

TRANSACTIONS OF THE
CAMBRIDGE
BIBLIOGRAPHICAL
SOCIETY

VOL. XIII, PART 2 (2005)

CAMBRIDGE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY
2007

DEFINING DOCTRINE IN THE CAROLINGIAN PERIOD:
THE CONTENTS AND CONTEXT OF CAMBRIDGE,
PEMBROKE COLLEGE, MS 108¹

SVEN MEEDER

The most concrete expression of the revival of learning associated with the ‘Carolingian Renaissance’ is the enormous increase in book production in the ninth century. The thousands of surviving ninth-century manuscripts are the most substantial witnesses to that revival. The image they convey, however, is fragmented and multi-faceted, both because they represent only a fraction of all books produced in the ninth century, and because every manuscript reflects the particular conditions, time and place of its production and the individual choices made by its compilers, copyists and decorators. This varied image is one manifestation of the diversity characterizing the Carolingian reform efforts, to which modern scholars have drawn attention in recent decades.² To understand the local aspects and, consequently, the full scale of the Carolingian reforms, we must study the manuscripts that facilitated them in detail.

Cambridge, Pembroke College, MS 108 is a modest ninth-century compendium of patristic texts, containing six mainly doctrinal works: the *Edictum de recta fide* of emperor Justinian (fos. 1r–47v),³ the Pelagian *Libellus*

¹ I am grateful to Professor David Ganz and Professor Rosamond McKitterick for their critical proof-reading of an earlier version of this article. I should also like to thank Dr Teresa Webber, who has seen many rough drafts of this article, for her invaluable comments and advice. All remaining errors and naïveties are naturally my own.

² Especially R. Kottje, ‘Einheit und Vielfalt des kirchlichen Lebens in der Karolingerzeit’, *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 76 (1965), 323–42; on the continued popularity of various canon law collections, see H. Mordek, *Kirchenrecht und Reform im Frankenreich: die Collectio Vetus Gallica* (Berlin, 1975); on diversity in ninth-century liturgy, see C. Vogel, ‘La réforme liturgique sous Charlemagne’, in B. Bischoff (ed.), *Karl der Große*, ii: *Das geistige Leben* (Düsseldorf, 1965), 217–32; on diversity with regards to the rite of baptism, see S. A. Keefe, ‘An unknown response from the archiepiscopal province of Sens to Charlemagne’s circulatory inquiry on baptism’, *Revue Bénédictine*, 96 (1986), 48–93 and eadem, *Water and the word: baptism and the education of the clergy in the Carolingian empire*, 2 vols. (Notre Dame, Ind., 2002).

³ Justinian I, *Edictum de recta fide*, in idem, *Drei dogmatische Schriften Iustinians*, ed. E. Schwartz (1939; 2nd edn., Milan, 1973), 129–69 (alongside the Greek text). For the foliation adopted, see the opening paragraph of ‘Physical description’ below.

fidei falsely attributed to St Jerome (fos. 48^r–52^v),⁴ a prayer on the Trinity equally wrongly ascribed to Augustine (fos. 52^v–56^r),⁵ a previously unknown tract *De fide, de spe et de caritate* attributed to Prosper, which is in fact an excerpt from a ninth-century penitential (fos. 56^r–58^r),⁶ the doctrinal *Altercatio inter Athanasio et Arrio* (with a preface on fo. 58^v), which until recently was thought to be a work of Vigilius of Thapsus and here seems to be attributed to Athanasius (fos. 59^r–118^v),⁷ and an excerpt from Rufinus's continuation of Eusebius's *Historia ecclesiastica* (fos. 118^v–124^r).⁸ Pembroke 108 thus combines works that may seem marginal to modern readers, but which in medieval eyes were by some of the greatest patristic authorities. In this article I propose to study Cambridge, Pembroke College MS 108 as a material witness to the revival of learning in the ninth century, and instruction in the writings of the Fathers in particular. I shall explore the palaeographical and codicological features of this small and unassuming ninth-century manuscript, as well as the combination of texts and their intended use in order to explain its place within ninth-century traditions of learning. It is with a brief description of the background of these traditions that I should like to begin.

Education and the Fathers in the ninth century

The revival of learning in the ninth century must be viewed in the light of the Carolingian reform efforts, whose principal aim was the education of the clergy in order that they might lead the people of God 'to the pasture of eternal life'.⁹ The educational goals set out in the royal capitularies, especially the *Admonitio generalis* of 789 and the *Epistola de litteris colendis*, were modest. Priests were to be taught the Creed, how to say Mass, how to give instructions to candidates for baptism and how to teach the Lord's Prayer. Furthermore, schools were to be set up in every monastic and episcopal

⁴ Pelagius, *Libellus fidei Pelagii ad Innocentium ab ipso missus, zosimo redditus*, PL, 45, 1716–18.

⁵ Pseudo-Augustine, *Oratio in libros de Trinitate*, ed. W. J. Mountain, CCSL, 50, 550–5.

⁶ Halitgar of Cambrai, *De vitiis et virtutibus et de ordine poenitentium libri quinque*, PL, 105, 651–710.

⁷ *Disputatio fidei inter Arium et Athanasium*, PL, 62, 155–79 (CPPM, ii.A, 1692). The preface on fo. 58^v: *Praefatio incerti auctoris*, PL, 62, 179B–80B.

⁸ Eusebius (Rufinus), *Historia ecclesiastica*, lib. X, cap. 1–14, in idem, *Eusebius Werke*, ed. T. Mommsen and E. Schwartz, 2 vols. (Leipzig, 1903), ii. 960–79.

⁹ 'ad pascua vitae aeternae': *Admonitio generalis*, in *Capitularia regum francorum*, 2 vols, ed. A. Boretius and V. Krause (MGH Legum sectio, ii; Hannover, 1883–1897), i. 53–62, at 54.

residence for teaching boys the psalms, musical notation, singing, computation and grammar.¹⁰ These modest aims of the capitularies, however, were advanced by schoolmasters with more ambitious ideals, and the ninth century witnessed a flourishing of the study of the liberal arts and a widespread notion of literacy and knowledge as necessary and praiseworthy.

