

## DOCUMENTS

AN UNKNOWN FRAGMENT OF THE PSEUDO-AUGUSTINIAN *QUAESTIONES VETERIS ET NOVI TESTAMENTI*.

IN the collection of *Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti CXXVII* there are contained three commentaries or homilies on the first, twenty-third, and fiftieth psalms respectively. They follow immediately on a tractate DE MELCHISEDECH, which is numbered CVIII in the collection. The text of this Question is given entire by most of the editors, but a note of the Benedictine editor, P. Coustant, informs us that about two-thirds are lacking in the Colbertine manuscript and also in the editio Ratisponensis<sup>1</sup>.

To this can now be added the information that Colbertinus, now Parisiacus *Biblioth. Nat. lat.* 2709 (s. IX), by no means stands alone in this respect. Five other manuscripts of the ninth century, two of the tenth, and a number of later copies, in fact all existing MSS of which the writer has any knowledge, with one exception, lack these two-thirds. This exception is Scaff. X. N. 191 of the Biblioteca Antoniana in Padua, and is of the thirteenth century. It is absolutely certain that none of the editors, who have printed the entire Question, had ever seen this manuscript, and it is highly probable that the MS or MSS, from which the complete Question was printed, existed among the manuscripts in Paris destroyed at the Revolution. If we could trust Coustant's silence, we should conclude that the other manuscripts named by him, all of late date, contained the document complete. We cannot, however, trust him, and a study of his text leads to the conclusion that he seldom opened any MS to which he had access except Colbertinus, and that

<sup>1</sup> This is a name for the *editio princeps*, edited by an Austin Friar of Paris, who was a native of Ratispona (Ratisbon, Regensburg), and published by Jean Trechsel at Lyon in 1497. Of this book ten copies are known to exist in France (see Mademoiselle Pellechet's *Catalogue Général des Incunables des Bibliothèques Publiques de France*, vol. i Paris, 1897); the British Museum has one, the Bodleian has two, Cambridge University Library has one, Jena has one, and the Biblioteca Antoniana at Padua one. Quaritch had a copy for sale in 1877, which had belonged to Pirckheimer, the friend of Erasmus.

rarely and to little purpose. My own belief is that there existed during the sixteenth century, perhaps also during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, either in France or Belgium, one copy of the *Quaestiones*, which had Question 109 in its complete form.

If we compare qu. CX *DE PSALMO PRIMO*, CXI *DE PSALMO VIGENSIMO TERTIO* and CXII *DE PSALMO QVINQVAGENSIMO*, in their printed form, we shall see that, while the commentaries on the twenty-third and fiftieth psalms are each provided with an introduction concerning its title and historical setting, the commentary on the first psalm, which might be expected *a fortiori* to have such an introduction, is without it. The writer plunges at once *in medias res* by citing the first words of the psalm and proceeding to comment on them. He has thus encouraged his few modern readers to adopt a patronizing tone which he ill deserves. Never was modest writer more cruelly treated, first by the misfortunes to which early manuscripts of his works were subjected, and second by the ignorance and carelessness of his first editor and his followers. No one who has read the prefaces to the work in the various editions and compared their text with that provided by any manuscript of the ninth or tenth century, will think these words too strong.

For the writer did compose an introduction to his commentary on the first psalm; and the same misfortune, which nearly lost us the greater part of the 109th Question, involved the first third or so of the 110th. Why the old editor, who first printed CVIII entire, did not also print the first part of CX, I cannot say. The problem would be further complicated if we could suppose that his MS, while it had CVIII complete, lacked the first part of the next Question. This I do not believe was the case, and I can only suppose that he omitted this part through oversight, or because it seemed to contain very much the same thoughts as are expressed later in the document.

Before going on to describe the MS which contains this missing part of qu. CX, and to give the text of it, let us look at the situation as it appears in all the other MSS. After they have given the first third of qu. CVIII quite correctly down to *quia natura quae potest* (p. 2326, 58), there follow immediately and without any warning the words *dicente Salomone quia spes impiorum peribit*, which have no sort of connexion with what has preceded, and conclude the *Quaestio*. Then is given the title CX *DE PSALMO PRIMO*, followed by the Question as we have it in the printed editions. In meditating on the problem of the words *dicente Salomone quia spes impiorum peribit* and their origin, I had observed that the same words recur near the end of qu. CX, but had been unable to draw the correct inference from the fact. The examination and collation of the Padua codex have solved the problem entirely.

The mysterious words are really part of qu. CX, and the concluding words of the lost first part of it. The ancient archetype to which all other copies go back had lost several leaves<sup>1</sup>. At the right foot corner of the verso of the last leaf before the gap were the words *quia natura quae potest* (p. 2326, 58): at the left top corner of the recto of the first leaf after the lost leaves were the words *dicente Salomone quia spes impiorum peribit*. The title of qu. CX had been lost with the rest, but any person, however ignorant, could supply it from the sentence which stared him in the face after the word *peribit*.

