a confession, systematically stating convictions concerning the faith. In doing so, it obtains a dogmatic focus. In this respect the *Libellus fidei* differs from the other undisputed works in genres: exegetical commentary as in the *Expositiones* and pastoral instruction as in *Ad Demetriadem*. If one sets out to reconstruct Pelagius's theology in its coherence, a confession seems to be a more fitting source than a letter with pastoral instructions intended for a young girl called Demetrias.⁸

Secondly, the *Libellus fidei* has explicitly been written to deal with the accusations cast in Pelagius's teeth and eventually leading to his conviction by Innocentius I. This cannot be said of any other extant writing, whether disputed or undisputed. The *Expositiones* were written before the Pelagian controversy broke out (between 405 and 410 A.D.). *Ad Demetriadem* (approximately 413 A.D.) shows some signs of dispute, but those are not the focus of this letter. The very fact that the *Libellus fidei* is the only extant writing in which Pelagius defends himself against the accusations of his opponents, should be enough to draw our critical but warm interest.

The third reason is that the *Libellus fidei* is Pelagius's last writing, as far as we know. It was written in 417 A.D., directed to pope Innocentius I but because of his death handed to his successor Zosimus. Its late date makes it indispensable for the chronological reconstruction of both the Pelagian controversy and the development of Pelagius's thought.

⁶ E.g. in *De gratia christi et de peccato originali: utquid ergo et hoc damnavit Pelagius, nisi ut catholica synodus falleretur* (II, 14), *absolutionem suam fallendo furatus est* (II, 15), *iam vero in libro fidei suae... multo evidentius se ipsum tegendo nudavit* (II, 24).

⁷ Cf. for example the opposite views of J. FERGUSON, *Pelagius: A Historical and Theological Study*, New York 1956, p. 99 and S. WENZLOWSKY, *Die Briefe der Päpste und die an sie gerichteten Schreiben*, (Bibliothek der Kirchenväter), Bd. 3., Kempten 1877, p. 191-2.

⁸ Another explicitly dogmatic source, though incomplete, is formed by the preserved Christological and Trinitarian fragments, which are supposed to belong to Pelagius's lost work *De fide trinitatis*.

In this article, I intend to draw attention to a fundamental aspect of the *Libellus fidei*: its textual restoration.⁹

Until the present day, no critical edition has appeared of this work.¹⁰ Since the invention of book printing at least fifteen editions were published, but most of them are dependent on each other, eventually going back to very few manuscripts.¹¹ Some editions tell us that the text *in vetere codice vaticano repertus est*, together with some letters of Zosimus.¹² This small basis contrasts with the almost

⁹ This preliminary survey is part of a dissertation I am preparing for the Vrije Universiteit in Amsterdam, under supervision of prof. dr. P.J.J. van Geest and prof.dr. A. van de Beek.

¹⁰ The lack of critical editions is a remarkable aspect of modern Pelagian-research. Only the *Expositiones* have been edited, by A. Souter, though his textcritical choices have not remained entirely undisputed. A critical edition of *Ad Demetriadem* remains in preparation for some two decades now.

¹¹ MIGNÉ's editions: PL 39, 2181-3 (pseudo-Augustine); PL 30, 181 (no text); PL 45, 1716-8; PL 48, 488-91 (pseudo-Jerome); PL 98, 1113-5 (*Libri Carolini*, III, 1).

Pseudo-Jerome: C. BARONIUS, *Annales ecclesiastici*, tom.V, Antwerpen 1596, p. 395-406 (ad anno 417); J. GARNIER, *Iuliani Eclanensis episcopi libellus fidei missus ad sedem apostolicam in causa Pelagianorum*, Paris 1673, p. 225-8; J.D. MANSI (ed.), *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio*, vol. IV, Graz 1960 (reprint, first edition Firenze 1757-1798), p. 355-8; D. VALLARSI, *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi operum mantissa*, tom. 11, pars 2, Venezia 1771, p. 202-5; C.G.F. WALCH (ed.), *Bibliotheca symbolica*, Lemgo 1770, p. 192-6; W. WALL (ed.), *Historia baptismi infantum*, vol. I, Bremen 1748, p. 372-91.

Pseudo-Augustine: *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis episcopi operum*, tom. V, Antwerpen 1700, Appendix IV, p. 274-5 (PL 39, 2181-3).

Libri Carolini (III, 1): H. BASTGEN, (ed.), *Libri Carolini sive Caroli Magni Capitulare de Imaginibus* (Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Legum sectio III, Concilia, Tomus II, Suppl.), Hannover 1924, 1979 (repr.), p. 106-8; A. FREEMAN (ed.), *Opus Caroli regis contra synodum* (*Libri Carolini*), (Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Concilia, Tomus II, Suppl. I), Hannover 1998, p. 336-40.

Combined or synoptic versions: A. and G.L. HAHN, (eds.), *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der alten Kirche*, Breslau 1897³, p. 288-92 (pseudo-Jerome with notes on variants of pseudo-Augustine and the *Libri Carolini*); J. LAUNOY, *De auctore vero professionis fidei, quae Pelagio, Hieronymo, Augustino tribui vulgo solet*, in: *Opera Omnia*, tom. 2, pars 2, Köln 1731 (first published in 1651), p. 306-8 (pseudo-Augustine and pseudo-Jerome synoptically).

Cf. also E. DEKKERS, *Clavis Patrum Latinorum* (Corpus Christianorum Series Latina), Turnhout 1995³, no. 731; J. MACHIELSEN, *Clavis Patristica Pseudepigraphorum Medii Aevi* (Corpus Christianorum Series Latina), Ia, no. 1021 and Iia, no. 1392; H.J. FREDE, *Kirchenschriftsteller. Verzeichnis und Sigel*, Freiburg 1981³, p. 478; F. STEGMÜLLER, *Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi*, tom. IV, Madrid 1954, no.6370.7; M. LAPIDGE, R.A. SHARPE, *A bibliography of Celtic-Latin literature 400-1200* (Dictionary of Medieval Latin from Celtic Sources, Ancillary Publications, 1), Dublin 1985, p. 5, no. 6.

¹² PL45, 1716; VALLARSI, *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi operum mantissa*, 11,2, p. 202; both referring to Baronius, who is not entirely clear on the subject (*Annales ecclesiastici*, V, p. 400-4). During a short visit to the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana in the early summer of 2007 I have not been able to trace a manuscript containing both

200 manuscripts listed by B. Lambert in his *Bibliotheca Hieronymiana Manuscripta*.¹³

Before we focus on the manuscript tradition, we will look at the confession from a redaction-critical point of view and consider the most important redactions: pseudo-Jerome, together with the version found in the *Libri Carolini*, and pseudo-Augustine. Also, we will compare them to some quotes from the *Libellus fidei* in other writings.

Pseudo-Jerome and the Libri Carolini

A remarkable characteristic of Pelagius's writings is that they survived only because the names of his most bitter opponents were placed above it: Augustine and Jerome.¹⁴ In fact, under the orthodox name of the last, the *Libellus fidei* acquired quite some fame during the Middle Ages.¹⁵ Its textual transmission is impressive. Only few of Jerome's writings are attested in as many manuscripts as his opponent's *Libellus fidei*. Even more ironically, Jerome's *Dialogus adversus pelagianorum* is transmitted in less than half as many manuscripts as Pelagius's confession.

Scholars usually refer to the pseudo-Jerome version of the *Libellus fidei*. The text of this tradition makes a genuine impression, ending with the promise to conform to the pope's judgement and expressing the hope that the writer's reputation be restored and that his opponents be exposed as heretics. Neither the pope nor the writer is mentioned by name, but it is clear that this passage fits the situation

the *Libellus fidei* and letters by Zosimus. The matter is of some importance, since a combination of writings of Pelagius and Zosimus suggests that the writer of the manuscript (or its *Vorlage*) was aware of the Pelagian origin of the *Libellus fidei*. In that case we are perhaps looking for a genuine, non-pseudepigraphic text, perhaps with Pelagius name above it. Cf. also GARNIER (PL 48, 488) and Severinus Binius's short introduction in MANSI (*Sacrorum conciliorum*, IV, p. 355), where a Vatican manuscript is mentioned but not Zosimus's letters.

¹³ B. LAMBERT (ed.), *Bibliotheca Hieronymiana Manuscripta* (Instrumenta Patristica IV), vol. IIIA, Steenbrugge 1970, no. 316.

¹⁴ An exception is the commentary, which was also transmitted in an anonymous version.

¹⁵ This fame is attested by the vast manuscript tradition and the many quotations from it by theological authorities. Remigius Lugdunensis, Peter Abelard, Peter Lombard, Bonaventura, Thomas Aquinas, William of Ockham, Duns Scotus and others quoted the confession as a patristic hall-mark of orthodoxy, not knowing whose work they were actually referring to. Peter Lombard even quotes a passage as if it were directed against Pelagius himself: *...quod Hieronymus in Explanatione fidei catholicae ad Damasum Papam, Ioviniani et Manichaei ac Pelagii errores collidens docet...*; PETER LOMBARD, *Sententiae* II, xxviii, 4. A similar harmonization is found in REMIGIUS, *De tribus epistolis liber*, 39; PL 121, 1053-4.

Pelagius was in after the condemnation by Innocentius I. It appears that in pseudo-Jerome we find a text that has not been revised, at least not thoroughly.

Within the pseudo-Jerome tradition we can distinguish two sub-traditions by their respective superscriptions. In some manuscripts the confession is directed to Augustine and Alypius – which is strange given the fact that the text itself addresses *te qui petri et fidem et sedem tenes*. This applies to neither of the two African bishops.¹⁶ In other manuscripts we find a more logical name above the text: pope Damasus, who indeed corresponded with Jerome several times.¹⁷

The different headings are of some importance. They may help to reconstruct the transmission of the pseudo-Jerome tradition, assuming that scribes were reluctant to change one address into another, which of course may have happened but not very often. From now on, I will indicate these sub-traditions as the A-family (Augustine and Alypius) and the D-family (Damasus). As we will see below, a selection of manuscripts shows that both traditions do have their own variants, though not many significant ones.¹⁸

The question remains which tradition is the oldest. The earliest manuscripts, dating from the beginning of the ninth century, are from the A-family.¹⁹ The D-family appears to be at least fifty years younger, with many witnesses from the tenth century onwards.²⁰

I suspect that some ninth century scribe or redactor has remarked the contradiction between the names of Augustine and Alypius on the one hand and the mentioning of a pope on the other, and decided to correct the apparent mistake in the conviction that Damasus was the most likely alternative. During the Carolingian Renaissance court-scholars like Alcuin revised the Bible and writings of the church fathers, aiming for widely accepted, authentic standard texts. Perhaps

¹⁶ Jerome's correspondence contains one genuine letter to Augustine and Alypius (*ep.* 143), which has a strongly anti-Pelagian character. In several codices this letter stands next to pseudo-Jerome's confession, probably because of the resemblance in address.

¹⁷ JEROME, *ep.* 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 35 and 36.

¹⁸ One significant example is the addition of *dicimus* in a textcritical key-passage (§17), a variant found only in manuscripts from the D-family.

¹⁹ *E.g.* Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Aug. Perg. 18, f. 16-16v; and Aug. Perg. 52, f. 48-49. One Paris manuscript of the same date mentions no specific address at all; Bibliothèque Nationale Lat. 1451, f 9-10.

²⁰ The earliest D-witness I have been able to find so far is an incomplete manuscript in The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, 130.E.6, f 6-7, dating from the second half of the ninth century.

the correction of *ad Augustinum et Alypium* into *ad Damasum* has taken place in these circles?

An indication that the *Libellus fidei* was highly regarded at Charlemagne's court, is its incorporation into at least two writings of his court-scholars.

The most important one is the *Libri Carolini*.²¹ Obviously, at that time no one was conscious of the Pelagian origin of the confession. It was accepted without question as an orthodox work of Jerome. The last paragraph, addressing the pope directly, has been reworked. Apparently it was not considered an essential part of the confession itself, but more a postscript that may be edited if necessary. The edited wording is adapted to its functioning in the *Libri Carolini*, but shows clear similarities to the original postscript:²²

Libellus fidei, 26

Haec fides est papa beatissime, quam in *catholica* ecclesia didicimus quamque semper tenuimus <et *tenuimus*>. In qua si minus perite aut parum caute aliquid forte positum est emendari cupimus a te, qui Petri et fidem et sedem tenes. Sin autem *haec* nostra *confessio* apostolatus tui iudicio conprobatur, quicumque me maculare voluerit, se inperitum vel malivolum, vel etiam non catholicum non me hereticum conprobat.

Libri Carolini, III, 1

Haec est catholicae traditionis fidei vera integritas, quam sincero corde credimus et fatemur et in hoc opere beati Hieronimi verbis expressam taxavimus. *Haec est vera fides, hanc confessionem* conservamus atque *tenemus*. Quam quisque inconvulse et intemperate custodierit, perpetuam salutem habebit.