Modern scholarship on Carolingian education has paid much attention to this foundation of liberal arts.¹¹ Far less attention has been directed to how the elements of faith and doctrine themselves were learned, either on a basic or more advanced level, once this foundation was laid. Instead, modern scholars have approached the subject of Carolingian doctrine and theology by focusing either on individual scholars, such as Alcuin and John Scottus Eriugena, or on particular doctrinal controversies.¹² The Carolingian reform efforts, however, were first and foremost concerned with teaching the fundamentals of orthodox faith to a wider audience.¹³ The doctrine found in the Bible was explained in the acts of the orthodox synods and ecumenical councils and, especially, the works of the Fathers, which together represented an integrity of faith. Unity of doctrine was necessary to achieve the *pax catholica*, which the Carolingians claimed could only be guaranteed by a universal church, expressing the true faith in the correct worship of the church.¹⁴ The writings of the Fathers were used to define doctrine and so the success of the reform was dependent on the understanding — and teaching — of the works of the Fathers.

Instruction in the writings of the Fathers was challenged by the absence of a uniform, agreed corpus of patristic texts and the uneven dissemination of many texts, so that works available to some could be unknown to others. The pseudo-Gelasian *Decretum*, widely diffused during the ninth century, listed the names of writers deemed orthodox or not orthodox, but did not

¹⁰ Ibid. 60.

¹¹ J. J. Contreni, 'The Carolingian Renaissance: education and literary culture', in R. McKitterick (ed.), *The new Cambridge medieval history*, ii: c. 700–c. 900 (Cambridge, 1995), 709–57, esp. 725–47.

¹² For instance, D. A. Bullough, *Alcuin: achievement and reputation* (Leiden, 2004); M. Cappuyens, *Jean Scot Erigène: sa vie, son oeuvre, sa pensée* (Leuven, 1933); cf. D. Ganz, 'Theology and the organisation of thought', in McKitterick (ed.), *The new Cambridge medieval history*, ii. 758–85.

¹³ See R. McKitterick, *The Frankish Church and the Carolingian Reforms, 789–895* (London, 1977).

¹⁴ Cf. W. Otten, 'Carolingian theology', in G. R. Evans (ed.), *The medieval theologians* (Oxford, 2001) 65–82, at 67.

list their works. In several ninth-century letters we find masters trying to obtain relevant works of the Fathers of which they had heard but which they had not read.¹⁵ It is not hard to imagine there being other relevant patristic writings of which they had no knowledge. Furthermore, the works of the Fathers themselves do not form a monolithic whole and are not always consistent with each other. Ninth-century scholars were very much aware of these difficulties and there was clearly an interest in attributing texts correctly and determining their orthodoxy. Some religious houses laboured to acquire more thorough patristic book collections, drawing upon such bio-bibliographical texts as were available, such as the recommendations for patristic reading made by Cassiodorus in his *Institutiones* and Bede's list of his own writings in the *Historia ecclesiastica*.¹⁶ Yet, in general, which works of the Fathers were read depended on the availability of the texts and the particular interests of the individual scholars and teachers.

Theological tracts and so-called 'patristic dossiers' inform us how ninth-century scholars at the highest intellectual level approached the works of the Fathers and the accompanying difficulties of availability and orthodoxy, but the use of patristic writings at the lower levels, for instance in the education of priests, is unclear.¹⁷ Ninth-century letters between teachers

¹⁵ J. J. Contreni, 'Carolingian biblical studies', in U.-R. Blumenthal (ed.), *Carolingian essays: Andrew W. Mellon lectures in early Christian Studies* (Washington, DC, 1983), 71–98, at 86–7.

¹⁶ The mid-ninth-century catalogue of the monastery of Murbach lists works that the abbey wanted to acquire, using the lists of Cassiodorus and Bede: see W. Milde, *Der Bibliothekskatalog des Klosters Murbach aus dem 9. Jahrhundert: Ausgabe und Untersuchung von Beziehungen zu Cassiodors 'Institutiones'* (Beihefte zum Euphorion: Zeitschrift für Literaturgeschichte, 4; Heidelberg, 1968), esp. 62–130; see also R. McKitterick, *The Carolingians and the written word* (Cambridge, 1989), 165–210.

¹⁷ On the use of 'patristic dossiers', see Ganz, 'Theology and the organisation of thought', 767; Alcuin compiled a dossier during the Adoptionist controversy and Ratramnus of Corbie prepared a patristic dossier on the subject of the Trinity for bishop Hildegard of Meaux, a compendium that was to be a matter of contention itself, see Hincmar of Rheims, *De una et non trina deitate*, PL, 125, 473–618, at 512–15; Ratramnus also delivered a massive dossier of texts to Charles the Bald on the Trinity and on predestination, see Ratramnus of Corbie, *De praedestinatione Dei*, PL, 121, 11–80; cf. J. M. Wallace-Hadrill, *The Frankish church* (Oxford, 1983), 366; Carolingian readers were furthermore wont to annotate manuscripts with headings and *notae* to indicate passages thought suitable to reproduce in an argument, see D. Ganz, *Corbie in the Carolingian Renaissance* (Beihefte der Francia, 20; Sigmaringen, 1990), 68–81; cf. also K. Zechiel-Eckes, 'Ein Blick in Pseudoisidors Werkstatt: Studien zum Entstehungsprozeß der falschen Dekretalen: mit einem exemplarischen editorischen Anhang (Pseudo-Julius an die orientalischen Bischöfe, JK †196) (avec résumé français)', *Francia*, 28/1 (2001), 37–90.

and students describe masters putting together collections of excerpts and notes on specific topics and often writing commentaries on the Fathers or rewriting patristic commentaries, because the original texts were found to be too difficult for the students.¹⁸ How, when, in which context and in which order students were confronted with patristic texts or collections of extracts remains unknown. Furthermore, the teacher's freedom to tailor his tutoring to the students' needs must have resulted in great diversity at a local level. The capitularies themselves demanded educational variety, stating that the study of letters should be taught to each 'according to their capacity'.¹⁹ In the instruction of their priests, the bishops and archbishops should decide on the form and contents of instruction on the basis of the individual priest's needs and competence. A bishop could recommend inclusion of a difficult tract on the Trinity as appropriate for one priest, yet recommend simpler, less demanding texts on the Trinity for another.²⁰ The individual interests of teachers and students, local tradition, as well as local availability of texts, defined the patristic curriculum that was available in each locality.²¹ To uncover the full extent and character of Carolingian education, and the function and use of patristic writings in particular, we must thus have recourse to detailed study of the individual manuscripts produced for the education of the clergy, as seems to be the case for Pembroke 108.

