Venantius Fortunatus and Christian Theology at the End of the Sixth Century in Gaul

by

Benjamin Byron Wheaton

A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Centre for Medieval Studies

University of Toronto

Venantius Fortunatus and Christian Theology at the End of the Sixth Century in Gaul

Benjamin Byron Wheaton

Doctor of Philosophy

Centre for Medieval Studies
University of Toronto

2018

Abstract

The writings of the poet Venantius Fortunatus are a major historical source for the study of Gallic society in the sixth century CE. The amount of Christian doctrine treated in these writings is considerable, and provides a fascinating perspective on late sixth-century Gallic theological thought and how it fit into broader Christian discussions of doctrine across the Mediterranean world. This approach to studying Fortunatus' writings is different from previous scholarship on the poet, and in addition to shedding light on Gallic society's approach to doctrinal issues will also serve to illumine Fortunatus' own capacity for theological discourse. Part 1 of this thesis explores his two extant sermons, one on the Apostles' Creed (The *Expositio symboli*) and the other on the Lord's Prayer (The *Expositio orationis dominicae*). The *Expositio symboli* of Fortunatus, when considered in the context of both the text from which it was adapted, Rufinus of Aquileia's fifth-century *Expositio symboli*, and other sermons on the same subject from the fifth and sixth centuries, showcases his skill at shaping and transmitting Christian doctrine. The *Expositio dominicae orationis* also does this, but has the additional facet of containing a strong polemic against semi-Pelagianism. It becomes clear from this polemic that Fortunatus held to a strongly

Augustinian doctrine of the freedom of the will. Part 2 of this thesis looks at Fortunatus' interaction with the Christological controversies of the sixth century, centring around the Three Chapters schism fomented by the decisions of the Second Council of Constantinople held in 553. Fortunatus' writings that touch on the subject display a careful attitude towards the schism that sought to reconcile the two sides. Venantius Fortunatus shows himself to be adept at doctrinal exposition amidst a late sixth-century Gallic church that retained a vibrant interest in these matters.

Acknowledgments

There are many people whose generous assistance and kind encouragement enabled this thesis to be successfully completed, and to whom my sincerest thanks are due. Michael Herren stepped in at a time of need and has been an excellent co-supervisor. His insightful comments on my text and enthusiasm for this project have been invaluable. Alexander Murray has been a supportive and wise co-supervisor whose expertise has been equally invaluable. Nicholas Everett rounded out my advisory committee, and I am grateful to have benefited from his thoughtful critiques and advice throughout my degree. Michael Roberts and Jesse Billett were very helpful external and internal readers.

The broader scholarly community at the Centre for Medieval Studies and the University of Toronto has been a pleasure to be a part of. Special thanks are due to William Robins, Dorothea Kullmann, Christopher Berard, Paul Greenham, Richard Shaw, Andrew Dunning and Justin Haynes for their encouragement and many a stimulating conversation. Most of the work on this thesis was done in the pleasant confines of the library of the Pontifical Institute for Mediaeval Studies, whose staff could not have been kinder.

My parents, Byron and Jackie Wheaton, have been incredibly supportive throughout this entire process. To them as well my loving thanks are due (although I got my doctorate 20 years earlier than you did, Dad!).

I believe that what I have written contributes to our knowledge of the truth. But as Fortunatus reminded me: *Unde in homine mendace causa veritatis sit, nisi ipsa veritas se ministret, hoc est, nisi in hominem ipsam bonam voluntatem Deus veritatis inspiret qui et velle tribuit et posse conplevit?* Therefore I say, in gratitude, *Soli Deo gloria*: to God alone be the glory.

Table of Contents

List of Appendices

Abbreviations

AA	Auctores Antiquissimi
ACO	Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum
BAV	Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana
BnF	Bibliothèque nationale de France
CCSL	Corpus Christianorum Series Latina
CCSM	Corpus Christianorum Series Mediaevalis
codd.	codices
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
MGH	Monumenta Germaniae Historica
MS	manuscript
PG	Patrologia Graeca
PL	Patrologia Latina
SSRM	Scriptores rerum Merowingicarum

General Introduction

Everywhere in the literature produced by the society of sixth-century Merovingian Gaul the centrality of Christian doctrine is evident. "Since I am about to relate the wars of kings with foreign enemies, martyrs with pagans and churches with heretics, I desire first of all to demonstrate my faith, so that anyone who reads this does not doubt that I am a catholic," writes Gregory of Tours at the beginning of his *Histories*.[1] Moreover, expositions of the Apostles' Creed (or Symbol) were a popular topic of sermons prepared for Gallic congregations, suggesting that, as Lisa Bailey observes, "the 'ordinary people' they addressed probably cared more about theology than we tend to give them credit for."[2] Holding to correct Christian doctrine was very important for all levels of Gallic society, from the aristocratic churchmen and the elites of the royal courts addressed by Gregory to the rural congregations addressed by their priest in sermons.

For all the importance of correct doctrine to society under the Merovingians, the reputation of this period for sophisticated theological thought is very poor. A dearth in specifically theological texts such as commentaries and a glut in such "popular" works as hagiographies have led scholars to underrate the theological acumen of the Gallic church of the late sixth century. Yet such texts as hagiographies can display more sophisticated and innovative theology than it might at first appear. Scholars have begun to realize this and the time is ripe for a re-assessment of the Gallic church's doctrinal activities.

Using the Italian-born poet Venantius Fortunatus to contribute to a re-assessment may seem at first glance an unusual choice. Yet when looking at the development of theology in

[1] "Scripturus bella regum cum gentibus adversis, martyrum cum paganis, ecclesiarum cum hereticis, prius fidem meam proferre cupio, ut qui ligiret me non dubitet esse catholicum." Gregory of Tours, *Historia*, ed. B. Krusch and W. Levison, MGH SSRM, vol. 1.1 (Hanover, 1951), 3.
[2] Lisa Kaaren Bailey, *Christianity's Quiet Success* (Notre Dame: Notre Dame University Press, 2010), 61.

Merovingian Gaul, it is important to take into consideration parallel developments across the Christian world. Venantius Fortunatus was educated in Byzantine Italy, migrated to Gaul in 566 and was heavily involved in Gallic society thereafter. He was made bishop of Poitiers at some point in the 590s. This means that his experiences on the one hand set him apart from the local clergy while on the other hand included him at the highest levels of the Gallic ecclesiastical hierarchy. He could bring the perspective of one educated in Ravenna, a place with ready access to Greek theologians as well as Latin ones, to the doctrinal discussions of his new homeland. In his letter to bishop Martin of Galicia (*Carmina* 5.1), Fortunatus recalls with pleasure Martin's commendation of his education: "For since you mention in your letter that after the opinions of the Stoics and Peripatetics I devoted myself to an apprenticeship in theology and theory, I perceive what love can do when it praises even those who do not deserve it."[3] So the poet's fame for learning even in theology was recognized by his contemporaries.

It is surprising that his writings have enjoyed relatively little examination in comparison to his more well-known contemporary Gregory. Moreover, Fortunatus has been construed exclusively as a transmitter rather than as an active shaper of religious thought. This lack of attention is a serious oversight given that Fortunatus reveals himself to be a careful and learned student of theology in his writings.

This dissertation will explore how Fortunatus shaped and transmitted Christian doctrine in sixth-century Merovingian Gaul, and will consist of two sections. The first section, Chapters 1-4, will look at the two surviving sermons of Fortunatus, on the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer respectively. Chapters 1 and 2 will explore how his sermon on the

[3] Fortunatus, *Carmina*, 5.1.7. "Nam quod refertis in litteris post sthoicam peripateticamque censuram me theologiae ac theoriae tirocinio mancipatum, agnosco quid amor faciat cum et non merentes exornat."

Apostles' Creed transmits Christian doctrine in his own way. They will also examine how Fortunatus' sermons were received by later generations. These two chapters will not deal with doctrinal controversy, but will focus on the technique, style and emphases of Fortunatus' transmission of Christian doctrine. Chapters 3-4 will examine the sermon on the Lord's Prayer. Chapter 3 will continue on with the focus in the previous two chapters on how the poet transmitted doctrine, as well as uncovering his doctrinal influences from previous authors. Chapter 4, however, will move on to looking at how Fortunatus engaged with doctrinal disputes. Specifically, this chapter will look at the debate over grace and free will in humanity's salvation that erupted in the fifth century, known as the "Semi-Pelagian" dispute. As well as uncovering where Fortunatus stood on this question, it will also look at what his reaction to it says about the broader position the Gallic church held.

The second section, Chapter 5-6, will deal exclusively with another dispute current in the fifth and sixth centuries, the debates around Christology that consumed both Greek and Latin churches across the Mediterranean. Chapter 5 will give an overview of the dispute, concluding with an examination of sixth-century Gallic interaction with it. Chapter 6 will then examine a number of Fortunatus' poems that deal with this subject, as well as look at his background in Italy and reach a conclusion about his positioning in this dispute.

Part I: The Sermons of Venantius Fortunatus

Introduction to the Sermons

0.1 *The Sermons of Venantius Fortunatus and their Context in the* Carmina

An important part of the bishop's task was to educate his clergy and congregation in the basic teachings of the Christian faith. One of his basic tools was the sermon. In sixth-century Gaul, it was the bishop's responsibility to both preach sermons himself and to see that they were preached by his clergy.[4] Two common kinds of sermon explained the meaning of the Symbol, or Apostles' Creed, and the Lord's Prayer. Most sermon collections that survive contain both of these types.[5] They were easy ways to instil orthodox doctrine in congregations and to guard against heresy. Both these tasks were of cardinal importance to a Late Antique bishop, so it is unsurprising that we find among the works of Venantius Fortunatus, himself a bishop at the end of his life, two such sermons entitled the *Expositio symboli* and the *Expositio orationis dominicae*. It would be natural for him, as someone who was famed for his literary skill, to compose sermons himself rather than rely on previous preachers. Such an effort reveals a great deal about Fortunatus the theologian and churchman and about the broader Gallic society which he served.

0.2 *The Composition of the Final Two Books of the* Carmina

The first part of any investigation into the *Expositio symboli* (hereafter the *ES*) and the *Expositio orationis dominicae* (hereafter the *EOD*) must be their place in the *Carmina*. A

[4] For a good summary of the importance of sermons in Late Antique Gaul, see Bailey, *Chritianity's Quiet Success*, 16-22.

[5] The place of these sermons in the Latin Christian catechetical tradition is summarized in Yves-Marie Duval, "L'Ecriture au service de la catéchèse," in *Le monde latin antique et la Bible*, ed. J. Fontaine and C. Pietri (Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1985), 275-280. Examples of collections containing such sermons are those of Augustine, Quodvultdeus, Peter Chrysologus, Caesarius of Arles and Pseudo-Eusebius of Emesa.

brief introduction to the *Carmina* and the history of their publication is in order here. The eleven books of the *Carmina* contain both poetry and prose pieces written for specific occasions. Thus Wilhelm Meyer, at the headwaters of modern Fortunatus scholarship, referred to the poet as a *Gelegenheitsdichter*, or "occasional poet." Most pieces in the *Carmina* have a title referring to their recipient or the occasion of their composition. They are frequently, though not invariably, placed together based on thematic considerations. There is a separate introductory letter from Fortunatus to Gregory of Tours, his patron who invited him to publish his poetry in a collection, at the start of the *Carmina*. Book 1 contains pieces about religious buildings; Book 2 has pieces about saints, relics and a few other occasional poems; Book 3 has pieces written for bishops and other clerics; Book 4 has epitaphs; Book 5 has pieces written to bishops; Book 6 has pieces written for secular nobles; Book 7 has pieces written to Austrasian recipients; Book 8 has pieces concerning the Holy Cross convent in Poitiers; Book 9 has pieces for various personal recipients, but with no particular theme; Book 10 has pieces from nearer the end of Fortunatus' life, including the *EOD* (*Carm.* 10.1) which begins the book, but again with no particular theme, and with a beginning set of pieces that are in an unfinished state; and Book 11 has poems written for Radegund, as well as the *ES* (*Carm.* 11.1) at its start.[6] Usually published alongside the eleven books of the *Carmina* in modern editions are a collection of thirty-one poems that appear in only one manuscript.[7]

Modern scholars of the *Carmina* of Venantius Fortunatus have agreed with Wilhelm Meyer that its publication should be assigned to three separate stages.[8] Meyer proposed that

[6] For a summary, see Marc Reydellet, ed. and trans., *Venance Fortunat: Poèmes*, vol. 1, 2nd ed. (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2002), xxxi-xxxiii.
[7] Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, lxxi-lxxii. This is the Σ manuscript, as labeled by Friedrich Leo and Reydellet.
[8] By "modern" I refer to the period from the publication of Meyer's seminal *Gelegenheitsdichter* to the present, and by "scholars" I refer principally to R. Koebner, D. Tardi, J. George, M. Reydellet, S. Di Brazzano and M. Roberts. I exclude Friedrich Leo, author of the first modern edition of the *Carmina* and so in his own way as foundational to modern Fortunatus studies as Meyer, for the simple reason that Leo did not speculate on the date

Books 1-8 were published first, around 576, at the encouragement of bishop Gregory of Tours, to whom a prologue was addressed; that Book 9 was published some years later as a stand-alone collection; and that Books 10-11 (which contain the sermons) were published after Fortunatus' death by his friends.[9] While accepting the tri-partite publication, D. Tardi modified the organization slightly by placing Book 8 alongside of Book 9 in a separate publication.[10] This modification has been accepted by later editors, as well as by most other scholars in the field. Meyer's proposals concerning the final two books (10-11) have been subjected to the most debate and revision, but they have remained remarkably resilient.

Meyer's suggestion that the final two books were put together by Fortunatus' friends after his death was extensively modified by Richard Koebner in his concise but extremely valuable work *Venantius Fortunatus: Seine Persönlichkeit und seine Stellung in der geistigen Kultur des Merowingerreiches*, published in 1915.[11] He suggested that rather than seeing the final two books as the posthumous handiwork of Fortunatus' friends, one should see the hand of the poet in their ordering.[12] Koebner pointed out that poems 7-19 of book 10 and all of Book 11 save the opening sermon, the *ES*, have a thematic order similar to Book 9. While agreeing with Meyer that a posthumous editor had a significant role in the final two books, he suggested that the arrangement of most of the poems displayed the influence of Fortunatus himself. The two sermons that begin Books 10 and 11 and the first part of Book 10 would

---

of publication of the various books of the *Carmina*. Leo provided the raw material for Meyer's analysis, but the innovation belonged to Meyer alone.

[9] Wilhelm Meyer, *Die Gelegenheitsdichter Venantius Fortunatus* (Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1901), 25-30. For a detailed argument concerning the publication of Books X-XI, see Meyer, *Gelegenheitsdichter*, 69.

[10] D. Tardi, *Fortunat: Étude sur un Dernier Représentant de la Poésie Latine* (Paris: Boivin, 1927), 92-94.

[11] Richard Koebner, *Venantius Fortunatus: Seine persönlichkeit und seine Stellung in der geistigen Kultur des Merowingerreiches* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1915).

[12] Richard Koebner, *Venantius Fortunatus*, 125-128.

perhaps have been added by a posthumous editor. Koebner's proposal has by no means been accepted by all later scholarship.

Tardi incorrectly read Meyer as dividing the publication history of Books 10-11 into two parts, one before Fortunatus' death and one after. Book 10 includes the poem *De Platone episcopo* (10.14), Fortunatus' predecessor in the bishopric of Poitiers, which would put its publication after 591 but still within the poet's lifetime. Tardi suggests that Book 11, with its collection of poems to Radegund and Agnes, would have been posthumous (i.e., after Fortunatus death sometime around the year 600) due to the private nature of their contents.[13] With regard to the *EOD* and the *ES* at the start of Books 10 and 11, Tardi agreed with Meyer and Koebner that they dated from Fortunatus' episcopate and were posthumous additions to the *Carmina*. There the question rested until Judith George took it up in 1992.

In her book *Venantius Fortunatus: A Latin Poet in Merovingian Gaul*, George agreed with Koebner's view that the final two books were largely the product of Fortunatus' own hand.[14] Book 11's collection of poems to Radegund and Agnes, written during the period between 567 and 587, would, against the views of Meyer and Tardi, have been published during the poet's lifetime in the 590's. George suggests that after the death of the two women (Agnes in 586, Radegund in 587) Fortunatus would not have felt any compunction about publishing his more private correspondence with them; indeed, "publication may have seemed a fitting memorial to them, or even a way of re-establishing the cultural status and reputation of the convent after the scandals of 589."[15] George thus stands on the far end of the spectrum on this particular issue: Fortunatus, by this reading, was responsible for

[13] Tardi, *Fortunat*, 93.
[14] Judith George, *Venantius Fortunatus: A Latin Poet in Merovingian Gaul* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 208-211.
[15] George, *Venantius Fortunatus*, 211.

practically all of the *Carmina* himself. This is reinforced by her article in *Eranos* in 1998, where she argues forcefully for the attribution of the organization of the final two books entirely to Fortunatus.[16] Before George staked out her last position, however, there was a new development on the scholarly scene that must be noted: Marc Reydellet's new edition of the *Carmina*.

The first volume of his *Venance Fortunat: Poèmes* came out in 1994 and with it a fresh assessment of the publication history of the final two books of the *Carmina*.[17] Reydellet agreed with Meyer that they were published posthumously, arguing that Fortunatus would not have been comfortable with publishing them during his own lifetime due to the private nature of his correspondence with Radegund and Agnes.[18] However, he also argued for the possibility that Fortunatus was in the process of preparing the two final books for publication when he died, explaining the unfinished state of Books 10 and 11.[19] Although Reydellet doesn't mention it, this also may help to explain the ragged state of the beginning of Book 10, with its unfinished opening sermon and the possibly rough-draft nature of *Carm.* 10.5 and 10.6.[20] The next edition that came out, by Stefano Di Brazzano, added little to the discussion on the subject of Books 10 and 11.

---

[16] Judith George, "Venantius Fortunatus: The End Game," in *Eranos*, vol. 96 (1998), 32-43.
[17] Marc Reydellet, ed. and trans., *Venance Fortunat: Poèmes*, 3 vols. (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1994-2004).
[18] Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, lxx-lxxi.
[19] Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, lxxviii. Reydellet argues as well, against the views of Meyer and Koebner, that the additional poems found in the Σ manuscript, which Leo assigned to an appendix, are not the final portion of Book 11 but an unrelated collection. The fact that Appendix 11 is an unfinished outline is the main reason Reydellet gives for this conclusion (Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, lxxix).
[20] Meyer observed the connection between *Carm.* 10.5 and 10.10, and concluded that the former was an outline of the latter (Meyer, *Gelegenheitsdichter*, 69). He also suggested that 10.6 was originally two poems, the latter a revision of the former. Koebner suggested that 10.6 was composed of two outlines put crudely together into one poem by a posthumous editor (Koebner, *Venantius Fortunatus*, 126). However Luce Pietri effectively refutes both these suggestions (Luce Pietri, *La ville de Tours du IVe au VIe siècle: naissance d'une cite chrétienne* (Rome: École française, 1983), 828-830). She proposes instead that *Carm.* 10.5 and 10.10 are distinct compositions and that *Carm.* 10.6 is a combination of possible epigraphs to be painted on the walls of the new church in Tours in 590. She presents the interesting parallel of Paulinus of Nola's *Epistula* 32, in which he provides poems on a number of themes for Sulpicius Severus to decorate the walls of a new church. Each theme

Di Brazzano's *Venanzio Fortunato: Opere Vol. 1* was published in 2001. In it he addresses the question of the publication history of the final two books.[21] His conclusions mirror those of Meyer, namely that the final two books were posthumously published by Fortunatus' friends or admirers. While mentioning George's article in Eranos, he makes no comment on it. Di Brazzano's acceptance of Meyer's essential position on the final two books of the *Carmina*—namely that Books 10 and 11 are posthumous—was strongly echoed by Michael Roberts several years later in his book *The Humblest Sparrow*.

Published in 2009, Roberts' work is the latest word on the publication history of Fortunatus' poems. He upheld Meyer's view that Books 10-11 were published posthumously and dismissed the attempts of Koebner and George to see evidence of the poet's hand in their order.[22] With regard to Book 10, in his view the unfinished nature of the opening sermon and of poem 6 pushes against a careful ordering.[23] Book 11 displays a careful ordering, but Roberts suggests that this is the responsibility of the posthumous editor. The playful nature of the poems on Radegund and Agnes in Book 11 display an image of the two women far distant from Fortunatus' earlier works on the nuns, especially Radegund, and thus it would have been counterproductive for the poet to publish them himself.[24] Fortunatus scholarship, it seems, has come full circle back to the original position of Wilhelm Meyer.

---

has several redactions for Sulpicius to choose from in Paulinus' letter, which Pietri suggests is likewise the case with Fortunatus' *Carm.* 10.6. Michael Roberts also commented on the poem, suggesting that it is a composite work, with the latter half being the older version of epigraphs set aside once the content of the pictures was known (Michael Roberts, *The Humblest Sparrow: The Poetry of Venantius Fortunatus* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2009), 190-192).

[21] Stefano Di Brazzano, ed. and trans., *Venanzio Fortunato, Opere 1* (Città Nuova: Società per la conservazione della Basilica di Aquileia, 2001), 80-81.

[22] Roberts, *Humblest Sparrow*, 192 n. 75, 286.

[23] Roberts, *Humblest Sparrow*, 192.

[24] In a collection of essays published at the same time (2009), Julia Smith came to the same conclusion, writing: "Arguments that *Carm.* 11 were…published by Fortunatus himself…fail to take account of his political tact" (Julia M.H. Smith, "Radegundis peccatrix: Authorizations of Virginity in Late Antique Gaul," in *The Transformations of Late Antiquity: Essays for Peter Brown, Vol. 2*, ed. P. Rousseau and M. Papoutsakis (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009), 314).

The positions outlined above may be divided in two: the 'orthodox' view and the 'revisionist' view. The orthodox view is the one expressed by Meyer that Books X and XI are the product of the efforts of Fortunatus' friends after his death, the revisionist the one expressed by Koebner that the poet himself ordered most of the final two books. Tardi may be counted in the orthodox camp, although he misread Meyer quite badly in attributing Book 10 to the hand of Fortunatus.[25] Reydellet tries to straddle the two positions by proposing that Fortunatus was working on the last two books at his death, but ultimately must be counted in the orthodox camp as well. George staked out the most radical revisionist position in her article for *Eranos* in 1998, but fails to account for the unfinished nature of the opening *EOD* and the composite nature of poem 10.6—not to mention the private nature of the Radegund poems in Book 11. Roberts' view then makes the most sense: Meyer was right.

The reasons for this conclusion are as follows. First, the unfinished nature of the *EOD* at the head of Book 10 and the composite nature of 10.6 both suggest the work of a later editor, since it would be highly unlikely for Fortunatus to include such rough works in a finished product.[26] Second, it is also unlikely that Fortunatus would have published the personal poems to Radegund and Agnes that appear in Book 11. Not only would it be lacking in sensitivity towards their remaining associates in Poitiers, but it would also contradict the image Fortunatus had so carefully cultivated in his previous work (i.e., the *Vitae sanctae Radegundis*) of Radegund as a model ascetic. Third, many of the titles of the poems of Book

[25] Tardi says of Book 10: "Il paraît donc vraisembable d'admettre avec Meyer que ce recueil fut le dernier publié du vivant de l'auteur" (Tardi, *Fortunat*, p. 93). But Meyer admits no such thing. "Ich werde später beweisen, dass überhaupt Buch X und XI…nicht von Fortunat, sondern erst nach seinem Tode von seinen Freunden aus seinem Nachlasse zusammengestellt und herausgegeben sind," he states (Meyer, *Gelegenheitsdichter*, 27). Later on in his book he devotes a short section to the subject of the final two books (Meyer, *Gelegenheitsdichter*, 69); it is difficult to guess how Tardi missed this.
[26] For Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.6, see note 20 above.

11 lack the specificity that is usual in the earlier books. Thus the final two books of the *Carmina* should be seen as Fortunatus' *Nachlass*, put together by his friends after his death.

0.3 *The Purpose of the Sermons in the* Carmina

Three manuscripts out of the twelve used by Friedrich Leo in his landmark 1881 edition of the *Carmina*, including two of the earliest, do not preserve either of the sermons.[27] The reason for this is that rather than a complete version of the *Carmina* they instead contain a selection of the poetry taken out of their original order.[28] The other nine manuscripts contain the *Carmina* in their original order, and include the sermons. Thus one may conclude that the order of Books 10 and 11 is likely original, and the sermons were part of them from the beginning.[29] The colleagues of the poet who produced the final version intended to transmit the eleven books of the *Carmina* as a whole. What then may one conclude about how they regarded the *ES* and *EOD* within the oeuvre of the poet-bishop Fortunatus?

It is likely that, whether it was Fortunatus' original intention or not, his colleagues sought to portray in Books 10 and 11 critical elements of his life which they felt had not been addressed previously in the collection (i.e., Bks. 1-9). The initial publication by Fortunatus in 576 at Gregory's behest divides the poetry into thematic sections.[30] For example, Book 4 is composed entirely of epitaphs, while Book 6 comprises royally themed poems. Chronology was a secondary consideration.[31] At the same time, it would not have escaped the attention of

[27] Friedrich Leo, ed., *Venanti Honori Clementiani Fortunati presbyteri Italici opera poetica*, MGH AA 4.1 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1881; repr. 1961).
[28] Namely the Σ manuscript (Paris. BnF Lat. 13048), comprised of two hands dating from the eighth and ninth centuries, the P manuscript (Petropolitanus F 14.1) from the eighth century and the V manuscript (BAV Vat. Lat. 552) from the tenth century, although it contains a catalogue of the *Carmina* which mentions the sermons. See further Leo, viii-xiii; and Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, lxxi-lxxvi.
[29] See Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, lxxxiii-lxxxv.
[30] See Meyer, *Gelegenheitsdichter*, 25.
[31] Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, xxx.

the posthumous editors that there is a general chronology to the collection, resulting at least in part from the two-stage publication. Thus the two poems from the beginning of Fortunatus' career in Italy, *Ad Vitalem episcopum* (*Carm.* 1.1) and *De templo domni Andreae quod ipse aedificavit* (*Carm.* 1.2), stand at the head of Book 1, while Book 9, the last one published during the poet's lifetime, is composed of works from the late 570s and early 580s.[32]

His friends published poems and sermons portraying neglected areas of his memory, such as the latter part of his life or his close relations with Agnes and Radegund. In Book 10 there are for example other poems relating to his final years such as the accession of his episcopal predecessor Plato in 591 (*Carm.* 10.14), the completion in 590 of the new cathedral church of Tours (*Carm.* 10.6) and his intercession for an unjustly enslaved girl in 589 (*Carm.* 10.12).[33] Book 11 takes a different approach: rather than taking poems from a later stage of Fortunatus' career, it paints a portrait of his relationship with Radegund and Agnes. Given the very different nature of these poems—frequently humorous, sometimes playfully amorous—it makes sense to see a different agenda from the poet's in the book's ordering.[34] A sensitive portrayal of Fortunatus' close relations with a renowned holy woman like Radegund would have given a fuller picture of his activities in Poitiers and further

[32] Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, xxxii.
[33] For *Carm.* 10.14 see Reydellet, *Venance Fortunatus, Poèmes*, vol. 3 (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2004), 93 n. 185, for 10.6 see Meyer, *Gelegenheitsdichter*, 64 and for *Carm.* 10.12 see Brian Brennan, "The Career of Venantius Fortunatus," in *Traditio*, vol. 41 (1985), 77.
[34] As Michael Roberts noted, "A coherent strategy is perceptible in the choice of poems for Book 11, consistent with an editor's desire to record posthumously this aspect of Fortunatus' life that had not been reflected in his writings published up to that point" (Roberts, *Humblest Sparrow*, 286). For the literary portrayal of Radegund and Agnes in Fortunatus' *Carmina*, see F. Consolino, "'Amor spiritualis' e linguaggio elegiaco nei 'Carmina' di Venanzio Fortunato," in *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Classe di lettere e filosofia*, vol. 7.4 (1977), pp. 1351-1368.

background to the main corpus of texts concerning his patroness.[35] But there still remains the question of the role of the sermons in this portrayal.

The role of the sermons at the head of each of the final two books was to display the poet's activities as bishop of Poitiers. The *EOD*, unfinished though it is, displays the talents of Fortunatus in original theological composition while his *ES* shows his ability to compress and transmit the teaching of the Fathers of the Church (since it is a summary of Rufinus of Aquileia's work on the same subject). This renders the portrait of the author of the *Carmina* complete.

What sort of portrait do the sermons paint of Fortunatus' doctrinal activities while he was bishop? That will be the task of the four chapters of this Part. The first chapter deals with the reception history of the *ES* in the medieval period and then its Late-Antique literary context. The second chapter explores how the *ES* functions as a summary of Rufinus of Aquileia's tractate of the same name. The third chapter turns its attention to the *EOD* and addresses its background along with questions about its authenticity. The fourth chapter narrows its focus to examine a passage from the *EOD* which has implications for how Fortunatus positioned himself in the semi-Pelagian controversy. Together, the four chapters will show how Venantius Fortunatus was a learned and clever expositor of Christian doctrine.

[35] There is a possibility that the *Carmina* may also have been formulated as a tool for promulgating Fortunatus as a saint; for this element of his *Nachleben*, see B. de Gaiffier d'Hestroy, "S. Venance Fortunat, évêque de Poitiers: les témoignages de son culte," in *Analecta Bollandiana*, vol. 70 (1952), 262-284. Oliver Ehlen makes the argument that the inclusion of Fortunatus' sermons in the two posthumous books reflects the desire to establish or to stabilize his saint's cult (Oliver Ehlen, *Venantius-Interpretationen: Rhetorische und generische Transgressionen beim „neuen Orpheus"* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2011), 177). However there is no evidence of a saint's life recording his miracles written shortly after his death, as is common in this period for other holy men.

Chapter 1

The Expositio Symboli*: Reception and Literary Context*

1.0 *Introduction to the* ES

Using the *ES* of Venantius Fortunatus as an exemplar of his theological writing makes good sense for a number of reasons. It is complete, unlike the *EOD*; it belongs to a very popular genre of sermon, thus enabling its distinctive elements to be measured more accurately; and it summarizes a previous text that is well known, showing how the poet made use of past sources. In order to understand Fortunatus the theologian it is therefore vital to understand his *ES*.

While Fortunatus' poetic afterlife has been studied, in particular by Peter Godman, the effect his theological writings, especially the *ES*, had on succeeding generations has not enjoyed any scrutiny.[36] The first part of this chapter, section 1.2, will remedy this neglect, and show how the *ES* was considered an important part of the poet's literary legacy by his immediate successors. Moreover, it was very widely disseminated not only as part of the *Carmina* but also, interestingly, in independent theological collections made for the aid of later clergy. The independent transmissions in particular show how Fortunatus was valued for his theological output throughout the Latin West. The sermon was also cannibalized by later authors for their own works, again attesting to the good reputation it had for clarity in content and grace in style. Poetry was not the only thing Fortunatus was known or appreciated for.

The second part of the chapter, sections 1.4 and 1.5, will explore the broader context of Symbol sermons in the Latin West in general. The sheer number of sermons on this subject dating from the fifth and sixth centuries makes patterns easy to discern and provides a good

[36] Peter Godman, *Poets and Emperors: Frankish Politics and Carolingian Poetry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 38.

basis for reaching conclusions about how Fortunatus' own sermon fits into the historical setting. The text of the Symbol itself will also be examined in all its bewildering variety. This will provide a good basis for the examination in Chapter 2 of how Fortunatus summarized Rufinus.

1.1 *The Medieval Reception of the* ES

Whatever the intent of the final editors of the completed *Carmina*, the poetry was in several instances transmitted in excerpts or individually. The two earliest extant manuscripts (Σ and P) are composed entirely of such excerpts.[37] Poem 8.3, the *De virginitate*, also likely circulated independently at a fairly early date.[38] In the case of the sermons independent transmission also occurs: the *EOD* is excerpted in only one manuscript, but the *ES* in five. This dearth of independent transmissions of the *EOD* is likely due to its incomplete condition. The *ES* on the other hand enjoyed a fairly widespread use in the Carolingian period. Not only do five examples of independent transmission of the entire sermon survive, a number of other widely disseminated texts excerpted it at length. The nature of the independent transmission of the *ES* is important to determine the reception, particularly by the Carolingians, of Fortunatus as a theologian.

The *ES* appears independently in five manuscripts: 1) Metz Bibliothèque municipale MS 351, from the late ninth century; 2) Monza Biblioteca Capitolare MS e-14/127, from the

[37] Although Reydellet cogently argues that the Σ manuscript derives not from an edition of the *Carmina* but rather from an independent collection (Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. I, lxxviii). If he is correct, it would push the practice of independent circulation back even further in the transmission history (see also Koebner, *Venantius Fortunatus*, 141-143, who argues that half of Σ came from an independent collection, while half came from a complete text of the *Carmina*). For other examples of excerpts transmitted more independently than Σ or P, see Leo, xiii-xiv.

[38] See the comments on this question by Michael Lapidge in his appendix to R.W. Hunt, "Manuscript evidence or knowledge of the poems of Venantius Fortunatus in late Anglo-Saxon England," in *Anglo-Saxon England*, vol. 8 (1979), 295. See also M. Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, vol. 1 (München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1959), 178-180.

late ninth or early tenth century; 3) Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana Codex Ottobonianus latinus 122, from the eleventh century; 4) Paris MS Bibliothèque nationale de France latinus 2316, from the late eleventh or early twelfth century; and 5) Milan Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS M.79 sup., from the late eleventh or early twelfth century. Of these five, only BAV Ott. Lat. 122 (3) is included in any critical apparatus (Leo's). What I will endeavor to do in the following analysis is to answer two questions: 1) Is there a common manuscript origin for all or several of the excerpts? 2) What does the context of the excerpts tell us about how Fortunatus' theological writing was classified by later generations?

1) Metz Bibliothèque municipale MS 351 is a late ninth-century to early tenth-century composite manuscript written by a variety of hands in Caroline minuscule.[39] Comprised of two parts written at different times, its chief interest for scholars has been the tonary contained in the second half.[40] The first half was written some time later than the second half, perhaps dating from the beginning of the tenth century, and has received almost no scholarly attention.[41] Comprising folios 1-64, it includes the following works, listed in the order in which they appear: 1) Hrabanus Maurus' *Liber de sacris ordinibus*, 2) Venantius Fortunatus' *EOD*, 3) Cyprian of Carthage's *De dominica oration*e and 4) an incomplete version of Venantius Fortunatus' *ES*. The second half is composed of a tonary, a number of *Laudes*

[39] Bernhard Bischoff, *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts*, t. 2 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2004), 188 n. 2779; Susan Keefe, *A Catalogue of Works Pertaining to the Explanation of the Creed in Carolingian Manuscripts* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012), 266. There is also a good description of the manuscript in J. Hanssens, *Amalarii episcopi opera liturgica Omnia*, t. 1 (Vatican City: Biblioteca apostolica Vaticana, 1948), 202-203.

[40] Tonaries are described as: "A type of book that flourished from the ninth century through the thirteenth century, in which antiphons, and often other chants, are listed according to mode and *differentia*," by Lora Matthews and Paul Merkley, "CANTUS and Tonaries," in *The Divine Office in the Latin Middle Ages: Methodology and Source Studies, Regional Developments, Hagiography*, ed. M. Fassler and R. Baltzer (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 549.

[41] C. Samaran and R. Marichal, *Catalogues des manuscrits en écriture latine*, t. 5 (Paris, 1965), 579; Bischoff, *Katalog*, 188. Most catalogues also only denote the second part in their description; e.g. Bischoff, Samaran and Marichal, and Lotte Kéry, *Canonical Collections of the Early Middle Ages* (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1999), 175.

regiae latinae et graecae, a collection of papal canons and the *Eclogae de ordine Romano* of Amalarius of Metz. The two original manuscripts were bound together, making a final codex apparently created for the purpose of clerical instruction, perhaps for use as a schoolbook.[42] What might mark this collection out as a schoolbook is its inclusion of the *Laudes regiae latinae et graecae*, which would be unlikely to find a place in a mere priest's handbook. These *Laudes* include a Greek set of liturgical praises whose lack of linguistic accuracy suggests that they are an academic exercise.[43]

At the same time, while one might assign the manuscript as a whole to the category of schoolbook, its composite nature demands that both parts be investigated individually. The latter (older) half, from folios 66-118, is plainly a schoolbook, given its inclusion of the *Laudes*. The first half, however, folios 1-64 (folio 65 is blank), containing the *ES* and *EOD*, does not seem to include any text that could be identified as specifically belonging to a schoolbook. Moreover, the final text in this section, Venantius Fortunatus' *Expositio symboli*, is incomplete. If it had been finished, it may have been followed by any number of different texts. Thus it is possible that the first part was begun as a schoolbook, a bishop's handbook, a bishop's reference work, or an instruction-reader for priests. It is impossible to know for sure.

In some ways it looks like it would have been completed as an instruction-reader for priests.[44] The basic instructional nature of Hrabanus Maurus' *Liber de sacris ordinibus*, combined with the three sermons on the liturgical core texts of the Lord's Prayer and Symbol, point to the first part of Metz 351 being this kind of manual. At the same time, one

[42] Susan Keefe's work on Carolingian clerical manuals provides the classification system which I will use for the following documents, beginning with Metz MS 351(S. Keefe, *Water and the Word: Baptism and the Education of the Clergy in the Carolingian Empire*, 2 vols. (Notre Dame, 2002)). See especially Keefe, *Water and the Word*, vol. 1, 28-35 for her delineation of the typical contents of a schoolbook.
[43] For the *Laudes regiae* found in Metz MS 351, see H. Leclercq, "Les laudes grecques," in *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, vol. 11.1, 860-864.
[44] See Keefe, *Water and Word*, vol. 1, 23-26 for a description of this category.

textual factor does point to a schoolbook. The heading of Fortunatus' *ES* in this manuscript is as follows: *Incipit Expositio Symboli Liber XI*. As will be seen later on, the *incipits* for the individual transmissions of Fortunatus' *ES* follow a slightly different pattern, not indicating that they are taken from a full text of the *Carmina*. Yet here is found the book number of the *Carmina* from which the sermon was taken. This may point to the original context of the first part being a school rather than a basic primer for a priest, given the evidence that this sermon was taken directly from an existing copy of the *Carmina*, a text unlikely to be available save in major centres.[45] Nevertheless, all that may be said for certain is that the first part was left unfinished and grafted on to the already existing second part, forming as a unit a schoolbook.

The text of the *ES* is introduced with the *incipit* noted above, and terminates midway through the sermon in the middle of the commentary on the article *descendit ad infernum*.[46] Although it is unfinished, it should still be possible with the text available to make a judgment about the manuscript family of the *Carmina* from which the text derives. In the following analysis Leo's apparatus will be used due to the existence of line numbers in his edition, while still consulting Reydellet as a second source.[47] The first clue to the parent manuscript lies in the exact text of the *incipit*: "Incipit Expositio Symboli Liber XI." Although Leo's apparatus does not include the variants of this line, Reydellet's does; and the only manuscript which matches this exactly is *A*. *A* refers to MS Paris BnF lat. 14144, a ninth-century manuscript from the abbey of Saint-Germain des Prés.[48] Its function as a

[45] For evidence of libraries (e.g., York and Corbie) that contained the full *Carmina*, see G. Becker, *Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui* (Bonn: Max Cohen, 1885), 3, 281. It is interesting to note that most of the library catalogues included in Becker's work which contain a work by Fortunatus only contain excerpts from his poetry, hymns or saint's lives. It is possible that the poet's work circulated in smaller centres only in excerpts, not in the full eleven books. Thus it is also possible that the full title mentioned above included in MS Metz 351 may have come from an excerpted edition.
[46] The text terminates at the bottom of folio 65, followed by a blank page.
[47] Leo, 253-258; Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 3, 101-113.
[48] Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 3, 101.

source for Metz MS 351 is possible given its date and provenance. In addition to the *incipit*, the Metz text itself favours a manuscript related to *A* being the source. Of some twenty-seven readings that differ from the critical text, 10 are the same as *A* or its close cousin, *C* (Paris BnF lat. 8312, s. 10).[49] No other MS family comes close to this number of variant agreements with the text of *ES* in Metz MS 351. Lastly, the text of the individual transmission of *Carm.* 10.1, the *EOD* of Fortunatus, also found in Metz MS 351, matches *A* most closely.[50] Therefore, I conclude that a text closely related to MS Paris BnF lat. 14144 was the source for the text of the *ES* found in Metz MS 351.

2) The next manuscript is MS Monza Biblioteca Capitolare e-14/127, dating from the same period as the last manuscript (i.e. the late ninth or early tenth centuries). It is also a schoolbook, identifiable by its inclusion of a Greek-Latin glossary at its end and a computus text at its beginning.[51] Written in Northern Italy, it includes such authors as Chromatius of Aquileia, Isidore of Seville and Ambrose of Milan as well as a series of anonymous catechetical texts.[52] The *Expositio symboli* of Fortunatus is located between a sermon on the Lord's Prayer attributed to Chromatius of Aquileia and a series of excerpts from Isidore of

[49] Using Leo's page and line numbers, some of the more prominent are: 1) p. 253 l. 1: *in qua* codd., *in qua et* ACM, Metz 351; 2) p. 253 l. 14: *sanctum spiritum* codd., *spiritum sanctum* A, Metz 351; 3) p. 255 l. 1: *intellegas* codd., *intelligas* A, L, Metz 351; 4) p. 255 l. 4: *idem* codd., *item* A, Metz 351; 5) p. 255 l. 13: *proponemus* codd., *proponimus* A, Metz 351; 6) p. 255 l. 15: *israhel* codd., abbrev. *isrl* A, C, G, Metz 351; 7) p. 255 l. 26: *ut breviter* codd., *ubi breviter* A, Metz 351.
[50] Using Leo's line and page numbers, some important variants are: 1) p. 221 l. 9: *spectabamus* codd., *expectabamus* A, C, Metz 351; 2) p. 221 l. 16: *veluti* codd., *velut* A, Metz 351; 3) p. 222 l. 19: *dispenset* codd., *dispensat* A; 4) p. 222 l. 24: *peccati* codd., *peccatis* A, Metz 351; 5) p. 222 l. 25: *servus* om. A, Metz 351.
[51] Keefe, *Catalogue*, 275-276; B. Bischoff, "The Study of Foreign Languages in the Middle Ages," in *Mittelalterliche Studien: Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte*, vol. II (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1967), p. 237; also Michael Herren, "Evidence for "Vulgar Greek" from Early Medieval Latin Texts and Manuscripts," in *The Sacred Nectar of the Greeks: The Study of Greek in the West in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. M. Herren and S.A. Brown (Exeter: King's College London, 1988), 57-77.
[52] A. Belloni and M. Ferrari, *La Biblioteca Capitolare di Monza* (Padua: Editrice Antenore, 1974), 88-90; Bischoff, *Katalog*, 214 n. 2890; see also Keefe, *Water and the Word*, vol. II, 41-42. I also examined the manuscript itself at the Biblioteca Capitolare di Duomo di Monza in June 2015 and made a transcription of the version of Fortunatus' *Expositio symboli* included in it.

Seville's *Sententiarum*.[53] Given that this version of Fortunatus' sermon is from an Italian manuscript, how does it compare with the manuscript tradition of the *Carmina*? From where might it ultimately derive?

The text of the *Expositio symboli* of Fortunatus is very poorly transmitted in this MS. Many mistakes are made which do not appear in other manuscripts. As such, it is less reliable a source for textual variants than might otherwise be expected given its date. Still, the most likely relation is to the *A* and *C* manuscript family. There are a number of reasons for this. First, Monza e-14/127 contains the phrase, *ergo una divinitas in trinitate, quia dixit symbolum: credo in Deum Patrem et in Iesum Christum et in Spiritum Sanctum*.[54] Reydellet has identified the italicized phrase, which is missing in a considerable number of manuscripts, as one of many markers between two different textual families; the manuscripts identified as *PACM* are in one, the remainder are in the other.[55] *PACM* all contain this phrase; only about a third of the remainder do. Those in the second family that do contain the phrase are, save *D*, unlikely to be related to the Monza text.[56] Second, where the Monza text differs from the critical text of Leo and Reydellet, its variants on eighteen occasions match those of *A*. This far outpaces the next closest text, which is *R*.[57] The third largest number of

[53] This particular sermon on the Lord's Prayer seems to have appeared in the Roman baptismal ritual at some point in the sixth century; its attribution to Chromatius is contested. See J.-P. Bouhot, "Les sources de l'*Expositio missae* de Remi d'Auxerre," in *Revue des Études Augustiniennes et Patristiques*, vol. 26 (1980), 136 n. 43 and R. Étaix and J. Lemarié, eds., *Chromatius Aquileiensis Opera*, CCSL 9A, 171.
[54] Fortunatus, *Carmina*, 11.1.36.
[55] Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, lxxxiii-lxxxv. The remainder are classed in three sub-groups, as follows: *GVDU* (*GDU* contain the phrase *ergo...sanctum*; *V* does not contain 11.1), *ELB*, *RWF* (none contain the phrase *ergo...sanctum*).
[56] The reasons for this are that *V*, as noted in the above footnote, does not contain 11.1; *G* only contains 5 variant matches with the Monza text, none of which are of any importance; *D*, although having more variant matches than *G*, also does not have any important ones; and *U* postdates Monza e-14/127 by a century (Reydellet, *Poèmes*, LXXIV).
[57] *R* (Vaticanus Reginae 329, s. 9) is unlikely to be a precursor in any case due to its lack of the phrase, "ergo...sanctum" in *Carm.* 11.1.36.

variant matches is with *C*.[58] For these reasons I conclude that the family which included *A* and *C* most likely formed the basis for the version of *Carmina* 11.1 found in Monza e-14/127. It should however be observed that the considerable number of different manuscript sources for the many variants makes this conclusion strictly conjectural. It is a good idea to remember, as Reydellet says, "dès le VIIIe-IXe siècle, il y a eu des confrontations entre divers manuscrits."[59]

There are few matches between Metz 351 and Monza e-14/127. I would therefore suggest that the two originated separately, using different manuscripts as a base. Their differing *incipits* are evidences for this. While Metz 351 contains an *incipit* plainly derived from a complete text of the *Carmina*, Monza e-14/127 has one that does not appear in any extant manuscript of the complete collection. Instead, its *incipit* reads: "Incipit expositio symboli, Fortunato presbitero conscripto." This appears to have been written for independent transmissions of the text alone.[60] Whether it originated with Monza e-14/127 or with another older text is unclear. Furthermore, Metz 351 mostly hews closely to the *AC* family's text, while Monza e-14/127 contains an extraordinary number of variants, many found only there. While the *AC* family is the most likely progenitor, it appears to be so by a far more circuitous route.

[58] Using Leo's line and page numbers, the more important variants are: 1) p. 253 l. 1: *in qua* codd., *in qua et* ACM, Metz 351, Monza e-14/127; 2) p. 253 l. 14: *sanctum spiritum* codd., *spiritum sanctum* A, Monza e-14/127, Metz 351; 3) p. 254 l. 11: *qui alicui* ADG, *qui cui* CMRFO, Monza e-14/127; 4) p. 254 l. 14: *coaequalis* codd., *quoaequalis* CR, *quo aequalis* Monza e-14/127; 5) p. 254 l. 24: *hebraice* A, Monza e-14/127, other codd. alternative spellings; 6) p. 254 l. 25: *posset* codd., *possit* A, Monza e-14/127; 7) p. 255 l. 32: *adhuc* codd., *ad hoc* B, *adhuc ad* ACMO, Monza e-14/127; 8) p. 256 l. 23: *tetharca* A, Monza e-14/127, other codd. alternative spellings; 9) p. 256 l. 24: *ligatus* codd., *legatus* ACDRF, Monza e-14/127; 10) p. 256 l. 27: *inferno* codd., *infernum* ACRO, Monza e-14/127; 11) p. 258 l. 7: *sepultos* codd., *sepultus* A, Monza e-14/127.

[59] Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, lxxxv.

[60] This incipit, or a variant thereof, is present at the start of every other independently transmitted text of the *ES* save Metz 351.

The next question that arises from this data is whether or not Monza e-14/127 was copied from an original *Carmina* manuscript or from a prior independent transmission. The numerous variants, added words and basic errors all suggest an added layer of manuscript tradition between Monza e-14/127 and a source text of the *Carmina*. The next manuscript to be studied will support this conjecture.

3) The next one is Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana MS Ottobonianus lat. 122. Mentioned by Leo in his textual apparatus for the *ES* and labeled *O*, this text has been little studied.[61] It dates from a period considerably later than the previous two manuscripts, the eleventh century. It contains the following works, listed in the order in which they appear: 1) the *Liber officiorum* of Isidore of Seville, 2) the *Sermo pastoralis* of Pseudo-Ambrose, 3) the *De mysteriis* and *De sacramentis* of Ambrose of Milan, 4) the *ES* of Fortunatus, 5) a portion of the *Liber sententiarum* of Isidore (Book 1.10), 6) the *Expositio quattuor evangeliorum* of Pseudo-Jerome, 7) an anonymous *Expositio super symbolum* (Keefe 347), 8) a patristic florilegium on sacramental and liturgical matters and finally 9) another anonymous *Expositio super symbolum* (Keefe 360). From its contents it seems to match the description of a priest's handbook, given its lack of canon law material or academic exercises. It is a practical book, giving instruction on things necessary for running a local parish. What is interesting about this text, however, is how closely related it seems to be to Monza e-14/127.

There are two reasons to conclude that there is such a relationship. First, although they are written for two different contexts (Monza as a schoolbook and Ott. Lat. 122 as a priest's handbook), they contain many of the same texts. Both have the same extract from

[61] Ott. Lat. 122 is cited as a source text for Christopher Lawson's edition of Isidore's *De ecclesiastics officiis*: Isidore, *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis*, ed. C. Lawson, CCSM 113 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1989), 27, 58-66. Lawson classes the Isidore text contained in Ott. Lat. 122 with an eighth-century version that was in Corbie shortly after its composition. Both derive, he surmises, from a hyparchetype located in North-east France (p. 62). There are no good descriptions of Ott. lat. 122 such as exist for the rest of the manuscripts dealt with in this section. I examined the codex and transcribed its *ES* text in person in situ in June 2015.

Isidore's *Liber sententiarum* on the nature and kinds of angels (*Lib. sent.* 1.10), although the Monza manuscript has a longer citation (*Lib. sent.* 1.10-13); both contain the anonymous Symbol sermons labelled by Keefe as 347 and 360; both contain the *Expositio quattuor evangeliorum* of Pseudo-Jerome; both have the *De mysteriis* and *De sacramentis* of Ambrose (copied together); and finally both contain Fortunatus' own *ES*. Both contain other texts that do not overlap, but that is due to their differing purposes. In particular, the inclusion of the same three Symbol sermons, amidst the plethora of anonymous texts on the subject, is especially striking. Monza e-14/127 contains several other sermons on the Symbol, but what makes the overlap striking is that *O* only has these three, making it plausible that it draws on the earlier manuscript.

Second, there are many similar textual variants between their respective texts of Fortunatus' *ES*. Out of all the extant texts of this sermon, including all independent transmissions, there are twenty-one variants which appear only in Monza e-14/127 and *O*.[62] In addition, there are four occasion in which a variant unique to *O* is clearly derived from an attempt to correct the obvious (and unique) errors of the Monza text.[63] This is not the whole story, because *O* also occasionally corrects the Monza reading to be in accord with the majority text, indicating that more than one manuscript of Fortunatus' sermon was available

[62] Fifteen of the more important ones are, using Leo's page and line numbers: 1) p. 253 l. 14: addition of *latine* after *graece*; 2) p. 253 l. 15: *recte* codd., *recte non* O, Monza e-14/127; 3) p. 254 l. 21: *hic* codd., *hic est* O, Monza e-14/127; 4) p. 254 l. 23: *potentatum* codd., *potestatum* O, Monza e-14/127; 5) p. 255 l. 9: *intellegendum* codd., *intelligendum* O, Monza e-14/127; 6) p. 255 l. 15: *quoniam* codd., *quia* O, Monza e-14/127; 7) p. 255 l. 26: *inveniet* codd., *inveniens* O, Monza e-14/127; 8) p. 255 l. 30: *martyrii* om. O, Monza e-14/127; 9) p. 256 l. 8: *generemus* codd., *generamus* O, Monza e-14/127; 10) p. 256 l. 15: *hominem et deum* codd., *deum et hominem* O, Monza e-14/127; 11) p. 256 l. 17: *principale* codd., *in principale* O, Monza e-14/127; 12) p. 257 l. 2: *psalmographus* codd., *psalmigrafus* O, Monza e-14/127; 13) p. 257 l. 13: *iudicandas* codd., *iudicandos* O, Monza e-14/127; 14) p. 257 l. 16: *huius* codd., *eius* O, Monza e-14/127; 15) p. 258 l. 12: *resurgent* codd., *resurgant* O, Monza e-14/127.

[63] Using Leo's page and line numbers, these are: 1) p. 255 l. 2: *de uno est unus* codd., *divino est unus* Monza e-14/127, *divinus est unus* O; 2) p. 255 l. 24/25: *in conspectu* codd., *in cuius pectu* Monza e-14/127, *in cuius conspectu* O; 3) p. 256 l. 24: *per hoc* codd., *pro haec* Monza e-14/127, *pro hoc* O; 4) p. 257 l. 3: *meminit* codd., *meminent* Monza e-14/127, *meminerant* O.

to the later copyist.[64] Yet more often than not, rather than adhere to the majority text reading, the editor of *O* chooses to adhere to Monza's text. So for these reasons it seems reasonable to suppose that the editor of *O* drew on Monza e-14/127 as a source text. What this relationship shows is that the independent transmission of the *Expositio symboli* of Fortunatus could be carried out without reference to the full text of the *Carmina*. This makes plausible the earlier conjecture about the indirect derivation of Monza e-14/127.

4) The next manuscript dates from the end of the eleventh or the early twelfth century. Deriving from the abbey of St. Martial de Limoges, Paris Bibliothèque Nationale de France MS latinus 2316 is composed of three originally separate MSS written at different times: the twelfth, the thirteenth and the ninth centuries.[65] The section containing Fortunatus' sermon is the first, dating from around the start of the twelfth century. It comprises the first 25 folios of the manuscript, and contains a fragment of Bernardus Iter's *Chronica*, a list of monks, a collection of extracts from a number of works by Isidore of Seville, Leo the Great, John Chrysostom and Augustine, the *Expositio symboli* of Venantius Fortunatus, an extract on the Lord's Prayer from Chromatius of Aquileia's *Tractatus in Mathaeum*, the *Expositio fidei catholicae* of Pseudo-Fortunatus and finally an extract from Alcuin's *Interrogationes et responsiones de Sancta Trinitate*. It is quite difficult to classify this twelfth-century manuscript according to Keefe's model due to the fact that it seems to have been intended for a monastic setting. It might have been a school book due to its inclusion of Alcuin's work. Fortunatus' *ES* is placed alongside Chromatius' work on the Lord's Prayer and the

[64] For example, using Leo's page and line numbers, p. 253 l. 4: *optulerit* Monza e-14/127 is a corruption of *pertulerit* codd., which O corrects to the majority text; p. 253 l. 5 *surrexit in carne ipsa* Monza e-14/127 is a corruption of *surrexerit et in carne ipsa* codd., which O corrects to the majority text; p. 253 l. 13 *per omnis gentes* Monza e-14/127 is a corruption of *per omnes gentes* codd., which O corrects to the majority text.
[65] See the catalogue entry for Paris BnF Lat. 2316 in *Catalogue général des manuscrits latins*, t. II, ed. Ph. Lauer (Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale, 1940), 400-401. See also the online entry, with a link to the digitized manuscript, at http://www.europeanaregia.eu/en/manuscripts/paris-bibliotheque-nationale-france-mss-latin-2316/en (Accessed August 12, 2015).

anonymous exposition on the Pseudo-Athanasian creed. What might be said about the version of the poet's sermon it presents?

The first thing to be noted is that it includes the line, "ergo una divinitas in trinitate, quia dixit symbolum: *credo in Deum Patrem et in Iesum Christum et in Spiritum Sanctum*," missing from MBLRF, as noted above, denoting that it does not derive from that family of manuscripts. The second is that the incipit is exactly the same as in *O*, "incipit expositio symboli a fortunato presbitero conscripta." This would seem to suggest that the *ES* contained in Paris BnF 2316 was copied from another independently transmitted text of the *ES*. If so, the transmission history is complicated still more, because the textual variants do not match up with any of the previous manuscripts that have been examined. Few of the variants of the *AC*-derived Metz 351 or those of the idiosyncraatic *O* and Monza e-14/127 match those of Paris BnF 2316. Instead, apart from a number of unique errors, the variants span a range of manuscripts from the North of France. While *AC* once again has the most variant matches, *D* and *G* contain nearly as many.[66] It is quite possible that the text of the *Expositio symboli* contained in Paris BnF 2316 was copied from a handbook like the ones categorized above, but one which derives from a Frankish transmission tradition. It is therefore not related to the independent transmission tradition found in Italy, as represented by *O* and Monza e-14/127.

5) The final manuscript which I will examine is Milan Biblioteca Ambrosiana MS M. 79 sup., a late eleventh- or early twelfth-century text most likely written in Piacenza in

[66] Using Leo's page and line numbers, the more important variants are: 1) p. 253 l. 1: *summam* codd., *summa* AW, Paris BnF 2316; 2) p. 253 l. 1: *in qua* codd., *in qua et* ACMO, Metz 351, Monza e-14/127, Paris BnF 2316; 3) p. 255 l. 4: *idem* codd., *id est* L, Paris BnF 2316; 4) p. 255 l. 4: *recipit* codd., *recepit* AC, Paris BnF 2316; 5) p. 255 l. 15: *israhel* abbreviated by *isrl*, ACG, Paris BnF 2316; 6) p. 255 l. 32: *ad hoc intellegendum* B, *adhuc intellegendum* DGB, *adhuc ad intellegendum* ACMO, Paris BnF 2316; 7) p. 256 l. 10: *non erant* codd., *non* om. DGL, Paris BnF 2316; 8) p. 256 l. 27: *inferno* codd., *infernum* ACRO; 9) p. 256 l. 27: *adpropriavit* codd., *adproprinquavit* G, Metz 351, Paris BnF 2316, agreeing with Vulgate; 10) p. 257 l. 4: *non ubi erat* codd., *non ubi non erat* DGU, Paris BnF 2316; 11) p. 257 l. 16: *sanctum spiritum* codd., *spiritum sanctum* GLO, Paris BnF 2316.

Northern Italy.[67] Bischoff and Lapidge describe it as a "massive theological compendium," containing texts written by a wide variety of church fathers.[68] Fortunatus' *Expositio symboli* is placed after a text on Greek grammar and begins a section of the manuscript devoted to commentaries on important catechetical texts, namely the Symbol, the Lord's Prayer and the Athanasian Creed. So it is followed by two more Symbol commentaries (Keefe 365 and Keefe 379), three commentaries on the Lord's prayer and two commentaries on the Athanasian Creed (the last one falsely attributed to Fortunatus). Does the particular text of this manuscript suggest that the author used the same independent transmission tradition as Monza e-14/127 and *O*? The answer to this question is probably no. Rather, the text of Milan MS Ambrosianus M. 79 sup. matches more closely that of Metz 351 and Paris BnF 2316.[69] Thus it is likely that the source for the Milan text was an independent transmission tradition originating and circulating in France.

Based on the preceding analysis of these five manuscripts, the following conclusions seem warranted. First, the manuscript family classified by Leo and Reydellet as *AC* is the most likely candidate to be the progenitor of the independent transmission traditions of Fortunatus' sermon. Second, there is a clear relationship between two North Italian manuscripts, Monza e-14/127 and Ott. Lat. 122. Indeed, a good case can be made that the

---

[67] For a detailed description of this manuscript, see B. Bischoff and M. Lapidge, *Biblical Commentaries from the Canterbury School of Theodore and Hadrian* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 275-287; see also M. Ferrari, "Introduzione," in *Virgilio Marone grammatico: Epitomi ed Epistole*, ed. G. Polara (Napoli: Liguori Editore, 1979), who dates it to the first half of the eleventh century.

[68] Bischoff and Lapidge, *Biblical Commentaries*, 275.

[69] Using Leo's page and line numbers, some important variant matches are: 1) p. 253 l. 1: *summam* codd., *summa* AW, Metz 351, Monza e-14/127, Paris BnF 2316, Milan Amb. M79 sup.; 2) p. 255 l. 17: *in carne natus* codd., *incarnatus* R, Metz 351, Paris BnF 2316, Milan Amb. M79 sup.; 3) p. 255 l. 32: *ad hoc* or *adhuc* codd., *adhuc ad* ACMO, Monza e-14/127, Paris BnF 2316, Milan Amb. M79 sup.; 4) p. 256 l. 10: *non erant* codd., *non* om. DGL, Metz 351, Paris BnF 2316, Milan Amb. M79 sup.; 5) p. 256 l. 12: *et cetera* added after *serpentem* Paris BnF 2316, *in et cetera* Milan Amb. M79 sup., F *in desertis et cetera*; 6) p. 256 l. 27: *adpropiavit* codd., *adpropinquavit* G, Metz 351, Paris BnF 2316, Milan Amb. M79 sup., cf. Vulg.; 7) p. 257 l. 4 *non ubi erat* codd., *non ubi non erat* DGU, Paris BnF 2316, Milan Amb. M79 sup.; 8) p. 257 l. 16: *sanctum spiritum* codd., *spiritum sanctum* GEL, *O*, Monza e-14/127, Paris BnF 2316, Milan Amb. M79 sup.

copyist of Ott. Lat. 122 used Monza e-14/127 itself as the main exemplar. Third, as demonstrated by the dependence of Ott. Lat. 122 upon Monza e-14/127, not to mention the textual idiosyncrasies of the latter, it is likely that the *ES* had an extensive independent circulation without any need for access to a complete copy of the *Carmina*. Thus the texts contained in Monza e-14/127, Paris BnF 2316 and Milan Amb. M79 sup. may have been copied from previous handbooks or schoolbooks. Fourth, the extant independent transmissions may be divided into two families, the "Italian" and the "French," with Metz 351, Paris BnF 2316 and Milan Amb. M79 sup. in the latter and Monza e-14/127 and Ott. Lat. 122 in the former. The *incipits*, which are exactly alike save for Metz 351 and a small orthographical variant on Monza e-14/127, indicate that there may be a common origin for both traditions. Yet the tradition seems to have branched fairly early on, providing evidence for its relative popularity as a theological text. So Fortunatus' *ES* was a frequent presence in theological works from the Carolingian period up until the twelfth century. Further evidence of its extensive use will now be presented.

There are three other sources that provide evidence for the early reception history of Fortunatus' *Expositio symboli*. The first is an anonymous Symbol commentary edited by Susan Keefe as *Textus 30* in her Corpus Christianorum collection of *Explanationes symboli*. Deriving from a single manuscript—Verdun Bibliothèque municipale 27—and dating probably from the same time the manuscript was written, that is, the middle of the ninth century, it is in essence a florilegium of older authors writing on the various articles of the Symbol.[70] The first section up to the comment on "unicum dominum nostrum" is organized in the form of question and response; there will be a question, then a quote from one or more

[70] Susan Keefe, ed., *Explanationes symboli aevi Carolini*, CCCM 254 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2012), 130-146; for a description of MS Verdun BM 27, see Susan Keefe, *Water and the Word*, vol. 2, 109-110 and Keefe, *Explanationes*, xvi.

of the redactor's sources. The second section does not use the question and answer format. Venantius Fortunatus' Symbol commentary is the most frequently cited of the authorities, among which are also texts by Isidore of Seville, Gennadius, Alcuin and Augustine. Does the text of Fortunatus' *Expositio* found in *Textus 30* align with either of the two manuscript traditions delineated above?

It is of course quite difficult to determine the precise textual variants of the Fortunatus text used by *Textus 30* due to its being adapted by the redactor to fit the new composite work. The redactor also clarifies the sources of Scriptural citations and compresses the word order on occasion. Still, he quoted sufficiently large chunks of Fortunatus, especially from the independent excursus on the cross, to enable an examination to bear some fruit. For example, the entire comment in *Textus 30* for the article, "Crucifixus, mortuus et sepultus" is drawn from Fortunatus' comment on the same article, although slightly rearranged and compressed. Several things may be said about its text. First, it is possible that the redactor of *Textus 30* used an independently transmitted text of the *Expositio symboli*., related in some way to the Italian tradition of independent transmission mentioned above. The reason for this is that there are four variants which match the Italian textual tradition, that of *O* and Monza e-14/127.[71] However, the manuscript from which Keefe T. 30 is derived is dated around the middle of the the ninth century and located in northeastern France.[72] Therefore, if it is related to the Italian line of independent transmission, it is derived from a source earlier than Monza e-14/127, perhaps indicating that the line originated in France and migrated to Italy some time earlier than the middle of the ninth century. Second, there are a few other traceable

[71] Using Leo's page and line numbers, these variants are: 1) p. 254 l. 23: *obtinet potentatum* codd., *optinet potestatum* O, Monza e-14/127, Keefe T. 30; 2) p. 256 l. 15: *inter hominem et deum pax rediret* codd., *et inter deum et hominem pax rediret* O, Monza e-14/127, Keefe T. 30; 3) p. 256 l. 20: *pomum et arborem* codd., *poma* O, Keefe T. 30, cf. *pomam* Monza e-14/127; 4) p. 257 l. 13: *iudicandas* codd., *iudicandos* O, Monza e-14/127, Keefe T. 30.
[72] Keefe, *Explanationes*, xvi.

variants, with the predominant manuscript family being AC, as is not unexpected with independent transmissions of this sermon.[73] Third, the redactor of *Textus 30* used a text which, like the rest of the independent transmissions, contained the passage in § 36 of Fortunatus' *Expositio* omitted by the *MELBRWF* manuscripts (*ergo...spiritum sanctum*).[74] Due to these three things, it would not be unreasonable to suggest that the redactor of *Textus 30* used an independently transmitted text, possibly the parent of *O* and Monza e-14/127, of the *Expositio symboli* of Fortunatus to provide extracts for his own Symbol commentary.

The second is Keefe's *Textus 31*, which is contained in a number of ninth-century manuscripts, usually only as a fragment—although in all cases it includes the quote taken from Fortunatus' sermon.[75] It is a short definition of the creed by question and response. The *Expositio symboli* of Fortunatus is quoted as a response to the question, "Quid continetur in symbolo?"[76] The section of the sermon used to respond is from the prologue (11.1.1): *Summa totius fidei...incarnationis Filii Dei*. There are no variants that might indicate any particular source, and although the text is adapted in places by skipping phrases and conjunctions and rearranging the word order, it does so using a text that follows the majority. Keefe makes an interesting suggestion in the apparatus that the author of *Textus 31* used the text of Fortunatus excerpted in the letter of Pseudo-Clement contained in the False Decretals of Pseudo-Isidore. However there is nothing to indicate in the text itself that Pseudo-Clement was used, due to the significant differences in word order and omissions. What in fact the brief quote from

[73] The variants of potential importance are: 1) p. 255 l. 4-5: *recipit* codd., *recepit* AC, Paris 2316, Keefe T. 30; 2) p. 255 l. 17-18: *in carne natus* codd., *incarnatus* ER, Metz 351, Paris 2316, Milan Amb. M79 sup., Keefe T. 30; 3) p. 256 l. 6: *crux fixa est* codd., *crucifixa est* CEW, Keefe T. 30; 4) p. 256 l. 14: *in medio positum* codd., *in medium positum* A, Keefe T. 30; 5) p. 256 l. 19: *mercator* codd., *mercatur* C, Keefe T. 30; 6) p. 257 l. 13: *adventu* codd., *adventum* D, Keefe T. 30; 7) p. 256 l. 6: *populos* codd., *populum* R, Keefe T. 30.
[74] This passage, from *Carm.* 11.1.36, is contained in *Textus 30*'s comment on the article *Credo in spiritum sanctum*; Keefe, *Explanationes*, 143 l. 274-276. For the importance of the passage, see Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, lxxxiv.
[75] See Keefe, *Explanationes*, xlv, 147.
[76] Keefe, *Explanationes*, 149 l. 16.

Fortunatus' *Expositio symboli* contained in this text suggests is that the sermon had become common coin in the Carolingian church by the ninth century, such that brief quotations from it were used routinely in instructional compilations.

The third source, mentioned above, is a part of the False Decretals of Pseudo-Isidore. This collection of ecclesiastical texts contains extracts from previous authorities, forgeries and sometimes combinations of both which originates most likely in the second or third quarter of the ninth century. It was written to reinforce the legal position of bishops in the complex political scene during the dissolution of the Carolingian Empire.[77] Near the beginning of the collection are a series of decretals claiming to be from the earliest period of the Roman episcopate, from Clement I (c. 90 CE) to Gregory I. There are about sixty letters purporting to be from these bishops, most forged, although a few are based on earlier texts (also inauthentic). The first two of these purport to be from Clement I to James the brother of Jesus, and are heavily modified versions of the older Pseudo-Clementine letters translated by Rufinus of Aquileia in the *Recognitiones*.[78] It is in the first letter that Venantius Fortunatus' *ES* is quoted.[79]

---

[77] For a good introduction to the Pseudo-Isidorean forgeries in all their complexity, see Horst Fuhrmann, "The Pseudo-Isidorean Forgeries," in *Papal Letters in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. H. Fuhrmann and D. Jasper (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 2001), 137-195; see also the analysis of Eric Knibbs, "The Interpolated Hispana and the Origins of Pseudo-Isidore," in *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, vol. 99 (2013), 1-71.

[78] Fuhrmann, "The Pseudo-Isidorean Forgeries," 162 n. 103. See also Walter Ullmann, "The Significance of the *Epistola Clementis* in the Pseudo-Clementines," in *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. 11 (1960), 295-317; and H. Fuhrmann, "Kritischer Sinn und unkritische Haltung: Vorgratianische Einwände zu Pseudo-Clemens-Briefen," in *Aus Kirche und Reich: Studien zu Theologie, Politik und Recht im Mittelalter*, ed. H. Mordek (Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke, 1983), 81-95; and H. Furhmann, *Einfluss und Verbreitung der pseudoisidorischen Fälschungen*, t. 1 (Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1972), 182 n. 100.

[79] The first critical edition of the False Decretals was P. Hinschius, *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae* (Lipsiae: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1863), but this is in the process of being superseded by a new edition being prepared by Karl-Georg Schon; for information on this work, see www.pseudoisidor.mgh.de. The citations of the Pseudo-Isidorean version of the *Epistola Clementis* will be from Hinschius' edition, but I will also make reference to the preliminary edition of Schon posted on the website noted above.

The original *Epistola Clementis* of Rufinus' translation, which introduces the narrative of Clement's journeys related in the *Recognitiones*, consists of an account by Clement of an admonitory address by the apostle Peter just before his death. It concludes with Clement informing the recipient of the letter, James the brother of Jesus, that he will now relate, according to Peter's command in his final address, the travels and deeds of the apostle.[80] The editor of Pseudo-Isidore's version of the letter modified the ending to include a lengthy speech by Peter on church offices. In keeping with the general agenda of the Frankish editors, the addition trumpets episcopal authority. However, before it does so, it has Peter give a summary of doctrine, drawn from a variety of sources such as Gregory the Great's *Moralia* and Isidore of Seville's *Sententiae*. An especially large chunk of the summary is taken from Fortunatus' *ES*, which features at the beginning of Peter's speech.[81] While slightly re-worked in places, the excerpts from Fortunatus are sufficiently coherent to enable an examination of the textual variants present in this version of the text.

All the excerpts are drawn from the first section of Fortunatus' sermon, but are in a confused order. The first excerpt is drawn from *Carmina* 11.1.2 almost word-for-word, barring a few small excisions. The second excerpt is from the first half of 11.1.1, again almost word-for-word, while the third is a slightly adapted 11.1.3. The fourth excerpt is from 11.1.4, but is considerably adapted. The fifth excerpt is taken from 11.1.5, almost word-for-word; the sixth, from 11.1.6-10, is somewhat modified but is still fairly faithful to the original. While the additions and adaptations by the editor of Pseudo-Isidore complicate the task of discerning a textual derivation, there is still a discernable series of text variants. They

[80] "Epistula Clementis," in *Die Pseudoklementinen II, Rekognitionen in Rufins Übersetzung*, ed. B. Rehm (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1965), 387.
[81] The Hinschius edition of the letter is found in: "Epistola Clementis prima," in *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae et Capitula Angilramni*, ed. P. Hinschius (Lipsiae: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1863), 30-46. Fortunatus is excerpted at chapters 20-22, p. 37 of this version.

tend to track along the same path that other independent transmissions do: namely, that they indicate a derivation from the *A* family of manuscripts.[82]

The fact that the authors of the Pseudo-Isidorean Decretals included significant excerpts from the *Expositio symboli* of Venantius Fortunatus confirms the conclusion reached above that the Carolingian church looked highly upon this sermon. Fortunatus was as much a bishop and teacher of doctrine as he was a hymnwriter, poet and author of hagiographies for the Carolingian church. The ubiquity of the sermon is also due to its common genre; Symbol sermons were a vital part of Early Medieval homiletic literature. The importance of the Symbol and the ubiquitous commentaries on it will now be investigated.

1.2 *The Symbol in Italy and Gaul*

The Symbol did not achieve a final, authoritative form until the Carolingian era, when Charlemagne, as part of his general program of ecclesiastical systematization, decreed that the form designated as "T" by later scholarship should prevail across his empire.[83] "T" simply stands for *Textus Receptus* and denotes a variant of the Old Roman Creed (called "R") that probably originated in south-western Gaul in the late sixth or early seventh century.[84] While this variant eventually came to dominate, before Charlemagne's efforts there was a remarkable diversity in such texts throughout the Latin-speaking world. All of them were

[82] The variants of potential importance are: 1) p. 253 l. 1: *in qua* codd., *in qua et* ACMO, Monza, Metz, Paris, Ps.-Is.; 2) p. 253 l. 5: *consideret* codd., *consederit* AMELBO, Ps.-Is.; 3) p. 253 l. 14: *symbolum graece conlatio dicitur* codd., *symbolum graece latine conlatio dicitur* O, Monza, Ps.-Is.; 4) p. 253 l. 14: *sanctum spiritum* codd., *spiritum sanctum* AW, Ps.-Is.; 5) *praeparetur* codd., *praeparatur* MF, Ps.-Is.; 6) p. 254 l. 11: *quia cui* codd., *qui habet cui* Ps.-Is., *quia habet cui* Milan.
[83] J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 3rd ed. (Essex: Longman, 1972), 420-426; L. Westra, *The Apostles' Creed: Origin, History, and Some Early Commentaries* (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002), 73-74; Kattenbusch, *Das apostolische Symbol*, vol. I, 196-199.
[84] Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 420.

based on the considerably older "R" creed.[85] Originating as a baptismal creed, to be learnt and, at their baptism, recited by catechumens, the Symbol played a vital role in the education of the laity in the church of the fourth and fifth centuries. When the baptism of new converts became less common as infant baptism became the norm and the number of non-Christians dwindled, the creed shifted to a homiletic context, although still used in the baptismal liturgy. The Symbol sermon became a common element in sermon collections and the creed itself was used as a tool of instruction for all classes of society.

Liuwe Westra identified the following regions as having clearly distinctive forms of the creed: Gaul, Spain, North Africa and Northern Italy.[86] Ireland and the Latin Balkans only yield one or two examples of credal texts, making it difficult to determine if they possessed actual regional variants.[87] Variants could be in a variety of forms, from differences in order and grammatical construction to additions of entire clauses. The original R creed is hypothesized as follows:

Credo in deum patrem omnipotentem
Et in Christum Iesum, filium eius unicum dominum nostrum
Qui natus est de spiritu sancto et Maria virgine
Qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est et sepultus
Tertia die resurrexit a mortuis
Ascendit in caelos
Sedet ad dexteram patris
Unde venturus est iudicare vivos et mortuos
Et in spiritum sanctum
Sanctam ecclesiam

[85] While all scholars affirm that R originated in the Roman Church, its date has been the subject of considerable controversy. Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 46-49; 68-72 summarizes the scholarship before 2002, coming down on the side of those who hypothesize the existence of a proto-R text beginning in the early third century. Opposed to this consensus, Markus Vinzent and Wolfram Kinzig proposed instead that R originated with Marcellus of Ancyra around 340 (W. Kinzig and M. Vinzent, "Recent research on the origin of the Creed," in *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. 50.2 (1999), 535-559). Westra responded on pp. 33-37, 40-46 of the work cited above to Vinzent's position, to which Vinzent responded in M. Vinzent, *Der Ursprung des Apostolikums im Urteil der kritischen Forschung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006), 312ff. For present purposes, the agreement by both sides that R was firmly established by the middle of the fourth century is what matters.
[86] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 100, 207.
[87] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 207.

Remissionem peccatorum
Carnis resurrectionem.[88]

Examples of variations in word order and grammar are: "unicum filium eius" for "filium eius unicum" in Rufinus of Aquileia's *Expositio symboli*; "conceptus de spiritu sancto, natus ex Maria virgine" for "qui natus est de spiritu sancto et Maria virgine" in Faustus of Riez's *epistula 7*; and "inde venturus et iudicaturus de vivis et mortuis" for "unde venturus est iudicare vivos et mortuos" in Priscillian of Avila's second *tractatus*.[89] Examples of clausal additions are: "creatorem caeli et terrae" to "Credo in deum patrem omnipotentem" in Caesarius of Arles' *De symbol*o (sermon 9); "descendit ad inferna" after "qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est et sepultus" in a seventh-century inscription from Toledo; and "vitam aeternam" after "carnis resurrectionem" in Augustine of Hippo's *sermo 215 de symbolo*.[90]

Differences of word order and grammar are probably not indicative of theological concerns, while additions of clauses frequently are. Rufinus of Aquileia for example points to the Sabellian heresy as the reason why the Aquileian church (whose creed he uses in his own *Expositio*) added the words *invisibilem et impassibilem* to the first clause.[91] Priscillian's unique form of the creed emphasizes the oneness of God, for example inserting *unum* before *deum patrem omnipotentem* and *dominum Iesum Christum*.[92] Westra argues, however, that changes in word order and grammatical construction often occurred throughout distinctive regions.[93] It should be possible, using these means, to plausibly suggest regions of origin for anonymous creeds. Westra lays out a detailed linguistic map for scholars to use in

[88] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 27.
[89] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 227, 230, 244.
[90] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 222, 236, 255.
[91] Rufinus of Aquileia, *Expositio symboli* 5.
[92] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 223, 228 n. 472.
[93] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 94, 238.

determining which regions had which variations; the present study will make use of this map in the following analysis.[94]

Two regions are of interest for the purposes of this chapter examining the *Expositio symboli* of Venantius Fortunatus: Gaul and Northern Italy. The peculiarities of the Gallic form of the creed will be treated first. Westra proposes that the following text was Gaul's ur-Creed by the beginning of the fourth century:

Credo in deum patrem omnipotentem
Et in Iesum Christum, filium eius
Qui natus est de spiritu sancto et/ex Maria virgine
Sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus et sepultus
Tertia die resurrexit
Ascendit in caelos/caelis
Sedet ad dexteram patris
Inde venturus iudicare vivos et mortuos
Credo in spiritum sanctum
Sanctam ecclesiam
Carnis resurrectionem.[95]

Barring minor variations such as *inde* for *unde* and *Iesum Christum* for *Christum Iesum*, this text is essentially a slightly abbreviated form of R. Additions unique to Gaul were inserted later: *Conceptus* in place of *natus est* in the third line of the above text, *Dei* and *omnipotentis* in the seventh line and a repeated use of *credo* in the tenth line all seem to have originated in the middle of the fourth century, in time to be used by Priscillian in his creed between 380 and 390.[96] The addition of *unigenitum* and *sempiternum* also occurred at the same time along with several more repetitions of *credo*, while additions borrowed from other regions such as *creatorem caeli et terrae* emerged in the fifth and sixth centuries.[97] The variant *Iudicaturus vivos ac mortuos* in place of *iudicare vivos et mortuos* also existed, but had limited influence,

[94] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 272-276.
[95] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 259.
[96] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 260.
[97] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 261.

although a genuinely Gallican invention dating perhaps from the fifth or sixth century.[98] The changes that lasted into the seventh century include the additions of *creatorem caeli et terrae* in the first line, *unicum*, *dominum nostrum* in the second line, *mortuus* in the fourth line, *descendit ad inferna* after the fourth line, and *dei omnipotentis* in the seventh line.[99] The fluidity of the creed is an interesting facet of the Gallic versions, although perhaps the fluidity is due in part to the sheer number of witnesses to the creed in Gaul that survive (15, by far the most according to Westra).[100]

Northern Italy has fewer witnesses to the creed than does Gaul, but the evidence is still ample enough to discern a regional variant. The ur-text for the Creed in Italy is deduced as follows by Westra:

Credo in deum patrem omnipotentem
Et in Christum Iesum/Iesum Christum, filium eius unicum dominum nostrum
Qui natus est de spiritu sancto et/ex Maria virgine
(qui) sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus (est) et sepultus/ crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato et sepultus
Tertia die resurrexit
Ascendit in caelos
Sedet ad dexteram patris
Unde/inde venturus iudicare vivos et mortuos
Et in spiritum sanctum
Sanctam ecclesiam
Remissionem peccatorum
Carnis resurrectionem.[101]

Roman additions to Northern Italian texts such as *a mortuis* arrived fairly early on, but apart from these there were few additions from outside the region itself. Westra lists *invisibilem et impassibilem* in the first line of the above text, the use of *qui* at the beginning of the fourth line, *surrexit* instead of *resurrexit* in the fifth line and *huius carnis resurrectionem* in the

[98] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 261.
[99] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 261.
[100] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 100.
[101] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 265.

twelfth line as native Italian additions.[102] As observed above, Rufinus claims that *invisibilem et impassibilem* and the demonstrative *huius* were added to refute various heresies. By and large, however, the North Italian creed tended to be conservative in its changes.

The particular formulae of the creeds are interesting for historians seeking to determine where such variants emerged, but for the people using them at the time such variants were usually less important. Since the creed was a teaching tool for the clergy as well as a mnemonic device for the laity, it was almost always accompanied by an extensive explanation. Most of the sources for the form of the creed that Keefe and Westra use are in fact Symbol sermons. The bishop had the responsibility to carefully instruct his flock in the proper understanding of the local variant of the creed. Given that the creed comprised statements which, although short, nonetheless carried precise and complicated meanings, it was vital that an explanation be given for each article. Such sermons took various forms and had varying emphases.

The emphases are important for historians interested in reconstructing theological disputes and mindsets, because they often resulted from the desire of the authors of the explanations to clarify a contested area of doctrine. This clarification took a different form in Symbol sermons than in other theological works due to the different social setting and format of such commentaries. Keefe identifies three other forms of credal confessions or professions that are similar to the Symbol sermons, namely "professions of faith," "explanations of the faith" and "defenses of the faith."[103] These alternative forms of theological exposition were not usually directed towards a broad audience, as Symbol sermons were, but rather towards

[102] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 275-276.
[103] Keefe, *Catalogue*, 10-11.

fellow clergy, social peers or one's superiors.[104] There were also numerous sermons and commentaries on the Nicene Creed, the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed and the Pseudo-Athanasian Creed. Yet sermons on the Symbol were by far the most common, just as the text of the Symbol itself was the most commonly known creed for the laity.[105] Venantius Fortunatus' own *Expositio symboli* has emphases that will prove useful in examining the state of religious thought among his contemporaries, but before this examination can begin the shape of Symbol sermons in the late fifth and sixth centuries in Gaul and Northern Italy must be dealt with. Fortunatus did not write in a vacuum.

1.3 *Symbol Sermons in Italy and Gaul*

Symbol sermons from the two geographical areas mentioned above, Gaul and Northern Italy, and from the period spanning the late fifth to late sixth centuries, will now be examined. More sermons will be from Gaul, not only because of the greater number of surviving Symbol sermons from that region, but also because, notwithstanding its Italian roots, the

[104] For example, Pelagius' *Libellus fidei ad Innocentium papam* is classified by Keefe (p. 75) as a *professio fidei*, and it was directed, as the title indicates, to the bishop of Rome Innocent in 417 to assert his own orthodoxy against the attacks of Augustine (somewhat ironically, this text was sometimes ascribed to Augustine himself!). Boethius' *De fide catholica* is identified by Keefe (p. 70) as an *explanatio fidei*, and was probably written in the philosopher's early years as an initial foray into theological philosophy (see the carefully thought-out conclusion by A. Galonnier, *Boèce: Opuscula Sacra*, vol. I (Louvain, 2007), 409; see also David Bradshaw's suggestion that, "he [Boethius] is deliberately underscoring for a proud and sophisticated audience that Christianity requires an act of intellectual submission." (David Bradshaw, "The *Opuscula sacra*: Boethius and theology," in *The Cambridge Companion to Boethius*, ed. J. Marenbon (Cambridge, 2009), 117)). An example of a *defensio fidei* is an anonymous text called the *Collatio beati Augustini cum Pascentio Ariano*, probably a fifth to sixth century African production defending the term homoousios (Keefe, *Catalogue*, 125). Such texts were frequently staged dialogues between different theological views, with the aim of instructing clergy how to argue for their position.

[105] Caesarius of Arles, for example, advised the "homo rusticus" who could not spare the time (and did not have the ability) to read the Bible or other spiritual texts to memorize the Symbol, the Lord's prayer, some antiphons, and Psalms 50 and 90 (Caesarius of Arles, *Sermones*, ed. G. Morin, CCSL 103 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1953), 32). The popular and personal nature of the Symbol is also reflected in the flexibility of its form, and the fact that the particular form of the Symbol with which the author was catechized often appears in sermons on the Symbol, regardless of where the sermon was actually delivered (e.g., Rufinus of Aquileia using the Aquileian form of the creed for his commentary, and Augustine using the Milanese form of the creed for a number of his sermons while he was bishop of Hippo (Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 189-196)).

Expositio symboli of Fortunatus was written in a Gallic milieu and reflects Gallic theological concerns. The context and content of five north Italian Symbol sermons will be compared with those of eight Gallic Symbol sermons. The *Expositio symboli* of Rufinus of Aquileia will be left aside for now, since it will be treated in a separate section due to its direct connection with the *ES* of Fortunatus. This survey of Symbol sermons will provide a broad-based context for developing a nuanced understanding of Venantius Fortunatus' own *Expositio symboli*.

1.3.1 *Northern Italian Symbol Sermons*

1) Peter Chrysologus was bishop of Ravenna from around 433 to his death in 450. His sermons were gathered together and published in the early eighth century by a later bishop of Ravenna, Felix. This collection contains a series of seven Symbol sermons, presumably given on seven separate occasions of baptism. All but the first give a full version of the Creed, with comments on each article. The comments in the six full sermons tend to focus on the first few articles devoting only single sentences to the final articles. The second sermon in the series, number 57 in Olivar's edition, is representative of Chrysologus' style.[106]

Most Symbol sermons open with an introduction stressing the importance of right belief for salvation. Chrysologus follows this trend in all his sermons on the subject. In the second sermon he begins with an exposition of the passage in Isaiah 6 where the prophet cries out, "Miser ego, quoniam compunctus sum, quia cum sim homo et inmunda labia habeam, in medio quoque populi inmunda labia habentis habitem, regem sabaoth vidi oculis

[106] Peter Chrysologus, *Collectio sermonum a Felico episcipo parata*, ed. A. Olivar, CCSL 24 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1975), 318-324.

meis (Is. 6:5)."[107] An angel then approaches him with a burning coal and touches his lips with it, proclaiming that his sins are now purged. Chrysologus interprets this passage in the following manner: "Hinc est quod Esaias ubi vidit regem caelorum, hoc est, Christum, ipsumque esse dominum sabaoth clara visione conspexit, sua suique populi labia inmunda deflevit, quia sicut inlustrat corda, purgat ora, labia emundat Christi confessa divinitas, ita Christi polluit negata maiestas."[108] He points to Isaiah's response to the angel's cleansing as a model for the listener's response to their own cleansing by means of a confession of Christ: "Et sicut Esaias post emundationem labiorum ineffabilem partum virginis est locutus dicens: *Ecce virgo in utero accipiet, et pariet filium*, sic nos passionis sacramentum et resurrectionis deferamus gloriam."[109] Belief, then, cleanses from sin, which in turn results in further confession. Chrysologus next proceeds to the articles of the creed itself.

The first article, *Credo in deum patrem omnipotentem*, has an explanation with two elements: a distinction between the Christian God and pagan gods and an excursus on the relation of the Son to the Father. "In deum vos hodie merito confitemini credidisse, quando deos deasque sexu dispares, numero confusos, turba populares, viles genere, fama turpes, impietate maximos, primos scelere, crimine singulares," proclaims Chrysologus.[110] The

[107] Chrysologus, *Sermones* 57.1. "I am a wretch, since I am stung by remorse because I am a man and have unclean lips, and live in the midst of a people with unclean lips, and I saw with my own eyes the Lord of Hosts!"
[108] Chrysologus, *Sermones* 57.1. "Hence it is that when Isaiah saw the King of Heaven, that is, Christ, and he saw with a clear sight that He was the Lord of Hosts, he wept over his own unclean lips and those of his people; for just as the confession of Christ's divinity enlightens the heart, purges the mouth and cleanses the lips, so too does the denial of Christ's majesty pollute."
[109] Chrysologus, *Sermones* 57.2. "And just as Isaiah, after his lips were cleansed, announced the ineffable virgin birth, saying: 'Behold a virgin will be with child and shall bear a son,' so we announce the sign of the passion and the glory of the resurrection."
[110] Chrysologus, *Sermones* 57.3. "Today you rightly confess that you have believed in God when you rejoice that you have fled gods and goddesses diverse in sex, confused in number, popular with the mob, worthless in nature, sordid in reputation, mighty in irreverence, ranked first in wickedness, remarkable in their crimes."

Christian God, conversely, is, "unum, vivum, verum, solum, sed non solitarium."[111] There then follows a discussion of the Son's birth and how it differs from an ordinary birth.

The second article, *Et in Christum Iesum, filium eius unicum, dominum nostrum,* has three elements to its commentary: 1) an interpretation of the meaning of "Christ" and "Jesus;" 2) an explanation of the distinction between the only Son of God and Christians as sons of God by adoption; and 3) a statement concerning the nature of Christ's rule. The first element is one which recurs frequently in Symbol sermons. Chrysologus' version of it is as follows:

> Sicut reges triumphorum suorum titulis nuncupantur, et subiectarum gentium nominibus conquirunt numerosissima cognomenta, ita Christus bonorum suorum titulis nuncupatur. A chrismate vocatus est Christus, sic Iesus vocatus est a salute, qui ob hoc nos divino infundit unguento, ut aegris certam salutem, perditis perpetuam redderet sanitatem.[112]

The second element is also fairly common, as will be seen. The third is a brief devotional note.

The comments on the third article, *Qui natus est de spiritu sancto et Maria virgine,* contain two elements. The first makes a distinction between normal human birth and Christ's birth and the second argues for the Virgin Birth. Our birth was subject to Original Sin, while Christ's birth was free from it. Chrysologus argues that the Virgin Birth is not remarkable compared to other divine acts in history, most particularly God's creation of Eve in the Garden of Eden: "Soporatus est Adam, ut de viro virgo sumeretur; nunc stupuit virgo, ut vir

[111] Chrysologus, *Sermones* 57.3. "One, living, true, alone, but not solitary."
[112] Chrysologus, *Sermones* 57.5. "Just as kings are announced by the titles of their victories and given a great multitude of *cognomina* according to the names of the subject nations they conquer, so Christ is announced by the titles of his own goods. Christ is so called from 'chrism,' he who now as a kind physician pours in the ointment of divinity upon the dry limbs of mortal men. And as Christ is from 'chrism,' so Jesus is called from salvation, who pours upon us the divine ointment for this reason: that he might provide a sure healing for the suffering and a continual good health to the lost."

repararetur ex virgine."[113] Moreover, it is only comprehensible to those who have faith: "Videatur hoc perfidis vile: magnum est credentibus sacramentum."[114]

The rest of the articles have much shorter comments appended to them. *Qui sub Pontio Pilato crucifixus est et sepultus* briskly moves through three issues: 1) why Pilate is mentioned, 2) why the crucifixion was necessary and 3) the importance of the burial of Christ. The first issue, Pilate, is a commonplace in later Symbol sermons, as will be seen. Chrysologus observes, "Audis iudicis nomen, ut tempus etiam passionis agnoscas."[115] This "historical proof" aspect of belief is emphasized also in the comment on *sepultus*: "Audis sepultum, ne mors putetur inlusa."[116] Two theological points, both regarding the nature of the atonement (as recapitulation of the Fall and as victory over the Devil), round off this article's commentary.

Tertia die surrexit a mortuis: here the comment focuses on the symbolism of the number three. Christ's death benefits three realms—hell, earth, heaven—by repairing what is on earth, restoring it to heaven, and redeeming it from hell. The Trinity is also indicated by this symbolism. The comment for *Ascendit in caelum* is a clarification: Christ did not ascend to return himself to heaven, since he was always in heaven, but rather to raise those believing in him up to heaven. *Sedet ad dexteram patris*: here again is a commonplace in Symbol sermons—God does not have a right hand, so Christ's sitting down must be understood as referring metaphorically to taking up authority. Chrysologus is concerned that his audience not take this passage literally. *Inde venturus iudicare vivos et mortuos*: here there is an

[113] Chrysologus, *Sermones* 57.6. "Adam slept, so that from a man a virgin might be taken; now a virgin is amazed, so that man might be restored out of a virgin."
[114] Chrysologus, *Sermones* 57.6. "This seems vile to the faithless; it is a great sign to the believing."
[115] Chrysologus, *Sermones* 57.7. "You hear the name of the judge in order that you might know as well the time of the Passion."
[116] Chrysologus, *Sermones* 57.7. "You hear 'buried,' lest his death should be thought a mirage."

explanation for the necessity of raising both the just and the unjust, because God cannot judge the dead.