The mentioning of a work *beati Hieronimi* suggests that the *Libri Carolini*-version belongs to the pseudo-Jerome tradition. A preliminary textual comparison based on several pseudo-Jerome manuscripts, confirms this suspicion. In fact, there are no unique variants at all to be found in the *Libri Carolini*, except for a few

²¹ *Libri Carolini*, III, 1. In the first version several other confessions were incorporated, but in an early stage their text was erased and replaced by the *Libellus fidei*. According to Freeman this was motivated by the campaign against adoptionism. FREEMAN, *opus caroli regis contra synodum*, p. 44, 336 (n. 3), 353, 355, 360. The original manuscript, though corrected, redacted and not preserved entirely, is kept in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Lat. 7207.

²² Parallels are indicated by italics. For the text of the *Libellus fidei*, see the work-edition below. The text of the *Libri Carolini* is taken from FREEMAN, *opus caroli regis contra synodum*, p. 340.

minor differences and of course the redacted postscript.²³ The *Libri Carolini*-text does not clearly concur with either the A- or the D-family, sometimes following readings of the former, at other times following the latter.

Though not fully independent because of its close relation to pseudo-Jerome, and despite of the redaction of the postscript, the *Libri Carolini* must be regarded as an important textual witness, if only for its early date.²⁴ A clear indication that the main body of the *Libellus fidei* has remained untouched, is the fact that the *filioque* has not been inserted into the text even though Charlemagne held the acknowledgment of it to be essential for salvation.²⁵

A second work related to Charlemagne's court, in which parts of the *Libellus fidei* are incorporated, is *De ordine baptismi* by Theodulf of Orléans.²⁶ Freeman argues that this Spaniard (760-821) is also the writer of the first version of the *Libri Carolini*.²⁷ Whether he also inserted the *Libellus fidei* into this work, is less clear. His quotations of Pelagius's confession in *De ordine baptismi* are somewhat loose and their textcritical weight must not be overestimated, but generally speaking they match with the *Libri Carolini* text, except for the addition of the *filioque*. Possibly, the redactors of the *Libri Carolini* used the same, or a similar, text as Theodulf did.

The earliest quotation of the pseudo-Jerome text dates from shortly before 780 A.D. Lullus of Mainz, who sent a profession of faith to Rome in order to receive the *pallium*. For the writing of it, he took inspiration from several other confessions, such as the Nicene Creed, the symbol of the Synod of Toledo (675 A.D.) and Pelagius's *Libellus fidei*.

²³ The only variants unique for the *Libri Carolini* compared to pseudo-Jerome, are three differences in word-order: *creata sunt omnia*: 3 1 2 (*Libellus fidei*, 2), *deitatis scilicet*: 2 1 (12) and *omnium potestate*: 2 1 (14), and a passage reading *mansuros* for *permansuros* (15). The differences among manuscripts of pseudo-Jerome are much more numerous and often more significant than these four variants. See also the work-edition below.

²⁴ The incorporation of the *Libellus fidei* can be dated 793 A.D.; FREEMAN, *opus caroli regis contra synodum*, p. 36-8, 44, 68.

²⁵ Cf. also the discussion in *Libri Carolini*, III, 3. The editions of Bastgen and Freeman, following the autograph, do not report any insertion of (*ex patre*) *et filio* (*procedentem*) into the text of the *Libellus fidei*. Migne however does read *et filio*, reprinting an earlier edition of Melchior Goldast. Footnote *a* explains this as a redactional intervention on the basis of III, 3 and 8; see PL 98, 1113. Besides, the insertion of the *filioque* is quite rare in manuscripts of the *Libellus fidei*. Among the manuscripts I have been able to consult, only one fifteenth century Paris manuscript adds *et filio*: Bibliothèque Mazarine, 575 (263), f. 63-64v.

²⁶ THEODULF OF ORLÉANS, *De ordine baptismi*, 7; PL 105, 227-8.

²⁷ FREEMAN, *opus caroli regis contra synodum*, p. 12-23

Lullus doesn't make his sources explicit, but W. Levison discovered that he took large parts from Pelagius's confession. He suggests that Lullus used a collection of symbols 'comparable with that of the Augiensis no. xviii of Karlsruhe of the early ninth century'.²⁸

Which textual tradition of it did Lullus use? Comparison shows that his quotations match pseudo-Jerome far better than pseudo-Augustine (see below), and that within pseudo-Jerome, Lullus's text is closest to the A-family.²⁹ It can therefore be used as an early pseudo-Jerome witness, for example in weighing differences with other textual traditions.

Pseudo-Augustine

The pseudo-Augustine version of the *Libellus fidei* is the other main textual tradition. It is found in a lot less manuscripts but still no less interesting. In most editions of Augustine's works it is found as *sermo 236 appendicis*.³⁰ It concerns a reworking of the text into a sermon and therefore shows evident signs of redaction, clearer than pseudo-Jerome and even the *Libri Carolini*-version.

In the seventeenth century, Jean Garnier suggested that this sermo actually wasn't the confession by Pelagius, but a very similar one by his companion Caelestius. In his *Dissertatio V* Garnier sets out to reconstruct Caelestius's text. In order to do so, he combines the pseudo-Augustine text with quotations of Caelestius found in Augustine's work.³¹ However, these two do not match. Moreover, quotations by Augustine of *Pelagius's* confession are found verbatim in pseudo-Augustine.

Garnier nevertheless published a synoptical overview of both Pelagius's and Caelestius's confession.³² The smaller differences in the text he interprets as signs of different authorship. However, according to some manuscripts of pseudo-Jerome those differences do not

²⁸ W. LEVISON, *England and the Continent in the Eighth Century. The Ford Lectures Delivered in the University of Oxford in the Hilary Term 1943*, Oxford 1946, 1956³, p. 233-40. The quotation is from p. 238. In fact, the indicated manuscript, which is some twenty to thirty years younger than Lullus's profession, is also the basis for our work-edition below.

²⁹ For this purpose, I have used the text as given by Levison. He admits not to have consulted the manuscript, which was not accessible because of the Second World War, but reconstructed it from other printed editions.

³⁰ This is the numbering of the Mauristes, the earlier numbering is *sermo de tempore* 191.

³¹ J. GARNIER, *Dissertatio V*; PL 48, 497-505.

³² *Ibid.*

appear at all. Textcritical comparison could have helped him avoid such pitfalls. In short Garniers reconstruction takes too much cutting and pasting to be credible. In modern scholarship his hypothesis is largely forgotten or ignored.

The reception of pseudo-Augustine is less impressive than that of pseudo-Jerome. The most famous use of the pseudo-Augustine version of the *Libellus fidei*, is when Sorbonne scholars in 1521 used it in their *Articulis* against Martin Luther, assuming that they were quoting an authentic sermon by Augustine.³³

It was the pseudo-Jerome version however that acquired quite some fame in Middle Ages scholasticism. Pseudo-Augustine possibly functioned more in (monasterial) liturgy. For example, there is a Dublin manuscript with sermons for the liturgical period between Easter and Pentecost, incorporating this version of the *Libellus fidei*.³⁴

The redactional development of pseudo-Augustine has probably taken place in two stages. First, the postscript was modified in a way similar to what happened with the *Libri Carolini*. Again the last paragraph was apparently considered an editable, non-essential part of the text. The purpose of this redaction was to make the confession suitable for reading in, probably, liturgical settings – for example in monasteries-as is indicated by a repeated *dilectissimi fratres*. This stage of the pseudo-Augustine version can be found in a Vatican manuscript from the ninth century: a text of the *Libellus fidei* with only a modified postscript.³⁵

The next stage is the addition of a prologue to the text. When this took place, and to what purpose, is not entirely clear. The Dublin manuscript already mentioned, written in the twelfth or thirteenth century, has the full text of pseudo-Augustine including the prologue. On this basis we may tentatively conclude that the addition of the prologue has taken place somewhere between the ninth and the twelfth century.

Whether the text *between* the prologue and the postscript has been redacted too, is another question. Often, scholars dealing with the *Libellus fidei* ignore the pseudo-Augustine version altogether. Taking the redactional changes and additions (postscript and prologue) into account, this may strike us as a logical choice. Since the pseudo-Jerome version appears much more authentic, this is the version usually referred to.

Nonetheless, it is thinkable that the main body of pseudo-Augustine's text has remained untouched, that is, not touched deliberately.

³³ LAUNOY, *De auctore vero professionis fidei*, p. 303-5.

³⁴ Dublin, Trinity College Library, 187, f.138-139 (no. 95), saec. xii-xiii.

³⁵ Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg. Lat.191, f49-49v and 51-52v.

To change the postscript serves a clear purpose. The reason why a prologue was added is less clear, but it suits the character of the text as it was at that time.

Between the prologue and the postscript, we find a text that shows significant differences with pseudo-Jerome. We will discuss some differences shortly below. But none of those variants arose evidently from the same motivation as the redaction of the postscript. They might as well be textual variants from a tradition that has developed independently from pseudo-Jerome for centuries.

One example may serve to illustrate this. In his *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali*, Augustine quotes the *Libellus fidei* three times.³⁶ The first and third quotation are in fact verbatim identical. It concerns a phrase focussing on baptism. When we compare Augustine's version of it to pseudo-Augustine and pseudo-Jerome, we find that they differ in only one word:³⁷

<i>De gratia Christi et de peccato originali</i> , I, 35; II, 24	<i>Libellus fidei</i> , 17 (pseudo-Augustine)	<i>Libellus fidei</i> , 17(pseudo-Jerome)
<i>Baptisma unum teneamus, quod isdem sacramenti verbis in infantibus, quibus etiam in maioribus dicimus esse celebrandum.</i>	<i>Baptisma unum teneamus, quod iisdem sacramenti verbis in infantibus, quibus etiam in maioribus dicimus esse celebrandum.</i>	<i>Baptisma unum teneamus, quod isdem sacramenti verbis in infantibus, quibus etiam in maioribus [asserimus] esse celebrandum.</i>

When we compare Augustine's quotation to the two main traditions of the *Libellus fidei*, it strikes that it matches the pseudo-Augustine version exactly. Pseudo-Jerome however, has two variants: one omitting any verb, one with *asserimus*. Augustine's quotation occurs twice and both are verbatim identical, and stems from a tradition that has come to us independently from the transmission of the *Libellus fidei*. When we use Augustine's quotation as a reference point for trying pseudo-Jerome and pseudo-Augustine, the last one turns out to be the best, at least in this case.³⁸

³⁶ AUGUSTINE, *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali*, I, 35, 36; II, 24.

³⁷ Cf. also a paraphrase of the same passage in *ibid.*, II, 1. The italics indicate parallels. The text of Augustine is taken from CSEL 42, p. 152-3, 182, the pseudo-Augustine text from PL 39, 2183, see also the work-edition below. The pseudo-Jerome text is taken from the same work-edition, of which the critical apparatus shows that some pseudo-Jerome manuscripts of the D-family add the word *asserimus* (indicated above between square brackets).

³⁸ Augustine's other quotation (*De gratia Christi*, I, 36) comes from *Libellus fidei* 25: *Liberum sic confitemur arbitrium, ut dicamus nos indigere dei semper auxilio.*

Until is proved otherwise, then, it seems wise to treat the main body of pseudo-Augustine as a source to reckon with for the textcritical reconstruction of the *Libellus fidei*, next to pseudo-Jerome and the *Libri Carolini*.

We now turn to a brief discussion of the prologue, the pseudo-Augustine variants and the postscript.

The opening sentences of the prologue were borrowed from an encyclical of the Synod of Sardica (343/4 A.D.), which reacted against spreading Arianism in the empire. Why especially this Sardica text was used, is not clear. The *Libellus fidei* criticizes Arianism, but also a whole range of other contemporary 'heresies'.

We now give the full text of the prologue of pseudo-Augustine's *Libellus fidei* and the relevant passage from the Sardica encyclical:³⁹

Libellus fidei

(pseudo-Augustine prologue)

Multa quidem et frequenter ausi sunt Ariani haeretici adversus servos Dei, qui fidem rectam et catholicam custodiunt, per adulterinam doctrinam asserere, et orthodoxos persequi tentaverunt. In tantum autem nunc exsurrexerunt contra fidem, ita ut multos ex vobis polluerint, et aures vestras commoverint, ut animas laniarent.

Sceleratae autem haeresis suae perfidiam tegunt: sed non diutius haec illis facere permissum est. Est enim

Synod of Sardica

Multa quidem et frequenter ausi sunt Arriani heretici adversus servos Dei, qui fidem rectam et catholicam custodiunt. Adulterinam <namque> doctrinam inserentes orthodoxos persequi temtaverunt. In tantum autem nunc exsurrexerunt contra fidem, <ut> non religiosam pietatem id clementissimorum imperatorum lateret... etc.

Remarkably, the sequence of these words is the same in every textual witness of pseudo-Jerome I have been able to consult, while in the traditions of Augustine and pseudo-Augustine the word-order differs from manuscript to manuscript.

³⁹ The italics indicate parallels. The text of pseudo-Augustine is taken from PL 39, 2181, but see also the work-edition below. The text of the Synod of Sardica is taken from A. FEDER'S edition in CSEL 65, p. 103-6. This edition prints several Greek and Latin versions of the text next to each other. I have followed the Latin of Hilarius of Poitiers, not because this is necessarily the most reliable one, but because it is closest to pseudo-Augustine's version of the *Libellus fidei*. Apparently, it is from this translation that the editor of pseudo-Jerome borrowed these words. According to Gelzer, Hilarius's translation is 'viel schlechter' than the other Latin translation that is taken from the collection of Dionisius Diaconus. Neither Gelzer nor Feder has recognized the borrowing of the Synod's letter for pseudo-Augustine's *sermo app.* 236. I. GELZER, 'Das Rundschreiben der Synode von Serdika', in: *Zeitschrift für neutestamentlichen Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 40 (1941), p. 12-3. Cf. also E. DEKKERS, *Clavis Patrum Latinorum* (Corpus Christianorum Series Latina), Turnhout 1995³, no. 448, and references.

gubernator ecclesiarum suarum Dominus, qui pro omnibus nobis mortem sustinuit.