Physical description

Cambridge, Pembroke College MS 108 is a modest volume of 124 folios (+ 2 parchment flyleaves), measuring 20.5 x 14.5 cm.²² It contains two series of foliation: one counting the first flyleaf as folio 1, but missing two folios in the

¹⁸ Contreni, 'Carolingian biblical studies', 85–93; idem, 'Education and learning in the early Middle Ages: new perspectives and old problems', *The International Journal of Social Education*, 4 (1989), 9–25, at 15; idem, 'The Carolingian Renaissance', esp. 733–4.

¹⁹ '[...] qui donante Domino discere possunt secundum uniuscuiusque capacitatem', *Epistola de litteris colendis*, in *Capitularia regum francorum*, ii, cap. I, 78–9, at 79.

²⁰ Keefe, *Water and the word*, 143–4; that the reform was an archdiocesan and diocesan undertaking with regard to learning can be understood from the relevant passages in the royal capitularies: *Admonitio generalis* 59, and the *Epistola de litteris colendis*, which includes monasteries and is addressed to (arch)bishops and abbots.

²¹ Cf. J. J. Contreni, 'Learning in the early Middle Ages', in idem (ed.), *Carolingian learning, masters and manuscript* (Hampshire, 1992), 1–21, at 9.

²² My collation is: iii (paper) ii (parchment) 1⁸ (wants 1) 2⁸ 3⁸ (wants 4, 7) 4⁸ 5⁸ (wants 5, 8) 6⁸ 7⁸ 8⁴ 9⁴ (wants 4) 10⁸–13⁸ 14⁸ (strip of parchment after 4) 15⁸–16⁸ 17⁶ 18⁴ iii (paper).

manuscript and one using smaller numbers on the first folios of every quire, starting with the leaf containing the opening of the first text, following the two parchment flyleaves. In this article I follow the latter numbering.

The binding is nineteenth-century with three paper flyleaves at the front and the rear of the manuscript and two parchment flyleaves preceding folio 1. The folios are of good quality thick parchment, in quires mainly of eight leaves, with drypoint ruling of 18 lines with double vertical bounding lines. Quire 9, containing the ending of the pseudo-Augustinian prayer, the short text attributed to Prosper and a preface to the pseudo-Athanasian *Disputatio*, is of thinner parchment and has 18–24 ruled lines.²³

The manuscript has almost no decoration other than some colouring of initials and rubrics. The opening of the Augustinian prayer on folio 52^v has a line-decorated initial ‘D’, with a small snake’s head protruding from the top of the shaft. A similar snake’s head is drawn in the lower margin of folio 79^v to indicate a run-over.

The two parchment flyleaves contain a short text on the life and times of Justinian I, taken from Paul the Deacon’s *Historia gentis Langobardorum*,²⁴ written in a continental hand from the middle or the second half of the eleventh century, which is characteristic of handwriting from north-eastern France or the Rhineland area.²⁵ The connection between this excerpt’s subject and the first text of the manuscript indicates that the parchment flyleaves have accompanied the manuscript at least since the eleventh century. The verso side of the last folio, covered with linen, has scribbles on it. The linen makes the text practically illegible, but the word written at the top of the page is discernible as ‘TRINITATE’. There are occasional scribbles in margins and a later reviser inserted faint word-separation lines and closed open forms of ‘a’, when appropriate.²⁶

²³ Fol. 56^r has 18 lines; 56^v, 22; 57^r, 24; 57^v, 22; 58^{r-v}, 20.

²⁴ Paul the Deacon, *Historia gentis Langobardorum*, lib. I, cap. 25–6, in *Scriptores rerum Langobardicarum et Italicarum saec. VI–IX*, ed. G. Waitz (MGH; Hannover, 1878), 45–187, at 62–4.

²⁵ In fact, the script resembles that of London, British Library, MS Royal 6 A.v originating from the Abbey of Lobbes (c.1049), cf. G. F. Warner and J. P. Gilson, *Catalogue of western manuscripts in the old Royal and King’s collections in the British Museum*, 4 vols. (London, 1921), i. 128–9, iv. plate 45a. See note 66. I am grateful to Dr Teresa Webber for this observation.

²⁶ Other manuscripts with Bury provenance show signs of the same reviser: Cambridge, Pembroke College MSS 17, 41, 81, 83, 88 and 91. See R. Rushforth, ‘The eleventh- and early twelfth-century manuscripts of Bury St Edmunds abbey’, Ph.D. thesis, 2 vols. (University of Cambridge, 2003), i. 103 n. 242.

There appear to be perhaps as many as five hands in the main part of the manuscript with a different scribe working on each text, except for the larger part of the pseudo-Athanasian *Disputatio* and the subsequent excerpt of the *Historiae Ecclesiasticae*, which appear to be copied by the same scribe (hereafter 'scribe C') responsible for the pseudo-Augustinian *Oratio*. The script throughout the manuscript is a somewhat irregular Caroline minuscule with some variant letterforms, such as 'cc'-shaped 'a', square 'n' with descender and uncial 'm', as well as high 'e' and 'r' in occasional ligatures. The use of the variant letter forms increases in the course of the individual writing stints. Rubrics and titles throughout the manuscript are entered by two different scribes in either rustic capitals with characteristic forms of 'A' and 'F', or in more rounded mixed capitals with some uncial letterforms. The *incipits* of the Justinian edict on folio 1^r and the *Disputatio* on folio 59^r correspond with quire openings. The first 7 lines of folio 1 are written in red uncial letters, while the *Disputatio* opens with a full, though uncoloured, display page with the title in square capitals and the opening of the text in rustic capitals.

The order of the manuscript seems to have been altered at an early stage. The last eight quires (fos. 59^r–124^r), containing the pseudo-Athanasian *Disputatio* and the excerpt from Rufinus's continuation, have quire signatures, 'i' to 'viii'. The display page for the opening of the *Disputatio* further suggests that this text was once intended to be the first of the manuscript. Quire 9, with atypical ruling and thinner parchment, seems to have been intended to join the two parts, confirmed by the presence of a preface to the *Disputatio* on folio 58^v.²⁷ The fact that the ending of the Augustinian prayer on the first leaf of quire 9 seems to be written by scribe C, like the earlier part, indicates that this rearrangement took place at an early stage. The presence of his (or her) hand in both parts of the manuscript, the recurrence of the snake's head, and the presence throughout the manuscript of both sets of capitals confirms that both sections were produced at one centre and were probably intended to form a whole.