Credo in spiritum sanctum: the comment here proclaims the fittingness of confessing the Third Person of the Trinity after one has confessed the assumed flesh of the Second Person. *Sanctam ecclesiam* is connected to the confession of belief in God; the church is Christ's bride, therefore he who confesses this article also confesses belief in God. *Et in remissionem peccatorum*: the comment here states that the believer who confesses that Christ is able to forgive sins gives mercy to himself. *Carnis resurrectionem*: Chrysologus engages with doubters by showing how God always raises things from the dead in natural cycles. Day arises from night and the elements are continually renewed, so it is not remarkable that God is able to raise the dead from their tombs: "Bene credit iste per deum resurgere a morte posse, cui resurgunt semper elementa. Sic tempus ex tempore, sic ex nocte dies, sic de sepultura sua semina."[117]

Finally, rather than concluding with an explanation of the article, *Vitam aeternam*, Peter sums up his sermon with a peroration on the importance of internal belief: "Haec fides, hoc sacramentum non est committendum chartis, non scribendum litteris, quia chartae et litterae magis cauta quam gratiam proloquuntur."[118] Memorized in the privacy of the heart and firmly believed, it will lead to eternal life. Chrysologus concludes: "Ipse autem dominus deus noster sensus vestros, corda vestra custodiat, et in his, quae praecepit vobis, ipse vobis fautor adsistat."[119] The concluding emphasis is twofold, and harks back to the opening:

---

[117] Chrysologus, *Sermones* 57.15. "It is easily believable that God is able to raise from death, for whom the elements always rise up. Thus time from time, day from night, his seeds from the tomb."
[118] Chrysologus, *Sermones* 57.16. "This faith, this sign must not be committed to paper, must not be written in letters, since papers and letters profess to be more a danger than a grace."
[119] Chrysologus, *Sermones*, 57.16. "But may that same Lord our God guard your understanding and your hearts, and in these things that He teaches you, may he stand forth as a patron for you all."

internalized intellectual belief is vital for salvation, and this belief is the gift of God which will be safeguarded by him.

Chrysologus' sermon has been outlined in some detail above in order to provide a base from which to examine the remaining sermons. Symbol sermons on the Creed tend to follow a similar outline, not only because they are commenting on a common text, but also because they tend to include similar content in their comments. A major reason for this similarity of content is the ubiquitous habit of preachers of patching together their sermons from older sermons by more famous figures such as Augustine. This practice contributed to making the comments on the articles as much matters of rote as the articles themselves. Thus variations in the set formula for commentaries on the Symbol are useful for identifying where and when they were written, and what theological issues were of concern to the author. The text which we will explore next demonstrates this.

2) Alejandro Olivar included in his CCSL edition of Peter Chrysologus a short commentary on the Creed, including it after the set of seven sermons *De symbolo* and entitling it *De symbolo octavus*.[120] He argued for attributing it to Chrysologus but more recently Westra has disagreed. Westra argued that the commentary was more likely a *cento* of Chrysologus' Symbol sermons due to the differences between the Creed used in the anonymous commentary and the one used by Chrysologus. Moreover, there are differences in emphasis in the commentary itself from that of Chrysologus' other Symbol sermons.[121] This is more probable, not only because of the differences stated but also because the commentary

[120] Peter Chrysologus, *Sermones*, ed. Olivar, 354-355.
[121] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 294.

is composed of short but pointed slogans that are uncharacteristic of Peter's sermons. Westra's more recent edition will be used.[122]

There is no opening admonition on the importance of proper belief; the preacher jumps right into the Symbol itself. The first article contains an admonition not to fall away from belief, but more importantly it contains a formula frequently found in commentaries on this article: "Dixisti: *Credo in deum patrem*. In unum deum totam confessus es trinitatem."[123] The first article is interpreted at least in part as referring to one's basic understanding of God (i.e., Trinitarian doctrine)—this will come up repeatedly. The second article contains another set formula: "Iesus salvator, Christus unctus mystice nuncupatur."[124] This etymology is then explained as referring to Christ's saving function and kingly function. The second article is further elaborated by another formula, that Christ's sonship is different from the sonship of Christians because He is a son by nature while they are sons by grace. The third article contains the formula of the mystery of the virgin birth: "Mundus non capit, ratio non habet, sapit fides, non sapit saeculi inquisitor."[125] The mystery of the virgin birth is presented as true but incomprehensible.

The comment on the fourth article repeats almost word-for-word the second comment on the fourth article of Chrysologus' sermon examined above. "Audisti nomen iudicis ne tempus persecutionis ignores," states the anonymous preacher.[126] The comment on the fifth article distinguishes between the actions of the two natures of Christ: "Quia quod passus est

[122] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 423-425.
[123] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 424. "You said: 'I believe in God the Father.' In one 'God' you confessed the whole Trinity."
[124] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 424. "Jesus is so-called from 'saviour,' Christ is so-called from the mystical anointing."
[125] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 424. "The world does not contain it, reason does not grasp it; faith understands, the questioner of the world does not."
[126] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 424. "You heard the name of the judge lest you should be ignorant of the time of the persecution."

solius est carnis, quod resurrexit totius gloria trinitatis."[127] The comment on the sixth article contains a formula clarifying the purpose of Christ's ascension: he did not ascend to return *himself* to heaven—for he never left it—but to raise humanity up to heaven. The comment on the seventh article contains the formula about the metaphorical nature of Christ's sitting down at the right hand of the Father. The comment on eighth article states the corollary of Christ's coming to judge: he will send some of the living and the dead to heaven and some to hell. The comment on the ninth article on the Holy Spirit stresses the importance of the repetition of the term *credo,* linking it to its first two uses before the first and second articles. This, too, is a formula which will recur. The commentary goes on to emphasize the equality of the Spirit with the Father and the Son.

The comment on the tenth article, concerning the Church, makes the point that when the believer confesses this article he or she also confesses Christ, since Christ is the head of the Church. The article concerning remission of sins contains the following comment: "Qui sibi credit dari regnum caeli, quomodo sibi dimitti peccata non credit?"[128] God will not welcome people into heaven if their sins have not been forgiven, and since Christians are by definition people whom God has welcomed into heaven and saved, their sins are necessarily forgiven. This line of reasoning is another popular formula, although one not found in all sermons on the Symbol. It may reflect an anti-Pelagian agenda, with a lack of emphasis on works of penitence such as one finds in other Symbol sermons. The comment on the eleventh article briefly restates Chrysologus' comment on the same article regarding the necessity of resurrection for judgment to occur. The comment on the twelfth and last article states briefly:

[127] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 425. "The fact that He suffered belongs to the flesh alone, but the fact that he rose again is the glory of the whole Trinity."
[128] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 425. "He who believes that the kingdom of heaven has been given to him, how can he not believe that his sins have been forgiven him?"

"Credimus et vitam aeternam, quia homo tunc vivere incipit quando se nesciet mori."[129] There is no conclusion.

The sermon's formulaic nature is partially explained by its being a *cento* of Peter Chrysologus, but there are several other conclusions about the nature of Symbol sermons that may be drawn from it. Preachers desired to inculcate in their congregations basic Christian doctrine, emphasizing those elements which were most contested, but covering as many bases as they could. The Symbol lent itself to this mission by its simple recitation of Christian belief. Comments on the Symbol's articles could also be put into short, punchy statements that were easily remembered. Preachers could also be sure that they stayed within the pale of orthodoxy by including trusted theological formulas in their comments.

The next three sermons will further illustrate the formulaic nature of the commentaries but also demonstrate the flexibility of the Symbol sermon. Three sermons on parts of the Symbol, ascribed to Augustine, are contained in a number of printed collections. They have most recently been edited by Giuseppe Sobrero.[130] Sobrero lists a number of manuscript witnesses to the broader collection of sermons to which the three Symbol sermons belong, but the earliest witness is also the most interesting.[131] Labelled "V" by Sobrero, it dates from either the end of the sixth or the beginning of the seventh century. Certainly written in Northern Italy, probably in Verona itself, it is a compilation of patristic and other polemical texts written to defend the two natures of Christ and the definition of the Council of Chalcedon.[132] This period, the middle of the sixth century, saw the controversy of

[129] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 425. "We believe also the eternal life, since man begins to live at the time when he does not know how to die."
[130] G. Sobrero, ed., *Anonimo Veronese: Omelie mistagogiche e catechetiche* (Rome, 1992). The text contained in PL 39.2183-2188, labeled as Pseudo-Augustine *Sermo* 237, *Sermo* 238 and *Sermo* 239, will be used.
[131] Sobrero, *Anonimo Veronese*, 41-67.
[132] Sobrero, *Anonimo Veronese*, 41-44; C. Lambot, "Le florilège augustinien de Vérone," in *Revue Bénédictine*, vol. 79 (1969), 70-71.

the Three Chapters flame brightly before burning out relatively quickly by the end of the seventh. The Second Council of Constantinople, held in 553, was seen by the churches of Northern Italy among others as a threat to the authority of Chalcedon due to its condemnation of three texts which Chalcedon had not condemned. The manuscript in question was probably compiled to support the arguments of, and encourage the faithful in, anti-Second Council of Constantinople churches in Northern Italy.

The identity of the original preacher of these sermons is unknown. Although handed down under the name of Augustine, the misattribution was recognized at an early date.[133] Although Lambot suggested that the sermons were preached by a Northern Italian author in the middle of the sixth century, Sobrero convincingly argued that the date should be set back to the last half of the fifth century.[134] Thus the author wrote in the aftermath of the Council of Chalcedon. Sobrero then suggested that a compiler of a pro-Chalcedonian dossier in the middle of the sixth century made use of these sermons, which was then copied into Verona Biblioteca Capitolare MS LIX (57) at the end of the sixth.[135] The importance of these three sermons on the Creed for the promulgation of the doctrinal concerns of the Northern Italian church lies in the second sermon's keen focus on Christology. By defending Chalcedon, the anonymous preacher vigorously sought to refute those who meddle with Chalcedon's decrees, a key concern for the later compiler.[136] He did so by carefully adapting the typical Symbol commentary to suit his theological purposes.

[133] Sobrero, *Anonimo Veronese*, 33.
[134] Sobrero, *Anonimo Veronese*, 237-8.
[135] Sobrero, *Anonimo Veronese*, 236.
[136] Lambot, "Le florilège augustinien," 76-80.

The Anonymous of Verona almost certainly preached a lengthier series of sermons on the Symbol than the three that survive.[137] Yet these three demonstrate his method sufficiently to allow certain conclusion to be drawn. First, the Anonymous of Verona is very interested in providing proofs for the doctrines on which he is commenting. He does this through both logical reasoning and scriptural proof-texts. Second, he makes each sermon teach the whole Symbol even while each explores one or two articles in depth. This method permits him to expand further on theological issues of contemporary import.

3) The first sermon in the series exposits the term *omnipotentem* found in the first article. The Anonymous of Verona advances two arguments in favour of God's omnipotence: the argument *ex creatione* and the argument *ex administratione*.[138] The argument *ex creatione* encompasses three points: that God created all material things from nothing, that he created all things by his word alone and that he created all spiritual beings from nothing. God is omnipotent because of his creative acts. The argument *ex administratione* concerns the governance of the world, and especially his acts related in the Scriptures, which are adduced as evidence for divine omnipotence. Surveying the full extent of biblical history, from Noah's flood to the Last Judgment, the Anonymous of Verona argues that God's omnipotence is plainly demonstrated by his miracles recorded in Scripture. Climaxing in Christ's incarnation and finishing with mankind's resurrection and judgment, the preacher concludes that on the basis of these beliefs a Christian ought to reach the conclusion that God is omnipotent. The Anonymous of Verona finishes this sermon with a paragraph urging his

[137] The use of the perfect tense of *ostendo* at the beginning of Serm. 237 is a trace of this: "Ostendimus, fratres dilectissimi, ut vestra certe Dilecto recordatur, Deum in quem vos credere promisistis et creditis, verum esse Deum..." "We have shown, dearly beloved brothers, as your Affection certainly recollects, that the God in whom you promised to believe and do in fact believe in is the true God…" (Ps. Aug. *Serm.* 237.1, PL 39.2183). Evidently the first sermon in the series adduced proofs for God's existence.

[138] Ps. Aug. *Serm.* 237.3, PL 39.2184. "Certe si breviter agnovistis ex creatione ista visibilium et invisibilium omnipotentiam Dei; nunc etiam eamdem eius virtutem ex administratione cognoscite."

listeners to believe in the God whose acts he has just described, and to act righteously and avoid sin.

The preacher avoids theological controversy in this sermon and makes his point on the basis of argument and rhetorical force. Unlike Peter Chrysologus' straightforward exposition of each article, the Anonymous of Verona instead uses his sermon to expound on one doctrine. Yet even while having a narrow focus, he manages to include most articles of the Symbol in some way in his commentary. This is a key point that will come up again: the text of the particular Symbol which is commented on need not be included in full in the text of the sermon. Rather, commentary may mention the elements left out of the quoted base text. So even though the Anonymous of Verona focuses on the term *omnipotentem* in the first article in this sermon, he nonetheless includes elements of the following articles, from Christ's crucifixion, death, burial and resurrection to the final Resurrection in the end times and the Last Judgment.[139]

4) The second sermon by the Anonymous of Verona exposits the second and third articles: *Et in Iesum Christum Filium eius, qui natus est de Spiritu sancto ex Maria virgine*. The thread running throughout this sermon is that of Christ's two natures, human and divine, and how they play into salvation history. Here theological controversy takes a position of importance. Two extreme positions are laid out with regard to the nature of Christ: the "Arian" position: "Arius sic in Christo hominem perfectum suscipit, ut Deum illum neget esse perfectum;" and the "Apollinarian" position: "Apollinaris vero Dei Filium e contrario

[139] E.g., Ps. Aug. *Serm.* 237.3, PL 39.2184. "Et ut innumeras virtutes Dei pauca commemorando praeteream, ostendit etiam tunc omnipotentiam suam Deus, cum Filium suum, quem secundum hominem mori voluit pro salute nostra, solutis inferni legibus a mortuis suscitavit." "And in order that I might pass over the innumerable powers of God by mentioning a few of them, he also showed his omnipotence at that time when his Son, whom according to the human nature he desired should die for the sake of our salvation, rose from the dead having undone the laws of hell."

perfectum credit esse Deum, ut ei verum hominem timeat copulare."[140] But the Catholic position takes the middle course: "Nos autem Catholici contra utrumque divinarum Scripturarum auctoritate muniti, adversus Arium veram et perfectam Verbi divinitatem; adversus Apollinarem perfectam hominis in Christo defendimus veritatem."[141] These two natures are combined in Jesus Christ, who was born twice: before all ages from the Father and in very recent times from the Virgin Mary. This way of stating the question in fact refers not to Arianism and Apollinarianism, but rather to the opposite positions of Eutyches and Nestorius. This facet was a major element in the rhetoric of those supporting the council of Chalcedon's Definition.[142] The Anonymous of Verona was preaching to an audience eager to uphold the authority of Chalcedon, so one might guess that the preacher was encouraging this sentiment.[143] In fact he also is seeking to instruct his audience how this core belief is linked to other beliefs included in the Symbol.

5) The third sermon in the series by the Anonymous of Verona exposits the meaning of the article on the Holy Spirit. Right at the start the preacher includes a commentary formula: "Hic enim est ordo Symboli, ut post Patris Filiique personam sancti Spiritus confessio subsequatur. Tunc enim prodest in Patrem et Filium credidisse, cum etiam Spiritum

[140] Ps. Aug. *Serm.* 238.2, PL 39.2185. "Thus Arius received a perfect man in Christ, so that he might deny that he is perfect God;" "But Apollinaris believed that the Son of God on the contrary was perfect God, since he feared to join a true humanity to him."
[141] Ps. Aug. *Serm.* 238.2, PL 39.2185. "But we Catholics, fortified by the authority of the divine Scriptures, defend the true and perfect divinity of the Word against Arius and the perfect truth of the humanity in Christ against Apollinaris."
[142] E.g. Facundus of Hermiane, *Pro Defensione Trium Capitulorum Ad Iustinianum*, ed. J.-M. Clément and R. Vander Plaetse, CCSL 90A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1974), 1.1, 4. "Namque cum duae nunc ferveant haereses ab eodem conciliio refutatae, quae contentione quidem contraria, sed detestatione simili dignae, mysterium divinae incarnationis oppugnant, Nestorianorum dico et Eutychianorum..." "For when the two heresies refuted by that same council [i.e., Chalcedon] are boiling hot, which although opposite in arguments are equally worthy of hatred (I mean the heresy of the Nestorians and of the Eutychians), they fight against the mystery of the divine incarnation."
[143] Cf. the anonymous *Epistula fidei Catholicae in Defensione Trium Capitulorum*, ed. J.-M. Clément and R. Vander Plaetse, CCSL 90A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1974), 11-13, 421-422. The author uses the Symbol to argue against changes to Chalcedon: "Symbolum itaque collatio sive pactum quod sit homini cum Deo patres nostri catholici doctores interpretari docuerunt."

sanctam eadem fidei veneratione credideris."[144] This surely refers to the repetition of the term *credo* at the start of the articles in question. The preacher then lists a large number of scriptural proof texts on the equal divinity of the Spirit, the Father and the Son. Just as the previous sermon focused on refuting Christological heresy, this sermon focuses on refuting those who deny the equal divinity of the Holy Spirit. Yet it does so in a slightly different manner: rather than explore abstract issues of theology through a discussion of precise definitions and historical narrative, the sermon on the Holy Spirit makes its case almost exclusively through scriptural exegesis. "His ergo, fratres dilectissimi, divinarum Scripturarum testimoniis instructi, Spiritum sanctum esse aequalem Patri et Filio, tota fidei perfectione fateamur," states the preacher.[145] The term *testimonia* has a specific technical meaning, but in this case I believe it simply refers to proof-texts from both the Old and New Testaments.[146]

There are a total of nine texts cited by the Anonymous of Verona in support of his proposition that the Holy Spirit is God: Matthew 28.19-20, Acts 5.3-4, 1 Corinthians 12.3-6, Matthew 12.32, John 15.26, John 14.26, John 16.7, Deuteronomy 6.4 and Deuteronomy 4.39. The first *testimonium* consists of Christ's commissioning his disciples at the end of the Gospel of Matthew: "Euntes baptizate omnes gentes in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus sancti."[147] There then follows an explanation of how the text supports the Holy Spirit's equal

[144] Ps. Aug. *Serm.* 239.1, PL 39.2187. "For this is the order of the Symbol, that after the confession of the person of the Father and of the Son there follows that of the Holy Spirit. For then it is useful to have believed in the Father and the Son, when you also have believed in the Holy Spirit with the same veneration of faith."
[145] Ps. Aug. *Serm.* 239.3, PL 39.2188. "Therefore, dearly beloved brothers, instructed by these *testimonia* of the divine scriptures, we confess with a total perfection of faith that the Holy Spirit is God, equal to the Father and to the Son."
[146] In brief, *testimonia* are quotations from the Old Testament that are interpreted as referring to Christ and Christian doctrines. As Martin Albl puts it, *testimonia* have "the forensic function of proving theological assertions" (Martin Albl, *And Scripture Cannot be Broken: The Form and Function of the Early Christian* Testimonia *Collections* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 7.
[147] Matt. 28.19. "Go and baptize all nations in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit."

divinity: "Et quemadmodum Pater, in cuius nomine baptizamur, Deus est; ita etiam Spiritus sanctus, in cuius nomine baptizamur, Deus est."[148] This is an argument not based on abstract logic, but on exegesis and the authority of the speaker. The second and third texts the author uses to support the Holy Spirit's divinity are from the apostles Peter and Paul, respectively. Peter's statement to Ananias in Acts that he was lying to the Holy Spirit and that therefore, "Non es mentitus homini, sed Deo," is linked to Paul's statement in 1 Corinthians that, "Divisiones gratiarum sunt, idem autem Spiritus; et divisiones ministrationum sunt, idem vero Dominus; et divisiones operationum sunt, idem vero Deus qui operatur omnia in omnibus."[149] The Holy Spirit is not ordered to do anything, but rather does what he wills.

The next two texts are again from the words of Christ in the Gospels (Matthew 12:32 and John 15:26 and 14:26) and show two things: that it is sacrilege to sin against the Holy Spirit, and that the Holy Spirit is one substance with the Father and the Son. The focus then turns back to proving that the Spirit is not less than the Father or the Son with another text from the Gospel of John, where Jesus says: "Expedit vobis ut ego vadam: nam si non abiero, Paracletus non veniet ad vos; si autem abiero, mittam eum ad vos."[150] This quote is used to support the Holy Spirit's equality. First a possible problem is dealt with: "Hoc quod dicitur, *mittam*, non minorem, quod absit, indicat Spiritum sanctum; sed simpliciter absque adulatione unitatem atque concordiam indicat voluntatis."[151] Then the support the text

[148] Ps. Aug. *Serm.* 239.1, PL 39.2187. "In whatsoever way the Father in whose name we baptize is God, so too the Holy Spirit in whose name we baptize is equally God."
[149] Acts 5.4. "You lied not to men, but to God." 1 Cor. 12.4-6. "There are allotments of gifts, but the same Spirit; and allotments of services, but the same Lord; and allotments of works, but the same God who works all in all."
[150] John 16.7. "It is for your benefit that I go, for if I will not go, the paraclete will not come to you; but if I go, I will send him to you."
[151] Ps. Aug. 239.3, PL 39.2188. "When he says 'I will send,' he does not mean that the Holy Spirit is lesser (far be it!), but rather simply means a unity and concord of the will without any worship."

provides for the equality of the Godhead is outlined: "Quomodo expedit discipulis ut ab illis Christus ascendat ad Patrem, si minor est ille qui pro Christo ad discipulos est mittendus?"[152]

There follows a definition of the Greek term *paraclytus*, which is translated as *Consolator*, or "comforter." Here a distinction is made between the *proprietas* (distinctive nature) of the Third Person of the Trinity and the others; *Consolator* designates the Spirit's particular work on earth. The final text is used by the preacher to re-assert the oneness of God, by quoting Deuteronomy 4.39: "Audi, Israel: Dominus Deus tuus, Deus unus est."[153] He states: "Non, inquam, obliti sumus unum Deum esse, quem utique Scriptura testante cognovimus."[154] He then concludes with a standard, "Cui est honor et gloria in saecula saeculorum. Amen."[155]

This sermon's reliance upon Scriptural *testimonia* is not the heaviest of the series, but their use in the previous sermons is usually quite different. The first sermon quotes the Bible eleven times, the second fourteen times. The difference between these quotations and the ones for the third sermon lies in the type of argument which they buttress. The first sermon relies on the logical arguments of *ex creatione* and *ex administratione* to prove God's omnipotence; the second relies on providing precise definitions of Christ's being and upon an extended relation of the salvation history connected to other articles in the Symbol. In both cases, citations of Scripture are used to buttress arguments not reliant upon the texts themselves. For example, in the first sermon the Anonymous of Verona uses the provision of manna for the Israelites as related in the Book of Exodus to show God's omnipotence *ex administratione*: "Cum vero ipsum populum per quadraginta annos in solitudine coelesti cibo

[152] Ps. Aug. 239.3, PL 39.2188. "How does it benefit the disciples that Christ ascend away from them to the Father, if the one who must be sent in place of Christ to the disciples is lower in status?"
[153] Deut. 4.39. "Hear, O Israel, the Lord your God, the Lord is one."
[154] Ps. Aug., *Serm.* 239.4, PL 39.2188. "We have not forgotten that there is one God, whom we assuredly recognize by the witness of Scripture."
[155] Ps. Aug., *Serm.* 239.4, PL 39.2188. "To whom is glory for ever and ever, Amen."

aluit, id est, manna; nonne ineffabilem virtutem suae divinitatis asseruit; ut ostenderet quia *non in solo pane vivit homo, sed in omni verbo quod procedit de ore Dei*?"[156] Note how the quote from the Bible here is not explained, but brought out to add authority to a conclusion already reached.

In the second sermon, the preacher again uses a Scriptural text merely to add authority to a conclusion already reached: "Siquidem hoc iam in carne Christi pretium, quod iuxta David prophetiam, caro exanimis et usque ad tertium diem sepulta, tamen incorrupta permansit. Sic enim ex perona Christi legimus in Psalmo dicentis ad Patrem: *Quoniam non derelinques in inferno animam meam, nec dabis sanctum tuum videre corruptionem*."[157] The third sermon's reliance upon detailed exposition of individual texts rather than broader arguments is a marked difference. The Anonymous of Verona therefore was flexible in how he used *testimonia* from the Scriptures, whether as primary source material for a doctrine or to lend its authority to a doctrine established from another set of primary material, such as the Nicene Creed or the life of Christ.

1.3.2. *Gallic Symbol Sermons*

Eight Gallic Symbol sermons will now be examined. 1) The earliest is an anonymous text which Westra, after an extensive survey of the secondary literature, proposes dating to the early fifth century.[158] It would therefore be roughly contemporary with Rufinus of Aquileia's

[156] Ps. Aug., *Serm.* 237.3, PL 39.2184. "And when he nourished the same people through forty years in the wilderness with the bread of heaven, that is, manna, did He not assert the ineffable might of His divinity, so that He might show how 'Man does not live by bread alone, but in every word which proceeds from the mouth of God?'"

[157] Ps. Aug., *Serm.* 238.5, PL 39.2186. "This ransom in the flesh of Christ, which according to the prophecy of David was buried, deprived of its spirit, for three days, nonetheless remained uncorrupt. For thus we read in the Psalm the person of Christ saying to the Father, 'For you do not abandon my spirit in hell, nor do you give your Holy One to see corruption.'"

[158] Westra, *Apostles' Creed,* 316-318. Westra provides an edition of the sermon on pp. 436-437.

more famous *Expositio Symboli* and Augustine's own Symbol sermons. Some of its characteristics are: the use of the imperative *credite* to introduce each of the articles, thereby making the sermon less expository and more hortatory; the extensive use of the language of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed; and the rare use of scriptural quotations (only one direct quote). It is short, crisp and has a logical flow. The theological focus of the sermon is on Trinitarian orthodoxy. This focus is most evident in the lengthy comment on the ninth article, concerning the Holy Spirit, in which the Trinity is explained using the image of *ignis et flamma et calor una res est*. This argument also appears, for example, in a Symbol sermon by Quodvultdeus, the disciple of Augustine.[159] Thus the sermon fits neatly into the early fifth century theological milieu, when Arianism and Macedonianism were still live issues in mainstream Christianity.[160]

2) The next sermon is the Pseudo-Augustinian *Sermo* 240.[161] As Westra observes, there is no modern edition, but it has played nonetheless an important role in credal scholarship.[162] It gives a complete text of the Symbol and includes an origin story: the twelve apostles gather together and each one speaks a phrase of the Symbol. The version provided is almost certainly Gallic, due to the presence of such phrases as *creatorem coeli et terrae* in the first article and the *sanctorum communionem* addition to the tenth article.[163] Each comment is phrased as if the apostle had said it himself. The sermon then ends with an admonition to hold fast to the true faith and to do good works, a threat of eternal damnation for the wicked and a promise of inexpressible joy for the righteous.

---

[159] Quodvultdeus, "De symbolo II," in *Opera*, ed. R. Braun, CCSL 60 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1976), 10.6-7, 346. "Ecce in igne quaedam tria conspicimus: ignis, splendor et calor."
[160] Macedonianism describes an understanding of the Trinity that makes the Holy Spirit less divine than the Father or the Son. For more, see R.P.C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988), 760-772.
[161] Ps. Aug., *Sermo* 240, PL 39.2188-2196.
[162] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 113 n. 45.
[163] As Westra classifies them (Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 225, 252, 260).

The last two sermons are relatively short. The next two sermons are considerably longer. Both are from the late fifth- to early sixth-century sermon collection known as the Eusebius Gallicanus sermons, from the name of their purported author, the early fourth-century author Eusebius of Emesa.[164] In fact almost certainly written by anonymous Gallic preachers in the fifth century, the sermons are an important source for understanding Gallic Christianity at the turn of the sixth century.[165] The two Symbol sermons contained in this collection display the formulas used by Gallic preachers to inculcate doctrine in their parishioners and the theological concerns held by those same preachers and parishioners.

3) Sermon IX, *De Symbolo I*, comments on a truncated version of the Symbol.[166] The sermon ends after a discussion of the tenth article. Although commenting on a shortened form of the Symbol, the preacher nonetheless spends a great deal of time on each article. The commentary has an elegant prose style, using such elements as Virgilian tags and flowery "purple passages."[167] Although incorporating Symbol sermon formulas into its structure, this sermon, like those of the Anonymous of Verona, focuses on the articles concerning the three persons of the Trinity. The comment on the first article takes up one-third of the sermon and borrows heavily from various anti-Arian texts such as the *De fide* of Ambrose of Milan.[168] It embarks upon a lengthy yet stereotypical discussion of the reasons behind Trinitarian theology, engaging with Arian formulas such as *ex aliquo initio coepisse filium* (2.75). The

[164] Edited in *Eusebius 'Gallicanus:' Collectio homiliarum*, ed. F. Glorie, CCSL 101, 101A, 101B, 3 vols. (Turnhout: Brepols, 1970-1971).
[165] A good summary of the collection and its importance may be found in Bailey, *Christianity's Quiet Success*, 29-38.
[166] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 130-134.
[167] *Eusebius Gallicanus*, ed. Glorie, Hom. 9.4.128-9; see note in source critical apparatus, p. 103. The tag *magnis parva* is from Virg. Georgics 4.176. Hom. 9.1.16-27 is a good example of the kind of "purple passage" so typical of Late Antique literature; see Michael Roberts, *The Jeweled Style: Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989).
[168] Cf. *Eusebius Gallicanus* Hom. 9.2.68 and Ambrose, *De fide* 1.8.55. Another example is a quote from Origen, *Fragm. Ex lib. In epist. Ad Hebr.* (PG 14, 1307) in 2.64.

explanation of the word *omnipotentem* dwells mostly on God's mighty acts, the importance of not trying to understand how they are done and the surety of the Christian's salvation due to God's omnipotence. Yet it too includes Trinitarian explanation, as does the second article and the ninth article. Again these three explanations include phraseology borrowed from more famous expositors of the Trinity.

4) Sermon X, *De Symbolo II* contains a complete version of the Symbol and comments on all articles.[169] Although similar in tone and style to Sermon IX, its content has a considerably different focus. Drawing extensively from the fifth-century bishop Faustus of Riez's *De spiritu sancto* the sermon concerns itself with making a number of extended arguments for certain doctrines mentioned in the Creed. The first argument is placed at the beginning of the sermon and concerns the nature of belief in the Christian religion. The second engages in a lengthy description of Roman triumphal imagery and a comparison with the imagery of the Crucifixion. The third discourse explains the nature of the resurrection. Comments on issues arising in the other articles, though briefer, follow the same pattern of careful reasoning. The sermon ends with the usual exhortation to preserve one's faith and hope intact.

5) Included in the *Corpus Christianorum* edition of the *Eusebius Gallicanus* collection, nine sermons frequently found appended to the main collection and titled the *Sermones extravagantes* by their editor, Glorie, include a single Symbol sermon.[170] This is the second sermon in the series, attributed to "Faustinus" and quoting Faustus of Riez frequently. It probably dates from the end of the fifth century to the early sixth century in

[169] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 135-136.
[170] F. Glorie, *Eusebius 'Gallicanus': Sermones Extravagantes*, CCSL 101 B (Turnhout: Brepols, 1971), 829-834.

Gaul.[171] It comments on a complete version of the Symbol and is considerably more derivative than the two genuine Eusebius Gallicanus sermons looked at previously, drawing extensively from not only Faustus of Riez but also Rufinus of Aquileia and John Cassian. Its theological focus is devoted to countering those who would deny the divinity of the Son, both Jews and Arians. This sermon, although shorter than the two previous ones, nonetheless shares many of their characteristics and theological concerns and should therefore be considered to represent the same cultural milieu.

6) The next sermon to be considered is from the collection of Caesarius of Arles, dating from the early sixth century. Caesarius at the very least edited it into its final form; Morin suggests that it derives entirely from the hand of the bishop and was intended for the specific use of the church in Arles.[172] An unusual feature of this sermon is the presence of a complete text of the Symbol placed at the beginning of the sermon, which is then followed by comments on the individual articles. Another feature is its obviously oral nature. This is a transcript of an actual sermon preached by Caesarius, given that after commenting on the first two articles the preacher says: "Iam, si iubetis, haec quae dicta sunt caritati vestrae sufficient: et die crastina secundum sanctam consuetudinem vestram per ministerium fratrum nostrorum ea quae restant maturius audietis."[173] It is a fairly short sermon all the same, briskly pointing out at the very start the necessity of right belief and what a good idea it is to memorize the Symbol. The simple Latin style used in this sermon—not for Caesarius the lengthy discourse on the nature of the resurrected flesh of *Eusebius Gallicanus* X—displays the bishop of

[171] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 119. A date as late as the seventh century, as mentioned by Westra, is improbable due to the close connection the sermon shows to the writings of the late fifth-century Faustus of Riez and its concern to defend the veneration of the saints.
[172] G. Morin, "Le symbole de s. Césaire d'Arles," in *Revue Bénédictine*, vol. 46 (1934), 216-223. For the authorship, see also Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 121-122 n. 71.
[173] Caesarius of Arles, *Sermones*, ed. Morin, 9.49, 48. "Now, if you wish, let these things which have been spoken to your Charity suffice: and tomorrow you will hear according to your holy custom through the service of our brothers those things which remain still to hear."

Arles' insistence upon preaching to the uneducated populace.[174] The *Eusbeius Gallicanus* sermons are more suited to an educated, urban audience; Caesarius was concerned for the rural parishes. The next sermon to be considered shows more similarities to Caesarius' style and emphases than the *Eusebius Gallicanus* sermons.

7) Likely originating in the same time and general area as Caesarius' own sermons, the Pseudo-Augustinian sermon 242, *De Symbolo ad Competentes*, was a popular text throughout the Middle Ages.[175] It is similar to Caesarius' sermon on the Symbol in that it includes a complete and uninterrupted text of the Symbol near its start. The introduction is quite different than Caesarius', however, and focuses more on the nature of the Symbol and its contents than the importance of faith. Its theological focus is exclusively Trinitarian, to such an extent that the preacher states: "Lex fidei nostrae in Trinitate consistit."[176] It is clearly a sermon for the baptismal rite, since it exhorts its hearers: "Crucem illam in qua ille crucifixus est in corpore, nos gestamus in fronte," indicating the application of the chrism, and given that the sermon borrows its conclusion from Augustine's genuine sermon 212, written for the same occasion.[177] This makes the sermon's popularity in late periods somewhat surprising given its antiquated character. Yet later preachers still found its content useful. A brief sermon, it nonetheless is a forceful composition that forcefully lays out the basic doctrines contained in the Symbol.

8) The next sermon uses the introduction of Pseudo-Augustine Sermon 242 before proceeding to its own (second) introduction. It is also attributed in the manuscripts to

---

[174] See William Klingshirn, *Caesarius of Arles: The Making of a Christian Community in Late Antique Gaul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 147-149.
[175] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 113 n. 45, 427; Keefe, *Catalogue*, 148-149; J. Madoz, *Le Symbole du XIe Concile* (Louvain, 1938), 44 n. 1; Kattenbusch, *Das apostolische Symbol*, vol. 2, 461, 772-774 n. 22. The text of the sermon is found in PL 39.2191ff.
[176] Ps. Aug. *Serm.* 242.2, PL 39.2192. "The law of our faith consists of the Trinity."
[177] Ps. Aug. *Serm.* 242.3, PL 39.2192. "We bear on our forehead that cross upon which he was crucified in the body."

Augustine, but was not included in the Patrologia Latina edition of the Pseudo-Augustinian sermons. Westra suggests that it should be dated to the latter half of the sixth century due to the peculiarities of its credal text.[178] Given that it borrows from the previous sermon, which is dated to the start of the sixth century, this makes some sense. There are two theological focuses: the Trinity, as might by now be expected, and the economy of salvation, especially with regard to the relation between Christ's humanity and divinity. The extent of the focus on the role of Christ's humanity in salvation reveals a theological concern quite in keeping with the interest in the sixth century on the two natures of Christ. Another unique element is its double introduction. Evidently the preacher considered the introduction of Pseudo-Augustine 242 to be lacking the necessary discourse on the importance of faith. "Nam si fides sine operibus otiose et mortua est, tamen sine fide nemo potest placere deo," admonishes the preacher.[179]

Venantius Fortunatus' own *Expositio symboli* was written soon after, at the end of the sixth century. It therefore makes sense to end the general investigation of similar types of sermons at this point. Fortunatus' own Symbol sermon reflects many of the characteristics noted above, from the commentary formulas to a unique theological focus in a certain small part of the broader commentary. The genre of Symbol sermons was, as has been seen, quite clichéd and repetitive. The primary theological focus is the Trinity; it is present in every sermon, showing the concern preachers had to inculcate correct belief on this matter into their congregations. Other theological issues, such as the validity of venerating saints or the union of divine and human in Christ, occur on occasion and indicate a special concern of the preacher's that helps to pinpoint the occasion of the sermon's proclamation. The

[178] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 304-307. He also provides an edition, which is used here, on pp. 428-431.
[179] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 429. "For if faith without works is useless and deadly, nevertheless without faith no-one is able to please God."

introductions almost always emphasize the importance of faith and mental assent to correct doctrine for salvation, and frequently conclude with a threat of eternal damnation for failing in these two things. There is also a positive aspect that usually appears at the conclusion, coinciding with the comment on *Vitam aeternam*, promising the reward of everlasting bliss in the presence of God. Symbol sermons had the aim both of instruction and motivation.

1.4 *Conclusion*

This chapter has concerned itself with laying a foundation for the study of Fortunatus' *ES* by examining the sermon's reception in later centuries and the broader context of Symbol sermons of which it is a part. The Carolingian church held the *ES* in high regard, as shown by its presence, whether as a whole or in excerpts, in priest's handbooks and other such texts that had a wide circulation. Symbol sermons as a whole were common productions of the church, and tended to be highly derivative and to include many of the same commentary formulas. However, they also could branch out and highlight a particularly pressing theological issue. Fortunatus' Symbol sermon has both these characteristics, depending in the main upon Rufinus' *Expositio symboli* but subtly including its own unique features. The next chapter will endeavour to demonstrate this.

Chapter 2

The Expositio symboli *of Rufinus of Aquileia and the* Expositio symboli *of Venantius Fortunatus*

2.0 *Introduction*

The second chapter will build on the work done by the first. First, the secondary scholarly literature on Fortunatus' *ES* will be outlined and assessed (2.1). Then, after a brief look at Rufinus' text itself, it will look at how later writers summarized or adapted it (2.2). Finally, a detailed comparison will be made between the content and emphases of Rufinus' *Expositio symboli* and Fortunatus' *Expositio symboli* (2.3). By this means answers to several important questions will be put forward. First, did Fortunatus follow Rufinus slavishly, and therefore reveal himself as an unoriginal thinker who merely excerpted an older author? The analysis will suggest that the poet in fact frequently departed from both the emphasis and content of his source in a way that showcased his considerable literary and theological skills.

Second, how did Fortunatus use the Bible, and how did this differ from Rufinus' use of it? What do the differences say about the poet's audience and their view of the Scriptures? The analysis will suggest that the poet did not usually exposit the Scriptural texts he cited, but rather piled them on top of one another as proof-texts, assuming his audience needed no other proof for the doctrines he expounded. Third, what were Fortunatus' sources, and did his summary of Rufinus reveal any preferences for regional theologies? Was this a Gallic sermon or an Italian sermon? The analysis will suggest that Fortunatus, though drawing on his Italian education, also used Gallic sources and crafted a sermon calculated to appeal to and instruct a local Gallic audience. Through such a detailed comparison, the groundwork will be laid for

understanding Fortunatus as a teacher and transmitter of Christian doctrine in his adopted Gallic home.

2.1 *The Secondary Literature*

In his landmark 1603 edition of the *Carmina*, Christophe Brouwer observed in his commentary on the *ES*: "Qui hanc cum Rufini contulerit, facile is viderit, illius esse velut epitome, et ex Rufini ingenio natam."[180] The reliance of Fortunatus upon Rufinus in this text has thus been long recognized. But what is the nature of this reliance? Brouwer's comments indicate that he considered the relationship to be very close. James Ussher briefly noted the same thing in his 1642 examination of the Old Roman Creed.[181] M. Luchi in his 1786 edition of the *Carmina* (which Migne reprinted in vol. 88 of the PL) agreed with Brouwer, and added a possible historical context: "Quod igitur Rufinus scripserat, Fortunatus, iam creatus episcopus Pictaviensis, ut videtur, ad plebem suam erudiendam in epitomen redegisse dicendus est."[182]

August Hahn, in his work on the origins of the Symbol in 1842, also noted this relationship. He demonstrates the reliance by citing 1) the similarities in the myth of apostolic origin Venantius adapts from Rufinus and 2) the possible similarity of the credal

---

[180] Christophe Brouwer, *Venantii Honorii Clementiani Fortunati Italici Presbyteri, Episcopi Pictaviensis, Vetusti et Christiani Poetae Carminum, Epistolarum et Expositionum Libri XI* (Mayence, 1603), 238: "He who compares this exposition with that of Rufinus will see that it is, as it were, an epitome thereof, and born from the mind of Rufinus." He follows this comment by saying that his commentary on Fortunatus' text will merely show how the poet taught the purest doctrine of the Catholic faith. Charles Nisard's comment on Brouwer's edition is apropos at this point: "Malheureusement, les notes et commentaires dont il l'accompagna laissent beaucoup à désirer sous le rapport de l'exactitude historique et de la clarté. Tantôt elles sont d'une prolixité fatigante, tantôt d'une brièveté dont on ne peut rien tirer de ce qu'on est avide ou de ce qu'il importe surtout de savoir." ("Unfortunately, the notes and comments with which he accompanied his edition left much to be desired in the areas of clarity and historical accuracy. At certain times they are wearyingly prolix, at others they have a brevity which prevents one from grasping anything that one desires to know or that is of any importance") (Charles Nisard, *Le poète Fortunat* (Paris: H. Champion, 1890), 38).
[181] James Ussher, *De Romanae ecclesiae symbolo apostolico vetere* (Oxford, 1660), 7-8.
[182] PL 88.0345D: "Therefore it should be said that what Rufinus had written Fortunatus, now made Bishop of Poitiers, as it seems, reduced to an epitome in order to educate his people."

text of Fortunatus to that cited by Rufinus, his source.[183] Friedrich Leo noted in his 1881 edition: "Rufini expositionem symboli in curtam epitomen redegit [Fortunatus] et pauca de suo adiecit."[184] Charles Nisard, in his translation of Fortunatus' *Carmina* made in 1887, declines to translate either of the sermons, claiming that they had no interest to anyone save theologians.[185] He noted the dependence of the *ES* on Rufinus, calling it: "l'oeuvre de Rufin plutôt que de Fortunat."[186] He did not comment on any interpolations the poet made into this summary.

In the latter half of the nineteenth century there was a flurry of scholarly activity in England on the history of the Symbol. Naturally enough Fortunatus' Symbol commentary came in for extensive treatment, though unfortunately not very adept.[187] The most useful work on Fortunatus' Symbol sermon in this period was written by Ferdinand Kattenbusch in 1894 as part of his monumental work *Das apostolische Symbol*.[188] While he was most interested in finding out what Fortunatus' *ES* had to say about the nature of the credal text itself, he also had a number of things to say about the commentary's substance. "Die expositio symboli," he wrote, "ist nichts anderes als ein nicht übler, geschmackvoller Auszug aus der expositio des Rufin."[189] He praised Fortunatus for writing a summary that was in many ways clearer and defter than the original. Kattenbusch acknowledges that there are a

[183] August Hahn, *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensegeln der Apostolisch-katholischen Kirche* (Breslau, 1842), 33 n. 1.
[184] Leo, 253: "[Fortunatus] reduced the *Expositio symboli* of Rufinus to a short epitome, and added a few things of his own."
[185] Charles Nisard, trans., *Venance Fortunat. Poésies Mêlées traduites en français pour la première fois* (Paris: Librairie de Firmin-Didot, 1887), 235.
[186] Nisard, *Venance Fortunat*, 257: "More the work of Rufinus than of Fortunatus."
[187] Edmund Ffoulkes, *The Athanasian Creed: By Whom Written and by Whom Published; With Other Enquiries on Creeds in General* (London, 1871), 53-70; Joseph Lumby, *The History of the Creeds* (Cambridge, 1880), 124-125 n. 2.
[188] Ferdinand Kattenbusch, *Das apostolische Symbol. Erster Band: Der Grundgestalt des Taufsymbols* (Leipzig, 1894), 130-132.
[189] Kattenbusch, *Das apostolische Symbol*, 130: "The Expositio symboli is nothing else than a nice, elegant summary of the *Expositio* of Rufinus."

few points at which the exposition of Fortunatus diverges from Rufinus', but these are rare and apart from them his text follows the thought of the original. His treatment of the sermon was by far the most thoughtful of all scholarship up to that point and was in my judgment to remain so until a century had passed.

The first scholar of the writings of Venantius Fortunatus who took notice of the *ES* in the 20th century was Richard Koebner. In his concise but extremely valuable work *Venantius Fortunatus: Seine Persönlichkeit und seine Stellung in der geistigen Kultur des Merowingerreiches*, published in 1915, he took considerable interest in the poet's religious sensibility. His exploration of this aspect of Fortunatus' writing led him to examine the two sermons. Koebner recognized the *ES* as a summary of Rufinus: "Die Auslegung des Symbols ist im wesentlichen nur ein Auszug aus dem Kommentar des Rufinus."[190] Yet Koebner goes further than previous scholars and comments on the significance of the original element in the exposition:

> Die §§ 25-27, die die Symbolik des Kreuzes darstellen, sind von Rufinus unabhängig. Fortunatus, der sich sonst in dem Traktat der Kürze befleißigt und seine Vorlage stark zusammenzieht, wird hier ausführlicher. Das liegt am Gegenstande: der Kult des Kreuzes ist ihm besonders vertraut; seine Hymnen kommen ihm in Erinnerung.[191]

Moreover, he observes that Fortunatus references the redemption of the entire world by means of the cross, echoing a theme found in the rest of his spiritual writings. Koebner's interest in the spiritual sensibility of the poet leads him to point out this interpolation, whose importance seems to have escaped earlier scholars. Yet this insight was ignored for decades,

[190] Koebner, *Venantius Fortunatus*, 113: "The exposition of the Symbol is in its essence only a summary of Rufinus' Commentary."
[191] Koebner, *Venantius Fortunatus* , 114 n. 1: "Sections 25-27, which describe the symbolism of the Cross, are independent from Rufinus. Fortunatus, who elsewhere in the text takes care to make things brief and to hew closely to his model, here goes into more detail. The reason for this is that the cult of the Cross is especially dear to him; his hymns are here in his mind."

until the new editions of Reydellet and Di Brazzano came out.[192] What these two editors had to say will now be examined.

Marc Reydellet contributed significantly to the study of this sermon, in particular its use of Scripture. He wrote: "Cette exposition du symbole est un résumé très proche du commentaire de Rufin...Les citations scripturaires sont faites selon Rufin et non selon la vulgate."[193] His interest in the source of the Scriptural texts used by Fortunatus adds an important (and new) aspect to the secondary scholarship. In additional notes he points to where Fortunatus follows Rufinus' citation of the Septuagint rather than a Latin text and also observes where the poet adds his own Scripture verses not found in Rufinus.[194] At the interpolation on the cross in §§ 24-27, Reydellet agrees with the assessment of Koebner not only that it is unique to Fortunatus, but: "On remarquera spécialement au § 25 l'idée, chère à Fortunat, que la Rédemption rachète la création tout entière."[195] The final exclamation of the interpolation, *O dulce pomum arbore!* is interpreted by Reydellet as representing, "une émotion personnelle et une dévotion particulière pour la croix."[196] For Reydellet, as for Koebner, this sermon represents a true expression of Fortunatus' own religious thought.

Stefano Di Brazzano's edition came out in 2001 and was rightly judged by Joseph Pucci to take third place to Reydellet and Leo in the general ranking of editions of Fortunatus' *Carmina*.[197] Yet Di Brazzano nonetheless made an important contribution to Fortunatus

---

[192] Manlio Simonetti, in his article laying the groundwork for his CCSL edition of Rufinus' *Expositio symboli*, also noted the relationship, although observing that Fortunatus' text was worthless as a textual source for Rufinus due to the fact that it paraphrased Rufinus quite freely (Manlio Simonetti, "Sulla tradizione manuscritta delle opere originali di Rufino, 2," in *Sacris erudiri*, vol. 10 (1958), 24 n. 2).
[193] Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 3, 101 n. 1: "This exposition of the Symbol is a greatly shortened summary of the commentary of Rufinus...The scriptural citations are made according to Rufinus and not the Vulgate."
[194] E.g., Reydellet, *Poemes*, vol. 3, 103 n. 4, 105 n. 14
[195] Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 3, 109 n. 20: "One's attention is held especially by the idea in section 25, dear to Fortunatus, that the Redemption ransoms the creation in its entirety."
[196] Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 3, 109 n. 20: "a personal emotion and a special devotion for the cross."
[197] Joseph Pucci, "Venantius Fortunatus Concluded," in *The Classical Review*, vol. 55.2 (Oct. 2005), 564-565. This judgment is restricted to Di Brazzano's work on the text itself and is due to his reliance upon Reydellet's

scholarship, not so much in his edition as in his commentary. Like Nisard, he separates the two sermons from the *Carmina* as a whole but unlike Nisard he translates them and places them at the end of his work. What is most useful in this method is that Di Brazzano adds separate introductions to each of the two sermons, commenting on their provenance and place in Fortunatus' corpus. His notes are also more extensive than Reydellet's. He, like all the rest, recognizes Fortunatus' dependence upon Rufinus: "Neppure questa seconda opera teologica di Venanzio è originale. Anzi...nel caso del *Symbolum Apostolorum* preferì compendiare l'opera più autorevole in materia, il commento composto da Rufino di Concordia."[198] Yet he notes carefully—more carefully than any of his predecessors—the departures that the poet made from his source.

First, he observes that Fortunatus cut out all in-depth analyses of heresy as well as the discussion of credal variants with which Rufinus' text abounds.[199] Second, Di Brazzano argues that the form of the creed differs from Rufinus' form and thus represents the creed of Poitiers, not Aquileia.[200] Third, he notes along with Leo, Koebner and Reydellet the interpolation on the cross.[201] Fourth, the notes on the text itself (the previous statements are all found in his introduction) take note of other departures from Rufinus' text, such as the introduction.[202] So with this edition of the *Carmina* a great stride forward was made in the study of the *ES* of Fortunatus. It is therefore fitting that the symposium held in Treviso, Italy,

---

work. Di Brazzano admits as much himself: "Non intendo pubblicare un'edizione critica, abbiamo preso a modello per la prefazione, per i *capitula librorum* e per i primi otto libri dei carmi la recentissima edizione curata da M. Reydellet." "Not intending to publish a critical edition, we have taken as a model the preface, *capitula librorum* and the first eight books of the recent edition prepared by M. Reydellet [the third and final volume of Reydellet had not yet been published at the publication of these words in 2001]." (Di Brazzano, *Opere*, 87)

[198] Di Brazzano, *Opere*, 597: "The second theological work [i.e., the *ES*] of Venantius is not original. Rather...in the case of the *Symbolum Apostolorum* he preferred to summarize a more authoritative work, a commentary composed by Rufinus of Concordia."

[199] Di Brazzano, *Opere*, 598-99.

[200] Di Brazzano, *Opere*, 599.

[201] Di Brazzano, *Opere*, 599.

[202] E.g. Di Brazzano, *Opere*, 600 n. 1.

for the publication launch of Di Brazzano's edition at the end of 2001 included a paper setting forth a detailed treatment of the contents of the sermon.

Alessio Peršič presented the lecture, "Venanzio Fortunato *presbyter Italicus*" at the conference *Venanzio Fortunato e il suo tempo*.[203] He argued that the two sermons contained in the *Carmina* are representative of Aquileian theology and spirituality. He focused especially on the *ES* due to its dependence upon Rufinus, the Aquileian theologian *par excellence*. He argued further that this text reflects a northern Italian spiritual sensibility on account of its peculiar creed and its adherence to theological emphases reflecting those of other Aquileian writers (not just Rufinus).

Peršič suggests that Fortunatus used the local creed of his hometown Duplavilis, which was in itself a variant of the Aquileian creed used by Rufinus.[204] He also suggests the reason why Fortunatus did so was also linked to the culture of his native land:

> Se ci si chiedesse, infine, perché mai il *presbyter italicus* Venanzio Fortunato avrebbe scelto di commentare e, forse per l'acquisita autorità di pastore-liturgo, proporre a fedeli merovingi il *Credo* ricevuto dalla propria Chiesa nativa, potrebbe aiutare l'analogia di un esemptio. Anche per un intellettuale cosmopolita come Rufino, al momento del bisogno, era scattato il richiamo forte e rassicurante della fede atavica: appunto dal *Credo* di Aquileia ricavò la difesa della propria ortodossia di fronte al sospetto del papa Anastasio...Non è affatto escluso che Fortunato abbia letto anche quelle parole, vista la probabilità di rimembranze dell'*Apologia ad Anastasium* nelle sue prose teologiche.[205]

---

[203] Alessio Peršič, "Venanzio Fortunato *presbyter Italicus*: Lettura dell'*Expositio symbuli* e dell'*Expositio orationis dominicae* alla luce della tradizione di fede della Chiesa di Aquileia, con un poscritto sull'*Expositio fidei catholicae Fortunati*," in *Venanzio Fortunato e il suo tempo* (Treviso: Fondazione Cassamarca, 2001), 403-463.

[204] Peršič, "Venanzio Fortunato," 406-410.

[205] Peršič, "Venanzio Fortunato," 411: "If one should ask why the *presbyter Italicus* Venantius Fortunatus chose to comment and, perhaps through the authority of a pastor-liturgist, to introduce to the Merovingian faithful the *Credo* he received from his own native church, one may be able to adduce a similar occasion from an example. Even a cosmopolitan intellectual like Rufinus at a moment of need resorted to a strong and reassuring reference to his native faith: he noted down the creed which he had received in Aquileia in defense of his own orthodoxy when faced with the suspicion of Pope Anastasius...It should by no means be excluded that Fortunatus had read this speech as well, given the probability of reminiscence in his [Fortunatus'] theological prose of the *Apologia ad Anastasium*."

The next argument Peršič makes is that there is a clear influence of an Aquileian theological orientation in the commentary in general. He argues that Fortunatus chose which elements of Rufinus' own *Expositio* to include in his summary on the basis of what fit best with the emphases of his youthful theological education in Aquileia. The first "Aquileian" element is the emphasis on Christ rising again with the same flesh he died in. In Rufinus' *Expositio symboli* this emphasis is present in the addition of *huius* to *carnis resurrectionem*. Rufinus explains this as an addition made by his maternal church, Aquileia, in order to combat various heresies.[206] Fortunatus includes this element in three places, two regarding the resurrection of all flesh at the end of days and one regarding the flesh of Christ.[207]

The second "Aquileian" element is contained in the comment on *tertia die resurrexit*, in which Fortunatus, though much shorter than Rufinus, nonetheless contains an element alien to the original *Expositio*: the image of Jonah in the whale's belly for 3 days.[208] Peršič suggests that this element is also Aquileian, with Fortunatus having in his mind the mosaics in the Patriarchal Basilica in Aquileia depicting Jonah and Christ.[209] Third, Peršič points out that the extensive commentary under the article *Crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato* neatly matches the "Aquileian" emphasis, under the influence of theologians in Asia Minor, upon the salvific centrality of the crucifixion and descent into Hell.[210] The narrow space given to the resurrection of Christ reflects, Peršič argues, a "Johannine" focus upon the salvific efficacy of the crucifixion rather than the resurrection.

Finally, Peršič uses the independent excursus on the cross in §§ 24-27 of Fortunatus' *ES* to demonstrate the sermon's "Aquileian" affinity. Continuing on with his point that the

[206] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 41.17ff. Manicheanism is the chief heresy combated by this addition.
[207] Fortunatus, *Carmina*, 11.1.1, 11.1.39; Peršič, "Venanzio Fortunato," 412.
[208] Fortunatus, *Carmina*, 11.1.30.
[209] Peršič, "Venanzio Fortunato," 413.
[210] Peršič, "Venanzio Fortunato," 413-414.

Johannine *theologia crucis* is a central "Aquileian" element in the sermon, Peršič argues for a "coerenza aquileiese" or "Aquileian coherence" in this section. Chromatius of Aquileia plays a major role in his argument since such ideas as the cosmic symbolism of the crucifixion, the reconciliation between God and Man symbolized by the suspension of Christ between heaven and earth, the identification of the cross with the Edenic Tree of Life, the image of Christ's death as a commercial transaction and the characteristic use of the phrase *suspensus est/ suspenditur* to refer to Christ's death on the cross rather than the more common *crucifigitur* or *configebatur* all feature in the writings of both Fortunatus and Chromatius.[211] The writings of Paulinus of Aquileia are also cited in the instance of the Cross as the Edenic Tree of Life. Peršič thus argues that the evidence for an "Aquileian" theology is obvious from the independent excursus as well. He then goes on to cite Fortuantus' other works on the cross, the hymns, the *EOD* and the (what he considers) Fortunatan creed *Quicumque vult* as evidence for his hypothesis.

Peršič's article represents the most sustained and interesting treatment of the theological content of the *ES* in scholarly literature to date. He also makes a powerful (though ultimately unconvincing) argument for the Aquileian provenance of the theological emphases dear to Fortunatus. What Peršič's paper also represents is the first serious attempt to come to grips with Fortunatus the theologian. The poet's literary education in Ravenna is well known; what Peršič explores is his theological education and proclivities through an intensive examination of his theological writings.

The same conference in which Peršič presented his paper was also the context for the paper of Rajko Bratož considering the question of Fortunatus' position on the Three Chapters

[211] Peršič, "Venanzio Fortunato," 415-416.

controversy.[212] The Three Chapters schism, with which the final section of this dissertation is concerned, involved a breach between Aquileia and Rome over the decisions introduced during the Second Council of Constantinople in 553. Bratož explores the effects of the schism on Fortunatus' career, and cautiously argues that the poet was generally favourable to the Aquileian point of view on the matter. In the course of his argument he briefly examines the *Expositio symboli*, noting how its creed seems to be based on the Aquileian creed.[213] However, he concludes that there is nothing particular in Fortunatus' use of the creed to indicate where he stood with regard to the issues surrounding the schism: "Il credo di Venanzio lo definiamo 'aquileiese' pur con riserve."[214] Thus Bratož was concerned only with the credal variant, not the content of the sermon itself, and concluded that the text is too generic to be of any use for determining Fortunatus' particular theology in any detail.

Lastly, and most recently, the *ES* of Fortunatus was subjected to an intensive literary analysis by Oliver Ehlen, who in his 2011 monograph *Venantius-Interpretationen* included a section on "Venantius Fortunatus als theologischer Schriftsteller."[215] Ehlen selects the *ES* for his case study in the poet's literary methods due to the fact that Fortunatus summarizes a previously existing (and longer) text, the *Expositio symboli* of Rufinus. This enables him to use a comparison between the two related texts to determine what Fortunatus emphasized in Rufinus' presentation. "Da diese Vorlage ungefähr den zehnfachen Umfang der fortunatianischen Fassung aufweist, kann von einer bloßen Übernahme des rufinischen Textes durch Venantius Fortunatus nicht die Rede sein. Allein durch die Kürzung ergeben

[212] Rajko Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," in *Venanzio Fortunato e il suo tempo* (Treviso: Fondazione Cassamarca, 2001), 362-401.
[213] Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma," 383.
[214] Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma," 383. "We may define the creed of Venantius as "Aquileian," although with reservations."
[215] Ehlen, *Venantius-Interpretationen*, 151-177. "Venantius Fortunatus as Theological Author."

sich notwendigerweise Akzentverschiebungen."[216] Ehlen therefore proceeds to a careful examination of the manner in which Fortunatus abridged Rufinus' commentary.

He begins by looking at the prologue to Fortunatus' *ES,* which contains a good deal of material original to the poet. "Hinsichtlich der Richtung dieser Akzentverschiebungen sind bereits die Äußerungen im Proöm aufschlussreich," states Ehlen.[217] He examines the introductory section's sentence structure, observing that the poet makes use of a number of literary techniques, such as chiasmus, in the course of his presentation.[218] At the beginning Ehlen identifies a chiasmus: "in qua et integritas credulitatis ostenditur et unius Dei omnipotentis, id est sanctae Trinitatis, aequalitas declaratur (11.1.1)." He explains that through the chiastic juxtaposition of *credulitas* and *aequalitas* the concepts of right belief (orthodoxy), corresponding to the term *credulitas,* and the Trinity, corresponding to the term *aequalitas*, are identified as relying upon each other. "So wird auch rein stilistisch die Orthodoxie mit ihrem Kernsatz, dem nizänischen Bekenntnis zur Dreieinigkeit Gottes, unausflöslich verklammert," he writes.[219]

Ehlen argues that the importance of orthodoxy for the practice of the Christian religion is further heightened by how the prologue is concluded. After examining the polyphonic ring composition of the rest of the initial sentence, he examines the shortened history of the Symbol's origin that the poet gives in place of Rufinus' lengthy explanation.[220]

---

[216] Ehlen, *Venantius-Interpretationen*, 152: "Since this edition [of Rufinus'] is about ten times the length of Fortunatus' version, nothing of import can be discerned from the simple adoption of Rufinus' text by Venantius Fortunatus. Only through the abridgement does it necessarily portray a shift in stress."
[217] Ehlen, *Venantius-Interpretationen*, 152: "Regarding the course of this shift in stress, the comments in the Prologue are especially instructive."
[218] Ehlen, *Venantius-Interpretationen*, 154.
[219] Ehlen, *Venantius-Interpretationen*, 154: "Thus orthodoxy is indissolubly joined with his key clause, the Nicene understanding of the Triune God."
[220] For the concept of "Ring Composition," see Mary Douglas, *Thinking in Circles: An Essay on Ring Composition* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007), x, where she describes it in this way: "It is a construction of parallelisms that must open a theme, develop it and round it off by bringing the conclusion back to the beginning...in a ring composition, the meaning is located in the middle."

He argues that Fortunatus highlights the role of the Symbol's definition of orthodox belief in individual salvation, as against Rufinus' emphasis on the Symbol as a rule for preaching.[221] Fortunatus emphasizes orthodoxy differently from Rufinus in that for the poet, right belief as outlined by the Symbol is a good work leading to salvation and eternal life, whereas Rufinus is mostly concerned for the Symbol's anti-heretical function.[222] Ehlen suggests that Rufinus' Symbol is an *indicium*, an identifier of a true Christian; for Fortunatus, the doctrines contained in the Symbol are vital for personal salvation.

Ehlen then proceeds to examine the body of the poet's sermon. He argues that the shift in stress discernible in Fortunatus' prologue continues into the body of the sermon. So Rufinus' text is adapted by Fortunatus in such a way that while the original ideas are usually included the actual phrasing is radically adapted.[223] He suggests that the focus on personal salvation, and the importance to it of right belief, is again accented by this stylistic shift.[224] All in all, Ehlen states, "Die Analyse...hat gezeigt, wie es Venantius Fortunatus gelingt, trotz zum Teil wörtlicher Übernahmen durch Umstellung, stilistische Bearbeitung und gezielte Auswahl aus dem Prätext eigene Akzente und eine eigene Gewichtung zu setzen."[225]

The emphasis on correct belief is traced by Ehlen throughout the body of the commentary. Other shifts in stress that he picks up through an examination of the poet's style and summarizing technique are a lack of interest in arguments for theological points that

[221] Ehlen, *Venantius-Interpretationen*, 155.
[222] Ehlen, *Venantius-Interpretationen*, 158.
[223] Ehlen, *Venantius-Interpretationen*, 159.
[224] Ehlen, *Venantius-Interpretationen*, 162-163.
[225] Ehlen, *Venantius-Interpretationen*, 165: "The analysis...shows how Venantius Fortunatus succeeds, despite a frequent word-for-word adaptation, in putting a stylistic treatment and a specific choice of topics to work in service of a distinctive focus and prioritization."

might appeal to pagans,[226] a concern to emphasize the lack of pollution in Christ's incarnation,[227] a penchant for replacing lengthy Rufinian arguments with short citations of Scripture, [228] a broad emphasis through the organization of the commentary upon the signal importance of the Son's death on the cross as the work of salvation[229] and the *telos* of belief as eternal life.[230] He also deals with the independent excursus on the cross (*Carm.* 11.1.24-27) and the *sui generis* comments slightly thereafter on Christ as a mediator.[231] He observes that the interest the poet shows in adding to Rufinus' exposition on the cross reflects the interest Fortunatus displays in this subject in many of his poems. He argues that the use of paradox plays the same key role in this independent excursus as it does in the hymns.[232] Ehlen also points out that the three main sections focus respectively on God the Father, God the Son and God the Holy Spirit.[233] In each of these, the poet traces the importance and result of belief.[234] The poet ends his sermon with the resurrection from the dead, which is the reward of right belief, and a recapitulation of the opening discussion of the Trinity.

Ehlen then wraps up his analysis. First, he states that Fortunatus stays close to the content of Rufinus' exposition in order to emphasize that his sermon is rigidly orthodox. Second, the sermon has a tripartite structure, based on the structure of the Trinity and the

---

[226] Ehlen, *Venantius-Interpretationen*, 166: "Im gegensatz zu Rufin, der die Jungfrauengeburt mit Beispielen aus der antiken Mythologie parallelisiert, bleibt Venantius Fortunatus in seiner Argumentation gänzlich im biblischen Kontext."
[227] Ehlen, *Venantius-Interpretationen*, 165: "Der Jungfrauengeburt widmet Venantius Fortunatus einen vergleichsweise langen Abschnitt, dabei legt er einen besonderen Akzent darauf, dass Christus durch did Inkarnation nicht verunreinigt wurde."
[228] Ehlen, *Venantius-Interpretationen*, 170: "hier [i.e., *Carm.* 11.1.32] aber durch die Beschränkung auf nur drei Schriftzitate, die jeweils nur eine These formulieren, wesentlich prägnanter als bei Rufin formuliert."
[229] Ehlen, *Venantius-Interpretationen*, 172: "Durch Umfang und inhaltlich eigene Ergänzung beim Erlösungswerk Christi am Kreuz erhält der zweite Großabschnitt über Gott Sohn das stärkste Gewicht..."
[230] Ehlen, *Venantius-Interpretationen*, 175: "Gleichsam ist hier das τελος des Glaubens, das ewige Leben erreicht, was durch Anlage und Komposition unmissverständlich herausgehoben wird."
[231] Ehlen, *Venantius-Interpretationen*, 168-170.
[232] Ehlen, *Venantius-Interpretationen*, 169-170.
[233] Ehlen, *Venantius-Interpretationen*, 172.
[234] Ehlen, *Venantius-Interpretationen*, 175.

story of salvation, with the cross at its centre. Third, he makes the importance of the Creed's profession a special accent, distinguishing his version of the *Expositio symboli* from that of Rufinus, which has no such accent or emphasis. Fourth, the independent excursus on the cross, and an allegorical interpretation of Christ as a mediator, has no parallel in Rufinus and enables a connection to be made between Fortunatus' sermon and his hymns, especially *Carmen* 5.6a. Ehlen concludes that the *ES* of Fortunatus is important for understanding the poet because it demonstrates how he interacted with a long-standing prose literary tradition, that is, with the tradition of Symbol commentaries, and lifted a mundane theological disquisition into a higher literary register. Thus the poet's sermon on the Symbol is connected with his other prose compositions, especially the letters.

Venantius Fortunatus' *ES* has enjoyed the most attention of Fortunatus' two theological prose texts. The reason for this is its place in the history of the Apostles' Creed. A downside of this focus on the text of the Creed itself is that the actual content of the sermon received little attention until fairly recently. The editions of Di Brazzano and Reydellet started to fill in the gap, and then Peršič and Ehlen both made great strides in analyzing different aspects of the sermon. But there has been as yet no in-depth examination of how Fortunatus adapts Rufinus. What follows will help to remedy that lack.

2.2 *Rufinus of Aquileia's* Expositio symboli

The influence of Rufinus of Aquileia's fifth-century *Expositio symboli* on Symbol sermons in general, and Fortunatus' in particular, can scarcely be overstated. Written at the very beginning of the fifth century, his commentary very quickly became esteemed. In his entry on Rufinus in his book *De viris illustribus* (published around 495), Gennadius of Marseilles observed: "Proprio autem labore, imo gratia Dei et dono, exposuit idem Ruffinus symbolum,

ut in eius comparatione alii nec exposuisse credantur."[235] John Cassian cited the *Expositio Symboli* as an authority in his treatise *De incarnatione domini* (written around 426), saying: "Rufinus quoque, Christianae philosophiae vir, haud contemnenda ecclesiasticorum doctorum portio, ita in expositione symboli de domini nativitate testatur..."[236]

While there were previous treatments of the Creed, such as that by Ambrose of Milan in his *Explanatio symboli*, Rufinus transformed the genre by abstracting the exposition from its liturgical setting and making it into a theological treatise.[237] Rather than address catechumens at a baptismal ceremony, Rufinus writes his commentary for a certain bishop Laurentius (otherwise unknown) at his request: "Sed quoniam, ut cum venia tui dixerim, temere in epistula tua per Christi me sacramenta, quae a nobis maxima cum reverentia sucipiuntur, adstringis ut aliquid tibi de fide secundum Symboli traditionem rationemque conponam…"[238]

While it has long been recognized by scholars that Rufinus bases much of his *Expositio* on prior baptismally-based sources, especially Cyril of Jerusalem's "Catechetical Lectures," he nonetheless integrates them into a more abstract theological treatise.[239] Thus Rufinus occasionally gives different variants of the Symbol's text, such as the Roman and

---

[235] Gennadius, *De Viris Illustribus*, 17, PL 58.1070A-1070B. "By his own effort, or rather by the grace and gift of God, the same Rufinus wrote an Exposition of the Symbol in such a way that in comparison with it others could scarcely be believed to have written anything at all."

[236] John Cassian, *De incarnatione domini*, ed. M. Petschenig and G. Kreuz, 2nd ed., CSEL 17 (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2004), 7.27, 385. "Rufinus, a man of Christian Philosophy—a group of church teachers who should not be despised—testifies in this way about the birth of the Lord in his *Expositio symboli*..."

[237] See especially Catherine Chin, "Short words on earth: Theological geography in Rufinus' Commentary on the Apostles' Creed," in *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, vol. 21.3 (Fall 2013), 391-412; also J.N.D. Kelly, *Rufinus: A Commentary on the Apostles' Creed* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1955), 9-11 for influences of previous authors on Rufinus.

[238] Rufinus of Aquileia, *Expositio symboli*, ed. M. Simonetti, CCSL 20 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1961), 133. "You rashly constrain me, as I might say with your indulgence, in your letter by the sacraments of Christ, which are held by us in the greatest reverence, that I should compose for you something about the faith according to the reason and tradition of the Symbol."

[239] Francis X. Murphy, *Rufinus of Aquleia (345-411): His Life and Works* (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1945), 179-181; see also Chin, "Short words," 394. As Di Brazzano notes, Rufinus draws mainly from eastern sources not western ones; thus the Greek texts of Gregory of Nyssa and Cyril of Jerusalem are drawn from, not Ambrose and other Latin writers (Di Brazzano, *Opere*, 598).

Aquileian variants, and comments on the significance of their differences.[240] Such an abstracted treatise on the Symbol lent itself to future preachers from all time periods and geographical regions drawing on its images and rhetoric. Many of the repeated formulas in Symbol sermons come directly from Rufinus; indeed it is rare for any such sermon to be completely unaffected by his *Expositio symboli*. Although not the only source for such sermons (Ambrose and Augustine were also frequently used, and many Symbol sermon tropes were considerably older than Rufinus), it was certainly the most ubiquitous. Its importance was such that not only was it widely disseminated along with the rest of Rufinus' works, it was also excerpted and summarized independently.

2.3 *Rufinus and His Summarizers*

Rufinus' works were held in great esteem after his death throughout the Latin west.[241] In addition to the mention of him made by Gennadius and Cassian, Sidonius Apollinaris praised the translations of Origen he found in a villa in Southern Gaul, Gildas in Britain and Gregory of Tours in Gaul used his *Ecclesiastical History* and both Isidore and Bede had knowledge of

[240] E.g., Rufinus, *Exp. Symb.* 41.13-20, where Rufinus explains the addition of the word *huius* to the article concerning the resurrection of the flesh by the Aquileian church. See also Rufinus, *Exp. Symb.* 4.2-3, 5.1-3, where he outlines the belief of the eastern churches concerning the omnipotence of God.

[241] This good reputation was tempered by Jerome's criticism of his Origenism; never cast as a heretic exactly, nonetheless Rufinus was dealt with carefully by later authors. The earliest example of this is, as Murphy notes, the *Gelasian Decretal*, written in the early sixth century in Gaul, which treats Rufinus respectfully but cautiously: "Item Rufinus vir religiosus plurimos ecclesiastici operis edidit libros, nonnullas etiam Scripturas interpretatus est. Sed quoniam beatus Hieronymus eium in aliquibus de abitrii Libertate notavit, illa sentimus quae praedictum beatum Hieronymum sentire cognoscimus..." "Rufinus, a very religious man, produced many books of worth to the Church and wrote some interpretations of the Scriptures. But since the blessed Jerome censured him concerning, among other things, the freedom of the will, we hold with those things which we understand the blessed Jerome held with…" (Murphy, *Rufinus of Aquileia*, 223-224; *Decretum Gelasianum*, PL 59.161B) Thus the *Expositio symboli*, for all its popularity, was transmitted quite frequently under the name of Cyprian, Augustine or (ironically) Jerome (Kelly, *Rufinus: A Commentary*, 8; see also the list of *incipits* provided by Simonetti in his edition (Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, ed. Simonetti, 133).

his works.[242] As for the *Expositio symboli* itself, the vast quantity of manuscripts in which it is transmitted demonstrates its popularity.[243] It is therefore not surprising that it is used as an exemplar for Symbol sermons; and not only as a source of quotations and ideas, but as a text important enough in its own right to be summarized or adapted for less learned audiences.

The first adaptation to be looked at is a text which no longer exists. Labelling it *X*, Simonetti hypothesized that this manuscript lay at the root of almost half of the existing manuscripts of Rufinus' *Expositio symboli*.[244] Basically just another copy of Rufinus' text, what makes this an adaptation is the presence of several interpolations made by its copier. Simonetti lists seven such interpolations that extend individual sentences of Rufinus; none add completely new sentences to the original text.[245] What makes these interpolations significant is that in almost every case the additions they make emphasize the anti-Arian and anti-Macedonian strain already present. Thus when Rufinus states in *Exp. Symb.* 37: "Concilium vanitatis est et quod Arrius atque Eunomius docuit, qui Filium Dei non ex ipsa Patris substantia natum sed ex nihilo creatum volunt," the anonymous interpolator of *X* adds: "et Filium Dei habere initium et minorem esse Patre; sed et Spiritum Sanctum non solum

[242] Murphy, *Rufinus of Aquileia*, 223-225. See also the interesting discussion by W.A. Baehrens about the textual transmission of Rufinus' translations of Origen's homilies, where he suggests that their archetype derives from Cassiodorus' Vivarium community in the middle of the sixth century (W.A. Baehrens, *Überlieferiung und Textgeschichte der latienisch erhaltenen Origeneshomilien zum Alten Testament* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1916), 194-196). Yet this still only deals with the homilies; Baehrens' suggestion that this is also the source for most other of Rufinus' texts may be doubted due at least in part to Sidonius' mention of the presence in Gaul of Rufinus' translation of the *Adamantius* (Sidonius Apollinaris, *Epistulae et Carmina*, ed. B. Krusch, MGH *Auctores Antiquissimi*, vol. 8 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1887, repr. 1961), 2.9, 31).

[243] See the list of manuscripts used by Simonetti (Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, ed. Simonetti, 127), and the additional manuscripts mentioned by Keefe, *Catalogue*, 127-128. While the earliest manuscript is from Northern Italy (Taurinensi G V 26, s. 6-7) and derives from Bobbio, it is far from the most accurate (Simonetti, "Opere originali di Rufino," 15 n. 2). Its presence in at least Southern Gaul is demonstrated by Gennadius of Marseille's positive mention, and the four oldest manuscripts barring MS Taurinensi G V 26 derive from Gallic centres. See also Kattenbusch, *Das Apostolische Symbol*, vol. 1, 102-106.

[244] Simonetti, "Opere originali di Rufino," 19.

[245] Simonetti, "Opere originali di Rufino," 20-21.

minorem Filio, sed et mittendarium asserunt."[246] Another interpolation is found at *Exp. Symb.* 6: "Ipsius tamen caput est Pater. Sic enim scriptum est quia: *Caput Christi Deus est*;" this sentence is not so much added to as much as it is completely revamped, so the text above becomes: "Ipsius tamen auctor est pater generando sine initio quia nec pater praecedit filium nec filius sequitur patrem in faciendo adoptivum sicut nos."[247]

Simonetti suggests that these additions represent a response by the copier to current theological concerns relating to Arianism. Since they were unlikely to have been made by Rufinus himself in a second version due to the lack of urgency surrounding the Arian issue in early fifth-century Italy, he suggests the possibilities of late fifth- to sixth-century Italy and Spain. The presence in those places at those times of the non-Nicene Visigoths, Ostrogoths and Lombards spurred anti-Arian polemic, and this version of Rufinus' *Expositio symboli* would have had this concern as well.[248] This theory seems likely on the whole, with perhaps the addition that Southern Gaul at the end of the fifth and the beginning of the sixth centuries would be equally plausible. Indeed, this setting might be more plausible given the high level of interest in Trinitarian dispute present at the Visigothic courts in Southern Gaul, as

[246] Rufinus, *Expositio Symboli*, ed. Simonetti, 37 l. 36-38; for text of the interpolation, see the note on line 38 on p. 173. "The counsel of vanity is also that which was taught by Arius and Eunomius, who wished that the Son of God was not born from the same substance of the Father but rather was created out of nothing;" *X* adds: "and that the Son of God had a beginning and was lesser than the Father; but also asserted that the Holy Spirit not only was lesser than the Son, but also was a subordinate messenger." A *mittendarius* was an official of the Late Antique Roman Empire, a subordinate to such high officials as the *Comes sacrorum largitionum*; mention of this title is made in both the Theodosian and Justinianic Codes (*Thesaurus linguae latinae*, vol. 8.1162). Its appearance here, one of the only ones extant in Latin literature outside of the Codes (it also occurs in Cassiodorus, *Variae* 4.47), is of interest for determining the context of *X*.

[247] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, ed. Simonetti, 6.38-40; for text of the adaptation of *X*, see the note on line 39 on p. 142. "Nonetheless, His [i.e., the Son's] head is the Father. For thus it was written that: *The head of Christ is God* [1 Cor. 11.3];" in *X* this becomes: "Nonetheless, His creator is the Father, who generated Him without any beginning, since the Father did not precede the Son nor did the Son follow after the Father, thus making Him adopted as we are adopted." See also Simonetti, "Opere originali di Rufino," 20-21 for further interpolations.

[248] Simonetti, "Opere originali di Rufino," 23 n. 1, where he also takes note of the term *mittendarius*, which gives the interpolation a date ranging from the fifth to the seventh century.

displayed for example in the writings of Avitus of Vienne.[249] A further point in favour of southern Gaul would be the presence of the anti-Macedonian addition in the first passage cited above; one need only look to the late fifth-century *De spiritu sancto* of Faustus of Riez to realize that this was a live issue in the area.[250] The first example of an adaptation of Rufinus demonstrates how a later preacher might feel free to insert additional text, or change the text entirely, to address a specific theological concern. Still, this is a very slight adaptation and the text remains substantially that of Rufinus. Later authors modified the text of the *Expositio symboli* more freely.

Before tackling the *ES* of Fortunatus, two later Symbol sermons which use Rufinus explicitly will be examined. These are florilegia, taking direct quotations from a wide variety of sources to make up their text. The first text, Keefe No. 7, is found in a single manuscript, Montepellier Bib. Int., sect. Méd. 141, which includes handwriting dating from the eighth to the ninth century.[251] It is composed of excerpts from a wide variety of sources, such as Pseudo-Augustine Sermon 242 which was encountered above, Ambrose's *Expositio evangelii secundum Lucam*, Bede's *In epistolas VII catholicas libros singulos* and other authors. Rufinus is quoted on three occasions: two are exact quotations (lines 159-163 of T. 7 = Ruf. *Exp. Symb.* 4.23-26; lines 166-181 of T. 7 = Ruf. 4.54-69) and one is a passage from Rufinus that has been slightly rearranged (T. 7 lines 58-63 = Ruf. 4.9-16). The text connects all its various citations into one continuous flow, merely marking out the words of the Symbol on which it is commenting rather than indicating its sources.

---

[249] See the list of references to Arianism in the index of D. Shanzer and I. Wood, eds., *Avitus of Vienne: Letters and Selected Prose* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2002), 440.
[250] That is, the insistence that the Holy Spirit was equal to the Father and the Son; the Macdonians denied that the Holy Spirit was an equal to the Father and the Son. See also the account of Gregory of Tours, *Histories* 6.18, concerning the Visigothic king of Spain Leuvigild's denial of the divinity of the Holy Spirit in the latter half of the sixth century.
[251] Keefe, *Explanationes*, xi, 29.

The next text, Keefe T. 10, is rather different: it names its sources. Deriving from ninth-century manuscripts, this text is explicitly titled a *Florilegium* and consists of direct quotes from various authors (from Augustine to Isidore), usually labeled with the author's name, under the various articles of the Symbol. Rufinus' *Expositio symboli* is cited three times; yet the citations are not always applied to the same phrase of the Symbol under which they appear in the original text.[252] Thus the first citation, taken from Rufinus *Expositio symboli* 15.3-11 (under the article *Crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato*), appears in Keefe T. 10 lines 98-107 under the phrase *Descendit in inferna*. What Rufinus applies to the incarnation and crucifixion, the anonymous author of the florilegium applies to the Descent to Hell. The second excerpt, taken from Rufinus' comment on the article *Sanctam ecclesiam* and applied to the same article in the florilegium, is in fact three separate citations melded into one. Though taken from the same section, they are nonetheless fairly widely separated in the original text. The florilegist adjusts the grammar slightly to make a single paragraph. The third citation is under the article *remissionem peccatorum* (lines 191-196) and is taken from the same article in Rufinus (*Exp. Symb.* 34.12-14; 38.1-3, 13-15). Much like the previous citation, this one also takes several quotes from the original and melds them into a single paragraph.

The main point in examining the methods of the last two sermons in such detail is to place the summary of Venantius Fortunatus in context. His method of summarizing was more thoughtful in its adaptations and resulted in a more original sermon. Compared with these excerpted texts, his *Expositio symboli* is an original work that seems only loosely based on Rufinus.

[252] Keefe, *Explanationes*, T. 10, 54-63.

2.4 *Venantius Fortunatus and Rufinus of Aquileia Compared*

Though usually classified as a summary of Rufinus, Venantius Fortunatus' *Expositio symboli* takes remarkable freedoms with its source. Compared with the other summaries of Rufinus examined before, Fortunatus' own voice comes through clearly in this sermon. While usually taking his lead from the text of Rufinus, he often makes significant changes and additions to it. This section will engage in a detailed study of the text of Fortunatus and compare it with the parallel sections in Rufinus. The changes and additions that are identified will then be examined, leading to a concluding discussion about the differences between Rufinus' and Fortunatus' theological visions, and how the latter's sermon fits into the general milieu of sixth-century Gallic doctrine.

The prologue to Fortunatus' version of the *Expositio symboli* contains both a summary of and an addition to Rufinus' text. Rufinus begins his text with an elegant foreword addressed to Bishop Laurentius in which he engages in the typical classical author's deprecation of his own abilities and outlines his purpose for writing. Rufinus writes:

> Equidem conperi nonnullos inlustrium tractatorum aliqua de his pie et breviter edidisse. Photinum vero haereticum scio eatenus conscripsisse, non ut rationem dictorum audientibus explanaret, sed ut simpliciter et fideliter dicta, ad argumentum sui dogmatis traheret...Nos ergo vel simplicitatem suam verbis apostolicis reddere et adsignare temptabimus, vel quae omissa videntur a prioribus, adinplere.[253]

He quotes an Old Latin translation of Isaiah 10:23, "Verbum enim consummans et brevians in aequitate, quia verbum breviatum faciet Dominus super terram," and claims that the

[253] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli* 1: "It has come to my notice that quite a few eminent writers have published concise and doctrinally sound manuals on the subject. But I know too that the heretic Photinus, instead of explaining the sense of the clauses to his audience, made it his object to twist straightfoward, orthodox statements so as to bolster up his own ideas...My endeavour, therefore, will be to restore and emphasize the plain, simple meaning of the Apostles' words, and at the same time to fill in the gaps left by my predecessors." The translation used for this passage is that of Kelly, *Rufinus of Aquileia: A Commentary*, 28-29. The remaining translations are my own. Photinus was a fourth-century bishop of Sirmium who denied the pre-existence of the Son. For more on this, see Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, 236-238.

Symbol is a fulfillment of this prophecy.[254] Rufinus' emphasis in his explanation is upon the plain meaning of the text, *simplicitatem suam*, because the text itself is simple and clear. Fortunatus in his prologue takes a rather different tack. There is no mention of any predecessors in explaining the Symbol, nor is there mention of heretics who need to be corrected. Rather, his purpose is catechetical, and so Fortunatus states: "Quia multa in symbolo paucis verbis conplexa sunt, mediocriter nobis sermo temperandus est, ne aut breviter dicendo non aperiat intellectum aut prolixitate verbi generetur fastidium."[255]

While Rufinus is concerned with correcting the errors of Photinus and restoring the Symbol's native simplicity, Fortunatus is concerned only with transmitting correct doctrine in an effective manner to his congregation. The Symbol's brevity, an aspect which is mentioned by both Rufinus and Fortunatus, poses a different problem for each. The brevity for Rufinus is an aid to understanding and needs only to be kept from contamination; for Fortunatus, it is theological code that needs to be unpacked before its truth becomes apparent. The understanding of critical catechetical texts as theological codes that need to be unpacked is apparent as well in his introduction to his commentary on the Lord's Prayer: "Inde retinentes eius mysteria et quam multa sint in brevitate conlata, propter aedificationem ecclesiae paucis docemus explicare, quia tunc nobis melius placebunt auditu, cum patuerint intellectu."[256] Moreover, in the *ES* he does not desire to cause repulsion by being prolix, while in his *EOD* he desires to open the mind to enable pleasure. Here then are two instances

[254] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 1. "Summing up the word, and making it brief in equity, since the Lord will make a brief word upon the earth," is the text found in Rufinus; the Vulgate translates the Hebrew rather better with its, "consummationem enim et adbreviationem Dominus Deus exercituum faciet in medio omnis terrae;" "For the Lord God will make a consumption and cutting short of armies in the midst of the whole land."
[255] Fortunatus, *Carmina*, 11.1.1. "Since many things are covered in the Symbol by a few words, the sermon ought to be moderately restrained by us, lest either by speaking briefly the intellect is not opened or by the speech's very length repulsion is formed."
[256] Fortunatus, *Carmina*, 10.1.2. "So because this prayer retains its mysteries and since very many things are gathered together within a small space, for the edification of the church we teach with a few words to explain these things, since then they will be better pleasing to our ear once they are clear to our intellect."

of his poetic sensibilities affecting his catechetical technique. This poetic sensibility present in Fortunatus' *ES* is absent in Rufinus, not because he lacks literary elegance (indeed, Rufinus' classical style is considerably superior to Fortunatus') but because he is not so concerned with causing his audience to take pleasure in his words. Rufinus' *Expositi symboli* is a technical theological treatise, while Fortunatus' *ES* is very much a sermon.

The majority of Fortunatus' prologue is taken up with a preliminary statement of the contents of the creed:

> Summam totius fidei catholicae recensentes, in qua et integritas credulitatis ostenditur et unius Dei omnipotentis, id est sanctae Trinitatis, aequalitas declaratur et mysterium incarnationis filii Dei, qui pro salute humani generis a Patre de caelo descendens de virgine nasci dignatus est, quo ordine vel quando pertulerit, quomodo sepultus surrexerit et in carne ipsa caelos ascendens ad dexteram Patris consederit iudexque venturus sit, qualiter remissionem peccatorum sacro baptismate renatis contulerit et resurrectio humani generis in eadem carne in vitam aeternam futura sit...[257]

Fortunatus immediately sets forth the subject of his sermon. Rufinus' prologue does not mention a single element of the Symbol's content until the explanation of the first article. This demonstrates the fundamental difference in genre between Fortunatus' sermon and Rufinus' treatise. Fortunatus is interested in grabbing his audience's attention at once; Rufinus is interested in bestowing compliments upon his patron and making the standard disclaimers to a literary work.[258]

---

[257] Fortunatus, *Carmina*, 11.1.1. "We go over the entirety of the whole Catholic faith, in which both the integrity of belief is shown and the equality of the one almighty God, that is of the holy Trinity, is declared, as is the mystery of the incarnation of the Son of God, who coming down from heaven and away from the Father deigned to be born from a virgin for the sake of the salvation of the human race, and in which order and at what time he suffered, and how he, having been buried, rose again and rising up in the same flesh he sat down at the right hand of the Father and will come back as judge, and how he conferred the remission of sins to those reborn by sacred baptism and how there will be the resurrection of the human race in the same flesh to the life eternal."

[258] Di Brazzano tentatively suggests that this section may be a paraphrase of the baptismal Symbol in use at Poitiers. This proposal is more likely than his statement that Fortunatus used the Symbol of Poitiers in his text, since this summary statement includes all the elements of a traditional Symbol text, whereas the quoted Symbol is considerably truncated (Di Brazzano, *Opere*, 600 n. 1). If true, it is a unique facet of this sermon that Fortunatus does not quote his complete Symbol text save in a stylized paraphrase. This indicates a more casual use of the Symbol text than one finds elsewhere, especially in Rufinus.

The next part of Fortunatus' prologue stays close to Rufinus, although there is an important addition near its end. Rufinus in his second paragraph embarks upon an account of the apostolic origin of the creed, followed by a definition of the term "Symbol." Rufinus' account of the apostolic origin is neatly summarized by the Fortunatus using many of the same words (e.g., the Symbol as a *regula* and the phrase designating the apostles as *in uno positi* when they crafted it). Fortunatus then plucks the two definitions of the Greek term "Symbol" from Rufinus, namely *conlatio* and *indicium*, and briefly explains them using Rufinus' ideas, omitting his lengthy disquisitions on the dangers of the Judaizers for *conlatio* and the nature of Roman military passwords for *indicium*. Here again is seen the difference in genre: Rufinus is writing a learned treatise, whereas Fortunatus just wants to get his point across.

As well, Rufinus' emphasis upon heresies as the reason for the terminology of Symbol differs from Fortunatus' more pastoral emphasis upon the importance of it for salvation. This pastoral emphasis is illustrated by the poet's original addition at the conclusion to this section: "Ergo cunctis credentibus quae continentur in symbolo salus animarum et vita perpetua bonis actibus praeparetur."[259] Rufinus' commentary on the meaning of *indicium* also emphasizes the authority of the Apostles. This is demonstrated not only by the Holy Spirit's gift of tongues at Pentecost but also by the Symbol being handed down secretly from Christian to Christian: "Idcirco denique haec non scribi cartulis aut membranis, sed retineri cordibus tradiderunt, ut certum esset neminem haec ex lectione, quae interdum pervenire etiam ad infideles solet, sed ex apostolorum traditione didicisse."[260] There

[259] Fortunatus, *Carmina*, 11.1.2. "Therefore for all those believing in the things contained in the Symbol, may both the salvation of their soul and the life eternal be held in readiness through good works."
[260] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 2. "They have related that the reason why the creed is not written down on paper or parchment, but is retained in the believers' hearts, is to ensure that it has been learned from the tradition

is no mention of that in Fortunatus; rather, his approach is to use the term *indicium* to point out the importance of personal belief to one's salvation: "Dicitur et indicium, quod per hoc qui recte crediderit indicetur. Ergo cunctis credentibus quae continentur in symbolo salus animarum et vita perpetua bonis actibus praeparetur."[261]

Before moving on to the commentary on the Symbol itself, it will be useful to compare the respective Symbol texts of Fortunatus and Rufinus and determine whether or not Fortunatus used a different Symbol variant than Rufinus. Piecing together the scattered quotes contained throughout his commentary, and placing each article on a separate line, Rufinus' Symbol runs as follows:

Credo in deum patrem omnipotentem, invisibilem et impassibilem
Et in Iesum Christum, unicum filium eius, dominum nostrum
Qui natus est de spiritu sancto ex Maria virgine
Crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato et sepultus
Descendit in inferna
Tertia die resurrexit
Ascendit in caelos
Sedet ad dexteram patris
Inde venturus iudicare vivos et mortuos
Et in spiritum sanctum
Sanctam ecclesiam
Remissionem peccatorum
Huius carnis resurrectionem

Compare this with the text given by Fortunatus:

Credo in deum patrem omnipotentem
Et in Iesum Christum unicum filium
Qui natus est de spiritu sancto et Maria Virgine
Crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato

---

handed down from the Apostles, and not from written texts, which occasionally fall into the hands of unbelievers."

[261] Fortunatus, *Carmina*, 11.1.3. "It is also called *indicium*, since through this he who rightly believes is disclosed. Therefore for all those believing in the things contained in the Symbol, may both the salvation of their soul and the life eternal be held in readiness through good works." Ehlen points out that Rufinus is interested in establishing the authority of the preacher, whereas Fortunatus cares about exhorting his listeners to believe and be saved (Ehlen, *Venantius-Interpretationen*, 155). Belief functions to a certain extent as a good work in and of itself.