Et ideo indeficiens nobis est oratio, dilectissimi fratres: primo, ut sancta Domini et catholica ecclesia dissensionibus omnibus et haeresibus carens, unitatem spiritus in vinculo charitatis ubique conservet, quam per fidem rectam et vitam immaculatam tenere, amplecti, servare, custodire omnibus invocantibus Dominum est quidem justum, praecipue tamen episcopis, qui ecclesiis praesunt; secundo, ut ecclesiae regula sanctaque patrum traditio atque iudicia in perpetuum firma solidaque permaneant. Est autem patrum nostrorum fides haec: (Credimus... etc.)

Now we turn to the brief discussion of some passages in which pseudo-Augustine differs from pseudo-Jerome. For each variant the question is: is this reading original, or inferior?

The first two passages run as follows:⁴⁰

Libellus fidei, 2, 6
(pseudo-Jerome)

Non factum aut adoptivum sed genitum et unius cum Patre substantiae, <quod Graeci dicunt homoousion> atque ita per omnia aequalem Deo Patri (...)

Non enim nomina tantummodo sed etiam nomina proprietates, id est personas vel ut Graeci exprimunt epostasis hoc est subsistentias, confitemur.

Libellus fidei, 2, 6
(pseudo-Augustine)

Non factum aut adoptivum sed genitum, unius cum Patre substantiae, quod Graeci dicunt homoousion, atque ita per omnia aequalem Deo Patri (...)

Non enim nomina tantummodo sed etiam nominam proprietates, id est, personas confitemur.

The omitted phrase *ut Graeci exprimunt epostasis hoc est subsistentias* is in every manuscript and printed edition of pseudo-Jerome I

⁴⁰ Italics indicate parallel wording. For pseudo-Jerome see the work-edition below. Pseudo-Augustine is taken from PL 39, 2181-3, but see also the work-edition.

have consulted. However, the similar phrase *quod Graeci dicunt homoousion*, found in pseudo-Augustine, is omitted in almost every pseudo-Jerome manuscript, though not in the printed editions. In short, the ambivalent textual evidence on both these sentences casts serious doubt on their authenticity.⁴¹

Another passage in paragraph 13:⁴²

Libellus fidei, 13 (pseudo-Jerome)

Mortuus <est> ergo Dei Filius secundum scripturas iuxta id quod mori poterat, resurrexit tertia die, ascendit in caelum, sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris, manente ea<dem> natura carnis in qua natus et passus est, in qua etiam resurrexit.

Libellus fidei, 13 (pseudo-Augustine)

Mortuus est ergo Dei Filius eadem natura carnis, in qua natus et passus est, in qua etiam resurrexit.

Is this an omission in pseudo-Augustine, or an expansion in pseudo-Jerome? Fact is that the omitted or added phrase resembles both the Apostolicum and the symbol of Nicea-Constantinople, which seem to have served roughly as models for Pelagius while he was designing his own confession. Second, the ascension to heaven is omitted altogether, so that the line of argument in pseudo-Augustine seems to ‘jump’ from Jesus’s death and resurrection to his return from heaven. Third, the text of pseudo-Jerome seems to echo Romans 8:34 and Pelagius’s commentary to that text.⁴³ Last, the words following this passage fit better to pseudo-Jerome than pseudo-Augustine.⁴⁴ I assume therefore that in this passage the text of pseudo-Augustine is inferior.

We find a similar problem in the next section:⁴⁵

⁴¹ Compare for details the critical apparatus of the work-edition below.

⁴² The italics indicate parallels. The text of pseudo-Jerome is taken from the work-edition below; pseudo-Augustine is taken from PL 39, 2182, but see also the work-edition.

⁴³ A. SOUTER, *Pelagius’s Expositions of Thirteen Epistles of St. Paul. II: Text* (Texts and Studies vol. IX), Cambridge 1926, Eugene 2004 (repr.), p. 70.

⁴⁴ I.e. *Non enim (!) exinanita est humanitatis substantia, sed glorificata in aeternum cum deitate mansura. Venturus est ad iudicium vivorum et mortuorum, ut et justos remuneret, et puniat peccatores* (PL 39, 2182). The word enim seems to refer to manente.

⁴⁵ The italics indicate parallels. The text of pseudo-Jerome is taken from the work-edition below; the text of pseudo-Augustine is taken from PL 39, 2182, but see also the work-edition.

Libellus fidei, 13-14 (pseudo-Jerome)

...sed glorificata et in aeternum cum deitate mansura. Accepta ergo a Patre omnium potestate quae in caelo sunt et in terra, venturus est ad iudicium vivorum ac mortuorum, ut et iustos remuneret et puniat peccatores.

Libellus fidei, 13-14 (pseudo-Augustine)

...sed glorificata in aeternum cum deitate mansura. Venturus est ad iudicium vivorum et mortuorum, ut et iustos remuneret et puniat peccatores.

It is difficult to judge whether this is an expansion or an omission. I reckon an unintended omission to be unlikely, since it concerns a complete ad neatly fitting phrase. Unintended omissions however tend to leave mutilated sentences.

Deliberate deleting is nevertheless possible. The phrase *accepta ergo a patre omnium potestate* echoes Matthew 28:18, but in a modified wording. As the Vulgate and the Old Latin read: *data est mihi omnes potestas*. Perhaps some scribe fell over this and removed the passage (which is in that case authentic)? On the other hand, the eight century quotation by Lullus Remigiensis leaves out these words, which suggests that they were missing in early pseudo-Jerome manuscripts as well (which indicates that these words not authentic).⁴⁶ In this case, arguments pro and contra weigh up to each other, leaving the final verdict over this passage yet to be reached.

In paragraph 18 we find a possible addition:⁴⁷

Libellus fidei, 18 (pseudo-Jerome)

Hominem, si post baptismum lapsus fuerit, per penitentiam credimus posse salvari.

Libellus fidei, 18 (pseudo-Augustine)

Hominem, si post baptismum lapsus fuerit, primo per reconciliationem, deinde per penitentiam credimus posse salvari.

As with the previous two, I have found this variant in no other textual tradition than pseudo-Augustine. And again it is difficult to judge whether it was added, or removed in some early stage of transmission of pseudo-Jerome. Since the distinction between reconciliation and penitence was no matter of dispute during the Pelagian controversy, and since Pelagius seemed anxious not to spend too many words on the matter, I find it hard to escape the impression that the phrase was inserted later, in order to specify its meaning.

⁴⁶ See above for a discussion of Lullus's quotations.

⁴⁷ The italics indicate parallels. The text of pseudo-Jerome is taken from the work-edition below; the text of pseudo-Augustine is taken from PL 39, 2183.

All together, some variants of pseudo-Augustine may be authentic, while others appear additions or omissions. As is the case with other traditions, also pseudo-Augustine remains to be treated with caution.

Last, we take a look at the closing paragraph, which has been subject to redactional changes. It's text is as follows, compared to pseudo-Jerome:⁴⁸

Libellus fidei, 26 (pseudo-Jerome)

Haec fides est papa beatissime, quam in catholica ecclesia didicimus quamque semper tenuimus <et tenemus>. In qua si minus perite aut parum caute aliquid forte positum est emendari cupimus a te, qui Petri et fidem et sedem tenes. Sin autem haec nostra confessio apostolatus tui iudicio conprobatur, quicumque me maculare voluerit, se inperitum vel malivolum, vel etiam non catholicum non me hereticum conprobabit.

Libellus fidei, 26 (pseudo Augustine)

Haec est fides, dilectissimi fratres, quam in catholica didicimus ecclesia, quamque semper tenuimus et tenemus, quam credimus et a vestra bonitate deinceps posse teneri.

What strikes most, is that the original postscript has been abridged by more than a half. Only the first sentence of the original was fit to survive, the passage on heresy and papal approval was not relevant in the new context and therefore deleted. One compact phrase ends the 'sermon'.

The fact that *et tenemus* is found in the pseudo-Augustine version, is important for textcritical reasons. Until now, I have not found these words in any manuscript of the pseudo-Jerome tradition. They are however in the printed editions I consulted. To conclude, these words probably belong to the original, but were dropped out in a later stage of pseudo-Jerome's textual transmission.⁴⁹

The textual transmission

The following overview roughly sketches the textual transmission of the *Libellus fidei*, based on the above analysis. The overview


⁴⁸ The italics indicate parallels. The text of pseudo-Jerome is taken from the work-edition below; the text of pseudo-Augustine is taken from PL 39, 2183, but see also the work-edition..

⁴⁹ Cf. also the passage above on the postscript of the *Libri Carolini*, where *atque tenemus* is possibly a remnant of the same text. All this together makes it defensible to incorporate *et tenemus* between sharp brackets in the work-edition below.

is provisional, illustrating the evidence seen so far in manuscript and printed edition. For a full stemma more research is necessary. Only a minority of the at least 200 manuscripts has been consulted.

In the overview, the capitalized text indicates the main traditions. The dotted lines pointing to names in italics, indicate quotations from the *Libellus fidei*. These reveal something about the reception of Pelagius's confession. After Augustine, who was quite aware of who he was quoting, several early and later mediaeval writers used the *Libellus fidei* assuming that it was written by Jerome or Augustine.

The quotations also have some textcritical relevance. Especially the quotations by Augustine, Lullus and the writers of the *Libri Carolini* antedate the earliest extant manuscripts of the *Libellus fidei*. Early quotations, especially the longer and unedited ones, supplement our findings from the manuscript tradition and are for that reason incorporated into the following overview.



Printed editions

Since the invention of book-printing, several editions of the *Libellus fidei* have appeared. These editions have been very different in scope. From the collections of works of Jerome and Augustine to collected symbols, from discussions on the *Libellus fidei* itself to a historical survey of infant baptism.⁵⁰

Today, Migne's reprints are the most commonly used. For this reason, I decided to incorporate them in my work-edition of the *Libellus fidei* below by their volume-number (*viz.* PL39, PL45 and PL48), and not by the name of their sources. I will do the same in the following discussion of the editions.

Generally speaking, the printed editions I have consulted form a text group of their own. In several readings, they resemble each other and differ from most of the consulted manuscripts. First, there are changes in word order. The editions for example read unanimously *in christo hominem confitetur* in paragraph 9 and *confiteri necesse est* in paragraph 12. Secondly, the editions add words and phrases, like (*duas*) *esse* in paragraph 9 and *et tenemus* in paragraph 26.

In a number of cases the printed editions concur with other traditions, like pseudo-Augustine, *e.g.* the addition of *quod Graeci dicunt homoousion* in paragraph 2.⁵¹ Also, a group of manuscripts of Italian origin shares some variants, for example the addition of *confitemur et* in paragraph 15. This sheds some light on the provenance of the manuscript or the editions are based upon: they probably are of Italian origin. This confirms what we have already discussed above, that some editions refer to an ancient Vatican manuscript.

Though the printed editions seem to go back to very few, closely related manuscripts, some resemble each other more than others.

Volume 48 of the *Patrologia Latina*, for example, is a reprint of Garnier's edition of Marius Mercator.⁵² The edition omits the phrase *non (...) quae adsumpsit sed secundum illam*, in paragraph 12. In 1673 Garnier published an edition of a confession similar to the *Libellus fidei*, attributed by him to Julianus of Eclanum. In this work he also included a text of Pelagius's confession. Remarkably, this 1673-edition leaves

⁵⁰ For a list of printed editions, see above, note 11.

⁵¹ Of the nineteen consulted manuscripts of pseudo-Jerome, I have found this variant only in Utrecht, University Library, 4.J.19 (106), f.61a-64a (saec. xv, D-family). See also the discussion in the above paragraph on pseudo-Augustine.

⁵² Within this work, the text of the *Libellus fidei* is found in *Dissertatio V*. After the text of Pelagius, Garnier sets out to reconstruct Caelestius's *Libellus fidei* based on pseudo-Augustine (PL 48, 497-505). The weaknesses of his approach have been discussed above.

out the same phrase, only maintaining the preceding *non* and thereby creating an opposite meaning.

Apart from this editorial mistake and a somewhat different paragraph division, 1673-edition concurs with Garnier's text as we now find it in Migne. Therefore, in the work-edition below of these two only PL 48 will be incorporated.

Two other editions closely related to each other, are those of Hahn and Walch, both collections of symbols. Hahn probably used the text of Walch for his edition, as his text matches exactly with that of Walch. He also copied the omission of *non enim aliter confiteri possumus eternum patrem nisi confiteamur etiam coeternum filium* in paragraph 3. The omission is caused by the homoioteleuton *filium-filium* and found only in these two editions.