²⁷ According to Montague Rhodes James this quire could be a (slightly) later addition to the manuscript: see M. R. James and E. H. Minns, *A descriptive catalogue of the manuscripts in the library of Pembroke College, Cambridge, with a hand list of the printed books to the year 1500* (Cambridge, 1905), 103.

Origin and provenance

In his *Katalog* Bernhard Bischoff states that Pembroke 108 was copied in the second third of the ninth century, possibly in eastern France, and this opinion was also adopted by Helmut Gneuss.²⁸ Unfortunately, Bischoff does not share his reasons with us for his localisation of the manuscript.²⁹ The appearance of the script agrees with a Caroline minuscule of the ‘second phase’ which dates it after the first quarter of the ninth century. The many variant letterforms, furthermore, seem to rule out a date in the late ninth century. While most of the variants must be interpreted as part of a larger corpus of accepted letterforms, the rare occurrences of the ‘cc’-shaped ‘a’ seem to be lapses into an older form that was no longer current. The manuscript is a small workmanlike volume, with a minimum of decoration or embellishment. The modesty, the changed order, the multitude of hands, as well as the irregular script indicate that it was intended as a utilitarian book. The form of the ligatures, the variant letterforms, and the fact that their use increases in the course of the stints, may suggest scribes who were not so much inexperienced, but whose formal Caroline minuscule bookhand was just one of the scripts they had mastered.³⁰ For this sober and practical book it is possible scribes were employed who were also experienced in the writing of documents.

The manuscript’s oldest certain provenance is the abbey of Bury St Edmunds. On the verso side of the second parchment flyleaf a short list of contents is entered in the distinctive hand of Henry of Kirkstead, a monk and librarian at Bury from 1338 to 1378.³¹ In the margin of folio 1^r the

²⁸ ‘Ostfrankreich(?), IX. Jh. 2. Drittel’: B. Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts (mit Ausnahme der wisigotischen)*, i: *Aachen–Lambach* (Wiesbaden, 1998), no. 833; Helmut Gneuss adopts the attribution from Bischoff but omits the query: see H. Gneuss, *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts: a list of manuscripts and manuscript fragments written or owned in England up to 1100* (Tempe, Ariz., 2001), no. 137.

²⁹ A lack of reasons is unfortunately a recurrent theme in Bischoff’s ascriptions, cf. David Ganz’s review of Bischoff’s *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften in Francia*, 27/1 (2000), 273–8, at 273.

³⁰ On ‘inexperienced’ scribes, see S. Tibbets, ‘*Praescriptiones*, student scribes and the Carolingian scriptorium’, in H. Spilling (ed.), *La collaboration dans la production de l’écrit médiéval* (Paris, 2003), 25–38, esp. 25–6.

³¹ James and Minns, *Descriptive catalogue*, 103; Henry of Kirkstead included three works contained in this manuscript in his *Catalogus*, see *Henry of Kirkstede: Catalogus de libris authenticis et apocryphis*, ed. R. H. Rouse and M. A. Rouse (Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues, 11; London, 2004), 43 (no. K1.182: Augustine), 107 (no. K6.10: Athanasius), 300 (K281.232: Jerome).

manuscript has the classmark 'F.12', assigned by Henry of Kirkstead.³² The manuscript has furthermore been identified in a twelfth-century list of books belonging to the abbey of Bury St Edmunds, compiled in stages on blank leaves in the last gathering of Cambridge, Pembroke College MS 47, a glossed copy of Genesis and the Song of Songs. Pembroke College 108 is featured under the heading *Edictum piissimi imperatoris Iustiniani*, the initial words of the title on folio 1^r of Pembroke 108.³³ How and when the manuscript came into Bury's possession is unclear. The text added by an eleventh-century continental hand on the flyleaves suggests that the manuscript was still on the continent at that time. Rodney Thomson nevertheless argued that it was in Bury's possession by 1100, referring to Neil Ker's observation that early manuscripts very rarely travelled in the later Middle Ages, and that any early book owned by a community in the thirteenth or fourteenth century was likely to have arrived there before 1100.³⁴ Rebecca Rushforth included Pembroke 108 in a list of seven ninth-century Frankish manuscripts that possibly found their way into the abbey's library through the agency of abbot Baldwin (1065–97/8), at a time when many English episcopal and monastic centres began acquiring more works of the Fathers.³⁵ The French Baldwin had been a monk of St Denis in Paris before becoming the physician of Edward the Confessor and subsequently abbot of Bury St Edmunds. He was a frequent traveller to the continent and doubtless brought books over to the abbey from St Denis and elsewhere, either as part of his personal collection or to expand his

³² R. Sharpe, 'Reconstructing the medieval library of Bury St Edmunds Abbey: the lost catalogue of Henry of Kirkstead', in A. Gransden (ed.), *Bury St Edmunds: medieval art, architecture, archaeology and economy* (The British Archaeological Association Conference Transactions, 20; n.p., 1998), 204–18, at 212; cf. Rouse and Rouse, *Henry of Kirkestede*.

³³ R. Sharpe et al. (eds.), *English Benedictine libraries: the shorter catalogues* (Corpus of British Medieval Library Catalogues, 4; London, 1996), 73 (no. B13.163).

³⁴ R. M. Thomson, 'The library of Bury St Edmunds abbey', *Speculum*, 47 (1972), 617–45, at 622 n. 23; cf. also Thomson's more implicit statement on p. 623, where he mentions that the extant (pre-conquest) books show a quite respectable range of interest for this period (i.e. before 1100).