Descendit ad infernum
Tertia die resurrexit
Ascendit in caelum
Iudicaturus vivos et mortuos
Credo in spiritum sanctum
Sanctam ecclesiam
Remissionem peccatorum
Resurrectionem carnis

Westra has this to say about Fortunatus' variant:

> We have to discard [as a source for the North Italian form of the Symbol] the sixth-century writer Venantius Fortunatus's *expositio symboli* (CPL 1035). This text is an adaptation of Rufinus's *expositio* and takes over substantial parts of the original. This circumstance makes it impossible to decide whether the credal quotations stem from Rufinus's original or flow from Venantius's pen, and if the latter is the case, whether he is quoting the credal variant of his native town in Northern Italy or that of his bishopric Poitiers.[262]

Westra rightly points out the difficulty of making any clear determination of the source of the poet's Symbol text. In this he is wiser than either Peršič or Di Brazzano, who suggest respectively that the Symbol text of Fortunatus derives from either his hometown of Duplavilis or from Poitiers.[263] However, his suggestion in a footnote that Fortunatus could have melded different texts together, drawing partly from Rufinus and partly from some other variant, is unnecessary. Instead, Kattenbusch has the most perceptive position on this subject. He suggests that one should simply see the quoted Symbol text as an abbreviation and adaptation of Rufinus:

> Venantius verrät eigentlich gar keinen lokalen Symboltext. Er nimmt von den Citaten des Rufin, was er brauchen kann...Es ist nach Rufin ganz klar, wie das zusammenhängt...Der „Text" des Venantius darf aus der Symbolgeschichte vielmehr verschwinden...Sie belegt in ihrer Weise auch, das man im Abendlande die lokalen Besonderheiten der Symboltexte nicht wichtig fand neben dem Grundstocke, der

[262] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 183. In a footnote to this paragraph (p. 183, n. 302), he suggests that, "It is perfectly conceivable that Venantius in one case simply took over Rufinus's formulation, but substituted it for one of his own in another."
[263] Peršič, *Venanzio Fortunato*, 411; Di Brazzano, *Opere*, 599.

> überall der gleiche war und die Rede gestattete von dem einen „Symbolum" als, mit Venantius (§ 1) zu reden , der „summa totius...ostenditur".[264]

Fortunatus is a very inconsistent citer of the Symbol text. At times he follows Rufinus exactly, other times he shortens the citation while still essentially following his source, while on one occasion he cites a different variant altogether. He also neglects to cite every article, even when touching on their subject matter in his commentary. The different variant is *Credo in spiritum sanctum*; while implied in Rufinus, the *credo* is not repeated as it is in Fortunatus. According to Westra, this variant is common throughout the Latin West, but oddly enough is comparatively rare in Northern Italy.[265] Unfortunately this bit of information tells us little about which variant Fortunatus was drawing from, if he was drawing from one at all. In fact it is just as likely that he chose to include the word *credo* in his citation of this article to clarify the simple *et* in Rufinus. The reality that most Symbol texts in the Latin West would have repeated *credo* at the beginning of this article merely indicates that the poet would naturally gravitate to this addition to make the clarification. It is most likely that the citations of the Symbol text are themselves summaries and modifications of the Symbol text found in Rufinus, and so say little about its local provenance.

That dealt with, the first article in Fortunatus' commentary is *Credo in deum patrem omnipotentem*. He omits the words *invisibilem et impassibilem* that appear in Rufinus, as part of a larger pattern of avoiding the discussion of heresies so prevalent in Rufinus. Rufinus

[264] Kattenbusch, *Das apostolische Symbol*, vol. 1, 132. "Venantius betrays in fact no local text of the Symbol at all. He takes from Rufinus' citation what he is able to use...The line of thought quite clearly follows Rufinus...The 'text' of Venantius ought rather to disappear in the history of the Symbol...Its existence shows that in the West the local particularities of the Symbol's text are not important next to the basis which was everywhere the same and which permits speech from such a 'Symbol' as, like Venantius says, the 'summa totius...ostenditur.'"

[265] Westra, *Apostles' Creed*, 245-246.

states that these two were added in Aquileia to combat the heresy of Sabellianism.[266] Fortunatus has no such concern, so ignores them. The first argument in Rufinus, after a brief historical note on the differences between the Roman Symbol and other variants (absent, quite naturally, from Fortunatus), concerns the importance of belief. He cites two Scripture passages, Hebrews 11.6 and Isaiah 7.9, to confirm this before embarking upon a rational argument. Fortunatus in his parallel text also cites these two verses; however, he shortens and re-arranges Hebrews 11.6. From *credere enim primo omnium accedentem ad Deum oportet, quia est et credentibus in se remunerator fit* in Rufinus, Fortunatus picks out *credere oportet accedentem ad Deum*.[267] The significance of this change is not in its content but rather in its style: the poet is concerned with making the Scripture quotations short and memorable. In addition to the changes to the one passage, Fortunatus adds three additional passages that are not present in Rufinus. Romans 10.10, *corde creditur ad iustitiam*; Psalm 115.1, *credidi propter quod locutus sum*; and Romans 1.17, *iustus ex fide vivit*: these three are inserted between Hebrews 11.6 and Isaiah 7.9. These are short, punchy passages that reinforce the point the poet is making.

Rufinus follows his two quotations with a rational argument: belief is necessary in all of life, from the farmer undertaking his planting due to the belief that the seeds will sprout to the child being sent to school due to the belief that the schoolmaster's teaching will have some effect. "Quid ergo mirum, si accedentes ad Deum, credere nos primo omnium

[266] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 5. "His additur: 'invisible et impassibile.' Sciendum quod duo isti sermones in ecclesiae Romanae Symbolo non habentur. Constat autem apud nos additos haereseos causa Sabellii." "To these things is added: 'invisible and impassible.' It ought to be known that those two words are not contained in the Symbol of the Roman church. But they are added to our own because of the heresies of Sabellius." Sabellius was an early fourth-century teacher who taught that God the Father was the same person as God the Son, and therefore suffered on the cross. For more on this subject, see J. Pelikan, *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975), 179-181.

[267] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 3. "For it is fitting for the one coming to God first of all to believe that he exists and that he is a rewarder of those who believe in him." Fortunatus, *Carmina* 11.1.4. "It is fitting for the one coming to God to believe."

profitemur, cum sine hoc nec ipsa exigi possit vita communis?" he notes.[268] His purpose in doing this is to answer the objections of pagans: "Haec autem idcirco in principiis praemisimus, quia pagani nobis obicere solent quod religio nostra, quia rationibus deficit, in sola credendi persuasione consistat."[269] Fortunatus has no such audience in mind, and thus he shortens Rufinus' argument to a single sentence: "Ergo vel in rebus humanis nullum opus incipitur, nisi labor omnis ad effectum venire credatur."[270] He then adds something of his own: "Unde credendum est in Deum a quo tam praesens vita quam futura tribuitur."[271] He here asserts that the principles applying to this life apply equally to the next, since the same God rules over both. This adapts Rufinus' own concluding statement on this matter: "Quod si haec singula, nisi prius crediderit futura, nullus aggreditur, quomodo non multo magis ad agnitionem Dei credendo veniatur?"[272] Fortunatus shifts Rufinus' meaning slightly, since although they use common vocabulary (e.g. *futura*), the poet prefers to emphasize spiritual realities rather than earthly ones.

Rufinus and Fortunatus next both proceed to expound the nature of God. The poet summarizes his source fairly closely for much of the argument, in places quoting Rufinus verbatim. Thus when Rufinus explains the nature of the Father's name, he says: "Pater archani et ineffabilis sacramenti vocabulum est."[273] Fortunatus puts it this way: "Deus ergo

[268] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 3. "Is it then at all surprising that, when we approach God, we first of all confess that we believe, seeing that without belief even the common routine of life cannot be accomplished?"
[269] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 3. "I have set these axioms down at the outset because pagans are in the habit of objecting that our religion lacks a rational basis, depending solely on the persuasion of belief."
[270] Fortunatus, *Carmina* 11.1.5. "And therefore in human affairs no work is begun unless each labor is believed to come to a good result."
[271] Fortunatus, *Carmina* 11.1.5. "From this one ought to believe in God, by whom the present life is as much bestowed as the future one."
[272] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 3. "But if no one undertakes enterprises like these without first believing that certain results will ensue, is it not all the more understandable that belief should be the way to the knowledge of God?"
[273] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 4. "'Father' is a term pointing to a secret, inexpressible mystery."

Pater secreti sacramenti vocabulum est."[274] Or again, when discussing the mystery of the Son's birth Rufinus says, "Credendus est ergo Deus esse Pater unici Filii sui Domini nostri, non discutiendus;" compare Fortunatus, who says, "Nec a nobis Deus discutiendus est, sed credendus."[275] Fortunatus here is less abstract than Rufinus, but essentially quotes him directly.

Other times the poet takes the main points of Rufinus' argument and presents them shorn of their extensive rational support and shaped to fit his own purpose and audience. For example, Rufinus discusses the incomprehensibility of the Son's generation and challenges those who seek to understand this mystery to first comprehend lesser mysteries, such as how the mind brings forth a word or how a river comes out of its source. Fortunatus picks a few examples from Rufinus and uses them not to challenge his audience to first investigate these things but rather to understand from their 'commonplace' incomprehensibility the nature of the Son's generation's incomprehensibility.[276] This argument is also found in Rufinus, but Fortunatus combines the two into one simpler argument.

The parallel passages in the exposition of the first article are §§ 4-5 of Rufinus and §§ 5-11 of Fortunatus; they differ significantly in only a few places. First, the list of attributes pertaining to God in Rufinus is: *sine initio, sine fine, simplicem sine ulla admixtione, invisibilem, incorpoream, ineffabilem, inaestimabilem*.[277] In Fortunatus the same list is, *sine principio, sine fine, simplex, incorporeus, inconprehensibilis*.[278] The poet excises the word *invisibilem* from this list in tandem with his excision of the word *invisibilem* in the Symbol

[274] Fortunatus, *Expositio symboli*, 7. "Therefore 'Father God' is the name of a secret mystery."
[275] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 4: "Therefore that God is the Father of his only Son our Lord ought to be believed, not disputed;" Fortunatus, *Carmina* 11.1.9: "God ought not to be disputed by us, but rather believed."
[276] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli* 4; Fortunatus, *Carm.* 11.1.9.
[277] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli* 4.
[278] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 11.1.6.

text which he quotes. Otherwise he shortens the list and substitutes the term *inconprehensibilis* for *inaestimabilem*, which is a fairly minor change.

Second, Fortunatus adds a phrase in § 7, after his abbreviation of Rufinus' statement about the mystery of the name *Deus Pater*: "Cuius vere filius est Verbum et speculum et caracter et imago vivens Patris viventis."[279] This phrase is unique to Fortunatus, but draws on a mixture of Hebrews 1.3, "Qui cum sit splendor gloriae et figura substantiae eius;" and Wisdom 7.26, "Candor est enim lucis aeternae et speculum sine macula Dei maiestatis et imago bonitatis illius."[280] Fortunatus also seems to draw from the *De Fide* of Ambrose of Milan, who says at the beginning of Chapter 2 of this work:

> Sunt enim evidentia indicia quae proprietatem deitatis ostendant: sunt quae similitudinem Patris et Filii: sunt etiam quae perspicuam divinae maiestatis exprimant unitatem. Proprietatis itaque sunt, generatio, Deus, Filius, verbum: similitudinis, splendor, character, speculum, imago: unitatis aeternae, sapientia, virtus, veritas, vita.[281]

This addition fits neatly after the previous phrase referring to the name of God, due to the fact that Ambrose is discussing how God's various names reveal His attributes. This shows how Fortunatus uses Rufinus neither exclusively nor uncritically.

Third, he inserts the citation of Isaiah 53.8, commonly quoted (though not by Rufinus) in the context of Trinitarian discussions: "Generationem eius quis enarrabit?"[282] There is little that one may conclude from this addition, save to note once again that

---

[279] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 11.1.7. "His true Son is the Word and mirror and character and living image of the living Father."

[280] Heb. 1.3, "The Son is the radiance of God's glory and the exact representation of his being, sustaining all things by his powerful word," Sap. 7.26, "For he is the brightness of the eternal light and the mirror without blemish of the majesty of God and the image of his goodness." Fortunatus was evidently not using the Vulgate for Hebrews 1.3, which translates the Greek term χαρακτὴρ as *figura*; the poet preserves the Greek term.

[281] Ambrose of Milan, *De Fide*, 2.2, PL 16.583. "For there are clear signs which show the distinctive nature of deity: there are those which show the likeness of the Father and the Son; there are also those which portray the evident unity of the divine majesty. Therefore pertaining to the distinctive nature, there is generation, God, Son, Word; pertaining to the likeness, there is splendor, character, mirror, image; pertaining to the eternal unity, there is wisdom, power, truth, life."

[282] Isaiah 53.8. "His begetting who shall tell?" For the ubiquity of this text in the Trinitarian disputes of the fourth century, see Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*, 141, 928 (index).

Fortunatus is not a slave to Rufinus but draws on other sources. Fourth, he again adds a Scripture citation, in this case Psalm 109.3, buttressing his discussion of the Son's mysterious begetting.[283]

The fifth and final difference is found at the end of the article's commentary in both texts. Both cite Baruch 3.36-38, but apply it differently. Rufinus quotes the entire passage: "Hic Deus noster: non reputabitur alter ad eum. Invenit omnem viam disciplinae et dedit eam Iacob puero suo et Israhel dilecto suo. Post haec in terris visus est et inter homines conversatus est."[284] He uses this passage as a prophecy of Christ's incarnation: "Secundum dignationem vero carnis adsumptae, Filius et visus et passus in carne est. Quod et propheta praedixerat, ubi ait: Hic Deus noster..."[285] It concludes his argument that the Godhead is impassible (i.e., that it cannot suffer in its divinity), and that Christ is only passible by virtue of his human nature. Fortunatus quotes part of the passage, skipping verse 37: "Hic Deus noster, et non reputabitur alter ad eum; et post: in terris visus est et inter homines conversatus est."[286] He takes it for a prophecy not of Christ's incarnation but of his divinity, linking it with Psalm 109.3:

> Sed, ut breviter dicamus, sufficit nos scire quia lux genuit splendorem, propheta testante: 'in splendoribus sanctorum ex utero ante luciferum genui te;' et illud: 'hic Deus noster, et non reputabitur alter ad eum;' et post: 'in terris visus est et inter homines conversatus est.'[287]

---

[283] Psalm 109.3: "In splendoribus sanctorum ex utero ante luciferum genui te." It is unlikely that Fortunatus obtained this quote from Rufinus because the only quotation of this passage in Rufinus' extant works uses a different wording (Rufinus, *De Bened. XII Pat*. 2.26: "De ventre ante Luciferum genui te").

[284] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 5. "This is our God: there shall be no other to be accounted of in comparison of Him. He found out every path of instruction, and gave it to Jacob his servant and to Israel His beloved. Afterwards He was seen upon the earth, and associated with men."

[285] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 5. "But in accordance with the dignity of His assumed flesh, the Son was both seen and suffered in the flesh. This matter the prophet also foretold, where he says: 'This is our God...'"

[286] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 11.1.10. "This is our God, and there shall be no other to be accounted of in comparison of Him; and after: He was seen on earth and associated with men." Reydellet interprets the words "et post" as an editorial interpolation of the author; but they also appear as part of the text of Baruch, so it is equally possible that they should be seen as integral to the citation.

[287] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 11.1.10. "But, so that we might speak briefly, it suffices for us to know that light begot splendor, by the witness of the prophet: 'In the splendours of the Holy Places I begot you from the womb before

Once again, Fortunatus compresses a passage that Rufinus quotes at length; and in this case, he also re-assigns it to a different subject. The significance of this change is that Rufinus includes the citation in a section in which he explains why the words *invisibilem et impassibilem* were added to the Aquileian Symbol. As noted before, Fortunatus omits these words (and their anti-Sabellian freight) as part of his general ignoring of Rufinus' anti-heretical points. He uses the authority of a prophetic text instead of making an argument.

The second article in Fortunatus' text is *Et in Iesum Christum unicum filium*. The poet divides up the article into two sections, *Et in Iesum Christum* and *unicum filium*, and comments on each individually.[288] He follows Rufinus quite closely once again, compressing his source's arguments and arranging them more neatly for the ease of his hearers. Both define the names "Jesus" and "Christ" and use Joshua the son of Nun as someone who prefigures Christ. The differences are as follows: Fortunatus uses the term *figura* for how Joshua son of Nun is an image of Christ while Rufinus does not; the citation of Isaiah 61.1 is shortened and *spiritus sanctus* substituted for *spiritus domini*; and he adds the idea (from Hebrews 1.9) of Christ's anointing being by the *oleo exultationis* and not just by the common *oleo corruptionis*, as Rufinus has it. Here again the poet is interested in pleasing the ears of his listeners by providing punchier Scripture citations and verbal parallels (i.e., *oleo corruptionis* = *oleo exultationis*) that are memorable.

The addition from Hebrews, though not found in Rufinus, is found in other Symbol texts, in particular Eusebius Gallicanus Sermon 9, *De Symbolo I*.[289] The commentary under

---

the Morning Star;' and also: 'This is our God, and there shall be no other to be accounted of in comparison of Him; and after: He was seen on earth and associated with men.'"

[288] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 11.1.12-14 explains the first section, *Carm.* 11.1.15-16 explains the second.

[289] Which reads, "Christus vero, a chrismate, 'unctus' interpretatur, secundum illud: 'Unxit te deus, deus tuus oleo laetitiae'" (*Eusebius Gallicanus*, ed. Glorie, 9.5).

unicum filium follows Rufinus, summarizing his ideas with only one significant difference. The concluding statement from Rufinus, "Igitur posteaquam propositus ordo fidei ineffabile sacramentum Filii de Patre nativitatis exposuit, nunc ad humanae salutis dignationem dispensationemque descendit," is summarized by Fortunatus: "Hucusque de deitate Patris atque Filii textus ordo secutus est."[290] Fortunatus shifts the emphasis of the first two articles in this passage to rest on the deity of the Father and Son.

The third article is *Qui natus est de spiritu sancto ex Maria Virgine*. Fortunatus cuts considerable amounts of anti-pagan and anti-Jewish arguments from his summary, as is his wont, but in the essentials follows the course of Rufinus' argument. Both deal with two main topics in the course of their comments: the equal deity of the Holy Spirit to the rest of the Trinity and His role in the Virgin Birth, and the possibility of God being born as a human being from a human being at all given his impassible and altogether holy nature. There is, apart from Fortunatus' excision of anti-pagan and anti-Jewish arguments, one main difference between Fortunatus and Rufinus. Both Fortunatus and Rufinus quote Ezekiel 44.1-2 as a prophecy of the Virgin Birth, with Fortunatus clearly following Rufinus' wording.[291] Rufinus spends a great deal of time in the first portion of his comment on the third article explaining how this passage is to be construed, with the eastern gate being an allegorical figure of the Virgin Mary.[292] He additionally adds an account of the Annunciation, quoting

---

[290] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 7. "Therefore, having set out the order of faith it exposited the ineffable sacrament of the Son's birth from the Father, and now proceeds to the honour and dispensation of human salvation." Fortunatus, *Carm.* 11.1.16. "Up to this point the order of the text followed what concerned the deity of the Father and Son."

[291] Rufinus cites the passage as follows: "Porta autem quae respicit ad Orientem clausa erit et non aperietur et nemo transibit per eam, quoniam Dominus Deus Israhel ipse transibit per eam, et clausa erit;" Fortunatus cites it as: "Porta quae respicit ad orientem clausa erit et non aperietur et nemo transiet per eam, quoniam dominus Deus Israhel ipse transibit per eam, et clausa erit." The Vulgate version runs: "Porta haec clausa erit non aperietur et vir non transiet per eam quoniam Dominus Deus Israhel ingressus est per eam eritque clausa." Marc Reydellet observes that both Rufinus and Fortunatus cite the passage in accordance with the Septuagint version of Ezekiel (Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 3, 105 n. 14).

[292] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 8.14-24.

from Luke's gospel, and explains how the Lucan account shows the cooperation of the Trinity in the Incarnation.

Fortunatus cuts the Annunciation from his comments and instead merely states: "Hinc plurima prophetae de virginis conceptu et de partu locuti sunt. Unum tamen exemplum pro brevitate proponemus, de quo Ezechiel dicit..."[293] The section then ends, with no allegorical explanation of the passage from Ezekiel. Fortunatus can assume that his listeners will accept the authority of the prophetic word alone, unlike Rufinus. This is evidence not only of Fortunatus' entirely Christian audience (contrasted with Rufinus explicitly connecting his citation and explanation of the prophetic text with convincing Jews of the truth of Christianity[294]), but also of the moral authority the Bible had attained in Gaul among the general population. Reason was not as necessary to support a doctrinal point as it had been in the late fourth century.

The fourth article is *Crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato*. At this point the poet begins to make the most considerable departures from his source text. He divides this article into two parts, commenting on the meaning of *Crucifixus* first and *sub Pontio Pilato* second. This section is by far the longest in the sermon, taking up almost one-fifth of the space. This is understandable coming from the author of the *Pange lingua* and *Vexilla regis prodeunt*, but more important than the unique emphasis is the difference in content between Fortunatus and Rufinus. Even when the poet does follow Rufinus' content he rearranges it more than in his previous summaries.

[293] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 11.1.18. "The prophets spoke much about the virgin conception and birth. Nevertheless for the sake of brevity we will put forward one example: concerning the birth Ezekiel says..."
[294] Rufinus begins chapter 9 of his *Expositio symboli* with the reason why he will spend the chapter (which is absent from Fortunatus' summary) refuting pagan objections, not Jewish ones: "Indeed these things (i.e., the Scripture citations) which are asserted from the prophetic Scriptures are perchance able to refute Jews, however unfaithful and unbelieving they might be" (Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 9).

Fortunatus begins his commentary on this article by an overview of the prophecies predicting the manner of and circumstances surrounding Christ's death and their allegorical significance. This is done in two lengthy sentences, taking up a numbered section apiece (§§ 21-22). The first sentence lists six items of prophecy fulfilled by the manner of Christ's death: his being fixed on the cross with his feet pierced, the drink of wine vinegar, the crown of thorns, the lance piercing him, lots being cast for his clothes and his being hung with arms outstretched in the sight of an evil people.[295] The whole sentence displays considerable rhetorical flair, particularly in the rhyming phrase *murrato potatus, spinis coronatus, lancea percussus*.[296] The second sentence (§ 22) reiterates the first four items in the same order and briefly states their theological significance. The suspension on the cross (here Fortunatus uses a different verb to describe it than in the previous sentence—*suspendere* (§ 22) vs. *configere* (§ 21)—but the significance of this change is hard to discern) releases us from the condemnation brought by the forbidden tree (*ligni vetiti*), the wine vinegar is drunk to cut off the bitterness of the fruit of transgression, the crowning with thorns destroys the old crime of the cursed tree and the piercing with the lance and the flow of blood and water preaches the baptism in blood and mystery of martyrdom. To this last item (the piercing with the lance) is added an additional interpretation, introduced as "aliquid altius," "something loftier:" Christ is pierced with the lance in order to cut off the wound upon humanity inflicted by Eve, who was formed from the side of Adam.[297]

---

[295] Fortunatus *Carm.* 11.1.21. "Hinc multa prophetae qualiter confixus in cruce, foratis pedibus, aceto vel felle aut vino murrato potatus, spinis coronatus, lancea percussus, super veste eius sorte missa et in conspectu populi maligni manibus extensis in die pependerit praedixerunt quae diligens lector inveniet."

[296] Denoted by the reference to the prophets at the beginning and end of the sentence (*quae* referring back to *multa prophetae*), the use of an ablative absolute clause at the begininng and end of the central subordinate clause introduced by *qualiter* and terminated by *pependerit* (*foratis pedibus* and *manibus extensis*) and the repetition at the very centre of the alliterative triad just referred to.

[297] Fortunatus *Carm.* 11.1.22: "Tamen ut breviter dicatur, in cruce suspensus est, ut nos a damnatione ligni vetiti dissolveret; felle vero potatur, ut amaritudinem praevaricati pomi et nimis acidi amputaret; spinis coronatur, ut

These two sentences adapt the contents of Rufinus §§ 20-25. Rufinus' commentary on the crucifixion extends, however, from §§ 12-25. Thus Fortunatus takes the last part of his source's comments on this article and places them at the beginning; the summary of Rufinus' first section is still to come. Rufinus in these six sections includes a list of prophesied occurrences lengthier than that of Fortunatus: the crowd's condemnation of Christ, his silence before Pilate, the crowning with thorns, his suspension upon the cross, the lance piercing him, the darkness from the sixth hour to the ninth hour on the day of his crucifixion, the division of his clothes by lot, his drinking of wine vinegar, his giving up his spirit after tasting the wine vinegar and the manner of his burial.[298] Rufinus places right after each event the prophecies referring to it, usually two or three citations from a wide variety of Old Testament sources. Rufinus also comments extensively on the allegorical meaning of the piercing by the lance, the darkness, the division of clothing and the wine vinegar. The differences between the summary and its source at this point are already large. Rufinus' vigorous comments defending the veracity of the prophecies and the reasonableness of interpreting them in the way he does are absent from Fortunatus, reflecting once again the former's Jewish and pagan target audience and the absence of these groups from the latter's audience.[299] What is more, Fortunatus omits the direct citation of Scripture altogether, advising his listeners to find the texts themselves: "Hinc multa prophetae...praedixerunt quae

---

maledictae terrae vetustum crimen erueret; lancea percutitur, ut per plagam lateris aqua fluente vel sanguine baptismum vel mysterium martyrii promulgaret; et ut dicatur aliquid altius: incosta Christus percutitur, ut vulnus nobis infixum per Evam, quae de costa viri formata fuerat, amputaret."

[298] The meaning of the crowd's condemnation, Christ's silence, the crown of thorns and the suspension upon the cross are in Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 20; the piercing by the lance is dealt with in 21; the darkness during the crucifixion is explored in 22; the casting of lots for Christ's clothing is in 23; 24 deals with the wine vinegar; the giving up of Christ's spirit and His burial are in 25.

[299] This defense is most prominent in the comment on the darkness during the crucifixion: "Quid tam evidens a propheta dici potuit, ut iam haec non tam futura praedici, quam narrari praeterita videantur?" "What clearer comment is able to be said by the prophet, that these things appear not as something preached about the future but narrated about things already gone by?" (Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 22.6-8)

diligens lector inveniet."[300] The selection of events in Christ's Passion that Fortunatus includes from Rufinus' longer list also reflects the poet's focus on the crucifixion itself, since he leaves out the events preceding and following the crucifixion.

The next section in Fortunatus' text (§ 23) deals with the allegorical meaning of the cross. This is a summary of Rufinus § 12, which stands at the beginning of the commentary on the crucifixion in his *Expositio symboli*. Fortunatus begins this section with a justification for continuing a little further on the meaning of the cross: "Ut tamen ad hoc intellegendum aliquantulum extendamur—sicut dicit scriptura: *cordis oculi aperti sint ad intellegendum quid sit altitudo latitudo et profundum* quod est crucis significatio—quare Dominus in patibulo se pati elegerit quaeritur."[301] Rufinus does not begin the parallel section with such a justification (although he does in the section following it, not summarized by Fortunatus), but does use the same combination of Scriptural passages. However, not only does Rufinus integrate the quote from Ephesians into his sentence structure without a citation formula (the off-set *sicut dicit scriptura* in Fortunatus), he also uses it quite differently. Fortunatus uses it to give authority to his desire to expand on the meaning of the cross for his audience's benefit; Rufinus explains its allegorical meaning: "Altitudo ergo et latitudo et profundum descriptio crucis est."[302]

The cross is extended into the air (height), its arms are extended outwards (breadth) and it is fixed deeply in the earth (depth). Fortunatus skips this explanation. He proceeds to summarize Rufinus' description of how the symbolism of the cross also relates to its salvific

[300] Fortunatus *Carm.* 11.1.21. "The prophets...predicted this in many places, which the diligent reader will discover."
[301] Fortunatus *Carm.* 11.1.23. "Now in order to lengthen somewhat, in order for this to be understood—as the scripture says: 'that the eyes of the heart might be opened to understand the height and the breadth and the depth' of the meaning of the cross—we now seek after the reason why the Lord chose to suffer on a cross-beam." Note the transitional "tamen," which also appears at the beginning of the previous sentence and again in the middle of this one. The poet cites a combination of Ephesians 1.18 and 3.18.
[302] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 12.4-5. "Therefore height and breadth and depth is a description of the cross."

activity. There is no significant difference between the two in this explanation. Both portray the cross as a *tropeus*, a "trophy," delineating Christ's victory over the three realms the cross covered: heaven, the earth and Hell (*infernus* in Rufinus, the poetic *Tartarus* in Fortunatus). This is the end, however, of Fortunatus' summary of Rufinus' commentary on the crucifixion. The remaining four sections are entirely *sui generis*.

The centrality of the cross to salvation is one of the characteristic emphases of Fortunatus' theology. Many of his hymns use the imagery contained in these sections of the *Expositio symboli*, but none shows so explicitly the way the poet saw the symbolic world of the cross and the way he makes the symbolism itself do the work of salvation. In § 23 Fortunatus proposes to answer the question, "Quare Dominus in patibulo se pati elegerit," "why the Lord chose to suffer upon the cross-beam." This is a fairly common question proposed and then answered in the homiletic tradition.[303] Rufinus himself seeks to answer this question, although he tends to focus on the fulfillment of prophecy as being the main reason for the cross.[304] Fortunatus answers the question in his own way in §§ 24-27.

To begin his independent excursus, Fortunatus once again explains why he has chosen to extend his commentary on this subject. "Et quia de aliis brevitatis causa praeteriemus plurima, non generemus fastidium, si pro honore sanctae crucis nobis hic sermo distenditur, ut vobis aedificatio et illi crescat praeconium," he states.[305] The poet's focus on the *honorem sanctae crucis* is probably connected to the presence in Poitiers of the relic of the True Cross belonging to the convent of Radegund. His words echo his opening promise to be neither too long nor too short: he will not produce *fastidium* because of *prolixitate*

[303] E.g., Caesarius of Arles, *Sermones*, ed. Morin, 11, 54. The title of the sermon itself asks the question: "Quare Dominus Iesus Christus genus humanum per duram passionem, non per potentiam liberabit."
[304] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 19.
[305] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 11.1.24. "And since in order to be brief we will pass over many other things, may we not produce an aversion if for the honour of the holy cross we extend this speech, so that edification might increase for you and glory might increase for him."

verbi, since by spending more time on this subject he will produce *aedificatio*, parallel to his opening promise not to be so brief as to *non aperiat intellectum*.[306] It should be observed that it is on this very subject, namely Christ's suspension on the cross, that Rufinus says that he must hurry on lest he go on too long: "Sed transcurrendum nobis est; iam enim propositae brevitatis excedimus modum et breviatum sermonem longa dissertione distendimus."[307] The poet has decided to fill in the blanks left by his source. This demonstrates how central the cross was to Fortunatus' thought.

There follow in §§ 25-26 six specific metaphorical meanings of the cross, and how they work to enact salvation. They are each introduced by a transitional formula: 1) *ergo quia*, 2) *aut quia*, 3) *aut quia*, 4) *aut ideo*, 5) *aut ideo*, and 6) *aut ideo*. Although divided up into different sentences by the critical text, the whole section is one long sentence made up of numerous independent clauses. 1) The first metaphor is Christ's suspension in the air, which purges both stars and land of the effects of original sin.[308] 2) The second metaphor is Christ's suspension on the cross, which achieves the fulfillment of prophecy, namely Christ's prophecy that, just as Moses raised up the bronze serpent in the wilderness in order to heal the Israelites from a plague, so too he would be lifted up.[309] 3) The third metaphor is again Christ's suspension in the air, this time so that he might be placed in between the parties he was reconciling. Heaven and earth represent God and humanity, between whom, "grandis

[306] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 11.1.1. "Mediocriter nobis sermo temperandus est, ne aut breviter dicendo non aperiat intellectum aut prolixitate verbi generetur fastidium."
[307] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 20. "But we must hurry forward; for now we exceed the measure of proposed brevity and we extend a brief speech with a long explanation."
[308] This concept has been the subject of considerable (for Fortunatus studies) scholarly discussion. It appears in many of the poet's other writings and seems to be something on which the poet placed a unique emphasis. See Di Brazzano, *Opere*, 606-607 n. 20, Koebner, *Venantius Fortunatus*, 114, 114 n. 1, and especially Evrard Delbey, *Venance Fortunat ou l'enchantement du monde* (Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2009).
[309] John 3.14.

erat discordia..."[310] Christ was positioned between them so that peace might be restored due to his acting as a reconciler and removing the stumbling block separating the alienated sides.

4) The fourth metaphor is Barabbas' release and Christ's condemnation.[311] Christ's dying in place of a thief symbolizes his death in place of humanity, which is absolved of sin as well as released from its power by means of his death. Humanity's main torment (*principale tormentum*) was original sin, so Christ chose to suffer the death penalty (*principale supplicium*) to absolve them of it.[312] 5) The fifth symbol is again Christ's suspension on the cross, which is here portrayed as a merchant's scales. Christ is both merchant and ransom, weighing out the price of his body to release humanity from bondage.[313] 6) The sixth symbol is the recapitulation on the cross of the Garden of Eden. As he put it: "Aut ideo crucifigitur, quia mortui eramus per pomum et arborem, ut denuo crux et Christus, id est arbor et pomum, per ipsam similitudinem nos a morte liberaret. Pomum dulce cum arbore!"[314] The similitude is in itself the means of liberation. This is the last of the symbolic meanings of the cross as explained by Fortunatus.

Two aspects of this independent excursus on the cross merit further investigation. First, did Fortunatus draw on other sources than Rufinus for this section? If so, what were they? And how much is his own original thought? Second, what can be discerned about the poet's theology of the cross—in other words, what was distinctive about Fortunatus'

---

[310] Fortunatus *Carm.* 11.1.25. "there had been great discord."
[311] Matthew 27.20-26; Mark 16.6-15; Luke 23.18-25; John 18.40. Fortunatus does not use Barabbas' name, but calls him a *gravis latro*; only the account in John calls Barabbas this, thus it is most likely that the poet is referring to the Johannine account at this point.
[312] Fortunatus *Carm.* 11.1.26. "Ad hoc elegit Christus principale supplicium, ut hominem absolveret originali peccato quod erat principale tormentum." "Christ chose the hightest punishment for this reason, that he might absolve man from the original sin which had been his highest torment."
[313] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 11.1.26. "Pro captivitate nostra pretium sui corporis mercator in statera pensaret." "He weighted out upon a scale as a merchant the price of his own body for our captivity."
[314] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 11.1.27. "Or for this reason he is crucified: since we were made mortal through the fruit and the tree, now the cross and Christ, that is the tree and the fruit, freed us from death through that very similitude. O sweet fruit with the tree!"

theology of redemption? The idea that Christ cleansed the creation from original sin as well as humanity is found in Rufinus § 20, where he assigns this meaning to the crown of thorns: "Oportebat eum qui peccata mundi venit auferre, etiam terrae maledicta purgare."[315] However, Fortunatus assigns this idea to Christ's suspension in the air, while ignoring any allegorical implications of the crown of thorns. Aside from this one similarity, however, Rufinus' content is absent.

At least one external source may be the fourth-century writer Chromatius of Aquileia. Fortunatus' idea that Christ hung in between heaven and earth to mediate between God and humanity is partially echoed in two texts by Chromatius dealing with Christ's Beatitudes (Matthew 5). Commenting on the Beatitude, "Beati pacifici, quoniam filii Dei vocabuntur," in his fragmentary sermon on the same subject, Chromatius writes: "Sed ideo Dei Filius descendit de caelo, ut damnaret diabolum auctorem discordiae, pacemque inter Deum et hominem faceret, hominem Deo reconciliando et Deum homini in gratiam revocando."[316] In his commentary on Matthew on the same passage, he writes: "Si enim Filius Dei ad hoc carnem suscipere et pati dignatus est, ut pacificaret nos Deo per sanguinem crucis suae, utique, secundum quod apostolus retulit, per omnia pacifici esse debemus."[317] The difficulty with assigning this idea's derivation conclusively to Chromatius is that Fortunatus applies the concept of Christ's death making peace between God and humanity to the positioning of the cross between heaven and earth, while Chromatius assigns it to the moral admonition to be peacemakers found in the Beatitudes. Moreover, the idea that Christ on the cross reconciles

[315] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 20.21-22. "It was proper for the one who came to take away the sins of the world to also purge the accursed earth."
[316] Chromatius of Aquileia, *Opera*, ed. R. Étaix and J. Lemarié, 170; *Sermo* 39.35-38. "For this reason the Son of God came down from heaven: that he might condemn the devil the author of discord and make peace between God and man, reconciling man to God and recalling God to man in grace."
[317] Chromatius of Aquileia, *Opera*, 276. *Tractatus in Mathaeum* 17.7.229-232. "For if the Son of God deigned to receive this flesh and to suffer in it so that he might make us at peace with God through the blood of his cross, certainly, according to what the apostle mentions, we ought in all things to be peacemakers."

humanity and God is a staple of Christian thought on the Redemption; the poet need not have gotten this idea from any particular source.[318] Still, the similarity in language if not context suggests that Fortunatus may well have had Chromatius' words in mind. Yet he made it his own; he was no slavish borrower.

Another piece of content in this independent excursus which may indicate an external source is the image of the cross as a merchant's scales (*statera*), with Christ as both merchant and money. This image became fairly widespread in later centuries and its earliest extant appearance in Latin literature appears to be in Fortunatus' own writings.[319] Around the same time as the *Expositio symboli* was written, however, it also appears in Gregory the Great's *Homilia in Iob*. While the mention in Fortunatus' *Vexilla regis* certainly predates Gregory's work, and thus Fortunatus may still lay claim to being the earliest user of the image, it is improbable that Gregory the Great drew on the *Vexilla regis* to formulate his own image, for reasons outlined below.

In Gregory's commentary on Job 6.2, "Utinam appenderentur peccata mea quibus iram merui et calamitas quam patior in statera, quasi arena maris haec gravior appareret," Gregory offers the interpretation that it predicts the sufferings of Christ.[320] He writes: "Quis alius staterae nomine nisi Dei et hominum mediator exprimitur...In manu etenim Patris quasi

[318] To give but one example of this idea's ubiquity, in the source for Rufinus' *Expositio symboli*, Cyril of Jerusalem's *Catechetical Lectures*, the fourth-century bishop writes: "The Saviour endured all this, 'making peace through the blood of the cross, for all things whether in the heavens or on the earth.' For we were enemies of God through sin, and God had decreed the death of the sinner." Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catacheses* XIII, tr. L.P. McCauley (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1970), 26. It is interesting to note that Rufinus does not include this aspect of the crucifixion in his adaptation of Cyril's work, while Fortunatus does.
[319] See on the history of the image F. Wormald, "The Crucifix and the Balance," in *Journal of the Warburg Institute*, vol. 1 no. 4 (1938), 276-280. Fortunatus uses the image of the *statera* in the *Vexilla regis prodeunt* (*Carm.* 2.6) as well as in the *Expositio symboli*. There is also an echo of the cross as a scale in the *In laudem sanctae Mariae* 170, which speaks of Christ *in cruce pensandus*.
[320] Job 6.2. "O that my sins for which I merited wrath and the calamity that I suffer were weighed upon a balance [*statera*], it would appear heavier than the sand of the sea."

statera miri libraminis factus, hinc in se calamitatem nostram, et illinc peccata suspendit."[321] In this passage, Gregory differs slightly from Fortunatus in his use of the image of the *statera*. As Wormald observes, "The imagery at first sight appears to be somewhat different from that employed by Venantius Fortunatus. Christ is himself the balance of the Father, in which what we deserve...and what he suffered are weighed against each other."[322] Thus in Fortunatus the cross is the balance, whereas in Gregory Christ himself is the balance. The difference is a significant one, and seems to indicate that the two writers arrived independently at the image.

Was there a common source for both texts? Where is *statera* used in the context of the crucifixion in previous Christian writings? One earlier occasion, and an entirely likely source for both later authors, is in Augustine's *Tractatus in Iohannis Evangelium*. There Augustine comments on John 1.36, where John the Baptist proclaims to two of his disciples standing by, "Ecce agnus Dei," "Behold the Lamb of God." Augustine, preaching to his congregation in Hippo, uses here the example of a local pagan festival (of uncertain identity) to show the superior value of Christ's sacrifice on the cross. He states:

> Fratres mei, si agnoscimus pretium nostrum quia sanguis est agni, qui sunt illi qui hodie celebrant festivitatem sanguinis, nescio cuius mulieris? et quam ingrati sunt? Raptum est aurum, disunt, de aure mulieris, et cucurrit sanguis, et positum est aurum in trutina vel statera, et praeponderavit multum de sanguine. Si pondus ad inclinandum aurum habuit sanguis mulieris, quale pondus habet ad inclindandum mundum sanguis Agni, per quem factus est mundus?[323]

---

[321] Gregory the Great, *Moralia in Iob*, ed. M. Adriaen, CCSL 143 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1979), 6.2.3-9, 335. "Who else is portrayed with the name of balance [*statera*] if not the mediator of God and of men...For we read that in the hand of the Father he was used like a balance of wondrous poise, hence he hung upon himself our calamity, and from that our sins."

[322] Wormald, "The Crucifix and the Balance," 278.

[323] Augustine of Hippo, *Tractatus in Iohannis Evangelium*, ed. A. Mayer, CCSL 36 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1954), 7.6.1-8, 69. "My brothers, if we recognize our ransom, which is the blood of the Lamb, who are they who today celebrate the Blood Festival, of I know not what woman? And what are they ungrateful for? They say gold was seized from an ear, the ear of the woman, and blood ran, and the gold was placed upon a scale or balance [*statera*], and it was far outweighed by the blood. If the weight of the woman's blood had the capacity to overcome the gold, what kind of weight does the blood of the Lamb possess to overcome the world, that Lamb through whom the world was made?"

According to the pagan story, the blood of a woman outweighed gold on a scale; if a pagan divinity's blood could outweigh gold, Augustine argues, how much more could Christ's blood outweigh the sin of the world! Augustine's connection of the crucifixion to a balance of some kind, although closer to Gregory's use of the image than Fortunatus', still is a plausible source for both later authors. The *Tractatus in Iohannis Evangelium* had a remarkably wide distribution across Western Europe both in complete versions and excerpts, so it is likely that both Gregory and Fortunatus would have had access to it.[324]

There are no doubt other comparisons to be made on the basis of content; Fortunatus is not by and large introducing new theological ideas (save one, which I will shortly look at), but rather revamping the imagery of these ideas. Whatever sources may have inspired him in this independent excursus, what comes out is the fertility of the poet's imagination in coming up with new ways to interpret the symbolism of the cross. While both sources mentioned above (i.e., Chromatius and Augustine) provide a certain similarity to Fortunatus, it is nonetheless quite clear how much the poet differs from the imagery of his potential sources. The cross itself is the *statera*, not Christ. The cross holds Christ between heaven and earth in order to reconcile God and man, again making Christ a passive figure. It is the cross as an object which is the centre of this independent excursus. Fortunatus himself makes it clear that he is diverging from his source a little *pro honore sanctae crucis*, "for the sake of the honour of the holy cross." The cross is a tool of Christ, but it is the indispensable tool that facilitates all the means of atonement mentioned. This is not the case in the sources cited above, where Christ's body and blood take centre stage. Why is this?

[324] See the list of surviving manuscripts in A. Mayer, *Sancti Aurelii Augustini: In Iohannis Evangelium Tractatus CXXIV* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1954), viii-xiii.

An important aspect of the poet's own theology of redemption is his concentrated focus on the crucifixion itself, not the lead-up or aftermath. It is at the cross that the forces of evil are defeated, that the world is purified, that prophecy is fulfilled, that God and humanity are reconciled, that humanity's sin is absolved, its ransom is paid and its freedom is gained through a re-enactment of the Fall. For example, Rufinus uses the crown of thorns (placed on Christ *before* the crucifixion) as a means of achieving the redemption of all of creation: "Oportebat eum qui peccata mundi venit auferre, etiam terrae maledicta purgare...Propterea ergo spinis coronatur Iesus, ut prima illa condemnationis sententia solveretur."[325] Fortunatus, on the other hand, assigns the purgation of the earth to the cross holding Christ between heaven and earth. Around two-thirds of Fortunatus' commentary on the clause *crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato* is devoted to the cross alone. While it is possible that this emphasis is due to an "Aquileian" background, it is more likely to have been inspired by the presence of the relic of the True Cross in Poitiers.[326]

Fortunatus was of course closely connected with the relic due to his hymns written for its ceremonial entrance in 567, his other poetry on the subject written afterwards for the decoration of local churches and especially his close relationship with and patronage by Radegund of Poitiers, in whose convent the relic lay. This connection was not just a matter of business, however. The cry closing the independent excursus, "Pomum dulce cum arbore," denotes, as Marc Reydellet observes, "une dévotion particulière pour la croix."[327] The cross took such a centre stage in the poet's theology of redemption because of the presence of its

[325] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 20.21-22, 25-26. "It was fitting that he who came to take away the sins of the world also purge the accursed earth...therefore for this reason Jesus was crowned with thorns, so that the first sentence of condemnation might be undone."
[326] Peršič argues that the centrality of the crucifixion to Fortunatus' theology of redemption is an Aquileian element, proving a theological education in that city (Peršič, *Venanzio Fortunato*, 413-414). I believe this to be unlikely, not only because of the easier explanation of the relic's presence, but also due to what the presence of the relic represents: namely, a broader interest in the cross on the part of the broader Gallic clergy and laity.
[327] Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 3, 109 n. 20. This devotion is present in similar terms in *Carm.* 2.1, 2, 4.

fragment in his city. Its miracle-working *virtus* in the here-and-now was proclaimed by him in his panegyric to the Emperor Justin and the Empress Sophia: "Gloria summa tibi, rerum sator atque redemptor, quod tenet augustum celsa Sophia gradum. Per te crux Domini totum sibi vindicat orbem: quo nescia fuit, hoc modo visa tegit."[328] The physical presence of the piece of the True Cross is what is in view here, given that the panegyric was written as a *gratiarum actio* to the emperor and empress for their gift of the relic in the first place.

Its *virtus*, or miracle-working power, plays a significant role in Fortunatus' poems to the cross contained in the *Carmina* as well. For example, in *Carm.* 2.4 (a *carmen figuratum*, probably written to be painted on a church wall), the poet writes: "Crux pia, devotas Agnen tege cum Radegunde. Tu Fortunatum fragilem, crux sancta, tuere. Vera spes nobis ligno, agni sanguine, clavo, arbor suavis agri, tecum nova vita paratur."[329] The combination of an enthusiastic regard for the relic and a clearly enunciated doctrinal understanding of how it figures in the economy of redemption suggests again that Fortunatus' special focus on it in his theological works was generated by its physical presence.

Fortunatus' devotion to the cross naturally spilled over into his sermon on the Symbol. The next section in his commentary (§ 28) contains a hint of another aspect of the poet's broader activity, specifically his political milieu. Picking up once again the thread of Rufinus' text, Fortunatus explores the second part of the article, *crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato*. Two aspects of the phrase *sub Pontio Pilato* are examined. First, the mention of Pilate is explained as being necessary to set the date of Christ's passion: "Bene hoc est additum, ut

[328] Fortunatus, *Carm.* App. 2.71-74. "Highest glory be to you, Saviour and Redeemer of the universe, since the great Sophia holds the imperial rank. Through you [Sophia] the cross of the Lord claims for itself the world: where it was unknown it is now seen and protects."
[329] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 2.4. "O pious cross, protect your devoted Agnes and Radegund. May you guard the frail Fortunatus, O holy cross. For us there is true hope through the wood, the blood of the lamb, the nail; O tree of the sweet field, new life is prepared by you." This passage is spelled out on the cross image in the *carmen figuratum*.

iudice cum tempore designato non esse videretur incertum."[330] This is essentially a slightly compacted version of Rufinus' explanation in *Expositio symboli* 16, near the beginning of his commentary on the same article. The commonality of this formula in Symbol sermons has already been observed, so it is difficult to see anything in it that might illumine an aspect of Fortunatus' own theological outlook.

The second part of the comment in § 28 again makes a point found in Rufinus, but while the content is similar the language used and application made is distinctive to Fortunatus. The point that both authors make is that Christ demonstrated his salvific role of mediator before his crucifixion by reconciling Herod and Pilate. This is a reference to Luke 23.12, where Christ is sent to Herod by Pilate during his trial to be questioned before being sent back again. Herod and his soldiers mock Christ before doing so, and Luke states: "And on that very day Herod and Pilate were made friends, for beforehand they had been enemies towards one another."[331] Rufinus uses the event of Christ appearing before Herod to explain how Christ's trial before the Jewish leaders and Pilate fulfilled a prophecy made in the Old Testament, specifically Hosea 10.6, which reads: "Et alligantes eum adduxerunt xenium regi Iarim."[332] Rufinus states: "Praesignavit etiam hoc propheta, ubi dicit: *Et alligantes eum adduxerunt xenium regi Iarim*: nisi si obiciat aliquis et dicat: Sed Pilatus non erat rex. Audi ergo quid in consequentibus Evangelium refert: *Audiens* – inquit—*Pilatus esse eum de Galilaea, misit eum ad Herodem, qui erat tunc rex in Israhel.*"[333] Rufinus goes on to compare

[330] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 11.1.28. "It is well that this is added, so that with the imperial official and time being designated, there might be seen to be no uncertainty."
[331] Luke 23.12. "Et facti sunt amici Herodes et Pilatus in ipsa die nam antea inimici erant ad invicem." "And Herod and Pilate became friends on that day, for before they had been enemies to each other."
[332] As quoted in Rufinus, *Expositio symboli* 19.19. "And binding him they led him as a gift to king Jarim." This is the Septuagint's version of Hosea 10.6; the Vulgate interprets "Iarim" as "regi ultori," or "avenging king."
[333] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli* 19.18-23. "Also the prophet designated this beforehand, where he says: [Hosea 10.6 quoted as above]. But someone may object and say, 'But Pilate was not a king!' Therefore hear what in the

Jesus in this case to a gift of reconciliation [*xenium*] exchanged between the two rulers, resulting in peace being made between them. Christ in this way symbolically demonstrates his character as one who reconciles people everywhere to one another, fulfilling the prophecy: "The Lord reconciles the hearts of the princes of the earth (Job 12.24)." Fortunatus takes this idea from Rufinus and shifts its meaning slightly, and adds language of his own.

Fortunatus notes that Christ is sent in chains to Herod, using the same term—*vinctum*—as Rufinus, but then forms from the event a different metaphor. Rather than Christ as a *xenium* between two rulers as a token of peace, Christ is a *legatarius* who creates peace between two countries. The poet states, "Et ligatus Dominus, magis legatarius, pax inter partes extitit et iudices a livore dissolvuit."[334] Making a play on words between *ligatus* ["chained"] and *legatarius*, the poet introduces contemporary diplomatic language into this section of his commentary. The use of the term "legatarius" to denote an envoy, as opposed to the more common "legatus," is almost always found in Gallic contexts in the sixth century, with a few exceptions from Cassiodorus' *Historia Tripartita*. Most of the appearances of this word are in the *Epistolae Austrasicae*.[335] The similarity between the language used by diplomatic authors and the language of the poet Venantius' sermon illustration demonstrates the clear diplomatic and political provenance of the latter. Given the poet's involvement in

---

following passage of the Gospel is reported: 'Pilate, hearing that he was from Galilee, sent him to Herod, who was king at that time in Israel.'"

[334] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 11.1.28. "The chained Lord, or rather legate, brought forth peace between the nations and released the officials from their ill-will."

[335] Th.L.L. 1101.60-71. Consider the following sentence from a letter of Childebert II written in 584 to a certain Patrician Venantius (not related to the poet): "Idcirco gloriosissime eminentiae vestrae salutationis iura devinctissimae persolventes et, quae incolomitati conveniunt, de vobis constanter optantes, vestrae cognitioni deponimus, praesentium nostros *legatorios* ad clementiam serenissimi principis distinasse, Romanam rempublicam gubernantes; quibus, Christo praesule, praesentatis, cum amplitudine vestra si qua pro communi utilitate, *pacatis* utrisque gentibus, videbuntur conferre, ea ratione recipite, ut augustae potestati a vobis inpenso consilio illa decernantur, quae vestris nostrisque *partibus* unitis studio proficiant communiter et indissolubiliter in futuro" (*Epistolae Austrasicae* 39, ed. W. Gundlach, MGH *Epistolae*, vol. 3 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1892), 145). Here we have a "legatarius" involved in bringing peace between nations, "pacatis utrisque gentibus," so that the respective "partes" of the sender and the receiver may be united.

Frankish political affairs, in particular his communications to the imperial court of Justin and Sophia on behalf of Radegund, his use of such language in a sermon illustration puts a unique mark on it.

Aside from the language used and the illustration chosen, Fortunatus also departs from Rufinus in his application of the illustration. Rather than the occasion of Christ being sent to Herod representing a fulfillment of prophecy and a demonstration of his moral effects on people, Fortunatus connects this event to Christ's redeeming work on the cross. While not stated specifically, placing the comment: *pax provenit post odium,* "between the officials peace prevailed after hatred," so soon after the comment that between God and humanity, *pax rediret post odium,* "peace should return after hatred," makes the connection clear. The almost identical phrasing also points to the connection. Christ is mediator between God and man, and demonstrates this in an earthly manner by mediating between Herod and Pilate. Fortunatus softens Rufinus' moral interpretation and refocuses the image towards reflecting the Redemption. Once again, the poet shows his predilection to emphasize the cross and its work over other aspects of Christ's life.

The next section of Fortunatus' sermon (§ 29) deals with the descent into Hell. There are two parts to his commentary on this article. The first part explores the Scriptural support for the doctrine, using the introductory words *hinc prophetae plura*.[336] Fortunatus puts forward two texts from the Psalms, which are in fact selections from one passage, Psalm 87.4-6, numbered in accordance with the Septuagint version of the text. "Unde est illud dictum: *vita mea in inferno adpropiavit* et *factus sum inter mortuos liber*," writes the poet.[337]

[336] Compare Fortunatus, *Carm.* 11.1.18: "Hinc plurima prophetae de virginis conceptu..."; 11.1.21: "Hinc multa prophetae qualiter confixus in cruce..."
[337] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 11.1.29. "Whence is that saying: 'my life neared Hell,' and, 'I was made as a free man among the dead.'"

He then adds a quote from Matthew 11.3, where John the Baptist sends a message to Christ asking, "tu es qui venturus es?"[338] Fortunatus interprets this message as being a prophecy akin to those in the Old Testament. He then proceeds to explain how Christ's descent into Hell did not harm him at all, but rather was like a king going down into a prison to pardon the prisoners there. Both of these elements, the prophetic texts and the assurance of Christ's being unaffected by Hell, are found in Rufinus yet are applied differently.

Rufinus in § 26 of his *Expositio symboli* supports the doctrine of the Descent into Hell by citing a number of verses from the Psalms in addition to several New Testament passages. None of his citations in this section are copied by Fortunatus, save the statement by John the Baptist mentioned above. The quote from Psalm 87 appears in Rufinus' commentary under a separate article, *Tertia die resurrexit*, and is accompanied by the explanation that although Christ descended into Hell, he also rose again since Hell could not hold him. He says: "Evidentissime autem in octogesimo et septimo psalmo de eo dicitur: *Et factus est sicut homo sine adiutorio, inter mortuos liber*. Non dixit: 'homo,' sed 'sicut homo.' Sicut homo enim erat, quia descenderat in infernum; sed inter mortuos liber erat, quia a morte teneri non poterat."[339] Fortunatus slightly repurposes this quote to refer exclusively to the Descent into Hell, and cuts out most of the other Scripture citations. He also adds the words, "Quod lector requirens inveniet," a formula found also in § 21 of Fortunatus' text, encouraging his audience to search out the prophetic texts predicting Christ's passion.[340] Both comments indicate that Fortunatus expected his audience to be able to read the Scriptures themselves

[338] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 11.1.29. "Are you the one who was to have come?"
[339] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 28.7-12. "But most clearly this is explained in the eighty-seventh Psalm: 'At he was made like a man without help, a free man among the dead.' He did not say: 'man,' but 'like a man.' For he was like a man, since he descended into Hell; but among the dead he was free, since death could not hold him."
[340] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 11.1.29. "Which the searching reader will find." A similar phrase, "Quae diligens lector inveniet," appears in 11.1.21. In the latter case no texts are actually cited, making the phrase more of a pure invitation to the poet's audience to do the work of seeking out the texts themselves.

and to have access to a copy for their perusal. This is quite unlike Rufinus, who takes care to exegete and write out the Scriptural texts he cites.

The second part of Fortunatus' comment on this article, the image of a king going into a prison to pardon those inside, is taken not from Rufinus' discussion on the Descent into Hell, but from his discussion on Christ's suffering in the flesh during his crucifixion. In § 15 of his *Expositio symboli*, Rufinus writes:

> Divina natura in mortem descendit, non ut lege mortalium detineretur a morte, sed ut per sese resurrecturus ianuas mortis aperiret. Velut si quis rex pergat ad carcerem, et ingressus aperiat ianuas...dicetur ergo rex fuisse quidem in carcere, non tamen ea conditione qua fuerunt ceteri qui tenebantur in carcere: sed illi quidem ut poenas solverent, hic vero ut absolveret poenas.[341]

Fortunatus applies Rufinus' image to Christ's descent into Hell instead: "Descendens ad infernum iniuriam non pertulit, quod fecit causa clementiae, velut rex intrans carcerem, non ut ipse teneretur, sed ut noxii solverentur."[342] At this point it is important to observe that three articles are merged into one article by Rufinus in his commentary: *crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato et sepultus descendit in inferno*.[343] Fortunatus divided this long article into three distinct parts: *crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato*, *sub Pontio Pilato* and *descendit ad infernum*.[344] It is therefore at this point that Fortunatus concludes his summary of Rufinus' commentary on the cluster of articles dealing with Christ's trial and crucifixion.

The next article dealt with in both Fortunatus and Rufinus is *tertia die resurrexit*. In Rufinus' commentary, it takes two lengthy sections to explain; in Fortunatus', a single

---

[341] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 15.3-6, 9-11. "The divine nature descended to death, not in order that it might be detained by the mortal law in death, but that through it, about to be resurrected, the gates of death might be opened. Just as if some king proceeds into a prison, and after he has entered opens the gates...even so the king is said to have indeed been in prison, but yet is not in the same condition of those who were being held in prison; although in the case of the king the penalties are remitted while in the case of Christ they are absolved."
[342] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 11.1.29. "Descending to Hell he did not endure an injury, since he did this for mercy's sake, like a king entering a prison, not to be held himself, but to release the guilty."
[343] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli* 12. The commentary under this long article extends from §§12 to 26.
[344] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 11.1.21-29.

sentence. Rufinus explores a number of doctrinal points pertaining to the place of the Resurrection in the economy of salvation and makes a brief apologetic argument for God's ability to do such a miracle. He then proceeds to list a large number of Old Testament prophecies which are connected with the Resurrection, explaining them in some detail. Fortunatus, on the other hand, summarizing the entirety of Rufinus' commentary, merely states: "De resurrectione eius idem prophetae plura locuti sunt."[345] Once again the poet assumes his audience will be familiar with the scriptural texts. Fortunatus then adds something of his own to the commentary, stating: "Quod et Jonas ipse triduo in ventre ceti permanens designavit."[346] The precise nature of this citation of Jonah's experience is interesting because of the way Fortunatus portrays the prophet's time in the belly of the whale.

Frequently theologians would refer to the "sign of Jonah," taking their cue from the words of Christ in several of the gospels, as being a figure or type of the crucifixion and resurrection. Jonah as a metaphor is commonplace; Jonah as a prophet—especially when in the belly of the whale—is rarer. Gregory of Nyssa and Augustine both interpret the sign of Jonah in this way.[347] For example, in the *De civitate Dei* Augustine states:

> Ionas autem propheta non tam sermone Christum, quam sua quadam passione prophetavit, profecto apertius, quam si eius mortem et resurrectionem voce clamaret. Ut quid enim exceptus est ventre belvino et die tertio redditus, nisi ut significaret Christum de profundo inferni die tertio rediturum?[348]

---

[345] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 11.1.30. "Again the prophets spoke many things concerning His resurrection."
[346] Fortunatus, *Carm.*, 11.1.30. "This also Jonah himself pointed out by remaining three days in the belly of the whale."
[347] Gregory of Nyssa, "De Tridui Spatio," in *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 9, ed. E. Gebhardt (Leiden: Brill, 1967), 604M., 277; Augustine of Hippo, *De civitate Dei contra Paganos*, ed. B. Dombart and A. Kalb, CCSL 48 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1955), 18.30.
[348] Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, 18.30.18-23. The translation used is that of R.W. Dyson, *Augustine: City of God against the Pagans* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 861. "The prophet Jonah, however, prophesied Christ not so much by what he said as by certain things that he suffered. Indeed, he prophesied more clearly in this way than if he had proclaimed Christ's death and resurrection with his voice. For why was he received into the belly of the whale, and given back on the third day, except to signify that Christ would return from the depths of hell on the third day?"

Some have suggested that Fortunatus drew his Jonah imagery from Aquileia, where the Patriarchal Basilica contains a mosaic of Jonah's ordeal.[349] Yet the application of the Old Testament prophet's story to Christ's remaining three days in the grips of death is absent from this mosaic, which assumes a more general application to Christ's entire crucifixion and resurrection.[350] It is therefore more likely that the poet is drawing the language from one of the sources mentioned above, most probably Augustine. He certainly thought that Rufinus' omission of Jonah needed rectifying.[351]

The next article to be explored is *Ascendit in caelum*. The full citation in Rufinus' text is: "Ascendit in caelos, sedet ad dexteram Patris: inde venturus iudicare vivos et mortuos."[352] Fortunatus divides this into two sections, the Ascension and the Judgment. For the article on the Ascension he omits the words referring to the Session at the right hand of the Father, but includes the substance of the doctrine in his commentary. There are no departures in content from Rufinus in this section on the Ascension; both authors cite the importance of Christ's flesh ascending and being seated beside God, and both cite the same texts. The poet follows his source so precisely that §§ 29 and 30 of Rufinus are parallelled exactly by §§ 31 and 32 of Fortunatus' own *ES*, and much of the same language is used in both. Fortunatus shortens and simplifies Rufinus' original, as always, and organizes his Scriptural citations as a list of proof-texts rather than explaining them one by one as Rufinus does.

---

[349] E.g., Di Brazzano, *Opere*, 608-609, n. 26.
[350] See Yves-Marie Duval, "Jonas à Aquilée: De la mosaïque de la Theodoriana sud aux textes de Jérôme, Rufin, Chromace?" in *Antichità altoadriatiche XLVII: Aquileia Romana e Cristiana fra II e V secolo* (Trieste: Editreg SRL, 2000), 273-296. He suggests that the Jonah cycle on the floor of the basilica represents the celebration of the bishop's success at educating and working with his community.
[351] Catherine Chin notes the fact that Rufinus does not include Jonah in his commentary, despite the prominent mosaic in the Patriarchal Basilica there by that time (Chin, "Short Words on Earth," 395-396). She suggests that his emphasis stems from his essentially *academic* approach to the Symbol. See also Duval, "Jonas à Aquilée," 286.
[352] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli* 29. "He ascended into heaven, sits at the right hand of the Father: from there he will come to judge the living and the dead."

In Fortunatus' discussion of the article *Iudicaturus vivos et mortuos* he once again follows the course of Rufinus' argument quite closely. The first part of the commentary in both authors deals with explaining the meaning of *vivos et mortuos* in the Symbol, and the second lists prophetic texts concerning Christ's return and judgment. There are two differences in the first part between Rufinus and Fortunatus. Rufinus mentions a possible interpretation of *vivos* and *mortuos*: that they refer to those still alive and those in the grave at the time of Christ's return. He rejects this interpretation and suggests instead that the reference is to the body and the soul of every human being.[353] Fortunatus does not explicitly reject the former as being mistaken, and adds a third interpretation: "Aliqui dicunt vivos iustos, mortuos vero iniustos; aut certe vivos quos in corpore invenerit adventus dominicus et mortuos iam sepultos."[354] He does emphasize Rufinus' preferred solution, saying: "Nos tamen vivos et mortuos, hoc est animas et corpora pariter iudicandas."[355] Still, the poet is chiefly interested in listing the possibilities, not in making a philosophical point like Rufinus. The second part of the commentary on this article is considerably shortened by Fortunatus, who lists a paltry three prophecies: Malachi 3.1, Daniel 7.13 and Christ's own words from Matthew 24.27. By comparison Rufinus cites and explains over a dozen. In all cases the poet follows the text given by Rufinus for these quotes, but shortens them and does not explain their meaning.

The next article is *Credo in spiritum sanctum*. Fortunatus follows Rufinus' exposition closely once again on this point. He makes the typical cuts to most of the

[353] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli* 31. "Quod autem dicitur iudicare vivos et mortuos: non quo alii vivi alii mortui ad iudicium veniant: sed quos animas simul iudicabit et corpora, in quibus vivos animas, mortuos corpora nominavit."
[354] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 11.1.33. "Some say that the living are the just, while the dead are the unjust; or certainly the living are those whom at the Lord's coming are found in a [living] body and the dead are those already buried."
[355] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 11.1.33. "Neveretheless let us understand the living and the dead as spirits and bodies which ought to be judged equally."

philosophical, historical and philological content present in Rufinus. The biggest change is the removal of all the material Rufinus includes on the canon of Scripture. Fortunatus is not interested in enumerating which books of the Bible are canonical because he is writing in a context where that has long since been settled. The philological aspect of Rufinus that Fortunatus keeps is in his discussion of the importance of the preposition "in" in the article on the Holy Spirit: "Ergo *in* ubi praepositio ponitur, ibi divinitas adprobatur, ut est: *credo in Patrem, in Filium, in Spiritum Sanctum*."[356] Rufinus spends a good deal of time on this grammatical explanation as well; plainly Fortunatus thought that this discussion would be helpful for his audience, while the historical question of the canon was not.

The next article is *Sanctam ecclesiam*. Here Fortunatus follows his source very closely. He cuts out Rufinus' lengthy discussion of historical heresies, as expected, but otherwise is almost word-for-word. He then proceeds to the article, *Remissionem peccatorum* which again is a fairly close summary of Rufinus' commentary. There are, however, two minor differences. First, Rufinus includes a discussion of the nature of sin, the human will and the manner in which God forgives sin, which Fortunatus excises. Second, Rufinus makes the argument that the God who is able to do miracles is able also to forgive sin: "Rex enim est omnium qui promisit; terrae caelique dominus est qui haec pollicetur. Non vis ut ei qui me ex terra hominem fecit, credam quod ex criminoso me faciat innocentem?"[357] Fortunatus picks up on this argument and expands it: "Ipse rex terrenus a nullo discutitur, si quodcumque largitur. Nam ille qui potuit de luto hominem facere, idem potens est etiam lutulentum purgare et valet innocentiam perditam restituere qui sepultos et membra perdita

[356] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 11.1.36. "Therefore, where *in* is placed as a preposition, there divinity is proved, thus: 'I believe in the Father, in the Son, in the Holy Spirit.'"
[357] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 38.12-15. "The king of all things is the one who promises forgiveness; the lord of heaven and earth is he who promises these things. Do you not think that I should believe that he who made me into a human being out of the earth can also make me innocent out of my criminal status?"

revocat ad salutem."[358] The poet adds the raising of the dead to Rufinus' proof of God's power.

Whether this is a reference to the final resurrection, Christ's resurrection or Christ's raising of Lazarus from the dead is unclear. Given the context it is likely that the last option is the correct one. The poet felt the need in his last section of the sermon on the resurrection of the flesh to make arguments for the resurrection, suggesting that there were skeptics in his audience, so it would be of little use for him to use the final resurrection of the flesh as proof of God's power. The raising of Lazarus in the Gospels neatly fits the description provided in the present text, and it was an event that Fortunatus used as well in his *In laudem sanctae Mariae*: "Virgo haec virga fuit de qua est flos Christus obortus,/ cuius odor vivax membra sepulta levat,/ laxus morte iacens de cuius aromate tactus/ postque diem quartam Lazarus ore reflat."[359] Christ's resurrection is also a possibility: in Gregory of Tours' *Historiae*, the bishop relates a dispute he had with one of his clergy who doubted the final resurrection, but who affirmed Christ's resurrection.[360] At all events, it seems likely that Fortunatus is referring to concrete past occasions of resurrection to make his point about God's power.

The final article dealt with in the *ES* is *Resurrectionem carnis*. Fortunatus spends four paragraphs expositing this article, then concludes his sermon with a prayer based on the hope of glorification and eternal life. An interesting aspect of this conclusion is that neither Rufinus nor Fortunatus include the usual final article *Vitam aeternam* in their Symbol text.

---

[358] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 11.1.38. "A king of the earth is questioned by no one, no matter what he bestows. Now he who is able to make humanity from the dirt is also able to purify the filthy; and he who recalls the buried and lost limbs to health is strong enough to restore lost innocence."
[359] Fortunatus, *In laudem sanctae Mariae*, 11-14. "This virgin was the branch from which Christ the flower sprung up, whose enduring scent made entombed limbs rise up, lying lifeless in death, having been touched by its spice—and after the fourth day Lazarus breathes out from his mouth."
[360] Gregory of Tours, *Historiae*, ed. B. Krusch, MGH *SS. Rer. Merov.* 1.1 (Hanover, 1937), 10.13.22-26, 496. "Quod ipsius Domini, qui est primogenitus mortuorum, resurrectionem manifestavit, qui morte mortem intulit et de sepulchro vitam mortuis reformavit. Ad haec presbiter: 'Quod Dominus in adsumpto hominem mortuus fuerit ac resurrexerit, non ambigo; illud tamen, quod reliqui resurgant mortui, non admitto.'"

Instead, they subsume its meaning within their commentary on the resurrection of all flesh, although Fortunatus includes *vitam aeternam* as part of his prologue. Fortunatus once again follows Rufinus' text closely, emphasizing that the same flesh shall be raised and listing the same passages of Scripture.[361] As expected, the poet excises the philosophical and historical elements of Rufinus, but otherwise is merely summarizing. The ending, while verbally unique, and skipping Rufinus' closing summary, closes on exactly the same note. Here is Rufinus' closing:

> Deprecemur ut nobis et omnibus, qui haec audiunt, concedat Dominus, fide quam suscepimus custodita, cursu consummato, expectare repositam iustitiae coronam et inveniri inter eos qui resurgunt in vitam aeternam, liberari vero a confusione et obprobrio aeterno, per Christum Dominum nostrum, per quem est Deo Patri omnipotenti cum Spiritu Sancto gloria et imperium in saecula saeculorum.[362]

Compare this with Fortunatus' closing: "Quod ipse salutis auctor nobis tribuere dignetur, qui triumphato Tartaro cum Patre et Sancto Spiritu glorioso principatu intrans victor regnat in caelo. Amen."[363] In both cases a prayer is uttered to God and mention is made of the entire Trinity. On the other hand, Rufinus urges his audience to pray for God's saving grace as a reward for keeping the orthodox faith outlined in the Symbol, while Fortunatus prays on

---

[361] This emphasis upon the same flesh being resurrected has been claimed as proof of Fortunatus' Aquileian catechesis (Peršič, *Venanzio Fortunato*, 412). Yet this theological difficulty was well-known to the Gallic church. In an Easter sermon contained in the Eusebius Gallicanus collection, which was certainly circulating at the same time Fortunatus preached, the anonymous preacher devotes a ferocious passage in denouncing this error: "Quid tibi inter haec iniquitas dolenda mentiris? Si te non de tuo pulvere, non de tuis ossibus aestimas reparandum, sine causa dicis in symbolo: *Credo carnis resurrectionem*. Quomodo potes de carne dicere qupod *resurgat*, si non est ipsa *quae cecidit*?" "Why do you tell lies in grievous iniquity? If you don't think that you will be restored from your own substance and from your own bones, there is no reason for you to say in the Creed, 'I believe in the resurrection of the flesh.' How are you able to say that the flesh rises if it is not the same that fell?" (Eusebius Gallicanus, *Homilia XXIII*, ed. Leroy, 4, 269-270). See also the discussion of Gregory of Tours with the erring priest in *Historiae* 10.13.

[362] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 46.18-25. "Let us pray that the Lord might concede to us and to all who hear these things, that, having guarded the faith which we received, having finished the race, we might look for the reserved crown of righteousness, we might be found among those who rise again to eternal life and we might be freed from confusion and eternal shame, through Christ our Lord, through whom, with God the Father Almighty and the Holy Spirit, is glory and power for ever and ever. Amen."

[363] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 11.1.42. "May the author of salvation himself deign to give this to us [i.e., to be made like the angels at the Resurrection], who having triumphed over Tartarus and entering as a victor reigns in heaven along with the Father and the Holy Spirit in glorious power. Amen."

behalf of his audience that Christ would grant them eternal glory. Fortunatus also cuts out the mention of resurrection and possible damnation that is found in Rufinus' conclusion, focusing his closing on the glorification of humanity at the resurrection. This is most likely simply a stylistic decision. Thus the sermon ends.

Oliver Ehlen points out a number of fundamental differences between Rufinus and Fortunatus: a disinterest in arguments for theological points that might appeal to pagans,[364] a concern to emphasize the lack of pollution in Christ's incarnation,[365] a penchant for replacing lengthy Rufinian arguments with short citations of Scripture, [366] a broad emphasis through the organization of the commentary upon the signal importance of the Son's death on the cross as the work of salvation[367] and the *telos* of belief as eternal life.[368] The preceding analysis adds to this list. Venantius Fortunatus not only has a lack of interest in addressing pagan and philosophical concerns, but also Jewish and even most Christian heretical ones. His sustained argument against a heresy comes in two places: the commentary on the virgin birth and the commentary on the final article, where heretics who deny the resurrection of the flesh are refuted. But even here, the poet mainly relies upon Scriptural citations and basic reasoning rather than abstract thought. He faces skeptics, but they are Christian skeptics who

[364] Ehlen, *Venantius-Interpretationen*, 166: "Im gegensatz zu Rufin, der die Jungfrauengeburt mit Beispielen aus der antiken Mythologie parallelisiert, bleibt Venantius Fortunatus in seiner Argumentation gänzlich im biblischen Kontext."
[365] Ehlen, *Venantius-Interpretationen*, 165: "Der Jungfrauengeburt widmet Venantius Fortunatus einen vergleichsweise langen Abschnitt, dabei legt er einen besonderen Akzent darauf, dass Christus durch die Inkarnation nicht verunreinigt wurde."
[366] Ehlen, *Venantius-Interpretationen*, 170: "hier [i.e., *Carm.* 11.1.32] aber durch die Beschränkung auf nur drei Schriftzitate, die jeweils nur eine These formulieren, wesentlich prägnanter als bei Rufin formuliert."
[367] Ehlen, *Venantius-Interpretationen*, 172: "Durch Umfang und inhaltlich eigene Ergänzung beim erlösungswerk Christi am Kreuz erhält der zweite Großabschnitt über Gottes Sohn das stärkste Gewicht..."
[368] Ehlen, *Venantius-Interpretationen*, 175: "Gleichsam ist hier das τέλος des Glaubens, das ewige Leben erreicht, was durch Anlage und Komposition unmissverständlich herausgehoben wird."

need to be persuaded by what amounts to a show of force with Scripture and an appeal to commonly held truths about God.[369]

Another aspect brought out is the comparative insignificance of the Symbol text itself in this sermon. The text, derivative of Rufinus as it probably is, is shortened and adapted as needed to fit the needs of the sermon text. The commentary is the main player in this sermon, not the Symbol itself, which serves almost as an excuse to write a sermon. Lastly, the sermon draws on other sources than Rufinus for its content. Chromatius of Aquileia, Ambrose of Milan and of course Augustine of Hippo all feature in one degree or another. Thus the statement of Brouwer that Fortunatus' *ES* is simply "born from the mind of Rufinus" is unjust.[370] Fortunatus shows considerable originality and literary flair in organizing his adaptation, shifting its emphases and drawing on other sources. This summary of Rufinus could not be more different than the ones mentioned above, which merely put together their summary like a jig-saw puzzle. Venantius Fortunatus put as much effort into his sermons, and showed as much literary talent in writing them, as he did in his poetry.

2.5 *Conclusion*

While it is unusual to take on the task of examining Venantius Fortunatus as a teacher of Christian doctrine, this chapter has demonstrated that the poet was not unskilled in this area of knowledge. The purpose of this chapter was not to investigate any one particular theological controversy (indeed, it would be ill-fitting for the content of this sermon, which avoids controversy) prevalent in sixth-century Gaul, but rather to lay the groundwork for a

[369] Lisa Bailey notes this strategy was quite common in the Eusebius Gallicanus sermons as well, since in Symbol sermons, "Access to the faith was provided, but only within strictly controlled limits" (Bailey, *Christianity's Quiet Success*, 69).
[370] Brouwer, *Venantii Honorii Clementiani Fortunati*, 238.

detailed appreciation of Fortunatus' theological work. This, as was demonstrated by the literature review at the start of the chapter, was something largely avoided by previous scholarship. Alessio Peršič and Oliver Ehlen both wrote short investigations, but the former focused on a supposed "Aquileian" influence while the latter was concerned chiefly with literary structure. But the *ES* shows Fortunatus as a capable teacher of doctrine.

There are advantages in using this particular sermon as a means of studying the poet's method, rather than some other text. First, because it is a summary of an earlier text it provides a showcase for how Fortunatus adapted and transmitted doctrinal teaching. Second, it is a very common type of sermon that shows how Fortunatus dealt with a very basic task of any clergyman. Lastly, it is complete: unlike the unfinished *EOD*, which will be examined in the next two chapters, it is a carefully crafted text which was clearly finished to the poet's satisfaction. It is therefore a useful foil for setting the stage for Fortunatus' engagement with his local context and the theological disputes present there.

Fortunatus' reputation as an author of doctrinal exposition, though not noticeable in modern scholarship, was very high in the centuries immediately after his death. The widespread use of the *ES* in priests' handbooks and schoolbooks points to this, as does the frequent use of portions of its text in theological compilations. The poet was good at communicating doctrine in an elegant and clear way, and this was recognized.

Finally, it is necessary to answer the questions put forward in the introduction. How did Fortunatus adapt Rufinus? On the one hand, he follows the older author quite closely in terms of general content. Each article's commentary makes use of at least part of Rufinus' own text, and many of the scriptural passages are cited directly from Rufinus. On the other hand, Fortunatus frequently shifts the meaning of Rufinus' words and foregrounds something that Rufinus backgrounds, or introduces a new subject altogether. He also adds in material of his

own, chiefly in the excursus on the cross, which is unique to the poet. He draws on other sources and introduces new theological concerns, such as the importance of the cross for salvation. Rather than stringing extracts from Rufinus together, as happens in other summaries, Fortunatus uses his own words to paraphrase what his source says. In this way he enables his own voice to come through, with his own literary techniques driving the teaching process.

How did Fortunatus use the Bible? The poet consistently trims Rufinus' exegesis of the texts and instead piles together his citations, some of which are not present in the original text of Rufinus. He makes a theological statement and then supports it with a concatenation of verses, the cumulative effect of which would create assent in his audience. They are combined with simple examples drawn from the natural world and other Christian doctrines such as the creation of all things by God. What this indicates about the poet's audience is that they were thoroughly Christianized; they accepted the authority of the Bible and of basic Christian teaching. The Bible's authority was self-evident and its text needed very little exposition.

Fortunatus was influenced by a wide variety of sources. While this will be made clearer in the next two chapters on the *EOD,* it is remarkable that even in the *ES,* a text with such a dominant external source, other authors intrude their influence. The poet was not a simple summarizer, and drew on his wide learning to formulate a sermon which transmitted Christian doctrine from an array of previous authorities. The text of the sermon is clear and elegant, avoiding the rhetorical excesses of the Eusbius Gallicanus sermons and the more openly "learned" compilations of later authors, who explicitly listed their sources and quoted them directly. Fortunatus wears his learning lightly, and makes use of it to instruct his congregation in basic Christian doctrine.

Chapter 3

Background to the Expositio Orationis Dominicae

3.0 *Introduction*

The previous two chapters, through the lens of Fortunatus' *ES*, laid the foundation for understanding the poet's theological writings. The next two chapters will build on that foundation by examining the other sermon contained in the *Carmina*, the *EOD*, and its relevance for a particular theological issue which had been in dispute in Gaul in the sixth century: grace and free will. How did Fortunatus relate to this dispute, and what does this relationship say about both the poet himself and about the broader context of Gallic ecclesiastical culture in which he found himself?

Studying a particular doctrinal dispute with which he engaged will enable Venantius Fortunatus the theologian to come into clearer focus. The *EOD* is probably Fortunatus' most openly polemical text. Placing an investigation of this sermon after a chapter studying the mostly non-polemical *ES* provides a useful contrast. Seeing how Fortunatus used his literary and theological skills to engage in theological polemic will shed light on the poet's intellectual relationship with the Gallic church, in his capacity both as insider, a senior cleric in the Gallic church, and as outsider, an Italian *emigré*.

In this chapter, there will first be an overview of the secondary scholarship on the *EOD*, then an argument for its authenticity. Next, the main sources Fortunatus used in his sermon will be identified, and some suggestions made about what these say about Fortunatus' own ecclesiastical and theological priorities. Finally, a brief overview of the style and content of the sermon itself will be made. This will provide a foundation for the fourth chapter, which will explore the implications of the theology on grace and free will contained in the *EOD*.

3.1 *The Secondary Literature on the* EOD

It is difficult for scholars to conceive of Fortunatus as a theologian, so it is perhaps not surprising that the most doctrinally dense as well as apparently original prose theological work that appears in the *Carmina* should be virtually ignored. Unlike the *ES*, which is an adaptation of Rufinus and plays a role in the well-studied history of the Apostles' Creed, the *EOD* is neither a summary of a previous text nor does it provide a unique version of the text on which it comments. Thus it remains unstudied. This is a shame, because it is in fact quite a rich document.

As was observed in the first chapter, the *EOD* is transmitted apart from the full *Carmina* on only one occasion in the extant manuscript record, in Metz Biblioteca Capitolare MS 351.[371] Yet it remained an integral part of the *Carmina* and was included in all of the best and earliest manuscripts.[372] Brouwer printed it in his 1603 edition of Fortunatus and commented that, unlike the *ES*, this sermon came *de suo ingenio*, although in imitation of such illustrious predecessors as Cyprian and Augustine.[373] Luchi in his 1786 edition said nothing of note, just reprinting the sermon in its proper place at the head of Book 10.[374] Friedrich Leo in his 1881 MGH edition of the *Carmina* responded in the same way as Luchi, with no extra notes on the content.

---

[371] Chapter 1.1, 16-19.

[372] Two of the earliest manuscripts containing significant chunks of Fortunatus' works, Paris MS Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 13048 (s. 8-9) and *Petropolitanus* F XIV,1 (s. 8), do not contain either the *ES* or *EDO*. The reason for this is that they are florilegia of Fortunatus' poetry alone and contain no prose pieces. All complete copies—including the earliest complete copies, Paris MS Bibliothèque nationale de France lat. 14144 (s. 9) and Laon Bibliothèque municipale MS 469 (s. 8-9)—of Fortunatus' *Carmina* include both sermons in the same positions, at the head of books 10 and 11 (Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, lxxi-lxxv).

[373] Brouwer, *Venantii Honorii Clementiani Fortunati*, 218. He also provides a commentary, but Nisard's comment noted above (1.4, 14 n. 34) applies, alas, here as well.

[374] Reprinted in PL 88.313ff.

The flurry of editions at the beginning of the twenty-first century brought considerably more analysis of the sermon. Di Brazzano's 2001 edition and translation of the *Carmina* placed the *EOD* at the end of the *Carmina* in a separate section, parallel to the *ES*. In the introduction to the sermon, he addresses the question of why the sermon was cut short, suggesting that the posthumous editor of the *Carmina* found a mutilated text and included it because of its inherent interest.[375] He also observes that while, unlike the *ES*, this sermon is not based on a specific text, it is still fairly dependent on previous authors such as Tertullian and Cyprian.[376] Next, he includes a summary of the content in his introduction which notes the extensive discussion on the freedom of the will. Finally, he suggests that the main reason the *EOD* has not been extensively studied is due to its essentially derivative nature.[377] Di Brazzano also included a number of interesting notes throughout the content of the sermon. The first comment of interest focuses on an especially lyrical passage in the sermon describing heaven.[378] He notes the similarity of this passage to much else in Fortunatus' poetic repertoire.[379] He also addresses the question of sources, observing where the poet draws a conclusion that differs from Cyprian or Tertullian, which he designates as the main sources.

Marc Reydellet in his 2004 edition produced the first translation of the sermon into French (Nisard ignored it, along with the *ES*). He also provided many notes that, while falling short of a full commentary, provided more analysis than any previous study. There are

[375] Di Brazzano, *Opere*, 570.
[376] Di Brazzano, *Opere*, 570-571. He suggests as well that Fortunatus probably had access to a florilegium of prior authors from which he drew content: "probabilmente attingendo a florilegi o ad altri reportori consimili, concepiti per fornire un ampio ventaglio di fonti a chi aveva il compito di predicare (p. 571)."
[377] Di Brazzano, *Opere*, 571.
[378] I.e., Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.29.
[379] Di Brazzano, *Opere*, 580 n. 5. Di Brazzano makes the comment that there is a tension between the vivid beauty depicted by the words of the poet and the austerity of the theology directly following it: "Pur nell'austerità dell'esposizione dottrinale, il poeta non può non immaginare la sublimità del paradiso nei termini assai concreti di un lussureggiante giardino."

a number of aspects that Reydellet briefly notes about this sermon. First, he addresses the question of audience, suggesting that this particular sermon is addressed to Fortunatus' own clergy in Poitiers.[380] Second, he suggested a number of resonances with the works of Augustine.[381] Third, he made some interesting observations and clarifications about the sermon's theological content.[382] Most importantly in this category, Reydellet notes the strongly Augustinian character of Fortunatus' theology of grace and free will.[383] He also provides a thoughtful analysis of the frequently difficult text-critical issues of this sermon and the reason for its truncation.[384] Reydellet's wrestling with the dense content of the *EOD* was a major step forward for the scholarship on this sermon.

Apart from the editions, there are a few secondary sources which make brief comments on the *EOD*. Koebner in his 1915 monograph discusses the pastoral imagery in the sermon and links it with the poet's other writing on the effect of Christ's passion on nature.[385] Concerning the pastoral imagery, he remarks: "Man wird das Bild nicht allzu wörtlich nehmen; Fortunatus hat gewiß nicht geglaubt, daß er sich den Himmel als ein fruchtbares Eden vorstellen dürfe, aber sinnliche Pracht hat er doch von der Erhabenheit des Paradieses selbst im strengen dogmatischen Vortrag nicht wegdenken können."[386] Koebner's emphasis on Fortunatus' spiritual sensibility—the *ekstatische Altersdichtung* or "ecstatic poetry of his old age" of his late poetic output—comes through here, enabling him to note a connection

[380] Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 3, 40 n. 4.
[381] Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 3, 40 n. 5; 43 n. 11.
[382] E.g., Fortunatus' precise Christology, Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 3, 43 n. 8.
[383] Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 3, 185 n. 35.
[384] Reydellet notes, "Sur cette phrase probablement inachevée, le commentaire s'arrête. C'est sans doute la preuve que ce texte n'a pas dû être publié par Fortunat, mais récupéré dans ses papiers après sa mort." (Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 3, 59 n. 66).
[385] Koebner, *Venantius Fortunatus*, 113-114.
[386] Koebner, *Venantius Fortunatus*, 114. ""One should not take the image [i.e., of an Edenic garden] all that literally; Fortunatus certainly did not believe that he might visualize Heaven as a fruitful Eden, but cannot dispense with a sensual glory even in an austerely dogmatic sermon." Koebner, like Brouwer before him (Brouwer, *Venantii Honorii Clementiani Fortunati*, 222-223), and Reydellet after him (Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 3, 185 n. 35), notes the austerity of the text's doctrine.

between a seemingly out-of-place passage in an otherwise austere sermon and the rest of the poet's poetic material. This is an important point, because it is difficult for many scholars to conceive of Fortunatus as being capable of writing something so doctrinally deep. Demonstrating that the poet showed no hesitation in merging theology with his poetic art shows that the two sides of his character displayed here are by no means irreconcilable. At least Fortunatus himself did not consider them to be so.

The next text that explored the sermon in any meaningful way was P.G. Walsh in his summary introduction to Fortunatus in 1960 for the journal *The Month*.[387] While Walsh's general portrait offers little that is new, he makes some interesting comments on the *EOD*. Walsh argues that this sermon is an example of Fortunatus' spiritually mature phase after his extensive association with Radegund and Gregory of Tours.[388] Walsh indulges in some rather unwarranted speculation about Fortunatus' early education in Italy, but his general point about the sermon being generated from Fortunatus' Gallic relationships and context is one which grasps an essential element in Fortunatus' doctrinal emphases.

The question of sources was looked into more thoroughly by Salvatore Costanza in a paper published in the year before Walsh's article came out.[389] He examined the commentary on the fourth petition, *Panem nostrum cotidianum da nobis hodie*. Fortunatus, he found, drew on Augustine, Tertullian and Cyprian for much of the of his comments on this petition. Specifically, Augustine's *Enchiridion* provides a precise verbal parallel to the opening lines of the comment on the fourth petition in Fortunatus' commentary.[390] However, Costanza notes that Augustine's interpretation of this section of the Lord's prayer is not picked up by

[387] P.G. Walsh, "Venantius Fortunatus," in *The Month* vol. 120 (1960), pp. 292-302.
[388] Walsh, "Venantius Fortunatus," 294-295.
[389] Salvatore Costanza, "La Quarta Petizione in Venanzio Fortunato," in *Convivium Dominicum: Studi sull'Eucarestia nei Padri della Chiesa Antica e Miscellanea Patristica* (Università di Catania, 1959), 87-97.
[390] Costanza, "La Quarta Petizione," 89-90.

Fortunatus. In Augustine's understanding, put forward in the *Enchiridion*, the fourth petition refers to, "il pane quotidiano come il Verbo divino tràdito nella dottrina della Chiesa."[391] Fortunatus follows the more traditional interpretation of Tertullian and Cyprian, interpreting the phrase in a spiritual sense as the Eucharist and Christ's body and in a material sense as one's actual daily bread. Costanza made a useful contribution to the scholarship on this sermon by pointing out the contributions of Augustine, Cyprian and Tertullian to this section.

Luce Pietri in her 2004 article on the patristic influences in the writings of Fortunatus made brief mention of the *EOD*.[392] A longer treatment was written by Alessio Peršič in his 2001 article "Venanzio Fortunato *presbyter Italicus*." He argued that the influence of Chromatius of Aquileia was evident in the structure of Fortunatus' sermon, as part of his broader argument about the poet's Aquileian theology.[393] The exegetical format of the poet's sermon on the Lord's Prayer matched that of Chromatius. Unlike the *ES*, which summarized a treatise and put it into a sermon form, the *EOD*, he suggests, followed a method of direct exegesis of a text that is drawn from Chromatius of Aquileia's *Praefatio orationis dominicae*. Peršič's proposal of yet another source for Fortunatus' sermon is helpful, as is the description of the sermon's exegetical methodology.

The next scholar to explore the sermon in any significant way is Roy Hammerling. In a lengthy footnote in an essay on the Lord's Prayer published in 2008, Hammerling argues that the *EOD* should not be attributed to Fortunatus.[394] Instead, it should be assigned to the fifth century. Several reasons are given for this conclusion. First, Hammerling claims that scholars

[391] Costanza, "La Quarta Petizione," 91.
[392] Luce Pietri, "Venance Fortunat, lecteur des Pères latins," in *Chartae Charitatis*, ed. B. Gain, P. Jay and G. Nauroy (Paris: Institut d'études augustiniennes, 2004), 127-141.
[393] Peršič, "Venanzio Fortunato," 420-424.
[394] Roy Hammerling, "The Lord's Prayer: A Cornerstone of Early Baptismal Education," in *A History of Prayer: The First to the Fifteenth Century*, ed. R. Hammerling (Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2008), 179-182 n. 31; footnote reprinted in R. Hammerling, *The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church: The Pearl of Great Price* (New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010), 155-158 n. 109.

of Fortunatus have, when they dealt with the *EOD* at all, been divided about its authenticity. Second, he argues that a section on how various heretics do not have the right to call God "Father" makes no sense in a late sixth-century setting due to the irrelevance of many of the mentioned heresies to the Gallic church by then. Third, he suggests that there is a baptismal catechetical context reflected in the sermon which fits better with early fifth-century practices rather than those of the late sixth century. This argument will be considered in greater detail just below.

Finally, published in 2013, *The Oxford Guide to the Historical Reception of Augustine* contains an entry in its third volume on Venantius Fortunatus and how he received the writings and teachings of Augustine.[395] The sermon on the Lord's prayer receives a brief notice, but unfortunately is confused with the sermon on the Apostles' Creed in being specified as a summary of a sermon by Rufinus. However, the article does note that Fortunatus incorporates the language and biblical citations of Augustine in his argument on grace and free will. Specifically, it suggests the presence of the ideas and terminology from the *Contra Iulianum* and *Epistola* 217. As well, Fortunatus' education in Ravenna is credited with giving the poet knowledge of Augustine, whether directly or through Eugippius and Orosius. The article provides some useful assessments of Augustinian influence, but is understandably brief and regrettably imprecise on Fortunatus' sermons.

3.2 *The Authenticity of the* EOD

Hammerling's claims (noted above) against the authenticity of the *EOD* as a work of Venantius Fortunatus' will now be explored in more detail. If the *EOD* is as he claims a fifth-

[395] Alexander Arweiler, "Venantius Fortunatus (c. 540-600)," in *The Oxford Guide to the Historical Reception of Augustine*, vol. 3 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 1847-1848.

century production, included by mistake in the *Carmina* by a later editor, then its strong anti-Pelagian sentiments would have no bearing on uncovering the status of the semi-Pelagian dispute in the late sixth-century Merovingian realms. Whether his arguments dislocating the text by two centuries can be sustained despite the well-attested inclusion of the *EOD* among the works of the poet in the manuscript tradition remains to be seen.

The first phase of the argument against the *EOD*'s authenticity asserts that it was always shakily regarded as legitimate, without any real foundation. To begin, Hammerling states: "A work entitled *An Explanation of the Lord's Prayer*, which has been falsely attributed to Fortunatus in some manuscripts, has gone virtually undiscussed by scholars."[396] He then cites the editions of Luchi and Leo as basic sources of the text, followed by a citation of the discussion of the publication history contained in Judith George's work on Fortunatus.[397] He goes on to say: "A few scholars have accepted Venantius as the author of the Lord's Prayer homily simply because it appears in the critical edition, while others have remained skeptical."[398] He then cites a few more secondary sources who have asserted Fortunatus' authorship, focusing on Walsh especially.