This indicates that Hahn's edition does not offer a fully reliable text, despite of its semi-critical reputation deserved by the footnotes with variants from the *Libri Carolini* and pseudo-Augustine. Since Hahn's edition is used more widely than Walch's, I will refer also to him in the critical work-text below.

Another coherent group is formed by PL 45, Baronius and Mansi. PL 45 is referred to more often than other versions, combining the accessibility of the *Patrologia Latina* series with a rather reliable text (Garnier being too deviant, Hahn being less accessible). Baronius has of course been of foundational importance with his *Annales ecclesiastici*, but the quality of his work has later been criticized. It is referred to in several other editions, among which PL 45 and PL 48. Mansi offers a collection of documents related to councils and synods. His text of the *Libellus fidei* has been translated into German by Wenzlowsky.⁵³

Their texts resemble each other, for example in paragraph 6 where they read *confutantes* instead of *confundentes*, and *confitemur* instead of *fatemur*. The only main difference is that for some reason, Baronius and Mansi omit the phrase *tres personas expressas sub proprietate* in paragraph 6, while PL 45 doesn't.⁵⁴

Vallarsi and Wall do not clearly belong to a group, at some places their readings concur, though seldom exclusively. Vallarsi published an edition of Jerome's work that was formerly widely used.

⁵³ WENZLOWSKY, *Die Briefe der Päpste, III*, p. 191-2.

⁵⁴ Whether the omission occurs already in a manuscript, or while editing the text for print, is not entirely clear. In the former case, PL 45 is possibly based on another manuscript than Baronius and Mansi. In the latter case, the Mauristes, on whose work PL 45 is based, have either remarked and corrected the omission of Baronius, or simply did a better job copying the same manuscript. I suspect that the omission has occurred while editing the text for print.

Wall focussed on the history of infant baptism, printing the *Libellus fidei* for its remarks on baptism. His edition is well annotated and comes with an English translation.

To conclude, the printed editions go back to few, closely related manuscripts. Apparently no textcritical comparisons have been made. Several editions mistakenly omit entire phrases (Walch, Hahn, Baronius, Mansi, Garnier, PL 48). Either they used unreliable sources, or their redaction and print setting happened uncarefully. It is striking that the edition that appears to be the most scientific, Hahn, is not reliable itself in its text. All together, Wall, Vallarsi en PL 45 seem to make the best impression, but of these only the last is easily and widely accessible.

Consulted manuscripts

For the purpose of this survey, I have consulted a selection of the large amount of manuscripts containing some version of the *Libellus fidei*.⁵⁵ I would like to emphasize that the text given below must therefore not be seen as a definitive critical edition but as a work-edition, intended to compare printed editions and manuscript evidence and trace the most important textcritical points of discussion.

For the selection of the manuscripts, I have used three criteria. First, the selection is focussed mainly on manuscripts of Italian and Northern French provenance. Second, the manuscripts date from a period ranging from the ninth to the fifteenth century. Third, I have attempted to find witnesses from all textual traditions: pseudo-Jerome (A- and D-family) and pseudo-Augustine. For reasons of brevity, only the most typical manuscripts will be displayed separately in the work-edition.⁵⁶

⁵⁵ For the heuristics, Lambert's overview (*Bibliotheca Hieronymiana Manuscripta*, IIIA, no. 316) has been taken as a starting point. A few things however must be kept in mind. First, his list of manuscripts is based on catalogues and not on original manuscripts; second, it is incomplete as it misses the codices that can be found in catalogues published after 1970; and third, Lambert focusses on the pseudo-Jerome tradition only. Some corrections and additions are listed in J. DIVJAK, F. RÖMER, 'Ergänzungen zur Bibliotheca Hieronymiana Manuscripta (1)', in: *Scriptorium* 30 (1976), p. 105. Pseudo-Augustine is covered by HÜWA: *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Werke des heiligen Augustinus*, Veröffentlichungen der Kommission zur Herausgabe des Corpus der lateinischen Kirchenväter, vol i-, Wien 1969-. A problem is that HÜWA is still incomplete, as for example volumes on France have not yet appeared.

⁵⁶ The consulted manuscripts are listed below. Those marked with an * are incorporated into the work-edition:

*Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 575 (263), f. 63-64v (saec. xv, pseudo-Jerome, A-family);

*Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 1451, f. 9-10 (saec. ix, pseudo-Jerome, no A/D-family);

*Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 1867, f. 115-116 (saec. ix, pseudo-Jerome, A-family);

As for their provenance, France and Italy are areas of some significance. Northern France has a rich history of textual transmission, with important scriptoria in for example Corbie, Tours and Saint-Germain-des-Prés. The provenance of manuscripts now in French public libraries is not always clear. Many manuscripts from local monasteries and cathedrals were confiscated during the French Revolution. The information on their origin often doesn't reach back further than what monastery or cathedral it originates from.

Italy has a manuscript tradition of its own.⁵⁷ In the *Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana* several ancient codices are preserved. As already indicated, the printed editions appear to have a connection with Italian traditions. Further, there is a group of Italian manuscripts that has a few specific variants in common. For example, in the last paragraph

Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 1896, f. 107-108 (saec. xiv, pseudo-Jerome, D-family);

Alençon, Bibliothèque Municipale, 9, f. 2-3 (saec. xiii, pseudo-Jerome, D-family);
Angers, Bibliothèque Municipale, 154 (146), f. 58v-59v (saec. xii, pseudo-Jerome, A-family);

Reims, Bibliothèque Municipale, 386 (E.248), f. 36-36v (saec. xii, pseudo-Jerome, A-family);

*Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Aug. Perg. 18, f. 16-16v (saec. ix, pseudo-Jerome, A-family);

Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Aug. Perg. 52, f. 48-49 (saec. ix, pseudo-Jerome, A-family);

Vatican City, B.A.V., Palat. Lat. 186, f. 1-3v (saec. ix, pseudo-Jerome, no A/D-family);

*Vatican City, B.A.V., Reg. Lat. 191, 49-49v, 51-52v, (saec. ix, pseudo-Augustine);
Vatican City, B.A.V., Reg. Lat. 192, f. 131-131v (saec. xii, pseudo-Jerome, D-family);

*Vatican City, B.A.V., Vat. Lat. 341, f. 49-50 (saec. x-xi, pseudo-Jerome, A-family);
Vatican City, B.A.V., Vat. Lat. 355, f. 73-74v (saec. ix-x, pseudo-Jerome, A-family);

Vatican City, B.A.V., Vat. Lat. 650, f. 37v-38v (saec. x, pseudo-Jerome, A-family);
Belluno, Biblioteca Lolliniana, 3, f. 43-44 (saec. xv, pseudo-Jerome, D-family);

*Den Haag, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, 130.E.6, f. 6-7 (saec. ix, pseudo-Jerome, D-family);

*Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Voss. Lat. F29, f. 2v-3v (saec. xii, pseudo-Jerome, D-family)

Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Periz. F.36, f. 81-82v (saec. xv, pseudo-Jerome, D-family)

*Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek, 4.J.19 (106), f. 61a-64a (saec. xv, pseudo-Jerome, D-family)

⁵⁷ It is perhaps also worth remarking that in Italy the *Libellus fidei* was first read, since it was sent to Rome. There Pelagius had worked for years and apparently gained support, which is indicated at least by the resignation of eighteen bishops refusing to subscribe Zosimus's *Epistola Tractoria* in which Pelagius was condemned. Whether this means that Italian textual traditions should be taken more seriously than others, is of course another question.

they read *culpare* and *catholico nomine* instead of *maculare* and *catholicum non me*.⁵⁸

Today, most manuscripts are found in the Paris and Vatican libraries, followed by those of Milan, London and Firenze. Further, there are manuscripts in libraries all over Western Europe. By my knowledge, the *Libellus fidei*, although written from Jerusalem, has not entered the Greek world, for example in translated form.

It is striking that manuscripts with pseudo-Jerome texts are numerous, while pseudo-Augustine is quite seldom. For this survey, I have not yet been able to find more than two and consult more than one pseudo-Augustine manuscript. In the work-edition below I will exhibit the consulted Vatican manuscript together with the printed editions of Migne (based on the Benedictine edition of Augustine's works, indicated in the critical apparatus as *PL39*) and Launoy (*A^{Lau}*).

The following work-edition of the *Libellus fidei* is based on the Aug. Perg. 18 from the Badische Landesbibliothek in Karlsruhe, dating from the beginning of the ninth century. It is one of the oldest manuscripts consulted, a famous one too, finding its origin in the reputed monastery of Reichenau and, concerning the *Libellus fidei*, offering an overall convincing text of the pseudo-Jerome tradition (in this case, the A-family). Pseudo-Jerome includes a postscript that is probably original and un-redacted, and deserves therefore, at least in the choice of a basis-text, priority over pseudo-Augustine.

At the end of the work-edition a collation of the pseudo-Augustine prologue and postscript will be displayed as well, based on the text of Migne, which concurs far better with the consulted manuscript than Launoy. The manuscript itself does not include the prologue, and can therefore not serve as a basis for the collation.

The same is done with the postscript as redacted in the *Libri Carolini*, based on Freeman's edition.

We now turn to the discussion of the displayed manuscripts. Unless indicated otherwise, the originals have been consulted. The presented literature is not exhaustive but offers a starting point for further investigation. The manuscripts are codified as follows:⁵⁹ first a serial number (of applicable), then a capital letter indicating the main tradition, next a letter indicating the sub-tradition (if applicable), and lastly a numbers roughly indicating the century. For example, *2Ha9* means:

⁵⁸ *I.e.* the Vaticana Latina 341 and 650 and the Paris Bibliothèque Mazarine, 575 (263). Cf. also the similar though not identical text of the quotations in THOMAS AQUINAS, *Summa theologiae*, II, ii, 11.2 and WILLIAM OF OCKHAM, *Dialogus*, I, iii, 50; I, vii, 71.

⁵⁹ This system is loosely inspired by the codification of Qumran-manuscripts.

- 2 the serial number
H pseudo-Jerome (A stands for pseudo-Augustine)
a A-family (d stands for D-family, x for texts without addressee)
 9 ninth century

Similarly, *Hx9* is a pseudo-Jerome without addressee, thus not belonging to the D- or A tradition, stemming from the ninth century; while *A9* is a pseudo-Augustine manuscript from the ninth century.

A9 Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Reg.Lat. 191, f.49-49^v, 51-52^v

Date: saec. ix-x (Carey: 800-825)

Provenance: Reims

Family: pseudo-Augustine

Parchment, 105+V ff., 175×125 mm, written in single column. The manuscript contains various works on ecclesiastical offices, grace, sin, free will and predestination, penitence, Trinitarian dogma, etc.

Pelagius's confession is incorporated in the early, short, pseudo-Augustine redaction. The catalogue (p. 453) refers to PL 39, 2181-2183, which indicates that the text has been recognized as pseudo-Augustinian, but nevertheless misinterprets the title above the text. The words *ex libro s(an)c(t)i aug(ustini)* are mistakenly suggested to refer to Augustine's quotations in *De gratia christi*. An easier and more evident solution would be that the given text is taken from a manuscript with works of Augustine, to whom it is therefore ascribed.

Significantly, it is immediately followed by a part of a treatise by Hincmar, archbishop of Reims (see PL 125, 63-64), explaining the *libero arbitrio*, already mentioned in the last paragraphs of the *Libellus fidei*, in a Augustinian sense, *viz.* that it was before the fall that man possessed this free will.

The codex contains several penitential texts, among which a list of penitential questions integrated into liturgical ordines, connected to the penitential of Halitgar of Cambrai (before 830). According to Gaastra, this type of penitentials began to appear from the late ninth century onwards (p. 87-8), which fits the date indicated by the catalogue (saec. ix-x, Carey however estimated 800-825, p. 57). Overall, free will and predestination together with sin and penance seem to form the themes of this small manuscript.

The version of the *Libellus fidei* in Reg. Lat. 191 attests an early redaction of pseudo-Augustine, without the prologue by

which it has become known in the printed editions (PL 39 and Launoy). The variants typical of pseudo-Augustine (see the discussion above), are all found in this manuscript.

The text of Reg. Lat. 191 is much closer to PL 39 (*i.e.* the Benedictine edition) than to the version of Launoy, in which second person plurals (*vobis, vestras*) have turned into first person plurals (*nobis, nostras*). The overall impression is that the Vatican manuscript confirms the quality of Migne's version of the text. From this we may infer that also Migne's version of the prologue, not included in the manuscript, is to be regarded the better one, at least for now.

Literature: F.M. CAREY, 'The Scriptorium of Reims during the Archbishopric of Hincmar', in: *Classical and Mediaeval Studies in Honor of Edward Kennard Rand*, New York 1938, p. 41-60; A. CERLINI, 'Una scuola Francesi di tachigrafi nel secolo IX', in: *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, vol. VI: Paleografia, Bibliografia, Varia (Studi e Testi 126), Città del Vaticano 1946, p. 122-46; A.H. GAASTRA, 'Penance and the Law: the Penitential Canons of the *Collection in Nine Books*', in: *Early Medieval Europe* 14, I (2006), p. 85-102; M. OBERLEITNER, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Werke des heiligen Augustinus*, Bd. I/1: Italiën (Sitzungsberichte 263), Wien 1969, p. 389; *idem*, Bd. I/2: Italiën (Sitzungsberichte 267), Wien 1970, p. 338; A. WILMART, *Codices Reginensis Latini*, tom. I: Codices 1-250, Città del Vaticano 1937, p. 452-8.