³⁵ These are Cambridge, Pembroke College MSS 17, 46 (fos. 82 and 83), 81, 83, 88, 91 and 108; Rushforth, 'Eleventh- and early twelfth-century manuscripts', 99–104; cf. Thomson, 'Library of Bury St Edmunds abbey', 617–45; on the acquisition of works of the Fathers after the Conquest, see R. M. Thomson, 'The Norman Conquest and English libraries', in P. Ganz (ed.), *The role of the book in medieval culture: proceedings of the Oxford International Symposium, 26 September–1 October 1982*, 2 vols. (Turnhout, 1986), i. 27–40.

community's resources.³⁶ The seven ninth-century manuscripts identified by Rushforth were copied at centres all over France and none of them seems to share a place of origin. If Baldwin played a role in the acquisition of Pembroke 108 for Bury, this is of no assistance in identifying its place of origin. Alternatively, Pembroke 108 may have been acquired via another English centre.³⁷

The manuscript eventually arrived in Pembroke College as part of a larger number of books donated to the college in 1599 by William Smart, who not much earlier seems to have acquired around a hundred manuscripts previously belonging to the abbey of Bury St Edmund's.³⁸

Textual context

In addition to the physical description and the evidence of the manuscript's wanderings we may learn something about the origin and context of the manuscript by considering its contents and arrangement. Pembroke 108 is a compendium of mostly pseudonymous doctrinal works, here attributed to the patristic authorities Justinian I, Jerome, Augustine, Prosper, Athanasius and Eusebius. The first text in the manuscript is the *Edictum de recta fide*, written by emperor Justinian I in the summer of 551, foreshadowing — and imposing — an end to the controversy of the Three Chapters and paving the way for the fifth ecumenical council.³⁹ The tract can be divided into two parts. The first part is in essence an affirmation of

³⁶ A. Gransden, 'Baldwin, abbot of Bury St Edmunds, 1065–1097', *Proceedings of the Battle Conference on Anglo-Norman Studies*, 4 (1981), 65–76; see for instance Cambridge, Pembroke College MS 23–24 (provenance St Denis, saec. xi^{med}).

³⁷ Cambridge, Pembroke College MS 88, provenance Bury St Edmunds, was probably at St Augustine's Canterbury in the second half of the tenth century, see F.A. Rella, 'Continental manuscript acquired for English centers in the tenth and early eleventh centuries: a preliminary checklist', *Anglia*, 98 (1980), 107–116, at 111; on the use of Canterbury exemplars in the scriptorium of Bury in the first half of the eleventh century, see Thomson, 'Library of Bury St Edmunds abbey', 632.

³⁸ M. R. James, *The wanderings and homes of manuscripts* (London, 1919), 67; the manuscript is recorded in both Thomas James's (221) and Matthew Wren's list of the gift of Smart (53), both partly printed in M. R. James, *On the abbey of S. Edmund* (Cambridge Antiquarian Society, 28; Cambridge, 1895), 12–22.

³⁹ Justinian I, *Edictum de recta fide*; on the date of the edict, see R. Schieffer, 'Zur lateinischen Überlieferung von Kaiser Justinians "Ὁμολογια τῆς ορθῆς πίστεως"' (*Edictum de recta fide*)', *Kléronomia*, 3 (1971), 285–302, at 286–7.

faith, upholding the acts of the four previous councils, ending with ten anathemas followed by threats to excommunicate the authors of the Three Chapters. The second part then proceeds to deflect all possible objections against the three threats.

The Latin translation survives in only eight manuscripts and Eduard Schwartz used four for his edition.⁴⁰ Two other ninth-century manuscripts contain the edict — Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, MS Palatinus lat. 573 (of Lorsch origin) and Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, MS Lat. 1687 (unknown origin) — which both seem older than Pembroke 108.⁴¹ The relationship between these manuscripts and Pembroke 108 is uncertain. Schieffer concludes that although the extant Latin texts of the edict stem from a single Latin translation of the Greek text, none of the surviving recensions is directly connected to another. Pembroke 108's text is of poor quality, though it displays a 'bemerkenswerte Zahl' of variants that appear to be deliberate emendations.⁴² As there are no obvious amendments in Pembroke 108, these corrections could have already been present in its exemplar.

The Latin version of the edict *De recta fide* found its way into the most notorious ninth-century collection of canon law, the pseudo-Isidorian *Decretales*. The identity of the author or authors of the so-called pseudo-Isidorian forgeries has long been an enigma to modern scholars. The collection is thought to have been composed between 847 and 852 and to originate from the diocese of Rheims, where it played a role in the disputes on the metropolitan rights of archbishop Hincmar of Rheims.⁴³ The

⁴⁰ The other manuscripts were identified by Rudolf Schieffer, see Schieffer, 'Zur lateinischen Überlieferung' and R. Schieffer, 'Nochmals zur Überlieferung von Justinians "Ομολογια της ορθης πιστευως"' (Edictum de recta fide), *Kléronomia*, 4 (1972), 267–84.

⁴¹ A. Wilmanns, 'Der Katalog der Lorscher Klosterbibliothek aus dem zehnten Jahrhundert', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, 23 (1868), 385–410, at 396; B. Bischoff, *Lorsch im Spiegel seiner Handschriften* (München, 1974), 42; cf. Schieffer, 'Zur lateinischen Überlieferung', 291–2.

⁴² Schieffer, 'Zur lateinischen Überlieferung', 298; see also idem, 'Nochmals zur Überlieferung', 279.

⁴³ Recently Klaus Zechiel-Eckes showed convincingly that the compilers made use of two manuscripts from Corbie: K. Zechiel-Eckes, 'Ein Blick in Pseudoisidors Werkstatt', 37–61. In another article Zechiel-Eckes even proposed abbot Paschasius Radbertus (*ob. c.860*) as its compiler, K. Zechiel-Eckes, 'Auf Pseudoisidors Spur: oder: Versuch, einen dichten Schleier zu lüften', in W. Hartmann and G. Schmitz (eds.), *Fortschritt durch Fälschungen? Ursprung, Gestalt und Wirkungen der pseudoisidorischen Fälschungen* (MGH Studien und Texte, xxxi; Hannover, 2002), 1–28.

authors included a passage from the *Edictum* — without citing the source by name — in the fabricated second letter from pope Clemens to the apostle James (as bishop of Jerusalem), where it is used to warn clerics not to speak ill or to spread rumours.⁴⁴ In the same letter — almost immediately after the first citation — and in the supposed first letter of Clemens to James, another long passage taken from the *Edictum* is similarly used to condemn ill-speaking clerics or those who persecute and accuse the Church's bishops.⁴⁵