He then seems to suggest that Leo in the introduction to his edition of the *Carmina* casts doubt on the sermon's authenticity: "Leo has noted that there has been some dispute over various works of Fortunatus, but earlier editors included the *Expositio dominicae orationis* as being part of the manuscript tradition, and therefore he included it in his critical edition."[399] Next, he cites Paul Antin's comment about the sermon in his *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité*, where Antin states that he would ignore Fortunatus' two sermons, although the Lord's prayer

[396] Hammerling, *The Lord's Prayer*, 156.
[397] I.e., Judith George, *Venantius Fortunatus: A Latin Poet in Merovingian Gaul*. Hammerling does not cite the editions of Reydellet and Di Brazzano, or the works of Roberts or Peršič.
[398] Hammerling, *The Lord's Prayer*, 156.
[399] Hammerling, *The Lord's Prayer*, 157.

sermon contained some comments of interest.[400] Hammerling concludes by citing a number of basic reference works which ignore Fortunatus' *EOD*. Thus he suggests that previous scholarship on the sermon has been ambiguous about its authenticity.

This argument does not hold up. It is not the case that the *EOD* has been attributed to Fortunatus in only a few manuscripts. Every manuscript which contains a complete copy of the *Carmina* places the *EOD* in exactly the same place, at the head of Book 10.[401] The sermon is an integral part of the *Carmina*, and has been from the very earliest evidence we possess.

Hammerling's claim that some scholars have accepted the authenticity of the sermon purely on the basis of its inclusion in the critical editions, while true, is beside the point: the editions include the sermon for excellent text-critical reasons, as noted above. Next, his attempt to use Leo to buttress his argument falls flat. Hammerling badly misreads Leo's comments in the introduction to the MGH edition. Leo does not cast doubt upon the authenticity of the *EOD*:

> Quoniam de recensendis Fortunati poematis satis disputatum est, restat ut paucis explicemus qualem in digerendis opusculis, in enotandis codicum scripturis, in constituendis denique verborum formis rationem secuti simus. Atque primo quidem loco conlocandi erant undecim carminum libri quibus insertae sunt pedestri sermone compositae epistulae atque orationis dominicae symbolique expositiones. Huic carminum corpori quod non solidum ut ex ipsius poetae manu prodierat, sed mutilum ut erat ab archetypi codicum praeter Σ auctore illo ad posteros traditum esse docuimus, editores qui ante hac fuerunt carmina nonnulla Fortunato non iure adscripta ad arbitrium infulciebant.[402]

---

[400] Hammerling, *The Lord's Prayer*, 157.

[401] See Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, lxxi-lxxv for the list of 15 manuscripts he used for his edition. Of these 15, 12 have the *EOD* in its proper place. Two of the three manuscripts lacking it comprise selections from Fortunatus' poetry that are not arranged in the *Carmina*'s order; the third, BAV Vat. lat. 552, dating from the tenth century, comprises two parts, one a selection of poetry like the previous two manuscripts, and the other the first three books of the *Carmina* in their proper order. At the head of the second section of BAV Vat. lat. 552 is the list of *capitula* from the whole *Carmina*, including the *EOD*.

[402] Leo, xxiv. "Since there has been sufficient discussion concerning the reception of the poetry of Fortunatus, it remains for us to briefly explain what kind of order we have followed in arranging the individual works, in noting down the readings of the codices, and finally in making up the forms of words. And indeed in the first

Leo then lists the suspect poems, which he places in a secondary appendix. If anything, Leo is too cautious; one at least of the poems that he asserts is inauthentic is almost certainly from the hand of the poet.[403] But there is no doubt in this passage that Leo does not impugn the authenticity of the prose sermons.

With regard to Antin's opinion, the brevity of his comment on the *EOD* does not mean he thought it inauthentic. As observed in the previous chapter, most prior authors had little to say about Fortunatus' sermons. None of this indicates that they thought the sermons inauthentic. Antin is not in any case questioning the authenticity of the sermon when he says, "On peut négliger son *Expositio symboli* d'après Rufin, et son *Expositio orationis dominicae*, encore que ce dernier texte puisse donner lieu à des remarques intéressantes."[404] This disregard was widespread throughout the scholarly world; it was not indicative of any belief in the *EOD* not being a genuine production of the poet Venantius Fortunatus. Antin's further comment about the source for one of the phrases in the sermon would suggest he thought it a product of the poet's pen.[405]

---

place there should be positioned the eleven books of poetry among which are inserted letters written in prose and commentaries on the Lord's Prayer and the Symbol. To this body of poetry, which we showed was handed down to later generations not as an intact manuscript (as it would have come forth from the hand of the poet himself), but one which was mutilated by the author of the archetype of the later codices, except for the Σ manuscript, editors coming before us freely added quite a few poems not rightly attributed to Fortunatus."

[403] I.e., the *In laudem sanctae Mariae*, as discussed by Koebner, *Venantius Fortunatus*, 143-148; Sven Blomgren, *Studia Fortunatiana II: De carmine In laudem sanctae Mariae composito Venantio Fortunato recte attribuendo* (Uppsala, 1934); and Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 2, p. 165 n. 1.

[404] Paul Antin, "Fortunat (saint)," in *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique: doctrine et histoire*, vol. 5, ed. A. Rayez et al. (Paris: Beauchesne, 1962), 725. "We can disregard his *Expositio symboli* according to Rufinus, and his *Expositio orationis dominicae*, although this last text might result in some interesting comments."

[405] Antin notes, as an example of *des remarques intéressantes*: "Ainsi, [MGH AA 4.1] p. 228, 20..., *impedimenta mundi faciunt homines miseros* vient de la *Visio Pauli*." (Antin, "Fortunat," 725). He cites a short but interesting article by P.B. Fischer on the phrase, which is found in a number of Gallic texts from the sixth century, including a few from Caesarius of Arles (P.B. Fischer, "Impedimenta mundi fecerunt eos miseros," in *Vigiliae Christianae*, vol. 5 (1951), 84-87). Fischer argues that Fortunatus drew on Caesarius of Arles for this phrase (p. 85).

The second phase of Hammerling's argument is one based on the internal content of the *EOD*. First, he argues that the list of heresies whose adherents have no right to call God 'Father' points to a fifth-century date. Fortunatus puts it this way: "Non est enim ipse pater Arriano Iudaeo Fotino Manicheo Sabellio et reliquis pestibus veneno pravi cordis infectis et pessimae confessionis falce succisis."[406] Hammerling comments:

> The inclusion of Arius and the Jews might reflect the concerns of the late sixth and early seventh centuries, i.e., concerns from around the time of Fortunatus. However, the earlier heresies were not of particular concern during Fortunatus' day. The practice of referring to earlier heresies by later authors is not uncommon; nevertheless, an earlier fifth century date would make more sense in light of the complete list.[407]

Hammerling's assumption that a listing of old heresies points more naturally to a period when they were relevant fails to take into account Fortunatus' style, where lists, especially those showing literary and historical knowledge, are a frequent feature. Compare the list in the *EOD—Non est enim ipse pater Arriano Iudaeo Fotino Manicheo Sabellio et reliquis pestibus*—with the one in a prose letter to the *vir illustres* Salutaris, a letter which follows immediately after the *EOD* in the order of the *Carmina*: *Sarra quoque, Rebecca Rachel Anna Elisabeth, licet sexus inferior, tamen hoc simul bibit amarum*.[408] The format of both lists is the same.

Another list, from his letter to Martin of Braga, shows his antiquarian bent: *Quid loquar de perihodis epichirematibus inthymemis syllogismisque perplexis?* Or slightly later in the letter: *Nam Plato Aristotelis Crysippus vel Pittacus cum mihi vix opinione noti sint nec legenti, Hilarius Gregorius Ambrosius Augustinusque vel si visione noti fierent,*

---

[406] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.13. "He is not a Father for the Arian, the Jew, Photinus, the Manichee, Sabellius and the rest of the pests who are infected by the poison of a corrupted heart and rent with the scythe of a vile faith."
[407] Hammerling, *The Lord's Prayer*, 158.
[408] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.2.7. "Also Sarah, Rebecca, Rachel, Anna and Elizabeth, although the lesser sex, nevertheless drank equally the bitter draught."

dormitanti.[409] Plato, Aristotle, Chrysippus and Pittacus were not, to put it mildly, all that relevant in the sixth-century post-Roman West. Yet Fortunatus mentions their names (probably drawn from a florilegium or a school book such as Martianus Capella's *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*) as a literary flourish. What is more, every single one of the heresies mentioned is found in Rufinus' *Expositio symboli*, a text which, as the previous chapter showed, Fortunatus knew well.[410]

Second, Hammerling argues for the *EOD*'s inauthenticity based on its apparent context in the fourth- and early fifth-century character of the baptismal ceremony. He states:

> The author does not mention a Lenten handing over of the LP to converts and mentioned that it was only after baptism that the believer had a right to pray the words "Our Father." Therefore, the work reflects Augustine's theology on the LP, but not the later fifth-century ideas of Peter Chrysologus or Pseudo-Quodvultdeus. The sixth-century concerns of Caesarius of Arles to educate parents, godparents, and children with the LP in baptismal catechesis is completely absent from the *Explanation of the Lord's Prayer*, which if it was written by Fortunatus, would have postdated Caesarius by half a century.[411]

There are a number of problems with this argument.

To begin with, the sermon does not seem to have a baptismal context at all. Hammerling's claim that the sermon, "mentioned that it was only after baptism that the believer had a right to pray the words 'Our Father,'" does not stand up. What Fortunatus does say is: "Item congrue *pater noster*, quia homo renascendo per baptismum effectus est Dei filius, qui prius per praevaricationem factus fuerat inimicus et perditus: ergo cuius gratia

---

[409] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 5.1.6, 7. "What shall I say about periods, epichyremes, enthymemes and confusing syllogisms?" "For Plato, Aristotle, Chrysippus and Pittacus were known to me only by reputation not by reading, and even Hilary, Gregory, Ambrose and Augustine were known by sight to me but drowsily."
[410] Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 5, 37; chapter 37 comprises a lengthy comment under the phrase *sanctam ecclesiam* listing various heresies and their teachings. Arius: *concilium vanitatis est et quod Arrius atque Eunomius docuit...*; Photinus: *concilium vanitatis est et quod Paulus Samosatenus et eius posthaec successor Photinus aderuit...*; the Manichee: *concilium vanitatis est quod Manichaeus docet...* Sabellius is mentioned in chapter 5: *Constat autem apud nos additos haereseos causa Sabellii, illius profecto quae a nostris Patripassiana appellatur*.
[411] Hammerling, *The Lord's Prayer*, 158.

fruitur iam Patrem libere confitetur."[412] Further down in the commentary on this phrase he continues: "Item bene *pater noster* additur, quia nisi quis recte credat in Christo non potest habere patrem in caelo."[413] These are the only comments the poet makes that might intimate something along the lines of what Hammerling claims is present.

Yet neither one asserts that only after baptism do people have the right to call God "Father." Instead, that right is received by rightly believing in the doctrines of the faith. Thus, says the poet, *Non est enim ipse pater Arriano,* etc. Baptism has nothing to do with it. When he does talk about baptism, he does not assert that the right to use "Father," specifically in its context of the Lord's Prayer, is as a result of the sacrament. Instead, baptism creates a state of adopted sonship that makes the use of the term "Father" logical. Next, Hammerling's comparison with Caesarius of Arles is useful only if the *EOD* of Fortunatus has the same liturgical context, namely baptism. But as was asserted above, it does not seem that there is a baptismal liturgical context for this sermon. The sermon is most probably one meant for a mature Christian audience, not catechumens. As Hammerling himself notes, "Early church authors used the LP as an important text in exegetical and theological training of clergy and mature members of the faith."[414] This was probably its general context.

The positive case for the *EOD*'s authenticity rests primarily on the manuscript evidence. It is unanimous that the *EOD* is an integral part of the *Carmina,* none of whose constituent parts have ever been challenged before as inauthentic. The tendency, instead, has been to add poems not included in the *Carmina* to Fortunatus' authentic corpus. To override this requires powerful internal evidence, which Hammerling does not provide. It is best to

[412] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.6. "Fittingly he says, 'Our Father,' since man by being reborn through baptism is made a son of God, he who previously through disobedience had been made an enemy and a lost soul. Therefore, him whose grace he now enjoys he freely confesses to be Father."
[413] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.13. "Again, justly is 'Our Father' added, since unless someone rightly believes in Christ he is not able to have a Father in heaven."
[414] Hammerling, *The Lord's Prayer*, 77.

wrestle with the paradoxical reality. The same man who wrote humorous verses to Radegund and Agnes about the delights of his table also wrote a ferociously Augustinian sermon on the sinfulness of humanity.

3.3 *The Sources of the* EOD

The *EOD* is unique amongst the prose works of Venantius Fortunatus. Its style, while incorporating a certain poetic flair at times, is that of a dry theological treatise. As Peršič observes, it is written in an exegetical style that makes frequent use of the linking term *item*, steadily working down the list of possible orthodox interpretations.[415] A sample of this style is found in a part of the section dealing with the phrase, *Adveniat regnum tuum*. It runs as follows:

> 23) Item dum dicimus *adveniat regnum tuum*, admonemur ut nihil de terreni regni divitiis exspectemus qui omnem spem in futuri regni facultate plantamus.
> 24) Item: *adveniat regnum tuum*. Agnoscimur his verbis eas increpare personas quae saeculi istam vitam diutius volunt protrahere, cum omnes iusti regnum illud ut festinanter veniat videntur optare.
> 25) Vel certe *adveniat regnum tuum* hoc est: Christus nobis adveniat quem cotidie sanctorum chorus veneranter expectat, in cuius promissione se confidunt iusti regnare, de cuius adventu apostolus ait: *tunc rapiemur simul in nubibus obviam Christo in aera et sic semper cum Domino erimus*.[416]

Here three different interpretations of the passage are laid out: 1) Christians should not be ambitious for great wealth, 2) Christians should long for the life of the future age after the resurrection and 3) Christians should long for the second coming of Christ. All are

[415] Peršič, *Venanzio Fortunato*, 421.
[416] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.23-25. (23) "Again when we say, 'may your kingdom come,' we are reminded that we who place all our hope in the power of the future kingdom should expect no wealth at all from the earthly kingdom. (24) Again: 'may your kingdom come.' We understand by these words that we are to cry out against those people who wish to extend further that life of the present age, since all those who are righteous are seen to wish for the swifter coming of the kingdom. (25) Or certainly, 'may your kingdom come' means this: may Christ come to us, he whom daily a choir of saints reverently attends, by whose promise the righteous are confident they shall reign and concerning whose coming the apostle says:'"then we shall be taken up all together into the clouds to meet with Christ in the air, and thus we shall be with the Lord forever.'"

eschatologically focused but address different aspects of how Christians should deal with the expectation of the end times in their lives. There is a mix of the practical and the doctrinal that is a common element throughout the sermon.

The list of a number of different interpretations of the same passage points to a variety of sources used by the poet to form his own sermon. The *EOD* is not all that original; the difference between it and the *ES* is that while the latter is based mostly on one text, Rufinus of Aquileia's own *Expositio symboli*, the former draws on many different sources which are integrated into a composite whole. The Lord's Prayer was almost as popular a sermon subject as the Symbol. There is therefore a great deal of material from which Fortunatus may have drawn his own sermon.

Tertullian's *De oratione* and Cyprian's *De dominica oratione* are two of the main texts used in the poet's own sermon. Both stand at the headwaters of all the Latin commentaries before Fortunatus' own time on the Lord's Prayer, so it is perhaps possible that the poet was using a florilegium rather than the texts themselves. Nevertheless, given the broad diffusion of both Cyprian and Tertullian, and the general importance that both of their works on the Lord's Prayer had to the theology of the Western Church as a whole, it is quite possible that the poet had direct access to at least Cyprian's complete commentary.[417] To Tertullian and Cyprian, other sources will also be added. There will not be a comprehensive examination of sermons on the Lord's Prayer like there was of Symbol sermons in the last chapter, but rather more of a pure *Quellenforschung* for this particular sermon. This makes

[417] Cyprian's diffusion is described by C. Moreschini in his introduction to the CCSL edition of Cyprian's *De dominica oratione* (Cyprian, *De dominica oratione*, ed. C. Moreschini, in CCSL 3A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1976), 88-89). See also Hammerling, *The Lord's Prayer*, 35 n. 87 for Cyprian's popularity. For a more general survey of the tradition, see Karlfried Froehlich, "The Lord's Prayer in Patristic Literature," in *A History of Prayer: The First to the Fifteenth Century*, ed. R. Hammerling (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 59-77.

sense given the focus of this chapter on a particular theological issues, grace and free will, rather than more general issues of the poet's practice and learning.

Tertullian's third-century *De oratione* formed the basis for much of the following exegesis of the Latin West, so it is no surprise that there are significant echoes of this seminal work in Fortunatus' own *EOD*. The first echo is found in Fortunatus' final comment on *Sanctificetur nomen tuum*. Tertullian makes only a short comment on that particular phrase, stating that: "Id petimus, ut sanctificetur in nobis, qui in illo sumus, simul et in ceteris, quos adhuc gratia Dei expectat, ut et huic praecepto parreamus orando pro omnibus, etiam pro inimicis nostris."[418] Fortunatus' own comment is similar: "Videmur non tantummodo pro nobis optare 'sanctificentur nomen eius,' sed et pro illis qui necdum ad baptismi meruerunt gratiam pervenire. Nam in Christi plenissima caritate docemur etiam pro inimicis orare."[419] The language is not very similar—save for the term *inimicis* for enemies—but the exegesis is the same. The second echo is found in the comment under the phrase, *Fiat voluntas tua sicut in caelo et in terra*. There, Tertullian says: "Quid autem Deus vult quam incedere nos secundum suam disciplinam?"[420] Fortunatus expands on this, but the sense and the manner of speaking are similar: "Nam qui de caelo descendit ad terras, quid aliud suae voluntatis esse vult credi, nisi salva redemptione nos debere caritatis et humilitatis ornamenta sectari?"[421]

A third echo occurs in the introductory comment to the phrase, *Panem nostrum cotidianum da nobis hodie*. There, Tertullian observes: "Sed quam eleganter divina sapientia

[418] Tertullian, *De Oratione*, ed. G.F. Diercks, CCSL 1 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1954), 3.4, 259. "We ask for this so that it might be made holy in us, who are in Him, and at the same time in others, who still await the grace of God, so that we also are obedient to this commandment by praying for everyone, even for our enemies."
[419] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.18. "We seem not only to wish for ouselves that, 'his name be hallowed,' but also for those who have not yet merited to attain to the grace of baptism. For in the greatly abounding love of Christ we are also taught to pray for our enemies."
[420] Tertullian, *De Oratione* 4.2. "But what else does God wish than that we walk according to his teaching?"
[421] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.32. "As for the one who came down from heaven to earth, what else is there pertaining to his will that he wishes to be believed, if not that besides redemption we ought to follow after the ornaments of charity and humility?"

ordinem orationis instruxit, ut post caelestia, id est post Dei nomen, Dei voluntatem et Dei regnum, terrenis quoque necessitatibus petitioni locum faceret!"[422] Fortunatus makes the same kind of observation, saying: "Considerandum est quam mirabiliter orationis huius ornatus sit textus, ut nominatis aeternis temporalia peterentur."[423] Lastly, Tertullian explains the meaning of the phrase *Et dimitte nobis debita* as follows: "Debitum autem in scripturis delicti figura est, quod perinde iudici debeatur et ab eo exigatur nec evadat iustitiam exactionis, nisi donetur exactio; sicut illi servo dominus debitum remisit."[424] Fortunatus explains a debt in a similar way: "Convenienter autem debita peccata dicuntur, quia et debentur et requirenda sunt. Nam sicut debitum a creditore requiritur, ita peccatum a Deo in die iudicii necesse est exigatur, nisi hic, dum vivimus, per pietatem eius indulgentiae ista nobis exactio condonetur."[425] This last echo is perhaps the most striking, since similar explanations are lacking in the other Lord's prayer commentaries which follow. The poet once again, however, does not draw verbatim from his source but creatively expands and clarifies its meaning.

Cyprian of Carthage's third-century *De dominica oratione* was if anything more influential than Tertullian's *De oratione*. While its exegesis was foundational to the Latin tradition of interpreting the Lord's Prayer, its use in theological polemic was even more influential. In particular, the role it played in Augustine's argument against Pelagianism and

[422] Tertullian, *De Oratione* 6.1. "But how elegantly did the Divine Wisdom devise the order of the prayer, so that after the heavenly things, that is after the name of God, the will of God and the kingdom of God, it should make a place in the petition also for earthly necessities!"
[423] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.52. "It ought to be considered how wondrously the text of this prayer is ordered, that with the eternal things having been mentioned the temporal things are besought."
[424] Tertullian, *De Oratione* 7.2. "But a 'debt' in the scriptures figuratively means 'a fault,' since due to its nature it is owed to a judge and is exacted by him nor does it escape the justice of the exaction, unless the repayment is given; just as the master remitted the debt of that servant."
[425] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.59. "Moreover it is fitting that debts are called sins since they are both owed and must be recalled. For just as a debt is recalled by a creditor, so sin is necessarily recalled by God on the day of judgment, unless here: while we live, the recall of our debt is forgiven through the mercy of his indulgence."

later semi-Pelagianism marked it out as a key text in later Augustinian polemics, as will be explored slightly later.[426] Fortunatus' use of this text therefore reveals not only that he is firmly in the mainstream of Latin doctrinal teaching on the Lord's Prayer, but also that he may have had knowledge of the pattern of Augustinian arguments.

There are many echoes of Cyprian's Lord's Prayer commentary in Fortunatus' sermon. Here are just a few examples. First, there are three echos of Cyprian in the introduction to Fortunatus' *EOD*. 1) Cyprian writes in his own introduction: "Qui inter cetera salutaria sua monita et praecepta divina quibus populo suo consulit ad salutem etiam orandi ipse formam dedit, ipse quid precaremur monuit et instruxit."[427] 2) Then he says: "Qui fecit vivere docuit orare." 3) Slightly further on, he says: "Ut aliter orare quam docuit non ignorantia sola sit sed et culpa."[428] Compare these quotes with an excerpt from Fortunatus' text:

> Cui parum videbatur de limo quod condidit, quod cruore redemit, quod baptismo renovavit, nisi ad salutis cumulum, mens nostra ne lapsum ignoranter incurreret, instrueret etiam qualiter exoraret, ne, si non docuisset quemadmodum deberemus iustas voti preces offerre, essemus aut certe temerarii aut erroris nube confusi et nesicendo quae petere magis admitteremus peccatum, potius quam purgare deberemus admissum, et unde expectabamus posse venire suffragium, videremur incurrere detrimentum, cum de oratione incondita fieret periculi plus causa quam voti.[429]

Like Cyprian, Fortunatus links Christ's instruction on prayer to the rest of his teachings and actions. The poet expands on his predecessor's comments, and changes them slightly, in this

---

[426] See Hammerling, *The Lord's Prayer*, 107-113, for an overview of its use in Augustinian polemic.
[427] Cyprian, *De dominica oratione* 2. "He who among his other salvific counsels and divine commands with which he counselled his people towards salvation also gave the form for praying, he it was who advised and instructed what we should pray."
[428] Cyprian, *De dominica oratione* 2. "He who made us living beings taught us also to pray;" "To pray otherwise than he taught is not ignorance alone but also a fault."
[429] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.1. "It seemed to Him insufficient that he created us from the dust...unless as the crown of salvation he also instruct us how to pray, in order that our mind might not rush ignorantly into error. He did this lest, if he should not have taught us how we ought to offer righteous prayers of desire, we be either over-bold with certainty or confused by a mist of error, and through our ignorance of what to ask for we instead commit a sin rather than doing what we ought and purging sin, and at the point from where we expect that our help is able to come we instead incur a fault, since an ill-formed prayer is more a source of danger than of hope."

case by focusing on Christ's actions in the economy of salvation rather than the teachings during his life. Both note the possibility of sinning by praying improperly, and the forestalling of this possibility by Christ's teaching on prayer. While Cyprian is explicit that the form of the Lord's Prayer is what matters, Fortunatus is not; still, the implication is there that carefully following the content of the prayer is important.

Second, another important echo is found in Fortunatus' comment on the article, *Pater noster qui es in caelis,* where the poet says: "Quod autem non singulariter "pater meus," sed "pater noster" dicimus ad hoc pertinere cognoscitur ut nullus pro se tantum sed generaliter pro omnibus misericordem Dominum deprecetur, quatenus ab hoste perfido cuncti pariter liberentur."[430] Cyprian says something similar in his comment on the same phrase:

> Ante omnia pacis doctor atque unitatis magister singillatim noluit et privatim precem fieri, ut quis cum precatur pro se tantum precetur. Non dicimus: "Pater meus, qui es in caelis" nec: "panem meum da mihi hodie," nec dimitti sibi tantum unusquisque debitum postulat aut ut in temptationem non inducatur atque a malo liberetur pro se solo rogat. Publica est nobis et communis oratio, et quando oramus, non pro uno sed pro populo toto rogamus, quia totus populus unum sumus.[431]

Cyprian's comment dwells on the importance of unity within the church, which Fortunatus echoes almost exactly. The poet immediately goes on to say: "Omnes enim qui in ecclesia conveniunt eodem se muro concludunt...in uno Christi corpore continentur et ideo...separari non debent nec in voto."[432]

---

[430] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.10. "But inasmuch as we do not say in the singular, 'My Father,' but rather, 'Our Father,' it is understood to pertain to this command: that no one should beseech the Lord's compassion just for himself but more generally for all men, so that all equally are freed from the treacherous Enemy."

[431] Cyprian, *De dominica oratione* 8. "Before all else the teacher of peace and master of unity did not wish prayer to be made individually and privately, so that anyone who prayed did so only for himself. We do not say: 'My Father, you who are in the heavens,' nor: 'give me this day my bread,' nor does it request that the debt of each individual be remitted only for himself or ask that the individual himself not be led into temptation and be freed from him. The prayer is public for us and for the community, and when we pray we ask not for one but for the whole people, since we are one as a whole people."

[432] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.11. "For all who gather in the Church enclose themselves in the same wall...they are contained within Christ's one body...and for that reason...they ought not to be separated in prayer."

A third example is more interesting, since it involves a peculiar practice regarding the Eucharist. Cyprian says under the phrase, *Panem nostrum cotidianum da nobis hodie*, that the Eucharist should be taken daily:

> Hunc autem panem dari nobis cotidie postulamus, ne qui in Christo sumus et eucharistiam eius cotidie ad cibum salutis accipimus intercedente aliquo graviore delicto, dum abstenti et non communicantes a caelesti pane prohibemur, a Christi corpore separemur.[433]

The insistence upon daily reception of the Eucharist is also present in Fortunatus' *EOD*: "Quod vero cotidianum panem petimus, hoc insinuare videtur ut communionem eius corporis, si est possibile, omnibus diebus reverenter sumamus, quia, cum Ipse vita nostra sit, nutrimento nostro peregrinos nos facimus, si ad eucharistiam tardi accedamus."[434] The significance of this for understanding Fortunatus' teaching is considerable. As Costanza noted, this understanding of the desirability of daily Eucharist is not present in either Greek authors or in Augustine, but is present in Cyprian and Peter Chrysologus.[435] Yet the words of this passage are drawn in large part from Augustine's *Enchiridion*, as Costanza also notes. Fortunatus was therefore drawing on a diversity of sources, creating his own particular approach to the Lord's Prayer.

Chromatius of Aquileia also features prominently as a source for this text.[436] As both Peršič and Costanza suggest, this author influenced at the very least Fortunatus' homiletic style.[437] Chromatius' main contribution to the tradition of exegesis on the Lord's Prayer

---

[433] Cyprian, *De dominica oratione* 18. "But we ask for this bread to be given to us every day, so that we who are in Christ and who receive His Eucharist every day for the bread of salvation, may not, by some more serious fault interposing itself, since we are prohibited from abstaining and not communicating with the heavenly bread, be separated from the body of Christ."

[434] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.55. "But because we ask for our daily bread this request seems to imply that we should partake reverently of the communion of his body, if it is possible, every day, since we make ourselves strangers to our nourishment if we are slow to come to the Eucharist, since He is our life."

[435] Costanza, "La Quarta Petizione," 95; see also Froehlich, "The Lord's Prayer," 73.

[436] for Chromatius as a source for the *ES* as well, see 2.4, 104-105.

[437] Costanza, "La Quarta Petizione," 95; Peršič, *Venanzio Fortunato*, 420-424.

comes in two texts: first, one of his sermons forming a part of his *Tractatus in Matthaeum* and covering the Matthaean account of the prayer; second, the short sermon known as the *Praefatio orationis dominicae*.[438] The *Praefatio* is a brief summary of some themes in Cyprian's *De dominica oratione*, and, despite Peršič's suggestion, is probably not a verbal source for Fortunatus' text.[439]

Its brevity rules it out as a major source. Chromatius' fuller thoughts on the Lord's Prayer are found in sermon 28 of the *Tractatus in Mathaeum*. This sermon has many verbal similarities to Fortunatus' *EOD*, making it a likelier candidate for a source text than the *Praefatio*. To begin, the introduction of the Chromatius' sermon includes the lines, "Quanta Domini circa nos dilectio! Quanta misericordia eius et pietas, quae nobis tantae gratiae munus indulsit, ut licenter Dominum ac Deum nostrum servi Patrem dicere audeamus!"[440] Compare this with Fortunatus' introduction, where he states:

> Tanta pietatis profunda misericordia, filii dilectissimi, circa genus humanum nostri patuit Salvatoris, qua nos ereptos de concatenatis mundi naufragiis ad portum perpetuae detulit libertatis, ut nec verbis exsequi nec lingua patefieri neque ipsa valeat cogitatione pulsari.[441]

Fortunatus changes *quanta* to *tanta*, but the verbal echoes are striking.

Another parallel passage is found under the phrase, *Fiat voluntas tua sicut in caelo et in terra*. There, Chromatius writes: "Cum ergo dicimus: 'Fiat voluntas tua sicut in caelo et in terra,' hoc oramus, id est ut sicuti Dei voluntas ab angelis fideliter custoditur in caelis, ita

---

[438] Chromatius of Aquileia, *Praefatio orationis dominicae*, ed. A. Hoste, in CCSL 9 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1957), 444-447; Chromatius of Aquileia, "Tractatus XXVIII in Mathaeum VI, 9-15," in *Opera*, ed. R. Étaix and R. Lemarié, CCSL 9A, 328-335.

[439] Peršič, *Venanzio Fortunato*, 422-423. Although it might be a conceptual one, as he also argues.

[440] Chromatius, *Tractatus XXVIII* 1.2. "How great is the love of the Lord towards us! How great his compassion and piety, which the gift of so great a grace yielded to us, that freely we slaves should dare to call our Lord and our God 'Father!'"

[441] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.1. "Dearly beloved sons, so great is the profound compassion of the Piety of our Saviour revealed to be towards the human race—that Piety by which, having been rescued from the enchained shipwrecks of the world, we entered into the harbour of eternal liberty—that the same compassion is not able to be explained in words, nor made clear by the tongue, nor examined by thought."

quoque a nobis religiosa ac fideli devotione semper servetur in terra."[442] Compare a section from Fortunatus' own commentary on that particular article: "Item 'fiat voluntas tua sicut in caelo et in terra,' id est: sicut in caelis angeli, ita te homines venerentur in terris."[443] While the meaning is again subtly shifted, the language is sufficiently similar as to suggest a direct dependence.

One final example will suffice to show the close dependence of Fortunatus' text on Chromatius' earlier text. Under the phrase, *Panem nostrum cotidianum da nobis hodie*, Fortunatus writes: "Postquam ad Christum pervenimus et mundum cum pompis suis reiecimus, non nobis necesse sit ad escam amplius quam cotidianus usus exigit ut quaeramus, re vera cum adventum Domini iugiter expectemus; nam inpedimenta mundi faciunt homines miseros."[444] While the final sentence in this quote is an ascetical slogan found in many texts, as noted above by P.B. Fischer, the rest is quite similar to Chromatius on the same phrase.[445] The earlier author says:

> Duplici modo hoc Domini dictum intellegimus. Primum, ut non aliud quam cotidianum victum postulemus; non enim iubemur divitias petere aut affluentiam saecularium rerum, sed panem cotidinaum, quod christianis fide viventibus et futuram gloriam exspectantibus ad praesentem vitam solummodo necessarium est.[446]

The temporary nature of earthly life is a common feature of both these comments. Chromatius is heavily dependent upon Cyprian, which partly explains the similarities

---

[442] Chromatius, *Tractatus XXVIII* 4.3. "Therefore when we say, 'May your will be done on earth as it is in heaven,' we pray this, that is that just as the will of God is faithfully carried out in heaven by the angels, so also may it be preserved always by us with a religious and faithful devotion on the earth."
[443] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.46. "Again, 'may your will be done on earth as it is in heaven,' that is: as angels worship you in heaven, even so may men worship you on earth."
[444] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.57. "After we come to Christ and reject the world and its ostentations, it is not necessary for us to eat more than our daily use demands, so that we might seek out the true bread as continually we await the coming of the Lord. For the obstructions of the world make men miserable."
[445] P.B. Fischer, "Impedimenta mundi fecerunt eos miseros," 84-87.
[446] Chromatius, *Tractatus 28*, 5.1. "We understand this saying of the Lord in a twofold manner. First, that we should ask for nothing more than our daily food; for we do not need to seek after riches or the affluence of worldly things, but rather daily bread, since it alone is necessary in the present life for those living out the Christian faith and awaiting future glory."

between his Lord's Prayer commentary and that of Fortunatus, but the commonalities stretch much deeper than that. It seems quite likely, then, that the poet used Chromatius' *Tractatus in Mathaeum* as a source for his own *EOD*.

Another important source for Fortunatus' sermon on the Lord's Prayer, and one which has special significance for the topic of this chapter, is Augustine. The doctrinal Augustinianism of the sermon is quite explicit, with Fortunatus stating near the close of his disquisition on grace and free will: "Nam qui cum apostolo Paulo, id est oculo ecclesiae, et cum beato Augustino eius sequace consonat, in eo ignorantiae caligo non regnat."[447] The fact that Augustine is the only prior (orthodox) ecclesiastical figure mentioned in this sermon does not necessarily point to any of his writings being a source, but strongly suggests it. As Costanza has already noted, the *Enchiridion* is one source, although only its language has been appropriated.[448] Other possible sources, such as Augustine's three sermons on the Lord's Prayer, are basically repetitions of Cyprian, and thus it is impossible to tell if the poet knew of them.[449] Augustine's use of Cyprian's work on the Lord's Prayer is famously extensive, especially in his engagement with the Pelagians. Thus most of the occasions when he uses the Lord's Prayer in his anti-Pelagian polemic are indistinguishable from Cyprian's content. For example, in his work, *Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum*, Augustine appeals to Cyprian as an authority on original sin and the inability of the human will in book 4, but quotes his *De dominica oratione* verbatim throughout.[450]

---

[447] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.42. "He who is in accord with the Apostle Paul, that is with the Eye of the Church, and with the blessed Augustine his follower, in him the darkness of ignorance does not reign."
[448] Costanza, "La Quarta Petizione," 89-90.
[449] Augustine, *Sermones in Mathaeum*, ed. P.-P. Verbraken, CCSL 41Aa (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), LVI-LVIII, 159-213.
[450] Augustine, *Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum libri quattuor*, ed. C. Urba and J. Zycha, CSEL 60 (Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1913), 4.21-28. e.g.: "Iam vero gratiam dei quemadmodum adversus istos praedicet Cyprianus, ubi de oratione dominica disputat, evidenter apparet. Ait enim: 'Dicimus: 'Sanctificetur nomen tuum,' non quod

In the same way, in his later books which sparked the semi-Pelagian controversy, Augustine placed great reliance upon Cyprian. In particular, in his book *De dono perseverentiae* he applies the *De dominica oratione* carefully to the question of whether the Christian's perseverance in the faith is due to the grace of God or to the Christian's own will. Augustine writes, "Legite aliquanto intentius eius expositionem in beati Cypriani matryris libro, quem de hac re condidit, cuius est titulus, De Dominica Oratione: et videte ante quot annos contra ea quae futura erant Pelagianorum venena, quale sit antidotum praeparatum."[451] What is more, Augustine mentioned in a letter he wrote to some fellow clergy about the beginnings of the semi-Pelagian controversy that he led skeptical inquirers through Cyprian's work. He writes in Letter 215, "Legimus eis etiam librum beatissimi martyris Cypriani de oratione dominica et ostendimus, quem ad modum docuerit omnia, quae ad mores nostros pertinent, quibus recte vivimus, a patre nostro, qui in caelis est, esse poscenda, ne de libero praesumentes arbitrio a divina gratia decidamus."[452] So Cyprian's work was crucial to Augustine's argument against both Pelagianism and semi-Pelagianism. While there is no apparent direct verbal connection between Augustine's use of the Lord's prayer in anti-Pelagian polemic and Fortunatus' sermon, the coinciding prominence of this prayer in both authors' engagement with the theological issues of grace and free will suggests that Fortunatus was at least familiar with its importance to the Augustinian tradition.

---

optemus deo, ut sanctificetur orationibus nostris, sed quod petamus a deo, ut nomen eius sanctificetur in nobis...'" (Augustine, *Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum*, 4.25).

[451] Augustine, *De dono perseverentiae*, 2.4, PL 45.996. "Read a little more attentively the commentary by the blessed martyr Cyprian on this prayer [i.e., the Lord's Prayer] in the book he wrote on this subject, titled, *On the Lord's Prayer*, and see what an antidote he had prepared, and how many years ahead of time, against the future poisons of the Pelagians."

[452] Augustine, *Epistulae*, ed. A. Goldbacher, CSEL 57 (Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1911), 215.3, 390. "We read with them as well the book of the most blessed martyr Cyprian concerning the Lord's Prayer and we showed all things he taught ought to be requested on this matter, which pertain to our precepts, with which we live rightly, from our father who is in heaven, lest presuming upon the freedom of our will we should fall away from divine grace."

Another example of anti-Pelagian polemic that may have influenced Fortunatus' sermon on the Lord's Prayer is Jerome's "Dialogue Against the Pelagians." There, in the final section, Jerome's anti-Pelagian character "Atticus" uses the Lord's Prayer to argue that Christians cannot be without sin without the assistance of God. "Atticus" contrasts the Lord's Prayer, with its protestations of need and personal guilt, with his Pelagian interlocutor Critobulus' confidence in his own goodness. Jerome draws on Pelagius' letter to Juliana for Pelagian sentiments with which to contrast the Lord's Prayer. An important facet of this dialogue is echoed in Fortunatus' sermon. Jerome's "Atticus" states: "Tu dicis: nosti, Domine, quam sanctae sint et innocentes et purae manus meae. Illi inferunt: 'adveniat regnum tuum,' spem regni futuro tempore praestolantes, ut, regnante Christo, nequaquam regnet peccatum in mortali eorum corpore."[453] Compare Fortunatus' comment under the phrase, *Adveniat regnum tuum*: "Tunc enim in nobis serpentina falsitate subdolus hostis non praevalet, quando nos constanter respexerit divini regni desideria concepisse: id est, regnante Christo non possit in nostris corporibus regnare peccatum."[454] The verbal echo is there between Jerome's line: *ut, regnante Christo, nequaquam regnet peccatum in mortali eorum corpore*, and Fortunatus' line: *id est, regnante Christo non possit in nostris corporibus regnare peccatum.*

Another source for Fortunatus is the prominent Augustinian, Prosper of Aquitaine (c. 390-455). Fortunatus' lengthy discourse on the freedom of the will (or, rather, the lack thereof) in the commentary under the phrase, *Fiat voluntas tua sicut in caelo et in terra,*

[453] Jerome, *Dialogus adversus Pelagianos*, ed. C. Moreschini, CCSL 80 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1990), 3.15, 118. "You ['Critobulus'] say: 'You know, O Lord, how holy, how innocent, and how pure my hands are.' They say: 'Your kingdom come,' expressing a hope for the kingdom in the future, so that, with Christ reigning, sin may not reign in their mortal body."
[454] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.22. "Then the deceitful enemy does not prevail over us by his serpentine falsity since he will observe that we have been firmly captured by the desire for the divine kingdom; that is, with Christ reigning in our bodies sin is not able to reign there."

makes one particular argument that parallels an argument made by Prosper. Prosper, in his work *Contra collatorem*, "Against the Conferencer," written to refute the controversial Conference 13 of John Cassian's *Collationes*, argues against Cassian's use of a passage from Romans.[455] Cassian argues that it implies the human will's ability on its own to do good and reject evil. On the contrary, writes Prosper:

> Dixit quidem beatus Apostolus: "Velle enim adiacet mihi, perficere autem bonum non invenio." Sed idem dixit: "Non quia idonei simus cogitare aliquid a nobis quasi ex nobis ipsis, sed sufficientia nostra ex Deo est." Et idem dixit: "Deus est enim qui operatur in vobis et velle, et operari pro bona voluntate." Non ergo apostolus sibi contrarius est.[456]

Compare Fortunatus, who writes:

> Sed si quis obiciat quod apostolus ait: "Velle adiacet mihi," cum ipse dicit: "Deus qui in vobis operatur et velle et operari pro bona voluntate," ergo si quis dicat quia ipsam bonam voluntatem Deus non inspirat, quantum ad hanc intellegentiam, beatus apostolus, discrepat sentiendo diversa. Sed absit ut ille vir pacificus qui uno eodemque locatus est spiritu, in his dictis ecclesiae generasset scandalum. [457]

Fortunatus' response to an imagined interlocutor's use of Romans 7:18 is exactly that of Prosper's response to Cassian, although the poet excises the use of the first passage cited by Prosper. It makes sense, therefore, to suppose that Fortunatus had Prosper's tract against Cassian in mind when he wrote this part of his sermon.

What has hopefully been made clear by the preceding examination is that Fortunatus drew on a broad, well-established body of Latin Christian teaching on the Lord's Prayer. This

---

[455] I.e., Romans 7.18: "Velle enim adiacet mihi, perficere autem bonum non invenio." "For to will lies with me, but to accomplish the good I do not find [the ability]."

[456] Prosper of Aquitaine, *Liber contra collatorem*, 4.2, PL 51.224. "The blessed Apostle did indeed say: 'For to will lies with me, but to accomplish the good I do not find.' But the same man said: 'Not because we are suitable to think anything by ourselves as from our own selves, but our sufficiency is from God.' And again he said: 'For God it is who works in you both to will and to do for the sake of a good will.'"

[457] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.39. "But if anyone should oppose this doctrine with that word of the apostle: 'To will lies with me,' when he himself says, 'It is God who works in you both the desire and the action for the sake of His good will,' therefore if anyone should say that God does not inspire that same good movement of the will, how much does the blessed apostle differ from this understanding with a far-distant opinion! But far be it from us to think that the same peaceable man who was placed within one and the same spirit should have created a scandal with his words in the Church."

teaching was characterized by a heavy dependence on and respect for the work of Cyprian of Carthage. It is therefore not surprising that Cyprian's exegesis of the text features prominently in Fortunatus' own sermon on the Lord's Prayer. Chromatius also seems to be a major influence, which, given the probable influence his writings on Matthew had on Fortunatus' independent excursus on the cross in the poet's *ES,* discussed in the last chapter, makes a considerable amount of sense. The sermon no doubt drew on other sources, given the broad scope of its exegesis. It is also possible that many of the echoes of previous authors reflect a dependence upon *florilegia* rather than the actual texts themselves.

3.4 *The Content of the* EOD

As with the *ES* the poet put his own mark on the material he drew from previous sources. Indeed, this is more the case with the *EOD* than with the *ES*, given the lack of any overarching single source governing its order and exegetical priorities. The most interesting mark that Fortunatus puts upon the traditional exegesis of the Lord's Prayer is the time he spends ardently defending an austerely Augustinian understanding of grace and free will. It is this section which will be the heart of the next chapter, since it sheds light on how Fortunatus the theologian and churchman interacted with a particular theological dispute. No other sermon devoted specifically devoted to the Lord's Prayer dating from this period or before this period that survives has such an emphasis. This is not to say that, as already observed, the Lord's Prayer did not play a key role in anti-Pelagian polemic; just that when most preachers gave sermons devoted exclusively to the Prayer they did not engage in such a polemic.

Still, like the rest of the tradition of Lord's Prayer sermons, Fortunatus' own sermon has a broad focus that covers many areas of doctrine and ethical conduct. In fact, one of the many

interesting features of this text is its functioning as a compendium of valid and useful interpretations of the passages of the Lord's Prayer. For example, under the phrase, *Pater noster qui es in caelis,* Fortunatus points out no less than seven different meanings. They are as follows: 1) The Son has the authority to reveal the proper form of prayer, which is a mystery of heaven, to mankind; 2) The life of the present age on earth should be disdained in favour of eagerly pursuing the things pertaining to the love of God; 3) Christians are adopted sons of God through baptism, raised up through God's grace to a level in a certain sense equal with Christ, who is the only-begotten Son of God; 4) *Pater noster qui es in caelis* is a confession of faith that actively contends for that same faith; 5) Christians need to live virtuous lives if they are to maintain their status as sons of God; 6) The prayer is said collectively, because Christians praying for each other is a sign of unity and strength and is more efficacious than individual prayer; and 7) It is important to correctly understand the nature of the Son in order to rightfully have God as Father.

The other phrases of the Lord's Prayer have a similarly broad range of interpretations appended to them by Fortunatus. Thus the poet sought to instil in his audience a detailed knowledge of how the prayer was to be interpreted and applied. Fortunatus the bishop, preaching to what, as will be argued in the next chapter, was a primarily clerical audience, gives a fairly advanced exegesis of the prayer. This exegesis is present in various earlier texts, but rarely brought together in so comprehensive a catalogue as this.

3.5 *Conclusion*

Fortunatus' *EOD* seems to have been designed as a comprehensive treatment of the Lord's Prayer for his clergy. It is, despite the suspicions raised by Hammerling, almost certainly an authentic production of the poet. It draws on a broad tradition of interpretation of the Lord's

Prayer, but it is put together in such a way as to obscure any one source. Yet it departs from the tradition of Lord's Prayer sermons by embarking upon a polemical defense of an Augustinian conception of grace and free will. This is unexpected, and its implications for the theology of Fortunatus will be the subject of the next chapter.

Chapter 4

The EOD *of Venantius Fortunatus and the Semi-Pelagian Dispute*

4.0 *Introduction*

Fleshing out the figure of Fortunatus the theologian will provide a clearer window on to the post-Roman world of the late sixth century. The poet's position on the semi-Pelagian dispute provides an important bridge in the history of the controversy over grace and free will in the Gallic church from the Council of Orange in the early sixth century to the Gottschalk controversy in the middle of the ninth.[458] Fortunatus' position on the dispute has the potential to provide insight not only into the intermediate period between the two most public eruptions of this dispute in the Gallic church, but also into the actual meaning of Orange itself. What was the nature of the settlement of Orange: was it a compromise between anti-Augustinians and pro-Augustinians that managed to lay down a detailed doctrine, or was it a base line that permitted a broad range of belief?

Furthermore, given the ambiguous relationship that much of the Gallic church had with Augustine's doctrines on grace and free will, this dispute provides a good window on to the nature of Gallic identity in the sixth century. It will be necessary in this chapter to provide a broader context for the discussion of the range of approaches in the Gallic churches, so the Roman church's approach to the question of grace and free will shall also be examined. Its distinctive character will be made clear, shedding light on the peculiarities of the situation in the Gallic churches. In addition to Fortunatus, other texts from this period emanating from

[458] The term "semi-Pelagianism" originated in the sixteenth century as a term to describe the fifth- and sixth-century dispute over grace and free will. Although anachronistic, it remains a well-established and useful term provided it is properly defined. For its origins, see I. Backus and A. Goudriaan, "'Semipelagianism': The Origins of the Term and its Passage into the History of Heresy," in *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 65.1 (2014), 25-46.

(and to) Gaul will also be examined. Fortunatus' stridency on the question of grace and free will is an interesting note amidst late sixth-century religious and cultural texts. He offers insights into the late sixth-century Gallic church's thinking about theology.

What is the significance of Fortunatus' insistence upon the absolute necessity of God's grace for the human will even after baptism? What does it say about him personally—about his theological training in Italy and Gaul, his perspective on Gallic theological propensities and his personal identity as someone who was not native to Gaul? More broadly, what does his perspective say about the situation in Gaul regarding Augustinian doctrine at the end of the sixth century? How widespread was the perspective against which Fortunatus inveighed in his *EOD*? Was there a uniquely 'Gallic' perspective on grace and free will, and if so, how did Fortunatus' position on it reflect his integration within his adopted society?

This chapter will endeavour to suggest answers to these questions. First, the origins and background of what are commonly known as the Pelagian and semi-Pelagian controversies will be outlined (4.1). Second, the state of the debate in sixth-century Gaul will be examined more closely, with a special focus on assessing the impact of the Second Council of Orange (529) and its mastermind, Caesarius of Arles (4.2). Third, Fortunatus' own position will be assessed against the background already sketched, and conclusions drawn on what light may be shed upon the state of Augustinian theology in Gaul (4.3). Lastly, an appendix will explore the precise nature of the position of the Roman church during the semi-Pelagian controversy.

4.1 *The Pelagian and Semi-Pelagian Controversies in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries*

Pelagianism is a term used to describe a Christian rigorist movement that emerged at the beginning of the fifth century.[459] Its namesake, Pelagius, was an ascetic teacher who, along with his disciple Caelestius, emphasized the freedom of the human will to follow God's commands and thus achieve salvation. Pelagius' conception of grace focused on the continuing strength of the human will as originally created, only tangentially affected by Adam's fall, and the divinely revealed Scriptures as a means of removing human ignorance and enabling the human will to obey God. Robert Evans enumerated the facets of Pelagius' doctrine of grace:

> "Grace" means to Pelagius the following: (1) that original endowment with rational will by which men have the capacity to be without sin; (2) the law of Moses; (3) the forgiveness of sins in virtue of the redeeming death of Christ; (4) the example of Christ; (5) the teaching of Christ, conceived both as "law" and more generally as teaching concerning the things proper to man's nature and salvation.[460]

Another important aspect of Pelagianism involved the insistence that Adam's primordial sin only affected himself, although giving his progeny a bad example which they followed. Habit, rather than innate tendency, solidified the human tendency to commit sins. Other facets of Pelagianism (though not necessarily held by Pelagius himself) involved the claim that the rich were unable to achieve salvation unless they gave all their riches away, the necessity of dedicated Scripture reading and a particular emphasis on the Last Judgment and Hell.[461]

---

[459] See Peter Brown, "Pelagius and his Supporters: Aims and Environment," in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. 19.1 (1968), 93-114. Brown notes: "The stream of perfectionism which, in a Jerome, a Paulinus, an Augustine, had flowered in a concentrated jet, will be widened, by Pelagius and his followers, into a flood, into whose icy puritanism they would immerse the whole Christian community" (Brown, "Pelagius and his Supporters," 103). For more on this movement, see the summary of Michael Herren and Shirley Brown, *Christ in Celtic Christianity* (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 2002), 70-76.
[460] Robert Evans, *Pelagius: Inquiries and Reappraisals* (New York: The Seabury Press, 1968), 111.
[461] Evans, *Pelagius*, 60-61, 76. For the emphasis on hell, see Evans' list of sources on p. 61 n. 137.

Pelagianism was ferociously opposed by Augustine and Jerome, and eventually condemned both by the emperor Honorius and the Council of Ephesus (431). Augustine's writings in opposition to Pelagius resulted in yet more controversy over grace and free will, however. In his letter to Sixtus (written in 418, at the end of the Pelagian controversy), Augustine lays out his full case against Pelagianism. In it, he insists that God's decision to give grace to some, with no preceding merits of their own inducing his action, but not to others, who are left hardened in their lack of faith, is not unjust. He writes:

> Quaerimus enim meritum obdurationis et invenimus. Merito namque peccati universa massa damnata est nec obdurat Deus impertiendo malitiam, sed non impertiendo misericordiam. Quibus enim non impertitur, nec digni sunt nec merentur ac potius, ut non impertiatur, hoc digni sunt hoc merentur. Quaerimus autem meritum misericordiae nec invenimus, quia nullum est, ne gratia evacuetur, si non gratis donatur, sed meritis redditur.[462]

Such a view was troubling to many, particularly monks. The letter to Sixtus caused a great deal of concern in 427 in a monastery at Hadrumetum in North Africa. The monks who read this letter questioned its assertions, in part because, as Rebecca Weaver notes, "The assumptions on which their very existence was based had been challenged. In brief, Augustine's insistence on grace as undercutting any pretensions to merit called into question the monks' striving to grow into perfection, to achieve union with God."[463] The objections of the church in Africa were stilled by Augustine himself, whose authority in Africa by the end of his life was utterly unchallengeable. But the writings he produced in response to the objections of the monks of Hadrumetum, especially *De correptione et gratia*, stirred up

---

[462] Augustine, *Epistulae*, ed. A. Goldbacher, 194.14. "For we seek out the justice of the hardening and we find it. For rightly was the whole lump of sin condemned, nor does God harden it by imparting malice to it, but by not imparting compassion. For those to whom it is not imparted, they are neither worthy nor are they meritorious; nay rather, they deserve and merit that it should not be imparted. But we seek out the reason for compassion and do not find it, since there is none, so that grace should not be made void. This would happen if it were not given freely but bestowed on the basis of merit."

[463] Rebecca Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency: A Study of the Semi-Pelagian Controversy* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1996), 8.

controversy in places where Augustine's authority was not quite so overwhelming, like southern Gaul, where his teaching was already under suspicion.

Around the same time as the controversy at Hadrumetum (427), Prosper of Aquitaine, a Gallic layman, had cause to write a letter to his friend Rufinus defending Augustine against charges of fatalism and Manicheanism.[464] Shortly thereafter, *De correptione et gratia* began to circulate in southern Gaul; in response to the new flare-up of anti-Augustinian criticism, Prosper and his colleague Hilary wrote to Augustine asking him to clarify matters. In 429, Augustine responded to their letters with one more work in two sections, the *De praedestinatione sanctorum* and the *De dono perseverentiae,* staking out in his boldest terms his doctrine of the absolute necessity of God's grace for salvation and its utter gratuity. Augustine and his southern Gallic opponents agreed that: "All have sinned in Adam; grace is essential for salvation; baptism is the necessary rite for regeneration."[465] Where they disagreed, however, was on the issues of the role of human merit and the extent of God's offer of salvation.

Augustine had insisted in his two last works that not only was grace given without regard to someone's prior personal merits, but also that the decision to give grace to some but not to others was God's own hidden, but just, decision. Moreover, this unmerited grace was necessary not only before baptism, in order to attain the sacrament, but also after baptism, in order to persevere in righteousness until the end.[466] The human will was unable, even after baptism, to will the good.[467] Moreover, the invitation to salvation was only extended to those

[464] Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency*, 42. The *Epistola ad Rufinum* of Prosper of Aquitaine is to be found in PL 51.77-90.
[465] Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency*, 45.
[466] This pertained to both the baptism of infants and the baptism of adults.
[467] Augustine, *De dono perseverentiae* 13.33. "Cum enim non sit in nostra potestate cor nostrum, sed divino sublevetur auxilio, ut ascendat, et quae sursum sunt sapiat, ubi Christus est in dextra Dei sedens, non quae super

whom God chose in His hidden wisdom, not to all humanity. Many clergy in southern Gaul objected strongly to these ideas throughout the course of the fifth and early sixth centuries. Two spokesmen for their point of view were John Cassian and Faustus of Riez. These two men are useful representatives because their writings on the subject caused further controversy.

John Cassian (c. 360-435) was a monastic leader, educated in the Levant and Egypt, whose influence on the Christian monastic communities in southern Gaul was great.[468] His response to Augustine's doctrine of grace and free will is found in his *Collationes*, or "Conferences."[469] This series of twenty-four conversations explored the contemplative life, touching on such themes as the necessity of moderation in one's asceticism, the achievement of internal holiness and, most importantly for the present discussion, the role of grace in the monastic vocation. John Cassian's position on grace has been much discussed.[470] Suffice it to say here that Cassian did not put forward a systematic account of grace and free will, instead weaving his doctrine throughout the discussions contained in the *Collationes*. In the first twelve conferences, Cassian insisted upon the necessity of grace in order for the human will—even the monastic one—to do good. The Thirteenth Conference, almost certainly a response to Augustinian teaching then circulating in southern Gaul—although probably not to the *De Correptione et Gratia* specifically—changes the tone slightly, and the very real differences between Cassian and Augustine's respective doctrines of grace become clearer. For Cassian, the human will at any time *could* desire the good. God's grace, ever necessary,

---

terram: cui de hac tanta re agendae sunt gratiae, nisi hoc facienti Domino Deo nostro, qui nos per tale beneficium liberando de profundo huius mundi, elegit, et praedestinavit ante constitutionem mundi?"

[468] A good overview of Cassian is by Columba Stewart, *Cassian the Monk* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

[469] See esp. on this subject the treatment of Boniface Ramsey, "John Cassian and Augustine," in *Grace for Grace: The Debates after Augustine and Pelagius*, ed. A. Hwang et al. (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2014), 114-130.

[470] For a list of relevant secondary material, see Ramsey, "John Cassian and Augustine," 115 n. 2.

sometimes preceded and sometimes responded to that desire. Grace was tailored to each individual case.

On a superficial reading, Cassian can seem very close to Augustine, especially in the first twelve conferences; yet his essentially monastic context, and general theological framework, is very different. As Weaver points out:

> What Augustine located at the moment of transition, i.e., delight in the good, Cassian located at the end of a long and arduous process, i.e., true delight in, undiluted love for, God. For the former, love for God, which was the gift of the Holy Spirit, was the precondition of the Christian life. For the latter, love for God, which was the attainment of disciplined struggle, was the culmination of the monastic life.[471]

So they differed; and this difference was in part determined, as Weaver also points out, by their respective social locations. Augustine was concerned, as a bishop and spiritual leader of thousands of laity, to explain how an ordinary person could attain salvation. Cassian was less concerned with this, being the leader of a monastery where an atmosphere of asceticism and spiritual discipline was cultivated to enable the pursuit of holiness by people who had devoted their lives to it, untramelled by worldly cares.

Cassian's views were shared by the greater part of the clergy of southern Gaul, influenced as they were by monastic teaching. Hilary of Arles and Gennadius of Marseilles were two prominent examples of skeptics of Augustinian predestination. Cassian finished his *Conferences* probably around 429 and died in 435. From there, the conversation, while scattershot, nonetheless became more heated. The main proponent of Augustine's doctrine of predestination, Prosper of Aquitaine, will be discussed in more depth below; for now, the course of the dispute during latter half of the fifth century will be discussed from the perspective of the opponents of Augustine.

[471] Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency*, 115.

That the general opinion of the Gallic church agreed with Cassian is demonstrated by the council which gave rise to Faustus of Riez's work *De gratia*. A cleric by the name of Lucidus around 470 aroused controversy concerning his support of Augustine's doctrine of predestination.[472] Faustus wrote him a letter demanding his adherence to a series of anathemas, as follows:

> 1) Anathema ergo illi, qui inter reliquias Pelagii inpietates hominem sine peccato nasci et per solum laborem posse salvari damnanda praesumptione contenderit et qui eum sine gratia dei liberari posse crediderit. 2) Item anathema illi, qui hominem cum fideli confessione solemniter baptizatum et adserentem catholicam fidem et postmodum per diversa mundi huius oblectamenta et temptamenta prolapsum in Adam et originale peccatum perisse adseruerit. 3) Item anathema illi, qui per dei praesciantiam hominem deprimi in mortem dixerit. 4) Item anathema illi, qui dixerit illum, qui periit, non accepisse, ut salvus esse posset. 5) Item anathema illi, qui dixerit, quod vas in contumeliam non possit adsurgere, ut sit vas in honorem. 6) Item anathema illi, qui dixerit, quod Christus non pro omnibus mortuus sit nec omnes homines salvos esse velit.[473]

[472] On Lucidus and his views, see Ralph Mathisen, *Ecclesiastical Factionalism and Religious Controversy in Fifth-Century Gaul* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1989), 245-246, 253, 255-256, 259-260; Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency*, pp. 163-164; Thomas A. Smith, *De Gratia: Faustus of Riez's treatise on Grace and its Place in the History of Theology* (Notre Dame, 1990), 56-58; Matthew J. Pereira, "Augustine, Pelagius and the Southern Gallic Tradition," in *Grace for Grace: The Debates after Augustine and Pelagius*, ed. A. Hwang et al. (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2014), 182-183. Mathisen suggests that Lucidus need not have been guilty of all the heresies imputed to him by Faustus (Mathisen, *Ecclesiastical Factionalism*, 265; see also Pereira, "Augustine, Pelagius and the Southern Gallic Tradition," 183 n. 8), but that such anathemas had at least partially a ritualistic function to affirm orthodoxy. Marianne Djuth, on the other hand, argues that there was a 'radical' predestinarianism at work in Lucidus' theological circles, at odds with both Faustus and Augustine (Marianne Djuth, "Faustus of Riez: *Initium bonae voluntatis*," in *Augustinian Studies*, vol. 21 (1990), 37-40).

[473] Faustus of Riez, "Epistula I," in *Fausti Reiensis Praeter Sermones Pseudo-Eusebianos Opera*, ed. A. Engelbrecht, CSEL XXI (Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1891), 162: "1) Therefore anathema to him who with condemnable presumption argues among other impieties of Pelagius that man is born without sin and is able through work alone to be saved and who believes that he is able to be freed without the grace of God. 2) Again anathema to him who asserts that a man baptized solemnly with a faithful confession and asserting the catholic faith, but afterwards through diverse obstacles and temptations of this world falls away, has perished in Adam and original sin. 3) Again anathema to him who says that a man falls into death through the foreknowledge of God. 4) Again anathema to him who says that the man who perishes was not able to receive that he might be saved. 5) Again anathema to him who says that a vessel for reproach is not able to rise to be a vessel for honour. 6) Again anathema to him who says that Christ did not die for all nor does he wish for all to be saved."

The gist of these anathemas may be summed up in Faustus' opening admonition to Lucidus that: "Loquentes ergo de gratia Dei et oboedientia hominis id omnimodo statuere debemus, ut neque proni in sinistram neque inportuni in dexteram regia magis gradiamur via."[474]

It seems that Lucidus declined at first to accede to Faustus' request.[475] Faustus then took the opportunity provided by the annual conference of bishops at Arles in 473 to put additional pressure on Lucidus, who eventually signed a slightly revised version of the first letter's anathemas.[476] Revised and duly signed by Lucidus, the anathematized teachings ran as follows: 1) That the effort of human obedience is not joined with God's grace; 2) That after the fall of the first human being the freedom of the will was wholly extinguished; 3) That Christ did not die for the salvation of all; 4) That God's foreknowledge forcibly compels those who perish to perish, and thus it is by his will that they perish; 5) That those who perish after receiving baptism die in Adam [i.e., are damned because of original sin]; 6) That some are appointed for death, other predestined to life; 7) That no one out of the Gentiles from Adam to Christ was saved by the primal grace [i.e., initial created free will], since the freedom of the will had perished at the fall; 8) That the saints of the Old Testament dwelt in paradise before the time of redemption; 9) That hell does not exist.[477] To this was added a

[474] Faustus, "Epistula I," 161. "When speaking of the grace of God and human obedience we ought to stand firm in every way, so that we proceed neither inclined to the left nor heedless to the right, rather following the royal way."
[475] Mathisen, *Ecclesiastical Factionalism*, 253-256.
[476] Smith, *De gratia*, 58.
[477] Faustus of Riez, "Epistula II," in *Fausti Reiensis Praeter Sermones Pseudo-Eusebianos Opera*, ed. A. Engelbrecht, CSEL XXI (Vienna, 1891), 165-166. While formally from Lucidus, the letter was almost certainly written by Faustus and put in front of him to affix his signature to (Mathisen, *Ecclesiastical Factionalism*, 260; Pereira, "Augustine, Pelagius and the Southern Gallic Tradition," 183). The anathemas runs as follows: "Proinde iuxta praedicandi recentia statua concilii damno vobiscum sensum illum, 1) qui dicit laborem humanae oboedientiae divinae gratiae non esse iungendum, 2) qui dicit post primi homnis lapsum ex toto arbitrium voluntatis extinctum, 3) qui dicit, quod Christus dominus et salvator noster mortem non pro omnium salute susceperit, 4) qui dicit, quod praescientia dei hominem violenter conpellat ad mortem vel quod dei pereant voluntate, qui pereunt, 5) qui dicit, quod post acceptum legitime baptismum in Adam moriatur, quicumque deliquerit, 6) qui dicit alios deputatos ad mortem, alios ad vitam praedestinatos, 7) qui dicit ab Adam usque ad Christum nullos ex gentibus per primam dei gratiam, id est per legem naturae in adventum Christi fuisse

number of broader explanatory statements. These anathemas, while not spelling out a concrete doctrine of grace, nonetheless through their denials spelled out what was in fact orthodox doctrine. Austere Augustinianism was condemned, as was Pelagianism of any variety. What is interesting is that the anathemas to which Lucidus eventually put his name were if anything even harsher in their denunciations of Augustinian doctrine than were the ones in the first letter, and ignored Pelagianism altogether. Of course, some of the teachings denounced in both letters, such as the forcible damnation of the reprobate, had no part in mainstream Augustinian teaching. To a certain extent these may have reflected an extreme faction of Augustinians who went beyond their teacher, and not just a caricature deployed for rhetorical effect.

The Council of Arles in 473, having duly achieved the submission of Lucidus and the condemnation of predestination, was followed by a council at Lyons a short time later, treating the same subject. Faustus of Riez wrote a text summarizing the theological conclusions of these two councils, addressed to Leontius of Arles, who had presided over the first council.[478] This document, called the *De gratia*, expresses the majority and official view of the southern Gallic church at the end of the fifth century.[479]

The *De gratia* is a systematic exposition on the relationship between grace and free will. In this it differs from the *Conferences*, which exposed themselves to critique from

---

salvatos eo, quod liberum arbitrium ex omnibus in primo parente perdiderint, 8) qui dicit patriarchas ac prophetas vel summos quosque sanctorum etiam ante redemptionis tempora in paradisi habitatione deguisse, 9) qui dicit ignes et inferna non esse. Haec omnia quasi impia et sacrilegiis repleta condemno."

[478] Smith, *De Gratia*, 66.

[479] Mathisen, *Ecclesiastical Factionalism*, 261-262; Smith concludes: "The treatise *De gratia*, therefore, represents Faustus' theological exposition of two episcopal synods' deliberations. Despite any idiosyncrasies that the word may possess, it is essentially the portrait of what one must regard as the mainstream, centrist doctrine of grace in southern Gaul in the latter fifth century. To examine its argument, its sources, and its theological affirmations is therefore to learn in its historical particularity the nature of Gallic Christianity at this time" (Smith, *De Gratia*, 59). For the reception of the *De gratia* in later eras, see Pereira, "Augustine, Faustus and the Southern Gallic Tradition," 199-206.

Prosper of Aquitaine due to their unsystematic nature. Faustus begins by refuting Pelagian doctrine, affirming original sin and the necessity of grace for salvation. However, this only makes up the first two chapters of the first book (out of two books). Faustus does this to set up his key rhetorical ploy, placing Pelagianism at one extreme and Augustinian predestinarianism at the other, with the "correct" view in between the two extremes.[480] He writes:

> Quorum unus, id est solius gratiae praedicator prima quidem fronte venenum suum sub specie pietatis occultat, alter, id est laboris assertor protinus extantem tumorem inproba elatione manifestat...Sed quia velut temerarii remiges sine magistro inexplorato mari vela conmittunt ac temperare moderamina nesciunt et gubernacula tractare non norunt, hic tamquam in Scyllae male dextrum fertur periculum, ille in laevum Charybdis tendit abruptum. Et quid eos inter haec facere oporteat...medium teneant cursum et ambo flatu dextro perducentur ad portum.[481]

The correct view thus integrates grace and free will in such a way as to do justice to both of them. Once Pelagianism is dealt with in a brief section of two chapters, Augustinian doctrine is explored in detail in the remainder. Faustus deals carefully with the exegetical arguments of his Augustinian opponents; as opposed to Cassian, whose treatment of the subject is fairly haphazard and in a narrative style, Faustus deploys his rhetorical education to good effect. Faustus' arguments have been explored by other scholars quite well.[482] Suffice it to say here

---

[480] For Faustus' treatment of Augustine personally, see Pereira, "Augustine, Faustus and the Southern Gallic Tradition," 188-192, 196.

[481] Faustus of Riez, "De gratia," in *Fausti Reiensis Praeter Sermones Pseudo-Eusebianos Opera*, ed. A. Engelbrecht, CSEL XXI (Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1891), 1.1, 7-8. "The one side, that is the preacher of grace alone, on the face of it hides his poison under the appearance of piety; the other, that is the proclaimer without pause of work, shows forth towering bombast with an insolent exultation...but since just as heedless oarsmen, without a leader, set sail to an unexplored sea and do not know how to set their helm and place their steering oar, behold the former teaching is like Scylla, a grave danger bearing to their right, while the latter draws towards the sheer-faced left side—Charybdis! And since it is fitting for them to go between these two sides...let them entrust their ship to the waves with a far-seeing pilot, let them hold to the middle way and with a fair wind they shall both be brought to harbour."

[482] The classic treatment of Faustus' *De gratia* is Thomas A. Smith, *De gratia*. See also Marianne Djuth, "Faustus of Riez: Initium Bonae Voluntatis," 35-53, Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency*, 165-180, and lastly Pereira, "Augustine, Pelagius and the Southern Gallic Tradition," 180-207. Djuth links Faustus' theology most closely with that of Pelagius, while Smith and Pereira believe his synthesis is further towards the Augustinian end of the spectrum than otherwise. Weaver is more ambiguous.

that Faustus argued for the greater power of the human will to choose to do good works and thus be saved.

The main point of interest is that while Faustus presents a detailed and vigorous series of arguments against predestination and the removal of the freedom of the will, he does seem to affirm, or at least only tentatively object to, elements of Augustine's notion of grace.[483] Smith concludes:

> Faustus' treatise, in its attempt to balance and synthesize the deepest concerns of both orientations [i.e., Cassian's ascetic tradition and Augustinianism], should not be seen as an example of resistance to Augustine's thought so much as a moment in the ongoing reception of Augustinianism into the mainstream of the western Church...The *De gratia* represents a point on the continuum of this century-long process of absorbing Augustinian sensibilities about grace and free will.[484]

This process came to its fruition with the somewhat moderated Augustinianism of the Council of Orange.

4.2 *The Semi-Pelagian Controversy in Sixth-Century Gaul*

The run-up to the Council of Orange in 529 shows the tensions present in the Gallic church over this issue. The view of Faustus of Riez on the subject of the freedom of the will had strong, although not unanimous, support among the Gallic clergy of at least Southern Gaul up until the early sixth century. This is demonstrated by the reaction to Caesarius of Arles' austerely Augustinian treatise on grace and free will, the *De gratia*. In 528 a council was called at Valence by Julianus of Vienne, in part for reasons of more practical ecclesiastical politics, but also to condemn the views contained in Caesarius of Arles' *De gratia*.[485] The

---

[483] Smith, *De Gratia*, 224-225.
[484] Smith, *De Gratia*, 232-233.
[485] See Mathisen, "Caesarius of Arles, Prevenient Grace, and the Second Council of Orange," in *Grace for Grace: The Debates After Augustine and Pelagius*, ed. A. Hwang, B. Matz and A. Casiday (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2014), 210-211; 229, and Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency*, 226-227.

Council of Valence's decisions are not preserved, but based on the partisan account of Cyprian of Toulon in the *Vita Caesarii* and based also on the responses of the Roman bishops (Benedict in particular) to Caesarius' pleas for support, it seems that the old Gallic orthodoxy expressed by Faustus was reasserted and Caesarius' predestinarian opinions condemned.[486] Caesarius' swift response of calling the Council of Orange in 529, not perhaps as wholly successful as sometimes portrayed, reflects the continuing power of this orthodoxy. Anti-predestinarian influence continued after the Council of Orange, as will be seen.

This anti-Augustinian traditional view, represented by Faustus and Julianus, was not without its dissenters in Gaul as a whole, and was increasingly out of step with the more rigorous Augustinianism of Rome and Africa. The course of the increasing strength of Augustinianism in Gaul begins with Prosper of Aquitaine before the middle of the fifth century, whose personal journey illustrates the convoluted manner in which the Bishop of Hippo's doctrine of free will was adapted to Gallic theological sensibilities. It is generally held that Prosper, initially an enthusiastic promoter of Augustine's most austere arguments about predestination, gradually shifted his views as they encountered opposition.[487] From

[486] Mathisen, "Caesarius of Arles," 210-211. Mathisen suggest that Caesarius may even have been "ritually deposed from office."

[487] There is a great deal of secondary literature on Prosper of Aquitaine, in which two main perspectives are represented. The first, and most common, is to emphasize the essential discontinuity between Prosper's early views and late views. The most comprehensive recent take on his theological development takes this line: Alexander Y. Hwang, *Intrepid Lover of Perfect Grace: The Life and Thought of Prosper of Aquitaine* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2009). Hwang's thesis is as follows: "Prosper concluded that Augustine's doctrine of grace was not the catholic teaching on grace, which he identified with the Roman Church," and, "Prosper had come to the full realization that the 'perfect grace' for which he had long labored to understand and defend was defined and expressed by the Roman Church (Hwang, *Intrepid Lover of Perfect Grace*, 236, 238)." This latter view of grace of Prosper's held to the position that those who were not saved were deprived of God's gift of grace due to His foreknowledge that they would fall, not on any hidden decree. This view is reiterated by Hwang in his essay "*Pauci Perfectae Gratiae Intrepidi Amatores*: The Augustinians in Marseilles," in *Grace for Grace*, ed. Hwang et al. (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2014), 31-50, esp. 48-49. Weaver's view is similar, and distinguishes three stages in Prosper's wrestling with Augustinian doctrine, beginning with a period of strict adherence and ending with a modification to predestination as stated, as well as an emphasis upon the universal salvific will for salvation (Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency*, 152-153). Weaver differs from Hwang in that she explains Prosper's modifications more as a result of intellectual wrestling with the paradoxes of predestination (not

insisting upon the utter gratuity of grace and the limitation of God's saving call to the elect alone, Prosper moved to viewing God's decision to withold grace from some as being based on his foreknowledge of their future sinful lives, not upon his hidden will, and to the idea that the call to salvation was universal. What is of chief interest to the present argument is Prosper's modification of Augustinian predestination to one that weakened the gratuity of the gift of grace. For Prosper, those who did not receive the gift of grace to choose salvation did not, as just indicated, because God foresaw their wickedness. This modification was not adopted by Caesarius of Arles.[488]

After Prosper but before Caesarius of Arles there is one interesting person in the Gallic reception of Augustinian doctrine that bears mentioning, leaving aside the question of the existence of the *praedestinati* group challenged by Faustus of Riez and Vincent of Lérins.[489] Augustinian doctrine on grace steadily increased in support among Gallic clergy, even if this might have remained a minority position. One name in particular stands out, not only because of his writings but because of the way in which his Augustinianism manifested

---

wholly successful) than by an increased appreciation for Rome-centred ecclesiology. The ur-text for this consideration of Prosper is the article by Dom M. Cappuyns, "Le premier representant de l'augustinisme médiéval, Prosper d'Aquitaine," in *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, vol. 1 (1929), 309-337. The second perspective emphasizes the continuities between Prosper's early and late views, considering the changes less as a serious modification of actual belief than a deeper understanding of Augustine's own thought and a more careful following of the bishop of Hippo's advice for preaching predestination. The main representatives of this view are, first, Rudolf Lorenz, "Der Augustinismus Prospers von Aquitanien," in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, vol. 73 (1962), 217-252, and second, Thomas L. Humphries, "Prosper's Pneumatology: The Development of an Augustinian," in *Grace for Grace*, ed. A. Hwang et al. (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2014), 97-113. While Lorenz's arguments have been essentially ignored, and thus presumably dismissed, Weaver, in her introduction to *Grace for Grace*, suggests that Humphries' view of Prosper going deeper into Augustine's pneumatology rather than distancing himself from Augustine's doctrine of grace is not necessarily at odds with the majority view expressed by Hwang (Rebecca Weaver, "Introduction," in *Grace for Grace*, ed. A. Hwang et al. (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2014), xxi-xxii). For the time being, the majority view will be taken for the purposes of our argument; but the arguments by Lorenz and Humphries are strong, and deserve more consideration than they have received.

[488] Although it was adopted by the author of a text contemporary to Prosper, the *Hypomnesticon*; see J.E. Chisholm, *The Pseudo-Augustinian Hypomnesticon against the Pelagians and Celestians*, 2 vols. (Fribourg: The University Press, 1967-1980).

[489] For the question of the *praedestinati*, see Smith, *De Gratia*, 51-55; and Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency*, 158-165, esp. 164. Both affirm the existence of such a group.

itself. Avitus of Vienne lived at the end of the fifth and beginning of the sixth century, dying around 517-18. He was bishop of Vienne by 496 or so, and remained in that post until his death. His engagement with Augustinian doctrine on grace and free will can be traced in two of his surviving works: *De spiritalis historiae gestis*, an epic poem on Genesis, and *De subitanea paenitentia*, a letter written to King Gundobad of Burgundy.

The *De spiritalis historiae gestis*, as Daniel Nodes has shown, endorses throughout Augustine's doctrine of unmerited grace and the complete dependence of the human will's goodness upon that grace.[490] The radical effect of Adam's fall on the human will of his progeny is insisted upon. The second text, the *De subitanea paenitentia*, was written in response to Gundobad's query to Avitus about the views of Faustus of Riez on penitence. In this letter, Avitus insists upon the primacy of grace over human action. Avitus writes:

> Apud sensum spiritus sancti promissiones sequentem principius est boni operis integre credidisse: si tamen, ut apostolus ait, "ipse spiritus testimonium reddat spiritui nostro:" non, ut super audistis assertum, quasi creatura nobis, sed quasi creator, infusus, auctor et testis est nostri spiritus, non natura.[491]

The Holy Spirit is the author and instigator of true faith, according to Avitus. Predestination is not in question here, but rather the external nature of grace, mediated through the Holy Spirit, granted without reliance upon fallen human nature. Thus Avitus is firmly, if a little vaguely, Augustinian.[492]

---

[490] Daniel Nodes, "Avitus of Vienne's Spiritual History and the Semipelagian Controversy: The Doctrinal Implications of Books I-III," in *Vigiliae Christianae*, vol. 38, no. 2 (1984), 185-195.

[491] Avitus of Vienne, *Epistola ad Gundobadum regem de subitanea paenitentia*, ed. R. Peiper, MGH *Auctores Antiquissimi* 6.2 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1883), 32. "In the mind of the Holy Spirit who follows our promises, it is the beginning of good action to have believed whole-heartedly: if, however, as the Apostle says, 'the Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit,' it does not do so, as you have heard claimed above, as a created thing for us, but as a creator: it is the author and witness of our spirit and is poured into us; it is not [part of our] nature" (D. Shanzer and I. Wood, tr., "Epistula 4: Letter to King Gundobad on sudden penitence," in *Avitus of Vienne: Letters and Selected Prose*, 200).

[492] See Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency*, 181, n. 110, for a good summary of the literature on Avitus of Vienne's views on grace and free will.

Thus Augustinianism had by the Council of Orange in 529 some support in the Gallic church. The organizer of the council, Caesarius of Arles, is the most important figure in Gallic Augustinianism in the sixth century. Indeed, as Weaver puts it:

> A bishop who brought the authority of an ecclesiastical council to bear on the resolution of the [semi-Pelagian] debate, an educator who was ever-diligent that his flock be informed in Christian faith and morals yet was at the same time somewhat suspicious of the classical heritage, an effective activist who was responsive to the needs of a society crumbling about him, a monk who was trained at Lérins but also profoundly influenced by Augustinianism—Caesarius was all of these. As a result, his work was revelatory not only of the character of the church in the early sixth century in South Gaul but also of the dynamics of the last stage of the Semi-Pelagian debate.[493]

Roughly contemporaneous to Avitus of Vienne, although slightly outliving him, Caesarius was bishop of Arles from 502 through to his death in 542.[494] Educated at the monastic centre of Lérins, centre of the traditional Gallic anti-predestinarian orthodoxy of grace and free will, Caesarius later came under the influence of Julianus Pomerius, an immigrant from North Africa (imbued with the staunch Augustinianism of that region). He became an advocate of Augustinian views on grace and free will. His sermons have been carefully studied by Weaver, who has concluded that they display a modified doctrine of predestination, in which God's grace is unmerited and absolute before baptism, but the freedom of the human will is partially restored by baptism. Thus, it is incumbent upon Christians to labour, with the cooperation of God's grace, to do good works once enabled by baptism in order to achieve salvation.[495]

[493] Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency*, 199.
[494] For Caesarius' life in general, see Klingshirn, *Caesarius of Arles: The Making of a Christian Community in Late Antique Gaul*.
[495] Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency*, 212-225.

Caesarius' sermons' theology of grace and free will is coloured by their audience context, which may distort the theological emphasis.[496] It is the dogmatic works that may be ascribed to his pen, that is, the *De gratia* and the decrees of the Council of Orange, which state most clearly his views on grace and free will. The *De gratia* is a short text entitled in the manuscript tradition, "Quid domnus Caesarius senserit contra eos qui dicunt: Quare aliis det Deus gratiam, aliis non det."[497] In this work, Caesarius defends unconditional election to salvation by God's grace. He does so mostly through a long series of rhetorical questions, drawn in large part from Augustine's *De praedestinatione* and *De dono perseverentiae*. The following excerpt illustrates the style and content of the text:

> Tu ergo, qui dicis, "Quare uni datur gratia, et alii non datur?" Rogo te, ut mihi respondeas, si iam pro illis qui salvantur quantum dignum est egisti deo gratias, ut de his qui remanere videntur eum iudicare praesumas. Cum enim, si pro te solo totus mundus deo gratias ageret, vicem misericordiae divinae repensare non possit, quare non magis ad referendas deo gratias humiliter inclinaris, quam ad repraehendendam misericordiam vel iustitiam eius arroganter eregeris? Et cum tot milia hominum videas per universum mundum dei gratia liberari, quare post tam inmensa beneficia, quae deus nullis praecedentibus meritis tribuit, magis praesumis eum redarguere quam laudare; cum etiam si iam egisses gratias pro tantis qui salvantur, deum tamen repraehendere non deberes? [498]

[496] Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency*, 224, notes: "One may conjecture that as Augustine had discouraged preaching of the overpowering character of sovereign grace and had encouraged moral exhortation, Caesarius was giving practical expression to the African bishop's advice." She opts for more originality on Caesarius' part, but the role of Augustine's advice needs to be taken into careful consideration when looking at sermons on grace and free will.

[497] Caesarius of Arles, "Ad sequens opusculum de gratia," in *Sancti Caesarii Arelatensis Opera Varia*, ed. G. Morin (Maretioli, 1942), 159-164. "What the Lord Caesarius reasoned against those who say, 'Why does God give grace to some, but not to others?'"

[498] Caesarius of Arles, "Opusculum de gratia," 160, l. 3-14. "You who say: 'Why is grace given to one, but not to another,' I ask you to answer me whether you have already given thanks to God for those who are saved in whatever number he has deigned to save, when you presume to judge him on account of these who are seen to remain [in their depraved state]. For since, if for you alone all the world gave thanks to God, it would not be possible to repay the turn of divine compassion, why do you not rather humbly bow to return thanks to God instead of rising up to arrogantly reprove his compassion or justice? And since you see so many thousands of human beings made free by the grace of God throughout the entire world, why, after so massive a blessing, which God gave without any merits going before it, do you instead presume to question him rather than praise him? And so, if now you have given thanks for so many who are saved, should you not refrain from reproaching God?"

Caesarius goes on to cite several biblical examples of God's selective grace, such as his call of Abraham in Genesis and his call of Lydia in Acts; he also cites a significant number of texts that refer to God's giving grace to some but not to others. All this is to make one point: it is beyond human comprehension, or indeed beyond human authority, to question God's choice of whether or not and where to bestow His grace.

Thus Caesarius, in his *De gratia*, insists upon the most stringent form of unconditional election to salvation. This view differs from Prosper's final opinion, in that it preserves the unconditionality of God's choice *not* to give salvific grace to some. While Prosper ended up concluding that God chose not to grant salvific grace to some because He foresaw that they would sin, Caesarius quite explicitly rejects this. He writes:

> Dicis forte: "Deus quidem vult omnes ut credant in eo, sed non toti volunt." Quare? Quia non possunt sine gratia eius. Et hoc loco te interrogo, utrum plus valeat voluntas humana contradicere voluntati divinae, an plus possit dei potentia converetere ad se voluntates humanas. Si hoc negare praesumpseris, clamat tibi psalmista: "Deus autem noster in caelo sursum, in caelo et super terram omnia quaecumque voluit fecit;" et apostolus: "Voluntati," inquid, "eius quis resistit?" Si omnia quaecumque voluit fecit, quod non fecit, utique non voluit: occulto quidem et alto, sed tamen iusto iudicio inconpraehensibili.[499]

God's grace is irresistible, so the human will alone cannot factor into its bestowal. This is a clear repudiation of Prosper (if Caesarius had him in mind, which is unknowable). The influence on Caesarius of African theology (via Julianus Pomerius) probably explains the difference. What this emphasizes, however, is the episodic and disconnected nature of the semi-Pelagian controversy; individuals, fairly widely spaced in time, came to quite different conclusions about Augustinianism.

---

[499] Caesarius of Arles, "Opusculum de gratia," 162 l. 12-22. "Perhaps you say: 'Indeed God wills that all men should believe in him, but not all are willing.' Why? Because they do not possess the ability without his grace. And in this place I ask you whether the human will is more able to deny the divine will, or whether the power of God is more able to turn human wills to itself. If you presumed to deny this, the Psalmist cries out to you: 'But our God is in heaven above, he made all things in heaven and upon the earth howsoever he willed;" and the Apostle: "Who resists his will?' he says. If he made all things howsoever he willed, what he did not make he doubtless did not will: in secret, certainly, and on high; but with a just, incomprehensible judgment."

If this were all we had regarding Caesarius' views of grace and free will, it would be easy to conclude that he agreed fully with Augustine's two final works on grace. The sermons complicate this picture, of course. Moreover, the *De gratia* is only one of the two main dogmatic texts coming from Caesarius' pen. The second is the group of writings produced at the Council of Orange, which complicates the picture further. There, among some other parts (i.e., the canons and a florilegia of patristic texts) not written by him, Caesarius wrote an introduction, a *definitio fidei* and a preface to Pope Boniface's letter of confirmation.

These original texts present a view of grace and free will that is considerably less austere, and more mediating, than the tone and content of the *De gratia* would suggest. In essence, Caesarius, in concert with the emphasis of his sermons on the same subject, affirms the unconditional election of Christians to baptism, but asserts that baptism restores a measure of free will. Caesarius writes in the *Definitio fidei*: "Hoc etiam secundum fidem catholicam credimus, quod post acceptam per baptismum gratiam omnis baptiszati Christo auxiliante et cooperante, quae ad salute animae pertinent, possint et debeant, si fideliter laborare voluerint, adimplere."[500] So while election to baptism may be utterly unconditional, election to salvation is dependent at least in part upon the human will, albeit in close co-operation with Christ's grace.

How to reconcile the views of the *De gratia* and the *Definitio fidei* of Orange? Weaver suggests that there is no actual contradiction:

> The argument of the *De gratia* readily coheres with the scheme that we have already found in the sermons and, in fact, strengthens that scheme with regard to the gratuity

[500] "Concilium Arausicanum a. 529," in *Concilia Galliae*, CCSL 148A, ed. C. de Clercq (Turnhout: Brepols, 1963), 63. "This also we believe in accordance with the catholic faith, that after having received grace through baptism all the baptized are able and ought, with Christ helping and cooperating, to do the things which pertain to the salvation of the soul, if they wish to work faithfully."

> of the intial gift of grace, a matter that had received far less attention in the sermons than had the issue of human accountability following baptism. As the sermons had effectively, although not explicitly, disallowed predestination to glory, or an unfailing gift of perseverance, the *De gratia*, by its silence on the matter, provided no occasion for a reconsideration of the issue.[501]

Thus her proposed scheme of Caesarius' doctrine of predestination, namely predestination to baptism but not predestination to glory, neatly explains the *De gratia* as well as the sermons and the Council of Orange. This makes some sense, although the unremitting focus of the *De gratia* on the utter gratuity of grace tends to muddle this conclusion. Moreover, despite Weaver's claim that, "in the *De gratia* Caesarius did not speak of predestination," Caesarius does in fact mention it, as part of a citation from the book of Acts: "Et quare praedicantibus Paulo et Barnaba, ut illi tantum 'crederent, qui praedestinati erant ad vitam aeternam.'"[502] It is interesting to note that in this passage predestination to glory certainly seems to be plainly stated, not just predestination to baptism. Weaver argues that another passage of Caesarius' points as well to a denial of predestination to glory.

Caesarius writes:

> Qui confitetur se per dei gratiam accepisse quod habet, additur ei; qui autem de meritis suis et de naturae bono praesumit, etiam quod videtur habere auferetur ab eo, et efficietur illi pharisaeo similis, qui pro eo quod de suis meritis gloriatus est, scriptum est de illo: "Qui se exaltat humiliabitur."[503]

Weaver suggests that this demonstrates Caesarius believes that grace after baptism is granted as a reward for the merit of humility.[504] However this warning is also present in the African

---

[501] Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency*, 226.
[502] Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency*, 225; Caesarius of Arles, "Opusculum de gratia," ed. Morin, 161 l. 25-26; "Why at the preaching of Paul and Barnabas only those ones 'believed who had been predestined for eternal life?'" Quotation from Acts 13.48.
[503] Caesarius of Arles, "Opusculum de gratia," ed. Morin, 164 l. 3-7. "He who confesses that what he has he received through the grace of God, it will be added to him; but he who presumes on his own merits and on the goodness of his own nature, even what he seems to have will be taken away from him, and it shall be done to him like unto the Pharisee of whom, because he boasted of his own merits, it was written: 'He who exalts himself shall be cast down.'"
[504] Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency*, 225-226, n. 131.

author Fulgentius of Ruspe, the austerity of whose Augustinianism is not in doubt.[505] The pastoral context may perhaps explain the admonition better than any particular theological conclusion. This is an important point, because Venantius Fortunatus uses this statement from Caesarius almost verbatim, even using the same citation, and seems to affirm a predestination to glory. So the question remains: how to reconcile the *De gratia* and the Council of Orange? Weaver's conclusion still makes considerable sense, but it is also possible that Caesarius held a more austere view of grace than that of the Council of Orange, but decided to respond to his opponents at Valence with a statement expressing what he considered to be the baseline orthodoxy on grace and free will.[506]

As Ralph Mathisen has recently pointed out, Caesarius' effort to exonerate himself from the charges of the Council of Valence in 528 by holding the impromptu Council of Orange in 529 does not seem to have had the impact he might have desired.[507] Caesarius, Mathisen argues, lost considerable political capital in Gaul itself by his tactics at the Council:

> Caesarius' support among his own partisans was waning: the number of supporters who subscribed to his provincial councils dropped from seventeen at Arles in 524 to

[505] Fulgentius of Ruspe, *De veritate praedestinationis et gratiae*, ed. J. Fraipont, CCSL 91A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1968), 1.47, 489. "Hac autem accipit lumen, ut hoc ipsum quod Deum cognoscit et diligit, non ex possibilitate naturae, nec ex auditu legis, nec ex sua voluntate, sed ex Dei dono sibi inesse non ambigat; semperque humilis esse meminerit, ne superbus amittat quod cum esset indignus accepit." "But by mercy, one receives light so that he may not doubt that the very fact that he knows and loves God derives not from the capacity of nature, or from hearing the law, or from his own will, but from God's gift. And he will always remember to be humble, lest he lose through pride what he received when he was unworthy" (R.R. McGregor and D. Fairbairn, tr., "The Truth about Predestination and Grace," in *Fulgentius and the Scythian Monks: Correspondence on Christology and Grace* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2013), 159).

[506] See Mathisen's suggested interpretation of the council, in Mathisen, "Caesarius of Arles," 218-219, 230-233. Concerning the Council's condemnation of double predestination in the *Definitio fidei*, which reads: "Aliquos vero ad malum divina potestate praedistinatus esse non solum non credimus, sed etiam, si sunt, qui tantum mali credere velint, cum omni detestatione illis anathimam dicimus;" "Indeed, not only do we not believe that some have been predestined by divine power to wickedness, but if there are those who wish to believe such a great evil we also say anathema to them with all loathing," Mathisen writes: "Was the explicit condemnation of predestination to evil a blind intended to obfuscate Caesarius's support for predestination to salvation, which surely would have marked him as a heretic in Gaul? If Caesarius was as devoted to Augustine as many believe, this may well have been the case (Mathisen, "Caesarius of Arles," 219). Quote from "Concilium Arausicanum a. 529," in *Concilia Galliae*, ed. C. de Clercq, 62.

[507] Mathisen, "Caesarius of Arles," 208-234.

> eleven at Vaison, just after Orange, in 529, where it must have been exceptionally embarrassing that Alethius, the bishop of Vaison itself, declined to subscribe.[508]

Caesarius' clout was reduced still further when the Franks conquered southern Gaul in 536. The Second Council of Orange was promulgated by a man who rapidly thereafter lost influence. It is thus unlikely that Orange's teaching on grace was viewed as uniquely authoritative in Gaul in the centuries immediately following.

After Caesarius of Arles and the Council of Orange, there is a dearth of official material on the subject of grace and free will until the Gottschalk controversy in the ninth century.[509] However, that is not to say that the issue was ignored by clergy during the rest of the sixth, seventh and eighth centuries. The seventh and eighth centuries will not be addressed in the present study, which instead will focus on the rest of the sixth. Taking centre stage is the *EOD* of Venantius Fortunatus.

4.3 *Venantius Fortunatus on the Freedom of the Will in the* EOD

As noted in the previous chapter, Fortunatus' *EOD* is remarkably thorough in its investigation of the variety of exegetical possibilities for each phrase of the Lord's Prayer.[510] Nevertheless, Fortunatus' uniquely broad focus is still only an expansion on prior traditional commentary; what is most relevant for the present purposes of the chapter is his remarkably

---

[508] Mathisen, "Caesarius of Arles," 228.