Hx9 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 1451, f. 9-10

Date: 800-816

Provenance: Saint-Maur-des-Fossés

Family: pseudo-Jerome (no addressee indicated)

Parchment, 108 ff., 325×235 mm., written in single column. The manuscript is a collection of confessions, letters, a papal list, council-texts and canons. It contains the *collectio canonum* by Dionysius Exiguus († 540), in the recension of Saint-Maur-des-Fossés, from where this manuscript originates. Other witnesses of this collection are the Vatican Reg. Lat. 1127 and The Hague, Museum Meermannno, 10B4. Most scholars believe that the Paris and Vatican manuscripts are copies of the Meer-manno-codex (see Boeren and Levison for references). Unfortunately, the first part of the Dutch manuscript has been lost, including the *Libellus fidei*. I have not yet been able to consult the Vatican witness. The three manuscripts are assumed to have their origin in an archetype from about 600 A.D.

By my knowledge, *Hx9* is, together with *IHa9* (see below), the oldest manuscript containing the *Libellus fidei* in its pseudo-Jerome version. Opinions differ somewhat on the exact dating (some argue 796, Rand estimates a careful ‘before 816’), which is based on a list of popes on f. 6v-7. Its original provenance is disputed. Also it has been suggested that *Hx9* was written in Tours, but it was again Rand who contested that opinion.

In the margin at the beginning of our confession we find written in a late hand: *Pelagij, non Hiernonymj*. The text itself contains many minor and major corrections, especially on folio 9v, apparently most of them made by the writer itself. I have tried to identify the original wording of some passages written *in rasura* by using ultra violet light, though without result. There are also some small variant readings, sometimes concurring with *Hd9* (see below), sometimes without parallel in other manuscripts or printed editions. Since many of these variants are added, changed or removed during the correcting of the text, I am inclined to doubt their value. They are perhaps more likely to be attributed to an uncareful scribe than to some unique textual tradition.

A few variants and unclear passages are not or only briefly mentioned in the work-edition below because of their complexity:

§2: lacuna between *esse* and *confitemur*, the original text is illegible.

§6: *nomen vel* in stead of *nominum*. Does the underlining indicate a correction, and if so, what kind of correction?

§6: omission of *epostasis*, possibly as a result of parablepsis with *hoc est*.

§10: the somewhat puzzling phrase *quod nulla [.....] haeresis profiteri videatur a confusione utraque...*, already deviant from the majority reading, has been corrected into *quod non nulla [.....] haeresis profiteri videatur quod confusione utraque et...* The lacuna probably once contained the word *umquam*, as in other manuscripts.

§12: instead of *tota trinitas quam* the text reads: *tota trinitas^{te} quam*. The text however difficult to decipher and the meaning of the underlining is unclear.

§25: *et peccare et non peccare posse* (a specifically Pelagian phrase) is written *in rasura*. The same counts for *et fidem et sedem tenes*. The original text is illegible.

Literature: P.C. BOEREN, *Catalogus van de handschriften van het Rijksmuseum Meermanno-Westreenianum*, Den Haag 1979, p. 29-31; K. KÜNSTLE, *Eine Bibliothek der Symbole und Theologischer Traktate (Forschungen zur christlichen Literatur - und Dogmeri geschichte, I, 4)*, Mainz 1900, p. 35-42, 119-21. LAMBERT, *Bibliotheca Hieronymiana Manuscripta*, IIIA, p. 85; W. LEVISON, *Handschriften des Museum Meermanno-Westreenianum im Haag* (Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für ältere deutsche Geschichtskunde 38), Hannover/Leipzig 1913, p. 513-18; E.A. LOWE, *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, vol. V, Oxford 1950, p. 4-5, nr. 528; *idem*, *Supplement*, Oxford 1970, p. 53; F. MAASSEN, *Geschichte der Quellen und der Literatur des canonischen Rechts*, Bd. I, Gratz 1870, p. 613-24; E.K. RAND, 'A Supplement on Dodaldus', in: *Speculum* (1931), p. 587-99; *Bibliothèque Nationale Catalogue Général des Manuscrits Latins*, vol. II, Paris 1940, p. 7.

1Ha9 Karlsruhe, Badische Landesbibliothek, Aug. Perg. 18, f. 16-16^v

Date: first quarter of the ninth century (Bischoff), ca. 806 (Holder), 802-806 (Künstle)

Provenance: Reichenau

Family: pseudo-Jerome, A-family

Parchment, 90 ff., 418×294 mm., written in two columns. Aug. Perg. 18 is a well-known collection of symbols, dating from the early church up to Charlemagne. I have consulted the manuscript from a photographic colour-reproduction.

The codex is mentioned already in the Reichenauer catalogue from 821/822. The text, written by librarian Reginbert von Reichenau in a clear Carolingian minuscule, contains several small corrections, mostly forgotten letters of adaptations in spelling. These appear to have been placed by the scribe himself, except for at least one correction: the addition of (*sed*) *ITA* in §5, the colour of the ink and the capital writing clearly differing from the other corrections. In §14 the text appears to read...*sint et in terra*, which is clearly a mistake and not attested anywhere else. Probably the *u* and the *n* of *sunt* have collided into *in*. The text does not give any further remarkable variants. By my knowledge, *1Ha9* is, together with *Hx9*, the oldest textual witness of pseudo-Jerome. Künstle (p. 40) argues that *Hx9* is dependent *1Ha9*, but this is not quite confirmed by textual comparison; see the critical apparatus below. Its provenance from

Reichenau, like Sankt Gallen one of the most prominent monasteries of the Carolingian age, adds some to its status. Souter's explorations into the textual transmission of Pelagius's *Expositiones* led to another Karlsruhe manuscript from Reichenau, the monastery of which is supposed to have had connections with Italian scriptoria. Being one of the oldest manuscripts, copied much more careful than *Hx9*, and of such reliable origin, *IHa9* seems the most likely candidate to be used as the basis for a critical work-edition.

Literature: B. BISCHOFF, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen)*, (Veröffentlichungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften), Teil I, Wiesbaden 1998, p. 333, no. 1590; K. KÜNSTLE, *Eine Bibliothek der Symbole und Theologischer Traktate* (Forschungen zur christlichen Litteratur- und Dogmengeschichte, I, 4), Mainz 1900; LAMBERT, *Bibliotheca Hieronymiana Manuscripta*, IIIA, p. 83; A. HOLDER (ed.), *Die Reichenauer Handschriften* (Die Handschriften der Badischen Landesbibliothek in Karlsruhe 5), Bd. 1, Leipzig 1906, Wiesbaden 1970 (repr.), p. 58-69.

2Ha9 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Lat. 1867, f. 115-116

Date: saec. ix

Provenance: uncertain

Family: A

Parchment, 210 ff., 270×220 mm., written in single column. The manuscript contains letters by, ascribed to or directed to Jerome. Such collections appear more and more frequently during the Middle Ages and form the bulk of the textual witnesses of the *Libellus fidei* in the fifteenth century.

Left of the incipit *Credimus...* stands the number 24. This numbering runs only from 22 to 25. The part before it has been written by another hand and with larger, red initials. In the part after it the lay-out changes gradually. Since the size of parchment, the colour of the ink and the distribution of text space remain fairly constant, I assume that the codex has not been assembled from different parts but rather was copied by different scribes. Perhaps the fragmented numbering is derived from a source-manuscript? Studies by palaeographical experts may shed more light on this. The catalogue record is very brief and not much literature has appeared on this manuscript.

The text of the *Libellus fidei* does at any rate not resemble the Italian text types I have seen so far. However, it cannot be identified unequivocally with either the Karlsruhe or the

Northern French manuscripts either, concurring at one place with the former and at the other with the latter.

There are no significant variants to be found in this text, compared to other pseudo-Jerome witnesses.

Literature: LAMBERT, *Bibliotheca Hieronymiana Manuscripta*, IIIA, p. 85; *Bibliothèque Nationale Catalogue Général des Manuscrits Latins*, vol. II, Paris 1940, p. 207.

Ha10 Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vat. Lat. 341, f. 49-50

Date: saec. x-xi

Provenance: Italy?

Family: pseudo-Jerome, A-family

Parchment, 219+II ff., 385×267 mm, written in two columns. The codex contains works by, ascribed to or directed to Jerome, some excerpts and lists of emperors and popes.

The provenance is not indicated in the catalogue, but the text type of the *Libellus fidei* points to Italy. It is similar to that of two other manuscripts from this region, Vat. Lat. 650 and Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine 575 (see below). Typical variants of these are *culpare* and *catholico nomine* in paragraph 26. Since not all consulted Italian manuscripts have these variants, apparently we are dealing with some sub-tradition.

Vat. Lat. 341 and 650 are closely related. Apart from a few minor differences, their text is identical. Both omit, for example, *invisibilis ut pater* in paragraph 12, apparently due to a homoioteleuton. The question arises whether the text in manuscript 341 (saec. x-xi) was directly copied from 650 (saec. x). The answer must be negative, as can be inferred from a similar fault on folio 49. There, the scribe of manuscript 341 has copied the passage running from *et qui semper* (paragraph 3) to *de una persona dicitur* (5) twice, caused by the homoioteleuton *dicitur – dicitur*. The double passage has been crossed out by the scribe. If 650 were the source for 341, we would expect both *dicitur*'s to stand at the end of a line, provoking the scribal error in 341. This, however, is not the case. In Vat. Lat. 341 the *Libellus fidei* is preceded by a genuine letter of Jerome addressed, like the confession itself, to Augustine and Alypius (*ep.* 143). As in other collections of Jerome's letters, the two writings probably stand next to each other because of their identical addressee.

Literature: B. Lambert, *Bibliotheca Hieronymiana Manuscripta*, III A, p. 87; A. REIFFERSCHIED, *Die römischen Bibliotheken* (Sitzungsberichte 63), Wien 1869, p. 686-90; M. VATTASSO, P.F. de'Cavalieri, *Codices Vaticani Latini*, tom. I: Codices 1-678, Roma 1902, p. 243-5.

Hal5 Paris, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 575 (263), f. 63-64^v**Date:** saec. xv**Provenance:** Italy**Family:** pseudo-Jerome, A-family

Parchment, 302 ff. (576: 322 ff.), 386×270 mm., written in single column, in a regular, humanistic handwriting. Manuscript 575 and 576 belong together, forming a two-volume collection of letters and works by, ascribed to or directed to Jerome. Since the manuscripts of the Bibliothèque Mazarine were not accessible because of construction-works, I have transcribed the manuscript from microfilm.

Both volumes open with a decorated portrait of Jerome, but parts of these illustrations were never completed. Also elsewhere in the manuscripts we find blank spaces never filled in. The text of the *Libellus fidei*, according to the tradition to which it belongs directed to Augustine and Alypius, is preceded by the authentic letter of Jerome addressed to the same bishops (*ep.* 143). The manuscript has been in possession in Saint Victor, but was copied and illuminated in Italy. Molinier (p. 244-5) points to the Italian character of the decorations and illustrations. This provenance is confirmed by the text-type of the *Libellus fidei*, resembling that of the Vaticana Latina 341 and 650 (see above).

Also remarkable is the addition of *et filio* (filioque) in paragraph 4, a clearly theological variant. An addition with a theological edge is (*quam hominem*) *imperfectum in deo*, in paragraph 10. It is probably intended as a clarification but creates problems by placing *in deo* parallel to *in filio*. In paragraph 25 we encounter another theological variant, where the text reads (*qui cum Ioviniano adserunt hominem*) *post baptismum (non posse peccare)*. By bringing baptism in, the sharp edge of contrasting two opposite extremities is diminished.

In other manuscripts I have found hardly any undisputable theological variants. In this respect, *Hal5* stands out as an exception.

Literature: LAMBERT, *Bibliotheca Hieronymiana Manuscripta*, IIIA, p. 85; A. MOLINIER, *Catalogue des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Mazarine*, vol. I, Paris 1885, p. 238-45.

Hd9 The Hague, Koninklijke Bibliotheek, 130.E.6, f. 6-7**Date:** ca. 865-900 (Bischoff), saec. ix-x (catalogue)**Provenance:** Southern Netherlands, Northern France, Stavelot?**Family:** pseudo-Jerome, D-family

Parchment, 7 ff., 214×142 mm., written in single column. A collection of symbols and commentaries to the credo. The

manuscript is in its extant form a fragment of a larger codex. The text breaks off in the middle of the *Libellus fidei*, after...*dolorem, mortem* (paragraph 11).

Of the consulted manuscripts of the D-family, *Hd9* is the oldest. The most remarkable variant is the omission of *personam ut dicamus duas perfectas atque integras esse* (paragraph 9), caused by the homoioteleuton *esse – esse*. Further the manuscript does not contain any significant variants.