Interestingly, Hincmar of Rheims also used the Justinian text. He cites the edict thrice in the years 870/1, twice under the heading *in edicto quinti concilii* and once as *edicto Justiniani super quintam synodum*.⁴⁶ In his *Opusculum LV capitulorum*, composed in 870, Hincmar countered his nephew, bishop Hincmar of Laon, who had advocated a lessening of the power of archbishops over their suffragan bishops. The archbishop uses a paragraph from Justinian's edict to warn the bishops not to repeat the complaints of some of their colleagues, because God punishes the impious person as much as the impious act. In the accusation against the bishop of Laon read before the synod of Douzy in 871 the archbishop repeated the same words.⁴⁷ The other citation, found in the *Opusculum LV capitulorum*, puts it even more bluntly. Here Hincmar's nephew and his allies were

⁴⁴ *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae et Capitula Angilramni*, ed. P. Hinschius (Leipzig, 1863), 50; Justinian I, *Edictum de recta fide*, 159 (l. 101.17–23); cf. Schieffer, 'Nochmals zur Überlieferung', 281–2; since there is no critical edition of the Pseudo-Isidorian texts, it is not possible to hypothesize on the exemplar of the citations, although the edition-in-progress accessible on the internet confirms that the text of Justinian's edict in Pembroke 108 is closer to the older, probably more original A1, A/B and A2 recensions of the Decretals than to any other recensions: cf. K.-G. Schon (2005), 'Project Pseudoisidor', <http://www.pseudoisidor.mgh.de/> (last accessed 13 March 2006).

⁴⁵ *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae et Capitula Angilramni*, 42, 50; Justinian I, *Edictum de recta fide*, 165 (l. 107.12–18); on the edict as its source, as opposed to the Acts of the Fifth Council, see Schieffer, 'Nochmals zur Überlieferung', 281–2.

⁴⁶ See H. Fuhrmann, 'Justinians "Edictum de recta fide" (551) bei pseudoisidor', in G. Fransen (ed.), *Mélanges G. Fransen*, 2 vols. (Studia Gratiana, 19–20; Rome, 1976), i. 217–23, at 222.

⁴⁷ Hincmar of Rheims, *Opusculum LV capitulorum*, ed. R. Schieffer, *Die Streitschriften Hinkmars von Reims und Hinkmars von Laon 869–871* (MGH Concilia, iv, suppl. 2; Hannover, 2003), 130–361, at 299; idem, *Libellus expostulationis*, ed. W. Hartmann, *Die Konzilien der karolingischen Teilreiche 860–874* (MGH Concilia, iv; Hannover, 1998), 420–87, at 434; cf. Justinian I, *Edictum de recta fide*, 161 (l. 103.03–8);

confronted with the example of a cleric of Justinian's time, who had rebelled against the hierarchy of the Church and was condemned. The archbishop warns the dissenting bishops that rebelling against one's superior can lead to damnation, even if one does not sin 'in fidem'.⁴⁸

Schieffer concludes that the source of the edict's diffusion over western Europe lay in ninth-century central Francia.⁴⁹ This is supported by the fact that the little used source was demonstrably available in the area of Rheims. The three oldest extant witnesses of the edict *De recta fide*, including Pembroke 108, all seem to have been copied around the same time as the Pseudo-Isidorian forgeries, and probably not far removed from its place of origin.

The *Edictum* is followed on folio 48^r by the *Libellus fidei*, which reads like a declaration of faith, opening with *credimus in deum patrem omnipotentem*.⁵⁰ The letter is introduced here as the work of Jerome, but modern scholarship agrees that it was written by Pelagius.⁵¹ Notwithstanding its origin, the work did not seem to have posed problems for ninth-century orthodox readers. It affirms 'our' faith in the Trinity of one substance and three persons, in which the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit are equal and none inferior. In the course of the text the heresy of Arius is explicitly renounced, as are other unorthodoxies, such as those propagated by Sabellius, Apollinaris and Photinus. In the penultimate paragraph there is even a reference to the heresy of Pelagius, where the version printed in the *Patrologia Latina* has the name of Manichaeus instead. As such the letter seems to fit in well with the anti-heretical and doctrinal *Edictum* preceding it in this manuscript, but with greater emphasis on the doctrine of the Trinity and the heresies disagreeing with orthodoxy on this point.

This focus on the doctrine of the Trinity is continued in the following text on folio 52^v, the *Oratio de Trinitate*. Here attributed to Augustine, this

⁴⁸ 'non quia in fidem peccaverit, sed propter solum ecclesiasticum ordinem, et quia contra suum archiepiscopum sacris canonibus obvians rebellaverat, est damnatus': Hincmar of Rheims, *Opusculum LV capitulorum*, 261; cf. Justinian I, *Edictum de recta fide*, 167–9 (l. 109.35–111.05).

⁴⁹ Schieffer, 'Nochmals zur Überlieferung', 283.

⁵⁰ Pelagius, *Libellus*, 1716–18.

⁵¹ M. Lapidge and R. Sharpe (eds.), *A bibliography of Celtic–Latin Literature 400–1200* (Dublin, 1985), 4–5 (no. 6); this text has a tradition of attributions to Jerome and Augustine, cf. CPL, 252 (no. 731).

prayer contains a plea for salvation as well as for the understanding of the Trinity.⁵² The prayer survives in at least ten manuscripts. It was long thought to be a genuine work of Augustine, but this attribution is now very much doubted on linguistic grounds.⁵³ The *terminus post quem non* can now only be inferred from the oldest witness to the text, which is Pembroke 108, but since the Pembroke version of the text has many variant readings compared to the texts surviving in other manuscripts and lacks the first and the last sentences, the prayer is probably older than the manuscript and may even be older than the ninth century. These first and last sentences were used in chapter XIX of the pseudo-Augustine *Speculum* (or *Manuale*) on the Trinity, a dogmatic tract with an invocational character.⁵⁴

The *Oratio de Trinitate* ends on folio 56^r, the first leaf of quire 9, which has the different ruling and parchment. At the bottom of the same folio the title of the following text, *De fide, de spe et de caritate*, is entered, ascribing it to Prosper. Modern cataloguers and scholars have habitually adopted this attribution.⁵⁵ In fact, the text copied on folios 56^v–58^r is an excerpt from the penitential of Halitgar of Cambrai.⁵⁶ This bishop of Cambrai (c.817–830) composed the penitential as a priest’s aid at the request of his archbishop, Ebo of Rheims.⁵⁷ His penitential is divided into six books. The first two books form a more general introduction to the penitential, describing the most important sins, followed by the main virtues, which

⁵² ‘beatus ut fertur augustinus in extremo aetatis suae haec uerba de fide catholica dixit’: pseudo-Augustine, *Oratio*, 550–5.