The manuscript (Scaff. X. N. 191) of the Biblioteca Antoniana in Padua is of the thirteenth century, and now consists of 116 leaves of very fine vellum, measuring 30 × 21 centimetres. The writing is in double columns, and is most careful and beautiful. The coloured initials, though not very elaborately decorated, are of exquisite form and beauty. There are catch-words at the end of each gathering. Quaternions in the strict sense there are none, at least in the part dealing with the *Quaestiones*. The gatherings there consist respectively of ten (of which the latter seven alone belong to the *Quaestiones* part), twelve [then the loss, presently to be described], twelve, twelve, twelve, and fourteen leaves. As the last leaf is empty, our work occupies sixty-eight leaves in all.

The codex now contains the thirteen books of the Confessions, the *Quaestiones Veteris et Noui Testamenti CXXVII* less qu. 46 (from the words *et uiginti quattuor classes institutae sunt*, p. 2247, 24) down to qu. 101 (the words *ut obsequium praebeat ordinando*, p. 2303, 9), and the latter part of qu. 127 from *renasci enim renouari est* (p. 2382, 44), the *Retractations*, the *De Consensu Euangelistarum*, and the beginning of the *De Quaestionibus Octoginta Tribus* (down as far as the words *suasor ille a quo damnatus sit. Non eius*). From an entry on the flyleaf, erased at an early date, it appears that the manuscript at one time contained, or was intended to contain, the whole of the *De Quaestionibus LXXXIII*, the *De Vera Religione*, and other works, in addition to those above mentioned. It is improbable that it ever contained these, because in the valuable fourteenth and fifteenth-century Inventories of manuscripts, preserved in the library, only the four works which are (more or less) complete are indicated. Further, the library possesses no MS containing the works, whose titles are erased, in the order of these titles, nor indeed any MS answering to the description given by them.

It is worth while to transcribe those entries:—

Inuentarium (dated 1396) f. 14 r.

(libri extra armariū cū catena sunt infra subscripti.)

<sup>1</sup> The 'stemma codicum' is printed in the *Sitzungsberichte d. phil.-hist. Kl. der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, Bd. cxlix (1904), Abth. i p. 21.

Item libri confessionum Augustini in quo uolumine sunt centum XXXVII (*sic*) questionum Augustini et retractorum (*sic*) cum tabulis copertis corio rubeo et cathena [*opposite a contemporary hand has written* deficiunt aliquanta].

The chain has perished, but the codex still shews clearly where it was fastened. Part of the 'corium rubeum' still exists, and the board which is on one's right, when the codex lies open before one, still retains a slip on which the titles of works in the MS were written and can be partially read.

Inuentarium (dated 1449) f. 20 u.

(Sexta Banca Sinistra.)

Liber confessionū beati augustini et aliorum diuersorum tractantium eiusdem copertus coreo albo per totum et clauiculis de metallo. Cuius principium est confessionū ipsa columpna cum uno C de azuro et principium 2<sup>o</sup> columpne ē Magnus ē domine cū uno M de azuro et cenaprio. Incipit etiam quinternus (?) me intanta (?) flagrantia. Finis nō ultimus nō enim.

On the flyleaf is a note to the following effect: 'Contuli haec quatuor opuscula cum editione veneta A. 1709 Ego Reinhardus Fischer Viennensis 2 Feb. 1751.' It is unlikely that the said Fischer was one of the Fratres Minores Conuentuales at Padua, but as the lists are contained in the Archivio Pubblico, which was not open at the time of my visit to Padua, it was not possible to investigate the matter. Nor have I thought it necessary to enquire whether the collation of Fischer was committed to writing and still survives, or not.

I have to thank Father Girolamo Mileta, Librarian of the Biblioteca Antoniana, for his very great kindness to me during my stay at Padua.

[The Text.]

#### DE PSALMO PRIMO CX.

Cum propheta Dauid per speciem carnalium spiritalem rationem significaret, diuersi generis ac meriti psalmos ad dei laudem et sacramentum alacri mente pronuntians, primum psalmum nullo uelamine textit, neque alicui adsignauit, sed generalem instituit, ut horum sit qui,  
 5 a malis segregati, bonorum se societate munierint. Nec debuit enim principium et maxime huius gratiae in obscuritate cantari (ante enim lux quam tenebrae, et caput uniuscuiusque rei in manifesto est), nec inde fit quaestio, sed de subiectis. Unde sic orsus est dicens:—

BEATUS UIR QUI <NON> ABIIT IN CONSILIO IMPIORUM.