Literature: B. BISCHOFF, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften*, I (1998), p. 300, no. 1435; A.W. BYVANCK, 'Aantekeningen over handschriften met miniaturen. XII. Weinig bekende handschriften met miniaturen in Nederland', in: *Oudheidkundig Jaarboek*, third series 11 (1931), p. 6-7, plate 6; *Catalogus codicum manuscriptorum Bibliothecae Regiae*, vol. I, Den Haag 1922, p. 96, no. 405; A.S. KORTEWEG, 'Les fonds médiévaux de la Koninklijke Bibliotheek (Bibliothèque Royale) de La Haye', in: *Pluteus* 3 (1985), p. 180; A.S. KORTEWEG, C.A. Chavannes-Mazel, *Schatten van de Koninklijke Bibliotheek. Acht eeuwen verluchte handschriften*, Den Haag 1980, p. XII, 24, 28, 29, no. 11; C.W. DE KRUYTER, 'Franse geïllumineerde handschriften in de Koninklijke Bibliotheek', in: *Bibliotheek-informatie* (1975), p. 3, no. 12; LAMBERT, IIIA, *Bibliotheca Hieronyminiana Manuscripta*, p. 82; M.T. WIESER, *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung der Werke des heiligen Augustinus*, Bd. VIII/1 (Sitzungsberichte 685), Wien 2000, p. 243.

***Hd12* Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Voss. Lat.F29, f. 2^v-3^v**

Date: saec. xii

Provenance: 'Gallia?' (De Meyier), formerly in possession the abbey of Orbais and Brie

Family: pseudo-Jerome, D-family

Parchment, 310 ff., 327×230 mm., written in two columns. A collection of letters and works by, ascribed to or directed to Jerome. The manuscript opens, as is the case more often, with the text of the *Libellus fidei* (f. 2^v).

Some variants are the omission of (*dominum*) *nostrum* (paragraph 2) and of *dei* (20), both typically occurring in manuscripts of the D-family. Also, *Hd12* reads *asserimus esse celebrandum* in paragraph 17. This passage is also quoted by Augustine, who reads, together with pseudo-Augustine, *dicimus esse celebrandum* (see above).

I assume that at an early stage the word *dicimus* was omitted in the D-family. Later, some scribe has corrected this by inserting

asserimus. It is quite unfortunate that the text of *Hd9* breaks off before reaching this passage, otherwise it could perhaps have shed some light on the matter.

Literature: WIESER, *Die Handschriftliche überlieferung*, VIII/1, p. 243; K.A. DE MEYIER, *Codices Vossiani Latini*, pars I: Codices in folio, Leiden 1973, p. 62-5.

***Hd15* Utrecht, Universiteitsbibliotheek, Cod. 4.J.19 (106), f. 61^a-64^a**

Date: ca. 1450-1475 (Wieser)

Provenance: Carthusian monastery 'Nieuwlicht' near Utrecht

Family: pseudo-Jerome, D-family

Parchment, 116 ff., 'in quarto', written in single column. The manuscript contains writings about, by or attributed to Jerome. The text of the *Libellus fidei* has been divided into six parts, each commencing with a colourized initial and a superscription in red. Smaller units are indicated by capitals marked red.

The most remarkable variant of this work is the addition of *quod graeci dicunt omousion* (paragraph 2, see also discussion above). *Hd15* is the only pseudo-Jerome manuscript I have found so far containing this phrase. Yet, it can be found in every printed edition of the *Libellus fidei* and in the pseudo-Augustine family.

Some other specific variants are: *profitemur* instead of *confitemur* (paragraph 6), *hominem* instead of *nostrum* (11), *incommutabilis* instead of *inconvertibilis* (12), and *mortuum* instead of *mentitum* (§23). A few omissions: *et humanitatis* (10), *peccatorum quoque* (16) and *damnamus* (24).

Literature: *Handschriften en oude drukken van de Utrechtse Universiteitsbibliotheek*, p. 26-9; LAMBERT, *Bibliotheca Hieronymiana Manuscripta*, IIIA, p. 86; P.A. TIELE, *Catalogus codicum manu scriptorum Bibliothecae Universitatis Rheno-Trajectinae*, vol. I, Utrecht 1887, p. 30; K. VAN DER HORST, *Illuminated and Decorated Medieval Manuscripts in the University Library, Utrecht*, Maarssen/s-Gravenhage 1989, p. 21-2, 368-9, no. 72; WIESER, *Die Handschriftliche überlieferung*, VIII/1, p. 243; *Godgeleerde Bijdragen*, vol. VI, eerste stuk (1832), p. 51-74.

Some technical remarks on the text-edition

The edition we now turn to, is presented in a manner largely based on the principles of the Ruusbroecgenootschap, to which I refer for reasons of brevity.⁶⁰ Some additional points of attention are:

⁶⁰ G. de Baere (ed.), *Jan van Ruusbroec. Opera omnia*, (Studiën en tekstuutgaven van ons geestelijk erf, vol. XX, 10 = Corpus Christianorum Continuatio Mediaevalis, vol. CX), Tielt/Turnhout 1991, p. 66-72.

1. Elements between sharp brackets (<>) indicate readings added to the text of *IHa9*. Elements between square brackets ([]) indicate readings found in *IHa9* but left out in other groups of manuscripts or printed editions. These two types of elements represent significant variants on which discussion is possible. I would like to stress that they should *not* be interpreted as definitive textcritical choices, but as an indication of the most important readings calling for further inquiry.

2. Words in the text that are marked with an asterisk (*), indicate corrected or adjusted readings, deviant from *IHa9*.

3. The spelling follows that of *IHa9*. An exception is formed by proper names, of which the first letter is capitalized. Abbreviations are solved, ligatures (æ, e, œ, &) are normalized (ae, oe, et).

4. Corrections in manuscripts are printed separately in the critical apparatus only if they are of some textcritical significance, such as the addition by another hand of (*sed*) *ita* (paragraph 5) in *IHa9*. Changes in spelling and corrected scribal mistakes are not mentioned separately.

5. The following variants are presented in the critical apparatus:

- omissions of syllables, words or phrases
- additions of syllables, words or phrases
- changes in word order
- replacements of words by other words

6. Not presented are:

- differences in spelling
- evident mistakes in spelling

7. Changes in word order are indicated as follows: the words concerned are presented first, followed by numbers indicating the alternative sequence of the variant. Other changes in the position of a word are indicated by the word *post*.

8. When all the incorporated printed editions of pseudo-Jerome (PL 45, PL 48, Baronius, Hahn, Launoy, Mansi, Vallarsi, Walch en Wall) have the same reading, they are together indicated as *Eds*. Their respective abbreviations are: *PL45*, *PL48*, *Bar*, *Hahn*, *Mansi*, *Lau*, *Vsi*, *Walch*, *Wall*.

9. The pseudo-Augustine editions (PL 39 and Launoy) are indicated by the abbreviations: *PL39* and *A^{Lau}*.

10. The *Libri Carolini* (according to Freeman's edition) is indicated by the abbreviation *LC*. Augustine's quotations in *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali* I, 35, 36; II 24 (CSEL 42, p. 152-3, 182) are indicated by *Aug*.

11. Further, the following sigla are used:

- *des.* *desinit*, the text breaks off after the indicated word
- *hapl.* *haplography*
- *homtel.* *homoioteleuton*

- ^c *correction*
- txt *text*, the text as exhibited (only used with corrections)

12. The text is divided into paragraphs. The numbers between square brackets incorporated in the text itself, indicate the paragraph-division as uses by J. Garnier in his *Dissertatio V* (PL 48, 488-91). This division is chosen for its small paragraphs, making precise references possible. The paragraph-divisions of PL 45 and PL 39 are also in use. Synoptically the respective divisions can be displayed as follows:

PL 48	PL 45	PL 39
		1
[1]	1	2
[2]	2	
[3]		
[4]	3	
[5]		3
[6]		
[7]		
[8]	4	4
[9]		
[10]		
[11]	5	5
[12]		
[13]		
[14]		
[15]	6	
[16]		
[17]	7	
[18]		
[19]	8	6
[20]	9	
[21]	10	
[22]		
[23]	11	
[24]	12	
[25]	13	
[26]	14	

Libellus fidei

[1] Credimus in Deum Patrem omnipotentem, cunctorum visibilium et invisibilium conditorem.

[2] Credimus et in Dominum nostrum Ihesum Christum per quem creata sunt omnia, verum Deum unigenitum et verum Dei Filium, non factum aut adoptivum* sed genitum et unius cum Patre substantiae <quod Greci dicunt homoousion> atque ita per omnia aequalem Deo Patri, ut nec tempore nec gradu nec potestate esse possit inferior. Tantumque esse confitemur illum qui est genitus, quantus est ille qui genuit. [3] Non autem quia dicimus genitum a Patre Filium

divinae et ineffabili generationi aliquod tempus adscribimus, sed nec Patrem <dicimus> aliquando coepisse nec Filium. Non enim aliter confiteri possumus aeternum Patrem nisi confiteamur etiam coaeternum Filium. Ex Filio enim Pater dicitur, et qui semper Pater fuit, semper habuit Filium.

[4] Credimus et in Spiritum Sanctum, Deum verum ex Patre procedentem, aequalem per omnia Patri et Filio, <natura,> voluntate, potestate, aeternitate, substantia.

[5] Nec est prorsus aliquis in Trinitate gradus, nihil quod inferius superiusve dici possit, sed tota Deitas sui perfectione aequalis est ut exceptis vocabulis, quae proprietatem personarum indicant, quicquid de una persona dicitur de tribus dignissime possit intelligi*. [6] Atque ut confundentes Arrium unam eandemque dicimus Trinitatis esse

1 prologus cf PL39, A^{Lau} • **3** et om Bar | nostrum om Hd12 • **4** creata sunt omnia: 3 1 2 LC | deum: dei Ha15 | et om PL39, A9 • **5** aut: non PL45 | adoptivum: adoptativum IHa9; optatum, 5Hd15 | et om PL48, Lau, PL39, A^{Lau}, A9 • **6** quod Greci dicunt homoousion Hd15, Eds, PL39, A^{Lau}, A9 • **7** ut om 2Ha9 | gradu... potestate: 2 1 Hx9 | esse possit: 2 1 2Ha9, Ha10, Ha15, Hd15, Eds • **8** esse confitemur: 2 1 Ha15, PL45, Bar, Hahn, Mansi, Vsi, Walch, Wall, txt Ha15^c | confitemur illum: 2 1 Hd15 | quantus: quantum Ha15 • **10** divinae: divina 2Ha9, Ha10, Ha15, PL45, Bar, Hahn, Mansi, Vsi, Walch, Wall | generationi: generatione IHa9, 2Ha9, Ha10, Ha15, PL45, Bar, Hahn, Mansi, Vsi, Walch, Wall; txt IHa9^c | (aliquod) ei Ha10, Ha15, PL45, Bar, Hahn, Mansi, Vsi, Walch, Wall • **11** dicimus PL48, Lau, PL39, A^{Lau}, A9 | non enim ... coaeternum filium om Hahn, Walch (homtel.) | non: nec Ha15, PL45, Bar, Mansi, Vsi, Wall | aliter confiteri possumus: 3 1 2 PL39, A^{Lau}; 1 3 2 A9 • **12** (etiam) et PL39, A^{Lau}, A9 | coaeternum filium: 2 1 PL39, A^{Lau}, A9 • **13** filio: illo PL48, Lau | enim om PL39, A^{Lau}, A9 • **14** habuit filium: 2 1 Eds, PL39, A^{Lau}, A9 • **15** deum verum: 2 1 Eds | (ex patre) et filio Ha15, cf LC apud Migne • **16** natura PL39, A^{Lau}, A9 • **19** superiusve: superiusque Ha15, Mansi, PL39, A^{Lau} | sed: ita IHx9, Hd9, A9; ideo PL39, A^{Lau} | (sed) ita IHa9^c | deitas: trinitas A^{Lau} | sui: sua PL39, A^{Lau}, A9 • **21** dicitur: dicunt Vsi | (dignissime) in divinitate Hx9 | intelligi: intellegi IHx9, IHa9, 2Ha9, Ha10, Hd9, A9; txt IHx9^c, Hd9^c • **22** confundentes: confutantes Hx9, Hd9, PL45, Bar, Mansi, PL39, A^{Lau}, A9 | esse substantiam 2 1 A^{Lau} •

substantiam et unum in tribus personis fatemur Deum, ita impietatem Sabellii declinantes tres personas expressas sub proprietate distinguimus. Non ipsum sibi Patrem, ipsum [sibi] Filium, ipsum [sibi] Spiritum Sanctum esse dicentes, sed aliam Patris, aliam Filii, aliam Spiritus Sancti esse personam. Non enim nomina tantummodo sed etiam nominum proprietates id est personas [vel ut Greci exprimunt epotasis hoc est subsistentias*] confitemur.

[7] Nec Pater Filii aut Sancti Spiritus personam aliquando excludit, nec rursus Filius aut Spiritus Sanctus Patris nomen personamque recipit. Sed Pater semper Pater est, Filius semper Filius <est>, Spiritus Sanctus semper Spiritus Sanctus <est>, itaque substantia unum sunt, personis ac nominibus distinguuntur.

[8] Ipsum autem Dei Filium qui absque initio aeternitatem cum Patre et Spiritu Sancto possidet, dicimus in fine saeculorum perfectum naturae nostrae hominem suscepisse ex Maria semper virgine, et verbum carnem esse factum adsumendo hominem non permutando deitatem. Nec* ut quidam sceleratissime opinantur Spiritum Sanctum dicimus fuisse pro semine, sed potentia ac virtute creatoris operatum.