⁵³ Cf. W. J. Mountain, in CCSL, 50, lxxviii–lxxxii; on the attribution to Augustine, see G. Morin, ‘Une prière inédite attribuée à Saint Augustin dans plusieurs mss. du *De Trinitate*’, *Revue Bénédictine*, 20 (1904), 124–32; G. Morin, *Études, textes, découvertes* (Maredsous, 1913), 29–30; A. Wilmart, ‘La tradition des grands ouvrages de Saint Augustin’, *Miscellanea Agostiniana*, 2 (1931), 257–315, at 276.

⁵⁴ Pseudo-Augustine, *Speculum*, PL, 40, 967–84, at 977 (CPPM, ii.b, no. 3075). The first part of this work is also used in the pseudo-Alcuin text *Confessio fidei* (PL, 101, 1027–98, at 1038C), now generally believed to be the work of the early eleventh-century author John of Fécamp, cf. Bullough, *Alcuin*, 7.

⁵⁵ James and Minns, *Descriptive catalogue*, 103–4; Helmut Gneuss has ‘Prosper?’, Gneuss, *Handlist*, 41 (no. 137); The excerpt’s *incipit* is taken up in the electronic database *In Principio* of Brepols Publishers, where it refers to Pembroke 108 and has Prosper as its author.

⁵⁶ Halitgar of Cambrai, *De vitiis et virtutibus*, excerpt taken from lib. II, cap. IV–VI, at 672–4.

⁵⁷ Ebo’s request is found in his letter: Ebo of Rheims, *Epistola Halitgario*, in *Epistolae Karolini aevi*, iii, ed. E. Dümmler (MGH *Epistolae*; Berlin, 1899), 616–7.

can counteract these sins. The third book deals with general questions on penance, followed by an exposé of the main offences of laity and clergy in the fourth and fifth books. The last book gives a liturgical *Ordo* for penance, as well as a list of transgressions and their respective penalties.⁵⁸ The extract in Pembroke 108 is a continuous passage taken from the second book and describes the virtues of faith, hope and charity.⁵⁹ The attribution to Prosper can be explained by Halitgar's extensive use of excerpts from Julianus Pomerus's *De uita contemplatiua*, a work regularly ascribed to Prosper of Aquitaine. The ninth-century manuscript diffusion of Halitgar's penitential was heavily concentrated in north-eastern France — without doubt the result of Ebo's promotion of the handbook among his priests and bishops — and somewhat less in northern Italy, possibly the result of Ebo's abbacy of Bobbio after 841.⁶⁰

The three paragraphs of the penitential in Pembroke 108 are more moral and homiletic in character and less polemic and anti-heretical than the other texts in the manuscript. The combination of more general moral texts with doctrinal works, however, is common in other manuscripts. Paragraphs with an anti-heretical character could be used to prescribe expected moral behaviour and, conversely, authors of doctrinal and polemic works sometimes used moral texts to describe the immorality of their adversaries. The three virtues, moreover, illustrate the ways in which the Trinity is mirrored in man's worldly existence. The adherence to the triad of virtues — faith, hope and charity — was seen as the truest form of affirming one's faith in the Trinity.⁶¹

On the verso side of the last leaf of quire 9 a page-long introduction was entered by a similar hand under the title *Praefatio altercationis Athanasii contra Arrium Sabellium uel Fotinum hereticos*.⁶² This preface, designed to

⁵⁸ Whether or not the sixth book, the so-called *Paenitentiale Romanum*, was part of the original work composed by Halitgar has been the subject of discussion. Raymund Kottje discusses the debate at length and concludes that there are important arguments to suppose that the sixth book was also written by Halitgar, see R. Kottje, *Die Bussbücher Halitgars von Cambrai und des Hrabanus Maurus* (Beiträge zur Geschichte und Quellenkunde des Mittelalters, 8; Berlin, 1980), 157–67.

⁵⁹ Halitgar of Cambrai, *De uitiis et uirtutibus*, 672–4.

⁶⁰ Kottje, *Die Bussbücher*, 13–83, 251; Kottje does not note Pembroke 108 as a witness to the penitential's diffusion.

⁶¹ See Paschasius Radbertus, *De fide, de spe et de charitate libri tres*, cap. XIV: *liber de charitate*, PL, 120, 1387–1489, at 1487–9.

⁶² *Praefatio incerti auctoris*, PL, 62, 179B–80B.

introduce the work *Contra Arianos, Sabellianos, Photinianos dialogus* of Vigilius of Thapsus (fl. 484) here in fact precedes the pseudonymous anti-Arian *Disputatio fidei inter Arium et Athanasium*, a shortened, almost certainly sixth-century Spanish version of Vigilius's text, focusing solely on Arianism.⁶³ This tract opens on a new quire, in a hand similar to the one recording the *praefatio*, but in darker ink. On folio 63^v, however, scribe C took over, using mixed capitals with some uncial letterforms for the rubrics, as opposed to the rustic capitals of the previous section.

The tract is styled as a debate between Athanasius and Arius before judge Probus, a pagan with a desire to become Christian, who is unsure whether to choose Arianism or the orthodox faith. During the dialogue Athanasius reasserts the equality of the Holy Ghost and of the Son to the Father and the unity of the Trinity. In conclusion judge Probus repeats the conversation and finally chooses the doctrine as described by Athanasius.

The pseudo-Vigilius *Disputatio* was used by Theodulf in his work at the court of Charlemagne on the *Opus Caroli* of 791, but only became more widely spread in the course of the ninth century.⁶⁴ It is usually accompanied by the genuine writings of Vigilius or texts attributed to Athanasius, a combination that seems to originate from the Carolingian era, and the pattern of its spread suggests the existence of court library archetypes.⁶⁵ It is unclear what Pembroke 108's place is in this manuscript tradition. Contrary to Schieffer's statement that 'keiner dieser Texte [in Pembroke 108] deutet auf einen näheren Überlieferungszusammenhang mit dem Edikt [of Justinian] hin', there seems to have been a tradition of

⁶³ *Disputatio fidei inter Arium et Athanasium*, 155–79; on the falsehood of the attribution to Vigilius of Thapsus, cf. CPL, 273 (no. 812); Gerhard Ficker, who regarded Vigilius also the author of this 'shorter version', remarks that, notwithstanding the occurrence of Sabellianus and Photinus, this preface seems to suit the shorter version better: see G. Ficker, *Studien zu Vigilius von Thapsus* (Leipzig, 1897), 32.