10 'Consilium impiorum' est conspiratio malignorum multifarie intellegenda. Idcirco impii a peccatoribus distant. Impietas enim

4 qui a] quia

grauissimum peccatum est, quia omnis impietas peccatum, non tamen  
 omne peccatum impietas. Quo modo ergo quis 'abit in consilio  
 impiorum'? Cum a se uocatur certe. Hoc enim dicens ostendit quia,  
 quamdiu quis a natura non exit, non incurrit peccatum. Propter hoc  
 'beatus', inquit, 'qui non abiit in consilio impiorum'. Impietas 5  
 enim a diabolo coepta, adsentientibus satell(ict)ibus eius, illicit homines  
 ut participes eos suae impietatis efficiat. Ipse enim prior in deum  
 peccans, dum uult sibi principatum per tirannidem usurpare, deiectus  
 de sacris sedibus, hoc solacium aestimauit, si perditioni suae acquireret  
 plurimos socios. Ideoque 'beatus', inquit, 'uir qui non abiit in con- 10  
 silio impiorum'. Illi enim semper inliciunt homines, qui sub hoc  
 principe agentes nobis inimici sunt, dicente apostolo; NON EST ENIM,  
 ait, CONLUCTATIO VOBIS ADVERSUS CARNEM ET SANGUINEM, SED AD-  
 VERSUS PRINCIPES ET POTESTATES, et in altera epistula de tyranno  
 eorum ait inter cetera ITA UT IN TEMPLO DEI SEDEAT, OSTENDENS SE 15  
 QUASI SIT DEUS. Quia enim peccare dulce uidetur, et non sentitur  
 malum nisi fuerit factum, ac per hoc fallentes non apparent quamdiu  
 capiant, sed, cum deceperint, tunc cognoscuntur, propterea beatum dicit  
 illum qui inlectus non fuerit in consilium impiorum, ut eat in contubern-  
 nium impietatis illorum. Prima ergo impietatis causa haec est, qua 20  
 rebelles in deum magna conspiratione esse coeperunt, qua imitatione  
 coepit idolatria. In supernis enim coepta praeuaricatio descendit ad  
 terras. Dum (enim) contenti non sunt uni deo et creatori esse subiecti,  
 impii extiterunt, maiestatem eius aliis partiendo, ut spreto eo alios sibi  
 ad culturam eligerent. Haec est enim prima causa offensionis humani 25  
 generis ex qua, neglecti a deo, diuersis inlecebris et passionibus in-  
 ludendi traduntur secundum fidem apostoli Pauli. Quid enim inuiolatum  
 opus manet, quod non agnouit auctorem? Inde iam seminatum malum  
 consuetudinem renuit, et in multas partes uelut propago palmites  
 tendit, ut qui deo non pepercerant, in parentum contumeliam et necem 30  
 facilius prosilirent, quia,—ut de ceteris taceam, dicente apostolo, QVO  
 ENIM MIHI DE HIS QVI FORIS SVNT IVDICARE?—Ruben in contumeliam  
 patris stuprum in concubinam eius admisit; et Absalon contra fas  
 regnum praesumpsit, ut patrem suum imperio et uita priuaret. Habet  
 adhuc et alias partes impietas quia et in periculo despiciere rogantem 35  
 cum prodesse possit impietas est, et in re aspera et maligna, ut impleri  
 possit, consilium dare † tam huius rei nec ad praesens euasit, et talia

2 consilium                      5 consilium (ex consilio)                      8 deiectis                      9 acquireret  
 10 consilium                      12 Eph. vi 12                      15 2 Thess. ii 4                      17 factura                      18 capient  
 (corr.)                      19 intellectus                      21 ceperunt                      22 cepta                      23 contempti  
 27 cf. Rom. i 24. 26                      28 manent                      31 I Cor. v 12                      36 prodesse  
 37-8 fortasse et talia...reperiri transponenda sunt ante tam, et uersus perit ut haud ita  
 raro in hoc codice

quae in hunc sensum poterant reperiri †. Non inmerito ergo 'beatus uir est qui non abiit in consilio impiorum'. Magna enim perniciēs est homini et incurabile uulnus post cognitionem dei his erroribus sociari. Deterius enim tractetur necesse est qui post uerum conuertitur  
5 ad falsum, et beatus uir est qui, ueri cognitione percepta, impiorum fugit consilia; quia caput erroris impietas est.

Et sequitur ET IN UIA PECCATORUM NON STETIT, quoniam impossibile est non peccare, sicut possibile impium non esse, quia grauissimum peccatum potest euitari, cetera autem de non est qua subrepanit. Ipsa  
10 enim humana conuersatio frequenter, dum peccare non cogitat, ex inproviso incurrit ut peccet. Ac per hoc beatus est qui in consilio impiorum non uadit. Hoc est nec incipere malum. Peccatum autem quia non potest non incipi, sicut dixi, beatum dixit qui non permanet in eo. Hoc est 'in uia peccatorum non stare'. 'Via' enim 'peccato-  
15 rum' est conuersatio in peccatis. Male enim ambulare dicitur, qui ad hoc procedit, ut quaerat peccare. Dum enim mens eius non stat in dei lege sed euagatur, 'in uia peccatorum' dicitur ambulare, quia euagatio haec quaerit peccare. Ideoque 'beatus est qui non stat in uia pec-  
20 et recedit (ab) aspiratione hominum peccatorum. Igitur sicut 'beatus est qui non abiit in consilio impiorum', sic inemendabilis erit si abit, dicente Salomone quia SPES IMPIORVM PERIBIT.

A. SOUTER.

2 consilium      11 consilium      18 hoc      21 consilium      22 Prov.  
x 28