[9] Sic autem confitemur in Christo unam Filii esse personam, ut dicamus duas perfectas atque integras esse substantias, id est deitatis et humanitatis, quae ex anima continentur et corpore. Atque ut

1 fatemur: confitemur *PL45, Bar, Mansi* | (ita) et *Ha15* • **2** tres personas expressas sub proprietate *om Bar, Mansi* | expressas: expressa *PL45* | sub: sed *IHa9*; sui *PL45, PL39, A^{Lau}, A9*; txt *IHa9^c* • **3** sibi (filium) *om PL39, A^{Lau}, A9* | sibi (spiritum) *om Hx9, Hd9, Hd12, Mansi, LC, PL39, A^{Lau}, A9* • **4** spiritus sancti *2 1 A9* • **6** nominum: nomen vel *Hx9* | vel ut greci exprimunt epotasis hoc est subsistentias *om PL39, A^{Lau}, A9* | ut: sicut *Hx9^c* | epotasis *om Hx9 (hapl.)* • **7** hoc: id *Ha15* | subsistentias: substantias *Hx9, IHa9, Ha15, Hd15, PL48* | confitemur: profitemur *Hd15* • **8** sancti spiritus: *2 1 Ha10, Ha15, Eds, PL39, A^{Lau}* • **9** sanctus: sancti *Ha15* | aut (patris) *Ha15* • **10** recipit: recepit *Vsi, A9*; suscepit *PL45, Bar*; suscipit *Mansi* | est *om Hd9, PL39, A^{Lau}, A9* | (filius) est *Hx9, Eds*; et *2Ha9* • **11** est *Ha15, Eds*; et *2Ha9* | sunt: est *Hx9* • **12** distinguuntur: distinguuntur *Hx9, 2Ha9, Ha10, Ha15, Hd9, Hd12, LC, A9*; txt *Hd9^c* • **13** aeternitatem *om A^{Lau}* • **14** spiritu sancto *2 1 A9* | possidet: possedet *IHa9*; possedit *Hd15, PL45, Bar, Mansi*; est *A^{Lau}*; txt *IHa9^c* | perfectum: perfecte *Hd15* • **15** naturae nostrae: *2 1 PL45, Bar, Mansi* | semper *om Hd12, Hd15*; txt *Hd12^c* • **16** sed (adsumendo) *PL39, A^{Lau}, A9* | adsumendo: adsumendum *Hx9*, txt *Hx9^c* | non: nec *Hd9, Hd12, PL48, Wall* | permutando: permutandum *Hx9*, txt *Hx9^c* • **17** nec: non *IHa9, A^{Lau}* | sceleratissime: scelestissime *IHa9*; ascleratisime *2Ha9*; sceleratissimi *PL39, A^{Lau}, A9*; txt *IHa9^c* | spiritum sanctum: *2 1 Hx9, A9* • **18** fuisse *om PL48, Lau*; post semine *A^{Lau}* | potentia: potentiam *Hd15* | ac: et *Hd15, PL39, A^{Lau}, A9* | operatum: operatam *Hd15* • **19** autem *om Mansi* | filii esse: *2 1 Hx9* | personam... integras esse *om Hd9 (homtel.)* • **20** perfectas *om A^{Lau}* | esse post duas *Edsl* id est *om PL39, A^{Lau}, A9* | (deitatis) scilicet *PL39, A^{Lau}, A9* • **21** quae: qua *A9* | continentur: continentur *Ha15*; constat *PL39, A^{Lau}, A9* •

- condemnamus Fotinum, qui solum et nudum hominem confitetur in Christo, ita anathematizamus Apollinarem et eius similes, qui dicunt Dei Filium minus aliquid de humana suscepisse natura, et vel in carne vel in anima vel in sensu adsumptum hominem his propter quos
- 5 adsumptus est fuisse dissimilem, quem absque sola peccati macula, quae naturalis non est, nobis confitemur fuisse conformem. [10] Illorum quoque similiter execramur blasphemiam qui novo sensu adserere conantur, a tempore susceptae carnis omnia quae erant deitatis in hominem demigrasse, et rursus quae erant humanitatis in Deum esse
- 10 transfusa. Ut quod nulla unquam heresis dicere ausa esse videatur hac confusione utraque exinanita substantia, deitatis scilicet et humanitatis, et a proprio statu in aliud esse mutata, ut qui tam Deum imperfectum in Filio quam hominem confitentur, ut nec Deum vere nec hominem tenere credantur.
- 15 [11] Nos autem ita dicimus susceptum a Dei Filio passibile nostrum, ut Deitas impassibilis permaneret. Passus <est> enim Filius [Dei] non putative sed vere omnia quae scriptura testatur, id est esuriem, sitim, lassitudinem, dolorem, mortem et caetera huiusmodi. [12] Secundum illud passus est quod pati poterat, id est [non] secundum
- 20 illam substantiam [quae adsumpsit sed secundum illam] quae adsumpta

1 condemnamus: condemnemus *IHa9*; txt *IHa9^c* | hominem confitetur in christo: 3 4 1 2 *Eds* • **2** et *om Hd15* • **5** quem: quoniam *A^{Lau}* | sola: soli *Hd15* | peccati: peccata *A9* • **6** non *om Hd15* | nobis *om Ha15* | fuisse: esse *PL45, Bar, Mansi*; *om Hahn, Walch* • **7** similiter execramur 2 1 *A^{Lau}* | execramur: execramus *Hd9, Hd12, Hd15, A9* | blasphemiam: blasphemias *Hx9^c* • **8** suscepte: acceptae *A^{Lau}* | erant: erat *Hd15* | deitatis: divinitatis *PL39, A^{Lau}* • **9** erant humanitatis: 2 1 *Hx9, Hd9, PL39, A^{Lau}, A9* | deum: deo *Hx9* • **10** transfusa: transfusum *2Ha9* | quod...utraque cf *Hx9 et Hx9^c* | unquam: nunquam *Mansi* | heresis: hereses *IHa9*; txt *IHa9^c* | dicere ausa esse: ausa est dicere *PL39, A^{Lau}, A9* | esse: est *2Ha9, Ha10, Ha15, Hd9, Hd12, Hd15, Eds, LC* | confusione: confessione *A9* • **11** utraque: utique *Hd9* | (utraque) natura *Hahn, Walch* | esse (substantia) et *PL39, A^{Lau}, A9* | deitatis scilicet: 2 1 *LC* | et humanitatis *om Hd15* | a: amisso *PL39, A^{Lau}, A9* • **13** aliud: alium *PL48*; aliquid *2Ha9* | ut *om Hx9, Ha10, Ha15, Hd12, Hd15, PL45, Bar, Hahn, Mansi, Vsi, Wall, Walch, LC* | imperfectum: perfectum *PL39, A^{Lau}, A9* | (hominem) imperfectum in deo *Ha15* • **13** confitentur: confitemur *PL39, A^{Lau}, A9* | ut *om Ha15, PL48, PL39, A^{Lau}, A9* | vere: verum *Eds* • **14** tenere: temere *A^{Lau}*, cf nota *PL39* | credantur: credamur *PL39, A9*; credamus *A^{Lau}*, cf nota *PL39* • **15** ita *om Hd9* | ita post susceptum *Hx9^c, Eds* | susceptum: suscepto *IHa9, 2Ha9*; txt *IHa9^c* | dei: deo *PL45, Bar, Mansi* | dei filio: 2 1 *Hahn, Walch* | passibile nostrum: hominem, *A^{Lau}* | nostrum: hominem *Hd15* • **16** deitas: deitam *Hx9, Hd9*; deus tamen *PL39, A^{Lau}, A9* | impassibilis: impassibile *Hx9, Hd9* | est *Hx9^c, Ha10, Ha15, Hd15, Eds, PL39, A^{Lau}, A9* | enim: etenim *PL39, A^{Lau}* | filius dei: 2 1 *Ha10, Ha15, Eds, PL39, A^{Lau}, A9* | dei *om Hx9, IHa9, 2Ha9, Hd9, Hd12, Hd15, LC*; txt *IHa9^c* • **18** mortem *des Hd9* | et (secundum) *Hd15*; sed (secundum) *PL39, A^{Lau}, A9* | illud: illam id *2Ha9* • **19** id est *om A^{Lau}* | non (...) quae adsumpsit sed secundum illam *om PL48* • **20** quae: quam *PL45, Mansi* •

est. Ipse enim Dei Filius secundum deitatem suam impassibilis est ut Pater, inconprehensibilis ut Pater, invisibilis ut Pater, inconvertibilis ut Pater, <inconvertibilis ut Pater>. Et quamvis propria persona Filii, id est Dei Verbum, suscepit passibilem hominem, ita tamen eius habitatione
 5 secundum suam substantiam Deitas Verbi nihil passa est, ut tota Trinitas quam [quam] impassibilem necesse est confiteri.

[13] Mortuus <est> ergo Dei Filius [secundum scripturas iuxta id quod mori poterat, resurrexit tertia die, ascendit in caelum, sedet* ad dexteram Dei Patris, manente] ea<dem> natura carnis in qua natus
 10 et passus est, in qua etiam resurrexit, non enim exinanita est humanitatis substantia sed glorificata et in aeternum cum deitate mansura. [14] [Accepta ergo a Patre omnium potestate quae in caelo sunt* et in terra,] venturus est ad iudicium vivorum ac mortuorum, ut et iustos remuneret et puniat peccatores.

15 [15] Et resurrectionem etiam carnis <confitemur et> credimus, ut dicamus nos in eadem in qua nunc sumus veritate membrorum esse reparandos, qualesque semel post resurrectionem fuerimus effecti, in perpetuo permansuros. [16] Unam esse vitam sanctorum <omnium>, sed premia pro labore diversa, e contrario pro modo delictorum peccatorum

1 deitatem suam: 2 1 *PL48, Hahn, Lau, Vsi, Walch, Wall* | deitatem: divinitatem *PL45, Bar, Mansi* | suam *om Hx9, PL45, Bar, Mansi* | (impassibilis) est *om A9* • 2 inconprehensibilis (...) invisibilis: 2 1 *2Ha9* | inconprehensibilis ut pater *om PL39, ALau, A9* | invisibilis: invincibilis *Vsi* | invisibilis ut pater *om Ha10* | invisibilis ut pater, inconvertibilis ut pater *om ALau* | inconvertibilis: incommutabilis *Hd15* • 3 incorruptibilis ut pater *PL39, ALau*; incorruptilis (*sic!*) ut pater *A9* | propria: tota *Ha15*; proprie *PL39* • 4 verbum: verbo *1Ha9, 2Ha9*, txt *1Ha9c* | suscepit: susceperit *PL39, ALau, A9* | habitatione: habitationem *Hx9, Hd15*; inhabitatione *PL39, ALau*; inhabitationem *A9* • 5 deitas: deitatis *1Ha9, 2Ha9*; txt *1Ha9c* | verbi *om Mansi* | (verbi) accepit iam *Hx9c* | est: sit *Hx9*; sit *om Hx9c* | tota trinitas quam *cf Hx9c* • 6 quam *om Hx9, Ha10, Ha15, Hd12, Hd15, Eds, LC, PL39, ALau, A9* | (impassibilem) esse *PL39, ALau, A9* | necesse est confiteri: 3 1 2 *Eds* • 7 est (ergo) *Hx9, 2Ha9, Ha15, Hd9, Hd12, Hd15, Eds, LC, PL39, ALau, A9* | secundum... manente *om PL39, ALau, A9* | iuxta: secundum *PL45, Bar, Mansi* • 8 id: illud *PL48, Hahn, Lau, Vsi, Walch, Wall* | in caelum: in caelos *Hx9* | sedet: sedit *1Ha9* • 9 ad: a *Wall* | dei *om Ha15* | ea: eadem *PL45, PL48, Lau, PL39, ALau, A9* • 10 et passus: est passus *Hd15* | est¹ *post natus ALau* | etiam: et *ALau* • 11 et *om PL39, ALau*; est *A9* • 12 accepta ... terra *om PL39, ALau, A9* | omnium potestate: 2 1 *LC*; omne potestate *1Ha9*; txt *1Ha9c* | sunt: sint *1Ha9*; *om 2Ha9, Ha10*; txt *Ha10c* • 13 ac: et *Hx9, PL48, Hahn, Lau, Vsi, Walch, Wall, PL39, ALau, A9*; hac *2Ha9* • 15 Et post carnis *2Ha9*; *om Hx9, Ha10, Ha15, Hd12, Hd15, Eds, LC, PL39, ALau, A9* | etiam *om Hx9, 2Ha9, Ha10, Ha15, Hd15, LC, PL39, ALau, A9* | ita (credimus) *Hx9, LC, PL39, ALau, A9* | confitemur et (credimus) *Ha10, Ha15, Eds* • 17 in *om A9* | effecti: affecti *PL45, Bar, Mansi* | (effecti) tales *Hx9c* • 18 perpetuo: perpetuum *Ha15, Hd15, Eds, PL39, ALau, A9* | permansuros: mansuros *LC, ALau* | unam esse vitam: 3 2 1 *Hd15* | esse: etiam *Ha15* | vitam sanctorum 2 1 *ALau* | (sanctorum) omnium *2Ha9, Eds, PL39, ALau, A9* • 19 et (e contrario) *PL39, ALau, A9* | e *om Hx9* | (delictorum) et *Hx9c* | peccatorum quoque *om Hd15* •

quoque esse supplicia. [17] Baptisma unum tenemus, quod isdem sacramenti verbis in infantibus quibus etiam in maioribus <dicimus> esse celebrandum. [18] Hominem, si post baptismum lapsus fuerit, <primo per reconciliationem deinde> per penitentiam credimus posse
5 salvari.