[509] For this controversy, see Brian J. Matz, "Augustine, the Carolingians, and Double Predestination," in *Grace for Grace*, ed. A. Hwang et al. (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2014), 235-270; D. Ganz, "The Debate on Predestination," in *Charles the Bald: Court and Kingdom*, ed. M.T. Gibson and J.L. Nelson (Aldershot: Variorum, 1990), 283-302; Jeremy C. Thompson, "God's Own Dwelling Place: Oppositions of Nature in the Ninth-Century Predestination Debate," in *Eriugena and Creation*, ed. W. Otten and M. Allen (Turnhout: Brepols, 2014), 85-104; and Diana Stanciu, "Double Predestination, Augustinian Tradition and Carolingian Ecclesiastical Politics: the debate on double predestination in the southern realm and its conclusion," in *Revue d'histoire ecclesiastique*, vol. 110.3-4 (July-Dec. 2015), 619-661. Stanciu argues that the debate remained essentially deadlocked, with Gottschalk having both prominent defenders and prominent opponents, and that the official decision was to enforce a peace that left the rival positions in place in the same church. This interpretation of the conclusion of the Gottschalk controversy matches the suggested interpretation of the Council of Orange above.

[510] 3.4, 152-153.

extensive excursus on grace and free will under the phrase, *Fiat voluntas tua sicut in caelo et in terra* (§§ 30-45). The existence of this excursus in such an incongruous setting raises many questions about audience and the poet's own intent in preaching such a sermon. Answers to these questions will be put forward below, but first it is necessary to carefully outline what the poet said on the subject and which sources he used.

The commentary on the phrase, *Fiat voluntas tua sicut in caelo et in terra*, has its fair share of standard exegesis. It begins by making a standard comment explaining that "may your will be done on earth" does not mean that God's will needs help being done, but rather that it is a request that, "in nobis inpleatur eius voluntas."[511] The following several paragraphs also follow the themes of Cyprian fairly closely (§§ 30-32). However, § 33 begins a new thought:

> Ideoque orandum est ut, si perire nolumus, ipsius voluntas operetur in nobis iuxta apostolum dicentem: "qui in vobis operatur et velle et operari pro bona voluntate;" sicut alibi Dominus noster locutus est: "Non vos me, sed ego elegi vos."[512]

This introduces Fortunatus' argument that a *bona voluntas*, or as he also puts it, a *voluntatem ad Christum*, "a will inclined towards Christ," is only possessed by human beings due to God's gift. Philippians 2.13 and John 15.16 are both standard scriptural texts in anti-Pelagian

[511] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.30. "His will might be fulfilled inside us." This is standard exegesis that originates in Cyprian: "Oramus et petimus ut fiat in nobis voluntas Dei;" "We pray and ask that the will of God might be done in us" (Cyprian, *De dominica oratione*, 14).

[512] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.33. "One also ought to pray for this reason: that, if we do not wish to die, his will might work within us according to the apostolic saying: 'he who works in you both desires and works for the sake of his good will;' just as in another place our Lord said: 'you did not choose me, but I chose you.'" The scriptural citations are, respectively, from Philippians 2.13 and John 15.16. The final sentence of this paragraph, not quoted above, is confusing: *alioquin homo Christum inveni*, which might be rendered: 'nevertheless, O man, I found Christ,' or perhaps: 'But I, a human being, found Christ,' or in another meaning: 'Otherwise I, a man, found Christ.' Manuscript transmission error may be to blame, and Leo suggests that the whole phrase should be struck as inauthentic, but there is also the possibility, suggested by Reydellet, that it is a gloss (Leo, 225; Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 3, 49 n. 30). Roberts translates it as: "Otherwise I, a man, have discovered Christ," making it fit more seamlessly into Fortunatus' argument (Roberts, tr., *Poems: Venantius Fortunatus* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2017), 623). However, he notes, "This sentence is oddly obtrusive." If Reydellet is correct, then this may give a fascinating insight into how at least one later reader of Fortunatus' works reacted to his sermon on the Lord's Prayer—he may have been displeased with the austere Augustinianism, assuming Roberts' rendering is incorrect.

disputation.[513] Fortunatus in this paragraph focuses on the necessity of God's grace for salvation as a whole, and neatly shifts the focus from the need to pray for God's will to work within oneself to the action of divine election.

The next paragraph (§ 34) focuses on the example of the Apostle Paul, whose conversion was an important example in Augustinian thought of the necessity of God's grace for salvation: "Beatus Paulus voluntatem habebat ad Christum, re vera cuius per ecclesias populum devastabat?"[514] He goes on to argue that Christ's power over Paul's will was evident in the manner in which Paul was converted, that is through physical blindness, "Ut ei spiritales oculos aperiret; de quo dixit: "ego illi ostendam quanta eum pro me pati oporteat.""[515] He concludes the thought at the beginning of the next paragraph: "Unde et ipsam bonam voluntatem pietas Christi contulit, non fragilitas humana possedit."[516] This concrete example of the importance of divine grace in granting a *bona voluntas* played a major role in arguments surrounding this issue.[517] In particular, it holds a prominent place in the interaction between Prosper of Aquitaine and John Cassian.

As mentioned above, Prosper of Aquitaine's *Contra collatorem* seems to be an important source for this particular section of Fortunatus' sermon. In *Collationes* 13.11.1, Cassian uses the conversions of Paul and Matthew the tax collector as examples of God's grace proactively transforming man's will, and Zaccheus the tax collector and the thief on the

[513] E.g., in Prosper of Aquitaine's *Contra Collatorem* he quotes Phillippian 2.13 three times (3.1, 4.2, 18.3). Two of these three have the same wording as Fortunatus' version. Compare also the mid-sixth-century anti-semi-Pelagian text *Ad Monimum* by the African bishop Fulgentius of Ruspe, where he cites Philippians 2.13 twice (*Ad Monimum* 1.9.2, 1.14.4), albeit with a different wording than Fortunatus uses.
[514] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.34. "Did the blessed Paul have a will inclined to Christ, when in fact he was the one who was destroying his people in all the churches?"
[515] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.34. "So that he might open to him spiritual eyes; concerning which he said, 'I shall show him how much he ought to endure for my sake.'"
[516] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.35. "And so the love of Christ also bestowed that same goodness of will; human frailty did not possess that ability."
[517] E.g., Augustine, *Grace and Free Will*, 5.12.

cross as examples of man's will not needing God's grace. Prosper argued that all four examples of conversion occurred as a result of God's grace:

> Qui ergo illuxit in corde Matthaei publicani et Pauli tunc Ecclesiam persequentis, ipse et in corde Zacchaei, et in corde crucifixi cum Domino latronis illuxit: nisi forte otiosa Domini vox fuit, cum Zacchaeum, qui quaerebat videre Iesum quis esset, compellare dignatus est dicens: "Zacchaea, festina, descende; quoniam hodie in domo tua oportet me manere;" et non sibi praeparavit eius animum, cuius elegit hospitium...Et ne lateret causa huius salutis, adiecit: "Venit autem filius hominis quaerere et salvum facere quod perierat:" ut quem agnoscebamus salvum factum, sciremus a quaerente praeventum...Instruat nos beatus Apostolus, et dicat: "Nemo in Spiritu Dei loquens, dicit anathema Iesu; et nemo potest dicere Dominum Iesum, nisi in Spiritu sancto." Ut non dubitemus in eiusdem hominis voluntate, et de proprio fuisse quod blasphemavit, et de Spiritu sancto fuisse quod credidit."[518]

Prosper tries to resolve the apparent diversity that Cassian points out among the four cases by appealing to the context and to other statements made by Christ and Paul. This method is followed in part by Fortunatus later on. The immediate point to be made, however, is that Fortunatus' example of the apostle Paul's conversion at the start of his discourse on grace and free will (§ 34) is in line with Augustinian tradition as a whole.

So far, Fortunatus has used the conversion of the apostle Paul to show how Christ's power is necessary to turn the human will towards God. The focus is at first on external inducements, namely Paul's blindness after his encounter with the risen Christ on the Damascus Road, but then closes on a note emphasizing the internal nature of Christ's grace.

---

[518] Prosper of Aquitaine, *Contra Collatorem*, 7.3, PL 51.231-232. "He, then, who illumined the heart of Matthew when a publican, and of Paul when he was persecuting the Church, is the same who sent light into the hearts of Zacchaeus and the thief crucified with the Lord. Unless, perhaps, [you say that] the words of the Lord were ineffective when He deigned to address Zacchaeus, who 'sought to see Jesus, who He was,' and said: 'Zacchaeus, make haste and come down; for this day I must abide in your house;' and that He did not prepare his soul for His coming when He chose the hospitality of his house...And so as not to leave hidden what was the cause of his salvation, He added: 'For the Son of Man is come to seek and to save that which was lost.' Thus, while learning that Zacchaeus was saved, we also come to know for certain that he had first been sourght out by the Saviour...Let St. Paul tell us: 'No man speaking by the Spirit of God saith anathema to Jesus. And no man can say the Lord Jesus but by the Holy Ghost.' We should have no doubt, therefore, that in the free behavior of one and the same man, his former blasphemies sprang from his own nature and his faith from the Holy Spirit" (P. de Letter, tr., "Against Cassian," in *Prosper of Aquitaine: Defense of St. Augustine* (Westminster, MD: The Newman Press, 1963), 87-88).

Fortunatus uses Paul as an example firstly of humanity's frailty of will, then secondly of Christ's action of grace which bestows a *bona voluntas* upon him.

The next paragraph (§ 35) introduces another example and a further development of the idea of the necessity of grace in bestowing a good will. In this case, Fortunatus argues that Christ's prayer in Gethsemane demonstrates the truth of the claim that a *bona voluntas* is due to God alone. He writes:

> Audiamus ipsum Dominum Iesum Christum in infirmitate carnis positum quid dixerit: "Pater si possibile est, transeat a me calix iste. Verum tamen non sicut ego volo, sed sicut tu." Filius Dei dicit: "verum non quod ego volo, sed sicut tu, Pater;" et homo quare tam superbus sit ut voluntatem sibi ex se esse dicat ad bonum et non potius Dei munus esse testetur?[519]

In this case, Fortunatus is arguing from the greater to the lesser: if the incarnate Christ acknowledges his need for the grace of God to provide him with the power to carry out God's command, how much more do lesser men need it. Fortunatus is careful to say that it is Christ in the flesh who requests that the will of God should work within him. This harks back to earlier paragraphs (§§ 31-32) of the commentary under the phrase, *Fiat voluntas tua sicut in caelo et in terra*, where Fortunatus holds Christ's life up as a form of divine revelation that leaves humanity no excuse for not knowing God's will. The poet writes:

> Si vero quaeritur quae sit Dei voluntas, habes decem praecepta...habes Dei filium qui patris voluntatem sciens quae erant abscondita reseravit...Nam qui de caelo descendit ad terras, quid aliud suae voluntatis esse vult credi, nisi salva redemptione nos debere caritatis et humilitatis ornamenta sectari quoniam et ipse hoc dignatus est facere ex caritate nimia, humilitate sincera?[520]

---

[519] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.35. "Let us hear what our Lord Jesus Christ himself said when he was placed in the infirmity of the flesh: 'O Father, if it is possible, may that cup pass from me. Nevertheless, not what I will, but what you will. The Son of God says: 'but not what I will, but rather what you yourself will, O Father;' and so why is man so proud that he claims that his own will is inclined to goodness through himself and does not bear witness that this inclination to goodness is rather the gift of God?"

[520] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.31-32. "Now if you ask what the will of God is, you have ten commandments...you have the Son of God who, knowing the will of the Father, laid bare that which had been hidden...As for the one who came down from heaven to earth, what else is there pertaining to his will that he wishes to be believed, if not that we ought to follow after the ornaments of charity and humility apart from our redemption, since he also deigned to do this out of his exceedingly great charity and sincere humility?"

Thus Christ's life should be emulated, especially in this case his dependence upon God's grace to give him a *bona voluntas*, or in this case what he calls a *voluntas ad bonum*.

The next paragraph (§ 36) further bolsters the argument by appealing to the wording of the Lord's Prayer. Fortunatus states: "Quid si bona voluntas ex homine est sine Dei inspiratione, dicat ergo christianus in oratione: fiat voluntas mea, quoniam bona est. Sed absit ut hoc aliquis confiteri praesumat."[521] Fortunatus uses the authority of the wording of the Lord's Prayer to argue that its opposite, not "may *your* will be done" but "may *my* will be done," is positively blasphemous. A *bona voluntas* arising from the human will alone would necessitate a re-wording of the Lord's Prayer. He then states what he considers to be the true implication of the wording, *Fiat voluntas tua*: "Immo magis deprecetur ut fiat voluntas Dei in homine, non hominis voluntas, quae bonum velle non habet nisi Dominus inspiret iuxta illud: 'Deus meus, misericordia eius praeveniet me.'"[522] This acts as a bridge to another point about the nature of the inherent feebleness of the human will and the necessity of God's grace to incline it to goodness. However, at this point a difficulty emerges that merits some discussion.

Fortunatus finally writes at the end of § 36: "Ergo non hominis voluntas praevenit Deum, sed Dei misericordia praevenit hominem, non voluntatem, quoniam sicut scriptum est 'Deus est qui iustificat impium'; item: 'spiritus ubi vult spirat.'"[523] The difficulty emerges in the words *non voluntatem* coming after *Dei misericordia praevenit hominem* in Reydellet's

[521] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.36. "Now if a good will is due to the man without the inspiration of God, then let the Christian say in prayer: 'may *my* will be done, since it is good.' But far be it from us that anyone should presume to pray this."
[522] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.36. "Let him pray that the will of God might be done within the man, not that the human will might be done, which does not have the ability to desire goodness unless the Lord inspires it according to that saying, 'My God, his compassion will come before me.'"
[523] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.36. "Therefore man's will does not anticipate God, but rather God's compassion anticipates man, not the will, since as it was written: 'It is God who justifies the impious;' and also: 'The Spirit breathes where it will.'"

edition. What is Fortunatus saying here? The logic of the paragraph seems to indicate that the poet's argument is exclusively to insist upon the point made by the verse quoted just before, namely, *Deus meus, misericordia eius praeveniet me*. In other words, Fortunatus seems to be concerned with making the argument for the necessity of the *prevenience* of God's grace.[524]

Yet the words *non voluntatem* are confusing. To whose will do they refer? God's will? The human will? If the *voluntas* being negated is God's, then Fortunatus is saying that God does not replace man's will with his own but rather changes it and leaves it intact. This would be Reydellet's argument: "Je comprends que Fortunat veut dire que Dieu s'empare de l'homme et non pas seulement de sa volonté, ce qui aboutirait, en somme, à ce que le moteur de l'action soit la volonté de l'homme inspirée par Dieu."[525] This nuance to Fortunatus' doctrine of the prevenience of the grace of God is standard Augustinian fare.[526] However, it fits poorly within the logic of the paragraph. Especially since the word *quoniam* immediately follows *non voluntatem*: the *quoniam* leads a clause interested only in affirming the prevenience of God's grace, not in affirming the continued importance of the human will.

There is a possibility of a manuscript error, which leads Leo to suggest *hominem bona voluntate* in place of *hominem non voluntatem*.[527] This would give a meaning rather different from Reydellet's assertion, focusing instead on God's gift of an externally-sourced good will: "God's compassion comes before man by means of a good will." Interestingly, it seems earlier copyists had trouble with this phrase as well. Two Carolingian copyists of this passage (whose reading was adopted by Brouwer) adjusted *voluntatem* to *volentem*, which suggests a mere clarification of *hominem*: *hominem non volentem*, or "God's compassion comes before

[524] For *misericordia* used in the same way as *gratia*, see Th.L.L. 8.8.1126.12-62.
[525] Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 3, 185 n. 35. "I read Fortunatus as wanting to say that God gets hold of the man and not simply of his will, which would lead, in brief, to the mover of the action being the will of man inspired by God."
[526] Augustine, *De dono perseverentiae*, 6.12.
[527] Leo, 225.

an unwilling man."[528] This would certainly make the text smoother, but is a reading found in only two manuscripts. Michael Roberts solves the problem by eliminating the wording altogether. He writes: "I have omitted *non voluntatem*. It is difficult in wording and sense and its elimination secures a perfectly balanced antithesis."[529] This makes good sense, but lacks manuscript support. Whatever the truth of the matter, the sense remains the same: man's will cannot incline towards God unless God first inspires it to do so.

Having dealt with the textual difficulty of *non voluntatem*, a theological concept now needs to be pointed out. As was noted earlier in this chapter, the question of the importance of God's grace after baptism may have been deliberately left unsettled at this point in the Gallic church's history.[530] The "semi-Augustinian" settlement of the council of Orange left unsaid whether or not the human will was sufficient, with only the cooperation of God's grace, to achieve salvation after baptism.[531] In other words, while a "predestination to baptism" was affirmed, a "predestination to glory [i.e., final salvation]" may have been implicitly discouraged, or at the least not insisted upon. Whether this was in fact the case will be explored in further detail below. Setting aside that question for now, however, it seems that Fortunatus is placing a heavy emphasis upon the necessity (and sufficiency) of God's grace *after* baptism. Fortunatus writes: "Quod si bona voluntas ex homine est sine Dei inspiratione, dicat ergo christianus in oratione: fiat voluntas mea, quoniam bona est. Sed absit ut hoc aliquis confiteri praesumat."[532] While other parts of the passage might be argued to point to the *bona voluntas* before baptism—especially the quotation of Romans 4.5, *Deus est*

[528] Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. III, 50 (app.), 185 n. 35; Leo, 225. The texts are two ninth-century ones: *A* and *G*.
[529] Michael Roberts, *Poems: Venantius Fortunatus*, 882.
[530] 4.2, 174-176.
[531] See on this subject the conclusions of Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency*, 237-239.
[532] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.36. "Now if a good will is due to a man without the inspiration of God, then let the Christian say in prayer: 'may *my* will be done, since it is good.' But far be it from us that anyone should presume to pray this."

qui iustificat impium—this section clearly seems to indicate that the *bona voluntas* in question is the Christian's after baptism. Fortunatus seems to insist that the human will *in general*, even after baptism, "bonum velle non habet nisi Dominus inspiret."[533] This points to a view similar to Augustine's most stringent interpretation of grace and free will, one which was not entirely accepted in Gaul at this time.

The next paragraph (§ 37) reinforces this point. Fortunatus embarks upon an admonition:

> Igitur quare non unusquisque recognoscit tenebras suas, ne inluminatus tamquam lampas, quae aliunde succenditur, per ventositatem suae superbiae extinguatur et subducto splendore maneat in caecitatis caligine, dum, si quid bonum velle habet, sui esse putet arbitrii et non exinde gratias referat conlatori, ne audiat quod dicitur: "qui autem non habet et quod habet auferetur ab eo?" Hoc est: quod per gratiam praevenitur; nisi Deo illud adscripserit, per superbiam hoc amittet, quoniam iuxta scripturam ipsa voluntas a Domino praeparatur.[534]

The metaphor of a torch is used to make two points: first, that the *bona voluntas* is totally dependent upon God's power; second, that it can be lost through pride. The image of the torch may be interpreted as follows: the torch is the human will, which cannot be lit without an external spark, which is God's grace. Human pride is like a breath of air that extinguishes the torch once the spark is withdrawn. The structure of the metaphor should not be over-read, but perhaps this supports the first proposed interpretation of the strange *non voluntatem* addition to § 36. Fortunatus insists that the human will remains intact, and is just transformed by God's power, not replaced.

---

[533] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.36. "Does not have the ability to desire goodness unless the Lord inspires it."
[534] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.37. "Therefore why should each one of us not recognize his own darknesses lest, illuminated like a torch that is ignited from somewhere else, he is extinguished through the puffing-up of his own pride, and remains in the darkness of his blindness when the divine splendour is withdrawn. And shall this not surely happen so long as, if he wills anything good, he believes that willing to be of his own volition and does not on account of it give thanks to the bestower? May he not hear that which is said: 'But he who has not, even what he has shall be taken from him!' And so: Since [*quod* added by Roberts] he is preceded by grace, if he does not ascribe it to God [the good movement of the will], he will lose that through his pride, since according to the Scripture his own will is prepared by the Lord."

Total reliance of the human *bona voluntas* upon God is consistent with the points made before, but the new addition is the warning about losing the *bona voluntas* if one thinks it comes from oneself and not from God. This warning may seem to contradict the previous emphasis upon the priority of God's grace. From one perspective it is reminiscent of John Cassian's comments in the twelfth Conference of his *Collationes*, where in a discussion of chastity Abba Chaeremon says:

> Quisquis igitur extractus a cunctis confabulationibus otiosis et mortificatus ab omni ira ac sollicitudine curaque mundana duobus tantum paxamatiis fuerit cotidiana refectione contentus, et aquae satietate subtracta quietem somni trium sive ut alii statuerunt quattuor horarum spatio terminarit, nec tamen laborum aut continentiae huius merito, sed miseratione domini eam se crediderit adepturum, quia sine hac fide vana est omnis humani laboris intentio, non amplius quam sex mensibus perfectionem istius inpossibilem sibi non esse cognoscet.[535]

The danger of losing one's progress in virtue due to pride is fairly standard monastic fare. What is interesting is that Cassian seems to be a target of Fortunatus' polemic. Yet it should be noted that Cassian's understanding of grace before the famous thirteenth Conference did not sound all that dissimilar to Augustine, and Prosper of Aquitaine made it clear in his criticisms that he had no problems with Cassian's early comments on the subject.[536] Perhaps Fortunatus alludes to Cassian's comments on grace in order to strengthen his arguments with those who agreed with Cassian. Yet while the sentiment is similar, the wording is very different. A case where the wording is almost exactly similar may be found in a text written by a figure much more sympathetic to Fortunatus' general stand: Caesarius of Arles.

---

[535] John Cassian, *Collationes*, ed. M. Petschenig and G. Kreuz, CSEL 13, 2nd ed. (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2004), 12.15.2, 358. "Whoever, then, has withdrawn from every useless conversation; has put to death all anger and concern and worldly care; is satisfied with just two loaves for his daily meal; does not drink his fill of water; wakes up after four hours of sleep; yet does not believe that he will obtain it due to these efforts or this abstinence but rather by the mercy of the Lord, because without this belief every intense human effort is in vain—that person will know in not more than six months that perfection in this is not impossible for him" (B. Ramsey, tr., *John Cassian: Conferences* (New York, NY: Newman Press, 1998), 453).

[536] Prosper of Aqutaine, *Contra Collatorem*, 2.2; see also Boniface Ramsey, "John Cassian and Augustine," 114-130.

In his *De gratia,* Caesarius makes a case for an austerely Augustinian position on predestination (or at least predestination to baptism). In fact, it was possibly the circulation of this text which resulted in the controversy which Caesarius attempted to quell by calling the Council of Orange.[537] At the end of this short treatise, Caesarius writes:

> Quia iudicia dei, quae sunt inscrutabilia et inmensa, sicut saepe dictum est, plerumque sint occulta, numquam tamen iniusta. Et ideo iam se conpescat humana fragilitas; et quod videt deum posse, et tamen occulto sed iusto iudicio non facere, sicut iam supra dictum est, audiat sibi apostolum dicentem: "O homo, tu qui es qui respondeas Deo? Et contremescat ne in eo impleatur illud quod scriptum est: "Etiam quod videtur habere auferretur ab eo." Quid est quod dixit, "Qui habet dabitur ei?" Qui confitetur se per Dei gratiam accepisse quod habet, additur ei; qui autem de meritis suis et de naturae bono praesumit, etiam quod videtur habere auferetur ab eo, et efficietur illi pharisaeo similis, qui pro eo quod de suis meritis gloriatus est, scriptum est de illo: "Qui se exaltat humiliabitur."[538]

Caesarius is defending Augustinian predestination, arguing that God's decision not to grant grace to some is justified and does not cast doubt upon God's justice. This concluding passage contains the same Scriptural citation as Fortunatus, *et quod habet auferetur ab eo* (Matt. 13.12), a citation which does not appear in the standard Augustinian literature preceding these two writers.[539] The sentiment is the same—that those who think their *bona voluntas* comes from within rather than from without will lose it—and it is in the same doctrinal context, that is a dispute over grace and free will. It is quite plausible to suggest, based on these similarities, that Fortunatus had Caesarius' *De gratia* in mind when

[537] Mathisen, "Caesarius of Arles," 229.
[538] Caesarius of Arles, *Opusculum de Gratia*, ed. Morin, 164. "Although the judgments of God, which are inscrutable and lofty, as has often been said, have for the most part been hidden, they are nonetheless not at all unjust. And for this reason let human frailty now restrain itself; and since it sees that God has the ability and yet with a hidden but just judgment does not act, as it has already been said above, let it hear within itself the saying of the apostle: 'O man, who are you who answers back to God?' Let it tremble violently, lest there be fulfilled in it what was written: 'Even what he seems to have will be taken from him.' Why is it that he said: 'He who has, it will be given to him?' He who confesses that what he has he received through the grace of God, it will be added to him; but he who presumes on his own merits and on the goodness of his own nature, even what he seems to have will be taken away from him, and it shall be done to him like unto the Pharisee of whom, because he boasted of his own merits, it was written: 'He who exalts himself shall be cast down.'"
[539] Although note the similar sentiment in the passage from Fulgentius of Ruspe quoted above in 4.2, n. 510.

composing this section. One likely implication of this is that Fortunatus agreed with Caesarius' text and wished to transmit its message to a skeptical audience.

The next paragraph (§ 38) moves on from this admonition to an argument for the necessity of God's grace for the existence within a person of a *bona voluntas*. Fortunatus uses the authority of Christ to support his argument that any good deed comes from God's grace alone and not from the human will by itself. He cites a variant of John 8:44:

> Audiamus in hac parte doctorem ubi dixit: "Qui loquitur mendacium de suo loquitur." Quare non addidit et: "Qui loquitur veritatem de suo loquitur," nisi ut hoc exemplo, quando veritatem aliquis loquitur, de Dei gratia, non de suo habuisse hoc bonum specialiter agnoscatur, quoniam de nostro solum habemus mendacium?[540]

What Fortunatus is doing is similar to what he did in § 35, where he uses Christ's prayer in Gethsemane, "Not what I will, but what you will," to show the necessity of Christ's adopted brethren, that is all Christians, relying upon God's grace for their own *bona voluntas*. And as in § 36, where Fortunatus posits an obviously wrong statement to make his point—*Fiat voluntas mea, quoniam bona est*—so in this paragraph he asks why Christ did not also say, *Qui loquitur veritatem de suo loquitur*. Fortunatus answers, naturally, that it is because Christ wished to encourage Christians not to assume the power of their own will. This is quite a restrictive view of free will—no person can refrain from telling a lie unless God inspires their will to do so.

Fortunatus then makes a point like the one made in § 35, using the example of Christ, the perfect man, to argue that every human being is utterly dependent upon God's grace. He writes: "Nam cum ipsa veritas Deus sit qui loquitur de Deo, unde in homine mendace causa

[540] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.38. "Let us hear on this matter the Teacher when he said: 'He who speaks falsehood speaks from within himself.' Why does he not also add, 'He who speaks truth speaks from within himself,' unless he does not do so in order that, by means of this example, when anyone speaks the truth he might especially recognize that he obtained this good deed from the grace of God, not from within himself, since from within ourselves we have only deceit?"

veritatis sit, nisi ipsa veritas se ministret, hoc est, nisi in hominem ipsam bonam voluntatem Deus veritatis inspiret qui et velle tribuit et posse conplevit?"[541] This passage is a little obscure; the words *cum ipsa veritas Deus sit qui loquitur de Deo* might be interpreted to mean, "when that same Truth is the God who speaks about God." In this case, it would be a further reference to Christ's authority (*veritas* is a normal epithet of Christ) backing up the argument for the inability of the human will to do good.[542] However, *de Deo* may also be interpreted as, "from God," referring to the incarnate Christ's dependence upon God's grace. Fortunatus' following phrase seems to indicate that the latter interpretation makes the most sense. He asks the rhetorical question: *unde in homine mendace causa veritatis sit, nisi ipsa veritas se ministret*, thereby arguing from the greater to the lesser once again. If Christ speaks *de Deo*, so must ordinary human beings. This interpretation is made more likely by the fact that in the previous sentence a similar locution, *de nostro*, is interpreted quite obviously as, "from what is our own." Thus I conclude that Fortunatus argues his listeners should realize that, like the incarnate Christ, who is himself also God, they are dependent upon God for a *bona voluntas*.

Another point involves the peculiar wording of the citation of John 8.44 within § 38. The Vulgate for this passage runs as follows, referring to the Devil: "Cum loquitur mendacium, ex propriis loquitur, quia mendax est, et pater eius."[543] The version of the passage Fortunatus cites differs slightly, excising the reference to the Devil and making it

[541] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.38. "Since truth itself is God, who speaks from God, whence comes the cause of Truth in a deceitful humanity, unless the Truth itself administer itself, that is unless the God of Truth inspire *bona voluntas* in that very man, and both provided the will and completed the ability?"
[542] Roberts translates it in this sense: "For since it is God, the truth itself, who speaks about God..." (Roberts, *Poems*, 625).
[543] John 8.44 (Vulg.). "When he tells a lie he speaks from what is natural to him, since he is a liar and the father of lies."

about people in general: "Qui loquitur mendacium de suo loquitur."[544] What is the source for this quotation? A possible answer is Augustine. The bishop of Hippo used a version of the *Vetus Latina* which included the wording used by Fortunatus for John 8.44.[545] Fortunatus may have followed Augustine's citation of Scriptural texts rather than the version of the Bible he had available to him. A possible candidate for the Augustinian text serving as Fortunatus' source is the *Confessions*. The poet may have had access to this text through excerpts contained in a florilegium. In any case, the poet's text including his quotation of John 8.44 contains many echoes of *Confessions* 13.25, where Augustine addresses God, sayng: "Neque enim alio praeter te inspirante credo me verum dicere, cum tu sis veritas, omnis autem homo mendax. Et ideo qui loquitur mendacium, de suo loquitur. Ergo ut verum loquar, de tuo loquor."[546] If Fortunatus is thinking of this source when making the point about human moral weakness, it fits neatly in with his general emphasis upon Augustinian doctrinal authority.

The next four paragraphs (§§ 39-42) comprise a single argument, and so will be explored as a unit rather than separately. They are critical to discerning Fortunatus' aim in going on this polemical excursus on grace and free will. Fortunatus draws on Prosper of Aquitaine's *Contra Collatorem* to respond to what may be the ideological influence of John Cassian. First, the argument of Fortunatus himself will be explicated. Second, a comparison with Prosper of Aquitaine's own parallel argument will be made.

Fortunatus introduces a new objection to his argument that God's grace is entirely responsible for the existence of a *bona voluntas* in sinful humanity:

---

[544] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.38. "He who speaks falsehood speaks from what is his own."
[545] Hugh Houghton, *Augustine's Text of John: Patristic Citations and Latin Gospel Manuscripts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 268.
[546] Augustine, *Confessiones*, 13.25. "For with no one other than you inspiring me I believe that I speak the truth, since you are the truth, but every man a liar. And for this reason he who tells a lie speaks from himself. Therefore in order that I might speak the truth, I speak from you."

> Sed si quis obiciat quod apostolus ait: "Velle adiacet mihi," cum ipse dicit: "Deus qui in vobis operatur et velle et operari pro bona voluntate," ergo si quis dicat quia ipsam bonam voluntatem Deus non inspirat, quantum ad hanc intellegentiam, beatus apostolus, discrepat sentiendo diversa.[547]

The poet cites the Apostle Paul at Romans 7.18, *velle adiacet mihi*, anticipating that this passage will be used to refute his point. Rather than argue from its context that it does not contradict the *bona voluntas* being entirely reliant upon God's grace, Fortunatus instead juxtaposes another Pauline quote from Philippians 2.13: *Deus qui in vobis operatur et velle et operari pro bona voluntate*. He interprets this quote as supporting the idea that the *bona voluntas* of the individual person is a divine work ("pro bona voluntate" referring to the free choice of God to change the human will). So Fortunatus presents a conundrum to the reader: how can anyone say that the *bona voluntas* is not a work of God given that Paul himself says clearly that it is? Of course, then, Paul contradicts himself. How can this be? How can his two statements be reconciled? Fortunatus seems to avoid explaining precisely how they can be reconciled; instead, he tries to solve the problem through appealing to Paul's character and authority.

Faced with the problem of the apostle Paul apparently having conflicting opinions, the poet states: "Sed absit ut ille vir pacificus qui uno eodemque locatus est spiritu, in hic dictis ecclesiae generasset scandalum."[548] Fortunatus appeals to Paul's character: it is impossible for the apostle to contradict himself, since it would be out of character for him to do so and thereby create confusion. The audience is faced with a moral conundrum based on their

[547] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.39. "But if anyone should oppose this doctrine with that word of the apostle: 'To will lies within me,' when he himself says, 'It is God who works in you both the desire and the deed due to his favour,' therefore if anyone should say that God does not inspire that same good will, how much does the blessed apostle differ from this understanding!"
[548] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.39. "Far be it from us to think that the same peaceable man who was placed within one and the same spirit should have created a scandal with his words in the church."

preconceived notions of Paul's authority and moral probity. Fortunatus then continues this argument in the next paragraph (§ 40):

> Unde doctor gentium velle sibi adiacere dicebat, quoniam non solum inspiratus, sed etiam vas electionis fulgebat qui docuit dicens: "Deus est qui in vobis operatur et velle," deinde: "Quid habes quod non accepisti?" Ac si diceret: quid boni est in te, nisi det ille qui fecit te?[549]

Here he clarifies the conundrum: the apostle Paul was inspired, so how could he say something wrong? Fortunatus adds another proof text that shows the apostle supported the inability of the human will to achieve a *bona voluntas*: *Quid habes quod non acceptisti*? (1 Corinthians 4.7). Two texts are now juxtaposed against the one, thereby reinforcing the point made before that Paul in other places firmly rejects the idea that God's grace does not provide the entirety of the *bona voluntas* within a sinful human being.

The implications of Paul contradicting himself are then spelled out in the next paragraph (§ 41): "Nam si bonam voluntatem Deus non confert, sed ex te est quod tu habes, iste mentitus est."[550] Fortunatus then proceeds to insist on the importance of God's gift of a *bona voluntas*, challenging his audience: "Quid est quod habes quod non acceperis? Unde tolle Dei voluntatem; mox agnosco, si tu per te ad bonum habes aliquam voluntatem, cum nisi a Christo velut lucerna inlumineris, cotidie, nesciendo quid elegerit divina potestas, excedis."[551] This last comment is striking in its insistence upon the human will's total dependence upon God's power to do anything good. What Fortunatus seems to be doing to

[549] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.40. "Why did the Teacher of the Gentiles say that the ability to will lies within him, since not only was he inspired, but also shone out as a vessel of election who taught by saying: 'It is God who also moves the will in you;' and again, 'What do you have that you did not receive?' As if he was saying: what is there of good in you, if he who made you does not bestow it?"
[550] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.41. "For if God does not bestow a good will, but rather it is from out of yourself that you possess it, that apostle has lied."
[551] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.41. "What is there that you have not received? Take away the will of God from there—I shall soon perceive if you have through your own power any will for the good at all, since unless you are illuminated like a lamp by Christ you shall transgress daily through not knowing what the divine power has chosen."

counter the notion that the apostle Paul supports his opponents is to strengthen the case for a *bona voluntas* being the product of God's power alone rather than interpret the debated passage differently.

The next paragraph (§ 42) concludes the argument, reinforcing the impression that Fortunatus is addressing the discrepancy between the two Pauline quotes in an oblique manner. He ends by making an appeal to authority:

> Dicamus humiliter quia nihil boni velle habemus, nisi singulis diebus Domino largiente sumamus, iuxta quod legitur: "Omne datum bonum et omne donum perfectum desursum est," ut domni Pauli teneant dicta concordiam et nos omne bonum ad Dei referentes gratiam fidelem consequamur doctrinam. Nam qui cum apostolo Paulo, id est oculo ecclesiae, et cum beato Augustino eius sequace consonat, in eo ignorantiae caligo non regnat.[552]

Fortunatus begins here with a further admonition to his audience, linking the Augustinian doctrine to humility. Then, quoting a non-Pauline scripture, James 1.14—*omne datum bonum et omne donum perfectum desursum est*—he reinforces his overall point that Christian doctrine as a whole endorses the complete dependence of the *bona voluntas* upon God's power. He then addresses directly the discrepancy he originally posed between Paul's two statements. *Velle adiacet mihi* cannot contradict the rest of Paul's teaching or that of James, so the contradiction must be merely apparent.[553] He then concludes with an admonition that doubles down on his appeal to authority: "Nam qui cum apostolo Paulo...et cum beato Augustino eius sequace consonat, in eo ignorantiae caligo non regnat."[554] Rather than address

[552] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.42. "Let us say humbly that we are able to will nothing good unless we choose each and every day, by the generous giving of the Lord, in accordance with that which is read: 'Every good given thing and each perfect gift is from above,' so that the words of Paul the teacher are in agreement and that we, attributing every good thing to the grace of God, might follow a faithful doctrine. For he who is in accord with the apostle Paul, that is with the Eye of the Church, and with the blessed Augustine his follower, in him the darkness of ignorance does not reign."
[553] For examples of rhetorical strategies used in setting forth correct Scriptural interpretation, see Bailey, *Christianity's Quiet Success*, 64-66.
[554] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.42. "He who is in agreement with the apostle Paul...and with the blessed Augustine his follower, in him the darkness of ignorance does not reign."

the discrepancy through exegetical work, Fortunatus responds to it through an assertion of authority and a positive case for Paul's true doctrine being one which insists upon the absolute sufficiency of grace in granting a *bona voluntas* to a sinful human being.

It is probable that Fortunatus is drawing on Prosper of Aquitaine's *Contra Collatorem*. This work, responding around the year 432 to the publication of John Cassian's Thirteenth Conference, addresses Cassian's argument that the human will unaided could desire a *bona voluntas*.[555] In particular, Chapter 4.2 of the *Contra Collatorem* addresses the same passage that Fortunatus does: *velle adiacet mihi*. Cassian had argued:

> Ut autem evidentius clareat etiam per naturae bonum, quod beneficio creatoris indultum est, nonnumquam bonarum voluntatum prodire principia, quae tamen nisi a domino dirigantur ad consummationem virtutum pervenire non possunt, apostolus testis est dicens: "Velle enim adiacet mihi, perficere autem bonum non invenio."[556]

To this Prosper responds:

> Falso ergo secundum hanc definitionem ante dixisti, "Non solum actuum, verum etiam cogitationum bonarum ex Deo esse principium; qui et incipit quae bona sunt, et exsequitur, et consummat in nobis." Sed hoc nullo modo ex aliqua parte potest esse falsum: cui nequaquam inferri contraria debuerunt; ut quod recte professus es ex gratia incipere, id postea confirmares per naturae bonum et per liberum arbitrium nos habere. dixit quidem beatus Apostolus: "Velle enim adiacet mihi, perficere autem bonum non invenio." Sed idem dixit: "Non quia idonei simus cogitare aliquid a nobis quasi ex nobis ipsis, sed sufficientia nostra ex Deo est." Et idem dixit: "Deus est enim qui operatur in vobis et velle, et operari pro bona voluntate." Non ergo apostolus sibi contrarius est.
>
> Sed cum donatum nobis fuerit bonum velle, non statim invenimus et facere, nisi petentibus, quaerentibus, atque pulsantibus, qui dedit desiderium, praestet effectum. Vox namque ista dicentis: "Velle enim adiacet mihi, perficere autem bonum non invenio," vocati est, et iam sub gratia constituti: qui condelectatur quidem legi Dei secundum interiorem hominem, sed videt aliam legem in membris suis, repugnantem legi mentis suae, et captivantem se in lege peccati: et quamvis acceperit scientiam

[555] For the *Contra collatorem*, see the account of Hwang, *Intrepid Lover of Perfect Grace*, 156-167.
[556] John Cassian, *Collationes*, 13.9.5. (B. Ramsey, tr.) "So that it might be still more evident that out of a good nature, which has been bestowed by the kindness of the Creator, the beginnings of a good will sometimes spring up, although they cannot attain to the perfection of virtue unless they are guided by the Lord, here is the witness of the Apostle, who says: 'To will is present to me, but I find no way to perform the good.'"

> recte volendi, virtutem tamen in se non invenit ea quae optat operandi; donec pro bona voluntate quam sumpsit, mereatur virtutum facultatem invenire quam quaerit.[557]

Prosper responds to Cassian's use of Romans 7.18 by making an exegetical move. He argues that the passage has a different context than Cassian maintains. Like Fortunatus, he starts out by juxtaposing Paul's comment *velle adiacet mihi* with contrasting statements from other Pauline works. Prosper includes both 2 Corinthians 3.5 and Philippians 2.13 as opposing texts, while Fortunatus at first includes only Philippians 2.13, then adds 1 Corinthians 4.7 slightly later on.

The fact that both authors juxtapose Philippians 2.13 with Romans 7.18, however, points to Fortunatus' dependence upon Prosper. And Prosper's comment: *non ergo apostolus sibi contrarius est*, is parallel to Fortunatus' insistence: *Sed absit ut ille vir pacificus qui uno eodemque locatus est spiritu, in his dictis ecclesiae generasset scandalum*. While Fortunatus doesn't follow Prosper's wording, and expands on the apostle's integrity and authority, the sentiment is the same. However, Prosper then proceeds to carefully explain how Romans 7.18 doesn't in fact contradict the rest of Paul's writings. He argues that, *velle adiacet mihi*, is spoken from the perspective of someone who has already received grace: "Sed cum

---

[557] Prosper of Aquitaine, *Contra collatorem*, 4.2, PL 51.224-225. "According to this statement, you were wrong when you said before: 'The beginning not only of good works but also of good thoughts comes from God, who starts in us what is good and carries it out and brings it to its completion.' But no, you were not. Your first proposition was not wrong in any way. And you should not have come with another, opposed statement. You were right in declaring that our salvation originates in grace, but now you assert that it comes from the gifts of nature and from free will. True, the Apostle said: 'For to will is present with me; but to accomplish that which is good, I find not.' But he also said: 'Not that we are sufficient to think anything of ourselves, as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is from God.' And still: 'For it is God who works in you, both to will and to accomplish, according to His good will.' St. Paul certainly does not contradict himself.
He means to say that, when we have received the gift of desiring what is good, we are not at once able to do it but must ask and desire and knock and be given to do it by Him who inspired the desire. For these words, 'For to will is present with me; but to accomplish that which is good, I find not,' are the words of one who was called and given grace already; of one who is delighted with the law of God according to the inward man, but sees another law in his members fighting against the law of his mind and captivating him in the law of sin; of one who, although he has been taught to will the right thing, yet does not find in himself the strength to do what he desires—not until, by virtue of a good will he has been given, he deserves to obtain the strength he is looking for, the strength to practice the virtues" (P. de Letter, tr., "Against Cassian," 79-80).

donatum nobis fuerit bonum velle, non statim invenimus et facere, nisi petentibus, quaerentibus, atque pulsantibus, qui dedit desiderium, praestet effectum."[558] So he solves the apparent contradiction through interpreting the text differently from Cassian.

Prosper responds exegetically to Cassian. Rather than respond as Prosper did, Fortunatus instead, as noted above, asserts Paul's authority and integrity, then makes a positive argument for a *bona voluntas* being entirely a gift of God's grace. This perhaps reflects their respective audiences: Prosper is speaking to an educated (and unpersuaded) clergy, while Fortunatus addresses people very much under his authority, his own clergy in Poitiers. They possibly were reading Cassian and therefore were affected by his position on grace and free will, which Fortunatus felt obligated to counteract with this sermon.[559] Thus he relies upon the widely-recognized authority of Augustine. This approach is similar to that discussed in the previous chapter and found in his *ES*, where Fortunatus lists scriptural passages in support of doctrines rather than make arguments as his source Rufinus does. The approach here is not exactly the same, of course, since Fortunatus also makes a positive case for Paul's support of the supremacy of grace in addition to citing authority.

Fortunatus' closing comment in this section is interesting: "Nam qui cum apostolo Paulo, id est oculo ecclesiae, et cum beato Augustino eius sequace consonat, in eo ignorantiae caligo non regnat."[560] There are two aspects of this comment that are worth considering. First, the mention of Augustine by name is unusual for Fortunatus. The poet mentions Augustine five times in his extant works outside of this sermon: 1) *Carm.* 4.5.12, in

[558] Prosper, *Contra collatorem*, 4.2. "He means to say that, when we have received the gift of desiring what is good, we are not at once able to do it but must ask and desire and knock and be given to do it by Him who inspired the desire."
[559] Fortunatus' rough contemporary and fellow Italian, Cassiodorus, also warns against Cassian's views on grace and free will, making specific reference to Prosper's arguments (Cassiodorus, *Institutiones*, 1.29.2).
[560] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.42. "He who is in accord with the apostle Paul, that is with the eye of the Church, and with the blessed Augustine his follower, in him the darkness of ignorance does not reign."

an epitaph for the two bishops named Ruricius of Limoges, where he mentions that the elder Ruricius had built a shrine in honour of Augustine; 2) *Carm.* 5.1.7, in a letter to the Spanish bishop Martin of Braga, where he lists Augustine along with Hilary, Gregory (either Nyssa or Nazianzen) and Ambrose as Christian authors whom he has read, but only *dormitanti*, "as if asleep;" 3) *Carm.* 5.3.39, in a panegyric concerning Gregory of Tours written for his ordination as bishop, where he prays that his patron may flourish amidst the brilliance of his episcopal predecessors such as Athanasius, Hilary, Augustine and Ambrose; 4) *Carm*. 8.1.58, in a poem written on behalf of Radegund, where Augustine is mentioned as one of the authors read at Radegund's convent in Poitiers; and 5) *Vita Martini* 4.664, where Fortunatus lists the places his book will travel, retracing his own journey from Italy to Gaul, and mentions Augustine's frequenting of the way around Concordia.

All of these mentions seem to be antiquarian points, given that most are included in longer lists of Christian luminaries of the past. The main point of interest in the list above is Fortunatus' humble claim to have read Augustine *dormitanti* in comparison with Martin of Braga. Yet the mention of Augustine in the *EOD* is clearly no mere antiquarianism, but a living devotion to a doctrine taught by the older author. Fortunatus may have read Augustine *dormitanti*, but it is clear that he had a good idea of his doctrine on grace and free will.

The primary point to be drawn from the final statement of the section is its emphasis upon established, recognized authority.[561] Two big names—the apostle Paul and Augustine—are cited in order as it were to complete the refutation of the apparent inconsistency in Paul's statements about grace and free will. The *caligo ignorantiae* would not, then, have any power over those who agree with the authoritative voices of Paul and Augustine. Paul is the *oculus*

[561] See Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency*, 238, for her conclusions on the importance of a developing authoritative Augustinian tradition to the eventual fall into disfavour of the 'Massilian' position of Cassian and Faustus.

ecclesiae and Augustine is his follower. Such guides should not, according to Fortunatus, be ignored.

The next paragraph (§ 43) of the excursus on grace and free will not only answers another real or potential objection to the necessity of God's grace in salvation, it also, I would argue, demonstrates that Fortunatus believed that God's gift of a *bona voluntas* was equally necessary after baptism. The assertion made previously to his (already baptized) audience, that *nisi a Christo velut lucerna inlumineris, cotidie, nesciendo quid elegerit divina poetestas, excedis*, also points to this conclusion.[562] The broader implications of this view for understanding Fortunatus' place in the sixth-century Gallic theological milieu will be explored later.

Following the extended counter-argument against the alleged discrepancy between Paul's statements, Fortunatus proceeds to answer another objection. Matthew 7.13-14 reads: "Intrate per angustam portam quia lata porta et spatiosa via quae ducit ad perditionem et multi sunt qui intrant per eam; quam angusta porta et arta via quae ducit ad vitam et pauci sunt qui inveniunt eam."[563] There is a parallel passage in the Luke 13.24: "Contendite intrare per angustam portam quia multi dico vobis quaerunt intrare et non poterunt."[564] This time Fortunatus makes a more complete case and interprets the passage rather than appeal solely to authority as before. He writes:

> Quod autem de duabus viis, id est spatiosa et angusta, dicitur, ut quis per quam elegerit gradiatur quid est: per spatiosam laxatis frenis libere discurrimus famulando peccatis; in angusta vero consideremus apostolum dicentem: "vocatione qua vocati estis per Dominum Iesum Christum."[565]

[562] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.41.
[563] Matthew 7.13-14. "Enter through the narrow gate, since wide is the gate and broad is the way which leads to destruction, and many are they who enter through it; but narrow is the gate and confined is the way which leads to life, and few are they who find it."
[564] Luke 13.24. "Seek to enter in to the narrow gate, since many I say to you seek to enter and are not able."
[565] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.43. "But as to what is said concerning the two roads, that is the wide road and the narrow road, that anyone might proceed along whichever path he should have chosen—we run freely along the

Fortunatus asserts that the human will is indeed capable under its own power to go on the broad way that leads to destruction. He uses the image of a horse given its head by its rider, *laxatis frenis*, to illustrate this point. On their own, human beings will naturally sin. However, the poet then proceeds to deny the second part of the hypothetical question: the journey along the narrow way is only achieved through Christ's power. For this, Fortunatus seems at first to rely upon raw authority, as he has previously: *consideremus apostolum dicentem.*[566] He does not explain the text in this paragraph, but proffers it as a proof-text.

The next paragraph (§ 44) sees Fortunatus embarking upon a more in-depth interpretation of Matthew 7.13-14 that matches Augustinian doctrine. He writes:

> Et ideo non elegit aliquis neque ad viam pervenit nisi vocatus fuerit ab ipso qui via est et vita et veritas. Sed in hac via cum apostoli verbis et praeceptis evangelicis excurramus dicentes ad eos qui iam ex Iudaeis in Christo erant fide conversi: "si vos Filius liberaverit, tunc liberi eritis."[567]

First, the poet explains the meaning of the proof-text cited just above: the necessity of Christ's power for a *bona voluntas* means that those who are saved are chosen by Christ. Then, he introduces an idea that nuances his interpretation: those who embark upon the narrow way of salvation by Christ's power will indeed be free—at the final resurrection. There is a possible source for this comment that bears noting, and will help clarify what Fortunatus is trying to say.

---

spacious way with our bridles slackened in service to our sins; but regarding the journey along the narrow way we should consider the saying of the apostle: 'upon the path to which you have been called through the Lord Jesus Christ.'"

[566] The passage cited is Ephesians 4.1: "Obsecro itaque vos ego vinctus in Domino ut digne ambuletis vocatione qua vocati estis."

[567] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.44. "And so there is no one who chooses to proceed along the narrow way unless he will have been chosen by that One who is the way and the truth and the life. But on this way let us run with the words of the apostle and the commands of the gospel saying to those who recently had been converted from the Jews to faith in Christ: 'if the Son has freed you, you will be free.'"

That source, once again, is Augustine. The use of John 8.36, *Si vos Filius liberaverit, tunc liberi eritis*, in the argument for the freedom of the saved human will at the resurrection occurs in several Augustinian writings. In his *Tractatus in Ioannem* 41, commenting on John 8.31-36, he writes:

> Quae igitur libertas plena atque perfecta in illo Domino Iesu qui dixit: "Si vos Filius liberaverit, tunc vere liberi eritis;" quando plena et perfecta libertas erit? Quando nullae inimicitiae, quando "Novissima inimica destruetur mors. Oportet enim corruptibili hoc induere incorruptionem, et mortale hoc induere immortalitatem; cum autem mortale hoc induerit immortalitatem, tunc fiet sermo qui scriptus est, Absorpta est mors in victoriam. Ubi est, mors, contentio tua?"[568]

John 8.36 features frequently elsewhere in Augustine's anti-Pelagian writings, but it is here that the same question Fortunatus asks, *quando sit istud* (referring to *tunc liberi eritis*), is asked by Augustine, with, as will be seen, a similar answer.

Fortunatus asks the question *quando sit istud* at the start of paragraph 45, clearly hearkening back to the quotation of John 8.36 in the paragraph before. When shall the human will be free? He answers:

> Et quando sit istud adtendite ipso Domino praedicante: "Si manseritis in verbo meo, vere discipuli mei estis et cognoscetis veritatem et veritas liberabit vos;" ac per hoc hortatur ut sequendo illud quod dedit per gratiam nos ad veram liberationem perducat. Unde tunc homo in bonum perfecte liberum possidebit arbitrium, quando omnino non poterit servire peccato.[569]

He interprets Christ's words in a way that indicates his belief in the recovery of the will's freedom only at the end of the ages, at the final resurrection. The timing of the true liberation

---

[568] Augustine, *Tractatus in Ioannis evangelium*, ed. D.R. Willems, 41.13.1. "What, then, is the full and perfect freedom in the Lord Jesus who said, 'If the Son shall set you free, then you will really be free'? When will there be full and perfect freedom? When there is not strife, when 'death, the last enemy shall be destroyed. For this corruptible must put on incorruption and this mortal must put on immortality; but when this mortal has put on immortality, then shall come to pass the saying which is written, 'Death is swallowed up in victory, where, O death, is your strife?'" (J.W. Rettig, tr., *St. Augustine: Tractates on the Gospel of John, 28-54* (Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1993), 148).

[569] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.45. "And as for when that thing shall be, pay attention to the declaration of the Lord himself: 'if you will remain in my word, you shall truly be my disciples and you will know the truth and the truth shall set you free;' and through this he encourages us so that by following that precept which he gave by grace he might lead us to a true freedom. Then in that true freedom we will possess in perfection a free will turned towards the good, when that will shall be wholly unable to serve sin."

is made clear by the following sentence: "Unde tunc homo in bonum perfecte liberum possidebit arbitrium, quando omnino non poterit servire peccato."[570] The impossibility of sinning is achieved only at the final resurrection. Fortunatus links even a marginal freedom of the will to future perfection. The Christian therefore is completely dependent upon God's grace act in order to act rightly and remain in the faith. Augustine's question, *quando plena et perfecta libertas erit*, is answered in the same way in his commentary on John. In addition to the comment, *Quando nullae inimicitiae*, which might be interpreted as referring to the present life, he quotes 1 Corinthians 15.26, 53-55, which unambiguously refers to the final resurrection at the end of days.[571] As for Augustine, so for Fortunatus: human will, even when baptized, is only truly free to choose to do good at the final resurrection.[572]

There are a couple of additional Augustinian sources for Fortunatus' final paragraph in his excursus on grace and free will (§§ 30-45) that reinforce the interpretation argued for just now. In chapters 104 and 105 of the *Enchiridion*, Augustine discusses the nature of the first man's—Adam's—freedom of the will, arguing that Adam had the freedom to choose either good or evil before his fall. However, at the end of days the saved human being will be unable to choose evil, as would have happened to Adam had he persevered in obedience to

[570] Fortunatus, *Carm.* 10.1.45. "Then in that true freedom we will possess in perfection a free will turned towards the good, when that will shall be wholly unable to serve sin."
[571] 1 Corinthians 15.26, 53-55. "Novissima inimica destruetur mors...Oportet enim corruptibili hoc induere incorruptionem, et mortale hoc induere immortalitatem; cum autem mortale hoc induerit immortalitatem, tunc fiet sermo qui scriptus est, Absorpta est mors in victoriam. Ubi est, mors, contentio tua?" "The last enemy he will destroy is death...For it is fitting for the this corruptible thing to put on incorruption, and this mortality to put on immortality; but when this mortality shall put on immortality, then there will be the word which was written: 'Death is swallowed up in victory. Where, O death, is your sting?'"
[572] Compare also the words of Pelagius I in his letter to Childebert I written in 557 (Gassò and Batlle, 7), where he says: "Et iustos quidem per largissimam gratiam Dei, utpote vasa misericordiae in gloriam praeparata, aeternae vitae praemiis donaturum, in societate videlicet angelorum absque ullo iam lapsus sui metu sine fine victuros." "And indeed the righteous through the most generous grace of God, as vessels for compassion prepared in glory, will be granted the rewards of eternal life—namely that in the society of the angels, now without any fear of their fall, they will be victorious without end" (Pelagius I, "Letter 7," ed. Gassò and Batlle, 24).

God rather than chosen to rebel, and enter into a true freedom of the will. The will will still be free even though unable to choose evil:

> Postea vero sic erit ut male velle non possit, nec ideo libero carebit arbitrio. Multo quippe liberius erit arbitrium quod omnino non poterit servire peccato. Neque enim culpanda est voluntas, aut voluntas non est, aut libera dicenda non est, qua beati esse sic volumus ut esse miseri non solum nolimus sed nequaquam prorsus velle possimus. Sicut ergo anima nostra etiam nunc nolle infelicitatem, ita nolle iniquitatem semper habitura est.[573]

Part of this is reminiscent of Fortunatus' earlier possible insistence upon the intact nature of the human will, where the poet says: *Dei misericordia praevenit hominem, non voluntatem* (10.1.36). But the most important similarity is in the words used. Fortunatus writes: *tunc homo in bonum perfecte liberum possidebit arbitrium, QUANDO OMNINO NON POTERIT SERVIRE PECCATO*. Compare this to Augustine, who states: *Multo quippe liberius erit arbitrium, QUOD OMNINO NON POTERIT SERVIRE PECCATO*. The verbal similarity reinforces the notion not only that the poet had the text of the *Enchiridion* in front of him (or at the least a selection of the text in a florilegium), but also that Fortunatus is referring to the same future condition of the human *bona voluntas* as Augustine clearly refers to.

The second possible source is Augustine's *De Correptione et Gratia*, where in chapter 32 he writes on the same subject as the preceding section of the *Enchiridion*:

> Posset enim perseverare si vellet; quod ut nollet, de libero descendit arbitrio quod tunc ita liberum erat, ut et bene velle posset et male. Quid erit autem liberius libero arbitrio, quando non potuerit servire peccato, quae futura erat et homini, sicut facta est angelis sanctis, merces meriti?[574]

---

[573] Augustine, *Enchiridion*, ed. E. Evans, CCSL 46 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1969), 28.105. "In the after-life he will not be able to will evil, and yet he will not be deprived of his free will. In fact, his will will be much more free, in that it will be in no way subject to sin. For the will is not to be blamed, nor should we say that it was no will or that it was not free, when we so will to be happy that we not only do not will to be wretched, but are quite unable to wish to be. As, then, our soul even now is incapable of desiring unhappiness, so it will then be forever incapable of desiring wickedness" (B.M. Peebles, tr., *Faith, Hope and Charity* (Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1947), 458-459).

[574] Augustine, *De correptione et gratia*, ed. G. Folliet, CSEL 92 (Vienna: Verlag der Österreichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2000), 12.32. "For he [Adam] could have persevered if he willed to, but his not willing to do so came from his free choice which was at that point so free that he was able to will both good and evil. But

This time the similar phrase is *quando non poterit servire peccato* to Fortunatus' *quando omnino non poterit servire peccato*. And once again the context points to the *quando* being after the final resurrection. In the section just quoted Augustine does not directly refer to the future state of the saved human will, only making a point about the current state of the angelic will. But he immediately goes on to make it clear that the human *bona voluntas* will become like the angelic will in the heavenly state. Continuing to discuss in turn the Adamic and then the final state of the human will, Augustine writes in the next section:

> Prima ergo libertas voluntatis erat, posse non peccare; novissima erit multo maior, non posse peccare. Prima immortalitas erat, posse non mori; novissima erit multo maior, non posse mori. Prima erat perseverentiae potestas, bonum posse non deserere; novissima erit perseverantiae felicitas, bonum non posse deserere.[575]

The inability to sin will be acquired when the inability to die is acquired; namely, at the final resurrection. Fortunatus' statement, *Tunc homo in bonum perfecte liberum possidebit arbitrium, quando omnino non poterit servire peccato*, drawn as it most probably is from one of these two texts, thus implies that God's grace is equally necessary after baptism as it was before it for the human being to possess a *bona voluntas*.

To conclude, there are a number of things to say about Fortunatus' excursus on grace and free will in his *EOD*. First, it relies on a range of sources. Augustine, Caesarius of Arles and Prosper of Aquitaine are all probable sources for Fortunatus. However, Fortunatus does not usually cite them verbatim, and relies upon his own eloquence and reasoning to make his

---

what will be more free than free choice when it will no longer be able to be a slave to sin? For this freedom would also have been for Adam the reward of his merit, as it has become that of the holy angels" (R. Teske, tr., "Rebuke and Grace," in *Answer to the Pelagians, IV: To the Monks of Hadrumetum and Provence* (Hyde Park, NY: New City Press, 1999), 131-132).

[575] Augustine, *De correptione et gratia*, 12.33. "The first freedom of the will, then, was the ability not to sin; the final freedom will be much greater, namely, the inability to sin. The first immortality was the ability not to die; the final immortality will be much greater, namely, the inability to die. The first power of perseverance was the ability not to abandon the good; the final blessedness of perseverance will be the inability to abandon the good" (R. Teske, tr., *Rebuke and Grace*, 132).

case. The poet is acting independently here, responding to objections and making positive arguments according to his own plan. His own pastoral interests are also at play, seen in his care to refute the argument found in Cassian's popular monastic text the *Conferences*. Second, Fortunatus' argumentation relies a great deal upon assertions of authority, whether of Scripture or of previous authors. Third, the poet seems to be asserting an Augustinianism of the most austere kind (i.e., as found in Augustine's *De praedestinatione* and *De dono perseverentiae*); namely, that the human will is unable, even after baptism, to desire to do good or to serve God unless God's grace works upon it at every moment.

4.4 *The Augustinianism of Venantius Fortunatus, Compared with Gregory of Tours*

Gregory of Tours has long had a poor theological reputation.[576] This is probably undeserved, but it is true that the bishop of Tours only rarely treats theological subects at any length in his surviving works, and still more rarely in a systematic form. A commentary on the Psalms represents a more systematically theological side of Gregory's writings, but is fairly short and fragmentary, composed of a brief discussion of the spiritual meaning of the Psalm headings and a list of brief statments about the Christological significance of each Psalm.[577] However, there is still an indication in one place of Gregory's views on the subject of grace and free will.

---

[576] See Martin Heinzelmann, *Gregory of Tours: History and Society in the Sixth Century*, tr. C. Carroll (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 153-154; a more in-depth investigation of Gregory's theology is to be found more recently by the same author in Martin Heinzelmann, "The Works of Gregory of Tours and Patristic Tradition," in *A Companion to Gregory of Tours*, ed. A.C. Murray (Brill: Leiden, 2016), 281-336.

[577] Gregory of Tours, *In Psalterii Tractatum Commentarius*, ed. B. Krusch, MGH *SSRM* vol. 1 (Hanover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1885), pp. 423-427. See Martin Heinzelmann, "Die Psalmen bei Gregor von Tours," in *Präsenz und Verwendung der Heiligen Schrift im christlichen Frühmittelalter: exegetische Literatur und liturgische Texte*, ed. P. Carmassi (Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz in Kommission, 2008), 33-57, for further information. Heinzelmann asserts that Krusch's edition is incomplete, since the MGH editor misunderstood the nature of the genre of *Tituli Psalmorum* that Gregory followed (Heinzelmann, "The Works of Gregory of Tours and Patristic Tradition," 312). The full version of Gregory's commentary is found in Dom P. Salmon, *Les 'tituli psalmorum' des manuscrits latins*, Études liturgiques 3 (Paris, 1959), 138-148.

Book I of the *Histories* contains a summary of biblical history, focusing heavily on typology. It is here that a reference to the relationship between God's grace and the human will is to be found. Relating the Babylonian exile to the human soul's sin and subsequent salvation, Gregory writes:

> De hac vero captivitate per Zorobabil liberantur; qui postea et templum et civitatem restituit. Sed haec captivitas typum illius captivitatis, ut puto, gerit, in qua anima peccatrix abducitur, quam nisi Zorobabil, id est Christus, liberaverit, horribiliter exsulavit. Ipse enim Dominus in evangelio dicit: "Si vos Filius liberaverit, vere liberi eritis." Ipse enim sibi in nobis templum, in quo dignitur habitare, constituat, in quod fides ut visibilis templi illius ornamenta in nostrorum sensuum honestate clariscant. Bonae etiam voluntate nostrae ipse salubrae effectu indulgeat, quia: "nisi ipse aedificaverit domum, in vanum laborant qui aedificant ea." Haec vero captivitas annis 70 fuisse dicitur.[578]

This excerpt contains the key phrase *bonae etiam voluntate nostrae ipse salubrae effectu indulgeat*. First, the goodness of the human will is clearly its own, not granted to it by God's grace. Second, God needs to grant to that good will a wholesome effect; in other words, grace is necessary to free the soul from slavery to sin. It seems that Gregory was more inclined towards the traditional Gallic position of allowing more space for the freedom of the will than the Augustinian position permitted. In short, Gregory sided more with Cassian than Caesarius.

This is similar to what Cassian places into the mouth of Abba Paphnutius in the third conference of his *Conferences*:

> Manifeste probatur et initium salutis nostrae domini vocatione fieri dicentis: "Exi de terra tua," et consummationem perfectionis ac puritatis ab eodem similiter tribui, cum

[578] Gregory of Tours, *Decem libri historiarum*, ed. B. Krusch and W. Levison, 1.15, 15. "They were freed from this captivity through Zerubbabel, who afterwards also restored the temple and city [of Jerusalem]. Now this captivity provides a type of that captivity, as I think, into which the sinning soul is led away; and unless Zerubbabel, that is Christ, has freed it, it will be horribly exiled. For the same Lord says in the Gospel: 'If the son will have freed you, truly you will be free.' And may he build for himself a temple in us, in which he deigns to live, in which faith might shine like gold, in which the eloquence of preaching might shimmer like silver, in which all the decorations of that visible temple become visible in the integrity of our understanding. May he himself also grant a wholesome effect to our own good will, since, 'Unless he himself will have built the house, they labour in vain who build it.' Now this captivity is said to have lasted for 70 years."

> dicit: "Et veni in terram, quam tibi monstravero," id est non quam tu ex temet ipso nosse vel industria tua valeas repperire, sed quam ego tibi non solum ignoranti, sed etiam non inquirenti monstravero. Ex quo manifeste colligitur, quod quemadmodum inspiratione domini provocati ad viam salutis adcurrimus.[579]

Confused, Cassian's friend Germanus asks what role free will has to play: Paphnutius then responds:

> Hoc vos recte movisset, si in omni opere vel disciplina principium tantum esset ac finis et non etiam quaedam medietas interesset. Itaque sicut occasiones salutis diversis modis deum cognoscimus operari, ita nostrum est occasionibus a divinate concessis vel enixius vel remissius famulari.[580]

Gregory's brief statement points to the framework outlined by Cassian.

The whole statement on the typology of the Babylonian exile and the return led by Zerubbabel certainly places the emphasis on God's grace, with the final section being framed as a prayer asking for it. Yet the mention of the *bona voluntas* being 'our own,' *nostrae*, and God's grace being needed only to give it a wholesome effect, indicates that Gregory is not quite in line with Augustinian thought, or even the modified Augustinianism of the Council of Orange. It suggests that Mathisen's assessment of its essential ephemerality to the theology of the sixth-century Gallic church is correct. It is true, however, that this is only one small section; perhaps if we had more of his theological writings he might display a different understanding.

Venantius Fortunatus' approach to grace and free will he outlines in his *EOD* differs from the import of Gregory's brief statement examined above. Still, the two remained in

[579] John Cassian, *Collationes*, 3.10.6. "It is obvious that the beginning of our salvation is by the Lord's call, when he says: 'Leave your country,' and that the consummation of perfection and purity is likewise bestowed by the same Lord, when he says: 'Come to the land which I shall show you'—that is, not to the one which you can know of yourself or find through your own effort, but to the one which I shall show you...thus it is plain that we hasten to the way of salvation as a result of the Lord's inspiration" (B. Ramsey, tr., *Conferences*, 131).
[580] John Cassian, *Collationes*, 3.12.1. "It would be odd indeed if in every work and practice of discipline there were only a beginning and an end, and not also something in the middle. Accordingly, just as we know that God offers opportunities for salvation in different ways, so also it is up to us to be either more or less attentive to the opportunities that have been granted to us by God" (B. Ramsey, tr., *Conferences*, 131).

close relationship and there is no indication that Fortunatus was publicly critical of Gregory's theology.[581] Either Gregory's comment should be read as being in essential continuity with the decrees of Orange (possible), or the issue was not considered by Fortunatus to be one of cardinal importance. This second possibility, however, has to reckon with the polemical tone of Fortunatus' *EOD*. Perhaps the poet became convinced of the importance of this position as bishop. Of course, there could also be an issue of societal context; as a minor cleric reliant upon Gregory's patronage, Fortunatus may not have felt it appropriate to make such a stark challenge.[582] However, as bishop, he may have felt more free to challenge the mainstream southern Gallic view.

4.5 *Conclusion*

It is time to place Venantius Fortunatus on the spectrum of belief around this theological question and to draw some conclusions as to Fortunatus' theological identity. Where, then, to locate Venantius Fortunatus' opinions on the semi-Pelagian controversy? Setting aside Cassian's perspective and that (most probably) of the Council of Valence, which are fairly explicitly rejected by Fortunatus, which of the variations of Augustinianism did he hold to? Augustine, in his last works, asserted that election to baptism *and* election to glory were unconditional and irresistible, and that those who were not elected to either baptism, to glory or to both were passed over in accordance with God's unknowable, but just, wisdom. The human will was utterly unable, due the effects of Adam's sin, to will anything good even

[581] Quite the reverse. In *Carmina* 5.12, Fortunatus praises Gregory for *florens in studiis et sacra in lege fidelis*, and there are many other examples (e.g., Fortunatus, *Carm.* 5.16).
[582] For a good discussion of Fortunatus' relations with Gregory, see Michael Roberts, "Venantius Fortunatus and Gregory of Tours: Poetry and Patronage," in *A Companion to Gregory of Tours*, ed. A.C. Murray (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 35-59. Roberts suggests that the most important bond between the two of them was their mutual interest in poetry, but that there was a true mutual esteem as well.

after baptism. Thus God's grace was necessary at all times, not just to aid the human will, but to be its prime mover.

Prosper of Aquitaine at first asserted this teaching in its entirety, but modified it considerably at the end of his life. For the later Prosper, God's grace is refused to some on the basis of His foreknowledge of their future apostasy, not refused unconditionally as a result of his hidden will. While the unconditional nature of God's grace is theoretically preserved in this scheme, it is practically undermined. Caesarius of Arles rejected Prosper's weakening of grace's unconditional nature in his *De gratia*, but introduced by way of his sermons and the canons of the Council of Orange a dividing line in the condition of the human will at baptism. Baptism was attained by God's utterly unconditional and irresistable will, but after that the human will was able, with God's help, to choose to do good. Thus election to baptism was affirmed, but election to glory was denied. Both of these views are in contrast to the Roman perspective, influenced by the Scythian monks and the African bishops, which held to the most austere form of Augustinian doctrine on this matter, affirming both election to baptism and election to glory.

As has been argued, Fortunatus seems to express a view on predestination that endorses both election to baptism and election to glory. The extensive focus on the human will's inability to do will anything good, and the direct address to already-baptized Christians, indicates that predestination to glory is tacitly affirmed. Fortunatus does not explicitly say this because the intent in this section is on persuading skeptical listeners, who are in all likelihood clergy, to accept the primacy of God's grace and the weakness of the human will even after baptism. Still, the implication is clear, even if subtly presented. Thus Fortunatus opposed the theology of the Council of Orange. It goes almost without saying that he even more starkly opposed the "traditional" view of the southern Gallic church, to which

the Council of Orange was also opposed. As bishop, therefore, Fortunatus brought his view of grace and free will to bear in this sermon on the Lord's prayer, attempting to persuade his Gallic colleagues of its truth. His view is that of the Roman church, reflecting his education in Italy.

Part 1 Appendix

The Roman View of Grace and Free Will

Venantius Fortunatus was born and educated in Italy, so it is fitting to turn now to the mainstream perspective held by the Roman church. How did the poet's clearly expressed opinions on grace and free will relate to the mainstream doctrine of the Roman church, that is of the Popes? And what does this relationship have to say about how this native of Italy would have viewed the traditional position of the southern Gallic church, which was out of step with that of Rome? In order to answers these questions, the Roman papacy's position should be established.

The decisions of the Council of Orange in 529, representing a "semi-Augustinian" viewpoint which upheld predestination to baptism but affirmed a measure of freedom of the will after baptism and thus rejected predestination to glory, were positively received by Pope Boniface in Rome. In his letter to Caesarius of Arles confirming the council's decisions, he wrote:

> Postulans ut pro ambiguitate tollenda confessionem vestram, qua vos e diverso fidem rectam in Christo totiusque bonae voluntatis initium iuxta catholicam veritatem per praevenientem Dei gratiam singulorum definitis sensibus inspirari, auctoritate sedis apostolicae firmaremus. Atque ideo, cum de hac re multi patres, et prae ceteris beatae recordationis Augustinus episcopus, sed et maiores nostri apostolicae sedis antestites, ita ratione probentur disservisse latissima, ut nulli ulterius deberet esse ambiguum, fidem quoque nobis ipsam venire de gratia, supersedendum duximus responsione multiplici.[583]

[583] Boniface, "Epistola ad Caesarium," in *Concilia Gallia: a. 511-a. 695*, ed. G. Morin, CCSL 148A, 66. "You ask us, in order to remove any doubt, to affirm with the authority of the apostolic seat your confession, in which you confess that on the contrary the correct faith in Christ and the beginning of all good will according to catholic truth is inspired within the limited senses of individuals through the prevenient grace of God. And so for this reason—since concerning this matter many fathers, and above all others Bishop Augustine of blessed memory, but also our predecessors in the apostolic seat, are proven to have discussed it with such an exceedingly wide-ranging argument, that there ought to be no further doubt on the subject that that same faith comes to us from grace—we decided that we ought to refrain from a many-faceted response."

He went on to briefly summarize the decrees of Orange, then stated: "Quapropter affectu congruo salutantes, suprascriptam confessionem vestram consentaneam catholicis patrum regulis adprobamus."[584] Boniface's letter is frequently taken as confirmation that Orange's decrees were authoritative for not only the Gallic prelates under Caesarius' jurisdiction, but also for the Latin church as a whole. Thus Orange's viewpoint on grace and free will is supposed to have become the new orthodoxy, adhered to by most in the Latin West, until the outbreak of the Gottschalk controversy.[585]

The pope's engagement with the semi-Pelagian controversy is commonly seen through the lens of a similarly well-established narrative. R.A. Markus puts it well: "The popes, Hormisdas (514-523) supremely, were determined to stand by the traditional orthodoxy, sufficiently defined, in their view, by the condemnations of Pelagius, Celestius and Julian of Eclanum. Their aim was to restrain further speculation and controversy on the matter, and they resisted trouble-makers who disturbed the peace of the church."[586] This story of Rome's engagement with the various figures and events of this controversy, and its own shifting positions on the questions under dispute, is one that needs to be modified somewhat.

R.A. Markus makes the following observation: "The pontificates of Gelasius and his predecessor [i.e., Felix III] do, however, seem to be a turning point in the tolerance hitherto shown to views of a semi-Pelagian [i.e., the views of Faustus of Riez and John Cassian]

---

[584] Boniface, "Epistula ad Caesarium," 68. "For this reason, greeting you with a suitable affection, we approve your above-written confession, conforming as it does with the rules of the catholic fathers."
[585] Variants of this narrative are present in R.A Markus, "The Legacy of Pelagius," in *The Making of Orthodoxy*, ed. R. Williams (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 214-234, although he freely confesses his judgment of Orange's effects is preliminary to further needed research (233, n. 54); in Rebecca Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency*, 232; and in Alexander Hwang, *Intrepid Lover of Perfect Grace*, 238-239. However, Weaver recently stated a slight change in her views, noting the remarkable complexity and locally contingent character of the Semi-Pelagian controversy—there was not, as she previously had thought, "a beginning, several intermediate states, and a conclusion:" instead, "The more I have worked with it...the more questions I have encountered about both the beginning and the end of the controversy" (R. Weaver, "Introduction," xvi).
[586] Markus, "The Legacy of Pelagius," 226.

kind...This seems to mark the beginning of a second conversion of the Roman see to the theological standpoint represented by the African church."[587] The evidence for this increasing hostility to Faustus' and Cassian's understanding of grace and free will is shown quite clearly in Boniface's brisk acceptance of Caesarius' doctrinal points. But there is further evidence not only that it was disapproved of by Rome, but also that the position of the African church—and thus that of Augustine in his last writings on the subject, namely the *De praedestinatione sanctorum* and the *De dono perseverentiae*—had become the position too of the Roman church, although not insisted upon absolutely as a standard of orthodoxy by the popes. The unique aspect of this argument—although Markus above also asserts the running together of African positions with those of Rome, with caveats[588]—is that the popes, near the beginning of the sixth century, held to the position of Augustine put forward in his last works.

There are several points that will be made in support of this proposition. First, the writings surrounding a controversy over Christology and semi-Pelagianism that roiled the Roman and African churches in the early sixth century indicate the church of Rome's strongly Augustinian position.[589] Two texts, the letter of Pope Hormisdas to Possessor of

[587] Markus, "The Legacy of Pelagius," 223.
[588] So Markus, "The Legacy of Pelagius," 226: "The agitation of the Scythian monks combined with the theological learning of the African exiles to expose the Roman church, once again, after a hundred years, to a strong current of the Augustinian theology of grace. But neither the Roman nor the Gallic church allowed themselves to be carried away by it." On the contrary, as will be seen, the Roman church seems very much to have been carried away by it, however much the Gallic church resisted its charms. Weaver echoes Markus: "In his letter to Caesarius Boniface ratified the council's position" (Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency*, 232). Hwang is a little anachronistic: "The doctrine of grace formulated in the decrees of Orange reflects a moderate Augustinianism and is the result of a cooperative effort with the pope...Prosper provided the Roman Church with the catholic interpretation of Augustine's doctrine of grace, that is, the way in which the Church is to understand Augustine's doctrine of grace, and formulated a doctrine of grace according to the pronouncements of the Roman Church" (Hwang, *Intrepid Lover of Perfect Grace*, 238-239).
[589] This controversy erupted in 519 when a group of monks, the "Scythian monks," from a region around the mouths of the Danube near the shore of the Black Sea, contacted Hormisdas and a number of African bishops living in exile in Sardinia in an effort to obtain their support for a mediating Christological dogma they had proposed to the emperor Justinian. They also brought up the issue of Pelagianism, connecting it with the

Carthage and the anonymous *Capitula sancti Augustini*, will be used to establish this argument. Second, the circumstances of Boniface's letter to Caesarius, and other correspondence surrounding the Council of Orange, will be examined to show how the Council was a more isolated event, and Boniface's approval more perfunctory, than it might seem. Third, the position of the popes after the Council of Orange until the end of the sixth century will be examined. The letter from Pelagius I to Childebert I written in 557 will be among the documents examined, as will the writings of Gregory the Great. A study of these three areas will show that the Roman bishops, while tolerating a certain amount of theological diversity on the subject, and averse to excessive controversy, nevertheless affirmed Augustine's final theology of grace, involving both predestination to baptism and predestination to glory, during at least the sixth century.

The *Capitula sancti Augustini* are a series of statements, some culled from Augustine's works, some *sui generis*, outlining an anti-Pelagian and pro-Augustinian theology. When they were written, where they were written and by whom they were written are all questions which have been extensively discussed.[590] The position which makes the most sense is that of Thomas Humphries, who argues that the *Capitula sancti Augustini*, at least in part, are the product of the Scythian monks led by John Maxentius.[591] His identification of the phrase *per infusionem et inoperationem intrinsecus spiritus sancti* as, "belong[ing] only to Maxentius and those who depended on his work," is particularly convincing.[592] Humphries suggests that at least the first ten statements are of Scythian

---

Christological heresy Nestorianism, and attacked Faustus of Riez for promoting it. In part this was an effort to ingratiate themselves with the great African champion of Augustine Fulgentius of Ruspe, one of the bishops exiled to Sardinia by the Visigoths. For more, see Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency*, 180-182.

[590] See the discussion in Humphries, *Ascetic Pneumatology from John Cassian to Gregory the Great* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 139-140.

[591] Humphries, *Ascetic Pneumatology*, 140.

[592] Humphries, *Ascetic Pneumatology*, 138.

derivation; it is quite probable, however, that more are also to be assigned to the Scythians. The argument, made most recently by Hwang, in favour of the *Capitula sancti Augustini* being a Gallic text, and particularly a 'semi-Augustinian' one, is dependent upon *capitulum* fourteen. While Humphries' suggestion that just the first ten *capitula* are the minimum number to be ascribed to the Scythians fits in with a Gallic source for the remainder, I will argue that *capitulum* fourteen should not be interpreted in a 'semi-Augustinian' manner, thus suggesting that it, too, should be ascribed to the Scythians.[593]

Hwang, following the suggestion of Markus, argues that the *Capitula sancti Augustini* were composed in southern Gaul by an anonymous Augustinian.[594] He also argues that its theology is akin to the modified Augustinianism adopted by Prosper at the end of his life, namely, that God's non-election of some is dependent upon his foreknowledge of human sin.[595] The foundation of this argument is *capitulum* fourteen, which reads as follows:

> Si quis eos, quos deus per propriam praescientiam, "ante constitutionem mundi, praedestinavit conformes fieri imaginis filii sui," posse perire dicit, aut eos, quos minime praedestinavit, participes aeternae vitae seu regni caelestis fieri posse asserit, a numero fidelium prorsus excluditur—non quod praescientia dei liberum nostrum peccare cogat arbitrium, quamvis per ipsum liberum arbitrium nos peccaturos esse praescierit; unde apostolus ait: "Quos praescivit, et praedestinavit conformes fieri imaginis filii sui;" de quibus et dominus: "Oves meae vocem meam audiunt, et cognosco eas, et sequuntur me; et ego vitam aeternam do eis, et nonperibunt in aeternum; et nemo eas rapit de manu mea." Inter praescientiam enim et

[593] Humphries, *Ascetic Pneumatology*, 139.
[594] Hwang, *Intrepid Lover of Perfect Grace*, 25-26, 180-181.
[595] Hwang, *Intrepid Lover of Perfect Grace*, 181. Hwang derives his view in part from Markus, who in turn derives his from D.M. Cappuyns in this, who classified the theology of the Scythian monks as: "Ni le pessimisme d'Augustin, de Prosper et de Fulgence, ni l'optimisme exagéré de Cassien et de Fauste touchant la nature déchue; mais une espèce d'augustinisme intermédiaire, tendant à sauvegarder quelque chose de notre liberté, à reconnaître quelque bonté aux vertus naturelles et à leur réserver une place entre l'acte salutaire et l'acte proprement peccamineux." *Capitula* I-X of the *Capitula sancti Augustini*, he argues, are written by the Scythian monks because they match this theology; the rest do not match their theological interests, he claims (D.M. Cappuyns, "L'origine des «Capitula» d'Orange 529," in *Recherches de Théologie anciennes et médiévales*, vol. 6 (1934), 135-136). It is noteworthy that Markus does not quite get Cappuyns right in his judgment on the *Capitula sancti Augustini*, since Cappuyns only makes this judgment on the first ten of the *Capitula*, while Markus attributes this theological position to all of them.

> praedestinationem hoc interest, quod non omnia quae praesciuntur praedestinantur, omnia autem quae praedestinantur praesciuntur.[596]

The question is whether or not this passage supports the 'semi-Augustinian' viewpoint of Prosper and the *Hypomnesticon*. If it does, the argument that it derives from southern Gaul gains some force. However, it is questionable if that indeed is the case. The content is just as easily read as merely denying that God predestines human beings to do evil, which denial is the position of the late Augustine as well, not to mention that of Fulgentius of Ruspe.[597] The latter author will provide a useful comparison for the language of *capitulum* fourteen.

The opening phrase, and one presumably which induces Hwang to the conclusion that this passage affirms Prosper's later doctrine of predestination, reads: "Si quis eos, quos deus per propriam praescientiam, "ante constitutionem mundi, praedestinavit conformes fieri imaginis filii sui," posse perire dicit...a numero fidelium prorsus excluditur."[598] On one hand, this may be interpreted as saying that God predestines human beings on the basis of His own foreknowledge of their good or evil deeds. On the other, however, it could also be interpreted

---

[596] *Capitula sancti Augustini*, ed. Glorie, CCSL 85A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1978), XIV, 260-261. "If anyone says that those whom God through His own foreknowledge, 'before the foundation of the world predestined to be conformed to the image of His son,' [Rom. 8.29] is able to perish, or asserts that those whom He has not at all predestined are able to be made participants in eternal life or the kingdom of heaven—he is certainly excluded from the number of the faithful. This is not to say that the foreknowledge of God forces our free will to sin, however much he might foresee that we will sin through that same free will. Concerning this the apostle says: 'Those whom he foreknew he also predestined to be made conformed to the image of His son;' concerning these ones the Lord also says: 'My sheep hear my voice, and I recognize them, and they follow me; and I myself give them eternal life, and they will never perish; and no man takes them out of my hand.' [John 10.27-28] For there is this difference between foreknowledge and predestination: not all who are foreknown are predestined, but all who are predestined are foreknown."

[597] See Augustine, *De dono perseverentiae*, 14.35; and more clearly Fulgentius of Ruspe, *De veritate praedestinationis et gratiae*, ed. J. Fraipont, 1.12. "Iniquis vero et impiis nec praeparare potuit Deus aliquando nec dare mala opera, quibus damnabiliter viverent; neque malas eis voluntates inseruit, quibus iniusta quaeque culpabiliter vellent; sed praeparavit eis ignis aeterni poenam, ut ultricem sentiant in aeterna combustione iustitiam." "It is true that God could never have prepared evil works or granted them to the unjust and godless, works for which they live to their condemnation. Nor has he planted in them evil wills, by which they might culpably desire unrighteous things, but he has prepared for them the punishment of eternal fire so that they might feel his avenging justice while they are in everlasting flame" (R.R. McGregor and D. Fairbairn, tr., "The Truth about Predestination and Grace," in *Fulgentius and the Scythian Monks*, 130).

[598] *Capitula sancti Augustini*, 14. "If anyone says that those whom God through his own foreknowledge, 'before the foundation of the world, predestined to be conformed to the image of his son,' is able to perish...he is certainly excluded from the number of the faithful."

as merely affirming that God foreknew that he would predestine some to salvation on the basis of His inscrutable will alone.

The connection of foreknowledge and predestination is a common theme in Augustinian texts. The connection originates in Romans 8.29-30, where Paul writes: "Nam quos praescivit et praedestinavit conformes fieri imaginis Filii eius ut sit ipse primogenitus in multis fratribus quos autem praedestinavit hos et vocavit et quos vocavit hos et iustificavit quos autem iustificavit illos et glorificavit."[599] While interpretations of this passage differed widely throughout the Christian world, the strict Augustinians saw no contradiction between their insistence upon God's absolute and secret discretion in deciding who did and did not receive grace and the divine foreknowledge. Thus Fulgentius of Ruspe writes:

> Magna quippe est altitudo sapientiae et scientiae, quibus divitiis plenus, omnia futura et scienter cognovit ut sapiens, et sapienter praeordinavit ut sciens...Et perficit Deus praedestinata, quia virtus eius non impeditur aut superatur in opere...Quia non solum omnia opera sua, quae utique bona sunt, "exquisita in omnes voluntates eius," sed etiam quaedam angelorum et hominum opera mala, quamvis in tempore facienda, ipse tamen incommutabilis et aeternus, incommutabili atque perenni cognitione praescivit, non solum ea disposuit quae ipse gratis quibus vellet donaret ut bonus, verum etiam illa quae et bonis et malis redditurus esset ut iustus.[600]

God's foreknowledge, then, does not discount his free predestination, but rather works alongside it.

---

[599] Romans 8.29-30. "For those whom He foreknew He also predestined to be conformed to the image of His Son, that He might be the firstborn among many siblings. But those whom He predestined He also called, and those He called he also justified, and those He justified He also glorified."

[600] Fulgentius of Ruspe, *De veritate praedestinationis et gratiae*, 3.2. "Great indeed is the depth of God's wisdom and knowledge! Full of these riches, he consciously knew all future things because he was wise, and he foreordained them wisely because he knew them...And God accomplishes the things he has predestined, because no one can impede or overcome his power to accomplish these things...Because God is immutable and eternal, he foreknew with immutable and everlasting knowledge not only all his works (which are definitely good and 'sought out in all his wishes'), but also evil works of angels and of men that had to be carried out in time. He foreknew not only the things he arranged to give freely to those to whom he willed (so as to show that he is good), but also the things with which he intended to repay the good and the evil (so as to show that he is just)" (R.R. McGregor and D. Fairbairn, tr., "The Truth about Predestination and Grace," 199-200).

This point of view is to be contrasted (at least in part) to the "semi-Augustinian" viewpoint of the anonymous Gallic text the *Hypomnesticon*, which on the same topic reads as follows:

> Et ideo Deus, cui praescientia non accidens est, sed essentia fuit semper et est, quicquid antequam sit praescit, praedestinat, et propterea praedestinat, quia quale futurum sit praescit...Sed non omne quod praescit, praedestinat. Mala enim tantum praescit, bona vero et praescit et praedestinat. Quod ergo bonum, praescientia praedestinat, id est priusquam sit in re praeordinat. Hoc cum, ipso auctore, esse coeperit, vocat, ordinat, et disponit...Quia vero iustus et misericors Deus praesciusque est futurorum ex hac damnabili massa non personarum acceptione, sed iudicio aequitatis suae inreprehensibili, immo inconprehensibili, quos praescit misericordia gratuita praeparat, id est praedestinat ad aeternam vitam; ceteros autem poena, ut praedixi, debita punit; quod ideo punit, quia quid essent futuri praescivit, non tamen puniendos ipse fecit vel praedestinavit, sed tantum, ut dixi, in damnabili massa praescivit.[601]

Does the opinion of the author of the *Hypomnesticon*, namely that God's decision to not bestow grace upon some is due to his foreknowledge of their evil deeds, match that of the author of the *Capitula sancti Augustini*? There is no indication that it does so. Apart from the ambiguity of the opening phrase, the rest of *capitulum* fourteen also does not support this view. The phrase, "Non quod praescientia dei liberum nostrum peccare cogat arbitrium, quamvis per ipsum liberum arbitrium nos peccaturos esse praescierit," is read by Hwang as

[601] *The Pseudo-Augustinian Hypomnesticon Against the Pelagians and Celestians*, ed. J. E. Chisholm, vol. 2, 6.2, 192-193. "And so God, whose foreknowledge is not accidental but was always indeed essential, foreknows and predestines beforehand whatsoever shall be, and he predestines for this reason: since he foreknows that such shall come to pass...But not everything that he foresees does he predestine. For evil things he only foreknows, but good things he both foreknows and predestines. Therefore what is good he predestines by his foreknowledge, that is he predordains beforehand what shall be in reality. When this, with his authorship, shall begin to be, he calls, he ordains, and he disposes...But since God is just and compassionate and foreknows future things, he prepares with freely given compassion—that is, he predestines to eternal life—those whom he foreknows out of this condemnable mass, not with respect for persons but rather with a judgment of his unimpeachable equity (that is not at all incomprehensible). But the rest, as I said before, he punishes with the penalty owed them; he punishes them for this reason: since he foreknew what they were going to be. Not that he himself made or predestined them to be punished, but only, as I have said, that he foreknew them to be in the condemnable mass." See also the comments of J. E. Chisholm, *The Pseudo-Augustinian Hypomnesticon Against the Pelagians and Celestians*, vol. 1, 172-174, where he argues that, "The author prepares the way for the conclusion reached shortly afterwards in the *Pro Augustino responsiones ad capitula objectionum Gallorum*, viz. that those not predestined for glory are rejected because God foresees their future evil deeds" (p. 174). Alexander Hwang gives a good overview of the scholarship surrounding this anonymous text, and concludes that it was written by a colleague of Prosper of Aquitaine's in Marseilles between 433 and 435 (Hwang, *Intrepid Lover of Perfect Grace*, 22-25, 180).

agreeing with the teaching of the *Hypomnesticon* and the later Prosper; but all it can reasonably be read to affirm is that God does not force anyone to sin even though he foreknows that they will.[602] Again, this is standard Augustinian doctrine even at its most austere.

The final phrase of *capitulum* fourteen—"Inter praescientiam enim et praedestinationem hoc interest, quod non omnia quae praesciuntur praedestinantur, omnia autem quae praedestinantur praesciuntur"— is noted by Hwang as a paraphrase from Augustine's *De praedestinatione sanctorum*.[603] He concludes from this paraphrase that the author of the *Capitula sancti Augustini* must have been someone different from Prosper or the author of the *Hypomnesticon*, and remarks upon the apparent incongruity between the source text and the doctrine of *capitulum* fourteen. However, it makes better sense to simply admit that there is no incongruity at all; merely stating that God's foreknowledge of evil does not imply that he causes sin is standard teaching. Thus there is nothing in *capitulum* fourteen to indicate that the Scythian monks, or some other austerely Augustinian author, could not have written it.

The *Capitula sancti Augustini* includes a section which does not appear in the earliest manuscripts, *Capitulum* XVIII, so it may be reasonable to conclude that it was added later.[604] Still, even if it is indeed an integral part of the document, or was added shortly thereafter, its quotations from Augustine's *Enchiridion* are all of the most austerely predestinarian

---

[602] Hwang, *Intrepid Lover of Perfect Grace*, 180 n. 174. *Capitula sancti Augustini* 14. "This is not to say that the foreknowledge of God forces our free will to sin, however much he might foresee that we will sin through that same free will."
[603] Hwang, *Intrepid Lover of Perfect Grace*, 180-181. *Capitula sancti Augustini* 14. "For there is this difference between foreknowledge and predestination: not all who are foreknown are predestined, but all who are predestined are foreknown." The quote is from Augustine, *De praedestinatione sanctorum*, 8.17-18.
[604] *Capitula sancti Augustini*, ed. Glorie, pp. 243-244. But Hwang, *Intrepid Lover of Perfect Grace*, 25-26, 180-181, seems to assert the essential unity of the *Capitula*.

variety.[605] So the *Capitula sancti Augustini*, far from endorsing a "moderate" Augustinianism, upholds an austere version, even if it ignores certain topics such as predestination to glory which exercised the minds of such authors as Fulgentius of Ruspe and the later Augustine.