⁶⁴ D. A. Bullough, 'Charlemagne's court library revisited', *Early Medieval Europe*, 12 (2003), 339–63, at 348–9; cf. *Opus Caroli regis contra synodum (Libri Carolini)*, ed. A. Freeman (MGH Concilia, ii, suppl. 1; Hannover, 1998), 66–7, and quotations on 145, 273, 278, 329, 345, 349 and 373.

⁶⁵ G. Ficker, *Studien zu Vigilius*, 35–9; cf. Bullough, 'Charlemagne's court library', 354; S. A. Keefe, 'Creed commentary collections in Carolingian manuscripts', in K. G. Cushing and R. Gyug (eds.), *Ritual, text, and law: studies in medieval canon law and liturgy presented to Roger E. Reynolds* (Ashgate, 2004), 185–204, esp. 193–6.

the combination of the *Disputatio* with Justinian's *Edictum de recta fide*.⁶⁶ The mid eleventh-century library catalogue of the abbey of Lobbes, in the diocese of Cambrai, has two references to books containing both texts.⁶⁷ The first two works in these books are the *Disputatio* tract and the *Edictum*, in that order. The headings recorded in the library list — different for both entries — do not correspond with the titles of the texts in Pembroke 108. Unfortunately, three successive fires destroyed most of the wealth of Lobbes's library and neither of these manuscripts has come down to us. The uniform arrangement in the Lobbes list echoes the observation of a reordering of the texts in Pembroke 108. The original arrangement of Pembroke 108 would have mirrored the Lobbes arrangement of texts, although the excerpt from the *Historiae Ecclesiasticae* would then have come in between.

The last text in Pembroke 108, beginning on folio 118^v, conforms to the general character of the manuscript. The excerpt from Rufinus's continuation of the *Historiae ecclesiasticae*, taken from book X, describes the Arian controversy, reaffirming the trinitarian and doctrinal focus of Pembroke 108.⁶⁸

Conclusion

Detailed study of the physical appearance and the contents of Pembroke 108 provides some further clues to its place of origin. The ninth-century diffusion of several of the manuscript's texts is concentrated in north-eastern France, more specifically in the archdiocese of Rheims. The penitential of Halitgar of Cambrai was composed and spread in this church

⁶⁶ Schieffer, 'Zur lateinischen Überlieferung', 293.

⁶⁷ London, British Library, MS Royal 6 A.v; F. Dolbeau, 'Un nouveau catalogue des manuscrits de Lobbes aux XIe et XIIe siècles: I. Présentation et édition du texte', *Recherches Augustiniennes*, 13 (1978), 3–36, (nos. 156, 209), also 4–7; another, shorter recension of the 1049 list was published by H. Omont, 'Catalogue des manuscrits de l'abbaye de Lobbes (1049)', *Revue des bibliothèques*, 1 (1891), 4–14; catalogue entry 156 also has two chapters on visions from Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica* and the first volume of the pseudonymous *Ammonitio de laude caritatis*; entry 209 also has a work by the deacon Effrem, four sermons of Augustine, Isidore's work on the conflict of vices and virtues, pseudo-Cyprian's *De duodecim abusivis saeculi* and Alcuin's *De vitiis et virtutibus*.

⁶⁸ Eusebius (Rufinus), *Historia ecclesiastica*, lib. X, cap. 1–14, ed. Mommsen and Schwartz, *Eusebius Werke*, ii. 957–1040, excerpt at 960–79.

province, and the pseudo-Isidorian forgeries, as well as Hincmar's writings confirm that Justinian's *Edictum de recta fide* was similarly known in the archdiocese of Rheims. The *Disputatio* seems to have been spread in the ninth century from the nearby imperial court in Aachen. The correspondence between Pembroke 108 and books recorded in the library collection of Lobbes, in the diocese of Cambrai, supports this concentration in north-eastern France. Moreover, the script of the short text entered on the parchment flyleaves suggests that the manuscript was in this region some time during the middle or second half of the eleventh century. This circumstantial evidence seems to permit amending Bischoff's conjecture of the manuscript's origin from 'ostfrankreich(?)' to 'nordostfrankreich(?)'.

This study furthermore shows that Pembroke 108 was a carefully compiled — and rearranged — modest book that was intended to form a whole. I would argue that it was intended as a tool to provide instruction in the doctrines of the Church, through the writings of the Fathers, with special attention to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. A wide range of patristic texts and genres was combined in this manuscript. It contained anti-heretical texts, especially dealing with heretical views of the Trinity, as well as prayers invoking God's help in understanding the Trinity, and historical accounts of the fight against Arianism and moral tracts on the trinity of faith, hope and charity. The range of the texts in this manuscript made it a very suitable book for the instruction of priests, who would need to know various ways to teach the doctrine of the Holy Trinity to their flocks and who might be confronted with a variety of questions by the faithful.

In view of the manuscript's concentration on the Trinity, it is interesting to note that Augustine's great, but demanding, tract on the Trinity, *De Trinitate*, is conspicuously missing in this manuscript. This might simply be a consequence of the length of this text. But it also might reflect a lower level of instruction appropriate for a less learned reader. Bishops and schoolmasters might deliberately exclude difficult texts and replace them with easier ones according to the particular capacities and needs of an individual priest. The combination of texts in Pembroke 108, a product of the careful selection of writings, is a strong indication of the local and personal approach to instruction in the teaching of the Fathers. When teaching and defining the doctrines of the Church, ninth-century scholars

had no set curriculum, but could decide to use an array of texts in a variety of combinations. Pembroke 108 contains one of these possible combinations.

Abbreviations

CCSL	Corpus Christianorum Series Latina
CPL	Clavis Patrum Latinorum
CPPM	Clavis Patristica Pseudepigraphorum Medii Aevi
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae Historica
PL	Patrologia Latina

Transactions of the Cambridge Bibliographical Society, XIII/2 (2005)