[19] Novum et vetus testamentum recipimus in eo librorum numero quem sanctae catholicae ecclesiae tradit auctoritas. [20] Animas a Deo dari credimus quas ab ipso factas dicimus, anathematizantes eos qui animam quasi partem Dei divinae dicunt esse substantiae.
10 Eorum quoque condemnamus errorem qui eas ante peccasse vel in caelis conversatas fuisse dicunt quam in corpora mitterentur.

[21] Execramur etiam eorum blasphemiam, qui dicunt impossibile aliquid homini a Deo esse preceptum et mandata Dei non a singulis sed ab omnibus in commune posse servari, [22] vel qui primas
15 nuptias cum Manicheo, aut secundas cum Catafrigis damnant. [23] Anathematizamus etiam illos qui Dei Filium necessitate carnis mentitum esse dicunt et eum propter adsumptum hominem non omnia facere potuisse quae voluit. [24] Ioviniani quoque damnamus heresim qui dicit nullam in futuro meritorum esse distantiam, nosque eas ibi
20 habituros esse virtutes quas hic habere neglexerimus*. [25] Liberum sic confitemur arbitrium ut dicamus nos semper Dei indigere auxilio, et tam illos errare qui cum Manicheo dicunt hominem peccatum vitare non posse, quam illos qui cum Ioviniano adserunt hominem non posse peccare, uterque enim tollit arbitrii libertatem. Nos vero dicimus
25 hominem semper et peccare et non peccare posse, ut semper nos liberi confiteamur esse arbitrii.

2 in¹ om *Ha10*, *A9*; txt *Ha10^c* | in infantibus om *Lau* | quibus: quibusve *A9* | in² om *A9* | dicimus *PL39*, *A^{Lau}*, *A9*, *Aug* (2x); dicimus: asserimus *Hd12*, *Eds* • 3 et (hominem) *Hd15* | lapsus: lassus *Ha15* | (fuerit) primo per reconciliationem deinde *PL39*, *A^{Lau}*, *A9* • 4 posse: possit *2Ha9*, om *Hd15* • 6 eo: illo *PL39*, *A^{Lau}*, *A9* • 7 quem: quo *Hx9^c* | catholicae ecclesiae: 2 1 *PL39*, *A^{Lau}*, *A9* | tradit: tradidit *Hx9*, *LC* • 8 anathematizantes: anathematizamus *Ha15* • 9 eos: omnes *Bar*, *Mansi* | animam: animas *Eds*, *LC* | dei om *Hd12*, *Eds*, *A^{Lau}* • 11 caelis: coelo *PL39* | fuisse: esse *PL39*, *A9* | corpora: corpore *Hx9*, *Mansi*, *A9* • 12 execramur: execramus *Hx9*, *Hd12*, *Hd15*, *PL45* | etiam om *Hd12* | eorum blasphemiam: 2 1 *PL39* | blasphemiam: blasphemia *Hx9*; blasphemias *Hx9^c* • 13 esse preceptum: 2 1 *Eds*, *A^{Lau}* | et: e *2Ha9* | (non) a om *Hx9* • 14 omnibus: hominibus *Hd12*; txt *Hd12^c* | commune: communi *Bar*, *Mansi* • 15 aut: vel *2Ha9*, *PL45*, *Bar*, *Mansi*, *PL39* | catafrigis: catafrigas *IHa9*; txt *IHa9^c* • 16 mentitum: mortuum *Hd15* • 18 damnamus om *Hd15* | heresim: errorem *PL39*, *A9* • 19 meritorum esse: 2 1 *Hd15* | eas ibi: 2 1 *Ha15* | ibi om *2Ha9* • 20 neglexerimus: negleximus *IHa9*, *Hd15*, *A^{Lau}*, *A9*; txt *IHa9^c* | (sic) esse *Bar* • 21 semper dei indigere auxilio: 3 2 1 4 *Aug*; 2 1 3 4 *PL39*; 2 3 1 4 *A9* • 22 errare: execrare *A9^c*; ecrare *A9* | manicheo: manichaeis *PL45*, *Bar*, *Mansi* • 23 post baptismum (non posse) *Ha15* • 24 arbitrii libertatem: 2 1 *PL45*, *Bar*, *Mansi* • 25 semper om *PL39*, *A^{Lau}*, *A9* | semper nos: 2 1 *Hx9* • 26 esse om *Hd15*, *A9* •

[26] Haec fides est papa beatissime, quam in catholica ecclesia didicimus quamque semper tenuimus <et tenemus>. In qua si minus perite aut parum caute aliquid forte positum est emendari cupimus a te, qui Petri et fidem et sedem tenes. Sin autem haec nostra confessio
5 apostolatus tui iudicio conprobatur, quicumque me maculare voluerit se inperitum vel malivolum, vel etiam non catholicum, non me hereticum conprobabit.

Prologus apud pseudo-Augustinum

Multa quidem et frequenter ausi sunt Ariani haeretici adversus servos Dei, qui fidem rectam et catholicam custodiunt, per adulterinam doctrinam asserere et orthodoxos persequi tentaverunt. In tantum autem nunc exsurrexerunt contra fidem, ita ut multos ex vobis polluerint et
5 aures vestras commoverint, ut animas laniarent.

Sceleratae autem haeresis suae perfidiam tegunt: sed non diutius haec illis facere permissum est. Est enim gubernator ecclesiarum suarum Dominus, qui pro omnibus nobis mortem sustinuit.

Et ideo indeficiens nobis est oratio, dilectissimi fratres: primo,
10 ut sancta Domini et catholica ecclesia dissensionibus omnibus et haeresibus carens, unitatem spiritus in vinculo charitatis ubique conservet, quam per fidem rectam et vitam immaculatam tenere, amplecti, servare, custodire omnibus invocantibus Dominum est quidem justum, praecipue tamen episcopis, qui ecclesiis praesunt; secundo, ut eccle-
15 siae regula sanctaque patrum traditio atque iudicia in perpetuum firma solidaque permaneant. Est autem patrum nostrorum fides haec:

[1] Credimus in Deum Patrem omnipotentem... *etc.*

Postscriptum apud pseudo-Augustinum

[26] Haec fides est, dilectissimi fratres, quam in catholica didicimus ecclesia, quamque semper tenuimus et tenemus, quam credimus et a vestra bonitate deinceps posse teneri.

1 Haec...conprobabit (*postscriptum*) cf *LC, PL39, A^{Lau}, A9* | fides est: 2 1 *Hd15, Bar* | est *om Hx9*; txt *Hx9^c* | catholica ecclesia: 2 1 *Eds* | ecclesia *om IHa9, txt IHa9^c* • **2** et tenemus *Eds* | minus: mens *Hx9*; txt *Hx9^c* • **3** in (caute) *IHa9*; txt *IHa9^c* | aliquid forte: 2 1 *Ha10, Ha15* • **4** sin: si *Ha15* | haec nostra confessio *om Hx9* • **5** maculare: culpae *Ha10, Ha15* • **6** malivolum: malevolum *Hx9, Eds*; manivolum *2Ha9* | catholicum non me: catholico nomine *Ha10, Ha15* •

3 tentaverunt: tentarunt *A^{Lau}* • **4** vobis: nobis *A^{Lau}* • **5** vestras: nostras *A^{Lau}* • **7** haec illis: hic vel *A^{Lau}* •

1 est fides: 2 1 *A9* | catholica didicimus ecclesia: 3 1 2 *A9* • **3** vestra bonitate: nobis *A^{Lau}* •

Postscriptum apud Libri Carolini

[26] Haec est catholicae traditionis fidei vera integritas, quam sincero corde credimus et fatemur et in hoc opere beati Hieronimi verbis expressam taxavimus. Haec est vera fides, hanc confessionem conservamus atque tenemus. Quam quisque inconvulse et intemerate custodierit, perpetuam salutem habebit.

Conclusions and perspectives

Having surveyed the redactions and textual transmission of the *Libellus fidei*, we may summarize the findings as follows.

First, of the two main traditions, pseudo-Jerome and pseudo-Augustine, the former is far better known and makes the most authentic impression. However, whether it is justified to lay aside pseudo-Augustine altogether, is another question. Of course, its postscript is clearly redacted and in some stage a prologue was added. But it takes more than that to prove that the main part of the text is unreliable as well. Quotations in Augustine's *De gratia Christi et de peccato originali*, for example, point to the opposite direction. Further investigation of the manuscript traditions is necessary to solve this matter. Given the significant differences between the two traditions something is at stake here.

Second, a critical edition is usually based upon a single manuscript. Given the differences between the two text traditions, however, it is not yet a settled matter that this procedure should be followed in the case of the *Libellus fidei* as well. The mutilated postscript of pseudo-Augustine is not fit to be used as the basis for a critical edition, of course, but what if the main text of this tradition turns out to be the most reliable? In that case it seems more fitting to collate a reconstructed text, comparable to that of the Nestle-Aland editions of the Greek New Testament, or to present a synoptic text in two columns. Pseudo-Augustine, if deemed worthy, might offer the better readings for the main part of the text, pseudo-Jerome for the postscript. What procedure we are to follow, depends on the results of the investigations announced above.

Third, apart from the clash between textual traditions, the work-edition presents a row of variants, of which a large part was not attested in the printed editions that have appeared so far. What can be deemed authentic and what not? More comprehensive manuscript-research and the reconstruction of a stemma are necessary for sound textcritical choice-making.

Fourth, the printed editions have a narrow textual basis and are often unreliable, sometimes omitting entire phrases. Of the well accessible editions of Migne, PL 45 stands out as the best.

Fifth, some printed editions have reports on a Vatican manuscript containing the *Libellus fidei* together with letters of Zosimus. That combination is remarkable. Zosimus first rehabilitated and then condemned Pelagius. If Pelagius's confession is contained in one manuscript with letters of this pope, the scribe must have been aware of its true origins. In that case, possibly there is, or was at the end of the Middle Ages, a non-pseudepigraphic version of the *Libellus fidei*. In the standard catalogues, that unfortunately do not cover the entire Vatican collection, I have not been able to trace this manuscript. Were the editors of the printed editions perhaps confusing matters? Is the manuscript lost? Or can it be recovered, and what kind of text will it then bring us?

Sixth, textcritical research is not the end but the beginning, opening new avenues for theological and literary investigation. In further research, I intend to make an analysis of the *Libellus fidei*, of its origins and sources, and its historical, literary and theological context. From its manuscript tradition and the quotations in works of mediaeval writers some insights can be drawn on the reception of Pelagius's confession, the work of a proclaimed heretic dressed in the orthodox clothes of the names of Jerome and Augustine.

Some specific questions of analysis arise already. The identification of the pseudo-Jerome and pseudo-Augustine texts with Pelagius's *Libellus fidei* is today undisputed. A few passages however seem to condemn theological convictions that were deemed heresy many years later. Paragraph 10, for example, seems to rebuke Eutyches, though without mentioning him by name. Eutyches was not condemned until 448 A.D. and eventually at the council of Chalcedon (451 A.D.), more than thirty years after Pelagius wrote his confession. Are we dealing here with a later insertion to the text? Or are those people (*qui novo sensu adserere conantur...*) criticized in the *Libellus fidei* perhaps early forerunners of Eutyches? Was Pelagius ahead of his time? Or is the text we are dealing with not his after all? That last question shows what is at stake: the very identification of the text surveyed in this article with Pelagius's confession called the *Libellus fidei*.

The identifying of texts has occupied much of last centuries Pelagius-research. Entire lists of letters and treatises have been ascribed to the British monk, only to be rejected some years later. Often an insufficient method was used: placing columns of text next to each other and then comparing the agreements. Later, scholars like R.F. Evans have tried to fine-tune methodology by focussing also on vocabulary, biblical quotations, and syntax and style.⁶¹ Nevertheless,

⁶¹ EVANS, *Four letters of Pelagius*, New York 1968.

discussion concerning the attribution of several works to Pelagius remains. Perhaps, a rethinking is necessary of the method of identifying texts.

A test-case for this is formed by a group of fragments that has been ascribed to Pelagius in the assumption that they belong to his now lost work *De fide trinitatis*.⁶² This identification was made partly on basis of comparison with the *Libellus fidei*. But are these fragments indeed all of the same work and all by Pelagius? What method was used, and was it sufficient? Do instruments like electronic databases open up new avenues for the identification of texts?

And of course, the question is also whether the identification will stand once a critical edition of the *Libellus fidei* appears.

P.J. VAN EGMOND

⁶² GENNADIUS mentions that Pelagius had written such a work; see *De viris illustribus*, 43. Arguments on the identification and an edition of the fragments can be found in P.C. MARTINI, *Ambrosiaster. De auctore, operibus, theologia*, (Spicilegium Pontificii Athenaei Antoniani 4), Roma 1944, p. 161-210.