The importance of the *Capitula sancti Augustini* to understanding Rome's position on semi-Pelagianism is that this text was sent, among some other selections from Augustine, to Caesarius by Pope Felix IV upon request, as representing the position of catholic orthodoxy as defined by Rome.[606] If so, the austere Augustinianism represented by the *Capitula sancti Augustini* was viewed as acceptably and usefully orthodox by the popes. As D.M. Cappuyns relates the story:

> Mais bientôt les archives du pape s'accrurent du dossier de Jean Maxence, qui contenait un autre recueil de *capitula*, précis et remarquable, également consacré à la grâce et visant sans ambages l'ancien évêque de Riez. A l'occasion, il pourrait remplacer avantageusement le syllabus de Prosper. Sans doute, les moines scythes, d'abord sympathiques à Hormisdas, avaient fini par encourir sa disgrâce. Mais Rome n'avait pas contre eux des griefs doctrinaux et, une fois les difficultés aplanies par le silence de Maxence et la mort d'Hormisdas, rien ne s'opposait à ce qu'on utilisât des auteurs que les évêques africains eux-mêmes déclaraient orthodoxes. Aussi bien verrat-on bientôt l'un des successeurs d'Hormisdas, Jean II, lors d'une consultation christologique de l'empereur Justinien, recourir aux écrits scythes et leur emprunter pour le faire sien, l'*unus de trinitate passus est carne*. Pourquoi le prédécesseur de Jean II, Félix IV, ne se souviendrait-il pas opportunément, des *Capitula* de Maxence, supposé qu'on le consultât au sujet de la grâce?[607]

[605] E.g., its use of passages from the *Enchiridion* insisting upon the limited scope of Christ's atonement.
[606] See Cappuyns, "L'origine des «Capitula» d'Orange 529," 140-142; Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency*, 228; Mathisen, "Caesarius of Arles," 217.
[607] Cappuyns, "L'origine des «Capitula» d'Orange 529," 141. "Soon the archives of the pope obtained the dossier of John Maxentius [i.e., the *Capitula sancti Augustini*], which contained another group of *capitula*, precise and remarkable, equally devoted to grace and aiming squarely at the old bishop of Riez [i.e., Faustus]. So at that time it was able to usefully replace the syllabus of Prosper [i.e., the *Liber Sententiarum*]. Of course, the Scythian monks, intially in favour with Hormisdas, ended up by incurring his disapprobation. But Rome did not have doctrinal problems with them and, once the difficulties disappeared due to the silence of Maxentius and the death of Hormisdas, nothing prevented the use of the authors whom the African bishops themselves had declared orthodox. As well, we see that soon after, one of the successors of Hormisdas, John II, during a christological consultation with the emperor Justinian, had recourse to the writings of the Scythians and borrowed from them a phrase which he made his own: *unus de trinitate passus est carne*. Why should not the predecesor of John II, Felix IV, have remembered on the proper occasion the *Capitula* of Maxentius, supposing he had been consulted on the subject of grace?"

Cappuyns goes on to suggest that Felix sent selections from the *Capitula sancti Augustini* and the *Liber sententiarum* of Prosper that consisted of texts dealing with the questions raised by Caesarius.[608] The possibility that it was Felix, and not Caesarius, who culled most of the selections that appear as the twenty-five canons of Orange is consonant with the generally held opinion that Caesarius laid before the clerics in attendance at the Council a prepared and authoritative document to which they were expected to affix their names.[609]

This document is by implication more austere in its Augustinianism than the surrounding annotations made by Caesarius. The key concept that makes Orange's doctrine of grace "semi-Augustinian" is, as has been mentioned before, that baptism restores a measure of freedom to the human will, so that, with the help of God's grace, a baptized person can act righteously. This rules out predestination to glory. The summary, the *Definitio fidei*, written by Caesarius and placed after the canons puts it this way: "Hoc etiam secundum fidem catholicam credimus, quod post acceptam per baptismum gratiam omnis baptiszati Christo auxiliante et cooperante, quae ad salute animae pertinent, possint et debeant, si fideliter laborare voluerint, adimplere."[610] The thirteenth canon reflects in a roundabout way this doctrine: "De reparatione liberi arbitrii. Arbitrium voluntatis in primo homine infirmatum nisi per gratiam baptismi non poetest reparari; quod amissum, nisi a quo potuit

[608] Cappuyns, L'origine des «Capitula» d'Orange 529," 141-142.
[609] See Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency*, 228-229; and Mathisen, "Caesarius of Arles," 211-212, 216-217.
[610] "Concilium Arausicanum," in *Concilia Galliae*, CCSL 148A, ed. C. de Clercq (Turnhout: Brepols, 1963), 63. "This also we believe in accordance with the catholic faith, that after having received grace through baptism, all those who have been baptized are able and ought, if they wish faithfully to labour, to fulfill with the help and cooperation of Christ the things which pertain to the salvation of the soul."

dari, non potest reddi; unde Veritas ipsa dicit: "Si vos Filius liberaverit, tunc vere liberi erites."[611]

This thirteenth canon does not reflect exactly what appears in the original wording of the article of Prosper's *Liber sententiarum* from which it is derived.[612] *Sententia* 152 reads as follows: "Arbitrium voluntatis tunc est vere liberum, cum vitiis peccatisque non servit. Tale datum est a Deo, quod amissum, nisi a quo potuit dari, non potest reddi. Unde Veritas dicit, *Si vos Filius liberaverit, tunc vere liberi eritis*."[613] The difference is in the addition of baptism as the dividing line between the loss of free will and regaining it. It seems likely, therefore, that the original document sent from Felix to Caesarius did not contain this change. Its emphasis was instead on the inability of the human will to free itself. Again, the Roman Church appears to hold to a more austere Augustinianism than Caesarius insisted upon.

The second piece of evidence illustrating this point also concerns the Scythian monks. When, in 520, the exiled North African bishop Possessor wrote to Pope Hormisdas inquiring about the orthodoxy of Faustus of Riez's *De gratia*, Hormisdas responded with a letter denoting what was to be believed about grace and free will.[614] Possessor had been in

---

[611] "Concilium Arausicanum," 59 l. 104-108. "Concerning the restoration of free will. The freedom of the will was weakened in the first man and cannot be restored save through the grace of baptism; and having been lost it is not able to be returned unless by the One whom it was able to be given; whence the Truth itself says: *If the Son will have freed you, then you will truly be free*."

[612] Cappuyns, "L'origine des «Capitula» d'Orange 529," 126 n. 15, notes the various changes between the canons of Orange and their sources, but suggests that the modification of canon 13, "peu[t] être aussi bien l'oeuvre de ce compilateur que de Césaire." This is possible, but unlikely, for two reasons: 1) Caesarius' own *Definitio fidei* lays special emphasis on the substance of this change, indicating Caesarius himself was concerned to make this qualification; and 2) The other texts, which will be discussed later, dating from around this period from the church of Rome, give no indication of this modified Augustinianism, but rather the reverse. See also on this point Weaver, p. 228.

[613] Prosper of Aquitaine, *Liber Sententiarum*, ed. P. Callens (Turnhout: Brepols, 1972), 292. "The freedom of the will is truly free at the time when it does not serve vices and sins. Such a freedom was given by God, which having been lost, is not able to be returned unless from the One by whom it was able to be given. Whence the Truth says: *If the Son will have freed you, then you will be truly free.*"

[614] For the background to this letter, see W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 244-245; Weaver, *Divine Grace and Human Agency*, 180-182; and R.R. McGregor and D. Fairbairn, tr., *Fulgentius of Ruspe and the Scythian Monks*, 18-19. The text of Possessor's letter may be found in *Collectio Avellana*, ed. O. Guenther, CSEL 35-2 (Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1898), 230, 695-

discussion with the Scythian monks, who had been criticizing Faustus' book, and Possessor wished to know if it was orthodox. Hormisdas responded by 1) condemning the Scythian monks for stirring up quarrels, 2) noting that Augustine, not Faustus, defined the doctrine on grace and free will of the Roman church, and 3) promising to send a collection of *capitula* to further clarify matters.[615] It is the second point that is worth paying close attention to. Hormisdas wrote:

> De arbitrio tamen libero et gratia dei, quid Romana, hoc est catholica, sequatur et servet ecclesia, licet ex variis libris beati Augustini, et maxime ad Hilarium et Prosperum, abunde possit agnosci, tamen et in scriniis ecclesiasticis expressa capitula continentur, quae, si ibi desunt et necessaria creditis, destinamus, quamquam qui diligenter apostoli dicta considerat, quid sequi debeat, evidenter agnoscat.[616]

Three pieces of evidence for the correct position on grace and free will are put forward by Hormisdas: 1) Augustine's works, *especially that one written to Hilary and Prosper*; 2) the *capitula* preserved in the records (i.e., the *Liber sententiarum*); and 3) the writings of the Apostle Paul. If Augustine's works in general had been cited, that would not have meant a great deal, given that all sides cited the African bishop's authority (even Faustus of Riez).[617] However, Hormisdas states explicitly that above all the rest of Augustine's works, the *De praedestinatione sanctorum* and the *De dono perseverentiae* define the truth about grace and free will. The significance of this should not be brushed aside, as it too frequently is:

---

696. Hormisdas' response to Possessor is printed in both Guenther's text, as *Epistula* 231, and also in Glorié's CCSL edition of the writings of the Scythian Monks (CCSL 85A), 112-121.

[615] This was probably the *Liber sententiarum* of Prosper; see Cappuyns, "L'origine des «Capitula» d'Orange 529," 141.

[616] Hormisdas, "Epistula quae dicitur esse Papae Hormisdae ad Possessorem episcopum Africae qui est Constantinopoli," in *Maxentii aliorumque Scytharum monachorum necnon Ioannis Tomitanae urbis episcopi opuscula*, ed. Fr. Glorie, CCSL 85A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1978), 15, 120-121. "Nevertheless, concerning the freedom of the will and the grace of God, the doctrine which the Roman, that is the catholic, Church follows and preserves is able to be amply known from the diverse books of the blessed Augustine, and especially that one written to Hilary and Prosper; as well, written *capitula* are contained in the ecclesiatical records which, if they are lacking where you are and you believe them necessary, we shall send them to you, although the one who carefully ponders the words of the Apostle shall know clearly what he ought to follow."

[617] Faustus of Riez, *De Gratia*, 1.5.13-14, 2.9.21-23. See further Thomas A. Smith, *De Gratia* 76, 98.

Hormisdas is endorsing Augustine's final position on the subject.[618] The pope may not have been too keen on the tactics of the Scythian monks, but it does not seem that he disagreed with their doctrine.

So it was that when Caesarius asked the church of Rome to support his position amidst the theological scuffle in southern Gaul, he was dealing with a doctrinally austere Augustinian authority. Yet the doctrine laid out in the Council of Orange diverges slightly from this version of Augustinianism. Why the discrepancy? And why, if Boniface confirmed the decrees of Orange, is it still reasonable to claim Rome as holding to such an austere Augustinianism?

It should be borne in mind that Boniface's confirmation of Orange was equivocal in two ways. First, nowhere in the letter does the pope clearly affirm that the human will was able after baptism to fulfill, with Christ's help, the ethical demands of God. This section of Caesarius' *Definitio fidei* and the particular modification of Canon 13 that he made is ignored. Instead, Boniface repeats standard Augustinian doctrine about the inability of the human will to do anything good without God's grace. The problem that Boniface sees, based on the account Caesarius sent him, is that, "Aliqui episcopi Galliarum, cum cetera iam bona ex Dei acquieverint gratia provenire, fidem tantum, qua in Christo credimus, naturae esse

[618] As Fulgentius of Ruspe took special note of, in his second letter to the Scythian monks: "Prae omnibus studium gerite libros sancti Augustini quod ad Prosperum et Hilarium scripsit, memoratis fratribus legendos ingerere. Quorum mentionem beatae memroiae Hormisda, sedis apostolicae gloriosus antistes, in epistula quam consulenti se sancto fratri consacerdotique nostro Possessori rescripsit" (Fulgentius of Rusepe, *Epistula XV*, ed. J. Fraipont, CCSL 91A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1968), 18, 456). "Above all, pay attention to the books that Saint Augustine wrote to Prosper and Hilary, and urge the above-mentioned brothers [i.e., those who agreed with Faustus of Riez] to read them. Hormisdas of blessed memory, the glorious bishop of the Apostolic See, made mention of these books, with great commendation of universal praise, in a reply letter he wrote to our holy brother and fellow priest Possessor." (Fulgentius of Ruspe, "Second Letter," in *Fulgentius and the Scythian Monks*, tr. D. Fairbairn and R.R. McGregor, 18, 119.) A typical assessment of Hormisdas' response is found in Matthew J. Pereira, "Augustine, Pelagius, and the Southern Gallic Tradition: Faustus of Riez's *De gratia Dei*," 202: "Hormisdas declared that Faustus was not to be considered as one of the Church Fathers and he affirmed that Augustine was the authoritative teacher on the doctrine of grace."

velint, non gratiae; et hominibus ex Adam, quod dici nefas est, in libero arbitrio remansisse."[619]

The response to this is to reaffirm that the *bonae voluntatis initium* comes only through the *praevenientem Dei gratiam*. While Boniface states that, because the matter had already been gone over thoroughly by his predecessors, he would refrain from a lengthy response, he did make a brief sketch of the correct doctrine. The grace of God over human nature is the emphasis. This sketch consists of these points: 1) Grace is conferred preveniently, that is, before any good inclination of the human will; 2) Grace from God is necessary for the beginning, performing, and completion of any good work. Standard Scriptural proofs are given (e.g., John 15.5, John 6.44, Hebrews 12.1-2) and the first conclusion drawn: "Quae cum ita sint, invenire non possumus, quid ad credendum in Christo sine Dei gratia humanae deputent voluntati, cum Christus auctor consummatorque sit fidei."[620] The second conclusion is drawn from a citation of Romans 14.23, *Omne quod ex fide non est, peccatum est*: "Quod cum ita sit, aut nullum bonum gratiae deputabunt, si ei fidem subtrahere moliuntur; aut si quod bonum esse dicunt de gratia, ipsa necessario fides erit gratiae deputanda."[621] The arguments surrounding these two points hammer them home, rather than nuance them in the manner of Canon 13 of Orange or of Caesarius' *Definitio fidei*. Baptism is nowhere mentioned.

---

[619] "Concilium Arausicanum," in *Concilia Gallia*, 1, 66. "Certain of the bishop of the Gauls, although they already agree that all other good things come from the grace of God, only the faith by which we believe in Christ do they wish to come from nature; and that humanity after Adam remained in the freedom of the will—which is impious even to say."

[620] "Concilium Arausicanum," in *Concilia Gallia*, 2, 68. "Since these things are so, we are not able to find what they impute to the human will in order to believe in Christ without the grace of God, since Christ is the author and finisher of faith."

[621] "Concilium Arausicanum," in *Concilia Gallia*, 3, 68. "Since this is so, either they impute nothing good to grace, if they strive to remove faith from it; or if they say anything good is from grace, that same faith necessarily must be imputed to grace."

Second, the import of Boniface's confirmation of Orange should not be overemphasized. What did the the pope's intervention on behalf of Caesarius really mean? How did both Caesarius and Boniface view the Council? There is a good argument to be made that its influence was not all that great, and was not seen either by the pope or by contemporary Gallic clergymen as the definitive statement on grace and free will. From Boniface's perspective, he was supporting an ally who was a reliable means of representing the authority of the papacy in Gaul.[622] Thus deviation from an austere Augustinianism—which the Roman church, as demonstrated by its dealings with the Scythian monks, did not consider to be a *sine qua non* of correct doctrine—would not have stopped Boniface from confirming the decisions of his chief Gallic ally and representative. But support, especially the almost *pro forma* support that Boniface's letter seems to express, does not indicate that the decrees of Orange precisely expressed the Roman church's own perspective on the matter. Rather, it makes better sense to see Boniface (and Felix before him) as safeguarding a standard of orthodoxy on grace and free will slightly less rigorous than the one they themselves held to. In any case, the Council of Orange does not seem to have had an immediate effect upon the opinions of the majority of either the Gallic or the Roman clergy and laity.

Nor was it held up in in the Roman church as authoritative. Boniface's support of Caesarius against those whom the bishop of Arles insisted were in essence Pelagians was fairly tepid:

> It would appear that, by introducing a possible accusation of Pelagianism, Caesarius had attempted to tar his Gallic opponents with the Pelagian brush, a tactic that had

[622] For the function of the papal vicariate, and especially Caesarius' role in its history, see Klingshirn, *Caesarius of Arles*, 127-131; also Georg Langgärtner, *Die Gallienpolitik der Päpste* (Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1965), 36-41. Langgärtner addresses the question of the significance of the intervention of Felix and Boniface in the same work, on pages 142-144.

> worked well in the past, and, by doing so, to gain even further support from the bishop of Rome. But Boniface was unreceptive. Rather than rising to the bait, Boniface simply told Caesarius to use his own powers of persuasion to deal with his problems. Clearly, Boniface's willingness to support his increasingly embattled and importunate Gallic client only extended so far.[623]

In addition to these points made by Mathisen, the point made earlier, that Boniface's letter ignored some of the unique doctrinal elements of Caesarius' declarations, demonstrates the hesitancy with which the pope endorsed him. Mathisen's conclusion about the papal view of Orange seems to make the most sense: "Nor is there much to suggest that Caesarius' efforts were part of some agenda of the Church of Rome, whose only involvement in these issues was purely reactive, to promote an Augustinian interpretation of prevenient grace."[624] Where he is mistaken is in saying, as every other scholar on the subject has, that: "The Councils of Valence and Orange mark the last time, for some three centuries, that dissension over the issues of grace, free will, and predestination is attested in Gaul."[625] Fortunatus' *EOD* is an attestation of something going on.

Further evidence that the Roman church held to a view more austere than that of Orange is provided by a letter of Pope Pelagius I, written twenty-eight years later in April 557. This letter was sent from the pope to the Frankish king Childebert I to allay concerns about the pope's adherence to the decrees of the Fifth Ecumenical Council. Childebert had evidently requested that Pope Pelagius send him a confession of faith to confirm that he was orthodox. Pelagius acquiesced to this request in this letter, which contains a lengthy and detailed statement of faith that confirmed the bishop of Rome's adherence to orthodox theological stances on the Trinity, Christology and original sin and grace.[626]

---

[623] Mathisen, "Caesarius of Arles," 227.
[624] Mathisen, "Caesarius of Arles," 231.
[625] Mathisen, "Caesarius of Arles," 233.
[626] Found in Pelagius I, "Letter 7," ed. Gassò and Batlle, 23-26..

Pope Pelagius I, having first assured Childebert of his orthodoxy on the Trinity and Christology, then proceeds to outline his views on original sin and the Last Judgment, touching on issues concerning both the Pelagian and semi-Pelagian controversies. He wrote:

> Omnes enim homines ab Adam usque ad consummationem saeculi natos et mortuos cum ipso Adam eiusque uxore, qui non ex aliis parentibus nati sunt, sed alter de terra, alter autem de costa viri creati sunt, tunc resurrecturos esse confiteor et adstare ante tribunal Christi, "ut recipiat unusquisque propria corporis, prout gessit, sive bona sive mala;" et iustos quidem per largissimam gratiam Dei, utpote vasa misericordiae in gloriam praeparata, eternae vitae praemiis donaturum, in societate videlicet angelorum absque ullo iam lapsus sui metu sine fine victuros; iniquos autem arbitrio voluntatis propriae vasa ire apta in interitum permanentes, qui viam Domini aut non agnoverunt aut cognitam diversis capti praevaricationibus reliquerunt, in poenis eterni atque inextinguibilis ignis, ut sine fine ardeant, iustissimo iudicio traditurum.[627]

The anti-Pelagian component is contained within the first sentence, where the pope states: "Omnes enim homines ab Adam usque ad consummationem saeculi natos et mortuos cum ipso Adam eiusque uxore." The Pelagian assertion that Adam's punishment applied only to him and not to his descendants as well is thus denied. An affirmation of the final resurrection and the Last Judgment follows.

Then, in an unusual twist in a confession otherwise concerned with doctrines routinely covered in most Symbol sermons, the pope writes in opposition to semi-Pelagianism. After quoting 2 Corinthians 5.10 on the judgment of Christ according to one's works, Pope Pelagius hastens to assert that salvation is nonetheless attributable entirely to God's grace.[628] The way he describes how grace works on those who are saved from hell and those who are

[627] Pelagius I, "Letter 7," ed. Gassò and Batlle, 24-25. "For I confess that all men from Adam up to the end of the age were born and died along with that same Adam and his wife, who were not born from other parents but rather the former was created out of the earth and the latter from the rib of the man, and at the end of the age they shall be resurrected and stand, 'before the judgment-seat of Christ, so that each one should receive the deserts of his body, just as he conducted himself, whether good or evil.' And indeed he will grant the righteous through the most generous grace of God, as vessels for compassion prepared in glory, the rewards of eternal life—namely that in the society of the angels, now without any fear of their fall, they will be victorious without end. But the wicked will be handed over by a very just judgment to the punishments of eternal and inextinguishable fire—so that they burn without end—due to the choice of their own will, remaining vessels fit for destruction, either not knowing the way of God or abandoning their knowledge of it having been captured by diverse transgressions."

[628] 2 Corinthians 5.10: "Ut recipiat unusquisque propria corporis, prout gessit, sive bona sive mala."

condemned to it indicates that he held to the austere position of Augustine put forward in his final two works.

The evidence for an explicit affirmation of the doctrine of predestination to glory (as found in Augustine's *De dono perseverentiae*) lies in the focus on the afterlife. The righteous, those who after the resurrection reside in the company of the angels, are the *vasa misericordiae in gloriam praeparata*, whereas the wicked are the *vasa irae apta in interitum permanentes* who are sent to the everlasting fire. The righteous will receive their reward *per largissimam gratiam Dei*, the wicked their punishment *arbitrio voluntatis propriae*. The description of the righteous as the "vessels of compassion *prepared in glory*" leaves little space for any independent action of the human will. It is not baptism which is in question here, but ultimate salvation. The freedom of the will is associated only with damnation, whether through ignorance or through choosing to forsake Christianity. The decision *not* to forsake the true faith is associated only with the grace of God. Thus the implication is that perseverance in the true faith is also entirely a gift of God; there is not only a predestination to baptism, but also a predestination to glory.[629]

The bishops of Rome immediately following Pelagius I did not leave a great deal of writing to posterity, so their views are impossible to ascertain on the matter of grace and free will. However, the end of the sixth century saw the beginning of one of the most important pontificates of Late Antiquity: that of Gregory the Great. The mass of writing emanating from his pen enables a very clear assessment to be made of his position on grace and free will. Many have done so, and the general conclusion reached is that Gregory was closer to

[629] For a comprehensive (and contemporaneous) discussion of the *vasa misericordiae* and the *vasa irae* that makes clear the connection between the language used by Pelagius I and the doctrine of predestination to glory, see Fulgentius of Ruspe, *De veritate praedestinationis et gratiae dei*, 35-36.

Orange's "semi-Augustinian" position than to the austere version embraced by Fulgentius of Ruspe and by his papal predecessors.[630]

This may perhaps be a result of Gregory's monastic tendencies conflicting with the traditional (by this point) position of the Roman Church. Dudden argued:

> Gregory's theory of Predestination is full of confusion and contradiction. Unable to accept in its entirety the Augustinian doctrine of an absolute decree, Gregory wavers between this and the older view of a conditional predestination, grounded on God's prescience of the free acts of man...His admiration for Augustine, indeed, led him into continual inconsistencies.[631]

Dudden is too harsh on this point. Much like John Cassian and the Council of Orange, Gregory is approaching the question of predestination from a practical perspective. As Dagens puts it: "Grégoire aborde en directeur d'âmes, en psychologue ou en moraliste, les questions qu'Augustin avait traitées en philosophe et en théologien."[632] Gregory's greater inconsistency on these matters than the teaching of Orange or Cassian—for at times he can sound very austere indeed—may be attributed both to his own personal attachment to Augustine and to the pressure of a Roman theological establishment that endorsed Augustine's conclusions in the *De praedestinatione sanctorum* and the *De dono perseverentiae*. In any case, a possible shift under Gregory makes little difference to the argument about Venantius Fortunatus, who had long left Italy behind by the time Gregory came to the fore.

The position taken by Fortunatus on the question of grace and free will matches most closely that of the Roman church throughout much of the sixth century. The popes held that

---

[630] See the excellent summary by Carole Straw, *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 140 n. 77. She notes especially the influence Cassian had on him.
[631] F. Homes Dudden, *Gregory the Great: His Place in History and Thought* (New York: Longman, Green, and Co., 1905), 400.
[632] Claude Dagens, *Saint Grégoire le Grand: Culture et expérience chrétiennes* (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1977), 272. "Gregory approaches as a leader of souls, as a psychologist or as a moralist the questions that Augustine treated as a philsopher and theologian."

the last two books of Augustine defined for them the catholic position on grace and free will. These last two books laid out Augustine's most austere take on predestination, insisting upon the absolute nature of God's decree of predestination both to baptism and to ultimate glory. Fortunatus, educated as he was in Italy, in a city (Ravenna) that was friendly to the Roman pontiff, supported this view, in contrast to his Gallic contemporaries.

Part 2

Venantius Fortunatus and the Three Chapters Schism

Chapter 5

The Background to the Three Chapters Controversy

5.0 *Introduction*

This second part will explore how Venantius Fortunatus interacted with the Christological controversies current in the sixth century, above all the Three Chapters schism resulting from the Second Council of Constantinople (553). How Fortunatus engaged with a dispute that sprawled across the sixth-century Mediterranean reveals a great deal about his background in Italy, his perspective on the Eastern Empire and the Gallic milieu in which he worked. This was a complicated dispute, geographically, culturally and linguistically diffuse, which makes it different from the controversy on grace and free will explored in the previous two chapters. The discussion of Christology will be composed of two chapters.

While Chapter 6 will deal narrowly and explicitly with Venantius Fortunatus, the present chapter will present the immensely complicated background of the Three Chapters controversy in the following steps. First, the history of the doctrinal disputes dealt with at the Councils of Ephesus (431) and Chalcedon (451) will be laid out (5.1). Then, the response of the churches across the Mediterranean to Chalcedon in the following century will also be explored, culminating in a discussion of the Second Council of Constantinople (553) (5.2). Next, the fissures in the western church caused by the decisions of the Second Council of Constantinople, the so-called "Three Chapters schism," will be outlined (5.3). Next, the continuing controversy over Christology up to the end of the sixth century in the Eastern

Empire will be given a brief look (5.4). Finally, the impact these disputes had on the Gallic church will be discussed (5.5).

5.1 *The Christological Questions at the Councils of Ephesus (431) and Chalcedon (451)*

The disputes over the nature of Christ erupted from the smouldering embers of the Trinitarian disputes of the fourth century.[633] Niceno-Constantinopolitan trinitarian orthodoxy was firmly established by the start of the fifth century. A synodical letter from a council held at Constantinople in 382 sent to the Western bishops Damasus of Rome, Ambrose of Milan and several others laid out the doctrine fixed upon by the First Council of Constantinople of 381:

διδάσκουσαν ἡμᾶς πιστεύειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, δηλαδὴ θεότητος καὶ δυνάμεως καὶ οὐσίας μιᾶς τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος πιστευομένης ὁμοτίμου τε τῆς ἀξίας καὶ συναϊδίου τῆς βασιλείας, ἐν τρισὶ τελειοτάταις ὑποστάσεσιν ἤγουν τρισὶ τελείοις προσώποις.[634]

Thus the Father, Son and Holy Spirit shared the same substance (*οὐσία*) but were different persons (*ὑπόστασις* or *πρόσωπον*—the two terms are here conflated).[635] The dispute over the nature of the Son's *hypostasis* after his incarnation revolved around the tension between the

---

[633] On the elements of continuity between the two disputes, see Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, 12-13; John A. McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria: The Christological Controversy: Its History, Theology, and Texts* (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 21; and Nicholas Constas, *Proclus of Constantinople and the Cult of the Virgin in Late Antiquity* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 31-35.

[634] Theodoret of Cyrrhus, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. L. Parmentier and G.C. Hansen, *Sources Chrétiennes* 530 (Paris: Les Éditions des Cerf, 2009), 5.9.11, 371-372. "[It] teach[es] us to believe in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and which declare[s] that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, have the same divinity, the same substance, and the same power; and that the three perfect hypostases, or three perfect persons, are co-equal and co-eternal." (E. Walford, tr., *A History of the Church* (London: H.G. Bohn, 1854), 210). Compare also Fortunatus' own terminology in the *EOD*, *Carm.* 10.1.4: "Filius enim in quo Pater est totus unitate substantiae, non confusione personae, subiectum habebat hoc nosse, non alterius munere, sed potestate naturae." "But the Son, in whom the Father exists in full through the unity of substance, not in confusion of person, held subject this knowledge—not through the gift of another, but through the power of his nature."

[635] A brief outline of the definition of *hypostasis* as it was used in the Christological controversies of the fifth and sixth centuries would be useful at this point. A *hypostasis* is the instantiation of a *physis*, or nature. So an individual human being is the instantiation of the nature "human;" and thus Venantius Fortunatus was a *hypostasis* of the *physis* "human." "Natures" do not exist as actual material substances, but only exist in individual *hypostases*. In the fifth century, the Latin neologism *subsistentia* was coined to more accurately translate *hypostasis*, which before had been literally translated as *substantia*, causing understandable confusion. "Person" is a translation frequently used for *hypostasis*, but lacks philosophical precision.

real humanity of the incarnate Son and the Son's shared *ousia* with the Father and Holy Spirit. Divinity is impassible (i.e., cannot suffer or change form), yet the Son both took on flesh and suffered on the cross as a real human being. The divine *φύσις*, or nature, and the human *φύσις*, or nature, were both present in the incarnate Son; how this occurred and what characterized this state of affairs was hotly disputed.[636]

The dispute over the two natures of Christ, divine and human, was in an important sense a clash between two modes of Christological thought: the Alexandrian and the Antiochene.[637] The pre-eminent theologian in the latter stream was Theodore of Mopsuestia, who lived from c. 350-428 and whose theology would later feature prominently in the Three Chapters dispute. He was to become a major antagonist of the Alexandrian party in later years, until his eventual posthumous condemnation at the Second Council of Constantinople (553). The Antiochene perspective on Christology spoke of the second person of the Trinity, the Son or *Logos*, as distinct from the *Christ*, the man specially graced by the Son.[638] This approach was concerned to distance itself from the Arian notion that the divine Son had suffered, while also staying away from the Apollinarian denial of Christ's true humanity. The solution was to affirm that the man Jesus possessed both a human *physis* and a human *hypostasis* and that the Son possessed a divine *physis* as a well as a separate divine *hypostasis*.[639] The convergence of the two was one *prosopon*, viewed in this case as a

[636] A good discussion of the terms in question is McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria, The Christological Controversy*, 138-145. Briefly: "Ousia: Essence, substance, being, genus, or nature. Physis: Nature, make-up of a thing. Hypostasis: The actual concrete reality of a thing, the underlying essence. Prosopon: The observable character, defining properties, manifestation of a reality" (McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria, The Christological Controversy*, 138).
[637] I will avoid talking about two "schools" of thought, since there is considerable variation within these two tendencies (Aloys Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, tr. J. Bowden, vol. I (London: Mowbrays, 1964), 421).
[638] The literature on this subject is voluminous; this account is based on Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian* Tradition, vol. 1, 421-439.
[639] Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 1, 437-439.

concept distinct from a *hypostasis*.[640] Still, the two *physeis* and two *hypostases* remained distinct. The subject of the name "Christ" was the graced man. As Fairbairn puts it, "Theodore's picture of Christ is that of a uniquely graced man, a man who has received such grace, co-operation and assistance from God the Logos that he can be considered one *prosopon* with him and can share in his honour."[641]

The Alexandrian understanding of Christology sat squarely opposed to the Antiochene. The pre-eminent theologian in this stream was Cyril of Alexandria (c. 376-444). In his opinion, and that of his followers, Christ's divine and human natures were united within one *hypostasis*.[642] The term *prosopon* for Cyril was used as a synonym for *hypostasis*.[643] Nicene Trinitarian dogma held that God was three *hypostases* with one *ousia*, that is substance. One of these *hypostases*, the Son, the Alexandrians asserted was incarnate. The Alexandrians accused the Antiochenes of making four hypostases out of the Trinity instead of three through their identification of the human *hypostasis* of Christ as being distinct from the divine *hypostasis* of the Son. They held instead that the pre-existent Son had joined the human nature to himself, and that the Son himself had truly suffered and died in his incarnate state. The one *hypostasis* of the Son was the subject of the incarnation. Thus Cyril of Alexandria, in his "Letter to the Monks of Egypt," stated: "ἐπελἀβετο τοίνυν σπέρματος Ἀβραὰμ καὶ κεκοινώνηκεν αἵματος καὶ σαρκὸς ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος, ἴδιον

[640] Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 1, 433-434.
[641] Fairbairn, *Grace and Christology*, 50.
[642] For the Alexandrian emphases, as they were perfected by Cyril of Alexandria, see McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria, The Christological Controversy*, 175-226; see also Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 1, 480-483.
[643] McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria, The Christological Controversy*, 144.

ποιησάμενος σῶμα τὸ ἐκ γυναικός, ἵνα μὴ μόνον ὑπάρχων θεός, ἀλλ' ἤδη καὶ ἄνθρωπος γεγονὼς καθ' ἡμᾶς νοοῖτο διὰ τὴν ἕνωσιν."[644]

The clash of these two understandings forms the central element in the lead-up to the Councils of Ephesus (431) and Chalcedon (451). An important additional element in the controversy is the role and proper title of Mary the mother of Jesus. In fact it was this element which became one of the catalysts for the initial clash between the Antiochenes and Alexandrians. In the spring of 428 the Antiochene cleric Nestorius was installed as bishop of Constantinople. He at once began a ferocious campaign against all heresy that quickly made him enemies.[645] At the end of 428 he began to address what appeared to him as an excessive veneration of the Virgin Mary. He believed this veneration endangered the impassibility of the Son as well as the true humanity of Christ. The use of the term *Theotokos*, "God-bearer," to refer to Mary was a special target, implying as it did that the Son had been born a second time.[646] This campaign provoked a fierce reaction from the people and clergy of Constantinople, for whom veneration of Mary as *Theotokos* was increasingly of paramount importance.[647]

The conflict in Constantinople culminated in December of 430, when the prominent and powerful clergyman Proclus delivered his "First Sermon on the Theotokos" in Nestorius' presence for a feast celebrating the Virgin. This sermon was both a passionate encomium to

[644] Cyril of Alexandria, *Epistola 1*, ed. E. Schwarz, *ACO*, vol. 1.1.1 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1927), 18. "The Word of God, therefore, took descent of Abraham's line and participated in flesh and blood, making his own the body from a woman, so that through the union he might be understood as God who has also become a man like us" (Cyril of Alexandria, "Letter to the monks of Egypt," in *St. Cyril of Alexandria: The Christological Controversy*, trans. John A. McGuckin (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 255).
[645] Nicholas Constas, *Proclus of Constantinople*, 47-48.
[646] Constas, *Proclus of Constantinople*, 51-53; see also McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria, The Christological Controversy*, 154-155 and Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. I, 451-452. For the importance of Nestorius' opposition to the "double birth" of the Son, see Fairbairn, *Grace and Christology*, 53-55.
[647] Constas, *Proclus of Constantinople*, 53-56.

the Virgin as *Theotokos* and a detailed theological expression of Alexandrian Christology.[648] Although Nestorius responded with a sermon of his own, it was plain from the response of the congregation that their sympathies lay entirely with Proclus.[649]

The rest of the Christian world had by this time taken notice of the internal disputes of the Constantinopolitan Church. Provoked in part by Nestorius' intrusion into the internal affairs of their jurisdictions during his anti-heresy campaigns as well as their fundamental objections to his Christology, the bishops of Rome and Alexandria, Celestine and Cyril, formed an alliance against him.[650] In the summer of 430 synods in both cities condemned the teaching of Nestorius, which resulted in the emperor Theodosius II, at Nestorius' request, deciding to call a general church council the following year. This council, held at Ephesus from June to October 431, resulted in the deposition of Nestorius.[651] However, the document emanating from the Alexandrian synod of 430 condemning Nestorius, Cyril's "Third Letter to Nestorius," or the "Twelve Chapters," remained deeply controversial due to its radical statement of Alexandrian Christology.[652] In the aftermath of the council of Ephesus in 431, the majority of the Antiochene church grudgingly agreed to the deposition and condemned Nestorius' doctrines.[653] Cyril responded with a slightly moderated statement of his Christology, the letter *Laetentur caeli*.[654] This letter, along with his Second Letter to

[648] Constas, *Proclus of Constantinople*, 60-65.
[649] McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria, The Christological Controversy*, 32-33.
[650] For the course of these events (although he incorrectly places Proclus' sermon in 428 rather than, as Constas correctly notes, in 430), see McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria, The Christological Controversy*, 35-51.
[651] See McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria, The Christological Controversy*, 53-107 for the raucous course of events at the council.
[652] This letter is found in the *ACO*, ed. Schwartz, vol. 1.1, 33-42; a good translation is in McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria, The Christological Controversy*, 266-275.
[653] McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria, The Christological Controversy*, 114.
[654] Otherwise known as the "Letter to John of Antioch," the text is found in *ACO*, ed. Schwarz, 1.1.4, 15-20; translated in McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria: The Christological Controversy*, 343-348.

Nestorius (sent at the beginning of 430 before the synod held in Alexandria in the same year), was eventually canonized by the Council of Chalcedon.[655]

The Christology of Cyril of Alexandria was to play a central role in the ensuing controversies. After the condemnation of Nestorius and the official reconciliation of the church of Antioch with Alexandria and Rome, Cyril continued to write vigorously against the theology of Theodore of Mopsuestia until his death. However, he also sought to establish an agreed terminology with the Antiochenes that acknowledged two natures, divine and human, in the one *hypostasis* of the Son.[656]

Support for Nestorian Christology basically collapsed in the Empire after 433, but there remained significant tensions between the two sides, Antioch and Alexandria. The successor to Cyril in Alexandria, Dioscorus, pursued a hardline policy that insisted upon full adherence to Cyril's Christology, without regard to the last bishop's concessions to the Antiochene two-nature party.[657] He was supported in this by the emperor Theodosius. Furthermore, in Constantinople itself, Eutyches, one of the original opponents of Nestorius in that city, began to teach a radical version of Cyril's Christology that minimized Christ's humanity.

Eutyches was accused of heresy by a number of Antiochenes, including Theodoret of Cyrrhus, a strong and sometimes intemperate critic of Cyril of Alexandria. The bishop of Constantinople, Flavian, successor to Proclus, condemned Eutyches as unorthodox at a local synod, which also produced a short confession of orthodox Christology.[658] Flavian obtained

---

[655] The Second Letter to Nestorius is found in *ACO*, ed. Schwarz, vol. 1.1.1, 25-28; translated in McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria, The Christological Controversy*, 262-265.
[656] McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria, The Christological Controversy*, 228.
[657] McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria, The Christological Controversy*, 229-230; see also R. Price and M. Gaddis, *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, vol. I (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005), 23-25.
[658] Price and Gaddis, *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, vol. 1, 25-30; McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria, The Christological Controversy*, 230-231.

the support of Pope Leo for this action. The Latin-speaking churches of the West did not have nearly so sophisticated a conception of Christology as that of the Greek East up to this point, tending to rely upon Tertullian's approach summarized by the slogan *una persona, duae naturae*, "One person, two natures."[659] Leo took the opportunity to write a treatise on Christology, the first in Latin which engaged competently with the issues raised in the Greek East, which he hoped would settle the issue once and for all. The *Tomus ad Flavianum* was a letter to Flavian that set out a Christology that laid emphasis upon the separation of the two natures even after the incarnation, in such a way that it laid itself open to being attacked as a Nestorianizing text.[660] It was nonetheless in essential agreement with Alexandrian theology in that it recognized the Second Person of the Trinity, the Son, as the subject of the incarnation. The Tome would prove to be an important piece in the later Chalcedonian formula, but its immediate fate was less good.

Dioscorus of Alexandria and the emperor Theodosius seized the opportunity provided by Flavian's act to suppress the Antiochene party once and for all. Theodosius summoned a general council to meet at Ephesus in 449 which was completely dominated by Dioscorus and his allies. Theodoret of Cyrrhus and Flavian, as well as a number of their allies such as Ibas of Edessa, were deposed from office and their teachings condemned. Eutyches was restored and his teaching affirmed. The assembled bishops were compelled by the threat of

---

[659] While Tertullian did not use this phrase himself, its seeds are found in his writings. See especially Tertullian, *Adversus Praxean*, ed. A. Kroymann and E. Evans, CCSL 2 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1954), 27.1, 1198. "Undique enim obducti distinctione Patris et Filii quam manente coniunctione disponimus ut solis et radii et fontis et fluvii, per individuum tamen numerum duorum et trium, aliter eam ad suam nihilominus sententiam interpretari, conantur ut aeque in *una persona* utrumque distinguant, Patrem et Filium." "For, convicted on all sides by the distinctness of the Father and the Son, which we say is ordained without disturbing the permanence of the union as of the sun and the beam and of the spring and the river, they attempt to interpret this [distinctness] in another way, not less in accordance with their opinion, so as no less than before to distinguish Father and Son both in one person" (Ernest Evans, tr., *Tertullian's Treatise Against Praxeas* (London: S.P.C.K., 1948), 27.1). See also Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 1, 126-131.

[660] See the summary and analysis in Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 1, 465-477; the Latin text may be found in *ACO*, ed. Schwartz, vol. 2.2, 24-33.

force to assent to these decrees. The representatives of Leo were marginalized and the Tome was ignored. They beat a hasty retreat when the armed monks of Dioscorus together with imperial troops burst into the council to compel the acquiescence of the assembled clerics and returned to Leo with a tale of outrage. Although the Second Council of Ephesus was supported by the current emperor, it was fatally crippled by Dioscorus' ruthless tactics and alienation of the Latin church.[661]

The political tide turned rapidly upon the accidental death of Theodosius II in 450. His sister Pulcheria proceeded to undo the Second Council of Ephesus. She married the old general Marcian, engineered his accession to the throne, and together they prepared to summon a new council. Leo insisted upon the general acceptance of his Tome as a condition of reconciliation. This was quickly agreed to by the new régime, but rather than wait to hold the council as Leo urged they decided to call one at once. Two measures were taken to forestall potential bullying from the monks of Alexandria: the council was held at Chalcedon, a short boat trip from Constantinople, and presided over by a lay committee led by the patrician Flavius Anatolius. Imperial power could thus be brought directly to bear to keep order. The emphasis was on strict procedural fairness, in pointed contrast to the Second Council of Ephesus.[662]

The Council of Chalcedon was held during the month of October 451.[663] It overturned the decisions of the Second Council of Ephesus. Leo's Tome was read out and acclaimed as orthodox; Theoderet and his allies were restored to their sees, while Dioscorus was removed

[661] For the Second Council of Ephesus, or *Latrocinium* ("Den of Robbers") as an enraged Leo was to call it, see Price and Gaddis, *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, vol. I, 30-37; McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria, The Christological Controversy*, 231-233; Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. I, 460-463; and Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, 38-44.
[662] Price and Gaddis, *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, vol. I, 37-42.
[663] A useful chronology of the sessions of Chalcedon is found in Price and Gaddis, *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, vol. I, 44.

from office; and, most importantly of all, a new confession of faith was drawn up.[664] The request for a new confession, or statement of orthodox faith, was made by Marcian quite unexpectedly, and was acceded to only reluctantly by the assembled bishops. The confession was quite ambiguous and therefore subject to different interpretations, as might be expected from a compromise text. It combined a moderate Alexandrian Christology (as found in Cyril's "Second Letter to Nestorius" and *Laetentur caeli*) with a two-natures terminology acceptable to Leo. Whether this staunchly two-natures language masked an underlying Nestorianism was a cause for the ensuing controversy in the Eastern churches. For the Western churches, on the other hand, the authority of Chalcedon was absolute, not least because it affirmed the doctrine of the bishop of Rome.

The Chalcedonian confession is worth quoting in full at this point in its Latin version.

> Sequentes igitur sanctos patres unum eundemque confiteri filium dominum nostrum Iesum Christum consonanter omnes docemus eundem perfectum in deitate, eundem perfectum in humanitate, deum vere et hominem vere eundem ex anima rationali et corpore, consubstantialem patri secundum deitatem et consubstantialem nobis eundem secundum humanitatem, per omnia nobis similem absque peccato, ante saecula quidem de patre genitum secundum deitatem, in novissimis autem diebus eundem propter nos et propter salutem nostram ex Maria virgine dei genetrice secundum humanitatem, unum eundemque Christum filium dominum unigenitum, in duabus naturis inconfuse inmutabiliter indivise inseparabiliter agnoscendum, nusquam sublata differentia naturarum propter unitionem magisque salua proprietate utriusque naturae et in unam personam atque subsistentiam concurrente, non in duas personas partitum sive divisum, sed unum et eundem filium unigenitum deum verbum dominum Iesum Christum, sicut ante prophetae de eo et ipse nos Iesus Christus erudivit et patrum nobis symbolum tradidit.[665]

---

[664] Price and Gaddis, vol. 1, pp. 45-51.

[665] *ACO*, ed. Schwarz, vol. 2.3.2, pp. 137-138. "Following, therefore, the holy fathers, we all in harmony teach profession of one and the same Son our Lord Jesus Christ, the same complete in Godhead and the same complete in manhood, truly God and the same truly man, of a rational soul and body, consubstantial with the Father in respect of the Godhead, and the same consubstantial with us in respect of the manhood, like us in all things apart from sin, begotten from the Father before the ages in respect of the Godhead, and the same in recent days for us and for our salvation from the Virgin Mary the *Theotokos* in respect of the manhood, one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-Begotten, acknowedged in two natures without merger, change, division, or separation (the difference of the natures being in no way destroyed by the union, but rather the distinctive character of each nature being preserved and coming together into one person and one hypostasis [*subsistentia*]), not parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son, Only-begotten, God, Word, Lord, Jesus Christ, as from of old the prophets and Jesus Christ himself taught us about him and the symbol of

The initial draft seems to have echoed the confession of faith produced by Flavian at the Home Synod of 448 as a means of further vindicating him.[666] This initial confession used the term *ex duabus naturis* in Latin, rather than Leo's preferred terminology *in duabus naturis*. *Ex duabus naturis* was the preferred terminology of the strict Alexandrians, who affirmed one nature of Christ after the incarnation, which came from two natures. A sub-committee of the council made the revision, agreeing to an acknowledgment of the continuing integrity of the two natures after the incarnation.[667] Much of this confession is drawn, as noted above, from Cyril of Alexandria's two canonical letters; the changes were made so as to reflect as closely as possible his language while also conforming to Leo's demands.[668]

"Chalcedon came not to bring peace but a sword," quipped the historian Norman Baynes.[669] The confession, combined with the acceptance of Leo's Tome and the restoration of Theoderet of Cyrrhus and his allies (including Ibas of Edessa) to their sees, meant that the strict Alexandrians and their allies in Syria, Jerusalem and Asia Minor fiercely opposed the council. They were called "monophysites" by their opponents, a pejorative term which has been replaced in modern scholarship by the more neutral term "miaphysite."[670] However, Marcian and Pulcheria were determined to enforce the council's decrees.[671] Leo was equally determined that Chalcedon's decrees were to be upheld, not least because it affirmed the

---

the fathers has handed down to us" (Richard Price, tr., *Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553*, vol. 2 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2009), 64).

[666] Price and Gaddis, *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, vol. II, 187.

[667] Price and Gaddis, *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, vol. II, 189.

[668] Price and Gaddis, *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*, vol. II, 189-191; see also the analysis of Patrick T.R. Gray, *The Defense of Chalcedon in the East (451-553)* (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 7-16.

[669] N.H. Baynes, *Byzantine Studies and Other Essays* (London, 1955), 355.

[670] Price, *Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553*, vol. 2, 311. Both terms refer to the insistence by the anti-Chalcedonians that Christ had one nature, *physis*, after the incarnation.

[671] For the approach to Chalcedon taken by the imperial couple, see Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, tr. P. Allen and J. Cawte (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1987), vol. 2.1, 93-114; Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, 148-157; Gray, *The Defense of Chalcedon in the East*, 17-21.

authority of his Tome. This was to be the unwavering position of Rome throughout the ensuing controversies until the Second Council of Constantinople in 553.[672]

5.2 *From Chalcedon (451) to the Second Council of Constantinople (553)*

Upon the death of Marcian in 457 and the accession of the new emperor Leo I, the anti-Chalcedonian forces in Alexandria led by Timothy Aelurus deposed and murdered the pro-Chalcedonian patriarch Proterius. Timothy Aelurus was then set up as patriarch and proceeded to challenge through various writings the conclusions reached at Chalcedon. In response to this the new emperor Leo I circulated a consultative letter, the *Codex Encyclicus*, to all bishops requesting their responses to Chalcedon and the usurpation of Timothy Aelurus. The vast majority of the responses affirmed that Timothy Aelurus should be deposed, but were lukewarm towards Chalcedon. Not that many opposed it, but they preferred (as did the Chalcedonian fathers themselves) to emphasize the faith of Nicaea as sufficient for orthodoxy.[673] Timothy Aelurus was thus duly removed from office and replaced by Timothy Salophaciolus, but the strength of opposition to the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon was shown. However, Chalcedon was strongly supported in Constantinople itself by the influential body of monks known as the *Acoimetae* led by the archimandrite Marcellus.[674] It was also steadfastly supported by the church of Rome.

The Latin churches did not experience the same level of controversy on this subject, in part because the complicated discussions going on in the mostly Greek-speaking east were

[672] For the activities of Leo, see Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.1, 115-149.
[673] Richard Price, "The Development of a Chalcedonian Identity in Byzantium (451-553)," in *Church History and Religious Culture*, vol. 89.1-3 (2009), 308-309.
[674] On the Acoimetae, see Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, tr. T. Hainthaler, vol. 2.2 (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1995), 252-253.

carried on in that language, and in part because of the authority of the Bishop of Rome.[675] Still, the Latin church played an important role in the Christological disputes, in large part because of its fierce championing of Chalcedonian orthodoxy. The foundational text for western Christology is Leo's *Tomus ad Flavianum*, his contribution to the debate surrounding Eutyches just before the Second Council of Ephesus in 449. This was adopted as a crucial statement of faith by Chalcedon, and remained an important text for Chalcedonians even in the east.[676] Although it firmly held to two natures in one person, its "concrete, non-technical language," as Grillmeier puts it, along with its strong emphasis on the two natures of Christ led to its rejection by miaphysites as granting too much to the Antiochians.[677] Nonetheless, the churches of Rome and Constantinople insisted upon the acceptance of the Tome of Leo concomitantly with Chalcedon. They were joined at the hip.

Leo himself continued to insist upon the immutability of Chalcedon throughout the rest of his life. Thus in 457, upon the accession of the emperor Leo I, he wrote urging the emperor to rectify the situation in Alexandria caused by the murder of Proterius. Pope Leo insisted that Chalcedon must not be overturned, since its decisions were perfect, irrevocable and indeed inspired by God.[678] This neatly encapsulates the position not only of the Roman church, but also that of the whole of the west. Not only the decrees of Chalcedon were authoritative, but also its acts, an authority only surpassed by the Scriptures themselves; in

---

[675] For the differences in outlook between Rome in particular and the east, see Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.1, 292 n. 208.

[676] For example, Bishop Gennadius of Constantinople wrote in Leo's lifetime a eulogy of the Tome (Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.1, 166-167); and the pro-Chalcedon patriarch of Antioch, Ephrem of Amid (526-544), wrote an "Apology for the synod of Chalcedon and the *Tome* of Leo" (Gray, *The Defense of Chalcedon in the East*, 142-147).

[677] Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.1, 170.

[678] Leo, *Epistola 145*, 1, PL 54.1114. "In illo concilio per Spiritum sanctum congregato, tam plenis atque perfectis definitionibus cuncta firmata sunt, ut nihil ei regulae quae ex divina inspiratione prolata est, aut addi possit aut minui, gloriosissime imperator." "At that council, assembled through the Holy Spirit, everything was confirmed by such complete and perfect definitions that nothing can be added to or withdrawn from that arrangement, which was produced through God's direction, O most glorious emperor" (E. Hunt, tr., *Pope St. Leo the Great: Letters* (New York: FOTC, inc., 1957), 234).

the years following the council, a kind of "conciliar fundamentalism," as Richard Price puts it, came into place in the Latin West, especially in Africa.[679] This was not the case in the east, but the high regard Chalcedon was held in the western churches was to guide their approach to the Christological discussions in the east.

Emperor Leo's successor Zeno pursued a moderate policy that, while declining to condemn Chalcedon, nonetheless chose to essentially ignore it and emphasize the common Nicene faith and the condemnation of Eutyches and Nestorius. His reign was briefly interrupted in 474 by the usurper Basiliscus (who was fiercely anti-Chalcedonian and firmly supported by Timothy Aelurus), but after suppressing the usurper and revoking his anti-Chalcedonian decrees, Zeno, in concert with Acacius the bishop of Constantinople, issued the moderating document the *Henoticon*.[680] It stated that the Nicene Creed was the sole standard of orthodox faith; that the Council of Ephesus (431) upheld this standard while condemning Nestorius; that Eutyches was condemned; and that the Twelve Chapters of Cyril of Alexandria were received as a standard of orthodoxy.

It also stated:

> Ταῦτα δὲ γεγράφαμεν οὐ καινίζοντες πίστιν, ἀλλ' ὑμᾶς πληροφοροῦντες. Πάντα δὲ τὸν ἕτερόν τι φρονήσαντα ἢ φρονοῦντα, ἢ νῦν ἢ πώποτε, ἢ ἐν Καλχηδόνι ἢ οἱᾳ δ΄΄ ποτε συνόδῳ, ἀναθεματίζομεν, ἐξαιρέτως δὲ τοὺς εἰρημένους Νεστόριον καὶ Εὐτυχέα καὶ τοὺς τὰ αὐτῶν φρονοῦντας.[681]

Chalcedon is only mentioned in an aside, and clearly its authority is not recognized given that it is subordinated to Ephesus (431) and Nicaea and is held capable of error. Still, some of its

[679] Richard Price, *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553*, vol. 1, 98. See also Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.1, 288 n. 184.
[680] Text in Evagrius Scholasticus, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, 3.14.
[681] Evagrius Scholasticus, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. J. Bidet and L. Parmentier, *Sources Chrétiennes* 542 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2011), 3.14, 422. "...And these things we write not as setting forth a new form of faith, but for your assurance: and every one who has held or holds any other opinion, either at the present or another time, whether at Chalcedon or in any synod whatever, we anathematise; and specially the before-mentioned Nestorius and Eutyches, and those who maintain their doctrines."

decrees are affirmed in a roundabout manner, although not the crucial and controversial terminology of *in duabus naturis*.[682] Leo's Tome is left unmentioned. The *Henoticon* was only partially successful, because although it was accepted by Peter Mongus, the anti-Chalcedonian bishop of Alexandria, and Peter Fuller, the likewise anti-Chalcedonian archbishop of Antioch, it proved unacceptable to both Rome and the *Acoimetae* monks in Constantinople.[683] As well, there remained considerable dissension in Egypt itself from the more fanatical of the miaphysites, since the Henoticon did not openly condemn Chalcedon and Leo's Tome.[684] The power of the Eastern patriarchs and the emperor himself kept open schism from erupting in the Eastern Empire; however, Rome broke off relations with Acacius and the other patriarchs and demanded that the Henoticon be retracted and Acacius condemned. The Henoticon thus failed.

The Acacian schism (as it came to be called) endured during the reign of Anastasius, Zeno's successor, who ruled from 491-518. Anastasius' priority was peace among the Eastern churches rather than reconciliation with Rome. He therefore urged the acceptance of the Henoticon upon the bishops of Rome, but to no avail.[685] His successors Justin I and Justinian took a different approach.

As mentioned before, the linguistic divide, combined with the different doctrinal focuses of the Latin west (e.g., the Pelagian dispute), meant that the issues were often treated in a confused manner in the west, without cognizance of the nuances of the discussion. Boethius experienced the problem firsthand during a meeting in 512. It occurred due to the reception,

[682] Price, "The Development of a Chalcedonian Identity in Byzantium," 310.
[683] Gray, *Defense of Chalcedon in the East*, 30-31.
[684] Gray, *Defense of Chalcedon in the East*, 31-33.
[685] for Anastasius' policy, see Gray, *Defense of Chalcedon in the East*, 34-44; Price, *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople 553*, vol. I, 3-6.

in the midst of the Acacian schism, of a letter from certain unnamed eastern bishops to the bishop of Rome Symmachus:

> Cum in concilio legeretur epistola, recitatum Eutychianos ex duabus naturis Christum consistere confiteri, in duabus negare: catholicos vero utrique dicto fidem praebere, nam et ex duabus eum naturis consistere et in duabus apud verae fidei sectatores aequaliter credi. Cuius dicti novitate percussus harum coniunctionum quae ex duabus naturis vel in duabus consisterent differentias inquirebam, multum scilicet referre ratus nec inerti neglegentia praetereundum, quod episcopus scriptor epistolae tamquam valde necessarium praeterire noluisset. Hic omnes apertam esse differentiam nec quicquam in eo esse caliginis inconditum confusumque strepere nec ullus in tanto tumultu qui leviter attingeret quaestionem, necdum qui expediret inventus est.[686]

This confusion present in the account illustrates the problems inherent in the pan-Mediterranean debate.[687] These problems were to reappear frequently during the rest of the sixth century.

Upon the death of Anastasius, among the first ecclesiastical acts of the new emperor Justin I—and, more importantly, of his influential nephew Justinian—was an immediate reconciliation with Rome and a crackdown on miaphysite bishops. Severus of Antioch, the influential miaphysite patriarch, was excommunicated and most of the demands of the bishops of Rome were rapidly acquiesced to.[688] At Justin's accession in 519 his nephew Justinian took the lead in negotiating with Hormisdas. The reconciliation with Rome was

---

[686] Boethius, *Contra Eutychen et Nestorium*, tr. and ed. H.F. Stewart and E.K. Rand (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968), 75. "When the letter was read in the assembly, it was asserted that the Eutychians confess that Christ is formed from two natures but does not consist of them—whereas Catholics admit both propositions, for among followers of the true faith he is equally believed to be of two natures and in two natures. Struck by the novelty of this assertion I began to inquire what difference there can be between unions formed from two natures and unions which consist in two natures, for the point which the bishop who wrote the letter refused to pass over because of its gravity, seemed to me of importance and not one to be idly and carelessly slurred over. On that occasion all loudly protested that the difference was evident, that there was no obscurity, confusion or perplexity, and in the general storm and tumult there was no one who really touched the edge of the problem, much less anyone who solved it."

[687] For a description of this text, and its circumstances, see David Bradshaw, "The *Opuscula sacra*: Boethius and Theology," in *The Cambridge Companion to Boethius*, ed. J. Marenbon (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 118-124; see also the older but fuller treatment in H. Chadwick, *Boethius: The Consolations of Music, Logic, Theology, and Philosophy* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981), 181-202.

[688] Gray, *Defense of Chalcedon in the East*, 44-48; Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.1, 344-346.

concluded in 519, one year after Justin's accession. It involved the acceptance of Hormisdas' formula of allegiance to Chalcedon and to the teaching of Leo I.[689] Thus John bishop of Constantinope subscribed to the *libellus* of Hormisdas containing this formula, the text of which was included in John's letter to Hormisdas of 519, and the main points of which were as follows: "Omnibus actis a sanctis istis quattuor synodis, id est Nicaeae Constantinopoli et Ephesi et Chalcedone, de confirmatione fidei et statu ecclesiae adsentio et nihil titubare de bene iudicatis patior...unde probamus et amplectimur epistolas omnes beati Leonis papae urbis Romae, quas conscripsit de recta fide."[690] Moreover, Acacius along with the other supporters of the Henoticon were anathematized. Thus Rome's position triumphed: Chalcedon and Leo's teaching were to be upheld, and their opponents condemned.

It was Justinian who played the central role in the next chapter of the Christologial disputes following Chalcedon. His endeavours to find an acceptable theological formula that would satisfy all sides found slightly more success than Zeno's Henoticon and was to be more long-lasting. When Justinian became emperor in 527 he both continued the stern enforcement of a pro-Chalcedonian line but also further attempted to conciliate the miaphysites with further theological experiments.[691] Four edicts issued from 533 to 551 spelled out this new approach to Christology. The Second Council of Constantinople of 553 was the culmination of this activity.

There were three main elements to Justinian's Christological policy. The first element is his support of the faction of pro-Chalcedonians, called by later scholarship "Neo-

[689] Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.1, 322-326.
[690] *Collectio Avellana* 159, ed. O. Günther, CSEL 35.2, 608-609. "I assent to all the acts done by those four holy synods, that is Nicaea, Constantinople and Ephesus and Chalcedon, concerning the confirmation of the faith and state of the church, and I suffer nothing to waver from their good judgments...we approve and embrace all the letters of the blessed Leo bishop of the city of Rome, which he wrote concerning the correct faith."
[691] Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 345-361; Price, *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople 553*, vol. I, 8-14.

Chalcedonians," and their interpretation of Chalcedon.[692] Because Chalcedon's definition had shied away from embracing the full language of Cyril of Alexandria's Christology, preferring to refer only to "One person and one hypostasis," it left open a route for the more radical Antiochian theologians to affirm the council.[693] The Neo-Chalcedonians, however, insisted that the council should be interpreted in such a way as to be in conformity with Cyril of Alexandria's most radical statement of Alexandrian Christology, the Twelve Chapters. This meant that the *hypostasis* of the Chalcedonian definition was clarified as the second person of the Trinity, the Word.[694] The formula *ex duabus naturis* was used by the Neo-Chalcedonians in tandem with *in duabus naturis* but with the caveat that it did not imply one nature after the union. As well, the term σύνθεσις, or *compositus* in Latin, was used to refer to the union without confusion of the two natures. Justinian's *Confessio rectae fidei*, issued in 551, reflects this theology.[695]

The second aspect of his policy was the promotion of theopaschitism. Justinian was persuaded to take up this position by a group of monks, the so-called "Scythian monks," who appeared in the last chapter, and who also influenced his support of neo-Chalcedonianism.[696] They proposed that part of the solution to the concerns of the anti-Chalcedonian miaphysites was the adoption of the phrase *unus ex Trinitate passus est*, "One of the Trinity suffered." Near the beginning of Justin's reign in 519 the Scythian monks presented their proposal to

[692] A major "Neo-Chalcedonian" figure was Leontius of Jerusalem (c. 485-543); for an analysis of his theology, see Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 271-312. Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 357-384, argues that the until the 540s Justinian did not support "Neo-Chalcedonian" theology.
[693] Gray, *The Defense of Chalcedon in the East*, 87-88, 99; Price, *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople 553*, vol. 1, 66-73; see also Grillmeier's analysis of Justinian's edict (551) against the Three Chapters, in Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 422-425.
[694] Major supporters of this approach were the Scythian monks; for their Neo-Chalcedonianism, see Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 327-338.
[695] Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 425-439; Price, *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople 553*, vol. 1, 122-129.
[696] See above in the *Appendix* to Chapter 4, p. 212 n. 595 for an introduction to the Scythian monks.

Justinian, who at first received them coldly. They therefore in 519-520 went to Hormisdas in Rome to get his support, but failed to get it; they did however succeed in persuading both Justinian and a number of prominent North African bishops, led by Fulgentius of Ruspe, to support it.[697] Upon Justinian's accession to the throne in 527 he continued to support the use of the phrase, and in 533 issued a decree supporting it.

This phrase had the merit of clarifying that the *hypostasis* of the Son was the subject of the incarnation and really suffered and died. It assured skeptical miaphysites that Chalcedon could indeed be compatible with the unity of Christ's person. As Grillmeier puts it, "The goal of the whole endeavour is not so much to introduce an equally justified use of the two systems of formulas, as rather to validate the Chalcedonian system of language in the sense of the unity of Christ."[698]

The third element of Justinian's policy was the condemnation of the Three Chapters. These consisted of: 1) The entire corpus of writings of the theologian Theodore of Mopsuestia, as well as the man himself; 2) The writings of Theodoret of Cyrrhus which attacked Cyril of Alexandria; and 3) The letter of the Antiochene bishop Ibas of Edessa addressed to Mari the Persian, also attacking Cyril of Alexandria. It was held as an irreparable black mark against Chalcedon by its miaphysite opponents that these three had not been condemned, although their theology was rebuked.[699] While maintaining the teachings of Chalcedon, Justinian was thus trying to remove one of the chief objections of the

[697] Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 320-327; Fairbairn and McGregor, *Fulgentius and the Scythian Monks: Correspondence on Christology and Grace*, 18-19. For the Christology of the Scythian Monks see Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 327-338.
[698] Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 331.
[699] Price, *The Acts of Constantinople 553*, vol. 1, 21-22.

council's enemies: that by reinstating Theodoret and Ibas, and by ignoring Theodore, it had been lenient towards Nestorian sympathizers.[700]

Justinian issued the edict condemning the Three Chapters in 544. While the Eastern patriarchs quickly acceded to it, the consultation of his fellow Western bishops by Pope Vigilius revealed a strong opposition to it. The Western bishops did not necessarily approve of the condemned theologians, but did not think the decisions of Chalcedon were overturnable. They resented the implication that Chalcedon needed to be improved upon. As well, they opposed the idea that long-dead theologians could be anathematized.[701]

In 547 Vigilius was brought to Constantinople in an effort to convince him to condemn the Three Chapters. On his way to Constantinople in 546, the bishop of Rome Vigilius stayed a while in Sicily to consult with the other western bishops, chiefly those of Sardinia and Africa, on the subject of the Three Chapters. They all steadfastly opposed the condemnation, as did most of the Roman clergy.[702] When he arrived in Constantinople in January of 547, Vigilius excommunicated the eastern clerics who had signed on to Justinian's edict; however, within six months he was persuaded to reverse his excommunication and

---

[700] R. Price, "The Three Chapters Controversy and the Council of Chalcedon," in *Crisis of the Oikoumene: The Three Chapters and the Failed Quest for Unity in the Sixth-Century Mediterranean*, ed. C. Chazelle and C. Cubitt (Turnhout: Brepols, 2007), 25-27.

[701] As argued, for example, by Vigilius in his *First Constitutum*, where he quotes from a letter [*Ep.* 91] of Cyril of Alexandria written after the First Council of Ephesus concerning Theodore of Mopsuestia: "Sed iuste audient, tamenetsi nolint, qui huiusmodi causas praebent: obliviscimini vos ipsos, quando adversus cineres arcus extenditis; non enim superest, qui apud vos inscriptus est. Et me nullus culpet in haec verba progressum, sed cedant valde nimium praecessori. Grave est enim insultare defunctis vel si laici fuerint, nedum illis, qui in episcopatu hanc vitam deposuerunt. Iustissimum enim apparet prudentibus viris cedere praescienti uniuscuiusque voluntatem et cognoscenti, qualis unusquisque futurus sit" (Vigilius, "Constitutum de tribus capitulis," *Collectio Avellana* 83, ed. O. Günther, CSEL 35.1 (Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1895), 288). "But let them listen duly, even if they are unwilling, those who present cases of this kind. You are forgetting yourselves when you draw your bows against ashes, for the person you indict is no longer alive; and may no one blame me for proceeding to these words, but let them yield utterly to a precursor. For it is a serious matter to insult the deceased, even if they were laymen, still less those who departed this life in the episcopacy. It is clearly most fitting for prudent men to yield to the one who foreknows the will of each person and is aware how each person will prove to be." (Price, tr., *The Acts of Constantinople 553*, vol. 2, 187). For more on this, see Price, *The Acts of Constantinople 553*, vol. 1, pp. 23-28; and elsewhere Price, "The Three Chapters Controversy," 26-27.

[702] Grillmeier, vol. 2.2, p. 426; Price, *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553*, vol. 1. p. 45.

agree to condemn the Three Chapters. However, the backlash from the churches of Africa and Italy was so great that he rescinded his condemnation.

Justinian initially permitted this action; however, in 551 the emperor issued his *Confessio rectae fidei*, confirming the condemnation. This was aimed at the miaphysites, not the recalcitrant Westerners, but it did not succeed in appeasing either. Vigilius persuaded Justinian to rescind the edict. However, the emperor then decided to hold a full council to condemn the chapters and overawe the Western church's objections while at the same time vigorously re-confirming Chalcedon. This was the Second Council of Constantinople, held in 553.[703] The council was thus not concerned chiefly with reconciling the monophysites but rather tamping down the new fire in the West. In this it may be said to have succeeded. The events during the council itself need not be gone over here, although a description of the moves made in opposition to its agenda by the western bishops present at it will be made in the following section.[704] It adopted Justinian's theological program outlined above, what Grillmeier terms "moderate Neo-Chalcedonianism."[705] However, its decrees against the Three Chapters were not swiftly or easily accepted by the Western church of Africa, Italy or Gaul.

5.3 *The Three Chapters Schism*

The agenda of Justin I and Justinian was not the agenda of the Western church. When Justinian embarked upon his theological project to reconcile the moderate miaphysites,

[703] The events leading up to the Council are described in Price, *Acts of Constantinople 553*, vol. 1, 28-30; and in Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 438-442.
[704] The meticulous commentary by Price, *The Acts of Constantinople 553*, vols. 1-2, gives an excellent account.
[705] Grillmeier, *Christ in Chritian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 461.

outlined above, the reaction from the West was intensely negative.[706] After the turmoil recounted in the previous section between 546 and 553, Vigilius agreed to the calling of the Second Council of Constantinople. His vacillations and travails were to continue, however.

The council began on May 5, but Vigilius absented himself, asking for a space of twenty days in which to draw up a response to the condemnation of the Three Chapters. On May 25 he presented his first *Constitutum*, drawn up on May 14 and signed by those western bishops present with him away from the council. This document rejected the condemnation of the Three Chapters, but affirmed that many of Theodore of Mopsuestia's teachings were heretical. It rejected the posthumous excommunication of Theodore, since it held that it was inappropriate for men who died in communion with the church of Rome to be posthumously excommunicated. Moreover, since Theodoret of Cyrrhus had affirmed the Tome of Leo at Chalcedon, his writings should not be condemned. The same went for Ibas of Edessa and his letter. At the same time, it agreed that the Twelve Chapters of Cyril of Alexandria were orthodox, thereby aligning western churches with Justinian's neo-Chalcedonianism.[707]

This attempt by Vigilius to affect the agenda of the ongoing synod was prevented by Justinian's presentation before the assembled prelates of a number of private documents from the previous few years in which Vigilius pledged to condemn the Three Chapters. Justinian also kept Vigilius in strict confinement and subjected him to further pressure. Finally, in December of 553 the aged bishop wrote a letter to Eutychius of Constantinople, president of the council, agreeing to the condemnation. This was followed by his second *Constitutum* in February 554 laying out at length the reasons for condemning the Three Chapters. It focused

[706] This reaction seems to have anticipated by many of the eastern bishops who acceded to Justinian's proclamation, as they made assurances to the papal representatives that they signed under duress (Price, *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553*, vol. 1, 23).
[707] Price, *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553*, vol. 2, 141-144.

mostly on the reasons for condemning the Letter of Ibas to Mari the Persian. It was an abject climb-down for Vigilius. He was finally granted leave to return to Rome, but died on the way back in June 555 while in Syracuse. His death was highly convenient for the emperor, and his successor Pelagius I was plagued with accusations that he had a hand in Vigilius' death.[708]

Pelagius I had been a chief aide of Vigilius in Constantinople during the controversy and a staunch opponent of the condemnation of the Three Chapters. However, upon Vigilius' death in 555 Pelagius was appointed by Justinian as his successor. In a turnabout which was by now quite a common phenomenon, he also agreed to support the condemnation of the Three Chapters. Upon his arrival in Rome in 556 Pelagius swore an oath that he was innocent of Vigilius' death and that he upheld Chalcedon. However, he also upheld the decrees of the Second Council of Constantinople (553) and worked to enforce their acceptance in Italy.[709] This twofold approach was to characterize the approach taken by Pelagius' successors.

It was an approach, indeed, which started with Vigilius himself. In 549, when under severe criticism from the western churches over his agreement to the condemnation of the Three Chapters, he wrote to Aurelian of Arles, his chief ally in Gaul. Vigilius assured Aurelian that he did not deny anything upheld in Chalcedon's definition or defined in the teaching of the bishops of Rome: "Nihil nos penitus admisisse, quod decessorum nostrorum constitutis vel sanctae, quae una eademque est, fidei quattuor sinodorum, id est Nicenae, Constantinopolitanae, Ephesenae primae atque Calcidonensis, inveniatur, quod absit, esse contrarium."[710] Then, he argues that those indicted in his *Iudicatum* opposed Chalcedon and

[708] Price, *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553*, vol. 1, 53-56.
[709] Claire Sotinel, "The Three Chapters and the Transformations of Italy," in *Crisis of the Oikoumene*, ed. C. Chazelle and C. Cubitt, pp. 93-100.
[710] *Epistolae Arelatensis Genuinae* 45, ed. W. Gundlach, MGH *Epistolae*, vol. 3 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1892), 67. "We have not professed inwardly anything that is found to be against the laws of our predecessors (which may God forbid) nor anything of the faith—a faith that is common to all—of the four holy synods, that is Nicaea, Constantinople, Ephesus I and Chalcedon."

the teaching of Cyril of Alexandria: "Plectentes [a reference to the *Iudicatum*] etiam eos, qui fidem beati Cyrilli, cuius sanctae recordationis Leo prodecessor noster ad praecessores vestros aliosque datis et probavit et laudavit scriptis...execranda superbia impiam vocaverunt."[711] Note he does not name the men he condemned; he also is vague about what exactly the condemnation is about theologically. Cyril of Alexandria is commended because Pope Leo praised him. This insistence upon Roman authority and doctrinal continuity with Chalcedon was to continue in the rhetoric of Vigilius' successor Pelagius I (556-561).

Faced with the vigorous questioning of many western prelates, and the open revolt of the churches of northern Italy (i.e., Milan and Aquileia), Pelagius wrote a flurry of letters justifying his position.[712] At first, he tended to merely affirm his continuing adherence to Chalcedon and the teaching of the Roman church. However, he later affirmed his condemnation of the Three Chapters even while obfuscating the issue. Several examples will now be provided.

In December 556, shortly after his formal accession to the Roman bishopric, Pelagius wrote a letter to the Frankish king Childebert I:

> Rufinus, vir magnificus, legatus excellentiae vestrae, nobis dixit eo quod et in provinciis Galliarum quidam semina scandalorum sparserint, dicendo aliquid contra fidem catholicam, quod Deus not patietur, admissum. Et quamuis a transitu dive memoriae Theodorae augustae, nullas de fide questiones ecclesia Dei in partibus orientis, Deo miserante, formidet, sed quaedam capitula extra fidem fuerint agitata, de quibus longum est, ut epistulari possint conplecti sermone, hoc breviter secundum ammonitionem praefati magnifici viri Rufini, ad sanandum animum vestrum vel omnium fratrum et coepiscoporum nostrorum in Galliae regionibus consistentium, faciendum esse perspeximus, dicentes, anathematizare nos et alienos ab aeternae vitae praemiis iudicare, quicumque ab illa fide quam beatae recordationis papa Leo in suis epistulis praedicavit, et quam Calchidonense concilium sequens eundem praesulem

[711] *Epistolae Arelatensis Genuinae* 45, ed. W. Gundlach, 67. "I punished those who called impious (with execrable pride) the faith of the blessed Cyril, whom our predecessor Leo of holy memory approved by his letters and praised by his words to your predecessor and others."
[712] See the analysis of Ian Wood, "The Franks and Papal Theology," in *Crisis of the Oikoumene*, ed. C. Chazelle and C. Cubitt, 226-231.

> edita definitione suscepit, in una syllaba aut in uno verbo vel in sensu erravit vel erraverit aliquando, aut declinavit vel declinaverit aliquando.[713]

Pelagius at first sidesteps the issue of the Three Chapters—*quaedam capitula extra fidem fuerint agitata, de quibus longum est*—and vigorously affirms his adherence to Chalcedon and the teaching of Leo. Then, however, he needs to deal with the rumours circulating about the decisions of the council itself, which he describes as being essentially anti-Nestorian:

> Maxime tamen Nestorianae heresis homines, pro eo quod Nestorius duas naturas in Christo separatas quidem et divisas adstruxerit, fraudulenter moliuntur dicere, se non longe ab intellectu esse Calchedonensis synodi et papae Leonis, dum Nestorium, pro eo quod divisas duas naturas assereret, ipso dogmate beati papae Leonis constat esse damnatum...Ut autem nos diu tribulationes Constantinopoli pateremur, illa res fecit, quam breviter superius tetigimus: quoniam, vivente augusta, quicquid in ecclesiasticis causis movebatur, suspectum habuimus; nam pater vester, clementissimus imperator, et beati papae Leonis dogmata et Calchedonensis synodi fidem nullo modo umquam patitur violari.[714]

This aligns with the general point made above, that the Second Council of Constantinople was concerned with clarifying the Cyrillian character of the Chalcedonian definition.

Pelagius insists that the actions of the emperor strengthened the Chalcedonian faith and the

---

[713] Pelagius I, "Epistula 3," in *Epistulae quae supersunt*, ed. P. Gassò and C. Batlle (Abadia di Montserrat, 1956), 6-7. "The Magnificent Man Rufinus, the legate of your Excellency, told us, because certain seeds of scandals were sown by rumour in the provinces of the Gauls, that anything against the catholic faith, which God does not permit, is an offense. And although after the passing of the empress Theodora of exalted memory [548] no disputes concerning the faith trouble the church of God in the regions of the east, with God being merciful, yet certain chapters were disputed as being outside of the faith, concerning which is a subject too long to be encmpassed in an epistolary composition. We perceived that this explanation ought to be made briefly according to the advice of the aforesaid magnificent man Rufinus, so that the spirit of you yourself and of all our brothers and fellow-bishops abiding in the territories of Gaul should be healed. We proclaim that we anathematize and judge as foreigners to the rewards of eternal life anyone who strayed in a single syllable, or in one word, or in the sense, or who will stray at any time, or who fell away, or who will fall away at any time from that faith which bishop Leo of blessed memory preached in his letters and which the Council of Chalcedon – following that same prelate – received through its decreed definition."

[714] Pelagius I, "Epistula 3," ed. Gassò and Batlle, 9. "Men of the Nestorian heresy in particular, on account of the fact that Nestorius constructed in Christ two natures separate and indeed divided, falsely strive to say that they are not far from the the understanding of the Chalcedonian synod and of Pope Leo, whereas it is well known that Nestorius, on account of the fact that he claimed the two natures were divided, was damned by the very dogma of blessed Pope Leo… But when we ourselves were enduring troubles for a long time in Constantinople, that matter occurred which we briefly touched upon above; whereas, while the empress was still living, we held a reverence for whatever was moved in ecclesiastical proceedings. For your father, the most clement emperor, in no way ever permits both the dogmas of the blessed Pope Leo and the faith of the Synod of Chalcedon to be violated."

authority of Leo, and that those opposing the emperor were outright Nestorians. A letter written two months later (Feb. 557), probably at the end of the Frankish envoy Rufinus' diplomatic mission from Childebert to Pelagius, provides a full confession of Chalcedonian and Nicene faith to further reassure the king of Pelagius' orthodoxy.[715]

Pelagius had also to deal with Italian churches in Tuscany who broke off communion with him over his condemnation of the Three Chapters. He wrote a letter in April 557 reassuring them of his orthodoxy.[716] Pelagius mostly focused on his adherence to the four ecumenical councils and to Leo's Tome. However, he did leave an opening to explain why he might condemn the Three Chapters:

> Anathematis nihilominus iudicio subdens, quisquis vel ad suprascriptarum quattuor synodorum fidem, vel ad beatissimi Leonis praesulis apostolicae sedis thomum, qui in Calchedonensis est synodo confirmatus, aliqua ex parte vel infirmandum quoquo modo, vel in dubium, quod absit, deducendum, aliquando consenserit.[717]

The Second Council of Constantinople condemned those who weakened Chalcedon. Additional judgments on heretics whom Chalcedon did not mention are perfectly permissible.

Shortly thereafter Pelagius wrote yet another letter, this time merely addressed *universo populo dei*.[718] Pelagius continued his steady insistence that he upheld Chalcedon. What is interesting is his defense regarding the condemnation of the Three Chapters:

> Sed et canones, quod sedes apostolica suscipit, sequor et veneror, et Deo adiuvante defendo, nec me ab hac professione reticere aut discedere aliquando promitto. Epistulas etiam beatae recordationis papae Caesestini, Xysti et prae omnibus beati Leonis, nec non etiam successorum eius Hilari, Simplici, Felicis, Gelasi, Anastasi,

[715] Pelagius I, "Epistula 7," ed. Gassò and Batlle, 20-25. This letter was discussed in Chapter 4, *Appendix*, pp. 224-226. It is *Epistola* 54 in the *Epistolae Arelatenses* collection.
[716] Pelagius I, "Epistula 10," ed. Gassò and Batlle, 33.
[717] Pelagius I, "Epistula 10," ed. Gassò and Batlle, 33. "Subjecting nonetheless to the judgment of anathema whosoever consented at any time, from any region, to weaken in any way or to bring into doubt (far be it!) the faith of the above-written four synods or that of the Tome of the most blessed bishop of the apostolic seat Leo, which was affirmed at the synod of Chalcedon."
[718] Pelagius I, "Epistula 11," ed. Gassò and Batlle, 38.

> Symmachi, Hormisdae, Iohannis, Felicis, Bonifacii, Iohannis alterius et Agapiti pro defensione fidei catholicae et pro firmitate suprascriptarum quattuor synodorum et contra hereticos, tam ad principes quam ad episcopos vel quoslibet alios, per Orientem et Illiricum atque Dardaniam aliasque provincias diversis temporibus missas inviolabiliter, adiuvante Christo Deo nostro, me custodire profiteor, et omnes quos ipsi damnaverunt habere damnatos, et quod ipsi receperunt, praecipue venerabiles episcopos Theodoretum et Ibam, me inter orthodoxos venerari.[719]

Note here Pelagius' insistence that Theoderet and Ibas *inter orthodoxos venerari*, just as his predecessors thought. This is technically true, since the Second Council of Constantinople condemned only some of their writings, not their persons. Theodore of Mopsuestia is left unmentioned. The insistence upon Nestorianism as the target of the imperial decrees against the Three Chapters is also left unmentioned. Thus this letter simply makes a full-throated affirmation of Pelagius' fidelity to the authority of Chalcedon and of the Roman bishops.

In 559 the Aquileian church elevated Paulus as bishop, in a ceremony held in Milan and presided over by the bishop of Milan; Pelagius' authority over these two bishops was thus denied.[720] Both churches were opponents of the condemnation of the Three Chapters and had broken off relations with Pelagius. Pelagius wrote a number of letters to imperial officials urging them not to cooperate with the schismatics, but was unsuccessful. The imperial authorities were not interested in rocking the boat in the precarious north.[721]

---

[719] Pelagius I, "Epistula 11," ed. Gassò and Batlle, 39. "But I also follow and venerate the canons which the apostolic seat received and, with God helping, I defend them, and I promise that I have not at any time kept silent about or moved away from this confession. As well, I proclaim that I preserve inviolate, through the help of Christ our God, the letters of Pope Celestine of blessed memory, of Xystus and above all others those of the blessed Leo. So too do I preserve those letters of his successors Hilary, Simplicius, Felix, Gelasius, Anastasius, Symmachus, Hormisdas, John, Felix, Boniface, the other John and Agapitus which were sent out at various times to defend the catholic faith and make firm the above-written four synods against the heretics, letters which were sent as much to emperors as to bishops and whoever else throughout Oriens and Illyricum and Dardania and other provinces. And all those whom those same men condemned I also hold as condemned, and all those whom they received I also venerate as among the orthodox, especially the venerable bishops Theoderet and Ibas."

[720] Claire Sotinel, *Identité civique et christianisme: Aquilée du IIIe au Vie siècle* (Rome: École française de Rome, 2005), 327-329.

[721] Sotinel, *Identité civique et christianisme*, 329-335; see also Sotinel, "The Three Chapters and the Transformations of Italy," 100-108.

The schism with both northern churches (i.e., Milan and Aquileia) continued through the Lombard invasions. When the bishop of Milan fled from the Lombards in 568 to Genoa he was left isolated, and in 573 reconciled with Rome and approved the condemnation of the Three Chapters.[722] The bishops of Venetia and Istria, led by the bishop of Aquileia, remained the lone holdouts. In 585 Pope Pelagius II wrote three letters to the schismatic bishops of Venetia and Istria in an effort to persuade them to reconcile with Rome and to condemn the Three Chapters. These letters were probably written by the future Gregory I. In them, he follows the typical papal arguments outlined above, but also most explicitly of all defends the decisions of the Second Council of Constantinople.[723]

The first and second letters make two points: the unity of the church is important, and Chalcedon has not been overturned but rather upheld. In the first letter, after a vigorous affirmation of Chalcedon and Leo's Tome, consonant with the arguments of Pelagius I, Pelagius II continues on to urge reunification and the settlement of conflicts without schism:

> Ubi ergo de fidei firmitate nulla vobis poterit quaestio vel suspicio generari, in unitate fidei atque in sinu sanctae matris catholicae et apostolicae ecclesiae permanentes, si quid forte causae est, unde vestri scandalizari animi videantur, manentes in unitatis caritate eligite de fratribus ac filiis nostris, quos ad nos ad inquirenda, de quibus movemini, transmittere debeatis...Considerate ergo, quia, quicumque in pace et unitate ecclesiae non fuerit, Deum habere non poterit.[724]

The second letter follows a similar line of argument, but with the added point that Chalcedon was upheld and preserved rather than weakened by the Second Council of Constantinople:

---

[722] Sotinel, "The Three Chapters and the Transformations of Italy," 111-113.
[723] Carole Straw, "Much Ado about Nothing: Gregory the Great's Apology to the Istrians," in *Crisis of the Oikoumene*, ed. C. Chazelle and C. Cubitt, 121-160. For the historical circumstances of the letters, see Sotinel, *Identité civique et christianisme*, 365-371.
[724] Pelagius II, *Epistolae Pelagii Iunioris papae ad Episcopos Histriae (1)*, 444. "Therefore when no question or suspicion is able to be formed by you about the firmness of our faith, remaining in the unity of faith and in the bosom of the holy catholic and apostolic mother church, if perchance there is any reason whence your spirits seem to be scandalized, remaining in the love of unity, choose from the brothers and our sons those whom you ought to send to us in order to make inquiry about the things you are concerned about... Bear in mind therefore that whosoever is not in the peace and unity of the church cannot have God."

> Propter quod praesentium portitoribus, quos fraternitas vestra direxit, et ex codicibus et ex antiquis polypticis scrinii sanctae sedis apostolicae relecta sunt aliqua, quibus evidenter ostenditur nihil eorum quae in vestra posuistis epistola causae trium capitulorum convenire ullatenus aut verisimiliter coaptari. Ideoque necesse est vos omnes epistolas synodales sollicite vigilanterque percurrere, ut evidentius agnoscatis, quia sancti patres nihil aliud de Chalcedonensi synodo in suis epistolis firmaverunt, nisi ut inviolabilis fidei definitio servaretur.[725]

Furthermore, Theodore of Mopsuestia and the letter of Ibas of Edessa are opposed to Chalcedon:

> Nolite ergo amore iactantiae, quae superbiae semper est proxima, in obstinationis vitio permanere, quando in die iudicii nullus vestrum excusare se valeat. Et neque Theodorus Mopsuestenus neque Ibae epistola, quae ab adversariis est prolata, ante tribunal tanti iudicis vobis valeat subvenire.[726]

So far the second letter. But again arguments about specific reasons for the condemnation of the Three Chapters are not made. The third letter, however, delves into the reasons and is the longest.

The third letter makes arguments for the unorthodoxy of the each of the Three Chapters, while also insisting yet again that the faith of Chalcedon has not been overturned. Pelagius II argues that when Leo referred to the inviolability of Chalcedon, he did not mean the council as a whole but only its doctrinal statutes. He thus opposes the "conciliar fundamentalism" of the Three Chapters supporters. Pelagius II then goes on to deal more directly with the Three Chapters. He obfuscates the issue considerably, claiming (with dubious accuracy) that the resistance to the condemnation of the Three Chapters was chiefly due to linguistic confusion,

[725] Pelagius II, *Epistolae Pelagii Iunioris papae ad Episcopos Histriae (2)*, ed. L. Hartmann, MGH *Epistolae* vol. II (Berlin: Weidmann, 1899), 446. "A few things from both the books and ancient files in the records of the holy apostolic seat were read out to the bearers of the present letters, whom Your Fraternity sent, in which it is clearly shown that nothing of those things which you put down in your letters concerning the matter of the Three Chapters in any way fits with reality. And for this reason it is necessary that you carefully and watchfully go over all the synodal letters, so that you might plainly know that the holy fathers affirmed nothing apart from the synod of Chalcedon in their letters, unless to preserve the definition of inviolable faith."

[726] Pelagius II, *Epistolae Pelagii Iunioris papae ad Episcopos Histriae (2)*, 447. "Therefore do not desire, with a love of self-importance, which is always close neighbour to pride, to remain in the vice of obstinacy, when none of you shall be able to excuse yourselves on the day of judgment. And neither Theodore of Mopsuestia nor the letter of Ibas, which was produced by his adversaries, shall be able to support you before the tribunal of so great a judge."

and when the errors contained in them were finally understood, the Latin-speaking churches came around to the right side:

> Latini quippe homines et Graecitatis ignori, dum linguam nesciunt, errorem tarde cognoverunt; et tanto eis celerius post cognitionem credi debuit, quanto eorum constantia, quo usque verum cognoscerent, a certamine non quievit; quorum consensum certe fraternitas vestra despiceret, si ausu praecipiti, priusquam verum cognoscerent, consensissent.[727]

He then goes on to lay out a detailed case for the condemnation of each of the Three Chapters, complete with citations from various church fathers as well as the condemned texts themselves, making use of the proceedings of the Second Council of Constantinople.[728] He concludes with another full-throated affirmation of Chalcedon. One thing is made clear: the faith of Chalcedon is not condemned but upheld. There is nothing to divide over.

As noted above, these three letters were probably written by the future Gregory I. After he became bishop of Rome, he wrote in 591 under his own name a 'synodical' letter to the four eastern patriarchs, John of Constantinople, Eulogius of Alexandria, Gregory of Antioch and John of Jerusalem, in which he affirmed his orthodoxy. In this orthodoxy was an affirmation of his adherence to the decrees of the Second Council of Constantinople, in addition to the first four ecumenical councils:

> Quintum quoque concilium pariter veneror, in quo epistola, quae Ibae dicitur, erroris plena, reprobatur, Theodorus personam mediatoris Dei et hominum in duabus subsistentiis separans ad impietatis perfidiam cecidisse convincitur, scripta quoque Theodoriti, per quae beati Cyrilli fides reprehenditur, ausu dementiae prolata refutantur. Cunctas vero quas praefata veneranda concilia personas respuunt, respuo, quas venerantur, amplector.[729]

---

[727] Pelagius II, *Epistolae Pelagii Iunioris papae ad Episcopos Histriae (3)*, ed. L. Hartmann, MGH *Epistolae* vol. II (Berlin: Weidmann, 1899), 455. "Now it is true that the Latin men, ignorant of Greek, understood the error only after some time, since they did not know the language. But as much as it ought to be believed swiftly by them after understanding, so much did their constancy, once they knew the truth, not rest from the struggle; whose agreement Your Fraternity certainly should have despised, if they had consented with headlong daring before they had understood the truth."

[728] Straw, "Much Ado about Nothing," 153-158.

[729] Gregory I, *Registrum epistolarum*, ed. P. Ewald and L. Hartmann, MGH *Epistolae* vol. 1 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1891), 1.24, 36. "I also equally venerate the fifth council [553], in which the letter full of error, which is said to

Thus Gregory affirms the first four ecumenical councils together as a group, then adds on as their equal the fifth ecumenical council.

In 592 he wrote a letter to the schismatic bishops of Istria, urging them to reconcile with Rome. He also sent them the third letter of Pelagius II examined above: "Ut igitur de tribus capitulis animis vestris ablata dubietate possit satisfactio abundanter infundi, librum, quem ex hac re sanctae memoriae decessor meus Pelagius papa scripserat, vobis utile iudicavi transmittere."[730] In 593 and 594 he dealt in a similar vein with Constantius bishop of Milan, who by this time was residing in Genoa due to the Lombard invasion. Constantius had just been consecrated as bishop of Milan in succession to Laurentius. Constantius, although on Gregory's side in the matter of the Three Chapters, nevertheless still had dissenters among his clergy and wished to soft-pedal the matter.[731] This came out quite clearly when Gregory asked him in 593 to send a letter to Theodolinda, queen of the Lombards.

Theodolinda (c. 570-628) was the catholic (though pro-Istrian) queen of the non-Nicene Lombard king Agilulf. Gregory wished to ask her to support the new bishop of Milan (Constantius) and reconcile the Istrian schismatics. Constantius was reluctant to forward this letter to Theodolinda because it named the Fifth Council as orthodox and insisted upon the condemnation of the Three Chapters.[732] Constantius objected to the wording of this letter since it acknowledged the existence of the Second Council of Constantinople and defended

---

be from Ibas, is rebuked; Theodore is convicted for having fallen into the faithlessness of impiety, separating the person of the mediator of God and man into two subsistences; and the writings of Theodoret in which the faith of the blessed Cyril is censured with the suggestions of demented daring are refuted. And I reject all those persons whom the aforesaid venerable councils reject; I embrace those whom they venerate."

[730] Gregory I, *Registrum epistolarum*, 2.49, 151. "Therefore, in order that your spirits should be able to be filled with satisfaction with doubt being taken away concerning the Three Chapters, I have decided to send to you a useful book which my predecessor of holy memory Pelagius wrote on this matter."

[731] Sotinel, "The Three Chapters and the Transformations of Italy," 112.

[732] Walter Pohl, "Heresy in Secundus and Paul the Deacon," in *Crisis of the Oikoumene*, ed. C. Chazelle and C. Cubitt, 250-251. The letter is Gregory I, *Registrum epistolarum*, 4.4.

it. He also related his difficulties with his rebellious subordinates to the bishop of Rome. So Gregory responded in July of 594 with a letter telling Constantius to evade their demand to condemn the Second Council of Constantinople, and simply affirm Chalcedon alone to his dissenting clergy:

> Transmittite eis epistolam, in qua sub anathematis interpositione fateamini, neque vos aliquid de fide Calcedonensis sinodi inminuere, neque eos qui inminuunt recipere, et quoscumque damnavit damnare, et quoscumque absolvit absolvere. Unde credo eis posse celerrime satisfieri.[733]

He assumes that the acceptance of the condemnation of the Three Chapters is a requirement for unity with the church as a whole, but he shows some pastoral concern for the dissenting clergy.

Gregory then addresses Constantius of Milan's reluctance to send on the letter to Theodolinda that had been written to her in September of 593. Gregory assured Constantius that the Fifth Council had done nothing against Chalcedon, but agreed to send a new letter to Theodolinda that did not mention the Fifth Ecumenical Council. Gregory's new letter to Theodolinda, sent at the same time as his above letter to Constantius (July 594), merely affirmed his adherence to the four synods prior to the Second Council of Constantinople.[734] Gregory leaves the Fifth Council unmentioned, and in the letter that was actually transmitted to Theodolinda merely insists, in a pattern of rhetoric that goes back to Vigilius, that he adheres faithfully to Chalcedon.[735]

In 599 Gregory wrote to Secundus of Trento, influential advisor to Theodolinda and Agilulf, responding to his request for a full setting-out of the papal position on the Three

---

[733] Gregory I, *Registrum epistolarum*, 4.37, 272-273. "Send them a letter in which you confess under the intervention of anathema that you have not diminished anything from the synod of Chalcedon, nor have you received those who do so diminish, and that you condemn whosoever it condemned, and absolve whosoever it absolved. This should quickly satisfy them."
[734] Gregory I, *Registrum epistolarum*, 4.33, 268-269.
[735] For more on this letter see Patrick T.R. Gray and Michael Herren, "Columbanus and the Three Chapters Controversy—A New Approach," in *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. 45.1 (1994), 162-164.

Chapters.[736] Rather than send him Pelagius II's third letter to the Istrians as he had done in 592, Gregory wrote another text, urging him to reconcile with the church because the Three Chapters were not, contrary to what Secundus had claimed, integral to the decisions of Chalcedon. The faith of Chalcedon itself is staunchly upheld.[737]

As has been seen, there is an essential continuity of sixth-century Roman rhetoric concerning the Second Council of Constantinople and its judgments concerning the Three Chapters. On the one hand, the bishops of Rome consistently defended the decisions of the Second Council of Constantinople as being fully compatible with the faith of Chalcedon, indeed strengthening it. On the other hand, they affirmed their adherence to theology of Chalcedon and the three previous ecumenical councils. This seems to have been their preferred stance, omitting to mention the Second Council of Constantinople altogether. When forced to do so, their emphasis lay on its anti-Nestorian implications and its narrow focus. So much for Rome.

The reaction of three other western regions to the Three Chapters controversy will now be examined up to the end of the sixth century: Northern Italy, Africa and Gaul. Northern Italy was the region that had the longest-lasting schism from Rome, in part due to the political isolation caused by the Lombard invasion. The bishop of Milan, Datius, played a major role in the initial opposition to the condemnation of the Three Chapters while in Constantinople between 537 and his death in 552. The details of this opposition are laid out in a letter written in 552 to some Frankish envoys on their way to Constantinople.[738] Sotinel suggests that this letter was composed by a general council of northern Italian bishops, not

[736] Pohl, "Heresy in Secundus and Paul the Deacon," 247-251.
[737] Gregory I, *Registrum epistolarum*, 9.147, 144.
[738] Text in *Epistolae Aevi Merovingici Collectae*, ed. W. Gundlach, MGH *Epistolae* vol. 3, 438-442, and analyzed and translated in Price, *Acts of the Council of Constantinople 553*, vol. 1, 160-161; 165-170; see also the thorough treatment of Sotinel, *Identité civique et christianisme*, 309-319.

just those of Aquileia and Istria.[739] It decried the force and various political machinations used by Justinian in his effort to impose the condemnation of the Three Chapters on the western bishops, and urged the envoys to write to the bishops of Provence telling them not to assent to the condemnation.

They wrote as follows about the perceived damage to Chalcedon's authority:

> Veniens enim ibi ante sex annus istus beatissimus papa Vigilius, magis autem, ut quod virius est dicatur, prope violenter deductus, coeperunt ibi ipsum expectare, ut damnationem alicorum capitulorum facerit, per quam sancta sinodus Calchidoninsis, quae fidem catholicam, insistente tunc beatissimo papa Leone, contra diversas heresis, vindecavit, modis omnibus solveretur.[740]

After a lengthy account of the travails of Vigilius in Constantinople and his supporters (chief among whom was Datius bishop of Milan), the authors of the letter accuse their opponents of spreading lies in both Italy and Gaul, to the effect that Vigilius and Datius of Milan have assented to the condemnation of the Three Chapters.[741] They urge the Frankish envoys to write to the Gallic bishops warning them against the bearers of false rumours. They write:

> Unde rogamus et contestamus gloriam vestram per futurum Dei nostri iudicium, quod omnis conditio humana formidat, ut ad provincias vestras haec omnia velociter indecetis, ne aut isti subripiant qui missi sunt, aut Anastasius quidam, quem sanctus episcopus Aurilianus Arelatinsis civitatis ad beatissimum papam ante hoc biennium direxerat, ibidem in Gallias aliqua mentiatur, quia et ipse, cum de Constantinopole exire non posset, usus est consilio, ut promitterit, se omnium episcoporum Gallicanorum ad damnanda capitula, pro quibus haec scandala orta sunt, animus inclinare. Cui et praemia plurima dantis, districtae ibi de hoc implendo sacramenta praestare fecerunt, et non permiserunt per eundem Anastasio beatissimum papam, quid in ipsam causam ageretur, fratribus suis, episcopis Gallicanis, scribere, nisi

[739] Sotinel, "The Three Chapters and the Transformations of Italy," 91-92.
[740] *Ep.* 4, *Epistolae Aevi Merovingici Collectae*, ed. W. Gundlach, MGH *Epistolae* vol. 3, 439. "When the most blessed pope arrived here [i.e., Constantinople] six years ago [547], or rather (to speak more truly) when he was brought almost violently, they began there to look to him to condemn some chapters, and thereby bring it about that the holy synod of Chalcedon, which defended the catholic faith against various heresies at the insistence at that time of the most blessed Pope Leo, might be completely annulled" (Richard Price, tr., "Letter from the Church of Milan to the Frankish Envoys," in *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2009), 165).
[741] For the rumours circulating in Italy at this time, see Sotinel, "The Three Chapters and the Transformations of Italy," 91.

> tantum de aliis causis et quia fidem catholicam et quattuor sinodorum reverenciam secundum traditionem patrum custodit atque conservat.[742]

As can be seen, the arguments of the bishops of Rome outlined in the previous section are anticipated here; but the clergy of Northern Italy will have none of it. Indeed, they were aware of Vigilius' letter to Aurelian, excerpted above, but Chalcedon's authority, and that of Leo, is still at stake.

When Pelagius I was consecrated in 556 as Vigilius' successor, the churches of Milan, Aquileia and a few bishops in Tuscany refused to recognize his authority. As noted above (pp. 255-256), the ordination of the Istrian schismatic cleric Paulus as bishop of Aquileia was a significant move that resulted in a more established anti-Roman hierarchy. When the Lombard invasion occurred, along with the formation of a Lombard kingdom, the churches in Lombard territory were even further removed from reconciliation. There was an incident in 590 when Severus bishop of Aquileia and two of his colleagues were taken forcibly to Ravenna by the exarch Smaragdus and required to submit to Rome, but upon their subsequent return to their sees they were required in turn by their clergy and populace to once again affirm the cause of the Three Chapters.[743] The bishop of Milan, as noted above, was reconciled after fleeing the Lombards to Genoa, but Aquileia and Istria as a whole remained stubbornly recalcitrant.

---

[742] *Ep.* 4, *Epistolae Aevi Merovingici Collectae*, ed. W. Gundlach, MGH *Epistolae* vol. 3, 441. "In consequence we beseech and adjure your gloriousness by the coming judgment of our God, before which quails every human station of life, to communicate all this rapidly to your provinces, lest either their envoys deceive or a certain Anastasius, whom the holy bishop Aurelian of the city of Arles sent to the most blessed pope two years ago, spread lies there in Gaul; for he, when he could not leave Constantinople, contrived the scheme of promising that he would induce the minds of all the Gallic bishops to condemn the chapters over which these scandals have arisen. Giving him a substantial bribe, they made him swear them a strict oath to bring this about; and they did not allow the most blessed pope to send a letter by the same Anastasius to his brethren the Gallic bishops about what should be done in this case, but only on other matters and to the effect that he is guarding and preserving the catholic faith and the respect of the four synods according to the tradition of the fathers [see *Ep. Arelat.* 45, excerpted above on p. 246]" (Price, tr., "Letter from the Church of Milan," 169).

[743] Sotinel, *Identité civique et christianisme*, 358-364; also Sotinel, "The Three Chapters and the Transformations of Italy," 115-116.

We have a number of papal letters addressing the Istrian schismatics, as examined above, but their own voice does not come through again until 591, when they addressed a letter to the emperor Maurice pleading their cause.[744] These bishops wrote in protest against the mistreatment of their leaders and insisted that they could never consent to the condemnation of the Three Chapters. Their reasons for doing so are worth noting. After a summary of the condemnation of the Three Chapters and noting for each the lack of any explicit condemnation in Chalcedon, they write:

> Vigilius scripta sua per omnes provincias mittens, anathematis vinculis omnem populum obligavit, si quis damnationi trium capitulorum praeberet aliquando consensum. Et licet postea imperiali pondere ad consensum damnationis capitulorum ipsorum paulatim singuli tunc fuerint coarctati, nostrarum tamen provinciarum venerandi decessores, quibus indigni successimus, praedicti quondam Vigilii instructionibus informati, ad hoc inclinare nullo modo potuerunt. Quorum nos exempla Deo propitiante servantes cum universo populo nobis credito, sequentes etiam in omnibus definitionem sancti Chalcedonensis concilii, defensioni capitulorum ipsorum et reverentiam exhibemus, et a communione damnantium cum divina gratia abstinere dinoscimur.[745]

They felt they were following the commands of Vigilius before he caved to imperial pressure, and also that they were continuing the decisions of their predecessors.

Another aspect of this continued defiance was the popular support this position enjoyed. The bishops of Istria write in the above letter that they are joined *cum universo populo nobis credito*, "with all the people entrusted to us," and slightly further down they write: *Sic accensi sunt omnes homines plebium nostrarum in causa ista, ut ante mortem*

[744] Sotinel, *Identité civique et christianisme*, 359; the letter is transmitted in Gregory I, *Registrum epistolarum*, 1.16a.

[745] "Suggerendum domino nostro," in Gregory I, *Register of Letters*, 1.16a, 18. "Vigilius, sending his letters through all the provinces, obligated all the people by the bonds of anathema to never give consent to the condemnation of the Three Chapters. And although afterwards under imperial pressure bit by bit each one individually was compelled to consent to the condemnation of those same chapters, nevertheless the venerable predecessors of our provinces, to whom we are unworthy successors, informed by the instructions of the same aforesaid Vigilius, were not able in any way to assent to this. Preserving their example with God's blessing, with the trust of all our people, following also in everything the definition of the holy council of Chalcedon, we sustain the defense of those same chapters and reverence, and we decide to abstain from communion with those condemning them, by divine grace."

perpeti, quam ab antiqua catholica patiantur communione divelli, "All the people of our congregations were so inflamed in that cause [i.e., the defense of the Three Chapters], that they would even suffer death steadfastly rather than depart from the old catholic communion."[746] And furthermore:

> Si conturbatio ista et compulsio praesentibus iussionibus vestris remota non fuerit, si quem de nobis, qui nunc esse videmur, defungi contigerit, nullus plebium nostrarum ad ordinationem Aquileiensis ecclesiae post hoc patietur accedere.[747]

The popular (at least with regard to their subordinate clergy) opposition to the condemnation of the Three Chapters would spark a rebellion against the Aquileian bishops should they assent to the imperial will and condemn the Three Chapters.[748] The dissenting bishops shrewdly point out that this has political implications as well for the empire:

> Sed quia Galliarum archiepiscopi vicini sunt, ad ipsorum sine dubio ordinationem accurrent, et dissolvetur metropolitana Aquileiensis ecclesia sub vestro imperio constituta, per quam Deo propitio ecclesias in gentibus possidetis, quod ante annos iam fieri coeperat, et in tribus ecclesiis nostri concilii, id est, Beconensi, Tiburniensi, et Augustana Galliarum episcopi constituerant sacerdotes. Et nisi eiusdem tunc divae memoriae Iustiniani principis iussione commotio partium nostrarum remota fuisset, pro nostris iniquitatibus pene omnes ecclesias ad Aquileiensem synodum pertinentes, Galliarum sacerdotes pervaserant.[749]

It therefore was the course of wisdom for Maurice to decline to put any pressure on the Aquileian church to reconcile with the Roman and imperial churches. Maurice agreed with the Aquileian arguments, and informed Gregory I that the imperial forces in the area would

---

[746] "Suggerendum domino nostro," 19.

[747] "Suggerendum domino nostro," 20. "If that disturbance and compulsion due to your present commands [i.e., Maurice's attempt to compel the end of the Istrian schism] should not be removed, if anyone who now seems to be one of us should happen to submit [to these commands], after this none of our people will endure to submit to the ordination of the Aquileian church."

[748] Sotinel, "The Three Chapters and the Transformations of Italy," 116-117.

[749] "Suggerendum domino nostro," 20. "But since the bishops of Gaul are nearby, they will without a doubt rush over to their ordination, and the metropolitan Aquileian church instituted under your rule will be dissolved—through which church you possess with God's favour churches among the nations. Before very long this will have come to pass, and in the three churches involved in our council—that is, those of Beconensis [unknown], Tiburniensis [Debern?] and Augustana [Augsburg?]—the Gallic bishops will have ordained priests. And unless by that time the agitation from the order of the emperor Justinian of pious memory should have been removed from our regions, Gallic priests will have dominated almost all the churches belonging to the Aquileian synod by reason of our sins." See also the thoughts of Sotinel, *Identité civique et christianisme*, 360-361.

not act to suppress the schism.[750] So at the end of the sixth century the schism remained in full swing; it was not to end until 698, when under the Lombard king Cunipert the Istrian churches were reconciled to Rome.[751]

What of the other major Italian church in the north, Ravenna? Although there seems to have been some resistance to the idea of condemning the Three Chapters from the local clergy, the strong imperial presence in the city along with Justinian's appointment of a (non-Ravennan) solidly anti-Three Chapters bishop, Maximian, in 546, succeeded in aligning the church of Ravenna with the bishop of Rome and the Emperor.[752] In the rest of the sixth century, throughout all of the generally unsuccessful papal efforts to achieve unity—by force or by persuasion—with the Istrians, the bishop of Ravenna played a key role.[753]

This is not to say that all of the clergy of Ravenna were on the imperial side, however. A letter from Gregory I in 595 provides evidence that Marinianus, whom Gregory had appointed as bishop of Ravenna that same year, and who came, like Maximian, from another city, encountered opposition on the basis of his support of the condemnation of the Three Chapters. Gregory writes to the whole church of Ravenna, saying:

> Pervenit ad nos quosdam homines maligni spiritus insitgatione pervasos erga opionionem fratris et coepiscopi nostri Mariniani mentes vestras corrumpere falsa locutione voluisse dicentes, quod isdem frater noster minus quam decet sanctam Chalcedonensem synodum veneretur. De qua re omnibus vobis et ipse praesens de integritate suae fidei satisfacit, et nos per omnia testamur eum a cunabulis in sanctae universalis ecclesiae gremio nutritum rectam praedicationem fidei cum vitae suae attestatione tenuisse. Veneratur enim sanctam Nicaenam synodum, in qua Arrius,

[750] Sotinel, *Identité civique et christianisme*, 361-364; the letter of Maurice on this subject is preserved in Gregory I, *Registrum epistolarum*, MGH *Epistolae*, vol. 1, 1.16b.
[751] For the end of the schism, see Pohl, "Heresy in Secundus and Paul the Deacon," 258-261.
[752] Sotinel, "The Three Chapters and the Transformations of Italy," 87-89.
[753] R.A. Markus, "Ravenna and Rome, 554-604," in *Byzantion*, vol. 51.2 (1984), 566-578. Walter Pohl makes the observation that Secundus of Trento, author of a lost chronicle written from the standpoint of the Aquileian schismatics, seems to view the bishop of Ravenna as the main adversary of Aquileia (Pohl, "Heresy in Secundus and Paul the Deacon," 256). For a unique perspective on a body of texts assembled for the use of reconciling Aquileian schismatics at the end of the sixth century, see Sotinel, *Rhétorique de la faute et pastorale de la réconciliation dans la* Lettre apologétique contre Jean de Ravenne (Rome: École française de Rome, 1994).

> Constantinopolitanam, in qua Macedonius, Ephesenam primam, in qua Nestorius, et sanctam Chalcedonensem synodum, in qua isdem Nestorius, Dioscorus atque Euthyches damnatus est. Se quis autem contra harum quattuor synodorum fidem et contra sanctae memoriae Leonis papae tomum atque definitionem aliquid umquam loqui praesumit, anathema sit.[754]

So here Gregory gives the standard minimalist defense of the imperial church in the matter of the Three Chapters: Chalcedon and Leo's Tome are upheld, thus the matter is ended. This was evidently sufficient for the suspicious clergy of Ravenna.[755]

Northern Italy saw the longest-lived opposition to the condemnation of the Three Chapters, but it was in North Africa where some of the most vociferous opponents of Justinian's policy lived. North African clergy had been involved in Christological disputes throughout the sixth century. The Scythian monks had consulted with Fulgentius of Ruspe about their theopaschite Christology in 519 and he had responded positively.[756] The positive response of Fulgentius illustrates a pattern in western responses to Justinian's doctrinal edicts, in that they did not object to the theology in and of itself. Rather, the North African clergy objected to Justinian apparently overriding Chalcedon's decrees and theology.

In 545-546 when Vigilius in Sicily requested the bishops of the western Mediterranean region to send him responses to the condemnation of the Three Chapters, two respected North African clerics, Pontianus bishop of Thenae and the deacon Fulgentius Ferrandus

---

[754] Gregory I, *Registrum Epistolarum*, 6.2, 381-382. "There came to us certain men, overcome with the instigation of a wicked spirit, who wished to corrupt your minds against the reputation of our brother and fellow bishop Marinianus with a false speech, saying that our brother revered the holy Chalcedonian synod less than was fitting. Both the man himself from the integrity of his faith is giving you all satisfaction, and we also bear witness that in all things he held fast to the right preaching of the faith along with the attestation of his life, nourished from the cradle in the bosom of the holy universal church. For he venerates the holy synod of Nicaea, in which Arius was condemned; that of Constantinople, in which Macedonius was condemned; that of First Ephesus, in which Nestorius was condemned; and the holy synod of Chalcedon in which the same Nestorius, Eutyches and Dioscorus were condemned. But if anyone presumes to say anything at any time against the faith of these four holy synods and against the Tome of Pope Leo of holy memory, and the definition, let him be anathema."

[755] R.A. Markus, "Ravenna and Rome, 554-604," 573.

[756] See R.R. McGregor and D. Fairbairn, tr., *Fulgentius and the Scythian Monks: Correspondence on Christology and Grace*, 16-21.

(client and intellectual successor of Fulgentius of Ruspe, whose name he took), wrote letters expressing the opposition of the North African church to the condemnation.[757] Pontianus focused on the impropriety of posthumously condemning individual persons, however heretical the works attributed to them might be.[758] Fulgentius Ferrandus went further, laying out the full case against the condemnation:

> Non expedit antiquorum Patrum qui Chalcedonensi noscuntur interfuisse concilio vituperari deliberationem, retractari iudicium, mutari sententiam: ne synodus venerabilis, apud omnes Ecclesias Orientis et Occidentis per annos tam plurimos sine aliqua dubitatione firmata, perdat subito reverentiam suam; nec possit in definitionibus fidei robur inflexibile custodire, si coeperit ex aliqua parte fragilis aut reprehensione digna convinci. Quidquid semel statuitur in concilio et congregatione sanctorum Patrum, perpetuam debet obtinere iugiter firmitatem.[759]

So first, church councils ought to be irrevocable, and Chalcedon was no different. The least admixture of error in their proceedings is fatal to the authority of the whole:

> Si pars aliqua displicet in concilio Chalcedonensi, cum periculo displicendi totum placet. Vas electionis sanctissimus Paulus manifeste profitetur: "Modicum fermenti totam massam corrumpit." Si in illa massa sanctarum definitionum, vel exigui fermenti potest acida commixtio reperiri, tota massa iudicabitur noxia; vel certe, ut magna extenuemus, inutilis ad efficiendum panem, qui confirmat cor hominis. Quid igitur profuit quia ibi Nestorius, ibi Eutyches anathematizantur?[760]

---

[757] Both letters translated and briefly analyzed in Price, *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople 553*, vol. I, 109-121. For a chronological account of the crisis as it pertained to Africa, see Yves Modéran, "L'Afrique reconquise et les Trois Chapitres," in *Crisis of the Oikoumene*, ed. C. Chazelle and C. Cubitt, pp. 42-58; and S. Adamiak, *Carthage, Constantinople and Rome: Imperial and Papal Interventions in the Life of the Church in Byzantine Africa (533-698)* (Rome: Gregorian and Biblical Press, 2016), 68-80.

[758] Adamiak, *Carthage, Constantinople and Rome*, 69-70.

[759] Fulgentius Ferrandus, *Epistola VI: Ad Pelagium et Anatolium Diaconos urbis Romae*, PL 67.922. "Regarding the ancient fathers who are known to have attended the Council of Chalcedon, it is not fitting for their deliberations to be defamed, their judgment revised, and their verdict altered. Beware lest a venerable synod, confirmed for so many years in all the churches of east and west without doubts being raised, should suddenly lose its respect. Inflexible firmness could not be maintained in definitions of the faith if it began in any part to prove fragile or worthy of censure; whatever is once decreed in a council and assembly of holy fathers ought to possess perpetual validity forever" (Richard Price, tr., "Fulgentius Ferrandus, Letter 6, To Pelagius and Anatolius Deacons of the City of Rome," in *Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553*, tr. R. Price (Liverpool:Liverpool University Press, 2009), 113).

[760] Fulgentius Ferrandus, *Epistola VI*, PL 67.923. "If there is disapproval of any part of the Council of Chalcedon, the approval of the whole is in danger of becoming disapproval. That vessel of election the most holy Paul openly declares, 'A small amount of yeast corrupts the whole mass.' If in that mass of holy definitions there can be found the sour admixture of even a little yeast, the whole mass will be judged pernicious, or at least (to use understatement) useless to make the bread that strengthens the heart of man. In this case, what good was

Councils are inspired by God, and have great authority:

> Universalia concilia, praecipue illa quibus Ecclesiae Romanae consensus accessit, secundae auctoritatis locum post canonicos libros tenent. Sicut legentibus Scripturam divinitus inspiratam non licet aliquid reprehendere, quamvis minime valeant altitudinem coelestis oraculi comprehendere, sed pius lector et quod non intelligit credit, ut quod credit mereatur intelligere; sic omnino nec aliter concilia quae vetustas firmavit et custodivit devota posteritas obedientiam de nobis exiguunt, nullam relinquentes dubitandi necessitatem.[761]

This is the 'conciliar fundamentalism' spoken of earlier that drove the objections of the western churches. Thus the view of the North African churches in 545-546 firmly stuck to the unchangeable nature of Chalcedon, and against any imperial meddling in the faith.[762]

A number of African bishops went with Vigilius on to Constantinople, arriving in 547. One of these was bishop Facundus of Hermiane, who in 550 wrote the most thorough treatment of the question of the Three Chapters from the side opposed to their condemnation. In his book of twelve chapters, titled *Pro defensione trium capitulorum ad Iustinianum*, Facundus makes a number of arguments against the condemnation.[763] His lengthy and careful arguments need not be outlined here, but they focused on the innocuous nature of each of the chapters and the impropriety of condemning the dead and changing Chalcedon.

In 550 Justinian caused a council to be called in Carthage in order to enforce conformity to the condemnation of the Three Chapters. This was achieved, and in 551 the emperor sent

---

it that there Nestorius and there Eutyches were anathematized?" (Price, tr., "Fulgentius Ferrandus, Letter 6," 114).

[761] Fulgentius Ferrandus, *Epistola VI*, PL 67.926. "General councils, particularly those that have gained the assent of the Roman church, hold a place of authority second only to the canonical books. Readers of the divinely inspired scriptures are not permitted to criticize anything, however much they misunderstand the sublimity of the heavenly oracle, but the pious reader believes even what he does not understand, in order that he may deserve to understand what he believes: likewise, in entirely the same way and not otherwise, the councils that antiquity confirmed and devout posterity has preserved demand obedience and leave no need for doubt" (Price, tr., "Fulgentius Ferrandus, Letter 6," 118).

[762] For a good summary of the African argument, see Adamiak, *Carthage, Constantinople and Rome*, 80-87.

[763] For Facundus' writings, see Aimé Solignac, "Un auteur trop peu connu: Facundus d'Hermiane," in *Revue d'études augustiniennes et patristiques*, vol. 51.2 (2005), 357-374; Y. Modéran, "L'Afrique reconquise et les Trois Chapitres," 41-42 n. 9; and Anne Fraïsse, "Un image historique et nuancée de l'héresie: Facundus d'Hermiane," in *Bulletin de litérature ecclésiastique*, vol. 96.3 (1995), 185-197.

an official by the name of Mocianus to enforce the condemnation by both persuasion and compulsion. Facundus wrote a letter, *Contra Mocianum*, to the African church in 552 or thereabouts urging them to reject Mocianus' arguments. Nevertheless, imperial policy, by a mixture of force and persuasion, was ultimately successful in Africa. The African clerics who continued to oppose the condemnation went into exile. Although officially there was no schism in Africa after this, there remained hold outs.[764]

Facundus of Hermiane probably died soon after writing the *Contra Mocianum*, but there exists an anonymous text incorrectly attributed to him, written in 568 or 569 and entitled the *Epistula fidei catholicae in defensione trium capitulorum*. Its argument is worth investigating a little more closely, as it is the final text written by an African author on the subject in the sixth century, and is moreover written about the same time as Fortunatus' own panegyric to Justin II that touches on the controversy.[765] The author declares that the Three Chapters were condemned by Vigilius and Pelagius at the instigation of the "Acephali" and "Semieutychians," the chief of whom he considers Primasius of Byzacena.[766] He argues that they have separated themselves from the true church and are heretics mainly because they deny the Apostles' Creed by their condemnation of the Three Chapters. Here is an interesting

[764] Adamiak, *Carthage, Constantinople and Rome*, 76-80; Modéran, "L'Afrique reconquise et les Trois Chapitres," 75-82.

[765] The *Epistula fidei catholicae* has been edited in *Facundi episcopi ecclesiae Hermianensis opera omnia*, ed. J.-M. Clément and R. Vander Plaetse, CCSL 90A (Turnhout: Brepols, 1974), 418-434. A. Solignac has argued against the attribution of the *Epistula fidei catholicae* to Facundus (A. Solignac, "Introduction," in *Epistolae fidei catholicae*, *Sources Chrétiennes*, vol. 499 (Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2006), 277-282), suggesting that its anonymous author should be placed in northern Italy instead; this has failed to convince Y. Modéran, "L'Afrique reconquise et les Trois Chapitres," 41-42 n. 9. Given the focus of the text on Primasius of Byzacena as the chief malefactor and the detailed knowledge displayed of the controversy, it is probable that Africa is the location of the text, even if its author is probably not Facundus.

[766] *Epistula fidei catholicae*, 7, 420. "Siquidem ab Acephalis haereticis, id est Semieutychianis, exquisita et elicita capitulorum damnatio, et Vigilii atque Pelagii Romanorum praevaricatorum, et Primasii Byzaceni praecipui doctoris Acephalorum, edita contra Ecclesiam scripta protestantur." "Indeed the condemnation of the chapters was sought after and brought forth by the Acephali heretics, that is the Semieutychians, and the promulgated writings of the Roman transgressors Vigilius and Pelagius, and of Primasius of Byzacena (the outstanding teacher of the Acephali), make pronouncements against the church." The *Acephali* were the miaphysites, or at least their sympathizers. See the definition of Price, *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople 553*, vol. 2, 307.

variant in the case against the condemnation of the Three Chapters: one cannot declare the dead to be anathema because to do so is an implicit denial of the Symbol's article *unde venturus est iudicare vivos et mortuos*. Those who condemn the dead are usurping the office of Christ himself, and so are committing the same sin that caused the downfall of Satan.[767] As can be seen from this, there remained in Africa, despite the general triumph of imperial policy, some few dissenters.[768] The Gallic response to the Three Chapters schism, and later controversies, will be dealt with after the next section, which will first explore the events in the East pertaining to Christology.

5.4 *Justinian and his Successors on Christology*

The Western opposition to the Second Council of Constantinople's decrees concerning the Three Chapters mostly died down, thanks to both imperial repression and repeated insistences that Chalcedon had been upheld.[769] Only in northern Italy did opposition result in any long term schism, with the church of Aquileia holding out until 698.[770] In the east the decisions were quickly accepted by the imperial church. The miaphysite church remained unreconciled, however, and so efforts by the emperors to bridge the divide continued. Justinian continued for the remainder of his reign to attempt to effect such a reconciliation.

---

[767] *Epistula fidei catholicae*, 13-17, 421-423. The canons of the Second Council of Constantinople condemning the Three Chapters (i.e., 12-14) are excerpted directly as evidence of the blasphemous pride of the emperor and his minions (*Epistula fidei catholicae*, 15, 422; for the canons in question in full, see the translation of Price, *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople 553*, vol. II, 124-126).

[768] The African texts of Facundus and the others were transmitted through Italian manuscripts; see Stacey Graham, "The Transmission of North African Texts to Europe in Late Antiquity," in *Medieval Manuscripts, their Makers and Users*, ed. H.A. Kelly and C. Baswell (Turnhout: Brepols, 2011), 151-167; also J.-M. Clément and R. Vander Plaetse, "Einleitung," in *Facundi episcopi ecclesiae Hermianensis opera omnia*, CCSL 90A, xv-xxix. Cassiodorus' monastery at Vivarium seems to be a critical component in their transmission.

[769] Price, *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople 553*, vol. I, 99-103.

[770] Claudio Azzara, "Il regno Longobardo in Italia e i Tre Capitoli," in *Crisis of the Oikoumene*, ed. C. Chazelle and C. Cubitt, 220-222.

The events near the end of his life merit special attention, as they caused the most controversy.

The miaphysite church in Syria was dominated by the followers of Severus of Antioch (d. 538), the miaphysite bishop, who were the main target of Justinian's attempts at reconciliation in the condemnation of the Three Chapters. However, there was another faction of miaphysites formed by the followers of Julian of Halicarnassus (d. 527), who was expelled from his see in 518 by the emperor Justin I. The split was a result of Julian's teaching that Christ's pre-resurrection body was characterized by uncorruption (*aphtharsia*), impassibility (*apatheia*) and immortality (*athanasia*).[771] Christ therefore did not suffer from sickness and would not have died a natural death. His suffering and death on the cross was real, but freely chosen: "Thus he confesses that Christ truly, and in this sense also physically, suffered, but in complete disposition over himself, over his humanity, and was in no way subjected to a natural necessity of suffering and death."[772] The Logos so controlled the human body of Christ and so infused it with its power that it could not suffer save at the direct willing of the Logos. There were other versions of this doctrine, which was labelled by its opponents *aphthartodocetism* (meaning "to seem uncorrupt"), but Julian was its most famous representative.[773]

Justinian made contact with both Nestorian and miaphysite groups at the end of his reign in an attempt to ease relations.[774] The Nestorian contacts came to nothing (the condemnation of their theological lodestar Theodore of Mopsuestia saw to that), but the dialogue with the Julianists resulted in a decree, according to a number of historians,

[771] Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 79-111.
[772] Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 103.
[773] Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 213-217.
[774] Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 463-466.

endorsing a form of Christ's *aphtharsia* before the resurrection.[775] Justinian almost certainly remained broadly faithful to the version of Chalcedonian teaching put forward at Constantinople II; but this edict was an attempt to further conciliate the moderate miaphysites.[776] The pressure put on the pro-Chalcedonian clergy by Justinian to accept this dialogue and the accompanying conciliatory measures resulted in ferocious denunciation in many of the histories and chronicles recording the generally ignominious end of his reign. Eutychius the Bishop of Constantinople was exiled in 565, probably in part because of his opposition to Justinian's ecclesiastical policies on this matter.[777] Justinian died in 565, cutting short his efforts, and sparing bishop Anastasius of Antioch from deposition for his own fierce opposition to the decree on Christ's *aphtharsia*. Justin II succeeded Justinian and initially put into action a more conciliatory policy.

Justin II was in fact a staunch adherent of Chalcedonian orthodoxy, and after a few years of conciliation once again cracked down on the miaphysite churches.[778] His theological edict on the subject of Christology which we possess, dating from 571, reaffirms Justinian's Christology enunciated in the Second Council of Constantinople while at the same time bending as far as possible to allow miaphysite affirmation.[779] When it did not succeed, he then resorted to force. The main point to be made here is that Justinian's doctrinal policies encapsulated in the Second Council of Constantinople continued to be supported going forward. The emperors Tiberius II and Maurice also adhered to this policy, and further

[775] Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 470-473.
[776] Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 467-468; Grillmeier's conclusions about Justinian's policy are on pp. 472-473.
[777] Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 468-469.
[778] Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 482-490; see also Averil Cameron, "The Early Religious Policies of Justin II," in *Studies in Church History*, vol. 13 (1976), 51-67.
[779] Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 484-490.

imperial negotiations with the miaphysite churches ceased.[780] The seventh century would see the divide among the eastern churches harden still further, aided by political divisions brought about by the Persian and Arab invasions.

5.5 *The Gallic Response to the Christological Controversies*

Finally the reaction of the Gallic church needs to be examined. This is the area of greatest relevance for the present study. The Gallic church, like the rest of the Latin-speaking west, was staunchly Chalcedonian. Thus upon hearing rumours of the controversy over the Three Chapters and the Second Council of Constantinople, Childebert I sent a legate to Pelagius I urging him to uphold Chalcedon. As Pelagius recounts:

> Veniens etenim Rufinus vir magnificus, legatus excellentiae vestrae, confidenter a nobis ut decuit, postulavit, quatinus vobis aut beatae recordationis papae Leonis tomum a nobis per omnia conservari significare debuissemus, aut propriis verbis nostrae confessionem fidei distinare.[781]

Childebert I was no doubt expressing the concerns of all the bishops of Gaul as well as his own. This is reinforced by the fact that a council was called by this king in 549 at Orange, perhaps in response to the events in the east, restating the condemnation of Nestorius and Eutyches.[782] Gaul was committed to Chalcedon. However, its commitment was considerably less well informed than that of Italy and Africa.

---

[780] Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 490.

[781] Pelagius I, "Letter 7," ed. Gassò and Batlle, 21. "The *vir magnificus* Rufinus came, the legate of your Excellency, and admonished us boldly, as was fitting, both that we ought to indicate to you that the Tome of Pope Leo of blessed memory is preserved in all things, and that we ought to send a confession of our faith in our own words."

[782] *Concilia Galliae a. 511-a. 695*, ed. C. de Clercq, CCSL 148A, 148-149. "Itaque nefariam sectam, quam auctor male sibi conscius et a vivo sanctae fidei catholicae fonte discedens sacrilegos quondam condidit Euthicis, vel si quaequae a venefico similiter impio sunt prolata Nestorio, quas etiam sectas sedes apostolica sancta condemnat, similiter et nos easdem cum suis auctoribus et sectatoribus execrantes praesentis constitutionis vigore anathematizamus adque damnamus, rectum adque apostolicum in Christi nomine fidei ordinem praedicantes." Childebert seems to have taken a personal interest in this matter; see Ian Wood, "The Franks and Papal Theology, 550-660," 230-231.

Two things characterized the state of affairs in Gallia regarding Christological controversies in the sixth century: a lack of up-to-date knowledge and a tendency to classify all Christological heresies as variants of Nestorianism. Avitus of Vienne wrote to Peter bishop of Ravenna in 515 about the difficulty communicating with Rome about the Acacian schism:

> Fateor apostolatui vestro, etsi cum verecundia, ignorantiam Gallicanam. Nec melius esse puto quemquem simulare, quod sciat, quam didicisse, si nesciat. Quae inter Romanam vel Constantinopolitanam ecclesiam res agantur, non quacumque auctoriate cognoscimus, sed de rumoribus magis ac nuntiorum varietate captamus. Et ideo, ne forte quam rustici tam neglegentes credamur, sanctum papam et beatitudinem vestram per Viennenses clericos provincia tota nunc consulit, ut quae vobis de statu fidei cum Orientis parte definita sint, rescripta salubri lumine declaretis.[783]

Avitus wrote a year later (516) to Hormisdas responding to a letter from the bishop of Rome that the bishop of Arles had forwarded to him. He still asked for sure information:

> Unde sola causa servos vestros filios meos, Aletium presbyterum et Viventium diaconum, totius provinciae Viennensis nomine, quae ecclesiae ad me pertinenti ab universis decessoribus vestris et apostolica sede commissa est, cum praesentis famulatus pagina destinavi: per quos oraculo beatissimae responsionis agnoscam, utrum fervor scismatum praefatorum, qui intra Constantinopolitanam urbem vitio perniciosae obstinationis exarserat cuique, quod magis dolendum est, Alexandrinam vel Antiochenam ecclesias dicitis inligatas, vobis Christo favente docentibus digna fuerit correctione restinctus, aut si reversa legatio in paginis evidentibus quod simplex legeretur, exhibuit.[784]

---

[783] Avitus of Vienne, *Epistularum ad Diversos*, ed. R. Peiper, MGH *Auctores Antiquissimi* 6.2 (Berlin: Weidmann, 1883), 40, 68. "I...confess to your apostleship, though it be with shame, the ignorance of those of us in Gaul...We have not heard from any authority what is happening between the churches of Rome and Constantinople, but we get our information from rumours instead and from a variety of different messengers. And therefore, in order that we not be thought both to be boorish and negligent, the whole province is now making an official inquiry of the pope and of Your Beatitude through the clerics of Vienne. We would like you to make clear to us through the health-bringing light of a reply what your understanding is about the state of the faith with the Eastern church" (Avitus of Vienne, "Epistula 40," in *Avitus of Vienne: Letters and Selected Prose*, tr. D. Shanzer and I. Wood, 126-127).

[784] Avitus of Vienne, *Epistularum ad Diversos*, 41, 69-70. "I have sent with this dutiful letter your servants, my sons Alethius the priest and Viventius the deacon, in the name of the whole province of Vienne which was committed to my church by all of your predecessors and by the Apostolic See. I hope to leaern through them—your answer will be my oracle!—whether the fervour of the aforesaid schisms, which had burnt in vicious obstinacy at Constantinople and to which—a greater cause for sorrow—you say that Alexandrian and Antiochene churches are bound, has been extinguished at your teaching, Christ willing, by the appropriate measures, or whether the embassy, once returned, has brought back something to show that can be easily read" (Avitus of Vienne, "Epistula 41," tr. D. Shanzer and I. Wood, 128-129).

Hormisdas responded with a letter bringing Avitus up to date with the negotiations surrounding the Acacian schism.[785]

These letters bring up a number of points that are important to understanding the extent of the knowledge of the Gallic church. Official knowledge, including documents such as the Tome, were transmitted from Rome to metropolitans like the papal vicar in Arles, who were expected to circulate it among their fellow Gallic bishops.[786] Thus Pelagius I in 557 wrote to Sapaudus of Arles a letter which accompanied his long letter to Childebert I containing a confession of faith, asking him about the reaction amongst not only the royal court of Childebert but also his fellow bishops:

> Hortamur, ut, si epistula, quam per diaconum atque subdiaconum fraternitatis tuae ad excellentissimum filium nostrum, Childebertum regem, direximus, in qua de institutis beatissimorum patrum nostrorum fidem catholicam nostro per Dei gratiam sermone deprompsimus, tam ipsi gloriosissimo regi quam caritati tuae vel aliis fratribus et coepiscopis nostris placuit, rescripto tuae caritatis celerius agnoscamus.[787]

This was sometimes also done by word of mouth from a trusted messenger. So Vigilius in 550 wrote to Aurelian bishop of Arles about the events in Constantinople:

> Sed, quanta possumus, per filium nostrum Anastasium de his, quae gesta sunt, breviter nos indicare necesse est, et, cum nos domnus filius noster, clementissimus imperator, sicut promisit, Deo, qui cor ipsius tenet, iuvante, reverti praeceperit, hominem, qui vobis ad singula suptiliter innotescat, Deo propitio, destinabimus; quod ideo adhuc non fecimus, quia et hiemis asperitas et Italiae, quae vos non latet,

---

[785] "Hormisdae papae ad Avitum episcopum Viennensem," in *Epistolae Romanorum Pontificum genuinae*, ed. A. Thiel (Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 2004), 783-786.

[786] For the role of the papal vicar, see R. Mathisen, *Ecclesiastical Factionalism and Religious Controversy in Fifth-Century Gaul* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1986), 50-51; see also Wood, "The Franks and Papal Theology, 550-660," 237-241; and G. Langgärtner, *Die Gallienpolitik der Päpste*, 36-41.

[787] Pelagius I, "Letter 9," ed. Gassò and Batlle, 28. "And we urge that we should know swiftly from the response of your Charity if the letter that we sent by means of the deacon and sub-deacon of your Fraternity to our most excellent son King Childebert, in which by our own word we spoke about the catholic faith from the customs of our most blessed fathers (by God's grace), was pleasing as much to that same most glorious king as to your Charity and the other brothers and our fellow-bishops."

> necessitas praepedivit, donec serenissimus princeps, sicut desiderat, Domino sibi auxiliante, subveniat.[788]

There were also other sources, namely rumours from travelers and other documents that circulated without papal authorization.[789] Italian and African clergy were often these sources. So Cyprian of Toulon, Caesaris of Arles' close associate, seems to have had knowledge of the theopaschite theology of the Scythian monks, and approved of it.[790] He would have been well placed as bishop of the port city of Toulon to have access to the African clergy exiled to Sardinia who were in touch with the Scythians. The letter from the clergy of Milan to the Frankish envoys represents another such source.[791]

Vigilius warns Aurelian of Arles in 550 about his enemies spreading rumours:

> Fraternitas ergo tua, quem apostolicae sedis per nos constat esse vicarium, universis episcopis innotescat, ut nullis aut falsis scriptis aut mendacibus verbis aut nuntiis qualibet ratione turbentur; sed potius primi apostolorum, sicut convenit, verba sectentur dicentis: "Adversarius vester, diabolus, ut leo rugiens circuit quaerens quem devoret; cui resistite fortes fide."[792]

Pelagius I had the same difficulties with the Gallic church when writing to king Childebert I in 556. After reassuring the king of his Chalcedonian beliefs, he attributes the origins of these rumours to Nestorian sympathizers.[793] Rumours also prompted Nicetius of Trier (c. 525-566)

---

[788] *Epistolae Arelatenses Genuinae* 45, ed. Gundlach, 68. "But it is necessary for us, as much as we are able, to make a brief report (through our son Anastasius) about these things which have been done, and we will send a man (God willing) who shall subtly make clear to you the details, once our son and master the most clement emperor has commanded us to return, as he has promised, with God (who holds that man's heart) helping. We have not yet done this because the harshness of winter and the exigency of Italy—which is not hidden from you—obstructed, until the most serene emperor should give assistance, just as he desires, with God helping."
[789] Wood, "The Franks and Papal Theology, 550-660," 231-238.
[790] See Cyprian's defense of this idea in his letter to Maximus of Geneva, in *Epistolae Merowingici et Karolini Aevi*, MGH *Epistolae* vol. III, ed. W. Gundlach, 434-436.
[791] Wood, "The Franks and Papal Theology, 550-660," 225-226.
[792] *Epistolae Arelatenses* 45, ed. Gundlach, 67-68. "Therefore let your Fraternity, who is established as vicar of the apostolic seat through our gift, make this known to all the bishops so that they might not be disturbed for whatsoever reason by anything in either false writings or in deceitful words or messages; but, since it is fitting, rather let them follow the words of the chief of the apostles, in his saying: 'Your adversary, the devil, goes about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he might devour; resist him as men strong in the faith...'"
[793] Pelagius I, "Letter 3," ed. Gassò and Batlle, 6-10.

to write a letter (c. 565) to Justinian accusing him (bafflingly) of Nestorianism.[794] These rumours may have been relayed to him by a pilgrim:

> Cum Lactantius, ut dicit, presbyter, loca sancta per Gallias propter Domini misericordiam visitaret, ante nos apparuit, quae legis, deprecavimus et per Iesum Christum redemptorem nostrum coniuravimus.[795]

Although Nicetius implies that Lactantius is merely the transmitter of the letter, it is quite possible that the pilgrim was also his source. Both rumours and papal messages could be deceiving, however, as will be seen.

There was a marked tendency to mash all Christological errors into a caricatured version of Nestorianism. The name of Eutyches and his clerical circumstances were known, but his theology was not (or at least not very well). So Avitus of Vienne's two books *Contra eutychianam haeresim*, written around 512, attack in part a theology that diminishes the divine nature of Christ and rejects the term *Theotokos* for Mary and substitutes *Christotokos*.[796] This is a caricature of Nestorius' teaching, not Eutyches'. However, it should be noted that, as suggested by Wood and Shanzer in the notes to their translation, the confusion of Avitus may have been due to imperial propaganda.[797]

---

[794] For this letter, see Wood, "The Franks and Papal Theology, 550-660," 225, 231-233; also Gray and Herren, "Columbanus and the Three Chapters Controversy: A New Approach, 168. Both articles contend that Nicetius was simply confused.

[795] *Epistolae Austrasicae* 7, ed. Gundlach, 119. "When Lactantius, a priest as he claims, was visiting the holy places throughout Gaul due to the Lord's compassion, he came before us, and we sternly told him those things which you read, and conjured him through Jesus Christ our Redeemer."

[796] See the comments of D. Shanzer and I. Wood, *Avitus of Vienne: Letters and Selected Prose*, 10-13, 89-92, 106-107.

[797] I. Wood and D. Shanzer, *Avitus of Vienne: Letters and Selected Prose*, 91-92, 107. They write: "Avitus' information may originally have come from Imperial circles, most probably from the *magister officiorum* Celer, with whom he is known to have corresponded subsequently (*Ep.* 48). Celer's success in making Macedonius look like a Nestorian to the Monophysites (because he failed to approve the Council of Ephesus in his profession of faith) and like a Eutychian to the orthodox (because of his failure to cite Chalcedon) may have further contributed to Avitus' theological confusion (p. 107)."

This work of Avitus' was well known in Gaul; thus Gregory of Tours notes in his *Historiae* that Avitus wrote a work against Eutyches and Sabellius.[798] What is interesting about Gregory's description of this work is that not only does he repeat its error of identifying Eutyches' error with that ascribed to Nestorius, but he links Sabellianism and Eutychianism:

> Magnae enim facundiae erat tunc temporis beatus Avitus; namque insurgente haeresim apud urbem Constantinopolitanam tam illam quam Eutices quam quae Sabellius docuit, id est nihil divinitatis habuisse dominum nostrum Iesum Christum, rogante Gundobado rege, ipse contra eas scripsit.[799]

Nowhere does Avitus mention Sabellianism, and it is more common in anti-Eutychian polemic as a whole to identify it with Apollinarianism. Gregory is probably confusing, among other things, the unitarian Trinitarian dogma of Sabellius with the unitarian Christological dogma of Eutyches. It is not surprising in any case to see heresies tumbled together with only a very loose ideological association.

The blame for a renewal of heresy in the East on nameless Nestorians recurs in the letters of Pelagius I to Childebert I and Sapaudus of Arles. In the letter sent to Childebert I in 556 that was mentioned above, Pelagius writes:

> Maxime tamen Nestorianae heresis homines, pro eo quod Nestorius duas naturas in Christo separatas quidem et divisas astruxerit, fraudulenter moliuntur dicere, se non longe ab intellectu esse Calchedonensis synodi et papae Leonis, dum Nestorium, pro eo quod divisas duas naturas assereret, ipso dogmate beati papae Leonis constat esse damnatum.[800]

---

[798] Gregory of Tours, *Decem libri historiarum*, 2.34.

[799] Gregory of Tours, *Decem libri historiarum*, 2.34, 82. "The blessed Avitus was in those days a man of great eloquence, and so, with heresy arising in the city of Constantinople, he wrote at the request of king Gundobad against as much as what was taught by Eutyches as what was taught by Sabellius, namely that our Lord Jesus Christ had nothing of divinity in him."

[800] Pelagius I, "Letter 3," ed. Gassò and Batlle, 9. "Nevertheless the men holding to the Nestorian heresy strove greatly to speak falsely – because Nestorius indeed constructed in Christ two separated and divided natures – saying that it was not far from the mind of the Synod of Chalcedon and of Pope Leo, even though it is well known that Nestorius was condemned by that same dogma of the blessed Pope Leo, since he asserted the two divided natures."

Justinian's theological program is portrayed as anti-Nestorian, which is true if vague, since his attempts to clarify Chalcedon served to make the council less susceptible to a Nestorian interpretation. The portrayal of the opposition to Justinian's condemnation of the Three Chapters as suffused with Nestorian sympathizers is interesting and perhaps helped to further the confusion of Nestorianism with the monophysite cause. The confusion inherent in the letter (probably) sent just under ten years later by Nicetius of Trier to Justinian may well reflect this papal narrative.

This letter will be the last piece of evidence examined before the writings of Fortunatus himself are dealt with. Its importance for the present study is due to Nicetius' own prominence in the Gallic church and his early relationship with Fortunatus himself when the poet first came to Gaul. The letter castigates Justinian for departing from the orthodox faith and adopting a theology that denied Christ's intrinsic divinity.[801] The heresy that Nicetius thinks Justinian has fallen into has the hallmarks of a Nestorian caricature.[802] The dating of the letter may provide some important context that clarifies what the bishop of Trier is talking about.

The editor of the MGH edition, Wilhelm Gundlach, placed the date of the letter around 565, presumably on the basis of the date of Justinian's death.[803] Wood dates it earlier, nearer to the Second Council of Constantinople (553), on the basis that it matches the concerns of the western opponents of the condemnation of the Three Chapters.[804] It is more probable that Gundlach is correct, for two reasons. First, Nicetius states that Justinian is old and near the end of his life: *cum in ultimae aetate tua percomponere et coniungere ad redemptorem tuum*

[801] *Epistolae Austrasicae* 7, ed. Gundlach, 118-119.
[802] As noted by Gray and Herren, "Columbanus and the Three Chapters Controversy," 168.
[803] *Epistolae Austrasicae* 7, ed. Gundlach, 118.
[804] Wood, "The Franks and Papal Theology, 550-660," 225-226.

debuisti; "when you ought in your old age to have made peace with and joined your redeemer." Second, the doctrine of which Justinian is supposedly a new adherent has been condemned three times by general councils: *qui, ut, quod iam semel, bis et tertio ad omnes rectores ecclesiae condemnatum fuerat, vel adoraris, commonuit?* "Who advised you to even adore what had already been condemned once, twice and again a third time by all the rulers of the church?" The doctrines of Nestorius were condemned first at Ephesus in 431, then at Chalcedon in 451 and finally at Constantinople in 553. Nicetius is thus urging Justinian to remember his own actions taken against the heresy of Nestorianism.

Where would Nicetius have learned that Justinian took action against Nestorianism? From the letters of Pelagius I mentioned above. Since Pelagius I blamed Nestorians for fomenting the opposition to Justinian's theological program, Nicetius describes a Nestorian doctrine being condemned a third time in 553 by the whole church. Why then does Nicetius, if he approves (even if ignorantly) of Justinian's actions taken in 553, accuse the emperor of abandoning what he had affirmed earlier in his life? Because Nicetius had not heard rumours of the Three Chapters controversy from Lactantius, but rather of Justinian's "aphthartodocetic" inclination at the end of his life.[805] The bishops who Nicetius claims were exiled would thus be an echo of the real exile of Eutychius of Constantinople. The admonition to condemn Eutyches and Nestorius is a call to uphold the teaching of Chalcedon.[806] Justinian's "aphthartodocetism" threatened this teaching.

As can be seen, then, the information transmitted to Gaul about the Second Council of Constantinople by the bishops of Rome could help shape Gallic conceptions of Christological heresy. The confusion of Nestorianism and Eutychianism, and the general tendency to mash

[805] As suggested by Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 472.
[806] The "code" suggested by Gray and Herren, "Columbanus and the Three Chapters Controversy," 166-167.

the two together, may be a result not of ignorance but of misinformation. The same may be said of Avitus' confusion, spurred on as it may have been by imperial messaging. In any event, though Gallic engagement with sixth-century Christological controversies was characterized by poor or misleading information that resulted in a confusing Nestorianism being made the chief representative of the heretical camps, the fact remained that the Gallic churches were staunchly committed to Chalcedon and needed to hear that it was upheld. The writings of Venantius Fortunatus concerning Christology should be seen in this light.

5.6 *Conclusion*

The Christological dispute in the fifth and sixth centuries was characterized in the East by complicated discussion resulting in increasingly bitter divisions between the miaphysite and Chalcedonian factions, with the emperors making increasingly vain attempts to reconcile them. In the West, the dispute was characterized by a pro-Chalcedonian "conciliar fundamentalism" that refused to tolerate any changes to the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon. The efforts of Justinian to impose a solution at the Second Council of Constantinople in 553 resulted in a rebellion on the part of the Western churches even while failing to satisfy the miaphysites. However, this rebellion, the Three Chapters schism, was quelled with some success, with the exception of the churches of north-eastern Italy. The bishops of Rome had a big role in this, and their consistent message on the subject was that the Council of Chalcedon had not been overturned by any decrees of Justinian. The Gallic churches, being furthest removed from the centre of the action, were confused about the issue, frequently confounding Nestorianism with miaphysitism. They were however devoted to Chalcedon along with the rest of the Western churches, and so their suspicions were

addressed by the bishops of Rome by a simple vigorous affirmation of Chalcedon's immutability.

Chapter 6

Venantius Fortunatus in the Context of the Christological Controversies of the Sixth Century

6.0 *Introduction*

Unlike chapters 1-4, the present chapter does not focus on one particular text from Fortunatus' corpus. Instead, a number of different texts will provide the necessary material. Fortunatus' poetic corpus has so far not featured prominently in this study, but it is mostly in the poetry that Christological reflection is found. Moreover, the occasions for the composition of the poems were considerably more varied than those of the sermons. These occasions included diplomatic correspondence as well as ecclesiastical settings. It is therefore also necessary to consider some historical questions surrounding the poet's early life in Italy as well as his later political relationships in Gaul. The context of the discussions of Christology is almost as important as their content for understanding Fortunatus' position and the lively concern for the subject in late sixth-century Gaul.

6.1 *The Panegyric* Ad Iustinum iuniorem imperatorem et Sophiam Augustos

The first text of interest, and the earliest, is a panegyric to the emperor Justin II and the empress Sophia. It is not part of the *Carmina*, and appears only in the unique Σ manuscript.[807] It is a *gratiarum actio*, composed around 569 on behalf of Radegund of

[807] Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, lxxi-lxxii, lxxv-lxxx discusses the manuscript; Koebner, *Venantius Fortunatus*, 128-143 explores its provenance; his analysis has been accepted by later scholarship, as opposed to Meyer, *Gelengenheitsdichter*, 131.

Thuringia in order to thank the eastern monarchs for their gift of a piece of the True Cross.[808] Its doctrinal content is not the majority of the text, which focuses (naturally) upon the *virtus* of the True Cross.[809] Still, there are a number of important things said about theology that help to place Fortunatus in the general milieu of the time.

The opening ten lines set forth a Nicene Trinitarianism. They run as follows:

Gloria summa Patris Natique ac Spiritus almi,
unus adorandus hac Trinitate Deus,
maiestas, persona triplex, substantia simplex,
aequalis consors atque coaeva sibi,
virtus una manens idem, tribus una potestas;
quae Pater haec Genitus, Spiritus ipsa potest.
Personis distincta quidem, coniuncta vigore
naturae unius, par ope luce throno,
secum semper erat Trinitas, sine tempore regnans,
nullius usus egens nec capiendo capax.[810]

What, one may well ask, does all this have to do with Christological controversies? The sole subject is the consubstantial Trinity, not the relationship between the two natures of Christ. After all, later on in the poem Fortunatus praises Justin II for his adherence to the

[808] For the general context, the standard treatment is still that of Averil Cameron, "The Early Religious Policies of Justin II," in *The Orthodox Churches and the West*, 55-62, and also Cameron, "Early Byzantine Kaiserkritik," in *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, vol. 3 (1977), 1-17, esp. p. 5; but see now also Vincent Zarini, "L'éloge de l'empereur Justin II et de l'impératrice Sophie chez Corippe et chez Venance Fortunat (*Poèmes*, Appendice, 2)," in *Camenae*, vol. 11 (2012), and Rajko Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," in *Venanzio Fortunato e il suo tempo*, 362-401. See also the insightful comments by Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. III, 190 n. 26 and Di Brazzano, *Opere*, 630-637. Judith George's comments on this poem are also worth noting (Judith George, *Venantius Fortunatus: Personal and Political Poems* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1995), 111-115, and George, *Venantius Fortunatus: A Latin Poet in Merovingian Gaul*, 62-67). Meyer's comments on the text are, as always, useful as well (Meyer, *Gelegenheitsdichter*, 135).

[809] Although as Reydellet observes, there is a connection between Fortunatus' focus on the cross as means of redemption and precise Christology: "La fermeté des positions théologiques de Fortunat est ici particulièrement sensible. Cela s'imposait en effet, parce que le lien est étroit entre l'adoration de la croix et la question de la communication des idiomes" (Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 3, 190 n. 26). For more on the connection between Christology and the Christian doctrine of the redemption, see Fairbairn, *Grace and Christology in the Early Church* and Nestor Kavvadas, "An Eastern View: Theodore of Mopsuestia's *Against the Defenders of Original Sin*," in *Grace for Grace: The Debates after Augustine and Pelagius*, ed. A. Hwang (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2014), 271-296.

[810] Fortunatus, *Carmina*, App. 2.1-10. "Highest glory belongs to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Spirit of nourishment, one God being adored in this Trinity, majesty, three in person, simple in substance, equal, partners and of the same age between themselves, remaining one and the same in power, one capacity in three; what the Father is able to do, so also are the Son and Spirit able to do. Indeed distinct in persons, joined in the strength of one nature, equal in might, light, office, with them there was ever a Trinity, ruling endlessly, lacking the ownership of nothing nor susceptible of restraint."

Council of Chalcedon and to the teaching of Peter's seat (i.e., the bishop of Rome). What then does a statement of Trinitarian orthodoxy have to do with Chalcedon?

Wilhelm Meyer surmised that the focus on the Trinity celebrates the mutual Catholicism of the Franks and Eastern Romans amidst the "sea of the Arian-German world."[811] It would thus have little or nothing to do with the current Christological controversies. While this context is possible, it does not fit the rest of the evidence provided by the poem, as will be seen. Averil Cameron, in her 1976 article, suggested that it was more likely to refer to Justin II's decree that the Creed of Constantinople I be recited during the liturgy.[812] As well, she notes that the contemporary African author Corippus, in his panegyric *In laudem Iustini Augusti minoris*, includes a short creed that has some potential similarities to Fortunatus' trinitarian section.[813] In her commentary on Corippus' poem, she additionally calls the Trinitarian section, "An uncompromising statement of Chalcedonian orthodoxy," and then notes its similarities to a decree of Justin II's issued in 571.[814] Judith George in her translation and comments on the *Ad Iustinum iuniorem* suggested that the opening ten lines addressed to the Trinity are a paraphrase of some of Chalcedon's own credal statements.[815] However, she rejected Cameron's suggested connection between Corippus' panegyric and Fortunatus' poem because that there are not, in fact, that many similarities.[816] George's judgment on this particular matter has been supported by later scholarship.

[811] Meyer, *Gelegenheitsdichter*, 135.
[812] Cameron, "The Early Religious Policies of Justin II," 58.
[813] Cameron, "The Early Religious Policies of Justin II," 60-62; see Corippus, *In laudem Iustini Augusti minoris*, ed. Cameron (London: Athlone Press, 1976), 4.293-297.
[814] Cameron, ed., *In laudem Iustini Augustini minoris* (London: The Athlone Press, 1976), 207.
[815] George, *Venantius Fortunatus: Personal and Political Poems*, 111-112 n. 3.
[816] George, *Venantius Fortunatus: Personal and Political Poems*, 112-113, n. 7.

Marc Reydellet agreed with George that the first ten lines outline a Chalcedonian theology, but did not address the Corippus comparison.[817] Stefano Di Brazzano in his edition and translation agreed with George and Reydellet about the provenance of the Trinitarian sentiments.[818] He also notes the potential Corippus connection, but rejects it for insufficient verbal similarities.[819] Luce Pietri in her article on Fortunatus' patristic knowledge identifies the Trinitarian section as deriving from the Niceno-Constantinopolitan credal formula, but argues that afterwards Fortunatus stopped using the term *triplex* to describe the Trinity due to Augustine's opposition to it in his *De Trinitate*.[820] Rajko Bratož in his article on Fortunatus and the Three Chapters noted the similarity with Corippus, but also pointed out the other potential source already mentioned by Cameron, the decree of Justin II, issued in the early part of his reign, that attempted a new conciliation between pro- and anti-Chalcedonians.[821] In addition, Bratož argued that the first ten lines were a personal expression of Fortunatus' theology, in concord with the Chalcedonian formula.[822] Vincent Zarini dealt with the question of Corippus and Fortunatus' similarities in a detailed manner in his 2012 article in *Camenae*.[823] His position was that it is impossible to tell, since so much of the language in the poem is found in other Christian and pagan poets, not to mention Fortunatus' own poetry.[824] He also noted the similarities with the anonymous sixth-century poem *Virgo parens*, although the same reservations apply to its language as well.[825]

[817] Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 3, 190 n. 26.
[818] Di Brazzano, *Venanzio Fortunato: Opere*, 631 n. 20.
[819] Di Brazzano, *Venanzio Fortunato: Opere*, 633 n. 24.
[820] Pietri, "Venance Fortunat: Lecteur des Pères latins," 133-134; 137.
[821] Rajko Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," 382, 399-400 n. 120.
[822] Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," 379.
[823] Vincent Zarini, "L'éloge de l'empereur Justin II et de l'impératrice Sophie."
[824] Zarini, "L'éloge de l'empereur Justin II et de l'impératrice Sophie," 8-10.
[825] Zarini, "L'éloge de l'empereur Justin II et de l'impératrice Sophie," 8.

There are three questions here that are worth answering. First, is there in fact a connection between the panegyrics to Justin II of Corippus and Fortunatus? Second, what is the point of the focus on the Trinity in the first ten lines? Third, what are the sources for the first ten lines? The answer to the first question is equivocal: maybe, but probably not. The lines from Corippus run as follows:

> Indivisa manens patris genetique potestas
> spiritus et sanctus, subtantia creditur una,
> tres sunt personae, sub quis tria nomina fulgent.
> utque pater deus est, genitus deus aequus honore,
> spiritus et sanctus pariter deus, ex tribus una.[826]

As can be seen, there are few direct verbal reminiscences, and those that do exist are probably due to a common background of prior Latin Christian poetry.[827] While Corippus' panegyric does have similarities to Fortunatus' much later *In laudem sanctae Mariae*, this will be dealt with later on.

The answer to the second question is closely tied to that of the third question. Zarini has noted the many echoes of prior Christian Latin poets in the language of this section.[828] Is this therefore an anodyne statement of orthodox Trinitarian belief, representing merely a general friendly affirmation of the Emperor being a Christian in good standing? This was the position of Meyer noted above. It is also generally compatible with Cameron's point in 1977: "Venantius' praise of Justin's orthodoxy is in part at least merely the expected reaction of a Westerner who saw the Byzantine emperor making a pious gesture to the Catholic

[826] Corippus, *In laudem Iustini*, 4.293-297. "One power of the Father and of the Son remaining undivided, and the Holy Spirit, one substance is believed, there are three persons, under whom three names shine out. And just as the Father is God, the Son is God equal in honour, and the Holy Spirit likewise is God, one from three."
[827] As argued by Zarini, "L'éloge de l'empereur Justin II et de l'impératrice Sophie," 9-10.
[828] Zarini, "L'éloge de l'empereur Justin II et de l'impératrice Sophie," 9-10. He points out some echoes of pagan classical poets, especially Virgil, and more plainly those of Christian poets such as Prosper, Sedulius, Paulinus of Nola, Prudentius and Arator. He also observes that the rest of Fortunatus' poetry contains many of the same phrases; in other words, the first ten lines are typically Fortunatan.

Franks."[829] The suggestion that it is based directly on the Creed of Constantinople 381 is unlikely. The relevant portion of this creed reads as follows:

> Credimus in unum deum patrem omnipotentem, factorem caeli et terrae visibilium omnium et invisibilium; et in unum dominum Iesum Christum filium dei unigenitum, qui de patre genitus est ante omnia saecula, lumen de lumine, deum verum ex deo vero, genitum non factum, consubstantialem patri, per quem omnia facta sunt, qui propter nos homines et propter nostram salutem descendit...et in spiritum sanctum, dominum et vivificatorem, ex patre procedentem, cum patre et filio adorandum et conglorificandum, qui locutus est per prophetas...[830]

There are certainly echoes of this creed in Fortunatus' own text, as one might expect given the importance of the Creed of Constantinople. The phrase *cum patre et filio adorandum* in particular stands comparison with the poet's own phrase *unus adorandus hac Trinitate Deus*. However, the order of statements, the vast majority of the language used by Fortunatus to define the Trinity and the excision of statements focusing on the acts of the individual persons within the Trinity all weigh against the possibility that he is directly imitating the Creed. Thus the idea put forward by Cameron and others that the first ten lines are a re-statement of the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed must be rejected.

The suggestion of George, Reydellet and Di Brazzano that the lines reflect a specifically Chalcedonian theology is mystifying, given the complete absence of any discussion of the two natures of Christ. True, Chalcedon did put an emphasis upon the creeds of Nicaea and Constantinople, placing them before its own definition.[831] But it is unlikely that a mere re-statement of Nicene-Constantinopolitan orthodoxy would refer specifically to

[829] Cameron, "Early Byzantine Kaiserkritik," 5.
[830] *ACO*, 2.3.2, 136. "We believe in one God the Father almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of all things visible and invisible; and in one lord Jesus Christ the only-begotten Son of God, who was born from the Father before all ages, light from light, true God from true God, born not made, consubstantial with the Father, through whom all things were made, who for us human beings and for our salvation came down...and in the Holy Spirit, lord and life-giver, proceeding from the Father, to be adored and glorified along with the Father and the Son, who spoke through the prophets..."
[831] *ACO*, 2.3.2, 136-137.

Chalcedon.[832] There is, however, a text related to Christology that the content of the ten lines echoes quite strongly: Justinian's edict of 551, the *Confessio rectae fidei* putting forth the theological judgments which would be confirmed by the Second Council of Constantinople in 553.

Rajko Bratož briefly noted the similarities between the first ten lines of Fortunatus' panegyric to Justin II and an edict on Christology by Justin reported by Evagrius Scholasticus.[833] It is not possible for this specific edict to have been an inspiration for Fortunatus, due to the fact that it was promulgated in 571, two years after the poet wrote his panegyric.[834] However, Justin II's edict of 571 borrowed heavily from Justinian's *Confessio rectae fidei*; in particular, the part outlining Trinitarian orthodoxy is almost exactly the same.[835] It is with this earlier text that a comparison with Fortunatus' Trinitarian exposition should be made.

The *Confessio rectae fidei* of 551 was the foundation for the dogmatic decisions of the Second Council of Constantinople held in 553. It was largely written by Justinian himself

[832] See Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 484-485 for an example of an attempt by Justin II to conciliate the anti-Chalcedonians by issuing a decree emphasizing Nicaea and Constantinople I and ignoring Chalcedon. It is true that John of Biclar connected the institution of the Constantinopolitan Creed with Justin's adherence to Chalcedon: *symbolumque sanctorum CL patrum Constantinopoli congregatorum et in synodo Chalcedonensi laudabiliter receptum in omnia catholica ecclesia a populo concinendum intromisit*; "And the Creed of the 150 holy fathers gathered in Constantinople and received in a praiseworthy manner at the Council of Chalcedon he introduced to be sung by the people in all the catholic churches." (John of Biclar, *Chronica*, in MGH *Auctores Antiquissimi* 11, ed. Th. Mommsen, 211 l. 14-16). But perhaps this was John of Biclar's impression of a decree with a double aim: to conciliate both pro- and anti-Chalcedonians. It would thus be deliberately generalizing.

[833] Rajko Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," 382, 399-400 n. 120. Oddly, Averil Cameron noted the same thing about Corippus' very similar Trinitarian section, but failed to make the connection between Fortunatus and Justin's edict (Cameron, *In laudem Iustini Augustini minoris*, 207). For the text of the edict itself see Evagrius Scholasticus, *Ecclesiastical History*, 5.4. Michael Whitby notes that the Greek text is only found in Evagrius, but there is a Syriac translation in Michael the Syrian (Michael Whitby, *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000), 257 n. 9).

[834] For the date and general background to the edict, a failed attempt to conciliate the miaphysite party, see Cameron, "The Early Religious Policies of Justin II," 62-65; Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, 319-323; and Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 486-490.

[835] Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 487.

as an original composition.[836] Issued initially in Greek, this edict was very quickly translated into Latin.[837] It would thus have been available in Ravenna, centre of imperial power in Italy. Fortunatus' education in that city would have given him the opportunity to become familiar with the text of the edict. The part outlining Trinitarian dogma opens the edict, and runs as follows:

> Confitemur igitur credere in Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum sanctum, Trinitatem consubstantialem, unam deitatem, sive naturam et substantiam et virtutem et potestatem in tribus subsistentiis sive personis adorantes, in quae baptizati sumus, in quae credimus, et quibus confessionem dedimus, proprietates quidem separantes, deitatem autem unientes. Unitatem enim in Trinitate, et Trinitatem in unitate adoramus, mirabilem habentem et divisionem et unitionem; unitatem quidem, secundum rationem substantiae seu deitatis; Trinitatem autem, secundum proprietates, vel subsistentias, sive personas. Dividitur enim sine divisione (ut sic dicamus) et conjungitur divise. Unum enim est deitas in tribus, et tria unum, in quibus deitas est: aut (ut subtilius dicamus) ipsa tria est deitas, Deus Pater, Deus Filius, Deus Spiritus sanctus, cum unaquaeque persona solum intellegitur, mente separante inseparabilia, et tria unus Deus, cum simul intelleguntur propter eandem virtutem eandemque naturam: quoniam oportet et unum Deum confiteri, et tres subsistentias praedicare, seu tres personas, et unamquamque cum sua proprietate.[838]

The ten lines at the start of Fortunatus' panegyric have significant similarities in content with Justinian's edict. For example, the line *unus adorandus hac Trinitate Deus* echoes *unitatem enim in trinitate et trinitatem in unitate adoramus*. The focus solely on the Trinity,

---

[836] See Price, *The Acts of Constantinople 553*, vol. 2, 122-129.

[837] E. Schwartz, *Drei Dogmatische Schriften*, 2nd ed., ed. M. Amelotti et al. (Milano: Dott. A. Giuffré Editore, 1973), 174-175; Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 427 n. 450.

[838] Justinian, *Confessio rectae fidei*, ed. E. Schwartz, 131. "We therefore profess belief in Father and Son and Holy Spirit, giving glory to the consubstantial Trinity, one godhead or nature and essence and power and authority in three hypostases [*subsistences* in Latin] or persons, in whom we were baptized, whom we have believed, and to whom we have sworn allegiance, dividing the properties [distinctive characters, *proprietates* in Latin] but uniting the divinity. For we worship unity in trinity and trinity in unity, possessing a mysterious division and union, a monad [*unitatem* in Latin] in respect of essence or Godhead and a trinity in respect of the properties or hypostases or persons (for they are separated inseparably, so to speak, and are conjoined separably, for the Godhead is one in three, and one are the three in which is the Godhead or, to speak more precisely, which are the Godhead). Each is God [*Latin*-The Father is God, the Son is God, the Holy Spirit is God], when each person is considered on its own with the mind dividing the indivisible, while the three are God when they are contemplated with each other in their identity of movement [*virtutem*, "power" in Latin] and nature, since it is necessary both to profess the one God and to proclaim the three hypostases or three persons, each with its property" (Price, tr., "Justinian, Edict *On the Orthodox Faith*," in *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople 553*, 130; Price translates from the Greek text; my clarifications of the Latin are in square brackets).

without immediately invoking the economy of salvation, is also a point of similarity, and a difference from the Nicene and Constantinopolitan Creeds. Of course, these similarities are far from conclusive; as both Pietri and Zarini observe, the language used by Fortunatus is found throughout Latin theological reflection on the Trinity.[839] What makes the similarities interesting is the context.

The poem in part celebrates Justin II's adherence to Chalcedon and was written in the context of the Three Chapters dispute. Yet rather than stating a basic Chalcedonian Christology, or even paraphrasing the Nicene or Constantinopolitan Creeds which formed such an integral part of Chalcedon's dogmatic proclamations, it opens with a statement on Trinitarian dogma. Either Meyer is correct in saying that the focus on the Trinity reflects only a common Catholicism in the midst of Arian kingdoms, or something else is going on. It is possible that Fortunatus is deliberately echoing Justinian's opening to his *Confessio rectae fidei* in an effort to convey Radegund's and Sigibert's orthodoxy on Christological matters to Justin and his court. The fact that Justin II would a few years later use Justinian's edict as the basis of a new edict testifies to its continuing importance as a dogmatic text.[840]

So it is quite possible that there is a Christological significance to the opening ten lines of the panegyric to Justin II. There are three other elements of the poem that reflect Christological concerns. First, he praises Justin for adhering to Church teaching in general:

> Quam merito Romae Romanoque imperat orbi
> qui sequitur quod ait dogma cathedra Petri
> quod cecinit Paulus passim tuba milibus una
> gentibus et stupidis fudit ab ore salem
> cuius quadratum linguae rota circuit axem

[839] Zarini, "L'éloge de l'empereur Justin II et de l'impératrice Sophie," 9; Pietri, "Venance Fortunat, lecteur des Pères latins," 134-136. Pietri's analysis of Fortunatus' Trinitarian theology is especially helpful. She emphasizes the reliance of the poet on the writings of Hilary of Poitiers and Augustine.
[840] It is also noteworthy that Pelagius I's confession of faith in *Ep. Arelat.* 54, written for the benefit of Childebert I and the Gallic church, also starts with a discourse on the Trinity alone.

eloquiique fide frigida corda calent.[841]

The key phrase in this passage is *qui sequitur quod ait dogma cathedra Petri*. Cameron argues that this phrase points to a general approval of the emperor's Catholicism, and more specifically to Justin's institution of the repetition of the Creed of Constantinople during the liturgy.[842] George suggests that this has a connection to the Three Chapters controversy, in that Justinian was accused by his Western opponents of overthrowing the power of the Church to determine its own doctrine.[843] Fortunatus is thus praising Justin for the opposite: submitting to the teaching of the Church of Rome on Christological matters. Di Brazzano agrees mostly with George, suggesting that Fortunatus is drawing a contrast between Justinian's *cesaropapismo* and Justin's obedience to Rome.[844] Brian Brennan, in his article arguing that the poems were not written by Radegund but by Fortunatus himself, makes the same assumption, that the poem honours Justin's "rapprochement with the Papacy after the Three Chapters controversy."[845] Bratož observes that the phrase serves to present Justin as in agreement with the Western Church as a whole.[846] Zarini makes the same point as Di Brazzano and Brennan, that Fortunatus is drawing a contrast between Justin II and Justinian in their treatment of the Western Patriarch.[847]

The argument for connecting the invocation of *quod ait dogma cathedra Petri* with the Three Chapters controversy is strong. However, the phrase appears in a broader context that has been largely ignored. The doctrine followed by Justin is not just *quod ait dogma cathedra*

[841] Fortunatus, *Carmina*, App. 2.15-20. "How rightly does he rule over Rome and the Roman world who follows the teaching that the seat of Peter speaks, what Paul sang far and wide, the lone trumpet to thousands, pouring out from his mouth the salt [of eloquence] for the foolish nations, whose wheel of speech circled the four corners of the heavens and by the faith of his eloquence cold hearts are kindled."
[842] Cameron, "The Early Religious Policies of Justin II," p. 58.
[843] Judith George, *Venantius Fortunatus: Personal and Political Poems*, 112 n. 4.
[844] Di Brazzano, *Opere*, 632 n. 21.
[845] Brian Brennan, "The Disputed Authorship of Fortunatus' Byzantine Poems," in *Byzantion*, vol. 66.2, 339.
[846] Bratož, p. 379.
[847] Zarini, "L'éloge de l'empereur Justin II et de l'impératrice Sophie," 7-8.

Petri, but also *quod cecinit Paulus*. The voice of the apostle Paul is joined to that of Peter, which tends to dilute the emphasis upon the papal throne. Peter and Paul are often mentioned jointly in Fortunatus' poetry.[848] Paul's name is frequently accompanied by the word *tuba* describing his teaching, denoting the apostle as the great preacher of Christianity.[849] The emphasis in the whole stanza, 11-20, is more on Paul than on Peter. Four lines are devoted to Paul (excerpted above, with translation in note 841):

> Quod cecinit Paulus passim tuba milibus una
> gentibus et stupidis fudit ab ore salem
> cuius quadratum linguae rota circuit axem
> eloquiique fide frigida corda calent.

This would tend to indicate that the emphasis in this stanza is not so much on the teaching of Peter's seat specifically as on Justin's adherence to the orthodox faith generally. Not only is Peter's name routinely connected with Paul's, but it is also connected with the location of Rome and the Petrine office in particular. Peter's *clavis* is routinely mentioned alongside his name, like Paul's *tuba*.[850] He is also identified as the chief of the apostles as a whole, the *princeps* in the *De Virginitate*.[851] Still, while the point Fortunatus is making seems to be about Justin's general orthodoxy, it is possible that adhering to the teaching of the Roman See on Christology is something Justin is being praised for. This is because the following stanza directly references the emperor's dealings with Christological issues.

The next stanza praises a number of religious policies undertaken by the emperor. First, Fortunatus praises Justin for restoring the orthodox faith:

> Ecclesiae turbata fides solidata refulget

[848] Fortunatus, *Carmina* 2.1.8, 2.13.3-6, 3.6.13-14, 3.7.1-14, 5.3.35, 7.12.51-52, 8.1.10, 8.137-138, 4.2.35-36, 10.7.19, 11.6.5, *In laudem sanctae Mariae* 269-270, 293, *Vita Martini* 3.450, 476.
[849] Fortunatus, *Carmina* 2.13.5, where the phrase, *tuba gentibus una*, is almost identical to that of *Carm.* App. 2.17; 8.3.386; 11.4.11, which also uses *tuba gentibus una*; and *Vita Martini*, 3.488: *tuba gentibus ampla*; compare also 10.3.17: *praeconis Pauli vox simulata tonitrui*.
[850] E.g. Fortunatus, *Carmina* 2.13.3, 3.6.13, 5.3.35, 8.1.10.
[851] Fortunatus, *Carmina* 8.3.16.

et redit ad priscum lex veneranda locum.
Reddite vota Deo, quoniam nova purpura quicquid
concilium statuit Calcedonense tenet.[852]

These four lines seem to praise Justin for restoring Chalcedonian orthodoxy after it had been allowed to lapse by the previous emperor (Justinian).[853] This is either a reference to Justinian's divisive policies condemning the Three Chapters or to the aphthartodocetic doctrine he attempted to force on the church at the end of his reign. The reference to the *lex veneranda* being restored to its former position merits some examination. Fortunatus uses *lex* quite frequently to refer to Christian dogma.[854] The term is used in this way by others as well in the sixth century.[855] So Fortunatus is praising Justin for restoring the orthodox

[852] Fortunatus, *Carmina*, App. 2.23-26. "The disturbed faith of the church shines forth once more having been strengthened, and the venerable law returns to its original place. Give thanks to God, since a new purple holds to whatever the Council of Chalcedon instituted."
[853] See Cameron, "The Early Religious Policies of Justin II," 58, who links this passage to Justin's decree on the Creed of Constantinople; George, *Venantius Fortunatus: Personal and Political Poems*, 111-112 n. 3, who links this to Justin's efforts to reconcile the opponents in the Three Chapters controversy; Di Brazzano, *Venanzio Fortunato: Opere*, 632 n. 22, who also links the passage to Justin's moves in the controversy; Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," 379, who discusses the section thoroughly, links the passage as well to Justin's moderate religious policy; and Zarini, "L'éloge de l'empereur Justin II et de l'impératrice Sophie," 6, who also links it to the Three Chapters controversiy.
[854] Fortunatus, *Carmina* 2.15.4, on Hilary of Poitiers; 6.1a.34, on Brunhild and Sigibert; see the comments of Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, 72 n. 101. An interesting point on *Carm.* 2.15 is Fortunatus' comments on the *virus Graecorum* (2.15.5-8): *Inprobus ut vidit plebes quod scinderet error,/ Graecorum virus protulit in medium,/ vipereo promunt semper qui ex corde venena,/ filius ut dicant quia est creatura Dei*; "When he saw that a wicked error was dividing the people, he showed forth the poison of the Greeks to the public, those Greeks who always heartily promote the venom of vipers, since they say that the Son is a creation of God." On the face of it, this is a reference to Arius (as he makes clear later on by naming the heresiarch). However, the *semper* in reference to the Greeks' promotion of the heresy of the Son's subordinate status indicates that Fortunatus identifies a continuing trend. Reydellet notes that the reference to Greek heresy fits better with Fortunatus' own day than with Hilary's (Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. I, 72 n. 102). Perhaps the poet is making a reference to Nestorianism, which was accused of making Christ into a *purus homo*, "mere man." See the letter of Nicetius of Trier to Justinian for a Western example of this—and an example of the tendency to reduce all heterodox Eastern Christological positions to Nestorianism on the part of ill informed Westerners (*Epistolae Austrasicae* 7, in MGH *Epistolae* vol. 3, 118-119).
[855] E.g., Pope Vigilius' letter to bishop Aurelian of Arles, where Vigilius asks Aurelian to ask Childebert I to intercede with the Gothic king (Totila) so that he would not interfere with the running of the Roman church (*Epistolae Austrasicae* 45, in MGH *Epistolae* vol. 3, 66-68). Vigilius describes Totila as *velut alienae legis* with regard to ecclesiastical matters, given that the Goths had their own distinctive 'Arian' church.

Chalcedonian faith to its old position of honour. It is also possible that he is making a more general point about a generous emperor's orthodoxy, as argued by Averil Cameron.[856]

After praising Justin for restoring the orthodox Chalcedonian faith, Fortunatus goes on to enumerate in two separate places the geographical area whose inhabitants praise Justin for this act.[857] In between the two lists, the poet praises Justin for upholding the true faith by letting exiled bishops return to their sees. He writes:

> Exilio positi patres pro nomine Christi
> tunc rediere sibi, cum diadema tibi.
> Carcere laxati, residentes sede priori
> esse ferunt unum te generale bonum.[858]

The identity of these restored bishops is uncertain. Cameron and Reydellet suppose that they are anti-Chalcedonians, although this falls afoul of Fortunatus' clearly Chalcedonian Christology.[859] George and Di Brazzano identify them as supporters of the Three Chapters.[860] Bratož, followed by Zarini, favours a general reference to Justin's moderate ecclesiastical policy upon his accession, which allowed anti-Chalcedonian bishops to return to their sees.[861] Indeed, as Bratož also observes, the only reference in extant histories to Justin II allowing exiled bishops to return at the start of his reign is to miaphysite bishops, specifically

---

[856] Cameron, "Early Byzantine Kaiserkritik," 5.

[857] Fortunatus, *Carmina* App. 2.27-32; 45: *Hoc meritis, Auguste, tuis et Gallia cantat,/ hoc Rodanus, Rhenus, Hister et Albis agit./ Axe sub occiduo audivit Gallicia factum,/ Vascone vicino Cantaber ista refert./ Currit ad extremas fidei pia fabula gentes et trans Oceanum terra Britana favet*; *Trax Italus Scitha Phrix Daca Dalmata Tessalus Afer*. Bratož suggests that of these lists, both of them of Latin-speaking areas surrounding the Western Mediterranean, the first is a generic exaggeration of *consensus omnium* typical of panegyrics, and the second contains areas directly (and negatively) affected by Justinian's ecclesiastical policies. Both, he argues, are used by Fortunatus to praise Justin for reversing his predecessor's policies (Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," 380-381). See also George, *Venantius Fortunatus: Personal and Political Poems*, 113 n. 9.

[858] Fortunatus, *Carmina* App. 2.39-42. "The fathers placed in exile for the sake of Christ's name returned to their own when the diadem was your own. Released from prison, occupying again their former seats, they declare you, one person, to be a general good."

[859] Cameron, "The Early Religious Policies of Justin II," 54 n. 19; Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. III, 142 n. 34. Reydellet, realizing the discrepancy, wonders: "Fortunat, est-il mal informé ou veut-il louer les efforts de conciliation de l'empereur?"

[860] George, *Venantius Fortunatus: Personal and Political Poems*, 111-112 n. 3.

[861] Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," 379-381; Zarini, "L'éloge de l'empereur Justin II et de l'impératrice Sophie," 6. Bratož argues that Fortunatus is praising Justin for lifting Justinian's "pressione esercitata sui partigiani dei Tre Capitoli."

Theodosius of Alexandria.[862] Fortunatus was therefore perhaps mistaken in taking the vague report of a generous and conciliatory imperial policy as being related to the return of bishops exiled because of the Triacapitoline controversy (none in fact did return, and the Aquileian schism continued). He may not have been doing this; the four lines' symbolic importance is more important. Orthodox emperors, with Constantine the Great at their head, restored orthodox bishops to their sees. Thus Athanasius was restored successively by Constans and Jovian and Gregory Nazianzen was restored by Theodosius. Like Constantine, Justin brings peace to a disturbed church.[863]

Furthermore, it is noteworthy that the main victim of Justinian's aphthartodocetic policy, Bishop Eutychius of Constantinople, was not restored at Justin's accession. Eutychius was exiled by Justinian in 565 for not assenting to the emperor's theological program.[864] When Justin became emperor, however, he did not restore Eutychius to his see but maintained his more compliant successor, John Scholasticus, until his death in 577.[865] Eutychius was then restored to his old seat. Given that Fortunatus' panegyric to Justin and Sophia was written in 569, it is impossible that the poet is referring to Eutychius' restoration. Yet it is still possible that the poet is thinking of Eutychius' exile. Instead of commemorating an actual restoration, Fortunatus may be urging Justin to restore Eutychius. Panegyrics,

---

[862] Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," 380; see for the return of exiles Cameron, "The Early Religious Policies of Justin II," 54; and Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 482-483. Evagrius Scholasticus, *Ecclesiastical History*, 5.1, records that Justin dismissed the bishops who had been gathered by Justinian at the end of his reign. Michael Whitby, in his notes in that section, argues that this comment relates to Justin's dismissal of bishops and their suffragans gathered in many locales throughout the empire in order to discuss their reaction to Justinian's aphthartodocetic decree (Whitby, *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus*, 254-255 n. 2). Justin overturned it, thus negating the need for any reaction. Stanislaw Adamiak suggests that the African bishops still living in exile at Justin II's accession were allowed to return home as part of the order for bishops to return to their sees mentioned by Evagrius (Adamiak, *Carthage, Constantinople and Rome*, 79-80).

[863] Ironically, Justinian himself upon his accession had permitted exiled anti-Chalcedonian bishops to return from exile as part of his conciliatory policy (Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 344-345).

[864] See Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 467-473, for a description of Justinian's "aphthartodocetic" policy, which Grillmeier asserts was more Chalcedonian than claimed.

[865] Cameron, "The Early Religious Policies of Justin II," 54; Evagrius Scholasticus, *Ecclesiastical History*, 5.16.

including thse written by Fortunatus, were as much hortatory as they were laudatory.[866] The poet might, by praising Justin for restoring exiled bishops to their sees, be urging the emperor to rectify the injustice done to Eutychius.[867]

The final element of Christological interest in this poem is a good link to other poems by Fortunatus that deal with Christology. This is the passage describing the important event which took place on the cross, a fragment of which was Sophia's gift to Radegund:

> qua Christus dignans adsumpta in carne pependit
> atque cruore suo vulnera nostra lavit.[868]

As Reydellet notes, the words *adsumpta in carne* point to a staunchly Chalcedonian conception of Christ's two natures.[869] The insistence upon Christ's suffering in the flesh is standard orthodox teaching, and repeated by Fortunatus in his *Expositio symboli* and elsewhere.[870] What is distinctive about this mention of the flesh is the adjective *adsumpta*, a

---

[866] For this facet of Fortunatus' panegyrics, see Brian Brennan, "The Image of the Frankish Kings in the Poetry of Venantius Fortunatus," in *Journal of Medieval History*, vol. 10.1 (1984), 1-11; Judith George, "Poet as Politician: Venantius Fortunatus' Panegyric to King Chilperic," in *Journal of Medieval History*, vol. 15.1 (1989), 5-18; Judith George, "Venantius Fortunatus: Panegyric in Merovingian Gaul," in *The Propaganda of Power: The Role of Panegyric in Late Antiquity* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 225-246; and Julia M.H. Smith, "Carrying the Cares of the State: Gender Perspectives on Merovingian 'Staatlichkeit," in *Der frühmittelalterliche Staat—europöische Perspektiven* (Vienna, 2009), 227-239.

[867] Although the knowledge of the Aphthartodocetic controversy was slight in the West, it was not entirely unknown; Nicetius of Trier's letter to Justinian (*Ep. Aust.* 7) was written around 565 in response to the rumours he had heard (Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition*, vol. 2.2, 472). Fortunatus was well acquainted with the bishop of Trier, who had been one of the first people he visited upon his arrival in Gaul in 566 (Brian Brennan, "The Career of Venantius Fortunatus," 57-58).

[868] Fortunatus, *Carmina* App. 2.59-60. "On this [cross] Christ willingly hung in the assumed flesh and with his own blood washed our wounds."

[869] Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 3, 191 n. 37.

[870] Fortunatus, *Carmina* 11.1.39, 2.6.3. As Leo's Tome put it: "Agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione quod proprium est, verbo scilicet operante quod verbi est, et carne exequente quod carnis est. Unum horum coruscat miraculis, aliud subcumbit iniuriis," "For each form effects what belongs to it in communion with the other, namely by the Word performing what belongs to the Word, and by the flesh carrying out what belongs to the flesh. The first of these shines in miracles, the second succumbs to injuries" ("Epistola ad Flavianum, *ACO* 2.2, 28). This emphasis upon the distinctive natures within the single person of Christ was to cause some problems with Eastern theologians, who felt it too close to Nestorianism, but as McGuckin puts it: "The intent of Leo was to teach substantially the same doctrine as Cyril, that is the single subjectivity of the Word presiding over his incarnate condition, perhaps with a more stressed sense of the distinction of natures, which in common Latin parlance had no other meaning attached to the word than 'natural properties'" (McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria, The Christological Controversy*, 234). For more on this

standard Chalcedonian qualifier. Its presence in a panegyric celebrating the emperor's adherence to Chalcedon reinforces this theological emphasis. Fortunatus' emphasis in the rest of this panegyric, as well as many of his other poems, on the crucifixion and its effects blends neatly into the Christological statements.

6.2 *The Christology of the* Carmina

"Fortunat est le poète par excellence de la Redemption," as Reydellet puts it.[871] The poet is best known to posterity through his hymns on the redemption, focusing on the cross especially as the means by which this was accomplished. This emphasis also took the poet into the realm of Christology, since the death on the cross of the God-man was a central part of this dogma. The texts dealing meaningfully with Christological questions involved in the crucifixion are as follows: *Carmina* 2.1, *Crux benedicta*; 2.2, *Pange lingua*; 2.4, *Dius apex carne* (a *carmen figuratum*); 2.6, *Vexilla regis*; 3.9, *Tempora florigero* (addressed to Felix of Nantes on Easter); 5.6a, *Dius apex Adam* (another *carmen figuratum* addressed to Syagrius of Autun); 8.3, *De Virginitate*; 10.1, the sermon *Expositio dominicae orationis*; 11.1, the sermon *Expositio symboli*; and lastly, the independent *In laudem sanctae Mariae*.

Across these nine poems and two sermons are several important elements of Fortunatus' Christology. First, Christ's two natures—divine and human—are emphasized as distinct wholes. Christ hangs upon the cross in the flesh, his human nature. Thus the *Crux benedicta* states: *Crux benedicta nitet Dominus qua carne pependit*, "The blessed cross shines out on which the Lord hung in the flesh;" it is the Lord who hung on the cross, but he did so in the

---

subject, and the paradox inherent in it that, "the Logos suffered impassibly," as Cyril was frequently to put it, see McGuckin, *St. Cyril of Alexandria, The Christological Controversy*, 175-193.

[871] Reydellet, "Tradition et nouveauteé dans les 'Carmina' de Fortunat," in *Venanzio Fortunato tra Italia e Francia*, ed. T. Ragusa and B. Termite (Treviso, 1990), 94.

flesh.[872] The *Vexilla regis* runs: *quo carne carnis conditor/ suspensus est patibulo*, "In the flesh the creator of flesh was hung on the cross-beam."[873] There are other examples of this element, but these two will suffice for the time being.[874] This is quite standard Chalcedonian and Leonian language, and emphasizes that the divine nature cannot suffer, nor are the two natures conjoined into one nature.

Second, the assertion is repeatedly made that although the divine and human natures are distinct, nonetheless it is the divine second person of the Trinity, the Son, who is the subject of the incarnation. A frequent emphasis is placed on the Creator himself as a frail human being in the virgin's womb. The *Pange lingua* states: *missus est ab arce patris natus orbis conditor/ atque ventre virginali carnefactus prodiit*, "The Son, creator of the world, was sent from the heaven of the Father, and made flesh came out from a viginal womb."[875] The *Dius apex carne* states: *Gavisurus ob hoc caeli fluis arce locator/ Nasci pro nobis miseraris et ulcere clavi in cruce configi*, "About to rejoice for this reason, O Ruler, you issue from the height of heaven, you show pity in being born and in being affixed by the wound of a nail on the cross for our sakes."[876] Here, Fortunatus directly addresses the *locator* (an imaginative circumlocution for "ruler," *locator* referring to a landlord) as the one who was born for the sake of humanity's redemption by means of the cross.[877] The *Vexilla regis* uses the identity of the one being crucified to heighten the paradox of the cross. Fortunatus writes: *regnavit a ligno Deus*, a quotation from an Old Latin version of Psalm 95.10.[878] God himself hangs on

[872] Fortunatus, *Carmina* 2.1.1.
[873] Fortunatus, *Carmina* 2.6.3-4.
[874] See also Fortunatus, *Carmina* 2.6.18-19; 3.9.48-50; 3.9.57-58; 5.6a.24; 11.1.19.
[875] Fortunatus, *Carmina* 2.2.11-12.
[876] Fortunatus, *Carmina* 2.4.13-15.
[877] For the stylistic significance of *locator*, see Oliver Ehlen, *Venantius-Interpretationen*, 417.
[878] See Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, 57, 185 n. 38.

the cross, as clear a repudiation of Nestorianism as one could wish.[879] The *Dius apex Adam* holds to this line as well:

> A patre iure Deus, homo dehinc carneus alvo,
> ut nos eriperet, vili se detrahit auctor.
> O regis venale caput, quod de cruce fixit,
> telo voce manu malfactus verbere felle,
> ac tu hac soluis captivos sorte, creator:
> sero vera data est vitalis emptio morte.[880]

Once again, the emphasis is on God himself coming down on earth, suffering and dying on the cross: *vili se detrahit auctor*.

The third part of Fortunatus' Christology that appears frequently in his poetry is the importance of the Son taking his flesh from the Virgin's womb. The *Pange lingua* puts it this way: *ventre virginali carnefactus prodiit*, "The man made flesh came forth from the virginal womb."[881] The *Dius apex Adam* states:

> At Deus excellens aie et de lumine lumen
> e caeli solio dum munera providet ultro,
> castae carne rudi vivax introiit agnus.
> Prodiit inde salus matutinive lucerna
> intactae partu lux eruit excita mundum;
> A patre iure Deus, homo dehinc carneus alvo.[882]

God is born from a virgin, *homo dehinc carneus alvo*. The flesh is taken up by God in the Virgin's womb, and the Son is born a second time. The *De virginitate* deals with this concept at some length:

---

[879] See also *Carmina* 3.9.37-39, 47-60. For the background to this poem, which Meyer called, "vielleicht sein bestes," see Meyer, *Gelegenheitsdichter*, 81-82, and especially the detailed analysis of Michael Roberts, *The Humblest Sparrow*, 139-163.

[880] Fortunatus, *Carmina* 5.6a.24-29. "Rightfully he is God from the Father, then an enfleshed man from a womb; so that he might rescue us, the Creator brings himself down low. O purchased head of the king, which was fastened on the cross, assaulted by weapon, voice, hand, scourge and gall, and you, Creator, release the captives by this fate: true redemption was given at long last by a life-giving death."

[881] Fortunatus, *Carmina* 2.2.12.

[882] Fortunatus, *Carmina* 5.6a.19-24. "But when God, ever excellent, and light from light, provides rewards freely from the throne of heaven, the enduring lamb enters into the common chaste flesh. From there salvation came forth, a light in the morning, a light arose from the unsullied birth and rescued the world; rightfully God from the Father, then a fleshly man from the womb."

Respice qui voluit nasci se ventre puellae
et Domini Summi qua caro carne venit.
Spiritus intactum venerabilis adtigit alvum,
virgineam cupiens inhabitare domum,
hanc Deus ingrediens hominis quae nesciit usum,
sola suo nato conscia virgo viro.
Concipiente fide nullo se semine lusit
et quo factus homo est non fuit alter homo.
Virginitas felix quae partu est digna Tonantis,
quae meruit Dominum progenerare suum!
Templa Creatoris sunt membra pudica puellae
et habitat proprius tale cubile Deus.[883]

Here the emphasis is on the virginal womb that creates the flesh of the Creator. Moreover, it is the Creator (the 'Thunderer', to use the standard Christian poetic borrowing from pagan literature) who dwells in the temple of the womb. God is born from a Virgin. Once again, perfectly Chalcedonian. The *Expositio symboli* continues this line of thought, when it notes: *Ille qui de Patre ante saecula natus est, postea de Spiritu Sancto eius templum in virgine fabricatum intellegendum est*, "He who was born from the Father before the ages must afterwards be understood as building a temple in a virgin from the Holy Spirit."[884] So what Fortunatus preserved in the *Carmina* is fully in line with classic Chalcedonian theology, exploring its nuances in a stylistically as well as theologically sophisticated way.

6.3 *The* In laudem sanctae Mariae *of Fortunatus*

The *In laudem sanctae Mariae* replicates this pattern in spades, and is the most sophisticated exposition of Chalcedonian theology in Fortunatus' poetic corpus. Friedrich Leo considered

[883] *Carmina* 8.3.85-96. "Observe him who wishes to be born from the womb of a maiden and from what comes the flesh of the Highest Lord. The venerable spirit touched the virginal womb, desiring to inhabit a virginal house. God entering this woman who knows not the usage of a man, the virgin alone being conscious of a union in conceiving a son. With faith conceiving, she had no illusion of any insemination, and there was not another man by whom the Man was made. Happy virginity, which was worthy to bear the Thunderer, which merits to beget its Lord! The chaste limbs of the girl are the temples of the Creator, and God Himself lives in such a room." For an analysis of the poem as a whole, see Brian Brennan, "Deathless Marriage and Spiritual Fecundity in Venantius Fortunatus' 'De Virginitate,'" in *Traditio*, vol. 51 (1996), 73-97.
[884] *Carmina* 11.1.17, taken from Rufinus, *Expositio symboli*, 8.

it to be spurious, but Richard Koebner and especially Sven Blomgren argued convincingly for its authenticity.[885] Reydellet included it in his edition of the *Carmina*, agreeing with Blomgren about its authenticity and linking it with the Christology of the *In laudem Iustini minoris*.[886] It has not otherwise been extensively examined, however. Such an examination will not be done here, but a brief outline of its Chalcedonianism will be undertaken.

There are good reasons for affirming the poem's attribution to Fortunatus. In addition to the characteristic style of Fortunatus present throughout the poem, its attribution to the poet is present in some of the earliest witnesses to his work. The eighth-century manuscript Petropolitanus 14.1 places the *In laudem sanctae Mariae* amongst a disordered collection of Fortunatus' *Carmina*.[887] Two ninth-century Carolingian writers, Ratramnus of Corbie and Rhabanus Maurus, also affirm the attribution.[888]

Nonetheless, the 360-line poem in elegiac couplets is an uneasy member of Fortunatus' corpus. The poem's content is unlike that of the rest of Fortunatus' poetry. For one thing, scriptural references are piled up one after another in a way more reminiscent of Gregory of Tours' conversations with Arians, Jews and recalcitrant priests in his *Histories* than Fortunatus' other religious poetry. It has a homiletic tone and content which sounds more like Fortunatus' prose sermons, leading to the conclusion that it was most likely composed during his episcopacy. One can easily understand Leo's dismissal of the poem as

[885] Leo, xxiv, where he states that the poem cannot derive from Fortunatus: *illa sententiarum et locutionum ex libris sacris excerptarum incondita farrago et natura sua et sermone plane abhorret a Venantii facultate et consuetudine*, "That ill-formed mish-mash of sentences and phrases taken from Holy Scripture is inconsistent both in its nature and its simple speech with the skill and custom of Venantius;" Koebner, *Venantius Fortunatus*, 143-148; Blomgren, *Studia Fortunatiana II: De Carmine in laudem sanctae Mariae composito Venantio Fortunato recte attribuendo*.
[886] Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 3, 165 n. 1.
[887] Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, lxxii; see Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 3, 164 for the full manuscript tradition.
[888] Blomgren, *Studia Fortunatiana II*, 3-4.

an *incondita farrago*.[889] The dogmatic nature of the poem and its long list of scriptural citations leads to the conclusion that the poem has an essentially homiletic purpose. This purpose seems to be an expression of Christology that is in accord with a sophisticated Chalcedonian dogma.

The two Christological excursus, *In laudem sanctae Mariae* vv. 29-46 and 251-258, contain an impressively precise theology. This theology meshes neatly with the Chalcedonian definition and subsequent expressions of it by Latin authors. The following examination will compare Fortunatus' language with the language of previous authors in addition to delineating the precise outlines of his theology.

"O bridal-chamber of the womb, a new union for salvation was made, in which God and the flesh wed in wondrous glory," begins Fortunatus:

O uteri thalamus, nova iunctio facta salutis,
qua Deus atque caro nupsit honore novo!
Quod Deus amplexus carnem est, caro iuncta cohaesit;
stat Deus et homo fit Christus, utrumque genus.
Non Deus in carnem est versus: Deus accipit artus,
non se permutans, sed sibi membra levans,
cuius non poterat Deitas per aperta videri,
velamen sumpsit carne videndus homo,
unus in ambabus naturis, verus in ipsis,
aequalis matri hinc, par deitate patri,
non sua confundens, sibi nostra sed omnia nectens,
quem sine peccato gignit origo virum,
de patre natus habens divina humanaque matris,
de patre sublimis, de genetrice humilis.
Quando incorporeus pie corporis induit artus,
unde aequalis matri, fit minor inde patri.
Carnem animam ossa cutem nervos venas femur ungues,
formam servi adsumens est minor inde patris.[890]

[889] Leo, xxiv.

[890] Fortunatus, *In laudem sanctae Mariae*, 29-46. "O bridal-chamber of the womb, a new union for salvation was made, in which God and the Flesh wed in new honour! Now God having embraced the Flesh, the Flesh holds together as a unity; God remains and Christ is made man, each of them a nature. God was not changed into flesh: God receives limbs, not changing himself, but rather lifting a body to himself; he whose deity is not able to be seen out in the open, he assumed a garment so he would be seen as a man in the flesh, one [person] in two natures, true to them both, equal to the mother, equivalent to the Father in deity, not confusing them, but

The *uteri thalamus* is a fairly ubiquitous image in Christological literature, both east and west.[891] The *nova iunctio* carried out in this chamber is carefully defined as each member of the union remaining complete in itself: *Quod Deus amplexus carnem est, caro iuncta cohaesit;/ stat Deus et homo fit Christus, utrumque genus*. *Utrumque genus* is a difficult phrase, but in essence means, "each a complete nature unto itself." Compare the *proprietate utriusque naturae* of the Chalcedonian Definition, with Fortunatus' use of *genus* standing in as a synonym for *natura*.[892]

Moreover, the *how* of this mystery is expounded: in keeping with the theme of the poem, the virgin Mary's place in the formation of this *nova iunctio* is emphasized.[893] Fortunatus states: *Non Deus in carnem est versus: Deus accipit artus,/ non se permutans, sed sibi membra levans*.[894] This body is taken from the Virgin, a key Chalcedonian dogma, and is

---

rather binding to himself all that is ours, which man the originator bears without sin, being divine born from the Father,being human from the mother, sublime from the Father, humble from the mother. When incorporeal he took on the limbs of a body, out of pity, so now equal to the mother, thus he is made lesser than the Father. Flesh, soul, bones, skin, sinews, veins, loin, and nails; taking on the form of a servant, for that reason he is lesser than the Father."

[891] E.g., Sedulius, *Carmen Paschale* 2.49-51: *Quae nova lux mundo? Quae toto gratia caelo?/ Quis fuit ille nitor, Mariae cum Christus ab alvo/ processit splendore novo? Velut ipse decoro/ sponsus ovans thalamo*; Augustine, *Sermo 195*, 3, PL 38.1018-1019: *Ad hoc processit sponsus de thalamo suo, et exsultavit ut gigas ad currendam viam...manens in sinu Patris implevit uterum matris. In quo thalamo, id est, Virginis utero, natura divina sibi copulavit humanam*; Proclus of Constantinople, *Homily I, On the Holy Virgin Theotokos*, ed. Constas, 1: ἡ παστὰς ἐν ᾗ ὁ λόγος ἐνυμφεύσατο τὴν σάρκα; also Proclus, *Homily V*, ed. Constas, 2: ὅτι ὅν πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις φόβῳ καὶ τρόμῳ ὕμνησεν αὕτη μόνη ἀνερμηνεύτως ἐθαλάμευσεν.

[892] Cf. also Pelagius I in "Letter 7," ed. Gassò and Batlle, 23, written in 557, where he describes Christ this way: *unum in utraque natura, divina scilicet et humana*; so too Justinian, *Confessio rectae fidei*, 133: *ipse deus, idem ipse homo, utrumque tamquam unum, utrumque tamquam solum. Unde ex utraque natura, id est ex deitate et humanitate unum Christum compositum dicentes confusionem unitioni non introducimus*. "True God, the same true man, each as one, each as one alone. Whence we say from each nature, that is from deity and humanity one Christ was composed, we do not introduce confusion into the union."

[893] Again, a common theme in patristic literature: see especially Constas, *Proclus of Constantinople and the Cult of the Virgin in Late Antiquity*.

[894] Compare Pelagius I, "Letter 7," ed. Gassò and Batlle, 9: *mox carnem in utero virginis, mox verbi Dei carnem factam, exindeque sine ulla permutatione aut conversione verbi carnisque naturae, verbum ac filium Dei factum hominem*, "The flesh was made directly in the womb of the virgin: the flesh, that is, of the Word of God. And from there without any change or transformation in the nature of the Word and of the flesh the Word and Son of God was made man, one in each nature, namely divine and human;" also Justinian, *Confessio rectae fidei*, 133: *nec enim divina natura in humanam transmutata est, nec humana natura in divinam conversa est*, "For the divine nature was not changed into a human nature, nor was the human nature turned into a divine nature."

taken up by the subject of the incarnation, the Second Person of the Trinity, the Son. Also, Christ is *unus in ambabus naturis, verus in ipsis,/ aequalis matri hinc, par deitate patri,/ non sua confundens*. The Chalcedonian *in duabus naturis inconfuse* is strongly echoed here.

The anti-Chalcedonians were accused by Justinian and other Chalcedonians of making the fleshly body of Christ a mere *φαντασία*.[895] Fortunatus opposes this idea, most strongly in line 46, *carnem animam ossa cutem nervos venas femur ungues*, describing in graphic detail (*femur* can refer to the genitals) the true body assumed by the Creator. This body is not a divine one, but rather is truly human in its lesser status in the creation order: *Unde aequalis matri, fit minor inde patri*. The flesh is real and truly belongs to the *genus* of humanity; the deity is utterly unchanged but assumes the flesh like a garment from the flesh of the Mother of God.[896]

The second dogmatic passage runs as follows:

> Et tamen est genitus Deus et Homo, verus et unus,
> spiritus atque caro Christus, utrumque genus,
> in deitate patri aequalis vel corpore matri,
> sed sine peccato de genetrice caro,
> factor dans legem, factus sub lege minister,
> ipse pater mundi, filius ipse tibi.
> Unde tuum, mater, generas natum atque parentem:
> hinc prolem, inde patrem: hoc Deus, illud humus.[897]

This comes after a passage insisting upon Mary's virginity before and after the birth: *Accipis et nescis: sic reddis ut integra constes;/ nec violata paris nec pariendo doles*, "You receive and yet do not know: thus you give that you may remain whole; you give birth unviolated nor

[895] See Justinian, *Confessio rectae fidei*, 147: *Qui autem dicunt quod non oportet post unitatem duas naturas in Christo, sed unam dicere, confusionem et phantasiam introducunt secundum Apolinarium et Eutychen impios*.
[896] For this image, see Constas, *Proclus of Constantinople*, 315-358.
[897] Fortunatus, *In laudem sanctae Mariae*, 251-258. "And nevertheless the child is God and man, one and true, Christ the spirit and the flesh, each one nature, equal in deity to the Father and in the form to the mother, flesh from the mother but without sin, Creator giving the law, made a servant under the law, the very Father of the world, the very son to you. And so, mother, you bear your son and your parent: on the one hand your offspring, on the other your father: here God, there dust."

do you suffer when giving birth."[898] The miraculous nature of the birth testifies to the dual nature of Christ. The phrase *utrumque genus* occurs again. The passage is full of rhetorical dichotomies that juxtapose Christ's human and divine natures against one another. The language echoes familiar Chalcedonian terminology.[899]

All this has plenty of verbal and ideological antecedents, as has been noted. Fortunatus drew on earlier Christian poets such as Ennodius and Orientius.[900] For example, Ennodius' *Hymnus sanctae Mariae* runs:

> In carne Verbum stringitur.
> De matre cunctus noster est,
> De patre nil distans deus:
> Utrisque partus integer,
> Quae gignit et qui praecipit.
> Nil maior ille servulis,
> Sed nec minor creante fit.[901]

Verbal echoes such as *De patre natus habens divina humanaque matris/ de patre sublimis de genetrice humilis* (Fortunatus), *De matre cunctus noster est,/ De patre nil distans deus* (Ennodius) and *Christus utrumque genus* (Fortunatus), *Utrisque partus integer* (Ennodius) are present, as is the common subject matter, linking praise of the Virgin Mary with a presentation of the doctrine of the incarnation.[902]

---

[898] Fortunatus, *In laudem sanctae Mariae*, 249-250.

[899] Cf. Justinian, *Confessio rectae fidei*, p. 135: *perfectus in deitate et perfectus in humanitate*; the Chalcedonian definition itself, *deum vere et hominem vere*; also Pelagius I, "Letter 7," ed. Gassò and Batlle, 24: *consubstantialem patri secundum deitatem, et consubstantialem nobis eundem secundum humanitatem, per omnia nobis similem absque peccato*.

[900] See Orientius, *Commonitorium*, 1.261, for a list of body parts similar to *In laudem sanctae Mariae* v. 45.

[901] Ennodius, *Carmina* 1.19.15-21, ed. F. Vogel, MGH *Auctores Antiquissimi* 7, p. 255. "The Word is pressed into flesh. From the mother he is all that is ours, from the Father there is no distance from God; unchanged in each birthing, what bears and who commands. He is made not greater than a young slave, but not lesser to the Creator."

[902] There are also, interestingly, two poems written in the late sixth century that have even closer verbal and material echoes: a hymn to Mary from Corippus' *In laudem Iustini iunioris* (Corippus, *In laudem Iustini Augusti minoris Libri IV*, ed. Cameron, 2.52-60), and an anonymous poem beginning *Virgo parens* (*Anth. Lat.* 1.2.494c, ed. Riese). See for Corippus: Cameron, "The Early Religious Policies of Justin II," 61-62; and for the *Virgo parens*: Cameron, "A Nativity Poem of the Sixth Century A.D.," in *Classical Philology*, vol. 74, no. 3 (1979), 222-232. For the place of the *In laudem sanctae Mariae* in the broader (pan-Mediterranean) theological

The *In laudem sanctae Mariae* expresses a rigidly Chalcedonian theology, dwelling on the paradox of Christ's two natures in one person and the fact that a human woman, Mary, provided the womb which bore the Second Person of the Trinity.[903] The Chalcedonian emphasis is typical and expected; the Marian emphasis is not and is new. Much more needs to be said about this poem and its sources and meaning, but for the present study only two conclusions will be drawn. First, Fortunatus near the end of his life remained convinced of the necessity of transmitting Chalcedonian dogma. Second, he did so in a way which was very much up to date with current theological trends.

6.4 *Venantius Fortunatus and the Three Chapters Schism*

Fortunatus' Christological writing touches on the questions that surrounded the Three Chapters controversy. What was his position on it? It will now be argued that Fortunatus favoured the imperial and papal positions, favouring reconciliation with the imperial church.

The emigration of Venantius Fortunatus from his home in northern Italy has been the subject of a great deal of scholarly discussion over the years.[904] Why did he leave Italy for Gaul? Were the reasons religious, political or for the sake of his career? The aspect of this question which is of interest to our present project is the potential relationship between the Three Chapters schism and Fortunatus' departure. Does the poet's Christological theology reflect the side of the dissenters or that of the bishop of Rome and the Emperor? If it reflects

---

movement to identify Marian doctrine with Christ's incarnation, see the preliminary thoughts of Cameron, "The Theotokos in Sixth-Century Constantinople," in *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. 29.1 (1978), 91-96.

[903] The role of the Virgin Mary in Christian theology and iconography up until the end of the sixth century, after which it took a new turn, is primarily as *theotokos*. Her womb and the union of natures which took place there are the focus, not the woman herself. As Cameron notes, "The Virgin's function is as instrument" (Cameron, "A Nativity Poem of the Sixth Century A.D.," 229). And more recently Cameron, "The Cult of the Virgin in Late Antiquity: Religious Development and Myth-Making," in *The Church and Mary*, ed. R.N. Swanson, *Studies in Church History* vol. 39 (Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2004), 1-21, esp. p. 19.

[904] The most important discussions are those of Tardi, *Fortunat*, 58-66; Brennan, "The Career of Venantius Fortunatus," 54-58; and Rajko Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," 362-401.

that of the dissenters, then the theory that Fortunatus' departure had something to do with the political fallout from the Three Chapters schism would have some merit. However, I hope to demonstrate in this section that the poet's approach to Christology, and the Three Chapters, mirrors that of the Roman church. Thus the emigration of Venantius Fortunatus from Italy to Gaul was not a flight from a hostile imperial government to friendlier territories.

The two positions on Venantius Fortunatus and the Three Chapters controversy, that he was either in favour of the Second Council of Constantinople's decisions or opposed to them, are represented by the following scholars. D. Tardi looked upon Fortunatus as a loyal adherent of the papacy, leaving Aquileia (where Tardi suggests he received his initial education) out of a desire to avoid a rupture with Rome.[905] While Tardi does not think Fortunatus was capable of grasping the complicated theological questions at stake, his "esprit clair" and simple adherence to Rome's teaching caused him to prefer adherence over conflict.[906] Tardi's opinion was followed by Marc Reydellet, who however produced a more closely reasoned explanation for his position.[907] Reydellet argued that the poet's rhetoric on the subject of Chalcedon echoed precisely the language used by Pelagius I and Gregory the Great in defending themselves against charges that they had abandoned Chalcedon by accepting the condemnation of the Three Chapters. These two scholars represent, however, a minority position.

Most scholars of Fortunatus have concluded that the poet was a partisan of the opponents of the Second Council of Constantinople. Ernst Stein made the argument in his *Historie du Bas-Empire* that Fortunatus opposed the Council.[908] First, Stein suggests that the

[905] Tardi, *Fortunat*, 38-39.
[906] Tardi, *Fortunat*, 39.
[907] Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, xv-xvi, n. 29.
[908] E. Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, vol. 2 (Paris-Bruxelles-Amsterdam: Desclée de Brouwer, 1949), 832-834.

poet's clerical connections in Northern Italy, such as Paul of Aquileia and Felix of Treviso, point to his sympathy with some of the Council's most ferocious opponents.[909] Second, he argues that Fortunatus' references to Justin II upholding the Council of Chalcedon's tenets in his panegyric to Justin and Sophia refers clearly to Justin's seeming repudiation of Justinian's theological policy.[910] Third, Stein points out that Nicetius of Trier's letter to Justinian accusing the emperor of Nestorianism and of abandoning Chalcedon was written about the same time as the arrival of Fortunatus in Gaul. He suggests that the poet used the opportunity of the aphthartodocetic controversy in Justinian's final years to inform Nicetius, bishop of a diocese usually uninterested in Eastern theological disputes, of the position of the opponents of the Second Council.[911]

The next major treatment of Fortunatus' engagement with the Three Chapters controversy from this perspective was Judith George in 1992. In an analysis of the panegyric to Justin and Sophia, she wrote that it was written from the perspective of western Christians dissatisfied with the condemnation of the Three Chapters, insofar as they knew about it. She was not concerned so much with Fortunatus' own perspective as with the general outlook of the panegyric, written as it was as a quasi-official document from Radegund. The emphasis is on the Gallic background to the Three Chapters schism. George suggests that the praise for Justin's adherence to Chalcedon and the teaching of the seat of Peter (i.e., Rome) indicates the complaint of those opposed to the condemnation of the Three Chapters that Chalcedon and Leo's Tome were being overruled. Justin's supposedly more conciliatory religious policy towards the schismatics is praised.[912] This view is repeated in George's notes in her

[909] Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, vol. 2, 833.
[910] Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, vol. 2, 833.
[911] Stein, *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, vol. 2, 833.
[912] George, *Venantius Fortunatus: A Latin Poet in Merovingian Gaul*, 62-67.

translation of selected poems published in 1995.[913] Di Brazzano follows the same line in his note under the *Ad Iustinum* in his edition and translation.[914]

In 2001 Rajko Bratož wrote a lengthy article giving a nuanced assessment of Fortunatus' interaction with the controversy.[915] This is the most thorough treatment of the question, and leans towards Fortunatus being friendly to the schismatics, although he refrains from making a definitive answer. Bratož first examined the poet's roots in Northern Italy and the clergy from that area mentioned in his poetry. There are five people of significance: Paulus of Aquileia, Felix of Treviso and John of Padua, mentioned in the *Vita sancti Martini*; and bishops Vitalis and John, the addressees of Fortunatus' two earliest poems. Bratož notes that Paulus, Felix and John were all Istrian bishops who opposed the condemnation of the Three Chapters, and were friends of Fortunatus before their elevation.[916] The identity of Vitalis and John has long been disputed, and Bratož gives a thorough overview of the various possibilities. He concludes that two hypotheses are most likely: either that Vitalis was the bishop of Altinum mentioned by Paul the Deacon as fleeing to the Franks and then exiled by Narses to Sicily in 566, and John was an associate of his, or that both men were local bishops from Istria who were under the authority of the bishops of Ravenna, namely Maximian followed by Agnellus, during Fortunatus' stay in that city.[917] Therefore on the first possibility they would be partisans of the Three Chapters schismatics; on the other, they would have been on the side of the imperial church and agreed with the condemnation of the Three Chapters. So Fortunatus' early associations are ambiguous and do not say enough to support

[913] George, *Venantius Fortunatus: Personal and Political Poems*, 111-115.
[914] Di Brazzano, *Venanzio Fortunato: Opere*, 631 n. 20.
[915] Rajko Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," 362-401.
[916] Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," 364-370. Fortunatus mentions these three in the *Vita Sancti Martini* 4.658-675.
[917] Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," 370-378. That Vitalis was bishop of Altinum was first suggested by Koebner (Koebner, *Venantius Fortunatus*, 120-125) and supported by most Fortunatus scholars after him (see Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," 394 n. 64).

a judgment one way or another on the poet's allegiances in the Three Chapters controversy.[918]

Bratož then analyzes Fortunatus' treatment of Three Chapters controversy in his own writings. First, he looks at the panegyric to Justin II and Sophia. He notes that the poem emphasizes the Chalcedonian allegiance of the emperor through its opening trinitarian confession, its praise of Justin for adhering to the faith of Chalcedon and the teaching of the Roman church and its praise of Justin for allowing exiled bishops to return to their seats.[919] As well, the poem presents the entirety of the west praising Justin for his Chalcedonian orthodoxy. Bratož argues:

> Il suo entusiastico panegirico di Giustino II è espressione del rifiuto o almeno di una critica idiretta della politica del predecessore, specie nella parte di importanza capitale per l'Occidente: la pressione esercitata sui partigiani dei Tre Capitoli.[920]

Bratož secondly looks at another aspect of Fortunatus' writings that he believes sheds light on the poet's position on the Three Chapters. Although he observes that there was no specifically Aquileian theological program introduced as a response to the controversy until the seventh century, he tentatively suggests Fortunatus' *concezioni teologiche* is Aquileian in tenor, as represented by the version of the Apostles' Creed presented in the poet's sermon on the Symbol.[921] Thus the poet may well have imbibed the theology and emphases of the Aquileian church, which was firmly opposed to Justinian's policy.

---

[918] Bratož observes: "L'indicazione rispettosa ma ideologicamente 'neutra' usata dal poeta per i vescovi mostra che negli anni successvi allo scoppio aperto del dissidio (557) ci si poteva 'distanziare' dai drammatici eventi e dai loro protagonisti, cosa che più tardi fu sempre più difficile e una generazione dopo (588-591 ca.), quando la controversia assume forme di violenza fisica, assolutamente impossibile (Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," 378)."

[919] Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," 379-380.

[920] Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," 381. "His enthusiastic panegyric of Justin II is an expression of his refusal or at least of an indirect critique of the policies of Justin's predecessor, especially in the area of premier importance for the west: the pressure placed on the partisans of the Three Chapters."

[921] Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," 381-383. Bratož concludes: "Il credo di Venanzio lo definiamo 'aquileiese' pur con riserve (p. 383)."

Bratož then concludes by assessing the reasons for Fortunatus' journey to Gaul. The answer to the question as to why the poet emigrated turns for Bratož around the identity of bishops Vitalis and John, the poet's first sponsors. If they were subordinates of Maximian and therefore loyal to the imperial church, then it would open up the possibility that he emigrated in order to promote imperial interests, as suggested by both Sašel and Reydellet.[922] On the other hand, if Vitalis is connected with the bishop of Altinum who was exiled by Narses and spent some time in Frankish territory, then it would make sense that the poet fled to Gaul due to imperial hostility towards the Three Chapters schismatics. However, it is not necessarily the case that either of these was the main motivating reason, according to Bratož. He next notes suggestions of George and Brennan that the poet emigrated to find better patrons in Gaul, and went with a letter of recommendation from Vitalis of Altinum. Finally, he makes a tentative conclusion: Fortunatus left Italy and went to Gaul in order to find a more peaceful and less troubled region in which to carry out his poetic activity. This troubled state of affairs in Northern Italy was in part due to the Three Chapters schism:

> Assieme a una serie di motivi personali e oggettivi, fra loro intrecciati, che portano alla decisione di partire per la Gallia e più tardi di rimanervi, non vanno ignorati, almeno in via indiretta, quelli legati alle condizione conflittuali nella chiesa provocate dallo scisma dei Tre Capitoli.[923]

Bratož hesitates to place Fortunatus firmly in one position or another, but his cautious analysis of the various aspects of the question is valuable.

---

[922] Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," 384-385; J. Sašel, "Il viaggio de Venanzio Fortunato e la sua attività in ordine alla politica byzantina," in *Aquileia e l'occidente mediterraneo*, Antichità altoadriatiche 19 (1981), 359-375; Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, xvi-xvii.

[923] Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," 386. "Amidst a series of personal and objective motives, intertwined among themselves, which resulted in his decision to leave for Gallia and slightly later to remain there, we must not ignore those connected at least in an indirect way to the conflicted conditions in the church caused by the schism of the Three Chapters."

Luce Pietri wrote in 2004 an article exploring Fortunatus' patristic knowledge, and dealt briefly with the question of the poet's Triacapitoline allegiances.[924] Pietri suggests that Fortunatus had some experience learning from Aquileian clergy, specifically bishop Paul, but that he did not dwell on this relationship in his writings.[925] She argues that Sapaudus of Arles accepted the arguments sent to him by Pelagius I on the matter of the Three Chapters, and so Fortunatus was careful not to associate himself with the Aquileian schismatics given that Sapaudus was hostile to them. His panegyric to Justin steered well clear of the controversy by making a very general Trinitarian statement heavily dependent upon Hilary of Poitiers. He discreetly bypassed the doctrinal issues at stake in the Christology of Chalcedon and its legacy in the panegyric itself.[926]

The last two published articles that deal with Fortunatus and the Three Chapters controversy are both part of the April 2012 issue of the online journal *Camenae* which was dedicated to the subject of Fortunatus studies. The first is by Vincent Zarini and explores the panegyric to Justin II and its relationship with Corippus' similar work. Zarini depends heavily upon the analysis of Bratož, but emphasizes the possibility that Fortunatus is referring in the poem not to the Three Chapters controversy but to the aphthartodocetic controversy of Justinian's final years.[927] However, the reference to the new emperor following the dogma of the Peter's seat does suggest Fortunatus' disapproval of the way Vigilius was treated by Justinian.[928] The second article is another one by Luce Pietri that explores the poet's experience as an Italian in Gaul, and the question of his allegiances and

[924] Pietri, "Venance Fortunat, lecteur des pères latins, 129-141.
[925] Pietri, "Venance Fortunat, lecteur des pères latins," 129-130.
[926] Pietri, "Venance Fortunat, lecteur des pères latins," 137.
[927] Vincent Zarini, "L'éloge de l'empereur Justin II et l'impératrice Sophie."
[928] Zarini, "L'éloge de l'empereur Justin II," 8.

reasons for coming.[929] She touches briefly on the Three Chapters schism, arguing that Fortunatus did not go to Gaul in order to escape the ill-will of imperial authorities. Instead, the poet probably went to Gaul in response to an invitation from Sigibert, and in hopes of further patronage from his court. Pietri argues that the fact that an official of Sigibert's court, Sigoald, was sent to conduct him safely to Metz indicates that he was called and did not flee secretly. So it would be unlikely that the Three Chapters controversy was a direct reason for his emigration.[930]

The authors writing in favour of Fortunatus' adherence to the Aquileian faction in the Three Chapters controversy may be subdivided into two groups: those who are fairly confident that the poet was of this group, namely Stein, George and Di Brazzano, and Pietri, Zarini and Bratož, who are more equivocal. An equivocal position is wiser given the evidence at hand. Still, the following analysis will hopefully demonstrate that, insofar as Fortunatus was involved with the controversy at all, he was engaged on the side of those seeking reconciliation with the Roman church. There are two main areas of evidence that need to be dealt with in order to reach a conclusion about Fortunatus' stance on the Three Chapters controversy. First, his origins in northern Italy and the relationships he formed there; and second, his writings once in Gaul that touch on Christology.

The two areas with which Fortunatus is associated in northern Italy are Istria (including Treviso and Aquileia) and Ravenna. The poet was born in Duplavis in the region of Istria, probably between 535 and 540, and so would have grown up in an area in which popular devotion to Chalcedon was strong.[931] He also encountered Paulus, a bishop in Aquileia

[929] Luce Pietri, "Autobiographie d'un poète chrétien: Venance Fortunat, un émigré en terre d'exil ou un immigré parfaitement intégré?" in *Camenae*, vol. 11 (2012).
[930] Pietri, "Autobiographie d'un poète chrétien," 2.
[931] Brennan, "The Career of Venantius Fortunatus," 50 n. 11; see also Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, vii.

probably to be identified with the schismatic patriarch ordained in 559, early in his life.[932] Paulus persuaded him to take up the religious life, which indicates a certain amount of influence upon the young Fortunatus. Paulus would have been a junior bishop at the time, since by 559 the poet was probably in Ravenna. Still, his elevation to the head of the scismatic Istrian church shows that he was devoted to the cause of the defenders of the Three Chapters. Fortunatus thus was influenced not only by the probable stance of his local church but also by an early authority.

Another significant figure in the poet's early life was his friend Felix, who studied with him in Ravenna but was probably from the same region.[933] Like Fortunatus, Felix was devoted to Martin of Tours; however, rather than go on a pilgrimage to Gaul, as the poet did, Felix remained in Italy and became bishop of Treviso no later than 565, but was succeeded by Rusticus by 589, when the latter's name appears in the list of those attending an pro-Three Chapters council in Marano, near Grado in Istria.[934] A couple of years later, another Felix of Treviso signed the letter to the emperor Maurice from the Istrian churches written in 591, presumably the successor to Rusticus.[935] What is interesting about the first Felix, the friend to Fortunatus, is that while he would not have been accepted by the church of Treviso had he not defended the Three Chapters, there is no record of him attending any pro-Three Chapters councils.[936] Was he perhaps someone who discreetly kept his silence on the subject?

---

[932] Brennan, "The Career of Venantius Fortunatus," 51 n. 15; Pietri, "Autobiographie d'un poète chrétien," 1. Brennan is more cautious about assigning the identity of Fortunatus' Paulus with the schismatic bishop. For Paulus, see Sotinel, *Identité civique et christianisme*, 326-327.
[933] For Felix, see Fortunatus, *Carmina* 7.13; *Vita Martini* 4.665-667.
[934] Sotinel, *Identité civique et christianisme*, 397-398.
[935] Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," 369. See the treatment of this letter in Chapter 5.4, pp. 263-265.
[936] Sotinel, *Identité civique et christianisme*, 353-354. Sotinel notes that Felix of Treviso did not attend the council of Grado (579), where the Istrian bishops listened to the appeals of the newly ordained Pelagius II for reconciliation; given the attendance of a wide variety of other bishops, from both imperial and Lombard-controlled regions, political interference is an unlikely reason for Felix's absence. Grado, although under

Fortunatus also spent time in Ravenna as a student. He may also have stayed after his studies in Ravenna. His references to the city in his poetry show he had great affection for it.[937] But did the pro-imperial position of the church of Ravenna have any influence on the poet? His clerical associates from the period, primarily a bishop Vitalis but also a bishop John, mentioned in two poems from that period of his life, may help provide an answer.[938] The identity of Vitalis has been extensively disputed by scholars for a long time.[939] He is not likely to have been a bishop of Ravenna, there being no evidence of any such man existing at the time.[940] There is no record of Fortunatus being associated with the church of Milan, so it is unlikely that the bishop Vitalis of that city would have merited two poems of praise.[941] There remain then two real possibilities: Vitalis of Altinum, who after a period of refuge in Frankish territory was arrested and exiled by Narses in 565, or an Istrian bishop (in the region of Pola) Vitalis who was loyal to the bishop of Ravenna.[942] As Bratož points out, the two

---

Byzantine control at the time, remained the headquarters of the schismatic bishop of Aquileia, until its bishop reconciled with Rome in 607 (Sotinel, *Identité civique et christianisme*, 366).

[937] Fortunatus, *Carmina* 8.3.167, "Vitalem ac reliquos quod cara Ravenna sepultat;" *Vita Martini* 4.680, "inde Ravennatem placitam pete dulcius urbem." Compare the references to Aquileia: Fortunatus, *Carmina* 8.3.166, "et Fortunatum fert Aquileia suum;" *Vita Martini*, 4.658, "aut Aquiliensem si forte accesseris urbem."

[938] Fortunatus, *Carmina* 1.1. and 1.2. The titles in the manuscripts, *Ad Vitalem episcopum Ravennensem* (1.1) and *Versus de templo domini Andreae quod aedificavit Vitalis episcopus Ravennensis*, both mention Ravenna; since Vitalis is not the name of a bishop of Ravenna, the question of what the poet is referring to in this title has arisen. Reydellet gives an overview of the discussion and makes the plausible suggestion that Fortunatus was labeling these two poems as being composed in Ravenna, not dedicated to a bishop of Ravenna (Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, 166 n. 1). Bratož argues that the term is most likely to refer to Vitalis being under the authority of the bishop of Ravenna (Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," 376).

[939] For an overview of the discussion, see Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, 166 n. 1; Brennan, "The Career of Venantius Fortunatus," 53-54; and especially the methodical and thorough analysis of Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," 372-376.

[940] This is the oldest suggestion, dating back in a rather clumsy version (i.e., "Vitalis" is another name for Maximianus) to Luchi; Ernst Stein proposed a more sophisticated version of this, suggesting that the interregnum between Maximianus and Agnellus was filled by a bishop Vitalis; alas, there is no evidence for this either (Luchi, in PL 88.63-66; E. Stein, "Beiträge zur Geschichte von Ravenna in spätrömischer und byzantinischer Zeit," in *Klio*, vol. 16 (1920), 53-56).

[941] Suggested by Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, 166 n. 20; refuted by Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," 373.

[942] See Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," 373-378, for an analysis; the former position was first suggested by Richard Koebner (Koebner, *Venantius Fortunatus*, 125), and supported by Brennan (Brennan, "The Career of Venantius Fortunatus," 53). The latter position was suggested by G. Cuscito, "Venanzio Fortunato e le chiese istriane. Problemi ed ipotesi," in *Atti e memorie della Società Istriana di*

positions point to mutually exclusive conclusions on Fortunatus' attitude towards the Three Chapters controversy.[943] If Vitalis of Altinum is the one referred to by Fortunatus, then the poet would have had an opponent of the condemnation of the Three Chapters as a patron. This Vitalis' association with the Franks would have made Fortunatus' journey to Gallia, and the contacts there he seems to have already made before this journey, a more logical choice after Vitalis' exile by Narses in 565.[944]

Still, it is just as, if not more, possible that Vitalis is better identified with an Istrian bishop under the authority of Maximian. There is no evidence that a church dedicated to the apostle Andrew was built in Altinum at this time, or in Lienz for that matter (the Frankish city where Vitalis stayed), but there is plenty of evidence that veneration of Andrew was flourishing in Pola.[945] As Bratož also points out, if Vitalis had been truly on the run he would not have had time (or, for that matter, the right) to build or restore new churches.[946] Fortunatus' two poems, written in Ravenna for an established bishop Vitalis and presumably after his education was complete, would make more sense if they were written for a bishop friendly to the church of Ravenna. His emigration to Gaul would have been a result of his seeking a stabler environment to make a living as a poet, as Bratož suggested, rather than a

---

archeologia e storia patria, *N.S.* XXVI (Trieste, 1978), 207-225. Bratož declines to makes a final judgment between the two hypotheses, but provides quite a bit of archeological evidence that the veneration of Andrew was popular indeed in Pola, where Maximian came from, thus indicating that the latter theory is the more likely. Pietri mentions the Vitalis of Altinum theory, but views it as "purement hypothétique" (Pietri, "Autobiographie d'un poète chrétien," 2).

[943] Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," 378: "Di Vitale e Giovanni non si sa niente di sicuro: se fosse valida la tesi 'altino-aguntese' risulterebbero vescovi scismatici anche questi due; nel caso della validatà della tesi 'istriana' il poeta esprimerebbe il suo attaccamento ai due vescovi dell'Istria meridionale, partigiani del vescovo ravennate Massimiano e di conseguenza anche della politica religiosa di Giustiniano. Le due ipotesi si escludono a vicenda per il fatto che portano a conclusioni contrastanti sulla personalità del poeta e sui motivi della sua partenza per il regno franco."

[944] As pointed out by Brennan, "The Career of Venantius Fortunatus," 57-58; see also Pietri, "Autobiographie d'un poète chrétien," 2 and Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, x n. 10. For Vitalis, see Sotinel, *Identité civique et christianisme*, 332-333, where she points out that there is no evidence that Vitalis was exiled for adherence to the schism (indeed, the imperial authorities were tolerant of the schismatics).

[945] Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," 377.

[946] Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," 374.

flight from imperial repression.[947] If this conclusion is true, then at the least Fortunatus would have had no objection to working for a bishop favourable to the condemnation of the Three Chapters.

What can be concluded from this account of Fortunatus' early life about his position on the Three Chapters? First, Fortunatus strongly associated himself with Ravenna and two bishops, Vitalis and John, affiliated with the pro-imperial church there. Second, his associations with Aquileian clergy, namely Paulus and Felix, do not necessarily indicate his adherence to their position on the Three Chapters. Paulus was not ordained as patriarch when the poet knew him, and Felix seems to have kept his head down. Third, his emigration to Gaul was not part of an effort to escape imperial repression against Three Chapters schismatics. Thus the known circumstances of his early life tend to indicate either that he remained neutral on the question or that he favoured the imperial and papal side.

The other piece of evidence that needs to be considered, and the most direct, is the position taken in his writings on the subject while in Gaul. This boils down to the analysis of the panegyric to Justin and Sophia, given the generic Chalcedonianism of the rest of his Christology. Both its content and its context must be taken into account to reach a conclusion about what the poet is saying about the Three Chapters controversy.

The content of the panegyric *Ad Iustinum iuniorem imperatorem et Sophiam Augustos* supports the conclusion that Fortunatus was as interested in reassuring Sigibert's court of the emperor's Chalcedonian orthodoxy as in praising Justin for upholding that same orthodoxy, even as reinterpreted by Justinian. It is not a statement that necessarily indicates support for the opponents of the condemnation of the Three Chapters. Rather, it echoes the Chalcedonian

[947] Bratož, "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," 386; see also Pietri, "Autobiographie d'un poète chrétien," 2. She points out that the poet doesn't seem to have traveled secretly, given his reception by Sigoald.

minimalist arguments of the bishops of Rome, from Vigilius to Gregory I, when they attempted to persuade the schismatics to return to the fold by praising the first four ecumenical councils only.

The opening ten lines of the panegyric reflect the typical opening of Christological statements in the sixth century such as the *Confessio rectae fidei* of Justinian, the confession of Pelagius I in his letter to Childebert I in 557 and the edict of Justin II issued in 571.[948] Rather than indicating a devotion to Chalcedon that chimes with that of the opponents of Justinian's ecclesiastical policy, then, this invocation of Trinitarian theology fits just as well with affirming the position of the Roman bishops as well as the Eastern emperors, who always insisted that they upheld Chalcedon.

The next section (vv. 15-20) deals with the emperor's adherence to the teaching of Peter's seat as well as that of Paul. *Quod ait dogma cathedra Petri* possibly refers to the traditionally staunch pro-Chalcedonianism of the church of Rome. Justin II is praised for following the tradition of the Roman church in upholding the Tome of Leo. This is precisely what the letters of reassurance from Vigilius to Pelagius I to Pelagius II and Gregory the Great insisted upon. The emphasis upon Leo's Tome was something also native to Gallic conceptions of Chalcedon, for example as represented by Childebert I's sharp questions to Pelagius about whether the Tome was still upheld in his letter of 557. So a passage in a panegyric to Justin II which emphasizes the emperor's adherence to Leo's Tome and to the teaching of Rome would serve to reassure the Gallic clergy and laity of the emperor's orthodoxy.

[948] Justinian, *Confessio rectae fidei*, ed. E. Schwartz, 131; Pelagius I, *Epistulae*, ed. Gassò and Batlle, 22; Evagrius Scholasticus, *Ecclesiastical History*, 5.4.

The next section (vv. 23-26) portrays the emperor upon his accession restoring Chalcedonian orthodoxy. What this refers to exactly has already been discussed. While the identification of the disturbance in the church as the Three Chapters schism is possible, the lack of significant discontinuity between the policies of Justinian and Justin II towards the Triacapitoline schismatics pushes against this conclusion. It is more likely that the praise for restoring the peace of the church refers to the end of the aphthartodocetic controversy, or the institution of the creed of Constantinople at the celebration of the liturgy, or Fortunatus is expressing a generic sentiment fitting for a new emperor. The connection with aphthartodocetism should not be dismissed because of an apparent lack of evidence for any western response to it; as argued before, Nicetius of Trier's confused letter of 565 may well reflect a reaction. But, at most, such knowledge would have been sketchy, so Fortunatus' generic praise for a new emperor's orthodoxy after the vague rumours of unorthodoxy on the part of Justinian would fit the panegyric's purpose.

The next section (vv. 27-48) sandwiches a further description of the new emperor's beneficent deeds between two lists of western Mediterranean regions which are united in praising Justin and his deeds. The first list runs as follows:

> Hoc meritis, Auguste, tuis et Gallia cantat,
> hoc Rodanus, Rhenus, Hister et Albis agit.
> Axe sub occiduo audivit Gallicia factum,
> Vascone vicino Cantaber ista refert.
> Currit ad extremas fidei pia fabula gentes
> et trans Oceanum terra Britana favet.[949]

The second list states: *Trax, Italus, Scitha, Phrix, Daca, Dalmata, Tessalus Afer/ quod patriam meruit nunc tibi vota facit*, "The Thracian, Italian, Scythian, Phrygian, Dacian,

[949] Fortunatus, *Carmina*, App. 2.27-32. "Gaul too sings about this action redounding to your merits, this the Rhone, Rhine, Danube and Elbe think upon. Galicia under the setting Pole heard about the deed, Cantabria reports them to their Basque neighbours. The legends of the piety of your faith hasten to far-flung nations and beyond Ocean the land of Britain is favourable to you."

Dalmatian, Thessalian, African—now they give thanks to you, since they won back their homeland."[950] The first, as Bratož argues, is simply a *consensus omnium* typical of panegyrics, listing the various regions of Gaul; the second is more specific and refers to areas under the emperor's direct control.[951] Bratož argued that this second list refers to areas directly affected by the Three Chapters schism, but this is unlikely. The mention of Thracians, Scythians and Phrygians in the second list—all from areas unaffected by Three Chapters schismatics even from the beginning of the controversy—rebuts this notion. So the geographical lists cannot be taken to refer to the Three Chapters controversy.

The section in between these two lists refers to a specific action supposedly taken by Justin II upon his accession to uphold Chalcedon, namely the return of the *patres* sent into exile on account of their faithfulness to Christ (vv. 39-44). This has widely been viewed as referring to Triacapitoline schismatics allowed to return to their sees in Africa and elsewhere. But as noted above, there is no evidence for this occurring. The suggestion of Bratož that Fortunatus is here sounding a note of praise for Justin's ecclesiastical moderation is possible. However, it is also possible, as argued above, that the poet is using the panegyric to urge moderation upon the emperor rather than praising an action already taken. If the aphthartodocetic controversy is behind some of this, then it makes even more sense: Eutychius of Constantinople was still in exile, after all.

An interesting parallel to this passage is found in Nicetius of Trier's letter to Justinian, where he rebukes the emperor for exiling opposing bishops: "Qui, ut patres, quo

[950] Fortunatus, *Carmina*, App. 2.45-46.
[951] Fortunatus, *Carmina*, App. 2.27-32; this first list mentions Gaul, the rivers Rhone, Rhine, Danube and Elbe, Galicia, Cantabria and Brittany. The second, *Carmina*, App. 2.45, is a single line listing people belonging to various nations under direct imperial rule (as the regions of Gallia were not): Thracians, Italians, Scythians, Phrygians, Dacians, Dalmatians, Thessalians and Africans.

venerare debuisti, ad caedes, ad diversas cruces mitteres, provocavit?"[952] And slightly further down: "Patres, a quibus benedictionem expectare debuisti, in exilio transmissisti."[953] While the first quote may be an echo of Vigilius' rough treatment at the hands of Justinian, the context of the letter suggests the aphthartodocetic controversy due to its probable dating, as noted above.[954] Slightly later, near the end of the letter, Nicetius tells Justinian: "Nam notum tibi sit, quod tota Italia, integra Africa, Hispania vel Gallia coniuncta nomen tuum cum deperditione tua plorat, anathematizant."[955] All the western churches are thus portrayed as condemning the emperor. Fortunatus echoes Nicetius' language, referring to certain *patres* sent into exile and listing a geographical catalogue of western regions. Perhaps, like Nicetius, Fortunatus is also urging the emperor to do something rather than praising something already done. Nicetius' letter may have been fairly well known in Sigibert's court, so Fortunatus' praise for Justin's orthodox deeds using similar language to the older bishop of Trier would carry additional meaning. The wounds upon the church inflicted by Justinian and condemned by Nicetius have been, Fortunatus implies, healed by his successor Justin II. It would have served to reassure the Frankish king and his advisors that the new emperor either had done or would do precisely what the great Nicetius of Trier would want him to do.

The rest of the panegyric does not concern the present argument any further, dealing as it does with the influence of the relic of the True Cross that Sophia has provided to Gaul. Insofar as it concerns Christological controversy the message of this panegyric was addressed in two directions: to the court of Sigibert and to the court of Justin II. The message to Justin

[952] Nicetius of Trier, *Epistolae Austrasicae* 7, ed. Gundlach, 118. "Who provoked you to send to slaughters and diverse torments the fathers whom you ought to have venerated?"
[953] Nicetius of Trier, *Epistolae Austrasicae* 7, ed. Gundlach, 119. "The fathers from whom you ought to have expected a blessing you sent into exile."
[954] Chapter 5.5, pp. 280-282.
[955] Nicetius of Trier, *Epistolae Austrasicae* 7, ed. Gundlach, 119. "For may it be known to you that all of Italy, Africa, Spain and Gaul together anathematize your name, although they lament your ruin."

II, in addition to thanking him and his spouse Sophia for their gift to Radegund, seems to be an encouragement to continue on a pro-Chalcedonian course of action, however vague Fortunatus' idea of that course of action might have been. It also may have implied an exhortation to allow the return of Eutychius. There is no indication, however, that the poet was referring in any way to the Three Chapters controversy.

It is the message to Sigibert's court, however, that is the most interesting. The panegyric comes down to the present through the Σ manuscript, the eighth-century collection of Fortunatus' poems that alone contains the Appendices.[956] As Koebner first suggested, the first section of the Σ manuscript containing the Appendices addressed to eastern recipients was collected by an admirer of Fortunatus' in Sigibert's court.[957] It is quite possible that this admirer had a motive besides that of Fortunatus' artistic excellence, and collected the poems addressed to the east as part of an effort to help Sigibert and his advisors smooth the way for an alliance between Constantinople and Metz.[958] Rumours of the Eastern Emperor's heresy were widespread and would not have made such an alliance popular, so this panegyric served to allay these concerns.[959] Fortunatus is as one with the agenda of the bishops of Rome, so it is unsurprising that his language of Chalcedonian adherence echoes their own.

So much for the panegyric to Justin and Sophia. The rest of Fortunatus' poetry demonstrates his adherence to Chalcedonian dogma, but says little about the issues under

[956] Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, lxxi-lxxii; lxxvii.
[957] Koebner, *Venantius Fortunatus*, 136; endorsed by Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, p. lxxix.
[958] For the political background of Justin's and Sophia's gift to Radegund and the subsequent *gratiarum actio* written by Fortunatus, see Cameron, "The Early Religious Policies of Justin II," 55-62; see also Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, xv-xvi. But see also the more skeptical take by Brian Brennan, "Venantius Fortunatus: Byzantine Agent?" in *Byzantion*, vol. 65.1 (1995), 7-16. The common catholicism of the Franks and the Romans is a theme in a number of letters in the *Epistolae Austrasicae* dealing with alliances. So Theudebert I in a letter to Justinian writes: "Et quia scimus, augustam celsitudinem vestram de profectu catholicorum, sicut etiam littere vestrae testantur, plena animi iucunditate gaudere," "Your greatness is made worshipful due to the increasing well-being of the Catholics, just as your letters bear witness, and thus we know that your august sublimity rejoices with a spirit full of joy" (*Epistolae Austrasicae* 20, ed. Gundlach, 133).
[959] In addition to the rumours around the Three Chapters noted before, consider Gregory of Tours' odd statement that Justin II succumbed to Pelagianism at the end of his life in *Historiae* 4.40.

dispute in the Three Chapters controversy. So the evidence that needs to be assessed to determine his allegiances in this matter has already been set forth. To sum up: it is most likely that Venantius Fortunatus favoured the official Roman and imperial position on the schism. This only means that he endorsed the "minimalist" approach to the controversy, namely that no dogma of significance had been overturned and that the Second Council of Constantinople strengthened Chalcedon by clarifying its anti-Nestorian character. Like the bishops of Rome, Fortunatus evaded the central issue. Moreover, his fondness towards Ravenna and his probable early patronage by a pro-imperial bishop shows that he worked easily with opponents of the church of his birthplace. His friend Felix's possible equivocation on the issue would tend to support this view; both spent time in Ravenna, seat of pro-imperial policy. This is not to endorse the unfounded view of Sašel and Reydellet that the poet was an agent of the emperor sent to Gaul on a mission to improve relations.[960] It is only to say that he favoured a reconciliation of the two sides based on the "minimalist" position of Pelagius I.

6.5 *Conclusion*

Venantius Fortunatus came from a community in Italy deeply concerned with Christological questions and went to one in Gallia where understanding was more limited. He dealt with this situation by sticking in his poetry to a staunchly Chalcedonian theology and encouraging church unity behind a generic Chalcedonianism. He desired comity between the churches even while hinting that he upheld the papal orthodoxy. His minimalist approach to the Three Chapters controversy demonstrates this. The complicated issues involved in Christology were ones that Fortunatus grasped reasonably well, showing his intellect in a good light. The light

[960] Sašel, "Il Viaggio di Venanzio Fortunato e la sua attività in ordine alla politica bizantina," 359-375; Reydellet, *Poèmes*, vol. 1, xvi-xvii. The classic refutation of this view is Brennan, "Venantius Fortunatus: Byzantine Agent?" 7-16.

touch he employed in dealing with the Three Chapters schism shows his reading of his audience in an even better light.

Conclusion

Venantius Fortunatus humbly demurred from Martin of Braga's praise for his *tirocinium theologiae* in his letter to the Galician bishop.[961] Yet as should now be evident, even if it is true that his education in Italy did not fully equip him with doctrinal expertise, in Gaul he found means of making up any deficit. Fortunatus was a learned and clever expositor of Christian doctrine at the very least at the end of his life when he wrote his sermons as bishop; yet even before, in his poetry on Christology, he shows a sophisticated knowledge of the issues at stake. His sermon on the Symbol shows his skill in making use of earlier doctrinal authors (in this case Rufinus) to instruct his congregants, while adapting what he had in order to focus on his own doctrinal emphases.

His sermon on the Lord's Prayer also demonstrates these features of the poet's doctrinal facility, but shows he was capable of more than just blindly transmitting doctrine. He was a staunch Augustinian in his understanding of grace and free will, in contrast to many of his contemporaries. He showed his dedication to this understanding by writing an attack on opponents of Augustine in the midst of his Lord's Prayer sermon, an attack that, while certainly drawing on prior authors, is nonetheless an original composition of the poet himself. He thus shows that he is capable of understanding the complicated issues at stake in the discussions on grace and free will, and also that he is willing to passionately and skillfully engage in doctrinal argument. But passionate engagement in doctrinal argument is not his only way of dealing with a dispute, as is shown by his engagement with Christology.

In the case of the Christological disputes, Fortunatus was carefully Chalcedonian in all his writings. He showed a good comprehension of the language and doctrine of at least Latin

[961] Fortunatus, *Carmina* 5.1.7.

Chalcedonian Christology, and worked to unite Christians around its formulas. The Three Chapters dispute was one on which he took no clearly discernible position, but it seems likely that he desired unity between the two sides and worked to reassure the Gallic church and broader society of the orthodoxy of the Eastern emperor. If anything, he seems quite open to Justinian's doctrinal clarifications from the Second Council of Constantinople (553) and its emphasis upon the unity of the person of the incarnate Son of God. Whether he had an affinity with the theology and controversial condemnations of the Second Council of Constantinople or not, however, it seems he had a good grasp of the issues at stake here as well.

Fortunatus was mostly famed for his saint's lives and hymns during the medieval period, and for his secular occasional poetry in the modern era. Yet as has been shown, he was adept at doctrinal exposition as well. This provides a new perspective on an important figure in sixth-century Gaul. Fortunatus' engagement with doctrinal controversy also sheds light on the continuing vibrancy of the Gallic church's religion. The Christianity of Merovingian Gaul was not superficial or ignorant. Venantius Fortunatus knew this, and reacted accordingly.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum. ed. E. Schwartz. 4 vols. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1914-1982.

Ambrose of Milan. *De fide*. PL 16.549-726.

Augustine of Hippo. *Confessiones*. ed. L. Verheijen, CCSL 27. Turnhout: Brepols, 1981.

———. *Contra duas epistulas Pelagianorum libri quattuor*. ed. C. Urba and J. Zycha, CSEL 60. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1913.

———. *De civitate Dei contra Paganos*. ed. B. Dombart and A. Kalb, CCSL 48. Turnhout: Brepols, 1955.

———. *De correptione et gratia*. ed. G. Folliet, CSEL 92. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2000.

———. *De dono perseverentiae*. PL 45.993-1034.

———. *De praedestinatione sanctorum*. PL 45.959-992.

———. *Enchiridion*. ed. E. Evans, CCSL 46. Turnhout: Brepols, 1969.

———. *Epistulae*. ed. A. Goldbacher, CSEL 57. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1911.

———. *Sermones in Mathaeum*. ed. P.-P. Verbraken, CCSL 41Aa. Turnhout: Brepols, 2008.

———. *Sermo 195*. PL 38.1017-1019.

———. *Tractatus in Iohannis Evangelium*. ed. A. Mayer, CCSL 36. Turnhout: Brepols, 1954.

Avitus of Vienne. *Epistola ad Gundobadum regem de subitanea paenitentia*. ed. R. Peiper, MGH *Auctores Antiquissimi* 6.2. Berlin: Weidmann, 1883.

———. *Epistularum ad Diversos*. ed. R. Peiper, MGH *Auctores Antiquissimi* 6.2. Berlin: Weidmann, 1883.

Boethius. *Contra Eutychen et Nestorium*. tr. and ed. H.F. Stewart and E.K. Rand. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Caesarius of Arles. "Ad sequens opusculum de gratia," in *Sancti Caesarii Arelatensis Opera Varia*. ed. G. Morin. Maretioli, 1942, 159-164.

———. *Sermones*. ed. G. Morin, CCSL 103. Turnhout: Brepols, 1953.

Capitula sancti Augustini. ed. Glorie, CCSL 85A. Turnhout: Brepols, 1978.

Cassiodorus. *Institutiones*. ed. R.A.B. Mynors. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1963.

Chromatius of Aquileia. *Opera*. ed. R. Étaix and J. Lemarié, CCSL 9A. Turnhout: Brepols, 1974.

———. *Praefatio orationis dominicae*. ed. A. Hoste, CCSL 9. Turnhout: Brepols, 1957.

Collectio Avellana. ed. O. Guenther, CSEL 35.2. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1898.

Concilia Galliae. CCSL 148A, ed. C. de Clercq. Turnhout: Brepols, 1963.

Corippus. *In laudem Iustini Augusti minoris*. ed. A. Cameron. London: Athlone Press, 1976.

Cyprian. *De dominica oratione*. ed. C. Moreschini, in CCSL 3A. Turnhout: Brepols, 1976.

Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catacheses* 13, tr. L.P. McCauley. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1970.

Decretum Gelasianum. PL 59.157-164.

Ennodius. *Carmina*. ed. F. Vogel, MGH *Auctores Antiquissimi* 7. Berlin: Weidmann, 1885.

Epistolae Aevi Merovingici Collectae, ed. W. Gundlach, MGH *Epistolae* vol. 3. Berlin: Weidmann, 1892.

Epistolae Arelatenses genuinae. ed. W. Gundlach, MGH *Epistolae*, vol. 3. Berlin: Weidmann, 1892.
Epistolae Austrasicae. ed. W. Gundlach, MGH *Epistolae*, vol. 3. Berlin: Weidmann, 1892.
"Epistula Clementis," in *Die Pseudoklementinen II, Rekognitionen in Rufins Übersetzung*. ed. B. Rehm. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1965.
Epistula fidei Catholicae in Defensione Trium Capitulorum. ed. J.-M. Clément and R. Vander Plaetse, CCSL 90A. Turnhout: Brepols, 1974.
Eusebius 'Gallicanus:' Collectio homiliarum. ed. F. Glorie, CCSL 101, 101A, 101B. 3 vols. Turnhout: Brepols, 1970-1971.
Evagrius Scholasticus. *Historia Ecclesiastica*. ed. J. Bidet and L. Parmentier. *Sources Chrétiennes* 542. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf, 2011.
Explanationes symboli aevi Carolini. Susan Keefe, ed., CCCM 254. Turnhout: Brepols, 2012.
Facundus of Hermiane. *Pro Defensione Trium Capitulorum Ad Iustinianum*. ed. J.-M. Clément and R. Vander Plaetse, CCSL 90A. Turnhout: Brepols, 1974.
Faustus of Riez. "De gratia," in *Fausti Reiensis Praeter Sermones Pseudo-Eusebianos Opera*. ed. A. Engelbrecht, CSEL 21. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1891.
———. "Epistula I," in *Fausti Reiensis Praeter Sermones Pseudo-Eusebianos Opera*. ed. A. Engelbrecht, CSEL 21. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1891.
———. "Epistula II," in *Fausti Reiensis Praeter Sermones Pseudo-Eusebianos Opera*. ed. A. Engelbrecht, CSEL 21. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1891.
Fulgentius of Ruspe. *Ad Monimum*. ed. J. Fraipont, CCSL 91. Turnhout: Brepols, 1968.
———. *De veritate praedestinationis et gratiae*. ed. J. Fraipont, CCSL 91A. Turnhout: Brepols, 1968.
———. *Epistula 14*. ed. J. Fraipont, CCSL 91A. Turnhout: Brepols, 1968.
Fulgentius Ferrandus. *Epistola VI: Ad Pelagium et Anatolium Diaconos urbis Romae*. PL 67.922-928.
Gennadius. *De viris illustribus*. PL 58.1059-1120.
Gregory I. *Moralia in Iob*. ed. M. Adriaen, CCSL 143. Turnhout: Brepols, 1979.
———. *Registrum epistolarum*, ed. P. Ewald and L. Hartmann, MGH *Epistolae* vols. 1-2. Berlin: Weidmann, 1891-1899.
Gregory of Nyssa. "De Tridui Spatio," in *Gregorii Nysseni Opera*, vol. 9. ed. E. Gebhardt. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
Gregory of Tours. *Decem libri historiarum*. ed. B. Krusch, MGH *Scriptores rerum Merovingicarum*, vol. 1.1. Hanover, 1937.
———.*In Psalterii Tractatum Commentarius*. ed. B. Krusch, MGH *SSRM* vol. 1. Hanover: Impensis Bibliopolii Hahniani, 1885.
Isidore of Seville. *De Ecclesiasticis Officiis*. ed. C. Lawson, CCSL 113. Turnhout: Brepols, 1989.
Jerome. *Dialogus adversus Pelagianos*. ed. C. Moreschini, CCSL 80. Turnhout: Brepols, 1990.
John of Biclar. *Chronica*. ed. T. Mommsen, in MGH *Auctores Antiquissimi* 11. Berlin: Weidmann, 1894.
John Cassian. *Collationes*. ed. M. Petschenig and G. Kreuz, CSEL 13. 2nd ed. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2004.
———. *De incarnatione domini*. ed. M. Petschenig and G. Kreuz. 2nd ed., CSEL 17. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2004.

Justinian. *Confessio rectae fidei*. ed. E. Schwartz, in *Drei Dogmatische Schriften Iustinians*. 2nd ed., ed. M. Amelotti et al. Milano: Dott. A. Giuffré Editore, 1973.
Leo I. *Epistola 145*. PL 54.1113-1115.
Maxentii aliorumque Scytharum monachorum necnon Ionnis Tomitanae urbis episcopi opuscula. ed. Fr. Glorie, CCSL 85A. Turnhout: Brepols, 1978.
Origen. *Fragmentum ex libro in epistolam ad Hebraeos*. PL 14.1307.
Orientius. *Commonitorium*. PL 61.977-1006.
Pelagius I. *Epistulae quae supersunt*. ed. P. Gassò and C. Batlle. Abadia di Montserrat, 1956.
Pelagius II. *Epistolae Pelagii Iunioris papae ad Episcopos Histriae (1)*. ed. L. Hartmann, MGH *Epistolae* vol. 2. Berlin: Weidmann, 1899.
———. *Epistolae Pelagii Iunioris papae ad Episcopos Histriae (2)*. ed. L. Hartmann, MGH *Epistolae* vol. 2. Berlin: Weidmann, 1899.
———. *Epistolae Pelagii Iunioris papae ad Episcopos Histriae (3)*. ed. L. Hartmann, MGH *Epistolae* vol. 2. Berlin: Weidmann, 1899.
Peter Chrysologus. *Collectio sermonum a Felico episcipo parata*. ed. A. Olivar, CCSL 24. Turnhout: Brepols, 1975.
Prosper of Aquitaine. *Epistola ad Rufinum*. PL 51.77-90.
———. *Liber contra collatorem*. PL 51.215-277.
———. *Liber Sententiarum*. ed. P. Callens. Turnhout: Brepols, 1972.
Pseudo-Augustine. *Sermones* 237, 238, 239. PL 39.2183-2188.
Quodvultdeus. "De symbolo 2," in *Opera*, ed. R. Braun, CCSL 60. Turnhout: Brepols, 1976.
Rufinus of Aquileia. *Expositio symboli*. ed. M. Simonetti, CCSL 20. Turnhout: Brepols, 1961.
———. *De benedictionibus XII patriarcharum*. ed. M. Simonetti, CCSL 20. Turnhout: Brepols, 1961.
Sedulius. *Carmen Paschale*. ed. J. Huemer, CSEL 10. Vienna, 1885.
Sidonius Apollinaris. *Epistulae et Carmina*. ed. B. Krusch, MGH *Auctores Antiquissimi*, vol. 8. Berlin: Weidmann, 1887, repr. 1961.
Tertullian. *Adversus Praxean*. ed. A. Kroymann and E. Evans, CCSL 2. Turnhout: Brepols, 1954.
———. *De Oratione*. ed. G.F. Diercks, CCSL 1. Turnhout: Brepols, 1954.
Theodoret of Cyrrhus. *Historia Ecclesiastica*. ed. L. Parmentier and G.C. Hansen. *Sources Chrétiennes* 530. Paris: Les Éditions des Cerf, 2009.
Venantius Fortunatus. *Poèmes*. 3 vols., ed. and tr. M. Reydellet. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2002-2004.
Venantius Fortunatus. *Opere 1*. ed. and tr. Stefano Di Brazzano. Città Nuova: Società per la conservazione della Basilica di Aquileia, 2001.
Venantius Fortunatus. *Opera poetica*. ed. Friedrich Leo, MGH *Auctores Antiquissimi* 4.1. Berlin: Weidmann, 1881.

Secondary Sources

Adamiak, S. *Carthage, Constantinople and Rome: Imperial and Papal Interventions in the Life of the Church in Byzantine Africa (533-698)*. Rome: Gregorian and Biblical Press, 2016.

Albl, Martin. *And Scripture Cannot be Broken: The Form and Function of the Early Christian* Testimonia *Collections*. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Antin, Paul. "Fortunat (saint)," in *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique: doctrine et histoire*. vol. 5. ed. A. Rayez et al. Paris: Beauchesne, 1962), 725.

Arweiler, Alexander. "Venantius Fortunatus (c. 540-600)," in *The Oxford Guide to the Historical Reception of Augustine*. vol. 3. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013, 1847-1848.

Azzara, Claudio. "Il regno Longobardo in Italia e i Tre Capitoli," in *Crisis of the Oikoumene*. ed. C. Chazelle and C. Cubitt. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007, 209-222.

Baehrens, W.A. *Überlieferiung und Textgeschichte der latienisch erhaltenen Origeneshomilien zum Alten Testament*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1916.

Bailey, Lisa Kaaren. *Christianity's Quiet Success: The Eusebius Gallicanus Sermon Collection and the Power of the Church in Late Antique Gaul*. Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame University Press, 2010.

Baynes, N.H. *Byzantine Studies and Other Essays*. London, 1955.

Becker, G. *Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui*. Bonn: Max Cohen, 1885.

Belloni, A. and M. Ferrari, *La Biblioteca Capitolare di Monza*. Padua: Editrice Antenore, 1974.

Bischoff , Bernhard. "The Study of Foreign Languages in the Middle Ages," in *Mittelalterliche Studien: Ausgewählte Aufsätze zur Schriftkunde und Literaturgeschichte*, vol. II. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1967, 227-245.

———. *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts*. vol. 2. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2004.

Bischoff, B. and M. Lapidge, *Biblical Commentaries from the Canterbury School of Theodore and Hadrian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Blomgren, Sven. *Studia Fortunatiana: Commentatio Academica*. Uppsala, 1933.

———. *Studia Fortunatiana II: De carmine In laudem sanctae Mariae composito Venantio Fortunato recte attribuendo*. Uppsala, 1934.

Bouhot, J.-P. "Les sources de l'*Expositio missae* de Remi d'Auxerre," in *Revue des Études Augustiniennes et Patristiques*, vol. 26 (1980), 118-169.

Bradshaw, David. "The *Opuscula sacra*: Boethius and theology," in *The Cambridge Companion to Boethius*. ed. J. Marenbon. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009, 105-128.

Bratož, Rajko. "Venanzio Fortunato e lo scisma dei Tre Capitoli," in *Venanzio Fortunato e il suo tempo*. Treviso: Fondazione Cassamarca, 2001, 362-401.

Brennan, Brian. "The Career of Venantius Fortunatus," in *Traditio*, vol. 41 (1985), pp. 49-78.

———. "Deathless Marriage and Spiritual Fecundity in Venantius Fortunatus' "De Virginitate," in *Traditio*, vol. 51 (1996), 73-97.

———. "The Disputed Authorship of Fortunatus' Byzantine Poems," in *Byzantion*, vol. 66.2, 335-345.

———. “The Image of the Frankish Kings in the Poetry of Venantius Fortunatus,” in *Journal of Medieval History*, vol. 10.1 (1984), 1-11.
———. “Venantius Fortunatus: Byzantine Agent?” in *Byzantion*, vol. 65.1 (1995), 7-16.
Brouwer, Christophe. *Venantii Honorii Clementiani Fortunati Italici Presbyteri, Episcopi Pictaviensis, Vetusti et Christiani Poetae Carminum, Epistolarum et Expositionum Libri XI*. Mayence, 1603.
Brown, Peter. “Pelagius and his Supporters: Aims and Environment,” in *The Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. 19.1 (1968), 93-114.
Cameron, Averil. “The Cult of the Virgin in Late Antiquity: Religious Development and Myth-Making,” in *The Church and Mary*. ed. R.N. Swanson, *Studies in Church History* vol. 39. Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2004, 1-21.
———. “A Nativity Poem of the Sixth Century A.D.,” in *Classical Philology*, vol. 74, no. 3 (1979), 222-232.
———. “Early Byzantine Kaiserkritik,” in *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies*, vol. 3 (1977), 1-17.
———. “The Early Religious Policies of Justin II,” in *Studies in Church History*, vol. 13 (1976), 51-67.
———. “The Theotokos in Sixth-Century Constantinople,” in *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. 29.1 (1978), 79-108.
Cappuyns, D.M. “L’origine des «Capitula» d’Orange 529,” in *Recherches de Théologie anciennes et médiévales*, vol. 6 (1934), 121-142.
———. “Le premier representant de l’augustinisme médiéval, Prosper d’Aquitaine,” in *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale*, vol. 1 (1929), 309-337.
Chadwick, Henry. *Boethius: The Consolations of Music, Logic, Theology, and Philosophy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1981.
Chin, Catherine. “Short words on earth: Theological geography in Rufinus’ Commentary on the Apostles’ Creed,” in *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, vol. 21.3 (Fall 2013), 391-412.
Chisholm, J.E. *The Pseudo-Augustinian Hypomnesticon against the Pelagians and Celestians*. 2 vols. Fribourg: The University Press, 1967-1980.
Consolino, F. E. “‘Amor spiritualis’ e linguaggio elegiaco nei ‘Carmina’ di Venanzio Fortunato,” in *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Classe di lettere e filosofia*, vol. 7.4 (1977), pp. 1351-1368.
Constas, Nicholas. *Proclus of Constantinople and the Cult of the Virgin in Late Antiquity*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
Costanza, Salvatore. “La Quarta Petizione in Venanzio Fortunato,” in *Convivium Dominicum: Studi sull’Eucarestia nei Padri della Chiesa Antica e Miscellanea Patristica*. Università di Catania, 1959, 87-97.
Cuscito, G. “Venanzio Fortunato e le chiese istriane. Problemi ed ipotesi,” in *Atti e memorie della Società Istriana di archeologia e storia patria, N.S.* 26 (Trieste, 1978), 207-225.
Dagens, Claude. *Saint Grégoire le Grand: Culture et expérience chrétiennes*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1977.
Delbey, Evrard. *Venance Fortunat ou l’enchantement du monde*. Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes, 2009.
Djuth, Marianne. “Faustus of Riez: *Initium bonae voluntatis*,” in *Augustinian Studies*, vol. 21 (1990), 35-53.

Douglas, Mary. *Thinking in Circles: An Essay on Ring Composition*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2007.
Dudden, F. Homes. *Gregory the Great: His Place in History and Thought*. New York: Longman, Green, and Co., 1905.
Duval, Yves-Marie. "Jonas à Aquilée: De la mosaïque de la Theodoriana sud aux textes de Jérôme, Rufin, Chromace?" in *Antichità altoadriatiche 47: Aquileia Romana e Cristiana fra II e V secolo*. Trieste: Editreg SRL, 2000, 273-296.
———. "L'Ecriture au service de la catéchèse," in *Le monde latin antique et la Bible*, ed. J. Fontaine and C. Pietri. Paris: Éditions Beauchesne, 1985, pp. 275-280.
Dyson, R.W. *Augustine: City of God against the Pagans*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
Ehlen, Oliver. *Venantius-Interpretationen: Rhetorische und generische Transgressionen beim „neuen Orpheus"*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2011.
Evans, Robert. *Pelagius: Inquiries and Reappraisals*. New York: The Seabury Press, 1968.
Fairbairn, Douglas. *Grace and Christology in the Early Church*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
Ffoulkes, Edmund. *The Athanasian Creed: By Whom Written and by Whom Published; With Other Enquiries on Creeds in General*. London, 1871.
Ferrari, M. "Introduzione," in *Virgilio Marone grammatico: Epitomi ed Epistole*. ed. G. Polara. Napoli: Liguori Editore, 1979.
Fischer, P.B. "Impedimenta mundi fecerunt eos miseros," in *Vigiliae Christianae*, vol. 5 (1951), 84-87.
Fraïsse, Anne. "Un image historique et nuancée de l'héresie: Facundus d'Hermiane," in *Bulletin de litérature ecclésiastique*, vol. 96.3 (1995), 185-197.
Frend, W.H.C. *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972.
Froehlich, Karlfried. "The Lord's Prayer in Patristic Literature," in *A History of Prayer: The First to the Fifteenth Century*. ed. R. Hammerling. Leiden: Brill, 2008, 59-77.
Fuhrmann, Horst. *Einfluss und Verbreitung der pseudoisidorischen Fälschungen*. vol. 1. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann, 1972.
———. "Kritischer Sinn und unkritische Haltung: Vorgratianische Einwände zu Pseudo-Clemens-Briefen," in *Aus Kirche und Reich: Studien zu Theologie, Politik und Recht im Mittelalter*, ed. H. Mordek. Sigmaringen: Jan Thorbecke, 1983, 81-95.
———. "The Pseudo-Isidorean Forgeries," in *Papal Letters in the Early Middle Ages*. ed. H. Fuhrmann and D. Jasper. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 2001, 137-195.
de Gaiffier d'Hestroy, B. "S. Venance Fortunat, évêque de Poitiers: les témoignages de son culte," in *Analecta Bollandiana*, vol. 70 (1952), 262-284.
Galonnier, A. *Boèce: Opuscula Sacra*. vol. 1. Louvain, 2007.
Ganz, D. "The Debate on Predestination," in *Charles the Bald: Court and Kingdom*. ed. M.T. Gibson and J.L. Nelson. Aldershot: Variorum, 1990, 283-302.
George, Judith. *Venantius Fortunatus: A Latin Poet in Merovingian Gaul*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.
———. "Venantius Fortunatus: The End Game," in *Eranos*, vol. 96 (1998), pp. 32-43.
———, tr. *Venantius Fortunatus: Personal and Political Poems*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1995.

———. "Poet as Politician: Venantius Fortunatus' Panegyric to King Chilperic," in *Journal of Medieval History*, vol. 15.1 (1989), 5-18.
Godman, Peter. *Poets and Emperors: Frankish Politics and Carolingian Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.
Graham, Stacey. "The Transmission of North African Texts to Europe in Late Antiquity," in *Medieval Manuscripts, their Makers and Users*. ed. H.A. Kelly and C. Baswell. Turnhout: Brepols, 2011, 151-167.
Gray, Patrick T.R. *The Defense of Chalcedon in the East (451-553)*. Leiden: Brill, 1979.
Gray, Patrick T.R. and Michael Herren. "Columbanus and the Three Chapters Controversy—A New Approach," in *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. 45.1 (1994), 160-170.
Grillmeier, Aloys. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. tr. J. Bowden. vol. 1. London: Mowbrays, 1964.
———. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. tr. P. Allen and J. Cawte. vol. 2.1. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1987.
———. *Christ in Christian Tradition*. tr. T. Hainthaler. vol. 2.2. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1995.
Hahn, August. *Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensegeln der Apostolisch-katholischen Kirche*. Breslau, 1842.
Hammerling, Roy. "The Lord's Prayer: A Cornerstone of Early Baptismal Education," in *A History of Prayer: The First to the Fifteenth Century*. ed. R. Hammerling. Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2008, 167-182.
———. *The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church: The Pearl of Great Price*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010.
Hanson, R.P.C. *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988.
Hanssens, J. *Amalarii episcopi opera liturgica Omnia*, vol. 1. Vatican City: Biblioteca apostolica Vaticana, 1948.
Heinzelmann, Martin. "Die Psalmen bei Gregor von Tours," in *Präsenz und Verwendung der Heiligen Schrift im christlichen Frühmittelalter: exegetische Literatur und liturgische Texte*. ed. P. Carmassi. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz in Kommission, 2008, 33-57.
———. *Gregory of Tours: History and Society in the Sixth Century*. tr. C. Carroll. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
———. "The Works of Gregory of Tours and Patristic Tradition," in *A Companion to Gregory of Tours*. ed. A.C. Murray. Brill: Leiden, 2016, 281-336.
Hinschius, P. *Decretales Pseudo-Isidorianae*. Lipsiae: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1863.
Houghton, Hugh. *Augustine's Text of John: Patristic Citations and Latin Gospel Manuscripts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
Humphries, Thomas L. *Ascetic Pneumatology from John Cassian to Gregory the Great*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
———. "Prosper's Pneumatology: The Development of an Augustinian," in *Grace for Grace*. ed. A. Hwang et al. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2014, 97-113.
Hunt , R.W. "Manuscript evidence of knowledge of the poems of Venantius Fortunatus in late Anglo-Saxon England," in *Anglo-Saxon England*, vol. 8 (1979), 279-295.
Hunt, E., tr. *Pope St. Leo the Great: Letters*. New York: FOTC, inc., 1957.
Hwang, Alexander Y. *Intrepid Lover of Perfect Grace: The Life and Thought of Prosper of Aquitaine*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2009.

———. "*Pauci Perfectae Gratiae Intrepidi Amatores*: The Augustinians in Marseilles," in *Grace for Grace*. ed. Hwang et al. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2014, 31-50.
Kattenbusch, Ferdinand. *Das apostolische Symbol. Erster Band: Der Grundgestalt des Taufsymbols*. Leipzig, 1894.
Kavvadas, Nestor. "An Eastern View: Theodore of Mopsuestia's *Against the Defenders of Original Sin*," in *Grace for Grace: The Debates after Augustine and Pelagius*. ed. A. Hwang. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2014, 271-296.
Keefe , Susan. *A Catalogue of Works Pertaining to the Explanation of the Creed in Carolingian Manuscripts*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2012.
———. *Water and the Word: Baptism and the Education of the Clergy in the Carolingian Empire*. 2 vols. Notre Dame, IN: Notre Dame University Press, 2002.
Kelly, J.N.D. *Early Christian Creeds*. 3rd ed. Essex: Longman, 1972.
———. *Rufinus: A Commentary on the Apostles' Creed*. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1955.
Kéry, Lotte. *Canonical Collections of the Early Middle Ages*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1999.
Kinzig, W. and M. Vinzent. "Recent research on the origin of the Creed," in *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. 50.2 (1999), 535-559.
Klingshirn, William. *Caesarius of Arles: The Making of a Christian Community in Late Antique Gaul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
Knibbs, Eric. "The Interpolated Hispana and the Origins of Pseudo-Isidore," in *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte*, vol. 99 (2013), 1-71.
Koebner, Richard. *Venantius Fortunatus: Seine persönlichkeit und seine Stellung in der geistigen Kultur des Merowingerreiches*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1915.
Lambot, C. "Le florilège augustinien de Vérone," in *Revue Bénédictine*, vol. 79 (1969), 70-81.
Langgärtner, Georg. *Die Gallienpolitik der Päpste*. Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1965.
Lauer, P., ed. *Catalogue général des manuscrits latins*. vol. 2. Paris: Bibliothèque Nationale, 1940.
Leclercq, H. "Les laudes grecques," in *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, vol. 11.1, 860-864.
de Letter, P., tr. "Against Cassian," in *Prosper of Aquitaine: Defense of St. Augustine*. Westminster, MD: The Newman Press, 1963.
Lorenz, Rudolf. "Der Augustinismus Prospers von Aquitanien," in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, vol. 73 (1962), 217-252.
Luchi, Michele Angelo. *Venantii Honorii Clementiani Fortunati presbyteri Italici deinde episcopi Pictaviensis Opera Omnia, Pars I*. Rome: A. Fulgonius, 1786.
Lumby, Joseph. *The History of the Creeds*. Cambridge, 1880.
Madoz, J. *Le Symbole du XIe Concile*. Louvain, 1938.
Markus, R.A. "The Legacy of Pelagius," in *The Making of Orthodoxy*. ed. R. Williams. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989, 214-234.
———. "Ravenna and Rome, 554-604," in *Byzantion*, vol. 51.2 (1984), 566-578.
Mathisen, Ralph. "Caesarius of Arles, Prevenient Grace, and the Second Council of Orange," in *Grace for Grace: The Debates After Augustine and Pelagius*. ed. A. Hwang, B. Matz and A. Casiday. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2014, 208-234.

———. *Ecclesiastical Factionalism and Religious Controversy in Fifth-Century Gaul*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1989.
Matthews , Lora and Paul Merkley, "CANTUS and Tonaries," in *The Divine Office in the Latin Middle Ages: Methodology and Source Studies, Regional Developments, Hagiography,* ed. M. Fassler and R. Baltzer. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000, 546-552.
Matz, Brian J. "Augustine, the Carolingians, and Double Predestination," in *Grace for Grace*. ed. A. Hwang et al. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2014, 235-270.
McGregor, R.R. and D. Fairbairn, tr. *Fulgentius and the Scythian Monks: Correspondence on Christology and Grace*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2013.
McGuckin, John A. *St. Cyril of Alexandria: The Christological Controversy: Its History, Theology, and Texts*. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
Meyer, Wilhelm. *Die Gelegenheitsdichter Venantius Fortunatus*. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1901.
Modéran, Yves. "L'Afrique reconquise et les Trois Chapitres," in *Crisis of the Oikoumene*. ed. C. Chazelle and C. Cubitt. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007, 39-82.
Morin, G. "Le symbole de s. Césaire d'Arles," in *Revue Bénédictine*, vol. 46 (1934), 216-223.
Murphy, Francis X. *Rufinus of Aquileia (345-411): His Life and Works*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1945.
Nisard, Charles. *Le poète Fortunat*. Paris: H. Champion, 1890.
———. *Venance Fortunat. Poésies Mêlées traduites en français pour la première fois*. Paris: Librairie de Firmin-Didot, 1887.
Nodes, Daniel. "Avitus of Vienne's Spiritual History and the Semipelagian Controversy: The Doctrinal Implications of Books I-III," in *Vigiliae Christianae*, vol. 38, no. 2 (1984), 185-195.
Peebles, B.M., tr. *Faith, Hope and Charity*. Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1947.
Pelikan, J. *The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition (100-600)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.
Pereira, Matthew J. "Augustine, Pelagius and the Southern Gallic Tradition," in *Grace for Grace: The Debates after Augustine and Pelagius*. ed. A. Hwang et al. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2014, 180-207.
Peršič, Alessio. "Venanzio Fortunato *presbyter Italicus*: Lettura dell'*Expositio symbuli* e dell'*Expositio orationis dominicae* alla luce della tradizione di fede della Chiesa di Aquileia, con un poscritto sull'*Expositio fidei catholicae Fortunati*," in *Venanzio Fortunato e il suo tempo*. Treviso: Fondazione Cassamarca, 2001, 403-463.
Pietri, Luce. "Autobiographie d'un poète chrétien: Venance Fortunat, un émigré en terre d'exil ou un immigré parfaitement intégré?" in *Camenae*, vol. 11 (2012).
———. *La ville de Tours du IVe au VIe siècle: naissance d'une cite chrétienne*. Rome: École française, 1983.
———. "Venance Fortunat, lecteur des Pères latins," in *Chartae Charitatis*. ed. B. Gain, P. Jay and G. Nauroy. Paris: Institut d'études augustiniennes, 2004, 127-141.
Pohl, Walter. "Heresy in Secundus and Paul the Deacon," in *Crisis of the Oikoumene*. ed. C. Chazelle and C. Cubitt. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007, 243-264.

Price, Richard. *Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553*. 2 vols. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2009.
———. "The Development of a Chalcedonian Identity in Byzantium (451-553)," in *Church History and Religious Culture*, vol. 89.1-3 (2009), 307-325.
———. "The Three Chapters Controversy and the Council of Chalcedon," in *Crisis of the Oikoumene: The Three Chapters and the Failed Quest for Unity in the Sixth-Century Mediterranean*. ed. C. Chazelle and C. Cubitt. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007, 17-37.
Price, R. and M. Gaddis. *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*. 3 vols. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2005.
Pucci, Joseph. "Venantius Fortunatus Concluded," in *The Classical Review*, vol. 55.2. Oct. 2005), 564-565.
Ramsey, Boniface. "John Cassian and Augustine," in *Grace for Grace: The Debates after Augustine and Pelagius*. ed. A. Hwang et al. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2014, 114-130.
———, .tr. *John Cassian: Conferences*. New York, NY: Newman Press, 1998.
Rettig, J.W., tr. *St. Augustine: Tractates on the Gospel of John, 28-54*. Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1993.
Reydellet, Marc. "Tradition et nouveauteé dans les 'Carmina' de Fortunat," in *Venanzio Fortunato tra Italia e Francia*. ed. T. Ragusa and B. Termite. Treviso, 1990.
Roberts, Michael. *Poems: Venantius Fortunatus*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2017.
———. *The Humblest Sparrow: The Poetry of Venantius Fortunatus*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2009.
———. "Venantius Fortunatus and Gregory of Tours: Poetry and Patronage," in *A Companion to Gregory of Tours*. ed. A.C. Murray. Leiden: Brill, 2016, 35-59.
———. *The Jeweled Style: Poetry and Poetics in Late Antiquity*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1989.
Salmon, Dom P. *Les 'tituli psalmorum' des manuscrits latins*. Études liturgiques 3. Paris, 1959.
Samaran, C. and R. Marichal. *Catalogues des manuscrits en écriture latine*. vol. 5. Paris, 1965.
Sašel, J. "Il viaggio de Venanzio Fortunato e la sua attività in ordine alla politica byzantina," in *Aquileia e l'occidente mediterraneo*, Antichità altoadriatiche 19 (1981), 359-375.
Shanzer, D. and I. Wood, eds. and tr. *Avitus of Vienne: Letters and Selected Prose*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2002.
Simonetti, Manlio. "Sulla tradizione manuscritta delle opere originali di Rufino, 2," in *Sacris erudiri*, vol. 10 (1958), 5-42.
Smith, Julia M.H. "Carrying the Cares of the State: Gender Perspectives on Merovingian 'Staatlicheit," in *Der frühmittelalterliche Staat—europäische Perspektiven*. Vienna, 2009, 227-239.
———. "Radegundis peccatrix: Authorizations of Virginity in Late Antique Gaul," in *The Transformations of Late Antiquity: Essays for Peter Brown, Vol. 2*, ed. P. Rousseau and M. Papoutsakis. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009.
Smith, Thomas A. *De Gratia: Faustus of Riez's treatise on Grace and its Place in the History of Theology*. Notre Dame, 1990.
Sobrero, G, ed. *Anonimo Veronese: Omelie mistagogiche e catechetiche*. Rome, 1992.

Solignac, Aimé. “Un auteur trop peu connu: Facundus d’Hermiane,” in *Revue d’études augustiniennes et patristiques*, vol. 51.2 (2005), 357-374.
Sotinel, Claire. *Identité civique et christianisme: Aquilée du IIIe au Vie siècle*. Rome: École française de Rome, 2005.
———. “The Three Chapters and the Transformations of Italy,” in *Crisis of the Oikoumene*. ed. C. Chazelle and C. Cubitt. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007, 85-120.
Stanciu, Diana. “Double Predestination, Augustinian Tradition and Carolingian Ecclesiastical Politics: the debate on double predestination in the southern realm and its conclusion,” in *Revue d'histoire ecclesiastique*, vol. 110.3-4 (July-Dec. 2015), 619-661.
Stein, E. “Beiträge zur Geschichte von Ravenna in spätrömischer und byzantinischer Zeit,” in *Klio*, vol. 16 (1920), 40-71.
———. *Histoire du Bas-Empire*, vol. 2. Paris-Bruxelles-Amsterdam: Desclée de Brouwer, 1949.
Stewart, Columba. *Cassian the Monk*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
Straw, Carole. *Gregory the Great: Perfection in Imperfection*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
———. “Much Ado about Nothing: Gregory the Great’s Apology to the Istrians,” in *Crisis of the Oikoumene*. ed. C. Chazelle and C. Cubitt. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007, 121-160.
Tardi, Dominique. *Fortunat: Étude sur un Dernier Représentant de la Poésie Latine*. Paris: Boivin, 1927.
Teske, R., tr. “Rebuke and Grace,” in *Answer to the Pelagians, 4: To the Monks of Hadrumetum and Provence*. Hyde Park, NY: New City Press, 1999.
Ullmann, Walter, “The Significance of the *Epistola clementis* in the Pseudo-Clementines,” in *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. 11 (1960), 295-317.
Ussher, James. *De Romanae ecclesiae symbolo apostolico vetere*. Oxford, 1660.
Vinzent, M. *Der Ursprung des Apostolikums im Urteil der kritischen Forschung*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006.
Walford, E., tr. *Theodoret of Cyrrhus: A History of the Church*. London: H.G. Bohn, 1854.
Walsh, P.G. “Venantius Fortunatus,” in *The Month* vol. 120 (1960), pp. 292-302.
Weaver, Rebecca. *Divine Grace and Human Agency: A Study of the Semi-Pelagian Controversy*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1996.
———. “Introduction,” in *Grace for Grace*. ed. A. Hwang et al. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2014, xi-xxvi.
Westra, Liuwe. *The Apostles’ Creed: Origin, History, and Some Early Commentaries*. Turnhout: Brepols, 2002.
Whitby, Michael, tr. *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius Scholasticus*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2000.
Wood, Ian. “The Franks and Papal Theology,” in *Crisis of the Oikoumene*. ed. C. Chazelle and C. Cubitt. Turnhout: Brepols, 2007.
Wormald, F. “The Crucifix and the Balance,” in *Journal of the Warburg Institute*, vol. 1 no. 4 (1938), 276-280.
Zarini, Vincent. “L’éloge de l’empereur Justin II et de l’impératrice Sophie chez Corippe et chez Venance Fortunat (*Poèmes*, Appendice, 2),” in *Camenae*, vol. 11 (2012).